UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 107—PART 7

MAY 18, 1961, TO JUNE 7, 1961
(PAGES 8299 TO 9768)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1961

J
11
.R
v.107
pt.7

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 87th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, at noonday, 'mid all the traffic of the ways, we would lift our souls into the light of Thy presence, that our perspectives may be corrected, and our sense of proportion restored, for we confess that often the errors of our fallible judgment grow out of mistaken magnitudes.

Wherever we serve in the great struggle now raging, molding the age to come and determining the world our children's children will inherit, may we be ever mindful that still stands Thine ancient sacrifice—an humble and a contrite heart.

Even out of the wrath of man may there come the reign of God whose alone is the power and glory, and the kingdom of love, which has no frowning frontiers.

We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 17, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1602. An act for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro;

H.R. 6611. An act to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 7035. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to exercise his authority to operate a program, to be known as University Free Cuba, to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes; and

H. Con. Res. 226. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 118. An act for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof;

S. 126. An act for the relief of Edward W. Scott III;

S. 138. An act for the relief of Mico Delic;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Hadji Benlevi;

S. 217. An act for the relief of Alesandro Gellhorn;

S. 285. An act for the relief of Aipo Fransila Crane;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah);

S. 330. An act for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks;

S. 532. An act for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 545. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou;

S. 663. An act for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes);

S. 894. An act for the relief of Captain Ernest Mountain;

S. 1097. An act for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt; and

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1602. An act for the relief of Ido Enrico Cassandro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6611. An act to amend paragraph 1798(c)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 to reduce temporarily the exemption from duty enjoyed by returning residents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 7035. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 209) requesting the President to exercise his authority to operate a program, to be known as University Free Cuba, to provide assistance to certain Cuban refugee students, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas there has long been a bond of friendship between the people of Cuba and the people of the United States dating from the years when the American people did battle for Cuba's freedom; and

Whereas these bonds of friendship, woven in the history of our two countries, and strengthened by our close association as neighbors of similar interest and aspirations, should and will continue as a shield against any alien assault to render these bonds asunder by the propaganda of suspicion and hate; and

Whereas the great goals of freedom set by the Patriot Jose Marti, envisioning a happy and free people governing themselves by the decisions of the ballot box and enjoying unhampered the rights of free speech and press, are just as revered today by the Cuban and American people, for they are the eternal goals of democracy; and

Whereas many thousands of Cubans are now residing in the United States in order to enjoy the individual freedoms which do not exist in their homeland; and

Whereas among these guests in the United States are many students whose education has been interrupted, and many professors from the University of Havana who have fled the tyranny and suppression which have replaced once again the sovereign right of the university to teach and maintain the hard-won freedoms of Jose Marti; and

Whereas the citizens of the United States recognize and esteem education at all levels, particularly the university level where international educational exchange programs have been operated for many years with great success; and

Whereas the aforementioned students, even if able to locate employment in order to continue their studies, will still need additional financial assistance to accomplish this: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President is requested to exercise his authority under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended, and the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, to operate a program to be known as "University Free Cuba", under which assistance in the pursuit of education will be furnished to college students in the United States from Cuba in need of such assistance because of the authoritarian restrictions placed upon the activities of its citizens by the Cuban regime, or because they are refugees in the United States from the present Government of Cuba. It is the sense of the Congress that existing college and university facilities, public or private, be utilized for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the President is requested to encourage the Organization of American States to undertake a study of all possible inter-American educational programs at the university level which might contribute to improved knowledge of inter-American affairs including an examination of the feasibility and desirability of establishing on a permanent basis a "University of the Americas".

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, and for other purposes, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Whereas the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties; and

Whereas Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activity throughout the hemisphere; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty, economic development, and social progress through all the Republics of the hemisphere; and

Whereas the Declaration of Havana of September 2, 1960, was an open attack on the Organization of American States clearly showing that the present Government of Cuba stands in defiance of every proclaimed principle of the inter-American system; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs; and

Whereas representatives of the present Government of Cuba continue to participate in the councils of the Organization of American States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour, for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the happy atmosphere which has been created, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, 2 or 3 days ago I was delighted to have the concurrence of the majority leader when I indicated that I felt constrained, in the public interest, to object to any committee meetings when this very controversial, all-embracing bill is before the Senate for consideration. So, with some sadness of heart, I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the seeming determination of the distinguished minority leader, I shall make one more attempt. This time I shall combine two committees in my request.

I ask unanimous consent that the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in this instance I have a particular interest. I happen to be a member of the distinguished subcommittee to which reference is made. I like to be on hand and hear the testimony as the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] investigates the question of price fixing in the electrical industry.

My distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is also a member of that subcommittee, and I know how grieved he would be if he could not get this testimony firsthand and be present at all the sessions of the subcommittee. So I am sure I speak for him as well as for myself when I say that I must object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The President pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT, RELATING TO INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES BY THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMEASUREMENT OF SMALL VESSELS

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

INCREASE OF PERIOD FOR THE OPERATION OF CERTAIN CONCESSIONS AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039) in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN STATES OF NEW MEXICO AND WYOMING

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of the Federal-aid highway program in the States of New Mexico and Wyoming, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTING, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of property management and accounting, National Institutes of Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, August 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONSTRUCTION PAYMENTS DUE THE UNITED STATES FROM FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on construction payments due the United States from the Fort Sumner Irrigation District, Fort Sumner project, New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR BUREAU OF THE CENSUS TO REIMBURSE BETWEEN ITS OWN APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Bureau of the Census to reimburse between its own appropriations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 21

"Joint resolution deploring the unregulated importation and use in certain American television film productions of foreign-made musical recordings and memorializing Congress to enact corrective legislation

"Whereas the widespread substitution of foreign-made musical recordings for the skills of American musicians in the production of television film programs designed to sell American products to the American consumer is deplorable and deleterious to the future of American music; and

"Whereas the indiscriminate importation of such recordings is a deplorable circumvention of Federal laws designed to protect American musicians from cut-rate competition which contributes nothing to the desirable exchange among nations of genuine musical and artistic expression: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada hereby expresses its condemnation of the unregulated importation of foreign-made musical recordings and the use of such recordings in American television productions; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to enact legislation to correct the abuses resulting from such importation and use; and be it further

"Resolved, That the legislative counsel forthwith prepare and transmit certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada congressional delegation.

"Passed by the senate, March 31, 1961.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. ARMSTRONG,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed by the assembly, March 22, 1961.

"CHESTER S. CHRISTENSEN,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent the designation of any Federal lands in Nevada as primitive or wilderness areas

"Whereas the economy of the State of Nevada is based upon its agriculture, mining, sheep and cattle industries, and the use of its waters for irrigation and related purposes; and

"Whereas more than 86 percent of the land area of the State of Nevada is federally owned; and

"Whereas the designation as wilderness or primitive areas of any of such federally owned lands would restrict the full utilization of natural resources and deny to the natural resources industries of the State of Nevada the right to develop wisely the natural resources contained in such areas within the State, and would also deny ready access to these areas to millions of American citizens, all to the detriment of such industries and to the people of the State of Nevada; and

"Whereas one of the great potential industries of the State of Nevada is its tourist trade and wildlife attractions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of Nevada respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to prevent the designation of any lands in Nevada as primitive or wilderness areas and the creation of locked-up areas for a single-purpose use which would deny to the natural resources industries the right to develop wisely the natural resources of such areas and would be to the detriment of such industries and to the people of the State of Nevada; and be it further

"Resolved, That all agencies administering Federal lands do so with the view of developing the full multiple use of the lands to further the general welfare and the economy of the State of Nevada; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be prepared and transmitted forthwith by the legislative counsel to the Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of Nevada's congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

"Passed by the assembly March 13, 1961.

"CHESTER S. CHRISTENSEN,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

"Passed by the senate March 2, 1961.

"REX BELL,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. ARMSTRONG,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

PROTECTION OF AMERICAN LIVES AND PROPERTY IN CUBA—RESOLUTION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 27, 1961, the Frontier Detachment of the Marine Corps League of Winsted, Conn., adopted a resolution urging that the U.S. Government take every precaution to protect American lives and property in Cuba and, in particular, at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas it has always been the policy of the Government of the United States of America to insure the safety of its citizens at home or abroad, and

Whereas many American civilians and military personnel in Cuba face possible harm, and

Whereas these Americans are entitled to the full protection of the U.S. Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Frontier Detachment, Marine Corps League is officially on record as supporting all measures and policies of our Government which are designed to insure the protection of American lives and property in Cuba; and be it further

Resolved, That particular attention be paid to those Americans fulfilling their duties at the Guantanamo Naval Base; and be it further

Resolved, That in the event an attempt is made by Castro forces to seize control of said base, that the full resources of this Government be marshaled to aid, support and defend these Americans; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to national headquarters, Marine Corps League, Department of Connecticut, Marine Corps League, the Marines magazine for publication, and to the Honorable Senator THOMAS DODD for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1456. A bill to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce (Rept. No. 262).

By Mr. YARBOROUGH, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1222. A bill relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States (Rept. No. 277).

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendmen':

S. 529. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States (Rept. No. 264);

S. 537. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes (Rept. No. 265);

S. 538. A bill to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses (Rept. No. 266);

S. 539. A bill to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (Rept. No. 267);

S. 540. A bill to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 268);

S. 541. A bill to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen (Rept. No. 269);

S. 649. A bill to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office (Rept. No. 270); and

S. 796. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 271).

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1317. A bill to change the designation of that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Hawaii, in the State of Hawaii, to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 272).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 311. An act to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt (Rept. No. 273); and

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco (Rept. No. 274).

By Mr. MILLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 275).

By Mr. CHURCH, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1768. A bill to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and other individual payments of tribal trust funds (Rept. No. 276).

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation (Rept. No. 278).

REPORT ENTITLED "COORDINATION OF INFORMATION ON CURRENT SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT SUPPORTED BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 263)

Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to Senate Resolution 255, sections 1–4, 86th Congress, submitted a report entitled "Coordination of Information on Current Scientific Research and Development Supported by the U.S. Government—Administrative and Scientific Problems and Opportunities of Central Registration of Research Projects in Science and Engineering," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Edward A. McDermott, of Iowa, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization;

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army; and

John H. Rubel, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of one brigadier general, two major generals, and one lieutenant general in the Army, three rear admirals in the Navy, and three brigadier generals and two lieutenant generals in the Air Force, and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations were placed on the Executive Calendar, as follows:

Rear Adm. John W. Crumpacker, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy;

Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart, Regular Air Force, and Maj. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr., Regular Air Force, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Peter Corradi, for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Navy;

Brig. Gen. Joe Calvin Lambert, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), for appointment as the Adjutant General, U.S. Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Webster Anderson, U.S. Army, for appointment as the Quartermaster General, U.S. Army;

Brig. Gen. Julian Alexander Wilson, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), for appointment as major general in the Army of the United States;

Col. Harold W. Ohlke, Regular Air Force, Col. Don S. Wenger, Regular Air Force, medical, and Col. Samuel C. Phillips, Regular Air Force; for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force;

Col. Oscar John Ogren, Dental Corps, for appointment as brigadier general, Dental Corps, in the Regular Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., U.S. Army, for appointment as Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army;

Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general; and

Capt. Louis R. LaPorte, Civil Engineers Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I report favorably 4,900 nominations in the Army in the grade of colonel and below, 3,190 nominations in the Navy and Marine Corps in the grade of commander and captain and below, and 1,470 nominations in the Air Force in the grade of captain and below. Included in these groups are appointments of the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1907. A bill to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 238) to clarify and protect the right of the public to information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. HART, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1908. A bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1909. A bill to amend section 17 of the War Claims Act of 1948 to authorize rehearing of certain claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE):

S. 1910. A bill to provide a pilot plant for the development of the human and natural resources of Indian reservations by providing an incentive to stimulate such development; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HICKEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 1911. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that income derived by an Indian from tribal lands or allotted and restricted Indian lands shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1912. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KEATING:

S.J. Res. 90. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to residence requirements for voting in presidential elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KEATING when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

DESIGNATION OF WEST VIRGINIA WEEK IN COMMEMORATION OF ITS 98TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 149), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas observances are being held throughout the United States this year commemorating the centennial anniversary of the Civil War which tested and strengthened the Union of the States; and

Whereas the State of West Virginia, born of the tragic conflict of the Civil War, observes on June 20 of this year the 98th anniversary of its creation as a State by order of proclamation of President Lincoln; and

Whereas the State of West Virginia provides an actual and symbolic link between the North and the South, and during the years of America's westward expansion was a main artery of trade and commerce between the eastern seaboard and the western frontiers; and

Whereas West Virginia occupies a vital role in providing fuels and timber for American industry, has created a vast modern industrial and chemical complex in its Ohio and Kanawha valleys, and maintains an important position in American glass, pottery and ceramics industries; and

Whereas the citizens of West Virginia are now engaged in an ambitious cooperative program of revitalizing the economy of their State, and modernizing and beautifying their communities, farms and highways to enhance the natural grandeur of our State's scenery for the benefit of all, and

Whereas, during the week of June 18–24, the citizens of West Virginia will be engaged in an active and intense effort through all media of communication to focus attention upon their program of revivifying the social, cultural and economic conditions of their State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the week of June 18–24 be set aside as West Virginia

Week in commemoration of the State's 98th anniversary and in recognition of the continuing contributions of West Virginia to the strength of this National Union.

NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ERADICATION OF HOG CHOLERA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators HICKENLOOPER, MUNDT, YOUNG of North Dakota, HART, EASTLAND, HOLLAND, and MCCARTHY, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to initiate a national program for the eradication of hog cholera.

Of the diseases which confront the hog producers of this country today, hog cholera is considered to be the most serious. This disease is estimated to cost our hog producers an annual loss of over $50 million, including the costs of the vaccination program for its prevention.

In addition to our domestic losses sustained as a result of hog cholera, this disease has also caused a restriction of our exports of pork. Some 11 countries now prohibit or restrict the importation of pork produced in the United States. Equally as important, if not more so, is the fact that we run the risk of having Canada, which is a substantial importer of our pork, place restrictions on our exports if we fail to eliminate this disease.

This disease can be completely eliminated with a concerted national program. This has been vividly demonstrated by Canada which has had a very successful program for years. As a result, Canadian pork producers pay only an average of one-half cent prorated per hog marketed for the entire program, as opposed to a prorated cost of 42 cents per hog sold in the United States for vaccination alone.

Many States have expressed an interest in a national eradication program and have taken active steps to stamp out the disease on their own. It is generally recognized that a Federal program will be needed to control the interstate movement of hogs since such movements of swine could introduce the disease into areas where it had been eradicated.

The program as envisioned under this bill is to be carried out in cooperation with the States on a Federal-State matching basis. Both Federal and State officials would work together in detecting and proving cases of hog cholera. Diseased animals would be condemned by the particular State involved and destroyed. The costs of indemnifying the owners would be shared by the Federal and State Governments on a 50–50 basis.

The proposed bill is self-explanatory, and I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1908) to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to safeguard the health of the swine herds of the Nation, to prevent the spread of hog cholera, to decrease substantially the estimated fifty million dollar annual loss from hog cholera, to expand export markets for pork and pork products now restricted on account of hog cholera, and to otherwise protect the public interest, the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed (1) to initiate a national hog cholera eradication program in cooperation with the several States under the provisions of section 11 of the Act of May 29, 1884, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114a), and related legislation, and (2) to prohibit or restrict, pursuant to the authority vested in him under the provisions of section 2 of the Act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U.S.C. 111), the interstate movement of virulent hog cholera virus or other hog cholera virus to the extent he determines necessary in order to effectuate such eradication program.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to establish an advisory committee composed of (1) eleven members selected from representatives of the swine and related industries, State and local Government agencies, professional and scientific groups, and the general public, and (2) one member selected from the officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture who shall serve as chairman of the Committee. The Committee shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

(b) It shall be the function of the Committee to advise the Secretary with respect to the initiation of the national hog cholera eradication program referred to in the first section of this Act, and with respect to the development of plans and procedures for carrying out such program.

(c) Committee members other than the chairman shall not be deemed to be employees of the United States and shall not be entitled to compensation, but the Secretary is authorized to pay their travel and subsistence expenses (or per diem in lieu thereof) in connection with their attendance at meetings of the committee.

PILOT PLANT FOR DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a pilot plan for the development of the human and natural resources of Indian reservations by providing an incentive to stimulate such development. Many people outside of Government have recognized the obligation the American people owe to the Indian tribes displaced during the time our country was developing its history and the underlying conclusion of those people who are not in Government has been that the most desirable way to rehabilitate the Indian and accept the obligation America owes him is to permit him to participate in the decisions or to make the decisions of how best this can be accomplished.

The bill introduced today comes about because of an agreement entered into between the Shoshoni Indian Tribe and the Arapahoe Indian Tribe on the Wind River Reservation in Wyoming and a Wyoming corporation desiring to test the feasibility of establishing on the reservation an enterprise which will provide substantial employment for the Indian and a part ownership in a corporation which will contribute to the tribal funds which have been sustained by oil royalties that are continually reducing. The philosophy of imposing Government conclusions from the top on the Indians has been compared to feeding castor oil to children. The Indians resist this approach and many of the other American citizens resist it and feel that the will of the Indian himself is the only solution to rehabilitating him in the manner he truly deserves. Therefore, it is our hope that this bill will be seriously considered as a new approach to satisfying the obligation so many Americans feel to the race of people who have been displaced during the growth and development of our great Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1910) to provide a pilot plant for the development of the human and natural resources of Indian Reservations by providing an incentive to stimulate such development, introduced by Mr. HICKEY (for himself and Mr. MCGEE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING IN PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, an amendment to the Constitution setting a maximum residence requirement for voting in presidential elections. I want to make it absolutely clear that my amendment applies only to presidential elections. It does not apply to State or local elections or to elections for the Senate or House of Representatives.

This resolution is a maximum. It would not bind the States except to say that they cannot have a residence requirement which exceeds 90 days for presidential elections. Many States and election districts already have adopted residence requirements lower than 90 days for presidential elections. I think this is desirable, and I am hopeful that, with few exceptions, all States and political subdivisions will be able to set their residence requirements for new voters well below 90 days for presidential elections.

On the basis of a survey of Governors on State and local residence requirements whic' I recently concluded, I am well aware that most State chief executives believe residence requirements for voting are and should be solely within the jurisdiction of the States. While I agree with them on the fundamental jurisdictional issue, I am afraid that there are some States and areas in which residence requirements will never be liberalized unless some minimal Federal action is taken. I believe that my

amendment, which applies just to presidential elections, represents a reasonable and workable solution, without at the same time infringing unduly upon the prerogatives and responsibilities of the States.

I make no bones of the fact that this amendment would not do the whole job. While 90 days may be a reasonable requirement for new residents, I would prefer to see this kind of a requirement combined with liberalized absentee ballot rules permitting new residents who do not meet the 90-day requirement to vote absentee in their States of former residence. Governor Rockefeller recently proposed that this combined approach be adopted in New York. However, in the interest of expediting some practical and constructive Federal action in this area. I feel that the 90-day requirement by itself is a worthwhile innovation.

I am extremely hopeful that at the forthcoming hearings on the constitutional amendments relating to electoral reforms of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee careful and serious study will be given to my proposal.

There is nothing so precious in a democracy as the right to vote. Protecting and strengthening this right is one of the most important obligations of government. In my mind, there is no question that something must be done to help the approximately 8 million loyal and interested American citizens who because they move from one place to another shortly prior to an election are prevented from voting for the holders of national offices.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the joint resolution printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary analysis which I have prepared on residence requirements for voting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and summary analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 90) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to residence requirements for voting in presidential elections, introduced by Mr. KEATING, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No citizen of the United States who is otherwise qualified to vote in any election held in any State for the purpose, in whole or in part, of choosing electors of President and Vice President shall be denied the right to vote for such electors in such election because of any residence requirement imposed by such State if such citizen has resided in such State, or the political subdivision thereof with respect to which the requirement applies, for a period of at least ninety days preceding such election.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

The summary analysis presented by Mr. KEATING is as follows:

SUMMARY MEMO ON RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

All States now require more than 90 days' residence for State and local offices, but some make an exception for presidential elections. For example: Wisconsin, 10 days; Ohio, 40 days; California, 54 days; Missouri, 60 days; 6 States have legislation pending to liberalize residence requirements for presidential elections, including New York, 30 days; 12 other Governors have said that they favor this approach. President Kennedy has proposed 90 days in the District of Columbia.

New York at present: State, 1 year; county, 4 months; election district, 30 days. Governor Rockefeller proposes: State, 6 months; county, 3 months; district, 30 days; President and Vice President only, 30 days; absentee, for 1 year, a former resident can vote absentee in New York, if he is not otherwise qualified in his new State of residence (Connecticut approach).

Present State requirements (50 States): 2 years in 3 States; 1 year in 35 States; 6 months in 12 States.

Absentee ballots permitted former residents for President and Vice President: Connecticut, 2 years after leaving State; Vermont, 15 months after leaving State.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO FILE REPORT ON HOUSING BILL—MINORITY OR INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Saturday night to file a report on the housing bill, and that any minority or individual views may be included therein.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CLARK submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. PROUTY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. SCOTT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1021, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961 — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AMENDMENT

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] may be added as a cosponsor of my amendment to Senate bill, S. 1021, the Education Assistance Act of 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROFESSIONAL TEAM SPORTS AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 11, 1961, the names of Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. WILEY and Mr. LONG of Missouri, were added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1856) to limit the applicability of the antitrust laws so as to exempt certain aspects of designated professional team sports, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators) on May 11, 1961.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS ON RESOLUTIONS EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 1, 2, 3, AND 4

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to make the following announcement: The Committee on Government Operations has scheduled hearings on Senate Resolutions 148, 147, 142, and 143, expressing disapproval of Reorganization Plans No. 1, SEC; No. 2, FCC; No. 2, CAB; and No. 4, FTC, of 1961, for June 6 and 7, 1961.

Because the committees which exercise legislative oversight over the regulatory agencies which are the subjects of the plans have a special interest in these agencies, I requested the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Commerce to let the Committee on Government Operations have the benefit of their views and recommendations on the resolutions of disapproval. Following this request, I have been advised that the Committee on Banking and Currency has scheduled hearings on Plan No. 1, SEC, for May 23, 24, and 25, and the Committee on Commerce has scheduled hearings on Plan No. 2, FCC, for May 23, 1961, and on Plan No. 3, CAB, for June 8, 1961.

It is expected that following their hearings these committees will submit their views and recommendations to the Committee on Government Operations, for the benefit of its members in their consideration of the pending resolutions of disapproval.

I suggest that any Senator who desires to be heard on these resolutions let us

know in advance, if possible, in order that a convenient time may be arranged to hear him.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL before the annual banquet of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, Los Angeles, May 13, 1961, entitled "Free Peoples Need To Stand Up and Be Counted."

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATORS JAVITS AND KEATING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may anticipate the distinguished minority leader, I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that today is the birthday anniversary of the two distinguished Senators from New York State, Hon. JACOB JAVITS and Hon. KENNETH KEATING.

I congratulate and commend them on this happy occasion, although it becomes less happy as we become more advanced in years.

In my opinion they are extremely diligent Senators. They are always on the job. They are active legislatively; and I think they represent their party and their State extremely well.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I should go a step further. I not only congratulate the two Senators, but I congratulate the Empire State of New York for being so ably and conscientiously represented in the U.S. Senate.

These Senators have brought to their task diligence, discernment, and a dedicated spirit, as evidenced by the fact that invariably they are at their posts. They are devoted to the work which they do on committees. In that respect I speak with some authority, for I serve on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and I serve on the Judiciary Committee with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

I trust that the great populace of New York State can hear these feeble words. May they take wings and go all over the State, when I say that the people of the State are to be congratulated on the discernment with which they chose when they selected these two great Senators.

BIRTHDAY CONGRATULATIONS TO SENATORS WILLIAMS AND BOGGS, OF DELAWARE, AND BUSH, OF CONNECTICUT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, having alluded to the birthday anniversaries of the two distinguished Senators from New York, my attention has been called to the fact that this week there were three other birthday anniversaries on the minority side. The minority is rich in birthday anniversaries this week. The list includes the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the distinguished junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], and the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

It is rather interesting to note that these birthday anniversaries come so close together, for both the two distinguished Senators from New York and the two distinguished Senators from Delaware.

All of them merit our heartiest congratulations. I reiterate what I previously said, that their States are to be congratulated on the selections they have made. May such discernment continue for a long time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I join with the Senator from Illinois, and express the hope that, with age, will come greater wisdom.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT INFORMATION POLICIES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a statement I placed in the RECORD May 16 referred to a deletion, by someone in the Department of Defense, of testimony in the galley proof of a hearing held before the Armed Services Committee, the transcript of which testimony had previously been cleared for security by the Defense Department.

When this deletion became known, on May 9 I wrote to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, Arthur Sylvester.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter to Mr. Sylvester be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 9, 1961.

Hon. ARTHUR SYLVESTER,
Assistant Secretary of Defense,
The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Confirming our conversation, I am totally at a loss to find out why certain items incident to a shift in position were taken out of the galley proof after having been passed for security by the Department of Defense in the transcript.

I would appreciate your reading this carefully—am confident much of it has nothing whatever to do with security—and would also appreciate your editing same to let me know what could be made part of the public record.

With high regard, I am

Sincerely yours,

STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to report to the Senate this morning that I have now received a letter from Secretary Sylvester which states that the testimony in question is being declassified for publication; and I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Sylvester's letter, dated May 16, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR SYMINGTON: This is in response to your letter of May 9 questioning the elimination of testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee from the galley proof that had been passed for security in the transcript.

The material was originally cleared on the recommendation of a reviewing officer who felt there was nothing objectionable on the grounds of security. A different reviewing officer, in handling the galley proof of the same material, felt that there was objection on the grounds of security. These two contrary views indicated that the subject matter is in the so-called gray area.

I have personally reviewed the material and have concluded the case is a marginal one. Therefore, I have decided to restore the testimony in the galley proof beginning with the word "restore" and ending with the words "end of restoration."

Sincerely,

ARTHUR SYLVESTER.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate very much this fine cooperation from Mr. Sylvester. I am requesting that the testimony in question be published by the committee.

Apparently there is now to be a real effort to at least curtail the steady stream of unilateral propaganda emanating from the various military installations supported by all three services, in this country and around the globe.

In this connection, it is refreshing to note that Secretary McNamara apparently intends to have the Department of Defense operated in accordance with the Constitution, in that he intends to have the proper civilian heads make the broad policy decisions, instead of having those decisions supplied by the military.

Citizens who are interested in both the security and solvency of the country can only be gratified by this development.

THE OVERSEAS WEEKLY

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, we have heard much of Gen. Edwin A. Walker's troubles. A very enlightening article entitled "The Overseas Weekly," written by George E. Sokolsky, was published in the Washington Post of May 16, 1961. Among other things, Mr. Sokolsky had this to say:

Who has set this newspaper up as an agency to monitor the thinking and the expression of thought of officers in the American Army? Surely this episode calls for an investigation by a congressional committee to discover what really happened in the Walker incident. Was the general committing an offense, or was he persecuted for loyalty?

This article happens to coincide with my views, and I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE OVERSEAS WEEKLY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Having read of Gen. Edwin A. Walker's troubles, I thought it might be well to have a look at the Overseas Weekly which was responsible for the fracas. The newspaper accused the general, in effect, of brainwashing American troops with American doctrines.

I got two copies of this newspaper which says that it is "a touch of home away from home." So, it is full of pictures of bosomy girls. On page 3, I came upon the General Walker story. The newspaper asserts that

the general is to be investigated because the Overseas Weekly accused him of exposing American troops, "to the philosophy of the controversial John Birch Society." The Weekly itself reports that General Walker had referred to it as, "immoral, unscrupulous, corrupt and destructive."

Men may differ as to policies and ideas, but no law forbids anyone from joining the John Birch Society or from advocating its policies. This organization does not propose to overthrow the American Government by force and violence. The issue of the Overseas Weekly at which I am looking gives the impression that membership in this society is a crime of sorts.

The principle set forth by this newspaper is embodied in this sentence.

"We don't pretend to know how to operate militarily and we have never thought we had a right to dictate the thought of others. No man has a right to do harm to another human being."

This is utter nonsense. This country is engaged in war with the Soviet universal state. This country is doctrinally opposed to communism. Every Communist is an enemy of the United States. It is the function of every official of the United States to dig out those who advocate communism and to drive them out of the Armed Forces.

The theory that the editors of the Overseas Weekly may say what they please but not the general responsible for the physical, mental and moral being of the troops is nonsense.

The tone of the paper may best be described by two pictures on page 28 of a German girl hardly clothed. The caption reads:

"Angelika Gesemann, Miss Hesse of 1960, is an aspiring 21-year-old actress whose favorite pastimes are traveling and meeting wealthy men. Sounds coldblooded? Well * * *"

Is this news from home?

The Overseas Weekly states its purpose in this instance:

"But it is the responsibility of this newspaper to bring to public attention any Government official in uniform who uses his power and authority, Government means of communication to influence or dictate the beliefs of subordinates.

"It is furthermore our responsibility to point out officials who propagate beliefs in direct opposition to those upheld by the duly elected leaders.

"These points, we believe, are important in considering the situation at the 24th Infantry Division."

Who has set this newspaper up as an agency to monitor the thinking and the expression of thought of officers in the American Army? Surely this episode calls for an investigation by a congressional committee to discover what really happened in the Walker incident. Was the general committing an offense or was he persecuted for loyalty?

THE URANIUM PROGRAM—SPEECH BY JESSE C. JOHNSON, DIRECTOR, DIVISION OF RAW MATERIALS, U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, it is my delightful privilege to call to the attention of the U.S. Senate the outstanding work accomplished by Jesse Johnson, a native of my home State of Washington, as Director of the Division of Raw Materials for the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

Last week Mr. Johnson was awarded the third Ambrose Monell Medal for distinguished achievement in mineral technology. The award consisted of a gold medal and a cash prize—given for the first time—of $25,000, and was made May 12 at Columbia University.

Seldom has a public servant been recognized in this manner, and I am confident his recognition will serve as an inspiration to all career public officials.

Mr. Johnson was born in Clallam, Wash., February 22, 1894. It has been my privilege to know him for a great many years, as well as his charming wife, Alice, the gifted reporter here in the Nation's Capital for the Seattle Daily Times.

After earning his bachelor of science degree in mining engineering and geology from the University of Washington in 1919, Mr. Johnson practiced as a consulting mining engineer in Seattle. Since 1942, he has been in Government service, first as an engineer, then chief engineer and deputy director in charge of domestic and foreign metal procurement with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In 1948, Mr. Johnson joined the AEC. He has received many honors, including the Distinguished Service Award of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Chemical Engineering Award of the American Institute of Chemical Engineers.

Under his direction, the Division of Raw Materials has been credited with developing the expansion of uranium resources available to the United States, introducing advanced techniques responsible for the extraction of uranium ore in the United States and Canada, as well as in the original large producing areas in the Belgian Congo and the Union of South Africa.

The citation for Mr. Johnson pointed out:

> Never in the history of mining and metallurgy has a scarce metal suddenly become so important to the defense of the free world as uranium became after the successful development of the atomic weapons and never has a challenge of meeting the exceedingly great demands for such metal been so successfully met in such a short period of time.

Not only has Mr. Johnson done an outstanding job technologically, he also has been one of our Nation's most skilled and successful ambassadors of good will. His work has been marked by an unusual degree of cooperation with his counterparts from the Governments of Canada, Great Britain, Australia, South Africa, the Belgian Congo, and Portugal.

Mr. Johnson has represented the United States at several international conferences. In 1946 he was adviser to the U.S. delegation, International Tin Conference. In 1955, and again in 1958, he was adviser to the U.S. delegation, International Conference for Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, and in 1960 he was Chairman of the International Conference on Uranium Resources and Possibilities.

In his speech accepting the Ambrose Monell Medal Award, Mr. Johnson spoke with great authority on the development of the uranium industry and its future outlook. Because of the importance of his remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have this speech printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE URANIUM PROGRAM—THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INDUSTRY AND THE FUTURE OUTLOOK

(By Jesse C. Johnson, Director, Division of Raw Materials U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, upon receipt of the Ambrose Monell Medal Award at Columbia University, May 12, 1961)

I am deeply grateful for the distinguished honor of having been selected as a recipient of the Ambrose Monell Medal Award. However, in accepting this award, I do so with full appreciation of the fact that the success of the uranium program has been due to the efforts of the mining industry—the prospectors and geologists, the small operators and the large companies. I take this occasion to pay tribute to the mining industry of this country, of Canada, of Belgian Congo, of South Africa, of Australia, and of Portugal.

The uranium supplied by these countries enabled the United States to maintain its lead in nuclear weapons at a most critical period in our history. Our possession of these weapons in quantity has been a dominant factor in maintaining peace and in preserving the freedom of the Western World.

No single material ever has been so essential to our safety, or even to our survival, as uranium. In 1947, when the newly established Atomic Energy Commission first studied the program it was to administer, scarcity of uranium loomed as a major problem. Military requirements—and they were small compared to those of a few years later—could not be met from existing sources of supply. More than 90 percent of our uranium then came from the Belgian Congo and most of the remainder from a small mine in Arctic Canada. Both mines since have been exhausted.

Except for South African gold tailings and the low-grade domestic shale and phosphate deposits, there were no known uranium deposits which could supply the projected military requirements. The only commercial source of uranium in the United States was the small vanadium-uranium sedimentary-type deposits of the Colorado Plateau. Reserves then were estimated at about 1 million tons of ore containing less than 2,500 tons of uranium oxide. The possibility of developing any large tonnage of such ores was considered remote. The hope for important low-cost domestic production was thought to depend upon discovery of vein or lode-type deposits rather than the sedimentary-type deposits which since have proved to be the world's most important source of uranium.

During the early period of scarcity, it appeared that large-scale recovery of uranium from low-grade shales would be necessary to meet military requirements. Research and development projects were undertaken even though the cost of uranium might be from $40 to $60 a pound of oxide. Recovery of uranium from sea water also was suggested.

The best available information at the time indicated that any large use of nuclear power would have to depend for fuel upon these low-grade sources. Consequently, those looking forward to the development of atomic power as a major source of industrial energy were faced with the prospect of such high-cost fuel that breeder reactors would be necessary to achieve competitive power. Although the breeder reactor still is a long-range goal, the technical difficulties in developing such a reactor would have greatly delayed the advent of nuclear power.

Let me quote a few sentences from a memorandum on atomic power prepared in

October 1947, by Dr. I. I. Rabi and Dr. J. R. Oppenheimer.

"In order to make atomic power available on the scale of present power consumption, one of two things, and probably both, need to occur. One is the development of means of mining and recovery of uranium from deposits presently regarded as unworkable. This problem is of more than usual difficulty, because the uranium deposits so far known to us fall either in the class of high-grade deposits, which are quite limited in their known occurrence, and whose product probably will not exceed a few thousand tons a year as an average for the next decade, or in the class of very lean deposits involving typically a few parts in 10,000 of uranium. It is in these latter that the technical progress is required, not only in finding methods for obtaining the uranium, but in conducting operations cheaply enough so that the cost of the fuel is not itself prohibitive. Such a program might aim at providing 10,000 tons of uranium a year for the United States, rather unpredictably far in the future."

And again I quote:

"Thus, the fuel problem probably will be solved on the basis (a) of exploiting new, low-grade sources of ore, and (b) of increasing the effective energy extractable from a pound of uranium by a factor of some 100, and of including thorium among the materials which can eventually be consumed. With great progress in either, or reasonable progress in both, of these lines, atomic power will be available on a large scale."

This was the outlook in 1947.

An urgent military requirement and an inadequate source of supply determined the pattern of the uranium program.

The instructions were to develop additional uranium production wherever available and as soon as possible, preferably in this country or in Canada. The long transport from central Africa, our major source at the time, was a matter of constant concern.

The domestic uranium program announced in April 1948, involved a major policy decision. In 1947 the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission were cloaked in strictest secrecy. Nearly all operations were conducted directly by the AEC or by fixed-fee contractors. Practically no private commercial-type operations were to be found in the entire field of atomic energy. There were early discussions about forming a contractor-operated company to undertake uranium exploration, development, and production. Fortunately, the decision was to encourage private industry to do the job by providing a favorable market—the incentive that has been responsible for nearly all mineral development.

The Congress in drafting the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 wisely anticipated the needs of the program by providing the Commission with necessary authority. This rather unusual authority is contained in section 5 of that act which, among other things, states:

"The Commission may establish guaranteed prices for all source materials delivered to it within a specified time."

This has been the Commission's authority for long-range uranium purchase programs.

Before the new uranium program could become operative it was necessary to balance security against the practical requirements of an effective uranium program. In 1947 documents referring to quantities of uranium, and even uranium assays of ore, were classified. Under such a restriction a uranium miner would have had to obtain a security clearance and be in possession of a safe approved for classified documents before he could receive a settlement sheet for the ore he sold to a mill.

Sufficient information was declassified to initiate the program but uranium production was of such military importance that production statistics and ore reserve data were not made public until 1956. The Commission's current and projected uranium requirements are still classified because most of the uranium is used for military purposes. Yet the AEC is the principal customer for an industry, domestic and foreign, which has invested nearly $1 billion of private capital in uranium mines and mills.

This estimate does not include the cost of finding ore. Thousands engaged in the search for uranium, and the cost of the search is a part of the cost of the final product. Only the relatively few who are successful in making valuable discoveries recover their exploration costs. The losses of the others are rarely recorded in the balance sheet of the industry as a whole. High risks are accepted only because of chances for commensurate profits. Without hope of substantial profits, there would have been no major uranium prospecting effort.

The search for uranium involved risks that were high even by the standards of the mining industry. Prior to 1950 few large deposits of commercial grade had been found anywhere in the world; little was known about the geology or the nature of uranium occurrences; less about uranium metallurgy. Except for the limited periods covered by the Government contracts and buying programs, the market itself was uncertain.

Offsetting these unfavorable factors were a widespread interest in atomic energy and the glamour associated with it. Also, it appeared to many that prospecting for uranium had been made easy by radiation detection instruments, such as the Geiger counter and the scintillometer. The Geiger counter did enable a novice to become an effective prospector for surface outcrops. However, many of our more important deposits showed little or no surface evidence. As in the case of exploration for other minerals, geological knowledge came to play an increasingly important role in uranium discoveries.

Progress was slow both in this country and in Canada until several important discoveries in 1952 and 1953 touched off a veritable uranium boom. Despite these discoveries, the fear of a possible uranium shortage continued until 1957. Production did not reach the required level until later. Although substantial reserves had been developed in Canada, at the end of 1955 our own reserves were small even in relation to our short-term requirements.

The surge of prospecting and development drilling in 1956 and 1957 quickly changed the domestic outlook. The prospects of greatly increased production and the reappraisal of requirements, including a more realistic forecast of nuclear power development, made it necessary in 1957 and 1958 for the AEC to limit its uranium procurement.

The task of suddenly reversing the trend and reducing the level of production presented difficult new problems. However, most of the adjustments now have been completed with reasonably satisfactory results and with a minimum dislocation of industry. The current level of AEC procurement has been reduced by negotiated stretch-out arrangements. Furthermore, limitations have been placed on new purchases under the 1962–66 domestic procurement program which had been announced in 1956.

From the initiation of the uranium program early in 1948, domestic production increased from less than 100 tons to nearly 18,000 tons of oxide per year; Canadian production from 250 tons to 15,500 tons; and South Africa, which first became a uranium producer in 1952, built its annual output to more than 6,000 tons. Although Congo production declined, additional uranium production was developed in Australia and Portugal. The AEC purchases from all sources increased from about 2,000 tons of oxide in 1948 to 35,000 tons in 1959. A portion of the oversea and Canadian uranium production is purchased by the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority.

About 80 percent of our uranium now comes from deposits discovered less than 15 years ago. The remaining 20 percent is from deposits which were known in 1948 but either had not been explored or required the development of an economic metallurgical process. The South African gold tailings were in the last category.

The speed with which uranium production was developed when so much depended upon new discoveries represents an outstanding accomplishment by the mining industry.

However, during most of the program there was constant pressure for more uranium. Huge construction programs were underway at Oak Ridge, Hanford, Savannah River, Paducah, and Portsmouth. We were never sure that sufficient uranium would be available in time to meet the expanded requirements. Nevertheless, there is good reason to believe that during the buildup of atomic weapons this country always had a greater supply of uranium than any other country. Today we are in a position to meet any foreseeable military requirement.

The expenditures for military and industrial operations which depend upon uranium provide a measure of the size of these operations and also an indicator of the importance of uranium.

Approximately $26 billion have been spent on the military and civilian atomic energy programs of the AEC and its predecessor, the Manhattan Engineer District. These expenditures cover research and development, construction of facilities, and operations, including about $3.4 billion for acquisition of uranium.

The missile program, which would be futile without nuclear warheads, has cost in excess of $22 billion. Nuclear submarines, completed and authorized, will cost about $5.5 billion.

Currently, this Government is spending more than $8 billion a year for military and civilian programs which involve the application or the development of nuclear energy.

Military requirements still take most of the uranium production. Military programs always are uncertain and this is particularly true with respect to the requirement for uranium. Since 1942 the United States has purchased about 192,000 tons of oxide. A relatively small quantity has been consumed. Fissionable material does not deteriorate and that used in the older weapons may be refabricated for newer types.

Although major emphasis has been on the military aspects of atomic energy, large sums have been devoted to developing the peaceful uses of the atom. We already are reaping extensive benefits from the use of radioactive isotopes in medicine, agriculture, and industry.

As diagnostic and medical research tools, radioactive compounds dramatically are advancing medical science. They are contributing materially to our understanding of physiological processes and to our ability to relieve misery and suffering. Such benefits cannot be assessed in terms of dollars.

In the field of agriculture, studies with radioactive isotopes involving plant assimilation of fertilizers, the use of insecticides, plant genetics, and methods of pest control offer promise of helping to grow more food, more cheaply, on less land. In a world undergoing a population explosion it is possible that agricultural applications may yield the most important single benefit derived from atomic energy.

The application of isotopes to many industrial processes is helping to make cheaper and better products—and we have barely begun to take advantage of the possibilities. Isotopes will provide reliable small power

sources for unmanned navigation aids, radiobeacons, as well as long-lived auxiliary power sources for space vehicles. Although the benefits to be derived from isotopes are significant and continuing their production does not contribute measurably to the market for uranium.

The future of the uranium industry depends upon the development of nuclear power for industrial uses and for propulsion. Much remains to be accomplished before nuclear energy will be competitive for a large share of the world's power market. However, the problem is being attacked on a broad front, with one of the greatest concentrations of effort ever brought to bear upon a single technological field.

Present forecasts indicate that non-Communist countries will spend between $8 billion and $11 billion on atomic power development during the next 10 years. Nearly half of this amount will be spent for research and development and prototype plants. The remainder will be spent for construction of large power stations.

The United States—Government and industry—has mapped a 10-year program for research and development and construction of commercial powerplants which may cost between $2 billion and $3 billion.

The British program, though revised downward, still calls for construction before 1970 of commercial power stations having an electrical capacity of 5 million kilowatts and involving an expenditure of nearly $3 billion. In support of this construction effort, the British are expected to spend about $1 billion on nuclear-power research and development.

Other European countries, including member states of Euratom, according to current estimates, are expected to spend from $2 to $3 billion for research and development and commercial plant construction by 1970. The atomic power projects of Canada, Brazil, India, and Japan, together with the research and development programs of these and the many other countries working on atomic power, may add another $1 to $2 billion.

The U.S. Atomic Energy Commission already has spent about $3.5 billion on reactor development. This covers research and development on both military and civilian reactors, construction and operation of research reactors and construction and operation of prototype power reactors. Not included is the cost of operational military reactors such as those installed in nuclear submarines.

American industry has spent approximately $400 million on nuclear-power projects and related research and development. The completion of nuclear powerplants under construction at the end of 1960 by the utilities industry will involve an additional expenditure of nearly $200 million. All these plants are scheduled for operation prior to the end of 1966. By that time, installed nuclear capacity will be further increased by the construction of plants now in the design or planning stage.

These past and projected expenditures are convincing evidence of the need for nuclear power and of the confidence that technical and economic problems will be solved.

Technical progress has been rapid. Only 10 years ago electricity produced from nuclear energy was used for the first time to light an electric bulb—an achievement heralded as a milestone in the development of nuclear power. Since then nuclear powerplants have generated billions of kilowatt hours of electrical energy. A fleet of nuclear submarines has cruised safely hundreds of thousands of miles—to be precise, 1,176,537 nautical miles as of midnight March 31 of this year.

We are now in the next stage of development—to produce nuclear power at costs which will be competitive in large industrial markets. The big question is, How close are we to this goal?

Large power stations now coming into operation, and those scheduled for operation during the next few years, should show our capabilities with present technology and point to improvements for reducing power costs. It should be remembered that no nuclear powerplant in operation was built to produce competitive power. The principal purpose has been to develop technical information and operating experience. However, the new plants have been designed with emphasis on reducing power costs as well as on technical and engineering improvements.

By 1966, the nuclear-power stations operating in non-Communist countries will have a total electrical capacity of approximately 6 million kilowatts. Additional capacity will be in operation prior to 1970 as a result of plans now being developed. About one-quarter of the firm capacity will be in the United States. These estimates do not take into account byproduct power from plutonium-producing reactors, such as the British Calder Hall reactors or the dual-purpose reactor at Hanford recently proposed by the President.

In the 6 years, January 1, 1961 through December 31, 1966, the AEC will purchase approximately 100,000 tons of uranium oxide from domestic producers—an average of about 16,500 tons a year. In the same period, the total uranium requirement for U.S. civilian and military power reactors, those now in operation and those authorized is estimated at 9,000 tons of oxide. The Commission also has commitments to supply about 1,000 tons of enriched fuel for certain foreign reactors. Thus, the total AEC uranium requirement for power in this 6-year period is about 10,000 tons of oxide, or less than 2,000 tons a year. The United Kingdom, which has the largest authorized nuclear-power program in Europe, has more than sufficient uranium under contract to cover its projected requirements through 1967.

It is evident that requirements for nuclear fuel are not likely to increase rapidly before 1970. But, the operating experience and cost data obtained in the 1960's could point to a major growth of nuclear power in the 1970–80 decade. In the latter half of that period uranium requirements for power should be substantial.

The principal concern of the domestic uranium industry today is the problem of survival during the years immediately following 1966. There still may be a substantial military market. I do not intend to suggest that the military market may be nearing an end, because I do not know. However, as I have said earlier, the duration of this market is uncertain, except to fuel-propulsion reactors. The space age, of course, may bring new uses for nuclear power. Nuclear-propulsion engines for space vehicles already are under development.

In a new industry, based upon a new technology, there always is the chance of a major technical breakthrough. Within the past month a research physicist of a leading American company spoke of a "thermionic converter" which might make nuclear power one-third more efficient than coal-fired plants. Any new development, however, could have little effect upon the uranium market for at least 10 years. Reliable information on power costs, based upon several years of operating experience, must be available before nuclear power will be considered for a major role in a utility system.

Nuclear-power development, however, already has progressed to the stage of commercial application. Major technological breakthroughs, though desirable in any field, no longer are essential. The problem now is to increase the field for commercial application by reducing nuclear-power costs. The opportunities for technical and engineering improvements are great. We can look forward with confidence to steady, and possibly rapid, progress as we gain experience from the design, construction, and operation of the large nuclear-power stations already assured.

The long-range outlook for the uranium industry is bright—of this I am certain. The intermediate period may be difficult but difficulties have been, and can be, overcome. I still am an optimist.

SUPPORT OF JAVITS-COOPER AMENDMENT TO FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am a supporter of the Javits-Cooper amendment. I support it because it provides a far more acceptable formula for distributing Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries than the committee bill.

I was led to this position, first, by the problem of my own State of Connecticut and, second, by my concern for the national picture.

The committee bill provides only $9.26 for each Connecticut school-age child, the lowest amount granted to any State under the committee bill. At the present time, the average educational expenditure per child in Connecticut is around $420. Action pending before the State legislature will raise that figure to about $450, and local action in many of our 169 communities will raise that figure closer to the $500 mark.

Against these figures, the $9.26 per school-age child provided by the committee bill is insignificant. It will scarcely make a dent in the educational problem of Connecticut. And to get this marginal aid, the taxpayers of Connecticut will be required to spend several dollars in Federal taxes for each dollar of aid they receive.

As a small sweetener, the committee bill permits private and parochial schoolchildren, which number about 18 percent of Connecticut's school population, to be counted for Federal-aid purposes. The private and parochial schools, of course, will not receive this money. Their children will merely be used as justification for raising the total which goes to the public schools.

This violates basic equity since it provides Federal money to States for financing education for which the States bear no expense. And it adds insult to injury to parents of private and parochial schoolchildren who not only receive no aid, but also find their great effort and sacrifice recognized only as a basis for increased aid to public schools.

Under the committee bill, Connecticut is at the bottom of the list in aid received, and at the top of the list in taxes paid to finance this aid.

Connecticut, though it has many serious economic problems and around 80,000 unemployed, ranks as the most prosperous State in the Union. I am, of course, happy about this. Our relative prosperity does not arise because we have any unusual natural resources.

We have practically no natural resources. The prosperity of Connecticut has been built over long decades by the thrift, ingenuity, know-how, and hard work of its people. And frankly, our people are getting a little tired of having their achievement used as a basis for discrimination in a variety of Federal programs.

I have voted on occasion for programs which tax Connecticut citizens disproportionately for the benefit of other sections of the country. I have done it because this is one country, one people, with one common cause. I believe that when we help Americans anywhere, if the program is reasonable, we help Americans everywhere.

Because of Connecticut's high standing in personal income, the people of our State stand to be taxed more for Federal programs than any other State. There are many programs of vital interest to the Nation such as conservation, agriculture, public power, reclamation, irrigation, and others which by their nature have little application to Connecticut. Yet we are willing to support these programs with our tax dollars because they are important to the Nation and Connecticut is a part of the Nation.

But we have before us today a problem which does apply to Connecticut. Our State, like other States, needs help in the field of education and it is entitled to get that help on an equal basis with other States.

Even if the allowance per schoolchild was the same in every State, Connecticut would still be giving more than it gets because of its high income position. But on top of this inherent disproportion, there has been added a discriminatory formula under which Connecticut receives the least though it pays the most. This is unfair.

The Javits-Cooper amendment provides a reasonable formula for dealing fairly with all States and dealing adequately at the same time with the national interest. It provides a basic payment of $20 per pupil to all States. It does not abuse commonsense by paying the public school system for the expenses borne by private and parochial schools. And for the several States which, because of their relative poverty, have special educational problems, the amendment provides extra money.

This is a formula that I can support. Under it Connecticut would receive almost $8.4 million as opposed to the $5.2 million under the committee bill. And as a matter of principle, it would treat Connecticut on an equal basis with most other States, making special allowances for the grave problems of the States least able to help themselves.

I congratulate my colleagues for offering this amendment, and I am privileged to join with them in its support.

NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST THREAT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, yesterday's Washington Evening Star carried an article by the distinguished columnist, William S. White, which was one of the finest nutshell summaries I have seen of the crisis we face.

Mr. White describes as neopacifists and neoisolationists those who today argue that we cannot do anything about Cuba, that we cannot do anything about Laos, that we ought not to be involved in Quemoy or Matsu, that we should try to gracefully withdraw from the Berlin situation. He describes these groups as the real descendants of the America Firsters and the isolationists of 20 years ago.

Mr. White points out that the neoisolationists and the neopacifists are far more influential and, therefore, far more dangerous, than their forebears in the late 1930's, because their arguments are less frank and more subtle.

Whether our country will succeed or fail, in my judgment, depends in large measure on whether our Government, our press, and our universities can free themselves of the influence of these latter-day pacifists.

I ask unanimous consent that the column by William S. White, appearing in the Evening Star of May 17, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST THREAT—GROUP SEEN PERILING NATION IN DELUSION THAT ALL FORCE, EVEN FOR RIGHT, IS EVIL

(By William S. White)

American foreign policy stands at the most fateful crossroads since the old isolationists and pacificists narrowly failed two decades ago to prevent this country from joining in the resistance to the Nazis and Fascists.

This movement honestly believed itself dedicated to "peace" and to America First. But had it had its way America would have finished not first but rather third—the third victim, after Britain and France, of an antihuman force centered in Adolf Hitler.

Now there has arisen to frightening influence a new American isolationism, a new American pacifism, which may well destroy the capacity of the United States to resist the equally antihuman force of international communism.

In one way, indeed, the danger is greater now than then. For the old isolationists, the old pacifists, at least did not deny their isolationism, their pacifism. But the new isolationism will not acknowledge itself for what it is. The new pacifism will not admit, even to itself, that the inevitable end of its reasoning is the surrender of one anti-Communist position after another until there will be at last no place for the West to turn and stand its ground.

Instead, the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, put the plain meaning of their policies under a bland, superior cloud of self-deluding talky-talk. They do not simply say flatly that we should take no risk in this world—not in Cuba, not in Laos, not anywhere—and let it go at that.

With that kind of candor, the issues could at any rate be met head-on. Rather, they argue, for example, simply that Cuba is not really a threat to the United States, in spite of the public alliance with the Soviet bloc publicly proclaimed by Fidel Castro. Cuba is only "peripheral," though Cuba lies 90 miles from the American shoreline and though for the first time in our nationhood an aggressive international power has an undeniable lodgment in this hemisphere.

So it is with Laos. Laos is not really worth any risk, either. We are held to be interfering there in local politics, or something or the other.

Again, the preconditions for fair debate are denied for lack of candor among the new isolationists, the new pacifists. For nearly all those who now declare that Castro offers no great danger to us were in the forefront of those who built up the dictator Castro, with almost hysterical hosannas, in the first place. He is in part their own creation. This truth they cannot admit without admitting their share of responsibility. So what is a truth becomes, to them, no truth at all.

The new isolationists, the new pacifists, have honorable motives. But at the very bottom they are also men caught by a dangerous and shallow myth exploded way back in Hitler's time for all mankind to see. This is the delusion that all force is always evil (and all generals always stupid) even when only force is left to defend right and justice. It is the delusion that only "diplomacy" and "negotiation" are acceptable weapons.

So we fail in Cuba, because we dare not risk direct action and thus the censure of the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, in this and other countries. So our Secretary of State refuses one day to sit down at Geneva with Communist gunmen and next day agrees to sit down with them, under pressure of the neopacifists in England, in France, and here.

It is easy to laugh aside those who object to these surrenders. It is only necessary to suggest that we are simply naive, excitable men, flagwavers and warmongers. But just as Hitler tragically fooled the old isolationists and pacifists, Khrushchev is tragically fooling this new lot.

So President Kennedy faces a great imperative of history. He must soon free himself of every shadow of the influence of this new lot, or this country is going down the drain—and so is his administration in the long book of that history.

ITALY'S ECONOMIC RENAISSANCE—EDITORIAL BY A. N. SPANEL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, only the unity of the free world can save freedom's cause on this planet, a theme that has been so consistently underscored to the people and to the statesmen of the West in persuasive editorial advertisements of the International Latex Corp., of Dover, Del.

In repeatedly emphasizing the need for true unity among the nations of the West, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder of that company, has maintained that initiative plus the aggregate strength of the nations of the free world are the most dependable insurance we have against planned Communist aggression. In this framework there appeared an informative article in the New York Times of May 17, 1961, by Mr. Spanel entitled "Italy's Economic Renaissance" in which is clearly traced the economic emergence of that nation, and its importance to the West.

Mr. Spanel and his company have rendered great public service over the years not only to Americans but to freedom-loving people everywhere. Indeed, the notice we now make of their contribution in the public interest is but a modest foreword to the unity which they have pleaded for so long, and which can be so decisive for our survival and growth.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel which appeared in the New York Times

on May 17, 1961, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITALY'S ECONOMIC RENAISSANCE

(By A. N. Spanel, chairman, International Latex Corp.)

Visitors to Italy are deeply impressed by palpable evidences not only of a new prosperity but of a new spirit. For those who have personal memories of the country's virtual collapse only 15 years ago, this rebirth of a great nation has a touch of the miraculous. And they have, too, the special satisfaction of knowing that the miracle was wrought by freedom.

The cold statistics, and reports by longtime American observers on the Italian scene, confirm the visitor's impressions.

The Rome correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, Walter Lucas, writes in the New Leader about "Italy's continuing economic miracle." Our former Ambassador to Rome, James D. Zellerbach, writing in the Saturday Review, attests that "Italy is not only emerging as an industrial nation of the first rank; it is also enjoying a major cultural renaissance whose impact extends far beyond its frontiers." The Fortune correspondent reports that in Italy "good times have arrived and may have come to stay for the next decade."

To grasp the magnitude of this victory, it should be recalled that in the short span of three decades—1914 to 1945—Italy was embroiled in two disastrous World Wars. For 23 years it was held in the paralyzing straitjacket of fascism. In the second of the wars it was caught in the strangling pincers of the Mussolini-Hitler alliance.

The end of these tribulations saw the nation's economy in a shambles, its currency virtually valueless, its spirit at low ebb. Deep social conflicts were impelling the country toward civil war. Exploiting idle hands and empty bellies with zealous skill were the Communists, who dominated the internal liberation forces. Small wonder that the experts sadly prophesied doom.

But today, though the country is still beset by economic and political problems, there is no doubt that the prophets were wrong. The Communists, true, are still the second largest political party; but, in the words of Mr. Zellerbach, they "now try to present themselves as the advocates of mild reform rather than of violent revolution."

The fact is that Italy today is busy, booming, optimistic. Even in relation to its most desperate problems—excessive population, unemployment, the underdeveloped Mezzogiorno or Italian south—the old defeatism is evaporating. The creative energies of a wonderfully gifted and industrious people are again in full eruption.

The national economy, initially pump-primed by generous American dollar aid, has been growing by 6 percent a year; the trade balance is favorable; the lira is stable. According to official figures, 1960 scored, as against 1959, an 18-percent rise in industrial investment, a 10-percent rise in employment, 6 percent more consumption.

The providential discovery of oil and gas in north Italy and Sicily helped trigger the economic upsurge. Italians entered the international market and became outstanding merchants in the petroleum world. By now it is the automotive industry that paces the new prosperity, with an almost fourfold expansion since 1950. Steel production tripled in the same decade. Smaller yet striking growth has been registered in rubber, synthetic fibers, chemicals.

The rise in living standards is visible to the naked eye. Italians are spending more than ever before not only for necessities but for luxuries. Once a land of bicycles, Italy has become a land of motor vehicles, its roads and streets jammed by everything from motor scooters and Italian-made automobiles to big foreign cars. Television antennas have become commonplace even in remote mountain villages.

In this economic renaissance, American investors and industrialists are playing a large and wholesome part. Already over 300 U.S. firms operate in Italy—usually in partnership with local capital—and their numbers keep growing. More and more of them, attracted by favorable tax and other incentives, find this land ideal for branch factories.

Most significant, as one surveys the Italian social scene, is a deep awareness among the people that the miracle of rebirth has been made possible by the climate of freedom and cooperation with the great democracies. The country plays an important role in the European Common Market. Undemonstratively and without histrionics, it stands resolute in devotion to the free world coalition. Italy has proved itself consistently as a loyal ally. Her people, old in civilization, are ever aware that nations, like human beings, are endowed with strengths and weaknesses, and they knowingly accept us as we are, with all our strengths and all our weaknesses.

Italy has risen from the depths of defeat and defeatism to become master of its own destiny. Forewarned by a hair's-breadth escape from the clutches of communism, the Italians appear determined to preserve human freedom. In this resolve they merit the understanding and unstinting cooperation of all their allies, and America especially.

It is altogether desirable that Italy's leaders and its special genius be given ever bigger roles in all free world alliances and enterprises. They have won this right by magnificent performance under the most adverse conditions.

The Italian people are the custodians of a glorious heritage of history and culture. Their contributions are in the marrow and at the heart of our Western civilization. It is cause for profound satisfaction, therefore, that their new renaissance is enabling Italy to contribute measurably once again to the world we cherish.

"THE PROFILE OF COMMUNISM: A FACT-BY-FACT PRIMER"

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, there is now a very considerable library on communism prepared by pro-Democratic sources. But, there are not enough works in that library that combine scholarship, balance, and readibility, so that they will impress at the same time the authority and the man in the street.

I am happy, therefore, to bring to the attention of the Senate a new book which does just that. "The Profile of Communism: A Fact-By-Fact Primer" has just been published by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The league's contributions in this field were hailed in the past by J. Edgar Hoover in his, "Masters of Deceit," as some of the most effective opposition to communism in the United States.

This book presents the basic history, aims, and techniques of the Communist movement in Soviet Russia and in the free world. In simple question and answer form, the book analyzes the strategy of this empire-building, totalitarian program and exposes its inconsistencies. it is designed for use in the schools and by community organizations.

"Profile of Communism" is a publication of the Anti-Defamation League's freedom books series. It is indeed a contribution to freedom.

FISH FLOUR

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am happy to report to the Senate a development which should help considerably in solving the problems of the fishing industry, and which may also be a significant aid to U.S. foreign policy.

At New Bedford, Mass., the New Bedford Fish Products Corp. is converting whole, fresh fish into a fish flour that will be an important supplement to human food.

It can be sold for only 15 cents a pound. It appears to be the cheapest source of animal protein in the world. It can be stored for long periods of time without refrigeration. It can be mixed with grains to give undernourished peoples a balanced diet. We are confident that we have in this product a helpful answer to widespread hunger adjacent to oceans teeming with fish.

For several months I have been working with my colleague from Massachusetts, Senator Smith, Senator Douglas, of Illinois, Congressman Keith, of the New Bedford District, Mayor Lawler, and the members of the New Bedford City Council to secure full public approval of this unique product.

We are asking this body to add $200,000 to the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to speed research on the product, to study other processes, to investigate the possibility of manufacturing this substance aboard trawlers while they are still at sea, and to check all the possible uses for human food.

I request that an editorial entitled "Fish Flour Fills Need," be printed in the body of the RECORD at the end of my remarks. This editorial is dated May 15, 1961, and it appeared in the New Bedford Standard-Times. This is good evidence of the fine community support which is available to this unique Massachusetts enterprise.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISH FLOUR FILLS NEED

The campaign to gain approval for the sale of fish flour in the United States and for increased world consumption, notably through the food-for-peace program, has moved ahead on two fronts.

Locally, the mayor, members of the city council, and business leaders agreed that the city must support the New Bedford Fish Products Corp. in every way possible. This feeling was created by a personal introduction to fish flour and the realization that it represents a significant commercial enterprise here.

In Washington, Senators SALTONSTALL and SMITH appealed to the Senate Appropriations Committee for a $200,000 grant to study fish flour, new uses and its wider world distribution.

Fish flour must be approved as a food by the Food and Drug Administration before it can be sold on the open market in the United States. The FDA has not granted this permission because of esthetic considerations, but every effort is being made to change the ruling.

Representative KEITH said here Friday, "The FDA is handicapped by legislation and regulations. We must convince the FDA to free this food which can be so important in our Nation's relationships."

Harold Putnam, counsel to the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, has been a prime moving force for Washington approval of the product. He seconded Keith's views and said a set of standards would be filed shortly in the FDA with the aim of winning approval for the sale of fish flour.

Dr. Ezra Levin, who developed the product, envisions a great potential for it. He sees in it not only a nutrient and cheap food for undernourished peoples everywhere, but since it can be easily transported and possibly prepared at sea, it can become a factor in America's food-for-peace program.

Dr. Levin and his New Bedford-based company deserve every support this community can give them.

Fish flour made here is now being sent to many nations, but it cannot attain full potential until it receives FDA approval for sale in the United States. Then it might be distributed on a giant scale to those countries which now are reluctant to import a product that has not received the U.S. Government stamp of approval for sale in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, a remarkable, protein rich product called fish flour has been developed in New Bedford, Mass., by the New Bedford Fish Products Corp. This inexpensive food product, which is made from waste fish found in all parts of the globe, can add at low cost badly needed protein to the diets of millions of undernourished persons.

At a recent worldwide conference in Rome it was estimated that 500 million people suffer from the type of protein deficiencies which small, inexpensive dosages of fish flour in their diet could cure. Mr. George McGovern, director of the food-for-peace program has expressed considerable interest in it.

An expansion of the sales of this product would also be of enormous benefit to the ailing American fishing industry.

There is now a request before the Senate to add $200,000 to the budget of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for additional research on fish flour. It would enable the Bureau to conduct studies on its protein quality and possible methods of manufacturing it. This request is being supported by Senator SALTONSTALL, of my own State of Massachusetts, Senator PELL, of Rhode Island, and Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois. I hope in addition that the Members of the Senate and the House will give their favorable attention to it.

I would also like to place in the RECORD a letter which I received recently from Secretary of the Interior Udall. This letter, I feel, outlines well the merits of fish flour and the arguments in favor of its being sold worldwide. It also tells of some of the obstacles facing the present fish flour program. I am in thorough agreement with the Secretary's remarks on these problems.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1961.

Hon. BENJAMIN A. SMITH II,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: Thank you for your letter of April 26, concerning the Rome fish meal conference and fish flour. It is indeed encouraging that the prices of fishmeal are now on the rise.

We were particularly pleased to learn of your interest in fish flour. It is our feeling, too, that fish protein concentrate offers tremendous potential in feeding hungry people all over the world. We in the Department recognize that such a product cannot, in all conscience, be sold abroad until approval for its use in America is first obtained from the Food and Drug Administration.

Mr. Donald McKernan, Director of our Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, is working closely with Mr. Harold Putnam, counsel, Senate Select Committee on Small Business, in an attempt to have Food and Drug approve the interstate marketing of fish flour for domestic human consumption. Mr. George Larrick, Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, in reply to our formal request for approval of fish flour, stated whole fish flour to be a product classed as adulterated under section 402(a)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act. The Food and Drug Administration's rejection of fish flour is based on their decision that it consists, in whole or part, of filthy material. Their view is that heads, tails, viscera contents, etc., of large whole fish constitute filthy matter in that they are "esthetically objectionable" to the consumer.

We in the Department disagree with the Food and Drug's position on this matter. It is our feeling that these so-called esthetically objectionable components of fish are either removed or else totally lose their identity during processing into fish flour. A direct analogy exists in the preparation of gelatin made from beef hoofs. Here the raw materials used have the same esthetic objections as whole fish. No one would seriously affirm that all traces of any objectionable materials are removed, yet the product is marketed and widely used. Another interesting point is that millions of pounds of whole or headed sardines are consumed annually in this country. This seafood, with its viscera and tails intact, is both delicious and highly nutritious.

Since the first of the year, Mr. McKernan and representatives of his staff have had several meetings with officials of the U.S. Food and Drug Administration to encourage them to change their position on this matter. We have also prepared a standard of identity that will permit production of only the highest quality fish flour. Despite these efforts, however, the Food and Drug Administration has not changed its original position on the use of fish flour. It is our understanding that Secretary Ribicoff is requesting the Food and Drug Administration to hold public hearings to consider this matter. At that time we will again present our views regarding approval of fish flour.

Another problem is the absence of a suitably low-cost method of producing a uniformly high quality fish flour. It is the opinion of our scientists and those of the World Health Organization, Food and Agriculture Organization, and the United Nations Children's Fund that no truly satisfactory method is known to exist for production of an inexpensive and highly nutritious fish protein concentrate. Comprehensive engineering and product utilization research is needed before we can produce a fish flour that we can use to feed the undernourished peoples of the world.

The Department feels that development of a suitable process for producing fish flour would be in the best interest of our country, both in helping the fishing industry and in furnishing a high quality animal protein concentrate to our neighbors in the underdeveloped countries. Such a program as this would appear to dovetail well into President Kennedy's food-for-peace plans and to further improve our social-political relations around the world.

The Department does not yet have a formal research program on fish flour, but it is hoped that we will be able to initiate one in the very near future.

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

FRANCIS BELLAMY AWARD TO THE TOPEKA (KANS.) HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, today is the birthday anniversary of Francis Bellamy, who wrote the Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag. The 23-word pledge was written in commemoration of the 400th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of the New World. This nationwide observance was on October 13, 1892.

The author of the Pledge of Allegiance was a man of foresight and a master handler of phrasing. The wording has been changed only three time since 1892. The most recent change came 6 years ago when the words "under God" were added.

During Mr. Bellamy's lifetime and as a member of the Youth's Companion staff, he urged the arousing of the patriotic spirit in the public schools. He felt that the public schools should be the keystone on which to build good citizenship.

As a result of his interest in public schools, the Francis Bellamy Award was started in 1942 and since that time many outstanding high schools have received it.

Today it will be officially announced that the winner of the 1961 Francis Bellamy Award is the Topeka High School, Topeka, Kans. Topeka High School was designated as the Bellamy Award School for the State of Kansas for achievement of its alumni good citizenship in the school and community and the proficiency of the performance of duty by the principal.

A DYING FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I invite attention to a column which was published in the morning press, written by a distinguished writer and philosopher, Walter Lippmann. The point of the Lippmann column today is that of the changing profile of America's defense problems and her security posture around the world in general. Mr. Lippmann examines carefully the implications of the new status of bargaining as between the Soviet Union and the United States, and suggests it is time the American people be told the harsh, though unpleasant, facts about these changed factors.

Because of the contribution this column makes to reassessing our position in many parts of the world, I ask unanimous consent to have the column printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DYING POLICY
(By Walter Lippmann)

The revolution in Iran and the revolution in South Korea are warning signs about the situation on the periphery of Asia. They are

warnings that it is not only in Laos that there is trouble for the American client states.

In Iran, the revolution is a desperate attempt at the top, with the blessing of the Shah, to reform the regime before it is overthrown from below. The present revolution is not anti-Western, anti-American, or pro-Communist. But it may well be all of these things in the end if the reforms which it has begun do not go deep enough. The hour is late in Iran.

In South Korea, the revolution is the work of the army, and it is not now anti-Western, anti-American, or pro-Communist. But this new military government, although it is not anti-American in theory, is in fact defying and ignoring our Embassy and the American Army commander.

The revolutions in South Korea and Iran, following the disorders in Laos and South Vietnam, are a warning that in Asia the policy of containment by American satellite states is breaking down. In all four of these countries the governments have been our clients, indeed they have been our creations. All of them are crumbling, and in the last analysis they are all crumbling for the same reason. In relation to the rising popular feeling of independence and the rising popular expectations of material welfare these American client states are not only corrupt but they are intolerably reactionary. The fact that they are also under the protection of a foreign and non-Asian power is an additional liability.

The Kennedy administration did not form the policy of setting up on the periphery of Asia a semicircle of American military clients. But it is now confronted with the breakdown of that policy, with the disorders, the dangers, and the pains of having to pick up the pieces. This is an experience which the American people have never had before and it is one for which their leaders have not prepared them. They have not been told by anyone in authority that there has been a radical change in the military situation and what the consequences of that change are. They have not been told that the military situation which existed when John Foster Dulles established this policy no longer exists. They have not been told that he made it work by shaking the bomb at the Communists. That is why so many of them suppose that Mr. Kennedy can make it work with a few marines and by shaking his fist.

Our moral and intellectual unpreparedness for the reality of things is causing widespread demoralization among us. We must not let ourselves be overcome by it. We can do that best, I think, by recognizing that our present experience on the periphery of Asia is the American equivalent of what the British and the French are experiencing during the liquidation of their colonial empires. For what we are witnessing is the dissolution of the Dulles system of Asian protectorates.

There are diehards in France who would like to overthrow General de Gaulle in order, as they think, to keep Algeria French. There are diehards in Britain who are passionately opposed to Mr. Macmillan because he is liquidating the colonial empire. And there are diehards here who are prepared to call Mr. Kennedy an appeaser or worse because he is trying to negotiate his way, rather than to fight his way, out of the Indo-Chinese disorders. But whatever the diehards now call De Gaulle and Macmillan and Kennedy, the future will be theirs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I express my appreciation to the Senator for his comments relating to the Lippmann column. I fully concur in the analysis he has given of the purpose of the column. I support very strongly the thesis Mr. Lippmann outlines. It seems to me what Mr. Lippmann is saying, to use old phrases for existing circumstances, is that it is time to take that new look and to make that agonizing reappraisal which was once made, for it needs to be made again in terms of the commitments of this country overseas.

Furthermore, we should take a frank and honest look at the power relationships in the world today. It seems to me that part of our difficulty today is basing our foreign policy on the assumption that the United States is the uncontested military power of the world. This was once the case, 10 years ago, but it is no longer the case. We are a powerful nation, and I hope we are the most powerful nation, but we do not stand uncontested in this world as we once did.

Mr. McGEE. I thank my colleague from Minnesota, the distinguished majority whip, for his comments. I agree with the Senator thoroughly on his analysis of the question. I think this point brings into focus the element of change which is continually going on about us. Unless and until we are willing to face up to the complications of change, instead of retreating to the convenience of static concepts and concepts of the past, we shall continue to end up short and too late in the strategic areas of the globe.

THE PEACE CORPS CAN WORK

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, an excellent series of articles describing the outstanding and successful accomplishments of the International Voluntary Services in South Vietnam clearly enunciates the fact that the program envisioned through the operation of the Peace Corps can contribute to international understanding while helping to alleviate the scourge of illiteracy, hunger, and poverty in the underdeveloped nations of the world.

The first IVS teams of young agricultural college graduates were sent to live and work with Vietnamese farmers in 1957. Its success story is still being acclaimed today. It goes without saying that the IVS experience in South Vietnam has proven that the Peace Corps can work through the devoted and sincere efforts of our most valuable export—America's enthusiastic and youthful expertise.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the four articles describing the IVS Vietnamese program for agricultural college graduates, appearing in the Minneapolis Star and Tribune May 9, 10, 11, and 15, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, May 9, 1961]

U.S. YOUTHS IN SOUTH VIETNAM PROVE PEACE CORPS PLAN CAN WORK

(International Voluntary Services (IVS) was founded in 1953 and has offices in Washington. Its governing board is drawn from the top echelon of 15 church denominations, Catholic and Protestant, to recruit and administer technical assistance personnel for oversea people-to-people community development projects. In its purpose IVS resembles President Kennedy's Peace Corps program. There are IVS teams currently in Egypt, Jordan, Iraq, Nepal, and Laos in addition to ones Hewett tells about in South Vietnam.)

(By Robert Hewett)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A group of American college graduates—all farm boys with practical experience—are demonstrating in the jungles and ricefields of this southeast Asian country that President Kennedy's Peace Corps program can be a success.

For nearly 4 years they have actually been doing the kind of day-to-day work with Vietnamese farmers and technicians that the newly formed Peace Corps aims at extending on a far larger scale to many of the underdeveloped countries of the world.

They have been planting test plots for hundreds of crops on newly established experimental farms under the direction of the older, more experienced technical experts of the U.S. International Cooperation Administration (ICA) mission.

Some of them have been living among the Vietnamese in villages. Others have been living with Vietnamese technicians on experimental farms.

All of them learn Vietnamese—with varying degrees of fluency—because they live and work in much closer association with the local people than do regular ICA technicians or U.S. Embassy officials.

They have planted demonstration gardens in isolated villages to show skeptical peasants the advantages of a varied diet. They patch up cuts and bruises on farmworkers with elementary first aid. Some of the youths teach informal English classes in the tropical evenings.

A hard-bitten U.S. Army colonel, one of several hundred American officers training the South Vietnam Army to fight Communist guerrillas in this strategic country, was discussing the work of the young Americans recently with a senior point 4 technical assistance expert with the ICA mission here. He said:

"This is a wonderful bunch of hard-working kids. They are doing more to give the Vietnamese an idea of what Americans are and what they can do than either one of us. And the impression they make here will probably last longer."

The wonderful bunch of hard-working kids are members of International Voluntary Services (IVS). IVS is a private American church-supported organization which has been sending young men and women abroad for several years on 2-year assignments to work on technical assistance projects and to live close to the people.

There are 19 IVS men, most of them in their 20's, now working in South Vietnam. All are agricultural college graduates from Minnesota and Iowa to California and Virginia.

Since 1957, 50 IVS members have worked under an ICA-financed contract here—and only one had to be sent home before he completed his 2-year assignment because of inability to adjust satisfactorily to unfamiliar living and working conditions.

The experience of the IVS group—including initial embarrassing mistakes as well as later satisfying success—could prove invaluable in drafting the beginning program for the Peace Corps in which recruiting and training will begin this spring and summer.

Critics of the Peace Corps program claim the average young American is too immature, inexperienced, and soft, to adjust and do effective work under hard living conditions in some of the more backward nations.

The usual uninformed and skeptical criticism runs this way: If "thousands" of young Americans are "dumped" abroad without knowing what to do, they will "run wild"

and cause irreparable damage to the present U.S. foreign economic aid program and to American prestige.

You get concrete answers that knock down this sort of opposition when you talk with enthusiastic ICA officials in South Vietnam and see the IVS youths here at work and play.

"In the first place, there is nothing 'average' about these young IVS men," says William Fippen, gray-haired chief of the U.S. economic mission's agricultural division.

"They are farm-raised boys with practical experience who come abroad after they have finished college with the conviction they want to accomplish something worth while," he said.

"And they are accomplishing something really worth while. They work just as seriously and probably harder in some ways than the older, experienced technicians on my staff.

"They live on the experimental stations and in localities where they can follow up on a day-to-day basis with their Vietnamese counterparts and programs for agricultural improvements we outline on a national level with the Vietnamese Government.

"We could use many more in the field of agriculture alone. There is no reason why the Peace Corps can't do a good job if the oversea workers are as carefully selected and supervised as are the IVS teams."

My wife and I traveled a week through central Vietnam visiting the projects where IVS are working and came away impressed. These young Americans are doing a constructive job for the U.S. aid program in South Vietnam and are widely liked and respected by Vietnamese ranging from mountain tribesmen to Government officials.

Just as important, these young college graduates are getting an experience and training that will benefit America in the years ahead—regardless of whether they take foreign service jobs or, as most of them must, work and live in the United States.

Lawrence G. Ulsaker, a 24-year-old agricultural college graduate from Battle Lake, Minn., expressed it this way:

"Sure, I can't use a lot of what I studied out here right now. But the benefits of learning about different peoples and tackling new challenges far outweigh what some might call a loss of 2 years in my professional career.

"This sort of experience kind of settles anyone just out of college. We're ready to go back to the States and really tie into something."

Ulsaker, son of Col. and Mrs. L. T. Ulsaker, of Battle Lake, lost his right leg below the knee in a grim tractor accident a year ago while working with an IVS team in Laos, in the Plaine des Jarres region which has now been occupied by Communist rebels.

He spent 5 weeks in a Bangkok hospital, was flown back to Minneapolis for fitting of an artificial leg. Seven months after the accident he was back with his IVS comrades in Laos but was assigned to Vietnam recently because Communist warfare in Laos forced a shutdown in his project.

[From the Minneapolis Star, May 10, 1961]

YANKS IN VIETNAM SAY, "HARD WORK, BUT FUN"

(By Robert Hewett)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—What will life in the Peace Corps be like? You get some interesting and encouraging answers from young upper Midwest agricultural college graduates with hard, practical experience in working and living with Vietnamese farmers in this tropical country.

Nineteen young men, most of them in their midtwenties, are pioneers in the kind of constructive jobs that hundreds of other young Americans will be doing before long under the Peace Corps program outlined by President Kennedy.

"There is a challenge working out here that is missing in the States," says 24-year-old Lawrence G. Ulsaker, of Battle Lake, Minn. "We all feel we are doing something worth while. It's hard work but it's fun, too."

It wasn't "fun" when a steel cable snapped off Larry's right leg below the knee last year while hauling logs with a tractor for a bridge in neighboring Laos. But 7 months later, after being fitted with a wooden leg and foot in Minneapolis, he was back at work in southeast Asia because "I like it out here."

Ulsaker is a member of International Voluntary Services (IVS), a private, church-supported organization. IVS concentrates in South Vietnam on agricultural development under the direction of the U.S. economic aid mission.

But IVS experience will play a big role in determining plans and policies for the more extensive Peace Corps, where young American men and women also will work in such fields as English language teaching, education, health, and community development.

Some 50 IVS youth have demonstrated in the last 4 years that carefully selected, enthusiastic Peace Corpsmen can give a much needed boost to American foreign aid programs in most parts of the underdeveloped world.

Ulsaker's experience—he was flown to a Bangkok, Thailand hospital within 7 hours after the accident—illustrates one of the harsher problems facing the Peace Corps.

More ordinary health hazards such as dysentery and malaria will cause the most trouble for Peace Corpsmen who will live closer to the local people than senior U.S. Embassy and economic aid technicians now do.

My wife and I spent a week recently driving through remote areas of South Vietnam to see how young IVS technicians live and work. We came away impressed with the constructive work they are doing.

One of the most heartening aspects was the way in which these young men—all learning to speak Vietnamese—were giving a new and more vital picture of Americans to Vietnamese ranging from peasants to sensitive Government bureaucrats.

"The thing that surprises most people here is the fact that there are foreigners who aren't afraid to get their hands dirty," commented Don Schmidt, of Arlington, Wis. "In Vietnam and most other places, everybody with a little education seems to want a white collar desk job."

Schmidt, 34, is the oldest and most serious-minded of the IVS team in Vietnam. He volunteered for the IVS—pay, $80 a month plus a modest living allowance—from an agricultural research job with the University of Wisconsin he has held since getting his master's degree at Madison in 1953.

He lives with another IVS teammate, James Green, of West Virginia, in a $25-a-month house rented in the little village of Thap-Cham and spends most of his time experimenting with various crops at nearby agricultural experiment stations and villages.

Why is Schmidt taking 2 years out of his University of Wisconsin career?

"Well, it seemed that if I did anything that amounted to something in Wisconsin, I just contributed to the farm surplus problem," he drawled. "Out here, there is need to develop more and better crops and it is satisfying to do a job that is really necessary."

Schmidt and Green had been living in one of the two-room brick bungalows used by Vietnamese supervisors at a country agricultural station but were forced to move into Thap-Cham recently when Communist guerrillas killed five people in a nearby village.

Stepped-up Communist activity throughout South Vietnam had led the Vietnamese Government to curtail IVS activity in more remote areas because of safety reasons.

"Naturally, we don't want to take any chances," says Howard Harper, 40-year-old ICA economic aid mission agriculturist who has been responsible for supervising IVS activities. "But, if we didn't have this trouble with the Communists we could put three or four times as many of these young men out in the field right now and make a much bigger and faster impact with our agricultural aid program.

"The Peace Corps has tremendous possibilities in many parts of the world if the young people are as carefully selected and supervised as the IVS teams."

These sentiments about the Peace Corps were echoed by all the IVS workers with whom we talked—but all cautioned against prospective corpsmen who are looking only for a free trip abroad.

"It's hard work but the interesting thing is that there is so much that needs to be done that it certainly isn't boring," said Michael W. Chilton, 23, son of Mr. and Mrs. A. R. Chilton of Sigourney, Iowa. He got his master's degree in horticulture in 1960 at Iowa State University, Ames, and came to Vietnam last August.

"There are a lot of Iowa State graduates who would be good for the Peace Corps. But in the agricultural field a farm upbringing is absolutely necessary. You need practical experience more than academic background out here."

Chilton lives with two other IVS teammates in a house in Dalat, in South Vietnam's relatively cool plateau area. By now, he speaks Vietnamese fairly well and in the evenings gives English lessons to the neighbors and to Vietnamese technicians from a nearby agricultural experiment station.

Chilton and his buddies pool their $2.80 daily living allowances to hire a cook and laundryman. They eat well, if not lavishly, by buying food on the local market. Their language teacher-interpreter and jeep driver live and eat with them.

IVS life is not all work by any means, and peace corpsmen will have the same opportunities for recreation. Nobody yet has shot any of the tigers that roam some areas of Vietnam, but for hunters there are plenty of leopards, deer, and wild chickens.

Most of the IVS men said that the chance to travel was one of the attractions for signing up for a 2-year tour. Each gets a 2-week vacation each year and about $200 to spend on it.

We met Ulsaker just as he returned from a 15-day trip that took him to Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, and Hong Kong.

A favorite recreation routine here is a flight to Bangkok, then a 3-day train ride (second class, to cut expenses) to Singapore and return by freighter to Saigon across the South China Sea.

"Maybe city kids would have a hard time living out here," one IVS youth commented. "But if you were raised on a farm and are the outdoor type, actual living conditions aren't much different from living in a hunting shack in northern Minnesota.

"There are some peculiar diseases and you have to boil and filter drinking water. Usually there are no flush toilets and there certainly is no corner drugstore for a quick malted. But how many people back home can eat with chopsticks?"

[From the Minneapolis Star, May 11, 1961]

LANKY YOUNG WISCONSIN MAN BUILDS BETTER PLOW

(By Robert Hewett)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—A lanky, curious young man from the University of Wisconsin came out to South Vietnam 4 years ago to help teach farmers about modern agriculture. He soon found out the hard way that the average Vietnamese peasant doesn't ever see enough cash to buy a cheap steel plow, let alone a tractor.

So he has invented a remarkable series of simple farm implements, using wood and scrap iron, that any village blacksmith or carpenter can build for a few piasters.

"The little farmer in southeast Asia simply can't afford the modern tools of 1961 agricultural practices," says 28-year-old Richard Koegel of Milwaukee. "It's a big advance out here if we can help him get to about an 1861 level right now."

Koegel has been using a similar approach to Vietnamese farming problems as that of the fictional American point 4 technician in the book, "The Ugly American," who succeeded by tackling the simple things first.

For several thousand years farmers in this part of the world have been harnessing their oxen or water buffaloes to awkward, heavy, and inefficient wooden yokes for pulling wooden plows or carts.

Koegel devised an easily homemade, oval-shaped harness consisting of light wooden frames padded with kapok, the fluffy mattress-filling material which grows on trees all over Vietnam.

With a few boards and hammered pieces of scrap iron, the Milwaukee-born agricultural engineer fashioned an adjustable drag harrow for a cost of about $1.50. We got unexpected proof that it really has an appeal for a Vietnamese farmer.

Koegel harnessed up an ox and demonstrated the cheap drag so my wife could take some photographs of his device. The picture taking over, Koegel started to lead the ox back to pasture on the agricultural college farm station at Bao-Loc.

A couple of Vietnamese fieldworkers who had been chopping away with mattocks at weeds between some corn rows rushed over shouting in the Vietnamese language.

Koegel grinned and turned the ox and harrow over to them. As we left, the farmers were steering the contraption down the rows and accomplishing about six times as much work as they had been with the hand mattocks—and letting the ox do most of the work.

In another nearby plot, a farmworker was pushing a wooden garden cultivator that Koegel had built, laughing with importance at using such a modern contrivance.

"I'd like to come back in a couple of years and see how these things catch on," Koegel said. "It is no use importing expensive tools and machinery when a farmer knows he'll never be able to afford such a thing in his lifetime."

Koegel's experiences in South Vietnam serve as an example of what can be accomplished by President Kennedy's Peace Corps program in which hundreds of young Americans will be sent abroad to work in underdeveloped countries.

"I think the Peace Corps is a wonderful idea—but you must get the right kind of people for it," Koegel commented.

Koegel graduated as an agricultural engineer from the University of Wisconsin in 1956 and came to South Vietnam early in 1957 with the first team sent by International Voluntary Services. IVS is a private, church-sponsored organization which has sent about 50 young men and women, working on 2-year assignments, for technical assistance projects in South Vietnam since 1957.

The IVS workers live and work in the villages and on agricultural experiment station under the general supervision of the U.S. economic aid mission here. Koegel learned Vietnamese and did so well that on the completion of his 2-year IVS assignment he was hired by the Vietnamese Government as an instructor at the Bao-Loc agricultural college.

Others of the original IVS team have come back to Vietnam on various jobs, indicating that the Peace Corps in the future may well open the way to new careers for young college graduates.

Tom Luche, a New York State farm youth, learned Vietnamese so well on his first 2-year assignment that he was hired by the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) to return as a program training officer.

Gordon L. Brockmueller, 25, of Freeman, S. Dak., the only one of the original group who was accompanied by his wife, was hired for a second term to serve as chief of the 19-man IVS team now working here.

At least 2 young men of the 19 now working on IVS projects will be hired as regular ICA technicians at the end of their present term.

This correspondent has found senior U.S. economic aid mission administrators in some underdeveloped countries skeptical or even hostile to the idea of sending college-age youths abroad to work in the Peace Corps.

But U.S. officials in South Vietnam are enthusiastic as a result of the IVS experience.

Aside from the constructive work that the Peace Corps can do, the IVS project here has shown that it can also serve as a training ground for regular ICA technicians and improve the whole economic aid organization in the future.

[From the Minneapolis Star, May 15, 1961]

SOUTH VIETNAM COULD BE LESSON FOR PEACE CORPS

(By Robert Hewett)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—One of the most important lessons organizers of the new Peace Corps can learn from the work of a group of young American agricultural college graduates here is that grave mistakes can be made early and easily.

Practical experience with American youths working and living in Vietnamese villages has proven an earnest desire to do good is not enough. Competent leadership and careful, go-slow planning is more essential.

Preceding articles have outlined some of the constructive work and valuable experiences achieved in the last 4 years here by young men and women sponsored by International Voluntary Services, a church-supported organization.

IVS workers win high praise now from the Vietnamese and United States economic aid mission technicians with whom they work.

They are the forerunners of hundreds of young Americans who will go abroad to live and work on the village level under President Kennedy's Peace Corps program.

But the first IVS teams of young college graduates who came to South Vietnam in 1957 made the kind of mistakes that could ruin the ambitious Peace Corps program before it gets well started.

It is regrettable that, up to now, Peace Corps Director R. Sargent Shriver and his aids (busily trying to put 500 to 1,000 workers in the field by fall) apparently have paid little attention to the experiences of the IVS in this southeast Asian country.

Vietnamese and United States officials here say the first IVS teams accomplished little and created resentments.

This was because they went to live in Vietnamese villages on their own with little preparation and without the necessary cooperation of either local Vietnamese administrators or U.S. economic aid mission technical experts.

Although the IVS teams were financed by contracts with the International Cooperation Administration (ICA) in Washington, team leaders actively discouraged any contact with experienced ICA technicians in their desire for an independent program.

At the same time, no adequate working relationship as established with policymaking Vietnamese Government officials—a situation that created so much suspicion of the "American strangers" that one team was forced to stop work and move to another locality.

"There was too much emphasis placed on living and eating exactly as the villagers did," one American official explained.

"That's all very well if it accomplishes something. But the fact was that there was no organized program.

"IVS workers, for example, had no idea of what new crops might be introduced to Vietnam and were discredited when some of their experiments failed on village land.

"Community development was stressed but all it seemed to prove was that some Americans could live in as poverty-stricken a condition as the Vietnamese—it didn't help the Vietnamese much."

IVS found itself without any real job when the Government ended its refugee resettlement plan and officially transferred the work teams to a new land development department. Land development officials simply ignored the IVS group.

This ICA administrative resistance was wiped out in south Vietnam by a 40-year-old North Carolina ICA agricultural specialist, Howard Harper, a former marine who likes and knows how to handle young men and who has a persuasive way with Vietnamese officials.

One of the main troubles with south Vietnam's agriculture, fostering low living standards among the peasants, stems from the fact that French colonial rulers were interested mainly in improving varieties of coffee, tea, and rubber.

The people in the delta area for centuries have lived on rice and exported any surplus.

Harper talked Vietnamese officials into starting the new nation's first real agricultural experiment station.

He wanted to find out the best varieties of vegetables, citrus, foreign grasses and other crops that could improve Vietnamese living standards.

"It was a waste of good, knowledgeable, enthusiastic manpower to have those IVA boys doing little except 'living with the people' and being boycotted by the ministries," Harper said. "They were tickled to death to get some direction and real work to do."

They went to work on a voluntary basis, showing Vietnamese how to use bulldozers to clear the jungle land for the Ban-Me-Thuot agricultural station.

They showed Vietnamese technicians and farm workers how to plant experimental test plots.

"One good effect of their work was to show Vietnamese officials and agricultural college graduates that there is nothing disgraceful about getting your hands dirty," Harper added.

The minister of agriculture was so impressed with the IVS work under Harper's supervision that he asked for another IVS contract financed by ICA.

In 1958, the IVS strength was down to 8 men and today it has been boosted to 19 as more agricultural experiment stations have been started.

"We couldn't have got these experiment stations going without these American farm-raised youngsters actually living and working on them on a day-to-day basis," Harper said.

"They keep the work going ahead and diplomatically point out things to be done by inexperienced Vietnamese technicians."

The IVS workers keep a strong team spirit, even though they are scattered in twos and threes over South Vietnam.

In contrast, to the past, they work closely—but not as "junior assistants"—with older U.S. mission technicians who can visit any given area only once a month or so

because they are helping work out national programs.

One such is Alton Levorson of Brooton, Minn., an ICA agricultural engineer with assignments in Turkey and Bolivia before coming to South Vietnam 21 months ago.

We met Levorson when he was talking over farm machinery maintenance with IVS worker Michael W. Chilton 23, Sigourney, Iowa, on a visit to the station when Chilton works near Dalat.

"If the Peace Corps get some people as good as these IVS boys, we can accomplish a lot more," Levorson said. "They have a great sense of responsibility and initiative and they know what's going on every day wherever they are working."

INCREASE IN AUTHORIZATION FOR INSURANCE OF MORTGAGES BY THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 234, Senate Joint Resolution 89.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is the Senate still in the morning hour?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Then I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the joint resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the ranking minority member of the committee, is present in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 217 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$15,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,000,000,000".

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, has action been taken on the joint resolution to amend the National Housing Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution has been passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to interpose the observation that it is my understanding the increase of $1 billion in the ceiling will suffice until about the middle of July of this year. It is anticipated that by that time there will be action on a general housing bill, and that the problem will then be reconsidered, and probably there will be an additional increase in the ceiling taken care of at that time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The understanding of the Senator from Illinois is as the majority side understands the situation to be. The general housing bill will be before the Senate shortly, and all of these problems will be given reconsideration at that time.

THE RISE TO POWER OF FIDEL CASTRO

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, when Fidel Castro came to this country 2 years ago last month, to be wined and dined as if he were a lifelong friend of the United States, I warned—and this was in April 1959—that a study of his record boded ill for this country.

I told the press at the time I considered it unfortunate, if not disgraceful, that the United States should welcome and dignify a man who clearly appeared, in my estimation, to be a pro-Communist agitator.

A number of my colleagues will well remember my alarm as long ago as 1958 when Castro, still in the mountains fighting as a guerrilla, had kidnapped 47 American citizens, including 30 unarmed U.S. marines and sailors, and held them captive for a number of days. This was clearly a tipoff as to Castro's contempt for the United States. Later, our citizens were released, but I never forgot that incident, and I deplored his being invited to this country and hailed as a liberator.

Following Castro's April 1960 visit, I carefully studied the events going on in Cuba. Thus, last year I made an extended speech in the Senate on Castro and what he was doing in Cuba. I laid before this body a carefully researched analysis of Soviet and American Communist publications proving beyond any doubt that Fidel Castro and his band of unshaven bandits were Moscow approved and Moscow supported.

In addition, I enumerated 21 historic steps in consolidating power which the Bolsheviks in Russia and the Reds in China had followed after their successful seizures of power. These 21 characteristic and typically Communist steps to total power were slavishly followed by Castro and his bully boys after Batista's flight let Cuba fall into their hands.

By January 1960, there could have been no doubt in anyone's mind—even those who depended solely on the press and radio for their information—that Castro was a conscious and articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy. Even the State Department, which seemed strangely loath and slow to recognize the hard and unpalatable facts of life in Cuba, has now belatedly come around to identifying the Castro regime as Communist.

It therefore seems almost incredible that the chief Cuban expert of a great metropolitan newspaper, which lays great emphasis on the accuracy of its foreign news coverage, would still persist in claiming that Castro's revolution is not Communist, but merely utopian socialism. An article in the March issue of the American Legion magazine, by William Buckley, editor of National Review, reproduced an issue of the Yale News for December 7, 1960, which quotes Herbert Matthews, Latin affairs editor of the New York Times, as defending Castro before an overflow crowd at Yale.

This excellent article, "I Got My Job Through the New York Times," throws a great deal of light on the little known story of just how an obscure Communist adventurer and terrorist, holed up in the mountains of Cuba with 8 or 10 followers, was built up into a world renowned figure through the magic of newspaper publicity.

I therefore commend the American Legion for publishing this timely and most important article. I also recommend it to the attention of those interested in learning just how Castro was sold to the American public as a pure and glamorous knight in radiant armor who rescued poor little Cuba from the fell clutches of an alleged dragon—only to turn out later to be just another Communist stooge like Mao Tse-tung and Josip Broz, alias Tito. They, too, were glamorized and sold to America as simple patriots and agrarian reformers by American writers and journalists whose integrity and honesty we had mistakenly accepted as above suspicion.

I ask unanimous consent that the American Legion magazine article be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I GOT MY JOB THROUGH THE NEW YORK TIMES

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

It is very much as in the early months of 1950 when, having chased the last remnants of the opposition off the mainland, Mao Tse-tung, wild with ideological lust, surveyed his kingdom, and threw himself into the job of communizing his people. He chopped off many more heads than Fidel Castro has had so far to do in Cuba, and there are no doubt differences between Mao and Fidel, as there are between China and Cuba; but then as now, as the public slowly awoke to the meaning of what had happened, the apologists for the revolutionary forces began to retreat in increasing horror from their sometime enthusiasm. Those who had told us again and again that the Red Chinese were primarily agrarian reformers began to fade away, only to reappear, many of them, before congressional committees, which asked them the same questions they are now beginning to ask the propagandists for Castro, questions to which we desperately need the answer, now as then: Who betrayed China? Who betrayed Cuba? Who, in the process, betrayed the United States?

There is no defensible defense any more of the regime of Mao Tse-tung. But here and there, where Cuba is concerned, there are pockets of loyalty to Castro. There is a Fair Play for Cuba Committee, which may

or may not be dominated by fellow travelers, but which certainly has among its supporters some men who are not fellow travelers, men whose faith in Castro is livelier, alas, than freedom is in Cuba. The leader of pro-Castro opinion in the United States is Herbert L. Matthews, a member of the editorial staff of the New York Times. He did more than any other single man to bring Fidel Castro to power. It could be said—with a little license—that Matthews was to Castro what Owen Lattimore was to Red China, and that the New York Times was Matthews' Institute of Pacific Relations: stressing this important difference, that no one has publicly developed against Matthews anything like the evidence subsequently turned up against Lattimore tending to show, in the words of a Senate investigating committee, that Lattimore was "a conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Herbert Matthews met Castro in February of 1957. To make contact with him—as he tells the story—he had to get in touch with the Fidelista underground in Havana, drive 500 miles all one night across the length of the island, using his wife as cover; and ride a jeep through tortuous dirt-road detours to avoid the patrols and roadblocks that an angry Fulgencio Batista had posted all about the Sierra Maestra mountains in the eastern tip of the island, to try to break the back of the little resistance group that 2 months earlier had landed, 82-strong, in Oriente Province in a diesel cutter from Mexico, pledged to "liberate" Cuba, or perish.

Matthews climbed up muddy slopes, swam across an icy river, ducked behind trees, ate soda crackers, and slept on the ground: and then, in the early morning hours, Fidel Castro came. In whispers, he talked for 3 hours about his plans for Cuba.

To put it mildly, Matthews was overwhelmed. From that moment on he appears to have lost all critical judgment. He became—always consistent with being a writer for the New York Times, which imposes certain inhibitions—the number one unbearded enthusiast for Fidel Castro.

Castro, he told the world in a series of three articles that made journalistic and indeed international history, is a big, brave, strong, relentless, dedicated, tough idealist. His unswerving aim is to bring to Cuba "liberty, democracy, and social justice." There is a seething discontent with Dictator Batista, corrupt and degenerate, after virtually 25 years of exercising power; hated by most Cubans for having installed himself as President in March of 1952 by military coup; become, now, a terrorist and a torturer. Fidel Castro is the "flaming symbol" of resistance. The fires of social justice that drive Castro on, that cause him to bear incredible hardships, playing impossible odds, with the single end in mind of bringing freedom to his people, these are fires that warm the hearthsides of freedom and decency all over the land; and they will prevail. * * *

Is Castro's movement touched by communism? Matthews dismissed the rhetorical question with scorn. Castro's movement "is democratic, therefore anti-Communist." And, flatly, "There is no communism to speak of in Fidel Castro's 26th of July Movement."

The impact of these articles all over the world was subsequently recognized even by the New York Times itself, normally bashful about celebrating publicly its achievements. When, almost 2 years later, Batista fell, the Times permitted itself to record jubilantly: "When a correspondent of the New York Times returned from Señor Castro's hideout [from that point on, by the way, Señor Castro was elevated by the Times to 'Dr.' Castro] * * * the rebel leader attained a new level of importance on the Cuban scene. Nor was the embarrassed Government ever able to diminish Fidel Castro's repute again."

Foreign correspondents have been very much mistaken before. Foreign correspondents who work for the New York Times are no exception, as anyone knows who will attempt to reconcile Soviet history and accounts of same filed over the years by, e.g., Walter Duranty and Harrison Salisbury; who will, in a word, attempt the impossible. It is bad enough that Herbert Matthews was hypnotized by Fidel Castro, but it was a calamity that Matthews succeeded in hypnotizing so many other people, in crucial positions of power, on the subject of Castro. "When I was Ambassador to Cuba," Mr. E. T. Smith complained to the Senate Subcommittee on Internal Security last August, "I sometimes made the remark in my own Embassay that Mr. Matthews was more familiar with State Department thinking regarding Cuba than I was."

As Ambassador assigned to Havana in August of 1957, Mr. Smith had been the representative of the U.S. Government in Cuba during the 18 crucial months that brought Castro to power, and he used just that word: Matthews' articles on Castro, he told the Senators, had literally hypnotized the State Department. Even as early as the summer of 1957, when Smith took over the ambassadorship from Arthur Gardner, the influence of Matthews was established, only a few months after the Castro interview in his hideout. Ambassador Gardner had met with stony resistance every time he attempted to pass on to his superiors the information he had about the nature of the Castro movement, which he was convinced—correctly, it proved—was shot through with Marxism. Gardner made himself such a nuisance that he was replaced: and his successor was instructed by Mr. William Wieland of the State Department, in charge of the Caribbean desk, to cap his month's briefing on the Cuba situation by consulting Herbert L. Matthews. Matthews told Smith that Batista was in all probability through. Castro, he said, was the man to back.

Smith went to Havana determined to do what he could, within the limits of propriety, to ease Batista out of the way. Batista pledged to hold elections in November 1958 and turn the presidency over to his successor in March 1959. The question in Smith's mind was whether he would last that long. Within 2 months after arriving in Cuba, Mr. Smith sincerely hoped he would: for he became convinced, he told the Senate committee, that the principal danger to the United States lay not in the survival of Batista for a year or so, but in the rise to power of Fidel Castro who was almost certainly a revolutionary Marxist. Abundant evidence was available that he had made "Marxist statements" in Costa Rica, in Mexico, and in Bogotá; and that, dating back to his college days, he had been a revolutionist and a terrorist. Smith had even heard—and had passed the report along—that while in Bogotá, Castro had had a hand in the assassination of two nuns and a priest.

But even if Castro wasn't then pro-Communist, Smith said, his closest associates were, and this was positively documented with respect to his brother Raûl (now head of Cuba's armed forces) and Ernesto "Che" Guevara (boss of the Cuban economy).

But the Ambassador's warnings were to no avail. During the succeeding 18 months, Herbert Matthews continued to write glowing accounts of the Robin Hood of the Sierra Maestra, predicting the downfall of Batista and the ascendancy of the 26th of July Movement. Others got into the act. The influential Foreign Policy Association's Bulletin for April 1, 1957, carried an article by Matthews on Cuba, followed by a list of "Reading Suggestions" prepared by the editors. Among them: "The best source of contemporary information of a general nature is probably the files of the New York Times, which published three uncensored articles on Cuba by Herbert Matthews on February 24, 25, 26, 1957." The State Department went along. "Herbert Matthews * * * is the leading Latin American editorial writer for the New York Times. Obviously," said Ambassador Smith, "the State Department would like to have the support of the New York Times."

Obviously indeed.

"Each month the situation deteriorates," Matthews exulted on June 16, 1957, a theme he elaborated in further dispatches in the succeeding months. Looking back at these reports one can only say how right Mr. Matthews was. Batista was losing and Castro was gaining. But reporter Matthews neglected to give all the reasons why, just as he consistently neglected to report on the lurid background of Fidel Castro and some of his associates. The increasing helplessness of Batista was the result primarily of the crystallization of U.S. support for Castro. During those months a fascinating dialectic went on. Matthews would write that American prestige was sinking in Cuba—on account of the aid the U.S. Government was giving to Batista. Our Ambassador in Havana meanwhile complained and complained to the State Department of the demoralization of the Batista government—on account of our failure to provide Batista with the aid to which, under the terms of a series of mutual aid agreements, we were bound by law and precedent to give him so long as we continued to recognize his government.

Matthews' forces proved much stronger than our Ambassador's. An important segment of the press, influential Members of Congress, and the Castro apparatus in Washington and New York hammered away at the State Department, urging it to desert Batista. At first the Department stalled. When Castro kidnaped 47 American servicemen in June 1958, the Government eagerly seized on the opportunity to hold up the shipment of 15 training planes that Batista was lawfully importing. "In accordance with instructions from the State Department," Smith testified, "I informed Batista that delivery would be suspended, because we feared some harm might come to the kidnaped Americans." Having in effect yielded to blackmail, the U.S. Government then refused to deliver the airplanes even after Castro had been prevailed on to turn the soldiers free. Batista's forces were becoming seriously demoralized by the growing aloofness of the U.S. Government, even while Castro was getting, the ex-Ambassador went on to say, illicitly exported shipments of arms almost every night from friends of Castro in the United States. By November it was clear that Batista's days were numbered. On December 17, Ambassador Smith received orders from the State Department to advise Batista that he could no longer hold power, not even pending the institution of the new President a few months later—whom the United States would not back in any case, since he had been fraudulently elected, and didn't have the support of the Cuban people. Two weeks later, Batista fled.

The next morning, on the first day of the new year 1959, Mr. Roy Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, announced that there was "no evidence" that "Castro is under Communist influence." Clearly he had paid no attention to his own Ambassador to Cuba. As clearly, he read the New York Times.

During the campaign, both Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Nixon expended a considerable amount of rhetoric on the subject of Cuba.

For they knew the birth, right up against the Florida peninsula, of what is now officially classified by the Government (under the terms of the Dirksen-Douglas amendment to the Mutual Security Act) as "Communist" territory, is a development that has deeply disturbed the American people. They want to know who, or what, was the Frankenstein who created the monster.

Mr. Kennedy blasted Mr. Nixon on the grounds that Castro and Castroism had come about as a reaction against America's tolerance of rightwing dictators—a familiar line, advanced by those who sincerely feel it is an American obligation to purify Latin American politics. But Mr. Kennedy was not convincing to those who remembered that in May, shortly before his nomination, he had said publicly that in two respects he backed completely the foreign policy of Mr. Eisenhower, "one of these being Cuba."

Mr. Nixon, on the other hand, pointed proudly to the disappearance of a half dozen military dictators during the Eisenhower years. He seemed to be suggesting that although the President continued officially to beam at every leader of every nation we formally recognize—as protocol dictated—actually, he sat on a pair of great bellows, on which he bobbed up and down, when nobody was looking, thus toppling, one by one, Latin American badmen. Beyond that, Mr. Nixon did not go. He did not express a detailed curiosity about the loss of Cuba to Fidel Castro. Indeed, both candidates gave the impression that, like the State Department, obviously they wanted to stay on the right side of the New York Times. But the candidates whetted the public interest, and it is likely that the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will pursue its investigation into the strange hold of Herbert Matthews, and the Matthews doctrine, on the men who make our foreign policy.

What will they learn about Mr. Matthews himself? That he is a scholarly, subtle man who makes and continues to make supercolossal mistakes in judgment, but whose loyalty to his misjudgments renders him a stubborn propagandist * * * and an easy mark for ideologues on-the-make. So well known is he as doyen of utopian activists that when in June of 1959 a Nicaraguan rebel launched a revolt, he wired the news of it direct to Herbert Matthews at the New York Times—much as, a few years ago, a debutante on-the-make might have wired news of her engagement to Walter Winchell.

Matthews was once, to use his own phrase, an "enthusiastic admirer of fascism." He turned away from fascism while in Spain covering the civil war, where he took up the cause of the Popular Front with the same ferocious partisanship that earlier he had shown for Mussolini's Italy, and later was to show for Castro's Cuba. The Spanish passion is not yet expended. Mr. Matthews wrote a book in 1957, recommitting himself to the good guys-bad guys reading of a war fought by democrats and Communists against traditionalists and Fascists. Always he writes with considerable sweep, and he likes to prophesy. His two most striking predictions of 1944 are surely that the "Franco regime is tottering" and that the disbanding of Russia's Comintern the year before was "the final indication that the Russia of 1943 and 1944 does not care to support revolutionary movements to bring about Communist states in other countries."

Certainly he has not proved over the years an astute judge of how to deal with Russia: "All they [the Russians] want is security," he wrote in Collier's in 1945. "By refusing to share the secret of the atomic bomb we are fostering Russian suspicions * * *. One can understand how they feel about our recognition of Franco, our seizure of Pacific bases, our exclusive policy in Japan, our Red-baiting press and our American-firsters. We have set up a vicious circle of mutual distrust and fear." And certainly he is not an enthusiast for the free enterprise system, preferring the militant socialism of postwar Britain: "* * * while Britain slowly struggles toward economic order, sanity and strength," he wrote in 1946, "the British experiment will be an example for the United States to follow."

The payoff came when on July 15, 1959, Herbert Matthews wrote a front page dispatch from Havana insisting that Castro was neither a Communist, nor "under Communist influence," nor even a dupe of communism. Moreover, he added, there are "no Communists in positions of control." Indeed, Castro continues to be "decidedly anti-Communist."

That dispatch was so brazen a contradiction of events that the Times reluctantly pulled him away from Cuba, as one might pull a man away from marihuana. Since then, he has not had one bylined story on Cuba.

That is almost 2 years ago. During that period he has continued to affirm his belief in the purity of the 26th of July movement: but mostly in the arcane journals of the specialists (e.g., the Hispanic American Report), and in lectures before important audiences. The fault, he says, is ours, for antagonizing Castro, and "forcing him" to take his present hard line. One might as well argue that the Jews, by protesting the confiscation of their property and the insults heaped upon them, forced Hitler into genocide. And in any case, Mr. Matthews' analysis never accounts for the compulsiveness with which Cuba turned to communism, beginning almost immediately after Castro took power.

Now and then Mr. Matthews invites attention to the fact that every one else, save himself, is out of step. "In my 30 years on the New York Times," he told the American Society of Newspapermen last April, "I have never seen a big story so misunderstood, so badly handled, and so misrepresented as the Cuban Revolution." Those words are, as a matter of fact, exactly true; and the fault was the New York Times.

The Senate subcommittee may want to know more about Matthews, and may want especially to know whether the Senate is to expect to have the honor of ratifying his appointment as consultant extraordinary to the State Department. Certainly it will want to examine the major premises of Matthews' position on Cuba. For it is a position that extends beyond the question of Castro, and one that is shared by many Americans, some of whom are influential with the new President. That position holds, in effect, that the United States should interfere, adroitly to be sure, in the internal affairs of nondemocratic Latin American nations. Matthews urged exactly that in the summer of 1958, by proposing that the United States arbitrate the differences between Batista and Castro. To have done such a thing would have been a clear reversal of United States policy—though we did, namely, pull the rug out from under Batista, and turn the entire country over might rather have done that than what we to Castro.

Another article in the Matthews position is that democracy and only democracy distinguishes the good society. Granted, he is perfectly satisfied with the kind of "democracy" that is practiced in Mexico, where everyone votes, and one party always wins; but it bears discussion whether "democracy" is the first objective of American foreign policy in Latin America, or whether it is subsidiary to other concerns, including our own national interest, and, for, Latin Americans, internal stability, economic viability, and nonpolitical freedoms. (Probably the highest per capita incidence of violent deaths in any country this side of the Soviet Union has been in chaotic Colombia, a "democracy.")

A third question is whether the United States can continue, in all good conscience, to encourage Americans to invest in Latin America. Our investments are over $7 billion—making American capital the largest single job creator in Latin America. But the Matthews position on foreign investment consists, as far as one can make out, in encouraging American investment in general, and those governments that will seize, nationalize, or tax to death that investment in particular. He has not, at least in any of his conspicuous writings, deplored Cuba's blithe confiscation of $800 million of American property. Symbolically, the new U.S. administration must answer the question whether the more offensive Fidel Castro is to this country, the madder we are going to get at General Trujillo.

[From the Yale News, Dec. 7, 1960]

MATTHEWS DECLARES REFORM IN CUBA NOT COMMUNISM: U.S. MISUNDERSTANDING OF REVOLUTION CITED

Herbert Matthews, Latin affairs editor of the New York Times, told an overflow crowd at last night's Challenge lecture that the Cuban revolution and reform is not communism per se although it has many communistic features.

Mr. Matthews stated that "the Cubans are doing what the Communists like to see and are tying themselves to the Communist bloc" but that these things do not signify an acceptance of communism. He said that this misunderstanding of the Cuban reform in the United States was having serious consequences.

A close acquaintance of Fidel Castro, Mr. Matthews also asserted that "Fidel Castro is not a Communist. If anything, he is a utopian Socialist." He asked his audience to put themselves in the place of Castro and the revolutionaries. He said that Cuba has been completely reliant on the United States and that after "the United States slammed the door," Cuba either had to surrender or seek * * * other friends.

PERMANENT CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES FOR THE SUPPLEMENT AIR CARRIER INDUSTRY

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, during this first session of the 87th Congress we will be called upon to consider permanent certification procedures for the supplemental air carrier industry. During the closing days of the preceding session, the Congress granted the supplemental airlines a 20-month extension of their operating authority as originally provided by the Civil Aeronautics Board. This was actually emergency legislation brought about when the Court of Appeals held that the Board was without power to issue supplemental certificates.

As a member of the Commerce Committee and the Armed Services Committee, I am vitally concerned about the fate of these much-needed airlines, for they fill an important need in civilian air travel and are currently effectively integrated in the Nation's defense mobilization program. The Military Air Transport Service now contracting with qualified supplemental air carriers, has urged these carriers to make plans for upgrading their airlift capacities. This same interest has been expressed by the

Military Traffic Management Agency, a department of the Army responsible for transporting troops within the continental United States.

This demand on the supplemental airlines is certainly reasonable but can only be achieved by the Congress making sure legislation is passed which will give the carriers an economically sound operational authority. The prominent role of these airlines in the Korean, Berlin, and Hungarian airlifts is a matter of record, and the people of the industry can be justly proud of their service during these emergencies. As a matter of fact, these air carriers were the first air carrier participants in the Congo crisis. The joint membership in the Supplemental Air Carrier Conference and Independent Airlines Association, the consolidated national trade associations representing this class of air carriers, now numbers 23 airlines and a total of 164 airplanes. The industry employs approximately 2,000 people.

I am not now speaking of any particular bill before the Congress, but I feel it is very important that the Congress know more about the promptness with which the supplemental air carriers can respond to a national emergency. Through a 24-hour system of direct contact with the military, these airlines can respond to an airlift need in a matter of hours—and not days. The flexibility of the routes flown by supplemental carrier pilots is a decided asset when they are called upon to respond to the Defense Department for troop movements. I also wish to report the airlines I speak of receive no Federal subsidy. Their growth, despite the usual hurdles which face all pioneer businesses, was achieved by efficient management and dedicated aviation personnel.

VERBOSITY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. President, on yesterday, after having waited for a considerable time for the opportunity, I obtained recognition of the Presiding Officer to address some brief remarks to the Senate on a pending question which I consider to have grave import. Promptly, there were various requests that I yield for motions, remarks, and so forth. Among those to whom I yielded was the distinguished minority leader, the fluent junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with whom it was my pleasure and honor to serve in the House of Representatives and with whom I have had the most pleasant personal association. In the exchange between us, my distinguished friend seemed to become a bit impatient, if not irritated, with my reluctance to permit repeated and prolonged interruptions of a brief statement. In response, I confess to having bristled a bit myself. In this colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois, surely one of the most ariose, mellifluous, dulcifluent orators the Senate now enjoys or has ever enjoyed, I used "verbosity" as descriptive of his utterances.

I understand that my distinguished friend took offense. I am sorry that he did and I wish to make a verbose apology.

Verbosity, Mr. President, is not really a bad word. It denotes wordiness, a prolixity which may serve equally to clarify or to confuse.

Disraeli, in speaking of his rival, Gladstone, described him as "a sophistical rhetorician, inebriated with the exuberance of his own verbosity, and gifted with an egotistical imagination that can at all times command an interminable and inconsistent series of arguments to malign an opponent and to glorify himself."

And the record does not show that Gladstone rose to a point of personal privilege in response.

Shakespeare found use for this rather expressive word—"verbosity"—in "Love's Labor Lost." He said:

> He draweth out the thread of his verbosity finer than the staple of his argument.

Now, I did not use "verbosity" in exactly that sense. I wish to assure the distinguished minority leader that I used the word "verbosity" to denote merely "wordiness." In my opinion, it is not necessarily derogatory to imply that it is possible for one to say in 1 minute what one generally says in 5. Perhaps others, surely including the junior Senator from Tennessee, could tidy their utterances with brevity. If the junior Senator from Illinois feels that such a sentiment, and the expression of it, is an affront to him, then I apologize and trust that this will be but an inconsequential ripple in the flowing tide of rhetoric which I have upon a few occasions enjoyed exchanging with the inimitable and euphonious sockdolager from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The verbosity of the Senator from Tennessee has exceeded 3 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when I find time in my busy life to take down Roget's Thesaurus and Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, and take a trip to Tennessee to drink in the beauty of its scenic hills, I shall then feel properly conditioned to make adequate response to my distinguished friend from Tennessee. But not having had time to think up all the appropriate adjectives, which do not come so "trippingly on the tongue," as Shakespeare phrased the thought, I feel that to respond readily and properly would require deep introspection and deep study on my part. But one day soon I shall address myself to this world-shaking apology.

NEW YORK TEAM TO BE NAMED "METS"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we New Yorkers are proud of our baseball. We have always had a very special brand. In fact, it is so outstanding that New York has exported its baseball to certain areas of the west coast. The move of the Dodgers and Giants to California is referred to by New Yorkers as "aid to athletically depressed areas."

Mr. President, I am glad to call attention to the fact that we are now forming in the great metropolis of New York a new major league baseball team to be called the Mets. This team will begin play next year. I think the name "Mets" is entirely appropriate and I am glad today to call attention to a very excellent baseball article on this monicker which appeared in the May 17 issue of the Sporting News. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOW IT'S OFFICIAL: NEW GOTHAM CLUB ADOPTS "METS" TAG—FRICK AND GILES ON HAND AS OWNERS ANNOUNCE MONICKER; $1,000 PRIZE OFFERED IN CONTEST TO PICK TEAM EMBLEM

(By Harold Rosenthal)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The bouncing ball searched from "Able" to "Zorro" in quest of a name for the new National League franchise in New York and lit right in the middle—on "Mets"—May 8. The official announcement of the new handle was made at a plush press conference at the Savoy-Hilton attended by the new club's owners, along with Commissioner Ford Frick and National League Prexy Warren Giles.

It surprised no one. Newsmen had been calling them the Mets virtually since the inception of the new club, scheduled to take its place along with Houston in the expanded senior loop in 1962.

There were five requirements to which the name had to match up, according to Mrs. Charles Shipman Payson, the leading stockholder. "Mets" met them all. In order they were:

1. Public and press acceptance.
2. Relation to the corporate name of the franchise holder (Metropolitan Baseball Club, Inc.).
3. Descriptive of the entire area from which the new club will draw support.
4. Brevity.
5. Historical background.

METS PERFORMED IN EIGHTIES

On the last count the new name is a repeat on one sported by a New York club in the then-major league American Association back in the eighties. It was called both the Metropolitans and the Mets. The club played in many parts of New York and even ventured under primitive lights in Staten Island after the adventuresome ferry ride across New York Bay.

The new club will be known simply as the "Mets." It will be the answer to a harassed editor's prayer. No matter how narrow the columnar working space permitted him, there will always be a spot to shoe-horn "Mets," just as will the "Colts" name of the new Houston club be accorded similar treatment. Between Yanks and Mets, no one will be able to accuse baseball of squandering any undue amount of printer's ink in New York.

Simultaneously with the name announcement, the club revealed a $1,000 contest to produce a suitable emblem. The contest is open to everyone; the general idea is to come up with an emblem which embodies the same thing behind the name.

Entries will close July 1, and three leading illustrators will serve as judges. They are Willard Mullin of the New York World-Telegram and Sun; Burris Jenkins, Jr., of the New York Journal American and John Groth of Sports Illustrated, famed sports and war artist.

Entries may be directed to the club's headquarters, 680 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Imagination and originality will count heavily. It should be remembered, too, that the outstanding Yankee bat-and-hat emblem was not the work of a professional artist.

Although there was growing feeling that it would be "Mets" in the last couple of months, there was some surprise that Mrs. Payson hadn't put up a sterner battle for her per-

sonal choice of "Meadow-Larks," a name that would fit the planned new stadium at Flushing Meadow. Mrs. Payson had expressed a strong preference for her choice at a winter meeting called among the newsmen. At that time, "Continentals," "Bees," "Skyliners," and "NYBS" were some of the names which made the first 10 on the list.

"Mets" outfooted them all.

GREENTREE STABLE COLORS

In connection with the emblem contest, it should be noted, too, that Mrs. Payson and her brother, John Hay Whitney, former Ambassador to Great Britain and now a publishing palladin, own the turf's Greentree Stable. Their colors are pink and black, a good combination for contestants to keep in mind.

With the lease for the new park still unsigned, it is fairly evident that the first segment of the Mets' campaign next season will be played in the Polo Grounds. The lease's final clauses were expected to be hammered out by the end of the week, after which it was scheduled to shuttle back and forth, from the city's lawyers to the club's lawyers for marginal notes and alterations. June 1 was set up as a possible target date for signing.

It is expected to take at least a week after that to get the lease through the board of estimate. The first time around, when a three-quarter vote is required, a wrangle over pay-TV should hold it up. The second time around, which will come within a day or two after that, only a majority will be required, and it will pass, as in previous tests. The photographers should be snapping that first shovel bite into the Long Island terrain about mid-June.

Met-ronomes: George Weiss, Mets' president, was awarded the Sporting News' citation as major league executive of 1960 at the Mets' christening. It was Weiss' fourth award along these lines, all won in his tremendous career with the Yankees. Accepting the citation, Weiss said with significance, "Off with the old, on with the new." Dixie Howell, former Dodger catcher, has been added to the scouting staff. He'll scout northern Kentucky, with particular emphasis on his native Louisville. Dixie played with the Dodgers, Pirates, and Reds in the majors. His last active year was 1957, when he was with the Dodgers' St. Paul farm.

CORRECTION OF LEGISLATIVE HISTORY, AMENDMENT TO PUBLIC LAW 480, S. 1027

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on April 24 of this year the Senate amended the Agricultural Trade and Assistance Act of 1954—Public Law 480—through the passage of S. 1027.

During the discussion of that particular measure, a colloquy occurred between the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Their discussion centered around the applicability of Public Law 480 to various agricultural commodities depending on whether or not such commodities were in surplus. This discussion appears in column 1 on page 6567 of the RECORD of April 24. During this discussion, the same Senator from Delaware referred to soybean oil, indicating it to be a commodity not presently in surplus and, therefore, ineligible for inclusion under the proposed program.

It is at this particular point that I would like for the record to be clarified.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] properly refers to corn and wheat as being in surplus and as having been designated as eligible for sales financed under Public Law 480. The Senator from Delaware then states in effect that soybeans, soybean oil and soybean meal would not be eligible. The Senator is correct insofar as soybeans and meal are concerned because they have not been determined surplus for Public Law 480, but soybean oil should not have been included. For each of the last 3 years a billion pounds more of edible vegetable oils have been produced in this country than this country would consume. Prices on soybean oil last marketing year reached its lowest point in years, but U.S. per capita consumption did not change and over 1.4 billion pounds of vegetable oil were exported. About half of this was exported for dollars, and about half programed through Public Law 480. Much the same situation exists today. If the U.S. industry crushes about 400 million bushels of beans as is expected—due in great part to meal demand—there will be about 1.5 billion pounds of vegetable oil produced that this country will not consume. Therefore, the Department of Agriculture designated soybean oil as surplus and quantities have been and will be programed under Public Law 480.

In the 1959–60 crop year we estimated how much the dollar market abroad would absorb and the Public Law 480 program was directed against the remaining surplus. We had the good fortune last year of being reasonably close in this dollar demand estimate. This year we have anticipated a very good dollar demand abroad, but again a demand well below quantities available for export. The portion that we do not believe the dollar market of the world will take is made available for Government programs such as sales under Public Law 480.

The purpose of the statement is to make the record abundantly clear that there is a surplus of vegetable oil.

THE EFFECTS OF THE PASSAGE OF THE FEED GRAINS BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on the matter of the feed grains signup, I ask to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Department of Agriculture dated May 10, showing that more than 12,200,000 acres will be diverted from feed grain production this year, because of the passage of the feed grain bill.

This means that the program is working, and that farmers are signing up, as had been anticipated.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

THIRD FEED GRAIN SIGNUP REPORT SHOWS MORE THAN 12.2 MILLION ACRES DIVERTED

WASHINGTON, May 10, 1961.—The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced that the third report on signup under the 1961 feed grain program—through May 5—shows 12,225,417 acres to be diverted from corn and grain sorghum plantings on 555,623 farms this year. Corn and grain sorghum plantings on these farms averaged nearly 30 million acres for 1959 and 1960.

This week's report shows an increase of 4,737,929 acres from the 7,487,488 acres of diversion reported under the program last week.

The third report shows that 11,045,005 acres of corn will be diverted from the 27,078,971 acres of corn base established for farms signed up. For grain sorghums, 1,180,412 acres will be diverted from the 2,810,087 base acres on farms signed up.

The corn base acreage on farms signed through May 5 is about 33 percent of the average 1959–60 U.S. corn plantings of about 83,648,000 acres. The 11 million corn acres to be diverted are about 41 percent of the base acreage on signed farms and about 13 percent of 1959–60 average U.S. plantings.

The grain sorghum base acreage on signed farms is about 15 percent of the preliminary national base of 18,674,989 areas for grain sorghums. The 1.2 million acres of grain sorghum acreage to be diverted are about 42 percent of the base acreage on signed farms.

For all farms signed, possible advance payments under provisions permitting about half of the payments to be made this spring come to about $159,800,000. While the potential total payments for acreage diverted to date under the program are not being determined for these initial reports, Department officials estimate that total payments will probably be more than double the value of the advance payments.

The 1961 feed grains program provides payments to farmers in the form of certificates for diverting corn and grain sorghum acreage to conserving uses. Producers may receive grain or the cash equivalent of grain for their certificates. Diversion of corn and grain sorghum acreage from production this year is expected to achieve a better balance between production and utilization of these grains. Payments to producers will maintain their income this year.

The report shows that certificates covering about $52.2 million worth of grain had been issued to farmers under advance payment provisions. Of the $52.2 million worth of certificates issued through May 5, farmers had received about $44.7 million in cashable sight drafts from county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) offices. In these instances, as provided under the program, the Commodity Credit Corporation pays farmers in cashable sight drafts and then acts as their agent in marketing the quantity of grain covered under the certificates.

Through May 5, farmers had used $10,587 worth of certificates to purchase from CCC 10,558 bushels of corn that had been under price-support loan, and $902 worth of certificates to purchase 863 bushels of CCC-owned corn at binsites.

The following tables show signup figures by States. The first table shows combined figures for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the number of farms with base acreage, number of farms signed up, the total acreage to be diverted, the advance payments that can be paid this spring, the value of certificates issued, and the value of certificates cashed.

The second table shows figures separately for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the average of 1959–60 planted acreages for corn. For grain sorghum, the preliminary total base acreages are shown. (Last week's report showed the 1959–60 planted acreage for grain sorghums. The base acreage figures provide a more accurate comparison with signed acreages, because acreages not eligible under the program, such as sweet sorghums, are not included.) This table also shows the base acreages on farms signed up and the acreage diverted on signed farms.

State	Number of farms with base acreage	Number of farms signed up	Total acreage to be diverted	Advance payments that can be paid this spring	Value of certificates issued	Value of certificates cashed
Alabama	107,874	17,351	274,283	$1,844,128	$455,006	$317,883
Arizona	1,997	333	17,202	305,830	136,455	129,574
Arkansas	15,878	1,834	29,935	305,705	250,911	209,626
California	5,283	752	27,664	432,994	162,992	129,184
Colorado	15,202	1,229	47,635	353,134	201,237	181,800
Connecticut	165	1	20	410		
Delaware	5,107	1,054	23,419	368,206	147,837	128,865
Florida	15,103	3,841	106,098	957,154	912,828	905,679
Georgia	51,460	6,258	149,109	1,266,153	558,862	451,478
Idaho	1,502	113	1,940	44,571	21,033	19,892
Illinois	208,418	71,260	1,625,790	26,723,481	1,494,138	1,129,176
Indiana	154,131	25,504	582,061	10,046,543	1,936,470	1,433,456
Iowa	198,845	88,836	2,327,072	28,667,631	1,321,347	276,710
Kansas	135,000	7,350	211,781	2,181,263	1,051,678	802,659
Kentucky	89,713	21,106	337,319	4,142,771	1,619,063	1,543,878
Louisiana	19,693	2,641	42,507	408,111	446,040	412,715
Maine	1,854	1	10			
Maryland	18,144	2,906	57,975	937,258	177,922	148,439
Massachusetts	1	1	25			
Michigan	92,673	13,171	239,150	3,208,898	1,042,289	706,643
Minnesota	125,943	32,620	807,835	10,095,447	5,790,553	5,361,190
Mississippi	77,662	8,616	119,922	1,251,316	1,078,794	1,062,278
Missouri	139,989	51,059	1,335,037	20,462,471	9,973,770	8,602,858
Montana	2,661	10	268	1,809		
Nebraska	109,921	21,240	676,600	7,208,532	2,056,072	1,429,937
Nevada	25					
New Hampshire	2					
New Jersey	4,191	899	19,770	$290,021	$35,505	$5,626
New Mexico	3,380	355	14,959	149,209	82,789	47,705
New York	35,529	7,576	100,000	1,773,071	1,362,562	1,754,785
North Carolina	141,012	30,489	341,728	5,017,103	4,716,209	4,394,700
North Dakota	27,480	4,363	89,306	421,960	338,041	271,432
Ohio	148,666	26,904	488,028	9,111,545	867,420	579,242
Oklahoma	42,636	5,918	131,881	836,056	602,432	494,305
Oregon	2,595	423	6,865	151,717	44,227	44,227
Pennsylvania	78,841	6,559	82,902	1,449,840	1,408,961	1,392,819
Rhode Island	9					
South Carolina	57,220	8,256	111,890	1,122,104	908,466	849,108
South Dakota	61,557	11,909	369,352	2,816,617	2,166,822	1,567,161
Tennessee	93,777	20,351	331,981	3,01,831	2,917,353	2,765,529
Texas	150,621	18,044	555,016	4,874,529	3,560,722	3,210,486
Utah	2,074	148	1,709	15,585	11,013	540
Vermont	118					
Virginia	41,635	8,272	85,055	1,235,925	1,193,304	1,184,532
Washington	2,945	492	9,532	250,674	219,031	215,704
West Virginia	1,132	88	1,169	19,538	1,047	234
Wisconsin	120,272	25,335	439,865	5,774,258	900,766	506,932
Wyoming	1,586	155	3,758	50,899	48,665	47,480
U.S. total	2,611,532	555,623	12,225,417	159,836,307	52,220,733	44,716,467

State	Corn			Grain sorghum		
	1959–60 average planted acreage [1]	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted	Preliminary base acreage	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted
Alabama	2,212,000	480,755	271,408	34,613	5,932	2,875
Arizona	35,000	922	363	158,208	41,083	16,839
Arkansas	390,500	42,014	26,816	33,580	6,795	3,119
California	230,000	24,050	9,873	250,794	42,011	17,791
Colorado	493,000	39,828	18,036	708,704	79,067	29,599
Connecticut	41,000	25	20			
Delaware	161,500	44,534	23,419			
Florida	600,500	238,222	104,891	4,901	1,593	1,207
Georgia	2,788,500	340,045	147,230	30,968	4,229	1,879
Idaho	81,000	3,414	1,937		11	3
Illinois	10,191,500	4,639,161	1,617,008	24,869	20,533	8,782
Indiana	5,292,500	1,205,745	580,255	19,100	4,262	1,806
Iowa	12,481,000	6,887,690	2,317,121	66,359	35,946	9,951
Kansas	2,032,000	204,470	100,679	5,473,200	314,590	111,102
Kentucky	1,779,000	542,718	332,622	27,029	10,461	4,697
Louisiana	527,500	71,813	40,873	7,430	3,119	1,634
Maine	11,000	20	10			
Maryland	506,000	118,529	57,899	910	99	76
Massachusetts	31,500	25	25			
Michigan	2,224,000	407,826	239,150			
Minnesota	6,822,500	2,474,100	807,541		899	294
Mississippi	1,344,000	205,947	116,459	17,500	7,723	3,463
Missouri	4,270,000	2,330,757	1,181,597	552,273	321,683	153,440
Montana	142,000	421	268			
Nebraska	6,851,500	1,648,454	504,777	1,809,354	482,281	171,823
Nevada	4,500					
New Hampshire	11,500					
New Jersey	191,000	33,884	19,770			
New Mexico	47,000	1,545	783	326,575	35,739	14,176
New York	656,500	164,502	100,000			
North Carolina	1,978,000	592,883	326,074	85,000	22,623	15,654
North Dakota	1,348,500	260,850	89,259	471	101	47
Ohio	3,889,000	911,713	487,942	1,476	176	86
Oklahoma	270,500	25,797	15,553	1,294,000	210,734	116,328
Oregon	67,500	16,777	6,825		92	40
Pennsylvania	1,286,000	126,816	82,665	9,812	381	237
Rhode Island	6,000					
South Carolina	895,500	208,604	109,914	9,500	3,781	1,976
South Dakota	4,283,500	992,295	345,763	222,070	45,429	23,589
Tennessee	1,620,000	504,610	319,861	34,500	20,704	12,129
Texas	1,409,500	212,645	101,930	7,463,564	1,082,799	453,080
Utah	51,500	2,068	1,611	339	316	198
Vermont	59,500					
Virginia	806,000	15,233	83,597	7,890	3,057	1,458
Washington	87,000	16,027	8,582		1,689	950
West Virginia	148,000	1,870	1,169			
Wisconsin	2,870,500	896,031	439,839		62	26
Wyoming	62,000	7,345	3,691		87	67
U.S. total	83,648,000	27,078,971	11,045,005	18,674,989	2,810,087	1,180,412

[1] Planted for all purposes as published in the AMS 1960 Annual Summary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the report of the 10th Federal Reserve District, indicating that as a result of the signup on feed grains considerable improvement has taken place in the towns and villages of rural America, as well as in the large marketing areas, in terms of actual sales of commodities. The improvement is noted along the main streets of town after town throughout the Nation, as a result of cash being made available to the farm producers of feed grains under the program passed by Congress, as recommended by the President. The program is not only working well for the farmers, but its effect is also being felt throughout industry and metropolitan America.

CIVIL DEFENSE AS NOW CONDUCTED INEPT AND WASTEFUL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the defense of American civilians is surely tremendously important.

Were the Soviet Union and Red China to wage war against us, no formal declaration of war could be expected. This Nation would, no doubt, be subjected to a sudden missile attack of a most destructive character, and then there would be immediate retaliation on our part of even greater destructiveness. Many of our civilians would be killed and injured.

This is a problem that cannot be lightly discounted. It is for this reason I have maintained all along that the defense of our civilians is too important to be entrusted to civilians in arm bands. It is not a matter for politicians, or ex-politicians, who have jobs at the public trough as officials or employees of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. It is an important duty of the Armed Forces of the Nation to defend American citizens at home as well as abroad.

Holes in the ground—which, in event of a nuclear holocaust would certainly in urban sections of our country prove to be terrible firetraps—cannot possibly be the answer.

Surely, with equal logic, the evacuation plan promoted by paid civilian defense officials in Ohio, is of no use whatever.

The Soviet Union has missiles on bases within the Russian homeland aimed at targets within the United States and fully capable of striking these targets within 18 minutes of the time of firing.

The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union have in operation intercontinental ballistic missiles capable of hitting on target at a distance of more than 8,000 miles.

That nation, with the largest submarine force of any nation in the world, is fully capable of firing missiles with nuclear warheads from a distance of 1,200 miles from positions off our east and west coasts.

From instant of firing to the time such missiles would strike on target the industrial centers and airfields chosen by the Soviet general staff, 3 minutes would elapse.

For any paid civilian defense official to urge an evacuation program advising residents of urban areas to leave their offices and homes and evacuate toward a neighboring city, is utter nonsense, particularly when the civil defense officials in the neighboring city advocate evacuating that city toward the other. It is futile. Such procedure would

probably result in greater loss of life instead of less.

The facts are that of all moneys appropriated for civil defense 60 percent has gone to payment of salaries and expenses. I was astonished to learn that more than 40 percent of the paid officials of OCDM receive $10,000 or more per year in salaries. Instead of officials advocating run or hide, or both at the same time, we should entrust all aspects of the defense of this Nation to the Armed Forces of our country, to men trained, skilled, and experienced in the science of national defense.

Defense of civilians, of airfields and of cities, and all offensive actions to be taken if and when a war is forced upon us must be handled by and under the authority of those best able to maintain that defense and prosecute an offense.

This means eliminating civil defense as it has been conducted. The lives of Americans are too precious to be entrusted to untrained civilians, including ex-politicians.

Our ally and friend to the north, Canada, has an extensive civil defense program placed in the charge of the home guard of that Commonwealth. In England, the home guard—not civilians with arm bands—handles all matters of civilian defense.

The task force which made a study of this problem and kindred problems under the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] advocated, among other things, that the defense of civilians in the United States be placed in the charge of the National Guard of this country and of the organized Reserves.

It is obvious to all that in event a nuclear war were to be suddenly waged against us, the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, would immediately declare a national emergency and place the Armed Forces in charge. This procedure was adopted more than a hundred years ago by President Abraham Lincoln when the Civil War occurred. Abraham Lincoln suspended the writ of habeas corpus during the early weeks of the war between the States. Though brutal in many of its aspects, this would be considered a brush-fire war according to modern standards.

More than $1 billion of taxpayers' money has been wasted during the last 10 years, and at the present rate it is likely to be another billion dollars within the coming 5 years.

This has been a total loss.

Civilian defense, as it has been conducted throughout the past 8 or 10 years, has been a huge boondoggle.

The patience of our taxpayers is wearing thin. Futile expenditures of their hard-earned money should not be permitted. It is a tragic burlesque to believe that the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization bureaucracy affords the American people any real and authentic protection from the great terrors of our time.

We in America, instead of talking of evacuation and of running for our lives, and, at the same time talking of building holes in the ground, or shelters in our basements, or squandering millions and millions of dollars to build shelters in public buildings, should maintain our Armed Forces in superbly powerful condition and strengthen our power of retaliation, if that should be deemed necessary.

At the same time, we should seek, by patient negotiation and the insistence upon adequate safeguards, to construct the only safe shelter—ending the armaments race between nations and building for permanent peace.

It is a hallucination and a grand illusion or mirage that in this nuclear age a hole in the ground would provide an escape in a rainfall of thermonuclear missiles.

Our Armed Forces will maintain their power of communications in the midst of sudden attacks, but exponents of the conelrad program blithely overlook the fact that were a city, such as Pittsburgh or Cleveland, to be devastated by missiles with nuclear warheads, commercial radio and television stations would be snuffed out of existence, along with many human lives.

The entire character of warfare has changed tremendously and radically since 1945, and civil defense—which was of great value in England in World War II—is as outmoded and as useless now as would be bows and arrows, flintlocked muskets, tallow dips, mustache cups, and other products of early America.

Our long-suffering taxpayers must not be compelled to lay out their hard-earned money in shelter programs. The facts are, as will be admitted by those who talk about "adequate shelter protection" and construction of modern caves in Federal buildings, the cost contemplated by these paid civil defense officials grows into billions and billions of dollars—perhaps $100 billion.

This is fantastic. It is unthinkable. Instead of indulging in such defeatist philosophy, instead of even contemplating such colossal and useless waste of public money, we must promote throughout the world the necessity of solid, workable international agreements with adequate inspection safeguards, to the end that armaments races between nations will gradually be terminated and permanent peace promoted.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one of the organizations which gives great attention to the question of international trade is the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry. It has an impressive membership list and with it is directed by highly knowledgeable and competent officers and directors. In recent years they have been devoting extraordinary attention to questions and problems of international trade and in connection with a consideration of this matter this outstanding organization developed a broad policy statement which is extremely useful and informative. It is of sufficient importance to merit wide diffusion and for that reason I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY STATEMENT CONCERNING INTERNATIONAL TRADE BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY, APRIL 7, 1961

A major economic problem confronting the United States is represented by those industrial nations that are dependent in a significant measure for their well-being and, in some cases even for their survival, upon the ability to sell their goods and services in world markets. In some countries exports amount to as much as 20 to 60 percent of the annual gross national product. It is necessary for these nations to sell abroad if they are to be able to pay for the imported raw materials and goods they require.

This same requirement faces the United States as it becomes more dependent upon foreign sources of raw materials and must export to obtain the necessary exchange. Presently, the United States does not produce more than 80 percent of any of the top list of strategic materials for its defense nor more than 60 percent of two of the most important, copper and zinc.

It has been generally assumed that our domestic market is so large that foreign markets are not important. We have forgotten that as an industrial nation we shall need to import increasingly greater quantities of raw materials in the years ahead. Unless we buy on credit and increase the dollar amounts we owe other nations for these imports, or pay for the imports with gold, the need to expand our exports to pay for imported raw materials will make foreign markets increasingly essential to our national welfare and security. Even purchases on credit must be paid eventually. If we fail to expand our exports, our domestic economy will suffer because of a lack of important raw material imports.

Furthermore, the export of American surplus production provides a major source of employment for U.S. workers and promises to be an area which will create many of the new jobs needed to take up the employment slack in the United States.

An expanding volume of international trade is essential, therefore, for our continuing growth, prosperity and security; to meet essential needs for increased imports and exports; and to help solve our international balance-of-payments problems.

As the largest exporter Nation, the United States has the most to gain from the liberalization and expansion of international commerce. Because metropolitan Chicago produces more manufactured goods for export than any comparable area, and is the center of the major originating region in the United States of exports of both manufactured and agricultural products, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry has consistently supported measures seeking the elimination or greater possible relaxation of discriminatory and restrictive trade practices that reduce the volume of goods and services and the level of international payments.

This support has included endorsement of and action for a constructive and realistic tariff policy, as provided for in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program which gives the Government authority to negotiate and enter into effective agreements for adjustment of tariffs, U.S. and foreign, and the orderly reduction of other barriers to world trade such as qualitative and quantitative restrictions, while affording reasonable safeguards for U.S. industry and agriculture against unfair foreign competition.

In accordance with its long-term policy of energetically promoting sound two-way world trade for the Chicago metropolitan area, the association reaffirms its support of a U.S. foreign trade policy of liberalization

and expansion of international commerce, rather than one that seeks solutions to problems such as balance of payments deficits and import competition through protective and restrictive measures.

The association specifically deplores such practices as boycotts against the products of other nations as those threatened by certain unions in their proposals of refusing to handle in the manufacturing process, components or raw materials from a foreign country.

It would be disastrous if the foreign trade policy of the United States were in this way to be determined by unilateral and unofficial action of certain segments of our population. Such action, the legality of which is questionable, would most certainly lead to retaliation by other countries in the form of restrictions on U.S exports at a time when their further expansion is being vigorously sought to help correct this Nation's continuing balance of payments deficit. As pointed out by President Kennedy and other administration officials, "Two can play this game."

Japanese electronic products and woolens are the objects of the proposed boycotts by the Chicago local of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union, respectively.

There is no question that there is unemployment in the electronic industry in Chicago, and that the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Union local has experienced a substantial drop in membership. Such unemployment is due, however, to production cutbacks in consumer electronic products resulting from a drop in demand rather than to any flooding of the market by Japanese-made components. Total U.S. imports from Japan of such electronic components and parts in 1961 were estimated to be $9.7 million, or less than three-tenths of 1 percent of U.S. production. The value of electronic components and parts manufactured in the Chicago area last year was approximately $370 million. Total Japanese imports of such products into the United States, therefore, represented less than 3 percent of the components produced in the Chicago area alone.

Neither in this instance, nor that of the threatened boycott by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers Union against Japanese woolens to secure a quota on shipment of men's suits from that country to the United States—imports of which amount to two-tenths of 1 percent—has any action been taken to secure relief before the Tariff Commission under the procedure legally established in reciprocal trade agreements legislation.

Japan is one of the largest customers of the United States. In 1959 it was second only to Canada as a purchaser of U.S. products. Last year, Japan dropped slightly behind Great Britain to third position, although it increased its purchases. In 1960, the United States sold Japan $1,332 million of goods, almost $200 million more than $1,148 million of products we purchased from Japan. Further, Japan is our major friend in the Far East, a bulwark against Red China. It must trade to live—if not with us and the rest of the free world, it might very well accept the invitations of the Communist Chinese to do so with them.

Any large-scale revival of the "buy American" fallacy of the depression 1930's that might result from the current recession can only do more harm than good to the United States, and Metropolitan Chicago, commerce and industry. In the decade 1951–60, the United States had a total excess of commercial merchandise exports over imports of $33.1 billion. Last year, with exports approximately $19.5 billion and imports $14.7 billion, the U.S. balance of trade was $4.8 billion in its favor. If the yardstick of $8,000 of manufacturing sales per employee is applied, exports directly provide some 2,440,000 jobs for U.S. workers. On the same basis, $8,000 in sales being equivalent to provide a Chicago area job, would mean that 1960 exports from Metropolitan Chicago directly supported 178,000 workers in this area.

Total national employment resulting from international trade activities, including services, is estimated at 4,500,000 jobs. The U.S. Department of Commerce, following an exhaustive survey a few years ago into the impact of foreign trade on various geographical areas of this country, reported that in Cook County, about 461,000 workers participated in the benefit of such trade.

A former director of this association, David M. Kennedy, chairman of the board of directors, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago, stated in his address to the 24th Chicago World Trade Conference last month:

"Protectionism delays adaption, and it makes it harder to adapt to changed circumstances when reality must finally be faced. Protectionism does not encourage adaption by the protected; it encourages ever greater demands for more protection. Protectionism makes adaption by others more difficult, because it reduces real wages (thus creating demands for higher dollar wages). In addition, it denies the users of protected products the possibility of access to sources of supply as cheap as those of their foreign competitors. Thus, it fosters a vicious circle of protectionism."

In recognition of the facts that protectionism, in whatever form it takes, frequently destroys more jobs in export industries than it saves in protected domestic industries; and we must buy abroad if we are going to sell abroad. Conversely we must sell abroad if we are to buy the foreign raw materials that we need, now and in the future as United States supplies are exhausted, maintaining and expanding our economy to serve an increasing population.

The board of directors of the association approves continued support of policies that promote sound international commerce and opposes those measures, whatever their nature, that inhibit it.

PARLIAMENTARY REVOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate a very important article which appears in this month's organ of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO Letter, entitled "Parliamentary Revolution." It is written by Mr. Desmond Donnelly, a Member of Parliament, who is himself a Socialist. It described how the Communists infiltrated the Czechoslovakian Parliament and turned it to their own purposes in order to subvert the Czechoslovakian Government.

This is more evidence of the degree of sophistication which we in the free societies must have if we are to keep adequate pace with our own cause in the struggle for peace.

I hope very much that every Member of the Senate will read the article, because it concerns a body very much like our own, and shows how it was misused, distorted, and destroyed. These are the kind of lessons from which we should learn. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PARLIAMENTARY REVOLUTION

(By Desmond Donnelly, M.P.)

It is just 13 years since Jan Masaryk was found lying dead in the courtyard of the Foreign Ministry in Prague.

A chill of horror, and fear, ran through almost every Western country. Impetus was given to the proposals for a European alliance that was already in train. Field Marshal Montgomery was rapidly dispatched from London to take over duties as commander in chief, Western Europe. The Brussels Treaty was signed on March 16, 1948, a week after Masaryk's dramatic death. Then there began the rounds of negotiations that led to the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance in April 1949. The events in Czechoslovakia that culminated in Masaryk's death had played their part in helping to bring about the Western alliance.

We now have the publication in English of a document from Prague, that has its roots in those extraordinary days of 1948.

Also, it has a direct relevance to the problems of the 1960's.

"How Parliament Can Play a Part in the Transition to Socialism and the Role of the Popular Masses," by Jan Kozak, a Communist member of the Czechoslovak National Assembly, is a little book that has just been translated by Joseph Josten and published by the Independent Information Center, 4 Holland Road, London, W. 14. It contains an introduction by Lord Morrison of Lambeth, better known as Herbert Morrison, the British Socialist and Home Secretary and Minister for Home Security in the Churchill coalition government during the war and later leader of the British House of Commons and Deputy Prime Minister to Attlee in the 1945 Labor government.

GETTING HOLD OF THE BOOK

The Kozak document came into Western hands in an interesting way. In the autumn of 1957, the annual conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union was held in London. The delegations attending included some from amongst the Communist bloc. At the conference there were the usual statements and assurances about the legality and true parliamentary character of the Communist regimes. Yet one member of the British delegation also heard from a Communist delegate of a book on how to use the parliamentary system to further Communist ends. He was told that its publication had been mentioned in the Czechoslovak Party journal, Rude Pravo.

The British delegate wrote, after the conference, to Prague to Dr. Frantisek Berak, the leader of the Czechoslovak delegation at the Inter-Parliamentary Union Conference. He received no answer. Simultaneously, an order for the book was placed with a Communist bookshop in London and also through an agent in Germany.

A few weeks later a brief answer arrived. It said that the book (that had just been published) was out of print. There the matter rested until a few weeks ago, when by a mere coincidence, a copy of the book was secured.

KHRUSHCHEV'S OWN WORDS

The value of Mr. Josten's translation of Mr. Kozak's book lies in the detailed description and explanation of the Communists' use of the parliamentary system as a significant route to political power. Its specific relevance to the contemporary international situation is made clear by the latest statements of Mr. Khrushchev himself.

The Soviet leader had this to say in his speech to the combined general meeting of the Higher Party School, the Academy of So-

cial Sciences and the Institute of Marxist-Leninism on January 6, 1961, that was published in the magazine, Kommunist (No. 1, January 1961). "Transition to socialism in countries with developed parliamentary traditions can also be carried out by making use of Parliament and, in other countries, of institutions in line with their national traditions. Here it is not a case of making use of bourgeois Parliaments but of the parliamentary form to make it serve the people and fill it with fresh content. * * * For us, the unification and rallying of the revolutionary forces of the working classes, and all working people, and the deployment of mass scale revolutionary actions are an essential condition to gain a firm majority in Parliament. To gain a majority in Parliament, to make of it a body of popular power with the existence of a powerful revolutionary movement in the country means the overthrow of the military bureaucratic machine of the bourgeoisie and the creation of a new proletarian popular state system in parliamentary form. Lenin taught the Communists to be ready, according to the situation, to make use of one or other of the forms of struggle."

In short, Mr. Khrushchev was saying that Parliament has its considerable uses in the struggle for Communist world domination. And Mr. Kozak's work is a more detailed and complementary thesis from the same point of view. It was produced originally as a primer for the theoretical conference of teachers of the Communist Party University in Prague; and it has the value of being based on the unique Czechslovak experience.

PERFECT FRANKNESS

Mr. Kozak is perfectly frank about the events of 13 years ago and the circumstances that led up to them. He writes: "This (Czech) struggle took place during the period 1946–48. In the course of these years the working class, led by the Communists, made effective use of all its old forms of fighting, employed by the revolutionary workers' parties in Parliament, adjusted however to the new conditions—and found new ones. Helped by Parliament, which was used by the working class for deepening the revolution and for the gradual, peaceful and bloodless change of the national and democratic revolution into a Socialist one as 'pressure from below,' and by its effect on the growth of 'the pressure from below,' the bourgeoisie was pushed step by step from its share in the power. This gradual and bloodless driving of the bourgeoisie from power and the quite legitimate constitutional expansion of the power of the working class and of the working people was completed in February 1948 by the parliamentary settlement of the government crisis engineered." I am not surprised therefore that the original British inquiry to Prague for a copy of Mr. Kozak's work went unanswered.

Just what did happen in Prague in those critical days to which he refers laconically as "the parliamentary settlement"? Because of the passage of time I recall them briefly.

PRAGUE'S DAYS OF CRISIS

Czechoslovakia after the war was a test case for the Communist use of the parliamentary system since she had both democratic institutions and a traditional friendship with Russia. Her climate of opinion was reinforced by her disillusionment over Munich and her fear of Germany. In the free elections of May 1946, the Communists won 38 percent of the votes. They also secured important posts in the coalition government, including Klement Gottwald as Prime Minister and Vaclav Nosek as Minister of the Interior. This enabled the Communist ministers once in office, gradually to put their own men into key appointments, despite the growing alarm of the non-Communist ministers.

Tension arose early in 1948, some months before new elections were due to be held in which the Communists appeared likely to lose support, partly because of Russia's hostility to the Marshall plan and Czechoslovakia's subservient withdrawal after, at first, expressing interest.

The crisis came in the middle of February. A majority of the Czech cabinet, becoming increasingly alarmed at the Communist manipulation of key appointments, instructed Vaclav Nosek to reinstate certain non-Communist police commissioners in Prague whom he had replaced by Communists. Nosek, supported by Gottwald, refused. Thereupon the Communist leaders publicly accused their non-Communist colleagues as being reactionaries who were precipitating a crisis in order to overthrow the National Front Coalition that had existed since 1946.

The reaction amongst the non-Communist ministers was swift. Twelve of them resigned. However, these resignations did not include the Social Democrats whose support was essential to secure a majority in Parliament. Gottwald was therefore able to force President Benes to accept the resignations.

AWAITING MILITIA

The Communists now seized the radio and newspaper offices. Party demonstrations were staged at once. Outside Prague and in the background, as in the prewar days of Farcist coups, an armed Communist militia waited in the woods, in case of need.

But it was not needed. The Communist takeover was completed without resistance. As Mr. Kozak says in his own jargon: "It was possible to transform Parliament from an organ of the bourgeoisie into an instrument developing democratic measures of consequence, leading to the gradual change of the social structure and into a direct instrument for the victory of the Socialist revolution."

THE LESSON OF PRAGUE

He goes on to drive home the lesson of Prague, "This fact, coupled with similar experiences gained by the other Communist and workers' parties, led to the possibility being envisaged of the transition of some countries from capitalism to socialism by revolutionary use of Parliament."

Thanks to Mr. Kozak we now have an authentic Communist document showing the Communist technique in the use of Parliament. Furthermore, its implications go wider, as Aneurin Bevan recognized clearly when he wrote in his introduction to a booklet on the fate of the Democratic Socialist Parties behind the Iron Curtain. "The Communist Party is the sworn, inveterate enemy of the Socialist and Democratic Parties," said Bevan. "When it associates with them, it does so as a preliminary to destroying them."

In conclusion, this brings me to my personal viewpoint, as a Socialist, in the struggle that is now going on for the world, the form of which is so clearly stated by Mr. Kozak and endorsed by Mr. Khrushchev. The central division in the world is "Who speaks for liberty?" Some people are against liberty—they are the authoritarians, such as the Fascists and Communists. The rest of us, whatever may be our particular political views, are on the side of liberty. Indeed, we must be alined so, because where there is no liberty, there is no argument—only the unanimity of the grave as Jan Masaryk and others have discovered.

THREAT IS SUBTLE

This concept of political liberty to which we subscribe now faces an attack in which the emphasis is not on the brash, sometimes stupid, frontal approach of Stalin or Hitler. It is the more subtle because it comes from within, based on the 1948 Czechoslovak experience. The fact that this change has come about is the greatest tribute that can be paid to the dawning realization in the Communist mind that the Western alliance—and the possession by it of the nuclear deterrent—makes all-out war an inappropriate instrument of Communist policy. (And so it will remain, only as long as the West retains the will and the necessary means.)

The new Communist attack poses the greatest political challenge in recorded history. For this reason we should be grateful to Mr. Kozak for stating so clearly the threat that we must meet.

AWARD TO MISS CHERYL LYNN MARTIN OF MANSFIELD, OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am gratified to learn that a young lady from Ohio, graduating from Wittenberg College, will be one of the three recipients of national $500 cash awards for outstanding scholastic achievements. Each year Recording for the Blind, Inc., a nonprofit organization recording educational material free of charge on loan for blind college students and blind adults, selects three graduating blind students who are outstanding in scholastic achievement. They are given awards of $500 each.

This year President Kennedy will make the presentation at the White House on May 19 at 12 noon. The Ohio recipient is Miss Cheryl Lynn Martin, a blind college student attending Wittenberg College, and a resident of Mansfield, Ohio.

Mr. President, I wish to join with her many, many friends in congratulating her upon this occasion and for her outstanding diligence and perseverance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief sketch of Miss Martin's scholastic activities be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Cheryl Lynn Martin, 22 years old, of Mansfield, Ohio, graduating with the degree of B.A. from Wittenberg College in Springfield, Ohio. Miss Martin attended Mansfield High School. At Wittenberg College she has grades of A–B and is in the top 10 percent of her class. She is vice president of three honorary societies. She plans to work with disturbed children or in some field of social service. The dean stated of her: "An outstanding young lady—lovely, poised, intelligent, courageous, dedicated—worthy of any consideration."

Recording for the Blind has been recording books for Miss Martin since 1957, primarily in the field of sociology and psychology.

WHAT AMERICANS SHOULD DO

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles that recently appeared in the press.

The editorial in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette is of particular interest, as the Post-Gazette had supported President Kennedy.

The column by William S. White is interesting as Mr. White has generally

supported the President on foreign policy.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, May 4, 1961]

ARE AMERICANS UNWILLING?

In a speech prepared for delivery in Chicago last weekend, President Kennedy said, "Our greatest adversary is not the Russians. It is our own unwillingness to do what must be done."

And that, according to James Reston, of the New York Times, is a topic that the President frequently raises in private conversation.

It also raises a logical and bewildered question from the American public: "What does the President want us to do?" Why doesn't he tell us in what particular we are failing to defend the Nation?

There has never been a time from the days of George Washington in which the American people have failed to follow their national leadership. But they have to be told what needs to be done.

Is the President suggesting that we ought to invade Cuba and/or Laos and perhaps the Congo? Are we refusing to be taxed sufficiently to support an enormous government and contribute to the support of less fortunate peoples around the world? Where are the American people falling down on the job? Do they not produce more than any other people on earth and share their bounty generously?

From his inaugural address ("Ask not what your country will do for you—ask what you can do for your country") until now, the President has suggested that we stand upon the threshold of great personal and national sacrifices. If they are in the cause of justice and freedom, the American people will as always be prepared to make them. But they will need inspiration and direction based upon a clear delineation of what they ought to do and why.

On the domestic front, at least, the President's programs thus far have been geared more to what government can do for the people than what people should do for their country.

COLUMN BY WILLIAM S. WHITE

American foreign policy stands at the most fateful crossroads since the old isolationists and pacifists narrowly failed two decades ago to prevent this country from joining in the resistance to the Nazis and Fascists.

This movement believed itself dedicated to peace and to America first. But had it had its way, America would have finished not first but rather third—the third victim, after Britain and France, of an antihuman force centered in Adolph Hitler.

Now there has arisen to frightening influence a new American isolationism, a new American pacifism, which may well destroy the capacity of the United States to resist the equally antihuman force of communism.

In one way, the danger is greater now than then. For the old isolationists, the old pacifists, at least did not deny their isolationism, their pacifism. But the new isolationism will not acknowledge itself for what it is.

The new pacifism will not admit, even to itself, that the inevitable end of its reasoning is the surrender of one anti-Communist position after another until there will be at last no place left for the West to turn and stand its ground.

Instead, the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, put the plain meaning of their policies under a bland, superior cloud of self-deluding talky-talk. They do not simply say that we should take no risk in this world—not in Cuba, not in Laos, not anywhere—and let it go at that.

Rather, they argue, for example, that Cuba is not really a threat to the United States, in spite of the public alliance with the Soviet bloc publicly proclaimed by Fidel Castro. Cuba is only peripheral, though Cuba lies 90 miles from the American shoreline and though for the first time an aggressive international power has an undeniable lodgment in this hemisphere.

So it is with Laos. Laos is not really worth any risk, either. We are held to be interfering there in local politics, or something or the other.

Again, the preconditions for fair debate are denied for lack of candor among the new isolationists, the new pacifists. For nearly all those who now declare that Castro offers no great danger to us were in the forefront of those who built up the Dictator Castro, with almost hysterical hosannas, in the first place. This truth they cannot admit without admitting their share of responsibility. So what is a truth becomes, to them, no truth at all.

The new isolationists, the new pacifists, have honorable motives. But at the very bottom they are also men caught by a dangerous and shallow myth exploded way back in Hitler's time for all mankind to see. Force is always evil (and all generals always stupid), even when only force is left to defend right and justice. It is the delusion that only diplomacy and negotiation are acceptable weapons.

So we fail in Cuba, because we dare not risk direct action, and thus the censure of the neoisolationists, the neopacifists, in this and other countries. So our Secretary of State refuses one day to sit down at Geneva with Communist gunmen and next day agrees to sit down with them, under pressure of the neopacifists in England, in France, and here.

It is easy to laugh aside those who object to these surrenders. It is only necessary to suggest that we are simply naive, excitable men, flag wavers, and war mongers. But just as Hitler tragically fooled the old isolationists and pacifists, Khrushchev is tragically fooling this new lot.

So President Kennedy faces a great imperative of history. He must soon free himself of every shadow of the new influence of this new lot, or this country is going down the drain—and so is his administration in the long book of history.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE MIDWEST INDEPENDENT DISTRIBUTORS OF NEWSPAPERS AND MAGAZINES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, I received a resolution adopted by the Midwest Independent Distributors of Newspapers and Magazines.

The resolution refers to a regulation by the Post Office Department imposing new requirements on second-class mailings.

We recognize, of course, the need for the freest possible distribution of information media in the country.

To give the Congress the benefit of the resolution adopted by the association, I ask unanimous consent to have its text printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY BUREAU OF INDEPENDENT PUBLISHERS AND DISTRIBUTORS AT ITS MEETING, APRIL 10, 1961

Whereas the regulations of the Post Office Department, imposing requirements of 55 percent, 65 percent or any other percentage of sale of the total print order of all periodicals as a condition of obtaining or retaining second class mailing privileges—

1. Is arbitrary because it relates to the entire print order although only a small portion may be delivered through the mails;

2. It will unreasonably interfere with the orderly distribution of publications;

3. Will prevent the establishment of new publications of the type successfully inaugurated in the past, thus reducing employment, legitimate business profits, and further harassing an industry already burdened, yet vital to the public welfare;

4. Will unnecessarily increase the cost of the publisher, the national distributor and the local wholesaler, and ultimately of every periodical reader which means nearly every family in the country; and

Whereas the Bureau of Independent Publishers and Distributors is the national association of publishers, national distributors and 850 wholesale distributors who distribute the periodicals sold on the 125,000 newsstands in this country: Now be it

Resolved, That the bureau express strong disapproval of the said regulations of the Post Office Department, because they are inimical to the best interests of the Nation, its citizens, and our industry; be it further

Resolved, That the members of the bureau communicate this resolution and its preambles to the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives representing them in the U.S. Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution and its preambles be communicated by the bureau forthwith to the Post Office Department and to the appropriate committees of each House of the Congress.

FOREST PRODUCTS RESEARCH

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, currently the bill, H.R. 6345, providing appropriations for the Interior Department is pending before the Senate Appropriations Committee. Among other things, the bill provides funds for utilization of our forest resources.

Wisely, the administration has recommended additional funds for expansion of the Forest Research Laboratory at Madison, Wis. Over the years, the Forest Products Laboratory has made a splendid contribution toward better preservation, management, and utilization of our forest resources.

These have included such specific accomplishments as: development of prefabricated home construction; improvement of processing of wood products; participation, with private enterprise, in creation of new products; encouragement of better management practices; engaged in research for better marketing for wood products; and generally contributed to better maintenance and utilization of forest resources by Government and private enterprise.

Regrettably, the House of Representatives cut out the $300,000 earmarked for such purpose. Recently, I urged the committee to reinstate such funds.

On May 12, the Green Bay Press-Gazette published a constructive, informative article endorsing the need for expansion of research facilities. The article is particularly significant, since the Gazette speaks to, and for, individuals and a State economy deeply concerned with vital forest resources.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point following my remarks, in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREST PRODUCTS RESEARCH

It is well known that once government engages in an activity it is next to impossible to end the project. There are many examples of unnecessary military establishments which are carried on at heavy Government expense merely because Congress finds it easier to go on paying unnecessary salaries than it is to face a brief period of unemployment for some few military and civilian personnel in various States.

The studies of the Hoover Commission have shown how the Government is wasting money carrying on unnecessary business activities in various parts of the country. Most of these activities contribute nothing in knowledge or experience, are merely routine activities which provide employment and thus bring a measure of prosperity to certain areas.

It is unfortunate that such experiences should be used to keep the Government from moving forward and spending money for important research projects which actually return more in benefits than they cost. Senator WILEY is now asking the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore an appropriation of $300,000 which was cut out of the appropriations bill in the House. The $300,000 is to be used for the extension of research for better management and utilization of forest resources at the Forest Products Research Laboratory at Madison.

In making his appeal Senator WILEY reviewed the past accomplishments of the Forest Products Laboratory. He says that the laboratory has made a contribution not only to better preservation and utilization and expansion of our forest resources but also to the economy and to improved living of our people. He declares that the requested appropriation of $300,000 would be a good investment for the United States because he says: "The Government gets back in taxes about $70 for every dollar spent for forest research and these are only direct returns. The revenue would be further multiplied many times if the wage factors of additional jobs could also be accurately computed."

Senator WILEY is right in making this request. The record of the forest laboratory is there for anyone to inspect and the Senator's claims for it can be verified. By no means should the unhappy experience of Congress in having some unjustifiable appropriations restored for political reasons be used to beat down this request for money which is in the nature of a profitable investment.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a top priority domestic problem of the years ahead is how to clean up the polluted rivers and streams of our country. Already waste materials and pollutants are present to a dangerous degree in much of the water supply of the country. A major effort will be needed to build sufficient municipal and industrial waste treatment facilities to provide clean water for the future. As part of this effort, the House of Representatives recently passed H.R. 6441, amending the Water Pollution Control Act, to provide increased funds for construction of these facilities.

As a cosponsor of a similar measure here in the Senate, I hope that we will act favorably in the near future.

Last year the people of Kansas City approved a $75 million bond issue for construction of municipal treatment facilities. The Council of Kansas City is very aware of the magnitude of the pollution problem and recently recommended passage of H.R. 6441.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of H.R. 6441, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A resolution commending House bill 6441 increasing Federal grants from $250,000 to $800,000 to certain projects.

Whereas House bill 6441, amending the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, among other things to increase the maximum Federal grant for any single project from $250,000 to $800,000, passed the House of Representatives on May 4 and will be considered by the Senate Public Works Committee at an early date; and

Whereas the passage of this bill is in the interest of Kansas City and should receive our support; and

Whereas Kansas City urgently needs financial assistance in carrying out the sewage treatment program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of Kansas City, That House bill 6441 be recommended to the U.S. Senate for early and favorable action and that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and to the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON and Hon. EDWARD LONG, U.S. Senators from Missouri.

PROJECT HOPE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of the outstanding efforts at bringing better health and medical services to the less fortunate peoples of the world is Project HOPE, of the People to People Health Foundation.

The first ship of this privately directed and sponsored group has been touring southeast Asia, on a teaching and training mission. This practical example of American good will has been warmly acclaimed by the nations visited.

GP, a monthly magazine published by the American Academy of General Practice in Kansas City, Mo., recently commented on the work of Project HOPE.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from GP, March 1961, entitled "Project HOPE, Warmly Acclaimed Abroad, Will Be Greatly Expanded During 1961," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT HOPE, WARMLY ACCLAIMED ABROAD, WILL BE GREATLY EXPANDED DURING 1961

An extended schedule for Project HOPE (Health Opportunity for People Everywhere) in 1961 has been announced by the project president, Dr. William B. Walsh.

The *Hope*, the hospital training vessel which set out from San Francisco last fall, has been anchored off Sumbawa, one of the many islands making up Indonesia.

Dr. Walsh reports that the *Hope*'s warm reception in Indonesia has shown that this teaching and training idea fills a long-existing vacuum. He said invitations had been received from Vietnam, Cambodia, Thailand and Korea for the *Hope* to visit their ports on its teaching and training mission, to aid in staffing a school of tropical medicine in Dacca, East Pakistan, and to give assistance in establishing a clinic in Karachi, Pakistan.

"There is no limit to the work that needs to be done and there is no change in our concept that floating teaching and training ships are the basis of our operation," said Dr. Walsh. He added, "We are actively planning to outfit vessels for Africa and South America."

During the *Hope*'s first 2 months in Asia, about 200 Indonesian medical workers—whose training ranges from American and European universities to village medicine men—attended daily teaching sessions on the hospital ship, with as many as four sessions a day.

Twenty-five nurses from the Bandung Nursing School, the only college-accredited nursing school in Indonesia, lived on board the ship so that they could utilize to the fullest extent the resources on board the training and teaching vessel.

THE ANNUAL SUDETEN GERMAN DAY CELEBRATION

Mr. THURMOND. During the period May 20–23, 1961, the annual Sudeten German Day Celebration takes place in Cologne, West Cermany. West German Federal Minister, Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, president of the Sudeten German National Union, will preside over the meetings of this great annual rally. In a meeting on Saturday, May 20, the Charles IV Price, founded by the Sudeten Germans in memory of the Bohemian King and German Emperor Charles IV whose reign brought a great flower to both the Czech and Sudeten German people in Bohemia in the 14th century, will be awarded to the president of the Slovak League of America, Mr. Philip A. Hrobak. The Slovak League of America represents over 2 million Americans of Slovak descent. In 1918, the first Czechoslovak Republic was founded through the agreement between the Slovak League of America and the Czech representatives.

In the Saturday meeting, several members of the German Federal Government will take part, together with numerous members of the Bundestag, state governments and legislatures, as at the mass rally on Sunday morning at which most of the participating 300,000 Sudeten Germans will be present. The series of meetings will end on Thursday, May 23, when Minister Seebohm has a reception for the guests of honor, including four Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and all members of the German Federal Government.

The Sudeten German Days of the past have shown the adherence of the Sudeten German people to the principles of democracy, free enterprise, political and economic freedom, and political and human justice toward other people and nations.

Out of the total of 13 million German expellees and refugees, including those from the Soviet Zone of Germany, the Sudeten Germans who had been deported from Czechoslovakia by the Communists in 1945 represent a most active and pro-American element. They have their representatives in the Federal and State legislatures, in the Federal and State governments in West

Germany, and they have built up their free economic enterprises in Germany. Their representatives have been in contact with numerous U.S. Senators and Congressmen.

The Sudeten Germans desire to live again, when Communist rule is removed from the Sudeten, as free people and neighbors in friendship and cooperation with the Czechs with whom they had lived for many centuries. They consider it, moreover, their duty to give any assistance they can to the Czechs and Slovaks who are working for the liberation of their peoples from communism and to give this assistance and cooperation to all Western nations who strive to keep freedom in the world.

I hope that the Sudeten German Day will be a success, and I trust that it will result in an even firmer resolve to work for freedom for all peoples everywhere in the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article which recently appeared in Bulletin No. 52 of the Press and Information Office of the Federal Government of Germany entitled "Instigation of the Central German Youth." I believe this article, which shows how the East German Communist regime is trying to influence adversely the minds of young children, will be of interest to my colleagues.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSTIGATION OF THE CENTRAL GERMAN YOUTH—COMMUNIST CAMPAIGNS FOR CAUSING AVERSION AGAINST THE WEST ARE ALREADY STARTING IN KINDERGARTEN

While, for some time, Ulbricht and his commissioners—strictly following the line of the soft wave—pose as affable and full of understanding, even making some allowances now and then, in order to meet the continuous escape from the zone and other difficulties, the old course of the SED is nevertheless carried on without any reductions as far as basic principles are concerned. The Communists discern very carefully whether it is a question of tactics which can always be changed or a question of strategic aims, which have to be steady, the eyes kept on them. Obviously all basic problems concerning education fall under the latter category, especially all the attempts of gaining the youth of central Germany for the SED course—undertaken since years however with questionable success—as well as those attempts of inspiring the same youth with fanatical hatred and aversion against the capitalistic West, especially the Federal Republic.

In setting their goal, the SED leaders assumed that the youth barred behind the Iron Curtain and incapable of own inquiries would not be able to make comparisons or to check the propagandistic assertions of the party. Thus commissioned functionaries of the youth organizations of the SED developed in day nurseries, houses of Pioneers, and schools an unrestricted propaganda of hatred against all that comes from the West. By it they speculated that all the impressions and imaginations they implanted in the souls of the children would produce considerable aftereffects, deciding, indeed, the minds of the young men and girls and, maybe, influencing them for the rest of their lives. These expectations, however, were not fulfilled. On the contrary, SED leaders had to admit that their efforts for many years to bring forth a Communist reeducation of the youth by far did not show the success to be expected, even though the SED state had spent considerable sums for this experiment.

Notwithstanding the above fact the SED leadership systematically continues their efforts for a political coordination of the youth, one may say with an even more increased zeal. Even the youngest, namely those between 6 and 10 years old, joined in the organization of the Young Pioneers, are not exempted from it. In spite of the pacific intentions which, from time to time, Ulbricht preaches in the present thaw period, the leaders of the Pioneers are directed to continue their efforts of stirring up the aversion against the West, especially against the Federal Republic, to teach the children accordingly, to further all premilitary training and thus to prepare the Pioneers for their readiness for the defense of peace and the grand achievements of our state of laborers and farmers. This education for hatred starts already in the kindergarten, where the infants are shown the happy life in the Socialist state of the future, which is, however, fatally menaced by the bad capitalistic West. According to the directions of the party the meetings of the Young Pioneers should be arranged more attractively in the future, so e.g., the joker in the puppet shows should not beat the devil's grandmother, but atomic bomb Adenauer.

In order to discourage hostile agents and informers, guards will be kept in holiday camps in the future and Western spies will be chased in outdoor games. The children are fed with sentimental stories about the humaneness of the Ulbricht regime and the infernal intentions of the Adenauer clique. Thus the ABC newspaper, a newspaper for children issued with governmental subsidy, tries to influence the children's feelings by the following story: "The plants in our German Democratic Republic belong to all of us. But that was not the way all the time. Before 1945 a few rich idlers possessed the plants. * * * These swindlers escaped to West Germany. There they brood over cunning plans. Like the big bad wolf among the animals they want to go out to plunder in our republic. Our plants, belonging to the nation, your beautiful houses of the Pioneers, and all recreation centers, all this they want to get back for their personal use alone.

Another essay of the ABC-Newspaper has as subject the following:

"Tears are running over mother's cheeks * * *. Why are mother and children so sad? Where is the father He was taken prisoner in West Germany. His name is Bruno Mirus. Why is he in jail? Only criminals and thieves, I suppose, are imprisoned. But Bruno Mirus was put in jail, because he is a courageous and kind man. He loves the people and especially children. It is his desire that no new war should ever break out again. One day he went to West Germany. In West Germany, however, rules an old bad man called Adenauer. He hates all kind people. For he wants war. His police forces imprison all those who wish to prevent war."

The thesis of a new Fascist regime ruling in West Germany and aiming at another war, is, in all variations, also propagated in other zonal literary magazines for children and juveniles. So the Soviet-zonal Department of Defense issues cheap periodicals, in which there are disseminated awful stories about West Germany's mercenaries of NATO and American gangsters of occupation. Along with these horrible tales a moral appeal is addressed to the readers, namely to defend the German Democratic Republic and its grand achievements. The Pioneers are admonished to take a lively interest in the military service—the earlier the better to practice premilitary outdoor training or all sorts of fighting sport. The Communist Pioneer organizations, consisting of the Young Pioneers between 6 and 10 years old and the Thälmann Pioneers between 10 and 14 years, undertake the patriotic education of the children, in order to keep them under the influence of the Communist policy of education and to train them, as much as lies in their power, for dull obedience toward the SED state. This educational system is continued in the Free German Youth—comprising the juveniles of more than 14 years—to an even increased extent.

The goal of this education of the youth, namely to hate everything that does not belong to the Communist part of Germany, is obvious. The SED leaders think that they have found in the young people living within their sphere of influence the suitable manpower for an army necessary in case of a civil war, i.e., in its last consequence, the manpower for a second Korea on German ground. Due to the strong spirit of resistance among the central German population, Ulbricht, no doubt, is still far off from this goal; but, considering the aforementioned facts, it is certainly very useful to check the various offers for a possible coexistence as to their true authenticity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR PROMOTES SEGREGATION

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think many Members of Congress and persons throughout the country will be interested to learn that while the Secretary of Interior talks boldly of integration and his support of it, even to the extent of telling the Washington Redskins who may play football in the public's stadium, he signally fails to practice what he preaches when it comes to the American Indian, whose Bureau of Indian Affairs is under his direction.

A case in point is the strange and unexpected resistance which the Department of the Interior, under the direction of Secretary Udall, is demonstrating to the efforts of South Dakota and other areas to improve the enforcement and administration of law and order on Indian reservations. Those interested will find a full explanation of the situation in the printed hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Department of the Interior Appropriations.

All we ask is that Secretary Udall show the same solicitude for the "redskins" on our Indian reservations as he shows for the Redskins footfall team in Washington, D.C.

Meantime, Mr. President, I call attention to this unhappy paradox by asking unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a syndicated article entitled "Indian Sign's on Udall," written by David Sentner. I think it will prove to be an illuminating discourse.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIAN SIGN'S ON UDALL

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON.—Interior Secretary Stewart Udall once again is mired in the grand canyon of controversy.

The No. 1 ad liberal in the Kennedy Cabinet recently drew fire from GOP Congressmen for allegedly being linked with a lobbyist who urged oil companies to buy tickets for a Democratic fund-raising dinner.

Udall also has been castigated by Republicans for lobbying in person for various administration-sponsored bills.

This time Udall is charged with trying to segregate the Nation's Indians despite his being billed as one of the major advocates for racial integration and civil rights.

Udall is pictured by Republican members of the Senate Interior Appropriations Subcommittee as supporting a policy which would make the 400,000 original Americans under his charge live a life apart from other Americans.

The Udall blueprint, they add, would make American Indians attend segregated schools on their reservations and in many instances, be subject to tribal courts in event they broke the law.

Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, in discussing the abandonment by Udall of the policy advocated by the previous Republican-controlled Interior Department, said:

"That doesn't quite square up with the administration's talk of integration in other fields.

"think they should have the same sympathy for the red man that they have for the black man and the yellow man and anybody else."

The present stand for segregation of American Indians by Udall was contrasted by GOP Senators with the Secretary's recent demand to George Marshall, owner of the Redskins, that he hire a Negro player for his professional football team.

The present hassle involving Udall is connected with the "law and order" measure pending in Congress which is intended to let the States exercise more powers in order to bring the Indians back into the general stream of American life.

The bill was approved wholeheartedly by Republican Interior Secretary Fred Seaton in the last session of Congress, although not voted upon.

The measure was reintroduced this session when Udall registered an adverse report to the committee conducting hearings.

The opposition of the Interior Department is based upon the argument that strong groups of Indians are against weakening the Federal Government's supervision of Indian affairs by sharing it with the States.

Critics of the Udall position charge he is working the old New Deal line in adding further powers to the Federal Government at the expense of State rights.

TELEVISION PROGRAMING

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, never before has one medium of communications come so far so fast as has television in the last 15 years. TV is so much a part of our life today that it is difficult to remember that it is only an adolescent having all the enthusiasm, energy, and faults of someone growing up. But remember we must; otherwise we shall fall into an unreasonable pattern of being too strict and too harsh when it errs.

There is much to praise in TV programing, and there is much to condemn. I venture to say that there is no perfect medium of communication, information, or entertainment to be found in this country or the world. Nevertheless, I believe broadcasters are becoming increasingly aware of their responsibility to strive for better programing, more educational programs, and more stimulating looks at the many facets of American society. At the same time, station owners and networks are in business; they must show a profit. Therefore, they will seek a balance in their programing which will include not only science, Shakespeare, news, and documentaries, but westerns, detective stories, and comedies, as well.

Balance is what broadcasters are seeking, Mr. President, and balance is what I believe the American viewing public wants. That balance cannot be achieved by dictatorial pronouncements by any one man, whether he be in the industry or in a regulatory agency connected with the industry.

About 1 week ago, I devoted my weekly newsletter to the subject, "Television on the New Frontier." Some of my predictions in that letter have since been proved right. The current issue of Broadcasting magazine, the most authoritative weekly of the broadcasting industry, has published two editorials touching on the key issue of censorship and self-regulation in the TV industry. They contain uncommon good sense and wise counsel. I recommend them to all who are interested in the fate and fortune of television.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD my weekly newsletter entitled "Television on the New Frontier," and the two editorials published in Broadcasting magazine of May 15, 1961, entitled "The Wrong Path to Greatness" and "Needed: More Light Than Heat."

There being no objection, the newsletter and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION ON THE NEW FRONTIER

(By Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, of Maryland)

WASHINGTON, May 8, 1961.—The determination of the administration to alter every possible area of our society (whether we like it or not) can be clearly seen in the activity of the Federal Communications Commission during the first 100 days. Led by its new Chairman, the FCC is contemplating several revolutionary decisions regarding television.

Since January 1, the three networks and most stations have had an agreement that a station will reserve 2½ hours of prime evening time each night for network programs. This contract has worked previously to the mutual benefit of both parties. The FCC, however, has questioned whether this practice is not monopolistic and a violation of antitrust laws. Yet, without option time and its obvious guarantees, networks might well fade away along with all their good and bad programs, including the many news and public affairs shows which the networks now carry without sponsors.

The FCC has also distributed proposed new program forms which each station must submit every 3 years to receive a permit to continue broadcasting. Each new station must also fill in these forms, which strongly emphasize public events, education, and news programs. Station owners understand that the New Frontiersmen on the FCC will not be overly sympathetic to their request to stay on the air unless they include what the Commission considers enough public service programing. This practice, while consistent with Federal law, could produce Government control of programing if carried to excess.

Another field which has caught the eye of the FCC is educational television (ETV). The Commission has stated that inasmuch as New York City and Los Angeles each have seven commercial channels in use, one of them should be an ETV channel. But is one educational channel, uncertainly financed, more in the public interest than a general educational program carried by several financially sound stations?

All this FCC activity suggests most emphatically that TV stations and networks had best begin to set their own house in order without delay. Leroy Collins, president of the National Association of Broadcasters, is a man with considerable experience in the ways of government. His advice to the gentlemen of radio and television to carry out an active and effective policy of self-regulation should be heeded before the Federal Government, through hasty and possibly ill-advised action, makes their future good intentions rather academic.

[From Broadcasting magazine, May 15, 1961]

THE WRONG PATH TO GREATNESS

The true condition of broadcasting lies somewhere between the extremes described last week during the annual convention of the NAB.

Broadcasting is not nearly as bad as FCC Chairman Newton Minow pictured it.

It is better than NAB President LeRoy Collins thinks it is.

It is not nearly as good as it is believed to be by the broadcasters who winced at Mr. Collins and cried in rage at Mr. Minow.

If any of the major speakers could be said to have identified, with accuracy, the nature of broadcasting today, it was President John F. Kennedy. Broadcasting, said the President, who must be acknowledged as an expert on the subject, is the most powerful and effective communications force yet designed, but it has an opportunity to be even more powerful and effective.

That, it seems to us, sums up broadcasting at this point of its evolution. It is good, even great in some respects. But it needs to be moved toward higher planes of greatness. The question is whether the movement will come from within broadcasting, from a restless, internal search for excellence, or from outside it, from those who would impose their personal tastes in the belief, however well intended, that they have a mission to elevate broadcasting by force and so to elevate the whole public.

If the movement is to be generated from outside broadcasting, it can be done only at the frightful cost of lost liberty. This to us is the real reason for alarm in Newton Minow's speech. He demanded improvement in programs and in the next breath threatened revocation of licenses as the penalty for failure to abide by that command. In his view that procedure is legal. In our view it is not. At some point soon an attack must be mounted against Mr. Minow's interpretation of the first amendment and of the anticensorship provision of the Communications Act. We think the attack can be successful if it is conducted by authorities who understand constitutional law.

The weakness of the theory that the FCC can evaluate programing without offending the first amendment was clearly revealed in Mr. Minow's speech last week. He said, for example, that in the new license application forms which the FCC is preparing he hoped there would be a place for TV network affiliates to report their clearances of network

information programs. To quote him exactly:

"I believe that stations taking network service should also be required to report the extent of the local clearance of network public service programing, and when they fail to clear them, they should explain why. If it is to put on some outstanding local program, this is one reason. But if it is simply to carry some old movie, that is an entirely different matter. The Commission should consider such clearance reports carefully when making up its mind about the licensee's overall programing."

It is obvious that Mr. Minow intends the commission to make a judgment whether a local origination that is substituted for a network show is good or bad. The minute the FCC makes a judgment of that kind—even if responsible people would agree with the judgment—it has put the Government in the business of program evaluation. And if the power to evaluate programing is accompanied by the power to revoke licenses, the business is censorship, no matter how many times Mr. Minow says it is not.

There is an element of sophistry, it seems to us, in Mr. Minow's professions of abhorrence of censorship. "I am unalterably opposed to governmental censorship," he told the NAB. "There will be no suppression of programing which does not meet with bureaucratic tastes."

That promise would be more persuasive if it were not contained in a speech otherwise devoted wholly to a description of the means by which Mr. Minow hopes to force a change in television programing. If he ever does persuade a majority of commissioners to cancel the license of a station whose programing has been judged inferior, the act would constitute a total suppression of all programing of that station. And the act would have been taken precisely because the programing did not meet with bureaucratic tastes.

The first opportunity for a challenge of Mr. Minow's position is already at hand. The FCC has requested comments on its proposed changes in license application forms. It will be interesting to see how vigorous a comment will be filed by the NAB under its new leadership. We would hope to see an NAB document at least as positive in its defense of freedom as the comments filed several weeks ago by the Washington law firm of Pierson, Ball & Dowd, on behalf of 19 of its client stations (Broadcasting, May 1).

The law firm said the FCC's proposed forms of program reporting would lead to "censorship in its simplest form." It is an attempt by Government to influence the content of communications, said Pierson, Ball & Dowd. "Whether the hand it lays upon broadcast programing is heavy or light, the clear purpose of the Commission is to use its licensing power to prevent some broadcast communications and to elicit others."

Mr. Minow's speech last week made the Commission's purposes even clearer. There can be no doubt now that he has embarked on a calculated plan of program controls, and it may be assumed that he believes he has the necessary votes to execute it. If broadcasters allow him to proceed on that course, they will deserve all the regulation they get.

It seems to us that the real message of the NAB convention last week was this: Broadcasting must invigorate its efforts to keep what freedom it has and indeed to reclaim the freedom it has lost. It must also invigorate its efforts to improve and diversify its programing. There was some truth in Mr. Minow's criticism and in what LeRoy Collins said. But the greatness that broadcasting must seek cannot be gained by Mr. Minow's methods. It will come only from broadcasters themselves, if it comes at all.

[From Broadcasting magazine, May 15, 1961]

NEEDED: MORE LIGHT THAN HEAT

Three thousand broadcasters came to Washington last week. They heard, they saw and they all but collapsed.

What they heard from FCC's new Chairman, Newton N. Minow, and from their new NAB president, LeRoy Collins, should not have surprised them. Both have been administering shock treatments on the same general theme since assuming their respective offices earlier this year.

There's always talk of defections from the NAB on the premise that broadcasters deserve something better than a scolding from their president. They do not like the similarity of the Minow and Collins views on programing. They want action now and vigorous action to stem the Minow tide and answer his threats.

It would be unfortunate if not disastrous to launch a rump movement now. A divisive movement to set up a new trade association would play into the hands of the opposition. The NAB board meets next month. There will be less heat. Moreover, a careful reading of Governor Collins' speech shows that he has revised some of his views since he has had broader exposure to the realities of competitive broadcasting. He is able, bright and energetic. He has the potential of becoming broadcasting's ablest spokesman.

It was not only what Mr. Minow said but the manner in which he said it that provoked broadcasters. His painstakingly prepared speech was intended more for public than for broadcaster consumption. He wanted to hit the front pages and he did because the speech was calculated to pander to the competitive press.

We deal with Mr. Minow's foray into program control on our editorial page this issue. To us it is evident that he is attempting to circumvent the first amendment. We believe he cannot sustain his campaign if broadcasters—and that means the NAB—will close ranks.

There is one immediate job that needs to be done with or without the support of the NAB. That is congressional veto of the President's reorganization plan that would give the FCC Chairman absolute control over the seven-man FCC. So far, Governor Collins has not seen fit to oppose this mischievous legislation.

After the Minow demonstration last week it should be clear what might happen with one-man control. The Chairman would be enabled to pick his own divisions or panels of commissioners for particular assignments and in that manner virtually guarantee the results he wants in any given circumstance.

Mr. Minow himself, unwittingly, helped the cause of those who oppose the FCC packing plan. Throughout his rather remarkable address he eschewed the collective "we." It was first person, singular throughout—what "I" rather than what the FCC would do.

Fortuitously, many Members of Congress were quickly made aware of the Minow ultimatums. They were the guests of constituent broadcasters at the NAB reception held only a few hours following the Chairman's address. And most of them were indignant.

Broadcasters interested in the preservation of what freedoms remain and in their own future well-being must move now to parry the first threat of the New Frontier. They should urge their congressional delegations—irrespective of party affiliations—to veto Reorganization Plan No. 2 covering the FCC. This measure becomes law 60 days from its date of delivery on April 27 unless vetoed by the Congress before then.

There are Members of both Senate and House who would willingly lead a veto movement. But they must know they will have adequate support. That support can be demonstrated if broadcasters will promptly let their elected legislators know. There isn't much time left.

INTERAMERICAN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 6518, the Inter-American appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the Inter-American social and economic cooperative program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senate will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 7, after "expended" it is proposed to insert: *"Provided,* That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at an interest rate in excess of eight per centum per annum."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the House has disagreed to the Senate amendment and has insisted upon its version of the bill. The Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, and the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Bowles, have written to the Committee on Appropriations urging that the Senate amendment be deleted, since it was felt by the administration that the restriction on interest rates is too rigid.

Mr. Bowles, in his letter, pointed out that the great majority of loans will be made bearing an interest rate of 8 percent or less, but that in some instances, it may be necessary to make loans at an interest rate in excess of 8 percent.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter from Secretary Dillon, a copy of the letter from Secretary Bowles, and a position paper from the executive branch on the Senate amendment.

There being no objection, the letters and paper were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to H.R. 6518, and to the amendment offered by Senator WILLIAMS which was adopted by the Senate, having the effect of placing a maximum limit of 8 percent on the interest rate which might be charged on loans or reloans of funds provided for the special Latin American fund.

The administration is fully in accord with the need to keep interest rates as low as possible which was the purpose behind the offering and adoption of the Williams amendment. However, as we have previously indicated, the setting of a flat ceiling of 8 percent would provide technical and other difficulties which might interfere with accomplishment of the purposes of the Latin American fund.

I believe that all of the purposes lying behind the Williams amendment, and on

which there is general agreement, could better be accomplished by insertion in the trust agreement of a specific provision to the effect that the funds made available will not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest which are excessive or unreasonable for the borrower.

I have in mind insertion in article IV, section 4.02, of the proposed trust agreement a new second sentence reading as follows: "In order to achieve the purposes of this agreement for benefiting the individual citizens of Latin American countries, the Administrator in granting loans shall establish such conditions as are necessary to assure that the funds made available will not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest which are excessive or unreasonable for the borrower."

I have no doubt that the directors of the Inter-American Development Bank, who are fully conscious of the need to provide funds at low cost to the borrower, will find this language acceptable.

I hope that the action which I propose, as described above, will make it possible for the Senate to complete action on this bill without the amendment.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 18, 1961.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to express the concern of the Department regarding the amendment added by the Senate to the Latin American social development appropriation bill reported by your committee.

This amendment would impose a rigid ceiling of 8 percent on interest on loans and reloans made with funds provided by the bill. Although the amendment would seem to be reasonable on its surface, it could in practice have a seriously damaging effect on the achievement of some of the purposes of the new program.

The Department is, of course, anxious that interest rates to the borrower under this program, and in fact generally, should be as low as is reasonably practicable. However, one of the principal purposes of this new program is to encourage the growth of savings and loan associations to attract widespread savings from ordinary people so that the capital thus assembled may be used for low-cost housing and other important social needs. Under the conditions existing in many Latin American countries the rigid interest ceiling provided in the amendment would seriously hamper the attainment of this important purpose.

I believe the proposal made by Secretary Dillon for insertion of a provision on interest in the trust agreement would achieve the valid objectives in which we are all interested, without incorporating the harmful rigidity of the amendment. Under such a provision we are confident that in the great majority of cases act of Bogotá loans under the Inter-American Development Bank can be kept at rates of interest at or below 8 percent and it is the intention to do so. In those cases in which this is not possible, there will be adequate documentation explaining why a higher rate was necessary.

I hope that for the full success of the new program the Senate will not find it necessary to insist on this amendment.

Sincerely yours,

CHESTER BOWLES,
Acting Secretary.

POSITION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH ON THE SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 6518

The administration is fully in accord with the need for keeping interest rates as low as possible in relending funds for the Bogota program. The amendment, however, would raise difficulties in carrying out the program, especially in achieving the important objective of using funds as seed capital to assist in creating institutions in Latin America which could mobilize domestic savings for housing and other social progress activities. In many countries a specific ceiling would make it impossible for savings institutions to attract private savings. Accordingly, we would favor the House version of the bill.

BAR TO ATTRACTING SAVINGS

The reason that it would be impossible for savings institutions to attract savings in some countries is because in order to attract the savings of those persons who do not now have the savings habit these new institutions must pay a competitive rate for deposits. The interest on deposits will determine the interest to be charged borrowers. The new institutions will require approximately a three point spread to cover administrative costs and to build up growth resources and appropriate reserves, even though they are not profitmaking institutions. In most countries in Latin America capital is generally scarce and ordinary people are not well accustomed to savings, so that the interest rate on savings accounts ranges from 5 to 10 percent. Therefore, for these cooperative savings and loan associations to succeed in their purpose of attracting and accumulating local savings, it will be necessary for them to charge borrowers from 8 percent to 13 percent. It should be noted particularly that such savings and loan institutions are mutuals in which the borrowers must all be depositors and in which, along with all other depositors, they will share in the net profits, if any.

These institutions have established maximum costs for houses for which they will make loans and this will be required of future institutions. The loans are thus limited to people of moderate income whose capacity to pay is carefully evaluated on a formula taking into consideration their monthly incomes. The encouragement of these thrift institutions will mobilize hitherto untapped resources and aid the economic development of the country involved as well as providing a larger pool of loan money available and hence tend to bring down interest rates.

EIGHT PERCENT MONEY

Although the amendment specifically places only a ceiling upon the interest rate for the loaning or reloaning of funds, it will provide an opportunity for Communist propaganda to refer to the funds available under this program as 8-percent funds and claim that Russian long-term credits are available at 2 percent. Despite the fact that the interest limitation in the amendment applies to the ultimate borrower and the Russian rate applies to the initial loan, it would be difficult—if not impossible—to counter the Communist claims by explaining this difference to the mass of people.

IMPACT OF INFLATION ON INTEREST RATES

Consideration of interest rates also requires consideration of the effects of inflation. As the table following shows, in most of South America and parts of Central America, price inflation has been a very serious problem in recent years. While strenuous efforts are being made to cope with this problem, and further such efforts will be an essential part of the intensified development programs, it is not possible to get rid of inflationary habits or expectations overnight.

When the whole price level is rising, for example, by 10 percent per year, and both lenders and borrowers expect a continuation of this degree of inflation, interest rates are bound to exceed 10 percent, since that much nominal profit (or capital gain) can be secured simply by buying land or raw materials (or foreign currency) and holding them for a year. A nominal interest rate of 15 percent in this situation would represent a true interest rate of 5 percent added to an allowance for inflation of 10 percent. As long as the inflation continues, or is expected to continue, private investors will not put money into such productive uses as savings and loan institutions, unless they foresee a positive real return. In order to cover both true interest on their savings and a provision for inflation, a lending interest rate substantially over 10 percent is necessary in this example. As stabilization programs prove successful, the money market responds by accepting a lower "inflation component" in the interest rate.

This problem of inflation is particularly pertinent in the case of IDB loans. With respect to these loans, the trust agreement provides that the value of the repayments must be maintained in dollar equivalent terms. The borrower from the IDB, in order to make certain that it can meet its obligation to maintain the value of repayments, should include in its relending terms a proper allowance for inflation. This is normally done by including an inflation allowance in the rate of interest.

While it is theoretically possible to allow for inflation through use of some kind of maintenance of value clause in the relending terms to the ultimate borrowers—something like the gold clause used in the United States before 1933—in many countries such clauses are not permitted by law; even where they might be lawful, their administration in a multitude of loan contracts with small borrowers would be inordinately difficult.

It should be clearly understood that an apparently high interest rate, which merely reflects an allowance for inflationary conditions, is not usurious. However, the Latin American money markets in many cases are so poorly organized that truly usurious rates often are charged to poor borrowers. It will be one of the clear purposes of the Bank in administering these funds to safeguard against relending on usurious terms, taking into account the money market situation in each country, and also to work in the direction of lowered interest rates generally in important fields of social development such as low-cost housing and agricultural credit. A uniform interest rate ceiling, however, in face of widely varying conditions, is not a well-designed instrument to achieve those important purposes.

Cost of living indexes, Latin America

[1953=100]

	Average, 1958	Average, 1959	Average, 1960	Annual average percent increase, 1953-60	Percent increase, 1959-60
Argentina	217	464	590	29	27
Bolivia	2,500	2,990	3,350	65	12
Brazil	238	325	450	24	38
Chile	752	1,040	1,160	42	12
Colombia	151	162	169	8	4

Cost of living indexes, Latin America—Continued

[1953=100]

	Average, 1958	Average, 1959	Average, 1960	Annual average percent increase, 1953–60	Percent increase, 1959–60
Costa Rica	113	113	114	2	1
Ecuador	102	102	104	½	2
El Salvador	107	107	107	1	
Guatemala	105	105	104	½	−1
Haiti	112	107	(1)	1	(1)
Honduras	111	112	110	1½	−2
Mexico	150	154	162	7	5
Nicaragua	118	116	114	2	−2
Panama	99	99	99		
Paraguay	221	240	270	15	12
Peru	135	152	165	8	8
Uruguay	175	244	340	19	39
Venezuela	103	108	115	2	6

[1] Not available.

Source: International Monetary Fund, "International Financial Statistics."

Mr. HAYDEN. I have discussed this matter with the Conferees on the part of the Senate, and it is the feeling that the Senate should recede from its position on this amendment.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona why this amendment is any handicap to this program, when, as I understand it, private assurance has been given that the rate of 8 percent will not be exceeded. If that be the case, why can we not live with the amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is obvious that in some places the interest rate is too high. I believe the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has some interesting information about interest rates in Latin America.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I understand that the Senator from Vermont intends to place such information in the RECORD. I am familiar with those interest rates. "Interesting" is a mild word for some of them.

I do not see how we are going to generate any good will in Latin America if we are a party to charging those people interest rates of 12, 15, or 20 percent.

The Senator from Tennessee, in his remarks on the same day this amendment was adopted, said that he knew of interest rates as high as 24 percent in those areas.

That is ridiculous, and we shall be labeled as "Shylocks" if we are a party to any such usurious rates.

When we participate in a program under which we charge the small homeowner or the small farmer such exorbitant interest rates for this money, not only are we not creating good will but we are also creating much ill will.

In addition, let us not lose sight of the fact that we are not getting this interest. We are not even getting the principal back. We are putting up the money; and the Senator from Arizona knows as well as I do that, in effect, it is a grant. To the extent to which any of it is repaid, it is placed in a revolving fund and spent again in the particular country for the benefit of that country. So far as the taxpayer is concerned it is a continuous revolving fund. Both the principal and interest are gone.

In this instance we will be making a donation of the American taxpayer's money to the extent of $500 million, presumably on the basis of helping the people in Latin America. We want the money to go to the people, and yet without my amendment we would siphon it through a group which wants not only to make the borrowers repay the principal but also to charge them 12 or 15 or 20 percent interest. I wonder why. How can anyone claim that a 12 or 15 percent interest charge is reasonable?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is perfectly obvious that the average interest rates in Latin America are higher than 8 percent at the present time.

Second, we have the statement that it is agreed to insert in article IV, section 4.02, of the proposed trust agreement, a new, second sentence reading as follows:

> In order to achieve the purposes of this agreement for benefiting the individual citizens of Latin American countries, the Administrator in granting loans shall establish such conditions as are necessary to assure that the funds made available will not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest which are excessive or unreasonable for the borrower.

I believe that is a flexible rule, and would be adequate to accomplish our purpose.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it is common knowledge that one reason why Latin-American states operate under a handicap and do not improve their economic and social levels any more than they have done up to now has been the usurious rates charged for money.

As has been said, 24-percent interest on an annual basis is not unusual. The rate even goes higher than that. I am told, from authoritative sources, that 10, 15, 20, or as high as 40 percent is sometimes charged. No wonder those countries are unable to advance more rapidly, when such conditions prevail.

A further trouble is that many of the Latin-American countries are trying to carry on long-term programs which we would consider paying for in 20, 30, or 40 years—programs such as reclamation projects—on short-term money, which must be repaid in 1, 2, or 3 years from the time it is borrowed.

The aim of many countries in Latin America is to bring interest rates down. Some of those countries are in about the same condition that some of our own Western States were in more than 40 years ago. I well recall that my neighbors used to invest in a Vermont loan and trust company and receive 8 percent for their deposits. That money would go to Montana and other western areas. I do not know what the borrowers had to pay, but it was at least 13 or 14 percent. Such conditions now prevail in Latin America.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have borrowed money in business at a rate of 1 percent a month, or 12 percent a year, and made a profit on it.

Mr. AIKEN. But conditions are changing in Latin America. I believe we have an opportunity to help those countries. It is true that the lending agencies state that they cannot, all at once, bring the interest rate to the ultimate borrower in Latin America down to 8 percent. Conditions do not permit it in some countries, but the rate is being brought down. In some countries it is well below the legal bank rate for those countries at the present time.

For example, in Peru the legal rate of interest is 13½ percent, and the building and loan associations have already brought it down, so that they are lending at approximtely 10 percent. However, they say that in order to attract savings, which is one of the aims of the building and loan associations, they must, at first, pay a higher rate of interest, as much as 6 or 7 percent, and they cannot do that and relend the money at 8 percent, all at once, although their aim is to bring down the charge to the ultimate borrower.

Rates in the Latin American countries run all the way from 6 percent, the legal rate in Panama, up to 15 percent, in Chile. There is a very high legal rate in Chile. But even there, as I understand, the building and loan associations are bringing it down already below the legal rate of interest.

I have talked with the heads of the lending agencies which deal with Latin American people, and while they say that a rigid limitation of 8 percent might prevent their helping some of the countries which need help the most, if we were to make it clear on this floor that we object to their lending money in any country where the ultimate borrower must pay more than the legal rate of interest for that country, that would strengthen their cause, and help them to achieve their purpose earlier than otherwise would be the case.

That is the situation. I believe that if we insist that the lending agencies not exceed the legal rate of interest in the country where the loan is made and that the ultimate borrower not be charged more than the legal rate of interest, we shall have made a good start. I know first hand that in some of the countries it has been possible to reduce interest rates below the legal rate. It is believed that with a little help to en-

courage savings in the various countries, it will be possible to bring the charges down more rapidly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad to yield for the purpose of trying to answer a question, if the Senator from Arizona, who has the floor, will give me the time.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is quite agreeable.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Vermont has pointed out that an agreement has been reached under which we would insist that the lending agencies not charge in excess of the legal rate of interest of the respective countries. I appreciate that point; and that would be somewhat better than the present situation. My amendment does not endorse an 8 percent rate. It only establishes this as a ceiling.

Mr. AIKEN. In some countries the rate would be lower than 8 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On the other hand, is it not true that in some countries the legal rate of interest runs as high as 12 or 15 percent, and in one or two countries, as high as 15 to 20 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. No. The highest legal rate of interest is in Chile, 15 percent. In Peru it is 13½ percent. In Paraguay it is 12 percent. Then the interest goes down. In Colombia it is 8 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What is the rate in Brazil?

Mr. AIKEN. In Brazil it is 12 percent. No deposits would be obtained there unless at the present time 7 percent interest were paid. There is much inflation in Brazil. I had Brazil in mind when I spoke of some of those countries that were trying to carrying on long-term development programs on short-term money. We are already trying to bring about some degree of stability to the currency of Brazil. I hope those efforts will succeed. They really have had a "wild west" country there, as our own country was 75 years ago.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator will agree with me that we are not interfering with the internal affairs of these countries and trying to tell them what they should charge in interest rates on their own money.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We are only proposing to limit the rates of interest on money which we contribute or loan. We want to make sure the money goes to the ultimate borrower at a reasonable interest rate. When we are giving the principal as well as the interest, why should we not get some good will and charge a reasonable rate of interest?

In this case we are giving the money, and we ought to be sure that we do not let certain people make an extra 12 percent on that money and put it into their own pockets; but we get blamed for helping exploit the people of the countries. This is our money. Why can we not lay down some rules of commonsense as to how it will be handled? They don't have to take our money if they disapprove of our rules.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure it is the purpose of this country, and of the Senate, also, to reduce the interest charges on money which we loan in foreign countries to what is a reasonable rate, and certainly to a point where it is legal, and does not exceed the legal rate of interest charged in a country. As I pointed out, there has been some improvement. The legal rate of interest in Peru, for instance, is 13½ percent. That must be on a different type of loan. I have before me bank figures. Some rates are already as low as 9 or 10 percent, and we hope to bring that rate down.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe the Senator from Delaware has accomplished a great deal in bringing this matter forcefully to the attention of the Senate.

At the same time, I hope the motion of the Senator from Arizona will be agreed to, and that the Senate will recede from its amendment on strictly limiting the payment of interest to 8 percent. I say that for the reason which the Senator from Vermont has just pointed out with respect to the rates of interest in countries in South America. Because of the discussion of the Senator from Delaware on this subject, and the amendment which was originally offered, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon, and the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Bowles, have written letters. I have personally talked with the Secretary of the Treasury three times on this subject, and I have talked with the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Bowles, once.

In the letter Mr. Dillon has written, he refers to an article proposed to be included in the trust indenture, which the Senator from Arizona has read. It reads:

> In order to achieve the purposes of this agreement for benefiting the individual citizens of Latin American countries, the Administrator in granting loans shall establish such conditions as are necessary to assure that the funds made available will not be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest which are excessive or unreasonable for the borrower.

If that article is included in the trust indenture, it will become one of the fundamental responsibilities of the people making the loan, and the director of the bank, to see that the purposes of that article are lived up to.

Then we could add to the discussion a paragraph from the letter of the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Bowles, the fourth paragraph of the letter, which reads:

> I believe the proposal made by Secretary Dillon for insertion of a provision on interest in the trust agreement would achieve the valid objectives in which we are all interested, without incorporating the harmful rigidity of the amendment. Under such a provision we are confident that in the great majority of cases act of Bogotá loans under the Inter-American Development Bank can be kept at rates of interest at or below 8 percent and it is the intention to do so.

Those are the words of the Acting Secretary of State. I emphasize them:

> Can be kept at rates of interest at or below 8 percent and it is the intention to do so.

The paragraph in the letter continues:

> In those cases in which this is not possible, there will be adequate documentation explaining why a higher rate was necessary.

In other words, where the interest rates go above 8 percent, they will be documented.

For those reasons, and to carry out the purpose of the act, I am glad the chairman of the Committee has made the two letters a part of the RECORD. I commend the Senator from Delaware for what he has done in stimulating action on the subject, as a result of the discussion, in order to achieve the purpose that the loans will be made at reasonable rates of interest.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator agree that in interpreting the words "which are excessive or unreasonable for the borrower," we intend that in no case shall the interest paid by the ultimate borrower exceed the legal rate of interest of the country where the loan is made?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would hope that would be so.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield. I appreciate the position of the Senator from Massachusetts, but what concerns me is that the Senator from Massachusetts has expressed "a hope." There is no assurance that what the Senator from Vermont has expressed as the intention will be achieved. Without the Williams amendment there is nothing which would prohibit rates above the legal rates of interest from being charged.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I think we could require full documentation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, yes, after it was done.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We have to rely upon the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bank, Mr. Robert Cutler, whom we know, and who himself is a banker, and we have to rely on the words of the Acting Secretary of State. I said I hoped, because I could not personally give that assurance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But I think through the assurance given in the debate, and through the statements of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Delaware, we have made it clear that we intend that the interest charge on those loans shall not be in excess of 8 percent or in excess of the legal rate of interest.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, when this matter was before the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] suggested that we include in the report a request for semiannual reports to the Appropriations Committee. So we will get those reports. We will see what is in them. If they are not clear, we can investigate and ascertain the facts, so they may be made public knowledge.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I may say that I was present at that executive meeting, and it was emphasized by many members of the committee that it be made clear these loans should not be made at usurious rates of interest, and we made it clear in our report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield on that point, I know the Senator is sincere in this matter, and I agree with everything he has said on the subject; but I do not think we said the rates of interest should be reported. Therefore, I think it should be made clear in the debate that when the methods of repayment are reported, and so forth, they should include the rates of interest.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There is no question of that, Mr. President. There is no question that the rate of interest should be included in the report to the committee.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wished to point out, first, joining with my colleagues in this request, that what we are criticizing is not simply usurious rates of interest. It is a social system.

There is talk about the feudal condition in Latin America. The situation described is what makes a feudal condition. This is what the Communists use against us, the fact that there are high interest rates charged by money lenders, which take away the fruits of the toil of the people.

I hope very much the Department will understand that putting the provision in the trust agreement is not enough, that we expect the Department to ride herd on the question, because this is what we are after in terms of allowing the money to be loaned at all. Therefore, when the Department reports, it should understand it is to report not simply because we have an interest in the money but also because we have an interest in what our aid is doing insofar as the fundamental conditions under which the people in those countries live are concerned.

I join with my colleagues in demanding that the language be very specific in terms of loans and amounts of interest rates, and that there be enough supervision so that the Department can give us these details exactly, because this is a very critical point to all of us.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think there must be some differentiation made as between types of loans about which we are talking.

United States money is often made available through the Inter-American Development Bank to a cooperative savings and loan association, which in turn uses the money for capital improvements such as housing. In such a situation there is brought in what we call "seed" money. In that way we aid in the development of the cooperative saving and loan association, but a good portion of the capital used comes from the savings of the people of the area. Because the prevailing rate of interest in a particular area may be far beyond 8 percent, one at times cannot get money into the cooperative savings and loan association unless one is willing to pay more than the amendment specifies.

I believe the State Department has a legitimate point in saying that this kind of an amendment would be too restrictive in its application. However, I wish to make it clear that when the Inter-American Development Bank is acting as our agent and loaning money to a financial institution in a Latin-American country, with no local capital involved, 8 percent interest is surely feasible. In other words, if we loan the money at 4 percent, let us say, to a cooperative association, and no local money is being brought in, surely an interest rate of 6 percent or 7 percent would be more than adequate for loans to citizens in that particular area.

There are two different kinds of financial transactions involved. In one we make a grant or a loan through the Inter-American Development Bank to an agency or to a voluntary group in a Latin-American country, with regard to which no local money is brought in. In that situation 8 percent interest ought to be a ceiling. We ought to make it crystal clear that it should be a ceiling.

In the other situation, when a cooperative savings and loan association brings in capital from the savings of the people in a country like Peru, let us say, it may be necessary to pay so much higher a rate for the savings that the 8 percent ceiling would, for all practical purposes, negate what we are trying to do. In that situation the language we are talking about in the trust agreement now would be satisfactory, and I support it.

I wish to make it clear for the RECORD that when money is loaned directly to an association or to a Government instrumentality in a Latin American country, when local savings are not brought in and are not added to the general pool of resources, we ought to insist that there be a charge not above 8 percent interest, because this is American money, United States of America money which is being transferred to another country for the purpose of aiding the people in that country. In that instance, when no local savings are brought in, the 8 percent interest ceiling is fully justified and should be feasible.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota has answered in part the question which I wish to ask.

As I understand the Senator, he makes the point that the funds provided by the United States will be, in a way, "seed" capital, to encourage savings in these countries, to be loaned to savings and home loan institutions, for additional capital and that savings cannot be obtained in the Latin American countries, unless a higher rate of interest is charged. I understand that to be the gist of the argument.

But, I hold there are purposes in the Latin American program which are very clear. One purpose is to make available to these countries capital to be used for wealth-creating projects. It seems to me that if the capital we provide could be loaned at lower rates of interest than now prevail in Latin America, it would encourage development of long-term projects.

Second, one of the most important purposes of the new plan, which was spelled out last year by President Eisenhower and again this year by President Kennedy, is to change the objective of our aid to Latin America. It is to stimulate administrative reform and social reform and, if possible, to encourage a change in conditions—in Latin America the poverty, disparity in wealth, since these conditions present a danger to freedom and to this hemisphere, and deserve to be alleviated because it is right to do so for the peoples of these countries.

The conference report contradicts these objectives. To allow an open-end interest rate, will not encourage—it will discourage administrative reform and social reform. I may not know all the banking problems. But I know well enough that if we encourage the continuation of the kinds of social practices which have gone on in these countries there is not much chance for any improvement. Let us try the imposition of limitation upon interest rates, that can be charged the people of Latin America for U.S. funds, and see if it will work.

I know we do not have the best position in Latin America. I do not believe it is a correctly held opinion by some of the people of Latin America, but evidently some look upon the United States as a grasping country. Are we again to place ourselves in the position of a Shylock?

I support some limitation upon interest, at least the 8-percent rate proposed by the Senator from Delaware. If we do not lead the way toward reform, the program we have initiated for Latin America well may be like other programs on which we have spent billions and billions of dollars—in many cases—ineffective, wasted, and never reaching the people.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall support the position taken by the committee. In doing so, I wish to point out that we are pledging the credit of the people of the United States in making these loans. If we did not put some limitation in a bill of this kind as it affected our own people, I am sure there would be loud protests and a great hue and cry. That is one thing to be kept in mind.

The second point I make is that it is rather traditional for an agency to protest any restriction which is ever placed in a bill; and I think this is particularly true of the State Department. That is done, doubtless, in the interest of flexibility of action. That I can understand.

I had hoped that perhaps sometime, when Congress interposed a restriction of this kind, the department at least might try it. If the department were hurt, or if it should be hamstrung in its operations, it could come quickly back to the Congress and say, "We ask that you repeal this restriction."

I think the tendency always is to rise up and to protest against any restriction which is ever interposed.

Notwithstanding that fact, having heard something about high interest rates in South America—and I profess no expert knowledge in that field—I shall support the committee position. I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations can give the Senate some kind of assurance, as a part of the legislative history being made today, that he will insist that in the reports to be submitted we shall have not only the nature of the loan, the amount of the loan, and the legal rate of interest which obtains in the country, but also the interest rate which is actually imposed in connection with a loan of this kind.

Mr. HAYDEN. It seems to me, judging from the attitude of the department, we would have no difficulty in obtaining that information. I shall be glad to ask for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the point made by the Senator from Minnesota has not been clearly developed. I doubt if any of the money will be loaned directly by the United States. I think the money to be made available will be mixed with money of savings and loan institutions, to create institutions to make developments, so the local money will be involved.

I believe their intention is to bring down interest rates. But I do not believe that an attempt to bring interest rates from 15 percent to 8 percent is realistic. I think the Latin American business people themselves realize that they cannot live with the present high interest rates.

The basic problem has been inflation in South America. Actually, while the current rates in South America appear high, very few people are borrowing money at those rates. When a large office building is erected, the builders do not mortgage. They sell rooms and apartments one at a time. They receive the money and put it to use in the erection of the building. The reason is that no one is willing to lend money even at the high rates, on the average.

There is very little money lending going on. The rates are high. Very few people are borrowing money, because the interest rates are so inflationary. Last year interest rates reached 30 percent in 1 year. If one had loaned money at that time at 20 percent, he would have lost.

I think the purpose of the amendment is good, but I do not think in the early stages the countries in question could live with an interest rate of 8 percent. It is a small figure. Unless we are willing to say that we shall undertake to finance all housing, which would run into billions, then we ought not to put a limit on the interest rate. The amount involved is small. It is certainly hoped the program will be handled in the way I have suggested. If not, the program would be a failure, and we would not continue it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I believe this discussion points up one thing. There will be an authorization bill for so-called foreign aid. This subject has been broached a number of times by building and loan associations and the various savings and loan leagues. When the authorization bill comes to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I believe that an item in the bill with respect to housing under cooperative association programs might well have some attention.

The U.S. Savings and Loan League raised this question 5 or 6 years ago. I think I mentioned it somewhere along the line, but we did nothing about it. But now that we are in the field, I think we can pick up the ball and do some good. Such opportunity will come to us again when the bill comes to the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a short statement as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

While all of us support the purpose behind the Williams amendment, I am convinced that it will not accomplish that purpose.

The limitation on interest rates, charged by thrift institutions receiving Inter-American Development Bank loans, to 8 percent, will destroy the potential effectiveness of this important component of the program under the Alliance for Progress.

The purpose of the new thrift institutions is to create new sources of long-term housing credit in countries where it does not exist today. Unless the Inter-American Development Bank, or the United States through some other agency, is prepared to put up all the funds to finance long-term housing credit, these new institutions must attract savings of the people within the country. In order to do so, they must pay a competitive rate for savings. It is this rate, competitive with other forms of investment, that must determine the interest to be charged to borrowers.

The new thrift institutions, I am informed by the ICA, will require a three-point spread, over the cost of money to them, to cover administrative costs and to build up growth resources and appropriate reserves. Because they are small, they will require, in the beginning at least, a somewhat larger spread than do institutions in the United States. Savings and loan institutions in the United States at present are operating on approximately a two-point spread, paying about 4 percent interest on savings, and lending at approximately 6 percent. Therefore, the three-point spread which ICA says will be required by South American institutions does not seem greatly out of line.

It should be kept in mind that these thrift institutions which are to be created are not profit-making institutions. They are mutuals in which the depositors share in any accumulation of excess earnings. As the institutions grow, become more efficient, and increase their scope of operations, it is probable that interest rates charged to borrowers will be reduced. That is the hope of the program. However, to impose arbitrarily an interest rate which is unrealistic in the beginning will prevent this growth and, in all probability, defeat the very purpose which lies behind the amendment.

I am informed that in most countries in Latin America, the interest rate paid on savings ranges from 5 to 10 percent. However, these rates have attracted very little savings because of chronic inflation and the lack of the very institutions which this program would seek to create. The unrealistic nature of the 8-percent ceiling can be illustrated by comparing central bank discount rates in Latin American countries. In Brazil, this rate is 8 percent. In Chile, it is 6 percent; Colombia 5 percent, Costa Rica 5 percent, Ecuador 10 percent, El Salvador 5.5 percent, Mexico 4½ percent, Nicaragua 6 percent, Peru 9.5 percent, and in Venezuela 4.5 percent.

Some rough indication of an appropriate mortgage rate might be made by comparing rates in the United States which are approximately twice our own central bank discount rate of 3 percent.

The thrift institutions which the United States or the Inter-American Development Bank have been or will be dealing in have established maximum costs for houses for which they will make loans. This has the effect of limiting the loans to persons of moderate income whose capacity to pay is carefully evaluated in consideration of their incomes.

As a result of the creation of a thrift institution in Peru under a development loan which supplied 50 percent of capital, a 12-percent, 20-year loan on 85 percent of the value of a house can be made. While this interest rate seems high compared to rates in this country, it represents a radical improvement over previous terms which approximated 25 percent interest for a 3-year loan on 50 percent of the value of a house. This is especially obvious when it is considered that there was practically no money available for inexpensive homes.

Unless this amendment is removed, it will not be possible for the Inter-American Development Bank to assume the current housing programs of the Development Loan Fund in Latin America.

The success of the thrift institutions depends upon the savings which can be attracted. This is true, as I have indicated, unless we wish to put up all the money, in which case we would be entirely justified in establishing maximum rates, but this would require a vast increase in the program.

In our own country we have attempted to establish housing interest rates on a basis unrelated to the private market without much success. The only way we have been able to do it is in our own country, in times of inflation and high interest rates, is to pump huge sums of money into the market, either in the form of direct lending operations or the purchase of mortgages by FNMA. I doubt that we are prepared to do anything comparable to this in Latin America.

Interest rates are, of course, related to economic conditions within the country concerned. With extremely high rates of inflation in most South American countries, virtually continuous, few people have been interested in savings at any price. In turn, the lack of savings has led to all sorts of devices for creation of money and, in turn, the cheapening of money again has removed any incentive to savings.

In Brazil, for example, the cost of living increased in the 12 months from January 1960 to January 1961 by 31 percent. In Uruguay, the comparable increase was 37 percent. Other countries have had lesser rates of increase, but chronic inflation has been characteristic in these countries in recent years. What possible incentive can there be to savings at interest rates of 5, or even 10, percent, when one's money at the end of the savings period may be worth considerably less, even with accrued interest, than when it was deposited.

The real answer to the problem of higher interest rates on Latin American mortgages must be approached from the standpoint of controlling inflation. These high interest rates presently existing are in large measure reactions to inflationary conditions. An artificial across-the-board interest ceiling is unrealistic and will serve no constructive purpose. The legislative history is already adequate, together with the various statements by the President, to make clear the importance of reducing interest

rates. This has to be accomplished, however, on a national and orderly basis. One constructive way to accomplish this objective is to continue encouraging the creation of the new thrift institutions without crippling limitations.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Together with others, I may have been using the term "savings and loan association" when I meant to say "building and loan association," because it is the building and loan association which is spreading rather rapidly throughout South America.

On another subject, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I doubt that there will be instances in which we will advance money to be loaned. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations in his report to the Senate made it very plain that we intend that the money under the bill shall be available for cooperative associations. Such associations are getting underway. They are well underway in Peru.

There are, I believe, now several hundred credit unions in Peru that are lending money at the same rate at which money is loaned in the United States—1 percent on the unpaid balance per month. Progress is being made.

In the case of the building and loan association at Lima, we loaned them $2 million and they raised $3 million themselves—much to their own surprise, I believe. They did not know whether they could raise that much money. First, they had asked us to put in a larger amount, but they found they had $3 million of their own available. In order to obtain $3 million in deposits from their own people, they must now pay, I think, 6 or 7 percent interest, and they are lending money at 9 percent or 10 percent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a spread of 3 percent.

Mr. AIKEN. There is one country where a limitation might not hurt at the present time. Others would be hurt. So long as we have made it plain—and I believe we have made it plain this afternoon—that we do not intend that any of our agencies which handle our funds should lend to ultimate borrowers who must pay more than the legal rate of interest in his own country, I believe we shall have covered the problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I must agree with the remarks of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] generally in regard to this situation. Of course, I will support the committee report. In not supporting the position of the Senator from Delaware, I would not want it to be inferred that I by any means agree that any particular rate of interest is fair.

I should like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, if the language of the Senate report with respect to the fixed rate, with which he is acquainted, and in which I have some pride of authorship, since I offer the language, should be rejected, would such action be in any way an abandonment of the objectives the Senate Committee on Appropriations placed in its report, and which we still believe to be the right way to conduct the program?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly. We take back nothing. On the other hand, we have been instrumental in having a directive issued from the Department that the Bank will try to hold the rate of interest down. They stated that 8 percent would be satisfactory in most instances. We are going to receive reports on the subject, as provided in the report from time to time. When those reports come in, if they do not disclose the facts that we desire, we will certainly let the Department know about it.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] particularly that I believe almost every member of the committee, and I do not recall anyone speaking in opposition to the idea, was fully in accord with the idea that we would not tolerate the lending of this fund to a credit institution or a bank and then have the money reloaned at usurious rate or at any rate which would take care of more than handling the money and the cost of administration. I believe that was our feeling.

For myself, I wanted to make the RECORD crystal clear. The assurance of the chairman and the letters from the Department of State have made it doubly clear what our intentions are, and that we are not going into this area under any great giveaway program, and that we shall be harder, tougher, and more realistic on this subject than perhaps we have been in the past. I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I should like the floor in my own right when the Senator from Arizona has finished.

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the argument is made that the amendment would not be workable. I disagree. Before the amendment was agreed to, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and I talked with representatives of the Treasury Department and they approved the amendment. Those representatives did say that they would rather not have it.

I first offered the amendment on the basis that it would provide a ceiling of 6 percent. The representatives of the Treasury Department said that such provision would handicap them, and they wanted it higher.

Finally we worked out a compromise with the 8 percent figure, and it was with the full approval of representatives of the Treasury Department. This Treasury official told both the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and me that the amendment could be administered, and they would accept it.

Not a single representative of the executive branch in any agency of the Government has told me that the provisions of the amendment would not work. Not one of them has been to see me and said, "Your amendment is something with which we cannot live."

We have heard read a statement from the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Bowles, indicating that his Department objects to the Williams amendment. I attended a meeting yesterday for 2 hours with Mr. Bowles, and he never mentioned the subject. If he had some objections to the amendment, why did he not mention them? Why does he not discuss them with me, the author of the amendment?

When this amendment was adopted last week the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] joined me in pointing out the need for this restriction on the excessive interest rates being charged under this program. The Senator from Idaho is on the floor here today joining me in resisting the effort to delete the amendment.

Let us stop kidding ourselves. The reason the departments want the amendment stricken is that they want the authority to charge 12 to 15 percent interest. There is no argument about that point. If that is not true then why resist the amendment?

I know many Senators have expressed sympathy for the Williams amendment, but sympathy alone will not do any good. Even if the countries affected insisted on the legal rate of interest it would in some countries be as high as 13½ percent and, in one country, 15 percent.

The criticism of our foreign aid program, not only in Latin America but in many other countries, has been that our money has not gone to the people.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from Delaware has said that the Senate has expressed its sympathy. I read from page 6 of the report of the Committee on Appropriations, report No. 201, and I ask the Senator if he still believes it is only sympathy when we find this kind of language in the report:

> In this connection, the committee recommends that the Department of State establish a firm policy of interest rates at which the funds may be reloaned so that such rates of interest cannot be considered to be usurious. Whenever it is brought to the attention of the IDB that a lending agency, bank, or other institution has violated or obviated its policy in any manner by the charging of higher interest rates to the ultimate consumer of the loan, then it should be the policy of the IDB to cease to transact future business with such agency, bank, or other institution.

I should like to ask the Senator how, without the impractical situation of fixing the interest rate in the act, we could make this language stronger.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. By incorporating the language in the bill putting a ceiling on the interest rates. Instead of making a recommendation put mandatory language in the bill. That is what my amendment did.

Mr. ALLOTT. It is not possible to legislate on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. This particular subject is not subject to a

point of order. Perhaps it would have been at the time the amendment was added, but no point of order was made when the amendment was approved by the Senate; therefore it is not now subject to a point of order. The question as to whether it is legislation on an appropriation bill does not arise here.

If we now delete this amendment and accept the recommendation of the committee these lending agencies in the various countries can charge as much as 30 percent interest if they wish to do so. There would be no limit, no ceiling. All they need do is tell us about it later by making a report to the Congress. The Senator from Vermont has suggested a limit providing that under no circumstances could a country exceed the legal interest rate in the recipient country. That helps a little, but it is not enough.

What does that mean? It means that 13½ percent would be the ceiling in some countries—15 percent in one.

We are giving this money away, Mr. President. We are not lending it. We are giving the money so far as the American taxpayers are concerned. Once it is appropriated it never comes back to the United States of America. Certainly we can follow through on the money we are giving. It is not their money, Mr. President, but our money. If we are going to advance the money to help people build homes and help some farmers start little farms, certainly we can say to these countries, "You must make sure that the benefit of our grants go to the people of your country who need this assistance."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I rise for two purposes. One purpose is to support the Senator from Delaware. The second purpose is to ask, How inconsistent can this body be?

The Committee on Banking and Currency has just reported a housing bill. We provide that in every instance where money is to be loaned we set the interest rate by law. We would lend the money to our farmers in the United States—to their cooperatives, to build electric facilities, to furnish electricity to the farmers. By law we set a 2 percent interest rate on those loans.

We in the United States have a much higher standard of living than most people in Latin America. Our people with the lowest income, still have a big income compared with the income of most people in Latin America who are going to buy houses. Yet we are subsidizing public housing and other kinds of housing at 3⅜ percent interest. Now we are going to borrow $500 million, and sell bonds at 3⅜ or 4 percent, or more, in order to get the money to lend to these people.

Yet there are those liberals who are constantly beating the brains out of the private enterprise system of America. Every time they pass a bill to lend Government money—and they pass a great many of them—they set the interest rate. They beat the brains out of the bankers of this Nation and every other person who has a nickel because he has been successful, and they even say that these interest rates are too high. I know Senators who refused to permit the President of the United States and the Treasury last year to increase the interest rate on long-term bonds. They cried to high heaven about it.

It has been considered a sin for the Senate to pass a bill for the purpose of lending money without setting the interest rate. Anyone who objected to setting it was called a reactionary. It was said there was something sinister about him, that he wanted to take advantage of the poor people.

Now it is proposed to lend money to Latin-American countries. I am in favor of that. However, we do not have the courage to say to them, "We are going to treat you and your people just as we treat the people in the United States. We are going to help you build up your standard of living. We are going to make it possible for the poor people to buy homes. We will help you do that because the interest rate is going to be lower." That is what we ought to be saying.

One reason we are in trouble all over the world today, in my opinion, is that we do not have the courage, when we lend money, to tell them on what basis we will lend it. If they do not want to do business with us on that basis, it is perfectly all right, I would not be angry with them about it. It is their business if they do not want to do business with us.

Now it is said that we must do this in order to stop communism in these Latin American countries. Let me say this, Mr. President. I do not like to say it, but I will say it. How silly and ridiculous can we be by saying to these countries that we will lend them this money to stop communism, when we have not had the courage yet to stop it in Cuba. Cuba is just as much a satellite of Russia as East Germany and the other satellites. Yet we are going to lend $500 million in order to stop communism in these countries.

How silly and ridiculous can we get? When are we going to have the courage to say to these nations, and at the same time gain their respect, "We will help you, but you must agree to do certain things."

I have just read in the newspaper that we have just loaned Brazil $900 million in new loans or in extension of old loans, for a period of up to 20 years.

In the same paper another article stated that the President of Brazil said he is against us, and is for Castro. It said that he was neutral. That is what the President of Brazil said. He said he was not going to help us, as a member of OAS. Yet we gave him $900 million.

When are we going to gain the respect of these nations? When are we going to gain the respect of the people of the world? How can we gain their respect by being so inconsistent?

Why should we limit the amount of money that people who save money can make in our country on mortgages, on housing mortgages, on REA mortgages, and on other mortgages, and then say to these Latin American countries that we are going to give them American taxpayer money, which we must borrow, of course, because we are in debt to the extent of $294 billion, and let them lend it at any rate they wish to lend it.

We are not going to help the poor people by doing that. We are not going to make them friendly toward us. We are not going to make it possible for them to buy housing by doing that.

How inconsistent can we be? Why do we not have the courage to do what we know we must do? Why do we permit the doing of things in other countries that we will not permit in our own country?

The time has come when we must stand up and have the courage to do so. We must at least treat our own people on the same basis on which we treat the people in foreign countries.

Therefore I think here is a good place to start to put rules and regulations on these loans. I would never agree to lend a nickel to any country which did not agree to give reasonable assurances, and do it publicly, that if we help them, and lend them money, that they will fight communism, that they will never expropriate American property, and that they will be friendly to the United States, and stand up and be counted.

When we have the courage to do that, then, in my opinion, the people of the world will have respect for us.

The Vice President of the United States is this very day in the Far East, assuring the little nations 10,000 miles from our shores that we will stand by them in their fight against communism. He is saying, in effect, "Don't worry. We are right behind you."

Yet 80 miles from the shores of the United States, in Cuba, we were not behind the people who were fighting against communism. We permitted the little nation to become dominated by Communists.

I do not like to say these things. I know there is a tendency to soft-pedal such views. I know our Nation is confronted with many problems. I know we should help the President of the United States and ought to be sympathetic to him. I understand that. I am sympathetic.

However, I say the time has arrived when responsible persons in the Government had better show some courage—if I may use the expression—some guts. If we do not show courage, we will lose the American system of government; we will lose our way of life; we will lose the benefits for which we have been fighting.

When will we have the courage to write such provisions into agreements to help our friends, to help those whom we want to stand by us?

Consider what is happening in South Korea at the moment. Yet the United States sent billions of dollars to Korea. Consider what is taking place all over the world.

What is the reason? I do not claim to be any wiser than any of the rest in the Senate; but I try to make my own judgments, and they are based on an old story. I will tell a story and then take my seat. I think perhaps Congress and the Government ought to adopt this philosophy. Perhaps if we did, the Nation might be better off.

The story relates to a small town which had a favorite mule. One day the mule was lost, and the wise men of the town could not find it. They looked for many days. One morning they observed the halfwit of the town riding the mule down the main street. The wise men rushed up and said, "Halfwit, how does it happen that you found the mule, when we wise men could not locate him?"

The halfwit said, "I just figured out where I would go if I were a mule. I went thar, and thar he was."

Mr. President, we had better begin to use a little of that philosophy. We had better return to fundamentals and regain the respect of the world, instead of being "softies," instead of doing so many things which are expedient.

We are asked to provide $500 million for aid to countries in South America. I favor that. I favor lending them more than $500 million. But also I favor doing it on our own terms.

If those nations do not want to accept our money on our terms, I will still be their friend. I will say, "I am sorry, but that is the basis on which I am willing to spend the American taxpayers' money."

The United States is fighting for its life. We must have friends. We must lend money and cooperate with them and become friendly with them; but only with those people who we are certain will stay with us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to call one example to the attention of the Senate in connection with what has been happening or what will happen unless we keep this amendment. This information was furnished to me under date of May 11, 1961.

A part of our loans will be financed through the Peru Mutual Savings & Loan Association. That association plans to furnish mortgage loans to home borrowers at 10 or 12 percent interest for a term of from 5 to 20 years. The average sized loan is $2,700, limited to a $5,000 ceiling. Why charge the fellow who has a $2,750 mortgage 12 percent interest in the name of the United States of America when the United States will not get back either the principal or the interest? Why do we not create some good will as has been suggested so often? We are being identified with a group which oftentimes exploits its own people.

I call attention to what would happen in Paraguay even if we adopted the proposal of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], which certainly is better than no proposal; namely, that we would insist that the money be loaned at a rate not to exceed the legal rate of interest in those countries. In Paraguay, that would be 12 percent. We would be charging the small homeowner, the small farm operator, of the small businessman 12 percent interest even under that restrictive provision. Yet we find in the same country, Paraguay, an operation which by being large enough does not have to go through this lending process. I refer to the International Products Corp. which owns 2.4 million acres of land, including forests. It owns 568,000 fenced acres which support a herd of 65,000 head of cattle and horses. That corporation operates the country's largest packing plant.

We lend that outfit $2,600,000 at 5¼ percent, even though it has 2.4 million acres of land and 568,000 fenced acres. Yet here we are asked to reject a proposal which would put a ceiling of 8 percent on the money which is going to the small home owner and the small farmer in that same country. In my opinion the 8 percent is too high, but the man who does not own such a farm will never get one paid for at an interest rate of 12 or 15 percent.

Yet we are being asked here today to reject an amendment which would correct this situation and to put our stamp of approval upon these usurious rates.

I will not be a party to such an arrangement.

Let us stop kidding ourselves. Consider it carefully. To reject this amendment is an open endorsement of the old feudalistic system at its worst.

I think it would be better to defeat the bill in its entirety and not to go through with it than to siphon our money through a group which in turn will lend our money, in the name of the United States of America, at rates of 12, 15, or 18 percent interest. We will be damned for helping this group exploit these people.

I emphasize again that while interest of 12 percent or 15 percent will be paid by the borrowers in those countries we will be paid, in turn, only 5 percent. A local group in these countries will pocket the profit.

I have a list of a long series of loans made by this country at 4½ percent; yet we are allowing that money to be relent at 12 to 15 percent. This has got to stop.

All the Williams amendment did was to provide that this money, which is money from the United States of America, not be used to exploit the people of these countries. It provides that they cannot be charged interest rates in excess of 8 percent. Certainly even 8 percent is a high charge on a mortgage. It is higher than I want to go. I emphasized in the beginning that 6 percent should be the ceiling. Frankly, I think if the rate of interest were to be lowered, that would create more good will than gifts.

We must not let the people of the countries which will be the recipients of our money get the opinion that the United States of America is a "Shylock" and out after the last bit of interest he can charge. And I have emphasized before we are getting the blame, but we are not even getting any return for our generosity.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Are not the loans to which the Senator has referred, to large American companies doing business in other countries, made under what is called the Cooley amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Some of them are; the particular one I have mentioned is not. This particular loan was for $2.6 million and was made through the Development Loan Fund.

Mr. AIKEN. Through an American company?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. My information is that it was the International Products Corporation.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator from Delaware know when the loan was made?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It appears in their most recent report.

In this instance, we are lending American money to an outfit which already owns 2.4 million acres, and are lending it at a rate of 5¼ percent. We say we want to create good will in that country, we want to help the poor farmer or homeowner; yet there are those in the State Department who would urge us to let these small borrowers be charged 12, 15, or 20 percent interest.

Let us stop kidding ourselves. If we want the money to go to the people let us retain the amendment; if we do not want the money to go to the people reject the amendment and support the group of exploiters.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

INTER-AMERICAN APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate continue at this time with the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to recede from the amendment of the Senate to House bill 6518.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has the floor.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to recede from the amendment of the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it has been suggested in this debate that a limitation on interest of 8 percent might not work, that it might prevent the accumulation of savings in the countries to which loans may be provided. I do not know whether these arguments have merit, but I suggest that we give an

8-percent interest rate limitation a chance, to see if it will work.

It has been pointed out in the debate—and by Senators whom I respect, including the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]—that the committee report contain a provision from the Treasury Department in the trust agreement which would guarantee, or at least encourage, the result which the Senator from Delaware hopes to achieve, that is a limitation in interest rates.

It has been said that if this provision in the trust agreement does not work, if the open-end interest provision should be abused, a limitation could be later required by the Congress.

In my judgment, if any limitation is to be asserted, it had better be asserted at the commencement of the Latin America program. Once the countries for which we provide loans adopt their provisions for interest rates, and have set out upon a course of action, all of us know that it will be extremely difficult to persuade them to change—to lower interest rates. And to do so would cause great resentment on the part of these countries—once we have loaned money to them without any requirement about the interest rates they may charge.

I do not claim any superior experience in this field, but I have had the opportunity to see, at first hand, the operation of a foreign aid program in another country. I know that once a program is undertaken and underway, it is extremely difficult to persuade countries to which we make loans or grants to make changes. If we intend to try to bring down interest rates in Latin American countries, we had better do it at the beginning of the program.

I should like to speak for a moment about the Latin America in the context of the entire foreign aid program. I have always supported the foreign aid program, and I intend to do so in the future. But I believe that unless a better organization of our aid program is established this year, unless continuity for a 5-year period is established by the Congress, unless means are provided to direct it to social ends and to better administration in recipient countries, we shall see our foreign aid program collapse.

It will end because of its ineffectiveness, because of waste, and because it does not achieve the purposes which all of us want to achieve. The most effective use of our funds for economic advancement, for a better standard of living—for justice—and to encourage democratic values.

This issue on which we will vote is a case in point, upon which we can act today. As I said a few minutes ago, President Eisenhower's administration proposed last year the Latin American program, although it did not spell it out in detail. President Kennedy has sent his messages to the Congress. He has elaborated the proposals. He has said to us, "We want to start a program in Latin America which will bring about administrative, financial, and social reforms which will reach the people."

If at the first opportunity presented to us to act on such a program we compromise its purposes, if we do not place some limitations upon usury, which helped create the conditions, which we are trying to persuade our friends to correct, I do not believe there is much hope for the Latin-American program—certainly little hope if we continue to make such compromises. I have seen this kind of compromise in our foreign aid programs all over the world. I hope today we can make a proper start. If 8 percent limitation does not work, it can come back to us for future consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

The opportunity President Kennedy and his administration to achieve a better organization of the foreign aid program, to achieve continuity, and to achieve the better use of our aid programs in the countries which we propose to help, must be grasped this year. He will never have such an opportunity again. Once we start on these programs, we cannot change them without incurring resentment on the part of the countries with which we deal.

For the sake of our integrity, to support the President, to protect the foreign aid program, which will die unless we do better with it, we must take advantage of this first opportunity to make a new start. And let us remember that the effectiveness of our aid program is closely linked to our hope for democratic values in Latin America and the world.

I will vote with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me, in order that I may ask the Senator from Kentucky a few questions?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Kentucky a couple of questions before I supplement the statement he has made.

I find myself in complete agreement with the objectives of his observations. I shall say something on that subject in a moment, but I should like to be sure I am factually correct with regard to one point.

My understanding is that the amendment of the Senate provides for an 8 percent limitation. Is that correct?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. My understanding is that without the amendment of the Senate there would be no limitation whatever, and the sky would be the limit so far as interest rates are concerned.

Mr. COOPER. That is the way I look at it. I believe that is correct.

Mr. MORSE. I understand from this debate that it is now apparently represented by the State Department and other officials that there are places in Latin America in which the legal rate is above 8 percent—in some countries 10 percent and in other countries 12 or 13 percent. I believe the evidence presented here this afternoon, which is in accord with my recollection from one of our subcommittee reports on Chile, is to the effect that in Chile the legal interest rate is 15 percent. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. COOPER. That was the statement made on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. MORSE. But under the terms of the Senate amendment, there is not even a limitation in regard to charging the legal interest rate of the country concerned.

Mr. COOPER. It was said that there was some language in the report from the Department which would attempt to dissuade lending agencies from charging more than the legal interest rate.

Mr. MORSE. Is the Senator referring to the report, or to the Senate amendment?

Mr. COOPER. I refer to the report from the Treasury Department.

Mr. MORSE. That has no legal effect. That is a pious wish. We all know that.

Let me add, very briefly, if the Senator from Delaware will indulge me, that the principles which the Senator from Kentucky has just laid down are unanswerable.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and I were the two U.S. delegates to Bogotá last September. The U.S. delegation brought back the Bogotá agreement. We brought it back under the very able then Under Secretary of State Douglas Dillon, now the Secretary of the Treasury. I said to the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senator from Iowa joined me in the evaluation when we got back, the whole country was indebted to Douglas Dillon for the magnificent leadership he gave to the U.S. delegation at Bogotá. That delegation was of one mind—it happened to be my honor and privilege to speak in behalf of the delegation on this particular point in that conference—that we stood ready and willing to help Latin America, we were perfectly willing to work out a cooperative program with Latin America, if Latin America was willing to help itself, we said the idea of continuing to drain the pockets of the American taxpayers to take money to Latin America, while the wealthy in Latin America were putting their money in New York and Swiss banks, for example, had to stop; that they had to give some demonstration they had enough faith in their own countries to be willing to invest their money, for their own profit, in Latin America and for the people of Latin America.

We said, quite frankly, to our friends in Bogotá—and the Bogotá Act carries out this principle—that they had to adopt some tax reforms, because the national pastime in much of Latin America is tax evasion. In fact, so many times, in Latin America, they really negotiate on taxes, and the negotiations are behind the scenes and under the table.

We have no right to continue to tax the American taxpayers and to take their tax money and spend it in Latin America, if the Latin Americans are not willing to pay taxes on the basis of their ability to pay. That is what the Bogotá Act means in part. We stood together in Bogotá in regard to this principle. We served clear notice on Latin America at the Bogotá conference that we are going

to help them if they are willing to help themselves.

Now we come to the interest rate matter. The Senator from Kentucky has eloquently spoken this afternoon about the practice of usury in so many parts of Latin America. Fifteen percent? Why, it is not uncommon to charge 18, 19, 20, 22, yes, even 25 percent.

I am glad the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has just come on the floor, because I have taken the liberty, I may say to the Senator, to refer to him in this speech in regard to the position he and I took, shoulder to shoulder, last fall in Bogotá. We have an obligation to make clear that the private or free enterprise system, in an enlightened economy, does not mean the right to privateer. Therefore, I think we must be ready and willing to stand with Latin America if Latin America is willing to stand with us to protect the principle of economic freedom. The interest rates charged in many parts of Latin America cannot be reconciled with a system of free enterprise and private enterprise. I am perfectly willing to face up to any exceptional cases that can be demonstrated in this debate which may need modification in regard to the limitation of 8 percent, but I am not willing to vote for a conference report that makes the sky the limit.

So far as I am concerned, the conference report should go back to conference, because what it does, in my judgment, is place a great obstacle in the way of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs as we are trying to work out an alliance progress program sponsored by the President of the United States in relation to Latin America.

I think the Senator from Kentucky is unanswerably right when he says this may very well be our last chance. If the barriers are not lifted now, then a lot of the talk that the Senator from Iowa and I engaged in at Bogotá will turn out to have been just wasted wind. I think our talks at Bogotá ought to be given meaning by the Senate of the United States this afternoon. I think right here this afternoon the Senate ought to say to Latin America, by asking for a modification of the conference report, "We are willing to put language in the appropriation itself that will make it possible for an adjustment, with checks on it, with regard to exceptional cases, where it is shown that a higher rate than 8 percent interest must be paid, because the legal interest rate may be 9 or 11 or 12 percent." But a great mistake will be made if the conference report is adopted in its present language, when we have an opportunity to make perfectly clear that we are going to insist on some interest reform in Latin America, as well as some tax reform, and provide a ceiling on the interest charges that are made on money which is, after all, the money of the United States taxpayers.

So I simply wish to associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky. I want to make it clear that I am not taking a position, when I vote to send the conference report back to conference, that I wish to limit the interest rate absolutely to 8 percent, because the debate has brought out there may be need for some language in regard to an adjustment necessary in regard to a specific loan. However, certainly we cannot justify having no ceiling whatsoever on interest paid on money being supplied, after all is said and done, by the taxpayers of the United States. So I wish to associate myself with the principles enunciated by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Kentucky for supporting this principle. As I pointed out earlier, one of the approved mutual savings and loan funds or associations which is being set up for the purpose of financing home loans to borrowers in Peru is being furnished $2 million by our Government at 5¾ percent, and in turn it is planning to lend it to home buyers at 12 percent. That is unreasonable. Certainly, by such a course, we are not going to get any good will in Latin America from the people who may need the money. In Paraguay as high as 13½ percent interest will be charged if we do not limit the interest on the money we lend to the ceiling which has been suggested. That money will be used in small loans. They will be charged as high as 13½ percent. Yet only recently we loaned $2.6 million at 5¼ percent to a corporation farmer in the same country who already owns 2.4 million acres and operates one of the largest cattle ranches there, consisting of 568,000 fenced acres and 65,000 head of cattle; and there are those who would charge the little fellow in the same country 12 or 15 percent.

How can these people who, through no fault of their own, have not been able to "get off the ground" pay these high rates and ever get started? How are they going to be able to pay 15 percent as against the operator who can expand on our money by paying 5¼ percent interest?

We have been failing to get our aid in those countries to the people where it belongs. This is our chance to correct past mistakes.

Again I emphasize that we are not going to get either the principal or the interest back. It will go into a revolving fund which will be used in those countries to finance additional projects. The very least that we can do is to assure the American taxpayers that we will generate some good will.

American taxpayers do not receive the benefits of the usurious rates of interest charged. Yet Americans will be charged with having collected them and with having condoned them. We will get all the bad effects, but we will not even get the money. I think it is indefensible that the Senate should even consider rejecting the amendment.

I emphasize, in conclusion, that the Williams amendment was approved by the Treasury Department before it was adopted by the U.S. Senate. There has not been any member either of the Treasury Department or of the State Department who has come to me and said, "Your amendment will not work," for any reason whatever.

Sure, there are letters which have been sent to the committee chairman which say the State Department would like to have the ceiling taken off. These bureaucrats do not want to be restricted. The Under Secretary of the Treasury told the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and me at the time the Senate adopted the amendment that the Department could live within it and that it was workable. I emphasize that. There has been no argument made for rejecting the amendment.

The motion of the Senator from Arizona which would instruct the Senate to recede from the Williams amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for yielding.

I commend the Senator for vigorously defending his amendment, which, as I recall, was adopted by the Senate without opposition.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There was not any objection.

Mr. BUSH. Many Senators have visited in Latin America. I have visited there recently. I came back with an impression that certainly cannot be strange to anyone who has visited in Latin America.

There are three most pressing needs of the people in Latin American countries: First is land development and a greater degree of ownership by the people in the land. Second is housing for the low-income group. Finally, there is a need for education up and down the line, from the lowest level to the highest level.

Mr. President, the report which we had before us with reference to the Inter-American Development Bank refers to use of the money to help land settlement; to improve the use of land, including access and feeder roads; for assistance to agricultural credit institutions; and so forth.

Mr. President, when we wish to promote the development of agricultural credit for our own people, we do so by subsidizing the credit of the farmers. We have done so through the Commodity Credit Corporation on a very extensive scale, one which almost shocks me when I think about it, inasmuch as there are now some $9½ billion worth of products in storage as a result of the subsidies.

Now there is talk about trying to help the farmers in Latin America without any subsidy at all, by providing loans.

With reference to housing, our committee recently has held hearings on a housing bill. Soon the bill will be reported to the Senate, perhaps next week. It deals with various aspects of the housing program.

We have rendered great subsidies to homeownership and to the housing business generally, in order to provide more housing, with particular emphasis on housing for the low income group. We have done this by subsidizing the interest rates in part.

Mr. President, in connection with community water supply and sanitation fa-

cilities, which are needed very much indeed in Latin America, in our country we have subsidized these by special plans and programs for those communities which need assistance because they have such poor credit it does not permit them to develop water supply and sanitation facilities without a subsidy from the Federal Government. This program has been a successful one in our country.

Finally, in regard to education, the program provides for supplementary financing of facilities for advanced education and training related to economic and social development, as may be agreed upon from time to time between the United States and the Bank.

What do we do in the United States for higher education? We subsidize it in various ways, principally through the college housing program, by a subsidized rate of interest, which is perhaps the single most important consideration in connection with the program. That is the reason so much use has been made of the program.

Now we are considering a $500 million or $600 million program to help alleviate the same conditions with respect to which we work so assiduously in our own country. Shall we put ourselves in the position of turning the money over to the moneylenders of Latin American countries without any strings attached, so that they may charge 15 or 16 percent interest for American money which comes to them without cost? Mr. President, I think that would defeat the whole program.

I would not compromise 1 percent on the 8 percent suggested by the Senator. Different from my friend from Oregon, who seems to be willing to come to some accommodation with the House, I am in favor of reducing the ceiling on the interest rate from 8 percent to perhaps 7 percent or 6 percent for this kind of program. I urge the Senate to stand fast behind the amendment of the Senator from Delaware, and I thank the Senator for the opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the question, it seems to me, is whether we are going to take pride in maintaining our own principles in respect to what we do for Latin America, or whether we merely wish to take pride in the opulence which permits us to give money away. Granted, if all we wish to do is to give money away without cause, purpose, reason or commonsense, it is not very difficult to accomplish that by simply putting no strings on the provision for Latin American aid. However, if on the one hand we wish to stand for certain American principles, and if on the other hand we are trying to promote an Alianza Para Progreso, an alliance for progress—if we really wish to help Latin America progress and if we really wish to be un buen vecino, a good neighbor—it seems to me we ought not to be a party to doing in Latin America what would affect the conscience if it were done in the United States.

Mr. President, if Senators were to be told that our housing progam or that our agricultural program was to be handled in a way by which the occupants of the housing or the users of the land would be charged 15 or 16 percent interest because of action of the Federal Government, because of an opportunity for enrichment of the moneylenders, they would rise in shocked alarm and they would shout that this was an incomprehensible and insupportable program. Why, then, should we send to Latin America American tax money to be used by the moneylenders in the temple, by those whose interest rates are usurious by our standards however legal they may be by theirs? How can we justify the transfer of American tax money not, as the Senator from Oregon so well stated, in support of private enterprise but in support of privateering? How can we be a party to an unconscionable action which will not advance the well-being of the people of Latin America but which will make the poor man—the campesino or paisano or whatever he is called there—pay enormous interest rates for the benefits which we fondly believe we are making available to him but which in fact we actually are denying to him because we are subjecting him to the same type of unconscionable practice which keeps him poor under the present system.

Therefore, I am certainly in accord with what the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Kentucky have said. I shall support the proposal of the Senator from Delaware. I hope the Senator from Delaware will demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator withhold his request and renew it later?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withhold the request, but I shall renew it later because I shall insist on the amendment, which means that we must defeat the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have talked to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee about the problem. I have followed the course of the bill. Actually, the proposal has never been to a conference between the House and the Senate. The Senate requested a conference. For some reason or other that request was diverted, and from both sides on the other side of the Capitol there was a firm opposition to the amendment to the bill. Consequently we have before us at the present time a bill which actually has not been to conference with respect to the amendment. It is my suggestion, in view of what has happened, that perhaps the bill can be withdrawn from consideration and that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations can ask the House for a conference, to see whether the problem can be amicably adjusted.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he makes his request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to associate myself with what the distinguished minority leader has said. I believe we should try to see if there is some way in which we can force a conference, which has not as yet been held, and thereby afford an opportunity to the representatives of the two bodies to discuss the issue. Otherwise, if the yeas and nays are requested and the Senator's amendment is agreed to—which, as the Senator will recall, the Senate agreed to before—we would accomplish only a repetition of the same procedure, and we would still have to go to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Except that if by a rollcall vote we defeat the motion of the Senator from Arizona and thereby retain the Williams amendment our conferees will be in a stronger position. Perhaps even the House may accept the bill without a conference. We could show that by record vote we insisted upon the amendment. When the conferees went to conference they would go strengthened by the result of the yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. Both the House and the conferees would know how the Senate felt about the amendment.

Let us not forget we sent the amendment to conference before. I will read what was said during the debate in the House concerning this particular proposal.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is only one amendment fixing a ceiling on the interest rates that can be charged by the recipients of loans from the fund. I have discussed this amendment with the several Department heads concerned, and they tell me they cannot live with it, and that if we are going to get along with the program they would have to have the right to establish the interest rates.

So I am not asking for a conference. I am merely disagreeing to the Senate amendment and hope the Senate will accept the House version of the bill.

Mr. TABER. You mean see the light?

Mr. PASSMAN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

That is all the conversation there was concerning the bill.

Thus, the House brushed off an amendment which was agreed to with the approval of the Under Secretary of the Treasury. This Treasury Department official told not only me, but also the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations that he agreed to its adoption. Since that time no representative of the State Department has come to me and said that the provisions of the amendment would not work. We have before the Senate today letters showing that the departments want the amendment removed, but they give no valid reasons. They want it removed because then the departments would have no strings on the fund and recipients could charge interest rates of 12 or 15 percent.

I agree with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I am not wedded to the language of the amendment, but I am wedded to the principle that we are not going to advance American money to any group in South America and then permit those recipients to extract exorbitant rates of interest from the people of those countries. That is the principle we are defending here. The hands of the conferees would be strengthened if we vote with the full understanding that when we vote we are telling the House of Representatives and the State Department that we stand back of the principle of the Williams amendment.

I would like to get a yea-and-nay vote ordered at this time on the motion of the Senator from Arizona, which proposes to strike out the Williams amendment. I hope we can overwhelmingly defeat his motion and thereby have this amendment in the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I hope the Senate will insist upon its position. The Senate has taken cognizance of this subject today. There has been tremendous concern expressed over the subject. I think it would be a shame for the Senate not to have a yea-and-nay vote so that it can register its will. This amendment has a great bearing on the possible success of this new program for Latin America. I hope the Senator will insist on his request for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The principle of this amendment is important not only in this instance but in our entire foreign aid program if we are to carry out principles as outlined by the President in his message. We want to make sure that the benefits of whatever funds we do give go to the people themselves and not to some group that can take the money and exploit its own people with it.

Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to withdraw my proposal, and ask for a conference with the House. I believe that is what the Senator wishes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We asked for a conference before. I should like to have an expression of the Senate on the motion. I believe it is very important. We can vote on the motion of the Senator from Arizona as it is and obtain an expression of the Senate. Let us defeat that motion. Then no one can misunderstand our position or intention.

Mr. President, I renew my request for the yeas and nays at this time.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under the parliamentary situation, as I understand it, even though the yeas and nays have been ordered, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations still has the right to withdraw the motion he has made. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I do not believe so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Permission to withdraw the motion requires unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am in thorough agreement with the objectives of the amendment. A short while ago the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] stated a position which I believe is quite sound. I think there are some reasons why a better formula than a rigid 8-percent formula could be worked out. But basically, if we do not attack the interest rate problem in connection with our loans, which are in turn to be reloaned for the benefit of the people that we want to reach in Latin America, and put some kind of guidelines that are specific on the use of that money by the people who will borrow it, then we will still be back in the same race that we have been in heretofore.

For instance, I know that in a certain area in South America the loaning institution pays the depositor 10 percent on his checking account and charges the borrower 28 percent. I know of plenty of other places where the interest rates are anywhere from 18 to 24 percent.

Here is the point we must keep in mind. I have respect for the Board of Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank. They are able, capable people. They are bankers, and most of them are highly trained men.

But let us remember that those people have been raised, nurtured, and have operated in the Latin American school of banking and its correspondent interest rates and charges and service additions, whatever they are, and their attitude, if they are left entirely to their own devices, might not entirely comport with what we believe to be a reasonable and adequate rate for the use of money.

I expect to support the request of the Senator from Delaware. I again say I hope a formula can be worked out which will not establish a rigid rate of 8 percent, but that a formula with guidelines can be worked out which will give assurance and direction to those who would handle the money that interest rates will not be exorbitant, and that they will be within the reasonable acceptance limits, not only for the borrower, but for the financial systems which operate in those countries. Some discretion, I believe, must be indulged in. I think we have to allow some discretion. But if we do not begin to establish some better guidelines for the use of American cooperative assistance, we will see further chaos and we will see very little progress toward the accomplishment of the things that must be accomplished in Latin America.

Basically, the object is the creation of a great big middle class in Latin America. That is very important. There are many tools that can be used to help along with the accomplishment of that purpose. One of them is credit at reasonable rates.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I could not be more in agreement with what the Senator from Iowa has said. The principle, of my amendment, I believe, is very sound. We should incorporate it in the legislation. It has no effect if mentioned in the report only. That is the reason that I have insisted on a record vote. The Senate can then express its sentiments and back up our conferees. They can then go into conference and maintain our position. I am confident that something can be developed which will be workable and which will make certain that any money we furnish will go to the people who need it and not to some group which would use the money to exploit these people in our name. I am in complete agreement with the position of the Senator from Iowa on that point. I hope we can have an unanimous vote of the Senate expressing our support of the sound principle that there must be a reasonable ceiling on the interest charged on any money which is loaned in the name of the United States. Without my amendment there is no limit.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Iowa for the statement he has just made. I would have the Senate keep in mind the fact that the Senator from Iowa is the ranking Republican member on the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, of which Senators AIKEN and CAPEHART are also members. I wish to say most respectfully to our friends on the Committee on Appropriations that this is a good example of action being taken in the Committee on Appropriations which contravenes the policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations. We have a job to do on the Committee on Foreign Relations with respect to Latin America. We are trying to use our influence to get reforms established that are needed—tax reform and interest reform. I know there was no intention on the part of the Committee on Appropriations to do so, but the fact remains that this kind of conference report is inconsistent with the very thing that the Senators on the Foreign Relations Committee are trying to do in having Latin American countries put a ceiling on the interest rate with respect to this kind of loan.

If we adopt this kind of conference report, with a "sky is the limit" provision, so to speak, we will say, in effect, to the Latin American countries, "Your own Appropriations Committee adopted a report that puts no limit on the interest rate. Yet you want us to make reforms in the interest rate."

I say that we on those two committees must get together. Here is a chance to get together. I am sure we have not reached the point where the House will determine these matters without any consideration to the desires of the Senate.

I close by saying, as the Senator from Vermont has pointed out and as the Senator from Delaware has stated, we

are not saying that we must use language which provides for 8 percent under all circumstances without any possible adjustment, but we are saying that we should send it back and see what can be worked out in conference. I believe that in a very real sense a good deal of our Latin American policy is packaged up in this problem here this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The sentiment in the Senate this afternoon seems to be very clearly in favor of having this matter go to conference. I did not think earlier that there was any chance of its going to conference. However, I wish to say that I will be very glad to vote to send it to conference. That means voting against the motion of the Senator from Arizona. In so doing I wish to make it clear that I am not so voting for the purpose of fixing an arbitrary ceiling of 8 percent with respect to all loans that may be made in Latin America, but for the purpose of getting the matter to conference, in the hope that the conferees of the House and the Senate may duly deliberate on it and come up with the proper phraseology which will accomplish the purpose which all of us have, and that is to prevent usury on any American money which may be made available to Latin American States.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Vermont. I congratulate the Senator from Delaware on the strong position he has taken on this matter by calling it to the attention of the Senate. I shall certainly support him in the effort to fix a reasonable ceiling on the interest that can be charged by Latin American Republics for lending this money, which is, in reality, money of the Government of the United States.

I firmly believe, as the Senator from Oregon has said, that we must make the money available at reasonable interest rates to the people of Latin America. As the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] has said, this is similar to the sums of money that we make available to our own people in connection with our own subsidy programs in endeavoring to help the condition of the people at large. I again congratulate the Senator from Delaware, and I shall support him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield so that I may address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As I understand, the motion which is presently before the Senate is for the Senate to recede on the Williams amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the event that motion were sustained by the Senate, it would then be necessary to make a further motion to send the bill to conference. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If anything further was to be done, that would be the case; yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. To make it clear, if the position of the Senator from Delaware is sustained, then it will be necessary to send the bill back to conference. Is that correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would make this suggestion. Let us get on with our voting on the Williams amendment. I hope every Senator will vote for it; that then every Senator will vote for the motion to send the bill to conference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would be wonderful if every Senator voted to reject the Hayden motion and thereby insist upon the retention of the Williams amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recede from the Senate amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I dislike to delay the yea and nay vote on a matter on which a very happy termination has been reached. However, there are some things that I should like to call to the attention of the Senate; this will also serve the purpose, perhaps, of making clearer the viewpoint of another Member of the Senate, for use in the conference which will follow.

I predicate my remarks on this proposal on the fact that, while this is not technically a part of our foreign aid program, in substance that is exactly what it is. Most of us recall, I am sure, the message sent to Congress by the President only 5 or 6 weeks ago, in which he criticized the foreign aid program very severely and in great detail. The second sentence of his message reads:

> Existing foreign aid programs and concepts are largely unsatisfactory and unsuited for our needs and for the needs of the underdeveloped world as it enters the sixties.

Then he went on to say:

> If our foreign aid funds are to be prudently and effectively used, we need a whole new set of basic concepts and principles.

The fifth principle that he lists in his message reads:

> Special attention to those nations most willing and able to mobilize their own resources, make necessary social and economic reforms, engage in long-range planning, and make the other efforts necessary if these are to reach the stage of self-sustaining growth.

The thrust of that sentence is that we should pay special attention to those nations which are willing to make necessary social and economic reforms. We certainly will not be contributing to that effort of social and economic reforms if we lend money to South America at a moderate rate, and then have it loaned by those countries at much larger rates of interest, running from 15 percent to 25 percent. That will simply be perpetuating the very feudalistic system which now exists, and is one of the bases for the criticism of the foreign aid program, to which the President has called our attention.

Consider what the President has suggested. To use his own language:

> In short, this Congress at this session must make possible a dramatic turning point in the troubled history of foreign aid to the underdeveloped world. We must say to the less-developed nations, if they are willing to undertake necessary internal reform and self-help—and to the other industrialized nations, if they are willing to undertake a much greater effort on a much broader scale—that we then intend during this coming decade of development to achieve a decisive turnaround in the fate of the less-developed world, looking toward the ultimate day when all nations can be self-reliant and when foreign aid will no longer be needed.

What did the President say concerning what should be done?

> To meet the varied needs of many nations, the new aid administration will have a flexible set of tools, coordinated and shaped to fit each national development program: the grant or sale (for either local currency or dollars with special repayment terms) of surplus foods, equipment and other items; technical assistance; skilled manpower from the Peace Corps; development grants; transitional, sustaining, or emergency grants; development loans repayable in local currency; and development loans repayable in dollars, with special terms of repayment that will meet the needs of the recipient country. These tools will be coordinated with the activities of the Export-Import Bank, and with loan and investment guarantees to private enterprise.
>
> The instrument of primary emphasis—the single most important tool—will be long-term development loans at low or no rates of interest, repayable in dollars, and designed to promote growth in those less-developed nations which have a real chance for ultimate self-reliance but which lack the ability to service loans from normal lending institutions. The terms of repayment will vary from as long as 50 years for those countries just starting on the road to development, to a much shorter period of time for those countries that are nearing the stage of self-sufficient growth.
>
> Such long-term loans are preferable to outright grants, or "soft loans" repayable in local currencies that are of little benefit to the American taxpayer. The emphasis on low or interest-free loans is not designed to undercut other institutions. The objective is to rely on flexibility in the repayment period and the requirement of ultimate dollar repayment for insuring strict accountancy while meeting individual needs in an area not met by suppliers of capital on normal terms.
>
> Lending on these terms is not normal banking practice. We are banking on the emergence over coming years and decades of a group of independent, growing, self-reliant nations.

There we have the President's program. We have the new concept. And we have available to us now, not only by voting to send this amendment to conference, but also by holding fast to our position there, one of the most important tools for changing the concept of the foreign aid program on which the President is relying to improve that program and to make it an effective and proper instrumentality of our foreign policy.

If we recede from this amendment, and accept the House position on this point, we will indeed be distorting the

President's concept for an improved foreign aid program.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for holding so tenaciously to his proposal. I hope that when the conferees go into conference, they will hold just as tenaciously to the amendment. If they do not, we will be denying one of the important means for increasing the effectiveness, quality, and caliber of the foreign aid program and its underlying purpose.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to express my concurrence in the views just declared by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] and to reaffirm my support of the views presented by the Senator from Delaware on this vital subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As I understand the motion now pending, offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], would delete the so-called Williams of Delaware amendment which provides for a ceiling on the interest rates. A vote in favor of retaining the amendment in the bill and thus to set a ceiling on the interest rates would be a vote of "nay," or a vote against the Hayden motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's explanation. I simply wish it to be made quite clear that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was accepted by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and was voted into the bill. The other body did not wish to go to conference and refused to accept the Williams of Delaware amendment.

Therefore, the vote we are about to take—and I trust it will be a unanimous vote of "nay"—will reaffirm the position of the Senate on this particular question. Then we will ask for a conference with the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. So that there will be no misunderstanding, a vote "nay" will be a vote to support the original position of the Senate as the bill was passed by the Senate with the Williams of Delaware amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. As I understand, the vote at this particular time is on the question of reaffirming the Senate's position at the time it adopted the so-called Williams of Delaware amendment. If the Senate reaffirms that position by rejecting the motion of the Senator from Arizona, the next action will automatically be a motion to request a conference with the House of Representatives.

Several Senators. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 0, nays 95, as follows:

[No. 41]

YEAS—0

NAYS—95

Aiken	Ervin	Miller
Allott	Fong	Monroney
Anderson	Fulbright	Morse
Bartlett	Goldwater	Moss
Beall	Gore	Mundt
Bennett	Hart	Muskie
Bible	Hartke	Neuberger
Boggs	Hayden	Pastore
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pell
Burdick	Hickey	Prouty
Bush	Hill	Proxmire
Butler	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Robertson
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Cannon	Jackson	Saltonstall
Capehart	Javits	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnston	Scott
Carroll	Jordan	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Church	Kerr	Sparkman
Clark	Kuchel	Stennis
Cooper	Lausche	Symington
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Talmadge
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Dirksen	Long, La.	Wiley
Dodd	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Douglas	Mansfield	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McCarthy	Yarborough
Eastland	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McGee	Young, Ohio
Engle	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—5

Blakley	Gruening	Morton
Chavez	McNamara	

So Mr. HAYDEN's motion was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate further insist on its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Presiding Officer appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. SOK KI LEE, MAJORITY LEADER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, we are very privileged to have a distinguished and honored guest and friend of the United States from the Republic of Korea here in the Senate Chamber. I take this moment to present him and to ask our colleagues to welcome him with the enthusiasm and the affection which we the American people have for the people of Korea.

These are very troubled days for that great country and those great people. Our hearts go out to them in these moments of decision.

Mr. President, the gentleman I am privileged to present is Mr. Sok Ki Lee, the majority leader of the House of Representatives of the Republic of Korea.

To Mr. Lee, on behalf of the Senate, we extend our good wishes and cordial welcome.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD biographic information concerning the Honorable Sok Ki Lee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHIC INFORMATION CONCERNING THE HONORABLE LEE SOK-KI, MEMBER OF THE KOREAN NATIONAL ASSEMBLY AND A PARTICIPANT IN THE LEADER EXCHANGE PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

PERSONAL DATA

Full name: Lee Sok-ki.

Born: January 2, 1907, in Puyo-gun, South Chungchong Province.

Home address: 14–19, 2-ka, Changchung-dong, Choong-ku, Seoul.

Knowledge of English: Needs interpreter.

Present position:

Majority leader of the National Assembly, Republic of Korea (South Korea); Democratic Party.

Member of the Transportation and Communication Committee of the Korean National Assembly.

Academic background:

Graduate of the Keijyo Law College, Tokyo, March 1931.

Bachelor of laws' degree from Chuo University, Tokyo, 1939.

Previous positions:

Democratic Party opposition floor leader in the National Assembly, 1954–58.

Has been member of the National Assembly 1950–58, and was reelected for a 4-year term in July 1960.

Judge of the Impeachment Court, 1951.

Chief Secretary to the Minister of Education, 1950.

Vice Mayor of Seoul, 1948–50.

Mayor, Taejon City, 1946–48.

Official in the South Chungchong Provincial Government, 1945–46.

County government official, 1941–45.

Publications: "A Summarized Review of My Parliamentary Activities", volume 1 (1953), volume 2 (1958).

Membership in organizations:

Democratic Party (Chief of the Finance Section).

Civil Rights Protection League (executive secretary).

Fair Election Promotion Committee (vice chairman).

Board of directors of the Dongkuk Woman's College.

Member of the board of directors of the Foreign Language College.

Interests and objectives in the United States:

Political parties in the United States, especially at State and precinct level: organization, functioning and assistance received from national headquarters.

The organization and procedures for holding elections, local and national. Mr. Lee is

especially interested in the mechanical aspects, including supplies.

The role and activities of interest groups and pressure groups in American political life: nonpartisan as well as partisan, and including labor, business and women's groups.

Educational activities of American trade unions.

The police system in various cities and States.

The tourist industry and activities for the promotion of tourism.

Social security and unemployment insurance systems.

Representative examples of educational, industrial, agricultural and social institutions.

Social customs and home life.

Sites of scenic and general interest.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6100) to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize off-season cruises by American-flag passenger vessels.

EFFIGY MOUNDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, IOWA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has reported today from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs a bill—H.R. 5571—providing for the addition of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill because of some extenuating circumstances, namely, that the bill relates to a public purpose park facility that will be dedicated this coming Saturday in Iowa.

Rather than explain the bill, I should like to have that done by the Senator from Iowa. I merely want to say it has been cleared with the minority leader and with the majority leader, and has the unanimous support of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5571) providing for the addition of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from the State of Minnesota for his graciousness in allowing us to take up the bill at this time. The bill was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior, and the request was confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior on March 3.

The bill has passed the House. It was reported unanimously this morning by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with the hope the Senate could pass the bill this afternoon, because of the dedication ceremony on Saturday.

It provides for the appropriation of $2,000 to acquire some 72 additional acres for this monument. The remainder of the land, which totals 272 acres, is owned by the Federal Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 5571) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing the floor?

Mr. COTTON. Before I yield, may I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are requested.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the majority leader, and I assure you, Mr. President, I shall not be verbose, I should like to ask about the program for the remainder of the day and tomorrow, and particularly with reference to a possible session on Saturday. A great many Members of the Senate have reservations to go home. They have speeches to make, and business of a character. I express to the majority leader the hope that there will be no Saturday session and that, at a normal hour, both today and tomorrow, the Senate might find it appropriate to adjourn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in answer to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, there will be no session on Saturday. We will meet tomorrow, and we will come in Monday.

I have been discussing with the minority leader and interested Members on both sides the possibility of a time limitation being set to cover the various amendments to be offered, let us say, after today, and the possibility of an agreement covering 10 hours on the bill itself.

If there are no objections to such a request at this time, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow, 2 hours be allocated to each amendment, 1 hour to a side, and 10 hours be allocated to the bill itself.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Has the majority leader checked with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] on this matter? He indicated he might want to make a speech of some length on the matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, I missed him, unfortunately. I intended to confer with him. But if this request is agreed to, there will be an appropriate amount of time set aside for him.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to suggest, and I would be perfectly willing to have the unanimous consent agreement contain, a section on modification, and that is that it would not be applicable to any amendment which might involve any issue of civil rights.

Mr. TALMADGE. If the Senator will yield, I know of no such issue involved in the present bill or the possibility of any such issue being raised. But I did want to protect the interests of the senior Senator from Mississippi. He has not asked me to do so, and I do not know what his intentions are in the matter, but I would appreciate it if the distinguished majority leader would check with him before agreement on this unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator and to state that I had him in mind, but I believe he will be satisfied with this agreement; and, just to make certain, I will extend the time from 10 hours to 12 hours, and assure the Senator from Georgia that the Senator from Mississippi will be taken care of.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, first, I was going to suggest to the majority leader that I presume it will take more time on the so-called redistribution formula than is contemplated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And we shall have to allow extra time. I would gather 12 hours on the bill would be ample. Incidentally, I expect to make some extended remarks on the bill, also. Now, if the so-called parochial school amendment, relative to the loan provisions of the bill, is submitted, I would be of the impression it would take a little longer time.

May I then respectfully suggest to the majority leader, with this kind of discussion, that the request not be presented until tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator allow me to state that in view of the importance of those two particular amendments we should allocate to each of them 4 hours, to be divided 2 hours to a side, with all other amendments having 2 hours, 1 hour to a side, and 12 hours on the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was going to ask my distinguished friend from Georgia,

who has an amendment to section 2, which I gather deals generally with the denial of funds where the integration issue is involved——

Mr. TALMADGE. Indeed not. The integration issue is not involved in any way. The amendment merely seeks to uphold the hands of the President of the United States and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in their desire to assure the respective States that not one shred of Federal control will be involved in this issue.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding of the so-called Talmadge amendment. What it would do, as I understand it, is that which has been said many times by practically every Senator on this floor. It would provide that Federal aid does not mean Federal control, to become a part of the legislation, if agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I read the language of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, which is sought to be added at the end of section 103, which in turn is an interdiction on any administrative officer with respect to school curricula, and so forth, the amendment would add the provision: "or withhold any funds which would be provided for under this Act."

So if something in that field comes up no employee, no officer, no department head and no agency, under the amendment, could withhold funds.

It is not my purpose to discuss the substance of the bill now.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I interpret the language correctly, I simply wish to serve notice that I might, conceivably, offer an amendment on that subject in affirmative form. I have religiously kept my hands off until now, but we have considered one amendment and have disposed of it. I thought if that were the intent, then I would feel free from any self-imposed objection I might have or from any self-imposed discipline on that subject, and I might offer an amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply wished to be sure that I was amply protected, since it no doubt would stir up discussion.

Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield first to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator's reading of the language is entirely correct. The language has no connotation except that which the able Senator has read.

As the distinguished Senator knows, the control over money has an enormous effect on the disposition of policies by any agency, be it local, State, or Federal.

I have been the Governor of my State. When I was Governor, I was the sole director of the budget. If one wishes to influence a policy, one can do it by the mere threat to withhold funds. The control over the purse strings, of course, is the greatest control one can possibly have in any governmental agency.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thoroughly agree.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I would oppose with the greatest of vigor the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. It is precisely what we defeated overwhelmingly. I have heard rumors that the amendment is something which is going to be accepted.

Mr. MORSE. Oh——

Mr. JAVITS. By somebody.

Mr. MORSE. Not by me.

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly not by the Senator from Oregon. Therefore, I should like to hear again the unanimous-consent request, in order to be sure that we shall have adequate time to take care of an amendment which, in my humble opinion, would result in the probable destruction of any effort at this session to have Federal aid to education, because it would start a chain reaction.

First we would have this amendment, and then would come an amendment against segregation. Then other Senators would pick up other ideas for similar amendments. The discipline, which has so far resulted in the bringing of the bill to the point it has reached, will be completely shattered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So long as the Senator from New York has raised the question, I think I should say, on behalf of myself as well as other Senators, as the Senator from Oregon has said, there has been no commitment made by anyone, that I know of, so far as the Talmadge amendment is concerned.

So far as the request goes, what I requested was that beginning tomorrow, 2 hours be allocated for each amendment, 1 hour to a side; and that for the Cooper-Javits amendment and the parochial school amendment, 4 hours be allocated, 2 hours to a side; and that there be allocated 12 hours on the bill.

Mr. PROUTY, Mr. GOLDWATER, and Mr. HICKENLOOPER addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. First I yield to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I intend to offer a so-called freedom of choice amendment. It will take me at least an hour to explain the amendment. I think there is some interest in the subject. I should like to be assured that I shall have at least an extra hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We should be delighted, between us, to give the Senator the time he needs from the time on the bill, to fully explain the amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Not less than 1 hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. One hour on the amendment, or on the bill?

Mr. PROUTY. A total of 2 hours.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as to the Talmadge amendment, we may need additional time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thought we might make an exception for that amendment.

Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is with great reluctance that I must object to any unanimous-consent agreement at this time. I shall offer an amendment concerning parochial and private schools. I shall offer an amendment to remove teachers' pay from the bill. I shall offer a substitute for the bill. Perhaps I shall offer other amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are all eligible.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The two amendments I have mentioned in particular—the amendment to strike teachers' pay and the amendment on parochial schools—I am sure will require far more than 2 or 4 hours, as suggested. I am sure the debate on the Talmadge amendment will require much longer time than even the distinguished Senator from Georgia feels it will require.

I do not believe, with respect to an important issue such as this—when we are asked, in effect, to remove responsibility from the local level and to place it in Federal hands—that we should decide the question in a week. It might take 2 weeks. It might take 3 weeks. I am prepared to fight this as long as it takes. I do not wish to be pushed into voting on Friday, on Monday, or on Tuesday. When the vote comes naturally, I shall not obstruct the vote. I simply do not wish to see the discussion cut down at the present time, so I shall object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the Senator will withhold his objection.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I withhold the objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I simply wish to say that I support what has been said by the Senator from Illinois and by the Senator from New York. I am not interested in how much time is allocated, but I am certainly interested in whether or not there does exist any plan by which the so-called Talmadge amendment may not be given adequate time for discussion. I know both sides desire adequate discussion.

I am glad to hear that there is no agreement and no arrangement of support, one way or another, on that amendment, because there were stories in the morning papers to the contrary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I read them.

Mr. SCOTT. I certainly should be constrained to demand such time as is necessary either to offer or to support an amendment which would be directly contrary to that of my friend the Senator from Georgia; an amendment which, in fact, would be designed to protect the civil rights of all persons as declared by the legislative and executive bodies.

Therefore, a chain reaction may well start here, and I think we will need ample time to discuss the proposal.

I make no comment as to the amount of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can well understand the position of the Senator from Arizona, who has never been an ob-

structionist, the position of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and the position of other Senators.

Mr. SCOTT. I should like to see the Senator agree on time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We simply cannot do so. I shall withdraw my request at this time, but I think in all fairness to the Senate I ought to say that so long as we are not going to meet on Saturday we should be ready to start coming in very early beginning Monday next. By "very early" I mean 9 o'clock. Perhaps we shall have sessions extending, for the first time, at some length into the evening.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am sure no one objects to coming in at a reasonable hour in the morning, when he is fresh. I trust we will not crowd the line too strongly as to staying late in the evening.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the Senate could well adjourn at 6 o'clock, because after 5 o'clock in the afternoon, ideas are not always too constructive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is withdrawn.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of the Senate what has taken place in the Senate Chamber in the last 30 minutes. I yielded the floor to the distinguished minority leader in order that he might discuss a program with the majority leader. There was an attempt to get a limitation of time on amendments to the bill. I counted 33 Senators standing in the well of the Senate Chamber. I heard them predict—I shall not say "threaten"—and warn that there would be amendments offered to the bill relating to the questions and problems of segregation versus integration in the schools. I heard them suggest—in fact, announce—that there would be amendments offered to the bill relating to assistance to parochial and religious schools.

We have had a preview of what is coming before we finish consideration of the bill. If the Senate should reject the amendment I am about to discuss, I will make the prediction—and I am not the seventh son of a seventh son—that the week after next Senators and perhaps the administration will have come to the conclusion that they would have been wise to adopt a form of assistance to the education of the youth of this country that is not subject to all the difficulties, dissensions, constitutional objections related to the questions of racial prejudice, racial problems, aid to children in church and religious schools, and of all other such complicating questions.

In the light of what has recently taken place, I ask consideration of my amendment, which incidentally I offered the last time that the Federal aid to education subject was considered in this body. At that time I did not even ask for a yea and nay vote, but when the bill was considered in the House of Representatives, the amendment was offered as a substitute, was debated, and on a teller vote came very close to being agreed to as a substitute for the bill.

This year the amendment is not being offered as a possibility or in the hope of its being considered and adopted at some future time.

To be very frank with the Senate, it has seemed to me that probably the obstacles to aid to education which have been a roadblock year after year would not block the pending bill because, as we all know, it has the support of a popular President of the United States, and his party has practically 2 to 1 majorities in both branches of Congress. I thought the bill probably had sufficient power behind it to force it through in spite of the complications that might arise with respect to the questions of religion and race. But what has happened in the last few moments convinces the Senator from New Hampshire that, even with all the favorable support and all the forces behind the committee bill or the administration bill, whichever one would choose to call it, my amendment, or one similar, is the only hope of actual tangible assistance to education in this country at this session of Congress.

In a certain sense the proposal I present in the amendment cannot be strictly called Federal aid. It is assistance to public education through assistance to the States. Strictly speaking, it is not Federal aid.

I wish to call to the attention of the Senate the preamble of the amendment. It is not important as far as the substance of the amendment is concerned, but it is worth noting in the RECORD. The preamble states:

SEC. 102. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that responsibility for and control over education is one of the powers not delegated to the United States but reserved to the States or to the people under the tenth amendment to the Constitution.

(b) The Congress hereby reaffirms and reenacts a portion of article III of the Ordinance of 1787, adopted by the Confederation Congress, July 13, 1787, as follows: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

(c) The Congress further finds that continued encouragement of the means of education requires the strengthening of State governments.

The reason why the preamble was placed in the amendment is that the sum and substance of the amendment is the strengthening of the States in their educational programs.

The amendment is very simple. It provides that 25 percent of the Federal tax on cigarettes shall be returned to the State from which it was collected, earmarked for use by the State for educational purposes. It would mean, if adopted, a very substantial amount of money. The income from this tax is increasing year by year. Last year when I presented the plan I named the estimate that I had received for that year.

This year it is much greater. My own estimate of the amount, at 2 cents on each package of cigarettes, which I obtained about 2 months ago, shows a total of $445 million which would be distributed among the States the first year. I have been informed today that the present estimate would mean the distribution of, I believe, $470 million. In other words, the amount is growing. It is nearly as much already as the amount the President originally asked for in the administration bill. Of course that amount has been increased in the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Would the Senator deal with the subject of how tobacco consumption relates to the population in the various States, and also how it relates to the income taxes paid in the various States?

Mr. COTTON. I am coming to the first part of the Senator's question.

Let me summarize very briefly the practical reasons for the adoption of my plan instead of the plan reported by the committee. If the assistance to education is in the form of a return of the portion of the tax to each State from which it was taken, it has these virtues. First, the plan requires no formula for dividing Federal aid among the States. Each State would receive the same proportionate amount of the cigarette tax as it had paid into the Federal Treasury, and it would be earmarked for education.

Second, it presents no problem of how the money shall be used for education, so long as it is used for education. It has all of the freedom that is suggested in the fine amendment of the very able Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in that the States may use the money for construction, for teachers' salaries, for equipment, or for any of the many necessities of their educational system, so long as it is used for education.

Third, this system requires no Federal department or bureau or hardly an additional employee to administer it. All the States in the Union, except two, levy a State tax on each package of cigarettes retailed in the State. Each State has a department which determines—even though the tax may be paid by the wholesaler—and keeps a record of the number of packages of cigarettes retailed in the State for the purpose of State taxes. So all that is necessary—and that is one of the reasons that I selected the tax on cigarettes in proposing the amendment—is to compile the information from the States' own departments, with the exception of two—and that could be easily calculated—and return to each State 2 cents out of the 8 cents, or 25 percent, of the Federal cigarette tax.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Has the Senator already given an estimate or would he give an estimate of the annual yield under the amendment?

Mr. COTTON. I will give that in detail. I have mentioned it already, but I will give it in detail shortly. I will summarize these points first. It would be easy to make that calculation, and quite simple. It also means that the Federal Government would not be collecting a brokerage fee before the money was sent to the States. Practically every cent of the amount would go

straight back to the State and into the hands of the State for use in assisting it in education. No slice of it would be sticking to the palms of the Federal Government in Washington in the form of administrative expenses. There would not be an increasing and expanding bureau in order to administer it, divide it up, and to determine a formula. All that would be obviated. We could well afford to have a smaller amount realized if we knew that it was all going to the States for the purpose for which it was designed.

Fourth. I come again to what I intimated at the start. One of the most important features of the proposal is this: It disposes of the issue or issues which have caused the death of every attempt at Federal help for education in the past, namely, the question of aid to pupils in private and religious schools, as well as questions arising from the problem of segregated schools.

The States are not entirely unhampered because the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Everson case, has indicated rather recently that there may well be some restrictions on the States themselves. The States, however, are certainly less hampered by constitutional restrictions in dealing with the problem of assistance to pupils of all creeds and in all the schools in their States.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that already throughout the country various States have various ways of dealing with this problem. It is perfectly natural. Hanging over the Senate for the last several weeks, and in the form of letters in our offices, is the specter of this problem with which we are going to be squarely faced in the next week, the problem of how to deal with the religious question involved in Federal aid to education. It is perfectly natural that the Catholic church, maintaining as it does, a parochial school system, paying the teachers, furnishing education to the pupils, and taking a very expensive load from the shoulders of the public school system, should view with anxiety and with interest the progress of aid to education which must be, if it is federalized aid, as the President has correctly stated, only for public schools, if it is administered as Federal aid.

Let us remember that in the States there are various systems which are being followed. There are States in which transportation is being furnished to pupils in church schools by the same buses which transport pupils to the public schools. There are sections of our country where there are a few Protestants and a vast number of Catholics, and there are certain communities, I am informed, where there are not enough non-Catholics to maintain public schools, and where the school district pays tuition in parochial schools to educate non-Catholics in those schools.

In other States, where the population is overwhelmingly non-Catholic, there are few Catholics and few Catholic schools. There the situation is entirely different. Gradually throughout the years this delicate problem has been dealt with and handled by the States and the local communities in such manner as their laws and public opinion seemed to justify.

The minute Congress enacts a Federal aid to education bill, the minute Congress begins to send money from the Federal Government into the States in the form of Federal aid, just as surely as night follows day this troublesome question will reach the courts. Not only is its effect likely to be felt upon the Federal aid system, but it is likely, also, to result in tipping over, destroying, or getting out of balance perfectly satisfactory arrangements used locally in the States throughout the years, because the Supreme Court has now held that the provision in the first amendment, which states, "Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," is no longer confined to Federal aid. It has been held in the Everson case that the 14th amendment reaches into the States.

When this question is raised, we shall find ourselves in a situation where we will have destroyed, at least for the moment, our educational system in some respects.

So I simply cite as the fourth reason for the adoption of my amendment that it will obviate all the controversy regarding this question. We shall simply be returning to the States, in exactly the way that the Association of State Governors has recommended, again and again, certain Federal taxes so that the States may use them, in their own way, for public education.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has that association recommended that the cigarette tax be used?

Mr. COTTON. No it has not. I thank the Senator for the correction. I did not intend to convey that impression. The State Governors have repeatedly suggested the relinquishment of some Federal taxes to the States.

The fifth point in favor of my amendment is that the amendment advances the education of our youth by helping the States to fulfill their obligations without providing a loophole for Federal control. There cannot possibly be even an entering wedge for Federal control of education.

The committee found it necessary to insert a section in the committee bill disclaiming Federal control. A similar section is in many of the amendments, including the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who is in the Chamber; and the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. In many of the amended plans, it has been necessary, or it has seemed necessary, to insert a provision disclaiming Federal control.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The declaration in the amendment which I had drafted was included not because I regarded it as necessary, but simply as conventional assurance. Actually, so far as divorcing the remedy from any possibility of control is concerned, the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota has drafted is as free from any opportunity for control as is the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. I shall comment on his amendment in a moment, while the Senator is in the Chamber.

The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire does not require any declaration on this subject, because fundamentally what is proposed is not Federal aid; it is simply a restoration to the States of money which has actually come from the particular State. Let me emphasize that point. The amendment does not give to the State of New York a single cent that was collected in the State of Vermont or the State of Alabama. It sends back a portion of the taxes paid on this commodity directly to the State in which the taxes were collected. Therefore, the people of the State are handling their own money; and if—I do not say this as indicative that I am trying to excuse or to promote segregation in the schools—a certain State still practices segregation, at least the State is using its own money; it is not taking the money from the pockets of the people of my State. Nevertheless, that State may follow a course which may well be disapproved by the people of other States. My amendment is a complete answer and a complete bar to Federal control.

Before I yield the floor, I wish to discuss very frankly for a moment some of the objections to the amendment. The first objection I heard stated to the amendment was that if it shall be adopted, and a portion of the cigarette tax is returned to the States, that will call for new money; it will be necessary to replenish the amount that will be lost to the general fund. I shall not take much time to discuss that point.

If the committee bill is passed, and we begin to pour billions of dollars into the Federal aid to education program, that money must, absolutely, be raised; and it will be raised in the very States which are receiving it. Many States will receive, in return, less than they paid into the fund. So any fund which Congress creates for this purpose must, of course, come from the pockets of the people.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The bill reported by the committee starts by taking twice as much from the State as is provided in the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. That is correct. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for that observation.

Another objection raised to the amendment is that it is a bad practice to earmark tax funds for particular purposes. As a member of the Committee on Finance in the last Congress, I heard that subject discussed by Members of this body for whom I have the most profound respect, and I agree with them.

It is a bad practice to start to earmark funds and to continue down the road earmarking funds. Congress has reached that wall already in certain instances, but always in the form of special taxes. Congress has earmarked gasoline taxes for the Interstate Highway System and for other highway purposes. There are certain other minor instances, such as the earmarking of revenue received from sale of ammunition, shotgun shells, and other hunting equipment, for hunting activities.

However, I concede it is not a practice that should be encouraged.

At this point I am obligated to compare my amendment, in one respect, with the amendment which will be offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. His amendment is a good amendment, but I assert that it is not so good as mine, and I will state why. But, if my amendment does not prevail, I expect that I shall vote for his. However, his amendment earmarks for education a certain part of the income taxes collected throughout the country.

I have heard Senators say they prefer that method because they do not want their children to be educated with cigarette money.

I do not give great weight to that objection. Our children are already being educated on cigarette money, because some of the cigarette tax goes into the various forms of aid we already have. It also goes into many other worthy projects. It certainly is carrying moral scruples to the nth degree, unless it is intended to encourage the smoking of cigarettes; and I doubt if anyone would smoke more cigarettes because he might be told that one-fourth of the tax goes to public education.

When we start earmarking straight income taxes for public education, we open the door for earmarking straight income taxes for other worthy objects. Moreover, we open the door for increasing the amount for public education. Whenever there is a tax on a commodity, whether it be tobacco, gasoline, or any other commodity which is being manufactured, distributed, and sold, we have a readymade lobby ready to resist further encroachments.

If someone says, "We have so many billion dollars this year for public education; that is fine; let us have more," immediately we have alined against the proposal all the influence of those who are opposed to it. Members of the Senate know that such influence may sometimes be very great. But the people have no lobby. Once we start earmarking general tax funds for worthy purposes, if the programs look good, more will be demanded, and there will be a powerful urge to open the door wider and spend more.

For that reason I contend that it is a safer and more prudent method to restore to the States funds that are collected on a particular commodity, because such a system would be self-policing.

I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] in just a moment. I have been commenting on his amendment. However, I think perhaps I should mention a further comparison between his amendment and mine, so that he can cover the entire question.

There is one further respect in which I suggest to the Senate that my proposal is preferable to his, although his has much merit. Under the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota, of course, a percentage—1 percent, I believe—of the income tax would be earmarked for aid to education, and then thrown into a pool and divided among the States by a formula in accordance, I believe, with the school population.

I have now reached the point of the greatest objection which will undoubtedly be made to my amendment. Under my amendment various amounts would be returned to the States. In at least 22 States such amounts would not correspond proportionately either to the school population or the income of the States. I frankly call that to the attention of the Senate.

The fundamental principle of my amendment is that no State would get anything from the Federal Government. No State would receive any grant, gift, or loan. The program would not be a Federal aid program. It would be a return of money collected in the States.

When money is withheld from a tax and thrown into a pool, and an attempt is made, with the best motives in the world, to divide it equitably among the States on the basis of any kind of formula, whether a complicated formula such as that in the committee bill, based upon school population and income or wealth of the State, or whether it be a formula based upon school population alone, it becomes Federal money. It means that some of the States are getting a grant, are receiving benefits from the Federal Government.

Then we open up again the same old problem. Members of the Catholic Church, for example, who are sending their children, at their own expense, to the church schools, and are also paying taxes to maintain the public schools, immediately begin to say—with understandable justification in their own minds—"If the Federal Government is sending money into this State based upon the number of children of school age, it should go to all the children of school age."

Then once more we have back in the picture the same perplexing problem which is presented by the committee bill. For that reason I strongly insist that, even through the formula of distribution among the various States, seems unequal under my plan, at least there is a reason for it. Every cent would go into the State whence it came. According to present estimates, the total amount distributed throughout the United States, based upon a rate of 2 cents, would be some $470 million.

I believe that an amendment to my amendment will be offered, which would make the rate 3 cents instead of 2 cents. Should that be done, it would mean an amount of some $700 million, which very closely approaches the amount under the bill as it stands.

I now yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New Hampshire in yielding to me.

First of all, in responding, I believe I should make this observation: The choice before the Senate at this particular time, or when the time comes to vote on the pending amendment, will not be between the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire and the amendment I may offer some time later. The choice before the Senate at any given time is between the pending amendment and the committee bill. I anticipate voting for the Senator's amendment, because at that particular stage I would regard it as a superior method to that provided in the committee bill for solving the problem before us.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. That is exactly my own attitude toward the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. With respect to the comparison between the two amendments, I do not expect to go into great detail at this time, but inasmuch as the Senator has made the comparison, I welcome the opportunity to clarify the situation a bit.

First, the fundamental weakness in the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, it seems to me, is that it ventures to say that the need for education is to be measured by the quantity of cigarettes smoked in a particular State.

The Senator found some objection to the proposal to use the number of school children—as my amendment would propose—as the measure for distribution among the States.

I venture the assertion that the most logical measure, the one least suspectible to tinkering, or to whims of any kind, is one providing that distribution shall be based on the number of school children in the particular State. Why have education at all? It is because of the children. My amendment would propose distribution based upon the number of children of school age within the State. That is the logical measure of need.

With respect to the other point, I think possibly the Senator from New Hampshire is under the impression that my amendment would propose placing a certain amount of money in a pool. It would not do that. Under the highway program we dedicate certain taxes to a highway trust fund, and then appropriate from that fund.

My amendment does not propose that. My amendment merely uses the income tax, both personal and corporate, and sets that up as a ceiling beyond which Congress may not appropriate. Neither the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire nor my amendment engages in back-door financing. They merely say there is authorized to be appropriated out of the Treasury a certain amount. The amendment of the Senator would authorize to be appropriated out of the Treasury an amount from each State equal to 2 cents on each package of cigarettes sold in that State.

My amendment merely proposes that there may be appropriated out of the

Treasury a certain amount to a State for education not to exceed 1 percent of the total collections of income taxes, both personal, or individual, and corporate.

The Senator from New Hampshire has pointed out that his amendment returns to the States an amount which is based upon the amount of taxes collected in that State. That is correct. I wish it were possible to say with equal confidence that was a measure of the educational needs of that State. That is the big problem connected with the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. At the same time, I think it is a better approach than the formula of high-income States and low-income States. I think a formula of that sort lands itself to tinkering and the establishment of controls. I am speaking of the formula in the committee bill, not the formula offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, which provides for using a yardstick beyond which funds may not be appropriated.

The amendment which the Senator from South Dakota will offer later, provided we reach that point, and provided some other amendment has not been offered that takes out of the bill the portion which would be subject to the amendment, would include the corporate tax as one means of bringing back to the States the tax on the income which is earned in those States but which is paid and credited to the other States.

I think the Senator has heard me make this statement before, and I do not wish to take his time explaining it or to go into detail at this time, but I can make my point with a single illustration. The people of my State buy a lot of gasoline. It is marketed by corporations which are organized elsewhere. Esso pays its corporation tax in the State of New Jersey. Standard Oil of Indiana pays its corporation tax in Indiana. Texaco presumably pays its corporation tax in Texas. Phillips Petroleum probably pays its corporation tax in Oklahoma. All of those oil companies make part of their income and profit in South Dakota.

Whether it is gasoline, groceries, machinery, automobiles, railroads, or insurance, almost none of the home offices of those corporations doing business in South Dakota are located in South Dakota. The income tax is paid in some other State. That is true of the State of New Hampshire. It is true of most of the so-called low-income States. We are not credited with the income taxes paid by the people who buy their goods from corporations whose home offices are located in other States.

That is why I sought to include corporate income, along with individual income taxes, as a means of making available to the school needs in every State a portion of the income tax earned in that State.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. I shall yield in just a moment to other Senators, but first I wish to emphasize, in a sentence or two, what the Senator from South Dakota has said. The Senator from South Dakota is completely correct that, if we are dividing Federal aid to education among the States, there is no criterion so just, so reasonable, or so fair as to use the population of the children of school age. That statement is completely correct. It is one reason why his proposal is much better than the committee bill, in my opinion.

My amendment is not Federal aid. It does not attempt to create a formula. It does not attempt to place it on the educational needs of the States. It is a means of giving assistance by returning money. This I consider a measure similar to that of the Senator from South Dakota. It seems to be the only tax of which we have readymade knowledge and can make a return to the States of this country and know that every cent came from those States.

If it were not for the complications of the parochial school and other problems, I would infinitely prefer the measure of the Senator from South Dakota; but the measure of the Senator from South Dakota is Federal aid.

It does, as justly as possible, take corporate taxes that are paid in the various States and spread them, on a formula, to all the States. But it is Federal aid, so it opens the way to Federal aid and Federal controls and all the problems of religion and race.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On the issue related to parochial schools, at a later time I shall point out how my amendment does not open the door, but in fact closes the door.

Mr. COTTON. I shall look forward to hearing the Senator.

Now I yield to my colleague from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleague from New Hampshire for the excellent presentation of his amendment, which would modify the administration's School Assistance Act.

I am firmly convinced that the Cotton amendment, which has the double virtues of simplicity and clarity, solves, on the one hand, the problem of financial aid in a direct, fair, and equitable manner and, on the other, avoids the pitfalls of Federal domination, conformity, and complicated equalization formulas imposed by the Federal Government.

Aid funds under this amendment—approximately $470 million—are directly available to each State to expend in the best way possible in order to meet local educational problems and regional conditions.

These funds, computed by returning 25 percent of the Federal tax on cigarettes to the State in which the cigarettes were purchased, provide a continuing and predictable method of Federal assistance in the field of education and permit long-range planning by local school officials.

The administration's proposals, and many of the other aid measures, have built-in drawbacks which make them unacceptable to large numbers of people; but the Cotton amendment, by its logical simplicity, should be acceptable to all who have studied this problem and wish to arrive at a solution.

The junior Senator from New Hampshire is to be congratulated for developing such a workable proposal, and I hope the Senate will vote to support it.

Mr. COTTON. I thank my colleague from New Hampshire.

Before I yield to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the estimated total amount, and the amount from each State, that would be received the first year, under my amendment, on the basis of 25 percent of the cigarette tax.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 2 cents of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes were returned to States, as proposed by Senator Cotton's amendment to S. 1021

[In millions]

State:	Receipts
Alabama	$5.60
Alaska	.50
Arizona	3.60
Arkansas	3.00
California	44.00
Colorado	4.00
Connecticut	8.00
Delaware	1.40
Florida	11.00
Georgia	8.50
Hawaii	1.10
Idaho	1.40
Illinois	35.00
Indiana	12.00
Iowa	6.20
Kansas	4.70
Kentucky	8.40
Louisiana	7.20
Maine	2.80
Maryland	8.00
Massachusetts	14.10
Michigan	19.10
Minnesota	8.30
Mississippi	4.00
Missouri	11.90
Montana	1.60
Nebraska	3.10
Nevada	1.15
New Hampshire	3.00
New Jersey	17.80
New Mexico	2.00
New York	50.00
North Carolina	9.50
North Dakota	1.30
Ohio	26.00
Oklahoma	6.00
Oregon	4.50
Pennsylvania	23.00
Rhode Island	2.10
South Carolina	5.00
South Dakota	1.40
Tennessee	7.70
Texas	22.00
Utah	1.25
Vermont	1.10
Virginia	8.20
Washington	6.60
West Virginia	4.10
Wisconsin	9.20
Wyoming	1.00
District of Columbia	2.50
Total	455.00

Mr. COTTON. I call the attention of the Senate, however, to what I said earlier, that, actually, the estimate is 2 or 3 months old, and, based on more recent estimates, which I cannot submit at this time, the total amount, instead of being $455 million, would be about $470 million.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an

article by David Lawrence which was published in the Washington Star of May 10, 1961, entitled "Dilemma on Federal School Aid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 10, 1961]

DILEMMA ON FEDERAL SCHOOL AID—TEACHING OF RELIGION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS VIEWED AS POSING A CRUCIAL CHOICE

(By David Lawrence)

President Kennedy has a real dilemma on his hands in connection with the bill that would provide Federal aid to public schools. If he means literally—as the administration's published statements have implied—that religion cannot be taught in schools supported with public funds without violating the Constitution, then logically Mr. Kennedy would have to withdraw altogether his support of the Federal-aid bill.

For the truth is that religion is being taught today in the public schools of the Nation in many States, and it is being done openly. Indeed, this is confirmed in a formal report issued by the American Council on Education and presented in a book entitled "The Function of the Public Schools in Dealing With Religion."

Although the report was issued in 1953, the same committee—composed of prominent clergymen of the Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish faiths—has continued its studies every year since. No further reports have been made public, but it is understood that the main principles outlined in the 1953 report are being adhered to today.

The report was based on a questionnaire sent to 1,233 educators all over the country—chief State school officers; superintendents of schools, nearly all in cities of over 50,000 population; presidents of State or municipal colleges or universities; presidents of church-related or independent colleges or universities; presidents of State teachers colleges, and deans of schools of education or heads of departments of education in all types of higher educational institutions. Usable responses were received from 556, or 45 percent of the total who received the questionnaire.

The purpose was to get the facts and to find a solution. The report speaks of religious teaching in the public schools as "a persistent unsolved problem," and says:

"In actual practice one finds many activities which are not consistent with the assumption that religion has been excluded from the public school program. For example, Bible reading is required in some States and permitted in others. The observance of certain religious holidays, such as Christmas, is characterized in nearly all schools by the use of religious subject matter, music, and religious ceremonies. Some schools, particularly those in communities which are nearly homogeneous from a religious standpoint, go much further than this in the encouragement of participation in religion by the pupils of the school.

"A few schools are beginning to experiment with the factual study of religion in order that pupils may understand its role in history and in the development of values and standards in our society.

"What to do about religion in the public schools is a persistent and vital problem. It will not be solved by drifting. We urge that this problem be studied carefully, with appropriate experimentation in different communities that are willing to undertake it. The solution will have far-reaching effects on the future unity and soundness of American society."

The 1953 report refers to a previous one issued in 1947 by the same kind of committee, and says that "in general we still subscribe to the major principles which were stated at that time." It restates some conclusions from the first report as follows:

"The separation of American public education from church control was not intended to exclude all study of religion from the school program.

"Teaching of a common core of religious beliefs in the public schools is not a satisfactory solution.

"Teaching 'moral and spiritual values' cannot be regarded as an adequate substitute for an appropriate consideration of religion in the school program. * * *

"The public school should stimulate the young toward a vigorous, personal reaction to the challenge of religion."

It is interesting to note that both the National Council of Churches of the Protestant groups and the National Catholic Educational Association are separately engaged in continuing studies of what steps can be taken to give some form of religious education to public school children.

These are regarded generally as worthy activities, but the real question is what can be done now that President Kennedy has contended that even to lend Federal money to construct a Catholic school building is unconstitutional as religion might be taught therein.

For, if the Federal Government cannot lend its money to any school, public or private, where any form of religion is taught, then many public schools throughout the United States may have to sacrifice Federal aid or give up their Christmas celebrations, their Bible readings and many other projects, including the study of religious history.

Also, if the Constitution literally means that Congress "shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion," then there could be an attack in the courts on the constitutionality of any law making Federal funds available to public schools where religious teaching of any kind is carried on. Incidentally, the Federal Constitution does not give the Federal Government any authority over education, and it could be argued that, when all is said and done, education might better be left to the States to handle exclusively.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks an article by Miriam Ottenberg, entitled Three Rulings Cited To Back Kennedy School Stand," which reviews some of the Supreme Court decisions in this field.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE RULINGS CITED TO BACK KENNEDY SCHOOL STAND

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Administration lawyers are relying on three controversial Supreme Court decisions and State court interpretations of these decisions to support President Kennedy's position that across-the-board Federal aid to parochial schools is unconstitutional.

Attorneys in the Justice Department and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are working on a brief on the subject that reportedly has grown to 70 pages and is still growing.

The brief, or memorandum as the attorneys prefer to call it, was requested by Senator MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, chief Senate sponsor of the administration's aid-to-education bill. Senator MORSE specifically asked whether long-term, low-interest loans to parochial schools are constitutional and whether there are other forms of Government aid to sectarian education that may be constitutional.

EVERSON CASE CITED

President Kennedy told a press conference on March 8 that the problem of loans to secondary education brings up constitutional problems.

"I do not think," he said, "that anyone can read the Everson case without recognizing that the position which the Court took, minority and majority, in regard to the use of tax funds for nonpublic schools, raises a serious constitutional question."

The Everson case was decided by the Supreme Court on February 10, 1947. On the face of it, the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-4 vote, ruled that public funds raised by taxation could be used to pay for transportation of children to Catholic parochial schools in New Jersey.

But, in applying the Everson case to the present controversy, the Government attorneys analyzing the constitutional questions involved note that it was in Everson that the Supreme Court, for the first time, held that the prohibitions of the 1st amendment clause relating to religion were binding on the States by virtue of the 14th amendment.

COURT BARRED TAXES

The clause in question: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

The majority opinion in the Everson case stressed that neither Federal nor State jurisdictions "can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all regions, or prefer one religion over another."

The opinion also noted that "no tax in any amount large or small can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."

Justice Hugo Black, in writing the majority opinion, quoted President Jefferson as saying "the clause against establishment of religion by law was intended to erect a wall of separation between church and state."

The lawyers interpret the 73 printed pages of majority and dissenting opinions this way: All nine judges agreed that the first amendment bars public assistance to parochial schools. But five judges felt that the New Jersey law was related to the health and safety of children generally and that the benefit to children attending parochial schools was entirely incidental.

EARLIER CASES RECALLED

Justice Black concluded his majority opinion by saying: "The first amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here."

To arguments that the personnel of the Supreme Court has changed much since 1947, attorneys developing the administration case take the view that they can only take the cases they have and determine what these cases require.

That isn't as simple as it sounds. For instance there were two earlier cases in which the Supreme Court held, in 1925, that children have a constitutional right to attend parochial schools and, in 1930, that a State could constitutionally provide textbooks for parochial schools. But, attorneys for the Government point out that, at the time of these decisions, the Court had not read the 1st amendment as a prohibition against State action via the 14th amendment.

The two post-Everson cases which figure in the legal analysis are the 1948 McCollum case and the 1952 Zorach case. Both cases brought further explanation of the Court's position in Everson.

The full impact of the Everson decision emerged in the 8-to-1 McCollum decision which, on its face, closed the doors of public schools to any form of religious instruction. Justice Stanley Reed, dissenting, said he could only deduce from the language of the opinions that religious instruction of public

school children during school hours is prohibited. He added: "The history of American education is against such an interpretation of the first amendment."

Justice Robert Jackson joined the majority but expressed regret that the Court had not been more careful in circumscribing its decision.

Four years later, the Court did do some circumscribing. In a 6-to-3 decision, it upheld a New York law permitting children to be released from public schools to get religious instruction elsewhere. Justice Black, who had written the majority opinions in both the Everson and McCollum cases, dissented this time.

Both the McCollum and the Zorach cases involved released time for religious instruction. The only distinction was that public school facilities were not used in the Zorach case.

AUTHORITIES DIFFER

But legal authorities differ on how the Zorach case affects the present controversy. Justice William O. Douglas, writing the majority opinion, talked about the impossibility of segregating religion in all its aspects from the life of the community.

Everson, McCollum, Zorach—those are the only three cases in the Supreme Court from which the Government attorneys can seek guidance. None of them deals in so many words with Federal aid to parochial schools.

There has been Federal aid to parochial schools in other connections—school lunch and milk programs and the 1958 National Defense Education Act, where loans were used for specific purposes. A question about these forms of aid has not been raised in the Supreme Court because the Court has made it clear the taxpayer does not have sufficient interest solely as a taxpayer to question what the Federal Government is doing.

Thus, the only cases on which the Government attorneys can rely in determining the Supreme Court's interpretation of the first amendment are the cases that have come up through State courts and deal with expenditure of State funds for educational purposes.

STATE COURTS WATCHED

Some attention also is being given to State court interpretation of the Supreme Court decision in the Everson case. The most recent State opinion was handed down by the Supreme Court of Vermont last January.

In that case, there was no public high school in the school district but there was a parochial high school. The township decided to give students a choice between traveling out of the district or attending the parochial school with the township paying the tuition.

The Supreme Court of Vermont unanimously held—under Everson—that it was unconstitutional for the township to pay tuition to the parochial school. A request for a Supreme Court review of this decision is expected.

Those favoring aid to parochial schools argue that the Government discriminates against religion when it doesn't give parochial schools the same assistance as public schools. The administration view is that it must be guided by the Constitution as it is interpreted by the Supreme Court.

Mr. COTTON. I emphasize, in connection with the insertion of this in the RECORD, that one reason why I am so earnestly interested in the amendment as a substitute for the committee bill is that I do not wish to see the door closed to part of the children of America because of Federal restrictions on school aid. I do not wish to see the present arrangements in local communities, which mitigate to the good and to the health of individual pupils, upset because of a Federal aid bill which is enacted.

Obviously the decisions of the Supreme Court indicates that we must, when we enact any Federal aid bill which puts Federal money into the States, by reason of the constitutional provision in the first amendment, provide for public schools only. That is a problem, I repeat, which before many days will cause the Senate to realize that a method such as I am suggesting is the just, the practical, the safe, and the fair way of giving assistance to education.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. First, I wish to compliment the Senator from New Hampshire for his presentation. I heard the Senator speak on his proposal last year, I heard him speak to a group of other Senators on the amendment this morning, and I have heard him today. I know he is very sincere in his convictions about his proposal.

I have no doubt that if the amendment should be finally adopted by the Congress it would be of help. The Senator knows I do not favor this approach, for reasons of my own conviction, but I respect the convictions and the firmly held opinions of the Senator from New Hampshire. The Senator is strong in his beliefs, and we know that.

I desire to ask the Senator some questions in the same spirit in which the Senator has discussed the problem.

Mr. COTTON. I am sure of the Senator's feeling, and I welcome the questions of the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator has described his proposal as being one which is far removed from any possibility of Federal control.

The power to provide the tax funds—in other words, to continue to levy the cigarette tax and to make 25 percent of the total collected available to the States—is a power which would continue to be held by the Federal Government, would it?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct. This represents a use of the Federal taxing power for the assistance of education in the States.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Congress have to provide that such amounts be made available to the States?

Mr. COTTON. The Federal Treasury would be instructed, in the words of the amendment:

> There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each fiscal year thereafter, to each State, to be used by such State for educational purposes only, an amount equal to 25 per centum of the Federal tax on cigarettes (computed as provided in this Act) collected on cigarettes sold within such State during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. COOPER. Would the Congress then be required to appropriate each year the funds to carry on the program?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COOPER. If the program were to be continued after 3 years, the Congress would be required to continue to appropriate the funds. Would the Senator not admit that this proposal is subject to at least some pressure upon the part of the people, the States, and the Congress itself to increase the funds—let us say, to increase the amount allocated from 25 percent to 50 percent, or to levy a larger cigarette tax?

Mr. COTTON. I commented upon that subject, though the Senator may not have been in the Chamber at that moment. I freely admitted—in fact, I pointed out—that whatever form of assistance we give to education, the earnest and dedicated educators of this country will come back for more.

I invited attention to the fact that when we divert a percentage of the income from a commodity, whether it be cigarettes, gasoline, or any other commodity, and it is sought to increase the diversion, there is a readymade lobby of those who do business producing and selling in that field. The Senator knows that can be a powerful lobby. There is, in a sense, a self-policing force to hold down the ballooning of the amount.

I do not wish to stir up my friend from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] again, but if we take the money from the general tax fund the people have no lobby, and when the educators present a very fine plea for more, there is not that counteracting or counterbalancing force.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator makes a good argument on that point. The point I make is that the same pressure, perhaps in lesser degree, still would apply. The same pressures to increase the tax or to increase the allocation would be found, as with regard to any other appropriated funds.

Mr. COTTON. Of course, there will always be pressures.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator from New Hampshire will permit me to interject, I am amazed that the argument about a lobby coming in to exert pressure against increasing the tax on cigarettes should be addressed to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I must say that we have had very little protection against the lobby to increase the taxes on cigarettes, levied not only by the Federal Government, but also by the States.

The people of Kentucky pay tremendous taxes on cigarettes. My State is one which pays more in taxes to the Federal Government than it receives from the Federal Government. I should like to have the Senators know that.

Mr. COTTON. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that it was the Senator from South Dakota who brought in the situation in Kentucky, not the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. COTTON. I know two things about the Senator from Kentucky. First, the Senator will fight for Kentucky until the end of time. Second, the Senator has one thing he stands for ahead of Kentucky, and that is the good of the whole country.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is very generous. As I said, Kentucky pays year after year a much larger sum in Federal taxes than it receives. The pay-

ments result from tobacco and also from bourbon whisky.

I have one other question. The Senator said that his amendment could not bring into discussion or debate the possibility of the troublesome questions about the use of funds in segregated schools or the use of funds in church and parochial schools. Is it not correct that if the proposal of the Senator should be adopted the same questions could be raised concerning the distribution of funds as could be raised concerning the distribution of any kind of appropriated funds?

Mr. COTTON. One can always have debate, and obviously questions can always be raised. I simply reiterate, without taking too much time of the Senate, that so far as I have been able to determine this is the only plan whereby every cent which goes from the Treasury, authorized by the Appropriations Committees of Congress, into the State of Kentucky, into the State of New Hampshire, into the State of Ohio, or into any other State, is collected from that State, paid by the people in that State. The people of the State will determine how the money should be spent and to what extent, under the laws of the State and the rules of the courts, the money can be spent for the benefit of all the children of that State, regardless of their race or creed.

Even though one could argue or one could debate, there would be very little grounds for tipping over the process and for objecting to the Federal Government's part in the plan.

The provision in the Federal Constitution would not be standing squarely in the path of such division among all the children in such State as public opinion and the laws of that State might permit.

Mr. COOPER. To be frank, actually, if the amendment should be agreed to, I think probably such questions would not come before us so often. But I do say that amendments could be offered that would direct that funds be used for private schools, in the same manner that amendments could be offered to any other bill before the Senate. An amendment could be offered to provide that funds could not be used in segregated schools.

My reason for opposing the amendment is that I know it does not take into consideration the equalization principle, which I consider to be the chief aspect of any Federal aid to education bill.

Mr. COTTON. I understand the feeling of the Senator from Kentucky on that subject, and I respect his viewpoint, which is entirely logical. I merely say to the Senator that " a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." I feel that if the amendment is adopted, the States will get some money. After witnessing what happened in the Senate this afternoon, I am quite convinced that if the amendment is not agreed to, the States will have only disappointed hopes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is great merit in the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire.

I believe it has the merit of making interference by the Federal Government about as difficult as it could be. I think it is good. I find that in the State of Wisconsin and elsewhere people are concerned about the prospect of Federal interference. My mail indicates that their overwhelming concern is that there might be Federal dictation in the field of education.

I think the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire meets the objection and meets it very well.

However, I feel that the last point raised by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has very great merit, and for that reason I am reluctant to vote for the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. I do feel that if we are going to have Federal aid to education, it should be given on the basis of need. Therefore, I invite the Senator from New Hampshire, if he would do so, to give some consideration to an amendment which I shall offer later and which attempts to solve the problem. It may not have precisely the same force as the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire. It attempts to solve the problem by returning part of the income tax to the State, but in varying percentages, so we would keep alive the distribution basis that is in the bill. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin, and I certainly will consider his amendment.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question, or does he wish to yield the floor?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am seeking the floor.

Mr. COTTON. I am sorry; I do not wish to hold the floor, if the Senator wishes to make extended remarks.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I do not expect to speak very long.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I think in fairness I should yield the floor. I should like to yield to the Senator from Iowa, but I think I ought to yield the floor and let the Chair make such recognition as the Chair desires to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in view of the excellent explanation of the amendment by the Senator from New Hampshire, there is not a great deal to be offered in addition. But I should like to point out a few misgivings I have about the bill and a few of the benefits, as I see them, with respect to the amendment. As the Senator from New Hampshire pointed out, the amendment would eliminate the problem relating to Federal control. It would eliminate the controversy over private schools. It would eliminate the controversy over the segregation issue. Moreover, it would not be subject to the same criticism as the income tax approach, which was contained in the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], which we debated yesterday.

The remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in which he cited or quoted from a statement by the late Senator Taft regarding the nonrelationship between the income tax and the particular State in which it is paid, were very persuasive. Those remarks, however, do not apply with respect to the cigarette tax. The purchase of cigarettes has a direct relationship with the State in which purchased.

I must say that I think all of us are familiar with the fact that down through the last few years the problem of State financing has become increasingly acute. If the Federal Government had not literally usurped from the States the various sources of raising revenue, and if the States had, for example, the entire income from cigarette tax, if the Federal Government had never gotten into the cigarette tax field, I venture a guess that we would not be confronted with Federal aid problems today.

For example, in my own State of Iowa the problem of increasing revenue to meet the requirements of the State for education has become a political problem. When the Iowa State Legislature increased the sales tax to 2½ percent, the result was the election of a Democratic Governor. It is a highly controversial and political problem.

It seems to me that the best solution of all would be to return to the States certain revenue-raising measures, such as some of the Federal excise taxes. The reason I support the amendment is that it comes about as close to doing this as any measure pending before the Senate that I know of. The only problem I have with the amendment is that there is a real need, and I am not convinced that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire will satisfy that need by providing a sufficient increase in the amount of money the States require for education purposes.

I have analyzed the amount of money which would go to each State under the amendment as presently offered, and the total comes to approximately $455 million. If instead of using 25 percent of the Federal cigarette tax we would use 37½ percent, or 3 cents instead of 2 cents of the Federal cigarette tax on each package of cigarettes, the result would amount to $682 million, which would come pretty close to the $766 million proposed originally by the administration in the Federal-aid-to-education proposal. It is a little further short of the $850 million proposed in the committee bill, but it still is pretty near the estimate which has been deemed to be the area of overall need today.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the States and the amounts they would receive if 3 cents, rather than 2 cents, of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes, were returned to the States under the amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 3 cents of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes were returned to States, as proposed by Senator Cotton's amendment to S. 1021, as amended by Senator Miller's amendment

[In millions]

State:	Receipts
Alabama	$8.40
Alaska	0.75
Arizona	5.40
Arkansas	4.50
California	66.00
Colorado	6.00
Connecticut	12.00
Delaware	2.10
Florida	16.50
Georgia	12.75
Hawaii	1.65
Idaho	2.10
Illinois	52.50
Indiana	18.00
Iowa	9.30
Kansas	7.05
Kentucky	12.60
Louisiana	10.80
Maine	4.20
Maryland	12.00
Massachusetts	21.15
Michigan	28.65
Minnesota	12.45
Mississippi	6.00
Missouri	17.85
Montana	2.40
Nebraska	4.65
Nevada	1.73
New Hampshire	4.50
New Jersey	26.70
New Mexico	3.00
New York	75.00
North Carolina	14.25
North Dakota	1.95
Ohio	39.00
Oklahoma	9.00
Oregon	6.75
Pennsylvania	34.50
Rhode Island	3.15
South Carolina	7.50
South Dakota	2.10
Tennessee	11.55
Texas	33.00
Utah	1.87
Vermont	1.65
Virginia	12.30
Washington	9.90
West Virginia	6.15
Wisconsin	13.80
Wyoming	1.50
District of Columbia	3.75
Total	682.35

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there are a couple of things about the administration bill which concern me very much. The first is that this is a bill which provides for a 3-year appropriation. What is going to happen after 3 years? I can visualize school districts throughout the United States setting up their budgets for construction, for teachers' salaries, for new teachers, for special projects, on the basis of the bill. At the end of 3 years, if this money is not continued, those school district budgets will literally be wrecked.

The virtue of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire is that while this is something that can be cut off after 1 year, the chance of its being cut off after 1 year is very remote. In other words, it is a continuing proposition. That was the virtue of the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] yesterday. It envisages a permanent policy. The present administration bill and the committee bill are a 3-year deal, after which we do not know where we are going. School budgets will not be firmed up very well unless they are firmed up on the basis of continuing assurance that these annual appropriations are going to be made.

Another thing that bothers me about the bill is that the logical result of providing 3-year appropriations for Federal aid, which would include teachers' salaries, will be that a couple of years from now someone will come along and say that we need Federal aid to help pay salaries of employees of State mental hospitals. It has been my experience that this is an area of need which is perhaps even greater than the education field.

After we take care of that matter, the next step is going to be Federal aid for the payment of salaries of State college employees. Where will we eventually stop? Will we next go to Federal aid in the payment of adequate salaries to State legislators and Governors?

If we carry this type of legislation to its logical extreme, the day will come when the States will be nothing but political subdivisions of the Federal Government instead of sovereign States.

Another thing that concerns me is that the proponents of the legislation say that the main purpose or the main idea behind it is equalization. I suggest that if that is the main purpose behind it, inevitably it will lead to Federal control. No matter how much money we appropriate, unless standards are set on the local level, we are not going to have equalization. I have argued this point on the State level many times. No matter how much money we send out to the various school districts, on a theoretical formula basis for the purpose of equalization, unless we have standards, we are not going to have equalization in fact. That is why so many people fear ultimate Federal control from this type of legislation. I know there are some people who will say, "We want Federal control. What is wrong with it if it is going to provide standards that will lead to equalization?"

The Senate must make up its mind which way it is going. Either we want no Federal control and recognize that we are not going to have equalization in fact, or we want Federal control so that we will have equalization in fact. We cannot have both at the same time.

Another virtue of the amendment is that it will return to the people in each State their own tax money. I am not convinced that the time is ripe for us to equalize the taxload among all the States. We always have inequities as between the various States. It is inevitable because of the physical and local situations in which the States find themselves. If our objective is to equalize taxes we might just as well pursue this to its logical conclusion and eliminate the identity of States and have one big Federal empire. I do not think that was the intention of the Founding Fathers, and I certainly trust it is not the objective of the Members of the Senate. However, that is the logical result if we pursue this line of legislation down through the next few years.

Mr. President, I trust the Senator from New Hampshire has had an opportunity to look at the chart to determine the results if we change the figure from 2 to 3 cents per package of cigarettes, and I ask him if he has any objection to an amendment, to bring this more in line with the overall total of the administration bill and the committee bill.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to address a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair. The Senator from Iowa has requested that I accept an amendment to my amendment. Having offered the amendment, under the rule can I accept the amendment to my amendment, or must it be voted on by the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, it requires unanimous consent.

Mr. COTTON. I feel that the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa is a justifiable suggestion. I believe it brings the substitute more in line with the amount under the committee bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my amendment be amended in accordance with the request of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. May we have my amendment read?

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 16, it is proposed to change the figure "25" to "37½."

Mr. KEFAUVER obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEFAUVER. I yield for that purpose.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to take this time to present a unanimous-consent request. I believe I shall have to read it, because I am not at all sure that the clerk, despite his great ability, would be able to decipher what I am about to say.

The unanimous-consent agreement reads as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, May 22, 1961, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1021), to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, debate on any amendment, except (1) on the so-called Javits-Cooper amendment, on the distribution of funds, (2) the amendment on parochial and private schools, (3) the amendment eliminating teachers' salaries, (4) the Talmadge amendment, (5) the Goldwater substitute amendment, (6) the Prouty amendment, and (7) the Case of South Dakota amendment—on each of which amendments there will be 4 hours of debate—motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours—that would be on other amendments or motions or appeals—to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority

leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 12 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader and I have endeavored to touch all bases and to contact all interested Senators. On that basis, we offer the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have discussed the proposal with the ranking Republican member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and also with another member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I have discussed it with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. The distinguished majority leader and I had a discussion of the question with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] this noon. So I think every major amendment has been covered. I believe we have concurrency from every Senator concerned.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I can well understand that there was no touching base with the junior Senator from New York. There was no reason why there should have been.

However, I shall send to the desk this afternoon, when I can get appropriate recognition, an amendment which may well have a bearing on what happens when the Talmadge amendment is considered. The amendment will certainly be offered if the Talmadge amendment is agreed to; and it may be offered in any event.

Without attempting to labor the point, I should like to point out that the amendment is designed to make certain that there will be a right to test in court the results which would come from turning over Federal funds to the various States for educational purposes. I request that the amendment, in the event it is offered, be subject to the same 4-hour limitation as is proposed to be applied to the other amendments. If that request is agreed to, I will have no objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The distinguished minority leader and I would have touched base with the junior Senator from New York had we known of his amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have no objection to that request, because I have been thinking along the same line as the Senator from New York. However, I was content to include it within the 2-hour limit in the proposal. I shall not offer it if the Senator from New York offers it. Then, of course, it can be included among the amendments for which 4 hours each have been allotted.

Mr. KEATING. In explanation, I should say that I believe the amendment I shall submit differs substantially from the one which the distinguished minority leader may possibly offer. However, I should appreciate it if the amendment were included in the 4-hour limitation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is perfectly acceptable.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am agreeable to the request. I am happy that my colleague, the Senator from New York, has been accommodated similarly with respect to his proposed amendment.

I noted that in the reading of amendments for which 4 hours each have been allotted, the names of Senators were not stated with respect to two or three amendments. It seems to me that that creates a difficulty. There might be more than one Senator who wishes to offer that type of amendment. If the movant understand that they may be covering similar amendments in the 4-hour limitations, that is agreeable to me.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did include it by name; and I simply referred to the redistribution amendment as the Javits-Cooper amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. That is correct; but other amendments were mentioned which bore no names. One was designated simply as the parochial school amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; but everyone knows who intends to offer the parochial school amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. So it is the intention of the movants that that amount of time shall apply to all amendments of that character.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, some amendments have already been offered, including the pending amendment and the Blakley amendment, acted upon yesterday, which relate to the use of certain tax receipts as a yardstick. I hope that the interpretation suggested by the distinguished Senator from New York will not foreclose the offering of additional amendments which may use tax receipts as a yardstick.

Mr. MANSFIELD. These designations are for identification purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Some of the amendments bear the names of Senators, and some do not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I noted that the proposed unanimous-consent request as presented would exclude nongermane amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is the usual procedure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is the usual procedure, and it is included, in many instances, for the purpose of excluding amendments which deal with the question of segregation and related subjects. In this instance, I assume that amendments concerned with the school problem would be germane, even though they relate to segregation or nonsegregation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should think so. That question would be for the Parliamentarian to decide.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have a further inquiry along this line, but perhaps we should first have some advice from the Chair on that question at this point. Would the exclusion of the customary requirement that the amendment be germane prevent the offering of an amendment dealing with the subject of segregation or nonsegregation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there must be something in the bill dealing with the subject of segregation before such an amendment could become germane.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The statement of the Chair will offer little comfort to some Senators who have amendments in mind. Pursuing that question one step further, would an amendment which seeks to amend the revenue laws be germane, provided that amendment related in some way to aid to education or appropriations for aid to education?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before ruling, the Chair would like to see the amendment and the context of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have examined an amendment which possibly will be offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. Certainly it proposes to amend the revenue laws as such.

In view of the history of the debate, and in keeping with the intent of the majority leader and the minority leader, the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Arizona would need to be considered, but it distinctly and directly amends the revenue laws. Would it be germane?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is any question about the parliamentary inquiry raised by the Senator from South Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered germane. I think it is germane anyway.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have a reservation concerning the ruling of the Chair, if I understood the Chair correctly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So do I.

Mr. President, to pin this down to what I think is the basic problem before the Senate, the bill deals with a program of Federal financial assistance for education. It is my judgment that any amendment which seeks to withhold those funds is germane; any amendment which extends those funds is germane; any amendment which places a limitation on those funds is germane.

Mr. BUSH. Or any amendment involving the use of those funds——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Any such amendment would be germane.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As has been indicated by an amendment previously offered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. On the diversion of other funds, or cigarette or other excise taxes or income taxes, whether from income or not, if they have a Federal

character and are designed for educational purposes, they come within the general broad concept; and if there is no provision in the bill that can be appropriately amended, they can always be offered as new sections, or as substitutes for the entire bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, having raised the question of germaneness, I point out that I think it would be most unfortunate for the practice of the Senate if, by a sort of gentleman's agreement, we were to waive what is meant by "germaneness." If we discuss the question briefly and venture opinions as to how the Chair will rule on the question of germaneness, we may be committing the Senate to a looseness in the definition of "germaneness" which would be most unfortunate down through the years.

It seems to me that the sounder practice in this instance would be to submit the order without the germaneness clause, having in mind that it could be resurrected at any time later, and the order amended; but to include in the proposed unanimous-consent agreement the provision that amendments must be germane, and then to say that we are going to permit anything that uses the word "education," even though it would amend the revenue laws, is a practice that would plague the Senate for years to come.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to propound a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Assuming that the proposed unanimous-consent agreement were offered without the so-called germaneness clause, could it be resurrected and inserted in the unanimous-consent agreement without further unanimous consent at some subsequent time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It could not be. Unless it were included in the first unanimous-consent request, it would require subsequent unanimous consent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So if subsequently we were to add the germaneness clause, it would require unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Chair repeat the ruling he gave with respect to the first question I asked, relative to questions of segregation and nonsegregation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Is it not possible for the Chair to order the Official Reporter to read the reply of the Chair to the inquiry of the Senator from South Dakota, so that Senators may know exactly what the Chair said on that subject?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the Official Reporter can read the question and the answer.

Mr. BUSH. I ask unanimous consent that he do so, in order that we may hear it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is not seeking to obstruct the orderly business of the Senate; and in raising this question, I am not seeking to cause trouble or throw any gravel on the road. However, I believe it should be stated that if the order is agreed to as it now stands, the Senator from South Dakota will raise the question of germaneness on any amendment offered which he thinks constitutes a valid test of what is and what is not germane.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is any Senator's privilege.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if certain amendments which I have heard discussed are offered, even though they may be among those which are mentioned, I shall raise the question of germaneness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may reply to the Senator from South Dakota, that would be something for the Chair to render a final decision upon; and any Senator may raise the question at any time he desires.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That opens the opportunity for an appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the Official Reporter is present, and can read the question and the reply of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The reporter will read.

The Official Reporter, Mr. Francis J. Attig, read as follows:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have a further inquiry along this line, but perhaps we should first have some advice from the Chair on that question at this point. Would the exclusion of the customary requirement that the amendment be germane prevent the offering of an amendment dealing with the subject of segregation or nonsegregation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that there must be something in the bill dealing with the subject of segregation before such an amendment could become germane.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, is there anything in the bill that deals with the subject of segregation?

Mr. BUSH. That is the point.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. In my opinion the bill from the very beginning involved the question of segregation. Before our committee there was a discussion of the subject. One witness, representing the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, testified in support of the Powell amendment. I made it very clear to him that I would oppose such an amendment.

In my opinion such an amendment would have the effect of defeating the bill in the Senate. I thought it had no place in an education bill. I thought that if people were interested in changing the civil rights laws they should change them in connection with civil rights legislation, and not in connection with education legislation.

Let me say to the majority leader that I am perfectly willing to accept a unanimous consent agreement with the provision in regard to germaneness left out. I will say to my southern friends that if there is any attempt to add the Powell amendment to the bill, I will do everything I can to see that it is defeated.

In my judgment we would overwhelmingly defeat it, because I think there has crystallized in the Senate the recognition that we should pass a public school bill, without any crippling amendment added to it, which the Powell amendment would be.

So far as I am concerned, if such an amendment should be adopted—and that is unthinkable—I myself would move to recommit the bill to the committee.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, what the Senator from Oregon has said justifies the inquiry. He said that the question was dealt with in the hearings, and that it was decided to keep such a provision out of the bill. So, on his testimony, there is nothing in the bill which deals with segregation or nonsegregation; and under the ruling of the Chair, any amendment pertaining thereto would be ruled to be nongermane.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest, as a way of settling the dilemma, including in the order the following:

That germaneness, for the purpose of this order, shall be deemed to include: Limitations on the expenditures or disbursements of such expenditures, or the means for raising the contemplated appropriations, or the source thereof, or any constitutional principles involved therein.

That would cover any conceivable amendment any Senator has discussed on the floor, without at the same time abandoning the principle for which the majority leader contends, namely, that a unanimous-consent agreement should have in it some reference to germaneness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate what the distinguished Senator from New York has just proposed, but it covers the rainbow, and goes a little beyond.

I had hoped that, as a result of the colloquy this afternoon, we would continue to adhere to the present language, which is strengthened by custom, tradition, and precept, and has served us well. It covers all types of legislation, which, in itself, I believe, would cover the questions raised by both the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and other Senators.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KEATING. Would it be proper at this time, in order to determine what position to take on the unanimous-consent request, to send to the desk a proposed amendment and inquire whether, in fact, it would be germane to the bill?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object. I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will not agree to it until there is some definition of the question before us.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What question?

Mr. BUSH. The question of germaneness. The Senator from New York has made a proposal to be included within the unanimous-consent agreement, respecting the question of germaneness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will yield, I have requested that the usual, traditional procedure be followed, which covers all types of legislation and which, until this afternoon, has never been questioned in this body. On the basis of the colloquy carried on by the Senator from South Dakota and other Senators, this is a wide-ranging bill and it would take something away out in left field to be ruled ungermane.

Mr. BUSH. But we have a ruling from the Chair that an amendment pertaining to civil rights would not be germane.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I respectively make the point that all of this discussion is out of order. The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], as I understood him, invoked the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. KEATING. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, 15 months ago I stood in this Chamber and spoke in support of legislation to provide Federal assistance to the State for school construction and teachers' salaries.

The need then was great, and it was unmet—through no default by this body. Today, the need is greater, if anything, and it must be met.

A sound educational system has traditionally provided the underpinnings of our democratic processes and free institutions. Today, its importance is critical: It may be the key to survival.

With such a system, progress knows no limits; man's curiosity is aroused and he probes and questions and discovers, and his discoveries he shares for the benefit of all. Without it, there is decay and degeneration, and ultimately, we can be sure, national collapse.

Nowadays it is fashionable to speak of all expenditures of public as well as private funds in terms of investment. We ask whether this expenditure or that, this investment or that, will bear a reasonable return.

I suggest that our National Government can make no better investment in our Nation's future security and well-being than by guaranteeing our children an education second to none.

As we consider the legislation now before us, many viewpoints will be expressed; many arguments for and against will be advanced. In one important area, however, I believe there will be broad agreement: that is, that we are short of classrooms, and our teachers are underpaid—and the situation seems to be getting worse instead of better.

I think it will also be generally conceded that many of our States and local communities, principally the least wealthy, have reached the limit of their taxing capacity for education.

Let me illustrate: Under this bill, an estimated $23,526,845 would be made available to my State of Tennessee during the 1962 fiscal year. This amounts to $25.30 per school-age child between 5 and 17 years of age.

Were Tennessee to raise this money within its borders, it would be necessary to increase the property tax rate in each county by more than 25 percent.

Well, one may ask, Why not raise property taxes? The answer is plain. Of Tennessee's 95 counties, 66—or more than two-thirds of the total—have already felt compelled to increase property tax rates during the past 2 years; 16 have increased rates twice during this period. Moreover, all large and many small municipalities have raised property tax rates. Few local jurisdictions, if any, feel they can go higher at this time. And yet the need is now.

Under this bill, Tennessee would receive almost three times as much money per child as the wealthiest States, and its ratio of benefits received to Federal taxes paid would be almost 2½ to 1.

Before anyone suggests that this may be unfair, let him consider these two points: First, Tennessee has a per capita income which is only about two-thirds of the national average, so it is only natural that Tennesseans pay less per person in Federal taxes than the average for all States. I am confident that a similar condition exists in other less wealthy States.

Second, by the very reason of its low-income condition, Tennessee has been plagued with outmigration of thousands of its talented young people seeking greater economic opportunities—young people whose education has been financed by Tennessee. Thus, the States to which they migrate become the beneficiaries of talents which have been developed at no cost to themselves.

But in a larger sense, can we conscientiously say to any child that he should be denied the opportunity for a public education equal to that of another child simply because he happens to live in a less affluent community?

It will be argued that the legislation before us represents a radical invasion by the Federal Government into a field of responsibility heretofore held solely by the States and local communities.

The fact is that since 1785 Congress has passed more than 160 different Federal aid-to-education laws involving public land grants, vocational education, school lunches, veterans' education, impacted areas, rural libraries, exceptional children, defense education, and international student exchange programs.

It will be argued that, by virtue of its financial contribution under this bill, the Federal Government will seek to control education at the State and local level.

The fact is that the Government has appropriated millions of dollars in aid to education over the years without ever usurping State and local authority over what may or may not be taught. Moreover, an express prohibition against Federal control has been written into this bill, just as it was written into the bill passed by the Senate last year.

It will be argued that it is cheaper to collect dollars at the State and local level to meet our current needs in education than to have the Federal Government collect them, bring them to Washington, and then redistribute them to State and local school authorities.

Just the opposite is true. Studies have shown that, on the whole, State taxes are more than twice as expensive to collect and local taxes are from 5 to 10 times as expensive to collect as Federal taxes.

And it will be argued that most Americans and those State and local officials most directly responsible for education are opposed to Federal aid.

As long as 4 years ago, a Gallup poll showed that a vast majority of Americans—representing every political persuasion, every section of the country, Protestants and Catholics alike—want the Federal Government to provide funds for the support of education.

In my own State, there is virtually unanimous sentiment for such aid. On January 20 of this year, the Governor of Tennessee, the Honorable Bufford Ellington; the State commissioner of education, the Honorable Joe Morgan; and officials of the Tennessee Education Association, the Tennessee Municipal League, the Tennessee School Boards Association, the Tennessee Congress of Parents and Teachers, and the Tennessee County Services Association—all signed a statement urging such assistance.

The urgency which they feel is summed up in one concluding sentence of this document:

> The State and local government leaders are facing financial problems to which, in the absence of Federal assistance, there seem to be no solutions. It is time for Tennesseans to unite in support of better education through locally controlled Federal aid, and to make this unified support unmistakably clear to those who can be instrumental in providing it.

This, Mr. President, is no statement of abdication of State and local responsibility for education. Rather, it is a reaffirmation of such responsibility together with a recognition that State and local communities cannot continue to meet it without Federal assistance.

I sincerely hope that this body and the House of Representatives will heed this call for help and respond to it in full measure. This time—fortunately for the sake of our children and our Nation's welfare—we have the full support of the President.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I believe the Federal Government should provide financial support for education in cases of demonstrated need, and when such assistance is clearly in the national interest.

In my judgment, it is in the national interest to provide every child in the

United States, no matter in which State he happens to be born or what may be his race or religion, an equal opportunity to obtain a basic education.

The responsibility for giving children this opportunity rests, first, upon the local community, and next upon the State. Only if these two units of government, acting together, cannot provide sufficient resources and the environment for a good educational system does it become in the national interest for the Federal Government to supplement their efforts.

Consistent with the standards of need and national interest, I have supported aid for education bills many times during my service in the Senate. I have voted for expanded funds for research, for college housing loans, and for the National Defense Education Act—NDEA—including its provisions for assistance to elementary and secondary schools and teachers. In the present session, I have introduced bills to extend and improve the NDEA, to add a new title providing competitive college scholarships under the NDEA, and to continue the college housing program.

The Republican platform of 1960 pledged Federal support to the primary and secondary schools "by a program of Federal aid for school construction—pacing it to the real needs of individual districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation."

I have supported school construction bills meeting this standard of need in the past, and would vote for a similar bill designed to accelerate the process of eliminating the classroom shortage, even though the evidence indicates that State and local efforts toward this end have exceeded previous expectations.

I cite these facts to demonstrate that it was as one actively friendly to education that I began my consideration of the administration's bill, now before the Senate.

But S. 1021, as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, meets neither of the essential tests of demonstrated need and national interest.

Instead of confining Federal assistance to the areas of real need—the dozen or so States in which income is substantially below the national average—S. 1021 proposes to scatter Federal dollars broadside throughout the country. It is a "pork-barrel" bill, with a political payoff for everybody, whether or not need exists.

It is a bill which departs from the recommendations of President Kennedy. Not only has the committee radically revised the formula for allocation of funds, compounding the inequities in this respect which already existed in the administration's bill, but it has added $250 million to the total cost.

We have heard eloquent statements from our President, calling upon the American people for sacrifices because of the serious times in which we live. And the times are serious. This Nation faces grave dangers.

Only recently, the Senate Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member, recommended that we add $500 million to the defense budget for bombers for the Strategic Air Command, and the Senate approved. We face the addition of another $600 million to next year's budget to accelerate the space program.

These additions will further unbalance a budget which already was showing a deficit, on a cash basis, of more than $4 billion in the fiscal year which begins on July 1. With recovery now well underway and record levels of gross national product, production, and income predicted for the next fiscal year, such a deficit can only produce serious inflationary pressures and add to the dangerous balance of payments problem we face.

Yet, under these circumstances, the committee proposes that we embark on a $2.55 billion program which will add still more to the projected deficit—more than had been already planned by the President.

Does this bill meet the test which President Kennedy asked the American people to give themselves in his inaugural address, when he said:

> Ask not what your country can do for you: Ask what you can do for your country.

I submit that a "pork-barrel" educational bill, with something in it for everybody instead of confining assistance to areas where real need exists and in which Federal aid would serve a genuine national interest, hardly meets that test. On the contrary, it is a reflection of the "business-as-usual, politics-as-usual" attitude which afflicts this country, and especially this, the Nation's Capital.

If the President wants the people to make sacrifices—and I agree with him that some sacrifices will be needed if we are to meet successfully the challenges we face in the world—then let him tell us what he wants us to do.

In my judgment, a pork-barrel approach to the Nation's educational problem, such as is adopted in S. 1021, is precisely what we should not do.

Instead, we should be limiting new Federal spending to defense and other national needs of highest priority. We should eliminate waste and unnecessary spending, bring the budget into balance as quickly as possible, now that the recession is over, and move at once for comprehensive tax reform, instead of postponing that task into the future.

S. 1021 is grossly discriminatory—discriminatory both in its allocation of more than $2.5 billion of Federal funds among the States over a 3-year period, and discriminatory because it imposes a burden upon millions of citizens whose children can derive no benefit from it.

The bill is intolerably unfair to the people of Connecticut. As initially introduced, S. 1021 proposed to allocate $20,865,000 to my State, while our share of the total cost of the 3-year program was an estimated $49,860,000. Under this formula, each dollar of so-called Federal aid would cost Connecticut taxpayers $2.38.

This was bad enough, but the committee has added insult to injury. The proposed allocation to Connecticut has been reduced to $15,646,620, while our estimated tax payments have increased to $55,335,000. The cost to Connecticut taxpayers for each Federal dollar has been increased to $3.54.

This represents a new high in discrimination against a State which is accustomed to contributing generously to other States of the Union.

As one of the wealthier States, Connecticut expects to pay much more for any Federal aid program than it receives in return. The average Federal aid dollar we received in fiscal year 1960 cost our taxpayers $1.83. While we recognize our obligation to help our less fortunate sister States, the committee's proposal that we almost double our contribution, paying $3.54 for each $1 we receive, is totally unacceptable.

My State has been the hardest hit by the allocation formula which has been proposed by the committee's majority. Connecticut's share of the Federal funds in the administration bill has been cut by 38 percent, the largest reduction suffered by any of the 26 States and the District of Columbia which have been adversely affected by this pork-barreling.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an article in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, May 15, 1961, in which the effect of the committee's change in the allocation formula is analyzed under the headlines, "Pork Barrel Issue Seen in School Bill Juggling: Senators Switch Formula for Grants, Boost Cost To Cover Political Angle."

The article in the Evening Star raises a basic question: "If the Government starts handing out money for education, will it be distributed on a 'pork-barrel' basis, or with some relation to need?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORK BARREL ISSUE SEEN IN SCHOOL BILL JUGGLING—SENATORS SWITCH FORMULA FOR GRANTS, BOOST COST TO COVER POLITICAL ANGLE

(By David S. Broder)

Why did the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee decide last week to boost North Dakota's share of the aid-to-education benefits 13 percent and cut Oklahoma's share 17 percent?

The two States are almost identical in resources for education; each has about $8,000 income per public school pupil. Yet the committee decided Oklahoma would receive $25.70 per pupil and North Dakota $35.97. How come?

The answers to these questions are part of the controversy over the merits of rival distribution formulas and equalization plans that will occupy a large part of the debate starting tomorrow in the Senate on Federal aid to education.

It sounds like dull stuff—and it is certainly technical—but the example of Oklahoma and North Dakota shows what these decisions can mean in terms of benefits to individual States and the ultimate costs to all taxpayers.

THE BASIC QUESTION

The basic question is this: If the Government starts handing out money for education, will it be distributed on a "pork barrel" basis or with some relation to need?

Neither North Dakota nor Oklahoma appears to have serious current problems in education. The official statistics of the U.S. Office of Education show that 91,552 teachers across the country were working last fall with substandard credentials. Oklahoma had none and North Dakota only

34. Neither State had any pupils in part-time classes. The classroom shortage in the two States combined was one-fiftieth of the national total and both States planned this year to build enough classrooms to meet the immediate problem of excess enrollment.

Opponents of Federal aid might argue that these States need no outside help. But the backers of Federal assistance are committed to the belief that every State has or will have problems in education, and, therefore, every State should receive money.

PLANS VARY

How much? There they begin to differ among themselves. Republican advocates of a "foundation plan" distribution system would give North Dakota 35 cents of every $100 in Federal grants; Oklahoma, $1.33.

The Kennedy administration proposed giving North Dakota 47 cents of each $100 and Oklahoma, $1.79.

But the Democratic majority of the Senate committee handling the bill last week rejected both these plans and substituted an "equalizing formula" of its own that, surprisingly, raised North Dakota's share to 53 cents of every $100 and cut Oklahoma's to $1.48.

Such changes were not uncommon. As a result of the committee's work, some States' shares of the available funds gained up to 62 percent while others lost up to 38 percent of their shares. More States lost than gained.

WHAT DEMOCRATS DID

What the committee Democrats did was this:

1. Both the administration and the Republican formulas included "floor" amounts per pupil to protect the interests of the wealthy States that contribute heavily to the Federal Treasury and "bonus payments" to provide special assistance to low-income States. Under the Republican plan, sponsored by Senators CLIFFORD CASE of New Jersey, COOPER of Kentucky and JAVITS of New York, North Dakota and Oklahoma, with nearly identical resources, each would have received $20 per public school pupil. The administration plan, for similar reasons, would have given North Dakota $24.60 per pupil and Oklahoma $24.39. But the committee Democrats knocked out the "floor" and thereby increased the spread in benefits between the very rich and the very poor States.

TWO OTHER FORMULAS

2. Both the administration and the Republican formulas distributed funds on the basis of average daily attendance in public schools. As President Kennedy said, "nonpublic-school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools." But the committee Democrats decided to count all children of school age, thereby increasing the subsidy for States with large numbers of private and parochial school pupils or with large numbers of truants.

3. As these changes worked out, 22 States, including North Dakota, gained money, 2 were unaffected, and 26, including Oklahoma, lost money. To deal with this political problem, the committee Democrats decided to increase the size of the first-year authorization to $850 million from the $666 million Mr. Kennedy proposed and the $693 million the Republicans recommended. By increasing the cost in this way, they were able to provide dollar increases for all but two States over the amounts the President and his Budget Bureau advisers had urged.

RESULT OF FORMULA CHANGE

As a result of the rejiggering of the formula by the committee Democrats, 8 of the 10 lowest income States received a smaller share of the Federal funds than they would have under the administration plan.

Of the 10 States with Democrats on the committee, 5 gained increases in their share of the Federal funds and 5 suffered decreases. The net result was that slightly more than one-third of the increase over the amount recommended by Mr. Kennedy for the first year—$62.2 million of $184 million—went to the 10 States with Democrats on the committee.

These are the 22 States whose share of the Federal funds would be increased by the change from the administration formula to the committee Democrats' formula:

Alaska, up 62 percent; Rhode Island, 48; Wisconsin, 36; Pennsylvania, 28; New Hampshire, 23; Maryland, 19; Missouri, 18; Louisiana and Kentucky, 15; Vermont, 14; Texas and North Dakota, 13; Michigan and Minnesota, 10; Nebraska, 9; Ohio, 8; Illinois and South Dakota, 6; Indiana, Montana and South Carolina, 5, and Virginia, 4.

TWO STATES UNAFFECTED

Two States—Iowa and Georgia—would be unaffected by the change.

The shares of the Federal funds to 26 States and the District of Columbia would be decreased by the following percentages: Oregon, 1 percent; Massachusetts, Colorado and Maine, 2; Arkansas, 4; New Mexico, West Virginia, Tennessee, North Carolina and Alabama, 5; Hawaii, 6; Arizona and Mississippi, 7; Kansas and Utah, 8; Wyoming and Idaho, 9; New Jersey and Florida, 10; Washington, 11; Delaware and Nevada, 12; New York, 15; Oklahoma, 17; the District of Columbia, 25; California, 31, and Connecticut, 38.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, looking at the problem on a national basis, and excluding those relatively few States in which a case of real need may exist, the evidence is clear that the great majority of the States and local communities can provide for their educational systems without Federal help.

S. 1021 restricts the use of all but 10 percent of the funds provided to the States to building classrooms or raising teachers' salaries.

The statistics concerning the alleged "classroom shortage" are highly suspect. But if we accept President Kennedy's estimate, in his education message, that classroom needs for the 1960–70 period will be 600,000, it is apparent that a continuation of State and local efforts at levels of the immediate past will close the gap. According to the Office of Education, a total of 349,300 classrooms were built between 1956 and 1961. This represents an annual average of 69,680, or almost 10,000 a year more than the yearly average of 60,000 asked for by the President.

As for teachers' salaries, I think many will agree that teachers belong to an underpaid profession, similar in that respect to clergymen, social workers, and others who devote their lives to service rather than to profit.

Yet, teachers' salaries have more than kept pace with other working elements of the population during the past 30 years. Between 1929 and 1959, teachers' salaries rose by 106 percent as compared to 91 percent for all persons working for wages and salaries and only 73 percent for Federal Government civilian employees.

This evidence concerning the national situation was presented to the committee. I have not heard these facts disputed. To me, they do not present a showing of need to scatter Federal dollars broadside over the country.

Turning now to educational problems confronting my own State of Connecticut, our general assembly currently is considering a substantial increase in State aid to the local communities.

State aid in Connecticut, now at a level of approximately $48 million a year, would be increased by annual amounts as much as $11.5 million or $15 million under proposals under consideration by the Connecticut Legislature.

The people of my State are facing increases in State taxation, including a one-half cent increase in the sales tax, in order to finance this new expenditure for education and other State programs.

On top of this increase in State taxes, S. 1021 would make them pay an estimated $55,335,000 to the Federal Government over a 3-year period in order to receive $15,646,620 for our school systems in return—$3.54 for every Federal dollar. Each year, Connecticut taxpayers would contribute more than $13 million to other States.

And how much assistance will these expensive Federal dollars provide in relation to Connecticut's total need?

S. 1021 proposes to allocate $9.26 per pupil to Connecticut, the lowest amount received by any of the States. Connecticut's total expenditures per pupil for 1960–61 are estimated to be $536.36. The proposed Federal contribution of $9.26 under S. 1021 is less than 2 percent of that amount; actually about 1.7 percent.

It is apparent that the Federal payments to Connecticut proposed in S. 1021, while extremely expensive to Connecticut taxpayers, amount to only a drop in the bucket in relation to the total school expenses our State and local communities must provide.

Unless there is a vast expansion in the Federal program contemplated by S. 1021, there will be only token contributions to our school systems. And once started, a vast expansion in a Federal program of this kind is to be expected. Proponents of S. 1021 have been frank to admit that the bill is merely a start. Although the bill is limited to 3 years, the program contemplated is unlimited, extending into the future as far as one can see.

The present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, former Gov. Abraham Ribicoff, of Connecticut, stated this candidly in testimony before the House committee.

He was asked by Representative ALBERT H. QUIE, Republican, of Minnesota, whether he agreed that the 3-year limitation in the bill does not necessarily mean the limitation of the program.

This was Secretary Ribicoff's reply:

> If you ask for my personal opinion, sir, I do believe if we have a Federal program for education it will be a continuing program; yes, sir.

For my part, I cannot view with complacency a continuing program which is so discriminatory against the taxpayers of my State—a program which for as far into the future as one may predict will cost them $3.54 for each $1 our Connecticut public schools will receive. And a program which may expand from the present $850 million a year proposed in S. 1021 to an annual total of $5 billion or more.

I am proud of the way in which the people of my State are meeting their educational responsibilities. We can do more, and there is bipartisan agreement in our State legislature that we should do more.

But if the Federal Government imposes a net drain on our tax resources of more than $13 million a year—as is contemplated in the program proposed in S. 1021—we shall be severely handicapped in our efforts to help ourselves.

In Connecticut, the classroom shortage has all but disappeared, and I am advised, on very high authority in our State educational system, that State building grants will be adequate to meet the remaining need.

Similarly, teachers' salaries in Connecticut have been substantially improved. A recent publication, "Survey of Teachers' Salaries, September 1960," edited by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., research director of the American Federation of Teachers, gives the facts.

Connecticut school systems pay their teachers more than the national averages, and more than the average salaries in the entire northeastern region.

The starting salary for a teacher with a bachelor's degree in the Nation averages $4,109, in the northeastern region, $4,060, and in Connecticut, $4.410. The highest salary a teacher with such a degree may receive averages $6,029 in the Nation, $6,274 in the northeast, and $7,009 in Connecticut.

The averages for the beginning master's degree are: National, $4,402; northeastern region, $4,292; and Connecticut, $4,485. For the ceiling for the master's degree, they are: National, $6,568; northeastern region, $6,667; and Connecticut, $7,463.

The beginning salary for the holder of a Ph. D. degree averages $4,931 in the Nation, $4,792 in the northeastern region, and $4,981 in Connecticut. For the ceiling for the doctorate, the averages are: National, $7,519; northeastern region, $7,413; and Connecticut, $8,204.

It is apparent that S. 1021 offers little to Connecticut in improvement of school facilities, or in improvement of teachers' salaries. Yet the funds in the bill are restricted to those two uses, except 10 percent of the total, which is reserved for special educational projects.

So far as classrooms are concerned, I repeat I have been informed, on high authority in our State educational system, that State building grants will be adequate to meet the remaining need.

Aside from the 10 percent reserved in each year of the program for special educational projects the only other use to which the Federal funds could be put in Connecticut is for teachers' salaries. Deducting the 10 percent for special projects, leaves $4,695,986 for this purpose. Assuming the money were to be divided equally among the 21,775 teachers, principals and supervisors in our public school systems, each would receive $215.56.

I would be happy to see our school people receive salary increases in this amount. However, I believe that the level of school salaries can best be determined by local boards of education. Moreover, I am certain that whatever amounts may be needed to increase school salaries in my State can be raised more efficiently and by methods less discriminatory than S. 1021 which proposes to tax us $3.54 for every Federal dollar involved.

If the more than $13 million annually which the Federal Government would take from us for other States under S. 1021 were left in Connecticut, and our State legislature decided to raise State taxes in an equivalent amount, we could use these funds for educational purposes. If it were decided to use this amount for salaries alone, and it were equally divided among the 21,775 men and women in the professional staffs of our schools, it would come to more than $590 per person—more than double the amount that theoretically could be used for this purpose with the expensive Federal dollars which would come to the State under S. 1021.

Mr. President, I now comment briefly upon the committee's decision to extend Public Laws 815 and 874, which otherwise would expire June 30, 1961, for 3 years without significant change.

Unlike the new program proposed in S. 1021, these laws are based both on need and on the national interest. They provide funds, both for construction and for operation and maintenance, to school districts upon which an extra burden has been placed by reason of defense installations or other Federal activities—the so-called federally impacted areas. They are essentially a grant in lieu of taxes.

The Kennedy administration proposed to reduce sharply the payments to these school districts—payments, in effect, for services rendered—under Public Laws 815 and 874. For Connecticut school districts, the loss of revenue, if the administration's recommendations had been adopted, has been conservatively estimated at more than $750,000 a year in the case of Public Law 874 alone.

I am pleased that the committee has decided to extend Public Laws 815 and 874 without substantial change. If it had accepted the administration's recommendations in this respect, it would have compounded the injury which would be done to my State under S. 1021. If these two laws could be considered separately on their merits—and they undoubtedly would be so considered if S. 1021 fails—I would vote for their extension.

I intend to vote for amendments such as that which has been proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], which will provide for a more equitable distribution of Federal funds. I intend to vote for other amendments which may be offered to counteract present discriminatory features of the bill.

Additionally, I invite attention to the fact that S. 1021 neglects what may be the most crucially important problem concerning our national education needs. It ignores the question of quality of education. Many of our citizens are convinced that what we need is more education for the money, and that this may be a more pressing need than more money for education.

I am so convinced myself. I discussed this matter last year on the Senate floor when another education bill was before us, and called attention to a bill which had been introduced by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] which was designed to raise educational standards in this country. In brief, the bill proposed a Presidential Advisory Council on Education which, through consultation with Governors and State and local educational authorities, would seek ways of improving curricula, and quality of teaching, raising standards of scholarship expected of students, and other means of raising levels of educational achievement.

I understand that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] may offer the text of his bill as an amendment to S. 1021. In that event, I will be happy to join him as a cosponsor, because I am convinced that it would be folly merely to provide more money for education without seeking to improve its quality.

Finally, although I shall vote for what I consider to be improvements in S. 1021, I shall not be able to vote for the bill if the tests of demonstrated need and national interest continue to be disregarded. If these essential elements of an equitable bill continue to be ignored, I shall be constrained to vote against S. 1021 on final passage.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief reply to my friend from New Hampshire, and then I hope we can vote on the Cotton amendment, unless other Senators wish to speak on it. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Some of our colleagues would like to have assurance that we shall vote at an early hour. Other Senators may wish to discuss other features of the bill this evening.

It is my understanding that the majority leader does not intend to have any vote other than the vote on the Cotton amendment tonight. Unless other Senators wish to speak on the Cotton amendment, I think we ought to close debate on it and vote on it, and then proceed to consider some other amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota rose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. I notice my friend from South Dakota is on his feet. Does the Senator disagree with the pious hope I have expressed?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I had in mind making some remarks on the amendment I have drafted, partly because the Senator from New Hampshire referred to the possible amendment at various points in his speech. I do not know how the Senator from New Hampshire feels about having a vote on his amendment tonight.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator expects a vote, I am sure.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall desire some time to present some observations in order that those who read the RECORD in the morning will have a clearer understanding of what my amendment seeks to do.

Mr. MORSE. All I can say to the Senator from South Dakota is that when the Senator from New Hampshire came to my desk a few moments ago, I told him I would be brief in my reply, so that we could get a vote as quickly as possible tonight. I am sure the Senator was perfectly satisfied with that announcement.

I say to my friend from South Dakota that we have not had a vote on a single amendment today. I think we ought to agree to have one vote tonight.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota is a little reluctant to do that, because one of the things he expected to do—he has his clerk working on the information now—is to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table to show the number of persons of school age in each of the several States and the amount that would be apportioned to the various States under the formula proposed in the Cotton amendment, as amended by the Miller amendment; the amount which would be apportioned to the several States under the original administration proposal; the numbers and amounts involved under the bill as reported by the committee; and the amounts which would be apportioned to the several States under the amendment the Senator from South Dakota will offer.

I really think we ought not vote on the amendment until we get those comparative figures clearly before us, to compare the returns to the States with the numbers of students and persons of school age in the States. I do not know how that can be accomplished until the table is presented for printing in the RECORD.

Mr. MORSE. Why cannot the decision on that be made in connection with the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota? I understand the problem. There is a question as to whether we should vote on the Cotton amendment tonight.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the stating of the number of pupils in each State, compared with the returns under the cigarette tax proposal, will show the disparity which exists between the potential need and the amount which would be apportioned to each State.

Mr. MORSE. What I shall do, then, is to make my very brief argument against the amendment, in the hope that we can obtain action.

If I may have the attention of the majority leader for a moment, I have had a colloquy with the Senator from South Dakota, who wishes to put some material and figures into the RECORD which the Senator thinks the Senate ought to have. I have told him it is my hope we can have a vote on the Cotton amendment tonight.

I shall make a very brief statement in reply to my friend from New Hampshire. Perhaps then we can work out, as best we can, the necessary procedures. I hope the majority leader will hold the Senate in session long enough tonight to hear whatever argument any Senator wishes to make on the Cotton amendment. I say, most respectfully, we have not had a single vote on the bill or on an amendment to it today. There are many amendments to be offered. I think it is only fair that we dispose of at least one amendment tonight.

I cannot see how disposing of the amendment would in any way affect the position of the Senator from South Dakota in connection with his amendment, to be presented tomorrow, either followed by or preceded by the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

I think, I say to the majority leader, that we ought to have one vote tonight. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Cotton amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned I should like to serve notice now that the Senate can expect to stay in session until a reasonable time, until we at least have a vote on the Cotton amendment, for which the yeas and nays have been ordered. Many Senators have been holding themselves in readiness to vote.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota is not normally long winded, but he has a good deal of material to present tonight. If the Senate is going to remain in session long enough to vote on the Cotton amendment I might as well say that Senators will be here a long time.

The Senator from South Dakota feels the table should be made available to Senators, for it shows the number of children of school age in each State and the amounts of money which would be returned to the various States under the various proposals.

I know of no way to provide that information at this time until I can place it in the RECORD. I expect to place it in the RECORD, tonight. I should like to have the RECORD printed, so that the Senators can read it afterward.

The Senator from South Dakota hesitates to state this any more categorically. He has been present on the Senate floor many times when other Senators have announced they were going to speak at some length, if necessary, in order to have a vote go over until the next day so that Senators might read the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I respect the Senator's right to take that parliamentary course of action if he cares to do so.

I wonder if the Senator would be willing to cooperate to the extent of seeking to obtain a unanimous consent agreement to vote on the Cotton amendment after the conclusion of the morning business tomorrow morning.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I shall be happy to agree to that.

Mr. MORSE. We could agree to a 30-minute limitation. I do not think we will use all the 30 minutes, but we can have 30 minutes for each side.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It could be made a shorter time, so that the vote would come tomorrow, after the RECORD has been published.

Mr. MORSE. If 15 minutes to a side would be satisfactory, I will ask that while I am making my closing argument the staff prepare a proposed unanimous consent agreement to provide for 15 minutes on a side on the Cotton amendment, and that the Senate shall vote after 30 minutes of debate following conclusion of the morning business tomorrow.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is handling the bill, whether he has any statistical charts showing what portion of the cost of each proposal under the respective bills that are pending would be paid by the respective States. For example, I refer specifically to how much each State would pay under the plan recommended by the President, and how much each State would receive. What I am inquiring about has relationship to what has been stated by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. MORSE. I know exactly what my friend from Ohio means, but in reply to his question I do not want him for one moment to think that I agree with the assumption contained in his question. As he knows, I take the position that no money is paid by the States, but that the money is paid by citizens of the United States to the Treasury of the United States, no matter where the citizens live. I discussed that point yesterday. The position is exactly the one taken by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, back on May 4, 1949. But I know some of the material the Senator wants is in our hearing record. I assure him I will have that material for him by tomorrow morning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in reply to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], I wish to say good naturedly that I have fingered through all the amendments of which I have knowledge, and I have not found one which proposes that we ought to remit any part of the internal-revenue funds collected on liquor to send clerical students to divinity schools.

I make that statement with a smile on my face, because I think such an endeavor would be about as logical as proposing to raise money for the education of boys and girls in secondary schools out of cigarette taxes. I have always thought, or at least I have hoped, that we are trying to discourage boys and girls from cigarette smoking.

I think when all the medical proof is in, we will find we had better be discouraging boys and girls from cigarette smoking. Therefore, good naturedly, may I say that I would not want to support the amendment for that reason alone, if for no other, although there are many other reasons. I do not believe it would be a very good example to suggest that our boys and girls are attending school on the basis of cigarette financing. To the contrary, we ought to discourage their acquiring the cigarette-smoking habit.

Be that as it may, I now turn to my other reasons for opposing the amendment.

The committee's hearings adduced a consensus that increased financial support of American public elementary and secondary education is necessary. Not all who testified, however, agreed on how this goal should be achieved.

The major areas of disagreement focused on the nature of the Federal role and the method of allocating funds among States in the Federal grant program provided in the bill.

Some, such as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], urged that the Federal role should be by way of Federal excise tax, remission, or relief. The proposals in this vein were advocated as a means, preferable to Federal grants, for strengthening the fiscal capacity of States and local communities for support of public education. The committee declined to adopt such an approach for three principal reasons.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] appeared before our committee. He testified very ably before us. He was kind enough to say to me, in effect, after the hearing that he appreciated very much the very thorough way in which the committee went into his proposals. We did so, and we rejected them. We rejected them for these three principal reasons:

First. The Federal tax credit or remission proposals do not achieve equalization as between low- and high-income States in their relative fiscal capacities for support of education. These proposals tend to aid States in direct relation to their income levels, rather than in inverse relation as the reported bill provides. The committee believes that the Federal role should equalize educational opportunity for young people throughout the Nation by grant assistance to States designed to equalize fiscal capacity among States. Federal tax remission and credit proposals made to the committee would not achieve this objective.

Second. Such proposals would not assure that there would be any increase in the level of support for public education by States and local communities corresponding with the Federal tax remissions or credits. Such resources could be used for any purpose and might not be devoted to education. Furthermore, even in States and local districts which decided to apply such resources to education, substantially more time would be required to enact at State or local community levels of government the programs of taxation and expenditure which would be necessary to apply Federal tax credit resources to public elementary and secondary schools.

Third. Such proposals would necessarily entail reductions in Federal revenues. It is beyond the jurisdiction of this committee to recommend legislation providing for substitute sources of revenue to avert such reduction.

In fact, a few moments ago I had a conversation with the Senator from Georgia in regard to where questions concerning revenue should arise, and in my judgment I have serious doubts as to whether or not the Cotton amendment would stand that test, because I am not so sure but what we might be interfering with the jurisdiction of the House of Representatives in regard to revenue bills.

The Cotton amendment, if adopted, might cause the House of Representatives to feel that the Senate would be verging upon a trespass of the constitutional prerogative of the House in appropriations matters, since the effect of the amendment would be to bypass the appropriations process by a ministerial act on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. Such "continuing appropriation" or "back door financing" language might unnecessarily create opposition in the other body to the worthwhile objectives of this bill.

I close by saying again that I am not at all moved by the argument of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], which was repeated many times yesterday, to the effect that there is any danger of Federal control of education under the committee's bill. As I said yesterday, and I repeat the statement tonight in passing, we have had a record of Federal aid to education in this country for decades. We have had a very high program of such aid for the last 10 years, when approximately $2 billion was poured into the schools of this country under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, without a scintilla of proof that the Federal Government has in any way interfered with the local administration of schools which have been the beneficiaries of such funds.

I repeat that the Cotton amendment cannot be justified on the ground that there is any danger of Federal interference in education under the bill which I have the privilege of conducting through the Senate. For the reasons I have set forth, it is my recommendation to the Senate that the Cotton amendment be defeated.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on April 12 I introduced an education bill that I had drawn up in an effort to draw a distinction between the two efforts which many suspect are involved in the Federal aid to education struggle. One of these efforts is directed at the need for more money for education. The other effort is said to be directed toward the prospect of eventually establishing education standards for the country as a whole.

The proposal I made in effect would return to the States on a per capita pupil basis 1 percent of the income-tax receipts collected by the Federal Government each year, the money to be used for primary and secondary education as the State saw fit. I contemplate offering the substitute of that bill as a substitute for title I of the committee bill.

Such a method would provide for distribution of sums of money comparable to the amounts recommended by the administration for the use in education.

I might say that the amount would be substantially the amount that would be provided by the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], as modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. The amount received by the Federal Government in income tax collections from personal or individual income tax and corporate tax, divided by 1 percent, would provide substantially $660 million. The figure that I understood the Senator from Iowa to state, by his modification of the Cotton amendment, would be $670 million or $680 million. That is fairly close to the amount proposed in the original administration recommendation, of approximately $670 million or $680 million. The amount proposed by the committee bill, I understand, is approximately $850 million in the first year of a 3-year program, costing altogether about $2½ billion.

I note that the distinguished majority leader is on the floor. Does he wish to submit a unanimous-consent request at this time?

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO LIMIT DEBATE—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposal and ask that it receive immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. *Ordered*, That further debate on the so-called Cotton amendment, numbered "5–16–61–G," be limited to 30 minutes, after the conclusion of the morning business on Friday, May 19, 1961, to be equally divided between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Ordered further, That the so-called Proxmire amendment, numbered 5–16–61–H, be the next order of business, and that debate thereon be limited to 60 minutes, to be equally divided between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Reserving the right to object, next on the list, I understood, to accommodate the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], was the amendment offered by myself and the Senator from Kentucky. It seems to me that we should proceed with what was an informal understanding. I have no desire to stand in the way of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. I know he has a time problem. Might it be well to include in the unanimous-consent request the Cooper-Javits amendment, in an effort to bring about a disposition of that amendment? I would consult the Senator from Kentucky in an attempt to arrive at a time limitation on the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I would be willing to cut my time down to a half hour, with 15 minutes to a side, if that will further accommodate the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have no desire to in any way inconvenience the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There does not seem to be any prospect at this time of reaching a unanimous-consent agreement outside of the one now before the Senate. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight it adjourn to meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will allow me, I have no objection to the unanimous-consent request he has propounded. I would hope that the Senator would include in the agreement that the next order of business after the Proxmire amendment might be the Cooper-Javits amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I am concerned, that would be agreeable, but I would point out to the Senator that he ought to be on the floor and he ought to make his unanimous-consent request and be recognized at the appropriate time.

Mr. JAVITS. Would the Senator be willing to attach it to the pending request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator wish to attach his request to my request?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; that the Cooper-Javits amendment follow the Proxmire amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. I will add that to my request.

Mr. JAVITS. That the Javits-Cooper amendment, No. 5–16–61–D, be the next order of business following the Proxmire amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent agreement is entered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That further debate on the so-called Cotton amendment, numbered 5–16–61—G, be limited to 30 minutes, after the conclusion of the morning business on Friday, May 19, 1961, to be equally divided between the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Ordered further, That the so-called Proxmire amendment, numbered 5–16–61—H, be the next order of business, and that debate thereon be limited to 60 minutes, to be equally divided between the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Ordered further, That the so-called Javits-Cooper amendment, numbered 5–16–61—D, be the next order of business.

Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. JOHNSTON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana still request that the Senate meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, by method I have described there would be absolutely no chance of our lapsing, in time, into the setting by the Federal Government of educational standards.

The bill would require only that the State agencies certify that the money received is used for primary and secondary education, Federal agencies or Federal courts being specifically prohibited from interference.

The reception which has been accorded my educational proposal in South Dakota may be of interest to those Senators representing States whose populations have not in general looked with favor on the prospect of a more direct entry by the Federal Government into the field of education. The preponderance of editorial opinion in South Dakota has been opposed to Federal aid as such. However, many newspaper editors who had editorialized against traditional proposals for Federal aid to education have expressed support for a measure drawn along the lines I have suggested.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point editorials from South Dakota newspapers. The first is from the Sioux Falls Argus Leader.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRIGUING PROPOSAL ON SCHOOL AID

Perhaps as interesting as any suggestion made in respect to Federal aid to education is that which comes from Senator FRANCIS CASE of South Dakota.

His proposal is quite simple. The bill which he has introduced provides that 1 percent of the Federal income tax receipts be distributed to the States. Each State's share would be determined by the number of residents in the 5- to 17-year-age bracket.

On the basis of current collection, this would mean a distribution of about $664 million, averaging about $15 per pupil.

Speaking in behalf of his proposal, CASE pointed out that it would require no special Federal agency and that, in fact, it wouldn't require a single additional Federal employee.

With these funds available to the schools, the States would be in a position to reduce the tax load imposed on general property and other sources.

If we are to have Federal aid to education, the Case proposal seems to be the ideal system.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Watertown, S. Dak., Public Opinion subscribed to such an approach. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE'S SCHOOL AID PROPOSAL

Whatever may or may not be its chances for consideration at the hands of a Congress under Democratic control and already well into widespread debate of a Democratic administration's own proposals on Federal aid to education, the bill introduced by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of South Dakota, appears to be a logical, and certainly one of the simplest solutions of the problem of how to spend Federal money to help elementary and secondary schools throughout the country.

Senator CASE announced his plan to introduce a measure on Federal aid to schools together with his ideas involving a fresh approach to the issue some time ago. He offered the bill in the U.S. Senate Wednesday.

In lieu of a Federal appropriation and any one of the more or less complex formulas for allocation of funds to the States, Senator CASE proposes to set aside and return to the States, for elementary and secondary school education on a per capita pupil basis, 1 percent of the amount collected annually by income taxes on both individuals and corporations.

Presenting his proposal on the floor of the Senate, the South Dakota Senator said this income tax diversion "would provide the funds to carry on and improve elementary and secondary education in every State, yet would close the door to Federal control."

The only requirement would be certification by the State that the money is used for elementary and secondary education. Aside from this, the determination by the State of how funds are spent would not be subject to review by any Federal officer, employee or court. The measure carries an express prohibition against Federal control or intervention in use of the funds.

The Case bill is devoid of any complex formula attempting to send more than proportional money to the less wealthy States.

For purely selfish reasons, this might make some States, which would receive far more than a paid-in proportional allotment under various other proposals, less enthusiastic over this one. Yet, as Senator CASE explained, it is obvious that the equities in the collection would rest upon the equities in the Federal income tax law, and the equities in the distribution would rest upon the number of children of school age.

In his presentation of his proposal, Senator CASE discussed alternate proposals based on income tax refunds:

"Other aid to education proposals built around an income tax refund have been advanced in Congress; but for them to be effective, States or localities would have to increase their present taxes in order to obtain the money refunded or not taxed by the Federal Government.

"That is, if a person were to deduct from his Federal income tax the amount of money he paid in local or State taxes, as some propose, his locality or State would then have to impose an additional tax to obtain the money not collected by the Federal Government. This would be necessary if there were really to be increased support for education.

"Such proposals, of themselves, would only reduce the Federal income tax. They are not proposals that of themselves would provide any aid whatever to education. Local property taxes and/or some personal or corporation taxes would have to be increased subsequent to the effecting of such measures if education were to benefit. Or, in some cases, as in South Dakota, a State income tax would have to be enacted."

The South Dakotan's plan involves, of course, aid primarily to elementary and secondary education and property tax relief. As an example of its effect, estimated distribution under the Case proposal in 1962 would make around $40,000 available in Watertown as property tax replacement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the Pierre Capital Journal, which calls the proposal "A Sensible Approach."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENSIBLE APPROACH

The most interesting approach to the subject of Federal assistance to the public schools of this country that we have heard of is the one introduced in the Senate by Senator FRANCIS CASE, of this State.

CASE'S suggestion is a simple one which avoids many of the difficulties inherent in some other proposals. CASE proposes that 1 percent of the money received as income taxes from the several States be distributed to the States on the basis of school enrollment.

Perhaps the most attractive feature of this proposal from the viewpoint of people who are primarily concerned with the burden upon the Federal Treasury is the fact that taxes paid by individual taxpayers for

school purposes are deductible from the income reported for income tax purposes.

As a result, if taxes are increased in a particular school district, or in a State as a whole, for the purpose of maintaining the schools, the full amount of that increase is deducted from the amount reported for income tax purposes. The result, of course, is a decrease in the amount collected as income tax.

What the ratio might be between such a figure and 1 percent of the total collected we do not know. Probably it is something less than 1 percent, but certainly it is some part of 1 percent. As a result, it can be argued, with considerable justification, that the real burden upon the Federal Treasury would be less than 1 percent; and it might be much less than 1 percent.

In the last analysis, of course, the entire cost of all tax-supported institutions is met by the taxpayers, and it is simply a question of whether the tax is collected by a Federal agent or a local tax collector. However, an income tax does have the virtue of spreading the burden pretty much according to ability to pay; and it could have the further virtue of placing some of the burden of supporting schools upon people who now virtually escape that burden.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Several of our weekly newspapers also view this approach to Federal aid as being acceptable. On April 19 the Sturgis Tribune editorialized on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE OFFERS PLAN

Senator FRANCIS CASE has introduced a bill to give the States 1 percent of the Federal income tax collections each year for elementary and secondary education on a straight per-pupil basis. He estimates $664 million, or about $15 per pupil, would be distributed to the States under this program in 1962.

CASE terms the measure "a fair, effective, easily administered, and uncomplicated method" of providing Federal aid to education without Federal interference in the operations of the schools. He points out no additional Federal agency or employees would be needed to administer the program.

"By this plan," CASE asserts, "all individual income-tax payers, many of whom now contribute little to the support of education, would help to meet a national need. By this plan the incomes of corporations would contribute to the education of the children of the families who provide the corporations with their profits."

The method of allocating this percentage of the Federal income tax for education is probably as fair as can be devised without adopting complicated formulas. It does not involve sending more money to the less wealthy States. The amount of Federal aid each State would receive would depend solely on the number of school-age children—the more of these each State has, the more money it would need and receive.

Neither does the Case proposal consider the Federal income tax contribution of each State. On the per pupil basis, some States would receive a greater amount than 1 percent of the Federal income tax collected in them represents. South Dakota, it appears, would receive more than 1 percent of its Federal income and corporation tax contributions.

South Dakota had about 189,000 school-age children (ages 5 through 17) in 1960. On the basis of $15 per pupil proposed in the Case bill, the State would receive about $2.8 million. A total of $103 million in personal Federal income and corporation taxes was collected in South Dakota in 1959. One percent of that contribution is $1.03 million. Thus, South Dakota would come out ahead in the exchange.

How would the Case bill affect Sturgis Independent School District No. 12? Well, the district has a school-age population of 1,400. Thus, it would receive $21,000 per year on the basis of $15 per pupil. That compares favorably with the $23,000 in State aid the district received this year. The State aid to the local district will increase to about $30,000 next year as the 1961 State legislature hiked its biennial appropriation for this purpose.

Senator CASE says his bill carries "an express prohibition against Federal control or intervention in the use of the funds." It merely requires that each State certify that its allocation is used solely for elementary and secondary education.

We don't like Federal aid to education: primarily because it preempts a local responsibility. But, if it's coming anyway we'd rather see it in the form that Senator CASE has proposed than the programs outlined by the administration. We have contended all along that the people will finance their schools if the Federal Government will leave them enough of their own money to do it.

The Case proposal, however, is likely to have rough sledding in the Democratic-controlled Congress which is naturally more interested in passage of the administration's bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Milbank Herald Advance of April 27, 1961.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR CASE OFFERS SOUND APPROACH TO FEDERAL AID FOR SCHOOLS

If Federal aid is granted for educational purposes under a system that will close the doors to Federal control of our schools then it seems that the plan Senator FRANCIS CASE, of the State of South Dakota, offered this week is the one plan that could make possible such a guarantee of freedom from regulation.

Oddly enough the plan is simplicity itself yet would have inbuilt features that make Federal aid possible without creating any agencies with power to dictate to or interfere with local school controls.

The plan is quite similar in some respects to the method used for distribution of school apportionment funds of South Dakota, a method of school aid that has served this State quite well.

Senator CASE has proposed that 1 percent of the amount collected nationally by income taxes, corporate and personal, be set aside for schools and apportioned back to States on a per capita pupil basis.

Under his proposal, once the total of the income tax revenues were determined for a year, the computation of the funds could be made by placing a single decimal point, the amount determined in the Appropriations Committees of the Congress.

The money would then be sent to each State in an amount equal to the national dollar-per-pupil figure multiplied by the number of school-age children residing in a given State.

Senator CASE states that his proposal would require not one single additional Federal employee and he is right. States would benefit according to the number of children to be provided for and this is fair.

There would be no complicating factors of bureaus, or agencies, of dictation of the circumstances under which the moneys were to be received. If this plan were adopted and based on the 1962 taxes, the Senator estimates that the amount to be so distributed would be around $664 million.

The Federal Government would utilize its existing tax mechanism to obtain money for education without disproportionately increasing the burden now borne by the already overtaxed property owner. By this plan all individual income-tax payers, many of whom now contribute little to the support of education would help to meet a national need. Agencies for distribution of the funds are already a part of every State government.

Senator CASE, in offering the proposal to the President, stated that he offered it as a fair, effective, easily administered, and uncomplicated method to provide the elementary and secondary schools of the Nation with the support they need in the national interest.

Long has the editor had misgivings about Federal aid to education, often wondering if it could be the Pandora's box to greater troubles than those now besetting the schools. Many of these troubles have already flown from their seclusion at the very mention of Federal aid to education. Already like swarming mosquitoes these Pandorian troubles have annoyed and stung those sincerely interested only in helping the children. Most obvious of these, of course, is the often discussed aid to parochial schools, but this is only one of the problems.

Once a cartoonist pictured the possibility of schools under national control. Children were going into the front door of a building—individuals—some with round heads, some with square heads, some with misshapen heads, but most of them average and normal.

As they entered the door, a bureaucrat grabbed each child and fitted him into a mold. The next bureaucrat hammered away at the mold—the child still encased—and then another took a blow and yet another.

Finally at the end of the educational process the children were released—all neatly molded to an individual pattern—each one with a neatly pyramided head, pointed and exactly like that of the children preceding him.

As each child left the school his bureaucratic tormentor nodded in pleasure. The children had been fitted to a mold.

But America is not that type of a nation. Education should be devised for the pupil, and subject to the needs of the immediate locality, as well as that of the individual.

Federal aid to education is coming. It will not be perfect and there will be those of us who will regret its necessity. Yet if we will have it, it seems that Senator CASE's proposals should be accepted.

He presents a sound plan, simple to administer, equitable, and secure against Government intervention.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Lennox Independent, which properly stresses the simplicity of the proposal and its freedom from the threat of Federal control of education.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASE EDUCATION BILL

So often a simple solution to a problem is passed over in favor of a complicated hodgepodge because we humans just can't stand to see things solved easily and quickly. Senator FRANCIS CASE has come up with an efficient, simple way of providing additional funds for elementary and secondary schools but our guess is that it will be passed over for some mixed-up mess introduced by a true "liberal."

We have outspokenly expressed our opposition to Federal aid to education but if it must be we are in favor of the Case proposal which will insure against Federal

control of our public education and will require no additional Government agencies or employees.

Senator CASE'S proposal simply calls for 1 percent of all Federal income taxes collected to be prorated back to the States according to school-age population between the ages of 5 and 17. The State governments would apportion the money to the schools and the Federal Government would have nothing to do with the administering of the funds.

According to CASE, 1 percent of Federal income taxes would provide approximately $15 per pupil. At this rate, the Lennox schools, with approximately 500 students, could expect about $7,500 added revenue. This would be a considerable sum and would measurably help to control a further rise in real estate taxes although it probably would do little to lower them.

To those who argue that a law must be devised which will be to the advantage of the less wealthy States, may we point out that this law would provide such an advantage. These States would be getting back more than 1 percent of the income taxes they pay for the simple reason that the large individual and corporation income taxes are paid by those who live in the so-called wealthy industrial States.

It would be nice to get even 1 percent of our income taxes back in the local community each year for the purpose of educating our youth so they too can rightfully fill their place in society and help pay more income taxes in the future.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table which gives by States the number of pupils of school age between the ages of 5 and 17 in each State; the amount that would be accorded to the States under the Case amendment, which would be the substance of S. 1556; the amount that would be appropriated to the States under the so-called Cotton amendment; the amount that would be accorded under the earlier administration proposal; and the amount that would be accorded to each State under the bill reported by the committee. The chart is set up in columns, so that the figures are available for quick comparison purposes.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated allotments to States under various proposals

[Dollar amounts in millions]

State	Number of school-age children in each State (age 5 to 17)	Case amendment (1 percent of total industrial and corporate income taxes)	Cotton's amendment (amended to 3 cents; cigarette tax)	Administration proposal (direct Treasury appropriation)	S. 1021 as reported (direct Treasury appropriation)
Totals	45,723,000	$664	$682	$666	$850
Alabama	933,000	13.6	8.40	19.7	24.0
Alaska	58,000	.8	.75	.6	1.1
Arizona	321,000	3.7	5.40	6.3	7.4
Arkansas	505,000	7.3	4.50	10.5	12.9
California	3,540,000	51.4	66.00	57.7	46.2
Colorado	451,000	6.5	6.00	7.2	8.9
Connecticut	556,000	8.1	12.00	6.6	5.2
Delaware	111,000	1.6	2.10	1.2	1.2
District of Columbia	180,000	2.6	3.75	1.6	1.6
Florida	1,049,000	15.2	16.50	19.1	21.9
Georgia	1,116,000	16.2	12.75	22.0	28.0
Hawaii	173,000	2.5	1.65	3.1	3.7
Idaho	188,000	2.7	2.10	3.8	4.4
Illinois	2,384,000	34.6	52.50	23.3	31.5
Indiana	1,201,000	17.4	18.00	17.0	22.8
Iowa	713,000	10.4	9.30	11.3	14.4
Kansas	552,000	8.0	7.05	9.4	11.1
Kentucky	854,000	12.4	12.60	14.6	21.4
Louisiana	921,000	13.4	10.80	15.0	22.2
Maine	243,000	3.5	4.20	4.1	5.2
Maryland	768,000	11.2	12.00	9.0	13.7
Massachusetts	1,127,000	16.4	21.15	11.8	14.8
Michigan	2,100,000	30.5	28.65	27.1	38.0
Minnesota	891,000	12.9	12.45	13.1	18.4
Mississippi	666,000	9.7	6.00	14.7	17.5
Missouri	1,029,000	14.9	17.85	12.2	18.5
Montana	187,000	$2.7	$2.40	$2.9	$3.9
Nebraska	370,000	5.4	4.65	5.3	7.4
Nevada	69,000	1.0	1.73	1.0	1.0
New Hampshire	141,000	2.0	4.50	1.7	2.7
New Jersey	1,352,000	19.6	26.70	14.4	16.6
New Mexico	266,000	3.9	3.00	5.3	6.4
New York	3,715,000	53.9	75.00	37.7	40.7
North Carolina	1,299,000	18.9	14.25	27.9	33.8
North Dakota	185,000	2.7	1.95	3.1	4.6
Ohio	2,408,000	35.0	39.00	28.7	39.5
Oklahoma	581,000	8.4	9.00	12.0	12.6
Oregon	458,000	6.7	6.75	7.1	9.0
Pennsylvania	2,686,000	39.0	34.50	26.9	44.0
Rhode Island	201,000	2.9	3.15	1.8	3.4
South Carolina	749,000	10.9	7.50	15.2	20.4
South Dakota	194,000	2.9	2.10	3.3	4.5
Tennessee	953,000	13.9	11.55	19.5	23.5
Texas	2,636,000	38.3	33.00	40.3	58.1
Utah	264,000	3.8	1.87	5.8	6.3
Vermont	99,000	1.4	1.65	1.5	2.1
Virginia	1,048,000	15.2	12.30	17.8	23.8
Washington	722,000	10.5	9.90	11.4	13.0
West Virginia	551,000	8.0	6.15	10.7	12.9
Wisconsin	1,016,000	14.8	13.80	11.6	20.0
Wyoming	91,000	1.3	1.50	1.5	1.8
Guam	19,000	.3			.5
Puerto Rico	823,000	11.9			21.1
Virgin Islands	10,000	.1			.3

JUDICIAL REVIEW AMENDMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I welcomed yesterday's resounding defeat of the Thurmond amendment. Unless the salutary effect of its defeat is undone by some agreements or understandings about accepting or weakly resisting a somewhat watered-down but equally effective Thurmond amendment, we can chalk up a good day's work.

As the New York Times points out in an editorial this morning, it is one thing to keep the civil rights issue out of the bill, but "it is quite unacceptable to give any Federal aid bill the appearance of endorsing segregation."

The legislative history which we made yesterday must be interpreted as recognition that the bill in its present form does not permit Federal grants in aid of segregated schools. Otherwise the Thurmond amendment would have been wholly superfluous, and no administrator or court would presume that a Senator had offered an unnecessary amendment. I have been very distressed by reports that the administration may support efforts to undo this legislative history.

I was happy, however, to hear the distinguished majority leader disavow the existence of any such agreement or understanding as has been rumored.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not quite understand what the Senator said.

Mr. KEATING. I said that I had been distressed by reports that the administration might support efforts to undo the legislative history that was made yesterday, but that I was very happy to hear the remarks of the distinguished majority leader, wherein he disavowed, so far as he knew, the existence of any such agreement or understanding as had been rumored.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To what does the Senator refer? Does he refer to the legislative history of yesterday.

Mr. KEATING. I had said that my interpretation of the legislative history made yesterday by defeat of the Thurmond amendment was that the bill in its present form does not permit Federal grants in aid of segregated schools, but that there was a danger that if we did something to undo yesterday's action, we would be altering the situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senator from New York referring to the so-called Talmadge amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I had in mind that amendment particularly, yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad we are now getting down to specifics, because I have read the newspaper articles. I am glad the Senator from New York made the statement he has just made, because where the newspapers got the idea that the administration was sponsoring and proposing this particular amendment is beyond my knowledge.

I said yesterday, and I am glad to say again today, that I believe the Talmadge amendment has much merit. I have preached for years in my own State that Federal aid to education does not mean Federal control of education. I cannot think of a Senator on either side of the aisle who would not agree with that concept.

I asked my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], to study the matter, because I believe he is one of the most knowledgeable persons in the field of legislation, having had

experience in this particular area in both bodies.

So far as the article about Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff having secret meetings and operating behind the scenes is concerned, that is news to me. I am happy to declare publicly that, so far as I know, Secretary Ribicoff has had absolutely nothing to do with this proposal, nor has anyone in the White House. If there is any responsibility for it, the responsibility is mine, and I accept it gladly. It is mine alone.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the repetition by the distinguished majority leader of his disavowal of such an agreement or understanding as has been rumored. I am grateful to him for repeating his statement.

I am definitely opposed to Federal control of education in any guise; but I am just as deeply opposed to any attempt to make the Constitution inapplicable to the Federal-aid-to-education bill or to any other proposed Federal legislation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I, too, have read the newspapers. I have read that some sort of arrangement was arrived at whereby I was to offer an amendment very much like the so-called Talmadge amendment. I have said that I would favor such an amendment, because I favor a provision in the bill whereby there will be no Federal control whatsoever—no Federal control such as the Powell type of amendment; no Federal control such as by the withholding of funds for any purpose, whether for failure to comply, for one reason or another, with the provisions of the bill. But that is the only statement that was made. I said that I would vote for such an amendment.

That is consistent with my 8 years of service in the House of Representatives, where I made statement after statement along the same line. It is consistent with all the statements I have made in the Senate. But I made that statement without any consultation with Secretary Ribicoff, without any secret meeting, without any discussion with the majority leader, and after the report was published in the newspapers. I hope I shall be able to obtain the floor tonight to address myself further to this question.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Montana. If it is not inappropriate, I should like to address an inquiry to him. If he feels it is inappropriate, I shall understand it perfectly. My inquiry is whether it is the Senator's intention to offer the so-called Talmadge amendment.

Mr. METCALF. It is not my intention to offer it. It is not my intention to do other than to vote for it, if it is modified somewhat to take care of certain objections I have to the present language. It is my intention, if the amendment, which is lying at the desk, is offered by its author—and I assume it will be offered, because it has been mentioned in colloquies on the floor today—to support and vote for that amendment. That position is consistent with the position I have taken ever since the day I first came to the House of Representatives to serve in Congress.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Perhaps the Senator from Oregon and I have the same idea. I say this to my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], as well, who is as deeply interested in this question as are any of the rest of us. I hope we will await the debate upon the Talmadge amendment, just as we awaited the debate on the Thurmond amendment, before any of us tries to make a legislative record on this issue.

What the Senator is now discussing concerning his intentions and his views is one matter. However, I express the feeling that I would not wish to be bound by the colloquy on this subject as it concerns the legislative intent which is involved in the bill, especially that section which relates to the proposition that there shall be no Federal control over education, whether that control be affirmative or negative, or however it is to be interpreted.

I make that expression only for myself, because I was so deeply involved with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the floor manager of the bill, in the debate on the Thurmond amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I say to my colleague, the Senator from New York, that it is my contention that the legislative history was made yesterday when the Thurmond amendment was rejected. There may be Senators who take a different approach to that amendment and who disagree with that position, but that is my position.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that this is not the time to engage in a discussion of the merits or the demerits of the expected-to-be-offered Talmadge amendment; but I thought that amendment would be reached today. There are two items I should like to raise concerning it, if the Senator from New York will permit me to take a minute to raise them. They ought to be raised in fairness to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and in fairness to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff before the Senate adjourns tonight. It will take only a minute to do so.

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the floor manager of the bill, I now testify that when this matter was first raised and there was some informal discussion about it among us, the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] took exactly the same position as he has just stated on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Montana said at that time, that, in his opinion, provided some changes were made in the proposed Talmadge amendment, he would vote for it, because it was consistent, as he has just said, with his 8 years of service in Congress. Furthermore, he said—and he did not mention this in his statement just now—that, in his opinion, the Talmadge amendment really was not necessary, in that the authority which was being considered in regard to it did not exist anyway.

But I have read the newspaper articles. In my judgment, they do the Senator from Montana an injustice. Whenever I find any Senator has been done an injustice, and I feel I have some facts which would help to rectify the injustice, I shall always come to his defense, as I now come to the defense of the Senator from Montana.

There never was any arrangement, so far as I know—and I am satisfied this is true—whereby the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would introduce any amendment in behalf of anyone, including the administration.

Next, the newspaper articles also do an injustice to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff, in that they give the impression, which is unwarranted, false, and untrue, that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare was in some way involved in a proposal to have the Talmadge amendment offered on the floor of the Senate with the blessing of the administration.

Again, as the floor leader of the bill, I think I would know of any such arrangement. I am satisfied I have been kept fully informed by my leader, by the administration, and by my committee concerning any plans in connection with any proposal for a modification of the bill. I now testify that no such proposal was ever made to me.

However, I had a talk with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare this morning, and he said he had sent a letter to the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] concerning one phase of the bill. I told him I was certain that the Senator from Vermont would be perfectly willing that I have a copy of the letter, so that I could use it in the course of the debate in the Senate, but that before I used it, I would speak with the Senator from Vermont about it. I have spoken with the Senator from Vermont.

I have spoken with Senator PROUTY. He told me that by all means I am free to use the letter which Secretary Ribicoff had sent to him. I think it is only fair that the RECORD show that letter before the Senate adjourns tonight, because I think it would be helpful toward a clarification of this question in the newspapers. I read it now very quickly.

First, I read the letter from Secretary Ribicoff to me, dated this morning:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, May 18, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: In view of the fact that you are chairman of the subcommittee handling the School Assistance Act of

1961, S. 1021, I am enclosing a copy of a letter sent to Senator PROUTY in response to his question concerning that bill.

Sincerely,

ABE RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

The letter to Senator PROUTY, dated May 17, 1961, and signed by Secretary Ribicoff, reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, May 17, 1961.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: We have a telephone inquiry from your office on the question whether under the School Assistance Act of 1961, proposed by the administration and introduced as title I of S. 1021, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.

In my opinion neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority.

Sincerely,

/s/ ——— ———,
Secretary.

I shall discuss the letters further tomorrow, or whenever the Talmadge amendment is offered. I shall oppose the Talmadge amendment, as my friend from Montana knows. We have a sincere and honest difference of opinion as to the implications and effects of the Talmadge amendment. I think it would be a mistake to adopt it. I am satisfied that when the Senate listens to the debate on the Talmadge amendment, a substantial majority of Senators will vote to sustain the floor leader of this bill by rejecting the Talmadge amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. First, I wish to comment briefly on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

I am not in agreement with the legal position taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and tomorrow I shall wish, in connection with the consideration of the Talmadge amendment, to pursue further with the distinguished Senator from Oregon certain questions dealing with the legal implications of the opinion rendered by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, no good purpose would be served by doing so tonight.

I now yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am in full agreement with the Senator from New York that the legislative history on this very important subject should not be written tonight.

I am in agreement with the letter which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wrote to Senator PROUTY, and which was read into the RECORD by the Senator from Oregon.

I propose tomorrow to address myself to some of the legal reasons why I think that is the proper attitude to take on this bill, and the proper legal decision on the question as to whether or not funds can be withheld. I hope the junior Senator from New York, the senior Senator from New York, and I, as well as other Senators who are interested and have been interested for many years in this very important question, can discuss the subject when more Senators are present, and that we can write some legislative history for this legislation.

Mr. KEATING. That I shall be very happy to do. I appreciate the remarks of the junior Senator from Montana.

There are some who mistakenly believe that the problem of preventing grants under this legislation for unconstitutional purposes can be safely entrusted to the courts under the established law.

The fallacy in this view is that there is no procedure under the present law or under court precedents by which an unconstitutional grant of Federal funds can be challenged in the courts.

Under a number of precedents, in the absence of an enabling statute, taxpayers' suits cannot be brought against the Federal Government to enjoin the disbursement of Federal funds. This is based upon two grounds: First, the question of sovereign immunity; and second, the fact that the interest of a taxpayer is held to be so minuscule as not to give him a right to bring a taxpayer's suit to restrain the use of Federal funds.

This is a classic example of constitutional wrong for which no constitutional remedy exists, other than what we may provide by express enactment.

In my opinion it would be unconstitutional for the Federal Government to contribute funds to school districts which refuse to comply with the Supreme Court decision on desegregation.

There is no more justification for using Federal tax moneys to promote segregation than there is for using State tax moneys for the same purpose. I cannot see any distinction which would alter the constitutional principle involved.

Also, in my opinion, as I have indicated, the defeat of the Thurmond amendment should serve as a directive to the Commissioner of Education to withhold the payment of funds to areas practicing racial segregation in their schools.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. It seems to me that an examination of the Thurmond amendment would be useful. It reads as follows:

On page 2, line 20, change the period to a comma, and add the following language: "and no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall withhold funds appropriated under authorization of this title from any State or school otherwise eligible because of any law, policy, or practice of the State or school with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools."

On page 3, line 6, change the period to a semicolon, and add the following language: *"Provided, however,* That no funds are authorized by this title to be appropriated which are conditioned on the compliance by a State or school with any policy or law with regard to segregation or desegregation of the races in the schools."

As I read that amendment, it implies that there is power to withhold for any other purpose, and that is the reason I support the Talmadge amendment, or a general amendment which says, "You shall not withhold," because I do not believe that there should be such power, and I do not believe there should be an implication of power to withhold. If there is power, of course, to me it would be unconscionable to say, "You can withhold for any other purpose, but you cannot withhold in order to enforce the 14th amendment."

I was hoping that this was the sort of thing we would be able to discuss with the Senator from New York and the floor manager of the bill, in order to settle the very important constitutional question; but I cannot sit here and refrain from commenting on the legal interpretation presented by my friend from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's position. We are here talking about the withholding of funds from areas practicing racial segregation in their schools. On that issue, by defeating the Thurmond amendment, the Senate has refused to deny the power to withhold under the present language of the bill. That is the position I take.

Mr. METCALF. With that position I respectfully disagree; and I hope to develop that argument tomorrow.

Mr. KEATING. I respect the Senator's great ability as a lawyer, and the interpretation which he gives. However, I must disagree with him.

Whatever ambiguity might have existed without the legislative history which we made yesterday by the defeat of the Thurmond amendment was dispelled by the action which the Senate took by such an overwhelming vote.

All that is needed now is a provision in the bill authorizing judicial review of any proposed grants of Federal funds for unconstitutional purposes. In the absence of some assurance from the administration—and none has been given; on the contrary, the reading of the letter by the distinguished Senator from Oregon is quite to the contrary—we certainly cannot rely upon the Commissioner to observe what many of us consider to be these constitutional limitations.

It would be shocking, in my judgment, for the Commissioner to act in this manner, but even more shocking if the injured citizens could not obtain judicial relief under such circumstances.

I am not against Federal aid to education in principle. There is a national responsibility, in my judgment, to foster a standard of excellence in our educational system. I do not want our country to be second best in any such important activity. If there are some States or areas which cannot meet their obligations in this regard, then, of course, the whole country should render the needed assistance.

Our vote, however, will not be for or against a general principle, but for a specific bill containing authorizations for expenditures to be made under specified conditions. These conditions must be fair and equitable, and they must satisfy constitutional limitations. Otherwise, the whole purpose of this legislation will be defeated. It is one thing for newspaper editorialists to base their positions on broad generalities, but no Senator would be acting responsibly if he did not weigh carefully the specific

proposals offered to achieve these objectives.

Mr. President, the Thurmond amendment pointed up one of the most serious problems arising out of this bill, the problem of providing safeguards against the use of Federal funds to promote segregated schooling. No one interested in protecting constitutional rights and defending the Supreme Court's decision can afford to overlook this issue.

So, Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself, I send to the desk a proposed amendment to S. 1021, designed simply to permit resort to the courts to protect against any constitutional deprivations which may arise in the administration of this statute.

I believe that anyone who has studied the law on the subject of a judicial review of Federal disbursements will recognize the vital importance of such a provision as we are advocating. This is not the Powell amendment. Its sole purpose, I want to emphasize, is to make certain that there is a remedy for any constitutional violations in the administration of this law. I do not understand on what basis anyone could object to safeguarding access to the courts under such circumstances.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk, and I ask that it be ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 18, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 188. An act for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof;

S. 126. An act for the relief of Edward W. Scott III;

S. 138. An act for the relief of Mico Delic;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Hadji Benlevi;

S. 217. An act for the relief of Alessandro Gellhorn;

S. 285. An act for the relief of Aipo Fransila Crane;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah);

S. 330. An act for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks;

S. 532. An act for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 545. An act for the relief of Mrs Elizabeth Clifford;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou;

S. 663. An act for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis;

S. 894. An act for the relief of Captain Ernest Mountain; and

S. 1097. An act for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I move that the Senate do now adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 19, 1961, at 9 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 8: 4–5: *What is man that Thou art mindful of him? Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor.*

O Thou whose presence and help are the supreme needs of our life in the events and vast upheavals of our time, wilt Thou daily inspire us with the enthusiasm and eagerness of high ideals and lofty principles.

May our minds and hearts expand with wonder and pride when we consider how mindful Thou art of us and always seeking to fill and invest our lives with enduring sanctity and significance, however frail and fleeting they may seem to be.

Grant that in our human relations we may manifest a sincere and deep concern for the welfare of mankind and strive to walk together with humility of spirit in the laws of Thy commandments and in the ways of brotherhood.

Give us more of the Master's purity of heart, His passion for righteousness, His pity for the poor and needy, and His power to release the hidden splendor of humanity.

To Thy name ascribe all the praise and glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

OFF-SEASON CRUISES BY AMERICAN-FLAG PASSENGER VESSELS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 6100) to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize off-season cruises by American-flag passenger vessels, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: That title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1171–1182), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new section 613, to read as follows:

"SEC. 613. (a) In this section, 'passenger vessel' means a vessel which (1) is of not less than ten thousand gross tons, and (2) has accommodations for not less than one hundred passengers.

"(b) If the Board finds that the operation of passenger vessels with respect to which an application for operating-differential subsidy has been filed under section 601 of this title is required for at least two-thirds of each year, but not for all of each year, in order to furnish adequate service on the service, route, or line with respect to which the application was filed, the Board may approve the application for payment of operating-differential subsidy for operation of the vessels (1) on such service, route, or line for such part of each year, and (2) on cruises for all or part of the remainder of each year if such specific cruise is approved by the Board under subsection (e) of this section.

"(c) Cruises authorized by this section must begin and end at a domestic port or ports on the same seacoast of the United States from which the operator operates or conducts the regular service to which the vessels are assigned. When a vessel is being operated on cruises—

"(1) it shall carry no mail unless required by law, or cargo except passengers' luggage, except between those ports between which it may carry mail and cargo on its regular service assigned by contract;

"(2) it shall carry passengers on a round-trip basis, except between those ports between which it may carry one-way passengers on its regular service assigned by contract;

"(3) it shall embark passengers only at domestic ports on the same seacoast of the United States as that to which the vessel is assigned on its regular service; and

"(4) it shall stop at other domestic ports only for the same time and the same purposes as is permitted with respect to a foreign-flag vessel which is carrying passengers who embarked at a domestic port.

Section 605(c) of this Act shall not apply to cruises authorized under this section.

"(d) The Board may from time to time review operating differential subsidy contracts entered into under this title for the operation of passenger vessels, and upon a finding that operation of such vessels upon a service, route, or line is required in order to furnish adequate service on such service, route, or line, but is not required for the entire year, may amend such contracts to agree to pay operating differential subsidy for operation of such vessels on cruises, as authorized by this section, for part or all of the remainder, but not exceeding one-third, of each year, if each specific cruise is approved by the Board under subsection (e) of this section.

"(e) Upon the application of any operator for approval of a specific cruise, the Board, after notice to all other American flag operators who may be affected and after affording all such operators an opportunity to submit written data, views or arguments, with or without opportunity to present the same orally in any manner, and after consideration of all relevant matter presented, shall, if it determines that the proposed cruise will not substantially adversely affect an existing operator's service performed with passenger vessels of United States registry, approve the proposed cruise. Such approval shall not be given more than two years in advance of the beginning of the cruise.

"(f) As used in this section the following three are the seacoasts of the United States: (1) the Atlantic coast, including the Great Lakes but excluding the Gulf of Mexico; (2) the Gulf of Mexico; and (3) the Pacific coast, including Alaska and Hawaii."

SEC. 2. Section 601(a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1171) is amended as follows:

(a) The first sentence thereof is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the words "or in such service and in cruises authorized under section 613 of this title".

(b) By inserting in the second sentence thereof after the words "to promote the foreign commerce of the United States" the words "except to the extent such vessels are to be operated on cruises authorized under section 613 of this title".

(c) By inserting at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "To the extent the application covers cruises, as authorized under section 613 of this title, the Board may make the portion of this last determination relating to parity on the basis that any foreign flag cruise from the United States competes with any American flag cruise from the United States".

SEC. 3. Section 602 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1172), is amended by striking out the word "No" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except with respect to cruises authorized under section 613 of this title, no".

SEC. 4. Section 603 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1173), is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after the words "in such service, route, or line" the words "and in cruises authorized under section 613 of this title".

(b) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting after the words "operating-differential subsidy" the words "for the operation of vessels on a service, route, or line", and by inserting at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For any period during which a vessel cruises as authorized by section 613 of this Act, operating-differential subsidy shall be computed as though the vessel were operating on the essential service to which the vessel is assigned: *Provided, however,* That if the cruise vessel calls at a port or ports outside of its assigned service, but which is served with passenger vessels (as defined in section 613 of this Act) by another subsidized operator at an operating-differential subsidy rate for wages lower than the cruise vessel has on its assigned essential service, the operating-differential subsidy rates for each of the subsidizable items for each day (a fraction of a day to count as a day) that the vessel stops at such port shall be at the respective rates applicable to the subsidized operator regularly serving the area."

SEC. 5. Section 606 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1176), is amended by inserting in subdivision (6) after the words "services, routes, and lines" a comma and the words "and any cruises authorized under section 613 of this title" and a comma.

SEC. 6. Section 607(b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1177), is amended by inserting in the second sentence of the second paragraph thereof after the words "on an essential foreign-trade line, route or service approved by the Commission" the words "and on cruises, if any, authorized under section 613 of this title".

SEC. 7. The cruises authorized by section 613 shall be in addition to and not in derogation of the right of an operator to make voyages on his regular service, route or line, including approved deviations within the general area of his essential service. There shall be no adjustment of subsidy in the event of such deviations if they are without prejudice to the adequacy of service.

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOLLING from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 299, Rept. No. 404), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. BOLLING (on behalf of Mr. DELANEY) from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 300, Rept. No. 405) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confirmed to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXPRESS RATES

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. TRIMBLE) reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 301, Rept. No. 406), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1986) to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ESTABLISHING AN OFFICE OF INTERNATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 610, to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the provisions of H.R. 4614 as passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce, improve the foreign payments position of the United States, and promote international understanding and appreciation of the United States of America by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. (a) In order to carry out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as "the Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program, utilizing all appropriate media of public information and communication, designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by the residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities conducive to better international understanding of the people and institutions of the United States;

(2) encourage the strengthening of tourist facilities, programs, and other arrangements within the United States for assuring a friendly welcome and meeting the special requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) coordinate all travel facilitation activities of the United States Government, and actively encourage progressive elimination, reduction, or simplification of barriers to travel;

(4) assist in the implementation of foreign technical assistance and economic development projects in the travel industry field; and

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information relating to international travel and tourism.

(b) In performing the duties set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall—

(1) utilize the facilities of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible;

(2) consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, private organizations, and

local, State, Federal, foreign government, and international agencies engaged in or concerned with international travel;

(3) obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified and experienced professional agencies, consultants, and specialists in the fields of travel, advertising, public information, and mass communication;

(4) establish such travel offices in foreign countries, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, as he deems to be necessary and desirable;

(5) refrain from conducting any activity or furnishing any service which might result in adverse economic competition to persons engaged in the business of providing transportation, accommodations, or other facilities to persons traveling between the United States and foreign countries.

(c) Beginning with the fiscal year 1962, the Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress a quarterly report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce a United States Travel Service (hereinafter referred to as "the Travel Service").

(b) The Travel Service shall be headed by an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Travel (hereinafter referred to as the "Assistant Secretary") who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Assistant Secretary shall be in addition to the other Assistant Secretaries provided by law for the Department of Commerce. All duties and responsibilities of the Secretary set forth in section 2 of this Act shall be exercised through the Assistant Secretary.

(c) In the absence of the Secretary the Assistant Secretary shall represent the Secretary on any interagency committee, board or other organization established within the executive branch to deal with travel matters.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Travel Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as "the Board") which shall be composed of twenty members who shall be appointed by the Secretary and who shall serve for such terms as may be designated by the Secretary. Such members shall not be officers or employees of the Federal Government and shall be individuals who, by reason of interest, training or experience, are qualified to carry out the duties provided for in section 5 of this Act. At least ten of the members of the Board shall be representatives of the travel and related industries.

(b) The Board shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from its members.

(c) Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its powers but shall be filed in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Twelve members of the Board shall constitute a quorum.

(e) Each member of the Board shall receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of his duties; and, while away from his home or regular place of business and engaged in the actual performance of his duties, he shall also receive travel and subsistence expenses in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

(f) Service of an individual as a member of the Board or as an expert or consultant under section 2(b)(3) of this Act shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, or 284 of title 18, or of section 99 of title 5 of the United States Code, or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceedings, or matter involving the United States, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service.

SEC. 5. The Board shall—

(1) advise and consult with the Assistant Secretary with respect to the activities of the Travel Service and from time to time shall submit to the Assistant Secretary recommendations for programs and policies to be adopted; and

(2) submit to the Secretary and the Congress from time to time, but not less than once a year, reports containing appraisals of the effectiveness of the programs and activities being carried on by the Travel Service and setting forth recommendations the Board has made to the Assistant Secretary and such other matters as it may consider pertinent.

SEC. 6. Section 104 of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 408, Eighty-third Congress) is amended by striking the period at the end of subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon, and by inserting after such subsection a new subsection as follows:

"(s) For financing the establishment and operation of travel offices and other activities authorized by the International Travel Act of 1961, in such amounts as may be specified from time to time in appropriation Acts".

SEC. 7. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and thereafter such sums as may be necessary.

SEC. 8. This Act may be cited as the "International Travel Act of 1961".

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States;

(2) encourage the development of tourist facilities low cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

(4) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally;

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics, information, and schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to international travel and tourism.

SEC. 3. (a) In performing the duties set forth in section 2, the Secretary—

(1) shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible including the maximum utilization of counterpart funds; and, to the fullest extent consistent with the performance of their own duties and functions, such agencies shall permit such utilization of facilities and services;

(2) may consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies;

(3) may obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified professional organizations and personnel;

(4) after consultation with the Secretary of State, may establish such branches in foreign countries, as he deems to be necessary and desirable.

(b) The Secretary, under the authority of this Act, shall not provide or arrange for transportation for, or accommodations to, persons traveling between foreign countries and the United States in competition with business engaged in providing or arranging for such transportation or accommodations.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce an Office of International Travel and Tourism.

(b) The Office of International Travel and Tourism shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $18,000 per annum. The Director shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and not to exceed $4,700,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read:

To direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes.

By unanimous consent the proceedings by which the bill (H.R. 4614) was passed were vacated, and that bill was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Elections Subcommittee of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may sit during general debate in the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any rollcalls on Monday and Tuesday be postponed to Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Monday is District Day, but there are no District bills to be considered. The legislative appropriation bill of 1962 will be considered.

There will be no legislative business on Tuesday.

For Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday the following bills are programed for consideration:

S. 1852, from the Committee on Armed Services, authorization for missiles, naval vessels, and so forth.

H.R. 1986, amending the Postal Railway Mail Act.

H.R. 6874, authorization for appropriations for NASA.

Any further program will be announced as quickly as possible, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tomorrow night to file a privileged report on the legislative appropriation bill for 1962.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

TRAVEL EXPENSES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 283, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 283 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3279, a bill to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 3279, as amended by the Committee on Government Operations, is to amend existing travel expense legislation so as to increase the maximum per diem rates, reimbursement for actual expenses, and mileage allowances for use of privately owned vehicles for civilian employees of the Government.

Travel expense legislation was last amended in 1955 at which time the current ceilings were set. In 1959, the House approved legislation increasing the maximum per diem rates to $15 per day, the mileage allowance from 10 to 12 cents per mile for autos and from 6 to 8 cents per mile for motorcycles, and authorizing the payment of parking fees for privately owned vehicles when on Government business. The Senate deleted the increases in mileage allowances when it passed the bill in 1960, but action was taken so close to the adjournment of Congress that it was not possible to hold a conference between the two Houses on the bill. The bill died, therefore, at the end of the session.

Certainly, it is unjust to require or expect Government employees to pay part of the cost of official travel out of their own pockets. This bill will help relieve such a situation by at least keeping up with the realistic travel costs which employees must incur in line with their duties.

I should like to emphasize the fact that the per diem rate prescribed in the bill is a maximum one and it is anticipated that the maximum rate will be allowed only where the circumstances clearly warrant it. The Bureau of the Budget and the heads of departments and agencies have both the authority and the responsibility to see that no deviation from this principle occurs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 283.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, reimbursement of Government employees for travel expenses incurred during the course of official business, is regarded as just and necessary.

The only question is: Whether the prevailing rates are adequate?

The Government employee representatives all favored the increase provided by the bill before us, H.R. 3279.

It is noteworthy that the Bureau of the Budget, the State Department, and the General Accounting Office, also favor certain sections of this bill.

Six years have passed since travel expense legislation was last amended. It is obvious that legitimate travel and subsistence costs of Government employees while in travel status have increased substantially since 1955 when the current rates were established.

The lack of upward adjustment to realities has meant that Government employees have been forced to supplement official expenses out of their own pockets, or to practice austerity in the form of substandard accommodations and food.

The Bureau of the Budget presented figures showing that in the fall of last year, the average subsistence of Government employees while in travel status was $15.13 per day. As of now, the costs are probably somewhat higher. The General Accounting Office, as a result of its experience, indicated that $16 a day would be required. The maximum of $16 per diem as provided for in this bill raising it from the current $12 is a reasonable increase.

A recent report of the American Automobile Association states that it costs 12 cents per mile to operate a car that is driven 10,000 miles per year.

This supports the recommendation to increase maximum mileage rates for the use of privately owned vehicles, from the current 10-cent allowance to 12 cents per mile.

In 1959, the House took notice of the fact that ceilings set in 1955 were inadequate to meet actual costs, and approved legislation to increase the per diem, the mileage allowance, and to authorize payment of parking fees for privately owned vehicles when on Government business.

The Senate deleted the increases in mileage allowances when it passed the bill in 1960. Congress adjourned before this difference could be reconciled, and the bill died at the end of that session.

Never before was it so urgent for the Government to recruit and retain able people in its service. Private enterprise is doing considerably better than the Government in this respect. One reason is their alert response to the competition for personnel, and their up-to-date provision for compensation and incentives.

It seems to me that we must modernize the Government's travel expense formula before we discourage competent civilians from entering into or staying with employment by the United States.

The prudent increases recommended by H.R. 3279 on well-documented proof of the need for such legislation merit approval by the House.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT], has explained the contents of this rule and the purpose thereof. It makes in order, under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate, the consideration of H.R. 3279, a bill originating in the House Committee on Government Operations, for the purpose of increasing the maximum per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and

for other purposes. It would increase the maximum per diem allowance for employees from $12 a day to $16 a day. Other employees traveling on official business would be authorized to receive as much as $30 a day, providing such a limitation had been granted by the agency head. The allowance for use of personal automobiles on official business will be increased from 10 cents a mile to 12 cents a mile and on motorcycles from 6 cents to 8 cents a mile.

If I recall correctly, there was no opposition to this bill in the Committee on Government Operations. It was reported unanimously. And, there was no opposition in the Committee on Rules to its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3279, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3279, as amended, was reported by the Committee on Government Operations with but one dissenting vote and I am happy to be able to present this bill with nearly unanimous support. This speaks well for the Committee on Government Operations and its long interest in the fair treatment of our Federal employees.

This bill will increase the maximum per diem rates and mileage allowances for Government employees while traveling on official business in accord with the increased costs for subsistence expenses and for driving a car that have occurred since 1955 when the present rates were set.

Specifically, the bill would amend existing law in the following respects:

First. Increase the maximum per diem allowance from its present rate of $12 per day to $16 per day;

Second. Increase to $30 from its present $25 the maximum allowance for official travelers authorized to be paid on an actual expense basis;

Third. Increase to $16 the maximum per diem for intermittent employees such as experts and consultants and persons serving the Government without compensation (w. o. c.'s);

Fourth. Increase to 8 cents per mile the present 6-percent allowance for the use of motorcycles;

Fifth. Increase to 12 cents per mile the present 10-cent allowance for the use of privately owned automobiles on official purposes;

Sixth. Authorize the payment to employees of parking fees incurred while using privately owned vehicles for official purposes;

Seventh. Make the following amendments recommended by the Department of State and concurred in by the Bureau of the Budget: First, transfer to the President authority now vested in the Bureau of the Budget to establish per diem rates outside the continental United States; second, allow reimbursement on an actual expense basis up to $10 in excess of the set per diem rate for employees traveling outside the continental limits of the United States in unusual circumstances; third, preserve the special status of Alaska as a high expense area; fourth, raise per diem of certain State Department Advisory Committees from $10 to the regularly established per diem.

H.R. 3279 is similar in its most important provisions to H.R. 5196 which passed this House in 1959. That bill provided for a $15 maximum per diem and the same mileage rates contained in the present bill. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on the measure for nearly 10 months and returned the bill to the House with amendments near the end of the 86th Congress. A conference could not be arranged to reconcile the views of the two Houses and the bill died as a result.

Since 1959, costs have continued to rise; hence we now recommend the maximum per diem rate, and I emphasize "maximum," of $16 per day instead of the $15 proposed in the last Congress.

Our justification for the increased rates are based primarily on the following information:

First. Every major employee organization recommended the increases contained in the bill. The groups I shall name either testified or presented written statements—all of which are contained in the printed hearings: The American Federation of Government Employees; the Government Employees Council, AFL–CIO; the National Association of Internal Revenue Employees; the National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees, AFL–CIO; the United Federation of Post Office Clerks; the National Society of Federal Engineers, Scientists, and Allied Professionals; Policemen's Association of the District of Columbia; National Customs Service Association; National Association of Post Office and Postal Transportation Service Mail Handlers, Watchmen, Messengers, and Group Leaders; National Association of Post Office and General Services Maintenance Employees; National Federation of Federal Employees; National Association of Postal Supervisors.

Some of the employee testimony was striking in the examples of sacrifices that many of our Federal employees must make to carry out their official travel assignments. One Internal Revenue employee reported he actually lost $12.75 on a 2-day trip to Chicago. You will find this on page 42 of the hearings.

Second. The General Accounting Office favored the $16 per diem based on a survey of its employee travel and in order to meet the costs of subsistence in the higher cost areas.

Third. The Bureau of the Budget advised us that its most recent survey, conducted in the fall of 1960, indicated subsistence costs of about $15.13 per day. Mr. Chairman, we believe this average would certainly justify a maximum of $16 per day. The Bureau, however, recommended that he hold to $15. We did not agree.

Fourth. The personal experiences of our committee members indicated a steady increase in subsistence costs which may be going higher all the time.

Fifth. The Bureau of the Budget presented a chart, printed on page 13 of the hearings, showing its study of the costs of operating a car in 1960 was 11.98 cents per mile. However, it did not approve our increase of the maximum from 10 to 12 cents per mile. This we could not understand. Their own figures justify it.

Sixth. A survey by the American Automobile Association showed that a low-priced car driven 10,000 per year would cost about 12 cents per mile to operate.

All in all, Mr. Chairman, we believe the available evidence fully justifies the increases contained in the bill.

The provisions for the reimbursement of parking fees incurred while on official business was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Many Members may not realize that the Government is not now authorized to reimburse its employees for this expense. On-the-street parking in the vicinity of public buildings has dwindled almost to the vanishing point. As all of us know, the use of parking lots is expensive. This is a legitimate expense and our bill will allow reimbursement.

In 1955, on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, we added to the law a provision authorizing the payment of actual expenses up to $25 per day in unusual cases where the maximum per diem would be much less than the actual expenses. We raised this ceiling to $30 in line with the general increase in costs.

The amendments recommended by the State Department and approved by the Bureau of the Budget are reported with the bill. See State Department report. Although the Bureau has the authority to set per diem rates for travel outside the United States, it has depended upon the State Department for advice on what the rates should be in various countries at various times. Under the bill this responsibility would be transferred to the President, who plans to delegate it to the State Department. The formula devised for reimbursement on an actual expense basis where there are unusual circumstances and the actual expenses of a trip are much more than the per diem rate set, is the maximum per diem plus $10. This formula is based on the years of experience the State Department has had in this field and seems practicable. As noted before, this is expected to be used only infrequently.

Let us remember that the law only establishes a ceiling. The departments and agencies may and do set the appro-

priate rates for per diem and mileage under the ceiling based on their own experiences and requirements for travel in different areas. Some high, some low, some medium, but all under the ceiling.

Furthermore, the cost estimates are averages with some falling above and some below. The committee feels that the ceiling should be realistic enough to take care of cases that may cross the border.

We believe the Travel Expense Act under regulations issued by the Bureau of the Budget has been administered conservatively in the past and see no reason why there should be any abuse under the changes we make.

We only wish to see that the legitimate expenses of Government are borne by the Government and not by its loyal employees.

I hope this bill will be passed by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania on introducing this bill. I also want to compliment the Committee on Government Operations, but I am sure every member of that committee will agree with my observation that it was due to the sound logic and the persuasiveness of the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania that the bill was reported out, and that it is such a favorable bill. The gentlewoman serves the people of her district not only with outstanding ability and vision but with courage. I know the Federal Government employees will forever appreciate what the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania has done not only in connection with this bill but in connection with other legislation, because she is always thinking of trying to improve. Again I congratulate the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Is it not true that the Committee on Government Operations found no evidence of any abuse—that is, substantial abuse in any department under this program?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. In other words, this is a very tightly run program.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. I believe you stated that the per diem rate is a maximum rate, but that the departments, under the authority granted to them, may set the rate at an amount less than the rate fixed in this bill as experience dictates it is possible; is that correct?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. That is correct.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to support the gentlewoman in her interest in this bill, and I join with her in the remarks she has made. She has carefully prepared the case on this in the full committee and, certainly, in her presentation here on the floor today she has been most clear and logical in her analysis. I want to commend her for continuing the fight she has made over the years to take care of these matters which to some may not seem too important, but which in reality are highly essential because they affect vitally the lives of the millions of our Federal employees.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note on page 11 of the report that the Bureau of the Budget says that 10 cents a mile for automobiles is not only adequate but is higher than similar types of allowances made by most private businesses.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. That was their old report. This is a new report from the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. GROSS. This report from the Bureau of the Budget is dated April 10, 1961.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. As I recall the evidence submitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the committee, and I think the gentlewoman is right in her remarks about the matter, their cost figure was 11.98 cents. When they first wrote it out it was as stated in the report, but as I recall the facts show that on the basis of their own system they came up with 11.98 cents, and the committee adopted 12.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. That is correct. I am sorry I misunderstood the question of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. 11.91 was their revised estimate of cost.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. That was the information I wanted to get.

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield.

Mr. TOLL. I want to commend the distinguished gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, my colleague from Philadelphia, for her spendid presentation of this matter. I wish to associate myself with her remarks for I believe she has submitted a reliable approach to the solution of this problem.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield.

Mr. MACK. On page 6 of the report, the statement is made that the rate is increased from 10 cents to 12 cents per mile for the operation of private automobiles. Is it not true that the rate is also increased from 10 cents to 12 cents for the use of private airplanes?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Yes; that is included.

Mr. MACK. Has the committee done any studying or conducted any survey of the cost of operating private airplanes to see whether or not the 12-cent rate is justified?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. No, we have not. We included private planes in the 12-cent rate, but I do not know that there are very many employees who have their own planes to travel in.

Mr. MACK. I believe there are quite a few employees in the Federal Aviation Agency who do own their own planes and use them for Government business. I hope the committee will at same time in the future investigate the cost to see whether or not a higher rate would be justified.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I asked the gentlewoman to yield for the purpose of asking a question: Do these adjustments apply to those in the judiciary as well as those in the executive branch of the Government?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. It applies to all Government employees, and all who come in as temporary employees.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, marshals and Federal court officials?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Not marshals.

Mr. HARRIS. Not marshals?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. No.

Mr. FASCELL. They have a special law.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I first of all commend the gentlewoman and the members of her committee for taking this interest in the obvious need for adjusting these allowances to cover the increased cost of living and other items. However, there is a matter about which I would like to ask a question or two, and that is what is the actual need for transferring to the President the authority now vested in the Bureau of the Budget. This seems to me to be purely a paper transfer for in effect the Bureau of the Budget answers to the President anyway. Just what do we gain by officially transferring this authority to the President?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I think possibly one of the reasons was for people traveling outside the continental United States. The President will delegate this to the State Department. He will make the decision, and the State Department will handle it instead of the Bureau of the Budget. I think that is correct.

Mr. DERWINSKI. One other question. Do we have any statistics about the actual difference in expenses in Alaska as compared to the rest of the Nation?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I really do not know. We do not do a thing about Alaska except to preserve the present status.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Here is the reason I asked the question: It would seem to me it would be incumbent upon some committee of Congress to determine whether or not Alaska will indefinitely receive this special treatment. I was wondering if you have any statistics to back up the allowance traditionally given for service in Alaska or shall we simply bring Alaska into balance with the other 49 States?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. The gentlewoman is correct that the bill preserves its present status. Expenses are higher, as shown by the Bureau of the Budget. We would hope at some time quickly we can do away with that differential, but the facts are as of today we cannot or should not.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. As a further contribution to the understanding of the gentleman, sections 3 and 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 do provide that the Bureau of the Budget in certain situations can prescribe a special travel allowance over and above the $16 a day.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. If need is shown.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If need is shown, and need can be shown in connection with Alaska because the cost of living in Alaska is much higher than in the rest of the Nation.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. The per diem allowances are flat rates, and they can be lower than that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is just another bill calling for additional expenditures of tax dollars.

The increases are specifically set forth on page 3 of the report, as follows:

Specifically, the bill would—

(a) Increase the maximum per diem allowance from its present rate of $12 per day to $16 per day;

(b) Increase to $30 from its present $25 the maximum allowance for official travelers authorized to be paid on an actual expense basis;

(c) Increase to $16 the maximum per diem for intermittent employees and persons serving the Government without compensation;

(d) Increase to 8 cents per mile the present 6-cent allowance for the use of motorcycles;

(e) Increase to 12 cents per mile the present 10-cent allowance for the use of privately owned automobiles on official business;

(f) Authorize the payment to employees of parking fees incurred while using privately owned vehicles for official purposes;

(g) Transfer to the President authority now vested in the Bureau of the Budget to establish per diem rates outside the continental United States;

(h) Allow reimbursement on an actual expense basis up to $10 in excess of the set per diem rate for employees traveling outside the continental limits of the United States in unusual circumstances;

(i) Preserve the special status of Alaska as a high expense area;

(j) Raise per diem of certain State Department advisory committees from $10 to the regularly established per diem.

I have no illusion about the fate of this bill. It undoubtedly will go through without a record vote, with very few if any votes against it.

However, attention is called to the fact that the present situation which confronts us would indicate, to some at least, perhaps to the hardshell reactionaries, if you want to so characterize them, that we should pay some attention to our national financial situation.

Looking through some old files this morning, I found a statement made on July 30, 1932, that I think is still good today:

Revenues must cover expenditures by one means or another. Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse.

Franklin D. Roosevelt made that statement during his first campaign. That advice is still good. No intelligent, interested citizen of voting age does not know that for a long, long time the Congress has been traveling that road. If any proof of that is needed, you will find it in the RECORD where from time to time we have raised the limit on our national debt.

Carrying on the Kennedy spending program of just last week—of course, that is water over the dam—we authorized the Economic Council to increase the salaries, the compensation, of their employees.

On the 25th of last month the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, Walter W. Heller, appeared before the Committee on Government Operations to ask Congress to lift the ceiling on appropriations for salaries of members, officers and employees of the Council. Congress, in its wisdom, had placed a $345,000 ceiling in the Employment Act of 1946.

While the House refused to go along with a "sky is the limit" type of authorization, it agreed, on May 11, to setting a new ceiling of $2 million, which, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] was only about four times as much as the Council would request for fiscal year 1962. As I understand it, this sound compromise was worked out as a "bipartisan venture" between the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. I have been advised that the limitation of $2 million was stricken from the bill by the Senate, so the ceiling is unlimited.

We were told at the time that the Council needed this extra money to continue its growing functions and to assume new responsibilities which the President plans to assign it.

Perhaps we have put our money on the wrong horse. It now appears from an article in the Washington Daily News for May 16, 1961, that the record of economists now helping the President forge his multi-million-dollar welfare state is not too good. In an article entitled "Germans Prospered When They Rejected U.S. Advice," Scripps-Howard Staff Writer Roger Stuart states that the extraordinary prosperity that the West Germans have achieved "resulted from practices which were precisely the reverse" of what a team of American economists, including Prof. Walter Wolfgang Heller, recommended in a report, the contents of which Stuart says the State Department is opposed to disclosing. The reason for the State Department attitude he gives as follows:

First, because it would reveal how poorly advised were the Germans by the team of American economists, since the extraordinary prosperity that has been achieved resulted from practices which were precisely the reverse of what the report advised.

Second, because those who prepared the report include economists now helping to shape the Kennedy administration's multi-billion-dollar program of Federal action and controls.

The Marshall plan team of 1951, whose prophecies were to prove so wrong in the case of West Germany, included Prof. Walter Wolfgang Heller, now serving as chairman of President Kennedy's three-member Council of Economic Advisers.

The gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], chairman of the Special Government Information Subcommittee, whose zeal for the public's right to know has flagged so noticeably since January 20, 1961, may find inspiration in this example of withholding information by the Government.

I read the newspaper article to which reference was just made:

GERMANS PROSPERED WHEN THEY REJECTED U.S. ADVICE

(By Roger Stuart)

A 10-year-old report and analysis of the West German economy is the button in a childish game of concealment now being played by the State Department.

The 446-page document was prepared by a Marshall plan team of U.S. economists in 1951 and was submitted to the German Minister of Finance with recommendations for action.

When the State Department was first asked about the report officials said they could not find their copy. Later they admitted it was in the files, but said it couldn't be released because its classification was uncertain. (It was recently declassified from "secret.") However, information about the advice was readily available from other sources.

Why do State Department officials, despite the report's declassification, oppose disclosure of its contents? The answer apparently is twofold:

First, because it would reveal how poorly advised were the Germans by the team of American economists, since the extraordinary prosperity that has been achieved resulted from practices which were precisely the reverse of what the report advised.

Second, because those who prepared the report include economists now helping to shape the Kennedy administration's multi-billion-dollar program of Federal action and controls.

The Marshall plan team of 1951, whose prophecies were to prove so wrong in the case of West Germany, included Prof. Walter Wolfgang Heller, now serving as Chairman of President Kennedy's three-member Council of Economic Advisers.

Mr. Kennedy made it clear before his inauguration last January that the Council would become a key element within the Presidential Office.

The President-elect said the CEA would deal not only with the state of the economy but with our goals for economic progress. And he was leaving it to the chairman, he said, to find ways and means of providing us with the best possible staff assistance and advice in the major fields of economic and social policy with which the administration will be concerned.

Among other things, Dr. Heller and his 1951 teammates told Dr. Ludwig Erhard and his Finance Ministry that West Germany couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept worrying about inflation.

A certain amount of inflation wouldn't hurt, it was suggested, and the Germans shouldn't confuse wartime inflation with the normal operations of peacetime credit.

Moreover, the newly organized ministry was told that it had an excessive concern for price stability and was overly timid in allowing the creation of new credit.

But Dr. Erhard knew from bitter experience in the catastrophic days following the First World War what terrible things might occur as a result of runaway inflation.

"We shall continue to resist inflation," he declared. And West Germany, to its great good fortune, did.

The report, calling for easy money, said that a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment.

Nevertheless, West Germany maintained its high rate of interest—and watched both personal savings and investments grow.

Rather than grant industry liberal depreciation allowances, a "compulsory investment program" should be put in force, said the American fiscal advisers, adding that "the nostalgic hopes * * * looking toward a revival of the 19th century role of the capital market plays no such role in any modern country and there is no prospect that it will."

Dr. Erhard, who had studied his economics under a professor whose slogan was "free enterprise is the essence," saw to it that West Germany kept its liberal depreciation policy. Industry expanded rapidly, and the country prospered.

By the end of 1951, John J. McCloy, U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, was able to report that already a "transformation" had occurred which "might almost be called a miracle," and he added:

"West Germany has largely reestablished itself as a solid, productive country. Its production has increased from 1947 threefold, until it has become the second largest industrial producing country in Western Europe."

The steady growth and development since then provide one of the brightest pages in the history of free enterprise—anywhere and in any age.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think the record ought to show that the amount for salaries was raised from $345,000 to a limit of $2 million by the House, and the other body took it off completely. Now the sky is the limit.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. Some of the members of the committee went along with that increase. I did not.

Now, why should we pick up the adviser whose advice was rejected by Germany? Germany turned down the methods and the policies suggested by Dr. Heller, practiced the opposite, and the result was a quick recovery and prosperity for Germany. Why should we authorize Dr. Heller, whose advice has been demonstrated to be unsound, to spend any amount that he may wish for employees?

Constituents in my district, should they learn of our action, would say we were "nuts" and certainly we are just giving our own economy a push along the road to bankruptcy.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does he know whether the Heller of whom he speaks is of the firm of Heller & Associates, consultants, that have taken quite a bit of change out of this Government?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, I do not. But that fact, if it be a fact, would be nothing new.

Permit me to go back and say to my dear friends on the majority side, you have had control of the Congress for a long, long time, and so far as I can find, by looking over the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at no time have you failed to increase our spending and our national debt.

Permit me to return to an earlier statement on sound fiscal policy made by your beloved Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Twice in that year, when he was seeking votes, he talked sense, made promises, the first, as was stated, on the 30th day of July 1932, at Albany, N.Y., and again on October 19, following. He advised us that no nation, however rich, could continue, as we have been doing, to spend beyond our income. Here are his words on the latter occasion:

Now, the credit of the family depends chiefly on whether that family is living within its income. And this is so of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If, in some crisis, it lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily on reasonable terms.

But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds, is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending, extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, it is on the road to bankruptcy.

We have been on that bankruptcy road a long, long time and, though we know the end, we go right along spending. We turn over to this Dr. Heller, whose advice is as bad as anything can be and has been so demonstrated, authority to spend unlimited sums for the hiring of employees selected by him, to advise the President what he should do to avoid national financial ruin.

If our constituents ever learn what we have been up to and realize their responsibilities, realize the burden that is being put upon them and those to come after, they will, as they should, kick us out of Congress. Apparently, however, we will go along and prove the truth of the statement made by Ben Franklin who said that "Experience keeps a dear school, but fools will learn in no other."

There is another aspect to the situation which confronts us today. There is reason to believe that President Kennedy won his office because of labor's support; because, as an overall policy, he advocated giving everyone whatever might be desired and because there was a fraudulent counting of the vote in some of the larger cities.

Be that as it may, events subsequent to the inauguration have demonstrated that expert politicians as they are—and we leave out the word "unscrupulous"—this administration is determined to build here in Washington an aggressive, efficient political machine, as it did during the campaign.

Most of us know how executive departments' employees—some of them career employees—have been kicked out or downstairs to make room for Democrats.

In addition the President has, on the civil rights issue, intimated that by Executive order he would make effective policies which, under the Constitution, should be determined by legislation.

It has already become obvious that the Labor Department—the handmaiden of the unions, especially of Reuther, long illegally, through force and violence, accomplishing his objectives—is a power in this administration.

It is obvious that advantages resting in the executive departments will be used to build up the authority of the President to enable him, or those to whom he may delegate the power, to win votes.

We know by what happened in connection with the consideration and enacting of the wage-hour bill that trades were made for votes.

We have the bill increasing the number of Federal judges, a measure held up last year and now enacted to take care of Democrats or judges or lawyers believing in the same political line of thought as do many of the President's advisers.

If you want something concrete to sink your teeth into, listen to section V(a) of this bill, as set forth on page 5 by the committee report:

Section V amends the Travel Expense Act by—

(a) Transferring from the Bureau of the Budget to the President the authority for setting per diem rates for civilian employees traveling outside of the continental United States. It is expected that the President will delegate this authority to the Department of State which already recommends to the Bureau what the rates should be.

Then drop down to subsection (d) of the same paragraph, which reads as follows:

(d) Making the same changes in the Administrative Expenses Act regarding experts and consultants employed intermittently as (a), (b), and (c) above made in the Travel Expense Act with reference to regular civilian employees. Thus, the authority of the Bureau of the Budget to set per diem rates outside of the United States would be transferred to the President.

You note the power given to the President to fix the compensation of some Federal employees, and you note that in the first section of the subsections cited the President is given authority to delegate that power to the Department of State?

Has the record not disclosed enough incompetency—and I am not now referring to Cuba—enough waste, extravagance, and corruption to justify opposition to this transfer?

Just remember, please, that in the days to come, when complaint is made of waste and corruption in connection with foreign aid—and the record of the past is replete with it—that here today we are opening the doors to additional avenues for actions of that nature.

For myself, I want no part in any such procedure, no matter under what guise it may be offered.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill, like most of the others passed this session, will feed the fires of inflation. It will increase the cost of government without a corresponding increase in services rendered. That fact cannot be disputed. It will increase the cost of government without making provision for a corresponding increase in tax revenue.

Multiply the increased allowances by the hundreds of thousands of people eligible for per diem and travel allowances, and one can readily see the magnitude of the proposal.

Present allowances are not munificent but neither do they impose hardship.

Those interested in holding the line against inflation should oppose this bill.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, in view of today's colloquy on the floor of the House and the number of articles printed in yesterday's Appendix of the RECORD, I call attention to the following economic analysis which appeared in the May 13 issue of the Christian Science Monitor. When the dean of American economists, Dr. Arthur F. Burns, points out serious gaps in the reasoning of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, I think there is cause for grave concern. As the article points out, "This use of facts and their resulting interpretation is a disservice to the economics profession. Even more serious, when such an analysis is used as the foundation of national policies it becomes dangerous." I hope all Members of the House will have an opportunity to review this article which refutes the "neostagnationist" theories of the Kennedy economic team.

THE BURNS MEGATON BOMB

(By Nate White)

BOSTON.—Dr. Arthur F. Burns, the dean of American economists, has taken issue with the theories of stagnation which the present official economists of the Kennedy administration have been advancing.

Th words of Dr. Burns ring with a background of factual clarity. Here is a man who has devoted his professional life to finding out what are the ingredients of business cycles, recessions, booms. He has no political ax to grind, and he has no commitments to the Republican Party or any other party to develop a theory of political economics.

Dr. Burns is not a political economist. He is a man dedicated to scientific fact-finding and analysis. He is president of the National Bureau of Economic Research, which is a private, nongovernmental, objective organization for factual analysis of economic movements.

Dr. Burns worked with the bureau's founder, the late Wesley Mitchell, in developing the early series on business cycles. He is the Einstein of the economics profession. He carried this valuable research work much further along, and his writings on the subject are the textbooks used throughout the world as source material on business cycles. His associates, Dr. Solomon Fabricant and Dr. Geoffrey Moore, together with Dr. Burns, constitute a triumvirate of fact and analysis which is grounded on bedrock facts.

Dr. Burns has dropped a megaton bomb. When he calls the economic theories of the Kennedy economic team "neostagnationist," it is time to listen.

He agrees with the thoughts advanced by Dr. Paul A. Samuelson, professor of economics at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who did the early spade work for Mr. Kennedy's economic analysis, Dr. Walter W. Heller, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, the other CEA members, and Labor Secretary Arthur J. Goldberg that unemployment is disturbing, that the lag in the economy is disturbing, but he thoroughly disagrees on the interpretations, either of the causes or the trend.

Furthermore, Dr. Burns finds that the Kennedy group deliberately chose a point of departure for their growth rate which gives, as he see it, an incorrect view of the economy—one of slow growth. If they had chosen a different departure point, the growth rate would be greater.

Washington journalists have accepted the Kennedy economic analysis and as a result a theory has been effectively spread through America and the world that the United States is in a posture of economic stagnation.

To an economic scientist such as Dr. Burns, especially the economic scientist who knows more about business cycles than any other, this use of facts and their resulting interpretation is a disservice to the economics profession. Even more serious, when such an analysis is used as the foundation of national policies it becomes dangerous.

Dr. Burns does not spare the Eisenhower administration, in which he served, the responsibility for its part in the recession now ending. He puts the blame on the sudden change in Federal finances from an annual deficit rate in 1958 of $17 billion to an annual surplus rate of $7 billion—a swing of $24 billion in little more than a year; the Government's restraints on expansion, including Federal Reserve action to raise interest rates; and the steel strike.

These factors stopped an expansion from the 1958 recession, Dr. Burns reasons, but he also argues that they were artificial factors, superimposed by decisions, and were not basic problems with the growth process.

Dr. Burns thinks the "neostagnationists" have wrongly reasoned and have based their conclusions on a too narrow period of time.

In answer to the CEA's conclusion that "we face a stubborn problem of chronic slack, and the road to recovery is a long one," Dr. Burns says, "there is no chronic slack of our economy. * * * Full employment is not a remote possibility. * * * The underlying forces of economic expansion are strong. * * * We would be courting inflation and a gold crisis if we now arranged new governmental spending programs so that they would mature when the economy is already advancing without them."

The issue between the economic schools of thought is thus joined. The Samuelson-Heller-Goldberg school will be heard from without question. They have been challenged by the dean of their profession, and they cannot remain quiet.

What will be even more interesting, however, will be the trend of events. Time is rushing on. The pace of the American economy is proceeding much more rapidly than seemed possible from the January forecasts.

Facts will soon catch up with theory, in other words, and the sooner the better.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the other member of our party, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], 10 minutes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I am still not clear as to this language on page 5 of the report:

> Transferring from the Bureau of the Budget to the President the authority for setting per diem rates for civilian employees traveling outside of the continental United States. It is expected that the President will delegate this authority to the Department of State which already recommends to the Bureau what the rates should be.

Does the Bureau of the Budget transfer to the President, and through him to any other department of Government, the same authority, or is this confined solely to the Department of State?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. This is confined to the Department of State.

Mr. GROSS. For what reason?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. This is for travel outside of continental United States. They are more familiar with travel abroad, the expenses of it and the conditions in various countries.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentlewoman mean that that information is not available to the Bureau of the Budget, the cost of travel outside continental United States?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. They are not as qualified as the State Department in that regard. They are traveling all the time and are very familiar with those conditions.

Mr. GROSS. There is no such delegation of power to any other department of Government, is that correct?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. No, there is not.

Mr. GROSS. This is the only one?

Mrs. GRANAHAN. This may in the end be more economical. You are dealing here with people who really know what the expenses are. And this is just a ceiling; they do not have to spend this much.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly hope the gentlewoman is right; that it will produce a little economy.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 836) is amended by striking out "$12" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16", and by striking out "$25" and inserting in lieu thereof "$30".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 5, change the comma to a period and strike out the remainder of the sentence.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 7: "SEC. 2. Section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) is amended by striking out '$15' and inserting in lieu thereof '$16', and by striking out '$25' and inserting in lieu thereof '$30'."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 9, strike out the comma, insert a period and strike the remainder of the sentence.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 837) is amended by striking out "6 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "8 cents", and by striking out "10 cents" and inserting in lieu thereof "12 cents".

SEC. 4. The second sentence of section 4 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949 (5 U.S.C. 837) is amended by inserting immediately after "the actual cost of" the following: "parking fee,".

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 9, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 3 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 836), is amended—

"(1) by striking out the words 'by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget' which appear before the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof 'by the President or his delegate (who may be the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or any other officer of the Government)' and

"(2) by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following proviso: '*And provided further*, That where due to the unusual circumstances of a travel assignment the maximum per diem allowance would be much less than the amount required to meet the actual and necessary expenses of the trip, the heads of departments and establishments may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to section 7, prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for such expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis not to exceed a maximum amount to be specified in the travel authorization, but in any event not to exceed, for each day in travel status, (1) the amount of $30, within the limits of the continental United States, or (2) the sum of the maximum per diem allowance plus $10, for travel outside such limits'.

"(b) Section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), is amended—

"(1) by striking out the words 'by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget' which appear before the proviso; and

"(2) by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following proviso: '*Provided*, That where due to the unusual circumstances of a travel assignment the maximum per diem allowance would be much less than the amount required to meet the actual and necessary expenses of the trip, the heads of departments and establishments may, in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Director, Bureau of the Budget, pursuant to section 7 of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 840), prescribe conditions under which reimbursement for such expenses may be authorized on an actual expense basis not to exceed a maximum amount to be specified in the travel authorization, but in any event not to exceed, for each day in travel status, (1) the amount of $30, within the limits of the continental United States, or (2) the sum of the maximum per diem allowance plus $10, for travel outside such limits'.

"(c) Section 48 of the Alaska Omnibus Act (73 Stat. 141; 48 U.S.C. note prec. sec. 23) shall not apply with respect to the amendments made by this section.

"SEC. 6. The last proviso of section 3 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 2870), is amended to read as follows: '*Provided, however*, That he may be paid transportation and other expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2)'.

"SEC. 7. Section 5 of the Act of July 30, 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 287q), is amended by striking out 'Under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, the actual transportation expenses of experts attending such conferences shall be borne by the Department of State, and they shall be allowed a per diem of $10 in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, for the period of actual attendance and of necessary travel.' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The Department of State may pay their transportation and other expenses as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2), for the period of actual attendance and of necessary travel.'.

"SEC. 8. Paragraph (6) of section 801 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1471(6)) is amended by striking out 'but he may be paid his actual transportation expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, while away from his home in attendance upon meetings within the United States or in consultation with the Department under instructions.' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'but he may be paid his transportation and other expenses, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended (5 U.S.C. 73b–2).'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 283, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 89) to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I wish to point out to the House that once again a squeeze play is being set up on FHA. This extension of FHA mortgage insurance authority is calculated to carry the FHA only until July. In other words, a new crisis for FHA is being planned deliberately so that further action will be necessary in the immediate future. The new threatened exhaustion of FHA insurance authority will be used as a club on the Congress to facilitate passage of this year's omnibus housing bill because it is in that bill that the new extension will be provided.

There are many things about this year's omnibus housing bill that are bad. The administration bill contains proposals which would undermine the basic soundness of the FHA program.

The bill would expand the already discredited public housing program by approximately 100,000 additional units. Perhaps of even more importance, the bill would vastly expand the authority of local public housing agencies.

Using their unjustified authority to issue tax exempt bonds, these agencies could buy, renovate and sell properties for other than low-income people. This poses a threat to our entire system of private enterprise mortgage financing. These local public agencies would even be given the power to buy raw lands surrounding our cities with no statutory restrictions as to when or how it would be developed.

I think it is safe to predict that when the omnibus housing bill comes before the floor of this House, it will provide for back-door spending exceeding $8 billion.

I might add in passing that a companion measure before the Senate Banking Committee at the present time contains back door spending exceeding $10 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to this resolution granting the FHA an additional $1 billion of mortgage insurance authority because I am informed that without this extension it would be necessary for the FHA to initiate a rationing program on commitments beginning next week.

Such an occurrence would be most unfortunate because it would come right at the real start of this year's building season and right at a time when housing, without any stimulus from any new liberal housing legislation, is rapidly picking up in activity, giving every evidence of a vigorous recovery.

Mr. Speaker, although I give my support to this resolution, I must strenuously object to the subterfuge that is implicit in it.

I deeply deplore these sandbagging tactics that are employed to make the FHA a hostage to unsound housing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate joint resolution?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will reconsider his objection. I am not going to enter into a discussion of the remarks made by the minority leader about "sandbagging" because there is nothing like that at all. This is one of these emergency situations, and this is not the first time that this has arisen. It is vitally important in connection with the construction of houses that there be a continuity of the program. I am informed that on next Monday it would cause quite a disturbance in the construction business in connection with new houses and so forth, and I hope under the circumstances, recognizing the great value of this particular program and the necessity for the passage of this bill, that the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw his objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. HALLECK. Two of our Members on the committee would likewise like to put their statements in the RECORD at this point, and I would hope that that would be permitted.

Mr. McCORMACK. If my colleague wants to make such a request now, I am glad to yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right to object and to make a statement.

Mr. McCORMACK. As our colleague realizes, of course, we have passed that stage of the proceedings and the gentleman can ask permission to extend his remarks, of course, but at this time I am trying to persuade my friend from Michigan to reconsider the objection he made to the present consideration of this legislation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if I may propound a parliamentary inquiry, if the gentleman from Michigan were to withdraw his objection, then I take it other Members could reserve the right to object and make brief statements if they wish to do so.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is correct but I hope that the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw his objection and allow the bill to be taken up for consideration, and then the Members can move to strike out the last word and make their statements.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In view of the fact that the minority leader said that the majority party had us "over a barrel" and was "sandbagging" us and notwithstanding the fact that there are less than 100 Members here, I ask unanimous consent to let them go ahead with the "sandbagging" and withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 217 of the National Housing Act is amended by striking out "$15,000,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$16,000,000,000".

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to give the House a bit of background.

Within the past month, the Housing Administrator and a coterie of assistants who filled half of the committee room, appeared before our Housing Subcommittee and spent a whole day in testifying on the administration's omnibus housing bill. At no time was any indication given by anyone that the mortgage insurance authorization of FHA was in jeopardy. Now, as I have said, that testimony was given only within the past month. I conclude that only one of two things could have possibly have happened; first that the pickup in home mortgage financing has been much more vigorous than was anticipated, or second, that the precarious position of FHA mortgage insuring authority was deliberately being held in reserve to be used as a blackjack on the Congress for speedy enactment of the omnibus housing bill which among other things would provide for an extension of the FHA insuring authorization.

Mr. Speaker, it is just plain wrong to hold the FHA in such a captive status. FHA has a proud record of over a quarter of a century of sound and successful operations. Not alone has it been conducted at no cost to our taxpayers but it has accumulated almost $1 billion of reserves to protect taxpayers in the future against losses which could occur in any severe upset to our economy. FHA has assisted millions of our families in obtaining home ownership. It is one of the most outstanding examples of Government-private cooperation in the best tradition of the free enterprise system. It is wrong that this very fine program be placed on a stop and go basis. The FHA has earned the right to better treatment than that.

Mr. Speaker, Members on our side of the aisle have consistently supported the FHA and I shall not object to this resolution. I think it is important to the American people and to our economy that the FHA not be forced to a rationing of commitments beginning next week as it would have to do if this resolution is not passed. But Mr. Speaker, this procedure is not the way this problem should be handled. Here on this Thursday, we are called upon for action to make it unnecessary for FHA to curtail its activities and begin the rationing of insurance commitments next Monday. We will get far sounder housing legislation when we abandon this procedure of using extension of FHA insurance authority in an omnibus housing bill as a fulcrum to pry out of the Congress other housing proposals of questionable merit.

Let us have the New Frontier show the requisite courage to have each segment of the housing program stand on its own feet. Programs of questionable need and direction should not be forced upon the Congress in order to obtain approval of a continuing FHA program that each year makes such a major contribution to our times.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has been urgently requested by the administration. It will provide the Federal Housing Administration with authority to issue additional mortgage insurance commitments up to a total of $1 billion.

The Housing Agency reports that FHA has come dangerously close to its present limitation. If it should run out, it would create a serious problem for home builders and lenders. Right now, about one-fifth of all new homes built are started under the FHA program and the agency also assists in the financing of many existing homes. Unless this resolution is approved, the FHA will have to sharply curtail its activities within a few days. This means that builders' plans would be held up and economic recovery will suffer a setback.

The general housing bill contains a provision which will take care of FHA's needs for several years to come. However, this bill is still in committee and it is evident that we will not be able to act on it quickly enough to assure adequate authority for FHA. Therefore, the administration has asked for this interim resolution which will carry the Agency until about mid-July. This will give the Congress ample time in which to work on the general housing bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me make it clear that no money is involved in this resolution. It simply authorizes FHA to insure residential mortgages. It is not a budget item. However, it is essential if FHA is to continue uninterrupted operation.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPECIFICATIONS FOR REFRIGERATORS FOR CAPEHART HOUSING

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 15, the Quartermaster Corps of the Department of the Army opened bids on about 15,600 home refrigerators for Capehart housing. Because of unnecessary and unwarranted restrictions written into the specifications for these home refrigerators the cost to the taxpayers on this procurement alone was increased by more than $212,000 and a reputable and responsible manufacturer in a city designated as an area of substantial labor surplus was prohibited from submitting a bid. Previously this manufacturer had supplied the Army with a satisfactory product. Furthermore, the home refrigerator barred from Capehart homes by specifications for the invitation to bid is a highly desirable and efficient refrigerator presently being sold in the retail stores of Washington, D.C., and throughout the country and is of a type which many Members of Congress have in their homes.

The Army took this action deliberately and over vigorous protests by me by restricting the purchase of nearly 16,000 refrigerators to a type of 12-cubic-foot home refrigerator known in the industry as type IV. It specifically refused to accept bids on a 12-cubic-foot home refrigerator known as type III. This deliberate action increased the cost on this one contract by over $212,000 and denied to a substantial labor surplus area an opportunity to bid on a defense procurement. This action runs counter to good public policy and is diametrically opposed to the public pronouncements of the present administration. Here is another example of the wide gulf between words and actions on the New Frontier.

I must point out, too, that the final decision to limit bidding to a type IV refrigerator was not made in the lower echelons at the Pentagon. The final decision was made by top civilian authorities in the Army, by the political appointees of the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a type III refrigerator has one refrigerating unit, one door, and can be quickly, easily, and completely defrosted by merely pressing a button. It is not necessary to remove the ice trays and frozen packaged foods from the freezer during the defrost period as the time to accomplish defrosting varies between 8 and 12 minutes. The user does not have to watch the process as the refrigerator door remains closed during defrosting and refrigeration is resumed automatically after defrosting is completed. I am certain that Members of the House are familiar with this type of refrigerator.

In the Washington Evening Star for May 9, 1961, there appeared a half-page advertisement by a leading city department store on behalf of a type III refrigerator. The advertisement in part reads:

> Presenting—"magic" push-button automatic defrost—total 12-cubic-foot capacity, extra roomy 68.6-pound capacity freezer chest, push-button automatic defrost, convenient waist-high crisper.

The advertisement in the Star by a well-known local department store urged you and me and all residents of the area to "come in tomorrow and see this wonderful convenience-designed refrigerator."

At the same time the Department of the Army, at the highest level, was denying the producer of this refrigerator the opportunity of offering to the Army an identical refrigerator to be used in Capehart housing.

The specifications in the invitation for bids which I am discussing, QM(MGS) 44-193-61-575, issued on March 29, 1961 by the Directorate for Procurement, Military General Supply Agency, limited bidding to a type IV refrigerator.

The type IV machine has one freezing unit, possibly two doors, but while the refrigerator section is automatically defrosted, the freezer section must be defrosted manually. While it is probably true that under normal usage defrosting of the freezer section is necessary only a few times a year, this depends a great deal upon humidity and frequency of door openings. And the defrosting is a long, tedious task which may result in damage to the machine. According to a book of instructions accompanying a type IV refrigerator, the user must complete the following seven steps:

> 1. Turn temperature control to "off" position.
>
> 2. Remove drain plug from floor of freezer. Pour small amount of hot water around plug to melt ice seal quickly.
>
> 3. Place container on top shelf in fresh food section directly under opening to catch freezer defrost water.
>
> 4. Place large pan of hot water in freezer to hasten defrosting. Do not use ice trays since very hot water will remove wax coating from tray surface. Large pieces of ice will be loosened and may be removed by hand.
>
> 5. Sponge excess water from interior of freezer and clean.
>
> 6. Replace drain plug, pour small amount of water around it to seal opening.
>
> 7. Return ice trays and food to freezer, and set temperature control to desired setting.

In addition the user is warned in green type at the bottom of the page:

> Do not use sharp-pointed or sharp-edged instruments during defrosting since it may cause damage to freezer liner. Use a plastic scraper to loosen chunks of ice.

This is a long and difficult method in which the user may be tempted to damage the machine in an effort to speed up the defrosting process. Compare this with the simple task of pushing a button to completely defrost a type III.

Yet the Army rules that only producers of 12-cubic-foot type IV models may submit a bid on over 15,000 units for use in Capehart housing.

Moreover, during 1959 and 1960 the Army purchased over 3,800 type III models from one producer alone and has in no way indicated that these refrigerators were unsatisfactory.

Top officials in the Army have denied the basic principle of open competitive bidding in this instance by refusing to permit inclusion in the specifications of a similar product of equal quality.

By refusing to authorize alternate bids on type III these officials have added over $212,000 to the cost of this procurement of refrigerators. I have conclusive evidence to prove that had the Invitation for Bids allowed type III models to be offered the total bid would be about $212,000 less than that received last Monday on the type IV. This is a substantial amount and indicates to me that the highest civilian authorities in the Department of the Army at least in this specific instance are not concerned with protecting the U.S. Treasury nor the taxpayer who foots the bill.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, by prohibiting consideration of bids on type III models, the Army eliminated from the bidding a manufacturer which would have produced the entire procurement of over 15,000 refrigerators in an area of substantial labor surplus. Because that area is in my congressional district, I am particularly concerned.

I, of course, have no assurance that a bid to be submitted by the manufacturer of a type III refrigerator to be produced in Grand Rapids, Mich., would be the low bid if type III had not been barred from consideration. But I do know that Grand Rapids is presently an area of substantial labor surplus by designation of the Department of Labor. I do know that a type III 12-cubic-foot refrigerator is manufactured in Grand Rapids. I do know that a type IV 12-cubic-foot model is not produced in Grand Rapids or elsewhere by our manufacturer. I do know that Grand Rapids would have submitted a bid on this Invitation to Bid had the specifications called for type III, or for either type III or IV, or partially for III and partially for IV.

I know that had Grand Rapids been able to bid and had it been the successful bidder, this contract would have meant a payroll alone of approximately $500,000 for an area of substantial labor surplus.

Mr. Speaker, the Army at the highest level knew that the restrictions in the specifications would bar Grand Rapids from submitting a bid. They knew about the unemployment rate in Grand Rapids. Frankly, I wish we could see more action from this administration in truly helping the unemployment situation in an area of substantial labor surplus and at the same time save tax dollars. We have heard many promises and innumerable fine speeches but in this case where there was an opportunity for constructive action, the top political leaders in the Department said, "No, Grand Rapids, you may not as much as submit a bid on this contract. We want only type IV refrigerators." This is not the way to help the unemployment situation or save money for the Government.

Mr. Speaker, this whole affair makes a travesty of the policy of open competitive bidding. A product of comparable quality was ruled out by the specifications; the total cost to the Government was increased by about $212,000, and an area with substantial unemployment was denied an opportunity to bid on a defense contract.

I make this statement in the hope that the Army will review any aspects of its procurement policies which lead to the untenable conclusions demonstrated in this particular Invitation for Bids on refrigerators. The interests of the taxpayers, of labor and industry, and of the Government demand stringent adherence to the fundamental principles of open, competitive bidding without a rigging of the rules.

THE ROSELAND KIWANIS CLUB BOOK DRIVE

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last year the Roseland Kiwanis Club of Chicago, Ill., in conjunction with the people-to-people program of the USIA, organized a book drive within the Roseland community of Chicago which met with great success. Through the cooperation of the USIA, these books were sent to various parts of the world as a contribution from the Roseland Kiwanis Club for better understanding and better knowledge of various peoples in their appreciation of progress in the United States. As an active member of the Roseland Kiwanis Club I was proud of the success of this program.

This book drive caught the imagination of many people throughout the Chicago area, and this year a Chicago area people-to-people book drive, in cooperation with the USIA, has developed into a most effective program. Under the cochairmenship of Chief Justice Augustine J. Bowe of the Municipal Court of Chicago, and Mr. Dwight W. Follett, a Chicago publisher and authority on world travel, this metropolitan area drive has reached amazing proportions and it is anticipated that over a half million books will be shipped overseas as a result of this operation. Mr. Ronald Swanson, President of the Roseland Kiwanis Club at the time of its successful book drive, is a member of the Greater Chicago area committee.

My purpose in calling this to your attention is to show how a grassroots program can be effectively developed into a huge operation, displaying the cooperation, spirit, ingenuity, dedication, and noble principles of the American public and American business concerns. Numerous publishing firms are contributing thousands of volumes to this program, various trade unions and business firms are offering material for the proper packing and shipment of these books.

Mr. Speaker, in commending this program I cannot possibly give credit to all the individuals who participated. The U.S. Navy has been most cooperative in providing transportation through the facilities of the Naval Air Arm at Great Lakes to transport the books to the Brooklyn Navy Yard from where they will be dispensed to all corners of the world. This type of cooperation, the hard work of Mr. Ben Stickney of the USIA, resulted in this eminently successful program.

The slogan, "Let's Send a Boatload of Books From Chicago!" is certainly ringing true, as the city whose motto is "I will!" again demonstrates the vitality and energy that is our national trademark, yet which we often take for granted and fail to appreciate.

As a Member of Congress representing a district in the Chicago area, and on behalf of all my colleagues who represent Chicagoland districts, I commend the hard working committee of the Chicago area people-to-people book drive, and take this opportunity to point out to them the tremendous effectiveness of the program, the good will it will create for us in all parts of the world, and most importantly, the example that they have set, which I hope will be followed by many other communities throughout the country.

THE SUDETEN GERMANS

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, before World War II, there were 7 million Czechs and 3.3 million Sudeten Germans living in Bohemia and Moravia Silesia for many centuries, in the frame of old Austria-Hungary and before it, in the frame of the German Empire. In the years 1918–38, they lived together in the Czechoslovak Republic. After World War II, the Communists drove out and forcibly deported the 3.3 million Sudeten Germans from their homeland. Most of these expellees live now in free West Germany, where they have represented a most constructive and democratic element. Their President, Dr. Hans Christoph Seebohm, is one of the cofounders of the German Federal Republic and has been member of the German Federal Government since its very beginning 12 years ago, as only the Chancellor Adenauer and Vice Chancellor Erhard have been.

Being a main part of the 13 million German expellees and refugees coming from the Soviet Zone of Germany and living now in West Germany, the Sudeten Germans are an important factor in the exile anti-Communist work. Their ranks are free of any Communist infiltration and they represent the strongest exile unit from the territory of former Czechoslovakia, a unit with its own political leaders in West German legislative and government bodies, with their own economy and resources. They are striving for cooperation with the Czech and Slovak and all other exiles from former Czechoslovakia and I believe that such a close cooperation would be in the interest of all the enslaved nations and the free peoples and to the disadvantage of world communism only.

The Sudeten Germans have proven their good will toward the other nations since they have started political work in exile. This year, they award the Charles IV-Prize, founded by them to be given to men who have won merits in the field of cooperation of European nations, to the President of the Slovak League of America, Mr. Philip A. Hrobak. The Slovak League of America represents 2 million Americans of Slovak descent. It was the Slovak League which in 1918 founded the first Czechoslovak Republic through the agreement with Czech representative Dr. T. G. Masaryk.

It is encouraging to see the great happenings of the Sudeten German Day and I wish the Sudeten Germans a full success for their day as well as for their future political work.

COMMUNITY SERVICES NEED OF PERSONS WITH LONG-TERM ILLNESSES

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, the Illinois Public Health Association, at its annual meeting Chicago April 15, unanimously adopted a resolution urging that local full-time health departments be given financial assistance in establishing community services for patients with long-term illnesses.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include here the association's resolution:

Whereas there are many areas in the State that have no community services for persons with long-term illnesses;

Whereas the development of community services for patients suffering with the long-term illnesses where none exists is a proper function of local full-time and health departments;

Whereas local full-time health departments need subsidies to employ additional staff before community services to patients with long-term illnesses can be provided; and

Whereas several years are required to develop such services before they can be

supported primarily by the local community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Illinois Public Health Association recommend to the U.S. Public Health Service, the Illinois Representatives and Senators in Congress and the Illinois State Legislature that action be taken to assure that appropriations will be made over a period of years to assist local full-time health departments in establishing needed community services for patients with long-term illnesses.

TIME FOR SOME VITAL AND MAYBE UNPOPULAR DECISIONS

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the record and to include an article by William R. White.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it has become so common to speak of these times in which we live today as times of peril that I often wonder if most of us do not really take to heart the impact of this phrase. Nevertheless recent events in Cuba and in Laos should have underlined more clearly than words can do the seriousness of the forces now at work in our world, and should make us ask whether we are really meeting these challenges as successfully and vigorously as we must do if our way of life is to survive and prosper. Are we really doing our best to shape the course of events, or are we instead quietly acquiescing in a series of seemingly small, unimportant, and more or less popular decisions which could nevertheless have a profoundly unfavorable bearing on our whole future?

In this connection I was very much impressed with an article I read last evening in the Washington Evening Star by the distinguished correspondent William S. White. As Mr. White so eloquently points out, there is more than just a surface parallel between the events of these present days and the tragic events in Britain that led up to Munich and to World War II. In our efforts to promote peace, and to do the easy and popular thing, are we perhaps forgetting the painful and costly lessons of that disastrous period of appeasement? After all, it was Mr. Chamberlain with his umbrella and his hat in hand who was the politically popular figure of the day. And it was Winston Churchill with his incessant demands for action against Hitler who was the bad boy of the back benches. But Chamberlain was wrong then and Churchill was right, and had the British and the French been willing to take just a little bit of action when Hitler moved illegally into the Rhineland in the spring of 1936, for example, we might never have had to fight World War II at all.

The desire for peace, in other words, does not always involve backing down, giving in, or refusing to act.

Mr. Speaker, events so far have been running all too rapidly against us. I sincerely hope we shall not lose sight today of the lessons of that costly appeasement period as we move to meet and solve the admittedly baffling and complex political and military problems of this hour. I hope we shall never forget either the courage of a Winston Churchill, or, for that matter, the courage of one of our own great Presidents, Harry S Truman, who on June 25, 1950 wasted no time in making his vital and absolutely correct decision that against aggression there can never be peace based on indecision, fear, or withdrawal.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article, previously referred to, by Mr. William S. White:

[From the Evening Star, May 17, 1961]

NEW ISOLATIONIST-PACIFIST THREAT—GROUP SEEN PERILING NATION IN DELUSION THAT ALL FORCE, EVEN FOR RIGHT, IS EVIL

(By William S. White)

American foreign policy stands at the most fateful crossroads since the old isolationists and pacifists narrowly failed two decades ago to prevent this country from joining in the resistance to the Nazis and Facists.

This movement honestly believed itself dedicated to "peace" and to America First. But had it had its way America would have finished not first but rather third—the third victim, after Britain and France, of an anti-human force centered in Adolf Hitler.

Now there has arisen to frightening influence a new American isolationism, a new American pacifism, which may well destroy the capacity of the United States to resist the equally antihuman force of international communism.

In one way, indeed, the danger is greater now than then. For the old isolationists, the old pacifists, at least did not deny their isolationism, their pacifism. But the new isolationism will not acknowledge itself for what it is. The new pacifism will not admit, even to itself, that the inevitable end of its reasoning is the surrender of one anti-Communist position after another until there will be at last no place left for the West to turn and stand its ground.

Instead, the neo-isolationists, the neo-pacifists, put the plain meaning of their policies under a bland, superior cloud of self-deluding talky-talk. They do not simply say flatly that we should take no risk in this world—not in Cuba, not in Laos, not anywhere—and let it go at that.

With that kind of candor, the issues could at any rate be met head-on. Rather they argue, for example, simply that Cuba is not really a threat to the United States, in spite of the public alliance with the Soviet bloc publicly proclaimed by Fidel Castro. Cuba is only "peripheral," though Cuba lies 90 miles from the American shoreline and though for the first time in our nationhood an aggressive international power has an undeniable lodgement in this hemisphere.

So it is with Laos. Laos is not really worth any risk, either. We are held to be interfering there in local politics, or something or the other.

Again, the preconditions for fair debate are denied for lack of candor among the new isolationists, the new pacifists. For nearly all those who now declare that Castro offers no great danger to us were in the forefront of those who built up the dictator Castro, with almost hysterical hosannas, in the first place. He is in part their own creation. This truth they cannot admit without admitting their share of responsibility. So what if a truth becomes, to them, no truth at all.

The new isolationists, the new pacifists, have honorable motives. But at the very bottom they are also men caught by a dangerous and shallow myth exploded way back in Hitler's time for all mankind to see. This is the delusion that all force is always evil (and all generals always stupid) even when only force is left to defend right and justice. It is the delusion that only "diplomacy" and "negotiation" are acceptable weapons.

So we fail in Cuba, because we dare not risk direct action and thus the censure of the neo-isolationists, the neo-pacifists, in this and other countries. So our Secretary of State refuses one day to sit down at Geneva with Communist gunmen and next day agrees to sit down with them, under pressure of the neo-pacifists in England, in France and here.

It is easy to laugh aside those who object to these surrenders. It is only necessary to suggest that we are simply naive, excitable men, flag-wavers and warmongers. But just as Hitler tragically fooled the old isolationists and pacifists, Khrushchev is tragically fooling this new lot.

So President Kennedy faces a great imperative of history. He must soon free himself of every shadow of the influence of this new lot, or this country is going down the drain—and so is his administration in the long book of that history.

DEPARTURE OF "THE WASHINGTON GRAYS," WASHINGTON, N.C., 1861

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, at my hometown of Washington, N.C., on Saturday of this week, exercises will be held celebrating Armed Services Day and, particularly, in commemoration of the Civil War Centennial. The departure of the Washington Grays, the first military unit of the Civil War, from Beaufort, N.C., will be reenacted.

Mr. Speaker, I include an article published in the local paper of Washington, N.C., dated 1861, which gives an account of the departure of the first unit organized in Beaufort County, N.C., for service in the War Between the States.

The Washington Grays took their departure on Monday morning in the steamer *Post Boy* for their destination. The occasion was one of unprecedented interest in this town. It being superior court week, many persons from the country were present, and we may compute the number assembled to witness the pageant to have been about 2,500.

The company was called at the beautiful grove of Mr. Jas. R. Grist. The Jeff Davis Rifle Corps, the Southern Guards, the Home Guards, the Citizens Guards, and the Cadets were in attendance, and seemed to vie with the former in performing their evolutions. The Grays were fully equipped, and presented an appearance exceedingly creditable; and it could not but be remarked that the expression of each countenance evinced a determination never to yield or to show their backs to the enemy, if assailed. They will add a luster to the good old town of Washington and County of Beaufort, and make the friends that they have left smile with exultation at their feats of arms if the ruthless foe approach within the reach of their deadly missives.

The peculiar interest given to the scene was the presentation of a beautiful silk flag by Miss Clara B. Hoyt on behalf of the ladies of Washington. Miss Hoyt delivered a very appropriate and elegantly concocted address to the company, and displayed a warmth of manner, a graceful self-possession, a clear and audible enunciation, and a patriotism of feeling which none but a southern lady

knows how to exhibit. The tenor of her address was such as to infuse an amount of ardor and zeal in the company which could never be assuaged, but which animate them to almost superhuman efforts in the day of sanguinary trial. Added to this influence, was the splendid appearance of several lovely ladies who were present, dressed in white, with such insignia as was emblematical of each seceding State.

These are the names of the several ladies of whom we write:

Miss Mittie Hancock, Virginia, Tobacco; Miss Martha Fowle, North Carolina, Pine; Miss Bettie Hoyt, South Carolina, Palmetto Tree; Miss M. A. Gallagher, Georgia, Rice; Miss Jennie McDonald, Alabama, Cotton; Miss Fannie Tredwell, Florida, Magnolia; Miss Julia Stevenson, Louisiana, Sugarcane; Miss Helen Shaw, Texas, Lone Star; Miss Martha Hanks, Tennessee; Miss Mary L. Perry, Arkansas, "Nary One."

Miss Mary Fowle and Miss Mollie Hoyt, flagbearers, badges of red, white, and blue.

Miss Clara B. Hoyt, badge of the Southern Confederacy.

Their brilliant countenances beamed with an expression calculated to thrill the hearts of all who were about to leave at their country's call. Capt. Thomas Sparrow received the flag, and responded in his usually happy manner, and withal in a style which showed at once the gentleman, the Christian, and one who will prove himself the able and efficient commander. The program was concluded with prayer by the Reverend E. Greer, with an earnestness and depth of feeling which will doubtless be heeded at the throne of divine grace.

Many were the eyes suffused with tears, and fervently no doubt did numerous hearts chime in unison with each petition. We cannot but hope that each member of the Company will be fully profited and as they have in their Captain a truly worthy exemplar, their moral conduct need not suffer but rather improve in their encampment.

We cannot refrain a passing notice of the Southern Guards under command of Capt. D. M. Carter. This company consists of 78 strong, stalwart men, who look able to bear the heat and burden of the day, and who manifest that avowed expression of bravery and devotion to the cause they have expoused, that there will be no shrinking in them when danger nears. They will be found equal to the emergency. Captain Carter is bold, fearless, and talented and has quite a commanding appearance, and stentorian voice.

The following shows a list of the Washington Grays:

Officers: Thos. Sparrow, Captain; Wm. Shaw, Jr. 1st lieutenant; A. J. Thomas, 3d lieutenant; J. J. Whitehurst, 2d lieutenant; Benj. Cowell, ensign; J. R. H. Carner, 1st Sergeant; Thos. A. Robbins, 2d Sergeant; J. R. Potts, 3d Sergeant; D. A. Gautier, 4th Sergeant; W. H. Von Eberstein, 5th Sergeant; W. M. Stevenson, First Corp; Harrison Hall, Second Corp; C. M. Mastin, Third Corp; W. W. Cordon, Fourth Corp; John M. McDonald, assistant surgeon.

Men: John E. Ellison, L. E. Satterthwaite, T. H. Ellison, J. B. Hancock, S. Hardenvergh, O. Harvis, T. H. Latham, Jr., Saml. Harrel, J. M. Blount, L. C. Quinn, D. F. Redditt, W. B. Willis, S. G. Schenk, C. H. Doughty, F. Buxtarf, Thos. Harrison, W. W. Pugh, G. W. Richardson, S. L. Grist, W. H. Hanks, W. H. Hancock, J. M. Wallace, J. F. Bond, J. J. Respess, M. McLaughlin, J. O. Wooten, J. M. Davis, Saml. Lanier, Henry Respess, W. J. Pedrick, F. M. Swindell, J. W. Cornell, J. L. Brown, W. W. Latham, C. C. Thomas, W. E. Satterthwaite, Godfrey Ott, Wm. Goffin, W. B. Mooring, Chas. Mohrn, H. J. Reaney, S. Bridgman, D. S. Liddon, J. M. Hawkins, A. Grist, Jr., V. R. Morton, J. C. Mallison, W. B. Myers, Samuel Rogerson, E. B. Shaw, J. R. Whitecar, J. Longman, J. B. Woolard, H. K. Woolard, R. H. Clark, John E. Stallings, W. L. Grimmer, A. Tredwell, N. O. Eborn, W. B. Lilley, W. H. Genkins, J. H. Jonson, J. G. Latham, J. C. Waters, W. H. Patrick, T. H. Satterthwaite, W. H. Harvey, Chas. Mallison, Asa Waters, Erwin Fulford, S. W. Williams, L. J. Lacarbe, Ezra Cornell, Bartemus Warters, J. A. McCullough, Slade R. Stallings, J. S. Whitehead, Chas. Wilson, Wm. H. Parvin, Jos. Pate, Lewis H. Reid, Jas. P. Volliver, R. B. Shaw.

Later service: Most of Grays were captured at Fort Hatteras. Later exchanged and served in North Carolina 10th Regiment at Fort Macon, various places in eastern North Carolina, and finally at Fort Fisher in the two battles at the end of the war.

Some men, of course, were transferred to other units; for example Sergeant Potts, of the Grays served in the Army of Northern Virginia until killed at Spotsylvania Courthouse.

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE A-PLANE

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of April 1961, newspapers across the country carried bold type headlines reading "Atom Plane Offers Little Value," "Too Unwieldy for Use by Military Is View of McNamara." Quoting from just one of these articles that tolled the demise of the manned nuclear aircraft, our Defense Secretary stated "the aircraft involved would have had little or no military value." These statements were made in spite of the fact that the criteria or specifications for the nuclear aircraft set down by the Department of Defense were being met. Therefore, if there were any complaints to be made concerning the value of the nuclear aircraft, they should have been addressed to Mr. McNamara's organization, the Department of Defense, who set down the specifications.

To those who have devoted themselves with great sacrifice to this program, the confusing and contradictory statements of public officials on the nuclear aircraft program have come to signify chaos, cost, and contempt. The chaos is evident in the history of the program itself which has been characterized by indecision on the one hand and faulty decision on the other on the part of the Department of Defense. This inconsistent state of affairs has resulted in a tremendous waste in time, money, and manpower, and has earned only contempt for those who have suffered under the aegis of dilatory Defense Department domination.

The truth of the matter is that manned nuclear aircraft would be militarily useful, in times of peace and in times of war; whether it be a limited or an all-out engagement. Here is a list of potential military applications of manned nuclear aircraft that refute the charge of inutility:

1. Strategic bomber.
2. Air missile launcher.
3. Airborne command post.
4. Reconnaissance aircraft.
5. Early warning and control aircraft.
6. Airborne antimissile and antiaircraft weapons carrier.
7. Antisubmarine warfare aircraft.
8. Cargo or troop carrier.
9. For aerial police force to maintain surveillance over enemy areas pending establishment of radiation tolerance to permit occupation by ground forces.
10. Weather station.
11. Rescue search craft.

Manned nuclear aircraft can do all of these things and more because of their unlimited range, high payload capacity, and the independence and freedom that nuclear propulsion permits in global operations. There are those who say that the missile is master. The more astute recognize the missile's limitations and see the need for the irreplaceable decisionmaking capabilities of men to wage war effectively. The nuclear aircraft would not replace, but would be a necessary supplement to guided missiles. It complements them, therefore, in carrying out tasks that missiles are unable to perform.

Still others say that manned aircraft are or soon will be obsolete, that we don't need "another airplane" because we have missiles. It is interesting to note the Department of Defense has made it quite clear that it is still very much interested in the B–70. Mr. McNamara has stated:

> Meanwhile, we plan to explore the possibility of developing other manned systems better adapted to an operational environment in which both sides have large ICBM forces.

What could satisfy this requirement better than the aircraft right under his very nose: the manned nuclear aircraft that the Department of Defense shot down with a piece of paper and a few well-placed drops of ink? Here is a plane that can fly over enemy territory through nuclear fallout from our nuclear weapons, or from enemy nuclear antiaircraft or antimissile weapons, can give on-the-spot reports of the effectiveness of our attack; and follow up on targets that were missed, mobile, or unexpected.

Some critics of the nuclear aircraft harp on the theme that it is "too heavy and too radioactive." Mr. McNamara has said it is "extremely cumbersome and requires an excessive amount of heavy shielding against radiation hazards." It is heavy, it is true, but no more so than our heaviest military aircraft. It also requires adequate shielding, but even with this weight, the weight of the aircraft does not exceed that of conventionally fueled military jets such as the B–52 and B–70. The overall powerplant weight, including shielding is low enough to meet the aircraft gross weight indicated as satisfactory by the Department of Defense in late 1959. The shielding has not only the merit of retaining radiation from its reactor, but provides the added advantage of protecting the crew and vital instruments that would then be capable of the penetration into radioactive areas we spoke of earlier.

There are those who question not only the adequacy of this shielding for the protection of the crew and cargo, but also the safety of the population and facilities over which it might fly. Under normal operating conditions, a nuclear-propelled aircraft poses no undue problems as far as radiation hazards are concerned. Extensive tests have proven

that the radiation received from large groups of such planes flying several thousand feet above the ground would be negligible. Similar studies have shown that even at the flight base from which the nuclear aircraft take off and then land in operational numbers the radiation levels would be below Atomic Energy Commission tolerance. Even if the same base were used for nuclear engine overhaul and ground runup, radiation levels would be acceptable.

Because of their almost unlimited endurance, nuclear-powered aircraft could operate from coastal bases and patrol the world without the necessity for flying over inhabited areas, except in the accomplishment of its mission. This will practically eliminate the possibility of a crash in an inhabited area.

Among the skeptics are those who say that the nuclear-powered aircraft is "too slow" and is incapable of high-altitude operation. They are wrong on both points, for high-altitude, supersonic nuclear aircraft would definitely follow from the ground and flight testing of the nuclear aircraft powerplant which was ready for fabrication when the program was canceled. This powerplant could meet the performance requirements established by the Department of Defense in late 1959.

The manned nuclear aircraft should not be looked upon as a scientific freak or stunt, as some are prone to do. Rather it should be judged for what it is, the most logical step before us today in the development of aerial transportation. Were the Russians to fly a nuclear aircraft we here would be the last to celebrate the achievement in the same fashion as the world has acclaimed their first man in space. We would know, gentlemen, that the defense of our country, as well as that of free people everywhere, would be seriously affected.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois has proposed a proposition here today which is of extreme importance and one which he has reiterated many times in the past, and that is the importance of nuclear propulsion for aircraft. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois in particular reference to the statement made, as to the reasons for turning down the program at this time. It is my understanding that when it was turned down it was referred to as developing an aircraft which had little or no military potential, which would be subsonic in speed and which would be limited—I believe the altitude was 30,000 feet. My question then goes to the point as to who set up these specifications in the first place, and would these have been overcome through this program?

Mr. PRICE. First let me answer one section of the gentleman's point dealing with military usefulness. I have enumerated in my remarks the many military uses that could be made of nuclear powered aircraft, all of which have been prescribed and stated as requirements for different types of manned aircraft now. The military leaders will say that these are important missions for manned aircraft, and I can think of no airplane more suitable to fill these missions than one that would have unlimited range and endurance.

As for the criteria, the criteria of 35,000 feet and 1,000 hours engine life and so forth, was set by the Defense Department itself, and under that criteria we were in an orderly program geared toward the objective set forth in this criteria. And, I might say in the past year all of these objectives were being gradually met and the program was on a sound basis and gave hope that within the next year or two we would have a plane in the air based on those criteria.

During the past year many milestones were crossed in the nuclear propulsion program.

It was a good year for the program. Then suddenly there were new criteria set up, criteria that the head of the Aircraft Nuclear Propulsion Branch knew nothing about until he was informed of it in a meeting before the Research and Development Committee of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This would indicate that the new criteria must have been rigged—at least in my opinion—to make it more difficult to achieve initial nuclear flight and to provide an excuse for canceling the program.

Mr. DADDARIO. But the point is that the requirements of this plane as originally set out in accordance with the specifications proposed were being adhered to; this was all that they were supposed to achieve in the first instance, and those objectives were achieved?

Mr. PRICE. Definitely. Under this criteria we would within the next 2½ years have had an entirely new airframe flying on nuclear energy, nuclear propulsion. And it would have been a plane that would have been useful, it would have been able to do several missions. But they make quite a bit of to-do about military usefulness. My position is that until we do have the first plane in the air we will never know the full potential of it, militarily or in any other way—the full potential of nuclear propulsion for aircraft.

Mr. DADDARIO. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois and I should like to have his comment on the manner and form in which this program has gone up and down, from the standpoint of the way in which it has been funded. Could the gentleman give us the background of that?

Mr. PRICE. It has been very discouraging and distressing. It has been plagued by indecision through the years. The program is about 13 years old now. Of course, in the early days, it was strictly basic research but in recent years, had greater effort been put into it and had more decisive action been taken with regard to it, we could have had a nuclear-powered plane in flight today.

Mr. DADDARIO. Then we have had a sort of yoyo approach to this from a funding point of view. If it had been a steady approach, you could have achieved in the past the technical accomplishments which have been proven over the last 2 years and could have had a strong and up-to-date program?

Mr. PRICE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DADDARIO. I am concerned, too, with a remark made by the gentleman from Illinois as to the possibility of this type of plane being developed by other countries and I refer to the hearings held in March, at page 1101, when the gentleman asked a question of General White. Referring to the development of this program the gentleman thought it was inevitable that a plane of this kind would eventually be developed. He said:

> It is inevitable that somebody—and I hope it will be this country—will exploit it to the maximum.

I call your attention to the phrase "will exploit it to the maximum." Is any other country exploiting this program to the maximum at this time?

Mr. PRICE. I do not know whether you could say that any other country is exploiting it to the maximum, but in my opinion there is another country exploiting it, working on it. As a matter of fact, I have had that information by word-of-mouth from some leaders in other countries, that they are engaged in a nuclear propulsion program. I have a copy in my office, and have had it in my office for 4 years, of a publication issued by the Soviet Union "Nuclear Engines for Aviation Purposes." We may assume that with that publication having been put out over 4 years ago, they must have had several years of activity in research and development on nuclear aircraft propulsion in order to assemble the material found in that publication. So we can be certain that for a period of at least a half a dozen years another country has been working on nuclear propulsion.

It would not surprise me a bit that instead of waiting to make an announcement of a single flight some day they might surprise us with a flight of a squadron of atomic-powered planes around the world.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. First, I want to compliment the gentleman on his long-standing interest in this aircraft nuclear propulsion program. I have shared with him many hundreds of hours of briefings and hearings which we have had on this subject over the years. I have always believed that his position was a justifiable position, and I certainly approve of it.

I certainly regret very much that it has been deemed necessary by those in charge of the program that we now in effect stop this program. I have been concerned about the matter which the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] has been discussing, and that is the fact that another nation has undoubtedly been working on this particular plan. I had felt that while a great deal of money has been invested in this project, in view of the fact that our technology was progressing as well as it has been we should continue and put

an airplane in flight which would be nuclear propelled, and that it made little difference whether it was supersonic or subsonic.

I had felt that from a propaganda standpoint to allow the Soviet Union to get another first in scientific achievement would be a very bad thing. It would cause us to lose prestige throughout the world. I can imagine in my own mind, certainly, a situation in which the Soviet Union would obtain a nuclear propelled plane and would circumnavigate the globe a number of times, 10 or 15 times, beaming down radio messages to the different nations of the world, and particularly the propaganda effect it would have on the Western nations and also on the neutral or so-called underdeveloped, have-not nations.

I can very easily imagine a message coming down from these planes in which the Soviet Union would extol the great scientific progress of their nation and would admonish the underdeveloped nations that if they wanted to develop into great technological capability they should follow the pattern of industry that the Soviet Union follows rather than that of the industrial processes and governmental processes of the free world. It would make an almost unanswerable propaganda onslaught on the minds of men. This is one of the things I have feared very much.

In conclusion, I hope the time will come when this technology which has been advanced thus far will be authorized to go further. I hope that before there is too much delay the United States can take its place in the forefront of this stage of scientific endeavor as it did in the case of the submarines and other nuclear projects of the kind.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I thank him not only for his statement here but for the support he has given through the years to this project and I pay tribute to him for his knowledge of the importance of this project.

The gentleman expressed his concern over the propaganda value this would have for another nation to have it first. That is something to be concerned about. We should also have greater concern for the military advantage this would give another country. You can picture a squadron of nuclear-powered planes that had unlimited range and unlimited endurance, that could stay in the air for a week at a time, depending on the capabilities of the crew, that could fly around the periphery of our country. What do you think that would do to the defense of this country? We not only have to worry about our northern boundaries, our early warning systems up in that area, but would be concerned about the east and west coast, the northern boundaries and the gulf coast.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois and to commend him for his profound interest and his excellent work in this most vital program.

The cancellation of the aircraft nuclear program is indeed a tremendous disappointment to many of our citizens who are vitally concerned with the security and defense of this country and the general welfare of the Nation. An analysis of the reasons given for the actions of the Defense Department in recommending this cancellation fail to support the decision that has been made and should be challenged. Much antagonism has been directed to this program by those in the Defense Department who feel that the nuclear-propelled aircraft is obsolete as part of our defense effort. This is an untenable position in light of requirements for an airborne alert system, airborne command posts, airborne missile launchers, and long-range reconnaissance. Manned nuclear aircraft, with its capabilities of unlimited range, endurance, and superior payload capacity, could perform without the need for elaborate tankers, forward bases, and a vast and costly array of supporting personnel and supply lines. These capabilities answer the often-stated Department of Defense position that the A-plane has little or no military value.

It is quite evident that such an aircraft would possess a high degree of military usefulness under the most imaginative conditions that would prevail in the world.

The objectives and specifications of the aircraft nuclear propulsion program were set forth by the Department of Defense, and to my knowledge, were being met by those engaged in this vital defense project. The criticisms, if any should have been made, should have been directed to the Defense Department's organization which set forth the criteria.

The history of the program reveals that indecision resulted in a waste of time and money and prevented the program from being further along at this particular time.

Statements have also been made that the achievement of nuclear flight is still very remote and that it would cost at least a billion dollars to achieve first experimental flight. It is my understanding that a proposal has been made to the Defense Department to perform first experimental flight within a few short years and for an amount considerably less than the billion dollars mentioned.

The goal is at hand and its achievement will be the birth of a new and infinitely promising air age, as well as a scientific and technological achievement of great magnitude.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Ohio. I know of his great interest in this project, and I appreciate his support.

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHERER. I want to take this opportunity to compliment both the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Ohio for the splendid efforts they have put forth to keep this nuclear propulsion research and development program in progress. I think those who have opposed them in this have made a serious mistake.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRICE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. The gentleman from Illinois again asked General White in the hearings previously referred to as to his opinion of the military application of such an aircraft and I quote:

> General WHITE. As to a military application, the first thing that occurs to one is the fact that with nuclear propulsion you can have practically unlimited endurance in an aircraft.
>
> That opens up several fields: surveillance of ocean areas and land areas, airborne alert with an aircraft that can fly for days at a time carrying missiles or bombs ready to go in on an instant's notice.
>
> I think it will have commercial application some day.

At that time, when you pressed your points further, it was not a question of cutting this program out altogether but of deciding on carrying out one part of the program or the other—either the direct cycle engine or the indirect cycle engine. I would like to have your opinion as to what the attitude of the House should be in the future insofar as this program is concerned. Should we pursue one feature of this—the direct cycle, or the indirect cycle, or both or none? Do we have today under the program as put forth any propulsion of a nuclear nature for aircraft?

Mr. PRICE. As of today as a result of the decision of the Secretary of Defense we do not have an aircraft nuclear propulsion program.

The gentleman asked what I would recommend. I would recommend to the Congress support of an aircraft nuclear propulsion program and place the guidance of the program in the Atomic Energy Commission with a direct expression from the Congress that we want to develop an aircraft nuclear program to the point of flight test.

I do not believe the membership of the House is qualified to determine what cycle should be followed; therefore, I think we should pursue both cycles until a final determination could be made by experts in the field as to which cycle gave promise of the highest performance.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. PRICE. I yield.

Mr. DADDARIO. I would like to congratulate the gentleman for the position he has taken and for the clear and concise statement he has made here today, which shows beyond any question of doubt the logic behind his remarks and the importance of this country's pursuing this goal to achieve a first in the field of nuclear propulsion for aircraft, not only for the obvious reasons he has set forth as supported by the gentleman from California, but also because it is of extreme importance to the military security of this country that we have such aircraft.

Mr. PRICE. I thank the gentleman from Connecticut. I thank him also for bringing up the reference to my question of General White in the hearings before the Armed Services Committee. I would like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the General White mentioned there is General Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. He not only made that statement but he has made other statements in support of the development of nuclear-powered aircraft.

The statement has been made by those who were responsible for canceling this program that there was no military use for it, that it was not a stated requirement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General White, however, is a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is true, it is not a specific requirement of the Joint Chiefs of Staff because you have a peculiar situation. In the first place you have no atomic plane in being, but it has been set down by the military authorities as a matter of required research and development.

We have had military witnesses before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for several years, gentlemen from both the Navy and the Air Force, who have stated the research requirements for nuclear-powered planes, and they give us many examples of uses for a nuclear-powered plane. In the hearings to which the gentleman has referred, a situation developed of the need for research in the matter of such a plane, the statement being made by high-ranking naval officers that such a plane would have a very definite sphere of usefulness and importance. I would say that a blanket statement to the effect that there is no military use for it or no military requirement for it is not based on sound grounds; it is not supported by the testimony given by military authorities before congressional committees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Hospitals of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, over which I have the honor and privilege of presiding as chairman, has recently completed a week of hearings on the general operations of the Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program.

As most Members know, this is the largest medical system in the world, consisting of 170 hospitals, plus 3 independent domiciliaries. This system, on a given day, hospitalizes in its own facilities 116,000 patients. In addition, 17,000 veterans are cared for in Veterans' Administration domiciliaries. When non-VA facilities are involved approximately 140,000 patients are treated each day.

Some extremely interesting testimony was received by the subcommittee and we were fortunate in having a number of our colleagues appear before us to urge the construction, renovation, and modernization of Veterans' Administration facilities in their individual States.

Our leadoff witness was a member of the subcommittee, the Honorable JAMES A. HALEY of Florida, who spoke in behalf of his bill, H.R. 1772, which seeks to provide for the construction of a 1,000-bed hospital at Bay Pines, Fla. Several of his colleagues from the State of Florida also appeared, including the Honorable D. R. "BILLY" MATTHEWS and the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT. The former urged approval of the construction of a hospital at Gainesville, where the medical school of the University of Florida is located. Mr. BENNETT spoke on behalf of a hospital at Jacksonville, Fla. The Honorable DANTE B. FASCELL stressed the need for 1,000 more beds at Coral Gables, Fla. Congressman CRAMER urged support of his bill, H.R. 3741, for 1,500 additional beds at Bay Pines, Fla. All of these Members stressed the need for an increase in the facilities in the hospitals in Florida and the Veterans' Administration is quite aware of the increase in population there—in fact, a sizeable increase has occurred in both Florida and California. Some relief has been afforded in both States but undoubtedly more will be required.

Our colleagues from the State of Texas, the Honorable JOE M. KILGORE and the Honorable JOHN YOUNG, renewed their plea for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital in south Texas and in this request they were supported by numerous witnesses from that area who appeared before the subcommittee to stress the need for more beds in the area.

The gentlemen from Indiana, the Honorable RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH and the Honorable WINFIELD K. DENTON, both appeared in behalf of proposals which we have pending before the committee—the latter to urge approval of his bill, H.R. 3970, to provide for the construction of a 500-bed Veterans' Administration hospital at Evansville, Ind.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable THOMAS J. LANE, urged approval of his bill, H.R. 694, to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration domiciliary facility in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The gentlewoman from Washington, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, focused attention on the needs of the veterans of the State of Washington, with particular reference to the construction of a new Veterans' Administration hospital at Vancouver.

The gentlemen from Hawaii and Alaska, the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, respectively, presented the unique situation which applies in these two new States where new authority is needed to permit non-service-connected veterans to receive hospital care in contract hospitals as they could prior to these two States assuming statehood. They did not urge the construction of a new hospital in either of these States.

The Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Dr. ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, spoke in favor of his bill, H.R. 214, which seeks to provide for the construction of a 750-bed hospital in Puerto Rico.

Members of the Subcommittee on Hospitals, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable SEYMOUR HALPERN, and the gentleman from Nevada, the Honorable WALTER S. BARING, also urged approval of construction of new facilities in their particular States as did the gentleman from New Jersey, the Honorable WILLIAM T. CAHILL.

The Honorable OTIS PIKE renewed his plea for assistance to the Veterans' Administration hospital at Northport, Long Island, N.Y., where 82 percent of the patients are service connected. Senator JAVITS supported his House colleague on the need at this installation.

Numerous other Members of the House filed statements showing their interest in this field, as did Senators MAGNUSON and NEUBERGER.

Sections 5001–5006, title 38, United States Code—section 5002 specifically—already provide the necessary authority for the construction, modernization, and renovation of Veterans' Administration facilities, but the subcommittee has found in the past that the focusing of our attention on the needs of individual communities is particularly helpful. It is hoped that the Veterans' Administration will be impressed with the need of these individual communities and take the necessary and appropriate action. In order for a project to be approved it must first be recommended by the Veterans' Administration to the Bureau of the Budget and after it has cleared that agency, the President must specifically approve the necessary authorization. Thereafter, funds are requested in the budget and it then goes through the normal appropriation channel.

The subcommittee was fortunate in being able to hear the testimony of Dr. Irvin J. Cohen, Assistant Chief Medical Director for Professional Services of the Veterans' Administration, who related his findings and experience based on a 9-week trip last summer to England and the Continent of Europe to determine what was being done for the aging population. The subcommittee was much impressed with Dr. Cohen's report and is urging him to publish his official findings at the earliest possible date.

The subcommittee also found more than unusually interesting the remarks of Mr. Joseph Pauls, who described the operation and the hopes of the Department of Medicine and Surgery for the utilization of the automatic data processing equipment at Hines, Ill. Members will recognize and recall that there have been many complaints as to the operation of that particular facility, insofar as the processing of compensation and pension checks go. However, we can all be happy that the Veterans' Administration plans to use this facility for research into various dread diseases.

For example, the Veterans' Administration is presently engaged in a cancer-tumor study and the electronic equipment at Hines will make this study much easier to perform and in a briefer period.

A full day of the hearings was allocated to the Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, Dr. William S. Middleton. I am sure I speak the sentiments of the entire subcommittee and the full committee when I say that I think that he is doing an outstanding job.

In addition to the activities of our own committee and the Committee on Appropriations, the Bureau of the Budget has individuals who continually make studies of the operation of the Department of Medicine and Surgery. In addition, there are internal audits, inspections by the area medical officers, and visits from the General Accounting Office. Perhaps, however, one of the most frustrating, and on occasion the most disruptive, forces stems from the so-called efficiency experts who are hired from private management groups. In recent years nearly three-fourths of a million dollars has been spent in this fashion.

The most recent of these is the investigation now being performed at the Bronx, N.Y., Veterans' Administration Hospital. It was authorized in the VA last year. I cannot claim any special knowledge or insight into the operations of such surveys, but I find it rather shocking that an organization which prides itself on management surveys could survey a hospital the size and magnitude of the Bronx Veterans' Administration Hospital—1,243 average daily patient load—for a period of less than a week and then make a flat statement that an astronomical sum could be saved as a result of its survey. I firmly believe in Government economy. It is essential. If the savings estimated could be realized at this one hospital it would be quite an indictment of the top management of the Veterans' Administration.

This study was first brought to the attention of the committee by one of our colleagues from the State of New York. In addition to doubting the ultimate savings which may flow from this investigation, and my guess is that there could be a saving of 3 or 4 percent of the figure cited by the efficiency experts, I question the propriety of allocating $168,000 for such a study. With funds so badly needed to meet the needs of veterans and particularly in view of the fact that this was not included as part of any budget request nor was it the subject of any discussion before the Appropriations Committee in either the House or Senate, I feel I must express my doubts of its propriety. When one considers that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs regularly surveys the operations of the Veterans' Administration hospital system, the most recent example being the publication of a 3,200-page volume; that the Appropriations Committee of the House also makes independent checks; that there is a continuing internal audit; that the General Accounting Office is making spot checks around the country; that the Bureau of the Budget has experts in this field; and that the seven area medical offices are staffed with individuals exceedingly competent in this subject, one cannot help but wonder at the wisdom of employing a private firm with little or no hospital or medical experience. I hope the result will be better than appears likely at the moment. Let us not lose sight of the importance of the care of sick and disabled veterans.

The Subcommittee on Hospitals is always happy to hear the representatives of the major veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS. This year, in addition to these, a representative of the Veterans of World War I testified.

In connection with the testimony of the American Legion, it was indeed heartening to those of us who know him and hold him in such high regard, to see Mr. Warren MacDonald back on the job after a very difficult operation and hospital experience. We certainly wish him well.

The representative of the American Legion brought along with him Dr. Irving B. Brick, their chief medical consultant, who, in addition to serving in this capacity, is associate professor of medicine at Georgetown University, consultant for gastroenterology at the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health and a diplomate of the American Board of Internal Medicine. Dr. Brick, in testifying and commenting upon the vast number of patients which the Veterans' Administration treats said:

> The chemotherapeutic program for tuberculosis with the use of these various drugs, streptomycin, and isoniozid, that has practically emptied many of the TB hospitals, is the greatest feat in this line which was accomplished by the Veterans' Administration not only because they have the setup but because they have the patients to do these studies on in a controlled fashion. This alone, I think, has more than paid for all the appropriations to the Veterans' Administration for the last 10 years, and it is of value not only to the Veterans' Administration but to the whole country because the advantages from this type of therapy have redounded to the benefit of every citizen in this country who has TB and those who potentially may have TB.

This is indeed heartening to hear and equally so is that portion of the final report, "Action for Mental Health" of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, which was cited by the American Legion's national rehabilitation director, Mr. John J. Corcoran:

> Thanks to Federal appropriations, the VA mental hospitals have been able to spend an average of $12 a day per patient, compared to an average of about $4 a day per patient in State hospitals. With this amount of money, as we have seen, the VA mental hospitals have been able to employ twice as many persons per patient, have been able to introduce innovations more frequently in the therapeutic environment, and have been able to undertake more training and research programs. Their more fortunate financial position has enabled them to explore and develop types of treatment and hospital ward management not so freighted with custodial restrictions or so dependent on the scarce phychiatrist as are the traditional patterns of State hospital staffing.

These statements, Mr. Speaker, are eloquent testimony to what the Veterans' Administration is doing in the field of medical care for our veterans.

Through the influence and hard work of the chairman of the full committee, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, and with the support of all members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 2 years ago the President announced a $900 million program for the modernization and renovation of Veterans' Administration hospitals. This is based on a $75 million increment each year. This was a great step forward and the benefits will be more apparent with each passing day.

Equally important in this connection is providing adequate repair and maintenance funds and here again the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been continually urging, and I am glad to say with considerable success, the granting of sufficient funds for these purposes. With a plant which has a value in excess of $2¼ billion it is simply a matter of good business to keep it in top operating condition.

The subcommittee was advised by Veterans' Administration witnesses that while the bed ceiling is 125,000, at the present time it is operating only 120,500 beds. We hope that this figure may be increased in the immediate future and particularly do we feel that approximately 2,000 vacant beds, which the committee found, could and should be staffed and utilized as soon as possible. Of this 2,000 figure, 614 were found by a recent survey of the committee to be suitable for staffing and immediate reactivation with comparatively small cost, both for physical reactivation and for maintenance of the patients.

The Veterans' Administration shortly plans to undertake some pioneering work at a so-called restoration center to be established in connection with the hospital at Hines, Ill. It will give special attention to the more aged and infirm veterans who still need considerable care. Some experiments along this line also are to be undertaken in Cleveland. The committee is heartily in favor of such a program since it means more and better care for our veterans. We hope that the experiment will be utilized to enlarge the program as the facts warrant.

In the above connection it should be mentioned that House Joint Resolution 73, recently reported by the committee and which we soon hope to have enacted into law, authorizes and directs the Veterans' Administration to make a special study of the needs of our aging veterans. This will provide opportunity to gain experience in new and different types of care with a view to providing better care for this group and also perhaps to keep them in their own homes or at least in their own surroundings for a longer period of time.

We have also brought to the attention of the Veterans' Administration the so-called circular hospitals. One of the members of the subcommittee visited such a hospital in southern California last fall and there are several such hospitals being constructed throughout the United States. The most recent one is underway in St. Paul. The Subcommittee on Hospitals does not consider itself an expert in matters of construction but it does believe that anything which is alleged to save 34 percent of the walking which a nurse has to do in a hospital is worthy of careful and considerable investigation.

Unfortunately, the Veterans' Administration has not shown novel leadership and initiative in new concepts of hospital construction. We hope that our interest in this activity will focus attention and serve to stimulate the Veterans' Administration in this field. The same may be said of our inquiry concerning plastic walls—realizing, of course, that all Veterans' Administration hospitals must or should be fireproof. However, in view of the rapidly changing concepts in medical and hospital care, careful consideration might be given to providing less than permanent construction so that these new concepts could be readily adapted for immediate use and better care of patients.

I was encouraged, too, by the testimony of the American Legion representative who suggested once again that we consider the construction of convalescent cottages or homes in or near Veterans' Administration hospitals to perhaps take care of some patients who are not in need of full medical treatment. In this connection we should consider House Joint Resolution 86, which seeks to provide, on a pilot project basis, loans and grants to veterans organizations for the construction and maintenance of installations of this type. It was most encouraging to hear from the representative of AMVETS that his organization would be willing to participate in such a program.

I have introduced two bills which seek to increase the pay of the professional men and women in the Department of Medicine and Surgery. One of the bills is based on an average of the recommendations by the managers of the 170 hospitals in the Veterans' Administration medical system. The other bill was based on the recommendations of the seven area medical directors. The gentleman from Tennessee, the Honorable ROBERT A. EVERETT, is also sponsoring legislation, H.R. 1766, which seeks to give the Chief Medical Director discretionary authority to pay higher salaries for professional personnel in certain remote stations which are having difficulty maintaining an adequate supply of doctors.

The committee has reported and the House has passed H.R. 858 which provides for the payment of slightly higher salaries to managers and directors of professional services in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This was done largely in recognition that it is good and valid management principle. I cite all of the above to indicate the interest which this committee has in the general subject of pay, recruitment, and retention of medical personnel for the Veterans' Administration. The chairman of the full committee is vitally interested in this subject.

We hope to be able to do something constructive in this field, and related to this is the question of whether or not greater utilization should be made of laymen in the management of hospitals. As an example, of the 21 hospitals in the Metropolitan Washington area only 3 are managed by doctors. The Veterans' Administration presently has 50 lay managers as distinguished from medical personnel. In view of the medical shortage which seems to grow rather than decrease, I feel that the Veterans' Administration should give considerable consideration to fully utilizing services of adequately trained laymen for these positions while making it possible for doctors of medicine to practice their own specialty and perform the services for which they are primarily trained. I hope to see an increase in the number of laymen who are managers.

Reference was also made during the course of the subcommittee hearings to Public Law 86-639, which was sponsored by the chairman of the full committee, and is ordinarily referred to as the "pre" and "post" hospital care program. This law permits non-service-connected veterans, who are scheduled for admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital, to receive prehospital care, tests, X-rays, and so forth, prior to admission and then posthospital care in the form of outpatient treatment, medication, and so forth, after discharge from the hospital. The net result, it is hoped, will be an increase in the turnover rate in Veterans' Administration hospitals, thus making it possible for the existing system to treat an increasing number of patients. The program has not been in effect long enough to permit a comprehensive evaluation, but the results thus far have been exceedingly encouraging.

When a veteran is admitted to a Veterans' Administration hospital for a non-service-connected, nonemergent condition, he is required to file an addendum to the application for admission, which, in effect, is a statement of his net worth. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has looked into this question on a number of occasions, the most recent being the study performed in the fall of last year. The result of this study was the publishing of the findings as a part of the 3,200-page hospital volume, which I have previously mentioned. Insofar as this question is concerned, the table showing the exact results are found on pages 1916A-1916D of this study. Questions were put by Members to the Veterans' Administration during their testimony before the subcommittee concerning the desirability and possibility of establishing priority admission procedures for veterans who are in this category. In effect this would mean that veterans who have greater income and resources than others who are waiting for admission would have to step aside until the most needy veterans have been treated. The Veterans' Administration is studying this question, and the committee expects to continue its interest in this field. This proposal was first suggested by a representative of the Veterans' Administration about 8 years ago.

As Members will readily note, this series of hearings was extremely interesting, and I believe can be productive of much good. At least it is the intent and hope of our subcommittee that such will be the case. We shall have to continue to work hard for this program, because with a system of this magnitude, continual study and support is absolutely essential. I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point the latest information on the Veterans' Administration hospital construction program and the number of beds by State per 1,000 veterans.

Veterans' Administration hospital construction program—Schedule of projects [1] not under construction as of Dec. 31, 1960

Program and location	Description	Total estimated cost	Fiscal year construction scheduled to start
New and replacement hospitals:		*Thousands*	
Atlanta, Ga.	580-bed GM&S hospital	$14,530	1963
Bay Pines, Fla.	866-bed GM&S hospital	18,284	1963
Charleston, S.C.	500-bed GM&S hospital	12,300	1962
Cleveland, Ohio	800-bed GM&S hospital	23,315	1961
Downey, Ill.	Replacement program, phase II	9,558	1963
Memphis, Tenn.	1,000-bed GM&S hospital	24,270	1964
Miami, Fla.	600-bed GM&S hospital	23,832	1963
Long Beach, Calif.	Medical buildings 1, 2, 7, and 8 (phase II)	1,035	1962
Los Angeles, Calif.	960-bed GM&S hospital	25,000	1964
Washington, D.C.	700-bed GM&S hospital	23,412	1961
Wood, Wis.	1,250-bed GM&S hospital (phase I)	28,162	1962

See footnote at end of table.

Veterans' Administration hospital construction program—Schedule of projects [1] not under construction as of Dec. 31, 1960—Continued

Program and location	Description	Total estimated cost	Fiscal year construction scheduled to start
		Thousands	
Modernization projects prior to 1961 program:			
Biloxi (Gulfport), Miss	Modernization building 1; addition to building 117 for PMR	$1,249	1961
Bronx, N.Y	Additions and alterations for research laboratory	305	1962
Do	do	264	1962
Chillicothe, Ohio	Modernize steam distribution, additions and alterations to laundry	1,561	1961
Dayton, Ohio	New electric plant, connecting corridors, replace elevators	2,475	1961
Fort Harrison, Mont	Modernization phase I, hospital building, alterations to dining hall and kitchen	5,400	1961
Kecoughtan, Va	Modernization program, phase II	3,277	1961
Lake City, Fla	Alterations, building 38	842	1961
Lebanon, Pa	Alterations, buildings 2 and 17 for dining facilities	874	1961
Muskogee, Okla	Additions and improvements to dining hall and kitchen, building 24	305	1962
Oteen, N.C	Additions and alterations, phase I	2,800	1962
Perry Point, Md	Alterations and additions to GMS building, sewage disposal	1,872	1961
Do	Rehabilitate 12 buildings	1,700	1962
Tucson, Ariz	Alterations and additions to buildings 1, 3, 4, and 30	1,204	1962
1961 modernization program:			
Battle Creek, Mich	Alterations to recreation building; close and heat corridor	332	1962
Coatesville, Pa	Addition to laundry, garage, cafe service building	568	1962
Danville, Ill	Modernization program, phase III	4,134	1962
Des Moines, Iowa	Alterations to buildings 1, 2, 3, and 4; replace electric distribution	2,943	1962
Indianapolis, Ind	Regional office and hospital clinic consolidation	870	1962
Knoxville, Iowa	Chapel	331	1962
Lincoln, Nebr	Modernization program, phase II	3,540	1962
Los Angeles, Calif	Special activities building 165, chapel and NP building	4,649	1962
Montrose, N.Y	Automatic sprinklers, 17 buildings	313	1961
New Orleans, La	Regional office and hospital clinic consolidation and bed addition	2,545	1962
Palo Alto, Calif	Modernization of buildings 101 through 105; 110, 137, 205	4,793	1962
Philadelphia, Pa	Air conditioning for clinical laboratory, CSS and general laboratory	459	1962
San Francisco, Calif	New clinical building and regional office consolidation	6,815	1962
Seattle, Wash	Animal research laboratory	341	1962
Sepulveda, Calif	Alterations for research and animal laboratories	325	1962
Tuskegee, Ala	Modernize buildings 68 and 69	2,141	1962
1962 modernization program:			
Fort Harrison, Mont	Alterations building 141	870	1963
Lake City, Fla	Alterations building 62; roads, walks and parking	599	1963
Togus, Maine	Replace existing boiler plant	585	1963
White River Junction, Vt	Alterations and additions to buildings	2,195	1963
Other improvements projects prior to 1961 program:			
Albany, N.Y	Isolate trans, oper. suite, building 1	51	1961
Do	Emergency generator	143	1961
Ann Arbor, Mich	Storm sewer and grading	59	1961
Bath, N.Y	Alterations to buildings 31, 76, and 92	100	1962
Bay Pines, Fla	Conversion for 250 additional beds	250	1962
Boston, Mass	Additions and alterations for research laboratory	200	1962
Chicago, Ill. (W.S.)	Alterations to NP unit; conversion of isolation ward	33	1961
Do	X-Ray for surgery	37	1961
Coral Gables, Fla	Expand research facilities	36	1961
Denver, Colo	Research laboratory	270	1961
East Orange, N.J	Alterations for cancer research	42	1961
Hines, Ill	Maintenance of spinal cord injury wards	136	1961
Indianapolis, Ind. (GM)	Research laboratory	300	1961
Kansas City, Mo	Recovery suits	45	1962
Lake City, Fla	Fire stairs and smoke barriers, building 62	35	1961
Lexington, Ky	Conversion, 100 beds, NP to GM	172	1962
Lincoln, Nebr	Fire escape from 2d floor, building 2	41	1961
Los Angeles, Calif	Animal laboratory	428	1961
Minneapolis, Minn	Additions and alterations for research laboratory	175	1962
New York, N.Y	Modify air conditioning in operating suite	43	1961
Do	Animal laboratory	190	1961
Northport, N.Y	Clinical alterations	250	1962
Oklahoma City, Okla	Research facilities	30	1961
Omaha, Nebr	Alterations to radioisotope laboratory	42	1961
Richmond, Va	Alterations for spinal cord injury wards	79	1962
Salt Lake City, Utah	Animal laboratory	73	1961
San Francisco, Calif	Exit stairs, buildings 1, 4, 5, 8, and 12	67	1961
San Juan, P.R	Air conditioning for operating suite, building 203	69	1961
Shreveport, La	Alterations for deep therapy room	79	1961
Sunmount, N.Y	New sewage treatment plant	271	1962
Wadsworth (E.S.), Kans	Alterations to boiler plant	216	1961
Wadsworth, Kans	Sewer connection	196	1962
Washington, D.C	Alterations, building 6, for research facility	39	1961
Wichita, Kans	Surgical recovery suite	96	1961
1961 other improvements program:			
Augusta, Ga	Emergency repairs, main dining hall and kitchen, building 10	100	1961
Birmingham, Ala	Air-condition X-ray, general and research laboratories	70	1961
Butler, Pa	Automatic sprinklers, area of building 3	134	1961
Chillicothe, Ohio	Chapel	300	1962
Fort Lyon, Colo	do	224	1963
Kansas City, Mo	Animal research laboratory	277	1961
Lebanon, Pa	Chapel	243	1962
Do	Alterations to building 19 for 28-bed ward	80	1961
Little Rock, Ark	Animal research laboratory	243	1961
Livermore, Calif	Additional exit, building 2	31	1961
Madison, Wis	Animal research laboratory	282	1961
Muskogee, Okla	Remodel CSS unit	95	1961
North Little Rock, Ark	Chapel	298	1962
Perry Point, Md	60 fire doors and smoke barriers	43	1961
Philadelphia, Pa	Enlarge air-conditioned operating suite	80	1962
Phoenix, Ariz	Central oxygen system	97	1961
Pittsburgh, Pa	Improvements to allergy clinic	100	1961
Salt Lake City, Utah	Manual arts, therapy shop	123	1961
San Fernando, Calif	Connection to Los Angeles sewer system	188	1961
St. Cloud, Minn	Chapel	260	1962
Togus, Maine	New elevator, P&N building 207	35	1961
Do	Replace fire alarm system	31	1961
Tuscaloosa, Ala	Chapel	232	1962
Waco, Tex	Outpatient clinic, VARO	80	1961
Do	New chapel	283	1962
Wadsworth, Kans	Additional exit for surgery, building 91	42	1961
1962 other improvements program:			
Albany, N.Y	Animal laboratory	246	1963
Ann Arbor, Mich	Alteration to X-ray and electronic outlets	285	1953
Baltimore, Md	Automatic elevator controls	53	1962
Birmingham, Ala	Enclose roof exercise area	59	1963
Brecksville, Ohio	Convalescent ward to special services activities	295	1962
Buffalo, N.Y	Storm sash	124	1963

See footnote at end of table.

Veterans' Administration hospital construction program—Schedule of projects [1] not under construction as of Dec. 31, 1960—Continued

Program and location	Description	Total estimated cost	Fiscal year construction scheduled to start
		Thousands	
Butler, Pa	Remodel laboratory, building 1	$181	1963
Canandaigua, N.Y	Sprinklers, buildings 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 33, 34, 36	35	1962
Do	Air-condition operating suite	71	1962
Chicago, Ill. (W.S.)	Enclose roof exercise area	54	1963
Cincinnati Ohio	Air-condition laboratory, CSS and X-ray	147	1963
Dallas, Tex	X-ray facilities, building 2; audio clinic, building 1	575	1963
Denver, Colo	Electric outlets, X-ray operating rooms	42	1962
Erie, Pa	Automatic elevator controls	47	1962
Hot Springs, S. Dak	Air conditioning for operating suite	77	1962
Indianapolis, Ind	Remodel nurses stations, building 3	27	1962
Iron Mountain, Mich	Automatic elevator controls	55	1962
Louisville, Ky	Addition building 19 (radioisotope)	219	1963
Lyons, N.J	Sprinklers, 11 buildings	34	1962
Northport, N.Y	Fire sprinklers, miscellaneous areas of buildings	28	1962
Omaha, Nebr	Enclose roof exercise area	59	1962
Pittsburgh, Pa. (GM)	Animal research laboratory	196	1963
Providence, R.I	Addition for recovery suite	149	1963
Salt Lake City, Utah	Enclose walkway	84	1963
Seattle, Wash	Automatic elevator controls	118	1963
Syracuse, N.Y	Regional office and hospital clinic consolidation	694	1962
Wilmington, Del	Automatic elevator controls	111	1963

[1] Includes only those projects costing in excess of $25,000 each for which a portion or all of the funds have been appropriated or are being requested in the fiscal year 1962 budget.

The table below relates beds in VA hospitals to the veterans population of each State. It does not represent the ratio of the number of veterans hospitalized in each State to the veteran population of the State. Eligible veterans are hospitalized in VA hospitals without regard to State boundaries.

Beds in VA hospitals by State per 1,000 veterans as of Dec. 31, 1960

Hospital by State	Veteran population (thousands)	Total bed capacity		Operating beds							
				Total [1]		Psychiatric		Tuberculosis		Medical, surgical, and neurological	
		Number	Per 1,000 veterans	Number	Per 1,000 veterans	Number	Per 1,000 veterans	Number	Per 1,000 veterans	Number	Per 1,000 veterans
Total	[2] 22,325	[3] 122,000	5.5	120,126	5.4	[3] 58,666	2.6	9,257	0.4	[3] 52,203	2.3
Alabama	356	3,640	10.2	3,640	10.2	2,199	6.2	162	.5	1,279	3.6
Alaska	14										
Arizona	145	919	6.3	914	6.3	37	.3	241	1.7	636	4.4
Arkansas	195	2,787	14.3	2,787	14.3	1,938	9.9	40	.2	809	4.1
California	2,018	10,808	5.4	10,262	5.1	4,542	2.3	1,120	.6	4,600	2.3
Colorado	222	1,361	6.1	1,361	6.1	767	3.5	25	.1	569	2.6
Connecticut	322	1,127	3.5	1,089	3.4	183	.6	186	.6	720	2.2
Delaware	52	300	5.8	300	5.8	36	.7			264	5.1
District of Columbia	130	335	2.6	335	2.6	18	.1			317	2.4
Florida	559	1,320	2.4	1,320	2.4	125	.2	64	.1	1,131	2.0
Georgia	409	2,544	6.2	2,544	6.2	1,275	3.1	221	.5	1,048	2.6
Hawaii	63										
Idaho	78	207	2.7	205	2.6					205	2.6
Illinois	1,329	7,726	5.8	7,726	5.8	4,049	3.0	625	.5	3,052	2.3
Indiana	583	2,577	4.4	2,548	4.4	1,752	3.0	185	.3	611	1.0
Iowa	336	2,385	7.1	2,376	7.1	1,590	4.7	40	.1	746	2.2
Kansas	263	2,099	8.0	2,099	8.0	1,078	4.1	79	.3	942	3.6
Kentucky	360	2,108	5.9	2,017	5.6	1,239	3.4	138	.4	640	1.8
Louisiana	334	1,447	4.3	1,427	4.3	62	.2	145	.4	1,220	3.7
Maine	124	869	7.0	869	7.0	564	4.5			305	2.5
Maryland	370	2,383	6.4	2,292	6.2	1,484	4.0	250	.7	558	1.5
Massachusetts	703	5,493	7.8	5,493	7.8	3,744	5.3	401	.6	1,348	1.9
Michigan	1,007	3,941	3.9	3,917	3.9	2,064	2.0	240	.2	1,613	1.6
Minnesota	440	2,393	5.4	2,360	5.4	1,481	3.4	99	.2	780	1.8
Mississippi	215	1,678	7.8	1,678	7.8	957	4.5	72	.3	649	3.0
Missouri	565	2,221	3.9	2,127	3.8	725	1.3	328	.6	1,074	1.9
Montana	85	261	3.1	261	3.1					261	3.1
Nebraska	176	967	5.5	937	5.3	110	.6	40	.2	787	4.5
Nevada	36	166	4.6	166	4.6					166	4.6
New Hampshire	87	150	1.7	137	1.6					137	1.6
New Jersey	813	2,959	3.6	2,959	3.6	2,045	2.5	160	.2	754	.9
New Mexico	101	715	7.1	715	7.1	8	.1	146	1.4	561	5.6
New York	2,144	13,616	6.4	13,212	6.2	6,892	3.2	989	.5	5,331	2.5
North Carolina	490	2,702	5.5	2,702	5.5	1,118	2.3	440	.9	1,144	2.3
North Dakota	72	228	3.2	228	3.2					228	3.2
Ohio	1,217	4,504	3.7	4,479	3.7	2,152	1.8	458	.4	1,869	1.5
Oklahoma	303	878	2.9	878	2.9	74	.2	44	.1	760	2.5
Oregon	254	1,224	4.8	1,196	4.7	670	2.6	116	.5	410	1.6
Pennsylvania	1,574	6,707	4.3	6,650	4.2	3,304	2.1	543	.3	2,803	1.8
Puerto Rico	114	200	1.8	200	1.8	10	.1			190	1.7
Rhode Island	129	393	3.0	393	3.0	39	.3	43	.3	311	2.4
South Carolina	243	600	2.5	600	2.5	42	.2			558	2.3
South Dakota	95	1,245	14.6	1,245	14.6	671	7.9	2	(4)	572	6.7
Tennessee	418	3,648	8.7	3,641	8.7	1,429	3.4	303	.7	1,909	4.6
Texas	1,150	6,410	5.6	6,116	5.3	2,607	2.3	557	.5	2,952	2.6
Utah	107	710	6.6	710	6.6	401	3.7	26	.2	283	2.6
Vermont	47	188	4.0	188	4.0	12	.3	2	(4)	174	3.7
Virginia	459	3,616	7.9	3,616	7.9	2,098	4.6	200	.4	1,318	2.9
Washington	365	2,305	6.3	2,271	6.2	1,057	2.9	102	.3	1,112	3.9
West Virginia	264	1,416	5.4	1,416	5.4	24	.1	251	1.0	1,141	4.3
Wisconsin	475	2,884	6.1	2,884	6.1	1,298	2.7	174	.4	1,412	3.0
Wyoming	38	840	22.1	840	22.1	706	18.6			134	3.5

[1] Operating beds by type per 1,000 veterans may not equal total due to rounding.
[2] Excludes veteran population in territories and possessions.
[3] Excludes bed capacity at VAH, San Juan, P.R.
[4] Less than 0.05.

Source: Controller, Department of Medicine and Surgery, Management, Reporting Service, Veterans' Administration, Feb. 28, 1961.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2 ON THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION SHOULD BE DISAPPROVED

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 27 of this year, the President sent down to the Congress a special message on reorganization of the Federal Communications Commission.

Today and tomorrow, the House Committee on Government Operations is having hearings on this plan. For 2 days this week, the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce heard the members of the Federal Communications Commission in testimony with reference to the plan. For a good many days before that, it had been known generally that the Commission itself was opposed to the plan by a 5-to-2 vote. Members who were representatives of both parties—Democrat and Republican—on the Commission disapproved the plan and believed that it was not an effective way to carry out some of the needed flexibility in the Commission.

I have had so many inquiries from Members of Congress relative to the plan that I have decided to take this hour today on the floor to give what I believe are the fundamental reasons why this plan should be disapproved by the House. I hope what I have to say will answer the many questions that have been put to me and will clarify in the minds of the Members the succinct points with reference to this plan.

The Federal Communications Commission was created to perform certain regulatory and licensing functions with respect to the use of radio and television and to exercise policymaking authority which we here in the Congress delegated to the Federal Communications Commission as an independent agency of Government.

That same Congress decided to establish this as a nonpartisan independent commission. It is just as important today as it was then that this Commission be free from politics or from Executive pressures.

The plan as sent down by the President would concentrate unprecedented power in the Chairman. The Chairman himself has indicated that he would ask that there be a transfer of certain functions to the Chairman. For this purpose, I quote from section II of the Reorganization Plan:

> There are hereby transferred from the Commission to the Chairman of the Commission the functions of the Commission with respect to the assignment of Commission personnel, including Commissioners, to perform such functions as may have been delegated by the Commission to Commission personnel, including Commissioners, pursuant to section I of this reorganization plan.

The Chairman has indicated that he intends to take these functions when delegated to him by the Commission and in a speech which he made before the National Association of Broadcasters he indicated that he would use this authority quite stringently.

In that same speech, he indicated that he intended to take charge of programing. That speech, together with Reorganization Plan No. 2, alarmed many of us on the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies, because of the vast implications involved.

This concern became so great that as a result of our hearings during this last week the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies went on record as being opposed to the Reorganization Plan No. 2 for the Federal Communications Commission.

In order to give you some idea of the concern generally, I insert at this point in the RECORD an editorial, "The Wrong Path to Greatness," from the May 15 issue of the magazine Broadcasting, and an editorial of this last week from the Wall Street Journal, "The Television Wasteland."

[From Broadcasting magazine, May 15, 1961]

THE WRONG PATH TO GREATNESS

The true condition of broadcasting lies somewhere between the extremes described last week during the annual convention of the NAB.

Broadcasting is not nearly as bad as FCC Chairman Newton Minow pictured it.

It is better than NAB President LeRoy Collins thinks it is.

It is not nearly as good as it is believed to be by the broadcasters who winced at Mr. Collins and cried in rage at Mr. Minow.

If any of the major speakers could be said to have identified, with accuracy, the nature of broadcasting today, it was President John F. Kennedy. Broadcasting, said the President, who must be acknowledged as an expert on the subject, is the "most powerful and effective communications force yet designed," but it has an opportunity to be even more powerful and effective.

That, it seems to us, sums up broadcasting at this point of its evolution. It is good, even great in some respects. But it needs to be moved toward higher planes of greatness. The question is whether the movement will come from within broadcasting, from a restless, internal search for excellence, or from outside it, from those who would impose their personal tastes in the belief, however well intended, that they have a mission to elevate broadcasting by force and so to elevate the whole public.

If the movement is to be generated from outside broadcasting, it can be done only at the frightful cost of lost liberty. This to us is the real reason for alarm in Newton Minow's speech. He demanded improvement in programs and in the next breath threatened revocation of licenses as the penalty for failure to abide by that demand. In his view that procedure is legal. In our view it is not. At some point soon an attack must be mounted against Mr. Minow's interpretation of the first amendment and of the anticensorship provision of the Communications Act. We think the attack can be successful if it is conducted by authorities who understand constitutional law.

The weakness of the theory that the FCC can evaluate programing without offending the first amendment was clearly revealed in Mr. Minow's speech last week. He said, for example, that in the new license application forms which the FCC is preparing he hoped there would be a place for TV network affiliates to report their clearances of network information programs. To quote him exactly:

"I believe that stations taking network service should also be required to report the extent of the local clearance of network public service programing, and when they fail to clear them, they should explain why. If it is to put on some outstanding local program, this is one reason. But if it is simply to carry some old movie, that is an entirely different matter. The commission should consider such clearance reports carefully when making up its mind about the licensee's overall programing."

It is obvious that Mr. Minow intends the Commission to make a judgment whether a local origination that is substituted for a network show is good or bad. The minute the FCC makes a judgment of that kind—even if responsible people would agree with the judgment—it has put the Government in the business of program evaluation. And if the power to evaluate programing is accompanied by the power to revoke licenses, the business is censorship, no matter how many times Mr. Minow says it is not.

There is an element of sophistry, it seems to us, in Mr. Minow's professions of abhorrence of censorship. "I am unalterably opposed to governmental censorship," he told the NAB. "There will be no suppression of programing which does not merit with bureaucratic tastes."

That promise would be more persuasive if it were not contained in a speech otherwise devoted wholly to a description of the means by which Mr. Minow hopes to force a change in television programing. If he ever does persuade a majority of Commissioners to cancel the license of a station whose programing has been judged inferior, the act would constitute a total suppression of all the programing of that station. And the act would have been taken precisely because the programing did not meet with bureaucratic tastes.

The first opportunity for a challenge of Mr. Minow's position is already at hand. The FCC has requested comments on its proposed changes in license application forms. It will be interesting to see how vigorous a comment will be filed by the NAB under its new leadership. We would hope to see an NAB document at least as positive in its defense of freedom as the comments filed several weeks ago by the Washington law firm of Pierson, Ball & Dowd, on behalf of 19 of its client stations broadcasting, May 1).

The law firm said the FCC's proposed forms of program reporting would lead to "censorship in its simplest form." It is an attempt by Government to influence the content of communications, said Pierson, Ball & Dowd. "Whether the hand it lays upon broadcast programing is heavy or light, the clear purpose of the Commission is to use its licensing power to prevent some broadcast communications and to elicit others."

Mr. Minow's speech last week made the Commission's purpose even clearer. There can be no doubt now that he has embarked on a calculated plan of program controls, and it may be assumed that he believes he has the necessary votes to execute it. If broadcasters allow him to proceed on that course, they will deserve all the regulation they get.

It seems to us that the real message of the NAB convention last week was this: Broadcasting must invigorate its efforts to keep what freedom it has and indeed to reclaim the freedom it has lost. It must also invigorate its efforts to improve and diversify its programing. There was some truth in Mr. Minow's criticism and in what LeRoy Collins said. But the greatness that broadcasting must seek cannot be gained by Mr. Minow's methods. It will come only from broadcasters themselves, if it comes at all.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

THE TV WASTELAND

Many people will readily agree with Federal Communications Commission Chairman

Minow that much TV fare is a vast wasteland. Despite some shows generally considered excellent the networks could obviously do better.

Still, there are disturbing implications in Mr. Minow's speech. On the one hand, he says he is against governmental censorship; on the other, he tells the National Association of Broadcasters that "it is not enough to cater to the Nation's whims—you must also serve the Nation's needs."

Such as what needs? Informing the Nation? We would say that is one field where TV shines. It provides spot coverage of the news, as in the magnificent detailing of Commander Shepard's space flight; it also provides, if anyone wants to look, a good many news background, discussion, and interpretation programs.

Indeed, the complaint about the wasteland hardly concerns the news services of TV. It is directed, rather, at the entertainment side, with its preponderance of westerns and violence in general. And here one begins to get an inkling of what Mr. Minow means about serving the Nation's needs in terms of entertainment.

"What will the people of other countries think of us," he asks, "when they see our western bad men and good men punching each other in the jaw in between the shooting? What will the Latin American or African child learn of America from our great communications industry? We cannot permit television in its present form to be our voice overseas."

Well, we will pass over the fact that American movies have been showing to foreign audiences for more than 40 years, incidentally in competition with foreign movies often more violent and more crudely made. If the United States faces problems abroad, we somehow doubt it is on that account. We beg to suggest that what an African child might or might not think about anything is a pitifully poor excuse for anything the United States does or does not do.

But the real point is this: Who is going to permit what kind of entertainment TV is to offer? If that is not an implied plug for governmental censorship, then it is hard to figure just what Mr. Minow is talking about.

It all smacks of the old business of intellectual puritanism. Somebody doesn't like the books you're reading; public tastes are too low and need to be elevated. So the answer is to substitute official taste for public taste.

When people permit officials to do that, they open up a real wasteland, and not just a cultural one.

Mr. Speaker, in providing for the delegation of hearing work for final disposition the plan also undertakes to abolish the legal right of oral argument before the Commission now provided for in the Communications Act. This is a very serious substantive change in the law and could work a great deal of mischief.

Section II also authorizes the Chairman, with the consultation with other members, to choose and assign personnel as he might see fit to process the matters which have been delegated. Since the great bulk of the Commission's workload, having been placed under delegations, the Chairman would be in a position to control the disposition of the case.

The individual Commissioners would be placed in the position of either accepting the Chairman's assignment or personnel, or refusing to agree to delegations. Much of this would mean acquiescence to the wishes of the Chairman. A much better plan, I submit to my colleagues, would be to follow the advice of a former Chairman of the Commission, who said in his statement as follows:

I would respectfully suggest that rather than accept Reorganization Plan No. 2, the Congress give consideration to legislation to grant the Commission greater flexibility in the management of its work. I am certain this could be accomplished without bringing about the profound changes in the organization and the relationship of the Congress to this Commission inherent in this reorganization plan.

Some have asked me if the plan will change anything unless the Commission orders it? Yes, it does. Section 3 abolishes the review staff and its functions. Therefore, the procedure for writing the Commission's decisions is changed, and the workload involved is shifted from that staff, presumably, to the individual Commissioners. Instead of reducing the workload of the Commissioners so they can devote more time to consideration of high-level policy matters, the Commissioners would be required to devote necessary time to good decision writing.

Since a Chairman of the FCC is appointed by the executive branch, it could be expected that the control of the Chairman's hands would be, in fact, in the hands of the executive branch itself. This would mean a definite dilution of control by this legislative body.

There appears to be no limitation to the workload a Chairman could assign any one Commissioner.

While it would not be expected that a Chairman would abuse his powers of personnel assignment, there are many subtleties which any Chairman could employ that would not be openly suspect but undesirable.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my firm conviction that Reorganization Plan No. 2 for the Federal Communications Commission for 1961 should be rejected. In the first place, it threatens to impair the status of the agency of an individual body of seven coequal members. Second, it is not likely to achieve its objective of more economical and expeditious administration. Third, because it attempts to alter radically the procedure rights of litigants before the Commission. Fourth, it is far more appropriate to give legislative consideration by the Congress than for executive action pursuant to this Reorganization Act.

A resolution has already been filed to disapprove the reorganization plan for the FCC. This matter is bound to come before the House within the next few days. Unless the Committee on Government Operations acts by tomorrow evening that privileged resolution can be called up beginning any time after the start of business on Monday of next week. It behooves every Member of this body to become sufficiently acquainted with the facts to be able to vote intelligently. If the resolution comes up in a certain fashion, there will be no debate. That is why I have taken the floor today to call it to the attention of the House to be sure that every Member is acquainted with the reorganization plan and its dangers before it arises for a vote.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to compliment my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] on the careful attention and analysis that he has made of this Reorganization Plan No. 2. It has been of particular interest to me, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Legislative and Executive Reorganization Committee of the House Committee on Government Operations to listen to what he has had to say. I hope very much that he will find the time to make these same remarks and whatever additional comments he may have before that subcommittee. We met this morning and heard some witnesses in that subcommittee on Reorganization Plan No. 1, which deals with the Securities and Exchange Commission. I have compared the language of that plan together with the introductory and prefatory remarks submitted in connection therewith by the President in his letter of transmittal with the letter of transmittal and language used in Reorganization Plan No. 2, which deals with the Federal Communications Commission. In comparing the language of those two plans I find that, with the exception of certain references to specific statutes, they are virtually similar. Therefore, I would assume that in large measure the observations which the gentleman has made with respect to this Reorganization Plan No. 2, dealing with the Federal Communications Commission would also be applicable to the plan which we considered at a hearing this morning which involved another regulatory agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I merely wanted to point out, in addition to what the gentleman has already said, that I share his concern over the extremely broad language contained in sections 1 and 2 of these plans with respect to the delegation of powers to the Chairman. I think it might be interesting to the gentleman to know, since he was not at the hearing this morning, that the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission in testifying before our subcommittee frankly admitted that there were certain powers of the Commission that would not and indeed should not be delegated. For example, the general rulemaking power; the power of the Commission to refer certain criminal charges to the Office of the Attorney General; the power of the Commission to make recommendations with respect to legislation—these are all examples of powers granted to these Commissions by the enabling legislation which established them that should not be delegated. And yet under the broad language contained in sections 1 and 2 of these plans it would be entirely possible for a delegation of those powers to occur. My question to the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission was, and I would repeat my question at this time, why should not a reorganization plan of this type specifically spell out those nondelegable powers that

should be at all times reserved in the Commission, or the Commissioners themselves?

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say in reply to my colleague from Illinois that he has hit on the real point and the real objection to the reorganization plans that were sent down here. We had Dean Landis before us who was the author, I might say, of this reorganization plan for the executive department. I asked him the specific questions, whether or not all the powers contained in the act itself which now reside in the Commission could be delegated to the Chairman, and he said, "yes, they could be." That is how broad the powers to delegate are, as contained in the reorganization plan, which means that you can put in the hands of the Chairman under this act all the powers the Commissioners now have. It seems to me that that is too much power to be concentrated in any one man regardless of his party.

May I say that in the testimony of the Commissioners yesterday before our Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies, these were the very things the Commissioners hit home on. And may I add that there were five Commissioners who disapproved the plan and two who were for the plan, one of those two being the Chairman.

This disapproval by the Commissioners themselves was so broad—and it included members of both Republican and Democrat Parties. I wish I could give you some of the statements that were given by those who were appointed as Democratic members of the Commission, because it is a bipartisan body, but the emphasis they placed on their disapproval was just as great as that placed by the members of the Commission from my side of the aisle—Republican.

This is an independent body. It is true they are appointed respectively as members of a certain party. But it is really an independent, nonpartisan agency. But I think what was brought home to us most forcefully was the power that the Executive would have by appointing a Chairman and then having all of these powers delegated by the Commission to him; so that the Chief Executive would in effect control undiluted, in the White House, the powers now contained broadly within the Commission itself.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. The gentleman's reference to the testimony before his committee by Dean Landis calls to mind some other statements made by that gentleman in the report he submitted to the, at that time, President-elect in December of 1960. One of the comments he made in that report, which was, of course, on the general subject of all the regulatory agencies, was:

> Much attention has recently been centered on efforts, unfortunately too frequently successful, to sway the judgment of the members of regulatory agencies by so-called ex parte approaches or arguments, usually personalized, made off the record in proceedings that should be decided on the record.

Does not the gentleman agree that under the powers to delegate under sections 1 and 2 of the Reorganization Plans if the Commissioners themselves were to delegate even more power to more people, hearing examiners, for example, to hear these cases, and give them greater power than they already possess, that this would perhaps increase rather than decrease the danger of having ex parte off-the-record approaches made? There would be that many more people, in other words, that could be contacted by those who might be interested in influencing the judgment of these Commissions.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think the gentleman has hit on the point, but one even more important feature of that is that if you concentrate powers in the Chairman, the off-the-record contact would be made with only one person in order to influence the outcome of any particular litigated case before the Commission. The broad assignment of personnel which it would be possible for him to make under this delegation would be almost unlimited. Therefore, if the Chairman wanted to assign them a certain way he could assign those that would be friendly, psychologically and ideologically, to the position the Chairman had.

Through the years we have had the Federal Communications Commission before our committee at least once a year. These problems have arisen with reference to off-the-record contacts with regard to both the practices and policies of the Commission. But generally among the seven of them, the Commissioners have been able to sit down around a table and ultimately arrive at some kind of policy and more forward with it. That is certainly a lot more democratic and representative of our form of government than delegating all of these powers into the hands of the Chairman, in order that he may delegate them to people friendly to his position.

I think these are fundamental issues on which we certainly ought to stand up and be counted. Having heard all the evidence, there is no doubt in my mind about what should be done on Reorganization Plan No. 2.

The Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies this morning met and by motion disapproved the plan insofar as their influence is concerned. May I say that we do not control this legislation. This legislation is in the hands of another committee. But naturally, having jurisdiction over legislation that has to do with the Federal Communications Commission, we are vitally interested. We made that recommendation to the House Committee on Government Operations for whatever consideration they saw fit to give it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I was certainly pleased to hear the gentleman from Illinois make his last statement there, that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies had by motion this morning gone on record as taking a position to oppose Reorganization Plan No. 2. I think the gentleman underestimates the influence of both the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies and also the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is inconceivable to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Government Operations, and even further than that, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, would even support the plan if he knew it was facing the opposition of the powerful Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, chairmaned by the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], who is also chairman of the Committee on Legislative Oversight. So it seems to me that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce this morning has probably taken the most significant action of the whole consideration on the reorganization plan. I hope the position taken by the committee will be made abundantly clear to the Committee on Government Operations when they commence the hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 2 tomorrow morning.

Mr. SPRINGER. I can assure the gentleman that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Regulatory Agencies, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], was authorized to appear tomorrow before the House Committee on Government Operations and will there advise that committee of what our action was based on—all the facts we had at hand in making that decision.

Mr. AVERY. As a former member of the committee, I certainly want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Illinois and to the full subcommittee for that matter for this action. I certainly feel they have taken a significant action not only to protect the public interest but also to protect the premise and the philosophy that the regulatory agencies are an arm of the Congress and not a vehicle of the Executive.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank the gentleman. When he was on our committee, he did an excellent job, may I say in assisting on this particular problem. He has been one of the foremost advocates all these years of maintaining the agencies absolutely independent of the Executive. Dean Landis in his appearance before our committee admitted that these agencies received their authority from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, from the other body and from this body and not from the Executive.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I noted in reading the report of Dean Landis, which he made in December last year in the concluding portion of his report, he made some 8 or 10 recommendations, I think. Does the gentleman from Illinois feel this is a rather modest implementation of all of what Dean Landis really recommended in his original report?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, and I do not think I am revealing anything off the record here when I say that when Dean Landis and the present chairman of the Federal Communications Commission came down with their first plan, that the chairman of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce let them know very pointedly that no such

plan would have a chance of being approved by this Congress nor would have a chance of getting through without the committee's approval. I asked Dean Landis how much had been taken out of this and he said—of the original proposal he had made to the chairman of our committee, there remained about one-third. So you can see that a great deal has been cut out already and it is still obnoxious, I think, even as to what remains of the original proposal.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Does the gentleman imply that there might be, as a matter of fact, a sort of a sleeper here in one of these sections, in section 1 of the plan which appears on the surface to contain purely innocent language? And far from cutting down—what was recommended is still implicit in the very broad terms of the language of that section.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, when you follow that with section 2, what the chairman can do in the assignment of personnel including the Commissioners. That is the sleeper in the whole thing. That was the great objection that these five members of the Commission had, in knowing what it would do to them individually insofar as their influence is concerned and insofar as their ability to do the job that they ought to be doing as individual Commissioners.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I want to disagree with the gentleman from Illinois now speaking in the well of the House and to some extent, perhaps, with the other gentleman from Illinois who is participating in this colloquy. I do not think anything has been taken out of the original Landis proposal. There has just been this confusion as to all of the Government agencies as far as the regulatory agencies are concerned that were identifiable in the original Landis report to then President-elect Kennedy, and contained Reorganization Plan No. 2 but just in different language. And to fully understand the full impact of Reorganization Plan No. 2, you must not only read the plan, you must go back and read simultaneously the Landis report—you must read simultaneously the Dutton letter to the chairman of the regulatory agencies on February 7, and to further understand it, you must consider the policy statements that have been made by the now chairman of the regulatory agencies themselves. In perspective, those four things will give you the full impact of Reorganization Plan No. 2, and I think probably it would apply to the other four as well, but I have not studied them in detail.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield so that I may reply to something that was said by the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I do not think, and I say this for the record, that we are in fundamental disagreement. The point I was trying to make by the question, which I addressed to the gentleman from Illinois, was that I think there is really much more in the sections of this somewhat innocent appearing reorganization plan than may meet the eye. I certainly agree with the remarks the gentleman made.

Mr. AVERY. I would just like to say that I am also going to appear before the Committee on Government Operations to oppose Reorganization Plan No. 2. I did not intend to make these remarks here on the floor this afternoon, but it seemed most appropriate in view of the matter being debated here between the two gentlemen from Illinois. If the gentlemen will yield further, I would like to observe that Illinois seems to be pretty dominant here on the floor this afternoon. We have a distinguished gentleman from Illinois, who has a special order. He is assisted by his colleague from Illinois on our side of the aisle. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK], presiding in the chair, also a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and these members of the minority also representing Illinois. It could be said that this was an Illinois effort, but I hope it will be more widely supported.

Mr. SPRINGER. In conclusion I would like to say that I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his remarks and to state that back in February or March when he first took the floor on this subject he told us what he intended to do when opportunity offered. He has lived up to his word.

SAN FRANCISCO'S BLACK FRIDAY

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, two of my constituents, Mr. W. E. Schmitt and Mr. A. O. Hanks, have invested considerable time and money in a thoroughly researched article entitled "San Francisco's Black Friday," which tells the story of the last year's riots in San Francisco against the House Un-American Activities Committee.

First a word about the authors.

W. E. Schmitt is a graduate of Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill., and is presently employed as a research engineer at the Lockheed Missiles and Space Division, Sunnyvale, Calif. He is married and has two children. He was present on the last day of the hearings held in San Francisco City Hall by the House Committee on Un-American Activities in May 1960. Since that time he has done extensive research and investigation into the demonstrations against the HCUA and has debated more than a dozen times throughout the San Francisco Bay area, speaking for the essential accuracy of the film, "Operation Abolition." He has recently been appointed Peninsula representative of the Christian Anti-Communism Crusade.

A. O. Hanks is a Navy career man who is presently serving as an instructor at Moffett Naval Air Station near Sunnyvale. He has collaborated with W. E. Schmitt in the inquiry into the events surrounding the May 1960 disorders at city hall. He is married and has three children.

Mr. Speaker, the following is the article written by Mr. Schmitt and Mr. Hanks which I commend to the attention of my colleagues:

SAN FRANCISCO'S BLACK FRIDAY

(By W. E. Schmitt and A. O. Hanks)

Friday, May 13, 1960, will long be remembered by San Franciscans as Black Friday, the day the fire hoses were turned on by police in the city hall to disperse an angry mob of screaming student demonstrators who were determined to push their way past police guards into the supervisor's chambers where the House Committee on Un-American Activities was conducting hearings. And with that hosing, there began a controversy over the student riot that has increased in intensity, and which at the present time of writing shows no signs of abating. Eight months after the city hall disorders, charges and countercharges appear almost daily in the Bay Area newspapers. Perhaps the main reason for this long-lived debate is the continued widespread showing across the Nation of "Operation Abolition," a 45-minute motion picture made by direction of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from over 6,000 feet of subpenaed newsreel films taken on the scene by cameramen from local television stations KRON–TV and KPIX–TV.

The movie opens with narration provided by Fulton Lewis III and exhibits a pamphlet urging abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities circulated by an identified Communist front organization, the Citizens Committee To Preserve American Freedoms. Frank Wilkinson, executive secretary of the CCPAF, was named as a Communist agent by Congressman GORDON H. SCHERER, and is described by J. Edgar Hoover as the "brains and energy" behind the CCPAF. Congressman FRANCIS E. WALTER then explains the title and purpose of the film:

" 'Operation Abolition': This is what the Communists call their current drive to destroy the House Committee on Un-American Activities, weaken the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to discredit its great director, J. Edgar Hoover, and to render sterile the security laws of our Government. The Communist Party has given top priority to 'Operation Abolition' and has assigned agents trained in propaganda and agitation to this project.

"The scenes which you will be viewing were taken by newsreel photographers during hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco, Calif., on May 12, 13, and 14, 1960. During the next few minutes, you will see revealed the long time classic communistic tactic in which a relatively few well-trained, hard-core Communist agents are able to incite and use non-Communist sympathizers to perform the dirty work of the Communist Party."

When the May 1960 House Committee of Un-American Activities hearings were announced, Communist Party activity to investigate opposition to the hearings went into high gear. In a Government document titled "Communist Target—Youth", J. Edgar Hoover gives complete details on the organization of student groups by Communist agents on the University of California, Stanford, and San Francisco State College campuses. Communist propagandists skillfully planted the impression among the students that the 1960 hearings were aimed basically at teachers and that the stated objective to inquire into Communist Party activities in the area was merely to cover a planned attack on the teachers. Hoover also points out that the Communist Party had two important objectives—first, to fill the scene of the hearings with demonstrators, and second, to

incite them to action through the use of mob psychology. Both objectives were attained by the Communists with amazing success.

Knowing that the Communist apparatus would attempt to pack the hearing room with highly agitated students who were certain to create physical disturbances to impede the hearings, the committee's chief west coast investigator, Mr. William Wheeler, issued white passes to civic, church, and fraternal organizations, whose members could provide a degree of stability in the hearing room and thus foil the disruption planned by the subpenaed Communist witnesses and their student sympathizers. In addition, 30 passes which could have admitted 80 students were distributed at random on the Stanford campus. The House committee was entirely justified in controlling admission to the hearing room. Past experience in Puerto Rico, for example, demonstrated how far the Communists would go in their attempt to vilify and destroy the HCUA. Congressman SCHERER, in a speech on the floor of the House June 2, 1960, described the vicious work of the Communist-controlled Emergency Civil Liberties Committee in Puerto Rico, prior to HCUA hearings there in December 1959. He said, "The ECLC sent its executive director from New York to San Juan in advance of our hearings. He was on the radio vilifying the committee before its appearance. He was meeting with subpenaed Communists and their leftwing lawyers and other groups in the city. He was busy preparing and issuing inflammatory press releases against the committee.

"As a result, in San Juan, December 1959, we had a preview of what happened at San Francisco, May 1960: pickets surrounded the Federal building; they jeered at the committee and spat upon our automobiles as we arrived; they chanted and shouted outside the U.S. courthouse in an attempt to disrupt the hearings * * *. In Puerto Rico, members of the committee and its staff required police protection." According to J. Edgar Hoover, Frank Wilkinson and the CCPAF attempted to produce similar results at the San Francisco hearings in May 1960. Knowledge of these plans was one of the reasons for the imposition of the white card pass system. On a recent nationwide television debate, Representative JAMES ROOSEVELT stated that only friends of the committee were given passes to attend the San Francisco hearings. This charge appears to be erroneous; the writers have been unable to locate anyone who was first asked if he was an HCUA supporter before being given a pass. Mr. Wheeler confirmed this when he appeared on the Goodwin Knight Show aired by KCOP–TV in Los Angeles on August 9, 1960. He said, "I have been working for the committee for 13 years. During these 13 years we have issued passes and we are going to continue issuing them in the future. Now I will give you one specific reason: to keep out the people that caused the disturbances in San Francisco * * * these passes were issued to clubs, religious groups, patriotic groups that called me. They were not screened."

The supervisors chambers in city hall provide the largest hearing room in the city of San Francisco. Entering the rotunda of city hall, one must climb an impressive flight of 50 marble steps to reach the great oak doors opening into the 400-seat hearing room. On the opening day of the hearings, 300 persons were admitted by pass; this number included the subpenaed witnesses, their lawyers and immediate relatives, and those of the general public, including students, who had requested passes. About 100 individuals without passes, mostly students, were then admitted to fill the remaining seats.

In addition, Mr. Wheeler admitted 100 more students from the waiting line outside the doors. These students were permitted to stand in the aisles and along the walls, contrary to fire department regulations. The responsibility for this was taken by Mr. Wheeler himself, as he explained on the "Goodwin Knight Show." As soon as the hearings got underway, it became evident that a great many of the students in the room had no intention of being orderly. In the words of Mr. Wheeler: "They hissed; they booed; they catcalled. They applauded and we absolutely couldn't control them. I went to the chairman, Willis, and recommended that we throw them out at that time, Thursday morning, because we could not conduct the committee hearing. And at noon we excluded them. They were not let back in and they will not be let in again. Now, if these students had conducted themselves properly, there would have been another 100 to 140 to 150 students in that hearing room every day."

The disorderly students clearly were not interested in observing the procedure of the congressional committee. They were merely following the advice printed on the front page of the May 12 issue of the University of California campus newspaper, the Daily Californian, which read as follows: "The SCCL (Student Committee for Civil Liberties) plans to picket the hearings today. It has issued a call for students to attend the rally and hearings and suggests that people laugh out loud in the hearings when things get ridiculous."

When the subpenaed Communist witnesses realized that most of the students they were depending on to impede the hearings were not to be readmitted, their tactics swiftly changed. The noon luncheon recess ended with Chairman WILLIS calling the subcommittee to order. As Richard Arens, committee staff director and interrogator, called informant Barbara Hartle to resume the witness stand, several of the identified Communist witnesses lined up near the railing that separated the witness' seats and Congressmen from the audience. Included were Archie Brown, No. 2 man in the California Communist Party, Ralph Izard, hard-core theoretician of the party, Sally Attarian Sweet and Saul Wachter. They began by screaming out their demands that either the doors be opened to allow the students back in, or the hearings be recessed and moved to a larger room. They then began the chant, "Open the doors. Open the doors." This action was later defended by the Communists and their apologists as petitioning Congress for a redress of grievances. Bedlam broke loose as Archie Brown turned to the audience and clapped his hands as a signal for the Communist dupes and sympathizers to join in the outburst. A cascade of sound erupted from the audience, and Archie Brown, smiling broadly at his evident success, turned to face the committee again. Again and again the shout "Open the doors," echoed through the chambers. In a vivid eyewitness account published on May 17, 1960, a group of ministers wrote, " * * * what we witnessed was utterly fantastic. The shameful demonstration against law and order and against this duly constituted committee of Congress defies description. We sat in the rear of the room on a raised platform where we could easily observe the proceedings, right in the midst of the student demonstrators. We studied the crowd carefully for hours and could easily discern which were the masterminds of the mob riots. It is our certain conviction that this indefensible demonstration against law and order was conceived, planned and directed by a few hard-core Communist agitators who were carrying out their textbook orders on insurrection with classic success.

Leaders of the mob included faculty members and well-known leftist lawyers for the fifth-amendment Communists. The ministers then described the demonstration within the hearing room with unusual clarity: "The Daily Californian, which was distributed widely at the scene, gave explicit instructions on the front page of the Thursday issue on exactly how to harass the committee. They were told to laugh out loud, to make the Congressmen look ridiculous.

These well-disciplined mobsters laughed on the dotted line and obeyed their masters to the last jeer. We watched a national committeeman for the party line up a dozen Communists near the railing and throw every sneer, invective, abusive language, vile profanity, and fiendish charge at the Congressmen they could conceive. For nearly 15 minutes at one point, this lawless crowd of students from the university, together with party cadres, had the chambers almost in their control. The students, comprising the rear third of the audience, stood up on their seats and yelled, jeered, hissed, and scoffed at the Congressmen. It was almost a complete breakdown of law and order. We witnessed more violations of the law in 15 minutes than we have seen in 15 years.

"The height of their devilish hypocrisy was reached when they had the consummate nerve to profane the national anthem by singing it at the peak of their demonstration, and giving expression to their treasonable delight by singing 'Mine Eyes Have Seen the Glory of the Coming of the Lord.' The depth of their deceit was reached when this mob element put their hand over their heart and pledged allegiance to the flag."

The committee waited through the hostilities for 20 minutes while a specially trained police squadron was called to the scene to attempt to restore order. The resisting demonstrators were then forcibly removed from the hearing room. These scenes are included in "Operation Abolition." Meanwhile, emotions ran wild among the excluded students in the hall outside the oak doors. Frustrated in their attempts to gain entrance, young Communist leaders from San Francisco State College and the University of California began to lead the students in singing and chanting with a guitarist furnishing accompaniment. The noise on Thursday became so intense that the courts on the floors above were forced to suspend operation. Sheriff Matthew Carberry later asserted that the student situation in the hall Thursday was so explosive that it could have become a "full-blood riot" but he added, "It was suppressed by force of persuasion." When the Thursday session was ended, the records showed that a number of subpenaed Communists, including Archie Brown, Merle Brodsky, Sally Attarian Sweet, Juanita Wheeler, and Saul Wachter, as well as a large number of their student stooges, had been ejected from the hearing room because of disorderly conduct.

The Communist Party had hoped, by their obstructionist tactics on Thursday, to force a suspension of the HCUA's hearings. The revealing searchlight of the committee's investigations has proved distressing to the Communist Party. To be successful, Communist subversion and infiltration require an environment of anonymity coupled with a certain lack of awareness on the part of the American public. The HCUA strips away both of these conditions so vital to the success of communism in America. Hence it is not surprising that the Communist Party has initiated Operation Abolition, and prosecutes this action with every available resource. The HCUA is labeled as "destructive of civil rights," "witch hunters," etc. The other three dozen congressional committees, which have identical powers and methods and in many cases are modeled after the HCUA, significantly are left totally unopposed. The answer as to why this one committee is singled out for all-out opposition by Communist fronts

and other infiltrated groups ought to be obvious to any thinking person.

Having been frustrated in their plans on Thursday, the Communists adopted still another tactic on Friday. This took the form of continued student agitation in the hall outside the hearing room doors and insulting personal attacks on Richard Arene and the Congressmen inside the room by the subpenaed witnesses. A specific example of such personal tirades against our Congressmen is that made by William Mandel, a lecturer and writer, who according to Congressman FRANCIS WALTER, serves the Communist conspiracy in the fields of radio and television. He currently finds employment at FM station KPFA in Berkeley, Calif. Mandel, in testimony before the HCUA on Friday afternoon, May 13, referred to the committee members as "sadists" and "beaters of children." Not satisfied with the impact of those insults, he added, "If you think that I am going to cooperate with this collection of Judases" (and at this point he glowered at informant Karl Prussion seated nearby), "if you think I will cooperate with you in any way, you are insane." Giving further vent to his contempt for the committee, Mandel capped his vitriolic stream of words by snarling, "* * * this body is improperly constituted. It is a kangaroo court. It does not have my respect. It has my utmost contempt."

Meanwhile, during the Friday morning session, Communist agitators (some of whom were local college and university students) trained in the art of inciting mob action, cleverly capitalized on the apparent inequities of the white card pass system. The word was passed throughout the student group that the committee gave passes only to "super-patriots," the implication being that the students were considered subnormal in their patriotism. Every device was used to excite the student group in the hall. Slowly the group changed, chameleon-like, into a furious singing, chanting, cursing mob, which now numbered about 200. Sheriff Carberry, with great difficulty and much interruption, attempted to reason and communicate with them. He pointed out that the disturbance on the previous day caused four courts on the floors above to suspend operation; that this was likely to be necessitated again unless the noise was stopped.

But the students were beyond reason. Tape recordings made on the scene are in the possession of the writers, and they reveal that at this point, the students actually demanded that the courts be closed down again in accommodation to their noise-making. And these are the students who are benignly referred to by the opponents of the HCUA as "civil libertarians." They then demanded that after the noon luncheon recess, the pass system be abandoned in favor of a first-come first-served basis for admission. Failing this, a spokesman for the group, Burton White, threatened Sheriff Carberry with a resumption of noise in the hall. Somehow, this demand was twisted in the student minds into an agreement with the sheriff. The truth is that Sheriff Carberry made no such bargain. He himself can be heard on the tape recording telling the students he had no authority to control the means of admission.

The noise reverberating up from below during Friday morning could no longer be tolerated by the courts on adjoining floors. Shortly before noon Judge Clarence Morris issued a court order to restore quiet in the building and, if necessary, eject the disorderly individuals. During the noon recess, Sheriff Carberry had lunch with Mr. William Wheeler and Chairman WILLIS, and interceded with them on behalf of the students. It was agreed that another attempt would be made to admit students without passes notwithstanding their disturbances in the hearing room on the previous day. But before the sheriff could return to the city hall to put the new rule into effect, the admission of the passholders began again at about 1:15 p.m.

Convinced that their bargain with the sheriff had been broken, the students again began chanting "Abolish the committee." When an attempt was made by the police to disperse the mob in accordance with Judge Morris' order, the crowd responded by throwing shoes and jostling the officers. Some of the officers shouted a warning that firehoses would have to be used unless the mob dispersed. But the crowd, whipped to a frenzy by professional Communist agitators, became progressively more unruly. Students began to leap the barricades set up to keep the doors accessible, and police were kept busy pushing the vaulting students back. From testimony given later to a grand jury, and from photographs taken during the next few moments, it appears that the firehoses were turned on briefly with little pressure as a warning. A few students were wetted, and this seemed to dampen their enthusiasm momentarily. When the police then moved out in front of the barricade to begin moving the crowd out of the hall, the violence flared.

According to his own testimony to a grand jury, Officer Ralph Schaumleffel became separated from his fellow policemen. He lost his footing or was tripped. While he was in a half crouch, his police club was knocked from his hand and passed from student to student while he attempted to struggle to his feet. Suddenly, one student grabbed the club, and brought it down on the officer's head. For a moment the two grappled on the floor, and eventually another officer helped drag the resisting student out of the crowd and promptly handcuffed him. The hoses were then turned on in earnest. The students, now in open defiance of orders to clear the hall, linked arms or sat with their backs to the hoses. For a few moments the officers were able to lead some of the demonstrators away.

Suddenly, realizing what was happening, a few militant agitators renewed the violence by kicking, striking, and biting the officers. Those who refused to move were dragged bodily down the wetted marble stairs. In all, 64 individuals, mostly students, were arrested on Friday for participation in a riot and resisting arrest. Immediately after the riot, Harry Bridges appeared on the scene and began haranguing the crowd that remained in the hallway. Fearing further outbreak of uncontrolled emotions, the police forced Bridges out of the building as he continued to voice inflammatory charges over his shoulder.

More mob violence was narrowly averted on the third day of the hearings. A crowd of 2,000 gathered outside of the building on Saturday and made a menacing move toward the doors shortly after an arrogant and insulting Communist attorney, Bertram Edises, was ordered removed from the hearing room. Committee members were escorted out a rear door as a cordon of mounted police, uniformed officers, and motorcycle police held back the aroused demonstrators. The crowd continued to mill about for an hour, despite a loudspeaker announcement that the HCUA staff had departed and the hearings were concluded.

The Communist Party rejoiced over the success of its members in mobilizing the student demonstrators and initiating the riots. FBI Chief Hoover reveals that Gus Hall, the party's national leader, sent congratulations to the west coast comrades. Particularly pleasing to Hall was the fact that a large number of students was involved in the demonstrations. History reveals that communism has never been able to make significant progress in a country until the party has induced students to be its standard bearer. Mr. Hoover also reveals that at a party meeting on the night of May 20, 1960, Archie Brown called for emphasis on police brutality as a rallying cry to attract the sympathy of student groups. This program to smear the San Francisco police was promptly begun. The People's World carried accounts of how police "dragged boys and girls down the marble stairs by their feet, their heads banging on each step" and choked a girl "until she turned blue, and then dropped her on the marble floor of the rotunda."

But even as these lies were being circulated, a powerful weapon of truth was being forged by the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Extensive newsreel films, both sound and silent, together with tape recordings made within and without the hearing room, had been subpenaed. In Washington the most illustrative scenes from the newsreel footage were selected and the voice of an announcer was added to identify the various individuals and scenes. When completed, the task of making prints of "Operation Abolition" was assigned to Washington Video Productions, Inc., and to date more than 500 prints have been distributed. The 45 minute film was made a part of H.R. 2228, the committee's official congressional report.

The appearance of "Operation Abolition" accomplished something rarely done before: it put the Communist Party on the defensive. The film has become one of the Communist Party's most dreaded opponents. The scenes on the marble stairs of the police ejecting the students with relative gentleness exposed the lie of "police brutality." Immediately, the party began its vilification campaign against the film through its extensive network of front organizations. One of the first efforts to discredit the movie took the form of a mimeographed document titled "In Search of Truth," published initially by the Orange County chapter of the American Civil Liberties Union, and later reprinted and issued as an 11-page pamphlet by the Bay Area Student Committe for the Abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, with headquarters in Berkeley, Calif. The present chairman of this group is Burton White, a graduate student at the University of California. He appears quite prominently in several scenes in "Operation Abolition," where he is shown leading the student yelling and singing outside the hearing room chambers. He was also one of those who disobeyed police orders to clear the hall on Friday and consequently was sprayed with water and arrested.

"In Search of Truth" is a masterful blend of out-of-context quotations and half-truths with an admixture of outright lies. An example of its intent to deceive is the excerpt taken from the panel discussion on the Goodwin Knight Show. This excerpt is printed on the front cover of "In Search of Truth" as follows:

"BURTON WHITE. I am basing my discussion on the fact that the film does have inaccuracies, does have distortions.

"WILLIAM WHEELER. All right, we have admitted that. Let's go on to another subject.

"BURTON WHITE. You have admitted that, Mr. Wheeler?

"WILLIAM WHEELER. Certainly."

This isolated portion of the exchange between White and Wheeler conveys the false impression that Wheeler was admitting that the entire film is interlaced with falsehoods. An examination of the context however, reveals that at this point Mr. Wheeler had admitted only two minor errors in sequence: The picture showing the mounted police around city hall while the commentator is speaking of the opening day of the hearings (Thursday), and the pictures of some students giving the Sig Heil salute during sequences of Friday, whereas both these events took place on Saturday. It should also be

noticed that Mr. Wheeler never used the word "distortion"; this word was put into Wheeler's mouth by Burton White. Distortion connotes manipulation of evidence to create an impression that something happened which didn't. Everything in "Operation Abolition" did happen.

The text of "In Search of Truth" begins with the charge that the subpenaed newsreel films were used in "Operation Abolition" without the knowledge or permission of the owners, KPIX–TV and KRON–TV. The truth is that the TV stations are disinterested in the use made of the subpenaed films. In a letter to us dated January 16, 1961, the vice president of the Westinghouse Broadcasting Co., which operates KPIX–TV, Philip G. Lasky, stated: "As a matter of general corporate policy, programing material such as this is not furnished to third parties, including the Government, except under subpena. When legally taken under compulsion of a subpena, we do not normally concern ourselves with the use made of the material taken." Clearly, in their hysterical attempt to discredit the HCUA, Burton White and the Bay Area Student Committee are attempting to create a grievance where none exists.

"In Search of Truth" abounds in outright lies. It states: "According to news members of KPIX–TV, footage which shows unjustified use of police clubs was deleted from the movie." During a debate with Burton White on the subject of the movie's accuracy, held in Watsonville, Calif., February 10, 1961, we challenged him to disclose the names of those news members. His response, which was tape recorded, was that Jerry Witter, KPIX–TV program manager, had said this to him "in the presence of witnesses." We again inquired of Mr. Lasky, and his reply was as follows: "I have spoken again with Mr. Witter * * *. He assures me that Mr. White either misunderstood or misinterpreted any conversation * * * by stating * * * that 'according to news members of KPIX–TV, footage which shows unjustified use of police clubs on demonstrators was deleted from the movie,' and later by identifying the KPIX news member as Mr. Witter. Such a statement implies that KPIX actually shot films of a club or clubs being used. No such film shots appear in our files, nor does our photographer recall photographing such action. I've looked into the matter thoroughly, and am confident that there is no foundation for the statement attributed to KPIX news personnel."

On February 27, 1961, Mr. Lasky arranged for a private showing at KPIX studios of the footage in question. The authors were present at this showing, and can, therefore, give their eyewitness confirmation that KPIX footage contains not even a single instance of police clubs being used. Such unfounded charges are typical of the disregard for truth exhibited by the authors of "In Search of Truth."

Even though these falsehoods have been pointed out to Burton White months ago, the "In Search of Truth" pamphlets continue to be printed and circulated on college campuses by White's student committee, not only in the San Francisco Bay area, but on college campuses across the Nation. The number of copies circulated so far exceeds 100,000.

Another outright lie in the pamphlet is the statement, "The sound track which accompanies the film which was shot inside the hearing room during the demonstrations of the subpenaed persons was a composite track made up of several tapes taken both inside and outside the hearing room." On January 26, 1961, Mr. Harold See, general manager of KRON–TV, gave a private showing of that station's newsreel films of the city hall events to a group of about 30 individuals. These films include the scene and sound track of the demonstrations in question. Mr. See also permitted a tape recording to be made of the sound track during the entire showing. That tape recording is in the possession of the authors, and it proves that the sound track of the demonstrations in "Operation Abolition" is exactly identical to that on the original newsreel film taken by KRON–TV.

A specious argument is used by the authors of "In Search of Truth" when they charge that "the film asserts that a directive was issued by the Students for Civil Liberties (SCL) telling students to laugh out loud at the committee, and was published on the front page of the student newspaper, the Daily Californian at the University of California." They then proceed to rebut the alleged assertion as follows: "The truth is that the newspaper, in a legitimate news article, reported an opinion which was expressed in an open meeting of SCL. This suggestion was not adopted by any organization participating in the demonstrations." This argument is devious on two counts: First, "Operation Abolition" does not assert that "a directive was issued by the SCL telling students to laugh out loud at the committee." Investigation of the transcript of the film's dialogue will reveal that the announcer referred to "a student directive published just prior to the hearings on the front page of the * * * Daily Californian." The announcer then goes on to say, "The directive reads as follows: 'The SCL plans to picket the hearings today. It has issued a call for students to attend the rally and laugh out loud in the hearings when things get ridiculous.' "

"Operation Abolition" therefore reports accurately the fact that such a student directive was published in the student campus newspaper. Second, the rebuttal deals with a totally different issue than the actual assertion made by the film: It attempts to prove that the SCL organization did not officially adopt the suggestion made by a person in their meeting. While this may or may not be true, it does not change the fact that 20,000 students at the University of California read that published directive. Neither does it alter the fact that copies of this directive were widely distributed among the student demonstrators at the city hall on Thursday, the opening day of the hearings.

The technique used by "In Search of Truth" in the preceding paragraph is an excellent example of two deceitful procedures which are generally followed when it is necessary to oppose truth: (1) Set up a "straw man" by slightly misquoting the opponent. Then proceed to knock it down with gusto. If cleverly done, most readers will not notice the imposter of straw. (2) Use a device called by logicians the fallacy of irrelevant conclusion. Described algebraically, it runs like this: The dialog of "Operation Abolition" asserts proposition X. We, the bay area students for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, say emphatically that proposition X is not true. If we say it often enough and loudly enough, most people will accept the rebuttal without noticing that we are rebutting X' instead of X.

"In Search of Truth" clearly prevaricates on the matter of the white card passes issued by William Wheeler. The pamphlet asserts that "each of the white cards could admit as many as six people." This assertion is absolutely false. A great many of the cards admitted only one or two. Mr. Wheeler exercised his own judgment in the admissions. In one case, for example, he admitted 30 law students from the University of California. In another instance, a Roman Catholic group of 20 was permitted to enter as a body.

The authors can testify that each of the passes we received had been marked in ink to admit the bearer plus three. The charge made by Professor Searle of the University of California that some of the passes would admit as many as the bearer wished has so far been totally unsupported by proof.

"In Search of Truth" also contests the assertion of the film that a student grabbed Officer Ralph Schaumleffel's police club and struck him with it, thus precipitating the hosing and the subsequent police action of forcibly removing the demonstrators from the building. The refutation used by the pamphlet makes use of another out-of-context quotation, "On KQED–TV in San Francisco, Sheriff Matthew Carberry told the public the true version of the events: 'There was no act of physical aggression on the part of the students.' " This alleged quotation was picked up by Paul Jacobs (who was traveling in Russia at the time of the city hall riot) and inserted into his article, "A Movie With a Message," which was published in the November 24, 1960, issue of the Reporter magazine. On December 6, 1960, Sheriff Carberry issued the following statement concerning the above quote attributed to him by Mr. Jacobs: "I did not make that statement. I do not know the author of the article, Paul Jacobs, and have never spoken to him and have never been interviewed by him. * * * I did not make that statement." The KQED television program on which the sheriff was alleged to have made the controversial statement was "Bay Area Profile," moderated by Casper Weinburger, a San Francisco attorney. The title of this particular panel discussion was "Retrospective on a Riot." The panel included, among others, Sheriff Carberry, Prof. Henry Nash Smith, of the University of California, and Moderator Weinburger. A complete tape recording of the audio portion of this program confirms the fact that the quotation attributed to Sheriff Carberry is inaccurate and taken out of context.

The facts are that, in answer to a question put to him by Professor Smith as to whether there had been any violence by individuals other than the police prior to the turning on of the hoses, Carberry replied, "No acts of physical violence; acts of noise and disturbance which occasioned two courts closing their sessions on Thursday afternoon." At this point the sheriff was interrupted by Professor Smith. This portion of Carberry's answer was the basis of the quotation by Paul Jacobs in the Reporter and by the Bay Area Student Committee in the pamphlet "In Search of Truth." Notice that the sheriff's answer related to Thursday, when no arrests occurred, and there was no student violence. Notice also, that before the sheriff could talk about Friday, the day of the riot when violence did occur, he was interrupted by Professor Smith. It is this partial statement by Sheriff Carberry relating to Thursday only, which enemies of "Operation Abolition" have lifted out of context and applied to the events of Friday. This intellectual dishonesty becomes all the plainer when one notes that a minute later in the program, Sheriff Carberry finally gets to the subject of Friday's events by saying, "The incident of Friday which took place—as I am told because I was not there—was occasioned by an act of violence against a uniformed police officer." Again the moderator and the other panel members interrupted the sheriff and noticeably succeeded in changing the subject, but fortunately not before Carberry was able to show that his former statement about no student violence referred to the day before the violence took place. It is inconceivable that the sense of Sheriff Carberry's words could have been misrepresented so thoroughly by accident, when audio tape recordings of the entire program are available, especially in the light of Carberry's clear statement about the events of Friday.

"In Search of Truth" attempts to make much of "police brutality." But the San Francisco Chronicle, Saturday, May 14, 1960, in a lead article on page 1, reported that eight policemen and four students were injured. Congressman JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, of the 25th District, California, observed, "By the ratio of injuries it would appear that the so-called brutality was felt more by the police than the students." Furthermore, Dave Hope, a reporter, stated in an article on January 25, 1961, in the Oakland Tribune: "I was there. I was in the committee room, in the hallway, on the rotunda. I mingled with the demonstrators, watched the picket lines." Hope then went on to say, "Police were careful not to use excessive force. When two or three officers carry out one person, they're being gentle. The party never gets rough until it's man for man. So there was no chance for martyrdom, and this was disappointing. Martyrs must above all else be dignified. You can't be a martyr when soaking wet you're skidded unceremoniously down a flight of stairs on the part of your anatomy that should have been spanked more frequently in your childhood." "In Search of Truth" quotes New York Post correspondent Mel Wax as saying, "Never in 20 years as a reporter have I seen such brutality." But what does such a quotation prove? Without additional description of Mel Wax's 20 years of experience, such an argument is pointless. For all the reader of "In Search of Truth" knows, Mel Wax may have spent 20 years reporting weddings. With nothing positive to cite as evidence of "police brutality," the authors of the pamphlet, as well as Burton White, must depend on (1) quotations that cause the desired inference to be made by the reader and (2) quotations from leftwing reporters whose supposed eyewitness accounts are based largely upon their disposition to discredit the police and the HCUA rather than upon what they actually saw.

Contrary to charges made by "In Search of Truth," the House Committee on Un-American Activities did not delete scenes of police violence against the students. That the KPIX–TV newsreels contain no scenes of police clubbings has already been proven. As already mentioned, the original KRON–TV footage was viewed by about 30 individuals on January 26, 1961. One of those viewers was Frederick H. Gere, college minister at the First Baptist Church of San Jose. The authors have a letter from him dated February 8, 1961, in which he discusses his conclusions after seeing the KRON films as follows: "It can be said without fear of contradiction that the scenes of 'Operation Abolition' with their sound tracks are an accurate and faithful condensation of the thousands of newsreel footage which was shot by the TV photographers." In discussing scenes of violence, Mr. Gere writes, "As for the police, they skidded many students down the wet staircase and some people may call this violence. In the only scene of real violence the police have picked up a student by the hands and feet to carry him out the door; the student is seen struggling to get loose and then a third policeman whacked him on the head with a billy club * * * which ended the student's resistance. The crucial observation which needs to be made is that this last scene and the others of police action were all included in 'Operation Abolition.' Nothing of significance has been deleted. The film is a faithful portrayal of the newsreels. It is a fair question to ask: If it is true that a justice in an upstairs courtroom had placed the police under orders to evict the student noisemakers, how else could the police have carried out their orders with any less violence?"

Poor scholarship on the part of the film's opponents is also evidenced by their repeated attacks based on the fact that several scenes in the movie are out of strict sequence. It seems not to have occurred to these critics that large sections of "Operation Abolition" are topically, not sequentially arranged. The truth is that the movie errs at only three points. Two of these were pointed out by Mr. Wheeler on the Goodwin Knight Show and have already been mentioned. The third is the statement by the announcer that accompanies the scene of Harry Bridges being escorted from the city hall "moments before the rioting broke out," whereas actually this occurred shortly after the riot was over. However, it should be noted in passing that Harry Bridges did enter the city hall and found a sizable crowd still within, including many students. He immediately began to harangue the crowd, and was then removed from the building by police who feared the starting of another riot.

On the basis of the evidence presently available to the authors, it would appear that the film commentary oversimplifies the circumstances surrounding the assault on the policeman, Officer Ralph Schaumleffel. It would be inappropriate at this time to deal in detail with the material we have uncovered. This should properly be left to the court which is scheduled to try the case against the student Robert Meisenbach, who is charged with assault with a deadly weapon. It is sufficient here to note two important points: (1) The film commentary describing the assault on Schaumleffel is based on information given to Chief of Police Thomas Cahill by his men who were on the scene. He said, "I was given to understand by my men who were present that the fire hoses were brought out following the assault on the police officer when the crowd refused to disperse and to move."

The testimony of Sheriff Carberry is similar. Hence the film commentary followed the available police testimony. (2) That an assault on Schaumleffel took place can and will be established by one or more eyewitnesses. Whether the assault took place behind or in front of the barricade, before the first warning squirt of water or afterward, is of very little importance. The film is essentially accurate in describing the action of the assault, and if it errs in minor details of this action, responsibility for these inconsequential errors rests with the San Francisco police officers who were present and made the initial description to Chief Cahill and Sheriff Carberry. Doubtless the details of the incident will be examined closely when the trial of Heisenbach is held. At the moment of writing the trial is expected to begin in a matter of a few weeks.

Sixty-two of the persons arrested during the riots were arraigned on May 18, 1960. Many local attorneys began to prepare for the trial. On the University of California campus, a faculty advisory committee was set up and money-raising campaigns were planned to obtain the sum of money needed to finance what was expected to be one of the largest mass trials ever to go through the courts of the United States. But on Wednesday, June 1st, Judge Albert Axelrod dismissed the charges against all but one after the defendants agreed not to file civil suits against the city. "In Search of Truth," in attempting to whitewash the dismissed defendants, again quotes out-of-context from Judge Axelrod's dismissal statement, as follows: "The defendants for the most part are clean-cut American college students * * *. I am convinced that they are not engaged in subversive activities nor in spreading subversive propaganda." During the next few months, Judge Axelrod was deluged with letters and phone calls from individuals who had seen only this out-of-context quotation, and who therefore thought that the Judge had befriended Communists.

On December 25, 1960, Judge Axelrod released a statement to the press clarifying his dismissal action. The article in the San Francisco Examiner said, "The Judge deplored what he called a false impression that he condoned the actions of 62 persons arrested during the riot when he dismissed charges against them for practical reasons. He said this impression has been created by quoting a single sentence from his dismissal decision and not using the more forceful words which followed that sentence. The sentence, taken out of context, the Judge explained, was 'I am convinced that they are not engaged in subversive activities, nor in spreading subversive propaganda.' Then, he noted, his dismissal continued: 'However, they chose the wrong means to accomplish their purpose and let themselves become victims of those who profit by creating unrest, riots, and the type of conduct which is outlawed by the penal code sections I have quoted.' Judge Axelrod also called attention to that part of his decision in which he said he felt the students had been punished and added: 'A protracted mass trial with 62 defendants and 16 attorneys would not only be costly from a monetary sense, but would play directly into the hands of those who create unrest and do everything in their power to upset our democratic processes and way of life.'"

Although the Judge's dismissal statement concluded that the defendants were guilty as charged, and although they were dismissed only for practical reasons, the majority of the defendants showed no sign of repentance. Immediately after dismissal of their cases, 55 of the defendants issued a statement containing the following words: "We appreciate Judge Axelrod's courage which has insured the triumph of justice and good sense. The defendants have been vindicated. Encouraged by the court's action, we shall continue our opposition to the House Committee on Un-American Activities. It is now doubly clear that public protests against it are in accord with American justice * * *. We acted as citizens aware of our duty * * *. Nobody incited us, nobody misguided us * * *. We shall continue our opposition to the committee * * *. From our efforts to abolish the committee, we shall not be moved."

The thought processes used by the students to conclude that their actions were those of responsible citizens are amazing indeed. Such thinking on the part of students ought to make the citizens of California and the Nation as a whole desirous of discovering whether university and college classrooms are teaching good old fashioned American citizenship.

The foregoing examples of dishonest reporting culled from The Reporter and "In Search of Truth" are only a few of those that could be exposed if space permitted. The Christian Century periodical and newspapers such as the Washington Post are examples of other publications that have aided in the dissemination of such lies. Even the National Council of Churches, spurred on by the work of Prof. John Searle and Methodist minister Robert Moon, has adopted resolutions based on these outright fabrications. It is the conviction of the authors that the avalanche of falsehoods that has descended on the HCUA and the movie has had its origin in the innermost councils of the Communist Party. The tragedy is that Communist front organizations can so successfully use well-meaning, liberal-minded, patriotic Americans as their standard-bearers to carry on the ominous work of the Communist Party.

The Communist Party has reserved its most potent venom, however, for the assertion in the movie that the student demonstrations and the riot had been planned and executed by the Communist apparatus. It is vital to the Communist program for the

nonviolent conquest of America that the American people remain unaware of the ability of Communist agents to recruit citizens to carry out the program desired by the Kremlin. But the fact that the Communist Party was responsible for the San Francisco City Hall disorders and demonstrations is proven by an impressive array of evidence:

1. The testimony of the FBI and its director, J. Edgar Hoover. In the document called "Communist Target—Youth," Hoover outlines in detail the manner in which the Communist Party planned the city hall activity and riot. Mr. Hoover's integrity has never been successfuly impeached, although one of the current principal aims of the Communist Party is to discredit him along with the FBI.

2. The sworn testimony of San Francisco Police Chief Thomas Cahill, given before the HCUA on Saturday, May 14, 1960. He testified that the group of students which was disorderly in the hallway outside the hearing room "was infiltrated with individuals, who, in some instances, were older than the average, and who agitated it." He added that some of these agitators were individuals who had been hostile witnesses before the HCUA. (It should be understood that the hostile witnesses were individuals subpoenaed by the HCUA for the May 1960 hearings. Their affiliation with the Communist Party was shown by considerable evidence and, in most cases, by informants.)

3. The sworn testimony of Police Inspector Michael J. Maguire, also given before the HCUA on Saturday, May 14, 1960. Mr. Arens, acting as interrogator, asked him, "Did you * * * observe the activities among the young people * * * assembled here in the hall, by certain people who were known by you * * * to be members of the Communist Party?" Mr. Maguire answered, "Yes, sir." Inspector Maguire then went on to identify Archie Brown and Merle Brodsky as two of the Communists he observed engaging in agitational activities among the students in the hall.

4. The sworn testimony of Sheriff Matthew Carberry before the HCUA, also on May 14. Carberry testified that there were some individuals seen by him who "refused to accept any element of order, and deliberately excited the persons who were there."

5. Eyewitnesses to Communist activity on the local college campuses arranging demonstrations against the HCUA. One of these is Jerry Nims, who was quite active in student campus political activity on the San Francisco State campus during 1960. He was on the board of control and the board of directors. He reports the following events: "On May 5, 1960, in Tub 2 (a campus snack bar), from 4 to 6 p.m., a meeting was held organizing actions against the HCUA. Leading this meeting was Douglas Wachter, a person who has been identified as a member of the Communist Party and one who is trained in agitation at the student level. His father, Saul Wachter, has also been identified as a hard-core member of the Communist Party. At this meeting, demonstrations were planned and methods were chosen which would rally and arouse students against the HCUA. Also at this meeting, it was announced that the next day at the noon hour, material attacking the HCUA could be obtained at the office of Lacey Spake, teaching assistant. It was also stated that this literature was being produced on a San Francisco State machine using college paper and other facilities. This propaganda was distributed during the next few days in some of the college classrooms."

On Monday, May 9, 1960, on the commons from noon to 1 p.m., a rally was held by the Social Work Club. This rally again attacked the HCUA and tried to stir up student resentment against the coming hearings in San Francisco City Hall. Speaking at this rally was Harry Loman, head of the American Friends Service Committee on Legislation, Dr. Robert Hall, a professor at San Francisco State College, and Joan Keller, daughter of Vernon Bown (Bown was identified as a Communist Party member by the HCUA until his recent expulsion from the party for a breach of party discipline). Joan Keller spoke and attacked the HCUA using material from a pamphlet put out by an identified Communist-front organization, the Citizen's Committee To Preserve American Freedoms (CCPAF), which is headed up by Frank Wilkinson. She recited this pamphlet almost word for word, and implored students to attend a noon rally in Union Square on Thursday, May 12, to hear speeches attacking the HCUA. Communist-front literature was passed out feverishly. The People's World was also passed out at a previous human rights rally on Wednesday, March 30, by Eugene Spake, student brother of Lacey Spake who is one of the principal agitators against the HCUA. Additional CCPAF literature was circulated in the political science building by a person who at that time was a high official in the campus model United Nations. Jerry Nims states that it is his personal conviction that there exists at San Francisco State College a Communist Party cell that is aided and abetted by a few teachers.

Jerry Nims also has knowledge of a student dean at San Francisco State College who by chance attended a certain meeting held in a home about three blocks from campus. The dean stated that it had all the characteristics of a Communist cell meeting. Its chairman was Rebecca Jenkins, whose father is alleged to have Communist Party connections. This same girl is on the executive committee of the Bay Area Students for the Abolition of the HCUA, the local group responsible for the widespread circulation of "In Search of Truth." She was also one of those arrested at city hall. The dean observed that although the meeting was ostensibly for the purpose of individuals getting acquainted for the first time, everyone at the meeting addressed everyone else by first names without prior introduction. When a bearded individual from the North Beach Area (a beatnik hangout) stood up and began attacking Charles de Gaulle as a Fascist and warmonger, the dean left hurriedly, considerably shaken at what he had just witnessed.

6. The public statement of Judge Axelrod: In the San Francisco Examiner newspaper article of December 25, 1960, referred to previously, Judge Albert Axelrod said he very definitely agrees with FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover that the city hall riot and mob demonstrations in May were instigated by Communist elements.

7. The public statement of George Christopher, mayor of San Francisco: To clarify his position, which had been distorted in some quarters, Mayor Christopher made the following statement in his office on January 18, 1961: "Known Communists—and I repeat this emphatically—known Communists were in the lead of this demonstration. The students were dupes who joined some of these causers of agitation believing it is an innocent and harmless expression of civil liberties not realizing that while they are doing this they are at the same time violating every precept of the liberties they profess to cherish."

The preceding data are only a sample of that which can be amassed to back up the charge made by the film "Operation Abolition" that the Communist Party was responsible for the demonstrations and violence against the HCUA and the San Francisco police.

J. Edgar Hoover has pointed out repeatedly that the Communist program of external encirclement and internal demoralization is proceeding at a frightening pace. Mr. Hoover has summed up the Communist program succinctly when he wrote the following words in an open letter to American college students: "You, the college student, whether or not you realize it, are the rich earth which the Communist conspirator hopes to till. Your mind is the soil in which he hopes to implant alien seed. Your subsequent acts are the products whose growth he strives to direct. The harvest which he seeks is the destruction of our democratic processes of government."

San Francisco's Black Friday can have a beneficial result after all, if college students, and indeed, all Americans, see in it a demonstration of what the Communist Party can accomplish in those individuals who have little or no understanding in depth of the specific purpose and methods of communism. Action against communism, if divorced from a precise understanding of communism, is largely futile. On specific knowledge, and on that alone, can an edifice of survival be built, so that freedom shall not perish from the earth. To that cause, let each of us rededicate himself.

THE HONORABLE JACOB JAVITS AND THE HONORABLE KENNETH KEATING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to call to the attention of the House the fact that today, May 18, is the birthday of our two distinguished Senators from New York, JACOB JAVITS and KENNETH KEATING. I believe that it is a unique situation—and a most significant one—that both Senators from the same State will cut a birthday cake on the same day.

We in New York are intensely proud of our two Senators both of whom were former Members of this House. Their able representation of the people of the Empire State has earned them a richly merited acclaim.

I am proud to count JACK and KEN among my good friends—as I am sure most Members of this House are also—and I know they join me in extending heartiest congratulations and warmest best wishes to them on this their double-header birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that every Member of the House shares the warm feeling, high regard, and deep affection for both of these fine gentlemen and great legislators, and joins in this sincere hope for many, many happy returns of this significant day.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include the testimony of Dr. Muhlbach.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there has been much talk about economic growth with little practical advice presented to help in promoting it.

Dr. Walter Muhlbach today, testifying before the Ways and Means Committtee,

on the Ikard-Curtis seed corn tax proposal. This testimony needs wide dissemination. It is imperative that we understand better the economics behind growth if we are to maintain it.

Here is Dr. Muhlbach's testimony:

STATEMENT OF WALTER F. MUHLBACH, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY, BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MAY 18, 1961

I am Walter F. Muhlbach, associate professor of business finance and management in the School of Business Administration of the American University. I am here today, however, representing the Small Business Tax Conference, which is a group of approximately 100 national trade associations representing small and medium size manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and service organizations. This group has endorsed the principles contained in the Ikard-Curtis bills (H.R. 2 and H.R. 2003). They are pleased that the President, in his recent message, recognized the importance of retained earnings for growth.

In retaining my services, the Small Business Tax conference imposed no conditions. I was given free rein in my investigation. No prior commitments were asked or given. I was asked, simply, to investigate, study, and reach an independent conclusion on the question of the significance of small business in the American economy, the financial status, and most pressing financial problem of the small and medium size business community, with special reference to the income tax, to analyze the several proposed means, including the President's proposal, by which this financial problem might be ameliorated, and the probable effect of such amelioration on the economy and on the Federal revenue.

I should like to add, as a further qualification, that in addition to 9 years of research and teaching in schools of business administration, I have had 30 years of experience in small and medium size businesses, in both management and as a consultant. Yet I am not urging consideration of the financial and growth problem of this large and important segment of the business community on the basis of an interest in small business as such. Rather, I am greatly interested in and deeply concerned for the future and improvement of the competitive free enterprise system and its continuing contribution to the national welfare.

In preparation for this hearing I have viewed the record of hearings and reports of the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate, the staff report to the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives, the Federal Reserve System report to the Committees on Banking and Currency and the Select Committees and the hearings before your Committee on Ways and Means, running from 1955 through 1960.

These hearings and studies on the status and financial problems of the smaller and medium size business units, with special reference to the income tax, have included studies and testimony of hundreds of economists, businessmen, accountants, attorneys and trade association executives who have appeared before this and other committees. Their almost unanimous testimony is now recorded in thousands of pages of records and reports. The findings of the committee have indicated a complete awareness of the situation and the committee has been favorably inclined to positive action consistent with the need for Federal revenue.

We can summarize the general findings and conclusions with some brevity, as follows:

ON THE MATTER OF NATIONAL POLICY

Your chairman, Mr. MILLS, presiding at the session of the Subcommittee on Tax Policy on December 14, 1955, quite succinctly stated that in considering the problems of taxation of small and new businesses, there appeared to be virtually unanimous agreement that a prime objective of public policy in a free enterprise economy is to strengthen as best we can the competitive position of such business. Dr. John Lintner of Harvard University added, "The kind of small business I think many of us are particularly interested in is the small business that has the vigor and the potentiality for growth to offer an effective challenge to the larger corporation." Possibly, in recognition of this view, the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate stated in 1959 that the national policy with respect to small business was not directed solely to the interests of small business for their sake alone but rather that it is the stated national policy "that the Government should aid, counsel, assist, and protect, insofar as possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free enterprise." It is on this basis, primarily, that we welcome consideration of the effect of the income tax on the smaller and medium size businesses.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN THE ECONOMY

An indication of the significance of smaller and medium size firms may be seen in the reports of the Treasury, "Statistics of Income, 1957–58". Approximately 85 percent of all businesses operate as sole proprietorships or partnerships. These are predominately smaller business organizations. Reported receipts (sales) of these units amounted to $228,786 million, about 24 percent of the total national sales. Adding business receipts of the smaller corporations, i.e., those with assets of less than $1 million, we get a total of $432,542 million, or 45.8 percent of the total national sales. These smaller corporations alone reported net income of $4,232 million. Unfortunately, we do not have a satisfactory statement of the taxable income of the unincorporated segment.

It may be significant, too, that these smaller and medium size companies can continue to operate notwithstanding the relative lower net profit per dollar of sales as shown by the following table taken from the Treasury's report, to the effect that corporations with assets below $1 million earned a profit, after taxes, of less than 2 percent on sales, whereas corporations with assets in excess of $250 million earned an average of 6.97 percent on sales, after taxes:

Profits after taxes—As a percent of gross income

After tax profits as a percent of gross income—

Corporations with assets of less than:	Percent
$50,000	0.41
$100,000	0.97
$250,000	1.41
$500,000	1.53
$1,000,000	1.94
$2,500,000	2.28
$5,000,000	2.80
$10,000,000	3.13
$25,000,000	4.04
$50,000,000	4.48
$100,000,000	5.23
$250,000,000	4.74
Over $250,000,000	6.97

Source: Treasury Department, "Statistics of Income, 1956–57: Corporation Tax Returns."

THE IMPORTANCE OF GROWTH

One of the chief characteristics of a free enterprise system is its contribution to the growth of the economy through its encouragement of initiative, innovation, and progress. The present administration has frequently referred to the comparative industrial growth lag of the United States and has emphasized the urgent necessity for a step-up in our rate of growth.

Economic growth is the fountainhead of our individual welfare. Our military capability, our scientific advances in the area of nuclear development, and our progress in conquering the practical problems of space exploration are directly dependent upon our economic capacity and its rate of growth.

Regardless of the accuracy of the claimed rate of growth in Russia, we simply cannot afford to continue any practice which seriously tends to limit or reduce our growth rate. The evidence is clear that the effect of our present tax system is just that, most effectively hampering the growth of millions of our smaller and medium size business units.

Here is an interesting statistic. According to the Department of Commerce "Historical Statistics of the United States: A Statistical Abstract Supplement to 1957" and the "Statistical Abstract, 1960," in the 10 years, 1949–59, over 1,400,000 new retail businesses were started—80 percent of the number in operation at the beginning of that decade. But during that same period nearly 1,300,000 such businesses (not necessarily only the newly organized firms) went out of existence, for a net gain of about 10 percent or an average of only 1 percent per year: An 87-percent effort, a 10-percent result. This is not to say that this high death rate was necessarily a result of the income tax; it simply suggests the magnitude of the risk involved in starting or investing in a new business—a 1–to–8 risk—and one of the reasons small businesses have such extreme difficulty attracting loan or equity capital. It also suggests the tremendous urge of so many American citizens to accept the challenge, to strive, against great odds, to achieve the American dream of economic independence.

In the hearing of the Subcommittee on Tax Policy, referred to above, Chairman MILLS observed that "the present tax structure is a greater deterrent to growth in new and small businesses than in older businesses of long duration and I cannot avoid that conclusion when I consider the fact that the older businesses have had opportunities for growth and accumulations during the periods when the tax rate on corporations was lower than it is today." Of course, this also applies to unincorporated business.

Dr. Dexter Keezer, economist for the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., in his appearance before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, observed that the existing tax structure was very definitely preventing the accumulation of capital for expansion and growth of smaller companies. This was corroborated by the exhaustive study made by Drs. Butters and Lintner, of Harvard University, on the "Effect of Taxes on Concentration"[1] which Dr. Lintner presented for inclusion in the record of the session. In this definitive investigation it was observed that "new firms are needed to replace existing business units that fall behind or drop out of the competitive race * * * to develop new ideas, techniques, and products that can potentially offer effective competition to established firms." And in considering the need for increased investment in these smaller firms, this study noted such "investments are of the greatest social consequence." They are "the investments that are particularly significant from the viewpoint of a dynamic competitive structure—i.e., from the standpoint of both industrial concentration and competitive behavior."

---

[1] Hearing before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Dec. 14, 1955, pp. 567–581, 84th Cong., 1st sess.

Yet the volume of business being done by these smaller and medium-size firms, their service to the Nation, has been declining in relative terms. Referring again to the Department of Commerce report, quoted above, we note that while there has been an increase of 53 percent in the dollar volume of retail sales in the 10 years, 1949–50, single-unit organizations' percentage of total dropped from 70.4 to 66.3. In terms of growth we see:

Percentage increase in retail sales, 1948–58, by size of business units

	Percent
Single-unit firms, increased sales volume	44.2
2-to-10-unit firms, increased sales volume	57.5
11-to-50-unit firms, increased sales volume	89.2
51-and-over-unit firms, increased sales volume	81.4

Source: Department of Commerce "Historical Statistics of the United States, Colonial Times to 1957: A Statistical Abstract" and "Statistical Abstract, 1960."

Growth requires additional investment. The rate of growth is very largely a function of the increase in capital employed. The source of increased capital is limited to credit, equity, or retained earnings. The evidence and testimony is practically unanimous that the smaller the business the greater the difficulty of attracting either loan or equity capital. The efforts by Congress to alleviate this all too obvious difficulty through the organization and operation of the Small Business Administration is a recognition but not a solution of the difficulty; the continuation of the difficulty on such a nationwide scale is indicative of its seriousness and suggests the reason for it: the risk is far too great to appeal to traditional or normal sources of loan or equity capital, and the size of the typical unit prohibits the flotation of securities. The owner's attitude can be readily understood when after investing his entire savings and having devoted his entire energies to the creation of an enterprise, he is required to give up a large part of his equity to a supplier of additional needed funds, in those relatively few instances in which speculative capital may be available. The practical impossibility of the smaller unit tapping the capital market has been attested to by both the hundreds of businessmen on the basis of their personal experiences and the economists who have investigated the problem.

All businesses are dependent more upon retained earnings for growth than upon other sources of capital. The Department of Commerce "Survey of Current Business" for October 1954 and September 1956 provides a forceful illustration. During the years 1946–56 increased investment funds for all corporations were secured as follows (average per year):

Average annual source of funds—1946–56

	Billion
Loans or credit (banks and trade), 23.5 percent of total	$8.29
Security issuance (net), 17.7 percent of total	6.37
Retained earnings, including depletion and depreciation, 58.3 percent of total	20.57
Other	.04
Total	35.27

Source: Based on data from "Survey of Current Business," October 1954 and September 1956, Department of Commerce.

Of the item "Retained earnings, depletion, and depreciation," more than half, or 10.7 billion, was composed of depreciation allowances. As the Butters and Lintner Harvard study noted, the older and larger firms already have larger investments in depreciable assets, whereas "the vigorously growing smaller companies * * * typically cannot rely to an equivalent degree on funds becoming available in the form of depreciation and other reserves. They must depend primarily on retained earnings and outside capital for funds with which to purchase new assets and to finance the introduction of new processes and techniques." And this investigation further reported that "the evidence that retained earnings are a much more important source of funds to finance expansion for smaller than for larger companies" is largely because "smaller companies generally have much less access to outside capital than larger companies." The report ended by observing that taxes may be 10 times as great a deterrent to growth of smaller firms as of larger firms.

It has been emphasized frequently that many of the smaller and medium size companies in the distributive and service trades are not so dependent upon so-called depreciable assets, i.e., plant and equipment, as are manufacturing companies. On the whole, these smaller units are more often hampered by shortages of working capital and their growth is limited to their retained earnings.

What is very frequently not appreciated is that as the dollar volume of business grows, whether as a result of more physical units of product produced and sold or as a result of inflation, the needed dollars of working capital must increase more or less in proportion. It is a commonplace in the field of business financial management that bankruptcy is often invited by attempting to do a larger volume of business than the working capital available can finance.

A very illustrative example of this fact came to our attention recently. A medium size corporation signed a contract to make 12 monthly shipments of a material valued at approximately $200,000 each. The monthly out-of-pocket expense of manufacturing this product was about $175,000 and the production time was about 30 days. Since terms of sale were 30 days net, the company found it necessary to secure about $350,000 additional working capital for materials, supplies, and wages for 2 months since payment for the first month's shipment could not be expected until the third month. The contract had required the purchase of a new machine costing in the neighborhood of $50,000. Of the $400,000 increased investment needed, only $50,000 was for depreciable assets; the $350,000 was invested in increased inventory and accounts receivable.

The important thing to remember is that an increase in the investment in depreciable assets is ineffective unless accompanied by sufficient funds to finance the operation of the plant and the distribution of the product. One of the efficiencies of our economic system is the division of functions which permits the production unit to concentrate on this activity and calls upon the distributive organization for the efficient distribution of the product. In relieving itself of the distribution function, the production unit conserves its own working capital by requiring the distribution unit to provide working capital for the distribution function.

THE NEED FOR INCREASED FEDERAL REVENUE

This committee, in 1958, reported that it would like to have provided needed tax relief for small and medium size businesses by permitting retention of earnings for investment in increased inventories and depreciable property but this relief could not be approved at that time because of the Federal budgetary requirements. These requirements are greater today than they were 3 years ago. Futhermore, in addition to the obvious requirement for increasing expenditures for military preparedness and scientific research, there is a constantly increasing demand for the enlargement of the area of Federal welfare activity. Demands for Federal services and assistance to many civilian areas of modern life have mushroomed in the past 30 years and appear to be growing at an accelerated rate. The increased emphasis upon a greater allocation of national resources to the so-called public sector will call for constantly more revenue.

Whence comes this revenue? And how can it be increased? There is only one source—the operation of the economic mechanism whether privately or publicly owned and operated. No responsible public individual has yet dared to advocate frankly abandonment of our historic reliance upon the free enterprise system. Throughout our national history, our miraculous industrial growth has been a direct result of the profit incentive: the plowing back into the economy of large portions of the annual earnings from business operations. For 150 years our tax policy—low rates—did not discourage growth. Isn't it rather obvious that a taxing policy which now seriously interferes with this plowback practice tends to retard the rate of growth—the logical source of increased Federal revenue?

A SHORTSIGHTED VIEW

Notwithstanding the weight of evidence and the inclination of this committee, the Treasury Department argued that the then budgetary requirements did not permit any reduction in the tax take. In the view of the Treasury we could not afford to return to the plowback percentages of the previous century. The need for Federal liquidity, to meet current and known future obligations, is a powerful argument. But it was not, and is not, now completely realistic in that it assumes a revenue loss more or less in proportion to the relief granted. It fails to consider the results of that relief. It is entirely possible, and in the well considered judgment of many, probable that there need be no reduction in revenue resulting from tax relief to encourage more rapid economic growth, even during the immediately following period.

In his message to the Congress the President also appears to believe that his recommendation will result in at least a temporary reduction in revenue and hopes to offset this contemplated loss by closing so-called loopholes. Real loopholes, in the sense of unjustified favoritisms, should, of course, be closed. But if tax relief to increase economic growth will not result in reduced tax take, its consideration should not be dependent upon action on the loophole front. It is our belief that this view of the effect on revenue of tax relief to encourage and insure growth, stems from an inadequate appreciation of the effects of the proposed action. Let us consider this effect in realistic terms.

It is inconceivable that business management will increase its investment in depreciable assets solely because a relatively small tax credit is available. The increased investment will be made when, in the opinion of management, it will be both possible and profitable to do so—that it will either reduce costs or increase ability to supply the market, or both. To the extent additional investment is encouraged, additional orders will be placed with suppliers who, in turn, will increase their activity. This will result in increased purchases of materials, supplies, increased employment, increased payrolls, increased profits and increased taxable income, all down the line. It will also mean an increased need for working capital, for every financial manager knows that a larger volume of business requires a larger amount of funds for investment in inventories, trade credit or accounts receivable, ready cash for wages, and other current expenses. There should be little lag, if any, in this reaction. Much of it may, in fact, be anticipatory.

For instance, if you, as a machine-tool manufacturer, begin to receive larger orders from your customers, or new customers, and

begin to sense an upturn in business, you must be prepared with larger stocks of your materials and a larger work force. You immediately place orders for more stock, call in your mechanics who have been laid off, or hire more men, increasing your payroll, increasing income-tax withholding, which is remitted fairly promptly to the Revenue Service. Your profits increase and so, consequently, do your income-tax payments. In the meantime, the suppliers from whom you are ordering your materials likewise expand their activity in much the same manner and with a similar effect upon payments into the Treasury. At the same time, your employees, with more money in their pay envelopes, in addition to having had larger income-tax withholdings, are buying more gas, tires, telephone and transportation service, and the many other items on which an excise is levied. Profits, no more than personal income, are not made on December 31—they are generated throughout the year, as income exceeds costs of operation. The Treasury does not await the year end; increased business activity and income, both personal and corporate, begins to show up in Federal revenue within a matter of months. Instead of a reduction in Federal revenue, it is conceivable there may be an actual, almost immediate, increase.

AN ADDITIONAL BENEFIT

There is another value to the Treasury evidently not considered in connection with the tax-relief proposal. Not only will the stepped-up activity produce almost immediate greater Federal income, but, to the extent it reduces the demand on the Federal budget for expenditures such as for unemployment compensation, public assistance of several types, aid to depressed areas, etc., the need for revenue may be reduced. But this happy result can be anticipated only if the program is sufficiently broad to include all business units capable of growth, the smaller and medium as well as the larger companies, the distribution industry as well as the producing industry.

The President's proposal will have but slight effect on the growth and increased profitability of many of the smaller and medium size firms not so dependent upon depreciable assets.

Large companies, particularly those engaged in manufacturing, so generally and heavily dependent upon plant and equipment, may find it desirable to take advantage of the opportunity afforded to increase their investment in depreciable assets. Limiting the tax credit to excess investment in depreciable assets will have relatively little interest or value to a large number of the smaller and medium size organizations. If they are to expand their activity it will be by means of greater promotional effort, modernization and enlargement of effort and manpower or employment rather than of plant and equipment alone. Greater activity will require larger funds devoted to increased investment in larger and more diversified inventories and increased extension of credit to their customers, i.e., larger accounts receivable. It has been the inability of the smaller businesses to retain sufficient amounts of past earnings for the enlargement of working capital that has had such a growth inhibiting effect in the past.

A MISCONCEPTION

Evidently a popular economic misconception has inadvertently been accepted by the President, as well as the Treasury. We all know, of course, that the process of physical production is not the only creator of value. Distribution and service are as productive of economic value as is manufacturing. As the president of one of our largest manufacturing companies now operating at about 50 percent of capacity was quoted recently: "There is nothing wrong with this company that an increase in sales won't correct." In a number of industries present capacity is currently and considerably in excess of demand. Increased promotional effort, increased ability of the distributive trades to move the potential output of the manufacturing plants, as well as lower costs and prices, are as essential as increased capacity, if not more so.

A COMPLEMENTARY CONTRIBUTION

The distributive and service businesses are in a position to aid the producing companies in fulfilling the purposes of the tax relief program proposed by the administration. To some extent, at least, the current volume of unemployment has resulted from the effort to reduce costs or increase productivity through increased mechanization, automation, or technological improvements in industry. The shift from a blue-collar to a white-collar work force has been noted. Increased growth in the distributive and service trades tends to absorb the labor released from manufacturing.

The Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, February 1961, reports the extent to which this has been going on in the recent past in spite of the handicap to growth of these generally smaller companies. The report indicates that the total number employed in manufacturing, mining, and contract construction increased from 18,189,000 in 1950 to 19,713,000 in 1960—an increase of 7.7 percent. But the number employed in wholesale, retail, and service trades increased 24.1 percent from 14,722,000 in 1950 to 18,280,000 in 1960. Thus to the degree the smaller businesses are permitted to expand and take up the unemployment created by the increased automation and production efficiency of the larger plant, they complete the beneficial effect of the relief granted the larger company. But unless and until the distributive and service trades are permitted to retain a larger portion of their earnings for expansion, they cannot enlarge on this contribution.

The President and the Treasury have both made a valuable contribution in their endorsement of the principle of encouraging growth through a tax credit based on increased investment. They have done so even while anticipating a reduction in revenue. We have demonstrated by illustration the probability of no immediate decreased revenue and a subsequent increased revenue in the near future. We have indicated the necessity for a recognition that for a great many businesses an increase in depreciable assets, alone, will not achieve maximum growth. An increase in investment in working capital, as well as in fixed assets, measured by the amount of retained earnings invested in the aggregate of depreciable assets, inventories, and accounts receivable will be far more realistic, a more equitable and a more effective means of achieving greater growth, a greater tax base and a larger Federal revenue.

We urge this not as a subsidy to smaller and medium size businesses, nor on the basis of a sentimental desire to help a presumed weaker group, but rather to right a wrong, to remove an evil created by the present tax system, and to help preserve, protect, and advance the national welfare through the competitive free enterprise system.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH OFFENSES

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege today to introduce a bill—H.R. 7178—to provide Federal assistance and leadership in the fight against juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. This bill is the legislation recommended by the President in his recent letter to the Speaker. It provides for a 5-year program of grants in three areas: demonstration and evaluation projects, the training of personnel, and technical assistance to State and local governments, and other public and private agencies working in this field.

The President's letter of May 11 sets forth the context of this problem and the ultimate objective of those who are supporting this legislation in the following words:

> By means of the proposed legislation, the Federal Government will be able to provide assistance to those dedicated persons in local communities throughout the Nation who are striving in many ways to create the social conditions that will insure the growth of a skilled and resourceful population of young men and women who are firm in character and committed to the development of a democratic way of life.

The President's letter sums up, in masterful fashion, the case for Federal leadership in the struggle against juvenile delinquency and youth offenses. This sickness in our social system has been a matter of concern for many people for a long time. Hearings on juvenile delinquency problems in general, and on specific legislation have been held on many occasions, in more than one recent session of the Congress, by the House Committee on Education and Labor, and by subcommittees of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the Judiciary Committee of the other body. All of these hearings and studies have tended to reinforce a number of conclusions, none of which are cause for complacency. These hearings have shown that juvenile delinquency and youth crime are not restricted to a few cities, or even to city environments in general. They show further that juvenile delinquency is not neatly tied in with one or two special problems. The hearings show conclusively that juvenile delinquency and youth offenses are not a phenomenon of one or two racial or religious or economic groups—that, instead, they permeate our society, and constitute a growing problem. The cost of juvenile delinquency and youth crime is great in simple dollars-and-cents terms, but in terms of the true social costs—the talents warped into destructiveness, the youthful potential for good twisted into antisocial channels—the cost to each of us is staggering.

The bill introduced today differs in one major and significant respect from the legislation which the House, and the other body, have considered in times past. In previous bills, the focus has been upon juvenile delinquency alone. In the present bill, at the President's request, the scope of the legislation has been broadened to include both the juvenile delinquent and the youthful offender. Juvenile delinquents, as that term is used here, are young people of a

particular age bracket, who have committed essentially minor crimes or antisocial behavior. Youth offenders may be young men and women somewhat past the chronological age of the juvenile delinquent, or juveniles who have committed serious crimes. The present bill seeks to deal with both problems—if, indeed, it is realistic to look upon them as distinct problems, and not as simply two aspects of the same basic social evil.

As in so many areas, the President has here offered leadership, not in eloquent words alone, but in deeds as well. At the same time that he wrote to the Speaker, submitting the proposed legislation, he issued an Executive order, directing the Attorney General, and the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, to coordinate their efforts in the development of Federal leadership in this field.

The proposed bill and the Executive order, Mr. Speaker, do not envisage a broad scale Federal program working directly in the area of combating specific acts of delinquency and crime. This struggle must be, by its very nature, a primary concern of the State and local authorities. But the bill and the Executive order do provide that Federal assistance shall be available to local government agencies and to private groups, to help them find out what programs are working, to help them find and train the personnel so badly needed, and to help them carry out existing programs and develop new ones in this field. The estimated expenditure involved is $10 million per year for each of 5 years. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is a tiny investment, indeed, in the future of the youth of our Nation.

The President's leadership in this field has once again demonstrated his deep faith in the young people of this country—to whom we will soon bequeath the burdens of maintaining a free society. If we examine the President's program for youth, I think this will become even more obvious. First, we have his broad program of aid for the elementary and secondary schools and for higher education—to improve the opportunities for young people to gain an adequate education, and make the fullest possible contribution to society. Secondly, the Peace Corps program demonstrates the President's faith in the willingness of our young people to contribute to their country, and their ability to do so. The overwhelming response among our young people to the Peace Corps proposal has been impressive confirmation of the President's faith. Finally, we have this third, and equally important, aspect of the total program of new frontiers for youth—legislation to help us reclaim the talents and energies of those young people who have, for whatever reason, turned those talents and energies into antisocial behavior. The President has demonstrated his faith in the potential of our young people. The Congress is asked, in this legislation, to make available the tools for the realization of that potential.

The Congress has always been willing, in the past, to appropriate funds and authorize construction in the fields of river development—flood control, navigation, power development, on the basis of a sound ratio of benefit to cost. We have looked upon such expenditures as investments, which would bring forth a substantial return. Surely there can be no surer investment, no more essential investment, than in the young people who will be taking our places in a relatively short span of years. To help these young people find themselves—to help them channel their energies into the areas where the Nation needs those energies—this is a return worthy of our best efforts. The President's proposals provide an opportunity to make that effort.

I ask unanimous consent that the President's letter of May 11, the letter of Secretary Ribicoff transmitting the proposed bill, and the Executive order of May 11 be printed in full at the conclusion of these remarks.

MAY 11, 1961.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have received reports indicating that there has been an increase in the amount of juvenile delinquency in both urban and rural communities. This delinquency seems to occur most often among school dropouts and unemployed youth faced with limited opportunities and from broken families.

I view the present trend with serious concern. Juvenile delinquency and youth offenses diminish the strength and the vitality of our Nation; they present serious problems to all the communities affected; and they leave indelible impressions upon the people involved which often cause continuing problems.

Many steps have already been taken to broaden the available opportunities for learning and work and to remove barriers to the full utilization of our young people. I am, today, issuing an Executive order directing the Attorney General, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Labor to coordinate their efforts in the development of a program of Federal leadership to assist the States and local communities in their efforts to reduce juvenile delinquency. But with our greatly increased teenage population, further measures are necessary. The social, educational, economic, and law-enforcement aspects of delinquency must all be considered in any effective program to combat this condition in our society.

In order to accomplish these objectives, I am transmitting herewith legislation to enable the Federal Government to undertake projects designed to demonstrate and evaluate the most effective ways of using our resources to combat juvenile delinquency within local communities. Measures must be taken to reach deeply into the experiences of everyday life in deprived families and local communities. We must undertake a program integrating specific remedies into a total attack upon the prevention and control of youth offenses.

By means of the proposed legislation, the Federal Government will be able to provide assistance to those dedicated persons in local communities throughout the Nation who are striving in many ways to create the social conditions that will insure the growth of a skilled and resourceful population of young men and women who are firm in character and committed to the development of a democratic way of life.

The enclosed letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare explains in detail the proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a bill, "To provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to juvenile delinquency control and control of youth offenses or will provide training of personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes."

In 1959, for the 11th consecutive year, court delinquency cases and police arrests of juveniles increased over the previous year. Preliminary data for 1960 indicate that the upward trend may continue. Since 1948, court cases and juvenile arrests have more than doubled while the population of our young people has increased by less than one-half. Among arrests reported by the FBI in 1959, about half for burglary and larceny involved persons under 18 years of age. Almost two-thirds of the arrests for auto theft involved such persons.

If present delinquency rates hold, with no acceleration at all, it is estimated that 3 to 4 million children will come before the courts in the next decade for delinquency (excluding traffic offenses).

The resources of the Federal Government should be promptly mobilized to provide leadership and direction in a national effort to strengthen our family life and social structure and correlate, at all levels of government, juvenile and youth services. Efforts to train personnel for juvenile and youth programs should be intensified. Research into the development of more effective measures for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses should be broadened. The draft bill is designed to encourage and facilitate close cooperation by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Departments of Labor and Justice in moving forward in a united national effort for these purposes.

Specifically, the draft bill would authorize a 5-year program, beginning with the fiscal year 1962, as follows:

1. Demonstration and Evaluation Projects: Grants would be available to any State, local, or other public or nonprofit agency, organization, or institution for projects for the evaluation, or demonstration of the effectiveness, of techniques and practices which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses (including the treatment of juvenile delinquents and youthful offenders).

Major emphasis would be given, under this program, to the selection of a limited number of communities or States that show promise of having programs for the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses that might be useful or applicable in other parts of the country. These communities or States would be given funds for financing part or all of the cost of evaluating or demonstrating the effectiveness of such programs and reporting on the findings. These findings would then provide a body of information that could be disseminated on a nationwide basis so that all parts of the country could benefit from the successful experience of those communities and States.

2. Training of Personnel: Grants would also be authorized for the training of personnel, employed or preparing for employment in programs for the prevention or con-

trol of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses. These grants would be available to any State, local, or other public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution, to carry out programs which hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the prevention or control of delinquency or youth offenses. These programs may include, among others, the development of courses, and fellowships and traineeships.

Those provisions would make possible an intensive effort in meeting the acute shortage of trained workers in this field—such as probation officers, police, social workers, institutional house parents, youth gang workers, and others. This not only would begin a flow of urgently needed trained personnel but would also improve, through inservice and other short-term training programs, the background knowledge and skill of existing personnel.

3. Technical assistance services: In addition to studies relating to the prevention or control of juvenile delinquency or youth offenses, including the effectiveness of projects carried under this bill, the draft bill would authorize technical assistance to State and municipalities and other public or private agencies in such matters, and the provision of short-term training and instruction in technical matters relating to the prevention or control of delinquency or youth offenses (again including treatment of the individuals involved).

The bill would require that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare consult with the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youthful Offenders on matters of general policy under the bill and consider any recommendations of the Committee on project applications or proposed studies under the bill.

The additional cost of the proposed bill for the fiscal year 1962 is estimated to be $10 million.

Faithfully yours,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10940

ESTABLISHING THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH CRIME

Whereas the U.S. Government has an obligation to maintain and develop programs and policies to promote the welfare of its younger citizens, and

Whereas the steady growth in the incidence of juvenile delinquency and youth crime has long been recognized as a national problem of major concern, and

Whereas there is a demonstrated need that the resources of the Federal Government be promptly mobilized to provide leadership and direction in a national effort to strengthen our social structure and to correlate, at all levels of government, juvenile and youth services; that training of personnel for juvenile and youth programs be intensified; and, that research to develop more effective measures for the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency and youth crime be broadened: Now, therefore,

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

SECTION 1. (a) There is hereby established the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime (hereinafter referred to as the Committee). The Committee shall be composed of the Attorney General, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Each member of the Committee shall designate an official or employee of his department as an alternate member who shall serve as a member of the Committee in lieu of the regular member whenever the regular member is unable to attend any meeting of the Committee; and the alternate member shall while serving as such have in all respects the same status as a member of the Committee as does the regular member for whom he is serving. The Chairman of the Committee shall be the Attorney General.

(b) The Committee may invite representatives of the Judiciary to participate in its deliberations.

SEC. 2. The Committee (1) shall review, evaluate and promote the coordination of the activities of the several departments and agencies of the Federal Government relating to juvenile delinquency and youth crime; (2) shall stimulate experimentation, innovation and improvement in Federal programs; (3) shall encourage cooperation and the sharing of information between Federal agencies and State, local and private organizations having similar responsibilities and interests; (4) shall make recommendations to the Federal departments and agencies on measures to make more effective the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency and youth crime.

SEC. 3. There is hereby established the Citizens Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the Council) which shall consist of not less than 12 and not more than 21 members, who shall be persons (including persons from public and voluntary organizations) who are recognized authorities in professional or technical fields related to juvenile delinquency or youth crime, or persons representative of the general public who are leaders in programs concerned with juvenile delinquency or youth crime, and who shall be designated by the Chairman of the Commitee after consultation with the Committee and serve at the pleasure of the Committee. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the Chairman of the Committee.

SEC. 4. The Council shall furnish the Committee advice and recommendations with respect to the matters with which the Committee is concerned under section 2 of this order and any other matters relating to the functions of the Committee on which it may desire information or advice.

SEC. 5. The Committee shall make reports to the President from time to time with respect to its activities and shall make recommendations to the President regarding policy, programs, and any additional measures including legislation which it deems desirable to further the objectives of this order.

SEC. 6. All executive departments and agencies of the Government are authorized and directed to cooperate with the Committee and to furnish it such information and assistance, not inconsistent with law, as it may require in the performance of its functions and duties.

SEC. 7 Consonant with law, the Departments of Justice, Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, shall as may be necessary for the effectuation of the purpose of this order, furnish assistance to the Committee in accordance with section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691). Such assistance may include the detailing of employees to the Committee to perform such functions, consistent with the purpose of this order, as the Chairman of the Committee may assign to them. One of such employees may be designated to serve as Executive Director of the Committee. The necessary office space, facilities and supplies for the use of the Committee shall be furnished by the three departments concerned as they shall agree.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1961.*

SUDETEN DAY

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, in the days of May 20 till May 23, the Sudeten German Day is taking place in Cologne, Germany. The Sudeten German expellees who were forcibly deported from their centuries-old homeland in Bohemia and Moravia/Silesia by the Communists in 1945, constitute now the main part of the 13 million of German expellees and refugees living now in the free West German Federal Republic. There were 3.3 million Sudeten Germans in their ancient homeland; over 2 million of them live now in West Germany, the rest in Austria and the Soviet Zone of Germany—many of them come again as refugees from the Soviet Zone to West Germany.

The issue of the German expellees and refugees and of the Sudeten German expellees is not only an old one, but a very present, actual one. Thousands of new refugees from the Soviet Zone of Germany arrive daily in West Berlin and in West Germany.

They are the main anti-Communist force in Germany and probably the world. They are an asset for anyone in the free world who wants to save human freedom. They are the anti-Communist wall—in the same way as if half of the United States were occupied by the Reds and American anti-Communists would flee from the occupied zone to the still free territory—they would be the same anti-Communist wall as are the German expellees and refugees today.

The Sudeten German expellees have always strived for the cooperation with conservative anti-Communist American statesmen in the Congress. They have, moreover, always striven for a close cooperation with the Czechs, Slovaks, and Hungarians, living now also in exile, with whom they had lived for the long 20 years in one state, Czechoslovakia, erected in 1918, but with whom they had lived for centuries before as inhabitants of the same territory in Austria-Hungary. One visible sign of these efforts is the awarding of the Charles Prize by the Sudeten Germans to the representative of the 2 million Americans of Slovak descent, the president of the Slovak League of America, Mr. Philip A. Hrobak, which takes place on Saturday, May 20, 1961.

The work which the Sudeten Germans have done is a great one. They have gathered material on the work of international communism. They have supplied this material to Members of Congress who have made several CONGRESSIONAL RECORD insertions about the system of the Communist state security in the East, the system of agent-provocateurs, and so forth. On May 5, 1957, for example, the Chicago Tribune and the Detroit Free Press reported about a speech which Congressman Timothy P. Sheehan made in the House of Representatives based on the Sudeten German

material. On May 14, 1958, Congressman Sheehan made a second speech about communism based on the Sudeten German material again.

If there will be more attention on the part of American statesmen opposing communism, the German expellees can constitute a great share in this anti-Communist fight for preservation and restoration of freedom. They are our best allies. They are united with us by the common aims and the common intelligent understanding of the menace threatening us.

We have followed, until now, policies which have been quite contrary. Certain agencies, especially private ones, believed that they should support and cooperate not with the German expellees, not with the conservative Czechs, Poles, Slovaks, Hungarians, and other exiles, but on the contrary, with the leftwing exiles, the former national front men. This policy has clearly failed in the past and present. It failed in the same way as other support for Communists and pro-Communists, the help to Tito and Gomulka, the initial support for Castro. The support for leftwingers among the exiles has been parallel to the support for Tito and Gomulka. In this way, communism cannot be weakened, but strengthened. So it has been in the past.

Since the agreements of Yalta and Potsdam, through the delivery of Central Europe, of the German rocket scientists and skilled workers to the Reds, we have followed the policy which has proven disastrous.

Today, it is high time to realize where our real friends are. We must give up the idea that we can win our enemies by handing over the property of our friends. We must stop believing that the best policy against communism is helping the Communists and the pro-Communists.

The Sudeten German expellees are allies of conservative anti-Communist men in the free world. They are the hope for the Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians and all others, that these nations once again will be free. I hope that the Sudeten German Day 1961 will be a full success and the start of an effective work for the freedom in Eastern Europe and the whole world.

CUBA AND CONTAINMENT

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I have written a report for the news media in my district on the policy of containment of communism. I have been opposed to this policy for many years and in this article the situation in Cuba is one of the most dangerous in our history. Closing our eyes and thinking we can contain communism to the island of Cuba is ridiculous, as explained below:

CUBA AND CONTAINMENT

You can drive 90 miles in less than 2 hours and fly it in half an hour. By boat, it takes just a few hours. Philadelphia is more than 90 miles from Long Island. Fisher's Island, N.Y., is about 90 miles from Lynbrook. Ninety miles is an infinitesimal distance these days. Cuba is 90 miles from the United States.

Less than 90 miles away from our shores, a bearded psychopath is, day by day, entrenching the evil of communism in our own hemisphere—closer to our country than many parts of our own State.

Castro isn't a fad with the Cuban people. He isn't just something we as a country can close our eyes to and hope that when we open them he will have disappeared. He represents the essence of an evil, unscrupulous philosophy that doesn't play by gentlemen's rules. He is a cancer—his beliefs will spread like a cancer until, if we don't recognize the danger signs, it will be too late.

He sits on that Caribbean island while we sit on our decisions. He is not going to wait for us to make up our minds about what to do with him. Every day he spins the web of absolute power a little tighter, a little more difficult to break. Every day that we delay action is another day for him to build his strength and entrench his position.

We have finally realized that he isn't just leaning toward communism—that he is and always has been a Communist and that we have permitted him to establish the first Communist country in the hemisphere.

We have, just a few weeks ago, lost the first move to eradicate this menace. Now it seems that we are going to revert to an old standby measure which has never worked in the past and which will not work now—the policy of containment.

This is the State Department theory that implies that the country itself (in this case, Cuba) is definitely a danger, but that if we just make sure that the country's influence does not spread beyond its borders, it will eventually cease to be a danger—or the even less realistic hope that the tyrannized people themselves will one day revolt.

This theory is just about as ridiculous as the medieval system of fighting the plague by doing nothing more than marking the houses of the sick with a huge red cross. We should have realized by now that this policy of containment is not the way to beat communism.

We cannot permit communism to spread anywhere in the world, but especially in our own hemisphere. When it has already gained a foothold within shouting distance of our country, it is time to act immediately and decisively.

Are we going to step aside—as we did in Laos?

Are we going to refuse to take action against this menace because certain countries might accuse us of being aggressors?

They are accusing us of this now. British Guiana, for example. Over every radio station, night and day, they are conducting a vicious hate America campaign.

In Venezuela, anti-American feeling has reached epidemic proportions.

Is taking action against Castro going to make us any more or any less popular? Survival of our system cannot be considered less important than a popularity contest.

Admittedly, deciding the course of action to be taken against Cuba is a difficult choice. We have struggled for years to erase the "American Imperialist" image from the minds of certain Latin Americans who cannot forget the Marines in Venezuela or Haiti—who remember Mexico and the Gadsden Purchase—who remember Honduras—who feel that the big brother to the north is domineering and tyrannical.

The history of our relations with Latin America is not altogether to our credit, and in recent years we have taken many forward steps toward erasing these unfortunate incidents and living in true harmony and cooperation with our neighbors.

Few if any of the governments of the Central and South American nations are on Castro's side. The Organization of American States (OAS) has often debated the Cuban problem. The OAS is a treaty organization bound to defend member states against aggression and could legitimately act in Cuba.

No matter what the source of the action taken is, however, something must be done about Castro's Cuba. It is painfully easy to see what will happen. If we permit our avowed enemies to remain in Cuba, we will begin losing valuable ground in Latin America—just as we have in Africa and Asia.

We must not—we dare not—forget that there is a certain genius behind the Communists' organizational and infiltration technique. They know how to foment uprisings. They know how to stay in once they've gotten in. They recognize the basic attraction and sympathy people have for the underdog and they capitalize on this at every turn.

They do not and never will play by any rules. Their ambitions are too great for that. Their method of operation has been demonstrated to us time and time again, yet we persist in thinking that we can fight them with diplomatic weapons as outdated as the bow and arrow.

They are not playing for fun. They are playing for keeps, and our very survival is at stake.

We have lost every time we have followed the policy of containment. We know from bitter experience that contained countries become stronger and our position becomes weaker. They can move. We cannot.

This policy has cost the free world dearly. It will continue to do so.

We cannot afford to experiment in Cuba. Nor can we afford to utilize policies that are proven to be ineffective.

Ninety miles is not a very big distance.

SHIPPING OF GRINDING MACHINES TO U.S.S.R.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a resident of the congressional district I represent recently wrote to the Department of Commerce in regard to the export license which was issued, and since revoked, authorizing shipment of precision ball-bearing manufacturing grinding machines to the Soviet Union.

In response to this correspondence a form reply, dated May 2, 1961, was sent by the Department. Knowing of my interest in this matter, the reply was forwarded to me by this constituent.

The Department of Commerce reply is misleading, and in my view, borders on the inaccurate. It is disturbing for other reasons as well, and for these reasons is being brought to the attention of the membership of the House.

The Commerce letter reads as follows:

Your letter about the export of grinding machines to the U.S.S.R. has been referred to me for reply.

The license to export these machines was originally issued in February 1960. The issuance of this license was approved at that time only after careful study of all the available facts, and was believed to be in full accord with the security interests of the United States.

This license was later suspended, and the proposed transaction was restudied. After taking into account all aspects of the situation, Secretary Hodges decided that the appropriate action for him to take as administrator of the Export Control Act of 1949 was to prevent the export. Accordingly, the license for the export of these machines to the U.S.S.R. was revoked as of March 2, 1961.

All of these machines are still in the United States, and the proposed export to the U.S.S.R. will therefore not take place.

The Department of Commerce is careful to obtain thorough technical and policy guidance, in implementing the act, and considerations of national policy and security are always the deciding factor when license applications are under review. However, trade in general with the European Soviet bloc is not considered to be contrary to the national interest, and may be entered into by American companies in accordance with the applicable export control regulations.

Very truly yours,

FRANK W. SHEAFFER,
Director, Office of Export Supply.

Mr. Speaker, I invite particularly close attention to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Commerce Department letter. It is true, as indicated there that the export license authorizing shipment of the grinding machines in questions was issued originally in 1960. It is also true that this license was later suspended.

What the letter fails to mention, however, is that Secretary Hodges approved the reissuance of this license in February of this year, prior to revoking the license on March 2, 1961.

This fact is completely ignored in the form reply, as it relates that the Secretary decided that the appropriate action for him to take as administrator of the Export Control Act of 1949 was to prevent the export.

For the benefit of the membership of the House on this point, I submit for inclusion in my remarks, a clipping from the February 16, 1961, issue of the Wall Street Journal, and the clipping carrying an Associated Press item which appeared in the February 16, 1961, Washington Post. The articles speak for themselves. Also included is a copy of an article from the March 3, 1961, issue of the Los Angeles Times, which discusses the revocation of the license:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 16, 1961]

BALL-BEARING MACHINE SALE TO RUSSIA IS APPROVED

WASHINGTON.—The Commerce Department has decided to go through with its approval of a shipment to the Soviet Union of grinding machines to make ball bearings, despite Defense Department objections.

The Senate Internal Security Committee had also questioned the transaction, originally approved last summer by the Eisenhower administration.

Involved is a $1,500,000 shipment of some 45 precision grinding machines, one of a number of components in the making of small ball bearings.

Bryant Chucking Grinder Co. will ship the machines. A. E. Stubbs, vice president and general sales manager of the Springfield, Vt., concern, said that while Bryant has shipped no machines to Russia, it was allowed to send some to Poland under an Export-Import Bank loan a year or two ago.

The Pentagon argued against the current transaction on the ground the equipment could only have military use, and the Commerce Department suspended its approval pending a further look at the issue.

Now Commerce Department officials have decided to lift the suspension. Secretary Hodges takes the position, it was explained, that the same machines are readily available in Europe, so that blocking their export from the United States to Russia would only deprive American firms of the business without denying the machinery to the Russians.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1961]

HODGES APPROVES SALE OF MACHINERY TO REDS

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges has authorized shipment to Russia of $1.5 million worth of precision machine tools which presumably will be put to military use.

The transaction was first approved last year by the Eisenhower administration but was held up when the Defense Department raised objections that they could have only military value.

It was understood that Hodges approved the deal on grounds that the equipment could be readily obtained by the Russians from manufacturers in Western Europe and that, in these circumstances, American industry might as well get the order.

Hodges told a news conference Tuesday that he had approved a transaction to which the Defense Department had objected. He said ball bearings were involved and that the matter had attracted the interest of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Neither Hodges nor the Commerce Department would give any details.

However, it was understood that the shipment involves 45 machines for making components for miniature ball bearing systems. These machines are produced by the Bryant Chucking & Grinding Co., Springfield, Vt.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 3, 1961]

UNITED STATES REVOKES LICENSE FOR TOOL EXPORT TO RUSSIA—COMMERCE SECRETARY ANNOUNCES DECISION, SAYS DEFENSE DEPARTMENT WILL BUY MACHINES

WASHINGTON.—The administration Thursday night permanently revoked an export license under which $1.5 million worth of machine tools could have been shipped to the Soviet Union.

Commerce Secretary Hodges announced the administration decision in a telegram to Senator DODD, Democrat, of Connecticut. He said the Defense Department will purchase the high speed ball bearing manufacturing machines instead.

DODD previously persuaded the Commerce Department to hold up the shipment pending a study of its strategic value by an independent panel of experts.

CRITICIZED DEAL

The Connecticut Democrat, vice chairman of the Senate Internal Subcommittee, has been sharply critical of the proposed deal as had Representative LIPSCOMB, Republican, of California, who called for a congressional investigation of exporting of the machinery to Russia.

DODD agreed with Hodges' decision to revoke the license as a wise one which will serve the interests of our country and the free world.

The machine tools are used to make miniature ball bearings for missiles and spacecraft guidance systems.

According to DODD, there are only 72 such machines in operation in this country. Virtually all their production is used in miniaturized guidance systems for the Defense Department.

FORTY-FIVE ORDERED

The Soviet Union's machinery procurement agency had ordered 45 of the 72 machine tools, which were built in Springfield, Vt.

DODD, LIPSCOMB, and other Congressmen have been pressing the Commerce Department to rescind the license because the tools could add immeasurably to Russia's military potential.

It became known, meantime, that the panel of experts consulted by the subcommittee voiced grave doubts about the wisdom of shipping the tools to the Soviet Union.

The experts disagreed with the Commerce Department's findings that the tools would not constitute a significant strategic hazard to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the Department of Commerce reply is an unwarranted attempt to misrepresent the facts, and is not in keeping with the Department's responsibility to provide factual and complete information to the taxpaying public.

Another portion of the letter is cause for concern, in my view, and that is the concluding sentence which states:

However, trade in general with the European Soviet bloc is not considered to be contrary to the national interest, and may be entered into by American companies in accordance with the applicable export control regulations.

Under existing procedures, certain goods may be shipped to the U.S.S.R. and other Eastern European destinations under the classification of general license commodities meaning that no validated export license is required. Strategic materials and those in short supply are placed on what is called a positive list. Commodities on the positive list and many nonpositive list goods require validated licenses for shipment to the U.S.S.R. and various other Eastern European destinations. Under existing procedures, the words "general license commodities" are thus used in a technical sense, and certainly cannot be considered synonymous with trade in general.

I certainly do not agree that "trade in general" with the European Soviet bloc cannot be considered contrary to the interests of the United States. The statement is therefore in error if it presupposes to speak for everyone in expressing the opinion that trade in general with the European Soviet bloc is not contrary to our interest.

It is disturbing if it portends a general shift in Department of Commerce policy, toward a weakening of our controls over Soviet trade. It is disturbing if it is intended to sell the public on the idea of accepting a weakening of controls on trade with the Soviets.

REGARDING HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, freedom of the individual and sovereignty of the people are so fundamental in American life as to need no restatement. The Republican Party has always espoused the principle that each person, regardless of race, religion, or any other consideration, has an inalienable right to vote for the officials who govern him. I am deeply troubled by the fact that our citizens in the Nation's Capital are denied the right to vote for the local officials who govern the District of Columbia.

The Republican Party platforms of 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960 called for some measure of self-government for District residents. This year the legislatures of 39 States ratified the 23d amendment to our Federal Constitution giving the 765,000 persons in Washington a vote for President and Vice President.

Now we must consider restoration of voting rights for a local legislative body to District residents. Although Congress has a constitutional responsibility to "exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatever" over the District, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that "It—Congress—may legislate directly in respect to the local affairs—or transfer the power of such legislation to a legislature elected by the citizens." (*Binns* v. *United States*, 194 U.S. 486, 491.)

Apart from the question of basic human rights, the time has come when Congress, in the Nation's interest, must free itself from the hundreds of hours of time required to legislate on purely local matters for the District of Columbia. Major legislation affecting the lives and property of all our citizens is the principal business of Congress. We do not now have sufficient time to deliberate national legislation. We have no more right to take the time of all the people to legislate solely for the people of the District than we do to legislate solely for the people of my own State of Iowa. Congress must give its whole time to national problems and leave local problems to State and local legislative bodies who are more able to make careful judgments in this area. The District should operate like the 50 States, to the extent national considerations permit.

One only needs to pick up a daily paper on any given day lately and be faced with plenty of evidence that Congress has not, and is not, doing a good job in running the city of Washington, D.C.

The recent crime wave shocks all of us. It is certainly a travesty that we have such a blot on the record of the Capital of the free world. The eyes of the entire world are upon us. What goes on here receives attention around the globe and some aspects of our daily activities are magnified all out of proportion. They serve the purposes of those who would ridicule and degrade us in the eyes of the other nations.

I am not saying that if Washington had home rule, it would not have crime. With so many diverse elements, the city will always have a certain amount of wrongdoing. What I am saying is that under home rule, the citizens of this city could deal more effectively with these problems.

All of us know that Congress does not have the time nor the will to do more than provide broad directives and policies for the operation of the city. The implementation of these directives and policies is left to someone else. Their effectiveness often times suffers because Congress is the controlling factor and Congress is not always prepared to act as quickly and as forthrightly as the situation demands.

James Madison, in the Federalist Papers—No. 43—explaining the Federal Constitution, said with reference to the proposed Federal district, "A municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

It ought to be pointed out, also, that the first Republican President and probably the greatest President in the history of our country—Abraham Lincoln—had some ideas about home rule, too. He said, on one occasion immediately after he arrived on the scene to take over the responsibility of chief in that tragic period, with special reference to the problem here in the District, I quote:

> I have not now, nor never have had, any disposition to treat you in any respect otherwise than as my neighbors. I have not now any purpose to withhold from you any of the benefits of the Constitution, under any circumstances, that I would not feel myself constrained to withhold from my neighbors.

In response to a serenade by Republican association a few days later, he said, I quote:

> I hope that, if things shall go on as prosperously as I believe we all desire they may, I may have it in my power to remove something of this misunderstanding, that I may be enabled to convince you, and the people of your section of the country, that we regard you in all things our equals and in all things entitled to the same respect and the same treatment that we claim for ourselves: that we are in nowise disposed, if it were in our power, to oppress you, to deprive you of any of your rights under the Constitution of the United States, or even to split hairs with you in regard to those rights, but are determined to give you, as far as is in our hands all your rights under the Constitution—not grudgingly, but fully and fairly.

The District of Columbia was established solely for the purpose of becoming the permanent seat of the Government of the United States. It was originally 10 miles square and lay on both sides of the Potomac River, extending into both Virginia and Maryland. In 1846 Congress retroceded to Virginia the area south of the Potomac, so the District now contains only 69 square miles or 43,677 acres, all formerly in the State of Maryland. Citizens of the area exercised local self-government during the first 75 years of the existence of the District of Columbia. Congress in 1800 directed the President to move the Federal Government to Washington. President John Adams arrived in June of that year, and Congress held its first meeting here on November 12, 1800, in the north wing of the Capitol, which was then only partially built. When the District of Columbia was first established it contained two incorporated cities, Georgetown in Maryland and Alexandria in Virginia, both of which had locally elected city governments, with the usual municipal powers. These local governments were not disturbed when Congress first assumed jurisdiction over the District. In 1802 a third city, Washington itself, was incorporated by Congress, with a government consisting of a mayor appointed by the President and a bicameral legislature with seven members in one house and five in the other. In 1812 this was changed to a 6-member board of aldermen and a 12-member common council, both elected by the people, with the mayor elected by a joint vote of both bodies. In 1820 the government was again reorganized to provide that the mayor be chosen by popular election. In 1871 Congress incorporated the entire District of Columbia, and the charters of Washington City, Georgetown, and Washington County were repealed. A new government was established with a governor and a secretary appointed by the President, and a bicameral legislative assembly consisting of an 11-member council, and a 22-member house of delegates. There was also a board of public works consisting of the Governor as president of the board, and four other persons, one of whom had to be a civil engineer, all appointed by the President. The members of the council were appointed by the President, and the members of the house of delegates were elected by the people. The voters of the District of Columbia were also permitted to elect a delegate to the House of Representatives of the United States, who, like delegates from the territories, had a right to speak but not to vote. Due to financial difficulties, Congress in 1874 abolished local self-government in the Nation's Capital. In that year Congress established the present form of government consisting of three Commissioners appointed by the President, one of whom must be an officer of the Engineer Corps of the Army of the United States, who generally has authority over all streets and bridges, similar to that of the old board of public works.

The present three Commissioners exercise all executive authority and certain legislative authority in the field of municipal regulations. All other legislation, including tax proposals, must be enacted by Congress itself.

We Republicans are obligated to honor the pledges in the Republican platform. Carl L. Shipley, Republican chairman for the District of Columbia, advises me that in the May 1960 District primary, Republicans voted 3½ to 1 for an elected local legislature. Nonetheless, the Democratic 86th Congress refused to act on President Eisenhower's local self-government bill (H.R. 4400) providing for an appointed governor and elected legisla-

tive council. Because of continuing opposition in Congress by many Members to proposals involving an elected mayor and an elected legislative body, Mr. Shipley drafted a compromise measure, designed to meet in a reasonable way most of the objections raised to other bills. It is based on the only District-wide local self-government law ever passed by Congress—in 1871—the Maryland Constitution, and some features of the Republican bill in the 86th Congress. I have studied the bill in detail and have made some changes in it. I have concluded that it is a reasonable and workable first step toward more complete self-government. If Congress will act favorably on such a measure, it will give us a sound basis to grant ever-increasing legislative authority to locally elected officials in the Nation's Capital.

The proposed bill provides for the following:

1. Governor and Secretary, appointed by President for 4 years. (Based on 1871 act.)

2. Legislative assembly, consisting of upper house (legislative council) and lower house (house of delegates). (Based on 1871 act.)

The 17-member upper house will be appointed for 4 years, 5 each by chairmen of House and Senate District Committees, and 7 by President, not more than a majority from same political party.

The 34-member lower house will be elected by wards, based on present precincts, for 2-year term.

3. Board of Public Works, consisting of Governor as chairman, an Army engineer officer designated by the President, and the Architect of the Capitol, all to serve 4 years (based on 1871 act), handling all responsibilities of present District of Columbia Engineer Commissioner.

4. District of Columbia budget will be a request for appropriations to the Federal Bureau of the Budget, as in the case of any other Federal agency, and Congress shall provide all funds necessary above taxes comparable to Maryland and Virginia. (Based on Senate hearings and District of Columbia Commissioners' recommendations.)

5. Board of Education, Redevelopment Land Agency, Armory Board, Zoning Commission, Public Utilities Commission, National Capital Housing Authority, and other District of Columbia and Federal agencies, will continue without change. (Based on H.R. 4400.)

6. All laws passed by the District of Columbia Legislative Assembly will be subject to referendum by the voters.

With the above general provisions, some of the opposition from vested agencies, Congress, and special interest groups will be met. The Federal interest is protected by an appointed Governor, Secretary, and upper house of the legislature. Congress' responsibility is protected by providing, in addition to a Governor's veto and President's veto, that the House and Senate District Committee chairmen shall appoint members of the upper house, as well as confirm the Presidential appointments. People concerned with the budget and taxes should approve the transfer of the District of Columbia budget to the Federal Bureau of the Budget and the provision for an adequate Federal payment. Those who think local interests require an elected legislature should approve the provision for 34 members of the lower house elected by District residents by wards. Also, any law passed by the local legislature, even though not vetoed by Congress, the President, or the Governor, can still be rejected in a referendum upon petition of 10 percent of the voters. This should allay the fears of those who think a locally elected legislature might run wild.

I hope all Members of Congress and citizens throughout the country will study this legislation carefully and take appropriate action. I believe every American can honestly join with me in supporting this legislation to restore to the residents of our Nation's Capital the right to elect the officials who make the laws which rule their daily lives.

MR. WHITNEY GILLILLAND

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and may include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on occasions, Members of the House get carried away or for some reason become careless with their thinking and speech and in the process reflect upon the good character and record of distinguished public servants and private individuals in our country.

This, in my opinion, was the case, Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] referred to a very dear friend of mine and a friend of thousands of people in Iowa as a broken-down politician during a colloquy on the House floor when we were discussing some matters that had little relationship, if any, to people like Mr. Whitney Gillilland of whom the gentleman from Ohio spoke when he said, I quote:

If they cannot find a Kennedy, maybe they can find a broken-down politician from Iowa like Gillilland that Eisenhower put on the CAB.

I do not know what the gentleman meant to infer when he said that Mr. Gillilland was a broken-down politician, because I have known Whitney Gillilland for 20 years and consider him to be one of the most distinguished and able citizens of Iowa. Every endeavor that he has undertaken during his long career has been marked by outstanding success.

In 1927 he was admitted to the bar in Wisconsin and Iowa, and practiced law at Glenwood and Waterloo, Iowa, between 1927 and 1953.

He served as Mills County attorney from 1928 to 1935, thereafter as city solicitor of Glenwood, and then as judge of the district court of Iowa for the 15th judicial district until his resignation to return to the general practice of law in August 1941. In 1953 he was appointed Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture and later in that same year as Chairman of the War Claims Commission. In 1954 he became Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, which had been created to assume the functions of the War Claims and International Claims Commissions, and continued in that capacity until appointed a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board in November 1959, for a term expiring December 31, 1965. He became Chairman of the Board in April 1960, and continued as such until February 1961.

Mr. Speaker, this record of service and achievement in the Government at the national level certainly does not indicate that he is a broken-down politician. Rather, it seems to me, he has demonstrated conclusively that he has performed his assignments well, with great ability, and always in the public interest or he would not have received the accolades and approval by Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and Members of the other body.

From 1948 to 1950 he served as chairman of the Iowa Republican State Central Committee. In 1949 he was chairman of the executive committee of the National Republican Strategy Committee.

I mention his service to the Republican Party because I think service to a party is a very important function of government and certainly a man should not be penalized for having served his country unselfishly through the political party of his choice.

Everyone in Iowa, Democrat and Republican, will agree that when he was the chairman of the Republican State Central Committee he handled that office as he has handled his public service, with complete fairness, frankness, and with a sense of dedication that indicated a rare kind of unselfish service to his State and to his country.

The fact that he is a distinguished member of the American, Iowa, Wisconsin, District of Columbia, and Federal Bar Associations; past president of the Federal Bar Association, member of its national council and the executive committee; member of the board of governors of the Washington Foreign Law Society, and a member of the Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia Circuit would seem to confirm the fact that he is respected and appreciated by those with whom he works and by those who know of his great ability and distinguished service to his country.

Whitney Gillilland's record as Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture and as Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission is well known to the Congress.

Senator HICKENLOOPER said of his service on the War Claims Commission, I quote:

I think you will find that Members of this Congress on both sides of the political aisle will speak in the highest terms of his handling of matters before that Commission and his judgment and his ability, his fairness, and his impartiality.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of the House, had this to say with respect to Whitney Gillilland's service on the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, I quote:

I found Judge Gillilland to be one of the finest public officials I have ever met. His judicial outlook and his fairness made a notable impression upon me. Under his leadership as Chairman of the above Commission, the Commission conducted itself on the highest judicial level humanly possible.

At the time of Whitney Gillilland's appearance before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for Senate confirmation as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, JOHN W. MCCORMACK had this to say, I quote:

It is a pleasure for me to convey to you and the members of your committee the very high regard that I have for Judge Gillilland. I consider him to be a gentleman and public official who is honorable and trustworthy in every respect. I have every confidence in conveying to you and to the members of your committee, the opinion, that if confirmed, which I respectfully and strongly urge, Judge Gillilland, as a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, will continue to render the same high character of public service as he rendered while Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission.

Senator Thomas E. Martin's opinion of Mr. Gillilland was stated as follows, I quote:

I consider Whitney Gillilland one of the best qualified men of my entire acquaintance. His experiences as a judge in the Iowa State courts and his long experience in government, most recently as head of the Foreign Claims Settlement Administration, make him very highly qualified for this appointment (Civil Aeronautics Board).

There is very little that I can add to the highly laudatory opinions of my distinguished colleagues except to state that from personal knowledge it is my considered opinion that Whitney Gillilland is one of the finest public officials I have ever met. His record has been outstanding as a county attorney, as a district judge, as the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and and as a member and Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. I am highly impressed by his capacity for work, his integrity and courage, and above all his outstanding judicial ability which he possesses to an unusual degree.

I have learned from his associates in the Department of Agriculture, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Board, that Whitney Gillilland has shown the highest degree of diligence, a most consistent personal application to the judicial process and has at all times given extreme care and objective consideration to all matters that have come before him in his official capacities.

In conclusion, I can only state that Whitney Gillilland has my unqualified endorsement as a faithful and judicious public official, and that his life, his public service, and his sense of dedication to the great ideals we are pleased to call American should receive applause rather than unfair and unwarranted charges that are implied when he is referred to as a broken down politician.

I hope I have, in these brief moments, appropriately and adequately set the record straight and I invite every Member of the House to do what a great Democrat once admonished us all to do and that is "to take a look at the record."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mrs. KEE, for 30 minutes, today, to revise and extend her remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. SPRINGER, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri (at the request of Mrs. WEIS), for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LESINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. WEIS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEARNS in four instances.

Mr. HOLTZMAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FINNEGAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SMITH of Virginia.

Mr. FOGARTY.

Mr. MULTER.

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. MACK.

Mr. BOYKIN.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 118. An act for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof;

S. 126. An act for the relief of Edward W. Scott III;

S. 138. An act for the relief of Mico Delic;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Hadji Benlevi;

S. 217. An act for the relief of Alessandro Gelhorn;

S. 285. An act for the relief of Alpo Fransila Crane;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah);

S. 330. An act for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks;

S. 532. An act for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 545. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou;

S. 663. An act for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes);

S. 894. An act for the relief of Capt. Ernest Mountain; and

S. 1097. An act for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 17, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1320. An act for the relief of Edward P. Wall;

H.R. 1329. An act for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun;

H.R. 1351. An act for the relief of Danica Dopudja;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;

H.R. 1368. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;

H.R. 1397. An act for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell;

H.R. 1424. An act for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mario Manna;

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;

H.R. 1896. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;

H.R. 2138. An act for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh;

H.R. 2188. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);

H.R. 2331. An act for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison;

H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston;

H.R. 3498. An act for the relief of William Joseph Vincent; and

H.R. 3842. An act for the relief of James Delbert Hodges.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FINNEGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 22, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

922. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 55th quarterly report covering the first quarter 1961, pursuant to the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

923. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on a review of certain operations of the Federal-aid highway program of the Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, in the States of New Mexico and Wyoming; to the Committee on Government Operations.

924. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of selected operations of the Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

925. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039) in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

926. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Civil Aeronautics Board, relative to a proposal to amend rule 14 in docket 11221, and stating that the Board has also adopted various clarifying amendments to part 300 of its "Principles of Practice"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

927. A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

928. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

929. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calender, as follows:

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 299. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6874, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 404). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 300. Resolution for consideration of S. 1852, a bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 405). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TRIMBLE: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 301. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1986, a bill to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 406). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2750. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force; without amendment (Rept. No. 418). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calender, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 215. An act for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren; without amendment (Rept. No. 407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 949. An act for the relief of John G. Tiedemann; without amendment (Rept. No. 408). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LIBONATI: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1891. A bill for the relief of Eng.lc. William J. Stevens; with amendment (Rept. No. 409). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2973. A bill for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi); with amendment (Rept. No. 410). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3101. A bill for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 411). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4557. A bill for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez; without amendment (Rept. No. 412). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4565. A bill for the relief of Nora M. Hammond; without amendment (Rept. No. 413). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4639. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter; without amendment (Rept. No. 414). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6452. A bill for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman; without amendment (Rept. No. 415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LINDSAY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6453. A bill for the relief of Earl Gupton; with amendment (Rept. No. 416). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6767. A bill for the relief of Charles H. Stype; with amendment (Rept. No. 417). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7170. A bill to protect the rights and interests of U.S. citizens by providing certain restrictions with respect to the broadcasting of foreign-made and controlled programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 7171. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7172. A bill to extend the benefits of the Panama Canal Construction Service Annuity Act of May 29, 1944, to certain individuals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7173. A bill to change the name of Little Pass to Clearwater Pass, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7174. A bill to provide for the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service rendered by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7175. A bill to amend the act of September 6, 1958, relating to expansion of teaching in the education of mentally retarded children so as to make it applicable to the other areas of exceptionality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRANT:

H.R. 7176. A bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 7177. A bill to provide for a national hog cholera eradication program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7178. A bill to provide Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 7179. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey certain lands in the State of Wyoming to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOLTZMAN:

H.R. 7180. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7181. A bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness) from $600 to $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON:

H.R. 7182. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners and operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7183. A bill to amend paragraph (1) of section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to authorize certain common carriers to furnish transportation to students at reduced rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7184. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to permit airmail letters to be sent free of postage by members of the Armed Forces of the United States on active duty outside the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 7185. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 7186. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7187. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7188. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance to certain States having limited financial resources to be used for constructing school facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7189. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary

between such States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 7190. A bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7191. A bill to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7192. A bill to strengthen the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7193. A bill to amend section 2 of the Automobile Information Disclosure Act so as to include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands within the provisions of such act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7194. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the irrigation and power systems of the Flathead Indian irrigation project, Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7195. A bill to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 7196. A bill to provide additional funds for education in the several States without Federal direction, control, or interference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7197. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply in the case of plays, operas, concerts, ballets, or other live dramatic or musical performances; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7198. A bill to provide for the District of Columbia an appointed Governor, Secretary, Legislative Counsel, an elected House of Delegates and nonvoting Delegate to the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 429. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLL:

H.J. Res. 430. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Res. 302. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 1 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 303. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 304. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 3 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 3, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H. Res. 305. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 9, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting passage of H.R. 1797 and S. 772, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7199. A bill for the relief of Howard G. Groth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7200. A bill for the relief of Michaelangelo Granato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON of Wyoming:

H.R. 7201. A bill to provide a pilot plant for the development of the human and natural resources of Indian reservations by providing an incentive to stimulate such development; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 7202 A bill for the relief of Rogers Brothers Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7203. A bill for the relief of Antonio Cracchiolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 7204. A bill for the relief of Angelos Spanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7205. A bill for the relief of Benarsi D. Parashar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 7206. A bill for the relief of Shmuel Pantol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of California;

H.R. 7207. A bill for the relief of Leon Llanos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Import Competition and American Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have had made a major study of the effects of imports and exports on employment of American workers. I have submitted it to the Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment of the House Education and Labor Committee.

I am ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

The chairman of the subcommittee, Congressman JOHN H. DENT, considered this study so important that he has made copies of the study available to each member of the subcommittee which he heads.

It is being used as the basic tract of the subcommittee at this point in its own work.

The study was made by Dr. Howard Piquet, senior specialist in international economics of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

Dr. Piquet is well-known, and is highly thought of by Members of the Congress.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from this study:

IMPORT COMPETITION AND SMALL BUSINESS

(By Dr. Howard S. Piquet)

There is no question about the potential advantages of free trade from the point of view of "pure economics." If trade were free everywhere and if each country were to specialize in producing the goods in which it has the greatest comparative advantage, relative to other countries, productivity everywhere would be greater and economic resources would be utilized more effectively than they now are.

If all the goods that can be produced in a country are listed in order of descending comparative advantage the products heading the list in each instance would be those that are exported. These are the products that can be produced most efficiently relative to other countries. In the United States, where land and other natural resources are relatively abundant but where labor, normally, is relatively scarce, the list would be headed by such mass-produced goods as office machinery, many kinds of industrial equipment, certain types of electrical machinery, road-building and other construction equipment, automobiles, and agricultural machinery.

At the lower end of the list would be a relatively small number of products requiring considerable labor to produce, such as: china tableware, hand-blown glassware, certain electronic products, and hardwood plywood. Somewhere between the two extremes would be goods in the production of which comparative advantage is less clear, such as certain wood and paper products.

The advantage of the United States lies largely in the production of goods that can be produced in quantity by automatic, or near-automatic, machinery. Such goods are produced under the principle of decreasing unit cost and require large fixed overhead. These are the industries in which large size is an advantage.

The lines of production in which the United States is at a comparative disadvantage are those usually characterized as small business, many of which involve a high proportion of labor cost. These are the industries that are most hard pressed by import competition.

Around the turn of the 20th century Mr. H. O. Havemeyer, the sugar magnate, said: "The tariff is the mother of the trusts." Whether or not the tariff then facilitated monopoly, it certainly is not an important factor in this respect today. At the present time most large businesses, such as petroleum and steel, are liberal trade minded. Their operations are worldwide and they oppose interference by government. The tariff has become more significant as an instrument for protecting small business.

There can be little doubt that, if the United States were to adopt a thorough-going policy of free trade, a number of small businesses would be hard hit. Certain marginal firms, and in some cases entire industries, would not be able to withstand the resulting low-cost foreign competition. This is one of the troublesome facts that must be faced regardless of one's theoretical convictions regarding the desirability of freer international trade conducted along multilateral

lines. Removal of tariff protection and the consequent stimulation of imports would have the effect of accelerating the concentration of industrial power in the United States.

INDUSTRIES THAT HAVE APPLIED FOR RELIEF UNDER THE ESCAPE CLAUSE

Congress has provided machinery for affording relief to industries that have been seriously injured by, or that are threatened by serious injury from, increased import competition resulting from concessions made in trade agreements with other countries. It seems reasonable to assume that industries that have not appealed to the Tariff Commission for relief under this provision of law, or that have failed to supply the Tariff Commission with data adequate to enable them to reach a decision as to the existence of injury, are not suffering serious injury from import competition.

Even a cursory examination of the list of industries that have applied for relief under the escape clause (sec. 7 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended) discloses that few, if any, of them could be regarded as big business. Typical of the products concerning which it is complained that imports have been seriously injurious are: women's fur-felt hats and hat bodies, garlic, tobacco pipes and bowls, screen-printed silk scarves, scissors and shears, ground-fish fillets, and bicycles. Nowhere in the list does one find such typically large-scale industries as bulk chemicals, automobiles, heavy iron and steel-mill products, office machinery, or agricultural implements.

Since the escape clause was enacted, 69 industries, or segments of industries, have applied for relief from injurious import competition. Of these, the Tariff Commission found "serious injury" or "threat of serious injury" to exist in 25. In 36 industries it found no serious injury, or threat of serious injury, and in the remaining 8 it either terminated the investigation because the complaining companies failed to provide adequate factual data or dismissed the investigation at the request of the applicants.

Keeping in mind that each of the really large industries in the United States employs a veritable army of workers (the Ford Motor Co. employs 160,000; the United States Steel Corp., 200,000; and General Motors, 55,000) it is evident that the industries that have appealed for relief from import competition under the escape clause, for the most part, are the smaller industries of the country. None of them is in the big business category. Even in those cases where the number of employees in the industry as a whole is sizable (such as lead and zinc, watches, women's fur-felt hats and stainless steel table flatware) the industry consists of a large number of units no one of which can be characterized as big business.

Table 1 lists the industries that either have been seriously injured, or threatened by serious injury, according to the findings of the Tariff Commission. Eighteen of the 25 industries listed employed slightly more than 65,000 workers. It is probable that the number of workers employed by all 25 of the industries on the list was not in excess of 90,000 workers. Although the figures are not all for the same year, ranging as they do from 1950 to 1960, there is no reason to believe that the figures for any one year would be any greater, or that the proportion of workers in the country as a whole who are seriously affected by import competition would be any greater.

TABLE 1.—*Industries which have been found by the U.S. Tariff Commission to be "seriously injured" or "threatened by serious injury" under the escape clause*

Industry	Number of workers	Year	Other indication of size
Hard-fiber cords and twines	(1)	1959	Production, 19,000,000 pounds.
Binding and baler twine	(1)	1959	Production, 100,000,000 pounds.
Cotton typewriter ribbon	2,770	1959	5 producers.
Tartaric acid	(1)	1959	2 small companies.
Clinical thermometers	316	1959	
Umbrella frames	486	1958	
Stainless steel table flatware	3,057	1958	
Spring clothespins	388	1959	
Alsike cloverseed	(1)	1955	Approximately 15,000 acres of land on 280 farms.
Ground-fish fillets	2,300	1956	Crewmen and filleting operations.
Safety pins	1,200	1960	
Straight pins	282	1955	
Violins and violas	30	1956	
Toweling of flax	(1)	.....	Only 1 producer; 700,000 pounds per annum.
Para-aminosalicylic acid	63	1955	
Fluorspar	736	1955	
Lighter flints (ferrocerium)	(1)	.....	Only 2 producers.
Bicycles and parts	3,261	1959	
Watches:			
Pin-lever	4,012	1958	
Jeweled	4,107	1960	
Screen-printed silk scarves	403	1952	
Tobacco pipes and bowls	1,300	1952	
Dried figs	(1)	1955	45,000,000 pounds produced on 29,700 acres.
Women's fur-felt hats and hat bodies	3,817	1950	
Lead and zinc	36,961	1954	Mines, smelters and mills.
Total (for 18 industries providing employment data)	[2] 65,469		

[1] Not available.
[2] Employment figures not given for hard-fiber cords and twines, binding and baler twine, tartaric acid, alsike clover seed, toweling of flax, lighter flints, and dried figs.

Source: Tabulated by the Legislative Reference Service from escape clause reports issued by the U.S. Tariff Commission.

Table 2 lists the industries that have appealed for relief under the escape clause but whose appeals were rejected by the Tariff Commission on the basis that no serious injury, or threat of serious injury, could be found.

TABLE 2.—*Industries whose claims of "serious injury" or "threat of serious injury" under the escape clause were rejected by the U.S. Tariff Commission*

Industry	Number of workers	Year	Other indication of size
Ultramarine blue	253	1960	
Women's and children's leather gloves	3,400	1960	15 producers.
Barbed wire	218	1954	
Typewriters	13,000	1958	
Lamb, mutton and sheep	(1)	1960	272,000 farms on 250,000 of which fewer than 100 sheep each.
Iron ore	32,000	1960	Mining and beneficiating.
Cast-iron fittings for soil pipe	3,800	1959	
Zinc sheet	265	1959	
Hatters' fur	388	1960	
Calf and kip leather	3,300	1959	
Handmade blown glassware	3,480	1957	15 plants.
Mink skins	1,424	1958	Full-time workers.
	2,755	1958	Part-time workers.
Wilton and brussels carpets and rugs	9,500	1959	
Axes and axheads	265	1958	
Scissors and shears	2,300	1957	17 concerns.
Hardwood plywood	14,300	1958	
Red fescue seed	(1)	1959	34,200 acres.
Garlic	(1)	1958	120 growers (10 principal ones).
Barium chloride	48	1958	Only 2 plants.
Nonwoven wool, felts	(1)	1958	11 producers.
Certain jute fabrics	203	1956	
Dressed rabbit furs	400	1955	10 producers.
Cotton pillowcases	15,444	1956	17 producers.
Animal glue	2,143	1953	
Coconuts	(1)	1954	Affects Puerto Rico.
Ground chicory	35	1953	
Pregnant mare's urine (medicinal)	(1)	1953	Output valued at $190,000.
Mustard seeds	(1)	1950	111 farms.
Chalk whiting	Under 100	1953	
Woodwind musical instruments	1,150	1951	
Cotton carding machinery	(1)	1953	Increased imports a "temporary condition."
Rosaries:			
Full time (estimated)	75	1952	
Part time in Puerto Rico	200	1952	
Metal watch bracelets	5,000	1952	
Bonito and tunafish (not in oil)	(1)	1950	Production valued at $61,000,000.
Motorcycles and parts	(1)	1951	Production $9,000,000.
Household china tableware	(2)	1950	
Total (for 26 industries providing employment data)	[3] 123,946		

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.
[3] Employment figures not given for lamb, mutton, and sheep; red fescue seed; garlic; nonwoven wool felts; coconuts; pregnant mare's urine; mustard seeds; cotton-carding machinery; bonito and tunafish (not in oil); and motorcycles and parts.

Source: Tabulated by the Legislative Reference Service from escape clause report issued by the U.S. Tariff Commission.

The Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the impact of imports and exports on American employment should be the concern of every Member of the Congress.

I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from a recent study of this subject by Dr. Howard Piquet of the Library of Congress:

(By Dr. Howard Piquet)

For 26 of the 36 industries shown in table 2 employment amounted to slightly less than 124,000. It is probable that employment in the 10 industries, for which employment data were not provided, would not bring the total employment figure to more than 170,000.[1]

Thus, at the outside, the number of workers employed by the industries that have been seriously injured or are threatened by serious injury, or that think they are so threatened total not more than 260,000 workers out of total national employment of some 68 million workers.

This is not to say that this many workers would be displaced even temporarily if imports were to increase. It does not even mean that the 90,000 workers in the industries for which the Tariff Commission made a positive finding of serious injury or threat of serious injury, would all be displaced by imports, even under free trade. The usual pattern is that where injury results from import competition only certain companies are affected. One of the major conclusions that can be reached from the many cost studies made through the years by the Tariff Commission is that unit costs of production vary widely among producers within any given industry. Usually the costs of the marginal, or highest cost, producers are considerably higher than the average costs for the industry as a whole.

ESTIMATED DISPLACEMENT OF WORKERS BY IMPORT COMPETITION

Estimates made within the past 8 years of the immediate displacement effects of the increased imports that would result from across-the-board suspension of U.S. tariffs are in line with the figures just presented.

At the request of the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy (Randall Commission) in 1954 the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated the number of workers who would be displaced by imports under such an assumption. It used its own data on interindustry relationships to analyze the employment implications of the probable increases in imports that would result from temporary overall tariff suspension.[2] The estimates represent only the number of workers producing the equivalent of the estimated increased imports. They take no account of the probable increases in U.S. consumption after tariff suspension, of new developments in U.S. products or production techniques, or of the capacity of companies concerned to shift to other lines of production. They also take no account of the rise in employment that would be required to handle the increased imports into the United States or of the increased exports that would result from the larger imports.

It had been estimated, on the basis of economic conditions prevailing in 1951 and on the further assumption that these economic conditions would continue to prevail for at least 3 to 5 years, that temporary tariff suspension by the United States would result in increased imports of between $800 million and $1.8 billion per year. Of these increased imports, from $420 to $900 million would have an immediate displacement effect on domestic producers in the United States.

Using its interindustry relationship tables, the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that the displacement of domestic production by increased imports would affect between 96,000 and 203,000 workers (on 60,000 to 128,000 workers the displacement effect would be direct and on 37,000 to 75,000 the effect would be indirect).

The individual industries in which there would be appreciable displacement of workers, according to the study cited, are shown in table 3. It will be observed that none of them could properly be characterized as big business. The conclusion seems clear that the tariff has the effect of maintaining in business a number of small industries that otherwise, either in whole or in part, would be forced to adjust to other lines of production. It appears, furthermore, that the number of workers who are protected in their existing jobs by the tariff is somewhere between 96,000 and 260,000.

TABLE 3.—*Industries in which there would be appreciable displacement of workers in the event of increased imports* [1]

Industry	Duty in 1951 (ad valorem equivalent)	Domestic production in 1951
	Pct.	*Thous.*
Knives with folding blades	33-184	$18,000
Scissors and shears	41-84	22,500
Leather handbags	14-25	75,000
Linen firehose	28	1,000
Fur felt hats	60	75,000
Bicycles and parts	11-15	63,400
Musical instruments	20	175,000
Embroidered linen handkerchiefs	49	8,500
Leather gloves	25-74	45,000
Earthenware and chinaware: table and artware	32-66	120,000
Coarse linen fabrics	40	3,000
Hemmed linen handkerchiefs	26	7,000
Hand-blown glassware	39	31,400
Lovers lace	32-65	30,000
Axminster rugs	28	45,000
Dental and surgical needles	18-40	1,000
Wool wearing apparel (knit or crocheted)	24-41	200,000
Rayon staple fiber	17	150,000
Motorcycles	10	9,083
Clay floor and wall tile	26-41	71,300
Woolens and worsteds	33	1,085,000
Crude barytes	35	7,828
Apparel wool	15	260,000
Cigar filler tobacco	13-18	85,000
Edible nuts, domestic types (almonds, walnuts, filberts)	35	52,300
Flower bulbs	7	(2)
Oats	5	1,112,608
Prepared pineapples	6	65,000
Fresh or frozen fillets	9	56,284
Vermouth	10	10,000

[1] Based on Piquet, H. S., "Aid, Trade and the Tariff," T. Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1953, on the basis of conditions prevailing in 1951.
[2] Not available.

SMALL BUSINESS ALSO BENEFITS FROM IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

It does not follow from the fact that small business, rather than big business, is the principal beneficiary of tariff protection that all small businesses stand to gain from the restriction of imports.

In recent hearings before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the U.S. Senate,[3] Mr. Donald A. Hipkins, Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, testified as follows: [4]

"Turning now from the effects of foreign imports on manufacturers, let us consider its effects on distributors of consumer goods. Approximately two-thirds of the small businesses in this country are engaged in this activity, mostly at the retail level. Some of those establishments, such as franchised dealers in automobiles and other high-priced durables, have close ties with one or a few manufacturers and are, consequently, sensitive to foreign competition. However, a majority of small retailers are less vulnerable, because they handle a wider variety of products. Obviously, the more items a distributor carries in stock, the less dependent he is upon any one of them. To take the simplest case, a proprietor of a drugstore who encounters difficulty in moving a domestic product at a profit, because competitors are underselling him with similar merchandise of foreign origin, is not confronted with a new or special problem. Losses on individual items, whatever their causes, are a normal feature of his operations. Without material injury to his business, he will discontinue the product and, if possible, replace it with the import. For these reasons, I believe that most small outlets are not endangered by foreign competition.

"To a large extent, imports, far from being injurious, are beneficial to small distributors. It is a hard fact that many foreign products, though priced well below their domestic counterparts, are of equal or superior quality. They often are fast-moving items which offer rich opportunities to discerning and energetic retailers. I have no doubt that such merchandise has contributed substantially to the success of a multitude of small stores.

"Another important factor to be considered in appraising the effects of imports is that in many industries, perhaps in too many, manufacturers favor large distributors to the detriment of the small.

"Chain organizations, mail order houses, and department stores are given volume discounts, advertising allowances, and other forms of price reduction which increase their natural advantage over small stores. Such big outlets can resell at prices substantially below the levels small dealers are required to maintain in order to show a profit.

"Needless to say, small concerns who are being squeezed out of the business of distributing domestic products will seize the opportunity to handle competitive imports. It is not surprising, therefore, to find such distributors resisting the efforts of their suppliers to impose or increase trade barriers.

"The effect, adverse or otherwise, on our domestic economy of imported foreign products is, of course, only one facet of a larger problem. Our domestic economy as we know it could not long survive without foreign trade, both imports and exports.

"I am told that of our workers every 10th is paid from export sales and every 4th is dependent on imported raw materials. Our country needs expanding new material imports to support our growth; and this need, in turn, makes necessary a balancing and offsetting export trade to pay for our imports. This is an inescapable fact of economic life."

[1] The industries whose requests for action under the escape clause were terminated because they failed to supply adequate data to the Tariff Commission, or whose appeals were dismissed at their own request, were: Woodscrews, cotton blouses, cotton ginghams, broadwoven silk fabrics, fine-meshed wire cloth, nails, Toyo cloth caps, and women's leather handbags. The number of workers employed in these industries is not available.

[2] Piquet, H. S., "Aid, Trade and the Tariff," T. Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1953.

[3] Impact of Imports on American Small Business, hearing before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business, U.S. Senate, 86th Congress, 2d session, June 16, 1960, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 212–213.

Testimony was also given by a private Washington attorney[5] showing how imports are of great importance to the plywood, hard board, almond, mutton, and shrimp industries.

Furthermore, many small businesses have a vital interest in exports, as was pointed out in testimony by former Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller.[6] He stated that many small business firms are selling abroad and that many more could do so. He cited a small firm in Missouri with only eight employees that has been prospering from exports. It manufactures automotive chemical tuneup oil and has been exporting lubricants for 8 years. Exports comprise over 50 percent of all its shipments, including 8 to 10 shipments monthly to South America and 51 shipments, each, to Venezuela and Canada. He also cited a small company in Oregon which manufactures front-end loaders and whose foreign sales have increased more than 30 percent in each of the past 3 years.

Although no statistics are available showing the importance of exports to small business, as such, there can be no doubt that it is considerable. Some years ago the Bureau of Labor Statistics published figures showing the private employment of wage earners and salaried workers attributed to exports from the United States in 1947. At that time 6.8 percent of all employees in nonagricultural industries were dependent on exports for their jobs.

The Case for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Congress must actively concern itself with the urgent problems of the impact of imports and exports on small business. I include as part of my remarks an excerpt from a recent study of this subject by Dr. Howard Piquet, senior specialist in international economics of the Library of Congress.

THE CASE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(By Dr. Howard Piquet)

The organization of a number of smaller industries into vociferous pressure groups probably has done more harm than good to their cause. Often the spurious arguments that professional lobbyists use to present the case for their clients have tended to obscure the legitimate arguments that could be used.

Equalization of costs of production here and abroad, for example, for which the lobbyists argue eloquently would stifle all trade and would be antithetical to the national interest of the United States. That unit costs abroad frequently are considerably lower than unit costs in the United States is a fact but it does not lead necessarily to the conclusion that all competitive imports should be excluded.

Most of the arguments that give weight to the complaints of small business against import competition are not in the area of economics. From the point of view of economic efficiency alone, small businesses that cannot compete successfully against foreign competition should be allowed to die. But, is this what the United States wants to do? Are the American people interested only in economic efficiency? Do they place economic efficiency ahead of all other considerations?

Here is where our way of life differs markedly from the way of life in countries that are dominated by totalitarian dictatorship. In the Soviet Union and in Red China the overriding objective is the production of capital goods. Human freedom and individual rights are secondary, or considered not at all.

We in the United States have a different philosophy. We fought our Revolution some 180 years ago because we were opposed to dictatorial oppression. Individual liberty always has been our watchword. No matter how much importance we may appear to place on economic efficiency it is always, and everywhere, subordinate to respect for human rights and the dignity of the individual. Ours is a government of law, not of men. We refuse to place dictatorial powers in the hands of anyone, even in the economic field. To our way of thinking, man is not merely a function in a mathematical formula as many modern economists make him appear.

The heart of the problem of small business in all of its ramifications, including import competition, is the basic question: Do we want to preserve small enterprise, as such, because of its beneficial values to American civilization? Economic efficiency is only one aspect of the problem. Some of our most brilliant thinkers, such as the late Justice Louis Brandeis, have questioned the desirability of bigness in both government and business. The impersonality of the super giant store in contrast to the friendliness of small neighborhood shops is not a matter of brute economic efficiency. It has an important bearing to our way of life. There are many Americans who believe that the small neighborhood store and the small business enterprise have virtues that are so important that they should not be allowed to be trampled under the onward sweep of bigness. The preservation of small business enterprise may be poor economics but it may be good sociology and an important force for preserving democracy.

The opportunity for a person to enjoy the fruits of his own labor, imagination and ingenuity is something that we Americans ought to want to preserve. The days of the covered wagon had their hardships, but they also offered opportunity. A man could feel that he was the master of his own destiny and king in his own castle. What he produced he could keep and what he produced depended on his own ability and ambition.

These are the considerations that facilitate the existence of an all-important middle class. Nations have perished when their middle classes have disappeared. The opportunity for a person to own his own business is important from the point of view of both the science and art of government. This is not to say that big business inevitably leads to annihilation of the middle class, but it does narrow its opportunities considerably.

There are also cultural considerations that should not be overlooked. If our small businesses collapse, there collapse with them many opportunities for creative production. Hand-blown glassware and pottery are cases in point. Here, where artistic skills are necessary, we lose something important to our civilization when the machines take over. Again, perhaps, it is bad economics but it is good for our civilization for persons with artistic talents to be able to find outlets for those talents in their daily work. The ancient Romans were genieses at government, but the art and culture of ancient Greece contributed more to subsequent civilization than did the arts of Roman conquest and governmental administration.

WHAT IS EFFICIENCY?

It does not follow, however, that imports should be excluded for the sake of protecting all small business. Some small businesses are inefficiently managed and need competition—both foreign and domestic—to keep them on their toes. Nevertheless, many small businesses that are efficiently managed cannot stand up competitively against either big business or against import competition for reasons beyond their own control.

The question that confronts us is: "Which imports should be encouraged and which should be discouraged?" The answer depends on our conception of the kind of economy that we want here in the United States. Do we want an economy in which business units are becoming ever larger, one in which the little fellow cannot stand up competitively and in which there is decreasing room for small enterprise, either old or new? It is imperative that the American people decide the kind of economy that they want and then take the necessary steps to bring it into being. This could be done, even within the framework of present foreign policy, if we were to adopt a program of stimulating selected imports. Such a policy would stimulate the importation of goods that we want, while restricting those that we do not want. Also, it would emphasize the importance of diversification. Instead of encouraging the importation of cotton textiles, chinaware, and similar goods which compete with the weaker segments of the U.S. economy, it would encourage imports that compete with those American industries that are relatively strong, such as automobiles, business machines, and agricultural implements. The recent spurt in imports of small European automobiles did not damage the U.S. automobile industry or the U.S. economy as a whole. On the contrary, it awakened the industry to the fact that Americans were becoming tired of being pushed around and really wanted smaller, more reasonably priced automobiles.

Before much headway can be made in solving the problem of import competition with respect to small business, it is necessary to distinguish between efficiently operated and inefficiently operated enterprises. Although it would be incorrect to hold that all small business is inefficiently operated, it is probably true that there is a greater proportion of inefficient management among small, than among large, businesses.

Yet, it cannot be denied that many of the smaller firms that are hardest pressed by import competition are exceedingly well managed. It is essential that a distinction be made between internal managerial efficiency and the external suitability of the type of operation in question to the American environment. An example will make the distinction clear.

Some of our china tableware factories in the Ohio River Valley are very well managed. To the extent that it is feasible to do so, the latest mechanical devices have been introduced. The management is efficient and the products that are turned out, by all the managerial yardsticks that can be conceived of, are produced efficiently. The same company—in fact, the entire industry—operates at a decided disadvantage, however, relative to much less efficiently managed plants in Japan. Since over three-fourths of the cost of producing the product is labor, the superior managerial efficiency and man-hour productivity of the American concerns are more than counterbalanced by the low wages paid in Japan. Externally, the industry is ill-adapted to the American environment.

This suitability to environment might well be called the external efficiency of an industry, as opposed to the internal efficiency of its management of men, materials, resources and production, and sales methods.

[5] Branhard, William J., op. cit., pp. 91–95.
[6] *Ibid.*, pp. 201–204.

It would make little sense to protect companies that are inefficiently managed internally. The very essence of our free enterprise system is that the efficient should drive the inefficient out of business. To prohibit imports for the sake of perpetuating inefficient management would be inconsistent with this philosophy.

However, there is something to be said for limiting the degree of competition from imports that hurt domestic establishments that are efficiently managed internally but which are at an external disadvantage. Here is the area in which consideration needs to be given of the extent to which limitations should be placed on competitive imports. This is particularly the case where it is deemed desirable to keep such concerns in business in the national interest because of considerations of culture, art, special skills, economic diversification, and national security.

The near-insoluble problem is how to establish yardsticks for measuring internal efficiency. Establishment of boards or commissions to make such determinations would smack too much of dictatorial methods. Yet, it would be circular reasoning to judge efficiency on the basis of profit and loss statements, since they reflect both internal and external efficiency.

POSSIBLE APPROACH TO A YARDSTICK OF EFFICIENCY

By the nature of the case there is no objective measure of internal, or managerial, efficiency. As a substitute for an objective yardstick, something along the following lines would appear to be equitable and practicable.

1. Instead of concentrating so exclusively on solving the problems of an industry that is being hard hit by import competition (the U.S. Tariff Commission has encountered tremendous difficulty in defining industry) the Tariff Commission should be instructed to pay greater attention to the range of unit costs among the individual firms producing a given product.

2. Establish the principle that a small business is one in which no company has more than 500 workers. Then reach a decision as to whether it is desirable, in the national interest (taking into account clearly specified noneconomic, as well as economic, considerations) to keep the industry in business.

3. If the answer is in the affirmative, establish the further principle that domestic producers of the product in question are entitled to 50 percent (or some other proportion) of the domestic market.

4. It seems reasonable to assume that firms persistently producing at unit costs substantially lower than the unit costs of the marginal producers are internally efficient.

5. Impose a tariff equalizing the marginal cost of the most efficiently produced half of the total domestic output. Equalize this marginal cost with the cost of production abroad, as indicated by invoice value plus transportation.

6. Invoke as import adjustment assistance program along the lines proposed by President Kennedy (when he was a Senator), Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS and Senator JACOB JAVITS, to assist producers, whose costs are so high that they cannot compete against imports.

These "adjustments" bills provide that in instances where imports threaten injury to domestic producers the President can utilize the powers of the Federal Government to assist producers who are adversely affected to adjust to other, more efficient lines of production. This objective would be accomplished by special low-interest bearing loans, by providing retraining for younger workers (following the philosophy of the GI bill of rights), by accelerating the retirement of older workers, by increasing unemployment compensation benefits, and by enlarging the powers and scope of the U.S. Employment Service. Some of the distressed area proposals now under consideration make specific reference to the problem of displacement of workers by import competition.

7. This approach would have the advantage of eliminating internally inefficient firms by spreading the cost of transferring their labor and capital to more efficient lines of production over the entire country, while keeping in business establishments that are internally efficient (at least according to this rough yardstick) but which are at a disadvantage, externally, relative to low-cost foreign production.

8. Although this approach does not provide a precise means for measuring internal efficiency of production it does provide a yardstick that appears to be just and workable. The plan could vary as to detail. Instead of allowing domestic producers one-half of the domestic market, it could allow them two-thirds, or production up to what used to be called (by the late Prof. Frank W. Taussig, of Harvard, who was the first Chairman of the U.S. Tariff Commission back in 1916) the bulk-line cost, or distance O–X in the diagram (not printed in RECORD). The bulk-line cost is the point beyond which the average unit cost of production shoots upward abruptly. Beyond the bulk-line the firms can be said to be marginal.

CONCLUSION

Expanding foreign trade—both exports and imports—is essential for the welfare of the United States in these days of worldwide political bipolarity. The least intelligent way to solve the present balance-of-payments deficit problem of the United States would be to curtail imports. International trade is so essential to free world solidarity that we must do everything in our power to enable it to expand. Although the United States probably could get along tolerably well with far smaller foreign trade than it now has, other countries could not. To some of them, particularly those specializing in the production of a few raw materials, exports can mean the difference between economic life and economic death. The self-interest of the United States demands that we think of the economic strength of our friends and neighbors as well as of our own national strength.

With production costs as low as they are in certain foreign countries, particularly Japan, a highly industrialized country, it would not make sense to open our doors wide to all imports without taking care of the domestic producers who are injured. This consideration lies at the very heart of the small industry problem.

The plan outlined in this memorandum provides a formula that seems to satisfy the requirements of the problem. It would not cut off all import competition, but it would provide for the transfer by the less-efficiently managed U.S. firms of their manpower and capital to other, more efficient lines of production. At the same time it would protect the more efficiently managed small companies against displacement by import competition.

No longer can we afford to drift in foreign trade policy, proclaiming a liberal, multilateral foreign trade policy while avoiding all serious injury from import competition, regardless of productive efficiency. We need to protect those American producers who are reasonably efficient, but it would be a disservice to perpetuate inefficiency be excluding all competitive imports.

Statement on Loan Made by Small Business Administration to CAN-DO of Hazleton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to make a formal statement for the RECORD regarding a $60,000 loan made by the Small Business Administration to Hazleton's CAN-DO.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT REGARDING HAZLETON LOAN BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

I am urging my colleagues in the House who are interested in industrial expansion in their districts, particularly in small towns and rural areas, to take a good hard look at the provisions of section 502 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, as amended, which is administered by the Small Business Administration, and which is now permanent legislation.

A $60,000 loan for a tunnel and conveyor has been approved by this Administration for Hazleton, Pa., under the provisions of this act in participation with the Northeastern Bank & Trust Co., Hazleton, Pa. This is my district and it is in the heart of the anthracite coal region, a truly labor-distressed area.

The Small Business Administration loan is going to the Community-Area New Development Organization, Inc. The initials of the organization very properly spell out CAN-DO. This development company has raised $1½ million in capital funds from some 4,500 donors in the locality over the past 5 years. After CAN-DO had exhausted all available local funds for further industrial projects, it came to me in desperation seeking additional funds for the construction of the tunnel. I turned to SBA for assistance, and within 17 working days after an application was filed, a $60,000 loan was approved.

The tunnel and conveyor which CAN-DO is constructing with the proceeds of this loan will make nine industrial facilities CAN-DO has provided for lease or sale to business concerns within the Hazleton area. This tunnel will be leased to and used by General Foam Corp., a company engaged in the manufacture and sale of urethane foam and foam rubber products. The tunnel will connect two buildings located approximately 250 feet apart and which are owned by CAN-DO and leased to General Foam Corp. Through the use of a conveyor in the tunnel, the transportation and handling costs of materials between the two buildings will be greatly reduced from the present costs incurred by transporting materials by truck.

This loan was approved by SBA as a part of its established program to assist in the economic development of particular local communities by lending to a State or local development company which, in turn, provides facilities for specific small business concerns located in either urban or rural areas. It therefore seems particularly appropriate that the Secretary of Commerce, in delegating the authority under the Flood-Douglas sponsored Redevelopment Act, should delegate the authority to handle all commercial and industrial loans to the Small Business Administration. SBA already has 55 field offices established in key cities

throughout the Nation, a staff of technical, managerial and production specialists who provide services to the small businessman in SBA's various programs.

Under the Area Redevelopment Act, before aid can be granted, financial assistance must be unavailable on reasonable terms from other sources, including Federal agencies such as SBA.

Accordingly, business concerns will be obligated to seek assistance from SBA before they will be eligible for assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. Thus, SBA will have reviewed the concern's application for financial conditions and the availability of SBA financing, so that only SBA can effectuate the lending under section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act without duplicating the work of other Federal agencies. As a matter of cold fact, section 24 of the Area Redevelopment Act specifically provides that the Secretary of Commerce shall use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, so as to avoid duplication of existing staffs and activities. I believe the section is crystal clear—therefore SBA is now actively making commercial and industrial loans in areas of substantial labor surplus as well as those in areas of substantial and persistent surplus. They, of course, also make loans in areas not classified as distressed areas.

SBA is approving loans every day to small business firms and local and State development companies such as the loan to CAN-DO in Hazleton, Pa. They should continue to perform this valuable and much needed financial assistance under the Area Redevelopment Act. All the Secretary of Commerce needs to do is to delegate to SBA the responsibility, and I feel certain and confident that SBA will do the job with utmost dispatch.

Income Tax Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing in the House of Representatives two bills which, in my opinion, will do much to provide some small measure of relief to the American taxpayer.

The first bill provides that an exemption from income tax in the case of retirement annuities and pensions, up to the amount of $2,500, would be granted. This legislation is introduced with the thought in mind that our elder citizens must be given a helping hand in meeting the current high cost of living. Many of them have been endeavoring to live on fixed incomes for a number of years, and with the continued upward spiral of living costs, this has made their situation a desperate one. Many of them have been forced to seek work to supplement their annuities or pensions, and with the unemployment situation as critical as it has been in the last several years, finding a suitable position has not always been possible or easy.

The second bill would increase the present personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer from $600 to $1,000, including the exemptions for a spouse, a dependent, and for old-age and blindness. The present $600 exemption is absolutely outdated and totally unrealistic today, having been put into effect a number of years ago when living expenses were considerably lower.

The tax laws have placed a heavy and onerous burden on our taxpayers, particularly those in the lower- and middle-income brackets, and I believe that a liberalization of these laws is long overdue. To increase the present exemptions will place more money in the hands of the consumer, and in turn will stimulate our economy.

Flood Damage in the Wabash River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, floods again have washed away tons of topsoil and ruined thousands of acres of crops in the fertile Wabash River Basin of Illinois and Indiana.

This is almost an annual occurrence in the Wabash Valley. Newspaper headlines for the past week have told a familiar story of National Guardsmen working with local sandbag crews along the levees, of families driven from their homes and of emergency assistance being offered to the stricken areas by the Federal and State Governments.

But helpful as the emergency measures are they are mere palliatives. What is needed is a coordinated attack on the basic problem of harnessing the Wabash and its tributary streams. They must be converted from a destructive to a constructive force.

I have, therefore, today reintroduced my bill to authorize the establishment of a Wabash Interagency Water Resources Commission. The commission would have the following duties:

First. To coordinate Federal, State, and local plans for development of water and related resources in the Wabash Basin.

Second. Prepare and keep up to date a comprehensive, integrated, joint plan for water and related water resources development.

Third. Recommended a long-range schedule of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data, for investigation and project planning, and for construction of projects.

Fourth. Foster and undertake studies of water resources problems in the basin.

The Commission would be composed of members appointed by the President from the various Federal departments or agencies having a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken and one or more members, as the President deems appropriate, from each of the States of Illinois and Indiana, as well as one member from each interstate compact commission which has jurisdiction over any of the waters of the Wabash Basin. The President also would appoint the Chairman of the Commission. The Governors of the two States would be authorized to nominate the members from the States of Illinois and Indiana.

Comprehensive water resources development plans have been prepared in the past for certain areas, including the New York-New England region and the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin. Such plans have been of great value in developing projects for construction.

I am of the opinion that only through such an integrated program can we realize the full potential of the Wabash and its tributaries for bringing prosperity to this area and enriching the lives of its citizens.

Free Peoples Need To Stand Up and Be Counted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Saturday night in Los Angeles I had the honor to speak at the annual banquet of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists. I ask unanimous consent that a partial text of my remarks at that time be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the partial text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE PEOPLES NEED TO STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

(Partial text of speech of THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator from California, before the annual banquet of the Association of American Editorial Cartoonists, Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Saturday, May 13, 1961)

The decade of the 1960's will present to the peoples of the earth unbelievable new horizons. Peoples will have traveled to the moon and back, and flights to the stars will be nearer to reality. From earth satellites, global television will reach into the homes of every hemisphere. Weather may well be subject to the control of man. Unimaginable breakthroughs in our struggle against the most dread diseases will have been attained. Twenty-six million young Americans will have come into our labor force for the first time. Our annual gross national product will have expanded from $500 billion to $750 billion.

But unsolved problems of supreme importance remain to plague us. How many people live together in a just peace? How may the United States best assure her own perpetuation? How may the evil dream of international communism for world domination be dissipated? How may freedom live and flourish?

For America, the quest for answers assumes a twofold, crucial importance: one, because we intend to keep our freedom, and, two, because we must, with courage and with vigor, and with honor, fulfill our tasks as

leader of the cause of human freedom, a heavy burden which the exigencies of time have thrust upon us.

America is a peaceful Nation. Our people yearn for a just peace. Our history is free from acts of wanton aggression. But there is aggression in the world. The assault upon the peaceful aims by communism seems to be a never-ending one. Meeting that assault, meeting it successfully, is the basic issue of the 1960's. It must be met by the free nations of the world, standing side by side, gaining strength from their common resources, and from their common resolve.

I believe in the wisdom of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization comment: "The fundamental historical fact * * * is that the nation state, by itself, and relying exclusively on national policy and national power, is inadequate for progress or even for survival in the nuclear age."

This protracted, interminable conflict with communism can be won only by the free world marshaling and applying its economic, technological, political, and military resources on a collective and coordinated basis. No single state, in the decade of the 1960's, can hope to "go it alone," and still provide security for its people.

We maintain, and shall continue to maintain and strengthen our own American Military Establishment. But we shall also seek to continue and to improve our collective security systems wherever that is feasible.

Our collective security systems came into being in the aftermath of World War II for the purpose of opposing the spread of communism. A few weeks ago, I attended ceremonies at the SHAPE headquarters of NATO, outside Paris, which commemorated the 10th anniversary of the establishment of NATO's defensive shield. I watched with pride, as NATO troops in the military uniforms of their several countries, marched together, an imposing symbol of their nations' compact to defend collectively the security of Western Europe.

And defend that security, they have. We must never forget that since NATO's creation, no free European country has followed her unfortunate neighbor down the dark Communist drain.

The world is in trouble and in turmoil. In every part of the globe, communism probes and penetrates, seeking to find or to develop weaknesses by which it may overrun and subjugate more peoples and more territory. Where it can create and control puppets, it does.

In our own hemisphere, a Communist clique, led by the infamous Castro, increases its control over Cuba. Freedom in Cuba is all gone. Elections are abolished. The highest judicial establishment is the firing squad. Private property is taken over by the Castro forces.

The strength for these opertaions has come from behind the Iron Curtain. Che Guevara, Castro's Minister of Industrialization, proudly proclaims a $100 million loan from Russia, a $70 million loan, interest free, from Communist China, and enough more from satellites to total, he says, about a quarter of a billion dollars.

To secure for communism what Lenin called the commanding heights, the Soviet and her pawns have loaded Castro with as much as a hundred thousand tons of military materiel. Castro has paraded over 50 heavy Soviet J–3 and J–4 tanks, plus lines of 55 and 105 millimeter cannon, truck-drawn field artillery, mortars, 6-barrel rocket launchers, 4-barrel antiaircraft guns, and bazookas. He has received an unlimited amount of small arms, and ammunition of all types. While there is no absolute evidence of Mig aircraft, there have been recurring reports along these lines. In any event, Castro's airmen are being trained in the Soviet bloc.

Last July, Khrushchev said: "One should not forget that now the United States is no longer an unreachable distance from the Soviet Union as it was before. Figuratively speaking, in case of necessity, Soviet artillerymen can support the Cuban people with their rocket fire if the aggressive forces of the Pentagon dare begin their intervention against Cuba."

Then on April 22, this year, he said: "I am stating again that our Government does not seek any advantages or privileges in Cuba. We do not have any bases in Cuba and we do not intend to establish any. And if * * * they (American generals and admirals) still try to frighten the people by fabrications about 'Soviet bases' on Cuba, this is obviously designed for simpletons."

Maybe so, maybe not. One never knows what the Soviet leaders really have in mind. But the facts, and the implications point up the gravest kind of question. How do we, the American people, and the American Government propose to answer?

The first obligation of the Government of our country is the security of our own people.

In the furtherance of that obligation, we have adopted, as one technique, the theory of collective security.

In the Americas, we have no unified system of defense such as NATO affords the Atlantic community, although mechanisms for coordinating joint hemispheric action do exist. Basic to this framework is the Organization of American States, agreed upon in 1948, designed "to achieve an order of peace and justice," "to provide for action on the part of (the member) states in the event of aggression," and finding that "an act of aggression against one American state is an act of aggression against all the other American states."

A year earlier, in 1947, the Rio Pact was adopted. It holds, in part: "If the inviolability or the integrity of the territory or the sovereignty or political independence of any American state should be affected by any aggression which is not an armed attack or by any extracontinental or intercontinental conflict, or by any other fact or situation that might endanger the peace of America, the organ of consultation shall meet immediately in order to agree on the measures which must be taken in case of aggression to assist the victim of the aggression or, in any case, the measures which should be taken for the common defense and for the maintenance of the peace and security of the continent."

There is the Declaration of Caracas of 1954, which finds, in part: "That the dominance or control of the political institutions of any American state by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American states, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of measures in accordance with existing treaties."

But there is also a basic U.S. hemispheric policy first enunciated in 1823. It is a rather intriguing fact that in that year, imperial Russian outposts were being established along our California coast. Russian expansionism threatened the Americas equally with the expansionism of European powers in Latin America. How strange this seems today when Soviet expansionism again threatens the New World.

At any rate, President Monroe laid it on the line. We were determined to prevent the encroachment of any outside power upon the soil of the Western Hemisphere. "We should," he said, "consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

That policy remains, as it should remain, America's policy in the 1960's as well.

Last year, in Brazil, President Eisenhower reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine, when he said: "I assure you that my Government, while honoring its commitments outside this hemisphere is in no mood to allow its special responsibilities among the American States to go by default. Indeed, these commitments and responsibilities are part and parcel of the same problem—preserving the strength and unity of the free world."

And on the steps of the American Capitol, as he took his oath of office, President Kennedy reiterated that policy and reminded the world that—"This peaceful revolution of hope cannot become the prey of hostile powers. Let our neighbors know that we shall join with them to oppose aggression or subversion anywhere in the Americas. And let every other power know that this hemisphere intends to remain the master of its own house."

In my view, the time has now come for our friends in this hemisphere to stand up and face the need to implement their jointly approved resolutions. The State Department accurately describes Castro's Cuba as a member of the Sino-Soviet bloc. International communism is implacably dedicated to the destruction of free Western institutions.

This is not simply a problem for our beloved Republic. It is the gravest kind of issue for all the peoples of the Americas. In my view, the members of the OAS should stand up and face the responsibilities which they assumed in approving the several declarations to which I have alluded. A meeting of the representatives of the OAS should shortly be convened. The meeting should be called by one of our neighbors or by us. The agenda for the meeting should be unequivocal. The menace of Castro's clique to the political independence of our hemisphere should be clearly enunciated. Arrangements should be agreed upon for collective defense if an act of aggression were to take place against any of us. With equal clarity, the members should agree upon specific diplomatic and economic measures to be undertaken, and undertaken jointly, to isolate this Communist pawn. Economic sanctions should be jointly invoked. It is fantastic, for example, that we, the United States, continue to enrich Castro's regime b· about $5 million per month. We prohibit Cuban sugar importation but continue to receive Cuban molasses, tobacco, fruits, and vegetables which totaled $60 million last year. Meanwhile, we prohibit our own people from exporting goods to Cuba with the exception of food, medicine, and medical supplies.

We are playing our part, with our neighbors, in attacking hunger, poverty, disease and despair here in the Americas. We are a minority stockholder in the Inter-American Bank. Congress is about to approve a $600 million appropriation for additional assistance to the Americas. This is a tremendously important joint undertaking. But it is not all that is required. While we try to take care of our own, we shall brook no interference from those whose single aim is our undoing. And in that resolve, let those who spoke with us at Rio, at Bogotá, at Caracas, and at San Jose, now agree to a common course of action which our several statements of common principle require.

I speak tonight as an American Senator devoted, like each of you, to the perpetuation of the Republic. Our country stands for liberty. It is our Nation which must hold high the torch of liberty. We dare not shirk our responsibilities of leadership. Let those who are like-minded repair to our side. Let those who, together with us, courageously underwrote clear declarations of our joint resolve, now stand together before mankind, ready, together, to extirpate communism

from the New World; ready, together, to improve the lot of our peoples, their life, their health, their minds, their homes, and their welfare, through freedom and not by slavery; ready to demonstrate to all our unyielding resolve to maintain our freedom. This is a time for free peoples to speak up and be counted.

I believe, with Lincoln, that sin by silence, when there is a duty to speak, makes cowards of men.

Statement by Hon. John Lesinski, of Michigan, on Work of Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the RECORD the following text of a broadcast I recently made over WJBK–TV, Detroit, Mich., reporting on my activities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics.

The text follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. JOHN LESINSKI OF MICHIGAN ON WORK OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND GOVERNMENT STATISTICS

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen of the WJBK television audience. I am pleased to appear before you once again to report on my activities in Washington.

Since everything that Congress does affects all of you directly or indirectly, I thought you would be interested in what I have been doing in the 87th Congress as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics. This committee was set up for the first time in the 86th Congress and is concerned with matters relating to our national census programs—population, housing, agriculture, manufacturing, business, etc., as well as with the statistical programs of the Federal Government, in general.

Statistics, as such, is a very dry and uninteresting subject to bring up, and although this activity may appear to be dry and uninteresting to some of you, I still find that some very interesting and challenging subjects come before our group. Just last week we held a hearing to review the results of the 1960 census with officials of the Census Bureau. You may be interested to know that the last census cost the taxpayers $128 million—it employed some 10,000 supervisors and over 160,000 enumerators. Right now in Washington the final results of the count are being processed on giant computers, and the census reports are coming out sooner than ever before in our history.

The matter of redistricting of the congressional districts in Michigan, about which I am sure you have read, by the legislature in Lansing is based upon the 1960 census figures.

My subcommittee has released a complete report on the 1960 census experience—it is free and I would be glad to mail you a copy at your request.

Now, the census is taken every 10 years as our Constitution directs, as you all know, but, recently considerable support has appeared for taking the census more often. Our subcommittee is considering a bill which would authorize a national census of population and housing in 1965. This proposal is strongly backed by State and local government officials who tell us that this country can no longer afford to wait 10 years for population and housing figures—city planners, school officials, public health officials, housing experts, and business, tell us that they must have more frequent population and housing figures in order to face up to the problems in their communities. Moreover, every year over $3 billion are allocated by the Federal and State governments to regional and local communities on a per capita basis, using official census figures for determining the population base. This means that a rapidly growing community loses out if its allocation is based on census figures of 10 years ago.

Of course, this is only one of the reasons for interest in a census of 1965—there are many others, but I cite this one because it explains why there is so much grassroots support for this new census. In his special report on the Union message, President Kennedy emphasized the need for strong national defense, so I hardly need mention that if we would have a census of population in 1965, it would be very valuable for national defense planning purposes, particularly as it relates to such needs as distribution of population and the number of males available for military service.

Our subcommittee plans to hold hearings on this proposal later this year. Since there is interest in every part of the country, we plan to hold hearings in Washington, D.C., and other cities. As a result of the hearings, we expect to be able to reach a decision and will, of course, report our findings to Congress for its action.

If any of my listeners would like to express their views on this census proposal, I'd like very much to hear from you.

Speech of Hon. A. Paul Kitchin, of North Carolina, Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner, May 13, 1961, Charlottesville, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert a very excellent speech of my colleague, Representative A. PAUL KITCHIN, delivered at the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner of the Eighth Virginia Congressional District at Charlottesville, Va., on May 13.

The sound principles of constitutional law and States rights are worthy of careful attention of all Americans who harbor a proper respect for the system of government devised by our forefathers:

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN A. PAUL KITCHIN, OF NORTH CAROLINA, JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, MAY 13, 1961, CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

Mr. Chairman, Congressman Smith, and fellow Democrats, I am flattered and highly honored to be here tonight and to be presented by my good friend and colleague, Judge SMITH, your able Congressman and one of the greatest American statesmen of all time. While the history of your great State is filled with the names and accomplishments of her great sons, I concede to none of them more sincerity of purpose, more love of country, more loyalty to constitutional government, and more patriotic zeal for the welfare of his Nation and its people than HOWARD SMITH. I congratulate the constituency of this district for your wisdom in the selection of your Congressman and in sincerity must say that your district is the best represented district in the House of Representatives. May the good Lord and the voters of the Eighth continue to allow him to serve his country for many, many years to come.

I also congratulate the people of Virginia for the selection of the other great Democrats of your delegation without whom the voice of Jeffersonian democracy in the Halls of Congress would be weak indeed.

The Commonwealth of Virginia, the birth and growth of our Nation, and the creation and meaning of the Democratic Party are synonymous. No State in this great Union has contributed more to the foundation and progress of our Nation than has your great Commonwealth. All freedom-loving Americans should press an humble knee upon your sacred soil and give thanks to Almighty God that from the pangs of birth, the agonies of youth, the trials of adolescense, and the present anxious and uncertain moments of the maturity of our Nation, we have always had Virginia.

We are gathered here tonight to pay tribute to Jefferson and Jackson, the founders and the guiding influence of our Democratic Party. I sometimes wonder if they or either of them would, if they were here with us tonight, discern any resemblance between their creation and the present trend of our national Democratic Party.

"Strong centralized government" is the motto of the day and does nothing but violence to the creed of Jefferson who believed and asserted that "the least governed are the best governed." The Democratic Party was firmly established by Jefferson and Jackson as the party of the people. The party that believes that people are capable of governing themselves. When this belief inculcated into the minds of people by Jefferson and Jackson has been put into action we have always had good government—a government that honored the rights of States and individual freedom. A government that sponsored a sound currency, a balanced budget, and an adherence to the principles of the Constitution of the United States. A government that decried centralized bureaucracy and stark Federal power. When we as Democrats turned our back on Jeffersonian philosophy we not only caused a split in our party but have digressed from the great principles that made us great. Selfish interest and political expediency have replaced fundamental ideals of our party and we find ourselves divided in our own ranks—there are those of us who still believe in the tenets of Jeffersonian democracy and there are others who have no confidence in the ability of the people to govern themselves at local and State levels and who advocate every measure which will further regiment our people and destroy the rights of State and local governments.

Yes; of late there appears to be a new order of things—a new approach to government by both major parties. Now big government must take over and run everything from bureaucratic Washington. This is the trend of the times but the responsibility for this trend must be placed where it belongs—upon the shoulders of the people of this country. The best people on earth but a confused, mixed-up people who believe they want constitutional government but who eagerly grasp for the personal benefits of any proposed welfare and privilege legislation. A people that have some confused idea that what the U.S. Government does for them is free, that it does not cost them anything, that if the cost of government must be shaved off a little, don't stop my benefits, stop the benefits of the other fellow. If someone has to be taxed to pay for all this, don't tax me. That's unfair. Tax the other guy. A people that have the confused idea that as long as taxes are not

raised to affect their personal pocketbooks, it's all right to give billions of dollars in foreign aid and go deeper and deeper in debt whether it buys any friends or not. If it proves later to be a mistake it won't cost us anything. Charge it to posterity. Let those generations, yet unborn, bear the burden of paying this enormous obligation. A people who have the confused idea that good, benevolent Uncle Sam in the many grant-in-aid programs and matching fund programs is being very nice to our State and saves us taxes and lets us spend the money as we see fit without any Federal control.

A people who have the confused idea that the only dangers we face are those in Laos, Cuba, the Congo, Berlin, and other far away areas of the world. A people who have the confused idea international communism is just a ghost story to frighten us into conformity. A people who have the confused idea that our internal government is not changing and that those of us who are old-fashioned enough to believe in constitutional government are just reactionary and preachers of doom and gloom—just close your eyes and ears and it will all go away.

There are some of us who seriously wonder whether our constitutional government can and will survive the avarice, greed, and selfishness of a confused citizenry. There are some of us who seriously wonder if about all of the Constitution they want now are the first three articles under which to organize, the welfare clause under which to legislate, and the fifth amendment behind which to hide. There are some of us who seriously wonder whether our democracy can survive the misuse of the Constitution by enemies of our society who, under the guise of rights and privileges, hide behind it; who, under the guise of freedom of speech, press, and assembly, castigate and vilify it; and who, under the guise of humanitarianism and the welfare clause, would legislate its destruction.

The people of this Nation must stabilize themselves, inform themselves as to what's happening and then decide what they want in Government. Do we want a welfare state, socialism, x-ism, call it what you please, or do we want a return to constitutional government as decreed by our forefathers, tested for over a century by its political enemies, and survived and prospered over the years guided and sustained by a great and freedom-loving people.

Norman Thomas gave up years ago joyously and victoriously stating that it was no longer necessary for the Socialist Party to exist because the two major parties had already accomplished its aims. Much more implementation has been made since then by legislation and Supreme Court decisions. Decisions not based upon stare decises but upon changing times and the changing of our social order; by legislation which bypasses the concept of jurisdiction between Federal and State but ostensibly bottomed upon the so-called welfare clause; by laws that tend to relegate our States to mere vassals of a Federal bureaucratic regime; by pseudolegal violence to the constitutions of our States in actions to dictate the control of State funds and the State's right to spend these funds for the continuation and preservation of State institutions; to dictate changes in voting qualifications; to dictate intrastate wages and hours; to dictate whom you must employ before you are eligible to bid on a contract with your own Government; and many other usurpations of States rights too numerous to mention.

If this is what the people want let them make a thoughtful and final decision. Final because once made to accept socialism there is no return. The choice must be between loyalty to our selfish interest and loyalty to our individual freedom—loyalty to social and political expediency and loyalty to principles and ideals—loyalty to a materialistic abundance and loyalty to a fiscally sound economy. The chosing of one's expression of loyalty is but to exercise the genius of democracy which still remains the type of government which men who are less than men seek to avoid. It is the most demanding system that has ever been created. It is not something created for soft man but a society and a way of life which our forefathers worked, fought, bled, and died for and can be maintained only with courage, work, sacrifice, and determination—courage of our convictions; work to acquire knowledge to nurture our convictions; sacrifice of selfish desires for patriotic citizenship, and determination to keep our Nation safe for a God-fearing and freedom-loving people.

The era in which we now live is fraught between two camps—democracy as we know it—and communism and other isms. These are probably more a political expression than a philosophy and the real intellectual war that is being waged within our world society is whether we can evaluate the true nature of man and history—whether man is free to create history or whether history will shackle man to the status of a soul-less creature dominated by the state.

We the people must awaken from our opiates of self-indulgence and regain our perspective. "What is America?" not the academic concept of geographical and material existence but—what makes it tick—why a declaration of independence. Why a Constitution. Why a Bill of Rights. These profound questions can only be answered by an intelligent, courageous, and patriotic people after a soul-searching admission that what they stand for cannot survive on apathy, ignorance, and irresponsibility. We must never take our freedoms and liberties for granted. I wish every native-born citizen could look upon the face of the foreign-born when he finally becomes a naturalized citizen of these United States; could see the tears of joy—could sense the great soul-filled pride of those who know what it is to be deprived of the rights we enjoy and take for granted. If we could regain from some of them the real value of American citizenship what a great lesson we could teach in our everyday lives.

We the people must determine the kind of America we want for the future.

I think I can speak with a unanimous voice for Americans when I say that we want an America for the future that lifts its head high in the world, not because of its military might, or its material achievements, but because we are morally right and sound, and because America is a living symbol of the rights and dignity of man. We want an America so constant to its principles, and so resolute in honoring its responsibilities to the free world that our friends all over the globe will never have reason to regret the trust that they have placed in us. We want an America ever prepared to meet any challenge or any competing ideology with great breadth of courage, and great depth of purpose.

Can this be done? Of course it can. The pattern was drawn with the first sketching of the framework of America in the Declaration of Independence. We need only reawaken to the challenge. This America of the future will demand citizens who recognize that the true greatness of our Nation does not lie in its high standard of living, but rather in its high standard of life. We shall need citizens who realize that the security of our Nation is the responsibility of each individual citizen. We must prove that a free people, through voluntary, cooperative effort, can achieve a better standard of life than can be gained in the regimented society of the Soviet Union. Communism and socialism require people who can be told what to do, who can be managed, democracy demands people who have self-control, who can manage themselves.

Yes; we can have this America of the future, but only if every citizen of the United States accepts his responsibility and fulfills his role in the spirit of self-discipline. You cannot say, "Let George do it."

Democratic government is a shared responsibility. It implies that every citizen, as well as every public official, make a career of citizenship. Only in this way can democracy be strong. Its strength rests wholesouled on the fact that we have on this soil the incredible phenomenon of 180 million people who are ruled by themselves. It is the people who tell the Government where it gets on, and where it gets off. It is the people who hire and fire the Government, through our system of elections. This is an immense responsibility that rests upon you and me and every individual American citizen. In a nation as large and complex as ours, only an intelligent, perceptive citizenry could accomplish this task without the machinery of democracy simply falling apart.

We can no longer escape the fact that our personal destinies are deeply involved with the actions of the Federal Government. If we fail to assume our individual responsibilities. We shall have surrendered our integrity as American citizens, and we shall have no cause for complaint. But if we are ever aware that government is a shared responsibility, and if we maintain an alert, unselfish, and participating citizenry, then our institutions will be safe and our freedom secure.

I would encourage each of you to look to the America that you want for the future, and to remember that there is no distinction between what is good for your future, and what is good for the future of the country. I would encourage you to exercise every act that is within your power to enrich and preserve the heritage that is ours, and to prove to the world that constitutional democracy is not a dying society, but a vibrant and rewarding way of life that holds the dignity of the individual on the highest pedestal. This task will require the effort and dedication of every single one of us.

Last, but not least, don't be ashamed to be patriotic, don't hide your face if a tear of pride comes in your eye when Old Glory is unfurled and the national anthem is played. Raise your head high and look at America—listen, and you'll hear her say to you: "I'm just what you make me, no more or no less."

Harper Lee's Novel Wins Pulitzer Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein an article from the Mobile Register dated May 2, 1961, with reference to Miss Harper Lee entitled "Harper Lee's Novel Wins Pulitzer Prize." Naturally, all of us in the First Congressional District of Alabama, of which Monroeville is a part, are quite proud of Miss Lee for winning this much desired prize on her first novel.

MAY 8, 1961.

Miss HARPER LEE,
Monroeville, Ala.

MY DEAR MISS LEE: All of us down in Alabama are quite proud of our Monroeville

girl, who made good and who won the 1961 Pulitzer Prize for fiction.

I know that your father and your sisters and all the rest of your family are happy indeed that you have scored such a success on the first work that you ever published. Your experiences prove that patience and perseverance remove mountains.

May God continue to bless you in your efforts. With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

FRANK W. BOYKIN,
Member of Congress.

[From the Mobile (Ala.) Register, May 2, 1961]

ALABAMIAN GETS TOP FICTION AWARD—HARPER LEE'S NOVEL WINS PULITZER PRIZE—MONROEVILLE WRITER SCORES BIG SUCCESS WITH FIRST BOOK

Harper Lee's novel "To Kill a Mockingbird," has won the 1961 Pulitzer Prize for fiction.

The 35-year-old Pulitzer winner hails from Monroeville, Ala., and is a frequent visitor to Mobile.

Her first novel, "To Kill a Mockingbird," concerning a small southern town and its people is both a Reader's Digest book-of-the-month selection and a Literary Guild choice.

Motion picture rights for the novel have been acquired by a producer-director team, Alan Pakula and Robert Mulligan. They plan to visit Miss Lee in Monroeville where they will finish negotiations with a major company for a release and are expected to start filming this year.

The candid and unassuming author is the daughter of A. C. Lee, Monroeville attorney and former publisher of the Monroe Journal.

The announcement of the award came in an Associated Press dispatch from New York.

Miss Lee's family, in Monroeville, expressed delight at the selection.

Her sister, Alice Lee, said, "It's the most amazing news we could imagine. It is absolutely amazing, especially since it is her first novel."

A. C. Lee, 81, her father, and Alice operate their own law firm in Monroeville. They are partners.

"The whole town is excited over the announcement," said Miss Lee. "I can't do anything but answer the telephone. It's been ringing all afternoon. It just won't stop ringing.

"You see, this is a small town and everybody knew Harper and the whole family.

"I talked with her other sister, Mrs. H. Conner of Eufaula (Ala.), a little while ago. She is just as excited as we are.

"And I've already talked with Harper twice from New York. She can't believe it either."

Monroeville, in south Alabama, has a population of about 3,000. It is a rural community, and many claim it was the setting for Miss Lee's novel, about the social problems of a small town.

"That's something for a first novel," said Alice Lee. "We know she would like to write another one, but this one has been so successful she simply hasn't had time to start another one."

"ALL THE WAY HOME" PULITZER WINNER FOR DRAMA—"MOCKINGBIRD" HONORED

NEW YORK, May 2.—"All the Way Home," a play which almost closed the week it opened on Broadway, is the 1961 winner of the Pulitzer Prize for Drama.

The play represented the first stage effort of Tad Mosel, 39, of New York, hitherto a television writer. It was based on the late James Agee's Pulitzer Prize novel of 1958, "A Death in the Family."

Winner of the Pulitzer Prize for fiction is Harper Lee's "To Kill a Mockingbird," a novel depicting a small Southern town's struggles to solve its social problems.

As in the case of Mr. Mosel and several others among the 15 Pulitzer recipients announced yesterday, it was a first for the 35-year-old Miss Lee, a native of Monroeville, Ala.

Although she had been writing things since she was 7, the novel was the first work she had ever published and emerged from a long and hopeless period of writing over and over again.

TEXAS PAPER WINS AWARD

The Pulitzer Prize gold medal for public service was awarded to the Amarillo Globe-Times, the first Texas paper to ever win the award.

The medal, the top newspaper award of the year, was for the newspaper's successful campaign to erase corruption in local government. Touched off by Editor Thomas Hazzard Thompson, the effort resulted in a law enforcement shakeup and election of a reform slate of officials.

Lynn Heinzerling, 54, of the Associated Press won the prize for international reporting. Mr. Heinzerling, a native of Birmingham, Ohio, who has been in foreign service since 1938, was honored for his coverage of Africa, including pioneer reporting during the early days of the Congo crisis.

The prize for national reporting went to Edward R. Cony, 38, news editor of the Wall Street Journal, for his "analysis of a timber transaction which drew the attention of the public to problems of business ethics." The transaction involved the Georgia-Pacific Corp., the Nation's No. 1 plywood producer.

PRIZE FOR PHOTOGRAPHY

Yasushi Nagao, 30, of Tokyo, became the first foreigner in the 45-year history of the prizes to win the award for photography. Only two foreigners ever won Pulitzer Prizes before—the first in history in 1917, and the other in correspondence in 1934.

Mr. Nagao, of the Tokyo newspaper Mainichi, was cited for his dramatic picture of the assassination last October 12 of Japanese socialist Inejiro Asanuma. It was distributed in this country by United Press International, thus making Mr. Nagao eligible for the prize.

The editorial writing award went to William J. Dorvillier, 58, editor and publisher of the San Juan (Puerto Rico) Star, founded a little more than a year ago and owned by Cowles Magazine, Inc.

Mr. Dorvillier, a native of North Adams, Mass., and a newspaperman for 26 years, won the prize for editorials criticizing the Catholic bishops of Puerto Rico for a pastoral letter forbidding Catholics to vote for the Popular Democratic Party of Gov. Luis Munoz Marin. Mr. Dorvillier, a Roman Catholic, wrote 20 editorials. Mr. Munoz Marin's party won the election.

Sanche de Gramont, 29 of the New York Herald Tribune, won the prize for local reporting under pressure of edition time. A native of Switzerland, now assigned to Paris by his newspaper, he was selected for his story of the death of Baritone Leonard Warren on the stage of the Metropolitan Opera House, March 4, 1960.

The prize for local reporting where deadline pressure was not a factor was won by Edgar May of the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News, also a native of Switzerland. Mr. May, 31, conducted a 6-month study of the cost and other problems of administering public welfare. He spent three months as a caseworker for the Erie County Department of Social Welfare. The series was entitled "Our Costly Dilemma."

The cartoon award went to Carey Orr, 71, a cartoonist for the Chicago Tribune since 1917. The award was for the Ada, Ohio, native's long and distinguished service in his field as exemplified by a cartoon last October 8 captioned "The Kindly Tiger." It showed a tiger representing communism licking its lips over the figure of Africa emerging to freedom.

Except for the gold medal award—which carries no cash—all journalistic citations carried prizes of $1,000. Those in arts and letters were worth $500 each.

SET UP BY JOSEPH PULITZER

The Pulitzer Prizes, set up by the late newspaper publisher Joseph Pulitzer in a bequest to Columbia University, are awarded annually by the trustees of the university on recommendation of an advisory board made up mainly of newspaper executives.

Besides fiction and drama, awards in the field of arts and letters were made in the areas of history, biography, poetry and music.

Herbert Feis, 68, of York, Maine, won the prize for history for "Between War and Peace: The Potsdam Conference." It was the latest in a long series of published works by the New York city native, going back to 1930.

David Donald, 41, of Princeton, N.J., won the award for biography for his "Charles Sumner and the Coming of the Civil War," a study of one of the foremost anti-slavery voices in the North.

The prize for poetry went to Phyllis McGinley, 56, of Larchmont, N.Y., for "Times Three: Selected Verse From Three Decades."

Walter Piston's "Symphony No. 7" brought him the prize for music. The symphony was commissioned by the Philadelphia Orchestra Association and was first performed by that group last February 10. Mr. Piston, 67, of Belmont, Mass., also won the Pulitzer Music Award in 1948, for his "Symphony No. 3."

A special citation was bestowed by the Columbia trustees on "The American Heritage Picture History of the Civil War," which covers the war's history in pictures, maps, sketches and text.

The mammoth volume was prepared by the book division of the American Heritage Publishing Co., Inc., with narrative by Bruce Catton, a 1954 Pulitzer Prize winner in history. Eight researchers, writers and artists provided background for the book.

Expansion of Teaching Services to All Handicapped Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation calling for the extension of the grant program for expansion of teaching services for mentally retarded children to include the hard of hearing and the speech impaired, the visually handicapped, the deaf, the emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted, the crippled, and those children with other health impairments. My proposal will also remove the present statutory limitation of $1 million per year for the program for the mentally retarded children.

The Members of the House will recall that I introduced the bill authorizing the creation of a fellowship program to prepare professional personnel in the education of the mentally retarded. My bill was enacted on September 6, 1958, and it contained two major provisions relating to the training of professional

personnel: First, it provided the necessary authorization for the U.S. Commissioner of Education to make grants to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher learning to assist them in providing training of college instructors who would, in turn, train classroom teachers and second, it provided authorization for the Commissioner of Education to make grants to State educational agencies for the support of fellowship programs for training classroom teachers and supervisors in the area of the mentally retarded.

This program has now been in operation for 2 full years and has already demonstrated several important facts. There was immediate favorable acceptance of this program. It stimulated nationwide interest among educators and laymen alike. Recently, my committee held lengthy hearings regarding the problems of educating exceptional children. There was a great deal of expert testimony given by leaders in both the field of medicine and the field of education. Based upon this information, the committee prepared a report which unmistakably indicated the urgent necessity for both expansion and extension of this program. I might also add that, due to my strong personal interest in the problems in this area, I have spent a great deal of time analyzing and observing the present fellowship program for educational services for the mentally retarded. From my own firsthand information I can report complete acceptance of the purposes and results of this very worthwhile undertaking.

I would like to call the Members' attention to a few pertinent facts which are related to this program. During the present school year, there are 148 fellows enrolled in 32 colleges and universities. Sixty of these fellows are in training to become college instructors, who will in turn train classroom teachers. The other 88 are training to be classroom teachers or supervisors. The statutory limitation of $1 million is the only factor which has prevented larger numbers of students from entering this program.

There are estimated to be some one and a quarter million mentally retarded school-age children in the Nation and only about 312,000 of them are receiving suitable education because of the lack of qualified teachers. An additional 50,000 specially trained teachers are needed to do a satisfactory job of educating these unfortunates. Because of this great need, and also because of the amount of interest being shown, the legislation which I have just introduced proposes the removal of the amount limitation of $1 million and will, therefore, permit appropriations to be more nearly commensurate with the need.

My personal observations and my mail both tell me that not only should our assistance for education of the mentally retarded be greatly expanded, but there are equally compelling reasons to extend the provisions of the existing legislation to include all areas of exceptionality. My legislation will authorize extension of this program to include fellowship grants in the areas of speech and hearing impairment, the completely deaf, the visually handicapped, the emotionally disturbed or socially maladjusted, and the crippled, and other special health problems. The fields of medicine and education are now able to do much to help many of the 4 million children suffering from these handicaps. Without Federal aid in all of these important areas, the application of medical and educational skills to the education of many of these children will be delayed for years because of a lack of a sufficient number of properly trained teachers. The education of these children cannot wait. With each passing year the benefits of a postponed education will certainly become less and less effective. The resulting toll in human suffering and economic loss will far exceed the costs of the program which I am proposing.

The Commissioner of Education has reported that with an average annual expenditure of slightly more than $9,500,000 for the training of professional educators in all areas of exceptionality we can expect to have approximately 3,500 additional well-trained leadership and instructional personnel by the end of 1966–67 academic year. This will still leave us far short of the total need, but it will have provided a large corps of college instructors and will also have permitted time for expansion of university facilities in such quantity and extent that a stepped-up training program will be possible in subsequent years. I know of no other area in education where the shortage of well-qualified classroom teachers is so appalling. There is an immediate need for almost 150,000 additional professionally trained teachers and supervisors to adequately meet the need. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in their support of this legislation.

Summer Jobs for Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Secretary of Labor Goldberg—which appeared in the Sunday newspaper supplement This Week on May 14, 1961—should help many of our colleagues to answer the inquires they receive from students wanting information about summer job opportunities. The Secretary's suggestions are excellent guidelines:

HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE KIDS: HOW TO MAKE YOUR SUMMER JOB REALLY PAY

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—This summer nearly 3 million young people will look for jobs to earn money till school and college reopen in the fall. For those youngsters—and their parents—I have a word of advice:

Summer work can be a rewarding and profitable experience—but don't let a summer job lead you away from school. The path away from school, even if it begins with an attractive summer job, can lead to an occupational dead end.

We have discovered that the dropout from school finds fewer good jobs, lasts a shorter time in them, earns far less over his lifetime, and has a much higher rate of unemployment than the graduate.

Those who work this summer will discover why. The good jobs are held for the educated and trained worker. A degree and a diploma are necessary passports to the better employment opportunities of today, and certainly of tomorrow.

A STEP UP THE LADDER

It is important to keep in mind the true values of summer work, keep it in the proper perspective. That way it can be fun—and a step up the job ladder.

A June to September job that is also a training ground for a career already selected is, of course, a real plus. But that is not the only criterion that should be applied.

The important objective in summer work is to acquire the disciplines that apply to all employment—responsibility for conscientious effort, taking direction from a job superior, promptness, proper handling of money, and learning to work with others.

It is always a good idea to start looking for a summer job early. Try to get one lined up long before school closes. Begin by looking in fields that will provide experience for a career, if you have decided on one.

A young girl who wants to teach, for example, might inquire into summer camps and summer schools, or into tutoring. A boy with medical school in view might seek summer work at a local hospital or clinic. A model or designer-to-be might make the rounds of dress shops and department stores for salesgirl openings.

If you are interested in engineering, many companies recruit college students for summer training. Other good bets for future engineers now in college or high school are summer jobs as garage mechanics, or factory work.

JOBS FOR 15-YEAR-OLDS

Whatever your chief job interest, your first visit should be to the local employment office. There are some 1,800 of these offices throughout the country, offering free placement service and good advice.

Summer job lists maintained by the employment service include, for the 14- and 15-year-old girl, clerical, sales and stock work in retail stores, various types of domestic service like baby sitting, and nursing aid work. A 15-year-old boy might find summer work in delivering, sales, packing or stock handling, caddying, or car washing, or in farm work.

The older girls and boys have a wider variety of choices—office work, resort employment, assisting skilled craftsmen, and factory jobs.

One field that should be thoroughly investigated by young people is service with the government—Federal, State, or local. Here's a unique opportunity for service to all of society.

All of the jobs listed with the employment service are legally permissible for young people under the Fair Labor Standards Act—an important point to consider. In most communities, work permits are required before a young person can be put on the payroll.

Once you land your summer job, don't consider it merely a source of income and welcome spending money. No job should exist only for the paycheck. Whether you are clearing a forest trail, stacking dishes, waiting on customers, marking stock in a market, waiting on tables, pumping gas or typing business letters, the values of work extend far beyond the hourly rate and wage scale.

The day of the unskilled worker is over. The new jobs of the new economy will require far wider educational and training

backgrounds than in the past—and they will also demand an interest, a willingness to understand and absorb that can be learned now. If you can discover that the reward of work is far more than monetary, your summer will be well spent.

A SENSIBLE WORD OF ADVICE

A young lawyer once wrote to a wise professor of law, asking him how he could best prepare for a successful law career. The professor replied: "Forget about it, and instead make yourself as wise and learned as you can in many fields—in music and literature and science. When you have done that, then you will be a good lawyer as well."

I have always thought that excellent advice. The man who understands his time and the great events in many fields is usually the man who is excellent in his own. So even though a summer job may not be an immediate steppingstone to your eventual career in life, it is a window onto a part of life that can be stimulating and valuable.

My best wishes to all of you as the summer begins—and good luck in your work.

The Freight Forwarding Industry and Our Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD an article of mine which is published in this week's issue of Brandon's Shipper and Forwarder, official weekly publication of the New York Foreign Freight Forwarders & Brokers Association. This issue is devoted to World Trade Week, which begins on Monday, May 22, and will continue through Saturday, May 27.

The title of my article is "The Freight Forwarding Industry Must Not Be Destroyed." It deals with the plight of this industry at the present time and also discusses my bill, H.R. 5562, which I introduced on March 14, 1961, containing several proposals aiming to protect the industry and our foreign trade.

The article reads as follows:

THE FREIGHT FORWARDING INDUSTRY MUST NOT BE DESTROYED

(By Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York)

When President Kennedy launched his New Frontier several months ago, he called on the American people to face up to the problems of this new era. One of these frontiers is world trade, an area in our national life which is extremely important not only to the prosperity of our Nation, but also to its economic security now and in the future. Moreover, it is vital to the economic welfare and the political strength of our allies in the free world.

International trade has been defined as "the lifeblood of the free world's economy." That is very true, especially as it concerns the United States. Trade with the rest of the world provides us with vital raw materials for our industry and security; we, in turn, provide those countries with manufactured goods, industrial products, farm commodities, and others which we ship abroad.

Let us also not overlook the fact that world trade is one of our largest industries. It is worth emphasizing that the value of U.S. goods marketed abroad annually is greater than that of consumer purchases of automobiles, or the value of home construction, or of gross receipts by all our farmers from their crops of livestock. The value of U.S. exports is about equal to that of our entire production of minerals and almost as much as the retail value of all clothing and shoes purchased by American consumers. And one other fact: Some 4,500,000 Americans are employed in industries associated directly with our foreign trade—or about 7 percent of the total labor force of the Nation.

It is clear, therefore, that the promotion of wholesome trade relations with other countries serves the best interests of our country. Anything that will expand and improve such relations will simultaneously strengthen our economy and our security, and as such must be encouraged.

Naturally, there exist certain abuses and practices which should be corrected. This is something for the experts to examine more closely. I merely want to dwell on one particular subject, i.e., the forwarding industry, which is of such vital importance to the economy of New York and the large shipping industry in our greatest port.

Freight brokerage and ocean freight forwarding is an ancient profession dating back to the early days of the sailing vessel. When a ship arrived in port, it sought the aid of an intermediary to obtain cargo for the ship and the commission paid for this service became known as "brokerage." As international shipping grew and became more complicated, governments adopted tariffs and other laws regulating foreign trade and shipping. This required new services for both shipper and carrier.

Thus, an expert was needed to guide exporters in their foreign transactions, as well as to insure prompt dispatch of their shipments. The forwarder developed into this kind of an expert, serving both shipper and carrier. They included the cost of the forwarder's services in their rates, prices and quotations, the shipper paying a fee to the forwarder and the carrier paying a commission or brokerage. In this way, the forwarder became an integral part of our foreign commerce.

This relationship between shipper, forwarder and carrier continued satisfactorily and worked efficiently for many decades prior to World War II. In 1943, the U.S. Maritime Commission entered the picture, and since then there has developed a situation which is gradually driving the forwarding industry to the point of bankruptcy. In that year the Maritime Commission issued a long questionnaire to the forwarders, resulting in a court challenge of the Commission's authority and a ruling by the U.S. Supreme Court in 1946 that forwarders were "other persons subject to the Shipping Act."

Now a series of investigations of New York freight forwarders began, followed by succeeding dockets and regulations regarding brokerage and its practices. Reams of testimony were accumulated from various persons directly concerned with foreign commerce, and the overwhelming concensus was that forwarders are essential to the smooth flow of our foreign trade and that both shippers and carriers were willing to pay for their services. Finally, the Federal Maritime Board, successor to the Maritime Commission, issued in March 1957, a proposed revision of the forwarders' regulations which would have rendered impossible the continued existence of the forwarding industry and would have seriously affected the flow of our foreign trade.

As was to be expected, a storm of protest arose in all parts of the country, including shippers, carriers, State and local governments, port authorities, chambers of commerce, export groups, and others. Of some 500 comments received by the Maritime Board, all but two condemned the proposed regulations. By this time, the forwarding industry realized the futility of endless litigation and turned to Congress for help to avert its total bankruptcy.

Bills were subsequently introduced in Congress to license, regulate, and protect the interests of the forwarders. One of these bills, H.R. 8382, was passed by the House in 1958 but the Senate failed to act on it due to lack of time when the session was adjourned. The legislation was reintroduced in the next Congress and after a long, drawn-out process, both Houses approved the measure—but in different versions. This required a conference to work out a compromise, but again adjournment intervened and final action did not take place.

Consequently, on March 14, 1961, I introduced a bill, H.R. 5562, contained the same or similar proposals as H.R. 5068 which came so close to adoption in the previous Congress. Specifically, my bill would do the following:

1. It would eliminate certain abuses and questionable practices with which the forwarding industry is being charged, notably:

(a) The "dummy" forwarder, who is set up and controlled by an exporter as a means for collecting the brokerage compensation from carriers. The bill seeks to eliminate the "dummy" forwarder by defining the independent forwarder as a person in the forwarding business "who is not a shipper or consignee or a seller or purchaser of shipments * * * nor directly or indirectly controls or is controlled by such shipper." Thus, licensing will be confined only to independent forwarders.

(b) The collection of unearned brokerage fees. The bill specifies six types of services which the forwarder may perform for the carrier, and he must perform a minimum of three of these services in order to be entitled to compensation. The maximum compensation is limited to 5 percent of the freight cost. This should eliminate the abuses in this field. The six services are: Solicitation of cargo for the ship; coordination of moving the cargo to shipside; preparation and processing of the ocean bill of lading; preparation of dock receipts or delivery orders; preparation of consular documents or export declarations; and payment of ocean freight charges on such shipments.

2. By requiring the forwarder to certify the services performed as a condition for receiving compensation, the carrier will now have an adequate guide to proper brokerage fees and the administrative agency will have a strong weapon for prosecution of any violations.

3. The ocean freight forwarding industry would be brought under strict but fair licensing and regulation.

4. The forwarding industry would be freed of the constant costs of litigation and the dire threats to its existence.

5. The clear and unambiguous language of the bill makes it an instrument for easy enforcement and inexpensive administration.

These changes and innovations are long overdue. This is the only and most logical way to save this industry. At a time when this country is seeking to restore its economic equilibrium, we cannot afford to destroy industries or to drive them to the edge of bankruptcy.

The ocean freight forwarding industry should be given a full opportunity to devote its time and effort to the performance of its duties as an integral part of our Nation's foreign commerce and as an indispensable link between shippers and carriers. The interests of our world trade and its expansion in the years ahead require it. At a time when both industry and labor in this country are complaining about the effect of increased imports on the economy of the United States

we ought to encourage our export trade to every extent possible.

I certainly will exert every effort to have this beneficial legislation passed.

The Concern of the Democratic Party for Small Business—Myth and Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 18, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time now the fearless leaders of the Democratic Party have been hard at work projecting an image of themselves as the one political party concerned with the problems of small business.

They have pursued this through the many avenues they have developed for reaching the public. Members of the Democratic Party in both Houses of Congress are constantly at work on this image, building it up. The press, radio and television find that it helps with the Democratic Party leaders to aid them in the projection of this image.

But the Democratic Party does not stop there. For many years its leaders have, at the same time, been engaged in the projection of the image of the Republican Party as the party of big business.

As a result of long practice the leaders of the Democratic Party have developed to a fantastic degree their expertise in this matter of image projection.

What is the reality behind the myth?

Well, let us look at what the Democrats are doing to a hundred small businessmen just down the street from them on Capitol Hill. It immediately becomes clear that the supposed concern of the Democrats for small businessmen is only a myth.

The Democrats are not even good neighbors.

Suppose a family moved into the house next door to you, and, after getting settled down began shortly thereafter to use the vast powers of Government to dispossess you and push you around?

You would not like it, and the small businessmen on Capitol Hill don't like it either.

If they are forced to move from Capitol Hill, they lose their customers and they lose their means of livelihood.

When they relocate somewhere else they will have to begin a hard fight for new customers and they will have to take these customers away from other businessmen. They may never recover from this enforced move.

Roll Call, the newspaper of Capitol Hill, reports in its current May 17, 1961, issue that Nicholas DeGiovanni, restaurant owner, said he has been on Capitol Hill for 14 years and will join any movement to stop purchase of the block.

According to Roll Call, Mr. DeGiovanni added that if the Government was really concerned with the plight of small businesses it would not be moving out a block of them.

This is exactly the point I have been making.

As a matter of fact, Mr. DeGiovanni might have added that the Democrats in the Congress would not have called the Attorney General—another great champion of small business—into the case to help throw their neighbors out of their places of business, and their homes.

The Government should not take over property under the powers of eminent domain when it does not even have a definite plan for the use of such property. This is totalitarianism.

The indiscriminate use of the vast powers of Government in this instance to satisfy the whims of the Democrats and their desire for wide open spaces is to take a long, long step toward the kind of governments with which we are at war in Europe and Asia.

Dave Bassin, president of the Capitol Hill Merchants Association, whose firm would be purchased under the Democratic move to dispossess the neighboring small businessmen, said, according to Roll Call that "his group will support the Kearns measure and anything else which will allow them to stay where they are."

Mr. Bassin and Mr. DeGiovanni and their colleagues among the small businessmen on Capitol Hill thus have had a personal experience with the reality behind the image of the Democratic concern for small businessmen.

I would judge that they are experts on what lies behind the image which the Democrats have been so industriously building up for so many years.

Actually, the Democrats are no more interested in small businessmen than they are in big businessmen. What they are really interested in, and are deeply committed to, is big government.

What would it cost them, actually, to be good neighbors? The Democrats like to pride themselves on being good neighbors to the rest of mankind.

The Congress has appropriated $80 billion to help businessmen in other nations get back into business and to stay in business.

Here at home, on Capitol Hill, they could not care less.

For the benefit of Dave Bassin, and Nicholas DeGiovanni, let me say that all Democrats are not alike.

Many of them are deeply interested in the plight of Mr. Bassin and Mr. DeGiovanni and their colleagues.

But for some strange reason all of them are silent.

All, that is, except Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina, who has joined me in sponsoring legislation to hold up the impersonal processes of government which the Democratic Members of the Congress have set in motion.

We have made a very simple proposition to the Democrats.

We have said to them, look, why not develop a long-range plan for beautifying the environs of the U.S. Capitol Building?

We have said, why not protect the small businessmen of Capitol Hill in line with the Democratic statements which have been given such wide publicity through the years?

We have said to the Democrats, why not make Capitol Hill as beautiful as Williamsburg, Va.?

We have said, these businessmen on Capitol Hill are wonderful hosts and they make constituents who come to Capitol Hill feel welcome. These constituents are not welcomed by the restaurants and cafeterias run by the Congress in its own buildings. There the signs plainly say, over and over again, "For Members of Congress and employees."

Where will the constituents of Members of Congress go to eat when the small businessmen on Capitol Hill are dispossessed by the Department of Justice and the Democrats in the Congress?

These are the problems, or some of them.

The Democrats seem to be perfectly unaware of the great human tragedy which they are inflicting on the businessmen and residents who are so unfortunate as to be their neighbors on Capitol Hill.

I would say to Dave Bassin and Nicholas DeGiovanni, Do Not Give Up. Hold on to the businesses which you have built up through the years.

I am confident that justice will triumph in the end.

Take your case to the American people. Take it to the voters who elected the Democratic Members of Congress.

The voters will undoubtedly respond, for they believe in fairplay. I am confident you will win.

I would only suggest that you mobilize support for the bills which Senator STROM THURMOND and I have introduced.

I include as part of my remarks an article from Roll Call, and the text of the bills which Senator STROM THURMOND and I have sponsored:

[From the Roll Call, May 17, 1961]

HILL MERCHANTS FIGHT ANEW IN 100 BLOCK

Merchants in a block to be leveled for Capitol Hill expansion are launching a new, two-pronged attack at the Government takeover.

One phase is a bill introduced by Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, which would prevent expenditures of funds for purchase or demolition of buildings in the Capitol area without a comprehensive plan for the development, preservation and improvement of the area.

The bill, if approved, would block eminent domain proceedings for the purchase of the block, which is bounded by Independence Avenue, First, C, and Second Streets, SE. There is no specific proposal for the use of the property.

The merchants are also planning a private bill which would be tacked onto the appropriations bill. It would authorize payments to them in addition to funds for the physical value of their property.

Several Representatives are looking over the measure for possible sponsorship. It would reimburse owners for intangible good will values of their locations in the event the Kearns bill dies and they must move out.

The private bill will substitute for another bill which had been introduced by Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, reimbursing the owners for intangible values. Word leaked out of the Public Works Committee that the bill could

not be adopted since it would set a costly precedent.

The Kearns bill will probably be bounced since proceedings are already well underway to buy the property.

Under an order of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, residents must vacate by August 1 and commercial establishments must vacate by March 1, 1962.

Dave Bassin, president of the Capitol Hill Merchants Association, whose firm would be purchased under the Government's move, said his group will support the Kearns measure "and anything else" which will allow them to stay where they are.

Nicholas DeGiovanni, restaurant owner preparing to open a new addition, said he has been on Capitol Hill for 14 years and will join any movement to stop purchase of the block.

DeGiovanni said he hoped the Kearns bill will revive interest, and "maybe someone will lend a sympathetic ear." He said Speaker SAM RAYBURN "has said he needs room to breathe," but "If he does he should go back to Texas."

The restaurant owner added that if the Government was really concerned with the plight of small businesses it wouldn't be moving out a block of them.

Representative KEARNS told Roll Call that the Government should not try to take over the property when it doesn't even have a definite plan for its use.

H.R. 6893

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of the home of John Philip Sousa, and to protect the homes of residents and the businesses and good will of the small businessmen in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (D.C. Code 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(j)(1) For the purpose of providing for the preservation, and maintenance as a shrine, of the former home in the District of Columbia of John Philip Sousa, there is hereby established a board consisting of the conductor of the band of the United States Army, the conductor of the band of the United States Navy, the conductor of the band of the United States Marine Corps, and the conductor of the band of the United States Air Force, ex officio, plus ten additional individuals appointed by the President, which shall acquire the home of John Philip Sousa at 318 Independence Avenue, in the District of Columbia, and shall preserve and maintain such home as a shrine dedicated to his memory, and as a museum for the preservation of memorabilia of John Philip Sousa.

"(2) For the purpose of obtaining funds for carrying out this subsection, the board is authorized to accept donations of funds, services, and property, and to conduct a nationwide fundraising campaign. All departments and agencies of the United States, upon request made by the board, shall transfer to the board all memorabilia of John Philip Sousa in the custody or control of such departments and agencies.

"(3) Members of the board shall serve without compensation for their services as such, but they shall be reimbursed for their expenses of travel and subsistence while actually engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the board. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this subsection.

"(k) Until a comprehensive plan has been prepared for the proper development, preservation and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court, no funds shall be expended for the acquisiton of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surroundng complex of Federal buildings."

H.R. 6134

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation or restoration of housing and certain other structures in the District of Columbia, where such housing or other structures are not substandard or can be restored to good condition, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, (1) housing (including structures of historic or general significance) which is not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and (2) the owner of any substandard housing (including structures or sites of historic or general significance) in the project area which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such housing (or structures or sites) shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration, has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring such housing (or structures or sites) shall itself provide for the rehabilitation or restoration thereof whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate.

"(k) There is hereby established a Commission, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the Librarian of Congress; the Chief Justice of the United States; and eleven distinguished cultural leaders from the fields of architecture, history of architecture, landscape architecture, and the other arts appointed by the President; which shall study, develop, and on or before February 15, 1962, recommend to the Congress a comprehensive plan for the proper development, preservation, and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court. Until such recommendations have been submitted to the Congress, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal Buildings.

"(l) The Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, acting separately or jointly, shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following matters as they relate to the Agency and to the performance by the Agency of its functions under this Act:

"(1) Methods of appraisal and land disposition procedures and contracts;

"(2) Compliance with this Act in the development of project plans;

"(3) Reduction of project cost by emphasis on rehabilitation;

"(4) Propriety of excessive credit for noncash grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia;

"(5) Public interest versus negotiation with single developers;

"(6) Establishment of sound accounting and financial practices;

"(7) Lack of provision for privately built middle-income housing;

"(8) Relocation procedures as they relate to displaced persons and businessmen, with special attention to the problems of small businessmen;

"(9) Adequacy of opportunities afforded local contractors and redevelopers to participate in renewal projects;

"(10) Problems of undue delays in restoring neighborhoods to viable condition so as to produce both business and individual tax revenues for local government; and

"(11) Such other matters as are related to the expeditious and efficient restoration of neighborhoods in accordance with provisions of Federal and local laws.

Each such committee shall report to its respective House at the earliest practicable time the results of the investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deems advisable."

S. 1681

A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation or restoration of housing and certain other structures in the District of Columbia, where such housing or other structures are not substandard or can be restored to good condition, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 (District of Columbia Code 5–706) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, (1) housing (including structures of historic or general significance) which is not substandard in any project area shall be preserved and shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area; and (2) the owner of any substandard housing (including structures or sites of historic or general significance) in the project area which can be rehabilitated or restored to good condition shall be encouraged and assisted by the Agency to undertake and carry out such rehabilitation or restoration, and such housing (or structures or sites) shall not be demolished or included in the acquisition and assembling by the Agency of the real property in such area unless such owner, after having had a reasonable time following notification by the Agency to complete such rehabilitation or restoration, has failed to do so; and in the case of any such failure the Agency, after acquiring such housing (or structures or sites) shall itself provided for the rehabilitation or restoration thereof whenever it determines that such rehabilitation or restoration is desirable or appropriate.

"(k) There is hereby established a Commission, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of

the Senate and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives and two members of such committee appointed by the chairman; the Librarian of Congress; the Chief Justice of the United States; and eleven distinguished cultural leaders from the fields of architecture, history of architecture, landscape architecture, and the other arts appointed by the President; which shall study, develop, and on or before February 15, 1962, recommended to the Congress a comprehensive plan for the proper development, preservation, and improvement of the physical environs of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings, including the Senate and House Office Buildings, the Library of Congress, and the United States Supreme Court. Until such recommendations have been submitted to the Congress, no funds shall be expended for the acquisition of real property or for the purchase or demolition of existing buildings located in the vicinity of the United States Capitol Building and the surrounding complex of Federal buildings.

"(1) The Committee on the District of Columbia of the Senate and the Committee on the District of Columbia of the House of Representatives, acting separately or jointly shall conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the following matters as they relate to the Agency and to the performance by the Agency of its functions under this Act:

"(1) Methods of appraisal and land disposition procedures and contracts;

"(2) Compliance with this Act in the development of project plans;

"(3) Reduction of project cost by emphasis on rehabilitation;

"(4) Propriety of excessive credit for noncash grants-in-aid to the District of Columbia;

"(5) Public interest versus negotiation with single developers;

"(6) Establishment of sound accounting and financial practices;

"(7) Lack of provision for privately built middle-income housing;

"(8) Relocation procedures as they relate to displaced persons and businessmen, with special attention to the problems of small businessmen;

"(9) Adequacy of opportunities afforded local contractors and redevelopers to participate in renewal projects;

"(10) Problems of undue delays in restoring neighborhoods to viable condition so as to produce both business and individual tax revenues for local government; and

"(11) Such other matters as are related to the expeditious and efficient restoration of neighborhoods in accordance with provisions of Federal and local laws.

"Each such committee shall report to its House at the earliest practicable time the results of the investigation and study together with such recommendations as it deems advisable."

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 19, 1961

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our gracious Father, hushing our thoughts to silence may we find Thee moving upon our minds higher than our highest thought, yet nearer to us than our very selves. Before the toil of a new day opens for these servants of the people, we would lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts: may they be acceptable in Thy sight.

Prepare us for the solemn role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day, with its vast issues that concern not only our own dear land, but all the continents and the islands of the sea.

Make us ministers of that healing love which will not halt its growing sway until it joins all nations and kindreds and tongues and peoples into one great fraternity of mutual service, including the least and the last of Thy children.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 18, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 3279) to increase the maximum rates of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of considering the various nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio;

Ellis Maylett, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah; and

William M. Parker, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Alabama.

By Mr. KEFAUVER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Elmer W. Disspayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John H. Rubel to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul R. Ignatius to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward A. McDermott to be Deputy Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. John W. Crumpacker to be Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the U.S. Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the U.S. Army are confirmed en bloc.

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF MAJ. GEN. WALTER K. WILSON, JR., TO BE CHIEF OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. STENNIS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senate confirmed unanimously the nomination of Maj. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Jr., as the new Chief of the U.S. Army Engineers.

I congratulate the Senate for this action, and I commend the President for the excellent selection, and I congratulate General Wilson on the promotion.

It has been my pleasure to know General Wilson through the years. His record of achievement for the Engineer Corps and for the Nation has been one of outstanding quality and noteworthy accomplishment.

During the time General Wilson served as district engineer at Mobile, which has jurisdiction of all engineer projects in a large area of eastern Mississippi, I observed his work and was thoroughly convinced of his ability to turn out first-class performance.

Moreover, I had the opportunity to see General Wilson in action as the engineer officer in charge of the construction of our vast American airbases in French Morocco where he did an outstanding job.

During World War II, he served as division engineer of the Mediterranean Division at Casablanca, and in the Pacific area.

A graduate of the U.S. Military Academy, General Wilson's professional competence gave him a record of steady promotions culminating in the new rank of lieutenant general to which he was promoted today.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the U.S. Air Force be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the U.S. Air Force are confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations placed on the Secretary's desk, in the Navy and Marine Corps; in the Army; and in the Air Force.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the routine nominations on the Secretary's desk, in the Navy and Marine Corps; in the Army; and in the Air Force, be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1961

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON EXPORT CONTROL

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on export control, covering the first quarter of the year 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATIONS AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED OPERATIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND TRAFFIC, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected operations of Department of Highways and Traffic, District of Columbia Government, dated May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RECOGNITION OF CENTENNIAL OF ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

"Joint resolution relative to relocating California Avenue in Washington, D.C.

"Whereas various streets in our Nation's capital are named after the States of the Union; and

"Whereas the street named for California is only one block long in a remote area; and

Whereas California is the second most populous State in the Union and, as such, deserves a larger and more prominently located street named after it: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes Congress that an appropriate street be named for the great State of California and that the renaming of 15th Street between K Street and Constitution Avenue be considered for this purpose; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 43

"Joint resolution relative to construction of the Mammoth Pass Road

"Whereas a Mammoth Pass Road would be of great significance not only to the residents of the two areas which would thus be joined by a direct route but also to the defense of our Nation by providing access to the Naval Ammunition Depot at Hawthorne, Nev., and other areas in Nevada strategic to the defense of California; and

"Whereas Federal-aid Secondary Highway No. 962 in California is a partially constructed county travelway directly connecting the road systems of two important counties of this State otherwise connected only by long and circuitous travelways through several other counties; and

"Whereas over the last several years both counties directly concerned have expended and are continuing to expend reasonable portions of the funds available to them for county road and highway purposes upon the improvement to presently required highway standards of the county approach connections to this Federal-aid secondary highway unit; and

"Whereas said connection is presently desirable for vehicular movements but funds now available and becoming available for construction work on Federal-aid Secondary Highway No. 962 are so limited that the completion thereof will be delayed for a great number of years; and

"Whereas a substantial portion of the entire proposed connecting system between the two counties lies within the boundaries of United States national forests; and

"Whereas the inclusion of this portion of the entire routing in the Forest Highway System will make additional funds for construction available and materially accelerate the date of completion; and

"Whereas the State Legislature of the State of California in 1955 by joint resolution

requested the Federal Government to construct this route in its entirety as a national defense highway; and

"Whereas the completion of this intercounty unit will complete and make available for immediate use an additional interstate way of travel materially shortening the interstate travel distances to substantial portions of California and also remove traffic from other presently congested interstate roads and highways; and

"Whereas, Federal-aid Secondary Highway No. 962 will meet the criteria of a forest highway in the following respects in that it will:

"1. Be a principal road into and through national forests;

"2. Be of nationwide significance for transportation, development of natural resources, national security, and the general welfare of the people;

"3. Serve as a major artery for interstate traffic and statewide travel;

"4. Provide a link in the principal highways important to national defense and population dispersion;

"5. Carry traffic to and from tributary forest development roads and trails: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the President and the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads are respectfully requested to forthwith place in the U.S. Forest Highway System that portion of California Federal-aid Secondary Highway No. 962 lying within the boundaries of the United States national forests, and the Legislature of the State of California expresses by way of this resolution its desire that the Mammoth Pass Road be constructed and that the United States Bureau of Public Roads is advised that the legislature finds there is a public necessity for the inclusion of this road in the U.S. Forest Highway System; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate shall transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Bureau of Public Roads, United States Department of Commerce, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 45

"House joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the old age assistance laws in order to permit individuals receiving old age assistance to earn extra compensation without being penalized

"The General Assembly of Maryland believes that it would be a wise enactment of legislation if the Congress of the United States would provide that individuals receiving old age assistance payments might earn at least thirty dollars ($30) per month without that sum being considered a resource in determining the amount of the old age assistance grant.

"It is believed that this would encourage a measure of self-support on the part of the recipients of old age assistance.

"The Federal law now requires that all regular earnings of an old age assistance recipient must be reported by him and deducted from his old age assistance grant.

"Yet old age assistance grants are very small and some supplementation by earnings would be extremely helpful.

"Many old age assistance recipients may not be able to hold down permanent employment, but some may be able to earn a little by odd jobs. The recommended change in the law would encourage them to do so.

"There is a Federal precedent for such a change in the law because the public assistance law for the blind now permits all earnings up to eighty-five dollars ($85) a month to be disregarded in determining need for such assistance.

"The amount of money involved for Maryland in the proposed change of the old age assistance law would not be large.

"A study of the 9,662 old age assistance recipients of the State of Maryland showed that during the month of September 1960, only 123 reported having earnings. The total earnings amounted to only $1,727 for the month of September. Accordingly, though the amount of money involved is small, it would be of genuine help to those who could do some work. That is, it would encourage a measure of self-support and eliminate some hardship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to amend the old age assistance laws to provide that an individual receiving grants under this program might earn at least $30 per month without that sum being considered a resource in determining the amount of the old age assistance grant; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of Maryland be instructed to send copies of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland to the Vice President of the United States, as Presiding Officer of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each Member of Maryland delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation to approve the proposed Delaware River Basin Compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Hawaii, State of Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for public school construction; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. KERR:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 549

"Concurrent resolution expressing commendation for sponsors of the First National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space at Tulsa, Okla., Friday, May 26, and Saturday, May 27, 1961; directing distribution of resolution.

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma and the city of Tulsa have been signally honored by having been selected as the locale for the First National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space to be held May 26 and 27, 1961; and

"Whereas the top minds and leaders in the internationally important field of space exploration—from Government, from industry, and from the professions—will convene in this Conference with the sole purpose of probing the infinite possibilities of peaceful uses of outer space; and

"Whereas a number of prominent Oklahomans, especially including the senior Senator, the Honorable ROBERT S. KERR, chairman of the U.S. Senate Aeronautical and Space Science Committee, and the Honorable James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, will make significant contributions to the success of the Conference; and

"Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., and the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce are sponsoring the Conference with the cosponsorship of the Aerospace Industries Association of America, the Aerospace Medical Association, the American Astronautics Society, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, the American Rocket Society, the Electronic Industries Association, the Frontiers of Science Foundation of Oklahoma, Inc., and the Institute of the Aerospace Sciences; and

"Whereas the 2-day Conference will be followed by a public exhibition for all Oklahomans and for citizens of surrounding States of the very latest information and equipment with which the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is conducting significant research probes, both manned and instrumented, in space for peaceful purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Oklahoma Legislature (the senate concurring therein), That the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Hon. James E. Webb, Administrator; the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, D. J. Tuepker, president; and the First National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, Harold C. Stuart, general chairman, be and they are hereby commended for providing this opportunity to the citizens of Oklahoma, the citizens of the Nation, and the citizens of the world to study peaceful applications of space technology; and be it further

"Resolved, That the people of Oklahoma, through their representatives, in this 28th session of the Oklahoma Legislature, do salute, support, and pledge themselves to take part in the First National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space; and be it further

"Resolved, That a duly authenticated copy of this resolution be presented or transmitted to Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.; Mr. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1329 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and Mr. D. J. Tuepker, president, Tulsa Chamber of Commerce, 616 South Boston, Tulsa, Okla."

APPROPRIATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL B–52 BOMBERS—RESOLUTION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Wichita, Kans., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide appropriations for the construction of additional B–52 bombers. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION RELATIVE TO THE PRODUCTION OF THE B–52 AT THE BOEING CO., IN WICHITA, KANS.

Whereas the sole production of the B–52 manned bomber is in Boeing, Wichita, and the present contract therefore expires at the end of 1962, and the production of the B–51 is in a Government-owned facility in which the peak employment involved was approximately 40,000, and now is approximately 20,000; and

Whereas the B–52 manned bomber will remain the mainstay of the Strategic Air Command, of which McConnell Air Force Base is an integral part, until the development of other manned aircraft or missiles reach the operational stage; and

Whereas the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives has added $337 million for additional B–52 and other manned bomber production and this amount is in addition to the administration's budget request, and which amount was added by the House Armed Services Committee to the de-

fense authorization bill passed by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the Armed Services Committee of the Senate has added $525 million to its separate bill for which the authorization language in the bill specifies production of the B–52 and other manned bombers and which defense authorization bill passed the Senate on May 15, 1961; and

Whereas the economic welfare of the entire central Kansas area is related directly to the continuance of a high level of employment at Boeing Wichita: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we do hereby pledge the wholehearted support of the city to assist members of the Kansas congressional delegation in their efforts to secure appropriations for the additional B–52 production as presently authorized and do hereby request the mayor to furnish all members of the Kansas delegation in Congress a certified copy of this resolution.

Adopted at Wichita, Kans., this 16th day of May 1961.

HERBERT P. LINDSLEY,
Mayor.

Attest:

C. H. FUNK,
City Clerk.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 1342. A bill to provide that participation by members of the National Guard in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall be held and considered to be full-time training duty under section 503 of title 10, United States Code, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 279).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 1877. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (Rept. No. 280).

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report an original bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, and extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 281) thereon. I ask that the report be printed, together with the individual views of Senators JAVITS, BEALL, and ROBERTSON, and the supplemental views of Senators CAPEHART and BENNETT.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, reported by Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1913. A bill to permit an individual who retired before September 1954 under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program to have his benefit amount recomputed, without acquiring any additional coverage, to take advantage of the dropout provisions in title II of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1914. A bill to amend the effective date of section 2(b) of Public Law 86–376 relating to, inter alia, subchapter S of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 1915. A bill for the relief of Orsolina Cianflone Iallonardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1916. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1917. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended;

S. 1918. A bill to extend benefits of the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act Amendments of 1957 to widows and surviving children of former members of the Metropolitan Police force, the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, the White House Police force, or the U.S. Secret Service Division, who were retired or who died in the service of any such organization prior to the effective date of such amendments; and

S. 1919. A bill to establish workmen's compensation for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1920. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment of unused compensatory time earned by deceased postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1921. A bill for the relief of Kam Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1922. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, and extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes; placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he reported the above bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which appear under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1923. A bill to change the name of Little Pass to Clearwater Pass, Fla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1924. A bill to amend the Act of August 27, 1954 (68 Stat. 868) with respect to the Uintah and Ouray Reservation in Utah; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS (for himself and Mr. HOLLAND):

S.J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to establish the Saint Augustine Quadricentennial Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTION

CAUTION AND DELIBERATION ON APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF RAILROAD MERGERS

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. MAGNUSON) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 150) urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to act with extreme caution and full deliberation on applications for approval of railroad mergers in order to afford Congress time to review the problems arising from the railroad merger movement, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY, which appears under a separate heading.)

MRS. ORSOLINA CIANFLONE IALLONARDO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, my practice is to introduce few private bills, and then only when a gross inequity seems to exist which apparently cannot be solved by administrative action. Accordingly, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Mrs. Orsolina Cianflone Iallonardo.

Twelve years ago, Mrs. Iallonardo, then a young girl, was adopted in Italy by her aunt and uncle and promised she would be in the United States within 6 months. Her adoptive parents left Italy expecting to be joined by their new daughter in a very short time. She never saw her father again. Today, she is a woman with a husband and two children—still waiting to come to America. Her widowed mother in Lewiston, Idaho, is still waiting to be joined by her family.

Mrs. Iallonardo has made continuing, strenuous efforts to comply with all administrative requirements; each time, when it seemed as though her dream would be realized, her hopes were shattered by a newly discovered requirement or statutory interpretation. The final blow came in May 1960. In February 1960, the Iallonardos were informed by the American Consulate General in Naples they could come to the United States within a very short time. They eagerly sold their possessions, including Mr. Iallonardo's barber shop, in order to obtain the necessary funds for the trip. In May they were informed by the Consulate General's office that due to

a clarified interpretation of the congressional act under which the family was to come they were no longer eligible for nonquota status and would continue to be registered under the fourth preference portion of the Italian quota. Since this portion of the Italian quota is heavily oversubscribed, they will encounter a waiting period of many years before quota numbers become available for their use. There is no administrative procedure that can hasten the issuance of immigrant visas to the Iallonardo family.

I share the Iallonardo's hope that the unfortunate circumstances which have so long delayed this family from being reunited, may soon be unraveled.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill to accomplish this objective, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1915) for the relief of Orsolina Cianfione Iallonardo, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Orsolina Cianfione Iallonardo is deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of the act of September 22, 1959 (Public Law 86-363).

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1441) for the relief of Cilka Elizabeth Ingrova, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EDUCATION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO ASSIST NEEDY PERSONS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be added as a cosponsor on S. 1720, a bill I introduced on April 27 to continue the authority of the President under title II of Public Law 480 to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy persons and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FAIR COMPETITIVE PRACTICES ACT — ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT, be added as a cosponsor on my bill, S. 1722, entitled the Fair Competitive Practices Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN LANDS TO WASATCH NATIONAL FOREST, UTAH—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 16, 1961, the name of Mr. Moss was added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1878) to add certain lands to the Wasatch National Forest, Utah, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BENNETT on May 16, 1961.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY AND S. 1084 AND S. 1176

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on S. 1084 and S. 1176, dealing with Government patent policy, to resume on Wednesday, May 31, 1961.

The hearings, set for 10:00 a.m., are to be held in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the Senate Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee, room 349A, Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., telephone CA 4-3121 or Government code 180, extension 2268.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

Article entitled "Trade Policy: A Strategy for the Coming Battle," written by Senator JAVITS and published in the Reporter magazine of May 25, 1961.

WASHINGTON'S CURRENT CRIME WAVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the very penetrating and, in my judgment, exceptionally sound editorial appearing in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Pushing the Panic Button." I wish to read three paragraphs very quickly, and make a very brief comment.

In the course of the editorial it is stated:

> There is no doubt that life would be easier for Chief Murray and his men if they could arrest on suspicion and interrogate suspects at leisure in a police station and without any interference from lawyers. But the Founders of the American Republic were not bent upon making a policeman's lot a happy one; their aim was to create a free society in which men and women could pursue their lawful concerns without fear of police officiousness.

The decision of Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of the Supreme Court, in the Mallory case is as sound today as it was the day Justice Frankfurter wrote it. It was a decision necessary to protect the American people from the arbitrariness and capriciousness of police, unless we place checks upon police departments.

If there is anything we have learned in this free society it is that we must always be on guard against the arbitrariness of police. I happen to be one Member of the Senate who will always vote to give the police department the financial assistance it needs and the personnel it needs in order to protect the people of the District of Columbia. But let me say to Chief Murray that I never intend, as a lawyer in the Senate, to accede to his request to have the Mallory rule changed, so that he can operate the police department in the District of Columbia without the check which the Mallory decision applies to him.

Next, as to the Durham rule, I am quite surprised at the Chief of Police of the District of Columbia going over into the field of jurisprudence, rather than confining himself to his duties of carrying out the functions of the Police Department.

With respect to the Durham rule, the editorial states:

> The Durham rule, which Chief Murray would also like to do away with, has nothing whatever to do with his job of apprehending criminals. It concerns the judicial responsibility of weighing the guilt of persons charged with crime. And it operates to protect the community by sending those judged insane to St. Elizabeths until they are judged cured, instead of sending them to prison and letting them loose on the community uncured at the end of a fixed term. Police energies devoted to fighting these two court rules might be better spent in fighting criminals themselves.

The Post is completely right, in my judgment. The Durham decision, in regard to the question of insanity, is absolutely sound. It is in line with what is well known in criminology today. Let me say again that I think Chief Murray ought to confine himself to police duties, and leave the matter of jurisprudence to the courts.

The editorial continues:

> In its blind, doctrinaire insistence that crime is entirely a racial phenomenon, the committee at every turn has impeded the efforts to promote racial integration which alone can give Negroes a full stake in the community and an enduring interest in up-

holding its mores. In its stubborn, primitive insistence that more and more savage punishment is the only way to deal with the community's outcasts, the committee at every turn has blocked a rational approach to reform and rehabilitation.

Let me say most respectfully that when we in the Congress do more than merely appropriate money, it will help us do something about the low state of living that we compel many thousands of Negroes in the District of Columbia to endure. We will then be making a more effective attack on the crime problem in the District of Columbia than by attacking the decision in the Mallory case. When we do something about minimum wages, when we do something about decent housing, when we do something about the equality of work opportunities in the District of Columbia, we shall be making an attack on the crime problem that will really produce some results.

It is easy, as the Post points out, to strike out in an emotional attitude at the wave of criminality in the District of Columbia, but that does not get to the root, the cause of it. I am for giving the police department all the support it needs to enlarge its personnel to handle the crime wave, but I say to the Congress of the United States that it should start doing something about the basic causes of crime in the District of Columbia. When we start doing something about the cause, which is basically economic and educational, then we can remove this danger, on a permanent basis, from the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUSHING THE PANIC BUTTON

There are elements of real hysteria in some of the reactions to Washington's current crime wave. These have manifested themselves in the hearings before a House District Subcommittee in two ways: first, by a reckless readiness to throw aside for the sake of safety the very rights which, under the American political theory, governments are instituted to secure; and second, by a focus of attention upon the symptoms rather than the causes of crime and upon punishment rather than prevention.

Violence and other serious crime in the District are unquestionably alarming and warrant the most thoughtful concern of the community and Congress. But the Chief of Police makes the remedies seem altogether too simple. He wants Congress to overturn the evidentiary rule laid down by the Supreme Court in the Mallory case—a rule which forbids the use of confessions obtained as a result of unlawful detention. And he wants Congress to do away with the Durham rule—a rule laid down by the Court of Appeals in an effort to deal rationally with the determination of insanity.

There is no doubt that life would be easier for Chief Murray and his men if they could arrest on suspicion and interrogate suspects at leisure in a police station and without any interference from lawyers. But the Founders of the American Republic were not bent upon making a policeman's lot a happy one; their aim was to create a free society in which men and women could pursue their lawful concerns without fear of police officiousness.

The law in the District of Columbia (and in every State of the Union) provides that arrested persons must be brought before a judicial officer without unnecessary delay. The so-called Mallory rule is simply a judicial device for requiring police observance of this law. It does no more than keep the courts from conniving with the police in violating the law. It does not impede law enforcement by lawful means.

The Durham rule, which Chief Murray would also like to do away with, has nothing whatever to do with his job of apprehending criminals. It concerns the judicial responsibility of weighing the guilt of persons charged with crime. And it operates to protect the community by sending those judged insane to St. Elizabeths until they are judged cured, instead of sending them to prison and letting them loose on the community uncured at the end of a fixed term. Police energies devoted to fighting these two court rules might be better spent in fighting criminals themselves.

Chief Murray's task has been made infinitely more difficult by the very District Committee which now applauds his lamentations. If Congress had appropriated the funds sought for community needs over the past two decades, crime might have been reduced. But the House District Committee has time and again thwarted efforts to provide a juvenile court and juvenile guidance facilities needed to keep juvenile delinquents from growing up into adult criminals. It has thwarted efforts to clear the slums and improve the schools and provide recreation and open up job opportunities. It has even prevented intelligent utilization of scarce police manpower by insisting that uniformed officers check parking meters and do clerical work that could better be done by civilians.

In its blind, doctrinaire insistence that crime is entirely a racial phenomenon, the committee at every turn has impeded the efforts to promote racial integration which alone can give Negroes a full stake in the community and an enduring interest in upholding its mores. In its stubborn, primitive insistence that more and more savage punishment is the only way to deal with the community's outcasts, the committee at every turn has blocked a rational approach to reform and rehabilitation.

Apart from the immediate need to cope with criminals, Commissioner Tobriner is eternally right in saying that it is imperative to deal with the roots of crime—and that these roots are to be found in slums, in overcrowded schools, in denial of job opportunities because of race, in neglect of children who, through no fault of their own, are born to parents who give them neither love, nor care, nor even sustenance. The one glimmer of reason in the whole sorry picture is to be found in the decision yesterday by the Board of Commissioners to promote a serious study of the causes of crime.

The causes of crime cannot be corrected by mere punishment of offenders. Confinement of criminals obviously is necessary. An expanded police force—with more efficient deployment of its personnel—can help curb criminal conduct. But cure of the social sickness that besets this city—and besets every urban center in the world today—requires two conditions. It requires unqualified respect for the law on the part of those entrusted with law enforcement. And it requires from the whole community respect for human beings whatever the circumstances of their birth.

INFORMATION AVAILABLE TO COMMUNISTS BUT DENIED TO AMERICANS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, we have heard much recently about the sources of information with reference to many of our defense establishments, and its availability to our potential enemies.

Recently, in a column written by Ed Koterba, under the heading "Assignment: Washington," there appeared an item entitled "Reds Get Information Denied to Americans." The item reads in part as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The way the President put it to the editors was: "Let's not give comfort and assistance to the enemy by publishing a lot of Government secrets."

You can't dispute the logic of that. But if only the Government would practice what it preaches.

Take, as an example, that background session for newsmen at the State Department recently. There was much said by people such as President Kennedy, Secretary Dean Rusk, and United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that was of rather secret nature.

None of us was permitted to breathe a word of it to anybody. Yet, right there among the newsmen was Henryk Zwiren, of Warsaw, taking everything down for the Communist Press Agency.

The State Department freely admitted that it goofed in letting the Communist in. But he stayed. And he took copious notes.

Now, even though the Communists have a transcript of what was said, we are still bound by State Department ruling to withhold that same information from our own people.

If you think that's silly, consider what happened just this past week at the Senate hearing on excessive Cape Canaveral wages.

I was jarred to find, at this open meeting, a huge map of the United States on the wall of the hearing room pinpointing our intercontinental ballistic missile support bases across the country.

Mikhail Sagatelyan, of the Tass News Agency, had as free access to the vital information on that map as I did. Location of our missile bases can indeed give comfort and assistance to the enemy.

Here is another thing the article points out:

One ridiculous example of the Pentagon violating its own doctrine of censorship happened last year when a reporter called the Defense Department for details on our air-to-air missile, the Eagle.

"Classified," said the Pentagon press man. And, I suppose, there was good reason for it to be.

But the reporter had the information before him—in the readily available 1960 Missile Handbook, a copy of which was presented to Vladimir D. Pavlov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

After the story appeared in this column, the FBI stopped around to see the distributor of the handbook. Where had he gotten the secret information?

The man replied truthfully: "From material published openly by the Pentagon."

Censorship—like charity—should begin at home.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appear in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. It is time we do something about this matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDS GET INFORMATION DENIED TO AMERICANS

WASHINGTON.—The way the President put it to the editors was: "Let's not give comfort and assistance to the enemy by publishing a lot of Government secrets."

You can't dispute the logic of that. But if only the Government would practice what it preaches.

Take, as an example, that background session for newsmen at the State Department recently. There was much said by people such as President Kennedy, Secretary Dean Rusk, and United Nations Ambassador Adlai Stevenson that was of rather secret nature.

None of us was permitted to breathe a word of it to anybody. Yet, right there among the newsmen was Henryk Zwiren, of Warsaw, taking everything down for the Communist press agency.

The State Department freely admitted that it goofed in letting the Communist in. But he stayed. And he took copious notes.

Now, even though the Communists have a transcript of what was said, we are still bound by State Department ruling to withhold that same information from our own people.

If you think that's silly, consider what happened just this past week at the Senate hearing on excessive Cape Canaveral wages.

I was jarred to find, at this open meeting, a huge map of the United States on the wall of the hearing room pinpointing our intercontinental ballistic missile support bases across the country.

Mikhail Sagatelyan, of the Tass News Agency, had as free access to the vital information on that map as I did. Location of our missile bases can indeed give comfort and assistance to the enemy.

In fact, Sagatelyan, Zwiren, or Tass man Gennadii Shishkin—or any other Communist newsman accredited to Washington—has as much freedom to gather military information as any U.S. Washington reporter.

So, what good does it do to aim the censorship request at editors, when the same rules do not apply to Communist correspondents?

The Tass men can be seen almost daily picking up printed material on military defense—and some revealing information can be culled from periodically published military testimony.

One ridiculous example of the Pentagon violating its own doctrine of censorship happened last year when a reporter called the Defense Department for details on our air-to-air missile, the Eagle.

"Classified," said the Pentagon press man. And, I suppose, there was good reason for it to be.

But the reporter had the information before him—in the readily available 1960 Missile Handbook, a copy of which was presented to Vladimir D. Pavlov, third secretary of the Soviet Embassy.

After the story appeared in this column, the FBI stopped around to see the distributor of the handbook. Where had he gotten the secret information?

The man replied truthfully: From material published openly by the Pentagon."

Censorship—like charity—should begin at home.

TESTING AND CONTROL OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS IN WESTERN EUROPE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, we are advised today that the NATO command will soon undertake an exercise to test the command and control of nuclear weapons in Western Europe. The initiation of this study, Mr. President, was in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. The committee, under the leadership of its chairman, the distinguished Representative from California, CHET HOLIFIELD, made a very learned report. It happened that the President of the United States, to my knowledge, read this report carefully.

The review not only looks to the readiness of nuclear weapons, but to the danger of readiness and to possible provocation and the dangers involved, as well as the defense readiness.

I think it is well that the matter is to be reviewed and tested. It is a tribute both to the originality of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and to the study and diligence of the President of the United States.

CENSORSHIP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, after the first 100 days of the New Frontier, which has been marked by a notable lack of achievement for the public good, one thing has emerged as an accomplishment of questionable merit. Much was said during the campaign about how free information would be if only the New Frontier were elected. One was led to believe that during the preceding years the public had been kept in abject ignorance about what went on in Washington. The promises, however, have not been kept, and the press of the Nation are beginning to ask their own questions about this strange censorship. The Arizona Republic, for example, has editorially quizzed the Frontiersmen about this, and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from that newspaper be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS CENSORSHIP

After gradually working up to it in its first 100 days of office, the Kennedy administration has now committed its first act of public censorship.

This trend toward suppression of free opinion began, innocently enough, with the refusal of the White House to inform reporters of the times and places of the President's golf games.

Next, we heard that Admiral Burke and Gen. George H. Decker had had their prepared speeches censored to conform to high policy.

Next, the Department of Defense announced that there was no longer a missile gap—but then subsided into complete silence about military missiles.

Next, the two RB-47 pilots shot down by the Russians were brought back. But the administration refused to allow them to tell their story to the American people. They are still under wraps.

Next, it was announced that cooks, valets, and maids in the White House had to sign an agreement never to write anything about their lives there.

A new censorship program at the Pentagon followed. As part of it, we were told that henceforth all nonpublic missile firings would not be announced. The new clampdown caused Washington reporters to describe the assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs as the "Department of News Suppression."

Then in April, the President attacked the press for endangering national security. He said that from now on they should not decide what to print by asking, "Is it news?" Instead, they should ask, "Is it in the public interest?" What is the public interest? What the Kennedy administration wants us to say?

Then the administration took out after TV stations. FCC Chairman Newton W. Minow attacked TV programing and told the station owners that they would have to devote more programs to cultural and public affairs (like what the Kennedy administration is doing for the people?). To force them to do this, Minow said the FCC would exert pressure on individual stations through its power to revoke licenses. "There is nothing permanent or sacred about a broadcast license," he threatened. (Or about freedom of speech?)

On May 11, Senator HUGH SCOTT read part of a confidential memo from the special assistant to the Secretary of Commerce, to department heads. It said, "Speeches of Cabinet and sub-Cabinet officers do not contain sufficient reference to the President and his personal interest in, and compassion with, the problems that face the Nation. Liberal quotations from his speeches, past or present, should be used." Big brother must be made to look good—and compassionate.

But these moves toward suppression of criticism were capped last April 21. A Mr. A. G. Heinshohn, Jr., president of the Cherokee Textile Mills in Sieverville, Tenn., had bought a postage meter machine from Pitney-Bowes, Inc., a company that has a virtual monopoly from the Post Office on supplying them. They stamp envelopes and print slogans or sales ideas on envelopes. His slogan read, "This is a Republic, not a democracy—let's keep it that way."

But on April 21, a New York Post reporter called Heinshohn for comment on the fact that Pitney-Bowes, at the request of the Post Office Department, had ordered him to return the plates with the slogan on it. Heinshohn had not received this demand, since it was mailed the same day. When he did, he was told that "the slogan has become strongly identified with a controversial and partisan political issue" and so it could not be used. The John Birch Society uses it.

On April 23, the Post quoted the Post Office Department as follows: "The Department cannot delve into censorship of the message to be carried, but there is a regulation which includes the statement that slogans may not be objectionable and misleading."

Is it objectionable and misleading to call the American Republic what it is? The Arizona Republic recently ran a high school essay contest on the question, "What is the difference between a republic and a democracy?" Will the Post Office Department now ban the Republic from the mails for being objectionable and misleading? This is a republic. It is not a democracy. Is it objectionable and misleading and unprintable to tell the truth?

If the Communists should run a slogan on their envelopes, "Pray for Peace," should it be banned from the mails because it comes from Communists, even though a lot of people are praying?

If a religious group runs a slogan, "In God We Trust," will we see this soon banned from the mails as "a violation of the separation between church and state"?

This is an act of outright, illegal censorship. It is a direct assault on the freedom of the American people to write what they please and send it through the mails under the law. It reveals also the authoritarian, arrogant, and insupportably dangerous tendency of this administration to use the vast powers of government to squelch all criticism of its actions.

This violation of liberty and the Constitution cannot be allowed to stand. It must be fought with the full power of the press, the public, and the Congress of the United States if freedom of speech is to live in America.

PRICES OF CERTAIN DRUGS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on May 8, during the morning hour, I described the situation that prevailed in a family that had been buying a medical concoction from a doctor in attempting to treat asthma. In Mount Gilead, Ohio, there was a doctor who developed a very effective formula for the treatment of asthma. The particular family to whom I refer bought the drug from the doctor for $4 for 2 ounces. The doctor passed away. When the man wanted to buy additional drugs, he was informed that the administrator of the estate had sold the formula to a drug company of Illinois, and that the only way the drug would be available was to get it through the drug company. The patient did get the drug, but, instead of paying $4 for 2 ounces, had to pay $15.

I did not intend to have included in the RECORD the letter of this Ohio citizen because it mentioned the drugstore to which the patient had to go. Regrettably, the letter was included in the RECORD, and I want at this time to state that the drugstore at Ravenna, Ohio, the Clark Pharmacy, is a highly respected store. The prices of the druggist are reasonable. The price he had to charge was primarily the result of the price he had to pay in getting the drug from the drug company in Illinois.

Now I ask unanimous consent to have printed in this morning's RECORD a letter from the druggist, Mr. H. J. Clark, of the Clark Pharmacy, in Ravenna, Ohio.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLARK'S PHARMACY,
Ravenna, Ohio, May 16, 1961.

Hon. FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator, State of Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In defense of Clark Pharmacy, Ravenna, Ohio, and the pharmacy profession, I wish to answer the letter Mrs. Beery wrote and recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 8, 1961.

I also request that this letter be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD along with Mrs. Beery's letter.

First of all, the only way my drugstore entered into this case is that the ingredients in this asthmatic formula require a narcotic order blank, No. 2513, to acquire it for the doctor and the customer. This is a service that all pharmacists will do for the doctor and the customer.

I am enclosing a brochure on the product—what it costs the druggist and the retail price. As is noted, the cost is $10 for 2 ounces and the retail price is $15, which is 33⅓ percent markup. My operational overhead is 30 percent, which leaves 3⅓ percent net.

A purchase of a shirt, tie, or a pound of hamburger has to show a net profit of at least 3⅓ percent or the doors would have to close.

I want to bring this point out clearly, as the druggists in the last couple of years have received very bad publicity through no fault of their own. We are very proud of our profession, and we will defend ourselves whenever the occasion arises.

I sincerely hope that this will help answer Mrs. Beery's letter from the druggist standpoint at the retail level and put a better taste in our customers' mouths in the future.

Sincerely,

H. JACK CLARK,
Registered Pharmacist.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the press indicates today, from many foreign sources, that there is about to be a summit conference between our President and Mr. Khrushchev. Our home press implies that this may be the case, and that the site of the conference will be in Vienna.

If such a conference is to be held, I would hope very much that some good would come of it. The whole Nation will be behind the President in pursuing whatever policy he deems necessary and wise in such a meeting with the head of the Soviet state. I do hope, however, that our American press will receive information shortly as to whether such a summit conference is or is not to be held, and also it would be most helpful to the American people and to the Members of Congress if we knew the reason for the summit conference, within the limits of security, of course.

Foreign comment today indicates that people abroad are not aware of the reason for the conference; that there is a general expression of curiosity as to why it needs to be held at this time. There is an indication that the conference is being requested by the United States, rather than by the Soviet Government.

There is concern as to what is expected to be accomplished in the handling of this important conference, and this is in the interest of the right of the American people to know, so eloquently argued by many prominent people on so many occasions.

If there is to be a summit meeting with Khrushchev, we are for whatever foreign policy procedure the President has in mind, but I do hope the American press will very soon be as adequately informed as the foreign press seems to be.

A DYING POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there was published in yesterday morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald a very penetrating article, entitled, "A Dying Policy," written by the incomparable Walter Lippmann. I think there is so much food for thought in the article that I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I not only would have Members of Congress read it, but I particularly recommend it for reading by the Secretary of State and by all members of his policymaking staff.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DYING POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

The revolution in Iran and the revolution in South Korea are warning signs about the situation on the periphery of Asia. They are warnings that it is not only in Laos that there is trouble for the American client states.

In Iran, the revolution is a desperate attempt at the top, with the blessing of the Shah, to reform the regime before it is overthrown from below. The present revolution is not anti-Western, anti-American, or pro-Communist. But it may well be all of these things in the end if the reforms which it has begun do not go deep enough. The hour is late in Iran.

In South Korea, the revolution is the work of the army, and it is not now anti-Western, anti-American, or pro-Communist. But this new military government, although it is not anti-American in theory, is in fact defying and ignoring our Embassy and the American Army commander.

The revolutions in South Korea and Iran, following the disorders in Laos and South Vietnam, are a warning that in Asia the policy of containment by American satellite states is breaking down. In all four of these countries the governments have been our clients, indeed they have been our creations. All of them are crumbling, and in the last analysis they are all crumbling for the same reason. In relation to the rising popular feeling of independence and the rising popular expectations of material welfare these American client states are not only corrupt but they are intolerably reactionary. The fact that they are also under the protection of a foreign and non-Asian power is an additional liability.

The Kennedy administration did not form the policy of setting up on the periphery of Asia a semicircle of American military clients. But it is now confronted with the breakdown of that policy, with the disorders, the dangers, and the pains of having to pick up the pieces. This is an experience which the American people have never had before and it is one for which their leaders have not prepared them. They have not been told by anyone in authority that there has been a radical change in the military situation and what the consequences of that change are. They have not been told that the military situation which existed when John Foster Dulles established this policy no longer exists. They have not been told that he made it work by shaking the bomb at the Communists. That is why so many of them suppose that Mr. Kennedy can make it work with a few marines and by shaking his fist.

Our moral and intellectual unpreparedness for the reality of things is causing widespread demoralization among us. We must not let ourselves be overcome by it. We can do that best, I think, by recognizing that our present experience on the periphery of Asia is the American equivalent of what the British and the French are experiencing during the liquidation of their colonial empires. For what we are witnessing is the dissolution of the Dulles system of Asian protectorates.

There are diehards in France who would like to overthrow General de Gaulle in order, as they think, to keep Algeria French. There are diehards in Britain who are passionately opposed to Mr. Macmillan because he is liquidating the colonial empire. And there are diehards here who are prepared to call Mr. Kennedy an appeaser or worse because he is trying to negotiate his way, rather than to fight his way, out of the Indochinese disorders. But whatever the diehards now call de Gaulle and Macmillan and Kennedy, the future will be theirs.

THE ARREST OF TSHOMBE IN THE CONGO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several days ago on the floor of the Senate

there was a discussion of the incident in which Tshombe, of the Congo, was arrested after he had been invited to leave his own domain and enter that of persons generally in charge of the Congo. The purpose of the invitation for Tschombe to leave his area was for him to participate in a discussion which would lead to solution of the problems in the Congo. Tshombe accepted the invitation, left his refuge, and went to the conference where the discussion was to be had. Then he suddenly found himself placed under arrest, charged with crime, and especially charged with the crime of having contributed to the death of Lunumba.

I felt rather keen on that subject the other day, when I expressed my views on it. The more I think about it, the more I feel that the deed must be denounced. The possibility of calling contesting parties to a conference for the purpose of working out international difficulties can be completely destroyed if, after the invitation is accepted, those who extend the invitation use the mighty power they have within their own areas.

I rise this morning merely to state that the more I think about what was done the more I feel it ought to be denounced. I do not believe that our Government can claim decency in operation if it countenances what happened in the Congo.

GEORGE W. NORRIS: INTEGRITY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, this week in Washington, D.C., homage is being paid to the memory of an illustrious Member of this body—the late Senator George W. Norris, of Nebraska. The event is the George W. Norris National Centennial, marking the 100th anniversary of the birth of a great American whose name is indelibly associated with the liberal tradition of our country.

I am sure that much will be said during this centennial about the role of George W. Norris in establishing legislative landmarks during his career as a U.S. Senator. The Anti-Injunction Act of 1932, which ended the era of so-called yellow dog contracts; the 20th amendment to the Constitution, which terminated lame-duck Presidents and Congresses; the TVA Act, which established a new role for Government in management of natural resources—all these statutes bear the stamp of George W. Norris.

But legislation in itself does not reflect the true merit of his greatness. The hallmark of Senator Norris was his fundamental integrity. This was the theme of one of the first books written by my late husband, Richard Neuberger. In fact, the book was entitled "Integrity, the Life of George W. Norris." It was coauthored by Dick Neuberger and Stephen B. Kahn, who at that time was an attorney recently with the Tennessee Valley Authority. Dick Neuberger was a 25-year-old journalist when the book was published in 1937, and Norris was at the height of popularity. The book described Norris as "a man who may in time become one of the great figures in the history of the United States." The centennial observation of today gives significance to that prophecy.

The authors also made the observation that—

> in the ability of these [American] workers to send to the capital at Washington men of the courage and integrity of George William Norris rests the fate of one of the planet's last sanctuaries of liberty and freedom.

The dimensions of George Norris' integrity were outlined in the book I have mentioned. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD with my remarks a portion of the opening chapter of the book: "Integrity, the Life of George W. Norris."

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I. A POLITICAN UNAFRAID—EARLY YEARS

No one would think of George W. Norris as a politician.

To most Americans a politician is a large, paunchy gentleman with an expansive smile and an enthusiastic handshake. He is always a spectacle of sartorial splendor, and varies between striped vests and checked suits at political meetings and cutaway coats and tophats on more formal occasions. A flower, never wilted, rests against his lapel, and his pocket is perpetually crammed with a battery of cigars which he passes out freely. He is all things to all people, and he never disagrees with anyone. For his home State he has nothing but praise, and his constituents are noble, warmhearted souls whom it is an unrivaled honor to represent.

He knows a myriad of persons by their first names, and he pummels with apparently unrestrained joy anyone he recognizes. He never takes a stand on any question he can straddle, and he balances himself between the two sides of a burning political issue as expertly as a tightrope artist walks a wire. He belongs to Rotary, Kiwanis, the chamber of commerce, and the Citizens' League, and, of course, he attends church religiously—or, rather, faithfully. He is an Elk, a Moose, an Eagle, and, as president of the local baseball boosters, thrills thousands of his admirers by throwing the first ball each season. If his district grows apples, he passes out the delectable fruit with his compliments, and there is no speech he cannot deliver at a moment's notice. To the pacifists he is for disarmament, and to the militarists he is for a big navy. To labor he is for the American standard of living, and to capital he is for law and order. Many of his constituents think he is shallow as a mirror and as sincere as a victrola, but he never offends anyone, and he controls a smoothly functioning patronage machine that nearly always assures him of reelection. He seeks publicity as assiduously as a Northwest Mountie stalks his prey, and he will invade the headlines by any means, whether it calls for embracing a movie actress, presenting a petition to deport 3 million people, or endorsing a certain brand of cigarettes.

In short, he is responsible for the disparaging tone of voice in which millions of Americans say, "Oh! He's a politician."

Not all men in public office conform to this picture. Through the hurly-burly of American political life plods a white-haired old man with surprisingly dark eyebrows and a melancholy smile. He wears clothes as drab as an army blanket, and he has helped thousands of people to maintain their confidence in democracy. George W. Norris, the senior U.S. Senator from Nebraska, is the direct antithesis of the general conception of a politician. He stubbornly refuses to compromise on any issue, and he takes a definite stand on virtually all public questions. He seldom resorts to oratory, and his speeches are delivered in a quiet, matter-of-fact voice. He does not control a jot of political patronage, and he rigidly refuses to write letters of endorsement for Government jobs. He has never pandered to the home spirit of the State to which he must turn for reelection every 6 years; he votes to cut down the tariff on sugar though Nebraska is a leading beet-sugar State, and he offends Nebraska pride by spending his summers in the rival Commonwealth of Wisconsin. He does not recognize party lines, and he blithely roams the no man's land between the country's major political organizations. He never hesitates to disagree with anyone, and he will condemn a President of the United States one minute and the ruler of Japan's military juggernaut the next. He belongs to no church and claims as his religion merely the doctrine of brotherhood. He lives simply and unpretentiously in a little town of less than 10,000 inhabitants; and, although he has been in Congress more than a third of a century, he has yet to be seen in formal clothes. He has ignored every accepted prerequisite of political success.

In 1917 he voted against American participation in the world war, when such an act was looked upon as certain suicide at the polls, and for a generation he taunted and denounced the ruling powers in the political party of which he was a member.

On a number of occasions he offered to resign because his views possibly were not those of his constituents, and he regards with disdain and contempt the rigmarole so many politicians go through to impress the more gullible among their constituents.

Even to more thoughtful Americans the word "politics" connotes unsavory manipulation and connivery: Boss Pendergast and the Kansas City ballot jugglers, Huey Long and martial law elections, the Ohio Gang and the Teapot Dome scandals, Boss Vare and the money-powered Mellon machine, Tammany Hall and corrupt campaigns, Dr. Townsend and his cruel and impossible promises. Gloomily, thousands of voters catalog politicians as men who will barter their ideals for a lobbyist's gold and their principles for a woman's body. To some degree, the daily news dispatches from the Capital of the Nation support this pessimistic outlook. In the columns of America's newspapers are stories of men who demand governmental economy one day and $24 billion pensions the next, of men who in a single breath call for a balanced budget and cash payment of the bonus, of men who mouth praise for civil service reform as they build up a vast spoils system, of men who would stifle free speech in the name of liberty, of men who insist upon high tariffs on products from their own districts and free trade for goods manufactured by the other fellow's constituents, of men who pose as seers and Olympian prophets but are unable to decide who they think should be President of the United States.

Yet, and yet—in this welter of demagoguery and dishonesty, it still is possible for a man to hold to his ideals and survive at the polls. An unbroken career of public service extending over half a century offers proof that integrity may be a strange bedfellow of politics, but not an impossible one.

"George W. Norris is the only honest man in political life in America," Lewis Gannett once quoted approvingly. He is among the many individuals who have made such an observation. Few men survey contemporary American democracy without pausing to comment on the character and courage of the senior Senator from Nebraska. Norris has been in Congress as long as any living

man, yet, in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, through all those years he has had only one boss—"his own conscience." In 1932 Charles Willis Thompson voiced a plea in Harper's magazine. "Wanted: Political courage," he wrote, and after an extended examination of the political scene, reported that only George W. Norris could be called "really brave."

Few men are better qualified to offer judgment on the public figures of the day than the newspapermen in the National Capital. Week in and week out, they meet Presidents and senators and judges, and talk to them in the privacy of hotel rooms and railroad compartments when they are stripped bare of the camouflage of official dignity. They see these individuals who rule America sidestep issues and parry questions. Cynically, they watch them plotting and scheming to hold the mace of power. And the Washington press corps is seldom taken in by sham or bombast. Only in rare instances have the Capital correspondents ever come to admire and revere a politician, and but once in this century has there been a politician the hard-boiled newspapermen in Washington have actually loved, that politician is George William Norris, the senior Senator from the State of Nebraska.

When the National Popular Government League gave a dinner in honor of Senator Norris, a large number of correspondents reserved plates. They selected Charles G. Ross, chief of the Washington bureau of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, to speak for them. Ross' impromptu remarks that night were unique in the journalistic history of Washington.

"This is indeed a novelty," he began. "I have interviewed you, Senator Norris, a great many times. I have written many thousands of words about you, but I have never before had the opportunity to stand up in public and tell you what I think about you. And what I think about you is shared by all my colleagues. Whatever may be their political faith, whatever may be the political faith of their papers, they love you."

Ross repeated the last three words for emphasis. As applause filled the dining hall, he continued: "We become cynical sometimes, we newspapermen, when we see our ideals toppling about us—so many promises and so little performance. Some of us despair of the success of our democracy, and then we go to Senator Norris and to one or two others like him and find refreshment and inspiration, and in them we find our democracy justified.

"If I were a senator in some plane of existence," the St. Louis correspondent went on, "and George Norris should be there in the senate, as I hope he would be, and I should come in late and know nothing whatever about the issue involved, when the time came to vote—I should find out how Norris had voted and vote the same way, knowing I had done no disservice to the people."

Newspapermen, as a rule, are notoriously grudging in their praise of politicians. This tribute from the hardened Washington reporters was without precedent, as have been most of the other commendations of Senator Norris by the men who cover the news at the National Capital. "Were I Diogenes," once mused Ulric Bell, of the Louisville Courier-Journal, "I know of no other public man who would come nearer to ending my quest than George W. Norris."

Here, then, is how the thoughtful men of America regard the silver-haired old Senator from the Cornhusker State. It is part of the folkways of America to classify public figures according to their outstanding qualities, whether it is an actress for shapely legs or a Senator for strength of character. Down through history notable Americans have been cataloged and remembered for specific traits: Webster and Bryan and Borah typify oratory; the two Roosevelts represent personality; Jackson stands for courage; Jefferson signifies tolerance and democracy; Lincoln personifies humanitarianism; Calhoun is remembered for his indomitability. And perhaps George W. Norris will come to symbolize integrity, for it is that characteristic above all others that he represents to his contemporaries.

Rarely are politicians associated with absolute honesty, yet here is one who signifies it. In an era in which it is not unusual to place politicians and rogues in the same niche, the senior Senator from Nebraska is a national symbol of personal integrity. Even his adversaries respect his idealism. The Senator's foremost antagonists are the private electric-power companies. They have fought him for a generation and he, in turn, has harassed and berated them. Yet Francis X. Welch, the associate editor of Public Utilities Fortnightly, has declared, "Differ as one may on his economic theories, no well-informed observer of Washington politics could ever deny that George W. Norris is 100 percent sincere and honest in his convictions. He has always fought fairly and squarely for his principles even in the face of unfair and pettifogging opposition."

"He is the very perfect gentle knight of American progressive ideals," Franklin D. Roosevelt said in 1932 of this unique old veteran of the political battlefront. To millions of Americans it was an apt metaphor, descriptive of a man who may in time become one of the great figures in the history of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the book written by the late Senator Neuberger and Stephen B. Kahn is one of the finest monuments to the memory of the great liberal from Nebraska, George Norris, which has ever been written. I associate myself with the comments of the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] with regard to the work of the great liberal, but I believe deserved tribute should be paid to her late husband and to Mr. Kahn for what I think is a great book they wrote really as a monument to the memory of George Norris.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I thank my colleague.

INTERVIEW RELATIVE TO HEARINGS OF ANTITRUST AND MONOPOLY SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, in the mail addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, I have received a newspaper account which relates to an interview given to a reporter on the Jackson Daily News, Jackson, Miss., on May 6, 1961, by a high official in the General Electric Co.

In this interview, John T. McCarty, identified as manager of employee and plant community relations in the important Defense Electronics Division of General Electric, expresses some policy views which are rather surprising to me, and which I think, Mr. President, that you and other Members of the Senate, as well as the public in general, will find of interest. According to the newspaper account, Mr. McCarty was in Jackson, Miss., to address the Mississippi Manufacturers Association.

I ask that the pertinent part of the account of this interview by this representative of General Electric be printed in the record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the account was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEFAUVER HEARINGS CALLED NONSENSE

(By Pat Flynn)

A General Electric official in an interview here yesterday called the Kefauver price-fixing hearings sheer nonsense.

The only reason for the hearings, said John T. McCarty, manager of employee and plant community relations for the company, was "a very ambitious little man (KEFAUVER) who almost got to be Vice President on the strength of another investigation and is just trying to see what he can do for next time."

McCarty, here to address the Mississippi Manufacturers Association annual management conference, added that he had been back and forth to Washington so many times lately he was beginning to feel like a ping-pong ball.

Throwing a crack at the Kennedy administration, McCarty said the easiest way to get from his native Syracuse, where GE's main plant is located, to Washington is to "go to Harvard and turn left."

GOLDEN OPPORTUNITY

McCarty said southern industrialists "have a golden opportunity that is all but slipping out of their fingers—the same opportunity that the North lost 30 years ago—operating their plants without unions."

He said management had to realize that loyalty could not be bought with company picnics, bowling teams, and Christmas parties.

"In fact," he said, "people go to Christmas parties, get all tanked up and set company relations back 15 years."

By using a film slide strip, he showed the procedure used by General Electric for combating union influence over its employees.

"Collective bargaining is the most insidious, spineless game played by adults," he said. "It's nothing but management and a bunch of union bums both getting a lawyer and sitting around a table to see how much they can get away with at the expense of the public.

"You can solve your own problems," he said, "if you do it now before a bunch of thugs force it on you."

Speaking on "Supervisor Training," he said the foreman had the most complicated job in the history of American labor, because he had to be "doctor, minister, den mother, and football coach."

Although strikes are losing thousands of manpower hours, he added, the largest time-killer is the "zombie time" spent by those inspiring people hanging around the water cooler.

"This is what the good foreman can combat without losing proper labor-management relations," he said.

TRIBUTE TO "ARE YOU A SHADOW VOTER?"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in view of the importance of the matter of assuring that our elections be conducted without the taint of fraud or corruption, I should like to draw attention to the recent publication of a booklet entitled, "Are You a Shadow Voter?" This booklet was developed and published by the Women's Division of the Republican Committee, under the able direction of

Assistant Chairman Clare B. Williams. I must emphasize, however, that "Are You a Shadow Voter?" transcends the field of partisan politics and directs its vital message to the entire electorate of this Nation. Indeed, I have been informed that Democrats and independents, no less than Republicans have been clamoring for copies of the booklet. More significantly, the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, a strictly nonpartisan organization, has taken an unprecedented move by endorsing this meaningful publication in a statement released last Tuesday. This is the first time in its history that the Fair Campaign Practices Committee has so acted. Further, the committee has underscored its warm endorsement by ordering copies of "Are You a Shadow Voter?" for distribution in every State of the Union.

I believe it pertinent and illuminating to quote herewith from the statement of Mr. Bruce E. Felknor, executive director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, commenting on the booklet in question.

This booklet is useful to citizens who want to make sure that their votes count, Democrats as well as Republicans. It is well and lucidly written. It is terse. It is much to the point. And it is based on facts that exist today. What people need to know are the techniques by which they may be cheated. Stolen votes are a disgrace owned by the American people. My hat is off to the Women's Division of the Republican National Committee, for this job needed to be done. We are listing "Are You a Shadow Voter?" as recommended reading in the next edition of our school and discussion group pamphlet, "Fair Play in Politics."

I would, therefore, recommend this booklet, already in its fifth printing, to the attention of my colleagues. Further, I believe that all of us, indeed all Americans, irrespective of party, owe a genuine debt of gratitude to the Women's Division of the Republican National Committee for the splendid contribution they have made to the cause of eliminating the defects and abuses that have too long plagued the conduct of elections in our Nation.

CONDITIONS IN THE LEAD-ZINC INDUSTRY

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, recently the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee conducted a 1-day hearing to learn up-to-date facts and conditions existing in the lead-zinc industry.

Some of the disclosures are shocking.

Mines are closing and the residents of the various mining communities are hard pressed to feed, clothe, and house themselves.

By way of illustration, I wish to call your attention to a few figures shown in a letter I have received from Mr. Miles P. Romney, manager of the Utah Mining Association. The tabulation is in two parts, that is—total U.S. mine production and Western States mining production. It is a comparison of 1947–49 average production with 1960. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Romney be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UTAH MINING ASSOCIATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, May 15, 1961.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: It was my privilege to address the Western Governors' Conference today on the status of the western mining industry. In the course of preparation, I discovered a rather shocking fact regarding the impact of lead-zinc mine closures on Western State mines and communities.

The Bureau of Mines annually reports mine production of lead and zinc from major areas—the Western States being one such area. Comparing the 1947–49 average mine production to 1960, the Western States lost 287,666 tons of lead-zinc metal production in 1960. The total U.S. loss in 1960 compared with the same base years was 338,746—which means loss experienced by all areas other than Western States was only 51,080 tons.

	Total, United States	Total, Western States
Average domestic production lead and zinc, 1947–49:	*Tons*	*Tons*
Lead	394,869	238,838
Zinc	620,263	356,663
Total, lead and zinc	1,015,132	595,501
Domestic production of lead and zinc, 1960:		
Lead	243,942	121,435
Zinc	432,444	186,400
Total, lead and zinc	676,386	307,835
Loss of production, 1947–49 average compared to 1960	338,746	287,666

Thus, loss of production in areas other than Western States was only 51,080 tons, or 15 percent of total, whereas the Western States loss of production was a shocking 85 percent.

Assuming that about 8 cents per pound of lead and zinc would have accrued to western mining, milling and smelting operations, the 287,666 tons loss means a direct loss of some $46 million in 1960 alone.

Provisions of S. 1747, sponsored by you and five other western Senators, are critically needed to stop the continuing decline in western mine production and start a trend toward restoration of the economic benefits traditionally enjoyed by Western States.

Thanking you for your very great interest and help, I am,

Yours very truly,

MILES P. ROMNEY,
Manager.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, interestingly enough, the lost mining production equaling 338,746 tons is almost precisely one-third of the 1947–49 average. Analysis of the tabulation discloses that the bulk of the loss was incurred in the Western States. Eighty-five percent of the lost production or 287,666 tons has been in the West, where today the lead-zinc mining industry is almost nonexistent. Only 51,080 tons or 15 percent was in areas outside the Western States. This vital industry must not be allowed to decline further.

SUDETEN GERMAN DAY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, from May 20 to May 23, 1961, Sudeten German Day will be observed in Cologne, Germany. The Sudeten German people are dedicated anti-Communists and have long maintained friendly relations with other nations of the free world including the United States. Recently, the Secretary General of the Sudeten German Council, Dr. Walter Becher, visited the United States and I had the pleasure of meeting with him. Dr. Becher is also a member of the Bavarian Landtag.

The Sudeten Germans are dedicated to assisting anti-Communist exiles from behind the Iron Curtain. They deserve special commendation for their efforts in helping Czechoslovakian and other Central European exiles.

Mr. President, I think it is eminently fitting that we note the courage and dedication of the Sudeten German people, particularly in connection with this year's celebration of Sudeten German Day.

DESTRUCTIVENESS OF CERTAIN FEDERAL PROGRAMS INVOLVING THE USE OF PESTICIDES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a recent meeting of the Kansas Academy of Science, at Manhattan, Kans., a resolution favoring the passage of the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act was passed. I have received from Mr. Gilbert A. Leisman, secretary of the Kansas Academy of Science, a letter dated May 15, 1961, incorporating the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Emporia, Kans., May 15, 1961.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: At the recent meeting of the Kansas Academy of Science at Manhattan, Kans., a resolution favoring passage of the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act was passed. As secretary of the Kansas Academy, I have been instructed to send a copy of this resolution to you. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas some Federal programs involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals designed for regulating the numbers of plants and animals are highly destructive of natural resources such as fish and wildlife; and

"Whereas the Federal function of investigation and demonstration of methods and means of regulating numbers of organisms has been extended to provide actual service that is regarded as a proper function of non-Federal governmental units or individual property holders; and

"Whereas H.R. 4668, 87th Congress, 1st session, known as the Chemical Pesticides Coordination Act, provides for advance consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and with State agencies that are responsible for wise use of biological resources before the beginning of any Federal program involving the use of pesticides or other chemicals or devices designed for biological controls: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Kansas Academy of Science in annual convention of May 5, 1961, at Manhattan, Kans., registers approval of H.R. 4668 and recommends its enactment; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary send a copy of this resolution to each of the Congressmen on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to each Congressman from

Kansas, and to each of the two U.S. Senators from Kansas."

We hope that this resolution will warrant your serious attention.

Very truly yours,

GILBERT A. LEISMAN,
Secretary, Kansas Academy of Science.

GERMANY TEACHES THE U.S.A.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there appeared in yesterday's Washington Daily News a very timely editorial entitled "Germany Teaches the U.S.A."

This editorial calls our attention to the fact that in 1951 Germany repudiated the unsound financial advice of Prof. Walter Heller and instead adopted the sound fiscal policy of balanced budgets.

Today Germany stands out as a financially strong nation.

Now Professor Heller, as the Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers, wants us to follow this same bad advice, which if followed, will unquestionably touch off another round of dangerous inflation here in our country.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANY TEACHES THE U.S.A.

U.S. economic advisers increasingly are embarrassed by contrasts between America and West Germany—persistent unemployment here as against a labor shortage there.

Scripps-Howard Writer Roger Stuart has dug up a long-secret report which helps explain the embarrassment.

The report was made by a team of U.S. economists and submitted to the West German Government September 24, 1951. On the U.S. team was Prof. Walter Heller, now Chairman of President Kennedy's Council of Economic Advisers.

Some of the recommendations:

West Germany was told it couldn't achieve the necessary rate of industrial expansion if it kept on worrying about inflation. The Government was chided for an "excessive concern for price stability."

However Dr. Ludwig Erhard, West German Finance Minister, knew something about inflation. He had seen his parents' life savings lost when the mark went to pot. He rejected this advice.

Dr. Erhard also was told by the U.S. advisers that "a rate of interest high enough to stimulate any large volume of personal savings would seriously curtail investment." But German interest rates were left to find their own high level and so were savings and investment. Today West Germany is investing up to a quarter of its national output annually in the most modern industrial plant in the world.

Dr. Erhard was cautioned against liberal depreciation policies and advised instead to adopt a "compulsory investment program." But liberal depreciation policies helped the German economy grow last year at the rate of 10.8 percent. The U.S. rate was less than 3 percent.

Just 15 years ago West Germany was a defeated and demoralized nation, its resources squandered by Hitler, its factories and homes flattened by bombs. Since then it has taken in more than 12 million refugees. It has imported nearly half a million more and still has a labor shortage.

Average wages have doubled in 10 years and still are climbing. And increases mostly are in true values because of effective measures against inflation.

West Germany last year lost fewer than 40,000 man-days through strikes. We lost twice that many on missile bases alone. German wage raises have come out of increased productivity—8 percent last year. German prices have been kept competitive in world markets, thus rapidly expanding foreign commerce.

The Germans, in short, have followed the historic principles of free enterprise—despite the advice they got from the U.S.A. Even the West German Socialist Party has repudiated socialism.

The general theories of the 1951 report, rejected by the Germans, are the general theories now being urged on America by Professor Heller and other administration economists: Big spending and even budget-busting tax cuts, which breed inflation; artificial restraints on interest rates, which discourage saving and encourage Americans to export jobs by investing abroad; gimmicks in the form of tax "incentives," instead of adequate depreciation allowances.

Somewhere in all this may be found a clue to our "creeping rate of growth," so roundly deplored in the campaign. Now Professor Heller wants us to follow some more of our own bad advice.

TOTAL ATTACK UPON JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I am enthusiastic about President Kennedy's Executive order of last Thursday, May 11, 1961, concerning his proposal for a total attack upon juvenile delinquency. As chairman of the Senate Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, I can say that the increase in juvenile criminality and violence is easily one of the most vital domestic problems facing the Nation today.

Recognition of the problem by the President as one of national importance makes possible for the first time in history the kind of "total attack" coordinated, well-conceived approach to the problem that is required to bring it under control. I am confident that when the administration's program becomes law it will eventually turn the tide in what has been a losing battle against the growth of juvenile crime and the devastating impact it has on our society.

I am equally confident the program will become law, because it is directed at the heart of the problem and is designed to correct the most glaring deficiencies in the hodgepodge of local programs now in operation across the Nation. I predict the administration's legislative program in this area will find wide support amongst those dedicated professionals who are every day confronted with controlling delinquency while working with wholly inadequate tools.

For my own part, I am 100 percent behind the President's delinquency proposals. The Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, of which I am chairman, cooperated to the fullest with the administration in putting together what I believe will be a truly effective program. I know that this program will have the support of virtually every person in the Nation concerned with delinquency control including the police, the courts, penologists, sociologists, psychologists, and others.

In its final form, it is a program based on the findings of nearly 7 years of hearings by the subcommittee in testimony from every quarter of the Nation. After careful and lengthy consideration by the most competent people available in this area, I introduced a bill, S. 802, on February 6, 1961, which is similar in every respect to the administration's proposal—even down to the $10 million annual appropriation. Though the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported out an abbreviated version of S. 802 under different sponsorship, I feel that the virtually complete agreement between the Delinquency Committee's S. 802 and the administration proposals call for a reconsideration of the delinquency measures now pending in the Congress with a view toward mobilizing the total attack against juvenile crime that the President has requested.

In mid-April, S. 279 was reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and passed the Senate. It is now in the Committee on Education and Labor of the House. In a statement following its passage, I pointed out that it was not the strongest bill available and that a more effective antidelinquency program would be developed under S. 802. I also said that I would support S. 279 only if the choice was between a weak bill or none at all. In reality, S. 279 intends to provide so little in so short a time that its usefulness is seriously curtailed.

I favor a measure strong enough to make a visible, measurable impact on the control of juvenile crime—a measure that would accomplish this before thousands and thousands of more juveniles are stamped with the indelible stigma of juvenile delinquency.

President Kennedy has asked for that, and his proposed legislation when introduced will reflect that, as do the provisions of S. 802.

Both proposals direct attacks where delinquency control is weakest, the lack of personnel to work in the delinquency field in the areas of prevention, control, and treatment; the lack of assistance to local communities in developing adequate programs, the need to demonstrate new techniques and to coordinate the orderly flow of information nationally to communities in need of technical assistance.

President Kennedy's delinquency proposals were warmly greeted by the public and the press. They have been greeted enthusiastically by the professionals in the field who have for years been waging the hopeless battle against increasing juvenile crime because they lack properly trained personnel in sufficient numbers, and have inadequate facilities which are poorly financed.

I myself intend to use all of the facilities at my disposal to work for the passage of these strong legislative proposals in the belief that only strong legislation adopted and put into effect at the earliest possible date will make the kind of significant impact on juvenile crime necessary to maintain the vitality of our Nation.

THE SUMMIT MEETING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the RECORD an interesting commentary on the proposed summit conference from the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of May 19.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS KENNEDY PREPARES FOR TRIP TO SUMMIT

Although no formal decision has been announced, all the signs point to an informal summit meeting of President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Vienna early in June.

Advance notice of the meeting has been given to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and to allies in friendly capitals. President Kennedy has discussed the possibility with Canadian Prime Minister Diefenbaker. And the Austrian Government is making preparations for the meeting, to follow immediately after Mr. Kennedy's discussions with French President de Gaulle in Paris May 31–June 2.

As plans proceed for a confrontation of the leaders of the world's two most powerful nations, it is interesting to recall what has happened to proposed summitry in the recent past and to examine world conditions in which the conference would be held.

A little more than a year ago, a summit meeting between Premier Khrushchev and former President Eisenhower collapsed in Paris because of the sensational U–2 spy plane incident. That episode gave the Russian leader a handy excuse for calling the whole thing off.

Then followed the 1960 presidential campaign and a rash of statements, official and otherwise, as to conditions that should prevail before a summit meeting is held.

Much was made, for example, of an article written for the April 1960 issue of Foreign Affairs magazine by Dean Rusk, a former U.S. Deputy Under Secretary of State who, a few months later, was to become Secretary of State in the new Kennedy administration. Wrote Mr. Rusk:

"The experienced diplomat will usually counsel against the direct confrontation of those with final authority. Negotiation ad referendum offers a greater opportunity for feeling out the situation, exploring the opposing points of view, trying out alternative approaches without commitment, testing general propositions by meticulous attention to detail. The process needs time, patience and appreciation, three resources which are not found in abundance at the highest political level. The direct confrontation of the chiefs of government of the great powers involves an extra tension because the court of last resort is in session. The costs of error or misunderstanding are multiplied by the seriousness of the issues and the power of those present."

And last October 21, in a TV debate with his opponent, Presidential Candidate Kennedy expressed these views on summitry:

"I believe we should not go to the summit until there is some reason to believe that a meeting of minds can be obtained on either Berlin, outer space, or general disarmament including nuclear testing * * * until we are strong here, until we are moving here. I hope that before we do meet, there will be preliminary agreements on these four questions, or at least two of them, or even one of them, which would warrant such a meeting."

If there has been any preliminary agreement on any of these subjects, we are unaware of it. Berlin is still an issue of perilous contention. Presently two international conferences on disarmament (nuclear testing) and Laos, are stymied in Geneva by Soviet insistence upon having its own way. The Russians are out front in the space race and the President, in the wake of reverses in Cuba and Laos, keeps telling us we aren't strong enough and that we will have to sacrifice for defense.

Perhaps the President is prepared to deal from a position of strength and prior preparation of which the American public is unaware. But when and if he pulls any rabbits out of his hat in Vienna, we hope they will not wind up in a 50–50 stew comprised in equal parts of one American rabbit to one Russian mule.

KOREA: NEW BLOW TO U.S. PRESTIGE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful commentary on U.S. prestige by the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 18.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KOREA: NEW BLOW TO U.S. PRESTIGE

It is hard to view the revolt of some segments of the armed forces of the Republic of Korea, and the apathy of others, as anything less than another blow to the prestige and world influence of the United States.

Coming so quickly after the Cuban debacle, it must surely have the effect of causing our remaining friends a certain queasiness and our enemies a full portion of high glee.

Korea is not just another Asian nation where we have tried, within limits, to be helpful in encouraging the growth of democracy. It is practically our stepchild.

We helped to form the South Korean Nation after the Japanese had withdrawn at the end of the Second World War; we shored up the regime of the patriotic old man who for years had the singlehearted devotion of his people, Syngman Rhee; we led the United Nations forces in defending the country from its Communist enemies, at great cost in lives and treasure; we have helped Rhee's successor, John Chang, and, in the current year, are obligated to the extent of more than $250 million to continue that support.

There are some hopeful portents, of course. The rebellion's leaders, despite our announced support of John Chang, have emphasized that they plan no change in foreign policy or alliance with the West. The ROK first army pointedly announced it was not taking its eyes off the north even though the domestic scene was in turmoil.

Nevertheless, what the United States has attempted to establish around the world is the validity and effectiveness of democratic process. And once again we have been kicked in the teeth for it.

At the moment the most sensible course for this country seems to be a redoubling of security along the 38th parallel to insure that the North Korean Communists and their Chinese allies are unable to take advantage of the impasse to infiltrate, agitate, or even to crank up full-scale war again.

If the Republic can stay free, accommodation and commonsense must in the end prevail. If the Communists should walk in unopposed, we might, in short order, find ourselves back on the beachhead at Pusan, wondering if it were worth the trouble to start in all over again.

AWARDS TO HELEN V. AARESKJOLD, CHERYL L. MARTIN, AND DANIEL R. WEBBER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, there are saluted today three students who have achieved outstanding scholastic records in their respective universities. Such achievement deserves acknowledgment under any circumstances. But these three students are especially worthy of honor. These three young people are representative of the "cream" of our 1961 graduates; they combined ability with determination—for each is blind. At noon today President Kennedy presented these students with special achievement awards of $500, sponsored by the nonprofit educational organization, Recording for the Blind, Inc. Throughout their collegiate careers all 3 have used recorded textbooks, which are provided free to more than 2,000 students by the sponsoring organization.

As an example to the youth of this country and to each of us, let us take a look at the remarkable achievements of the award winners—young persons who have successfully met a challenge.

Helen Vivian Aareskjold of Brooklyn, N.Y., will graduate in the upper 20 percent of her class at Clark University in Worcester, Mass. After attending graduate school, this ambitious young lady plans to work with the Federal Government in either law or international relations.

Another award winner, Cheryl Lynn Martin, of Mansfield, Ohio, is planning on a career in social service work. She is vice president of three honorary societies and in the top 10 percent of her class at Wittenberg University in Springfield, Ohio.

The young man honored is from my own State. He is Daniel R. Webber, of Saginaw, Mich., who was graduated magna cum laude from Michigan State University in 1958 and now is a senior at the University of Notre Dame School of Law. Mr. Webber is a class representative in the school law association and is in the upper third of his class.

These award winners, along with the hundreds of other blind students, both young and old, owe much of their success to the efforts of the Recording for the Blind. This organization, which is observing its 10th anniversary, serves the blind with its library of more than 30,000 talking books, ranging in subject matter from literature and science to philosophy and law.

The group's objective is to assist blind persons to become self-supporting and useful members of their respective communities. Some 1,500 volunteer readers assist the organization in preparing the records, which for the most part are educational books produced at the specific request of the student or his instructor.

Obtaining an education is always a challenge—and even more so for the blind. Both Recording for the Blind and the three award winners are to be commended for their successful efforts, an example to all.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MORSE rose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from California desire to be recognized?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I was merely going to suggest, if there is no further morning business, that the un-

finished business be laid before the Senate, so that the absence of a quorum may be suggested, with the understanding, if it is agreeable, that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be taken from the half hour which is available for debate on the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to suggest one modification. I think the Senator from New Hampshire would agree that we should return to consideration of the unfinished business and make whatever statements we wish to make prior to the suggestion of the absence of a quorum, because I think there is not a great deal to be added to the debate.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am simply acting as the minority leader. The request to me was to suggest the absence of a quorum before the debate.

Mr. MORSE. Fine. In that event I join with the Senator in his request.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I make this request with the understanding that the time for the call of the roll will be charged to neither side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the Cotton-Miller amendment, as modified.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum and that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call may be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes on the amendment. I will not take the time of the Senate to reiterate the points brought out in the debate last night. I will merely try to recapitulate the case from the standpoint of the proponents of the so-called Cotton amendment to the bill. I call attention to the fact that my proposal for rendering Federal assistance to the States in the interest of education is extremely simple, clean cut, direct, and reliable. The proposed method would result in an annual appropriation and payment to each State in the Union of 3 cents out of the 8 cents, or 37½ percent of the Federal cigarette tax collected in that State from the people in the State, which would be returned to the Treasury of such State, earmarked for use for educational purposes. I wish to reiterate and remind the Senate that the amendment contains these important attributes:

First. The proposed method would require no complicated formula for dividing the so-called Federal aid between the States, because each State would automatically receive a proportionate amount of the cigarette tax it had paid into the Federal Treasury earmarked for education.

Second. The proposed method would present no problem of how the money should be used for education. It is the State's own money, paid by the taxpayers who are inhabitants or residents of that State, and can be used, as the State authorities and its legislatures determine, for education, whether it be teachers' salaries, construction, maintenance, or for any other necessity.

Third. The proposed method would require no Federal department or bureau or additional employees to administer the fund, because the States of the Union levy their own cigarette tax and already have departments to determine the number of packages sold in each State, so that the division and computing of the shares would be a simple matter without the creation of new bureaucracy.

I am interested in that point. This morning I came upon this quotation from the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]:

> It costs up to 20 cents for the Central Government to collect a dollar, bring it to Washington, and then to allocate it back with strings attached.

The method proposed in the amendment has no strings attached. Under the amendment no "brokerage fee" would be collected by the Federal Government. Every cent would go right back to the States, and would be available for education.

Fourth. The proposed method would dispose of the issue which will be before the Senate in the coming week, and before the American people for years to come, of using Federal funds for schools where integration has not been fully effected. More than that, it would dispose of the great problem of children in private and parochial schools in the States of this country, because it would return the money received from the tax to the States, where it could be used according to State laws and according to State practice in dealing with their problems, and would not lead the Federal Government into such fields.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I yield myself 2 more minutes. No. 5 is a complete answer to those who oppose and fear Federal aid to education because they fear Federal control. It is not in a direct sense of the word Federal aid. It is more of a relinquishment of certain taxes collected under the taxing power of the Federal Government, which are returned to the States for use in education.

In closing I merely wish to make this point to those in the Senate who believe in Federal aid for education and desire it. I number myself among them, to the extent that I have always felt that the Federal Government, which takes care of its trees, ought to take care of its children. I have always felt that it is one of the duties of the Federal Government to bolster and help the States in the cause of education.

To those who believe in aid for education, I submit that the amendment is the best hope of permanent, steady help to the States. If we pass the committee bill, with the large sums of money involved, and with all the hope it holds out, it is still subject to the appropriation process. The amendment I have offered is also subject to the appropriation process, but it definitely sets aside an amount of money to each State, and does it permanently.

For those who oppose Federal aid to education as such, I submit that this is not an entering wedge to bring federalized education to the country. On the contrary, it sets up a barrier and bulwark against federalized education and against the Federal Government extending its hand into the classrooms and schools of this country. It strengthens the States. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. COTTON. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I yield myself 1 more minute.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire about the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] yesterday, at page 8360 of the RECORD, where he states three objections to the amendment. The second objection the Senator from Oregon made was:

> Such proposals would not assure that there would be any increase in the level of support for public education by States and local communities corresponding with the Federal tax remissions or credits. Such resources could be used for any purpose and might not be devoted to education.

That was the second objection of the Senator from Oregon. Do I understand correctly that the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire would override that objection, because it specifically provides that the money must be used for education?

Mr. COTTON. That is correct. I will not take the time to read the amendment, but it specifically provides that this return of money to the States is made under the condition that it must be used by the States themselves for education, and for no other purpose. Anyone who reads the amendment will agree that, on the face of it, the amendment provides that if the States did not comply they would be deprived of the return of these funds.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask the Senator one further question.

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Oregon also stated that proposals such as

the one the Senator from New Hampshire has offered would necessarily entail reductions in Federal revenues. Would the Senator from New Hampshire care to comment on that point?

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from New Hampshire mentioned that point yesterday. Obviously, if we return to the States some Federal revenue, it reduces the Federal revenues. Obviously we must replace them in some way if we continue the scale of Federal expenditures—I repeat, if we continue the scale of Federal expenditures.

However, if we proceed to appropriate billions of dollars under the committee bill, we must provide the money. Therefore, it is as broad as it is long. If we take money from the Federal Treasury, it must be replenished.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 2 minutes. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, at page 8359, starting in the third column on that page, I gave my answer to the arguments in favor of the amendment. I stand on that argument. I am in opposition to the amendment, and stand on the argument I made yesterday.

In closing, I merely wish to add that adoption of the amendment would emasculate the bill and, in my judgment, would establish a very unsound fiscal policy at the Federal level. In my judgment it would also constitute an infringement on the revenue raising power of the House of Representatives, and therefore is even subject to question as to its constitutionality.

I also point out that the amendment is opposed by great educational organizations of the country. They are fully aware of the need of enacting a bill such as the one the committee is offering, with a sound provision for equalization. They recognize that if these taxes are to be raised by U.S. citizens, they ought to go into the U.S. Treasury and be disbursed by the Treasury in accordance with legislation passed by Congress on the subject matter of education itself.

In my judgment, there is no problem at all of any Federal interference with education. We have covered that point in the bill in section 103.

Furthermore, as I said yesterday, we are already spending hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal aid to education for a third of the school population of our country. What makes anyone believe that we cannot do it for the other two-thirds without Federal interference in the operation of our schools?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 1 more minute. The Senator's amendment was thoroughly considered in committee. The committee by a vote of at least 12 votes in committee against it, out of 14 votes, recommended against the Senator's amendment. I urge the Senate to defeat the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, before the Senator yields back the remainder of his time, will he yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator has suggested that educational organizations of the country are opposed to the amendment. The author of the amendment is not aware that educational organizations are opposed to it. Would the Senator be willing to indicate what organizations have expressed themselves as being opposed to the amendment and being unreceptive to the opportunity of having approximately $700 million being distributed among the States for education?

Mr. MORSE. The legislative representative of NEA, who is in charge of representing that organization on legislative matters, has advised me that they are opposed to the Senator's amendment. I believe they speak pretty well for the teachers of the country.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator. Are there any other organizations opposed?

Mr. MORSE. That is the one on which I principally rely to bear out my belief that it is largely opposed by educators. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COTTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, as modified.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the time has been set. I must object. There will be a slow rollcoll on the yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CARLSON (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; and if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business and his pair has previously been announced by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is detained on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 42]

YEAS—29

Allott	Goldwater	Russell
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Scott
Butler	Hruska	Smathers
Capehart	Johnston	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Talmadge
Cotton	Long, La.	Thurmond
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Mundt	

NAYS—63

Anderson	Gore	Monroney
Bartlett	Hart	Morse
Beall	Hartke	Morton
Bennett	Hayden	Moss
Bible	Hickey	Muskie
Burdick	Hill	Neuberger
Bush	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Prouty
Cannon	Jordan	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Keating	Randolph
Church	Kefauver	Robertson
Clark	Kerr	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Symington
Engle	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGee	Yarborough
Fulbright	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—8

Aiken	Carroll	Gruening
Blakley	Chavez	McNamara
Carlson	Cooper	

So Mr. COTTON's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed:

On page 2, line 3, to strike out "Federal grants to" and insert in lieu thereof "income tax sharing with the".

On page 2, line 15, after "title" to insert "since the amounts to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title are a portion of tax payments originating in such State."

On page 9, line 10, after "STATES," to insert "AND DETERMINATION OF SUCH PAYMENT AS RETURN OF PERCENTAGE OF THE INCOME TAX COLLECTIONS FROM SUCH STATE".

On page 11, line 2, after "SEC. 107" to insert "(a)".

On page 11, between lines 10 and 11, to insert the following:

"(b) (1) The payment to each State for any fiscal year under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be considered as a return to such State of a percentage, to be determined by the Commissioner, of the income taxes collected in such State for such year. The Secretary of the Treasury shall provide the Commissioner with such data as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner to determine such percentage.

"(2) For the purposes of this subsection, the amount of income taxes collected in a State during any fiscal year is an amount equal to (A) the total amount of income taxes collected in the internal revenue district or districts in such State during such fiscal year, less (B) the total amount of credits, refunds, and abatements allowed or paid in such internal revenue district or districts during such fiscal year with respect to overpayments of income taxes. For the purposes of this subsection the term "income taxes" means—

"(i) the taxes on the income of corporations imposed by chapters 1 and 6 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954;

"(ii) the tax on the income of individuals imposed by chapter 1 of such Code;

"(iii) the withholding tax on the income of nonresident aliens and foreign corporations imposed by subchapter A of chapter 3 of such Code; and

"(iv) the withholding tax on the wages of individuals imposed by chapter 24 of such Code."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allotted on this amendment is 30 minutes to each side.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, this amendment would modify Senate bill 1021 by changing it from a Federal grant to an income tax sharing program. However, it would do so without touching the distribution formula. This is the most conservative way in whch the bill can be modified while at the same time providing protection against further restriction on local education.

In other words, if my amendment were adopted, there would be no change in the distribution to Illinois, Mississippi, New York, Virginia, or any other State. At the same time it would also not affect the Javits-Cooper proposal or any subsequent proposal which might change the distribution formula in the bill. Previous amendments like the Cotton amendment and the Blakley amendment would have quite drastically changed the distribution formulas. This amendment does one thing, and one thing only, and that is restrain the Federal Government from interference.

Yesterday the junior Senator from Montana said that virtually every Senator and Representative with whom he had talked who had supported Federal aid to education reiterated strongly that there should be no Federal interference with education.

I think that is true not only of present Senators, but of previous Senators, like Robert Taft, who, of course, had the same conviction.

The way my proposal accomplishes this end is to provide that there shall be returns of income taxes on the residents of each State and resident corporations of each State, but the return shall vary in the different States, so that a State with a few corporations and a modest income would receive a higher percentage of its income tax, and a State with many big corporations and with a high income would receive a smaller percentage of the income tax.

As I have said, this is the most objective way in which we can provide for restrictions against Federal interference without touching any other element in the bill.

It has been argued that there is no need for such legislation, that there has been no interference in the past, and that there will not be any interference in the future. However, I think we can read our mail. I have brought a few of the thousands of letters I have received from Wisconsin. I have solicited virtually every teacher in my State for views on aid to education, and have received some unsolicited views. Their view is that there is a need for improved education, but they are afraid that if there is Federal aid for education, there will also be Federal interference with education. This statement is not made by people who are parroting a party line. This statement is made by teachers, principals, school board members and many plain citizens.

It has been said that there is no Federal interference. I have conferred with teachers in 250 Wisconsin high schools in the past 2 years. Over and over again, I have heard complaints that under the Smith-Hughes Act, there has been direct Federal interference.

The National Defense Education Act limits the kind of education which may be given in accordance with the act. Many educators tell me they oppose the Federal restrictions in the act.

I think Senators should be particularly aware of the fact that the loyalty oath and affidavit requirement of that act constituted direct Federal interference with education, an interference debated at great length on this floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I will yield in just a moment.

When we are breaking new ground by providing Federal aid for teachers' salaries, which we do in this particular bill, and which we have never done before, it is especially important that we find ways of protecting local districts and teachers from interference by the Federal Government.

Now, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What formula is adopted in the Senator's proposal covering the manner in which the count shall be made of pupils attending schools? Does the formula include those attending parochial schools as well as those attending public schools?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I was just coming to that point. My position is that the other proposals did change the formula. My proposal is neutral, and the formula has nothing to do with it. Therefore, if the Senator from Ohio wishes to introduce a formula later that is different from the formula in the bill, he is perfectly free to do so, and my proposal will not affect his formula. My proposal does one thing and one thing only—provide a restraint against Federal interference with education.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then the money would be distributed according to need.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If my amendment is agreed to, and no further amendments are agreed to, it would be based upon the number of school-age children, State income, and State effort. This is what the bill now provides.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the amendment which is known as the Cooper-Javits amendment were agreed to, then the distribution would be based upon the average daily attendance of pupils attending public schools.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from South Dakota is absolutely correct. It could go either way, depending upon what the majority of the Senate wishes to do. If the majority of the Senate wishes to stay with the committee proposal, that is the way the funds would be distributed. If the majority of the Senate chooses to go with the amendment to be offered by the Republican Senators, the distribution would vary.

Mr. LAUSCHE. So that I may correctly understand, would the Cooper-Javits amendment count only those students who are attending public schools on an average daily basis?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The average daily attendance.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The committee bill would count the children attending Lutheran, Catholic, and other religious schools, as well as those attending public schools. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

My amendment would not touch that concept. That would be left for a future determination by the Senate. We can decide whom we wish to count later.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Both the committee proposal and the Cooper-Javits amendment have another factor involved, in the measuring of the income of the States.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is right.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To understand this correctly, the proposal which I may offer as an amendment at a later time would not relate to either the average daily attendance or to the income of the State, but would simply ask how many children of school age there are in a State, and would use that as the basis for distribution of funds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senators for their questions. They have been very helpful in clarifying my position. I should like now to describe the amendment.

On page 2 of the bill, line 3, the words "Federal grants to" would be deleted, and in place of those words the words "income tax sharing with the" would be inserted.

Every Senator knows that this change would provide a clear and obvious basis for local resistance to any kind of Federal encroachment. In the second place, it would also provide Senators in the future with a firm basis for arguing that because of the origin of the funds themselves this program, unlike other programs, shall not brook Federal interference or dictation.

It has been said that this is a unique way of distributing funds. It is indeed a unique way of distributing funds. I think we face a unique situation. This is one program for which we wish to be sure the Federal Government does not provide limitations or standards or conditions. This is why in this particular, exceptional instance we should find an exceptional way of safeguarding the program against Federal encroachment. I submit that my proposal would do so.

It has been said that this is a new and novel way to proceed, in that it has not been tried before. Mr. President, the fact is that Wisconsin has an older income tax law than the Federal Government. Our income tax goes back to 1911. Almost since the beginning, we in Wisconsin, have shared the income tax with municipalities and counties. This has been done continuously for 50 years, and there has been no question that it has worked out very well. There has been no question of the State's power to raise taxes and there has been no question of the power of the localities to spend revenues in any way they wish, without restraint or restriction.

In addition to the amendment I have mentioned, on page 2, line 15, words are to be inserted after the word "title" so as to make the bill read:

> In the administration of this title, since the amounts to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title are a portion of tax payments originating in such State, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

My amendment would add a permanent basis for this restraint and make it more than a pious pronouncement. It would reinforce the expression with a designation of exactly for what the funds are to be provided and from where they come.

Madam President, to sum up, I submit that the amendment would restrain Federal interference as absolutely as possible, consistent with a distribution system deliberately calculated to meet the criteria of need and of effort.

Madam President, when speaking on the amendment—and I have spoken on it a number of times—I have found this is the kind of proposal favored by teachers. I have spoken to a number of groups of the American Federation of Teachers, who warmly applauded the proposal. I have spoken to school principals, to school district representatives, and to school boards. Overwhelmingly I have found among the citizens who want improved education, but who are concerned with the possibility that there may be Federal interference, support for my proposal.

Madam President, I yield the floor, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator's amendment, or would the bill at any point if the Senator's amendment is agreed to, actually require that the States use the money for education? Could a State receive the money and use it for some other purpose?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the bill provides there must be a State effort in order to qualify. That State effort is made upon the basis of the relationship between expenditures per pupil and the income of the State, and the record this shows over a preceding 3-year period. In order to continue to qualify for full aid it is necessary that the State continue to make the same effort as the national average. If the national average effort increases, the State must increase its effort at the same rate in order to qualify.

My amendment would not touch that procedure. If the Senator wishes to change or to modify that procedure he is free to do so. My amendment is neutral on that point.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me we ought to be assured on that point. While I have some reservations in respect to the whole average income and needs formula, I certainly think the Senator is to be commended for attempting to find a basis on which to produce a tax return rather than a grant.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, during his testimony before the Subcommittee on Education on March 13, 1961, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] offered a proposal to amend title I of S. 1021 by adding a provision to section 107 to require the Commissioner of Education to determine in each year of the program what percentage of the total individual and corporate Federal income tax collections in each State is represented by the Federal grant payment under title I to the State, as he has explained today. The Senator's proposal would also change some of the language in sections 102 and 103, designated to characterize the Federal payment to States under title I as returns or sharing of income tax collections rather than as Federal grants.

The bill as drawn calls for Federal grants.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has stated that the purpose of his proposal is to strengthen the protection against a potential Federal control of educational policy in the public schools, which he said some people fear might result from the making of Federal grants to the States.

Madam President, I desire to read again section 103 of S. 1021 as it was reported by the committee. Since I am one of the coauthors of the bill, I am very much in favor of this section 103. I think it is a very basic and essential part of the bill.

Section 103 has the title, "Assurance Against Federal Interference in Schools." That is the title in the bill itself.

With the title as to what it means, section 103 reads as follows:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Madam President, we think that language is very much stronger than any language I am able to find in the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, though I have read his amendment over several times this morning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would keep in every single word of the language which is in the bill.

But it would add additional language, which, it seems to me, would reinforce the language of the bill, by providing, in addition to what is in the bill, "since the amounts to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title are a portion of tax payments originating in such State."

What the Senator from Texas has said is correct. The provision is excellent. I say it can be reinforced by giving it substance. It seems to me my amendment would do exactly that.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We feel that if it would reinforce section 103, it would strike a crippling blow at the Federal Government, not only in school questions but all matters.

The amendment would return a share of the income tax collections to the States.

In effect it would establish a proprietary interest of the States in the income tax collected.

The constitutional amendment by which the income tax was authorized states that the Government would levy taxes on individuals without respect to State lines. The constitutional amendment provided graduated income taxes upon the incomes of individuals and corporations without respect to State lines. The amendment would turn back the clock, in effect, by providing that the States should have an interest. We recognize that the State is a unit of the Federal Government.

The amendment is not quite as pointed as that offered by the distinguished junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] a day or two ago this week, but it is still in the same vein since it recognizes some right of the State to have a share of the taxes separate from the duty of the Federal Government to collect taxes from individuals. And then by appropriate laws we would provide for the welfare of the people of the United States.

The determinations called for by the proposed new provision for section 107, of what percentage of tax collections in each State is represented by payments made to such States under title I, would be misleading. Presumably the proposed determinations are intended to state with some accuracy the quantitative relationship between the total amount which the residents of a State pay in Federal income taxes and the amount their State receives in Federal grants under title I. The internal revenue collections reported in the annual report of the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue do not accurately reflect the amount of taxes paid by residents of the various States, since Federal taxes collected in one State may be borne by residents of other States.

A company may have its domicile in New York City. Its pipeline may draw all its resources to that city, where reports are made. It may be making its profits on oil transported from Texas,

Oklahoma, or Kansas, but it pays its income tax in New York. A system of recognizing it by the State in which it is paid does not do justice to the economy and the people who are working to produce and to create the wealth from which the income tax is paid.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is exactly correct. That is why a varying percentage of the tax is returned. As I said, and as the Senator has so well said, the people of Texas, Wisconsin, and North Dakota produce a great deal that ultimately results in a profit or income in other States, and is taxed in that way. My amendment recognizes this circumstance by returning a varying percentage, so that, for example, North Dakota would receive a larger percentage than Nevada, and Texas would receive a larger percentage than some other State, if that other State happens to have a greater per capita income.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But under the Senator's formula, what each State would receive would be the same. The amount of money that would go to any particular State for schools would be the identical amount reported out by the committee. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is exactly correct. It does not touch that point at all.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. But if the principle contained in the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin were moved to other Federal programs, such as social security, it would inevitably lead to an attack on the Federal tax structure, because some States would not receive as much back per capita as other States would receive.

Some States would receive larger amounts because of their depressed school system, while others would pay more taxes, because they would funnel into such areas the productive wealth of the country, the creative power of human beings who work with their hands and brains, which is the source of the wealth of our country. The real source of wealth is the productive capacity of the people, which has been led into certain areas under our economic system. The clock will not be turned back in that respect. With the increase in technology and the scientific advances that are made, which will require tens of millions of dollars to produce one space vehicle, the economic system will probably become more concentrated. Such projects call for a concentration of capital. It will be concentrated in certain places. The money will be funneled into those areas. But soon, under the proposed amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, we would be striking at the root of our income tax system as such tax is presently levied on individuals and corporations, because when States would see the comparative disparate figures in these measures, discontent would be caused in the States where the money is collected. The outcome would not be at all disparate if we consider the productive capacity of the people rather than the wealth of the place where the material is paid for or the checks are issued.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I agree with the Senator's position, and notwithstanding my great affection for the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], I am opposed to his amendment. I should like to ask the Senator this question: Is it not a fact that the bill is an authorization bill and not an appropriation bill, and, so, too, is the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin. It is an authorization amendment. Therefore, the Congress would still be required to appropriate, whether it appropriated under the scheme that the Senator from Wisconsin prescribes or the scheme that is prescribed in the bill. It is tweedle dum and tweedle dee. The minute we must appropriate, no matter what the source of the funds is called, the amendment would invite all the deficiencies the Senator from Texas has spelled out, and would not provide any fundamental or substantive, as we lawyers say, diminution of the control question. Congress must still appropriate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. In response to the question of the Senator from New York, I say he is exactly right.

It would not lower or raise by one penny the amount authorized under the bill. It would not lower by one penny the amount needed to be collected in taxes or raise it either. The amount would depend, as the Senator from New York so well pointed out, on the appropriation.

It is really a battle of semantics. What the amendment would do is to recognize a proprietary interest in the State in income tax collections in that State, which would start a whittling away of the present tax structure of the country, not by changing any amount of money authorized under the bill for any State, not by changing, as it has been so well pointed out by the distinguished senior Senator from New York, what the Appropriation Committees will appropriate or recommend that we appropriate to support schools, but by changing the basic language of the tax structure of the country. That is what it would really do. It would go into the theory of Federal income taxation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are making an excellent argument. But I think they are trying to have it both ways. The Senator from Texas has said that a proprietary right of the States would arise from the amendment, and then he said the amendment would not do anything. The Senator from New York said it would not have any effect. But he also agreed with the Senator from Texas it would give the State an executive proprietary power. It seems to me that the gentlemen have to take it one way or the other. Make up your mind. I agree with your argument when you say the amendment provides unique protection for the State.

It would provide a proprietary right. It would provide protection. I say in this particular instance we have a unique kind of Federal assistance program in which the Federal Government wants to prevent itself, now or in the future, from interference. This is exactly the kind of method by which we should provide this kind of proprietary right, and defend the program against Federal interference.

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I have listened with great interest to the discussion between the distinguished Senator from Texas and the author of the pending amendment. I was rather sympathetic to the thought that every effort should be made to preserve the control of local schools in the States and communities. With section 103 in the bill, I sincerely hope that that would be the true situation. I was hoping I could go along with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], but I do feel that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] have made some points here. I believe the amendment would interfere with future tax collections and have great ramifications for the future. Therefore, I think the Senator from Texas is doing an excellent job in explaining the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas. I serve with him on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, on which the Senator from Kansas serves as the ranking minority member. I have learned from that service with him of his great knowledge of fiscal affairs of the Government and his great concern with the fiscal soundness of our Government and of his knowledge of the civil service of our Government.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield? I would like to refer to Senator Taft's statement on this subject.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is a very fine statement. However, let me state one more fact. We have gotten into this matter of income tax collections. The distinguished Senator from Kansas points this up very clearly.

Income tax collections, for example, reflect only the place where corporations and individuals filed their income tax returns. Returns of corporations must be filed in the internal revenue district of the principal place of business or principal office of the corporation. Only one return is filed even though business activities are conducted in many or all States or even on a nationwide basis. An individual may file his return in the internal revenue district of his residence or principal place of business. Many individuals reside in one State but derive most of their income from other States. Individual income taxes withheld from wages by employers are remitted to the Government by the employer and are tabulated as collections from the district in which the employer is located which may differ from the home district of the employee.

This points up the soundness of the conclusions of the Senator from Kansas.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from New York to call attention to the statement by Senator Taft.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I merely wished to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that Senator Taft, who was a great friend of Federal aid to education, met the same problem we are confronting. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] introduced his views, which Senator Taft uttered in 1949, at page 8218 of the RECORD. Senator Taft said:

> It is based on the supposition that in some way a State has some property right to the taxes collected from sources within its boundaries. If, for one moment, we admit such a principle, the entire Federal financial system will crash, because a State has no such interest. The place where tax moneys are collected has no relationship even to whether people living in that State pay the taxes.

That is the argument that has been so well made by the Senator from Texas.

I believe we are all very sympathetic to the Senator from Wisconsin in his fundamental thrust of what he proposes to accomplish. I hope very much, notwithstanding our differences on his amendment, we will all join together in seeing to it that our purposes are kept clear at every phase, that we do want independence by the school district. However, we are not getting it by the proposed amendment. I differ with the Senator. In my opinion we invite other problems that we do not have to invite, because the appropriation process must be met nonetheless.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, I do not wish to speak against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield time to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. MILLER. I would like to propose an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the amendment is proposed to my amendment, how will the time be allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is required to offer an amendment at this time.

Mr. MILLER. I would rather not offer it before I have a chance to make a few comments.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in my time I will engage in colloquy with the Senator from Iowa for that purpose.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the Senator's indulgence. I am not sure that the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is much more than a matter of a form, without substance. Granting that the proprietary-interest-of-the-State principle is valid, which I understand the amendment is designed to cover, I would make the same comment I made with respect to the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] the other day.

I made the same argument with respect to the provision in the amendment that takes into account the taxes on income of corporations collected within the State, and that the objection is that because the accidental home situs of corporations, as the Senator from South Dakota has pointed out, does not constitute a true test of the proprietary interest of a State. The Senator from South Dakota pointed out the other day that all the corporations doing business in the State of South Dakota, and which derive their income in the State of South Dakota, still file their corporation income tax returns in their home States. That is why this portion of the amendment should be deleted.

Further, on page 3, with respect to the withholding of taxes, the Senator's amendment provides that in considering the proprietary interest of the State, the withholding on the wages of individuals be taken into account. As in the case of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Texas the other day, I believe we should make it clear that this refers to resident individuals, and that the word "resident" should be inserted before the word "individuals." If the Senator would concur in these refinements, I would offer the amendment as an amendment which would incorporate those observations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We can labor this subject for some time, and find all kinds of refinements that should be made to change the amendment. For example, I can visualize a good argument being made for modifying the individual income tax provision, because there are many people who work in New York and obtain all their income there, but who live in Connecticut, or New Jersey, or Pennsylvania.

All of that is taken care of by the fact that there is provided a distribution formula in the bill. I am sure the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky have the same kind of distribution formula in their amendment, which would permit a varying percentage to be returned to the State.

I believe this is far more than a matter of form. It is a matter of real substance, because it would seem to me to make possible for Senators in the future to resist any condition being placed by the Federal Government on aid to education. They could do this by pointing to the legislative history made today, to the action of the Senate if this amendment should pass and the fact that the Senate had made it very clear by the adoption of the amendment, that funds provided in this bill originated in Iowa or originated in Wisconsin. Here is the basis, the reason why the Federal Government shall not condition the distribution of that money.

All kinds of problems are involved, and the Senator's amendment might work out all right. I do feel that I would want to have a little time to study it, and we are proceeding under a time limitation now, and I could not accept the amendment at present. We have worked very hard on the amendment I have offered. It was drafted over a period of several days in consultation with experts.

The amendment was before the committee both in the House and in the Senate. Neither saw any technical defect in it. Because it is a matter of distributing varying percentages, it seems that the amendment, very constructively offered by the Senator from Iowa, would not significantly modify it.

Mr. MILLER. I recognize that an allocation formula may take care of the problem ultimately, but if the Senator is arguing for the proprietary-interest theory, his amendment will be very defective unless the modifications I have suggested are added to it. It does not make sense to provide that because a State is collecting withholding taxes, therefore all of these taxes belong to the State from a proprietary tax standpoint, because there are employees who work in a State and have their taxes withheld in that State but who cross a State border and live in another State, where they file their income tax returns.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator from Iowa wishes to submit a separate amendment along the lines he has suggested, I will enthusiastically support it. However, I believe it would be a mistake to modify my amendment, because I would not have time to study it to determine whether I would be making a technical error. However, I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. MILLER. Then I should like to offer my amendment to the Senator's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Iowa that it is not in order at this time to submit an amendment without unanimous consent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, as I stated, I should be happy to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa if he offered it separately, but not as an amendment to my amendment, because of the technical problem.

Mr. MILLER. I withdraw my amendment.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY WHITE HOUSE OF FORTHCOMING MEETING BETWEEN PRESIDENT KENNEDY AND PREMIER KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, will the distinguished Senator from Texas yield time to me?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, out of my time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Madam President, at 9:20 a.m. I suggested to the Senate that in view of the many reports coming from the foreign press concerning a possible summit conference between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev, it would be most desirable if our own Government were to inform us so that the American press might have definitive information concerning the fact that the President and Mr. Khrushchev were, indeed, about to meet.

At 10:06 a.m. an announcement was made by the White House that such a conference will be held on June 3. This is very fast work. I am glad we got such quick action.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, the Senator from Pennsylvania is to be congratulated on having moved the Governments of the two greatest powers

in the world to act as he requested in less than an hour's time.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator is much pleased.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am much pleased that the Senator from Pennsylvania has been able to move these two Governments in—Will the Senator state the number of minutes again?

Mr. SCOTT. Between 9:20 a.m. and 10:06 a.m.—just about sufficient time for a couple of telephone calls.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The ability of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania to move the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America within 43 minutes to agree upon a date for a meeting between the heads of the two governments is a marvelous accomplishment by the Senator.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened to the remarks by the esteemed Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] concerning the scheduled meeting to be held between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev and the manner of its announcement. The forthcoming meeting will be a resumption of the conferences with Premier Khrushchev which have been held at various times in the past by the former President of the United States, General Eisenhower, and the former Vice President of the United States, Mr. Nixon.

It is my belief, Madam President, that the press of this country is alert and well able to evaluate and publicize such an upcoming event as the anticipated meeting of the President of the United States and the recognized leader of the Soviet Union.

As I commented in the Senate last year in respect to the practice of personal diplomacy by President Eisenhower, "The success or failure of personal diplomacy ultimately rests on an imaginative, flexible foreign policy rooted in the realities of this changing world."

It is my firm conviction that President Kennedy and his advisers are in the process of developing such a policy. It is encouraging to learn that my alert colleague from Pennsylvania will support our President in this time of international tension when such a conference is to be held.

Especially in view of the recent setbacks in Cuba and Laos—resulting from conditions which were well developed before January 20 of this year—it would seem that President Kennedy is the best person to effectively convince Mr. Khrushchev of the determination and resolve of the United States to resist the encroachments of communism.

I would not presume to know the President's specific intentions regarding the announced meeting. Based on our knowledge of past Soviet actions and their use of "summitry," I for one would not hold forth too much optimism for an immediate resolution of international tensions as a result of such a face-to-face conference. But since so much of the destiny of mankind turns upon the point of the decisions of these two men, I would devoutly hope for affirmative results as we work for world peace with justice and honor.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, a mere reading of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin is needed to demonstrate that it does not strengthen the control by the States over their own school systems. The Senator has talked about the opposition to his amendment. The Senator states that this is an illustration of the control of the States over their own educational systems. I point out that it does not do away with the collection by the Federal Government of income taxes. Under the Senator's amendment, the Federal Government will collect the taxes and then pay back to the States a certain percentage of the collection to the States.

If the States were allowed to withhold income taxes, that would further the control by the States. But there is nothing in the amendment to strengthen the control by the States of their own school systems.

That control is assured under section 103. The amendment provides that the income tax will be collected, and then:

> The payment to each State for any fiscal year under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall be considered as a return to such State of a percentage, to be determined by the Commissioner, of the income taxes collected in such State for such year.

The amendment makes a grant to a State and provides that the State shall receive a return of a percentage of its income taxes. It simply recognizes the proprietary right of a State to income taxes, but the safeguards against Federal interference, provided in section 103 of the bill, are not extended one iota by the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is beyond me to understand the argument of the Senator from Texas that there is a proprietary interest recognized in the amendment—which is the very basis that I think justifies resistance to Federal encroachment, when the Senator argues there would be no basis for this resistance.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No; the Senator from Wisconsin says that the Federal Government can collect taxes and pay back under the formula established by it.

The Senator's amendment is an entering wedge, under the proprietary interest, by which a State may later say that it wants a proportionate share of defense contracts, Army posts, and air fields, and will seek to run those requests through its tax structure. Pretty soon there will be a nibbling away at the tax structure. The Senator's amendment relates to the tax structure rather than to the educational structure.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There are many examples within the States including the State of Wisconsin, of income tax sharing which has taken place for many years without any question of a State having the right to redistribute the money and without any question of the right of a locality to spend the money in any way it wished.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I believe the point has been labored sufficiently. I think it is clear that the control by the States of the educational systems is secure under section 103, and that the bill does not extend to the States.

Madam President, I yield the floor. I do not yield back the rest of the time, because the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is engaged in a vital conference in the Committee on Foreign Relations. He may wish to speak on the amendment if he can finish his business in the committee before the agreed time has expired. He may not be back in time. If he cannot return soon, I shall yield back the rest of the time. However, I should like to reserve it for the present, in case the Senator from Oregon finishes his critical work in the committee and can return.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, that puts me in a puzzling position, because it was my understanding that the Senator from Texas suggested that I finish the debate. I have a brief summary which will take but a minute; then I shall be through and the Senate can vote.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are asking a member of the staff of the Senator from Oregon to ascertain whether the Senator can return to the Chamber before the time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, how much time remains on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 13 minutes remaining; the Senator from Oregon, represented by the Senator from Texas, has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. An attempt is now being made to learn whether the Senator from Oregon can come to the Chamber to make his statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, in that case, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I thank the Senator from Texas, the Senator from New York, and all other Senators who have served in my capacity while I was attending a meeting with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, which I was obliged to attend in my

capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

So far as the opposition to the amendment of my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is concerned, I close by saying that this amendment received the careful consideration of our committee. The committee was opposed to the amendment.

In my judgment—and I speak most respectfully—the amendment really is a semantic device for the States exercising a proprietary interest in Federal income taxes. Federal income taxes do not belong to the States. Federal income taxes belong to the Federal Government. As I stated the other day, I think the late Senator Taft answered the proposal completely on May 4, 1949, when he pointed out that they are collected from U.S. citizens, for the fiscal needs of the U.S. Government.

In my judgment, the amendment would emasculate the very foundation of the bill. I sincerely hope that the Senate will support the committee and reject the amendment.

Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, as I told the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Texas, I enthusiastically support the pending bill. I think it is necessary. I think it is the most important domestic legislation which will come before the Congress this year. Nothing the Congress could do would be more important to this country, not only from the standpoint of education and the well-being of our young people, but from the standpoint of national defense, and national growth.

I believe that we must have an aid-to-education bill. I believe that my amendment would greatly assist the passage of the bill in the House, as well as in the Senate.

Furthermore, it would greatly improve prospects for the future. We could move ahead with Federal assistance for education.

I conclude, in response to the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Texas, by saying that there may be a kind of proprietary interest established within the State in the income taxes on the basis of the proposed amendment. If so, what is wrong with it? What is the matter with it? Do we not all recognize that this is one aid program in which the Federal Government should permit some basis for local resistance to Federal encroachment? Everyone says so, over and over again. All I am trying to do is to provide that kind of basis.

Madam President, I hope that all Senators who favor adding substance to section 103 by providing a real basis for local resistance will support my amendment.

I am happy to accept the modification proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], which I have had an opportunity to consider. I think it is technically sound.

Stated very simply, what the modification does is to strike out the reference to corporation income taxes. It also refers to a resident individual, rather than an undefined individual. I think it improves the amendment. It would in no way affect Federal distribution. I think it would improve the bill, so I am happy to accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification of the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to modify the Proxmire amendment by deleting subsection (b)(2)(i) in lines 18, 19, and 20 on page 2, and renumber the remaining sections; also to insert the word "resident" following the word "of", in line 4 on page 3.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the Senator from Wisconsin accepting the modification? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico, [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 73, as follows:

[No. 43]

YEAS—22

Capehart	Johnston	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Stennis
Dworshak	Long, La.	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Fong	Miller	Wiley
Goldwater	Mundt	Young, N.Dak.
Hickenlooper	Proxmire	
Holland	Russell	

NAYS—73

Allott	Carlson	Fulbright
Anderson	Carroll	Gore
Bartlett	Case, N.J.	Hart
Beall	Church	Hartke
Bennett	Clark	Hayden
Bible	Cooper	Hickey
Boggs	Cotton	Hill
Bridges	Curtis	Hruska
Burdick	Dirksen	Humphrey
Bush	Dodd	Jackson
Butler	Douglas	Javits
Byrd, Va.	Ellender	Jordan
Byrd, W. Va.	Engle	Keating
Cannon	Ervin	Kefauver
Kerr	Morton	Scott
Kuchel	Moss	Smith, Mass.
Long, Mo.	Muskie	Smith, Maine
Long, Hawaii	Neuberger	Sparkman
Magnuson	Pastore	Symington
Mansfield	Pell	Williams, N.J.
McCarthy	Prouty	Williams, Del.
McGee	Randolph	Yarborough
Metcalf	Robertson	Young, Ohio
Monroney	Saltonstall	
Morse	Schoeppel	

NOT VOTING—5

Aiken	Chavez	McNamara
Blakley	Gruening	

So Mr. PROXMIRE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Javits-Cooper amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, beginning with line 22, it is proposed to strike out all through line 18 on page 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 104. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and the two succeeding fiscal years, such amounts as may be necessary to pay the States the Federal share of the minimum foundation provided for under the provisions of this title.

MINIMUM FOUNDATION AND FEDERAL SHARE THEREIN

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of this Act, the minimum foundation for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for public elementary and secondary school education in each State shall be the product of the number of public school pupils in such State in the preceding fiscal year multiplied by—

(1) $350 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961;

(2) $375 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962; and

(3) $400 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963.

(b) The Federal share of such minimum foundation allocated to each State for each such fiscal year shall be—

(1) one-third the amount by which such minimum foundation exceeds 4 per centum of the total personal income for such State, or

(2) the product of the number of public school pupils in such State in the preceding fiscal year multiplied by $20, whichever is larger.

(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b), the Federal share allocated to Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, shall be such amount as is determined by the Commissioner to be necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

(d) The Federal share allocated under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only).

(e) For the purpose of this section total personal income of a State for the purpose of determining such State's Federal share

for any fiscal year shall be the average of the total annual personal income of such State for the calendar years ending in the second, third, and fourth preceding fiscal years, according to data available from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is said that hope springs eternal in the human breast. I have discussed the possibility of a time limitation with the distinguished Senators from New York and Kentucky, and with the minority leader. I am prepared at this time, with their approval, to ask unanimous consent that debate on the Cooper-Javits amendment be limited to 4 hours, the time to be divided 2 hours to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, I must object. I announced I would not object to any limiting of debate starting on Monday next, but that I would object to a limitation on debate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator withhold his objection?

Mr. GOLDWATER. There were two time limitations on amendments. This is the third amendment. Then there will be a request for limitation on the next amendment. The two were agreed to, but I object to this proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is great interest in the amendment, and I have received information in regard to a Senator who wishes to be away.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not wish to start a procedure of limiting debate today.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, may I have the attention of the majority leader?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky would like to have the attention of the majority leader.

Mr. COOPER. We have discussed the amendment in the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare many times. I think the committee is familiar with the amendment. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has spoken of the amendment before the Senate. I did so some time ago, when the bill was introduced.

My good friend the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is quite familiar with the amendment, because he is a member of the committee.

We believe we can present our case within a 2-hour limitation. I hope the Senator from Arizona will reconsider and let us finish the debate in 4 hours. We can present our case within that length of time, and we wish to do so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The question was thoroughly discussed yesterday by me and the minority leader. I said that I would not object to a limitation on time starting on Monday, but that I would object to a limitation on time starting today. When I was absent two time limitations were agreed upon. Had I been present I would have objected to those.

I announced to the Senate my intentions on yesterday. I do not think it will take long for the two Senators to present their arguments in support of the amendment. In fact, I intend to support the amendment. I do not intend to speak on it.

I think the Senators can present the case for the amendment ably and easily within whatever time is required for any Senator to leave, if any Senator has an appointment in the next 4 hours or so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, what the Senator from Arizona has said is correct. I repeat, the Senator is not an obstructionist. What I thought was that the Senator's objection had to do with consideration of amendments and the bill. Evidently I was mistaken. We would not have made the proposal last night had we known that was the Senator's desire.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I find no objection to what has taken place, but I do not wish this to become a daylong habit. We have established a precedent. If I allow this request to go through I shall not be true to my objective.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. As I said, I believe the Senator from New York and I can present our case fairly quickly. This is a rather basic amendment to the bill. It goes to the most important part of the bill, to the allocation formula. There is a vast difference between the philosophical approaches of the two concepts, as well as in regard to cost and the whole future Federal aid to education, if a Federal aid to education bill is to be passed.

I hope, in view of our promise to complete our arguments very quickly, that those Senators who are interested will stay in the Chamber to hear our remarks, for whatever they may be worth.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I wish to state what I have already committed, with the consent of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], upon the assumption that we would have a time limitation. I have consented to allow the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] to have the floor on a question of personal privilege for a half hour. I know there are two other Senators who wish to be recognized for insertions in the RECORD.

Therefore, I state the following as the ground rules which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I shall follow. I propose now, with unanimous consent, if it is granted—and I hope it will be—to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] to make insertions in the RECORD; and then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who has assured me that he will not take more than 30 minutes on the question of personal privilege. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I will then hope to hold the floor for as much as an hour and a half, as we require, in order to explain our amendment. We hope very much that the opponents will similarly accommodate themselves to a reasonable time schedule of that kind so that although the distinguished Senator feels that he cannot break his own statement of yesterday, which we thoroughly understand, we may nonetheless, for all practical purposes, have the debate over so that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] can leave in season for his engagement in Kentucky.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] for insertions in the RECORD; and that I may also yield to the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] for independent remarks, which will appear after the debate on our statement, and that I may again regain the floor at the end of the remarks of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the desk.

THE TRUE STATEMENT OF HOW THE PEOPLE OF GONZALES COUNTY HELPED AN INJURED WOMAN WHO NEEDED HOSPITALIZATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, on May 1, 1961, I called to the attention of the Senate a letter from Mr. A. L. Thomas, of Gonzales, Tex., concerning the case of an elderly Gonzales County woman who had suffered serious burns and was needing hospitalization.

That statement is printed on page A2947 of the daily RECORD.

Thereafter, on Tuesday of this week, May 16, there was printed an attack on that insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8134 by the Congressman from Dallas, who happens to be on the opposite side of the aisle from the side of my party.

The case of this lady in Gonzales is an example of the far-reaching problem we are trying to correct through legislation on health care for the aged. It very clearly illustrates the need for a program of prepay health care insurance under which elderly people of modest income can secure the hospital treatment they need.

On April 29, 1961, an appeal to the public to donate funds for hospitalization of Mrs. Louis Muenich was published in a Gonzales, Tex., newspaper, not as an ad, but as a news item. I hold the Gonzales, Tex., clipping in my hand.

I read the story as it appeared in the Gonzales Inquirer of April 29, 1961, under a two-column heading: "Financial Assistance Needed by Severely Burned Woman."

The article read as follows:

A. L. "Gus" Thomas has informed the Inquirer that a Clark Baptist Church community resident, Mrs. Muenich, age 62, was severely burned over a great portion of her body some 5 weeks ago. During the night, clothes caught on fire while she was warming at an open gas stove.

She is in a very critical condition now and needs hospitalization. Contrary to the general belief, there seems to be no local legal setup for caring for such emergencies.

Mrs. Muenich and her husband live alone and are in desperate need of financial aid to put her in a hospital; lack of aid might well be fatal for her.

Neighbors are supplying food and medicine, and doing all they can to take care of Mrs. Muenich, but they admit that their care is not enough. They have started a fund to meet the situation, but they need a lot of help, all financial.

If anyone in the county wishes to help, please bring or send your donation to the Mrs. Willie Smith, special account, at the Gonzales National Bank. Or get it in the hands of any Clark Baptist community resident for Mrs. Smith.

She has volunteered to keep books on donations and expenditures.

Will the citizens of Gonzales County come to the aid of this desperately ill woman?

The family of the injured lady agreed to the publication of this appeal before it was published, which is shown in the affidavits attached to my statement, and which I shall later ask to have printed in the RECORD.

The family met with committees of the community. Members of the family stated that they had no money, and asked for aid. The members of the community said they would appeal for aid if it would meet the relatives' approval. The relatives said, "It meets our approval."

They placed the matter in the paper. After this public appeal was published in the Gonzales Inquirer, I placed in the RECORD of May 1, 1961, a letter account of April 26, 1961, of this case sent to me by Mr. A. L. Thomas, owner of the Gus Thomas Insurance Agency and a reputable citizen of Gonzales. After receiving this letter from Mr. Thomas, I ordered the facts investigated by my Washington staff by long-distance telephone.

Madam President, that point is very important because of the attack which was made on me in the House of Representatives by the Congressman from Dallas, who stated that I put the Thomas letter in the RECORD without any investigation of the facts. We investigated the facts before this letter was printed in the RECORD on May 1. We had communicated by long-distance telephone. We found not only a substantial basis, but a basis so substantial that the paper of Gonzales had, as a public service, printed a public appeal to the people to contribute money for this cause. It was not a paid ad, but a public appeal brought about by a congregation of a church and others asking that something be done for the lady.

After we had the letter and had investigated it by long-distance telephone as well as it could be examined into—we had no hired agents to investigate it, as does the Texas Medical Association—having investigated and becoming convinced of the soundness of the article, and knowing of the article in the paper, and having had it mailed airmail, and having learned that the kindhearted people of Gonzales had donated over $150 to hospitalize this elderly lady, and other facts substantiating the seriousness of the case that we learned orally, in writing, and in the newspapers, and in other ways, I had printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 1, in a responsible manner, the written report of this case.

The attack on this letter in the House of Representatives on May 16, 1961, by the Congressman from Dallas is printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 8134. The affidavits being printed herewith reflect the inaccuracy of many of the contentions of the Texas Medical Association in this case, as is patent from a reading of them. To save time I shall not read all the attacks made by the Texas Medical Association.

The Congressman from Texas put those articles in the RECORD, obtaining some immunity and security, and then having that immunity in the RECORD, last Sunday, May 14, 1961, the Dallas News devoted a full page to an attack on me for having made the insertion in the RECORD on May 1, contending that I placed it in the RECORD without knowing anything about the facts, when the facts are as I stated. We investigated as fully as could be done by long distance telephone. The local newspaper had printed a story about it before we put the insertion in the RECORD. We had made far more investigation than the average Senator can possibly make on materials that come to him through the mail and in the press, because we knew when we mentioned medical aid, we would be attacked. So we investigated first.

Presently I shall introduce a sworn affidavit by the minister of the Clark Community Baptist Church and a number of other concerned people of the Gonzales area who, in a spirit of Christian fellowship, cared for this woman in her hour of need.

This case goes far beyond Clark community and Gonzales County and the State of Texas. It is a matter of national concern, because similar things happen many times each year across the countryside and in some homes of every city in America.

That this case could occur in Gonzales, Tex., is especially significant, for the founders of this proud city fired the first shot in Texas' glorious revolution to win our independence from the dictator, Santa Anna. Texans who live in Gonzales are a proud, upstanding breed of men who believe in the principles of independence, individual dignity, and human rights. They are the kind of Americans who, when their neighbor is sick or down and out, get together and help him if they can.

That is exactly what the good people of Clark community and Gonzales have done in this case. When they found that one of their neighbors had been seriously burned, was without proper nursing care, and needed to be in the hospital, they spent many hours trying to nurse her back to health and finally ended up raising some $200 through public contributions so she could enter the hospital for treatment.

I believe that the people of Gonzales are to be highly commended for their care of this elderly lady. The fact is that with the funds they contributed, the woman was admitted to the hospital in Gonzales and was treated for several days.

The contention is made in these articles that this woman did not need hospitalization. Actually, after the community had raised $150 so that she could get hospitalization, her case became so desperate that she was removed to the John Sealy Hospital in Galveston, one of the Nation's top-ranking medical facilities, where she went under treatment, not only for the severe burns she had sustained, but also for bronchial pneumonia. The people of her community had said, "We are afraid that she will get pneumonia." This has not been stated before this time, but the woman did get pneumonia, and she is now in the John Sealy Hospital in Galveston for treatment for pneumonia.

The pneumonia, which as everyone knows, could be extremely serious or even fatal, apparently was contracted those days that she was at home without professional nursing care and without medical attention for periods of up to 10 days at a time. She is presently under treatment at John Sealy Hospital and public donations are being raised at Gonzales and sent to help meet the costs of her hospitalization there. Thanks to the concerned citizenry of Gonzales, she is getting the care she needs—the health care which should be available to every American.

Madam President, on May 1, I stated to the Senate that this case pointed up many aspects of the problems of assuring health care for elderly citizens. Here is the dilemma in which members of the family of this burn victim found themselves. They did not want charity; they did not intend to take a pauper's oath, but this lady had a very real need for hospital treatment.

The husband has a job in which he earns $25 a week. Because of her burns she was hospitalized on March 30th and stayed in the hospital 5 days. Her hospital bill for 5 days was $69 which almost equals the family income for 3 weeks. Is it any wonder that despite her serious condition that she insists on trying to go home and tough it out alone? How many thousands of other elderly Americans have been forced to the same choice? How many have paid the supreme price for need of funds? Only God, who "notes even a sparrow's fall" knows the answer to these questions.

Madam President, my original purpose in calling this matter to the attention of the Congress was twofold. First, I had hoped that public review of this case might help this elderly person secure hospitalization, and it has done that. Second, I felt the case especially worthy of congressional consideration as we

prepare to take up President Kennedy's proposal for a program of health care for the aged under social security system. These are still my reasons for discussing this matter.

It was not my purpose to be critical of any individual or organization, but instead to strongly urge affirmative action to correct one of the most serious problems confronting elderly Americans. I know that we have many dedicated doctors—and Texas has its share of such men—who daily devote hours of care to people who cannot pay. I know that our doctors and scientists have been the keystone in giving our Nation the greatest advances in medical care of any nation on earth. I congratulate them on their professional and scientific accomplishments. But I believe these are hollow victories to thousands of elderly Texans and millions of Americans who cannot afford modern hospital and nursing care.

In Texas today there are 700,000 persons 65 years of age or older. This is 10 times as many as there were in 1900. This total will climb to 1 million by 1975. Competent studies show that the No. 1 problem facing Texans and other Americans in this age group is how to afford the high costs of medical care at a time in life when they are most likely to be ill and least likely to be able to work.

The same problem confronts comparable numbers of Americans nationally. Until we have a health care program where the great majority of elderly Americans of modest income, as well as the financially fortunate, have the means for decent hospital and nursing care, it is apparent that our society has not kept pace with the remarkable advance of medical science. Under such circumstance, achievement made in the name of humanity is really only progress for the limited numbers who can pay the price.

In bringing this matter up, I find that I have been placed with a very select company of Americans. Last fall when then Senator Kennedy cited the case of an elderly American as a need for the medical care for the aged program, he was attacked by the American Medical Association. A few days ago, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Ribicoff explained the proposed medical care program on television and the American Medical Association charged that he was not telling the truth.

In my own State of Texas, the Texas Medical Association has attacked me in the Texas press for bringing up the Gonzales matter, and charged that I was misinformed. Only this week, one of my colleagues on the Texas congressional delegation from Dallas, rose to the defense of the Texas Medical Association position.

At a cost of time and money that far exceeds what it would have been necessary for the Texas Medical Association to invest to help this injured lady get the medical and hospital care she needed, leaders of the Texas Medical Association have widely circulated news releases and articles charging that I did not investigate or know the facts of the case, and the president of the Texas Medical Association, Dr. Harvey Renger, has mailed letters to many Members of both Houses of the Congress attacking me for placing the Thomas letter in the RECORD. Dr. Renger's charge that I failed to investigate before placing the Thomas letter in the RECORD is untrue.

I mention that point because I hold in my hand a copy of a letter which Dr. Renger, president of the Texas Medical Association, on the stationery of the association, sent to Members of the House. I also hold in my hand a copy of a letter which Dr. Renger sent to Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia. I have spoken to a number of other Senators who also have received letters. Other Senators did not receive the letter. I talked to some Senators who apparently had not seen the letter, or a least I do not know whether they had received it, but they told me that they had a standing rule in their office that all letters attacking another Senator be thrown in the wastebasket. There is one paragraph in the letter which was mailed to me that was not included in the letter sent to Senator RANDOLPH, which I should like to quote. It is contained in the letter that Dr. Renger, president of the Texas Medical Association, mailed to me and mailed to other Members of the Senate and to Members of the House. He concludes with this paragraph:

> I know of no other community in Texas where the birthplace of the truth can better originate than in Gonzales, Tex. As you know, it was there that the first shot was fired by a group of freedom-loving people who began a long, hard struggle toward seeking their independence as Texans.

I thoroughly agree with the president of the Texas Medical Association that the truth might well originate in Gonzales. In this case it would not hurt the president of the Texas Medical Association to take a little bit of that truth over to his hometown, and he could deposit a little bit of the truth at the headquarters of the Texas Medical Association in Austin, where this letter originated. As a matter of fact, I do not even know whether the doctor sent the letter himself. It was mailed at the State Medical Association headquarters, in Austin, Tex.

Let me make it absolutely clear that my staff made very careful inquiry into this matter before I brought the case to the attention of the Senate. We followed up since then by making almost daily inquiry into various facts and whether the TMA knows it or not, or likes it or not, we have the truth in this matter.

Among other statements my colleague on the House side presented was a letter signed by Dr. Harvey Renger, president of the TMA, which cited the TMA's alleged factfinding in the case and reached the conclusion:

> I have been assured that this lady was not, in any way, neglected because of the lack of medical or hospital care.

Madam President, I have here a group of seven statements, sworn to under oath, voluntarily made by a young Baptist minister and several members of his congregation, and others who saw that this elderly lady needed hospitalization, and they saw to it that this woman received hospitalization. These statements were not drawn by a lawyer or publicist working with some high powered lobby group or any employee of mine. They are honest, sincere statements of fact written by the people of Gonzales, which bare the truth of this case, and the truth, I regret to say, is not pleasant or pretty to those who attacked Mr. Thomas' letter to me. But it is true, and the thing that these people did in coming to the aid of this injured lady at Gonzales was right and decent and in the highest tradition of Christian conscience. At this point, I will read excerpts from these affidavits, and at the close of my statement I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in full in the body of the RECORD.

I read from an affidavit by Mrs. A. L. Thomas, one of the neighbors:

> On Saturday afternoon, April 29, 1961, I visited the home of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Muenich. I met Rev. Stanley White, the pastor of the Clark Baptist Church, and Mrs. Evelyn Criswell, of Victoria, Tex., a daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Muenich.
>
> Mrs. Criswell said that she had never seen her mother in that condition, that she was a very jolly person and usually was talking and laughing, where at that time she was lying so quiet and motionless with her eyes closed and seemingly not aware of anything. Reverend White and Mrs. Criswell discussed the fact that they thought that she was in a state of shock.
>
> Mrs. Muenich had a deep chest cough and it was very apparent that she was in pain from the coughing. Mrs. Criswell said that her mother had said that she could never sleep on her stomach, but since she was burned she had had to lie on her stomach and she was not able to turn on either side or her back because of the burns—

The affidavit showed she was burned on her back—

> The sheet on her bed was pinned to a chair on either side of the bed and at the foot of the bed so that it would not touch her body any place. The weather had turned cool because it was raining and the daughter was worried that her mother would take more cold, and there was no way to cover her to get her warm. She had a blanket over the upper part of her body and on her arms—

That was her condition when the president of the Texas Medical Association said she was getting good care, but she was living in an unheated house—

> The nature of Mr. Louis Muenich's work detained him for hours away from the house and it was very apparent that Mrs. Muenich was in no condition to be left alone for hours.
>
> Mr. Muenich could not prepare her food even though he managed to cook some for himself. The neighbors took food and clothing for her. The water supply was not fit for human consumption and the neighbors carried water there every day, for drinking and bathing purposes.
>
> Mrs. Criswell said that she (her mother) had not had a drink of water that day, but because it was rather cool she had managed to get by, but if the next day were hot she didn't know how she would do without water. Mrs. Smith told her that she had brought water that day and for her to drink of it and she (Mrs. Smith) would bring more water the next day—

Madam President, this is the testimony concerning the injuries the woman received. Yet the president of the Texas Medical Association said the injuries were trivial—

> The burns on her back looked like the burned bark of a tree, and the daughter said

her mother cried when she had to treat the burned area. The treatment consisted of applying a wet towel (soaked in a salt and epsom salts solution) to the burned area for an hour and then removing it, at which time some of the scabs would come off.

Mrs. Muenich's feet were black on the bottom because of walking on the bare floor; she was sleeping in the only bed in the house. There was no heat in her bedroom, and her daughter was afraid that she would develop pneumonia because so many of the nights are cold.

My impression of a situation of this kind is that she was in no condition to stay alone for hours, and without bathroom facilities I believe she could easily become infected—

When the Dallas News printed the article, it said the woman had a chest or a lung condition. The Dallas News did not tell the public that she had to be carried to the John Sealy Hospital, in Galveston, on an emergency basis, suffering from bronchial pneumonia, the very ailment her neighbors feared she had.

Every word of what I am reading is contained in voluntary affidavits made before a notary public—

A person just out of a chickenhouse is not clean and sterile enough to take care of a person in Mrs. Muenich's condition, even if he knew how to do, but a person in her condition should have constant professional care in a hospital where cleanliness is prevalent.

Madam President, Mrs. Willie Smith, another person who helped to take care of Mrs. Muenich, went to bed with nervous prostration and had to be sent to a hospital, because Mrs. Muenich's illness had placed such a burden on her and the other good neighbors who took care of her.

A spokesman for the Texas Medical Association, the president, who said the medical care was so excellent, has taken the position that the folks who helped out were not doctors and did not know the victim's condition; and that, therefore, they were not in a position to judge whether Mrs. Muenich might develop pneumonia. However, she did develop pneumonia, and those good neighbors knew enough about it to know that Mrs. Muenich's condition was dangerous—

The care and everything that the friends and neighbors have given Mrs. Muenich I feel sure saved her life, but those people are at their rows end. It was impossible for them to continue the care that they had been giving her. Mrs. Willie Smith went to bed of nervous prostration after Mrs. Muenich was placed in the hospital—

Madam President, the spokesman for the TMA, who is convinced this lady's medical care was so fine, has taken the position that these folks who helped out were not doctors and did not know the victim's condition. I think it pertinent to note that Mrs. Smith and most of the others were extremely concerned for fear that the patient would catch pneumonia and thereby become increasingly ill. In view of the fact that Mrs. Muenich has been under treatment for bronchial pneumonia at John Sealy Hospital since then, it seems clear that they had a reasonable understanding of what they were doing.

The following are excerpts from the statement by Rev. Stanley E. White, pastor of the Clark Baptist Church:

Mr. and Mrs. Muenich are an elderly couple that live in the community where I am pastor. Customarily, I picked them up for church services on Sunday night, and Mr. and Mrs. Willie Smith bring them home from services.

Mrs. Smith then informed me that Mrs. Muenich was in the hospital suffering from a severe burn. I went immediately to the hospital to visit her.

April 9, I heard that she was improving and was much better, and had been released from the hospital.

On April 23, I went to the Muenich home to see of what assistance I might be. When I arrived, Mrs. John Ball was attending her, while Mr. Ball had carried Mr. Muenich to town for groceries. After a few minutes Mr. Ball returned with Mr. Muenich and some groceries, with some sheets that had been carried on top of some straw in the back of the pickup, in which a cow had been hauled to market the day before.

Madam President, I am reading from the affidavit of the Reverend Stanley E. White, pastor of the Clark Baptist Church, who led the neighbors in seeking help for Mrs. Muenich, when they requested his aid. His statement shows that Mrs. Muenich's condition was so bad that one of the neighbors came into the church during the church service, and the service was suspended, to enable the whole community to talk about what they could do to get hospitalization for the woman.

The pastor of the church voluntarily signed his affidavit. He narrates his visits to Mrs. Muenich day after day at her home, to see what assistance he could give her. He said:

Mr. Muenich informed me that his wife needed to go to Galveston to John Sealy Hospital for treatment—

That was for the bad burns—

but he did not know when she would be admitted. I, believing that it was an emergency case, called Dr. Shelby, and he told me that it was not an emergency case, and that all was being done that was necessary for her health.

Seeing that we could get no help here in getting her in a hospital immediately, we sought local aid on account of her condition. I felt that at least someone of professional medical knowledge should investigate her case every few days, to see that she was kept clean and that the burns were not becoming infected.

Before evening services, I came by to visit and Mrs. Smith was there She had taken Mrs. Muenich's temperature, and it was 101 fever.

In their statements, they said the fever never rose above 99, but the preacher was there, and he saw Mrs. Muenich's temperature being taken—

Mrs. Muenich had friends and relatives in the home at this time. We and they thought it necessary that a doctor be consulted on account of this temperature; since it was near time for services, I advised Mrs. Smith to call Dr. Shelby, while I went on to church. Between training union and church, Mrs. Smith came in, and said that she could not get Dr. Shelby since he was out of town, but that she had gotten Dr. Sievers, but that he couldn't advise over the phone, but that he would come out immediately. She was to meet him at the church turnoff to show him where the Muenich's lived, so she left the church and went to wait for him.

When services were nearly over, Mrs. Smith returned to church. Since everyone was greatly concerned, we asked her what the doctor said. The doctor would not comment, but said that she needed some antibiotics which he made out a prescription for, and left some samples for her to take that night. After church, we discussed what we might do as a community to help Mrs. Muenich in her present situation. A group of our men were going to try to get a nurse to come and attend to her, once or twice a week, until she could be admitted to a hospital. I had to leave to go to Fort Worth and did not get to stay and go with the men the next day as they went to try to find help.

When I return the next weekend, I found that our community had taken up a donation among themselves of approximately $60 but that no aid was given by the Red Cross or the welfare.

Sunday, April 30, Mrs. Smith told me at church that when she came by Mrs. Muenich's that morning, that the daughter was somewhat disturbed because her mother had had a very bad night; she had a bad cough and a temperature of 101, and her legs were swollen, and that she was developing bed sores. She called Dr. Shelby and he came out.

The other son-in-law came out from Gonzales, and I counseled with them concerning the care that Mrs. Muenich needed. They said they were willing to accept help, from whosoever cared to help. By this time an article had come out in the paper, and the people were responding to the plea for help. I assured them that we would help all we could, and that was our sole purpose as it should be any Christian's purpose.

Upon returning to the field May 6, I found that there was some friction from the doctor, and that he had stated that his medical assistance has been questioned. I called him up on the phone to get the more detailed account of Mrs. Muenich's case as she was back in the hospital now, and to see why he thought his profession had been questioned. He said that all the articles in the papers were unnecessary, but I told him that had not these articles appeared, Mrs. Muenich would not have received the assistance that she needed.

Madam President, there is an affidavit lending weight to Reverend White's conclusion that this lady would not have gotten immediate hospitalization had it not been for the newspaper article. In a sworn statement, Mr. Thomas, who first called this matter to my attention, relates that he was called to the office of the Gonzales newspaper.

After the article was published in the Gonzales newspaper, some persons protested, but the editor said the letter had been printed in the newspaper because it had been written voluntarily by the neighbors.

The doctor objected to the article which was published in the newspaper on Saturday, April 29, suggesting it was only for the purpose of supporting Mrs. Louis Muenich, the burn victim, in the hospital. Dr. Shelby is the doctor who objected so violently to the article.

Mr. Thomas stated under oath:

Dr. David Shelby was there with Mr. Ed. Reese, publisher, and Mr. Robert McKenney, the editor. The doctor objected to an article run in the paper Saturday, April 29, 1961, soliciting funds for the purpose of

supporting Mrs. Muenich, burn victim, in a hospital. * * * Dr. Shelby admitted to Mr. Reese and me that if it had been our wives who had been burned, that they would be in a hospital from the first day, and would still be there. But he told us that Mrs. Muenich was not used to the same environment, consequently, she did not require hospitalization like our wives; further, that she would do all right in the crude setup where she resided.

That is the very thing which was protested. If a person has enough money, he can get adequate medical care. However, the doctor said that Mrs. Muenich was not used to the environment of the wives of Mr. Reese, Mr. McKenney, and Dr. Shelby, so she did not need such treatment—

Mr. Reese said that the paper had not run the fund-soliciting article to hurt anyone, but only to help Mrs. Muenich. * * * Mr. Reese then asked me how the money was coming in. I told him that over $150 had come in and more would be needed. I also said that I had not intended any hurt to anyone or any organization; that my only concern was to help get Mrs. Muenich in a hospital where she could receive professional care.

The colloquy between the publisher and the doctor is revealing—

Mr. Reese then said that we all want the money to keep coming in, "Don't we, Doctor?" The doctor said, "Yes; we want the money to keep coming in."

That was the question put to the doctor, when he went there to protest the editorial. The doctor said, "Yes, we want the money to keep coming in"; and he kept after it until more than $200 had been raised.

Affidavit after affidavit tells of the condition of the woman and of the visits by the neighbors who looked after Mrs. Muenich.

Madam President, the money did "keep coming in" from the good people of Gonzales until it reached approximately $200. Thanks to these public-spirited contributions this lady was hospitalized.

The following is an excerpt from the affidavit of Mr. Willie Smith, one of those neighbors who led the effort to see Mrs. Muenich had hospital care:

I and a neighbor arranged the next day (Tuesday) to place her in a local hospital; I talked to the head nurse and told her about the money; the other man called a doctor and talked to him; the nurse also told me that she would call the doctor, to tell him. That evening after work, we called an ambulance and had her taken to the hospital; my wife and I both went in with her. The hospital was prepared for her, and took her right in. My wife went to see her at the hospital on Wednesday and the following Monday. She went Tuesday to see her, and she was gone, and nobody could tell her where or why. That same evening I called on Mr. Muenich and told him that his wife was not at the hospital; he called the doctor while I was there, and the doctor told him on the phone that his son-in-law had taken her to Galveston that day.

The next morning the son-in-law called my wife and told her that he had taken Mrs. Muenich to the hospital at Galveston in an ambulance; that he had learned that there would be a $3 per day charge at Galveston. She told him that the money had quit coming in; that the local bills would be taken care of first, and additional bills would just have to wait.

After having, in the beginning, been unable to get here in a hospital, we are very happy that she is now in the hospital at Galveston, where we are sure she will have the proper professional care.

Madam President, Smith's wife, Mrs. Lillie Smith, a member of the Clark Baptist Church, and the neighbor who personally worked hard and long trying to care for Mrs. Muenich, states:

Several neighbors helped make arrangements to get her in the hospital, and early that evening the ambulance came for her. I went with her to the hospital.

Wednesday I went by the hospital to see her, and then again on the following Monday I visited her in the hospital. On Tuesday when I went to see her she had been moved and nobody there could give me any information as to her whereabouts. However, the secretary had a bill ready and it was given to me. The following is the bill: May 2, 1961, to May 9, 1961, room and nursing service $70, dressing $5; drugs $26.60; X-ray $10; laboratory $5, making a total of $116.60 which I have paid out of the donations made by the people.

They gave the neighbor the bill when she came in to see the lady—

The next day the son-in-law called me and told me that he had taken her to Galveston in an ambulance. He told me that he learned that there is a $3 a day charge at Galveston.

Madam President, as I said earlier, the complete text of these and other affidavits will be placed in the RECORD immediately following my statement.

In summation, to those who are determined to block the health care plan for the aged at all costs, let me set the facts in the RECORD:

First. This elderly lady from Gonzales County has been under treatment for bronchial pneumonia as well as her burns in John Sealy Hospital. I daresay not a single doctor or Congressman, Republican or Democrat, would tolerate a member of his family only having such nursing and medical care this lady had under such conditions.

Second. She is receiving competent hospital care and much more medical attention today, not as a result of anything the TMA did, but as a result of action and donations of her neighbors and friends in Clark community and Gonzales county, and particularly the church congregation.

In closing, let me say that in sincere defense of the majority of our doctors in Texas, most of them are devoted, capable, sincere men just as are most of our physicians and surgeons across the Nation. But while they have generally turned their intellect and energies to the advancement of medical science and the benefit of mankind, they have sometimes allowed professional propagandists and reactionary radicals to seize control of their organizations and turn them into propaganda machines.

The people of Gonzales County who worked and contributed funds for the care of the elderly lady I have discussed here today had no profit motive. They did not stand to gain a dime in any sort of fee, and some of them invested part of their own income, which is meager compared to that of most physicians. But for their efforts they found the strength of the TMA arrayed against them. It is inconceivable to me that the majority of doctors who support such tactics, and I earnestly hope that members of the TMA will take a careful look at this matter and support a health care plan for the aged under the social security system.

There are certain affidavits by members of the family, printed in the RECORD on May 16, showing that they did not agree to this arrangement. The circumstances I am about to mention were not covered in Mrs. Willie Smith's affidavit of May 10. Mrs. Willie Smith said the son-in-law, Mr. Wachtendorf, was very obnoxious, and told Mr. Muenich to get a shotgun and run the Baptists, Methodists, and Catholics—good neighbors who were helping out—off the place before he lost his job. The owner of the chickenhouses did not particularly like the neighbors coming in and helping this lady. So Wachtendorf told his father-in-law to get a shotgun and "run those Baptists and Methodists and Catholics off the place" before he lost his job.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD affidavits in support of the foregoing statement in proof of the real situation at Gonzales that has existed in this case. They are:

No. 1, the affidavit of Mrs. A. L. Thomas, dated May 9, 1961;

No. 2, the affidavit of Rev. Stanley E. White, pastor of Clark Baptist Church, dated May 14, 1961;

No. 3, the affidavit of Mrs. Lillie Smith, dated May 14, 1961;

No. 4, No. 5, and No. 6, three separate and duly sworn affidavits by Mr. Willie Smith, the sworn statements Nos. 4 and 5 are dated May 10, 1961, and affidavit No. 6 was made May 11, 1961;

No. 7, the affidavit of Mr. A. L. Thomas, dated May 9, 1961.

Also, the four other affidavits which are identified.

There being no objection, the affidavits were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To Whom It May Concern:

On Saturday afternoon, April 29, 1961, I visited in the home of Mr. and Mrs. Louis Muenich. I met Rev. Stanley White, the pastor of the Clark Baptist Church, and Mrs. Evelyn Criswell, of Victoria, Tex., a daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Muenich.

Mrs. Criswell said that she had never seen her mother in that condition, that she was a very jolly person and usually was talking and laughing, where at that time she was laying so quiet and motionless with her eyes closed and seemingly not aware of anything. Reverend White and Mrs. Criswell discussed the fact that they thought that she was in a state of shock.

Mrs. Muenich had a deep chest cough and it was very apparent that she was in pain from the coughing. Mrs. Criswell said that her mother had said that she could never sleep on her stomach, but since she was burned she had had to lay on her stomach and she was not able to turn on either side or her back because of the burns. The sheet

on her bed was pinned to a chair on either side of the bed and at the foot of the bed so that it would not touch her body any place. The weather had turned cool because it was raining and the daughter was worried that her mother would take more cold, and there was no way to cover her to get her warm. She had a blanket over the upper part of her body and on her arms.

Mrs. Muenich was not able to sit down therefore she had to stand up to eat. There were no modern facilities in the house.

The daughter was worried because she was not able to stay and take care of her mother because of her own little family in Victoria.

The nature of Mr. Muenich's work detained him for hours away from the house and it was very apparent that Mrs. Muenich was in no condition to be left alone for hours.

Mr. Muenich could not prepare her food even though he managed to cook some for himself. The neighbors took food and clothing for her. The water supply was not fit for human consumption and the neighbors carried water there every day, for drinking and bathing purposes.

Mrs. Criswell said that she had not had a drink of water that day, but because it was rather cool she had managed to get by, but if the next day were hot she didn't know how she would do without water. Mrs. Smith told her that she had brought water that day and for her to drink of it and she (Mrs. Smith) would bring more wate. the next day.

The burns on her back looked like the burned bark of a tree and the daughter said her mother cried when she had to treat the burned area. The treatment consisted of applying a wet towel (soaked in a salt and epsom salt solution) to the burned area for an hour and then removing it, at which time some of the scabs would come off.

Mrs. Smith had previously told the daughter that money was being raised to put her mother in the hospital, and she was so appreciative and thanked us for doing so much for her mother and she said some very nice things about Mrs. Smith and the friends who had been visiting and bringing food, clothing, and supplies of every kind.

She said that her father (Mr. Muenich) was so happy that it was going to be possible for Mrs. Muenich to go to the hospital where she could have proper medication and care.

While we were there Mr. Muenich came in from the chickenhouse and he was very pleased that we were there and that we were interested in doing for Mrs. Muenich.

Mrs. Muenich's feet were black on the bottom because of walking on the bare floor; she was sleeping in the only bed in the house. There was no heat in her bedroom and her daughter was afraid that she would develop pneumonia because so many of the nights are cold.

My impression of a situation of this kind is that she was in no condition to stay alone for hours, and without bathroom facilities I believe she could easily become infected.

A person just out of a chickenhouse is not clean and sterile enough to take care of a person in Mrs. Muenich's condition, even if he knew how to do it. Mr. Muenich was doing all he knew how to do, and was able to do with the time that he had, but a person in her condition should have constant professional care in a hospital where cleanliness is prevalent.

The care and everything that the friends and neighbors have given Mrs. Muenich I feel sure has saved her life, but those people are at their row's end it was impossible for them to continue the care that they had been giving her. Mrs. Willie Smith went to bed of nervous prostration after Mrs. Muenich was placed in the hospital.

STATE OF TEXAS:
County of Gonzales, ss:

I, Mrs. A. L. Thomas, the undersigned, being duly sworn, do depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May 1961.

Mrs. A. L. THOMAS,
(S) A. L. Thomas,
Notary Public.

To Whom It May Concern:

I, Stanley E. White, give the following information as to be the truth from my viewpoint, in the case concerning Mrs. Louis Muenich.

Mr. and Mrs. Muenich are an elderly couple that live in the community where I am pastor. Customarily I picked them up for church services on Sunday night, and Mr. and Mrs. Willie Smith bring them home from services. Such was the case Sunday, March 19, 1961.

Saturday when I returned from seminary, which would be April 1; I returned to the field and visited the Smiths, asking about Mrs. Muenich, since she was reported sick and did not come to services March 26. Mrs. Smith then informed me that she was in the hospital suffering from a severe burn. I went immediately to the hospital to visit her.

The following Saturday, April 9, I heard that she was improving and was much better, and had been released from the hospital. I did not visit her this time, or the following Saturday, April 16, because she was staying in town, and I was well occupied by visiting in the immediate community.

On April 23, I visited Toney Brietschopfs; upon arriving they immediately told me of Mrs. Muenich's return home and that she was in serious condition. I went to the Muenich home to see of what assistance I might be. When I arrived, Mrs. John Ball was attending her, while Mr. Ball had carried Mr. Muenich to town for groceries. Mrs. Muenich was resting; Mrs. Ball stated that she had not rested very good the night before. After a few minutes Mr. Ball returned with Mr. Muenich and some groceries, with some sheets that had been carried on top of some straw in the back of the pickup, in which a cow had been hauled to market the day before.

Mr. Muenich informed me that his wife needed to go to Galveston to John Sealy Hospital for treatment, but he did not know when she would be admitted. Seeing these circumstances, I, with Toney Brietschopf, went to Judge Romberg's office this same day, April 22, to see if he could do anything to speed up the application to get her in the Galveston Hospital. Mrs. Romberg said that she had talked to Dr. Shelby, and that this was not an emergency case, therefore there was nothing that they could do. I, believing that it was an emergency case, called Dr. Shelby from the judge's office; the doctor told me that it was not an emergency case, and that all was being done that was necessary for her health.

Seeing that we could get no help in getting her in a hospital immediately, we sought local aid on account of her condition. I felt that at least someone of professional medical knowledge should investigate her case every few days, to see that she was kept clean and that the burns were not becoming infected. We went to the welfare office, hoping to get funds for this service. It being Saturday, the office was closed. We then went to the home of the welfare manager and he was out of town visiting relatives. We then came home in defeat as far as getting aid of any sort.

On Sunday morning before services, I went by to check with Mrs. Muenich again. Mr. Muenich was attending chickens and she was resting, so I did not get to go in. That afternoon immediately before evening services, I came by to visit and Mrs. Smith was there. She had taken her temperature, and it was 101 fever. Mrs. Muenich had friends and relatives in the home at this time. We and they thought it necessary that a doctor be consulted on account of this temperature; since it was near time for services, I advised Mrs. Smith to call Dr. Shelby, while I went on to church. Between training union and church, Mrs. Smith came in, and said that she could not get Dr. Shelby, since he was out of town, but that she had gotten Dr. Sievers, but that he couldn't advise over the phone, but that he would come out immediately. She was to meet him at the church turnoff to show him where the Muenichs lived, so she left the church and went to wait for him.

When services were nearly over, Mrs. Smith returned to church. Since everyone was greatly concerned, we asked her what the doctor said The doctor would not comment, but said that she needed some antibiotics which he made out a prescription for, and left some samples for her to take that night. After church, we discussed what we might do as a community to help Mrs. Muenich in her present situation. A group of our men were going to try to get a nurse to come and attend to her, once or twice a week, until she could be admitted to a hospital. I had to leave to go to Fort Worth and did not get to stay and go with the men the next day as they went to try to find help.

When I returned the next weekend, I found that our community had taken up a donation among themselves of approximately $50, but that no aid was given by the Red Cross or the welfare. However, a nurse did come out during the week to bathe Mrs. Muenich and change her bed; she did not charge for this. This was April 24, I was informed. Also another nurse came April 26; she did not charge. Then on Friday, three ladies came and ministered to her. Upon going to Mrs. Muenich's home on April 29, I found that the daughter from Victoria was there, attending her mother. She said that the reason she had not come down before was that husband had been out of work, and that their car was not in shape to go out of town. I told her that we were doing all that we could do but that this did not seem to be enough. I asked her and Mr. Muenich if it would be all right, if we sought the aid of the people of the town through the newspaper; they both said that this was all right. I informed them that the purpose of this was to raise funds to enable them to put Mrs. Muenich back in the hospital. Her daughter agreed that she was not getting sufficient care at home.

Sunday, April 30, Mrs. Smith told me at church, that when she came by Mrs. Muenich's that morning, that the daughter was somewhat disturbed, because her mother had had a very bad night; she had a cough and a temperature of 101, and her legs were swollen, and that she was developing bed sores. She called Dr. Shelby and he came out. That evening, I visited in the home and found that Mr. Muenich's brother from Shiner was there. The daughter said she had to go back to Victoria, and that they were not financially able themselves to assist.

The other son-in-law came out from Gonzales, and I counseled with them concerning the care that Mrs. Muenich needed. They said they were willing to accept help, from whosoever cared to help. By this time an article had come out in the paper, and people were responding to the plea for help. I assured them that we would help all that we could, and that was our sole purpose as it should be any Christian's purpose. There was some friction in the immediate family, which was somewhat per-

sonal, and I do not feel it necessary to discuss at this time, but these differences were ironed out, and I was able to go back to Fort Worth Sunday night feeling sure that everything was being taken care of, since the Muenich's were receiving help from the people of this county.

Upon returning to the field May 6, I found that there was some friction from the doctor, and that he had stated that his medical assistance had been questioned. I called him up on the phone to get the more detailed account of Mrs. Muenich's case as she was back in the hospital now, and to see why he thought his profession had been questioned. He said that all the articles in the paper were unnecessary, but I told him that had not these articles appeared, Mrs. Muenich would not have received the assistance that she needed. I told him that all of us were at fault to some degree, possibly because we could not get full cooperation from Mrs. Muenich and her family. We were prone to think they did not want help, but when they realized the seriousness of their condition, they wanted our help desperately. From this point on, it is hoped that no more friction arises, because our primary concern has been Mrs. Muenich, and she is now in the hospital at Galveston.

STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales, ss:

I, Stanley E. White, the undersigned being duly sworn, do depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of May 1961.

STANLEY E. WHITE.

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Lillie Smith. I live in the Clark Community near Gonzales, Tex. The Louis Muenich family, husband and wife, moved into the community about 8 months ago. After they moved here we took them to church quite often on Sunday nights.

About March 20, 1961, Mrs. Muenich was badly burned on the back, one night while she was warming at an open fire. About 1 week later someone reported that she had been burned and was there without medical help. On March 28 she was taken to her son-in-law's in Gonzales; a doctor was called out to see her. On March 30 she was taken to the hospital where she remained until April 4, she then returned to her son-in-law's house where she remained until April 19.

On April 19 she was brought back to her husband's house via station wagon by the son-in-law. I happened to see her in the station wagon. The son-in-law said they had been to see the doctor and he was bringing her back home to her husband.

The next day I saw Mrs. Muenich at her house and saw her burns. I did what I could for her. She did not have any medicine. The next day I went to see her doctor and I asked the doctor if she did not need some medicine. I mentioned the medicine to relieve pain, and I had in mind infection also. The doctor asked if Mrs. Muenich had mentioned any pain, I said "No" because she just lay there and said nothing. Then I asked him if he thought that she could lay there in those conditions and get well. He admitted that it looked hopeless. Then he indicated that he had applied for her admittance to Galveston Hospital. Then I asked if I could give her aspirin and he said it would be all right if I wanted to.

On April 23, she was running temperature and being worried. I called for a doctor to ask him what to do. He was out of town and the secretary-nurse could not advise me. Later that day I called another doctor and he came out immediately. He left antibiotics for her to take, and also left a prescription to be filled the next day.

On April 24 I brought a nurse out to bathe Mrs. Muenich and change her bed. I took the nurse back to town. I had gathered up the clothes that she had been using and while I was in town I went to the Washateria and washed and dried them.

On April 26, I brought another nurse for the same reason. On the 28th this nurse brought two ladies with her to help her bathe and care for her.

On the 29th Mrs. Muenich's daughter came from Victoria. She was worried about her mother's cough which was worse, and she called a doctor on the 30th. He came out and left a prescription for cough medicine.

I discussed the case with the daughter and told her that I couldn't take care of her mother as I was exhausted and had so many responsibilities of my own that I had been neglecting, and she told me that she could not stay. Then I told her that the friends and neighbors had taken up some money to help her mother, and we discussed putting her in the hospital. The husband and daughter agreed that the hospital would be the best place for her. The daughter told me that she would ask the doctor about putting her in the hospital. I later heard that the doctor did not think that she needed to be in a hospital, someone could take care of her at her home.

The daughter went home on Sunday. Monday morning I went by and took her temperature, she still had temperature and also her cough was no better. I picked up the prescription that the doctor had left the day before and took it to town and had it filled. Later that day I took it to her and gave her the first dose.

Several neighbors helped make arrangements to get her in the hospital, and early that evening the ambulance came for her. I went with her to the hospital.

Wednesday I went by the hospital to see her, and then again on the following Monday I visited her in the hospital. On Tuesday when I went to see her she had been moved and nobody there could give me any information as to her whereabouts. However the secretary had a bill ready and it was given to me. The following is the bill: May 2, 1961, to May 9, 1961, room and nursing service $70; dressing $5; drugs $26.60; X-ray $10; laboratory $5 making a total of $116.60 which I have paid out of the donations made by the people.

The next day the son-in-law called me and told me that he had taken her to Galveston in an ambulance. He told me that he learned that there is a $3 a day charge at Galveston.

I told him that the donations had stopped coming in since there had been public controversy about the case, and it remained to be seen how much money would be left after the local hospital bill was paid.

STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales:

I, Lillie Smith, the undersigned, being duly sworn, do depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

Susbcribed and sworn to before me this 14th day of May 1961.

LILLIE SMITH,
A. L. THOMAS,
Notary Public.

To Whom It May Concern:

Saturday morning, April 29, 1961, after some 3 weeks of fruitless efforts by myself, my wife, and some 30 members of the Clark Baptist Church community to obtain hospitalization for Mrs. Louis Muenich, who was severely burned approximately March 24, 1961, I went to the Gonzales Inquirer with A. L. Thomas and talked to the editor, Mr. Robert McKinney. I explained the situation to him and asked him to run an article asking for donations to help put Mrs. Muenich in a hospital. He ran the article that afternoon.

Donations came in liberally Monday to a special account at a local bank, reaching $150. That night several members of the Clark community agreed that there was enough money on hand to immediately take Mrs. Muenich to a hospital. We called on the Muenichs Monday night, and Mr. Muenich agreed that we should make arrangements to hospitalize her the next day.

Tuesday morning, May 2, I went to Holmes Hospital, saw Mrs. Fox, the head nurse, told her that we had money coming in and wished to get Mrs. Muenich in the hospital immediately, and that I would guarantee payment of her bill. Mrs. Fox told me to bring her right in when we were ready, and that she could call Dr. Shelby. I went to Dr. Shelby's office to tell him, but he was out and I finally had to go on to work. Mr. Hendershot was able to call him later. That evening, after work, we called an ambulance and had her brought in. Dr. Shelby had talked to Mrs. Fox and the room was ready for Mrs. Muenich when we arrived with her. Mr. Muenich was present and fully in agreement, consented, and was happy that we were able to arrange and take his wife to the hospital. My wife and I went to the hospita' and saw that she was received. My wife called on her the next 2 days and said she was being cared for in a fine manner, and the hospital was where she had belonged all the time.

We were later advised that Mrs. Muenich would be taken to John Sealy Hospital at Galveston Saturday morning, May 6, so we got her things ready from her husband to take with her. We later learned that she was not taken to Galveston Saturday. We have not learned why she was not taken after we had been told that she would.

STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales, ss:

I, Willie Smith, the undersigned, being duty sworn, so depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of May 1961.

WILLIE SMITH,
A. L. THOMAS,
Notary Public.

To Whom It May Concern:

On Wednesday, April 19, 1961, my wife went over to the Muenich's to inquire about her. She met their son-in-law, Adolph Wachtendorf, coming out. He had just left Mrs. Muenich at her residence, unattended except by Mr. Muenich; after having kept her at his house some 5 days; after she had previously been in the hospital some 5 or 6 days. He told my wife that Mrs. Wachtendorf could not take care of her mother, so he had brought her home. My wife went on into the Muenich's house to see her, and was horrified to see Mrs. Muenich's condition. She immediately began getting the neighbor women together to start ministering to Mrs. Muenich.

Later, the son-in-law was very obnoxious, and told Mr. Muenich to get a shotgun and run those Baptists and Methodists and Catholics, etc. off the place before he lost his job. This was cleared up and he was sorry about it.

Later he expressed himself obnoxiously about the neighbor women taking care of his mother-in-law.

After we had taken Mrs. Muenich to the hospital Tuesday evening, May 2, I took Wachtendorf to my house and demanded that he apologize to my wife and two other neighbor women who had been ministering to Mrs. Muenich since April 10, for talking obnoxiously about them. He apologized to them.

The 2-week ordeal of working uptown daily, ministering to Mrs. Muenich 7 days per week, and taking care of her own house and children was too much for my wife. Her doctor sent her to bed for nervous prostration.

STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales, ss:

I, Willie Smith, the undersigned, being duly sworn, do depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

WILLIE SMITH,

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 10th day of May 1961.

A. L. THOMAS,
Notary Public.

To Whom It May Concern:

My name is Willie Smith; I live in the Clark community near Gonzales, Tex. The Louis Muenich family, husband and wife, moved into the community about 8 months ago. After they moved here, we took them to church quite often on Sunday nights.

About March 20, 1961, Mrs. Muenich was badly burned on the back one night while she was warming at an open fire. About 1 week later someone reported that she had been burned and was there without medical help. On March 28 her son-in-law took her to his house and called a doctor to see her. A doctor came to the house, and Mrs. Muenich was placed in a local hospital on March 30, where she remained under professional care until April 4. She was then returned to her son-in-law's house. We know of no professional care after she was taken out of the hospital by her son-in-law.

On April 19 she was brought back to her husband's house via station wagon by the son-in-law; my wife happened to see her in the station wagon. The son-in-law said they had been to see the doctor and he was bringing her back home to her husband.

The next day my wife saw Mrs. Muenich at her house and saw her burns. She did what she could for her; Mrs. Muenich did not have any medicine. She saw a doctor the next day in town about Mrs. Muenich. She asked the doctor if he didn't think Mrs. Muenich needed some medicine; she had in mind on account of infection and pain. He said that she had never told him that she was in pain, did she tell you? My wife said no, because she just laid there and said nothing. Then she asked him did he think that she could lay there under those conditions and get well. He admitted that it did look hopeless. She asked him about giving her aspirin, and he said all right, get her some aspirin. He did not write a prescription for Mrs. Muenich.

On Sunday, April 23, my wife took Mrs. Muenich's temperature; she had temperature, and being worried she called for a doctor to ask him what to do. She called his secretary and told her that Mrs. Muenich had temperature and a cough. She asked for advice, but the secretary assured her that she couldn't advise her, since the doctor was out of town. The same day she called another doctor and he came out immediately. He left antibiotics for her to take, and also left a prescription to be filled the next day.

On April 24 my wife arranged for a nurse to come out to bathe Mrs. Muenich and to change her bed. My wife brought her out and took her back to town. This procedure was followed through April 28. Her daughter came from Victoria on April 29. The daughter was worried about her mother's cough, which was worse, and called a doctor the next day. He came out and left a prescription for cough medicine. My wife had told the daughter and husband Saturday (the day before) that money was being raised to put her mother in the hospital, that she couldn't continue the burden of care, and the daughter said that she couldn't stay to care for her mother; therefore, she and her father were very pleased that someone was raising money for hospital care, and thought that that was the answer to the problem. She told the doctor while he was there that money was being raised and they could get her mother in a hospital; the doctor did not agree.

On Monday my wife went by and took her temperature; she still had temperature and also cough. The daughter had gone back to Victoria on Sunday. My wife took the prescription to town and had it filled. That night I and some neighbors went to see Mr. Muenich and he agreed that we should arrange the next day to put her in a hospital, since money had come in to the amount of $150.

I and a neighbor arranged the next day (Tuesday) to place her in a local hospital; I talked to the head nurse and told her about the money; the other man called a doctor and talked to him; the nurse also told me that she would call the doctor, to tell him. That evening, after work, we called an ambulance and had her taken to the hospital; my wife and I both went in with her. The hospital was prepared for her, took her right in. My wife went to see her at the hospital on Wednesday and the following Monday. She went Tuesday to see her, and she was gone, and nobody could tell her where or why. That same evening I called on Mr. Muenich and told him that his wife was not at the hospital; he called the doctor while I was there, and the doctor told him on the phone that his son-in-law had taken her to Galveston that day.

The next morning the son-in-law called my wife and told her that he had taken Mrs. Muenich to the hospital at Galveston in an ambulance; that he had learned that there would be a $3 per day charge at Galveston. She told him that the money had quit coming in; that the local bills would be taken care of first, and additional bills would just have to wait.

After having in the beginning been unable to get her in a hospital, we are very happy that she is now in the hospital at Galveston, where we are sure she will have the proper professional care.

STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales, ss:

I, Willie Smith, the undersigned, being duly sworn, do depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

WILLIE SMITH.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 11th day of May 1961.

A. L. THOMAS,
Notary Public.

To Whom It May Concern:

Tuesday morning, May 2, 1961, I was called to the Gonzales Inquirer office. Dr. David Shelby was there with Mr. Ed Reese, the publisher, and Mr. Robert McKinney, the editor. The doctor objected to an article run in the paper Saturday, April 29, 1961, soliciting funds for the purpose of supporting Mrs. Louis Muenich, burn victim, in a hospital. Mrs. Muenich had been without hospital care for approximately 4 weeks.

Dr. Shelby admitted to Mr. Reese and me that if it had been our wives who had been burned, that they would be in a hospital from the first day, and would still be there. But he told us that Mrs. Muenich was not used to the same environment, consequently, she did not require hospitalization like our wives; further, that she would do all right in the crude setup where she resided.

Mr. Reese refused to run a controversial article to please the doctor. He asked the doctor point blank if he had applied to admit Mrs. Muenich to John Sealy Hospital at Galveston; and if so, when had he applied. The doctor advised that he had applied for her admittance to John Sealy a "couple of days ago," and that he usually heard from such applications within a week.

Mr. Reese then said that the paper had not run the fund-soliciting article to hurt anyone, but only to help Mrs. Muenich. The article did not mention any doctor. Mr. Reese then asked me how the money was coming in. I told him that over $150 had come in and more would be needed. I also said that I had not intended any hurt to anyone or any organization; that my only concern was to help get Mrs. Muenich in a hospital where she would receive professional care.

Mr. Reese then said that we all want the money to keep coming in, "Don't we, doctor." The doctor said, "Yes, we want the money to keep coming in."

Mr. Reese then said, "Let's run an article saying that the money is coming in, and that more is needed; and we will quote the doctor that he has applied for Mrs. Muenich's admittance to John Sealy and expects to hear on it this week." The editor wrote out a short article covering the subject in this manner, and I okayed it. Later in the day the doctor picked up the proposed article to look it over, but never returned it to the editor, so it was not published.

Earlier in these conversations, the doctor told us that skin grafting and plastic surgery was indicated, which she could obtain from the best at John Sealy; further that proper exercise would be available to assure that her muscular movement would not be impaired.

As I was leaving the newspaper, Mr. Reese said, "Well Gus, you have got her in the hospital."

STATE OF TEXAS,
County of Gonzales, ss:

I, A. L. Thomas, the undersigned, being duly sworn, do depose and say the above statements are mine; that to the best of my knowledge and belief they are true.

A. L. THOMAS.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 9th day of May 1961.

[SEAL] CLARA M. THOMAS,
Notary Public.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I yield the floor. I thank my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for yielding to me.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for himself and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President I have had the honor of carrying the flag, as our distinguished colleague the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is wont

to say, for what is essentially the basic idea of the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] as to how the allocation of school aid funds should be handled. I am proud to have been able to do that. I am thoroughly convinced that the concept of the Senator from Kentucky is the right one, and I hope very much the Senate will agree.

We did discuss this matter in the greatest detail in the committee, Madam President, so I should like, being a lawyer as my colleagues know, to state first to the Senate what we want. What we want to do is to change the allocation formula in the bill so that in lieu of the allocations of the bill, which are now based exclusively upon the numbers of school-age children and the incomes per school-age child for each State, without any minimum, we may provide a minimum of $20 per public school pupil. We provide $20 per public school pupil for all the States which have 75 percent or more of the national average income per public school child. For States below that line, we propose that over a period of 3 years, their participation in the program of Federal assistance to their public school systems shall be based upon a Federal contribution of one-third the difference between an optimum foundation of $400 per pubilc school pupil and 4 percent of the States total personal income—which is what they ought to be able to accomplish for themselves.

That is the fundamental difference between our formula and the formula which is now incorporated in the bill.

Madam President, our formula results in a bill that would cost, over a period of 3 years, $2,224 million. The formula contained in the bill will cost the taxpayers, over a period of 3 years, $2,550 million.

I think it fair to say that the Senator from Kentucky and I believe that, in order to serve the fundamental purposes of this legislation, it is unnecessary to have it cost the country $326 million more. We feel that the only reason for the extra $326 million over 3 years as contained in the bill is to "sweeten up" the participation of the 20 States whose people have incomes in the middle level, between the upper group and the lowest group.

We respectfully submit that this is a "sweetening" which is unnecessary, because those States already have reasonably high levels of education today, and not a single one of the 20 States has reached the maximum capacity for helping itself.

On that basis, what is being done is to increase Federal expenditures to the extent of $326 million without relation to need, in the case of the so-called middle income States, so that something is done which need not be done. The cost of the bill is increased, but the fundamental purposes of the bill are not being served.

What the committee formula does, in addition, is to distort and reduce the participation for most of those States which are in the high income category—States like my own, for example. It also results in less benefit for the States at the lowest end of the scale in terms of the income of their people and the amounts available now in those States for public school education—States which require the most Federal aid and which the Federal Government should be trying to help by this bill.

On all those grounds, we feel the formula which has been developed by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not a sound formula, and certainly is not comparable to the formula developed by the Senator from Kentucky and myself.

I point out also that the committee concept is quite different from our concept, and that this is a very important substantive consideration in respect to the bill. The bill has no standard toward which the State effort is to be projected. It merely proposes that the effort which has been made shall be maintained, and that the States, in order to earn participation under this bill, shall continue to scale their efforts in accordance with the national level; but it provides no optimum level toward which the school effort and the aid under this bill is to be projected.

Our bill does that through the foundation plan to which I have referred. We provide that the Federal Government will contribute one-third of the amount by which 4 percent of the State income fails to equal $350 per public school pupil for the first year, $375 per pupil for the second year, and $400 per pupil for the third year—$400 being the present national average expenditure per pupil.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the distinguished Senator have a compilation of States, such, for instance, as that shown on page 4 of the committee report, indicating how the program advanced by himself and the Senator from Kentucky would deal with the several States?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes. There is on every Senator's desk a statement entitled "Explanation—Cooper-Javits Amendment to S. 1021," and on the last page of that statement is a compilation which, when laid beside the committee report at page 4, which contains the committee's compilation, gives precisely the differences in terms of the individual States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Now, referring to the committee compilation on page 4 of the committee report and to the page of the document which the able Senator has mentioned, which is found on the desks of Senators, I should like to ask the Senator to compare, for instance, the amount to be received in the first year by his own State, the State of New York, under the committee bill and under his amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. For the State of New York the amount would be constant under the committee bill, $40,652,380. Under our amendment, it would be $48,905,680.

I might point out that in the case of Florida, the home State of the Senator, the amount under the committee bill is $21,923,016, on a constant basis, for the 3 years, and the amount provided by our amendment is $17,217,740—again, in the case of Florida, on a constant basis, because it is in the group of States which get the $20 minimum.

I point out to my distinguished colleague, who is always very watchful in safeguarding the use of public money, that under the committee bill we are asked to spend $326 million more over the 3-year period. As a matter of fact, if we took the $326 million and divided it among all the States, under our formula also every State in the list would get much more.

Our whole argument is based upon the fact that, to reach the fundamental purposes of this bill, the additional expenditure is unnecessary because it moves to States which do not need the money. It does not in any material way better the position of the States which most need the money. This is one of the major arguments which we make in support of our own proposal.

Mr. HOLLAND. Am I correct in my understanding with respect to the State of New York that even considering the overall savings of $326 million over the 3-year period which the amendment would make possible, the State of New York would receive $48,905,000, or approximately $49 million under the amendment, on an even basis for all 3 years, whereas under the committee bill the State of New York would receive $40,652,000 for each of the 3 years?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct. The Senator from New York would like to point out a very interesting thing, which is that the original administration bill sought to carry out much more nearly the plan we present than the committee plan which is before the Senate—for it provided a basic $15 minimum per public school child for the larger taxpaying States. I make the point because I think it is very important that all of us understand that the bill now before the Senate is essentially the concept of the committee, not essentially the administration concept. It includes the addition of a very substantial sum in the total, which is greater than the bill recommended by the administration and certainly greater than would be provided by our amendment.

The administration bill when originally brought to the Senate—indeed, when reported by the subcommittee—involved a sum of $2,298 million. As a matter of fact, the amount was extremely close to our own proposal, with a difference of only $70 million odd.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, I ask the Senator to refer to the figures for the State of Georgia. If I correctly understand the two compilations, they indicate that under the committee bill the State of Georgia would receive $28,045,000 plus for each of the 3 years. Is that the Senator's understanding?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Whereas under the amendment of the distinguished Senators, the State of Georgia would receive only $15,786,000 for the first year; $22,289,000 for the second year; and $28,867,000 for the third year—which is only a trifle more for the third year than the State would receive under the committee bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I point out to the Senator that of course the total amount under our amendment is smaller by $326 million. Also, the formula is scaled according to need. In other words, in the hierarchy of need and in terms of a foundation plan which measures the State income eligible to be used for school purposes, this is where Georgia ranks. The figures work out that way, based on the facts.

Mr. HOLLAND. In effect, is the Senator stating he thinks the formula to determine the need of the several States as advanced by himself and the Senator from Kentucky is a more sound formula than that advanced in the committee bill?

Mr. JAVITS. That is exactly correct, I say to the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I shall yield to my distinguished colleague on that point in a moment. We figure need upon the difference between the foundation amount, an optimum amount for basic education at least, and the income per public school pupil of the people of the State.

I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. COOPER. I do not wish to intrude upon the time of my colleague, and I shall speak on my own time, but I hope the Senator from Florida and other Senators will remain in the Chamber. We wish to explain that our formula is based upon the need of the States—which can be statistically established from the national average expenditure, $400 per public school child, and the deficit in the amount available for the public schools in the various States which are unable to reach the national average expenditure for their schools.

If everyone looks upon the bill as a kind of a grab bag, from which they can get money for the various States, we shall not have much of a chance for our amendment. But if Senators will consider the bill as one designed to try to equalize educational opportunity and to be fair to every State, we shall have. There is a flat grant of $20 per child for every State in our amendment, but there is also provision for additional funds to raise the levels of education in the low-income States, to fulfill a need which can be statistically proved. If Senators consider these two provisions, I think they will then understand the rationale of our proposal.

I am not trying to appear as some great hero, but my own State, under the Javits-Cooper formula, will receive about $26 million less over the 3 years than under the formula proposed by the committee. However, I am looking forward to the future, and to the needs of all the States, as well as to the equities among the various States.

I think our plan is grounded in principle and on facts, rather than being something which could develop into a grab bag from which people can get all the money they wish, without any reference to the need of the State or to the effort being made.

A formula was somehow devised in the committee to satisfy nearly everyone in this country.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a brief comment upon the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly no one in this body would accuse the Senator from Kentucky of approaching a question of this kind upon the basis of trying to make a grab or trying to reach into a grab bag for his State or for anybody else. The facts the Senator has cited, as shown by the comparative compilations, well establish his position.

I hope the Senator from Kentucky does not think the Senator from Florida is desirous of having a grab bag, because the Senator from Florida is not supporting the proposed legislation at all.

Mr. COOPER. I know the position of the Senator from Florida. I respect the Senator greatly, although we differ at times.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Madam President, if the Senator will yield further, the Senator from Florida has felt that many people, both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, have regarded the whole program as a grab-bag program, and he is glad to note that his friend the Senator from Kentucky apparently has had that same sort of reaction with respect to the committee bill.

The Senator from Florida is against passage of the bill for that and for many other seasons, yet he recognizes the good faith and excellent motives of the Senator from Kentucky and of the Senator from New York in offering the amendment. If the committee bill is not grounded upon sound principles of establishing a foundation fund which is supportable and defensible, the two Senators are to be commended for trying to work out a better program, even though apparently their judgment differs from the judgment of the committee which has studied the matter for a long while.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I reply by saying that I am a member both of the Education Subcommittee and of the full committee. I participated in the search. It is my deep conviction—I think the Senator knows I am not doctrinate about the effort, simply to cut down the money in the bill—that ours is the proper approach. I really very much wish to do what my judgment as to principle tells me ought to be done.

As we went through this study it became my deep conviction that it is unnecessary to spend the extra money, and that the committee formula does not hit the bull's-eye. It does not really do what in principle we are trying to do. My best evidence of that, aside from my honest judgment on the magnificent initiative of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], is the fact that Senator Bob Taft, who is so much revered in this Chamber and who was pretty much a father—I will not say the father—to the idea of Federal aid to education, had this very foundation concept.

The foundation concept was absolutely fundamental to all that he proposed for education—it was the idea that we would try to establish a standard of basic education for every American child, and that that standard could be expressed in terms of school expenditures per pupil per year. Further, it was that the Federal Government ought to help bring up to that level the States which could not meet the standard from their own resources, because when a child has matured, having been educated, he is free to move anywhere in the United States, and often does. So, for example, a badly educated child from Mississippi—which happens to be the lowest State in terms of income—might easily come to New York and be one of my constituents. I would want that child to have an optimum of education as much as I would want it for my New York child. This was Senator Taft's basic concept.

So it has been difficult for me, as the committee has worked upon this subject and as I have discussed it and debated it with my colleagues on the committee, to become anything but more fortified in my basic view that if I am really for Federal aid to education—and I am—then I ought to embrace the principle of a standard toward which we would be projecting the money of the taxpayers of the United States which is to be used for education.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator whether he proposed the program embodied in the amendment now under discussion to the full committee?

Mr. JAVITS. I proposed the program both to the subcommittee and to the full committee. It was argued at great length. I do not mind telling the Senator from Florida that the formula the administration brought in was completely revised, because, from the arguments which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I were making, it was felt that something had to be done in order to give it countenance. So they came to some other conclusion than the one they originally brought in themselves.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I particularly appreciated his use of the word "sweetened" a while ago, by which he indicated that approximately $326 million was put in to sweeten the attitude of certain Senators toward the bill. I believe that is not the only item in the bill that is so designed, because, as I recall, the administration bill as it was introduced would have covered only a fraction of the former appropriations for defense-impacted schools in the various States. I note that the committee in its wisdom, whether it was a sweetening process or not, has stepped up this particular item in the bill to a continuance of the full amount of the present appropriation for an additional 3 years. So I think there is plenty of sweetening in the bill. I appreciate the Senator mentioning that fact.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. First, I give to every Senator credit for being interested in a sound bill, whether he supports the bill or not. It should be as sound as possible. In order to understand better the formula presented by the Senator from New York, I should like to consider two States as an example. They are not the States of the two sponsors of the amendment or my own. According to the committee report, California would receive $46 million, and under the proposal of the Senators from New York and Kentucky it would receive $63 million. Kansas, a midwestern farm State, would, under the committee bill, receive $11 million, and under the amendment $8,500,000. What are the facts in the proposal of the Senators from New York and Kentucky that bring about such a situation?

Mr. JAVITS. Based upon the income per public school pupil of the people in both States, these States come in that group whose people enjoy a personal income above the figure of 75 percent of the national average. Therefore, under the formula of the Senator from Kentucky and myself, they are among the $20 States. They would receive the basic $20 grants per public school child.

Mr. CURTIS. Both Kansas and California?

Mr. JAVITS. Both Kansas and California fall in that category. First, California, on the $20 basis, would do better than it does under a formula which does not have a minimum, as ours does.

Second, it fares better, relatively, than does a State like my own, because it has a larger number of children in the public schools. California, based upon its public school attendance, has a public school population of 3,164,000. Notwithstanding the fact that New York is a more populous State than California, the public school population of California exceeds that of my own State by a very substantial amount—in excess of 25 percent, in fact. The pupils eligible in computing the aid to California are very much more numerous than those in New York, because in New York we send many of our children to private and parochial schools. So that on a formula for helping public schools, California, on the $20 basis, would do better than it does under a formula which does not have a minimum and which proportions aid among the States on the basis of school-age population.

Mr. CURTIS. California would do better under the plan of the Senator from New York?

Mr. JAVITS. California would do better under our plan, because such a large number of its children attend public schools—and our plan is essentially a public school plan—whereas the plan of the committee proposes to distribute money on the basis of the total school-age population.

Mr. CURTIS. What can the Senator say about Kansas?

Mr. JAVITS. I come now to Kansas. As far as Kansas is concerned, on the basis of the income of its people, under our plan Kansas would be a 20 minimum base State. On the other hand, under the plan of the committee, Kansas would be one of the States I referred to as in the middle income group which would be given more money than it needs, or really ought to have, for the purpose of sweetening the bill. Under the committee bill, Kansas would be given $25.84 per pupil per year, converting the committee's amount per school-age child to its equivalent per public school pupil.

Kansas is spending $131,650,000 a year for education—it did so in the 1957–58 school year, the latest for which official office of education figures are available. Thus, it is spending 3.2 percent of the income of its people for education, which is less than the optimum of 4 percent, which we take as the figure representing a maximum reasonable effort toward operating the public schools.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator have some figures for California?

Mr. JAVITS. I have the percentage of effort figure for California—it is 2.9 percent, which is slightly above the national average of 2.8 per cent. California is making expenditures per pupil of $494 per annum, and is not one of the States among the 20 to which I referred as being sweetened up, because under the committee bill California would receive less than $20.

Mr. CURTIS. In the language of the busy citizen who does not have the time to refer to statistics, can it be said that the Senator from New York is attempting to provide aid on the ability of the States?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, the ability of the States as related to an optimum education for every American child.

Mr. CURTIS. The Senator bases it on the number of youngsters who attend school?

Mr. JAVITS. Public school.

Mr. CURTIS. Public School. How does the Senator take into account those who do not go to school at all?

Mr. JAVITS. We do not take into account children who do not attend public school.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose in some States there are children beyond a certain age who do not go to school at all, or suppose other States have very lax truancy laws or compulsory education. Under the amendment of the Senators from New York and Kentucky would the money that they would receive be cut down?

Mr. JAVITS. It is the average daily attendance of children in full-time public elementary and secondary schools that is considered. I could not tell the Senator what would be the ebb and flow of particular children who did not go at a particular time but went at another time.

Mr. CURTIS. What I am getting at is this. Is there any parallel between the quality of education in a State and the number of children going to school?

Mr. JAVITS. Well, perhaps that might be a factor. But I do not believe that in a pedagogical sense it has been an appreciable enough fact to affect anyone's formula—ours or anyone else's—because apparently it has not been, in the eyes of educators, a big enough question to impinge upon any formula.

Mr. COOPER. I know the answer to the question. Will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield, of course.

Mr. COOPER. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that our amendment would meet that question. Our calculations have been made upon the basis of the average attendance in the public schools as shown by the latest figures of the U.S. Office of Education. Our amendment provides, first, a $20 payment to every child in the public school system. If the children are brought into school, our amendment automatically picks them up.

Suppose that in the Senator's State there were 500,000 children in school this year. On the basis of our amendment the State would get $20 for each child. Let us suppose that next year there were 600,000 children in school. Our amendment would apply. It would pick them up. That is another difference between the committee formula and our formula. The committee formula makes no provision for the national increase in the school population.

Mr. CURTIS. I am satisfied that the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky are approaching this subject in an unselfish manner. Based upon the fact that a busy citizen does not have access to or the time to study statistics, I cannot understand why, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, the educational needs for New York are higher than the educational needs for Kentucky.

Mr. JAVITS. They are not under the formulation of our amendment. We do not place them higher. On the contrary, we might place them lower for New York, if New York as it is not, were in the position of not putting out as much effort as it should in terms of support of its own school system.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the contention that Kentucky is a wealthier State?

Mr. JAVITS. No, it is not. Kentucky, under the bill, is a State whose income, with relation to a foundation plan for its students, brings it into a category where it gets a higher figure under our amendment than a $20 per pupil figure beginning with the second year. That is, for the second and third years of the operation of the program.

Mr. CURTIS. In the third year it would still get less than under the committee bill. Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. It would still get less than under the committee bill.

Mr. CURTIS. New York would get more. I am not clear how the Senator arrives at that result.

Mr. JAVITS. Because whatever may be one's supposition as to income, the fact is that the income per capita of Kentucky is superior to the income per capita of people of perhaps 10 or 11 States which rank lower. Therefore under our formula, we are giving greater weight to the States that have the greatest need.

Mr. CURTIS. What is the income per capita of the two States—New York and Kentucky? Does the Senator have the per capita income?

Mr. JAVITS. The per capita income—the income per public school pupil, rather, is $7,868 in Kentucky, and the income per public school pupil in New York is $17,510.

Mr. CURTIS. What is it for my State of Nebraska?

Mr. JAVITS. It is $10,561 for Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. That is the per capita——

Mr. JAVITS. The income per public school pupil.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the Senator have the general per capita income?

Mr. JAVITS. I do not have that figure.

Mr. CURTIS. The general per capita income would be a measure of the ability of the people to tax themselves, would it not?

Mr. JAVITS. This is the same measure precisely that I have stated, because this takes the aggregate income of the State and divides it by the number of public school children. When we compare that as between the States, it translates into about the same proportion. It is a true proportion whether we take the per capita income of the State or the income per public school pupil.

Mr. CURTIS. Let us confine it to the third year of the Senator's plan. How much would be paid to New York per pupil in the third year, and how much would be paid to Kentucky per pupil in the third year?

Mr. JAVITS. New York would be paid $20 per pupil in the third year. In the third year, $28.43 would be paid per pupil in Kentucky. The reason why the relationship is not the same as the relationship of the income per public school pupil in Kentucky and the income per pupil in New York is that we are dealing with the optimum cost of education, and the income per person in New York is in excess of any relationship to the need for optimum education. In Kentucky the income gets closer to the need for additional funds, but even there the people are well able to maintain their schools.

Mr. CURTIS. Why are not the people of New York able to carry the load themselves?

Mr. JAVITS. They are. New York would save enormous sums of money if we forgot about the bill altogether, and if it did not have to pay its 18 or 19 percent share of the tax. The reason New York is included in every one of the measures—our amendment, the committee bill, and the original administration bill—is that the concept which dominates all of these bills is that if we are going to give aid to education at the Federal level, we cannot discriminate against any State; we must have a fair basis so that every State can participate.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose the Senator wrote a bill limiting it to those States which cannot carry the load themselves. How many States would participate?

Mr. JAVITS. On that basis we would probably have 15 or 20 States, and perhaps fewer than that.

Mr. CURTIS. That is what disturbs me about the whole bill—and I am not in favor of the bill—that we are transferring a function of education, not in the pending bill, but in a period of 25 years, from the parents and local clergymen and scoutmasters and the PTA people in a community to a bureau in Washington for 50 States, two-thirds of which are able to carry their own load according to the Senator's statement.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to make two points with the Senator on that question. When the Senator says, "able to carry their own load," that means that the income of the people of the State is such that the State is capable of doing it in terms of whatever amendments it would make of its laws or constitution. The fact is that there is a great feeling in the States and municipalities about the taxing sources of the Federal Government preempting an enormous amount of the feasible taxing opportunity at any governmental level.

That is one argument which was advanced in committee, and strongly advanced, for extending the bill so that it calls for a payment to all of the individual States. I believe there is something to that argument. Adherence to it is reflected in our amendment by the $20 per pupil figure.

The other point is that the Senator from Kentucky and I believe there is far less chance of the program being an indefinitely expanding form of aid, if most of the States receive a flat sum, than if every State participates on the sliding-scale basis. Our amendment nails down the amount for most of the States to a flat sum per pupil, on the assurance that this is something into which a State can sink its teeth, and that there is less likelihood that the program will run away with itself on some open-end basis, as it could under the terms of the committee bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Has it been the history of other Federal aid to State programs that where all the States have been taken into the program, the Federal cost has remained constant?

Mr. JAVITS. I would not say one could generalize about that. This is a new program; it is just beginning. We rather think the principle which we propose, a flat sum per pupil for most of the States, lends itself better to some discipline both on the part of Congress and the country than does the completely graduated scale concept.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank both the distinguished Senators. I commend them particularly for their forthrightness and frankness. It seems to me that if two-thirds of the States—and the percentage may vary according to the compilations for the different States—can clearly carry their own load, the Federal Government could very easily withdraw from some field of collecting revenue—perhaps not even levy a tax—and meet whatever problem may arise in such a way as to take care of less than one-third of the States which cannot carry the load.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I think we must keep in mind that we are not dealing with an ideal situation, in which an ideal formula can be used. The formula might be ideal if there were an aid to education bill under which States which can meet the national average would be selected, considering the wealth of those States. I should say that probably 15 or 20 States might be in that category.

We are actually proposing an amendment for allocation as opposed to the committee bill.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Kentucky and commend him for his fairness. As for myself, I am thoroughly convinced that if this general program is adopted, it will be the beginning of the end of the control of education in America by the parents, and that 25 years from now there will be in Washington a Bureau of Education elected by no one and responsible to no one.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, the amounts set forth in the Cooper-Javits amendment are based on a formula, whereas the amount in the committee bill is based on a set amount of $850 million, and that amount is distributed.

Mr. JAVITS. That, I think, is an entirely correct statement. We start from the bottom and build up; the committee starts from the top and works down.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The result is that in the Cooper-Javits amendment the amount is a little under $850 million.

Mr. JAVITS. We calculate a difference of $326 million under the committee amount. The amount proposed by the committee is $2,550 million; the amount we propose is $2,224 million.

We deeply feel and submit that the $326 million is unnecessary. It simply gives to a group of 20 States an additional sum in terms of their own school population. When we analyze what the States are spending per pupil now and what percentage that is of their income; namely, the income of the people of the State—it indicates that those States are not being strained. Therefore, it is hard to understand why it is necessary suddenly to move in with a sum of $81 million, which is what is added on in the committee version of the bill to those 20 States over and above the figure which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I have given.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the formula which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky are using or recommending the same as the formula which was used in 1947 and 1948?

Mr. JAVITS. It follows the same principle. The foundation principle was Senator Taft's great contribution, and the Senator from Kentucky has adopted it as the basis for his formula. The Senator from Kentucky advises me that he himself was a cosponsor of the bill introduced by Senator Taft in 1947.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I recall that discussion very well. It was an extended discussion.

As I understand, the distribution purposes are the same in the Senator's amendment as they are in the committee bill.

Mr. JAVITS. That is a very interesting point. The answer is yes. However, people have wondered why the commit-

tee went through all the gyrations of basing their allocation and appropriation to the States—that is, their authorization and allocation to the States—on the aggregate school age population rather than the attendance in the public schools, when, as a matter of fact, a consideration of children who do not attend the public schools is excluded. The question is, Why did the committee suddenly adopt the standard of authorization and appropriation for the total school age population without regard to the number of pupils in the public schools, which is so different from the way in which the money will be used?

The answer is that in that way, more dollars will be given to each State.

That is typical, in the opinion of the Senator from Kentucky and myself, of the manner in which the whole allocation formula was derived. If more money was needed, and there was no other way to get, then all the children in the State would be used for the computation, even though that method bore no relation to the way in which the law would be administered.

Mr. COOPER. I think this is one of the most flagrant additions to the committee bill. The administration bill, as proposed by President Kennedy, was based solely upon the attendance in the public schools. Certainly when he asked for the basis of the public school attendance, he must have had in mind the fact that in his message he had held very strongly to the view that Federal funds could not be appropriated for private and religious schools. So the administration bill was based on the public school attendance.

The amendment the Senator from New York and I have offered provides for aid on the basis of public school attendance.

In the last day or two of the committee's consideration of the bill—I think it was on the last day—suddenly a proposal was made which involves $250 million more than the President recommended. The formula was changed from the basis of the number of children in public schools to a basis of the total school age population.

As the Senator from New York has asked, Why? Simply to give more money to the States, particularly States which have large Catholic or private school populations.

I think that is a flagrant action.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Although the Catholic or private schools will get no part of the money.

Mr. COOPER. While we say, on the one hand, that we will not provide money for Catholic and other religious schools, because that is said to be unconstitutional, nevertheless the children attending such schools are included as a method of securing additional funds for, say, the State of Massachusetts. I have no particular purpose in selecting Massachusetts. It might be Rhode Island, New York, or some other State. They would be given more money. What would the extra money be used for? Not for the benefit of the children attending the private schools, but to increase the amount of money to be used for the benefit of public schoolchildren.

I say that is like rubbing salt, as was said by another Senator today, in the wounds of the Catholic or private schoolchildren. Such a proposal has only one purpose. It is simply to increase the amount for a number of States, and $250 million was added to increase the total amount distributed to all the States. Whatever might happen to the bill, I hope that provision will be changed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask two questions. One is based on the statement made by the Senator from Kentucky. Was the $250 million added in committee to make up the $850 million?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If that is so, how is it based upon the distribution system rather than the flat amount proposal, which I understood the Senator from New York to say the committee had proposed to appropriate $850 million and then to distribute it?

Mr. JAVITS. A formula for distribution is contained in the committee bill. It takes the amount which is authorized and divides it among the States.

Each State is allocated a share of the authorization equal to the percentage its allotment ratio times the number of its schoolchildren bears in relation to the total of the products for all the States, and so forth.

What was done was to work out a formula in the bill which gave each individual State a proportion of the $850 million, whereas what we did was to take the $20 per pupil base. Then, for the States outside the realm of those whose citizens have an income per pupil at least 75 percent of the national average, we adopted a standard of one-third the difference between what 4 percent of the income of the State would produce and what the State needs to spend if it is to come up to the national average expenditure for education.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The formula is based upon a foundation base, and the Senator would build from there up.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. When the committee added this amount, it made a certain allocation up and down to the various States.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, it sweetened the bill by counting the additional students.

Mr. JAVITS. It sweetened the bill for the "middle 20." That is the basis of the argument. I made the point in the committee—and I make it here—that this was unnecessary, because those States are already maintaining quite high standards, well within their capacity in terms of individual income.

I was asked about the attitude of New York State. In terms of an overall approach to the situation, and looking at it from a purely theoretical position, New York might be much better off with a bill confined to the 12 or 15 States which actually need Federal aid. But that is not the way in which the world is operated, and it is not the way in which the taxing power is divided between the States and the Federal Government. To get something done, we have had to establish some standard for all the States, but that does not mean that we must go overboard and do more than is really required to meet the necessities. Yet that is precisely what was done in the committee formula.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Let me ask one further question.

The money provided for in the committee report and the money covered by the amendment offered by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky—the money which goes into the States—is left for the States to use in whatever way they see fit.

Mr. JAVITS. We do not change the provisions of the bill in many respects. One of those respects is that the money may be used for teachers' salaries or for school construction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The principal change is in the formula.

Mr. JAVITS. The basic change is in the allocation and distribution, of both the larger total in the committee bill and the lesser sum in our amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the President's recommendation was that in counting the number of pupils in a State only those attending the public schools should be counted.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the allocation was made on that basis.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The committee changed the President's recommendation and said:

> We will count in the aggregate also the pupils who attend the parochial schools, even though the parochial schools will not benefit at all by the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is exactly correct.

I may point out also, as an additional answer and as I argued before the committee, that I, for one, felt that an obligation in good faith existed to give immediate consideration to a bill which would deal with the problem of parochial and private schools.

If I were really to take this formula seriously, in a sense I would be disabling myself. It might be said, "We have made provision for the State. Let the children go to the public schools if they want to get the benefit of what we have done." I feel that we are not making provision for certain children in the operative part of the bill. We are authorizing the appropriation of money on the basis of counting a number of children whom we are not benefiting.

So we are not yet performing in good faith our obligation to parents whose children go to parochial or private schools. Nonetheless, if we look at the face of the bill, and how the money is being computed, one might assume that we were making provision for them. That was one of the great points I made against the proposal.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Does not the situation in some degree amount to this: We say to the parochial schools, "Under the Constitution, no money can be provided

for you, either for the construction or operation of your schools. But while no money will be provided for you, we will count the pupils attending your schools, and add them to the number attending the public schools."

Mr. JAVITS. I am not prepared to join the Senator in his constitutional law views. I think there will be another occasion for argument on that subject. But from a practical point of view, and leaving aside the constitutional argument, that is substantially what happened. I am distressed about this situation. There is a point to the additional money in the bill, and to the fact that, for purposes of appropriation, we are counting all children, not merely public school children.

I can already hear the echoes from the arguments which will be made on this floor when we reach the day we consider a bill to aid parochial and private schools in some fashion that we might consider constitutional.

The echo I hear from the arguments on this floor is, "Why are you doing that? You have already counted them. You have already distributed money on a capitation basis, on the strength of that count. Why come forth with this proposal? Forget it. We have spent the $326 million. That is gone."

So it seems to me the proposal cannot be justified on that basis. We might as well recompute the figures on the basis of more money for each State per public school child. But if it had been done that way, the "sweetening" would have been made to look even worse than the committee could tolerate. So it had to accept the basis of the total school age population.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What reason can be logically given for counting the parochial school students together with the public school students, as a basis for distributing the money?

Mr. JAVITS. I cannot see a logical reason. However, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is handling the bill, is an excellent lawyer. He has a very fine mind. I would rather leave it to him, when his turn comes, to give his view on that point. However, speaking for myself, I saw the argument coming, "We have provided for them. Let the parochial and private school children go to the public schools. There is no need for considering a bill relating to parochial and private schools."

That was one of the arguments I used against this way of computing the amount to be distributed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator comment upon the statement I have heard made, to the effect that counting the parochial school pupils as a part of the aggregate number of pupils was motivated by a desire to give some States more money, thus inducing them to support the bill, whereas if that had not been done, they might not support the bill, because, on the basis of their own calculations, they would conclude that their State would have to pay more taxes to support the entire bill than the money they would get back.

Mr. JAVITTS. I will let that stand as the conclusion of the Senator from Ohio. When one speaks of motivation, I am too much of a lawyer to go into that subject on the evidence before us.

I should like to say, for my own State, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] correctly pointed out, that on the basis of the $20 formula the State of New York would fare somewhat better, in terms of the aggregate, than it would under the committee bill. But I respectfully submit that I cannot help feeling strongly that New York already contributes so very much to the Federal tax rolls that it is inconceivable that we would take this opportunity to try to better our own situation, in defiance of some general principle which, if applied generally, would do us 100 times more good in terms of the economy of the taxpaying State of New York. It happens to work out that way in connection with this particular bill. In connection with some other bill it might work out some other way.

When I voted for school aid previously, I voted for a bill which disadvantaged my State in a strict financial sense, because I felt it served great national purposes, and therefore the purposes of my State.

I believe, considering the size of New York and what it pays, that the fact that New York would fare somewhat better under the terms of any bill would hardly be a factor in the consideration of its Senators, with respect to the soundness of a basic principle which could, and probably would, be applied in many other situations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to commend the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New York for their objective approach in the formula. I have compared the figures, and while New York does get some more money, I have found that North Carolina, South Carolina, and Mississippi get substantially more money under the proposed amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And I found that the State of Kentucky, represented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], would get less. Still, he advocated the fairness of the principle.

I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful for that statement, because the Senator from Kentucky and I did not consult the tables first. We arrived at what we are proposing by the necessities of the situation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Looking at the computation, I notice Ohio would get more under the committee formula than under the Javits-Cooper formula. So I appreciate the support by the Senator from Ohic of the principle rather than the amount of money involved.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a few questions?

Mr. JAVITS. I apologize for having detained the Senator so long. I yield to him.

Mr. MILLER. On page 3, subsection (e), of the amendment, we find that the calendar years are used as a basis for determining the personal income of a State, but I am not quite sure which calendar years are referred to, and, just to make it absolutely clear, I wonder if the Senator would tell us which calendar years would be used with respect to determining the personal income of a State in connection with the allocation or determination of the $350 for the fiscal year starting July 1, 1961.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is referring to the annual personal income of the people of such State. The definitions which rule all of these particular provisions which are contained in our amendment are also in the fundamental bill. Instead of poring through it now, I shall do so while the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is speaking. I prefer to reply after the Senator from Kentucky speaks.

Mr. MILLER. I shall be happy to wait. My second question is this: Does not the amendment with the minimum foundation approach proceed on the assumption that the costs of education are the same in all of the States?

Mr. JAVITS. It proceeds upon the assumption that an optimum education—that is, not the highest, not the lowest—will require a certain amount of money, and that that is pretty universally true. I do not think that is quite the same thing as saying the costs of education are the same in every State. I think it is accurate to say that if refinements of one kind and another were indulged in, they would be more expensive in New York than they would be, for example, in South Carolina; but when we think in terms of a certain basic amount of money needed in a State in order to give a reasonable optimum amount of education, the cost is a fixed amount.

For example, one could say that in any State of the Union a per capita income of somewhere around $2,000 was absolutely essential to maintaining any kind of a respectable standard of living, even in family life. That does not mean one could do as well in New York on that amount of money as he could in Iowa or in another State which probably does not have such high costs. Yet that figure would be accepted as being basic to everybody in the United States.

That is the concept the Senator from Kentucky and I have tried to get over in terms of average education expenditures over the country. The average expenditure per pupil through the country is $390 for the 1960–61 school year we are now in. We have picked the $400 figure, to be obtained in the third year, as representing some optimum basis, without going into the fine details of the high-cost and low-cost States, and yet have come to a reasonable basis, overall, of the same general character I have described in referring to a standard of living.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the fact that it is very difficult to have this come out on a, let us say, theoretical basis; but I think in practice the difficulty is that we are overlooking the fact that in certain areas of the country $20 will buy a lot more than it will in other areas of the country. That is where this formula has a tendency to break down. That is where the concept of a minimum

foundation has a tendency to break down; $400 in New York State will not go as far as $400 in my State. I am afraid this minimum foundation approach is defective in that respect.

I also should like to ask the Senator this question: What guarantee do we have that this money is going to be put to the usage necessary to achieve equality of educational opportunity? For example, we have all seen articles which have been critical of local school boards for spending school money for what are known as frills in education, which do not achieve educational opportunities, at least, of the kind we know are desirable. There is nothing in the amendment or in the bill that I can see which would preclude a State or local school district from using the frill approach. Therefore, I repeat, the minimum foundation approach breaks down in that respect unless we put standards of some kind in this proposal.

Mr. JAVITS. We will not fall into the trap of putting curriculums standards in the measure, because the Senator from Kentucky and I are just as devoted to the idea that the Federal Government shall not control education as is anyone else in this Chamber. But I cannot agree with the Senator's statement on the minimum foundation plan for these reasons: When the Senator refers to a certain amount of money and what it will buy in New York as compared with Iowa, for example, I point out that in our proposal the Federal Government will contribute to the $400 one-third of the difference between that amount and what the State is able to do with its own efforts. So there is a leeway in terms of costs as between the different States. Nobody will make the statement, I am sure, that $400 represents particularly fancy education.

If the $400 will buy more education in Iowa, very well. There still would be a long way to go before the frill category could be reached. If it will buy less in New York, that is well, too, because New York can buy more for itself.

As to the argument about frills in education, I do not think that argument is valid. I point out that there is no difference between our amendment and the bill as it is before the Senate in that regard. In the second place, expenditures under the bill, and therefore under our amendment, are confined to school construction and teachers' salaries. That category cannot be considered as involving frills, in any concept, because those are basic elements that go into the education scheme. If efforts are made to utilize the money for purposes other than teachers' salaries or school construction, the money can be cut off, and the bill requires that it be cut off. If those spending the money should be profligate in other respects, then under our amendment, and also under the bill—since we are contributing only a part necessary to bring below-par educational systems somewhat up to parity—the local taxpayers and local school authorities can be depended upon to see to it that money received for education will not be wasted in that way.

Finally, I point out that if anything, this is an argument for our amendment, because one of the big points we make is that the amendment will save $326 million—a third of a billion dollars—because there would not be passed out to those States in the middle income range the money they really do not need, based on the effort they are putting out and what they are spending and can spend per pupil now.

I think for all those reasons the fears which the Senator expresses are not warranted either by the bill or by the amendment. If anything, our amendment would button it up more certainly than the bill itself.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the fine remarks of the Senator. I am persuaded that the amendment may achieve a little greater uniformity on a sounder basis than the bill, but I still fail to see anything in the amendment or in the bill which would assure us that simply because we are spending more money we will necessarily have equality of educational opportunity.

Mr. JAVITS. I respect the Senator's views enormously. The Senator, who is rather new in this Chamber, has delighted all of us by the intensity of his activity and the excellent judgment he has shown in his active participation.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the Senator's complimentary remarks.

Mr. JAVITS. I have not had an opportunity to say that publicly before. It has been gratifying to see how the Senator has been encouraged by the surroundings in which he is placed.

What we are discussing is a relative matter. The bill is not going to attain the supreme in education. We all feel deeply that improvements are urgently required, and we feel that for the first time, through a program on the Federal level, there will be a great financial inducement. That is still what makes the mare go, as the old saying goes.

There will be great financial inducement toward making a relative improvement. Perhaps the most profound argument for the bill is the same argument which, unfortunately, must be made time and time again; that the urgency of the struggle for freedom is so great as to require a whiplash on the backs of the people of the entire world. Things have to be moved faster than they would normally move if we stood aside and let them take their normal course. This gets deeply into the question of the preparation of our youth for the responsibilities of a highly technical and highly dangerous world. I think that is why we are here and why this rather new innovation, which got nowhere 12 or 13 or 14 years ago, when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] was a most distinguished part of the effort, is probably going to get somewhere today.

In answer to the Senator's question, I would say we are dealing with relatives. I cannot guarantee anything absolutely. Those who support the measure feel this will provide a real stimulus toward what the country must somehow attain.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the kind remarks of my colleague from New York. I also appreciate the frankness with which he has answered my questions. There is one more question I should like to ask, which pertains not only to the amendment but also to the bill. I should like to have the manager of the bill answer it for himself, but I should like to have the thinking of the Senator from New York and possibly the thinking of the Senator from Kentucky on the question.

What will happen after 3 years? Will Congress renew the appropriations? If that is the idea, why not provide a continuing program, instead of limiting it to only 3 years?

I ask the question because I can visualize literally thousands of school boards throughout the country budgeting on the basis and on the assumption that they will receive the money. At the end of 3 years, if the program is not renewed, I can visualize a lot of school budgets being literally torn apart. What will happen after 3 years?

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator has asked a very valuable question. I hope very much the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] will soon be in the Chamber. I shall ask him that question, and I hope the Senator will also do so directly. I think we should both be joined in the answer.

I am a member of the committee. I am a member of the subcommittee. I favor the bill. Therefore, perhaps on this side of the aisle, with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who are also with me in favoring the bill on our side, I have a right to speak at least the ideas of the minority in terms of the legislative history of the bill.

I say to the Senator from that point of view, speaking because of my membership on the committee and on the subcommittee—perhaps the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], who is in the Chamber, will also say a word about it—we do not consider that the United States has any obligation of any kind or character, implied or express, to continue the program beyond 3 years as specified in the bill.

I hope very much, as has happened in the past with respect to other programs—like the supplementary unemployment compensation, which comes immediately to my mind, which we had at one time and terminated and then reinstated when we had a recession situation and needed it—that the program can be terminated. This will depend strictly upon how it works and upon the condition of the world as well as the condition of our educational system at the time the act expires.

We all understand that we can pass legislation at any time. I think it is only fair to say, and to make it crystal clear, that so far as I see it as a member of the minority, the obligation, express or implied, of the United States if the bill should become law, is such that we recognize no hidden or leading-up-to motive other than that this should be truly a 3-year program with the fullest of good faith being exercised.

If the program is ended at that time because in the good judgment of the Congress it will not be needed from that time on, I think it is only fair this should be made so clear that school administrators, State officials, and local officials will handle themselves in no other way.

The fundamental idea we have is to give an incentive and a push forward to the educational system, because the overwhelming majority of the States—I am not now discussing laws or constitutions or sources of taxes—in terms of income of the people, have potentials which certainly are sufficient to provide a far greater effort and a far greater improvement in our educational system over and above and beyond whatever we seek to do now in the Federal aid to education bill.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me once we adopt the policy that the Federal Government is obligated to participate in a program of maintaining a minimum foundation approach, once we have established that principle, at the end of 3 years if we do not have the minimum foundation assured for the future, we shall be forced to continue the program or, at least, to go into another program.

Mr. JAVITS. I am sorry, but I cannot agree with the Senator from Iowa that any commitment is involved in the foundation approach, other than to be even more true than the bill now is to the fundamental purpose of telling the States what we wish to have them do, what we expect them to do, and what we hope they will do. This is an objective we are setting which we seek to move forward with our amendment.

We are not trying to debate the difference between what a State might do and the objective desired. We simply state an objective. We will contribute only a part—one-third, under the formula proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and by me.

I cannot, for the life of me, see how, when we erect a standard toward which we point the States, as it were, there is any commitment to maintain that standard through appropriations. We might find that the whole program will not be successful, whether with standards or without standards. I cannot see why the establishment of a standard, which will be very helpful in giving to the States a practical picture of where they ought to be going, would in any way commit the United States to continue to maintain or to help to maintain the standard by using the taxpayers' resources.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to respond to the question asked by the Senator from Iowa because I am one of the authors of the amendment.

I must be perfectly frank with the Senator. I know once any aid program to the States is adopted there is a great danger, or there is at least a possibility, it will be continued. We all know that. I am sure that if the Federal aid to education bill is passed by the Senate and by the House of Representatives and becomes a law, at the expiration of 3 years there will be great pressure to continue the program.

So far as my own convictions are concerned, I believe very strongly there is a need for legislation now. I am not sure a 3-year program will solve all the problems we are trying to solve, but I hope that at some time—whether it is 3 years or 6 years or some other time—such improvements can be made in the programs in the States that the Federal program can be ended.

I make that statement, and hold that view very strongly. Again, that is one reason I believe our formula is superior to that of the committee bill. I will tell the Senator why.

First, we deal with 15 States that spend less than the national average of $400 per pupil. Yet those 15 States are making a larger effort on the average than are the 35 richest States. So it is our hope that if we help those 15 States, we will induce or encourage them to raise even more their own expenditure. We would also hope that the wealth within those States would increase so that their taxes would produce more funds, and therefore produce more per child, and that they would eventually reach the present national level of $400. If they reach that figure, we could say that the Federal responsibility has ended, they have reached the national average.

There is nothing in the committee bill which speaks about a national average.

Second, what about States above that level? All 35 of those States either provide $400 per pupil or, if they would increase their effort to 4 percent, and in some cases one-tenth of 1 percent, or two-tenths of 1 percent, they could easily provide the $400 level.

Let us consider, for example, the State of New Hampshire, which spends $363 per year per pupil. Its effort is 2.4 percent, against the national average of 2.8 percent. It could certainly reach the $400 level. Our contribution of $20 per pupil would encourage them to do so. It would help in school construction. It would take part of that burden off the State.

Under our amendment there is an opportunity that some time—3 years from now or 6 years from now—we could look at the record against objective criteria and say that the Federal responsibility had ended.

What about the committee amendment? Money would be distributed and Congress would be subject to pressures every year to increase the kitty—to enlarge the amount appropriated so that more States could get more money. No standards or criteria are provided. In some instances it provides more than the original administration bill for States with great wealth, and which are making a minimum effort per pupil. In other cases it provides insufficient aid for States with small wealth, and which are making a maximum effort.

Among the States with lowest income, 14 are making an effort greater than the national average of 2.8 percent of the personal income within those States. Only 14 of the 35 States that I mentioned exceed the national average effort.

Mr. MILLER. The subject about which the Senator is speaking is one of the most persuasive features of the amendment I have heard discussed, and I appreciate the comments of the Senator very much. I feel a little more reassured about the situation so far as the amendment is concerned, as compared to that under the bill.

One point that bothers me about the bill is the fact that in the hearings, page 151, part I, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare made this statement:

> You are in the process of raising the standards in all the different States, and frankly I do not conceive of this program being a 3-year program. I could not come to the Congress of the United States and say that is the end of Federal aid to education. Personally I don't think so, and I have to be frank with you.
>
> So you are dealing with a program that I think will be a continuing program, frankly, and you are raising the standards of education throughout the Nation, and I think it can be done with this approach as well as the approach that you and Senator COOPER have advanced—

He was speaking to the Senator from New York with respect to his amendment.

I can detect a considerable distinction between the philosophy just now expressed, as it applies to the bill, and as it applies to the amendment, because, as the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has pointed out, the lower income States, or States that are not in the national average range yet, by virtue of increased economic growth which ordinarily follows better education, would have the hope of coming up.

There is only one point I might make. I would feel a little more reassured about the amendment if the amendment were confined to raising the level of the lower States and appropriated only for that purpose, along the lines the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] developed earlier.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that very technique has been tried and has failed in other years, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I, who are for Federal education, felt that we had to come within a practical frame of reference or our work would be less than meaningless.

I would like to answer the other question of the Senator, which was a technical question, by pointing out that the word "preceding" in line 11 on page 3, as it refers to the fiscal years used to determine the annual personal income of residents of each State, refers to the latest 3 years for which figures will be available from the Department of Commerce.

The difference between our bill and the committee bill is that we would take a 3-year average with respect to the subject of personal income. The committee would confine it to 1 year. I

would like to refer the Senator on that question to page 9, lines 3 to 9, of the bill, which relates the committee's formula only to the income for 1 year.

Mr. MILLER. Might I ask the Senator, referring to page 2 of the amendment—

(1) $350 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961—

What calendar years will be used under the amendment with respect to that fiscal year?

Mr. JAVITS. That would be 1957, 1958, and 1959, with relation to the first fiscal year.

Mr. MILLER. But not 1960?

Mr. JAVITS. I think we had better give the answer to the Senator after we have had the question checked.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the amendment which was offered in the Senate by my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS, and in which I joined. I know we want to get to a vote, and I know also that the Senator from New York has discussed very exhaustively and ably this amendment. Therefore, it will not require any great amount of time on my part.

I should like to say that even before the administration bill had been introduced, I introduced a bill, S. 723, containing the formula upon which the Javits-Cooper amendment is based. I believe that was on January 31. I should like to read the names of the Senators who joined in the introduction of that bill, to show its bipartisan support and, I believe, very good support. Senators JAVITS, AIKEN, FULBRIGHT, ANDERSON, KUCHEL, FONG, and WILEY joined in the introduction of the bill.

In the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Senator JAVITS bore the burden of supporting the amendment. He has taken, of course, the lead on the floor of the Senate. I want to give the greatest credit to Senator JAVITS for his work for the amendment. However, the formula and the essence of the amendment was contained in the bill which I introduced several months ago, and, therefore, I do want to speak in support of it. It was derived from the work of Senator Taft in 1947, and it is based upon the formula contained in his bill, which passed the Senate with the largest support ever given any Federal aid to education bill. It has been adjusted somewhat to take into account the increase in the cost of education and the changes in the wealth of the States, upon which the ability of a State to provide funds for education must be based.

Here I would like to give credit for hours of work to my legislative assistant, Mr. Bailey Guard, and to Mr. Allen Lesser of the office of Senator JAVITS, who, I must say, worked out the mathematical calculations and secured the basic information upon which our amendment is based.

I say also that I have always supported the principle of Federal aid to education. I remember when I came to the Senate in 1947 for a 2-year term—it ended at the close of those 2 years—I appreciated very much that one day Senator Taft called me to come to his office and asked me to join with him in the introduction of the Taft Federal aid to education bill.

In 1953 and 1954, when I served on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Education. In 1954 a bill which I introduced relating to school construction was favorably reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and came to the Senate. It was not acted upon. I remember very clearly why.

I believe it did not have the support of either our majority leader at that time, Senator Knowland—and I say this with all due respect—and it did not have the support, as shown by the RECORD, of the minority leader at that time. He made very clear in a statement one evening that he would not favor the bill being brought up for action.

All that is past history. I voted last year for the McNamara-Clark bill. So I speak upon this amendment as a friend of the principle of Federal aid to education. Because I am a friend, I believe very strongly that a bill which we pass should be rooted in principle and based upon criteria which can be understood this year, and next year, and in the years that are to come in the future.

Our amendment proposes to change the system of allocation of funds to the States now incorporated in the committee bill. I emphasize that it is quite different in many respects, and in basic respects, from the system of allocation proposed in the committee bill.

First, it is different in its total cost. President Kennedy, in making his recommendations to Congress for a Federal aid to education bill, proposed a sum, to be spent over 3 years, of $2,298 million. The Senator from New York and I have retained approximately that sum in the amendment which we propose.

In the last day or two of the committee's consideration of the Federal aid to education bill, a bill which had proposed the expenditure of the same amount the President had requested—$2,298 million—the committee suddenly increased the amount by $350 million. So, first, if the Senate accepts our amendment, the cost will be more than one-quarter billion dollars less over a period of 3 years.

The second difference between the committee bill and the amendment which the Senator from New York and I have offered, is that our amendment is based on the number of public-school children. That basis was provided in the administration bill sent to Congress at the instance of President Kennedy.

However, again during the last 2 or 3 days of the consideration of the bill by the committee, the committee changed that aspect of the bill. It changed it from a computation or a consideration of the number of public-school children and, instead, included all children of school age within a State. Why was that done? Of course, when provision is made for all children of school age in a State, the number of children is increased, and the amount of money to be provided can be increased. That was the way in which the $250 million was added to the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would that added amount be used for the benefit of the additional children?

Mr. COOPER. Oh, not at all; of course not.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would it be used for the education of those added children?

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator mean the children in private or church schools?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. COOPER. No; of course not.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, is this another one of the sweetening aspects of the bill, which was so ably referred to by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]?

Mr. COOPER. It was meant to add $250 million to the bill. Of course the committee knew the additional money would not be spent for those pupils; it was a device simply to secure more money for distribution among the States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Was it based upon the belief that by establishing such a system, the pressure would be such that the church and private schools would be closed, and everyone would send his children to the public schools?

Mr. COOPER. I cannot, of course, judge that, and I would not. I should say it would have no effect upon the religious beliefs of the people of those States. If they wish to continue to send their children to religious schools or to private schools, they will continue to do so. I think we know that.

Mr. HOLLAND. The net result is this, is it not, that the children who attend private and church schools were added to the total for the purpose of distributing money to the States, with full knowledge that those children would not receive a dime for their education; but that instead that device would be used to build up the per child allowance for the other children, the ones attending public schools?

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. That would be the effect. It could not be anything else.

Upon this point, I think we want to deal fairly with the parents of children who attend private and public schools. The President has taken a very firm position that under the Constitution public moneys cannot be used for the general purposes, at least, of parochial schools. I hold the same view. Last year when the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] offered his amendment to provide loans for church schools, I voted against the amendment.

I think that to be consistent—and I believe the President was consistent when he sent his bill to Congress—the

bill should be applicable to the number of public school pupils.

I believe that when the basis is changed to that which is provided in the committee bill, namely, the total number of children between the ages of 5 and 17, it is almost like rubbing salt into the wounds of the parents of children who attend the private schools, who have been told—and I believe rightly so—that under the Constitution they cannot secure any public funds. But by having their numbers used as the basis of securing more money, they will see that money used to increase the amount to be used for public school children.

Furthermore, it is possible that in this Congress a bill will be developed to give assistance to children attending other schools, if that can be done satisfactorily. I think it would be wise to save the $326 million for such a bill, if such a constitutional bill can be developed.

So, first, I have said our amendment differs in terms of cost. It differs in its formula in that the Senator from New York and I use only the public-school children to determine the amounts which shall go to the public-school systems of the States. The committee bill uses—I think unfairly and without any basis—all school children, even those who attend religious schools.

But I should say those are not the most important differences in our amendment. I shall now discuss what I consider to be the basic difference between the two proposals for the allocation of funds.

There is a difference in our philosophy; there is a difference in the purposes of the two amendments, and I shall try to explain them.

What is the reason, if there is one, for providing funds to the States to assist them in meeting their educational needs? There must be a reason, if we are to pass a bill. We know there are strong arguments and objections against a Federal aid to education bill. Those objections are made with sincerity by a great number of persons.

Some persons simply say that such aid will cost too much money. Others say it will lead to Federal control. There is also the problem of parochial and religious schools and private schools, about which there is a difference of opinion. Finally, in recent years, the question of segregation in the schools has entered into the problems which attend the passage of a Federal aid to education bill. So we know that many kinds of objections are made to the passage of any Federal aid to education bill.

To meet those objections, there ought to be a bill which contains some basic principles, one which we can advocate rationally, logically, and with conviction against the objections which are held with real conviction by thousands of persons throughout the country—and many Members of Congress.

So I return to my question: If there is to be a Federal-aid-to-education bill, what is to be its purpose? Is its purpose to give additional money to the States, States which are able to provide adequately for the needs of their own children? Is that the fundamental purpose? I would not say so, because we know that the fundamental responsibility for education lies with the States and local bodies.

There can be only one reason for a Federal-aid-to-education bill, and it is a fundamental reason. It is to raise the level of educational opportunity for the children in States which, because of their lack of wealth and their inability to provide adequately for the education of their children, are unable to raise the level of educational opportunity for their children who, through no fault of their own, are deprived of an equal start in life.

That was the basic principle of the Taft bill. I shall never forget that in 1947, when Senator Taft made his opening argument for the Federal aid to education bill, he said, in his modest way:

> Perhaps I defeated the last education bill that was before the Senate. But I have changed my mind since then, because I know that every child in this country cannot have an educational opportunity at least approaching the national average unless the Federal Government augments the funds of States which are not able to provide such funds.

So I start with the principle of equal educational opportunity. No bill can ideally meet that goal. Our proposal does not do it. But it would establish a standard. The committee bill does not approach it in any way.

How do we try to reach some goal of equality of educational opportunity for the children of this country?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator is making a most important statement. I deeply feel that more Senators should be present. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum?

Mr. COOPER. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question with respect to his amendment?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have been reading the letter from the distinguished Senator from Kentucky dated this day, and addressed to Senators. The third paragraph reads:

> It provides an equal amount—$20 per public school child—to all the States which have a capacity to provide a basic level of education from State and local resources.

With respect to the $20 per public school child, does that mean that for every child who is enrolled in a public school a basic $20 would be allocated to the State?

Mr. COOPER. It does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Or is it based upon the average daily attendance?

Mr. COOPER. The computation would have to be made upon the basis of average daily attendance. I do not know of any other way to arrive at any average figure.

However, if in the following years the record of attendance should increase—which we all hope, of course—the amount allocated to a State would be increased, and our amendment would take into account such increases. The committee bill has no provision which would take into account the increased national school population or the improvement in attendance.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that is a very important distinction to be made between the committee proposal and the amendment offered by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky.

If no change can be made to accommodate the growth of school population or the shifting of school population as between States, it seems to me that the formula proposed by the committee is defective in that respect.

As I understand, then, the formula proposed by the Senator in the pending amendment would automatically adjust from year to year according to the actual record of average daily attendance, which would mean adjusting to changes in population.

Mr. COOPER. Yes, with one limitation. It would be within the limit of the appropriation furnished by the Congress. Certainly it would take into account, even with the limitation of the appropriation, the shift in school population.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would still be within the appropriation. It would change the ratio to the States according to the shift in school attendance, which would mean both school attendance and the number of children.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. The differences as a result of an increased school population would be reflected in increased appropriations being sought to fulfill the authorization in our amendment. It would be simple to determine what increase to ask for, because there is the provision of $20 per pupil, while in the committee bill there would have to be a larger authorization in order to maintain throughout the States the same amount per pupil. The committee bill does not accurately take into account the increase in school population in the State or attendance records.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In that respect I think the proposed formula is better than that contained in the committee bill.

Mr. President, I should like to make a distinction between the way the term "per child" has been used and the way the Senator from South Dakota has used the term "per child" in the amendment which he has been discussing and which he will offer sometime later if the debate continues.

The figures I put in the RECORD this morning carry a column which shows the number of schoolchildren in each State, and the distribution, under the amendment which the Senator from South Dakota contemplates offering, would be on the basis of the number of

children of school age, regardless of their average attendance and regardless of whether they are attending public schools or private schools.

When the Senator from Kentucky uses the phrase "$20 per public-school child," it should be understood he is speaking of average, ordinary attendance of children enrolled in public schools.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the Senator from South Dakota later offers his amendment, he will be speaking of the average schoolchild regardless of his attendance and what school he attends.

I had ascertained that 1 percent of the revenues collected from the individual, or personal, income tax and the corporate tax would provide sufficient money to allow $15 for each child, regardless of his regularity of attendance and regardless of which school he was attending. The amount would go to the State, and the amount would be $15 per schoolchild.

If the amount is recomputed in terms of the amount per public-school child based upon average attendance, I suspect the figure of the actual distribution would not be far different from that proposed by the Senator from Kentucky, because the total amount involved in his proposal is how much, in millions of dollars?

Mr. COOPER. Two thousand two hundred and twenty-four million for 3 years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Or close to $700 million a year?

Mr. COOPER. The amount increases each year.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. For the first year it is somewhat less?

Mr. COOPER. Yes; the amount advances.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the table I saw indicated there would be about $680 million the first year.

Mr. COOPER. I have the figures. For the first year, the amount would be $693 million, for the second year $737 million, and for the third year $794 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The figure of $693 million for the first year would be slightly more, but not much more, than the $664 million contemplated under the earmarking of the 1 percent of the income tax receipts.

I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky for yielding. I recognize that he and his colleague, who are presenting the amendment, have spent a great deal of time on this subject. I think any proposal they make is entitled to careful consideration, both because of their devotion to the subject and because of the earnest way in which they have studied the question.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. May I say I know he has worked very hard on a proposal to provide funds for Federal aid for our schoolchildren, and we give the proposal great respect.

I wish to answer, briefly, two questions raised by the Senator from South Dakota, and then I wish to get on with my talk on the fundamental philosophy of our proposal as compared to the committee bill.

First, the Senator from South Dakota asked if my proposal takes into account an increase in school population. It does, because we authorize an expenditure of $20 per child attending the schools. If the school attendance increased in a State the following year, the amount authorized to the State would be increased.

The second matter the Senator brought out was the fact that in our formula we use the numbers of public school children, while the committee bill uses the total school-age population. I have already referred to that matter, but I should like to read what President Kennedy said about it when he sent his proposal to the Senate. This is what he said:

> In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church schoolteachers' salaries, and thus nonpublic schoolchildren are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools.

That is what the President said. We think that concept is correct. As I said before, in the last 2 or 3 days of the committee hearing, as I understood it, the committee left the President and changed the provision to the total population of school age. The result was to increase the total cost of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me just a moment on that last point, and I say this for clarification—I do not seek to interrupt the Senator's logical presentation of his amendment—the reason why the Senator from South Dakota, in his own suggested amendment uses the phrase "number of total children of school age" is that the amendment would make available to the States that amount for educational purposes. How the State used that amount after it received it would be the State's own business.

I think there is some justice in providing the distribution on that basis, for, after all, under the theory of public school education, every child—at least it is true in my State—should be entitled to go to a public school if he wants to. We can never tell when that burden may come to the public schools. Further than that, if in any State a considerable portion of the burden of the education of her children in elementary and secondary schools is cared for by private or parochial schools, then it must mean a pretty heavy burden is put on the people who both pay tuition for their children and also carry the taxload of the public schools.

So it seems to me there was justice in providing that whatever aid we made available to the States be made available, not on the condition that the children must attend public schools, but be made available for school purposes, and leave it to the States to spend or distribute the money however they may under their State constitutions.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I simply make the point the money could not be spent for any purpose except for public school purposes, so in a way there is a using of the children who go to religious schools as a basis for securing money for the State when it is known those children will not get a benefit from it. I do not think that is a proper procedure.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Kentucky to yield to me for an observation, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I yield to the Senator, if I shall not lose the right to the floor thereby.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I commend the Senator for two reasons.

The Scripture says, in First Timothy, chapter 5, verse 8:

> But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

I shall vote for the Senator's amendment in order to look after my own house—that is, in order to look after North Carolina—because under the amendment North Carolina, which has a most thriving infant industry, will receive substantially more benefits.

In the second place, I think the formula proposed by the Senator is more fair and more realistic, in view of all the circumstances surrounding this important proposed legislation.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I have listened to the Senator from North Carolina many times make pleas for justice based upon firm and sound principles of law. The Senator need have no qualms about the proposal, if he votes for the amendment, simply because it happens to provide North Carolina a little more money than the committee bill would provide. The Senator can sleep with a good conscience, because the formula is based upon sound criteria which apply to all States.

The Senator's State is making a great effort in the field of education. The State of North Carolina is spending 3.3 percent of its personal income for education, while only 14 of the 35 States in the upper level are providing that much. North Carolina happens to be eligible to secure more under our formula because, despite the great effort being made, the wealth of the State will not produce as much per child.

The Senator has great legal knowledge and has expressed great principles in the past, and he need have no fear. In this case, the amendment provides justice, and the Senator can sleep soundly.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall end my remarks in a few minutes. I shall close because we wish to have a vote on the amendment.

I return to what I think is the great distinction, or at least an important distinction, between the amendment and the committee bill.

I say to the Senator from Oregon, while I have the opportunity, I have joined with the Senator in the past in support of many Federal aid to education bills. I know of the Senator's great and

sincere interest in these bills. I know that in the committee the Senator permitted all opportunity to my colleague from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to discuss the amendment, even though in the subcommittee the Senator was almost defeated, for the amendment offered by the Senator from New York was rejected by only one vote. The Senator permitted me to come before the committee. I appreciate the many courtesies he extended.

In this case I think the decision which the committee made was not a correct decision.

I have said that our amendment differs from the committee bill in cost and in the use of the public school attendance instead of the total school age population, but I base my appeal primarily upon the difference in philosophy of the two bills.

As I said a few minutes ago, if there is any reason at all for a Federal aid to education bill it ought to be to equalize educational opportunities for the schoolchildren of this country. No bill will do that ideally, but at least our amendment attempts to equalize educational opportunities in the States which are not able to provide even the national average effort, and gives opportunity for equalization in other States as among various school districts.

I should like to explain our formula. All of the figures can be determined by mathematical calculation and by the statistics which are available from the Department of Commerce and from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

First, what should every schoolchild in this country enjoy at the minimum? I think he should certainly enjoy school opportunities at the average level of those enjoyed by other schoolchildren in the country. We learned that the average expenditure per child throughout the Nation was $390 per child. Then we adopted the $400 figure as the national average, as a minimum which should be expended for each schoolchild.

We thought there should be another test, before a State could enjoy the augmentation of its funds by the Federal Government. We felt a State ought to make a maximum effort to use its own sources of wealth to provide funds for its schoolchildren. We learned that the largest effort being made by any State in the Union amounted to 4 percent of the total personal income of the State.

We used these criteria to establish what we believe is the measure of Federal responsibility. We took the first figure, which is certain, of $400 per schoolchild. Then for each State we calculated the average amount which would be expended for the schoolchild if the State spent 4 percent of the personal income of the State, which is the highest percentage any State is providing. We calculated the 4 percent of the total income to get the total that the State should provide for education. By dividing total income by the number of schoolchildren one can get an ideal figure, at least for this year, that a State should spend for each schoolchild.

For example, my own State, Kentucky, spends less than $400 per child. It spends only $275 per child. According to the last figures available, the State was using 2.7 percent of the State personal income for education. I can tell Senators that since these figures were obtained that percentage has been increased by about one-third.

We take the figure which the State ought to spend and we subtract that amount from $400. It might be, let us say, $340 subtracted from $400. Then we say the Federal Government will supply at least one-third the difference.

In making the statistical and mathematical calculations, which can be done by anyone, we learned that even if the 26 States which provide less than $400 per child—the national average, which is the first test—spent 4 percent of their personal income for schools, 15 States could not reach the $400 level. In the 15 States, 3 are expending the highest rates in the country, or 4 percent; 14 are levying rates of over 3 percent.

I ask Senators to think of that. These States are making the greatest effort of all States in the Union.

Yet because of the fact that some States do not have the necessary wealth, they cannot meet the national average of $400 per child. Certainly if there is any sense or logic at all to the principle of equality of educational opportunity, the children in such States should be given help first.

Our amendment so provides. Over a period of 3 years we would provide one-third of the educational deficit in those States, in the hope that it would stimulate them to make an even greater effort, and in the belief that with education and perhaps the growing wealth of our country, the tax base would be increased until the State's contribution would finally reach the $400 average.

What about States whose national average is higher? There are 34 States that spend more than $300 per child per year. Three States are spending more than $500 per child every year; 18 States are spending more than $400 per child per year; and 13 States are spending more than $300 per child per year, which makes a total of 34.

If every one of those States would impose taxes equal to 4 percent of the personal income of its citizens, they could easily meet and far exceed the $400 national level.

I have said that 14 of the 15 poorest States are levying over 3 percent of their personal income for taxes for school purposes, and 3 States are levying 4 percent.

What about the 35 highest States? Twelve of the thirty-five are levying over 3 percent of their income. None is levying as much as 4 percent. The remainder are below the national average of 2.8 percent.

So when the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the committee say that they want to balance out the program among the middle income States, they would merely provide funds to States which have wealth now if they would use it, and if they would levy taxes anywhere approximating the amount that the 15 poorer States levy, their expenditures per child would surpass the $400 average that we now have.

One of my objections to the committee bill is that under the committee bill we would be giving money to States which have not made the effort that they should make, States which have the wealth that could be used to improve their schools, and States which do not need the Federal money.

Several Senators have already said to me, "Well, my State would get more money under the committee amendment."

Of course; since either $250 million has been added to the bill and it is $326 million larger than our amendment, States would receive more.

Second, the money would be given without any criteria as to the actual need of the States and the effort they are making to meet their own school needs.

The question was asked of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as to whether his State would not receive more money under the Cooper-Javits amendment. We have provided that $20 be made available for every public-school child in every State.

We did so upon the theory that those States could improve the quality of their education. If there are poorer districts within the States, they could equalize opportunities within their States.

Frankly, we drew from the experience of Senator Taft in 1947. In 1947 Senator Taft's first idea about a Federal aid to education bill was to do what several of my colleagues have suggested here today. That would be to make the money available to States which actually need it, and which number 15 or 16. Senator Taft found out, of course, that the bill would receive 15 or 16 votes. So he then did what he thought was practical to secure the passage of the bill and help the quality of education in other States. That is what we have done.

If the amendment should help New York a little more than the committee bill would, then it would be because there are more public-school children in New York. Also, there is some justice to the argument that five or six States pay about 50 percent of the cost of the bill and should not be discriminated against.

Considering the formula under the committee bill as it would apply to my own State, my State would receive $64 million over a period of 3 years. Under the Javits-Cooper amendment, we would receive about $38 million. But I know that we would receive more under the committee bill because the bill would cost more. Even if it did not, there ought to be some principle and some criteria to which we could adhere now and in the future.

Our amendment contains two principles which are known throughout every State in the United States. First is the principle of equalization. Every State has a fund to equalize expenditures and to provide more for poorer districts. I believe nearly all States have what is called a minimum foundation to try to raise the level of expenditures to the basic minimum. Our bill contains both of those provisions.

I wish to address myself to two other subjects, and I shall close. I think a

bill should have a measurable goal. Our amendment would allocate funds to the 15 poorest States. After 3 years it could be seen what progress had been made in those States and whether those States had made additional efforts to improve the quality and scope of their education. Under the committee bill, with the distribution of funds among the States, it would help without question. When money is given to States it is bound to help the recipients. But I say there are no measurable goals.

There has been some talk about whether the program would continue forever. I do not know. I know the tendency that once a program is adopted, it continues. Ideally, I hope it would continue only to that time when the disparities have been remedied and when the States could pick up the burden. Under the committee bill I see opportunities for pressures to increase the total amounts so the States would get more without any kind of criteria. Under our amendment I see that if such pressures should arise, we could say in answer, "Every State receives $20 for each child. They are all treated fairly to that extent, and we have a definite goal of raising the standards of education in the poorest States, and those which can be demonstrated to be the poorest States."

I know the tendency of Senators who work on a bill or an amendment to have a kind of pride of authorship, and we often tend to think our amendment or bill is perhaps the best. But I believe that today Senator JAVITS and I have demonstrated that our amendment contains criteria which are explainable and which could be recognized.

It defines, as we feel at this time, the Federal responsibility. It goes to the principle of trying to raise the level of educational opportunity for those children in States who are denied that opportunity. We do it to a greater extent than does the committee bill.

Finally, we do not give money away, except for the flat $20 grant, to States throughout the Union which, if they use their full capacity to provide funds for their children, would not need Federal aid.

I have supported aid to education bills in the years that I have been a Member of the Senate. I have cosponsored every bill of this nature. I have introduced bills myself. I have supported these bills. I say to my good friends on the other side: "You make it very difficult for us. We are a group on this side of the aisle who go along with many proposals which are initiated on your side of the aisle and which are not supported by many on the Republican side. We go along with them because we believe they are right and just. There are some limits to that. We must have reason to believe that they are just and that they have goals and are not just a device for spending money."

So I say you make it difficult for us. We are disappointed with the position you have taken.

I say that with great respect for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], because I know of his deep interest in Federal aid to education.

I say to our friends on the other side: Even if the amendment is defeated, I will vote for the bill, because it will help our schools. However, I do not like these devices for spending money without any criteria. I think you do harm to our States and our teachers and our schools. I am terribly disappointed with the action of some of you, my friends, on the other side of the aisle. Sometimes I think you just want to spend money—and you do, most of the time.

With all due respect I say: You make it terribly hard for Senator JAVITS and me and many others, who support many of your bills, when you come with a device which has no criteria and has no meaning except a plan to spend money. I hope the final bill will not be a plan to extend ignorance throughout the land. I hope the bill will improve the education in the land.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Kentucky has enumerated seven attributes or virtues in his bill. I should like to add what I believe is a very important one. The general purpose of the bill is to provide help in the financing of the operation and in the construction of public schools.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Having in mind that it is a public school bill, the proposal of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky confines the students to be taken care of to the public school students, and there are not included parochial school students.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct. President Kennedy asked for that, too.

Mr. LAUSCHE. President Kennedy asked for it, too.

Mr. COOPER. Exactly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. While others may disagree with me, it is my opinion that under the Constitution we cannot give aid to schools of a parochial character.

Mr. COOPER. That is my judgment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As long as we cannot do that, we ought not to rub salt into the wound of those who feel that they ought to get something too by counting their pupils in the number to be supported by the bill, when their pupils get no benefit from the bill whatever. I would merely add that as another reason why the amendment of the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky ought to be supported.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like, first, to state to my colleague from Kentucky that I have rarely heard him more eloquent or more convincing than he was today. I felt gratified and honored to be able to join with him in what is to us a very important project, and has been to him for many years.

I would also like to add a word to the Senator's view on the specific role that some of us like himself and myself and a few other Senators occupy on this side of the aisle. I believe that we exercise commendable independent judgment and we bear great responsibility. Especially is that true with respect to measures important in the eyes of our colleagues of the majority and in the eyes of the country and of the world, and I have no doubt will be so again. I believe that in doing what Senator COOPER and I have done, and what I tried to do last year in respect of medical care for the aged, and as I am sure we will have to do in other bills, we have shown that we are hard-headed. That is something which is very essential. This is often very confusing, especially for those who consider themselves liberals.

In my view, Senator COOPER has defined the situation most eloquently. A liberal is a man who is hardheaded, who does not wish to invalidate his own forward-looking programs by making them cost more than they should, or be less well administered than they should be, or in any way be wasteful, result in advantages for States and municipalities, or for people who do not need them. That is what Senator COOPER and I have tried to do today. I hope very much that the Senate will consider our efforts in that light, and that our colleagues in the majority will consider them in that light, in our trying to carry out what I deeply feel is our true and most constructive function in this area.

Mr. COOPER. I merely wish to add that in my closing remarks I did, in a sense, go beyond the argument on the amendment. I am glad I did. I am glad my colleague from New York has followed that up. I depart from the subject we are discussing and submit that there has been a great deal of talk since the beginning of this session as to what the role of the Republicans is to be. There is a good deal of difference of opinion on this side of the aisle as to what our role is.

It grows out of deep-seated convictions. All of us represent different areas of the country. We have had different experiences. We have different philosophical viewpoints about the Government. We cannot escape those things.

There are differences on our side. I may say that they show up clearly. I do not think that is any criticism. I am glad that they are there and that they show up clearly. I believe that there are differences on the other side, too, but they do not show up so clearly, and our colleagues on the other side always get together on a final vote.

Of course, I have heard a great deal said about a coalition. I know there is no such thing as a formal coalition. My own judgment is that on certain issues there are Senators on this side who feel as other Senators on the other side feel, particularly those from the South, because their convictions and beliefs go that way.

However, there are some of us over here who have our beliefs and our convictions and our experiences, who have many times voted for bills which have been presented on the other side by the administration. We have done so because we have believed in those programs. At times we have to go up against the arguments that are made against us here because we support those bills.

I see that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has entered the Chamber while we were talking; and while we have politics in mind, I will speak of him. We know his position on issues throughout the country.

We understand the great support which the Senator has. We know how sincere he is in his convictions. But some of us do not agree with the Senator as a matter of principle and conviction because, as I see it, the Senator from Arizona does not provide any way for solving some of the problems with which we have to deal, such as civil rights, unemployment, and the like. But that is beyond the point, and I do not wish to get into a political debate with the Senator.

What is our role? I think our role is to examine the proposals which are made by the other side and to bring them into debate and before public view, even if we support the basic principle.

I must say that I have been increasingly disappointed by this administration. I had hoped that it would maintain the fine idealism which was expressed in the messages of the President. I do not say that that idealism is not maintained in every respect.

But we are confronted with the kind of proposals today in which it always seems to us that the purpose of our great liberal colleagues on the other side of the aisle is to provide larger expenditures of money, and the distribution of that money among the States and the people of the States. It makes it very difficult for us.

In closing, I say to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has been a friend throughout the years, that he gave us a chance to be heard in his committee. We appreciate that. We understand the sincerity of his convictions. We salute him. But we do not salute the kind of methods which, it seems to us, are being increasingly followed by Senators on the other side of the aisle, even our liberal friends.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply to the statements made by the distinguished Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky; but, before doing so, I desire that the RECORD show my everlasting gratitude toward them and my admiration for them in connection with their work in relation to the bill for Federal aid to education, which the Senate is now considering. Except for this difference, the Senator from New York, the Senator from Kentucky, and the Senator from Oregon have worked as a team in support of legislation which seeks to place for the first time on our statute books a legal principle authorizing Federal aid to education.

The enactment of such legislation has been the objective of all three of us. The amendment they are now offering is not, and never was, offered with the intent of crippling the measure. It is a good-faith amendment, and I have greatly appreciated their honest and sincere effort to make what they regard as an improvement in the committee bill. We simply differ over its merits.

Not only were the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky invited by the committee to testify at the time formal hearings were held, but I insisted that they also be invited—of course, the Senator from New York is a member of the Subcommittee on Education—to sit with us in executive session when the matter of the formula was under discussion to consider again our varying views in regard to this particular subject matter. All of us profited from that discussion. It resulted in a reconsideration on our side of the aisle and subsequently to a revision in the committee formula.

When the discussion was over, we voted on the two formulas. The RECORD should show that Senators on the Democratic side of the table voted for the formula which is in the bill I have the honor of advancing as its floor leader, and the Republicans voted for the Cooper-Javits amendment.

Of course, Senators on the Democratic side of the table who voted for the committee formula will vote for the bill. That is not true of all Senators on the Republican side of the table. Some who voted for the Cooper-Javits formula will not, in any event, vote for the bill, even though the Cooper-Javits formula should be added to the bill. I sincerely hope it will not be added to the bill. I think it would do great damage to the bill and to the whole program of Federal aid to education, for reasons I shall now set forth.

There was raised again in some of the colloquies today in connection with the discussion of the Cooper-Javits amendment—although the particular subject matter had nothing to do with the Cooper-Javits amendment—the old fear argument that Federal aid to education will lead to Federal domination of education. On February 24, 1859, President James Buchanan submitted to Congress his veto of the Morrill Act. It is interesting to note that in 1859 the same old argumentative bromide, as I would refer to it, was used by President Buchanan. But a later Congress responded by passing the measure again. It was signed by President Lincoln and so there went on the law books the Morrill Act, by which the land-grant colleges of the Nation have functioned ever since.

As I have said so many times in debate and in the hearings, there is not a scintilla of evidence that the Federal aid to education has ever led to any control or domination of our colleges.

Also, we are now giving substantial support to about one-third of the school children of the Nation, and have been ever since 1950, under both Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, totaling, in round figures, since 1950, $2 billion. That is a further proof that the old argument that such aid will lead to Federal control of education is really an appeal to the fears and prejudices of the American people, not an appeal to fact. Of course, there have been many other programs of Federal aid to education.

I simply say, in closing this argument, and for the first time it will be necessary to mention it on the floor, that if Congress can give aid to all the colleges and their students who have been receiving it for decades, and if Congress can give financial aid to one-third of the elementary and secondary schools of the country, without any evidence that such aid has ever led to Federal control and domination, then let us stop being frightened. Let us work for the benefit of the school children of the country by passing this Federal aid to education bill.

I now turn to some brief comments on the Cooper-Javits amendment. The Cooper-Javits amendment is based on average daily attendance. In the course of their argument, my very dear friends from New York and Kentucky have referred to the position taken by the late distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, in 1947, and 1949. I point out that the Taft bill of 1947, and the Thomas bill of 1949, of which Bob Taft also was a leading sponsor, and which I cosponsored with him, together with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], was not based upon the average daily attendance. It was based upon the total school age population in the States.

I wish to make this fact very clear, because there may be a false assumption in the minds of some Members of the Senate that the Cooper-Javits amendment is identical to what has been referred to in this debate as the Taft bills of 1947 and 1949. More accurately, the measures should be referred to as the Taft bill of 1947 and the Thomas bill of 1949. Those bills were not based upon average daily attendance; they were based upon the total school age population between the ages of 5 and 17, just as the bill I am presenting to the Senate and just as the bill, S. 8, which the Senate passed last year, were based upon total school age population.

It is the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from New York who are varying from the established policy of the Senate. Do not forget that in 1947, 1949, and 1960 the Senate passed Federal aid to education bills which were based upon formulas which included the total school age population between the ages of 5 and 17 in the States.

Without taking the time to read all of it, I should like to document the statement I have just made by referring Senators for a moment to a Senate committee report dated July 3, 1947. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE REPORT NO. 425, 80TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION—EDUCATIONAL FINANCE ACT OF 1947

(By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare)

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, to whom was referred the bill (S. 472) to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools, for the general welfare, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, with an amendment, and recommend that the bill, as amended, be adopted.

The amendment made by the committee was as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That this Act may be cited as the 'Education Finance Act of 1947'.

"SEC. 2. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or to prescribe any requirements with respect to any school, or any State educational institution or agency, with respect to which any funds have been or may be made available or expended pursuant to this Act, nor shall any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this Act, whether by agreement or otherwise, relating to any contribution made under this Act to or on behalf of any school, or any State educational institution or agency, or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this Act, seek to control in any manner, or prescribe requirements with respect to, or authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to direct, supervise, or control in any manner, or prescribe any requirements with respect to, the administration, the personnel, the curriculum, the instruction, the methods of instruction, or the materials of instruction, nor shall any provision of this Act be interpreted or construed to imply or require any change in any State constitution prerequisite to any State sharing the benefits of this Act.

"APPROPRIATION AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 3. For the purpose of more nearly equalizing public elementary-school and public secondary-school opportunities among and within the States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $300,000,000 to be distributed among the States as hereinafter provided.

"APPORTIONMENT

"SEC. 4. Ninety-eight per centum of the funds appropriated under section 3 of this Act for each fiscal year shall be distributed among the States, excluding those enumerated in paragraph (G) of this section, in the following manner:

"(A) Multiply (a) the number of children from five to seventeen years of age, inclusive, in each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third calendar year next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) $45.

"(B) Multiply (a) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh calendar years next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) 1 per centum.

"(C) Subject to the succeeding provisions of this section, the amount of the Federal allotment for any State shall be (a) the amount, if any, by which the amount calculated under paragraph (A) exceeds the amount calculated under paragraph (B) with respect to such State, or (b) $5 multiplied by the number of children in such State from five to seventeen years of age, inclusive, as determined under paragraph (A), whichever is greater.

"(D) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) the amount spent in each State from revenues derived from State or local sources for current expenditures for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the third fiscal year next preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined under paragraph (B) of this section. When the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.5, the amount of the Federal allotment to such State, as computed under paragraph (C), shall be proportionately reduced.

"(E) Determine the percentage ratio of (a) current expenditures in each State from revenues derived from State or local sources for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education for the year for which the computation is made, as estimated on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose, to (b) the average of the annual income payments for each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the three most recent calendar years for which annual income data are available. When for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1952, the percentage ratio thus determined for any State is less than 2.0, such State shall be ineligible to receive any part of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this Act for such fiscal year, unless the estimated current expenditures under clause (a) of this paragraph is an amount equal to or greater than $120 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance for such fiscal year as determined on the basis of reports submitted by the State for such purpose. Any State thus determined to be ineligible shall remain ineligible until such time as revised estimates, determined as provided under this paragraph, produce a percentage ratio equal to or greater than 2.0, or an amount equal to or greater than $120 multiplied by the number of pupils in average daily attendance.

"(F) In the event 98 per centum of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 3 of this Act is insufficient to pay to all eligible States the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State, computed in accordance with the foregoing provisions of this section, the amount to be paid to each eligible State shall bear the same ratio to the amount of the Federal allotment to each such State as 98 per centum of such appropriation bears to the sum of the Federal allotments to all eligible States.

"(G) From 2 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this Act, such sums as may be necessary shall be apportioned by the Commissioner to Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam according to their respective needs for additional funds for public elementary and public secondary schools upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective State educational authorities.

"CERTIFICATION AND PAYMENT

"SEC. 5. The United States Commissioner of Education shall certify for each fiscal year the amounts to be paid under this Act to each State that has qualified under section 7 of this Act to the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall, through the fiscal service of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the treasurer or corresponding official of such State the amount certified for such fiscal year in four equal installments, as soon after the first day of each quarter as may be feasible, beginning with the first quarter of the fiscal year for which appropriations made under the authorization of this Act are available. Such treasurer or corresponding official shall pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

"AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 6. In order more nearly to equalize educational opportunities, the funds paid to a State from the funds appropriated under section 3 of this Act shall be available for disbursement by the State educational authority, either directly or through payments to local public-school jurisdictions or other State public-education agencies, for any current expenditure for elementary or secondary school purposes for which educational revenues derived from State or local sources may legally and constitutionally be expended in such State.

"STATE ACCEPTANCE PROVISIONS

"SEC. 7. (A) In order to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this Act a State—

"(1) through its legislature, shall (a) accept the provisions of this Act and provide for the administration of funds to be received; (b) provide that the State treasurer or corresponding official in the State shall receive the funds paid to that State under this Act and shall be required to submit to the United States Commissioner of Education, on or before the 1st day of November of each year, for transmission to the Congress, a detailed statement of the amount so received for the preceding fiscal year and of its disbursement; (c) provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of funds received; (d) provide for an annual audit, and for the submission of a copy thereof to the Commissioner, of the expenditure of funds received under this Act, and for a system of reports from local public-school jurisdictions and other State public-education agencies to the State educational authority; (e) provide that the State educational authority shall make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education, on forms to be provided by the Commissioner, which reports the Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress with recommendations for such revisions of this Act as in his judgment the Congress should consider, with particular reference to recommendations arising from changing conditions in our national economy; (f) provide that the funds paid to any State from the funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall be disbursed only to those local public-school jurisdictions or other State public-education agencies that, from revenues derived from State or local sources, pay average monthly salaries to their teachers not less than the average monthly salaries paid as of February 1, 1947, or the nearest prior date when school was in session; (g) in States where separate public schools are maintained for minority races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds to public schools maintained for minority races, without reduction of the proportion of revenues, derived from State or local sources, expended for educational purposes during the fiscal year ended in 1947 for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education of minority races: *Provided*, That, until the end of the fiscal year in which occurs the adjournment of the first regular session of the legislature of any State, which convenes after the enactment of this Act, or until such legislature takes the action required under this section to qualify for receiving funds, whichever first occurs, such State shall be deemed to qualify for receiving such funds if the chief executive of such State takes the action required under this section to so qualify;

"(2) through its legislature, shall provide that the State educational authority shall formulate and effectuate, for each fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1951, a plan for the apportionment of amounts paid to such State from funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this Act for such fiscal year under which (a) there will be available from all sources to each local public-school jurisdiction or other State public-education agency, for current expenditures for public elementary-school and public secondary-school education, an amount per pupil in average daily attendance at public elementary and secondary schools within such local public-school jurisdiction, or under the jurisdiction of such State public-education agency, not less than $50 or, in any fiscal year for which the amount to be

paid to a State is less by reason of the provisions of paragraph (F) of section 4 than the amount of the Federal allotment to such State, an amount which bears the same ratio to $50 as 98 per centum of the funds appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to section 3 bears to the sum of all Federal allotments under section 4; and (b) in States where separate schools are maintained for minority races, there will be available from all sources to each local public-school jurisdiction or other State public-education agency for current expenditures for the schools maintained within such local public-school jurisdiction, or under the jurisdiction of other State public-education agency, for such races an amount per pupil in average daily attendance in such schools not less than the amount per pupil required under clause (a) to be made available with respect to all schools within such local public-school jurisdiction or under the jurisdiction of such other State public-education agency.

"(3) shall transmit through its State educational authority to the United States Commissioner of Education notice of acceptance and certified copies of the legislative enactments and the regulations that may be issued by the State educational authority in connection with such funds. Any amendment of such enactments and revisions of regulations shall in like manner be transmitted to said Commissioner.

"(B) The funds appropriated pursuant to section 3 of this Act shall be paid only to those States which, during the preceding fiscal year, have provided from revenues derived from State sources for all public elementary-school and public secondary-school purposes an amount equivalent to at least one of the following: (1) The total amount actually spent for such purposes from such sources in the fiscal year ended in 1947, or (2) the amount per pupil in average daily attendance actually spent for such purposes from such sources in the fiscal year ended in 1947.

"RIGHT OF APPEAL

"SEC. 8. In the event a State educational authority is dissatisfied with any action by the United States Commissioner of Education taken with respect to such State pursuant to this Act, or with his failure to take any action with respect to such State pursuant to this Act, such authority shall have a right to appeal to the Commissioner to change the action he has taken or to take the action he has failed to take, and to present to him in support of such appeal such statements and other evidence as such authority may deem appropriate. If the action taken by the Commissioner on such appeal is not satisfactory to the State educational authority, or if he fails to act thereon within ninety days after he receives such appeal, such authority shall have a right to appeal to the United States district court for any district in which any part of such State is located. The court shall receive in evidence a copy of the statements and other evidence presented by the State educational authority to the Commissioner, and such further evidence as the court in its discretion deems proper; and shall have jurisdiction to enter such judgment as the facts and the law may require.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 9. As used in this Act—

"(A) The term 'State' shall include the several States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam.

"(B) The term 'legislature' means the State or Territorial legislature or other comparable body, except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa and the Virgin Islands it shall mean the Governor.

"(C) The term 'minority race' shall mean any race or racial group that constitutes a minority of the population of the continental United States.

"(D) A just and equitable apportionment of the funds provided under this Act for the benefit of public schools maintained for minority races in a State which maintains by law separate public schools for minority races, means any plan of distribution which results in the expenditure, for the benefit of such minority race of a proportion of said funds not less than the proportion that such minority race in such State bears to the total population of that State.

"(E) The term 'State educational authority' means, as the State legislature may determine, (1) the chief State school officer (such as the State superintendent of public instruction, commissioner of education, or similar officer), or (2) a board of education controlling the State department of education; except that in the District of Columbia it shall mean the Board of Education, and in American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, it shall mean the Governor.

"(F) The term 'current expenditure' does not include expenditures for interest, debt service, and capital outlay.

"SEPARABILITY

"SEC. 10. If any provision of this Act or application thereof to any State, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other States, persons, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby."

Your committee has thoroughly studied several proposals for Federal aid to education. The committee held hearings for 10 days, and received the testimony of over 100 individuals and organizations.

The question of whether or not the Federal Government should establish a policy of financial assistance to the States for public elementary and secondary education was not at issue before the committee. From the beginning, the Federal Government has encouraged education through various types of grants-in-aid. Federal aid to the States for education is not new. The considerations of the committee had to do chiefly with problems of how to achieve this end.

Extensive hearings on Federal support for elementary and secondary education were held by the Committee on Education and Labor of the Seventy-ninth Congress. A report of that committee, recommending the enactment of S. 181[1], outlines arguments in support of Federal aid to education. These arguments have been resubstantiated fully by abundant and convincing evidence examined by your committee. Such new evidence as has been brought to the attention of the present committee has served only to underscore the conclusions of the earlier report. In recent months, as a result of economic adjustments following World War II, the critical inadequacy of the financial structure supporting American school systems has been accentuated.

At no time has there been greater public attention to the problems of extending educational opportunity. The facts are now legend, the arguments patent. In the national interest the Federal Government must assume the responsibility of seeing that all American children and youth have an opportunity for a defensible minimum of education.

THE BASIS FOR A FEDERAL POLICY

The primary obligation to educate children under our constitutional system falls on the States and local communities, control being in the State. The public-school systems in the United States operate under State law and receive their primary support through provision made by the several States and their political subdivisions.

[1] Rept. No. 1497, 79th Cong.

The national interest

In our Federal form of government, the youth of our country are not only citizens of the States in which they reside, but also citizens of the entire Nation. There is a free movement of population and commerce among the States. Each State is economically dependent upon the others. Due to increased population mobility, moreover, future citizens of areas in which there is the greatest concentration of wealth are now being educated or neglected in the less-privileged areas. No State is immune to the diffusion of ignorance.

We are a great and wealthy Nation. The Federal Government is authorized to levy taxes to provide for the general welfare and, under that constitutional authority, has the right to dispense money to the States for purposes not within the constitutional power of the United States to control or regulate.

Not only are some of the States relatively poor, but States in general have a limited power of taxation. Though the Federal Government's powers of taxation are not unlimited, its revenue resources have increased at a much greater rate than have the sources of revenue within States and their political subdivisions upon which the costs of public education must depend.

Apart from the general humanitarian interest of establishing a floor under educational expenditures, equality of opportunity lies at the basis of the entire Republic. No child can begin to have equality of opportunity unless he has in his youth, above all, effective schooling. It is the concern of the entire Nation to see that the principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution are translated into reality.

Citizenship and education

Democracy cannot function, nor can it carry its heavy international responsibilities, unless all citizens obtain the basic education to permit intelligent and informed participation in the work and life of the Nation. Our children are facing today a tremendously complex world. There are serious economic problems and social problems requiring intelligent solution; there is international unrest; and there are many other problems which, to be properly met, require the best training and education our children can possibly be given. It is evident that millions of them are not getting this now.

Education and the preservation of democracy

We cannot preserve the Republic at all unless the people are taught to read and to think so that they can understand its basic principles and the application of those principles to current problems. No man can be free who does not understand the opportunities which lie before him. No man can have equality of opportunity if he has not the knowledge to understand how to use the rights which may be conferred upon him in theory.

The most precious asset this Nation, or any nation, has is its children. To conserve and develop this human resource is the best insurance we can have for the future greatness and security of our Nation. Not only is education essential to economic welfare, but it is the major defense of liberty against totalitarianism.

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

The dimensions of the educational crisis may be summarized as follows:

1. Vast numbers of American children are receiving a substandard education or no education at all: (a) In the present school year, 1946–47, at least 2 million children are suffering a major impairment in their schooling because of poorly prepared teachers. One teacher in eight in public elementary and secondary education is serving on an emergency or substandard certificate.

(b) Because no qualified teachers could be found thousands of children have been closed out of schools or classes; other thousands are attending part-time schools.

(c) More than a million school children are in schools in which annual current expenditures of all types, such as administrative expenses, teachers' salaries, teaching supplies, transportation, health service, and operation and maintenance of school buildings are less than $500 per classroom.

(d) According to United States census estimates for the year 1945 more than 4,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17, inclusive, attend no school whatever.

(e) The present lack of opportunity is an enlargement on long-time educational inadequacies which resulted (1) in the Federal census reporting in 1940 that 10,000,000 American adults had less than 5 years of schooling, and (2) in World War II 8 percent of the young men examined by the Selective Service being rejected for educational deficiencies.

2. School systems are unable to compete with other occupations for competent and trained personnel because of a lack of funds.—During the war period teachers in unusually large numbers left the profession for better-paying opportunities in nonteaching employment. At least 350,000 qualified teachers left during the years from 1941 to 1945, many never to return. This exodus largely caused by low pay was in turn due to insufficient funds for educational purposes.

Under the pressure of higher living costs and the turnover in employment school systems have raised salaries. The States have increased their financial aid. Yet in spite of this only two States have been able to enact a $2,400-minimum-salary law for new teachers. Most States still have legal minimums below $2,000 annually even for teachers with 4 years of college preparation; one-third have prescribed no official minimum salary.

At the beginning of the school year 1946–47 careful estimates indicated that nearly 54 percent of the teachers in public schools were to be paid less than $2,000 for the year; 16 percent had been promised salaries of less than $1,200.

Salaries in teaching are so unattractive that an unprecedentedly small number of college students are preparing for teaching. Although enrollments in all colleges have been swelled by GI's and those whose education was delayed by the war, teachers colleges have not grown in size comparable to other types of institutions. Of those enrolled in teachers colleges in 1941, nearly 90 percent took courses leading to employment in teaching; in 1946–47 only 67 percent of teacher-college enrollments were in teacher-preparatory courses.

Throughout the Nation the amounts of money allotted to school supplies, the repair and maintenance of school buildings, and the construction of new buildings have reached a critically low point. Materials and labor have doubled the cost of building construction and maintenance. The condition of physical equipment and facilities has fallen below 1941 and the outlook for funds to meet these conditions and, at the same time, the promised higher salary schedules, is not encouraging.

3. Educational inequalities are prevalent: In 1939–40 the best financed school systems spent $6,000 or more per classroom and the poorest financed systems less than $100 per classroom, a variation of 60 to 1. Checks upon the current situation indicate that the differences are today of the same magnitude. Comparable variations in expenditures for education exist within most of the States.

4. Educational inequalities are primarily due to inequalities in the financial resources of school districts and States to support schools: There is a wide variation in the wealth and income of different States and school districts. The income per capita ranges from $556 in Mississippi to $1,595 in New York for the year 1945, a difference of 3 to 1 in the average wealth of the people. The differences between school districts in the same State are even wider. By and large, it is in States and localities where income is lowest that least adequate educational services are provided. That is to say, in many school districts the failure in education is primarily due to the relative poverty of the locality or the State in which it lies. In such districts a satisfactory level of expenditure for schools is not possible with available or potentially available State and local tax resources. Only through Federal assistance can all States raise the level of service in substandard areas. While money is not the only requirement of a good school system, it is certainly an essential one.

It is without a doubt a national obligation to provide funds for at least a minimum defensible expenditure in those areas which are not able to maintain such a minimum otherwise.

BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE BILL AS AMENDED

The provisions of the bill satisfy three principles which the committee considers fundamental.

1. Preservation of State and local control: The administration of education and the control of school systems must be left completely in the hands of organizational units within the States. The conditions to be met by the States are clearly established in the bill, the apportionment of funds is based upon an objective formula, and no discretionary power to determine amount of funds available to any State rests with any Federal official or agency. The amount of Federal assistance is such as merely to supplement the revenues of State and local school systems, and is thus not sufficient to approach Federal assumption of the costs of educational programs. It is believed that the amounts are sufficient to provide an essential strengthening of the financial base supporting such program such that they may continue to operate under the principles of local self-government.

2. The principle of equalization: It is the purpose of the bill to provide through Federal funds assistance to those school systems which, by virtue of inadequate State and local sources of revenue, are in greatest need of such assistance. The allotments to States are variable, from $5 per child in the ablest States, to $25 or more per child in poorer States. Without interfering with the freedom of States to determine their methods of financing schools, the bill requires States to distribute Federal funds so that the neediest school districts will receive a prior claim to the benefits accruing from the appropriations. This is achieved by requiring States to develop plans for guaranteeing a floor of $50 per pupil in average daily attendance under expenditures in all local school jurisdictions within the State. The formula for apportioning Federal aid provides sufficient funds, taking into consideration the financial abilities of the States, to make this possible without taking money now being spent from schools in wealthier districts to raise low expenditure schools to this minimum expenditure level.

3. Maintaining reasonable levels of State and local effort: It is not believed that Federal funds for the support of public education should be used to replace State effort to support public schools. Under the bill States are not eligible to receive the benefits of the Federal-aid program unless from their own sources they are expending for public elementary and public secondary education a minimum percentage of their income or an amount equivalent to approximately the national average level of expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance. To the extent that State and local expenditures are less than 2.5 percent of a State's income its Federal allotment is proportionately reduced.

ANALYSIS OF THE BILL AS AMENDED

The purpose of the act is to assist the States in equalizing educational opportunity through Federal allotments of not less than $5 per child of school age to any State, and sufficient additional amounts to those States which, after making reasonable effort to provide support for schools, are still unable to produce an amount necessary to guarantee a minimum educational program. This minimum is defined as that kind of school that can be provided by an average annual current expenditure of not less than $50 per pupil in average daily attendance.

Limitations on Federal control

Section 2: Specifically prohibits any department, agency, officer, or employee from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over any school, educational agency, or institution with respect to this act. This is a positive prohibition against impairment of local and State control over public elementary and public secondary education with reference to expenditures made under the act. In this section an additional safeguard is provided. Federal agencies or officials are prohibited from attaching "any term or condition of any agreement or any other action taken under this Act * * * or any limitation or provision in any appropriation made pursuant to this Act * * *."

Appropriation authorized

Section 3: Authorizes for the purposes of the act an annual appropriation of $300,000,000 beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

Appointment

Section 4: Defines the method by which Federal funds are apportioned to the States. The formula is objective, leaving no discretion to any Federal agency or official. The basic allotment to a State is either (1) the excess of $45 per child over 1 percent of a 5-year average of annual income for the State, or (2) a flat amount of $5 per child, whichever is greater. Number of children in each State is the population from 5 to 17 years of age, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third year next preceding the year for which the computation is made. Income payments in each State is the average of annual income payments, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for 5 years—the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, and seventh next preceding years for which the computation is made.

Subsection (D) provides a reduction to any State which is not spending from State and local revenues at a percentage rate of its income as much as the average throughout the United States for the decade immediately preceding World War II. In the event a State eligible for Federal aid spends less than 2.5 percent of its annual income for schools, its amount of Federal aid as computed in subsection (C) is proportionately reduced. The purpose of this provision is to discourage any tendency of Federal funds to replace State effort in support of public schools.

Subsection (E) further discourages any tendency toward shifting the financial responsibility from States to the Federal Government. It provides that after the fourth year of the operation of the act, a State to be eligible to receive any amount must spend from State and local sources an amount equal to or greater than 2 percent of its annual income payments or $120 per pupil in average daily attendance, whichever is the lesser amount.

Subsection (F) provides for a pro rata distribution of funds to States in case the amount appropriated is less than the total amount of the allotment to all States.

In subsection (G) 2 percent of the funds appropriated are reserved for apportionment to the Territories and outlying possessions, including Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. These Territories and outlying possessions are omitted from the formula provisions applying to the States for the reasons that they represent unique educational problems and needs and comparable statistical information is not applicable. The United States Commissioner of Education is vested with authority to apportion to the Territories and outlying possessions 2 percent of the amount appropriated according to their respective needs and upon the basis of joint agreements made with their respective educational authorities.

Certification and payment

Section 5: Provides for the certification by the Commissioner of Education and payments in quarterly installments through the Secretary of the Treasury of amounts due each State. Payments are made to the treasurer or corresponding official of the State to pay out such funds only on the requisition of the State educational authority.

Availability of appropriations

Section 6: Defines the objects for which Federal funds may be expended under the act. An expenditure in any given State, to be a proper expenditure of Federal funds under the act, must be (*a*) for an elementary- or a secondary-school purpose, (*b*) a "current" expenditure for such purpose, and (*c*) an expenditure for which non-Federal educational funds may legally and constitutionally be expended in that State.

Variations in State finance systems is recognized in the section. Disbursements may be made directly by State educational authorities as is done in some States, through local public school jurisdictions as is customary, or through other State public-education agencies. Non-public-school children may in any State receive benefits of the act to the extent that expenditures relating thereto meet the foregoing conditions; that is, the expenditures must be "current" expenditures for elementary- or secondary-school purposes, and they must be only for such objects of elementary- or secondary-school current expenditure as are legally and constitutionally objects of such expenditure from non-Federal educational funds in that State.

With respect to this section, the committee has examined extensive materials bearing upon the question of aid to nonpublic schools. The committee considered bills which would make Federal funds available to such schools regardless of the policy of any State government in refusing in any way to recognize such schools as part of the public-school system. There are many who argue in support of this position. There are others who hold that Federal funds should not be available for nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, even though made eligible by State governments to receive the benefits of State and local revenues. If the Congress were to yield to either of these arguments, it would clearly be changing the educational policy of the State and thus the principle of State and local control which we accept as basic to this legislation.

The difficulty has to do chiefly with those nonpublic, non-tax-supported institutions which are sectarian. The committee has looked into the question of the constitutionality of direct financial assistance to sectarian schools. While there is no doubt in the minds of the committee regarding the constitutionality of use of Federal funds for the support of public schools under public control, it is equally certain that direct payments of public funds of all types to private sectarian schools is unconstitutional. In the words of the Supreme Court: "No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion."[2]

Courts have upheld practices of States providing children in sectarian schools, through public taxation, certain services auxiliary to education, such as free textbooks and transportation. These decisions have been based on the theory of benefit to the child, not benefit to the school. The most recent example is a decision of the Supreme Court which ruled that a statute in New Jersey authorizing reimbursement to parents for transportation of children attending parochial schools did not violate the Federal Constitution. The decision was based upon the theory that the statute was for a public purpose and not for support of the private school. According to this opinion—

"This Court has said that parents may, in the discharge of their duty under State compulsory education laws, send their children to a religious rather than a public school if the school meets the secular educational requirements which the State has power to impose. See *Pierce* v. *Society of Sisters* (268 U.S. 510). It appears that these parochial schools meet New Jersey's requirements. The State contributes no money to the schools. It does not support them. Its legislation, as applied, does no more than provide a general program to help parents get their children, regardless of their religion, safely and expeditiously to and from accredited schools.

"The first amendment has erected a wall between church and state. That wall must be kept high and impregnable. We could not approve the slightest breach. New Jersey has not breached it here."

This provision is not limited to the question of support of nonpublic schools. Many types of educational services are recognized as a part of tax-supported free public elementary and secondary education in some States and not in others. Not all States, for example, have generally established kindergartens. In some States the elementary and secondary school program includes only 11 years. In other States public tax-supported education under local control includes the 13th and 14th years.

It is natural that the character of education under our decentralized system differs in type and quality from State to State and community to community. Experiments in method have been freely made and have failed or succeeded after a fair trial. The people of States and localities are continuously changing, adapting, or extending their educational programs as so to provide improved educational services for children and youth. Men differently taught have developed novel and clashing theories which have finally met in the form of national debate to be passed upon by the entire people, as they should be in a free republic. This very variety of education has promoted a freedom of thought and, consequently, a material progress, greater than that of any other country in the world.

It is the intent of this section to supplement the prohibitions of section 2 in leaving a broad mandate to the States to continue exercising responsibility for determining the character of public-supported educational programs, and the means by which it is to be achieved. It is not intended as an invitation to introduce practices which would breach provisions of the Constitution or which would otherwise violate the will of the people in any State as expressed through their legislatures and courts.

State acceptance provisions

Section 7: Provides that a State, if it wishes to qualify for receiving funds appropriated under this act, shall through its legislature, accept the provisions of the act, and set up the necessary procedures for the administration of the act. Until the legislature has had an opportunity to act, the Governor may act in lieu of the legislature.

The legislature is to provide that the State treasurer or corresponding State official shall serve as trustee of the funds received under the act and report to Congress, through the United States Commissioner of Education, a detailed statement of the amount so received and of its disbursement; provide that its State educational authority shall represent the State in the administration of these funds; provide for an audit by the State educational authority of the expenditure of funds received and apportioned to local school jurisdictions and a system of reports to such State authority; provide that the State educational authority shall make reports to the Commissioner with respect to the progress of education within the State, which reports said Commissioner shall convey to the Congress; in States where separate public schools are maintained for minority races, provide for a just and equitable apportionment of such funds to public schools maintained for minority races without reduction of the proportion of State and local moneys expended for educational purposes during the fiscal year ended in 1947 for public schools for minority races.

This section stipulates that funds appropriated under this act shall be allotted only to those States which provide from State revenues for all public elementary and public secondary school purposes not less than the total amount, or the amount per pupil in average daily attendance, actually spent for such purposes in the fiscal year ended in 1947.

The same section of the act provides that only those local school jurisdictions shall be entitled to receive funds appropriated under the act that continue to pay average monthly salaries to their teachers not less than the average monthly salaries paid as of February 1, 1947, or the nearest prior date when school was in session. This provision does not apply to the salary of any individual teacher, but does apply to the average salary paid in the local school jurisdiction. Clearly, the intent of this provision is to prevent the reduction of teachers' salaries customarily paid from State and local funds and a substitution of Federal funds therefor without the improvement of teachers' salaries.

The State, either through its legislature or through its State educational authority, if the legislature so directs, shall provide for the apportioning of funds under the act in such manner that, not later than the fourth year of operation of the act and each year thereafter, there will be available from all sources, to all local school jurisdictions not less than $50 (or a proportionately smaller amount, if the amount of Federal funds appropriated is less than the total amount of Federal allotments to all States) per year per pupil in average daily attendance for current expenditures (excluding interest, debt service, and capital outlay) for the maintenance of a program of public elementary and public secondary school education. The bill thus sets up a minimum foundation program of education providing equal basic education to all youth within the Nation.

This section further provides that in States where separate public schools are maintained for separate races, the State

[2] *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, No. 52—October term, 1946, decided February 10, 1947.

through its legislature shall provide a just and equitable apportionment of such funds for the benefit of schools maintained for minority races, without reduction in the proportion of State and local moneys expended for educational purposes, during the fiscal year ended in 1947 and further requires that the State plan shall provide that in local school jurisdictions where separate schools are maintained for minority races current expenditures for the schools maintained for each separate racial group shall average not less than the foregoing minimum established for all local school systems.

Right of appeal

Section 8: Gives State educational agencies the right to appeal questions of administration to the Commissioner of Education and after 90 days, if not satisfactorily terminated, the right to appeal to the U.S. district court.

Definitions

Section 9: Contains certain essential definitions of terms used in the act.

Separability

Section 10: Is a separability clause providing that provisions of the act held invalid to any State, person, or circumstance, does not affect the application of such provisions to other States or persons or the application of other provisions of the act.

ESTIMATES OF APPORTIONMENT OF FUNDS AUTHORIZED

In the accompanying tables are statistics showing the approximate distribution of funds assuming the appropriation of the full amount authorized. These are estimates based upon latest available statistics on expenditures, income, attendance, and number of schoolchildren in each State.

TABLE 1.—*Basic statistics, by States: Income payments, population 5–17 years, average daily attendance, and current expenditures for public elementary and secondary education*

State	Total annual income payments, average 1941–45 (millions)[1]	Estimated number of children 5–17 years of age, 1944 (thousands)[2]	Average daily attendance, 1944–45[3]	Total current expenditures for public elementary and secondary education[3] (thousands)	Percent expenditures of income payments
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Continental United States	$129,844	28,930	19,671,398	$2,431,130	1.87
Alabama	1,616	790	529,165	28,884	1.79
Arizona	491	143	91,444	11,348	2.31
Arkansas	957	488	315,742	18,362	1.92
California	10,924	1,452	1,125,733	176,377	1.61
Colorado	1,034	245	170,276	21,885	2.12
Connecticut	2,419	341	223,971	35,272	1.46
Delaware	353	57	36,234	4,724	1.34
District of Columbia	1,082	144	77,762	12,252	1.13
Florida	1,856	452	322,748	29,847	1.61
Georgia	1,938	825	546,480	34,933	1.80
Idaho	439	120	93,040	10,367	2.36
Illinois	9,016	1,504	954,458	160,446	1.78
Indiana	3,433	729	534,535	69,603	2.03
Iowa	2,127	501	386,021	47,661	2.24
Kansas	1,620	372	271,784	35,311	2.18
Kentucky	1,556	704	415,478	33,073	2.13
Louisiana	1,642	611	366,965	34,599	2.11
Maine	740	188	131,521	12,746	1.72
Maryland	2,316	427	250,109	28,221	1.22
Massachusetts	4,892	832	514,334	85,315	1.74
Michigan	6,057	1,196	859,517	108,014	1.78
Minnesota	2,220	556	395,227	56,483	2.54
Mississippi	979	595	448,684	19,488	1.99
Missouri	$3,213	751	498,688	$55,845	1.74
Montana	485	109	78,600	12,732	2.63
Nebraska	1,093	270	200,753	25,339	2.32
Nevada	180	27	19,192	2,784	1.55
New Hampshire	377	98	57,601	7,470	1.98
New Jersey	5,142	805	532,669	105,063	2.04
New Mexico	345	152	94,397	11,204	3.25
New York	16,972	2,402	1,566,225	303,180	1.79
North Carolina	2,114	977	713,146	46,719	2.21
North Dakota	487	145	100,700	13,281	2.73
Ohio	7,744	1,418	1,006,961	136,365	1.76
Oklahoma	1,488	535	381,028	36,068	2.42
Oregon	1,338	225	176,453	25,351	1.89
Pennsylvania	9,667	2,082	1,352,646	184,192	1.91
Rhode Island	856	144	80,312	11,879	1.39
South Carolina	1,058	543	362,056	23,241	2.20
South Dakota	472	137	97,565	13,949	2.96
Tennessee	1,847	739	509,678	35,016	1.90
Texas	5,220	1,575	1,013,514	102,888	1.97
Utah	553	157	122,432	14,295	2.58
Vermont	276	75	49,436	5,747	2.08
Virginia	2,379	708	467,297	38,490	1.62
Washington	2,524	364	292,917	44,868	1.78
West Virginia	1,205	499	363,275	33,586	2.79
Wisconsin	2,868	660	431,229	60,088	2.10
Wyoming	234	56	41,220	6,259	2.67

[1] From U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, August 1946.
[2] U.S. Office of Education.
[3] U.S. Office of Education statistics adjusted to eliminate amount received from Federal Government.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated allotment of Federal aid to States under S. 472*[1]

State	$5 per child 5–17 years of age (thousands)	Excess of $45 per child over 1 percent of income payments (thousands)	Total amount of allotment (thousands)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Continental United States	$144,650	$215,855	$295,260
Alabama	3,950	19,390	19,390
Arizona	740	1,750	1,750
Arkansas	2,440	12,390	12,390
California	7,260	----------	7,260
Colorado	1,225	685	1,225
Connecticut	1,705	----------	1,705
Delaware	285	----------	285
District of Columbia	720	----------	720
Florida	1,260	1,780	2,260
Georgia	4,125	17,745	17,745
Idaho	600	1,010	1,010
Illinois	7,520	----------	7,520
Indiana	3,645	----------	3,645
Iowa	2,505	1,275	2,505
Kansas	1,860	540	1,860
Kentucky	3,520	16,120	16,120
Louisiana	3,055	11,075	11,075
Maine	940	1,060	1,060
Maryland	2,135	----------	2,135
Massachusetts	4,160	----------	4,160
Michigan	5,980	----------	5,980
Minnesota	2,780	2,820	2,820

[1] As computed in sec. 4 (C) without application of reductions provided in sec. 4 (D).

TABLE 2.—*Estimated allotment of Federal aid to States under S. 472*[1]—Continued

State	$5 per child 5–17 years of age (thousands)	Excess of $45 per child over 1 percent of income payments (thousands)	Total amount of allotment (thousands)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Mississippi	$2,975	$16,985	$16,985
Missouri	3,755	1,665	3,755
Montana	545	55	545
Nebraska	1,350	1,220	1,350
Nevada	135	----------	135
New Hampshire	490	640	640
New Jersey	4,025	----------	4,025
New Mexico	760	3,390	3,390
New York	12,010	----------	12,010
North Carolina	4,885	22,825	22,825
North Dakota	725	1,655	1,655
Ohio	7,090	----------	7,090
Oklahoma	2,675	9,195	9,195
Oregon	1,125	----------	1,125
Pennsylvania	10,410	----------	10,410
Rhode Island	720	----------	720
South Carolina	2,715	13,855	13,855
South Dakota	685	1,445	1,445
Tennessee	3,695	14,785	14,785
Texas	7,875	18,675	18,675
Utah	785	1,535	1,535
Vermont	375	615	615
Virginia	3,540	8,070	8,070
Washington	1,820	----------	1,820
West Virginia	2,495	10,405	10,405
Wisconsin	3,300	1,020	3,300
Wyoming	280	180	280

TABLE 3.—*Estimated income, and Federal allotment under S. 472, per child, 5–17 years, by States*[1]

State	Income per child, 5–17 years	Federal allotment per child, 5–17 years
(1)	(2)	(3)
Continental United States	$4,490	----------
California	7,520	$5.00
District of Columbia	7,510	5.00
Connecticut	7,090	5.00
New York	7,070	5.00
Washington	6,930	5.00
Nevada	6,670	5.00
Delaware	6,190	5.00
Illinois	5,990	5.00
Oregon	5,950	5.00
Rhode Island	5,940	5.00
Massachusetts	5,880	5.00
New Jersey	5,750	5.00
Ohio	5,460	5.00
Maryland	5,420	5.00
Michigan	5,060	5.00
Indiana	4,710	5.00
Pennsylvania	4,640	5.00
Montana	4,450	5.00
Kansas	4,350	5.00
Wisconsin	4,350	5.00
Missouri	4,280	5.00
Iowa	4,260	5.00
Colorado	4,220	5.00
Wyoming	4,180	5.00
Florida	4,110	5.00
Nebraska	4,050	5.00

[1] Derived from tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 3.—*Estimated income, and Federal allotment under S. 472, per child, 5–17 years, by States*[1]—Continued

State	Income per child, 5–17 years	Federal allotment per child, 5–17 years
(1)	(2)	(3)
Minnesota	$3,900	$5.10
Maine	3,940	5.60
New Hampshire	3,850	6.50
Vermont	3,680	8.20
Idaho	3,660	8.40
Utah	3,520	9.80
South Dakota	3,450	10.50
North Dakota	3,360	11.40
Virginia	3,360	11.40
Arizona	3,320	11.80
Texas	3,310	11.90
Oklahoma	2,780	17.20
Louisiana	2,690	18.10
Tennessee	2,500	20.00
West Virginia	2,410	20.90
Georgia	2,350	21.50
New Mexico	2,270	22.30
Kentucky	2,210	22.90
North Carolina	2,160	23.40
Alabama	2,050	24.50
Arkansas	1,960	25.40
South Carolina	1,950	25.50
Mississippi	1,850	28.50

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall read only one sentence:

Number of children in each State is the population from 5 to 17 years of age, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third year next preceding the year for which the computation is made.

Turning to the report on the 1947 bill, section 4, subsection (a), we find the following:

(A) Multiply (a) the number of children from 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, in each State, as determined by the Department of Commerce, for the third calendar year next preceding the year in which ends the fiscal year for which the computation is made by (b) $45.

I am arguing this afternoon for the adoption of a formula which is consistent with the formulae we have adopted every time we have passed a Federal aid to education bill in the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Assuming that the description of the contents of the 1949 bill is correct, what reason is given to support the proposition that in a bill to provide aid for public school children there shall be counted those attending parochial schools, the percentage of which in some States is as high as 27 percent, in others 15 percent, and in still others 1 percent. I should like to hear what the Senator has to say on that question.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to give the Senator from Ohio the reasoning of the majority of the committee—the same reasoning which was followed on the floor of the Senate last year when the now President of the United States, then the Senator from Massachusetts, voted for Senate bill 8. Senate bill 8 was based upon total school age population, and not merely upon the average daily attendance in the public schools. In the debate last year the same reasons were given which I now give.

First, we take judicial notice of the fact that at the present time in every State there is a considerable amount of public expense and money outlay for students who attend private schools. There are expenditures for fire and police protection, for public utilities, and, in some States, for supplying bus service, textbooks, and health services. The expenditures vary from State to State. That is one reason why we think it is only fair to incorporate students in private schools in the formula, as we have done every year the question has been before the Senate.

Second, every private school student is potentially a public school student. There is this potential educational burden hovering over the States at all times. Some indication of how that operation works is that, taking the country as a whole, 50 percent of the children from so-called parochial homes attend public schools. There are various reasons for that, but there is no doubt, as our hearings brought out, that the primary reason is that the parochial schools do not have the facilities to take care of all of the students who might wish to attend. Furthermore, we know that there is a continuing decrease in the number of students attending parochial schools, for the reason that the sponsors of such schools claim that they have not the facilities. These schools have teacher recruitment problems and equipment problems.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator was very kind and did not interfere with my presentation, so I shall not take much of his time.

However, the Senator raised the question about the use of school-age population in the Taft bill. That is correct. I have before me the RECORD of the debate. Senator Taft was asked by Senator McMahon, of Connecticut, why that factor was included. This is what Senator Taft said:

I do not know what the figures are. But what we want is a definite formula. If we try to base the formula upon the number of pupils in average daily attendance, those figures are collected by the States. They are more or less indefinite. On the other hand, this particular school population figure is determined by the Census Bureau. We have a perfectly definite formula. As between the different States, the money is not given to them for those particular children. That is simply a basis of calculation, according to the formula.

I do not greatly object, if the Senator wishes to offer an amendment, to saying that it shall be the school population of the State less the number of children who have been habitually accustomed to attend private schools. That is perfectly agreeable to me. It makes a little more difficult formula; but if the Senator wishes to offer such an amendment, I certainly shall be glad to accept it.

In other words, he said that the figures were a little more easily obtainable with respect to total school age population, because they came from the Census Bureau, than if they were based upon the average daily attendance in public schools. I have quoted Senator Taft verbatim.

Mr. MORSE. We all know that Senator Taft, when he sat in the chair at the dividing line of the aisle of the Senate, was a very able parliamentary general. Many times I heard him follow that kind of parliamentary strategy on the floor of the Senate.

The fact remains that both in 1947 and 1949, he was the author and sponsor of bills which included as a basis for calculation the same factor as is included in the bill I am offering the Senate today, namely, total school age population.

I was about to say to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] that, as in 1949 Taft took the position, so I take the position in 1961, that when we come to the matter of the computation and calculation of the distribution of funds under the formula, we believe that the school age population of the State as a whole is much easier to determine. It is more fixed. It is more easily obtained.

Further, we think its use will produce a fairer result in the calculation for each State than if we based the computation on average daily attendance. The very fact that if we were to use the average daily attendance factor would bring the danger of a great flexibility in the keeping of records from school district to school district. There would be a much greater chance for variation in the computations. Here in the committee bill we have a figure that is about as definite as any we could use. We think that fact alone adds to the soundness of the formula we are offering.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to point out what I think are some of the weaknesses in the position taken by the Senator from Oregon.

First, as has been pointed out by the Senator from Kentucky, the distinguished Senator Taft did not argue against the proposal to amend, by eliminating from the count, pupils attending parochial schools.

Second, the Senator from Oregon says that when President Kennedy was a Member of the Senate, he voted for the formula prescribed by the committee, but Mr. Kennedy as President has departed from the vote which he cast last year, and recommends that the parochial school pupils be not included in the count.

Third, the Senator from Oregon says that every private school student is potentially a public school student. The Senator from Oregon is dealing with potentialities, but not realities. We have the realistic fact that approximately 20 percent of the children of the Nation are in private schools.

Fourth, the Senator from Oregon says that money is expended by the States and local governments to provide police, fire, and other types of protection. It is not my understanding that we are contemplating giving financial aid to provide fire, police, and other protection. The purpose of the bill is to provide aid for the operation and construction of schools.

That is my analysis of the various reasons which have been given for opposing this proposal.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I reply briefly by pointing out that we cannot eliminate the fact that, at present, to the extent of many thousands of dollars in State after State, contributions are

made to public services for private schools. We cannot change the fact that there is a constant shifting back and forth from private to public schools. These are the educational burdens of which I spoke.

The figure for total school age population is a figure which can be determined from objective sources. It gives an unquestionable basis for making an allotment determination. We can never know with certainty, when we consider a group of 4-year-olds, whether they later are going to attend a public school or a private school.

Moreover, I say most respectfully to my friend from Ohio that I am going to assume the responsibility of speaking for the President of the United States on the issue now pending before the Senate. I want the Senate to understand that this administration is working through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, speaks for the President on this subject. I can give assurance that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare supports the formula which I am offering this afternoon.

Senators can be very sure that the formula contained in the bill is supported by the Department. There is no doubt about the fact therefore that the bill as reported receives the enthusiastic approval of the President of the United States. I take to myself the privilege of speaking the President's present views about this formula.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That fact does not negative the proposition that in the President's original bill the count was confined to pupils attending public schools.

Mr. MORSE. I do not deny that fact, but the President is a keen student, with a brilliant mind. When there is presented to such a keen student with such a brilliant mind such facts as our committee presented to him, he learns quickly. There can be no doubt that the President takes the position that the Senator from Oregon is now expressing on the floor of the Senate in regard to his preference for this formula over the formula proposed by the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oregon would not expect me to dispute the statement the Senator from Oregon just made about the keenness of the President. Would he?

Mr. MORSE. Not at all. May I say, good naturedly, and with deep respect, I also have a high regard for the brilliant mind of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. The figure that has been bandied about here is 20 percent of the school load that will be handled by nonpublic enrollment. That figure has been distorted quite a bit. The figure which was before the subcommittee was 13.5 percent. It appears on page 226 of the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. I think the RECORD should show that fact, and I thank the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for pointing out that the non-public-school enrollment percentage of the total enrollment of all schools is 13.5 percent, and not 20 percent as was indicated by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table referred to may be incorporated in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 15.—*Enrollment in full-time public and nonpublic elementary and secondary regular day schools, by State, 1957–58*

Region and State	Total enrollment, all full-time day schools	Public school enrollment				Nonpublic school enrollment			
		Total	Kindergarten and grades 1 through 8	Grades 9 through 12 and post-graduate	Public school enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools	Total	Kindergarten and grades 1 through 8	Grades 9 through 12 and post-graduate	Nonpublic enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
United States (48 States and District of Columbia)	38,756,005	33,528,591	25,668,820	7,859,771	86.5	[1] 5,227,414	4,296,806	930,608	13.5
North Atlantic	10,135,758	7,901,198	5,943,098	1,958,100	78.0	2,234,560	1,840,211	394,349	22.0
Connecticut	529,881	436,552	336,654	99,898	82.4	93,329	70,951	22,378	17.6
Delaware	89,775	[2] 72,436	55,894	16,542	80.7	[2] 17,339	13,943	3,396	19.3
Maine	217,951	184,226	143,490	40,736	84.5	33,725	23,121	10,604	15.5
Maryland	653,626	538,790	415,780	123,001	82.4	[2] 114,836	97,758	17,078	17.6
Massachusetts	1,040,101	[2] 810,614	600,256	210,358	77.9	[2] 229,487	184,739	44,748	22.1
New Hampshire	129,035	97,478	74,040	23,432	75.5	31,557	23,155	8,402	24.5
New Jersey	1,228,079	959,479	730,797	228,682	78.1	[2] 268,600	[2] 220,800	[2] 38,800	21.9
New York	3,473,479	2,658,869	2,001,573	657,296	76.5	814,610	694,641	119,969	23.5
Pennsylvania	2,379,380	1,834,553	1,345,576	488,977	77.1	544,827	441,091	103,736	22.9
Rhode Island	171,959	125,301	95,056	30,245	72.9	[2] 46,658	33,095	13,563	27.1
Vermont	86,309	69,717	54,348	15,369	80.8	16,592	11,417	5,175	19.2
District of Columbia	136,183	113,183	89,619	23,564	83.1	[3] 23,000	[3] 16,500	[3] 6,500	16.9
Great Lakes and Plains	11,425,938	9,514,535	7,200,348	2,314,187	83.3	1,911,403	1,584,231	327,172	16.7
Illinois	2,133,541	1,654,311	1,255,583	398,728	77.5	479,230	395,494	83,736	22.5
Indiana	1,054,598	934,948	709,691	225,257	88.7	119,650	102,453	17,197	11.3
Iowa	655,058	[3] 573,152	435,437	137,715	87.5	[3] 81,906	65,518	16,388	12.5
Kansas	501,726	[3] 456,810	348,220	108,590	91.0	44,916	37,538	7,378	9.0
Michigan	1,777,696	[3] 1,495,729	1,161,769	333,960	84.1	281,967	225,637	56,330	15.9
Minnesota	780,020	637,642	467,344	170,298	81.7	142,378	121,887	20,491	18.3
Missouri	909,507	778,507	591,282	187,225	85.6	[3] 131,000	[3] 107,000	[3] 24,000	14.4
Nebraska	312,377	266,769	202,435	64,334	85.4	45,608	37,775	7,833	14.6
North Dakota	147,634	130,173	96,954	33,219	88.2	17,461	13,992	3,469	11.8
Ohio	2,100,124	1,763,837	1,352,064	411,773	84.0	336,287	276,237	60,050	16.0
South Dakota	158,801	143,801	108,588	35,213	90.6	[3] 15,000	[3] 12,700	[3] 2,300	9.4
Wisconsin	894,856	[3] 678,856	470,981	207,875	75.9	[3] 216,000	[3] 188,000	[3] 28,000	24.1
Southeast	8,890,330	8,452,116	6,619,758	1,832,358	95.1	438,223	337,483	100,740	4.9
Alabama	786,614	758,214	584,674	173,540	96.4	[3] 28,400	[3] 21,300	[3] 7,100	3.6
Arkansas	431,354	420,011	320,988	99,023	97.4	11,343	8,951	2,392	2.9
Florida	925,233	874,377	681,338	193,039	94.5	50,856	36,068	14,788	5.5
Georgia	932,331	914,431	732,946	181,485	98.1	[3] 17,900	[3] 11,500	[3] 6,400	1.9
Kentucky	684,280	609,548	477,604	131,944	89.1	74,732	58,488	16,244	10.9
Louisiana	771,184	648,854	509,273	139,581	84.1	122,330	101,701	20,629	15.9
Mississippi	553,593	536,417	433,282	103,135	96.9	17,176	13,175	4,001	3.1
North Carolina	1,072,287	1,060,187	815,177	245,010	98.9	12,100	9,600	2,500	1.1
South Carolina	596,683	584,283	466,032	118,251	97.9	12,400	[4] 10,900	[4] 1,500	2.1
Tennessee	810,189	780,933	606,648	174,285	96.4	29,256	20,142	9,144	3.6
Virginia	847,464	800,464	638,810	161,654	94.5	[3] 47,000	[3] 35,000	[3] 12,000	5.5
West Virginia	479,127	464,397	352,966	111,411	96.9	14,730	10,658	4,072	3.1

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 15.—*Enrollment in full-time public and nonpublic elementary and secondary regular day schools, by State, 1957–58*—Continued

Region and State	Total enrollment, all full-time day schools	Public school enrollment				Nonpublic school enrollment			
		Total	Kindergarten and grades 1 through 8	Grades 9 through 12 and post-graduate	Public school enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools	Total	Kindergarten and grades 1 through 8	Grades 9 through 12 and post-graduate	Nonpublic enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
West and Southwest	8,303,970	7,660,742	5,905,616	1,755,126	92.3	643,228	534,881	108,347	7.7
Arizona	288,105	262,220	205,512	56,708	91.0	25,885	21,701	4,184	9.0
California	3,128,384	[2] 2,826,339	2,192,256	634,083	90.3	302,045	248,341	53,704	9.7
Colorado	401,518	365,518	285,448	80,070	91.0	36,000	[4] 29,500	[4] 6,500	9.0
Idaho	161,030	154,111	113,776	40,335	95.7	6,919	5,969	950	4.3
Montana	154,700	136,832	102,470	34,362	88.4	17,868	14,148	3,720	11.6
Nevada	61,220	58,218	45,841	12,377	95.1	3,002	2,406	596	4.9
New Mexico	233,343	209,739	163,568	46,171	89.9	23,604	20,347	3,257	10.1
Oklahoma	530,520	513,500	376,984	136,516	96.8	17,020	[3] 13,600	3,420	3.2
Oregon	386,487	359,987	266,774	93,213	93.1	26,500	[4] 21,100	[4] 5,400	6.9
Texas	2,042,212	1,915,612	1,496,830	418,782	93.8	[3] 126,600	[3] 109,600	[3] 17,000	6.2
Utah	219,812	214,812	161,684	53,128	97.7	[3] 5,000	[3] 4,000	[3] 1,000	2.3
Washington	618,011	569,176	437,370	131,806	92.1	48,835	40,569	8,266	7.9
Wyoming	78,628	74,678	57,103	17,575	95.0	[3] 3,950	[3] 3,600	[3] 350	5.0
Outlying parts:									
Alaska	37,672	36,017	30,923	5,094	95.6	1,655	1,374	281	4.4
American Samoa	6,070	5,012	4,510	502	82.6	1,058	971	87	17.4
Canal Zone	12,697	12,118	9,589	2,529	95.4	579	(6)	(6)	4.6
Guam	16,331	13,197	11,129	2,268	81.0	3,134	2,463	671	19.0
Hawaii	157,869	[3] 130,158	100,503	29,655	82.4	27,711	20,708	7,003	17.6
Puerto Rico	616,886	[3] 564,041	488,322	75,719	91.4	[4] 52,845	[4] 39,584	[4] 13,261	8.6
Virgin Islands	9,021	6,392	5,429	963	70.9	2,629	2,333	296	29.1

[1] Represents nonpublic enrollment in full-time regular day schools only. For enrollment in other types of nonpublic schools, see table A.
[2] Enrollment not cumulative but as of a specific date.
[3] Estimated.
[4] Distribution by grade group estimated.
[5] Distribution by grade group not available.
[6] Data for accredited schools only.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me make very clear, so there will be no room for doubt about it, S. 1021 as it now stands before the Senate is the administration bill. It is the bill which the administration supports. That does not mean the administration originally did not make other suggestions, but after our committee hearing, after our markup, after consultations with representatives of the administration, I am in a position to say that this bill can be accurately referred to in this debate as the administration bill.

The formulas contained in both the administration bill, S. 1021, as amended, and in the Cooper-Javits bills, reflect a sincere desire on the part of the sponsors to distribute funds to the States for educational purposes on the basis of need and ability. The distribution of Federal funds under either formula would have some effect upon the ability of the States to provide funds for improved educational opportunities for American children.

The difference between the two formulas lies basically in how the States share in the relative amount of funds distributed. Under the formula in S. 1021, as amended, the equalization ratio would be 3 to 1, which means that the poorest State in terms of ability to support education, Mississippi, would receive three times as much per child as would the wealthiest State, Connecticut. The allotments to the States would vary between these ratios inversely with the State's ability to support education.

In the case of the Cooper-Javits substitute, the distribution formula is essentially a flat grant, or a fixed number of dollars per child in average daily attendance. In addition, an equalization amount is allotted to States at the lower end of the ability range. The equalization allotment is determined by the amount deemed to be required to finance a minimum educational program in each State. The minimum foundation figure is increased in the second and third years of the program. For those States which share in the equalization, the amount rises sharply. In the first year of the program, the equalization between the poorest State and the flat grant States is 2.4 to 1; the second year, 2.8 to 1; the third year, 3.3 to 1. This step-up in equalization ratios in the bill is in contrast to a constant 3 to 1 ratio in each year of S. 1021, as amended.

In S. 1021, as amended, all funds are distributed according to an equalization formula. By contrast, the Cooper-Javits bill is a flat grant in the first year to 43 States, with only 7 States sharing in the equalization amount. In the second year of the Cooper-Javits bill, the flat grant States would number 38 and the equalization States 12. In the third year of the bill 35 would receive flat grants while 15 would receive equalization funds. The precise number of States receiving equalization funds and the expected amounts would be dependent upon economic conditions in the States.

Mr. President, I trust that my good friends from New York and Kentucky will agree with me that the statement I have so far made presents an objective description of the differences between the two formulas.

I do not expect, however, that they will be in wholehearted agreement with the points I shall make henceforth in this speech. In fact, I rather expect the contrary, because I have discussed the matter with them in the committee hearings and in the executive meetings of the committee.

My objections to the Javits-Cooper formula are of two types and are based upon slightly different grounds.

If we take the philosophical approach of the foundation concept and apply it rigorously, and there will be found many proponents of this point of view including, I believe, the Committee for Economic Development, we would write the educational bill this year to funnel all of the money to the bottom 5, 10, or 12 States in terms of economic ability.

This would be, not a general educational assistance bill, but rather a special assistance bill, and it would take its normal course through Congress and stand or fall upon the case its proponents could make.

I want to make clear to the Senate that S. 1021 is not a special education bill. It is a general education bill. Therefore, we think the formula should be worked out so there can be certainty as to its application; where flexibility of computation is reduced to a minimum; and where the States can count at all times on a 3 to 1 ratio. It is a bill which contains no discrimination against that body of middle States, which I respectfully say, and I shall seek to present evidence in support of my argument, are unfairly dealt with under the Cooper-Javits substitute. I speak of the States of Washington, Oregon, Montana, and Wyoming. I speak of Kansas and Oklahoma. I speak of Nebraska in the Great Plains.

The result of the Cooper-Javits formula is that it puts to disadvantage a great body of States in the middle which are listed neither as poor States nor rich States. These States, in my judgment, do not get a fair funds allocation in comparison with the rich States and the poor States under the Javits-Cooper formula.

May I digress from my manuscript long enough to say at this point that from many States like Washington, Oregon, Kansas, Wyoming, and Montana,

we have had a good many protests from spokesmen representing the interests of those States in opposition to changes in the reported bill. Many of those States are contributing to the educational needs at a higher percentage, in accordance with their wealth, and in accordance with their ability to pay, as is shown in table 55 on page 259 of our hearing record, than are some of the richer States such as New York, for example, or some of the poorer States.

What we are trying to do in the bill is to provide a measure which will be an incentive and inducement to all States to make a contribution more nearly in accordance with ability to pay.

Consider my State, for example. I am proud of the record of my State. I note that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is in the Chamber. This is true with respect to Kansas. It is true with respect to Washington and with respect to the Dakotas. It is true for Iowa. These States all make substantial contributions over and above those made by many other States on the basis of an ability-to-pay figure.

We do not think we should stand by and watch the Cooper-Javits formula adopted, since everyone has to admit, on the basis of the facts, it favors both the rich States and the poor States.

The question is, are we really being fair to the poor States under our formula? If I thought for a moment that the formula we are offering did an injustice to the poor State I would be in favor of its modification.

We went through all this in the debate last year. We went through committee hearings on a bill last year and again this year. This formula is identical to the formula in S. 8 last year. This is the same formula the majority of us voted for last year in the Senate.

We made the argument then that I make now. When we look at the country from coast to coast and north to south, this is a fair and equitable bill for all concerned. It eliminates some arbitrary lines of demarcation.

There is the problem of the 15 lower States. That line must be drawn. I respectfully say, as I said in the committee, at best that is an arbitrary choice. It involves a question of judgment. In this instance I think the judgment is characterized more by subjectivity than objectivity. Why end at 15 States? Why not use 16 States, or 17 States, or 18 States, or 19 States? What is so sacrosanct about the line drawn at the end of the 15th State?

I think this line of argument illustrates the philosophical approach the majority took. We think we ought to avoid a formula which has such elements of arbitrariness in it. We think our formula avoids this pitfall. We think it is a fair, equitable, and just formula across the country.

The formula proposed by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is primarily a flat grant formula, giving a fixed sum per child to each State without regard to the relative ability to pay of that State. The great bulk of the States—35—would receive that kind of allocation even in the third year of the Cooper-Javits proposal.

There is no full equalization in the Cooper-Javits formula. There is lip service to equalization, and it comes in the form of large additional payments to about 15 of the very lowest income States for the last year of the program.

The two ends of the Cooper-Javits formula are really contradictory. The flat grant, which applies to most of the States, extends the same amount to each State no matter what the financial circumstances of the State.

But when its advocates come to the other end of the formula, they stop talking about flat grants regardless of State wealth, and instead talk about the need for a minimum national educational standard.

If we accept the minimum standard concept, which implies that each State should be brought up to a certain level of expenditure per child which it cannot meet from its own resources, no matter how hard it tries, then there would be no need to give any money at all to New York, to Illinois, or to Rhode Island, or to New Jersey, or to my State of Oregon. Neither the wealthy nor the middle income States would need Federal funds under the minimum standard theory, which is advanced in support of one-half of the Cooper-Javits formula.

I simply say that the Senators cannot have it both ways in one formula, and still be logical. They are welding two unlike things in their formula.

There is a case to be made for a flat grant allocation all across the board—the same amount per child for each State regardless of its own wealth.

There is also a case to be made for steeper equalization, perhaps in a ratio of five times the amount to the poorest State as to the richest State, if that is the inverse of their relative wealth. But to say that the flat grant theory shall apply to 35 States and equalization only to 15 is simply not the most sensible way to allocate the funds, because there is not a State—not even Illinois, Connecticut, or Massachusetts—anywhere in the country in which there is not a need for some equalization. There is not a State in which there are not at least some school districts which are sorely in need of raising the educational opportunities for the boys and girls who go to school in those districts.

We have taken that into account in the so-called Morse formula. We think it is a fair formula for each and every State.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Does the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to my teacher from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When the Senator from Oregon defends a ratio of 5 to 1, he is reflecting the difference in average income, is he not, and really defending the use of the square of the difference? The difference as between averages is approximately 2½ to 1.

Mr. MORSE. I am not defending that. I am not proposing it. Our ratio is 3 to 1. I said if one were going to do so, on an equalization basis and not a flat grant basis, perhaps one could make a case for 5 to 1. I am not proposing 5 to 1. Ours is a ratio of 3 to 1.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from Oregon has pointed out that if there is a difference of 5 to 1 as between per capita income of the richest State and of the poorest State, there might be justification for using such a ratio. In the State of Montana, although 94 percent of the income comes from local property taxes, there is an elementary school district in which there is only $600 worth of property behind each individual student, and there is another elementary school district in which there is $22,000 worth behind each individual student. In every State of the Union the disparity is 10 or 20 times as great as between the wealthiest district and the poorest district. There is also a great difference between the wealthiest State and the poorest State.

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly what I pointed out when I said there is not a State in the Union in which there is not a need for equalization within the State.

Mr. METCALF. Of course that is true. There is a need for equalization in the richest State, in the highest per capita income State.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, when I make comments such as these in the course of debate I always speak with complete sincerity.

I should like to have the RECORD show, on behalf of my committee, the debt we owe to the Senator from Montana for the professional advice he has given our committee throughout our deliberations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is not a member of our committee, but in the House of Representatives, where he served with great distinction for many years, it is proper to say he was known as "Mr. Education." He was always in the forefront of the fight for every bill involving the school interests of this country. Because of his great background, his wealth of experience and knowledge, my subcommittee used the Senator as one of its experts. We did not have a consultation with the administration, we did not go to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to talk about the problems which confronted the subcommittee without taking the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] along with us.

I should like to have the RECORD show that I have expressed on behalf of my committee this public thanks to the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for the great help he has been to the committee.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I am of course very pleased by the tribute the Senator from Oregon has paid to me. I was even more pleased by the opportunity to work

with the subcommittee and with the experts on education, on the Senate side of the Capitol to try to work out a bill. I believe this is the best bill I have seen presented to the Congress of the United States since I have been in the Congress.

I was one of the coauthors of the Murray-Metcalf bill in the last session of Congress, and I worked hard for that proposed legislation. This bill is an even better bill. It has worked out some of the inequities which were in the previous bill. With one exception I propose to support the bill in its entirety.

I point out, also, in the bill it is provided that after allocation of money to the States there is supposed to be an allocation by the States in turn to the neediest districts.

Therefore, even the richest State would have to allocate the money it receives in turn to its needy districts, of which we all agree there are some in the State. This is one of the virtues in the bill of the administration before the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the bill presented by the committee requires that Federal funds be allocated primarily to those districts within the State which are most needy?

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator to turn to page 14 of the bill. Paragraph (3) states—

(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds received under this title (exclusive of amounts to be used for projects under section 109 and amounts to be used under section 108) to local education agencies (A) the amounts to be used for school facilities construction will be allocated within the State so that priority is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities, and (B) the amounts to be used for teachers' salaries will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional teachers or increases in their teachers' salaries and which are least able to finance such costs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The provision which the Senator has read is excellent, and I am very glad it is in the bill. May I ask whether there is a similar provision in the Javits-Cooper amendment?

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator from New York can answer that question. The Senator from Illinois wishes to know whether or not there is in the Javits-Cooper formula a provision that is similar to the one on page 14 of the bill which I read.

Mr. JAVITS. Our amendment does not change that part of the bill at all. We do not affect that part of the bill. We do not affect the effort part of the bill or any other parts of the bill under the distribution in our formula.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So under the Javits-Cooper amendment money which would go to a particular State would first be distributed to the school districts which would be in greatest need within that State?

Mr. JAVITS. Whatever answer the Senator from Oregon has given to that question authoritatively would apply as well to our formula.

Mr. MORSE. There is no difference between us except as to the formula itself.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I think that a degree of equalization is a desirable method of allocation. But if we do have equalization, it should be constant and for the whole country, not just for 15 States. It should extend to all States, so that their allotments will also be in inverse proportion to their ability to pay. I do not see anything fair in applying that principle just to 15 States and not to the others.

Second, the committee formula counts the entire school age population in allocating the funds. This means that States with large numbers of children in private school—or with large numbers of dropouts—will receive considerably more in terms of their current public school load than in terms of their school age population. Remember that the per child allotment of the committee formula is smaller for many States because it counts the entire school-age population between 5 and 17. Yet in States like Rhode Island, where about 27 percent of its school-age population goes to private school, and Illinois, where 22 percent goes to private school, the funds received under this bill regardless of what formula is finally adopted, will all be spent for public schools only.

The Cooper-Javits formula would increase the per child allotment by counting only public school children in the distribution. But when it comes to the total State allotment, the total is closer to what Illinois and Rhode Island and New York would get under the committee formula than would appear from the per child figures.

In this connection, it must also be remembered that under the National Defense Education Act it is hoped that some loan funds will be extended to private elementary and secondary schools. The great bulk of those funds will be expended in the wealthy States, because it so happens that that is where the private school systems also exist. All the States in the North Atlantic area have private school enrollments in excess of 15 percent of their school-age population.

But only Louisiana of the Southern States has 15 percent of its children in private schools. Elsewhere in the South the figure is less than 5 percent.

In the Western States, New Mexico has 10.1 percent in private schools and Montana 11.6 percent. The other Western States all have between 2.3 and 10 percent in private schools.

Thus, by far the greatest amount of private school aid will go to the wealthier States of the North Atlantic and Midwest regions. If the Cooper-Javits formula, or any other formula, is used to increase the funds for the wealthy States at the expense of the so-called middle-income States, one of the major reasons for private school aid will disappear, because the wealthy States will then be so well taken care of in the public school bill that their citizens will be better able to support private schools without Federal help.

While the Senator from New York invokes the name of Senator Taft in support of his distribution figures, he neglects to point out that the Taft formula, as I have already said, was based upon school-age population, and not on average daily attendance in public school. So the committee has only changed the Taft formula in one respect, while the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] have changed it in another respect.

One major argument made for the Javits-Cooper proposal is that it is fairer to the "poorer" States than is the S. 1021 committee-reported bill in terms of equalization.

Overnight, I have had some tables prepared showing what percentage changes would occur in the amounts allocated to the 15 "poorer" States if the Javits-Cooper formula were to be substituted for the committee formula.

I ask unanimous consent that the tables be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparison of the 1st year

[Percentage of amounts distributed under both formulas]

Top 15 States	Javits-Cooper formula	S. 1021 formula	Bottom 15 States	Javits-Cooper formula	S. 1021 formula
New York	7.06	4.79	Mississippi	3.20	2.06
Delaware	.21	.15	South Carolina	3.27	2.40
Illinois	4.25	3.71	Arkansas	1.91	1.51
New Jersey	2.66	1.95	North Carolina	4.57	3.97
Connecticut	1.21	.61	Alabama	3.14	2.82
Rhode Island	.33	.40	Tennessee	2.33	2.77
Massachusetts	2.25	1.74	Utah	.65	.74
Alaska	.10	.13	Georgia	2.28	3.30
Pennsylvania	5.04	5.18	West Virginia	1.20	1.52
Missouri	1.96	2.18	New Mexico	.58	.75
Maryland	1.51	1.61	Idaho	.42	.51
Ohio	4.87	4.65	Kentucky	1.60	2.52
Nevada	.16	.12	South Dakota	.39	.52
Wisconsin	1.87	2.36	Louisiana	1.82	2.61
California	9.14	5.44	North Dakota	.35	.53
Total	42.62	35.02	Total	27.71	28.53
Grand total				70.33	63.55

Mr. MORSE. Under the Javits-Cooper formula, 70 percent of the money would be distributed to 30 percent of the States. I wish to repeat that statement. I think this is a statistic which helps prove the case that we have a fairer and more equitable bill. Under the Javits-Cooper amendment, 70 percent of the money would be distributed to 30 percent of the States.

Under S. 1021, 63.55 percent of the money would be distributed to the same 30 percent of the States. But 28.53 percent of the money under S. 1021 would go to the 15 poorest States, while only 27.71 percent of the money would go to them under Javits-Cooper. Yet under Javits-Cooper 42.62 percent of the money would go to the 15 richest States, while under S. 1021 only 35.02 percent of the money would go to the richest States.

Therefore, despite the amounts appropriated, the 15 poorest States would do better under S. 1021 than they would do under Javits-Cooper. Conversely the 15 richest States would do less well under S. 1021 than under Javits-Cooper and the in-between States would do far better under S. 1021.

I wish to close my argument by saying I raise my voice in defense of what I think are the equitable rights of those inbetween States which constitute a majority. Most respectfully I say that I believe those States also, without casting any reflection on any State, are doing a better job in the country in comparison with the richest States and the poorest States. They make contributions in relation to their State income in excess of what is being made on the basis of a comparison with some other States.

We all know that it is unfair to ask the poorer States to make heavy contributions beyond their ability to pay. But it is also true that we have the right when, as a Federal Government, we offer Federal assistance to the poorer States to say, "Yes, but you do owe an obligation to do for your children what you can do on the basis of your ability to pay."

Such is not being done in some of the poorer States. Under the formula we present and in our bill we try to provide a formula of equalization. We endeavor to stimulate and inspire States to do more. We carry out what we believe is the clear duty we owe to all States in this country, and particularly to the so-called middle income group of States, which, I respectfully say, we think are not dealt with as fairly under the Cooper-Javits formula.

I close by saying that after we went over and over the matter, and after we had discussed it up and down and through and through with administration representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, we decided on our side of the table unanimously to adopt this formula.

I make one more point, and I am through. There has been some talk in the debate—and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] knows I am going to say this, and we have joked about it—during the colloquy which occurred between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], about the committee decision on extending in the bill unimpaired Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. During the colloquy the term was used that the chairman of the subcommittee supported the proposal as a sweetener to this bill.

Well, I enjoy a good joke on myself, but I want the RECORD to show that I deny the motivation. I wish to make perfectly clear that we did not revise the original administration proposal in regard to Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 either as a flycatcher for votes, or even as a little sugar held out for votes.

I will tell the Senate what we did. I see in the Chamber the Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], one of the Senators who filed a complaint about cutbacks in Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. We had many Senators who came before the subcommittee in person as well as many who filed statements which pointed out the gross injustice to the educational systems of their States which would result from the original proposal of the administration to cut back very seriously on these funds for schools in the federally impacted areas. What did we do? What we did is far different from offering a political sweetener. We went into the facts. We took page after page of testimony. We talked to leaders of the administration. When the evidence was in we simply said, "We do not think that this abrupt termination is fair on the basis of the evidence before us. We are going to give the Department 18 months. We will ask you to undertake another study for 18 months, and at the end of that time you will submit to us your proposals for any further changes in Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 which you can substantiate by evidence."

I say most respectfully, that in my judgment this was not a proposal of the administration which had sufficient evidence to support it. So we said, "We will take a report from you in 18 months. We will continue the program for 3 years. We have dovetailed it with the total length of the full program under title I."

I would ask Senators to keep in mind that the total length of all three programs is 3 years. At the end of 3 years, Congress will again have to consider the subject and to decide whether it wishes to continue it, in what ways it wishes to modify it, or whether the Federal aid program should be dropped.

I will tell the Senate what my prediction is. If we put this program on the statute books and it is put to work, we will find that it will result in such great dividends to this country in the conservation of the most precious reserves we have—namely, the potential intellectual power of the young men and women and the boys and girls of this country—that we will not wish to discontinue it. Instead, we will take another look at it to see what can be done in 3 years from now to make it an even better piece of legislation.

One last word, Mr. President. It has been said in the course of the debate that the Cooper-Javits amendment will cost less money. I say most respectfully that this argument does not commend itself to me. Does that mean that I am a wastrel? Of course not. When we spend $850 million as proposed by the Morse bill, we spend far too little. I know the practical legislative situation which confronts us in the Senate. I know that the important thing is to get the principle of general aid to education upon the statute books of the country.

When in committee, we came to the point of deciding what the authorized amount should be, we proposed $850 million. Why? Because when we apply the formula to $850 million, we have a sum of money which we can distribute most equitably under the equalization program.

Last year the majority of us—and the Senator from Massachusetts who is now the President of the United States sat with us and voted for it too—voted not to provide $850 million, but $916 million. That was the bill last year. So when I am asking for a vote for this bill, for $850 million, I believe I am asking for a minimum program. We ought to keep this bill intact. Therefore, I urge my colleagues in the Senate to give to the majority of the committee the support it deserves by adopting the committee bill, and defeating the Cooper-Javits amendment. I urge my colleagues to adopt the bill in its present form without any serious modification.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I first wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that the inclusion of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 in the bill is surely a commendable act. The documentation which had been presented by the administration for doing away with this program or sharply reducing it was not full and complete. There would have been gross injustices to the educational systems of some 16 or 18 States had the committee followed that procedure, and if it had not included within the bill Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

Secondly, I note that under the committee bill 38 of the 50 States will do better in terms of the total allotments for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964, the 3-year period covered by the bill.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to interrupt the Senator at this point to have the table to which he has referred inserted at this point. This is a table entitled "Comparison of Estimated Allotments to States Under S. 1021 and Under the Javits-Cooper Amendment, Totals for Fiscal Years 1962, 1963, and 1964." I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a companion table entitled "Comparison of Estimated Allotments to States Under S. 1201 and Under the Javits-Cooper Amendment."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Comparison of estimated allotments to States under S. 1021 and under the Javits-Cooper amendment

	S. 1021	Javits-Cooper amendment				S. 1021	Javits-Cooper amendment		
		Fiscal year 1962 (1st year) estimated State allotments	Fiscal year 1963 (2d year) estimated State allotments	Fiscal year 1964 (3d year) estimated State allotments			Fiscal year 1962 (1st year) estimated State allotments	Fiscal year 1963 (2d year) estimated State allotments	Fiscal year 1964 (3d year) estimated State allotments
Alabama	$24,005,156	$21,733,450	$27,473,458	$33,213,466	Nebraska	$7,357,227	$5,171,740	$5,171,740	$5,171,740
Alaska	1,111,660	72,140	721,140	721,140	Nevada	1,040,292	1,122,660	1,122,660	1,122,660
Arizona	7,405,140	4,584,880	4,584,880	4,584,880	New Hampshire	2,726,162	1,889,720	1,889,720	1,889,720
Arkansas	12,867,468	13,272,366	16,309,916	19,347,466	New Jersey	16,592,271	18,423,860	18,423,860	18,423,860
California	46,230,357	63,279,320	63,279,320	63,279,320	New Mexico	6,370,666	4,041,580	4,659,874	6,343,866
Colorado	8,896,358	6,757,240	6,757,240	6,757,240	New York	40,652,380	48,905,680	48,905,680	48,905,680
Connecticut	5,215,540	8,380,860	8,380,860	8,380,860	North Carolina	33,751,156	31,696,266	40,012,666	48,329,066
Delaware	1,239,501	1,457,840	1,457,840	1,457,840	North Dakota	4,535,574	2,421,800	2,421,800	2,932,400
Florida	21,923,016	17,217,740	17,217,740	17,217,740	Ohio	39,517,893	33,719,520	33,719,520	33,719,520
Georgia	28,045,856	15,786,060	22,289,542	28,867,066	Oklahoma	12,602,078	9,270,180	9,270,180	9,270,180
Hawaii	3,739,329	2,646,880	2,646,880	2,646,880	Oregon	9,042,171	6,608,020	6,608,020	6,608,020
Idaho	4,408,622	2,943,800	3,345,416	4,572,000	Pennsylvania	44,026,417	34,964,360	34,964,360	34,964,360
Illinois	31,516,867	29,449,960	29,449,960	29,449,960	Rhode Island	3,433,585	2,292,200	2,292,200	2,292,200
Indiana	22,781,255	16,719,420	16,719,420	16,719,420	South Carolina	20,398,967	22,629,300	27,067,584	31,505,866
Iowa	14,386,515	10,598,740	10,598,740	10,598,740	South Dakota	4,459,796	2,731,940	2,731,940	3,799,600
Kansas	11,111,415	8,558,780	8,558,780	8,558,780	Tennessee	23,526,845	16,126,150	22,120,874	28,115,600
Kentucky	21,409,762	11,088,280	11,141,750	15,761,866	Texas	58,063,833	36,736,260	36,736,260	36,736,260
Louisiana	22,202,969	12,618,160	12,618,160	17,521,066	Utah	6,321,123	4,533,984	6,318,792	8,103,600
Maine	5,175,297	3,574,420	3,574,420	3,574,420	Vermont	2,083,288	1,295,220	1,295,220	1,295,220
Maryland	13,681,203	10,493,760	10,493,760	10,493,760	Virginia	23,803,278	14,945,960	14,945,960	14,945,960
Massachusetts	14,789,751	15,569,280	15,569,280	15,569,280	Washington	12,976,374	11,278,460	11,278,460	11,278,460
Michigan	37,928,701	29,679,420	29,679,420	29,679,420	West Virginia	12,913,602	8,328,400	11,625,834	15,096,000
Minnesota	18,395,829	12,118,660	12,118,660	12,118,660	Wisconsin	20,021,484	12,932,920	12,932,920	12,932,920
Mississippi	17,480,858	22,177,734	25,965,666	29,753,600	Wyoming	1,793,553	1,285,200	1,285,200	1,285,200
Missouri	18,520,779	13,614,620	13,614,620	13,614,620	District of Columbia	1,565,588	2,034,220	2,034,220	2,034,220
Montana	3,888,736	2,656,000	2,656,000	2,656,000					

Comparison of estimated allotments to States under S. 1021 and under the Javits-Cooper amendment—totals for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964

	S. 1021	Javits-Cooper amendment
	Estimated State allotments, total for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964	Estimated State allotments, total for fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964
Alabama	$72,015,468	$82,420,374
Alaska	3,334,980	2,163,420
Arizona	22,215,420	13,754,640
Arkansas	38,602,404	48,929,748
California	138,691,071	189,837,960
Colorado	26,689,074	20,271,720
Connecticut	15,646,620	25,142,580
Delaware	3,718,503	4,373,520
Florida	65,769,048	51,653,220
Georgia	84,137,568	66,942,668
Hawaii	11,217,987	7,940,640
Idaho	13,225,866	10,861,216
Illinois	94,550,601	88,349,880
Indiana	68,343,765	50,158,260
Iowa	43,159,545	31,796,220
Kansas	33,334,245	25,676,340
Kentucky	64,229,286	37,991,896
Louisiana	66,608,907	42,757,386
Maine	15,525,891	10,723,260
Maryland	41,043,609	31,481,280
Massachusetts	44,369,253	46,707,840
Michigan	113,786,103	89,038,260
Minnesota	55,187,487	36,355,980
Mississippi	52,442,574	77,897,000
Missouri	55,562,337	40,843,860
Montana	11,666,208	7,968,000
Nebraska	22,071,681	15,515,220
Nevada	3,120,876	3,367,980
New Hampshire	8,178,486	5,669,160
New Jersey	49,776,813	55,271,580
New Mexico	19,111,998	15,045,320
New York	121,957,140	146,717,040
North Carolina	101,253,468	120,037,998
North Dakota	13,606,722	7,776,120
Ohio	118,553,679	101,158,560
Oklahoma	37,806,234	27,810,540
Oregon	27,126,513	19,824,060
Pennsylvania	132,079,251	104,893,080
Rhode Island	10,300,755	6,876,600
South Carolina	61,196,901	81,202,750
South Dakota	13,379,388	9,263,480
Tennessee	70,580,535	66,362,624
Texas	174,191,499	110,208,780
Utah	18,963,369	18,956,376
Vermont	6,249,864	3,885,660
Virginia	71,409,834	44,837,880
Washington	38,929,122	33,835,380
West Virginia	38,740,806	35,050,234
Wisconsin	60,064,452	38,798,760
Wyoming	5,380,659	3,855,600
District of Columbia	4,696,764	6,102,660

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a good deal of work has gone into the bill on the part of many Senators. However, I believe that at this stage, after weeks of hearings and, I may add, years of work by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we would be ill advised to reject the formula which represents the most equitable formula which the combined judgment of the committee thought was obtainable. There is no doubt that any formula has its weaknesses. I sat in on one or two conferences with the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Montana when the formula was discussed. It seems to me that the arguments pro and con were stated at that time relating to the Morse formula on the one hand, or the committee formula, and the Javits-Cooper formula on the other hand, and it is my judgment that the formula which provides a total gross amount, which gives the poorer States larger amounts, as the Morse formula does, and a total amount for 38 of the 50 States which is more generous, as the committee bill does, and a formula that provides less for the wealthier States, as the committee or Morse formula does, is a justifiable formula.

We can find weaknesses in it. There is no doubt that there are some weaknesses in it. There are some weaknesses in the other formula, too. If we take a look at any bill we can find plenty of weaknesses in it.

I come from a State that has made a tremendous effort to support its schools. I come from a State where we have taxed our people with property taxes, excise taxes, income taxes, severance taxes for education. We have gone a long way. Yet we have, in the northeastern part of the State of Minnesota, grave economic conditions in the iron mine area. The bill which the Senator from Oregon is sponsoring will help keep our young people in schools in northeastern Minnesota. Our State laws already provide for equalization. The bill will help the people of the State that I am proud to represent in the Senate. I do not want to justify a bill on the basis of what it does for any one State. I never have. I have voted for legislation which at times took much more from my State than it gave. I simply say that when a formula which does better by 38 out of 50 States and gives a more equitable distribution of the fund to the poorer States, and provides at least some recognition to the efforts that some of us have made in what we call the middle States, that that kind of formula deserves support.

I hope the majority of the Senate will see fit to support the efforts of the committee, after the committee has worked tirelessly, anxiously, and, I may say, objectively on the formula for weeks.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his comments. He has been a great help to the committee. The RECORD should show that when the committee held its meetings on the formula, the Senator from Minnesota, the majority whip, and the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, sat with us and gave us their advice and counsel. They sat with us when we had our conversations with the administration spokesmen. Therefore, it can be said that the bill comes to the Senate after careful consideration not only by the committee, but careful consideration with our leaders in the Senate itself—the majority leader, and the majority whip, and also a considerable number of the members of the policy committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. JAVITS asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a brief comment before he yields the floor?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Before the debate ends, I hope to take not more than 5 minutes to sum up the position of the sponsors of the Cooper-Javits amendment. The Senator from Oregon was very gracious to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and to me. He did not chop up our presentation with individual questions. We have sought to return the compliment.

However, the Senator from Oregon said some things which I wish to answer directly. If the Senator from Kentucky desires to speak, I am confident he will not take more than 5 minutes, either. We are both desirous of bringing the question of adopting the amendment to a vote promptly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon has made a devastating case in favor of the bill and against the Javits-Cooper amendment. I say that because I think the point which stood out over and over again in the Senator's splendid presentation was that the Javits-Cooper proposal would provide justice for 15 States—justice in the sense of providing criteria to deal with amounts that relate to those criteria—but no justice for the other 35 States.

On the other hand, the Morse proposal—the committee proposal—applies the same criteria to every State. I do not see how anyone can answer that argument. If there is to be justice, it ought to be indivisible and should apply to every one of the 50 States and not draw a line anywhere.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], for the formula they have presented in their amendment. Their formula strikes me as being more equitable, less politically motivated, and more effective in meeting the educational needs which the country still faces than the committee formula.

First, Mr. President, if the Nation does need any program for Federal aid to education—and many would deny that it does—then the principal justification for Federal aid is that certain States are too poor themselves to finance the needed improvements. And a case can certainly be made for the problems faced by those States, a dozen or so in number, with a personal income per child of school age under $5,000. We New Yorkers have a personal income per school child of over $12,000 and we New Yorkers are having a hard enough time maintaining the educational level which we want. We can therefore understand the real difficulties of States which have less than half this much as a base on which to support the educational needs of their schoolchildren.

Moreover, there is no doubt that some of these poorer States make a very considerable effort in the field of education, more of an effort even than New York. Utah for instance, spends 5.6 percent of its personal income on education; Louisiana spends 4.1 percent; Mississippi spends 3.7 percent; New York spends 3.5 percent as of 1959–60 figures, and stands, I am sorry to say, 29th in the Nation in the percentage of total personal income spent on education.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am not opposed to Federal aid to education on principle. For these reasons also I am in favor of the Javits-Cooper amendment which would do several things that the bill as it now stands does not do. It would provide a steeper equalization formula, so that the States which really need help will get enough help to make a difference. Without such a provision there is no point in Federal aid for education at all.

The Javits-Cooper bill would also provide a minimum of $20 per pupil in public schools in every State. This is very important, because the States with the largest number of students face the biggest expenses and the greatest need for the expansion of existing facilities. Property and labor on the whole is more expensive in these States, like New York and California. Without a $20 minimum per child, those States with the largest number of students and with the fastest rate of increase in students, will be shortchanged. That means a substantial number of the children throughout the country would be shortchanged.

Also, Mr. President, the Javits-Cooper bill sets a definite, progressive, and overall goal for each State to meet in its educational efforts. It sets $350 per pupil for fiscal year 1962, $375 for fiscal year 1963, and $400 for fiscal year 1964. The Federal share of this sum is determined by a formula relating these figures to the total personal income for the State. For those States already meeting the minimum, $20 per public school child is allowed. This is an equitable formula, with a clear aim comprehensible to all, of lifting the standards in poor States to a new minimum, and of assisting the more prosperous and more populous States to meet their heavy demands.

Mr. President, it has been rumored—and I recognize that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which handled the bill has disavowed this—but certainly the rumor is rife that the allotment formula of S. 1021 was doctored up and altered or "sweetened"—although I understand the Senator from Oregon does not like the use of the word "sweetened"—from the formula recommended originally by the administration, it is said that this was done primarily in order to provide more benefits to those States with Democratic members on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I cannot speak with knowledge, because I was not in on that. Certain other Senators were not either. Whether the statement is true, I could not say. I do not want to impugn the motives of any of my colleagues.

Nevertheless, here is the fact. It may be a mere coincidence. The fact is that nearly one-third of the difference between the administration formula for a total of $666 million for 1962 and the committee's formula for a total of $850 million for 1962 will go to States with Democratic members on the committee. At the same time, 8 of the 10 lowest income States would receive a smaller percentage share of aid under the committee bill than they would receive under the President's plan. I do not feel, therefore, that the formula arrived at by the committee is sufficient to meet the educational problems of the Nation.

Finally, Mr. President, the committee bill does a very real injustice in counting, for allotment purposes—and this has been referred to by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]—the pupils in private schools; yet, in fact, depriving them of any aid.

Thus those who undertake additional sacrifices to send their children to private schools find their efforts recognized in the committee bill only by additional Federal aid to public school children. This is a clear slap in the face. If they are not to share in this aid, they should not be counted in for the benefit of someone else.

The allotment formula in the Cooper-Javits proposal is much more realistic. It is a much more effective formula for Federal aid to education. It was not determined by political considerations, but by educational needs. For that reason, I feel that it deserves our support.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had hoped to conclude the debate promptly on this issue, but a number of questions were raised by the floor manager for the bill [Mr. MORSE] which I think require answering.

First, it has been said that the committee formula was very carefully worked out over a period of time that the committee slaved over it, as over a hot stove. Nothing could be further from the fact.

The fact is that on the very last day, after the bill had been brought by the Subcommittee on Education before the full committee, it still contained the administration formula, including a basic $15 payment for a number of States.

After that had been done, on the last day of committee consideration of the bill, after many caucuses, in which Republican members did not participate—and I do not complain; that is perfectly all right, I am only trying to set the framework of the stage on which this happened—this new formula was brought in.

It was brought in one morning and voted into the bill. And that was that.

The Cooper-Javits formula has been developed over a long period of time. If anything, the arguments made with respect to the committee formula are more applicable to our formula.

I raised this question in the subcommittee. Our formula has been documented, analyzed, and reanalyzed dozens of times. It was debated for hours, whereas the formula before us was not subjected to such deliberation.

Whether or not the administration participated in the decision to change their formula I do not know. I am sure it did, or the Senator from Oregon would not say so. I am sure that it does represent the administration view. If so, it is certainly a last-minute view; whereas our formula was considered,

developed, worked upon, tried out, and debated many times. So I think, if anything, the argument is more strongly in favor of our formula than the formula in the bill, if we are to adopt the standard of deliberation.

I point out that on the last day this formula was completely revised, brought in, and voted into the bill almost as quickly as I say it.

Second, we have a very new situation with respect to the school bill, which bears very strongly on the advisability of including all school-age children, whether or not they attend parochial or private schools. As a practical matter, we all know that the issue of parochial and private school children has really boiled up. It is a major issue in the country. It is a major issue before the Congress. Therefore, whatever Senator Taft may have felt free to do on other occasions, or whether the Senate may have felt free to do on other occasions before this issue was a keen and burning issue, that is hardly the situation today. Because today, whatever we do with respect to the inclusion of all school-age children, immediately, in terms of the country, there arises the question of an intendment. That is what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I were arguing. We say that we should rebut the intendment that we are trying to do anything about private and parochial school children, because I feel a great obligation to do something in a separate bill, as soon as action is completed upon the pending bill.

Others may have constitutional objections. The President himself said he was placing this measure before us only for public school children because there is a constitutional prohibition against the use of elementary or secondary school funds for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries. The brief of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare maintained that very point. It was up to my colleague [Mr. KEATING], rather than anyone in the administration, to reply to that argument. It seems to me that there is an effort to draw away from the very important constitutional law position which has already been taken. In his message the President said:

> In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution, no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries, and thus non-public-school children are rightfully not counted in determining the funds each State will receive for its public schools.

Whose formula is improvised—the formula now in the bill, or the formula of the junior Senator from New York and myself? I respectfully submit that it is the formula now brought into the bill.

So the intendment which could be drawn from what we do if we vote for that formula is that we are intending to exclude certain children from any other consideration, or that they are imported into the bill because something is going to be done about them.

This proposal defies the terms of the bill. We are authorizing payment on the basis of children who would receive no benefit under the bill. The bill is clear and explicit. It gives benefits only to public school children; yet when it comes to paying the States money, it is counted on the basis of more children than that. Why?

The only reason is to provide more money. A moment ago the majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], said that 38 States would receive more the first year. Certainly 38 States would receive more the first year. Does that make the formula right? I could write a bill which would give 50 States more in the first year. Would that make it right? Is that the way we are going to legislate? Is there any reason why 38 States should get more the first year? Is there any reason why the money of the United States should pay for it? I have not heard any reason given, except that it is more convenient to do it, and that it would command greater support.

The Senator from Kentucky and I conclude on this note: The only purposes for which those of us who are devoted to the idea of a Federal aid to education bill can justify such a bill is to bring up the level of the very low-income States, which cannot, no matter how hard they try, give to their children an adequate education. We say that that must be done in the national interest.

I am from New York, as is my colleague [Mr. KEATING]. We pay about 19 percent of all the Federal taxes. The ideal bill would be a bill confined to the 12, 13, or 14 States which really need Federal help, but that cannot be done. But, somehow or other, that cannot be done. We know from experience, from the debate, from the discussion, that we just cannot do it that way. So we have proposed the next best thing, which is to make a flat grant to all of those States that really, on this kind of standard, may not need it. There may be reasons why they cannot raise money, because of taxation problems or sources of taxation. There may be districts in those particular States which need help. There may be many reasons. But, fundamentally, if we were writing a bill solely on the basis of pure need, we would write it for States which have an income that is under par.

So the next best thing to do is give a flat grant to those who are not in extremis in terms of Federal aid. The Senator from Kentucky and I do it by our proposal, but the majority bill wants to go further than that and add—and there is no gilding this lily—$326 million to that amount.

When it gets down to cases, it is that which is unjustified, and we present the Senate an alternative means by which that money can be saved—and I would not be a liberal if I did not try to save the money—and yet let justice be done.

Finally, a good deal has been said about the idea of the foundation basis, the idea of establishing the optimum basis to which States can direct their efforts. I point out that in most of the States that is precisely what the States do internally. The States, in administering the program, will have foundation money.

It seems to me the greatest validator of a plan is experience. On the basis of experience, the foundation plan makes more sense than does the plan proposed by the committee, which, I repeat, is an ad hoc one, one brought in at the last moment and voted, and one which has not had the experience, the consideration, and the backing of the plan which has been presented by the Senator from Kentucky and myself.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I think the distinguished Senator from New York has made a devastating argument in favor of his amendment.

I may ask the Senator this question. How much time was devoted to the argument on the change in the formula from the original administration bill to the new formula that is in the bill now?

Mr. JAVITS. Subject to correction by another member of the committee, my recollection is that, at the very most, we took one session, that is, one meeting, of the committee, which may have been one hour and a half or so. We may have taken something of another session as well. But, at the very most, giving it the benefit of every doubt, there were two committee sessions, at which time also was considered the substitute of Senator COOPER'S and mine, which was voted down.

Mr. KEATING. How much time was devoted to the consideration of the Senator's substitute?

Mr. JAVITS. We talked about it in the subcommittee and committee for at least twice that amount of time, and probably three times that amount of time.

Mr. KEATING. As well as before?

Mr. JAVITS. As well as before, whenever the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has been sponsoring this idea.

Mr. KEATING. Was the proposal which is in the committee bill now discussed in the last session or was the proposal the one in the original bill?

Mr. JAVITS. No; the way in which it worked out was that overnight our colleagues on the majority side came back with the new formula. They were all set up. They apparently knew precisely how many votes they had, and they impatiently listened to Senators like myself, and then voted. I think the country is very familiar with the climate that I describe. That is exactly what happened on the new alternative formula.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I want to compliment the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky for offering the amendment, for which I expect to vote.

Because I am not supporting the bill at all, I think it is important for me to state for the RECORD why I shall vote for the amendment without any intention to vote for the bill, in whatever form it may come out, for reasons which I shall not discuss now and for some reasons

which do not relate to this particular formula.

Whatever we may think now, when we are voting here on the floor of the Senate, I think there is a bitter issue in the country on the question of the exclusion of a large number of children who happen to go to either church or private schools from benefits to come from money which they, their families, and their businesses contribute. I think that is going to be a necessary bitterness if we hew to the law, and act as the Constitution requires, so long as we deal only with grants to schools. But I think we compound that bitterness exceedingly if we do what is proposed in the committee bill, and count children who go to the religious and private schools for the purpose of determining how much each State gets, in other words, apportioning to each State a sum for the particular children who go to those religious or private schools, but, by the express terms of the bill, requiring that that money so apportioned to the States be distributed entirely among the other children in the States—those children who go to public schools—and that it be withheld from children who go to religious or private schools.

I think those who are talking about a later program which will do something for those children who go to religious and private schools are suggesting that we count those who go to religious and private schools twice. I do not think we are going to do that. I think if we vote for the committee bill, it is notice to the world that we do not propose to do anything for those who go to the other kind of schools.

Furthermore, it seems to me that for some millions of children, and their families, who send their children to religious and private schools for reasons which are sufficient to the families and the children, who pay larger sums of money in order that their children may get an education, because they want them to go to that type of school, it will be an aggravating cause of bitterness to have them feel that their children are counted for the purpose of giving money to the States, with full knowledge of the fact that that is only going to add to the allocation of money to the other children who go to the public schools. In other words, they are entitled to a share—that is, those who go to religious and private schools—for one purpose, but when it comes to the actual division of the moneys, they are not entitled to a share.

I cannot think of anything by which one could more aggravate these problems than by adopting that kind of double standard, under which large numbers of children shall be counted for the purpose of making allocation of Federal moneys and left out in the cold when it comes to participation.

I do not think the latter can be included in any grants from Federal funds, because I have very definite views that, under the Constitution, such cannot be permitted; but if they cannot be included in a grant, why, under the dome of heaven, should it be fair to include them for the purpose of allocation of grants to their States, with full knowledge all the while that the money is going, not to them but to other children?

Mr. BUSH. It is not right.

Mr. HOLLAND. In my estimation, that is not right. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut. It cannot be supported on moral or any other basis. It is for those reasons that I shall vote for the amendment, and not for the reason that the proposed Federal aid to education is supportable, under the views I have on this matter.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I have the floor. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from Florida that I have an amendment which I shall offer next week that will correct the mistake which the Senator has pointed out—namely, the elimination of private schools from the bill. My amendment will put them in.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may be permitted to speak again?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the distinguished Senator from Arizona did not get all my statement. I do not think, constitutionally, they can be included if this program is to be on a grant basis, and it is because of that fact, and other reasons, that I am not supporting the bill. I feel very strongly against the proposal for Federal aid to schools largely on account of that point of view. I cannot support voting for a heavy school grant which necessarily leaves out a large number of children and at the same time counts them for the purpose of determining how much money their State will get.

I thank the Senator for yielding. I shall vote for the amendment, but I think the Senator knows that I cannot vote for the bill in any case.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, it is well known that I shall support the bill, in which I thoroughly believe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my argument three charts and an excerpt from a document entitled "Public School Financial Programs of the United States, 1957–58 Issue," by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, backing up my statement about the foundation programs in many of the States.

There being no objection, the charts and excerpt were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Allotments per child—Cooper-Javits amendment and S. 1021

	Cooper-Javits amendment amounts per public school child in ADA			S. 1021 as reported each of 3 years, per—	
	1st year	2d year	3d year	School-age child	Public school child in ADA [1]
New York	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00	$10.90	$16.20
Delaware	20.00	20.00	20.00	10.59	16.10
Illinois	20.00	20.00	20.00	13.11	20.28
New Jersey	20.00	20.00	20.00	11.98	17.28
Connecticut	20.00	20.00	20.00	9.26	11.85
Rhode Island	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.08	28.61
Massachusetts	20.00	20.00	20.00	13.38	18.82
Alaska	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.53	30.04
Pennsylvania	20.00	20.00	20.00	16.56	24.57
Missouri	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.09	25.76
Maryland	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.23	24.52
Ohio	20.00	20.00	20.00	16.16	22.42
Nevada	20.00	20.00	20.00	13.69	17.34
Wisconsin	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.61	30.38
California	20.00	20.00	20.00	12.45	14.75
New Hampshire	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.47	27.82
Michigan	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.65	24.76
Indiana	20.00	20.00	20.00	18.75	24.87
Oregon	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.49	25.62
Washington	20.00	20.00	20.00	17.73	22.37
Minnesota	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.67	28.56
Nebraska	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.05	27.66
Wyoming	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.93	24.57
Colorado	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.09	24.64
Vermont	20.00	20.00	20.00	22.16	30.19
Iowa	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.41	27.04
Montana	$20.00	$20.00	$20.00	$20.80	$27.78
Florida	20.00	20.00	20.00	19.30	23.67
Arizona	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.84	26.73
Kansas	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.20	25.84
Texas	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.84	30.87
Maine	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.84	27.97
Virginia	20.00	20.00	20.00	22.65	30.52
Hawaii	20.00	20.00	20.00	21.74	27.50
Oklahoma	20.00	20.00	20.00	22.50	25.72
North Dakota	20.00	20.00	24.02	25.20	36.00
Louisiana	20.00	20.00	27.78	24.35	34.80
South Dakota	20.00	20.00	27.82	23.60	32.55
Kentucky	20.00	20.10	28.43	25.86	36.66
Idaho	20.00	22.72	31.06	23.83	29.20
New Mexico	20.00	23.06	31.40	24.22	30.05
West Virginia	20.00	27.92	36.26	24.60	30.97
Georgia	20.00	28.24	36.58	25.61	33.19
Utah	21.16	29.50	37.84	23.67	27.72
Tennessee	22.42	30.76	39.10	25.30	31.45
Alabama	31.56	39.89	48.22	26.70	33.25
North Carolina	31.76	40.10	48.43	30.41	32.96
Arkansas	36.42	44.75	53.08	27.79	34.40
South Carolina	42.49	50.82	59.18	27.79	37.85
Mississippi	48.80	57.13	65.48	27.79	35.31
Cost (millions)	$693	$737	$794	$850	----------

[1] S. 1021 amounts per school-age child converted to amounts per public school child in average daily attendance, for comparison.

States ranked by personal income per public school child.

Cooper-Javits minimum foundation formula: Federal share is ¼ the difference between (a) 4 percent of State personal income per child and (b) foundation level of $350 1st year, $375 2d year, $400 3d year; or $20 per child, whichever is larger.

Cooper-Javits amendment to S. 1021—Estimated State allotments

[3 years; $20 per child guaranteed every State; equalization up to about 2:1 (1st year) and 3:1 (4th year) in neediest States (reaching 15 States below 75 percent of national average income in 3d year)]

	1st year	2d year	3d year		1st year	2d year	3d year
New York	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	$48,905,680	Arizona	$4,584,880	$4,584,880	$4,584,880
Delaware	1,457,840	1,457,840	1,457,840	Kansas	8,558,780	8,558,780	8,558,780
Illinois	29,449,960	29,449,960	29,449,960	Texas	36,736,260	36,736,260	36,736,260
New Jersey	18,423,860	18,423,860	18,423,860	Maine	3,574,420	3,574,420	3,574,420
Connecticut	8,380,860	8,380,860	8,380,860	Virginia	14,945,960	14,945,960	14,945,960
Rhode Island	2,292,200	2,292,200	2,292,200	Hawaii	2,646,880	2,646,880	2,646,880
Massachusetts	15,569,280	15,569,280	15,569,280	Oklahoma	9,270,180	9,270,180	9,270,180
Alaska	721,140	721,140	721,140	North Dakota	2,421,860	2,932,400	2,932,400
Pennsylvania	34,964,360	34,964,360	34,964,360	Louisiana	12,618,160	12,618,160	17,521,066
Missouri	13,614,620	13,614,620	13,614,620	South Dakota	2,731,940	2,731,940	3,799,600
Maryland	10,493,760	10,493,760	10,493,760	Kentucky	11,088,280	11,141,750	15,761,866
Ohio	33,719,520	33,719,520	33,719,520	Idaho	2,943,800	3,345,416	4,572,000
Nevada	1,122,660	1,122,660	1,122,660	New Mexico	4,041,580	4,659,874	6,343,866
Wisconsin	12,932,920	12,932,920	12,932,920	West Virginia	8,328,400	11,625,834	15,000,000
California	63,279,320	63,279,320	63,279,320	Georgia	15,786,000	22,289,542	28,867,066
New Hampshire	1,889,720	1,889,720	1,889,720	Utah	4,533,984	6,318,792	8,103,600
Michigan	29,679,420	29,679,420	29,679,420	Tennessee	16,126,150	22,120,874	28,115,600
Indiana	16,719,420	16,719,420	16,719,420	Alabama	21,733,450	27,473,458	33,213,466
Oregon	6,608,020	6,608,020	6,608,020	North Carolina	31,696,266	40,012,666	48,329,066
Washington	11,278,460	11,278,460	11,278,460	Arkansas	13,272,366	16,309,916	19,347,466
Minnesota	12,118,660	12,118,660	12,118,660	South Carolina	22,629,300	27,067,584	31,505,866
Nebraska	5,171,740	5,171,740	5,171,740	Mississippi	22,177,734	25,965,666	29,753,600
Wyoming	1,285,200	1,285,200	1,285,200				
Colorado	6,757,240	6,757,240	6,757,240	$20 per child, United States	640,354,520	640,354,520	640,354,520
Vermont	1,295,220	1,295,220	1,295,220	Equalization	52,729,930	96,803,932	153,863,152
Iowa	10,598,740	10,598,740	10,598,740				
Montana	2,656,000	2,656,000	2,656,000	Total	693,084,450	737,158,452	794,217,672
Florida	17,217,740	17,217,740	17,217,740				

States ranked by income per public school child. States below the line receive equalization grants (more than $20 per pupil). District of Columbia included in totals, at $2,034,220 each year.

Allotments computed as ¼ the amount by which minimum foundation exceeds 4-percent of State income, or $20 per public school child, whichever is larger. Minimum foundation is product of number of pupils in ADA in public elementary and secondary schools times $350 1st year, $375 2d year, $400 3d year. Pupils for 1959–60 school year. State personal income, 3-year average 1957–59. Increase in school enrollment not projected.

STATE COMPARISON OF INCOME, PUBLIC-SCHOOL PUPILS, AND CURRENT EXPENDITURES

Supporting data for Cooper-Javits amendment providing a minimum foundation for public schools

	Annual personal income	Public-school current expenditures	Current expenditures as percent of income	Public-school pupils	Income per pupil	Present current expenditures per pupil		Annual personal income	Public-school current expenditures	Current expenditures as percent of income	Public-school pupils	Income per pupil	Present current expenditures per pupil
	Thousands	*Thousands*		*Thousands*				*Thousands*	*Thousands*		*Thousands*		
New York	$42,817,000	$1,146,125	$2.7	$2,445	$17,510	$585	Montana	$1,313,000	$47,547	$3.6	$133	$9,887	$427
Delaware	1,259,000	28,842	2.3	73	17,272	460	Florida	8,468,000	227,837	2.7	861	9,836	310
Illinois	24,635,000	544,950	2.2	1,472	16,730	457	Arizona	2,200,000	80,709	3.7	229	9,597	360
New Jersey	14,602,000	373,271	2.5	921	15,949	512	Kansas	4,097,000	131,650	3.2	428	9,574	384
Connecticut	6,625,000	151,356	2.3	419	15,810	420	Texas	17,242,000	535,798	3.1	1,837	9,387	330
Rhode Island	1,752,000	40,540	2.3	115	15,287	417	Maine	1,648,000	42,516	2.6	179	9,221	320
Massachusetts	11,801,000	269,750	2.3	778	15,159	413	Virginia	6,701,000	172,638	2.6	747	8,967	275
Alaska	540,000	16,441	3.0	36	14,976	585	Hawaii	1,182,000	33,083	2.8	132	8,931	378
Pennsylvania	23,949,000	620,191	2.6	1,748	13,699	421	Oklahoma	3,941,000	129,987	3.3	464	8,503	320
Missouri	8,734,000	207,199	2.4	681	12,830	355	North Dakota	991,000	38,264	3.9	121	8,184	345
Maryland	6,717,000	166,143	2.5	525	12,802	415	Louisiana	4,995,000	202,624	4.1	631	7,917	370
Ohio	21,137,000	525,090	2.5	1,686	12,537	388	South Dakota	1,081,000	42,741	4.0	137	7,914	350
Nevada	694,000	18,770	2.7	56	12,363	435	Kentucky	4,362,000	116,216	2.7	554	7,868	275
Wisconsin	7,798,000	218,873	2.8	647	12,059	422	Idaho	1,129,000	37,280	3.3	147	7,670	285
California	37,832,000	1,081,847	2.9	3,164	11,957	494	New Mexico	1,545,000	61,592	4.0	202	7,646	365
New Hampshire	1,125,000	27,468	2.4	94	11,907	363	West Virginia	3,032,000	96,953	3.2	416	7,281	255
Michigan	16,999,000	512,657	3.0	1,484	11,455	424	Georgia	5,728,000	190,430	3.3	789	7,257	236
Indiana	9,349,000	264,927	2.8	836	11,183	372	Utah	1,534,000	56,849	3.7	214	7,162	340
Oregon	3,500,000	127,172	3.5	330	10,866	448	Tennessee	5,085,000	146,365	2.9	719	7,069	228
Washington	6,057,000	200,823	3.3	564	10,741	430	Alabama	4,307,000	135,901	3.1	689	6,384	217
Minnesota	6,440,000	218,574	3.4	606	10,628	415	North Carolina	6,355,000	207,750	3.3	998	6,368	240
Nebraska	2,731,000	75,123	2.8	259	10,561	320	Arkansas	2,194,000	74,182	3.4	365	6,019	242
Wyoming	678,000	26,608	3.9	64	10,551	454	South Carolina	2,963,000	105,368	3.6	533	5,563	223
Colorado	3,537,000	106,246	3.0	338	10,469	407	Mississippi	2,314,000	77,379	3.3	455	5,091	226
Vermont	656,000	20,631	3.1	65	10,130	339							
Iowa	3,255,000	172,527	3.3	530	9,916	400	United States	361,896,000	10,153,803	2.8	31,916	11,339	390

Total annual personal income, 3-year average, 1957–59. Current expenditures for full-time public elementary and secondary schools, 1957–58 school year. Current expenditures as percent of income, col. 2/col. 1. Pupils in average daily attendance in full-time public elementary and secondary schools, 1959–60 school year. Income per pupil, col. 4/col. 1.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Education. Present current expenditures per pupil, NEA estimate 1960–61 school year.

EXCERPTS FROM PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE PROGRAMS OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Dr. Munse, specialist, School of Finance, Office of Education, and Dr. Hutchins, Chief, School of Finance, Office of Education)

In almost all States there is one major fund which is usually designated as the foundation program fund. This fund indicates the policy of the legislature with regard to the establishment of the level of school support.

The foundation program represents a program of State support for the public schools which defines basic educational services that should be available to all the children in the State and provides for complete financing through local tax contributions and through funds granted from State revenues.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope very much the Senate will now approve the amendment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to tell my good friends from Kentucky and New York that I shall support their amendment. If we are to have a Federal aid to education bill passed—and I am against it—this is the only fair formula we can adopt for this type of bill.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New York has very eloquently outlined the argument for his formula. I agree with the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent, if my friend has no objection, to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table from the United States Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, for 1957, the latest figures I can get, listing "all local tax-

able real property in the United States—1956."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

All local taxable real property, 1956

State	Estimated market value in billions of dollars locally assessed taxable real property, 1956	Assessed value in millions of dollars	Percentage of assessed value to real market value (weighted)
Alabama	7.1	1,291	18.2
Arizona	3.8	554	14.6
Arkansas	5.0	466	9.4
California	85.2	16,212	19.0
Colorado	8.3	2,126	25.5
Connecticut	10.8	5,058	46.7
Delaware	2.0	928	46.2
Dist. of Col	3.8	1,948	50.7
Florida	19.7	5,878	29.8
Georgia	8.3	1,792	21.6
Idaho	3.5	353	10.1
Illinois	47.2	21,600	45.7
Indiana	19.4	4,114	21.2
Iowa	15.2	3,533	23.3
Kansas	9.6	2,282	23.6
Kentucky	7.5	2,295	30.7
Louisiana	9.4	1,675	17.7
Maine	2.6	927	35.8
Maryland	10.8	5,222	48.4
Massachusetts	17.7	7,823	44.2
Michigan	32.0	10,102	31.5
Minnesota	12.3	1,590	12.9
Mississippi	4.1	669	16.2
Missouri	15.7	4,618	29.9
Montana	3.4	272	7.9
Nebraska	7.2	2,112	29.3
Nevada	1.5	353	23.3
New Hampshire	2.3	926	40.6
New Jersey	23.1	6,361	27.5
New Mexico	2.7	458	16.7
New York	62.1	34,662	55.8
North Carolina	12.2	4,037	33.1
North Dakota	2.7	403	14.8
Ohio	39.3	14,150	36.0
Oklahoma	7.5	1,440	19.2
Oregon	7.6	1,403	18.5
Pennsylvania	30.8	11,951	32.5
Rhode Island	2.6	1,752	66.3
South Carolina	4.2	302	7.2
South Dakota	3.0	1,300	43.5
Tennessee	8.3	2,221	26.9
Texas	52.4	7,708	14.7
Utah	3.3	483	14.7
Vermont	1.2	359	30.1
Virginia	13.4	3,501	26.2
Washington	11.4	1,884	16.6
West Virginia	4.5	1,341	30.0
Wisconsin	14.7	7,064	48.0
Wyoming	1.5	263	17.8
Continental United States	629.9	209,765	30.4

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1957.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I invite the attention of my colleagues to the great discrepancies which exist in the tax methods employed by the various States. For example, my State has a total estimated market value of local taxable real property of $3.8 billion. That is about half of what one of the so-called distressed States has in taxable real property value, yet my State spends more money per student and in capital investments than the other State.

I think it would be wise for my colleague to look over this table and come to some conclusion as to why some States are anxious to have the bill passed. It will mean these States will continue to enjoy benefits they should provide for themselves, to be furnished by other States. I do not believe our generosity should extend so far as to try to help States which are not trying to help themselves.

I also invite the attention of my colleagues, as they consult the table, to the information which the distinguished Senator from New York has had printed in the RECORD.

I thank my friend from New York and my friend from Kentucky, who earlier insinuated that perhaps I never had any suggestions to make. I hope the Senator can be present when I offer my substitute bill, because I think he will find it is beautifully adapted to the needs of Kentucky. I hope he will be present when I offer other suggestions which I think will get the same job done without relieving the families or the local authorities of their responsibility.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I would not wish to have the impression left on the RECORD that I insinuated the Senator from Arizona never made good suggestions. I was talking rather generally about political positions in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. We will not go into that.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure the Senator at this moment does not wish to go into that.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wonder if the Senator from Colorado and the Senate would consider the possibility of having a vote on the Javits-Cooper amendment, for a variety of reasons, with the understanding that the Senator from Colorado will not lose his right to the floor. The Senate has been considering this particular proposal since about 11:30 a.m. or 12 o'clock. I hope there will be no objection to such a unanimous-consent request, because I think there are good reasons for approving it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have no objection. I wish to say that I concur in the views of the distinguished Senator from Florida, and for that reason I shall support the amendment. I have no objection whatever to the vote, provided I retain my right to the floor after the vote on the amendment is taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the graciousness and the patience of the Senator from Colorado, who has been on his feet for a long time seeking recognition. It is understood, of course, that at the conclusion of the vote the Senator from Colorado will retain his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the Cooper-Javits amendment. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. JORDAN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. ENGLE. On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Utah would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Nebraska would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

On this vote the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from

Nebraska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 44]

YEAS—33

Allott	Douglas	McClellan
Beall	Dworshak	Miller
Boggs	Eastland	Morton
Bridges	Ervin	Saltonstall
Bush	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Butler	Holland	Scott
Case, N.J.	Javits	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston	Stennis
Cotton	Keating	Thurmond
Curtis	Kuchel	Wiley
Dodd	Lausche	Williams, Del.

NAYS—50

Bartlett	Humphrey	Muskie
Bible	Jackson	Neuberger
Burdick	Kefauver	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Kerr	Pell
Cannon	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Carlson	Long, Hawaii	Proxmire
Carroll	Long, La.	Randolph
Case, S. Dak.	Magnuson	Russell
Church	Mansfield	Smathers
Clark	McCarthy	Smith, Mass.
Fong	McGee	Sparkman
Gore	McNamara	Symington
Hart	Metcalf	Talmadge
Hayden	Monroney	Williams, N.J.
Hickenlooper	Morse	Yarborough
Hickey	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hill	Mundt	

NOT VOTING—17

Aiken	Chavez	Hartke
Anderson	Dirksen	Hruska
Bennett	Ellender	Jordan
Blakley	Engle	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	Young, Ohio
Capehart	Gruening	

So the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS for himself and Mr. COOPER was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Illinois with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader what the program is for the balance of the day and for the balance of the week, and what the order of business will be on Monday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the Senator's question, today comprises the balance of the week. There will be no more votes today.

It is anticipated that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] will offer his amendment.

It is the intention of the leadership, after discussing the question with interested Senators, including the author of the amendment, to ask unanimous consent that 4 hours be allotted to the consideration of the Bush amendment at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday.

It is further anticipated, after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority leader, that the Senate will consider convening at 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In effect, is the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Connecticut, the so-called Powell amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does it touch upon segregation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assume so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. ON MONDAY, MAY 22, 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn until 11 o'clock on Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me, without losing his right to the floor, so that I may call up my amendment? It will take me about 10 or 12 minutes to discuss it.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I have promised to yield to two or three Senators for matters which I believe have particular pertinency at this time. Then I shall immediately yield to the Senator from Connecticut. However, I shall yield to the Senator now only for the purpose of permitting him to offer his amendment, not for the purpose of explaining it at this time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, line 13 through 17, it is proposed to amend section 111(a)(1) to read as follows:

> The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110(a) and the public schools of which do not in fact practice discrimination in their entrance requirements on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

On page 16, line 22, after the comma, insert the following: "or that any public school in such State is not in compliance with the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection,".

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to yield, because of an unusual circumstance, to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, it is my sad duty to announce the death of George W. Malone, our former colleague, who served with distinction for 12 eventful years as Senator from Nevada.

Senator Malone had been gravely ill for several weeks and he was aware of his condition. It was typical of the man that he faced this last battle with the same indomitable courage that always set him apart from other men.

"Molly" Malone, as he was affectionately known by thousands of Nevadans, lived a full and useful life—much of it devoted to public service.

His studies at the University of Nevada were interrupted by the First World War. He enlisted as a private in the field artillery in 1917 and received a battlefield promotion in France to lieutenant in Intelligence. At war's end he returned to Reno and again enrolled at the university, where he excelled as an engineering student and gained wide renown for winning the Pacific coast amateur middleweight boxing championship.

As a young man he was appointed State engineer of Nevada, beginning a career in public life which would span almost a quarter of a century. His vast knowledge of water problems, coupled with his ability as an engineer, made him an invaluable figure in the complex negotiations which eventually led to the construction of Hoover Dam on the Colorado River.

"Molly" Malone returned to his private engineering practice in the mid-thirties, and also established the Industrial West Foundation, a nonprofit research organization for the Western States. At the outbreak of World War II he was named as a consultant to the Secretary of War and traveled to many bases in the Aleutions and Pacific as a specialist with the U.S. Senate Military Affairs Committee on Strategic and Critical Minerals and Materials and on Examination of Military Establishments.

In 1946 he ran successfully for the U.S. Senate. His 12 years in this great body, Mr. President, were devoted to many and varied problems, but his underlying concern lay with what he described as the ineffectiveness of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the damage being done to our economy through indiscriminate foreign aid spending and cheaply made foreign imports.

There were times when Senator Malone was fighting virtually a lone battle, but that never deterred him for an instant. He had a deep devotion to the welfare of his country, and he believed implicitly in the course of action he followed with such unwavering consistency.

As is only natural with those of different political affiliation, Senator Malone and I would at times find ourselves in areas of disagreement. I believe it was a tribute to his sense of fairness and understanding, however, that we could disagree without being disagreeable—a refreshing situation which does not always prevail in the rough and tumble arena of modern politics.

"Molly" Malone always exemplified the same qualities which stamped him as an outstanding college boxer in his youth—plenty of heart, tenacity, the

ability to roll with the punch, and, most important, the determination to fight one more round.

He might well have asked, as did the poet, Louis Untermeyer:

From compromise and things half done
Keep me with stern and stubborn pride;
And when at last the fight is won,
God, keep me still unsatisfied.

Mr. President, it is with heavy heart that I express heartfelt condolences to his devoted wife, Ruth, and their daughter, Molly, on the irreparable loss of their husband and father.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep sorrow at hearing the sad news of the death of former Senator Malone, which comes at a time when so many of us who served with him are still serving in the Senate and knew of his courage and strong adherence to his views.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, at this time one cannot say very much. We who come from the western part of the United States will always remember George Malone as faithful and loyal to the West and to all the causes in which he believed.

I had not heard of his serious illness until late yesterday. I attempted to call him this morning and was shocked when I learned of the condition which had set in.

I express the deep sympathy of Mrs. Case and myself to his bereaved wife.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is with a sense of deep loss and sorrow that I rise to do honor today to the former Member of this body whom I replaced in the U.S. Senate.

To know George W. Malone was a rich experience for all those who came in contact with him. He possessed to a degree not gifted upon many a rare exuberance of personality and a tenacious trait of character that made him devoted to those ideals for which he stood.

"Molly" Malone described himself perhaps better than anyone could. He often said that he was a builder and not a destroyer. He prided himself upon those things in Nevada that he helped as an engineer and as a public servant to build for the benefit of the State. He had a rich life and a productive one.

He was a product of the University of Nevada Engineering School. Later he began a practice that took him to many parts of the West, but dearest to his heart was his home in Nevada, and he early announced his intention to help build our State.

His name is well known through the length and breadth of Nevada and by miners, industrialists, and men and women in all the spectrum of economic life.

A man of tremendous physical energy and courage, Senator Malone prided himself on having slept upon every square mile of the State during his early days as a civil engineer. He was an outstanding State engineer, and served from 1927 to 1935. He served in the armed forces of the United States with distinction during World War I and acted in a consulting capacity to a special Senate military committee during World War II.

Oftentimes Senator Malone was the vocal spokesman for minority viewpoints, but always he expressed himself in such a manner as to deserve and win the respect of the opposition. He was in all things a gentleman and a clean fighter.

Mr. President, I am sure that the association he had with many colleagues who serve in the Senate today enriched this institution. I am sure that we all share the burden that is so deeply felt today by citizens of Nevada and particularly by his wife and daughter who survive Senator Malone.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join my colleagues in expressing deep regret at the passing of our late colleague, George Malone, of Nevada.

He was a man of great conviction. He was a man of outstanding courage. He served his State and the Nation to the very best of his ability. We shall miss him, because of the many contributions he made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have been deeply affected by the passing of George Malone. For a long time I counted him as an intimate friend, not only in the Senate, but in the early days when I first knew him, when he was such an active member of the American Legion, particularly at the national level.

At a future time I shall address myself to a tribute, but at the moment I wish to express my condolences to Mrs. Malone and the family.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of Mrs. Morse and myself, I wish to extend to the family of the late Senator Malone our deepest sympathy.

George Malone and I were close personal friends and co-hobbyists. We both were horsemen together and enjoyed horses and riding together. We used to joke with each other about the fact that, although many times we did not vote together in the Senate we were both mavericks politically. We had a great deal of respect for each other's independence of judgment.

It is sad news to learn of the death of such a good friend; and it is a sad loss to the country to lose one who has made the record of public service which Senator Malone made throughout his years of service to his State and Nation.

RAILROAD MERGERS—A MATTER OF CONCERN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a few weeks ago here in the Senate I expressed concern over the wave of railroad merger proposals. There is now pending before the Interstate Commerce Commission an application to consolidate into a new company the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroads. This consolidation, if approved, would adversely affect literally thousands of railroad employees in Minnesota.

It is also reported that the Milwaukee road is seriously considering plans to merge with the Chicago and Northwestern Railway which would result in the largest railroad in the country covering 21,325 miles of track in 15 States, including Minnesota.

I ask consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a summary prepared by the ICC of the various merger and consolidation proposals involving major railroads which are currently pending before the Commission.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Competitive applications filed by the New York Central and the Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad Cos. to acquire control of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. are scheduled for public hearings beginning June 19, 1961. Competitive applications for acquisition of control of the Western Pacific Railroad Co. have been filed by the Southern Pacific and Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Cos., but no hearing date has as yet been assigned. An application for authority to consolidate into a new company the Great Northern, Northern Pacific, and Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroads, and for the new company to lease the properties of the Spokane, Portland & Seattle Railway Co. was filed February 17, 1961. Applications seeking authority, inter alia, for merger of the New York, Chicago & St. Louis Railroad Co. into the Norfolk & Western Railway Co. and for the latter to lease the properties of the Wabash Railway Co. were filed March 17, 1961. It is not expected that hearings on the last mentioned applications involving the Great Northern and Norfolk & Western will begin before late summer or early fall. A number of hearings have been held upon the application for merger of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co. into the Seaboard Air Line Railway Co., and hearings will probably be completed during the summer. Hearings recently have been completed upon an application of the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. to acquire control of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co.; and a hearing is assigned for May 29, 1961, on the application of the Southern Railway Co. to acquire control of the Central of Georgia Railway Co.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a sentiment is mounting day by day for Congress to make a thorough review of railroad mergers and the problems arising as a result thereof. I believe that such a study would be most timely and that it would help us to ascertain the facts and to evaluate the situation with the view in mind of considering amendments to the Interstate Commerce Act so as to give the ICC in merger application cases greater authority to protect the public interest.

I am hopeful that Congress will institute such a study at this session. I hope that while the Congress is reviewing this whole matter that the ICC will proceed with extreme caution and deliberation in considering railroad merger and consolidation applications.

I fear, Mr. President, that in all too many railroad mergers of late the public interest has been pushed into the background and largely ignored.

Because of the seriousness of this matter I submit a resolution which reads as follows:

RESOLUTION URGING THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION TO ACT WITH EXTREME CAUTION AND FULL DELIBERATION ON APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF RAILROAD MERGERS IN ORDER TO AFFORD CONGRESS TIME TO REVIEW THE PROBLEMS ARISING FROM THE RAILROAD MERGER MOVEMENT

Whereas under existing law the Interstate Commerce Commission does not have adequate authority to protect the public interest in the matter of consolidation, unification,

or acquisition of control of railroad properties, since it is without power to make such developments conform to any pattern for the most efficient development of our national railroad network or to the long-range future needs of our Nation for economic expansion, national defense, and overall continuing transportation needs; and

Whereas there is now an intensive struggle between dominant regional railroad corporations to gain control of other strategic railroad properties in order to strengthen and extend their position in traffic interchange and in access to traffic producing areas without consideration of the effects of the elimination of competition and curtailment of railroad services resulting from such consolidations, unification, or acquisitions of control on the small and weaker railroads, or on the welfare and convenience of the general public, small business establishments, shippers and industries in the respective areas; and

Whereas members of the Interstate Commerce Commission have been actively encouraging consolidations, unifications, mergers, and acquisition of control on any basis, however fragmentary and without regard for their effect upon the long-range transportation needs of the Nation; and

Whereas the Commission recently rejected an appeal from one railroad for a suspension of mergers until it had undertaken a study to establish a proper pattern and policy for such unifications which would adequately protect competing railroads now threatened with adverse consequences if the present unification process is allowed to proceed without proper planning in the public interest; and

Whereas the U.S. Department of Justice has more recently petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission to consolidate the proceedings in the number of pending merger applications on grounds that consideration of adequate rail service to the public calls for consideration, not only of what rail service is required to serve the economy in the territory involved, but also, the extent to which competitive service should be preserved and required, as well as consideration of adequate rail service to satisfy the needs of the postal service and the national defense, as specified by the National Transportation Policy; and

Whereas the comprehensive study of our national transportation problems which has just been completed by a special study group for the Senate Commerce Committee, while favoring further mergers in the industry, has nevertheless warned that the process should be halted temporarily until a proper overall plan is evolved lest irreparable damage be done to our existing railroad network; and

Whereas consolidations, unifications, mergers, and acquisitions of control already accomplished and proposed reveal the problems of greater difficulties for weaker railroads, elimination of competition for traffic, curtailments of railroad facilities in the respective areas, and a fragmentary, negative, and inadequate approach to the necessity of adjusting our railroads to the needs of a dynamic, expanding economy:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in order to afford Congress time to review the problems arising from the present railroad merger movement and to consider amendment of the Interstate Commerce Act in terms of giving greater protection to the public interest and developing a nationwide plan for any future reorganization of our Nation's railroad network, the Interstate Commerce Commission, in considering applications for railroad mergers, is urged to act with extreme caution and full deliberation and to refrain from granting approvals unless it is fully convinced that such mergers would definitely be in the interest of better service to the public, would safeguard the needs of the national defense and the postal service, and would conform to the long-range transportation needs of our country.

Mr. President, the resolution does not seek to tie the hands of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It does not state that railroad mergers are necessarily contrary to the public interest. All of us recognize that consolidations and mergers may very well promote a healthier economy and be in the Nation's interest.

The intent of my resolution is to indicate the Senate's concern over the growing merger wave in the railroad industry and to express the hope that while Congress looks into this subject that the ICC will weigh with extreme caution pending applications bearing in mind that the interest of the American people must have top priority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Minnesota allow me to become a cosponsor of the resolution?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am pleased to have the senior Senator from Montana do so.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I also wish to become a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am honored to have the junior Senator from Montana become a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am in thorough accord with the resolution. Because the Committee on Commerce, of which I am the chairman, has been considering this subject for some time, the resolution probably will be referred to our committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It will, indeed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say that the Interstate Commerce Commission has followed exactly this advice. It has informally suggested to the committee that it would not make any final decisions in these matters for at least 14 to 18 months. In the meantime, the Commission plans to hold hearings in the field and to discuss the subject further.

I think this is very worth while, because it would coincide with what I think the Commission wishes to do, and what I think we all wish to do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I hope this resolution will be helpful to the Interstate Commerce Commission in expressing the views of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And helpful to the committee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution lie on the desk until May 26, for additional signatures.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The resolution (S. Res. 150), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators), was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement will be read.

The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was read, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That further debate on the so-called Bush amendment on antisegregation, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 4 hours, after the conclusion of morning business on Monday, May 22, 1961, to be equally divided between the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. BUSH, and the Senator from Oregon, Mr. MORSE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as I understand, this proposed agreement does not apply to anything except the Bush amendment and amendments to it. It would not apply to any other amendments offered dealing with this question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. KEATING. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I promised to yield to the Senator from Connecticut to present a statement in connection with his amendment. I do so with the understanding that at the conclusion of his remarks I may resume the floor. I put that in the form of a unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I do not believe the amendment needs further explanation than that given by the clerk in reading it. It is intended to come to grips with a basic issue—whether Federal aid for education should be extended to those States, which in defiance of the Constitution and the law of the land, continue to practice segregation in their public schools.

On yesterday, I made a speech in the Senate in which I pointed out the grossly discriminatory features of S. 1021 in the formula for allocation of funds among the States—a formula which, as pointed out in the Washington Evening Star, which I inserted in the RECORD, distributes funds on a "pork barrel" basis instead of on a basis of need.

Mr. President, when I went to bed last night I could not sleep. I tossed and turned for several hours. I realized that in concentrating my discussion of S. 1021 on the allocation formula I had neglected to focus attention on the most

obnoxiously discriminatory feature of the bill. I resolved then to bring this issue before the Senate.

I am aware that introducing an amendment to withhold Federal funds for education to States which practice segregation in the public schools makes its sponsor subject to a charge that he is attempting to kill the bill.

Although I am opposed to S. 1021, as reported by the committee in its presently discriminatory form, I deny that charge.

I am confident that the bill will pass the Senate. It is impossible for this Senator to kill it. The manager of the bill on the Senate floor, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has expressed his confidence that he has the votes to defeat any amendment to which he and the administration are opposed. And although the Senator has been an eloquent advocate of civil rights, he has made it clear that he is opposed to any antisegregation amendment being attached to this bill.

Mr. President, my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has on occasion referred to what he terms an "unholy alliance" in the Senate. He considers such an alliance to exist whenever he finds southern Senators voting with some of us on this side of the aisle.

I will not call it unholy, but I say, that if my amendment is defeated it will be because of an alliance between Senators who represent States which are defying the law of the land by continuing segregation in the public schools and Senators who have been the most vociferous in their professed devotion to the cause of civil rights.

I hope that the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is mistaken in his appraisal of the situation, and that an appeal to conscience may triumph on the Senate floor over political cynicism and expediency.

Mr. President, I did not offer my amendment in an attempt to defeat the bill, but to appeal to the consciences of Senators and require them to face squarely the grave moral issue which is here involved.

S. 1021 proposes that the Federal Government, for the first time, embark upon a broad program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools. It is presented as a 3-year program, but all Senators know that, once approved, it will be unlimited.

If there are any doubters let them refer to the words of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the former Governor of my State, Abraham Ribicoff, which appear on page 151 of the Senate hearings while he was engaged in a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

This is what Secretary Ribicoff said:

> You are in the process of raising the standards in all the different States, and frankly I do not conceive of this program being a 3-year program. I could not come to the Congress of the United States and say that this is the end of Federal aid to education. Personally I don't think so, and I have to be frank with you.

So, this is not a program for which we are going to tax the American people $850 million a year for 3 years only. It is a program which, once enacted, will continue on into the future as far as one may predict, and one which will grow and grow. The eventual tax burden for this program which will be placed upon the American people will, in my judgment, reach $5 billion a year or more within a short period of time.

The taxes which will be imposed to pay for this program, Mr. President, will respect no lines of race, creed, or color.

Whether a citizen be Negro or white, Baptist, Roman Catholic, Protestant, Jew, or agnostic, he will be forced to contribute a portion of his taxes to this program.

Think of what we are doing, Mr. President.

We are asking the colored people of this country to help pay for a program in which a substantial share of the funds will go to States which deny children of their race an equal opportunity for education in defiance of the law of the land.

We are asking millions of people, white and Negro alike, who are deeply convinced that segregation is a moral evil, to help pay for the perpetuation of this unhappy situation.

For, Mr. President, let there be no mistake, if the bill is passed, without an antidiscrimination amendment in it, it will indefinitely delay the integration of public schools in the South.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, has informed Senators that, under his construction of the bill, neither he nor the Commissioner of Education would have authority to withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.

This statement was made in a letter responding to an inquiry from the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include the Secretary's letter at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
> EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
> *Washington, May 17, 1961.*
>
> Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
> *U.S. Senate,*
> *Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: We have a telephone inquiry from your office on the question whether under the School Assistance Act of 1961, proposed by the administration and introduced as title I of S. 1021, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.
>
> In my opinion neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ——— ———,
> *Secretary.*

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, there we have it. If S. 1021 is passed without my amendment the Secretary, who, I know, is a believer in civil rights, will feel that he is required to allocate funds to States which are in defiance of the Supreme Court's decision.

If S. 1021 is enacted without my amendment, it will be a permanent roadblock against integration of the public schools in those States.

Mr. President, I know that there are some persons who believe political party platforms may be discarded after elections.

I disagree with that point of view, particularly as it may apply to those who helped write the platforms, such as myself, and I now remind Senators of what was said in the platforms of both parties less than a year ago.

I quote first from the Democratic Party platform of 1960, under the heading of civil rights:

> A new Democratic administration will also use its full powers—legal and moral—to insure the beginning of a good-faith compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education.

I observe that Secretary Ribicoff believes he would not have power, under existing law, to withhold funds from segregationist States if we enact S. 1021. I urge my Democratic colleagues now to give him that legal power by voting for my amendment, and thus give meaning to that platform pledge for the new administration.

I quote further from the 1960 Democratic platform:

> We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

I appeal to my Democratic colleagues not to postpone compliance for all eternity, rather than to 1963, by voting now for a bill which would provide Federal funds to States which practice segregation in their schools.

My own party's platform was critical of the 3-year delay condoned in the Democratic platform. We said:

> We oppose the pretense of fixing a target date 3 years from now for the mere submission to plans for school desegregation. Slow-moving school districts would construe it as a 3-year moratorium during which progress would cease, postponing until 1963 the legal process to enforce compliance.

I say to my Republican colleagues that, if we pass S. 1021 without an antidiscrimination amendment such as I have proposed, we will be condoning, not a 3-year moratorium, but likely a permanent moratorium on school desegregation.

Mr. President, both party platforms, in 1956 and 1960, contained many noble sounding words about equal opportunity for children, and about the equality of citizens under the law, regardless of race, creed, or color. I will not burden the RECORD by including them all.

But, Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that there must come a time when deeds are substituted for words. And when we are considering an education bill in which this subject is so deeply involved, the time has come for deeds. We must put up or shut up.

Mr. President, it may be argued that to insert an antidiscrimination amendment in the bill will raise an issue of Federal coercion or control.

If that be the case, then Federal coercion or control already is involved in the bill.

I invite attention to section 112, page 18, which requires the payment of prevailing wages to workers employed in construction work financed by funds made available under the bill—prevailing wages as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended.

Surely, if we can require compliance with the Davis-Bacon Act, we can require compliance with the Constitution of the United States.

While maintenance of wage standards is important, and I support it, is it more important than the supreme law of the land?

I say to you, Mr. President, that an amendment withholding Federal funds from States which practice discrimination on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin in their entrance requirements for their public schools, is far more important than the provision now in the bill withholding such funds from States which fail to observe Davis-Bacon wage standards in building their schools.

And my amendment does not involve any degree of coercion or control. It does not force a State to integrate its public schools. It merely says the Federal Government will not provide funds to encourage continued segregation.

I say we are faced here with a grave moral issue. Are we going to tax millions of American citizens who regard segregation as an evil cancer in our society to provide Federal funds to States which are perpetuating segregation in their public schools, in defiance of the law of the land?

Mr. President, to join that issue, I have called up my amendment, and asked that it be made the pending business of the Senate.

I thank my very genial friend the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] for his patience and tolerance in permitting me to present these preliminary remarks on my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield so that I may make a brief comment on the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. ALLOTT. I shall be very happy to do it. I hope the Senator will give me some assurance that it will not take more than two or three sentences.

Mr. KEATING. It will be less than a minute.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut. I shall support the amendment. The statement he has made about the moral issue we are faced with is true. Yesterday afternoon I sent to the desk an amendment which authorized a judicial review of any proposed grants for Federal funds for unconstitutional purposes. It would cover this question. It would cover every other question of constitutionality in the bill.

I would not want anyone, because there has been discussion of the amendment, to decline or refrain from voting for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut because of the possibility that my amendment may later be offered. I may very well offer it later, but I wanted to make that explanation because a number of Senators have expressed interest in the amendment which I have at the desk.

Mr. BUSH. I am familiar with the Senator's amendment. We have discussed it. I want to assure him that I will support his amendment. I do not think my amendment conflicts with it, but, rather, I think, runs parallel with and actually supports, rather than conflicts, with my amendment.

I thank the Senator for his comments and assurance of support on the pending amendment.

Again I thank the genial Senator from Colorado for his wonderful patience.

Mr. KEATING. We are agreed that he does have great patience.

A SATIRICAL COMMENT ON MISSILE BASE PROBLEMS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the sinister overtones of malpractice at our missile bases have been brought forcefully home to us recently by the outstanding efforts of the junior Senator from Arkansas and his committee. I would say to my friend at this point that all of us are again in his debt for his diligence, courage, and unflagging efforts to make our American society something of which we can be more proud.

However, in the course of these investigations, examples of gross cheating, laziness, and deliberate slowdowns have come to light. Situations have been reported in which many unskilled laborers are earning double and triple the weekly salary of, for instance, our first astronaut, Comdr. Alan Shepard. This disproportionate situation has come about because of unnecessary overtime, double time, and even—as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out—double double time.

Perhaps another good way to show what is going on is by taking the oblique approach through the means of satire. To that end, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Richard Starnes, published in the Washington Daily News on May 11, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S JUST NOT NORMAL

(By Richard Starnes)

(The following essay is a commentary on the recent reception in Washington for Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., as it might have been seen through the eyes of Sam Flinders, a fictitious pipefitter at the missile base in Cape Canaveral, Fla.)

NEW YORK, May 11.—I liked to laugh myself to death, I tell you the truth, when I see that guy, what's-his-name, getting a medal from the President the other day. That medal and 50 cents will get you a cold beer at any saloon in Cocoa Beach, and nothing else.

I mean this guy Shepard gets his kicks riding rockets, which I couldn't care less, but you got any idea how much dough he takes down? About $140 a week, that's what, $140 a week if he's got 10 years in the Navy. But that isn't the worst of it. I mean he's getting his hand shook by Mr. Kennedy but he's pulling only $140 a week and he's working an average 14–16 hours a day.

Look, maybe I don't know all that A–OK talk these guys spout, but I can figure pay scales, and this spaceman, or whatever you want to call him, is probably averaging $1.75 an hour. Which is why I'm laughing until my stomach hurts. Ever since I found this home at the cape, I been pulling on an average $365 a week wiping pipe joints, and just between you and me I ain't been hurting myself with work.

Look at it this way: This guy Shepard and his six buddies got a mortal lock on the rocket-driving trade, right? They going to get a jurisdictional dispute with the airline pilots, say? Of course not. Shepard and his buddies fly the rocket or it doesn't fly.

You get the picture now?

Oh, you got to know the angles to get well in this business. Like we get these assemblies for the Titan missile and we find out a lot of factory stiffs already put them together? What are we supposed to do, stand still for watching somebody take the bread outta our kids' mouths? Of course not. We go fishing for a couple of days and finally they see the light and tell us to go ahead and tear down the assemblies and put 'em back together.

Sure, it slows down the rocket, but man and boy, does it ever make a guy's bank account get well.

I mean, look at it this way: Who's going to take care of old No. 1, anyway? You're darn right. And suppose there have been 327 strikes at missile bases in the past 4–5 years? You let those wise guys in Washington blackjack a no-strike pledge out of us and see where it gets 'em. They can't stop a guy from getting sick if things aren't going right, can they?

Speaking of which, I get another laugh when the doctors say this Shepard is "disgustingly normal." I don't think he's normal, nor his six pals either. Here they got a mortal lock on rocket driving and they're working for peanuts. Call that normal?

COMMUNIST JARGON

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as the American people attempt to judge the scope of the menace posed by the international Communist conspiracy; as they attempt to evaluate statements made by Communist leaders; as they reach for a reaction to swift-moving events, they too often do so from a basis which lacks understanding of communism. They fail too often to realize that Communists have a carefully distilled jargon all their own. This jargon has its peculiar twisted meanings, sharpened through half a century of usage. These meanings are applied to common words in our vocabulary—symbolic words such as "peace" and "freedom" and "democracy" which carry a very sharp and precious image to us—and a completely different meaning to Communists.

Frequently over the years peaceful nations such as ours have been led down a Communist primrose path toward what Communists term "peaceful coexistence." But does this mean two powerful and conflicting ideologies living side by side in this world without armed conflict?

Not to the Communists, and certainly not to Mr. Khrushchev. When he uses the term, he says:

Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems does not mean reconciliation between the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies an intensification of the struggle of the working class and of all Communist parties for the triumph of Socialist ideas.

Mr. President, I commend to my colleagues for their attention and for their constituents, an article and an editorial on Communist jargon, which appeared in the Washington Daily News Thursday, May 18, and which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RELAX, IT'S THE UNDERTAKER—REST IN PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

(By Robert Molyneux)

What does Nikita Khrushchev, the friendly undertaker ("We will bury you"), really mean by peaceful coexistence.

This is what he means. And it's official: "Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems does not mean reconciliation between the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies an intensification of the struggle of the working class and of all Communist parties for the triumph of Socialist ideas."

Relax, in short, while the Reds continue the fight.

There it is, straight from the manifesto issued after the Moscow conference of world Communist leaders last December.

HOT DOCUMENT

Because it established current guidelines for Communist global troublemaking, it perhaps is the hottest document of its type since Khrushchev's supposedly secret speech denouncing Stalin.

It is heavy going, but it is perhaps the best example of newspeak and doublethink since George Orwell's book "1984" (full of such big brother mottoes as "Freedom Is Slavery"). The lingo is pure newspeak, and only when you get the hang of it does the manifesto make sense.

Since it is shaping up into something of a best seller an abbreviated glossary is in order:

Belligerent: Anyone who defends his homeland and his way of life against communism.

Creative Marxism-Leninism: Any act calculated to bring about the downfall of any or all of the free world.

Criminal plot: Any act of the free world calculated to stymie communism.

Culture: Whatever the Reds say it is; subject to change.

Democracy: Totalitarianism.

Equality: Commies are more equal than others.

Exploit: Anything the United States does to help others.

Heroic: Any gimmick the Reds can dream up to give the free world a bad time. Korea, Laos, Vietnam.

Imperialism: Anything the free world does.

Liberation: Communist enslavement, domination.

Masses: The voiceless millions in Communist lands in whose name the Red elite acts.

National independence: Communist satellite status.

Peace: Anything at all short of total thermonuclear war. Korea, Laos, Vietnam.

Progressive: Communist.

Provocation: Self-defense against communism.

Reaction, forces of: Anti-Communists of all stripes.

Renegades: Disillusioned defected Communists.

Revisionist: A Communist who doesn't buy the Sino-Soviet line.

Stooges: Anybody on our side.

War: Thermonuclear holocaust only. Not Korea, Laos, Vietnam.

Yoke of capitalism: On our side.

It would be all too easy to ridicule newspeak, to kid about Red true-is-false, false-is-true patois, but these sample definitions are in dead earnest.

LET'S NOT KID OURSELVES

Official Soviet definition of peaceful coexistence appears on this page in the story by Scripps-Howard writer Robert Molyneux. It points the way the free world can avoid tension. In fact it points to the only way.

What caused the tension in Berlin, Vietnam, Congo, Laos, and Cuba? Communist action. The only way to ease the tension is to submit to it, or overcome the force causing it.

We point this out today, because there are reports that the State Department, in order to ease tension in the Caribbean, will not press for OAS action against the Cuban Soviet, but instead will seek to develop a policy of containment of Cuba.

Cuban containment is not a policy; it is a dream. The Cuban revolution is already uncontained.

Fidelismo is established in Ecuador, Mexico, El Salvador, Panama, Haiti and Brazil, and has many beachheads elsewhere.

Operating in conjunction with the Soviet embassies in South America, as well as on its own, Cuban embassies have staffers and undercover agents right now actively subverting many South American governments. Operating through a Moscow-Havana subsidized propaganda service disguised as a news service called Prensa Latina, it is also subverting the air waves and the press. Red Cubans are buying up union officials, student leaders and so-called intellectuals for planned internal overthrow and conquest.

Granting that the complacency, inertia and ambivalence of many South American governments make any hope of concerted action within the treaty structures of the Organization of American States mere childish fantasy at this time, let's not kid ourselves further by talking about containment easing tension when what we're really talking about is retreat, which won't ease tension at all.

The ambitions of Castro to become the Red Bolivar of South America will not be contained until superior political, economic, social and military force—preferably collective—is deployed against him and his Moscow employers.

The reported administration policy contemplates no such deployment.

Therefore tension won't be relieved.

Therefore, we fear things will get worse before they get better.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, as a preface to my remarks on the pending bill, I ask unanimous consent that a timely editorial from the Wall Street Journal of today be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HYPOCRISY ON THE SCHOOLS

We hear a great deal these days about the Nation's unmet needs that only massive Federal spending can remedy. And we hear especially of the alleged needs of education; a $2.5 billion Federal aid program is now gliding through Congress on promises of what Washington will do for the schools and the people. But unmentioned is what the people have been doing for themselves and their schools.

Ten years ago, the American people were spending about $6 billion a year on education, which was a lot of money but not enough in the view of many. They were paying teachers an average salary of $3,126; again, some thought the figure was too low to attract talented personnel. The Commissioner of Education argued that school construction was proceeding at a rate that would fall 370,000 classrooms short of meeting the need in 1954. Another gloomy guess, by the chairman of the Senate Education Committee, put the Nation's classroom shortage at an alarming 600,000 by 1958.

But what did the people actually do about their school problems in the absence of Federal aid?

Well, while school enrollment was increasing 44 percent from 1951–61, school expenditures increased 153 percent—to an estimated $16.4 billion in 1961. The National Education Association (NEA), a main force behind Federal aid for teachers' salaries, found that without a cent of Federal money salaries had jumped 74 percent over the decade, to an average of $5,389. In the meantime, the Nation's average per capita income was rising 30 percent.

What about the 600,000-classroom shortage forecast for 1958? By 1959, according to the generous estimate of the U.S. Office of Education, the shortage amounted to about 132,000 classrooms. To clean up that alleged backlog and meet future needs, the Federal agency called for 61,000 classrooms a year to be built during the sixties. But when the call went out from Washington, classrooms were already being built at a rate of 68,000 a year—which would produce a classroom surplus rather than a shortage.

Moreover, figures on enrollment indicate that the worst of the schools' population explosion is over. Enrollment leaped by 44 percent during the decade of the fifties; in the coming 10 years, enrollment is expected to increase by about 20 percent. Yet while the additional influx of children will be half that of 1951–61, the level of community effort continues to rise. During 1960–61, reports the NEA, school construction hit a record high of more than $3 billion in capital outlay.

Were the States and localities wrung dry by these Herculean labors, as proponents of Federal aid insist? Hardly. Only 237 of the Nation's 40,000 school districts—or one-half of 1 percent of the total—were found to be borrowed up in a 1959 survey by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

A broad margin remains for State and local school financing. Some States are entirely free of debt; the total indebtedness of State and local governments is about $62 billion. In striking contrast, the Federal Government which would support them has present and accruing liabilities of some $750 billion.

We don't suggest that every community has all the classroom space it might wish or require. Or that teachers' salaries are as high as everyone would like. But scattered local school needs do not amount to an unmet need of the entire Nation, save

in the imaginations of Federal aid enthusiasts.

Let them make a straightforward argument for Federal control of education, if they will. But let us have an end to hypocrisy about a nonexistent need.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, judging from the quantity of mail which I have received on the subject of Federal aid to education, this administration is attempting to jam down the people's throats something which most do not want—and do not need. Those who have written to me—and they are from all walks of life, educators and lay people alike—have been telling me, almost unanimously, that they favor the ministrations for education to be left at home. In the letters, time after time are repeated the thoughts that education belongs at the local and State level; that Federal contribution leads to Federal control; and that Federal administration requires unnecessary Federal expenditure. Judging by the editorials, magazine articles, pamphlets and books written on the subject, most people across the Nation share the sentiment.

As a good illustration, at their 21st annual convention in Philadelphia, May 6, 1961, the National School Boards Association—those people most concerned with our schools at the local level—overwhelmingly voted to oppose Federal aid to education. Having had it demonstrated to me from so many sources that massive Federal aid to education is not needed legislation, I shall oppose this bill as it now stands.

The test of need is and should be the primary consideration prompting legislation. The 1960 Republican platform, on the subject of education, recognizes the crucial importance of strengthening our system of education to prepare our youth for understanding and shaping the powerful emerging forces of the modern world and to permit the fullest development of individual capacities and potentialities. It goes on to say that education is not a luxury nor a gift to be bestowed upon ourselves and our children. Education is an investment; our schools cannot become second best. Each person possesses the right to education. It is his birthright in a free Republic. But, primary responsibility for education must remain with the local community and State. The Federal Government should assist selectively in strengthening education without interfering with full local control of schools. The Republican Party pledge "Federal support to the primary and secondary schools by a program of Federal aid for school construction, pacing it to the real needs of individual school districts in States and territories, and requiring State approval and participation."

A demonstrated need for construction, which State and local governments are unable to remedy, should signal Federal participation. Similar demonstrated needs have arisen in the past, and I willingly have been associated with remedial legislation. The National Defense Education Act is a case in point. I worked hard for the enactment of that legislation, and was, in fact, a coauthor of the bill. I helped write many portions of the bill. Parenthetically, I deplore the turn that the National Defense Education Act has taken. It was enacted to toughen our basic education system to combat one of the threats of Soviet communism. But under this guise, we find ourselves supporting so-called educational activity in such fields as glassblowing, church music, and folklore. But, I shall have much more to say about the NDEA at a later date. I think it is a typical and classical example of what happens when the Federal Government dips into these areas.

I also have favored in the past—and will continue to support—such significant assistance programs as school lunch and aid to federally impacted areas. They have been valuable endeavors in the national interest.

It has long and universally been recognized, however, that the primary responsibility for education belongs with the local community and the State; and there is every indication that such responsibility has been willingly and successfully assumed. A good indication of local interest in education is the willingness with which communities accept a bonded indebtedness. The Investment Bankers Association of America reported recently that in 1960, new issues of school bonds for public elementary and secondary schools aggregated over $2,183,870,000. That represents a formidable investment in the present and future education of our children.

In my own State, 1960 saw a new bonded indebtedness of $10,300,000, and in the first 3 months of 1961 the voters approved an additional $3,610,000. It is significant to note that Colorado expends more than 38 percent of its total State general fund budget on education. Likewise, its local governments equal or surpass that figure.

In this field of school construction I suggest that the Federal Government's role is to help make up classroom deficiencies, as and where they exist, for a limited time—3 or 4 years—in limited areas where the local districts have exhausted all reasonable bonding and taxing possibilities, in an effort to help themselves. The administration's bill, S. 1021, is urged as the panacea to relieve an alleged classroom shortage over the country. On January 19, 1961, the Secretary of HEW released a report "Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69." The report indicates that during the decade of the 1960's there should be built 607,600 classrooms to take care of added enrollment, replacement of obsolete facilities, and the existing backlog. This suggests a need for annual construction of 60,700 classrooms, but the report shows an average annual rate of classroom construction of nearly 70,000 for the last 5 years. Thus, even if the current rate of classroom construction dropped 13 percent the HEW goals would still be met. And there is nothing to indicate any lessening of public school construction.

As I mentioned earlier, one has but to look at what the taxpayers of this country approved in new bond issues last year to detect the general attitude toward school construction. According to the U.S. Office of Education, classroom construction requirements in public schools in Colorado for the decade 1958 to 1968 were established, as follows:

1. To accommodate overcrowding	797
2. To replace unsatisfactory facilities	541
3. To accommodate enrollment increase (1958–68)	5,893
4. To replace obsolescence (1958–68)	2,223
5. Total construction needs (1958–68)	9,454
6. Annual average number of classrooms required	788
7. Annual average number of classrooms built (1954–55, 1957–58)	877

Colorado is certainly meeting, and exceeding, its present and long-range needs effectively, and locally. Small wonder that Coloradans write urging me to oppose this Federal aid bill. Colorado, along with so many of the States, is doing the job at home.

However, this bill would provide not only classroom construction funds but grants for teachers salaries as well, based upon the belief that there is a shortage of teachers and that they are underpaid. Records show that the public schools in this country have increased their teaching staff proportionately faster than the rise in enrollment so that the number of pupils per teacher has been reduced from 35.6 in 1900 to 24.4 in 1961. Colorado presently has a pupil-teacher ratio of 23.5 to 1—which is better than the national average.

The U.S. Office of Education, in a recent report, indicates that the enrollment increase in the public schools averaged 1,207,000 annually between 1955 and 1961, and that it will average only 589,000 between 1965 and 1969. The required annual increase in instructional staff in the public schools, which averaged 60,000 in the past 5 years, will average only 25,000 between 1965 and 1969. At the same time, the output of college graduates will jump from an annual average of 336,000 in the past 5 years to an average of 594,000 between 1965 and 1969, according to the experts. During the period from 1950 to 1960, Colorado school enrollment increased 48 percent while the instructional staff increased 51 percent.

Prof. Roger Freeman, a leading authority in the field of education, in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Education, had this to say:

> With the demand due to shrink and the supply rising it is likely that the colleges would be training more teachers than could land jobs if the present percentage of college students seeking a teaching career were maintained. * * * The NEA "Teacher Supply and Demand Report for 1956," predicted an end to the teacher shortage by the early 1960's, and this status has just about been reached. Within a few years the problem is likely to be to find jobs for all teacher graduates.

The plea for increased teacher pay is one with which I have a deep sympathy, stemming from the time I remember my own mother teaching in her classroom. Teacher rewards too often are scant, even humiliating, for the trust we repose in them. There is an imbalance too often between the pay they can command in a city system and in a rural system. But nothing in this bill will correct that

within any given State. If we look at the record, we find that good progress is being made in the overall adjustment of teacher pay rates: A National Education Association study shows that, in the 30-year period from 1929 to 1959, pay for teachers has increased 106 percent while that for all other salaried workers has increased only 91 percent and that for civilian Federal employees has increased but 73 percent. This trend of adjustment is continuing, and it is being done quite properly at the State and local level.

I must, therefore, oppose any Federal aid for the support of teachers' salaries, or for the support of school operating expenses, based upon my convictions and the expressed wishes of the most people of Colorado.

I understand that it is not contemplated that the operating expenses would come in the bill. Basing my opinion on my experience with the National Defense Education Act and other matters, I cannot help but believe that we would actually contribute to the operating expenses of schools.

It is well to remember that control of the means is control of the minds. Nothing would stifle more effectively or prevent more completely the continued progress being made by the teaching profession than Federal intervention and control.

In the remarks of Allen P. Burkhardt, superintendent of schools at Norfolk, Nebr., can be found a good illustration of what I mean. Mr. Burkhardt had some experience with Federal assistance in the field of vocational agriculture and home economics. The program under which he had been operating required each State to submit a plan, not unlike the requirements of the bill we are now considering, which had to meet with the approval of the Federal Office of Education. Mr. Burkhardt had this to say:

> To get this money we have to accept and adopt the course of study outlined and specified by the Federal Government through the State department of education. We have to permit inspection by State employees who receive part of their money from the Federal Government. We have to hire teachers whose qualifications are approved by the same groups. We have to send our teachers to conferences designated by those authorities. Because we get Federal support for agriculture and home economics, we have to accept courses of study worked out by other people. We are told how long our periods of recitation have to be. We are told how large the classrooms and the shops have to be, what type of equipment we have to have, even the type of floor in the rooms. We are told about how much money to spend per student. We are not allowed to use the teachers in those departments in any other fields. If we do, we lose our Federal money. If this doesn't constitute control from Washington, then at least it's a reasonable facsimile.

Up to the present, the responsibilities for school policies and curriculums have been shouldered by parents, lay boards, local districts, and communities. But should the Federal Government intervene, and begin financial support for teachers' salaries, this picture will change rapidly and markedly. There is already precedent for the outcome—witness what has happened in the case of existing grants for welfare, highways, urban renewal, to mention a few.

Turning now to the question of Federal control, section 103 of the bill states:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Unfortunately, there are other provisions of the bill which negate that laudable disclaimer.

I call your attention to section 112 of the bill. Will local authorities have complete freedom over construction of the facilities built with Federal funds? It is quite clear that they will not. Section 112 requires that the wage rate for all laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this title shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act. Now we have another Secretary in the act. I have repeatedly supported the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, but if the bill means what it says, then it is more appropriate that such controls be exercised by the individual States.

The application of Federal control—be it with respect to construction, teachers' salaries, curriculum, and the rest—may be modest at the outset, but it will inevitably grow to the point where full control rests in the Government. I predict that if this bill is enacted into law, within 10 years our American educational system will have changed drastically, with criteria imposed upon construction, curriculum, and teachers; and that in such time the Government will have complete control over the system, including the selection of teachers. We can look forward to a strict hierarchy, with attendant abuses the likes of which exist in parts of the civil service today. I must say that, very tragically, it exists. This hierarchy will be supervised by an ever more costly bureaucracy in Washington and in the field, supported by tax dollars which, if paid directly at the local level, would be worth a dollar, instead of rubbing off 12 to 15 cents in the handling of it through the Federal Government.

I should like to interpolate to say that I regard the program in effect as a tax of 15 to 25 percent on the tax money that our people pay locally for the support of their schools.

Once such a program has been woven into the fabric of our national life, demands properly are made for an accounting of these funds to halt waste and duplication. As a result, the Federal Government becomes directly involved in its execution at the local level. This is the history of such promises, and there is no reason to trust that history will not be repeated should the bill become law.

My prediction is not based upon surmise or speculation. The means actually exist in the bill. Examine further this bill and it discloses the presence of control devices. Section 110(a) is the provision which deals with applications for participation in the program. If the bill is a simple and honest effort to allocate funds to the various States, why are the States required to furnish an application to the Federal Commissioner of Education containing three separate assurances? Why must the States comply with three separate criteria and procedures and 13 sections or subsections? A State, in order to qualify, must meet all these requirements and to the satisfaction of the Commissioner, a Federal employee.

At the beginning of each fiscal year a State must specify the proportion of its allotment that will be spent for teachers' salaries and the amount that will be spent for construction of public school facilities. If this bill were simply intended for Federal assistance to education, without the suggestion of governmental control, then it would be in order to make an annual allotment to each State and specify simply that it shall be used for construction, teachers' salaries, or both.

But no; each fiscal year, in advance, a fairly detailed application needs to be furnished. Subsection (3) specifies that the State in making its expenditures shall give priority, in both school construction and teachers' salaries, to the area of greatest need. Criteria and procedures must be established by the State for that purpose. Although these procedures and criteria are established by the State, nevertheless it is the Federal Government which must approve them. Is this not Federal control? Obviously it is.

All of the procedures which the State agencies establish, all of the criteria which the State agencies establish, must meet with the approval of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, before a State can claim a penny. And there are those who suggest that this bill has no Federal control attached to it.

Subsection (8) of section 110(a) requires the State to furnish reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information as he may require. We are not advised at this time of the nature of such reports, but what purpose is served if the Government does not intend to take a hand in education? This subsection also grants the Commissioner access to State records for examination, upon request. Perhaps my prediction is inaccurate, it may not take 10 years; for the tools are present in this bill not only to exert Federal control, but to eliminate any effective State and local administration in the field of education.

Suffice it to say, that, should this bill pass, then from the moment of its enactment, Uncle Sam will go to school. In all probability, the "big stick" he once carried to safeguard our Western Hemisphere, so little used these days, will instead serve to mete our punishment to unruly youngsters.

ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate, under the previous order, adjourned until Monday, May 22, 1961, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 19, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

John H. Rubel, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Edward A. McDermott, of Iowa, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Rear Adm. John W. Crumpacker, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

U.S. NAVY

To be rear admirals

Peter Corradi for permanent promotion to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Navy.

Capt. Louis R. LaPorte, Civil Engineer Corps, U.S. Naval Reserve, for temporary promotion to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

U.S. ARMY

To be brigadier general

Col. Oscar John Ogren O20037, Dental Corps, for appointment as indicated in the Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306.

To be Adjutant General

Brig. Gen. Joe Calvin Lambert O30033, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), for appointment as indicated in the U.S. Army, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States and as major general in the Army of the United States under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3036, 3442, and 3447.

To be Quartermaster General

Maj. Gen. Webster Anderson O17101, U.S. Army, for appointment as indicated in the U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Julian Alexander Wilson O30359, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), for appointment as indicated in the Army of the United States under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447.

To be Chief of Engineers

Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr. O17512, U.S. Army, for appointment as indicated in the U.S. Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3036.

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr. O17512, U.S. Army.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank indicated under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Frank A. Bogart 585A, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Howell M. Estes, Jr. 1211A, Regular Air Force.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10, of the United States Code:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Harold W. Ohlke 1777A, Regular Air Force.

Col. Don S. Wenger 19186A, Regular Air Force, Medical.

Col. Samuel C. Phillips 8981A, Regular Air Force.

IN THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning James B. Abbitt, to be ensign in the Navy, and ending John R. Puckett, to be first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 24, 1961.

The nominations beginning Frank Dattilo III, to be ensign in the Navy, and ending Claude K. Snow, to be first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate on May 11, 1961.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning John O. Allin, to be captain, and ending Richard L. H. Wulf, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 10, 1961.

The nominations beginning William F. Hancock, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Thomas N. Pattie, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on May 8, 1961.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Fred L. Burkhart, to be captain, and ending David L. Zuck, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on April 10, 1961.

The nominations beginning Edwin H. Braly, to be captain, and ending Jack D. Morris, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate on May 8, 1961.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Trade Policy: A Strategy for the Coming Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 19, 1961

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, problems now confront many segments of American industry, their employees and their communities, as a result of increased foreign competition. In seeking a solution, two basic requirements appear to me to be essential:

First. Our country must avoid restricting foreign imports in a way which would touch off retaliation by other countries and lead to a downward spiral of world trade. It is generally agreed that such a process had much to do with bringing about the great depression of the thirties. The nations of the free world could be committing economic suicide if we were to follow that course again.

Second. We must avoid arbitrarily cutting off imports where this would permit an economically aggressive Soviet bloc to move into world trade as America moved out. We must keep in mind the vital needs of our trading partners as well as ourselves. We must not force our friends, particularly among the newer and less developed countries, to become dependent on trade with the Soviet bloc, for such trade is manipulated to serve the political ends of the Soviet empire.

It has seemed to me that the basic concept which most nearly meets these requirements is that of trade-adjustment assistance, in which my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator JAVITS, has displayed such creative leadership. His article "Trade Policy: A Strategy for the Coming Battle," appears in the May 25 issue of the Reporter magazine. I believe this article deserves the widest attention and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRADE POLICY: A STRATEGY FOR THE COMING BATTLE

(Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, of New York)

In the coming months, Congress and the Kennedy administration will face the most crucial struggle over U.S. trade policies since the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act became law in 1934. The act itself is not up for renewal until next year, but the battlelines are now forming.

Even as our economy recovers from the recession, there is no letup in complaints about "unfair competition" from foreign imports or in demands for quotas or other protection to reduce or keep them out. Last year there were four requests for specific tariff increases for every one on file in 1955, and there were three opponents of further tariff reduction for every one in 1955. There is no doubt that the problem some businesses are facing is a real one, and their firms and workers need help from the Federal Government.

Protectionist sentiment today is getting an added boost from the recent imbalance in our international payments and from the chronically depressed areas around the country where unemployment has persisted in recent years even when the business cycle was in its boom phase. Perhaps a quarter to a half million American workers are being seriously affected by concentrated import competition today, and many of these firms are located in chronically depressed areas.

Against this background the Senate recently took a giant step in the direction of greater economic cooperation with our allies by approving our membership in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Scheduled to start formal operations next September (after ratification by at least 15 nations), OECD is the first serious attempt to build an economic complex of free nations equal to the task of clos-

ing the development gap between the so-called "have" and "have not" areas of the free world. The 20 prospective member nations of OECD—18 European members, plus the United States and Canada—possess a total productive power of more than $900 billion a year, and account for two-thirds of all world trade. Here is potentially the most important economic bloc in the world.

TRADE IS OFTEN THE BEST AID

But obviously any retreat by the United States from the principles of expanding multilateral, nondiscriminatory trade could ruin OECD's chances of achieving its major objectives right at the start. Last year the United States imported nearly $15 billion in goods and services. Protectionist barriers erected around this largest of all national markets are bound to invite sharp retaliation from OECD members and other free world trading nations. They will also affect the willingness of the other OECD members to shoulder a greater share of the aid burden in the less developed areas of the free world, a primary objective of the second Eisenhower administration and now of President Kennedy's. Indeed, the goal of supplying in partnership the $10 billion in grant and loan aid required annually by these areas could then not be realized. For that matter, if economic nationalism stages a comeback in the free industrial nations, how long could the United States maintain its present level of foreign economic aid? Last year, our $5 billion trade surplus was big enough to pay for our entire foreign-aid bill, economic and military.

Unless we devise a program that can negate the appeal of protectionism to businesses hit by concentrated imports, the Communists may be able to dictate the terms of economic survival to key nations in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The United States now buys about a quarter of everything these nations export, including great quantities of raw materials required by our industries. The dollars they earn from us give them an amount to invest in development three times greater than the dollars we loan and grant them as economic aid. It would be unrealistic to believe that Congress could pass an aid bill large enough to compensate for any substantial decline in this trade.

Right now the 20 prospective OECD members are the principal trading partners of the Asian, African, and Latin American nations. But we are on notice that the Communist bloc intends to reverse this situation wherever and however it can; and in view of the rising rate of Communist bilateral trade deals, this objective might be realized in more countries by 1975 than we dare to contemplate. It will also be more likely to happen if markets in the OECD countries shrink.

In other words, unless we lead the OECD bloc in a trade-aid offensive, the free nations will soon find their position as the principal trading partners of the less developed areas of the free world undermined. This is the general conviction of the leading legislators of the NATO nations, almost all of them foreign-policy specialists, with whom I confer regularly as chairman of the Economic Committee of NATO Parliamentarians.

FROM TEXTILES TO TOYS

We must start working now, not next year, to head off a damaging controversy over protectionism. Much valuable time has already been lost both in Congress and in the administration, even though the danger signals of an impending trade struggle are everywhere. Paralleling the all-out effort of many businesses, unions, and trade associations, 16 southern Governors last fall pressed the Tariff Commission for restrictive rulings. In a unanimous resolution, they demanded a comprehensive investigation of our trade policy and urged specific protection to reduce foreign competition with goods produced by industries in the South, particularly textiles.

The accent on protectionism is not heard in the South alone. Congressmen from almost every area are paying increasing attention to similar protests. Witness, for example, the uncomfortably close vote last month on Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's amendment to the minimum-wage bill. It would have permitted import quotas based on differentials in wages paid to workers in exporting countries and those paid to workers in the United States. This generally protectionist Goldwater measure lost by only 11 votes.

The Kennedy administration did manage to head off the threatened May 1 boycott of Japanese fabric imports by the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, and at the same time took a first step to meet the basic problem. The business and labor leaders in the textile trade have been promised a program of special assistance by the Kennedy administration, including an international conference to discuss the quantity of textiles that Japan, Hong Kong, Pakistan, India, and others may export to the United States; presumably the conference will work out agreements on such things as voluntary quotas and minimum labor standards.

This approach, however, is woefully incomplete if it stops there. Those in the textile business who are hurt as much by technological obsolescence as by imports should be helped to increase their productivity, diversify their lines, or transfer into other economic activity entirely. We must make a fair distinction between producers who do and those who do not need Federal help. And we must be able to reduce gradually whatever new trade protection may be granted. Unless these other steps are taken, our major trading partners will interpret this first move by the administration as the start of a retreat toward economic nationalism. American consumers and taxpayers will face the prospect of supporting a permanent program of Government subsidy that could extend far beyond the limits of the textile industry.

The great majority of briefs filed last year in opposition to new tariff reductions came from groups involved with fabricated metal products, industrial chemicals, cord and twine, electronic and office-machine equipment, sporting goods, buttons, and toys. They are not going to understand or tolerate favoritism toward the textile industry, which filed less than 15 percent of all opposition briefs received by the Tariff Commission in 1960.

In early February, President Kennedy told Congress that protectionism was no answer to our adverse balance of international payments, and he urged an export drive to earn more dollars. But we are still waiting for him to recommend or support—as he did in the Senate—a positive legislative approach to the very real problem of those who are already being seriously hurt by concentrated import competition. Helping hard-pressed industries and promoting exports are two sides of the same coin, but apparently Democratic leaders in Congress are waiting for a go-ahead from the White House before scheduling action on import legislation already introduced this session.

ON TWO FRONTS

In company with other Senate colleagues, I have proposed two bills to head off the coming conflict over trade policy. One is a measure to stimulate exports; the other would help workers, businesses, and communities that are seriously disrupted by import competition.

The proposal to stimulate exports calls for the creation of a Council for Export Promotion, under the chairmanship of the Under Secretary of Commerce. The Council would augment, coordinate, and publicize the Government's various services to the U.S. exporter. The proposed legislation also strengthens the authority of the Export-Import Bank to make short- and medium-term export credit guarantees against both political and commercial risks. The American exporter wants and deserves a service similar to that offered by the major exporting countries of Western Europe, where guarantees cover between 6 and 15 percent of exports annually.

These suggestions have been well received in the Senate by Republicans and Democrats alike, including JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee, who is a sponsor of the export bill. The importance of exports in our economy is becoming ever more appreciated, since some 4 million workers in the United States are engaged in producing and servicing exports. Between one-fifth and one-third of our production of civilian aircraft, railroad cars, construction and mining equipment, textile machinery, sewing machines, and steel-rolling machinery has been exported in recent years, along with 10 to 20 percent of our machine tools, coal, agricultural machinery and equipment, diesel engines, trucks, and buses. All this is quite apart from our enormous agricultural exports. Forty-five percent of all our cotton and wheat, 29 percent of our tobacco, and 25 percent of our soybean production is exported.

Last year the United States sold $19.6 billion in merchandise exports, nearly $5 billion more than we imported in merchandise. Our exports to the new European Economic Community went up 50 percent in 12 months and topped our imports from this area by $1 billion. It is obvious that increased exports can be a very helpful antirecession measure and can contribute substantially to solving our balance-of-payments problem while helping to meet our international responsibilities.

More difficult but equally important is the form that legislation should take to help workers, business firms, and communities adjust to an economy where foreign trade plays an increasingly important role every year. Today those who cannot get relief under existing trade-agreement legislation turn to Congress. We are asked, sometimes almost ordered, to revise duties, broaden "Buy American" provisions, impose quotas, and strip the President of his power to negotiate reciprocal tariff concessions. While such remedies are usually unacceptable, the descriptions of hardship are often accurate and compelling.

The solution I propose is based on the principle of trade-adjustment assistance, which is endorsed by leading economists and key segments of management and labor. It recognizes the Federal Government's responsibility to help workers and those injured by the national interest in developing multilateral nondiscriminatory trade as the cornerstone of U.S. foreign economic policy.

Under my proposed legislation, Federal loans and tax incentives would be available to individual businesses and communities that could prove hardship as a result of concentrated import competition. Money would be available to retrain and relocate workers. Unemployment payments could be extended and early retirement under social security would be possible. Businesses failing to regain their competitive position could be helped to diversify or to undertake a new line of production.

With trade-adjustment assistance, the Federal Government could help individual firms and communities without according blanket protection to a whole industry. The present "escape clause" provision does not differentiate between those segments of an

industry which can compete and those which cannot. Relief under it is on an all-or-nothing basis. But with trade-adjustment aid available, the Tariff Commission, which now rules on requests for relief under the escape clause, would do so with the knowledge that help of a nonprotectionist nature could also be given. In addition, my bill would permit the President to limit additional tariff or quota protection recommended by the Tariff Commission to 7 years, during which time it could be reduced gradually.

There is growing bipartisan support for this approach in both Houses, along with a growing recognition that the President must play a more active role in this special area if we are to remove the major threat to the continuation of the broad trade policies this country has followed so successfully for nearly a generation. Such legislation may be highly complex and it may be highly controversial. But it is urgently needed to head off a really damaging struggle over present U.S. trade policy. It is vital to continue that policy both for the national interest and for peace.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 22, 1961

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of all mercies, as the pressing demands of another week summon Thy servants here to high endeavor, we would pause for the sound of the trumpets in the morning—trumpets of faith and of hope.

In this national forum, with all its divergent human interests, we would rear an altar where a constant sense of eternal values may save us from spiritual decay, from moral cowardice, and from any betrayal of the highest public good. Only when our outlook is cleansed and corrected by constant communion with Thee, and by the far horizons of the heavenly vision, can we see the transient in the light of the everlasting.

And so, like tillers of the soil who stand reverently with bowed heads, listening to the music of holy bells, we too would be strengthened with might in the inner man as each new day our ears wait for the sweet chimes of Thy approval. Send us forth to meet an agitated world with a tranquillity that is strength, and an inner integrity which is the courage of the soul.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 19, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On May 16, 1961:

S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments.

On May 19, 1961:

S. 912. An act to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6100. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises; and

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

REPORT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 22, 1961.*

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, in the following watersheds: Crowdabout Creek, Powell Creek, Ala.; Grady-Gould, Ark.; Napa River, Calif.; Hog River-Pig Creek, Ill.; Beasha Creek, Miss.; Panther Creek Mo.; Haikey Creek, Okla.; Cane Creek, Tenn.; Blue Creek-Howell, Utah, and Polk Creek, Saltlick Creek W. Va. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the overobligation which occurred early in calendar year 1960 under the appropriation "Construction, Public Buildings Projects"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LAWS ENACTED BY LEGISLATURE OF GUAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Fifth Guam Legislature, 1960 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PLANS FOR WORKS OF IMPROVEMENT UNDER WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, plans for works of improvement under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, in the following watersheds: Magma, Ariz.; Muddy Fork of Illinois River, Ark.; Bull Creek, Ga.; Seven Mile Creek, Ill.; Fall River, Kans.; Bayou Rapides, La.; and Camp Rice Arroyo, Lower Plum Creek, Tex. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 29

"Joint resolution relative to the loan deadline of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958

"Whereas the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 presently provides for no loans to be made to local development companies after June 30, 1961; and

"Whereas local development companies perform a highly significant function in aiding systematic and planned urbanization and prevention of the blight of our fair cities brought on by haphazard development; and

"Whereas there has been introduced a bill in the Senate of the United States, namely S. 902, 87th Congress, 1st session, to eliminate the time restriction after which no loans may be made to local development companies; and

"Whereas, this bill is worthy of support and passage by the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas without the strong Federal participation and aid to local development companies provided by the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, many community development projects would fail to be initiated: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress to eliminate the time limitation on loans that may be made to local development companies in order that such companies' significant contribution to the public good may be continued to its fullest extent; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 119

"Resolution relative to East Side Division of Central Valley Project

"Whereas the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, is preparing a feasibility report for the East Side Division of the Central Valley project; and

"Whereas the east side division is a staged plan which will be comprised principally of the Auburn Dam unit, the Folsom South unit, and the East Side Canal, with auxiliary reservoirs; and

"Whereas the Auburn Dam and the Folsom South units need recommendations by the Department of Water Resources, State of California, to the U.S. Department of the Interior in order to hasten congressional appropriations for these vital units; and

"Whereas the Auburn Dam unit is designed with a reservoir capacity of 1 million acre-feet to produce an additional 265,000 acre-feet for irrigation, municipal and industrial purposes, and would provide additional flood control for the Sacramento area; and

"Whereas the Folsom South unit would convey 852,000 acre-feet of irrigation, municipal and industrial water from Lake Natoma (Nimbus Dam) on the American River to a service area of about one-half million acres in Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties, thus halting an existing overdraft of ground water, making available a firm water supply for lands presently unirrigated, reducing the threat of underground saline water intrusion, and providing supplemental municipal and industrial water for the city of Stockton and other local or bay areas; and

"Whereas the east side system will average a delivery capacity of about 5,500 cubic feet per second and will be able to initially deliver a water supply of about 1,500,000 acre-feet into Madera, Fresno, Kings, Tulare, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, and Kern County areas with a minimum of new facilities; and

"Whereas the utilization of existing project facilities and the use of off-stream storage reservoirs to maximize use of canal capacity that is available in nonpeak irrigation months will make possible this tremendous water conveyance with a minimum of additional capital investment; and

"Whereas the preliminary estimates of costs for the combined pumping, conveyance and off-channel storage system, which includes new works in Sacramento, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Tuolumne, Stanislaus, Merced, Madera, Fresno, Tulare, and Kern Counties, approach $500 million; and

"Whereas the sum total of the benefits of the East Side Division of the Central Valley project will increase agricultural, industrial, and municipal progress and prosperity throughout the great Central Valley, in particular, and throughout the State of California, in general: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Senate of the State of California urges the department of water resources to initiate its study and recommendations for the East Side Division of the Central Valley project and to forward its recommendations to the U.S. Department of the Interior; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of California desires and encourages the full cooperation between agencies of the State of California and the United States of America for the rapid completion of the East Side Division of the Central Valley project; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of California urges the California delegation in the Congress to support such appropriations as may be requested by the U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, for the Auburn Dam unit, the Folsom South unit, and the East Side Canal construction works; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

"J. A. BEEK,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 63

"Whereas the Congress of the United States authorized the establishment of a Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West in Hawaii on May 14, 1960, and appropriated funds under Public Law 86–678 on August 31, 1960, to carry out the purposes of this authorization and a contract was negotiated between the Department of State and the University of Hawaii on October 25, 1960, to implement this act; and

"Whereas the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West in Hawaii has excited great interest in Asia and the Pacific; and

"Whereas the purposes and programs of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West in Hawaii are being duly implemented by the University of Hawaii in accord with the original authorization and contract with the Department of State; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii has met and will continue to meet its obligations in giving the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West in Hawaii its wholehearted support; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1961 (the senate concurring), That the people of Hawaii earnestly and respectfully request the Congress of the United States to continue its support of this program so that the purposes and ideals which it represents may be achieved; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President of the United States; the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable John J. Rooney, chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for State; the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Honorable Philip Hall Coombs, Assistant Secretary for Educational and Cultural Affairs, Department of State; the Honorable Hiram L. Fong, the Honorable Oren E. Long, and the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, Senators and Congressman, respectively, from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of American Samoa; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to grant for American Samoa the sum of $2,298,000 to improve its water system

"Whereas American Samoa should exercise leadership in the use of modern sanitation methods in the South Pacific Islands; and

"Whereas existing facilities along the shores of Pago Pago Harbor and in outlying villages are dangerous to health and unsightly in the eyes of the tourists; and

"Whereas this disgraceful situation discourages those tourists who may wish to see the natural, world renown beauty of Pago Pago Harbor and other areas of American Samoa; and

"Whereas family units in American Samoa are unable to use normally accepted, modern sanitary facilities in the construction of their homes because of an inadequate reservoir or other usable water supply systems: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Seventh Legislature of American Samoa, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby respectfully requested to grant for American Samoa the sum of $2,298,000 beginning with fiscal year 1963 to fiscal year 1973 in order to undertake a sound, comprehensive program for the construction of greatly needed water and sanitation facilities; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this joint resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and the chairmen of the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of the U.S. Congress.

"RAPI SOTOA,
"President of the Senate.
"MUAGUTUTI'A F. TUIA,
"Speaker, House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County and State of Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide funds for public school construction and teachers' salaries; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of a resolution which I have received from the New York Board of Trade, Inc. urging congressional action to expand and improve export credit guarantees for American exporters.

Having long been interested in this subject and believing, as I do, that export expansion is the most logical and direct way to deal with our balance of payments situation, I feel this resolution is of real importance.

I urge its careful study by the appropriate committees.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION BY NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE, INC.

Whereas believing that, with mounting competition making deeper inroads into traditional markets for U.S. products and services and with our current balance of payments deficit, there is a continuing urgent need for a program which will contribute to the expansion of U.S.

exports on a sound basis, and that there is also a need to modernize and adapt American export credit equipment to prevailing world market conditions by providing U.S. exporters with facilities which they do not now possess, but which are in effective use by all other principal trading nations, and

Whereas having duly considered a proposal prepared by the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, providing for the creation of a federally chartered American Export Credit Guarantee Corp. for the furnishing of such facilities, with government support as therein provided: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade, Inc., urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a national system for issuance of export credit guarantees insuring American exporters of goods and services against loss due to:

1. Political risks, including restriction on the transfer of payments from the buyer's country to the United States; war, revolution and expropriation in the debtor's country; and other governmental action which is beyond the control of the exporter or the foreign buyer;

2. Commercial credit risks, including insolvency and protracted default of the buyer, his failure or refusal to accept goods, and any other loss (other than a political risk loss) not normally insurable with insurers covering other than export credit risk; and be it further

Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade, Inc., favors the export credit guarantee plan prepared by the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees substantially in the form presented to this board providing for the creation of a federally chartered American Export Credits Guarantee Corp. and for the support thereof by the U.S. Government in the manner and to the extent provided in the Committee's plan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State; the Secretary of the Treasury, U.S. Treasury; the Secretary of Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce; the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture; the Secretary of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor; the Director of the International Cooperation Administration; the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; the President and Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 1229. A bill to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriated American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 283).

ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL COUNTIES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 282)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 1869) to provide for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties, and I submit a report thereon.

Mr. President, coincident with these remarks, I am filing a report from the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate on S. 1869, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission on the Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties. My able colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is a cosponsor of this bill.

I should point out, Mr. President, that an almost identical bill (S. 3140) was favorably reported in the 86th Congress by the Committee on Government Operations and was approved by the Senate.

One of the deficiencies confronting our small towns and rural areas—at which this bill is directed—is that they do not have economic resources and research facilities to initiate constructive studies on common problems confronting these areas, the factors leading to such problems, and what steps communities can take or are taking to overcome these difficulties.

Through this proposed legislation, it is my hope that a comprehensive study can be made so that we can learn what are the needs and problems of these areas and thereby develop recommendations which can be helpful in fostering continued growth and success of these areas which have contributed so much to the strength of our country.

Mr. President, when the bill was considered last year, much support was demonstrated by various groups and organizations throughout the country. Since many of the statements expressing favor with this proposed legislation were made a part of the RECORD at the time the bill was favorably reported last year, I do not feel it is necessary to review these endorsements other than to invite attention to the fact that they appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 106, part 8, pages 10647–10649.

Mr. President, it is my earnest hope that early action will be taken on this measure, and I am confident that the Senate will reaffirm its position by approving the bill as it did during the 86th Congress.

Mr. President, I request that an excerpt from the report of the Committee on Government Operations be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the excerpt from the report will be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

The excerpt from the report submitted by Mr. MUNDT is as follows:

EXCERPT FROM REPORT

PURPOSE

S. 1869 provides for the establishment of a Commission on Problems of Small Towns and rural counties. This bipartisan Commission shall be composed of 20 members.

In the 86th Congress, an identical bill, S. 3140, was favorably reported by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate (S. Rept. 1392) and the legislation was approved by the Senate.

Under the provisions of the bill, this Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's small town and rural county areas. It shall study such problems as the needs, present and future, related to highways, public services, water resources, schools, recreation, financing, law enforcement, and business and industrial development.

The Commission shall attempt to determine the capabilities of State, county, and local governments to meet such needs and seek means of improving coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies. It shall investigate the possibilities of Federal Government encouraging wider dispersal of Government procurement operations and in the location of Federal facilities, as well as other matters which may be of assistance in solving the various problems of, and promoting the social and economic well-being of, the Nation's small town and rural county areas.

The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress on or before February 1, 1963 its findings and recommendations; and the Commission may also make such interim reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The small towns and rural counties of America have made significant and lasting contributions to the development of our way of life. The complex of rural counties and small towns, which is a unique form of community living not found in other parts of the world, is highly desirable and essential and should be continued.

These small communities provide for wholesome family life. They give opportunities for spiritual development as well as adequate economic, social, and political balance to our country.

The survival and economic well-being of rural towns and counties have been threatened by the technical and industrial development of our country. This development has brought changes in transportation facilities and patterns of economic activity which have resulted in shifts in population as well as other modern phenomena, creating challenges and problems with which small towns and rural counties are unable to cope, primarily because of lack of research facilities or economic means to instigate studies into the exact causes and cures of their problems.

In the past, many Commissions have been created or proposed to study the problems involved in big government; the problems of our metropolitan areas; farm problems; labor problems; educational problems; and other social and economic problems.

There is no agency in Government responsible for handling problems of small towns. No Cabinet member is charged with the task of assembling data about our rural counties and small towns. No research department, no commission, no committee in Congress, has been directed to find solutions to the hardship posed by the economic or social problems threatening the existence of small towns.

ENDORSEMENT OF LEGISLATION

In the 86th Congress, an identical bill was endorsed by a number of nongovernment groups which are concerned with rural problems and the problems of small towns. Those who have indicated their support are: The American Municipal Association; National Association of County Officials; the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod; American Baptist Home Mission Societies; Methodist Rural Fellowship; Southern Baptist Convention; the National Catholic Rural Life Conference; and the Colorado Baptist General Convention.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by

unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF):

S. 1925. A bill to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Assiniboine Tribe and the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1926. A bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. ENGLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1927. A bill to amend further the Federal Farm Loan Act and the Farm Credit Act of 1933, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 1928. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lee Chee Shee (Mrs. Lee Buck Yau); and

S. 1929. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Goo Mau Yet Kui (Mrs. Goo Choy); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1930. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Edmund G. Ross, a courageous United States Senator from Kansas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARLSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1931. A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance; and

S. 1932. A bill to amend the Act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039) in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1933. A bill to amend section 322 of title 28, United States Code, in order to provide for the inclusion of a district judge or judges on the judicial council of each circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1934. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. JACKSON):

S. 1935. A bill for the relief of Andrew Furesz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1936. A bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 1937. A bill for the relief of Michele Emilio Maffeo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1938. A bill authorizing a survey to be made of Eel Pond at Menauhant, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S.J. Res. 92. Joint resolution authorizing the State of Arizona to place in the Statuary Hall collection at the U.S. Capitol the statue of Eusebio Francisco Kino; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

CERTAIN LANDS TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR INDIAN TRIBES OF FORT PECK RESERVATION, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished junior colleague from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which proposes to transfer in trust 85,338 acres of submarginal land on the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana to the Fort Peck Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has the support of all the local interests, including the tribal officials, and it brings to a conclusion many years of controversy over the proper disposition of these lands. I hope that the Department of the Interior will be able to cooperate in this matter and submit a report on the proposal at an early date.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks the text of the bill and documents I have received which indicate local support for this proposed compromise legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and documents will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1925) to provide that certain lands shall be held in trust for the Assiniboine Tribe and the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. METCALF), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the rights, title, and interest of the United States in the lands, and the improvements thereon, in the submarginal land project identified as "Fort Peck, LI-MT-6", containing approximately 85,338 acres on the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana, acquired by the United States under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act, of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and section 55 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), and now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for administration for the use and benefit of the Assiniboine Tribe and the Sioux Tribe of Fort Peck Reservation, Mont., are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for those Tribes in the same manner and to the same extent as other lands held in trust for those Tribes.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person of any right of possession, contract right, interest, or title he may have in the land involved.

SEC. 3. Any receipts from leases or permits for minerals in the land identified in section 1 of this Act, received on or after the date of this Act, shall be handled pursuant to the rules applicable to other tribal property held in trust status. Any such receipts, received prior to the date of this Act, that are required by section 6 of the Act of August 7, 1947 (61 Stat. 913, 915), to be deposited in a special fund in the Treasury pending final disposition thereof by Congress shall be disbursed as follows:

(a) Twenty-five per centum shall be paid to the county in which the land from which the mineral receipts were derived is located, for school and road purposes;

(b) Seventy-five per centum shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the tribes with interest at 4 per centum per annum from the date of this Act until expended. One-half of the amount so deposited shall be used exclusively for industrial development on or near the reservation with a preferential right of employment for members of the tribes. The remaining one-half so deposited, less the amount required under section 6 of this Act, shall be used for the construction of low-cost rental housing on trust land owned by the tribes on the reservation for members of the tribes residing on or near the reservation on the date of this Act. Funds for industrial development and low-cost rental housing shall be expended in accordance with plans and programs and terms and conditions approved both by the executive board of the Fort Peck Reservation and the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 4. The Executive Board of the Fort Peck Reservation is hereby authorized and directed to sell, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, tribal land, exclusive of minerals, platted as town lots (1) within the original corporate limits and the first addition in and to the city of Wolf Point, (2) within the present corporate limits of the city of Poplar and the three areas contiguous to the present corporate limits of the city of Poplar identified as follows:

(a) That area bounded on the north by "'C' Street East"; on the west by "Boulevard Avenue"; on the south by "'A' Street East"; and on the east by "Second Avenue East";

(b) That area bounded on the north by "'D' Street East"; on the west by "Court Avenue"; on the south by "'C' Street East"; and on the east by "Second Avenue East"; and

(c) That area bounded on the north by "'A' Street East" on the west by "Block 35 Original Poplar"; on the south by "the Great Northern Railroad right-of-way"; and on the east by "Second Avenue East";

and (3) within the present corporate limits of the towns of Brockton and Frazer, Montana. The sale shall be by competitive bid for not less than the appraised fair market value, or by negotiated sale at not less than the appraised fair market value, with the consent of the Secretary of the Interior and the Executive Board, under such terms, conditions and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided,* (1) That there shall be no sale for speculative purposes; (2) that within 60 days after written request for sale the lots shall be offered for sale; (3) that the tribes shall not be subject to any charges or fees of any kind whatsoever by the United States; and (4) that the tribes shall be saved harmless from all expense resulting from requests for sales, from sales, or from incidental matters. The receipts from the sales shall be deposited in the Treasury to the credit of the tribes.

SEC. 5. The town lots which were occupied on May 1, 1961, by members of the Tribes, who on that date were the owners of the improvements on such lots, shall not be subject to sale under this Act without the consent of such members, the Executive Board and the Secretary of the Interior: *Provided,* That if any such members are minors or under other legal disability the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to act on their behalf for all purposes under this Act.

Any tribal member qualified under this section who owns such improvements located on more than one lot shall be required

on reasonable notice from the Executive Board to remove them to one of the lots on which they are located. Any tribal member qualified under this section may sell his improvements and retain the proceeds or, may remove his improvements except that they may not be removed to a town lot subject to sale under section 4 of this Act or to a lot occupied by another member of the Tribes. If the new location is on tribal land, outside of the lots subject to sale under section 4 of this Act, the consent of the Executive Board to the use of such tribal land shall be required. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to bar an Indian from purchasing any lot subject to sale under section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 6. The Executive Board, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, shall make available, not to exceed $100,000, from the funds set aside for low-cost housing under section 3 of this Act, to pay the expenses, costs, losses and damages incurred by members of the Tribes qualified under section 5 of this Act, as a direct result of moving themselves, and their possessions, including without limitation, dwelling and other buildings owned by such individual members, to a new location on the reservation within three years from the date of this Act, where such move is on account of the provisions of section 5 of this Act.

SEC. 7. The Executive Board, with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with the City of Wolf Point, the City of Poplar and the towns of Brockton and Frazer for sewage, water, street, and street lighting, improvements and services, for the benefit of any lots covered by section 3 of this Act which are owned by the Tribes: *Provided*, That, in the judgment of the Executive Board and the Secretary of the Interior, sufficient lots are or can be sold to justify such contracts. Expenditures under such contracts shall be paid out of the receipts from the sale of the lots and shall be charged pro rata against those unsold lots owned by the Tribes receiving the direct benefits of such improvements and services.

The documents presented by Mr. MANSFIELD are as follows:

POPLAR, MONT., *May 18, 1961.*

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD:
Washington, D.C.:

The tribal executive board unanimously endorsed the plan to transfer the submarginal land submitted in the proposed bill. On behalf of the tribe I urge that you introduce and prosecute the submarginal land bill.

WM. YOUPEE,
Chairman, Tribal Executive Board.

CITY OF WOLF POINT,
Wolf Point, Mont., May 10, 1961.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. LEE METCALF,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. JAMES F. BATTIN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.
Hon. ARNOLD OLSEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Re proposed bill to transfer submarginal land to the Fort Peck Indian Tribes, and to provide for sale of tribal lots in Wolf Point and disbursement of accrued funds.

GENTLEMEN: Attached please find a copy of the above proposed bill which has been approved by the civic groups and political bodies that we the undersigned represent. We endorse the bill as presently written and we urge its introduction and passage. We further state that if any amendments to the attached bill are made before or after introduction, we withdraw our endorsement until we can rule on each and every amendment. The groups that we the undersigned represent have authorized us to endorse this proposed legislation by unanimous vote.

Respectfully submitted,

R. E. COFFEY,
Mayor.
S. V. NEDRUD,
President, Wolf Point Chamber of Commerce.
CARSTEN BECK,
Chairman, Board of County Commissioners, Roosevelt County, Mont.
C. A. HARMALA,
President, Wolf Point Lions Club.

ADDITION OF CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LAND TO THE LASSEN VOLCANIC NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes.

The Department of the Interior requests enactment of this legislation. Its purposes are set forth in a letter to the President of the Senate from Assistant Secretary John A. Carver, Jr., and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter, along with a copy of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1926) to add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ENGLE (for himself and Mr. KUCHEL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following described lands of the Lassen National Forest are hereby excluded from the forest and added to the Lassen Volcanic National Park:

Lots 1, 2, and 3, south half northeast quarter, and southeast quarter northwest quarter section 4; west half southeast quarter and those parts of the south half northwest quarter and of the southwest quarter of section 11 lying east of Lost Creek; and section 19, township 31 north, range 4 east, Mount Diablo Meridian: *Provided*, That the aforesaid lands in section 19 are included within the national park subject to the right of the Secretary of Agriculture to construct and maintain a permanent road through such section in order to permit the use, protection, and administration of adjacent national forest lands and the removal of timber from the national forest.

The letter presented by Mr. Engle is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To add certain federally owned land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the State of California, and for other purposes."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

This proposed legislation would result in adjustment of the boundaries between the Lassen Volcanic National Park and the Lassen National Forest so as to add approximately 1,040 acres of land to the park. Three separate parcels of land are involved in this transfer of administrative jurisdiction.

One of these tracts comprising about 240 acres, contains a loop of the Lassen Peak Road. The entire length of this road, which traverses much of the park between its south and west boundaries, lies within the park except the loop included in this proposed addition. Maintenance and administration of this portion of the road would be simplified through its inclusion in the park.

A tract of approximately 170 acres that lies to the east of Lost Creek would also be added to the park. This tract of forest land which is plainly visible from the Lassen Peak Road should be added to the park while it is in its presently uncut state so as to preserve the scenic vista from the road and afford a protective strip along the east side of Lost Creek.

A third tract is needed for use in expanding the park campground at Manzanita Lake. This location contains the only campgrounds near a store, post office and general supplies. The need for additional campground space in this section of the park has been so urgent that—pursuant to authority contained in the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 885)—an agreement was entered into with the U.S. Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture whereunder this Department has undertaken the development and administration of campground and other recreational facilities on Forest Service lands in the Manzanita Lake region. Approximately 640 acres are needed here to provide adequate space for public campground facilities.

The Department of Agriculture which administers the Lassen National Forest is agreeable to these boundary adjustments and concurs in them. In this connection, a provision has been included in the bill that will insure the right of the U.S. Forest Service to establish and use a road, for national forest purposes, through a portion of the lands proposed for addition to the national park in section 19 (near Manzanita Lake). Such reservation would have no adverse effect upon the park.

Since all the lands to be added to the park are federally owned, no land acquisition costs are involved.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. CARR, JR.,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP TO HONOR EDMUND G. ROSS, U.S. SENATOR FROM KANSAS, 1866–71

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill providing for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring Edmund G. Ross, who served as U.S. Senator from Kansas from 1866 to 1871.

Edmund G. Ross' appointment was a popular one in Kansas. He entered the Senate a critic of President Johnson and opposed the President's program. When Johnson removed Stanton in January 1868, Ross voted for the Senate resolu-

tion declaring the act illegal. However, after the President's impeachment, Senator Ross insisted that Johnson should have a fair trial, and voted on some questions with known opponents of conviction.

This action brought a flood of protests from his State of Kansas, and others. At the time, Ross rather favored conviction, but the character of the pressure made him doubtful.

In reply to this pressure Senator Ross replied:

> I have taken an oath to do impartial justice—and trust I shall have the courage and the honesty to vote according to the dictates of my judgment and for the highest good of the country.

Senator Ross' conclusion to vote against conviction was with the belief that he would thereby secure his own political destruction, and I again quote his words:

> I almost literally looked down into my own grave. Friends, position, fortune, everything that makes life desirable to an ambitious man, were about to be swept away by the breath of my mouth, perhaps forever.

The burst of denunciation which followed the first vote on impeachment fell most heavily on Senator Ross. His State repudiated him and charges of corruption were made and every species of pressure known were exerted. Ross faced the ordeal with the fortitude of the real statesman and again voted "not guilty."

At the conclusion of his term Senator Ross returned to Kansas and became a well-known journalist. He later moved to Albuquerque, N. Mex., where, a short time before his death, a messenger brought him greetings from the Governor, and Legislature of Kansas, expressing appreciation of his conduct in the impeachment trial.

In honor of a man who was fearless, honest, and of good ability, a man who had the courage to vote according to the dictates of his judgment, and for what he believed to be for the highest good of his country, I now introduce a bill providing for a commemorative stamp in his honor.

I ask that the bill be printed as part of these remarks and that it be received and referred.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1930) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in honor of Edmund G. Ross, a courageous United States Senator from Kansas, introduced by Mr. Carlson, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp in honor of Edmund G. Ross, who was a fearless and honest man serving in the United States Senate from July 1866 to March 3, 1871.

Such postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design and for such period as the Postmaster General may determine.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, together with a statement of purpose and need in support of the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1931) to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter and statement presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a proposed bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance.

There are also enclosed four copies of a statement of purpose and need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD GUDEMAN,
Under Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED IN SUPPORT OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The bill would extend the life of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1531), relating to war risk insurance, until June 13, 1966. Section 1312 of the act now provides for expiration of aviation war risk insurance authority on June 13, 1961.

Title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, to provide war risk insurance for the protection of aircraft, cargoes, and crews and their personal effects, when commercial insurance cannot be obtained on reasonable terms and conditions. At present, as at the time of original enactment of these provisions as Public Law 47, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 65), commercial policies covering aviation war risks are issued only subject to automatic termination clauses in the event of outbreak of war between any of the four Great Powers (France, Great Britain and/or any of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America). Even though the United States might not be involved immediately, American aircraft would be without protection against loss by risks of war. Furthermore, prompt mobilization of the air transport facilities of the United States would be jeopardized without such insurance.

The general order on aviation war risk insurance which was issued on November 1, 1956, established an interim binder program for war risk hull insurance, war risk liability insurance, exclusive of cargo liability, and war risk carriers' liability to cargo insurance. This general order has been revised so as to provide, among other things, for the providing of war risk insurance, without premium, to the Department of Defense for participants in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program, and to the Department of State for American air carriers entering into certain agreements with such Department. The Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State have agreed to indemnify the Secretary of Commerce against all losses covered by such insurance.

If the provisions of title XIII are extended as proposed, it is anticipated that binder fees to be collected will more than cover expenses chargeable to the war risk insurance fund under peacetime operations.

The Department urges consideration and enactment of this bill at the first session of the 87th Congress in order that there will be no hiatus in the continuance of arrangements for immediate furnishing insurance in the event of outbreak of war or a critical emergency, and in the arrangements for participants in the Civil Reserve Air Fleet (CRAF) program and American air carriers entering into certain agreements with the Department of State, referred to above.

INCREASE OF PERIODS OF AGREEMENTS FOR OPERATION OF CONCESSIONS AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1932) to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the attached proposed bill "to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," be introduced in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

At the present time the need for first-class hotel facilities and services at the Washington National Airport is becoming increasingly evident. Several private investors, well

known and established in the hotel industry, are extremely interested in providing this type of facility. These concerns have all made long-term proposals for the construction of a $3 million to $5 million hotel to be located adjacent to the Washington National Airport. They have proposed a lease period of from 35 to 50 years for the purpose of borrowing long-term capital.

Under the provisions of the act entitled "An act making supplemental appropriations for the support of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," approved October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1039), agreements for the operation of any concession, except the restaurant at Washington National Airport, are prohibited for a period exceeding 5 years. The construction of a permanent facility, such as a hotel of the size required by this location, represents a potential investment of several million dollars. Obviously, the 5-year lease period is not sufficient to allow for amortization of the investment.

I feel certain that the Congress can appreciate the need for an adequate first-class hotel which would serve the large number of travelers arriving at and departing from Washington National Airport. The construction of large first-class hotels at other major airports in the United States, for example the hotel located at New York International Airport, is proof that such facilities are necessary for the benefit of the traveling public.

It should be pointed out that the granting of a long-term lease for the construction of such a hotel could be an extremely profitable venture and would provide additional funds to offset the operating costs of the airport.

Other important areas may be cited in which it would be advantageous to have longer leases than are now permitted. Among them are rental car maintenance buildings and in-flight commissary buildings which require considerable capital investment totaling upward of a million dollars.

Therefore, in the best interest of the Government, the 1940 Supplemental Appropriations Act should be amended as it pertains to the length of time for which leases and concessions may be granted, so that in certain cases long-term leases could be made when it appears that a substantial capital investment for the permanent construction of buildings of substantial value, such as a hotel or in-flight commissary, may be required. This will be necessary before potential investors will show more than a casual interest in these much needed facilities.

It is the considered opinion of this Agency that the proposal will provide the necessary stimulus to encourage the construction of a hotel at the Washington National Airport, providing first-class facilities for travel, and a new means of revenue to offset the cost of operating the airport. It will also enable the airport to provide necessary improvements in its in-flight commissary facilities with resultant added revenues.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this draft bill to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

SIMPLIFICATION OF ADMEASUREMENT OF SMALL VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to simplify the admeasurement of small business. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1936) to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a proposed bill to simplify the admeasurement of small vessels, and for other purposes, which is the result of a joint study by the Bureau of Customs and the U.S. Coast Guard.

The purpose of the bill is to substitute for the present complicated method of tonnage measurement a new system which would permit the assignment of tonnages from a table on the basis of length and breadth only. The tonnage assignments would be limited to self-propelled vessels of less than 500 gross tons and non-self-propelled vessels of not more than 997 gross tons.

The bill is identical with that submitted to the last Congress, with one exception. The present draft embodies amendments requested by representative industry groups which would allow a vessel owner the choice of formal measurement or a tonnage assignment. The reasons are outlined in the attached memorandum. Suffice it to say here that probably not over 1 percent of the vessels covered by the bill will be affected.

Enactment of the bill is essential to eliminate the artificial and technical tonnage measurement now applicable to something over 85 percent of our total mercantile marine, including pleasure vessels documented as yachts, for which the Government receives no tangible return. Of immediate benefit to the Customs Service will be the anticipated annual savings of $150,000 in man-hours which will permit the reassignment of part-time admeasurers to more worthwhile duties and the concentration of full-time admeasurment personnel on large vessel work where their services are sorely needed to fulfill the Government's obligations to vessel owners.

It will be appreciated if you will lay the draft bill before the Senate. A similar proposal has been transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

THE RIGHT OF THE BLIND TO ORGANIZE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 17, 1961, the names of Mr. Moss, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. LONG of Missouri and Mr. ENGLE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1893) to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY on May 17, 1961.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON S. 167

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Antitrust Legislation of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on S. 167, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to compel the production of documentary evidence required in civil investigations for the enforcement of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, to commence on Wednesday, June 7, 1961.

The hearings, set for 9:30 a.m., are to be held in room 457, Old Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, room 412 Old Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., Telephone CA 4–3121, extension 5573.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON S. 1474

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Standing Subcommittee on Antitrust Legislation, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on S. 1474, establishing the office of a national boxing commissioner, to commence on Wednesday, May 31, 1961.

The hearings, set for 9:30 a.m., are to be held in Room 318 of the Old Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, room 412, Old Senate Office Building, Washington 25, D.C., telephone CA 4–3121 or Government code 180, extension 5573.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

INCIDENTS IN ALABAMA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the incidents which have occurred over the past several days in Alabama should cause us—as a Nation—to hang our heads in shame. This is the United States of America, and the responsibilities of administering these United States are ours.

I do not blame the great majority of the people of Alabama, but I do blame the hoodlums who perpetrated these outrages in at least three cities. Equal blame also attaches to the local law-

enforcement officers, their superiors, and the officials of the State of Alabama. Protection could have and should have been given at all levels of government. Protection will and must be given by the Federal Government.

I commend the administration for stepping into a delicate and dangerous, situation. I heartily endorse the sending of United States marshals and deputies to maintain and enforce the law. I would hope that the threat of State officials against the power, the authority, and the responsibility of the Federal Government will not come to pass, because if it does, there can be no question of which will and must prevail.

The protection guaranteed to all our citizens will be furnished and the laws of the United States, as interpreted by the Congress and the Supreme Court, will be carried out.

If we cannot keep our own house in order at home, how, may I ask, do we propose to keep allies on our side, win friends in the uncommitted areas of the globe, and lead the nations of the free world in the struggle for survival—and I mean survival—in which we are now engaged? Every one in this Chamber and every citizen in this country must face up to and must answer this question. It cannot be avoided.

Mr. President, there appears this morning in the New York Times an editorial which I should like to quote in part, as follows:

The issue in Montgomery and in Birmingham is not school segregation, as in Little Rock. It is the right of American citizens, White and Negro alike, to travel in safety in interstate commerce, without being segregated in contravention of the Constitution. This right is now being tested by the so-called freedom riders, a racially mixed group consisting primarily of students, who are waging their campaign for civil rights in the South in a Gandhian spirit of idealism and of nonviolent resistance to an evil tradition. But it is also being waged with loud advance publicity and in deliberate defiance of State laws and local customs. There can be no question that in the freedom riders' completely legal action there is an element of incitement and provocation in regions of high racial tension.

There can also be no question, however, of the freedom riders' constitutional right to do what they are doing, nor—and this is the key point—of the duty and responsibility of the city and State authorities to protect them. The freedom riders are acting in accordance with the law and they are doing what they are doing frankly to test that law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an article entitled "The Law," which was published today in the New York Herald Tribune.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAW

The "freedom riders" touring the South have one avowed purpose: to test segregated intrastate bus practices.

President Kennedy's action in sending Federal marshals into Alabama was taken under an 1871 law that also served as the legal basis for sending troops to Little Rock in 1957.

The statute, in part, reads:

"The President by using the militia or the Armed Forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination or conspiracy."

Justice Department aids stressed the "or by any other means" provided the basis for Federal marshals. They added that the law was invoked since a class of citizens was being denied a constitutional right "and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right."

The action was also taken because of violations of sections 33, 34, and 35 of title 18 of the United States Code, which the Justice Department described as "very broad laws" dealing with the protection of interstate commerce and destruction or damage to interstate vehicles.

Violations of these laws carry a $10,000 fine or 20 years' imprisonment or death if the loss of a life occurs as a result of actions interfering with interstate commerce.

Although the specific trip involved was in intrastate commerce, the Justice Department said the carrier, the Greyhound line, was in interstate travel and therefore under Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I congratulate the able majority leader upon the splendid statement he has just now made, and I associate myself with the comments he has just made and the insertions he has made in the RECORD.

I noted particularly what he said about the effect of these events over the world. I call his attention to the fact that we have before the Senate, as the pending business, an amendment to a bill which has a very direct relationship to events of the last few hours in the South. I expect to modify slightly this amendment in such a way that I believe it may induce many who are very strongly in favor of this school bill to look favorably upon the amendment.

Without attempting in any way to embarrass my good friend—which I certainly do not rise to do—I do ask that in the light of the recent events, he reconsider the entire question of whether we should add a reasonable civil rights amendment, a reasonable amendment on the question of desegregation, to the gigantic school bill which will be before us very shortly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut does not embarrass me in the least. I do not think there should be any civil rights amendments in this bill, nor do I think there should be any religious amendments in the bill. They can be considered separately. But so far as this measure is concerned, it is a Federal aid to education bill, and I hope to see it passed unamended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I associate myself with all the observations which have been made by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]; and in connection with them, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, published this morning in the Washington Post, in regard to the problems which have arisen in Alabama.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALABAMA OFF DEEP END

Alabama came close to open rebellion against the United States yesterday with Governor Patterson's threat to have State authorities arrest the marshals sent to that State by the Department of Justice to help curb mob violence. It seems improbable that the Governor will carry out this threat, but the fact that he has made it heavily underscores the gravity of the situation. Any such lawless interference on the part of State officials with the right of the United States to protect the movement of interstate commerce would necessarily have to be met by force, with tragic consequences for Governor Patterson, the State of Alabama, and the country as a whole.

The basic cause of the trouble in Alabama lies in the decision of hoodlums to resort to violence to perpetuate racial segregation and in Governor Patterson's failure to maintain order. The Governor looks upon the so-called freedom riders as "rabble rousers" who went to Alabama for the avowed purpose of "creating racial incidents." But they are free citizens of the United States. They have a right to travel in Alabama singly or in an integrated group. This is a basic constitutional right which Alabama is obligated to respect and uphold.

Since the riots of last week, the Department of Justice had repeatedly urged upon Alabama officials its concern for the safety of the bus-riding students. Governor Patterson gave assurance that he had ample men and equipment and that he was determined "to fully protect everyone in Alabama." He declined Federal aid for this purpose. On the basis of this assurance the students boarded a bus in Birmingham for a peaceful trip to Montgomery.

Past experience gave every indication of violence at Montgomery when the bus arrived. Moreover, the FBI notified the Montgomery authorities that the controversial group was coming and asked for its protection. Yet no law-enforcement officials were in evidence when the bus arrived. Hoodlums had ample time to beat the students, white and Negro alike, before the police arrived, and to assault numerous others who merely showed sympathy with the students.

Especially flagrant was the slugging of John Seigenthaler, President Kennedy's representative in seeking a peaceful solution, when he tried to help a girl endangered by the mob. The crass disregard for the safety of individuals was further illustrated when Mr. Seigenthaler was left lying unconscious in the street for about 25 minutes—the only excuse being that all the "white" ambulances in the city were broken down.

In the face of this willful failure of the Alabama authorities to protect interstate travel, the administration was fully justified in taking bold measures to enforce the law. It seeks to enjoin the Ku Klux Klan and other groups from interfering with interstate travel. It has sent marshals to assist State and local authorities in protecting persons and property against mobs. Governor Patterson's attitude creates a series of unnecessary problems, but the presence of the marshals constitutes a show of force and, presumably, a warning of more drastic action if that should become necessary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I say, in conclusion, that I think the administration is trying to act with calmness and reason. May I say, furthermore, so far as the bill which is presently pending before us is concerned, I would hope we could consider it without reference to race and without reference to religion, but solely on the merits of the bill proposed, which

I think is a good measure, and which I hope will be passed practically intact by the Senate later this week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in inserting the editorial in the RECORD and in associating myself with the position taken by the Senator from Montana, I add only that I am very glad that he stressed the fact that the entire problem of race relations in the South is one of the major foreign-policy problems confronting our country.

As I said at the United Nations last fall, when, as a Senator, I was there as one of the Senate's delegates of the United States, that question arose there time and time again; and we must face it today.

As I said this morning, at a committee hearing, I wish we had some scientific device by means of which we could measure psychological effects. If we could do that, we would have some interesting objective data in connection with what is happening in the world and in our own country in regard to this problem.

We need to keep in mind that millions of colored people in the world have won their political independence from various forms of colonialism—some paternalistic, some more kindly than others, some highly tyrannical that placed them under subjugation and exploitation. I think that fact has had a great psychological effect on the colored people of the United States.

We Americans have to face up to this problem. We cannot sweep it under the rug any longer. We have to recognize now that there are thousands and thousands of colored people in the United States who have developed a sort of Ghandi philosophy. I say, as a Christian, that they also have developed an attitude that, under their Christian principles, they have a moral duty to future generations of colored boys and girls in the United States to make whatever sacrifices are necessary in their generation to bring to an end second-class citizenship for the colored people.

I raise my voice in the Senate pleading for calmness on the part of the people of the South; pleading that they face this problem intellectually; pleading that they recognize that the time has come when they have got to insist that there be substituted for mob law anywhere in the South where it raises its head, as it has in Alabama recently, government by law and order; pleading today that they recognize that the people have the right to travel in interstate commerce as those persons involved are traveling.

This does not mean that I advocate what they are doing, but it does mean that I recognize their constitutional right to do what they are doing, under the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution. It is the clear duty of the Federal Government to see to it that their constitutional rights are protected anywhere in the country, including some very troubled spots in the North, and I say that because the question of racial discrimination and denial of first-class citizenship in this country is not limited to the South.

My plea to all Americans this morning, as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, is to recognize now that this has become a foreign policy issue. The time has come for us all to recognize now that the Constitution has to have uniform application throughout the length and breadth of this country.

I congratulate the President and the Attorney General of the United States, no matter how sad the experience, no matter how they wish it could have been avoided, for their courage, for their dedication to their oaths, to see to it that the Constitution is for the protection of people all over the country.

If there is the Governor of any State in this country who wants to seek to place himself above the Constitution of the United States, the Federal Government must deal with him in accordance with the clear application of the constitutional rights of the Federal Government.

I hope we will at least learn, out of the lessons being taught in connection with those very unhappy incidents which have occurred recently, that there never was a time in the last 100 years when it was more important that all sections of the country join and bind themselves together in a united determination to see to it that mob law is put down and that constitutional law prevails in this land.

CUBAN INVASION FAILURE

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for not more than 4 minutes. I am to speak on a very important subject, and I should like to complete my statement without being interrupted.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I have been allowed to take more than 3 minutes, I shall not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, on April 30, I proposed a congressional investigation of the Cuban invasion failure similar to that conducted last year on the U–2 incident. At that time, I suggested that the inquiry should be closed, but that a daily transcript of the investigation should be released to the press and radio and television.

Now, in light of the recent charges made against the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I believe the following remark which I made 3 weeks ago is particularly pertinent. At that time I said:

> In view of the many conflicting stories already published and yet to come, the public has a right to know the truth. And a calm dispassionate inquiry would be of considerable use to the administration and to the American people.

Mr. President, events and public statements of the past several weeks have borne out my worst fears.

It has been publicly stated that we direly need a new chairman and members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been publicly implied that the Cuban fiasco was the fault of the military leaders of the Nation, of such distinguished men as General Lemnitzer, my friend Adm. Arleigh Burke, and others.

It has been publicly suggested that our military leaders went into the Cuban invasion without taking cognizance of all the factors. Now, Mr. President, surely a Nation which conducted one of the greatest emphibious wars in the history of man has the knowledge, and the military background to conduct a simple landing on an island only a few miles from our shores.

Surely, the men who carried the United States to success in the Second World War were not guilty of overlooking or simplifying the problems of setting ashore a few thousand men.

I say that it is time to stop looking for scapegoats and start seeking the truth. And that truth can only be found in the traditional way of this country—a calm, quiet, deliberate investigation by the Congress. The truth cannot and will never be uncovered by leaked comments or off-the-cuff pronouncements by individuals eager for publicity.

Mr. President, I am not a military expert although I have served my country in time of war, but I associate myself with the military man who declared about the Cuban invasion failure:

> No military man in his right mind would have approved the plans that were carried out.

I believe, then, an investigation is imperative, that its need grows more and more obvious daily, and will continue to grow so long as we have statements about dismissing our top-flight military leaders. But this investigation should be conducted by the legislative branch. And this inquiry should be work of a full congressional committee.

Without such an investigation, the public will remain in darkness, unaware of the very real dangers which confront us. Without such an investigation, the reputations of our finest and most honorable military generals and admirals who are under wraps will continue to be besmirched and stained. Without such an investigation, suspicion and the darkest doubts will fill the minds of our people, who in this time of crisis must have the utmost confidence in the men who will lead us into battle should that battle ever become necessary.

With such an investigation, Mr. President, the American people will valiantly respond as they always have and support a program for victory in the cold war. And with such an investigation, the politicians and popoffs will be silenced by the truth. I again urge an investigation of the Cuban invasion and call upon my colleagues to put an end to trial by innuendo, by hearsay, and by ignorance.

PRESERVATION OF OUR HISTORIC SITES AND BUILDINGS

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, early this year the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and several Members of the House introduced measures designed to halt the headlong destruction of our irreplaceable sites, buildings, and objects of historic and cultural importance.

The Historic Sites Act of 1935 gives the Secretary of the Interior some authority for preserving buildings and sites of national significance. The proposed legislation would strengthen his hand. The Historic Sites Act of 1935 was adopted at a time when the Federal Government played a relatively insignificant role in construction programs. Today the Federal Government is spending great sums of money for federally assisted housing programs, urban renewal, highways, and so forth. In the implementation of these programs very little attention is being given to what they are doing to important historic sites. If the law is not amended to reflect the new situation, in a few years most of the physcial evidences of our American heritage will be reduced to rubble.

When the historic American buildings survey ended in 1941, they had recorded more than 7,000 structures of outstanding architectural or historical merit worthy of preservation. Since the reactivation of the survey in 1957 it has been estimated, conservatively, that more than 40 percent of these have been destroyed or so materially altered as not to warrant preservation.

It is ironic that the destruction of the historic sites that tell the story of our country's fight for independence is being done by programs and projects financed either in whole or in part by the Federal Government. The very things that Americans seek out when they go abroad are systematically being destroyed at home. The preservation of our historic sites has more than just sentimental value. In the cold war between free nations and Communist nations it has great practical value. In destroying the visual evidences in which the broad cultural, political, economic, or social history of our Nation is best exemplified, we are blurring the portrait of America—and thus making it easier for our enemies to distort the true meaning of our country.

In recent years, with Federal funds aiding in urban renewal, highway building, and housing construction, the rate of destruction of our historic sites is accelerating to such an alarming degree that only corrective Federal legislation can diminish its impact. A number of States, with direct encouragement and help from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, have passed legislation enabling communities to adopt ordinances to protect old and historic districts, or specific single sites and buildings.

But this is not enough. There is a pressing need for specific Federal legislation to make sure that funds used in federally assisted programs are well spent in terms of human values. We need legislation along the lines introduced by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and others which provide that the effect on historic sites and buildings of a project involving Federal funds shall be taken into account in the planning of such project; that consideration be given to alternative schemes when such vital factors as scenic, historic, and architectural values may be irretrievably destroyed by such projects.

In the State of California we have a number of examples pointing up the need for this kind of legislation. The lore, legend, and history of Old Sacramento are being threatened by the proposed routing of a freeway. The Old Sacramento district in a blighted area on the riverfront has been surveyed and analyzed by experts, and plans for its redevelopment as a living, revitalized historic commercial area have been urged as part of the city's redevelopment program. But it may all be lost if plans of the State highway commission go through for locating the north-south freeway immediately in the area. This would prevent redevelopment of the old district as part of today's living city. Under California law, the selection of freeway routes is the sole prerogative of the State highway division. Proponents of the preservation program have urged location of the freeway on the west bank of the river.

If we had on our statute books a provision along the lines of the Humphrey proposal, the State highway commission would be under obligation to give consideration to alternative plans for the freeway—before Federal funds could be spent for this purpose.

I should like to make it perfectly clear that, in expressing my support of this legislation, I am not in any way expressing any reservation about public works programs needed to meet the demands of our times. At the same time, I think we need some mechanism in our law that will make us pause and consider what our extensive construction program might be doing to important evidences of our American heritage. We need, in short, a provision in the law to make sure that in projecting federally assisted programs, due consideration is given to plans that will allow us to have redevelopment, preserved landmarks, and sound traffic planning—and to have all three in harmony without one being sacrificed to achieve the others.

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on March 19, 1961, Hon Edwin Gill, state treasurer of North Carolina, made a speech entitled "The Faith of the Fathers," at the North Carolina State Service, Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa. This speech contains some sound advice for all of us, and it ought to be made available to all Members of the Congress. For this reason I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FAITH OF THE FATHERS

(Address by Edwin Gill, State treasurer, at the North Carolina State Service, Washington Memorial Chapel, Valley Forge, Pa.)

I count it a great privilege to speak to you today in this beautiful chapel erected by patriotic citizens and dedicated to the worship of God. Near this sacred spot, the men of Valley Forge suffered great hardships. Under the leadership of the great Washington, they carried on a valiant fight for all the rights and privileges that we hold dear. As we sit here together in this spiritual retreat, our minds naturally turn to that portion of the Bill of Rights that guarantees to all of us the right to worship God as we please. All of us owe a debt of gratitude to the Founding Fathers who had the foresight to declare in our fundamental law for religious as well as political liberty.

The Founding Fathers had a highly developed sense of history. They were aware of the long struggle of mankind for freedom. They knew of the trials and errors of the past. They were well informed as to the rise and fall of republics, and they knew of the first stirrings of self-government—faint and feeble though they had been—both on the European Continent and in England. And they were determined, as far as possible, not to repeat the mistakes and errors of the past.

In their minds, one of the greatest blunders of history was the centuries-old alliance between church and state. For a thousand years, this mixture of politics and religion had bred intolerance as dogmas were enforced through the rack, the wheel, the faggot, the hangman's noose and the block. They knew from experience that it was unwise to trust any church with political power. Although Washington and his associates were deeply religious men and believed that civil society could best endure if undergirded by religion and morality, they were determined that here in America the state would protect all religions but prefer none. This policy they fervently believed would prevent the intolerance and fanaticism that had scarred and defaced the story of civilization.

It has been said that it was fortunate for the United States of America that it came into being in the 18th cenutry; that the Founding Fathers, breathing the tolerant air of the age of enlightenment, were prepared to conduct a successful experiment in human freedom that would have been difficult, if not impossible, to accomplish at an earlier time. For instance, it is extremely doubtful that our Nation could have been conceived in freedom during the 16th century, which was generally a period dark with intolerance, during which mankind was afflicted with the cruel blight of religious wars.

During this century mankind was divided more by religion than by either race or politics. During a civil war that ravaged France, a well informed observer[1] declared:

"It was folly to hope for peace between persons of different religions. A Frenchman and an Englishman who are of the same religion have more affection for one another than citizens of the same city, or vassals of the same lord, who hold to different creeds."

In all this dark era of intolerance and persecution, there were, of course, bright spots such as the tolerance of William the Silent who led the Low Countries in their war for independence against Spain, and the expedient moderation of King Henry of Navarre, who sought without much success to establish a truce between Catholics and Huguenots.

Yes, it was fortunate that the Founding Fathers were permitted to work in the more tolerant atmosphere of the 18th century, but it was also fortunate that they had fresh in their memories the appalling record of intolerance, fanaticism, and persecution that had desecrated the centuries that preceded it.

Sir Edward Newenham wrote to George Washington in 1792 telling him of the deplorable condition of affairs in Ireland due to religious conflicts and received in reply from Washington a letter, from which I quote the following excerpt:

"Of all the animosities which have existed among mankind, those which are caused by a difference of sentiments in religion appear

[1] Michel L'Hopital, French jurist and statesman (1507–73).

to be the most inveterate and distressing, and ought most to be deprecated. I was in hopes that the enlightened and liberal policy, which has marked the present age, would at least have reconciled Christians of every denomination so far that we should never again see their religious disput s carried to such a pitch as to endanger the peace of society."

As an example of the consciousness of the Founding Fathers of the tragedy of mixing politics and religion, we find James Madison writing to Robert Walsh on March 2, 1819:

"It was the universal opinion of the century preceding the last, that civil government could not stand without the prop of a religious establishment, and that the Christian religion itself, would perish if not supported by a legal provision for its clergy. The experience of Virginia conspicuously corroborates the disproof of both opinions. The civil government, though bereft of everything like an associated hierarchy, possesses the requisite stability and performs its functions with complete success; whilst the number, the industry, and the morality of the priesthood, and the devotion of the people have been manifestly increased by the total separation of the church from the state."

There are, of course, some who contend that the Founding Fathers were against the recognition of any church in our Constitution for the simple reason that they were indifferent to religion itself; that most of them were formal Christians who merely gave lipservice to the church.

Now, there is no denying the fact that during the 18th century there was a great deal of skepticism and indifference to religion, and that many intellectuals favored an approach which ignored the individual creeds of all churches and that in the process the Christian faith, whether Protestant or Catholic, was diluted by a sort of pagan viewpoint. Typical of this attitude is a verse from the universal prayer written in 1738 by Alexander Pope, which said.

> Father of all! In every age,
> In every clime adored,
> By saint, by savage, and by sage,
> Jehovah, Jove, or Lord!

However, I do not agree with those who think that the religion of the Founding Fathers was cold and formal, and that they worshiped only with lipservice. No one can read the letters and papers and the contemporary testimony without feeling that Washington and his associates gave serious and solemn allegiance to God, and that they were unanimous in contending that His worship should include working for the welfare of all men.

As Norman Cousins points out in his excellent book, "In God We Trust,"[2] the founders' "view of man had a deeply religious foundation: rights were 'God-given'; man was endowed by his 'Creator'; there were 'natural laws'; and 'natural rights'; freedom was related to the 'sacredness' of man; * * *."

On the other hand, I think the Founding Fathers, although men of faith and of deep religious conviction, did take advantage, if you please, of the latitudinarian atmosphere of the 18th century, as expressed by Pope, which was congenial to widely divergent opinions in matters of religion, to imbed in our Constitution the fundamental rights of man, which, of course, included freedom of religion.

It is true that Washington never spoke or wrote with particularity about his creed. In fact, he was extremely reticent not only about his individual religious faith, but also about his theories of government. It was a part of the nature of the man to say little, to refrain as far as possible from useless controversy, and to make deep and abiding commitments only when great issues were at stake. More than any of the Founding Fathers, Washington reserved the intimate details of his faith for the inner recesses of his own heart. And yet it is clear not only that he believed in a benign providence, but that he felt the need of the comfort and powerful support of the Christian religion for himself, for his soldiers, and for his country. You are familiar, of course, with his celebrated statement to his soldiers here at Valley Forge in which he said:

"While we are zealously performing the duties of good citizens and soldiers, we certainly ought not to be inattentive to the higher duties of religion. To the distinguished character of patriot it should be our highest glory to add the more distinguished character of Christian."

It is true that John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States, opposed the selection of a chaplain for the national House of Representatives (because he feared it would be in conflict with the principle of separation of church and state), and yet Jay was a fervent and devout Christian, serving as president of the American Bible Society.

If you will read the papers of Jefferson, you will find that he was deeply absorbed in the philosophy of Jesus, and went to the trouble to prepare, as he called it, his own bible, including in it quotations from the lips of the Master. Certainly few men in America believed more in the good life as advocated and as practiced by Jesus. Speaking of this book in which he had collected the sayings of Jesus, Jefferson said: "It (the book) is a document in proof that I am a real Christian."

And we cannot summarize the religious convictions of Alexander Hamilton better than to quote words that he sent in a message to his wife upon the eve of his duel with Aaron Burr, which was to end in Hamilton's untimely death. Speaking from his heart and with the realization that he might soon face his Maker, Hamilton said:

"The consolations of religion, my beloved, can alone support you; and these you have a right to enjoy. Fly to the bosom of your God and be comforted. With my last idea I shall cherish the sweet hope of meeting you in a better world. Adieu, best of wives—best of women. Embrace all my darling children for me."

And the brusque and crusty master of Braintree, John Adams, who was perhaps more conservative in his views than most of the Founding Fathers, summarized his religion neatly by saying it was embraced in the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount.

Benjamin Franklin, associate of intellectuals both in Europe and America and undoubtedly a man of unconventional beliefs, sought to state his faith in language broad enough to constitute a common denominator for all men of good will and of spiritual conviction. Here is Franklin's credo. He believed:

"That there is one God, who made all things.

"That He governs the world by His providence.

"That He ought to be worshiped by adoration, prayer, and thanksgiving.

"But that the most acceptable service of God is doing good to man.

"That the soul is immortal.

"And that God will certainly reward virtue and punish vice, either here or hereafter."

Of course, there are those who would deny to Thomas Paine a place among the Founding Fathers. However, Washington and the other Founding Fathers valued Paine's service to the revolution, particularly his pamphlet called "Common Sense," which was used to stimulate the morale of our soldiers during the War of the Revolution. There are many who are willing to accord Paine a high place in the struggle for freedom, but who are disturbed by his attitude toward religion, which was highly irregular and something of a scandal following the publication of his book—"The Age of Reason." In this connection, it is interesting to quote from Paine's own statement as to his beliefs. Here it is:

"I believe in one God, and no more; and I hope for happiness beyond this life.

"I believe in the equality of man; and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavoring to make our fellow creatures happy."

So, I submit that generally speaking the Founding Fathers were men of faith. Although they differed individually in matters of creed and in degrees of conformity, there is no doubt that they believed firmly in a Divine Creator and were convinced that in worshiping Him they must work for the welfare of mankind, and with the exception of Paine, who in his language was often intemperate and incendiary, the Founding Fathers approached the issues of the day with amazing moderation and restraint. I have the feeling that they frequently leaned over backward declining to engage in theological discussion not because of any lack of interest in religion, but because of their deep conviction that religion could flourish best where each individual was free to approach the throne of grace along the path that seemed best to him.

Typical of the Founding Fathers' attitude is the following excerpt from a letter written in 1814 by Jefferson to Miles King, from which I quote in part:

"Our particular principles of religion are a subject of accountability to our God alone. I inquire after no man's, and trouble none with mine; nor is it given to us in this life to know whether yours or mine, our friends or our foes, are exactly the right. Nay, we have heard it said that there is not a Quaker or a Baptist, a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, a Catholic or a Protestant in heaven; that on entering the gate, we leave those badges of schism behind, and find ourselves united in those principles only in which God has united us all. Let us not be uneasy then about the different roads we may pursue, as believing them the shortest, to that our last abode; but, following the guidance of a good conscience, let us be happy in the hope that by these different paths we shall all meet in the end. And that you and I may there meet and embrace, is my earnest prayer. And with this assurance I salute you with brotherly esteem and respect."

Just because the Founding Fathers did not talk, as a rule, in terms of dogmas and creeds does not mean that they were indifferent to religion, or that they were not men of spiritual conviction. They did not think any nation could prosper or long endure whose people were not deeply religious and moral. They insisted, however, that religion was a matter of individual experience, and that the specific creed involved was of no concern to the State. The truth of the matter is that the Founding Fathers sought to emphasize the ideas that united all men of faith, thus they hoped that religion would cease to be a matter of discord and that the worship of God would have a unifying effect, bringing all men together as spiritual brothers. This view coincided not only with their religious beliefs, but was also in harmony with the overriding concern of the Founding Fathers for the unity of the new Nation.

Jews, Protestants, and Catholics today have complete freedom of conscience, and are able to worship God as they please because these great men had the courage and the wisdom to eliminate creed from the domain of government.

Of course, the adoption of our Bill of Rights did not overnight remove from the

[2] In God We Trust, by Norman Cousins, Harper & Bros., 1958.

constitutions of the States all remnants of religious intolerance that had been brought to our shores by our forefathers. Progress in purging such provisions from the fundamental law of the States was to take time. If you will pardon me, I would like to give you an incident from the history of my own State.

In 1833, our legislature prevailed on William Gaston, a Roman Catholic, to accept election to our State supreme court. The action of the legislature in offering this position to Gaston was taken in spite of article 32 of our constitution which provided, among other things, that no person should be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit who denied "the truth of the Protestant religion." After much soul searching and after conferring with some of the foremost legal authorities of the day, Gaston came to the opinion that this provision did not bar him and consequently accepted election to the supreme court. Later, in a constitutional convention held at Raleigh in 1835, this provision, which cast doubt on the right of Catholics to hold office, was removed from the constitution after an eloquent plea by Gaston, who was a member of the convention. Thus the cause of religious freedom was advanced in North Carolina because of the growing spirit of tolerance among our people and because of the outstanding character and ability of William Gaston.

I wish to observe that the recent election of John F. Kennedy, a Roman Catholic, to the Presidency of the United States symbolizes the fact that our people have reached a very high plane in this matter of religious tolerance. It is true that we had had judges and Governors and Senators who were of the Catholic faith, but not until Mr. Kennedy was elected had the people demonstrated that adherence to the Catholic faith was not of itself a bar to holding the highest office within the gift of the people.

In this connection I wish to echo the plea of President Kennedy in the current debate about Federal aid for education, which has involved parochial schools, that our people speak with moderation and restraint, keeping in mind at all times that we who engage in this discussion are, after all, Americans and that we are the heirs of the Founding Fathers who found a way in a great crisis to settle their sharp differences wisely in a spirit of moderation and with mutual respect for each other.

We are all aware of the fact that the debates of 1787 and 1791 were often sharp, threatening again and again to disrupt the plans of those who desired a constitution with a bill of rights, and yet somehow the Founding Fathers, regardless of their differences, managed to preserve a broad, basic understanding that gave room for cooperation. It is to be hoped that the current debate about Federal aid to our schools can reflect this spirit of harmony that pervaded the minds of the Founding Fathers.

Is it too much to hope that this important discussion can be carried on with the dignity of Washington, the candor of John Adams, the broad philosophic approach of Jefferson, the courage and sound judgment of Hamilton, and last but not least, the homespun wit and wisdom of Franklin? This question probes deeply into the minds and hearts of all of us and is one of the challenges of our day.

Let me say by way of summary, that the faith of the Fathers was an affirmative force in the building of this Nation. Their faith in God was associated with their faith in man. After all, in their opinion, man was created by God and was endowed with certain inalienable rights and abilities. So, in their judgment, man had the right, the duty and the potential to govern himself. It was upon this grand assumption that our Republic was founded, and which encouraged Washington and his associates to believe that it had a chance to endure. So here is one Nation that refused to recognize any particular religion as being superior to another, and which in fact took a neutral position toward all creeds, and yet owes its existence and its hope of survival to a deeply held religious conviction that all men are brothers subject to the governance of divine providence. So it is entirely in keeping with our concept of religious freedom to continue to say: "In God We Trust."

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the attack made upon a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by one of our colleagues is a serious affair which cannot be lightly brushed aside. Public confidence in the State Department and in the CIA has been severely shaken by the events in Cuba, and I might add justifiably so because of their close connection with the episode. But to add the Joint Chiefs of Staff, upon only the word of one Senator, has implications which need explaining. The entire Congress has, I believe, acted with propriety in this matter, refraining from accusations of a partisan nature. We have been waiting for the story to unfold, as unfold it must, but now it seems that one in this body has information the rest of us do not have, and questions arise which must in fairness to a group of dedicated Americans, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, be answered.

For example, my understanding at the time of the invasion was to the effect that the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been consulted. Since that time I have wondered at the lack of mention of the presence at any such meeting or meetings of the Chief of the Air Force or of the Marines. I have, in addition, heard statements to the effect that none of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had been consulted immediately prior to the attempted invasion. I have withheld questions on both of these points, feeling that after due investigation a report would be made to the President and subsequently to the Congress, but after reading the accusations made by our colleague last weekend, I feel that, in defense of the good names of those who constitute our Joint Chiefs of Staff and in the interest of the millions of Americans who want to know and who are entitled to know what happened, I must ask that the full role of the Joint Chiefs of Staff be made available to this body. Did they participate or did they not? If they did, to what extent? Were there some who were not consulted while others were; and, if so, who were they, and why were the others excluded?

The President is to be commended for his willingness to assume full responsibility in this matter, and I know the American people are proud of him for that assumption. They are not looking for scapegoats. They are only asking why, and I am sure that when they know the whys they will stand behind the President in his actions in this matter, but they will not condone accusations against General Lemnitzer, an American of unquestionable loyalty proven time and again in the service of his country, which cannot be backed up by proof.

Mr. President, I have heard with a great deal of mutual concern the feeling expressed this morning about what has been taking place in Alabama. I heard the majority leader justly ask "What must other people be thinking of us?"

I wonder at the same time, Mr. President, while we are worrying about what the world thinks of us in relation to the South, what the world and our own people are thinking of us in relation to Cuba. Mr. President, what should we do when Castro attempts to blackmail us by offering 1,000 lives for 500 tractors and by throwing in what he calls "the Fascist priests" for free? What is the answer when we ask what will happen if we do not succumb to this blackmail? I think these are questions we should be meditating this morning, instead of asking the people of America to put up with blackmail from a Communist country 90 miles off our shores.

I think the people of the world will judge us as strongly by what we do or do not do in the case of Castro as they will judge us by what we do or do not do in relation to what is happening in the South.

I do not think we can abandon our moral responsibility to the Cubans we placed on the shores of Cuba in the hope that they would help get rid of communism there. We have a deep moral responsibility—I think a deeper moral responsibility to those people than we have ever had in the history of this country. If we ignore this and succumb to the Communist blackmail with which Castro is threatening us today, I think we will slide down further in the opinion of the people of the world.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Senators who may have had neither the opportunity to hear the testimony nor the opportunity to read the transcript of the investigation which the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the subcommittee, has been conducting, I advise that the clerk of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has informed me six transcripts of the verbatim record have been made and are available to any Member of the Senate who will make the effort to walk down one flight of steps to the Foreign Relations Committee room, No. F53, to read them.

It is true that President Kennedy has assumed and accepted full responsibility for the Cuban affair. Like the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, I applaud him for doing so.

Other participants, others charged with official responsibility, should be held responsible for the part they played, for the recommendations submitted, for the advice given. Ours is a Government of responsibility.

Answers to the questions raised this morning—to many of them, at least—are available already in the RECORD, if Senators will take the time to read the RECORD, which is very nearby.

DR. JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Friday, May 19, 1961, Dr. John Temple Graves—a great American patriot, an outstanding newspaperman, and one of

the South's most eloquent spokesmen—passed away while making an address before the Mobile, Ala., Bar Association. Long a spokesman for States rights, Dr. Graves was calling for observance of the Constitution when he was apparently stricken by a heart attack.

Dr. Graves rendered valuable service to the cause of constitutional government over his long and brilliant newspaper career, which began on the New York Journal and ended on the Birmingham Post-Herald. On the Post-Herald he wrote a news column which was published in 24 other newspapers across the Southland, which he loved so dearly.

In addition to the laurels and respect he earned as a newspaperman, Dr. Graves was the author of three books—"The Shaft in the Sky," "The Book of Alabama," and "The Fighting South"—and he was a much sought-after public speaker not only in the South but throughout the country.

I knew Dr. Graves very well as a good friend and a noble gentleman of sterling character. He will be missed by many friends and in many ways, but he has left a great mark—in his writings, his speeches, his courage, and his personal integrity—and he made many valuable contributions toward making this country and the world a better place in which to live.

In tribute to this great newsman, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, an editorial written to his memory in the May 21, 1961, issue of the Charleston News and Courier, one of the newspapers which used his column for so many years.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOHN TEMPLE GRAVES

The South lost one of its ablest spokesmen when John Temple Graves died in Alabama. A faithful trouper, he was in action till the end. A fatal heart attack struck him on a lecture platform at Mobile.

His eloquence had brought speaking invitations from every State. His fame went far beyond the circulation areas of the newspapers for which he wrote, among them the News and Courier. We counted him not only as a respected member of our editorial staff, but as a warm personal friend.

John Graves was a gentleman by birth and upbringing. He was also a gentle man in the best sense of both words. His instincts were noble. He had a keen respect for the feelings of others. By no means did these sensitive qualities detract from the courage or the frankness of his journalistic approach.

In his writings he was a stanch defender of States rights and southern philosophies. Through his college years at Princeton, his service with the New York Journal and his journeys up and down the land, he had a thorough understanding of other parts of the United States. But he never lost his southern accent.

Born 69 years ago in Rome, Ga., he was a son of the first John Temple Graves, distinguished editor, native of South Carolina and kinsman of John C. Calhoun. John Temple Graves II practiced journalism in Florida, where he was editor of the Palm Beach Times and the Jacksonville Journal, and since 1929 had served newspapers in Birmingham. His syndicated column appeared in several other newspapers. It had been a part of the News and Courier since 1946.

Mr. Graves published several books, played a good game of tennis and had many other qualities to round out a full personality. We mourn his passing and cherish the memory of a gallant, talented colleague.

FEDERAL CONTROLS OVER SCHOOL CURRICULUM, PERSONNEL, OR ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, many people have written me concerning Federal controls or regulations over school curriculum, personnel, or administration which might follow Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary schools.

We have had Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools for many years under the provisions of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. These programs offer financial assistance directly to school districts affected by unusual Federal governmental activity in the district, such as the location of military bases or other Federal installations within or near the school district boundaries.

Under these laws the Federal aid is directly given to the local school authority. In this sense, the danger of Federal control or Federal regulation would seem more real to those who conscientiously fear control than in the Federal aid to education bill we are now considering, which, of course, allocates funds to the States for distribution to local school districts.

To find out whether any Federal control over local school autonomy over its school curriculum, personnel, or administration, either specific or implied, might have resulted from the administration of these programs, I recently wrote to the executives of all of the school districts in Indiana which had received such assistance in recent years.

To date, I have received replies from nearly half of those contacted. I would like to report the response to the inquiries I made of them:

1. What percentage of the total school district budget was derived from Federal assistance under Public Law 874?

Respondents indicated that the Federal assistance was generally constituted a small percentage of their total budget, but they emphasized its importance in no uncertain terms.

Ray Geyer, superintendent of Miami County public schools wrote that in one township where nearly three-fourths of the pupils are children of airmen stationed at Bunker Hill Air Force Base, the Federal assistance is of major importance to the education of the pupil in this area. He further states that Public Law 874 assistance to four other Miami County townships plays a major role in keeping top teachers in these areas.

Charles L. Stalcup, president of the Bloomfield School Board said that—

it would mean that our local property taxes would have to be raised 20 cents [per $100] to get the amount now contributed by the Federal Government.

2. Was the Federal grant contributed to the general fund of the school district or was it allocated for specific expenses?

Most of the school districts replied that the Federal grants are used for general school expenses and particularly for teachers' salaries. Use of the money to meet capital expenses or to retire capital debt is, of course, prohibited by the law.

3. Did the acceptance of the Federal grant result in any Federal regulation, specific or implied, with regard to school curriculum, personnel, or administration?

Response to this important question has been a consistent and emphatic "no." Not a single instance of Federal control or regulation was reported. Typical of the comments on this question was the statement of Leo J. Costello, superintendent of the Loogootee public schools, who said:

I hope that you will do all in your power to get us more Federal help because the fear, that so many have, of Federal control has not materialized.

4. Is the administration of the program satisfactory?

The comments generally indicated that the program was being administered satisfactorily, although some criticized the amount of paperwork involved and the timing of the grants.

5. Do you favor continuation of this Federal aid program?

Without dissent, every one of the respondents voiced their anxious hope that the program would be continued. Glenn D. Barkes, superintendent of the New Albany-Floyd County Consolidated School Corporation said:

Since our experience has been exceptionally good, we favor this program without reservation.

6. Further comments—

Most of the comments offered reemphasized the general acceptability of the program and favored further Federal assistance. Not uncommon was this comment by Vance B. Collins, superintendent of the Clarksville School Town: "I would like to urge that very serious consideration be given to the education bills of the present administration. I feel that Federal funds can be utilized efficiently in the field of education. It seems to me that is the only source of funds left open to take care of increased enrollment, increased and intensified curriculum and increased demands being made by the public in general."

From the replies, I have concluded:

First. That the programs of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 are vital to many communities and should be continued.

Second. That Federal aid to education can be free of Federal control and regulation and still be effective, if we in Congress insist that local school autonomy be preserved.

I hope that those who seriously questioned the practicality of Federal aid to education without imposed Federal regulation will be enlightened by the results of this survey. I hope that the fears of Federal controls resulting from Federal assistance will be quieted.

NATIONAL FREEDOMS FOUNDATION CLASSROOM TEACHER MEDAL AND CITATION TO DONALD R. TERRY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am pleased to join with the many friends and associates of Mr. Donald R. Terry, director of the speech department of Louisville High School, Louisville, Ohio, in congratulating him upon the occasion of having been chosen to receive a National Freedoms Foundation Classroom Teacher Medal and citation, in recognition of his outstanding contributions.

This will be the third time that Mr. Terry has been so highly honored by this foundation.

First in 1951, he received a George Washington Medal in recognition for his literary contributions.

In 1956, the school newspaper in Warsaw, Ind., the Hi-Times, which Mr. Terry sponsored, won the editorial award and in 1961 the Classroom Teacher Award, for significant contributions to the American way of life in teaching America's youth our American heritage. This most recent award will be presented by Mr. Russell A. Strausser, executive head of Louisville High School at the commencement program to be held May 23, 1961. Mr. Strausser will be acting in behalf of Dr. Wells, president of the foundation.

Ohio is proud that one of its citizens in the teaching profession is again to be so highly honored.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Association of School Boards has just conducted a poll of the school board members in our State concerning Federal aid to education. This questionnaire was sent to 1,200 members of the Kansas Association of School Boards and replies were received from 328.

In response to this questionnaire, it was interesting to note that 58 percent favored Federal aid to education in any form and 40 percent were opposed. Of those replying 58 percent wanted help with both salaries and construction, while 35 percent felt it should go for construction only.

The response to this questionnaire is most interesting, in view of the present debate in the Senate and I ask unanimous consent that a news release analyzing the replies be printed as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSANS AND FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

School board members who fight the battle of budget and pressures to improve public schools favor Federal aid to education in some form. A recent study conducted by the Kansas Association of School Boards among school board members whose districts belong to the association revealed that board members want Federal aid and are not particular whether it comes for teachers salaries or for school construction.

A short questionnaire was sent to members of boards with membership in the association. Replies were received from 328 people.[1] Some replies did not answer all of the five questions but the answers indicated the following:

1. Fifty-eight percent favored Federal aid to education in any form. Only 40 percent were opposed to Federal aid in any form.

2. Preference as to type of aid showed 58 percent wanted help with both salaries and construction, 35 percent felt it should go for construction only, while 5 percent wanted it for salaries only.

3. Fifty-one percent thought that Federal money should be distributed and administered through the State department of public instruction while 39 percent felt it should be allocated directly to the local district. Ten percent did not react to this question.

4. A majority, 51 percent of those responding felt that, if available, Federal aid money should be distributed in relation to a district's overall need. Forty percent preferred distribution on a student population basis while 8 percent did not respond to the query.

5. Among the group responding 63 percent said they would work to qualify for Federal funds, if and when enacted. Only 5 percent would not work to qualify for such help, however, 32 percent did not react to this question.

Comments registered with question responses could be summarized as follows:

(1) Some are violently opposed to and some are wholeheartedly in favor of Federal help for public education.

(2) Federal help should come only after a State has established its ability to support and support should be based on ability.

(3) Kansas can do a better job at the State level with better organization.

(4) Kansas accepts Federal aid now and additional aid would help.

(5) Available Federal moneys should be handled through the State department, and districts should qualify for such help.

[1] All percents were calculated using the total response of 328.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, at a meeting of the 91st annual convention of the West Central Conference of the Augustana Lutheran Church, held in Denver, Colo., April 19–23, 1961, a resolution was adopted opposing the proposed legislation of financial aid to the nonpublic schools of the elementary and secondary levels.

The Augustana Lutheran Church, of which the West Central Conference is a part, is a Minnesota corporation, with congregations in 34 States and the District of Columbia. The church consists of 1,242 congregations and numbers 592,000 members. Its president is the Reverend Dr. Malvin H. Lundeed, whose office is at 2445 Park Avenue, Minneapolis, Minn.

The West Central Conference is a Kansas corporation, with congregations in Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and Wyoming. The conference consists of 63 congregations and numbers 23,592 members. Its president is the Reverend Dr. N. Everett Hedeen, whose office is at Salina, Kans.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed as a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE WEST CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF THE AUGUSTANA EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, APRIL 22, 1961.

Whereas the National Lutheran Council has made a statement in regard to the issue of governmental aid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, as follows:

"The National Lutheran Council views with concern the proposal made in connection with legislation currently before Congress which would authorize loans to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools for the construction of school buildings, on the bases that:

"(a) Such Government aid previously given to colleges and universities operated by religious groups has been considered by many a borderline practice in proper relation between church and state, but Government aid for the construction of church-operated schools at the elementary and secondary level is clearly a form of tax support for sectarian instruction; and,

"(b) The availability of such aid to nonpublic schools would facilitate with public funds the establishment of racially segregated private schools as an alternative to integration in the public schools": Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. The West Central Conference of the Augustana Evangelical Lutheran Church record its opposition to the granting of governmental aid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools;

2. We urge members of conference congregations to write their congressional representatives giving expression of their convictions on the subject of governmental aid to nonpublic elementary and secondary schools; and

3. The secretary of the conference be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to the members of the congressional delegation from each of the States represented in our conference.

CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago in the Committee on Foreign Relations I stated that practically nothing that is discussed in the committee, regardless of how highly sensitive it may be from a classified information standpoint, remains within the walls of the committee rooms. The experience of every day fortifies me in that conviction. There is no information divulged in that committee room sensitive and dangerous to the country, and hence classified though it may be, that does not ultimately, by direct or indirect expression, become knowledge for the world.

From my own standpoint I have become deeply apprehensive that, while trying to abide by that understanding about confidential, sensitive, and classified information, I have subsequently found that by direct quotation or indirect statements everything that occurs becomes public information.

I cannot associate myself with the efforts to condemn the Central Intelligence Agency or the Joint Chiefs of Staff on the basis of what happened in Cuba. The failure to keep classified information inviolate is one of the reasons why we are in the rather delicate position we occupy today.

Whatever happened in Cuba was wrong, in my opinion, because the invasion, or whatever it may be called, was tolerated and then allowed to become a failure after it had started. If invasion was the decision, nothing should have been left undone to make it a success. I think that it was a debacle, of course.

We have suffered unduly in the world on account of that event, and the suffering has not yet come to an end. We do not know what will happen in Laos,

South Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia, and other places.

My principal reason for addressing the Senate today is to state that I do not condone the statement condemning our Chiefs of Staff that was made following last Friday morning's meeting of the committee. I have implicit confidence in the Chiefs of Staff. They have done great work, and the interest of our country is not served by these "interhouse accusations." It would be far better if we would point out the weaknesses of the Soviet and their depradations. Not one word is spoken about them. But in the Chamber today I have heard nothing but criticism of my Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for additional time so that I may be allowed to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator believe that this question, which I am sure is not clear to the public or, indeed to the Senators, should be reserved until such time as an impartial investigation, such as was made of the U–2 incident, is made of the invasion and a full report is made by the committee entrusted to make the investigation?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I opposed the U–2 inquiry. No good purpose that would benefit our country could be served through such an investigation. Nothing of a constructive nature could follow.

Mr. BUTLER. At least, did not the people learn the truth concerning the U–2 incident? Does not the Senator from Ohio believe that the people of America are entitled to know who made the decisions and why they were made?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur in the appraisal of the Senator from Maryland with respect to the subject, but I do not concur in the idea that we should conduct an investigation. The investigation of the U–2 incident served the Communists and not our country. I cannot see what good would be served our country by a general open and public discussion.

Mr. BUTLER. Then I believe it behooves Senators to remain silent about the whole matter and make accusations against innocent people who have served their country well and who are unable to make answer.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I were to express myself, I would suggest that we do not become slaves of the microphone and the television lens when it is in the corridor outside the room of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Let us not run up to it with great avidity to tell the world what happened in the Committee on Foreign Relations, which has been discussing sensitive and classified material.

Mr. BUTLER. Such information does nothing but degrade the Military Establishment of this great country.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I commend the Senator from Maryland for making that statement.

VIOLENCE IN ALABAMA

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is a sad day for America when a group of young white and Negro citizens cannot safely travel through any of our States. The Communists already are making the most of this incident in the world press.

Firm action is needed to restore law and order and constitutional protection to the victims of the mob in Alabama. It must be made clear that such deprivations do not go unremedied in our great democracy.

Our integrity as a nation of law is at stake as well as our standing in the international community. We cannot permit the proud inheritance of freedom which we all enjoy as Americans to be besmirched and stained by hoodlums, racists, and demogogs.

I commend Attorney General Kennedy for his bold response to this ugly situation. No other course was open to him but to invoke whatever Federal authority existed to cope with this situation. This is not an invasion of States' rights. There is a national responsibility to uphold the Constitution and to safeguard travel by interstate facilities. We would be a Union of States in name only if the Federal Government had no authority to restore law and order under circumstances such as exist in Alabama.

It must be assumed that the Attorney General is acting with the approval and encouragement of the President. However, it would be very desirable for the President to give the full legal and moral support of his Office to the Attorney General's efforts. A strong public statement by the President would prevent any misconceptions as to where the overwhelming majority of Americans stand on this issue.

Mr. President, I believe strongly in the need for new civil rights legislation and this incident in Alabama emphasizes the great gap which still exists between our constitutional principles and their enjoyment by all Americans. But certainly no new laws are needed for the Federal Government to deal with such conditions as exist in Alabama. The present laws are fully adequate to enable the Department of Justice to take action in this situation. Obviously we need not and should not wait for additional legislation to meet the clear responsibilities of the Federal Government to protect the freedom riders.

PURR WORDS AND SLUR WORDS: HURDLES IN THOUGHT TRANSMISSION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, much of our time on the floor of the Senate is spent in dissecting the meaning of words. Indeed, the bulk of material in the RECORD in which this appears deals in some degree with this process because the same word evokes different responses in different individuals. At the same time our language offers a broad spectrum for description of abstract ideas. For instance, "chronic complainer" and "perfectionist" are terms that might be used to describe the same individual, but the meanings are poles apart.

Mr. Stuart Chase, a word craftsman of some precision, has delved into the language barrier between reasonable men in an article which appears in the spring 1961, issue of the Lamp. A little reflection on the article, entitled "What Are We Talking About?" makes me wonder whether work of the Congress would be facilitated by creating a Joint Committee on Definitions, thus providing more definite boundaries within which we could pursue our discussions. It might be advantageous to set forth the meaning of such phrases as "the public interest," a condition frequently alluded to here.

But the task of defining is not without peril. How would members of the Joint Committee on Definitions react when dealing with words such as "Democrat" and "Republican"?

I ask consent to include with my remarks portions of an article by Stuart Chase from the attractive and enlightened house organ of one of the Nation's largest corporations, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM ARTICLE ENTITLED "WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT"

(By Stuart Chase)

What is free enterprise? In a recent survey of public opinion, a scientific sample of adult Americans were asked to define this familiar phrase. Only 30 percent of them had a passable answer; many thought it meant something given away free at a sale. Surveys conducted by Opinion Research Corp. show that most Americans have only the foggiest notion of such terms as "capitalism," "socialism," "communism," "productivity," "depletion." Even the word "dividends" baffles some citizens.

Fogginess about economic terms is not confined to the rank and file. Discussion and dispute rage in academic, congressional, journalistic, and executive circles about the political, economic, and social issues of the day, in words that shed little light, although they often generate heat.

* * * * *

Beware, the semanticists say, of "slur" words and "purr" words, terms which have a built-in emotional bias. They raise the blood pressure and fog the vision. They can transform reasonable men into unreasonable table pounders. "Profiteer" is a slur word, and so is "spender," while "budget balancer" is a purr term, along with "home" and "mother." Campaign oratory normally contains a generous larding of slurs and purrs; indeed it is often intended to stir the emotions and confuse.

* * * * *

Let us compare briefly our present economy with the language currently used to describe it. The United States has developed a series of economic habits and arrangements which produce a fantastic output of goods, together with a somewhat uneven balance between private and public expenditures. Automobiles are in oversupply and places to park them in undersupply. A television set is in nearly every home, while the country is gravely short of school classrooms. Average family income—more than $7,000—is the highest ever known on earth; the poor are getting richer, and the rich disgorge in in-

come taxes up to 91 percent of their annual take. Hours of labor have declined so dramatically over the years that the use of leisure has become a serious problem. The stockholders of large corporations, in many cases and for various reasons, no longer exert management control; control is in the hands of a continuing group of professional managers who may hold only a minority stock interest. The Federal Government administers a social security system with more than 100 million Americans on its rolls. Farmers now constitute less than 10 percent of the gainfully employed, with the ratio shrinking year by year, yet they still produce tremendous surpluses. Factory workers are declining relative to white collar workers, automation speeding the process.

OLD WORDS FOR NEW REALITIES

The Washington Post in a recent editorial summed up the current economic pattern:

We live in a mixed economy, with tariffs, subsidies, tax privileges, credit arrangements, and direct and indirect governmental regulation. In total this is neither socialism nor capitalism, but a composite adjustment of a practical people to the realities of day-to-day affairs. We live in private houses which we can afford because of governmental control of the mortgage market.

One might go on to give unlimited examples of the way private affairs are entangled with those of government on its three levels. They are interwoven too with nonprofit institutions like universities and foundations, and with cooperative enterprises. The reality just will not fit into neat, exclusive categories. This mixed economic pattern is spreading throughout the so-called free world.

Here then is the objective reality, the mixed economy which is steadily raising living standards but at the same time creating new problems of imbalance, some badly in need of correction. Responsible citizens are concerned with these problems; they are also concerned with the rapidly expanding Russian economy and the competition it offers to our system.

* * * * *

"Socialism" has long been explicitly defined by scholars as the public ownership and operation of the principal means of production. Webster will corroborate this one. It follows that there is very little socialism in the United States. Public utilities are the only important exception, and these in many cases have been operated by the community ever since the first water and sewage works, a century and more ago. Regulation, to be sure, is gaining. Federal, State, and local governments are moving in to regulate motor traffic, the airwaves, water and air pollution; they are stepping up social security laws. This is welfare legislation, but it is not socialism or communism.

"Capitalism" can be defined as a system where the private owners of capital decide and direct the flow of investment, and so control the nation's economy, within certain overall rules laid down by the Constitution and the state. Capitalists freely vie in choosing what resources shall be developed next and what goods placed upon the market. They must abjure monopoly and keep the market free. They hire and fire at their discretion, unimpeded by social legislation and trade union rules. There is reason to believe that Britain in the 1840's and America in the 1870's were not too far from such performance.

A hard look at the American economy today reveals that it corresponds about as little to "capitalism," as defined above, as it does to the accredited definition of "socialism." Discussion based on these terms is likely to be stale and unprofitable, as well as overemotional. Remedial action based on these terms is likely to be confused. There is simply no such animal out there in the real world.

Take "free enterprise" and its sister terms, "free competition" and "the free market." Plenty of lively competition goes on in Main Street, but over the years the free market, as the Washington Post points out, has been drastically modified. Protective tariffs; subsidies of many kinds; "fair trade" laws, where manufacturers set the price at which retailers can resell; "oligopoly," where a handful of firms more or less control a market; Government regulation of utilities and the airwaves—all these practices modify, if they do not contradict, free competition. In brief, "our free enterprise system" is a wild misnomer for what is actually going on. But "our monopolistic system" is almost equally wild. The system varies from the airtight monopoly of the Atomic Energy Commission to the unhampered competition of roadside vegetable vendors.

Take the national debt, which looms in many minds as an arching tidal wave, about to engulf us all. A neighbor told me recently that he was more afraid of this "crushing burden" than he was of nuclear war. Most of us think of the national debt as similar to a mortgage on one's house. Speaking as a CPA, I know that the analogy is weirdly inaccurate.

The Federal debt is little greater now than it was in 1946—about $290 billion as against $279 billion—while the gross national product has almost doubled and population has soared. The "crushing burden" thus grows relatively less. The debt furthermore is practically all internal, and interest received by citizens is subject to taxation; we are on both sides of the equation. It is utterly impossible for the United States to "go bankrupt" under these conditions. The real difficulty with the debt is its unequal distribution among groups inside the country—banks, trustees, insurance companies, corporations, individuals, and other bondholders. The debt could be better managed, doubtless, but such action will be difficult as long as the words are so far from the facts.

Take "balanced budget," a term closely allied in our minds to the debt. It is a purr term, while "unbalance" is a slur. Practically every candidate for President in my memory has promised to balance the budget. It is a battle of words, not of facts. Fiscal prudence over the years is certainly mandatory, but there is no occasion for a scrupulous balance every year. A deficit is sound procedure in a recession year, and in prosperous years a surplus should be planned for, to retire some of the debt. Few citizens, furthermore, ever stop to define "the budget." Shall it be on a cash basis or on an accrued basis? Shall social security fund transactions be included or excluded? Shall earning assets, like the TVA, be capitalized as in a business balance sheet, or treated as running expenses?

This brings us to the powerful slur word "spending." Spending for what? Is it better for the community to have money spent for liquor, roadhouses, cigarettes and chewing gum, or for schools, hospitals, and water supply? A great nation can afford anything it can produce, and the United States does not have to choose so carefully between wealth and filth as does a poor nation. The United States does seriously need to strive for a healthier balance, but to cower before the word "spending" is not only stupid but dangerous as well.

"Planning" is another slur word for many Americans, and again one must ask: Planning for what? Planning is a highly respectable form of activity in all spheres except that of government. The Russian Government, we are told, has a 7-year plan, so a free society should have nothing to do with such an immoral exercise. This amounts to saying that we should not use our minds to come to terms with the problems—the very grave problems, both domestic and foreign—which lie before us. If we persist in our refusal, we give the Russians a potent advantage and a roomy margin in which to maneuver; they may use their heads about the national future and we may not.

* * * * *

As a sidelight on our semantic analysis, it is not without interest to compare the ideologists of the 1960's with those of the 1930's. Criticism of Mr. Roosevelt's program was largely muted during the early years, due to the severity of the crisis. But by 1935 one could take a breath and find fault with what was going on, or what seemed to be going on. One could call it names: "socialism," "communism," "fascism," "the same old capitalism."

A generation after the event we are in a position to evaluate the economics of the New Deal and appraise its aftermath. We now know that it was no revolution, no call to the barricades. It engineered no fundamental changes in production or distribution, established no dictatorship. It was a series of bold experiments, designed to halt what seemed like a bottomless depression.

* * * * *

Meanwhile the laws and directives of the New Deal administration proceeded—or floundered, if you will—between these rigid ideological walls, never departing far from the middle course of a mixed economy. Many of the ideologists of 1935 have since changed their minds, some very drastically. It is not impossible that many now sounding off in 1961 will also reconsider their labels.

IN CONCLUSION

Reasonable observers are obviously in trouble. The evidence shows an alarming gap between economic realities and the words normally used to describe them.

Applying a little semantics helps to put the record straight. It is a good idea, for instance, to identify slur words and purr words, discount them in others, avoid them oneself. I seldom use "capitalism" or "socialism" to describe the current scene; I use "open" societies and "closed" societies, where emotional content is at a minimum. In the former, investment, ownership of property, consumer choices, assembly, speech, the ballot, religious worship, are relatively free. In the latter they are relatively controlled. Closed societies thereby gain the advantage of more rapid action and less waste when investment and production must be shifted—say from guns to butter in a disarmament program. Closed societies can keep their outlays for health, education, and other community services in balance with their gross national product.

A fully developed open society, however, whose leaders understand its structure, can give members plenty of consumer goods, while maintaining public services and adequate military deterrents. So far, however, our terminology has made it extremely difficult for reasonable men to understand what they are talking about and proceed to reasonable action.

Finally, to quote Lincoln: "When men wrangle by the mouth with no certainty that they mean the same thing while using the same word, it perhaps were as well if they would keep silence."

SENATOR FROM VERMONT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I have just had the pleasure of reviewing a book by a former colleague of ours. The book, entitled "Senator From Vermont," was written by former Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont.

I wish to invite the attention of Members of the Senate, who I know will wish to read the book in its entirety, to a section of it on page 264, where the former Senator from Vermont discusses eloquently the meaning of the words "conservative" and "liberal" as applied to Senators.

I particularly enjoyed reading this section of the book because it deals with the time when the Senator from Vermont was a Member of this body and while I had an opportunity to observe him. He writes:

> The well-being of the American people and the very safety of the Nation depend on the maintenance and strengthening of the attitude which has long gone by the name "liberal." How can we preserve and extend that attitude? Shall we find a new name, or fight the battle out under the old one?

SPECULATION ON THE STOCK MARKET

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, many people in positions of responsibility have become alarmed over recent, excessive speculation on the stock exchanges, as well as in over-the-counter trading. Brokers have been suspended, the Securities and Exchange Commission is investigating the operations of one of the major exchanges, and many, including the president of the New York Stock Exchange, have warned about the consequences of this recent development.

There have been all sorts of suspected rigging, including manipulations involving foreign stock exchanges, and put-and-take operations backed up by options of one kind or another.

One of the ways to control gambling and speculation on the exchanges is to raise the margin requirement. This is one of the economic regulators which has been turned over to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to administer.

Last summer when stock market credit fell to about $4 billion, the Federal Reserve Board lowered the margin to 70 percent. It had been at 90 percent.

Now stock market credit has risen to more than $5 billion. This is the first time it has been this high since before World War II. It seems to me that it is well past time for the Federal Reserve Board to raise the margin requirement, not to 90 percent, but to 100 percent.

Excessive speculation—gambling, if you will—on our stock market benefits no one, with the possible exception of a few sharpies and insiders who are willing to ignore the welfare of their stockholders and the public generally.

THE BODY AND SOUL OF BUTTE—ARTICLE BY SISTER MARY BRIDGET, S.C.L.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Butte, Mont., is one of the most colorful cities in the West. Butte and Silver Bow County cut a large slice of my State's history, which has been filled with more than its share of happiness and tragedy. I am extremely fond of Butte and the wonderful people who live there.

In recent years the city has been beset with economic difficulties of great proportions because of depressed mining conditions and mechanization in the industry. Butte is now beginning to pull itself up by the bootstraps, and one of the finest interpretations of Butte, its people and history, is contained in the June issue of the Catholic Digest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article "The Body and Soul of Butte," written by Sister Mary Bridget, S.C.L., printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BODY AND SOUL OF BUTTE

(By Sister Mary Bridget, S.C.L.)

My city, Butte, Mont., has a deeply scarred face. She is grimy with the refuse of a long-dead smelter. But those who know her realize that beneath that rugged surface she has great resources of kindness and courage as well as minerals. She cherishes the ageless values for which one always has to dig deep.

The clash of the giant wills of the early copper kings—William Clark, Marcus Daly, and P. Augustus Heinze—can still be felt in the mining-camp atmosphere of Butte. And the mines they fought over still produce the copper which gives her the right to be called the richest hill on earth.

A stranger coming into Butte at night, dazzled by the twinkling lights, expects to find a wide, airy city with trees, flowers, and fountains. Then he wakes up in the morning to the ugliest face he has ever gazed upon. There astride buttes nestling at the foot of the Rockies, is a a sprawling community quite unconcerned about her lack of beauty. The Mountain Con peers out over the valley. To those who venture close to her, the roar of her cage, carrying its load of miners from the heart of the earth, is deafening.

Over on the eastern approach to the city the Leonard mine opens right onto the main street of Meaderville, and oré cars slide past on their shimmering rails.

Seeping out of the mines, channeled by sluice boxes, the copper water flows into paddies reflecting shades of green, turquoise, and blue. The kids of Butte have always loved to wade in these copper ditches, and many an evening their feet and hands are minus the upper layer of skin.

To know the people of Butte is to know what courage and humor are. Fifty years ago or more the Irish were told not to stop in the United States but to go on to Butte, Mont. And on they went in great hordes. Overnight Dublin Gulch and Corktown sprang up with almost as many Irish inhabitants as in the cities they were named for.

St. Patrick's Day became a holiday in Butte, and Tom Kelly never failed to see that the brewery turned out keg after keg of green beer, usually served "on the house." Citizens cheered the news of the Irish rebellion and mourned the death of Terrence MacSwiney, the Lord Mayor of Cork.

If you wanted to get your hair cut, you hiked up to Mickey the Bird's and Mamie the Barber's, where you not only received your money's worth of service but were enchanted by the songs of Hugh O'Neil, the Bard of Armagh, and thrilled to hear Mickey recite all stanzas of "My Dark Rosaleen."

Butte had characters who spiced the town with an unforgettable flavor. One of them was Shoestring Annie, who stood on the corner of Park and Main selling her wares, unaware that she had become a landmark. Then there was Straight-Back Dan, who would begin his favorite recital with the words, "I was down at the Union, at the Union," and tell in extraordinary detail how he escaped when the Miner's Union was blown sky high.

Barry O'Leary, mayor of a decade or two ago, still carried out in great tradition the Fourth-of-July street dances, following the fanciest parade you'd ever see. Sparrow Murphy was (and probably still is) the most beloved of all shift bosses. None of his "boys" was permitted to enter the mine without his partner, and many a man saw daylight once again because of "the Bird."

The Irish are by no means the only inhabitants of this city. The Cousin Jacks and the Cousin Jennies from Wales and Cornwall contributed to making Butte unique. They brought with them the art of making dainty pasties and saffron buns.

They went down into the mines side by side with the Irish, and proved that they, too, were stouthearted men when it came to fusing the dynamite or pulling a partner out of an air-deficiency pocket. They could expand their vocal cords just as loudly on "The Cruiskeen Brawn" as they could on "God Save the King."

Meaderville was the center of gravity for those migrating from sunny Italy. They brought their uncanny knowledge of grapes and wine, of spaghetti and meat balls, and the strange, delicious ravioli. Ted Traparish's Rocky Mountain Restaurant became the No. 1 spot for connoisseurs, and Charlie Erb's Savoy could serve a chicken dinner that even the chickens would have to admire.

Along with their knowledge of good things to eat, those sons of Italy brought the love of music, and this, too, became part of the growing culture in Butte.

Over on East Park, past Wyoming Street, the Scandinavians settled, and the Greeks added a Turkish bath to the growing town.

At times, the price of being the richest hill has been almost too high. You don't have to reread old headlines in the Butte Daily Post or the Montana Standard (Seven Men Die in Cave-In) to know the tensions of a miner's life. You know it by reading the faces of the miners as they come up to surface. You see it in the determination of these men to see that their sons receive an education which will enable them to become a part of a white-collared world.

Yet those very men will never renege on their chosen occupation. It takes stamina to go back, day after day, into the depths of the earth, knowing with certainty that the mine will eventually take its toll. But these men are the seed of the early giants who inhabited Butte.

On a hot July day in 1864, two bearded miners, George Humphrey and William Allison, staked a gold claim at the foot of a sprawling butte in southwestern Montana Territory. This was destined to become the site of the bloodiest, most expansive, and most expensive battle of wits and muscles ever witnessed in the Northwest, the war of the cropper kings.

After a gold rush of 3 years the claims folded up, and Butte Township became just another ghost town. For the consolation of 50 miners who remained in the town, two bars stayed open. All other supplies had to be hauled in. In the spring of 1872 William Andrew Clark, one-time miner, mail runner, teacher, banker, and financier (and future U.S. Senator) arrived from Deer Lodge to look the hill over with hope of claiming either silver or gold. Within a year he purchased the Calusa, the Original, the Gambetta, and the Mountain Chief mines. One king was here to stay—one stick of TNT.

Around 1875 a fellow named William Farlin struck a rich vein of silver. The population, like his blood pressure, rose: to 5,000.

When Farlin began paying his freighting bills with silver bars, the Walker brothers, bankers from Salt Lake City, sent a young Irish foreman, Marcus Daly, to look over the situation.

Daly not only looked over but took over the hill. First he purchased the Lexington and Alice mines; then he managed to talk Mike Hickey into selling his claim to the Anaconda mine. It was this mine that became synonymous with Daly and copper—another stick of TNT.

For the next 13 years the two giants were locked in constant struggle for control of the hill. Pickaxes, dynamite, 5,000 miners at their beck and call, two powerful newspapers with some of the best journalistic talent ever gathered in the West were the weapons these men used. They hit both above and below the belt.

While the slugging was reaching a peak of intensity, there arrived in town, in 1889, a 22-year-old mining engineer who eventually hit harder than the other two combined. Surveyor, reporter, and buccaneer, P. Augustus Heinze had the height, width, and depth to match any king who ever reigned. He was the third stick of dynamite. When you fuse a Clark, with his personal interests at stake; a Daly, with the development of western Montana uppermost in his mind; and a Heinze, who had never known what it was to be defeated, you have an incomparable Donnybrook. The mines became no man's land. The war raged for 10 years.

Finally, in 1899, Daly, broken in health, sold his holdings to the Amalgamated Mining Co. with the provision that he would be president of the new company. When he died a year later, the Anaconda Mining Co. (the new name) took over in full.

Clark, whose election to the Senate was opposed by Daly, was reelected in 1900, but the price included settling with the AMC. When he died in 1926, his heirs sold the Clark interests in full to the company. That left the last king, Heinze, to do battle with the giant Anaconda. In 1913 the company bought out his properties and holdings for $10.5 million, and the war ended. The greatest giant of all, Anaconda, had succeeded in mesmerizing and swallowing up the copper kings of Montana.

Christ came to "the land of the Shining Mountains" in the person of the great Blackrobe Father Peter de Smet and other stronghearted Jesuits who labored among the Indians and whites of the new territory. The Vicar Apostolic of Leavenworth, Bishop John B. Miege, S.J., blessed the undertaking of those pioneer missioners. Father Laurence Pallidino, S.J., left a monumental work in his "Indians and Whites of the Northwest" as a testimony to the vanishing tribes and the new frontier.

On April 8, 1883, Bishop John B. Brondel, of Vancouver Island, was appointed administrator of the Montana Territory. On the following March 7 a new bishopric was erected in Helena, with Bishop Brondel as first bishop of Montana.

Three months later the first synod was attended by the largest number of clergy assembled up to that time in Montana: nine Jesuits and four secular priests. Among those were Father Remigius de Ryckere, dean of the Montana clergy. This pioneer priest, a missioner at Deer Lodge, attended to the mining camps in the surrounding districts. In 1876, heeding the need of the copper camp, he purchased a small frame building to serve as St. Patrick's Church. Father J. J. Dols was appointed to St. Patrick's in 1884.

Other churches followed: St. Mary's in Dublin Gulch; St. Lawrence O'Toole, rising up from the hilltop of Walkerville with Father Baten keeping his eye on his tribe. The younger parishes of St. Joseph's, St. John's, and St. Ann's added to the Litany of the Saints. The saintly Father J. J. Callaghan started Sacred Heart Parish for the neglected and forsaken. He died worn out from his labors at 38. Every hack and carriage in the city was pressed into service; his was the largest funeral ever accorded to any man in Butte. He was buried in St. Patrick's cemetery, at the foot of Montana Street.

You won't be in Butte long before you are informed that the town has a population of 33,250, but that population fluctuates with the rise and fall of the price of copper. There are 500 miles of streets on the surface of the city, while 2,000 miles of corridors and tunnels run parallel underneath it. The city has 20 public schools, nine parochial schools, three high schools, and the Montana State School of Mines. Three teaching orders, the Sisters of Charity of Leavenworth, the Sisters of Charity of the Blessed Virgin Mary from Dubuque, and the Christian Brothers of Ireland staff the parochial schools.

Twelve thousand men have been employed at a single time on the hill, with a payroll of $1.5 million a month. Butte produces 8 percent of the copper mined in the United States, 13 percent of the zinc, and 4 percent of the lead. A bronze statue of Marcus Daly by Saint-Gaudens stands on the School of Mines campus in recognition of the advancement of metallurgy in the field of mining.

You may come into Butte as a stranger, but you don't remain a stranger long. You join in her songs and listen to her stories. Her chamber of commerce isn't concerned because it can't brag of a central park, towering skyscrapers, museums and art galleries. These things are good, Butte agrees, but what she offers to every newcomer is the heartfelt hospitality of a stalwart people.

U.S.S. "ARIZONA"—A NATIONAL SHRINE

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the sacrifices of patriots—in peace and war—live long after them. By such actions, history is created and an indelible imprint is made on the generations of the future.

During World War II, for example, there were innumerable acts of heroism, patriotism, dedication to duty, and sacrifice that excel our poor power to pay homage.

In the hearts of our people, however, gratitude is great for the sacrifices that enabled us to defeat a totalitarian enemy and to perpetuate our way of life.

As one memoriam, an effort is underway to build a permanent shrine over the hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk on December 7, 1941, in Pearl Harbor. The Navy Club of the United States of America and the Pacific War Memorial Committee have raised $250,000 toward the $500,000 needed for the shrine. In addition, the Legislature of Hawaii appropriated an additional $50,000. This leaves $200,000 still needed.

Recently, the Legislature of Wisconsin adopted a joint resolution urging the appropriation of the remaining $200,000 for completion of the memorial.

In recognition of the sacrifices of the men of the U.S.S. *Arizona*—of the tremendous efforts already made for this shrine—and the deep concern of the State legislature and of patriots everywhere for its completion, I bring this resolution to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 49

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941

Whereas the project to build a permanent memorial over the hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk in the December 7, 1941, attack on Pearl Harbor and still containing the bodies of 1,102 servicemen entombed within it, is slowing because of lack of funds although the project is nearing completion; and

Whereas the Navy Club of the United States of America, one of the originators of the plan to enshrine the *Arizona* and its gallant dead as a memorial to all who died at Pearl Harbor on the "day of infamy" in 1941, has been responsible together with the Pacific War Memorial Commission for raising $250,000 privately toward the $500,000 needed; and

Whereas the Hawaii Legislature has appropriated an additional $50,000 toward the memorial leaving an additional $200,000 still needed; and

Whereas the completion of this memorial is in the interest of the Nation as a whole as a shrine to the men who gave their lives and as a symbol for future eternal vigilance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, the assembly concurring, That the Congress is memorialized by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin to appropriate the necessary $200,000 in additional funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed at an early date as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from this State.

W. P. KNOWLES,
President of the Senate.
LAURENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DAVID J. BLANCHARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

NEEDED: A GREATER SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND "FREEDOM RIDERS" IN RIOTS IN ALABAMA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a U.S. Senator, as a citizen, and as a human being, I, along with my fellow Americans deplore, and am saddened by, the race riots in Alabama.

As Americans, we believe in perpetuation of a climate in which the rights and privileges of all citizens—regardless of race, creed, or national origin—can be fully exercised and protected.

We recognize, of course, that racial interrelationships have a long, turbulent history.

In our efforts to resolve the inherent problems, there is always the need for the exercise, by all sides, of human understanding and good judgment.

Fundamentally, there is a need to preserve the legal rights of all citizens. This includes the right to travel, to be protected from mob violence, and the full exercise of other legitimate privileges.

To assure a climate in which this can be accomplished, our law enforcement agencies—local, State and Federal—have a basic responsibility. If violations occur, then whatever force is necessary should be deployed to guard against such violations.

However, our citizens—individually, and by association—also have a great responsibility for the exercise of good judgment in such circumstances.

Today, our free system is engaged—militarily, sociologically, economically, politically, ideologically—in a life-and-death struggle with totalitarian communism.

Previously, the riots in Little Rock gave our Nation a "black eye"—a blow to our national prestige.

Undoubtedly the tragic events in Alabama also will be "ballooned" globally, to distort the image of the United States.

In the larger world—as well as the legal, social, interracial—view, then, there is a need to ask: Are the law enforcement agencies, as well as the so-called "Freedom Riders" exercising the kind of judgment that will, first, further, not retard, their separate causes; and second, reflect favorably, not unfavorably, upon the Nation of which they—regardless of this specific cause—are, and should be, responsible citizens.

There is, then, a national call to rise above the prejudices, hates, blind action—whatever motivations are the underlying factors in these tragic events—and to remember that we serve ourselves best if we, first, best serve our country.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON LEGISLATION TO CREATE A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to announce to the Senate that hearings have been scheduled on the legislation which provides for the creation of a new Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. These bills include S. 289, S. 375, S. 609 and S. 1633. The latter bill was submitted to the Congress by the President as a part of the administration's program. These hearings will be held before the Reorganization Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Government Operations in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, on Wednesday and Thursday, June 21 and 22.

A number of Senators have expressed interest in this proposed legislation, and I am making this announcement well in advance of the hearing dates so that those Senators wishing to appear before our subcommittee can arrange to do so.

Also, there are many private groups and individuals who have indicated a desire to testify on this bill.

I would suggest that anyone wishing to appear as a witness or who wishes to file a statement on the bill to create a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, should communicate with the Government Operations Committee, room 3304, New Senate Office Building. Telephone CA 4-3121, or Government code 180, extension 4753 at the Capitol. We wish to give the opportunity to testify to all who are interested in this important legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FUNERAL OF SENATOR GEORGE W. MALONE, OF NEVADA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as all Senators know, today we are sad because of the death of our former colleague, Senator Malone of Nevada. Many in the Senate wish to pay their tributes to his memory by attending his funeral at 1 o'clock. Therefore, I shall request that the Senate stand in recess until 1 o'clock. Let me say that I have cleared this matter with the majority leader.

So, Mr. President, in order to enable the Senate to proceed at 1 o'clock with debate on the Bush amendment, and also in order to allow ample time for Senators to attend the funeral of the late Senator Malone, of Nevada, and thereafter to return to the Senate in time to vote on the Bush amendment, I shall either move or shall ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, although I may not object, let me say that Senators have come to the Chamber to transact morning business. Therefore, will the Senator from Oregon modify his request, so as to make it possible for Senators to transact morning business and for the reassembly, following the recess, to occur 1 hour after the conclusion of the transaction of morning business?

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Mr. President, I modify my request accordingly, with the understanding that the 1-hour recess will begin at the conclusion of the transaction of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the modified request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none; and it is so ordered.

Morning business is now in order.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on May 3, on behalf of myself and 32 other Senators, I submitted a resolution (S. Res. 134) to amend the standing rules of the Senate to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has since requested that his name be added as a cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the resolution the name of the Senator from Iowa be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed; and, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess for 1 hour.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

At the conclusion of the recess, the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

THE ATTEMPTED INVASION OF CUBA

During consideration of H.R. 1021, Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other day the distinguished Senator from Oregon held some hearings before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in his capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. He invited other Senators to be present. I was one of the Senators who was present part of the time. I should like, with the Senator's indulgence, to take a moment or two to clarify some interpretation placed on the remarks attributed to me following the hearing.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. President, may we have the understanding that this interruption will appear either previous to or following discussion of the education bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other day, during the hearings being conducted by the Senator from Oregon with respect to the Cuban matter, one of the Senators leaving the room made a statement which implied some criticism of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Later on, at the conclusion of that hearing, I left the room and was asked by some reporters by the door what I thought. I said, "Well, I thought there were certain aspects of it that should be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee," of which I am a member. Another reporter made some further interrogatory. He said, "Well, how do you personally feel about it?" I said, "I was flabbergasted," and started to say why I was flabbergasted.

Just then General Lemnitzer came out of the door, and the reporter turned to find out what General Lemnitzer had to say in comment on an earlier statement by another Senator that he thought there should be a shakeup.

Subsequently, or as soon as I could, I turned to see if there was any reporter interested in having me finish the sentence. They were interested in what

General Lemnitzer was saying. Later, reporters from the Associated Press and CBS asked me, and I finished the sentence for them. Apparently the completion of the sentence never reached the editor of the Washington Star or the Washington Daily News. The Washington Daily News, in its editorial of today says:

> All the public knows is that one Senator, having heard the testimony, thinks a shake-up is essential. Another Senator—CASE of South Dakota—says he was "flabbergasted" by what he heard.

In yesterday's Washington Sunday Star, an editorial reads:

> It is true that Senator GORE, except possibly for some implied support from Senator CASE of South Dakota, stands alone. Senator MORSE, chairman of the investigating subcommittee, has expressed his confidence in the Joint Chiefs.

What I started to say, and what I did say to those who listened to the completion of the sentence, was that I was flabbergasted that the military reputation of the United States could be laid on the line by persons who are not in the Military Establishment or under their control—which puts a different meaning on it. I started to say I thought there were aspects of the matter that ought to be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee. I was a member of that committee. We had in the hearings testimony by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and some of their associates. It was only natural that I should say certain aspects of the matter should be reviewed by the Armed Services Committee.

I was flabbergasted—I am still flabbergasted—that the military reputation of the United States could be laid on the line by persons who are not under the control of the Military Establishment of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for coming to the hearing of the committee the other day. The questions he asked and the contributions he made by way of his suggestions and statements were very helpful to the record we are making. I did not hear what transpired outside the committee room, but I am sure no confidence is violated when I say that the Senator from South Dakota did say in the committee room, practically verbatim, just what he said on the floor of the Senate. In fairness to the Senator from South Dakota, the public record should show that. Beyond that, I do not intend to involve myself in any controversy which the Senator from South Dakota may be involved in with anybody else; but I do want to say that what he has said on the floor of the Senate he said, in meaning, in the committee itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has said, I should also like to say, if I may, and I hope I am not violating any confidence of the subcommittee, that a question was asked, and I think some emphasis was placed on it by the distinguished Senator from Oregon which would have shed some light on the whole situation, and which would have been helpful to members of the committee who were obliged to leave before the hearing was concluded. I think the Senator from Oregon recalls the question which he asked, or the matter to which he directed attention, and said that was a very significant comment; that if that had been brought to the attention of the Senators present, there would perhaps have been a different feeling about some of the issues involved.

Mr. MORSE. As the Senator knows, I propose to make the recommendation to the full Foreign Relations Committee, if the subcommittee approves, that the full Foreign Relations Committee give approval to the subcommittee to advise the President that we think the contents of the transcript should be made known to the President, and particularly the piece of information that the Senator alludes to, which bore upon the question I asked.

The press representatives asked me afterward, "Do you mean to imply, Senator, that the President does not know all these things?" My reply was, "I simply want to make sure he knows. I think we owe it to him to give him the opportunity to make absolutely certain he knows the condition of the transcript and also, if it meets with his pleasure, that he have whatever benefit, if any, would come from a brief consultation with the members of the committee in respect to some of our observations and interpretations as to the significance of what the transcript indicates."

He might obtain benefit from reviewing some of the problems which I think confront the President of the United States in respect to the whole matter of our procedures and our policies in the field of Latin American affairs.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Connecticut wishes to modify his amendment, and that is perfectly acceptable to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The author of the amendment has that right.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a modification which I make of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment as modified will be stated.

The amendment as modified was read, as follows:

> On page 16, lines 13 through 17, amend section 111(a) to read as follows:
>
> "The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110(a) and which, in good faith, is proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.
>
> On page 16, line 22, after the comma, insert the following: "or with the requirements of paragraph 1 of this subsection,".

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I understand that the acting majority leader wishes to request that there be a quorum call at this time. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available to either side under the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 45]

Anderson	Ervin	Miller
Bartlett	Fong	Monroney
Beall	Gruening	Morse
Bennett	Hart	Mundt
Boggs	Hartke	Muskie
Burdick	Hickey	Pastore
Bush	Hill	Prouty
Carlson	Humphrey	Proxmire
Carroll	Johnston	Robertson
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Scott
Church	Kefauver	Smathers
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dodd	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Douglas	McClellan	Young, Ohio
Dworshak	McNamara	
Ellender	Metcalf	

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], is necessarily absent.

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] and [Mr. COOPER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr.

CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COTTON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GORE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOSS, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PELL, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. WILEY, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YARBOROUGH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). A quorum is present.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the time for the quorum call has not been charged to either side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the quorum call has not been charged to either side.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield on my time, so that I may propound a unanimous-consent request, and with the understanding that my interruption will precede the Senator's speech?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the debate on S. 1021, Dr. Samuel Halperin, a political science congressional fellow who is working with my subcommittee, be permitted on the floor of the Senate to assist the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, before explaining my amendment, I wish to make a few introductory remarks. I allot myself 20 minutes at the present time.

Today the Senate will finally come to grips with an issue long debated. Will Congress pass a gigantic school assistance law without requiring that the Federal Government withhold funds from any State which is proceeding in defiance of the constitutional requirement that segregation in the public schools be ended? Both party platforms are dedicated to upholding the Supreme Court decision of 1954. Repeated statements by the leaders of both parties in the Senate endorse the principle behind this amendment. The failure of the amendment will surely set back the cause of desegregation for many years. Yet it appears that some of the staunch supporters of civil rights are about to foresake this cause in the interest of a highly discriminatory, pork barrel school bill for which a case has not been made. But the need for this amendment is clear.

Unfortunately, perhaps, this debate follows upon the heels of one of the most shocking racial riots and disturbances in recent years.

Emotions have been stirred deeply by the violent attacks on the Freedom Riders in the South. Federal marshals or Federal law enforcement officers have been ordered out of the State of Alabama by its Governor.

As the author of the pending amendment, I express the hope that it will be considered calmly, on its merits, and that in the debate the Senate will live up to its highest tradition of careful deliberation and dignity. I urge Senators in both parties who have stanchly supported the cause of reasonable civil rights measures and who support the Supreme Court's 1954 decision on segregation and their party platforms on this issue to reconsider their determination, if indeed they have so determined, to defeat this amendment. Let us consider the human rights involved in this issue. Let us consider the human rights involved in this amendment. But above all, let us not compel the Federal Government to pay a big bonus in Federal funds for defiance of the Supreme Court's decision on schools.

My amendment has been read; but in order to explain it, I shall read its essential provisions again.

> The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110(a) and which, in good faith, is proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools: *Provided*, That the Commissioner shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

Mr. President, I have been asked if this is the Powell amendment. That is a reference to the distinguished Chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, who for some years has submitted an amendment known as the Powell amendment, which he has discussed at various times in respect to bills dealing with education. I say mine is a different type of amendment. I would broadly differentiate the two amendments by saying that the so-called Powell amendment was absolutely a prohibition against the use of Federal funds in any State where a school practicing segregation was involved; and I say this with all respect to the gentleman; I would have supported his amendment if it had come for a vote in the Senate.

My amendment is different in that it gives considerable discretion to the administrator of the act, namely, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or, under him, the Commissioner of Education. It gives the administrator a chance to look at the situation within an individual State and to form his opinion as to whether that State is making a decent effort to comply with the Supreme Court decision of 1954. If he finds that, in his judgment, that is the case, then he may not withhold funds upon the application of the State. That is a very different thing.

Some may say, perhaps, that this gives the Commissioner much discretion. I do not object to that. I realize that judgment must be exercised somewhere along the line, either under my amendment, the Powell amendment, or any other amendment. The Commissioner must decide whether he will give the money or not.

I am perfectly willing to agree, certainly, that the present incumbent of the office of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is quite competent to investigate such a situation and to make a decision. I think Secretary Flemming was, also. So also were Secretary Folsom and Secretary Hobby. I would not doubt that the President would have in this post a Cabinet officer who could decide fairly and with justice to all whether a State was proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in the public schools. So I think it is well to differentiate between my amendment and the so-called Powell type amendment. The Powell amendment is mandatory; it gives no discretion. My amendment gives considerable discretion. It imposes an obligation upon the part of the Administrator to investigate these situations and to reach a fair conclusion as to whether the State is proceeding in full compliance with the constitutional requirements.

The question now arises: Is this an appropriate place for such an amendment? If this is not an appropriate place to discuss such an amendment to a school bill, I do not know, frankly, where an appropriate place is. I have been told by Senators who oppose the bill that this kind of amendment must come at some other place, in some other kind of bill. So long as I have been a Member of the Senate, I have observed the same Senators offer amendments to bills which are much more general than this amendment, because this one has directly to do with the question of education and who may attend the schools. So the amendment is germane and appropriate, if an amendment ever was appropriate.

The very bill itself contains a provision which is known as the Davis-Bacon provision. As all of us know, the Davis-Bacon provision is designed to require any State, in building any school with Federal funds provided under the act, to pay prevailing wages in the area where the building is to be constructed, as determined by the Secretary of Labor. In other words, the wages paid must be the wages prevailing in the area in which the building is being constructed. That is the philosophy and the requirement of the Davis-Bacon Act.

What does that have to do with education? I submit it has nothing to do with education.

Is it not more important to obey the Constitution of the United States than it is to comply with the pressures of the labor unions, who insist upon the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision in this bill? I have supported the Davis-Bacon Act, without failure, since becoming a Member of the Senate. I do not object to provisions of that act being included. I know that many Senators who object to having my amendment included in the school bill have supported the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon Act in bill after bill after bill when that provision had no connection whatever with the purpose of the bill, but was simply included so as to protect the wage rates in the area where the building was being constructed.

So I wish to make clear that I do not object to the inclusion of the Davis-Bacon provision. But I repeat that if that inclusion is appropriate, even though the provision has nothing to do with education, why should there be objection to including in this bill an amendment which deals directly with education and has to do with the law of the land and with upholding the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States? So I say that the statement that the bill should not be amended by means of such an amendment simply does not hold water; it makes absolutely no sense to me.

Earlier today my able friend, the distinguished majority leader, said:

> The protection guaranteed to all our citizens will be furnished and the laws of the United States, as interpreted by the Congress and the Supreme Court, will be carried out.

That statement was made in connection with the remarks the distinguished and able Senator from Montana made about the situation in Alabama.

Concerning his statement, I ask this question: Should we now move in the direction of carrying out the findings of the Supreme Court and the decision of the Supreme Court in respect to education in our public schools; or at this point should we provide a Federal bonus to States for noncompliance with the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. President, it seems to me that is an appropriate comparison, because as now drafted, the bill says, "If you do not comply, nevertheless, we still will give you substantial sums of money with which you may build schools and may carry on your own policies in respect to education on a segregated basis."

Mr. President, I wish to make clear—and this is very important—that this amendment does not actually compel integration or desegregation in the public schools of any State. It is not that kind of a measure. The amendment simply says, "If you wish to pursue that policy, if local conditions seem to indicate to you that that should be done, then you may not call upon the Federal Government for funds"—inasmuch as to do that would be in defiance of the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. What we do say is that if they will proceed toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination in the public schools be ended, then the Commission will allot to them funds under the bill, to assist them with their educational program.

So I say to my friends and to all Senators that this bill does not compel anything. It does not compel integration; it does not compel desegregation. But it gives the States this opportunity to go along and to proceed toward full compliance with that constitutional requirement; or else, if they, in their own way, decide not to do that, the bill will simply deny them the use of these Federal funds, without which they have been getting along for so long, and without which they have provided schools in their respective States.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield for a question.

Mr. METCALF. I wish to ask a question: Would not this amendment be a mischievious one? The money provided by the bill will go directly to the States. Suppose there were a situation in which most of the schools in a State were complying with the "gradualism" called for by the decision of the Supreme Court, although there was a defiant county or there were a couple of defiant schools: What would the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare do in such a situation?

Mr. BUSH. I think that is an excellent question, and it is not easy to answer it. But my answer is that in all such matters the Secretary must exercise his judgment. If there were a State in which a positive effort to enforce the Supreme Court's decision had been made, that fact would be known to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and in judging whether he should allot funds to that State, I believe he would have to use his discretion in arriving at a judgment on his part as to whether the State was proceeding in that direction, even though there were some recalcitrant sections of the State. I believe he would have to weigh those two parts of the State, so to speak, in his own judgment, and then would have to decide whether, in view of the determined effort made in certain parts of the State, he was justified in proceeding. I may say that his judgment in connection with this matter will be final.

Mr. METCALF. Yes. I appreciate the Senator's answer that, in his opinion, one or half a dozen recalcitrant or defiant schools in a State would not justify a withholding of the funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Is it not true that under present law and the present situation and the developments in connection with the Supreme Court, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would not be allowed, under this amendment, to deny the allocation of the funds to any State?

Mr. BUSH. If I correctly understand the Senator's question, I reply by stating that under this amendment, if a State is in defiance—as some of the States are at this time—and is not making any attempt to comply, the Secretary, in his judgment, would have to deny the allocation of funds to that State; and I am certain that he would.

Mr. METCALF. I do not know of any State in the Nation in which 100 percent of the school districts of the State are in compliance. There are States that are not integrating, and there are States that have not done so. It seems to me that a decision by the Supreme Court would be required, in order to determine that those States were not using the "deliberate speed" which the Supreme Court said would have to be used.

Mr. BUSH. The Commissioner would have to use a good many considerations in determining whether in his opinion progress was being made. One of them would be what legislation had been passed in the State. That would indicate whether the State was proceeding in the proper direction.

I do not want to pin down the Commissioner too closely. I merely say that I do not think we should lose this God-given opportunity to make some progress in this field; and I am willing to place a great deal of discretion in the present Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in connection with the administration and application of the bill, once it is enacted, in order that we may take another step forward in this most important civil rights field.

The reason why the amendment is so important in the entire field of civil rights—and I have been listening to the debates here for 9 years, and before that I followed them with deep interest—is that in my opinion the most important aspects of this matter are education and voting, which are wrapped up with each other.

If we are to get decent voters, if we are to get intelligent voters to run a democracy—and we must have intelligent voters to run a democracy—they have got to be educated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, I yield for a question.

Mr. METCALF. Would it be the Senator's position that discrimination in employment or hiring of teachers would justify action on the part of the Commission?

Mr. BUSH. It would be a matter of judgment on the part of the Commissioner.

Mr. METCALF. I take it, then, that discrimination in the employment of teachers would justify the Commission's withholding funds, in the opinion of the Senator?

Mr. BUSH. I am not sure the Supreme Court decision reaches toward the question of employment of teachers. We are talking about whether a State is reaching toward compliance with the Supreme Court decision. If it involves the employment of teachers—and I would not answer offhand with any certainty that it does—then I think the Commission would have to take it into account. My impression is the question is not involved, but I would not be sure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not resent the question which I am about to ask him.

Mr. BUSH. I would hardly be able to resent any question from the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator. I assure him that it is asked in good faith.

The Senator from Connecticut on Friday stated that he was opposed to Senate bill 1021 in its presently discriminatory form. May I ask this question? Suppose the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut or a similar amendment were to be adopted. Would the

Senator still be opposed to the bill, or would he then vote for the bill if so amended?

Mr. BUSH. I thought the Senator was going to ask me that question. The Senator has asked me that question before in connection with other bills. Sometimes I have answered "Yes," and sometimes "No."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have tried to ask it gently and in as good a spirit as possible. I still ask the question.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator had read all I said, which possibly he did, he would see that I said I was opposed to the bill in its present form.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Suppose the bill were changed by the Bush amendment, or something similar to it. Would the Senator still be opposed to the bill?

Mr. BUSH. I would be opposed to the bill for entirely different reasons. I stated the reasons in detail—not in full detail, but in some detail. I am opposed to the bill for various reasons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand.

Mr. BUSH. But I am pretty certain that the bill is going to pass. Being pretty certain that the bill is going to pass, I would like to see it improved to the extent that the Senator from Illinois knows, in his own heart, is a decent, honorable improvement of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the Senator has said that, even though the bill is amended as he wishes, he will still vote against it?

Mr. BUSH. That is true, but not for any reason connected with the debate this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. The reason for my asking the question is due to the experiences we have had in the past. The Senator from Connecticut will remember that a few years ago Representative POWELL offered a somewhat similar amendment in the House. The liberal Democrats——

Mr. BUSH. Which amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Powell amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I just tried to explain I do not think it is somewhat similar. I think it is somewhat different.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is somewhat different, but it is certainly somewhat similar. [Laughter.]

The Powell amendment was offered. It was supported by nearly all the Republicans and by a very large proportion of the liberal Democrats of the North. It was passed. This then made it impossible for any southerner to vote for the bill——

Mr. BUSH. Why?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Because of their objections to this feature. Then the conservative Republicans of the North, who had voted for the Powell amendment, turned around and voted against the bill with the Powell amendment, and with the southerners defeated the bill.

Mr. BUSH. That was within their right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it was rather sharp practice.

Mr. BUSH. I resent that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not accused the Senator from Connecticut of sharp practice. I have simply said it was sharp practice in the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. I will yield to the Senator, but I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania will not call my good friend from Illinois to order.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I certainly would not think of calling any good friend of ours to order, but I would express the hope that references will not be made to the other body, or to any other Member of the other body, which are in any sense derogatory.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for his appropriate suggestion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I can understand the Senator's objection to referring to these actions in the other body——

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has the floor.

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has the Senator ever heard of the Bricker-Capehart amendment to the Housing Act of 1949?

Mr. BUSH. I do not think so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Connecticut permit me to explain it?

Mr. BUSH. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator will not?

Mr. BUSH. No.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. Before I yield, I would remind the Senator, on this question, that a few weeks ago we had a bill in the Senate in which the Senator disliked being called the distressed areas bill. He has a much better term for it, which is what?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Area redevelopment.

Mr. BUSH. The area redevelopment bill. In that case I had an amendment which I thought was very important to the bill, and he said to me, "If I take that amendment, will you vote for the bill?" I said, "Yes, I will." He did take the amendment, and I did vote for the bill.

In the case of the bill now before us, I said in my remarks, forthrightly, I intended to vote against the bill, and I gave my detailed reasons for it.

The Senator, I think, has made his point. I am not embarrassed by it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It was not my intention to embarrass the Senator.

Mr. BUSH. Oh. I did not think so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator like me to tell him about the Bricker-Capehart amendment?

Mr. BUSH. No, not on my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, on my time?

Mr. BUSH. If the Chair will stop the clock on my time, I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I may be wrong, but I think the Senator should refer to it as the Bricker-Cain amendment. I think it was an amendment offered by Senators Bricker and Cain. The Senator from Indiana is not on the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us call it the Bricker amendment, then. Will the Senator from Oregon now yield on his time?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I am delighted to yield on my time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I think I have the floor, but if the Senator wants me to yield to him on his own time, I am glad to do so, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I want to be completely fair to the Senator from Connecticut. I think he has been courteous to the Senator from Illinois in taking time to yield to him. I do not think the time should be charged to the Senator from Connecticut. I want it understood that any time taken by the Senator from Illinois be taken out of my time.

Mr. BUSH. I am happy to have that understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask that it be made retroactive.

Mr. MORSE. If it can be done retroactively, I have no objection.

Mr. BUSH. With that proviso, I shall be glad to have the Senator make a statement about the Bricker amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that time cannot be kept on a retroactive basis.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, was the retroactive request agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is impossible to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Very well. Now let us proceed on the time of the Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In 1949, when the housing bill was under consideration, Senator Bricker offered an amendment to provide that there should be no discrimination and no segregation in any local public housing project. The bill without such a feature was being supported by a considerable number of southern Senators, led by Senator Maybank of South Carolina. We all knew that if the amendment were agreed to the southern support would be lost. We were anxious to find out what the attitude of Senator Bricker would be if the amendment were to be agreed to. I remember asking the sponsor of the proposal whether he would vote for the bill if his amendment were adopted. He replied he would not.

I think there is no doubt, without reflecting upon Senator Bricker in the slightest, that his amendment was a device intended to split the proponents of the measure.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish the Senator to yield to me at that point.

I have no such intention. I stated in my remarks last week that that was not the intention. I offer the amendment in anticipation of the fact that the bill will pass, and I said so.

Mr. President, I think it is a perfectly honorable thing to do to bring an amendment of this importance to a bill which is so closely related.

If the amendment, which is a very moderate one—a very moderate step forward in connection with integration

or desegregation in our schools—shall not be added to the bill before us, the Senator will not be here long enough this year for this type of an amendment to get through the Senate of the United States on its own merits. I am very much of the belief that the Senator would agree with me on that point.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me briefly?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield, on my own time.

Mr. SCOTT. I suggest, if I may do so, with all deference to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut, it would be interesting to know whether the distinguished and able senior Senator from Illinois would vote for the bill if the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would I vote for the bill if the amendment were agreed to? Yes, of course I shall vote for the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I hope the Senator will support the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may do that.

First I should like to see, however, what are the actual parliamentary tactics.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I fear that if we are going to get into the question of parliamentary tactics, I can tell the Senators a few things about those, too; but let us not do so. Let us talk about the merits of the amendment. Does the Senator wish to comment on the merits of the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). The additional 10 minutes of the Senator have expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut is recognized for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator wish to comment on the merits of the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask a question. In the State of Georgia the city of Atlanta probably wishes to comply in good faith with the decisions of the courts and to desegregate, but the State does not wish to have the city of Atlanta desegregate and will take steps to prevent it.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have answered exactly that same question, asked by my good friend on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was out of the Chamber at the time.

Mr. BUSH. I realize the Senator was out of the Chamber. I would rather not go over the same ground, except to say, in a general way, that the amendment would put a great deal of discretion in the Commissioner, who would be in charge of the administration of the provision.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. It would be the duty of the Commissioner to take into account what is taking place in one of the great cities in a State, when he makes a decision in regard to a State.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator to yield to me on my own time.

I say to the Senator from Connecticut, as floor leader of the bill I have no question about the sincerity of purpose of the Senator from Connecticut. I have talked with the Senator at some length. The Senator has done his best to lobby me over to his side, very legitimately. I have explained to him that he cannot convert me, but that I shall urge the rejection of his amendment because, in my judgment, the amendment would kill any opportunity to have the bill passed.

I think the RECORD will show that in the early 1940's this straw was thrashed, too. The then incomparable Senator from North Dakota, former Senator Langer, offered a similar amendment to a similar bill at that time. The amendment was agreed to. The RECORD shows that the bill was defeated.

I am not one to make a cause-to-effect argument. I do not know to what extent the Langer amendment caused the defeat of the bill at that time, but it was an interesting coincidence.

If I may have the attention of my friend from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I think this is the place for me to make a brief comment.

Mr. BUSH. Before the Senator does so, I am sure the Senator will admit we have made some progress in this field since the 1940's.

Mr. MORSE. I think we have made some, but not nearly enough.

Mr. BUSH. I agree with that comment.

Mr. MORSE. I remember very well what the Senator from Illinois called the Bricker amendment to the housing bill. That was offered by the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Washington at that time, Mr. Cain. The RECORD will show that I spoke against it on the floor of the Senate in 1949, when the head of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the wonderful Walter White, sat in the front row of the Senate gallery with a good many of the officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored people. They had lobbied me, too. They had urged me to vote for the amendment. I did my best to explain to them why it would be a great parliamentary mistake for them to follow that course of action, and pointed out to them that it would mean the end of the housing bill. Senators will find that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There was a meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People at the Unitarian Church in Washington, D.C., and I was invited to come before them to defend myself. I can always defend myself.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is pretty capable at that.

Mr. MORSE. When I know I am correct I never hesitate, and I was convinced I was correct. I pointed out that I thought they were making a great parliamentary mistake when they asked to have the amendment agreed to in the Senate.

We beat the Bricker-Cain amendment at that time, and we made progress in getting a housing bill passed.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I close by saying that I am going to follow the same course of action this afternoon. I am going to urge the defeat of the Senator's amendment, because I think where the amendment belongs, as I shall say in my major argument, is as an amendment to the civil rights law, and not as an amendment to this bill.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator permit me to observe, in response to what he has said, that in the Federal law now I believe we have a provision against segregation in respect to public housing. This has already been accomplished in that particular field. In other words, one cannot use Federal funds in public housing projects which practice segregation between the races.

Mr. MORSE. That is an example of the type of progress the Senator is talking about.

Mr. BUSH. Exactly.

Mr. MORSE. We are not in a position to take that step in respect to an aid to education bill.

Mr. BUSH. It appears that the Senator is correct, but I will say to the Senator—I speak in respect to what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said a moment ago—I do not think we should fail to take advantage of the opportunity to try to make a step forward in an appropriate place. I cannot think of a more appropriate place to make headway, in connection with a school bill and in connection with desegregation in the schools, than on a bill which will provide Federal funds in the amount of $2½ billion over a 3-year period to various States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on my own time, my reply to my good friend is that that is a matter of judgment and sagacity. It is a matter of whether we shall try to jump over the abyss or whether we shall try to bridge it. To use that figure of speech, I am in favor of bridging the abyss. The bridge I would build is an amendment to the civil rights law. I am satisfied that if we try to jump over the abyss this afternoon we shall all go down and there will be no aid to education bill.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I know the Senator is deeply committed to the principle of civil rights. The Senator has demonstrated that so many times it needs no endorsement or further comment.

Is it the Senator's belief that if the school bill before us passes the Senate we shall have a civil rights bill this year, in respect to segregation within the public schools financed with public funds? Is the Senator suggesting such a bill may come from the committee on which he serves this year?

Mr. MORSE. In my judgment, that is the way to make progress. I shall do my very best to join with the Senator from Connecticut on amendments to the civil rights law.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator hopeful that such a bill, on its own merit, would pass the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. I am always hopeful. I am a born optimist.

Mr. BUSH. I say to the Senator that I am not at all hopeful or optimistic in respect to that particular idea. I think if there is any opportunity at all to adopt the amendment it is in connection with the bill which has a money bonus in it.

Mr. MORSE. I point out to the Senator that on page 520 of the RECORD for January 10, 1961, this comment was made by the majority leader:

> Both the minority and majority leaders believe that this matter ought first to go to the Rules and Administration Committee. We are confronted with possible rulings by the Presiding Officer of far-reaching consequence. These have never been given adequate hearing and consideration by the Committee on Rules and Administration. As probable chairman of that committee, I wish to assure the Senate that this proposition will receive such consideration, and that I shall leave no stone unturned to see to it that a measure of the kind proposed by the Senator from New Mexico is reported to the Senate at a later date. And, further, the minority leader joins with me in assuring the Senate that we shall do everything in our power to bring such a measure to a vote in this body.

A few days ago the majority leader made a similar statement to the press, which I read. I have complete confidence in the majority leader. His word is his bond, and he will do everything he can.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Montana can report on what has been done to date with respect to that subject. Does the Senator care to comment on it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I certainly do.

Mr. MORSE. On my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe I stated at the beginning of this session of Congress that it was the intention of the leadership to try to get through as much of the Kennedy program as possible. I gave my word then—give it again—that hearings will be held and a bill will be reported before the first session of the Congress is concluded.

Mr. BUSH. No one trusts the word of the Senator from Montana more than do I. I merely wished to know what progress had been made. I am glad to hear that we are nearing the time when hearings on the subject will be held.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. Yes, but first I wish to yield to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and then to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to those Senators without losing my right to the floor, and without having the time for their statements charged to the time of either side, because the matters they wish to present are entirely extraneous to the issue now being considered by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join in that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Connecticut will yield with regard to the comment of the majority leader?

Mr. BUSH. The subjects which the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] wish to present are extraneous questions, and I wish first to yield to the Senator from Washington.

PROPOSED U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND A TRAVEL ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 610, to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally.

SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") shall—

(1) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and of the United States;

(2) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of foreign visitors;

(3) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

(4) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and the facilitation of international travel generally;

(5) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics, information, and schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to international travel and tourism.

SEC. 3. (a) In performing the duties set forth in section 2, the Secretary—

(1) shall utilize the facilities and services of existing agencies of the Federal Government to the fullest extent possible including the maximum utilization of counterpart funds; and, to the fullest extent consistent with the performance of their own duties and functions, such agencies shall permit such utilization of facilities and services;

(2) may consult and cooperate with individuals, businesses, and organizations engaged in or concerned with international travel, including local, State, Federal, and foreign governments, and international agencies;

(3) may obtain by contract and otherwise the advice and services of qualified professional organizations and personnel;

(4) after consultation with the Secretary of State, may establish such branches in foreign countries, as he deems to be necessary and desirable.

(b) The Secretary, under the authority of this Act, shall not provide or arrange for transportation for, or accommodations to, persons traveling between foreign countries and the United States in competition with business engaged in providing or arranging for such transportation or accommodations.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established in the Department of Commerce an Office of International Travel and Tourism.

(b) The Office of International Travel and Tourism shall be headed by a Director who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be compensated at the rate of $18,000 per annum. The Director shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall submit to the President and to the Congress an annual report on his activities under this Act.

SEC. 6. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and not to exceed $4,700,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to direct the Secretary of Commerce to take steps to encourage travel to the United States by residents of foreign countries, to establish an Office of International Travel and Tourism, and for other purposes."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. COTTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial explaining the importance of the bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

ATTRACTING FOREIGN TOURISTS

Recent votes in Congress indicate that the U.S. Government will soon begin to make a modest, but welcome and useful, contribution toward attracting more foreign tourists to this country.

The need for effective, vigorous action in this area is clear. A rise in the number of foreign visitors here should help to improve foreign understanding of our Nation and help end the deficit in our balance of payments. This is a field in which cooperative action by government and private enterprise can be fruitful.

But much more is needed than promotional activity abroad, such as the legislation

now in Senate-House conference authorizes. We need a new climate of opinion in many areas, a climate of real hospitality and welcome for foreign visitors and of action designed to remove present obstacles. Though the State Department has made some progress toward simplifying the visa process, we are still a long way from matching those Western European countries that welcome American tourists without visa.

Action is needed to cut the relatively high cost of transatlantic passage and of travel and housing in this country to bring tourism here within the reach of more foreigners. We need to make available personnel with language skills at airports, hotels and elsewhere to help the visiting foreigner who does not speak English. We need, in short, bold and imaginative efforts commensurate with the importance of the opportunities open to us.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY CABINET MEMBERS FROM SIERRA LEONE

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, without losing my right to the floor, and having the time charged to either side, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] in order that he may introduce some distinguished guests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the latest and newest member of the United Nations, the people who have most recently gained their independence, the country of Sierra Leone have sent their first official delegation abroad to visit the United States of America. As chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations it was my pleasure to have these cabinet members, together with several Senators, as my guests for luncheon.

We have had a most interesting and friendly discussion. I have asked these distinguished gentlemen to come to the Senate Chamber, and I ask unanimous consent that I may introduce them at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, we have with us:

Hon. M. S. Mustapha, Minister of Finance and Deputy Prime Minister.

Hon. Albert M. Margai, Minister of Natural Resources.

Hon. R. G. O. King, Minister of State for Development.

Hon. W. H. Fitzjohn, Ambassador of Sierra Leone.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On behalf of the Senate, the Chair is happy to welcome our guests to the Chamber.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority, I join heartily in the welcoming remarks of both the Presiding Officer and the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield to the Senator from Montana, the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I join the distinguished acting minority leader, as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on African Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, in extending our best wishes to the newest of the free nations, and expressing the hope that this official group from the Republic of Sierra Leone will find its stay in the Capital City of this Nation both pleasant and profitable. We are delighted and happy that they are our guests this afternoon.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, how much time on the amendment have the proponents consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut has used 31 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. How much time have the opponents used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the Senator from Connecticut does so, I wonder if he would be willing to yield to me briefly on the time of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to make an observation and ask his comment on a remark which was made a moment ago.

Mr. BUSH. The junior colleague of the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to speak on the same subject. I shall be glad to yield to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] after he has spoken, because I have already promised to yield to him, and I do so yield at this time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

At this time I wish to clear up a possible misapprehension on the part of some. The distinguished majority leader has said that he has given his word that certain action will be taken in this body at this session, but I believe that what the distinguished majority leader was referring to was action on a proposed amendment of rule XXII of the Rules of the Senate, and so the Senator from Montana, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD] was not at this time making any statement or offer or promise as to action on the civil rights measures introduced by my senior colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and by Representative CELLER in the other body. Those measures were not the measures to which the Senator from Montana referred, were they?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, because to do so would have been very presumptuous on my part.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator. I asked the question only to clarify the point.

Mr. President, I support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut. I believe that it is most desirable.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I meant to say earlier that the amendment in its modified form is in part the result of suggestions made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania, to whom I have now yielded. He made a very constructive and helpful suggestion, which is incorporated in the modified amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank my colleague, the very able Senator from Connecticut, whose attention to the subject is certainly one which makes many of us grateful to him, because this is a moral issue which, in the present state of our times and the present concern which we have as to the rights of human beings and the dignity of individuals, warrants the most serious consideration by this body.

Section 110(b) at lines 9 to 11, provides that the Commissioner, in acting upon requests of the States for allocations, may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a), which in turn is the allotment section with respect to funds specified for school construction or teachers' salaries, as the case may be, to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

Mr. President, what that means, I do not know. What it purports to mean, I assume, is that the Commissioner has some discretion in allocating the money. What I suppose it means is to give the Commissioner an opportunity to say that if something he does not like happens in any State, he may withhold the money.

However, what is wrong with stating that the Commissioner of Education, in allocating funds in any State, shall comply with the law? What is wrong with stating that before the Commissioner approves an allocation, he shall determine, in the interest of the dignity of the individual and the rights of all persons receiving the benefits of Federal funds, whether such a State is in good faith proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools?

Not all the dialectic in the world, not all the rhetoric, not all the comments which have been made or will be made in the Senate indicating reluctance to support the amendment, can serve to answer the question: Is this amendment morally right? Is this amendment legally justified? Is this amendment in keeping with the law and the spirit of the Constitution and the decisions of our courts? I submit that all we are trying to do with the amendment is to make sure that when we in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, pay out in the third year of the operation of the bill a sum approximating $60 million in tax money, and receive back a sum approximating $39 million, we shall have the right to be concerned about what happens to the other $21 million; that when we in Pennsylvania pay real estate assessments on a tax rate basis of

anywhere from 33 to 50 percent of the value of our property and support our schools to educate our children, and when the other States, to which we are sending $21 million, assess their property at 7½ percent of the market price of the real estate, we shall have the right to conclude that such other States are not asking their citizens to do as much as we ask ours to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I yield such additional time as the Senator from Pennsylvania may require.

Mr. SCOTT. A house in my State with a market value of $10,000 is assessed at $3,300 to $4,500, or even $5,000. In some other States, which get the $21 million which my State pays out and does not get back, a $10,000 house is assessed for tax purposes at $750 or even $720. The tax is figured on that basis. Therefore, the taxpayers in Pennsylvania are paying twice; first we are losing the money, which we never get back; and, second, we are paying on a higher tax basis than do other States.

What is more reasonable than that we in Pennsylvania, who distribute our tax funds for children in our public schools, regardless of whether they be of one race or another, are entitled to assume that at least the Federal Government will expect the same procedure to be followed equally among the several States?

Otherwise, there is discrimination, not merely in the State involved, but also against my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which is being asked to carry more than its proper share of the load on a tax rate which is higher than that paid by other States, and is expected, if we do not adopt such an amendment, to support practices of discrimination in other States.

Therefore I strongly support the amendment. I thank the Senator from Connecticut for having mentioned my interest in the amendment. As the Senator from Connecticut knows, the word "proceeding" was one which was put in the amendment after a discussion between the two of us, because the word does not indicate that everything which our courts have directed to be done with all deliberate speed must be accomplished at once. It merely directs that evidence of good faith and honorable intent be shown, and a disposition toward fair dealing, which would indicate, through the use of the word "proceeding" some forward action, some movement, some will to comply with and intent to abide by the decisions of our courts. That is all we ask.

Therefore, this is a milder amendment in that respect than some which have been offered in the past in both bodies. At the same time it is an amendment which rests on honorable and faithful compliance with the law. It is an amendment which conveys within it the thought that action is being taken rather than assurance is being given.

For those reasons and the others, which are consistent, I believe, with my past record in this field, I very strongly urge support of the amendment. I hope our friends on the other side, who sometimes accuse us of a coalition with some of their members, will recognize, as so many of us have recognized, that sometimes there is a coalition on the other side of the aisle among themselves, which defeats desirable amendments, and that sometimes there is collusion on the other side which unfortunately delays progress on civil rights.

It would be most difficult for our friends to explain why they have voted against an amendment which indicates an attempt to proceed to comply with the provisions of our law and decisions of our courts merely because some other members of their political party may view it differently, when their platform, as did our platform, promised in substantially these words, and certainly with this meaning, that we would support in Congress this kind of amendment. If anyone is curious, I suggest that he read the platforms of the two parties. He will find that the amendment is in keeping with both platforms.

Mr. BUSH. I am grateful indeed to the able Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks. He has very well stated the tolerant tone of the amendment and the consideration which it shows to the various States which believe that they have very heavy problems in connection with complying with the Supreme Court decision. The junior Senator from Pennsylvania has very ably stated the situation, and I congratulate him upon his statement and his analysis of the amendment pending before the Senate. I now yield 5 minutes to the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. On the time of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BUSH. Then I cannot yield to the Senator. I will yield to the Senator against the Senator's time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to have the attention of the Senator from Connecticut, even though I am speaking on the time of the Senator from Oregon, with the understanding that the Senator from Connecticut will not lose the floor.

Mr. BUSH. That is the understanding.

Mr. CLARK. I have asked to speak now because my colleague from Pennsylvania has just spoken, and it may be helpful to our constituents if our remarks appeared in the RECORD somewhat in juxtaposition. I asked to speak now, also, because I would like to buttress what the Senator from Oregon said a few minutes ago. He and I have worked together very closely on the Subcommittee on Education, which brought the bill to the Senate with the concurrence of the full committee. We have concluded that we had better fight off all civil rights amendments, although he and I—and I am sure my friend from Connecticut and my colleague from Pennsylvania will agree—do have our hearts in the struggle for civil rights.

We fear, as a practical and pragmatic political matter that to attach the civil rights amendment would kill the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator explain that statement? I do not really see why the amendment should kill the bill. This is not a mandatory integration amendment. I do not understand why it should kill the bill. This is a considered amendment. It considers problems which have been presented to us by representatives of the various organizations. It should not kill the bill.

Mr. CLARK. I agree with the Senator; it should not kill the bill. I think if we were living in the best of all possible worlds, it would not kill the bill. This must be a matter of the political judgment of the Senator from Connecticut as opposed to the political judgment of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I have no assurance that my political judgment is any better than that of the Senator from Connecticut; it may be worse. I simply believe there will be enough votes against the bill, if something like the Bush amendment is included, to defeat its passage. I could be wrong, but I hold firmly to that view. My own suggestion as to how best to handle the matter is the same as the suggestion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], which is that we had better make certain that before this Congress adjourns a civil rights bill dealing with the problem of school segregation is passed.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania seriously believe that that can be done at this session of Congress?

Mr. CLARK. I believe it can be done before the 87th Congress adjourns. I hope it might be done at this session, although I would not be too sanguine that it could. I would be more hopeful that it could be done next year. I say that for this reason: Last week, together with Representative CELLER, of New York, I introduced for appropriate reference, six bills which deal with the civil rights commitments of the Democratic platform, which was adopted by my party in Los Angeles last year. One of the bills deals with the whole problem of school segregation. It contains an elaborate program for requiring every school district in the Nation to start integrating its schools not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

That bill was not referred to the Committee on the Judiciary; it was referred, and properly so, to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which I serve, and will, I am confident, in due course be referred to the Subcommittee on Education, of which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is chairman, on which I serve, and on which I am confident there is a majority in support of the bill. I am also confident that a majority of the full committee will support the bill.

I am confident that procedures and ways and means can be found, after appropriate hearings, to bring that bill to the floor. Then, if we have done as the majority leader says he intends to do, brought up and voted upon a change in the cloture procedure under rule XXII, I should say that there is an excellent chance that before the 87th Congress adjourns this direct method of handling school desegregation can be brought to a

vote in the Senate and passed. If it passes the Senate, experience shows, I think, that it will pass in the other body. I say that is the way to handle this matter, rather than the indirect way of the Senator from Connecticut, which runs the risk of having the bill defeated.

Mr. BUSH. There is nothing indirect about my amendment. Certainly, as I have said many times before, there is no intent to defeat the bill. I should say the bill will pass. I simply cannot understand how the Senator from Pennsylvania can feel that if a bill were before us containing an amendment like mine, which does not impose anything mandatory upon the States in respect to integration and in respect to discrimination within the schools, that kind of bill on its own merits would have a better chance than the pending bill, which contains a big bonus for the States. I simply do not understand the Senator's reasoning.

Mr. CLARK. I suggest to the Senator from Connecticut that his reiterating his position and my reiterating my position will not get us very far. Again, as I said earlier, this must be a question of political judgment. I am perfectly willing to lay my political judgment on the line, as I am certain the Senator from Connecticut is, too.

Mr. BUSH. So long as I have yielded to the Senator, I do not wish that political judgment to pass without observing that it simply does not "add up" to me that we can expect to get by in the Senate with a desegregation bill on its own merits with not nearly so good a chance as it would have if the Senate adopted my amendment to a bill which provides a great big bonus for the States.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Connecticut has quite fairly expressed his view. I disagree with him. Let me pass on, though, to the form of the amendment itself, which I find unacceptable. If I were determined to vote for some kind of amendment which dealt with the question of segregation in a way which I hope would not have the same chance of killing the bill as, in my judgment, the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut has, I would proceed in a quite different way.

I know the Senator from Connecticut has answered this argument to other Senators; therefore, I shall not ask him to answer it again to me.

I think his amendment makes it impossible for many a school district in the South, and some in the North, to get the funds necessary to build up their educational systems as they should be improved with Federal aid, because the State in which that school district is located simply will not make the kind of good faith proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement which is required under the Senator's amendment as a condition of obtaining the funds.

I go back, again to what I believe is the classic situation of Georgia and Atlanta. I do not believe there is any Senator who thinks for 1 minute that in the foreseeable future the State of Georgia will take the slightest procedure toward good faith full compliance with the constitutional requirement which requires that discrimination be ended in the public schools. It is simply not in the wood.

The city of Atlanta, however, is today ready to—desegregate and should get its share of these funds. In my judgment, though, it will not get them if the Senator's amendment is adopted.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Atlanta situation was discussed earlier. I shall not repeat what was said then. However, I can not follow the Senator's argument that Congress should appropriate funds received from the taxpayers, which includes the funds of the colored people of the South, and say to them, "You must pay the taxes on your cigarettes; you must pay the taxes on your gasoline; you must pay the 20 percent withholding tax; all of which money goes to the Federal Government; but you cannot send your children to the schools for which the tax money is raised."

Mr. CLARK. I do not understand the Senator's point.

Mr. BUSH. To me, it does not "add up" that we can pass a $2,500 million school bill and then say to the taxpayers, "You cannot have any part of it; you cannot receive any consideration in connection with it." My amendment provides that consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, as I understand, we were speaking on the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. We were speaking on my time. I suggest now that the Senator use a little of his time.

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the time has come when we must stop raising money from our people for highly discriminatory purposes. The Senator knows that in the case of housing we have provided that Federal funds cannot be used in a discriminatory way in connection with Federal public housing projects. The Senator from Pennsylvania himself has argued in that fashion. I have heard him speak in defense of the proposition that Federal funds should not be used in a discriminatory way in connection with housing measures. Now the Senator from Pennsylvania takes a different view.

He would pass a big school bill, but still permit the pursuance of segregation in the schools. He is not even willing to take some step to give a Cabinet officer the right to use his discretion and say whether compliance is being sought for; whether progress is being made; whether the situation within a State is proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in the public schools. That is all we are asking the Senate to do.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will search his recollection, I think he will conclude that he is not correct with respect to housing legislation, because today, to my chagrin, and, I am certain, to the chagrin of the Senator from Connecticut, segregated public housing is being built all over the country with Federal funds. I deplore it as much as does the Senator from Connecticut.

Efforts were made to include that kind of antisegregation amendment in the Housing Act, as was done by Senator Bricker, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] pointed out several years ago. It would have killed the housing bill, just as I think it will kill this bill, if the Senator from Connecticut persists and is successful.

I wish an antisegregation rider could be included in the housing bill; but if we do, I think we will kill the bill.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have the floor. If the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to yield to the Senator from Oregon, I have no objection, provided I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy. I will take a minute of my own time.

One of the best examples which the Senator from Pennsylvania could cite in support of his argument is Virginia. In many parts of Virginia, integration will be a rather slow progress, but it will come. Arlington will integrate, pretty much, next year. Prince Edward County has closed all of its schools as a manifestation of opposition to integration. In my judgment, the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut would have the effect of really denying the great educational process in Virginia which Arlington is illustrating. Under the Senator's amendment, Virginia would not get anything. It is necessary to make steady progress in this field. What is happening in Arlington is most dramatic.

Therefore, I think that is a very good example for the Senator from Pennsylvania to use in support of his argument.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield 1 more minute to me, so that I may finish.

Mr. BUSH. Under the circumstances, Mr. President, I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to express my complete concurrence in what the Senator from Oregon has stated just now.

I have before me an issue of the Southern School News for December 1960, in which there appears, on the first page, a table entitled "Segregation-Desegregation Status." The table shows the total number of school districts, the number that are biracial, the number that are desegregated, the enrollment of whites and the enrollment of Negroes in the schools, in which students of both races are present, and the enrollment in segregated schools. From that table, I reached the conclusion—and I direct the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to this point—that 15 States would not get a nickel of this money if the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut were enacted into law, despite the fact that in those States there are a

number of school districts which are doing their best to comply with the decision of the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. BUSH. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Segregation-desegregation status

State	School districts			Enrollment		In desegregated districts		Negroes in schools with whites	
	Total	Biracial	Desegregated	White	Negro	White	Negro	Number	Percent
Alabama	114	114	0	[1] 516,135	[1] 271,134	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	422	228	10	[2] 317,053	[2] 105,130	52,126	12,639	113	.107
Delaware	93	51	24	67,145	15,061	48,505	8,665	6,734	44.7
District of Columbia	1	1	1	24,697	96,751	24,697	96,751	81,392	84.1
Florida	67	67	1	776,743	202,322	[3] 133,336	[3] 27,502	27	.013
Georgia	198	196	0	[1] 682,354	[1] 318,405	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	211	171	128	[1] 593,494	[1] 41,938	[3] 445,000	[3] 32,000	16,329	38.9
Louisiana	67	67	1	[3] 422,181	[1] 271,021	37,490	51,113	4	.001
Maryland	24	23	23	[3] 449,879	[3] 134,379	[1] 406,286	[1] 114,682	[1] 28,072	20.9
Mississippi	151	151	0	[1] 287,781	[1] 278,640	0	0	0	0
Missouri	1,889	[3] 214	[3] 200	[3] 758,000	[3] 84,000	----------	[3] 75,000	[3] 35,000	41.7
North Carolina	173	173	10	[1] 816,682	[1] 302,060	117,404	54,746	82	.027
Oklahoma	1,276	241	189	[3] 504,125	[3] 40,875	266,405	30,725	9,822	24.0
South Carolina	108	108	0	[1] 352,164	[1] 257,935	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	154	143	6	[3] 670,680	[3] 157,320	87,393	19,644	342	.217
Texas	1,531	720	130	[3] 1,840,987	[3] 288,553	[3] 800,000	[3] 85,000	[3] 3,500	1.21
Virginia	130	128	11	668,500	211,000	177,731	52,286	208	.099
West Virginia	55	43	43	416,646	21,010	416,646	21,010	[3] 14,000	66.6
Totals	6,664	2,839	777	10,165,246	3,097,534	[4] 3,013,019	681,763	195,625	6.3

[1] 1959–60.
[2] 1958–59
[3] Estimated.
[4] Missouri not included.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, in view of the way in which section 110(a), on page 13 of the bill, reads, it seems to me that the words "a State" supply the key for the determination of who shall apply to Washington for the money. In that connection, I do not think the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be inhibited from granting to Georgia funds which would be used in Atlanta; and, similarly, I do not think he would be inhibited from refusing to grant to Georgia funds which could be used in other parts of the State.

Mr. CLARK. That would be inhibited by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. No.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will read the amendment, I think I shall be able to convince him that what I have said is a fact.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will yield first to me, I should like to point out that the money is to go to the State—not to Atlanta or to Podunk, but to the State.

Mr. BUSH. I know that.

Mr. MORSE. Then it seems to me that the amendment would simply result in a denial of the money to the State.

Furthermore, it is to be noted that the amendment does not apply to title II, which relates to Public Laws 874 and 815, under which the Federal Government has provided, in round numbers, about $2 billion since 1950. So I think it interesting to note that the Senator has seen fit to limit his amendment by excluding it—in effect—from applying to the use of the funds available under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, in support of the schools.

Mr. BUSH. In reply, I repeat that if the Senator from Oregon is able to suggest a further modification of the amendment, so as to remove the obstacle he has in mind, I should be glad to consider such a modification.

However, as I read section 110 of the bill, under the heading "State Applications," if the amendment were enacted it would not prevent the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the administrator of this bill from taking into account situations such as the one in Georgia which has been brought to our attention by the Senator from Pennsylvania, and it would not prevent the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare from saying, "Great progress has been made in this State, and it is proceeding"—which does not mean that every corner of the State is proceeding, but means that the State as a whole is proceeding. Therefore, under my amendment it would be difficult to deny fair treatment to Georgia.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield at this point?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Connecticut and I should read, together, his amendment.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Pennsylvania can read it, and I shall follow his reading of it.

Mr. CLARK. I now read the modified amendment of the Senator from Connecticut:

The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110(a) and which—

And there the word "which" relates back to the State——

Mr. BUSH. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I now continue to read:

and which, in good faith, is proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools.

Not 1 of those 15 States is proceeding in good faith, although many of the school districts in those States are proceeding in good faith. So I say the amendment would prohibit the allocation of any of this money to those 15 States.

Mr. BUSH. But it should be remembered that the application will come from the State itself.

Mr. CLARK. But the State government in each of those States is doing its best to avoid the obligation; it is not complying with that obligation.

Mr. BUSH. However, a State which wished to avail itself of the benefits of the bill or of the money might be induced to enact legislation which might result in making the money available to Atlanta, even though not to all the other cities and towns in the State. So this provision would be an inducement to the States to proceed and to move ahead.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to do so, I should like to address my question to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Let me say that, along the line we have been discussing, I have before me the Democratic platform, entitled "The Rights of Man."

Mr. CLARK. Will my colleague permit the Senator from Connecticut and me to finish our colloquy, first?

Mr. BUSH. But I have yielded to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. However, I am glad to withhold my comment for the time being, if the Senator from Connecticut does not object.

Mr. BUSH. No, I do not object.

Mr. CLARK. I merely wish to state, briefly, that although neither the Senator from Connecticut nor the senior Senator from Pennsylvania has ever had the privilege of serving in the Georgia Legislature, it is rather unlikely that the Georgia Legislature and the Governor of Georgia would be ready to comply with the conditions imposed by the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, in order to obtain more money for the city of Atlanta. And when I say "it is rather unlikely," that is certainly an understatement.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to see them move ahead and comply, does he not? In that event, why not use this "bait", in order to induce more rapid compliance?

Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I was about to propound a question of my senior colleague as follows: The Democratic platform, which is entitled "The Rights of Man," sets forth on the next to the last page——

Mr. CLARK. The title—"The Rights of Man"—is certainly a good one.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, if the promises were followed by performance.

Mr. CLARK. We are trying to perform them right now.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall give the Senator an opportunity to perform them this very minute.

Mr. CLARK. The Democratic platform promises a new Democratic administration.

Mr. SCOTT. And there is one.

Mr. CLARK. All right.

Mr. SCOTT. Now let us see what will be done with it—and I now read from page 54 of the Democratic platform:

A new Democratic administration will also use its full powers—legal and moral—to ensure the beginning of good-faith compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in education.

We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation—

And, Mr. President, I add the comment "Music supplied by me." [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. But a little out of tune.

Mr. SCOTT. I would not say it is a little out of tune; instead, I would say the band has stopped playing. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I will say, for the Senator's information—because I believe the Senator from Connecticut will not object to my doing so—that the promises I have read just now from the Democratic platform are a composite of—promises contained in the Republican platform and promises contained in the Democratic platform. The words "good-faith compliance" or "compliance in good faith" are taken from both of them.

Is there ever going to be a time when a civil rights amendment to the education bill will be in order? We have been told the amendment to rule XXII will come after the program. We have been told by my senior colleague, whose interest in civil rights is unimpeachable, and for which I respect and admire and praise him, that within 2 years he hopes action will be taken favorably. I personally think it will not be. I do not think there is any intention to secure enactment of a bill, finally, so carefully drafted by my senior colleague.

Then we are told, when we come to an education bill, that an education measure is the wrong place to ask that civil rights be included. If, for heaven's sake, we cannot include civil rights in an education bill to protect the rights of our children to be educated, and we cannot get it in a civil rights bill because, somehow, such measures are not brought up, my query is, when and under what circumstances will those who favor such action be able to put into the education bill the provisos which the Democratic Convention accepted and promised? That is, when do Senators expect to use the full powers of their administration, legal and moral, to insure the beginning of good-faith compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education?

I apologize now for the embarrassment which comes from reading back either party's platform to a member of that party.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator need not apologize for reading from that distinguished document, my party's platform. I am glad to have it quoted on the floor of the Senate. I think it is well that even a Republican refer to it.

Mr. SCOTT. Especially Republicans of good will.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is well to have it referred to, even when they object.

I had a little difficulty in following the question of my colleague, which was not exactly terse.

Mr. SCOTT. Verbose, perhaps. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. I would not say it was verbose.

Let me say, in short answer, I will support any civil rights amendment to the education bill which I think will not kill the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. What the Senator is saying, in effect, is that as long as Members of his party will not support civil rights amendments, there is no use in supporting them or in any Senator offering them. Why do we not quit there and go home on that issue?

Mr. CLARK. I think not, because the test is how many conservative Republicans who vote for the amendment will vote for the bill; and I think not enough will.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not think the Senator can put that simian on our shoulders.

Mr. CLARK. I have been trying to all afternoon.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have been trying to yield to the Senator from South Dakota, which I now do, for such time as he requires.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The inquiry I am about to propound I hope will be noted by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], in charge of the bill.

In the judgment of the Senator from Connecticut, would his amendment add an additional condition as a requirement before an application is approved?

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator repeat that question?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator's amendment be an additional requirement that must be met before the Commissioner could approve the application of a State?

Mr. BUSH. Before it was approved, yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In other words, it is the interpretation of the Senator that the bill without this amendment would permit the approval of applications where the State is not in good faith proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools?

Mr. BUSH. Exactly, and my authority for that is the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who so testified in the hearings on the bill. He said he had no authority to withhold funds.

I make a correction. The statement was contained in a letter addressed to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] in which the Secretary said he had no authority to withhold funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is that interpretation of the bill accepted by the proponent or sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare made that doubly clear the other day when he sent to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] his letter, which I read into the RECORD.

Mr. BUSH. That was the letter I quoted.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry. I thought the Senator was referring to the Secretary's testimony before the committee.

Mr. BUSH. I also meant the letter.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the Senator mention the letter.

Mr. BUSH. The Secretary is simply confirming the fact he has no authority to withhold funds.

Mr. MORSE. The Secretary has made very clear that he has no authority to withhold funds, and that such authority would be an attempt on the part of the Federal Government to exercise control by the Federal Government. We simply cannot have it both ways. We are either going to make the funds available to the States to be used by the States in accordance with their educational policies, or we are going to interfere with the educational policies of the States.

When we come to the constitutional question, I think it has to be considered in connection with the civil rights law. In that regard I will be found on the Senator's team in supporting amendments to the civil rights law.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator in charge of the bill made it very clear that it was the intent of the legislation to deny that authority to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, if I may in the time which has been yielded to me, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] if he accepts that interpretation—that the bill as it stands, and without the Bush amendment or something similar to it, permits the allocation of funds to States in which there has not been good faith or is not good faith in moving to end racial discrimination in public schools.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I regret that I did not hear the question of the Senator from South Dakota. If it is a question involving interpretation of the provisions of the bill, I would prefer to have the Senator from Oregon, who is the Senator in charge of the bill, answer, rather than I. He is right here, if the Senator wants to ask him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from Oregon has already answered my question. I was hoping I would get an answer also from the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I regret to tell the Senator from South Dakota that I was not listening when he was asking the question. I apologize to him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps I can repeat it. Without the Bush amendment or something equivalent to it, is it the Senator's interpretation that the bill would require the Commissioner to approve the application of a State which fulfills the conditions set forth in section 110(a) but which had not made provision to comply with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools?

Mr. CLARK. I am giving that matter consideration for the first time right now, so I am sure any answer I make will not be satisfactory to the Senator from South Dakota. I do not really know, but I would think that if it were determined by way of judicial knowledge or common understanding, that Federal funds were to be used for the purpose of advancing the cause of segregation, the extension of such aid might well be considered as unconstitutional, if subjected to court test.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seems to me that by any fair reading, section 111(a) as set forth in the modified Bush amendment says, in effect, that, in addition to the conditions which have been specified in section 110(a), an additional condition is to be required. That is—

The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the condition specified in section 110(a)—

Then begins the Bush amendment:

And which, in good faith, is proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools.

The use of the conjunction "and" seems to me to add a separate requirement.

Mr. CLARK. I think it does.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is an affirmative answer, in effect, without which——

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Without which the conditions would rest upon the conditions specified in section 110(a).

Mr. CLARK. No. Plus the conditions stated in the Constitution of the United States as interpreted by the Supreme Court, which are implicit in any legislation passed by this Congress.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to interject again that the Secretary himself said he could not withhold funds.

Mr. CLARK. The Secretary is not the final judge of the Constitution.

Mr. BUSH. He is a pretty good judge. I think he knows what he is talking about. He will have to administer the provisions of the bill. He is the man who will have to pass out the money.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. Has the Senator from South Dakota finished?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is apparent that there is some difference of opinion between the interpretation which would be applied by the Senator from Pennsylvania and the one which would be applied by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has said, apparently, that the bill, standing alone, would not require him to examine as to the question of racial discrimination.

Mr. BUSH. It is specifically said that he cannot withhold funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have been interested also in the fact that the bill uses the term "Commissioner." The definition on page 20 is:

The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

Repeatedly in the debate Senators have referred to the Secretary. It is said that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the man who wrote the letter, that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the man who will make the determination. The bill as it stands says "Commissioner," and section 111, which is sought to be amended, says, "the Commissioner shall approve."

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator permit an observation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. The letter to which reference was made was sent to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] and signed by Secretary Ribicoff. It says that neither he nor the Commissioner could withhold funds.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner.

Mr. BUSH. Neither of them. The Secretary said that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In passing, I invite attention to the fact that we have been using "Secretary" in the debate when actually the "Commissioner" is the officer specified by the terms of the bill. There could be a situation when the Commissioner and the Secretary might not interpret the language in the bill in exactly the same way.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I have frequently made that mistake myself in the proceedings this afternoon. I have referred to "Secretary" very often. In order to make clear the point of the Senator from South Dakota, I should like to read into the RECORD the very brief letter which was addressed to the Honorable WINSTON L. PROUTY, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: We have a telephone inquiry from your office on the question whether under the School Assistance Act of 1961, proposed by the administration and introduced as title I of S. 1021, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.

In my opinion, neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority.

Signed by Secretary Ribicoff.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall take only a minute or two longer. I have asked these questions partly to clarify the issue which, in my judgment, is before the Senate as a whole.

There is a question as to whether we shall try to write a bill which will distribute tax money to the States upon the basis of conditioning the distribution of setting conditions upon what the State may do in the field of education.

It has been my contention that we ought not try to tell States what they shall do with the money. I apprehend that if money is taken out of the Treasury generally, by a general appropriation, it would become very difficult to say that the general taxing power of government can be exercised to take money from the general funds of the Treasury and to allocate it to the States in any way when there is any discrimination or any denial of opportunity. I think it is almost axiomatic that if we take funds from the general funds of the Treasury to make a distribution among the States we cannot permit the States to discriminate in the use of those funds within the States.

However, because of that problem, which bothered the Senator from South Dakota in all of this discussion, the Senator from South Dakota undertook to try to find a formula which would meet the problem without running into the violation of ethics—that is, taxing all of the people and distributing the funds in such a way as to deny use of the funds to some people.

Therefore, the Senator from South Dakota has prepared an amendment, which has been printed and which is at the desk, which proposes to allocate to the States a percentage of revenues from the income taxes, both personal and corporate, not on the basis of any elaborate conditions, but purely and solely upon the basis of the number of children of school age within each State. It seems to me, from my study of the problem, that this is the only way we could consistently and conscientiously allocate money to the States and avoid entirely the question of conditions. There is no condition whatsoever provided in the amendment which I have had printed other than the certification by the State that the money would be used for the purpose of education at elementary and secondary levels.

The amendment would set up no conditions with respect to discrimination. The amendment would set up no conditions with respect to whether the money would be used for teachers' salaries, to pay interest on school debt, to pay for janitor services, or to pay for school buildings. The amendment would provide for a distribution of money to the States on one basis only: on the basis of how many children of school age were in the State. There would not even be a question as to whether the children attended public school, attended parochial school, or stayed at home. There would not be a provision with regard to daily attendance.

The amendment provides that the proper basis for determining need is: How many children are there to educate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the money is returned to the States, the States could spend the money as the State laws required.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I am permitted to do so, I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from South Dakota except for one comment. I think it is perfectly clear, from the language in the bill, that a State is bound to use the money for the public schools.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The State would be bound to use the money in any way that the State uses its own money. In my State we have a very firm constitutional provision which forbids the use or the appropriation of any State property or money for sectarian schools or anything of that sort. In my State, there would be no question but that the money would have to be used for public schools.

I point out that the real basis for talking about aid to education is the pressure upon the property taxpayers for funds to meet the educational requirements of the day. If part of the money is provided by a return by the Federal Government of income taxes collected, then this obviously will ease the pressure upon other sources.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will permit an observation. I do not wish to prolong the discussion in regard to the Senator's amendment, since he will have an opportunity to develop it fully, but I should like to observe that he is talking about Federal funds which are to be returned to the States. These are funds to be collected by the Federal Government and returned to the States. For that reason, I do not think the amendment, if agreed to, would eliminate the necessity for an amendment such as the one now pending, or something similar to it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I shall have to say I should resist any amendment of the character the Senator from Connecticut has proposed if it were proposed as an amendment to my amendment. I should resist any other movement to set up any kind of a condition whatsoever other than a determination as to the number of children in a State.

Mr. BUSH. I did not realize the Senator was opposing my amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not necessarily opposing it. I have tried to help the Senator from Connecticut by clarifying the situation. Without the Senator's amendment the bill would set up conditions the States would have to meet. The Senator's amendment would set up an additional condition. I think if we are going to start setting up conditions we can set up conditions from A to Z, if we wish to do so.

Mr. BUSH. My amendment is addressed to the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I did not write the bill. The amendment has to be attached to the bill. I cannot take responsibility for all these things.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that fact. The Senator is meeting his responsibility and meeting it effectively, I think, in trying to see to it that, if we are going to set up conditions as to how the money is spent, the money shall not be spent to further discrimination.

Mr. BUSH. That is the whole point. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe the Senator will recall that at one time the Senate acted upon an amendment which the late Senator Taft of Ohio and I sponsored when the first aid-to-education bill was before the Senate. At that time we encountered the problem which the Senator from Connecticut is seriously considering and trying to solve in his own way. Without going into the formula, at that time our amendment provided that a State could use the funds appropriated for education purposes in any way that would be legal and constitutional within the State.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Such a provision would move in the same direction.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think the Senator will recall the amendment. It met with some opposition, in that most States prohibit the use of such funds for private schools. In my State the prohibition is contained in the State constitution. I believe in the State of South Dakota such a prohibition is also in the constitution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We thought a State should, regardless of the formula, be able to use the money appropriated in any way that would be legal and constitutional within the State. I did not proposed such an amendment to the present bill because perhaps conditions have changed. But at that time the argument was made by someone in a State that prohibited the use of funds for private schools that he did not want to contribute money to the Federal Treasury which in turn would be used in a State that did not prohibit such use. That was almost a minor consideration, considering the number of States that limit the use of such funds for public schools, as the bill actually proposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I wish to develop one thought a little further. It relates to the discussion between the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] with respect to the source of the proposed funds.

I do not accept the proposition that money which is collected in Pennsylvania from income taxes is Pennsylvania income.

I do not accept the proposition that all money collected from income taxes in New York is New York income.

I know full well that the money which corporations pay as their income tax is collected from all over the country. I know that the Connecticut insurance companies make profits on policies written in South Dakota. I know that one Connecticut insurance company makes a great many farm loans in South Dakota, and I assume such companies make some money on those loans. I assume they pay some corporation taxes as a result.

I know that the automobile companies that pay their corporation tax in Michigan make their money largely from States all over the Union.

So far as I know, the Senators from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA and Mr. HART], have never been so provincial as to deny the legitimacy of some appropriations for the benefit of the entire country. I am sure Senators from other States, when they consider the statement, will agree to the proposition that New York, Equitable, Metropolitan, and other insurance companies, which make money all over the Union, ought to recognize, and do recognize, that some of the money they receive is earned in States other than the ones in which taxes are paid.

I represent a State which is doing what it can for education. If the table which was printed in the RECORD the other day at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is examined, it will be found that 4 percent of the income in my State is expended for education. I think the highest percentage of any State in the Union was 4.1 percent. The average is only 2.7 percent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] alluded to the property tax. The other day I made a list of the personal property of the Case family. I noted that the taxes were to be levied on the basis of a valuation of 70 percent of the market value. This is fairly close to the figure mentioned by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], 75 percent, I believe, of the true market value. We pay at that rate. The property tax on a house which I owned in my hometown was double, in effect, in actual dollars and cents, to the tax on a comparable house in the city of Washington.

We try to meet our educational responsibility. Yet, with all our endeavor, we are rated nearly at the bottom of the list of States with regard to the payment of teachers' salaries, an unfortunate fact. One reason for this situation is that we do not receive the benefit of the corporate income tax on income earned in South Dakota but paid in other States. Standard Oil Co. of Indiana sells much gasoline in South Dakota. The corporate income tax on those sales is paid in Indiana. The automobile tax is paid in Michigan. Some of the tobacco tax we pay is credited to companies in North Carolina. We could go through the gamut of operations today.

The principal railroads in my State are the Chicago and Northwestern; the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific; and the Chicago, Burlington, and Quincy. They pay their corporate income tax in the State of Illinois, and Illinois is boosted in its rating as a high income State.

The question is not one of largess. We do not wish pity. We are not mendicants to these other States when we say that a portion of the money that is paid in corporate income taxes in the so-called wealthy States should be used to defray the educational expenses of children whose families are responsible for the business that earns corporate incomes.

There is a basic difference in the approach to this question. That is why I

have not felt we should base a Federal-aid-to-education bill on an endeavor to level off things by saying "Here is a low income State. There is one in the gutter. We will take some money out of the Treasury and hand them a largess, a gift, or a grant."

I have said that the proposed legislation should be based on a return to the States of a fair share—what the Treasury can afford—of the income tax. It should be apportioned on the basis of the number of children, because the number of children to educate is the primary consideration.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I repeat that if it is provincial for me to have the point of view I stated, I hope that more money will return to the provinces and remain there. But I am making the point that Pennsylvania, under the aid-to-education bill, would pay $3 for every $2 it would receive back. I am not playing the third man theme, but I am playing the third dollar theme; and as to that third dollar, Pennsylvania taxpayers have a right to know where it would go and what would be done with it.

I do not like some of the proposals that have been made as to what should be done with the third dollar contributed by the people of my State, and which they would not receive back. I would like to see some government power go back home anyway, especially in connection with proposals of this kind.

I should like to address a question to the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the floor leader of the bill. It seems to me it is of the greatest importance that whatever agency—in this case the Commissioner of Education—may carry out legislative authority, the officials of that agency should clearly understand the congressional intent at the time the authority was granted. What I would like to ascertain, if the Senator will help me, is the intention of the proponents and the framers of the proposed legislation so far as the allotment of funds to States having segregated schools is concerned. Does the Senator, as floor leader of the proposed legislation as it is now before the Senate believe that, without consideration of the amendment, the bill would permit the Commissioner of Education to allot funds to segregated schools?

Mr. MORSE. The bill in its present form would authorize and direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to allot the funds to States in accordance with the formula of the bill.

It has nothing at all to do with segregation. The Secretary has made very clear, in his letter to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], that in his opinion he has no authority to withhold funds from any State on the basis of the segregation matter; that the bill provides for the distribution of funds in accordance with the formula set out in the bill.

I wish to say again, because I do not want anyone to have any doubt as to my position on the bill, that this is a bill which has no civil rights provision in it in any form whatever.

Mr. SCOTT. If a State making application fulfills the conditions of section 110(a) but practices and officially announces a promulgated policy of segregation, does the Commissioner then have the power to withhold funds?

Mr. MORSE. No, he does not, in my opinion, any more than we have withheld funds under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. What in the world do Senators think would happen if it were suggested that we adopt the Bush amendment in respect to Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. When I say this, let me say to my friend from Pennsylvania that I yield to no one in my desire to proceed with amendments to the civil rights laws of this country. I do not believe in proceeding on the civil rights issue on a segmented basis, bill by bill. If the Senator wishes to have my view, the first step is to amend Rule XXII. That is the first step. The majority leader has told us today that he will get that issue before us before we adjourn. When we get Rule XXII amended, then we can proceed very effectively with amendments to the civil rights law. Then we can find out from the Department of Justice, for example, what legislation the Department of Justice believes would be helpful in speeding up the integration of our school system. Then we can find out from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare what legislation they believe would be helpful in carrying out their statutory obligations.

If we proceed on a piecemeal basis, the legislative process being what it is, we will kill the proposed legislation now before the Senate. I believe it is very important to get on the statute books some legislative principles in regard to Federal aid to education. The pragmatic approach to this problem is to enact the pending bill without any amendments added to it, whether it be the Bush amendment or the Keating amendment or the Goldwater amendment for private schools, or any of the other amendments which bring up ancillary issues in regard to which we all have very deep-seated convictions. I am violating no conviction of mine today; nor did I in 1949, when I spoke out against the so-called civil rights amendment to what was then the Bricker-Cain amendment to the housing bill. I will defend my position before any meeting of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored people anywhere in this country. We build roads a foot at a time, not 10 miles at a time. We build them inch by inch. I used a figure of speech earlier this afternoon, and I repeat it now. I wish to build a bridge across the abyss. I do not want to try to jump it and fall down. If we try to make the Bush amendment jump today, we are all going to take the schoolchildren of America down with us into the abyss. We will not get a Federal-aid-to-education bill if we do that. That is the pragmatism of the situation.

Therefore I urge that the Senator join with me in support of the bill as it is, without the Bush amendment, without the Keating amendment, without the Goldwater amendment. Let us get this bill on the books. Then let us join forces in trying to improve the civil rights laws of the country, after we get rule XXII amended.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield me some additional time?

Mr. BUSH. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon, in order to help us establish the legislative history of the measure, advise me whether in his opinion without the Bush amendment there is any provision in the bill under which Federal funds can be withheld from segregated schools?

Mr. MORSE. Not from public schools in the South.

Mr. SCOTT. I am fully aware of the Senator's interest in civil rights and of his argument here as a pragmatic argument, but as I see it, what the Senator is in effect saying is that because he cannot do justice in this matter, in which the Senator and I both want to do justice, since the Senator feels he cannot do justice and get the bill passed, he would get the bill passed and hope to do justice later through other legislative procedures.

Mr. MORSE. I understand what the Senator has in mind. The bill will do great justice in its present form. It does justice to millions of little boys and girls in this country who ought to get some Federal aid. They will get it if my bill is passed. They will not get a bit of it if the bill is defeated. That is progress. I do not want to bore the Senator, but to protect my own legislative record I wish to take a minute to read a few paragraphs of the speech I made on the floor of the Senate on April 21, 1943.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. MORSE. On my own time now I read:

I am concerned also, Mr. President, with this sort of parliamentary strategy as represented by the Bricker amendment in connection with other great pieces of social legislation to be voted upon during this session of Congress. I mention one for illustration purposes. I say that if it is proper to attach this type of amendment to the particular bill now pending before the Senate, the same parliamentary strategy can and probably would be used in connection with Federal-aid-to-education legislation. By such a parliamentary device an attempt could be made to defeat a bill for Federal aid to education. The use of such civil rights amendments to various pieces of social legislation would not solve the great civil rights issue which confronts this Congress but would succeed in defeating needed social legislation so that we can get ourselves into a better position to win the civil rights fight.

As a member of the board of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People I wish to say here this afternoon, Mr. President, that I completely disagree with the officers of that association in respect to their request that we vote for the Bricker amendment. I am satisfied that a vote for the Bricker amendment is not in the interest of the colored people or in the interest of advancing civil rights legislation through the Senate of the United States.

I feel the same way this afternoon with regard to the proposed legislation now before the Senate. I believe that time has proved me right. We have a chance to do something for the schoolchildren of America. Then I would like to join with the Senator from New York and the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Pennsylvania in an all-out fight to improve our civil rights legislation by amending the civil rights laws.

I close by asking Senators to keep in mind, of course, that the obligation of the Federal Government in regard to the enforcement of the 14th amendment—that is what the discussion is all about—has nothing to do with the proposed legislation now before the Senate. There is still the responsibility resting upon the Federal Government to enforce the 14th amendment. The segregation practices of the South are in violation of the 14th amendment.

What I believe we need to do is to keep these two issues separate and distinct—the issue of passing needed Federal aid to education legislation, and the duty of the Federal Government to use all its available processes to see to it that all citizens enjoy and are protected in their rights under the 14th amendment.

If the Federal Government needs some enforcement legislation to be added to the civil rights laws now on the statute books to carry out that objective, I will join in seeking to pass amendments to those laws.

However, as in 1949, so in 1961 I am not going to join in adding a civil rights amendment to a piece of very much needed social welfare legislation, in this instance Federal aid to education. In principle I favor civil rights legislation, but I believe our legislative approach to civil rights ought to be limited to the amendment of civil rights laws, and that we should not adopt amendments such as this, which would result in denying to the school children of America Federal aid to education in the year 1961. I have already said I have no question about the sincerity of the Senator from Connecticut. But while I am not a higher mathematician, I can count political noses when it comes to votes on the floor of the Senate.

I think it would be a calamity to adopt the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to ask the Senator a question. The Senator read, the other day, a letter from Secretary Ribicoff, which said in part——

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York permit me to interrupt him, to verify a statement I made earlier this afternoon, when I relied on my recollection? I made the statement in fairness to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. It was suggested that the civil rights amendment to the 1949 housing bill was the Bricker-Capehart amendment. I stated that my recollection was that it was the Bricker-Cain amendment. I have checked the RECORD, which I have just read, and it was the Bricker-Cain amendment. In fairness to the Senator from Indiana, I think the RECORD should show that I was correct in my recollection. It was the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Bricker, and the Senator from Washington, Mr. Cain, who proposed the so-called Powell amendment to the housing bill of 1949.

I apologize to the Senator from New York for interrupting him. Now we will start all over.

Mr. KEATING. That is perfectly all right. The other day, the Senator from Oregon read a communication from Secretary Ribicoff which said, in part: "In my opinion, neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority," meaning authority to withhold funds from any State because of the segregation of schools within that State. Unless the Senator has already specifically stated it, I should like to ask him whether he agrees with that legal conclusion of Secretary Ribicoff.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I agree with it. The Attorney General of the United States, as the Senator well knows, has been very much occupied in recent days. However, a request has already been made to the Attorney General to advise, if he will, in regard to the position of the Department of Justice. He need not; I think he will.

I shall continue to ask for such advice from the Department of Justice, because if there is any one thing I always insist on doing, it is to try to get for my colleagues in the Senate, both those who are with me on a bill and those who are opposed to me, every operative fact which I think will be helpful to them in forming their final judgment; always believing and hoping that any Senator would be willing to change his mind on any issue in the last 5 minutes of debate if an operative fact can be presented to him which shows that his previous course of action was a mistaken one. It is very important to every Senator that we get from the Department of Justice, if we can get it from the Department of Justice, its opinion concerning the question which the Senator from New York has just asked me.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I agree with him that it would be highly desirable to get the opinion of the highest law enforcement officer of our Nation on this particular question.

I wish to pursue one point. I know the Senator from Oregon is of a sufficiently open mind to recognize that there are those who sincerely feel that the legal conclusion reached by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is wrong. If the Department of Justice and the Attorney General render a contrary opinion, I believe that it might be persuasive with the Senator from Oregon. Let me pursue that one step further.

Does not the Senator agree that it is clear that the President of the United States could, by Executive order, direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold such funds?

Mr. MORSE. I am too careful a lawyer to "curbstone" on the floor of the Senate in answer to that question. It so happens that a part of my inquiry to the Department of Justice goes also to the question of the executive authority and power of the President. I would not in any way duck the question; the Senator will get an answer from me after I have given the question further study and have had the benefit of my counsel in the matter, and he is the Senator's counsel, too; he is the counsel for all of us, namely, the Attorney General. I should like to read the opinion on this matter before I commit myself.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's comment. I simply add that I believe such authority to issue an Executive order is clear; and that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be bound by such an order.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have listened very carefully to the debate both by the able Senator from Connecticut and the able Senator from Oregon and other Senators. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind, as I look back through the years and consider what happened many years ago in the House of Representatives, what will happen if this amendment is attached to the bill. The House then was considering a housing bill. An amendment containing the civil rights aspect of legislation was added to the bill. The amendment was legal. It was moral. It was just in principle. Then, as we did in our younger days, we hoped to move forward. The vote was a teller vote. I voted for it. The amendment was adopted. That was in the 80th Congress. What happened? It killed the housing bill.

We are now considering an amendment offered by the able Senator from Connecticut. It is legal. It is moral. It ought to be in the law. However, for the first time in 14 years, based upon my own experience, I see an opportunity to pass a Federal aid to education bill. If we include the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut, not because it is not right, not because it is not just, we will do the same thing that was done to the housing bill 12 or 13 years ago.

That is the practical side of the question. Do not ask why these things are practical. It is within the knowledge of every Senator who has had legislative experience to understand the true nature of this truism.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for an observation?

Mr. CARROLL. I do not have the floor.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator from Connecticut will let the Senator from Colorado finish his statement, I shall then be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I have been impressed by the debate today. If I were to follow the dictates of my conscience from the standpoint of principle—and I have been a fighter for and a supporter of civil rights as much, I believe, as any other Senator—within my limited experience——

Mr. MORSE. I verify the Senator's statement; the record demonstrates it.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. When I consider the devastating effect of this amendment, the question is not what it will do for civil rights in 15 States, it is not what it will do for Federal aid to education in those States, but what it will do for the schoolchildren of the entire Nation. No matter how well intentioned the amendment is, it will destroy the bill. This is the first time I have spoken on the bill. I now feel it will be necessary from now on to consider every amendment carefully, no matter how conscientiously it is offered, no matter how sound it is in legal principle or on a moral basis. Now is the time we shall have to be on watch. I say to the able Senator in charge of the bill that we must make certain that the bill is not scuttled. More than a civil rights amendment is at issue. Mr. J. Edgar Hoover said recently that crime is costing our Nation $22 billion. Let us consider the situation in Washington. I ask the Senator from Oregon: Will the benefits of the bill flow to the District of Columbia?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Will the children of the District of Columbia benefit by the bill?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, although not enough. The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] and I discussed that point earlier.

Mr. CARROLL. If we expect to reduce crime, improve the mentality of the children, and support a strong educational system, we must realize that most of the elements of crime are a result of social disorder—crime is, partly, a symptom of social disease—a lack of intelligent understanding, a lack of character, a lack of proper environment.

The bill is only a small step forward in a critical period of American history.

One other question has bothered me. Let us assume that in Virginia, Georgia, or any other State, the State board of education does not approve a school district which is integrating its program. Could the State withhold funds from that school district?

Mr. MORSE. The money will go to the State. Once the money has gone to the State, the State will have control of it. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have no control of it. But, I point out to the Senator from Colorado, that is limited to the administration of the bill; it does not in any way limit the Federal Government with respect to other Federal powers it may have in connection with enforcing the guarantees of the 14th amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, it has nothing to do with the educational criteria of a State?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. I should think, as I read the provisions of that section of the bill, that the school board may be entitled to a hearing.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct; it is entitled to a hearing.

Mr. CARROLL. Before what group will it be entitled to a hearing—the State board of education?

Mr. MORSE. The State board of education.

Mr. CARROLL. These are conditions which I think are reasonable but do not constitute Federal control.

Mr. MORSE. Some of us do not like all the results, in effect, of this guarantee of State control of education, so far as the granting of Federal funds for education is concerned. But, as I said earlier, we simply cannot have this both ways. Either we must keep faith with the people of the country by presenting a bill which removes entirely any Federal restriction on education, or we must say we have some gimmicks in the bill.

I am proud to be the floor leader in consideration of a bill which in my judgment does not contain a single legislative "gimmick." This measure is a forthright, honest bill. In dealing with this subject, we wish to incorporate into law the principle of general Federal aid to education; and we want to say to the States, "Many of you have some horrible educational problems, and we want to help you, with money."

When all is said and done, this is a money bill, one which for the first time authorizes the Federal Government to make money available to the States, by means of a general aid-to-education bill, so as to help them with their school problems.

The fact that some civil rights problems may be raised in connection with this program or this activity has nothing to do with the Federal aid to education bill. Instead, it has to do with the civil rights law which already is on the statute books, or it has to do with the authority of the White House and the Department of Justice to see to it that there is uniform application of the 14th amendment to the people in all the States, regardless of race, color, or creed. But it has nothing to do with an education bill. So if we can keep these two in separate departments, we shall have less trouble, here on the floor, in having the Senate reject amendments which seek to join the two, and thus we shall have less trouble in having the bill passed.

I hope the bill will be passed soon, this week. Likewise, I hope to be successful in pleading that aid to education not be confused with civil rights matters or with private school matters.

So my plea is that Senators permit this bill to be passed without the adoption of any civil rights amendment or any private school amendments; and then let us take up the separate problem of legislation needed in the field of civil rights in order to make the existing civil rights law meaningful and in order to give the White House and the Department of Justice whatever aid they say they need in order to enforce those constitutional guarantees.

But I plead with the Senator to give me his help—and I know he will do so—so that the Senate will be able to pass this aid-to-education bill, without having it encumbered by the addition of civil rights amendments.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say that the able Senator from Oregon has given excellent leadership here on the floor in connection with this aid-to-education bill, and no one has been able to state the issue more clearly than he has stated it. Certainly this is an aid-to-education bill, not a civil rights bill. Although under existing circumstances the bill cannot be administered as equitably as I should like to see it administered, I cannot favor the inclusion in this bill of an amendment which would, as a practical matter, prevent the taking of this forward step.

If, later on, Senators submit amendments which I think will aid or improve the aid-to-education bill, I shall reserve my judgment on them until I see them.

But I do not wish to have the fight for civil rights confused with the fight for the giving of aid to education, although I recognize that they are rather closely related or intermingled. But here we have, for the first time in 14 years, an opportunity to enact a bill in the field of aid to education.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Colorado said this is the first time in 14 years——

Mr. CARROLL. It is the first time in 14 years that we have had an opportunity to succeed in having such a bill passed and enacted into law.

Mr. BUSH. Yes, and thus it is the first time in 14 years that the Senate has had a real opportunity to pass a reasonable, decent integration measure.

This amendment is directly in point in connection with the aid to education bill, because the amendment simply provides that no element of the population may be discriminated against in connection with the use of these tax dollars. This is the first time we have had a chance to vote for such a measure, which is not mandatory. The amendment housing bill to which the Senator referred was mandatory; but this amendment is not mandatory. It simply gives the Commissioner and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare considerable discretion in connection with the use of these funds; but they must be used and the decisions must be made in such a way as to promote the cause of desegregation. That is all.

Let me say this is the most reasonable civil rights measure I have seen during my service here in the Senate.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I do not question for a moment the integrity of the Senator from Connecticut in submitting the amendment; and if I thought the amendment could be incorporated in the bill and the bill as thus amended could be passed, I would go along 100 percent with the Senator from Connecticut.

But any Senator who has served here for very long and has observed such fights—and especially the junior Senator from Colorado, who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, where there have been many hard fights in connection with such legislative matters; and

I say this also in view of my experience in both the Senate and the House of Representatives—knows that I am accurate when I say that if this Bush amendment is added to the bill, the bill will be killed. Any Senator who believes that the addition of the Bush amendment to the Federal aid to education bill will not kill that bill is smoking questionable tobacco from a peculiar pipe or else is floating on cloud No. 9.

Mr. MORSE. Or is not realistic.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes. I have seen these discouraging developments over the years.

Personally, I should like to have the bill broadened. I have been reading the various amendments, including that of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]; and I have heard rumors about other amendments which I should like to see included. But I warn now that Senators should be careful about the inclusion of any such amendments, especially amendments submitted by Senators who do not wish to see the bill enacted.

Perhaps I may ask whether the Senator from Connecticut wishes to see this bill passed.

Mr. BUSH. No, I certainly do not. I made that clear last Thursday and Friday, and I made clear my reasons. I also made clear, in answer to questions asked by the Senator from Illinois, that when I find there is an opportunity to improve a bill in such a way as to result in an advance in civilization—and we now have such an opportunity—I shall seize it, regardless of whether I like the bill or do not like it.

As I said last Friday, I think the bill will pass; and, therefore, I should like to see it in as acceptable a form as it can possibly be in. I do not believe that the Senator from Colorado believes that is a bad practice.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I never question motives. I think the Senator from Connecticut is offering a fine amendment. But I hope it will be offered on another occasion; and when that fight occurs, I shall be there.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator to the fact that the time available for debate on both the amendment and on the bill is limited. So if the Senator and his friends will accept the amendment, there will be no question that the bill will be filibustered.

Mr. MORSE. Only the time available for debate on the amendment is limited.

Mr. BUSH. I thought unanimous consent had been given to have a limitation on the time available for debate on both the amendment and the bill.

Mr. MORSE. No. Will the Senator from Connecticut help me obtain such an agreement?

Mr. BUSH. Certainly.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his excellent presentation this afternoon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado, from the bottom of my heart, for the very fine contributions he has made to the debate. They will be very helpful to the bill.

Let me also thank the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. He has been very cooperative and very helpful to me. It is only fair that I now proceed to yield some of the time available to those who oppose the amendment. I imagine that the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Iowa wish to make certain points in connection with the recent debate. Therefore, I shall be glad to yield now to Senators who may wish to speak in opposition to the amendment.

I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon to yield for 1 minute so I may make a statement.

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator on my time.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps I have an old-fashioned concept of what is practical and pragmatic. With respect to what the Senator from Oregon, and particularly the Senator from Colorado, have said, I venture the opinion that, instead of being practical and pragmatic by leaving the amendment out of the bill, we are being impractical and unpragmatic. It will not be practical for this country to deny minority rights; and minority rights will be forfeited unless the amendment is adopted.

It seems to me that in his argument the Senator from Oregon has said that we must enact a bill such that thousands of little schoolchildren will have the benefit of the bill, even though perhaps not as many thousands of schoolchildren will not receive benefits.

I say to the Senator, with all respect, that it seems to me that the thousands of little schoolchildren who would not receive the benefits of the bill are the minority, whom we ought to protect. If we in this body do not protect minority rights, we shall have lost a great cause, and we shall no longer be practical and pragmatic.

Mr. MORSE. I say, respectfully, that if we follow the course suggested by the Senator, we will not help the Nation. If we follow the course of action I am suggesting, we will establish a principle. This is not the last inning in the ball game. There will be another time at bat. We shall take up other amendments to advance the cause of minority rights. I think we are helping minority rights, if we succeed in passing the bill in both Houses and having it signed by the President, when we establish the principle. Once we place on the statute books the principle of general Federal aid to education, we shall be able to protect minority rights in this country much more rapidly than I think is implied and envisioned by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senators from Montana, Maine, and New York, I must leave the Chamber for a few moments for a conference which I have been called to attend. The ranking member of my subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], will serve in my place. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] would like to have 5 minutes, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] would like to have 8 minutes, and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] would like to have 10 minutes. If it meets with the pleasure of Senators, I should like to suggest that time be released to them in that order.

I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Montana, and I ask my friend from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] to favor me by taking over my position of floor leader for the bill until I can return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I asked for this time to set the RECORD straight in regard to the discussion of the senior Senator from Pennsylvania a few minutes ago. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania put into the RECORD a list of 15 States and said that in his opinion all those 15 States would be deprived of any aid under the bill if the Bush amendment were agreed to.

In an earlier colloquy, the Senator from Connecticut made the statement that he felt the amendment which is pending would give a good deal of flexibility to the Secretary or to the Commissioner; that in some instances there would be some recalcitrant districts, but that the money would go to the States and there would have to be a determination on the part of the Secretary or of the Commission as to whether, in the balance of all the situations and all the conditions, the money should be given to the State—whether there was a good faith compliance with the constitutional requirement.

I cannot let the debate go further without saying that under the amendment, in my opinion all the 15 States would not be deprived of aid and assistance. I believe therein is the very mischief of the amendment. The amendment would create such a condition of chaos and uncertainty insofar as the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education is concerned that it would be very difficult to determine the situation in each instance. The Secretary would have to make a determination, and then the money would go to the States. The States would then have to distribute the money in accordance with the provision set forth on page 14 of the bill; that is, to the neediest districts for school construction and to the neediest districts for teachers' salaries.

With all due respect to the Senator from Connecticut, I point out that this is not the first time in 14 years that there has been an opportunity to attach this provision to a school bill. Public Laws 814 and 874 provide money which does not go to the States but goes to the individual school districts. Each individual district must make an application to the Commissioner of Education, to the Office of Education, for the impacted-area money. The bills to renew those laws have come before the Senate every 2 or 3 years. I respectfully submit that the proper place for the amendment is not in title 1 of a bill which is the beginning of a general aid program, but in title 2, for a program which has been in effect for 10 years and is going forward. It should not be attached to a program providing for aid to the States, to be distributed to the States, but instead to a program which can be pinpointed to the individual districts.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I point out to the Senator that we are talking about a new program, a program to affect primary and secondary schools.

Mr. METCALF. Public Law 874 affects primary and secondary schools.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator is talking about impacted areas.

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator wishes to join me in proposing an amendment on that phase of the bill, I shall be glad to join in that effort also.

Mr. METCALF. I do not wish to have the amendment on any phase of the bill. I submit that this is not the first time in 14 years that the opportunity has been offered. There has been an opportunity to pinpoint the districts every time Public Laws 815 and 874 have been renewed and continued by the Congress.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator may differ with me in judgment about the 14 years and about the first opportunity. I made that assertion. I make it again because of the moderation of the amendment, because of the fact that it would go to a primary and secondary school bill, which is directly in point. It would give us the best opportunity which has appeared in 14 years to move forward in connection with desegregation of schools. That is way I say, and on the face of it I think it is true.

Mr. METCALF. My whole point is——

Mr. BUSH. If the Senator will think back, when amendments of this nature have been considered before they have been mandatory in their provisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The 5 minutes yielded to the Senator from Montana have expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, does the Senator from Montana desire additional time?

Mr. METCALF. No.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Maine. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Oregon allotted me 8 minutes, I believe.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to a discussion of the so-called Bush amendment. I am certain that all the elements and arguments on each side of the issues created by the amendment have been discussed. I can add nothing to them. More than that, I doubt that I could state them as well.

However, because of my concern about the two objectives which are involved—Federal aid for education and civil rights—I feel I should make my position clear at this point in the RECORD.

The so-called Bush amendment presents an issue which is very simply stated. Should we try to advance the cause of integration in our public schools by tying it to the cause of Federal aid for public schools?

In other words, should we require that these two horses, if they run, run harnessed together, or should we permit them to run separately?

Those who support the amendment may include the following:

Those who honestly believe this to be an effective and proper way to advance the cause of integration.

Those who honestly believe that such Federal aid, without an integration string tied to it, would delay the integration of public schools in the South.

Those who oppose such Federal aid and who see in this amendment an effective obstacle to passage of the bill.

Those who oppose both objectives and would like to defeat them both by uniting them.

Those who, confident that the Bush amendment will not be adopted, see a delightful opportunity to force advocates of integration on the Democratic side to vote against that objective.

I suppose that each of these motivations, and others, might be justified, depending upon one's point of view as to when the end justifies the means. And I concede that idealists and cynics can be found on either side of almost any question.

As one who wholeheartedly supports both objectives—both integration and Federal aid—I would like to briefly state my reasons for opposing the Bush amendment. I address my remarks particularly to those who support both causes, who believe that both can be advanced by uniting them in this bill, and who may believe that the cause of integration may be delayed if this is not done.

Over the years, opposition to Federal aid has come from all areas of the country, from groups differing in many ways from each other, and for varying reasons and combinations of reasons. There can be differences of opinion as to which of these has been most influential in achieving the result. The fact is that the combined opposition has been successful. If the result is to be changed, the opposition must be reduced by enough to reduce it to a minority status in both Houses of the Congress.

The ranks of the opposition have included the following formidable groups:

First. Those who believe that Federal school money should be used as a club to force public school integration in the South.

Second. Those who fear that Federal school money will be used as a club to force public school integration in the South.

The existence of either of these sources of opposition insures the existence of the other. If both exists, without substantial reduction in their ranks, they can defeat the bill. That is a result which, in my honest judgment, can be avoided only by eliminating the issue from the bill.

It seems to me that those of us who pursue the goal of integration must consider three possible results:

First. Passage of the school bill with an integration rider. I have indicated that, in my judgment, this is not a reasonable possibility, desirable as it might seem. We then must consider the second possible result.

Second. Defeat of the school bill with an integration rider. In my judgment, this is an almost inevitable result if the rider is approved. In that event, how is the cause of integration served? Such a result would generate resentment among many, who believe in the cause of Federal aid. If that cause is right, the defeat will delay an improvement in educational standards for children of all creeds, colors, and racial and national backgrounds. Such a delay will further postpone the day when enlightened self-interest, generated and developed in an educational system of the highest attainable standard, will promote the cause of equality in all areas of the country.

Finally, there is the third possibility.

Third. Enactment of a Federal school aid bill without the integration rider. Surely, this is a cause great enough to warrant attention on its own merits. Further, if, as we have been taught to believe, education is the foe of ignorance, and fear, and prejudice, its advancement will constitute a victory for the cause of integration as well.

Mr. McNAMARA. The Senator from New York requested some time. I yield 10 minutes to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the decision to be made on the amendment is not an easy one, particularly for those, including myself, who have been ardently fighting for civil rights for many years, in good seasons and out, and under trying conditions in this Chamber, as well as throughout the country and, in my case, in the other body as well.

But it seems to me there is one simple test which, when applied to the amendment, should resolve the question for those who feel as do the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], many others, and I myself. The test is, if the amendment is agreed to, will the bill ever become law? Otherwise, it would obviously be a fatuous exercise. If the amendment is agreed to, the bill would never become law. Then there must be some other purpose which it will serve.

Under these circumstances I do not have to make a prediction, based not solely upon my own judgment, but upon a very authoritative source. The new chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor in the other body, the very person whose name this type of amendment bears—ADAM CLAYTON POWELL—has himself said, "I will not interpose this kind of amendment because I am confident it will kill this legislation."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Possibly the Senator from New York was not in the Chamber when I tried to explain that the amendment was not to be compared to the Adam Clayton Powell type of amendment, which was a mandatory amendment. The amendment I have proposed, as the Senator will realize, I am sure, is not that type of amendment. I wanted to make that difference between the two types of amendment very clear. The amendment

is not a mandatory amendment. There is a great deal of discretion given to the administration in connection with the disbursing of funds. The Powell type of amendment would not give that discretion, but would simply forbid flatly the use of the funds.

Mr. JAVITS. When one speaks in terms of a "Powell type of amendment," I think that statement in itself answers the question. The question is one of degree. The Senator does not feel that the amendment is mandatory. I feel it has the same thrust, the same purport, if carried out in good faith, and so I call it the Powell-type amendment. But POWELL himself has said, "If any kind of antisegregation rider is attached to the measure, it will be killed."

That is why he said, "I am not going to do it." He added, "If someone else starts a chain reaction, I may have to join in. But I am not going to do it."

Under those circumstances I must decide whether I am for Federal aid to education. Deciding that I am, I come to the conclusion that even if I voted for the amendment, the result would be that it would never become law. Therefore, I have my choice, and it is not a very happy one. I have the choice of joining those who are opposed to the bill or joining those who are against the desegregation of public schools.

In either case, I shall be in very unhappy company so far as I am concerned, and so I had better do what, on judgment and principle, would at least accomplish one result, and at least that would be the inauguration of a program of Federal aid to education. I hope very much it will be clear in the procedure on the vote that we are not deciding the issue on a substantive basis, but that we shall show in the parliamentary situation we face that we are laying the issue aside. I hope very much that there will be a motion to table the amendment rather than to vote on the amendment in substance, because that is the only way we can show the country precisely what we are doing.

Mr. President, this is a most unhappy day to be discussing this question. We are under the shadow of events which are absolutely disgracing our country at home and abroad. We are under the shadow of events in which conditions of anarchy and disorder, in violation of the fundamental rights of Americans, have broken out in the sovereign State of Alabama. The President has had to send Federal officers to that State to protect or try to protect citizens in the exercise of their civil rights. There may have taken place the most outrageous violations of law, in terms of our penal statutes, in the destruction of the carriers of interstate commerce, through conspiracies to interfere with the exercise of the civil rights of individuals, perhaps by the highest officials in government.

Certainly this is hardly a day which is conducive to a detached review of the amendment, when literally we see a state of events which causes a sense of outrage to us as Americans.

Yet, that is why we are here. We are here notwithstanding the deep feelings which we have. I know everyone will take my word for the fact that I do feel very deeply about these tragic events. Notwithstanding those conditions, we still must keep our eyes on the ball. Right now the ball is the passage of a Federal aid to education bill. History has shown us that every time an amendment such as the one before the Senate has been attached to proposed legislation, it has resulted in the end of the bill.

Let us attain at least one objective. I know we cannot secure two objectives in the bill. That is, we cannot amend the bill with the proposed amendment and pass the bill, too. But I do not want to go away without anything. I want to get at least one objective. I do not want to end up with a blank.

Finally we all know that an amendment such as the one before the Senate can be added to any bill.

It does not have to be a Federal aid to education bill. It can go on any bill at any time we want to do it. There is no rule of germaneness in the Senate. Therefore, if it is unwise and prejudicial to load it on the pending bill, why load it on?

Finally, I disagree with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in his opinion, which he gave to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. I do not believe that we should permit the giving of funds to a school district which is in contempt of a Federal court order to desegregate its schools.

As a matter of fact, I do not believe that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will have to stand by this opinion, notwithstanding it is his opinion now. Therefore, I wish to state that I support and add my name to the amendment, the initiation of which comes from my colleague from the State of New York, Senator KEATING, which will involve us as individual citizens, in order to test out this question, to the extent that I have described. The Secretary's opinion is couched in very general terms. He says that he does not believe he can "withhold funds from any State because of the segregation of schools within that State."

That is quite different from standing in violation of a court order, because we know—and this is Hornbook law—the Constitution is not self-operative.

As the law stands now I have very little doubt that the Secretary could define his words—and he would not have to take them back—if he runs into the kind of situation I have described.

To make insurance doubly sure, however, I shall support the amendment which my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] will propose, in the way he will revise it. I believe that will button the matter up in the proper way.

Let us remember also that no matter what may be said in terms of the amendment's voluntariness, and its not being mandatory, as the Senator from Connecticut says, it is directed toward a whole State and relates to Federal aid to education in that whole State.

I have not held with those who believe that we can get integration or desegregation by educational processes alone. I emphasize the "alone." I also feel very deeply that if in this battle for civil rights we get tired of waiting for the administration to get on its horse, and do what it should do, that is, make civil rights legislation "must" legislation, giving it equal priority with other parts of its program, we can add civil rights legislation to any bill. I have done it, my colleagues have done it, and other Senators can do it. The question is whether we shall do it here and now to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I believe, also, that the whole educational system of the United States must be bucked up, and must be bucked up very materially, particularly in those very States which in my opinion in many respects have denied it in terms of the outlook in the United States.

I believe we need Federal law. I do not believe Executive action alone will succeed. President Kennedy, no matter how deeply interested he is in this subject—and I agree he is—and diligent and forceful, he must have legislation. He must stop appeasing the South and come to Congress and ask Congress to back this effort, as he has tried to do with Federal marshals.

That will not be made or unmade by what we do with the pending amendment. What will be made or unmade by the amendment is whether or not the Federal aid to education bill passes. At least in that connection I want to score on one, instead of scoring a zero on two.

In closing I wish to point out that the amendment which my colleague from New York will present is not to be described—of course my colleague understands that I am not trying to characterize it—as a Powell-type amendment. It will give authority to test whether the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are proceeding in accordance with the Constitution. As the law stands today, it is doubtful that a taxpayer could bring about a test unless we provide that authority.

Senator KEATING will explain his amendment. I wish to pay tribute to him for having thought up the idea for a most effective way in which to deal with the problem in terms of people like myself who want to get at least one thing nailed down, and that is by getting a bill for Federal aid to education. If we cannot get legislation right away, at this moment, on desegregation of the schools, I want at least to get one bill, if I cannot have both.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that suggestion for a moment. The junior Senator from New York has asked for some time. I will yield some time to the Senator from New York, if the Senator from Michigan will withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. McNAMARA. Does the Senator from Connecticut intend to yield some time to the Senator from New York?

Mr. BUSH. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my appreciation to my distinguished colleague from New York for the remarks he has made about the amendment which I have sent to the desk. Before closing my remarks I shall send to the desk a revised or modified version of that amendment.

I appreciate the support which my colleague accords to that proposal. I find myself, however, in difference with him, and with many other sincere proponents of the proposed legislation, in the field dealt with by our distinguished colleague from Connecticut. It is my intention to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

When this debate began, I was uncertain as to whether I would favor the inclusion of an express provision in this bill to prevent the use of Federal grants for racially segregated public schools. It is my view that even if the act is silent on this question, the executive department would be required by the overriding mandate of the Constitution to prevent any Federal funds from going to schools operating in defiance of the law of the land. At the same time I recognize that some support for this amendment will be motivated by a desire to defeat the bill, and I do not want any action of mine to suggest that I would favor any such obstructionists' objective.

It is one thing, however, to be silent on this issue in the hope that the requirements of the Constitution will be strictly adhered to in the administration of the statute. It is quite another thing, however, to be silent in the face of an explicit statement by the chief officer of the Cabinet department that he does not have any authority under the present language of S. 1021 to "withhold funds from any State because of segregation of schools within that State."

We are now clearly on notice that unless an amendment such as that offered by the Senator from Connecticut is included in S. 1021, or my amendment, we will be sanctioning the use of Federal funds collected from all over the country—and nearly one-fifth from New York—to reinforce the very policy which the Supreme Court has condemned.

It has been my opinion for some time that the official policy of open defiance of the decision of the Supreme Court has created an atmosphere of lawlessness in large parts of our country, and that this has bred a new kind of hoodlumism which preys on schoolhouses, churches, private homes, and, most recently, young citizens traveling by bus. Certainly I would not want the Senate to take any action which would contribute one iota of support to any such forces who are fighting against law and order. In that respect, I know that many Senators who share that viewpoint will vote against the amendment. However, we cannot close our eyes to the consequences which would flow inevitably from our refusal to write into the bill a specific prohibition of aid to schools which are not acting in good faith to comply with the law of the land.

Mr. President, 6 years ago the Supreme Court of the United States ruled that neither the States, under the 14th amendment, nor the Federal Government, under the 5th amendment, could constitutionally maintain schools segregated on grounds of race. Yet under the interpretation given by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and read to us by the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the bill, the Secretary would be unable to prevent the use of Federal funds for segregated schools, even though the Department of Justice might be involved at the same time in a suit to enjoin the use of State funds for such schools.

I do not agree with the legal opinion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is my hope that when the Senator from Oregon has been able to procure an opinion from the Attorney General, that opinion will not coincide with the opinion expressed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, in the absence from the bill of any provision for judicial review of a decision by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, there would be no one—absolutely no one—I repeat: no one—who could bring suit to enjoin the Attorney General from such a dispensing of Federal funds.

The difficulties which arise under the interpretation of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare are legion. They can all, however, be greatly clarified by the acceptance of the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. His amendment would put the Constitution, the courts, and the Federal and State Governments in a consistent alinement to block the use of Federal funds where constitutional principles are violated.

Let me recall for the Senate the position which the administration took with regard to Federal aid for parochial and private schools. The President himself, in a press conference on March 2, 1961, declared that Federal aid to religiously oriented schools could not even be debated, because such aid was clearly prohibited by the Constitution.

Mr. President, it is fair to ask, Is Federal support of racially segregated schools not even more clearly forbidden by the Constitution?

Upon the question of segregated schools, the courts have ruled emphatically and incontrovertibly, not once but several times. On the former question, of aid to religiously oriented schools, there have been few rulings, and the meaning is concededly open to many different interpretations. Certainly there is room for doubt. I, for one, do not believe that it can be shown that the courts have clearly ruled out Federal aid for private schools. But certainly there is no room whatever for doubt as to the court's view on the question of segregated schools. Why, then, is the administration so anxious to deny funds to private schools and to transmit them instead to racially segregated schools? Why is the administration so anxious to invoke the Constitution when its meaning is not clear, and so reluctant to invoke it when the meaning is crystal clear?

As I have said, I am not opposed to Federal aid to education on principle. I have repeatedly said that. I would not like to see a good bill defeated by obstructionist and irrelevant tactics. Since the Senate has declined to accept the amendment offered by my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], which, in my judgment, would have improved the formula in the bill. I am not sure that I shall support the bill when the amendment stage is finished. But I am not opposed to the principle of Federal aid to education.

In all honesty, however, I submit that no Senator should support any bill without a full awareness of its meaning and implications. The meaning and implications of this bill, as they have now been indicated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the principal senatorial advocates of the bill, are so far reaching that I believe we should pause to reconsider it. I trust that the bill will be amended to conform to the Constitution.

In my judgment, the Bush amendment is a step in the right direction. For that reason, I shall support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, may I have 5 minutes on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is advised that time has not been allotted on the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Then may I have 5 additional minutes on the amendment?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from New York. First, however, I commend the Senator warmly for the wonderful case he is making. I wish to associate myself with his remarks on the subject. I yield 5 additional minutes to him.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the statement of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, on Thursday of last week I offered an amendment, which has been referred to most kindly by my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], to provide for judicial review of any constitutional issues which may arise in the administration of the Federal aid to education bill. I have had a series of discussions in which several Senators have indicated an interest in the amendment, but a desire to have it somewhat revised. I have decided to revise the language of the amendment in a manner which, in my judgment, does not affect its basic purpose.

I send the revised amendment to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and myself.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I wish to add my name, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] that his name be added as a cosponsor. I ask that the amendment be ordered to lie on the table and be printed, and also to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed,

and will lie on the table; and without objection, it will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in order that the RECORD may contain an explanation of the amendment, the amendment would authorize civil actions to be brought by any taxpayer against the Commissioner of Education, to challenge any grant which it is alleged will be used in any manner which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

All such actions would have to be instituted in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia and would be subject to direct appeal to the Supreme Court. Provision is made for expediting the hearing and disposition of all such cases in order to avoid any undue interference with the operations of the act.

This is not a so-called Powell amendment. It is applicable to any constitutional issue which may arise in the administration of this statute. For example, it would permit a taxpayer's suit to be brought to test the validity of loans to nonpublic elementary schools, if provision for such loans is added to the bill.

The sole purpose of the amendment is to make certain that there is a judicial remedy for any violations of the Constitution under this statute. It is widely believed that the problem of preventing grants for unconstitutional purposes can be safely entrusted to the courts under the established law. This view is erroneous. The fallacy in it is that there is no procedure under the present law or court precedents by which an unconstitutional grant of Federal funds can be challenged in the courts. Under a number of precedents, in the absence of statute, taxpayers' suits cannot be brought against the Federal Government to enjoin the disbursement of Federal funds. This is a classic example of a constitutional wrong for which no constitutional remedy exists other than that which we may provide by express enactment.

Section 111(b) of S. 1021 already authorizes suits by any State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner of Education. This amendment would provide a remedy in the converse situation; namely, where a taxpayer objects on constitutional grounds to a grant to the State education agency.

EXHIBIT 1

On page 20, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 114. (a) Any citizen of the United States upon whose taxable income there was imposed an income tax under section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the last preceding calendar or taxable year and who has paid any part of such income tax, may bring a civil action against the Commissioner to restrain or enjoin him from making any payment under this Act which the plaintiff alleges will be used in any manner which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. No additional showing of direct or indirect financial or other injury, actual or prospective, on the part of the plaintiff shall be required for the maintenance of any such action.

"(b) Any action brought under subsection (a) of this section must be commenced within sixty days after the final decision of the Commissioner. Such action shall be brought in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Upon the commencement of such action the Commissioner shall file in the court the record of the proceedings upon which the determination complained of is based. The District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such action, and the court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and record of proceedings a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner. The findings of the Commissioner as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but all rulings of law, conclusions of law, and mixed conclusions of fact and law, shall be subject to unlimited judicial review. Any party to such action aggrieved by a final order entered therein by the district court shall be entitled to a review thereof by the Supreme Court through the filing in that court, within sixty days after the entry of that order, of an appeal therefrom. Any such action pending before any court for hearing, determination, or review shall be heard, determined, or reviewed at the earliest practicable time, and shall be expedited in every practicable manner. Any action instituted in accordance with this section shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office."

On page 20, line 5, in lieu of "114" insert "115".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I ask one of the Senators who is in charge of the time to yield to me?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Education and also as a member of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I wish to say that this subject was most intensively discussed and considered. On the amendment, there seemed to be pretty much of a division of opinion between Senators who wish to have a Federal aid to education bill enacted and Senators who oppose the enactment of such a bill.

Certainly many Senators who are devoted advocates of civil rights and civil rights legislation have a deep feeling that this is a time when we can win in this endeavor if we exercise the kind of self-discipline to which I referred in my previous remarks.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding this time to me.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan wish to request that the time required for the quorum call not be charged to the time available under the agreement?

Mr. McNAMARA. No, Mr. President. I am not requesting any special privileges or favors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then is it understood that the time required for the quorum call is to be charged to the time under the control of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. McNAMARA. Naturally; of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Very well.

The absence of a quorum has been suggested; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

INCIDENTS IN ALABAMA

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the 5 minutes which have been yielded to me on the amendment, I wish to speak briefly on the very tragic and unfortunate situation which exists in reference to the rioting and the violence which have occurred in Birmingham, Ala.

I desire to compliment the distinguished majority leader on what I consider to be one of the finest public statements I have ever heard from a public official concerning difficult and trying circumstances.

I join the majority leader and as I am sure, the vast majority of the American people do in commending the Attorney General—who is acting as the chief law-enforcement official of our country, and, of course, is acting in the name of the President of the United States—for his efforts to bring law and order to the area which has been afflicted with violence and disorder.

All of us call upon the responsible constituted officials—Federal, State, and local—to join in seeing to it that the violence and disorder are controlled and stopped.

It is a sad day for Americans when some of our citizens are set upon as if they were enemies or as if they were not even human beings. We have witnessed cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity. I submit that if the United States is going to suggest to other nations, such as Vietnam, nations in Latin America, and various other nations, that they must make social reforms before they will receive aid or cooperation from us, we must come with clean hands and we must make our country a proper example of social justice and freedom.

Instead, these incidents have made a mockery of our democracy and of our national purpose, for the outbreaks have evidenced disorder and violence unworthy of a great nation. This problem is not confined to any particular area; it is a national problem.

I know that the vast majority of the American people want to see this situation corrected at once.

Again we have exposed ourselves—revealed our weakness—to the entire world; and we must make amends. The only way we can do so is by calling upon all law-abiding citizens and self-respecting citizens to respect the law and the constitutional rights of our fellow citizens, and to give their support to the officials of our Government who are calling for observance of the law and the protection of our citizens.

I rise to support what I know has been a difficult, and yet a very necessary, decision on the part of the Federal administration, and, in particular, on the part of a courageous Attorney General. He surely has my best wishes and my unqualified support.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, speaking on the amendment before us, I want more education for the American people. I believe we need Federal aid to education; and I have a feeling that if this bill is encumbered with amendments which are highly controversial, which have as their purpose, ultimately, if not intentionally—and I impugn no one's motives—the division and destruction of support for a program of Federal aid to education, such amendments must be defeated.

It is not easy for those of us who have committed ourselves to a program of civil rights and human rights to vote to table an amendment which has on its face, as its alleged purpose, the protection of certain civil rights.

The courts of this land are designed to protect those rights, and the courts of this land will protect those rights. The office of the Attorney General is designed to protect those rights. There is unmistakable evidence today that the Justice Department acts promptly and courageously. We can expect such courageous action in the future.

I look for the time in the very near future when we shall be able to expand and extend the program for civil rights and we shall do this. I have been in the Senate 13 years. One of the first bills I was privileged to vote upon was a bill for Federal aid to education. That was in 1949. This is 1961. We have been working for, fighting for, hoping for, and promising Federal aid to education, and still we have very little of it. We have as in certain areas, the so-called impacted areas. I am proud that it was my privilege and opportunity to help author and pass Federal aid to education in areas where there are heavy Federal activities. I refer to Public Law 874 of the 81st Congress and Public Law 815, two laws sponsored by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from Minnesota. Under these laws we have provided over $2 billion in Federal aid. Such Federal aid has been to limited areas, and has been provided without Federal interference or domination, without any complaint. It is a successful program.

The bill presently before the Senate has in it those provisions of Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

So if the Senator from Oregon moves—and I have been told he may and that is, of course, within his discretion; he has been a courageous leader in managing the bill—to table this particular amendment, difficult as that decision is, I think the decision must be made to table it, and to have the bill go to the other body unencumbered. We need Federal aid to education and I am concerned that some amendments are being offered not to secure passage of the bill, but, in effect, to hinder such passage.

A program of Federal aid to education will stimulate the arts, sciences, and humanities, and will help build schools and assist teachers' salaries. In so doing we may very well do more for civil liberties and human rights than we could do with amendments which could only add to the difficulties we face in securing passage of this vital legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It disturbs me that some Senators who support the amendment which is before us are the same Senators who have never supported Federal aid to education. People can change their minds, of course, and we always welcome into the fold Senators who change their minds; but I appeal to them to help us pass the Federal aid to education bill.

I point out that there are those who disagree. I respect their judgment. There are Senators who have told me privately they could not go along. I understand their concern. My word is not a word of criticism. I am doing only what I believe to be proper under the legislative circumstances. I proceed, not on the basis of perfection or imperfection, but on the basis of what we should do to advance and secure progress in the field of aid to education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall yield myself such time as may be necessary to make a brief summary of my position.

After conference with Senators on my side of the aisle, I propose, after the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] finishes his final argument in support of his amendment, to move to lay his amendment on the table. I shall not do so until the Senator from Connecticut has concluded his argument. He is entitled to do it as a matter of right. I would extend him the opportunity to do so as a matter of courtesy if it were not a matter of right.

I shall not use all the remaining time at my disposition, because I have presented, in colloquy after colloquy on the floor of the Senate today, and on preceding days, my views, and my reasons for urging that the amendment be rejected. I think the most appropriate way to handle the situation is by way of a motion to lay on the table.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is praiseworthy in its intention. I object to it, not on the basis of content, but rather on the basis that it is offered to the wrong bill at the wrong time.

As I indicated during the hearings on S. 1021, I yield to no Senator on this floor in my strong belief in, and determination to fight for, my convictions in the field of civil rights. On page 153 of the hearings I said then, and I reaffirm now, the following:

> I shall oppose any civil rights amendment to this bill. To begin with, it is not a civil rights bill. It is an education bill. It seems to me most unfair to risk the defeat of this bill, and thereby jeopardize the educational interests of little boys and girls just because their elders enter a controversy over constitutional rights.
>
> The direct approach, so far as the Senator from Oregon is concerned, is a civil rights bill. I want the strictest enforcement of the Supreme Court decisions. I want an end to segregation in all schools in this country, and anywhere in this country, as rapidly as can be brought about by the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States. I shall offer, in due course of time, in this session, amendments to the civil rights bill, and to the civil rights law, which will bring that end about. I think such a procedure is the forthright, frank, and direct way to do it.
>
> Secondly, and I am through with this, we all know, no matter how sincere the motivations of some may be, that the addition of a civil rights amendment to this bill can be used for the dilatory purpose of defeating the public school aid bill. I do not think that to do this is fair to our boys and girls. I think we owe it to them to give them an opportunity to obtain an education in accordance with present practices until the Congress lives up to its responsibility by passing a civil rights bill which protects their constitutional rights.
>
> To my critics, I want to say that this is my philosophy on this matter. I do not yield to any of them, or to anyone else, in my record of stanch defense of civil rights in this country, but I am not going to be diverted from an educational bill by participating in defeating that bill through a dilatory tactic such as a civil rights amendment.

Mr. President, again, as set forth on pages 425 and 426, and again on pages 430 and 431 of the hearing record during the testimony of Mr. Clarence Mitchell, Director, Washington Bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, my position as set forth speaks for itself. I quote:

> I think Mr. Mitchell knows that I am always very pleased to have him before a committee. I am particularly pleased to have him here this morning because I know the responsibilities of the job he has before him, and I want to give him adequate time to present his case.
>
> The witness knows the present position of the thinking of the chairman of the subcommittee. I have always been most frank with the witness. As I said the other day, I yield to no one in the Senate in my support of civil rights legislation. I haven't always agreed with the witness as to what civil rights legislation ought to be passed, probably will not in this instance, but this record is before him and I want him to make his case and I want him to make his case irrespective of the views of the chairman.
>
> I happen to be one who can take it as well as give it. I want you to make the record, but you know my present position. I don't expect to change it; even though the witness

is a very persuasive man, I don't expect to change it. I do not think anything which could be called a civil rights amendment should be added to this bill. As I announced the other day, I stand ready and willing to fight just as hard as I can for amendments to existing civil rights laws. I think those laws are the place for the amendments. However, I respect differences in point of view, and this witness may be sure I am going to respect his difference in point of view if he has one, as I suspect he has.

The floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF CLARENCE MITCHELL, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON BUREAU, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

Mr. MITCHELL. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that suspicion is well founded, and I also would like to say that the record certainly ought to show that this witness has a respect and admiration for the Senator from Oregon that goes back beyond the period when he was a Member of the U.S. Senate. The Senator from Oregon has always stood for fairplay and for championship of the rights of the underdog as long as I can remember.

I am happy to say that I am on record in the Senator's State before his friends and before his critics as expressing my admiration for him and my belief that he is a real champion of the rights of man.

Senator MORSE. I have appreciated the statements you made to my State. I want to thank you for them.

Mr. MITCHELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MORSE. I think the insistence that you place upon the guarantee of full constitutional rights for all people, irrespective of the color of their skin, is a service to all Americans.

I always face up to the facts as I find them. I am always willing to change my view when the facts warrant a change in my view. I think you should know, as I said at the beginning of your testimony that it is my judgment that as a matter of promoting the best educational interests, in carrying out the old Benthamite theory of the greatest good for the greatest number in connection with this specific problem, that I should work as hard as I can for the passage of the administration's bill without a civil rights amendment added to it.

This does not mean, and I know it will be misunderstood by some, this does not mean that I am not an enthusiastic supporter of amendments to the existing civil rights law. I am. I intend to offer such amendments along with some of my colleagues, some of whom serve on this subcommittee, to the civil rights law later in this session of Congress. On the basis of the record made to date, Mr. Mitchell, I think I would be less than honest with you, if I didn't say I think it is my clear responsibility to seek to carry this bill through the Senate without the civil rights amendment to it. There is one reason for my position which I think, at the present time, is unanswerable.

I indicated the other day I am not a mathematician, but I can count congressional noses. I do not think, contrary to your opinion, that there is any chance of passing the administration bill with the civil rights amendment added to it. I think that failure would be most unfortunate, because our real need, in my judgment, is to get the principle of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education on the statute books of this country. We can then proceed, in independent legislation, to see to it that our educational program is carried out in accordance with the constitutional rights of all citizens.

This brings us to the question of the enforcement of the U.S. Supreme Court decisions. Enforcement procedure and policy ought to be clearly set out in separate independent legislation, because such legislation covers many facets of the civil rights problem which goes beyond the problem of education. I want an enforcement policy in independent legislation which covers the whole gamut of our civil rights enforcement problem.

Now, as far as I am concerned, we have an honest and sincere difference of opinion in regard to the legislative procedures which ought to be followed to accomplish the same end.

I respect your point of view. I trust, as I think I have a right to, that you and others in your group will at least give me credit for a sincere and honest difference of opinion with you as to the policy which ought to be followed in this instance.

Mr. MITCHELL. I certainly do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. President, I have read into the RECORD of the debate these excerpts from the hearings for two purposes. First, that there can be no misunderstanding of the position taken by the senior Senator from Oregon on this matter, and, second, to show that this position is understood and appreciated by the leadership of an organization which can claim to speak with authority for a very large segment of our Negro community.

I say, again, that the appropriate vehicle for civil rights attainment is a bill designed to strengthen the Civil Rights Act. I voted against the Civil Rights Act, because, in my judgment it was too weak. I shall fight with all my vigor to strengthen the act through amendment when a civil rights bill comes before the Senate, as I trust it will, during the present session of the Congress. But this is not the appropriate time, nor is it the proper bill for such amendment.

Let me say that I shall welcome the assistance of the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut when the right time and the right bill is on the floor. I will be found fighting shoulder to shoulder with him then.

As I have said before this afternoon, I think the place for a civil rights amendment is by way of proposed civil rights legislation. It can come after we have modified rule XXII, so that we may have some hope of the majority view prevailing in the Senate in the passage of an amendment to the existing civil rights law.

But what we are considering today is a Federal aid-to-education bill. If the amendment were to be adopted, it would kill the bill. The lives and the aspirations of far too many of our boys and girls of all creeds and color are far too precious for me to jeopardize them through any kind of educational crippling, which could result from the killing of the bill. Through an amendment such as the Senator proposes, these boys and girls could be educationally crippled to a degree, and the responsibility for it would rest with us in the Senate.

The amendment proposed suffers from a flaw. It is unnecessary in a public school bill. Why? There is a remedy now available, and it has been available since Brown against the Board of Education. The courts of the United States are available and willing to protect the civil rights of any man, woman, or child who seeks the protection of our Constitution. The amendment of the Senator is a work of supererogation as far as civil rights protection is concerned.

The amendment reveals a lack of faith in the American judicial process.

I fail to find the evidence, for example, to support the flat assertions on page 8485 of Friday's RECORD:

For, Mr. President, let there be no mistake, if the bill is passed, without an antidiscrimination amendment in it, it will indefinitely delay the integration of public schools in the South.

Or, again:

If S. 1021 is enacted without my amendment, it will be a permanent roadblock against integration of the public schools in those States.

To the contrary, I feel that by putting this principle of general Federal aid to education on the statute books of this country, we can speed up integration through the country. It can result in many children receiving the benefits of a raise in the standards of education. This is especially pertinent for those parts of the country where, at the present time, we are actually denying the development, to the greatest extent possible, of the intellectual resources of the children of those sections of our country.

The truth is that there is no need to denigrate the work of our Federal district courts. In community after community, they have shown both courage and diligence in furthering the implementation of the law of the land. Therefore, we need not go ahead of the courts and, in the process, provide a deadly stiletto to the education bill.

What says the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to such a proposal?

On pages 149 and 150 of our hearing record Secretary Ribicoff says, and I quote:

Secretary RIBICOFF. I would say this personally now, talking for myself. I would decry anything in this bill that would divert attention from the main provisions of this measure. I know, Senator JAVITS, that you are interested in education. I believe that you are for Federal aid to education. I am very anxious, and I know the President is very anxious to pass a Federal aid-to-education bill.

I would feel that we should avoid the insertion of any amendment in this legislation which would weaken its chances of passing. It would be my feeling that to place an amendment such as you indicate in this bill would definitely weaken the chance of passage of this bill.

Education is important throughout this Nation. It is important to further the education of children in the North, East, South, and West. I think we have a problem concerning whites and Negroes alike. It is my feeling that this bill will increase education opportunity for whites and Negroes alike in all the 50 States. It would be my deep hope that we would not have our friends to this, as well as the enemies of this bill, and I cannot urge with any more strength or passion my hope that there would not be introduced in either House such amendment—but of course the Senate and the House are in their own right to do so—any amendment which would cause the defeat of this bill.

I would hope the day is here when the Senate and the House of Representatives will have a clean and clear-cut vote—are you or are you not for Federal aid to education—not have placed in the measure such amendments which will divert from the issue and cause this bill to go down to defeat?

Senator JAVITS. Then the Secretary's view is based upon the practical question of action

in the Congress rather than upon any basis of principle?

Secretary RIBICOFF. Let me say this: As far as principle is concerned, Senator JAVITS, I believe in the decision of the Supreme Court of 1954. I believe it is legally correct and I believe that it is morally correct. It is my feeling that there are many problems facing the United States of America. There are problems facing us internationally and there are problems facing us nationally. There are problems that have an impact on each one of our citizens day in and day out in every conceivable field, and I can imagine no greater tragedy than to try to solve every problem facing America by trying to place every one of those problems on the back of education. We need education. Education is necessary. But if we try and solve all other problems on the back of education then education itself will fail.

It is my feeling that many of the problems we talk about can be solved with better understanding and better education will promote better understanding, and this is very, very important for all of us in America.

The problems of civil rights are problems that are going to have been solved by the Congress of the United States by facing up to its own responsibilities in the debate on this issue. It is going to have to be solved by decisions of the Supreme Court. It will have to be solved by legislators and Governors in all the 50 States. When I say all the 50 States I mean all the 50 States. Your own State of New York has civil rights problems in some of the communities on the outskirts of New York City. And it is going to take understanding by all the people of this country.

So I would feel that we could do no greater disservice for the future of education than to attempt through this bill to try to solve all our problems and in the process we fail and solve none.

So it isn't just a question of being practical, but it is also a question of principle, and it is very hard to separate them. Those of us who have been in public life understand the problems as they come in on one another. They are not mutually exclusive. Sometimes being practical is the best way to advance a principle.

What of other witnesses? Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers, on page 301 states:

Amendments to withhold Federal funds from States or local school districts for failure to desegregate schools have been used as vehicles to defeat legislation similar to this bill. We strongly recommend passage of S. 1021 without such extraneous amendments.

It is highly unfair to expect the schools to assume the major effort to enforce desegregation, which is a political, social, and economic problem pervading all aspects of society. The very education needed to reach solutions to this problem would be denied by withholding funds from schools. The problem cannot be solved by such tactics, and public education itself would become the major victim.

Violations of civil rights should be dealt with by specialized law enforcement agencies, rather than through punitive and ineffective administrative methods that primarily injure innocent pupils and undermine the schools. And I subscribe fully, Senator MORSE, to your statement this morning on the extraneous amendments which ought to be kept off this bill.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], on page 581, states:

I would hope very much that this committee would not write into the bill, and I hope it will not be written in on the floor of the Senate, the so-called Powell amendment.

I was very much interested a few days ago when I read in the newspapers that the chairman of this subcommittee had made that recommendation, and I think it is a statesmanlike recommendation.

I follow his belief that if we are attempting to raise the opportunities, to equalize opportunities for schoolchildren, that we should not penalize children whether they are white or Negro, in whatever State they live, because others have failed to follow the Brown case decided by the Supreme Court.

They are not responsible for this failure, and they should not be deprived of needed funds.

I may say also that I have always thought that this is a very easy way to support civil rights and the Brown case. It is very easy to vote for the Powell amendment and say that you have supported the Brown case and you are a strong supporter of civil rights.

But it could be also, I think, an evasion of your responsibility.

I would say that if we want to do something about the segregation in the schools, that we should face it directly. I have recommended and, in fact, introduced bills to permit the Attorney General to intervene in these cases where school boards have not followed the directions of the Supreme Court case, because I think it has come to the time now, after 7 years, when we should face it directly.

So I hope that this amendment will not be attached to the bill.

Mr. President, I turn now to remarks taken from the testimony of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] on S. 1021 before the Education Subcommittee, March 13, 1961, page 561–562 of the hearings record:

Senator METCALF. Now, today, Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to two very important phases of this bill.

First is the proposal that there be an amendment providing that there shall be no Federal funds contributed to segregated schools.

I agree with the colloquy that has gone on here, especially from the Senator from Illinois, that the 14th amendment is what the Supreme Court says it is.

I believe that the Supreme Court was correct in its interpretation of the 14th amendment.

Now, back in 1890, when the second Morrill Act was passed, there was a provision in that act that provided that no funds from the Federal Government for land-grant colleges would go to colleges where there was discrimination as a result of color.

But when they went on and provided in advance of *Plessey* vs. *Ferguson* a provision for separate, but equal, facilities and provided that that part of the act would not be violated if there was a provision for separate, but equal, colleges, a colored and a white agricultural college.

In *Plessey* vs. *Ferguson* one of the bases for that decision was previous congressional declaration that separate, but equal, doctrine in the second Morrill Act was compliance with the Constitution and compliance with equality. I point that out because I believe that it points up the danger of writing into this legislation these special things to take care of a special local and sometimes temporary situation.

Now, the interpretation of the Constitution, as interpreted by the 14th amendment as interpreted by the Supreme Court, is an integral part of this act, just as it is a part of every other act of Congress.

We cannot pass any legislation that is not subject to the 14th amendment and subject to that interpretation of the Constitution.

Therefore, we can no more aid this legislation by putting in a Powell type of amendment than we can aid it by saying that there shall not be treason committed on any of the schoolbuildings that are constructed by Federal funds.

We have other legislation and other laws in connection with this type of legislation, and we should legislate for the special and specific purpose with which we are concerned; that is, building more schools and providing more money for teachers' salaries for the boys and girls in the public schools of America.

Secondly, I want to point out that if we do have this type of legislation, we are perhaps destroying the Supreme Court's own idea of deliberate speed and taking away some of the flexibility that is permissive on the part of the administration to enforce this law in different directions in different sections of the country, as the need may be.

Thirdly, I want to point out that in cases where there has been enforcement of the Supreme Court decision such as Little Rock, not a cent of Federal funds was involved. They were all State funds down there.

And it does not make any difference whether Federal funds are involved or State funds are involved or local funds are involved.

The 14th amendment, as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Brown* v. *School District* and the series of cases that followed it, is applicable whether we write it into this legislation or not.

Then the only reason to write it into this legislation is to help destroy it; is to prevent its passage; is to encourage people who would otherwise vote for it to vote against it because in black and white they have a political situation down in their own communities, their own congressional districts in their own States, whereby they cannot vote for that specific statement.

Mr. President, the National President of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, in his statement on page 924 of the hearings record said; and I quote:

The issue of civil rights as a roadblock to Federal aid to education is equally improper in determining the fate of school aid legislation. Civil rights—equal public education for all children, regardless of race, creed, or color—is a constitutional right, upheld by the courts, and supported by the American Federation of Teachers. Civil rights is now a matter of law enforcement.

In conclusion: The public school and college teachers of America ask the Congress to enact President Kennedy's Federal school aid legislation, for the greatest need for the greatest number, and that America may adequately train its children to remain free.

The spokesman for the American Veterans Committee on pages 1004–1005 of the hearing record said, in answer to my question:

But now let's come to your major position.

Suppose that in the wisdom of the subcommittee—and it happens to be the judgment of the chairman—the subcommittee is of the opinion that a civil rights amendment added to this bill would in all probability result in the defeat of the bill, am I to understand that it then would be the position of the American Veterans Committee that the bill should be passed without a civil rights amendment added to it?

Mr. FELDMAN. That would be my interpretation of our position, Senator.

Senator MORSE. As I said the other day in my colloquy with Mr. Mitchell of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, I think the approach to make to this problem is to amend the existing civil rights law and not use a Federal aid to education bill as a vehicle for seeking in effect to amend the existing civil rights law.

Now, in regard to any proposal for an amendment to this bill calling for loans to private schools, would I be correct in my interpretation of your testimony that here, too, if in the opinion of the majority of the subcommittee and the majority of the Senate it should be decided that such an amendment would very well endanger the passage of the Federal aid to education bill for public schools, that such an amendment should not be added to the bill?

Mr. FELDMAN. That is correct, Senator.

As a matter of fact, I would go further and say that our national board, which is not the full convention, as you know, our national board took the position that the two issues should not be involved in the same piece of legislation.

The president of the American Council of Learned Societies, in a letter to the committee which may be found on page 1149, said:

Allow me, therefore, to urge upon the committee the seriousness of the situation, and let me respectfully request that the members not permit themselves to be distracted by other national issues, important in themselves but extraneous to the specific problem of education with which as a subcommittee they are immediately concerned. Finally, permit me to repeat, as an individual whose professional career has been devoted to higher education and whose organization has been striving to bring the talents of scholars to bear upon the problems of secondary education, that the several levels of education are interdependent and that higher education, therefore, stands upon a firm base only when the educational system below it is strong, flourishing, and vigorous.

The Public Education Association of New York City, in a prepared statement submitted to the committee which can be found on page 1296 of the hearing record, stated:

The Public Education Association strongly endorsed the U.S. Supreme Court's historic decision outlawing racial segregation in the schools. We do believe, however, that desegregation should be implemented through a school-aid bill. Other powers of the Federal Government should be brought to bear on this important problem. Improving the quality of education for all American children, as this bill seeks to do, will be a vital contribution to the elimination of discrimination and the enhancement of opportunity for all.

Mr. Tuttle of School Board Leadership in America, in a letter printed on page 1365 of the RECORD, said:

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I write to express wholehearted approval of your handling of the School Assistance Act of 1961 (S. 1021).

The simplest law will be the best. Please urge your committee and the Congress to stand firm against complicating amendments. Confine the bill to assistance to public education only, on the basis of a flat grant per child in average daily attendance, channeled through the several State departments of education.

All other claims and issues can be debated on their own merits in separate legislation to come later.

Thank you for your courageous efforts in behalf of American public education, and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD M. TUTTLE.

The general secretary of the National Consumers League likewise wrote the committee, and the letter may be found on page 1308, as follows:

We would urge also that the committee report S. 1021 unencumbered by controversial amendments. These amendments can be dealt with in separate legislation when due consideration has been given them by Congress. The need to provide funds to our public education system is so clearly established and widely supported in the country that any delay at this time in order to consider new, complicated, and unexplored proposals would be tragic.

Mr. President, I have summarized in the debate the position taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have had printed in the RECORD the letter written to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY]. I answered the problem in a colloquy this afternoon with the Senator from New York.

I am satisfied that the position taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is correct, when he points out that in his judgment and opinion he would have no power to deny funds to the States, because the purpose of the bill is to provide financial aid to the States. That is the controlling purpose of the bill. We have made clear over and over again that we shall do so without any Federal control of schools.

As I said earlier this afternoon, we cannot have this both ways. Either we will stand firm in support of the principle of no interference so far as educational legislation is concerned, with the States having the right to operate their schools on the basis of their own school policies, or we shall be reneging on the promise we are making to the American people that if they will support us in our demand to put on the statute books the principle of general Federal aid to education we assure and guarantee to them that the bill will in no way interfere with State and local control over education.

Mr. President, section 103 of the bill has nothing to do with the constitutional rights of the American people. Those constitutional rights flow, in this instance from the 14th amendment. The Supreme Court has made it perfectly clear that under the 14th amendment segregation in education violates the Constitution. In my judgment that great landmark decision is comparable to another great constitutional law decision of 1803, Marbury against Madison. In that decision the great Chief Justice of the United States—incidentally, a great Virginian—pointed out that the ultimate fountain for determining and nourishing the American people in respect to their constitutional rights is the Supreme Court, unless a constitutional amendment is passed reversing the Supreme Court on a constitutional question.

In 1954, under another great Chief Justice of the United States, a great Californian, Chief Justice Warren, there was a further landmark decision on the meaning of the 14th amendment in respect to educational opportunities in this country. That decision merely said, in effect, that the 14th amendment means exactly what it says.

I think we need to keep the issues separate and distinct. There is the issue of guaranteeing to the American people under a general educational bill a complete assurance that we in the Congress are not going to seek to dictate to any State its educational policy. That is a separate and distinct issue from one involving the constitutional right of every boy and girl and every parent in this country under the 14th amendment. The enforcement of the Constitution rests with the executive branch of the Government, and in particularly with the Department of Justice. Such enforcement has no cause to effect relationship in respect to any education bill we may pass in this session of Congress.

In closing, let me say that I have not attempted to be exhaustive in presenting the testimony heard by the committee. I have given a sampling of the testimony before our committee. From what I have given, Senators can see that the position of the committee is sustained by many, many witnesses who testified.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate who really believe it will be in the public interest to establish, for the first time in our history, the principle of general Federal aid to education, to support me in a few moments from now when I shall make a motion to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. When the Senator from Connecticut finishes I shall be ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate more than a few minutes, but I wish to make a few remarks in summary.

My amendment is intended to require the Senate to face a grave moral issue—whether Federal aid for education should be extended to States, which in defiance of the Constitution of the United States, continue to practice racial discrimination in their public schools.

The issue, I repeat, is a moral one. We are about to embark upon a broad program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools—a program which is presented as a 3-year program, but which, in fact, is intended to be unlimited in time.

This is not a program for which we will tax the American people $850 million a year for 3 years only. Once enacted, the program will continue on into the future as far as one may predict, and grow until, within a few years' time, it will involve a tax burden which may reach $5 billion or more each year.

And the taxes which will be imposed to support this program respect no lines of race, creed, or color. Whether a citizen be Negro or white, Protestant, Roman Catholic, Jew, or agnostic, he will be forced to contribute a portion of his taxes for this program. He will pay taxes on his cigarettes, on his gasoline, and on his income, 20 percent of which will be withheld at the source when he earns it.

Can we, in good conscience, ask the colored people of this country to help pay for a program in which a substantial share of the funds will be given to States which deny children of their race an equal opportunity for education in defiance of the Constitution?

Should we force millions of people, white and Negro alike, who are deeply convinced that segregation in the public

schools is a moral evil, to help pay for a continuation of that discrimination?

Mr. President, another shot is about to be heard around the world, for the reason that on the heels of recent events in the South—the violence and the race riots—the Senate is about to pass a school bill to provide funds to perpetuate segregation in the public schools. That is the issue I wish the Senate to consider before we vote to enact this program.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. If S. 1021 is passed without an antidiscrimination amendment in it, it will indefinitely postpone integration of the public schools in the South.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I will not yield at the moment.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, who has frankly stated his opinion that this will be a "continuing program" without time limitation, has said that he and the Commissioner of Education will be without authority to withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State as S. 1021 now stands.

This, apparently, is the intent of the bill as stated to the Senate today by its sponsors.

My amendment simply proposes to give to the Secretary authority which he believes he now lacks.

Mr. President, I have modified my amendment. As initially introduced, the amendment proposed to withhold Federal education funds from any State in which public schools "practice discrimination in their entrance requirements on the basis of race, creed, color, or national origin."

As modified, the amendment would permit Federal funds to go to any State "which, in good faith, is proceeding toward full compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public schools."

The modified amendment is in keeping with the Supreme Court's decision that desegregation proceed with "all deliberate speed." It recognizes that the process of desegregation will take time, and permits Federal funds to be given to States which are, in good faith, proceeding to comply with the Supreme Court's decision.

It would withhold funds only from those States which are deliberately defying the Supreme Court and the Constitution of the United States.

I invite the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the modified amendment is in keeping with the platforms of both parties on this issue.

I particularly invite the attention of my democratic colleagues to the fact that the language of the modified amendment closely parallels the following statement in their 1960 platform:

> A new democratic administration will also use its full powers—legal and moral—to insure the beginning of a good-faith compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BUSH. I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. President, the Secretary of HEW has said that S. 1021, as now drafted, does not give him authority to withhold funds from any State in which there are segregated schools.

Let us now give him the legal authority he should have to withhold funds from States which are openly and stubbornly in defiance of the law of the land. Let us give him legal authority to reinforce the moral convictions that I know are held by many Senators on both sides of the aisle concerning this issue.

Mr. President, unless there are questions, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it correct that the Senator from Connecticut has announced that even if his amendment is agreed to, he will vote against the bill?

Mr. BUSH. That question has been asked me several times. I have answered in the affirmative. I stated last Friday why I would vote against the bill. I stated my reason very clearly and in rather forceful language.

Mr. PASTORE. The answer is "yes"?

Mr. BUSH. The answer is "yes." In the present form of the bill I certainly intend to vote against it. I consider it a highly discriminatory bill. It is beyond my comprehension how such an allotment of funds could ever have been made. I reported in the remarks I made last week that the Washington Evening Star referred to the allocation as a pork barrel proposal. I have never seen my State so discriminated against in any bill since I have been in the Senate as it is discriminated against in the bill pending now before the Senate.

That is only one of the reasons, however, why I am opposed to the bill. There are other reasons. As I have said before this afternoon—and since the Senator from Rhode Island raises the question, I repeat the statement—I wish to make very clear that I think any Senator has a right at any time to try to improve a bill which in his good judgment and conscience he thinks needs improvement, even though he may decide to vote against the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island does not question the motive of the Senator from Connecticut in making his announcement. I came into the Chamber to assure the Senator from Connecticut that I was inclined to sympathize with his position. I think he raises a very strong moral issue. Sometimes, however, in analyzing the sincerity of an amendment that is proposed, the Senator from Rhode Island is concerned when a Senator seeks to refine the language of a bill on a moral question, he says, "Moral or otherwise, if my amendment is agreed to, I will still vote against the bill."

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator is correct that sometimes such a device is used. However, I have said that was not my purpose. I have submitted the amendment in good faith. I am glad the Senator is sympathetic with my argument.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

In my opinion it injects an issue into this bill, already the subject of much controversy, that can only result in delaying the enactment of a school assistance program. The history of this amendment makes that clear. It has been supported not only by vigorous advocates of civil rights, but also by those whose principal concern was to defeat education legislation. When the Senate last voted on such an amendment, in the 81st Congress, it was defeated by a vote of 65 to 16; and among those 16 who supported the amendment were many who opposed the bill on final passage. I do not mean to impugn the motives of any Senator who may support this amendment today. I know that the Senator from Connecticut is a stanch advocate of civil rights, as are many others in this Chamber who will oppose the amendment in the interest of getting a bill and of retaining in the courts, rather than in an education bill, the question of compliance with the school integration decision. The Senator from Connecticut does not, I am sure, offer this amendment today merely to encumber the bill and prevent its ultimate adoption.

Friends of S. 1021 have in general decided that the education needs of the entire country are so urgent that issues such as that raised by the Senator's amendment should not be permitted to defeat the bill. I join in that decision, and I urge the Senate to defeat the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I yield back the remainder of my time, I wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that I hold him in very high respect for being a very able, courteous, and cooperative protagonist in this debate in regard to his amendment.

The RECORD should show that the Senator from Connecticut came to me even before the amendment was scheduled for debate and told me that he intended to offer the amendment. He told me he intended to vote against the bill, but he thought he had a duty to try to perfect the bill if it was to pass anyway, and he thought his amendment would perfect it.

I told him I was very sorry but that I could not agree with his conclusion with regard to his amendment. I told him that I would oppose the amendment. I want him to know that I appreciate the fine spirit in which he has joined me on his side of the debate.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his very gracious and generous remarks in this connection. I wish to reciprocate by saying that no one could have been more courteous and generous in consideration of a Senator offering an amendment of which he disapproved than has the Senator from Oregon this afternoon. The majority leader and other Senators on that side of the aisle have been most considerate in this debate, and I appreciate their courtesy very much indeed.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

I shall now yield back the remainder of my time with the understanding that, my time having been yielded back, I shall retain my right to the floor in order to move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is now in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BUSH and Mr. MORSE asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUSH. Are we about to vote on the motion to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSH. A vote for the motion to table, then, is a vote against the amendment, and so that those who wish to support the amendment should vote "no" on the pending motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARLSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. COTTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HART (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to cast my vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. BRIDGES. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER and Mr. MORTON] are necessarily absent.

The pair of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has been previously announced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The pair of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been previously announced by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 46]

YEAS—61

Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Bartlett	Holland	Pell
Bible	Humphrey	Prouty
Bridges	Jackson	Proxmire
Burdick	Javits	Robertson
Butler	Johnston	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Jordan	Smathers
Cannon	Kefauver	Smith, Mass.
Carroll	Kerr	Sparkman
Church	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Ellender	Magnuson	Thurmond
Engle	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Gore	Metcalf	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Hartke	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Moss	
Hickey	Muskie	

NAYS—25

Allott	Dodd	Miller
Beall	Douglas	Mundt
Bennett	Dworshak	Pastore
Boggs	Fong	Saltonstall
Bush	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Scott
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	
Curtis	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—14

Aiken	Cooper	Mansfield
Blakley	Cotton	McGee
Byrd, W. Va.	Dirksen	Morton
Carlson	Hart	Randolph
Chavez	Kuchel	

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment of Mr. BUSH was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "5-17-61—B" and ask that it be read.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may we have order, so that the Senate may listen attentively to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont? He is proposing an amendment which I shall agree to take to conference. I think it is a good amendment. However, the Senate ought to understand the purpose of the amendment, so that it cannot be said it was adopted when the Senate's attention was not specifically directed to it.

Mr. PROUTY. I am grateful to the Senator from Oregon for his comment. I assure the Senate that I shall not speak at length. I think a vote can be reached tonight. I do not ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "and".

On page 2, line 8, before the period it is proposed to insert a comma and the following: "and in paying other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education".

On page 11, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may".

On page 13, line 22, it is proposed to strike out "and".

On page 13, line 23, before the semicolon it is proposed to insert "and (C) other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education".

On page 13, line 25, it is proposed to strike out "either of".

On page 14, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "and".

On page 14, line 16, before the period it is proposed to insert "and (C) the amounts to be used for other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for assistance in paying such costs.".

On page 22, between lines 10 and 11, it is proposed to insert the following:

"(12) The term 'other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education' means any expenditure for public elementary or secondary school education for which revenues derived from State or local sources may be expended in such State."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield, so that I may propound an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to ask the majority leader what the program will be for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the amendment now

pending will be accepted by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I was about to ask the Senator to yield. I wish to ask for the yeas and nays on the Prouty amendment. It is an important, far-reaching amendment. I think the Senate should express its will on the amendment by a yea-and-nay vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Vermont desire to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield, so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, without objection, the amendments of the Senator from Vermont will be considered en bloc.

The yeas and nays have been requested. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the latest development, which was not anticipated by the leadership, can the Senator from Vermont state when he expects the Senate might vote on the pending amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. I had not intended to speak at length on the amendment. However, now I shall probably speak at a little greater length than if this development had not occurred. I did not think the amendment was particularly controversial.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, does the Senator from Maryland wish to indicate how long he might wish to discuss the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. I do not wish to discuss it at all.

Does the amendment include books for the children?

Mr. PROUTY. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. And funds for custodial and administrative personnel?

Mr. PROUTY. Operating personnel.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I cannot conceive of an amendment with greater sweep to get the Federal Government into the middle of every public school in the country. I do not believe the Senate should vote upon such an amendment without being on record.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a feeler, would the Senator agree to a limitation of 1 hour's debate on the amendment?

Mr. BUTLER. So far as I am concerned, I do not wish to speak against the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator from Vermont be agreeable to limiting debate to 1 hour beginning at the conclusion of the morning hour tomorrow?

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to limit the time to 1 hour and a half.

Mr. BUSH. The time to be divided?

Mr. MORSE. The time to be divided equally?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have some remarks to make about Castro and bulldozers. If the intention is to have the agreement become effective this evening, I shall object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, 1 hour and 30 minutes be allocated to the consideration of the Prouty amendment, half the time to be in charge of the Senator from Vermont, and half the time to be in charge of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That further debate on the so-called Prouty amendment on school maintenance or administrative expenditures, numbered 5–17–61—B, be limited to one and one-half hours, after the conclusion of morning business on Tuesday, May 23, 1961, to be equally divided between the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN.]

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Is this a part of the "operation nibble," whereby the limitation of debate is constantly to be applied to each individual amendment, but a request will not be made for a general unanimous-consent agreement such as was discussed a few days ago? Is this procedure a continuation of the pattern of making separate unanimous-consent requests, and having a continuation of the same general course of conduct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was under the impression that the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont would be accepted with a minimum of debate, and that another amendment would then be offered this evening for consideration and would be pending for tomorrow's business. It was only because in this particular instance a situation arose which I thought made it advisable to do so that I propounded a unanimous-consent request to the Senate on this amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

CASTRO'S OFFER TO TRADE PRISONERS FOR TRACTORS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Fidel Castro's offer to trade the God-given breath and souls of 1,200 free Cuba prisoners for 500 tractors has twofold significance for all people, everywhere.

First, it is an opportunity to save human life. The mysterious ways of providence have worked through the twisted mind of this comic-strip Communist, to preserve the gift of life for 1,200 brave men, and at the same time to give America a chance to demonstrate, once more, that it values human life above any material thing. The tractors or bulldozers are essential materials which could, at some future time, be used against us or other members of the Organization of American States.

Second, the incident shines brighter than a neon light before the eyes of the world, illuminating the character of this Communist dictator. Now the world sees, once and for all, that he embodies the traditions of history's best known criminal leaders—Hitler, Stalin, Mussolini, Attila the Hun, and the pirates of the Barbary Coast, all of whom murdered for fun and profit, and ransomed when it suited their fancy.

Two men for one machine. This is the newest form of blackmail and ransom contrived by the Communist stooge Castro. Bulldozers and tractors can be used to make airfields and trenches. Would it not be far more humanitarian to exchange food and medical supplies?

Humanitarian principles are involved; and, of course, all of us want freedom for these men.

However, not since the days of Hitler, when the infamous Eichmann offered to trade on an even basis—one Jew for one truck, has the civilized world been confronted with such heinous barter.

Ten hostages have been given 1 week to raise the money for tractors; at the end of that time they must return to Castro's prisons with the assurance of a successful trade, or else suffer who knows what punishment for themselves and the hostages for whom they are dealing.

Mr. President, how complacent must we get before we do something about this cancer which is festering at our doorstep? How much more humiliation and contempt must we suffer from this Communist dictator?

Human lives and freedom are at stake; but must we supinely give in to any and every demand made upon us by this Communist dictator who rules through terror and threat?

Where are those who have criticized our allies and have accused them of exploiting their people; where are those who are willing to give aid to Communist satellites, on the theory that we can influence them? Why do not they protest to the high heavens against this blackmail for the ransom of those who were fighting for freedom and liberty in their own homeland of Cuba? They seem strangely silent.

There was a time when the United States was respected—when freedom meant standing firm.

We are far down the road; and it is time to take stock of ourselves and our principles, if we are to fulfill our destiny as a free land.

All of us can well recall from the history books we studied in school that there was a time when the United States, in its earliest days, 1797 is the exact date, proclaimed "millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

That was said by Charles Pinckney, our minister to the French Republic.

The day when that heroic phrase must once again be invoked if we are to stay free may come sooner than we think.

I think the American people and the Senate should be alerted to what is going on. I never expected to see the day when a dictator 90 miles from our shores would offer to trade human lives for tractors or bulldozers. We have reached a new low.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators, of our own Government, of our President, and

of all the people of our country, particularly in connection with what I consider to be the misguided efforts of the so-called Tractor Committee, to what is known as the Logan Act, which was passed on January 30, 1799. In my opinion, the so-called Tractor Committee is violating that act, which reads as follows:

PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

That act is known as the Logan Act. It was passed on January 30, 1799.

Today, we are confronted with a situation in which Castro, the dictator of Cuba, is attempting to blackmail the people of the United States and their Government into giving him 500 tractors in exchange for 1,200 prisoners. However, they are not American citizens. The fact is that they are Cuban citizens; they are the blood and flesh of Cuba. They are not nationals of the United States or citizens of the United States. Instead, they are citizens of Cuba.

Who would have thought there would come a time when a little dictator who had captured 1,200 of his own people, 1,200 Cubans, would say to us, "If you give me 500 tractors, I will release these 1,200 people."

Trujillo, the head of the Dominican Republic, is holding approximately the same number of Cuban prisoners; and in the last few days he offered to exchange prisoners with Castro. Trujillo said, "I will return every Cuban I am holding if you will release the 1,200 you are holding, whom you are trying to trade with the United States for 500 tractors."

But of course Castro said he would not do that, and said he was not interested in doing it. He is not interested in his own people, Mr. President; he is only interested in blackmailing us and humiliating us in the eyes of the world, in order to obtain 500 tractors, because then he can use them against us. For example, he would be able to use them for the purpose of building airfields and various other installations, including missile bases. He could also use them for agricultural purposes.

In other words, the 500 tractors could be used by him to help him make communism work in Cuba.

Mr. President, are we or are we not opposed to communism? Are we in favor of helping Castro, or are we opposed to helping him?

There would be no question if the 1,200 were Americans. However, they are not Americans.

Of course, some persons will say that our Government is not engaged in a dispute with Castro. However, today Castro said the 500 tractors would be in partial payment for the war damage the United States of America inflicted upon Cuba, as a result of the invasion.

Ten days before the invasion, the President of the United States made a statement to the American people and the world, in which he said we would not participate in an invasion or interfere with the internal affairs of that country; that we were having no part in it. Why he made the statement, I do not know. He said we were taking no part in it.

I do not see how this country can hold up its head to the rest of the world if we are to yield to blackmail. When, oh, when, will we stop being blackmailed by Castro?

To make things worse, I understand the Internal Revenue Service has ruled, or is about to rule, that any contribution made toward buying the tractors will be tax deductible; that it is a charitable contribution. How ridiculous can we be? Why do we do it in one instance, and not do it for Americans who are having trouble paying their taxes, and who need deductions for tax purposes? What are we thinking about? Is the President of the United States giving this committee authority to act for the Government of the United States, or is it acting on its own? Those are questions the answers to which I think the Foreign Relations Committee should ascertain. I suggest to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that tomorrow we open an executive session to ascertain whether or not the President has commissioned and authorized the committee to act on behalf of the U.S. Government.

To me, it is a silly and ridiculous thing. I cannot conceive of this great Nation of ours being permitted to be blackmailed in this way. We are proposing to help the dictator and help the Communists to further harass the United States.

We are now prohibiting the exportation of certain materials to Cuba, among them materials with which Cuba can make war. Yet we are now talking about giving Cuba outright, as a government, 500 tractors, or bulldozers, as they are called.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. When the Senator says we are talking about it, is he suggesting that the United States as a government or in any official capacity is considering responding to this blackmail?

Mr. CAPEHART. Evidently. The Internal Revenue Service has said——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has it? The Senator from South Dakota has not heard that the Internal Revenue Service has made any such ruling.

Mr. CAPEHART. The report was on the news ticker tape today. That is all I know.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. So far as the junior Senator from South Dakota is concerned, he subscribes wholeheartedly to the sentiments expressed by the Senator from New Hampshire. I think this is a proposal which could be blackmail. It certainly would be if the United States officially, in any way, responded or took any notice of the proposal.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me read what appeared on the ticker tape from Washington:

Contributions to buy tractors to be exchanged for the freedom of Cuban rebels now prisoners of the Castro Government will be deductible from Federal income taxes, the newly organized Tractors for Freedom Committee said today.

In a brief press release the committee said it had been "advised that the U.S. Treasury Department will make a necessary ruling that contributions are tax exempt."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Internal Revenue Service has officially said that, I, for one, think the ruling should be challenged. I do not think the Internal Revenue Service ought to make that kind of ruling. Personally, I would not support it by vote or in any other way. I think there is some question as to the applicability of the Logan Act. I personally believe the Logan Act is a sound policy and good law, and it has been on the statute books a long time. It reads:

Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof * * * in relation to any disputes or controveries with the United States * * *.

The Senator from South Dakota is not a lawyer and he hesitates to pose as a legal authority, but he thinks we cannot overlook the clause which says "in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States."

Mr. CAPEHART. Can there be any question in the mind of anyone that this is a dispute between Castro and the U.S. Government?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. There is a question in the mind of the Senator from South Dakota as to whether or not there is any controversy between Cuba and the United States which relates to the conduct of that particular invasion.

Mr. CAPEHART. If there is any question, the ruling of the Internal Revenue service should have completely taken the question out of the Senator's mind.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota has said very explicitly that is not a proper ruling by the Internal Revenue Service and that he personally would be opposed to it. I was approached this afternoon with the suggestion——

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Just a minute.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know the Senator has the floor, but I think I should have the courtesy of completing the statement on the Internal Revenue Service. Earlier this morning I was approached with the information that there would be a movement, by unanimous consent, to pass a resolution which would take this approach by the Internal Revenue Service. I said, if no one else objects, I will, because I do not believe, either by unanimous consent or otherwise, that the United States should

officially, in any way, shape, or form, recognize this act of piracy, an act which I think is exactly like the acts of the Barbary pirates, to hold so many people for ransom. I would not recognize that kind of demand for ransom in any way, shape, or form, the Internal Revenue Service ruling to the contrary notwithstanding. Personally, I regard it as an act of piracy and an attempt to commit the United States. I do not think the United States should be committed in any way. I think the Logan Act is applicable.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it not be inevitable that the United States would get into the transaction eventually, because the tractors could not be shipped without a license to export them?

Mr. CAPEHART. I was about to go into that question. At the present moment goods with which to make war cannot be shipped to Cuba. In order to be able to ship the tractors, the committee would have to get permission from the U.S. Government.

Mr. BUTLER. That would certainly make it a controversy between the two Governments.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think so. But who will stand up on the floor and read into the debate a technicality to the effect that this dispute is not between the U.S. Government and Castro? If Senators are to stand on a technicality like that——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Surely.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not going to do it. The Senator can do so if he wishes. I am not going to stand on that technicality, because there is no truth in it. This dispute is between the United States and Castro, and Castro is blackmailing the U.S. people and the U.S. Government. I repeat, the proposal is not to release 1,200 U.S. citizens, but to release 1,200 of his own people, and to get 500 tractors or bulldozers with which to build missile bases, airports, submarine bases, and I presume other such facilities.

He turned down Trujillo, who was willing to return a Cuban prisoner he was holding for each of the prisoners Castro held. He does not wish to do that. He would like to humiliate, embarrass, and blackmail the United States. He would like to hold the United States up to the scorn of the world. He would like to show that the world should not respect the United States because it is not worth respecting and because it has no courage. That is my opinion of what he would like to do.

I think this committee is a misguided committee, in trying to do what it would like to do.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

If it is right that we do this, then the U.S. Government ought to do it, and every American ought to pay taxes for the privilege of doing it. I say it is wrong.

I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Senator from Indiana should be commended, along with the Senator from New Hampshire, for raising some very serious questions about a very fundamental concept of American foreign policy in an hour of great international peril.

With respect to the Logan Act, I remember a great deal of discussion about that Act during the many years I served as a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. I must agree with the Senator from Indiana, insofar as his colloquy with my colleague is concerned. I think there is a controversy between Cuba and the United States specifically about the issue of whether there was an American invasion or a Cuban invasion and we are certainly in dispute with Cuba over many of the Castro policies.

There is an "out" however which the committee might find in the Logan Act, for the act permits private citizens to negotiate with foreign countries provided they have secured the advance permission of the Government to do so. I do not know whether the group seeking to raise blackmail bounty to pay Castro has done so. I hope not.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Even if the money to pay for the 500 tractors is available, someone will have to negotiate for the release of the 1,200 prisoners. Who will do that? That will be done by the officials of the State Department, because individual citizens cannot do it. Individual citizens would have no way of screening the prisoners, and would have no organization for the purpose.

Mr. MUNDT. I would hope that would be the case. Speaking for myself, though I think my sentiment is shared by many, I have not been too happy about the way the Department of State is being operated these days, or about the international situation. However, I would not be so harsh as to condemn the State Department to the degree of saying that we must now turn everything over to volunteer Peace Corps members from the outside, so that they can negotiate American foreign affairs in areas where they must assume our State Department has failed. I have more confidence in the President and in the Secretary of State than to say that they have failed so completely and hopelessly that volunteers must be recruited from the outside to negotiate with other governments concerning the basic aspects of our foreign policy.

Are we to become such abject appeasers as to pay blackmail to get out of our difficulties?

If this group has secured from the Department of State or from the White House a mandate to proceed with the authority of the Federal Government—I hope it has not—then it will not be in violation of the Logan Act. If that has not been done, it seems to me to be a clear violation of the Logan Act and a dangerous precedent unless we stop it firmly and without delay. The Logan Act has served our country well for more than a century and a half. It is sound legislation. It has averted many dangerous developments in the past and if courageously enforced it can protect our country now. Fixing foreign policy must not become the plaything for enthusiastic amateurs.

There is a second point which disturbs me even more. I submit it is a matter of clear logic that for every 1 of the 1,000 or more unfortunate "Freedom Fighters" whose release we might obtain in trade for a tractor by such a device, we shall help to enslave 100 people presently in Cuba who are still able to hope for freedom, because we would be strengthening the power of the Cuban dictator to condemn them to a slave economy.

Mr. CAPEHART. If this condition continues, the lives of thousands of American boys may be lost, because Castro is building up and Russia is building up so that some day they can make war against the United States. Cuba will have missile bases and submarine bases for one purpose only, to kill American boys and to make American boys prisoners. Then who will trade tractors for those boys?

Mr. MUNDT. Success for dictators is a pretty heady and intoxicating wine, especially for comic opera dictators like Castro, who is now thumbing his nose at his great neighbor, the United States.

If we, in trying to provide happiness for people in Cuba, trade a few pieces of farm machinery and equipment for the freedom of some 1,000 nationals of his own country, we shall help to condemn into greater tyranny and longer slavery at least 100—perhaps 1,000 or even 10,000—Cubans for every one we liberate, because we shall be strengthening the hand of the dictator to do his filthy job more effectively by providing him new equipment with which to perpetuate his power.

Mr. CAPEHART. How many hundreds of thousands of political prisoners does Castro have at the moment?

Mr. MUNDT. Nobody knows—but the number is vast.

Mr. CAPEHART. They are in jails in Cuba. Does Castro wish to trade something for those people, too?

Mr. MUNDT. Probably so if we make the first false step. There is a third thing wrong with the proposal, as I see it. What a horrible example the United States, acting through its new volunteer "Department of State" headed by Mrs. Roosevelt and some of her associates, who aparently feel the present Department of State has failed so miserably they must volunteer their services, will be setting. If the United States, acting through this new volunteer "Department of State" sets such an example in Cuba, in what a wonderful bargaining position we shall be placing every little dictator in the world. All any dictator would need to do would be to enslave some of his own people, or some of our people, and then offer to trade them for locomotives, for a few pieces of silver, or for a few shiploads of cotton. We shall be issuing an open invitation to every dictator in the world to make us pay blackmail, because once we start down this sorry course there will be no return,

and the tribute we shall be asked to pay will become more and more excessive and humilating.

Finally, I point out that if by some remote possibility the Bureau of Internal Revenue should say this blackmail money is tax exempt, it would place the United States squarely in the business of paying such blackmail with the taxpayers' funds, because the money will then in fact be the taxpayers' money. The money is being collected from corporations and individuals, most of whom are at least in the 50-percent-income-tax brackets, so to the extent of more than 50 percent the money to be paid to buy our way out of trouble in Cuba would be the money of the U.S. taxpayers. I submit, Mr. President, this would place our country officially in the business of paying blackmail to communism with the people's money.

I submit that, bad as conditions are, we have not reached that sorry state in America. Speaking as a Republican, I have more confidence than that in the President of the United States. I have more confidence than that in the Department of State. I think this well-meaning committee of volunteers should fold up their tents and silently steal away. Perhaps I should say they should fold down their umbrellas of appeasement, close up their publicity offices, and stand up with other Americans to meet this Communist challenge in an American manner and by American methods.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator in yielding to me again.

I trust that nothing which has been said will dim the fact that I have said, from the outset, that I regard this as blackmail, as an act of piracy or attempted piracy.

I have no sympathy whatever with the idea of responding in any way, shape, or form to associate the United States, in any official way, with such an action.

I raised the question with regard to the clause in the Logan Act. If the facts should demonstrate that the Cuban operation was a U.S. operation and the United States was officially in it, that is one thing. I would hang my head in shame if that were true.

Earlier in the day I said I was flabbergasted by the way in which the military reputation of the United States was being laid on the line, or gambled, by people who were not in the military department, by people who had no authority to commit the United States.

The reason I do not like to recognize such a situation is that I, for one, do not wish to admit that the U.S. military establishment could take the humiliation which I think anybody should take if he planned or carried out the operation, which was such a flasco.

I was flabbergasted by this situation the other day. I do not believe the Joint Chiefs of Staff would accept responsibility for the way that operation was conducted. I would hang my head in shame if I thought the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States directed that military operation, because of its failure. I personally think a handful of marines could have planned it and handled it better than that operation was conducted. I do not wish to accept the implication that it was an operation of the United States.

That is the reason I directed attention to the clause in the Logan Act. So far as the proposal itself is concerned, I regard it as an insult. I would not have dignified it. I would not dignify it today by any act of any bureau or any agency of the United States. I think it is an act of blackmail. I do not think it ought to be regarded as a proper approach or a proper proposal to the United States as such, and I would not recognize it by responding in any way which would recognize it as anything that the United States itself will officially act upon.

Further with respect to the whole situation, I think we confront a very difficult situation today, but I do not believe we can help by making interpretations of laws on the floor of the Senate. Such action would be for the courts. If the Logan Act has been violated, I hope that those who are responsible for its violation will face the consequences of the violation. However, I hope that when the entire story is written, a shameful page will not be written in the history of the United States to the effect that we responded officially in any way to this proposal for blackmail.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. First, I congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for his vigorous and accurate condemnation of the unthinkable proposal that has apparently received some currency and acceptance by people in the United States. It is the most fantastic story I have ever heard since the story of the days of the Barbary pirates, who defied the United States, and we had to settle that situation on a basis of principle.

I congratulate also the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for raising the issue. I am not concerned about the Logan Act. I have read the Logan Act. I admit there is some room for argument as to whether, on a question of pure technicality, the Logan Act may or may not apply. But I do not get as far as the Logan Act. I stop with the moral revulsion that is involved in the effrontery of this bearded psychopath in Cuba in making a proposal of this kind that he hoped would have the slightest degree of acceptance or approval by anyone in the United States. I am perfectly aware of the humanitarian aspects of this question.

But if Castro can get bulldozers down there in Cuba and get his airfields scraped away and his military installations established, I suppose the message would come to us, "Pay us $10 million a day or we will turn the rockets loose on you." By the same line of reasoning, some of the self-appointed leaders of the international policy of the United States, such as those who have just sprung up to head this organization, would probably be around trying to raise public money to pay off Mr. Castro every day, because he had used the bulldozers to lay out airfields from which he could launch rockets, and we would either have to pay off or he would pull the trigger.

If the situation were not so tragic, if it were not so unthinkable that this kind of blackmail would be considered for one instant, I would say it was the most comic of comic opera themes. We are all sympathetic with the humanitarian aspects of people who are captured. But I certainly agree with the statement of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] who, I believe, said, that every little dictator or puppet in the world could capture an American seaman, and then say "Pay us $500,000 per seaman or we will keep them in our dungeons over here."

What has happened to the vigorous principle of independence that has moved this country throughout its history? If we succumb to blackmail of this kind, we would abandon our responsibilities of world leadership on the basis of principle and the things for which America stands.

I was not so concerned about the original news story of this incident because I thought surely no one would take it seriously. I have since become appalled.

I do not know whether the Treasury Department has ruled that contributions to a private fund without organization are tax exempt or not. I have not looked up the law and I am not prepared to argue the law on that point, except to say that it is inconceivable to me that contributions made under those circumstances could possibly be tax deductible under any kind of theory.

I hope and trust that the present administration, or any other administration, will see this question in the light of exactly what is presented. It is difficult enough in these days of tension, I think, for any of us and all of us to resist the temptation to point out some of the failures that have contributed to the lessening of American prestige in the world today. I wish to support this administration or any other administration on foreign policy when it has been decided, and I do not want to be a party, if I can help it, to anything that might be considered carping or partisan political criticism.

But I say that it is entirely possible that a time will come when, in the very vital interests of American security, some of these issues will have to be talked about with more exactness and vigor and even with more controversy than they have been talked about up to this time. A few more mistakes, a few more catastrophes, a few more failures of ordinary judgement will probably precipitate that time soon.

I earnestly hope that the American people have not lost their perspective, and I earnestly hope that this latest, unthinkable proposal will not be taken seriously.

I again congratulate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. He stood on the floor of the Senate at the time of the ill-advised invitation to Mr. Castro to come to this country. I know

that he, as well as I, refused to attend any of the luncheons or meetings that were held for Mr. Castro, because we thought he was a bearded subversive at that time. I still think so. I did not make the speech which the Senator from New Hampshire so eloquently and prophetically made at that time, but I have my convictions.

I congratulate the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for raising this issue. I shall not quarrel with him about the Logan Act, because in my reasoning I do not reach that point. Principle stops even before the application of the Logan Act to this question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thank the able Senator from Iowa for his straight thinking on this subject.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I had an opportunity to look at the wire service clipping from which the Senator spoke. According to that report, the Treasury has not yet received such an application. Mr. Caplin said he has not yet received an application for tax exemption for this purpose. I agree with the Senators. I can see no authority for the proposed action. I certainly would not approve of it if I should have any opportunity to approve. I think it would be very bad policy. I agree that our Government should not in any way lend itself to this kind of blackmailing operation.

I believe it is stated in the news report that Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Milton Eisenhower, Mr. Walter Reuther, and one or two other persons, have taken it upon themselves to form this committee. Of course thousands of committees are established for raising money for all kinds of purposes. Some of them are good and some of them are indifferent. I suppose it is not in violation of the law. However, I do not believe that the Federal Government or the Senate ought to approve the paying of blackmail for any such purpose. I hope that the clipping is accurate, and that the proposal has not been approved by the Treasury Department, and that it will not be.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope it has not been approved. The dispatch states that Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin conferred with top officials about making the ruling. There is no question that they are considering it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the Department had not yet received the application, according to that clipping.

Mr. CAPEHART. It says it is being considering and discussed. The press report states:

> Contributions to buy tractors to be exchanged for the freedom of Cuban rebels now prisoners of the Castro government will be deductible from Federal income tax, the newly organized Tractors for Freedom Committee said today.
>
> The Internal Revenue Service declined to give immediate confirmation that donations would be deductible from taxable income.
>
> A spokesman said that such a ruling could not be issued until the Service had in hand an application for tax exemption from the Tractors for Freedom Committee.
>
> He said this had been explained to committee officials and that the Service expected to receive such an application before the end of the day.
>
> Commissioner Mortimer M. Caplin conferred with top officials about making the ruling.

They are almost up to that point, according to the dispatch. At least they are considering it. Mr. Reuther said they were going to make it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not my understanding that the——

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator is correct. I do not believe it is official as yet. I hope it will not be. I hope that the colloquy and the speeches today will stop it from ever being made.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope so. I do not believe the Internal Revenue Service has absolute discretion to give a tax exemption to anyone it pleases. There are certain requirements. I cannot imagine how this committee would qualify under any requirement that I am familiar with.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I am glad that we have had this exchange between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Indiana, because I believe it is quite true that the official application had not been received at the time the report came to us. Perhaps by now it has been received. I certainly hope that the Department of the Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service will give some heed to the sentiment expressed here this afternoon. It is not surprising, however, that Mr. Reuther and his committee should be making proclamations of this kind, to the effect that they were expecting to receive a tax exemption. Having assumed the authority of the State Department one day, it is quite understandable that the committee should seek to speak for the Department of the Treasury the next day, and that these new volunteers should be acting as though they were operating both Departments.

It is just another reason why we ought to stay with constitutional government and with our properly elected officials, and not have either the State Department or the Treasury Department operated by volunteers who happen to bob up, no matter what wonderful intentions they have or what splendid pedigrees or backgrounds they may possess.

Mr. CAPEHART. If the Internal Revenue Services rules that such contributions are tax deductible it will certainly place the U.S. Government 100 percent in this transaction, because it will be taking the taxes that would ordinarily have been paid by people to the American Government and passing them on to Mr. Castro. Let us assume that $50 million is raised. The tax which would be exempted would probably be $20,000 or $25,000. Then the Federal Government certainly would be up to its neck under the Logan Act, because the Government would become a party to the operation by permitting it to be considered as a tax-deductible contribution.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I was impressed by something the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] said, and I would like to emphasize it briefly. I have been among members of the Republican Party, at policy meetings, who have urged a policy of prudence and a reservation from criticism of various foreign policy decisions and international repercussions which have confronted this new administration.

It is not only right and proper to give the new administration an opportunity to become adjusted and get started, but it is also an act of patriotism for Republicans to pursue that kind of policy at a time when the country is confronted with great international problems. I have felt the new administration was trying its best and that criticism should be held to a minimum under these trying circumstances.

As one who has done his fair share of speaking to groups all over the country since January 20, I have myself refrained meticulously from entering into criticism of errors or mistakes of judgment or discussing the repercussions which have been flowing from weaknesses in our foreign policy.

I was not happy about the fiasco in Cuba. I was very much disappointed at the decision to admit Communists from Laos to the Geneva talks. In private correspondence I predicted that this would be the end of freedom in Laos. We can have no effective conference on Laos with the rebel Communists at the conference table. This is becoming more apparent every day.

I have also been terribly disillusioned by the utterances some of the President's appointees in the State Department, and in diplomatic posts, with regard to their attitude toward recognition of Red China. I believe it is deplorable that there should be people in positions in which the President has placed them who hold that appeasement position. However, I have refrained from saying anything even about that situation serious as it is. I have continued to hope for the best.

However, if abject appeasement is to be the policy of this Government, and if this Government is to sit idly by while volunteer groups usurp the authority of the State Department and the White House, and start their own negotiations with a Communist dictator, then certainly I believe Republican Senators as well as independent Democrats who still have freedom of thought and freedom of expression will be subject to legitimate criticism, if they do not protest now against this kind of misadventure and against this type of dangerous nonsense unless the Kennedy administration acts promptly and firmly to put it to an end.

The time has come when the foreign policy of our Government might well become a major subject of Senate debate and national discussion, if, in fact—and

it appears to be entirely possible—this kind of appeasement program has either won silent acceptance by the administration or its active cooperation, as certainly must be the case if it is even romotely considered that tax exemption will be given without respect to contributions made to the committee. I hope that I can be reassured by the President and the State Department, and that all Americans can be reassured on this point, and that the matter will be cleared up by a statement issued without delay and with crystal clarity.

I shall continue my policy of not unnecessarily criticizing the State Department in connection with these difficult problems, but if all we are to see is failure compounded upon failure, followed by appeasement of communism and a cringing recognition of Red China, there is nothing more important to discuss on the Senate floor, with no holds barred, than what should be the attitude of this country in a world, in which communism today is flapping its wings, making bold remarks and boasting about its invincibility and its inevitably. The time has come when America needs leadership—and not from volunteer committees seeking to take over because they may feel that others have failed.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe it is my responsibility as a Senator and as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations to take part in shaping foreign policy. I believe the American people expect me to do so. My oath of office compels me to do so. My responsibility as a Senator requires that I do so. Otherwise, what am I here for? If I am only to keep still, without any thoughts or ideas or suggestions, I am certainly not living up to my oath of office, and I ought not to be here. I feel the same way about every other Senator.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the consideration of new reports on the Executive Calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 248.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with new reports.

U.S. MARSHALS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of U.S. marshals are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, of course, these nominations were cleared by the minority and were unanimously reported by the committee.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CASTRO, CUBANS, AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] leave the floor, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the issue which they have raised.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is one of the very valuable members, I feel that I owe it to my duties as a member of that committee not to sit in silence while this very important issue is discussed before the Senate. It is an exceedingly complex one.

Interestingly enough, yesterday afternoon, when I was in Cleveland, appearing on a television program called "Open Circuit," a question bearing on this subject matter was called in. I discussed it briefly. I shall get a transcript of those comments and place it in the RECORD tomorrow, so that the Senate will at least know what comment I made when the question was first submitted to me publicly. When the transcript appears in the RECORD, it will show that the following was my position:

I said I sincerely hoped that Mrs. Roosevelt and the members of her committee had discussed this subject thoroughly with the Department of State before they proceeded to make plans for the program. I said I knew of no one in the country who undoubtedly was more appreciative of the fact that private citizens have a great obligation to follow a course of action toward foreign governments which in no way possibly could embarrass the State Department or the U.S. Government. I took it for granted that the committee of which Mrs. Roosevelt, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and Mr. Walter Reuther, and apparently others, are members had discussed the question with the State Department. I do not know whether they have. However, the State Department has an obligation in this matter too. The State Department owes it to the American people to make a statement of policy on this matter.

We are dealing with a very difficult matter of great human values. It appeals to our sense of right and wrong; our desire to come to the assistance of our fellow men who may find themselves in a position of being executed if this attempt at blackmail is not successful. This was brought out by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the speech he made earlier, with much of which I agree. With as much as I object to, I shall discuss in a moment.

There is a parallel between the heinous proposal of Castro and the proposal of Eichmann, who undoubtedly was carrying out the orders of Hitler, to trade Jews for trucks, at the time of the shocking persecutions of the Jews, as a part of the Nazi program.

As the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Indiana well know, I took the position very early in the Castro administration that we were dealing with a madman—and I used that word in its literal sense. I think we are dealing with a psychiatric case. But this is not the first madman who has for a time on the stage of history determined the temporary destiny of a large population.

I point out in passing that we are not, of course, in a position as a government to negotiate directly with the Castro regime. There has been some talk in the debate in the last 45 minutes that what is proposed is an interference on the part of the Roosevelt committee with the right of our Government to negotiate with the Castro administration. However, we cannot carry on direct negotiations with the Castro administration; we must do that through the Swiss Government. It is not a very satisfactory substitute for direct negotiation. We can differ sincerely and honestly, but I believe it was a great mistake for the U.S. Government to break diplomatic relations with Castro. We had more to lose than did Cuba. I thought the Cuban people had more to lose than anyone else when the American flag was hauled down in Havana and removed, because that flag had been a symbol of hope for the people of Cuba.

There was an allegation at the time that we had never attempted any satisfactory negotiations to determine whether Castro would limit the United States to a personnel of 11 in the Embassy. There was a great dispute as to whether that number was to include gardeners and janitors or only the diplomatic personnel. I thought that question should have been determined

In my judgment, the act of breaking diplomatic relations with Cuba was an impulsive act on the part of the preceding administration. I said, at the time, that it was a great mistake. I thought the American flag should be kept flying in Cuba as a symbol of hope for the Cuban people and as proof that we would not walk out on them.

Furthermore, I believed our Embassy in Havana should have been maintained as a listening post. We should also have

kept ourselves in a position where diplomatic negotiations and discussions, such as now present themselves, could have been carried on. It was a great mistake additionally to discontinue diplomatic relations because we cannot satisfactorily conduct business through a foreign power, no matter how competent the substitute is—and the Swiss are very competent. To do so is bound to create great difficulties.

It was a mistake in my judgment to break diplomatic relations and thus leave a time bomb for the Kennedy administration. That is exactly what the Eisenhower administration did by its breaking of diplomatic relations. There is some internal evidence, at least, that the situation which has developed in connection with the so-called invasion by Cuban exiles with American logistic support and financial support was, in fact, a planned program and one which had been in progress for many months before the Kennedy administration took office. I simply say to the Senate there is no question about that being true. It has been brought out in the hearings before the subcommittee of which I am the chairman.

It verifies the fact that the expedition was a part of the Eisenhower plan which had been worked on for many months. It explains in no small measure why the former President does not desire to have the ashes of the Cuban invasion incident raked over. When those ashes are raked over, it is plainly disclosed as a Republican program as well as, now, a Democratic program.

I hold no brief for the Democratic President proceeding with the program. I believe he should have made it very clear that the United States would not proceed with the program. The results have demonstrated how unwise it was.

I have no question in my mind that had there been consultation with the Hill, we would have obtained much evidence and plenty of proof to support the conclusion that the President should have dropped the plan and should not have given it support. That is water over the dam. We are still confronted with the problem and the question is, Where do we go from here?

Before commenting specifically about some wise observations made by the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Indiana, I should state that I do not believe we have taken all the steps we should at least try to take in concert with our friendly associates, the other countries in Latin America. These countries tell us quite informally that they are in our corner, so to speak. We are having much difficulty, however, in getting them into the ring. I say most respectfully, that there appears to be a shocking breakdown of the functions of the Organization of American States, if we will simply reread the charter which created that Organization.

I ask again: Where are our friends in the Organization of American States? This is a troublesome problem, not only for the United States of America, but for each one of them. In fact, in the long run, they are far more endangered than is the United States.

So again I plead with the members of the Organization of American States and with our State Department not to wait until some time in July, when it is contemplated there will be some economic conference, possibly at Montevideo, to implement the Alliance of Progress. We have an immediate problem of much greater concern and more vital concern to the security of the Western Hemisphere than what is contemplated as the agenda for the Montevideo Conference in July.

I do not think we can delay longer in making a formal approach to this Cuban matter through the Organization of American States; and I hope our State Department and our President will give formal consideration to it, and I hope the American people obtain from this administration some policy statement about it before much more time passes. There is increasing division and confusion among the American people in regard to the Cuban problem—largely, I think, because the American people do not know the facts, not only those in regard to Cuba, but also those in regard to the Organization of American States.

That is why the other day, in the Latin American Subcommittee, I said I hoped the President would quickly be apprised of the active interest in this matter of the Members of the Senate and also of the fact that we are ready and willing to have him advise us regarding this Cuban matter.

Now we have received the proposal that we pay ransom in order to save the lives of approximately 1,000 prisoners.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] pointed out that Castro came to the United States at the invitation of a group of newspaper publishers, I believe, or a group of newspaper editors. It can be stated that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee were very much concerned about that matter. At that time, representatives of the State Department consulted with us. I remember a conference we had in a room one floor below this Chamber. We conferred with the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs.

That conference was in regard to this matter. He pointed out to us that the newspaper editors had never given his Department even an inkling of warning that they were going to extend that invitation to the head of a foreign state. At that time we were having our troubles with Castro, and at that time our country was shocked by Castro's blood baths. Some time before that, several of us had made speeches on the floor of the Senate in protest against the totalitarian procedures and the techniques used by Castro. I shall always take some satisfaction from the fact that I made the first speech which was made here on the Senate floor in criticism of Castro. It was my opinion that Cuba was having visited upon it the substitution of one form of totalitarianism for another. It seemed to me that I was morally bound to make that speech. As the Senator from Indiana well knows, I made it after there had been some discussion of that matter in our committee. Shortly after that, other members of my subcommittee supported my statement and views. At that time the present President of the United States was a member of that subcommittee; and in that capacity and in his capacity of U.S. Senator from the State of Massachusetts he completely agreed with my position. I recall that fact with great pride.

But in our conference with the Assistant Secretary of State for Latin America, there was raised the question, What do we do now? The newspaper editors had then extended the invitation, and we realize that that was bound to be embarrassing to our Government.

My position was that they were no different from any other group in the country, and I saw no reason why they should be treated any differently. They were guilty not only of bad judgment, but also of definitely seeking to interfere with the foreign policy of our Government, and I thought they were subject to censure and to criticism. It will be recalled that I took it upon myself to criticize them.

When I do such things, I expect to be criticized in turn. Many of them published editorials which did not at all flatter me; but not once was I proved wrong on the merits. Actually, in their editorials they engaged in alibiing and in attempts to explain away their lapses of good judgment.

I pointed out that I was not a participant in the extending of entertainment and of hospitality to that madman. The Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] pointed out that I did not participate in that course of action. I am proud to state that I refused—and I did it in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Countries—to attend the meeting which was held. First of all, I could not attend it because at the meeting there would be a discussion of the Cuban problem with which our committee was concerned, and because at the meeting there would also be a discussion of Castro's course of action in Cuba, with which our committee was likewise concerned. I was not willing to take any action which might be regarded as prejudicial to future action by our subcommittee. Secondly, I did not attend the meeting because otherwise the State Department would be embarrassed, inasmuch as the State Department had not then decided on the policy that it intended to follow. Until our State Department had decided what course to follow officially, it could not avoid being embarrassed by such a meeting.

The State Department decided officially that the meeting would be treated on an unofficial basis. That was a policy based on semantics, for everyone knew Castro was in the United States, and it was clear that any protocol extended to him would be regarded elsewhere in the world as an official reception of Castro by our State Department. And such proved to be the case.

To the everlasting credit of the present chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. FULBRIGHT, who, I regret to say, has been called from the floor, and cannot be present at the mo-

ment, at least—he, likewise, disapproved that entire procedure. I happen to know that is a fact.

The Cuban delegation which accompanied Castro called the Foreign Relations Committee room, and said that Castro would like to go there, to meet informally and unofficially with the members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. With the understanding that the meeting would be unofficial and informal, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]—although he did not like any bit of the proposal—said that he felt that as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee he should at least notify the other members of the committee of what Castro wanted. The Senator from Arkansas said that members of the committee who wished to come to the committee meeting, to meet Castro informally and unofficially, could come.

That is what happened; some Senators went, and some Senators not on the Foreign Relations Committee went. I did not go. I refused to go, because it seemed to me at that time the official position of this Government ought to have been one of making perfectly clear an official protest of the policies and the procedures that Castro was following in Cuba.

In one of my speeches I proposed that we call upon Castro to follow the Geneva Convention in regard to handling prisoners. Is it not interesting that we have another prisoner problem now? I said that morally, if not legally, Castro was bound by the Geneva Convention, because Cuba signed the Geneva Convention. This is the Geneva Convention on the Treatment of War Prisoners.

It is true that Castro had a technical out. His technical out was—and he took it—that these prisoners were captured in connection with his revolt against Batista, and were not prisoners taken in a war with a sovereign power; that the Geneva Convention deals with procedures for handling war prisoners in a war between two sovereign powers, and that this was a civil war, and therefore those procedures did not, technically, apply.

Knowing that Castro might fall back on that technicality, my speech in the Senate pointed out it was all the more reason, morally, why he ought to apply the procedures of the Geneva Convention to his own flesh and blood. After all, those captured in his revolt against Batista were Cubans. They were misguided in their support of Batista, but, as we have seen, they were no more misguided than were those who supported Castro.

I spoke out against Castro at that time, and have been consistent in my position since that time.

Now we come, to the question, Where do we go from here? We cannot separate the activities of the committee, headed by Mrs. Roosevelt, Dr. Eisenhower, and Mr. Reuther, from its effect and influence in relation to American foreign policy; and it is going to be so interpreted around the world. A private committee cannot be established in this country which purports, at least, to speak in regard to a foreign policy problem without many people around the world attributing to that committee the official status of speaking for American foreign policy. It is bound to happen. It is happening, I think, already.

Furthermore, as the Senator from Indiana pointed out in his remarks this afternoon, let us not forget that the prisoners in Cuban jails today are just those exiles who were captured in the ill-fated attempted invasion of April 16. We do not know how many thousands of Cubans the Castro police have rounded up and put in Cuban jails as alleged counterrevolutionaries.

One would have to be very shortsighted to assume that Castro was going to take a different attitude toward the counterrevolutionaries who were in his own country at the time of the ill-fated attempted invasion than he did toward the counterrevolutionaries who attempted to invade the country. He knows—we all know—that a part of the plan was the hope, the expectation, that the invasion would stir up, within a few days thereafter, at least, a counterrevolutionary movement in his own country. It was part and parcel of the whole plan.

I think the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from New Hampshire are quite right when they say we do not know what kind of chain reaction we shall start with this proposal. Ransomers, extortionists, pirates, do not stop with just one proposed ransom. If a ransom is obtained for this group, then others can be proposed, and there are estimates of prisoners in Cuban jails varying from 50,000 to 100,000. Once we yield to such blackmail, where is the end?

There is no member of the committee, Mrs. Roosevelt, Dr. Eisenhower, Mr. Reuther, or any one associated with it, who has a more disturbed inner feeling or more pangs of heartache about the plight of these Cuban exiles who were captured in the ill-fated invasion than has the Senator from Oregon.

Furthermore, the fact is made more sad because, to no small measure, we were implicated in the episode. In a very real sense, we cannot wash this dirty spot off our hands, any more than could Lady Macbeth, because there is no doubt about the fact that we aided and abetted and supported the unfortunate attempted invasion, about which many of us knew nothing.

But that, too, is water over the dam. The point I want to stress is that this is a matter which involves American foreign policy. I do not care how one tries to word it in order to seem to keep the committee out of interference with American foreign policy. We want to know from our State Department, and soon, its position in regard to this question. It is much more forthright for us to stand up before the world and say, "Approval is given to this as a matter of Government policy," or "Approval is denied"—one way or the other.

Now I come to the Logan Act. I call this matter to the attention of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], who has said he is not a lawyer. In my book, he is a pretty good sea lawyer, as we say of one who renders a sound legal judgment, although he may not be a member of the bar. This is more than a technicality. It bears on the main thesis of my comments.

The Senator from South Dakota has pointed out the Logan Act has nothing to do with this matter, for many reasons. The act reads, as was brought out by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]:

> Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.
>
> This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects.

I agree with the Senator from South Dakota. The committee has in no way violated the Logan Act, for two main legal reasons. First, their program in no way involves carrying on any direct or indirect correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof. The committee is carrying on its negotiations with the Cuban exiles. The Cuban exiles are in revolt against Castro. The negotiations are with them directly. One cannot, in my judgment, legitimately claim that the exiles are functioning as agents of Castro. Castro has announced to the world what are the terms of his ransom.

In my judgment, what the committee is seeking to do, out of its humanitarian impulses—I share those impulses—is to raise some ransom money in this country to save the lives of the prisoners. The act itself, however, is bound to affect our foreign policy. If our Government wishes to approve of that course of action, it should say so.

We should not engage in any subterfuge. We ought not to engage in any indirection. We ought to stop our pretense. We have a right to ask our Secretary of State—and I now call upon him—to tell the American people what his position is, as Secretary of State, in regard to the course of action which is being followed by the volunteer committee. Once we have that opinion from the Secretary of State, then we shall be in a position to decide what course of action should be followed concerning the attempt of the committee to raise funds.

As it relates to national policy, it is a dangerous thing to countenance in this country voluntary committees which may proceed to follow any course of action which may have repercussions on American foreign policy. In my judgment, that is not a violation of the Logan Act but is an interference with our whole constitutional policy that American foreign policy should be directed by the President of the United States and by the Secretary of State acting as a representative of the President of the United States.

This can be a very bad precedent from the standpoint of American foreign policy procedures.

It is quite proper that my colleagues in the Senate took the course of action they took this afternoon, of calling upon the administration to tell the American people specifically what is its position.

The last point I wish to make in regard to the Logan Act is the point made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], when he said that technically there was no dispute or controversy involved in regard to the United States. That has been removed.

This illustrates again why it was such a great mistake to break diplomatic relations with Cuba. Would that we had an Embassy there. Then there could be direct negotiations with Cuba, at least through diplomatic channels.

I see no basis for a finding that, as a matter of law, there is any dispute or controversy between the United States and the principals with whom Mrs. Roosevelt's committee is negotiating. They are negotiating with the Cuban exiles.

To show the direct relationship between this and American foreign policy, we must remember that the Cuban exiles could not get back into this country without the approval of this Government. That is a procedural act within the sphere of American foreign policy. The exiles are allowed to come into the country with the full knowledge of the administration, so apparently there is knowledge they are going to negotiate with the Mrs. Roosevelt committee, which I think makes it perfectly clear that there is a direct tie between what that committee is doing and American foreign policy.

In order to prevent this from being a precedent, in order to make it very clear that the State Department and the administration will assume full constitutional authority and duty in connection with American foreign policy, the administration ought to proceed without delay to tell the American people to what extent, if any, the procedure outlined by Mrs. Roosevelt's committee has the approval of this administration as a part and parcel of American foreign policy.

I wish to point out, in half a moment, some of the dangers. We are all heartfelt moved by the plight of the exiles who have been captured and are in Cuban prisons. We are all concerned and worried about what the madman may do with them or to them.

We certainly do not wish to lay down a foundation of precedents so that there will spring up in the months ahead one volunteer committee after another which will seek to influence the American people in a quasi-official or semiofficial capacity in respect to some particular program connected with American foreign policy.

There are many trouble spots in this world about which we as individual citizens are very much concerned. Volunteer committees may spring up about something in Laos, in Hungary, in the Congo, in South-West Africa, in Angola, in Goa, or in a good many other places in the world, where fellow human beings are being trampled and their lives are being crushed out by the hundreds and thousands month after month by tyrannies, many of them either Communist or Fascist tyrannies.

In my judgment we cannot have a sound foreign policy program in this country if, in those instances in which it may seem to be expedient to do so, we either close our eyes or turn our heads and look in the other direction when volunteer committees set up volunteer programs concerned with some segment or other of American foreign policy.

In closing, I quite agree with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators who have spoken on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. This procedure has many danger signs written all over it. We must be on guard that we do not approve a course of action because we are heartsick about the fact that some 1,000 or 1,200 Cuban exiles are in Cuban prisons and might be murdered by this madman, as he has murdered so many others through his blood baths. I think we should not let our heartache and our understandable sentiment blind us to the fact that there may be thousands upon thousands of lives put in danger by such a course of action, if we yield at this time to this blackmail.

I think that is the first reason why we have a right to say to the administration, "You owe it to the American people to take an official position upon the proposed determination of American foreign policy by a volunteer group."

Second, I think we have a right to say to the administration, "You have a duty to now make clear, without any further delay, to the Organization of American States that every Latin American country, including Canada to the north of us, ought to convene quickly through the Organization of American States to determine what our joint program and policy ought to be in relation to this tyranny which has taken over Cuba."

I speak respectfully of Canada when I say it is fine for the Foreign Minister of Canada to suggest that Canada mediate the differences between the United States and Cuba, but it would be better for Canada, in the first instance, to fill its seat in the Organization of American States, to stop being merely an observer in the Organization of American States, and to become a voting member of the Organization of American States. I think if Canada did that, she could exercise much more influence in the development of foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere. It would be better to do this than to offer her good offices to serve as mediator between the United States and Cuba on problems between those two countries.

The important thing is that these are not simply United States-Cuban problems. Each and every one of them is a hemispheric problem.

Each and every one of them involves the rights, interest, and the future of every country in this hemisphere. What I have been pleading for is that we stop unilateral action on the part of the United States in relation to Cuba, recognize that the situation calls for joint action on the part of Canada, the United States, and every other Latin American country to try to work out a program for the settlement of problems that have arisen in this hemisphere as a result of Castro going over to the Communists.

Ah, but some say to me, "If you follow that course of action, Mr. Senator, then are you not going to have to negotiate with Cuba?"

Of course, we could negotiate with Cuba or go to war with Cuba. I know there are those who think we ought to go to war with her. And what a great victory that would be. We could defeat her very quickly, although not without the loss of many thousands of American boys. We could not defeat her without the loss of thousands of lives probably in some of the southern strategic areas of Florida and some of the other Southern States. We do not know to what extent such conflict might be the spark that would start a nuclear war. If we have to fight a nuclear war, we will not hesitate to fight it, if we have done everything that we could possibly have done in order to bring mankind to reason without a nuclear war.

We should not follow a course of action that will record that we pulled the trigger. We do have peaceful procedures available to us that we ought to try to use, both through the Organization of American States and through the United Nations.

There are special procedures, both in the Organization of American States and in the United Nations, that at least could be used to seek to get extraordinary meetings of both of those organizations. Have we tried? Are we trying? If not, why not?

This shocking proposal of Castro ought to be the basis for an immediate call upon the part of the United States for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations to focus world opinion on the subject. I do not think that we have started to do the things that we ought to do in order to seek with honor some accommodation by way of a peaceful settlement of this great threat to war in the Western Hemisphere—and it is a growing threat to war in the Western Hemisphere.

One more word about my suggestions with respect to negotiations so that I will not be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that we should offer on a bilateral basis to start negotiations with Cuba, but I do say that we ought to offer to have the Organization of American States start negotiations with Cuba, and if Castro does not want to accept that proposal, offer to have the United Nations start negotiations with Cuba, because whether we like it or not, we cannot wish Cuba off the face of the map. Naturally, either through the Organization of American States or the United Nations, we ought to try to find out if there is any basis for an honorable diplomatic negotiation of procedures for the settlement of the disputes that have arisen between the United States and Cuba.

I offer these thoughts this afternoon because again I wish to say the United States should stop moving away from

the Cuban problem in the direction of war and intervention, and start to move into the Cuban problem through the Organization of American States and through the United Nations, so that history will record that we did our level best to try to avoid any resort to military defense and military action in order to protect American lives and American property.

Speaking of American lives, do not forget that we do not know how many hundreds of American citizens are still in Cuba, but they are there. When we are dealing with a madman who places no more value on life than Castro does, we run always the risk that he would be perfectly willing to go to any extreme in order to vent his perverted emotional makeup on the United States. What would we do if he announced that, "Now you can ransom—how many hundreds we do not know—of American citizens still in Cuba?"

What would be the reaction of this country to that proposal? Of course, there would be every reason for us then to go to the military defense of those American citizens. That is how delicate I think the situation is.

So I close my comments with the plea once again to my Government. Let the State Department run American foreign policy. Let the State Department make clear to the American people its position in regard to any volunteer committee's program in this country. If we want to make such proposals the official program of the State Department, let us say so. But let us not start a chain of precedents of having American foreign policy, from the standpoint of expediency, turned over to private citizens who can follow a course of action that can possibly embarrass—yes, jeopardize—the welfare of this country, and in the end lead to a much greater loss of human life possibly than would be true if Castro should seek to liquidate the exiles that he captured in this invasion, every one of whom knew that he ran the risk of being liquidated by participating in the invasion.

What I have said during the last 15 or 20 minutes on the floor of the Senate can be subject to a great deal of distortion and misrepresentation, but, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, I shall never duck my clear responsibility so long as I serve in that capacity.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has listened with interest to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations. At this hour I shall not try to comment any further. I will say that I share in his hope that the Secretary of State will make a statement that will clarify the official position of the United States with regard to the proposed blackmail. I also hope that the discussion on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, participated in by several Senators, will make a contribution. I am confident it will make a contribution to answering the question, Where do we go from here?

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 22, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 23, 1961, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, May 22, 1961:

U.S. Marshals

Adam J. Walsh, of Maine, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years, vice Harry W. Pinkham.

James H. Dillon, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years, vice Lyle F. Milligan.

Bureau of Customs

Ernesto Flores, of New Mexico, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 50, with headquarters in Columbus, N. Mex.

Cornelius F. Reardon, of Montana, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 33, with headquarters in Great Falls, Mont.

Public Health Service

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations:

To be medical directors

Carl I. Pirkle
Isaac M. Zigler
Thomas E. O'Brien
Josef J. Weisskopf
Carl J. Mankinen
Leslie H. Thomasson
Raymond Hofstra
James A. Hunter, Jr.
James T. Hearin
Norman B. McCullough
Marvin O. Lewis
Lawrence Kilham
Trois E. Johnson
Anibal R. Valle
Glen W. McDonald
Louis C. Floyd
Ardell B. Colyar
Warfield Garson
William P. Ramey
Leo J. Gehrig
R. Leslie Smith
Arthur E. Rikli
C. Dudley Miller
Philip L. Spencer

To be senior surgeons

Frank R. Freckleton
Clarence A. Imboden
Roger L. Black
Albert W. Hilberg

To be surgeons

Arden A. Flint, Jr.
William S. Lainhart
David P. Michener
Eugene H. Guthrie
James L. Wellhouse
Claude R. Garfield
Nicholas Revotskie
Lewis E. Patrie
Robert I. Katase
Edward B. Cross
William S. Dunford, Jr.
Orlando L. Clark
Betty E. Hathaway
Alan S. Rabson
Paul J. Schmidt
Nicholas P. Sinaly
Henry V. Belcher
Louis Levy
George G. Browing
George W. Gaffney
James N. Winblad
Charles H. Boettner
Adolph J. Urban
Emil Frei III
Roger W. Ogara
Emil J. Freireich
David J. Sencer
Eugene Braunwald

To be senior assistant surgeons

Gerald R. Bassett
Jack D. Poland

To be dental directors

John W. Holt
Thomas J. Riley, Jr.
Francis W. Pomije

To be senior dental surgeons

Robert C. Likins
Charles J. Gillooly
Tyler C. Folsom, Jr.
William J. Braye
Samuel S. Herman
Paul H. Keyes
John M. Frankel
William J. Putnam
Harry W. Bruce, Jr.
Frank W. Nelson
Lawrence J. Stanwich

To be dental surgeons

Jack D. Robertson
Herbert Swerdlow
A. Fogle Godby
Bill J. Brady
Winston W. Frenzel
Kenneth C. Potter

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

Warren V. Judd
John R. Stolpe
Jim D. Webb
Charles C. Swoope, Jr.
Donald R. Swatman
Richard L. Christiansen
Wellesley H. Wright
William L. Knudson
Richard K. Fred
Gerald W. Gaston
David A. Dutton
Buckner S. Burch
Manuel H. Marks
Gresham T. Farrar, Jr.

To be sanitary engineer directors

Daniel W. Evans
Charles D. Spangler
Archie B. Freeman
John H. Burgess
Arthur H. Johnson
Paul C. Henderson
Harry Stierli
Kenneth C. Lauster
Joseph A. Boyer
Ross W. Buck

To be senior sanitary engineer

William B. Schreeder

To be sanitary engineers

John L. S. Hickey
Donald J. Nelson, Jr.
Herbert H. Rogers
Edwin M. Lamphere
Malen D. Bogue
Lawrence C. Gray
Melvin W. Carter
Ralph I. Larsen

To be senior assistant sanitary engineers

Donald J. Baumgartner
Harry J. Ettinger
Andre F. LeRoy
Edwin L. Johnson
Eugene J. Donovan, Jr.
Albert H. Story
Norman J. Petersen
Charles F. Walters
Jack L. Witherow

To be assistant sanitary engineers

Harold C. Ervine
Howard P. Zweig
Robert Frank Grossman
John A. Little

To be pharmacist directors

Francis R. Ellis
Robarts L. Proper
Arnold H. Dodge
Ernest J. Simnacher
Carmen A. Carrato

To be senior pharmacists

William M. Hanna
Abraham Wolfthal

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Bernard Shleien
Samuel Merrill
Jacob H. Hendershot
Philip R. Hugill
Robert P. Chandler

To be assistant pharmacists

Ray D. Crossley II
Harley A. Mills
Jerome A. Halperin

To be scientist directors

Melvin E. Griffith
Lloyd W. Law
Everette L. May
Olaf Mickelsen
George W. Lones
F. Earle Lyman

To be senior scientists

John E. Porter
Colvin L. Gibson

To be scientists

Frank P. Brancato
Harold V. Jordan, Jr.
William B. Dewitt
Joseph M. Butler, Jr.
Maxwell J. Wilcomb, Jr.
Thomas E. Anderson

To be senior assistant scientists

John C. Feeley III
Sheldon D. Murphy

To be senior sanitarian

Leroy S. Houser

To be sanitarian

James V. Smith

To be veterinary officer director

Robert D. Courter

To be senior veterinary officers

John F. Winn
Arthur H. Wolff
John H. Scruggs
Herbert G. Stoenner
Samuel Abramson

To be veterinary officer

Joe W. Atkinson

To be nurse directors

Lydia M. Zetzsche
L. Dorothy Carroll
Lois E. Gordner
Rosalie G. Abrahams
Madeline Pershing
Daphine D. Doster
Edna A. Clark
Mary O. Jenney
Harriett G. Dexheimer

To be senior nurse officers

Maud J. Larssen
Jeanette E. Westlake
Mary E. O'Connor
Margaret E. Benson
Dorothy E. Reese
Marie F. Hanzel
Doris E. Roberts

To be nurse officers

Marie M. Lech
Violet C. Ryb
Josephine I. O'Callaghan
Helen Troxell

To be assistant nurse officers

Elizabeth L. Cooper

To be dietitian directors

Clare B. Baldauf
Myrtle M. Vincent

To be senior dietitians

Edith A. Jones
Frances M. Croker

To be dietitian

Letitia W. Warnock

To be senior therapist

Elizabeth M. Finke

To be therapist

John F. Burke

To be health services directors

Ralph L. Jerkins, Jr.
Evelyn Rahm
Nell McKeever
Mary Jo Kraft

To be health services officer

Gloria M. Russo

To be senior assistant health services officer

Richard E. Gallagher

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointments to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be ensigns

William E. Blankinship, Jr.
L. Logan Boles
George M. Cole, Jr.
Darrell W. Crawford
William E. Gott
C. William Hayes
Archie L. Higgins
Richard N. Hune
Seymour R. Kotler
James T. Lane
J. Rodney Lewis
Robert J. Lewis
William B. Merselis
Arthur L. Moshos
Edward J. Murphy
William H. O'Hanlon
Sigmund R. Petersen
Leonard E. Pickens
Saul Rosenberg
B J Taylor, Jr.
Andrew Tczap
Ronald D. Walkenspaw
Richard E. Williams
William B. Williford III

IN THE AIR FORCE

Gen. Thomas D. White, 22A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, under the provisions of Section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code.

Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, 26A (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force, for a period of 2 years, under the provisions of section 8034, title 10 of the United States Code.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended:

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Abernathy, Julian R., Jr., 11730A.
Aberson, Albert D., 33348A.
Abrams, Stuart M., 12442A.
Accola, Jacob P., 33051A.
Adair, Asa A., 11295A.
Adair, Philip R., 11927A.
Adams, Gail J., 12622A.
Adams, John B., 33485A.
Adams, Paul E., 33124A.
Adams, William P., Jr., 11810A.
Adcock, James K., 20589A.
Addis, Walter A., 11563A.
Alagna, Antonito F., 12585A.
Alber, George D., 11917A.
Alexander, Arthur K., 11472A.
Alexander, Ernest L., 18143A.
Alexander, Jim V., 12215A.
Allen, Charles T., Jr., 33084A.
Allen, Hubert E., 11549A.
Allen, Merle F., Jr., 11508A.
Allen, Nelson, 21434A.
Allen, William C., 11382A.
Alston, Archer S., 12516A.
Ambos, William G., 12404A.
Ammon, Robert H., 11697A.
Amundson, Maynard N., 12501A.
Anders, Edwin R., 33277A.
Andersen, Paul C., 33457A.
Anderson, Alfred I., 11863A.
Anderson, Charles C., Jr., 33257A.
Anderson, David S., 11954A.
Anderson, George S., 11726A.
Anderson, James E., 12562A.
Anderson, John B., 12485A.
Anderson, Ralph R., Jr., 11610A.
Anderson, Reid J., 33292A.
Anderson, Richard R., 11588A.
Anderson, Wyman D., 11283A.
Andre, Donald P., 33109A.
Andrews, Ralph P., 12420A.
Angel, Ralph E., 12278A.
Angell, Donald R., 33070A.
Angley, Clyde C., 12200A.
Annis, Ross E., Jr., 12669A.
Antalis, Stephen J., 12332A.
Archer, John H., Jr., 12013A.
Armbruster, Martha L., 21266W.
Arnette, John W., 33378A.
Arnold, Edison F., 33054A.
Arnold, George M., 33486A.
Arnold, William B., 18091A.
Arp, Elwood D., 33387A.
Artwohl, Arpod J., 12153A.
Ashley, Garland O., 11605A.
Ashman, Richard C., 11302A.
Ashmore, Vincent H., 33489A.
Ashworth, Kenton L., 12536A.
Atkinson, Margaret P., 21242W.
Austin, Paul F., 12691A.
Avise, Herbert J., 18114A.
Awtrey, William E., Jr., 33058A.
Ayers, Agustine W., 11496A.
Ayersman, Richard L., 12314A.
Bailey, Felix R., 33166A.
Bailey, Lawrence O., 12640A.
Bailey, Richard F., 12414A.
Bailey, Walter H., Jr., 33136A.
Baker, Dexter K., 11929A.
Baker, Harry F., 12247A.
Baker, Homer A. Jr., 33126A.
Baker, Ogden Z., 33452A.
Baldwin, Oscar F., Jr., 33326A.
Baleski, John J., Jr., 25490A.
Barbieri, Michael J., 51729A.
Barefoot, Selwyn J., 33394A.
Barker, Buford W., 33275A.
Barley, John N., 11428A.
Barnett, William E., 12353A.
Barney, Robert O., 12057A.
Barraclough, Edmund L., 12374A.
Barrett, Paul C., 33293A.
Barricklow, Fred M., 51717A.
Barry, John G., Jr., 33131A.
Bartel, Harry C., 12287A.
Bartol, Wante J., 12238A.
Bartos, Edmund J., 11308A.
Basham, Edward A., 12381A.
Baska, John W., 33311A.
Bayer, Ralph R., 33335A.
Bayne, Harry C., 12289A.
Beahan, Willard J., 33172A.
Beasley, Carl J., 12265A.
Beatty, Ibrie M., Jr., 12017A.
Beck, Joseph P., 12578A.
Beckett, James P., 12360A.
Beecham, William P., 33327A.
Beeler, Robert L., Jr., 11490A.
Beers, Robert L., 11672A.
Belew, John F., 33434A.
Bell, Roscoe L., 11389A.
Bellan, Rudolf A., 11579A.
Bennett, Walter D., 12563A.
Benton, Roger G., 11524A.
Berger, Marvin E., 12337A.
Bergeson, Harold M., 11809A.
Berry, John M., 12561A.
Berry, Vernon H., 51738A.
Bertie, Gilbert H., 12471A.
Betette, Albert G., 33337A.
Bethea, William E., 51703A.
Bice, John D., 33151A.
Biggs, Ernest E., 11417A.
Biggs, George J., 12375A.
Biles, James L., Jr., 12342A.
Bilotta, Joseph P., 11358A.
Birge, Walter C., Jr., 12275A.
Birmele, William J., 33236A.
Biscayart, Jules D., 8374A.
Black, David P., 12052A.
Blacksten, Harry B., 33363A.
Blair, Ben R., 12232A.
Blair, Frank S., 11451A.
Blair, Guy N., 33433A.
Blake, Robert J., 12398A.
Blanck, Eugene L., 21433A.
Blodgett, John H., 33287A.
Blomgren, Norman E., 12580A.
Blue, Eugene A., 33295A.
Bobbitt, Aubrey M., 20644A.
Bogan, Leon S., 12224A.
Bogard, Lawrence M., 12550A.
Bogert, James H., 33106A.
Boland, Jeremiah M., 12210A.
Boland, Joseph E., 12497A.
Bollinger, George W., 12544A.
Bone, Marshall B., 11293A.
Booth, Raymond W. W., 12104A.
Borchers, Clyde R., 12124A.
Borgens, James H., 33296A.
Boutelle, Winston E., 33226A.
Boutwell, Rufus C., Jr., 20033A.
Bowden, John D., Jr., 11468A.
Bowers, Charles J., 33072A.
Bowers, Joseph S., Jr., 33435A.
Bowers, Thomas E., 12222A.
Bowers, William R., 11462A.
Bowling, Temple, 33103A.
Bown, Fred B., 33235A.
Bowry, Donald W., 12620A.
Boyd, Hugh F., Jr., 33159A.
Boyd, Willis G., 51715A.
Boyle, Francis T., 11845A.
Braddock, Edward I., 33313A.
Bradshaw, Marion E., 33336A.
Brady, Roland H., Jr., 11736A.
Brand, Dudley V., 33396A.
Brandon, Harold E., 11353A.
Brantley, William L., 11510A.
Brassfield, William H., 11501A.
Brauer, Karl H., 12192A.
Bray, Leslie W., Jr., 18136A.
Brazee, Donald F., 11803A.
Brazil, Virgil L., 11429A.
Breeze, William A., 33297A.
Bregar, Adolph J., 12611A.
Brenner, Felix G., 12000A.
Brent, James O., 33488A.
Bressan, Christopher, 11476A.
Bridge, John E., 33372A.

Bridges, John L., 22643A.
Briery, Jack, 11513A.
Briesemeister, Edward E., 33316A.
Brimhall, Victor O., 11441A.
Brinson, William L., 18117A.
Brockhouse, Frederick W., 11790A.
Brockman, Warren D., 11383A.
Broussard, Eddie J., Jr., 33098A.
Brown, Clarence W., 11536A.
Brown, Clement F., Jr., 11517A.
Brown, David A., Jr., 11491A.
Brown, Dayton F., 12296A.
Brown, Donald H., 12507A.
Brown, Howard O., 12482A.
Brown, James W., 33341A.
Brown, Robert C., 12363A.
Broyles, Roy L., Jr., 51711A.
Bruckner, Louis M., 12264A.
Bruson, George F., 11813A.
Bryant, Billie B., 12402A.
Bryant, Ernest D., 12292A.
Buchta, Joseph, 20036A.
Buck, Ralph J., 33380A.
Buckspan, David, 33174A.
Buckwalter, John S., 11394A.
Buglass, Kenneth G., 33181A.
Bujol, George W., 12660A.
Bull, Leonard P., 12198A.
Bull, Stephen D., Jr., 12066A.
Bullock, Ralph E., 12339A.
Bunnell, Jerry A., 11990A.
Burdette, Archie G., 33400A.
Burgess, Samuel C., 33376A.
Burnett, Elvin E., 20601A.
Burnett, Ernest T., 33091A.
Burnett, John J., Jr., 12071A.
Burnette, Willis D., 12206A.
Burns, Carlton L., 11841A.
Burns, Richard L., 11840A.
Burns, Robert J., 11586A.
Burrows, Adrian M., 12251A.
Burt, George W., 3d, 11492A.
Burton, Herbert C., 11312A.
Bush, Frederick E., 20643A.
Busha, George F., 20628A.
Butler, Floyd N., 11637A.
Byers, John R., 11785A.
Byington, Telford S., 11928A.
Byrne, George T., 11414A.
Byrne, James F., 12662A.
Byrne, John P., 12218A.
Byrne, Joseph P., 11676A.
Cabas, Victor N., 12162A.
Cadwell, Truman F., 12174A.
Caldwell, John S., Jr., 33360A.
Callander, Thomas J., 12063A.
Callis, William A., 11528A.
Calnon, Jack F., 11532A.
Cameron, Wallace H., 12044A.
Campbell, Frederick A., Jr., 33473A.
Campbell, John L., 51735A.
Campbell, Joseph L., 19667A.
Cannell, James L., 33237A.
Cannon, William B., 11574A.
Canny, Robert W., 12700A.
Capio, Fred, Jr., 12343A.
Caputo, John A., 51725A.
Carkeet, John L., Jr., 11950A.
Carlyon, William P., 33194A.
Carmody, Francis C., 11910A.
Carney, Reed H., 33245A.
Carpenter, Noel, 33096A.
Carraway, James B., 33191A.
Carroll, William J., 12258A.
Carson, Russell V., 12520A.
Carter, Daniel R., 11983A.
Carter, David L., 12035A.
Carter, Herbert E., 11639A.
Carter, Hobart E., 12347A.
Carter, Walter T., 11288A.
Cartledge, Binford M., 12214A.
Carwile, Ernest D., 12392A.
Case, Richard D., 20040A.
Caseria, Armando, 33117A.
Caskey, James W., 11292A.
Cavell, Everett L., 33073A.
Cavin, Edgar R., 12240A.
Cercek, John F., 11738A.
Chaffee, Ralph F., 33105A.
Chalifoux, Alphonse, Jr., 12293A.
Chamberlain, David S., 19927A.
Chapman, Albert V., Jr., 12089A.
Chapman, Paul V., 12407A.
Chenchar, Paul, Jr., 33416A.
Choate, Henry L., 33463A.
Christensen, Edward M., 11677A.
Christianson, Lyle C., 11477A.
Cipolla, Roland H., 33271A.
Clark, James F., Jr., 11866A.
Clark, Leon R., 33156A.
Clark, Ovie D., 33079A.
Clark, Robert S., 12565A.
Clark, Tom S., 33121A.
Clarke, Donald L., 12531A.
Claunch, John G., 12604A.
Clay, Richard L., 22647A.
Cleary, Gerard O., 51745A.
Clellen, Raymond L., 33415A.
Clements, Ross L., 12460A.
Clifford, Raymond V., 12564A.
Clower, Freeling H., 11642A.
Clyde, John F., 33225A.
Clymer, Harvey C., 11310A.
Cobb, James W., 12615A.
Coleman, David H., 11819A.
Coleman, Francis J., 51708A.
Collins, Edward M., 11629A.
Collins, John J., 12244A.
Collins, Rupert P., 33402A.
Combs, Lloyd D., 11337A.
Conkey, Howard L., 12356A.
Conley, Keith, 33246A.
Connell, Milton M., Jr., 33085A.
Connell, Royal W., 12302A.
Conway, Thomas H., 12559A.
Cook, Carl L., Jr., 12019A.
Cook, John W., 33238A.
Cook, Marshall A., 18074A.
Cooke, Raymond K., 33430A.
Copenhaver, Donald L., 12495A.
Corcoran, Edward L., 11481A.
Cordell, Richard N., 33228A.
Correll, Harold M., 10649A.
Cosby, William L., Jr., 11291A.
Cossaboom, William M., 12371A.
Cottingham, Paul F., 51734A.
Couch, James F., 33312A.
Coverdale, Harold F., 33097A.
Craft, William C., 20043A.
Crampton, William M., 33148A.
Crandall, Edmund B., 12642A.
Creighton, Vernon F., 11671A.
Cresto, Joseph L., 12373A.
Crosby, John W., 11340A.
Crow, Robert P., 33478A.
Crow, Roy H., 11777A.
Crowley, Robert B., 33110A.
Cruciana, Louis G., 12175A.
Crump, James B., 11646A.
Cruse, Marshal H., 12431A.
Culwell, Orrel, 11277A.
Cummings, James O., 12508A.
Cummins, Daniel G., 12136A.
Cummins, Frank R., 11633A.
Cunningham, George C., 12135A.
Curran, Arthur R., 11391A.
Curtis, James E., 11431A.
Curtis, John E., 33161A.
Cushman, Henry R., Jr., 33342A.
Dafler, Henry A., 11301A.
Daggitt, William E., 33122A.
Daniel, Charles L., 33190A.
Davies, Edwin R., 11756A.
Davies, George A., 19668A.
Davis, Calvin C., 11497A.
Davis, Lance R., 51743A.
Dean, Frederick F., 12552A.
Dean, Robert M., 12533A.
Deardon, Russell W., 11670A.
Dearment, Harry F., 33436A.
Dearmond, Velfort J., Jr., 33279A.
Decker, Richard H., 33220A.
Deimling, Paul L., 12312A.
Delap, John E., 33417A.
Delisle, Arthur B. C., 12201A.
Delvecchio, Dino, 11721A.
Desaussure, Hamilton, 15486A.
Detroy, Frank, Jr., 33319A.
Deutsch, Edward N., 33437A.
Devee, Earl W., 12257A.
Devoe, Robert C., 11531A.
Diantonio, Andrew, 33255A.
Dill, Alvin W., 11974A.
Disilvestro, Mario, 33438A.
Dixon, Dale V., 12303A.
Doenges, Robert W., 33050A.
Donohoe, Charles A., 12126A.
Dooley, Clarence A., 33353A.
Doran, Brendan J., 12083A.
Dornbrock, Richard C., 11960A.
Dotson, Herbert F., Jr., 20587A.
Doty, Edward A., 12523A.
Dougan, William P., 11381A.
Dougherty, Ralph E., 11514A.
Douglas, James D., Jr., 11688A.
Douglas, Robert F., 33412A.
Dowlearn, Alfred C., 3d, 33397A.
Doyle, Miles M., 12345A.
Draemel, Dean H., 11399A.
Drake, Leo A., Jr., 12489A.
Draper, William G., 12383A.
Dreyer, Arthur, 12513A.
Drubek, Gene E., 12522A.
Ducat, Kenneth H., 11941A.
Duckworth, Robert O., 33041A.
Duffy, Robert A., 11984A.
Duncan, Kenneth R., 12098A.
Dupont, Rene G., 11836A.
Duval, Joseph E., 11989A.
Dwinell, Clifford H., 33082A.
Dwyer, James G., 12496A.
Dyke, Eugene H., 33471A.
Dzamba, John P., 11275A.
Eagle, Comly J., 18115A.
Easley, Sidney P., 33167A.
Eckerson, Olive L., 21341W.
Ecklund, Eugene, 20600A.
Edington, Leonard E., 11875A.
Edwards, Clifford E., 11912A.
Edward, Joseph E., 11530A.
Edwards, William H., 11020A.
Egender, Herbert F., 24317A.
Eichman, Edward A., Jr., 12571A.
Ekrem, Harvey Z., 12305A.
Eldredge, Clayton R., 11985A.
Eldridge, George W., 11620A.
Elias, Samuel M., 12096A.
Ellen, Cicero J., 33350A.
Elliott, McLean W., 12307A.
Ellis, Charles J., Jr., 11537A.
Elrod, Erwin B., 12607A.
Emerson, Jack G., 12697A.
Emmons, Perry C., 11526A.
Emrich, Daniel C., 11824A.
Epperson, George M., 12574A.
Erdmann, Orville L., 12028A.
Esch, Maurice E., 11873A.
Estes, Winston M., 33298A.
Evanco, Michael, 12065A.
Evans, George G., Jr., 33216A.
Evans, William H., 33086A.
Everett, Franklin A., 12180A.
Everett, Phillip E., 11571A.
Everhart, John W., 33150A.
Eyler, Carl G., 12122A.
Fahringer, Frederick H., 12645A.
Fancher, Jack N., 33093A.
Farr, Ned W., Jr., 33130A.
Farr, Robert, 12109A.
Farrell, Everett N., 12003A.
Farrell, Thomas D., 16200A.
Farrington, Raymond F., 12493A.
Favors, Marcus W., 11360A.
Fecher, Louis A., 3d, 12288A.
Felice, Carman P., 11816A.
Felski, Daniel J., 51720A.
Felt, Blaine J., 33364A.
Fenlon, Peter C., 51746A.
Fernandes, Joe L., 12111A.
Ferris, Joseph, 12368A.
Feuerstein, Donald W., 12433A.
Finke, Eugene, 12351A.
Finnell, Herbert S., Jr., 12263A.
Fisher, Charles D., Jr., 51740A.
Fisher, Jay N., 11926A.
Fisher, Max L., 11436A.
Fisher, Roy L., 33203A.
Fitzhenry, Oscar C., 12031A.
Flanagan, Preston S., 12223A.
Flanders, Robert C., 33480A.
Fleming, Joseph F., 33258A.
Flesner, Eugene E., 11507A.
Fletcher, Edward C., 11762A.
Flicek, Jerry F., 12113A.

Floyd, John F., 12074A.
Flynn, Thomas G., Jr., 11294A.
Fondaw, Sidney G., 11751A.
Ford, Geoffrey R., 12183A.
Ford, Oscar C., 12086A.
Ford, Perry C., 33142A.
Forrest, Birdene E., 33240A.
Fortney, Alvin R., 33141A.
Foster, Martin A., Jr., 33431A.
Fowler, Oscar F., 20583A.
Frederick, Russel R., 12148A.
Frederickson, Marshall V., 12069A.
French, Philip N., 11402A.
Frenk, Ardelle W., 33418A.
Freund, Darral J., 33180A.
Friedrich, Walter R., 12589A.
Fritz, Paul C., 12284A.
Frizzie, Bernard E., 21442A.
Frobom, Leo, 12664A.
Froehlich, Vernon W., 11666A.
Frymire, William D., 11741A.
Fuss, John H., 12291A.
Gaertner, Adolph, Jr., 20603A.
Gahl, Ralph D., 11300A.
Gajan, Stephen A., 33059A.
Gallagher, Kenneth F., 11693A.
Gallagher, Rial F., 20621A.
Garcia, Abraham G., 11352A.
Gardner, Robert E., 33266A.
Garris, Phillip W., 33081A.
Garuti, Mario A., 33265A.
Garvin, Louis A., 12676A.
Gates, William M., 12115A.
Gay, Dillar, Jr., 33479A.
Gay, William M., 11422A.
George, Daniel T., 33253A.
Georges, Robert E., 33398A.
Gerbing, Thomas M., 33288A.
Gervase, Edward M., 11319A.
Gerwick, James A., 33132A.
Giannini, Jack L., 11600A.
Gibson, Marion B., 12695A.
Gibson, Orrin, L., 11423A.
Gibson, William M., 11874A.
Gillespie, Leonard V., 33299A.
Gilliatt, Paul T., 33147A.
Gillis, Jack T., 11309A.
Gilluly, John W., 33351A.
Gilpin, Harry D., 18124A.
Glassburner, Thomas M., 51710A.
Gleichauf, Paul W., 12209A.
Glover, Jerry C., 20659A.
Goddard, Ernest D., 12103A.
Gonske, Walter F., 11973A.
Good, Arnold N., 11918A.
Good, Clyde E., 11585A.
Good, Roger R., 12299A.
Goodman, Raymond E., 12306A.
Goodrich, Wallace C., Jr., 33370A.
Gorham, Robert M., 33460A.
Goris, William B., 33321A.
Grady, Robert J., 11619A.
Grammas, George T., 33177A.
Gray, David F., 12678A.
Gray, Zack, 11567A.
Greathouse, Nathan G., 33361A.
Green, Frank R., 51706A.
Greene, Sidney, 20658A.
Greenspun, Morris J., 21432A.
Greer, Edwin H., 12540A.
Gregg, Charles R., 11416A.
Grider, Arthur P. Jr., 12447A.
Griffin, John A., 12049A.
Griffin, Ralph O., 12648A.
Griffith, Joseph H. Jr., 33128A.
Grinsted, Albert H., Jr., 11901A.
Griswold, Edward D., 33352A.
Grover, Roy L., 11434A.
Gruber, Kenneth W., 20623A.
Gshwandtner, Frank J., 11387A.
Guernsey, Harold J., Jr., 11806A.
Gunn, Leon O., 12340A.
Gunter, Lester E., 12040A.
Gwaltney, Laverne, 12396A.
Hagenback, James J., 12372A.
Hague, Owen E., 12558A.
Haines, Carroll E., 11868A.
Hale, Charles E., 12229A.
Hale, Jimmie W., 33481A.
Hall, James H., 12254A.
Halloran, James P. S., 11955A.
Hamby, Malcolm C., 11880A.
Hamilton, Julian W., 12602A.
Hamilton, Ralph W., 12449A.
Hamlin, Robert W., 18084A.
Hammett, Charles E., 11466A.
Hand, F. Ned, 19789A.
Haney, Charles W., 12002A.
Hange, Richard H., Sr., 11944A.
Hansen, Carleton V., 33323A.
Hansen, Paul H., 12665A.
Hansen, William R., 12355A.
Hanson, Kermit T., 11674A.
Hanton, John T., 18138A.
Hardin, Neal H., Jr., 12687A.
Hardy, Fred P., 33204A.
Hardy, Preston B., 11969A.
Harkness, Orlo V., 12424A.
Harmon, Clifford W., 12056A.
Harmon, William A., 21438A.
Harrell, Thomas, 33219A.
Harrington, Homer F., 33262A.
Harris, Charles A., 11589A.
Harris, Floyd D., 33094A.
Harris, Howard L., Jr., 11467A.
Harris, James W., 3d, 12370A.
Harris, William P., 11286A.
Harrison, Robert B., 11946A.
Harrison, William C., Jr., 11652A.
Hart, Ernest J., 33440A.
Hart, Raymond J., 11440A.
Haslett, Hugh J., 11644A.
Hasskamp, Harold E., 11418A.
Hatcher, Albert D., Jr., 33042A.
Hathaway, Bruce R., 11959A.
Hausman, James J., 33045A.
Haven, Galen M., 33314A.
Hawkins, William R., 33410A.
Haws, George A., 33414A.
Hayden, Dean E., 33441A.
Hayes, Lloyd R., 33357A.
Hayter, Gerald H., 11580A.
Healy, Warren R., 12487A.
Hearn, Walter J., 11274A.
Heggenberger, Robert W., 11649A.
Heifner, George E., 12410A.
Hein, Gordon E., 11942A.
Heinzel, Roy H., 11167A.
Helton, Homer, H., 33259A.
Hemmer, Albert B., 11988A.
Henderson, Vernon J., 11899A.
Henner, Ernest S., Jr., 11658A.
Henry, Harry C., 33099A.
Henry, Jesse G., 12204A.
Herrington, William C., 12468A.
Hewitt, George E., 12081A.
Heyl, Rodney W., 11690A.
Hibbert, John A., 11713A.
Hickey, James E., 33217A.
Hicks, Lindsey, 12573A.
Hicks, Lonnie W., Jr., 11573A.
Hicky, Dan M., 11385A.
Hill, Marcus L., Jr., 20622A.
Hill, William A. F., 51723A.
Hinck, Robert B., 12364A.
Hiney, John W., 12105A.
Hinkley, Eugene L., 12454A.
Hintze, Milton A., Jr., 12188A.
Hirshberg, Sidney S., 11838A.
Hobbs, Harold W., 12609A.
Hogan, Walton L., Sr., 12143A.
Hogg, Roy B., 33469A.
Holeman, Harry G., 11758A.
Holguin, Jose L., 33260A.
Holliday, John H., 49132A.
Hollingsworth, James S., Jr., 12551A.
Holmes, Douglas I., 12237A.
Holmes, Weldon F., 51726A.
Hood, Charles T., 12217A.
Hopkins, Harold J., 10492A.
Horr, Wayne L., 12430A.
Horschman, Robert L., 51713A.
Houghten, Robert L., 33107A.
House, Walter G., 33482A.
Howard, Blake P., 33211A.
Howard Harold E., 12387A.
Howard, Herbert B., Jr., 12009A.
Howell, Joseph V., 12088A.
Howell, Selah H., 33192A.
Hudson, Reed O., 11511A.
Huffman, Delbert L., 12233A.
Hughes, Lewis C., 12025A.
Hughes Paul A., 19947A.
Hugunin, Guy J., Jr., 11662A.
Huke, Theodore C., 20027A.
Hundley, Everett L., 12686A.
Hunt, Jerry J., 33374A.
Hunter, Harry F., 12246A.
Hurlburt, Dana F., 18119A.
Hurlburt, Gaines, 12262A.
Hurst, John D., 12367A.
Husband, Toy B., 33263A.
Husemoller, Kenneth E., 11502A.
Hutchins, Ralph, 11453A.
Iddins, Donald J., 11746A.
Iovine, Guy T., 11648A.
Italia, Santo, 11556A.
Jackson, Frank R., 11627A.
Jackson, Harley F., 12683A.
James, John G., 12008A.
Jameson, Dorence C., 51709A.
Jameson, Lowell R., 33149A.
Jensen, Lloyd K., 20624A.
Jensen, Wiley O., 12503A.
Jenstrom, Eino E., 11401A.
Jess, Edward O., 33426A.
Jewell, Malcolm E., 20588A.
Johansen, Martin C., 11774A.
Johnson, Arthur H., 22684A.
Johnson, Clyde J., 33451A.
Johnson, Donald W., 12361A.
Johnson, Douglas D., 12362A.
Johnson, Forrest D., 12463A.
Johnson, George A., 20672A.
Johnson, George W., Jr., 11384A.
Johnson, Isham M., 11322A.
Johnson, Thomas B., 12119A.
Johnston, Robert D., 33427A.
Johnston, Ruby E., 51719A.
Johnston, Wallace W., 12106A.
Jones, Donald P., 11699A.
Jones, Ernest C., Jr., 11297A.
Jones, James M., Jr., 11647A.
Jones, Kenneth L., 12587A.
Jones, Percy L., 12377A.
Jones, Robert L., 11961A.
Jones, William M., 20641A.
Jordan, Jay J., 10581A.
Jordan, Raymond V., 11780A.
Joyce, Daniel G., 25605A.
Joyner, William H., 11403A.
Judas, Maxwell V., 11667A.
Jungman, Clarence A., 12659A.
Kanable, Gerald E., 51730A.
Kane, Randall S., 12510A.
Karas, Philip, 12459A.
Kaufman, Frank L., 12300A.
Kaufmann, Milton M., 33175A.
Kearney, John L., 12357A.
Keefer, Irvin J., 12393A.
Keeffe, Donald J., 12632A.
Keene, Forrest M., Jr., 11555A.
Keiper, John A., Jr., 12051A.
Kelley, Carroll W., 22992A.
Kelly, Charles E., 22995A.
Kelly, Francis A., 12509A.
Kemerling, William E., 21460A.
Kemper, George A., Jr., 11443A.
Kendall, Gardner W., 12511A.
Kennedy, Clarence C., 11558A.
Kennedy, Francis S., 12220A.
Kenney, Richard F., 11425A.
Kibler, Bertram A., Jr., 33322A.
Kilroy, Walter D., 33331A.
Kimbrough, Donovan, 11919A.
Kincaid, Norris R., 33371A.
Kingery, William W., 11390A.
Kirk, Norbert W., 33044A.
Kirkland, Jack M., 11392A.
Kirklin, John M., 12419A.
Kirsner, Sheldon W., 11569A.
Kissell, William G., 11776A.
Kleppinger, Paul G., 11554A.
Klohe, Ivon F., 33413A.
Knight, Billy E., 12189A.
Knutson, Bruce B., 11363A.
Knutson, Gerald P., 12154A.
Koeck, Adolph K., 33063A.
Koepp, Harry J., 11317A.
Kohrman, Elwood N., 20602A.
Kolbe, John E., 51712A.
Koller, Rudolph C., Jr., 11324A.
Korger, Harold F., 11856A.

Kral, William, 11722A.
Kramer, Vernon J., 11638A.
Krause, Arthur F., 12532A.
Krout, Harold E., 33143A.
Kuchenbecker, John E., 11705A.
Kuehl, Albert R., 21436A.
Kuhn, Francis L., 11943A.
Kuhn, Robert W., 12428A.
Kumnick, Chris A., Jr., 12270A.
Kyle, James A., 51728A.
Laberge, Vincent R., 11915A.
Ladd, Robert B., 11700A.
Lairmore, Glenn E., 11905A.
Lake, James, 12145A.
Lakin, John W., 12470A.
Lally, Glenn J., 11598A.
Lambert, Joseph R., 12039A.
Lambert, Lee R., 11426A.
Lambertson, Norman F., Jr., 11330A.
Lancaster, Rayburn D., 12022A.
Landry, John F., 33283A.
Lane, Franklin K., 12623A.
Lane, William F., Sr., 33483A.
Langdon, George E., 33221A.
Larsen, Howard W., 51733A.
Lasko, Charles W., 12169A.
Latella, John J., 20032A.
Latham, Seymour E., 12548A.
Latta, Farley A., 12395A.
Laughlin, Harlan L., 11993A.
Lavalley, Ernest A., Jr., 33367A.
Lavigne, Edwin W., 12239A.
Lee, John J., 12411A.
Lee, Maurice E., Jr., 33345A.
Lee, Raymond C., Jr., 12261A.
LeFrancis, Richard G., 11937A.
Leonhardt, Herbert V., 11767A.
Lesonik, Leo, 51724A.
Lester, Raymond N., 51731A.
Lethers, Edward W., 11831A.
Levan, Jay E., 11839A.
Levine, Arnold, 12653A.
Levine, Howard M., 33300A.
Lewandoski, Joseph W., 11493A.
Lewis, Rone H., 33133A.
Lewis, Warren R., 11469A.
L'Heureux, Harry D., 11520A.
Liebscher, Charles V., 33358A.
Light, Herbert M., Jr., 18128A.
Liles, Cecil N., 33224A.
Linck, John J., 12484A.
Lindberg, Frank R., 33339A.
Linden, Eric O., 11660A.
Lipari, James R., 11518A.
Lipe, Fort W., 33183A.
Litchfield, Robert L., 11764A.
Little, Oliver W., 33152A.
Livesay, Willie E., 11958A.
Lockhart, George M., 11386A.
Lockhart, Warren L., 33346A.
Lockie, Stanley M., 33090A.
Locklear, James Q., 18133A.
Locy, James A., Jr., 12576A.
Lodge, James D., 12666A.
Logan, Harry R., Jr., 33252A.
Long, John B., 11885A.
Long, John D., 33123A.
Long, Robert F., 18142A.
Long, Walter W., 11454A.
Longer, Donald K., 33286A.
Looney, Victor N., 33232A.
Looney, William A., 11654A.
Lorino, Nash E., 11372A.
Loughlin, Charles T., 12191A.
Lovell, Stanley R., 33464A.
Lowther, Dale R., 51707A.
Lugo, Frank M., 12338A.
Luke, Ernest P., 12518A.
Luksic, Carl J., 33388A.
Lunsford, George M., 22646A.
Lynch, Clyde M., 11505A.
Lyness, Charles J., 11321A.
Lynn, William J., 11362A.
Mabrey, Owen D., 12598A.
MacAaron, Kenneth A., 10362A.
MacDonald, Earle F., 11376A.
MacGhee, David F., 33206A.
Machado, Joseph G., 12537A.
Mack, Charles C., 33250A.
MacLean, Lynwood A., Jr., 11781A.
Maddalena, Joe, Jr., 33087A.
Madole, William H., 11640A.
Magers, James W., 11307A.
Mamalis, Solon, 12453A.
Manatt, James C., 33377A.
Mandell, Robert I., 12570A.
Manteuffel, Roger W., 11419A.
Marginean, Charles V., 33184A.
Markiel, Henry J., 33354A.
Marriott, William B., 12401A.
Marsden, Roy F., 11921A.
Marshall, Benjamin C., 12129A.
Marshall, George L., 11909A.
Martin, William P., 11547A.
Mascot, Paul J., 33092A.
Masden, Gilbert A., 11991A.
Mask, Kenneth J., 12690A.
Mason, Robert J., Jr., 12577A.
Mason, Wallace A., 12045A.
Massett, Joseph J., 51742A.
Massey, Holman C., 11998A.
Matthews, Richard G., 12674A.
Mauck, Ernest B., 33278A.
Maxey, Horace H., 11459A.
Maxwell, George S., 11896A.
Mayes, Archie S., 33267A.
Mayland, Lawrence P., 33078A.
Mayo, Jesse L., 33116A.
Maze, Charles L., 11341A.
McAusland, Douglas G., 11795A.
McBrayer, James R., 12437A.
McBrayer, Madison M., 33355A.
McCarroll, Billy J., 12504A.
McCaskill, Roderick E., 33408A.
McCaslin, Kenneth R., 12603A.
McCauley, Lon A., Jr., 11787A.
McClean, William E., 33202A.
McClelland, Alva L., 11356A.
McClung, James D., 12269A.
McClung, Thomas S. L., 12250A.
McClure, John E., 11740A.
McCombs, John R., 33074A.
McCrea, Arthur, 33233A.
McCuskey, Michael A., 33428A.
McCutchen, Robert W., Jr., 11606A.
McDonald, Gorman A., 11791A.
McDonald, James M., 33048A.
McDowell, Samuel A., Jr., 33301A.
McElroy, James T., 11994A.
McElroy, Perry B., 33139A.
McEnerney, Margaret E., 21245W.
McFadyen, James B., 33302A.
McFalls, John O., Jr., 33101A.
McFarland, James M., 33052A.
McGee, George R., 11375A.
McGill, Paul E., 11590A.
McGinnis, Benton W., 33241A.
McGrath, Thomas J., 11495A.
McHugh, John F., 11527A.
McIntosh, Laurence P., 33066A.
McIntosh, Richard K., 11442A.
McKay, George P., 12029A.
McKee, Harvey A., 11421A.
McKeehen, Lloyd R., 33470A.
McKeever, Daniel L., 33242A.
McKenzie, Sheppard A., Jr., 33064A.
McKibban, Robert V., 12649A.
McKinley, James W., 11723A.
McKinney, Baylus B., Jr., 12590A.
McKinney, Claude G., Jr., 33179A.
McKinney, Clell H., Jr., 12639A.
McKinney, David W., 12281A.
McKnight, Theodore, Jr., 11577A.
McKoy, Wendell G., 12194A.
McLain, Mack A., 12030A.
McLain, Steven J., 12545A.
McMillan, Clinton, Jr., 12498A.
McMillin, Wallace D., 11570A.
McQuown, Herbert W., 33328A.
McVay, Richard B., 12365A.
Meek, Frank E., Jr., 12334A.
Meeker, Roy L. 12388A.
Meier, Clifford H., 11783A.
Meis, William L., 33060A.
Melucas, Paul J., 20640A.
Menaker, William M., Jr., 51737A.
Mendrop, Richard G., 33127A.
Mercogliana, Albert P., 11861A.
Metcalf, Curtis N., 12668A.
Metzger, Edward W., Jr., 33442A.
Michalowski, Joseph S., 33472A.
Mickelsen, Earl H., 12335A.
Miles, James H., Jr., 12050A.
Miller, Carr L., 11335A.
Miller, Harold M., 33264A.
Miller, James, 33071A.
Miller, Raymond L., 11483A.
Miller, Vernon H., 33274A.
Millis, Billy J., 12245A.
Mills, Charles M., 33366A.
Mills, Jack W., 12137A.
Mills, Robert J., 12661A.
Minett, Robert T., 33100A.
Minietta, Eugene D., 12421A.
Minihan, Charles E., 12652A.
Minow, James W., 23651A.
Minton, Silas J., 33157A.
Misner, Richard F., 12445A.
Mitchell, Collins P., 22570A.
Mitchell, George C., 33185A.
Mitchell, J.C., 33168A.
Mitchell, Stanley P., 33443A.
Mitchell, William E., 33444A.
Modesitt, Walter E., 11285A.
Moehle, Charles F., 18131A.
Moffat, Harold L., 11931A.
Mokszanowski, Raymond J., 33381A.
Monaco, Anthony W., Jr., 20605A.
Money, Thomas J., 33303A.
Monkiewicz, Witold B., 33065A.
Montagne, Robert D., 33115A.
Montgomery, James W., 33445A.
Montour, Gilbert E., 19790A.
Moody, Edgar W., 11971A.
Moore, Bryce S., 11512A.
Moore, Donald F., 12568A.
Moore, Ernest F., 12693A.
Moore, Milton R., 11361A.
Moran, Charles K., 33144A.
Morel, Dante V., 33047A.
Morgan, Charles W., 33088A.
Morgan, Emory C., 12112A.
Morgan, Spencer G., 12255A.
Morris, Lester W., 12276A.
Morris, Thomas E., Jr., 33153A.
Morrison, Harry B., Jr., 11548A.
Morton, Walter P., Jr., 18129A.
Mosall, George W., 12202A.
Muir, Robert W., 12241A.
Munnerlyn, Billy J., 12090A.
Murchison, Weldon O., 33210A.
Murphy, Bernard L., Jr., 33487A.
Murphy, Charles L., 11328A.
Murphy, James J., 11957A.
Murray, Joseph D., 33165A.
Myers, Andrew J., Jr., 20769A.
Myers, Duncan C., 33197A.
Myers, George G., 12560A.
Myers, Robert A., 11881A.
Nadler, Paul O., 11332A.
Nance. Ernest T., 11904A.
Nash, John F., Jr., 11543A.
Nash, Tom L., Jr., 33146A.
Naum, Albert C., 33134A.
Nave, Elza W., 33243A.
Neff, Leo M., 33324A.
Nelsen, Maynard P., 11760A.
Nelson, Charles L., 11455A.
Nelson, William H., 33458A.
Netherland, James O., 10514A.
Newbern, Robert G., 33280A.
Newstrom, Carroll M., 11850A.
Nibouar, Grover C., Jr., 10342A.
Nickols, Jess R., 11284A.
Nielsen, Austin, 11964A.
Niemczyk, Julian M., 20671A.
Nolan, Alson V., Jr., 12095A.
Nole, Jack D., 20598A.
Nordenstrom, Wallace O., 12059A.
Norman, Joe R., 33155A.
Norton, Howard B., 33119A.
Norton, Ross D., 33447A.
Novinski, Norbert L., 11626A.
Nowak, Edwin H., Jr., 12248A.
Nowell, Rufus H., Jr., 12614A.
Nowinski, Will M., 11450A.
Noyes, Arnold V., 12472A.
Nylen, Arthur H., Jr., 11299A.
O'Brien, Alden W., 11872A.
O'Brien, James E., 33382A.
O'Brien, Raymond C., Jr., 33477A.
O'Carroll, Thomas K., 11898A.
O'Connor, Henry M., 11972A.

O'Connor, Joseph J., 33247A.
O'Day, Russell M. H., 12187A.
Oehme, Vance, 12076A.
Ogburn, George H., Jr., 11739A.
Ogg, Charles L., 33043A.
Ohlmeyer, Harold Z., 12656A.
Okey, Joseph T., 11887A.
Oldham, Charles B., 12391A.
Olney, Richard O., 11562A.
Olsen, Eugene M. R., 12295A.
Olson, Harold A., 33448A.
Olson, Robert C., 33401A.
Orem, Robert E., 33455A.
Orlando, Michael J., 12682A.
O'Rourke, Gordon J., 33467A.
Orr, Jack P., 11978A.
Osborn, Robert R., 33334A.
Osborne, William H., 12316A.
Otis, James D., Jr., 11821A.
Overholser, Earle L., Jr., 11420A.
Owen, Arthur W., Jr., 12166A.
Owen, Clyde W., 12348A.
Owen, George F., 33187A.
Owens, Edwin B., 33234A.
Pallo, John, 11891A.
Palmer, Robert T., 12569A.
Palowez, John, 12667A.
Pappas, Gus J., 33272A.
Pappas, Thomas R., 11373A.
Parello, Thomas L., 12390A.
Parker, George E., 12327A.
Parker, Henry L., 33056A.
Parker, Hunter D., 12285A.
Parker, John F., 11714A.
Parrish, Alexander H., 11473A.
Parsons, Robert P., 12553A.
Parsons, Wyly, 33285A.
Partridge, Robert J., 12107A.
Patterson, Neill T., 33129A.
Patton, Gene M., 12034A.
Patton, William H., 12190A.
Paul, Arthur W., 33196A.
Paul, Benjamin, 33490A.
Paule, William, 33118A.
Pautz, Martin R., 11516A.
Payne, Alice H., 21269W.
Pearson, Karl R., 12097A.
Pearson, Samuel L., 11897A.
Pearson, William H., 33077A.
Pebles, Glen A., 12159A.
Peck, Douglas T., 11770A.
Pedigo, John H., 12439A.
Pellegrini, Joseph, 33390A.
Pellegrini, Joseph J., 33176A.
Penn, William W., Jr., 12023A.
Penrod, James B., 12389A.
Peratt, Jon David, 12594A.
Perkins, Dale J., 33356A.
Peronto, Earl N., 33362A.
Perry, Donald J., 33432A.
Perry, James W., 20673A.
Peters, Francis D., Jr., 18137A.
Peterson, Howard W., 24307A.
Peterson, Sumner W., 11992A.
Petkus, Walter A., 22613A
Petscher, James A., 11380A.
Pettibon, Dale E., 33449A.
Phears, William D., 11970A.
Phillips, Arthur G., Jr., 11817A.
Phillips, Francis T., Jr., 11584A.
Phillips, Robert P., 12595A.
Phipps, Charles E., 11645A.
Phoenix, Homer J., 33407A.
Pierce, Russell K., Jr., 18118A.
Pinney, Norman W., Jr., 33104A.
Pinson, Claud C., 11900A.
Piper, Max L., 33068A.
Pippin, Theodore C., Jr., 12157A.
Pirozek, Wasil, 11336A.
Pivarnik, Michael, Jr., 11349A.
Planey, John A., 11273A.
Platz, Alfred W., 33456A.
Platz, Gerhardt H., 33193A.
Plecha, Stanley L., 11458A.
Plunkett, Marvin K., 33359A.
Poehler, Garland W., 33304A.
Poindexter, William R., 11843A.
Poling, Don L., 12521A.
Polve, James H., 11597A.
Porter, Denver M., 12221A.
Porter, James B., 33222A.
Post, George M., 12321A.
Pottebaum, Cletus J., 33391A.
Potter, Dwight H., 12151A.
Potter, Nolen L., 33404A.
Potter, Richard E., 33114A.
Pouliot, Albert S., 33067A.
Poulson, Raymond P., 11867A.
Powers, Robert L., 33325A.
Pratt, Charles J., 33269A.
Price, Teller S., 33332A.
Prien, Kenneth W., 11981A.
Prince, Robert A., 21779A.
Prochaska, Joseph R., 12172A.
Prout, Donald G., 11949A.
Provancha, George J., 11696A.
Pryor, Gaillard S., 11906A.
Psomas, Harry P., 33318A.
Puglisi, Vincent, 33108A.
Purkey, Gerald L., 33392A.
Puttkamer, Kenneth, 12075A.
Quayle, Gerald D., Jr., 12078A.
Quigley, Edward C., 12491A.
Radomski, Meko M., 33305A.
Raeke, Louis A., Jr., 12033A.
Ragsdale, Roy D., 11369A.
Raines, Lewis D., 33198A.
Ralph, John H., 11911A.
Ramirez, Norbert D., 11924A.
Randazzo, James J., 33223A.
Rankin, William H., 12273A.
Rapisardi, Augustin J., 33062A.
Rawlings, Udell R., 33281A.
Ray, James A., 33080A.
Ray, Norman W., 33461A.
Ray, Raymond R., 33329A.
Ray, Robert J., 11823A.
Reddall, Gordon C., 12297A.
Reddrick, Noel B., 12046A.
Redford, Bynum H., 33270A.
Reed, Howard E., 33369A.
Rehak, Frank, Jr., 11986A.
Rehm, Maurice P., 11616A.
Reiter, Jack, 11982A.
Renk, Norman G., 12671A.
Renneisen, Robert M., 33102A.
Revere, Floyd, Jr., 11607A.
Revoir, Kenneth J., 33406A.
Reynolds, William L., 33076A.
Reynolds, William M., Jr., 11568A.
Rice, Arthur E., 11692A.
Rice, Gale F., 12061A.
Rice, William L., Jr., 12699A.
Rich, David A., 33207A.
Richardson, Glen W., 11848A.
Richardson, Jack P., 51732A.
Richardson, Robert F., 12462A.
Richardson, Rolland L., 11679A.
Roberts, James B., 12584A.
Roberts, Robill W., 33182A.
Roberts, Thomas C., 11859A.
Robertson, Everett E., Jr., 11987A.
Robinson, Charles C., 33289A.
Robinson, Hunter R., 11788A.
Robinson, Jack, Jr., 12271A.
Robinson, Michael F., 33421A.
Robinson, Richard S., 33309A.
Rodby, Stanley E., 33215A.
Rogers, Ellard T., 33383A.
Rogers, William B., 11282A.
Rohrbough, Merrill H., 11535A.
Rosa, Joseph J., 12320A.
Rose, Denis R., 33399A.
Rosenberg, Louis S., 12326A.
Rosenfield, Joseph W., Jr., 12058A.
Rosentreter, Edward M., 33306A.
Rossano, Marcello J., 33411A.
Roy, Clyde, 11552A.
Ruddick, Lynn W., 11718A.
Rudrud, Norman V., 12280A.
Ruff, George F., 12054A.
Ruppelt, Ellis A., 12350A.
Ruscitto, James O., 12235A.
Rust, Henry B., 11761A.
Rutherford, Richard T., 18134A.
Ryhlick, Lawrence T., 19654A.
Sackett, Carl L., Jr., 11621A.
Salmon, Delbert J., 11834A.
Saltmarsh, Frederic A., 11408A.
Sampson, George A., 11858A.
Sanders, Wendell W., 12121A.
Sandusky, William F., 11575A.
Sandvig, Kenneth L., 20595A.
Sanford, Douglas F., 12256A.
Santala, Eugene W., 11940A.
Sanxter, Donald L., 11732A.
Sapp, Roger E., 11789A.
Satterlee, Dean H., 33178A.
Saum, Hugh H., Jr., 33344A.
Saunders, Alan, 11576A.
Scariano, Frankie R., 11596A.
Schaitel, Leonard J., 11907A.
Scharf, Richard E., 12596A.
Schaunaman, George S., 12588A.
Schiavoni, Vincent P., 12572A.
Schlabs, Frank W., 11832A.
Schlitzkus, Samuel C., 33229A.
Schmelz, Richard E., 12412A.
Schmidt, Howard R., 18123A.
Schmitz, Frederick H., 12448A.
Schnauber, Louis G., 11793A.
Schreffler, Charles E., 12542A.
Schuler, Eldor H., 12384A.
Schwartz, John C., 11314A.
Scott, Dale W., 11733A.
Scott, George W., 11412A.
Scott, Robert F., 12313A.
Scott, Robert G., 33403A.
Scott, Winton A., 12379A.
Scoville, Curtis L., 11765A.
Sealy, Raymond J., 33347A.
Seaman, Clarence O., 11727A.
Seay, Earl, 51727A.
Seay, James S., 12319A.
Seacrest, Edgar L., Jr., 12621A.
Segal, Alfred, 33145A.
Seigle, William H., 51716A.
Semanek, Joseph J., 33061A.
Senser, William J., Jr., 12294A.
Shaefer, Earl A., 33075A.
Shaeffer, William F., 12515A.
Shafer, Philip S., 12647A.
Shareck, Michael W., Jr., 12253A.
Shearer, Richard E., 12161A.
Shelton, Donald A., 12070A.
Shepard, William A., Jr., 12579A.
Shidal, Howard G., 33268A.
Shimkus, Albina H., 21278W.
Shipley, Francis M., 12016A.
Shiver, Arthur M., Jr., 11844A.
Shoemate, Foy L., 12012A.
Shwiller, Seymour, 33422A.
Siddens, John V., 12196A.
Sidenberg, John H., 33158A.
Siegfreid, Keith P., 33393A.
Sifford, Lynn D., Jr., 11488A.
Silliman, James G., 22644A.
Simons, Doyle E., 12677A.
Simpkins, Alan P., 11814A.
Simpson, Dale P., 12679A.
Simpson, Jesse W., 11538A.
Simpson, Robert H., 11470A.
Simpson, Russell R., 19565A.
Sims, Keith E., 33389A.
Sinclaire, Lance W., 11290A.
Singleton, John W., 33154A.
Skidmore, Lester J., Jr., 11475A.
Slaker, Kenneth W., Jr., 11771A.
Slaughter, Charles W., 33049A.
Slaughter, Clarence B., Jr., 12673A.
Sledge, Thomas E., Jr., 12698A.
Sly, Peter R., 12322A.
Smith, Alwyn V., 51704A.
Smith, Bennie C., 18141A.
Smith, Carl C., Jr., 11716A.
Smith, Charlie M., 11500A.
Smith, Clifford E., 11474A.
Smith, Donald H., 19782A.
Smith, Douglas T., 33111A.
Smith, Durward, 12226A.
Smith, Francis H., 11333A.
Smith, Gayle L., 20683A.
Smith, George R., 11745A.
Smith, James W., 12600A.
Smith, John W., 11623A.
Smith, Larkin B., Jr., 33317A.
Smith, Lawrence J., 11463A.
Smith, Robert G., 11669A.
Smith, Robert N., 11311A.
Smith, Roger H., 11725A.
Smith, Walter A., Jr., 33453A.
Smotherman, Benjamin F., 12007A.
Snell, Lester D., 11878A.

Snell, Robert M., 12490A.
Snook, Allen W., 33069A.
Snyder, Harold T., 12341A.
Snyder, Marilynn F., 21377W.
Soderberg, James W., 11379A.
Soderberg, Robert W., 33375A.
Sollars, John A., 11650A.
Solomon, Edward T., 11811A.
Solomon, Joseph L., 11388A.
Sonntag, Willie H., 33138A.
Sorrells, William M., 18090A.
Spain, Frank H., 33163A.
Sparks, Belmont E., 11846A.
Sparks, John S., Jr., 33055A.
Spiro, Bernard, 20627A.
Sprague, Carl W., 11303A.
Squiliace, Dominick P., 11864A.
Squires, Joseph C., 12309A.
Stackhouse, Carl B., 33420A.
Stalzer, Eugene A., 11347A.
Stanch, Paul M., 11304A.
Stankowski, John F., Jr., 11680A.
Starkey, Earl E., 11449A.
Statts, John H., 33284A.
Staudenmayer, Marion W., 12466A.
Staylor, Leroy W., 12530A.
Steffen, Harold J., 12216A.
Stephen, Gerald L., 11424A.
Stephens, Marvin L., 11471A.
Stephens, Robert D., 33209A.
Stephens, Valdane, 11566A.
Stevens, Arthur L., Jr., 12005A.
Stevens, Corbin D., 33395A.
Stevens, Howell E., 11902A.
Stevens, Richard D., 12434A.
Steves, Walter T., 22581A.
Stewart, Hugh W., 12539A.
Stewart, Ronald P., 12344A.
Stewart, Walter C., Jr., 20639A.
Stine, Donald A., 11837A.
Stokes, Louis S., 12626A.
Stolarz, Andrew R., 12272A.
Stone, Herbert B., 12366A.
Stone, Raymond F., 12308A.
Stoner, Lyle W., 11452A.
Storck, Gordon F., 12125A.
Stout, Loren R., 12477A.
Strauch, Leland G., 51736A.
Stumpf, Oscar J., 11826A.
Sullivan, Francis C., 11682A.
Sullivan, Leo W., 12184A.
Summers, Clifford C., 33057A.
Summers, John C., 33053A.
Sutton, John L., 11572A.
Swafford, Frederick L., 11298A.
Swanger, Joe N., 12450A.
Swanson, Dustin H., 12581A.
Swayze, Jack, 12546A.
Swickard, Jack D., 11430A.
Swindal, James B., 33465A.
Swope, Ira A., 12048A.
Syphers, Victor K., 24316A.
Talbot, Adrien A. G., 33249A.
Talbot, George E., 18126A.
Tally, William S., 11366A.
Tarbell, Swift, Jr., 12499A.
Tate, John C., 12156A.
Taylor, Cecil P., Jr., 33475A.
Taylor, Charles A., 12186A.
Taylor, Garner W., 2d, 11742A.
Taylor, Irving C., 12068A.
Taylor, James L., 12483A.
Taylor, Merrill E., 12500A.
Taylor, Robert F., Jr., 11559A.
Tedrowe, Thaddeus W., 11659A.
Templin, Jack D., 11715A.
Tennyson, Francis I., 48715A.
Tenold, Leslie A., 11835A.
Testa, John J., 11296A.
Thomas, Frank M., 12624A.
Thomas, Parry L., 11635A.
Thomas, William W., 33291A.
Thompson, Arnold F., 11883A.
Thompson, Donald V., 11320A.
Thompson, John R., Jr., 11655A.
Thompson, Robert C., 12073A.
Thornton, Otis B., 12235A.
Thorvaldson, Joel D., 11763A.
Tidwell, Samuel A., Jr., 33169A.
Tillotson, Bascom E., Jr., 33466A.
Tissue, Jimmie L., 11822A.
Todt, Donald C., 11782A.
Torpey, Charles L., 12644A.
Torpey, Robert F., 11591A.
Towne, Ralph W., 11368A.
Trefny, Milton J., 11371A.
Trimble, Kenton H., 3d, 51739A.
Trimble, William W., 12514A.
Trojan, Joseph E., 11665A.
Trumble, John B., 11523A.
Tucker, James R., 11979A.
Turk, Herbert A., 48716A.
Turner, Arthur L., Jr., 12093A.
Tuten, Wilson P., 11634A.
Tuttle, Donald W., 51722A.
Twomey, Thomas A., 12441A.
Tyree, Eugene F., 33218A.
Tyson, James L., 11365A.
Uhring, Frank G., 12004A.
Ulrich, Alvin E., 12038A.
Urban, Harry, 12582A.
Urquhart, Charles T., Jr., 20584A.
Valentine, Dwane R., 12694A.
Vanbibber, Charles E., 33462A.
Vandiver, Robert S., 12586A.
Vanetten, Chester L., 33248A.
Vanhoy, Leslie B., 22645A.
Vanmarter, William H., 11632A.
Vannatta, Richard H., 12350A.
Vannoy, Glen S., 11920A.
Vanwingerden, Nicolas, 10577A.
Venable, James M., Jr., 11326A.
Veneziano, Salvatore J., 33214A.
Vetter, Lawrence E., 11829A.
Vickrey, Charles R., 11967A.
Vinston, Stonewall P., 11278A.
Vogler, Alfred F., 20670A.
Vogler, James B., Jr., 12079A.
Voight, Dean A., 33244A.
Vonkaenel, Earl W., 33405A.
Voorhees, Roy D., 12167A.
Vuchetich, Peter F., 12380A.
Wacker, William W., 33315A.
Waclawski, Walter B., 33459A.
Wagner, James B., Jr., 11947A.
Wagner, Robert M., 12478A.
Wakeman, Coyd V., 11922A.
Waldher, Eugene N., 11122A.
Waldman, Herbert, 33333A.
Walker, Demelt E., 11509A.
Walker, James O., Jr., 11804A.
Walker, Samuel A., 11807A.
Walker, Willie G., 11587A.
Wall, Risden B., 11374A.
Wallander, Robert L., 11996A.
Walmer, Harry E., 12633A.
Walsh, Robert L., 11553A.
Wanty, Donald W., 33307A.
Ward, Charles A., Jr., 12026A.
Ward, John W., Jr., 33484A.
Warner, Raymond P., 12110A.
Warner, Robert L., 12592A.
Warren, James D., 11628A.
Warren, Joseph B., 22586A.
Washer, Larche M., 11769A.
Watkins, Miles H., 11539A.
Watkinson, Arlie G., 11884A.
Watts, Arthur M., 33276A.
Watts, Ernest L., 12486A.
Wayland, Robert H., Jr., 33308A.
Webb, Ernest L., Jr., 33113A.
Webb, James H., 12543A.
Weddle, Walter M., 20024A.
Weigand, Frederick E., 11377A.
Weil, Melvin S., Jr., 11279A.
Weiland, Francis H., 33373A.
Weiner, James H., 33425A.
Welch, James W., Jr., 12219A.
Wells, Charles R., Jr., 12301A.
Wells, Ernest J., 12260A.
Wells, Robert L., 33256A.
West, Robert W., 33384A.
Wettstein, James D., 11622A.
Wheeler, Glenn M., 33200A.
Wheeler, William J., 12646A.
Whipple, Ray W., 33273A.
White, Boyd B., 20626A.
White, Floyd, 11594A.
White, George W., 11331A.
White, Samuel A., Jr., 11393A.
White, Thomas A., 12567A.
Whitehead, Robert S., 3d, 33282A.
Whittington, Richard L., 12193A.
Wicker, Samuel J., 12116A.
Wickman, Vernon E., 33125A.
Wier, Charlie Y., 21785A.
Wilcox, Charles R., 33290A.
Wilcox, Lawrence R., 11768A.
Wilcox, Robert W., 12176A.
Wilds, Walter C., 12467A.
Wildt, Jesse H., 33320A.
Wilkerson, Harold H., 11801A.
Wilkerson, Henry M., 33205A.
Wilkerson, Joe T., 33386A.
Williams, Dave W., 10804A.
Williams, Edgar G., 11748A.
Williams, Eugene S., 51714A.
Williams, Jack E., 11997A.
Williams, Joe C., 11744A.
Williams, Paul E., 25501A.
Williams, Robert G., 12020A.
Williams, Wilson B., 20668A.
Willson, Harry W., 12458A.
Wilson, Emmett S., 12128A.
Wilson, Ernest B., 11930A.
Wilson, George H., 11698A.
Wilson, Harold H., 10388A.
Wilson, Myrt P., 12178A.
Wilson, Raymond E., 33424A.
Wilson, Richard S., 18121A.
Wilson, Ronald C., 12524A.
Wilson, Waring W., 12140A.
Wilson, William W., 22571A.
Winchester, Charlton W., Jr., 11630A.
Wine, Joseph R., Jr., 19788A.
Wingard, Jesse O., Jr., 12197A.
Winningham, Porter L., 11753A.
Winter, Ambrose J., 33476A.
Wise, John W., 33419A.
Wishart, James H. N., 12268A.
Witry, Frank, Jr., 11980A.
Wittbrodt, Edwin S., 33201A.
Woeltz, August L., 33343A.
Wolf, Gayle C., 12164A.
Wolfendon, William, 33160A.
Wollner, Richard P., 12259A.
Womack, Jack E., 11405A.
Wood, George R., 11860A.
Wood, John R., 11975A.
Wood, Robert E., 11545A.
Wood, Theodore S., 33349A.
Woodall, Merle P., 12526A.
Woodward, Charles H., 12435A.
Woodward, Edgar F., Jr., 33231A.
Worde, Marcus H., 11289A.
Working, William H., 11305A.
Worthington, Joseph A., 33140A.
Woy, Jack A., 54686A.
Wright, Fred A., Jr., 11280A.
Wright, Hanford R., 11827A.
Wright, John P., 33254A.
Wright, John W., Jr., 11934A.
Wright, Theodore O., 11432A.
Wynne, Lawson P., 12591A.
Yaden, Earl N., 11461A.
Yahr, Raymond R., 11176A.
Yarborough, Benjamin H., 51701A.
Yarbrough, Thomas E., 12443A.
Yates, John H., 20041A.
Yaworski, John, 11707A.
Ybarra, Cecil R., 51702A.
Yeager, Paul M., 18116A.
Yeates, William E., 11345A.
Yeoman, Edwin T., 11325A.
York, Banta M., 33409A.
York, John C., 33385A.
Young, Fred W., 12608A.
Young, Harry H., Jr., 33199A.
Young, Joseph J., 33162A.
Young, Kenneth A., 33189A.
Yraceburn, Joseph R., 11805A.
Yusievicz, John J., 20582A.
Zager, Joe, Jr., 33164A.
Zais, Richard A., 11710A.
Zalonka, Adam F., 33310A.
Zepp, Rex E., 11503A.
Ziegler, John H., 12469A.
Zimmerman, Arnold E., 12385A.
Zipper, Harry, 11460A.
Zwicke, Norbert A., 12378A.
Zwink, Wayne E., 11779A.

Medical Corps

Baczewski, Zbigniew J., 19380A.
Brannon, Earl W., Jr., 19288A.

Chambers, George H., 19362A.
Culver, James F., 54938A.
Dimichele, John D., 18075A.
Foley, Francis E., 19543A.
Giffen, Martin B., 19319A.
Gilliland, Jack M., 21844A.
Green, Harry C., Jr., 20838A.
Henderson, John A., 19297A.
Hill, John J., 27582A.
Kenoyer, Wilbur L., 19604A.
Kraus, Ralph N., 19296A.
Mays, Oliver A., 19332A.
McManus, Hugh B., Jr., 19316A.
Miller, Richard K., 20830A.
O'Brien, Francis D., 19556A.
Osetinsky, Venedict M., 19334A.
Rowen, Burt, 19291A.
Sorensen, Charles C., 20844A.
Stonehill, Robert B., 21684A.
Sutherland, Lawrence R., 19265A.
Tkach, Walter R., 19360A.
Vanpelt, James F., Jr., 24124A.
Wilkins, John H., 19295A.

Dental Corps

Bateman, Herbert E., 25696A.
Brown, Charles A., 26634A.
Burnette, Elmer W., Jr., 25666A.
Cole, Thomas R., 19959A.
Copeland, Henry I., Jr., 22396A.
Dybowski, Eugene L., 18964A.
Feldmann, Earl E., 20008A.
Fricke, Vernon S., 18951A.
Hartley, Jack L., 18972A.
Hayden, Arthur L., 24119A.
Hombs, Roger, 18950A.
Lavere, Arthur M., 19824A.
Runco, Joseph G., 25466A.
Sandlin, Harold G., 18944A.
Tomey, William H., 19825A.
Wilson, Howard R., Jr., 18969A.
Zellers, Howard W., Jr., 24121A.
Zellhoefer, Robert W., 27598A.

Veterinary Corps

Dalziel, George T., 21605A.
Hornickel, Edward P., 21606A.
Sullivan, William G., 51118A.
Weil, Frederick, 21604A.

Medical Service Corps

Hall, Austin S., 19486A.
Holmes, Warren H., 19488A.
Maybell, Robert E., 19490A.
Merritt, William F., 19487A.
Meyer, Emil J., 48900A.
O'Malley, Robert J., 19593A.
Otter, Henry F., 19480A.
Pomphrey, Patrick J., 19485A.
Swanson, Fred H., 19491A.

Nurse Corps

Bakutis, Alice R., 22026W.
Becker, Josephine M., 21978W.
Burke, Menla, 20990W.
Christison, Dorothy J., 22022W.
Chupka, Helen A., 21976W.
Cosma, Helen R., 20983W.
Dittmar, Louise E., 20940W.
Hovland, Otelia A., 21001W.
McGinnes, Madeline B., 22012W.
Menge, Dorothy M., 21974W.
Miller, Isabelle A., 22029W.
Murphy, Elizabeth A., 21966W.
Ottoy, Suzanne M., 21967W.
Richey, Margaret A., 21989W.
Spearnak, Pearl, 20914W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Creech, Kathleen R., 21201W.

Chaplain

Chess, Edwin R., 55101A.
Hammon, Wilson C., 18805A.
Hanlon, Thomas C., 48574A.
Hartman, Kenneth E., 55098A.
Marler, Charles H., 48571A.
Miller, John H. K., 55102A.
Paulk, Ivan L., 20853A.
Ressel, Delvin E., 18803A.
Schaefer, Roman J., 18802A.
Schumacher, Bernard F., 48573A.
Sharbaugh, Cornelius A., 18808A.
Teska, Glenn F., 48570A.

SECOND LIEUTENANT TO FIRST LIEUTENANT

Line of the Air Force

Allen, Melvin A., 55253A.
Allen, Robert L., 54997A.
Ames, Park O., 51624A.
Andre, Frank J., Jr., 51676A.
Anllo, Reynaldo A., 51528A.
Arent, Robert E., 55306A.
Arner, Harold L., 55010A.
Ault, Robert T., 55261A.
Bailey, William D., Jr., 51645A.
Balhorn, Robert J., 51630A.
Batson, Don T., 55021A.
Beer, Michael, 55273A.
Belella, Carlo A., 55310A.
Belsom, Cletus A., 55264A.
Benjamin, John H., 55039A.
Bitton, Gary W., 51673A.
Blake, John C., 55006A.
Blake, Roy G., 51536A.
Bloom, Gordon E., 51658A.
Blystone, Paul A., 55014A.
Brackett, William R., Jr., 59102A.
Brasure, John E., 51527A.
Brees, Anton D., 55046A.
Brenden, Jerry B., 55931A.
Bryan, Hayes R., 51659A.
Burnett, Bernard B., 55035A.
Burrus, George C., 51526A.
Butterfield, Marcius R., 55017A.
Byrd, Herman L., 55302A.
Cairns, James G., Jr., 51607A.
Campbell, Gary L., 55262A.
Cannaday, John E., Jr., 55237A.
Chappelle, Robert L., 51534A.
Clark, John W., 55251A.
Clark, Paul W., 55002A.
Clarke, Samuel H., Jr., 55889A.
Clarkson, Edward M., 51672A.
Clovis, Gordon T., 55284A.
Cochran, Bobby E., 51677A.
Coolidge, Robert B., 55278A.
Costello, Walter M., 55266A.
Coughlin, John J., 3d, 55012A.
Criswell, Reynolds L., 51680A.
Cummock, David R., 59101A.
Cunningham, Jay L., 55024A.
Curtis, Lawrence C., Jr., 51665A.
Daley, Jerry F., 55038A.
Darling, Gordon P., 51654A.
Davidson, Troy H., Jr., 55049A.
Davis, Sedley C., 55231A.
Demidovich, Carl W., Jr., 55029A.
Demontigny, Dennis N., 55275A.
Deriemacker, Allen J., 51668A.
Dillion, Douglas C., 55289A.
Dodge, Richard E., 51662A.
Donahue, Roger P., 54998A.
Dortch, Harold D., Jr., 51625A.
Durrieu, Armand E., 51529A.
Edgett, Conrad B., Jr., 56376A.
Elmore, Memory H., 55270A.
Espey, James G., 3d, 51685A.
Evans, Donald J., 55004A.
Fenske, Gary T., 55036A.
Ferruzza, David, 55781A.
Fischer, Milo L., 55042A.
Flesch, Ronald L., 51650A.
Flood, William F., 55991A.
Foerster, Leroy C., Jr., 51634A.
Foy, William M., 54860A.
French, Raymond W., 54996A.
Frishett, John C., 55260A.
Gane, Charles E., 55030A.
Giacobbe, John A., 55005A.
Gibson, Gary D., 55051A.
Giddings, Edward N., 51656A.
Gillam, Shelton B., 55052A.
Ginn, Howard H., 55981A.
Grandrimo, John R., 55267A.
Gray, Donald D., Jr., 55825A.
Greene, Douglas C., 55043A.
Grimes, George H., Jr., 55028A.
Griswold, David B., 51660A.
Grove, William J., Jr., 51617A.
Gullett, William B., 55285A.
Hagler, Ronald E., 51533A.
Hall, Arthur D., 55780A.
Hall, Gordon L., 55283A.
Hall, William S., 55268A.
Hamill, James F., 51524A.
Hamilton, Donald L., 55257A.
Harrill, James W., 51670A.
Harrington, Ronald R., 51648A.
Hathaway, Kenneth A., 55303A.
Hawkins, James R., 51635A.
Hayworth, Hubert R., 51623A.
Heiliger, Donald L., 55023A.
Hiner, William L., 51619A.
Holland, Winford E., 55053A.
Holzknecht, William J., 55785A.
Hunt, Ralph P., 55045A.
Hunt, William E., 55399A.
Inman, J. W., 55003A.
Israel, Paul S., 55007A.
Jackson, Donald I., 55304A.
James, Charles E., 55888A.
Johnson, Arlen R., 51631A.
Johnston, Maurice B., Jr., 51615A.
Jones, Joseph D., 55044A.
Jones, Malcolm M., 55271A.
Joyce, William R., Jr., 51646A.
Junkin, Jackie G., 55009A.
Kellim, James D., 55033A.
Kiser, James M., 55992A.
Kobylak, Roger W., 55300A.
Koch, Richard C., 55265A.
Kraft, John L., 51664A.
Kravarik, Martin E., 51661A.
Krueger, Armin A., 55013A.
Kurzenberger, John L., 51649A.
Kyle, Logan W., 55282A.
Lampel, Thomas R., 55269A.
Land, Peter A., 55011A.
Lantz, Donald L., Jr., 51628A.
Larison, Robert J., 51614A.
Larsen, Larry L., 55274A.
Leblanc, Lynn L., 58527A.
Lee, Victor T., 51640A.
Lenhardt, Larimer J., 55777A.
Lerch, Ralph A., 55293A.
Lessard, Charles S., 51540A.
Lindemuth, Robert W., 51674A.
Long, Michael J., 51636A.
Long, Ray B., 51611A.
Loynd, James A., 55263A.
Luddington, Frank I., Jr., 55982A.
Mackay, Donald M., 51647A.
MacMillan, David T., 55301A.
Mahan, Allen V., 51632A.
Majors, Donald M., 51655A.
Mandart, Tracy J., Jr., 55008A.
Matos, Philip W., 51633A.
May, Robert M., 55018A.
Maynard, Charles N., 55828A.
McCallum, William S., Jr., 55250A.
McLauchlin, James A., 51537A.
Miles, Wayne L., 51608A.
Miller, Robert J., 55016A.
Miller, William H., 55025A.
Mondor, Martin, 55294A.
Monroe, William N., Jr., 55307A.
Moore, Gerald W., 55295A.
Mouton, Clifford P., 51539A.
Mustoe, Arlie L., Jr., 55244A.
Nakarai, Charles F. T., 55027A.
Nation, Raymond P., 55255A.
Nelson, Richard W., 55305A.
Ness, Richard D., 51522A.
Noren, Clinton L., 55247A.
Orne, Kenneth J., 51610A.
Ostrom, John C., 56010A.
Pace, Dennis G., 51605A.
Palms, John M., 51469A.
Panella, Robert F., 51652A.
Parker, Everette F., 51468A.
Patton, Lawrence L., 55248A.
Paul, Jean A., 55246A.
Phillips, Frederick C., 55277A.
Potter, William H., Jr., 51613A.
Pranger, Robert J., 55037A.
Price, John C., 51606A.
Prueitt, Vernon K., 55243A.
Rankine, Robert R., Jr., 55019A.
Rans, Donald L., 55887A.
Ray, Gary G. 51675A.
Rector, William K., Jr., 55782A.

Redinger, Larimore A., 51671A.
Reid, Richard G., 51616A.
Reining, Robert R., Jr., 51612A.
Retherford, Norman L., 51626A.
Rhoten, Billie J., 55259A.
Richard, Arthur M., 55015A.
Richey, Charles W., Jr., 55933A.
Roberson, Charles E., 55932A.
Roberts, Brooke D., 55276A.
Robinson, Andrew T. J., 55272A.
Rodgers, John H., 51621A.
Roetcisoender, Robert J., 51637A.
Roush, Charles D., 55308A.
Rowan, Roger W., 55256A.
Rowley, Ralph A., 55784A.
Rudzinski, Edward J., 55031A.
Rutledge, Ernest W., Jr., 55298A.
Salman, Gary A., 55050A.
Sanford, William W., 55047A.
Sattler, Harold, 55232A.
Schaefer, Richard C., 55993A.
Schaltenbrand, Eugene D., 55286A.
Schneider, Ralph R., 51532A.
Schoonover, Russell R., 51651A.
Shornak, Thomas R., 55233A.
Schwartz, Raymond G., 51679A.
Scoggin, Philip R., 55311A.
Senseney, Harvey G., 3d, 51669A.
Shaffer, William C., 55026A.
Shane, Douglas F., 55290A.
Shriber, Richard W., 51663A.
Sides, William B., 51683A.
Sigmund, Volney G., 55783A.
Sims, Ernest P., 55829A.
Skinner, Charles R., Jr., 55249A.
Skovgaard, Richard A., 55985A.
Smith, Carl M., 55287A.
Smith, Paul G., 55990A.
Smith, Roger J., 55236A.
Smither, Chester P., Jr., 51622A.
Souder, David L., 55258A.
Spearman, William L., Jr., 51620A.
Spencer, Keith A., 55296A.
Staas, Philip C., Jr., 55034A.
Staver, David A., 51639A.
Stear, James R., 55779A.
Stell, John R., 55279A.
Street, Gerald W., 51523A.
Stupka, Otto J., 3d, 51535A.
Summerhill, Edward W., 55241A.
Tarr, Alfred E., 51653A.
Tennyson, Arthur V., 55230A.
Thomas, Gary E., 55827A.
Thorpe, Thomas S., 55234A.
Topp, Wayne R., 55040A.
Vanblois, John P., 55297A.
Vanmeter, Richard K., 55288A.
Verna, Joseph B., Jr., 55281A.
Vogel, Frank C., Jr., 51666A.
Voorhees, John H., 54999A.
Voshell, Robert N., 51531A.
Wagner, Frederick J., Jr., 55280A.
Waldron, Kirk T., 51618A.
Ward, Donald T., 51682A.
Watts, Claudius E., 3d, 51467A.
Waymire, Lester D., 55994A.
Weaver, William G., 51609A.
Wege, David J., 51644A.
Weinstein, Martin E., 55252A.
Wells, Jan A., 55983A.
Wenstrand, Arlo P., 51657A.
Wheatley, John R., 55041A.
White, Leslie M., 55312A.
Whiteaker, John W., 55242A.
Whitsett, Charles J., 51629A.
Williams, Charles B., 55229A.
Williams, Norbet T., Jr., 55048A.
Wilson, Robert L., Jr., 55245A.
Winemiller, Thomas E., 55235A.
Wiseman, Jerry F., 55240A.
Woloshyn, Bohdan D., 55022A.
Woodward, Charles C., Jr., 55299A.
Yancey, William S., 51681A.
Yingst, Chauncey O., 55032A.
Youngblood, Allan C., 55984A.
Zimmerman, Walter J., Jr., 51667A.
Zoss, Alan R., 55239A.

Medical Service Corps

Breeskin, John, 55020A.
Obermyer, William N., 55000A.
Schuman, Minot K., 55001A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 1961:

U.S. MARSHALS

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

Elmer W. Disspayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

Ellis Maylett, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah.

William M. Parker, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 22, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, DD., offered the following prayer:

II Timothy 1: 7: *God hath not given us the spirit of fear, but of power and of love, and of a sound mind.*

O Thou God of all goodness, who art our help and hope in the tasks of each new day, give unto us the light that reveals Thy wisdom and the grace that renews our strength.

We beseech Thee to discipline our minds and hearts, bringing them under the complete control and sovereignty of Thy wise and holy will.

Grant that in seeking the right solutions to our social, economic and political problems we may have respect for one another's convictions and points of view.

Many of these problems are so vast, so many sided, and so complex and far reaching that we dare not be too dogmatic and too unduly positive.

Make us magnanimous in spirit, believing that neither liberalism nor conservatism is large enough to include the whole truth and have the one and only answer.

Hear us in the name of the Christ who is the way, the truth, and the life for our troubled and baffled humanity. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 18, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 4, 1961:

H.R. 5189. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from tax income derived by a foreign central bank of issue from obligations of the United States, and for other purposes.

On May 5, 1961:

H.R. 3935. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

On May 8, 1961:

H.R. 4884. An act to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to authorize Federal financial participation in aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, and for other purposes.

On May 15, 1961:

H.R. 1723. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution.

On May 16, 1961:

H.J. Res. 143. Joint Resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the week in May 1961 in which falls the third Friday of that month as National Transportation Week.

On May 19, 1961:

H.R. 2195. An act to convey certain land of the Pala Band of Indians to the Diocese of San Diego Education and Welfare Corporation.

On May 20, 1961:

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendment to the bill (H.R. 6518), entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program and the Chilean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHN C. KUNKEL, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Member-elect will present himself to the bar of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. KUNKEL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President

of the United States, which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the provisions of section 5(a) of Public Law 307, 73d Congress, approved June 12, 1934, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the National Capital Housing Authority for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 22, 1961.*

MRS. ALICE M. HUNT AND MRS. MAX WEIL

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor and the pleasure to announce to the House of Representatives that this is the 100th anniversary of the birth of one of my fine constituents, Mrs. Alice M. Hunt. I know that my colleagues join me in sending greetings to this noble woman whose century of living has enriched the wide community of her associations. At 100 Mrs. Hunt makes no concessions to time. She does all the family dishes, washing and drying them. In the age of the New Frontier she keeps alive the spirit of the new frontier of another era. It is only when the spirit of youth is lost that age descends. Mrs. Hunt is still very, very young in the spirit of youth.

In little over another week, on May 29, another fine and noble woman in the Second District of Illinois will celebrate her 100th anniversary, Mrs. Max Weil, and to her also may we send the warmest greetings of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. She, too, has kept aflame the spirit of youth and has set a pattern for us all.

I am happy and glad that in the great Second District of Illinois this month of May we are celebrating the 100th anniversaries of two fine and noble women.

At 79 in the district I represent, I am just a kid.

FORTHCOMING SUMMIT MEETING IN VIENNA

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, there has been much speculation about the value of the forthcoming summit meeting in Vienna between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. Concern has been expressed over the dangers to our so-called prestige, and the possibility that mistakes of the past may be repeated.

I recall that on May 17, 1960, in Eugene, Oreg., Kennedy was asked about the U–2 incident, and he replied:

> I certainly would express regrets and give assurances that it would not happen again. I would express regret that the flight did take place.

Several informed sources have indicated that Khrushchev might allow Kennedy to announce the release of U–2 Pilot Francis Powers, as a token concession to the United States. I am hopeful that President Kennedy does not intend to barter his proffered apology for our valuable reconnaissance flight to obtain this concession.

Our prestige, if there is any left, in the wake of Cuba, Laos, and Korea should not be subjected to further deterioration.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit this week during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REREFERENCE OF BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the two committees concerned, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H.R. 6277) for the relief of Maj. Lionel L. Riave, U.S. Air Force, be rereferred from the Committee on the Judiciary to the Committee on Armed Services.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7208, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with some pride and humility that I come here to present for the first time this particular bill to the House. As the Members know, our late beloved colleague from Arkansas, Mr. Norrell, had charge of this bill for many years. All of us admired and loved him for the wonderful job he did on the legislative bill for all of us, since it is one in which we have a great deal of personal interest and one in which our own housekeeping on Capitol Hill is involved.

We have had a fine committee this year. I personally appreciate the wonderful help and cooperation I have had in these new duties from all my colleagues on this committee. They worked hard and gave me the benefit of their long experience on this legislation.

We are proud to bring a bill in today which in its total represents a considerable reduction in dollars from the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1961. The bill today, for fiscal year 1962, asks for a total appropriation of $104,353,335, which is a reduction of $1,294,242 from the budget request, and a total of $5,124,371 less than appropriated for comparable items for fiscal year 1961. In line with custom, no provision is made for items for the other body. They will insert their own requirements when the bill reaches the other body. I include a summary at this point:

Group	Appropriations, 1961 (to date)	Budget estimates, 1962	Committee bill, 1962	Bill compared with—	
				1961 appropriations	1962 budget estimates
House of Representatives	$45,543,510	$48,226,635	$47,856,835	+$2,313,325	−$369,800
Joint offices and items	3,494,669	4,063,842	4,063,300	+568,631	−542
Architect of the Capitol	28,056,800	17,107,000	17,051,500	−11,005,300	−55,500
Botanic Garden	352,300	489,000	489,000	+136,700	
Library of Congress	16,086,100	17,637,100	16,768,700	+682,600	−868,400
Government Printing Office	15,944,327	18,124,000	18,124,000	+2,179,673	
Total (excludes Senate items)	109,477,706	105,647,577	104,353,335	−5,124,371	−1,294,242

NOTE.—Includes all appropriations for 1961 (through 3d Supplemental Act, 1961) and all budget estimates for 1962 for items covered to date of reporting of this bill.

We were able to do that largely because of the fact that we have been carrying on for a number of years a heavy capital investment program and because of some nonrecurring items we are able this year to show a substantial reduction in the total amount of money required.

In that connection, Members may be interested to know that we are now approaching the end, appropriation-wise, of a large portion of the capital investment on Capitol Hill. Probably not to exceed $25 million in the next 2 or 3 years, as to projects now authorized, will see the conclusion of that part of our problem. But we now know that in the next few years we have two other major items of capital investment facing us that we will have to deal with. We will soon have to make some provision for an additional building for the Library of Congress, since their space situation over there has become intolerable, and we will need to build a new warehouse for the Government Printing Office.

We are told that the warehouse situation there is such that it will pay for itself in savings in rentals and other costs in 21 years, that the present arrangement is very inefficient, and that it is good business to proceed as soon as possible with the provision of an adequate warehouse at the printing plant.

Neither of these two projects is included in this year's bill, and I bring it up only so the Members will know that some time in the not too distant future we will doubtless be faced with these two propositions.

Another item I want to emphasize is that currently the Post Office Department is faced with the highest deficit in modern times. Recommendations have been made that postal rates be increased. One of the common criticisms throughout the country has been that one of the reasons for a postal deficit has been that Congress has the franking privilege and we use what is often known as free mail. I call the attention of the House to the fact: Whatever the postal deficit may be, it cannot be attributed to any franking use of the mail by the Members of Congress. This bill this year has in it a provision for $3,836,000 to be paid to the Post Office Department, which is an actual payment for the mails used by the Congress last year. We make our payments retroactively, so we pay for actual use. I think we all need to keep that in mind, because as time goes on and these criticisms arise I think it is only fair and right that the people know that we do charge ourselves this cash item, so whatever blame there may be for the use of this frank we take it forthrightly upon ourselves and without any equivocation or evasion of the point.

Questions have come up about the acquisition of some of the properties around the Hill. Last year, Congress authorized and appropriated the money to acquire a block over here just east of the Old House Office Building. Most of that purchase has now been concluded or is in the process of being concluded.

We are advised that the destruction of the buildings and the razing of the site will commence next August, with the commercial property on Independence Avenue having until March 1 of next year to vacate. Questions have come up as to what will be done with the property. If you go back and check the action of the House, authorizing its purchase, you will find that the act said it was to be acquired as additions to the Capitol Grounds and other than being used as part of the Capitol Grounds, it is my understanding that no other use can be made of that property until further action by the Congress itself. I thought the Members would like to know that, whatever may be done with that piece of property after it has been cleared, will require further action by the House and, therefore, whatever is done will be a decision that will have to be made in the House of Representatives. I wanted to clear that up because some questions had come up about it.

There is another point I want to make. In our functions here as a legislative body, we carry on a number of activities which require our employees to handle funds. We have a disbursing office, we have the Sergeant at Arms, we have the stationery room, the recording facility, and so on. All these agencies of the House are regularly audited by the General Accounting Office. This committee has gone over many of these audits, and we find they are all performing a good job. There have been improvements made in efficiency and in the way these departments are operated. I am glad to be able to advise you that these employees have done a good job. The audits show they have carried on their affairs in a businesslike manner and there is constant improvement in efficiency in the jobs they do in the service of the House of Representatives. I want to pay a word of tribute to these fine employees today for the constant improvement they are making in the very important jobs that they perform.

Mr. Chairman, there are one or two other items in the bill today which may be of special interest. One is for a new heating and air-conditioning plant for the main building of the Library of Congress. That is an item of $2.5 million. The heating plant in the Library of Congress is breaking down. It is most inefficient. Its condition is such that it has been beyond satisfactory repair for the past several years. It is 64 years old and the only solution to the matter is the installation of a new plant. After having made a personal tour of both the Capitol Building and the Library Building, this subcommittee decided it was high time we do something about it so we have allowed this item.

Another item is that we have in this bill some funds to reclaim 7 acres of land owned by the Congress across the river in Anacostia. It is adjacent to the new greenhouse being built over there. Under the Architect of the Capitol, a program has been worked out to reclaim this land and to stock it with nursery stock. They say they can produce and develop much of the shrub material and trees needed for the landscaping of the present Capitol Grounds and the newly acquired Capitol Grounds, the new office building, the proposed new Library Building, and so on. To do it otherwise, if these shrubs and trees were purchased from commercial sources, it would be several times more costly. We felt that this sort of long-range program at such a great saving is fully justified and we have recommended the money for it.

By and large, many of the increases in the bill are mandatory increases brought about by action of the House and the Congress. The great majority of items recur from year to year, often without change, for well established activities and functions. They are covered in some detail in the committee report which is available to all Members, so I shall not take the time of the House on the routine items. Insofar as I know we have kept this a pretty clean bill; we have deliberately avoided any effort to put anything in this bill that was not properly authorized by law or in accord with the usual practice. We wanted to bring to the House what we considered a clean bill, one we could assure the House was in keeping with the wishes of the House expressed by official action of the House. So, Mr. Chairman, I think we have this year a bill that we hope will meet most of the urgent housekeeping needs around the Capitol and one that will continue making this great national shrine the source of pride and pleasure we know the American people find in it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I note there is money in this bill for certain additional Senate Office Building expenses. It was my impression that the Senate expenses were added to this bill by the other body when it went over to them.

Mr. STEED. By and large, that is true, unless it is something handled by the Architect of the Capitol in which we have some jurisdiction. Purely Senate items in this bill would be placed in the bill when it goes to the Senate.

Mr. GROSS. Would not additional expenses for a Senate Office Building be a purely Senate expense?

Mr. STEED. I know of no additional items of expense in this bill for the recently completed Senate Office Building as such.

Mr. GROSS. I note you have some reference to it in the hearings.

Mr. STEED. We discussed several items in the committee, one, for instance, an item of $30,000 to paint the legislative garage which is jointly owned by the House, but often referred to as the Senate garage. We disallowed that this year. The gentleman will recall that we have been making some repairs and doing some wiring in the underground garage. We did not see the need to paint it this year. If the other body thinks differently, they can of course insert the money.

Mr. GROSS. It is nicely lighted for them now, is it not?

Mr. STEED. I think it is. It seems to be a really good job. The committee did not think we should include this painting item.

Mr. GROSS. I do not see the need of painting a cement ceiling.

Mr. STEED. We left that item out. We did not see the need for it either.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad you felt that way about it. I think it ought to be

called a Senate garage. With two garages they are pretty well off over there, are they not?

Mr. STEED. They have, of course, some additional garage facilities in their new office building. There are 58 spaces in the legislative garage assigned to the House of Representatives, and it is my understanding currently they are not all being used.

Since we have some facilities of our own on this side of the Capitol there has been less demand on the part of House Members for space over there. It may come to the point that they will want to make some other regulatory disposal of it; I do not know. That did not come up for our consideration this year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STEED. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I understand each Member of the other body has two garage spaces. Is that correct?

Mr. STEED. There is something in our hearings to that effect. That is under their jurisdiction, and we did not go into it very thoroughly. I do not know just what their rules are. That is a matter we did not feel was our business to go into, so we did not.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any money in this bill by any chance for the new stadium to the east of Washington?

Mr. STEED. That is an item that does not come under this bill, and there is nothing in this bill, not 1 penny, touching that.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that is the case. I just wanted to make sure there was no money in this bill to permit Secretary of the Interior Udall to organize a professional football team. He seems to be determined to tell the owners of the existing club how to run it.

Mr. STEED. The gentleman need not worry about that in this bill. This committee does not have any jurisdiction in that regard.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I realize that the gentleman has quite a responsibility in handling this particular measure. I am sure the gentleman is aware of this situation: Whenever we Members of the House, and the other body as well, have to do with anything that affects the operation of our committees or buildings within our jurisdiction, there is a tendency to quickly point out the flaws. We as a body have been condemned by members of the press, and the public picks it up. We are accused of abusing the taxpayers because of a little item that is subject to some criticism. I am sure the gentleman is aware that there is going to be a lot of criticism of the new office building we are constructing. The gentleman remembers the problems that were raised in connection with the new Senate structure.

Is the gentleman's committee doing everything possible to see that we will at least be spared the extreme criticism that the other body received in connection with the construction of their new building?

Mr. STEED. Yes, everything within our jurisdiction. I may say they have a field office over here adjacent to the construction work, and they welcome all Members of the House coming by and checking up to see what is going on. They encourage more Members taking an additional interest. It is easy to criticize after something has started, whereas the situation might be different if we took more interest in what is being done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that everything over there is going along very well. We have tried in our hearings this year to make them as informative as we could. We have a bill that we think is clean in every respect, and we hope the press does scrutinize this bill. We hope the Members will read this record we have brought here this year so that they will themselves know more about the detail of what is going on on Capitol Hill. We encourage that. We wanted a record this year that would give as much information to the public and to the Members as to what is being done and what it is costing, the time schedules, and all that, as is possible.

Mr. DERWINSKI. May I say that I hope the members of the committee will see fit to study the gentleman's report carefully and follow his suggestion and look at the record. I hope that some of this unfair criticism will be eliminated and that the Members will take the time and make the effort to go over and see what is going on. I hope all the Members will avail themselves of that opportunity.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentleman. And I may say further that if Members want information that is not in this record, if they will make that fact known to the committee we will do our best to get the information and let them have it, because we think it is better for all of us to be better informed on what is being done here, and that it will be better for everyone concerned.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague from Oklahoma in paying respect to our departed colleague from Arkansas, Mr. Norrell, who handled this bill for so many years. He did a fine, conscientious job. We all miss Bill Norrell. I think it is very fitting that we take this occasion to remember him.

We have a fine successor to the chairmanship of the subcommittee in the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], who did a fine job as chairman of the subcommittee this year. We think we have brought a bill to the floor that we can live with and that is honest, and I think can stand scrutiny. We are in complete agreement on the items in this bill, so we hope that the House will accept it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I have not read the committee report, and this matter, perhaps, may have been treated in it. What is the status of what is presently known as the Congressional Hotel as far as this legislative bill is concerned?

Mr. HORAN. Well, that is the property of the Congress, as you know. It has been leased to the Knott Hotel Corp. and the lease expires in about 2 years.

Mr. AVERY. Well, do we have any plans for it? Why are we in the hotel business?

Mr. HORAN. We are not in the hotel business. It was acquired as a part of the general expansion of the Capitol Grounds area, and within the next 2 years the decision will have to come on what disposition to make of it.

Mr. AVERY. Well, if we own the hotel, we are in the hotel business, whether we are actually managing it or not. Has the final price of acquisition been definitely determined upon? As I recall, a deposit was made in the court regarding its acquisition. Has the final figure been made?

Mr. HORAN. Yes; we have the final figure. I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. STEED. If memory serves me correctly, the cost of that piece of property is $1.6 million. Yes, I find the precise amount was $1,686,000. It is now in the possession of the Congress, and whatever disposition is to be made at the end of the present lease contract will remain to be made by the Congress. It was found that it would be much cheaper to permit someone to occupy the building in the interim than to maintain it on a standby basis. When the property was acquired, that had to be taken into consideration, and since it was such a fine piece of property it was felt that it should be leased until it was determined what would be the most appropriate use of it. It seemed to be too good a piece of property to be torn down. And, by doing that, we saved some $60,000 to $70-000 a year, as I recall, to maintain the building on a standby basis.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions. I understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma is not a member of the Building Commission, but I thought perhaps he could clarify or answer a question or two, if he has the information. It is my understanding that it is proposed to start clearing the residences in the square east of the Old House Office Building in August of this year and the business establishments will begin to be demolished in March of next year.

Mr. STEED. That is correct. Those are the dates shown in the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Now, the question is this, if the gentleman can answer: Why clear this taxpaying property? Why clear out these business establishments and these residences until there is some clear use for the property?

Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is this, that the House passed the bill authorizing its acquisition for addition to the Capitol Grounds, and that under that mandate the only way it can be made part of the Capitol Grounds is to clear it. What is being done was done under a legislative act. The clearing of the property is the completion of what that act of the House and the Congress authorized last year.

Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentleman agree with me that there is no purpose in clearing land or property that is now paying taxes to the District of Columbia until there is some use for that property?

Mr. STEED. Well, I am not in a position to disagree with the gentleman except to say this, and that is, under the law, within the purview of the commission in charge and not this committee, and what you and I think individually would probably have no bearing on it at this stage.

Mr. GROSS. Now, this east front of the Capitol, what was the original estimate of the cost? Was it $13 million or $15 million, or what?

Mr. STEED. We have exact figures here in the record. I would have to look them up to be accurate. Something on the order of $17 million.

Mr. GROSS. That was the original estimate?

Mr. STEED. The original estimate. That was subsequently increased by $4 million to include the Senate subway terminal and related improvements. That since has been increased by the action of the commission in charge by $3 million, the full justification of which is in the record beginning on page 135 of the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. It is now up to $21 million and there is another $3 million in this bill; is that correct?

Mr. STEED. Not all of the total amount is for the actual extension of the east front. There was a considerable amount of work that had to be done on the dome and some other projects within the building. We have those figures in the record, for the benefit of those who want the dollars and cents breakdown.

Mr. GROSS. It is considerably above the original estimates, is not that correct? The total cost is now going to be, if this bill passes, $24 million as of this date for the dome and the east front, is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is correct. Of course, the gentleman realizes that all that this committee has any authority to do is to make available the money that the special commission in charge has contracted to spend under the authority it received from the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. STEED. All that we do here is to ask for a breakdown and justifications and report on status of the work. Apparently, when they go into the old wall of the old part of the Capitol Building they found situations no one knew anything about. There were no records of them and it created quite a problem. They had to make quite a few changes because of the conditions they found. It had been remodeled two or three times in years gone by, but no one had kept precise records, so some of these situations could not have been anticipated until they actually got into it and found what were the conditions of the wall. There are explanations of this in the record. We thought it best to record them, so that all Members could know the whole story.

Mr. GROSS. I do not want anything I have said to be construed as critical of the gentleman from Oklahoma or any member of this subcommittee.

Mr. STEED. I understand that. The gentleman will find in the hearings and the report that about half of this total of $24 million can be charged to the actual extension of the front itself. The other work that had to be done accounts for the rest of the total. And as also noted in the report there has been a 17-percent rise in construction costs nationally since the project was first authorized 6 years ago.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. May I say to the gentleman that on page 135 of the hearings there is a complete table showing the cost of the extension of the east front and related work. The cost of the actual extension is $11,825,901. The rest of it is for incidental work, such as furniture and equipment, painting the dome, and so forth. It is all set out in the table.

Mr. GROSS. The point that I am making, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, is that as usual those responsible underestimated the total cost of this project, this extension of the Capitol by 32½ feet. It was badly underestimated as to cost. And while the gentleman is on his feet, can he give me for the record the cost of the third House Office Building, the square on which it is located, plus the cost of the building to date?

Mr. HORAN. The additional House Office Building?

Mr. GROSS. The additional House Office Building, if he has that information available.

Mr. HORAN. That is itemized on page 162 of the hearings. The total cost is estimated at just under $100 million. That is not all for the additional office building. That includes the acquisition of property, remodeling work in the two existing office buildings, and other related items.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. STEED. Including the Tiber Creek sewer work, the acquisition of the land, the excavation, and the actual construction of the House Office Building itself, the total will be about $75 million.

Mr. GROSS. For the square on which the new building is located, and the cost of the building, is that correct?

Mr. STEED. That is right. As I say, that includes the cost of the Tiber Creek sewer work and everything else connected with the building, including the square to which you refer.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, and I would like to add that I opposed the construction of the additional House Office Building when it originally came to the House floor. I also opposed the purchase of the square along Independence Avenue and I cannot understand why anyone would move to tear down the tax revenue producing properties located thereon until there are firm plans for use of the land. Both the Federal and District Governments need all the revenue it is possible to obtain. Destruction of these properties, until the land is needed, is unwise and unreasonable.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of advising the House of something that many Members may have already heard about. That is the fire hazard here in the Capitol. I express the hope that all Members will cooperate with this committee in an effort to do something about it.

The committee made a tour down through the subterranean areas of this building. There we found stacks and stacks of papers, much of which are unnecessary. Some areas had scaffolding stored on the side. There are areas where walls have been taken out, which creates a flue that would actually help to spread a fire.

This is a serious question. It is the intention of the committee to go forward in an attempt to do something about it. This is a question which requires action. We have here a very big Capitol with all these treasures that could never be replaced. They are actually in danger from the situation that exists. The committee under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Oklahoma is going to do something about it. We do not mention it in the report but we are going forward with it.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio. It has been almost entirely due to the good offices of the gentleman from Ohio that this very vital and urgent matter has come to our attention. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for taking the sort of action that we expect will get some results in meeting this important matter. I want to thank the gentleman for the good offices he has performed in that connection.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

In conclusion, may I say that some areas of the Capitol have about 32 coats of paint. This in itself is a hazard, even with fireproof walls. We found places where paints were stored in rooms that are not fireproof. There are places that should have fire doors that do not exist. This is a serious situation. We call on all Members to join us in an attempt to clear up this situation.

I join the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Washington in paying tribute to Bill Norrell, former chairman of this committee. He was one

of God's chosen noblemen. He was a great man to serve with on this committee and we all miss him. We are delighted with his successor, the gentleman from Oklahoma, who has done an outstanding job on this bill.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month the Honorable PHIL WEAVER, our colleague from the State of Nebraska, addressed a letter to all of the Members of this House, in which he detailed his reasons for asking for support of H.R. 3690, which he introduced on January 31, 1961, to amend the Small Business Act to provide that no contracts for Government construction would be set aside for or limited to bidding by small business concerns. In answer to my request for his comments on Congressman WEAVER's bill and letter, the Honorable John E. Horne, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, has addressed a very comprehensive and well-reasoned letter to me, responding in detail to the arguments made in Congressman WEAVER's letter and commenting, very learnedly, in my opinion, on the merits of the proposed legislation. I find myself in complete agreement with Mr. Horne's statements and conclusions, and feel that the factual manner in which the pertinent data were presented by him will be of great interest to all of my colleagues, particularly in view of the fact that each of them received a copy of Congressman WEAVER's letter. It is my hope that all of my colleagues will give careful consideration to Mr. Horne's rebuttal:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: Reference is made to your May 9, 1961, letter requesting our comments on the April 28 letter submitted to Members of Congress by the Honorable PHIL WEAVER. His letter refers to set-asides as they relate to the construction industry.

The Small Business Administration (SBA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on Congressman WEAVER's letter.

It is our opinion that the phraseology—"(including but not limited to contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction)"—referred to in the first paragraph of the Congressman's letter did not find its way into the Small Business Act by inadvertence. Prior to 1958, there had been a question in some contracting agencies as to whether Congress intended that construction contracts should be among those of which Congress desired small concerns should have a fair proportion. To eliminate any doubt, Congress added in the Small Business Act of 1958 the specific wording, "(including but not limited to contracts for maintenance, repair, and construction)." Congress specified that there was to be no differentiation between property, service or construction contracts, and that the Small Business Act covers all types of Government contracts.

The construction set-aside program was initiated in the beginning of fiscal year 1959, or the middle of calendar year 1958. In May 1959, SBA concurred in a proposal of the Department of Defense to suspend temporarily construction set-asides provided that the small business share of this work would not be adversely affected. Unfortunately, the participation of small firms in military construction contracting promptly declined. By the end of fiscal year 1960, the small business share of military construction contracts had dropped to about two-thirds of the dollar value of fiscal year 1958. Because of this decline, SBA requested reactivation of the construction set-aside program.

Under this agency's agreement with the Department of Defense, that Department's construction procurement offices automatically considered that this agency has initiated (recommended) a set-aside on all construction procurements (except Capehart housing) between $2,500 and $500,000. Thereupon, the military contracting officers evaluate the justification of the set-aside for each separate procurement. The contracting officer may concur in the initiation or state his reasons for nonconcurrence. The fact in the matter is that those construction projects which this agency and the Department of Defense jointly agree meet the criteria for small business set-asides will be set aside, and those which do not will not be set aside. It is not even within the realm of possibility that all contracts between $2,500 and $500,000 will be reserved for small contractor bidding only. There will be many projects in this dollar value category which are not suitable for small contractors.

I am sure you will be interested in knowing the history of military construction contracts of more than $500,000 since the construction set-aside program was renewed 9 months ago. Thirty-two projects with an estimated cost of $36 million were set aside. Eighty-seven projects with an estimated cost of $202 million were determined to be unsuitable for small business and were not set aside.

With reference to paragraph 5 of the Congressman's letter, I want to point out that on a 100-percent set-aside for supplies, services, or construction, only small business bids are invited and only small business bids are responsive. On partial small business set-asides, big business is permitted to bid on approximately 50 percent of the requirement. Since 1953, over $3 billion in contracts have been awarded to small concerns under the set-aside program but not more than 2 percent of these were partial set-asides. Thus, I think it is fair to say that awards resulting from set-asides are made at reasonable prices or they would not be made. The identical safeguards apply to making awards for construction procurements under the set-aside program as apply to property and services, for the Defense Department and in fact all Government procurement agencies. The Armed Services Procurement Regulation and the Federal Procurement Regulations authorize set-aside awards to be made at fair and reasonable prices, but at the same time empower contracting officers to reject any bid that in their opinion is unreasonable.

Competitive bidding is present on construction procurements which are set aside just as it is on set-aside purchases of property and services. In authorizing the setting aside of procurements exclusively for small business participation, Congress must be presumed to have been cognizant of the fact that competition afforded by large business participation in such procurements will necessarily be absent. Let me stress too that in determinations by contracting officers as to whether or not the lowest bid of a small business is fair and reasonable, the contracting officer may and does take into consideration, when available, the prices bid by big business on similar contract work. Moreover, the contracting officer may and does take into consideration the lowest bid on similar prior contracts of successful small business bidders. Set-asides on construction procurements are neither initiated by this agency nor agreed to by the contracting agency unless there exists a reasonable expectation that bids will be received from a sufficient number of responsible small business concerns.

While it may be argued that the set-aside program for small businesses may possibly cost a little more, there is no conclusive proof that such generally is the case. And, it can just as logically be argued that the program results in lower prices to the Government. Your attention is also called to the fact that the Secretary of Defense himself has expressed doubt that this program adds to the cost to the Government. On April 25 at a hearing held by the Procurement Subcommittee of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, the Secretary of the Navy stated, and I quote: "I don't know of a case where the Navy and the Government have wound up paying more for an item as a result of doing business with small business firms."

Because of the decline since 1954 in the small business share (25.3 percent in 1954 to 16.1 percent in 1960), it would seem particularly untimely to restrict a program that now channels procurement opportunities to small firms. Further, we hope through a more vigorous set-aside program, among other things, to arrest the downward trend of recent years in small business participation in Government procurement.

With thanks to you and with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

JOHN E. HORNE,
Administrator.

ARMED FORCES DAY

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in a very short time I cannot begin to cover even a tiny fraction—a one-thousandth part of the glories of our Armed Forces. Nor can I single out certain events, certain historic deeds, grand victories gained on the battlefields, in the air, or on the seas. This is neither easy to do, nor would it be quite fair, because at all times and in all periods of our history the Armed Forces of this Nation have always been held in high esteem. In wartime, of course, our very existence as a sovereign and independent Nation is entrusted to them. In peacetime they are charged with the supreme responsibility of preparing themselves, and being ready, for any eventuality that might endanger our security. They constitute the basic underpinnings of our foreign policy. These are the awesome and onerous responsibilities of our Armed Forces which they carry out regardless of the sacrifices involved. The manner in which they have borne these responsibilities have earned them the gratitude of the Nation. We are justly and rightly proud of the spirit, the ideals, and the glories of our Armed Forces.

RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAMS

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a danger in the current discussion of supervision of radio and television programs that claims of constitutional privilege may obscure the very real mediocrity of the programs involved.

In fact, in some cases, these current programs go beyond mediocrity and become actively injurious.

I append herewith an article which appeared in the New York Times on May 16, 1961, in which Jack Gould describes one of these frightful programs.

It is nothing short of frightening to consider the antisocial implications of this program, and when one realizes that susceptible children may be watching, one cannot escape the conclusion that such efforts are subversive of the values which we should be trying to inculcate in our youth.

We would be performing a disservice to the country, indeed, if we permitted any calculated cry of censorship to divert us from our efforts to improve the standards of our radio and television programs and to eliminate the active danger in the type of mental aberration typified by "Whispering Smith."

TV: NEW SHOW, SAME OLD MURDER—"WHISPERING SMITH" IN PREMIERE OF MAYHEM

(By Jack Gould)

A widow raised her son and daughter to avenge her husband who had been killed by a deputy sheriff. To instill adequate hatred in the young people, she periodically lashed their backs with a blacksnake whip.

The son's assignment was to get the draw on the sheriff, and for this task he practiced firing bullets between the eyes of scarecrows. The daughter's function was to play the old badger game by tricking the sheriff into her bedroom, throwing her arms around him and screaming that he wanted to compromise her.

The sheriff chanced to meet the son and explain why he had to kill the latter's father: the father had pushed a weapon into the stomach of an old man, pulled the trigger and laughed. Nonetheless, circumstances dictated that the sheriff and son meet in the main street of the town for a climactic duel; the sheriff got the draw. The elderly widow, in her rage, tried to shoot the sheriff but instead shot her daughter in the back.

The purpose: the violence illustrated that a mother should raise her children in love and not hate. The occasion: The National Broadcasting Company's premiere last night of its new series entitled "Whispering Smith." The medium: 1961 television.

THE FUND FOR SOCIAL ANALYSIS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I arise today for the purpose of inviting the attention of the House to the latest development in the Communist campaign to smear, discredit, and bring about the eventual abolition of the Committee on Un-American Activities. This new attack stems from hearings which are scheduled by the committee into the activities of an organization known as the Fund for Social Analysis.

After issuance of the subpenas, certain individuals who were officers or directors of the Fund for Social Analysis, certain recipients of its awards, the Communist Party, its members and supporters put into motion the second phase of their "Operation Abolition." In format, it is quite similar to their original abolition campaign.

As you will recall, in June 1959 the committee scheduled hearings in the State of California. Subpenas were served on over 100 witnesses, most of whom were employed in educational institutions in that State. The names of many subpenaed appeared in the public press and, while neither members of the committee nor members of its staff made this information available to the press, we were accused of deliberately releasing the names in order to destroy the character and employment possibilities of those subpenaed. Even though the committee in that instance saw to it that these witnesses, who were employed in the school system, were subpenaed in their homes, we were nevertheless accused of subpenaing them in their classrooms as a part of a campaign to impede academic freedom. Without investigation to determine the sources from which the press learned the identity of the persons subpenaed and without an effort to determine that all but four were served in their homes and not at their schools, attacks were made upon the committee's procedures in speeches throughout the United States and, yes, on the floor of the House of Representatives.

At the start of this Congress the staff of the committee was again instructed to release no information on hearings scheduled and to insure that the identity of subpenaed witnesses would not become public knowledge prior to their appearance.

The committee, or the members of its staff, did not make public release, directly or indirectly, of the names of any of the witnesses subpenaed in this inquiry. Yet, the press has that information, and where do you think this information came from?

The first notice to the press of the committee's proposed hearings on this subject was in the form of a release by the Communist-controlled Emergency Civil Liberties Committee dated May 4, 1961.

On May 11, this same Communist organization presented to the Speaker a petition urging the House of Representatives to pass a resolution asking the committee to cancel its hearings. As a part of this petition, recipients of grants were identified.

On May 12, the New York Council To Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee, as well as the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, released a statement to the press and dispatched unsolicited letters, using membership lists of organizations such as trade union locals to individuals throughout the United States, charging that this committee's investigation was a "clear attack on academic freedom" and identifying not only the recipients of awards, but the directors of the Fund for Social Analysis.

It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that some individuals identified in press releases of these organizations have not been subpenaed to appear before the Committee on Un-American Activities in connection with this inquiry. These Communist organizations have included the names of educators not subpenaed by the committee in order to support their fraudulent claim that the committee's hearings constitute an attack on academic freedom. This is typical of Communist propaganda tactics against the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let us look at one of these so-called educators who has received an award from the Fund for Social Analysis and examine whether or not the committee is attacking academic freedom in subpenaing this individual. The man I refer to is identified in the press releases as Dr. Herbert Aptheker.

Who is Dr. Herbert Aptheker? He is none other than a member of the National Committee of the Communist Party of the United States. He is none other than the editor of the theoretical organ of the Communist Party, Political Affairs. And how did he become editor of Political Affairs? He was appointed

to that position through a recommendation of the National Education Committee of the Communist Party and with the approval of the Communist Party's National Committee, of which he, Aptheker, is a member.

Mr. Speaker, these hearings into the Fund for Social Analysis were scheduled to commence this morning. They have been postponed to a later date. The postponement results from the committee's inability to sit at this time and, in a way, I am glad the postponement was necessary, as it will allow the Fund for Social Analysis, the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, the National Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee and its local councils additional time to carry out a phase of their abolition campaign. This delay will enable the House to see to what extent a small group of hard-core Communists are able to dupe the non-Communist educational community into supporting them in their attack on the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Speaker, the predictions I have made as to what will happen in this abolition campaign are not based on allegations or doubtful evidence. They are based on the recommendations of that Communist, Frank Wilkinson, and are contained in the recommendations for a national abolition campaign program, an authentic copy of which our colleague DONALD BRUCE of Indiana placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3.

RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, with the growth of competing forms of transportation, our railroads have been beset with ever-mounting financial problems. As a result, pressures for mergers and consolidations have proliferated. In many instances, mergers may offer the only answer for railroad companies fighting for their lives. Reasonable men would not object to carefully planned mergers as a solution for specific financial problems.

Likewise, reasonable men would wish to consider any such mergers in the light of the public interest. They would support mergers which strengthen our national transportation pattern, remembering that railroads are the backbone of our economic strength in peace and especially in war. They would wish to protect valid rights of all parties concerned, including passengers, stockholders, employees and shippers, for these too are elements which must be included in any estimate of the broad public interest.

On the other hand, reasonable men would not support mergers which appear to be motivated primarily by financial considerations, rather than by those of public interest.

These views of reasonable men traditionally have been the attitudes of Congress as well.

Generally speaking, the Congress has held, over the last 40 years, that rail mergers should fit logically into a broad pattern designed to give the United States a healthy and competitive railway system, not one which is fragmented. Each such system should consist of economically sound units, capable and anxious to serve the public interest.

In the Transportation Act of 1920, for example, the Congress is reported by the Special Study Group of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee as having treated of the merger problem in the following way:

> The Transportation Act of 1920 relaxed and eased previously existing policy on competition. It sought to encourage the consolidation of railroads into a limited number of systems but under the comprehensive plan for the consolidation of railway properties embodied in the act, competition was to be preserved as fully as possible and existing routes and channels of trade and commerce were to be maintained wherever practical.

This general and reasonable policy was intended to place the public welfare first. Along with subsequent protections for the employees, investors, users, and others involved, it has remained a cardinal point of congressional policy for 40 years.

Now we are faced with a vast railroad affiliation, that of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co.—C. & O.—and the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co.—B. & O. We in Congress, as well as the pertinent regulatory and executive authorities, should look carefully at this matter for many reasons. Among these are its profound effects upon workers, investors, users, and passengers, to name but a few. Is it primarily for financial purposes or does it further the public interest?

One railroad importantly affected, the New York Central System, has raised serious questions regarding the economics and the public policy raised in this matter. I would like, therefore, to call the attention of my colleagues and others affected to the views of the New York Central on this matter:

HOW ABOUT THE PUBLIC?

The Chesapeake & Ohio Railroad is seeking to control the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad. C. & O. says it wishes to eventually merge with B. & O.

The merging of these two systems will create the second largest railroad in the country, second only to the Pennsylvania.

The B. & O. is financially weak. The C. & O. is financially strong. By controlling or merging with the B. & O., the C. & O. hopes to become stronger.

Ordinarily, for the bondholders, stockholders and others financially interested in railroads, mergers can be a good thing. Mergers may also benefit, to varying degrees, the shippers and travelers who depend upon the resulting system for service.

On the face of it, then, it would appear that a proposed merging of the two companies might receive the blessing of the Interstate Commerce Commission—the Government agency which, under the law, must grant approval for such a move.

But, there is another side to the story. A side which we believe should be told simply and honestly, in the public interest.

It raises the key question, "How about the public?" Meaning the whole public to be affected by this proposal and not only those individuals with financial interests in the companies.

MERGERS CAN BENEFIT THE PUBLIC

Both the shipping and traveling public can benefit through mergers of railroads. Where there is an excess of rail capacity, elimination of duplicate facilities can result in great savings which can be passed on to the users.

By making more efficient use of the remaining facilities, the merged railroad can afford to invest in modernizing its plant and equipment. The public interest is served by thus upgrading equipment and service.

But when there is no great amount of duplicate rail capacity and facilities such as terminals, track, piers, and passenger accommodations, no substantial savings can be achieved through a merger. The public does not benefit and could well be hurt. Only those individuals with direct financial and other interests in the two carriers benefit through the merging of nonduplicating rail facilities or of railroads with relatively little duplication of facilities.

THE CASE AT HAND

In order to answer "How about the public?" we need only look to see whether the proposed B. & O.-C. & O. merger meets that simple yardstick of railroad economics: Will it result in the elimination of substantial duplications of facilities and thus permit the economies and improvements which benefit the public?

The answer is "No."

Throughout their combined 11,000 miles of track in 13 States and the District of Columbia, the C. & O. and B. & O. have only 17 connections and 23 common points of service. In Washington, D.C., they have 1 common point, in Illinois 1, in Indiana 2, in Kentucky 1, in New York 1, in Ohio 11, in Virginia 1, in West Virginia 5, and none in Pennsylvania, Michigan, Missouri, Maryland, Delaware, or New Jersey.

Even the complete elimination of these duplications, for which no plan has been announced to date, would fail to achieve the major economies which result in benefits to the traveling and shipping public.

HOW CAN SAVINGS BE ACHIEVED BY C. & O.-B. & O?

But despite this bleak outlook for achieving major savings from economies, the supporters of the C. & O.-B. & O. merger claim that it will result in savings for the system. There is only one way that such savings can materialize. That is by the ability of the combined system to take traffic away from other railroads in the territory.

The New York Central Railroad is the obvious prime target for the C. & O.-B. & O. raid on other freight business—the business which permits the continuation of any passenger and commuter services.

The freight traffic most susceptible to raiding by the C. & O.-B. & O. provides the backbone of Central's revenues. These revenues make it possible to provide essential Central freight and passenger service over the entire New York Central System, as well as the New York area commuter and terminal freight services. If these essential services are to be maintained, the New York Central must have the revenues which make them possible.

Thus, a C. & O.-B. & O. merger would not benefit the public through major savings achieved by eliminating duplicate facilities. There aren't that many duplicate facilities. And a C. & O.-B. & O. merger would hurt the public by depriving competitors of revenue they need to continue their freight, passenger and commuter services.

WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE?

There is a workable alternative to this potentially dangerous and harmful C. & O.-B. & O. merger scheme. And the alternative offers a permanent long-range cure for many of the chronic economic ills afflicting the eastern railroad complex.

It is to build in the eastern United States two balanced, strong competitive rail systems. The Pennsylvania Railroad, through its control of the Norfolk & Western, the Wabash and other railroads, has already begun to establish one such system. There is room only for one more. The second system cannot be created through haphazard C. & O.-B. & O. type mergers born of expediency or in quest of narrow economic or competitive gains.

If haphazard self-serving C. & O.-B. & O. type mergers continue, there can be only one result. Carriers arbitrarily excluded from such mergers will be driven into bankruptcy. The shipping and traveling public will be the losers.

There is a compelling reason why the New York Central must be included in the proposed C. & O.-B. & O. merger as a step toward the creation of a healthy eastern railroad economy. Only through the inclusion of the Central will this merger result in the major economies through elimination of duplicate facilities which in turn will result in service improvements in the public interest.

Today, the New York Central system has 61 connections and 98 common points with the B. & O. It has 45 connections and 67 common points with the C. & O. This tremendous duplication of facilities, you will recall, compares with the mere 17 connections and 23 common points between B. & O. and C. & O.

The savings of millions of dollars annually which can be achieved through elimination of duplicate facilities by a N.Y.C.-C. & O.-B. & O. merger will be the subject of a later report.

The logic of creating a strong, balanced, competitive two-system railroad service in the East is so obvious that B. & O. was publicly committed to the approach outlined here.

Detailed studies of the plan were well underway. Though far from completion, these studies indicated beyond a doubt that savings would result which would be of unprecedented benefit to the railroads concerned, their investors, their customers, their users and to the public at large.

Then, abandoning the studies in the face of their promising outlook for all concerned, B. & O. entered on-again-off-again negotiations with C. & O. which resulted in the present situation.

In the light of the facts at hand, however, N.Y.C. intends to pursue the objective of helping to create a healthy two-system eastern railroad structure in the public interest.

We shall present to the Interstate Commerce Commission a feasible, practical plan which will protect the territory, the customers, the owners of the affected railroads, and, most importantly, the public, against such haphazard affiliations as that being proposed for C. & O.-B. & O. In doing so, we believe we will be working in your interest and in the interest of promoting the commerce and the defense of our country.

We shall be reporting further to you on this vital subject and we welcome your active interest in the problem.

I do not know, for I am not a railroad authority, the specifics in a technical matter like this. I do know, however, that the public interest must be paramount. Also, I am cognizant of the impact the proposed merger will have on the railroad workers and their welfare must be kept in mind when consideration is given to the possibility of a merger. If the merger is not realized, what security can the financially weak B. & O. offer its employees, if any at all? If the C. & O. and the B. & O. do merge and the B. & O. is thereby strengthened, will this stronger financial position offer more job security to the railroad workers?

It must be borne in mind, also, that the railroad plant is too essential to this Nation for mergers on a hit-and-miss or piecemeal basis. They should be planned carefully so that the result will not be to have all the strong roads merged on one side, with the weak roads left out in the cold, so to speak. This would do irreparable damage to the communities served by the latter roads.

I would hope that the appropriate Federal regulatory and policy officials will, therefore, consider this merger within the context of the overriding public interest.

SPACE CONQUEST

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, now that our Nation has successfully demonstrated the ability to put a man into outer space and return him safely, we can begin to think constructively about the next stages of such exploration.

Recently I attended the formal dedication of a space-orientated facility which increases my optimism that we have the resources and ability to translate tomorrow into today. Republic Aviation Corp., which for three decades has produced fighter aircraft which have been a backbone of our defense, publicly opened its new Paul Moore Research and Development Center. This $14 million facility has since been described by reporters as "the most diversified privately owned facility of its type in existence." The work to be carried on within its walls is best reflected by the names of the seven research laboratories around which it is built. They are: Space Environment and Life Sciences, Re-Entry Simulation; Electronics, Materials Development; Fluids, Guidance and Control Systems; and Nuclear Radiation. In addition it is supported by three wind tunnels which, coupled with other units, give the company the unique capability of testing spacecraft models at speeds ranging from 400 miles per hour to over 19,500 miles per hour, which is orbital velocity.

Mundy I. Peale, president of Republic, and my constituent, pointed out that the technical transformation of the company from its original role as an airplane company had been going on for several years. Since 1958 alone, he said, the company had ventured into 29 new technological areas and had enlarged its research and scientific staff three times.

I would like now to quote some excerpts from the remarks of Mr. Peale during the luncheon address at the ceremonies because I feel they are especially timely and reflect the kind of clear thinking which will stand this Nation in good stead during the days ahead.

Mr. Peale said, in part:

The laboratories you will see in this center have been bought and paid for by the past work of scientists, engineers, production workers, and office employees. They have been paid for, also, by the men and women who invested their earnings and their savings in this country. Looking back on my own 23 years with Republic, it sometimes seems that our stockholders were the bravest of us all.

A Russian major has orbited the earth and returned. It is a fine achievement. But even if we try to apply the traditional and sincere philosophy of American sportsmanship and say "Well done, Russia," the rest of the world will no longer let us get by with it. Laotians and Cubans and Congolese, and undoubtedly many others, accept the feat as proof of Soviet superiority in all things—diplomatic, scientific, military, mental and muscular.

Congressman WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, expressed his doubts over the profitability of negotiating with the Communists on disarmament by making this point: "The difference between us is that we simply want to end the struggle—the Soviets want to win it."

In his inaugural address President Kennedy reminded us that we should not "ask what our country can do for us, but what we can do for our country."

This was intended and, I'm sure, accepted as an exhortation to the individual American. I would like to remind you all that this also applies to the American corporation which, under our laws, is a citizen of the United States.

There is no mystery as to what the corporation can do for our country. Its greatest contribution can be the utilization of capital to make possible the doing of worthwhile work, to provide employment, to increase our standard of living, and to give something to the enlargement of human values.

We are inclined to forget that progress is no longer measured in what we can do with our hands alone. It is also measured by what we can create in capital facilities that make human labor easier and vastly more productive.

Only 20 years ago the theme of the Temporary National Economic Committee hearings was that America's frontiers had closed and that this was what had caused the stagnation of the thirties. A famous survey made at the University of Notre Dame concluded that during the 1930's not $1 had been added to the capital equipment of the United States.

Now, with a suddenness that we still can hardly grasp, the frontiers have opened in a way that no frontier ever opened before: to include the space and the universe.

This is the most dramatic aspect. Probably the more practical one is the flowering of dozens of sciences that make accomplishment possible in a hundred directions—not merely in outer space, but in the molecules of metals and the composition of the human body, to mention just a few.

It is important we see this revolution in accurate perspective:

Space, after all, is only a new and unexplored part of that universe we have been studying since Copernicus. The achievements of only the last 7 years impress upon us that the pace of discovery is more breathtaking than anyone would have dared prophesy. But still, what we are doing is simply wrenching truths about matter from the unknown and finding applications for this new knowledge.

Unless we convert this knowledge into progress for people it isn't worth anything. Our greatest need and our greatest opportunity is to interpret the new momentum of science so as to make it directly important and valuable to millions of Americans.

This can be done. Our facilities for communicating knowledge and ideas are highly developed. How long ago was it that, supposedly, only 10 people in the world understood the theory of Einstein? Today a scientist must not only know it, he must have 20 different ways of applying it, to get a job.

From there we must be careful to remind ourselves that there is no assurance of success in any single line of discovery. We must pursue broad parallel lines of development. Our assurance then is this: That the support of scientific thinking with physical facilities administered by dynamic and creative industrial management will increase the opportunities where people can be put to work gainfully in large numbers to create new wealth.

Science affects people through people—the concern for humanity is the endless responsibility of living men and women. This responsibility can never be delegated to the machine. Some might assume that the keynote of this dedication is a sense of awe at the rapidly expanding scientific world and the new tools it requires.

But that is not the keynote. The keynote is our renewal of the solemn pledge to make human life here—and everywhere—more meaningful. This requires a mighty effort at communication, keeping the family circle unbroken, with scientist linked to assembly line worker, executive to farmer, educator to investor, and clerical worker to minister.

Finally, we must use our best talents in the greater enterprise of discovery—seeking and making truly understood the elements of human progress that are embedded in this onrush of technical accomplishment.

This is the challenge to all of us—resolutely to give and to receive clear and helpful interpretations of all that we are doing, so that we strengthen our faith and inspire the hope and courage of all mankind.

EXCHANGE OF CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a resolution to urge the U.S. Government to explore an exchange of Cuban military and political prisoners for U.S. nonmilitary assistance to the Cuban people, including milk for Cuban children or school lunch programs.

It is unfortunate that Premier Fidel Castro should take the cynical and materialistic view that human lives can be traded for 500 bulldozers. But his offer of May 17 now opens up the possibility for releasing the Cubans who participated in the abortive invasion effort in April.

I feel sure all Americans welcome the formation of a group, organized to seek the release of the captives by private subscription.

My resolution goes beyond that worthy effort in three important respects—

First. It would establish the principle that the U.S. Government as well as private citizens should share in the cost. Our Government shared some responsibility for that invasion and now shares a moral responsibility to help obtain the release of brave men who have been captured.

Second. It would not be confined to an exchange of men for bulldozers. The Cuban people need many things in their efforts to build a better life for themselves and their children. Among the items which we could offer them are milk for their children, school lunch programs as well as a variety of health and technical assistance programs.

Third. It is not confined to prisoners captured in the invasion. Reports from Cuba indicate there are many thousands of political prisoners held by the Castro government. If they wish to leave the country, my resolution would authorize negotiations for their release.

The text of my resolution follows:

Whereas the United States and Cuba have committed themselves under the Charter of the Organization of American States to settle their disputes by peaceful procedures, such as "direct negotiation, good offices, mediation, investigation and conciliation, judicial settlement and arbitration"; and

Whereas the expansion of Communist influence within Cuba has contributed to greatly increased tensions between Cuba and the United States and has resulted in an armed invasion of Cuba by Cuban refugees which has failed, with an unfortunate loss of life and the capture of more than 1,000 invaders by the Cuban Government, which is now threatening to sentence them to hard labor for an indeterminate period of time; and

Whereas Premier Fidel Castro on May 17 is reported to have offered to exchange most of these prisoners for 500 bulldozers; and

Whereas the United States in the past has participated in arrangements whereby prisoners were exchanged for prisoners; and

Whereas it is reported that many thousands of men and women in Cuba have been arrested and are being held as political prisoners; and

Whereas the United States has a moral responsibility to aid these military and political prisoners: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States should offer to explore the possibilities for some exchange, through the United Nations or the Organization of American States or otherwise, which would result in the freeing of the captives and political prisoners, and at the same time show the Cuban people in Cuba that the United States is willing to supply them with nonmilitary equipment, health or technical assistance programs, school lunches or milk for children, or other programs which will contribute to the well being of the Cuban people as a whole.

SUMMIT MEETINGS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WILSON] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, many Congressmen on both sides of the aisle have noted with dismay and misgivings the news that once again an American President is "going to the summit" to meet Mr. Khrushchev, of Russia.

Many of us have sat in this Chamber and heard similar announcements about the late Mr. Roosevelt, and about Mr. Truman and Mr. Eisenhower.

We had our misgivings then and they proved well founded. Down through the years we have seen time and again that it does not pay to deal in "summitry" with the Russians. For some reason, though, our Presidents seem obsessed with the idea. None have been able to resist its siren call.

Summitry will never replace a strong and nationalistic foreign policy, nor should it be used to divert the attention of the American people from what seems to me to be the No. 1 foreign problem of today. That problem is Cuba.

While the President prepares to go to the summit at Vienna with the same man whose character, as he rightly said, was stamped forever on the bloody streets of Budapest, Fidel Castro is preparing himself to become the Lenin of the Western Hemisphere.

Our previous experiences at the summit have proven the truth of an old midwestern saying—man is the only animal that can be skinned more than once. We have been skinned at Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam, Geneva, Camp David, and other places; yet it seems that every time Russia beckons, our chief executive is ready to run to a meeting.

Nothing is really gained. Much has been lost. You would think that by this time President Kennedy would profit from the mistakes of the late Mr. Roosevelt, and from the errors of Mr. Truman and Mr. Eisenhower.

It is apparent that is not the case. It is also apparent that this latest summit is a diversionary tactic to take the minds of the American people off the problem that sits 90 miles off our shores—the problem of Cuba.

Cuba is going to continue to be our No. 1 problem until this administration stops vacillating and adopts a firm policy designed to bring down Castro and his henchmen.

It is my opinion and the opinion of many military and foreign policy experts that this administration should at once clamp a tight air and sea blockade on Cuba. This blockade should be designed to prevent any military goods from Iron Curtain countries from reaching Cuba.

Many gentlemen on this side of the aisle have withheld criticism and advice in a true attempt to create a bipartisan air about our policy concerning Cuba. Since it is now apparent we have no true policy on Cuba, then perhaps it is our job, as the opposition, to suggest one.

We must start now, and we must bring down Castro now; otherwise, his military position may, in the future, be demolished at a cost dear to this Nation. Otherwise, we may see a Soviet missile base 90 miles offshore.

This blockade does not require any great change in foreign policy. It merely calls for implementation of the basic principles of the Monroe Doctrine and other past foreign policy edicts.

This House has already recognized the threat of Cuba to this hemisphere's peace and well being. Only last week, we passed a resolution that demanded col-

lective action against the clear and present danger of Cuba and communism in our midst.

Unless we insist that the sense of this resolution be followed up, unless we insist on adoption of a hard and firm policy in regard to Cuba, we are setting the stage for Fidel Castro to build up an island bastion of power. We are also allowing the stage to be set for a Communist springboard to Latin America.

We can expect Castro-agitated uprisings in other South American countries and we will some day find our weak-kneed policies in regard to Cuba have cost us nation after nation in Latin America.

Now, what are we actually doing?

Instead of concentrating on this hemisphere's "Communist cancer in Cuba" we see an attempt to divert the attention of the American people to another summit—which will see little or nothing accomplished and which will see Russia concede nothing and demand all.

When are we going to wake up to our peril? When will we realize that this Nation needs a positive, energetic, nationalistic foreign policy?

This, Mr. Speaker, is now the duty and responsibility of this administration, which, in just 4 short months, has plunged our prestige to its lowest ebb in history. I say it is the responsibility of this administration—it promised sweeping changes in our national prestige, but it certainly missed the call on the direction.

Since it has plunged us into the depths, it now becomes its responsibility to get us out. I want to state here and now that I will join in any attempt to get that job done and will back any strong stand on Cuba.

I will support any policy formed to get rid of communism in Cuba in particular and thwart the spread of communism in general.

I cannot support our present policy. It is, at its best, poorly conceived, poorly thought out, poorly administered, and its returns have been anything but encouraging.

Many of my constituents believe we are seeing an administration that is weak-kneed on foreign policy and civil rights legislation, and that really has only two accomplishments about which to talk.

These are the rough, tough political pressures on the home front and the diarrhea of words later weakened by utter inactivity.

This administration is willing to act tough and be tough with Congressmen. The President recognized that last week when he penned a short note on a photograph attesting to the ability of the administration to have its way in this House.

Yes, the administration is willing to get tough to get its deficit spending, welfare state schemes through the Congress.

Why doesn't it shift this toughness to the foreign scene, where it is really needed? And why does it not back up all those words with action?

Those of us who have served in Congress through World War II, the Korean action, and through most of the cold war have seen that the Russians only respect strength, firmness and power.

It is time that this administration adopt just this sort of a policy and declare to the world that the United States intends to campaign vigorously for the republic concept of government, for the right of man to live in freedom, for the principles of individual enterprise, and for the principles for which Americans have been willing to fight and die since 1776.

It is time this administration state that America will be pushed no farther and that, in the future, it, too, intends to protect its interests and the interests of its people wherever and however necessary.

That is the type of course the American people want. That is the type, of course, they will endorse and support to the utmost, in Cuba and elsewhere.

THE KENNEDY ANSWER TO THE TEXTILE PROBLEM

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, on May 2, 1961, President Kennedy gave his answer to those of us who have called for Government action in behalf of the domestic textile industry. This industry is the second largest employer in the United States and has been hard hit by a flood of imports of textile products from low-cost countries abroad. Industry and labor spokesmen had requested President Kennedy to take necessary steps to impose import quotas by category and country as the only feasible solution of what almost everyone now agrees is a very serious problem.

In response to these pleas for the imposition of import quotas, which incidentally were supported by many Members on both sides of the aisle in both Houses of Congress, President Kennedy on May 2 announced his seven-point program, as follows:

First. I have directed the Department of Commerce to launch an expanded program of research, covering new products, processes, and markets. This should be done in cooperation with both union and management groups.

Second. I have asked the Treasury Department to review existing depreciation allowances on textile machinery. Revision of these allowances, together with adoption of the investment incentive credit proposals contained in my message to the Congress of April 20, 1961, should assist in the modernization of the industry.

Third. I have directed the Small Business Association to assist the cotton textile industry to obtain the necessary financing for modernization of its equipment.

Fourth. I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

Fifth. I will shortly send to the Congress a proposal to permit industries seriously injured or threatened with serious injury as a result of increased imports to be eligible for assistance from the Federal Government.

Sixth. I have directed the Department of State to arrange for calling an early conference on the principal textile exporting and importing countries. This conference will seek an international understanding which will provide a basis for trade that will avoid undue disruption of established industries.

Seventh. In addition to this program, an application by the textile industry for action under existing statutes, such as the escape clause or the national security provision of the Trade Agreements Extension Act, will be carefully considered on its merits.

Upon the announcement of this seven-point program, spokesmen for the textile industry issued statements indicating that they were "encouraged," and certain Members of Congress have stated they were happy about it. If these seven proposals are satisfactory to the textile industry, they should certainly be agreeable to me because I have no financial interest in any textile operation. I do, however, have a profound interest in the well-being of the textile industry because many people in the district I represent here make their living working in textile plants and many of my constituents have substantial sums invested in the industry. Moreover, a prosperous textile industry is vital to the economy of North Carolina as well as the entire country. This is made manifest by the fact that more than 200,000 persons or 1 out of every 2 manufacturing employees in the State of North Carolina work in textile plants. Moreover, the President himself stated in his May 2 statement that there are approximately 2 million workers directly affected by conditions in the textile industry and another 2 million persons are employed in furnishing requirements to the industry.

The subject is of such vital importance to my State that recently the North Carolina General Assembly adopted a joint resolution memorializing President Kennedy and the Congress to "take immediate action to establish quotas by country and category on textile imports." Following is the text of that joint resolution, a copy of which was sent to the President before he announced his seven-point program:

A JOINT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO TAKE IMMEDIATE ACTION TO ESTABLISH QUOTAS BY COUNTRY AND BY CATEGORY ON TEXTILE IMPORTS

Whereas the textile industry is and has been the backbone of the economy of North Carolina, employing 219,000 persons or nearly one out of every two manufacturing employees in the State; and

Whereas hundreds of millions of dollars in payrolls and millions of dollars in taxes are provided by the textile industry in North Carolina; and

Whereas the textile industry is vitally important to the economy of the Nation, employing nearly 1 million Americans and providing the livelihood for their families and dependents; and

Whereas the U.S. Quartermaster General has declared textiles second only to steel in time of national emergency and the Office of Civil Defense has officially affirmed the essentiality of the textile industry to national security; and

Whereas imports of foreign textiles have reached an alltime high level and increasing each year at alarming rates; and

Whereas these imports are responsible for the loss of hundreds of thousands of textile jobs, curtailment of the hours worked in the

textile industry, the closing of many textile plants, and drastically reduced consumption of cotton by American mills; and

Whereas the very existence of the whole textile industry and the jobs and livelihood of the millions that are dependent upon it are in grave danger due to textile imports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That the North Carolina General Assembly strongly urges that the President and the Congress of the United States take whatever steps are necessary to immediately establish textile quotas by country and by category.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Secretaries of Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, State, and Treasury, and the Members of Congress from North Carolina.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

I do not take issue with the industry spokesmen who may be satisfied with the seven-point program announced by President Kennedy, but on the basis of conversations I have had with both management spokesmen and workers in the textile industry since the decision was announced, I feel compelled to state that I am disappointed that more positive and direct action was not proposed by the President. This disappointment stems from the fact that on August 31, 1960, when he was a candidate for the presidency, Senator Kennedy wrote a letter to the Governor of South Carolina, which was widely circulated throughout the textile-producing areas of the South during the 1960 presidential campaign, in which he stated that "Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy."

Following is the text of that letter:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, August 31, 1960.

Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
Governor of the State of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR HOLLINGS: I would, of course, be delighted to discuss with you and with industry leaders the import problems of the textile industry and the development of constructive methods for showing the growth and prosperity of the industry in the future. The critical import situation that confronts the textile industry which you so eloquently describe in your letter is one with which I am familiar. My own State of Massachusetts has suffered and is suffering from the same conditions. The past few years have been particularly difficult for this industry. There seems to have been a basic unwillingness to meet the problem and deal constructively with it. During the first 6 months of this year imports of cotton cloth are twice what they were during the same period in 1959, the highest year on record. Similarly, alarming increases are occurring on other textile and apparel products. Since 1958 imports have exceeded exports by constantly increasing margins. There are now 400,000 fewer jobs in the industry than there were 10 years ago. It is no longer possible to depend upon makeshift policies and piecemeal remedies to solve the problems which the industry faces.

As you know, I supported the establishment of the Special Senate Subcommittee for the Textile Industry, under the chairmanship of Senator PASTORE, of which Senator STROM THURMOND is a member. In an effort to help develop suggestions to improve the competitive position of the industry in the United States and world markets, this subcommittee for the first time undertook a broad investigation of the problems of the U.S. textile industry and offered a number of constructive recommendations. With only minor exceptions, the Eisenhower administration has failed to implement these recommendations.

I agree with the conclusions of the Pastore committee that sweeping changes in our foreign trade policies are not necessary. Nevertheless, we must recognize that the textile and apparel industries are of international scope and are peculiarly susceptible to competitive pressure from imports. Clearly the problems of the industry will not disappear by neglect nor can we wait for a large-scale unemployment and shutdown of the industry to inspire us to action. A comprehensive industrywide remedy is necessary.

The outline of such a remedy can be found in the report of the Pastore committee. Imports of textile products, including apparel, should be within limits which will not endanger our own existing textile capacity and employment, and which will permit growth of the industry in reasonable relationship to the expansion of our overall economy.

We are pledged in the Democratic platform to combat substandard wages abroad through the development of international fair labor standards. Effort along this line is of special importance to the U.S. textile industry.

The Office of the Presidency carries with it the authority and influence to explore and work out solutions within the framework of our foreign trade policies for the problems peculiar to our textile and apparel industry. Because of the broad ramifications of any action and because of the necessity of approaching a solution in terms of total needs of the textile industry, this is a responsibility which only the President can adequately discharge. I can assure you that the next Democratic administration will regard this as a high-priority objective.

Additionally, we shall make vigorous use of the procedures provided by Congress such as section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and the escape clause in accordance with the intention of Congress in enacting these laws.

Lastly, I assure you that should further authority be necessary to enable the President to carry out these objectives, I shall request such authorization from the Congress.

I hope that these thoughts are helpful to you in your own deliberations and I reaffirm my interest in discussing problems of mutual concern with you.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

In the light of the favorable references by candidate Kennedy to the recommendations of the Pastore committee, as contained in the foregoing letter to Governor Hollings during his 1960 campaign for the Presidency, it is interesting to contrast the seven-point program announced by President Kennedy on May 2 with the five recommendations made by the Pastore committee restated in its supplementary report dated March 14, 1961. Those recommendations are as follows:

1. That quotas on textile mill products, and on garments and apparel, and on man-made fiber staple, filaments, and filament yarn, be established by country and by category of product.

2. That the program of data collection and research instituted by the Business and Defense Services Administration be continued.

3. That the Internal Revenue Service publish a revised schedule of depreciation rates, taking into account current industry practices, which would permit a more rapid writeoff for tax purposes.

4. That appropriate Government agencies expand, and initiate where necessary, textile research.

5. That the two-price system for cotton be eliminated.

As one who is vitally interested in the well-being of the textile industry, although as previously stated I have no financial interest in any textile operation, I sincerely hope that the Kennedy seven-point program will be effective in substantially curtailing the flood of textile imports. This is the fundamental problem besetting the textile industry. I therefore announce my support of the program, although I must add that I do not share the optimism over it as expressed on this floor frequently by Members who previously joined industry spokesmen in saying that import quotas by category and country offer the only practicable and effective method of solving this problem.

While I hope the seven-point program will succeed, I am disappointed that President Kennedy did not announce his acceptance and the implementation of the recommendations of the Pastore committee. Because he had stated in his letter to Governor Hollings of South Carolina that "The outline of such a remedy—for the textile problem—can be found in the report of the Pastore committee," the widespread circulation of the Kennedy letter to Governor Hollings during the campaign had led people in the textile producing areas of our country to believe that, if Senator Kennedy became President, he would implement the Pastore committee recommendations.

I am also disappointed that President Kennedy did not see fit to follow the example set by President Eisenhower in 1957–58, when the domestic textile industry was then threatened by textile imports from Japan. The Eisenhower administration opened direct negotiations with Japan which resulted in an agreement whereby Japan voluntarily agreed to restrict textile exports to the United States.

When this voluntary agreement was concluded in 1958, Japan was exporting cotton textile manufactured products to the United States at an annual rate of 278 million square yards. But by 1960 these imports had gone down to 264 million square yards, according to figures released by the Northern Textile Association on May 11, 1961. Industry spokesmen have repeatedly stated that they are satisfied with the way the Japanese agreement has worked. For example, Mr. J. Spencer Love, chairman and president of Burlington Industries, Inc., stated in February 1961 that "the Japanese should be commended" for negotiating reasonable textile quotas with the U.S. Government, but that they "now feel frustrated and irritated over this because, while they have been living with reasonable limits, other areas have stepped into the breach and ex-

panded enormously their exports to the United States."

The following table from the Northern Textile Association Bulletin of May 11, 1961, shows the effect of this voluntary agreement:

U.S. imports of certain textile manufactures, 1958–60

[Millions of square yards]

Cotton manufactures	1958	1960
Total	456	1,008
Japan	278	264
Hong Kong	66	278
Portugal	1	62
Spain	1	61
Egypt	1	55
India	3	53
France	2	38
Formosa, Pakistan, and Korea	5	52
All other	99	145

It will be seen from the foregoing table that in 1958 the Japanese share of U.S. cotton textile imports was about 60 percent of the total while after the voluntary agreement was negotiated that share had declined to about 26 percent.

But in the meantime, Hong Kong's share had increased from 66 million square yards in 1958 to 278 million square yards or from about 14 percent to about 28 percent of the total. Moreover, substantial increases occurred since that agreement in exports to the United States from Portugal, Spain, Egypt, India, France, Formosa, Pakistan, Korea, and other countries.

The Japanese agreement to limit textile exports to the United States is always referred to as voluntary on the part of Japan. This is technically correct although all of us who worked on the problem in 1957 and 1958 know full well that it only resulted from long and intensive negotiations between our Government and Japan.

I would not presume to claim undue credit for this agreement although I was quite active in bringing industry spokesmen together with officials in the Eisenhower administration and enlisting the active support of the latter in the effort which proved successful so far as Japanese exports to the United States are concerned. I personally arranged a number of separate conferences between textile industry spokesmen and Government officials of the Eisenhower administration at the White House and participated in those conferences. We were always received with courtesy and consideration. The resulting negotiated voluntary agreement with Japan proves that the interest always manifested by President Eisenhower and his associates was sincere and fruitful.

I shall always be grateful to President Eisenhower for giving me the privilege of announcing, from the White House itself, the successful outcome of these negotiations with Japan which led to the voluntary agreement.

Despite comments that have been made repeatedly on this floor, and similar ones made during the last presidential campaign to the effect that the previous administration evidenced no interest in the problems of the domestic textile industry, the facts just related indicate conclusively that the Eisenhower administration was interested in the problem and that it moved decisively and effectively when the Japanese threat became so pronounced.

I regret that the Kennedy administration did not at least make a similar effort. It chose instead to approach the problem on a worldwide basis through an international conference to be arranged by the Department of State. For the sake of a vital U.S. industry and the millions of citizens who derive their livelihood from it, as well as for the sake of our national security, I sincerely hope that the efforts of the Kennedy administration, through the seven-point program announced on May 2, will prove as effective in curbing the flood of textile imports from other countries in the world as the efforts of the Eisenhower administration were with respect to imports from Japan.

But the volume of textile imports is only part of the problem besetting the textile industry. Assuming that some tangible curtailment of imports will result from the Kennedy proposal for an international conference, there will remain the very serious problem of our two-price system for cotton which substantially penalizes the domestic textile industry.

One of the Pastore committee recommendations was that this two-price system be eliminated. That it is discriminatory against and unfair to the domestic textile industry is too obvious to need elaboration. How can anyone possibly justify a system which will permit foreign textile manufacturers to purchase American-made cotton at $42.50 per bale less than our own textile manufacturers have to pay and then flood our markets with goods manufactured from that cotton?

But instead of taking affirmative and positive action to eliminate this unfair two-price system, the fourth point in the seven-point Kennedy program recognizes the problem but utterly fails to come to grips with it. The fourth point is worthy of reproduction here:

> Fourth, I have directed the Department of Agriculture to explore and make recommendations to eliminate or offset the cost to U.S. mills of the adverse differential in raw cotton costs between domestic and foreign textile producers.

There is nothing new in this proposal. The March 14, 1961, Supplementary Report of the Pastore committee indicated that the Department of Agriculture was already studying the problem. Actually, it has been studied so many times that, as the Rock Hill Evening Herald for May 7, 1961, said:

> It is threadbare. Another study is not apt to shed new light. The idea of selling U.S. cotton at a lower price to foreign competitors of U.S. mills does not make sense.

But right in the midst of all of the activity on the part of industry spokesmen and Members of Congress urging the President to take positive action to save the textile industry from utter destruction, and in the face of the positive recommendation of the Pastore committee to eliminate the two-price system for cotton, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman on February 21, 1961, compounded the injury and damage to the textile industry by announcing an increase in the support price of cotton from 75 percent to 82 percent of parity, and also announced an increase—effective August 1, 1961—in the export cotton subsidy from 6 cents to 8.5 cents per pound. The increase in the price support for cotton will cost U.S. mills an additional $18.75 per bale for cotton and will enable foreign mills to buy U.S. produced cotton for $42.50 per bale less than U.S. mills will have to pay for it.

To announce these increases in price supports and export subsidies, with the consequent heavy increases to U.S. mills in the cost of their cotton, right at the time the Pastore committee was calling for the elimination of the two-price system as one of its recommendations to help the textile industry, and at the very time the strong push was on by the industry itself, supported by a large number of the Members of Congress, for some relief against the unfair competition from abroad, is incompatible with promises for relief against an intolerable situation. It is like giving a hungry man a stone when he asks for bread.

I recall President Kennedy said, speaking on another subject, that things are likely to get worse before they become better. This action by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman seems to be a case in point.

Secretary of Commerce Hodges was quoted in the March 1, 1961, issue of the Washington Post as discussing the action of Secretary Freeman just referred to. The following paragraphs of that story, which was written by Mr. Bernard D. Nossiter, and which I have said appeared in the Washington Post on March 1, 1961, should be read in the light of my comment that this action by Secretary Freeman was a substantial disservice to an already hard-pressed textile industry:

> Hodges (Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges) also discussed the plight of the long-sagging textile industry which he said was getting "worser and worser." Because of the anomalous farm laws, Agriculture Secretary Orville L. Freeman "can't let his left hand know what his right hand is doing," Hodges cracked.
>
> He meant this: Freeman wants to raise cotton price supports, thus increasing costs for domestic textile producers. At the same time, he wants to raise the subsidy for cotton exports, keeping costs down for competing foreign producers. These programs may help cotton producers, but they hurt textile manufacturers.
>
> Government programs, Hodges declared, "are actually destroying a basic industry" and threaten to put textile producers here "out of business completely."

The Wall Street Journal, the editor of which incidentally is a gifted North Carolinian, recently published an editorial in which this particular subject was discussed. The contents of this editorial are pertinent in the light of President Kennedy's use of the words "offset the cost" in the fourth point of his seven-point program.

BALLED-UP COTTON

Having heard President Kennedy's thinking on the problems posed by rising foreign competition, textile industry leaders came

away from the White House "highly encouraged" the other day. The "atmosphere" there seemed sympathetic, said one spokesman, but neither he nor anyone else could point to a specific remedy promising relief.

That isn't surprising. The program outlined by the President is purposefully vague, reflecting the contradiction between the administration's official advocacy of free trade and the mounting domestic political pressure for protectionism. The relief held out to hard-pressed textile men consists mainly of a promise that an application for tariff or quota protection "will be carefully considered on its merits."

As for the rest of the President's program, it reveals a lack of thoughtful consideration of some fundamental causes of the domestic textile industry's ills. One of these is the Government's two-price policy on cotton. Foreign textile makers are able to buy American raw cotton at $30 a bale less than American mills. On August 1, the differential between the export price and the Department of Agriculture's domestic support price is due to leap to $42.50 a bale.

Hence, the Government to which cotton textile manufacturers turn for relief is in no small part the agent of their distress. But if the demand is loud enough, the Government may be prevailed upon to extend to textiles some of the same type of "protection" it has given agriculture. This approach is hinted in the President's order directing the Department of Agriculture to recommend a scheme of subsidies either to cotton producers or to the mills themselves to offset the price differential.

But an economic woe caused by the Government isn't likely to be cured by further Government spending and meddling. Nor would such subsidy help the textile industry solve its real problems; handouts would only cover them up temporarily.

Before leaping into the Government's arms, textile men ought to look at the plight of Government-subsidized agriculture. And Congress, instead of yielding to protectionist demands, ought to look hard at the cause-and-effect tie between subsidized cotton and suffering mills.

Other points in the seven-point Kennedy program may eventually be of some advantage to the textile industry, such as his direction to the Treasury Department to review current depreciation allowances on textile machinery and the direction to the Department of Commerce to launch an expanded program of research. However, the Pastore committee had recommended that the Internal Revenue Service publish a revised schedule of depreciation rates to permit a more rapid writeoff of machinery for tax purposes. While I do not have any right to speak for the textile industry, I assume it would welcome a stepup in research by the Department of Commerce. Such a program may have some long-range benefits, but will hardly have any immediate effect upon the competitive situation which has brought about the current textile industry problems.

Other points in the seven-point program call for the SBA to assist the cotton textile industry to obtain easier financing and for the textile industry to be made eligible for other assistance from the Federal Government. These points also avoid the current problem. While I assume that many textile organizations would be glad to receive Government loans on favorable terms as well as other unspecified assistance from the Federal Government, my impression from talking with people in the industry is that they are not seeking Government handouts or loans, nor do they care to be placed on a Government dole, or to be treated on a depressed area concept. My impression is that all the textile industry is seeking is an opportunity to compete on fair terms with a modernized, efficient textile industry which has been assisted to its present condition by the U.S. Government using tax funds partly furnished by the textile industry which bears the brunt of the competition.

Their complaint is that such competition cannot be fair when the foreign plants have been partially financed through the U.S. foreign aid program, when labor costs in the competing countries are ridiculously low in comparison with wage rates and other labor costs imposed by the Government on U.S. mills, and when the Government also makes it possible for the foreign producer to purchase U.S. produced cotton at $42.50 a bale cheaper than it costs our domestic mills.

This seems to me to be a reasonable position. Yet advocates of free trade label it "protectionism," and leave the impression that the textile industry is seeking to erect high trade barriers to avoid competition from abroad. These charges are incorrect.

I do not think the domestic textile industry is seeking a captive market. The leaders in this industry recognize the importance of foreign trade and they know we cannot sell goods abroad unless we are willing to import foreign-made goods. All they are seeking is a fair opportunity to compete in their own markets with low cost and subsidized manufactured goods from abroad. They maintain that the record clearly shows that, because of the factors enumerated above and others that might be cited, fair competition under present conditions is impossible.

Unless the U.S. Government is prepared to preside over the liquidation of the important textile industry, affirmative and positive action is imperative. I do not believe any action will be effective unless it eliminates the competitive advantage given foreign producers under the cotton export subsidy program and unless it results in the establishment of import quotas by country and by category.

I repeat what has previously been said, and that is that I hope the 7-point program announced by President Kennedy will prove to be effective in resolving this problem before it is too late. I feel that it is a timid approach instead of the dynamic one the industry has been led to expect. Nevertheless, it is the program announced by the President and I join my colleagues here in the House and industry spokesmen in expressing the hope that it will do the job we all feel must be done. If it has that result, I will be the first to applaud. If it fails, it will be my purpose again to urge a program which will deal with the real problem.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

CIVIL RIGHTS LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, not since President Eisenhower was compelled to send troops to deal with the school crisis in Little Rock has there been a more flagrant challenge to the forces of decency and human rights than the raging Alabama mobs which have attacked the so-called freedom riders and other citizens in the capital of that State.

So open has been the threat to constitutional law and order that, even in the absence of enabling legislation, the Attorney General has felt it necessary to send hundreds of armed Federal marshals into Alabama and to threaten Federal prosecution of certain individuals alleged to be responsible for violations of Federal law in the riotous attack upon groups of American citizens who had determined to challenge Alabama segregation on inter-State buslines.

In answer to this Federal action, the Governor of Alabama has declared martial law and threatened to arrest U.S. marshals, while conflicting injunctions from State and Federal judges raise again, as at Little Rock, the specter of a major conflict between State and Federal authority.

All good citizens will share the sense of national shame at this savage demonstration of racial bigotry and will trust that the President's appeal for reason and order in this and other aspects of race relations will be upheld. For the sake of our Nation and our position in the world, we cannot afford to permit such an exhibition of intolerant violence, least of all on the eve of the President's summit conference with the Soviet dictator at Vienna. It is, rather, time for all Americans of good will—including the many fine citizens of Alabama and other Southern States—to reassert their devotion to our national heritage of respect for the rights of all, regardless of race, creed, or color.

Last January, among eight measures which I introduced to give effect to the civil rights pledges of both parties in last year's election, was the key proposal to add title III to the civil rights laws to authorize the Attorney General to institute court action where an individual's civil rights have been violated. This would have eliminated the legal no man's land in which Alabama's racist mobs and officials feel free to operate.

While I am in full agreement with the dispatch of Federal law officers to Alabama to halt racial violence compounded by collusion of local authorities, I wonder if this most recent fiasco affecting elements striving for freedom was to some extent caused by too much talk and too little effective action by the administration.

After promising civil rights legislation before last year's Presidential election,

the President has withheld support from the rights legislation prepared by Democratic Party leaders at his own instance. Instead, the New Frontier indicated it would implement civil rights through executive department activity rather than legislation. But Federal action has been so irresolute that mobs, and even Alabama State authorities, have been emboldened. With the complicity and tacit approval of Alabama officials, violence erupted and the blame placed upon the victims.

I happened to be among the first Members of Congress to protest the recent appointment of Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, Governor Patterson's campaign manager, to be a Director of the U.S. Import-Export Bank. I requested the President to rescind the nomination before it went to the Senate.

This appointment was made despite Mr. Meriwether's links with the Ku Klux Klan and even his open admission that he still favored racial discrimination. The appointment appeased Governor Patterson but did it promote respect in Alabama for Federal authority and compliance with civil rights laws?

Instead of appointing Mr. Meriwether, Governor Patterson's own campaign manager, to an internationally vital post dealing with emerging Afro-Asian nations, maybe we should have sent the Peace Corps to Alabama to familiarize backward peoples with democracy and aid them along the path toward freedom.

Will Federal authorities now permit Alabama to prosecute the Freedom Riders, already victims of brutal beatings, on the trumped-up charge of contempt of an obviously unconstitutional injunction that would prevent Americans from traveling freely within their own nation? Will we have to negotiate a tractor-for-prisoners exchange with Governor Patterson?

Apart from the issue of minority rights, the basic freedom of the press demands Federal action when mobs, with seeming impunity, smash news and TV cameras, beating newsmen attempting to cover the news. Alabama is a State of the United States and is not a part of Cuba or Communist China.

Ours is a government of laws and I therefore urge the President to place the full powers of his administration behind the speedy enactment of legislation which will empower the Federal Government to take prompt, constitutional action, to deal effectively with any and all threats to the civil rights of the U.S. citizens anywhere in the Nation.

BRITISH STEEL PRODUCING COMPANY TO IMPORT U.S. COAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, recently, a major British steel producing company announced that it had requested permission from the Board of Trade to import U.S. coal.

Despite the fact that the steel company is located in the heart of the Welsh coalfields—among the largest in Britain—it told the Government it can buy coal from the United States at about $2.24 a ton less than it can from domestic nationalized mines.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the fact that U.S. coal can be produced in our mines by men enjoying one of the highest wage scales in industry, moved by rail to the Atlantic coast and then shipped to Europe and be sold for less than British produced coal will come as a surprise to many people. But to persons familiar with the technological revolution which has occurred in the American coal industry in the past 10 years the fact that American coal is competitive with foreign produced coal in just about every coal market of the world is one more bit of proof of the efficiency and productivity of our coal industry.

The U.S. coal industry is without a doubt the most productive and efficient in the world. Today, the average production of all coal mines is more than 13 tons per man per day—more than double the 1947 production rate and about 10 times greater than individual production in most Western European mines.

In a period of strong inflationary pressures, the average mine price of commercial coal has actually declined during the past 12 years. As newer and more modern machines are put into use, there is every reason to believe that the price line can be held, regardless of what happened in other domestic fuels industries.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the coal industry has not been able to use its great efficiency and productivity to win new export markets for American coal. The truth of the matter is that because our coal mines are so efficient and productive foreign government has resorted to tariffs, quotas, and a variety of other trade barriers to keep out American coal.

If American coal was a high priced product, produced in an old, deteriorating plant, and unable to compete abroad without an export subsidy or some other form of government assistance, the decline in coal exports would be understandable. But the truth is that American coal is being frozen out of many markets through Government edict. American coal is the victim of the rankest kind of trade discrimination in many world markets, particularly in Western Europe.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government has an obligation to the American coal industry to do everything it possibly can, through negotiations and other means at its disposal, to open once more European markets to American coal. In 1957, we exported 76 million tons of coal. At the present exports are running at the rate of about 37 million tons a year—a decline of almost 40 million tons.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the decision to bar or limit imports of coal from the United States was largely a matter of policy in each of the nations involved. But I am sure our Government can take steps to ease the situation for American coal without infringing upon the sovereignty of our allies or interfering in their internal affairs.

Mr. Speaker, an increase of 40 million tons a year in coal exports would go a long way toward alleviating conditions of significant and persistent unemployment which exists in almost all of the great coal producing regions of the Nation. Men would be put back to work in the mines, the coal carrying railroads would undoubtedly have to put on more men to handle the increased coal traffic and business generally throughout the coal areas of the Nation would receive a shot in the arm.

The Government is now pursuing policies which are detrimental to the coal industry. For example, the Government is permitting an increasing amount of foreign residual fuel oil, which can be priced to undersell coal along the east coast, to be imported and it also is doing nothing to discourage the sale of natural gas at dump prices in coal markets.

Imported residual fuel oil and dump gas are seriously affecting efforts of the coal industry to put the domestic coal industry on a sound and expanding basis. If these domestic policies are continued and nothing is done to reopen world markets to American coal—if this combination of adverse marketing conditions continue, then I say, Mr. Speaker, that the coal industry faces an impossible task and all of the modernization and improvements in efficiency and productivity will be for naught.

The American coal industry and the American coal miner have given ample evidence that they can produce coal more efficiently and cheaper than any other coal industry in the world. I trust the Government will do everything it can to see that the coal industry has the opportunity, both at home and abroad, to put this efficiency and productivity to work in free, competitive markets.

GIFT ENTERPRISE LAW

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the District of Columbia has been at a disadvantage in recent years because of its antiquated "gift enterprise" law. This law—title 22–3401, District of Columbia Code 1951—was passed in 1871 by the then legislative assembly of the District as a tax revenue law. Proprietors of gift enterprises were required to pay a $1,000 annual license fee. After 2 years, Congress, on February 17, 1873, repealed the license clause of the enactment, and prohibited gift enterprises under a penalty.

The historical purpose underlying the District's gift enterprise law was the prevention of lotteries or similar schemes. These were a common problem throughout the United States in the 1870's. For example, in *Comm. v. Emerson*, 165 Mass. 146, 42 N.E. 559, the purpose of a similar law in one of the States was stated as being "to prevent offers of bargains

which appeal to the gambling instinct, and induce people to buy what they do not want by the promise of a gift or a prize, the precise nature of which is not known at the moment of making the purchase." The gambling problem today is under control, but the District's out-of-date law remains on the books.

Although there has never been a judicial decision construing the District's "gift enterprise" law as preventing the usual and normal sort of premium or gift-with-purchase merchandising carried on throughout the 50 States, the District's Corporation Counsel has so interpreted the law because of its rather broad and specific language.

As a result, residents of the District are being deprived of the opportunity to make bargain purchases, and the District is losing tax revenue, at a time when it is badly needed. Legitimate business is being unnecessarily interfered with under the present law.

The Federal Trade Commission reviewed this matter carefully in 1953 and issued a trade practice rule on the use of the word "free" in advertising and other commercial offers. I believe it will be in the public interest, in the interest of residents of the District, and in the interest of business in the District to amend the present law and incorporate the substance of the Federal Trade Commission rule. This will permit the same pattern of merchandising in the District of Columbia as prevails in the other States and territories. I am introducing such an amendment today.

AND NOW EXTORTION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, at the moment, do-it-yourself diplomacy and do-gooder sentimentality threaten to compound and complete the disaster of the Cuban invasion fiasco.

I am appalled at the apparent eagerness of many Americans to accept the principle of extortion and comply with the ransom terms laid down by Communist stooge Fidel Castro.

By what standards of responsible governmental leadership is the authority to negotiate with a ruthless foreign regime transferred to, or assumed by, Solidarity House and a private citizens committee?

By what standards of common humanity do we deliberately hand Castro an enormous propaganda victory, tighten the grip of a ruthless, dictatorial, Kremlin-dominated regime over millions of Cuban people and give incalculable aid to the Soviet campaign of subversion in this hemisphere?

By what standards of elemental prudence do we forge and sharpen the tools and weapons of Communist blackmail, extortion, and intimidation throughout the world?

How, by all this, do we strengthen the hand and the position of the President of the United States in his impending conversations with Soviet Premier Khrushchev?

I earnestly hope that we will recover from our current emotional binge, and that our national leadership will regain its voice, before we are too badly burned.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TOLL (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for today, on account of a death in the family.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. WILSON of Indiana for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. JONAS for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. MOORE (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. STEED), for 30 minutes, tomorrow.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. STEED), for 30 minutes on Wednesday next.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, for 20 minutes on Thursday, May 25.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANKFORD.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MURRAY and to include an article.

Mr. GIAIMO.

Mr. STEED to revise and extend his remarks on the bill H.R. 7208, and to include certain tabular material.

Mr. HARRIS and to include a speech by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the James E. West Boy Scouts annual meeting.

Mr. RAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. STEED) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. JENSEN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6100. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises.

SENATE ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 18, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7030. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 23, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

930. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Crowdabout Creek-Powell Creek, Ala., Grady-Gould, Ark., Napa River, Calif., Hog River-Pig Creek, Ill., Beasha Creek, Miss., Panther Creek, Mo., Haikey Creek, Okla., Cane Creek, Tenn., Blue Creek-Howell, Utah, and Polk Creek-Saltlick Creek, W. Va., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Agriculture.

931. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, relative to plans for works of improvement relating to the following watersheds: Magma, Ariz., Muddy Fork of Illinois River, Ark., Bull Creek, Ga., Seven Mile Creek, Ill., Fall River, Kans., Bayou Rapides, La., and Camp Rice Arroyo Lower Plum Creek, Tex., pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1005), and Executive Order No. 10654 of January 20, 1956; to the Committee on Public Works.

932. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "'A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purpose"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

933. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a copy of the report on backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in the Federal Communications Commission as of March 31, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 554,

82d Congress; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

934. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of an overobligation which occurred early in calendar year 1960 under the appropriation "Construction, public buildings projects," pursuant to title 31, United States Code, section 665; to the Committee on Appropriations.

935. A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the 40th report on property acquisitions for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization for the period ending March 31, 1961, pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950; to the Committee on Armed Services.

936. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain laws enacted by the Fifth Guam Legislature, 1960, pursuant to the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 entitled "Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to grant for American Samoa the sum of $2,298,000 to improve its water system"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

938. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated December 27, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a beach erosion control study of Palm Beach County, Fla., from Martin County line to Lake Worth Inlet and from South Lake Worth Inlet to Broward County line, prepared under the provisions of section 2 of the River and Harbor Act, approved July 3, 1930, as amended and supplemented (H. Doc. No. 164); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with eight illustrations.

939. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 28, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on Great Lakes Harbors Study—Interim Report on Huron Harbor, Ohio, requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted on May 18, 1956, and June 27, 1956 (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with one illustration.

940. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated January 4, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of report on Allegheny River at Salamanca, N.Y., requested by resolutions of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted May 9 and July 6, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 166); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 18, 1961, the following bill was reported on May 19, 1961:

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7208. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 419). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 22, 1961]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week; without amendment (Rept. No. 420). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14–20, 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day; with amendments (Rept. No. 421). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5255. A bill to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service; without amendment (Rept. No. 422). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 109. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December in each year as "Wright Brothers Day"; with amendments (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 18, 1961, the following bill was introduced May 19, 1961:

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 7208. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

[Introduced and referred May 22, 1961]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 7209. A bill to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 7210. A bill to amend section 1803 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to prescribe such rate of interest on guaranteed loans as the loan market demands; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 7211. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7212. A bill to give to the Walker River Paiute Tribe the reserved minerals underlying its reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7213. A bill to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GARLAND:

H.R. 7214. A bill to regulate the foreign commerce of the United States by providing for fair competition between domestic industries operating under the Fair Labor Standards Act and foreign industries that supply articles imported into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H.R. 7215. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarship grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 7216. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarship grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7217. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarship grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARSHA:

H.R. 7218. A bill to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. IKARD of Texas:

H.R. 7219. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow railroad corporations a tax credit equal to the deficit in passenger service revenue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H.R. 7220. A bill to further amend the act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7221. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to permit the utilization of space within certain highway rights-of-way for commercial, industrial, and residential structures and purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7222. A bill to regulate gift enterprises in the District of Columbia and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 7223. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7224. A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to reimburse the owners and tenants of certain real property acquired as additions to the U.S. Capitol grounds for their moving expenses; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 7225. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of services performed at special places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 7226. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7227. A bill to amend section 4B of the Clayton Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7228. A bill to amend the Clayton Act to declare private antitrust suits to be impressed with a susbtantial public interest; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7229. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7230. A bill to establish an equitable basis for application of the Federal income tax to mutual fire insurance companies which operate on the basis of perpetual policies or premium deposits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7231. A bill to amend title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955 to put idle men to work at useful local improvements and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7232. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia, Virginia, Kentucky, and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7233. A bill to amend section 503 of title 39 of the United States Code to provide that, for purposes of determining the annual income of an individual eligible for pension, payments of State bonus for military service shall be excluded; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7234. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 7235. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7236. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Ice Age National Park in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 7237. A bill to amend subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a small business corporation may in certain cases retain its tax status thereunder even though one of its shareholders becomes a trust; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7238. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to permit the utilization of space within certain highway rights-of-way for commercial, industrial, and residential structures and purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H.R. 7239. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 7240. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands at Wupatki National Monument, Ariz., to provide access to certain ruins in the monument, to add certain federally owned lands to the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H.R. 7241. A bill to amend section 410 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that all retired members of the uniformed services who served not less than 25 years on active duty, or who were retired for disability in excess of 50 percent, and who die shall be considered to have died service-connected deaths; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 431. Joint resolution providing for the revision of the Status of Forces Agreement and certain other treaties and international agreements, or the withdrawal of the United States from such treaties and agreements, so that foreign countries will not have criminal jurisdiction over American Armed Forces personnel stationed within their boundaries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the loan deadline of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to relocating California Street in Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the Department of Water Resources to initiate its study and recommendations for the east side division of the Central Valley project and to forward its recommendations to the U.S. Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue its support of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West in Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the old-age-assistance laws in order to permit individuals receiving old age assistance to earn extra compensation without being penalized; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H.R. 7242. A bill for the relief of Norman W. Enfield; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7243. A bill for the relief of Maria Oricchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7244. A bill for the relief of Geom. Luigi Varnero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 7245. A bill for the relief of Wei Hsiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7246. A bill for the relief of Tsu-ming Yang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7247. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Gioia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 7248. A bill for the relief of Tadashi A. Okada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 306. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 7244 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

156. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Margaret M. Kaaua, county clerk, county of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, urging enactment of legislation to provide funds for public school construction and/or teachers' salaries, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Results of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM V. MOOREHEAD

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently, I have been conducting a public opinion poll of the 15th Congressional District of Ohio in an effort to determine how the residents of the seven southeastern Ohio counties I represent here feel about a number of important national issues. These are issues which, in one form or another, may be considered by the Congress this year. Many of the 19 questions in the poll are based upon specific recommendations on which President Kennedy has requested legislation. The survey is now complete and I wish to call the attention of the Congress to the expressions of opinion I have received.

This poll represents the tabulation of responses from 5,860 residents of my district. The questionnaire was given a large distribution by direct mail and through the cooperation of daily and weekly newspapers in the seven counties. Every effort was made to assure that the circulation was completed without regard to the political sentiments or special interests of those who received the questionnaire. It has also been my purpose to exercise care in the preparation of the questions so that their phrasing would not influence the answers given or impose my own opinions in any way. The results represent a very large sample of the total population of the district and it is my belief that the poll is a very good gage of public sentiment there at this time.

Since this is my first experience with a survey of this kind, I was very pleased that such a large number of persons responding commented in considerable detail, explaining why they feel as they do. These remarks cannot, of course, be reflected in the statistical tabulation. However, they have often raised points of view that I have not previously considered. Therefore, they have been very helpful to me in my own analysis of these issues. I am particularly grateful

for the serious and widespread interest the questionnaire has been accorded.

The most persistent expression in the poll was concern over increased Government spending and the expansion of Federal powers. Overwhelming responses to actual questions dealing with these issues were received and I received an avalanche of comments on these subjects, often as part of explanations pertaining to other questions.

I had expected a far greater divergence of opinion on many questions than was borne out by the poll. Out of the 19 questions, the tabulation showed that, on 9, more than two-thirds of the responses were in agreement. These involved opposition to the expansion of Federal authority, agreement on the need for stronger laws to protect voting rights of all citizens in Federal elections, approval of changing the Constitution to require the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents by direct population vote, opposition to empowering the President to raise and lower taxes, approval of tax deductions by parents for their children's college expenses, opposition to farm programs providing more price supports and crop-production controls, approval of assistance for economically distressed areas, opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations, and approval of stronger laws to protect American industry from foreign import competition.

Greater variation of opinion was expressed on a number of other issues. On the measure to raise the hourly minimum wage from $1 to $1.25 and to broaden the coverage of the law, 2,734 responses favored the proposal, while 2,733 disapproved—a difference of 1 vote. Only 3 percentage points separated those who approved and those who disapproved changing the social security laws to permit men to obtain reduced benefits at age 62, although more than 60 percent favored increasing benefits to widows.

Much interest was directed to the question of financing medical assistance for the aged. The answers and the comments in the poll showed wide disagreement. Twenty-seven percent of the people agreed with the proposal to include such assistance in the social security program. Twenty-four percent opposed Federal participation in medical care costs for older citizens. However, 39 percent favored Federal and State participation with the individual on a voluntary basis in financing the expense of such care.

The complete tabulation of the results of my 1960 public opinion poll is as follows:

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Would you authorize the President to estimate annual world food needs and to use existing tax-supported farm programs to raise U.S. production to a level to meet world deficiencies?	32.85	57.50	9.56
2. Do you believe stronger laws are needed to protect voting rights of all citizens in Federal elections?	78.24	17.44	4.32
3. Are you in favor of Federal aid to education costing a minimum of $5,600,000,000 over several years to be used either for school construction or teachers' salaries?	37.06	56.39	6.55
4. Should social security taxes be raised to—			
(a) Permit men to obtain reduced benefits at age 62?	45.39	48.08	6.53
(b) Increase widows' payments from 75 to 85 percent of their husbands' benefits?	60.95	31.05	8.00
5. Do you think the Federal Government is taking over too many responsibilities from local and State governments?	71.16	23.30	5.54
6. Do you feel increases in Federal spending are important enough to justify resulting rises in the cost of living?	21.55	64.26	14.19
7. Which one of the following do you support:			
(a) A compulsory Federal program of medical care for the aged under social security with costs borne by increased taxes on employees and employers?	27.51		6.20
(b) A voluntary program of medical care for the aged with costs shared by the Federal Government from general tax revenues and the individual beneficiary?	39.84		
(c) No medical care for the aged involving Federal Government participation?	24.65		
8. Should expansion of our economy be encouraged by granting Federal tax relief to companies which modernize and expand their plants?	53.49	39.09	7.42
9. Would you change the Constitution to abolish the electoral college and require the direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents by popular vote?	75.26	21.25	3.49
10. Do you think the United States should continue its ban on testing nuclear weapons without reliable assurances that the Russians have also abandoned their tests?	15.36	80.19	4.45
11. Should Congress give the President power to raise or reduce taxes?	6.72	88.15	5.13
12. Do you favor a farm program with increased price supports and more production controls?	14.51	76.82	8.67
13. Do you believe Red China should be admitted to the United Nations?	13.23	79.43	7.34
14. Would you support the extension of the 1-cent tax on gasoline which expires this year to finance more rapid expansion of highways?	66.42	31.64	1.94
15. Should students' college expenses be deductible from parents' income taxes?	67.49	27.92	4.59
16. Would you favor stronger laws to protect domestic industries from competition of products imported for sale in the United States?	78.11	15.08	6.81
17. Should Congress raise the minimum hourly wage from $1 to $1.25 and increase the number of workers covered by the law?	46.6551	46.6382	6.7067
18. Should Federal aid be given to areas which are suffering chronically depressed economic conditions?	69.89	19.84	10.27
19. Do you support the proposal that a Peace Corps be established and financed by the U.S. Government wherein Americans would be recruited and sent abroad to help underdeveloped countries?	41.18	49.25	9.57

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Newsletter of May 20, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Tex.)

MAY 20, 1961.

Fear: (Noah Webster) "Painful emotion marked by alarm; dread; disquiet; also, an instance of this feeling."

Fear can be good or bad. It can be a protection (fear of fire and other bodily harm) or a weakness, as when dread or disquiet prevents the right action or provokes the wrong action. Examples of fear that tend toward weakness are found alternately in the fear of people of their government leaders, elective or appointive, and politicians' fear of their constituents. It is an interesting phenomenon to me that because of unfounded fear some Members of Congress and some people wanting Federal aid or a special concession from government are willing to trade out their conviction and principles for a harbor, a lake, a bridge, or a Federal building. Is it possible for a Member of Congress to equate a public works project against his vote for or against civil rights, aid to education, foreign aid, minimum wages, a judgeship, tax legislation or social security benefit changes? Is it possible for citizens, businessmen and laboring men to abandon or accept a position on a controversial matter contrary to their own view to secure some political or government aid? Yes, these things are possible and are occurring in our country today.

The next question might then be, how much is our country weakened by fear of political reprisal, of insecurity, of communism? In an earlier day, men of stature laid peoples' fear to rest by saying,

"These are the times that try men's souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of their country; but he that stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph."

"You ask, what is our aim? I can answer in one word: Victory—victory at all costs. victory in spite of all terror, victory however long and hard the road may be; for without victory, there is no survival."

"We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

Indeed, these powerful statements in their times resolved doubts and anxieties and resulted in a rebirth of confidence.

Today we need a reawakening and a rededication to our way of life and the reasons underlying a society designed to respect the freedom, the dignity, the happiness of human beings. We have so much to be thankful for, so many spiritual and material blessings, we should face every day confidently. There should be no groundless fear, no dread, no anxiety; rather, a zeal to protect, enjoy and perpetuate our heritage. Instead we see people cowed by government power, by political reprisal or the threat of it, by communism's sterile philosophy. Such conduct is not worthy of U.S. citizens, as I see it. Obviously it is both a matter of ideals—that is, a dedication of purpose, a depth of feeling—and of attitude. Generally when fear is recognized (as cited above) and brought to light, groundless and unnecessary anxiety can be replaced by confident activity. This is what we need today in all walks of life in the United States. Indeed, our form of government is intended to rest upon and maintain its vitality by the unfettered exchange of controversial differences of viewpoint by men of good will. It is the difference of opinion,

based on facts, evolving into a later compromise that fuels the engine of a "republic in a democracy". Any capitulation of viewpoint, not warranted by the facts and adherence to high principle, weakens our system of government and society. For my part, I am totally unafraid of political pressure or reprisal and will never be so intimidated.

On several significant issues this week the House took action which could have far-reaching effect: (1) H.R. 4641 to establish an office of International Travel and Tourism. In my opinion it is unnecessary to establish another Federal bureau and bring the Government into yet another facet of our personal lives. (2) House Concurrent Resolution 226 expressing the sense of Congress in encouraging the Organization of American States to institute action against Cuba. We should not rule out unilateral action by the United States against Castro if such a move becomes necessary to protect our country. (3) House Concurrent Resolution 209 authorizing the President to provide assistance to Cuban refugee students. This was another instance of Congress waiving its authority to safeguard the peoples' money. Also, it is no more constitutional, in my judgment, to give Federal aid to foreign students than it is to our own. (4) Appropriations for Department of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare. I opposed the expenditures called for in the bill because in it we continue to increase our welfare spending two to one over our defense expenditures.

Thank you: To so many of you who have sent contributions to help defray the cost of this newsletter, my heartfelt thanks.

Annual Sudeten German Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, it is quite natural for us as liberty-loving Americans to join in spirit with those who celebrate the annual Sudeten German Day in Cologne, Germany.

First of all, the over 2 million Sudeten German expellees and refugees from the stark terrors of ruthless communism have reaffirmed their dedication to the cause of freedom, democracy and peace. These ideals are more precious to us than life itself, therefore, we desire them for all people.

Second, the United States became the great nation it is largely as a result of the invaluable contributions of men, ideals, culture, and knowledge, from Europe. We all acknowledge that the Germans played a leading role with their natural scientific and technical genius, love of music, and deep religious faith.

Every American is to some degree influenced for the good by the Germany of the past. The present Chancellor, Dr. Konrad Adenauer, has given concrete evidence to the entire world that he sincerely works for a return of what was best in the past and that the lessons of history and of Germany's tragic era are not forgotten.

The free world desperately needs a strong and democratic Germany to face the evil forces in the Kremlin. We must be realistic. A new and united Germany, reborn with its prior thirst for knowledge and learning, having a democratic republic as its form of government, merits the full support of the West.

All of us fervently pray that the day is not too distant when the many enslaved people and nations under the Communist heel behind the Iron Curtain will become free, and that liberty, toleration and the right to worship God as one wishes, will be respected everywhere.

It is in that spirit that I convey my sincere greetings and good wishes to those who commemorate the Sudeten German Day.

Foreign Aid: A Form of Glorified Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. RAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am glad to place in the RECORD the remarks of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, of Iowa, made by him in his appearance on the Manion Forum on May 14, 1961. His discussion on foreign aid as it affects our national strength and therefore our national security is timely and valuable.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you, Dean Manion. I appreciate this opportunity to appear on the Manion Forum to discuss an issue which is of vital concern to all Americans—foreign aid.

Frequently I have been labeled as being "negative," "an isolationist" and out of step with the times because of the warnings I have issued during my entire service in Congress that it was not within the capacity of the citizens of this country to finance the rest of the world and still maintain the integrity of the American dollar and this constitutional Republic.

In my campaign for reelection last year, some of the assorted eggheads even asserted that I didn't know the world was round because of my refusal to imperil this Nation by dissipating the resources of our people—too often capriciously—in foreign lands.

It is reassuring to know that there are those in this country, like Dean Manion and those associated with him, who recognize that we cannot continue forever a reckless giveaway program and still, by some magic, avoid the day of accounting.

Since the end of World War II, the United States has spent the fantastic sum of at least $100 billion in some 70 countries of the world, and contributed heavily to the loading of a staggering Federal debt of $290 billion upon the backs of our children.

We have given economic and military aid to dictators who then used this aid to suppress their own people in the name of anti-communism. We have given to dictators, like Sukarno of Indonesia, who have indicated by word and deed their affinity for our Communist enemies.

And we have given to outright Communist dictators, like Tito of Yugoslavia.

A VERY SORRY SPECTACLE

Our aid has been used by our so-called allies and former foes to rebuild and modernize their industrial complexes in such a way that they are now this Nation's chief competitors.

Corrupt officials have used our aid to enrich themselves and their cronies, leaving little for the people we supposedly were trying to help.

And the waste, the extravagance, the outright corruption in this vast foreign giveaway program almost defies imagination.

What have we bought with this incredible outpouring of our treasure? The record is clear that the billions of dollars we have lavished on foreign governments has bought us neither friends nor respect. Neither has it fashioned a world that is peaceful, prosperous, or free.

We have only to look to Laos as an example of how dismally foreign aid has failed.

If all the figures could be brought together, the ledger would show that the United States has pumped more than $500 million into that little country in the form of economic aid, defense support and for military training and equipment.

And now comes word that the Laotian Army is strong enough in point of numbers and well equipped to meet the attacking forces, but it lacks the will to fight.

It is interesting to recall that foreign aid was first sold to Congress as a strictly temporary program. The original purpose, we were told, was to assist war-devastated nations on an emergency basis so they would be in a position to buy needed American goods at the end of World War II when the United States had nearly all the gold in the world.

We spent money in all corners of the globe to close what was called the foreign dollar gap.

Within 5 years, the tide started turning. Foreigners no longer were using their American dollars to buy our goods. Their factories, rebuilt with our tax dollars, were humming. Nations such as Great Britain, Japan, West Germany, France, and Italy prospered, but continued to demand and receive our aid. It has been in all too many instances a form of glorified blackmail.

Adding insult to injury, foreign beneficiaries of U.S. aid began to eat into the American market with imports of cars, cameras, steel, sewing machines, machine tools, textiles, and many other items. Today a flood of foreign merchandise is rising ominously in all American marketplaces—merchandise which was produced with low wages, new factories, American processes, and American money.

With this closing of the dollar gap, what we should have done was reduce substantially our spending overseas, but, unfortunately, the international do-gooders were in command and foreign-aid spending continued unabated. Attended with the same old specious arguments that peace in the world depends on the buying of friends, Congress has been stampeded each year, year in and year out, to appropriate billions of dollars to be added to an already clogged foreign-aid pipeline.

Now, as a result of our own consummate foolishness, the chickens are coming home to roost.

The outflow of gold from this country continues at an alarming rate. The peril to the stability of the dollar is obvious, and yet only halfhearted measures have been instituted to deal with the very real problem of heavy deficits in America's balance of international payments.

Well, halfhearted measures won't get the job done, and the time is long overdue for the eggheads and internationalist do-gooders to face up to the fiscal facts of life.

The first and most important step for our Government to take is to serve notice on our so-called free world friends that the honeymoon is over: that no longer can they expect lavish handouts from a generous, and often foolish, Uncle Sam.

Unfortunately, there is nothing to indicate that the new administration plans any such move. As a matter of fact, President Kennedy's foreign aid message—which could very well have been entitled "Foreign Aid Forever"—makes it clear that he wants to spend even more money overseas in the years ahead.

The consequences of such an unwise course are too frightening to contemplate. Perhaps the day will come when the American taxpayers, who must carry the foreign aid burden, will demand an end. At least I hope so, and let us pray that day does not come too late.

To Build—To Serve—To Achieve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OREN HARRIS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, on the evening of May 10, 1961, the James E. West District, of the National Capitol Area Council Boy Scouts of America, held its annual meeting at the Naval Weapons Plant here in Washington. The Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, was the speaker for the occasion and made an outstanding speech to several hundred Scouters on the subject "To Build—To Serve—To Achieve." As a former Scout, the Secretary spoke to this fine group out of the abundance of experience. It was well received by the several hundred Scouters in attendance. It is most appropriate that it be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with these remarks:

TO BUILD—TO SERVE—TO ACHIEVE

During the past half century, since the founding of the Boy Scouts of America in 1910, someone has estimated that the unique service rendered by the Scouts in their splendid service-to-others program has been the 10 billion good turns—little ones and big ones—which have been done by members of the organization.

Your gracious invitation to me to speak tonight makes 10 billion and 1 such good turns. It gives me an opportunity to honor the adult leaders of the District of Columbia for their service to Scouting and to speak on a subject which is very close to my heart. However, one good turn deserves another and as a former Boy Scout my good turn will be to try to keep my remarks brief and to the point.

It is always a privilege to speak in behalf of the Boy Scouts program; to recognize its high purposes; its unique opportunities and its mighty accomplishments. The needs of youth are many today. We live in a highly complex society with many pulls in many different directions.

The Scouting program provides a balance of good citizenship, high character, and physical fitness. It is a program with a purpose. It is a program of depth not only in getting across to boys the skills and techniques necessary for maturity but in using the learning processes related to those skills. It develops character and citizenship of a high order.

We build finer youth through scouting. We build democracy through finer youth. We build understanding and well-being through democracy. And we build peace and progress through understanding.

The Scouting program, dedicated to youth, is a program for the present and for the future. Its continued success will contribute much to the lives of countless individuals and to our progress as a Nation.

The James E. West District of the National Capital Area Council honors tonight the 1,100 area adult leaders of the Boy Scouts of America. But with this recognition of your outstanding services there is an implied obligation and a challenge to continued effort. You are carrying forward the ideals of which our fathers dreamed. You are giving a bit of service to the sons of America. You are partners in building a finer Nation and a better world. You are guardians of the character of youth. In a very special way, you represent one of the great essences of Americanism. This Nation was built upon the willingness of men and women to give service on a voluntary basis. In Scouting you have evidence of the positive result of this kind of service.

Today the Scouting program reaches more than 5 million boys and adults. We can do still better. In the period ahead, none of us can do too much in relation to the need. In the face of great economic, social, and technological change, we are all called to new challenge, sacrifice, and dedication. "I will do my best to build, to serve, to achieve" is the theme of your program. The record of Scouting in the past has been spectacularly outstanding. The record of Scouting in the future is in your hands.

You cannot rest upon the achievements of yesteryear, no matter how tremendous they have been. You cannot be complacent in the face of the world situation, or happy in view of our nationwide problems of juvenile delinquency.

The Scouting program must go forward with increased vigor, new planning, and new ideas. Any program, no matter how purposeful or dynamic, can lose its freshness and vitality if the leaders are not continually rechallenged and reinspired.

The Scouting program could be reduced to routine, mediocrity, and boondoggling, to rote and repetition, if it were ever to lose its zest and zeal. It could become uninspired and stereotyped if it lost its sense of dedication. It could grow stale and indifferent if the leaders did not constantly reeducate themselves. You who work in Scouting would be the first to agree that kind hearts are not enough to waken young minds.

This, then, is the essence of your challenge: Scouting must continue to stress a rigorous, rugged program, rich in resources to keep alive the old-fashioned virtues on which a pioneering democracy was built and which made America strong and have kept us free.

Scouting must continue to stress a program which will stir the imagination of our youth, demanding their finest abilities, enlisting their idealism, seeking their best efforts and accepting nothing less.

I would challenge you to keep that spirit of ruggedness always alive and growing. I would challenge you to new efforts in building boys who are well grounded in citizenship, well exposed to those ideals which go hand in hand with high moral character, well equipped with the physicial attributes that bespeak and reflect the energy, dynamism, and strength of true Americans.

Scouting must continue to emphasize individual initiative and resourcefulness. In a recent article by Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther published in Scouting magazine, General Gruenther said, "The competion is much more keen than it was in my day. I am not talking about the competition for a job—I am talking about the development of great individual responsibility." Today, when in so many parts of the world the freedom and dignity of man is being threatened, individual responsibility must be inculcated in our children as something they owe both to themselves and to their country.

Scouting must always be a purposeful program with serious intent in building well-grounded citizens for this Nation. I see it as a highly significant, vital program of informal youth education, due the highest priority in any community from the standpoint of obtaining understanding and support. It has that community support. It richly deserves it.

But Scouting is more than a community program. It is worldwide in application and it must reach out increasingly to touch and influence the whole world. Scouts are aware of their responsibility to the world community. They are conscious that out of every 200 boys in our world only 5 of them live in this country; that on these 5 rests a heavy responsibility for the peace of tomorrow's world. It is heartening to know that since 1944 more than $1¾ million worth of material help has been provided for the extension of Scouting in 90 countries, help in training adult leaders and increasing world understanding among youth. Much of this has been made possible by small contributions from individual Scouts and leaders. Since the beginning of the Boy Scouts of America, over 8,443 members have taken part in 10 world jamborees that have helped to promote world friendship and understanding.

It is particularly pleasant to note that the Boy Scout program during the coming year is placing special emphasis on health, safety, and physical fitness.

The need for physical fitness training for youth has been clearly established. Comparisons of the physical fitness ratings of children show that the average American boy or girl is not as physically fit as is a member of the same age group in many other countries. These fitness tests also indicate a downward trend in physical fitness in our own country in recent years. Working together, parents, schools, and youth organizations can do much to help solve this problem.

It was my great privilege, on behalf of President Kennedy and his Council on Youth Fitness, to preside at the recent Conference on Physical Fitness of Youth. The President's informal remarks at the closing general session are evidence of the concern with which the administration regards this problem.

"We do not want in the United States a nation of spectators," said President Kennedy, "we want a nation of participants in the vigorous life. * * * We want to make sure that as our life becomes more sophisticated, as we become more urbanized, that we don't lose this valuable facet of our national character; physical vitality, which is tied into qualities of character, intellectual vigor and vitality."

The Boy Scouts of America were represented at this conference by their leaders from all across the country. They and the other delegates were in agreement that we need to think and act in terms that will assure our young people healthy and vigorous bodies, alert and intelligent minds, and that degree of emotional stability required to live in an age of both promise and peril.

What part will Scouting play in this great effort in the years ahead?

Scouting must be the spearhead of our drive against juvenile delinquency. This does not mean that Scouting should modify its high standards or accept responsibility as a punitive agency. Scouting is one of the strongest forces in the Nation today as a preventive factor in juvenile delinquency, guarding against the disease before it starts, guiding before habits of delinquency are formed, building constructively before the forces of destruction become operative.

Scouting must lead in the search for talent which is so important to America today. It must do everything possible to stimulate the intellectual curiosity of everybody, to stretch his mind and imagination, to supplement the work of the school, to encourage the

bright lad and to guide and counsel him toward the pursuit of excellence.

Scouting must emphasize the newer skills and understandings, recognizing the unlimited potentialities on the part of a boy for abstractions which we have previously considered beyond his grasp. We must awaken the mind of youth to new understandings, new concepts, new ideas, new inventions, new searchings, new challenges.

Only thus can we fulfill our obligations to our youth, and our responsibility to the society we live in.

Only thus can we meet the challenge of the days ahead.

Speech Delivered by Alfred E. Santangelo, of New York, Before the American Committee on Italian Migration in New Haven, Conn., May 15, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, on May 15, I had the pleasure of welcoming our colleague from New York, Congressman ALFRED E. SANTANGELO, to my district in Connecticut. Representative SANTANGELO spoke at a meeting of the American Committee on Italian Migration at the Waverly Inn in Cheshire. In commending his speech to the attention of our colleagues, I respectfully ask that they examine Mr. SANTANGELO's bill, H.R. 37, and my own bill, H.R. 5201; both of these measures provide for greatly needed changes in our basic immigration law. Congressman SANTANGELO's talk follows:

My colleague, ROBERT GIAIMO, thank you for such a glowing introduction. Reverend Fathers, Lt. Gov. Anthony Armentano, Mayor Dick Lee, Vice Consul, Dr. Emanuele Scammacca De Murgo, Mr. Ciro Paolella, Judge Alfred Toscano, Mr. William De Tullio, distinguished guests on the dais, members of the American Committee on Italian Migration, Connecticut Italian Yankees, I am pleased to visit your fair city of New Haven to discuss a subject which is of vital importance, not only to you, but to all America. On May 24, 1957, I delivered a speech in Congress which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the heading, "How Long Quotas?" As a consequence, one of the readers, named Oscar Dam from Seattle, Wash., wrote to me criticizing me for my position on immigration and stated that we should keep out the southern Europeans, especially the Italians, the Greeks and the Spaniards, that the native-born Americans of many generations do not want the immigration law changed. He stated further that his family had come to America in the 17th century and his ancestors had helped to develop the wilderness of America. One of his forebears was killed by Indians on a trek to California. He proudly stated that the Anglo-Saxon people had made this country great and not only must we keep out the southern Europeans, and especially the Italians, but also we should deport many who are here. I told him that he did not understand the contribution which the Catholics, the Spanish, the French, the Poles, the Hungarians and other ethnic groups have made to the development and growth of this country and the sacrifices that they have made to preserve its freedom and liberties.

I answered him and said that if the restricted immigration laws were in effect when his forebears came to America, I was certain that the whole Dam family would have been excluded. The attitude of Mr. Dam is shared by many people in the United States. If we take as a measuring rod the number of appointments of persons of Italian ancestry to high Cabinet office, one can infer that those in control of our Government today believe that the Italians have just gotten off the boat.

Yes, my friends, people forget that there was no restricted immigration law before March 3, 1875. If this country in its beginning had a restricted immigration law, Giovanni Cabot would not have been permitted to plant the Union Jack on American soil; Francis Vigo would not have been permitted to explore the Northwest with Rogers and Clark and could not have helped George Washington, after the American Revolution, with the Northwest Indians; 16 Venetians would not have built the first glass works in Jamestown, Va., in 1622; 300 Piedmontesi would not have settled in New Castle, Pa. at the invitation of the Dutch; Alfonso Tonti would not have founded the city of Detroit, and his daughter would not have been the first white woman to be born in that city; 50 Italians would not have gone to Georgia to set up the mulberry plantations and construct a silk factory; William Paca would not have signed the Declaration of Independence and then become the third Governor of Maryland; Caesar Alberti would not have planted his roots and trees in Brooklyn, N.Y.; and in your own State of Connecticut, they would not have had men like Deodati, Rossetti from Hartford, and Benzi, who came in the early 18th century.

We have mentioned only persons who were immigrants in the strict sense of the word. We do not speak of men like Christopher Columbus who discovered America; nor do we speak of Amerigo Vespucci, after whom this continent is named; nor of Giovanni da Verrazano, who discovered the Hudson River. They were explorers who came here but did not settle here. Not only did persons of Italian origin help to discover and explore America, but they helped in its early development in colonial times, and also in its development throughout the country in its early years.

From 1700 until the beginning of the 20th century, artists and craftsmen migrated to this land from Italy. The first decade of the 20th century shows the peak of this migration. At that point in time, the Italian peasant farmer began to outnumber the craftsman. They were poor indeed and were attracted to this land of opportunity, and when they came to America, they could qualify only for the most menial and humblest kind of labor—ditch digging, hod carrying, carpentry, and similar occupations.

Despite this humility and menial toil, within one generation the Italian immigrant and his offspring has repaid America for the opportunity more than a thousandfold by his contribution to the social, cultural, and economic development of our land and also in the preservation of its institutions and liberty.

Millions of people view with pleasure the beauty and the artistry of Constantine Brumidi on the frescoes in the rotunda of the U.S. Capitol. Arturo Toscanini, Enrico Caruso, Tommaso Salvini, Ernesto Rossi, gave pleasure to opera lovers throughout the land. When war came, 1,400,000 boys in World War II joined the services in defense of our country, and while newspapermen may assert that many Italian-Americans belong to the "big M," we can say with pride and with truthfulness that no one of the 1,400,000 servicemen belonged to the "big C" (communism).

During the war there were many heroes. We proudly recall the exploits of John Basilone, of Raritan, N.J., the country's only two-time Medal of Honor winner. We rejoice at the aerial exploits of Don Gentile, known as the eagle of the skies. We take pride in the valor of a New York State Senator, Peter Dalessandro, who earned the Congressional Medal of Honor, two silver stars, and the Distinguished Service Cross. Many others could be mentioned, such as Gino Merlo, Bianchi, and Bangor, etc.

Persons of Italian ancestry have made their contribution, and we will not permit any Oscar Dam or a Walter Winchell to denigrate, blacken, or destroy the reputations of Americans of Italian origin or stereotype our people as gangsters.

The first restrictive legislation excluding entry into the United States of certain classes of immigrants was the act of March 3, 1875. On August 3, 1882, further legislation was passed which excluded paupers and criminals. That same year saw the enactment of the first Chinese exclusion law which remained in effect until its repeal in 1943.

Thereafter, other attempts were made to curb immigration, but it was not until 1917, when, to quiet the demands for restrictive and selective legislation, a law was passed on February 5, which codified and grouped together all laws affecting immigration which has previously been in effect.

The post period of World War I witnessed a radical change in our national immigration policies. The result was that on May 19, 1921 our country effected a change to a policy which restricted the number of imgrants who could enter. It limited the number of any particular nationality to 3 percent of foreign-born persons of that nationality who lived here in the year 1910. This, in effect, permitted about 350,000 immigrants to come here who originated mostly from northern and western Europe.

On May 26, 1924, further legislation was passed which changed both the base census year and the method of calculation. It was then changed to be based upon the 1890 census and the rate was lowered to 2 percent. Under this law until 1929, the total quota became 164,600.

The 1924 act was a farreaching change during that quarter century in that it restricted any change in the basic composition of the American makeup. Thus these two basic acts—of 1917 and 1924—qualitatively and quantitatively operated to regulate the flow of immigration to this country.

In 1952, the Immigration and Nationality Act was enacted. This—the McCarran-Walter Act—pooled together all existing laws and regulations dealing with immigration and to this day it is the law which governs the immigrant. Under current law the total quota is 154,887 and the quotas are allocated to each area on the basis of one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of such nationals in the United States in 1920.

These laws are based on the absolute principle of national origin. The theory of national origin upon which the allotments of immigration quotas is based was developed in the early part of the 20th century when, following World War I, this country dug its head into the sands of isolationism with its xenophobic fear of aliens who were not of Anglo-Saxon stock. Northern Europe was favored over southern Europe, the Nordic races above the Slavic and Mediterranean peoples.

We see that the whole pattern of the national origins fabric has been shredded since the 1924 act. We have tried to put the cloth together by enacting special refugee legislation, by enacting special nonquota legislation relating to the principle of reuniting of families and by nonquota immigration from the western hemisphere. The national origins theory has lost all its practical meaning. It stands as an indictment not only as against American tradition, but also American logic. It mocks our Declaration of Independence and statement that

all men are created equal. Special legislation was enacted for refugees, escapees, spouses, etc. who came from such countries as Cuba, Italy, Spain, Poland, Czechoslovakia, all countries whose quotas, under the law, are severely restricted. While our immigration laws close the front door, the back door is left wide open. We know, too, that much immigration from the western hemisphere, particularly from Canada, is not of Nordic origin. Mexican nationals come into the United States by the hundreds of thousands under a bracero program, under a special program, or as resident aliens. Many people who fled persecution in the last 20 years have settled in Canada, Brazil, Argentina, and their children as native-born citizens in the western hemisphere enter the United States without regard for quota allotments. Puerto Ricans, as well as Mexicans, have entered in large numbers. The spirit which Emma Lazarus captured in her stirring words should be repeated despite the fact that in practice the Statute of Liberty does not offer a wide open door to democracy. I quote her words:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me
I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

Some of us in Congress, including your Representatives, ROBERT GIAIMO and EMILIO DADDARIO, have fought together for a realistic immigration law. In the midst of the last presidential campaign, on September 20, 1960, I proposed a four-point program, which in many respects conforms to the program which your organization has been advocating for a long time. I proposed at that time four points:

1. That the United States update the quota based on 1950 figures instead of 1920 figures.

2. A redistribution and a reallocation of the unused quotas which annually total about 55,000.

3. That the Attorney General be authorized to admit 60,000 refugees.

4. A reuniting of families by converting the preferential quotas to a nonquota status.

Both presidential candidates responded. On October 8, 1960, President John F. Kennedy, despite the demands of his campaign, replied to my solicitation. For his comments on my proposals, I quote in part from the President's reply:

"I believe that the most important immediate objective of immigration reform is the reuniting of families. There are many new citizens in America whose immediate families are in other lands, waiting patiently to join them. In countries which oversubscribe their quotas, they have been waiting for many years. We have a social obligation to bring these families together. For this purpose, I have suggested that nonquota status be granted to parents, minor children, and spouses of citizens and resident aliens, provided they are otherwise eligible under the law.

"I believe that each of the other proposals you set forth in your letter also provides a sound basis for legislative action. Updating our present quotas, and pooling unused quotas, are sound methods of assuring that present authorizations are used up in an equitable manner. A flexible formula for admission of refugees should be devised so that our country can act more speedily in meeting our share of the world's responsibility to the victims of oppression. But I also feel that we should look beyond these proposals to the abolition of the national origins quota system and its replacement with a more equitable method of regulating the inflow of immigrants."

On January 3, 1961, the first day of the congressional session, I introduced H.R. 37 to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

No action on legislation can be taken without the support or the approval of a man who considers himself the father of the immigration law, FRANCIS WALTER. Finally, on April 13, 1961, FRANCIS WALTER introduced H.R. 6300 revising the immigration law in which he gives a little with his left hand and takes away with his right. If we complain about the insufficiency, he threatens to take away what he offers to give. The major proposal is the reallocation of the unused quotas. Congressman WALTER proposed that of the approximately 150,000 quotas, those nations which have a quota of less than 7,000 should share the unused quotas in the proportion that the particular nation's quota bears to the total quota numbers of all countries, excluding Germany, Ireland, and Great Britain. You are aware, of course, that Germany has a quota of approximately 25,814; Great Britain, a quota of 65,361; Ireland, a quota of 17,756; and approximately 55,000 annually are unused; whereas the quotas of other countries have been mortgaged for many years to come.

These unused quotas, according to the Walter bill, shall be allocated 40 percent to those in second preference status; 30 percent to those in third preference status; and 30 percent for those in fourth preference status. This quota will vary from year to year, and the relatives who will benefit from the quota reserve include (1) parents and unmarried sons and daughters over 21 years of age of U.S. citizens, (2) spouses and unmarried sons and daughters, minors or adults, of lawfully resident aliens, and (3) married sons or daughters or brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens and their spouses, and minor children if accompanying them. Under this formula Italy will get about 2,500 more. The remainder of the Walter bill is, in my opinion, more restrictive than beneficial. Some of the provisions are designed to facilitate the deportation and denaturalization of lawfully resident aliens and naturalized citizens. Some provisions make easier the waiver of obstacles, such as sickness, TB, and other contagious diseases. There is some good to this legislation, but I believe that some of the provisions have such harmful procedures that the bad outweighs the good and one is tempted to oppose such legislation.

What has happened to the President's promise? Why has he not acted? I can understand his thinking. I believed the President when he wrote to me and I believe that he intends to carry out his promise, but we get awfully annoyed at the long wait, not only for his recommendations in the immigration field, but also in his delay in appointments of persons of Italian ancestry. For practical political reasons, I believe, the administration has not sent a message to the Congress asking for a revision of the immigration laws as was promised.

The many measures which the President has recommended relate to legislation for the improvement of the economic position of the people of the United States—the minimum wage law to increase the earning capacity of the workers of America, the aid to depressed areas, the extension of the unemployment insurance law for dependent children, the social security increases, are all designed to help a struggling people where unemployment is high and misery is rampant. The climate for opening the doors to permit a larger number of immigrants to enter our country would not sit well with a Congress or a people who claim that they cannot obtain decent wages and a good standard of living. Last week we voted and passed in the House of Representatives the Mexican national or bracero program which permits the entry of Mexican workers, approximately 400,000, to work on American farms. The paradox is that while we claim that we must keep out immigrants because there is unemployment, we permit the entry of 400,000 Mexicans because we need farmworkers throughout the Southwest and the South of our country. It might be wiser for us to revise our immigration laws to permit farmworkers from Europe who are not specialists to come to work on the farms of America which are feeding not only the 180 million people of the United States, but practically all of the peoples of underprivileged nations.

For us to maintain our image to the peoples of the world, we must have a fair and realistic immigration law. We cannot say to the people of the Mediterranean, Africa, and Asia that we are interested in your welfare and yet when they come to our doors we raise our hands and say, "Thou shalt not enter here." Our Nation had the respect of the world since 1776 because the people felt that ours was a land of opportunity; we proclaimed that all men were created equal and that we welcomed in friendship the homeless, the tempest-tossed to our shores. The Statue of Liberty, which stands high on Bedloes Island in New York, is still a magnet to the homeless and the refuge of the teeming shores of the peoples of the world. We must continue to keep its light bright, reflecting glory not only in the East but also in the West. We must give encouragement to those, who like our forefathers, have a contribution to make and we must open our doors wide once again to let democracy in.

Light a Candle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, the very able and gracious gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, has served with distinction for over 2 years as chairman of the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee. During this period Representative GRANAHAN has contributed immeasurably to the public welfare through her vigorous and effective subcommittee program to rid the U.S. mails of traffic in obscenity and pornography.

I commend to the attention of the Congress a recent article by Representative GRANAHAN on this important subject. The article, most appropriately entitled "Light a Candle," and printed in Men of Malvern, a monthly publication of the Laymen's Weekend Retreat League at Malvern, Pa., follows:

LIGHT A CANDLE

(By Representative KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN, of Pennsylvania, chairman, Subcommittee on Postal Operations)

"It is better to light just one little candle
Than to stumble in the dark;
Better far that you light just one little candle—
All you need's a tiny spark."

The words of this beautiful song, so gloriously sung earlier in the evening by the famed Justin Lawrie Choral Group, stayed with me as I returned to my Washington hotel room. Another day's work was behind me and another night's official functions were over. Now was the welcomed moment for reflection.

In pondering Joe Tinney's request that I do a short article for Men of Malvern on my pet project—the work of my Subcommittee

on Postal Operations in exposing and combating the traffic in obscene and pornographic literature—I couldn't help but think that here, beautifully expressed in poetry and music, was exactly what we are trying to accomplish.

It was not until I became chairman of this important investigating subcommittee that I began to understand the enormity of the problem of pornography. I was shocked when I learned of the depths of depravity to which filth merchants will resort. I soon came to realize the type of subhuman venality we are up against.

I quickly found out that one of the basic reasons for the growing volume of indecent matter in the mails and on the newsstands was the fact that the average decent citizen is entirely unaware of the nature and extent of this scourge.

So, in 2 years of extensive hearings on this problem, which took my subcommittee to most of the major cities of the country, in the report which we later issued, and in all my own speeches and personal contacts with citizen groups everywhere, our purpose has been to establish an aroused community consciousness to this vital problem.

We have, if you please, been trying to light just one little candle and to help provide the tiny spark for other such candles, so that we may not stumble in the dark over this cancerous growth which, if unchecked, will insidiously destroy the moral tissue of our Nation.

FILTH PEDDLING IS BIG TIME

Pornography today is big business. The peddling of obscene and pornographic literature is no longer confined to the backrooms of pool halls. It has become a lucrative business with wide and varied sources of distribution. According to reliable estimates, filth peddling brings in from $\$\frac{1}{2}$ billion to $1 billion a year.

Besides the fact that the average citizen is unaware of the extent of this problem, I believe there are two other basic reasons for the increased traffic in obscene literature. The first is the fantastic profits which can be derived with a relatively small capital outlay. The second is the difficulty of prosecuting offenders, especially in the jurisdictions where most of the mail-order business in pornography originates.

But, primarily because of public unawareness of this creeping menace, printed filth now appears in drugstores, supermarkets, and newsstands in addition to widespread distribution through the mail (which, actually, is the primary jurisdiction of my subcommittee). Too often it stands indiscriminately on the magazine rack next to respectable family magazines dedicated to the improvement of the American home.

Here, I fear, its ready accessibility to our young ones imparts a flavor of acceptability, with the result that they are gaining dangerously false impressions of the moral foundations of our society. For the fundamental unit of that society—the family—is challenged in the mind of every adolescent with each distorted idea he acquires regarding the true meaning of natural sex instinct.

SMUT AND DELINQUENCY

The evidence that juvenile delinquency is sharply increasing with each year, that it is more commonly concerned with acts of violence, and that it is appearing in the suburbs as well as in the slums, is unmistakable. In the 9-year period, 1949 through 1957, the number of appearances before juvenile courts for delinquency increased two and one-half times, while the child population increased by only one-fourth.

The direct relationship between obscenity and this rising incidence of juvenile delinquency was clearly pinpointed by many distinguished witnesses who appeared before my subcommittee—among them, the Rev. Father Terrence J. Murphy, of the Loyola University Law School; Dr. Nicholas G. Frignito, chief neuropsychiatrist and medical director of our own Philadelphia municipal court, whose position affords an unusual opportunity to study and evaluate the effects of obscenity and pornography on the conduct of youthful law violators; and Mr. John Cornelius Hayes, president of the National Council of Catholic Men and professor of law at Loyola University.

I know there are psychiatrists who hesitate to relate publications devoted to distorted sex, terror, sadism, and crime with juvenile delinquency. However, after having listened to many authorities and worked closely with this problem for over 2 years, I find myself in complete agreement with J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who recently wrote:

"I say that we can no longer afford to wait for the answer. What we do know is that in an overwhelming large number of cases sex crime is associated with pornography. We know that sex criminals read it, are clearly influenced by it.

"I believe pornography is a major cause of sex violence. I believe that if we can eliminate the distribution of such items among impressionable school-age children, we shall greatly reduce our frightening sex crime rate."

KNOWLEDGE WILL BRING ACTION

More than ever, I am firmly convinced that only when the public is fully enlightened—when enough "candles" are lit—will we be able to stem the ravages caused by filth and smut. The "light" of knowledge will surely be followed by determined action. I have enough faith in the moral and spiritual backbone of this Nation to know that when thinking men and women get to know the whole sordid story of pornography, they will not long stand by and do nothing. They do not need to be reminded of Edmund Burke's admonition: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

Fortunately, good men are doing something about the evil of pornography. Civil and church leaders in many cities and towns, large and small, throughout the country are demonstrating the effectiveness of organized committees and groups in combating and cleaning up the traffic in filthy publications in their own areas. Moreover, action in one community helps provide the tiny spark for similar action in other communities and these shared experiences yield large rewards.

In helping to encourage this kind of action by individuals and groups, my subcommittee's report summarized what the situation is both as to obscene matter sent through the mail and the increasing prevalence of smutty publications on the newsstands. We describe the efforts being made in some communities to combat the spread of this evil among their youth. We also suggest a program of community action and list recommendations to help stamp out the nationwide traffic in indecent publications.

Copies of this report, entitled "Obscene Matter Sent Through the Mail," may be obtained from the Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Washington 25, D.C., for the nominal charge of 20 cents per copy.

As I indicated earlier, the basic unit of our society—the family—is most seriously in danger from the pornographic attack. The family must, therefore, be the center of the counterattack against this festering disease. Additional laws, community action, and other group efforts—while valuable—are no substitute for the "light" of parental guidance. They cannot absolve fathers and mothers from their obligation to know their children, to understand their thinking, to lead them onto paths of better reading, and to guide them by appealing to their interests at least as forcefully and attractively as the "dirt peddlers" are doing.

Truly, the brightest "candle" of all is the one that shines in the home.

What Will the Harvest Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a letter to me under date of April 27, from a typical, good American farm wife, Mrs. Jack W. Hester, of Honey Creek, Iowa, who speaks for herself and her husband, along with my letter in part to them asking their permission to have their letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and their reply.

Mr. Speaker, the letter to me dated April 27 sets out in plain, scholarly, understandable language the position which these good, hard-working American farmers fear they will experience in complying with the 1961 feed grain law. Of course, thousands of our farmers are in the same category with the Hesters, who it appears have no choice but to sign up, or else. The letters follow:

HONEY CREEK, IOWA, *April 27, 1961.*

DEAR MR. JENSEN: For several years now we have been asked to write our President and Congressmen, how we feel about different Government legislation. Little attention did we give to it until the last couple years, when the agricultural controversy got to the place it is making even more satisfied farmers feel poverty stricken.

Jack and I are 32 and 28 years, respectively. We have four children ranging from 7 years to 3 months. We live on a rented 173 acres which has both bottom and hills. With lots of work and modern farming practices we have averaged over 80 bushel an acre corn. We aren't specializing, but milk cows, sell some eggs, and our main source of income is hogs.

We would like to point out we started farming in 1953, with a Farmers Home Administration loan. We are not debt free, but feel we have gained a lot not only in material assets, but in doing what we enjoy.

Please don't get the idea we feel we've reached our goal, as we're working toward the day we can buy the land we now rent. If we can accomplish this and raise our family with hopes of college for them, we don't feel we have room to complain. We feel we can reach this goal without the Federal Government giving it to us.

We do not like the present farm plan, but what choice is there when the landlady has to seal her corn. The corn program came out saying to put 20 percent and 40 percent in diverted acres. You would receive 50 percent of your average yield on first 20 percent. When we received our papers, we got a 65 bushel average yield. Where did our other 15 bushels go?

The television program out of Ames on the farm plan said the main purpose of the program was to increase farm income. Does this mean the farmer with the initiative to improve his farming practices takes the penalty for someone who doesn't try? Was it just a snow job for farmers, figuring they wouldn't know any better?

As far as the soybean support price is concerned, more people will raise them. Then another excess crop. We have always sold them for more than support prices. After this is there going to be complete control, too?

We are definitely against the Government controlling everything as suggested by the long-range farm plan. What initiative (the one thing our country boasts about) will be left if everything goes to bushel, pound, etc., measurements? The Government telling us to raise so much and no more.

We believe our country is the best, but the only difference in this policy and the Russian is they are told to raise more and we will be told exactly how much less to raise. Either way the Government takes over.

What do we have left to work for if the Government tells us what we can do? Then they take care of us through old age with social security and medical aid. At this rate all we got left is to say we'll be glad when we're 65 years, as so many are saying. Of course, someone is going to have to pay for all these so-called benefits. There are some people you can give everything and still they want more.

We realize the surplus problem is bad and something has to be done. We believe in the soil bank, with high enough rates, based fairly, and used to get rid of the surplus is still the solution. With high enough payments and lower prices why wouldn't farmers be better off cooperating? Using this system until the surplus is gone. Then give it a chance to take care of itself.

Have been reading where Secretary of Agriculture Freeman is overjoyed with the sign up on the present plan. I do hope he realizes there are a lot of us that had little choice.

Would like to thank you for your time taken to read this.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JACK W. HESTER.

MAY 11, 1961.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. HESTER: Your letter to me about the feed grain law for the 1961 crop year is the best I have received in that you explain in more detail the effect which the law will have on your income, etc.

Therefore, I feel your letter deserves the wide publicity it would receive by having it inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Please know I would not have your letter made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is mailed each day to over 68,000 people in the United States, without your approval. May I have your approval to do so?

Sincerely yours,

BEN F. JENSEN,
Member of Congress, Seventh Iowa District.

MAY 16, 1961.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: In regard to your letter of May 11, we'd be honored to have our letter printed in any publication.

We feel very proud and happy to find out that an individual still has a chance to be heard in our great country. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. JACK W. HESTER.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Democratic Republic of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, we all know of 1961 as the centennial of our War Between the States—it is also the year of the centennial of the unification of Italy. June 2 marks the 15th anniversary of the democratic Republic of Italy and I should like at this time to pay tribute to our great Mediterranean ally.

Italy has always been a country of cultural inspiration—from the villas of Pompeii to the renaissance paintings and sculpture of Florence to the architectural center of the modern world, Milan. Music lovers find paradise at La Scala. Engineers still study the technical genius of Da Vinci. Sun worshippers find its shores and islands the most beautiful in the world.

Most important of all, Italy has been our continued friend for all of the 15 years of its Republic. It is our ally in NATO and is carrying out its share in the great struggle for freedom against oppression. And so, to the Italians across the sea and to the many Italo-Americans here, I extend my warmest congratulations and best wishes for a continued future in the fine traditions of the past.

Michigan Week: The Michigan Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, each year since 1954 the citizens of the great State of Michigan have set aside 1 week in the year as Michigan Week. It is a period when we Michiganders reaffirm our pride in our State and rededicate ourselves to its future growth and prosperity. Michigan Week this year will be observed May 21–27. As a native and lifelong resident of Michigan, I would like to say a few words, in the spirit of Michigan Week, about some of the reasons why the people of Michigan are proud of their State.

Of course, Michigan is proud that it is first in the Nation in the production of automobiles. In Michigan's automobile industry, the manufacturing revolution which is now sweeping over the underdeveloped world came to maturity. The industrial genius of Michigan made Detroit the "arsenal of democracy" in World War II. Without the mass production techniques that emerged out of the auto industry, America could not have reversed the Nazi-Japanese tide.

But Michigan is out front not only in the production of motor vehicles and parts. Michigan's unmatched industrial know-how and the world's finest labor force, representing almost every skill listed by the U.S. Census Bureau, have placed Michigan first in the Nation in the production of mobile homes, boats, conveyors, internal combustion engines, metal stampings, steel springs, machine shop work, gray-iron foundry production, public building fixtures, hardware supplies, sporting and athletic goods, padding and upholstery filling as well as salt and cereals. Michigan leads all other States in the value of its manufactured products per worker. We have justly earned our reputation as the industrial capital of the world. Few areas in the United States can compare with Michigan as a State in which to locate industry and business.

Michigan believes that it has a mission of providing the same leadership in the space age as it did in the automotive age. As evidence of this, the booster chosen for the momentous flight into space of astronaut Navy Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., on May 5, 1961, was the Michigan-built Chrysler Redstone. Indeed, Michigan is taking its place on the frontier of the forces that are shaping the modern world. To the greatest pool of labor skills and managerial brains in the world, Michigan has added first-rate research facilities. The University of Michigan's Institute of Science and Technology is the Nation's first State-supported space age research endeavor. High resolution radar was designed at the University of Michigan. The Bomarc missile was designed and developed at the university. The ultra-high-performance Rambler rocket was conceived in Michigan, designed in Michigan, and can be built by Michigan companies with Michigan products. Atomic power installations are already under construction by Detroit Edison and Consumer Power companies.

During the past few years electronics companies have been showing increasing interest in locating in Michigan to take advantage of the research and consultant talent our universities are making available. The Greater Ann Arbor Research Park, now under construction, will provide a most fertile base for extending the partnership between industry and the university for the development of new and startling research and products for the space age. Yes, the people of Michigan are proud that their State is not a status quo State, not resting on past laurels—that it is a State on the move.

We are proud that Michigan is known all over the world as a great industrial State. We are equally proud of our preeminence as a great agricultural State. The first land-grant college in the United States emerged on the campus of Michigan State University at East Lansing. From the technical and scientific achievements of such colleges American agriculture was transformed. In Michigan, agriculture is one of the three principal sectors of the State's economy. Only a handful of States can boast of such a varied and successful agriculture. In all, 44 different fruit and vegetable crops are grown commercially. Michigan leads all other States in the production of strawberries, sour cherries, cantaloupes, late celery, cucumbers for pickles, and field beans. The famous bean soup served in the U.S. Senate and House dining rooms is made from Michigan beans. The sale of products from Michigan farms totaled nearly three-quarters of a billion dollars in 1958—the latest year for which statistics are available. In addition, the volume of business directly connected with the processing, storing, distribution, and transportation of farm products amounted to $1,880 million. More than half of Michigan's

83 counties rank among the top 100 counties in the Nation in the production of field crops, fruit, and livestock. Despite Michigan's magnificent industrial and agricultural accomplishments, Michigan still has about 40 percent of its land area available for development.

Michigan's bountiful natural and physical resources are another source of great pride to the citizens of our State. Michigan's location in the greatest iron ore producing region of the world places Michigan second among the iron ore producing States in the Union. Michigan is still a major lumbering State with 19 million acres of forests which serve Michigan's furniture, paper and pulp industries. Michigan is first in salt production in the Nation. Michigan has the world's largest limestone quarries and deposits of gypsum. Michigan ranks sixth in the production of copper and is high in the annual production of oil. Michigan's abundant quantities of sand and gravel make possible one of the finest highway systems in the country.

All of these natural resources are helping build a chemical empire in Michigan. There has been amazing progress in this industry in the last few years and there will be additional developments in the near future. The value added by manufacture in our new and rapidly developing chemical industry is now in the neighborhood of $600 million.

Michigan is proud of its roadbuilding program. In our State we are constructing freeways at the rate of 1 foot a minute. By the end of 1962 people and products will be able to travel nonstop from the Ohio border to the Mackinac Bridge and from Detroit to Muskegon over superb modern roads. This highway system will make Michigan's recreation areas more easily accessible than ever before.

Most people know how much wonderful fun it is to vacation in Michigan, but relatively few know the extent of the tourist industry in Michigan and the vital role it plays in our economy. There are some 28,000 individual businesses serving the wants of people who come from all corners of our Nation for refreshing and restful holiday fun in Michigan. Michigan is bordered by four of the Great Lakes and has the longest shoreline of any State except Alaska. We have more than 11,000 inland lakes, 36,000 miles of rivers and streams and 19 million acres of forest land in which are situated 61 State parks and recreational areas. We have more ski areas than any other State in the Nation. Last year Michigan tourism grossed more than $650 million and provided employment for about 100,000 persons. Sales and use tax receipts from the tourist and resort industry have reached an annual figure of $40 million and this figure is expected to rise to $46 million this year. The U.S. Department of Commerce figures show that money spent by an average of 24 tourists a day equals the economic impact of a manufacturing plant with a $100,000 annual payroll. This places in sharp focus the importance of tourism in the Michigan economy.

One of Michigan's unique assets for industry, health, and pleasure is her ever-abundant supply of fresh water. It is an asset envied by many other States which are faced with a critical water situation. Because of Michigan's geographical location, bordered by four of the five Great Lakes, our relatively level topography, our porous soil, our water-holding geological formations and our heavy and uniform rainfall, we have in Michigan the largest continuously available supply of fresh water in the world. In Michigan we do not use water, we only borrow it. By a relatively simple and inexpensive practice of water conservation we are capable of returning the same quantity and quality of water we receive back to its source. Water emptied anywhere into our 36,000 miles of streams is returned to its source, the Great Lakes. We do not have the costly problem of tapping water for use and later returning it to the same watershed. Michigan is indeed the "Water Wonderland" of the Nation.

In the area of industry, agriculture and recreational resources Michigan is a proven leader. The people of Michigan are also proud of another great accomplishment—the continuing development of its human resources through one of the finest educational systems in the Nation. Michigan ranks fifth among the States in its support of public education. Since 1948 Michigan has spent a billion dollars for school construction. Enrollment in elementary and secondary schools last year reached almost 1,700,000. In the Nation in 1958, State and local expenditures for all public education averaged 35.5 percent of the general expenditures of State and local governments. In Michigan it constituted 40.7 percent. The estimated current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance in Michigan for 1959–60 was $425 in contrast to the national average of $369. The expenditure of $425 per pupil is a 93.6 percent increase over the same expenditure in Michigan in 1949–50. During this decade, only two other States had a higher percentage increase in current expenditures per pupil. State aid per pupil in average daily attendance in 1957–58 in Michigan was $206 as compared with the national average of $162. Michigan is rated among the top 10 States for its program of educational excellence. Michigan's colleges and universities are recognized for the excellence of their programs, facilities, and graduates.

Michiganders point with pride to many other tangible advantages and accomplishments, to the fact that Michigan is located in the heart of the Great Lakes consumer market which has an annual retail sales of $43.5 billion; that in transportation Michigan is serviced directly by the St. Lawrence Seaway, 32 railroads, 190 trucklines, 14 major feeder airlines; and that Michigan leads the Nation in homeownership with a total of almost 70 percent.

Yes, Michigan is a great State. We are proud of our great physical and human resources and of the splendid use to which they have been put. But we are not too proud to realize that we must be even greater in the sixties, that we must set new goals of attainment in every area of endeavor not only for Michigan, but for the Nation and the future of the entire free world. It is in this spirit that we launch Michigan Week—1961.

Kennedy Administration Fights Organized Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BYRON G. ROGERS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 22, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Kennedy administration is interested in curbing organized crime and racketeering. The Honorable Robert F. Kennedy, Attorney General, has appeared before the Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee and urged enactment of legislation that will accomplish this purpose. I know there is great interest in preventing crime and racketeering and the Attorney General has proposals to meet this problem as is evidenced by his statement, and under unanimous consent, I insert his statement in the RECORD. The statement is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, I am here today supporting proposed legislation which we, in the Department of Justice believe can be extremely effective in combating organized crime and racketeering. These proposals have been developed in the Department over a period of time to aid and assist local law enforcement officers in controlling hoodlums and racketeers, who in many instances have become so rich and so powerful that they have outgrown local authorities.

Some of these proposals are new. Others are revisions of proposals submitted by the prior administration. Still others were submitted by my predecessor and I have endorsed them.

There have been large scale investigations into this problem on both the national scene and at the State level. You are all familiar with the Kefauver investigation and its disclosures which shocked the Nation. In the Senate Rackets Committee's investigations into improper conduct in the labor-management field, we found organized crime and racketeering moving into that field. Both investigations highlighted problems existing in the larger cities.

Sometimes we get the impression that the general public believes that organized crime is a problem for the big cities, alone. If any one is under that misapprehension he can be corrected very quickly by reading the report of the New York State Commission on Investigation issued in February of this year. It deals with organized crime in central New York State. Then there is a report by the General Investigating Committee to the House of Representatives of the 57th Legislature of Texas. The latter report details what I can describe only as the rape of the city of Beaumont by organized crime. What the Texas committee found to be the results of organized crime having gained control of the town, will be of interest to you.

The investigation found houses of prostitution, gambling clubs, punchboards, pinball machines, slot machines, numbers, and bookmaking widely distributed throughout the city. Liquor was sold to teenagers and 45 pounds of raw opium worth $500,000 was

seized. As has been pointed out so often, gambling, liquor violations, narcotics, bribery and corruption of local officials and labor racketeering and extortion go hand in hand.

The Texas report details the effects of organized crime as follows: The crime rate of the city rose 22 percent in 1960; desirable citizens left town; the city is in the red by $1,125,833; $350,000 in current checks were issued with no covering funds in the bank; within 3 years two water improvement projects ran out of money; the city is deficient in neighborhood parks and supervised recreation facilities; municipal bonds are difficult to sell; the city records were in such bad shape that independent auditors refused to certify an accounting rendered by them; and finally the efforts to attract industry to the city were sabotaged by the corrupting influence.

This appalling story has not had its ending recorded yet. An aroused citizenry currently is conducting a cleanup of what they rightly consider to be a local problem. However, we in the Federal Government can be of great assistance to them and other honest citizens.

The opium seized in Beaumont was not grown locally in Texas. The pinball machines and other gambling devices were not manufactured there. The profits from the activities did not remain in Texas. The information so necessary to the conduct of gambling operations did not originate locally. All the information and implements flowed into Beaumont through the medium of interstate commerce. Our package of bills is designed to prohibit the use of interstate facilities for the conduct of the many unlawful enterprises which make up organized crime today.

I now would like to discuss these bills in some general terms.

I will turn first to H.R. 6572, which would prohibit travel in aid of racketeering enterprises.

Organized crime is nourished by a number of activities, but the primary source of its growth is illicit gambling. From huge gambling profits flow the funds to bankroll the other illegal activities I have mentioned including the bribery of local officials.

The main target of our bill is interstate travel to promote gambling. It also is aimed at the huge profits in the traffic in liquor, narcotics, prostitution, as well as the use of these funds for corrupting local officials and for their use in racketeering in labor and management. Thus, when we speak of unlawful business it is business engaged in the aforementioned improper activities.

A brief explanation of the method by which the funds are obtained by the bigtime gambling operators may be useful at this time.

Many persons think of the corner handbook operator or the neighborhood merchant, who sells a numbers ticket to him, as the person to whom we refer when we talk of the gambling racketeer. This is about as accurate as describing an iceberg as a section of ice floating on top of the water. As with the iceberg the danger and the size of the problem can only be fully appreciated if we go below the surface.

On the surface is the handbook operator. He makes a profit from the persons who place bets with him because he has an edge on every bet. He pays track odds but usually not in excess of 20 to 1. The odds at the track are calculated after deducting the 15 to 18 percent of the total betting pool which goes to pay taxes and other expenses. The bookmaker pockets that amount. However, he is not a man of unlimited resources. He must balance his books so that he will lose no more on the winner than has been bet on the other horses in a race, after his percentage has been deducted. He cannot control the choices of his customers and very often he will find that one horse is the favorite choice of his clientele. His "action," as he calls it, may not reflect the action of the track. Therefore, he must reinsure himself on the race in much the same fashion that casualty insurance companies reinsure a risk that is too great for it to assume alone. To do this the bookmaker uses the layoff man, who for a commission, accepts the excess wager.

The local layoff better also will have limited funds and his layoff bets may be out of balance. When this occurs he calls the large layoff bettors, who because of their funds, can spread the larger risk. These persons are gamblers who comprise a nationwide syndicate or combine. They are in close touch with each other all the time and they distribute the bets among themselves so that an overall balance is reached on any horserace.

With a balanced book at the handbook, layoff or syndicate level the edge is divided and no one loses except the man who placed the original bet. As an indication of the volume of business I am talking about, one of the largest operators in the combine does a layoff business of $18 million a year. His net profit is $720,000 a year. This is a 4-percent return on volume with relatively no risk as a result of the balancing of his books on each event.

The term "gambler" is a misnomer for these persons. They accept money that the small gamblers wager but they do not gamble at all. This is further illustrated graphically by what we know as the numbers racket.

A man purchases a ticket with three numbers on it, paying a dollar for the ticket. Since there are 999 such numbers he should reasonably expect the odds to be 999 to 1. The numbers bank usually pays 600 to 1 on such a wager—or less—so you can see that the only gambler in this situation is the man making the bet. The operator pockets 40 cents on every dollar bet. That is if the game is run honestly. That, however, is too much to expect from this group. If the play is too high on any one number they manage through devious means to insure that a number on which the play has been small will be the winner.

With that background on the type of business done by these persons, let me now move to their interstate travel activities to show how we hope to be of aid and assistance to local law authorities.

The examples I am going to give have a factual basis, but I will speak mainly in generalities in open session for obvious reasons.

Our first example is as follows: Some notorious individuals, whose names you would immediately recognize, had interests in a numbers bank but lived in a resort town far from the scene of operation. Every month a messenger carried the profits of the numbers racket from the scene of operations to the resort town. One of the payments was in excess of $250,000. Thus, the persons reaping the profit from the illegal activity remained beyond the reach of the law enforcement officials at the place of operation and committed no crime in the State where they lived. Only the Federal Government can curtail the flow of funds which permit the kingpins to live far from the scene, preventing the local officials, burdened by the gambling activity, from punishing him.

If our bill is enacted we will be able to prosecute the courier who carries the funds across State lines and in conjunction with the aiding and abetting statute (18 U.S.C. 2) we will be able to prosecute the person who caused the courier to travel—the kingpin. This example illustrates what we have found to be a pattern around the country where the apparently innocuous 10-cent numbers bet in a large city turns into tremendous profits in the hands of bigtime hoodlums.

Another example involves the frequent travel from a middle Atlantic State to a New England State by the operator of a lottery—and/or members of his family—to make payments to winners or pick up money wagered. Our information reveals that, in order to avoid the statute proscribing interstate transportation of lottery tickets (18 U.S.C. 1301), the individual carried the plates for printing the tickets to the various States. He did that so the tickets could be printed locally.

In another instance in a Midwestern State, the scene of illicit operations is close to the border of the State. One individual travels daily between the two States. He conducts his layoff business in the one State and lives in a $200,000 house in the suburbs of a large city across the border in the other State.

Let me cite another example. The layoff men at the top of the bookmaking organization are in daily contact with each other to reinsure their bets and divide the action, thus assuring that all make a profit and no one takes an exorbitant risk.

These people can conduct their businesses by telephone. When local authorities get close to them, they merely pick up stakes and move to another jurisdiction. The best example of this moving to frustrate local police, is the case of a man who started operations as a layoff man in the Midwest in 1946. He moved to another town in 1949 and then to Newport, Ky., in 1950. In 1952, under pressure of the Kefauver investigations into organized crime, he moved to Montreal, Canada. When the Royal Canadian Mounted Police raided his establishment he moved back to Newport, Ky.

We can follow these people from State to State and prosecute them for the very activities which now make a mockery of local law enforcement if this travel bill is enacted.

The layoff men, who comprise the gambling syndicate, must settle their accounts periodically for they do not trust each other any more than they trust the average bettor. They settle the accounts by having a bagman travel throughout the country picking up and depositing funds to balance the books. He receives reports of balances due from each of the layoff men. He acts as a clearinghouse and accountant for the group—settling the accounts in accordance with good accounting practice—in much the same manner that our banking clearing houses operate. The only difference is that the banking houses are not afraid of divulging their incomes through the use of banking channels. The gamblers use cash and a messenger to clear the daily balances.

When a Braniff airplane crashed at Buffalo, Tex., on September 30, 1959, a collection man for a prime subject of the Kefauver investigation, was killed. The collection man was enroute to New York with his boss's share of profits from gambling operations in Texas. With the enactment of this bill, prosecution may be undertaken in future situations against men like this and the persons who send them to collect the proceeds.

In summary, our information reveals numerous instances where the prime mover in a gambling or other illegal enterprise operates by remote control from the safety of another State—sometimes half a continent away. He sends henchmen to the scene of operations or travels himself from time to time to supervise the activity and check on his underlings. As for the profits, he receives his share by messenger.

Another example of the type of situation which we are trying to curb in proscribing the interstate travel in furtherance of an unlawful activity is the situation which arose in Hot Springs, Ark., in 1960. A printing company in Jefferson Parish, La., receives race wire information from Chicago bookmakers and disseminates the data to gambling establishments in sections of the South and Southwest. The company is owned by a racketeer, since deported, and his race

service manager, of New Orleans. The manager, while in Hot Springs in March of 1960 got into a violent argument with the owner of the race wire service there. The Hot Springs man told the New Orleans man to stay in New Orleans as he could operate his business without help.

In May of 1960, the owner of the Hot Springs service traveled to Chicago and visited a Chicago rackets overlord. The Hot Springs man sought assistance in curtailing the activities of the New Orleans group in seeking to take over his race wire service. If we could show the existence of race wire services in New Orleans and Hot Springs and the travel on the part of the New Orleans man to expand the New Orleans service and the travel of the Hot Springs man to protect his interest in the Hot Springs service we could prosecute both of these top racketeers with the enactment of the proposed bill.

A race wire service has been provided in Wisconsin by Chicago hoodlums. In return for allowing the race wire service to prosper in Wisconsin, a person, who is now the subject of intensive investigations, has been allocated a portion of Antioch, Ill., for the conduct of gambling. This individual apparently has trained his housemen at Kenosha before they traveled to Antioch to run the gambling operations. Such travel as by the Chicago people to Kenosha and the Kenosha hoodlums to Antioch would violate the bill as travel to promote an unlawful business, thus permitting the interruption if not the destruction of the gambling empires.

There is wide open gambling in Newport, Ky., adjacent to Cincinnati, Ohio, and Covington, Ky. A review of the financial statements of four Newport gambling casinos in 1957 revealed that 11 persons, who reside outside of Kentucky, participated in the casino profits. With this bill we would be able to move against interstate travel to distribute the profits of these casinos to the out-of-State owners.

Edward Silver, the district attorney of Kings County, testified before the New York State Commission of Investigation that there have been several unsolved gangland homicides connected with gambling in recent years in his jurisdiction. It would be in keeping with past practices of this element if the perpetrators of the crimes had come from out of State. This practice was amply illustrated by the disclosures in the trial of the members of the notorious Murder, Inc.

None of the activities of which I have just spoken, that is, interstate travel to carry on a racketeering enterprise, travel to deliver the profits of an illegal enterprise, or travel to commit a crime of violence in furtherance of the activities of an illegal business is now per se, a violation of State or Federal law. The travel is performed by these persons with impunity, but because of that travel and the interstate aspects of the activities, the task of the local law enforcement officials is staggering.

I am not discussing isolated instances but what we have found to be a pattern of behavior in a number of geographic areas.

We have skirted the area of social gambling by limiting the proposed statute to gambling, as a business, which violates State or Federal law. In this limited aspect, the enactment of the bill will be a tremendous tool for stamping out the vicious and dangerous criminal combinations.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is vital. We need it. Local law-enforcement officials need it. The country needs it.

The second bill I wish to discuss, H.R. 7039, amends chapter 50 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the transmission of bets, wagers, and related information. Its purpose is to assist the various States in enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling and bookmaking. It would prohibit the use of wire communication facilities for the transmission of certain gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

Gambling in the United States, we estimate, involves about 70,000 persons and a gross volume of $7 billion annually.

The most diligent efforts of local law enforcement officers are often frustrated by the ease with which information essential to gambling operations can be disseminated in interstate commerce.

Bookmaking bases its operations upon races at about 20 major racetracks throughout the country, and requires rapid transmission of the results on each race. Usually there are only a few tracks in operation at any given time and the average bet placed with a bookmaker is a small one.

In order to run a successful book that pays a good return, the bookmaker needs a volume of business. This volume is usually obtained by the fact that bettors can play their money and any winnings upon the whole card of daily races reported from one or more tracks, if they know their standing from race to race. Thus, information almost simultaneously transmitted prior to, during, and immediately after each race on such items as the starting horses, scratches of entries, probable winners, betting odds, results and the prices paid, is essential to both the bookmaker and his clientele in order to insure any sizable gambling.

Furthermore, let me emphasize that no matter by what means the bookmaker and his clients receive this in-bound information—whether by telegraph ticker tape, by telephone, or even by radio or television broadcast—the bookmaker needs a means of rapid out-bound communication. This usually is by telephone—with other bookmakers, the purpose is to balance his book and protect against a severe loss when the betting becomes heavy on any particular entry. I have explained this hedging process, known as layoff betting, in my earlier testimony on the interstate travel bill.

The rapid gathering and dissemination of trackside information is a highly profitable and integral part of commercialized gambling on horseracing. This information can be obtained by stealth and use of various ingenious devices, such as the pitch-catcher type operation where a man at the track flashes the result of a race by a hand signal or other device, to a confederate at an open telephone line. The confederate then gives the result to a central point of dissemination. The information is placed upon leased telegraph circuits or long distance telephone lines running to the major cities of the country from which it is further fanned out on other leased circuits or telephone lines, or in some cases by radio broadcast, to the ultimate subscribers, the bookmakers, who pay a substantial fee for this vital service.

The rapid results provided by this wire service are indispensable to all bookmakers operating on any but the most modest scale. They are a means of expanding the play and stimulating further betting from race to race. They protect the bookmaker from the dilemma of either refusing bets which are placed about the time a race is scheduled to start, or of accepting a bet on a horse which has already won the race.

Equally essential to the bookmaker is the local telephone service which he must have to avoid the risk of arrest for running an open betting room. He needs the telephone to take a substantial portion of bets; and, of course, the betters also will use the phone to be informed of the results. Furthermore, telephones provide auxiliary service for rapid results where telegraph tickers or speaker circuits fail. In areas where ticker or speaker service is not available, the bookmaker must have at least one telephone for the exclusive purpose of receiving service from the subdistributor who supplies him with the trackside information.

In addition to the unique transmission situation in the field of commercialized horserace betting, the gamblers also have moved into large-scale betting operations in such amateur and professional sports events as baseball, basketball, football, and boxing.

This has been highlighted recently by disclosures that for the second time in 10 years, gamblers have bribed college basketball players to shave points on games. In this situation the bookmaker needs telephone communication to get the latest "line" on the contest. This is the handicapped prediction of the probable results and the point spread in basketball and football. Without the latest information as to the condition of the team, and the happening of such things as late injuries to key players, the bookmaker is the victim of fate. He cannot permit this to happen, so he subscribes to a service which gives him and his confederates the latest up-to-the-minute information which may bear on the result.

It is quite evident that modern, organized, commercial gambling operations are so completely intertwined with the Nation's communications systems that denial of their use to the gambling fraternity would be a mortal blow to their operations.

This is the precise purpose of the proposed legislation. It would be an exercise by the Congress of its plenary power over interstate communications to aid the States in coping with organized gambling, by denying the use of interstate communication facilities for such activities.

It cannot be overemphasized that this bill is designed, first to assist the States and territories in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling and like offenses. Second, the bill would in that regard help suppress organized gambling by prohibiting the use of wire communications for the transmission of gambling information in interstate and foreign commerce.

The word "organized" is underscored because it should be clear that the Federal Government is not undertaking the almost impossible task of dealing with all the many forms of casual or social wagering which so often may be effected over communication facilities. It is not intended that the act should prevent a social wager between friends by telephone. This legislation can be a most effective weapon in dealing with one of the major factors of organized crime in this country without invading the privacy of the home or outraging the sensibilities of our people in matters of personal inclinations and morals.

The next bill I would discuss is one we sent to the Congress, but which has not been introduced in the House. At this time, I would like to speak in support of subsections (a) and (b) of our draft. Subsection (c), dealing with false and misleading information will be presented as a separate bill. The bill would amend chapter 73 of title 18, United States Code dealing with the obstruction of justice. Its purpose is to prohibit the intimidation of witnesses in administrative investigations.

The need for this legislation stems from the language of the existing obstruction of justice statutes (18 U.S.C. 1503 and 1505) which prohibit the intimidation of witnesses in matters pending before a court or an administrative agency. Section 1503 prohibits the intimidation of any witness in any court proceeding. Section 1505 prohibits the intimidation of any witness in any proceeding pending before any department or agency.

Section 1503 has been construed in *United States* v. *Scoratow* (137 F. Supp. 620) as not applying to the intimidation of a witness in an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation until a complaint is pending in a Federal court. As so construed, the section leaves a gap in the law which permits the intimidation of witnesses in preliminary

investigation. This withholds sanctions against persons who may by their actions forestall the commencement of criminal proceedings in the Federal courts. The gap was recognized in the 85th Congress and remedial legislation was recommended by the Senate Subcommittee on Improvements in the Federal Criminal Code.

You will, of course, understand that in very many cases investigations are conducted in order to ascertain whether a complaint should be filed or a matter referred to a grand jury. If this preliminary investigation is frustrated by the intimidation of witnesses, the investigation may be brought to a halt before evidence sufficient to warrant the filing of a complaint or the referral of the evidence to a grand jury has been ascertained. Intimidation at this point, therefore, is more effective than it would be at a later point when there may be other evidence upon which to proceed.

Some examples of this intimidation are as follows. In the *Scoratow* case, the defendant threatened to kill a Mr. and Mrs. Friedman if Friedman gave any information to the FBI. Friedman was being interrogated by the FBI in an investigation of a possible false statement to the FHA involving a nephew of Scoratow. The court held that such intimidation was not within the purview of existing obstruction of justice statutes and dismissed an indictment against Scoratow.

Another case such as this involved a man named Lloyd Scuttles. Scuttles had been interviewed in connection with a stolen automobile. When the man who sold Scuttles the automobile got out of prison, he threatened to kill Scuttles because he believed that Scuttles had given the FBI information leading to his conviction. Scuttles was never a witness at the trial of the man who threatened him. Therefore the case was not within the purview of the obstruction of justice statute.

In still another case, a man who had been interviewed by FBI agents in a white slave case was accosted by another man who displayed a knife and threatened to kill our witness if he gave any information to the FBI, or the police. Again, since the man threatened was not a witness in a proceeding, no action could be taken against the threatener.

These are some of the cases we know about. We don't know, of course, the number of cases where the intimidation has been wholly effective.

We are asking for an expansion of the obstruction statutes to cover this situation. It is particularly necessary in view of the other bills I am discussing today.

If those bills are enacted the Department of Justice is going to be involved in large-scale combat with the forces which use interstate commerce to conduct their criminal activities. The persons who make up this element are tough and ruthless. They also are shrewd enough to be aware of the need of secrecy in the conduct of their activities. They know the dangers to which they will be subjected if witnesses talk freely to our investigators. Therefore, we expect attempts will be made to mislead us through intimidation of witnesses by threats or by violence.

I am sure that the gap of which I spoke previously is known to the leaders of organized crime. They are made well aware of the laws' limitations and the opportunities for forestalling investigations. This loophole permits the use of threats and violence in the first stages of an investigation thus preventing the development of a case.

Our opponents are ruthless, vicious, and resourceful. I cannot stress this too much. They will use every weapon at their command to prevent our discovery of incriminating information. The present state of the law is an open invitation to them to cripple our efforts and prevent our inquiries at the very point where witnesses need protection the most. The need for this bill seems to me to be self-evident.

The next bills are H.R. 468 and H.R. 3023 to amend the Fugitive Felon Act. They are identical. This amendment was introduced in the 86th Congress at the behest of my predecessor as H.R. 11897. It passed the House on August 23, 1960, but no action was taken on it in the Senate. It was again introduced at the beginning of this session of the Congress at Mr. Roger's recommendation. I endorse this proposal and urge its enactment.

The purpose of this proposal is to expand the coverage of the Fugitive Felon Act (18 U.S.C. 1073) which now makes it a Federal offense to flee a State jurisdiction in order to avoid prosecution or confinement for certain crimes of violence. These crimes include murder, kidnaping, burglary, robbery, mayhem, rape, assault with a dangerous weapon, arson punishable as a felony, extortion accompanied by threats of violence or attempts to commit those offenses.

Although the law only applies to fugitives, who have committed these crimes, this section has been extremely useful in strengthening local law enforcement. It has enabled the FBI to arrest fugitives fleeing a State jurisdiction and turn them over to the State in which they are arrested to await extradition by the demanding State. In 1960, the FBI apprehended 1,361 fugitives under the provisions of this law. Only two were tried in Federal courts. The rest were turned over to local authorities.

We can understand the limited scope of the section if we go back to the time of its enactment in 1934. Local law enforcement officials were troubled then, as they are today, with the ease with which fugitives could escape their jurisdiction by crossing a State line. The local officials could not follow, find, and return the criminals. It became apparent that the Federal Government had to assist those officials by apprehending fugitives in other jurisdictions and returning them for prosecution.

The nature of the publicized crime of that era was, however, different than it is today. At that time, the Congress and the public were greatly disturbed by widespread crimes of violence. Names like Capone, Dutch Shultz, Mad-dog Coll, Dillinger, and Karpis were on the front pages of the newspapers of the country.

Today, as in 1934, the major responsibility for the combating of crime and the prosecution of offenders rests with the States. Today, however, the face of organized crime has changed. While there still are crimes of violence, the modern criminal has become somewhat more sophisticated in the planning and perpetration of his activities in gambling, prostitution, narcotics, bribery, fraud and larceny. He has moved into legitimate businesses and labor unions where he embezzles the funds and loots the treasury. He has much more rapid means of escape from the jurisdiction of the local law enforcement. Unless his offenses also are Federal offenses, the Federal Government may not through the means of this section enhance the power of the State officials to apprehend racketeers and hoodlums.

If the Fugitive Felon Act is expanded, as proposed by this bill, the FBI will be able to put into operation the first of the necessary steps leading to the return to the proper jurisdiction of any person who has committed a crime punishable by death or imprisonment for more than 1 year. In such an expanded scope, we in the Federal Government can be of the greatest aid and assistance to the States.

Another area of gambling which needs attention, if we are to make a coordinated and successful attack on organized crime, is the easy interstate transportation of wagering paraphernalia. This was highlighted by the report of the Texas commission mentioned in my earlier testimony. That problem is the subject of H.R. 6571.

Federal laws, designed to suppress the lottery traffic in interstate and foreign commerce, have been on the books since 1895 (28 Stat. 963, act of March 2, 1895, ch. 191). The present statutes are found at 18 U.S.C. sections 1301 to 1305. In summary, these statutes make illegal the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of "any paper, certificate, or instrument purporting to be or to represent a ticket, chance, share, or interest in or dependent upon the event of a lottery * * *" (18 U.S.C. 1301).

From the very beginning the courts narrowly have limited the scope of these statutes. In 1897, the Supreme Court held that the statutory proscription against interstate transportation of lottery paraphernalia applied only to writings, instruments, or tickets representing chances on an existing lottery and not an already completed one (*France* v. *United States*, 164 U.S. 676 (1897)). The 1903 decision in *Francis* v. *United States*, 188 U.S. 375 (1903), further limited the scope of the statute by holding that a duplicate slip, retained by the agent of a numbers lottery to indicate the number played, is not a paper "purporting to be or to represent a chance, share, or interest in a lottery." I have previously told you of the shipment of the plates for printing numbers tickets. That shipment will violate this section whereas the travel to deliver the plates will also violate our travel proposal.

Finally, it has been held that the use of the mails in advertising and conducting a bookmaking business does not violate the present statutes because the selection of winners may require some skill or knowledge rather than mere chance (*United States* v. *Rich*, 90 F. Supp. 624 (E.D. Ill. 1950)).

Since the classic definition of a lottery is the payment of consideration for a prize to be awarded by chance, this intepretation excludes sport betting slips from the existing statutory prohibition against interstate transportation.

The proposed statute is designed to close the most important loopholes resulting from the above decisions. This measure would make it a felony to send, or knowingly carry in interstate or foreign commerce, any wagering paraphernalia or device used, adapted, or designed for use in bookmaking, wagering pools with respect to a sporting event, or numbers, policy, bolita, or similar games. This language makes clear its applicability to slips, papers, or paraphernalia which may be used in a lottery scheme not yet in existence or already completed. It also specifically prohibits the interstate transportation of slips recording the amounts and numbers bet in a numbers lottery and betting slips and other materials of a bookmaking operation.

In addition to the example I have previously cited there is considerable evidence that the operators of certain types of lotteries—which are undeniably interstate in character—have adopted various ways to avoid violating the narrow prohibitions of existing law. For example, lottery tickets may be printed in blank at a central point in one State, then transported to other States where the so-called playing numbers are overprinted. Without these numbers the blanks are not within the statutory definition of lottery tickets and their interstate transportation is not prohibited. Under the proposed measure, the blank tickets would be prohibited from interstate shipment as paper designed for use in a numbers or similar game.

The so-called numbers lottery, or one of its infinite variations, operates in virtually every major metropolitan area. Particularly where such a metropolitan area covers part of several States, it is not unusual that the numbers sellers in one State turn over their

play to runners who report at a numbers bank in another State. The interstate carrying of slips or writings, indicating the amounts of bets and the numbers played, is essential to this type of operation. The proposed statute would prohibit the interstate carrying of such numbers slips.

The fear of a raid by Federal or local police has turned the attention of the numbers operators and the bookmakers to the problem of quick disposition of the records used in the conduct of the business. This would include the papers used to record the bets of the numbers played by the individual bettor. The operators are making our task more difficult through the use of flash paper for the quick disposition of the records. This paper is highly inflammable and will burst into flame if a cigarette is placed on it. In less time than it will take a law enforcement officer to cross the room, a bookmaker can turn his records into a pile of ashes of no use as evidence against him.

We wish to curtail the interstate transportation of this type of equipment. If we do so, the bookmaker and numbers operator is going to find another specialized type of equipment to frustrate our efforts. We thus are asking for this bill to curtail the interstate shipment of paraphernalia that is used, intended or designed for use in their activities. With this broad prohibition we hope to be able to keep step with the criminal element as it tries a different approach to the problem.

The last bill I will comment upon is H.R. 3021, which would amend chapter 95 of title 18, United States Code, to permit the compelling of testimony under certain conditions and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith. This proposal was first submitted to the Congress on May 25, 1959, by my predecessor. The bill was introduced as H.R. 7392 but did not pass. It was resubmitted to the Congress on January 18, 1961. In our examination of the program submitted by the previous administration, we found that the bill will perform a necessary function and I recommend its enactment.

The experience of the Department has shown that there are difficulties in obtaining proof of violation of the Taft-Hartley Act and the Hobbs Act because certain portions of those acts overlap. For example, an employer may have been the victim of labor extortion, which is prohibited by the Hobbs Act. However, because he has made payments to the labor racketeer, he may fear that the payments will be construed by prosecutive agencies or a grand jury as a payment to the labor leader in violation of the Taft-Hartley Act. Thus, the employer understandably is reluctant to testify about transactions that are not clear-cut violations of the Hobbs Act. In this gray area of activity our difficulties in obtaining proof are substantial.

This proposal will permit us to call the buinessman before the grand jury, compel him to testify as to the transactions. If he first refuses to answer the questions on the basis of his constitutional privilege, he could be given immunity against prosecution for any matter, thing, or transaction about which his testimony is compelled.

We will then be able to obtain the evidence we need against the person who is most culpable in the matter while relieving the fears of the person who has been wronged.

In addition, in Hobbs Act violations, we very often run into a situation where a person is a conduit for funds from an employer to a labor racketeer. The conduit, while not the most culpable person involved, is nevertheless able to and under the present law justified in refusing to answer any questions about the transaction on the basis of his constitutional privilege. If the present bill is enacted we will be able to require testimony from the least culpable of the conspirators and obtain the proof we need for conviction of the real offenders.

In summary this bill will enable the Department to prosecute with more effectiveness the persons engaged in labor racketeering which is tied into the rest of organized crime and has become such a blight upon the business community.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I would like to read into the record the comments of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, about the bills I have discussed. Mr. Hoover's statement is as follows:

"Your legislative program as to interstate crime currently pending in Congress should receive the wholehearted endorsement of law enforcement at Federal, State, and local levels. As we are all aware, the growing seriousness of the Nation's crime problem presents an increasing threat to the safety and welfare of the Nation. Today its severe effects are felt directly or indirectly in every home in America. In terms of dollars and cents alone crime imposes a tremendous burden upon us all. Our annual cost of crime now totals $22 billion—the equivalent of $128 for every man, woman, and child in these United States.

"One of the most deeply entrenched segments of crime is represented in the underworld activities of racketeers and professional hoodlums. I refer to the vice barons, those engaged in illegal gambling, commercialized prostitution, and illicit liquor operations as well as the narcotics peddlers and the strong-arm racketeers whose lucrative illicit profits are derived from every stratum of our society. Many of these racketeers utilize interstate facilities and operate with impunity, if not in open defiance.

"The ranks of law enforcement are closing against the challenge of hoodlum lawlessness. As an example, on a day-to-day basis the FBI exchanges information with other law enforcement agencies at the local, State, and Federal levels concerning the operations and activities of professional hoodlums. During the past 6 months the FBI has disseminated over 53,000 items of a criminal intelligence nature to other law enforcing authorities.

"In addition, the scientific facilities of our laboratory and the fingerprint services of our Identification Division have been fully available to all agencies which are joined in the fight against crime. In return the FBI received invaluable assistance throughout the year from other members of the law enforcement profession in all parts of the Nation.

"These important weapons, science and cooperation, are successfully meeting the hoodlum challenge of lawlessness every day in the areas where we are now empowered by law to use them. These can be made even more effective if the law enforcement profession is given authority to bring these facilities to bear on those present voids in the law which allow organized crime and racketeering to operate on an interstate basis.

"This new and vitally needed legislation, which you have proposed, will strengthen the Federal Government's hand and will provide it with additional effective weapons in stamping out the evil of organized crime. If enacted into law, these legislative proposals would certainly enable the Government to proceed more effectively and vigorously against the well-entrenched interstate racketeers who are beyond the reach of local law enforcement."

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Jeremiah 31: 3: *I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we thank Thee for the tenderness and tenacity of Thy love which we need so supremely and which alone can satisfy us.

We humbly acknowledge that day by day we plan and propose, we counsel and contrive, and often feel very self-confident and self-sufficient.

Help us to understand that our hope for success and security cannot rest upon our own skill and human ingenuity, but upon Thy divine guidance and hold upon us.

May our hearts go out in love and sympathy toward all whose faith is being assailed by doubt and whose whole life seems to be one of conflict and struggle, of labor and sorrow, and of heartache and anguish.

Grant that our love may be a world feeling and may Thy light and truth shine in all the dark and dismal places of the earth, bringing unto mankind the blessings of peace and joy.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 610) entitled "An act to strengthen the foreign and domestic commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. COTTON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

HON. LOUISE G. REECE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Tennessee, Mrs. LOUISE G. REECE, be permitted to take the oath of office today. Her certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with regard to her election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. REECE appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

RESIGNATION OF MEMBER FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Member of Congress,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: It is with regret that I submit to you my resignation from the Committee on Public Works.

It was an honor and a privilege to serve on this committee, and I wish to commend the Members with whom I served who worked so hard to produce an outstanding record in the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO A COMMITTEE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 307

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Works: JOHN C. KUNKEL, Pennsylvania; LOUISE G. REECE, Tennessee.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INVESTIGATION OF OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MI. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have asked Subcommittee No. 4, of the House Small Business Committee, to make an investigation of the present import quota program for foreign crude oil. The Honorable TOM SNEED, chairman, has assured me that the subcommittee will make a thorough investigation and appraisal of this program as it affects small business in the oil exploration, production, and refining fields.

Congress has recognized that a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States is vital both to our domestic economy and our national defense and, in the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958, gave the administration both the power and the duty to limit foreign oil imports sufficiently to maintain a vigorous and competitive industry in this country.

Recent hearings held by the Department of the Interior suggest, however, that, instead of making full use of the powers which have been granted, the previous administration put into effect a program which may be weakening the domestic oil industry and fostering monopoly control. The program which has been devised is a most unusual kind, to say the least, and may indeed be the only one of its kind. If the testimony given by industry representatives at these hearings is correct, the import program now in effect amounts to a cash dole to independent refiners, by way of compensation for large-scale imports which serve the special advantage of the few big companies that own or control sources of foreign oil, as well as refineries and distribution systems in the United States.

Refineries in all parts of the United States are given quotas of foreign oil—and ration tickets good for the purchase of this cheap oil—though most of these refiners have never used foreign oil and cannot, as a practical matter, use foreign oil because of the freight cost from coastal points inland. It appears that cash markets for these ration tickets are in operation and inland refiners are selling their quotas to coastal refiners at prices ranging from between $1 to $1.25 per barrel. If the effect of this system is as it seems, namely to encourage independent refiners to trade a portion of their markets to the international oil companies in return for cash payments, then certainly the program is neither helping to maintain a vigorous competitive U.S. industry nor encouraging discovery and development of new sources of oil in the United States. Yet the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1958 was intended to serve both purposes.

There is little doubt that the serious plight of the U.S. crude oil industry is a direct result of the big company imports of foreign oil. Since this program was put into effect, the number of oil wells in the United States has declined steadily, and today only one-half of the oil drilling rigs in this country are in operation. In Texas, the country's largest oil producing State, producing wells are operating only 8 days a month. The result has been a loss of tens of thousands of jobs and a serious weakening of an industry in which the United States has previously led the world.

It is a sign of the future that only 14 college freshmen enrolled in petroleum engineering courses this spring, at the University of Texas, a leading center of training in the petroleum sciences. As late as the fall of 1957, the University of Texas was giving training to 134 freshmen in petroleum engineering.

I am confident that the subcommittee, under Chairman STEED, will make a fair and careful study of the present quota system, to make sure that this is the best system that can be reasonably devised in view of both our domestic and foreign obligations, and not just a system which confers undue favoritism on the few great international oil companies.

CASTRO'S RANSOM DEMAND

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Castro is a gangster of the lowest order. He is now adopting the tactics of the kidnap outlaws of the "Ma" Barker-"Machinegun" Kelly era. If he is successful with his present ransom demand, his success will set a precedent and model for every Communist gangster in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. We do not have enough bulldozers, tractors, or dollars in the United States to buy off every Communist thug and racketeer in the world.

With this ransom, Castro's prestige and military potential will be greatly strengthened. We should face reality and for once be practical and approach this shocking demand with commonsense. Castro can sell these tractors or exchange them for jet aircraft, missiles, and artillery. This deal might thus better enable him to bomb Miami, Mobile, and New Orleans. In the long run it could cost us thousands of lives on the beaches of Cuba and the lives of innocent civilians in the United States.

Our Government should forbid any equipment of any nature from leaving the shores of the United States to strengthen and support an avowed enemy. Our Government should go further and prevent with our Navy and Air Force any material from being shipped into Cuba from Russia, China, their satellites, or from misguided American sympathizers. Any arrangement with Castro will work to his advantage. This despicable Castro proposal could be a scheme to get more of his subversive agents into the United States.

At least I hope our State Department and Government will take no action to encourage and support this type of blackmail which strengthens our Communist enemies and will cost us more lives in the future.

MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, submission to Fidel Castro's demand for 500 bulldozers in exchange for the Cuban freedom fighters he now is holding in prisons, would constitute an abject surrender to the crudest form of blackmail and an abandonment of principles this Nation has held sacred since its founding.

In Tel Aviv at this moment another mass murderer—Adolf Eichmann—is on trial for the most heinous crime of all time. He, too, offered to free Jews held in the barbarous Nazi prison camps if he were given trucks in exchange. The Allies, acting on principle, refused to bow to Eichmann's blackmail attempt, even though his price was considerably less than that being demanded today by the paranoiac dictator of Cuba.

It long has been an established criminal fact that blackmailers do not abandon their odious demands upon acquiesence to their initial terms. Those who received Eichmann's demands knew this, and the American people and their Government should know it about Castro.

If Castro's ransom demands are met, there will be additional and more costly exactions. That this will be the course of his actions already has been indicated in his statements of yesterday, in which he threatened to cancel the bulldozers-for-prisoners offer if this Nation continues to refer to it as an exchange. Castro prefers to call his blackmail an indemnification and said that if an exchange is called for, it should concern political prisoners.

He is offering, as an alternative to the bulldozer exchange, to free prisoners held in Cuba for such men as Francisco—the Hook—Molina and other of his followers here, in Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Spain.

Molina, whom Castro refers to as a political prisoner and a martyr, it should be remembered, now is awaiting sentencing in New York for the killing of a 9-year-old Venezuelan girl in a restaurant there during a political fight.

If Castro succeeds in getting his demands, Mr. Speaker, we can expect to be subjected to more such blackmail and to further immoral and unjust conditions.

That this Government does not officially endorse the Castro ransom demand or the so-called exchange of political prisoners would in no way lessen American responsibility. We would be in the disgraceful position of passively endorsing an action by private citizens which is contrary to all codes of justice and of giving our tacit blessing to international blackmail.

Further, the meeting of Castro's demands would negate the very purpose of the invasion in which his prisoners were captured—the liberation of the Cuban people. We would be doing so because of the obvious fact that the tractors thus paid in tribute would be used to strengthen the one Communist fortress in this hemisphere and further stifle the hopes for a free and independent Cuba.

Only the naive or the purposely blind could believe that those who now suffer in Cuban prisons because of their efforts to overthrow the tyrannical rule of Fidel Castro were not willing to die, if necessary, to free their native Cuba.

To meet at this time the hysterical demands for the tools this oppressive and rabid dictator requires to further inter-Cuban freedom would be a dishonor to those who already have sacrificed their lives in the cause of freedom 90 miles to the south of us and would make the admittedly awkward and inept invasion attempt sanctioned by the White House even more ridiculous in the eyes of the world.

Although the American people historically have aided the oppressed and sought free captive peoples everywhere, our countenancing of the Castro blackmail would have an opposite effect in that it would prolong the period during which all Cubans must remain the slaves of communism. Such an action also would give even greater credence to communistic claims that ours is an opportunistic country completely lacking in principle.

No one, Mr. Speaker, appears to have proposed an exchange of our surplus grain, which is costing American taxpayers millions of dollars annually in storage costs alone, for the Americans who have been held prisoner by the Chinese Reds for 10 years. And most of these prisoners, it should be remembered, are missionaries whose only crime against the government in which they are held seems to have been that they were there when the Communists took over that hapless land.

But wheat can only be used to relieve hunger. It cannot aid tyranny and is not the price Castro demands. He needs weapons of a type he is not receiving from his Communist masters, but which he can use to further fortify Cuba and thus strengthen the bonds with which he now holds the Cuban people.

Those who now would bow to Castro's rabid demands, Mr. Speaker, should keep in mind that many of the men who landed on Cuban beaches in the abortive invasion attempt of last month gave their lives that Cuba might be free. Our surrender now would sully the memory of those whose lives were spent in this vain battle of independence.

In four short months, this Nation's prestige abroad has been lower almost to the vanishing point. It is to be hoped that we will not further assail our national image by kowtowing to a pint-sized dictator.

In 1797, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, who was our minister to the French Republic, made a statement which is familiar to all Americans. It was, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Actually, Mr. Pinckney's words were a bit stronger and were toned down because they were to be inscribed on his cenotaph in St. Michael's churchyard in Charleston, S.C. He said, "not one damned penny for tribute."

As strong as that was for the day and time, Mr. Speaker, I believe this Nation should be even stronger and more outspoken in its dealings with this, the most deranged criminal we have had to deal with in many years.

CASTRO THE BLACKMAILER

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will America, lulled in the sweet dream of peace, slumber too long, unaware of the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, until we awake to find our cause has been lost? The astounding news stories of this past weekend make me fearful that our desire to be humane, to be good, has blinded us to the real purpose of the Communists, destruction of the United States and domination of the world. How often must we recall this Red purpose, stressed by every Communist leader since Lenin, before our people recognize that they mean it? Yet, in the face of recent Communist aggression, in spite of the demonstration of Red bestiality as exemplified in Hungary, Tibet, and Cuba, we now have a national movement underway, approved, according to press statements, by the State Department, to submit to blackmail by Castro in order to help him build up his military and economic strength and further insure the success of a Communist satellite 90 miles from our coast.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to no man in caring for my fellowman. I, too, am imbued with humanitarian instincts, and I grieve deeply for those unfortunates now held prisoner by Castro. But, Mr. Speaker, we are at war—at war with a ruthless enemy who will show no mercy, will stop at nothing to accomplish the complete destruction of our country and its guarantees of freedom and individual liberty. These prisoners are the unfortunate victims of that war, just as millions of Jews were the victims of Hitler, and thousands of American boys were victims of the Nazi campaign to rule the world. We grieve for the prisoners of Castro, yes. We salute their bravery in their fight for freedom. But we betray them and ourselves if we now submit to coercion, to blackmail, in bringing about their release.

What effect will such a trade as proposed by Castro have on the peoples of other Latin-American countries? He will become a hero all over again to the misguided who refuse to recognize his real purpose and know only that he has been able to humble and humiliate this great Nation.

We cannot afford to give further aid and comfort to the enemy by helping to build up Castro. We dare not be blackmailed into bringing about a trade of heavy construction equipment for prisoners of war. Such a barter is morally wrong—trading human lives for pieces of machinery. Should we be so foolish as to enter into such a trade, it will not be many days until other twobit bandits and potential dictators will be seizing American tourists and holding them for ransom. Americans, who once were secure in the knowledge that wherever they traveled they were safe because of the strength of the United States and the guarantee that we would protect them, will become fair targets to a worldwide kidnapping ring.

Mr. Speaker, on October 20, 1960, the United States took action to prohibit shipment to Cuba "of all goods except certain nonsubsidized foodstuffs, medicine, and medical supplies which are permitted for humanitarian reasons." There has been no change in our relationship with Cuba to alter this decision made 7 months ago. The need for a complete embargo of shipments to Cuba is greater now than it was then because since that time, Castro has hurled defiance at the Western Hemisphere and has openly and completely set up a Communist state. To now give him, for

whatever reason, the heavy construction equipment he so badly needs, will enable him to strengthen his position in Cuba. It will not lead to peace, nor guarantee freedom for those it is intended to help. It will make more certain further demands by Castro, will endanger the lives and safety of all Americans traveling outside the borders of this country, could lead to the loss to communism of other Latin-American countries, and could well pave the way to war once this Communist stooge is able to complete the construction of jet airbases and missile sites for the convenience of Soviet-based military strength.

Hard as it will be for Americans to do, we must steel ourselves against the action now being proposed by some well-meaning citizens to raise by public subscription some $20 million ransom to pay to Castro. The Government must forbid the exportation of the heavy construction equipment Castro demands. We must serve notice that we do not deal with international gangsters on their terms and that we are ready, willing, and able to use the might of this Nation, if need be, to bring about the freedom of political prisoners held in defiance of international law and to protect our own citizens wherever they may be. If we can show unity of purpose in protecting ourselves and those who believe in freedom, we will be much more successful in dealing with Castro, the Soviet dictators, and any others who threaten the peace of the world and the liberty of mankind. To do less is to admit weakness and invite further aggression and the war we all hope may be avoided.

The President only recently stated that we will free Cuba. It may well be that in the end we will have to take such action through the sacrifice of American lives. If this be the case, how can we justify giving Castro the equipment he needs to strengthen his military might?

SOUTH VIETNAM AND LAOS

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, there is an ominous parallel between a recent statement made by Vice President JOHNSON and the speech of Dean Acheson as Secretary of State shortly before the Communist invasion of South Korea.

In this speech Acheson placed Korea beyond America's defensive perimeter. It was an invitation to trouble, and trouble came.

In Saigon the Vice President said he would not recommend that U.S. combat forces be stationed in South Vietnam. This, too, is an invitation to trouble.

Today nobody knows how far the United States will go, and the Vice President has added to the uncertainty.

U.S. combat forces are the most effective deterrent to aggression, and we should publicly offer such forces to South Vietnam without delay.

Another Laos is in the making. Supplies and training are not enough. Sooner or later, we will be forced to send combat forces to a war already in progress, or once more be identified with failure.

In South Vietnam and other similar trouble spots, we should first determine whether the local population really wishes to resist Communist takeover. If not, forget them. Do not waste resources on them.

If the will to resist does exist, we should offer to station U.S. combat forces.

It is a fact of history that no country where the U.S. Army has been stationed has ever been attacked.

If we had kept forces in Korea, that debacle might have been avoided. Marines effectively stabilized the situation in Lebanon. West Berlin would not be free today except for the presence of American troops.

The presence of U.S. forces under U.S. command has always proved to be the most effective deterrent to aggression.

We should adopt a firm policy, announce it to the world and stick by it. Today nobody knows how far we will go. This uncertainty has led to trouble in the past and will do so again.

Perhaps the people of Laos had no desire to resist the Communist takeover. In any case, we spent a lot of money there, we are identified in the eyes of the world with the resistance which failed, and Communist takeover of a large portion of that country has already been accomplished.

In Cuba, we used no combat forces, but we are identified with the invasion failure nonetheless. All this delights the Communists and disturbs the rest of the world. Our role in the Cuban invasion was incredibly inept and hardly calculated to quicken the spirit of freedom-loving people.

Now we are confronted with the problem in South Vietnam. Another Laos seems to be in the making. We seem to be following the same ill-fated road. Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON made it clear in Saigon last week that he will not recommend to President Kennedy that American combat forces be stationed there.

By announcing to the world that our combat forces will not be stationed in South Vietnam, we invite trouble. South Vietnam forces may be superior, but they cannot head off determined Communist forces indefinitely. Sooner or later, we will be forced to commit our own combat forces or be identified once more with failure.

If we commit our forces in advance of Communist action, the attack will probably never come. If we get into the fight in midstream, we may trigger a big war.

President Kennedy may be concerned lest his party be identified once more as the war party.

If so, he should realize that the uncertainty and weakness of present policy is far more apt to bring war than an open, strong, and consistent policy of containment. No patriotic American will ever criticize President Kennedy for commiting combat forces to protect freedom-loving people from aggression. Every patriot has the right and duty to criticize ineptitude and the too-little too-late policies which invite aggression.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit while the House is in session today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ONE-WAY STREET IN TRADE AND AID PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave from the House, I have been permitted to speak for 30 minutes, and as usual—I am discussing a matter that is paramount in my opinion.

I have tried to call to the attention of the House that we are traveling down the one-way street in trade and aid programs. I have attempted to show that under our reciprocal trades agreements, we have allowed American industry and the American workingman to be victimized by foreign producers of consumer goods.

I have tried to explain that many of the items that are sold are not identified to the consumer with their country of origin.

When I made this statement I was challenged by certain authorities who said that this was a figment of my imagination.

On January 3, I introduced legislation concerning all foreign produced goods to be so advertised and so marketed in these United States.

I have presented today facts and information to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which I will make part of my talk here today showing the brazen, bald-faced attempt by foreign producers through their American mouthpieces to undermine American industry and American production by disguising foreign products in such a manner that their state of origin is not known to the consumer.

I sincerely believe that the time has come for this Congress to stop living in the past—to awaken to the dangers inherent in our present status, and to read behind the headlines in the world's many disorders and disruptions such as Cuba, Laos, Vietnam, Belgian Congo, and the entire African Continent, as well as our neighbors to the south, the Latin American countries.

Unless we become realistic and practical in the operation of this Government and its economy, I can assure this Congress that the one-way street we are on will lead us into political oblivion.

The following is a true copy of all material and references to the above statements:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1961.

MY DEAR COLLEAGUE: On January 3, 1961, in the very beginning of this session I introduced H.R. 1149, copy of which is attached hereto.

Like many other American buyers, I was disturbed by the fact that I could purchase consumer goods in any of the public marketplaces not knowing the country of their origin.

Although we do have Federal regulations and some Federal law pertaining to this subject, it appears that in the phase of advertising either at the local point of sale or through the recognized advertising medium, newspapers, radio, television, and other media, there is no restrictive covenant to protect an unsuspecting purchaser who does not particularly want to buy a foreign-made product and even if he were inclined to buy same, he would at least like to know where it was made.

I call this to your attention because this day, May 19, I have received a letter that shows this practice of selling unmarked or unidentified foreign-origin products has gone beyond the local housewife consumer stage that invaded the area of primary procurement in the manufacturing process so essential to our well-being.

I quote from a letter without quoting the names of the companies involved for reasons you can understand:

"On another subject, I am attaching to this letter a copy of the most recent glaring example of what we are up against in the tool steel business in regard to imports. This new threat is described in the attached copy of a letter from the ---------- Co. to one of our very good customers in the Detroit area. This is an offer from a Japanese firm to send material into this country at substantially lower prices, but I would like to call particular attention to paragraph 3 of page 2 of this letter. I call attention to the portion which reads as follows:

" 'The high-speed steel bars will not bear any markings except heat numbers, unless you desire your own marks or colors to be placed on the steel. If, for any reason, it is necessary for us to rebox the material here upon arrival in order to obscure the fact of Japanese origin, this can be arranged at a nominal charge.'

"This, John, is a barefaced statement of illegal intent to evade the law requiring marking or to change the marking once the material has arrived here. What other evidence do we need that we are in an all-out war for survival?

"Thanks again for your many courtesies and your helpfulness.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOE,
"*President.*"

Copies of the correspondence between the offering foreign importer and the American buyer are attached for your information.

I would appreciate an opportunity to appear before your committee if, in your wisdom, this legislation merits your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN H. DENT,
Chairman.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) no person shall disseminate, or cause to be disseminated, any advertisement—

(1) by the United States mails, or in commerce by any means, for the purpose of inducing, or which is likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of any article manufactured or otherwise produced in any foreign country, or

(2) by any means, for the purpose of inducing, or which is likely to induce, directly or indirectly, the purchase of any article manufactured or otherwise produced in any foreign country,

unless such advertisement contains words stated or printed in such manner to as give actual notice to prospective purchasers of the country of origin of such article.

(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) of this section shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for a term of not more than one year, or both.

MAY 5, 1961.

DEAR MR. ———: It was a pleasure to talk with you again on Thursday after a lapse of several years. This letter will attempt to acquaint you with our company and some of its objectives in the field of imported specialty steels.

Our company has been formed very recently and is supported by responsible people who are interested in building a sound organization for the attainment of long-range objectives in the specialty steel markets. While it is possible for us to obtain European specialty steels, we are placing our emphasis upon five excellent Japanese sources, with whom we have exclusive long-term contracts executed in Japan. The quality of their products is fully equal, and in some respects superior, to the domestic or European product. This is so primarily because their mills and equipment are much more modern, their laboratories are ultra-modern, even to the extent of being equipped with electron-beam microscopes, X-ray, reflectoscope, and spectrographic equipment.

The tool steel plant has the reputation for being the leader in its field in Japan. It is fully equipped with melting flexibility consisting of various sizes of electric arc furnaces; electric induction furnaces, and vacuum furnaces for the production of the higher alloys. Your orders will be produced to AISI standards for chemistry, tolerances in inches, finish, etc., or to your own proprietary specifications. You can incur no risks on quality. If the steel, when inspected by your personnel upon arrival at your plant, proves to contain any defective material, we will accept it for our account, subject to the mill's examination—identical to domestic mill procedure.

Your company is famous for the production of a superlative, high-precision product, and as such, you are familiar with the Japanese reputation for precision workmanship. This same concern for precision is carried over into their art for making high quality specialty steels.

Delivery to your plant should average approximately 105/120 days from the date of order placement. The high speed steel bars will not bear any markings except heat numbers, unless you desire your own marks or colors to be placed on the steel. If, for any reason, it is necessary for us to rebox the material here upon arrival in order to obscure the fact of Japanese origin, this can be arranged at a nominal charge.

We plan to carry stocks in the Detroit area and elsewhere, but whether or not an operation such as yours could depend upon local stocks in the variety of specific sizes, quantities, grades, and finishes you require would involve further discussion at your convenience.

Our prices are quoted to you on a "f.o.b. delivered" basis to your plant and include all charges, ocean freight, insurance, duty, and inland freight.

We are enclosing a chart showing some of the high-speed grades and prices for your study. You can readily appreciate that these substantial savings will range from approximately $800 to over $3,000 per ton in these grades on the high-speed base price alone. In your particular size requirements, the domestic high-speed size extras in hot-rolled and/or cold drawn are also high, on which you have a further saving of 20 percent.

These considerable savings could be utilized by your company in several ways, at no compromise with quality, namely:

1. Use a higher grade alloy to make a better blade at the same selling price.
2. Obtain more steel in a given grade from same total raw material cost as from present domestic sources.
3. Increase your overall gross profit with no change in selling prices.
4. Buy a cold-drawn or ground bar instead of hot-rolled and reduce present straddle-milling losses through less wastage, etc.
5. Offset competition from entering your field through patent expirations, etc.

From my limited experience with your operations, the above options immediately came to mind. You can undoubtedly think of many more.

The only real test is for you to submit an order for sufficient quantities in various sizes, grades, and finishes to give our product a realistic production run and try it in the field. Once this is behind you, we believe you and your customers will be more than satisfied. We should have your complete specifications, tolerances, and finish desired.

There is one other type of finish commonly employed in Japan, and that is a sand-blasted finish on hot-rolled annealed flats or rounds. This removes practically all scale, and there is no extra for this operation, if desired. This should be to your advantage in milling if you are now using hot-rolled material.

We have tried to convey as much information as possible; however, should you wish us to call at your plant for further details or discussion, we shall be glad to oblige.

For obvious reasons we wish you would treat all of the pricing information enclosed as intended only for you and your other company officials.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

Pricing information

Grade	Domestic base	Our base (per pound)	Your savings on base		Plus your savings on domestic H.S. extras (percent)
			Per pound	Percent	
M-2	$1.345	$0.9415	$0.4035	30	20
M-15	2.665	1.8655	.7995	30	20
M-30	1.545	1.0815	.4635	30	20
M-34	1.83	1.2810	.5490	30	20
M-36	2.32	1.6240	.6960	30	20
T-2	2.005	1.4035	.6015	30	20
T-4	2.545	1.7815	.7635	30	20
T-5	2.915	2.0405	.8745	30	20
T-6	4.33	2.8145	1.5155	35	20
T-8	2.485	1.7395	.7455	30	20
T-15	2.77	1.9390	.8310	30	20

Congressman JOHN H. DENT, 21st District of Pennsylvania, today called upon the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to give consideration to H.R. 1149, a bill introduced in January by the Congressman which would make it mandatory that all foreign made products be so advertised as to leave no doubt as to the country of origin.

The Congressman said "that many Americans innocently buy foreign made goods which are deliberately mislabled and misbranded with a definite plan in mind to fool the American consumer."

DENT quoted from a letter from an importer of Japanese steel which recognizes that it is to their advantage to hide the origin

of the product. The following was quoted from the letter:

"The high-speed steel bars will not bear any markings except heat numbers, unless you desire your own marks or colors to be placed on the steel. If, for any reason, it is necessary for us to rebox the material here upon arrival in order to obscure the fact of Japanese origin, this can be arranged at a nominal charge."

The Congressman labeled this "a barefaced statement of illegal intent to evade any existing law requiring markings or even worse, to create a condition of collusion between an American purchaser and a foreign exporter after the material had arrived by destroying all evidence of its Japanese origin.

"When my committee on imports starts its hearings, I fully intend to subpena the parties participating in such schemes and plots in order to expose how far this country has traveled on the 'one-way street of economic self-destruction'," concluded DENT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SELDEN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FRAZIER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter in his special order of today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SHORT and to include extraneous matter, notwithstanding the fact it exceeds the limit and is estimated by the Public Printer to cost $425.25.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WHITENER), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGARTY.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 22, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6100. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 24, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

941. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on review of the military assistance program for Taiwan, as administered by the Military Assistance Advisory Group (MAAG) in Taiwan; to the Committee on Government Operations.

942. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 31, 1961, submitting a report together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a survey of Red River at Garland City, Ark. This investigation was made in response to an item in section 203 of Public Law 86-645, approved July 14, 1960, which calls for an immediate study to be made of emergency bank protection along Red River in the vicinity of Garland City (H. Doc. No. 167); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with three illustrations.

943. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving increases in limitations on administrative expenses in the amount of $245,000 for the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (H. Doc. 168); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

944. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended"; to the Committee on Agriculture.

945. A letter from the executive secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting the 47th Annual Report of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, pursuant to law approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

946. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting a combined statement of income and expenditures of the American National Red Cross for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960, pursuant to 33 Stat. 599, as amended by 67 Stat. 173; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

947. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department on the activities and transactions of the Administration for the period January 1 through March 31, 1961, pursuant to the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4109. A bill to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7249. A bill to terminate the retailers excise tax on cosmetics and other toilet preparations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7250. A bill to amend section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, so as to provide rates of 1½ cents a pound for publications mailed for delivery within the county of publication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7251. A bill granting the consent of Congress to interstate compacts for the development or operation of library facilities and services; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7252. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7253. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7254. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7255. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7256. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Act of 1933 to establish an International Home Loan Bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 7257. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of 300 years of operation of hotels in America, and the 50th annual convention of the American Hotel Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7258. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Fort Bowie National Historic Site in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 7259. A bill to waive section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Louisiana, Lafayette Division, holding court at Lafayette, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.J. Res. 432. Joint resolution designating the first day of July in each year as Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKEN:

H. Con. Res. 315. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on representation of China in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOW:

H. Res. 308. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H. Res. 309. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Joint Memorial No. 11 of the Legislative Assembly of Oregon, relating to the development of the domestic mining and minerals industry.

which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H.R. 7260. A bill for the relief of Kazimierz Sadkowski Kwast; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 7261. A bill for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Demetrios Flessas and two children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 7262. A bill for the relief of Mr. Fernando Pereira Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PFOST:

H.R. 7263. A bill for the relief of Orsolina Cianfione Iallonardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 7264. A bill for the relief of M. C. Pitts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

157. By Mr. CASEY: Petition of 100 citizens of Houston, Tex., for the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

158. By Mr. STRATTON: Resolution of the common council of the city of Oneonta, N.Y., opposing S. 1197, S. 1089 and H.R. 5937, legislation setting forth amended criteria to be used with respect to the rates where competition between carriers of different modes of transportation is involved; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 23, 1961

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, whose mercy and patience, like the wideness of the sea, are never exhausted by Thy erring children.

In the midst of toiling days, as the fever and fret of these clamorous times take their toll of our spirits, we are grateful for quiet arbors where we can look out and up to the hills of our help and where sighs and sobs turn to songs of deliverance from panic and defeat.

In Thy light may we bring to the bar of judgment the motives which have betrayed our highest quests, the methods which have failed us and the values which have cheated us. Earthen vessels though we are, give us a part in making the crooked things straight and earth's deserts blossom as the rose.

We ask it in the name of the Master who makes all things new. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THURMOND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 22, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS BY OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Office, for the quarter ended March 31, 1961; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Executive Secretary, Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the calendar year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY DEPARTMENT OF STATE

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on tort claims paid by that Department, during the calendar year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 11

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the development and utilization of Oregon's abundant mineral resources have always been and must continue to be bulwarks of this State's economy, providing not only a source of employment and income but also a sound base for revenue and a substantial market outlet for agricultural and manufactured products in mining areas; and

Whereas this basic and essential mining industry has for several years been confronted with adverse economic conditions so severe that many major mining enterprises in this State have been forced out of business and many others are being reduced to the status of marginal operations; and

Whereas the cause of this serious predicament of our mining industry can be traced to governmental policy that stimulates the development and exploitation of foreign mineral resources and permits relatively free access to this low-cost foreign production by U.S. markets; and

Whereas this policy, if continued, will not only threaten the economic survival of Oregon's mineral industries but will also impose a serious handicap on our Nation's capacity for providing from domestic sources the basic requirements for national defense; and

Whereas the executive department of the Federal Government and both major political parties, as well as the Conference of Western Governors, have officially recognized the necessity for maintaining a domestic mining industry that is sufficiently progressive and vigorous to assure a minerals mobilization base adequate for national preparedness and security; and

Whereas past efforts by the Federal Government to alleviate the depressed conditions that prevail in various segments of the domestic mining industry by means of short-range programs and temporary expedients, such as stockpiling and quota limitations, have proved ineffective and inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate jointly concurring:

1. The 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully urges that the Federal Government in the national interest foster and encourage:

(a) The development of an economically sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

(b) The orderly development of domestic mineral resources and reserves necessary to assure satisfaction of industrial and security needs.

(c) Mining, mineral and metallurgical research to promote the wise and efficient use of our mineral resources.

2. The 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon recommends that this policy be implemented by:

(a) More effective enforcement of the antidumping laws.

(b) The imposition of adequate duties on metal and mineral imports, to be applied only if the price of such metals and minerals falls below the level that is required to maintain a sound and healthy domestic mining industry.

3. The secretary of state shall send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment:

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope (Rept. No. 285).

By Mr. ENGLE, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1462. A bill to amend the act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 286).

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 162) providing for a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, and I submit a report (No. 284) thereon.

Mr. President, this bill is cosponsored by my able colleagues, Senators SCOTT, PROUTY, KEFAUVER, BIBLE, KUCHEL, BUSH, KEATING, SCHOEPPEL, FONG, BRIDGES, YOUNG of North Dakota, BENNETT, COOPER, CASE of New Jersey, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, THURMOND, RANDOLPH, SMATHERS, CARROLL, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, and SPARKMAN.

Mr. President, I do not believe there is an informed citizen in this country today who does not recognize the problem which confronts us in the form of this traffic in obscenity.

I doubt whether a single Member of the Congress is unaware of this blight upon our moral structure, because many Americans are aroused and are demanding that action be taken to bring an end to these activities which are enriching these merchants of filth.

Mr. President, we have known for a considerable time that this is not a small change operation. Many months ago the former Postmaster General of the United States reported that the peddlers of pornographic and obscene literature were operating a racket which was bringing in half a billion dollars yearly.

And today we look at the report of our FBI Director, Mr. Hoover, telling us of the increased crime rate. We need not even look into the detailed reports to know this is true—we merely have to pick up any edition of a Washington newspaper detailing the acts of lawlessness in our own Capital City.

I recognize that a variety of causes can be given for the increases in crime. But I submit that we can readily find that one source of the troubles that have been unleashed upon us can be traced back to the degenerating effect the pornographic, obscene, and salacious materials being circulated thoughout this country have had on immature minds.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that a U.S. Senator must take the floor and discuss these reprehensible, immoral activities by people who have no respect for decency. But it would be more unfortunate to ignore this threat to the very moral fiber of our people.

My colleagues who join with me in sponsorship of this bill do not pretend to be experts on how to solve this problem. But we are all agreed that a starting point has to be made so that we can proceed promptly and in the right direction toward ending these practices which constitute a danger to every American home and family.

It is our belief that this measure does offer that starting point by presenting us with the opportunity to bring together dedicated citizens who can closely scrutinize every possible step that can be taken consistent with our Constitution and to recommend a course of action that will firmly and fairly end this despicable racket.

Mr. President, I request that excerpts from the report of the Committee on Government Operations be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the excerpts from the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The excerpts from the report are as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 162 provides that a commission will be established to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious materials and to (1) seek means of improving coordination between various levels of Government to suppress such traffic; (2) endeavor, through the cooperation of various information and communication media, to inform the public about the problem and to further the objectives of the Commission; and (3) report its findings and recommendations as to what legislative, administrative, or other forms of action needs to be taken to combat the traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

S. 162 is identical to S. 3736, a bill introduced in the 86th Congress which was favorably reported by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate (S. Rept. 1749) and passed by the Senate.

This legislation has been introduced in an effort to bring about a workable and effective program to fight the traffic in obscene and noxious matters and materials. While considerable interest has been shown by Congress and by the general public in the serious problems involved in the distribution of pornographic literature, no single effective piece of legislation has been adopted which deals a crippling blow to this insidious industry.

Many religious, patriotic and service organizations and groups have been continually urging Congress to take action on this serious and menacing problem. The Congress has taken note of the widespread harm done to youth and others through the dissemination of lewd, obscene and noxious materials, and a number of bills have been introduced in Congress on the subject.

Twenty-three additional Senators have joined in the sponsorship of this bill. It is the belief of the sponsors that the best approach to the problems resulting from the distribution of obscene materials would be through the establishment of a Commission which could thoroughly examine all the facets of the problems and could then recommend steps to be taken both by legislative bodies and by private groups and citizens to meet the threat posed by the dissemination of obscene matters.

It is the belief of the sponsors that this small group of experts, drawn from a wide area of interests, could make recommendations and initiate action more effectively.

The Commission is to be made up of persons from several walks of life who have knowledge of the seriousness of the problem and the many legal problems connected with the suppression of the traffic in obscene materials.

The Commission will study the need for any new Federal regulations for controlling such traffic, as well as the general need for State laws or local ordnances for this purpose.

Efforts will be made by the Commission to alert the public, especially the parents and school-age children, about the seriousness of this pernicious traffic and give guidance to the public in suppressing the distribution of such lewd and obscene matters, or in bringing the purveyors of filth into court.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

The following Government agencies will have representatives on the Commission: The Post Office Department, the Department of Justice (including the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There will also be one Member from the House of Representatives and one Member of the Senate on the Commission.

Public members are selected from groups knowledgeable on this question both from a moral aspect and from a law enforcement aspect. These will include three clergymen, a secondary school official, a State attorney general, a county or city prosecutor, and a county or city law enforcement officer.

Representatives from the information and communications media will sit on the Commission. One member will come from the moving picture industry, one from the radio-television industry, and one from the publishing industry.

This group will represent all segments of the population concerned with the problems resulting from distribution of noxious and obscene matters and materials.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1939. A bill to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CANNON:

S. 1940. A bill for the relief of Wing-Jing Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1941. A bill to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 1942. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1943. A bill for the relief of Hajime Sumitani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. RANDOLPH):

S. 1944. A bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with respect to the method of enforcement and to provide certain additional sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCNAMARA when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. DOUGLAS):

S. 1945. A bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide, in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico, protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States, and other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCARTHY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARROLL:

S. 1946. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act relative to hearings concerning the lawfulness of new rate schedules; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CARROLL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1947. A bill for the relief of Annemarie Herrmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATING THE MANUFACTURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF HABIT-FORMING BARBITURATE AND AMPHETAMINE DRUGS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 21, United States Code, to place under Federal regulation certain activities in connection with the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturates and amphetamine drugs.

In the entire field of juvenile crime, I do not think there is a more disturbing problem than the use of drugs by our young people. As chairman of the Subcommittee To Investigate Juvenile Delinquency, I have examined investigative reports that tell the frightening and revolting story of youths drawn to these drugs. The subcommittee's files reveal a record of robbery and violence, of sex crimes and complete abandonment of moral standards.

Unfortunately, these are not isolated incidents. The misuse of amphetamine and barbiturate drugs has grown to such an extent that it now must be considered a national problem.

Efforts by Federal authorities to curb the illicit drug trade present a study in frustration. It is obvious that the underworld has been diverting supplies from legitimate channels of distribution. The drugs are then redistributed to local pushers for sale to anyone looking for a "kick." Although the method of operation is well known, attempts to crack down on this aspect of the drug traffic have met little success.

The failure to eliminate this activity is due primarily to inadequate laws. The purpose of this bill is to remedy the existing situation by providing authorities with three tools essential to effective drug control. First, the recording and listing provisions will enable authorities to locate and close the primary sources of illicit distribution; second, the extension of Federal control to all areas of unauthorized drug traffic will enable officials to clamp down on previously immune activity; third, the increased penalties for sales to juveniles will emphasize the serious nature of the crime and make this trade less appealing.

The present difficulty arises because amphetamines and barbiturates are not classified as narcotics and therefore not subject to the stringent narcotic laws. The problem of regulation is made even more difficult by the lengths to which youths will go to obtain the drugs.

A prime example of this is the case of amphetamine inhalators which, prior to 1959, were available without prescription. The inhalator was designed to relieve nasal congestion and was commonly sold in drugstores throughout the country. It was soon discovered that the amphetamine core of the inhalator could be used to produce a "hopped-up" sensation. This was accomplished simply by removing the core, dissolving its active chemical ingredient in a water solution, and injecting it into a vein.

The effects of uncontrolled distribution were amply demonstrated in Kansas City, Mo. There, sales of the inhalator, mostly to youths, were averaging 1,000 a week above normal. The natural result was a marked increase in juvenile crime and arrests.

That the inhalator incident is simply one form of widespread drug misuse is readily supported by daily newspaper stories. Even more common are reports of crimes involving the misuse of benzedrine, dexedrine, and other so-called "pep pills," and various forms of barbiturates referred to by illegitimate users as "goof balls."

I should like to give just a sample from our files for the month of April relative to this problem.

A New York Post story of April 6, 1961, reported the uncovering of a youthful drug ring in New Jersey. The four youths said, and I quote from the article—

> In the last year they had consumed from 2,000 to 3,000 pills and about 2,000 bottles of cough medicine * * *. One officer said the combination of the pills and cough medicine was worse than marijuana. "On this stuff," he said, "sometimes they don't remember for 24 hours. They really go rammy."

Latest reports on this case indicate there may be as many as 50 youths involved with this one drug ring. In referring to this investigation, the police said:

> These kids are mixing barbiturates with pep pills. They combine this with as many as 4 to 6 grains of codeine at a clip. I don't know how they keep from killing themselves. That's enough to stop their hearts.

A New York Times article of April 7, 1961, reports that—

> State and local police at Woodbridge, N.J., broke up a criminal operation that had been supplying thousands of teenagers with illicit drugs.

State narcotic investigators estimated that about 10 pushers, mostly teenagers, had been peddling stimulants such as benzedrine at about $1 a tablet. These pushers reportedly worked establishments which catered to teenagers, especially dance halls where teenage dances were held.

Mr. President, it is difficult to believe that a society so conscious of public health and morality would allow this situation to continue. The measure I now propose would close a major gap in our present law and would be a decisive step toward the elimination of this ugly business.

Under existing controls the Food and Drug Administration has been issuing orders banning the sale of specific drugs without prescription. Now most amphetamine and barbiturate drugs are sold only by prescription. An order by the Food and Drug Administration, however, is basically a stopgap measure. It falls short of restrictive legislation in two areas:

First, the order is aimed primarily at legitimate retail outlets and does not provide effective sanctions against bootlegging and underworld distribution.

Second, in a criminal action the law enforcement officers are forced to proceed under criminal provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and consequently face evidentiary problems which make conviction difficult.

These problems of proof occur because the crime, under existing law, is the unauthorized sale or distribution of drugs which have traveled in interstate commerce. But it is the unauthorized sale or distribution itself, whether interstate or intrastate, that is wrong, and that does the damage. This is clearly pinpointed in the bill.

From a realistic standpoint, it is this provision that puts teeth into the law. A violator caught in the act of an unlawful sale could not escape conviction because of a legal loophole; that is, the unauthorized sale or distribution of these drugs now would be a Federal crime whether or not the drug is proved to have traveled in channels of interstate commerce.

The bill contains two listing and recording provisions which would not be unduly burdensome and which would be of great assistance to authorities in tracing contraband drugs.

The first provision requires manufacturers, compounders, and processors of the drugs to list their names and places of business with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The second provision requires every person, including manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers who sell, deliver, or otherwise dispose of the drugs, to keep a record of the kind and quantity involved including the name and address of the person to whom the drug is sold. An exception is made for duly licensed medical practitioners.

I want to emphasize at this point that these are not licensing provisions that subject the manufacturers' and distributors' right to engage in business to arbitrary Federal discretion. The sole purpose is to provide authorities with an effective means of locating and eliminating the primary sources of illicit distribution.

In addition, and of prime importance, is the provision that would amend the criminal sanctions by providing stiffer penalties for those offenders selling to minors. It increases the fine and imprisonment from $1,000 and 1 year to $2,000 and 2 years with more severe penalties for second offenders.

The provisions of this legislation will in no way hamper the legitimate, legal, medical use of these drugs, but its stiff penalties will discourage blackmarketing and under-the-counter sales. Increased penalties for sales to juveniles will make trafficking in these drugs undesirable as a sphere of activity for the underworld, thereby eliminating what is often the first step in the long downhill journey into drug addiction. For thousands of young people this could easily be the first ounce of prevention.

If the amphetamine or barbiturate habit is not out-and-out drug addiction, it is the other end of the same stick. Its prolonged use softens an already weak moral fiber and predisposes the young mind to seek out the more subtle "kicks" of the deadly "hard" narcotics. All too often this leads down the dead-end road to habituation.

It is the high cost of the drug habit—often approaching $100 a day—that generates crime waves. There are no rules or laws to the down-and-out addict trying to feed his habit. He has no restraint. He will rob and steal, often murder accidentally, in his frenzied attempts to obtain drugs. I say accidentally because the one thing the addict is afraid of most is the commission of a serious crime and the possibility of long-term incarceration. This means prolonged separation from the one thing he wants most—narcotics.

Passage of this legislation would be an effective way to remove from the easy access of juveniles drugs which, when abused, frequently entice them into the disasters of criminal drug addiction, a major part of our youth crime problem.

Let the introduction of this bill serve as notice to those distorted and degenerate characters who trade in human misery that the Federal Government is strengthening its efforts to clean up this whole rotten business.

It is with these very strong feelings—which I am certain are shared by many of my colleagues—that I commend this bill to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1939) to protect the public health by regulating the manufacture, compounding, processing, and distribution of habit-forming barbiturate and amphetamine drugs, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. WILEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1958

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators DOUGLAS, MORSE, and RANDOLPH, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958.

The bill is designed to provide the Secretary of Labor with the investigating and enforcement powers needed to accomplish the purposes for which Congress passed the original act in 1958.

The amendments proposed here are substantially the same provisions as were passed by the Senate in 1958.

The attached letter from the President to the Vice President, the letter from Secretary Goldberg to the President, and the explanatory statement from the Department of Labor present the purposes of the bill in detail.

I ask unanimous consent that the letters and statement be printed in the RECORD, together with the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letters, and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1944) to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958, introduced by Mr. MCNAMARA (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act Amendments of 1961."

SEC. 2. The first line of section 3 of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is amended by striking out "(a)".

SEC. 3. Paragraph (1) of section 3 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "to" after the word "communicated".

SEC. 4. Paragraph (9) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(9) The term 'State' includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and Outer Continental Shelf lands defined in the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331–1343)."

SEC. 5. Section 3 of such Act is further amended by striking out paragraph (11) and adding the following new paragraphs 11, 12, and 13:

"(11) The term 'industry or activity affecting commerce' means any activity, business or industry in commerce or in which a labor dispute would hinder or obstruct commerce or the free flow of commerce and includes any activity or industry 'affecting commerce' within the meaning of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, as amended, or the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

"(12) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Labor.

"(13) The term 'party in interest' means any administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, or employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or a person providing benefit plan services to any such plan, or an employer any of whose employees are covered by such a plan or officer or employee or agent of such employer, or an officer or agent or employee of an employee organization having members covered by such plan."

SEC. 6. Subsection (a) of section 4 of such Act is amended by striking out everything after the word "if", by inserting a "—" after the word "if", and adding the following new paragraphs:

"(1) such plan is established or maintained by any employer or employers engaged in commerce or in an industry or activity affecting commerce or by any employee organization or organizations representing employees engaged in commerce or in any industry or activity affecting commerce or by both; or

"(2) the income of such plan is claimed to be exempt from taxation under the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by reason of its nature or activities, or the costs of or contributions to such plan are claimed as allowable deductions in computing taxable income under such provisions."

SEC. 7. Paragraphs (3) and (4) of subsection (b) of section 4 of such Act are amended to read as follows:

"(3) such plan is administered by an organization which is exempt from taxation under the provisions of section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and is administered as a corollary to membership in a fraternal benefit society described in section 501(c)(8) of such Code or by organizations described in sections 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) of such Code; or

"(4) such plan covers not more than twenty-five participants."

SEC. 8. Subsection (a) of section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu of the following: "Such description and such report shall contain the information required by section 6 and 7 of this Act in such form and detail as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe and copies thereof shall be executed, published, and filed in accordance with the provisions of this Act and the Secretary's regulations thereunder. No regulation shall be issued under the preceding sentence which relieves any administrator of the obligation to include in such description or report any information relative to his plan which is required by sections 6 or 7. Notwithstanding the foregoing, if the Secretary finds, on the record after giving interested persons an opportunity to be heard, that specific information on plans of certain kinds or on any class or classes of benefits described in section 3(a)(1) and (2) which are provided by such plans cannot, in the normal method of operation of such plans, be practicably ascertained or made available for publication in the manner or for the period prescribed in any provision of this Act, or that the information if published in such manner or for such period would be duplicative or uninformative, the Secretary may by regulations prescribe such other manner or such other period for the publication of such information as he may determine to be necessary and appropriate to carry out the purpose of this Act."

SEC. 9. Subsection (b) of section 6 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any change in the information required by this subsection shall be reported to the Secretary at the time the plan files with the Secretary the annual report required by section 7."

SEC. 10. Subsection (b) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the word

"summary" immediately preceding the word "statement".

SEC. 11. Subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the word "summary" immediately preceding the word "statement".

SEC. 12. Subparagraph (C) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out "total fund" and inserting "total funds," by striking out "by reason of being an officer, trustee, or employee of such fund", and by striking out "listed at their aggregate cost or present value, whichever is lower" and inserting in lieu thereof "valued as provided in subparagraph (B)."

SEC. 13. Subparagraph (D) of paragraph (1) of subsection (f) of section 7 of such Act is amended by striking out the words "by reason of being an officer, trustee, or employee of such fund".

SEC. 14. Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding thereto the following new subsection (g):

"(g) If some or all of the benefits under the plan are provided by an insurance carrier or service or other organization, such carrier or organization shall certify to the administrator of such plan, within ninety days after the end of each policy year, the information necessary to enable such administrator to comply with the requirements of this Act."

SEC. 15. Section 9 of such Act is amended by striking out subsections (d) and (e) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) The Secretary or his designated representative may investigate and gather data respecting matters subject to this Act, and may enter and inspect such places and such records (and make such transcriptions thereof), question such persons, and investigate such facts, conditions, practices, or matters as he may deem necessary or appropriate to determine whether any person has violated any provision of this Act, or which may aid in the enforcement of this Act. The Secretary may report to interested persons or officials concerning the facts required to be shown in any description or report required by this Act and concerning the reasons for failure or refusal to file such a description or report or any other matters which he deems to be appropriate as a result of such an investigation.

"(e) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this Act, the provisions of section 307 (relating to the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, records, and documents) of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended (16 U.S.C. 825f), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Secretary or any officers designated by him.

"(f) Whenever it shall appear to the Secretary that any person is engaged in any violation of the provisions of this Act, he may in his discretion bring an action in the proper district court of the United States or United States court of any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, to enjoin such acts or practices, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or restraining order shall be granted.

"(g) The United States District Courts and the United States courts of any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, to restrain violations of this Act."

SEC. 16. (a) Such Act is further amended by renumbering sections 10, 11, and 12 as sections 13, 14, and 15, respectively, and by adding the following new sections to the Act:

"REPORTS MADE PUBLIC INFORMATION

"SEC. 10. The contents of the descriptions and reports filed with the Secretary pursuant to this Act shall be public information, and the Secretary may publish any information and data which he obtains pursuant to the provisions of this Act. The Secretary may use the information and data for statistical and research purposes, and compile and publish such studies, analyses, reports, and surveys based thereon as he may deem appropriate.

"RETENTION OF RECORDS

"SEC. 11. Every person required to file any description or report under this Act shall maintain records on the matters required to be reported which will provide in sufficient detail the necessary basic information and data from which the documents may be verified, explained or clarified, and checked for accuracy and completeness, and shall include vouchers, worksheets, receipts, and applicable resolutions, and shall keep such records available for examination for a period of not less than five years after the filing of the documents based on the information which they contain.

"RELIANCE ON ADMINISTRATIVE INTERPRETATIONS AND FORMS

"SEC. 12. In any action or proceeding based on any act or omission in alleged violation of this Act, no person shall be subject to any liability or punishment for or on account of the failure of such person to (1) comply with any provision of this Act if he pleads and proves that the act or omission complained of was in good faith, in conformity with, and in reliance on any written interpretation or opinion of the Secretary, or (2) publish and file any information required by any provision of this Act if he pleads and proves that he published and filed such information in good faith, on the description and annual report forms prepared by the Secretary and in conformity with the instructions of the Secretary issued under this Act regarding the filing of such forms. Such a defense, if established, shall be a bar to the action or proceeding, notwithstanding that (A) after such act or omission, such interpretation or opinion is modified or rescinded or is determined by judicial authority to be invalid or of no legal effect, or (B) after publishing or filing the description and annual reports, such publication or filing is determined by judicial authority not to be in conformity with the requirements of this Act."

(b) The table of contents of the first section of such Act is amended by striking out the last three lines and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 10. Reports made public information.
"SEC. 11. Retention of records.
"SEC. 12. Reliance on administrative interpretations and forms.
"SEC. 13. Effect of other laws.
"SEC. 14. Separability of provisions.
"SEC. 15. Effective date."

CRIMES

SEC. 17. (a) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"§ 224. Offer, acceptance, or solicitation to influence operations of employee benefit plan.

"Whoever, being an administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, or employee of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or a person providing benefit plan services to any such plan, or an employer any of whose employees are covered by such a plan or officer or employee or agent of such employer, or an officer or agent or employee of an employee organization having members covered by such a plan, receives or agrees to receive any money or thing of value because of, or with intent to be influenced with respect to, any of his actions, decisions, or other duties relating to any question or matter concerning such plan, or any person who directly or indirectly gives or offers, or promises to give or offer, any payment or delivery of money or other thing of value prohibited by this section, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both: *Provided*, That this section shall not prohibit the payment to or acceptance by any person of usual salary or compensation for necessary services performed in the regular course of his duties as such administrator, officer, trustee, custodian, counsel, agent, or employee of such plan, employer, or employee organization, or person providing benefit plan services to such plan.

"As used in this section, the term 'any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan' means any such plan subject to the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

(b) The analysis of chapter 11, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 201 thereof, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"224. Offer, acceptance, or solicitation to influence operations of employee benefit plan."

(c) Chapter 31 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"§ 664. Theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plan.

"Any person who embezzles, steals, or unlawfully and willfully abstracts or converts to his own use or to the use of another, any of the moneys, funds, securities, premiums, credits, property, or other assets of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, or of any fund connected therewith, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"As used in this section, the term 'any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan' means any such plan subject to the provisions of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

(d) The analysis of chapter 31, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 641 thereof, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"664. Theft or embezzlement from employee benefit plan."

(e) Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, as amended, is amended by adding a new section captioned and reading as follows:

"§ 1027. False statements and concealment of facts in relation to documents required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act.

"Whoever, in any document required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act (as amended from time to time) to be published, or kept as part of the records of any employee welfare benefit plan or employee pension benefit plan, makes any false statement or representation of fact, knowing it to be false, or knowingly conceals, covers up, or fails to disclose any fact the disclosure of which is required by such Act or is necessary to verify, explain, clarify, or check for accuracy and completeness any report required by such Act to be published, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

(f) The analysis of chapter 47, title 18, United States Code, immediately preceding section 1001, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"§ 1027. False statements and concealment of facts in relation to documents required by the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act."

SEC. 18. The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is further amended by substituting the term "Secretary" for the term "Secretary of Labor" wherever the latter term appears in such Act.

SEC. 19. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect January 1, 1962.

The letters and statement presented by Mr. McNAMARA are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 19, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Since the enactment of the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 we have had an opportunity to study its operation and effect. This has disclosed several serious deficiencies. I am transmitting herewith for appropriate consideration by the Congress a draft bill designed to correct these deficiencies.

The proposed legislation will give the Secretary of Labor the investigative and enforcement authority which he needs to implement the legislation and make it effective. In addition, it will authorize the Secretary of Labor to provide uniform interpretations and clarify existing ambiguities.

The Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act is designed to prevent repetition of abuses and irregularities in the administration of employee benefit plans. I believe these amendments are necessary to carry out that purpose.

The enclosed letter from the Secretary of Labor and the explanatory statement attached to the proposal describe the measure in detail.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a bill to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 and a statement explaining its purpose and effect. The need for enactment of this legislation at the earliest possible date is clear.

You will recall that the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act was enacted in 1958 after investigations and hearings lasting several years had shown that disclosure legislation would be most desirable both as a remedy in cases where abuses already exist in particular employee benefit plans and as a preventative against possible future irregularities. The Senate in April 1958 adopted a broad welfare and pension plan reporting bill, S. 2888, 85th Congress, of which you were one of the sponsors. This measure would have authorized the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations, to make investigations, and to bring injunctions to enforce the bill's provisions. Willful violations carried a heavy penalty and embezzlement, kickbacks, and false entries in and destruction of books and records, would have been made felonies.

However, the House committee passed a much milder bill which was essentially agreed to by the conference committee. It was evident at the time to supporters of disclosure legislation, such as the proponents of S. 2888, that the measure was weak and unsatisfactory and would have to be reappraised in the future. Nearly 2½ years experience under the act have now amply demonstrated that it is not achieving either its disclosure or its reporting objectives in a satisfactory manner.

The draft bill is designed to remedy the act's deficiencies and to make certain necessary clarifications in its language. Its principal substantive provisions are as follows:

1. The bill would empower the Secretary of Labor to make authoritative interpretations, and good faith compliance therewith and protect administrators. Great confusion has resulted from the act's failure to authorize any Government agency to provide uniform interpretations.

2. The bill would give appropriate investigative and enforcement power to the Secretary of Labor, including the power to bring enforcement litigation. The failure of the act to furnish him with any such authority has left the Department of Labor virtually powerless to uncover abuses respecting reports called for by the statute. The act's reliance on the concept of self-policing, with individual employees or participants expected to achieve compliance through private litigation or by other means, has proved wholly unsuccessful and inadequate.

3. The bill would make embezzlement from the funds of a plan a felony. The same would be true with respect to kickbacks and payments to influence certain actions in connection with plan operations. This would remedy the act's failure to deal with these flagrant abuses.

4. The bill would also require supporting records to be kept and retained for 5 years.

5. By deleting the word "summary" in certain places, the bill would remedy the act's shortcoming which requires only "summary" statements of many important aspects of the plans' financial operations. This invites concealment of many abuses by simply filing sketchy or incomplete reports.

These and other changes, of a clarifying nature, are described in detail in the attached explanatory statement.

A provision requiring the bonding of persons handling funds and assets of these plans is being prepared and will be forwarded to the appropriate committee in the near future. As you know, the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act contains a provision in this area.

Yours sincerely,

_____,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE WELFARE AND PENSION PLANS DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1958

This bill is designed to put teeth into the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act of 1958 so that its reporting and disclosure purpose can be effectively achieved.

As enacted in 1958 this law fell far short of the measure developed by its original sponsors.

A series of congressional and other investigations in the 1950's had clearly shown that legislation at the Federal level was necessary to protect all those who have an interest in the honest management of the billions of dollars invested in private employee welfare and pension benefit plans in this country.

The original bill developed before enactment in 1958 called for broad and effective registration, reporting and disclosure of all types of such plans with adequate penalties and administrative and enforcement powers in the Secretary of Labor.

As finally enacted, all effective penalties and administrative and enforcement powers had been deleted.

Experience under the act since its enactment has amply proved that in its present form the law is a woefully inadequate instrument for fulfilling its purpose. Neither its reporting or disclosure objectives are being achieved.

For example, no agency of the Government has been authorized to provide uniform or authoritative interpretations of the act. Nor has any agency of the Govenment any investigative or enforcement authority, leaving the Government powerless for all practical purposes to uncover abuses or do anything about them. In this respect, the act's reliance upon suits by individual employees is completely unrealistic. Experience and commonsense demonstrate that most employees do not have the financial resources or expertise to bring the necessary private litigation to compel compliance with such a law. Furthermore, as employees, they are in a position to be intimidated and made subject to reprisal if they should venture to bring such a suit, thus effectively discouraging any such action. The failure of the act to provide any effective criminal penalties for dealing with the most flagrant abuses, such as embezzlement and kickbacks, has also contributed to the present act's serious weakness.

The present bill is thus designed to make the substantive changes which are essential if the law is to be at all effective, as well as to provide certain technical amendments which will be very helpful in establishing a workable disclosure system.

The substantive changes which the bill would make are as follows:

1. The word "summary" would be deleted from section 7(b) of the act in order to insure that abuses cannot be concealed by the simple expedient of making the financial report extremely sketchy or incomplete. A corresponding deletion would be made in section 7(f)(1)(B). The act presently provides that the annual reports shall contain, among other things, a summary statement of the plan's assets, liabilities, receipts, and disbursements. Such a provision makes it possible to conceal abuses with respect to a number of important aspects of the financial operations of those plans.

2. Protection would be extended to the beneficiaries of more plans by amending the coverage provisions of section 4 of the act to include all employee welfare and pension benefit plans claiming tax exemption instead of, as at present, only plans having an interstate character.

3. Under a new section 12, plan administrators and others affected by the act would be permitted to place full reliance upon the opinions and report forms of the administering agency, thereby correcting another defect in the present provisions of the act. This provision of the bill, patterned on section 10 of the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947, would enable persons who have acted in good faith in compliance with and in reliance on interpretations of the Secretary of Labor, to plead such reliance as a defense when charged with violation of the act.

Likewise, if they can show that they published and filed the required description and annual reports on the forms prepared by the Secretary of Labor, in conformity with his instructions accompanying such forms, they have a defense if charged with failing to publish or file any information required by the act. The establishment of such a plea would protect the person from liability or punishment for the actions in question even though those actions were later determined not to have been in conformity with the act.

4. The enforcement deficiencies present in the act would be remedied by conferring appropriate investigatory power, including that of subpena, upon the Secretary of Labor. It would also authorize the Government to seek injunctions compelling compliance with and restraining violations of the act. Compliance presently rests solely on court proceedings brought by individual employees. These provisions are essential for an adequate enforcement program.

5. Further protection would be afforded by new criminal provisions to deal with the flagrant abuses of embezzlement and kickbacks. The embezzlement or unlawful conversion of money or any other assets of these plans would be made a Federal felony.

In addition, plan beneficiaries would be further protected by making certain conflicts of interest in connection with such plans a Federal crime. Under this provision administrators, officers, and employees of plans, persons who service such plans, and officers and employees of employers and unions whose employees or members are covered by these plans, would be prohibited from receiving monetary or other inducements in the nature of bribes, to influence

their actions or decisions respecting important operations of the plan. The giving of any such inducement would likewise be prohibited.

6. Along the lines of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, the bill would require plans to make and retain supporting books and records.

7. The Secretary of Labor would be given appropriate authority to make rules and regulations.

8. Benefits under many plans are provided by insurance companies or service or other organizations. Much of the information required by the plan administrator is therefore in the possession of a carrier or other organization and must be obtained from it by the administrator. The bill would require any such organization to certify the necessary information to the plan administrator within 90 days after the end of the policy year, so that the administrator may meet the act's reporting requirements.

9. Experience gained since the enactment of the statute has shown that certain technical amendments are also necessary, as follows:

(a) A provision is added to section 5(a) to relieve administrators of plans which utilize an insurance carrier or service organization to provide benefits, from certain reporting difficulties under the present act. For example, information relating to benefits provided through insurance is generally available on the basis of the contract year, but section 7(b) appears to require information respecting benefit payments to be furnished on the basis of the plan's reporting year. In many instances these 2 years are not coincidental with the result that many insured plans, through no fault of their own, have difficulty meeting the act's reporting requirements.

(b) Paragraph (2) of section 7(d) in its present form has also proved burdensome, particularly to the Government. This provision requires every plan which section 7(d) covers to attach to its annual report a copy of the financial report of the carrier or service organization. Since some organizations service as many as several hundred plans, it is evident that the files of the Labor Department will be encumbered with a multitude of unneeded copies of the same report of the same organization or carrier.

(c) The two defects outlined above would be remedied by the proposed amendment to section 5(a) included in the bill. This section deals with the duty of plan administrators to disclose and report information. New language would be added to the section to take care of situations where specific information required by the statute cannot, in the normal method of the plan's operations, be practicably ascertained or made available for public inspection in the manner or for the period prescribed by any provision of the act. It also would take care of situations where the information if published would be duplicative or uninformative. The amendment would thus authorize the Secretary of Labor, where he finds after hearing that such a situation exists, to prescribe by regulations such other method or such other period for the publication of the particular information as may be appropriate to carry out the act's purposes.

(d) An amendment to subparagraph (C) of section 7(f)(1) of the act would conform the basis for valuation of securities thereunder to that specified under subparagraph (B).

(e) Section 6(b) of the act requires that all amendments to a plan's organization or procedures must be incorporated in the description published by the administrator. It fails, however, to prescribe any time limit for doing this. The bill would require that any change in the information required to be reported to the Secretary must be reported when the plan files its next annual report.

(f) The bill would broaden the term "party in interest" used in subparagraphs (C) and (D) of section 7(f)(1), by eliminating certain language from these subparagraphs and adding a broad definition of the term to section 3. The persons included within the term would correspond to those to whom the new conflict-of-interest provision applies which is included in section 17(a) of the present bill.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators HUMPHREY, YOUNG of Ohio, and DOUGLAS, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide, in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico, protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Mexican farm labor program—Public Law 78—was established as a temporary measure in 1951 at the time of the Korean conflict. Under the law the U.S. Government has entered into agreements with the Republic of Mexico to regulate the conditions under which the Mexican agricultural workers can be employed in the United States. The contract provides a number of benefits for Mexican nationals: Payment of transportation costs, free housing which must meet minimum standards, a guarantee of work opportunities for at least three-fourths of the workdays in the contract period, insurance to cover major occupational hazards, and wage guarantees. The Mexican Government has set a minimum of 50 cents per hour for Mexican nationals employed under contract for work in this country.

It is important to recall that Public Law 78 is an enabling act. It is a voluntary program. It does not impose any obligations on any farmer, unless he chooses to use the program, and in general it does not carry any penalties except denial of the use of the service.

On the other hand, it is reasonable and just that the good offices of the U.S. Government should not be used as an employment agency which would either exploit foreign workmen or would undercut wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of domestic workers. There is general agreement that the conditions of the Mexican nationals have considerably improved under the program.

The question now being raised is whether the growth and size of the program has had an adverse effect on domestic workers.

Public Law 78 has been extended on four occasions by the Congress, the most recent being at the close of the last session of Congress. At that time agreement was reached on the floor of the Senate for a 6-month extension, to December 31, 1961, with the understanding that at this session public hearings would be held and a careful review made of the program.

As Members of the Senate know, on May 11 the House of Representatives approved a 2-year extension of Public Law 78—H.R. 2010—by a vote of 231–157, after amendments backed by the administration and incorporated in the Coad bill—H.R. 6032—had been defeated.

The bill which I am introducing today was drafted to implement the administration's recommendations with respect to modification and extension of the Mexican farm labor program. Its provisions are essentially the same as those of the Coad bill, previously introduced in the House.

The purpose of the amendments proposed in the bill is to provide more specific guidelines for the Department of Labor in carrying out the original intent of Congress. Section 503 of Public Law 78, as adopted in 1951, states:

> No worker recruited under this title shall be available for employment in any area unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed, (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed, and (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

Over the past 10 years the Department of Labor has issued a number of regulations to implement this directive of the Congress. Yet there has been extensive testimony from many sources that the Mexican farm labor program has had an adverse effect on wages and working conditions of domestic workers. In 1959 a special group of consultants was appointed by Secretary Mitchell to study the program. The members were former U.S. Senator Edward Thye, Dr. Rufus B. von Kleinsmid, chancellor of the University of Southern California, Glenn E. Garrett, chairman of the Texas Council of Migrant Labor, and Msgr. George Higgins, director of the social action department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The consultants agreed that adverse effect on domestic workers had taken place, and they recommended against extension of the program unless Public Law 78 were substantially amended so as to prevent adverse effect, insure utilization of the domestic work force, and limit the use of Mexicans to unskilled seasonal jobs. In the last session, Secretary of Labor Mitchell opposed extension of the program unless it were amended.

The new administration is also firmly opposed to extension of Public Law 78 unless it is accompanied by substantial reforms. Secretary of Labor Goldberg stated recently:

> Evidence accumulated by the Department of Labor proves beyond doubt that the mass importation of Mexican labor has had, and is having, an adverse effect on the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of U.S. farmworkers.

Assistant Secretary of Labor Jerry R. Holleman pointed out the difficulties in implementing the existing law in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies and Manpower of

the House Committee on Agriculture, March 17, 1961. He stated:

In spite of the diligent efforts of the Department of Labor and its affiliated State employment security agencies to give meaning and effect to these provisions, evidence has been accumulating which shows that the Mexican labor program has adversely affected the position of domestic agricultural workers. Studies of the Department of Labor demonstrate that wages in the majority of areas where foreign workers are employed have not kept pace with the rise of farm wage rates nationally. The reasons for this are inherent in the present provisions of the law. There is no indication of what specific standards are to be used to overcome the automatic adverse effect of the pressures of an inexhaustible supply of labor on the operations of a free labor market. All too often we have found ourselves in litigation challenging the validity of the Department's policies and criteria to prevent such adverse effect. Even today a suit challenging the validity of a policy which would require the payment of wages which would produce earnings as low as 50 cents an hour is pending in the courts.

Mr. President, I do not believe that it is necessary to impute motives to or to place the blame on any one group for the adverse effects resulting from this program. I do not suggest that the Department of Labor has been derelict in its duty or that the growers using Mexican nationals are unprincipled and indifferent to human needs. Nor do I believe that the Congress in 1951 could have foreseen all the consequences of this program. But I believe that we have a responsibility, after 10 years of experience with it, to review the program most carefully and to provide the necessary guidelines to improve it.

In making this decision, I believe that there are a number of facts which we must keep in mind.

First. The Mexican farm labor program expanded rapidly. In 1952, fewer than 200,000 Mexican nationals entered the United States, but from 1956 through 1959 the number was over 400,000 annually. In 1960, the number declined to 315,000 but this appears to represent increased automation, particularly in the harvest of cotton, rather than decreased proportionate reliance on Mexican nationals—see table I.

Second. The expansion of the Mexican farm labor program has taken place during a period of declining employment of hired farmworkers—see table II. Rural unemployment and underemployment have increased, and the underemployment of rural people has been estimated as the equivalent of 1,400,000 fully unemployed workers. Table III—from House Report 274, page 3—shows the seasonal composition of the farm labor force in 1960 on a monthly basis, including the number of Mexican nationals.

Third. The impact of the Mexican farm labor program is not spread evenly. About 54 percent of the U.S. farms use no hired labor, and the farms using Mexican nationals constitute about 2 percent of the U.S. farms. However, the farms using Mexican nationals are heavily concentrated, with about 12 percent of the farms in California, Arizona, and New Mexico making use of such workers. Of all the farms using Mexicans, about 70 percent are in two States: Texas and California. Mexican nationals are employed in some 1,000 crop areas in 1960 in several States, but in a majority of these States their number was not significant—see table IV.

The bill which I am introducing would extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years, until December 31, 1963. It incorporates the administration's recommendations for providing the Department of Labor with more and clearer standards designed to prevent the program from having adverse effect upon the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of domestic farmworkers. The provisions are similar to those proposed in the past, with the addition of a new section to establish a wage formula. I ask unanimous consent that a memo from the Department of Labor explaining the reasons and effects of this section be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAGE AMENDMENT

Section 505 of the proposed amendment would require employers who wish to employ foreign Mexican workers and are offering less than average wages to—

1. Bring their wages, in yearly steps of not more than 10 cents an hour, up to the State or national farm wage average, whichever average is lower.

(Employers would in no case be required by the amendment to raise their wage offers by more than 10 cents per hour in any one year or to raise their wage offers to more than the lesser of the state average farm wage or the national average. Where the wage offer thus determined is less than the wage already prevailing in the area for the activity, the prevailing wage must, of course, be offered and paid.)

The reasons for the amendment are as follows:

1. It is necessary in order to fulfill the congressional intent, expressed when Public Law 78 was first enacted, that Mexicans not be used where their employment would adversely affect the wages of U.S. farmworkers. Despite vigorous efforts of the Department of Labor, it is now clear that adverse effects have been substantial in many areas.

2. Farm wages in activities and areas using braceros have lagged materially behind farm wages generally. In some cases wages have actually declined in the face of labor shortages met by use of braceros. In many areas the wage offered has remained at 50 cents per hour, unchanged for almost 10 years. In this respect, the Mexican labor programs seems clearly to have adversely affected wages of U.S. workers. It seems also to have created unfair competition for farmers in the great majority of areas where farm wages have risen more normally in response to labor stringencies, often to $1 per hour or more.

3. The only visible solution to these adverse effects, if Public Law 78 is to be continued, is to assure that Mexican labor availability is made dependent upon upward wage adjustments of the type that would occur if foreign workers were not used.

4. The rate at which such adjustments in wage levels are required should be decided by the Congress rather than by the Executive.

5. The formula proposed would simply cause wages in these activities to keep pace with farm wages generally. No employer willing to offer average wages would be deprived of needed braceros by this amendment.

The effect of the amendment. In the States where the wages offered by farmers using Mexican labor have continued to advance as would be expected in a normal labor market, the effects of the amendment will be negligible. Thus in States like California and Wisconsin, where the prevailing wage rates for employers authorized to use Mexicans are already above the national average farm wage rate of 97 cents per hour in many areas, this amendment would require no revision upward of the wage level.

The amendment's effects will be felt most in those States and areas in which wages have been most severely affected by the Mexican program. Thus in areas where wages in the activities employing Mexicans have failed to increase during the last 8 or 10 years, a significant increase would be necessary in order to "catch up" with the average State wage. In order to avoid wage increases so sharp as to be unnecessarily disruptive in such States, the amendment specifically limits the amount of wage increase required in any 1 year to 10 cents per hour.

A table presenting in more detail the effect of the amendment on wages in each of the States employing Mexicans at an hourly wage rate is attached (table V).

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statistical tables referred to in my statement be printed in the RECORD and that the bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

The tables ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

TABLE I.—*Total number of foreign workers contracted or admitted to the United States for temporary agricultural employment, by year, 1951–60*

Calendar year	Total	Mexican	British West Indies [1]	Canadian	Japanese [1]	Filipinos [1]	Calendar year	Total	Mexican	British West Indies [1]	Canadian	Japanese [1]	Filipinos [1]
1951	203,640	192,000	9,040	2,600	.....	.....	1956	450,850	445,197	7,563	6,700	390	.....
1952	210,210	197,100	7,910	5,200	.....	.....	1957	452,205	436,049	8,171	7,300	652	33
1953	215,321	201,380	7,741	6,200	.....	.....	1958	447,513	432,857	7,441	6,900	315	0
1954	320,737	309,033	4,704	7,000	.....	.....	1959	455,420	437,643	8,772	8,600	400	5
1955	411,966	398,650	6,616	6,700	.....	.....	1960	334,729	315,846	9,820	8,200	863	0

[1] Due to carryover of workers from year to year, the number admitted is usually less than peak employment.
Employment of Filipinos remained relatively constant throughout the year.

Source: Administrative reports, Bureau of Employment Security; figures for Canadians, Japanese, and Filipinos are approximations.

TABLE II.—*Average number of workers employed on farms, United States, 1951–60*

[Thousands]

Year	Total	Farm operators and unpaid family workers	Hired workers	Year	Total	Farm operators and unpaid family workers	Hired workers	Year	Total	Farm operators and unpaid family workers	Hired workers
1951	9,546	7,310	2,236	1955	8,364	6,347	2,017	1958	7,525	5,570	1,955
1952	9,149	7,005	2,144	1956	7,820	5,899	1,921	1959	7,384	5,459	1,925
1953	8,864	6,775	2,089	1957	7,577	5,682	1,895	1960	7,118	5,249	1,869
1954	8,639	6,579	2,060								

Source: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Statistical Reporting Service, Farm Labor.

TABLE III.—*Seasonal composition of farm labor force in 1960*

[Thousands of workers]

Month	Total farm labor force [1]	Farmers and family labor [1]	All hired workers [1]	Seasonal workers				Month	Total farm labor force [1]	Farmers and family labor [1]	All hired workers [1]	Seasonal workers			
				Total [2]	Local [2]	Domestic migrants [2]	Mexican nationals [2]					Total [2]	Local [2]	Domestic migrants [2]	Mexican nationals [2]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
January	5,006	4,139	867	343	233	42	65	July	8,416	5,569	2,847	1,200	784	293	118
February	5,305	4,321	984	328	218	38	60	August	8,344	5,694	2,650	1,112	716	263	128
March	5,994	4,763	1,231	309	205	34	60	September	9,120	6,283	2,837	1,282	848	251	168
April	7,151	5,507	1,644	417	284	52	70	October	8,283	5,965	2,318	1,316	823	256	227
May	7,725	5,758	1,967	766	543	114	97	November	6,593	5,075	1,518	743	463	119	152
June	8,271	5,627	2,644	1,225	867	222	128	December	5,206	4,285	921	405	260	58	75

[1] From Farm Labor, published monthly by U.S. Department of Agriculture.
[2] From Farm Labor Market Developments, published monthly by U.S. Department of Labor. Entries in col. (5) include a few foreign workers not shown in cols. (6), (7), and (8).

TABLE IV.—*Employment of Mexican nationals—Selected data*

	Number of farms using Mexican workers, 1959		Peak employment of Mexican workers, 1959 [1]	Domestic-worker employment on date of peak employment of Mexican workers, 1960			Number of farms using Mexican workers, 1959		Peak employment of Mexican workers, 1959 [1]	Domestic-worker employment on date of peak employment of Mexican workers, 1960	
	Number of farms	As percent of all farms		Total	In areas and activities in which Mexicans were employed [2]		Number of farms	As percent of all farms		Total	In areas and activities in which Mexicans were employed [2]
Total, United States	48,788	1.3	234,171	1,136,720		Wisconsin	213	.2	1,004	9,759	5,222
						Tennessee	65	(3)	659	37,347	6,391
Total, all States using Mexicans	48,788	2.1				Indiana	46	(3)	612	6,852	1,208
						Missouri	200	.1	469	29,220	29,220
Texas	22,310	9.8	103,680	205,794	178,814	Utah	211	1.2	426	6,849	3,949
California	12,176	12.3	73,430	150,150	124,850	Oregon	15	(3)	349	20,410	1,395
Arkansas	2,641	2.8	31,296	67,360	58,214	Illinois	3	(3)	234	11,205	817
Arizona	923	12.8	14,312	24,763	17,475	South Dakota	76	.1	229	508	288
New Mexico	1,888	11.9	11,257	3,684	1,004	Kentucky	9	(3)	179	20,272	1,621
Michigan	3,921	3.5	11,151	66,546	17,426	Iowa	10	(3)	126	19,462	144
Colorado	2,060	6.2	6,539	14,230	8,359	Nevada	27	1.1	121	605	174
Montana	749	2.6	2,563	8,606	2,793	Minnesota	21	(3)	97	4,888	2,212
Nebraska	562	.6	2,310	5,429	2,282	Washington	(4)	(4)	60	37,919	1,840
Georgia	102	.1	1,264	57,837	10,302	North Dakota	13	(3)	56	9,427	302
Wyoming	536	5.5	1,213	4,328	2,623	Kansas	5	(3)	22	41,478	1,503

[1] Since peaks occur at different dates, items in this column are not additive.
[2] Less than 0.05 percent.
[3] No Mexican nationals employed in 1959.
[4] Less than 0.5 percent.
Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security.

TABLE V.—*Proposed wage standards for Mexican labor program indicators of impact*

State [2]	Average hourly rate without room and board, USDA, 1960	Hourly wage rates paid U.S. workers in activities in which Mexicans are employed			State [2]	Average hourly rate without room and board, USDA, 1960	Hourly wage rates paid U.S. workers in activities in which Mexicans are employed		
		Under present law [1]		Under proposed amendment, lowest rate for employers authorized to use Mexicans in 1963 [3]			Under present law [1]		Under proposed amendment, lowest rate for employers authorized to use Mexicans in 1963 [3]
		Lowest rate for employers authorized to use Mexicans	Most common rate for employers authorized to use Mexicans				Lowest rate for employers authorized to use Mexicans	Most common rate for employers authorized to use Mexicans	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Arizona	$0.97	$0.70	$0.70	$0.90	Minnesota	$1.10	$0.75	$0.75	$0.95
Arkansas	.73	.35	.50	.70	Missouri	.99	.50	.50	.70
California	1.23	.75	1.00	.95	Nebraska	1.10	.85	.85	[4].97
Colorado	1.09	.65	.75	.85	Nevada	1.24	.75	.75	.95
Illinois	1.10	.75	.75	.95	New Mexico	.85	.60	.60	.80
Indiana	1.06	.75	.80	.95	Tennessee	.63	.50	.50	.63
Kansas	1.12	.85	.85	[4].97	Texas	.78	.40	.50	.70
Kentucky	.82	.50	.50	.70	Utah	1.19	.75	.75	.95
Michigan	1.07	.75	.85 and 1.00	.95	Wisconsin	1.09	.80	1.00	[4].97

[1] Based upon U.S. Department of Labor surveys to determine the prevailing wage.
[2] The States in which Mexican nationals are employed at hourly wage rates.
[3] Rates for 1963 are shown here because, with a 2-year extension of the program, that is the year in which Congress would be reviewing the program.
[4] 97 cents was the average hourly farm wage rate for the Nation in 1960. In 1963, the pertinent figure (the average for 1962) will, of course, be different, probably somewhat higher. Between 1959 and 1960, the average hourly farm wage rate rose 2 cents per hour.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk through Thursday next for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1945) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide, in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico, protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States, and other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 502(2) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows: "(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses incurred by it under this title, except salaries and expenses of personnel engaged in compliance activities, in amounts not to exceed $15 per worker; and".

SEC. 2. Section 503 of such Act is amended by changing the comma at the end of clause numbered "(2)" to a period, deleting the word "and" and clause numbered "(3)", and substituting the following in place thereof: "As an additional means of carrying out his responsibilities under this section, the Secretary may, in order to provide such active competition in the labor market as is necessary to assure that wages and working conditions of domestic workers are not adversely affected, limit the number of foreign workers who may be employed by any employer."

SEC. 3. Sections 504 through 509 of such Act are renumbered sections "506" through "511" respectively; the reference to "section 507" in section 508, renumbered as section "510", is changed to section "509"; and the following new sections "504" and "505" are inserted after section 503:

"SEC. 504. No workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer—

"(1) unless the employer has made reasonable efforts to attract domestic workers at terms and conditions of employment reasonably comparable to those offered to foreign workers and is furnishing such terms and conditions to domestic workers in his employ;

"(2) for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship, or

"(3) for employment involving the operation of power driven machinery, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship.

"SEC. 505. (a) No workers recruited under this title shall be made available to any employer or permitted to remain in the employ of any employer unless the employer offers and pays to such workers wages equivalent to the average farm wage in the State in which the area of employment is located, or the national farm wage average, whichever is the lesser: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this paragraph a wage offer equivalent to 10 cents per hour above the highest wage rate prevailing during the last previous season in which workers recruited under this title were employed in the area and in the activity involved, shall be deemed to fulfill the requirements of this paragraph: *Provided further,* That in no event shall such workers be permitted to be employed by any employer who is paying domestic workers less than he offers workers recruited under this title for the activity in the area.

"(b) The determination of the average farm wage in a State and the national farm wage average required in (a) above shall be made by the Secretary of Labor, after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture. In making these determinations, the Secretary of Labor shall consider, among other relevant factors, the applicable average farm wage rate per hour for workers who do not receive board and room, or such other appropriate information and data as may be available."

SEC. 4. Paragraph (1) of section 507 of such Act, renumbered as section "509" is amended by changing the comma after the words "Internal Revenue Code, as amended" to a period and deleting the remainder of the paragraph.

SEC. 5. Section 509 of such Act, as amended, renumbered as section "511", is amended by striking "December 31, 1961" and inserting "December 31, 1963."

UNJUSTIFIED INCREASES IN NATURAL GAS PRICES

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act. Under the terms of this bill, no rate increase for an interstate natural-gas pipeline company could become effective until it received the approval of the Federal Power Commission.

Many bills have sought to alleviate the hardships imposed upon consumers and distributing companies by the piling of rate increase upon rate increase in the gas industry. These bills have usually sought to prevent a second increase from becoming effective until an initial application has been approved. Other bills propose to lengthen the permissible period suspension from 5 to 12 or more months. I wholeheartedly support such proposed legislation. I do so even though I know these attempted solutions are merely compromises and at best palliatives.

Even though I support such bills, I am convinced that we would do better to face this issue head on. I urge a return to the fundamental and time-honored principles upon which effective rate regulation has in the past depended. The underlying theory of effective rate regulation has been the law's recognition of the fact that public utility rates are the result of hammering out the basic facts in a hard-fought adversary proceeding. Once a decision has become final, it should stand until it has been demonstrated that changed conditions have made it unfair.

Under the existing laws, the Federal Power Commission cannot suspend rate increases for more than 5 months. This has allowed natural gas pipelines to file enormously padded applications for increased rates, to put those rates into effect, and to collect great sums of money from the consumers. This money is then used by the pipeline company as though it were the pipeline's own equity capital. I do not think the fact that the pipelines have used unjustified rate increases as a source of equity capital can be seriously challenged. Nor can forcing consumers to supply capital for a utility be defended.

A report of the Federal Power Commission showed that between July 1, 1949, and March 1, 1960, in the cases disposed of by the Commission, pipeline companies had collected $522,073,400 annually in increased rates. But when the Commission was able to dispose of the cases, these companies were entitled to retain only $310,828,100. Thus, the natural gas consumers had, during each of the 11 years covered by the study, supplied the pipelines with $211,245,300. The pipelines were able to use this huge sum as equity capital. Even though the pipelines were eventually required to repay this capital with interest at 6 percent, their common stockholders received a significant windfall.

All of the pipelines have been complaining for years that the return of 11 to 12 percent for common stock equity capital is niggardly. But even if we assume that the return on equity capital be limited to 10 percent, the rate increase process enables the company to receive this $211 million of capital per year at 6 percent instead of 10 percent. Consequently, there is a saving of 4 percent in interest cost—all of which benefits the common stockholder, and the common stockholder only. The existing rate procedures have enabled the common stockholders of the pipeline companies to gain $8,440,000 a year at the expense of the consumers. During the 11 years covered by the study, perhaps $90 million has thus been taken from the consumer for the benefit of the common stockholder.

I think that every pipeline company is entitled to fair treatment, just as I think everyone else in business is entitled to fair treatment. But the consumers of natural gas are also entitled to fair treatment, and I think that it is time that we in the Congress see that the consumers do get fair treatment.

The pipeline companies apply for increases to which they know they are not entitled. Every Senator from a State in which natural gas is consumed can parallel the experience of the people of Colorado. But let me cite as an example of the lack of fundamental fairness in dealing with the consumer the cases of Colorado Interstate Gas Co. The Federal Power Commission challenged the fairness of this company's rates. As a result, there was a hard-fought battle which ultimately ended in a decision by the Supreme Court of the United States on March 28, 1955. By that decision the Commission was upheld upon every contested point. But even before that case could be decided, Colorado Interstate had applied, September 2, 1953, for an increase in rates amounting to $6,508,000 a year. The purported justification of this increase was a challenge to the very principles upon which the Supreme Court had just found the Commission to be right and the company to be wrong. This new rate proceeding was not decided until December 30, 1958. But in those 5 years that the rates were effective, the company collected $31,625,000

from its customers. On February 1, 1955, the company applied for another increase, amounting to $10,269,000 annually, and on July 1, 1957, for a still further increase amounting to $3,135,000 annually.

None of these applications were decided until December 30, 1958. By that time the representatives of the consumers had been exhausted, and a compromise settlement was reached.

While the settlement required the consumers to pay at least $20 million more than the examiner, after careful study of the record, had found to be fair, the cases were settled. But in the meantime, consumers had been forced to pay to the company a total in excess of $75 million on rates which had never received the sanction of the Commission, and which the astute businessmen who operate Colorado Interstate must have known they could never establish as fair and just.

Illustrations such as this—and they could be multiplied many times—strengthen my belief that the time for compromise is past. I think the time has come to return to the basic principle that the pipelines should not be permitted to collect a single cent from their customers until they have demonstrated that the proposed rate is lawful. Anything less than firm adherence to this principle is a compromise which permits consumers to be victimized by unjust exactions.

My bill proceeds upon that principle. It is right in theory, and it is right in fact.

I know that it will be argued that the regulatory lag may cause unjustified injury to the pipelines. I can conceive that there may come a time when some pipeline company may fairly be entitled to an increase in rates, and may ask only for that to which it is fairly entitled. If that time should come, the proposed bill would empower the Commission, after hearing all of the facts, to make the new rates retroactively effective to the filing of the application. In considering the question of ultimate fairness, we should keep in mind that the pipelines are wholesalers, dealing with distributing companies whose financial responsibility is equal to that of the pipelines.

The traditional justification for allowing rates to be placed in effect under suspension arises from the fact that the distributing companies are dealing with many customers, some of whom may die, some may move, some may terminate the service, and a few may prove to be persons from whom the increased rate, if it is allowed, will be uncollectible. But none of these considerations apply in the case of pipelines, and the power to make the rate retroactive should fully protect the pipelines from the loss of anything to which they are entitled.

But the bill goes further in protecting any legitimate interest of the pipelines. If they can make a showing that this power to make rates retroactive is not an adequate remedy, the Commission is authorized to put all or any part of the rate into effect. But, if a rate does go into effect, the Commission is granted plenary power to insure that the consumers who furnish the money are fully repaid. Under this power, the Commission could—and I think it should—require that the disputed rates be deposited in escrow until the matter has been decided. Certainly, no company should be permitted to commingle the consumers' money by investing it in the plant which belongs to the common stockholders. This is precisely what Colorado Interstate Co. did. This is precisely why, when the Commission's experienced examiner finally concluded that the company was not entitled to the $75 million it had collected from the consuming public, the company was able to force a settlement more advantageous to itself by claiming that the repayment of the consumers of what was rightfully theirs would destroy the company.

I believe the bill which I am introducing is sound. It involves no compromise with what ought to be. It can be supported as a full and complete recognition of any constitutional rights any pipeline may have. It will effectively protect the public from the abuses with which all of us from the consuming States have become all too familiar. I urge its passage at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a comparison of the text of the proposed Carroll bill with the text of the present section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act.

There being no objection, the comparison was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPARISON OF TEXT OF PROPOSED CARROLL BILL WITH TEXT OF PRESENT SECTION 4(E) OF NATURAL GAS ACT

[Matter proposed to be omitted in black brackets, new matter in italic]

(e) Whenever any such new schedule is filed the Commission shall have authority, either upon complaint of any State, municipality, or State Commission, or upon its own initiative without complaint, at once, and if it so orders, without answer or formal pleading by the natural-gas company, but upon reasonable notice, to enter upon a hearing concerning the lawfulness of such rate, charge, classification, or service; and, pending such hearing and the decision thereon, the Commission, upon filing with such schedules and delivering to the natural-gas company affected thereby a statement in writing [of] *fixing the time and place for such hearing and containing* its reasons for such suspension, may suspend the operation of such schedule and defer the use of such rate, charge, classification, or service, [but not for a longer period than five months beyond the time when it would otherwise go into effect: *Provided*, That the Commission shall not have authority to suspend the rate, charge, classification, or service for the sale of natural gas for industrial use only;] *for such time as is reasonably necessary for the completion of such hearing and the decision thereon.* [and after full hearings, either completed before or after the rate, charge, classification, or service goes into effect, the Commission may make such orders with reference thereto as would be proper in a proceeding initiated after it had become effective.] *If it shall finally be determined that such schedule is lawful, the Commission shall have the authority to make such schedule effective retroactively to the date of its filing.* [If the proceeding has not been concluded and an order made at the expiration of the suspension period, on motion of the natural-gas company making the filing, the proposed change of rate, charge, classification, or service shall go into effect. Where increased rates or charges are thus made effective, the Commission may, by order, require the natural-gas company to furnish a bond, to be approved by the Commission, to refund any amounts ordered by the Commission, to keep accurate accounts in detail of all amounts received by reason of such increase, specifying by whom and in whose behalf such amounts were paid, and, upon completion of the hearing and decision, to order such natural-gas company to refunds, with interest, the portion of such increased rates or charges by its decision found not justified.] *Upon motion of the natural-gas company making the filing, and upon a showing that such natural-gas company will suffer damage for which the retroactive effectiveness of such schedule will not constitute an adequate remedy, the Commission may, by order, to the extent necessary to prevent such irreparable damage, and upon such terms and with such security as in its discretion will assure to the ultimate consumers the repayment of any amounts they may have been required to pay on account of such rates to the extent that such rates shall be finally determined to have been in excess of just and reasonable rates, permit such schedule, in whole or in part, to become effective pending final determination of the lawfulness of such schedule.* At any hearing involving a rate or charge sought to be increased, the burden of proof to show that the increased rate or charge is just and reasonable shall be upon the natural-gas company, and the Commission shall give to the hearing and decision of such questions preference over other questions pending before it and decide the same as speedily as possible.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for a week, so that Senators may read my comments and may read the purposes of the bill. This is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress. It involves almost every State of the Union.

In closing, we have learned from the report submitted to the Congress that over $600 million of the consumers' money has been tied up as a result of heavy backlogs of cases which have failed to be acted upon by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk for 1 week, in order that other Senators may read it and cosponsor it if they desire. I trust the bill will have the cosponsorship of every Senator on this important proposed legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested.

The bill (S. 1946) to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act relative to hearings concerning the lawfulness of new rate schedules, introduced by Mr. CARROLL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. DOUGLAS) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend

laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. BUSH) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

IMPLEMENTATION OF 23D AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 16, 1961, the names of Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, and Mr. PELL were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1883) to regulate the election in the District of Columbia of electors of President and Vice President, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE on May 16, 1961.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, relating to strengthening of U.S. policies to halt Communist aggression.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Article entitled "Totting Up the Cost of Health Care," written by Senator NEUBERGER, published in the Washington Post of May 21, 1961; and article entitled "Study Backs Expanded Medical Aid," written by Lewis Hawkins, published in the Washington Post of May 22, 1961.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Address delivered by him before the Second Annual Travel Clinic, sponsored by the Upper Monongahela Valley Association at Blackwater Lodge, Davis, W. Va., on May 12, 1961, regarding the glories of West Virginia.

By Mr. ENGLE:

Statement by Representative HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California, before Mining Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee, regarding the production of more gold at home.

PROPOSED INCREASE IN WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION OF LONGSHOREMEN AND HARBOR WORKERS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, intermittently I have been pointing out, on the floor of the Senate, the various bills which are coming before the Committee on Commerce, proposing increases in the subsidies granted to the private operators of our merchant marine, carrying cargoes and passengers.

I have been a Member of this body for 4 years; and petitions for increased subsidies have repeatedly come before the committee, of which I am a member.

Since the enactment of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Federal Government has paid in subsidy, to aid the development of our Merchant Marine, $232 million in construction differential costs and $944 million in operating differential costs. These figures, in large part, represent the difference between wages paid American shipyard workers and operating seamen and wages paid to comparable workers in foreign countries.

Presently, there is pending before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare Senate bill 733, which contemplates increasing the maximum weekly workmen's compensation benefits paid to ship repairmen and other harbor workers from a level of $54 a week to $70 a week, or a 30-percent increase which would, in part, have to be paid for by the taxpayers of the United States because of the subsidy features of the Merchant Marine Act which I have just mentioned.

The liberality of these increases, compared to what the States are paying, in my opinion is influenced by the fact that the taxpayers have to pay a part of it.

The following is a tabulation of the maximum weekly benefits paid under State workmen's compensation laws at the present time and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION LAWS

Maximum weekly benefit for single employee for temporary total disability by States

State	Rate	Date of available information
Alabama [1]	$31.00	1957
Alaska [1]	100.00	1959
Arizona	[2]	
Arkansas [1]	35.00	1959
California [1]	65.00	1959
Colorado	40.25	1959
Connecticut [1]	[2]	
Delaware [1]	50.00	1959
Florida [1]	42.00	1959
Georgia [1]	30.00	1959
Hawaii [1]	75.00	1959
Idaho	28.00	1959
Illinois [1]	45.00	1959
Indiana [1]	65.00	1959
Iowa	32.00	1959
Kansas [1]	38.00	1959
Kentucky [1]	36.00	1960
Louisiana [1]	35.00	1958
Maine [1]	39.00	1961
Maryland [1]	40.00	1959
Massachusetts [1]	50.00	1961
Michigan [1]	33.00	1960
Minnesota [1]	45.00	1959
Mississippi [1]	35.00	1960
Missouri [1]	45.00	1959
Montana	28.00	1959
Nebraska	37.00	1959
Nevada	[2]	
New Hampshire [1]	40.00	1959
New Jersey [1]	40.00	1960
New Mexico [1]	38.00	1959
New York [1]	50.00	1960
North Carolina	35.00	1959
North Dakota	38.00	1960
Ohio [1]	49.00	1961
Oklahoma	35.00	1959
Oregon [1]	[2]	
Pennsylvania [1]	42.50	1960
Rhode Island [1]	36.00	1960
South Carolina [1]	35.00	1956
South Dakota	30.00	1957
Tennessee [1]	34.00	1959
Texas [1]	35.00	1959
Utah	37.00	1959
Vermont	36.00	1959
Virginia [1]	35.00	1960
Washington [1]	[2]	1957
West Virginia	35.00	1960
Wisconsin	[2]	
Wyoming	[2]	
Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act	54.00	1961

[1] Maritime.
[2] Not applicable.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a study of this listing discloses that the $70 a week maximum proposed by S. 733 will be practically 40 percent, and in many instances 100 percent, more than the amounts paid in the individual States.

I cannot see anything else but a chain reaction throughout the country demanding that the increase granted by the Congress shall likewise be granted by the States.

Perhaps the increase ought to be granted, but before it is, we ought to make certain what are the actual facts. Prior to the amendments of 1948, maximum weekly benefits for workers covered by the Longshoremen and Harbor Workers Act was $25 a week. In 1948, it was raised to $35. In 1956, it was raised from $35 to $54, an increase of approximately 50 percent.

Now, 5 years later, it is sought to be raised from $54 to $70, an increase of 30 percent.

It is my understanding that only perfunctory hearings are contemplated on this bill. It seems to be accepted that the grants ought to be made. I hope that, before we act upon this bill, it will be studied adequately, not only from the standpoint of the Federal Government, but from the standpoint of the effect it will have on the various States in the Union.

THE FAIR PLAY FOR CUBA COMMITTEE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the facts I am about to present to the Senate today are of particular concern to students in America's institutions of higher learning, for reasons which will quickly become apparent. They are of particular concern to the parents of these students, and to faculty members in these institutions. They are of particular concern to Senators from California, Colorado, my own State of Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Minnesota, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Vermont, Washington.

I believe they are also of general concern to the people of the United States. Fitted together, they provide a priceless example of how gullible persons can be misled into serving as victims for a cheap Communist shakedown. I believe part of the responsibility for this situation lies with certain self-misguided liberal editors, who, in their blind fury, rush to the defense of anyone and everyone who receives a subpena from the Subcommittee on Internal Security. The victims in this case are 7,000 students who have given their support to something that calls itself the Fair Play for Cuba Committee.

Months ago, the subcommittee published testimony making clear that the so-called Fair Play for Cuba Committee was a fraud set up under the auspices of a concealed agent of Fidel Castro.

Nevertheless, according to testimony of Richard Gibson, the acting executive secretary, before the subcommittee last Tuesday, May 16, the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has chapters located at Antioch, University of California, City College of New York, Stanford, Columbia, University of Colorado, Brooklyn, Queens, Cornell, UCLA, Fisk, Los Angeles City College, University of Minnesota, Carleton College, University of Indiana, Yale, University of Virginia, Oberlin, Brandeis, Harvard, University of Washington, University of Michigan, Wayne, Brown, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, St. John's, Boston University, University of Ohio, Grinnell, Tufts, Bennington, Goddard, University of Kansas, Reed College. The committee also has what it calls adult chapters in Los Angeles, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Tampa, Fla.; Detroit, Mich.; Chicago, Ill.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Baltimore, Md.; Palo Alto, Calif.; and New York City.

Other chapters are located in Washington, D.C., Newark, Boston, New Haven, Denver, Cleveland, Seattle, San Diego, Hartford, Lynn, Mass., Santa Clara, Calif., Brooklyn, Queens, Bergen County, N.J.

On Thursday, May 18, an excellent editorial entitled "For Exposure's Sake" appeared in the Washington Evening Star. I will read it to Senators:

It is said that a congressional investigating committee "has no right to expose for exposure's sake." Generally, this makes sense. For an investigating committee is supposed to be seeking facts for purposes of possible legislation. It is not supposed to use its authority to embarrass and humiliate an unoffending citizen.

There are exceptions, however, to all generalities. And this week's quizzing by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee of a representative of the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is one of them.

The Senate group had before it one Richard Gibson, acting executive secretary of the committee. He told a remarkable story.

This Fair Play Committee claims to represent 7,000 people in the United States and Canada. It has 23 chapters and 37 student councils in the United States. Mr. Gibson, one of two people authorized to write checks on the committee's bank account, testified that he had never asked where the money came from. Why? So he couldn't be forced to reveal the names of contributors. His committee, he said, kept no membership list, using, instead, a general mailing list. Again, we suppose, to avoid having to disclose the names of members. Finally, Mr. Gibson said he didn't know that his committee's executive secretary, who is now in Cuba, was sentenced in Ohio in 1939 to serve up to 30 years in jail for armed robbery, auto theft, and kidnaping.

We assume that the Senate subcommittee, in eliciting this testimony, had some legislative purpose in mind. But it doesn't matter very much. The point is that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee, on the basis of Mr. Gibson's testimony, ought to be exposed for what it is. The dupes who belong to it and who contribute to it, assuming that they are dupes, ought to know what they have been conned into. And if this comes within the sweep of "exposure for exposure's sake," we are all for it.

To begin with, the Star correctly assumes that we had a legislative purpose in mind when we sought facts about the Cuba committee. On this floor, I have kept Senators continuously informed about the committee. Our legislative purpose was stated three times at the hearing last Tuesday. At page 211 of the hearing transcript, I am quoted as follows:

There has been evidence before this committee, sworn testimony, that advertisements were placed in the newspapers with funds supplied by Castro.

If your agency is not registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act, this committee is interested, and we shall suggest to the Attorney General that he may be interested.

The following appears on page 225 of the transcript, quoting Subcommittee Counsel Sourwine:

There is evidence before this committee that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee is a foreign-sponsored propaganda organization. There is also evidence that it is supported and encouraged by the Communist Party, U.S.A. We want to know as much as we can about its activities for the purpose of determining the extent that it threatens the security of this country and what, if any, legislative action can be taken to meet that threat.

Mr. Sourwine commented further at page 281:

This committee has developed that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has thousands of dollars in finances in deposits, and withdrawals of large amounts have been made subject only to the control of this witness and Mr. Taber; that American citizens, including college youth, are being asked to contribute to this organization.

It is a perfectly proper legislative purpose for the committee to consider whether there is a situation here which could be met by recommendations for legislation to govern such organizations so as to give assurance of a sounder or at least a tighter financial control in cases where the public is involved.

The founder of the committee, Robert Taber, is now in Cuba. He was sentenced in Ohio in 1939 to serve up to 30 years in jail for armed robbery, auto theft, and kidnaping.

He was a newswriter for the Columbia Broadcasting System. An article by him in Nation magazine in January of 1960 was the instrument which brought the Cuba committee into existence. Needless to say, it was a whitewash of Fidel Castro. It extolled the alleged social gains of the Cuba revolution and it pooh-poohed the clear facts about Moscow's dominating influence in Havana.

When we called him to the witness stand last year, Taber denied that the committee used funds supplied by Castro representatives. When we later developed proof that there was Castro money in this alleged fairplay operation, he was gone.

But he can still draw checks against the committee's account made up of funds contributed at least in part by gullible youngsters on America's campuses.

Our hearing developed the fact that he had taken at least $19,000 from the committee's account in one single withdrawal.

There is also more to be said about the man he left behind him, Richard Gibson.

For many years, Mr. President, we have heard a good deal about athletic bums, who hop from campus to campus, season after season. It is time we began hearing about Communist front bums, who do the same kind of hopping.

Richard Gibson is a Communist front bum. Our record shows that he was a freshman at Kenyon College 12 years ago. He vanished just before the end of the spring term, leaving behind him a tuition bill of $579, which has never been paid. Regardless of this, he got a John Hay Whitney fellowship a year later to study in Rome.

Five years later, a GI grant sent him to the University of Paris, the Sorbonne. Today, he is a graduate student at Columbia University, at the expense of his former employer, CBS.

Columbia is the operating base, from which he operates the fairplay racket. He went to Canada, in his role of Fidel's Typhoid Mary, to solidify a fraternal connection with Canadian undergraduates. He helped start the committee chapter on the Columbia campus and is president of the New York chapter. He has thrown the weight of his organization behind what he describes as a "very brilliant book by a Columbia University professor, C. Wright Mills." The book is entitled "Listen Yankee."

It excoriates the American position in Cuba and glorifies Moscow's Fidel. Needless to say, the Communist press is equally overjoyed at this "very brilliant book by a Columbia University professor."

Our hearing also developed that the Cuba committee has refused to register under the Alien Registration Act. The committee, in its own publications, has boasted about mass demonstrations it organized outside the United Nations and in Union Square.

How was it possible for this group of Red racketeers to solicit funds and to organize demonstrations after the initial facts about Taber's concealment of Castro's hand in his committee appeared in some newspapers?

I believe this can be laid at the door of the liberal publications that spent so much time furiously assaulting the Subcommittee on Internal Security that they overlooked the truth about this specious Fair Play for Cuba outfit.

There are many of these, Mr. President. The most flagrant of all is the eminently respectable Harper's magazine, for the falsehoods it circulated in collaboration with a certain Kenneth Tynan.

Tynan, dramatic critic for the London Observer and guest critic for the New Yorker magazine, another eminently respectable publication, signed the New York Times advertisement which was the kickoff for the Cuba committee's activity.

He was called into executive session by the subcommittee when he began looking into the shenanigans of this Fidel-financed group. Tynan wrote an article for the October 1960 issue of Harper's, which purported to tell what happened in this executive session.

His account of what happened in the session may be accurately described as a double-barreled lie. Harper's lent the

full weight of its prestige to this lie. According to him, here is what took place:

Had I received money for signing the [Fair Play for Cuba] ad?
No.
Was it paid for by Cuban gold?
No.

The record of the hearing shows that Kenneth Tynan was not asked either of these questions and consequently he gave neither of the answers. Obviously the Fair Play for Cuba Committee needed to have something like this said about it under respectable auspices, so Mr. Tynan took care of its needs. It was unfortunate for him that the committee ran across another witness, who swore that the ad was paid for with Cuban money.

But it is even more unfortunate, Mr. President, for the gulls who fell in behind Harper's, the Nation, and a whole string of liberal newspapers across the Nation. These were so determined to give the Subcommittee on Internal Security a black eye, that they gave the Fair Play for Cuba Committee a clean bill of health.

More than all others, Mr. President, they have an obligation to begin to tell the truth about what this Red shakedown racket really is.

LAWLESSNESS IN ALABAMA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the ugly passions which have distorted reason and law in some cities in Alabama have given birth to a violence resulting in most serious damage to our great Nation—not only here at home but throughout the world.

I call particular attention to the brutal attack upon John Seigenthaler, a fellow Tennessean and outstanding former newspaperman, who was sent by the President and the Attorney General to the area to seek facts about the protection of citizens who were exercising their constitutional rights in a peaceful manner.

Caught up suddenly in the violence, Mr. Seigenthaler courageously sought, as any honorable citizen would, to protect a young woman from attack and was struck down from behind by a coward's blow. Fortunately, Mr. Seigenthaler is recovering from his injuries and will be able to continue contributing his valuable talents to the important post that he holds as special assistant to the Attorney General.

I call attention to the tragic case of Mr. Seigenthaler because it represents all that is reprehensible about the unchecked lawlessness which has led to senseless injury of many other citizens who deserved protection from violence, regardless of issues argued by either side in the situation.

Mr. President, I suggest that some of the local officials of Alabama have been negligent of their obligations to control brutality brought about by hotheaded lawlessness. I submit that these officials, also by their failure to move quickly and effectively with the local enforcement facilities at their disposal, have turned their backs on their responsibilities.

Mr. President, much as we regret the need for using U.S. marshals to protect the rights of people and to prevent violence, it seems to me that the Attorney General had no alternative in this instance. He is to be commended for taking this necessary step.

Our Nation and our people will not be able to count, today, the depth of the damage that has been done the cause of freedom throughout the world by these days of shame that have occurred in Alabama.

I pray that those who have inflicted this damage, those who have condoned it, and those who have turned their backs upon it will seek forgiveness in their souls. I hope sincerely that strength and steadfastness will continue to support those who have deplored this tragedy and who have sought and are still seeking to establish law and order where a mob has run rampant and struck bloody blows at individual freedom.

TRIBUTE TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the strength and vigor with which Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall is attacking his job as Secretary of the Interior is well characterized in the article which appeared recently in the Deseret News and Telegram, one of the West's most influential newspapers.

Easterners may look upon Mr. Udall at the moment as the stormy petrel of the Kennedy administration, but to the West the strong wind he is blowing up about our long-neglected natural resource development is as welcome as rain in August. His recent hike up into Utah's Rainbow Bridge country to see for himself this spectacular corner of Utah, his announced plans to expand and preserve it, his efforts to move along at a more rapid pace our crucial water development projects, his program to conserve our public lands, and his obvious intention to help us to make the most of every natural resource we have, have already earned him the respect and gratitude of the citizens of Utah. We are confident he will "make his mark."

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD the article on Secretary Udall published by the Deseret News as a well-illustrated spread on May 13, and written by Louis Cassels of United Press International.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEWART LEE UDALL: THE YOUNG CURMUDGEON—MAN IN A HURRY WHO LOVES HIS WORK

(By Louis Cassels)

WASHINGTON.—Stewart Lee Udall, the "young curmudgeon" of the Kennedy administration, has at least four notable accomplishments to his credit since he took office as Secretary of the Interior.

Serving in what is normally a rather obscure post, the 41-year-old ex-Congressman from Arizona has reaped more newspaper headlines than any other member of the Kennedy cabinet.

He has demonstrated an unusual ability to draw howls of rage from Republicans—and sometimes from his fellow Democrats—in Congress.

He has shocked this blase capital by saying out loud what is widely believed but seldom acknowledged—that "there are times when you have to be ruthless in politics."

Finally, along the way, he has attracted public attention to the urgent and often neglected problem of conserving America's natural resources, particularly its disappearing wilderness areas.

The Washington judgment on Udall is that he is likely to be the most controversial Secretary of Interior since the late Harold L. Ickes, the self-styled "old curmudgeon" of the Franklin D. Roosevelt Cabinet.

At times the 41-year-old Udall appears to be consciously emulating the "old curmudgeon." Ickes once created a national sensation by inviting Negro soprano Marian Anderson to sing from the steps of the Lincoln Memorial after she had been barred from giving a concert in the DAR's Constitution Hall. Udall has stirred up a similar storm by serving notice on the Washington Redskins pro football team that it will have to hire some Negro players if it expects to use the new stadium being built on Government land here.

Ickes' truculent spirit pervades the very room in which Udall works. The Interior Department Building was erected while Ickes was feuding with Postmaster General James A. Farley. Ickes gave the architects explicit orders to make his office bigger than Farley's. As a result, every Secretary of the Interior since Ickes has worked in a mammoth, paneled room which is almost as big as a basketball court.

Udall submitted, more or less restively, to an interview in this cavernous chamber. He is chronically late for appointments, and in an effort to keep up with his schedule, he sometimes tries to carry on conversations with visitors while sneaking in a few quick glances at correspondence or reports lying on his desk.

Udall is not given to small talk or levity, especially when he is in a hurry, which apparently he nearly always is. He may break into a hearty guffaw over a political joke, but his face is usually fixed in a fairly grim expression. He has dark, crewcut hair, a hawk nose, and the athletic build (5 feet, 11 inches, 180 pounds) of a prizefighter.

But if you steer him onto his favorite subject—the outdoors—he begins to sound more like a poet. He grew up in the wide open spaces of Arizona, and he has retained an almost mystical passion for nature in its unspoiled state.

His greatest concern is that Americans will do too little, too late, to preserve their fast-dwindling heritage of majestic streams and forests.

"This is the most urgent problem in the whole field of natural resources," he said with conviction. "The glory of America has always been its green face * * * its spaciousness. The whole character of the American people has been shaped by living on a virgin continent where men could test themselves against the wilderness.

"But our land is changing before our eyes. The bulldozers are eating away the last remaining wild areas in the East, and even in the West rapid population growth is exerting pressure on the open spaces."

Udall considers it disgraceful that only 92,000 acres of land were added to the national parks system under Presidents Truman and Eisenhower. He wants President Kennedy to go into the history books as the greatest conservationist since Woodrow Wilson, who added 5.5 million acres to the park system. He is particularly anxious to acquire more parklands in the East, where most of the Nation's people live. The vast majority of present parks are in the West, far from centers of population.

As a starter, he is pressing for congressional action on long stalled legislation to

preserve 3 of the 8 or 10 U.S. shorelines which have not yet been taken over by the commercial resort developers. The proposed national seashores are located at Cape Code, Mass., Padre Island, Tex., and Oregon Dunes, Oreg.

Another project dear to his heart is development of the Delaware River Basin to create a vast manmade lake in the Catskill Mountains, within 2 hours' driving time of New York and Philadelphia.

"We have got to move fast" on these projects, he said earnestly. "It will never get any cheaper. In many areas, land prices are doubling every 10 years."

Udall's Department is possibly the least understood in the Government, partly because its name—Interior—means nothing to the average citizen. It might more accurately be described as "The Department of Natural Resources."

Its major functions include managing about 500 million acres of land, mostly in the West, which are still in the public domain; providing irrigation for nearly 8 million acres of reclaimed land, also in the West; building and operating hydroelectric systems which now generate 6 million kilowatts of power; fostering the economic health of mineral extraction industries, including such chronic invalids as coal, lead, and zinc; promoting mine safety; protecting fish and wildlife; conducting geological surveys; operating a railroad in Alaska; and looking out for the welfare of 400,000 American Indians and Eskimos who are wards of the Federal Government.

Nearly one-fourth of the Nation's Indians live within the Arizona Congressional District which Udall formerly represented, and he is a militant champion of their interests. He thinks it is a national scandal that the living standards on many Indian reservations are as low as those of any nation in Asia or Africa, and that it is past time for the United States to launch a sort of domestic point 4 program for economic development of Indian reservations.

Udall's forebears were rugged Mormon pioneers who settled in Arizona before the Civil War.

He was born January 31, 1920, in St. Johns, Ariz., a town founded by his grandfather. There are almost as many Udalls as Indians in Arizona, and most of them are prominent in the business and political life of the State. His father was Levi S. Udall, chief justice of the Arizona Supreme Court.

Washington is getting another Udall—Stewart's brother, Morris, who won the Arizona election last week to replace the Interior Secretary in the House.

Udall's love for the outdoors goes back to his boyhood, when "you could stand on the front steps of my home and shoot ducks."

After graduating from high school, he went to Pennsylvania to put in the 2 years of volunteer service as a missionary which is performed by many young men in the Mormon Church.

When the United States entered World War II, he signed up for bombardier training in the Air Force, but washed out of cadet school, and became an enlisted gunner. As a technical sergeant, he made 50 missions over Western Europe in B–24 Liberators.

After the war, he went to the University of Arizona, where he played guard on a basketball team which was good enough to make the National Invitational Tournament in Madison Square Garden.

He still likes basketball. During a recent mine inspection tour of West Virginia, he spotted a group of kids playing basketball on a crude homemade court. He ordered his driver to stop, leaped out of the car, and sank three baskets in a row.

He graduated from the university in 1948 with a law degree and a wife, a blonde coed named Ermalee Webb, whom he married during his senior year. After a few years of private law practice with a family firm, he was elected to Congress in 1954.

He was known in Congress as an able member of the "Western liberal bloc." He served on the House Interior Committee, where he got a thorough grounding in the problems of the Department he now heads, and also on the Labor Committee, where he had the opportunity of working closely with Senator John F. Kennedy on passage of a moderate union reform bill.

His relationship with Mr. Kennedy was cemented during the 1960 campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination, when Udall swung to Kennedy the 17 Arizona convention votes which were supposed to be in Lyndon B. Johnson's bag.

Udall clearly enjoys the power and responsibility of his new job, but he does not seem to be greatly interested in the status symbols and personal perquisites of Cabinet office. His private life has undergone little change since his days of Congress, and he still is more at home driving his own station wagon than sitting in the back seat of a chauffeur-driven limousine.

He lives with his wife, six children, two dogs and a badly outnumbered cat in a modest house in suburban Virginia. The whole family is outdoors-minded. Udall sometimes packs the entire menage, including dogs and cat, into the family station wagon for a drive across the continent to the open spaces of Arizona.

He keeps in trim for this and other challenges by doing a lot of hiking and playing paddle ball in the congressional gymnasium several times a week. He does not smoke.

Like President Kennedy and nearly everyone else in the New Frontier, he is an omnivorous reader, and especially likes the poetry of Robert Frost.

After a recent visit to Capitol Hill to testify on a pending park bill, Udall strode down a corridor, his right hand clutching the yellow memo pad on which he jots down ideas and things to do as they occur to him, and a pack of harried Interior Department underlings at his heels. He looked like a young man in a hurry, and the spectacle caused an old Washington hand to muse aloud:

"That fellow is either going to make a mark for himself—or get a bloody nose." He might, like honest Harold Ickes, do both.

STRAIGHTFORWARD SCHOOL AID

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the New York Times an editorial entitled "Straightforward School Aid." I wish to associate myself with the views expressed in the editorial. It relates to the action taken yesterday by the Senate, when it rejected the Bush amendment; and the editorial also refers to the importance of the passage of this school bill without the adoption of amendments which would bog it down or would limit the possibility of its enactment.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRAIGHTFORWARD SCHOOL AID

In a determined effort to pass a straightforward bill to aid the public elementary and secondary schools, the Senate's Democratic leadership yesterday opposed segregation or antisegregation amendments of any kind.

This move was essential. It dispelled lingering suspicions that administration spokesmen last week, in an effort to save the faces of southerners who wanted to reverse their earlier opposition to school aid, had actually encouraged the introduction of a rider prohibiting the Government from withholding funds from segregated schools.

Now the administration's stand is again clear, as it should have been throughout. The issue is Federal aid to the schools to help them build classrooms and pay teachers. Desegregation can and must be tackled separately under the rulings of the U.S. Supreme Court.

As for appeasing the South, the irony of such political counsel is evident to those who know that the Southern States need Federal aid most urgently. Since they are to be the principal beneficiaries, it ought not be too much to ask them to refrain from polluting the bill with their prejudices.

Whatever debate remains ought to be confined to perfecting the mechanics of the measure, including the distribution formula. We continue to believe that funds should be allocated according to the number of children actually attending public schools and not, as is now contemplated, according to the number of school-age children (private as well as public) in each State.

But aside from efforts to improve details of the bill, such amendments as Senator PRESCOTT BUSH's civil rights proposal and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's attempt to reintroduce the parochial school controversy would, if successful, result not in amending the measure but in killing it. The Senate task now is to defeat these antiaid maneuvers and to pass a simple, basic bill to help the public schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary be allowed to meet today while the Senate is in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it has been the policy for the last week or so, since the debate on the Federal aid to education bill started, to refuse permission to all committees to hold meetings during the sessions of the Senate. It is with great regret I express objection at this time to the request of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time necessary for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have been requested to interpose an objection to the unanimous-consent request, so I hereby object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask my friend if this means there will be a live quorum. I hope the Sergeant at Arms will be notified I may put him to work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me so that I may make two unanimous-consent requests?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Internal Security be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in keeping with the announcement previously made this morning, the Senator from Nebraska objects.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I make the same objection, for the same reason.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, through inadvertence yesterday I called up my amendment B instead of my amendment F. Therefore I should explain that amendment F is in conformity with the mimeographed statements that have been placed on the desks of Senators, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to substitute my amendment F for my amendment B.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the amendment proposed to be offered, 5–18–16—B, it is proposed to insert the following:

On page 2, line 7, strike out "and".

On page 2, line 8, before the period insert a comma and the following: "and in paying other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education".

On page 11, line 23, strike out "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may".

On page 13, line 22, strike out "and".

On page 13, line 23, before the semicolon insert: "and (C) other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education".

On page 13, line 25, strike out "either of".

On page 14, line 11, strike out "and".

On page 14, line 16, before the period insert "and (C) the amounts to be used for other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for assistance in paying such costs".

On page 22, between lines 10 and 11, insert the following:

"(12) The term 'other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education' means any maintenance and operating cost of public elementary or secondary school education for which revenues derived from State or local sources may be expended in such State."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the parliamentary situation? Has the Senator withdrawn his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has offered a substitute for the amendment previously offered.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the amendment which I now offer and the amendment which I offered yesterday are similar in nature. The only difference is that the amendment which I offered unintentionally yesterday provided for an authorization of money for debt retirement and other capital expenditures. The present amendment would limit the expenditure of funds purely and simply to operation and maintenance expenses. That amendment is the one that I intended to offer yesterday. Since the Senator from Maryland has refused to allow me to substitute the amendent, I have offered it now.

Mr. BUTLER. I say to the Senator from Vermont that I have no regret.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has the floor.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the main provision in S. 1021 as presently drafted restricts the use of Federal funds to public school teachers' salaries and construction of public school facilities.

I heartily agree with the Council of Chief State School Officers that this leaves less freedom of choice than is desirable.

In November 1960, in annual meeting assembled, the Council voted by a three-to-one margin in favor of including teachers' salaries in Federal aid legislation, but voted 100 percent in favor of including current expenses. A part of the text of the Council's resolution reads as follows.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that we might be clear as to exactly the amendment now being considered?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has amended his original amendment so that at the present time we are now considering the Prouty amendment which is identified on our desks as amendment B?

Mr. PROUTY. Amendment F.

Mr. MORSE. Amendment F.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has offered a modification of amendment B.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Vermont has offered the amendment identified on our desks as amendment F as a substitute for his previously offered amendment identified as amendment B. Is that the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to emphasize that point.

I repeat, the Council of Chief State School Officers in November 1960, adopted a resolution a part of which reads as follows:

> The State should be free to choose the proportions in which they will use the Federal grants for school construction, capital debt requirement, or current expenses in the maintenance and operation of schools.

During the hearings held by the Senate Education Subcommittee, State officials made it unmistakably clear that they need more freedom than is permitted by the administration bill. Not only did Dr. Edgar Fuller speak for these officials, he presented to the subcommittee telegrams he had received from all regions of the country asking Congress to give the States flexibility in spending grant money.

The committee reported measure does not allow expenditures for textbooks, transportation, utility costs, and other areas important to the local people who have to run our schools and to the students themselves.

Permitting States to use Federal funds only for school construction and teachers' salaries is not giving them full freedom of choice by any means.

Let us listen for a moment to what the people back home say they want in an education bill. I shall begin with the State of Alabama. In a telegram dated March 7, which may be found on page

304 of the printed hearings, Frank Stewart, Alabama's State superintendent of education, objected to the provision in the administration bill which would force States to spend 10 percent of their allotted funds on pilot and experimental projects regardless of their overall problems. He asked that this mandatory provision be made permissive.

When the Arizona State superintendent of public instruction learned that I planned to offer an amendment which would give the States the liberty to spend Federal grants for not only school construction and teachers' salaries but other current expenses, he wired me stating:

Proposal as explained would be in the interest of Arizona. Current expenses should be included.

A. W. Ford, Arkansas commissioner of education, believes very strongly that States should be given more freedom of choice and be allowed to expend Federal moneys for current expenses. On page 11 of the Senate hearings he is quoted as saying:

I concur wholeheartedly in this recommendation and recommend that S. 1021 make provision for these expenditures at the option of the State boards of education.

Colorado also made its voice heard on the need for flexibility in the school aid bill. On page 405 of the hearings, Craig P. Minear of the State Teachers Association is quoted as saying:

Let me emphasize that legislation providing Federal assistance for school construction only would be of little help in Colorado. * * * The only Federal legislation which would give help to Colorado would be legislation which would allow our State to decide how much should be spent on buildings and how much on teachers' salaries or other school costs.

William J. Sanders, Connecticut commissioner of education, has indicated full support for the freedom-of-choice amendment I am proposing. In a telegram to me dated May 15, he said:

Proposed amendment removing restriction of Federal funds to salaries and construction would be much better for Connecticut.

Delaware feels that its people know more about Delaware problems than the Federal Government does and the reaction of the State to my amendment is one of complete support. In a wire to me dated May 15, George R. Miller, Delaware superintendent of the department of public instruction, stated:

I agree that greater freedom of choice in the use of Federal funds to public schools would be a benefit to the State of Delaware.

The State of Florida, which has long adhered to the principle of States rights, did not deviate from its traditional pattern on this education bill. Thomas D. Bailey, as appears on page 312 of the Senate hearings, brings sharply to focus the lack of flexibility in the administration bill. He said:

Section 110 ignores maintenance, transportation, textbooks, and other essential areas of expenditure necessary for overall improvement of education.

The State superintendent of schools for the State of Georgia, Claude Purcell, called to my attention the fact that the Georgia House of Representatives passed resolutions favoring increased Federal support, provided funds can be received and spent as State funds. In other words, Georgia, too, wants a greater freedom of choice.

Hawaii, the newly admitted 50th State, is not unmindful of the importance of having State and local educators decide in what areas moneys should be expended and for what needs. William F. Quinn, Governor of Hawaii, and Walter M. Gordon, superintendent of public instruction, cabled me as follows:

We believe in maximum flexibility in administering Federal aid to education and endorse your amendment.

The great State of Idaho wants to be recorded in favor of the freedom-of-choice amendment. D. F. Engelking, Idaho superintendent of public instruction, declared in a wire to me dated May 12:

The State of Idaho is very desirous of Federal aid for teachers' salaries and/or construction and/or other current expenses. We concur with your ideas. We appreciate the opportunity to express our views.

The State of Maine wants more liberty in handling Federal funds. It dislikes the provision in the administration school aid bill which requires States to spend 10 percent of their allotment for special projects. Warren G. Hill, commissioner of education for the State of Maine, urges that the provision relating to special projects be permissive rather than mandatory.

My amendment would, of course, give the States the discretion they seek.

Minnesota is far removed from Maine, but shares a similar view with respect to the mandatory provision which requires the States to spend 10 percent of their money on research and special projects. Dean Schweickard, Minnesota commissioner of education, had this to say about the inflexible 10 percent requirement:

Ten percent of State allotment to be spent on research at the local level is commendable, perhaps too high.

The Mississippi State superintendent of public education, J. M. Tubb, favors school aid legislation, but makes it very clear that he does not want the hands of the State tied by Federal requirements. In a telegram to me dated May 13, Mr. Tubb said:

Favor legislation that includes teachers' salaries and construction of public school facilities; however, would not object to it covering other items of school expense provided it is done without undue restrictions.

The chief school officer of the State of Missouri, Hubert Wheeler, indicated his support of education legislation but he, too, dislikes the mandatory provisions in the bill dealing with special projects. On page 315 of the Senate hearings he is quoted as saying:

Ten percent for special projects seems too great.

My neighboring State of New Hampshire favors the freedom-of-choice amendment which I am proposing. In a wire to me dated May 16 New Hampshire Commissioner of Education Charles F. Ritch, Jr., made this observation:

Agree with you wholeheartedly. General aid to States for education is better than categorical aid. I support the concept you propose in your amendment to the administration school aid bill.

The New Mexico superintendent of public instruction, Tom Wiley, endorses wholeheartedly my freedom-of-choice amendment. In a telegram to me dated May 12, he said:

Your proposed amendment would be to our interest. We are, also, concerned about deletion of funds earmarked for research and administration, both of which are important to States such as New Mexico. Your efforts are deeply appreciated.

New York, like other States in the north, south, east, and west, also wants freedom of action when it comes to solving educational problems with Federal help. New York deputy commissioner of education, E. B. Nyquist, indicated full support of my amendment. His message is as follows:

Our position on Federal aid is that the funds should be as general and as unrestricted as possible. Therefore, we would favor your proposal for amendment for increased freedom of choice for use of Federal funds in order to meet the different needs in the several States.

Oregon, the home State of my distinguished colleague on the Labor Committee and floor manager of the bill, has expressed support of my freedom-of-choice amendment. In a wire to me dated May 12 the Oregon superintendent of public instruction, Leon P. Minear, had this to say:

Agree wholeheartedly with your proposal to broaden school aid provisions.

Michael P. Walsh, commissioner of education for the State of Rhode Island, acknowledges the need for State flexibility and indicates approval of my amendment with the following caution:

If you feel this amendment would in no way interfere with the bill's progress, I would concur.

The State of South Dakota favors the freedom-of-choice amendment which I have proposed. M. F. Coddington, South Dakota State superintendent of education, said in a wire to me dated May 15:

Favor your amendment for the State to allocate Federal aid for capital outlay for operation and maintenance.

I have been in touch by telephone with John Holden, Vermont's commissioner of education, and he has assured me that Vermont wants no unnecessary restrictions and would like the privilege of determining where and how Federal funds should be expended for elementary and secondary education.

Apparently this view is shared by the Vermont Education Association, because I received a telegram from the association which remarks:

Vermont needs Federal support of education with the State itself determining how such funds should be expended.

The great State of West Virginia, which my able committee colleague represents, is not entirely satisfied with the

limited flexibility provided by the committee reported school aid bill. Rex M. Smith, West Virginia State superintendent of schools, is quoted in the hearings as saying:

> Suggest that Federal grants be made for school construction, capital debt retirement or current expenses in the maintenance and operation of schools with States free to choose the proportions to be expended. * * * We subscribe to provision whereby Federal funds can be applied to most critical areas of education expenditure.

As I pointed out earlier, when all of the State commissioners of education and State superintendents met in convention assembled last November, they voted unanimously in favor of a school aid program which would permit States to use Federal grants not only for school construction and teachers' salaries, but for other costs involved in the maintenance and operation of schools.

The telegrams and statements which I have read are an indication that an overwhelming majority of State officials still want a freedom of choice provision in the education measure which will allow them to spend funds on the problems they deem most important.

We have had on the statute books now for several years Public Law 874, which provides for the distribution of funds to schools in federally impacted areas. There has been almost no instance of complaint about Federal control. Why not? Because local school authorities are not restricted by the law in regard to school operating costs for which they can spend Federal money. They are free to use the money for heat, light, textbooks, library books, clerical help, educational supplies, school health services and many other items. People at the grassroots level are more likely to welcome Federal assistance when they are not bound and gagged by regulation.

I have reviewed the hearings very carefully and there is not one scintilla of evidence that would justify denying to States under this school aid bill a freedom of choice which local communities have under the very successful Public Law 874, the defense impacted areas statute.

Mr. President, I do not think there is one Senator here today who knows of any abuse of discretion exercised at the local level in carrying out Public Law 874. I say we ought to give the people back home the same freedom of action under a general aid bill that they enjoy under the special aid program.

Dr. Edgar Puller, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers, pointed out the serious difficulties you can run into when you have an inflexible statute.

He made a strong case for a broader freedom-of-choice provision in the bill when he said:

> If you have the Federal funds used only for teachers' salaries and construction you may have a situation something like the following illustration. * * * If a State were to allocate to all its districts, for instance, 75 percent of the Federal funds for teachers' salaries and 25 percent of the Federal funds for construction of schools, and a school district had bonded itself to the legal limit and had just built its school plant completely for the next 5, 10, or 15 years, then there may be no way under this bill as it is now written for this school district to use the 25 percent which the State allocates for construction even though the district is very poor.

Yes; this is a classic example of what may happen in a poor community that has overtaxed itself to pay for construction and other school needs. Its teachers' salary level may be in fairly good shape. Its new building may be constructed but the town might be bonded up to its neck and have a hard time paying for bus service, textbooks, school health services and the like. Are we going to say to this little community, "We're sorry. You need help all right but we're not giving that type of help this year."

I do not think that the Potomac River is the fountainhead of all wisdom, and and when State after State indicates its strong desire to get funds without absolutely unnecessary restrictions, we ought to heed that desire.

Mr. President, it is vitally important that we allow the States to use the Federal grant money for maintenance and operating costs. In many instances if Federal funds are not so used the major burden of education will fall on the regressive local real estate tax which is frequently devastating to marginal farmers with small incomes and older people with homes not much else.

The research and policy committee of the Committee for Economic Development etched sharply the need for additional money not only for classrooms and teachers' salaries, but also, and I quote, "to cover other necessary expenses."

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the average retail list price of books in 1958 was $5.28, 43 percent more than the average price in the period 1947–1949. Since the base period 1947–1949, the retail price of books on science, technology, law, business and art increased 60 percent or more. Even books of fiction rose 32 percent.

Josph J. Schwab of the University of Chicago has charged that science books in the Nation's schools are obsolete in content.

We all know that Connecticut has one of the most advanced educational systems in the country, yet in April of this year, William J. Sanders, the Connecticut State commission of education remarked, as appears in the April 10, 1961, Publishers Weekly:

> In Connecticut we have some high schools without libraries. The majority of elementary schools do not have libraries. I would like to see less enthusiasm for educational gadgets and more money in school budgets for books.

In an article entitled "How Good Are Our Teaching Materials?" the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools pointed out that in one Southern State junior and senior high school students are required to buy all their own books. In a Midwestern State, the commission said:

> All students must purchase their own unless the school district votes to furnish them.

In still another Midwestern State the commission said, there are school districts where students must purchase all textbooks. There are some States that rent textbooks to students. What conclusion did the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools reach with respect to this whole situation? I think it is summed up very eloquently in these words:

> How shortsighted it would be to save pennies on instructional materials and thereby devalue the dollars we are spending as a whole.

I would like to call the attention of the Senate to a statement made by the senior Senator from Oregon which appears on page 8063 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because I think it is very pertinent to the cause I am advancing today. The Senator from Oregon said:

> I take the view that if we pass a bill limited to school construction, by imposing that very condition we shall, in a sense, be interfering with the educational process of the States.

I repeat, Mr. President, that the Senator from Oregon pointed out that by limiting the items for which the grants may be expended by the States, we are "interfering with the educational process of the States."

The distinguished Senator went on to say:

> I believe the States should determine what they wish to use the money for.

Mr. President, I could not have stated the issue before us half as well. The bill now says, in its main provision, you can spend the money only for construction and teachers' salaries. I am asking the Senate to allow the States to spend their Federal grants for any aspect of elementary and secondary school education. To do less is to impose conditions; to do less is to interfere with the educational process of the States.

Mr. President, it has been suggested by some that statistics could be conjured up which would create an impression that teachers might get less money under the bill if my amendment is approved. Mr. President, a good teacher wants good health services in the school; a good teacher wants decent instructional materials; and a good teacher is not going to be angry if we give her a history book that goes up to 1961 in text instead of 1945.

My respect for the American teacher is too great for me to believe that they will take issue with my amendment. In fact, I am sure they will give it their enthusiastic endorsement.

We all know that the way the bill is written now States could spend everything for construction and nothing for teachers' salaries or, conversely, everything for teachers' salaries and nothing for construction. My amendment does not change that discretionary feature of the bill one whit. It simply builds on it by allowing States to spend that portion of the money they deem advisable for maintenance and operating costs.

I would point out to the Senate that the bill now has a mandatory provision which requires the States—and that is Federal control—to spend 10 percent of

the allotted funds for special experimental projects. My amendment makes this provision permissive rather than mandatory, so that the States could use this 10 percent for teachers' salaries or other purposes if they deem it advisable. So, in one sense, my amendment adds money for teachers' salaries.

In summary, then, all the statistical magicians are simply talking through their hats.

Federal aid to the States to pay for the maintenance and operating costs of public schools is nothing new. We have been giving such aid for years to defense impacted areas under Public Law 874, as I pointed out previously. School districts in these Federal aid affected areas now use Federal money for bus transportation, utility costs, salaries of secretarial and custodial personnel, library and textbooks and many other purposes. Congress recognized that aid to the defense impacted areas for construction alone was not enough and that assistance should also be given for maintenance and operating costs. I think the same principle holds true with respect to a general aid bill such as we are considering today. We must give the States the freedom to use Federal funds as if they were State funds or else we will be passing a bill that has an element of Federal control.

Mr. President, I would like to give a breakdowrr of overall school financing which will give a picture of what the school budget looks like.

During the 1956 school year, the United States spent $10.9 billion on elementary and secondary education. Of this amount, more than half, $5.5 billion went for instruction. Out of the $11 billion school financing costs $2.6 billion went for capital outlay and interest, leaving a balance of $2.9 billion for other maintenance and operating costs.

If each State followed the pattern I have just outlined then roughly 50 percent of the grants we are approving will go for teachers' salaries. We, of course, know that some States will use a higher percentage of their funds and others will use a lower percentage for instructional purposes.

I have demonstrated, Mr. President, first, that the Chief State School Officers at their convention last November unanimously endorsed a Federal aid program which will permit the expenditure of funds for current expenses.

I have also demonstrated, Mr. President, that the overwhelming majority of State school officials still want a freedom of choice provision in the school aid bill which will allow them to spend money how and where they feel it should be spent on elementary and secondary education.

In addition, I have pointed out that the defense impacted area program under Public Law 874 gives local school authorities complete discretion with respect to the current expense items for which Federal funds may be used, and that there has been no abuse of this discretion.

I have pointed out further that there was not one scintilla of evidence brought forth in the hearings which would suggest that it would be unwise to allow States to use these moneys we are giving them for textbooks, transportation, fuel and other current expense items. On the contrary, I have shown that there is plenty of testimony which supports a broad freedom of choice provision.

My amendment does two simple things. First, it modifies the restrictive and mandatory provision in the bill which requires States to spend 10 percent of their allotted funds on experimental and pilot projects. My amendment makes this provision permissive rather than mandatory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Second, my amendment adds to the items eligible for assistance—ordinary operating and maintenance costs of public elementary and secondary schools. The way the bill stands now one cannot buy textbooks, library books, school supplies, fuel, school buses, nor can one pay clerical help, librarians, stenographers, school nurses and custodial help.

I say the bill needs to be changed so that school administrators back home can operate without Federal direction. They do not want it and they do not need it.

It seems to me the issue is clear. The States ought to determine how the money to be provided under the bill should be spent. Those who oppose the amendment take the position that if the Federal Government sends money to the States, it will tell the States how to spend it. My amendment follows extremely closely the language which the late great Senator Taft placed in the education bill in 1948 to guarantee State freedom and State rights. On page 3356 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 24, 1948, may be found the following language of Senator Taft which would have permitted the use of Federal money:

> For any current expenditure for elementary or secondary school purposes for which educational revenues derived from State or local sources may legally and constitutionally be expended in such States.

The Ohio Senator, who did so much to protect the rights of the States and local communities, had this to say about his proposal. I commend this language particularly to the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]:

> If we are going to maintain a system of local autonomy, if the Federal Government is not going to use this money to change the educational system which is desired by the people of any State, then it seems to me that we must adopt a provision of this kind.

Senator Taft knew very well that whenever a bill provides category aid, what always happens is that Congress at a later date will take the position that the local government is not spending enough money in this category or that category. He clearly understood that the real necessity is to give the States the right to spend the money for any and all primary and secondary school items.

There is only one issue in this debate, and that issue is: Who is to determine how the money should be spent? I say the States should make the determination. Those who would oppose me, or at least some of them, say that the Federal Government should assume control—lock, stock, and barrel. I am very much opposed to that concept.

Mr. President, my amendment strengthens the bill. It is an amendment which preserves the rights of the States to supervise the control of their own educational activities within their respective State borders.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, the author of the pending amendment. If I believed the amendment which he has proposed would accomplish what he has said it will accomplish, I would support the amendment. Indeed, I would be very reluctant to go against the judgment of the man whom all of us revered and loved—the late Robert A. Taft, of Ohio.

Mr. President, I do not happen to believe that the amendment would accomplish what the Senator from Vermont thinks it will accomplish. I believe that if this amendment were once enacted into law, it would put the Federal Government into the middle of the school system of the Nation, even down to the point of replacing a pane of glass in a schoolhouse window whenever a child threw a ball through one of the windows.

It is true that at the moment, and for the time being, under the amendment the State control would be preserved. But let us not forget that the money proposed to be expended will be Federal money, and the one who pays out the money in connection with any enterprise sooner or later will control that enterprise.

If this amendment were adopted, not only would every schoolteacher come to the Congress and petition the Congress whenever a salary increase was desired, but like action would be taken by every playground instructor, every janitor, every maintenance worker, and all the school policemen who stand at the street corners and help the schoolchildren cross the streets, on their way to and from school. All these groups would come to the Congress and would beg to be placed on the gravy wagon also, and soon the Congress would have the entire educational system of the country in its grip. In that event, those who now are sending to the Senator from Vermont telegrams in which they beg that this proposed change be made would then be coming to the Congress, with hats in hand, begging for their jobs, because this amendment would make their jobs unnecessary. I believe that sincerely.

I do not wish by my vote to help socialize and federalize our great country and its school systems. I do not wish to see the schools of the country put into the hands of a vast Federal bureaucracy, even down to the point of repairing the roof of a country schoolhouse.

I ask Senators to think several times before they vote to add this amendment to the bill, because the amendment would be the entering wedge for total and complete Federal control.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Maryland yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does not the Senator from Maryland believe that an argument completely contrary to the one he has been making could perhaps be made? I recognize his opposition to any bill which would result in general Federal aid to education. I respect his position, although I do not share it.

I may, however, find myself voting—in the final analysis—in the same way that the Senator from Maryland intends to vote, because at this time the provisions of this bill are certainly unsatisfactory to me. I supported the Cooper-Javits amendment, which was rejected. I am not sure that the bill, in its final form, will be one which I can support.

But if a Federal aid to education bill is to be enacted, could not it well be argued that the Prouty amendment, rather than detracting from States rights, actually would be reinforcing States rights, in that it would permit the use of the funds by the States in any way they might see fit to use them?

Mr. BUTLER. That was the premise on which I opened my brief remarks; namely, that if I thought the Prouty amendment would do what the Senator from Vermont thinks it will do, I would vote for it—for the same reason as the one the Senator from New York has pointed out.

However, I believe this amendment would lead to a system under which the Federal Government would do everything in connection with the schools, even down to repairing the roof of a country schoolhouse, and also paying the teachers, the janitors, the playground supervisors, repairing the school buildings, purchasing the books—doing everything in connection with the schools which is now done by the local school district.

Furthermore, Mr. President, once the Federal Government commenced to control the school system, how would it be possible to do away with such control by the Federal Government? I do not care who might be the administrator; in any event, once the administrator obtained such power, he would use it.

In addition, as I have already stated, those who now are sending to the Senator from Vermont telegrams in which they beg for the adoption of his amendment would then be begging him to help them keep their jobs, which they would then be in danger of losing.

Let me say, Mr. President, that I do not mean to have my remarks interpreted in any way as constituting the slightest criticism of the Senator who is the author of the amendment. However, I feel that the amendment would constitute the entering wedge for Federal control, whereas today—at least on the surface of things—the States do have some control of their educational systems. All the funds proposed to be spent in connection with the proposed program will be Federal funds; and in that event it would be extremely easy for the administrator, who would control the money, to prescribe what would be done in the educational system.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. PROUTY. I fully understand that the Senator from Maryland meant no personal criticism of me.

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly I did not intend to do so; and if any of my remarks could be understood as constituting a personal criticism of the Senator from Vermont, I humbly apologize, for that definitely was not my intention.

Mr. PROUTY. It is not necessary for the Senator from Maryland to apologize, for I know he did not intend his remarks to be understood as constituting a personal criticism.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, let me say that I know how the Senator from Maryland feels about this matter. I, myself, feel very strongly about it.

I do not want the Federal Government to take over the school systems of the various States; and that is why I have offered this amendment. Certainly no one of us can state what action some future Congress might take in the field of education or in any other field. But I am convinced that this amendment will give the States greater control than the control they now have in the absence of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. But does not the Senator from Vermont admit that there is some validity to the point that all the money used in connection with the bill will be Federal money? That points up the argument I have made, namely, that when the Federal Government provides all the money, the Federal Government will eventually run the entire educational system.

Mr. PROUTY. I think a similar point could be made in connection with Public Law 874. The money used in connection with it is Federal money. But certainly there has been no Federal control; and I am sure the Senator from Maryland would not wish to deny those funds to his State.

Mr. BUTLER. Does not the Senator from Vermont believe that if the bill were enacted in its present form, there would be no more lobbying at the State level for increases in teachers' salaries or increases in the salaries of other school personnel; instead, all that would be done here in Washington? Does not the Senator from Vermont believe that would be the case?

Mr. PROUTY. I believe that if my amendment is included in the bill there will be less likelihood that that will happen than there will be if the amendment is not adopted.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator says "less likelihood," but the fact is that it is easier to deal with the Congress of the United States than it is with 50 State legislatures. If the bill passes, does not the Senator know that teachers will come to Washington and lobby for increases in teachers' salaries? If the amendment is adopted, does not the Senator know, by like token, that if a certain schoolhouse needs repair, and the local board does not want to spend the money for that purpose, but for some other purpose, Congress will be lobbied to provide funds for repairs to that schoolhouse?

Mr. PROUTY. The fact that the money is to be spent by the States in the local communities seems to me to give assurance that that will not be done, for the time being——

Mr. BUTLER. I notice that the Senator is very careful when he says "for the time being."

Mr. PROUTY. We are talking about Federal aid to education. Who knows what will transpire in the years ahead? Neither he nor I can make predictions about the future.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, is it not the position of the distinguished Senator from Vermont, that, actually, the adoption of the amendment would reinforce State rights? In other words, when we give Federal aid only for construction and/or teachers' salaries, we are imposing or encouraging some Federal restraints?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes more.

Mr. KEATING. And if a wide-open grant is made to the States, the supervision of the funds is left to the States. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROUTY. What the Senater has said is absolutely correct. It is the purpose of the amendment to do everything possible to preserve the rights of the States. We are not taking anything away from the States; we are giving them greater authority than we want to give the Federal Government in supervision of the expenditure of the funds.

While I am on my feet, I may point out that this amendment relates only to public schools. I understand an amendment will be offered later to deal with the private school question, but this amendment does not.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, expressions of approval from various members of State

educational offices, many superintendents of schools, commissioners of education of various States, and so forth have been cited.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that all the persons and officials who have been cited by the Senator from Vermont in this connection are not policymaking officers. They are administrative officers. They are the spenders. Of course, it would be natural that anyone charged with paying the bills would welcome money from any source—that is in the nature of the beast—and would welcome increases of those funds on any score whatsoever.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that when the National School Boards Association met in Philadelphia recently; in fact, earlier this month it took a position which is at loggerheads with the opposition taken by the Senator from Vermont.

I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that it is the school boards who represent the people. It is the members of the school boards who must go before the electorate of their independent school districts and say, "I am better qualified to serve in the office of a member of the school board than my opponent." It is they who speak for the policymaking bodies that pertain to the school systems.

I read from a press report on the meeting to which I have referred which states that the school board group voted overwhelmingly to:

1. Oppose Federal aid to education because it would be naive to think that it will not mean Government control.

2. Oppose any broadening of the National Defense Education Act, which, among other things, provides Government scholarships.

Another point covered by the recommendation of the group is:

Insure that choice of textbooks in the Nation's schools remain a local and State matter.

I submit this is a much more cogent argument in the premises than that which is made by the school administrators.

It has been said here that certainly it cannot be contended that there is any Federal control under Public Law 874, which advances Federal funds to federally impacted areas for the purpose of maintenance and operation of the schools.

The situations are not parallel. Under Public Law 874, the Federal funds are paid directly to the independent school districts by the Office of Education in Washington, D.C. There is direct contact with them. Not so in the case of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont. Under the amendment before the Senate now, as I understand it, Federal money would be paid to a single State agency, and by that single State agency would be parceled out under a system of priority determined by the State agency, after it receives approval by the Commissioner of Education or whoever administers the law here.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand there are one or more States in which, by State law and interpretation of the State courts, public funds can be used for transporting of students going to religious and private schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand also, under State laws and by interpretation of the State courts, there are States in which public school moneys raised in those States may be expended to supply schoolbooks to students at religious and private schools.

There are included in the amendment the words:

The term "other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education" means any maintenance and operating cost of public elementary or secondary school education for which revenues derived from State or local sources may be expended in such State.

I ask the Senator if those words do not mean very clearly that under the proposed law, if this amendment were adopted, Federal funds could be used in the States which I have mentioned for the purposes which I have mentioned, which are not for what are generally regarded as public school purposes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not think there is any question about it whatsoever. The funds would be available for those purposes. As I understand the amendment, there would be only one prohibition, that the money would not be used for payment of debt service. As I understand the amendment, the funds could be used for the purposes to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to the Senator from Florida that is an inescapable conclusion. The Senator from Florida appreciates the fact that his friend from Nebraska has come to the same conclusion.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, with reference to control and management by the Federal authorities in the event the amendment is approved, of course there would be eventually, if not now, an exercise of control over the program the money would support. That has always been the history in these matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I wish to refer to the hearings held in March of this year on the bill, and to read from the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], in which he quotes from a speech by former Representative Graham Barden, as shown at page 558 of the transcript of hearings. This is a quotation from the speech of Representative Barden in July of 1957:

You will hear it said there has not been any Federal control or interference through Public Law 815 of federally impacted areas. I tell you there have been some of the most horrible instances of interference and wrongdoing under that bill that you can imagine, and I challenge anyone to deny that statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the first three paragraphs on page 559 of the hearings, being an excerpt from the speech of former Representative Barden, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

That is the picture, and you will hear it said there has not been any Federal control or interference through Public Law 815, the Federal impacted area bill. I tell you there has been some of the most horrible illustrations of interference and wrongdoing under that bill that you can imagine, and I challenge anyone to deny that statement.

It has not been 2 years since the U.S. Commissioner of Education flatly and determinedly, and I will almost say intentionally and willfully misinterpreted the language we had written into that law which was intended to take care of some military installations so they could move the children out if there were not enough to warrant the operation of a separate school. And what happened? He issued an order closing the Quantico High School of approximately 150 pupils, and he persisted in closing that school even though it would have required children to travel from 13 to 26 miles to schools that had no hope of having room for them for more than 1 year. I called him before the committee. He still persisted in interpreting the word "suitable" to mean adequate; and the entire committee just said, "You are wrong, and you know you are wrong." We had to pass a Federal law, and you gentlemen voted for it virtually unanimously, to make that Commissioner of Education do what? To follow the intention of Congress and drop that order he had issued to close the Quantico school. The Senate passed the bill, and the President signed it.

Now we find before us a bill with 10 or 15 pages of discretionary power. You first say what the States must do; they must file their plans, and then from there on the Commissioner has the right to do this and the right to do that, and so it goes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the fact that the Senator has quoted the remarks of former Representative Barden, but there is not a scintilla of evidence to back up the quotation. Let Mr. Barden come forward with any evidence to back up the quotation.

Mr. HRUSKA. On the contrary, Mr. Barden went into detail. I did not think it would be appropriate at this time to go into detail, and I do not wish to use my time to read the details, but he did outline the situation in Quantico, Va., where the Quantico High School was actually closed because the Federal authorities said it was not a "suitable" high school.

Mr. MORSE. That was under the Constitution of the United States, and involved the segregation problem and a violation of the Supreme Court decision of 1954. That has nothing to do with Federal Government interference with education under Public Law 815 or Public Law 874.

Mr. HRUSKA. The excerpt from Representative Barden's speech will speak for itself. There was an interpretation by the Commissioner that the word "suitable" meant "adequate." Therefore, since the school was considered inadequate, it was closed.

As to other examples, there was the testimony of Prof. Claude J. Bartlett, assistant professor of psychology at George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tenn., as shown on page 548 of the transcript of hearings on the bill before the Senate. The professor described the fate of two guidance and counseling institutes set up under title V of the National Defense Education Act. Professor Bartlett participated in both, and was the director of one.

In one institute, the standards of admission for students were lowered as a result of pressure from the Federal Government. The result was the acceptance of many persons who were of questionable ability.

Based on the experiences in its first institute, changes in the operations of the second institute were deemed desirable. Nevertheless the Office of Education refused to permit changes in the plan of operation even though the changes did not affect the cost of the institute as specified in the contract. Thus, the Federal Government dictated curriculum and administration of the institute as well as financial arrangements.

The professor also said:

The Office of Education insisted that all of the students of the second institute be recruited before authorization for establishing it had even been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I continue to quote:

As a result of these difficulties, the college chose to cancel the contract for the institute rather than submit to bureaucratic whims.

There are other examples of the same or similar experiences. As soon as funds are allocated to any State agency for any purpose by a Federal agency, management, and eventually control follow. The same will happen in this instance if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont is made a part of the bill and of the law, because ultimately there will be control over even textbooks and supplies and the personnel whose salaries will be paid.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Is the Senator not expressing an opinion or making a prediction which cannot be justified? I do not think the Senator can say categorically that will happen. Certainly, so long as I have a vote which amounts to anything, it will not happen.

Mr. HRUSKA. Precisely.

Mr. PROUTY. That is true. The Senator from Nebraska and a great many other Senators no doubt feel the same.

Mr. HRUSKA. After all, the only lamp by which we can be guided is the lamp of experience. I have made reference to the National Defense Education Act, which is not even 3 years old, and I have recited the details of one of the efforts to control or to exercise control. There are other specific examples.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I do not know of any way to predict the meaning and effect of proposed legislation other than by reference to past incidents and past history with respect to similar legislation.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon, if he at this time wishes to offer an amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I should like to offer an amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I do not think I will need that much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, some concern has been expressed in regard to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, and I have talked to the Senator about it. A question was raised only a few moments ago by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] when he talked about the practices in some States of using State funds, under educational policy, for private school and parochial school purposes.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the objective of the Prouty amendment, and I have told the Senator that for a number of days. There has developed, however, the confusing problem which I should like to have cleared up.

The Senator from Vermont has assured us of his purpose, and I have assured the Senator that I support the amendment because of the objective of the amendment. His purpose is to see to it that the funds go to States for maintenance and operating costs of public elementary and secondary schools, as well as for the other purposes authorized by the bill.

We have said from the very beginning of the debate, as well as for months in the committee, that we seek to give to the States complete authority over their educational processes without any Federal domination or control. I like the Prouty amendment, because it would be in keeping with that pledge on our part.

In the last hour on the floor of the Senate a considerable amount of doubt has arisen as to one part of the amendment. Some of the representatives of educational associations have come to me and to other Senators and have said they are very much concerned that it be made perfectly certain the money shall be used for public elementary and secondary school education only. The present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], raised the question with me only a few minutes ago. In order to avoid any doubt, I should like to offer an amendment to the Prouty amendment.

On page 2, lines 14 and 15, I propose to strike out the language "for which revenues derived from State or local sources may be expended in such State."

The amendment would then read:

The term "other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education" means any maintenance and operating cost of public elementary or secondary school education.

That would leave no room for doubt as to the objective for which the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Oregon have stood shoulder to shoulder in the debate. The parliamentary situation is such that the yeas and nays have not been ordered on the substitute amendment, and it is the substitute amendment which is before the Senate. The Senator from Vermont can, if he cares to do so, modify his own amendment to conform to the suggestion made by the Senator from Oregon. I respectfully ask the Senator if he is willing to accept my amendment as a modification of the substitute amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am very happy to accept the Senator's amendment. It is almost identical to, if not identical with, one I drafted some time in the past myself.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will give me 1 more minute, I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. As I understand, the amendment as modified would provide that the money would be expended in exactly the same way as moneys are expended under Public Law 874, for public school purposes only.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. METCALF. It would be parallel to the situation we have had under Public Law 874 for the last 10 years.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment, the amendment just accepted by the Senator from Vermont would eliminate one serious concern which I have had respecting the original amendment. I do not think we ought to have in the bill the slightest indication that aid for private and parochial schools would be granted. Personally I am strongly in favor of such assistance on a loan basis and will work with my friend from Oregon to bring from our committee in the very near future a bill which would make such a provision.

But in the interest of passing a clean Federal-aid-to-education bill I am delighted that we have removed the remaining doubt that the Prouty amendment might have permitted with respect to private or parochial schools and, to that extent, I support the modified amendment.

However, I am still opposed to the amendment, even if modified, but for very different reasons than those stated on the floor of the Senate by my good friend from Nebraska.

The point that concerns me is that as the bill left the committee, it was based

on voluminous testimony taken not only this year, but over a period of years, and it hit hard at the three major deficiencies in our system of public education at the local and the State levels. Those three major deficiencies are, first, an inadequate number of modern fireproof classrooms; second, inadequate teachers' salaries across the board throughout the country; third, the inadequacy of special programs to deal with special categories of students, ranging from those who are defective in terms of their ability to read or to assimilate knowledge, to those unusually gifted pupils for whom adequate provision to move ahead as fast as their brains will let them, have not been made.

The difficulty I find with the amendment is that it would dilute those three objectives which, in my judgment, represent the consensus of informed opinion in the field of education as to the three major deficiencies in our school system, and it would dilute those three objectives by making the special programs optional instead of mandatory to the extent of 10 percent.

I have had enough experience with school districts in Pennsylvania to know that many school districts will take the easy way out and not use any money for purposes of these important special programs.

Again, it would make money available for any kind of school expenditure which is permitted under the laws of the State in question, save alone the situation respecting private and parochial schools, which has now been taken care of.

What I fear, based upon my knowledge of the education system in my own State, is that the money would be frittered away for athletic programs, domestic science courses, and for all kinds of things that would not raise the level of education a bit, but would comply with the general legality and form of an educational system.

My friend from Nebraska said that he was afraid of Federal control if the Prouty amendment were adopted. I disagree with him thoroughly in that regard, because I believe the Prouty amendment would limit the area of Federal suggestion and would turn things wide open to the local school districts and to the States. I am not one who is afraid of Federal control of education, because we have Federal assistance to education. We have had Federal assistance to education ever since the Northwest Territory Act of 1787. We have had massive aid ever since the Morrill Act of 1865. I see no evidence in my Commonwealth of Federal control of education, either generally or in connection with the application of Public Laws 815 and 874. I am not afraid of Federal aid to education. I suspect that a good many of my colleagues are not either. There are a few who are seeing something under the rug that is not there, and, insofar as the bill, as it came from committee, put the greatest emphasis on the three needs which are serious in our educational system. I think we did a wise thing.

I regret that this amendment would dilute those three major objectives essential to the progress of our entire educational system. For that reason, with deep regret, I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. I find myself in very considerable agreement with the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has pretty well expressed my own views.

I am opposed to the pending amendment. It would transform the present aid to education bill from a program aimed at two particular emergencies, the shortage of classrooms and the shortage of teachers, into a general aid to education bill that would be used to finance everything from cutting grass in front of the school to replacing worn-out light bulbs.

I oppose this amendment on practical and philosophic grounds. The bill reported out by the committee is a very modest bill in comparison to the total educational need. Its impact upon my State would be an addition of about 3 percent to the total amount spent for education, and there is no State where the impact would be greater than about 12 percent.

Thus, if the bill is to be at all effective, and if these modest amounts are not to be merely melted into the general education fund where their impact will be negligible, the Federal money provided must be aimed at certain limited objectives. This money can be effectively used to finance the building of schools that might otherwise not be built. It can be effectively used in raising the salaries of teachers in the poorer school districts to a higher level. But to attempt to do more with this limited Federal aid would only dilute the program and spread it so thin as to destroy its purpose.

My second objection is on the ground of public philosophy. The committee bill, however inequitable some of its provisions may be, does not violate the principle that education is primarily a local responsibility. Rather, it acknowledges that temporary emergency conditions exist and that Federal help is required to meet specific problems that are presently beyond the means of local governments.

The classroom shortage, for instance, was brought about by an abnormally low school building program during 15 years of depression and war from 1930 to 1945, followed by an unusually high birth rate from 1945 on. Federal aid for school construction is aimed at restoring the balance and when it is restored, it is my hope that this part of the program will come to an end. But the pending amendment would use Federal funds to finance routine maintenance costs, the heating and lighting of schools, the upkeep of school grounds and all the other normal day-to-day expenses. These expenses are clearly the obligation of local and State authorities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to direct the question also to other Senators who have participated in the discussion. What would prevent a local school board from using its normal appropriation of moneys to hire teachers and then to substitute reduction through the use of funds which it would get from the Federal Government, ultimately putting itself in the identical position that it occupied before it received Federal aid? What is there in the bill in that regard?

Mr. CLARK. I would like to answer that question, if the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to do so.

Mr. DODD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. We would have to rely for control on the State educational authority, which in my State would be effective. It might not be as effective elsewhere. However, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, if the Prouty amendment is adopted, there will be no control at all. Without the Prouty amendment, there would be maintained the three purposes, with certification that the money is being used for those purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, the certification could be made that the money was being spent for one of those three purposes, without the establishment of the fact that the Federal money had been used to supplement the moneys that have been expended before the Federal money was granted. The local moneys could be diverted to such operations as are contemplated by the Prouty amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, there is the maintenance of effort clause in the bill, which would still be in the law.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I wish to complete my statement.

Somewhere we must draw the line as to what local and State governments must do for themselves and what they can legitimately expect the Federal Government to help them to do. The pending amendment would transform the most basic and fundamental of local responsibilities into an obligation of the Federal Government. I cannot support this concept, and I therefore oppose the amendment.

I have been informed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that he has received a wire from Connecticut's Commissioner of Education William J. Sanders, expressing support of the Prouty amendment. Commissioner Sanders is an extremely able and knowledgeable educator and I can well understand the desire of any commissioner to use these Federal funds as he thinks they ought to be used, without any restrictions. But I do not believe the Federal Government should finance purely local obligations and I think the majority of the people of Connecticut share this view. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. What is the status of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proponents have 21 minutes remaining; the opponents have 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, first, I disagree with the Senator from Pennsylvania in his view on the value of domestic science training when he says that it is not the kind of training that raises the level of education. Either he has not had any contact with the kind of courses that are being conducted in domestic science in American high schools, or he has a different concept from that of the Senator from South Dakota as to one of the great purposes of education.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. My concept is that education should increase the capabilities of the young people who go to school and to provide for better family life. I believe that domestic science training stands high on that agenda. I will not stand silent while it is being slandered on the Senate floor.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, I think that a girl can learn to cook out of a cookbook or by going to the A. & P. and doing a little practical work. The girls going to school ought to spend a great deal more time on other courses which are important.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps that is why so many people in Pennsylvania have ulcers, if they are living in homes where the wives have learned to cook only by attending an A. & P. school.

However, Mr. President, I rise primarily to oppose the Prouty amendment. As one who has supported in the past and hopes to support now a Federal aid to education program, I believe the amendment would change the entire concept of the type of proposed legislation we have before us. The amendment is called the freedom-of-choice amendment. It is hard to quarrel with that kind of name. One gets into a difficult semantic situation. However, it should more appropriately be labeled, it seems to me, if it were named a freedom from local responsibility amendment. That is what it would provide. It would transfer the whole responsibility of supporting education from the local level, where it should be, to the Federal level. It would permit school authorities to use the money for any purpose including the purchase of better floor-waxing machines, or better electric hair curlers, so that the girls in the school could get a better permanent. The whole purpose of aid to education would be changed if we were to accept the Prouty amendment. As originally presented very persuasively, it certainly had the favorable consideration of the Senator from South Dakota. It was a pump-priming operation, for the purpose of more or less setting an example and providing extra funds to make it possible to pay better salaries to teachers and to provide better school buildings and facilities which was precisely what would have been done had we enacted the legislation that was passed in the Senate a year ago and which I supported.

However, if we inject this new concept by asking the Federal Government to participate in meeting all of the expenses of local education, then it becomes simply a matter where finally the Federal Government could have almost total responsibility for public education. In short, as proposed originally, this year and in the bill we passed a year ago, the Federal aid to education proposal was to put a carrot in front of the horse, to get the school boards to spend extra money to improve teachers' salaries and to build better buildings.

With the Prouty amendment, the Federal Government could supply the whole load of hay to the horse. Ultimately, it would assume responsibility for the entire upkeep of the horse, including the hiring of people to bring water and oats to the horse and finally bed it down for the night.

Mr. President, by broadening the purposes of Federal aid to education as proposed by the Prouty amendment, we make a basic and fundamental change in the philosophy and concept which won approval for this legislation a year ago in the Senate and which has been inherent in the committee bill this year. I hope the Prouty amendment is defeated. If it should prevail it will make it very difficult—perhaps impossible—for some of us to continue support for a proposal which has been changed so substantially.

I do not like to see the concept changed, because to do so could get us into real difficulties. It is unwise and dangerous to approve this amendment, and certainly it would open the door to greater opportunities for Federal control. Just as soon as we insert a provision that the Federal Government shall help in the purchase of textbooks, for example, it will mean that ultimately the Federal Government can assist in selecting them or in excluding certain textbooks from the classroom. That would be the end of local control of education at the local level. Let us keep this a clean bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to supply for the RECORD information for the benefit of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] in regard to the question that he raised as to what would happen if a State stopped supporting its education in the way it is now supporting it. I refer the Senator to section 106(a) on page 6 of the bill.

We have a memorandum which we used in committee, which discusses this very problem raised by the Senator from Ohio. I will state the effect of the conclusion of the memorandum, and then shall ask unanimous consent to have the entire memorandum placed in the RECORD. I read:

In order to assure the maintenance of present State effort to meet its needs for school construction and improved public school teachers' salaries, the bill contains provisions to reduce the size of the grant otherwise allocable to any State that, in either of the last 2 fiscal years of the program, reduces its school effort (i.e., the ratio of the school expenditures per public school pupil in average daily attendance within the State to the average personal income per such pupil) below the average level of its effort during the 3 fiscal years immediately preceding the second and third years of the program, as the case may be.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the entire memorandum.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS REGARDING EFFORT REQUIRED OF PARTICIPATING STATES, S. 1021

Title I, section 106 of S. 1021, requires both (a) maintenance of effort and (b) improvement of effort in order to qualify for grants under the bill without reduction of amounts initially allotted.

I. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

In order to assure the maintenance of present State effort to meet its needs for school construction and improved public school teachers' salaries, the bill contains provisions to reduce the size of the grant otherwise allocable to any State that, in either of the last 2 fiscal years of the program, reduces its school effort (i.e., the ratio of the school expenditures per public school pupil in average daily attendance within the State to the average personal income per such pupil) below the average level of its effort during the 3 fiscal years immediately preceding the second and third years of the program, as the case may be.

For example, a State with an average effort during the base year of 4.76 percent and an effort during the allocation year of 4.28 percent will have its allocation reduced by an amount which is the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the expenditures it would have made had it extended an effort of 4.76 percent of its personal income. If 4.76 percent of the personal income per pupil yields $490 and the actual expenditures per pupil amount to $487, the reduction would be $490 minus $487, or $3 per pupil. If the State's unreduced allocation is $26 per pupil, the $3 reduction amounts to about 11 percent of the amount allotted.

II. IMPROVEMENT OF EFFORT

A State's allotment would also be reduced if it failed to increase its effort in the second and third fiscal years of the program by a fixed percentage (equal to the average annual increase in the national effort, over the 5-fiscal-year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, inclusive) unless, in either such year, it exerts the same or greater effort as the Nation as a whole, or makes an expenditure per public school pupil which exceeds the national average expenditure per such pupil by 10 percent.

The reduction bears the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort bears to the national effort, or (2) if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 percent of the national expenditure per public school pupil, bears to 1 percent of the national expenditure per public school child.

For example, if a State's average effort during the base years is 3.60 percent and the national average annual increase in effort between 1957 and 1961 was 0.14 percent, the State would be required to increase to 3.60 percent plus 0.14 percent, or 3.74 percent, during the allocation year. If it

actually increased to only 3.68 percent, and if the national average effort for the allocation year is 4.07 percent, the State's allocation is reduced

$$\frac{(4.07\% - 3.68\%)}{4.07\%}$$

or 10 percent. However, if this State's expenditure per pupil is $460 and if 110 percent of the national average expenditure per pupil is $532, the reduction is

$$\frac{(\$532 - \$490)}{\$532}$$

or 8 percent. In this example, if the State's expenditure per pupil is $532 or more, it does not receive any reduction for failing to increase its effort.

If the total reduction for failing to maintain effort amounts to 10 percent and the reduction for failing to increase effort amounts to 11 percent, the total allocation otherwise due the State is reduced 21 percent (10 percent plus 11 percent=21 percent).

III. MAXIMUM REDUCTION

No State would have its allotment for any year reduced under these provisions by more than one-third. For example, if the sum of the reductions under maintenance and increase of effort totaled 40 percent, the State's reduction would be 33⅓ percent of its allotment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Ohio may be assured that that section is in the bill to prevent an attempt on the part of a State to pass the burden of supporting its schools on the basis of its present effort to the taxpayers of the country as a whole. It is intended to help the Federal funds from becoming a substitute for State and local funds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator from Vermont yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. There is one other matter that I believe, as Senator in charge of the bill, it would be very unfair of me not to comment upon. It has not been commented upon by anyone else. The record ought to be clear even if a Senator would use the statement as a basis for not voting for the bill. I owe it to the Senate to give all the facts I have available.

Let us face up to it. There are States making present allocations to education. Section 106(a) of the bill makes it important that they continue at least to maintain that effort. If they do not maintain and increase their efforts at least as much as the national increase in effort, they are not going to get the same amount of money under the bill as they would if they did maintain and increase that effort. One of the things that I like about the Prouty amendment as modified is that it makes very clear that the Federal money will go to the States to be commingled with State funds and to be spent by the States in accordance with State policy in support of its public school system.

The basic Taft principle that we maintained in the Senate in 1947, in 1949, and last year, in 1959, is that the money will be turned over to the States.

Now, why not adopt the Prouty amendment? We know this is a question of bookkeeping. Suppose the Prouty amendment is not agreed to, and the problem which someone stated at my desk a few moments ago is raised. I was asked, "WAYNE, do you really support the idea of Federal aid to education to pay the salaries of janitors?" My answer was, "Of course. It is necessary to have janitors in the schoolhouse. They have to be paid." What difference does it make whether Federal funds are commingled with State educational funds, so that with respect to this particular item it will not be necessary to keep a separate set of books to provide for the payment of janitors from State funds and the payment of teachers from Federal funds; and the payment for microscopes and chemicals for the laboratory from State funds, but the payment for school construction from Federal funds?

Let us be realistic. Certainly the funds should be commingled. So long as the money will be spent for public schools, it should be possible to say to the State authorities, "You may keep one set of books. You do not have to go to the extra expense of maintaining a separate bookkeeping system."

The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont provides economical management. But also it is a test of the good faith of the authors of the bill and the supporters of the bill in committee as to whether we meant it when we say we will write into the bill absolute guarantees that the States will have the control of their public school systems.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Oregon has made an eloquent, logical, and persuasive statement. I hope Senators will give his remarks the attention they merit.

My purpose, from the start, has been to maintain maximum controls within the States themselves, with only the money to be provided by the Federal Government. My State of Vermont insists upon State control over its educational policies. Vermont intends to continue to insist upon that approach to education. I think that is the view of the overwhelming number of States throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I recognize the argument of those who have indicated that this amendment, if adopted, will increase the area of Federal control beyond what is provided in the original bill. I do not agree with that argument. It strikes me that the amendment would tend to eliminate rather than to expand the possibilities of Federal control of education. The amendment follows pretty much what has been spoken of as the Taft formula, which was embodied in the substitute amendment offered by my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The bill as now written provides for a degree of control, if we are to say that control exists in limiting the use of the funds. In other words, the bill as now written provides for a certain degree of control so far as the States are required to spend Federal funds for construction, teachers' salaries, and experimental and pilot projects alone.

The proposal of the Senator from Vermont would restore to the State educational authorities full control and full power to determine where Federal funds could best be used within their States. I believe the State education departments are better fitted to reach such decisions on their own with a view to the separate needs of the different States than is a Senate committee or, indeed, the entire Senate meeting in Washington.

Furthermore, Mr. President, Dr. Edgar Fuller, Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, made this very point himself on March 9 in testimony before the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Dr. Fuller represents the State superintendents and State commissioners of education of the 50 States and the chief school officers of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone, Guam, and American Samoa. They are the legal officers of the States and territories for public elementary and secondary education and will be responsible for administration on the State level of any Federal aid-to-education bill.

Dr. Fuller, their representative, has pointed out that these chief State school officers believe there should be a freedom of choice in the State as to how these funds should be allocated. As Dr. Fuller pointed out:

If the school district should have a bill of $10,000 a year for interest on bonds for buildings that had been built to last them for the next 10 or 20 years, it seems to me entirely reasonable and in accord with the spirit of this bill to allow the States to have as an additional option the payment of interest on bonds that have made the building possible.

There can be no hard-and-fast answer to these problems that will apply across the country. Therefore, I believe we should leave this crucial authority, this right to decide exactly how Federal funds may be used, with the responsible State officials who are themselves overwhelmingly in support of this kind of amendment.

I believe the amendment of the Senator from Vermont should be supported.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is under control.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland will state it.

Mr. BUTLER. Do I correctly understand that the Prouty substitute amendment is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. If there is a voice vote on the Prouty substitute amendment, may we then have a yea-and-nay vote on the Prouty amendment as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Prouty substitute amendment is agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER. Would it be in order now to ask for the yeas and nays on the Prouty amendment as amended?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request the yeas and nays on the Prouty substitute?

Mr. BUTLER. It is not my desire to do that; but after the substitute has been agreed to, I will ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered on the Prouty amendment.

Mr. MORSE. On the Prouty amendment. If the Prouty substitute is agreed to by a voice vote, then we will have the yeas and nays on the Prouty amendment as amended.

Mr. BUTLER. It was my understanding that the yeas and nays had been ordered on the Prouty amendment B, and that the substitute for that is now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is correct.

Mr. BUTLER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending substitute?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. BUTLER. They have not been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In further opposition to the Prouty amendment, I should like to make this comment. Its adoption will certainly result in important changes in the bill itself. I refer to page 21 of the bill, in which the definition of "elementary and secondary education" is contained.

(8) The terms "school facilities" and "public school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed.

That language will have to be changed, because these functions clearly will be within the meaning of expenditure of funds as indicated by the amendment. The same is true of the following:

Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

So they will be included; and if it is said it is not a cost of maintenance, the simple expedient of leasing those facilities could be resorted to. The payments under the law will be the cost of operation, and the moneys will be available for all the purposes which are presently excluded in the bill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the funds provided by my amendment could be used for the construction of gymnasiums?

Mr. HRUSKA. No; but they could be used for the purpose of leasing gymnasiums, because the payments under the leasing agreement would be a part of the cost of operating the school system.

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct; I misunderstood the Senator.

Mr. HRUSKA. Many statements have been made to the effect that no control will be exercised by the Federal agencies in that respect. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Allen P. Burkhardt, superintendent of the Norfolk, Nebr., public schools at the time he testified on July 16, 1958, before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, be printed at this point in the RECORD. This testimony is an excerpt from pages 63 and 64 of the hearings of that day.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR
AND PUBLIC WELFARE,
Washington, D.C.

I have always been opposed to Federal aid for schools or education in any form. I am opposed to general aid, and also opposed to the present bill which calls for aid for school construction purposes. It's my feeling that the communities of Nebraska and, for that matter, of the entire United States are better able to build their own school buildings than is Uncle Sam. There isn't a school district in the United States in as bad shape, financially, as the Federal Government. Furthermore, if we ever accept aid from Washington, we will have to expect to accept accompanying control. Contrary to what some people try to say, there is no such thing as Federal aid without Federal control.

A good example is in the field of vocational agriculture and home economics. We receive Federal aid through the State department of education in the amount of about 27 or 28 percent of the teachers' salaries in these two departments. In order to get this money we have to accept and adopt the course of study outlined and specified by the Federal Government, through the State department. We have to permit inspection trips by State employees who receive part of their money from the Federal Government. We have to hire teachers whose qualifications are approved by the same groups. We have to send our teachers to conferences designated by those authorities. If we have night classes, they have to be operated according to the rules of the Federal and State departments. In other words, we are perfectly able to work out our own course of study in all other fields, including science, mathematics, English, and other technical fields because we don't get any Federal aid—but, because we get Federal aid for agriculture and home economics, we have to accept courses of study worked out by other people. We, also, have to accept supervision from the outside in those fields, while in every other field we are trusted to do our own supervision. Other examples of control in these fields are these: We are told how long our periods of recitation have to be—that's not true in any other field; we are told how large the classrooms and the shops have to be, what type of equipment we have to have, even the type of floor in the rooms. We are told about how much money to spend per student. We are not allowed to use the teachers in those departments in any other fields, except home economics, or agriculture. If we do, we lose our aid money.

If all the above doesn't constitute control from Washington, then at least it's a reasonable facsimile thereof. The school lunch program, veterans' aid for college students, etc., are all examples of aid with control. There is no such thing as aid without control and, for that matter, there probably should be control with aid. My whole story is that we don't need the aid, and since we don't need it, why should we ask for it and then give up local control of the schools in the process.

ALLEN P. BURKHARDT,
Superintendent, Norfolk Public Schools,
Norfolk, Nebr.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, finally it has been suggested that this is a parallel case, again, with the expenditure of funds under Public Law 874. I most respectfully contend that it is not a parallel. Under the instant bill, payment will be made to a single State agency, which must enter into an agreement. The agreement will not be effective until it has been approved by the State Commissioner of Education. Under Public Law 874, that is not the case. There the Department of Education deals directly with the school district which is federally impacted. No such intermediary is provided in the pending bill.

So there is that difference, and there is no parallel between those two situations.

Mr. President, unless there are further requests for time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. PROUTY. I should like to say a further word.

Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed, as amended by the Senator from Oregon, will reserve to the States the right to control their educational systems.

I believe this bill is a States rights bill, insofar as education is concerned. That is why I offered the amendment. I believe the amendment should be adopted; and I hope very much that a majority of the Members of the Senate will vote for the amendment.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I do likewise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). All remaining time on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont has been yielded back.

The question now is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont that his amendment be amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont, as amended. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Prouty amendment, as amended. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent on official business and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 39, as follows:

[No. 47]

YEAS—51

Anderson	Hartke	Monroney
Bartlett	Hayden	Morse
Beall	Hill	Moss
Bible	Humphrey	Muskie
Burdick	Jackson	Neuberger
Bush	Javits	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Pell
Cannon	Keating	Prouty
Carroll	Kerr	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	Randolph
Church	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Engle	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Fong	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Fulbright	Long, La.	Wiley
Gore	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McNamara	Yarborough
Hart	Metcalf	Young, Ohio

NAYS—39

Bennett	Dworshak	Morton
Boggs	Eastland	Mundt
Bridges	Ellender	Robertson
Butler	Ervin	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Scott
Carlson	Hickey	Smathers
Case, S. Dak.	Holland	Smith, Maine
Clark	Hruska	Stennis
Cotton	Jordan	Talmadge
Curtis	Kefauver	Thurmond
Dodd	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Miller	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—10

Aiken	Cooper	McGee
Allott	Dirksen	Saltonstall
Blakley	Magnuson	
Chavez	Mansfield	

So the Prouty amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

COMMEMORATION OF THE GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AVIATION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have conferred with the leadership on both sides, and the leadership is agreeable to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 249, which I can explain in about half a minute.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 398) would permit the manufacture of a galvano, which I understand to be a very fine ornamental copper-plated artifact, for presentation at Pensacola on the celebration of the 50th anniversary of naval aviation, all at the expense of the citizens of Pensacola.

The measure has been unanimously approved by the House, and now comes from the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency with a unanimous recommendation. The work needs to be done prior to the celebration, which will take place June 6. I believe there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 398) authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, with the understanding that if there is objection to the request I shall be glad to withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ALABAMA RACIAL AGITATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the recent events in Alabama have brought sharp criticism of the white people of Alabama from many sources, including large segments of the national press and high-placed officials of the national administration. It is imperative that all involved in the situation in Alabama—members of both races—exercise restraint and refrain from further violence, whatever may be the extent of aggravation. Violence plays into the hands of the agitators, for the horrors created by the picture of an angry mob effectively shield from the public all the evil instigation which lies at the root of the trouble.

The criticism and derision directed at the people of Alabama by much of the national press and the administration officials ignore the obvious fact, however, that this is not a one-sided issue. The self-styled freedom riders set out deliberately to create trouble at all costs. Their avowed purpose, publicly expressed, was not to work toward the creation of better race relations, but to incite incidents. They, as were the lawbreaking participants in the sit-ins, were encouraged by both a large part of the press and the administration. In fact, the bus-borne agitators consulted with the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Attorney General before they began the agitation trip. There can be no question that the purpose of the sponsoring organization, CORE, was to create trouble at all costs and it succeeded. It ill behooves those who conspired and cooperated in begetting the violence to exhibit such a self-righteous attitude when it occurs.

Even as the situation is beginning to subside, leaders of the agitating Congress on Racial Equality have announced that they are sending another group of bus riders to Alabama, with the obvious purpose of further attempting to incite riots and violence. Their purpose is not interstate transportation, but to keep alive the high tensions and passions which their predecessors have aroused. If the administration has any real desire to prevent further trouble, these people should be advised by the administration to stay at home, and the bus load in Alabama should be advised to go home.

Mr. President, a front-page editorial in the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., on May 22, 1961, entitled "Intervention in Alabama," objectively analyzes the events in Alabama. It illustrates again that some of the most infamous crimes against mankind are committed in the name of freedom. I am in thorough accord with this editorial, which reads as follows:

INTERVENTION IN ALABAMA

Though it was unwilling to intervene effectively in Communist Cuba, the U.S. Government moved armed men into Alabama despite the protest of the Governor of that State. Outside demonstrators, using the familiar scheme of starting riots in or-

der to demand protection, furnished the pretext to invade State authority.

President Kennedy acted under an 1871 (reconstruction) statute empowering Federal intervention to quell disorder in a State.

The face of white mobs of Birmingham and Montgomery is ugly. That is the face of Alabama and the South being shown the world today. Mobs are ugly in any race or nation. What lies behind the mobs in Alabama is even uglier.

Back of the freedom riders is an organization called CORE (Congress of Racial Equality). In its high command are people with records of Red front affiliation. Whether any of them could be convicted in court is beside the point. The turmoil in Alabama is following the pattern that Communists all over the world pursue in setting up for the kill.

Once they seize power, Communists permit neither disorder nor protest. Those who don't like Red rule and 20th century slavery disappear in dungeons or unmarked graves.

We do not say that white and Negro demonstrators, including earnest college students of both races, are Communists or even conscious tools of communism. Like many others today, they confuse freedom, social justice, and democracy with subversion and revolution. Perhaps they are only muddleheaded idealists and fiery youths in search of excitement. But they are being used to tear out the vitals of the Republic.

If State and local authorities are suppressed—as happens with dispatch of U.S. marshals to Alabama—the whole country could be brought under central police control. This would simplify enormously the mission of revolutionists. Subversion and seizure at the top would be far simpler than taking America State by State.

Communist leaders know this. That is why they welcome, if indeed they did not engineer, such incidents as occurred at Birmingham and Montgomery.

Someday, as Lenin predicted, our country may fall like ripe fruit into the lap of communism. Russian soldiers need not tramp our streets. Occupying forces could wear the badge of the U.S. Government—as they do today in the State capital of Alabama.

Do we then despair for freedom? Not yet. A little time remains to waken the American people. While the alarms are ringing, southerners of both races must guard the homes and firesides. They must not succumb to hatred and violence. The deep reservoir of respect and affection still can save white and Negro skins.

Economic changes already are at work. They will bring gradually and peaceably many of the things that militant race leaders are trying to ram through by force. These things cannot prevail without an atmosphere of good will.

Meanwhile, our people should not fall into traps set with Red bait. Despite provocation, calm heads on both sides must hold the line. Southerners whose forebears rode our Reconstruction can endure hardship and humiliation. They also must maintain civilized decency and human kindness.

These people and these qualities will help to save the Republic if it can be saved. The goal is worth the gamble.

Mr. President, it is about time the administration started tempering its actions and enthusiasm with a little mature judgment.

I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding to me.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I most respectfully invite the attention of Senators to a section from the Legislative Reorganization Act that reads as follows:

> No standing committee of the Senate or the House, except the Committee on Rules of the House, shall sit without special leave, while the Senate or the House, as the case many be, is in session.

In commenting on that part of the law of the land the volume "Senate Procedures" states as follows:

> No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session, which rule applies also to subcommittees of standing committees. Permission to sit while the Senate is in session includes all meetings, whether for hearings or the transaction of business.

Members of the minority, exercising their rights under the rules, in the past several days and weeks have interposed objections with the minority leader to the holding of committee meetings of the Senate while the Senate is in session. They were clearly within their rights in doing so, and the minority was clearly within its rights in objecting to any committee of the Senate holding hearings of any kind, with, of course, the single exception of the Committee on Appropriations. Such objection has been lodged from time to time on this side of the aisle.

The minority regrets to state that information has come to it which apparently indicates that some committees have purported to sit without right, and in violation of objections taken in accordance with the law of the Senate.

Mr. President, such an action by any committee is wrong. It is in violation of the law of this land, and it is against the rules of the Senate. The minority leader, and the acting minority leader, speaking for the minority leader, urge Senators scrupulously to follow the rules with respect to the meetings of committees during session of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to my able friend the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am wholeheartedly in accord with what the distinguished acting minority leader has said. Last week on several occasions the minority leader, the able Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], raised objections to the sitting of committees during the session of the Senate, and stated that he would object to such procedure during the course of the consideration of the aid-to-education bill. In his objection I concur.

Frankly, I must admit that I do not know of any committees which have been meeting, but if any committees have been meeting, I wish they would heed the objection on the part of the minority leader and the acting minority leader, and also on the part of the majority leader, who concurs with the action of Senators on the other side of the aisle, so I hope the joint endeavor will be sufficient.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank my able friend, the distinguished majority leader, for the comments he has made. There should be no such thing as a subcommittee of a committee of the Senate sitting while the Senate is in session in the absence of complete Senate approval; and that statement goes for all purposes. That is the rule. That is the law. And they must be observed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. May I have the attention of the majority leader and the acting minority leader, in order that I may give a small amount of free legal advice? I think the committee chairman of any full committee or subcommittee who might be conducting a hearing while the Senate is in session without the approval of the Senate ought to know that committee funds cannot be paid out for the services of an official reporter or, for that matter, for any services at all, and Senators who participated in such a hearing, if a test were made, would have to pay such expense out of their own pockets.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is, of course, correct in the point he makes.

Mr. President, the illegality cuts across any function which might be performed by a committee or a subcommittee attempting to meet in the absence of the approval of the Senate.

I yield to my able friend, the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. If there is illegality in the holding of committee sessions under those circumstances, would not a motion lie to expunge from the records of the committee any testimony taken at such an illegal hearing; and should not such a motion or request be complied with?

Mr. KUCHEL. In my judgment the Senator from Nebraska is correct. Since, in the absence of approval, there is no authority whatsoever for such a meeting to be held, no one subsequently could contend that a meeting of that committee was held.

Mr. HRUSKA. When the Senator from Nebraska says "expunged" he means physically and literally taken out of the record, and permanently removed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Vitiated and extirpated.

SUDETEN GERMAN DAY, 1961

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Sudeten German Day, 1961, which takes place on Whitsuntide, May 20–23, 1961, in Cologne in the German Federal Republic, is an expression of the will of the Sudeten German expellees to seek friendship and cooperation with the exiles of the Czech and Slovak peoples. The Sudeten Germans are awarding the Charles IV-Prize to the President of the Slovak League of America, Mr. Philip A. Hrobak. Two years ago, the receiver of this award was the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Austria, the Honorable Dr. Julius Raab.

The 3.3 million Sudeten German people lived for many centuries in the Sudetenland, the border regions of Bohemia and Moravia, while the 7 million Czechs lived in the inner parts of these countries. These long centuries have been a time of cooperation and intermarriage between these two nations, and the time of Charles IV, Bohemian King and German Emperor, has been

one of the period of flower of this cooperation.

The unhappy events of World War II interrupted this cooperation. In 1945, the Communists deported the 3.3 million Sudeten Germans from their old homeland. Today, over 2 million Sudeten Germans live in West Germany. They have built up their existences in their temporary new homeland and reached considerable influence in the new democratic Federal Republic of Germany. They have their representatives in the Landtags and in the state governments, in the Federal Bundestag, and their President, Dr. Ing. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, was one of the cofounders of the new Germany and has been cabinet member of the German Federal Government for 12 years, as only Chancellor Adenauer and Vice Chancellor Erhard have been.

Since the start of their political activities, the Sudeten German expellees have been one of the main pillars of German democracy, of anticommunism and also of free enterprise. They came with bare hands to West Germany, yet did not embrace socialism, but built up their existences in private free economy, through hard work, in a truly pioneering spirit of free men.

Since the time they engaged in political work, the Sudeten German expellees have been friends of the United States and of the people of this country. They have—in their numerous contacts with U.S. statesmen and in their publications—recommended a clear sober policy of abolishment of both communism and war and were not seduced to lead a pretended phony anti-Communist fight as many of the leftwing former pro-Communist refugees have been.

The Sudeten Germans have sought not only the cooperation with America. They hope and work to achieve a close friendly cooperation with the representatives of the Czech and Slovak peoples and with all the nations of former Austria-Hungary and former Czechoslovakia. They have set up aims for a future arrangement in Europe, once again free, which could unite all nations of Central and Eastern Europe: First, the establishment of full political and economic freedom and of conditions as they had existed before the Nazi and Communist measures in Europe. Second, full self-determination right to any people, and, at the same time, cooperation in territorial confederations. The Sudeten Germans, moreover, believe that it is their duty, because they are in a position to do so, to help the Czech, Slovak, Polish, Hungarian, Ukrainian, and all other exiles in their struggle for freedom and self-determination of their presently subjugated nations.

Mr. President, I hope that the Sudeten German political work will be a success in the interest of all of us and I give my best wishes to the Sudeten Germans for their Sudeten German Day in Cologne.

I would like to include at this point an article, written by the President of the Sudeten German National Union, Dr. Hans-Christoph Seebohm, in the Sudeten German Bulletin of May 1961:

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUDETEN GERMAN DAYS 1961 IN COLOGNE

Continuing a 12-years tradition, the Sudeten German Association has again summoned Sudetenlanders from Germany and other parts of the free West to participate in this year's 4-day rally to be held during Pentecost in the Rhine city of Cologne.

Highlights of the program are lectures by German university professors on questions related to Germany and the expellees, concerts, folk dances and songs, awarding of the Sudeten German Kulturpreise (cultural prizes) and the Sudeten German Karl's Prize. Members of the German Federal Government and expellee leaders will address the convention on Cologne's fair grounds, climaxing the rally on Sunday, May 21.

Events will be brought to a close by a demonstration for Berlin in the form of a torchlight procession of Sudeten German youth, Berlin's Mayor Willy Brandt will be a guest speaker on the evening of the Berlin demonstration.

The motto under which this year's Sudeten German Days will be held is: Unity, Justice, Freedom.

OVERSEA MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, shortly after taking office in January, Secretary McNamara undertook a study of oversea installations with a view to closing or consolidating certain activities. With the changing nature of military requirements, this must be a continual process.

It appeared to me at that time that there were several types of installations which could be closed without damage to our security, but which would save much money for our Government. I thought this was particularly true of the many hotels and lodges operated abroad by the Armed Forces.

As a result of World War II and postwar activities, the armed services acquired, by confiscation or otherwise, a great many hotels, castles, and other facilities scattered around the world. While these may have served a useful purpose at one time, it appeared to me that their usefulness had been, in many instances, outlived and that they now constitute an unnecessary expense and manpower drain.

Ostensibly these hotels are for housing personnel on official duty in travel status, or on temporary duty in various locations where regular BOQ type accommodations may not be available, and where commercial hotel facilities are unsuitable.

With these thoughts in mind, I wrote to Secretary McNamara on February 4, 1961, suggesting that these hotels be included in the list of oversea installations being studied for possible closing or consolidation. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1961.

HON. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It has come to my attention that you are now engaged in a study of oversea bases and installations with a view to closing or consolidating certain installations.

Among the types of installations which, it appears to me, could be closed without interfering with the efficiency of the armed services are certain hotels and similar housing accommodations which no longer serve a necessary purpose.

There is, for example, as you know, a rather large commercial hotel operated by the Army in Tokyo. There is a commercial hotel operated by the Air Force in Madrid. One of the services, I believe the Army, operates a hotel in Nuremburg. There are, I am sure, others.

These hotels and similar installations may well have served a useful purpose at one time, but it appears to me that there are sufficient accommodations near these cities to house transients or TDY personnel. On the other hand, there are commercial hotels operated by business interests in these cities for the accommodation of tourists, including service personnel and their families.

I am sure you will find a great many installations of this type, the operation of which contributes to our imbalance of payments and gold drain and which do not add materially to the efficiency of our armed services units or personnel overseas.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE.

P.S.—The rates charged in the above are ridiculous.

Mr. GORE. On February 27, 1961, Secretary McNamara's Deputy, Mr. Gilpatric, wrote to me to say that, although the Pentagon had no information about these installations, the matter was being studied, and reports from the field had been requested.

These reports, when later received, revealed that there were about 57 facilities of the type I had in mind. Also, from the fiscal information furnished at that time, it would appear that some of these facilities were being operated at a profit. This fiscal information, it occurred to me, would not stand close scrutiny.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 27, 1961.

HON. ALBERT GORE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: Following our telephone conversation last Friday, I am writing to provide the information that we have been able to collect thus far in response to your letter about the operations of hotels and similar facilities by the military departments overseas.

Since the information that you requested in your letter is not available within the Pentagon, I directed an inquiry to all oversea commands. Replies disclose 57 facilities of the kind about which you inquired, operated by the Army and the Air Force; no such facilities are operated by the Navy. Cost figures were furnished for 30 of these 57 facilities and showed a total cost of operations of approximately $7,900,000 against an

estimated annual income of $9,100,000. Income is based on actual charges to occupants, most of which are quite nominal as you suggest, plus per diem deduction made during periods of such occupancy by personnel on temporary duty or in travel status.

It appears, therefore, from the information that we have been able to obtain to date that the net effect of continued operation of these installations is to reduce the imbalance of payments and the gold drain on the United States.

Your letter mentioned several locations such as Nuremburg, Germany, where the U.S. Army hotel is located. This facility is a 252-bed installation provided by the German Government at no cost. Gross operating costs for fiscal year 1960 amounted to $504,216, including $67,000 O. & M. costs. Total receipts, including deductions for per diem, amounted to $611,695 thus indicating a favorable balance of $107,479. The facility was utilized for 63,500 guest days during the period and each guest averaged 2 days occupancy. At Madrid, Spain, where Air Force operates the Balboa Hotel similar conditions prevail. It is a 170-bed facility leased for $196,335 per annum. It was utilized 31,555 guest days and on the basis of charges and per diem deductions showed an excess of $11,986 above the lease rental. Guests averaged 4 days per occupant during the period. In the case of the Sanno Hotel at Tokyo, Japan, which you also mentioned, it was found to be a 297-room hotel leased by the Japanese Government for assignment to the Department of the Army. Compelte information relative to gross costs and receipts are not available. On the basis of available information, however, it appears O. & M. costs exceed receipts by an amount of $41,370 per annum. The current reports show the facility was occupied 44,543 guest days and each guest averaged 4 days per stay.

Secretary McNamara has already ordered a general review of all oversea facilities to parallel the review already initiated of bases and installations in the United States. In the course of this review, we shall determine which of these installations should be retained and which ones may be dispensed with. Among the matters under review is the question of the rate structure for military personnel using these accommodations (including those in leave status and who, therefore, do not forfeit per diem allowances during their stay).

Sincerely yours,

ROSWELL GILPATRIC,
Deputy.

Mr. GORE. On March 1, I again wrote to Secretary McNamara, pointing out some of the inadequacies of the information contained in the first reports obtained by the Department from oversea commands.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 1, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On February 4 I wrote to you concerning the operation of hotels and similar facilities by the military departments overseas. On February 27 I received a reply from your deputy, Mr. Gilpatric. This reply indicates that the review of these facilities and installations is likely to be conducted on a superficial basis with a view to defending their continued operation, rather than determining whether their operation should be continued because of their need.

For my own information, I would appreciate having whatever figures you choose to furnish me given on a uniform basis. Mr. Gilpatric's letter, for example, classifies two hotels by beds and a third by rooms. In one case, the purported total operating cost is given, while in another case only the "lease rental" is given. I do not assume that this "lease rental" includes all gross operating costs.

I note also from Mr. Gilpatric's letter that income is computed on the basis of the inclusion of per diem which is not allowed those who are occupying these hotels, but which would be allowed were these persons occupying non-Government facilities. Since this appears to be a rather large item of income, I would appreciate being furnished, in each instance, a breakdown of the occupants of these hotels showing the number entitled to per diem and those not so entitled, as well as a breakdown showing the number of officers and enlisted men, respectively, occupying these quarters.

In many instances—Madrid and Tokyo, for example—there are adequate quarters otherwise available for those on official business. The BOQ at the airbase just outside Madrid is, in fact, quite luxurious and suitable for any officer, including general officers. I would like to be furnished information on the availability of other quarters already operated by the Government within reasonable distance of these hotels. Incidentally, within reasonable distance, I would include the base near Madrid since schoolchildren are daily transported to school at this base from the housing area which was constructed, unaccountably and unbelievably, on the other side of Madrid.

Mr. Gilpatric's letter states that the Army and the Air Force operate 57 facilities. I would like to know whether the hotel and other facilities at Garmich and similar recreation areas are included. If not, I would appreciate having information on their operation as well.

Sincerely,

ALBERT GORE.

Mr. GORE. On May 15, I received a further letter from Mr. Gilpatric which indicated that progress was at last being made. By then it had been discovered that about 100 hotels are being operated around the world by the armed services. Some of these appeared to be serving a useful and legitimate purpose.

At least, however, we seem now to know that the armed services are operating such establishments and we have learned, I think, how many of these installations the services are operating and where they are located.

I am glad, too, to know that six of these installations are being closed, and that further study as to the need for the others is continuing.

I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1691.

Hon. ALBERT GORE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GORE: This is first to report that, on the basis of the facts we have now accumulated from the various oversea commands of the military departments, as to the hotels and hotel-type accommodations in foreign areas, we have directed, as an initial action measure, the orderly closing of the following hotels:

1. The Palast Hotel, Wiesbaden, Germany.
2. Hotel Powers, Paris, France.
3. Columbia House, Tempelhof Central Airport, Berlin, Germany.
4. Newhaven Court Hotel, United Kingdom.
5. The Hotel de Paris, Paris, France.
6. General John K. Cannon Hotel, Ramstein Air Base, Germany.

In addition, we are directing the military departments to adjust the rates charged personnel occupying hotel space on a leave basis, in order to provide the Government a more favorable return. Travelers on official business are subject to a flat 40-percent reduction of the per diem allowance established for the locality under the joint travel regulations, and, in addition, pay a $1 to $1.50 daily service charge when they occupy Government quarters. This service charge is apparently the rate to which you referred in your letter of February 4. I might point out that in a number of localities, official per diem rates are substantially higher for travelers who cannot be accommodated in Government quarters.

The survey to which I referred in my letter of February 27 has disclosed the existence of a total of 100 hotels, as against the 57 identified in the teletype survey reported in my first letter. In addition, we have been informed by the military departments that during the period 1949 to the present, they have closed a total of 499 hotels or hotel-type accommodations in foreign countries throughout the world. For all of the facilities now in operation we have collected information on occupancy rates, charges, per diem allowances, operating income and expenses, the extent to which the activities are financed from moneys generated by nonappropriated fund activities, and the purposes served by their operations.

A preliminary analysis has been made of the information reported on the particular facilities to which you referred in your letters. This analysis indicates that the Torrejon Guesthouse (BOQ), near Madrid, is not adequate to satisfy the demand for accommodations during 7 months of the year. In fact, that demand exceeds the combined capacity of the guesthouse and the Torrejon housing annex (Balboa Hotel), which you suggested closing. We propose to investigate the possibility of making the annex available for civilian occupancy during this slack period. The facilities in Nurnberg, as I reported in my letter of February 27, show a net profit to the Government, and are used primarily by enlisted military personnel and their dependents on leave and change-of-station travel. As to the Sanno Hotel in Tokyo, we have been requested informally by the Department of State to maintain this triservice facility, and we are inquiring about the basis of this request. The Garmisch-Berchtesgaden area, which contains several facilities for rest and recreation of service personnel, supported completely by nonappropriated funds, was covered by our survey. We have not yet reached a decision on the future of these facilities.

We intend to pursue vigorously further analysis of the factual information now accumulated, and we expect to have a further report by June 30. In the meantime, this material is available for inspection or study by you or your staff.

We have also requested the military departments to study the use of full-time military personnel engaged in the management and administration of all hotel-type accommodations for the purpose of either reducing the numbers required, or, where feasible, considering their replacement by nonmilitary personnel.

I am sure you appreciate the problems involved in balancing the need for adequate official travel and recreation facilities for military personnel in foreign countries, and for facilities that will minimize adverse effects on our balance of payments position, against the necessity for the lean and fit Defense Establishment that President Kennedy has called for.

I am sending copies of this letter to the chairmen of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL GILPATRIC,
Deputy.

Mr. GORE. It is my hope that the Defense Department will pursue this matter further, and close or consolidate such activities, including hotels, as their study indicates to be in the public interest.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer my amendment identified as "5–18–61—D" and ask that it be stated; and that I may then be permitted to yield to several Senators, including the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Florida, without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4 line 25, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia,".

On page 5, line 4, after "and (iii)" insert "the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv)".

On page 5, line 24, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia,".

On page 6, line 11, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia,".

ACTION IN THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES TO REEVALUATE THE ROLE OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CUBA IN INTER-AMERICAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the House of Representatives has approved a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) expressing the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance.

This resolution lays the facts on the line with regard to Cuba, and expresses the sense of Congress that the present Government of Cuba constitutes a clear and present danger to the United States and to all the free nations of Latin America.

The concurrent resolution, Mr. President, specifically recites that "Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activities throughout the hemisphere" and that "the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of House Concurrent Resolution 226 may be printed in the RECORD at this point at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, I want to express my own very strong conviction that House Concurrent Resolution 226 should be brought to the floor of the Senate as quickly as possible so that my colleagues may have the same chance that was afforded Members of the other body to express their views with respect to the Cuban situation.

I am confident that an overwhelming majority of Senators will favor this resolution if they get a chance to vote on it; and I shall do everything I can to see that the resolution is speedily considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that it is reported favorably to the Senate.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 226) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Caracas Declaration of Solidarity of March 28, 1954, declares that the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extracontinental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties; and

Whereas Cuba today has become a base and staging area for Communist subversive activity throughout the hemisphere; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba offers a clear and present danger to the spread of political liberty, economic development, and social progress through all the Republics of the hemisphere; and

Whereas the Declaration of Havana of September 2, 1960, was an open attack on the Organization of American States clearly showing that the present Government of Cuba stands in defiance of every proclaimed principle of the inter-American system; and

Whereas the present Government of Cuba has signified its unquestioning acceptance of the Soviet line on international affairs; and

Whereas representatives of the present Government of Cuba continue to participate in the councils of the Organization of American States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that such steps as may be necessary should be initiated in the Organization of American States to reevaluate the role of the Government of Cuba in inter-American affairs for the purpose of imposing sanctions under the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance; and also to exclude representatives of the Government of Cuba from attendance at meetings of the Inter-American Defense Board.

SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on April 12 of this year, I introduced for myself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], S. 1567, a bill to amend section 3 of the Administrative Procedure Act of 1946.

I said at that time that large sums of the American people's money are being spent by Government agencies. Such a trust should be open to constant access for review by the taxpayers and their elected representatives in the executive and legislative branches.

The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] is the author of an article on this subject which was published in This Week magazine of the Washington Sunday Star on May 14, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STOP SILLY SECRECY IN GOVERNMENT

(By Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE, of Wisconsin)

WASHINGTON.—A few years ago a Federal agency decided to classify as secret the amount of peanut butter used by our Armed Forces. It was thought that an alert enemy might be able to determine the size of our forces from the amount of peanut butter consumed.

This was a fuzzy-headed try at censorship. Unfortunately, another Government agency in Washington was at the same time publishing reports which gave down to the last man the size of our Armed Forces. These reports weren't classified. Anyone could buy them.

The peanut butter situation was one of the more comic aspects in the continuing battle between the dictates of secrecy and the people's right to know. In recent years the balance in this tug of war has swung drastically to the side of secrecy.

We must reverse this situation before it is too late. For Government is everybody's business, and what you don't know about it will hurt you.

Today thousands of Government decisions are made in secret. You as a private citizen cannot find out what is going on. Time and time again we, your lawmakers, have also been denied access to important information which is essential in representing you responsibly and intelligently.

I have made a list of some of the more fantastic examples of needless secrecy. The list could run on for pages, but I've tried to condense it for brevity's sake:

A group of college students prepared a scrapbook of newspaper clippings, scientific magazine articles, and articles from foreign publications about atomic energy. The Pentagon got wind of this, and classified the whole scrapbook as top secret.

The secrecy stamp was placed on a report describing shark attacks on shipwrecked sailors, even though the shipwrecks occurred more than 20 years ago.

A scientific study on a modern adaptation of the bow and arrow was classified secret.

After congressional pressure, the Immigration and Naturalization Service declassified a report in the use of public funds to send border inspectors to rifle and pistol matches.

At one time, the State Department stored gifts received by Federal officials from foreign nations in a classified building. Under fire for this action, the State Department finally and reluctantly let reporters enter the building.

One result of this secrecy-happy approach has been the creation of a giant mountain of

classified documents. Each week our Government now classifies a stack of documents higher than the Empire State Building.

In the past 14 years we have accumulated more than three times as much secret material as was classified in the entire history of our Government from the Civil War to 1946, and this includes all of World War II and the Manhattan Project, which built the first atomic bomb.

What is being done to end this stifling growth of secrecy? For one thing, we in Congress are trying to limit the number of agencies with the right to classify papers.

As you might imagine, once a Federal official is given the right to wield a secrecy stamp, he doesn't like giving it up. But recently the authority to classify documents was withdrawn from some 30 Government agencies which included the Indian Arts and Crafts Board, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission.

Why do Government agencies desire to cloak their activities in secrecy, for reasons other than national defense, or to prevent invasion of personal privacy? Nearly always the cause stems from a desire to avoid public criticism of inefficiency and waste. Decisions considered and adopted without public scrutiny are much less subject to public criticism, even though they affect many citizens. But with a Federal budget topping $80 billion, every citizen has the right to know how his money is being spent.

With a very few limited exceptions your Government has no more right to deny you access to all the facts than a hired bookkeeper has to deny the owner of a business the right to see his books. This is your Government. You own it, you pay for it. You have a right to know about it. And, yes, you have a duty to find out about it.

THE FIGHT IN CONGRESS

Not all government secrecy conceals wasteful spending or graft. But the snap reflex of any official on the verge of exposure is to shroud his error by claiming a secrecy privilege. Time and time again investigators have pryed the screen aside and uncovered influence-peddling, embezzlement, and other violations of the public trust.

We in Congress have begun to meet the problem of unnecessary secrecy.

In the House of Representatives the Government Information Subcommittee, brilliantly led by Representative JOHN E. MOSS, of California, has handled nearly 200 cases of Federal abridgement of freedom of information. In over half the cases the subcommittee succeeded in freeing the information from the censors. The House committee has been at work 6 years. The Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights also has been working on the problem. The vigilance of the two committees has prevented much unnecessary secrecy.

Two other nongovernment groups—the American Society of Newspaper Editors and Sigma Delta Chi, the national journalism fraternity—have waged long and courageous battles against unnecessary government secrecy.

But I fear that the cases of unwarranted secrecy which come to light are only the top of the iceberg. Beneath the surface, a vast amount of information continues to be withheld.

Perhaps the worst offender in silly secrecy is the Department of Defense. A classic example took place when the first Atlas communications satellite was launched. For some reason only 88 of the many hundreds of men working on the project were told its real purpose: to place in orbit a communications package which would broadcast a taped message from the President. Of course, all of the employees had been cleared for top-secret work.

To keep the secret from the others, the 88 men had to sneak around the missile site at night altering circuits and rebuilding parts of the missile, changing what had been done during the day by the people who didn't know what the real purpose of the missile was. You can guess at the confusion this caused, and how much money was wasted.

THE PENTAGON'S SECRET PHOTO

On another occasion the Defense Department refused to declassify photographs of the Titan missile for months after it had been stored outside a factory near Denver, viewed by local residents, seen on television and photographed from a helicopter. Finally—2 weeks before the 1958 congressional elections, pictures of the President viewing the missile appeared. The Pentagon claimed it had wanted to avoid premature "ballyhoo." Or, putting it another way, they wanted the ballyhoo, but at a time of their own choosing.

Let me underline one point: In the interests of national defense, it is absolutely necessary to classify information about weapons, codes, strategies, and a number of other subjects. But I think that many of our military men are infected with "secretitis." Their secrecy policies and procedures must be reexamined.

There is no simple way to lift the giant lid of secrecy over Washington. It is a constant struggle in which we all must fight. One thing that will help is new legislation. I am a sponsor, with Senator CARROLL, of Colorado, of S. 1567, which provides:

1. All Government records, rulings, reports and all other papers not specifically excluded for reasons of national defense or personal privacy be made public.

2. Except as justified by reasons of national defense, no order or rule of a Government agency shall be valid unless made public.

3. Any citizen may bring a suit in any Federal district court to compel such public inspection.

Enactment of such a law would go a long way toward ending the more flagrant examples of secrecy.

But it will take more than a new law to end foolish secrecy. More and more citizens must become increasingly aware of the dangers. You, the voter, should realize that every time a Federal official wields that secrecy stamp unnecessarily you and the people of your country are losing another bit of freedom.

Laws will help end the secrecy mumbo-jumbo. But in the long run the key figure in the fight for the right to know is the citizen who keeps a vigilant and inquiring eye on his Government.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, is it my understanding that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has the floor and that he has yielded to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am glad to yield briefly to the acting majority leader.

AWARD OF MEDAL TO DR. THOMAS ANTHONY DOOLEY III

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 230, House Joint Resolution 306.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the clerk will state the resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 306) to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this is a House joint resolution. A Senate joint resolution identical with the House joint resolution has been reported unanimously by the Committee on Banking and Currency by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. It is Senate Joint Resolution 64, Calendar No. 229.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut for whatever comment he may wish to make.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. It would be redundant for me to take the time of the Senate today to go fully into the life and story of the great humanitarian service of Dr. Thomas Dooley.

Two years ago I introduced a joint resolution similar in nature to the one before us today, to provide for the awarding of the Congressional Medal to Dr. Dooley. The joint resolution was not acted on at that time, and Dr. Dooley's great work continued. Unfortunately, during the past year he died of cancer at the very peak of his career.

Senators almost unanimously have joined in support of a joint resolution which would give this recognition to Dr. Thomas Dooley. I take great pride in presenting the resolution to the Senate on behalf of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The life story of Dr. Thomas Dooley is one of the most inspiring I have ever read. His book, entitled "Deliver Us From Evil," is one of the most thrilling books I have ever read. I hope that every young American will read about the life of Dr. Dooley. I daresay no citizen in this century has done more on his own, by his own effort and through his own sacrifice, to create a favorable image of the United States in distant lands among the poorest people of the world than has Dr. Thomas Dooley. I recommend that the Senate pass the joint resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 64 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The names of the Senators sponsoring Senate Joint Resolution 64 are as follows: HUMPHREY, SYMINGTON, PELL, LONG of Missouri, CARROLL.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the report of the committee, report No. 257, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The resolution would authorize the President to award an appropriate gold medal, in

the name of Congress, to the late Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III, in recognition of his services to the people of Laos and to peoples in other newly developing countries.

Dr. Dooley is survived by his mother, Mrs. Thomas A. Dooley, and two brothers. It is the committee's understanding and intention that the medal will be presented to Dr. Dooley's mother.

The resolution would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by him. An appropriation of $2,500 would be authorized for this purpose.

The Secretary of the Treasury would also be authorized to manufacture and sell bronze duplicates of the medal to the public under regulations to be prescribed by him. The cost of manufacturing the bronze duplicates, including labor, would be covered by the sales proceeds.

The proposal to honor Dr. Dooley by giving him a medal has received widespread and bipartisan support. Senate Joint Resolution 64 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on behalf of himself and a number of other Senators. Senator BRIDGES introduced S. 1377, in which Senator BUSH later joined. In the last Congress Senator BUSH introduced Senate Joint Resolution 148 for himself and 44 other Senators.

The State and Treasury Departments offer no objection to the bill. Letters from those Departments are printed below as a part of this report. A copy of a letter from Senator HUMPHREY is also printed below.

Attached is a biographical summary of the life of Dr. Dooley. The facts of Dr. Dooley's life explain the reasons for the award of the medal.

THOMAS A. DOOLEY III, M.D.—A BIOGRAPHICAL SUMMARY

Dr. Thomas A. Dooley was born in St. Louis, Mo., on January 17, 1927. He was one of four sons born to Mr. and Mrs. Thomas A. Dooley. He selected medicine as his career while in high school. He had a year of premedical training at the University of Notre Dame in 1943–44, then served for 2 years, 1944–46, as a Navy corpsman, or medical aide attached to the U.S. Marine Corps. He then studied for a year at the Sorbonne in Paris. He was graduated from the St. Louis University School of Medicine in 1953.

He rejoined the Navy for his internship as a lieutenant, junior grade, and was at first assigned to the naval hospital at Camp Pendleton, Calif., and from there was sent to Japan, where he received an assignment as medical officer aboard the attack transport U.S.S. *Montague*.

In May 1954 the *Montague* was one of four ships assigned to help in "passage of freedom," which comprised the evacuation agreed upon under terms of the Geneva Treaty after the French Indochina war was over.

This was the flight of those who wished to flee from Communist-held northern Vietnam to live in free South Vietnam. Dr. Dooley was assigned as a medical officer at an evacuee staging area set up at Haiphong. The main interest of this medical team was in preventing epidemics and the infestation of the ships being used in the evacuation.

More than 600,000 refugees were cared for at this camp. When Communist demands forced reduction of the medical mission, Dr. Dooley was the only Navy doctor left behind. Enormous as it was, the medical problem involving the refugees was not the only one with which he had to cope.

"I had to provide shelter and food, sanitation, and some human solace to a flood of humanity, undernourished, exhausted, bewildered, and pitifully frightened," he wrote later in a book about his experiences.

"My primary task was medical—to stamp out contagious diseases * * * but there was no ducking the huge problems of housekeeping and administration for the shifting camp population, normally between 10,000 and 15,000 persons."

For his extraordinary efforts in this operation, he was awarded the Legion of Merit, becoming the youngest officer in the history of the U.S. Medical Corps to receive it. President Ngo Dinh Diem, of Vietnam, also awarded him that nation's highest decoration, the National Order of Vietnam.

The assignment also brought a decision for young Dr. Dooley. After seeing the sick and dying in southeast Asia, observing the amount of preventable disease which could be halted or cured, he felt that his place henceforth was with these people; that he must do what he could do to alleviate some of the suffering among countless millions of underprivileged peoples of the world who have scant hope of any medical care in their lifetime.

Dr. Dooley returned to the United States in 1956 and became a civilian. His book, "Deliver Us From Evil," about the work at Haiphong, became a bestseller. With the proceeds, plus generous help from pharmaceutical companies, he rounded up as his staff three former Navy corpsmen who had worked with him at Haiphong, returned to southeast Asia and obtained permission from the new government of Laos to establish a small village hospital. It was located at Nam Tha, 5 miles from the border of Communist-held China.

Dr. Dooley turned the Nam Tha hospital over to the Laos Government in late 1957 and returned to the United States, planning to raise funds with which to start another such medical mission. He met with Dr. Peter D. Comanduras, a Washington specialist and medical professor who also had observed the medically underprivileged in other lands and had been working for the acceptance of an international program of direct physician-to-patient medical aid in areas where no facilities existed at all.

Together, these two physicians founded Medico (Medical International Cooperation Organization). This voluntary, nonpolitical, nonsectarian organization was at first under auspices of the International Rescue Committee, but in late 1959 became a separate entity, incorporated as Medico, Inc.

Dr. Dooley's second bestseller book "The Edge of Tomorrow," was published in May 1958. Proceeds from it, from other writings, and a lecture tour went toward the financing of oversea operations begun by Medico.

The young doctor returned to Laos to establish another hospital, this one in the remote village of Muong Sing and the first under Medico auspices.

Less than 2 years later, by the end of 1960, Medico had 17 projects in operation in 12 countries. These included seven hospitals in southeast Asia—in Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Malaya—and Dr. Dooley had an important role in getting all of them underway. Medico established such projects only after the invitation of the host government, and in these instances it was Dr. Dooley who handled, for the most part, all of the necessary preliminary negotiations and the other details concerned with starting these projects.

In August 1959, Dr. Dooley learned that he had a highly malignant (melanoma) cancer of the chest wall and flew to New York to undergo major surgery for its removal at Memorial Hospital.

After a few weeks of convalescence, Dr. Dooley embarked on a nationwide lecture tour which raised nearly a million dollars for Medico. He then returned to his Muong Sing hospital and was soon working at his usual pace—which often kept him going 20 hours a day.

On two subsequent trips to the United States within the next 14 months he underwent checkups which showed no recurrence of cancer. On a trip in the spring of 1960 he gave 55 lectures in 30 cities in 34 days.

Then on November 30, 1960, Dr. Dooley entered a hospital in Hong Kong, suffering from what was described as "extreme fatigue and exhaustion." He also suffered severe pain in the lower spinal area but, wearing a brace—which he immediately characterized as his "Iron Maiden"—he left the hospital within a matter of days and attempted to resume his customary arduous schedule.

The pain, however, became progressively worse and he finally gave in to the persuasions of associates and relatives to come home for a new examination and any treatment which might be required.

He arrived on December 27, 1960, and entered a hospital. On January 10, 1961, the attending physician announced that extensive analytical examinations had proved without doubt that this was a recurrence of the previous primary cancer. On January 18, 1961, Dr. Dooley passed away, 1 day after his 34th birthday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 306) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate Joint Resolution 64 is indefinitely postponed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this action on the part of Congress by both Houses is to me a very rewarding experience, because for a long time many of us in Congress have wanted to honor this great American, who has exemplified compassion and mercy, and who has lived a life in the finest tradition of our democracy and in accordance with the finest ideals of his Christian faith.

NONSUBSIDIZED INTERCOASTAL STEAMSHIP LINES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield, under the same conditions, to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, all of us know the acute problems at present facing the nonsubsidized intercoastal steamship lines which travel from the mainland to Alaska, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other places.

As an example of the difficulties confronting these carriers, I would like to place in the RECORD remarks made recently to the Hawaii House of Representatives by Mr. Randolph Sevier, president of the Matson Navigation Co. These remarks, which show a common problem of this sometimes overlooked segment of the Nation's transportation industry, follow:

Most of us have a tendency to take for granted those things which we have enjoyed for most of our lives and on which our very existence depends. To some extent, this may be true of the attitude of many people toward the shipping service provided to Hawaii by Matson.

For nearly 80 years, through good times and bad, through a period of two World Wars and Korea, when greater profits could have been realized by diversion of its vessels to other trades, Matson has provided the principal transportation service between Hawaii and the mainland.

During this time, Matson has rendered frequent, dependable, and specialized steamship service, making it possible for Hawaii to mar-

ket its two principal products—sugar and pineapple—and to obtain from the mainland the goods it has needed to support its expanding population, its tourist industry, the vast Defense Establishment and its basic agricultural economy.

From time to time, Matson has introduced special facilities, both in its ships and ashore, for the purpose of meeting more efficiently and economically the special transportation requirements of the Hawaii trade.

In 1956, Matson organized the first research department at the top management level of any American-flag steamship company. This was done for the purpose of carefully analyzing the cause and effect of transportation cost increases, as well as methods of improving operations and reducing further cost increase. Analysis by our research department indicated that the greatest opportunity for service improvements and cost reductions lay in the cargo handling of general merchandise. This led Matson to pioneer its present containerized shipping service between San Francisco, Stockton, and Los Angeles port areas in California and Honolulu.

In this service, cargo may be loaded and sealed in a container at a shipper's warehouse on the mainland and the goods not touched until the container is unsealed and unloaded at the consignee's warehouse in Honolulu. Cargo handling costs, vessel port time, and damage and pilferage of cargo have been materially reduced, enabling Matson to render a premium service to the public at rates lower than those charged for carriage of cargo in conventional loose stowage. Matson's present investment in this container system, including ship conversion costs, shoreside facilities, and lease obligations, totals some $17,800,000.

Who has benefited to date from these costly technological improvements in Matson's freight service? Not any individual, or firm or group—but the vigorous total Hawaiian economy.

There is no other island community of comparable size and remoteness which enjoys such a regularity and frequency of service as Hawaii receives from Matson. As a result, in the postwar era the Matson freighter fleet has become Hawaii's floating warehouse. Goods in large volume go directly from mainland warehouses to shipside, and from the docks in Hawaii to store shelves, eliminating multiple handling, reducing inventories and minimizing the need for costly warehousing. What might have happened had it been necessary to build warehouses in Honolulu for this volume? In land-scarce Hawaii, the reduction of the need for warehouse space as well as the elimination of costly multiple-handling and other costs inherent in large-scale warehousing holds down the price to the ultimate consumer. If such frequent service should cease, so would these benefits.

Hawaii is the Nation's only island State, separated from the other States by 2,100 nautical miles of ocean. It is almost totally dependent upon commerce with the mainland to support its economy. This commerce moves, and for the foreseeable future must continue to move, by ocean shipping.

The statistics and expert opinion concerning the growth and condition of the Hawaiian economy, demonstrate, as a matter of experience and not of theory, that Matson's rates have not retarded the Hawaiian economy. It is manifesting greater vitality than almost any other section of the United States. It is dependent for its vigor and growth upon high quality ocean transportation service. It has the financial strength to support the transportation service which it requires.

Because labor costs are so great a portion of total costs, Matson has sought where possible to increase mechanization when such programs would result in savings. This is not always an easy course, for it brings in its wake sociological and financial problems of some magnitude.

In addition, Matson's management, together with other steamship operators, is seeking means whereby the recent pattern of successive increases in wages can equitably be ameliorated in fairness to labor, management and the public. Recently, representatives of the steamship industry, including myself, met with the Secretary of Commerce to discuss this important question. So long as Matson is confronted with annual increases in wage costs without offsetting reductions in other elements of costs, it is faced with the choice of making offsetting rate increases or going out of business. Matson simply does not have an excess of earnings with which to absorb these recurring cost increases.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the issue before us is what is the most realistic and over the long run the most efficient way in which to educate our children. Indeed, this is the only question before the Senate. There is no monopoly in concern or action in this field; we all believe with intense sincerity that America must remain the best educated Nation in the world. We owe affirmative action to ourselves, our children, and the destiny of our democratic way of life.

What we must keep in mind in our search for the best course of action is that the availability of classrooms and high-paid teachers by themselves will not make our educational system successful. So in these deliberations we must attend to the business of providing adequate facilities and talent, but we must look beyond them.

Last year I sponsored S. 1016, providing for a 5-year program to finance $3 billion worth of school construction, and S. 1017, assisting American colleges and universities in building $2 billion worth of academic and housing facilities for the same period. I have always supported the National Defense Education Act and will support recommendations to strengthen and extend this act in the present Congress.

On June 24 of last year I wrote Senator HILL, chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, concerning S. 1017, and said in part:

> Throughout the world there is tremendous educational ferment. It becomes increasingly obvious that the education of a nation's people will carry huge importance in terms of the struggle between freedom with justice and Communist totalitarianism, and the future of mankind which the outcome of that struggle will so significantly influence. It is imperative that the Federal Government assume a sound and vigorous role to assist our educational institutions.

These thoughts essentially were stated by the President in his special education message to Congress on February 20, when he said:

> Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity.

The committee report on S. 1021 says:

> The Federal Government should invest a larger portion of our national resources for public elementary and secondary education. * * * The committee further believes that in spite of the very substantial efforts which we have made as a nation on behalf of our schools, Americans want and need to do more.

While I am in accord with these general statements, I shall vote against the bill for the reasons I shall now briefly state.

The facts that there are presently shortages in teachers and classrooms, that the Federal Government should help to fill these needs, and that America must improve the overall quality of her educational system, do not mean that the Federal Government must automatically launch huge programs of Federal involvement. In considering the manner of Federal aid we must be careful to examine the facts of the situation to determine the precise nature of the need, and we must reexamine the essential qualities of the American educational system. We must decide if those essential characteristics are still valid today. If they are still valid we must act vigilantly to sustain them, and carefully measure the effect of proposed methods of Federal help on them accordingly.

President Kennedy emphasized in his message that "education must remain a matter of State and local control" and I strongly agree with him. Speaking of the importance of providing every American child an equal educational opportunity, the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] summed up this philosophy very effectively. He said in a speech before the Senate on May 18:

> The responsibility for giving children this opportunity rests, first, upon the local community, and next upon the State. Only if these two units of government, acting together, cannot provide sufficient resources and the environment for a good educational system does it become in the national interest for the Federal Government to supplement their efforts.

I, too, am most concerned that the Federal Government should not get into primary and secondary school education in such a way as to bring control over local policy. The States and the localities simply have the greatest competence to do the job. They are close to the situation, they are intimately associated with the communities in question, they are familiar with the problems therein, they can give quick, sympathetic and tailormade supervision. A larger, necessarily impersonal bureaucracy located far away simply does not have such understanding and firsthand interest. In this case distance destroys efficiency. I believe not only that American citizens in a given community or State want to make the decisions concerning the education of their children. I am certain that they are the most competent to do so. This unique characteristic of our way of life is as important in the 1960's as it has been throughout the earlier history of the Nation.

Large-scale, permanent-type grant aid for a variety of uses including teachers' salaries cannot help, in my opinion, but introduce Federal Government control into our free primary and secondary educational system. The committee bill which we have before us proposes this kind of aid, and its safeguards against Federal involvement in local policy are, in effect, of little value. Congress cannot appropriate billions of dollars without at some time acting to guarantee that the funds will be efficiently and properly spent. Political independence is closely related to fiscal independence and we can see in a number of Federal programs that program control inevitably follows the flow of money.

It is important to examine the committee bill both in view of the controls it contains over the $2.5 billion it provides, and in view of its assurance that the Federal Government will not exercise any kind of control over the policy determination of any school system.

Section 106 of the committee bill allots funds for the second and third fiscal years of the program on the basis of effort exerted by the States for public school purposes. Here is a very definite kind of control. Here we have a tested and a worthwhile device to guarantee proper use of Federal funds and to stimulate helpful activity on the part of the States. Nonetheless, this is a stipulation which cannot help sooner or later having its effect on local decisions with regard to overall educational policy. It should be recognized as such.

Section 110 and 111 of the bill, dealing with applications made by the States to the Federal Government, also involve, and again desirably so, a measure of Federal control. The Commissioner of Education requires that the State give priority or preference to the areas most in need. He can disapprove an application if it falls short of this or certain other criteria. Here again the State must act in a certain way if it is to receive the financial assistance from Washington. We all agree with this kind of requirement on its own merits, yet the desirability of this regulation cannot overshadow the fact that it is regulation. The fact is that the Federal Government's aid will bring—most probably in increasing degree—Federal control over the recipient.

Section 103 of the act provides:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Such a disclaimer will be, in practice, virtually valueless. There is no mention, for instance, of the indirect control asserted if the Federal Government decides to withhold funds under the act for any reason. There is no mention of how such control as mentioned under section 103 is to be measured or how the section itself is to be enforced. As an example, I need merely to mention the data presented in the minority views in the committee report with regard to Federal controls contained in the National Defense Education Act. Such controls are inevitable. As I have said, considered on their own merits they are often desirable, but they exist and they grow.

Another aspect of control can be seen in the allocation formula adapted by the committee. This formula is different from the one recommended in the administration bill. The committee made changes in the allocation technique, upping some States' shares as much as 62 percent and lowering others as much as 38 percent. It appears that political considerations were not overlooked in this juggling. Even if this is not true, it is certainly very possible. In another 3 years, when the 1961 act would be considered for extension if it passes now, different criteria based on the political makeup and performance of the regions in question might dictate the mathematics of distribution. It is foolish to say that the Federal Government does not and will not have a strong influence on local educational policy in such a pliable spoils system.

When the Federal Government provides money—and a great deal of it—which can be used to increase teachers' salaries, the issue of bureaucratic control reaches its peak. This is largely a psychological matter rather than one involving obvious mechanical regulation, but it is nonetheless significant. It strikes me as virtually impossible that the Federal Government can stay out of local educational policy if the Federal Government provides the teachers who execute that policy with a substantial portion of their livelihood. Strictly as a matter of human nature, men and women will find it extremely difficult over the years to teach with complete freedom from Washington's influence when they realize that Washington's influence is paying their way.

As I have said, the considerations before us in the committee bill involve much more than just the abundance of teaching talent and teaching facilities. They involve the future security of an educational system which is free, responsive, efficient, and directed close to home. Also, because of the great importance of education to a free society, they involve such corollary issues as: the freedom of the individual, the free enterprise system, the prevention of a mushrooming Federal bureaucracy entering more and more areas of private life, and government by the people—the preservation of our society's very nature. These matters, because they cannot be evaluated in dollars and cents or other tangible measurements, have less appeal in politics but they must be considered now before the opportunity ebbs away.

The other side of the coin is equally important. That is, administering the educational system of his own children gives the American citizen an invaluable opportunity to keep himself in shape to help govern himself and his fellows. It has been said again and again that without well-informed, deeply concerned citizens who are willing and able to participate vigorously in the democracy they make up, this democracy cannot survive. Recently the American people have been called upon for sacrifice, have been asked to participate in the great decisions before us. Such activity cannot come in the abstract. In order for the people to govern they must have the opportunity, the tools to participate with; they must learn first hand, they must themselves be involved with the decisionmaking which will affect the nature of their society. Without such opportunity for self-government in its broadest sense, our people will lose their initiative and their incentive; their spirit will wither as they become further and further away from the workings of their Government. If the paramount duty of educating our youth is preserved for the people themselves and if they are aided in this endeavor in such a way as to encourage their continued responsibility, then democracy itself will be the beneficiary.

While I believe that there is need for classrooms, and that the Federal Government should assist in stimulating their construction, and while I believe that we must encourage more qualified people to become teachers, and that their salaries should be improved, I doubt some of the arguments about "unmet needs" used to call for heavy Federal aid.

Present estimates, generally agreed upon, are that deficiencies are at the level of 142,100 classrooms and 100,000 teachers. President Kennedy predicts we shall need 600,000 new classrooms for the next decade. What about recent performance in meeting these needs? First, we should note that in the last 10 years, the financial support of education has risen sharply, as has the share of national income spent for education. Second, the numbers of pupils per teacher and per classroom have persistently declined. It is important to look as closely as possible at the facts.

In 1954, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare predicted that the classroom shortage would reach 476,000 by 1960. Mr. President, we simply are not in such straits, and the dire prediction does not make it so. The U.S. Office of Education has made available data which show that the number of pupils increased 15.2 percent and the number of classrooms in use increased 23.2 percent in the last 4 years, reducing the number of pupils per classroom from 29.0 to 27.1. What is more important, at the rate of current construction of classrooms, the stated goals for the next few years can easily be met without any Federal involvement. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that during the 1960's, 607,600 classrooms should be built, or 60,760 each year. Yet from 1956–61, the average classrooms completed per year has been 69,860; and the Department of Commerce estimates that school construction should pick up about 8 percent this year.

During the past three decades the number of employees in public education has increased 140 percent while the population rate and school enrollment both rose by 45 percent. Teaching staffs have increased faster than

enrollment has. During the past 7 years the number of pupils increased 29 percent, and the number of certified teachers increased 40 percent. If the number of college graduates going into teaching remains steady proportionally during the sixties, the number of new teachers will nearly double, while enrollment, which rose 46 percent in the last decade, will slack off to a 20-percent increase in the next. Men teachers generally earn less than men engineers, lawyers, judges, physicians, and architects; and an Office of Education report recommended that teacher salaries be doubled from 1959 to 1964. At the same time it should be kept in mind that in the last decade, teachers' salaries rose 74 percent while the Nation's per capita income rose 30 percent.

Many persons feel that the local and State governments simply do not have sufficient resources to be able to meet the educational needs of the next decade, such as they may be. In the first place, we cannot assume that it is automatically better and easier for the Federal Government, whose income has met its expenditures in only 6 out of the past 30 years, to take money from the taxpayer's pocket. He still has to give it up, after all; the burden to him is the same. In the second place, the inability of the local districts and States to provide the necessary backing has been overexaggerated, to the point where we are playing the role of convincing them they cannot do a job which is rightfully theirs to do, instead of trying to help them do it.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare recently conducted a telegraphic canvass which indicated that only 237 out of a total of over 40,000 school districts had run out of access to funds with which to build needed classrooms. Also, it is interesting to note that the volume of school bonds sold in 1960 was close to a record, and those approved by the voters in the elections of last fall established an all-time high. These facts hardly indicate destitution, in either interest or ability, for community education. Instead of saying to the local and State governments: "You can't do it, let us do it," we should be saying, "You are not doing a bad job now. What can we do to help you do a better one?" One way to help would be to work out a coordinated adjustment in Federal, State, and local tax systems—a big job, but not an impossible one. Dr. Walter W. Heller, now the President's chief economic adviser, once recommended that the Federal Government put its fiscal relationships with State and local governments on a constructive, cooperative relationship, through organizing Federal tax reductions in such a way as to assist in making an increase of State and local revenues; through adopting fiscal and monetary policies more consistent with State financial needs; and through strengthening the administrative relationships between Federal, State, and local tax enforcement agencies.

Finally, let me refer briefly to S. 1021, as it affects my State of Massachusetts. The committee bill imposes a substantial financial burden on many persons who will receive a disproportionally low benefit from it. Massachusetts, which would receive $44,400,000 in benefits under the bill, would contribute $88,485,000 over a 3-year period to the program. In other words, the people of my State would be contributing about $2 for every dollar of Federal aid they received. Although I accept the principle that the wealthier States should assist the poorer States in national programs such as this one, the gap in this case is very wide.

Although I have not based my arguments concerning my position on the committee bill on the expense of its program, I point out that its cost is high at a time when the budget for the coming fiscal year is already unbalanced by at least $4 billion and will become more and more out of kilter if we consider each new piece of legislation by itself, without regard to the whole.

All agree that a strengthened educational system is essential to the fulfillment of democracy. But in my opinion, for the reasons I have explained, the committee bill is designed in such a way that, in the profoundest sense, it will not strengthen the American educational system. Therefore, as I have said, I shall vote against S. 1021 as it is now before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

PRIVATE COMMITTEE OF THREE TO EXCHANGE BULLDOZERS FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the RECORD will show that yesterday I discussed the problem involved in connection with the volunteer committee, headed by Mrs. Roosevelt, and joined by Walter Reuther and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, which is seeking to raise funds to ransom a group of Cuban exiles who are held prisoner in Cuba by Castro.

Earlier in my remarks I said that, interestingly enough, I had discussed this matter in answer to a question which was put to me on a television program in Cleveland Sunday afternoon. That occurred in the course of the program known as "The Open Circuit," conducted by station KYW. I told the Senate that today I would place in the RECORD the statement I made on that program Sunday, because I thought the Senate should know what public statement I had made prior to the time when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] raised the question on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon.

I have received from the director of that program on Station KYW-TV, in Cleveland, the following telegram:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, *May 23, 1961.*

Hon. Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following is transcript of your remarks in answer to a question from Glen Lavery: "Do you believe that Mrs. Roosevelt, Mr. Milton Eisenhower, and Mr. Reuther perhaps as a suggestion should appoint themselves a committee of three to meet Castro's demands for bulldozers in exchange for prisoners?"

"Well, in my judgment, I want to stress that I think any private group in the United States should not take any course of action in regard to a foreign policy problem without first getting clearance from the State Department. I assume from what I read in the papers today that there has been some unofficial indication to them that the State Department doesn't intend to stand in the way. But let us remember that under the Constitution the job of handling foreign affairs is the job of the President, acting through the State Department, and not the job of private citizens. I don't know any body that recognizes that more than the incomparable Mrs. Roosevelt. So I take it for granted that whatever program they are working out on humanitarian basis is getting clearance from the State Department."

Deeply grateful for your providing most successful program in "Open Circuit" series. Hope you will be able to send copy of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. May I add my personal appreciation to the deep gratitude of KYW-TV.

BEN WECHSLER,
Public Affairs Director.

I close this comment by restating what I said yesterday on the floor of the Senate—that, in my judgment, the American people are entitled to know whether the program of the Eleanor Roosevelt committee does have clearance from the State Department; and if it does, let us openly say this is a part of the foreign policy of the United States, and this committee is acting as an agent for the State Department.

Mr. President, if there is anything I do not like in the administration of government, it is any procedure which could, to the slightest extent, be described as indirection or subterfuge.

I repeat that, as a matter of public policy, it is bad precedent to have volunteer committees springing up in this country and proceeding to exercise jurisdiction in regard to any phase of foreign policy. That is why I was a critic of the newspaper editors of this country when, a couple of years ago, they published a statement without clearance from the State Department. I know they did not have clearance from the State Department, because the Under Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs came to the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs and asked for counsel and advice as to what the State Department should do about the embarrassment which had been caused by the editorial association of this country in its intervention in a foreign policy matter, without even extending to the State Department the decency and the courtesy to find out whether inviting Castro to the country might in any way be embarrassing to the Government. I protested it then, and I would feel derelict in my duty as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs by failing to raise the question now.

Notwithstanding the fact that there are on the committee persons whom I consider to be wonderful people, and whom I consider as my friends, and for whom I have nothing but admiration for their instinct of humanitarian reaction to the brutality of Castro, nevertheless I want to say to the administration, which is my administration, too, it is its duty to make clear that our foreign affairs are going to be run by the

White House and the State Department, and not by any self-appointed volunteer groups, no matter how distinguished the personnel of the groups may be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator, as I understand, does not take the position that committees of people cannot get together for the purpose of raising funds, but that where they get together for the purpose of raising funds, where they become involved in our international or foreign policies, then certainly the administration, through the State Department, should take a position as to whether or not it is or is not an interference with the foreign policy. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is exactly the position of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator in that position.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for his association with my point of view. The Senator from Massachusetts knows the high regard I have for him in the whole field of foreign relations and in our defense program, too.

I had the honor of serving with the Senator from Massachusetts on the Armed Services Committee for some years, before I went to the Foreign Relations Committee. I feel buttressed in my conviction in knowing that the Senator from Massachusetts shares my view.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I hear the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the Senator in charge of the bill, I am in the position that I understand the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] has been called off the floor of the Senate in regard to an official matter, and cannot return at this time.

Although I am going to accept the amendment, I am told by my staff associate that some Senators wish to ask questions about the Clark amendment. Therefore, I am going to take it upon myself to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the Clark amendment and proceed with the Keating amendment, if the Senator from New York is ready to offer the amendment, with the understanding that the Clark amendment can then be considered immediately following the Keating amendment. I make that unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not know that I should object, I am in a dual situation here. Momentarily I am deployed as acting minority leader in charge of the Senators gathering on my right. There are two Senators who wish to speak on the Clark amendment and who have asked me to suggest the absence of a quorum for that purpose. I think I should let that request supersede my own desire to call up my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I withhold my unanimous-consent request, and while the Senator from New York consults with staff members of the Senate, we can start a quorum call.

Mr. KEATING. I have been informed that it is believed it would be appropriate to proceed with my amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. First I want to get a ruling on my request. I ask unanimous consent that the Clark amendment be withdrawn temporarily and that it be renewed following the consideration of the Keating amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending Keating amendment may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate may resume consideration of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the previous agreement is vitiated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from New York, whose amendment, I understand, has been set aside temporarily, so that the Senate may continue consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. I am prepared to suggest a unanimous-consent agreement to the effect that on the Keating amendment there be allocated a period of 3 hours, to be divided 1½ hours to each side, half the time to be controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and half the time to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Does the unanimous-consent request include amendments to the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Keating amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, reserving the right to object momentarily, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator who is handling the bill whether he expects there will be amendments to the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. No. I am glad the Senator asked. The reason why I make the request is that I found myself in the position this morning, when the Prouty amendment was before the Senate and we had a unanimous-consent agreement to limit debate, when I wished to offer an amendment to the amendment, but I was in such a position that I really could not do so unless the Senator from Vermont would accept my amendment—which he did—until after the debate had been finished.

The Parliamentarian tells me that we might very well find ourselves in a position in which the proponent of an amendment, under those circumstances, might be very much handicapped. So I thought that if any amendment were offered, we could always try to arrange a division of the time within the time limit agreed upon, or seek to join in obtaining an extension of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in view of the discussions which have taken place on the floor of the Senate, I am quite content to have my amendment set aside again. I understand that the Senator from Connecticut wishes to be present when the amendment is discussed. He cannot be present now. I hope my amendment can be disposed of in 10 or 15 minutes. But if it is the view of the majority leader that the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] should be considered first, that is entirely satisfactory with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the commitment that was made, it would be appreciated if the Senator from Pennsylvania would agree to defer consideration of his amendment.

Mr. CLARK. May I have the assurance of the majority leader, so far as he can give it, that my amendment will be considered immediately after the Keating amendment is disposed of?

Mr. MANSFIELD. So far as I can give such assurance. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania will be temporarily set aside. The amendment of the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 20, between lines 3 and 4, to insert the following:

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 114. (a) Any citizen of the United States upon whose taxable income there was imposed an income tax under section 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for the last preceding calendar or taxable year and who has paid any part of such income tax, may bring a civil action against the Commissioner to restrain or enjoin him from making any payment under this Act which the plaintiff alleges will be used in any manner which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States. No additional showing of direct or

indirect financial or other injury, actual or prospective, on the part of the plaintiff shall be required for the maintenance of any such action.

(b) Any action brought under subsection (a) of this section must be commenced within sixty days after the final decision of the Commissioner. Such action shall be brought in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Upon the commencement of such action the Commissioner shall file in the court the record of the proceedings upon which the determination complained of is based. The District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such action, and the court shall have power to enter, upon the pleadings and record of proceedings a judgment affirming, modifying, or reversing the decision of the Commissioner. The findings of the Commissioner as to any fact, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but all rulings of law, conclusions of law, and mixed conclusions of fact and law, shall be subject to unlimited judicial review. Any party to such action aggrieved by a final order entered therein by the district court shall be entitled to a review thereof by the Supreme Court through the filing in that Court, within sixty days after the entry of that order, of an appeal therefrom. Any such action pending before any court for hearing, determination, or review shall be heard, determined, or reviewed at the earliest practicable time, and shall be expedited in every practicable manner. Any action instituted in accordance with this section shall survive notwithstanding any change in the person occupying the office of Commissioner or any vacancy in such office.

On page 20, line 5, in lieu of "114" insert "115".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New York. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

This amendment is offered on behalf of myself, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. It represents a group, some of whom supported and some of whom opposed the amendment offered yesterday by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

I supported the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] yesterday because of the explicit statement by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in his letter to Senator PROUTY that neither he nor the Commissioner of Education "could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State." But I was apprehensive that my disagreement would be entirely academic if we did not write a specific direction to the Commissioner into S. 1021.

The reason it would be academic is because there is no method under the present provisions of S. 1021 to challenge the administrative rulings of the Commissioner of Education even on constitutional grounds. Section 111(b) of the bill does expressly authorize a State education agency which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner to obtain judicial review of the Commissioner's determination. But it contains no provision whatever for court suits by taxpayers or other individuals who want to protest against proposed grants on constitutional grounds.

My amendment is not a so-called Powell amendment or a civil rights amendment, unless all the jurisdictional provisions of the Judicial Code or the Administrative Procedure Act are placed in this category. The amendment is part of the tradition of American law to provide a remedy for every constitutional wrong. It has no special application to segregation problems and would apply just as plainly to any action which sought to enjoin the disbursement of funds for an allegedly unconstitutional purpose. For example, it would apply to suits to challenge grants for private schools, if such are authorized, or grants for teachers' salaries, or any other grants protested on constitutional grounds. It does not suggest that such grants are unconstitutional or constitutional. Such question would be for the courts to decide. It guarantees only that the complainant shall have a day in court in which to test the constitutional issue he raises.

There is a widespread misconception that the courts would hear such cases even if we said nothing in the bill. This view is mistaken. As explained in Professor Corwin's Analysis and Interpretation of the Constitution, Senate Document No. 170, 82d Congress, 2d session—1953—page 542:

> As a general rule the interest of taxpayers in the general funds of the Federal Treasury is insufficient to give them a standing in court to contest the expenditure of public funds.

This whole subject is discussed in an article in volume 41 of the American Bar Association Journal beginning at page 718, entitled "Judicial Standing in Subsidy Cases. The article is replete with references to precedents which make it clear that in the absence of a specific enabling act, the courts do not have jurisdiction to prevent the disbursement of Federal funds on the grounds of unconstitutionality. As a lawyer, I am convinced that no suit would lie by any taxpayer to prevent the disbursement of funds by the Commissioner of Education for unconstitutional purposes unless this amendment is adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my friend from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that one of the most prominent cases is the so-called Frothingham case in Massachusetts, in which Lewis A. Frothingham tried to have one of the Federal aid acts declared unconstitutional, and the Supreme Court ruled that, as a private citizen, Frothingham had no right to question the constitutionality of such acts?

Mr. KEATING. That is correct, the reason being that the interest of a single taxpayer is so minuscule or remote that he would not have standing in Federal court to challenge that law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the opinion was a unanimous one, was it not?

Mr. KEATING. It was unanimous, as I recall. In the Supreme Court the name of the case became *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon* (262 U.S. 447).

In that case Justice Sutherland distinguished the right of a taxpayer in a municipality having the right to sue and that of a Federal taxpayer. Taxpayers in municipalities have been given the right to sue.

Justice Sutherland said in that case:

> But the relation of a taxpayer of the United States to the Federal Government is very different. His interest in the moneys of the Treasury—partly realized from taxation and partly from other sources—is shared with millions of others; is comparatively minute and undeterminable; and the effect upon future taxation, of any payment out of the funds, so remote, fluctuating and uncertain, that no basis is afforded for an appeal to the preventive powers of a court of equity.

The Senator is correct in his reference to that case. I appreciate his bringing it up.

There is another ground, which is also mentioned in some of the cases, and that is the sovereign's right not to be sued, which can be waived by statute.

The fact that no suit will lie by a taxpayer to prevent the disbursement of funds by the Commissioner of Education for unconstitutional purposes, it is submitted, must have been recognized by those who included the express provision for suits by State agencies under section 111(b) of the pending bill. It must have been recognized also by those who included a similar provision in the Clark-Morse bill for loans to nonpublic schools, the wording of this amendment being very similar to the wording of the amendment which those distinguished Senators have included in the bill which they have offered.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in its brief on the pending bill, also recognizes the legal point that I am making, and concedes the effectiveness of language similar to that contained in my amendment, to provide a judicial remedy.

I have been critical of some of the legal conclusions reached by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. However in the brief which the Department has submitted there is cited the case which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has mentioned, and it is pointed out and conceded that there would be no way to test the constitutionality of an alleged unconstitutional payment by the Commissioner of Education, in the absence of express provision in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I yield myself 5 additional minutes. The brief dealt with the constitutional question in connection with aid to nonpublic schools. It pointed out that Congress could, of course, make a provision to permit the courts to pass on the subject, which is exactly what my amendment is designed to do.

It is really very difficult for me to understand why anyone who subscribes to the rule of law—and I assume that all

of us here subscribe to the rule of law—would deny recourse to the courts where an allegation is made that the Constitution is being violated in the administration of the law. I can conceive of no considerations which could possibly justify the denial of access to the courts under such circumstances.

These are times when we must enforce and enhance the rule of law. We should not yield on so fundamental a principle. This is the time to express to the full our support for the judiciary by permitting this coequal branch of our Republic to exercise its scrutiny over the constitutionality of enactments and disbursements. I emphasize that the amendment is in no respect a new departure. It is the converse of provisions already in the bill permitting court actions by States. Under the wording of the bill, a State agency would have the right, if money were withheld, to bring an action to compel payment. Indeed, questions in such suits by the States are not limited to the Constitution. My amendment is limited to the constitutional question. It is the other side of that coin, and provides that a taxpayer who believes it is unconstitutional to disburse funds shall have the same right as a State agency to bring an action in court.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. It is not exactly the converse, is it? I say that because under the pending bill, S. 1021, a State's appeal is to the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the appellant is located.

Under the proposed amendment the case would have to be brought in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia and tried here. As the Senator knows, I have consistently maintained that we should try these issues in the district court of the State in which the issue arises, rather than, in the case of my State, going to the district court in San Francisco, for example. Under the amendment we would ask everyone to come to the District Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested to know whether the Senator from Montana would support the amendment if the venue were changed.

Mr. METCALF. It would certainly make it much more palatable if the jurisdiction were changed to the district court for the State in which the issue arose, rather than have all the cases tried in the District Court for the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. I say frankly to the Senator from Montana that my initial reaction was the same as his, that it is desirable to have as many cases as possible tried in the most convenient district courts. The District Court for the District of Columbia is a very busy court. I wish to explain to the Senator the reason why the amendment is worded in this way. It is because of the possibility that all kinds of different decisions would be rendered in various district courts. For that reason, I think it would be better to require actions to be brought here, but I would not seriously oppose an amendment to the bill which would provide, as the Senator has suggested, that the action also could be brought in the district where the issue arises, and where the funds are sought.

Mr. METCALF. As the Senator knows, under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, actions are brought in the district court, not in the circuit court. This would create a parallel situation.

Mr. KEATING. I will consider the Senator's point of view. I have no pride of authorship about the language in the amendment. If it is the feeling of the majority of Senators that they would prefer to have these actions brought in the taxpayer's State, I would not seriously oppose such an amendment.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Would it not be desirable, if a change of this sort were considered, to give the plaintiff the option of choosing where he may sue, whether in the District Court in the State where the question arises or, as the amendment now provides, in the District Court for the District of Columbia, where the defendant is to be found and where, for convenience, the Government would logically have the suit brought?

Mr. KEATING. There is a parallel to that in the Administrative Procedure Act and in some other statutes, under which a person has such an option. I would consider the jurisdictional question as to where the suit could be brought as distinctly secondary to the main objective of the amendment, and I am prepared to yield to the position of the majority on the exact language of the amendment.

As I have pointed out, the State agencies have the right now to seek to enforce in court what they allege to be the law. My amendment proposes the converse; namely, to give the taxpayer the right to go into court if he feels that an illegal distribution has been made.

It is fair to ask this question: Do the children and the parents affected, many of whom are poor and helpless, deserve less consideration from Congress when judicial remedies are considered than the powerful States in which they reside, and which now have the right, under the bill, to bring an action? I cannot accept any such disparity in the treatment of the interests involved. I am as much concerned as anyone else about Federal encroachment on public education. I would favor almost any provision to prevent such control. But no Federal legislation which Congress enacts should be immune from constitutional limitations. We cannot make the Constitution inapplicable to a Federal aid to education program in the guise of trying to limit interference with local education. For practical purposes, unless this amendment shall be accepted, we will have made the Constitution inapplicable because we will make it impossible, in any manner, to test the constitutionality of disbursements under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois. I will yield the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I desire to ask the Senator a question.

While the Senator from New York has said that this is not a civil rights amendment as such, nevertheless, is it not true that one of the major fields in which it might be applied is that of civil rights?

Mr. KEATING. It is, I say frankly. It is my contention as a lawyer that it would be illegal for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to turn over funds under the proposed act to a State whose schools are operating in defiance of Supreme Court decisions. I recognize that that viewpoint is disputed by many good lawyers.

My amendment would permit a taxpayer who had paid his income taxes to test that question in the courts. But the amendment is not limited, by any means, to a single purpose. It would permit the distinguished Senator from Virginia, who spoke at length last Wednesday and contended that the entire act is unconstitutional, to test the constitutionality of the act. There are sincere proponents of that point of view. It would permit a taxpayer to test the constitutionality of the entire program of Federal aid to education.

My reason for saying it was not a civil rights amendment is that it is by no means limited to that field.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that hitherto Congress has refused to pass legislation which would support the decisions of the Supreme Court in so-called segregation cases? I take it that this is merely a statement of fact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not also true that the letter of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare addressed to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] constitutes a voluntary abstention from withholding grants to districts or States which are in violation of the decision of the Supreme Court?

Mr. KEATING. That is the way I interpret the letter. In utter frankness he has said, as has the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the bill, that no funds would be withheld.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, the only way in which the constitutionality of such grants can be tested is in the courts; but since in the precedents which the Senator from New York has cited it has been held that individual taxpayers, in the absence of further legislation, have no right to bring such suits therefore, unless a provision similar to the amendment in question is adopted, the courts, as well as the legislature and the administration would be powerless to act.

Mr. KEATING. There would be no way to test the constitutionality or legality of such action. The Federal Govern-

ment taking the same position as the State government, there would be no manner in which that question could be tested in court.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This proposal, therefore, seems to be about the only way in which this issue can be considered in a legal, constitutional fashion.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator is correct. I know of no other way. If some other way were suggested which was better, I should be happy to withdraw my amendment. But I have not had my attention called to any manner in which the constitutionality of the provisions of the bill can be challenged, except in the manner suggested in my amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May it not be that there is one small loophole, namely, in the letter of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, in which he said that neither he nor the Commissioner of Education would withhold funds? That would not preclude the Attorney General from acting, but certainly the implication of the Secretary's letter is that in the absence of a positive statement by the Attorney General or the President, that the Attorney General will act, the door to executive action is barred.

Mr. KEATING. It would also be open to action if the President issued an Executive order directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold funds. Then the issue would be raised in a suit by a State agency to compel the funds to be turned over. If the President were to make that announcement during the debate on this amendment it might change the situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would not have supported the Bush amendment yesterday if such a statement had been issued; but in the absence of such a statement then and in the absence of such a statement today, I shall support the amendment of the Senator from New York and shall be very happy to join with him in sponsoring it.

I do not believe, however, that it is the fault of the President that he has not issued such a statement, because so many events are happening all at once that it is impossible for a Chief Executive to be on top of every issue at every second. Nevertheless, it seems to me that in the absence of some such statement, the only way in which provision can be made for a sure opportunity to test the constitutionality of grants under this act to schools which practice segregation is by some such amendment as that which the Senator from New York is proposing.

I say all this with a certain degree of modesty because I am not a member of the bar. But while this may be the opinion of a sea lawyer, this proposal seems to me to be the only sure means by which we can assure judicial review of the constitutionality of the granting of Federal funds to foster segregation.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from Illinois may not be a lawyer, but he has a very keen awareness of legal implications, as I have often recognized. He also has a keen interest in the subject which we have been discussing, as he has demonstrated over and over again.

I wish to say two things to the Senator: First, there was not the slightest implication of criticism of the President in my remarks. This is not the time to criticize the President of the United States. I hope that when the events in Laos, Cuba, Alabama, and other places in the world become less crucial, and if my amendment should be rejected—although I hope it will not be—the President will turn his attention to the issuance of such an Executive order as I have referred to.

I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from Illinois for his cosponsorship of the amendment. It adds much to have him join in my effort.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY MEMBERS OF THE KOREAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it will meet with the pleasure of the Senator who has the floor to have the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] be recognized, in order to introduce a group of very distinguished guests who are visiting the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that the time required for their introduction not be charged to the time available to either side under the unanimous-consent agreement which now is in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, visiting the Senate today, and now on the floor of the Senate, are five gentlemen from Korea. Four of them have been in the United States for several days. Today they were at lunch with members of the Far East Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I am especially pleased to welcome these gentlemen to the Senate and to the United States, knowing that the people of South Korea, 25 million in number, are in heart and in pulse-beat in sympathy with and have affection for the people of the United States. They have stood by our side today, regardless of what has happened in Korea within the last week. The Korean people still believe in our cause and want to be with us.

It is therefore my special privilege and pleasure to introduce today to the Senate the following gentlemen, who are members of the Korean Parliament.

Mr. Soon Eung Chung, member of House of councilors

Mr. Il Tong Yang, minority leader, house of representatives.

Mr. Do Yoon Choo, member of house of representatives.

Mr. Chun Sung Lee, member of house of representatives and house steering committee.

And, from the Korean Embassy, the Honorable Kwang Lim Koh, former Minister.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me, so that I may say a word?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Inasmuch as I happen temporarily to be occupying the seat of the minority leader, I wish to join the Senator from Ohio, on behalf of the minority, in welcoming these distinguished gentlemen and friends who come from Korea. Korea and the United States of America have stood together through thick and thin, through some rather difficult times. We have great affection for South Korea, and a very great stake in the maintenance of sound government in South Korea.

I join the Senator from Ohio in welcoming these gentlemen to this Chamber.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It has been said that the proposed legislation should not be used as a means of enforcing desegregation—that is to say, as an instrument for putting into effect the Supreme Court's interpretation of the Constitution, in the school desegregation case.

If the Senator from Ohio will permit me to say so, I wish to state that I think that, except for those who favor segregation, that argument is made only on the basis that the bill will have less chance to be enacted into law if the bill is made an affirmative instrument of desegregation. But I have not heard anyone say that even for the sake of effecting the passage of the bill, it should be allowed to be an instrument for strengthening segregation.

Is it not true that the Senator's amendment would not in any way make the bill of any effect, affirmatively, toward bringing about desegregation in the schools?

Mr. KEATING. Only if a suit were brought and if a court were to hold that it would be unconstitutional for the Secretary or the Commissioner to turn over the funds to a State which defies the Supreme Court's decision and acts in an unconstitutional manner.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. But that would not amount to use of the act in an affirmative way to bring about desegregation. It would merely prevent this act and the program it would originate from being used as instruments to perpetuate segregation.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from New Jersey is eminently correct; and he has forcefully brought out the fact that the bill, as written, when taken with the opinion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, at present encourages segregation in the public schools. On the other hand, this amendment merely states that if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is wrong in the opinion he has expressed, a taxpayer shall have the right in court to prove that he was wrong.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I appreciate very much the fact that the Senator from New York has made that point very clear. I am a cosponsor, with him, of this amendment, as is the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and

other Senators. It seems to me that regardless of whatever may be our view as to the desirability of making the school system's program an instrument to bring about, a little more quickly, decency in this country, and to do so affirmatively, there can be no justification whatever for putting on the statute books of the country a bill which would delay desegregation. Yet that would be the effect, as stated more than once, and as announced officially on the floor—namely, that no account whatever will be taken, in connection with the distribution of the funds, as to whether the funds will be given to a school which is practicing segregation or whether the school has made any move at all—and some have not done so—to comply with the Supreme Court's decision.

Mr. KEATING. I agree, and I am very thankful to the Senator for his remarks and for his cosponsorship.

I wish to supplement what he said—and I have permission to say this—by stating that one of our friends who comes from one of the Southern States, and who, of course, views this subject somewhat differently from the way in which many of the rest of us view it, said to me, this morning, and after he said it, I asked whether I could quote him as saying it; and he replied that I could if he was quoted anonymously—that this amendment is so right in principle that it is very difficult to oppose it; it is so right in principle that the constitutionality of the proposed use of public funds should be subject to being tested in the courts.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It may be argued—and I assume that no other argument could be made in opposition to this amendment at this time—that even this very mild provision to prevent the act from being used in aid of segregation, will run some risk of having an adverse effect on the final passage of the bill, either here or in the other body.

Is it not the view of the Senator from New York, in agreement with my view, that if, in order to have this bill passed, we must "buy" segregation with it, it comes at too high a price?

Mr. KEATING. It is too high a price for me to pay, I say to my friend. Furthermore, in addition, we would "buy" the barring of the courts to anyone who might wish to test the constitutionality or the unconstitutionality of the administration of this law. That is what we have to "buy" if this amendment were rejected and if subsequently the bill were passed.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It is my judgment that it is not fair to the Members of the Congress of the United States, in this body or the other body, to say that any substantial number of them are going to be affected in their voting on the school aid bill by the consideration we are now talking about, and that any asserted danger that adoption of this amendment might endanger the passage of the bill is not based upon any reasonable prospect.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I know the Senator has correctly stated the basis of the opposition to this amendment. I am sure that those Senators, like the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who have stated that they will oppose the amendment do not oppose the objectives sought to be achieved, but that their opposition is based on the fact that they fear it would militate against the enactment of the school aid bill. I sincerely do not believe it would. I sincerely do not believe that to give the right to test this question or any other constitutional question to any taxpayer, in order that the courts might pass on the question, would militate against the enactment of the school aid bill. If it would, I think that fact is highly regrettable.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The junior Senator from South Dakota is a little uncertain as to the practical effect of this amendment, and for that reason I should like to ask two or three questions.

First, the sponsors of the amendment require that the action must be brought in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia. Why not in any district court?

Mr. KEATING. That question was the subject of some colloquy when the Senator was necessarily off the floor, at which time I stated I would not seriously oppose an amendment to the amendment to provide that action could be brought in the district where the taxpayer resided.

I recognize that we should not overload the district court in the District of Columbia with litigation. That court is overloaded with litigation now. There are many factors and the matter was referred to by the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], why it would be better not to require that the action be brought in the District of Columbia.

The other side of the situation is that, if actions were brought all over the country, there could be a wide variance in the decisions which were made. For that reason it would be better to bring the actions in the District of Columbia. Normally, it would involve not a large number of witnesses, but merely legal argument, and that could be done in the District of Columbia.

However, if a majority of Senators feel it would be better to have the actions brought in the various States, I would not oppose such amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Generally speaking, from the standpoint of the taxpayers—and this amendment establishes the right of taxpayers—it would be an additional expense for them to come from California or Alaska or Florida or Texas to bring suit here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. That is true, although I do not anticipate that a taxpayer from Alaska would bring such an action; but I do agree that point has some merit. I would think one or two actions—probably only one—would be brought to test the question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The last remark which the Senator has made suggests an assumption about which I am a little dubious. The Senator referred to one or two test cases. What I wonder is if the administrator of the act might be plagued by a great number of cases. That is, if there were people—and I know there are people in my State who have no sympathy with any form of Federal aid to education—who wanted to defeat the purposes of the act under the right proposed to be given to them by the amendment, would it not be possible for them to impose a series of suits, and keep the act from being effectively administered in a number of States?

Mr. KEATING. I must concede, as I said in my previous remarks, that this provision is by no means limited to the issue of desegregation, and would permit any test of a constitutional character with regard to any part of the legislation. Having said that, it will be noticed the proposal provides that anybody aggrieved by a final order shall be entitled to a review by the Supreme Court within 60 days.

In other words, a direct appeal to the Supreme Court is provided in the amendment, which would expedite the procedure. It would not be necessary to go through the court of appeals. I would not think there would be any substantial delay in connection with the administration of the act. If there is a comparatively small amount of delay, it would be justified, in my judgment, by the establishment of the constitutionality of the act, or the establishment of the unconstitutionality of the act. The Senator would not, any more than I, want to support unconstitutional legislation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think most of us, of course, as an abstract principle, do not believe in unconstitutional expenditures. On the other hand, in this field we do run very close to sensitivities. Ordinarily a right is not given to a citizen to sue a Federal officer except by express provision. To extend that right against the Commissioner opens the possibility that those who want to defeat the operation of the act could do so by a series of suits which would load the court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Certainly it would load the District Court of the District of Columbia. Then, with the provision that the action must be brought within 60 days, I notice the Senator has a proviso that the action shall be expedited and a review shall be heard and determined at the earliest practicable time. In the final analysis, it might be possible that this provision would let those who wanted to defeat the purpose of the act do so.

Mr. KEATING. Let me endeavor to disabuse the Senator's mind of the fear that there would be any great delay as to operation of the act. The bringing of an action would not mean an injunction would be granted or that a restraining order would be issued. In order to issue a temporary restraining order, the judge would have to be satisfied of the substantial merit of the case. A judge will not grant a restraining order on request.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the judge would not, but I know that the language provides "to restrain or enjoin him from making any payment under this act which the plaintiff alleges will be used in any manner which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States."

I suspect there are some people who have some rather deep feelings about certain phases of the operation of the act. They might make allegations in various ways that the payments might be used unconstitutionally.

Mr. KEATING. I am sure there are sincere advocates of the point of view that any payments under the act would be unconstitutional because the whole act is claimed to be unconstitutional. I do not share that point of view, but there are sincere people who feel that way.

I point out to the Senator that the mere fact that the act would give the right to restrain or to enjoin does not mean that a restraining or enjoining order would be granted any time the question arose. There would have to be a meritorious case presented before such a restraining or enjoining order would be granted.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from South Dakota seems to be under the misapprehension that there would not be a speedy decision by the Supreme Court and that by the institution of a series of suits one might be able to indefinitely postpone the operation of the statute. I do not think that would be possible under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. KEATING. No. If opponents of the act tried to bring a series of actions in lower courts the judge, after one case had been decided and passed upon by the Supreme Court, which can be done very quickly, would not give more than 5 minutes to the case.

Mr. BUTLER. The judge would stay all the other proceedings until the Supreme Court decided the issue.

Mr. KEATING. He would.

Mr. BUTLER. I think that is one of the things which is worrying the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KEATING. Then the judge would summarily dispose of the other cases in accordance with the decision in the Supreme Court.

Mr. BUTLER. I say to the Senator from New York that I wholeheartedly join in support of his amendment, and I hope it will be agreed to. I think it is a very meritorious amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The second sentence of paragraph (b) of the amendment, as offered, reads:

> Such action shall be brought in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia.

In view of what the sponsor of the amendment has said, would the sponsor object to changing the language to read:

> Such action shall be brought in the district court of the district in which the taxpayer has paid his tax.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he answers that question?

Mr. KEATING. I do not wish to accept the language. I would prefer to give an option, so that the taxpayer can bring an action in either of two places, as was suggested by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, and as is provided in some of the statutes already. I would prefer to add to the present language, "or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which the taxpayer resides."

I would prefer to do it in that way.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I started to write in the word "resides," but there are some people who reside in the District of Columbia and who pay taxes in their home States.

Mr. KEATING. Under this language those people could bring suits in the District, if they wished.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator provided a choice, that would be satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. KEATING. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my own State, for example, we have a district court at the opposite end of the State. There are complaints that taxpayers or lawyers have to travel 400 miles and back to go to the district court to enter a motion. If it were necessary to come to the District of Columbia, that would be even a longer trip.

Mr. KEATING. I must say to my friend that when one gets down to the specific courts, if we are to enlarge the language, to not require the suit to be brought in the District of Columbia—I think it would be a fair compromise to give the taxpayer an option of bringing the suit in one place or the other.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would be satisfied with such a provision.

Mr. KEATING. We could add the words, "or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which the taxpayer resides."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad the Senator has not succumbed to the temptation, often presented in the Senate, of agreeing to something a colleague wishes out of hand. The Senator knows, because of long and valuable experience in the civil rights field, how expensive these cases may be, and therefore knows the desirability of allowing a case to be brought at the seat of government as well as elsewhere. I agree with that.

Mr. President, I think I am the only one of the cosponsors who voted to table the Bush amendment. I hope the Senator will be able to yield 5 minutes to me, because I strongly support the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. I surely shall.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the amendment will make a splendid contribution to the bill and should in no way, in all reason, interfere with its becoming law. The amendment will in every way contribute to an equitable and fair administration.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the remarks of my colleague. I appreciate the cosponsorship of the amendment. I assure my colleague that, at the appropriate time, I shall yield to him. In so far as I am concerned, if the Senator would like to have time now, with the permission of the distinguished manager of the bill, I shall yield to the Senator.

I have taken a great deal of time. I shall be glad to let the Senator from Oregon proceed, if he wishes; otherwise, I yield to the Senator from New York 5 minutes or such additional time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I believe I am the only one of the cosponsors of the amendment—which I am delighted to see cosponsored in a bipartisan way through the graciousness of our colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]—who voted to table the Bush amendment and who felt quite sincerely that if we desired to obtain Federal aid to education we had to make that sacrifice.

I compliment my colleague from Connecticut, not only for his eloquent but also for his able espousal of that cause. Under the pressures of the day, it was almost an exercise beyond self-discipline to keep from voting with him, considering what is taking place in terms of the national disagrace and the national tragedy in Birmingham and Montgomery, Ala.

Mr. President, the reason the pending amendment is not in the same category with the other amendment—deeply as I feel that the other amendment was quite understandable, though I could not support it—is that the Keating amendment would leave the situation as it is.

This is a very important point to make. The amendment would leave the situation as it is because, as we stand today, any citizen who has a modest interest of having a child or children in school can seek the desegregation of a school district and can go through the court process in respect to that school. Why should not the same citizen have the same opportunity to question the support of the school system, when he has the right to sue to bring about its desegregation. That is all the Keating amendment would provide. It would give the citizen the same position he has today.

If the Keating amendment is not agreed to, in view of the opinion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as contained in the letter which was sent to the Senator from Vermont

[Mr. PROUTY], the Secretary will reserve to himself the right—indeed, as he says, the duty—to pay funds out of Federal aid to any State. The Secretary says that he "cannot withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State."

I respectfully submit that this is much too wide an interpretation and that is unsound law. I am really quite surprised that it is even contemplated, considering the learning and erudition as a lawyer of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I hope he will take another look at it.

It is quite unlikely that the Secretary has not seen the letter, because it bears his signature. I know Mr. Ribicoff, and I know he is a man of great responsibility as well as of considerable learning. I am amazed the statement is as broad as it is.

I agree with my colleague [Mr. KEATING] in saying that when this comes to be refined by the Attorney General it will never stand up, for the reason that, according to the letter, the Secretary would feel it proper to pay over money for the benefit of a school district which might be in contempt of court. It is conceivable that a school district subject to an order to desegregate might defy the order and be in contempt of court, but nonetheless, the Secretary says, he would pay over the money.

I cannot believe it. I am sure it will not happen. The Secretary says he must do it, but it is inconceivable.

Mr. President, I think the strongest argument for the Keating amendment, which is a most constructive amendment, upon which I complimented him yesterday and again compliment him today—is that it is a constructive addition to the bill. Were I in the shoes of the sponsor of the bill I would accept the amendment, because I think it is eminently proper.

We cannot hope to please people who are unreasonable. We cannot hope to try to shape a bill to deal with unreasonable points. Most of us have thought, notwithstanding our deep feeling about school desegregation, and considering Representative POWELL's expression upon the subject, that the practicalities of the situation dictate that the question must be dealt with separately. But the practicalities of the situation certainly do not dictate that we should change the existing situation. What the amendment of my colleague from New York would do would be to maintain the existing rights and the existing situation of the individual citizen. Therefore, I hope very much that his amendment will be agreed to, because it is reasonably adapted to do what must be done in all equity and justice.

I cannot see how any reasonable person—and I am glad the Senator quoted his southern friends—could refrain from accepting this amendment as fair, no matter how he may feel about school desegregation, because it would do nothing but continue a right a citizen enjoys today with respect to suing to bring about the desegregation of a school district.

Another point in respect to a desegregation amendment is that the Supreme Court itself has held that the Constitution must be implemented. It is not self-operative. It must be implemented either by law or court decision.

Therefore, in order to desegregate a school district, one must start a suit. The Supreme Court has said, "We will cause the district court to enter a decree," and added that desegregation must take place with "all deliberate speed." Such a condition involves questions of law and fact. So one may say that the antisegregation amendment is too broad. Even the courts do not make that statement. They have said, "You must bring the suit and satisfy the conditions and timing for desegregation." But when a decree has been issued, the possibility that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare could fly in the face of that decree in giving aid would be inconceivable. I do not believe it would happen. I do not care what the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare says now. But he certainly puts us on notice that if we want to maintain the existing situation, we must adopt the Keating amendment; and I hope very much that the Senate will vote favorably on the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute. I express my gratitude to my distinguished colleague from New York for his support of the amendment. I think it is significant that my colleague, who took a different view of the Bush amendment from my own, and who had his sincere reasons and his commitments in committee with others for the position which he took, is now supporting the amendment which would do exactly what he said it would do. It leaves things where they are now, but it would give the taxpayer the right to test the constitutionality of the administration of the act.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time is necessary, but I shall be relatively brief.

I feel the same way I felt the other day when the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was under discussion. I have the utmost respect for them, as I had for the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], when I found it necessary to oppose his amendment, as I do this one, on what I consider to be opposition based on the merits and not based on floor strategy. I have heard in the cloakrooms that, "If the Senator from Oregon were not the floor leader of the bill, he probably would be on our side of the amendment."

I want to dispel that notion. I would not support the amendment, whether or not I was in charge of the bill. I think the amendment is an unwise one. Having made that statement, however, I quickly add that I have the greatest respect for the legal ability of my friends from New York. They are two of the most brilliant lawyers in the Senate. I find myself on the opposite side only in regard to what I consider to be the legal merits of the amendment.

I hope that at the earliest possible moment we shall find ourselves joining forces again in support of a common cause, which is the major objective of the bill itself. The great regret I have is to leave them on the amendment.

In my judgment, the amendment would add a new section to the bill providing for a Federal income tax payers suit against the Commissioner to restrain or enjoin him from making any payment under this act which the plaintiff alleges will be used in any manner which is in violation of the Constitution of the United States.

The administration's memorandum on the impact of the first amendment to the Constitution upon Federal aid to education, dated March 28, 1961, contains the following statement:

> Individual taxpayers lack standing sufficient to sue in a court of the United States, and, where a party to a lawsuit lacks sufficient standing, there is no case or controversy which the Federal courts may decide. This requirement of a case of controversy is imposed upon the Federal courts by article III of the Constitution, and there appears to be no way in which legislation can dilute this requirement.

It can be seriously questioned whether the Congress has power under the Constitution to confer standing upon an individual Federal tax payer to being suit to enjoin expenditure of Federal funds allegedly in violation of the Constitution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator's frankness is very disarming at times, but I ask the Senator whether, having considered the language, it is not for all practical purposes the same language as that contained in the Morse-Clark bill. The language of the amendment was taken almost bodily from the wording of the Morse-Clark bill, which has been introduced with reference to aid to nonpublic schools.

Mr. MORSE. I thought that part of the bill was identical. I did not think it was almost identical.

Mr. KEATING. It is very similar.

Mr. MORSE. I thought the Senator adopted my identical language.

Mr. KEATING. I assume that the Senator from Oregon would not propose an unconstitutional bill. Knowing of his great erudition as a lawyer, I was sure that he had studied that problem and had reached the conclusion that such a bill would be constitutional.

Mr. MORSE. I would not knowingly or intentionally propose an unconstitutional section in any bill.

There are many differences between a public school bill and a private school bill. For example, in a private school aid program there would be no legal protection whatsoever for the Negro taxpayer unless it is written into the bill, and we did propose such a limitation in our bill because the desegregation decisions are limited to public education. Also I point out in the private school bill we provided two methods in addition to a taxpayer suit, for testing the constitutionality of the proposed loans to private schools.

It is my opinion that in connection with the public school bill, the amendment of the Senator from New York could not, without fundamental changes in the bill and the amendment, give a taxpayer legal standing to bring a suit, under the constitutional restriction of Justice Sutherland's decision in the Mellon case.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I should like to cite to the Senator some language which supports the position taken in favor of the amendment and also the position taken on the so-called Clark bill, which is identical with the provision in the amendment. I know the Senator will wish to have the constitutionality of his provision substantiated in every possible way. Judge Frank, in Associated Industries against Ickes, said, in part:

> While Congress can constitutionally authorize no one, in the absence of an actual justiciable controversy, to bring a suit for judicial determination either of the constitutionality of a statute or the scope of powers conferred by a statute upon Government officers, it can constitutionally authorize one of its own officials, such as the Attorney General, to bring a proceeding to prevent another official from acting in violation of his statutory powers; for then an actual controversy exists, and the Attorney General can properly be vested with authority, in such a controversy, to vindicate the interest of the public or the Government. Instead of designating the Attorney General, or some other public officer, to bring such proceedings, Congress can constitutionally enact a statute conferring on any nonofficial person, or on a designated group of nonofficial persons, authority to bring a suit to prevent action by an officer in violation of his statutory powers; for then, in like manner, there is an actual controversy, and there is nothing constitutionally prohibiting Congress from empowering any person, official or not, to institute a proceeding involving such a controversy, even if the sole purpose is to vindicate the public interest. Such persons, so authorized, are, so to speak, private attorneys general.

That seems to be very forcibly put.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Will the Senator give me the citation?

Mr. KEATING. *Associated Industries v. Ickes* (134 Fed. 2d, 694). The language which I have quoted is at page 701. I wish to be entirely fair with the Senator. The case was vacated on other grounds, which in no way dealt with this question, in 320 U.S. 707, a decision in 1943.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to point out to the Senator that I was not going to use the argument that the case had been vacated as a judgment being passed by the Supreme Court on Judge Frank's opinion. I am familiar with that case. I would be less than honest with my friend from New York if I did not say I used the language of the decision in preparing for consideration in committee of the Clark-Morse bill.

As a lawyer, however, I cannot escape the fact that the Mellon case still stands on the books as the unreversed decision of the U.S. Supreme Court on this subject matter. As far as I am concerned, the Mellon case is controlling upon us. In my judgment we cannot give that right to the taxpayer, merely by the means provided in the Senator's amendment, in light of the Mellon case. In essence the Mellon case is a determination of a constitutional matter, is a constitutional rule, is a constitutional principle. It cannot be changed by this amendment. Congress cannot by such legislation change a constitutional ruling of the U.S. Supreme Court once the Supreme Court in effect says—and I believe this is what the Mellon opinion says, "This is the Constitution put to practice."

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. My interpretation of the Mellon decision is simply that no such suit would lie unless Congress had acted. I respect the Senator's opinion, but that is what I would say the opinion means. In any event, if the amendment were adopted and became a part of the law, and it were held that a taxpayer could not constitutionally bring an action even after Congress had given him that right, it certainly would be hurriedly disposed of and would not cause any delay in the disbursement of funds.

Mr. MORSE. It would cause many more troubles, which I wish to talk about. I shall return to the legal argument in a moment, but first I wish to cover this argument.

Apart from the constitutional question, it may be seriously questioned that the cause of desegregation of public schools will be furthered by the withholding of Federal assistance funds. If the proposed amendment would be legally effectual in conferring taxpayers standing to sue, there is grave risk that the entire program of Federal aid to education authorized by the bill could be interfered with if a series of taxpayers' suits were brought under any constitutional law theory to enjoin payments to any and all States. This would obviously be a most unfortunate result and one not intended by the adoption of the Keating amendment.

The constitutional right to attend public schools operated in a racially nondiscriminatory fashion was established by a decision of the Supreme Court in a suit brought without benefit of the provision of law proposed in the Keating amendment. Progress has been made since the Supreme Court's decision toward desegregation of public schools in many areas where school segregation has been practiced. Further progress can be expected without the adoption of the Keating amendment. The most likely result of the Keating amendment would be to imperil the enactment of Federal aid to education, or, if it were enacted, to imperil the carrying out of the program of Federal aid authorized. Neither result would further desegregation. Both results would interfere with the extremely necessary improvement of public elementary and secondary education which the bill is designed to help achieve.

Furthermore, it seems to me that if we start the precedent which is proposed this afternoon, and attach it to the pending bill, I do not see how in the world there could be any objection to the offering of a stark, stereotyped amendment to every piece of legislation that is brought to the floor of the Senate, when anyone could say, "Ah, but someone may raise a constitutional question about this bill, and therefore we ought to put the Keating amendment on the bill in order to assure taxpayers that they can bring an action to test the constitutionality of it."

That takes us a long way from the sound constitutional theory of the Mellon case which I wish to discuss momentarily.

Furthermore, in my judgment it would lead to the initiation of unnecessary litigation. It would certainly be very unsound legislative policy.

We cannot start to draw a line of distinction between bills which involve possible constitutional questions. We cannot say, "Well, we will offer this only to a bill that involves the civil rights issue or have a relationship to the whole matter of segregation."

I fully understand the position of the Senator from New York. He was very frank with us, as I tried to be with the Senate. He said that he was not offering his amendment as a so-called civil rights amendment. He rejects the notion that it is to be considered as a civil rights amendment. But when we consider the practicality of the situation, we cannot escape the fact that even if the Senator from New York is not offering his amendment for that purpose, many other Senators who are supporting the amendment, have said to me, quite frankly—and I shall paraphrase them, but accurately—"Listen, WAYNE, we must get something on civil rights into the bill. We must get into the bill some restriction on civil rights. We must include in the bill something which will make it possible for me to say, 'After all, I voted for some language in the bill which sought to impose some restriction with respect to the matter of segregation.'"

I do not think it can be denied that we are dealing with an amendment which, whether the authors so intended or not, has the effect of being designed to take effect with respect to the segregation issue.

So I say, most respectfully, that I find myself in the same position in which I found myself yesterday, when I opposed the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. When all is said and done, in my capacity of floor leadership of the bill, I am confronted with one practicality that because many Senators look upon this amendment as having a civil rights import and impact, it raises in the Senate the civil rights issue, which in my judgment would have the effect—and I say this most respectfully—of endangering the passage of the bill itself.

I believe it is not necessary to adopt the Keating amendment in order to solve the problem raised by the Supreme Court decision of 1954. However, as I have said before in the debate, in the discussion of any amendment, I shall never lose sight of my objective. Mr.

objective is the objective of the administration. Our objective is to place on the statute books, for the first time, the principle of Federal aid to education, so that we can bring to the boys and girls of the Nation, who are now really being cheated in many States, the opportunity to develop fully their educational opportunities, and at least seek to come somewhere near providing the same measure of equality of educational opportunity. I shall never lose sight of the fact that that is the important goal of the proposed legislation.

Any amendment which, in my judgment, jeopardizes the attainment of that goal, I consider a crippling amendment. I say most respectfully that I consider the Keating amendment a crippling amendment because it endangers the placing on the statute books, for the first time, the principle of Federal aid to education.

Returning to my legal argument, I believe the Senate should take a few minutes to ponder the significance of Commonwealth of Massachusetts against Mellon. I am somewhat surprised that some Senators seem to hold a point of view that this case is wrong and has an unfortunate result. But I defend the case of Massachusetts against Mellon. I shall take the Senate, for a few minutes, to the landmark decision of Justice Sutherland in the Mellon case.

Note the date of the case. It is reported in 262 United States, decided in the October term, 1922. It will be found in 262 United States beginning at page 447. I shall read from page 478.

Since 1922, the Mellon case has stood every attempt to have it modified by the Supreme Court It has stood every procedural attempt to change it. I think the reason is a general recognition that as a matter of law, the decision is sound in connection with the constitutional points which it raises. I shall read two or three paragraphs to give Senators who are not familiar with the case the operative facts. Justice Sutherland, delivering the opinion of the Court, said:

> These cases were argued and will be considered and disposed of together. The first is an original suit in this Court. The other was brought in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. That court dismissed the bill and its decree was affirmed by the District Court of Appeals. Thereupon the case was brought here by appeal. Both cases challenge the constitutionality of the act of November 23, 1921 (ch. 135, 42 Stat. 224), commonly called the Maternity Act. Briefly, it provides for an initial appropriation and thereafter annual appropriations for a period of 5 years, to be apportioned among such of the several States as shall accept and comply with its provisions, for the purpose of cooperating with them to reduce maternal and infant mortality and protect the health of mothers and infants.

There are many differences between the Maternity Act and S. 1021, the Federal aid to education bill; but there are many similarities, too. I have just read a couple of similarities. I think it is interesting to note that the Maternity Act, to which the decision applied, was a 5-year act. The bill under consideration will be a 3-year act.

I think it is also interesting to observe that Justice Sutherland pointed out, in regard to the Maternity Act, as I now point out in regard to the Federal Aid to Education Act, that the aid was not forced on the States. Remember, he said:

> Briefly, it provides for an initial appropriation and thereafter annual appropriations for a period of 5 years, to be apportioned among such of the several States as shall accept and comply with its provisions, for the purpose of cooperating with them to reduce maternal and infant mortality and protect the health of mothers and infants. It creates a bureau to administer the act in cooperation with State agencies, which are required to make such reports concerning their operations and expenditures as may be prescribed by the Federal bureau. Whenever that bureau shall determine that funds have not been properly expended in respect of any State, payments may be withheld.

That is an interesting similarity, is it not, between many of the procedures set forth and the jurisdictional controls set up in the Maternity Act and the Federal Aid to Education Act. I point this out because we are now dealing with the consideration of a problem in connection with two bills, one already decided by the Supreme Court, but which, in my judgment, is clearly applicable to the Federal aid to education bill, which I am seeking to have the Senate pass.

Justice Sutherland then said:

> It is asserted that these appropriations are for purposes not national, but local to the States, and together with numerous similar appropriations constitute an effective means of inducing the States to yield a portion of their sovereign rights. It is further alleged that the burden of the appropriations provided by this act and similar legislation falls unequally upon the several States, and rests largely upon the industrial States, such as Massachusetts; that the act is a usurpation of power not granted to Congress by the Constitution. * * *

Have we heard any of those arguments in connection with this bill? We can almost say, "This is where we walked in," because this kind of debate in connection with this kind of Federal aid to legislation is historic in this body. We have not really plowed any new ground; we have simply been harrowing some ground really plowed, in my judgment, back in 1922, when the Mellon decision was handed down. Justice Sutherland then went to to say:

> The act is a usurpation of power not granted to Congress by the Constitution—an attempted exercise of the power of local self-government reserved to the States by the 10th amendment; and that the defendants are proceeding to carry the act into operation. In the Massachusetts case it is alleged that the plaintiff's rights and powers as a sovereign State and the rights of its citizens have been invaded and usurped by these expenditures and acts; and that, although the State has not accepted the act, its constitutional rights are infringed by the passage thereof and the imposition upon the State of an illegal and unconstitutional option either to yield to the Federal Government a part of its reserved rights or lose the share which it would otherwise be entitled to receive of the moneys appropriated. In the Frothingham case plaintiff alleges that the effect of the statute will be to take her property, under the guise of taxation, without due process of law.
>
> We have reached the conclusion that the cases must be disposed of for want of jurisdiction without considering the merits of the constitutional questions.
>
> In the first case, the State of Massachusetts presents no justiciable controversy either in its own behalf or as the representative of its citizens. The appellant in the second suit has no such interest in the subject matter, nor is any such injury inflicted or threatened, as will enable her to sue.

Then the Justice proceeds to discuss the claim of Massachusetts as a State. He rejects the claim that Massachusetts has any standing to bring action as a State.

Then, on pages 488 and 489 he proceeds to discuss the alleged rights of the taxpayer, as follows:

> We have no power per se to review and annul acts of Congress on the ground that they are unconstitutional. That question may be considered only when the justification for some direct injury suffered or threatened, presenting a justiciable issue, is made to rest upon such an act. Then the power exercised is that of ascertaining and declaring the law applicable to the controversy. It amounts to little more than the negative power to disregard an unconstitutional enactment, which otherwise would stand in the way of the enforcement of a legal right. The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally. If a case for preventive relief be presented the court enjoins, in effect, not the execution of the statute, but the acts of the official, the statute notwithstanding. Here the parties plaintiff have no such case. Looking through forms of words to the substance of their complaint, it is merely that officials of the executive department of the Government are executing and will execute an act of Congress asserted to be unconstitutional; and this we are asked to prevent. To do so would be not to decide a judicial controversy, but to assume a position of authority over the governmental acts of another and coequal department, an authority which plainly we do not possess.

We must keep in mind the fact that in the Mellon case the court simply found that the taxpayer did not meet the test of having a controversial issue with the Federal Government, and therefore there was no jurisdiction to make a determination of what he wanted to have determined, namely, the alleged unconstitutionality of the act.

I respectfully say—I realize that my good friend, the Senator from New York, as a lawyer completely disagrees with my position—that this amendment would not change the Mellon case decision one whit, and that even if the amendment is made a part of the law, the Mellon case decision decision will remain as a bar to the taxpayer suits contemplated by the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I do not take issue with the Mellon case decision. That case did not involve a Federal statute which gave the right to bring the action. In that case there was no express provi-

sion to test in court the constitutionality of the payment.

This seems to be an entirely different situation, and seems to be controlled by the decision in the Associated Industries case, which referred to the decision in the Mellon case, and stated that even in the light of that, there is a justiciable controversy, and a taxpayer can be designated to bring the action as "a private attorney general," as the Court put it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I have already stated, the Senator from New York and I disagree on the correct interpretation of the Mellon case decision. In my judgment the two cases are quite similar in purpose and in the procedure. In the Mellon case an attempt was made by a taxpayer to bring the action. The Court stated, in effect, that that did not meet the test on a controversial issue with the Federal Government, within the meaning of the Constitution; and, in effect, the Court threw out his case.

I do not think a "case or controversy" can be created merely by an act of Congress which states that one exists. There must be a finding that, in fact, such a controversial relationship between the parties does exist. Standing to sue cannot be imposed on a taxpayer by means of a simple statutory declaration.

That is my position, Mr. President. In my judgment, we shall proceed with various tests as to the constitutionality of this act, as the Attorney General of the United States seeks to enforce desegregation of the schools or as private parties seek to enforce desegregation of the schools.

But I do not believe that in the Keating amendment we are dealing with anything more than legal surplusage.

Mr. President, I am ready to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield briefly to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I wish strongly to support the amendment of the junior Senator from New York. I believe he has made a sound argument for the adoption of his amendment. The amendment is a sound one and a constitutional one. So I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

It seems to me that the argument goes about as follows: The President of the United States has urged that funds in connection with this bill be withheld from religiously oriented schools, because the President has stated that such would be of doubtful constitutionality. Indeed, the President said that, in his opinion, it would be unconstitutional.

But there is a great deal of difference of opinion about this matter. Some who are as well versed in the law as is our resepected President think it would be constitutional. In other words, there is some doubt about that question.

On the other hand, the bill as now written requires that funds be given to States which practice segregation in their public schools, in open defiance of the Supreme Court and the Constitution of the United States.

This case is no longer in any doubt. It was settled, not in the Senate, but in the Supreme Court of the United States. So the constitutional question here is really not in doubt.

The Senator from New York wishes to give an individual taxpayer the right to bring suit against the Commissioner, so as to restrain him from using the taxpayers' money in a manner which already has been declared by the Supreme Court of the United States to be unconstitutional.

Yesterday, the Senate refused to take advantage of an opportunity to reinforce the Supreme Court's decision by adopting a very mild amendment to the bill; and the amendment was tabled.

Surely the injury done yesterday should not be extended to millions of our citizens who object to the use of their taxes to perpetuate segregation. Yet that will be the result if the Senate rejects the Keating amendment, which gives the citizens an opportunity to appeal to the court. This opportunity is the least we can provide in connection with the entire matter now under debate.

Mr. President, I applaud the Senator from New York for thinking of this very just way to handle the situation. I do not think anyone would wish to have his taxes used in violation of the Constitution.

I join the Senator from New York in hoping that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Connecticut for his support of this amendment. In some respects it is not as explicit as the amendment which he offered yesterday. I think it would encompass what he was seeking to accomplish by his amendment. Under its provisions it would, admittedly, as I have said, go further than that, and permit the review of any constitutional question.

Mr. BUSH. I agree with that statement, and I think in some respects, for that reason, it is a better amendment than the one which was rejected yesterday. The Senator from New York and I have discussed this matter off the floor. These are not conflicting amendments, but, rather, mutually compatible amendments, and both would fortify the bill. However, there is no chance for the amendment offered yesterday. I do hope the Senate will sustain the Keating amendment. I shall certainly support it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, I speak as one who has been long and deeply concerned with the protection of the constitutional rights of all Americans, and particularly the achievement of equality of opportunity for all our citizens, regardless of race, color, or religion.

I speak, too, as one who is deeply convinced of the central importance of education to the survival of this Nation—indeed, of the whole free world.

No one has suggested, because no one could suggest, that the Senator from New Jersey is one who would like to see the bill defeated. The Senator from New Jersey has believed in Federal aid to education since he has been a Member of Congress, since 1945. He has not changed. He is for Federal aid to education. He is also for implementation and enforcement of the Supreme Court decision in the school desegregation cases.

The Senator from New Jersey is of the belief that these two matters are not incompatible, and that they can go along in parallel, and that the Congress will have far from fulfilled its obligation if it attempts to do one thing and not the other.

I can think of no field in which equality of opportunity is more important, from the point of view of the individual, and that of the Nation, too, than education itself. It is, in the most basic sense, the foundation for both individual development and national growth.

In recent years we have made some measure of progress—it has been halting progress, at that—toward the growth of equality of educational opportunity. In this session we will, I hope, finally achieve action to help the States and localities in meeting the general educational needs of our children. It is essential, I believe, that we do not allow either one to become the vehicle or means of defeating the other.

It would be unconscionable, in my judgment, if a program of Federal assistance to public education should become an instrument to perpetuate, indeed to strengthen, segregation in our schools.

Yet, without some safeguard in the proposed act, this could literally happen. Indeed, it has already happened with aid provided under the program for federally impacted areas.

A telling case in point was cited in testimony before our committee. At Redstone Arsenal in Alabama the Federal Government transferred to the Huntsville School District 21 acres of land to be used for an elementary school for the children of military personnel. Federal funds in the amount of $473,144 were granted, according to the Defense Department, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the construction of a school of 24 classrooms, completed and occupied in September 1959. Huntsville contributed funds in the amount of $10,000 for school equipment. In 1960, an additional 12 rooms were constructed with a Federal grant of $121,000 to provide for increased enrollment.

The school is segregated. Only white children living on the post are permitted to attend it. Negro children living on the post are transported by Army bus to a segregated elementary school for Negroes only.

The Department of Defense admits to no authority to act in the matter. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare takes the same position.

Mr. President, it is strikingly reminiscent of the letter received from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, addressed to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

Mr. President, I submit this is a deeply disturbing situation. The armed services of the United States have been largely desegregated, but the children of the members of the Armed Forces of the United States stationed in Alabama are forced to attend segregated schools built and supported by the Government of the United States of America.

But how much worse will the situation inevitably be if we do not insist upon some measure of constitutional rights in the measure now pending.

We have already been told explicitly by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that neither he nor the Commissioner of Education has any authority, under the bill as it now stands, to withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.

Many of us do not happen to agree with that legal opinion. But there it is, and we cannot ignore that it means millions of taxpayers might be forced to help pay for the perpetuation of an injustice and a wrong which not only violates their own deepest convictions, but defies the Constitution itself.

The least we can do is to provide a means by which an unconstitutional grant of funds can be challenged in the courts. By giving judicial standing to a taxpayer's suit, we will make possible judicial review of any allocation of Federal funds to States violating constitutional principles.

Perhaps there is some question about this means, but it seems to me it is incumbent upon the Senate, if it be unwilling, as it demonstrated yesterday, affirmatively to state that there is an obligation on the part of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education to follow the Constitution in the distribution of funds, to indicate that the very least it should do is take every possible opportunity to bring the question before the courts for a decision by the courts on the constitutional question. I suggest there may be cases in which people taking a very legalistic view of the situation may be inclined not to take that view in other circumstances.

Not to provide this minimum protection would be, I believe, morally reprehensible. For surely both Negro and white alike are entitled to some assurance that this bill will not be utilized to delay indefinitely the integration of public schools. Surely, we cannot, in good conscience, appear to acquiesce in a view which might put the Federal Government in the role of abetting defiance of the law of the land.

For too long Congress has delayed affirmative action to secure the constitutional rights of all citizens. Let us not now, by further inaction, risk making the Federal Government an actual partner in the flagrant denial of a basic right whose realization goes to the heart of our whole way of life.

As I said in my colloquy with the distinguished Senator from New York, the prime sponsor of the amendment, I do not fear that a majority of this body or the other body are unwilling to vote for the bill unless they are "bought" by an agreement to deny the constitutional right of all Americans.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have rarely heard the Senator from New Jersey so eloquent and so deeply moving as he has been today. I think he has a right to be. I appreciate and associate myself with his presentation.

Would the Senator agree with me that, even if there is some question, under the Mellon case, the only way we can show we do not agree with Secretary Ribicoff's opinions is by writing a provision into the bill of the kind now proposed? Is not this a minimal way to accomplish that purpose?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I agree. I think this is not only the only way, but I think it is the logical way to do it, because we have, after all, very good authority. Judge Frank's opinion in this matter points the way, I believe, that the Supreme Court, if we give it the chance to rule on this question, will rule.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I compliment the distinguished Senator from New Jersey on the forceful presentation he has made. Like my colleague from New York, I am well acquainted with what makes our friend from New Jersey tick. I agree with him that since I have been a Member of the Senate I have never heard the Senator from New Jersey so moved or so eloquent. His presentation lends great weight to the amendment, as does his sponsorship.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to modify my amendment in accordance with the colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Montana.

On page 2, line 10, after the word "Columbia" add the words "or in the district court of the United States for the district in which the taxpayer resides."

I sincerely hope that this modification will convince my friend from Montana and that he will support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. The modification will not convince the Senator from Montana that he should support the amendment, but I thank the Senator from New York for the modification, because I believe not only in regard to the proposed legislation, but also in regard to many other acts which embrace the whole field of State-Federal relations we should permit the cases to be brought in the home district and thereby keep from overloading the District Court of the District of Columbia.

Mr. KEATING. So long as the option is retained, I share a good many of the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes. I say to the Senator from New York that I think that upon the conclusion of that much argument I shall be ready to yield back the remainder of my time.

I wish to make a brief comment particularly with respect to an observation made by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], because I think all Members of the Senate know the very close relationship between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Oregon in respect to our positions on most issues in this body. We differ on the pending issue. It is one of the few times I have found myself in disagreement with the Senator from New Jersey.

I can well understand how in the course of debate we frequently use very colorful figures of speech or descriptive terms to describe what we may consider to be a motivation of the opposition. I assure the Senator from New Jersey that I do not know of any Senator on this side of the aisle to whom it can be appropriately applied that his position in opposition to the bill if a civil rights amendment is added to it is an indication of a purchase price he has put on his vote in the Senate. I do not think anybody on this side of the aisle has been bought one way or another in regard to a civil rights amendment.

There is a sincere point of view held by many of us that the addition of the Keating amendment would be very unwise from a legislative standpoint, in addition to the view that it would be unnecessary from a legal standpoint.

I wish to say, in defense of all those who have been supporting me in my position in opposition to the Keating amendment, that there is not the slightest basis for any accurate description of our motivation as that we are insisting upon the elimination of the Keating amendment as a price for voting for the bill.

I make that statement in defense of my colleagues. I now come to the legal argument.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I understand that implicit in the statement is the fact that the Senator from Oregon would, of course, support the bill if the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. To be very frank, if the Senate made the mistake of crippling the bill by adopting the amendment, I would take it rather than no bill at all, but I hope to get a good, healthy, vigorous child out of this legislative birth process, and not one which is hurt aborning.

Mr. KEATING. I recognize the reference to the case to which the Senator was earlier alluding.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey rose.

Mr. MORSE. Did the Senator from New Jersey rise to say something to me?

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Yes, Mr. President, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I am sure the Senator does not take to himself any suggestion that the motives were, from his standpoint, wrong.

Mr. MORSE. I do not. I only wished to say I did not think it would be proper to apply such a motivation to any of my colleagues who are supporting me.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Things are what they are. Things are what they are. One could phrase the statements I made differently, could suggest that the bill might not pass if a provision for the prevention of implementation of segregation were eliminated. If that is more palatable in the circumstances, I should be happy to have it understood in that way, so long as we know what are the facts.

I should not have risen, I think, if my colleague will permit me to so state, if he had not used the adjective "crippling," which so easily falls from the lips of anyone convinced of the correctness of his own position in describing opposition to what he thinks ought to be done. This, I think, is the same kind of thing.

Mr. MORSE. I shall read an opinion to the Senator in a moment which demonstrates there are others who share this evaluation of the amendment. We shall come to that in a moment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on another point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator in citing the Mellon case in respect the alleged unconstitutionality of the amendment should point out that the court in that case struck down the suit by the State as well as the suit by the taxpayers or individuals.

Mr. MORSE. I mentioned that.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator has provided in the bill for a suit by a State agency. The Senator has provided in the bill for the type of thing which was struck down in the decision. Therefore, if it would be unconstitutional to adopt the amendment it would be equally unconstitutional, it would seem to me, to provide, as the Senator has done in the bill that a State agency may bring a suit.

Mr. MORSE. No. As the bill is worded, I think it brings the States, in connection with the bill, under article III, section 2 of the Constitution, which I am about to read. It reads as follows:

> The judicial power shall extend to all cases, in law and equity, arising under this Constitution, the laws of the United States, and treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls; to all cases of admiralty and maritime jurisdiction; to controversies to which the United States shall be a party; to controversies between two or more States; between a State and citizens of another State; between citizens of different States; between citizens of the same State claiming lands under grants of different States, and between a State, or the citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.

The latest case I can find, one which, so far as I am concerned, is exceedingly convincing on the legal issue now pending before the Senate, is *Doremus* v. *Board of Education*, 342 U.S. 429, decided January 31, 1952.

This is a decision which was written by Justice Jackson. There was a dissent to the decision. I shall invite attention to the dissent also, in fairness to all concerned. I think the dissent draws very clearly the issue I have been trying to point out this afternoon, leaving no room for doubt as to what the court decided, both in the Doremus case and in the Mellon case. The dissent was written by Mr. Justice Douglas, with Mr. Justice Reed and Mr. Justice Burton concurring.

In the majority opinion, Mr. Justice Jackson said:

> The State raised the defense that appellants showed no standing to maintain the action but, on pretrial conference, perhaps with premonitions of success, waived it and acquiesced in a determination of the Federal constitutional question. Whether such facts amount to a justiciable case or controversy is decisive of our jurisdiction.
>
> This Court has held that the interests of a taxpayer in the moneys of the Federal Treasury are too indeterminable, remote, uncertain and indirect to furnish a basis for an appeal to the preventive powers of the Court over their manner of expenditure. (*Alabama Power Co.* v. *Ickes*, 302 U.S. 464, 478–479; *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 486 et seq.)

In 1952 the Supreme Court made this statement in basing its decision on the Mellon ruling. I wish to repeat that we have honest differences of legal opinion on this question, but I do not believe that passage of the Keating amendment would confer standing to sue under the circumstances existing here in absence of a genuine case or controversy as required by the Constitution for the exercise of judicial power.

Listen again to what the Court said in the Doremus case:

> This Court has held that the interests of a taxpayer in the moneys of the Federal Treasury are too indeterminable, remote, uncertain and indirect to furnish a basis for an appeal to the preventive powers of the Court over their manner of expenditure.

Of course, the Justice bases his statement on an article of the Constitution, leaving no room for doubt that he was bringing this kind of action within the meaning of the word "controversy" as used in article III, section 2, of the Constitution.

Justice Jackson continued:

> The latter case recognized, however, that "the interest of a taxpayer of a municipality in the application of its moneys is direct and immediate and the remedy by injunction to prevent their misuse is not inappropriate" (262 U.S. at 486). Indeed, a number of States provide for it by statute or decisional law and such causes have been entertained in Federal courts (*Crampton* v. *Zabriskie*, 101 U.S. 601, 609). (See *Massachusetts* v. *Mellon*, supra, at 486.) Without disparaging the availability of the remedy by taxpayer's action to restrain unconstitutional acts which result in direct pecuniary injury, we reiterate what the Court said of a Federal statute as equally true when a State act is assailed:

Mr. President, I yield myself another 5 minutes.

> The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally.

Quoting again. What case? Massachusetts against Mellon.

I wish to say that if a taxpayer can show that he stands in that relationship to the meaning of the word "controversy" as contained in the Constitution, we do not need the Keating amendment to the bill. If he does not stand in such relationship, all the legislation in the world that could be passed by the Congress could not give him the power to bring the action, because again he would not comply with the meaning of the word "controversy" in article III, section 2 of the Constitution.

If my colleagues who wish to interrupt will wait until I finish the argument—I shall not be too long—then I will be glad to yield.

Justice Jackson continued:

> "The party who invokes the power must be able to show not only that the statute is invalid but that he has sustained or is immediately in danger of sustaining some direct injury as the result of its enforcement, and not merely that he suffers in some indefinite way in common with people generally" (*Massachusetts* v. *Mellon, supra*, at 488).
>
> It is true that this Court found a justiciable controversy in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1. But Everson showed a measurable appropriation or disbursement of school-district funds occasioned solely by the activities complained of. This complaint does not.
>
> We do not undertake to say that a State court may not render an opinion on a Federal constitutional question even under such circumstances that it can be regarded only as advisory. But, because our own jurisdiction is cast in terms of "case or controversy," we cannot accept as the basis for review, nor as the basis for conclusive disposition of an issue of Federal law without review, any procedure which does not constitute such.
>
> The taxpayer's action can meet this test, but only when it is a good-faith pocketbook action.

If it is a good faith pocketbook action, we would not need any legislation. If it is a good faith pocketbook action, the citizen has that constitutional right anyway. His right would then fall within the meaning of "controversy," as contained in article III, section 2, of the Constitution. That is why I said in my previous argument that, in my judgment, when all is said and done, the Keating amendment is surplusage, because unless the taxpayer in fact meets the "controversy" test of article III, section 2, we could not give him the right by legislation.

Mr. Justice Jackson continued:

> It is apparent that the grievance which it is sought to litigate here is not a direct dollars-and-cents injury but is a religious difference. If appellants established the requisite special injury necessary to a taxpayer's case or controversy, it would not matter that their dominant inducement to action was more religious than mercenary. It is not a question of motivation but of possession of the requisite financial interest that is, or is threatened to be, injured by the unconstitutional conduct. We find no such direct and particular financial interest here. If the act may give rise to a legal case or

controversy on some behalf, the appellants cannot obtain a decision from this Court by a feigned issue of taxation.

I should like to cover the dissenting opinion for a moment, because I believe it will bring the question into focus. As I said, I wish the Senate to know that three Justices dissented, and they dissented on the following ground. It is an interesting dissent, because it draws into focus, in my judgment, the very distinction I have tried to bring out in my argument this afternoon.

Writing the dissenting opinion for his colleagues Justices Reed and Burton, Mr. Justice Douglas said:

I think this case deserves a decision on the merits. There is no group more interested in the operation and management of the public schools than the taxpayers who support them and the parents whose children attend them. Certainly a suit by all the taxpayers to enjoin a practice authorized by the school board would be a suit by vital parties in interest. They would not be able to show, any more than the two present taxpayers have done, that the reading of the Bible adds to the taxes they pay. But if they were right in their contentions on the merits, they would establish that their public schools were being deflected from the educational program for which the taxes were raised. That seems to me to be an adequate interest for the maintenance of this suit by all the taxpayers. If all can do it, there is no apparent reason why less than all may not, the interest being the same. In the present case the issues are not feigned; the suit is not collusive; the mismanagement of the school system that is alleged is clear and plain.

But the answer to the dissenting opinion of the Justice is that the majority found there was no "case or controversy" within the meaning of the constitutional requirement.

Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The Court did not find that injury or threat of injury to the plaintiffs that would create a controversy as required by article III, section 2, of the Constitution.

But if they can find such interest in a case, they can proceed under the Doremus and Mellon cases to bring an action testing the statute, and we would not need a Keating amendment. The Keating amendment does not add one wit to the right to bring an action. A citizen has the right to bring such an action under article III, section 2, of the Constitution or, if he does not, we could not possibly give such right to him by any proposed legislation that could be passed here on the floor of the Senate. That is my case and, as we lawyers say, I rest. I know I shall be cross examined with respect to my position by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am struck with what seems on the surface to be a contradiction in the position of the Senator from Oregon, because, as I understand it, the Senator has in his committee a bill to provide Federal aid to private schools. Press reports indicate that that bill contains a clause which would permit individual taxpayers to bring suit to test the constitutionality of its provisions.

Mr. MORSE. Do not rely on press reports. Take my word for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from Oregon is successful in defeating the Keating amendment, will the Senator guarantee that there will not be such an amendment in the bill he proposes to report to the Senate on Federal aid to private schools?

Mr. MORSE. I assure my friend from Illinois that if the taxpayer suit provision in the Clark-Morse private school loan bill does not stand up under analysis, it will be eliminated, but the situation in which that bill provides means of obtaining court tests are ones where genuine controversies would exist.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In its present form, does the bill before the committee of which the Senator from Oregon is chairman provide for suits by individual citizens to test the constitutionality of a Federal aid to private schools? Does it or does it not?

Mr. MORSE. I have already said this afternoon that the answer to that question is yes, yes, yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. It does. If the Keating amendment is surplusage, why is not the similar provision in the bill to which I referred surplusage, and if the Senator from Oregon felt it was necessary to put such a clause in the Federal aid to private school bill, why is it not also necessary in the present bill?

Mr. MORSE. Because there is quite a difference in the taxpayers. I had not intended to proceed to argue the private school bill in connection with the pending bill. However, I will pull back the curtain a little and let the Senator take a look at the argument that will be made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is highly desirable.

Mr. MORSE. I do not believe my friend from Illinois was in the Chamber when I said earlier today that I had been wading in this stream of legal decisions until I felt I had gotten in over my waist and up to my neck and, I was not sure, perhaps over my head as well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon reminds me of a German Ph. D. who could go down deeper, stay down longer, and come up muddier than anyone else.

Mr. MORSE. Although it was muddy down there, I think I have come out of it fairly clean.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Of course I am not sure that I will come up with this one. I said to the Senator from New York earlier this afternoon that I am not sure that my taxpayer suit section of the private school bill will stand up under legal argument. But there are two other means of obtaining court review provided in that bill, separate and apart from the taxpayer suit section.

I would also point out that a parochial school denied a loan under our private school bill on the determination of the administrator that the making of such a loan would violate the first amendment, could show a clearly demonstrable financial loss which would provide a genuine case of controversy for the court to review.

There is another fundamental difference between the private school and the public school bills. Unless the private school bill provided protection for the Negro taxpayer, as our bill did in several sections, such a taxpayer would have no legal remedy or protection whatever. The Supreme Court desegregation mandates are limited to public education.

That is not true in conection with a public school bill. In a public school case there are a great many existing court remedies to protect a taxpayer. They may not prove to be adequate at the present time, but one does not know until a remedy is tried. There is available the whole injunctive process in regard to a public school bill that one might wish to try. There is that great difference between a public school bill and a private school bill. So I am not as far down in the mud as my friend thought I was.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is a veritable legal Houdini in being able to escape from the bonds of logic.

Mr. MORSE. I never make the mistake of failing to recognize distinctions in facts between many cases. This is very basic to any lawyer. One must not make the mistake of assuming that all the cases are alike, unless one can find that the operative facts are really applicable, as we say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does it not all come down to saying that a lawyer can always find a reason to justify what he wants to do?

Mr. MORSE. No. I rise to the defense of my profession. The Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Iowa, whom I see smiling, will join me in this, I am sure. The job of a lawyer is to consider the facts of a case and give his best advice as to the application of the law to those facts. There is a major difference between a private school situation and a public school situation. Therefore, I believe it is possible that my final judgment may be that there is a basis for having provisions in a private school bill which would be out of place in a public school bill, for the reasons I have advanced.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I merely wish to make the comment that in my judgment the interest of a Negro taxpayer, which is the illustration the Senator has used, is even greater in relation to segregated public schools than it is in connection with the issue of parochial schools.

I point out what I am sure the Senator recognizes as a fact, that the Doremus case was an appeal from a State court, and there was no Federal statute in that case.

Mr. MORSE. That is true. However, the constitutional principle is just as applicable in an appeal from a State court as in direct Federal court test, such as that involved in Massachusetts against Mellon.

I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, on whose opinion the Senator places so much reliance, as embodied in the Secretary's letter to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], states in his brief, immediately after citing the Doremus case:

> If Congress wishes to make possible a constitutional test of Federal aid to secretarian schools, it might authorize judicial review in the context of an actual case or controversy between the Federal Government and an institution seeking some form of assistance. In the absence of some such statutory provision, there appears to be no realistic likelihood that Federal legislation raising the constitutional issues discussed in this memorandum will be resolved by judicial decision.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if, contrary to the Department's views, the amendment were held effective to endow U.S. district courts with jurisdiction, it would have an unsettling effect on the States ability to plan their primary and secondary school programs.

Federal grants would plainly not be held invalid, I believe, merely because school districts in a State have availed themselves of the gradualism in desegregating which has been permitted by the Supreme Court. That being so, any serious challenge to constitutionality would necessarily rest on undue delay by a particular school district or districts in carrying out judicial orders, and in the complex processes of litigation the situation is likely to change from day to day or week to week. The result would be that, if such delay were the basis of invalidating Federal grants—and I can think of no other—the State educational authorities might be subjected to continuing uncertainty about their prospects of receiving Federal funds.

It seems to me that the judicial process is more wisely used to deal with individual school districts, and to adapt its relief, where relief is called for, to the particular and widely varying situations which are encountered. If the expenditure of Federal funds is ever found to be illegal because of failure to desegregate, it would seem to me that the appropriate point for judicial intervention to cut off their flow would be between the State and the school district, rather than between the Federal Government and the State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I now yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The Senator from New York has quoted from the opinion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I wish to read a letter which I received from the Secretary today. The Secretary writes:

> THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
> *Washington, D.C., May 23, 1961.*
>
> Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
> *Chairman, Subcommittee of Education, Labor and Public Welfare Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I want to express to you my appreciation for your skillful and courageous handling of the administration's bill to provide financial assistance to public elementary and secondary schools. Knowing your deep and abiding interest in the advancement of civil rights, I can appreciate how difficult is your role in defending the school bill against amendments which seek to inject the civil rights issue into legislation whose sole concern should be education.
>
> I understand that again today an attempt is to be made to attach to S. 1021 a civil rights amendment. This amendment would authorize lawsuits by any taxpayers who wish to challenge expenditures of Federal funds for public elementary and secondary schools. I am steadfastly opposed to such an amendment and take this opportunity to set forth my reasons:
>
> 1. The case for Federal assistance to public schools is clear. The need is great; the time to face the problem is now. To doom this legislation by the addition of amendments which, however phrased, are nonetheless concerned with collateral issues, would be nothing less than tragic. Let me reaffirm my belief that the Supreme Court decision on school desegregation was correct both legally and morally. But as the Court itself indicated, the way to implement that decision is on a case by case basis where the facts of eaoh local situation may be conscientiously examined.
>
> 2. To allow individual taxpayers throughout the Nation to tie up this legislation with a multitude of lawsuits would be a blow to education that would not even offer the hope of a compensating gain in the field of civil rights.
>
> 3. It is highly doubtful that the Constitution permits a taxpayer suit. The memorandum discussing legal issues arising in this area, which was previously filed with your subcommittee, discusses this problem and concludes that Congress cannot dilute the constitutional requirements of a case or controversy existing between parties to a lawsuit in the Federal courts.
>
> Let me reiterate my basic point: Our objective is to help education. Let us stick to the task. Other problems deserve our serious attention, but they must not cripple the cause of education when we are now on the verge of success.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, without unduly prolonging the controversy, I must comment that I have never before heard it said by a Cabinet officer or anyone else high in the Government that the constitutionality of a statute was a "collateral issue." We are dealing with the question whether there shall be a possible way to settle constitutional questions under the proposed statute, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare calls that a collateral issue.

Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question. On page 2, lines 7 and 8, of his amendment, reference is made to a "final decision of the Commissioner." As a matter of clarification, what is meant by that language? Do I correctly understand that what is meant or is intended to be meant is approval by the Commissioner of payment to the States?

Mr. KEATING. That is what is meant. It will be remembered that the original amendment had a paragraph in it relating to a decision by the Commissioner. In the revised amendment that paragraph was stricken out, but this change was not made. I think probably the wording proposed is desirable.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have read. I wonder if it would be acceptable.

Mr. KEATING. I shall be glad to have the amendment read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to strike out "the final decision of the Commissioner." and insert in lieu thereof "approval of any payment under this act by the Commissioner."

Mr. KEATING. I think that improves the language of the amendment and makes it clearer. It is what is intended by the amendment.

Mr. President, I am happy to ask that my amendment be modified in that respect. I commend the Senator from Iowa for calling my attention to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his amendment, and it is so modified.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I do not wish to take any unfair advantage of the Senator from Oregon. I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, and following the quorum call speak for about 3 minutes. If the Senator from Oregon wishes to ask unanimous consent to vacate the order by which he yielded back the remainder of his time, I shall be happy to have him use 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is perfectly satisfactory. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side. Following the quorum call, the Senator from New York may use whatever time he wishes. I have yielded back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the Keating amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I hope Senators who were unavoidably absent

during the debate will look briefly, if they have not already done so, at the explanation of this amendment which, in mimeographed form, has been placed on their desks.

This amendment would permit a taxpayer to bring a suit to prevent payment of the funds to a State for an unconstitutional purpose. I wish to be very frank; the amendment would permit suits to test the validity of grants to segregated schools.

But the amendment goes far beyond that, and would permit the raising of any constitutional question under this bill.

There are those who sincerely believe the entire act is unconstitutional. There is now no way in which that question can be raised in court, if this amendment is not adopted. If the amendment is adopted, that question or any other question relating to constitutionality can be raised in court.

The purpose of the amendment is to provide a method of determining in court these very serious constitutional questions, which arise on all sides of the controversies relating to Federal aid to education.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Were he present and voting, he would vote "yea." Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness and his pair has been previously announced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 62, as follows:

[No. 48]

YEAS—32

Beall	Cotton	Kuchel
Bennett	Curtis	Miller
Boggs	Douglas	Morton
Bridges	Dworshak	Mundt
Bush	Fong	Prouty
Butler	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Capehart	Hart	Schoeppel
Carlson	Hickenlooper	Scott
Case, N.J.	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Young, N. Dak.
Cooper	Keating	

NAYS—62

Aiken	Hickey	Muskie
Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Bartlett	Holland	Pastore
Bible	Humphrey	Pell
Burdick	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Byrd, W.Va.	Jordan	Robertson
Cannon	Kefauver	Russell
Carroll	Kerr	Smathers
Church	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Eastland	Long, La.	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Symington
Engle	McClellan	Talmadge
Ervin	McNamara	Thurmond
Fulbright	Magnuson	Wiley
Gore	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Monroney	Yarborough
Hartke	Morse	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Moss	

NOT VOTING—6

Allott	Chavez	Mansfield
Blakley	Dirksen	McGee

So Mr. KEATING's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I offer my amendments identified as "5–18–61–D," and ask that they be read, after which I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy. I was about to ask the majority leader the plans for the rest of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 4, line 25, after "American Samoa," to insert "the District of Columbia,".

On page 5, line 4, after "and (iii)" to insert "the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv)".

On page 5, line 24, after "American Samoa," to insert "the District of Columbia,".

On page 6, line 11, after "American Samoa," to insert "the District of Columbia,".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to ask my good friend the majority leader what plans he has for the rest of the day for the session of the Senate, and what plans he has for convening tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is anticipated as of this moment that the Senate will be in session until approximately 10 o'clock tonight. It is hoped we can come in at 9 o'clock tomorrow, Wednesday, and proceed diligently and at length.

If the consideration of the bill is not finished tomorrow, we might consider meeting at 8 o'clock on Thursday. If it is not finished then, we might meet at 7 o'clock on Friday. [Laughter.]

If it is not finished then——

Mr. KUCHEL. At dawn on Saturday.

I thank my friend.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NAVY DEPARTMENT SYSTEM OF SELECTION OF NAVAL RESERVE ADMIRALS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, for 2 years or more the Committee on Armed Services has been pointedly critical of the Navy Department on its system of selection of Naval Reserve admirals. The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee has issued reports that have been specific in sharp criticism of the Navy.

In March of this year, the Chief of Naval Personnel submitted a report on corrective action that the Navy Department was planning to take in the matter and it was impressive and I was encouraged.

This spirit of cooperation continued until about a month ago, and since that time there are indications that it has stopped. A request to the Navy Department made on April 25, 1961, on action taken by the Secretary of the Navy in special treatment for a Naval Reserve captain—in which the Secretary of the Navy vetoed and overruled the captain noncontinuation board that had selected this particular Naval Reserve captain for being "plucked out" and forced into involuntary retirement—has not been answered. On May 9, 1961, an oral inquiry was made as to why there had been no response. As of this time, still no response has been made.

This matter involves a very important issue because practically every time that the Committee on Armed Services raises a question on admiral and general officer nominations, the answer given by the armed services is that no one can go behind the selection boards and a claimed sanctity and infallibility of selection boards is raised. Such claim then becomes the iron curtain behind which the committee has not been permitted to go to get at the real facts in some very questionable nominations.

Specifically on April 17, 1961, in his letter of that date to me, the Chief of Naval Personnel made this very argument as he stated:

> We must assume that this board, and others so convened, select the best qualified officers. To do otherwise would destroy the faith of the naval service as a whole in the impartiality of the selection system.

If there is such claimed sanctity of such selection and noncontinuation boards, then it certainly has not been recognized at times by the Secretary of the Navy and the Board of Correction of Naval Records, who have taken action to overrule and nullify selections and nonselections of such boards—and specifically, boards meeting in the late fall of 1960.

In this particular period, there were two important Reserve boards that met and made selections. One was the Reserve Flag Selection Board. The other was the Captain Non-Continuation Board. According to the March 30, 1961, letter of the Chief of Naval Personnel to me:

> Captain Non-Continuation Board was made up largely of the same flag officers who sat on the Reserve Flag Selection Boards.

Now because of the action taken by these two boards, the common membership of the two boards—that is, the fact that many of the same flag officers sat on both boards—is very important because of what each board did.

The Reserve Flag Selection Board selected, out of hundreds of Naval Reserve captains, 22 for promotion to rear admiral. The Reserve Captain Non-Continuation Board selected 500 Reserve captains for noncontinuation—for being plucked out—for being forced into involuntary retirement.

These same members of the boards on the one hand selected for forced retirement—for being kicked out of the active Naval Reserve—many, many Reserve captains with excellent records of very active participation and training in the Naval Reserve; but on the other hand, and in the same period, selected for promotion to rear admiral some reservists with records of practically no participation in the Reserve.

For example, one naval reservist selected for rear admiral had not earned a single participation point in the Naval Reserve for the 5 years prior to the board selecting him for promotion to rear admiral—in other words, his 5-year participation point record was zero. Yet, at the same time hundreds of loyally and actively participating Reserve captains were being forced into involuntary retirement.

The end result of this joint action was that the reward for loyal and active participation for hundreds of Naval Reserve captains was to kick them out of the Active Reserve—while some who were not active were being rewarded for their inactivity and being promoted to rear admiral.

And these 500 naval reservists, who were being kicked out, were not just point gainers who were without any distinction or honor. In fact, one of them—whom I do not know and have never had any contact with—was honored as an outstanding naval reservist in the very year that he was being selected to be kicked out.

By the very words of the Chief of Naval Personnel, this particular naval reservist was so outstanding and his performance so "splendid" that the Chief of Naval Personnel stated to me in a letter dated April 17, 1961, that it was his intention to ask this particular Naval Reserve captain to remain as the commanding officer of a Naval Reserve division during the next fiscal year, in spite of the fact that he would be on the retired list of the Naval Reserve—because of the captain's splendid performance in that particular assignment.

Yet, this outstanding Naval Reserve captain was selected for involuntary retirement while another Naval Reserve captain who had a zero participation point record for 5 years was selected in the same general time and by the same general group for promotion to rear admiral.

In the process of my inquiry in these matters, I discovered that the Secretary of the Navy had overruled and vetoed the action of the Captain Noncontinuation Board and had ordered stricken from the list of the 500 Reserve captains, to be kicked out of active status and forced into retirement, 1 Naval Reserve captain.

It was on April 25, 1961, that I asked for the full facts in this exception made by the Secretary of the Navy in which he breached the so-called sanctity of the Board. I wanted the facts because I wanted to compare the record of the one Naval Reserve captain given a reprieve and exceptional treatment by the Secretary of the Navy with that of the outstanding Naval Reserve captain who was being kicked out of the active Naval Reserve but whose performance was so splendid that the Chief of Naval Personnel intended to ask him to remain as commanding officer of his division for another year in his forced retired status.

Perhaps the reason why the facts have not been given to me as yet in this case is because they would be far too embarrassing to the Navy Department and the special treatment action given by the Secretary of the Navy cannot be justified.

Mr. President, the overall performance of the Navy Department in these matters casts a serious shadow over the integrity of the Navy in the administration of its Naval Reserve at the senior officer level. It is so serious that I shall ask the Senate Armed Services Committee to conduct a full investigation of these matters.

TRIBUTE TO SENATORS STYLES BRIDGES AND NORRIS COTTON

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I happened to read an editorial recently concerning two of my Republican colleagues, which I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate.

The editorial, which appeared in the May 19 edition of the Nashua, N.H., Telegraph, pays tribute to Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON for their interest in the welfare of that community of some 40,000 persons.

Having served in the Senate for some time with these two able gentlemen, I have long been aware of their substantial contributions to the welfare of the country, as well as to the State of New Hampshire. However, it is gratifying to note that their service to the city of Nashua has received editorial recognition.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial from the Nashua Telegraph entitled "Kudos," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KUDOS

Several important Federal projects will provide jobs for Nashuans and add considerably to our economy during the next few years, thanks to the vigilance and support of our New Hampshire Senators STYLES BRIDGES and NORRIS COTTON.

Ground-breaking ceremonies will take place early next month for the new $5 million air safety control center which will rise in the south end of the city and which will be in operation late in 1962. That figure is for the cost of the building alone. When it is completely equipped the Federal Government will have invested more than $15 million in the project.

Within 90 days the Government will ask for bids on a new post office, which will be leased from the builder for a long term. This building will arise on a site other than the present post office property, which has outlived its usefulness in this growing community.

Here again the interest and enthusiasm of Senators BRIDGES and COTTON is evident. Both have been working on the needed new post office building for many months and their efforts have been successful. Without their help and aid the project might well have been delayed many months, regardless of the need.

Both projects will offer a number of jobs to local citizens during their construction stage, thus adding to our payrolls which feed the economy of our retail business.

When the air safety center is completed it will mean the eventual moving to Nashua of about 200 experienced personnel needed to man this station. This, again, will be a tremendous boost to our community, along with some obligations, too.

A vote of thanks should be given the two New Hampshire Senators for their continued interests in the welfare of Nashua.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes

its deliberations today, it stand in adjournment until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for not more than 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] who has some remarks he desires to address to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise in my individual capacity, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to express an opinion on the proposal made by Castro that he will release the 1,200 Cuban prisoners captured by him in the recent invasion in exchange for 500 tractors from the United States.

I do not feel that I can be simply an auditor and spectator with regard to this grave problem confronting our country. My sympathies and compassion naturally are for those 1,200 men. I would like to urge that the proposal be accepted but I cannot do so. Castro is demanding ransom. He is blackmailing not only the Government of the United States but also its citizens. He anticipates that we will yield. He views us as a rag without character. As a consequence of what happened in Cuba, we have lost our prestige in the world to a degree that is beyond calculation at the present time. If we yield to Castro in his demand for tribute, such action will only constitute a message to our friends throughout the world who wonder why we yield to every demand made by Khrushchev, Castro, and their cohorts.

The demand is one for tribute and requires that we abjectly surrender. In my judgment, we cannot do so and preserve our honor. We could not do so and still declare to the world that we will not become the victims of blackmail and the demands for ransom and the trembling slaves of Communist threats.

Moreover, I think that under no circumstances should our Government permit private citizens to become negotiators in our international relations, and that point applies regardless of the dignity and the worth of the citizens who are attempting to act as such negotiators. Whatever is done should be done through the proper representatives of our Government. When we allow individuals to become the negotiators, we are abandoning the very principles upon which our Government is built.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish the RECORD to show that I completely share the point of view that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has expressed. I happen to believe that the foreign policy of this country should be run by the White House and the State Department and not by volunteer committees. I do not know where the end of the rope will be.

May I have the attention of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], when I make the following comment. I also believe that the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate is entitled to know from one Mr. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, as to whether or not the State Department in any way, manner, shape or form gave clearance to the program of this committee before it announced its program to the American people.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I can see that the affairs of the District of Columbia, so far as education is concerned, will have to take a back seat. Knowing the mood and temper of the Senate, I am perfectly willing to continue to yield, if my friend will remember that sometime before we go home tonight I should like to have my amendment considered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio, and commend him for the magnificent statement he has made today concerning what proper American policy should be. One hundred and sixty-four years ago a great American, Charles C. Pinckney, said, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

I fully agree with my colleague that, as far as the Government of the United States is concerned and as far as individual Americans are concerned, that statement should be the sentiment followed by Americans now. If we pay this ransom, our national conscience will have fallen to a new low. We must not yield to this flagrant attempt at extortion by Castro.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I express gratitude to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who was a prosecutor for many, many years, and I believe he knows clearly the meaning of blackmail.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield further?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my opinion, the Treasury Department should be cautious in the manner in which it approaches this problem. It is rather distressing to observe newspaper reports indicating that the Treasury Department has approved this proposal even before it has ripened into a state where it has assumed its proper form. The question of giving tax exemption to donors of funds for this purpose under no circumstances should be determined in any manner except under the law. I doubt very much that the question has been considered in that manner.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana, but I had promised that I would yield to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] first for not in excess of 5 minutes, after which I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is willing to yield to me now.

Mr. CLARK. Then I am happy to yield to my friend from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, yesterday I took the floor to inquire whether or not the Tractors for Freedom Committee has been officially recognized by our Government. While some of that committee claim that they are operating officially, we have not had any word of this.

Today I am asking the President of the United States, or the Secretary of State, or any other responsible official, whether or not these people are acting with the advice and consent of our Government, or whether or not they are in violation of the Logan Act of 1799.

The spirit of the Logan Act is that there will be only one voice speaking for our Government, and that private individuals cannot take it upon themselves to speak for our Government.

Chairman FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee aptly summed this up last year in discussing the role of some of the Israelis in the Suez Canal dispute. I am enclosing a copy of his statement on April 25, 1960, made on the floor of the Senate.

I am also asking Chairman FULBRIGHT to call the responsible Government officials before the Foreign Relations Committee immediately in an effort to ascertain once and for all who is running this country and by whose authority are we going to be blackmailed.

I wish to read what the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] stated on April 25, 1960:

> Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for some years I have become increasingly concerned at the development in the United States of special pressure groups for purposes of pushing U.S. foreign policies in special-interest directions.
>
> We must, of course, accept the concept that in a democracy such as ours shipping interests will pressure Congress and the Executive to adapt foreign policies so they may serve collaterally, at least, the shipping interests; citizens will organize to promote foreign aid, or to oppose foreign aid; exporters will seek foreign policies to develop new markets and importers will seek policies that may hurt domestic manufacturers; religious groups will seek to promote some policies and oppose others.
>
> Our representative Government is designed to deal with these special interests, to balance them, and ultimately to develop policies which will skillfully blend conflicting interests in such a way that the total national interest will be served.
>
> There are limits, however, beyond which special interests cannot go without undermining the conduct of our foreign policies.

Many years ago, Congress enacted the so-called Logan Act. It reads as follows:

"Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both. This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects (title 18, sec. 953, U.S.C.A.)"

The basic theory behind the Logan Act is that this Nation should speak with only one voice when it deals with other nations. No one save the President, or, with his approval, some specified individual, may presume to speak for the United States.

This basic rule is as good today as it was when enacted in the early days of the Republic.

But, Mr. President, there is a shadowland between the legitimate activity involved in the organization of special interest groups to influence foreign policy and the illegitimate activity proscribed by the Logan Act.

The questionable operation of individuals and groups in this area of foreign relations is illustrated by a recent dispatch in the New York Times. On April 15 the Times reported the activities of two maritime unions which picketed and thus prevented the unloading of the Egyptian passenger and cargo ship, the *Cleopatra*. The ostensible reason for this activity was that the unions by this demonstration protest the action of the United Arab Republic in boycotting ships that have traded with Israel or called at Israeli ports.

I hold no brief for UAR interference with international traffic passing through the Suez Canal. The point is, however, that the U.S. Government is proceeding through diplomatic channels to promote free passage through the canal. The Israeli Government, which complains that the UAR stops its ships, has available to it the procedures of the United Nations as well as other diplomatic devices for urging its views on the Government of the UAR. Yet, despite the official actions of the United States, we find private groups proceeding by coercive devices of their own to interfere with the official activities of our Government in the field of foreign policy.

These maritime unions do not seek an economic result related to wages or working conditions. Rather, they seek to force political action in an area of most delicate international negotiation.

I am not privy to any international secrets involving efforts to reopen the canal to Israeli shipping. But let us suppose that the work of U.N. Secretary General Hammarskjold, aided by the good offices of the United States and other governments, is nearing a conclusion. Were this the case, I can imagine few interventions by private groups—such as these unions—which might be more clearly calculated to thwart the objectives of our Government's foreign policy; in this case, peace and stability in the Middle East.

Subsequent to drafting these remarks, my attention has been called to the fact that the State Department has informed the picketing unions that their conduct is embarrassing this Nation in the conduct of its foreign policy.

My objection to this kind of activity is an objection of principle, not of specifics.

I understand that the Internal Revenue Service at this very moment is meeting, and may be deciding that they will make the $15 or $20 million involved a tax deductible item. I have also heard the rumor today that there is talk about people trying to figure out a way of perhaps shipping the tractors to Canada and then reshipping them to Cuba, and that they are tryng to figure out some way of going behind the law requiring the obtaining of an export license before these tractors can be shipped to Cuba.

This leads me to an editorial which appeared in the Indianapolis News of yesterday, from which I should like to read:

WHAT GOES ON HERE?

As of this writing, self-appointed private citizens' groups—the most notable headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower—are raising money for the release of some 1,200 Cuban rebels, captured during the recent unsuccessful attempt to rescue their homeland from Communist rule. The money, $20 million, will be used to purchase tractors or bulldozers for Fidel Castro's Red regime.

One newspaper, supporting the idea of a trade with Castro, declared in a front page editorial that it believes "a human life is worth more than a machine," and so do we. But, if, for the purpose of preserving human lives, we submit to Castro's brazen blackmail attempt, we will be opening the door to every future tyrant and bully boy, large or small, who decides to make a laughing stock out of the United States. Also, there is the little matter of the law, conveniently overlooked by the State Department, prohibiting private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments. The activities of these self-appointed committees, unofficially supported by our Government, are unprecedented in our own history or in the history of international diplomacy.

Castro is not offering this deal because he especially needs 500 tractors, although he certainly could put them to good use in helping to solve his dire farm problem. He offered the deal precisely because he and his Communist bosses want to see exactly how far they can push the United States before it stops acting like a sniveling coward and once again flexes its national muscles. Why else did Havana radio gloatingly announce that Castro would deal only with the United States—and remember, the 1,200 prisoners are Cubans, not U.S. citizens—and not with a neutral country.

What happened to that national pride we displayed in 1797, when after the unsavory French Foreign Minister Talleyrand demanded a bribe as the price of negotiating with the United States, our envoy Charles C. Pinckney replied with his memorable, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute." What happened to the courage displayed by our Nation in 1853, when, after Austria kidnaped a former citizen who had since taken out his first U.S. citizenship papers, an American war sloop pulled into the harbor of Smyrna (where the prisoner was being held) and its commander ordered the Austrian commander to return the man or face immediate consquences? (Naturally, the man was returned.)

How different today. It's bad enough we supplied the push to the rebel invasion of Cuba, and then lacked the courage to see it through to victory. It's bad enough that we allow Castro to insult our Nation, and publicly declare his island a part of the Soviet bloc. But to pay blackmail to his Communist government, just days after both our President and our House of Representatives agree that it constitutes "a clear and present danger" to our sovereignty, is nothing short of fantastic.

Patrick Henry once asked his fellow men, "Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?" Today, 186 years later, during which time we have grown from an infant Nation of unlimited courage to a mighty Nation which appears suddenly to have lost her national conscience, we might ask whether life is so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of blatant blackmail? We think not.

Shades of George Washington, shades of Patrick Henry, shades of Thomas Jefferson, shades of Capt. John Paul Jones, shades of Admiral Farragut, shades of Abraham Lincoln, shades of Teddy Roosevelt, shades of Iwo Jima and Anzio.

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

That should be the philosophy of every Senator.

I said yesterday, and I repeat, How silly and ridiculous can we get? According to a ticker tape report, the President of the United States has told the majority leader today that the Government is going to have nothing to do with this matter. So I ask again, Who is running the State Department? Who is running the Government? Is it Mrs. Roosevelt or Mr. Reuther or Dr. Milton Eisenhower? Or is it the President of the United States? The Senate should find out. Certainly the American people are interested in knowing. What right do we have to deal with a blackmailer like Castro? What right do we have even to be considering making $15 million or $20 million tax deductible? That would mean that the American taxpayers would contribute 80 percent in taxes. I repeat, How silly and how cowardly can we in the United States become?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Delaware without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from Indiana in denouncing the so-called tractor deal with Castro. I call particular attention to an article published in the New York Times of today. I will quote from it, as follows:

The Tractors for Freedom Committee was organized this morning to provide a formal group for the collection of contributions.

The article is dated today. It states that the group was organized this morning. I continue to read from the article:

In discussions over the last 3 days, the Government had ruled that contributions to the committee would be tax exempt, given assurances that export licenses would be granted for a shipment of the tractors, and told committee officials they would not be considered to be violating the Logan Act forbidding private citizens from negotiating with foreign governments.

I raise the question of the propriety of a tax exemption. However, first I ask how can the Treasury rule on an application for a tax exemption for an organization prior to the time that it has even been organized, or prior to the time that it could possibly have filed an application?

At this point I would like to read the law on the establishment of tax-exempt organizations. I quote section 170(c) of the 1954 Tax Code:

> Section 170(c) of the 1954 code defines the term "charitable contribution" for purposes of the deduction to include any contribution to an entity organized in the United States "* * * exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals * * *" providing "no substantial part of the activities is attempting to influence legislation." The word "charitable" is not defined or explained in the statute.

The word "charitable" is not defined or explained in the statute, but the regulations under section 501(c)(3) more fully defines what the term includes. I quote that regulation:

> Relief of the poor and distressed or of the underprivileged; advancement of religion; advancement of education or science; erection or maintenance of public buildings, monuments, or works; lessening of the burdens of Government; and promotion of social welfare by organizations designed to accomplish any of the above purposes, or (i) to lessen neighborhood tensions; (ii) to eliminate prejudice and discrimination; (iii) to defend human and civil rights secured by law; or (iv) to combat community deterioration and juvenile delinquency.

By no stretch of the imagination can the Department refer to Mr. Castro's regime as a religious organization. Certainly his regime is not a charitable organization. It is not a scientific organization. There is nothing about Mr. Castro which would contribute to literary or educational purposes. Under the act those are the only reasons on the basis of which a ruling can be made that such contributions can be said to be tax exempt.

Certainly this is not charity; it is nothing short of international blackmail.

I hope the Committee on Finance will give this question attention the first time the Secretary of the Treasury is before us. Certainly we should get the answers to these questions: First, did the committee to aid the Cubans get a ruling as reported in the New York Times? If so, how could the Internal Revenue Service have made such a ruling for a group before it was organized? How could this ruling have been made before the Internal Revenue Service had received the application? A committee cannot file an application until after it has been organized. How could the Internal Revenue Service review and evaluate what was an an application filed by a group which had not yet been organized?

As the Senator from Indiana said, I think it is time we found out who is managing this fast action, who is giving assurance to this committee that tax exemptions will be granted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

First. Can there be a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service without a policy being established by the administration?

Second. Is it not true that the legal interpretation of "charitable organization" is based upon charities located within the United States and not charities located outside the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The answer to the Senator's second question is as he has stated. The law relates to contributions made to organizations in the United States, not to those located outside the United States.

Will the Senator please repeat his first question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My first question was, How can a ruling be made by the Internal Revenue Service concerning a problem of this kind without a policy having been established by the State Department or the administration as to whether what is proposed is an organized effort and a proper effort by U.S. citizens?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Treasury Department, in making its ruling, could properly consult the State Department and ascertain some of the background of the committee. However, final rulings are supposed to be based upon the merits of the case as applied to interpretations of the law, not upon special appeal made by the State Department or anyone else in the executive branch.

The rulings are supposed to be based upon law. I have read the law. The Treasury Department has no right to issue an arbitrary ruling merely to comply with the wishes of anyone in any agency of the Government, whether he be in the legislative branch or the executive branch.

We have had similar trouble along that line before. Several years ago, the executive branch insisted upon the issuance of a ruling by the Treasury Department which permitted certain large contributors to the Democratic Party to be written off as charitable deductions. There was over half a million dollars' worth of such contributions. Under that ruling the Democratic National Committee was in effect classified as a charitable organization for tax deductible purposes. When discovered though, they hastily reversed this ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Is not the Democratic National Committee a charitable organization? [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The rulings of the Internal Revenue Service are supposed to be based upon strict interpretation of the law, after the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has had the application of the organization submitted to him and after he has evaluated all the points raised in the application. If the executive branch can get these rulings merely upon request without regard as to merits, then why have a Commissioner?

Sure, the Commissioner may ask for advice, but he is not supposed to make a ruling based upon pressure from the executive branch or from anyone else. If he did, Congress might as well stop passing laws.

Ordinarily, it takes months to get such a ruling. Most certainly one cannot get a ruling as quickly in bureaucratic Washington as apparently the organization in question secured its ruling. The bureaus simply do not rule that fast, and if they do then something is wrong.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that the purchase of machinery, no matter for how humane a purpose, cannot be regarded as a charitable undertaking under any circumstance?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Certainly. By no line of reasoning can it be said that what is proposed to be given to Mr. Castro is charity. Certainly it cannot be ruled that blackmail payments to his regime are charity. I repeat the language of the law: tax exemptions are for gifts made:

> Exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals.

How can Mr. Castro qualify under any of those definitions?

Under the regulation which has been issued under section 501(c), it is provided that a charitable organization, for tax deduction purposes, includes organizations which have been formed "to combat community deterioration and juvenile delinquency."

The closest Castro might come to qualifying under that language would be in the category of juvenile delinquency, and I doubt their application will be based upon helping Mr. Castro as a "juvenile delinquent."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Pennsylvania yield me 1 minute, so that I may address a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as I understand, the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, has stated that it is his understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], will ask representatives of the State Department to appear before the committee tomorrow. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. MORSE. In a conversation with the chairman of the committee, he said he planned to ask representatives of the State Department to appear before the committee tomorrow afternoon. However, I cannot speak definitely for him.

Mr. CAPEHART. I did not wish to leave the impression that the able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations or the able chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs were not in any way cooperating in this matter.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is fair to say—and I believe the chairman of the committee would say so, were he on the floor—that he is concerned about the situation, and desires that there be consultation.

Mr. CAPEHART. The point is that both the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Oregon are cooperating to have these questions answered.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD instead of at a point some minutes earlier, before the colloquy which has just been concluded developed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, line 25, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia,".

On page 5, line 4, after "and (iii)" insert "the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv)".

On page 5, line 24, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia,".

On page 6, line 11, after "American Samoa," insert "the District of Columbia,".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to increase the allotment to the District of Columbia for public school education purposes.

The formula provided in the bill for apportioning the funds divided among the States, the District of Columbia and U.S. possessions, is unfair to the District of Columbia for a reason readily apparent on examination of the bill.

One of the factors on which the apportionment formula is based is income per public school pupil, which is determined by dividing the number of school age children 5 to 17 inclusive by the total income of individuals in the State or district.

There is, of course, a highly artificial element in the income of the District of Columbia because there are many residents here with substantial income who contribute little to the District of Columbia government because of exemptions in the District's tax laws for Members of Congress and certain other Government officials. Naturally this inflates the District of Columbia income figure considerably with the result that the District's allotment ratio is the minimum permissible figure of 0.25 and under the committee bill $9.26 share per school age child provided the District is the lowest share for any State, district, or possession.

Mr. President, having served on the Committee on the District of Columbia with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in charge of the bill, during the first 2 years of my membership in the Senate, I had occasion to learn at first hand the almost pitiable condition of the schools of the District of Columbia, schools which should be really the showcase of our public school system but which unfortunately are far from that.

I have asked Mr. Charles Lee, a member of the staff of the Subcommittee on Education, to prepare a memorandum concerning the educational needs of the public school system of the District of Columbia. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 11, 1961.

Memorandum to: Mr. John S. Forsythe.
From: Charles Lee, professional staff member, Education Subcommittee.

In response to your request the following information concerning educational needs in the public school system in the District of Columbia is respectfully submitted:

1. Total enrollment	121,448
Elementary	80,805
Junior high school	24,419
Senior high school	12,696
Vocational high school	2,274
Americanization School	674
Veterans High School Center	551
Capitol Page School	29
2. Teachers	4,500
Fully accredited	3,200
Uncertified	1,300

29.4 percent of teachers lack full accreditation.

3. School buildings:

According to a recent survey conducted by the Office of Education there are 49 school buildings definitely substandard which should be replaced out of a total of 165 buildings currently being used for schools. An example of the type of school building for which replacement is being sought is Hines Junior High School. This structure was built in 1894. In part it was condemned in 1923. It has been used consistently since that date although the auditorium is boarded up and one-half of the top floor is cut off. The situation has been repeatedly brought to the attention of the District officials by the Members of the Senate District Committee. Senator MORSE in the 86th Congress warned the District in a statement on the floor of the Senate that the building was a potential fire hazard. Some 3 months later a fire occurred. Fortunately, at the time there was no injury or loss of life because the pupils under excellent discipline were quickly evacuated.

4. Fiscal situation in the District of Columbia:

For fiscal year 1962 a total budget of $291,400,000 has been requested. This amount includes $54,500,000 for operations and maintenance, including salaries, of the school system. Capital outlay for the school system is $9,200,000. A revenue deficit is forecast for the general fund (on the assumption that Federal payment will be as in the past $25 million annually) in the amount of $32 million.

Revenue possibilities being explored include a legislative program to increase District sales taxes, increase taxes on liquors, additional taxes on cigarettes, and a change in the method of computing the corporation income tax, all of which, if enacted, would yield $14 million. In this connection, it might be noted that the Senate and the House in the 86th Congress could not agree upon requested tax increases.

Real estate is taxed in the District currently at $2.30 per $100 of assessed valuation (assessed value is computed at 55 percent of full value). For fiscal year 1963, District Commissioners had indicated that they would request an increase of 20 cents per $100 so that the rate would be $2.50 per $100 of assessed value. District income tax rates are proposed to be 4 percent on the first $100 of Federal taxation, 8 percent on the amounts between $100 and $200, 12 percent on rates $200 to $1,000 and 13 percent on all amounts of Federal taxation over $1,000.

Because of the unique characteristics of the District of Columbia 53.2 percent of the area of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets, alleys and water, is tax exempt because it is occupied by Federal instrumentalities, foreign embassies, charitable and philanthropic organizations, or Federal park land. In terms of value 44.8 percent of the property in the District is tax exempt.

I am advised that with respect to taxing policy the District ranks at the median and slightly below the contiguous metropolitan counties of Maryland and Virginia. In this connection, it should be noted that the District does not share in Federal educational moneys of Public Laws 815 and 874.

I am advised that the teacher pay and other pay increases granted by the last Congress (on the assumption that the Federal payment is not increased) will force a cutback in capital outlay of $30,500,000 from the project $40 million program. This would affect adversely among other items one junior high school, one addition to a junior high school and two large elementary public schools.

In addition to the tax revenues the District has access to borrowing authority of $75 million for capital construction needs, $36 million of this authority has already been obligated, $16 million is included in the 1962 fiscal year estimates, leaving but $23 million available for future use.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to quote one paragraph from that memorandum:

Because of the unique characteristics of the District of Columbia, 53.2 percent of the area of the District of Columbia, exclusive of streets, alleys, and water is tax exempt because it is occupied by Federal instrumentalities, foreign embassies, charitable and philanthropical organizations, or Federal park land. In terms of value, 44.8 percent of the property in the District is tax exempt.

My amendment sets the District of Columbia's allotment ratio at .50, the median provided for all States and possessions under Senate bill 1021. The result would be to increase from approximately $1,600,000 to $3,100,000 the amount of funds to be received by the District of Columbia under the bill.

I believe the amendment would have been accepted in the committee if it had been offered there in time. Unfortunately, the inequity which the formula under the committee bill does to the District of Columbia was not pointed out to me until the committee had ordered the bill reported, and it was then too late to poll the committee on that question.

I ask the Senator from Oregon to accept this amendment, for I am confident that it would do no more than give the

District of Columbia its fair and equitable share. Is the Senator willing to accept the amendment?

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield before the debate on the amendment concludes.

Mr. CLARK. I am glad to yield at this time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am very much disturbed by this allocation of funds, because it is impossible for me to ascertain how the State which I have the honor to represent, in part, could come out as badly as it does, in relation to all the other States, under almost any formula which could be devised.

I know this formula was not devised in order to punish Connecticut in any respect or for any reason. I do not believe Connecticut has done anything which would cause it to incur the enmity of the committee or the statisticians or the staff and so forth.

On the contrary, we believe that our State has been progressive in the matter of education, and we have done better than has the average State in regard to the construction of classrooms, improving the salaries of teachers, educating teachers, and so forth; and I believe that the experts in this field consider our State to be a very progressive one in many areas. However, we find that we come out at the bottom of the totem pole, as regards the allotment of funds.

I do not wish to protest against having the District of Columbia receive a better "deal", for I have never felt that the Congress was adequately generous as regards the total allocations to the District of Columbia. In fact, I have felt so strongly about that matter that I have proposed that the Constitution of the United States be amended so as to permit the District of Columbia to be represented by 2 Senators in the Senate of the United States and by proportionate representation in the House of Representatives. If the District of Columbia has found a method by means of which it will receive a better "break" in connection with this school bill, I shall vote for such a provision.

But I wish the Senator from Pennsylvania would explain to me how it is that Connecticut—to be specific—could possibly come out with the very worst treatment that any State receives. No other State will receive worse treatment.

On page 5 of the report, near the top of the page, we find the following:

> The allotment of Federal funds among the States under the reported bill follows an equalization formula which is based upon relative number of school-age children (5 to 17, inclusive) and relative income per school-age child.

If we examine page 108 of the hearings, part I, we find a table which shows "Personal Income Per Pupil." In the table, we find that Connecticut is about the 7th or 8th from the top of the list. The District of Columba heads the list, and is followed, in order, by New York, Delaware, Illinois, New Jersey, Massachusetts, and Alaska, all of which have personal incomes per pupil greater than does Connecticut. So it is impossible for me to ascertain how it is that Connecticut comes out with so bad a "deal."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I have great sympathy for the position taken by the Senator from Connecticut; and, in my judgment, under the formula, which presumably has been applied uniformly, Connecticut certainly gets a very bad "deal." I, for one, will be glad to have Connecticut treated better.

Mr. BUSH. Have we any recourse?

Mr. CLARK. Well, of course I am not in charge of the bill.

As regards the table which appears on page 108 of the hearings, to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred, let me say the table is based on the number of children in average daily attendance in the public schools, rather than on the number of children in the 5 to 17 age group, regardless of whether they are in public schools. Of course, the two are not comparable.

I know the Senator will agree that in Connecticut a very large proportion of the children are enrolled in private or parochial schools. Therefore, this table does not give us much help in connection with the formula, insofar as Connecticut is concerned.

Furthermore, I am advised that the per capita income in Connecticut is the highest in the country. Therefore, it is not hard to understand how Connecticut comes out so badly. Thus, I thoroughly sympathize with the position taken by the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I do not wish to challenge what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said; but in this connection I may point out that in the same volume of the hearings—part I—there is to be found a table 49. It appears on page 256, and is entitled "Per Capita Personal Income, 1959." The list is headed by Delaware; Connecticut is second; Nevada is third.

However, when I look on page 4 of the report, I find from the table which appears there that Nevada will receive $13.69 per school age child, whereas Connecticut will receive only $9.26 per school age child. In other words, Nevada will receive almost 50 percent more than will Connecticut.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator from Connecticut will yield to me, let me say that I can sympathize with the position he takes, because in the list to which he has referred, Delaware is next to Connecticut in terms of the low amount it will receive. Certainly both Delaware and Connecticut receive less than the average—even though I realize that the announced purpose is to help the poorer States. The trouble is that under the committee formula that is not what happens.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I agree that Delaware is not very well treated. On the other hand, Pennsylvania is well treated. I wish I could say that I am entitled to credit for the treatment Pennsylvania receives in that connection; that I had fought like a tiger to have the amount to be received by Pennsylvania increased. However, as a matter of fact, Pennsylvania's share was arrived at purely as a result of the committee's determination of the formula which appeared fairest to all States.

If the Senator will examine the table on the right hand side of page 257 of part 1 of the hearings—the table is entitled "Personal Income Per Child of School Age"—he will see that Delaware is the 3d in the list and Pennsylvania is 10th. This formula was worked out in terms of personal income per child of school age—ages 5 to 17, inclusive. That is why Connecticut does not come out as well as Pennsylvania does, under the formula that is used.

Let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that although any one of a dozen formulas could have been used, we used one which we thought was fair. I found out that, in the end, the formula resulted in having Pennsylvania receive generous treatment. Needless to say, I did not object to that. But it occurred to me that the formula was unfair to the District of Columbia; perhaps it was also unfair to Connecticut. However, my amendment is confined to the District of Columbia.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania know of any way to alleviate that situation?

Mr. CLARK. It is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is prepared to accept my amendment. But I am somewhat afraid that he would not accept the amendment if it were modified in such a way as to have it also deal with Connecticut and Delaware.

However, I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut address his remarks, not to me, but to the Senator who is the floor manager of the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Well, the floor manager of the bill has been in a very generous humor during the last few days and has been extremely courteous to us. So I should like to see whether the Senator from Oregon has any suggestion to make as to how our distress may be alleviated.

Can we escape from this discrimination? I have heard the Senator talk against discrimination so often that I hoped he would find a very simple way to correct it.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Connecticut has made several eloquent speeches against discrimination in connection with the Bush amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I am making one right now, although I am afraid it is not very eloquent. It is falling on deaf ears.

Mr. CLARK. Before the Senator from Oregon replies, let me say that I think there is quite a precedent for offering the District of Columbia slightly different treatment from that given the 50 States. The way of handling it in my proposed amendment is to put the District of Columbia in with a number of other parts of the United States of America which are not themselves States—Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, and Guam—and treat the District of Columbia as being in that kind of special category, instead of in the category as though

it were a State, which it is not. I think the amendment does justice to the District of Columbia. I will not pretend it does justice to the State of Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator reminds me of a poem I read on a roadside billboard:

Here lies the body of John O'Shea
Who died maintaining his right-of-way.
He was right, dead right, as he drove along,
But he's just as dead as if he'd been wrong.

That is the way I feel about it, so far as Connecticut is concerned.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it not true that the District of Columbia Committee has tried to get additional money for the schools in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CLARK. I am no longer on the District of Columbia Committee. The Senator from Oregon can answer that question. I know that when I was on the committee we tried to get more money for educational purposes in the District of Columbia. We were not able to do so because of an attitude in the other body of Congress which I am not at liberty to criticize on the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I find myself in sympathy with the District of Columbia and the position in which the District of Columbia finds itself, but I think this is more a matter which should be left to the District of Columbia Committee, and not a matter to be inserted in a Federal aid to education bill, especially when it favors one area of our country over another in the distribution of funds.

I would think it would be proper for the Senate to vote on this proposal, but I would object to the amendment being accepted by the floor manager of the bill. I would suggest the absence of a quorum so that we might obtain a vote on the amendment at the proper time.

Mr. CLARK. Let me say to the Senator from Arizona, before we proceed any further that the District of Columbia is not getting any special treatment. It is being treated as though it were a median State. It is being given the same treatment as is American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. If the Senator wishes to persist in his position, very well, but I say to him that this is a simple, compassionate, and decent way to give the District of Columbia Federal money for schools which it so badly needs, and that the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona will inevitably result in not giving to the District of Columbia the kind of assistance which those of us who have had an opportunity of looking into the educational needs of the District of Columbia know it needs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator that this is a very good way to get more money for the District of Columbia, but there are a number of other States in the category between low and median, and I think the precedent set by adopting this amendment could be a dangerous one.

I sympathize with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who complains that his State is not adequately treated. It would be perfectly proper for him to make a similar move to bring Connecticut higher up. It would be proper for any Senator representing a State which was in the category from low to medium to make a move to bring those States up to a higher level. I think they might be considered as being derelict in their duty if they did not do so.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as is not infrequently the case on this floor, I disagree with everything the Senator from Arizona says, but defend his right to say it. I see no point in prolonging the discussion. I renew the question to the Senator from Oregon as to whether he would be agreeable to accepting the amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, before yielding to the Senator from Oregon, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I want to find out what the effect of the Senator's amendment is. Would the District of Columbia get funds under the bill as it stands?

Mr. CLARK. It would get funds under the bill. If the Senator will turn to page 4 of the report, he will see the amount the District of Columbia would get under the bill would be $1,565,588, which represents $9.26 per school-age child from 5 to 17, inclusive, the lowest figure per school-age child of any one of the 50 States except Connecticut, with respect to which it is identical.

Mr. KEATING. The purpose of this amendment, then, is to upgrade the District of Columbia so that it would get more than it would otherwise receive. How much would it receive under the Senator's proposal?

Mr. CLARK. The District of Columbia would get the national average figure of and per school-age child. It would get $3,100,000 instead of $1,500,000. The method of computation, as I said a minute or two ago, is to treat the District of Columbia as being in the same category with all the other geographic areas which are receiving assistance under the bill, aside from the 50 States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. CLARK. In just a minute.

In further answer to the Senator from New York, the District of Columbia would be treated, on a per capita per schoolchild basis, as receiving $18.54, which is the median amount.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if it is not true that the personal income per pupil in the District of Columbia is the highest in the country, and that in the territories to which the Senator keeps referring it is probably the lowest?

Mr. CLARK. That is a deceptive figure, although it may well be accurate. The reason why it is deceptive is that so much personal income is included in the District of Columbia figures which is not subject to taxation. I point out, for example, that the salary of the Senator from Arizona and my own salary are not subject to District of Columbia income taxes. The incomes of Presidential appointees, or any Member of Congress, or the salaries of staff officials who are domiciled elsewhere, are not subject to District of Columbia taxes. I point out again, as I did earlier, when the Senator from Arizona was not present, that only 44 percent of the total valuation of property in the District of Columbia is subject to taxation, because of the huge Federal holdings.

I point out what the Senator from Arizona knows, that for many a long year Congress has been unwilling to make adequate Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Pennsylvania had made the remark that we were to treat the District of Columbia as we were treating Puerto Rico and some of our other holdings. I want to make clear that we are not talking about comparable figures when we talk about the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and other places in our possession that we take care of.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator from Arizona says is fundamentally true, but I suspect, in all candor, he will agree with me that the District of Columbia is a pretty special case so far as tax incidence is concerned, because it is under the control of the Federal Government. It does not have the right or ability to impose taxes. It does not get an adequate Federal payment. Tens of thousands of residents of the District of Columbia are not liable to District taxation, because they are legal residents elsewhere, except for property taxes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. When my friend served on the District of Columbia Committee, was any effort made to increase the taxes which would apply for school purposes?

Mr. CLARK. I shall have to ask my friend from Oregon to answer the question. My memory is hazy.

The question asked is whether any effort has been made to increase District of Columbia taxes, the implication being, perhaps, that the District of Columbia ought to raise taxes instead of getting an additional Federal payment.

Mr. MORSE. We tried last year, and we were not able to do so. The two Houses could not get together in that regard.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I intend to ask for a vote on the amendment, instead of merely having the amendment accepted.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my acceptance of the amendment would require a vote. I cannot accept the amendment without the Senate having a vote. All my acceptance of the amendment would do would be to show what is the position of the floor leader on the amendment. I shall make a statement briefly as to the position of the majority of the committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I realize that what the Senator says is true, but I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum and to ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. I think the amendment would establish a dangerous precedent.

Mr. MORSE. I give the Senator my assurance that he will have an opportunity to suggest the absence of a quorum before a vote is taken.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

RIGHTS AND INCITEMENT TO RIOT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the able columnist, David Lawrence, has again demonstrated the perceptiveness necessary to separate the wheat from the chaff in confused national issues. A column entitled "Rights and Incitement to Riot," appearing in today's edition of the Evening Star, by Mr. Lawrence points up the distinction between the exercise of lawful rights and the breach of public order which constitutes an infringement of the rights of others. This is the context of the article:

There is a constitutional right to free speech, but—as the Supreme Court has said—there is no right falsely to cry "Fire" in a crowded theater.

There is a constitutional right to demonstrate, but not a right to provoke or incite people to riot.

There is a constitutional right to assemble in a hall to espouse any cause, but not a right to organize a "sit-in" demonstration for the express purpose of using private property—against the wishes of the owners—to stir up passions and create incidents of disorder.

For decades now the American people have been denouncing lynch rule and mob action, and the cry has been for adherence to constitutional law and the orderly precedures of the courts.

But what happened in Alabama over the weekend reveals clearly that incitement to riot is the fundamental cause of the trouble. Mayor Robert Wagner of New York, not many months ago, rightly refused to give a permit to a rabble-rouser who wanted to defend the Nazi point of view at meetings in the heart of the metropolis, where the bulk of the population was bound to resent such statements and perhaps be stimulated to mob action.

It was all very well for civic groups later to argue that a permit should have been granted by the mayor and that the champion of Nazi doctrines had a right to free speech, but the mayor knew what the consequences would be and acted wisely. Alabama's attorney general has just told the same rabble-rouser to keep out of the State.

Today the Federal Government under the Kennedy administration has made the same mistake at Montgomery as did the Eisenhower administration at Little Rock. Both refused to let local authorities deal with the situation. The more than 400 Federal marshals fully armed, who were mobilized in Montgomery last Sunday were, as Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, says, hardly different from Federal troops.

There are, of course, plenty of legalisms involved. At Little Rock the Governor of Arkansas ordered out the National Guard to prevent mob violence around the school. But the Federal Government construed this as an impediment to the enforcement of a Federal court order on desegregation of public schools.

In Alabama a court order issued by an Alabama State judge had called on the so-called freedom riders to abstain from their demonstrations on buses which had been advertised in advance and were certain to stir up trouble. Notwithstanding the existence of this State court order, the Federal Government intervened with Federal marshals, claiming that law and order had broken down.

Indeed, an 1871 Federal statute was cited by the United States Department of Justice as authority for the step, though this law specifically refers to Federal intervention only where there is insurrection or domestic violence due to a refusal or inability of a State to grant protection. It can hardly be said that the action of a mob, even though some negligence is temporarily displayed by local police, constitutes such an insurrection in a constitutional sense. On the contrary, the Governor of Alabama recognized the right of the bus to engage in interstate travel and the right of passengers on the bus to be protected. Just how this gets to be insurrection is hard to understand. Neither the Governor nor the legislature requested the Federal intervention as the Constitution prescribes must be done when domestic violence develops beyond the State's control.

It is true that the U.S. Attorney General and the Governor of Alabama discussed beforehand the events leading up to the crisis on Saturday, but this does not justify Federal intervention any more than it justifies mob action. Unless the regular processes of the law are permitted to take their course, the whole thing just becomes an emotional spectacle with politics and the bid for votes in the populous Northern States playing its part, both under a Democratic and a Republican national administration.

If, as Supreme Court decisions in the past have indicated, there is a right of any citizen to travel through a State or inside a State without color discrimination on vehicles of transportation, the proper course for the aggrieved parties is to apply for court orders. Long drawn out as the cases might be, the necessary court support would be forthcoming and arrests for contempt for violating court orders would follow as a routine procedure.

To say that "all this takes too much time," and that "we have waited long enough" is exactly what the mobsters used to argue passionately as they prepared to lynch a rapist. The cry was then heard: "He's guilty anyhow, why wait for the courts."

Unfortunately, the 14th amendment, under which "equal protection of the law" has been fostered, was itself ratified at the point of the bayonet when, 3 years after the Civil War was over, the Southern States were coerced—by militiamen sitting in the State legislatures—into ratifying the amendment. The Constitution itself prescribes a proper method of ratification, and the present generation is suffering 100 years later the consequences of the disregard of the Constitution in the period immediately after the Civil War. The Supreme Court has ruled on many 14th amendment cases but has consistently refused to pass upon any case involving the legality of the "ratification" of the 14th amendment itself.

Mr. President, we are fortunate that there are still columnists who publish the facts in a context which permits and assists in the interpretation of the facts in their proper relation.

I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. This is the second time today that I have heard the Senator from South Carolina speak about the situation in Alabama, which the New York Times this morning called a national tragedy. It is a national tragedy and a national disgrace. It cannot be colored in any other way.

I do not wish to interfere with the debate tonight, but I could not sit here and listen to comments on the Alabama situation again. Tomorrow during the morning hour I shall use my own time to say what I think about the problem, and how I think every decent American should regard it. I have yet to hear any excuse for the anarchy and the refusal or failure to take authoritative State action in terms of protecting the lives of citizens and enforcing the laws and Constitution of the United States. I have yet to hear any real excuse for it. But, as I say, I do not want to intrude on the Senator's debate. I will speak tomorrow on my own time.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. In reply to the Senator from New York, I wish to say that I did not expect him to agree with the distinguished columnist, Mr. David Lawrence, or with the Constitution of the United States.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the Clark amendment. First, I wish to reply to my good friend the Senator from Connecticut. May I say goodnaturedly that he used one phrase or sentence in his comment in regard to which I would like to register a statement. He was very gracious to me. He said that for the past several days the Senator from Oregon—I believe I paraphrase correctly his statement—has been very courteous and good natured. I wondered if the Senator from Connecticut meant that such courtesy was typical of the Senator from Oregon only during the last few days. I have always tried to be courteous and goodnatured. Of course, I have the responsibility to be firm if I think firmness is called for. But I want the Senator from Connecticut to know that if at any time earlier than the last few days I have not been courteous to the Senator from Connecticut, I here now offer my abject apologies, because I have never knowingly or intentionally been discourteous to anyone.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator should not draw any inference of the kind that I think he is drawing, because I have always found the Senator courteous. However, I have noticed that in the last 2 or 3 days, with the large bundle of notes he has been carrying in his arms, he has been especially happy and courteous. We have appreciated and been glad to see him in such a frame of mind, even though it hurts.

Mr. MORSE. I say to the Senator that I am having a little fun, and what I say is offered in a jocular vein. I know the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will undoubtedly take a position somewhat similar to the position taken by the Senator from Connecticut.

I am going to make some comments now and then reserve an opportunity to reply to my friend from Delaware a little later.

I do wish to say to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] that on the basis of the review of an overwhelming majority of the subcommittee and the majority of the full committee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am accepting the Senator's amendment in regard to the District of Columbia. All such action means is that we put our stamp of approval on the amendment for whatever reinforcement value that stamp may have in helping others in the Senate to form their judgment. As we all know, if an amendment meets with the approval of the majority of the committee, it has a certain presumptive advantage, because all Senators are inclined at least to give a presumptive benefit to an amendment that is approved by a majority of the committee.

I wish to make clear that the amendment was never formally acted upon by the committee, for the reason that it was not until after we had marked up the bill that we discovered what we consider to be an unfair disparity with regard to the District of Columbia, and then the Clark-Morse amendment was devised and offered to the bill.

When we have a formula that calls for the distribution of money to the States of the country on the basis of an equalization principle, which is involved in the bill, there will be some States at the top of the list that would receive more than States at the bottom of the list, which would receive less. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] find their States at the bottom of the list. So the question is whether the formula is fair in its application to the facts of Delaware and Connecticut.

As I said when I made my first speech on the formula, questions of judgment are involved.

We think that the formula, when all is said and done, is reasonably fair, and for those reasons, as far as Connecticut and Delaware are concerned, I suggest that the Senators from Connecticut and Delaware have the privilege of representing two of the wealthiest States in the country from the standpoint of personal per capita income.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I call the Senator's attention to a fact, which embarrasses me, but nevertheless, because it has reference to our being a wealthy State, I must state it. The State of Connecticut and the State of Delaware are the two most heavily bonded States in the United States on a per capita basis. Connecticut is bonded at $369 million and Delaware at $463 million. There is not a single other State that is bonded up to $300 million, and I believe only one other State is bonded in excess of $200 million.

In proceeding with our school and other programs, in an attempt to keep pace with the advance of our economy, we have borrowed very heavily—much more so than I approve—but nevertheless such borrowing places a very heavy burden upon us. It is fortunate that we do have a high per capita income, or else we would not be able to carry that kind of indebtedness.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that situation. I congratulate the Senator on his representing a State that can carry such bonded indebtedness in promoting the public welfare. After all, it is the decision of the citizens of the State. I congratulate the citizens that they have taken that step. But such action does not erase the pertinent fact that I have stated. On the top of the list, on the basis of personal income per child of school age, Connecticut leads the Nation with $12,762.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I inquire what the Senator is reading from?

Mr. MORSE. I am reading from page 257, table 52, of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Education. Following Connectitut comes New York, $12,480. Then comes Delaware, with $11,838.

As far as personal income per child of school age, 5 to 17, based on 1959 data is concerned, the States of Connecticut and Delaware are first and third in position in the entire country.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I wish to point out to the Senator from Connecticut that I suspect those figures about bonded indebtedness are subject to some discount. In my State our constitution limits the bonded debt of the Commonwealth to $1 million. Yet we have a public school building fund; we have a general State authority; we have various other devices, I am prepared to call them, under which bonds have been issued, against which the credit of the State is pledged on a lease basis where the amount involved—I do not carry it in my head—is a good many times more than the figure suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. So I do not believe the bonded debt figures are really comparable.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think the bonded indebtedness has a bearing on the whole situation. When one speaks about the wealth of the State, he should take into account its obligations also. Our legislature is now in session. It will appropriate either an additional $32 million for the biennium approaching or else it will appropriate $22 million or $23 million. Two bills before the legislature provide those appropriations. We are going ahead with either of those programs regardless of what happens here.

The proposed legislation is very distressing to me, because we have been progressive and have been willing to move ahead and keep up with our classroom construction and raise teachers' salaries, perhaps as well as any of the States. I think the records will show we are in the top group in that respect. When a bill such as the one before the Senate comes along, we are very severely prejudiced.

I cannot get over my hurt in that respect.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to add to my answer to the Senators from Connecticut and Delaware that I invite attention to table 51, on page 257 of the hearings entitled "Per Capita Disposable Income, 1959." When we deal with per capita disposable income, Delaware tops the list, with $2,516. Connecticut is second, with $2,460. New York is third, with $2,350.

Senators will see the position in which I find myself. We have devised a formula. It was constructed by what we believe are qualified experts in this field. They have advised us that it is a fair formula. Of course, we all know that in the application of a formula such as this the richer States will make a greater contribution than the poorer States. What we must decide is the question whether, from top to bottom, the division of funds will be fair and equitable in terms of the ability of a State to pay.

Let us take the question of bonded indebtedness, so far as Connecticut and Delaware are concerned. The fact that a State is bonded, does not mean that it has thereby depreciated the value of its wealth. The money raised by the bonds goes into very important and valuable capital investments. The fact that figures are available which show the bonded indebtedness of a State does not mean that the figures have made that State poor. On the contrary, we must look to see what the bond money has been used for. I believe we must recognize that because of the progressiveness of the Senator's State, that State has enriched itself in many particulars. By the issuance of bonds, the State has built wealth-creating and wealth-producing projects.

So, if I may say so good naturedly to my friend from Connecticut, the mere fact that his State has bonded itself, does not mean that his State is any poorer for that reason.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has been very kind. I would like to make two observations. One is that our State does not feel in an enriched condition because of our bonded debt; on the contrary, a big argument at present in our legislature is over the question of debt. If there is not a majority, certainly there is an evenly divided situation on that question. Many people feel that our State is in very serious financial condition.

The other point I wish to make to the Senator is that over the years our State has been contributing over and over again to grant-in-aid programs on a very generous basis. We have not always complained about it, by any means. In fact, I have gone back to my State to defend various grant-in-aid programs, because I realize that we are a part of the United States and have a national interest in the welfare of the poor States which buy many of our manufactured products. So my position is not entirely provincial. I feel that in the pending bill the formula that has been arrived at has a very serious and severe impact on our State, far greater than any that has ever been produced in any bill that I have seen in the Senate so far as any State is concerned. It happens to be our State this time, and I feel bad about it.

Mr. MORSE. When I use these statistics I hope the Senator will not think that I am seeking to put Connecticut in a bad light in any way, because I am not. I must deal with these facts as the record shows them. When we talk about expenditures in any State for governmental and public purposes, we must take a look to see for what purposes a State is spending the money.

In many States we find that a great deal of money is spent on roads. It is comparatively easy to get appropriations for road construction through a State legislature, because a State can appropriate $1 of State money and get several times that amount through Federal assistance. I do not know what the explanation is for the figures I now cite. I point to table 46 on page 254 of the hearings, entitled "Per Capita Expenditures of States and Local Governments for all Public Education, 1959." That table places Connecticut twentieth in the list of States. In fairness to the Senator from Delaware I am frank to admit that it places Delaware second. I call attention to this fact because I surmise that Connecticut spends a great deal of money for many governmental purposes. However, in comparison with the other States it is not near the top of the list.

When I say what I am about to say I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will understand that I make the argument only because I think it is a fair and proper argument, or I would not make it. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, is a distinguished citizen of the Senator's State. He is a former Governor of the Senator's State. I am privileged to say that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is accepting the formula. In fairness to him I must also point out that it is not the first recommendation the administration made through his office. However, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is accepting the formula as a fair and equitable distribution of the funds on a nationwide basis.

If the Secretary were present and I were to call him as a witness, I am sure he would say, "We would like to have more for Connecticut." What State would not feel that way? That is understandable. However, if we start changing the formula, unless there is a demonstrable case of injustice, which I believe the case of the District of Columbia is—and we thought the Alaska case was and we thought the Samoa case was, because in Committee we accepted the amendment of the Senator from Hawaii with respect to Samoa—and we start to change the formula in respect of the rich States, then I believe we will for all intents and purposes destroy the bill.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. The Senator has called my attention to a table. I invite his attention to a table at page 107 of the hearings. It is table No. 6. It is a very appropriate table. It is entitled "School Expenditures per Pupil." The information portrayed in that table is more indicative for the purpose of our discussion. Connecticut is in 14th position, or in the first third of the States, with an expenditure of $536 per pupil. So I still stand on my statement that we have been doing very well in respect of our own expenditures for education.

The Senator has been very generous, and I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I know that he wishes to get ahead with the bill. I thank the Senator for his courteous consideration.

Mr. MORSE. It is only fair that table 6 on page 107 of the hearings be placed in the RECORD, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. Of course it will not be possible to print the crossbars, but the table will show the relationship of the various States, as is the case with the table I have been using.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 6.—*School expenditures per pupil* [1]

New Jersey	$692.64
New York	681.15
Alaska	676.47
Delaware	643.84
California	636.03
Arizona	624.03
Illinois	598.40
Wisconsin	587.13
Washington	583.94
Wyoming	583.33
Nevada	581.82
Minnesota	559.81
Michigan	550.98
Connecticut	536.82
Ohio	535.14
Maryland	529.96
Colorado	520.35
Oregon	507.25
Kansas	505.91
Louisiana	504.04
Montana	496.30
Texas	474.50
Iowa	473.28
Utah	467.59
Indiana	459.55
Rhode Island	449.15
Massachusetts	438.25
Pennsylvania	432.06
North Dakota	432.00
New Hampshire	421.05
Missouri	419.36
Nebraska	419.23
Florida	400.69
South Dakota	400.00
New Mexico	396.04
Hawaii	378.79
Oklahoma	378.60
Idaho	347.22
Maine	344.44
Vermont	343.28
District of Columbia	339.62
Virginia	335.55
North Carolina	295.11
Mississippi	290.12
West Virginia	285.04
Alabama	277.86
Tennessee	264.95
Arkansas	251.34
Kentucky	250.88
Georgia	242.39
South Carolina	235.40
National average	484.00

[1] Estimated 1959–60 expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools, per pupil in average daily attendance.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senators from Delaware and Connecticut might be interested in this statement, because it bears on the point I raised in objecting to the simple adoption of the amendment; namely, that any Senator who felt his State was not being treated fairly could offer a similar amendment.

The figures on page 4 of the report and on the table between pages 298 and 299 of the hearings are interesting. For example, Delaware has 82,206 pupils enrolled in its public schools. Under the formula, Delaware would receive $1,239,501.

The District of Columbia has 121,448 pupils enrolled, but the District of Columbia would receive $3 million under the Clark revision of the formula.

Connecticut has 480,473 pupils enrolled. Under the formula it would receive $5,215,540.

By the very nature of the figures, the distribution seems to be wrong in these two instances. I have not perused the remainder of the table, but if it is proper to adjust the figure for the District of Columbia to $3 million for 121,448 pupils, certainly it would be proper to adjust the figure for Delaware upward because of the $1,239,501 which Delaware would receive for 82,206 pupils. The ratio simply does not appear to be fair.

I suggest to Senators from States which are below the median, so to speak, that they include their States in this amendment or offer amendments to the amendment, so that the amounts may be made proper. If it is right for one State, it is right for all. We all drink from the same bucket. That goes for the District of Columbia as well as the States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona permit me to observe that I have inquired if there was any possibility of offering an amendment to the amendment of the Senator with the big bundle of votes under his arm. He says he cannot consider such an amendment, so I shall not take the time of the Senate to offer it.

I think the point made by the Senator from Arizona is a good one, but we are up against a stone wall.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which appears on pages 226 and 227 of the hearings, entitled "Enrollment in Full-time Public and Nonpublic Elementary and Secondary Regular Day Schools, by State, 1957–58."

This table, I submit, shows that Delaware and Connecticut rate very high. It demonstrates clearly, I believe, that it is fair to apply the formula to them.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 15.—*Enrollment in full-time public and nonpublic elementary and secondary regular day schools, by State, 1957–58*

Region and State	Total enrollment, all full-time day schools	Public school enrollment				Nonpublic school enrollment			
		Total	Kindergarten and grades 1 through 8	Grades 9 through 12 and post graduate	Public school enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools	Total	Kindergarten and grades 1 through 8	Grades 9 through 12 and post-graduate	Nonpublic enrollment as a percent of total enrollment in all schools
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
United States (48 States and District of Columbia)	38,756,005	33,528,591	25,668,820	7,859,771	86.5	[1] 5,227,414	4,296,806	930,608	13.5
North Atlantic	10,135,758	7,901,198	5,943,098	1,958,100	18.0	2,234,560	1,840,211	394,349	22.0
Connecticut	529,881	436,552	336,654	99,898	82.4	93,329	70,951	22,378	17.6
Delaware	89,775	[2] 72,436	55,894	16,542	80.7	[2] 17,339	13,943	3,396	19.3
Maine	217,951	184,226	143,490	40,736	84.5	33,725	23,121	10,604	15.5
Maryland	653,626	538,790	415,789	123,001	82.4	[2] 114,836	97,758	17,078	17.6
Massachusetts	1,040,101	[2] 810,614	600,256	210,358	77.9	[2] 229,487	184,739	44,748	22.1
New Hampshire	129,035	97,478	74,046	23,432	75.5	31,557	23,155	8,402	24.5
New Jersey	1,228,079	959,479	730,797	228,682	78.1	[3] 268,600	[3] 229,800	[3] 38,800	21.9
New York	3,473,479	2,658,869	2,001,573	657,296	76.5	814,610	694,641	119,969	23.5
Pennsylvania	2,379,380	1,834,553	1,345,576	488,977	77.1	544,827	441,091	103,736	22.9
Rhode Island	171,959	125,301	95,056	30,245	72.9	[2] 46,658	33,095	13,563	27.1
Vermont	86,309	69,717	54,348	15,369	80.8	16,592	11,417	5,175	19.2
District of Columbia	136,183	113,183	89,619	23,564	83.1	[3] 23,000	[3] 16,500	[3] 6,500	16.9
Great Lakes and Plains	11,425,938	9,514,535	7,200,348	2,314,187	83.3	1,911,403	1,584,231	327,172	16.7
Illinois	2,133,541	1,654,311	1,255,583	398,728	77.5	479,230	395,494	83,736	22.5
Indiana	1,054,598	934,948	709,691	225,257	88.7	119,650	102,453	17,197	11.3
Iowa	655,058	[3] 573,152	435,437	137,715	87.5	[2] 81,906	65,518	16,388	12.5
Kansas	501,726	[3] 456,810	348,220	108,590	91.0	44,916	37,538	7,378	9.0
Michigan	1,777,696	[3] 1,495,720	1,161,769	333,960	84.1	281,967	225,637	56,330	15.9
Minnesota	780,020	637,642	467,344	170,298	81.7	142,378	121,887	20,491	18.3
Missouri	909,507	778,507	591,282	187,225	85.6	[3] 131,000	[3] 107,000	[3] 24,000	14.4
Nebraska	312,377	266,769	202,435	64,334	85.4	45,608	37,775	7,833	14.6
North Dakota	147,634	130,173	96,954	33,219	88.2	17,461	13,992	3,469	11.8
Ohio	2,100,124	1,763,837	1,352,064	411,773	84.0	336,287	276,237	60,050	16.0
South Dakota	158,801	143,801	108,588	35,213	90.6	[3] 15,000	[3] 12,700	[3] 2,300	9.4
Wisconsin	894,856	[3] 678,856	470,981	207,875	75.9	[3] 216,000	[3] 188,000	[3] 28,000	24.1
Southeast	8,890,339	8,452,116	6,619,758	1,832,358	95.1	438,223	337,483	100,740	4.9
Alabama	786,614	758,214	584,674	173,540	96.4	[3] 28,400	[3] 21,300	[3] 7,100	3.6
Arkansas	431,354	420,011	320,988	99,023	97.4	11,343	8,951	2,392	2.6
Florida	925,233	874,377	681,338	193,039	94.5	50,856	36,068	14,788	5.5
Georgia	932,331	914,431	732,946	181,485	98.1	[3] 17,900	[3] 11,500	[3] 6,400	1.9
Kentucky	684,280	609,548	477,604	131,944	89.1	74,732	58,488	16,244	10.9
Louisiana	771,184	648,854	509,273	139,581	84.1	122,330	101,701	20,629	15.9
Mississippi	553,593	536,417	433,282	103,135	96.9	17,176	13,175	4,001	3.1
North Carolina	1,072,287	1,060,187	815,177	245,010	98.9	12,100	9,600	2,500	1.1
South Carolina	596,683	584,283	466,032	118,251	97.9	12,400	[4] 10,900	[4] 1,500	2.1
Tennessee	810,189	780,933	606,648	174,285	96.4	29,256	20,142	9,114	3.6
Virginia	847,464	800,464	638,810	161,654	94.5	[3] 47,000	[3] 35,000	[3] 12,000	5.5
West Virginia	479,127	464,397	352,986	111,411	96.9	14,730	10,658	4,072	3.1
West and Southwest	8,303,970	7,660,742	5,905,616	1,755,126	92.3	643,228	534,881	108,347	7.7
Arizona	288,105	262,220	205,512	56,708	91.0	25,885	21,701	4,184	9.0
California	3,128,384	[2] 2,826,339	2,192,256	634,083	90.3	302,045	248,341	53,704	9.7
Colorado	401,518	365,518	285,448	80,070	91.0	36,000	[4] 29,500	[4] 6,500	9.0
Idaho	161,030	154,111	113,776	40,335	95.7	6,919	5,969	950	4.3
Montana	154,700	136,832	102,470	34,362	88.4	17,868	14,148	3,720	11.6
Nevada	61,220	58,218	45,841	12,377	95.1	3,002	2,406	596	4.9
New Mexico	233,343	209,739	163,568	46,171	89.9	23,604	20,347	3,257	10.1
Oklahoma	530,520	513,500	376,984	136,516	96.8	17,020	[3] 13,600	[3] 3,420	3.2
Oregon	386,487	359,987	266,774	93,213	93.1	26,500	[4] 21,100	[4] 5,400	6.9
Texas	2,042,212	1,915,612	1,496,830	418,782	93.8	[3] 126,600	[3] 109,600	[3] 17,000	6.2
Utah	219,812	214,812	161,684	53,128	97.7	[3] 5,000	[3] 4,000	[3] 1,000	2.3
Washington	618,011	569,176	437,370	131,806	92.1	48,835	40,569	8,266	7.9
Wyoming	78,628	74,678	57,103	17,575	95.0	[3] 3,950	[3] 3,600	[3] 350	5.0
Outlying parts:									
Alaska	37,672	36,017	30,923	5,094	95.6	1,655	1,374	281	4.4
American Samoa	6,070	5,012	4,510	502	82.6	1,058	971	87	17.4
Canal Zone	12,697	12,118	9,589	2,529	95.4	579	(5)	(5)	4.6
Guam	16,531	13,397	11,129	2,268	81.0	3,134	2,463	671	19.0
Hawaii	157,809	[3] 130,158	100,503	29,655	82.4	27,711	20,708	7,003	17.6
Puerto Rico	616,886	[3] 564,041	488,322	75,719	91.4	[6] 52,845	[6] 39,584	[6] 13,261	8.6
Virgin Islands	9,021	6,392	5,429	963	70.9	2,629	2,333	296	29.1

[1] Represents nonpublic enrollment in full-time regular day schools only. For enrollment in other types of nonpublic schools, see table A.
[2] Enrollment not cumulative but as of a specific date.
[3] Estimated.
[4] Distribution by grade group estimated.
[5] Distribution by grade group not available.
[6] Data for accredited schools only.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think it is important for the purpose of considering this amendment that we should all understand that there are very great differences, indeed, between the District of Columbia and the 50 States. Ever since the Constitution was adopted and the District of Columbia was set aside as the seat of the National Government, not only has it been, in fact, different from each of the States, but also it has been treated differently by Congress.

I submit to the Senator from Arizona that his argument is not tenable when he assumes that because the District of Columbia gets somewhat different treatment than the other States, the other States, too, should be upgraded. In point of fact, the District of Columbia is a large city which is surrounded by a metropolitan area which it cannot tax. A majority of the students in its school system are of the Negro race. The District of Columbia does not have the tax resources which are available to States because it cannot impose any taxes at all unless Congress is willing to permit it to do so; and Congress, as the Senator from Oregon has said, has not been willing to permit the District of Columbia to do so.

Actually, the condition of the educational system in our major cities is a

critical one, indeed. The only reason it has not been necessary to call the attention of the Senate to the critical condition of the larger cities has been that only in the case of Washington is the city a unit of local government not surrounded by a State which has taxing powers under which the State is able to help the city. However, I think it would be proper, for the purpose of this argument, to have printed at this point in the RECORD a research memorandum of the National Education Association which deals in statistical terms with the condition of the cities with respect to the educational expenditures and also with respect to the difficulties in which they find themselves because their public schools have a very high percentage of students from low income families. As wealth flees to the suburbs, it can be taxed to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; it can be taxed in the State of Delaware; it can be taxed in the State of Connecticut. But such wealth cannot be taxed in the District of Columbia because in this area such wealth comes under the taxing jurisdition of Virginia and Maryland.

I close with the commet that I really do not believe an argument can be made that because certain States would receive certain amounts under the bill, with which they are, perhaps properly, not satisfied, a good ground exists for singling out the District of Columbia for special treatment. The District of Columbia has always received special treatment, and in my judgment it is entitled to receive special treatment in the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania that the District of Columbia is a city which is not surrounded by enlarged areas which it can tax. I recognize that anything that is done for the District of Columbia is done at the will of Congress, so to speak.

However, the same argument the Senator has used has been used for low-income States which have taxable property. We are picking States in the South, for example, which have low taxing policies, probably because of low values. So we cannot isolate the District of Columbia and say that it is different. We are doing this for a number of States in the South, and, I may suggest, for other parts of the country, where the argument is that the income is so low that they need help from other States.

I believe that any State which is not helped by the formula certainly has a right to receive the same kind of treatment which is given the District of Columbia. This is not a District of Columbia appropriation bill or authorization bill; it is a Federal aid-to-education bill. All the States and all our possessions should be treated alike under the formula.

I believe we must admit that we are deviating from the rule with respect to a number of States in the South, whose expenditures for schools have been low, possibly because of low income or low taxation which produces school income. I cannot quite accept the argument that the District of Columbia must receive separate treatment.

Mr. President, when the distinguished Senator from Oregon has completed his statement, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum, but not until that time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will permit me to make a brief statement, he can then ask his questions based on the entire statements of the Senator from Pennsylvania and me.

We have not violated the rule of fairness. We are only seeking to establish a program which we are satisfied, based upon the expert advice we have received, is fair. We believe the District of Columbia is not being dealt with fairly, just as we believe Alaska and Samoa are not.

With respect to the territories, such as American Samoa, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands, the figure is 0.75 instead of the 0.50 which we are recommending for the District of Columbia.

Furthermore, let us face up to the fact that Connecticut and Delaware are two States which have a very high percentage of private school students. Connecticut has 17.6 percent; Delaware, 19.3 percent. I have no reason to speak with absolute assurance on this question, but I believe the probabilities are very great that in due course of time the National Defense Education Act will, undoubtedly, be modified, with some expansion with regard to funds already provided for special purposes for education in private schools.

When that is done, Connecticut and Delaware will be direct beneficiaries of those appropriations, far in excess of the overwhelming majority of the other States of the country which do not have so large a private school population.

Furthermore, this amendment will do something for the District of Columbia which is sorely needed. When all is said and done, it will help to earmark some funds for schools. That is one of its effects. Let us not forget that the city government has no control at all over its own tax collections, insofar as income is concerned. The District of Columbia Commissioners have no power to distribute these funds, other than as is done by means of the District of Columbia appropriation bill. The Members of Congress are the bosses in that connection; in fact, they constitute the District of Columbia School Board, for all practical purposes. So we must consider whether we are being fair to the District of Columbia schools. The fact is that we are not. Now we have an opportunity to be fair to the District of Columbia and, in effect, to have these funds earmarked for the benefit of the District of Columbia schoolchildren.

We must remember that a great many of the people who live in the District of Columbia, particularly the military personnel, send their children to the District of Columbia schools, but make relatively small contributions to the District of Columbia, insofar as its income is concerned.

At this time I wish to refer to a statement which was made to the committee by Helen E. Samuel, executive secretary of the District of Columbia Education Association. I have worked for years with that association, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee. This afternoon I speak in two capacities—one, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and, second, I draw on my experience as a longtime member of the Committee on the District of Columbia. So I wish to say—as one of the aldermen of the District of Columbia, so to speak—that the Clark amendment is particularly equitable and fair, because the District of Columbia schoolchildren need the kind of help they will receive under this amendment.

Helen Samuel pointed that out fairly well. In her memorandum, which is applicable to both the bill as it was then before the committee and the bill as it is now before the Senate, she stated the following:

> The District of Columbia Education Association wishes to call to the attention of the committee that under the bill Washington, D.C., a big city with a full load of special educational problems, will be eligible to receive only the minimum allotment of $15 per pupil in average daily attendance. Yet the surrounding metropolitan area partly in Virginia and partly in Maryland, to which the city has been losing many of its high-income families, would be eligible to receive from $18.28 to $26.34 per pupil. Since the District of Columbia is not a part of a State there is no source from which to draw the 10 percent for special projects except from the allotment of $15 per pupil in average daily attendance. Yet table 6 in the attached report ("Income and Population Trends in the 20 Largest Cities") reveals that in the last decade the District's population declined by 4.8 percent, while the school population increased by 20.8 percent. During this same period the District of Columbia school system received a gradually declining percent of the total appropriation for the city (from 22.5 percent to 19.1 percent as revealed by the attached table.)

She closed her memorandum as follows:

> In considering this request, we urge the committee to give due recognition to the fact that, unlike the surrounding areas, where in addition to State aid, a very substantial percent of current educational expenditures is received under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815, Washington, D.C. receives no Federal assistance under these laws which are amended to become permanent in titles 2 and 3 of the currently proposed public school assistance bill. The District of Columbia public school system will be further penalized unless the committee sees fit to increase the currently planned allotment of $15 per pupil.

That memorandum was based on the original formula; but it is equally applicable, as regards the comments she makes in reference to Maryland and Virginia, to the present formula; and it is equally applicable, insofar as her comments are concerned, to Public Law 874 and Public Law 815; and it is also applicable when we consider the fact that the District of Columbia funds still have not been earmarked and appropriated for the public schools in the proportion which I am satisfied they would have

been if the citizens of the District of Columbia had an opportunity to exercise home rule and thus to exercise pressures upon their legislators—with the result, I believe, of bringing about a greater allocation of District of Columbia funds for public-school purposes. Whose fault is that? Let us admit frankly that it is our fault.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Does not the Senator from Oregon think the position of the District of Columbia residents would be much better fortified if they had representation in the Congress by two Senators and by proportionate representation in the House of Representatives, rather than to have home rule?

Mr. MORSE. I hope the Senator from Connecticut will not draw me into a home rule debate tonight. I have some suggestions to make about that matter, of course. I believe that as a matter of right the people of the District of Columbia should have the right to govern themselves. The Senator from Connecticut and I may disagree about the form to be used in that connection; but I believe that to the extent that Congress now exercises control over them, Congress should treat them better, especially as regards the allocation of funds for the public schools.

Three years ago I called attention to the fire hazard at Hines Junior High School. Of course, that school is not the only one in the District of Columbia that is a fire hazard. At that time I warned the Congress that it should see to it that more money was earmarked for educational purposes in the District of Columbia, or else there would be a serious fire. Not long after that there was a fire at Hines Junior High School; and the fact that that fire was not a serious and tragic one was due almost entirely to the courage of the teachers and the students. So the fire department put out the fire, although for some time the situation there was nip and tuck. That fire occurred only a few months after I informed the Senate of the danger of Hines Junior High School as a fire trap—a building which had been condemned for years, and over a long period of years no students whatever should have been going to that school.

But only a short time after I made that statement, the fire broke out in that school. Furthermore, as I have already stated, that school is not the only fire-trap school in the District of Columbia.

So I plead with the Senate to increase the allowance for the District of Columbia to 0.50, the national average. Certainly these funds should be earmarked.

Again I wish to be perfectly fair in connection with what some no doubt will say; some probably will say that an increase for the District of Columbia will probably result in a decrease in the amounts for some other areas.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, the important point for all Senators to bear in mind is that if this amendment is agreed to, the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia cannot be less than 0.50, which is what the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia should be; it should be at least that much.

That is my case for the amendment. I think the amendment is fair, in all good conscience.

This argument is so frequently made that I almost hesitate to make it now; but it is so apropos that it should be made: All of us know the direct relationship between the quality of education in a city and the problem of juvenile delinquency. That is particularly true as regards the District of Columbia. As I recall the figures for the District of Columbia, approximately 73 percent of the public school population of the District of Columbia is colored. Recently we have read much in the newspapers about the crime problem and about the fact that so much of it seems to originate in the Negro quarters. So again I make my plea: Let us consider what the research studies have shown in regard to criminology and juvenile delinquency. Certainly there is a direct relationship between the quality of the schools, the quality of education, and juvenile delinquency. I make the plea yet. Of course, it may be said, "Perhaps it ought to be changed a little for Connecticut and Delaware." All I can say is that the best advice and opinion we have received in regard to our formula is that it is the best fair and equitable formula that can be proposed, save and except that we have this disjuncture. We corrected it as to Samoa and Alaska.

Mr. President, I am ready to rest my case. I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Before the Senator concludes, I should like to put into the RECORD two more basic facts. The Senator from Oregon has referred to the fire hazard at the Hines Junior High School, and the fact that subsequently there was a fire there. I point out that 49 of the 165 school buildings owned by the District of Columbia are definitely substandard, and should be replaced.

It is not the fault of the school board. It is not the fault of the school superintendent. It is not the fault of the citizens of the District of Columbia that they do not have funds to replace the 49 substandard school buildings. It is the fault of the Congress of the United States. Now we have a chance to remedy it.

One more fact, and I shall be through. The Senator has referred to the spread of juvenile delinquency. He has properly pointed out the relationship between a good school system and juvenile delinquency. I point out that 29.4 percent of the teachers teaching in the District of Columbia schools are not fully accredited. Why are they not fully accredited? Because there is not enough money to pay teachers salaries high enough to get teachers who are fully accredited.

Therefore, substandard teachers must be accepted. Many of those teachers are fine individuals. Many will become fine teachers. But no school system in which one-third of the teachers are inadequately prepared to teach can hope to cope with the problem of juvenile delinquency.

It is not the fault of the superintendent of schools that there is this high percentage of teachers who are not fully accredited. It is not the fault of the school board or of the citizens of the District of Columbia. It is the fault of the Congress of the United States. Now we have an opportunity to go a small way to remedy it.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator for placing those facts in the RECORD. They make powerful support for the amendment. I congratulate him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an article which appeared in the Washington Post, by Carole H. Bowie, entitled "Wilson High Has Problems Only Money Can Cure."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILSON HIGH HAS PROBLEMS ONLY MONEY CAN CURE

(By Carole H. Bowie)

The Middle States Association of Colleges & Secondary Schools has added Woodrow Wilson high school to the growing list of District schools with problems money could cure.

In a report of a recent evaluation of Wilson's program and facilities, Principal James W. Suber said an association committee commended the school's general effectiveness in meeting the needs of the Northwest Washington community it serves.

The report noted particularly the large number of Wilson graduates—about 85 percent of the 1960 senior class—who entered college, the breadth of course offerings, and apparently high student and staff morale.

The committee, however, found Wilson—which is thought to enjoy one of the city's most favorable school situations—suffering from aging facilities, inadequate counseling and clerical services and too few teachers.

NEW LIGHTING URGED

Lighting in the 26-year-old building, the report stated, is inadequate and should be completely renovated. About $60,000 to replace the bulb-type lights originally installed in 1935 has been requested by Wilson for several years.

Wilson, school officials say, is only one of the city's many old schools where classrooms are too dark to meet current educational standards. About one-third of the District's 122,000 school children are housed in buildings constructed before 1925.

Renovation of lighting systems at two schools—Dunbar Senior High and District Teachers College—was included in the school board's $10 million capital fund request. Only the Teachers College project, however, was included in the District Commissioners $9.2 million school building and improvements budget now before Congress.

Wilson's library, the report stated, is too small and has too few books. To meet professional librarians' minimum standards the school should have 13,000 books—or about 10 for each student. Wilson's collection is about 8,500.

The accrediting committee also recommended that two counselors be added to the staff to bring the counselor-student ratio nearer the 250-to-1 recommended by educators. Wilson now has two counselors with work loads of about 400 students each.

In addition, 3 teachers serve as part-time counselers for 510 10th graders. Funds for

additional secondary school counselors were cut from the school board's 1962 budget request by the District Commissioners.

The committee called for two additional clerks to assume duties such as processing transcripts for college admission—Wilson sent out more than 2,000 last year—now performed by counselors and a committee of five teachers.

MORE CLERKS SOUGHT

With the addition of clerks, teacher time now spent on paper work and counseling might be used to lower pupil-teacher ratios in academic subject classes which the accrediting body found to be too high, Suber said.

English, science, mathematics, foreign language and social studies classes larger than the school board's standard of 25 each are a problem Wilson shares with senior highs throughout the city.

Over half the District's 2,335 high school academic classes are larger than 30 students each. About 53 have 45 or more students. The average class size is 29.7 students.

High schools in the Middle Atlantic area are evaluated about every 10 years by MSACSS teams who compare their judgments of needs and performance with those prepared by the school staff. Recommendations for improvements customarily accompany accreditation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I close by saying that I want to make a plea also for one of the most able school superintendents in America. How fortunate we are to have Dr. Hansen as Superintendent of the Schools of the District of Columbia. He works under very great handicaps, particularly in regard to substandard buildings and fire hazards. He has pleaded time and time again to remove the fire hazards and give the children decent school buildings in which to go to school.

We have an opportunity to help Dr. Hansen by having some of the money earmarked in the aid-to-education bill. I do not think we should forego that opportunity. Here is an opportunity to put the money to work before our eyes in the District of Columbia, for the education of thousands of boys and girls who go to school in the District of Columbia.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on many occasions I have said on the floor of the Senate that I marveled at the wisdom of two Senators on the other side of the aisle; namely, the Senators from Oregon and Pennsylvania. Today, once again in their arguments they presented a good case against what they thought I was going to say. But their argument is wasted; I am not going to oppose the amendment, and at no time have I said I would.

Frankly, I do not know what the committee was thinking about when it wrote the formula as it applied to the District of Columbia. The Kennedy administration has sent a formula to Congress under which the District of Columbia would receive $1,411,000. The committee, at the last moment, out of a clear sky, or through the back door, brought out another formula, in which it decided to add about $200 million to the overall bill, or an increase of 28 percent. But the amount for the District of Columbia was increased about $154,000, to $1,565,000. The District of Columbia got only 4 percent of the increase out of the 28 percent overall addition to the bill. Only about 4 percent went to the District of Columbia. Why is that?

The State of Pennsylvania, which was ably represented on the committee by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] received an increase of around 64 percent in its allotment under the extra addition. But the District of Columbia received only 4 percent. Why?

I can now understand why the Senator is offering the amendment. I think he should offer it. I compliment him on his support of it, but I do wonder why it is only offered at this late date.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I wish only to reiterate what I said before. I would be happy, indeed, to take credit for the increase Pennsylvania received. Unfortunately, as the Senator from Oregon will be able to testify, I had nothing to do with it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is too modest. I hope the Senator from Pennsylvania does not succeed in getting his hand into the Federal purse sometime when he is really trying, because if he got a 65 percent increase without trying, I shudder to think what will happen to the rest of us when he tries. [Laughter.]

Rhode Island received an increase of 90 percent. The District of Columbia received an increase of 4 percent.

The State of Delaware got only 7 percent out of this adjustment. We were already down at the bottom under the administration formula and went even lower in the committee formula.

I can understand that the consciences of some of the members of the committee were bothering them. I compliment them for bringing forth this amendment to correct an inequity in the bill as regards the District of Columbia and not trying to defend a formula which evidently nobody fostered, a formula which, like Topsy, "just growed." Hearings were held for a number of weeks on the administration bill, then all of a sudden we read in the newspapers that there was another formula being approved.

This second formula really ruined some of us.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. My conscience has bothered me. I am trying, as we sing in an old hymn, to "Wash me whiter than snow." I want to wash my conscience with regard to the District of Columbia. I have been trying to do it for years. I plead with Senators that now is the time to do equity to the District of Columbia.

If the Senator wants to know where the formula comes from, I point out that last year we held lengthy hearings. This is the basic formula of S. 8 of last year, which was voted and approved by the Senate, and which the then Senator from Massachusetts, Senator Kennedy, voted for. So this formula was not suddenly pulled out of a hat. We had the entire background of information on it.

From the very beginning there were deliberations on the bill. I assure the Senator that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and also the administration officials at the White House, gave it consideration. One night, at the home of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, we talked at great length.

The Senator from Pennsylvania will verify what I now say, that from the very beginning certain members of my subcommittee said we were not going to change the formula of S. 8, that we were going to retain the basic formula contained in S. 8. It was a matter of give and take. I think the RECORD should show how we hammered out this final formula on the anvil of discussion and debate with the administration.

I did not get a chance to answer the point during the debate the other day, and I am glad the Senator has brought it up now, but I do not want the legislative history on the bill to close without my saying, as the floor leader on the bill, that this formula was not drawn out of a hat the night before it was reported from the committee.

For several weeks this formula had been discussed by those of us on the administration side. We finally said, "We have now come to the conclusion that the basic formula in S. 8 is the formula we should recommend and the one we shall urge be included."

That is the explanation and the history of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, hearings were held on the administration bill, which was sent to the Congress, but at some time later apparently there were conferences with administration officials who developed another formula. We now have the bill before us. Apparently there are enough votes to pass it, as the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, but that does not make it right, nor does that mean that it is a good bill. Again I compliment the Senator from Pennsylvania for offering the amendment which would give to the District of Columbia an additional amount of money, because otherwise I would not understand how the committee members could sleep well tonight, realizing that they had added an extra $200 million to the bill and had given an increase in the allotment to the State of Pennsylvania of 63 percent, an increase in the allotment to the State of Oregon of 28 percent, an increase in the allotment to the State of Texas of 45 percent, an increase in the allotment to North Carolina of 45 percent, an increase in the allotment to Michigan of 40 percent, and so on down the line, with Connecticut, Delaware, and the District of Columbia at the bottom.

I can understand how it is that the District of Columbia, which had no representative on the committee, drew a measly 4-percent increase, and I can readily understand why Senators are now trying to increase it. At least they

will be able to go home and sleep a little tonight. I am going to support them in that effort. I point out, however, that this is not the first time the District of Columbia has been taken for a ride.

Under the terms of the bill, based on statistics furnished by the Department of Commerce, if the bill is passed as it is now before the Senate it will cost the taxpayers of the District of Columbia $5.8 million in additional taxes to pay their proportionate part of the $850 million program. Those taxpayers would receive $1½ million without the Clark amendment, or they would lose $4.3 million under the terms of the bill.

How will this help the District's educational problem?

This is the second Federal aid program which the Senate has passed under the New Frontier. I know that those who live in the District of Columbia wish to know how they are faring on the New Frontier under this other program.

On March 16 we passed H.R. 4806, to provide an extension of unemployment compensation benefits. Under the terms of that bill the employers of the District of Columbia will pay $5½ million into the Federal Treasury. The residents of the District of Columbia will collect in benefits $2.2 million. This represents a loss of $3.3 million.

In respect to the two bills, aid to education and aid for the unemployed in the District, the District of Columbia will lose $7.6 million. The amendment would give back $2½ million.

Where will the $7.6 million which is to be taken from the District of Columbia go? It will be used to underwrite the expenses of educational systems in the so-called poor States throughout the United States—Texas, for example.

Where will the money for unemployment compensation benefits go? To whom will the extra money be paid under the terms of the extension of unemployment compensation benefits bill? This time it is to be used to underwrite payments in the poor States in the North—I emphasize, the poor States in the North, such as New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania.

All the bills define which are the poor States, and which are the rich States, and set out that the rich States, which have a great deal of money, can afford to help pay for the poor States. But the States keep switching sides.

For instance, on March 16th we had under consideration a bill under which the great State of Pennsylvania was listed as one of the poor States. Pennsylvania presumably could not possibly meet the cost of the extension of unemployment compensation benefits without some assistance from some of the other States it was contended. As a result of the heroic appeal by my good friend from Pennsylvania the Senate passed a bill under which Pennsylvania would then get assistance from the "rich Southern States." Under that bill Pennsylvania gained some $14.3 million for unemployment compensation benefits. Based upon the Department of Commerce statistics Pennsylvania will receive under the extension of unemployment compensation benefits bill $85 million in benefits, and will pay as its proportionate part of the cost of the bill, $70.7 million. That gives Pennsylvania $14.3 million, which the then defined richer States of the United States are asked to provide. That bill was passed on March 16, 1961.

Which were the rich States on March 16 which were to help Pennsylvania? From where was the money for Pennsylvania to come? The State of Tennessee at that time was defined as one of the rich States. The State of Tennessee contributed $7 million more than it received to help underwrite the expenses of the unemployment compensation benefits for Pennsylvania and other Northern States.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. CLARK. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Three and one-half million dollars was contributed by Mississippi to help the poor State of Pennsylvania. Mississippi, under that bill was a State which was listed as able to help these poor Northern States.

Yes, Mississippi was listed, under the extension of unemployment compensation benefits bill as one of the richer States. The Administration said it could afford to help the "poor States" in the North which could not afford to meet their own problems of unemployment.

Under that other bill another rich State was Alabama. Alabama contributed an extra $2.2 million as one of the rich States to assist in meeting the unemployment compensation expenses in the States of the North. Now, this bill lists Alabama as a poor State needing Federal assistance.

Today we find under the definition of the bill before the Senate that Pennsylvania is listed as one of the rich States which can help Alabama meet its educational problems. This is a complete reversal in 3 months.

In other words, money was taken from the South and brought to Washington, D.C., under the terms of one bill to aid Northern States, and now under the terms of this bill, money from the North is to be returned to the South.

The operations is like a merry-go-around—only it is more expensive. What is overlooked is the fact that as the money goes through the city of Washington and is siphoned off to these States there is taken a political brokerage, or a cost which is necessary to maintain the bureaucracy which administers these programs.

That is the reason we have here in Washington an ever-expanding bureaucracy. New programs mean new office buildings, more bureaucratic jobs, more patronage for the politicians, and more controls and taxes for the American taxpayers.

I have yet to hear of a man who ever went to a race track who did not say he made money. Everyone says he makes money at the race track.

Mr. MORSE. I do not. I do not bet.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. To hear them talk they all make money; yet we all know that at the race track the track takes a percentage of all that is bet on every race. Mathematically we know that only the track makes money.

The same is true with regard to the Federal aid programs. We start these Federal aid programs, and everybody is told he is going to get something for nothing. The money is siphoned through Washington, D.C. The money is distributed, but the people lose sight of the fact that there is a political brokerage which is taken out as the money goes through Washington. The people lose on every Federal aid program.

To show how ridiculous the formula under the first bill was I cite that under the terms of the bill Pennsylvania was listed as one of the poor States of the Union which was unable to meet its obligations with respect to its unemployed.

Under the terms of the bill now before the Senate, Pennsylvania is listed as one of the rich States. Now Pennsylvania will provide an extra $14.9 million for the same States from which 3 months ago it collected $14.3 million.

That is not an uncommon situation. It is also true with respect to the neighboring State of New York. Under the terms of the bill which was passed on March 16th, the great State of New York collected in benefits $170 million, yet would pay into the program only $119.9 million. The State of New York collected $50.1 million more than it will pay under that bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he leaves Pennsylvania?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure my friend I am not leaving Pennsylvania, but I am glad to yield to him at this time.

Mr. CLARK. I merely wish to express my deep gratification and pride that the Senator from Delaware intends to vote for the District of Columbia amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remark. I assure the Senator that his amendment is a worthy amendment, and I shall certainly support it; but at the same time I want to point out the utter ridiculousness of the formula of his bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on a question of fact?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to my good friend from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am not sure I heard the Senator correctly, but I thought I heard the Senator say that under the terms of the bill my State of Oregon would get 90 percent more than it would have received under the terms of the original administration bill. Did I correctly hear the Senator?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No. I do not think I mentioned Oregon. It was Rhode Island that got a 90-percent increase.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; the Senator did.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oregon will get a 28-percent increase, as I understand the situation.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to submit the figures in that regard.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The 90-percent figure relates to the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator referred to Oregon. Will he permit me to give the figures for Oregon, so that the RECORD will be accurate?

There is no intention on the part of the floor leader of this bill, who comes from Oregon, to get any undue amount for Oregon.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It is a 28 percent increase which the State of Oregon would receive—I think the Senator will find I did not refer to 90 percent for Oregon, and if I did it was in error, for that figure relates to another State——

Mr. MORSE. I think it was an error.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Twenty-eight percent is also the average that was being added to the overall program.

Mr. MORSE. I think it was an error.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator will find I mentioned another State as getting the 90 percent.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator turn for a moment to table 3 on page 98 of the transcript of hearings? That table shows the "Estimated allotments to States under the proposed administration School Assistance Act of 1961."

That was the original proposal. My State of Oregon would receive $7,095,843, based upon a $666 million authorization.

If the Senator will turn to the table on page 4 he will see that under the bill which the committee brought to the Senate, my State of Oregon would receive $9,042,171 out of—not $966 million, but $850 million. So there is a difference of $250 million in round numbers between the authorizations. According to my figures, Oregon's allotment was increased not 28 percent, but about 8 percent over the 3-year life of the bill. The total amount was raised about 1 percent. That is considerably less than 28 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have checked the figures, and I suggest that the figures which the Senator from Oregon has quoted are the figures I am using. The amount provided in the original bill for the State of Oregon was $7,095,843. Under the bill reported it would now receive $9,042,171. That is an increase of nearly $2 million, or about 28 percent. If the Senator will recompute his percentage he will find the increase, which is approximately $2 million, is not 8 percent but is nearer the figure I stated. It is a $2 million increase based on $7 million.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Delaware is completely eliminating one point from his calculation. If one is going to figure the cost of this bill with relation to what my State will receive, he must figure it on the basis of 3 years, and not on the basis of the first year. The Senator from Delaware is taking only the first year. He must take the cost of the bill on the basis of 3 years, and when he does so, I think he will find that my State would receive an increase of some 8 percent only, in contrast to the suggested 28 percent.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am taking the figures which are before us, which are the figures for 1 year. I quoted, and the Senator from Oregon quoted, figures for 1 year.

Mr. MORSE. It is purely a matter of mathematics, and I am willing to abide by the result of the mathematical calculation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The amount would be increased from $7 million to $9 million, and the District of Columbia would be increased 4 percent, or from $1,411,000 to $1,565,588.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it not a fact that the increases which have been identified by the Senator from Delaware are the product of the fact that the pupils of both public and parochial schools are counted in the reformed bill, and the public school pupils are not counted by themselves?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That statement is correct and is a part of the reason for the increase. The remainder of the amount results from the fact, as the Senator from Oregon pointed out, that about $200 million was added to the cost of the bill, which when divided up would result in greater benefits to practically all States. It should be pointed out at the same time that the additional cost was added to cover the $200 million.

Continuing my statement, I think a comparison of the two Federal aid programs is interesting. Under the New Frontier there is a trend toward the philosophy that someone can get something for nothing from the U.S. Government. We are now told that all we must do is to pass a Federal aid program such as the Federal aid to education bill or any other program, and someone would have some free money to spend.

I should like to emphasize that the Government has no access to mysterious sources of income. The only money that we can distribute is the money we take either directly or indirectly from the pockets of the taxpayers.

In the early part of the year we passed H.R. 4806, the Unemployment Extension Act. As I mentioned before, under that bill the State of New York was listed as a poor State, needing Federal assistance. It would collect $170 million, whereas it would be expected to pay $119.9 million under that bill, or $50.1 million over and above what it would put in.

Yes, that bill was presented on the basis that the great State of New York was not able to underwrite its own unemployment problems and needed the assistance of the richer States of the South. Now, where did the $50 million come from which New York received under that earlier bill?

Under that bill we find that the State of Missouri was listed as a rich State, able to contribute $12.6 million to relieve unemployment in the poor States in the North.

The State of Arkansas was listed as one of the rich States under that bill and it contributed $600,000 to help the North.

The State of Oklahoma defined as another rich State, contributed $3.1 million under that bill to New York, Pennsylvania, and other so-called poor States in the North.

The great State of Texas contributed $12.1 million, in a humanitarian effort, as one of the rich States in the South, to the poorer States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York.

The State of Florida contributed $11.9 million to the unemployed in New York.

The State of Louisiana contributed $200,000 as its share to help the North.

Georgia under the bill which we had before us about 9 weeks ago was listed as a rich State. It contributed $4.7 million, which was drawn from the State of Georgia and used to provide benefits for the unemployed in the North.

From the State of Kansas, $5 million was drawn to help the unemployed in the poor States of New York, New Jersey, Michigan.

All of the other States which I mentioned as being listed as rich States last March, and which were helping New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania in their unemployment problems, under this bill before us here today, are now listed as the poor States that cannot underwrite their own educational systems, and therefore under the bill New York would contribute $75.5 million toward the effort to help them.

All that we had to do was let them keep their own money in the States and they could have financed their own unemployment and educational problems.

It is true that New York would lose $25 million in the transfer when both bills are considered. Under the definition in the bills we find that New York was first listed as a poor State and others as rich States. Now New York is defined as a rich State, although it could be said that New York was listed as a little bit richer rich than it was poorer poor.

Under the Federal aid to education bill the great State of New Jersey, one of the rich States, will help the educational problem in the poor States of the South.

Under the bill we find that the State of New Jersey would pay into the Federal Treasury $36.9 million as its part of the cost and then collect in benefits only $16½ million.

Thus it would contribute $20.4 million toward the education system of the poor States in the South. This is very complimentary. However, about 9 weeks ago, when we considered the unemployment bill, under the definition in that bill New Jersey was listed as one of the poor States in the Union that could not underwrite their unemployment problem. Under that bill, passed just last March, the "poor State" of New Jersey received $11½ million in extra benefits

from other so-called rich States to assist it in its unemployment problems.

Where did New Jersey's $11½ million come from to pay their unemployed? $1.8 million was taken from the State of South Carolina, which under that bill was one of the rich States. South Carolina contributed $1.8 million to help New Jersey and the other "poor" Northern States.

Just last March the State of Virginia contributed $10.6 million over and above the benefits it received to help underwrite the unemployment problem in the State of New Jersey. Every time this money comes through Washington we will deduct the so-called political brokerage to establish a bureaucracy to administer these various programs.

Actually, the State of Virginia gains $9.4 million under this Federal aid to education bill but under the other bill passed last March, the Unemployment Extension Act, Virginia lost $10.6 million. Thus, Virginia is over one million dollars worse off when these two programs are added together.

I call attention to the fact that the State of Iowa, under the pending bill, would gain $4.3 million to help improve its educational system. This bill is designed on the basis or theory that Iowa is a poor State and cannot afford to underwrite its own educational system.

Yet on March 16, only about 9 or 10 weeks ago, we passed another bill which took from the State of Iowa $10.8 million, against a reimbursement of $3½ million. This means that when the pending bill is passed, the State of Iowa will have $3 million less to underwrite its educational system than it would have had had neither of these two bills passed. Iowa's educational program is $3 million worse off after the passage of this bill.

Under the pending bill the State of Kansas would gain $3 million. Under the bill passed last March the State of Kansas lost $5 million. Therefore the State of Kansas is $2 million worse off than it would have been if it had never heard of either of these New Frontier bills.

The State of Maine gains $1½ million under the pending bill. It lost $2½ million under the bill which was enacted 9 or 10 weeks ago. Therefore the educational program of the State of Maine is $1 million worse off as the result of the New Frontier policy.

A great deal of this money goes to pay the political brokerage or salaries of the bureaucrats who are dreaming up these programs. They are sitting up nights trying to figure out ways in which they can spend the money of the American people.

I cite the case of the State of Michigan. The State of Michigan is always on the gravy train. It is defined as a poor State under both bills. Yet, Mr. President, who is there in the Senate who would say that with proper financial control over expenditures, the State of Michigan could not meet its own obligations? It is its own fault that it is near bankruptcy.

The State of Minnesota gains $4.7 million under the pending bill. Who will say that Minnesota cannot underwrite its own educational system? It is interesting to note that, while under the pending bill Minnesota will gain $4.7 million, this is exactly the same amount which would be lost by the District of Columbia under the committee formula. The District of Columbia, without the adoption of the Clark amendment, would lose $4.3 million, so it could be said, in effect, that if the bill were enacted as approved by committee, the District of Columbia would pay that $4.3 million to underwrite the educational system of Minnesota.

Can any man argue that the District of Columbia is so well fixed financially that its residents can shoulder an additional $4.3 million tax burden to finance Minnesota's educational system?

I cite these examples to point up the unfairness, the absurdity of the committee bill.

I say it is ridiculous, it is absurd, and this formula cannot be justified by any line of reasoning. Another example:

The State of Nebraska is told that it cannot underwrite its own educational system. The bill then gives $2 million in extra money to Nebraska. That is over and above what Nebraska is expected to pay. But just 9 weeks ago we took $4.7 million from the State of Nebraska to help underwrite the unemployment problems of what was then described to us as the poor States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and so forth. Nebraska's educational system is $2.7 million worse off as the result of these two bills.

So far as the State of Delaware is concerned, we are hooked on all programs. We are used to it, as the Senator from Connecticut has pointed out, but we do not have to like it.

The trouble is that many States have not made an effort to support their own educational systems. Others did not make an adequate effort to take care of their own unemployment problems.

The States of Delaware and Connecticut have bonded themselves. We have underwritten our educational systems by bonding and taxing our States.

In Delaware there is an income tax and an inheritance tax as well as a corporation tax on corporate earnings. In addition, we have the highest per capita debt of any State. The State of Connecticut, which is trying to do the job of supporting its own educational system, is the State with the second highest capital debt.

We created that debt largely by trying to underwrite our own responsibilities. We built our own schools. Now, under this bill we will be forced to pay extra taxes to pay for the educational systems of other States which are unwilling to help themselves.

The State of Texas, which under the pending bill would receive substantial benefits, is a case in point. Under the bill Texas would receive $58 million against a proportionate payment of $36.7 million, or a gain of $21.3 million. That is on the basis, apparently, that the State of Texas is a poor State and cannot underwrite its own educational system.

In the State of Texas the wealthiest oil man pays no income tax. The State of Texas has no income tax or corporation tax. The wealthiest man in Texas is paying less in State income taxes toward the support of the educational system in the State of Texas than the man who drives an oil truck in Delaware pays toward the support of the educational system of our State. States which want Federal aid for the support of their educational systems can at least make an effort to tax their own millionaires before asking for Federal aid. I have no sympathy for these poor millionaires who ride to the poorhouse in Cadillacs and are always begging for Federal aid.

I for one am growing tired of helping States which make no effort toward financing their own educational system or to take care of their own unemployment problems, and which are always asking the Federal Government for support. If the State of Texas has no State income tax and no corporation tax, that is its business; but when the State of Texas asks the State of Delaware to help underwrite its educational system, then it becomes our business.

It is time some of the States which are always talking about States' rights—and I have argued for them as much as anyone else—to begin talking about States' responsibilities. It is a ridiculous situation when the richest man in Texas is paying less toward the maintenance of his State's school system than a teacher in the State of Delaware pays in income tax toward the support of her own salary. A teacher in Delaware pays more toward the support of the schools in our State than the wealthiest oil man in Texas pays in State income taxes toward the support of his schools.

My neighboring State of Pennsylvania does not have an income tax. That is its own business. On the other hand, why should the State of Pennsylvania under the pending bill, expect our State to underwrite its educational system.

How can you ask the State of Delaware to support a bill which would require the State of Delaware to help support the educational system in Pennsylvania? I am sure my friend from Pennsylvania admits that the State of Pennsylvania does not need relief. Yet under the bill the State of Pennsylvania would get a 60-percent higher allocation per pupil than would the State of Delaware. The per capita debt of Pennsylvania is $114.18. It has no income tax. The per capita debt of the State of Delaware is $463.35. Delaware has an income tax, an inheritance tax, and a corporation tax.

Why can Pennsylvania not finance its own educational system?

Some of the States which are talking with bleeding hearts for the passage of this bill had better stop and think where they are going to get the money to pay the cost. I could make an eloquent appeal for some of these programs, too,

if we forget the cost. How did the committee arrive at the figure of $15.66 per pupil for the great State of Pennsylvania and $26.76 for Alabama, when only 9 weeks ago, when we passed H.R. 4806, the great State of Alabama was listed as one of the rich States, and the great States of New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, and the other States were appealing for relief.

Under the pending bill States which were listed as poor States under the unemployment bill are practically the same States which are now listed as the rich States. This is nothing more than an excuse for some people to get their hands on more money as it goes through Washington.

I should like to read a list of allocations per pupils in the respective States which are represented on the committee: Alabama, 26.70; Michigan, 17.65—I have often heard that Alabama is, perhaps, one of the poorer States; but when did Michigan become unable to provide for the education of its pupils—Oregon, 19.49; Texas, 21.84; Pennsylvania, 16.56; West Virginia, 24.60; New Jersey, 11.98.

Under this bill, Connecticut and Delaware are being asked to provide a portion of their tax money to underwrite the educational systems of New Jersey, New York, as well as other States.

Massachusetts, 13.38, is 30 percent higher than for Delaware and 40 percent higher than the allotment for Connecticut.

All of these allotments are higher than the allotment for the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia went to the bottom, even lower than the State of Delaware.

Mr. President, I shall support the amendment giving extra funds to the District, I do not think the members of the committee could go home and sleep tonight if the amendment were not passed. Certainly any bill which takes from the District of Columbia the way this bill does is wrong.

Under both bills—under the bill which was first passed last March and under the bill as it stands before the Senate today without the Clark amendment, we shall be taking $7.6 million of the District of Columbia taxpayers' money and disbursing it to the 50 States in the Union over and above what the District of Columbia will get on the basis that the District of Columbia is one of the rich areas of America, and is able to underwrite the educational systems of 49 States, Connecticut being excepted because it is on a par with the District.

The very least that Congress can do is to provide this extra money to the District of Columbia. I shall not endanger the District of Columbia amendment by proposing any amendment to correct what I believe is an inequity to Delaware. I believe it would be unfair to the District not to adopt the Clark amendment.

However, some day there will be a revolt on the part of the taxpayers. I do not believe Congress can continuously siphon money into Washington under the guise of giving all the people something for nothing.

Mr. President again I endorse the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I express surprise and concern that the committee did not think of this proposal earlier. I simply do not understand by what line of reasoning the committee did not think of it when it decided to add $200 million to the bill, a 28-percent overall increase.

I do not know what they were thinking of when the State of Pennsylvania took a 63-percent increase in its allotment and gave the District of Columbia a 4-percent increase. I do not know what the committee was thinking of when it decided to give a 63-percent increase to Pennsylvania and a 45-percent increase to Texas, but gave Delaware only a 7-percent increase in its allotment.

Furthermore, it is time for the committees and Members of Congress to realize that these programs cannot be financed on hot air; they cannot be financed on promises.

If the bill is enacted, the Federal Treasury does not have the $850 million to pay the cost of the bill. Before 60 days are out, it will be necessary to increase the ceiling on our national debt and borrow the money and thereby charge the cost of the bill against our children and grandchildren. The only alternative is to raise taxes.

I should like to see the day come when all such bills could be accompanied by revenue-producing measures and thus let those who are fighting to give this money away express some of their enthusiasm as they fight to increase the taxes to pay for the projects. When they go back home, they can then brag to their constitutents how they have increased the taxes to pay for the programs. I wonder if there would be the same enthusiasm in voting for and bragging about the tax increases which will be necessary to finance programs as there is when we go back and brag about the benefits.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this point in my remarks a statement showing the benefit payments, the cost to the State, and the gain or loss under S. 1021, the School Assistance Act, and similar figures under H.R. 4806, the Unemployment Extension Act.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Figures in millions]

	S. 1021, School Assistance Act			H.R. 4806, Unemployment Extension Act		
	Benefit payments[1]	Cost to State	Gain or loss	Benefit payments[2]	Cost to State[3]	Gain or loss
Alabama	$24.0	$8.3	+15.7	$10.0	$12.2	−2.2
Alaska	1.1	.9	+.2	2.2	1.2	+1.0
Arizona	7.4	4.8	+2.6	2.1	5.7	−3.6
Arkansas	12.8	3.9	+8.9	4.7	5.3	−.6
California	46.2	93.0	−46.8	80.0	99.4	−19.4
Colorado	8.8	7.9	+.9	2.0	8.3	−6.3
Connecticut	5.2	18.4	−13.2	18.2	18.5	−.3
Delaware	1.2	4.7	−3.5	2.0	3.2	−1.2
Florida	21.9	21.3	+.6	9.5	21.4	−11.9
Georgia	28.0	11.2	+16.8	12.0	16.7	−4.7
Hawaii	3.7	2.5	+1.2	.7	3.1	−2.4
Idaho	4.4	2.2	+2.2	1.6	2.5	−.9
Illinois	31.5	60.8	−29.3	40.0	68.6	−28.6
Indiana	22.7	19.3	+3.4	26.0	28.0	−2.0
Iowa	14.3	10.0	+4.3	3.5	10.8	−7.3
Kansas	11.1	8.1	+3.0	3.5	8.5	−5.0
Kentucky	21.4	8.9	+12.5	15.0	10.6	+4.4
Louisiana	22.2	10.0	+12.2	12.9	13.1	−.2
Maine	5.1	3.6	+1.5	2.0	4.5	−2.5
Maryland	13.6	16.2	−2.6	10.0	15.8	−5.8
Massachusetts	14.7	29.4	−14.7	30.0	34.2	−4.2
Michigan	37.9	38.0	−.1	93.0	46.6	+46.4
Minnesota	18.3	13.6	+4.7	14.4	16.0	−1.6
Mississippi	17.4	3.8	+13.6	2.2	5.7	−3.5
Missouri	18.5	19.4	−.9	11.0	23.6	−12.6
Montana	3.8	2.3	+1.5	1.1	2.6	−1.5
Nebraska	$7.3	$5.3	+2.0	$0.5	$5.2	−4.7
Nevada	1.0	1.7	−.7	2.0	2.0	.....
New Hampshire	2.7	2.8	−.1	.4	3.4	−3.0
New Jersey	16.5	36.9	−20.4	51.2	39.7	+11.5
New Mexico	6.3	3.1	+3.2	2.3	3.9	−1.6
New York	40.6	116.1	−75.5	170.0	119.9	+50.1
North Carolina	33.7	11.7	+22.0	7.9	19.9	−12.0
North Dakota	4.5	1.6	+2.9	.9	1.6	−.7
Ohio	39.5	49.0	−9.5	85.0	62.4	+22.6
Oklahoma	12.6	7.8	+4.8	5.8	8.9	−3.1
Oregon	9.0	8.0	+1.0	10.6	9.6	+1.0
Pennsylvania	44.0	58.9	−14.9	85.0	70.7	+14.3
Rhode Island	3.4	4.4	−1.0	5.5	5.5	.....
South Carolina	20.3	5.1	+15.2	7.3	9.1	−1.8
South Dakota	4.4	1.6	+2.8	.2	1.6	−1.4
Tennessee	23.5	10.1	+13.4	8.0	15.0	−7.0
Texas	58.0	36.7	+21.3	30.0	42.1	−12.1
Utah	6.3	3.0	+3.3	2.0	4.1	−2.1
Vermont	2.0	1.4	+.6	.6	1.7	−1.1
Virginia	23.8	14.4	+9.4	5.5	16.1	−10.6
Washington	12.9	13.8	−.9	8.9	15.4	−6.5
West Virginia	12.9	5.7	+7.2	9.5	8.4	+1.1
Wisconsin	20.0	17.5	+2.5	16.0	21.5	−5.5
Wyoming	1.7	1.3	+.4	1.1	1.5	−.4
District of Columbia	1.5	5.8	−4.3	2.2	5.5	−3.3

[1] Based on committee report.

[2] Excludes payments to Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen in all States except Pennsylvania. Figures furnished by State employment security agencies.

[3] Figures furnished by Department of Labor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in my remarks a statement showing the State gross debt by States in 1942, 1946, 1950, 1958, 1959, and the per capita in 1959.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State gross debt, by State, end of selected fiscal years 1942–59 [1]

State	Gross debt outstanding (thousands)					Per capita, 1959	State	Gross debt outstanding (thousands)					Per capita, 1959
	1942	1946	1950	1958	1959			1942	1946	1950	1958	1959	
Total	$3,256,680	$2,352,822	$5,285,102	$15,393,996	$16,929,769	$98.09	Montana	$13,161	$12,674	$25,088	$44,050	$45,800	$67.85
Alabama	[2] 69,570	[2] 50,211	[2] 53,785	[2] 133,922	[2] 150,930	47.70	Nebraska	1,384	850	1,922	9,689	9,665	6.74
Alaska				2,932		15.35	Nevada	669		775	3,065	2,856	10.50
Arizona	3,663	2,768	3,538	13,248	12,777	10.87	New Hampshire	18,062	11,570	22,472	78,990	85,751	147.34
Arkansas	154,442	134,619	132,791	109,595	105,044	59.99	New Jersey	106,143	63,796	98,686	872,729	874,370	150.78
California	218,241	169,864	263,272	1,455,496	1,711,997	119.85	New Mexico	27,426	21,232	29,886	51,256	50,927	59.56
Colorado	24,089	19,482	14,562	58,361	67,220	40.62	New York	725,311	563,149	866,882	2,074,703	2,433,985	149.21
Connecticut	30,213	22,835	158,509	797,047	873,213	369.54	North Carolina	136,013	101,869	202,322	290,243	273,324	61.16
Delaware	5,874	4,695	78,588	184,217	205,727	463.35	North Dakota	21,866	19,012	43,571	19,580	14,828	23.24
Florida	4,465	4,419	19,696	213,719	250,785	55.54	Ohio	[2] 7,008	[2] 3,708	189,788	852,191	897,768	94.17
Georgia	26,679	8,358	2,829	297,131	308,495	81.46	Oklahoma	54,132	41,261	96,346	201,668	200,825	89.18
Idaho	3,601	355	893	6,258	6,524	10.01	Oregon	31,289	18,283	36,684	219,480	283,182	162.19
Illinois	148,931	104,819	427,772	686,792	667,388	66.74	Pennsylvania	290,644	125,629	804,715	1,214,349	1,278,787	114.28
Indiana	7,960	7,210	14,946	355,401	407,288	89.22	Rhode Island	29,333	24,417	53,713	106,528	101,785	117.67
Iowa	3,051	1,241	35,144	31,259	56,001	20.14	South Carolina	86,639	74,603	98,725	267,819	268,331	112.23
Kansas	15,522	10,279	5,500	196,612	202,353	95.72	South Dakota	32,415	23,460	37,154	4,734	5,352	7.82
Kentucky	6,843	3,175	7,198	146,315	148,328	48.05	Tennessee	95,995	73,987	99,446	118,487	118,555	34.19
Louisiana	[2] 182,153	156,054	229,474	332,433	362,744	116.75	Texas	[2] 21,242	[2] 12,187	[2] 52,259	[2] 286,051	[2] 316,425	33.94
Maine	26,963	17,028	30,096	116,823	122,565	129.84	Utah	2,590	1,898	993	5,991	9,725	11.33
Maryland	[2] 52,452	34,563	101,771	545,198	558,599	188.65	Vermont	6,204	2,236	6,291	26,578	37,894	101.87
Massachusetts	[2] 111,187	83,967	242,394	1,162,763	1,332,264	271.89	Virginia	27,818	22,530	38,140	188,041	187,115	47.92
Michigan	44,248	23,106	232,137	624,430	729,235	93.13	Washington	17,257	11,894	97,694	348,208	394,148	142.29
Minnesota	105,086	66,157	131,885	132,558	178,081	53.29	West Virginia	79,660	68,226	70,448	283,697	294,634	149.94
Mississippi	80,122	63,370	77,628	123,606	153,246	71.05	Wisconsin	5,403	3,731	4,351	15,303	39,125	9.94
Missouri	[2] 90,093	59,146	40,309	82,926	87,103	20.66	Wyoming	[2] 3,568	[2] 2,901	[2] 2,934	4,456	3,773	11.98
							Hawaii				124,108	172,403	272.79

[1] Comparable data by State available only for 1942 and subsequent years; 1959 total includes Alaska.

[2] Fiscal year ending in preceding calendar year.

Source: Department of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer my amendment designated "5–16–61—E." I ask that it not be read, except by title, but that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Short title

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Educational Opportunities Act of 1961".

TITLE I

Establishment of National Scholarship Board

SEC. 101. (a) There is hereby established an independent body to be known as the National Scholarship Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board"). Such Board shall consist of thirteen members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows:

(1) Five members who are recognized scholars in any of the following fields: Engineering, mathematics, or science.

(2) Five members who are recognized scholars in the field of humanities.

(3) Three members from such fields of endeavor as the President deems appropriate. It shall be the duty of the Board to carry out the scholarship programs provided for in this title. Any vacancy on the Board shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(b) Members of the Board shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 for each day engaged in carrying out this title, and shall be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary travel and subsistence expenses while serving away from their places of residence.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 102. The Board shall make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. All actions of the Board shall be by majority vote of the members thereof.

Award of scholarships

SEC. 103. (a) The Board shall establish principles and policies to be followed in the selection of individuals to be awarded scholarships. Such principles and policies shall provide for the selection of individuals to be awarded scholarships by objective examinations designed to measure achievement, such as the cooperative achievement test of the Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. The Board shall establish a minimum attainment grade for such examinations and notwithstanding the number of scholarships authorized in this title for any year, a scholarship shall not be awarded under this title to any individual unless he equals or exceeds such minimum grade. As part of such examination, the Board shall require each individual competing for a scholarship under this title to submit an original theme or composition written in English, as well as a written translation, of such material as the Board may prescribe, from English into a foreign language and from a foreign language into English. Scholarships awarded by the Board shall be known as "national scholarships".

(b) To be eligible to compete for a national scholarship, an individual (1) must be in his last academic year of secondary school or must hold a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, (2) must have completed (or be in his last academic year toward completion) four academic years of study in English, three academic years of study in mathematics, three academic years of study in history, three academic years of study in foreign language, and three academic years of study in science or in Greek or Latin (if such Greek or Latin study is not used for the foreign language requirement above); (3) must have attained, or be reasonably assured of attaining, secondary school grades which average in the upper 15 per centum of the group with which he is completing secondary school; and (4) must make application for such scholarship in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Board may prescribe.

(c) Examinations for determining national scholarship winners shall be scheduled by the Board as as to permit the announcement of winners not later than the first week in March in each year that such scholarships are awarded.

(d) There are authorized to be awarded one thousand national scholarships for education beginning in the academic year which begins in the calendar year 1962, and for each academic year thereafter.

(e) All recipients of national scholarships shall receive a certificate signed by the members of the Board designating the recipient as a "national scholar."

Institution of higher learning to be attended

SEC. 104. An individual awarded a national scholarship may attend any institution of higher learning which will admit him if such institution (1) admits as regular students only persons having a certificate of graduation from a school providing secondary education, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate, (2) is legally authorized to provide a program of education beyond secondary education, (3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, and (4) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited.

Amount and duration of scholarships

SEC. 105. (a) The scholarship allowance to be paid each academic year to an individual awarded a national scholarship shall be

determined for each academic year by the Board on the basis of the estimated expenses which will be incurred for such year in attending the educational institution in which he is enrolled. In no event shall such allowance for any such year exceed $3,000, nor shall such allowance for the first such year be less than $500. The scholarship allowance shall be paid in such manner and at such times as the Board may prescribe.

(b) The scholarship allowance herein provided for shall be granted for a period of time not to exceed four academic years, or such longer period as is normally required to complete the undergraduate curriculum which the recipient is pursuing; but in no event shall such allowance be paid beyond the completion by the recipient of the work for his first bachelor's degree. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the scholarship allowance shall be paid only so long as the recipient (1) devotes substantially full time during the academic school year to educational work at the educational institution which he is attending, and (2) maintains the standards and requirements prescribed by the institution he is attending and those prescribed by the Board. If the recipient fails to maintain such standards and requirements, his national scholarship shall be terminated and he shall be dropped from the program.

Appropriations

SEC. 106. There are authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Credit against income tax for real property taxes paid for support of public elementary and secondary education

SEC. 201. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 38 as section 39, and by inserting after section 37 the following new section:

"SEC. 38. REAL PROPERTY TAXES PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the taxes on real property paid or accrued during the taxable year which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education, but only to the extent that such taxes do not exceed the lesser of—

"(1) $100, or

"(2) the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the credits allowable under secton 32 (relating to tax withheld at source on nonresident aliens and foreign corporations and on tax-free covenant bonds), section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), and section 37 (relating to retirement income).

"(b) INCOME TAX BENEFITS NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—If the amount allowable (but for this subsection) as a credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year, when added to the amount by which the tax under this chapter for the taxable year is less by reason of the deduction allowed under section 164 for real property taxes for which credit is otherwise allowable under subsection (a), exceeds the total amount of real property taxes paid or accrued during the taxable year which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education, the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF REAL PROPERTY TAX PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the amount of any tax on real property which is imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education shall be—

"(1) with respect to any real property tax imposed solely for such support, the amount of such tax; and

"(2) with respect to any real property tax imposed in part for such support, the portion of such tax—

"(A) designated in the bill for such tax submitted to the taxpayer by the taxing jurisdiction imposing such tax; or

"(B) determined from information set forth in such bill or from information furnished to the taxpayer by such taxing jurisdiction,

as the amount of such tax which is imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) TAXES MUST BE DEDUCTIBLE.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any real property tax unless such tax is allowable as a deduction for the taxable year under section 164.

"(2) TAXES CONSTRUCTIVELY PAID.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the provisions of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 164 shall apply to real property taxes with respect to which credit is allowable under subsection (a)."

(b) The table of sections for such part IV is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 38. Real property taxes paid for support of public education.
"Sec. 39. Overpayment of tax."

Deduction for expenses incurred in providing higher education

SEC. 202. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as section 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"SEC. 217. EXPENSES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction the expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year which are incurred by him, by his spouse, or by a dependent (as defined in section 152(a)).

"(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EXPENSES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'expenses for higher education' means amounts paid for—

"(A) tuition and fees required by an institution of higher education for attendance at such institution;

"(B) fees required by an institution of higher education for a course of instruction at such institution;

"(C) books, supplies, and equipment certified by an institution of higher education as necessary for a course of instruction at such institution; and

"(D) meals and lodging while attending an institution of higher education, but only if the individual for whom such amounts are paid is, at the time such expenses for meals and lodging are incurred, a full-time student at such institution or is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(2) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which is accredited by a recognized national or regional accrediting agency, and

"(B)(i) which is authorized to confer any baccalaureate or higher degree, or (ii) whose curriculum consists of courses at least two-thirds of which are courses of instruction within the meaning of this section.

"(3) COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.—The term 'course of instruction' means a course of instruction for the successful completion of which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree by an institution of higher education authorized to confer such degree, or which is required for graduation by the institution of higher education offering such course.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EXPENSES OF EACH INDIVIDUAL.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education of any one individual paid during the taxable year only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $2,000.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education of the spouse of the taxpayer paid during the taxable year only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(3) MEALS AND LODGING.—

"(A) FULL-TIME STUDENTS.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed—

"(i) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution away from home, $90, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an educational institution away from home, or if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution away from home; or

"(ii) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution not away from home, $45, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an institution of higher education not away from home, or, if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution not away from home.

"(B) LESS THAN FULL-TIME STUDENTS.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses of higher education described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is not a full-time student but who is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed an amount determined under subparagraph (A) (i) or (ii), whichever is applicable, except that, for purposes of this subparagraph, there shall be substituted for $90 in subparagraph (A)(i), and for $45 in subparagraph (A)(ii), an amount which bears the same ratio to $90 or $45, as the case may be, as the number of hours in which such individual is enrolled bears to the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(C) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), a month during which an individual attends an institution of higher education for less than 10 days shall be disregarded; and an individual who is attending an institution of higher education not away from home, but who is required by such institution to accept meals and lodging furnished by such institution,

shall be treated as if he is attending an institution of higher education away from home. For purposes of this section, the amounts paid for meals and lodging of an individual while he is attending an institution of higher education not away from home shall, in the case of meals and lodging furnished to such individual by the taxpayer, be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. For purposes of the preceding sentence, a month during which an individual is in attendance at an institution of higher education for less than 10 days shall be disregarded. For purposes of this paragraph, an individual who is attending an institution of higher education not away from home, but who is required by such institution to accept meals and lodging furnished by such institution, shall be treated as if he is attending an institution of higher education away from home. For purposes of this section, the amounts paid for meals and lodging of an individual while he is attending an institution of higher education not away from home shall, in the case of meals and lodging furnished to such individual by the taxpayer, be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(4) OTHER PERSONAL AND LIVING EXPENSES.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), deduction shall not be allowed under subsection (a) for any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for any personal or living expenses. In the event an amount paid as tuition or fees includes an amount for any personal or living expense (including meals or lodging) which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount paid which is attributable to such personal or living expense shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(5) TAXPAYERS HAVING SUBSTANTIAL TAXABLE INCOME.—The amount which (but for this paragraph) would be allowable as a deduction under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer (computed without regard to this section) exceeds—

"(A) $10,000, if the taxpayer is unmarried and is not a head of a household (as defined in section 1(b)(a) for the taxable year, or is married and files a separate return for the taxable year, or

"(B) $20,000, if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return with his spouse for the taxable year, or is a head of a household or surviving spouse for the taxable year.

"(d) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as—

"(1) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which, under section 177, is not includible in gross income, or

"(2) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(e) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 217. Expenses for higher education.
"Sec. 218. Cross references."

Effective date

SEC. 203. The amendments made by sections 201 and 202 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment now pending be considered over a 2-hour period, 1½ hours to be allocated to the Senator from Arizona and one-half hour to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida with the understanding that the time for his statement not be charged to my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the time consumed by the Senator from Florida may be charged to the time under my control.

CASTRO, PRISONERS, AND TRACTORS

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, Fidel Castro's callous offer to exchange prisoners for tractors has now put him into the dilemma, in which he had hoped to put the United States.

This offer was made solely for propaganda value. Castro knows and we know that he can obtain and is, in fact, obtaining tractors from Russia and the Soviet bloc nations. Castro hoped to make it appear throughout Latin America that the United States "imperialists" cared more for machinery than they did for human lives, to use his own propagandist's words.

He knows that the U.S. Government could not, and would not, accede to his unconscionable offer, for to do so would put the United States in the position of paying tribute in response to his blackmail.

He was advised that the principle of "millions for defense but not one cent for tribute" still exists in the United States and, indeed, we still embrace that principle.

But where he miscalculated was in not reckoning with the depth of sympathy and the extent of the friendship which the ordinary citizens of the United States feel for the Cuban people as such, and particularly for the Cuban freedom fighters. For now private citizens have, together with the Cuban refugees, responded to Castro's challenge for an exchange of a machine for a life, and now he seeks to squirm out of the deal.

All of Latin America has been horrified and appalled by Castro's Eichmann-like offer to exchange a life for a machine.

The newspaper O Estado de São Paulo in São Paulo, Brazil, São Paulo being the province of the President of Brazil, Mr. Quadros, had this to say:

A tractor will be sent to Fidel Castro by the great liberal newspaper O Estado de São Paulo in order to contribute to the ransom demanded by the Cuban Premier for counter-revolutionaries taken prisoner in the abortive landing operation. At the same time as it announced this decision the newspaper editorial expressed its complete disagreement with the "erroneous attitude of the Brazilian Government toward the problem of Cuba, which is vital for all America."

O Estado de São Paulo writes:

When our Foreign Minister says that it is too soon to know whether the Cuban regime is Communist or not, he contradicts with these words the statements of Fidel Castro and Ernesto Guevera themselves. The truth is that both of them have proclaimed themselves to be disciples of Lenin. Either our Government believes that the Cuban regime is the best, and if it wants to be consistent it must then try to establish such a regime in Brazil, or it must defend our own regime.

The editorial concludes by saying:

What is to be decided is how to protect the dignity of the office of the President of Brazil.

Since I received this particular newspaper, it is my understanding that four more newspapers in Brazil have now made an offer of a tractor, saying that they, too, have finally begun to wake up and realize that in Castro's offer of a life for a machine, they realize the callousness of the Communist government of Cuba. The whole reaction now has begun to work against Castro, and that is why he wants to be released from his offer.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield, although I have only limited time in which to speak.

Mr. JAVITS. I am glad to state, in connection with the statement of the Senator from Florida, that today the New York Post and the New York Journal American have published editorials praising the citizens committee in New York which is seeking to supplement the fundraising effort to which the Senator from Florida has referred.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from New York.

In La Paz, Bolivia, the paper Ultima Hora stated the Castro proposal was worse than Nazi Eichmann's proposal to barter Jews for trucks, since Castro was trading his own countrymen and his actions have resulted in Communist establishment of a base of operations in America. The editorial is also harshly critical of Latin American governments which are sympathetic to this "inhuman act."

In San Jose, Costa Rica, La Republica and La Hora front paged the Associated Press story on Castro's proposed barter. An editorial in Diario de Costa Rica calls the proposal cynical and cruel and a genuine example of Marxism which values machines more than man. It calls Castro's Cuba more Communist than any Iron Curtain satellite, and states Castro stays in power only through a reign of terror. The editorial adds that the proposal is hardly surprising, however, since Castro is "possessed of devils, Marxist, atheist, and inhuman."

In Montevideo, Uruguay, El Bien Publico—Union Civica and La Manana Colorado Independent followed the same editorial approach on May 19, comparing

Castro's offer to Hitler's offer to exchange Jewish prisoners for trucks. El Paid—UBD—stated they found it hard to believe, but, if true, is simply further proof of Communist disregard of human beings, and that Castro had arrived at the extreme of selling Cuban citizens for machinery. They also compared it with the Moorish custom of selling Christian prisoners for money.

No wonder that Fidel Castro is desperately endeavoring to change the terms of his offer, because it has been for him a monumental propaganda blunder. It has opened the eyes of doubters and dreamers to the cruelty, the callousness, and the materialism of the Communist ideology as it is practiced in Cuba today.

I am satisfied that if the Government of the United States continues to follow the present position of "hands off" with respect to this problem, with all of its humanitarian appeal, and leaves it to the private citizens here in the United States and in the neighboring Latin American countries, the solution can be found, the lives can be saved, and all Latin America can be thoroughly awakened to the terrible danger of communism.

An extra dividend may well be that, through this cooperative effort, we shall finally realize the unity of the peoples of this hemisphere in a giant, joint effort to stop the encroachments of communism in all of Latin America, and the pressing need to cooperatively eliminate communism from Cuba at the earliest feasible moment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I did not understand the statement the Senator from New York made.

Mr. JAVITS. I referred to editorials published today in two newspapers in New York City. The editorials commented favorably on the effort of private citizens to do something about this matter, without all the implications—blackmail, and so forth—which some are trying to read into this situation. The editorials bore out the fundamental thesis which just now has been explained so very eloquently and well by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the Senator from New York willing to have the editorials printed in the RECORD?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; but that will have to be done tomorrow, for the editorials were published only today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to point out that no doubt Castro wanted the people of the United States to state, following his proposal, "We cannot do it"; and in that event Castro would have been able to say that although the United States had been talking for 20 years or more about how much it wanted to help the countries to the south of it, nevertheless, when the time came to save the lives of these people, the United States would not do anything about it. In my judgment, if that had been the case, the back of the revolutionary movement would have been broken.

In addition, Castro wanted to have word go throughout Latin America that although the United States has talked about progress in the housing field, yet the United States would not give up construction equipment—wheelbarrows or shovels or tractors or bulldozers—in order to save lives; and Castro hoped thereby to win a tremendous propaganda victory. But he did not realize the depth of feeling of the people in that connection. Newspapers all over Latin America are showing that the people are appalled by what Castro has done.

So now Castro is trying to say, "I will not deal with citizens' groups. I want to deal only with the Government."

Mr. President, the Government should stay out of this situation. We are now about to win a tremendous propaganda victory over Castro, because he has put his foot right into his mouth. At any rate, I hope the Government will stay out of this situation, and will permit our people to continue to act. By this means, the people all over Latin America will be able to realize the dangers of communism.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I do not have the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have the floor; and I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy may continue, but that the time required for it be not charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this is a very important subject. I know the able Senator from Florida has studied it very carefully. Will he inform us as nearly as he is able to, based on what he has been able to learn from the press and in other ways, how many prisoners are being held in Cuba, today, by Castro?

Mr. SMATHERS. Over and above the so-called freedom fighters?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; the 1,200.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over and above the 1,271, my information is—although I cannot vouch for its authenticity—that in the neighborhood of 100,000 people are being held.

Mr. CARROLL. A few days ago I read in the newspapers that the estimated number was 147,000. However, whether it be 100,000 or 50,000——

Mr. SMATHERS. The information is that on the night of the revolution, Castro picked up 147,000 or 157,000. Since then, approximately 50,000 have been released; but 100,000 are still incarcerated in theaters and in pens of all kinds, under the most terrible conditions imaginable.

Mr. CARROLL. In order to be conservative, let us say that the number still held by Castro is only 50,000. But regardless of the exact number of prisoners Castro still holds, certainly the negotiations are most important, for they involve thousands of people. So if the Government of the United States has to negotiate on this basis, let the negotiations be across the board.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not disagree with the Senator. I merely say I do not think the Government, itself, is in a position to become involved in this particular matter. The whole burden of what I was trying to say is that citizens' groups do a much more effective job. I understand the Government has taken no particular position with respect to this question, and I hope that will continue to be the case; but I agree that we ought to try to have every prisoner in Cuba released, and, for that matter, anywhere else. There are three boys in Ecuador who need to be released.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator not say that, if we are to negotiate for 1,271 prisoners, we should talk about all the people who are now in prisons, whether it be done by private groups, or by a Commission of the Government, or by the U.S. Government?

Mr. SMATHERS. I could not disagree with the Senator. Certainly, we want to see that all people who are incarcerated wrongly are freed. Certainly, there are some in Cuba. Certainly, if we are to try to free 1,200, we ought to try to free more. Certainly, we should try to free Cuba. Certainly, we should try to get rid of communism there.

Mr. CARROLL. Emphasis has been placed on some 1,200 people. Some persons call it a ransom, some call it blackmail, to exchange machines for men. What about the thousands who languish in the jails of Cuba? It seems to me, they also represent a proper basis for negotiation.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOMER CAPEHART

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, it is not often that well-deserved great tributes are paid to statesmen and other fine public servants while they are still in office; all too often the fine, effective service a man, or a Senator, gives to his country is commented upon after he leaves office.

But today, Mr. President, as the senior Republican Senator, I am delighted to report that one of our most hard-working, truly effective Senators—one who comes from the very heartland of America—has received an excellent tribute from one of Washington's distinguished correspondents.

The Senator is HOMER CAPEHART, the self-made man, who, born on a farm, has worked all his life and succeeded in every endeavor to which he has put his hand. For the past 17 years he has served Indiana in the United States Senate—longer than any other Senator ever elected from that State. This in itself attests to the ability and character of Senator CAPEHART, and likewise to the good judgment of the men and women of his State.

I know only too well, Mr. President, of the capacities within this Senator, because I have known many Senators over the years and know from firsthand experience what a man is and is not. In Senator CAPEHART, as the news story in

the Chicago Sunday Tribune relates, Indiana and the Nation have a remarkable public servant. He ranks high in the councils of his party and his seniority enables Indiana to have unusual representation and attention. His activities encompass a wide range in the Halls of this body: Agriculture, the interests of small businessmen, banking and currency matters, housing and other fields of welfare, and, last, but not least, foreign relations. In passing, I might mention that there are a number of laws on the Nation's statute books today which bear the name of CAPEHART.

The article in the Chicago Sunday Tribune, written by Mr. Willard Edwards, a longtime observer of the political scene, points out, because of space limitations, only a few of Senator CAPEHART's abilities. For example, his very simplicity of action during Senate committee hearings frequently results—and this is well known—in getting to the root of problems.

In foreign relations, he has been ahead of his time. He has called the turn of events time after time, recently in the case of Cuba and Laos. All this is singled out specifically in the newspaper article.

Mr. President, because of this unusual and longtime coming tribute—which all of us are delighted to see—I ask unanimous consent that the story be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITNESSES SQUIRM WHEN CAPEHART CUTS LOOSE ON THEM—EVEN MURROW, AN OLD PRO, GETS THE FIDGETS

(By Willard Edwards)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The two men facing each other were not only opposites in appearance. Their subsequent dialog was to show that they were poles apart in thinking. Neither would ever understand the other.

The Senator on the rostrum was HOMER E. CAPEHART, Indiana Republican, 63 years of age, a portly man with a round, sunburned face. He spoke slowly, sometimes hesitating as he groped for the proper word. He looked like a farmer or businessman and, in fact, is both.

OLD PRO SQUIRMS

The witness in the Senate committee hearing room was Edward R. Murrow, 53, shortly to be confirmed as Director of the U.S. Information Agency. His long and narrow face was pale. His voice, trained by many years of public speaking as a professional television commentator, had up to this moment rolled forth polished phrases in deep, resonant tones.

Now, strangely, the man accustomed to a vast listening audience, was nervous. Little beads of perspiration dripped from his chin, sullying an expensive tie. His left foot beat a tattoo on the floor. Famed for a bored imperturbability, Murrow seemed almost to be squirming.

PERPLEXED BY SENATOR

Some Senators might have given the witness comfort at that moment. They, too, have undergone questioning by Capehart and found difficulty in answering queries of a deceptive simplicity.

The Senator is no orator. After 17 years in the Senate, longer than any other Senator from Indiana in history, he talks as plainly and directly as when he first entered the perilous field of Hoosier politics back in 1942 as a county chairman.

Some might call him a plodder. He wrestles with a legislative proposal, ignores the fancy verbiage in which it may be presented, applies the commonsense which helped him to a highly successful career in the business world before he entered the Senate, and comes up with a practical verdict.

The process frequently baffles minds capable of more agility. On this occasion, Murrow, an idol in the liberal and intellectual world, was plainly perplexed. The Senator's reasoning was beyond his ken.

CAUGHT OFF BALANCE

CAPEHART was openly worried about the methods Murrow would use in his new job as Director of an agency set up to combat Communist propaganda around the world by spreading the American gospel of freedom.

Murrow had been taxed about scores of TV programs he had directed which appeared to concentrate more on the faults of the American system than its virtues. In presenting the United States to the world, he said, he would maintain an editorial balance, not omitting the Nation's weaknesses.

Some excerpts from the questioning:

"Mr. CAPEHART. What do you mean by editorial balance?

"Mr. MURROW. It means, basically, telling the truth insofar as human fallibility permits it * * * one does not get out of balance in reporting of difficult or depressed or contentious areas.

"Mr. CAPEHART. Do you mean that you must cover every phase, be it good or bad?

"Mr. MURROW. Yes, sir.

"Mr. CAPEHART. You intend to tell the bad about the United States along with the good?"

MUST REPORT BAD, TOO

"Mr. MURROW. If the bad is significant, it is going to be reported anyway and we must report it. We must report it honestly, otherwise it will be distorted.

"Mr. CAPEHART. My understanding of your position is that you are to sell the United States to the world, just as a sales manager's job is to sell a Buick or a Cadillac or a radio or television set. Now, I never knew of a salesman who was very successful that ran in advertisements and sales stories the weaknesses of their product and of their company. Now, aren't you selling ideas, just the same, in reality as selling physical things?

"Mr. MURROW. I do not mean to suggest that we should put emphasis on the unpleasant or the unsuccessful. But we cannot be effective in telling the American story if we deny that we have controversies or difficulties."

HE SHRUGS IN DESPAIR

"Mr. CAPEHART. I grew up as a farmer and manufacturer, and salesman. In selling, we deal with positives. We talk completely about our strength.

"Now why can't we concentrate on strength rather than weakness? This Agency (USIA) has not been very successful in the past. Here we sit, a Nation some 180 years old, with the greatest system of government, but other people in the world have not and are not copying it. I would like to see us concentrate on the positive and good. Let them find out for themselves about the weaknesses. If they do, the weaknesses may look so small to them in comparison to the good that they may discount them."

Murrow shrugged his shoulders slightly in seeming despair. As a $200,000-a-year Columbia Broadcasting System executive, he was no stranger to advertising techniques. But the concept that American propaganda abroad should fail to note flaws in the American system was obviously repugnant to him. He seemed about to argue, then remained silent.

RESEMBLANCE TO TAFT

The incident was typical of the Capehart approach to an issue. It has confounded others than Murrow. Senators in floor debate, seldom at a loss for words on any subject, have been known to falter under the persistent prodding of the Senator from Indiana, who insists that complicated legislation be discussed in simple, everyday terms.

CAPEHART puts the questions which many want answered but hesitate to ask for seeming to disclose lack of knowledge. In this respect, he bears a resemblance to the late Senator Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, one of the most knowledgeable men who ever served in the Senate. Taft never hesitated to confess ignorance of a subject and would not render an opinion until he turned it inside out and examined it from all angles.

CAPEHART was born near Algiers, Ind., the son of a tenant farmer, and never got beyond high school. He now owns and operates a 2,400-acre farm where his father once scratched out a living.

CORNFIELD CONFERENCE

He was a traveling saleman for a Wisconsin plow company at the age of 22, became a sales manager for an Indianapolis company, and at 31 organized his own corporation. In 1932, he founded a musical instrument manufacturing company and made a fortune.

He was 41 when he first took a direct interest in politics and gained nationwide attention by sponsoring a Republican "cornfield conference" on his farm in 1938.

In 1944, he was elected to the Senate, was reelected in 1950 and again in 1956. He will seek a fourth term next year and is regarded as a shoo-in.

CAPEHART reports weekly to Indiana, in a radio-TV broadcast, on what's going on in Washington. As a high-ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he has made some remarkable predictions and uttered some blunt comments which make this show sprightly listening and more informative than the product of the big networks.

KNEW LAOS WAS LOST

Thus, on March 31, 5 weeks ago, his listeners knew that Laos was lost to the Communists, a conclusion now visible even to the State Department. He has been urging action for months against Cuban Premier Fidel Castro ("a little bearded fellow with a dirty neck—an out-and-out Communist who's been beating the brains out of the United States").

After the Cuban invasion failure, CAPEHART warned that Cuba had become "as truly a satellite of Soviet Russia as East Germany" and said a further delay "in getting Russia out of Cuba" before it became a great missile base would involve a major war effort in the end.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is recognized. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield myself such time as I need.

Mr. President, I want to voice some general comments and objections to the bill that is now before us. I do not believe in Federal aid to education of any type; but if we must have it, if it is the consensus of the Congress that we must

have it, I believe the amendment which I shall discuss shortly would do a far better and safer job than the bill as it is before us.

The bill to provide Federal grants-in-aid to the States for classroom construction and teachers' salaries for public schools reported by the committee is one which I cannot support. The proposed measure rests on a number of assumptions which I regard as unsound and completely unsupported by the evidence. These false assumptions are:

First. Our public schools are inadequately financed.

Second. There is a substantial classroom shortage in the public schools.

Third. There is a serious shortage of teachers in the public schools.

Fourth. State and local governments are incapable of continuing to finance the public schools.

Fifth. The committee bill is consistent, fair, and equitable in its allocation of benefits and costs.

I am of the opinion that there is no "crisis in education," as claimed by the supporters of the committee bill. Judging by all the relevant criteria, statistical and otherwise, as provided by the bill's proponents themselves, I can find not the slightest justification for extending the activities of the Central Government into the field of education which, both traditionally and constitutionally, has been the exclusive domain of the States and the localities.

On many occasions on the floor I have heard the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the floor leader of this particular measure, speak in general terms. I quote these words from page 8524 of the RECORD of yesterday, May 22:

> I believe it is very important to get on the statute books some legislative principles in regard to Federal aid to education.

This statement appeared on page 8057 of the RECORD of May 16:

> What is new is that we now stand on the threshold of passing a law which will, for this day and age, begin to make significant contributions to the education of all public school children in each of the States, and that we recognize an obligation to do so under the general welfare clause of the Constitution.

The repetition of these remarks, or similar remarks, indicates that the proponent of the bill recognizes that we have no constitutional right to act in this general field. He rests his case upon the general welfare clause, which has never been held to govern education.

We are in a new era, so to speak. We are legislating around the Constitution. We are legislating to the effect that we might satisfy ourselves that we have the right to move into the field of States and localities in relation to the support and operation of the schools.

ARE OUR SCHOOLS INADEQUATELY FINANCED?

The answer to that question is "No." In the past 20 years, enrollment in educational institutions of all kinds and at all levels increased 57 percent, while total educational expenditures increased 642 percent.

Although prices more than doubled during this period, the increase in educational expenditures of 642 percent would still have been 257 percent if computed in dollars of constant purchasing power, as compared with the 57-percent increase in pupil enrollment, a ratio of almost 5 to 1—U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56; Progress of Public Education in the U.S.A., 1959–60; releases of August 28, 1959, and August 14, 1960."

If we look at the share of the national income being spent for education, we find a similar upward trend. In 1890, 1.4 percent of the national income was spent on education. In 1913 it was 2.2 percent, in 1930, 3.7 percent, in 1950, 4 percent, in 1956, 5.1 percent, in 1960, 6 percent. Thus the percentage of the national income going to education has multiplied more than four times since 1890, and increased 50 percent between 1950 and 1960—Roger A. Freeman, "Financing of the Public Schools," volume I: School Needs in the Decade Ahead, 1958, page 5. It is also not without significance, that according to UNESCO figures, almost all other countries of the world allocate a smaller percentage of their national income to education, and that the Soviet Union, whose national income is far smaller than ours, spends no greater proportion on education than do we, erroneous assertions to the contrary notwithstanding.

Growth in our total educational expenditures has outdistanced the advance in both business profits and living standards. Thus, between 1929 and 1958 expenditures for education grew 580 percent, corporate net profits 129 percent. As a percentage of national income, corporate profits dropped sharply from 9.4 to 5 2 percent, while the percentage for educational expenditures rose from 3.7 to 6 percent for the same period—U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education 1955–56; Progress of Public Education in the U.S.A., 1958–59; U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, July 1959."

When we turn to the public elementary and secondary schools, attendance at which has been declining in proportion to our population growth while college and private school attendance has been increasing, we find that the rate of expenditure has gone up more rapidly than the living standards of our people. Over the past 30 years, per capita expenditures for personal consumption have increased 57 percent while public school expenditures per pupil have risen 166 percent, both ratios being measured identically in constant dollars—"Economic Report of the President, January 1961"; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; National Education Association, "Status and Trends, 1959"; Estimates of School Statistics. And while this development was taking place public school expenditures were far outstripping public school enrollments in the rapidity of their increase. Thus, from 1900 to 1961, enrollment multiplied 2.4 times whereas school expenditures per pupil, on the average and in constant dollars, have doubled about every 20 years, and the current school expenditures per pupil have multiplied 8.4 times in terms of the same constant dollar, an increase more than 3½ times as great as the increase in enrollment—U.S. Office of Education; "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–1956"; National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960–1961."

When we examine the population projections made by the Bureau of the Census, the evidence indicates that the peak of educational needs in terms of population growth has already been reached, and that this ratio will decline during the next decade. The school-age group—those between 5 and 17 years of age—increased 46 percent between 1950 and 1960. It is estimated that for the next 10-year period—1960 to 1970—this rate of increase will be cut in half, shrinking to about 20 percent—U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Current Population Reports, Series P–25, No. 187".

2. HOW LARGE IS THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE?

The size of the classroom shortage has been a major issue in the continuing debate on Federal aid to education. Figures on classroom shortages issued by the Office of Education show a shortage of 250,000 in 1950, 312,000 in 1953, 370,000 in 1954, 159,000 in 1956, 142,300 in 1957, 141,900 in 1958, 132,400 in the fall of 1959 and 142,100 in the fall of 1960. If we take these figures at face value, they indicate a reduction in the classroom shortage from 370,000 to 142,100 between 1954 and 1960 without the benefit of a Federal aid program—various reports, Office of Education.

There is, however, some doubt about the accuracy of classroom shortage figures. In March 1955 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare testified before a congressional committee that a revision of estimates placed the expected shortage in 1959–60 at 176,000 instead of the 407,000 he had estimated a few months earlier. Actually, the report issued in the fall of 1960 placed the figure at only 142,100. These estimates are usually based on statistics prepared by the school authorities in each State; there are no national standards, and many believe the estimates reflect the subjective attitudes of the compilers rather than any actual classroom situation. For example, two neighboring States with roughly similar classroom situations, and great similarities in other important respects—Wisconsin and Minnesota—reported classroom shortages of 3,941 and 310, respectively. The disparity is so great as to raise serious doubts about the objectivity of many of these estimates.

At any rate, a comparison of the inventory contained in the long-range phase of the school facility survey of 1954 with the autumn 1959 survey shows that in those 5 years enrollment increased 20 percent, number of classrooms 30 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom was reduced by 2½ from 30.6 to 28.1.

President Kennedy, in his education message, asserted that classroom needs for the coming 10-year period between 1960 and 1970 will be 600,000. This averages out to 60,000 classrooms per year—paper presented to American Statistical Association on December 30, 1959,

by Louis H. Conger, Educational Statistics Branch, Office of Education. However, figures released by the Office of Education disclose that between 1956 and 1961, a total of 349,300 classrooms were built for an annual average of 69,860, or almost 10,000 per year more than the yearly average asked for by the President. Assuming these estimates to be reasonably accurate, it is as plain as a pikestaff that to take care of all estimated classroom needs for the next decade it will not be necessary to maintain even the annual volume of school construction that was completed in the average of the past 5 years by the States and localities acting without benefit of a Federal grant-in-aid program—"Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69," Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, January 19, 1961.

3. HOW SERIOUS IS THE TEACHER SHORTAGE?

Here again we are confronted with highly suspect statistics. Thus, on August 30, 1959, the Office of Education reported a shortage of 195,000 qualified teachers.

But in 1953, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had estimated that the teacher shortage would be 292,000 by the fall of 1960. These huge disparities between projected estimates and actual future developments are common in the discussions of the issue—National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1959–60," pages 10 and 11; U.S. Office of Education, release of August 30, 1959, and earlier releases. They indicate to us that much of the so-called data consists of poetry and propaganda rather than objective research. At any rate, even if we use these dubious statistics, they point only to the conclusion that the so-called need for Federal aid to education has been exaggerated by its proponents. As a matter of fact, the 1959 report on teacher shortages was so severely criticized that the Office of Education omitted a reference to the teacher shortage in its regular report in the autumn of 1960.

Actually, the figures seem to indicate that education has made great strides in meeting its manpower needs. Over the past 30 years, the number of employees in all forms of public education, both lower and higher, increased 140 percent while employment in private industry rose by only 45 percent; but enrollment in public education rose at the same rate as the population of the United States as a whole—45 percent—U.S. Department of Commerce, "National Income, 1954 Edition"; Survey of Current Business, July 1960.

Our public schools have increased their teaching staff proportionately faster than enrollment and the number of pupils per teacher has been consistently reduced. Since 1900, the number of public school pupils rose 140 percent, the number of teachers 250 percent, and the pupil teacher ratio was reduced by 11.2, from 35.6 pupils per teacher to 24.4 for 1960–61. Even if we take the figures for the last 7 years alone, the number of pupils increased 29 percent, the number of qualified teachers increased 40 percent, and the pupil-teacher ratio declined by 2.4 pupils per teacher, from 28.4 to 26.—U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56"; National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960–61."

At this point I cannot resist a further illustration or two of the unreliability of the figures emanating from some of the most active and articulate proponents of Federal aid to education. Thus, in a release dated August 28, 1958, the Office of Education estimated the number of qualified teachers in 1958–59 at 1,334,800 and the shortage at 132,200. A year later, on August 30, 1959, it reported the number of qualified teachers in the same year—1958–59 to have been 1,400,700 or 65,900 higher than previously estimated. But strangely enough, instead of reducing the shortage correspondingly by 65,900, it increased it retroactively by 49,800—from 132,200 to 182,000. In that very same report—August 30, 1959—in which it raised its estimate of qualified teachers for 1958–59 to 1,400,700, it estimated for the next year, 1959–60, a supply of 1,368,000 qualified teachers, a decline of 32,700. But in the December 1959 issue of its magazine School Life the Office of Education reported that the number of qualified teachers had risen during the same year—between 1958–59 to 1959–60—by 55,200. Thus one report suggests a decline of more than 32,000; another, from the same source, an increase of more than 55,000.

When we come to the question of the future supply of teachers the outlook is highly favorable. If the percentage of college students seeking a teaching career merely remains stable over the next decade the number of newly graduated teachers will almost double. But pupil enrollment will be far less, for, as I have pointed out, it will be only about 20 percent as compared with 46 percent during the last decade.

Much has been said about the inadequate earnings of the teacher. But these judgments must remain subjective unless they are based on comparisons with earnings of other segments of our population. The figures show that during the past 30 years—1929 to 1959—teachers' salaries have more than kept pace with the other working elements of our population. In that period, teachers' salaries rose by 106 percent as compared to 91 percent for all persons working for wages and salaries and only 73 percent for Federal Government civilian employees. It should also be emphasized that a huge proportion of our public school teachers are women, and all the surveys on the subject have shown that women teachers average higher earnings than other women college graduates or professional workers.

4. CAN STATE, AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CONTINUE TO FINANCE THE SCHOOLS?

Mr. President, let us take a look at the fourth false assumption, which relates to the question, "Can State and local governments continue to finance the schools?"

I should like to preface my remarks by reading from the April issue of Construction Review of the Department of Commerce. These are extremely interesting figures and show the picture for the first 3 months of 1961, January through March. All private construction in this country for that period was down 5 percent, but public educational construction was up 18 percent. To show increases over comparable months a year ago—January was plus 19 percent, February was plus 17 percent, and March was plus 18 percent.

According to the same source, constructions costs were up only 1 percent over a year ago. This increase is a solid one and a new alltime record volume of public educational construction for the first 3 months of the year. This fact, together with the fact that bond approvals in 1960 were at a record high, proves that there is no slackening, no State and local exhaustion, no state of crisis in the building of public schools, and there has been provision by the localities for the construction of schoolbuildings and also the operation of them.

In December 1959, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducted a telegraphic canvass among chief State school officers, 45 of whom replied; 15 of the States reported having districts which, although needing additional classrooms had reached their borrowing limits and had no access to other funds—Office of Education, "Projection of Earned Degrees to 1969–70"; "Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69." "Survey of Current Business, July 1960"; "National Education Association." "Economic Status of Teachers in 1959–60."

There were 237 such districts, most of them small, out of a national total of over 40,000—a showing that only one-half of 1 percent of all the school districts in the Nation, legally lacked financial means to build needed schools. Despite the heavy burden of Federal taxation, the States and local communities, as I have shown, have done magnificently in meeting their own school needs. The sales of State and local bonds have been at a high level for the past several years, and the overwhelming majority of them are being approved by the votes of the citizens in the States and localities. If the heavy yoke of Federal taxation were eased, there can be no doubt that the States and local community would not only be able, but would be most willing, to increase both their taxes and expenditures for all public services including education.

I remind Senators that about the only tax collector that taxpayers can really get at is the man who proposes school bonds for school construction or school maintenance. He is the only tax collector on whom the American taxpayer can vent his wrath. He can become angry at the Internal Revenue Service and the State collector. But the only one before whom the citizen can rise and shake his finger and say, "No; I am not going to be taxed in this manner," is the man who handles the school bond programs. In most instances he is the county tax collector. I mention this point because most people believe that school bonds are not being voted, when the opposite is the case.

I have heard the argument advanced in the Senate Chamber that local people are not taking care of their responsibility, when in truth the local people have been taking care of their responsibilities to an extent far greater than is needed to overcome any shortage, whether real or imagined.

As I shall shortly show, if, through the adoption of my substitute, we would allow local taxpayers to keep some $3¼ billion in their pockets instead of sending it back to Washington, from which we deduct a brokerage fee and then send what is left back to the States, we could really attack local problems.

Many people have said to me, "How do we know they will spend such money for schools?"

I will discuss this subject later. How do we know they must spend the available money for schools? For example, in my hometown, there is no school shortage at present, but we need many new roads and expanded sewage system. Money would be better spent for such projects, in the judgment of the local people. Then when new school buildings and grounds are needed, it would not be a difficult problem to supply them. I will discuss this subject in greater detail when I reach the discussion of my amendment.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The esteemed Senator from Arizona has indicated that in his area there is an apparent need for highway construction and for the building of sewers or sewage treatment plants. Would the Senator agree that those programs are on a Federal-local basis at the present time in most instances?

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said "highways," I meant to have said "roads," because they are city roads. They are financed by the city. The expansion of the sewer system is financed by bonds. In my hometown we are now in the process of voting on $103 million of bonds to take care of these particular needs, and Federal money does not enter into this particular project.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Perhaps I misunderstood. These Federal statutes call for cooperative effort. There needs to be a sharing rather than a dividing of educational responsibility.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I said "highways," I should have said "roads," because highways are the broad concrete strips upon which we travel across the State. If I inadvertently used the word "highways," I should have said "roads," because I think that "highways" would have a different connotation. City-built streets would probably be better.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am glad my friend from West Virginia put my words right, because I would not want them to be misunderstood by others.

5. INEQUITIES AND INCONSISTENCIES IN THE COMMITTEE BILL

It is plain that, judged by any of the relevant criteria, which we have set forth above, there is no "crisis in education" and no justification for extending the activities of the Central Government into that area as the committee bill would do. But even apart from the lack of need for legislation of this type, the proposed measure is self-contradictory in important respects, inequitable in its allocation of benefits, as we heard earlier this evening, and in a number of instances fails to achieve the President's stated objectives of giving the greatest aid to those who need it most—U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Historical Summary of Governmental Finances in the United States, 1959"; "Governmental Finances in 1959, 1960."

The high-income States which will pay the largest shares of the cost of the program and receive the smallest allocations, which in many instances are considerably smaller than the amounts they pay out, are precisely the States in which most of the increase in school enrollment has taken place. The low income States which will contribute least to financing the program and receive far larger sums in their allocations have had the smallest growth in pupil enrollment. Thus four-fifths of the increase in school enrollment between 1955 and 1970 has and will occur in States with above-average per capita income; but only 6 percent of the enrollment increase will be in the 12 lowest income States.

We need to illustrate only a few of these inequities. According to the Office of Education's 1960 survey, New York State had a net schoolroom need of about 10,200. Texas needed a net of 809. During the 3-year program under the committee bill, New York State, although paying far more than Texas in financing the program, will receive considerably less in allocation, although its classroom needs are 12 times as great.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to emphasize the point the Senator from Arizona has just made. It seems highly inequitable that Texas should receive not a greater percentage of dollars than New York but actually a greater amount in dollars than New York. A formula which results in anything of that kind strikes me as highly inequitable and as being motivated by considerations other than national interest.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I cannot help but agree with my friend from New York. I point out that I put into the RECORD yesterday, I believe, a table showing the assessing practices of the various States. I make a quick comparison between the State of the Senator from New York and the State of Texas which we have been discussing, because they are almost identical so far as value is concerned. It points up why some of the States have not provided proper educational facilities. The estimated market value in dollars of the assessed taxable real property in 1946, which is the last year for which figures are available, shows that New York had a value of $62.1 billion. New York assessed at the rate of 55.8 percent of the market value.

Texas, on the other hand, which has a total estimated market value of $54.4 billion, which is comparable and close to that of New York, assessed at 4.7 percent. The national average is around 30 percent.

We cannot force a State to provide adequate educational facilities, because it has a right to do what it pleases, and I hope the States will never give that right to the Federal Government. If my State, which is about the 29th or 30th wealthiest State in the country, can provide more than an adequate educational system, I cannot understand why the wealthier States cannot provide the same kind of system. It works a complete inequity upon States like New York, which is the leader in public education. California ranks second. I cannot understand why the people of New York and the people of my State should be taxed in order to support education in States which have never adequately supported education.

Mr. KEATING. Under the formula which now exists in the bill a premium goes to those States which underassess their property and do not tax their citizens sufficiently to cover their own requirements for public education. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have to come to that unfavorable conclusion. I had hoped to be able to offer statistical proof to prove that point. However, some States finance education through a portion of their income tax; others through a sales tax; still others through ad valorem taxes. Some States do it through a combination of such taxes. Therefore, it is difficult to arrive at a set of statistics which proves what I have concluded. However, I am convinced that the States which will receive the biggest increases will be States which have never practiced proper taxation methods so far as their schools are concerned.

Wyoming, according to this same survey, will have a net shortage of 22 classrooms but will receive the relatively enormous allocation of almost $5½ million. And finally, Indiana which according to the official Office of Education Surveys, needed 1,505 classrooms in 1959 and 1,321 in 1960 and which more than kept abreast by scheduling the completion of 2,000 classrooms in 1959–60 and 2,152 more in 1960–61 will get more than $68 million under the committee bill, although it actually has more classrooms than the surveys indicate that it needs. It should be added that the average teacher salary in Indiana is also $370 above the national average.

What are we going to do about Indiana? Indiana is taking care of herself. Yet it is proposed to give Indiana $68 million. It will be interesting to see what Indiana finds to do with these funds. Many States in the Union, with proper application of taxation, could more than adequately finance their schools.

In Arizona we found ourselves blessed with a $12 million surplus last year. Most of it came about from raising our sales tax one point in order to take care

of our schools. We are happy that we have this amount to work with.

To return to what the Senator from New York and I were discussing a moment ago, it is not fair to tax States which are taking care of their own to pay for education in States which have never shown any inclination to take care of their own.

Thus it is plain that the operation of the bill's allocation formula is unfair. It appears to us to have been concocted simply with an eye to the unjust results which it actually would achieve, and with little or no concern for equity and fairness.

I would like to make a further comment. The loud fanfares which have accompanied the bill are quite misleading. Many have been led to believe that the bill will add substantially to our educational resources. This is utterly inaccurate. The total amount of aid for public schools which it would provide is about 4 percent of what the States and localities will themselves spend on education during the same period even if they do not increase their own efforts by a single penny. And when we compare this additional 4 percent with the 16 percent by which the States and localities have during the past 5 years exceeded the rate of construction of classrooms asked for by the President for the next 10 years, it becomes apparent that the committee bill will add little to improving our school facilities. But there is no doubt that it will do much to further impair the strength of our constitutional State-Federal system.

Those who speak for the administration in behalf of this bill are equally selfcontradictory in its support. Thus, during the interrogation of Secretary Ribicoff when he appeared before the Senate subcommittee to support the administration bill, he admitted that the States and localities had made enormous expenditures for education during the past 10 years. But he insisted that that was precisely what caused the problem requiring Federal educational grants to the States for its solution, and indicated that the States and localities could not be expected to continue to maintain such efforts. He said:

> Now you have had the fantastic commitments by the States and the local communities in their State and local debt requirements, their expenditures and the increase of taxes. I think that is the reason why we are here now, because of that large increase in the past decade (Public School Assistance Act of 1961, hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 159–160).

He referred to this increase as "indigestible economically" by many of the localities.

But the committee bill, like the administration bill, specifically provides that as a condition of receiving its benefits in full, the States must maintain, at the very least, their present level of school expenditures, and as we read the bill, they are actually required to increase these expenditures.

It necessarily follows therefore that Secretary Ribicoff's implication that the bill would to some degree relieve the States of the need for continuing to make the enormous educational efforts of the past few years is quite inaccurate. To the contrary, it will add to those burdens if they are to secure the full benefits the bill provides.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, Secretary Ribicoff used the expression that the States have taken the position that they are faced with an indigestible economic responsibility; therefore, the Federal Government should supply the States and local governments with money. Except for States which would get back more than they will pay, how would the bill relieve them in their efforts to digest this economic responsibility? Whatever they get, they will have to pay back. Thus the responsibility, in the end, will still remain. The only States to which relief will go are those which will have given less than they will receive; and when one adds up the figures, he learns that the percentage of aid, instead of being 4 percent of the total expenditures that will be made, is probably a fraction of 1 percent.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If the bill is to be made digestible economically, some Federal "alkaseltzer" will have to be provided; otherwise, it simply cannot be done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. By declaring that Congress will provide relief and implying that the States will not have to pay for it, but that it comes as a gift from heaven, the impression is left that the taxpayers will not have to pay for it. That, of course, is a complete fallacy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Ohio is expressing the exact truth about the bill. There is no source of money for the Federal Government other than the people. The idea that Congress can give the States something they do not have to give the Federal Government first is utterly and totally ridiculous. If we are to spend the rest of our economic lives supporting States which have never shown any inclination to take care of their own problems, we shall probably extend our activities further than this.

The State of Ohio will pay into the program $50,050,000 a year. Ohio will receive in return $39,031,368 a year. In other words, the people of Ohio will send $11,018,632 outside their State when they could be using that money to very good advantage to meet their own educational requirements within the State.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Arizona will find that although the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said that by the bill Ohio would be relieved of some of its economic problems, that simply is not so. Some States would be aided, and such aid would not come on an equitable basis or meet any logical formula which would provide the aid proportionately to the States which are in distress.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It would be almost impossible to devise a formula to accomplish what the Senator from Ohio has suggested. It simply will not work out in an equitable fashion.

While the figures I have just read to the Senator from Ohio seem large, he should feel a little sympathetic toward the Senators from New York, whose State will receive $39,735,000 from this beneficent plan. However, to get that amount, New York will have to contribute $118,470,000. In other words, New York will send out $78,735,000 which New York could very well use, I believe, in order to maintain an excellent school system. This is the case all down the line.

Mr. LAUSCHE. From what page is the Senator from Arizona reading?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am reading from page 346 of part 1 of the hearings.

Mr. LAUSCHE. One of the paradoxes I have observed is that under the President's recommendation, Pennsylvania was to receive, I believe, $92 million. Under the committee's formula, Pennsylvania will receive $132 million. My query is: Since when has Pennsylvania become an impoverished State, one which requires Federal financial aid to help solve its fiscal requirements?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not know when it became that way. I have always considered Pennsylvania, with its great cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh—Pittsburgh being one of the great industrial cities of the United States—as being among our better-off States. I was rather surprised to see that Pennsylvania felt it needed Federal aid for education. Actually, Pennsylvania will be out far more than it will receive, under the adjusted formula. I am reading from the original formula. I do not know when Pennsylvania became impoverished.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Pennsylvania simply is not impoverished. Pennsylvania is one of the richest States in the Nation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I shall go to the other extreme and point out the ridiculousness of the formula. Under the original formula, my own State of Arizona would receive $9,043,884; but Arizona would have estimated tax payments of $4,070,000. We do not need it. We have never taken any Federal aid other than under the National Defense Education Act. The taxing efforts we have put forth have resulted in a $12 million surplus. So Arizona is confronted with the fact that it can more than adequately take care of its education system. However, evidently we shall have to swallow that $9 million. I do not know what we will do with it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will Arizona get back more than it pays in?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It will; and we have no right to it, because Arizona can more than take care of itself.

Mr. LAUSCHE. How much more will Arizona receive than it will pay out?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Almost double.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I might enlighten the Senator from Ohio by reminding him of the figures which the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]

brought out, namely, that in the formula which was sent to Congress by the President, but was rejected by the committee, the committee added to the formula. By some curious coincidence, the States represented by members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare got an additional gratuity from the Federal Government. That might have a bearing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand that to be so. I was much impressed by the argument of the Senator from Delaware, who pointed out that in the bill which we passed last March——

Mr. GOLDWATER. The unemployment compensation bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. He stated that certain States received more money under that bill than they would be required to pay, but that under this bill the same States will have to pay more than they receive.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is a sort of whirlygig. Under the previous bill, some States paid out more than they will receive. Now they will be given more than they will pay out. That will leave them where they started.

The fact that the States represented on the committee got more money under the committee version of the bill I ascribe to coincidence.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, yes; under the rules of both Houses of Congress, we must ascribe that fact to a coincidence; so although I join the Senator from Ohio in ascribing it to a mere coincidence, I think the fact is worthy of note.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to say it has been noted with great clarity by the Senator from New York and also by the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to mention the case—reported in the lawbooks—of a defendant who shot the same man on three different occasions. At the first trial the defendant was acquitted, on the basis of his defense that the shooting was an accident.

At the second trial, the defendant was again acquitted, also on the basis that the shooting was an accident.

But at the third trial, the jury decided that it was rather odd that on 3 different occasions the same man was shot by the same defendant, and in each case by accident.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In this case the same animal has been shot several times since I have been a Member of the Senate; and I hope that we can succeed in having it shot this time, and that this time it will fall down for good.

Arizona ranks 35th in income per pupil, but ranks 6th in educational expenditures per pupil—a fact of which we are very proud.

Again, Secretary Ribicoff was asked the following question:

> Now, Mr. Secretary, if all the States and local communities were able to finance their own educational development, in other words if the problem were not a financial one, but rather an unwillingness on their part to expand or improve their education facilities to the degree you regard as necessary, would you still favor a program of Federal aid to education?"

The Secretary replied:

> Personally, if I thought that every community and every State could do their own I would not (ibid., p. 159).

III. THE REAL OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPONENTS OF FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID FOR EDUCATION

As the figures have shown, there is no national necessity for Federal aid to education. The States and localities have demonstrated both their willingness and ability to meet their educational needs adequately. But in spite of the tremendous job which the States and local communities have done during the past 15 years to overcome the backlog of school facilities needed in some areas, a backlog brought on by the depression, World War II, and Korea, the proponents of direct Federal aid to education are nevertheless absolutely insistent that the only way to reduce the backlog is by a massive infusion of Federal grants into the States. In recent years, the same proponents have added to their propaganda the claim that teachers are not paid enough by the local school districts, and, therefore, that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to correct that situation, as well.

It is interesting and significant that the demands for Federal aid to education have grown louder and more insistent as the need for expanding our school facilities diminishes. It is fully apparent that many of those promoting the idea of Federal aid to education are interested only in the element of centralized control, and, consequently, refuse to recognize that the States and local communities have been rapidly solving the backlog problem. They have seen their crisis selling point melt away, in the face of determined local responsibility, and are attempting to cover it up by adding new items to their list of needs and more power to their propaganda efforts. The present offensive for Federal aid to, and control of, the Nation's education is the heaviest ever mounted; and it must be resisted if the real, but rarely disclosed, objectives of these proponents are to be defeated.

The strongest and most persistent demands for Federal aid to education come from organized pressure groups—the professional educationists represented by the National Education Association—NEA—the labor unions, and small but vocal liberal organizations, of which Americans for Democratic Action—ADA—and the American Veterans Committee—AVC—are typical. The professional educationists, particularly, are influential in many State departments of education. That, incidentally, is why, under the committee bill, the entire administration of the program, including the allocation of funds within the States, is placed in the hands of the State departments of education. Legislatures and Governors are bypassed, as are local school boards, all of which have hitherto manifested a complete lack of enthusiasm for a Federal aid program in education.

Thus, the National School Boards Association, which represents the State school board associations and the country's 50,000 local school boards, year after year has refused to endorse Federal aid—most recently at its annual convention in Chicago in April 1960, and at its convention in Philadelphia on May 5, 1961. In short, only a few days ago, at this year's convention of the National School Boards Association—held in Philadelphia—the association adopted a resolution opposing Federal aid to education until the school boards of America express the need for such funds.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona explain some of the details in connection with the Philadelphia convention? Will he state what the convention was and what were the responsibilities in the educational field of those who were delegates to the convention?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall answer by reading into the RECORD a telegram which provides the information the Senator from Ohio desires. As a matter of fact, I referred to this matter several days ago, and that statement appears in the RECORD.

This telegram was sent to me by a lady in Pennsylvania who evidently is a member of the association, and also evidently attended the convention. The telegram reads as follows:

> WYNNEWOOD, PA., *May 19, 1961.*
>
> Senator BARRY GOLDWATER,
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> National School Boards Association Convention, Philadelphia, May 5, 1961, passed resolution "opposing further extension of Federal aid to education until the school boards of America express the need for such funds." Earlier that day convention soundly defeated resolution supporting Federal aid for public schools. Who is in better position to judge needs of public schools than public school directors? Why is their resolution being ignored by the Senate?
>
> Mrs. ROY MCKISSOCK.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am familiar with the resolution. The National Association of School Boards met in Philadelphia; the delegates there represented school boards all over the country; and those school boards have the responsibility of managing and providing the finances for the schools. In their convention they adopted a resolution asking that the Federal Government not go into the program of providing funds for the construction and operation of schools. Is not that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Ohio is absolutely correct; and he will find that a similar statement was previously inserted in the RECORD.

I repeat that the association represents more than 50,000 local school boards; and year after year they have refused to endorse Federal aid to education.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Ohio in regard to certain action taken at the Philadelphia convention of school boards.

Is it not true that at the Republican National Convention in 1960, the views of a much vaster number of persons were ostensibly represented by the declaration, adopted by delegates at that con-

vention, representing millions of citizens, in favor of Federal aid to education?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from West Virginia is absolutely correct that such a plank was included in the Republican platform, just as it is likewise true that both parties included civil rights planks in their platforms.

But in this particular case my heart is perfectly at ease, because I voiced open opposition to this part of the platform. In fact, if the platform committee on education had been allowed to vote out what it wanted to vote out, there would not have been in the Republican platform a plank in favor of Federal aid to education. I know that is a weak argument, because such a plank was voted out. But a survey was made by Dr. Ernest Wilkinson, the president of Brigham Young University, who was a member of that committee. He polled the 1,300 members of the convention, and asked whether they would support Federal aid for school construction and Federal aid for the payment of teachers' salaries. The last information received—and I inserted it in the RECORD some time ago—showed that he received responses from 63 percent of those who were polled—a surprisingly large percentage; and the breakdown of the replies received was as follows:

On the question of Federal aid for the payment of teachers' salaries, 97 percent were opposed, 2 percent were in favor, and 1 percent did not express any opinion.

On the question of Federal aid for school construction, 82 percent were opposed, 17 percent were in favor, and 1 percent did not express any opinion.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I have personal and official esteem for the intellectual integrity of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

I am attempting, for the record of this debate, to indicate that not only the Democratic Party in its national convention, but the Republican Party in its national convention, as well—those duly chosen or elected delegates speaking for the people of the United States of America, studies having been made of the problems of education—gave their stamp of approval to Federal aid to education. It varied, of course, but the stamp of approval was given by the two major parties. To what motive does the Senator ascribe that action?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree that that is the case, but I do not agree that the platforms of both parties expressed the desires and wishes of the American people. I think if that were so, the Democratic platform adopted in Los Angeles would be pressed with more vigor than has been the case. For example, there was a plank in the platform about civil rights. I do not recall seeing anything on the floor about civil rights. When the Republicans try to put civil rights into the bill, we are soundly defeated on it. I toss the question right back: Why is not the Democratic Party doing something about the promise it made?

When I stood up to speak my piece to the people across the Nation, I made it clear what I did not agree with in my own party's platform. I did that because I did not want to be dishonored by coming to the floor and opposing some of the things my party said it was for.

I have cited figures showing all the Republican delegates did not go along with it, even though it was a part of the platform.

I cannot agree that either platform was the expression of the American people. I would dislike to think that the American people had gone so far that they would allow these documents to be written.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to allow me to make a comment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If I had to decide whether the delegates to the association of school boards, on the one hand, or the delegates to the conventions of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, on the other, were the most objective and impartial and best fitted to judge, I would have to answer that the delegates from the association of school boards were. They have an interest in seeing to it that their schools are run economically and efficiently. They would seemingly have their burdens lightened if Federal money were given to them; yet they said they did not want it. On the other hand, the Republican Convention and the Democratic Convention were trying to win votes, and in order to win votes, they were prepared to make promises which would insure the attainment of that result.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, may I comment following the remarks of my courageous colleague from Ohio?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not think the Senator from Ohio really desires the Senate or the country to believe that men and women who stand for public office, and parties setting forth their pronouncements in platforms, are not honest or forthright in their appeal to the American people.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In my view, they are human beings engaged in the game of politics; and, based upon my experience in the past, commitments are made at political conventions primarily for the purpose of attracting votes. There is, seemingly, an auction between the two parties, one hoping to bid more than the other party in order to gain the support of a political segment of the voting public.

That is my candid view, and it is the view I have developed through 10 years in the governorship and 4 years now in the Senate.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the viewpoint expressed is an indictment of the democratic process in the United States of America. We approach these vital matters through the participation of men and women who exercise the franchise of freedom, which is the ballot. To indicate that there is some ulterior motive in the party platform declaration or in the proposal of a candidate as he appears before the people, it seems to me, is an indictment, as I have said, of the very process or system which has contributed so much to the strength of America.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think it is merely a reflection of the weaknesses that reside with people in political life. It is no condemnation. If it is a condemnation, it comes from the fact that in the zeal to win office, there are too many of us who are willing to promise anything and everything. I frankly say that it is not very soothing to me to feel that way, but that is the absolute fact.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I ascribe to the Senator from Ohio the same feeling for intellectual integrity that I have toward the Senator who has the floor. But let us think for a moment what the teachers of America, as well as the members of school boards, to whom reference has been made, have been saying. Certainly, there would be a recognition—not a reluctance, but eager, recognition—that men and women who are the teachers within our educational system in this country come, not with ulterior motives, in asking Congress for Federal aid to education. They represent no improper motive when they say they believe the time is here to share the responsibility on a national level for a better educational system.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I remind the Senator from West Virginia that I have repeatedly seen a statement ascribed to the organization asserting that laymen should not operate the school systems; that they should be managed by professionals. This is what I assert is the end desire of the groups on the outside who advocate Federal aid to education.

I think nobody can argue with the facts of the case, as they were reviewed before the committee. We have been building classrooms at a higher rate than the President has asked for; the teacher shortage has been solved; the increase in school population will be cut in half in the next 10 years; and we have increased our school expenditures by about 15 percent each year for the last 7 years.

There can be no question that the States and localities are attempting to take care of the problem. So there must be some other motive. I suppose, if I were in their place, I might feel the same way; but as a parent, I feel it is my responsibility to pay attention to my own school board. I do not like the idea creeping into the Federal Government that we have the right and the duty to move into the local areas and take over any of the school boards' activities and have control over the schools or education; and that, I think, is what is desired by the groups on the outside who advocate this measure. That is my feeling.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to make a comment. I think these people are

sincere in their arguments, and they feel the aid ought to be given.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank my colleague from Ohio for his statement. I feel that there is no more dedicated or devoted group of citizens in our country than the men and women who teach our youth.

Mrs. Randolph and I have reared two children—our sons now grown to manhood—in educational processes in the public school system. I have watched them develop through the public schools and to evaluate their instructors. By and large, I have felt that those teachers were knowledgeable, helpful, and dedicated. When teachers, almost in concert, feel that this program is important and needs attention at the national level, with a sharing by the States in a common problem, they have a valid influence on my conclusions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I did not wish to impugn the sincerity of any people or of any groups, but I have no recollection of observing any long list of State teachers' organizations which have approved this program. I have no recollection of teachers from my State or from other States approaching me to say that we must have Federal aid to education.

Nor has a witness representing a State or local board of education appeared at congressional hearings to testify for Federal aid for at least 5 years, although several members of such boards have testified against it during that period. Although the overwhelming majority of witnesses before congressional committees strongly favor such aid, it should be noted that they represent teachers associations, other private organizations, or were school superintendents, principals, and teachers. In other words it was the school employees who testified to the financial inability of the State and local school systems, while the lawful governing school boards made no such claims.

In the spring of 1959, the House Committee on Education and Labor asked all Governors whether future educational needs in their States could be met through State and local efforts. Not all of the 39 who responded answered with a clear "yes" or "no." To the extent to which the replies can be classified, they appear as 27 in the affirmative, 7 uncertain, and only 5 in the negative. Interestingly, among the affirmative answers were several Northern Democratic Governors of pronounced liberal views. Some of their statements are most interesting.

Gov. Herschel C. Loveless, of Iowa, said:

I would like to point out that the mechanism of Federal aid to education will not make available economic resources not already available to the various States and the local political subdivisions financing public school systems in this country.

Perhaps the most basic problem to which insufficient attention has been devoted is that of securing efficiency in the operation of our State-supported educational systems. Improved education is not synonymous with more money for education. Realistically viewed, teachers' salaries can be raised in much the same way that wages and salaries have been raised in other industries, that is, by increased output per worker. Reliable statistics indicate that we are making less effective use of present-day employees in the public school system than was being made a half-century ago. Partly the problem is one brought on by the proliferation of courses and of activities not basic to the true functions of a public school system. Partly the problem has been brought on by the growth of an idea that the quality of education depends upon reducing the ratio of pupils to teachers. With modern methods of communication and the vast improvements in visual aids and other techniques for mass education, it is unthinkable that we should continue to require more and more teachers to educate any given number of students.

Declared Gov. Michael V. DiSalle, of Ohio:

It is my feeling that in many cases requests for financial aid from the next highest level of government stems from an unwillingness to face up to increased taxes. Although greater taxes always accompany subsidies, it seems to be less painful if they are levied by another political entity. In Ohio, we are in the process of increasing taxes, much of which can be attributed to increased school subsidy.

Gov. George Docking, of Kansas, said:

It is my opinion that, given anywhere nearly equal opportunity, the local and State governments are better able to solve educational problems than are members of a Federal bureaucracy.

The weaknesses which are apparent in the present educational system are due almost entirely to the development of a bureaucratic psychology at the State and local levels. The system, in my opinion, can be improved only by eliminating the unnecessary bureaucratic ideas at the local and State levels. It cannot be improved by superimposing a Federal bureaucracy on one which is now topheavy with unnecessary, and sometimes detrimental, personnel.

And the Governor of New Jersey, Robert B. Meyner, expressed himself as follows:

The "weakness" of State and local taxing systems is the impact of heavy Federal taxes particularly when the "export-import ratio" is disproportionate, as it is in New Jersey. What is under discussion is a substantial increase in tax dollars, aggregate. State and local tax systems are capable of raising any amount desired so long as the citizen-taxpayer will approve. The State's taxing power is exercised by the people themselves, through representative government. The question of "systems" is irrelevant to the problem. "Tax systems" are concerned with providing methods as equitable as possible for assigning a fair share of the tax burden to each taxpayer. The "system" is not related to amount. That is determined by the effective net rate of the particular "system." Changes of system will not meet the problem presented, for the taxpayer will quickly discover that the change merely meant paying his tax out of a different pocket. This is well demonstrated by those States which have reduced their reliance on property taxes in exchange for sales and income taxes, only to find that, when revenue needs grew they were forced to go back to the property tax for more revenue.

IV. FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION—THE ULTIMATE RESULT

It is plain to see that the citizens, the taxpayers, and their legally elected representatives, both State and local, are not demanding Federal aid to education. The professional educationists and their allies, fully aware of this, realize that their complete control of our educational system can come about only if education is federalized. It is much easier for pressure groups to influence a single legislative body like the Congress, and a single executive, the President, than 50 State legislatures, 50 Governors, and 50,000 local school boards.

I have heard it said repeatedly on the Senate floor that no controls are provided in the bill. That is not the fact of the case. I ask Senators to read section 106(a), which says:

The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year.

If that is not control, I do not know what control means. In other words, the State would not get the money unless its effort equaled the base effort.

Subparagraph (b) of the same section 106 provides:

The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961.

There are controls all through the bill.

In section 106, subsection (e)(1) there is the provision with respect to how the State's effort will be determined. This provides a formula which must be followed. It is a control. If the formula is not followed, the State will not get the funds.

In subsection (e)(4) of section 106 it is provided:

The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title,

If that is not control by a man in Washington, D.C., I cannot read the English language.

Section 108 of the bill relates to sums allocated under section 105, as adjusted by section 106, and provides:

a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) ten cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

Controls? They are all the way through the bill.

Section 109 provides:

Each State education agency shall set aside, from the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106 for any fiscal year, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the sums.

And so forth.

Section 110(a)(1) relates to the application to be made to the Commissioner, and says:

provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

Let us assume that the State does not have such an agency and does not desire to have such an agency. The State could not participate unless it set up the agency provided.

There is a further provision, under subsection (a)(2), as follows:

provides for specifying at the beginning of each fiscal year the proportion of its allotment for such year that will be expended for (A) public school teachers' salaries, and (B) the construction of public school facilities; and provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with sections 108 and 109, shall be used exclusively for either of such purposes;

Mr. President, I could go through the bill page by page. The bill is filled with controls written into it, as have to be written into any bill when we attempt to give Federal grants-in-aid for any purpose.

The proponents of Federal aid insist that funds can—and will—be granted to the States without undue controls. They have inserted in most of their legislative proposals, as they have done in the committee bill, clauses enjoining Federal administrative officials from exercising powers over local schools. But these are pious platitudes designed to divert attention from the inevitability of Federal control following upon Federal grants.

Thus, even the late Representative John Lesinski, Sr., a former chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and himself a leading liberal within the Democratic Party, had no illusions on that score. He stated:

It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid bill which will not contain a great deal of Federal control over local school systems. * * * I am convinced, after the hard study we have put to the question, that no acceptable bill preventing Federal domination of local schools can be drawn. I reluctantly come to the conclusion, but I had to face the facts. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 5, p. 6348.)

As an example of the correctness of Representative Lesinski's assertion, I should like to point out some of the Federal controls in the most recently enacted congressional legislation on education, the National Defense Education Act, Public Law 85-864. Here are a few of the controls contained in that statute:

First. With respect to the payment of Federal capital contributions, the Commissioner of the Office of Education of HEW sets the date for filing the application by the educational institution. He may reallot excess amounts to other States, and he determines the manner in which the installments of Federal contributions will be made.

Second. Participating institutions must make an agreement with the Commissioner providing for certain conditions which must be met.

Third. Loans made by an institution to a student are subject to such conditions, limitations, and requirements as the Commissioner may prescribe; there are eight exceptions which the institution must abide by.

Fourth. Each State must submit a detailed plan to the Commissioner in order to receive payments.

Fifth. Loans made to nonprofit private schools must meet four conditions.

Sixth. The awarding of fellowships depends on the making of certain findings by the Commissioner.

Seventh. The right of a fellowship student to continue to receive payments is dependent upon a finding by the Commissioner that the student is making satisfactory progress in, and devoting full time to studies and research.

Eighth. In order to be eligible for participation in the fellowship program, again the State must submit a detailed plan to the Commissioner.

Ninth. Payment to the States under the vocational education program of the act are conditioned on the State meeting certain requirements.

Tenth. Again, a State plan must be submitted.

Eleventh. Any person receiving funds under the act must take a loyalty oath.

Twelfth. The State plans which are a condition to receiving benefits under the act must contain certain specified provisions.

I agree that many, if not all, of these controls are necessary. After all, the Federal Government, when it spends huge sums of the taxpayers' money, must attach conditions and controls to see that the money is spent both properly and in accordance with the requirements of the law. But they are controls nevertheless, and they are inescapable when the Federal Government participates in any field of activity by spending Federal funds.

But these Federal controls, necessary as they may be, inevitably lead to further Federal controls, which, despite all pious protestations to the contrary, have a direct impact on the substantive content of these programs, an impact which may be directly contrary to the wishes of the beneficiaries.

To illustrate, I should like to refer to the experience of Prof. Claude J. Bartlett, assistant professor of psychology at George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn. He describes the fate of two guidance and counseling institutes set up under title V of the National Defense Education Act. Professor Bartlett participated in both, and was the director of one.

Professor Bartlett points out the following Federal controls and their consequences:

First. In one institute, the standards of admission for students were lowered as a result of pressure from the Federal Government. The result was the acceptance of many persons who were of questionable ability.

Second. Based on the experiences in its first institute, changes in the operations of the second institute were deemed desirable. Nevertheless, the Office of Education refused to permit changes in the plan of operation even though the changes did not affect the cost of the institute as specified in the contract. Thus, the Federal Government dictated curriculum and administration of the institute as well as financial arrangements.

Third. When the contract setting up the institute was signed, the director of the college's child study center was named acting director of the institute. When the college sought to substitute a permanent director to permit the acting director to return to his regular duties elsewhere, the Federal Government refused to allow the change in directorship, thus interfering with the operation of the college.

Fourth. The Office of Education insisted that all of the students of the second institute be recruited before authorization for establishing it had even been completed.

As a result of these difficulties, the college chose to cancel the contract for the institute rather than submit to bureaucratic whims emanating from Washington.

Financial aid to the States could be provided without the possibility of Federal control through purely monetary, nonearmarked, and unconditional grants or tax sharing—Roger A. Freeman, "Grants Without Strings," National Civic Review, June 1959. But the proponents of Federal school aid insist that the funds must not only be earmarked for the schools but also channeled through the U.S. Office of Education and the State departments of education as provided in the committee bill, so as to insure and enforce the supremacy of the professional educationists.

The influence of parents, communities, and legislatures is likely to wane if an increasing share of the funds does not depend upon their approval but is derived from Federal grants. Local boards of education for many years have tended to concern themselves mostly with approving tax rates and bond issues and selling them to the public rather than with the setting of educational policies. They have largely been ratifiers of professional proposals.

School boards which have tried to assert themselves against their superintendents in regard to educational policy have been regarded with suspicion, even with hostility. Thus, an editorial in the publication, the Nation's School, for June 1960, referred to "the indefinable sense of uneasiness" with which some school administrators view the growing strength of school board organizations and questioned whether "the school board is to be secretly appraised as a group to be controlled or stymied." Further, they fear "the possibility that school boards as organized groups may embark upon programs to influence school legislation in direct conflict with the goals of professional groups." Another report of the professionals stated that "the deepening concern board members show for their responsibilities gives rise to a major problem. One aspect of this is the alarm with which professional educators view amateur direction of school policy"—Education Summary, October 12, 1958.

The education reporter of the New York Times warned or threatened that "local boards are in danger of voting themselves out of power, if they refuse to accept guidance from those who will increasingly map out national goals and standards"—Fred M. Hechinger, "School Conflicts," the New York Times, May 29, 1960.

The purse strings have been the main instrument by which communities and boards of education have tried to make their influence upon school policies felt. Federal aid would make it less necessary for educational administrators to bow so low to State legislators, school boards and to the lay public; it would give them more of the independence they have so long sought.

The fight over Federal aid to education has been commonly viewed as a battle over money for the schools. It is conceivable that the real issue is not just money. The crucial issue may well be a power struggle over the control of the schools between the organized profession and the lay public. Federal funds would strengthen the hand of the educational bureaucracy—but it would weaken the authority of the citizens and their communities—Roger A. Freeman, "Financing the Public Schools," volume II, Taxes for the Schools, pages 366–392.

Mr. President, I have spent a good deal more time on the general discussion of the bill than I had intended. I do not believe I have much time remaining. I shall finish the explanation of my amendment, to the best of my ability, in the time remaining. If I need more time, because we discussed the platforms of both parties, perhaps the majority leader might be good enough to allow me more time because of that extracurricular activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I fail to understand why the interjection was termed "extracurricula." When the Senator from Arizona told the Senate that a certain group of school board members in one instance was opposed to Federal aid to education, I think it was pertinent to the discussion for the Senator from West Virginia to remind the Senator of the pronouncement of the Democratic and Republican platforms concerning the very vital subject that we are considering tonight. We are discussing our youth, our most valued resource, and we talk candidly of their educational needs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Possibly it is not extracurricular, because it gave the Senator from Arizona an opportunity to point out that the other side of the aisle has done nothing about civil rights yet. I will stand on what I have said and let it go at that.

Mr. President, I will continue to hope that I can visit with the majority leader relative to a little more time, because we were engaged here in a colloquy that was of pertinence to the bill but was charged to my time and not to the time of the opponents. As I understand, we are trying to get out by 10 o'clock. I think if I might be allowed to go until 9 o'clock, I can finish the presentation of my amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement be modified to permit the Senator from Arizona to speak until 9 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. It is understood that thereafter I shall have half an hour to reply.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank my friend from Oregon.

Mr. President, the amendment to which I address myself is my amendment 5–16–61—E, and it is offered in the nature of a substitute.

Early in this session of Congress, a three-part program dealing with education which I believe if enacted, would provide the solution to all problems, real and imaginary, confronting our educational system today. I now offer as an amendment in the nature of a substitute these proposals.

My substitute sets forth a program dealing with the proper role of the Federal Government with respect to education at all levels—elementary school, high school, and college, university, and institutions of higher learning.

This is a role which must be directed toward helping our people to help themselves without the direct intervention of the Federal Government. It must recognize first and foremost the danger of centralized control over the vitally important area of life encompassed by the education of our children. Then, it must take account of the actual need which exists for expanding and augmenting the facilities which we now have for meeting the Nation's educational needs. Finally, it should use the power of the Federal Government to restore to the States and local governments the financial means to handle the needs that may exist or arise, which have been substantially preempted by the Federal Government.

The problem is one of letting the people decide, in their own communities where that decision can best be made, just what are their educational needs. After that, it is one of equipping them to handle their needs locally, through their own school boards and without the direction of Washington bureaucracy.

The major domestic problem now facing our Nation is the threat of inflation with its disastrous impact on private savings, insurance, pension funds, and social security. This threat has enormous ramifications when applied to our educational problems.

This is true because an increasingly larger share of these funds is being accumulated by parents for the purpose of providing for the higher education of their children, the costs of which are outstripping the ability of many people to keep pace.

I. THE DECAY OF AMERICAN PRECOLLEGE EDUCATION

It is my belief that what is primarily wrong with American precollege education is not lack of money but lack of quality. The deterioration in the standards of the American elementary and secondary school has been recognized not only by leading scholars in and out of the academic community but finally, by the vast majority of the long-suffering American people as well. It seems obvious that huge sums of additional money should not be spent in perpetuating and aggravating our educational shortcomings. Any program which makes additional funds available for use by our elementary and secondary school systems should be accompanied simultaneously by a program designed to induce improvements in the quality of education.

Speaking before the American Society of Civil Engineers in February 1958, Dean Martin Mason, of the George Washington University School of Engineering, stated bluntly:

> Our schools are not fulfilling what should be their main function—basic education and the stimulation of minds. Pupils spend half their time learning social graces, automobile driving and in building their bodies.

Mortimer Smith, director of the Council for Basic Education, in his recent book "A Citizen's Manual for Public Schools," writes:

> To sum up, this should be the bare minimum expected of a normal child finishing the elementary school: He should be able to read and write with some fluency, and spell, add, subtract, multiply, and divide with accuracy; he should know the basic geographic facts of his country and the world, have a knowledge of elementary science; know something of the culture and history of other peoples and much of his own. And above all, his schooling should have taught him the difference between aimless mental activity and orderly thought.
>
> There is a strange quirk in modern educational thinking which produces pessimism about the school's ability to teach such tangibles as geography, spelling, and reading, but optimism about the ability of the school to teach such intangibles as good citizenship and wise use of leisure time and to produce tolerant, well-rounded personalities.

Title I of my amendment provides, as a step in aiding and improving precollege education in the United States, a measure to help achieve these goals which will invoke the most limited participation by the Federal Government but which will be wholly voluntary in character, completely free from any compulsion, either through law or otherwise, and which will be based entirely on the principles of emulation and inspiration.

Title I would establish a national merit scholarship program to make it possible for the most promising students to obtain college and undergraduate university educations, but primarily designed to establish a set of voluntary secondary school scholastic standards which can serve as a guide and a beacon both for the high schools of the Nation and for the parents of America.

These national scholarships will require only a tiny expenditure of Federal funds. They will be severely limited in number but generous in amount so as to be attractive to students and parents alike. They will be administered by a Board appointed by the President, and consisting of scholars and authorities in the humanities, literature, foreign lan-

guages, science, mathematics, history, philosophy, sociology, economics, and so forth.

This Board will implement the basic scholastic requirements for eligibility to compete for these scholarships as set forth in the law itself. These requirements, as a minimum, will include the study in high school of English, foreign languages, science, mathematics, and history—emphasizing American history. The examinations conducted by the Board will require the student to achieve an absolute passing mark. If more students pass than the number of scholarships available, only that number, in order of performance, will receive the scholarship awards. If fewer than this number manage to get the passing grade, then only they will be selected and the rest of the scholarships will remain unused. The examinations will be conducted on a nationwide basis with no geographic restrictions or limitations on the number of students from any State or community who participate or who secure the scholarships. If all of them go to the students of a single State, community or even school, unlikely as that may be, then the rest of the Nation's school system would do well to reexamine their own educational establishments.

There are several beneficial effects which are to be hoped for from this proposal. First, it will encourage a healthy spirit of academic rivalry among the secondary schools of the Nation, similar to that which now exists in athletics and debating. Second, it will spur scholastic competition among individual students. And last, but most important, it will expose the weaknesses in some of our secondary schools while at the same time revealing the strength in others.

The American public will assess the results of these examinations. A school which consistently fails to qualify its students for participation in the examination, or whose students consistently fail to secure any of the scholarships will come under intensive critical scrutiny. The parents and the community will want to know why their children are not eligible to compete; they will ask why their school lags behind while the school in the neighboring county or adjoining State can boast of producing national scholars. Where these seriously inadequate educational standards exist, I am confident that the American people, with their customary diligence, will ferret out the evils which have brought about the deterioration and provide the necessary corrective.

II. FINANCING PRECOLLEGE EDUCATION

The second step in the proposed program to aid and improve education in the United States is a measure which, if adopted, makes all the alternative plans for Federal aid to education, which are currently under serious consideration, irrelevant and unnecessary.

Since the end of World War II, we have witnessed the greatest school building program ever conducted in this country. In the past 5 years alone, 350,000 classrooms have been built, an average of 70,000 classrooms a year, and based on the sale of school bonds for the past several years, there is every reason to believe that this high rate of classroom construction will continue.

In spite of the tremendous job which the States and local communities have done during the past 15 years to overcome the backlog of school facilities needed in some areas, a backlog brought on by the depression, World War II, and Korea, the proponents of direct Federal aid to education are nevertheless absolutely insistent that the only way to reduce the backlog is by way of a massive infusion of Federal grants into the States. In recent years these same proponents have added to their propaganda the claim that teachers are not paid enough by the local school districts and, therefore, that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to correct that situation as well.

It is interesting and significant that the demands for Federal aid to education have grown louder and more insistent as the need for expanding our school facilities diminishes. It is fully apparent that many of those promoting the idea of Federal aid to education are interested only in the element of centralized control and, consequently, refuse to recognize that the States and local communities have been rapidly solving the backlog problem. They have seen their "crisis" selling point melt away in the face of determined local responsibility and are attempting to cover it up by adding new items to their list of needs and more power to their propaganda efforts. The present offensive for Federal aid to and control of the Nation's education is the heaviest ever mounted and it must be met with a courageously sound proposal incorporating the principles of individual freedom and personal responsibility.

I am fully aware that a growing student enrollment has made it difficult for some localities completely to overcome classroom shortages despite the expenditure of considerable amounts of money and effort. I am also conscious of the fact that teachers' salaries have lagged behind those of other professions and vocations, causing some qualified instructors to resign from teaching and enter more highly paid occupations and making it difficult to attract qualified replacements.

However, recently published school statistics dealing with pupil population, enrollment, teachers, and public school expenditures are most revealing. Between 1950 and 1960, public school enrollment increased by 44.4 percent; during this same period, the number of teachers in elementary and secondary schools increased by 51.9 percent, thus reducing the pupil-teacher ratio to 26.4 to 1 as compared to 27.8 to 1 in 1950. But while pupil enrollment and number of teachers are increasing in these ratios, total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools rose by more than 150 percent.

It is quite obvious from these figures that the States and local communities have been making enormous and effective efforts to meet their school needs. Wherever the problem of the need for additional classrooms has not been solved, it has not been due to any reluctance on the part of the local community or the State to find and expend the necessary funds.

In view of the willingness of the State and local communities to keep pace with growing educational needs, I reject the wasteful and undemocratic measures to appropriate for school aid billons of Federal dollars extracted from the States only to be partially funneled back to them again with strict limitations on the use to which the funds may be put.

I believe that the alleged evil plight of our schools has been grossly exaggerated and that the magnificent efforts of our State and local governments to find the money to meet school needs has been largely and purposely ignored.

These efforts represented the quiet response of millions of forgotten Americans to the educational problems arising in their communities. The job was done without fanfare by the people who meet their responsibilities on a day-to-day basis without the benefit of prodding by nationwide pressure group organizations. It represents a monument to the efforts of a free people, working with initiative and enterprise in their own communities to meet the problems of those communities as they arose. This is where the big job of meeting the Nation's educational problems has been accomplished up until now and this is where the job, rightfully, should be finished.

My proposal would provide the means for solving additional school problems, if they really exist, but it would leave the determination of this highly debatable question where it properly belongs—with the State and local communities, and not with the Federal Government. The basic problem, if there is one, is financial. If State and local governments in some parts of the country are unable to keep pace with their school needs it is because the Federal taxing power has preempted State and local sources of revenue. Hence, the proper approach is to compel the Federal Government to restore to the States and localities at least a portion of the tax resources which it has taken away. This is precisely what my amendment would do.

The proposal is a simple one. Every homeowner, every owner of real estate in the United States pays a real property tax to his local community government. In most cases, a substantial part of this tax is used to meet the primary and secondary public school needs of the community whether for new construction or for maintenance, teachers' salaries or other past or current school costs. My amendment would merely provide that every taxpayer who pays a school tax on his real property or as a part of his real estate tax shall, after having calculated the amount of Federal income tax which he must pay Uncle Sam, be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes the full amount of such school property tax, or such proportion of it as will result in a total additional tax benefit to these taxpayers of between $3 billion and $4 billion.

Under existing Federal income tax law, State and local school taxes are

deductible from gross income but the amount actually saved by the taxpayer depends on his Federal income tax bracket. Thus, for example, a taxpayer who has paid $200 in school taxes as part of the local real property tax on his home, and is in the 20 percent Federal income tax bracket, realizes a saving of $40. My proposal would retain this present practice, but in addition would permit him to take a $100 credit against what he owed Uncle Sam, that is, against his net Federal income tax. Hence, instead of a saving of $40, the homeowner under my amendment would save $140 of the $200 he paid in school taxes on his home. Of course, if the taxpayer's school tax was less than $100, he would be permitted to save in toto no more than the actual amount of his school tax.

This tax credit would be available to real property-school taxpayers whether they itemize their Federal income tax returns or take the standard deduction.

The concrete advantages of this approach are overwhelming; let me enumerate a few of these advantages:

First. The tax benefits provided would go directly to approximately 40 million taxpayers, including about 34 million homeowners, who with their families constitute almost 90 percent of our population.

Second. With the Federal Government completely excluded from the program, there would be no danger of Federal control over education. Depending on State law, each community itself, or the State, would be the final judge of how much more it would like to spend on its educational needs than it is currently spending.

Third. The funds made available to the taxpayers are greater than the sums contemplated under any of the other Federal aid to education measures which are seriously being considered; greater even than the combined sums contained in the committee bill and S. 1241, the administration's bill on higher education.

Fourth. Because of the complete exclusion of the Federal Government, there would be no expanded bureaucracy, no Federal administrative costs, and every dollar of tax money thus made available would purchase a full dollar's worth of school aid if the community decided to expand its expenditures for education.

Fifth. Inasmuch as the tax resources of every State and locality would be substantially increased under this proposal, each would have ample funds to provide for its own school needs as it chooses, for none know better what these needs are than the citizens of the States and localities themselves.

Sixth. The so-called richer States would not be required to help finance the school needs of the allegedly poorer States, for under my proposal every State would have sufficient funds to meet its school needs out of its own resources. Rich State A would not be required to pay to the Federal Government in taxes twice or three times as much as it gets back in Federal school aid while poor State B was receiving back in Federal aid two or three times the amount of tax money it paid to the Federal Government as its share of financing the Federal school aid program.

Seventh. Under any of the other proposed Federal school aid measures, States which have fully met their school needs and would not, if given a free choice, expand their school facilities during the next few years would nevertheless be compelled to pay their share in Federal taxes to finance the program. The only way those States could recover any of the money thus extracted from them under these various proposals would be to accept the Federal grants and use them to expand their school facilities. The result would be the highly uneconomic and wasteful extension of school facilities in many areas where such extension is unnecessary and where other more urgent needs exist and must perforce remain unsatisfied. Under my proposal, the use made of their money is not dictated to the taxpayer by the bureaucrats in Washington—it is determined by the taxpayers themselves; that is, by the parent, the citizen, the local school board, and the community.

Eighth. Any objection to my proposal based on the assertion that it would bite into the Federal Treasury is equally applicable to the committee bill. I believe that mine would lead to a good look at the Federal budget and the discovery of many items of less importance, or even of no importance, which could be readily eliminated with no ill effects for the public welfare.

Ninth. If unemployment does not decrease and business continues to falter my proposal will provide the necessary tax relief which some of the proponents of expanded Federal aid programs assert to be necessary to stimulate the economy.

Tenth. The preemption of State and local tax resources by the Federal Government would be diminished, and thus an important step would be taken in contracting big central government and strengthening State and local government.

III. FINANCING COLLEGE EDUCATION

Most American colleges and universities are being forced to raise their tuition fees to cover even a part of their costs. As a result, many families find that financing the higher education of their children is extremely difficult. I believe that higher education for American youth is not only desirable but increasingly essential both in the national interest and for the sake of these young people themselves. I therefore believe that the Federal Government, which absorbs so much of the income of the American people in the form of taxes, should provide some relief in order to encourage and make possible a college education for those who have the ability to perform academic work on the college level.

Providing an education for their children is traditionally the responsibility of the American family and not of the Government. Hence, a Federal program to aid our young people to secure a college education should, wherever possible, avoid the form of Federal grants with their accompanying proliferation of Federal bureaucracy and Federal supervision, which not only wastes funds through unproductive administrative costs but creates a risk of undesirable Federal intervention in the educational process.

The third step in my amendment would provide tax relief for families with children attending college, by granting every family a substantial additional deduction for each child attending college or other institution of higher learning. These deductions will be limited to families in which the set taxable income does not exceed $20,000 after all exemptions and deductions have been taken, including the proposed deduction for children attending college.

SUMMARY OF MY SUBSTITUTE PROPOSAL

1. A PROGRAM PROVIDING FOR THE AWARD OF NATIONAL MERIT SCHOLARSHIPS

A. It establishes a National Scholarship Board, appointed by the President, consisting of 13 members who are recognized scholars in the fields of engineering, science, mathematics, languages—including classical—the humanities and the arts. The duties and responsibilities of the Board shall be to set forth the policies and principles for selection of individuals for scholarships which shall be known as naitonal scholarships. As a part of the examination, designed to measure achievement, the Board shall require each competing individual to submit an original theme or composition written in English as well as a written translation of such theme or composition from English into a foreign language.

B. In order to compete for these scholarships, an individual must meet the following requirements: First, must be in his last academic year or must hold a certificate of graduation from a secondary school; second, must have completed at least 4 years of English, 4 years of history, 3 years of mathematics, 3 years of a foreign language, 3 years of science or, in lieu thereof, 3 years of Latin or Greek; and, third, must be or have been in the upper 15 percent of his class.

C. Each scholarship awarded by the Board shall be for 4 years or such longer period of time necessary to complete the course which the student is pursuing. The amount of the scholarship shall be based on the estimated expenses of the recipient, but in no event shall the amount exceed $3,000 for any academic year. The recipients of these scholarships shall be designated "National Scholar."

D. The Board would be authorized to award every year a maximum of 1,000 scholarships. The Board shall establish a minimum attainment grade for such examinations, and notwithstanding the number of scholarships authorized, a scholarship shall not be awarded to any individual unless he equals or exceeds such minimum grade. Thus, if only 700 of the applicants receive such a grade, only that number will be awarded, and the remaining 300 will not be used. If

more than a thousand applicants receive a passing grade, the scholarships will be awarded in accordance with the principles and policies established by the Board.

E. The examinations conducted by the Board will be on a nationwide basis with no geographic restrictions or limitations on the number of participants from any State or community. This same condition will also apply with respect to the award of these scholarships.

2. TAX CREDIT TO HOMEOWNERS FOR THAT PORTION OF THEIR REAL PROPERTY TAX WHICH IS USED FOR THE MAINTENANCE, OPERATION AND CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

A. The taxpayer would continue to deduct the amount of his real property tax from his gross taxable income; after he determines what his tax will be, he then credits against his final tax that amount of his real property tax which is used for the maintenance, operation, and construction of public elementary and secondary schools.

B. Tax credit would be the amount actually paid by the taxpayer or $100 whichever is less. To illustrate, a taxpayer pays a real property tax of $600, of which $350 is used for public school purposes. As he does at present, the taxpayer would be able to deduct from his taxable income, $600, and assuming that he is in the 20-percent bracket, this would result in a tax saving to him of $120—20 percent of $600. After determining his final tax, for example, $500, the taxpayer would be able to take a credit of $100 against his net tax—thus, instead of paying a tax of $500, he would pay only $400.

C. The taxpayer who takes a standard deduction would also benefit since the credit granted is taken against the final tax after all exemptions and deductions have been made.

D. The deduction, together with the tax credit, cannot result in a saving to the taxpayer of more than the actual amount of that portion of the real property tax devoted to public school needs. For example, the taxpayer pays a real property tax of $100, of which $60 is used for public school purposes. Assuming the taxpayer is in the 20 percent bracket, he would be able to reduce his tax by $20—20 percent of $100—$12 of which is attributable to the tax for school purposes. Giving such a taxpayer a $60 credit—the actual amount paid for school purposes—would return a saving to the taxpayer of $72 or $12 more than the tax he paid for support of public schools. Thus, the tax credit in this case would be limited to $48.

3. TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN ATTENDING COLLEGE

A. The taxpayer is granted an additional deduction from his taxable income for the expenses incurred by him, his spouse or his dependent or dependents, while attending college.

B. Expenses shall include tuition and fees charged by the college for a course of instruction and attendance at such college; books, supplies, and equipment; room and board, whether the student is living on or off the campus. The amount the taxpayer may deduct shall be the actual amount of expenses paid but not to exceed $2,000 for each child attending college. Of this amount, the cost of room and board may not exceed $90 a month while the student is in attendance at college—$45 in the case of the student living at home.

C. In addition to his child or children, the taxpayer may also deduct such expenses which he incurs as a student as well as those of his wife and anyone else whom the taxpayer can lawfully claim as a dependent.

D. The deduction is available to a taxpayer whose dependent is attending a college, university or other institution of higher learning, such as medical school, dental school, law school or other graduate school. This deduction is not available to a taxpayer whose dependent is attending a trade or vocational school or any other school which does not award a baccalaureate or higher degree.

E. The amount of expenses which the taxpayer may deduct from his taxable income shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer exceeds $10,000 if the taxpayer is unmarried or if married, files a separate return, or $20,000 if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return or is the head of a household or a surviving spouse. Thus, if a taxpayer has $2,000 in educational expenses and a taxable income of $20,800, he would be entitled to a deduction of $1,200—$2,000 less $800, the amount in excess of $20,000. The taxpayer thereby reduces his taxable income from $20,800 to $19,600. If the taxpayer is in the 50 percent bracket, he would thereby reduce his tax by $600—50 percent of $1,200.

Mr. President, that concludes my principal statement on the amendment. I am sorry that more Senators are not present, so that I might discuss it with them. However, my time is drawing to a close.

I shall merely say that my amendment would provide all the funds needed for education in this country, but the funds would be provided at the local level. My amendment would do away with the necessity of having money travel to Washington, having the brokerage fee deducted, and having what is left travel back to the States.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I have listened with the greatest of interest to the Senator's description of his amendment. Has the Senator estimated the amount of funds likely to be involved in the operation of his amendment, so to speak? In other words, if the amendment were agreed to, how much money are we talking about in the form of deductions and tax credits? What would be the net effect upon the Federal Treasury? Has the Senator been able to estimate that?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes; we can only estimate it, because we do not know the precise level of income tax collections. Already, through the deduction process on gross income, the amount which is already allowed to stay at home comes to about $3¼ billion or $3½ billion.

My amendment would merely make a tax credit applicable after figuring the net income tax. That would total, I estimate, somewhere between $3¼ billion and $3½ billion.

Mr. BUSH. Annually?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Annually; making available at the local level a total of around $7 billion plus, which could be appealed to for school purposes or any other purposes which the local government felt were needed.

Mr. BUSH. That is a much larger annual amount than is provided in the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct. The reason I have made it high—I have made it almost twice as high as the amount in the President's bill—is that certainly not everybody will respond to the appeal to purchase of tax bonds. The taxes are included. However, when a man has money in his pocket, he is more likely than not to respond favorably to these requests, as the history of school bonds during the past several years has shown.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for the information.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have a few minutes left; I shall reserve them.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. It is in the nature of a technical question.

On page 9, line 14, of the Senator's amendment in the nature of a substitute, the paragraph provides:

No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any real property tax unless such tax is allowable as a deduction for the taxable year under section 164.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I can see how a question might arise over the word "allowable." In other words, if a taxpayer takes the standard deduction, it is my observation that generally the Internal Revenue Service will interpret a page 2 deduction as not being allowable. If the Senator concurs in my view of this, I suggest that a technical amendment might be appropriate, to add a sentence at the end of line 17, as follows:

Provided, That such tax shall not be deemed to be unallowable merely because the taxpayer uses the optional standard deduction.

I am quite certain that this amendment will fit in with the Senator's explanation of the bill, and I believe it will make his proposal clear from the technical standpoint. If the Senator from Arizona agrees with me, I shall be happy to draw up the amendment in a moment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Iowa, whom I recognize as one of the ablest tax lawyers in the Senate, and one of the ablest tax lawyers in the whole country, for calling this item to my attention.

I felt that the language in my amendment would be satisfactory, but I can understand that some question might arise over it. I shall be happy to accept the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator. I will draw it up shortly.

On page 10, line 11, the section provides:

> In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction the expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year which are incurred by him, by his spouse, or by a dependent (as defined in sec. 152(a)).

In the case of a child who is 18 or 19 years old, who is working, and who is earning enough money to require him to file an income tax return, and possibly even to pay an income tax, is it the intention that that person be treated as a dependent also?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; under the present income tax law the person might be paying his own way through college and could take this amount as a deduction, or it could be taken by the family of the dependent.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, this section ties in with the concept of dependent when the child is a full-time student under the present Internal Revenue Code.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. I feel certain that that satisfies my question on that point. My last question is perhaps the most basic one, with respect to the entire bill. Has the Senator an estimate of the cost of the bill in terms of loss of Federal revenue?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I can give only an estimate because, as I told the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], we do not know what the totals will be. At the present time, deductions allow about $3¼ billion to $3½ billion to remain at home. This has been continuing for a long time. This credit would, when taken, leave a similar amount, or a total, as a result of both deductions and the credit, of something in the nature of $7 billion-plus under the present rate of tax collections.

Mr. MILLER. In other words, if the credit for the real property tax attributable to the local school taxes and for the deduction for the expenses of a spouse or a taxpayer or a dependent attending college were applicable, it is the estimate of the Senator from Arizona that there would be a loss of Federal revenue approximating $7 billion?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; it would be an additional "staying home" of about $3¼ billion to $3½ billion as a result of deductions from the gross. This would be a credit to the net, after the tax had been figured, of not to exceed $100.

Mr. MILLER. What I am trying to ascertain is how much less money will come into the Federal Treasury?

Mr. GOLDWATER. From $3¼ to $3½ billion, based on the present income tax.

Mr. MILLER. I am very sympathetic to the approach, as the Senator knows, and to this way of helping to meet local school costs. At the same time, I am quite dedicated to doing my utmost to achieve a balanced Federal budget. I recognize, as the result of legislation which has already been passed——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield 2 additional minutes to me?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, Mr. President; I yield to the Senator from Arizona 2 minutes of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, at this time I yield further to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I recognize that as a result of legislation already passed by the Senate and as a result of the increased expenditures for national defense and for developments in space, we face a deficit in the next fiscal year of between $2 billion and $5 billion. So I find it very difficult to support this amendment if it will aggravate still more that budget deficit.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Undoubtedly the present effort is only a foot in the door, a case of having the camel put his nose in the tent. Mark my word, Mr. President: What will cost $2 billion this year will cost, next year, $4 billion or $5 billion; and we shall find that the cost will constantly grow and grow, so that in 10 years it will be perhaps $15 billion.

I prefer to take the chance of losing a little Federal aid, rather than to take the certain step of having the Federal Government's annual deficit increased to that extent. I point out, in this connection, that we must assume that if this program is put into effect, it will result in greater and greater amounts of deficit spending by the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Arizona for his very frank answers to my questions; and I shall proceed at once to prepare the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair point out that inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered on the question of agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, unanimous consent must be had if the amendment is now to be modified.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, if the proposed modification of the amendment will not cause any interference with the time limitation already agreed to, I shall have no objection to the request for unanimous consent to modify the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No change in the time schedule already agreed to is now proposed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Then, Mr. President, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise at this time to summarize my position on the amendment.

First, let me say to the Senator from Arizona that it has been a real privilege to work with him on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare during the many weeks we have consulted together in connection with the subject of Federal aid to education.

The Senator from Arizona and I have disagreed in regard to many fields of legislative activity. In this instance we have not agreed on the philosophical approach to be made to the entire question of general Federal aid to education. However, I wish the RECORD to show that at all times I have received from the Senator from Arizona the utmost of courtesy, consideration, and accommodation, and every bit of fair dealing that a colleague on the opposite side of an issue could possibly expect to receive from an opponent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish the Senator from Oregon would also include the leadership on this side of the aisle, because we have always received the utmost of cooperation and consideration from the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MORSE. Indeed so. Furthermore, perhaps the Senator from Arizona would even appreciate having me pay a compliment that is due the very able counsel for the minority, Mr. Michael J. Bernstein, who tonight sits beside the Senator from Arizona, here on the floor of the Senate. As the minority Members have heard me say more than once at the committee meetings, Mr. Bernstein has served not only the minority; he has also served the entire committee, as every staff member should, and at the same time he has been a very ardent advocate of the position of the minority. I believe it should be stated now that Mr. Bernstein and the other staff members have been most helpful to the committee. Indeed, from time to time they have conducted for us a seminar upon the contents of these bills and the material to be presented by both sides in connection with the presentation of the bill.

Many members of the public do not realize that a Senate committee works in that way. The qualified experts of the committee assist us very greatly and do very much of the necessary research.

So I wish to pay my respects not only to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] but also to Mr. Bernstein and his assistants.

Mr. President, I have already stated that the philosophical approach favored by the Senator from Arizona and the philosophical approach which I favor are quite different. In fact, I believe it accurate to say that they are almost diametrically opposed.

The Senator from Arizona has made clear to me, from time to time, that he is unalterably opposed to the position I take in regard to this matter. I believe it fair to say that at times he has even characterized the approach I favor as one dangerous to the continued operation of our form of government. I believe that in fairness to him and also in fairness to myself I should at once draw this line of cleavage.

I believe I should also say that the pending bill is based on the approach that, under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, it is important that general educational aid legislation of the type represented by the pending bill should be enacted. It is legislation which, in my opinion, will provide the assistance so sorely needed by the many tens of thousands of schoolchildren in our country who, in the opinion of the supporters of the pending bill, have been waiting far too long to receive the assistance which we seek to provide by means of the pending bill.

Mr. President, that statement shows the very great difference—in fact, the entire difference—between the approach favored by the Senator from Arizona and the approach which I favor. I know of no way to bridge the difference. If the Senate adopts the approach favored by the Senator from Arizona, the result will be that the Senate will pass his amendment in the nature of a substitute. If the Senate adopts the approach which I favor, the result will be that the Senate will pass Senate bill 1021.

I also wish my friend to know that I speak half in jest and half in earnest, but entirely in good humor, when I say the Senator from Arizona favors the enactment of a bill which will provide a certain measure of Federal control, but which will provide very little Federal aid to education.

Furthermore, I believe that the bill the Senator from Arizona favors relates more to higher education than it does to elementary and secondary school education. I really believe that most of the remarks made this evening by the Senator from Arizona and most of the provisions of the measure he favors relate to a higher education bill, not to a bill in regard to elementary school and secondary school education. For example, I refer to the various provisions of the amendment concerning scholarships. Such provisions should not be included in the pending bill. Instead, they should be included in a bill which deals with aid to higher education.

In fairness to the Senator from Arizona, I wish to make it clear that when he first introduced his bill—which then was known as Senate bill 991; yet to all intents and purposes his present substitute is substantially the same as the original Senate bill 991—when he spoke in favor of Senate bill 991 at our hearings, he testified in support of his scholarship proposals. However, we have not yet held hearings upon the administration's proposals contained in S. 1241 in the field of higher education. Extensive hearings will be held. I shall have something to do with those hearings, and I shall see to it that a full record is made upon them.

I believe the record should also show that whereas the Senator from Arizona proposes 1,000 scholarships, the administration has proposed about 25,000. As a matter of fact, I am sure that even that many will be too few, in view of the need which exists.

In addition, let me point out that, in my opinion, title 2 of the substitute measure the Senator from Arizona favors deals in part with taxes and with changes in the Internal Revenue Code. Section 202 deals with deductions for expenses incurred in providing higher education. I say that provision does not belong in the pending bill.

It belongs in a higher education bill, or in a revenue measure and not in an elementary and secondary school bill.

I close this argument by asking my colleagues to vote against the Goldwater substitute, because, in my judgment, much of it is really not relevant to the purposes of S. 1021, which is a secondary and elementary school bill.

I now have a few bits of factual information to put in the RECORD, and then I shall yield the floor.

If this amendment were enacted, it would immediately reduce Federal income tax revenues by a large amount. There would be no benefit to the schools unless the leeway provided were tapped by higher property taxes for schools. To the extent this is not done, the amendment operates to provide income tax relief to property taxpayers rather than to provide additional money for schools.

Estimates of the money involved are very tentative. The loss of Federal revenue under existing patterns cannot even be estimated with great accuracy. I do not claim any great accuracy for the figures, but I think these are fair and reasonable estimates. A figure of $2 billion annually at present income levels is estimated by the Tax Analysis Staff of the Treasury Department. A somewhat smaller figure of something like $1.6 billion is the judgment of Dr. McLoone of the Office of Education, School Administration Branch. Treasury Department finds it difficult to provide a State breakdown because homeowners and income tax payers cannot be matched.

The benefit to schools lies in the property tax leeway made available. The extent to which schools can and will recover the Federal loss is speculative. Undoubtedly, a great potentiality is opened up; efficient tapping of it under existing taxing patterns might be a problem in some States, but presumably legislation and new patterns could be developed to take care of this problem.

Estimates of potential gains to schools seem to be too "iffy" to be worth very much. It is easier to estimate the potential loss of Federal revenue.

I respectfully say that the weaknesses of the substitute seems to me to be as follows:

First. The Federal Government will give up a great deal of revenue, but there is no requirement that the schools benefit to the same extent. Thus, it may be an extremely inefficient method of channeling money to the schools. Prosperous communities that are already supporting their schools at a good level will enjoy the full tax credit, but may not need or wish to increase property taxes for schools accordingly.

Therefore, there might be nothing flowing into the schools from those areas, under the Goldwater proposal.

Second. Some persons hit by increased property taxes would benefit only nominally, by comparison, from the income tax credit. This would be the case for corporations and any large private, commercial, or industrial properties. A substantial percent of property taxes is paid by corporations. Consequently, such taxpayers can be expected to resist the increased property tax levies through which the schools are to take advantage of the amendment.

Third. Poor districts today are those with little taxable property behind each pupil. For this reason, such districts stand to benefit least in the leeway provided for increased property taxation. The amendment thus equalizes the wrong way—it gives more leeway to the district that already has a big tax base.

I say most respectfully that we have no assurance that under this proposal there would be any guarantee that the schools would benefit. There would be nothing to prevent the money from being used for other purposes.

Lastly, title II of the Goldwater substitute proposes a tax credit against Federal income tax, limited to $100, for real property taxes paid for support of public elementary and secondary education.

This tax remission proposal is very similar in principle to other tax remission proposals referred to in this debate which we have already defeated by substantial votes.

I take the position that, so far as income taxes are concerned, they are not paid by the citizens of Arizona for Arizona, they are not paid by the citizens of Oregon for Oregon, they are not paid by the citizens of any State for that State; they are paid by U.S. citizens living in the respective States of this country for national purposes of the Federal Government.

In my judgment, it is an entirely erroneous theory to take the position that there is an equity in a tax remission in a given State based upon what U.S. citizens in that State pay in Federal income taxes.

I close this segment of my argument by saying I think the substitute proposal is mistaken in its philosophy. I think it is unsound in its implications and effects. I do not think it is going to accomplish the major purpose which the senior Senator from Oregon has stated throughout the debate. It is a purpose he does not propose to let the Senate forget for a single moment. It is the need to meet, at the Federal level, the problem of providing an equalization program for education, which we do in S. 1021. The committee bill gives at the least, a fairer chance to the boys and girls of this country who are not now enjoying equality of opportunity to develop to the maximum extent possible their intellectual potential. The bill provides greater equality of opportunity for them.

Mr. President, in March, during 2 weeks the Subcommittee on Education, of which I have the honor of being chairman, heard a convincing group of witnesses testify in the support of the administration bill S. 1021 which would provide Federal grants to the States to be used for teachers' salaries and school construction or both purposes and with a small portion going for special educational projects which the States would

use for educational research and development projects of their own choosing. These witnesses presented ample testimony regarding the need of such legislation and of the urgency for its passage. They showed that the Nation's schools are facing real and existing shortages of teachers and classrooms. It has been fully demonstrated that one of the most pressing measures facing the administration, the Congress, and the American people is the enactment of broad Federal support of legislation for our public schools.

The subcommittee heard a few witnesses testify to the effect that there was no need for such Federal action. On March 13 my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] who is himself a member of the Subcommittee on Education appeared before the committee in support of his bill, S. 991, and to present his views on the proposed legislation now pending before the subcommittee. In doing so the distinguished Senator stated:

> It is my strong belief that most of these proposals, including the bill, S. 1021, sponsored by the administration, are both unnecessary and unsound. I am convinced that they represent another long step in the direction of reducing our State and local governments to mere subordinate, administrative divisions of the Central Government in Washington.
>
> It is for that reason that I introduce my own bill [S. 991]. If a genuine problem of educational shortage really exists, which I do not believe, my proposal will provide the means to solve the problem far more effectively than any of the other measures now before this subcommittee. But what is most important, it will leave the matter entirely in the hands of the States and local communities without an iota of intervention by the Federal Government.
>
> I wish to make it clear that I do not believe that we have an educational problem which requires any form of Federal grant-in-aid program to the States. Even a casual glance at the significance statistical indicators serves to demonstrate that the States and localities have done extremely and exceedingly well during the past several years in meeting their educational needs, and that these needs themselves are growing at a much slower rate than during the past period.

The distinguished Senator then asked the question:

> Are our schools inadequately financed?

Then he promptly stated:

> The answer to the question is "no."

To support this answer the gentleman from Arizona searched the past for a yardstick to measure the future. He compared percentages of increase in school expenditures over the past several years with percentage increases in pupil enrollment and in a number of other items. He dipped back to 1890, dropped down to 1913, 1930, 1950, and then to 1960 to show a percentage of increase in the national income devoted to education.

I wish to point out to my colleagues that the amount of this increase has been far too little and too slow. The gentleman from Arizona does not measure the financial inadequacy of our schools in terms of their financial needs of 1960 or 1970 but only in terms of how financial expenditures have grown since 1890.

Suppose we were to measure the adequacy of our national defense needs only in terms of the increase in the percentage increase of defense expenditures in 1960 as compared with the amount spent in 1890. I have made such a comparison and here is what I have found. National defense expenditures 1890, $66,589,000; 1900, $190,728,000; 1960, $45,627 million. This is an increase for expenditures for national defense of 585 percent during the 70-year period. But what does this tell about the adequacy of defense expenditures in 1960? Similar comparisons are no more relevant as measures of the adequacy of educational expenditures in 1960.

I sincerely question whether my distinguished colleague would judge the adequacy of present expenditures for national defense or highway construction by reference to amounts spent for these purposes in 1890, since it is obvious that an entirely new set of conditions prevails today. Dirt roads suitable for horse drawn vehicles have been replaced by highways designed for modern cars, buses, and trucks. The Army mule has been replaced by helicopter and jet planes. In a similar way, I am sure that discerning Members in the Senate and other American citizens will recognize that public education today is confronted with an entirely new set of conditions than in 1890.

Those who look backward in search of standards of adequacy frequently fail to see the role education must play in building the Nation's future. For example, let us consider the impact of technological changes on our past and future manpower needs. For the convenience of my colleagues, I am submitting for the RECORD a table showing the actual and projected occupational distribution of workers from 1900 to 1975. The contrast between the trends in the occupations requiring the high degree of educational attainment and those requiring a lesser degree is striking.

TABLE 1.—*Actual and projected occupational distribution of workers: 1900–75*

[In percent]

Occupation (1)	1900 (2)	1910 (3)	1920 (4)	1930 (5)	1940 (6)	1950 (7)	1965 (8)	1975 (9)
Professional, technical, and kindred	4.3	4.7	5.4	6.8	7.5	8.6	11.3	14.0
Managerial	5.8	6.6	6.6	7.4	7.3	8.7	10.3	10.8
Clerical	3.0	5.3	8.0	8.9	9.6	12.3	14.4	14.4
Sales	4.5	4.7	4.9	6.3	6.7	7.0	6.5	7.4
Craftsmen, foremen	10.5	11.6	13.0	12.8	12.0	14.1	13.5	13.7
Operatives	12.8	14.6	15.6	15.8	18.4	20.4	19.6	17.5
Laborers, industrial	12.5	12.0	11.6	11.0	9.4	6.6	5.0	4.4
Service	9.0	9.6	7.8	9.8	11.7	10.5	11.8	12.4
Farm	37.5	30.9	27.0	21.2	17.4	11.8	7.6	5.3
Total number (in millions)	29.0	37.3	42.2	48.7	51.7	59.0	73.5	86.9

Source: Data for 1900–50 from: Kaplan, David L., and Casey, M. Claire, "Occupational Trends in the United States, 1900 to 1950." Working Paper No. 5. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1958. Table 2, p. 7. Data for 1965 and 1975 derived from unpublished data, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Totals may not add to 100.0 percent because of rounding of percents for specific items.

For example, the table shows that in 1900, 59 percent of our Nation's workers were employed as industrial laborers, in service occupations, or in farm occupations. In 1950 this percentage had dropped to 29 percent and by 1965 it is expected to drop to less than 24 percent. The figures clearly show that the educational system of our Nation in 1900 functioned in an economy in which workers needed much brawn but little education. In our present economy, most workers must have both technical knowledge and general education.

I am surprised that my distinguished colleague has ignored the effects of these changes on the cost of education and upon the future demands for increased educational expenditures, for most appraisals of future expenditures for education have accounted for these changes and have seen them as presenting added responsibilities and costs to public education.

The following statement from the Rockefeller report on education entitled "The Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America," clearly points out this important factor which my distinguished colleague has overlooked:

> One of the striking features of contemporary life is the growing range and complexity of the tasks on which our social organization depends. This is dramatically apparent in science but is no less a reality in nearly every field of endeavor. It can be seen in the ever increasing range of skills demanded of the doctor, the teacher, the government administrator, the labor leader, and the business executive.
>
> The reasons are not far to seek. They lie in the explosive rate of technological change and the increasing complexity of our social organization. Not only are the tasks that must be performed to keep our society functioning ever more intricate and demanding, they are constantly changing in character. As a result, we are experiencing a great variety of shortages of human resources in fields requiring high competence and extended training. We are having to become more and more concerned with seeking and cultivating talent. We have become more conscious of the strategic importance of education in our society (pp. 6–7).

I am also surprised that my colleague from Arizona has been able to sit through the hearings of the subcommittee and to read the testimony of a host of expert witnesses, not only in this session of the Congress but in many sessions, which have explained the critical educational shortages and the urgent need for increased Federal financial support for schools and then come before the subcommittee and state that the Nation's schools are being adequately financed.

Truly, to sit through the hearings which have been conducted by the Subcommittee on Education, only to conclude that our schools are adequately

financed, is to have eyes that see not, and ears that hear not.

Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a few examples of possible statistical misinterpretations of my friend from Arizona.

My colleague stated in his testimony:

> The size of the classroom shortage has been a major issue in the continuing debate on Federal aid to education.

He then proceeds to link together a series of shortage estimates over the last 10 years to show that estimates of the shortage have been varied. He does not mention that the estimates in the first half of the 1950's come from different types of procedures than those in the last half of the decade and that it is statistically incorrect to link these in series.

But, be that as it may, and ignoring the fact completely, I wish to call to the attention of my colleague that at no time during the decade were the estimates of the shortage ever less than 132,400. And I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate that, by the best estimate of the U.S. Office of Education in the fall of 1960, our Nation was short 142,100 classrooms. This is the figure that we must keep in our minds—142,100 classrooms short now, this year. This is the best estimate of the present shortage and I wish to call further to the attention of my colleagues that this figure is only 200 less than it was in the fall of 1957. It is granted that there be some variation in the estimates. This is only natural; it is only human, and it should be. After all, these are only estimates.

The only reason that the size of the classroom shortage has been a major issue in Federal-aid debates—and I emphasize the word "size"—has resulted from the efforts to focus attention upon the precise size of the shortage as a means to divert attention from the actual shortage itself. The opponents of Federal aid have contended, in effect, that because the exact size of the classroom shortage could not be determined and pinned down precisely to the very classroom no shortage actually existed. This reasoning is preposterous. It is somewhat like going out on a broad sandy beach and saying, "Since we cannot determine actually how many grains of sand are on this beach, no sand is here."

Mr. President, I submit to you that very real and tangible shortages of classrooms and teachers exist in the schools of this Nation, and that these shortages exist regardless of whether this Congress is able to say specifically how many teachers or classrooms we are short. The point is that these shortages are real; they are present today, and they are affecting the education and the lives of millions of American children. They are affecting the future economic strength and growth of our Nation. They are affecting our future political vigor as a free and democratic people. They are affecting our future national security and defense. They are affecting the future of free society and will affect the course of world history.

Let us have eyes that see and ears that hear; and let us have minds that can clearly discern the facts and apply them to speedy remedies with lasting solutions to our problems in education.

How large is the present shortage of classrooms? No one can pinpoint an actual specific answer to this question because the answer depends upon a great many judgments and some of them differ in judgments. But we can and do have a very good estimate of what the shortage is as seen by the chief State school officers of the various States. Certainly no one is in a better position to estimate their shortage of classrooms than are these 50 chief State school officers.

Each year for the past 5 years the U.S. Office of Education has compiled estimates of the shortages made by the chief State school officers in the various States. The following are the classroom shortage figures that have been reported to the U.S. Office of Education:

Fall 1956	159,000
Fall 1957	142,300
Fall 1958	140,520
Fall 1959	132,400
Fall 1960	142,100

Two things should be obvious from this series of figures to any discerning and objective person: One, is that a critical shortage of classrooms does exist in the Nation at the present time. Two, this shortage has remained virtually constant over the 5-year period and has fluctuated in the neighborhood of 140,000 classrooms short.

What is this classroom shortage doing in terms of the education of boys and girls of our Nation? I would like to quote from a press release dated August 26, 1959, by Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur S. Flemming, regarding the effects of the classroom shortage on the children of our Nation. Mr. Flemming stated:

> However, if we add the 5.9 million urban elementary pupils affected by overcrowding merely to the 1.8 million pupils enrolled in excess of capacity throughout the Nation, we have a figure approaching 8 million.
>
> We know, however, that this is by no means the total number of pupils affected by crowding since it does not take into account additional pupils affected in this way in any high school or in any rural school, either elementary or secondary, anywhere in the country.
>
> Even this is not the only disturbing effect of the classroom shortage. For in addition to pupils reported as excess in the national study, there are more than 2 million others estimated as housed in obsolete or otherwise inadequate buildings. By these measurements alone, therefore, the number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degrees by the classroom shortage is about 10 million.

In his testimony, the Senator from Arizona also raised the question: "How serious is the teacher shortage?" He began his answer to this question with the following sentence:

> Here again we are confronted with highly suspect statistics.

He later adds:

> They indicate to me that much of the so-called data consists of poetry and propaganda rather than objective research. At any rate, if we use these dubious statistics, they point only to the conclusion that the so-called need for Federal aid to education has been greatly exaggerated by its proponents.

The Senator then offered some statistics of his own of which he said:

> Actually, the figures seem to indicate that education has made great strides in meeting its manpower needs. Over the past 30 years, the number of employees in all forms of public education, both lower and higher, increased 140 percent while employment in private industry rose by only 45 percent; but employment in public education rose at the same rate as the population of the United States as a whole—45 percent.

Exactly what these increases in percentages are intended to contribute to clarifying the present shortage of teachers is impossible for me to see. The Senator's entire comparison is completely irrelevant to the question that he raises of "How serious is the teacher shortage?" Comparing the percentage of increase of employment of teachers with the percentage of increase in private industry over the past 30 years, tells absolutely nothing about the seriousness of the present shortage of teachers.

The Senator from Arizona in his testimony completely ignored the careful work of the research division of the National Education Association in attempting to develop accurate and reliable estimates on teacher supply and demand of the public schools of the Nation. For the past 13 years the NEA Research Division in close cooperation with the authorities in the State departments of education in the various States have attempted to estimate, as accurately as possible, the shortage of teachers on an annual basis. The latest report estimates that the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools were short approximately 135,000 classroom teachers in September 1960.

It is impossible to say that this 135,000 figure is the actual shortage of classroom teachers in the Nation. However, it is reasonable to say that this is a reliable estimate of the classroom shortage. Certainly the existence of a shortage of classroom teachers is widely recognized throughout the Nation. Every major survey of education that has been made in recent years has pointed to the shortage of well-qualified teachers as a deterrent to quality education of American children. For example, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report on education, "The Pursuit of Excellence—Education, the Future of America" stated:

> No educational system can be better than its teachers. Yet we face severe problems both in supply of teachers at all levels and in their quality (p. 23).

There can be no reasonable doubt that a chronic shortage of well-qualified teachers exists in this country, that it has existed since at least the start of World War II. Prompt action by the Congress is needed to help eliminate this shortage by providing grants to the States that can be used for teachers' salaries. But my colleague from Arizona by using a familiar technique of selecting the base year of 1929 in comparing the increases of teachers' salaries with those of other workers implies that the teachers are being paid adequately at the present time. He says nothing about the relative increase in the professional qualifications required of teachers in 1960

as compared to 1929 or of their relative standing in 1929 to their relative standing compared with other professions in 1960. Actually these comparisons like his former comparisons tell nothing about whether or not teachers are being paid adequately at the present time. The question that confronts the Senate is: Are teachers being paid adequately today? The answer is "No."

Ample testimony has been presented to the Subcommittee on Education to show that other professions with similar educational requirements to teaching have averaged earnings that are double the average teacher's salary. It is true, teachers' salaries average slightly higher at the present time than the average of all workers, but school boards are not competing for the average worker with less than 12 years of schooling. As Dr. Sam M. Lambert, director of the research division of the National Education Association, recently stated before the Subcommittee on Education:

> The typical teacher in the United States is no longer a sweet young thing in her early twenties who lives with her mother and father at no cost to herself. She is not a person with only 2 years of college training. Her working day is not a 6-hour arrangement, and she doesn't always have a 3-month vacation, even without pay.
>
> This typical teacher in the American public school is both mature and well educated. This person is about 43 years of age, has gone to college 4.7 years, and has taught school for 13 years. One summer in three this teacher goes back to college at his or her own expense. During the school year this teacher averages a 45-to-50-hour week in teaching, grading papers, and planning work for the days ahead. With this much college training and experience, and at an age when the worker should be getting somewhere, the typical teacher's salary is likely to be $5,200.

In his testimony, Dr. Lambert went on to point out that despite improvements in teachers' salaries in recent years, we are not as well off in recruiting able persons for teaching as we have been in former years. As teachers' salaries have increased so have the salaries of other occupations which tend to attract potential teachers. We must remember that teachers' salaries must be compared to professions where, like teaching, 46 percent of the professionals have 4 years of college and 35 percent have 5 years or more of college training. How does teaching compare with other professions in terms of salaries? Dr. Lambert answered this question by providing the latest comparable figures available from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, for 1958. He stated:

> The average earnings of physicians, lawyers, and dentists was $13,457. The average for engineers was $9,647. The composite average for 17 professions requiring college graduation was $9,439. The comparable figure for public-school teachers the same year was $4,827.
>
> Persons in other professions not only start out with higher earnings, they are much farther ahead after 10 years on the job. Men engineers just out of college, for example, start at an average of $6,120; accountants at $5,352; sales personnel at $5,280; but teachers at only $3,900.

Truly, in light of such evidence, to contend that teachers are paid adequately and commensurate with their responsibility, their training, and their experience is to have a sustained and determined will not to see the facts that are before one's eyes.

It is surprising indeed to find such lack of vision Every major study of educational needs in recent years has called special attention to the need for increased teachers' salaries. In a press release dated May 24, 1959, acompanying the President's Science Advisory Committee report entitled, "Education for an Age in Science," President Eisenhower stated:

> One subject discussed in this report warrants special emphasis—the importance of raising the standards of our teachers in their communities. Higher salaries are a first requirement, but we need also to recognize the great importance of what teachers do and to accord them the encouragement, understanding, and recognition which will help to make the teaching profession attractive to increasing numbers of first-rate people.

The need for increased teachers' salaries as they relate to the professions was emphasized in the Rockefeller Brothers Fund report on education, "The Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America." The report stated:

> The root problem of the teaching profession remains financial. More perhaps than any other profession, teaching needs dedicated men and women to whom pay is not an overriding consideration, but until we pay teachers at least as well as the middle echelon of executives we cannot expect the profession to attract its full share of the available range of talents. Salaries must be raised immediately and substantially (pp. 25–56).

There can be no doubt that teachers' salaries are far too low for the present and future good of our Nation. And the future outlook for the possibilities of moving to significantly higher salaries for teachers in the immediate future is dim indeed. With the backlog of demands on State and local governments and with the increasing impact of their taxes on their ability to attract and to keep industry, States are not prepared to pay teachers the going rate for the high quality college trained persons needed. Help from the Federal Government through a broad support program is imperative. This is the only logical conclusion that one can draw from the facts when they are considered calmly, impassionately, and objectively. However, my colleague from Arizona comes not to this conclusion but to the following conclusion, and I quote from his testimony:

> To me it is plain that, judged from any of the relevant criteria which I have set forth above, there is no "crises in education" and no justification for extending the activities of the Central Government into that area as the administration's bill, S. 1021, would do.

Yet after denying that any need exists, the Senator from Arizona declared that his proposal would meet it better.

My friend from Arizona said, in reference to the proposal he supports, that—

> I shall take Secretary Ribicoff at his word and describe to you a program which will make available to every community in the United States sufficient funds to enable each of them, if their citizens so desire, to meet all of their school needs even as determined on the basis of the Secretary's own estimates. That program is embodied in title II of my bill, S. 991. Its enactment would make all the alternative plans for Federal aid to education which are under serious consideration by this committee irrelevant and unnecessary.

Mr. President, I have studied carefully S. 991 introduced by the Senator from Arizona. I have heard his testimony, I have read it, and have gone back to study S. 991 again. And I must confess to you that I am puzzled as to the purpose that my friend from Arizona had in introducing this bill in the U.S. Senate. It has very aptly been described as offering Federal control of education with no Federal aid.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona described title II of S. 991 in the following words:

> My proposal will provide the means for solving additional school problems, if they really exist, but it will leave the determination of this question where it properly belongs—with the State and local communities—and not with the Federal Government. The basic problem, if there is one, is financial. If State and local governments in some parts of the country are unable to keep pace with their school needs it is because the Federal taxing power has preempted State and local sources of revenue. Hence, the proper approach is to compel the Federal Government to restore to the States and localities at least a portion of the tax resources which it has taken away. This is precisely what my measure will do.
>
> The proposal is a simple one. Every homeowner, every owner of real estate in the United States pays a real property tax to his local community government. In most cases, a substantial part of this tax is used to meet the primary and secondary school needs of the community whether for new construction or for maintenance, teachers' salaries or other past or current school costs. It would merely provide that every taxpayer who pays a school tax on his real property or as a part of his real estate tax, shall after having calculated the amount of Federal income tax which he must pay Uncle Sam, be permitted to subtract from the Federal income tax which he owes, the full amount of such school property tax, or such proportion of it as will result in a total additional tax benefit to these taxpayers of between $3 and $4 billion.

The Senator went on to say that in his bill the tax credit would be limited to $100 against the taxpayers net Federal income tax. This tax credit would be in addition to the amount that the taxpayer would have retained as a result of previously counting the $100 as a tax deduction in the same manner that he would have deducted his other State and local taxes. The Senator used the following example of how his program would work:

> A taxpayer who has paid $200 in school taxes as part of the local real property tax on his home, and is in the 20-percent Federal income-tax bracket, realizes a saving of $40. My proposal would retain this present practice, but, in addition, would permit him to take a $100 credit against what he owed Uncle Sam, i.e., against his net Federal income tax. Hence, instead of a saving of $40, the homeowner under my proposal would save $140 of the $200 he paid in school taxes on his home.

The Senator then went on in his testimony to state:

> The concrete advantages of this approach are overwhelming.

The concrete advantages of this approach are overwhelming.

He then enumerated several of these so-called advantages, and herein, if we are to believe that our friend from Arizona is serious, lies the fallacy in S. 991 and an amendment. For it would fail to do the things which its author claims for it.

First of all, the bill is proposed as an aid-to-education measure which, as the Senator from Arizona claimed in his testimony, "would make all the alternative plans for Federal aid to education which are under serious consideration by this committee irrelevant and unnecessary."

Actually title II of S. 991 and the amendment is not an aid-to-education measure. There is nothing in this title of the substitute which would assure that $1 of the Senator's estimated $3 to $4 billion loss in Federal tax revenue would be spent for improved educational benefits for children.

As my friend points out:

> The tax benefits provided would go directly to approximately 40 million taxpayers, including about 34 million homeowners.

Of course, the Senator does not say anything about the more than 20 million other American families who either rent or lease their homes. It might be argued that there would be tax relief for the landlords but one would have to stretch a point pretty far to see the landlord, after subtracting $100 from his Federal income tax bill, passing the savings along to his tenant.

The Senator states indirectly that under his bill the money subtracted from Federal income tax returns would not necessarily go to education but if the local citizens decided, they could use the funds to pave their streets, improve their fire or police departments, expand their medical facilities, if this is what they believe their State and locality needs to do most urgently. It would have been more appropriate for the Senator to have said that the Federal revenue lost under this program need not be spent for any public service of any kind and in all probability this would be exactly what would become of the $3 to $4 billion loss to the Federal Treasury.

Thus, it would require an actual increase in the Federal tax rates to make up for this revenue loss. And at the same time property tax rates would also have to be increased in local communities if any of the Federal taxes given to local taxpayers were to find their way into school budgets. This is about as cumbersome and unrealistic a procedure as could be devised. The possibilities of realistically meeting school needs by such an arrangement are small.

One of the biggest claims made for the substitute by its author is that—

> With the Federal Government completely excluded from the program, there would be no danger of Federal control over education.

In this statement the Senator is referring to title II. But I caution my colleagues not to be misled by protestations that there would be "no danger of Federal control over education" if it were enacted into law.

Read the entire bill, read title I as well as title II of the amendment, and then see if you agree with the assertion by the Senator from Arizona. Read for yourselves title I and you will see it to be one of the surest and swiftest ways to bring about a subtle but effective control of the secondary schools of our Nation.

Title I would provide a national scholarship program of 1,000 scholarships annually. It would establish a national scholarship board appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate to be composed of the following: First, five members who were recognized scholars in any of the following fields: engineering, mathematics, or science; second, five members who were recognized scholars in the field of humanities; third, three members from such fields of endeavor as the President deems appropriate. It would be the duty of the board to make rules and regulations as it deemed necessary to carry out the bill. The board would be responsible for setting up and administering an achievement test for testing the scholarship applicants. Those who receive the highest awards on the test would be awarded national scholarships.

But I call the careful attention of Senators to the fact that to be eligible to compete for a national scholarship an individual would have to be in his last academic year of secondary school or hold a certificate of graduation from a secondary school and most important, he must have completed—or be completing—the following:

First. Four academic years of study in English.

Second. Three academic years of study in mathematics.

Third. Three academic years of study in history.

Fourth. Three academic years of study in foreign language.

Fifth. Three academic years of study in science, in Greek, or in Latin.

In his statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1961, upon the introduction of S. 991, the Senator stated in reference to these scholarship provisions that they were primarily designed to establish a set of voluntary secondary school scholastic standards which can serve as a guide and a beacon for both the high schools of the Nation and for the parents of America. Referring to the alleged educational benefits of the scholarship provision the Senator stated:

> Most important, it will expose the weaknesses in some of our secondary schools while at the same time revealing the strength in others.
>
> The American public will assess the results of these examinations. A school which consistently fails to qualify its students for participation in the examination, or whose students consistently fail to secure any of the scholarships will come under intensive critical scrutiny.

It is important to remember that the 1,000 Federal scholarships awarded annually would be sufficient to average less than 1 to every 18 high schools in the country.

The substitute amendment has further defects.

First. It would encourage fiscal irresponsibility in that it would tend to give the impression that citizens in local communities were passing on to the Federal Government the cost of building school buildings.

Second. It would tend to put money where the wealth is; not where the children are to be educated. In effect, it would be the equivalent of a Federal appropriation of $3 or $4 billion—according to the Senator's estimate—distributed not to States but to localities on the flat grant basis of $100 per local property taxpayer on the average. No consideration would be given to the fiscal capacity of the locality or the State to support education.

Only the number of property taxpayers would be considered in distributing these funds, not the number of children to be educated. No measure of the fiscal capacity of the State or school district would be taken into consideration in distributing this vast amount of Federal funds. No equalization of educational opportunity would be considered either among States or among localities within States.

Third. It would tend to disrupt State school construction programs in States where school construction is financed by State funds. Thus, it would tend to disturb State aid programs designed to raise the level of education in many of the poor school districts. It would tend to discourage State support of school construction, since taxpayers could not subtract such State funds from their Federal income tax return.

Fourth. It would offer little or no relief to school districts in States which have complicated legal structures or constitutional debt or millage limits. In some cases it would be impossible for a single dollar of this program to go for increased school funds. Statutory and constitutional millage limits and debt limits would have to be overhauled to permit sizable increases in property taxes. Such changes would be virtually impossible in many cases. But where property tax rates were at or near their maximum limit, there would be no way that additional property taxes could be collected.

Fifth. It would tend to exaggerate both the local and the Federal tax rates and to keep the overall tax figures high. At best, one must conclude that the amendment goes the long way around to do nothing for schools and as I have pointed out before, it would provide no assurance that any of the money given away in the tax credit plan would be added to education.

After studying the amendment, I am surprised to find my friend from Arizona, whom I have heard so many times denounce Federal aid programs as being giveaway programs and programs designed to promote fiscal irresponsibility, come up with a scheme whereby the Federal Government becomes a donor of the sum of $3 to $4 billion to be given to property taxpayers in every

community across the Nation. Furthermore, I am surprised to find that my friend would propose a measure which he asserts would aid education but which would not assure that a single dollar would be spent to strengthen the schools of our Nation. Moreover, I am surprised that my friend declares that State and local control of education must be maintained but provide a Federal prescription of the curriculum of secondary schools and of a board designed to set standards for secondary schools.

Mr. President, to sum up major points of title II of the Goldwater substitute. It proposes to allow an income tax deduction—not to exceed $2,000—for college expenses paid by a taxpayer for himself, his spouse, or his dependents. Expenses would cover tuition and fees, books and supplies, and meals and lodging—up to $90 a month for an individual living away from home and up to $45 for an individual living at home. Expenses taken into account would be reduced by the amount of any scholarships.

The amount allowable as a deduction would be reduced by the amount by which the "taxable income" of the taxpayer exceeds $10,000 if single or married and filing a separate return, or $20,000 if married and filing a joint return, or a head of household, or surviving spouse. Thus, no deduction would be allowed to single taxpayers whose "taxable income" reaches $12,000 and to married persons whose "taxable income" reaches $22,000.

Since "taxable income" is income after deductions and personal exemptions, the $10,000 and $20,000 levels at which the deduction would begin to be reduced would be the equivalent in terms of an adjusted gross income of almost $12,000—$11,777—for a single individual and almost $25,000—$24,888—for a married person with two children, assuming deductions were about 10 percent of gross income. Since the bulk of taxpayers are below these income levels most taxpayers would be able to deduct college expenses, without reduction, up to the maximum $2,000 limit. It is estimated that the annual revenue loss to the Federal Government at present income levels resulting from the proposed deduction would be about $800 million.

As President Kennedy indicated in his special message on education, our desire is that every talented young person who has the ability to pursue a program of higher education be able to do so, if he chooses, regardless of his financial means. An estimated one-third of our brightest high school graduates are unable to go to college principally for financial reasons. It is highly doubtful, however, that a deduction for college expenses along the lines proposed by the amendment would be the best means of helping these talented and needy young persons in meeting the financial problem. A study made in recent years points out that it is two and a half times as likely that a child will go to college if his parents' income is in excess of $9,000 than if it is less than $5,000. Further, the striking fact was revealed that if a youth were academically in the lower half of his high school graduating class, and his family was in the income group of $9,000 or more, he was more likely to go to college than if he were in the upper one-fourth of his class and a member of a family with an income of less than $5,000.

Families not financially able to send their children to college even with the tax allowance would receive no benefit under the amendment. In many cases the tax benefit derived from even as generous a deduction as proposed would not be sufficient to be a deciding factor in whether the child goes to college. Moreover, persons whose incomes do not exceed their present exemptions and deductions could not receive any benefit from the new deduction. This would include many students who supplement scholarships by vacation and part-time employment while attending college.

Large families with low incomes would receive little or no benefit while families of fairly substantial means who would send their children to college in any event would get the most relief. The effect of the deduction proposed by the Goldwater substitute amendment in savings to taxpayers would vary with the taxpayer's bracket rate. For single persons and married persons the tax saving would range from 20 cents on the dollar at the bottom bracket to about 38 cents on the dollar in the highest income brackets eligible to receive any deduction. For a head of household the range is from 20 to 47 cents on the dollar.

If the Federal Government is to give assistance to talented and needy young people, a program of direct aid along the lines proposed by President Kennedy would be the most efficient and economical means of providing such assistance. The President has proposed specifically a 5-year program of State-administered scholarships for talented and needy young people which will supplement the private and public scholarships and loan programs established by numerous States, private sources, and the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act. These scholarships would be open to all young persons, solely on the basis of their ability—as determined on a competitive basis—and their financial need. The President's program would provide 25,000 scholarships the first year, 37,500 the second year, and 50,000 for each succeeding year. The amendment proposes in title I a small scholarship program of 1,000 scholarships a year beginning in 1962.

Also, in recognition of the fact that tuition and fees do not normally cover the institution's actual expenses in educating the student, additional allowances to the college or university attended would accompany each scholarship to enable these institutions to accept the additional students without charging an undue increase in fees or suffering an undue financial loss. It has been generally recognized that the full benefits of a deduction for college tuition would not necessarily accrue in the long run to taxpayers since colleges could be expected to increase their tuition charges. In fact, some proponents of a deduction for college tuition have urged its adoption on the grounds that such a deduction would make it possible for colleges to increase their tuition without additional costs to parents and others who pay the tuition.

Mr. President, title II of the amendment proposes a tax credit against Federal income tax, limited to $100, for real property taxes paid for support of public elementary and secondary education. The tax credit would be allowed in addition to the present deduction for property taxes allowed under the income tax and therefore would be available to taxpayers whether they itemize their deductions or use the standard deduction. If the amount allowed as a credit plus the saving by reason of the deduction exceeds the total amount of the property tax, however, the credit is reduced by the amount of the excess.

The bill does not limit the credit to individuals, but since a tax credit of $100 would be of little significance to corporations, the discussion here is directed toward the effect of the credit upon individuals.

Under the present Federal income tax an individual who itemizes his deductions is allowed to deduct from gross income all State and local property taxes, including those for school purposes. The benefit which a taxpayer derives from the deduction depends upon his income tax bracket and ranges from 20 cents on the dollar in the lowest bracket to 91 cents in the top bracket.

The amendment proposes that an individual be allowed, in addition to the present deduction, a dollar for dollar offset against his Federal income tax for property taxes—up to $100—paid for the financing of public schools. For example, a taxpayer who has paid $200 of taxes and is in the 20-percent Federal income tax bracket has a $40-tax saving under the present deduction and under the proposal would have in addition a $100 credit against his income tax.

The Federal Government in effect would reimburse the taxpayer $140 of the $200 he paid in school taxes. Thus, a significant portion of the costs of public schools would be shifted to the Federal Government. All homeowners, who are contributing to the support of public schools, however, would not be able to benefit fully from the proposed credit. Many persons who own property incur no Federal income tax liability because their incomes are below taxable levels. Older persons, for example, who own a home may pay no Federal income tax because of low incomes or because of the double exemption and other special relief provisions for the aged.

Some property taxpayers would not be able to take advantage of the credit because school revenues in many jurisdictions are from general fund appropriations and the taxpayer cannot identify the amounts derived from property taxes.

In States which finance schools largely from sources other than the property

tax, taxpayers who are supporting the schools through payment of nonproperty taxes may not pay as much as $100 of property taxes for school purposes, and therefore would not get full benefit of the credit. The extent to which State-local school revenues are derived from property taxes varies widely from State to State. For the country as a whole a little more than 50 percent of total State-local school revenues comes from property taxes. This includes taxes on both real and personal property. The proposed tax credit relates only to real property taxes. In the various States the percentages ranged from 5.2 percent in Delaware to 91.3 percent in Nebraska in 1957–58—table 1.

States in which less than 20 percent of total State-local school revenues was derived from property tax were New Mexico, 15 percent, and North Carolina, 18 percent. Dependence on the property tax was in the range of 20 to 30 percent in 6 States, all of which are Southern States with the exception of Washington—Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Tennessee. Other States which are below the national average of 50 percent are Arkansas, Maryland, Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, and Pennsylvania.

This wide variation in reliance on the property tax for school revenues results from a number of factors. Some States have taken over large responsibility for financing of schools and the States' revenues are derived from nonproperty tax sources. In Delaware, for example, 94 percent of total school revenues is provided by legislative appropriation from the State general fund none of which is derived from property taxes. In North Carolina 69 percent of total school revenues is provided from State general fund appropriations. In Alabama and New Mexico where more than 70 percent of total school revenues is provided by the State, the State's school revenues are almost entirely derived from earmarked nonproperty taxes. Even though the local share of school revenues may be financed mainly by property taxes in some of these States, many homeowners will not pay as much as $100 of property taxes for school purposes.

Some States have authorized local boards of education to secure school revenues from local nonproperty taxes, including income, sales, and various other types of taxes. In Alabama, for example, several counties levy sales taxes and gasoline taxes for specific school purposes which are shared with any independent city school system within their borders. In Pennsylvania local districts of the second, third, and fourth classes are authorized to levy any tax of the nonproperty kind which is not being levied by the State. Revenues from nonproperty tax sources now account for approximately 23 percent of local school revenue. These nonproperty taxes include such taxes as income, per capita, amusement, severance, real estate transfer, mercantile, and occupational.

From what I have said, it is obvious that the proposed tax credit would discriminate against residents of States which over the years have developed sources other than property taxes as a means of financing schools. If such a credit were allowed, there might be some tendency for State and local governments to make more use of the property tax in school financing in order to make certain that their taxpayers got the full benefit of the tax credit against Federal income taxes.

The proposed tax credit would also be inequitable in that it would be available only to owners of property and not to renters, even though renters may pay the tax.

A further disadvantage of the proposed tax credit would be the fact that the relief granted to taxpayers in particular States and localities by the proposed tax credit would bear no direct relation to the current need for Federal assistance to public schools in the States. It is estimated that the credit would cost the Federal Government about $2 billion annually at present income levels. This amount of Federal funds if distributed along the lines proposed in the administration's program of Federal aid would give a considerable amount of assistance where most needed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point a table showing the percentage of public school revenues derived from property taxes.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage of public school revenues (State and local) derived from property taxes, 1957–58

State	[Percent from property tax]
U.S. aggregate	54.1
70 percent and over:	
Arizona	70.0
Colorado	74.5
Connecticut	72.2
Illinois	70.0
Indiana	70.0
Iowa	85.5
Kansas	77.7
Montana	72.9
Nebraska	91.3
New Hampshire	84.6
New Jersey	72.0
Rhode Island	71.3
South Dakota	81.4
Wisconsin	78.2
50 to 70 percent:	
California	58.6
Idaho	68.0
Maine	67.0
Michigan	50.7
Minnesota	55.2
Missouri	55.4
Nevada	51.9
New York	58.7
Ohio	67.8
Oklahoma	51.2
Texas	51.0
Utah	54.4
Vermont	66.0
Virginia	59.8
Wyoming	66.9
30 to 50 percent:	
Arkansas	44.8
Maryland	48.3
Florida	35.2
Kentucky	36.3
Mississippi	34.1
Pennsylvania	37.9

Percentage of public school revenues (State and local) derived from property taxes, 1957–58—Continued

State	[Percent from property tax]
20 to 30 percent:	
Alabama	22.0
Georgia	24.0
Louisiana	25.0
South Carolina	27.7
Tennessee	28.4
Washington	26.1
Less than 20 percent:	
Delaware	5.2
New Mexico	14.9
North Carolina	18.2

Source: Office of Education "Public School Finance Programs of the United States," 1957–58.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject the Goldwater amendment on the basis of the broad principles of opposition I have raised to it; namely, the philosophic approach of the amendment, the tax remission theory of the amendment, the fact that there is no guarantee that any money which is saved to the individual person will actually be added to what the State would otherwise spend for educational purposes. There is no assurance it will not go for some other purpose.

In my judgment, it also does not have what I call a principle of sound uniformity in the application of the equalization formula.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the rest of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the substitute amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 79, as follows:

[No. 49]

YEAS—10

Bennett	Eastland	Stennis
Bridges	Goldwater	Thurmond
Capehart	Hruska	
Curtis	Schoeppel	

NAYS—79

Aiken	Hartke	Morton
Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hickey	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Boggs	Holland	Pastore
Burdick	Humphrey	Pell
Bush	Jackson	Prouty
Butler	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Johnston	Randolph
Cannon	Jordan	Robertson
Carroll	Keating	Russell
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Scott
Church	Kuchel	Smathers
Clark	Lausche	Smith, Mass.
Cooper	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Dodd	Long, La.	Symington
Douglas	McCarthy	Talmadge
Dworshak	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Engle	Magnuson	Yarborough
Ervin	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Fong	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Gore	Miller	
Hart	Morse	

NOT VOTING—11

Allott	Chavez	McGee
Blakley	Dirksen	Monroney
Byrd, Va.	Fulbright	Wiley
Carlson	Gruening	

So Mr. GOLDWATER's amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer my amendment 5–16–61—D, and ask that it be stated and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 5 through 7, it is proposed to strike out "to employ needed additional public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries".

On page 13, lines 19 through 25, strike out all of paragraph (2) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(2) provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with sections 108 and 109, shall be used exclusively for the construction of public school facilities.

On page 14, lines 5 and 6, strike out "to be used for school facilities construction".

On page 14, beginning with the comma on line 11, strike out everything down through line 16 and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 16, lines 3 and 4, strike out "or for the payment of teachers' salaries".

On page 16, lines 8 and 9, strike out "with respect to funds specified for school construction or teachers' salaries, as the case may be".

On page 22, lines 5 through 10, strike out paragraphs (10) and (11).

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield, in order that I may propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I desire to ask the able majority leader what his plans are for the remainder of the evening and for the work of the session tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by the acting minority leader, there will be no more yea-and-nay votes tonight. It is my intention, after discussing this subject with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and other Senators, at this time to propound a unanimous-consent request that on the pending amendment, 2 hours be allowed, 1 hour to each side, 1 hour to be controlled by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and 1 hour by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is a morning hour scheduled for tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be a morning hour.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the 2 hours begin to run tomorrow, or will it start tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No, the 2 hours will start tomorrow at the conclusion of the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

Ordered, That further debate on the Goldwater amendment numbered 5–16–61—D, be limited to two hours, after the conclusion of morning business on Wednesday, May 24, 1961, to be equally divided between the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] May 23, 1961.

Mr. KUCHEL. May I ask the Senator from Montana at what hour he intends to convene the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Nine o'clock.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will there be a morning hour, and then thereafter the 2-hour time limitation which has been agreed to?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The time limitation will begin at the conclusion of the morning hour.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish the attention of the Senate for a moment in order to have the RECORD show that we sought to hold up the announcement of the vote for an additional 30 seconds so that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] could reach the floor. We were unable to do so. I know very well that if I ask for unanimous consent to permit the Senator from Oklahoma to be registered on that last vote, Senators may think it would set a bad precedent, although I think this case is extraordinary.

At least my comment leaves no room for doubt as to the presence in the Chamber of the Senator from Oklahoma. I assume that, irrespective of what his vote would have been—and I assume his vote would have been "nay" on the amendment—I would like the RECORD to show that he is now present. If we could have the charity of the brotherhood for a moment, I would be tempted to suggest that we grant unanimous consent to have the Senator from Oklahoma recorded as voting.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule the Chair is not permitted to entertain such a request.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague. Unfortunately I could not leave for the Capitol from an important meeting in time, but I would not wish to be recorded as being present in the Chamber and not voting at the regular time. The rule must always be observed. I would not permit the exception if it were requested.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have 2 brief items I wish to place in the RECORD in order to complete the RECORD on the day of debate.

Earlier there was some discussion of what the administration costs of the bill would be. There was an argument made that Federal collection of taxes for the program would be much more costly than if the money were collected by State administrative agencies.

A statement was presented at our hearings, to which there was no successful rebuttal in our hearings—and I know of no evidence to the contrary—that the collection cost of Federal taxes is approximately one-half cent per dollar. The collection costs of State taxes is 1½ cents per dollar. Local collection cost is about 5 cents per dollar.

That statement is my answer to the claim that we are supporting a bill which will prove to be administratively costly to the American taxpayer when the opposite is true. It is the most economical method of collection.

It is the most economical way of collecting taxes so far as administrative costs are concerned for school purposes that we could have provided. That is borne out further by the testimony of Secretary Ribicoff, which is found at page 157 of the hearings, when the question was raised as to what the administrative cost of the bill would be.

The Secretary said:

So when you consider a program such as this where the administrative cost would be

some one-tenth of 1 percent, I do not believe that that is an excessive administrative cost.

Neither do I, Mr. President.

Lastly, I invite attention to very important information which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] placed in the RECORD yesterday, which is found at page 8504 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 22, 1961. It is a very interesting questionnaire which the Senator from Indiana sent to the school administrators of his State, bearing upon the question of alleged interference with local school districts in connection with Federal aid under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. This bears on the view expressed by former Representative Barden, of North Carolina, that under Public Law 874 there was a great deal of interference with local school districts.

I said that there was not a scintilla of evidence presented to our committee which established or documented any such opinion expressed by Mr. Barden. The material which Senator HARTKE put in the RECORD yesterday gives further support to this contention, which I have made throughout the debate. It is easy to allege that there is Federal interference, but when we come to examine the expenditures of the Federal Government over the decades—whether we speak of Public Law 874 or Public Law 815 or the National Defense Education Act—we find there has been no Federal interference with the educational process.

Certain Senators have tried to point out instances in the debate that for some special pieces of legislation, such as the National Defense Education Act, there have been limitations. However in the National Defense Education Act the Congress specified for defense purposes what the money was to be used for. It was to be used to strengthen science teaching or mathematical training or linguistic training. In such cases it has been argued that because we set that out as the purpose of the expenditure of the money it represents Federal interference in education. This is a non sequitur. It falls to the floor by the weight of its own fallacy.

Furthermore, concerning the opinion expressed by Representative Barden, quoted in the debate, it should be borne in mind that he was referring to a school on a military reservation. It was the case of a determination not to take the school off the base, because if it were maintained on the base it would be an integrated school.

There were those who did not like to have it remain on the base and who would have liked to remove it from the base. Therefore it was easy to contend that when the Air Force took the position that the school was not to be removed it was improper Federal interference with education. Not at all, Mr. President. That action was certainly within the defense powers and duties of the Air Force, because it was consistent with a well-established Federal constitutional authority and power.

I ask Senators to look at the Hartke evidence which was put in the RECORD yesterday. I thank the Senator from Indiana for placing that information in the RECORD. I am sorry that he is not present at this moment so that I might thank him on the floor for supporting the work of our subcommittee in reinforcing what I have said many times on the floor.

In the hearings we took testimony on the bill at great length. Those who charge that there is any interference in connection with the administration of Public Law 815 or Public Law 874 simply do not make their case, because they have not produced any evidence to substantiate their case.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I wish to direct a question to the Senator from Oregon. He refers to Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 as Federal Education Acts. They are not such acts. Under those acts schools are paid for services which have been rendered. There is no contract. Under Public Law 815 a school district is paid for educating Indians. Under Public Law 874 payments are made in lieu of taxes in impacted areas. It is not Federal aid to education under either act.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Arizona and I have debated the issue before, and we could debate it all night and not reach agreement. The Federal money is paid to the schools and the schools use it in carrying out the educational processes.

Many Senators appeared before us as witnesses or filed statements. I do not see how anyone can doubt what their testimony showed; namely, that the States considered the Federal money that they were getting from the Federal Treasury as very important and vital Federal aid money in the operation of their educational systems. In round numbers it amounts to helping the school districts which educate about a third of the public elementary and secondary school pupils throughout the country. As I have said before, if we can thus aid these students, we should not hesitate to pass the pending bill so as to give general aid to all the States.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Those two acts can under no circumstances be considered Federal aid to education. The schools do not even have to take the children if they do not want to do so. They take them and the Government pays the money in lieu of taxes. I can cite an example in my own State, where Hughes Aircraft had taken five sections of tax exempt land and thus created an impacted area. The school district said:

> We will take these children only if you will pay us after we send you a bill for the services.

Along the perimeter of the Navajo Reservation in my State Indian children were sent to white schools, and those schools were paid after the services had been performed. Several times I have introduced bills with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] which would require the payment of money in lieu of taxes. For example, in the Grand Canyon area there are only two taxpayers and there is need for a high school. Each year the Federal Government provides the money. There is a great deal of difference between that and having to make an application to the Commissioner of Education in Washington, and having to comply with any number of requirements, as in the pending bill, before the money can be given. I do not believe there was a witness who appeared before our committee who claimed that under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 there was any Federal aid to education.

Federal aid to education is what we are trying to provide in S. 1021. It is not what is provided under the two public laws we have been discussing. Under those acts the Federal Government pays for services where the Federal Government by preemption has not allowed the local tax collector the right to collect taxes.

Mr. MORSE. If I were the treasurer of an impacted area school district operating under either Public Law 815 or Public Law 874, I would know when I made my report that I was making my report on a considerable amount of Federal aid money. After all, this is the money which pays many of the bills, and there is no doubt as to the source of the money.

The Senator from Arizona and I could argue this matter all night, and he could not get me to agree with his definition of Federal aid to education. We are apart on that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is very simple, if the Senator from Oregon will let me explain it.

In one case there is a provision relating to what must be done before the money can be had. In the second case, under the public law the Senator and I are talking about, the act has been performed. The services have been purchased. There are no ifs, ands, or buts about it. The school board, the county school superintendent, or the State superintendent, as the case may be, merely sends a bill to the Federal Government based on the average daily attendance of pupils covered by the bill. Under section 106 it is provided:

> The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall be reduced if such State's efforts for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

That is the control with which a State must comply before it can get the money. That is the difference between Federal aid money and lieu money, the latter being paid for services which have been rendered. There are no strings attached; the bill is submitted, and the money is collected.

Mr. MORSE. I am certain there is one thing on which the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Oregon will agree, namely, that we will not reach an agreement on this subject, because, as the Senator himself has pointed out, the school district does not

have to accept the money. If the school wants it, it takes it. Under S. 1021, a State will not have to accept Federal aid unless it wants it. But we would not be able to hold the States back from wanting it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Under S. 1021, it will have to comply with many regulations which under Public Law 874 it does not have to comply with.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, but under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 they must comply with the standards provided in those acts.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I had hoped that the Senator from Oregon, with his broad, elastic mind would take the description I have given. I regret, I cannot accept the Senator's assumptions.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Public Law 815 contains a title for school construction in areas of Federal activities. I know; I was the author of the act. Public Law 874 has as its title Federal Aid for Maintenance and Operation.

As an old pharmacist, I can say that what is on the label generally tells what is in the bottle.

Mr. GOLDWATER. As an old pharmacist, the Senator from Minnesota ought to know better than that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As a new one, I make the same statement.

DR. TOM DOOLEY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I knew Tom Dooley for some years and was, in fact, vice president of the International Rescue Committee at the time we established Medico as a division of our organization.

If ever a man was driven by the desire to help his fellow man, to give himself to the cause in which he believed, and to again make whole and healthy the maimed and sick, it was Tom Dooley.

Through his village hospital medicine, he brought American humanitarianism and personal care to the remote villages of Laos. No matter what obstacles developed abroad in Laos or at home in the United States, Tom Dooley rose to the challenge and defeated them.

Neither the rigors of his work nor the looming shadow of cancer were able to make him lag or wilt. He died, figuratively, with his boots on and his scalpel in his hand. And, as he was in life, so in death, he will live on as an inspiration and spur to free men everywhere. Specifically, he will live on through Medico, which does so much with so little money, but with heart and dedication, in bringing the real humanity and concern of Americans for their fellow man in the newly emergent nations. Medico does what others preach—it stops communism in its tracks.

JOURNALIST CON EKLUND DOCUMENTS PENTAGON USE OF CALCULATED LEAK

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Mr. Lawrence C. Eklund, Washington correspondent of the Milwaukee Journal, recently wrote a thoughtful interpretive report on the widespread practice of "leaking" secret Government information to serve the ends of various policies or programs. His article observes that while the press is often blamed for such security violations, the fact is that newspapers do no more than print information deliberately leaked by Government officials, agencies, or the military services.

The use of the calculated, controlled leak is nothing new to Washington. Members of our military services, including highly placed officers, have repeatedly shown themselves willing to break security barriers in order to win popular—and congressional—support for their pet projects, and to demean those advocated by their rivals in the annual appropriations scramble.

It may well be that such leaks have provided our Nation's enemies with useful information. If so, this constitutes a most serious and sobering reflection on the attitudes of the officials who are responsible. At the very least, it reveals a grotesquely wrong sense of proportion and values to willingly reveal information which for sound reasons has been declared secret in order to push one program at the expense of another. Even the promoter, P.R. man, and flack have an obligation to observe the legitimate security requirements of our Nation's defenses.

The existence of these calculated leaks should not divert attention from the serious, continuing problem of unnecessary governmental secrecy. The right of the public, and Congress, to know what is going on, what is being done by the Government in their name, is only modified, not diminished by the proper demands of national defense. It would indeed be a bitter irony if attempts to curb the self-serving leakers of confidential data are used as an excuse to throw a stifling wet blanket over freedom of Government information, which already stands in serious need of protection and extension.

During his many years in Washington, "Con" Eklund has established a distinguished record for perceptive, painstaking, and responsible newspaper reporting. His article in the Milwaukee Journal of May 14, 1961, relating to deliberate security violations by military personnel, is in that fine tradition. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENTAGON CHIEFS, AIDES ACCUSED OF DELIBERATE SECURITY BREACHES—WRITER ALSO CHARGES THAT SELF-SEEKING POLITICIANS USE THE PRESS FOR OWN ENDS

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—While the Kennedy administration tends to blame the press for breaches of national security, the fact is that the newspapers have merely published material deliberately leaked by persons in Government.

In his speech to the American Newspaper Publishers' Association last month, President Kennedy implied that some of our difficulties in fighting communism were caused by the newspapers. He said:

"The facts of the matter are that this Nation's foes have openly boasted of acquiring through our newspapers information they would otherwise hire agents to acquire through threft, bribery, or espionage; that details of this Nation's covert preparations to counter the enemy's covert operations have been available to every newspaper reader, friend and foe alike; that the size, the strength, the location, and the nature of our forces and weapons, and our plans and strategy for their use, have all been pinpointed in the press and other news media to a degree sufficient to satisfy any foreign power."

RUSSELL IS IRATE

In testimony made public last week, Chairman RUSSELL, Democrat, of Georgia, of the Senate Armed Services Committee was quoted as expressing "an almost unspeakable contempt" for any man in politics "who would be frightened by newspapers telling him they would attack him because he was not giving them intimate details about defense planning."

RUSSELL produced no examples of editors threatening politicians in efforts to extract military secrets.

In fact, the record of this young administration and of the Eisenhower administration is replete with instances of unfrightened politicians and military men planting classified information with the press, for reasons best known to themselves.

The politicians in some cases were interested in self-aggrandizement. The generals and admirals and their subordinates at the Pentagon have used the "leak" to gain advantage for their own branches of the service. Newspapers didn't have to resort to "theft, bribery or espionage," to use the President's own words, to get the information.

MOSS PLANS PROBE

After Mr. Kennedy made his request for self-restraint on the part of the newspapers—some insisted he was asking for censorship—Chairman Moss, Democrat, of California, of the House Government Information Subcommittee promised to look into the matter.

"In the past our subcommittee has investigated repeated charges that information damaging to the national security has been published in the press," Moss said.

"In almost every past instance the so-called security breach has turned out to be a carefully controlled leak of information favorable to the viewpoint of some Government official, Federal Agency, or military service."

CUBA, U–2 CITED

Senator MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, told the Senate last week that the American people had a right not to be lied to by their Government. Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, insisted in the Senate that the Government be frank and honest in dealing with the press.

The two Senators were referring to the Government's apparent debasement of the press in the Cuban fiasco and in the U–2 incident a year ago.

Reporters were given contradictory information about the size of the Cuban invasion force and were told an untruth a year ago in the U–2 incident when the State Department said, "there was no deliberate attempt to violate Soviet space and there never has been."

Last fall the Moss subcommittee inquired into the publication in the New York Herald Tribune in September of eight articles by Earl Mazo purportedly based on the secret conversations between Vice President Nixon and Nikita Khrushchev in July 1959.

Chairman FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had tried vainly to get a copy of the

transcript of the conversation. He was told by the State Department that this was a highly classified diplomatic document.

NIXON IS BLAMED

Two members of the Moss subcommittee staff called on Edwin M. J. Kretzmann, then Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, to learn the significance of this statement in Mazo's first article: "The secret reports of the Nixon-Khrushchev talks make a fascinating and enlightening profile of the Soviet chief."

Kretzmann told the staff members that these reports were highly classified and had not been made available to anyone outside the State Department. He said he had determined that Mazo had had a number of private talks with Nixon, but that he did not know what the former Vice President had done with his copy of the State Department notes on the meeting.

"The issue for the subcommittee would appear to be an indication that highly classified diplomatic documents were made available by the Vice President to his official biographer so that a partisan complimentary version of the historical incident involved could be prepared and published," said a Moss subcommittee staff memorandum.

CITE EARLIER LEAK

"The obvious inference that the Vice President has leaked this highly secret information to a sympathetic biographer fits in with an earlier performance in which the Vice President announced at a political breakfast the fact that two Soviet spies had been apprehended earlier in the year.

"It was widely held at the time that Nixon's premature and unauthorized disclosure had compromised security measures then being employed for surveillance of other suspected Soviet agents in the United States."

The Moss subcommittee has traced innumerable leaks of secret military information to the Pentagon.

One of the earliest leaks of the Kennedy administration occurred when the Army slipped to a reporter a secret report by Secretary of State Rusk downgrading nuclear warfare and recommending development of a greater capacity for limited, conventional means of waging war.

Another security breach traceable to interservice rivalry occurred February 20, when the Air Force made public classified information concerning plans for a Congo air and sea lift, including details of the forces needed and operating costs.

The generals and admirals for years have leaked information in connection with the Army-Air Force fights for a bigger share of the defense dollar, the Navy-Air Force feud over the B–36 bomber and the conflict over supercarriers and military unification. There is no evidence that they have ever been punished for their indiscretions.

One of the most flagrant leaks to come to the attention of the Moss subcommittee occurred in May 1956, when the Air Force surreptitiously took pictures purporting to show the vulnerability of Navy carriers.

Included in the pictures turned over to the press were one of the supercarrier *Forrestal* and a radar picture made from a reconnaissance plane at 32,500 feet, showing how an enemy might see the *Forrestal* in its radarscope.

WILSON ORDERED STUDY

Rivalry between the services reached a peak in 1956. Charles E. Wilson, then Secretary of Defense, publicly proclaimed his concern over leaks of information revealing sharp disagreements among the services, but the leaks continued.

A story in the New York Times on May 19, 1956, by the late Anthony Leviero, began: "Grave interservice differences are afflicting the armed services." It outlined in detail the major conflicts and quoted from staff papers.

Two months later Leviero revealed a proposal before the joint chiefs to cut the Nation's military manpower by 800,000 men by 1960. Wilson then appointed a five-man committee to find ways to plug what he claimed were leaks threatening national security.

Charles A. Coolidge, Boston attorney who was chairman of the committee, testified before the Moss subcommittee that this particular leak of classified information damaged the security of the United States by upsetting the West Germans terrifically and ending up with their reducing their term of military service down to 1 year.

URGED HALT TO PRACTICE

The Coolidge Committee, which cited numerous other instances, recommended an attack on the deliberate unauthorized disclosures which it said constituted a major shortcoming in the operation of the classification system at the Pentagon.

But the leaking of secret material has continued right down to the present, as evidenced by angry outbursts by members of the Senate Armed Services Committee in the testimony made public last week.

Senator SALTONSTALL produced a story from the Journal-Every Evening of Wilmington, Del., of April 1, which revealed that the United States "now has 59 missiles with hydrogen bomb warheads ready, if needed, to hurl against enemy targets." The story said this country's combat ready missile force soon would increase to 91.

Senator THURMOND, Democrat of South Carolina, objected to a recent magazine article telling the exact number of bombers and missiles we had ready to hurl at an enemy. Defense Secretary McNamara explained the information for this detailed story came from the Defense Department and Defense contractors.

COMPLAINS ABOUT ADS

RUSSELL objected to the publication, "time and again," of the fact that Charleston, S.C., is "the only place where we can load a Polaris submarine." He protested the disclosure of military information in the advertisements of defense contracts.

Senator FRANCIS CASE, Republican of South Dakota, complained that the taxpayers pay the bill twice for those advertisements, "once in the cost and next in the tax deduction for the ads as business expense," and he proposed the disallowance of that cost.

Senator STENNIS, Democrat of Mississippi, acknowledged that there had been leaks of secret military information by Members of Congress of both Houses and that such leaks "doubtless will continue to some extent."

RUSSELL said he had complained about this situation to at least four Secretaries of Defense.

So now the present Secretary has asked Lt. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, Inspector General of the Air Force, to see what he can do about plugging the leaks, which is where the Coolidge Committee came in 5 years ago.

PURE MILK COOPERATIVES OF WISCONSIN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Wisconsin enjoys a membership of more than 15,000 dairy farmers. It is a remarkably active organization and is especially responsive to its membership.

Pure Milk is ably represented by Bill Eckles, its general manager, and Paul Affeldt, its president. These two men appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry last week to give vigorous support to President Kennedy's farm bill.

The testimony was forthright and convincing, but most impressive in this Senator's experience in committee hearings was the way in which these men backed up the support of their organization for the President's farm program with a compendium of resolutions passed by the membership of this fine organization supporting the position its leaders have taken.

Mr. President, too often leaders of big organizations come before committees and offer emphatic opinions on legislation when their membership has not expressed the vaguest position on that legislation.

Because this testimony is such a fine model of testimony that truly represents the viewpoints of the constituent members of the organization, I ask unanimous consent that both the statement by Mr. Eckles and Mr. Affeldt and the appendix which supports the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and appendix were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE OF WISCONSIN, BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, IN SUPPORT OF THE AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1961, S. 1643

(Presented by W. C. Eckles, general manager, and Paul Affeldt, president)

Honorable Chairman ELLENDER and Senate Agricultural Committee Members, we first would like to thank you for the opportunity of appearing before your committee. We would especially like to compliment the chairman for the early hearings and opportunity for offering various interests a chance to express their views on the Ellender-Cooley farm bill, or technically the Agricultural Act of 1961 (S. 1643) and (H.R. 6400).

On behalf of more than 15,000 Wisconsin dairy farmers who belong to Pure Milk Products Cooperative with offices at Fond du Lac, Wis., we would like to state that this Ellender bill (S. 1643) conforms very closely to many policy resolutions enacted over the past several years by the members of Pure Milk Products Cooperative at their annual meetings. Copies of several of these resolutions have been added as an appendix to this presentation to indicate the agricultural policy and programs desired by the organization membership.

These were not developed by employees and officers. But they came up from the grassroots of P.M.P.C.'s membership. Each local (77 in number) considers drafts and recommends resolutions at their 77 local meetings. These in turn are considered by an overall committee from all locals. They are debated, changed and finally enacted by members at the annual meeting or organizationwide convention each fall.

The organization Pure Milk Products Cooperative has long recommended that the farm problem be attacked and solved by action:

1. On a commodity by commodity basis, with all programs finally correlated into an overall program.

2. On which the advice and consideration of real farmers be heard even though in advisory capacities when such programs are being drafted and developed.

3. In which farmers are finally given an opportunity through referendum to approve or reject programs if quotas or marketing limitations are considered.

4. In which domestic consumption and use of our agricultural abundance is in maximum use to better feed, clothe and house our own citizens.

5. That permits our other production in agriculture beyond a reasonable reserve for domestic safety, to be used to promote better relations between the other nations who are our allies and who also need more food and fiber.

6. That permits farm organizations and cooperatives to do as much of the management, processing, distribution and development of new outlets as is reasonable and consistent with American business methods.

7. That programs contributing to improved general health and well-being be charged at least partially to departments other than agriculture. That food programs contributing to better allies and improving international relation be "tabbed" or charged to the appropriate category and not the farm program.

We strongly support the Ellender-Cooley bill as enabling legislation through which agricultural programs could be developed that would begin moving farmers incomes toward a party-of-income level.

TITLE I

Set up machinery through which advisory committees could be designated for assisting in developing programs. Of these, a substantial majority (66 percent) would have been nominated by farm vote. Consumers and farm organization specialists would also be given consideration.

It is our opinion that programs as are developed should, if they are to be effective, provide for supply adjustments if such are needed to maintain a reasonable balance between production and marketing of agricultural commodities.

We strongly support these provisions that provided quotas, marketing limitations, etc., if they are applied across the board to all producers following a referendum or vote where a two-thirds majority of farmers have approved such.

The extension of marketing order authorization to all commodities as proposed we believe to be sound. Many years of experience with Federal milk orders by our and other organizations have proven successful. Classes based on grade and use for establishing minimum prices to be shared in and pooled to various producers has proven sound when used. On several agricultural products, marketing order and regulatory programs for other commodities than those presently eligible for protection should be given the chance to come under such minimum pricing programs. Orders have operated successfully on several commodities. Other branches of agriculture should be given a chance for similar protection.

We have found order programs most useful in stabilizing and marketing milk. Other commodities might have similar success if authority were granted through new or amended legislation.

We presume some groups who now have such orders will be reluctant to support amendment of the laws under which they operate fearing some lessening of the effectiveness of their program. We believe the umbrella or protection provided by the Agricultural Agreements Act of 1937, as amended, should be extended to other commodities. If this is too strongly opposed, similar market order legislation might be enacted to extend the protection and voice in marketing to more of agriculture than that which in the past has been enjoyed by fluid milk markets and some fruits and vegetables, etc.

Quotas or marketing allotments are not new to agriculture or businesses. They should be on effective unit basis if used. Their application under orders should be effective and reasonably efficient to administer. We repeat, that in our judgment their introductions and uses should follow a referendum process by affected producers.

The provisions that would permit only congressional review and veto prior to introduction of a farm program under these bills seem to be the cause of major disagreements. We would hope that appropriate amendments satisfactory to the legislative and executive branch of our Government might be developed so that this type of legislation might be made available to American Agriculture.

TITLE II

We strongly support Title II of the Ellender-Cooley bill that would substantially increase funds for and lengthen the period of operation of Public Law 480.

This program has successfully moved agricultural products into international channels where needed. Assurance of longer range programs could materially improve the program in our opinion.

TITLE III

Title III providing for consolidating and improving the lending authorities to agriculture is quite important in our opinion. Much of agriculture needs expanded credit to move it out of a position of inefficiency due to limited sized units.

As the American population explosion continues more efficient agricultural units must be developed. This demands reasonable priced and available credit for farmers.

There is urgent need for reasonable loans to farmers to improve facilities, production units and living standards. Farm people use moneys for purchasing commercial products. Increased credit would stimulate and improve business and the national output.

TITLE IV

Title IV providing for expanding the school milk program and improvements in the bargaining position of cooperatives is strongly urged by Pure Milk Products Cooperative.

Farmers with larger cooperatives properly financed could in time, we believe, reduce the need of agriculture for so much dependence on Government. The legislation providing for merging and consolidating cooperatives into more effective units could, in our opinion, result in a more efficient movement of food and fiber to consumers after a period of time.

We believe the Ellender-Cooley bill would be excellent because:

(a) It can cut the cost of farm programs to Government and still assure consumers adequate food at the cheapest relative price.

(b) It would let farm selected groups have a major voice in developing and suggesting farm programs to the Department of Agriculture and Congress.

(c) The program would be most democratic by having farmers, consumers, the executive and legislative branches of Government all involved in its promulgation and activation or use.

(d) The wide powers presently delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture would be reduced. Less bureaucracy and governmental red tape would be involved.

(e) It would mean less government in agriculture by giving farmers an opportunity to expand cooperatives and do a more effective job in producing for market needs. Farmers would make major decisions on programs, quota enactments, etc.

(f) It is enabling legislation through which a variety of approaches to improving farm income could be developed and effectuated.

In conclusion, honorable chairman and committee members, we believe this enabling legislation of S. 1643 through which farm income could be materially improved, our agricultural abundance could be efficiently utilized and American farmers given more of a voice to help develop programs they desire, is most sound and very good legislation.

We, of Pure Milk Products Cooperative, would again urge the reconciling of difference between branches of Government and political parties to make such adjustments as will make the legislation acceptable to Congress for early enactment.

We believe you will have done a great service to America's farmers and the economy.

We believe it to be basically the soundest and finest agricultural legislation to ever come before Congress. We think farmers will heartily approve its use and reduce governmental costs and materially improve farmers' income and living standards.

We are honored at Pure Milk Products Cooperative to have had you kindly, and as usual, objectively listen to our views and suggestions on this very important matter. We hope this presentation has been of value in transmitting the views of a large segment of America's organized agricultural producers and dairymen to Congress.

Our policy resolutions attached are indicative that what we have presented has been the views of those we represent and work for.

Again, thanks for granting us time to present our views to you.

APPENDIX TO PRESENTATION BEFORE SENATE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE RESOLUTIONS REGARDING MEMBERS' POLICY ON FARM PROGRAMS

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT POLICY (ENACTED 1960)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes that the solution to the price support problem must come from a commodity approach. We believe the abundance of our American food supply has been a blessing to the Nation, but it has worked a serious hardship on the farmers in the form of low prices which have meant low farm income and decreasing farm purchasing power. We deplore the misunderstanding and erroneous opinions of farm prices and farm prosperity which consumers have drawn as a result of increasing marketing margins which have taken an ever larger share of consumer food expenditures. We believe it is imperative that farm income be high enough to provide a living standard for farmers equal to that of nonfarm people, and to maintain our Nation's food production economy in a sound and healthy condition in order that it may adequately meet our future food needs.

We stand ready to support and abide by effective controls on dairy farm marketings whenever such supply management is approved by a two-thirds vote of all dairy farmers. We insist, however, that marketing controls must be imposed on an effective quota basis and applied to all dairy farmers across the board and that such controls are applicable to effectuate a price level which will result in equality of income for dairy farmers in accordance with our national income.

In the event other methods do not, in the opinion of the State board, adequately support dairy farm income, we stand ready to accept direct payments to producers as a means of price support for milk. These payments may come from Government appropriations, assessments against producer marketing, or a combination of the two. We feel that direct payments should be limited to manufactured milk marketings subject to quality standards as may be prescribed in minimum quality regulations. Such payments should be limited to that portion or pro rata share of manufactured milk which is consumed on the domestic market at prices high enough to maintain full parity of income to producers who meet the required standards.

We believe that the Government should continue the purchase of nonfat dry milk

and other dairy products for relief, school lunch, foreign disposal, and other similar outlets.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT POLICY (ENACTED 1959)

I. Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes that the solution to the price support problem must come from a commodity approach.

II. We reaffirm our belief and support of the principles of "Self-Help" which were formulated by the conventions in past years.

III. In the event that the State Board finds it inadvisable or impossible to secure the adoption of "Self-Help" this cooperative stands ready to accept direct payments as a means of price support for milk. These payments may come from Government appropriations, assessments against producer marketing or a combination of the two. We feel that direct payments should be limited to manufactured milk marketings subject to quality and other standards as prescribed in minimum quality regulations.

Further, such payments should be limited to that portion or pro-rata share of manufactured milk which is consumed on the domestic consumer market at prices high enough to maintain full parity of income to the producer who meets the required standards.

IV. We believe that it is advisable for the Government to continue the purchase of skim milk powder for relief, school lunch, foreign disposals, and other similar outlets.

SUBSIDY DIRECT TO FARMERS (1959)

Resolved that if the Government is going to support dairy prices, the subsidy should be paid direct to the producer instead of the big processors.

MARKETING CONTROLS AND QUOTAS (1959)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative stands ready to support and abide by effective controls on dairy farm marketings whenever such controls are approved by a two-thirds vote of all dairy farmers. We insist, however, that marketing controls must be imposed on an effective quota basis and applied to all dairy farmers across the board and that such controls are applicable to effectuate a price support level which will result in equality of income for dairy farmers in accordance with our national income.

DAIRY PRICE SUPPORT POLICY (ADOPTED 1958)

I. Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes that the solution to the price support problem must come from a commodity approach.

II. We reaffirm our belief and support of the principles of self-help which were formulated by the convention of 1957.

III. In the event that the State board finds it inadvisable or impossible to secure the adoption of self-help this cooperative stands ready to accept direct payments as a means of price support for milk. These payments may come from Government appropriations, assessments against producer marketing, or a combination of the two. We feel that direct payments should be limited to manufactured milk marketings subject to quality and other standards as prescribed in minimum quality regulations.

Further, such payments should be limited to that portion or pro rata share of manufactured milk which is consumed on the domestic consumer market at prices high enough to maintain full parity of income to the producer who meets the required standards.

IV. We believe that it is advisable for the Government to continue the purchase of skim milk powder for relief, school lunch, foreign disposals, and other similar outlets.

FEDERAL ORDERS (1960)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative give consideration to hearings and orders of markets in other sections of the Nation which might affect Midwestern milk prices and outlets for our milk. We express special concern that some Federal orders price grade A milk used in certain manufactured products at levels far below prices paid in Wisconsin for manufacturing grade milk going into similar products. The interests of Pure Milk Products Cooperative members should be protected either by direct participation in such hearings or by representation through affiliated groups.

FEDERAL ORDERS AND SUPPORT PRICES (1958)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes in the principle of Federal milk orders. However, we believe that in the event of direct or other incentive payments as a means of support for manufactured milk, such payments should be incorporated with quoted prices for manufactured milk which may be used as basic formula prices in Federal orders.

FEDERAL ORDERS (1959)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative give closer study and consideration to hearings and orders of markets in other sections of the Nation which might affect midwestern milk prices and outlets for our milk. The interests of Pure Milk Products Cooperative's members should be protected either by direct participation in such hearings or by representation through affiliated groups.

DAIRY IMPORTS (1960)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes Congress should maintain rigid import quotas on all dairy products until such time as domestic production and consumption warrant further imports. We are shocked that our Government has seen fit to make sharp increases in import quotas of several foreign types of cheese recently, while domestic prices for manufactured milk were still at the low levels maintained by the dairy price support program.

Be it resolved that as long as we have a surplus of dairy products, we should maintain a strict curb on imports.

DAIRY IMPORTS (1959)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes that Congress should maintain rigid importation quotas on all dairy products until such time as domestic production and consumption warrant importations.

DAIRY IMPORTS (1958)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative believes in the expansion of America's foreign trade and especially trade with our friendly allies, but we believe that all trade treaties must be negotiated for the mutual benefit of buyer and seller. The importation of dairy products should in no way impair or interfere with Government farm support programs or dairy farm price levels. We, therefore, urge the Congress to maintain rigid import quotas on all dairy products (containing butterfat and/or milk solids-not-fat) until such time as domestic production and consumption warrant importations.

STATE MILK ORDERS (1960)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative continue efforts toward improved marketing conditions for its members through the increased use of marketing orders, both State and Federal, including manufactured as well as fluid milk.

MANUFACTURED MILK ORDERS (1959)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative reevaluate past work and give new consideration to the possibility of market orders, State and Federal, for manufactured milk.

MILK PRICE CONTROLS (1958)

Because of the tendency for some corporations to use unfair competitive methods to obtain even larger shares of the milk market and the consumers milk dollar, and because such acts tend to reduce milk prices to farmers and ultimately eliminate many local producers and local distributors from our markets, we urge our State board to work for the establishment of minimum fluid milk prices at both producer and resale level and for sound and workable fair trade practice regulations for both milk and dairy products offered to consumers.

FOREIGN DISPOSAL OF DAIRY PRODUCTS (1960)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative urges careful consideration in foreign disposition of our daily surplus to insure that the methods used do not jeopardize world dairy markets. We are pleased with recent suggestions that such foreign disposals be made at least in part through United Nations agencies which are in position to evaluate foreign needs and requests.

FOREIGN DISPOSAL OF DAIRY PRODUCTS (1959)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative urges careful consideration in foreign disposition of our dairy surplus to insure that methods used do not jeopardize world dairy markets.

INCREASED USE OF DAIRY FOODS BY GOVERNMENT AGENCIES (1958)

Resolved, That we favor still further increased use of dairy products in our Armed Forces, Veterans' Hospitals, State, county and city penal institutions, and expansion of the use of dairy products in school lunch programs. We therefore urge our State board to urge this expansion wherever possible, thus supplementing the work of the American Dairy Association.

FREE INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF GRADE A MILK (1960)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative continue its support of the National Milk Sanitation Act to provide for free interstate movement of grade A milk and encourage its support by all other interested groups.

FREE INTERSTATE MOVEMENT OF GRADE A MILK (1959)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative support the National Milk Sanitation Act to provide for free interstate movement of grade A milk.

INTERSTATE DAIRY QUALITY STANDARDS (1958)

We urge Pure Milk Products Cooperative to work to establish effective Federal minimum quality standards for milk and dairy products imported or moved in interstate commerce. Such standards are important to the protection of health and have been so recognized in the procurement of milk and dairy products for consumption by our Armed Forces and Federal agencies. We believe, however, they are of equal importance to the health of our civilian population and especially to our children, invalids, and aged. We believe effective regulations should be secured and enforced and made applicable to all milk and dairy products marketed in interstate commerce.

WORK WITH OTHER COOPERATIVES (1960)

We compliment previous delegates for urging the Board and Management of Pure Milk Products Cooperative to take the leadership which resulted in the organization of Federated Dairy Cooperatives. Dairy farmers supplying milk to the Chicago market have realized substantial returns because that organization had been developed and was ready to take over price negotiations when needed. Therefore, the State Board and Management shall continue to maintain a watchful eye toward every possibility for increasing bargaining power and influence of Pure Milk Products Cooperative members in the dairy industry through affiliation,

federation or merger with other cooperatives, or to improve and increase its service by contractual relationships with other dairy organizations.

STUDY POSSIBILITY OF MERGING PMPC WITH OTHER DAIRY ORGANIZATIONS (1959)

Resolved, That the State board of directors of Pure Milk Products Cooperative study the possibilities of merging or federating with other dairy organizations in the State and Nation so that we could have more bargaining power and influence on the dairy industry.

WORK WITH OTHER COOPERATIVES (1959)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative give continued consideration and effort to the possibility of affiliating with and providing services for other cooperative groups.

AGRICULTURAL INTEGRATION (1958)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative views with alarm some developments toward vertical integration in agriculture. We urge our board to keep a watchful eye on such developments and to keep the membership informed as to developments which may endanger the family type farms.

IMITATION DAIRY PRODUCTS (1960)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative reaffirms its stand to exert all efforts to strengthen and maintain present laws regulating the production, advertising and merchandising of all dairy product imitations. We urge increased Government action to prevent fraudulent misrepresentation of such imitations to consumers by promoting their sale within the general classification of dairy products.

DAIRY PRODUCTS IMITATIONS (1959)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative reaffirms its past stand to exert all efforts to strengthen and maintain present laws regulating the production, advertising and merchandising of all dairy product imitations, and should seek legislation to prevent discrimination against dairy products in the use of preservatives.

DAIRY PRODUCTS IMITATIONS (1958)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative reaffirms its past stand to exert all efforts to strengthen and maintain present laws regulating the production, advertising, and merchandising of all dairy product imitations, and should seek legislation to prevent discrimination against dairy products in the use of preservatives.

EMPHASIS ON MARKETING (1959)

Whereas overproduction has become the major problem of agriculture today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the county agents office and otherwise place more emphasis on the marketing, advertising, and distribution of farm products in the future.

Resolved that Pure Milk Products Cooperative should go on record recommending that the Federal Government should spend a larger part of research funds for marketing and less on increasing production.

PARITY COMPUTATIONS (1958)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative favors continued use of the parity index as a measure of farm price supports. However, we reaffirm our position that parity equivalent for manufactured milk should be computed by the method used prior to April 1954, namely, according to the relationship between manufactured milk prices and prices of all milk which existed from July 1946 to December 1948, or a ratio of 88.5 percent of all milk.

ECONOMIC FORMULA (1958)

Pure Milk Products Cooperative is directed to formulate, propose, and support at hearings under various milk orders through which our members' milk is marketed, an economic formula for class I pricing. The formula should reflect into the price, business activities, farm costs, and the ability of consumers to pay for milk.

FEDERAL INVESTIGATION (1959)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative demand a Federal investigation of the Chicago milk market because of the vast differential between the producer price and the consumer price.

DAIRY PRICE SPREADS (1958)

In view of the continuously widening spread between the farmer's price and the price charged consumers for dairy products, Pure Milk Products Cooperative's board of directors and employees are directed to immediately request a congressional investigation of such spreads to determine whether or not consumers are being charged unreasonable prices for the products of the farm and to further determine whether or not monopolistic pricing and marketing practices are being used by the processing and distribution industry. Pure Milk Products Cooperative should solicit the cooperation of other dairy farm interests in instituting and developing evidence to submit to the congressional committees so that this problem can be thoroughly studied.

DAIRY COUNCIL PARTICIPATION (1958)

The board of directors and employees of Pure Milk Products Cooperative are directed to work to secure contributions for dairy council work and its activities in all markets in which they are interested, not only from cooperative members but from nonmembers and all producers supplying these markets. If this necessitates amendments to the Agricultural Agreement Act of 1937 to provide for such, employees and the State Board are directed to propose such amendments to the act and to vigorously work to secure their enactment.

FEDERAL ORDER CLASS PRICES (1960)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative seek prices for manufactured milk sold in Federal order markets which are more nearly in accord with the value of such milk as indicated by grade B milk prices.

IMITATION DAIRY PRODUCTS PRESERVATIVES (1960)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative exert every possible effort to eliminate the use of preservatives in imitation dairy products which may aid in the use of inferior ingredients and eliminate the need for refrigeration of such imitations.

BLUE CHEESE IMPORT RESTRICTIONS (1960)

Resolved, That Pure Milk Products Cooperative use every possible means to prevent the increase in import quotas for blue cheese as recently requested by the Danish Government.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Wisconsin State Legislature recently adopted a joint resolution memorializing the Congress to appropriate funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION 49

A joint resolution memorializing the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941

Whereas the project to build a permanent memorial over the hull of the U.S.S. *Arizona*, sunk in the December 7, 1941, attack on Pearl Harbor and still containing the bodies of 1,102 servicemen entombed within it, is slowing because of lack of funds although the project is nearing completion; and

Whereas the Navy Club of the United States of America, one of the originators of the plan to enshrine the *Arizona* and its gallant dead as a memorial to all who died at Pearl Harbor on the day of infamy in 1941, has been responsible together with the Pacific War Memorial Commission for raising $250,000 privately toward the $500,000 needed; and

Whereas the Hawaii Legislature has appropriated an additional $50,000 toward the memorial leaving an additional $200,000 still needed; and

Whereas the completion of this memorial is in the interest of the Nation as a whole as a shrine to the men who gave their lives and as a symbol for future eternal vigilance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress is memorialized by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin to appropriate the necessary $200,000 in additional funds so that the memorial over the U.S.S. *Arizona* may be completed at an early date as a national shrine for the men killed at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, and that suitable copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state to the President of the United States and the Members of Congress from this State.

W. P. KNOWLES,
President of the Senate.
LAWRENCE R. LARSEN,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
DAVID J. BLANCHARD,
Speaker of the Assembly.
ROBERT G. MAROTZ,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1948. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Pea Ridge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1949. A bill for the relief of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRIDGES (for himself, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1950. A bill to extend for 4 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, relating to Federal assistance in the construction and operation of schools in areas affected by Federal

activities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 1951. A bill for the relief of Dr. Gerardo L. Yubero, his wife, Luz Fortuny de Lopez, and their two minor children, Gerard Lopez Fortuny and Fernando Lopez Fortuny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1952. A bill to provide for an additional benefit factor for flood control projects located in labor surplus areas; to the Committee on Public Works.

ISSUANCE OF A SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP IN COMMEMORATION OF CENTENNIAL OF BATTLE OF PEA RIDGE, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a special postage stamp in commemoration of the centennial of the Battle of Pea Ridge, Ark.

Pea Ridge is located in Benton County in the northwest corner of Arkansas. It was the site of what is considered by historians of the period to be the most significant engagement of the Civil War fought west of the Mississippi River. The battle took place on March 6, 7, and 8, 1862, and involved a total of over 26,000 men. As a result of the fighting, the northward push of the Confederate forces was halted and the State of Missouri remained in Union hands.

By an act of the 84th Congress, a national military park was created to preserve the historical value of the landscape and buildings touched by the fighting. Nearly 4,000 acres have been acquired for the park—largely through the efforts of State and local authorities and residents of the area. It is contemplated that the Park will be ready for public use on the 100th anniversary of the battle next March. Dedication ceremonies are planned for the occasion and those in charge foresee a large gathering. The issuance of this commerorative stamp would be proper recognition of the significance of the battle and a tribute to those who fought at Pea Ridge. I hope that the Congress will see fit to act expeditiously on this legislation in order that there will be sufficient time for the design and production of the stamp prior to the centennial.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1948) to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Battle of Pea Ridge, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. COOPER (for himself, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, and Mr. JAVITS), submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the previous order, I move that the Senate adjourn until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 24, 1961, at 9 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23, 1961:

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Albert A. Ridge, of Missouri, to be U.S. circuit judge for the eighth circuit, vice Archibald K. Gardner, retired.

U.S. MARSHAL

Gibson Greer Ezell, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice William K. Holt, Jr.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

A. Bayard Angle, of Florida, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 18, with headquarters in Tampa, Fla.

Mrs. Edna M. Scales, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 29, with headquarters in Portland, Oreg.

Dr. Ernest I. Mural, of Hawaii, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 32, with headquarters in Honolulu, Hawaii.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298.

To be first lieutenants

Carper, Robert R., O91180.
Dobson, Benjamin F., O91578.
Edwards, Tom R., O91815.
Emigh, Edward W., O83706.
Frye, Norman E., O91831.
Gauntner, Donald E., O91196.
Johnston, Jerry M., O91891.
Jung, Paul T., O91164.
Ney, Leland E., O88461.
Redman, David E., O92117.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Nattier, Carolyn M., N3001.

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenant

Yeatts, Frederick L. (MSC), O87985.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

McCrady, Richard T., O733936.

To be captains

Bessler, Felix J., O1930372.
Creed, William H., O1885200.
Curry, Jerry R., O1936019.
Glunn, Franklin J., O1341660.
Holland, Raymond, O4009817.
Mooneyham, Bill M., O2263072.
Roper, Devrix S., O4011978.
Sauberan, Robert L., O4005262.
Seeley, Wayne L., O1924841.
Small, Harold I., O1936075.

To be first lieutenants

Bannister, Barry B., O4010665.
Born, Edward G., O4031063.
Bowen, Cecil R., O2287796.
Brill, James H., O4066030.
Crompton, William B., Jr., O1935429.
Daly, Frederick R., O2287600.
East, Kenneth E., O5405012.
Fratzke, Walter E., Jr., O4074382.
Griggs, Carlvin J., O5300527.
Hill, Gene P., O5301758.
Kollhoff, Ronald K., O4084486.
Leister, Glenn A., O4026287.
Mascia, Donald J., O4074719.
Merritt, Sylvester A., Jr., O5301779.
Pace, Linwood A., Jr., O4031247.
Pfeiffer, Richard W., O2302243.
Piff, Walter F., Jr., O4085203.
Pitts, Walter E., Jr., O5402878.
Sonnier, Robby J., O5400198.
Vail, Nathan C., O4030766.
Willis, Raymond E., O4047918.

To be second lieutenants

Bentley, Robert G., O5505798.
Bettge, Darryl A., O5404275.
Blake, William, O5510651.
Burley, Edward B., O5212011.
Clark, Vernon L., O5403491.
Copeland, Richard L., O5213693.
Covington, Dwight H., O5305871.
Curren, William F., III, O5307553.
Daly, Charles F., O5208003.
Durham, William D., O5207175.
Ellerthorpe, Donald O., O5304200.
Estes, Glen A., O5403212.
Goff, DeWayne B., O5206205.
Gray, Robert M., III.
Herms, Alfred M., O4049144.
Howard, Jimmie B., O5404377.
Kiely, Kendall F., O5006681.
Kouril, Robert F., O4204565.
Leary, Paul E., O5403653.
Luzietti, John E., O5402034.
McGranahan, Kenneth L., O5303767.
McQuaid, Ronald J., O5308165.
Miller, Wayne R., O5509175.
O'Connell, Thomas R., O5006237.
Ondecker, Lawrence W., O5207128.
Parr, Gary K., O5403061.
Peterson, Humphrey L., Jr., O5305198.
Ranney, Thomas A., O5506014.
Roy, Daniel S., O5002875.
Schwartz, Paul R., O5507752.
Simpson, Felix D., O5208831.
Simpson, Robert M., O5505986.
Sinkler, Paul F., O5509765.
Smith, Marcus D., Jr., O5306005.
Smith, Robert D., O5208084.
Stainback, William C., O5311193.
Strong, Edward M., O5307409.
Taylor, Vernon K., O5704354.
Vogl, Raymond E., O5507911.
Walton, James F., O5308508.
Winterbottom, Rodney L., O5511272.

The following named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3294 and 3311:

To be captains, Medical Corps

Darlak, Joseph J., O4065011.
Dyer, John T., O2295027.
Mayfield, Gerald W., O1940721.
Miller, Louis V., AO3001700.
Nowosiwsky, Taras, O5004238.
Stansifer, Philip D., O2238665.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Dysart, Stanley H., Jr., O4005988.
Evans, Wayne O., O1929872.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Clark, Anna M., N2244275.
Dixon, Georgia M. F., N901442.
Donnelly, Gwendolyn N., N805773.

Garmon, Betty L., N792333.
Hernandez, Nilza R., N2291970.
McCormack, Winifred R., N5003710.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Andrews, Frank B., Jr., O2300486.
Epling, John P., Jr., O2300464.
Ewald, Roger A., O2298304.
Feagin, John A., Jr., O72048.
Herrington, Jack K., O2300465.
Raffety, John E., O2300495.
Rapoport, Morton I., O5206067.
Stambaugh, Roy A., O5501070.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Voelker, Richard W., Jr., O2297929.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Carnahan, Robert P., O5306173.
Fulton, William R., Jr., O5409958.
Harling, John T., O5300471.
Heaton, Billy A.
Lanham, Richard H., Jr., O2300453.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Ball, Elizabeth C., L2298584.
Kelly, Jacquelin J., L2300221.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Dawley, Donald D., Jr.
Fladd, Frederic H.
Foulds, David G.
Reilly, William F., Jr.
Schultz, Paul L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenants, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Aikman, Peter R.
Allred, James R.
Atkinson, John M.
Avery, John, Jr.
Bailey, Fred E.
Biggers, Homer L. H., Jr.
Bissell, Norman M.
Blanke, Richard C.
Bone, David M.
Bossart, Walter R.
Bradley, Sylvan K.
Burns, Frederick A.
Burwell, Rodney P. O5513516
Byrn, Noel R.
Campbell, Larry D.
Cavezza, Carmen J.
Chester, Michael Q.
Chronis, Nicholas N.
Corson, John R.
Crigger, Donald E.
Cundiff, Brian H.
Dickinson, Curtis L.
Dierking, Irwin S., Jr.
Dittmar, Richard S.
Dougherty, Charles H.
Eckman, Philip L.
Elan, John N.
FitzPatrick, Thomas
Flory, Richard A.
Fox, Edwin F., Jr.
Fryday, Jack C.
Garrison, David M.
Goldman, Paul J.
Harbach, David V.
Harmon, Charles E.
Harper, Jack R.
Hill, George R.
Hitchcock, Dickey
Hitt, Gary C.
Holder, Arthur T.
Howard, Barry
Ioanidis, Gabriel
Jones, William L.
Kelly, Benjamin E., Jr.
Lane, Stanley W.
Larens, James M.
Luff, Gary M.
Mack, Donald J.
Malone, William K.
Matz, Stanford
McCormick, Allen L., III
McGough, Robert E.
McLaughlin, Charles, III
McNamara, William P.
Meek, John E.
Miner, Ellis D., Jr.
Modine, Kent A.
Moore, John K.
More, Angus S., Jr.
Natkowski, Leonard J.
O'Connell, Joseph
Osterman, Gerard D.
Patterson, Freddie L.
Ragin, William D. H.
Sager, David W.
Shimer, Preston L.
Simpson, William A.
Skiles, Carl L.
Smock, Jimmie E.
Spencer, James I.
Stewart, Michael O.
Sulzen, Robert H.
Taylor, Hazel H., Jr.
Thompson, Charles R.
Weaver, Kenneth J., Jr.
Westerbeke, John H., Jr.
Williamson, Robert F.
Zerby, John G., Jr.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Cost of Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a review which appeared in the Washington Post of May 21 be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It was written by the junior Senator from Oregon and relates some of the most significant points in "Doctors, Patients, and Health Insurance," by Herman Somers and Anne R. Somers. I also ask that a news report on this book from the Washington Post of May 22 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review and news report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOTTING UP THE COST OF HEALTH CARE

(Reviewed by MAURINE B. NEUBERGER)

Medical and health care costs now total over $25 billion annually and take 5.4 percent of our Nation's total gross national product.

These figures are likely to rise, with medical care costs since World War II increasing far more rapidly than the general cost of living. In the last decade the increase was twice as fast as all prices and between June 1958 and June 1960 the rate was three and a half times. The American people are showing a growing concern with the organization and financing of medical care.

To help supply some of the answers in this complex field, Mr. and Mrs. Herman Somers have written a particularly valuable and penetrating analysis of the organization, distribution, and financing of personal medical care. I do not believe that anyone should argue the pros and cons of the Kennedy administration's proposed health coverage legislation for the retired under the social security system until he has read this book.

The problem of providing adequate health coverage for the aged has aroused public opinion and controversy. The aged in the population are increasing at the rate of more than 1,000 per day and by 1970 there will be nearly 20 million persons 65 and over.

Three-fifths of the aged had less than $1,000 in total income in 1958, according to the Bureau of the Census, and nearly four-fifths had income of less than $2,000 the same year.

In a well-reasoned chapter the Somers argue that the social security financed health coverage will best meet the needs of the aged. They point out that meaningful insurance must meet at least 75 percent of an aged person's health expenses and should embrace 85 percent of the aged population. They also argue that it is unreasonable to expect older persons to spend more than 12 percent of their incomes for medical care, which is double the national average. The husband and wife team says:

"The probable average level premium required for 75 percent protection with 12 percent of income would exclude more than three-quarters of this age group. This makes no allowance for the additional 25 percent costs to be met out of pocket. Even allowing a substantial margin for error, the situation reveals a dead end."

Dr. Basil C. McLean, recently retired president of the Blue Cross Association, is quoted as saying that "a lifetime's experience has led me at last to conclude that the costs of care for the aged cannot be met, unaided, by the mechanisms of insurance or prepayment as they exist today. The aged simply cannot afford to buy from any of these the scope of care that is required, nor do the stern realities permit any carrier, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide benefits which are adequate at a price which is feasible for any but a small proportion of the aged."

One of the most interesting and rewarding sections of the book deals with the changing pattern of medical practice and the doctor-patient relationship. The technological revolution in medicine, growing specialization in the profession, the role of clinics and combined practice have all done much to change the image of the traditional doctor-patient relationship.

The authors conclude that an inversion of some popular slogans with respect to the relationship between the quality of medical care, medical financing and the optimum doctor-patient relationship is clearly in order.

Federal employees will be reassured by the comments on the Federal employees health benefits program administered by the U.S. Civil Service Commission. The authors also endorse the closed-panel, group practice type of health coverage such as is operated by Group Health Association in the Washington area, Health Insurance Plan of New York and the Kaiser Foundation health plans on the west coast.

The entire varied field of personal health care is carefully explored with chapters devoted to the role of modern hospitals, the drug industry, the growing doctor need and shortage, health carriers and the strengths and needs in the medical insurance industry. The book is well documented by extensive footnotes, tables and charts.

The authors carefully chart the pattern of change and direction in medical care and have produced a valuable study in a highly complex and controversial field. I am sure this volume will be carefully read by all those dealing with medical care problems.

STUDY BACKS EXPANDED MEDICAL AID

(By Lewis Hawkins)

Mounting public pressure for providing adequate medical care to all Americans makes expanded Federal aid inevitable, it was reported in a research study released yesterday.

Part of this aid should be old age health insurance under the social security system but this is no sound basis for alarm among physicians or private insurance systems, the book says.

"Doctors, Patients and Health Insurance," released by the Brookings Institution, is a 534-page volume resulting from 3 years' research by Herman M. Somers and his wife, Anne R. Somers. Somers is head of the political science department at Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., and was a member of President Kennedy's preinauguration Task Force on Health and Social Security.

FORD BACKED STUDY

Research and publication were financed by the institution with assistance from the

Ford Foundation. Brookings is a private organization engaged in research and education in the social sciences. As usual, the institution notes that the conclusions reached in studies it finances do not necessarily represent the institution's views.

Much of the book is devoted to reviewing the problems of medical care including mounting costs, especially those in the drug field; the shortages of doctors and supporting personnel; the acute lack of "parahospital" facilities—nursing homes, outpatient clinics, rehabilitation centers, etc.—to care for patients now being sent to regular hospitals.

Advances in private insurance plans are praised but it is reported that about 49 million persons—28 percent of the population—remain without any protection. Most of these are in the medically indigent group who are otherwise self-supporting but cannot provide for medical care.

GENERAL AGREEMENT

Insofar as the aged are concerned, the authors find there is already general agreement on the need for public action. The main question is said to be whether it should be under Federal-State subsidy or private insurance—as provided under a 1960 Federal law—or insurance within the present social security system—which is what the Kennedy administration seeks.

The authors say:

"The latter appears simpler, more economical and more equitable as well as involving less Government intrusion in the affairs of private carriers, and greater dignity for the beneficiaries."

Interstate Compacts for Library Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would grant the consent of Congress to interstate agreements for the purpose of developing or operating library facilities and services.

Libraries, like all other governmental agencies, are searching for ways to provide service effectively and economically for all people regardless of where they live. While State, county, town, and municipal library systems are serving a large segment of the Nation, population expansion and shifts within recent years have created new groupings, bound by economic, topographic, and social considerations, but separated politically by the intrusion of State lines. Like transportation and other public services, most efficient library operations in many cases would follow these natural patterns rather than those of the more artificial political boundary lines. Interstate planning is the next step which should be taken in many localities. It appears timely, therefore, that Congress give consent in advance so that progress may be encouraged and it is for this purpose that I have introduced the bill.

Article I, section 10 of the Constitution of the United States has apparently been a deterrent to States joining in projects for mutual benefit, yet it appears that educational and library service projects cannot in any way be a "clear and present danger to the sovereignty of the United States"; in any way affect the powers delegated to the National Government; or affect the political balance within the Federal system. However, some attorneys general have ruled otherwise, and many States appear to be reluctant to pass legislation which will permit joint action on library matters.

There are two distinct areas where library service might be improved through interstate agreements—one is the great metropolitan district, and the other sparsely settled rural areas where boundaries hinder development of an area large enough to provide modern library services.

Of the 25 largest metropolitan districts 12 are on State borders. The large metropolitan library, chiefly supported by local taxation, is faced with demands for service from the entire area. Developing library service programs for the entire area could be best undertaken by the large metropolitan library and would result in a well coordinated and strengthened service for the entire district but a compact of some type would appear to be necessary.

The general statute, New York General Municipal Law, sections 460–473—supplement—interlocal agreements with governmental units of other States, in its statement of purpose clearly defines the problem for both rural and urban areas:

> To permit local governmental units to make the most efficient use of their powers by enabling them to cooperate with governmental units of other States on a basis of mutual advantage and thereby to provide services and facilities in a manner that will accord best with geographic, economic, population, and other factors influencing the needs and development of local communities.

Since the great change in transportation, and especially since the automobile has become a regular means of private transportation, populations have shifted to a point where the self-contained local village hardly exists. Shopping centers have made great changes in our way of life, as has the development of industrial centers centralized and decentralized.

We have discovered that a village library cannot provide all the information and books its residents need and desire. Television and other media are arousing interest in many subjects and problems our onetime small towner was willing to let others be informed about. Now it is necessary for the library to have greater resources than local taxes could ever provide. The centralized reference service at the State library and the bookmobiles which move from town to town leaving collections of current books of interest to all ages and groups are permitting our towns to provide the needed broader library services.

Since State boundaries are artificial at best and frequently ignore topographical limits, as well as population distribution and economic developments, it seems appropriate that every opportunity taken be given for successfully bridging these boundaries.

There are many library services which are possible on an interstate basis. Those of the large metropolitan district may be somewhat different but many of our smaller cities might effectively expand service to more rural areas in neighboring States.

A group of small libraries on a State border could jointly employ a cataloger, pool their book funds and buy and catalog their books not only with a saving of money, but with an improvement in the quality of the cataloging.

Every library of any size, particularly if it is a reference library, has a stock of books and journals which should be preserved but which are seldom used. In small States such as ours a depository could be established by several States for these seldom used materials and operated for the benefit of all. This would release valuable shelf space and permit disposal of all but one copy or set of these resources.

There will be many problems for individual States to work out ranging from methods by which State aid is to be applied to a service jointly operated at the local level, the selection of governing boards for these agencies and tax support. But if we have cleared the way by achieving the consent of Congress, then we can tackle the purely local problems.

Needed: Stronger Effort To Halt Expansion of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today, the free world is, as it should be, reexamining its policies designed to halt the outspreading of communism.

In Laos, Cuba, Vietnam, and elsewhere, we are witnessing the devious tactics employed by the Communists.

Over the weekend, I was privileged to discuss the situation over radio station WGN, Chicago.

During the address, I reviewed some possible ways in which we might strengthen our policies to halt Red aggression.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF SENATOR WILEY'S ADDRESS OVER RADIO STATION WGN

Around the globe the Communists are engaging in a powerful offensive to further their aims of world conquest. They control about one-third, or nearly 1 billion, of the people of the world.

In Laos and Cuba, the Reds are strengthening their grip on the reins of government.

Will Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia be next?

How long can the non-Communist nations permit this gobbling up, piece by piece, of more people and territory?

If this expansion continues, the scale of world power, and voting strength in the United Nations will eventually tip toward the Reds. We must not forget Mr. Khrushchev's threat to bury us.

Now what can be done?

We must "stiffen our backbone."

We must take a new look at Communist aggressions, particularly their success, and determine how to cope with the Red offensives.

Should we adopt Monroe Doctrine type policies with our allies for areas like southeast Asia? What would be involved? The following steps:

Determine a defensible line against Red aggression;

Provide forces capable of stopping the Communists at that line;

Warn the Reds that if they commit aggression against such territories, either political, military, or economic, they can expect to pay a price, war;

Develop a capability for more effectively fighting brush-fire wars;

Increase the capability of NATO, SEATO, CENTO and ANZUS to expand political, so-social and economic efforts to strengthen the free world and assist noncommitted nations to ward off the attempted inroads by the Reds;

Finally, but most important, create a more effective nonmilitary counteroffensive involving (1) designing blueprints for freedom for the nations of the world to counter communistic blueprints for takeover; (2) more strongly challenge the Reds' control of subjugated people behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains; and (3) engage in a more effective political, economic, social, cultural offensive on all fronts.

Regrettably, the free world alliances, including SEATO, have not yet developed the kind of firm, strong policy that would evoke confidence for example of the southeast Asia nations in warding off the Red offensive. Currently, countries such as Thailand are reportedly toying with the idea of adopting a "neutralist" policy.

To me, this is untenable. Why? Because a small nation, in my judgment, by itself cannot repel the concerted military, economic, political, social pressures which the Communists will be concentrating for a takeover. For the Reds, a declaration of neutralism is a sign of "open hunting season."

While India, a large country, has been able to maintain a policy of relative neutralism, she has stiffened her backbone.

In the East-West contest, the Reds have been substantially helped by lack of realistic workable plans of the West for the triumph of freedom.

In Laos, let's face it, the Reds have the upper hand.

* * * * *

While we are talking about Laos and Cuba and South America, don't forget to keep our powder dry and our eyes also focused on Berlin and the rest of the world.

Persuasion of the Amish (To Join Social Security)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, many of us have been made aware of the recent seizure and sale of the horses owned by an Amish farmer in Pennsylvania. This act, undertaken by the Internal Revenue Service to collect delinquent social security payments was a matter of concern so that I requested the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to explain the action. I have just received the Commissioner's reply and I believe that, because of the interest which the case has stimulated, this correspondence should be called to the attention of all Members of Congress.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I submit the following letter to Commissioner Caplin, the Pittsburgh Press editorial referred to in the letter, Commissioner Caplin's reply, and an excellent editorial from the Berwick Enterprise of May 2, 1961.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1961.

Hon. MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner of Internal Revenue,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I am writing to you in regard to recent action by the Internal Revenue Service against Mr. Valentine Byler of New Wilmington, Pa., in regard to a Federal tax lien amounting to $308 for unpaid taxes under the Federal Insurance Contributions Act.

I am enclosing herewith an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press of Wednesday, May 3, 1961. One of the things not mentioned in the editorial is the fact that some of Mr. Byler's fellow citizens have joined together to help him with his spring plowing.

I recognize that the payment of this tax like all other taxes is mandatory and that you and your associates have the responsibility for enforcing the payment of any Federal tax liability. However, I am very concerned with the manner which this particular problem was handled. I particularly question the timing—during the plowing season—and the particular property confiscated. I believe that you may well be concerned that this is an instance where the Federal Government got its tax dollar but where very serious damage has been done to the public attitude toward our Federal tax system. I would sincerely appreciate receiving from you some information as to the endeavors made to collect this tax prior to seizing Mr. Byler's horses. I would also like to know the reason for the timing of this particular seizure and the reason for selecting the particular assets that were involved. Your comments on the extent to which recognition was given to the restrictions on levy contained in section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code will be appreciated. Whether or not you regard draft horses as livestock is another question that I would like to have answered.

In closing I would make it clear that I am not criticizing anyone for enforcing the law, but I am seeking information as to the rationale for doing it in the particular way that it was done.

Sincerely yours,

HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI,
Member of Congress.

U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
COMMISSIONER OF INTERNAL REVENUE,
Washington, D.C., May 16, 1961.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHNEEBELI: This is in reply to your letter of May 9, 1961, concerning the collection of the delinquent social security taxes of Valentine Y. Byler for the years 1956 through 1959.

As you are aware, Public Law 761, 83d Congress, which became effective on January 1, 1955, extended social security coverage to additional groups of self-employed persons, including farm operators.

For religious reasons a minority group of Amish farmers were opposed to paying the tax on self-employment income, although they properly reported such tax on their income tax returns. The Service, being aware of the sincerity of these individuals' convictions, undertook a program of education and persuasion by which we hoped to collect the taxes involved on a voluntary basis.

In the fall of 1956 the District Director in Cleveland held meetings with Amish farmers and their church officials in an effort to solicit cooperation and voluntary compliance with the 1954 amendment. The major point which was stressed at these meetings was that the social security levy was a tax rather than an insurance premium, and that the Revenue Service was responsible for the enforcement of this legislation.

As a result of these meetings and of letters sent to the individuals involved, emphasizing their duty to comply with the tax laws, payment, in the majority of cases, was voluntarily remitted. Out of the 2,000 to 3,000 Amish farmers filing taxable returns there remained a number whose refusal to pay continued, and in approximately 130 cases over the last 2 years, collection was enforced by levying on bank accounts and from the proceeds of farm produce. In a few cases enforcement in this manner was not possible, because of the inability of Internal Revenue officials to locate bank accounts or sources of income subject to the levy process.

The instant case arose with respect to one of the more conservative members of the Amish faith. Mr. Byler, at the time of the recent seizure, owed the following self-employment taxes:

Year	Tax	Interest
1956	$82.60	$19.91
1957	76.57	17.08
1958	32.98	7.05
1959	65.63	7.14

For some time efforts to secure voluntary payment of the above taxes had been made without success. On July 13, 1960, a duly executed summons, requesting Mr. Byler to appear before a revenue officer to answer questions concerning his financial condition, was issued. Mr. Byler failed to respond to this summons. On August 2, 1960, an assistant U.S. attorney wrote Mr. Byler with regard to the summons, but there was no compliance. Subsequently, a civil contempt proceeding was brought before the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania. After a number of continuances, this proceeding was dismissed on motion of the U.S. attorney on January 20, 1961.

On April 18, 1961, a notice of seizure was handed Mr. Byler. In seizing the horses recognition was duly given the provisions of section 6334 of the Internal Revenue Code concerning property exempt from levy. The Internal Revenue officials who handled this matter were as considerate as possible of Mr. Byler's interests in seizing three of his six horses in deference to other personalty. At all times it had been the intent of the Service to avoid the imposition of any undue hardship which might arise.

On May 1, 1961, a sale was conducted in accordance with the provisions of section 6335 of the Internal Revenue Code. The gross proceeds of the sale amounted to $460.

The expenses (drayage, boarding, insurance, and advertising) amounted to $113.15. Since the liability amounted to $308.96, the surplus, $37.89, was refunded to him.

The collection of the Federal self-employment tax from Mr. Byler and other Amish people who are opposed to social security

coverage for themselves has been an unpleasant and difficult task for our people. With patience in their dealings, however, we have been successful in persuading most of them to pay their taxes voluntarily. I have been advised by our attorneys that there is nothing under the present law which would represent an exemption for individuals who would otherwise be covered, who are opposed to participation on grounds of religious belief. Since the Internal Revenue Service has no authority to relieve the Amish farmers of their liability for the Federal self-employment tax, when Mr. Byler remained adamant in his refusal to pay the tax, it was incumbent on the Pittsburgh office to proceed with collection enforcement.

I can personally assure you that the seizure of Mr. Byler's property was not timed with any malice in mind. It was merely the culmination of extended administrative proceedings. As you are aware, the Amish do not surround themselves with many of the comforts of our present-day society, so that the choice of property to levy upon was not an easy one. The selection of three horses was based upon the fact that Mr. Byler owned six horses at the time.

In recognizing the status of property exempt from levy, the revenue officer seizing the property set aside to Mr. Byler that portion of property aggregating $500 in value under section 6334(a)(2). Therefore, the question as to whether draft horses are regarded as livestock was never reached. Although the word "livestock" is not defined in section 6334, common usage would imply the inclusion of draft horses. This, of course, would be restricted to the $500 limitation set out in the section.

If additional information is desired, I would be most happy to accommodate.

Sincerely,

MORTIMER M. CAPLIN,
Commissioner.

THE STUPIDITY OF THE LAW

You don't have to go behind the Iron Curtain to find an example of the heartless and inhuman use of the power of government against the individual citizen. You need go no farther than New Wilmington, Pa.

It was there that the power and majesty of the Federal Government was invoked to show one Valentine Byler the necessity of conforming to the dictates of the Central Government.

Mr. Byler is a member of the Amish sect, whose way of life is part of their religion. They are a frugal farming people who eschew modern machinery and use horse-drawn equipment. Their religion forbids them to make war or to accept anything from government. In case of need, they take care of their own. They are entirely self-reliant.

Among other things the Amishman won't touch is the social security system. In their way of life, there is no need for old-age pensions, and some 250 Amish families around New Wilmington therefore make no payments into the social security trust fund.

But the Government contends that, as self-employed farmers, they are obligated by a 1955 law to pay 4½ percent of their gross earnings into the social security fund. In essence, this contention is that they must save for their old age whether they want to or not and whether they ever draw a nickel's worth of benefits, which no Amishman will do.

So, one W. K. Shaw of the regional Internal Revenue Service, figured out a way to teach the Amish obedience to the law. He selected Valentine Byler as the first candidate and seized his three workhorses on a lien of $308.

The other day the animals were sold, harness and all, for $460. Not a single Amishman was present at the auction sale. The IRS plans to proceed in a similar manner against other members of the Amish sect.

This is a legal atrocity and it calls for review by officials of the Internal Revenue Service, or by higher Government officers. And if relief from such a stupid enforcement policy cannot be gained that way, Congress should act promptly to amend the law.

For what the Government is saying to Valentine Byler and his neighbors is: "You'll join the social security system whether you want to or not, and if you refuse we'll take away the horses you need to make a living by tilling the soil."

This is on a par with the old vaudeville skit of a Communist orator declaiming that "Come the revolution, the workers will eat strawberries and cream." When one bystander objected that he didn't like strawberries and cream, the orator persists: "Come the revolution, you will eat strawberries and cream and you'll like strawberries and cream."

The Federal Government will look just as ridiculous if it continues seizing the horses of peaceful Amishmen to dragoon them into a forced welfare system.

[From the Berwick Enterprise, May 2, 1961]

AN OUTRAGE

Another outrage has been perpetrated in our socialistic state, and it is socialistic, whatever you care to think.

The latest outrage is the confiscation of three fine horses, owned by an Amish farmer, at New Castle, in default of $308 in back social security payments.

The Amish and Mennonites, we have said before and we repeat again, are our most admirable Pennsylvanians in these crackpot days. They pay their own way, live sensibly and ask no favors of anyone. Their beliefs do not permit them to become wards of the State in any manner, not even to the extent of social security.

Now understand, we have no fault to find with social security and we only hope there is still some of it available for pension use when we reach pension age. However, we don't feel that social security or any other socialistic idea should be forced upon those who do not want it and the Amish do not.

A tragic angle of this is that at least a dozen Amish families in the New Castle area have decided they have had enough, not only of Pennsylvania but of the United States itself, for it is the Federal Government which is attempting to force social security taxing on the Amish. So those dozen-plus families are going to sell their Pennsylvania farms and move to Canada where people still enjoy some of the freedoms that those who had the spirit of '76 fought for.

There are a lot of citizens we could well do without but the Amish are not among those. The State government has made a mess of things in attempting to force our school ideas on these people. Now the Federal Government is making a mess of things by attempting to force social security on them.

Somewhere there should certainly be a lesson in all this, but what's the use. The powers that be wouldn't believe it anyway.

Tourism—The New Economic Frontier for West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address which I was privileged to make before the second annual travel clinic, sponsored by the Upper Monongahela Valley Association, at Blackwater Lodge, Davis, W. Va., on May 12 of this year. The glories of my State of West Virginia are so many that I believe Americans in all walks of life should have the opportunity to become acquainted with them, and I trust that a reading of my remarks will spur them to do so.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When God created the earth, He richly endowed West Virginia with natural resources, not the least of which is an abundance of scenic beauty, with unparalleled mountain views, cool green forests, sparkling streams and lakes, and fertile valleys. He also gave it four distinct seasons, for He must have had in mind that these would one day provide for the people who inhabited this area a variety of opportunities for the development of a recreational center for the eastern half of these United States.

And God is infinitely wise and farseeing, for today 55 percent of the Nation's population is within a 500-mile radius of the borders of West Virginia, and I, for one, believe that all of those millions of people would welcome the opportunity to see God's handiwork in West Virginia. It remains for us to find the ways and means of stimulating them to do so.

The tourist and recreation industry in the United States is big business. Although complete statistics for recreational expenditures are not available, the size and importance of the industry is evident from the estimates of annual recreational spending, which vary from $18.3 billion to $42 billion, depending on the definition of what is to be included as recreational expenditures.

It is interesting to note, however, that in 1959, the latest year for which statistics are available, American workers took 77.7 million weeks of vacations, compared to only 54.3 million weeks in 1949. All the signs point to further increases in leisure time and all types of recreational spending. The outlook for the sixties is for an additional population of about 30 million persons, a gross national product expanded by about $256 billion, a total employment of more than 80 million compared to the present 64.5 million, and comparable increases in per capita and disposable family incomes.

Moreover, the United States is shifting from a production oriented economy to a consumption oriented economy, with increasing emphasis on services, cultural activities, travel, and recreation of all types.

Outdoor recreation, in particular, has a larger role in the life of most Americans. The tremendous increase in usage of Federal parks, State parks, and other public recreational facilities in the last decade clearly illustrates the growth trend in outdoor recreation. From 1950 to 1958, attendance at public parks and recreation areas increased as follows: National parks, by 76 percent; national forest lands, by 150 percent; Bureau of Reclamation projects, by 195 percent; Corps of Engineer reservoirs, by 492 percent; State parks by 108 percent; TVA lakes by 120 percent; and wildlife refuges by 165 percent.

The actual use of these public recreational areas has far exceeded the planning estimates made over 10 years ago, and there is every indication that this growth will continue and probably accelerate. In 1959 alone, the number of people visiting national parks and national monuments had surpassed the

highest pre-World War II total by about 14 million.

Americans have taken to spending more time and money in a variety of outdoor recreational pursuits which include: hunting, fishing, boating, skiing, and swimming. In 1955, a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service survey estimated that there were 25 million sportsmen in the United States. The executive secretary of the Sport Fishing Institute, Mr. Robert N. Pavel, estimates the number of fishermen in the United States today at 28 million. The Fish and Wildlife Service survey showed that there were one or more sportsmen in one out of every three households, and that 18 percent of all persons over 12 years of age in our country fished, and that 10 percent hunted. Today, collectively, the Nation's sportsmen spend from $2 billion to $10 billion a year on this form of recreation.

The rise in the number of fishing and hunting licenses issued annually is another indication of the growing number of people who have joined the ranks of the country's sportsmen. Since 1950, the number of fishing licenses sold increased by 30.4 percent nationally, and the number of hunting licenses rose by 20.2 percent. In addition, more sportsmen are going outside their home State to pursue these sports. This is attested to by the fact that the number of nonresident fishing and hunting licenses sold during this same period increased by 40.9 percent and 132 percent, respectively.

Boating has been called the Nation's fastest growing family sport. Between 1948 and 1958, retail expenditures for boating increased by 167 percent, the number of recreational boats in use increased by 144 percent, and the number of participants in recreational boating increased by 196 percent. A 1960 Department of Commerce estimate placed spending on boating in our country at $2.7 billion, and the average annual expenditure of each boatowner at $146.

A number of factors are responsible for the boom in all types of outdoor recreational activity. In addition to the population explosion expected in this country in the next decade, during which some 30 million more persons will be added to our population figures, there is a trend toward shorter workweeks, toward longer vacations, toward earlier retirements, and a longer lifespan. Then, too, higher standards of living give further impetus to the growth of a recreation industry.

What does all of this mean, and what should all of this mean to West Virginia? To answer this question, I think it is important that we examine what tourism means to some of our neighboring States. Travel expenditures amounted to $654 million in 1960 in Virginia, and $360 million in North Carolina. Maryland expects to reach a $300 million tourist business by the end of this year, and says that $12 million of this will be in sales of gasoline, out of which the State will also realize taxes and fees. In West Virginia, the State industrial and publicity commission estimated that tourists spent $270,569,477 in 1959. The commission is now the department of commerce.

The figures which I have just quoted show that our State experienced a smaller income from tourism than did our neighboring States, despite the fact that West Virginia has far more to offer in the way of scenic beauty and water resources than our neighboring States.

In West Virginia, the number of visitors dropped from a high of 8,115,429 in 1955, to 7,378,218 in 1958, and then increased slightly to 7,450,625 in 1959. There are several indicated reasons for the fact that there has been no substantial increase in tourism in our State, at a time when our neighboring States have been enjoying solid spurts in this business.

One major deficiency is the fact that our State lacks adequate accommodations for tourists either inside or outside the parks and forest areas—and this includes 20 State parks, 12 State forests, 2 national forests, 2 reservoir areas, as well as 63,000 acres in public hunting areas which are owned or leased by the State conservation commission. In 1959, 114,313 visitors stayed overnight in the State parks, which was a substantial increase over the prior year. But, although attendance at State park and forest areas now exceeds 2 million annually, there are overnight cabin accommodations for only 1,200 people. Tent and trailer camping facilities are also desperately needed, but at present there are only about 150 sites available.

As a result of these shortcomings in accommodations, hundreds of people must be turned away from West Virginia's recreational areas for lack of overnight lodging facilities. In comparison, I might add, California has furnished some 30,000 camping sites for its citizens and tourists.

Another major problem confronting our State, insofar as tourism is concerned, is the pollution of our streams and rivers. Although the State issued more than 487,000 fishing and hunting licenses in 1959, this number could be substantially increased if the ugly pollution in our water resources were remedied in some parts of the State.

West Virginia has many public land areas stocked with an abundance of game—deer, bear, quail, and wild turkeys, to mention some. But out-of-State hunters have been finding it difficult to arrange for sleeping accommodations during hunting season. A few years ago, a program was started to encourage farmers and other local residents to provide housing for sportsmen during hunting season. This program needs to be augmented by an educational campaign, because every additional sportsman we can accommodate means anywhere from $50 to more than $100 spent in our State.

The historical attractions of West Virginia are surpassed only by its impressive scenic beauties. But here again, full use has not been made of the potentialities of, say, the Civil War sites around Keyser and in other sections of the State, nor of the antebellum homes and other historic attractions. Better roadside markings and more publicity on West Virginia's rich heritage might bring many more visitors to our State, particularly during this Civil War Centennial period. Moreover, the establishment of a national monument near Parkersburg, Point Pleasant, and Charles Town, would further emphasize the historic significance of our State and its valleys since before the Revolutionary War days.

Other possible means of attracting tourists to West Virginia include augmenting the spectator sports facilities of our State. These now include four horseracing tracks, and various baseball, football, and basketball events. However, ice hockey, and skiing, which are becoming more and more popular, offer excellent opportunities for expansion of the off-season tourist trade. West Virginia is one of the few States south of the Mason-Dixon line which offer skiing on a commercial basis, and I want to say that the management of Black Water Lodge has done a notable job in acquainting out-of-Staters with the excellence of ski slopes hereabouts.

An equally notable job in attracting tourists to West Virginia has been done by the communities and organizations which sponsor local festivals. I have in mind the Buckhannon Strawberry Festival, the Spencer Walnut Festival, the Forest Festival at Elkins, the Folk Festival at Glenville, and the Preston County Buckwheat Festival. These events are unique to the culture and resources of West Virginia, and every effort should be made to advertise them more widely, at least throughout the eastern half of the United States.

In connection with advertising, one possible explanation for the decrease in the number of visitors to the State since 1955 is the lack of adequate promotion or advertising. State appropriations for this purpose amounted to $375,000 in North Carolina, $501,000 in Virginia, and only $20,000 in West Virginia, according to the American Automobile Association. Moreover, additional amounts are spent in adjoining States by private interests in the promotion of tourism. This is a matter which I am certain Governor Barron's administration will correct. But beyond what the State may attempt to do, I believe that more can be done through an association of all resorts, hotels, motels, and restaurants, because in the final analysis they get the largest share of the tourist dollar.

Finally, I want to say that if the construction of the proposed scenic highland road through the Monongahela National Forest can be undertaken and completed, the tourist potential of West Virginia will increase by leaps and bounds. The road would open up scenic panoramas of breathtaking beauty, and would afford access to presently inaccessible streams and lakes, camping and picnic sites, richly gamed hunting areas, and numerous other attractions.

The existence of the Skyline Drive in Virginia is said to be largely responsible for that State's having grossed approximately $645 million in tourist business last year. I feel that if our scenic highland road becomes a reality, tourism will suddenly become the biggest business in our State. But until ways and means are found for the task of getting this road built, let us concentrate on the many little ways of increasing tourism in West Virginia—for if we take care of all the little ways, the growth of tourism and its effect upon the economy of our State may prove to be the greatest of all blessings which the natural resources of West Virginia have afforded our people.

Federal, State, Municipal Cooperation—An Address by Joe L. Evins, Member of Congress from Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. FRAZIER, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. FRAZIER. Mr. Speaker, my friend and colleague, the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, recently addressed a meeting of the Tennessee Municipal League in my hometown of Chattanooga. His remarks were particularly fitting and they are significant for the great amount of information regarding Federal spending in Tennessee and for the excellent illustrations of Federal-municipal cooperation contained in them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of our distinguished colleague be reprinted in the RECORD.

The address follows:

REMARKS BY HON. JOE L. EVINS, OF TENNESSEE, TENNESSEE MUNICIPAL LEAGUE, CHATTANOOGA, TENN., MAY 15, 1961

President McInturff, Mayor Olgiati, Judge Frost, distinguished guests, members of the Tennessee Municipal League, my fellow Ten-

nesseans, and friends, certainly it is a pleasure to be able to meet with you again. When your able and energetic executive secretary, Herbert Bingham, invited me to meet with you again, I accepted without hesitation for I had never forgotten my enjoyable visit with the Municipal League here in Chattanooga a few years ago. I consider your invitation for this repeat visit as indeed a compliment.

I always enjoy the bracing air of Chattanooga and certainly am pleased to visit in the hometown of my colleagues, Tennessee's senior Senator ESTES KEFAUVER and Congressman JAMES B. FRAZIER, both of whom represent Chattanooga, this district and our State so ably in the Congress.

I respect the membership of the Municipal League of Tennessee. This organization is composed of a body of men who are among the leaders of our State and experts in the science of Government.

There are those who say that we in the Congress have not introduced scientific methods in the Federal Government, that we are falling behind and slipping backward.

We have our debates and difficulties and, like you, our problems, but I take the affirmative side that we are moving forward and making progress.

This year, in just a few months, we have succeeded in passing a lot of legislation and even in putting a man into space.

However, we all recognize there is much yet to be accomplished.

I must confess that perhaps the greatest satisfaction of serving in Government is found among your group, those on the local level who see progress each day, who see great programs put into effect and materialized. We in the Congress deal in policies and plans, programs in the abstract, and, I should add, appropriations. Whereas you, our mayors and municipal officials, see many of these programs materialize. It is you who put them into operation and actually see the improvements completed.

Our cities and towns are being improved with interstate highway systems and municipal airports constructed.

Many additional projects are financed by both the local and Federal Governments. The building of great housing projects, programs of slum clearance, urban renewal, sewage disposal plants, local National Guard armories, and, yes, many local industrial developments are aided by federally financed programs. All are made possible by local initiative, some local financing, but largely by appropriations passed by the Congress, all to serve our people, the public needs, through matching fund programs and cooperation.

As you know, there are those who attack the Congress and those who cry against Federal aid and Federal spending, but in this day I believe that the mayors of our cities recognize perhaps more than others that it takes the combined energies, imagination and dedication of all our elected officials, at all levels of government, cooperating and working together to achieve progress and to advance freedom in our civilization.

While we speak nationally of New Frontiers, I know that here at home in Tennessee we have our own new frontiers—problems pressing for solution. Our work and efforts are so entwined, the destiny of the people we represent are the same, so there exists a real need for a closer cooperation, better working relationships at all levels of government and particularly between our municipalities and the Federal Government.

With the complexities and the problems of our day, perhaps the best Government that can be evolved in America is a partnership government, involving partnership action between our cities and State officials and the Federal Government.

I must admit a partiality toward our municipal officials and interest in city government.

My father, who for 16 years was mayor of my hometown of Smithville, has had a very great influence on my attitudes, naturally.

He gave me an early start toward the forming of philosophical ties with individuals whose principal concern is the building of the community. My interests, growing out of this experience, have been of inestimable value to me in my work as a Member of Congress. They have served to focus attention constantly on the basic consideration of government, whether it be in Washington, Chattanooga, Smithville or elsewhere, and that basic consideration is that what is happening on the local level is what is important. How our laws and programs affect the local community is of the greatest importance, for local government is the bedrock of our society.

As you gentlemen are aware and know all too well, there has been an increasing demand over the years from locally elected officials for more and more programs of aid and assistance from the Federal Government. This has grown out of the fact that the local tax base has to a large extent been exhausted and because there exists a need for additional skills and finances to provide the services which our modern-day cities and municipalities require and the public demands.

While we have had change, one thing has not changed, with which I am sure you will all agree, the demands for more service and more appropriations.

I am reminded that our position collectively as a city and a nation is like the multimillionaire who, on being interviewed, was asked about his good fortune and he commented, "I never hesitate to give full credit to my wife and her assistance." "In what way did she help?" the reporter asked. "Well if you want the whole truth," the man replied, "I married her because I was curious to find out if there was any income she couldn't live beyond."

Many of our cities are requested to provide services which require living beyond their incomes and they are calling on the Federal Government for help and assistance. It is only in recent months that some say that this era of Federal aid has been enhanced.

In almost every bill that comes before the Congress the question is raised, How will it affect our States and cities and municipalities?

In the consideration of legislation we are interested in knowing what you are doing, what you are thinking, and what our municipal leaders are planning and accomplishing. Your programs have a tremendous bearing on legislation in Congress.

The Appropriations Committee on which I serve, and, yes, the House Select Committee on Small Business, on which I also serve, are almost daily made aware of the growing concentration of problems facing our local communities and States. These problems of local governments, on an increasingly extensive scale, are reflected in the many requests for Federal appropriations.

When I spoke to the Municipal League several years ago, our country was engaged in the Korean war, and the Federal Government necessarily was concerned with measures affecting our war effort—shortages, rationing, priorities and allocations.

Today we are engaged in the cold war and a war on slums, poverty, unemployment, surplus labor in our cities and idle plant capacity.

AREA REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The Area Redevelopment Act is the most recent example of dual action, action which calls for increasing our joint energies to help solve these problems, to arrest unemployment, to provide for a greater and more satisfactory rate of national growth.

This new act, recently signed into law by President Kennedy, sets up a fund totaling $394 million for use in treating some of our Nation's economic ills.

The Depressed Areas Act is largely a loan program, and essentially a local self-help program.

The Federal Government has been directed by Congress to carefully confine its participation to measures which will encourage local initiative and stimulate local leadership in this effort over the next 4 years.

The new law, considered in perspective, provides a relatively small amount of money to do a large and vitally important job. For example, the total outlay authorized represents less than half of 1 percent of our total Federal budget, and about one-tenth of what we have been spending on foreign aid annually for many years. It should be pointed out that this measure is designed to help our own country and will provide assistance in alleviating our own problems in distressed areas and underdeveloped areas throughout the United States.

From the marshaling of such attention will come large benefits not only to the communities receiving direct assistance but to all America.

The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to cooperate with leaders in designated areas of need for a well-planned attack on the increasingly complex problems of local communities.

It puts a new challenge to every community to make more careful assessment of community needs, to make larger plans, to exert greater efforts for public improvements, to organize its own industrial corporations.

The new law focuses attention upon the needs, opportunities and rewards of local industrial development.

It provides aid and expert advice for the development of long-range planning at the local level.

It encourages the local community to engage in the important work of technical training and retraining, which is increasingly essential in this day of automation.

In a word, the Area Redevelopment Act is designed to give real impetus to industrial decentralization which must be speeded up in the interests of a stable national economy and to promote our free enterprise system.

This program has been rather aptly described as operation "seed corn" for the American community. Federal loan funds are provided in cases where adequate private financing is not available, and Federal grants are authorized in cases where communities are unable to finance public works for themselves.

Specifically, the bill provides $100 million for each of two revolving funds, one to be used for loans in industrial areas and the other for rural areas.

Community and regional development agencies may borrow up to 65 percent of the cost of clearing land, building plants, and, in special cases, the cost of equipment and machinery to attract new plants.

The new legislation also permits the Federal Government to make grants to pay up to two-thirds of the net cost of clearing slum areas. This supplements the urban renewal program previously in effect.

In addition to making the urban renewal grants, the Secretary of Commerce is empowered to make up to 10 percent of any future capital grant for urban renewal for nonresidential slum clearance projects in designated areas. This will make it possible for these communities to provide industrial sites and to bolster their tax bases.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

The Small Business Administration, now a permanent agency of the Government, with a loan authority of approximately $1 billion

serves our cities and small business communities in an increasingly wide range of public service.

The SBA has been empowered to make loans to State and local development corporations for plant construction, conversion, and expansion. This authority was about to expire in 6 weeks but the Congress included a proviso in the Area Redevelopment Act removing the time limitation, and thus extending this program which is beginning to be more widely understood and appreciated.

Congress has thus made available some valuable tools for municipal use. These programs are not imposed upon anybody. They are simply available and cities may use them if they wish to do so. If any of you experience any difficulty in obtaining information as to how to participate and take advantage of the provisions of SBA services, let me know and I shall try to be of helpfulness.

A few figures from the Small Business Administration will serve to show how the services of this agency may be locally utilized.

SBA has well been called a little RFC. Loans are made available direct to small business, to local development corporations, and in times of disaster, to all residents of the community.

Since 1958, when this agency was created, direct loans amounting to $17.5 million have been made and another $26.5 million in loans committed; for a total of approximately $43.5 million.

In Tennessee alone, SBA has made business loans exceeding $21 million.

Recently, SBA Administrator John E. Horne announced the lowering of interest rates to 4 percent on loans to companies located in surplus labor areas, and pointed out that funds were available to local industrial development companies for this purpose. He urged and invited wider use of this type of financial assistance.

The State and local development companies have not used the credit facilities of this agency as much as expected. Mr. Horne, SBA Administrator, tells me that to date 123 industrial development corporation loan applications have been received, 99 have thus far been approved for a total of about $12 million.

The House Small Business Committee has exerted constant pressure for greater use of the Small Business Administration's capacities in this and other phases of our economic life—and now a heartening change has come under the new administration. Fresh vigor and broader purpose are being evidenced in all SBA operations under the direction of the new Administrator, John E. Horne, a native of Alabama.

Real opportunities which exist for the development corporation are illustrated by the experience of a development corporation of North Carolina, which borrowed $1 million from SBA. This loan made up about one-fifth of the corporation's financial backing, the remainder coming from commercial banks, life insurance companies, building, savings and loan associations. Since 1956 this one industrial development corporation has approved 131 loans for $16 million for new plants and expansions, and for purchase of machinery and equipment. The new business activity sparked by this enterprise resulted in maintaining employment for at least 8,000 persons and created jobs for 14,000 more, a total of 22,000 jobs resulting from the work of this one development corporation.

SBA's major function, that of providing financial assistance to small firms, is now being brought into the full exercise which the Congress prescribed for it.

The Subcommittee on Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration, which I have the honor to serve as chairman, held extensive hearings during the last session of Congress. We attempted to focus the spotlight on the deficiencies in SBA's loan policies. Our hearings were significant in pointing up the negative loan policies and the many instances of discouragement offered business and community initiative.

Our congressional committees spearheaded a drive to reverse policies of the last administration under which the small business share of total military purchases of goods and services declined from 25.3 percent in 1954 to 16 percent in 1960.

Today I believe this trend has been reversed and conditions have improved.

Now there is both congressional and administrative support for steps giving small business a larger voice in Government procurement policy.

The President has set as an administrative goal an increase of at least 10 percent in the amount of defense work, defense contracts going to small business.

Only last week in hearings before our Appropriations Committee I heard and saw evidence of this policy being put into effect. The Chief of Engineers testified that the number of construction contracts awarded to small business is being stepped up and that the Corps of Engineers is now setting aside for small business virtually all construction contracts under $500,000.

ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

There are other Federal agencies, as you gentlemen are aware, which offer both financial and technical assistance in community development programs—such as the Housing and Home Finance Agency, including especially its Community Facilities Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, among others.

The Federal Interstate Highway System is one of the most outstanding examples of Federal-State cooperation and of the vast benefits which Tennessee and the Nation receive as a result of an excellent program of cooperation.

Since the interstate program was enacted by Congress there has been allocated to Tennessee more than $415 million of Federal funds for the highway program in our State. Last August $80.7 million became available for fiscal years 1961–62 alone.

Two weeks ago we passed in the House a bill authorizing funds to complete the 41,000-mile Interstate Highway System and put the program back on schedule. Seventy-eight million dollars additional has been earmarked for Tennessee for fiscal 1963.

The services of the Community Facilities Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, are well known to you gentlemen. Certainly much has been accomplished through the advances made available for public work planning and loan programs of this branch of our Government which is especially set up to assist and serve the needs of our cities and municipalities.

During this year, the Community Facilities Administration has approved or now has before it for approval 21 loan applications from cities in Tennessee.

This agency is asking for an appropriation of $4 million for next year for payment to the revolving fund out of which planning advances to cities are made.

Grants are made by CFA for drawing of architectural plans for a variety of types of community improvements, including water or sewer, health facilities, public buildings, roads and streets, among others.

The U.S. Public Health Service also has a program of making grants to cities, but specifically designed for another purpose; namely, water pollution protection and community public health needs.

So far during the current year, the Public Health Service has made grants of $1,286,000 for nine projects in Tennessee which will cost $6 million plus when completed.

The very recently enacted Water Pollution Control Act is designed to augment the work of the Public Health Service and increases the authorization for sewage treatment plants from $50 to $100 million annually.

The demand and need for this increase has been clearly shown and demonstrated in the public interest.

The Public Housing Administration, under the Public Housing Act of 1949, has certified 164 low rent housing projects for Tennessee. There are today in our State 57 local housing authorities serving 70 communities with grants to our large- and medium-sized communities.

The latest figures show that currently there are 18,018 units completed and under local management, with 550 units under construction and 1,685 additional units in the planning stage.

Local housing authorities in our State have received more than $30,700,000 in contributions and, in fiscal year 1960 alone, payments have exceeded $4.5 million.

The urban renewal program has also been well received by the cities of our State.

On the national scale more than $1,871 million has been spent for urban renewal programs with more than $67.7 million going to 21 cities in Tennessee for 31 urban renewal projects. President Kennedy in a recent message to the Congress called for acceleration of this program to help clear our cities of slums. He has requested an authorization of $2.5 billion to be used over the next 4 years. Since 1949 total expenditures for urban renewal projects have been $1.8 billion. The President's new program thus calls for a 30-percent increase in this field during the next 4 years.

This money is matching-fund money and will require the city and State combined to match available Federal funds for urban renewal projects.

Federal grants for airport construction in Tennessee have amounted to almost $15 million.

Thirty-one airports in our State have been built or partially built by Federal grants.

There are a number of uncompleted and planned other airport projects for Tennessee.

FAA's revised budget for 1962 calls for an appropriation of $75 million for an accelerated airport modernization and improvement program on a matching fund basis.

We in Tennessee are all familiar with and certainly proud of the work and contributions of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

One of the brighter aspects of the new Washington picture appears in the field of conservation and water resource development.

New long-range policies on water and power development and conservation are in the making.

The "no new starts" era has ended. The TVA spirit is soaring. The 1,000-mile-long Tennessee River with its many untapped and unused industrial sites should, in my view, be acquired and made ready for future industrial growth needs. Our cities and State should purchase these sites in cooperation with private industry and the TVA to insure requirements for the future.

The revised budget of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation calls for 57 new starts and the completion of 36 other great dams and reservoir projects throughout the Nation.

The Department of Agriculture's small watershed project program and the rural development program are encouraging and assisting some 200 such projects in 40 States, including 10 in Tennessee.

Many large-scale programs having an immense bearing on the future of our cities,

towns, and rural areas are now before the Congress.

Today our cities are offered challenging opportunities for planning for future growth needs.

With initiative, imagination, and a spirit of cooperation and working together we can move forward to eliminate slums and depressed areas, revitalize underdeveloped areas, promote industry and employment, beautify our cities, raise the level of our community life and make our cities more prosperous and a better place in which to live throughout our beloved State.

Our future progress will depend, to a large degree, on the extent of cooperation we each give to our several levels of government. Each is interrelated to the other. All local, State, and Federal agencies are concerned for the common good and the promotion of health, education, safety, and welfare of all our citizens in Tennessee.

I find myself among old friends, those who are interested in public affairs and dedicated to public service. This makes it abundantly clear that our joint purposes will not falter nor fail for lack of local leadership.

I take from you increased purpose in our mutual task of community building. Best wishes as you go forward in community building.

Thank you very much.

Address by Representative Frank Boykin, of Alabama, at Dedication of Jackson Lock and Dam on the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway, April 7, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the completion of another vital step in the modernization of Alabama's Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway was observed on April 7, 1961, with the dedication of the Jackson lock and dam on the lower reaches of that great river system. On that important occasion, Representative FRANK BOYKIN, dean of the Alabama delegation in the House of Representatives, made the main address at the dedication ceremonies held before an audience of several thousand interested Alabamians. Included below are the timely remarks made by Congressman BOYKIN on this occasion:

We are gathered here this afternoon to commemorate a major step forward in the modernization of one of Alabama's most important, most valuable and potentially most useful natural resources—the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. The river system, more than 460 miles in length, extends from the deep-water port of Mobile into the very heart of the State. It has been a significant factor in the growth and development of this area since the earliest pioneer settlement, but its greatest value and service are yet to be realized.

Jackson lock and dam which we dedicate today is one of the keys that will open the way for maximum utilization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway and transform it into a fully productive, wealth-creating instrument of progress. Jackson lock and dam is an essential and integral part of the master plan conceived by the Army's Corps of Engineers to harness the river system to the needs of Alabama and the Southeast for the next half century or more.

The program envisioned by the Army Engineers, carried to a successful completion, will pay enormous dividends. It will provide an efficient, low-cost avenue of transportation; it will give us new sources of hydroelectric energy; it will assure greater supplies of water for home, farm and factory; it will alleviate floods, abate pollution, and create unexcelled opportunities for healthful recreation.

The vast impact of the waterway's development already is being felt. Construction of new industrial plants and the expansion of existing manufacturing and service facilities along the Warrior-Tombigbee are taking place at a multimillion-dollar pace. Announced investments for capital growth by industry in the Warrior-Tombigbee Basin have totaled more than $380 million over the past 6 years, and this amount does not include additional millions spent for improvements to transportation systems, expansions by utilities and the construction of military installations.

These investments are of benefit, directly and indirectly, to the entire State. In addition to the generation of additional tax dollars for much needed enlargement of essential public services, they have produced several thousand new jobs in many fields and skills for our people.

The economic expansion fostered by the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee is not concentrated in one area. Rather, it is occurring throughout the valley, and is being carried on by a variety of industries. During the past few years, we have seen new coal mines opened along the upper waterway; we have seen the establishment and growth of paper-producing plants at Tuscaloosa, Naheola, Demopolis, and Mobile; we have seen more than $150 million invested in chemical plants in the Washington County area; we have seen a major steam electric generating plant built at Barry; we have seen the lumber, shipbuilding, textile, and metal fabricating industries increase their productive capacities.

Yet, even with these gratifying developments, we have hardly scratched the surface. Other areas of the Nation are growing at an even faster rate—as evidenced by the fact that we shall lose one of our Congressmen on the basis of the 1960 census.

Yes, we still have a lot of catching up to do. And if we are to move ahead, one of the things we must do is press for the wise conservation, development, and use of the water resources Nature has so abundantly bestowed on Alabama.

Our State is practically framed by rivers. To the north is the Tennessee, which carries more than 12 million tons of commerce annually. To the east is the Chattahoochee, a part of the Apalachicola-Chattahoochee-Flint system which is now under development. To the west are the Mobile and Tombigbee Rivers, and to the south is the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway which, while not a river, is an improved navigation channel. And running diagonally across the State is the Alabama-Coosa system.

In all, Alabama has 1,500 miles of authorized waterways with depths of 9 feet or more. Of this total, approximately 750 miles have been completed.

We must press forward with all our energy to insure that the remaining mileage is improved as rapidly as practicable. We cannot afford to do otherwise.

This is not a matter of concern for the few. It is a matter of concern for every man and woman who lives and works in Alabama. All of us must remain keenly alert to the progress being made in the conservation, development, and use of our water resources. We must all gives these programs our active support, for only this way can we hope to accomplish our objective.

As General Barney has indicated, considerable progress has been made in recent years in carrying out the modernization of the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. Demopolis lock and dam was completed in 1955 to eliminate four obsolete navigation projects; the Warrior lock and dam between Eutaw and Greensboro was finished 2 years later to remove two deteriorated, inadequate structures, and today we dedicate still another new facility.

In the headwaters of the Warrior River, the Alabama Power Co., always in step with the needs and ambitions of the State, has built with private capital the Lewis Smith Dam on the Sipsey Fork, thereby becoming an active partner in carrying forward the waterway's improvement. The Alabama power project, representing one of the three headwater dams urged several years ago by the Corps of Engineers, was designed and built so as to fit into the comprehensive program for the Warrior-Tombigbee.

Our next step in modernizing the waterway is construction of Holt lock and dam in the district of my colleague, ARMISTEAD SELDEN. By replacing four old locks and dams, it will extend above Tuscaloosa the modern waterway dimensions which the Warrior, Demopolis, and Jackson projects provide between that city and Mobile.

The Corps of Engineers will be in a position to use initial construction money for Holt lock and dam in fiscal 1962, which begins July 1. We are encouraged by the fact that the budget now being considered by Congress recommends $750,000 for that purpose. But let us remember that it's a long way between a budget recommendation and an appropriation. And even then, we will have money only for the first year's construction. It will be necessary for us to fight year by year for subsequent appropriations to complete the project in an orderly manner.

The urgent need for Holt lock and dam is demonstrated by the Warrior-Tombigbee's steady growth in commerce, which has more than doubled during the past decade, reaching 5,756,227 tons in 1959 to set a record high for the seventh consecutive year.

Accompanying the continued rapid growth in movements has been a change in the pattern of traffic that makes early completion of the Holt project even more vital. In 1949, only a little more than 800,000 tons or 38 percent of the Warrior-Tombigbee's total commerce moved in that reach to be improved by Holt lock and dam. In 1959, however, this portion of the river carried almost 2,900,000 tons or 50 percent of the total.

Major difficulty encountered by navigation above Tuscaloosa is caused by the small size of the existing locks, built between 1905 and 1915. These structures are only 52 feet wide and about 285 feet long, as compared with lengths of 600 feet and widths of 110 feet at the new locks.

Only four 500-ton barges can transit these four locks at one time, and as a consequence multiple barge tows must break their formations and transit the structures in two or three operations. A double lockage tow spends about 1½ hours in passing each of the structures or a total of 6 hours. A triple lockage spends a total of more than 9 hours in lockages alone.

The Holt lock and dam with its single large chamber will accommodate all size tows in one operation of about half an hour.

Overall, it is estimated that the new project will save an average tow more than 21 hours per voyage. Such economies will make the waterway still more advantageous for the transportation of bulk commodities

and heavy finished and semifinished goods, and thereby greatly improve our position in attracting industry.

Construction of Holt lock and dam is the next logical step in the waterway's modernization and unless we obtain an initial construction appropriation for the coming fiscal year a serious interruption will occur in our timetable. The Corps of Engineers has carefully studied the need for the project and has solid proof of its economic merit. We have made and shall continue making every effort to see that it is undertaken without delay.

I assure you that the Alabama congressional delegation is unanimously behind the plan to improve the Warrior-Tombigbee Waterway. I can say without fear of contradiction that no other State in the Union has a congressional delegation that is more dedicated to the development of our natural resources. And I can say that we in the delegation will work for every meritorious program to make all of Alabama's rivers fully useful and productive.

But to do this, we need your help. With your assistance and your interest, we shall surely succeed.

How To Get More Gold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, anyone interested in gold—and who is not?—should read the story told to the Mining Subcommittee of the House Interior Committee recently by Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON, of California.

It clearly shows, as I have often argued, that one good way to correct our troublesome international gold imbalance is to produce more gold at home. It can be done. Congressman "BIZZ" JOHNSON, who represents the Mother Lode District of California, tells how and why it should be done.

His statement relates specifically to House Joint Resolution 185, of which he is the author. It is equally pertinent to Senate Joint Resolution 44, of which I am the author with the cosponsorship of Senator CASE, of South Dakota, and Senator KUCHEL, of California. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Congressman JOHNSON be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, OF CALIFORNIA, BEFORE MINES AND MINING SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman, the Second Congressional District of California contains the mother lode and major California gold-producing counties which made our State famous in the days of the forty-niners. For myself and on behalf of the gold-mining industry of California, I want to express my sincere appreciation for the opportunity to be heard and discuss with you the critical conditions which exist in the gold-mining industry.

Gold was one of the first metals used by man and has been valued above all others because of its beauty, scarcity, and imperishability. It has become the standard of our world monetary systems. The search for gold has led to the settling of new lands. As I mentioned a moment ago, discovery of gold in California gave tremendous impetus to the great westward movement in our own country.

During the last half of the 19th century, the United States was the leading producer of gold in the world. Yet today it produces only 3 percent of the world's gold.

What happened to change the picture so drastically? Several things happened. The goldfields of Africa developed rapidly, and this restless nation became the world's leading producer of gold in 1905. The United States held onto second place until about 1930, when it was displaced by Canada, and then a few years later the Soviet Union became the world's second largest producer of gold, relegating this country to fourth place.

This was a relative comparison, because the U.S. production continued to climb through the years spurred by President Roosevelt's proclamation of January 31, 1934, increasing the price of gold from $20.67 to $35 per ounce. Production reached an all-time record of 4,869,949 ounces in 1940. This record was achieved even though at that time—two decades ago—profit margins had become so narrow that extremely efficient operations were required.

Gold mining became a casualty of World War II. War Production Board Order L–208 and other official restrictions denied goldmines equipment, supplies, and manpower. Mines were closed down. When order L–208 was lifted on July 1, 1945, 2½ years of idleness had left its toll. Many of the mines had watered up. Equipment had deteriorated from lack of use, and rehabilitation required great investment. Companies with closed mines had suffered financial losses from which they never were able to recover. Higher prices for equipment, and supplies, and higher wages combined with the difficulties of recruiting efficient labor forces made former operators reluctant to reopen mines, especially when profit margins were even narrower than those existing in 1940.

During the war years of 1943–45, for the first time on record, over half of the domestic gold output was recovered from base-metal ores, and a pattern was established. Today 28 percent of our gold production still is the byproduct harvest of the base-metal industry. The Nation's second largest individual gold producer is a copper mine.

In spite of these difficulties, production staged a modest comeback from the depths of 1945 when the yield was only one-fifth of the 1940 record, until the critical year of 1947 when domestic production reached 2.1 million fine ounces. From that time on, the trend has been downward due to continuously rising costs of gold-mine operations and cutbacks in base-metal production. The production dropped to 1.7 million ounces, valued at about $58 million in 1960. This is only 3 percent greater than the 1959 production, which was the peacetime low of the century.

Mr. Chairman, we hear much of depressed industries. I think you would have to agree that the gold mining industry of the United States is one of the most depressed industries in our Nation's economy. Throughout the gold producing areas of the United States, and especially in the gold producing areas of California, the number of producers has declined steadily as more and more go out of business. Two decades ago there were 4,000 placer mines in operation in this country; by 1958 there were only 250. In 1940 there were about 5,000 lode mines; in 1958 there were only 300. World production has been following the opposite trend—upward. In 1959, alltime record yields were realized throughout the world. A total of 42.8 million ounces valued at nearly $1.5 billion was produced.

Mr. Chairman, the trends are shown by the following production chart:

Year	U.S. mine production	World production
	Fine ounces	*Fine ounces*
1945	954, 572	26, 100, 000
1946	1, 574, 505	27, 500, 000
1947	2, 109, 186	28, 900, 000
1948	2, 014, 257	29, 600, 000
1949	1, 991, 783	31, 000, 000
1950	2, 394, 231	32, 700, 000
1951	1, 980, 512	33, 500, 000
1952	1, 893, 261	34, 300, 000
1953	1, 958, 293	33, 700, 000
1954	1, 837, 310	35, 100, 000
1955	1, 880, 000	36, 300, 000
1956	1, 827, 000	38, 400, 000
1957	1, 794, 000	39, 600, 000
1958	1, 739, 000	40. 600, 000
1959	1, 604, 000	42, 800, 000

Source: Minerals Yearbook, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Mines.

You will note that when our national production of gold started its postwar downturn, world production continued to climb. About the same time other major gold producing nations realized the seriousness of this situation and took action.

Canada, for instance, adopted a subsidy program which went into effect January 1, 1948. The immediate result was a 15-percent increase in production. Production of gold in Canada has been stable throughout the postwar years with the result that today the United States is buying nearly $275 million worth of gold annually from Canada. You will note this is five times the amount of our domestic production. United States mines could produce much of this supply if our domestic mining industry was given the opportunity.

In this country, however, the opposite approach was taken. In 1947, the Treasury Department established new regulations under the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 with a view of curbing international gold transactions by domestic producers who could receive premium prices at international free markets. This was done at the request of the International Monetary Fund, although most other major gold producing countries of the world did and still permit a limited amount of this premium business in order to meet costs of operations.

I might note here also that the International Monetary Fund, in its annual report of April 30, 1948, took a dim view of subsidies being initiated in Canada. The Fund expressed a fear that the subsidy would undermine the exchange relationships. After 12 years of operation, it appears that the Canadian program improved the Canadian balance of payment situation.

On the other hand, it would seem to me that the requirement which the United States has placed upon itself by restricting domestic production of gold to such a point that the United States must import the great preponderance of the gold it uses, has harmed the United States balance of payment situation.

I believe it would be far more appropriate to correct our balance-of-payment problems by increasing the production of domestic gold mines than by any proposal to prevent families from joining servicemen overseas, or by making more restrictive import duties on travelers returning home to the United States, or even by spending millions to attract foreign visitors to our shores.

This then is the situation the mining industry finds itself in.

I would like to emphasize that this is not the result of a reduced demand for gold. The

steadily increasing amounts of gold being imported into this country are proof of this.

Gold imports to United States

Year:	*Ounces*
1955	2,930,000
1956	3,730,000
1957	7,701,000
1958	8,120,000
1959	8,485,000

Source: Minerals Yearbook, 1959.

Consumption in this country is increasing steadily. In 1959 gold used by the arts and industries increased 38 percent over the previous year, reaching a total of 2½ million ounces. This is 57 percent more than the total domestically mined production. This has been due to increased uses in the markets of jewelry, art, dental supplies and others, along with a tremendous increase in industrial use of gold.

There are ever increasing national defense and scientific uses of gold. Gold coatings on missile and aircraft sections are unequaled for reflecting infrared radiation. A gold solution sprayed on vulnerable surfaces and baked to form a thin metallic film reduces the rate of heat transfer on engine shrouds, drag-chute containers, tailcone assemblies and blast shields. A gold solution is applied to porcelain-enamel, stainless steel, fiberglass laminates, and other heat-resistant materials.

A transparent conductive film of gold deposited electrically on safety glass was developed to overcome the hazards of obstructed vision caused on occasion by fog and frost on windows in transport vehicles. Increased quantities of high-purity gold are employed in fabricating silicon transistors and diodes for use in computers, aircraft missiles, and satellites. For silicon devices, gold is alloyed with silica, antimony, germanium, and other elements. Gold plating applied to microwave vacuum tubes improves the operation of communications equipment. Radioactive gold is used as a source of heat in a thermionic converter to produce an electric current for use in space vehicles.

In view of the increasing importance of gold for scientific and defense uses, I would call to your attention once again the fact that the Soviet Union and Africa, whose political future is anything but stable, are the leading producers in the world.

If there is a demand for this precious metal, why is production steadily decreasing? An artificial price of $35 per ounce has been maintained since 1934. None of us has to be told how much the cost of operation, labor and materials has increased since 1934. Thus, the gold industry is faced with fixed prices and rising costs, with constantly declining reduction resulting. At the same time, we have had a substantial increase in the demand, due to these new industrial uses, many of them required for the defense of our Nation.

In the words of your own committee (H. Rept. No. 708, 86th Cong.; 1st sess., "Depressed Domestic Mining and Mineral Industries" p. 53):

"Whereas gold mines in some countries have been aided by subsidies, tax concessions, currency devaluation, and/or sales of their product at premium prices on the 'free market,' domestic miners have been held down to a price which brought prosperity to the industry through the 1930's but which does not reflect inflationary trends of later years."

That same report (p. 55) quotes one of the most distinguished gold mining experts from the mother lode district I represent, L. L. Huelsdonk, of Downieville, Calif., as pointing out that the U.S. Treasury still sells gold to industrial consumers at approximately $35 per ounce whereas the cost of producing gold has increased 300 percent since that price was established.

And again, that report takes note of evidence that the $35 an ounce price—while it may have to be maintained for world monetary and economic reasons—is not realistic when it comes to the actual production of gold.

Barron's (July 6, 1959) quotes a Soviet economic journal statement that the cost of Russian gold runs to about 660 rubles per ounce. This is equivalent to $165 at the official rate of exchange, $66 at the tourist rate.

It would seem appropriate at this point to comment on what some of the other gold-producing nations are doing to keep their gold industries alive.

The nearest and most important country, of course, is Canada. The Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act was first enacted in 1948 and has operated continuously ever since. It has been extended until 1963.

To be classified as a gold mine under the act, a mine must meet the following requirements:

1. The value of gold produced must be 70 percent or more of the total value of output of the mine.

2. The mine or operation must produce at least 50 troy ounces of gold in a designated year.

3. The cost of production, computed on all ounces of gold produced from the mine during a calendar year or less, must exceed C$26.50 per ounce.

In a designated period, e.g., a quarter, the mine must sell all its production to the mint to qualify for aid. Exporting the gold is considered the same as sale to the mint for the purposes of the act. The mine cannot both sell to the mint and to the free domestic market in the same designated period if it is to receive aid.

The formula for calculating assistance payable under the act consists of two factors: the "rate of assistance" and the "assistance ounces." The rate of assistance factor is based on the cost per ounce of gold produced while the assistance ounces factor is a specified proportion of the total ounces of gold produced.

The rate of assistance factor is determined by taking two-thirds of the amount by which the cost to produce an ounce of gold exceed C$26.50 up to a maximum of C$12.33. The number of assistance ounces factor equals two-thirds of the total ounces produced. The amount of assistance payable is calculated by multiplying the rate of assistance by the assistance ounces.

To the foregoing, the 1958 extension of the act added an extra 25 percent of the amount payable in computing the final amount to be paid. This extra 25 percent is continued in the present bill.

The Minister of Mines and Technical Surveys, Paul Comtois, says that the Canadian gold mining industry employs over 16,000 men directly in dependent communities with population in excess of 70,000 persons. In 1958 the industry expended C$106 million in salaries and wages, fuel, electric power and supplies and equipment, and produced a total of C$155 million in gold, most of which was sold to the United States.

A summary of the payments made during 1959 under this program follows:

Cost per ounce	Number of mines	Percentage of total production	Assistance payable	Assistance payable per ounce produced
A. Lode gold mines:				
$26.50 to $34	10	53.35	$3,548,901.97	$3.32
$34 to $41	12	24.45	2,776,600.43	5.69
$41 to $45	7	10.52	1,837,545.39	8.68
$45 and over	11	11.57	2,337,313.88	10.27
	40	99.89	10,500,361.67	5.26
B. Placer gold mines	2	.11	23,590.05	10.27
Total	42	100.00	10,523,951.72	5.26

Source: Department of Mines and Technical Surveys, Government of Canada, "Report on Administration of the Emergency Gold Mining Assistance Act."

Australia, whose production (1.07 million ounces in 1959) nearly equaled that of the United States in 1959 extended its Gold Mining Assistance Act for 3 more years. At the same time, the maximum assistance was raised from $7.70 an ounce to $9.10 an ounce. Gold output in the Philippines (402,600 ounces in 1959) is supported at the price of 150 pesos per ounce, equivalent to $75. In the Union of South Africa, the world's leading producer of gold, tax concessions are extended as additional amortization allowances to deep mines. The Ghana gold fields are benefited directly through a program of financial assistance to mining companies for development of new properties and expanding operations and through a 3-year mines training course supported by the government to educate Africans in mine operation. Ghana also is reported considering a subsidy program.

Colombia, the major South American gold producer which had a 397,900 ounce yield in 1959, also has a subsidy program in effect.

In international gold production, subsidy or incentive payments are not uncommon. In fact, it appears this is the only way that production levels can be maintained.

Certainly, in our own national picture, subsidies are no strangers. In addition to the more common agricultural subsidies, there are Federal assistance programs for many industries, including transportation by air, rails, and sea, and many others.

The Joint Economic Committee prepared a report on subsidy and subsidylike programs of the U.S. Government" during the 2d session of the 86th Congress. In reporting the scope of subsidies, this report included a list of the types of subsidies granted by the Federal Government. These cover seven full pages, listing everything from school lunch programs to disaster loans for small businesses.

So broad and complex is the scope of the subsidy program, that the committee report (p. 18) states "It is probably impossible to make an estimate of the total subsidy payments of the Federal Government during any single year that would receive general acceptance."

The committee did, however, attempt to make an estimate covering agriculture, business, labor, homeowners, tenants and civilian and national defense stockpiles. These added up to $7,460 million in 1960.

In the minerals subsidy review, the Joint Economic Committee listed many commodities, from aluminum to zinc. Gold was not among the minerals whose industries were receiving benefits through tax amortizations, loan guarantees, subsidy or other assistance programs.

This study concluded: "It is apparent from the foregoing discussion that, in the course of our history, the Federal Government has engaged in a great variety of subsidy and subsidylike programs. Originally

they were limited substantially to assistance to transportation interests, to encourage foreign trade and domestic expansion and development; more recently subsidies have expanded to the point where few segments of our economy are completely unaffected by them. Diverse as these subsidy programs are, it is unrealistic either to condemn or to praise Federal subsidies as such. Each particular program which is determined to contain an element of subsidy must be judged independently, taking into account the economic, social, and political conditions prevailing at the time."

And in conclusion, I would like to point out an indirect subsidy we are making to the economies of foreign nations. Some of this economic assistance, I am sure, will find its way to the mining industries.

I speak now of our Public Law 480 grants to other countries. Two examples are the recently approved agreement with Brazil whereby that nation acquires some $70 million worth of grain from this country. All of the grain will be paid for in Brazilian currency and all the Brazilian cruzeiros will stay in Brazil.

Twenty percent of the $70 million—some $14 million—will be given back to the country as a direct grant for economic development. Sixty-five percent—$47,500,000—will be loaned back to Brazil for economic development.

A similar situation exists in India where $1 billion in farm commodities has been authorized for delivery. Of the $1 billion India is paying for these farm commodities, $420 million is being given to India as an economic development grant. Another $427 million is being loaned to India for similar economic development.

The cost of this gold mining incentive program, which would benefit one of our own industries, would help our own economy, would be slight compared to these tremendous and great grants and loans.

In return for our investment, this country would be aiding unemployment in reviving a badly distressed industry, would be stabilizing our own economy and would be building up our own gold reserves.

This is a statement by Congressman HAROLD T. JOHNSON supporting House Joint Resolution 185 and H.R. 6734.

A Selected Chronology on Cuba and Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON L. SHORT

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 23, 1961

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the verbal beating the United States has taken around the world in the wake of the Cuban defeat, I feel we should soberly assess in the Congress and in this country America's foreign relations. I realize this is now being attempted by the semisecret hearings which have been taking place in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the not-so-secret comments being made by many public officials, commentators, columnists, and so on.

In an effort to keep the facts straight and to help me in a personal evaluation, I some time back asked the Legislative Reference Services to provide me with a chronological listing of the sequence of events in Cuba which brought us to this sorry state of embarrassment.

The latest addition to this chronology, of course, is the present blackmailing exchange of prisoners for 500 bulldozers program suggested by Castro over the past weekend. Needless to say, I feel this would be compounding all our former errors were we to do this as an official act of our Government.

I would like to ask special permission that this chronology of events, as prepared by the Library of Congress, be inserted in the RECORD in toto—for the enlightenment and use of those concerned with this problem. It most emphatically tells a story—a continued story—and should prove to be a convincer—as well as a shocker—to many who lost sight of what was transpiring, and who we feel should not have done so. We of the Congress who are not privileged to sit in on the private councils, and the general, do not wish a repeat performance.

The chronology follows:

A SELECTED CHRONOLOGY ON CUBA AND CASTRO [1]

March 10, 1952: Fulgencio Batista ousts President Prio Socarras (elected on June 1, 1948) in a military coup. Batista was a candidate for the presidential elections scheduled for June 1952.

July 26, 1953: A band of rebel youths (led by Fidel Castro Ruiz) attacks the Moncado Barracks in Santiago de Cuba. About 100 students and soldiers are killed. (This is the origin of the name of the "26 de Julio" movement.) Castro is sentenced to 15 years in prison (for his release, see below Nov. 1, 1954; for the revolt led by Castro, see below Nov. 30–Dec. 4, 1956).

November 1, 1954: General Fulgencio Batista is elected President (inaugurated on Feb. 24, 1955) for another 4 years. (He was the only candidate.) Presidential amnesty lets Castro out of prison. He goes abroad, where he begins to organize the "26 de Julio" movement (see below Nov. 30–Dec. 4, 1956).

April 29, 1956: Government forces put down an uprising in Cuba. (A group of rebels try to seize an army post in Matanzas, 60 miles east of Havana.) President Batista suspends constitutional guarantees for 45 days, and imposes press and radio censorship.

June 2, 1956: President Batista announces that press and radio censorship will be terminated as of June 3, 1956.

November 30-December 4, 1956: Revolutionary uprising against the Batista regime, in the Cuban Province of Oriente. Fidel Castro, at the head of a group of approximately 40 rebels, lands in Cuba from Mexico. The uprising is reported crushed by the Cuban Army and Castro killed. A number of rebels retreat to the Sierra Maestra (at the southern tip of the island). Hundreds of opposition leaders are arrested. "Fidel Castro and his 26th of July movement are the flaming symbol of opposition to the regime. The organization is formed of youths of all kinds. It is a revolutionary movement that calls itself socialistic. It is also nationalistic, which generally in Latin America means anti-Yankee. The program is vague and couched in generalities, but it amounts to a new deal for Cuba, radical, democratic and therefore anti-Communist. The real core of its strength is that it is fighting against the military dictatorship of President Batista." (Herbert L. Matthews in New York Times, Feb. 24, 1957).

December 18, 1956: New wave of terrorism breaks out throughout Cuba. By January 18, 1957, the violence results in 70 deaths and hundreds of arrests.

March 11, 1957: New wave of violence breaks out in Oriente Province.

July 31, 1957: Anti-Government demonstrations in Santiago de Cuba (capital of Oriente Province), during a visit by U.S. Ambassador Earl T. Smith. Ambassador Smith is reported to have described as "excessive police action" the use by police of fire hoses to disperse the demonstrators.

August 1, 1957: Constitutional guarantees suspended for 45 days throughout Cuba. Censorship of the press and radio is imposed. A general strike is called in Santiago de Cuba in protest against the dispersal of the demonstrators on July 31.

August 9, 1957: Cuban Army announces that two encounters have taken place between rebels and Government troops in Las Villas Province (central Cuba). "This is the first time there has been an official report of rebels operating in Las Villas." (New York Times, Aug. 10, 1957).

September 4, 1957: President Fulgencio Batista reaffirms his decision to hold general elections on June 1, 1958.

September 5–6, 1957: Units of the Cuban Navy and maritime police revolt in Cienfuegos. The uprising is suppressed by the Cuban Army, supported by tanks and aircraft, after a 2-day battle. One hundred persons are reported killed.

September 12, 1957: President Batista announces he will not be a candidate for reelection. On the same day, Cuban Government extends the suspension of constitutional guarantees (imposed on Aug. 1, see above, July 21 and Aug. 1, 1957).

November 1, 1957: Cuban Liberation Council consisting of the seven major groups opposing Batista formed in Miami.

November 19, 1957: U.S. customs authorities seize a yacht loaded with arms and medical supplies, in Florida. Thirty-one Cubans are arrested aboard the yacht, which was preparing to sail for Cuba.

November 29, 1957: U.S. customs authorities in Miami seize another arms shipment destined for Cuba.

December 30, 1957: Letter from Castro (dated Dec. 14) to Cuban Liberation Council in Miami made public. Castro asserts that the 26th of July Movement is alone in carrying on the entire revolutionary struggle inside Cuba and calls the unity pact signed by the council "fraudulent." He insists on naming Dr. Manuel Urrutia provisional president (the council had previously excluded Urrutia from its list of candidates) and calls for elections within 18 months. Orthodox Party follows 26th of July Movement's walkout from council. Authentic Party, principal remaining force in the council, soon agrees to accept Castro's terms.

January 14, 1958: Rebels raid the port of Manzanillo in Oriente Province.

January 25, 1958: Constitutional guarantees are restored, except in Oriente Province.

February 3, 1958: Censorship of press and radio is lifted in Oriente Province.

February 13, 1958: Former Cuban President Carlos Prio Socarras and eight other Cubans are indicted by a U.S. Federal grand jury on charges of conspiring to set up a military expedition to invade Cuba.

February 20, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro declares (to a correspondent of the New York Times), that he would be ready to end the civil war and agree to general elections under President Batista under the following two conditions: if military forces are withdrawn from Oriente before the elections, and if the elections are supervised by the Organization of American States.

[1] Based chiefly on excerpts from Deadline Data; reproduced with the permission of Deadline Data on World Affairs.

March 14, 1958: U.S. Government imposes embargo on shipment of arms to Cuba.

March 17, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro issues a manifesto setting April 1 as the date for commencement of total war against the regime of President Batista. According to the manifesto, a strike, backed by armed action, is to be called at a later date, to lead to overthrow of the Government.

March 20, 1958: Superior Electoral Tribunal Cuba announces postponement of presidential elections (scheduled for June 1) until November 3.

April 2, 1958: Communists issue manifesto stating intention to join with "all Cubans to end tyranny."

April 9, 1958: Rebels to call for general strike and clash with armed forces in Havana and other sections of Cuba.

June 26–July 1, 1958: Cuban rebels in Oriente Province kidnap 3 Canadian and 45 United States citizens, including 30 sailors and marines from the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base.

July 28, 1958: Marines from the U.S. Guantanamo Naval Base land in Cuba (with approval of the Cuban Government) to guard a pumping station, 6 miles away, which supplies the base with water. (The pumping station is in an area from which Cuban Government forces have been withdrawn.)

July 30, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro demands "immediate withdrawal" of U.S. Marines.

August 1, 1958: U.S. Marines are withdrawn from Cuban territory.

August 2, 1958: Cuban Government announces its forces have resumed guard duty at the pumping station.

August 28, 1958: Outlawed Cuban Communist Party issues open letter to Cuban rebels, calling for "united front" against the Batista regime.

October 20, 1958: Rebel leader Fidel Castro orders confiscation of property of British companies and citizens in territories controlled by the rebels, in reprisal for the sale of jet planes by Britain to the Batista government.

On the same day, October 20, Cuban rebels kidnap (near Santiago de Cuba) two Americans and seven Cubans employed by the Texas Oil Co. (For previous kidnapings of U.S. citizens by the rebels, see above 1958, June 26–July 1.) All nine men are released 3 days later.

October 23, 1958: U.S. Government orders evacuation of dependents of U.S. employees working at U.S.-owned Nicara nickel plant in Oriente Province.

November 3, 1958: Elections for President, Vice President, Senate, one-half of the House of Representatives, and Governors of the six provinces. Andres Rivero Aguero, candidate of the four-party government coalition, is elected president. (Voting in Cuba is obligatory, however, approximately 40 percent of the electorate failed to vote.)

November 12, 1958: Cuban rebels announce beginning of an offensive in Oriente Province.

November 27, 1958: Government forces announce offensive in Oriente Province.

December 1, 1958: Rebel forces cut off water supply of the Preston sugar mill, owned by the United Fruit Co.

December 24, 1958: Rebel forces capture Sancti Spiritus in Las Villas Province.

December 30, 1958: House-to-house fighting between rebel and government forces in Santa Clara, capital of Las Villas Province. On the same day, a powder magazine explodes in Havana.

January 1, 1959: President Fulgencio Batista resigns and appoints a ruling junta, headed by Gen. Eulogio Cantillo, which designates Dr. Carlos Piedra, the oldest judge of the supreme court, as provisional president in accordance with the constitution of 1940. General Cantillo assumes duties as chief of staff of the armed forces. On the same day, General Batista flees to exile in the Dominican Republic. Mob violence breaks out in Havana.

January 2, 1959: Castro proclaims Manuel Urrutia Provisional President of the Cuban Republic.

January 3, 1959: Urrutia is sworn in as Provisional President in Santiago (provisional capital of the rebel government). On the same day, Urrutia appoints Fidel Castro commander in chief of Cuban armed forces, and announces composition of new Cabinet.

January 6, 1959: Provisional President Manuel Urrutia dissolves Cuban Congress and assumes legislative powers until new elections are held. On the same day, Urrutia orders the removal from office of all Governors of provinces, mayors, and aldermen.

January 23, 1959: Public trial of Major Jesus Blanco opens in Havana sports stadium. Since the beginning of the new regime large-scale summary trials by military tribunals and executions of ex-Batista officials have taken place. By mid-January the published total of executions reached 150. Castro, in reply to statements made in United States deploring these executions, charged that the protesters never voiced any objections to the years of killing and torture by the Batista regime and insisted that the trials would continue.

February 16, 1959: Fidel Castro is sworn in as Premier (replacing Jose Miro Cardona).

April 15, 1959: Premier Castro arrives in the United States on an 11-day unofficial visit (by invitation of the American Society of Newspaper Editors). The unofficial total of executions in Cuba reaches 509.

May 13, 1959: Cuban Government orders the confiscation of the holdings of 117 companies and 18 individuals charged with crimes against national economy and with enriching themselves illegally under the Batista regime.

May 17, 1959: President Manuel Urrutia Lleo signs into law the agrarian reform bill. (The law is published in the Official Gazette on June 5.) The law provides for distribution of unused lands.

June 11, 1959: U.S. note to Cuba delivered: the Cuban agrarian law "gives serious concern to the Government of the United States with regard to the adequacy of the provision for compensation to its citizens whose property may be expropriated."

June 29, 1959: Chief of Cuban Air Force, Maj. Pedro L. Diaz Lanz, resigns. He charged "there was Communist influence in the armed forces and Government." (N.Y. Times, July 1, 1959).

July 14, 1959: President Manuel Urrutia in a press conference states: "I reject the support of the Communists, and I believe that any real Cuban Revolutionary should reject it openly."

July 17, 1959: Fidel Castro announces his resignation as Premier. On the same day, President Manuel Urrutia resigns after being accused by Castro of actions "bordering on treason." Also on July 17, the Cabinet appoints Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado as new President.

July 18, 1959: Osvaldo Dorticos Torrado is sworn in as President. He announces that the Council of Ministers has refused to accept Fidel Castro's resignation.

July 26, 1959: Fidel Castro resumes duties as Premier.

October 21, 1959: Two unidentified planes fly over Havana dropping anti-Castro leaflets. One person is killed and several wounded in bomb explosions in Havana.

October 22, 1959: Premier Fidel Castro declares (in a television broadcast) that the planes involved in the October 21 "bombing" are based in the United States. Castro calls the "attack" "base and unpardonable."

October 26, 1959: Mass rally (attended by an estimated 300,000) to protest U.S. "aggression." Premier Castro (in a speech) attacks the United States, announces the reestablishment of military courts to try "traitors" and "counter-revolutionaries."

October 28, 1959: President Eisenhower declares (at a news conference) that the United States is using "every single facility that is available" to prevent illegal flights from the United States to Cuba.

November 2, 1959: Government seizes nearly 75,000 acres of foreign-controlled agricultural and mineral lands in Oriente Province. "The seizures included nearly 10,000 acres on which the Bethlehem Steel Corp. held mineral concessions." (AP, November 2, 1959).

November 10, 1959: U.S. Department of State issues statement on Cuban campaign of "inaccurate, malicious and misleading reports" on the alleged bombing of Havana October 21.

November 22, 1959: Cuban Confederation of Labor withdraws from the Inter-American Regional Organization of Labor (a branch of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions).

November 26, 1959: Maj Ernesto Guevara is appointed president of the National Bank of Cuba.

November 30, 1959: Trials by military courts are resumed in Cuba.

January 11, 1960: United States note to Cuba delivered, protesting against "numerous actions" taken by the Cuban Government "which are considered by the U.S. Government to be in denial of the basic rights of ownership of U.S. citizens in Cuba—rights provided under both Cuban law and generally accepted international law." According to the note, these actions "involve principally the seizure and occupation of land and buildings" of U.S. citizens "without court orders and frequently without any written authorization whatever."

On the same day (January 11), Cuban Government rejects the U.S. note and states that "* * * the revolutionary Government [will] accelerate the works of agrarian reform, applying equal methods of expropriation and indemnification to nations and foreigners." Hundreds of millions of dollars worth of American property has already been seized with little or no formality."

January 21, 1960: U.S. Ambassador Philip Bonsal was ordered back to Washington for consultation by Secretary of State Herter after Premier Castro accused the United States of waging a campaign of hostility against Cuba. Secretary Herter characterized the speech as Castro's "most insulting" attack on "the American Government and the American people" since he came to power a little more than a year ago.

January 26, 1960: President Eisenhower (at a news conference) rejects Cuban charges against the United States, reaffirms U.S. policy of nonintervention in Cuban domestic affairs and declares that "We are not going to be a party to reprisals or anything of that kind." "The President underlines U.S. amity for Cuba in reply to a question whether it would be desirable to cut the quota of Cuban sugar imported to the United States. This quota amounts to a third of U.S. consumption." (New York Times, Jan. 27, 1960.)

February 4–13, 1960: Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan in Cuba. (Cuba does not have diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union.)

February 5, 1960: Mikoyan opens Soviet cultural exhibition in Havana.

February 10, 1960: Military court in Havana sentences 104 persons to prison terms ranging from 3 to 30 years on charges of conspiracy against the Cuban Government.

February 12, 1960: Mikoyan announces that the Soviet Union is willing to sell military aircraft to the Cuban Government.

February 13, 1960: Mikoyan and Premier Castro sign an agreement under which the Soviet Union is to buy 5 million tons of sugar at world market price, over a 5-year period, and to grant Cuba a credit of $100 million "for the acquisition of equipment, machinery, and material." The credit is repayable in 12 years at 2½ percent interest. (The sugar agreement makes the Soviet Union the second largest buyer of Cuban sugar, after the United States.)

February 18, 1960: Premier Castro announces (in a television-radio address) that two American flyers were killed (on Feb. 18) in a crash on Cuban soil of a U.S.-based plane which attempted to attack a sugar mill in Matanzas Province.

February 19, 1960: U.S. Department of State acknowledges that the plane took off from Florida and relays "sincere regrets" over the incident to the Cuban Government. "The United States welcomed Cuba's acceptance of Washington's offer to send technical experts to help determine the cause of the crash [Department of State spokesman], Mr. White said. * * * [The incident] lent considerable weight to numerous past charges by Cuba that planes from [the United States] had been setting fire to sugarcane fields on the island." (New York Times, Feb. 20, 1960.)

February 20, 1960: Central Planning Board is established by the Government. Its function is to supervise and coordinate the economic affairs of Cuba and to fix the general regulations of guidance for private enterprise. The board is headed by Premier Castro.

February 21, 1960: Unidentified plane drops several bombs on an industrial suburb of Havana, according to a statement by the Cuban Government. The windows of an Esso oil refinery are damaged.

February 22, 1960: Cuban Government (in a note delivered to the U.S. chargé d'affaires in Havana) expresses its willingness to renew negotiations through diplomatic channels concerning the differences between Cuba and the United States—the Cuban Government stated that it wished to clarify that the negotiations would be contingent on abstentions by the United States from any unilateral action that would prejudge the results of these negotiations or might cause damage to the Cuban economy or the Cuban people. Unilateral action refers to any possible reduction of Cuba's sugar quota at approximately 2 cents above the world market rate. (New York Times, Feb. 23, 1960.)

February 25, 1960: Premier Castro announces that the Cuban Government will spend 152 million pesos ($152 million) in 1960 on the first phase of a program to industrialize Cuba and make it economically independent.

February 26, 1960: Ernesto Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba, declares (in a speech to cane planters) that the Cuban Government intends to use a system of cooperatives, as opposed to individual effort, in the development of Cuban economy.

March 4, 1960: French freighter loaded with ammunition and explosives for the Cuban Army explodes in Havana Harbor. Seventy-five to 700 persons were killed and more than 200 injured.

March 5, 1960: Premier Castro, at the mass funeral of 27 dockworkers killed yesterday, implied that the United States was involved in the sabotage of the munitions ship which exploded in Havana Harbor. The United States issued a vigorous protest against the Premier's accusation.

March 7, 1960: Secretary of State Herter told Cuba's chargé d'affaires that Premier Castro's implication that the United States was involved in the munitions ship explosion was baseless, erroneous, and misleading. Mr. Herter protested strongly against the Premier's unfounded and irresponsible attitude and added that such statements could only contribute further to the unhappy deterioration of United States-Cuban relations.

March 8, 1960: Cuba rejects the U.S. protest as "insulting," made in an "aggressive tone," and "derogatory to our national dignity."

March 16, 1960: President Eisenhower submits to Congress proposals for new legislation to replace the Sugar Act (due to expire at the end of 1960).

March 17, 1960: On the same day (Mar. 17), Rufo López-Fresquet resigns as Finance Minister. The resignation removes the last anti-Communist from the Castro Cabinet.

March 20, 1960: U.S. Secretary of State Christian A. Herter declares (in a television interview) that although some Communist sympathizers hold high offices in Cuba, and some of Premier Castro's acts appear to follow a Communist pattern, "I don't think anyone could say affirmatively that Cuba is Communist at the present time."

U.S. Ambassador to Cuba Philip W. Bonsal returns to Havana.

March 21, 1960: A U.S.-based private plane is shot down over Cuban territory by Cuban Government troops. The American pilot and copilot are captured.

March 29, 1960: Premier Castro announces that he will not send the Cuban Ambassador back to Washington unless the United States modifies its unfriendly policies toward Cuba.

Premier Castro announces (in a television address) that his Government will "not be bound by the inter-American pact against communism because it did not sign the pact."

March 31, 1960: Poland and Cuba sign a trade agreement under which Cuba is to receive industrial plants, and equipment, ships, planes, and helicopters on credit and in exchange for goods. The agreement also provides for technical and scientific assistance to Cuba by Polish experts.

April 8, 1960: U.S. Secretary of State Herter declares (at a news conference): "There is one very disturbing development that is taking place in Cuba, and that is that anti-communism is now being made synonymous with antirevolution, and that those who express concern about Communist influence are now being accused of being antirevolution, and anti-Castro. This is obviously an effort to stop any anti-Communist criticism that might arise within the country itself." "Asked later whether he felt his anti-anti-communism was being done with the active support and aid of some of the officials of the Cuban Government, Mr. Herter replied, 'Yes, I think very definitely.'"

April 25, 1960: Agrarian Reform Institute expropriates more than 170,000 acres owned by the United Fruit Co. in eastern Cuba.

On the same day Guatemala asked the Organization of American States to investigate Cuban charges that Guatemala is planning an invasion of Cuba.

April 28, 1960: Guatemala severs diplomatic relations with Cuba.

April 29, 1960: Cuban police announce arrest of opposition leaders accused of a conspiracy to overthrow the Castro government.

May 8, 1960: Foreign Ministry announces that the Soviet Union and Cuba have renewed diplomatic relations at Embassy level.

May 11, 1960: Two progovernment unions seize the Diario de la Marina, Cuba's oldest and largest newspaper.

May 16, 1960: Presna Libre, a Havana daily, is seized by union workers.

May 17, 1960: Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba, Enrique Perez Serrentes, attacks communism in a pastoral letter. Referring to communism, he says: "It cannot be said that the enemy is at the gates because in reality it is within the gates."

May 23, 1960: United States and British oil companies in Cuba will be required (according to Cuban official sources) to refine Soviet crude oil, instead of the crude hitherto obtained from Venezuela.

May 27, 1960: U.S. State Department announces that the U.S. economic aid program to Cuba (which has been running at between $150,000 to $200,000 a year) will be terminated on December 1, 1960. U.S. military aid (presently consisting of training of a few Cuban air cadets in Texas) will be terminated in June 1960.

June 1, 1960: U.S. House of Representatives' Agriculture Committee rejects the administration request (see above March 16, 1960) to authorize the President to cut Cuba's share of U.S. sugar imports, and votes a 1-year extension of the present Sugar Act, which authorizes cuts in the Cuban sugar quota only if Cuba fails to fill its quota of sugar imports to the United States. The committee chairman declares that the administration proposal would enable the President to commit "an act of economic aggression against Cuba" which would endanger U.S. relations with the rest of Latin America.

June 7, 1960: United States and British oil refineries in Cuba reject Cuban Government's demand that they refine Soviet crude oil.

June 10, 1960: Czechoslovakia and Cuba sign trade agreement providing for the building of eight factories in Cuba by the end of the year, each costing about $4 million. The factories are to turn out refrigerators, sewing machines and other consumer goods. Under the agreement Czechoslovakia will grant Cuba credits of about $20 million, repayable in 10 years at 2½ percent interest.

June 11, 1960: Cuban Government seizes four hotels, among them the American-operated Nacional and the Havana Hilton, the two largest luxury hotels in Havana. The Tropicana nightclub is also seized.

June 16, 1960: Cuban Government orders two attachés of the U.S. Embassy in Havana to leave the country within 24 hours. They are accused of "conspiring with counter revolutionaries."

June 18, 1960: U.S. Government orders two Cuban consular officials to leave the country within 48 hours. They are Carlos Manuel Lazaro Feliz Sanchez y Basquet, assistant to the Cuban Consul at Miami, and Dr. Berta Luisa Pla y Badia, Cultural Attaché at the Cuban Consulate in New York.

June 26, 1960: Army ammunition dump in the Havana Harbor area explodes, killing 2 and injuring at least 200 persons.

June 27, 1960: U.S. House of Representatives' Agriculture Committee unanimously approves a 1-year extension of the present Sugar Act and includes authority for the President to reduce the Cuban sugar quota in 1960 and to eliminate it in 1961.

On the same day, U.S. Government submits memorandum to the Inter-American Peace Committee, a unit of the Organization of American States. In the memorandum (made public on June 29) the United States accuses the Cuban Government of contributing to tensions in the Caribbean by waging a campaign of lies and slander against the United States. Stating that it had responded to "hostile attitudes and actions of the Cuban Government with patience and forbearance," the U.S. Government declares that this "exercise of restraint, however, has been in vain," and goes on to present an inventory of aggressive acts and statements of the Cuban Government. The memorandum ends with the remarks that "the Cuban Government's systematic and provocative campaign of slander and hostile propaganda against the United States, of which various examples have been cited in this memorandum, is a major contributor to international tensions in the area of the Caribbean and of the hemisphere as a whole."

June 29, 1960: Cuban Government seizes Texas Co. petroleum refinery in Santiago de Cuba.

July 1, 1960: Cuba seizes the United States-owned Esso oil refinery and the British-controlled Shell refinery, the last two foreign-owned oil refineries in Cuba.

July 3, 1960: U.S. Senate and House of Representatives pass a compromise sugar bill which authorizes the President to "determine the quota for Cuba for the balance of the calendar year 1960 and for the 3-month period ending March 31, 1961, in such amounts as he shall find to be in the national interest."

July 5, 1960: The Cuban Ambassador-designate to the United States, José Miro Cardona (who was first Cuban Premier of the Castro regime), resigns because of "ideological divergencies" with the Castro government, and takes refuge in the Argentine Embassy in Havana.

July 6, 1960: The Cuban Cabinet authorizes the expropriation of all United States-owned property in Cuba, "when deemed necessary in the national interest."

July 9, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev threatens the United States with rockets if the United States intervenes militarily in Cuba. President Eisenhower declares that the United States will not "permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere." He also says: "There is irony in Mr. Khrushchev's portrayal of the Soviet Union as the protector of independence of an American nation when viewed against the history of the enslavement of countless other peoples by Soviet imperialism."

July 10, 1960: President Osvaldo Dorticos announces that the Soviet Union has offered to buy the 700,000 tons of sugar which the United States cut from Cuba's quota for the rest of the year.

July 11, 1960: Cuba asks the U.N. Security Council to take action on her charges that the United States has been guilty of "repeated threats, harassments, intrigues, reprisals, and aggressive acts" against Cuba.

July 12, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev declares that the Soviet Union will support Cuba in any attempt to oust the United States from its naval base at Guantanamo. He denounces President Eisenhower's declaration that the United States will prevent the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere, and says: "We consider that the Monroe Doctrine has outlived its time, has died."

July 13, 1960: Peru calls for a meeting of the foreign ministers of the Americas to consider the Soviet threat to inter-American unity.

July 14, 1960: Argentine Note to Cuba calls on the Castro government to dissociate itself from the Khrushchev offer to protect Cuba with rockets in the event of U.S. aggression. (The Note is vehemently rejected by the Cuban press and radio as "Argentine meddling.")

July 15, 1960: Two Latin American members of U.N. Security Council (Ecuador and Argentina) recommend that the Security Council refer to Cuba's charges against the United States to the Organization of American States. On the same day, the Brazilian Foreign Ministry recommends the same procedure.

July 16, 1960: OAS Council meeting in Washington. 16 out of 17 delegates who speak (including the United States and excluding only Cuba) favor the Peruvian call for a "coordination of will to reject the interference of any extracontinental power or of any totalitarian ideology."

July 18, 1960: OAS Council (meeting in Washington) agrees unanimously to hold a foreign ministers' meeting on the United States-Cuban dispute.

July 19, 1960: UN Security Council refers Cuba's charges against the United States to the Organization of American States. The vote on the Argentine-Ecuador resolution is nine to zero, with the Soviet Union and Poland abstaining.

July 21, 1960: Defense Minister Raul Castro leaves Moscow after a 4-day visit. In a joint statement with Premier Khrushchev, Raul Castro expresses "the profound gratitude" of the Cuban Government and people for Soviet support. Khrushchev promises that the Soviet Union will deliver "oil and other goods in amounts fully meeting the requirements of Cuba" in order to surmount the United States "economic blockade."

July 23, 1960: Communist China signs agreement (in Havana) with Cuba to buy 2.5 million long tons of sugar during the next 5 years, at an average of 500,000 tons a year. Communist China agrees to grant Cuba a credit (reported to be about $70 million) to buy "complete factories" in China.

July 29, 1960: OAS Council (in Washington) votes to hold a meeting of American Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, beginning August 16. The agenda will include the Venezuelan charges against the Dominican Republic, the United States-Cuban dispute, and the threat of Communist interference in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere.

August 7, 1960: Premier Castro nationalizes all remaining U.S.-owned property in Cuba.

On the same day, the United States (in a memorandum to the Inter-American Peace Committee) makes a violent attack against the Cuban Government, and declares that it is "now in open league with the Soviet Union and Communist China."

On the same day (August 7), the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Cuba expresses concern (in a pastoral letter read in all Cuban churches) over "the increasing advance of communism" in Cuba and over the close relations between the Soviet Union and Cuba.

August 8, 1960: OAS Council (in Washington) adopts by a vote of 20 to 1 over Cuban objections the revised agenda for the American Foreign Ministers' meeting in San José, on August 16. A new agenda item will be the "defense of the democratic American institutions against the subversive activities of any organization, government, or their agents."

August 16–29, 1960: Conference of OAS Foreign Ministers in San José, Costa Rica, to consider the Dominican and Cuban questions.

August 19, 1960: U.S. Government announces it will not allow other countries to use U.S. loans to buy sugar from Cuba.

August 24, 1960: In an address to the OAS conference, U.S. Secretary of State Herter declares that Cuba is being led "in the Communist direction." He declares that what is happening in Cuba is "part of a determined effort by the Sino-Soviet powers to extend their control over an American state," and he asks the conference to take "the necessary positive decisions to meet the threat."

August 28, 1960: Cuban delegation walks out of the OAS meeting prior to a unanimous vote of the remaining Foreign Ministers approving the Declaration of San José, which condemns Sino-Soviet intervention in the affairs of any American state. Cuba is not mentioned specifically in any part of the declaration.

September 5–13, 1960: Inter-American Economic Conference in Bogotá. Cuba is represented by her Minister of Economy. On September 11, the Act of Bogotá, which incorporates a wide-ranging U.S. social and economic development aid plan for Latin America, is signed by 19 American republics. (The Dominican Republic did not attend the conference.) Cuba alone refuses to sign the act. On September 7, the Cuban delegate attacks the U.S. aid plan as an attempt "to silence the militant hope awakened in the people of Latin America by the Cuban revolution."

September 13, 1960: Cuban Government announces that Premier Castro and Foreign Minister Raul Roa will attend the U.N. General Assembly session which opens in New York on September 20. Foreign Minister Roa declares that Cuba will support the following aims in the U.N. General Assembly: A U.N. seat for Communist China; Algerian independence; the position of Patrice Lumumba as premier of the Congo; denunciation of U.S. "imperialistic policies."

September 14, 1960: United States restricts Premier Castro to Manhattan during his proposed visit to the U.N. General Assembly—the same restriction as that imposed on Soviet Premier Khrushchev.

September 16, 1960: The Cuban Government seizes control of the tobacco industry and of all U.S. banks in Cuba.

September 18, 1960: Premier Castro arrives in New York for the U.N. General Assembly session.

September 20, 1960: Soviet Premier Khrushchev pays a call on Castro in Harlem.

September 24, 1960: Cuba formally recognizes Communist China and North Korea (the first Latin American state to do so).

September 25, 1960: President Nasser of the United Arab Republic calls on Castro in Harlem.

September 29, 1960: United States advises American citizens in Cuba to send home their wives and children.

October 9, 1960: Cuban Government announces that it has crushed an anti-Castro revolt in south-central Cuba, and accuses the United States of supplying the rebels with arms and ammunition.

October 14, 1960: Cuban Government nationalizes all major companies and banks.

October 18, 1960: Cuba asks the U.N. to consider the question of U.S. "aggression" against Cuba.

October 19, 1960: United States puts an embargo on all exports to Cuba, except medical supplies and various food products. The State Department announcement declares that "this step has been reluctantly taken by the United States in order to carry out the responsibility of this Government to defend the legitimate economic interests of the people of this country against the discriminatory, aggressive, and injurious economic policies of the Castro regime."

October 20, 1960: U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, Philip W. Bonsal, is recalled to Washington for "an extended period of consultations."

October 25, 1960: Cuban Government nationalizes 166 more United States-owned enterprises, valued at about $250 million.

October 28, 1960: U.S. note to the Organization of American States asks for an investigation of large-scale arms shipments to Cuba. The note says: "With the notorious assistance of extracontinental powers, specifically those of the Soviet bloc, Cuba is expanding rapidly its capacity to give armed support to the spread of its revolution in other parts of the Americas."

November 1, 1960: President Eisenhower issues a statement reiterating U.S. determination to defend the Guantanamo Naval Base. He declares that "because of its importance to the defense of the entire hemisphere, particularly in the light of the intimate relations which now exist between the present Government of Cuba and the Sino-Soviet bloc, it is essential that our position in Guantanamo Bay be clearly understood."

November 1, 1960: On the same day, the U.N. General Assembly rejects Cuban and Soviet-bloc demands for an immediate Assembly debate on "U.S. aggression." The Assembly votes to send the Cuban complaint to the Assembly's Political Committee.

November 9, 1960: Premier Castro informs a mass meeting in Havana that Cuba has prevented the United States from attacking the island by denouncing U.S. aggression in the U.N., by making great military preparations, and by alerting world opinion.

November 14, 1960: Cuba withdraws from the World Bank.

November 18, 1960: U.S. State Department issues statement: "Since Fidel Castro came into power, Cuba has created and armed a military force 10 times the size of that of ex-President Fulgencio Batista and far larger than any army in Latin America. Total Soviet-bloc arms provided to the Castro government amount to at least 28,000 tons."

November 27, 1960: Premier Fidel Castro (in a speech at a student rally in Havana University) makes a bitter attack against the Roman Catholic clergy in Cuba, accusing them of being "counterrevolutionaries."

November 30, 1960: Communist China agrees to buy a million tons of Cuban sugar in 1961, thereby doubling the annual amount in the earlier agreement. Communist China also provides Cuba with an interest-free loan of 240 million rubles (about $60 million). The agreements are announced at the end of a visit of Maj. Ernesto Guevara, head of Cuba's National Bank, to Communist China.

December 2, 1960: U.S. Government officially designates Cuba for the first time as "Communist-controlled." This was done when the White House made a determination that refugees from Cuba from now on qualify under that section of the Mutual Security Act which provides assistance for persons displaced from Communist-ruled lands. A White House announcement said that President Eisenhower had released $1 million worth of mutual security funds for assistance of 30,000 Cuban refugees in Florida." (New York Herald Tribune, Dec. 3, 1960.)

December 3, 1960: Roman Catholic hierarchy of Cuba (in an open letter to Premier Castro) rejects Castro's attacks against the Church. The letter also declares that the Government's revolutionary indoctrination has been following "purely Marxist lines."

December 8, 1960: Cuba nationalizes the Royal Bank of Canada (in Cuba), which has 23 branches in the country.

December 10, 1960: Major Ernesto Guevara, head of the Cuban National Bank, declares (in Moscow) that the Cuban Government "wholeheartedly" endorses the Communist manifesto, drawn up by the leaders of 81 Communist parties at their recent meeting in Moscow. He declares that in accordance with the manifesto, Cuba will serve as a model for armed revolution in Latin America.

December 16, 1960: President Eisenhower cuts to zero the import of Cuban sugar into the United States for the first 3 months of 1961.

December 19, 1960: Soviet-Cuban communique is signed (in Moscow) by Soviet First Deputy Premier Anastas I. Mikoyan and Major Ernesto Guevara, head of the Cuban National Bank. The Soviet Union promises to help Cuba build an iron and steel mill, an oil refinery, electric power stations and other industrial units. The communique says that the Soviet Union will buy from Cuba "2,700,000 tons of sugar if the United States carries out its threat not to purchase Cuban sugar."

December 21, 1960: Government decree dismisses 17 out of 32 justices of the Cuban Supreme Court.

December 31, 1960: Foreign Minister Raul Roa flies to New York and calls for an immediate meeting of the UN Security Council, to take action on a Cuban charge that the United States is ready to "carry out, within a few hours, direct military aggression" against Cuba.

January 1, 1961: Security Council agrees to meet on January 4 to consider the Cuban charge against the United States.

January 2, 1961: Premier Castro declares (in a speech to a crowd of over 100,000 in Havana) that the U.S. Embassy will have to reduce its staff within 48 hours to 11, the number in the Cuban Embassy in Washington.

January 3, 1961: United States severs diplomatic and consular relations with Cuba, and asks Cuba to withdraw all its diplomatic and consular personnel from the United States. President Eisenhower issues a statement, in which he declares: "The Government of Cuba has decided to limit the personnel of our Embassy and consulate in Havana to 11 persons. Forty-eight hours was granted for the departure of our entire staff with the exception of 11. This calculated action on the part of the Castro government is only the latest of a long series of harassments, baseless accusations, and vilifications. There is a limit to what the United States in self-respect can endure. That limit has now been reached. Our friendship for the Cuban people is not affected. It is my hope and my conviction that in the not-too-distant future it will be possible for the historic friendship between us once again to find its reflection in normal relations of every sort. Meanwhile our sympathy goes out to the people of Cuba now suffering under the yoke of a dictator."

January 4, 1961: Swiss Government agrees to handle U.S. diplomatic and consular affairs in Cuba.

January 5, 1961: U.N. Security Council declines to act on Cuba's charge that the United States plans a military invasion of the island.

January 15, 1961: Press reports from Havana indicate that Premier Castro's armed forces have launched a major offensive against anti-Castro insurgents in the Escambray Mountains in south-central Cuba.

January 16, 1961: United States bans travel of American citizens to Cuba except by special permission of the State Department.

January 30, 1961: Kennedy declares (in his state of the Union message): "In Latin America, Communist agents seeking to exploit that region's peaceful revolution of hope have established a base on Cuba, only 90 miles from our shores. Our objection with Cuba is not over the people's drive for a better life. Our objection is to their domination by foreign and domestic tyrannies.

"Cuban social and economic reform should be encouraged. Questions of economics and trade policy can always be negotiated. But Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated."

February 3, 1961: Cuban Government dismisses 119 judges in a purge of the courts.

On the same day (Feb. 3), President Kennedy allocates $4 million to help Cuban refugees in the United States up to the end of the fiscal year on June 30.

February 11, 1961: Premier Castro denounces U.S. aid for "Cuban counterrevolutionary exiles." He says that "if the United States believes it has the right to promote a counterrevolution in Cuba, Cuba believes it has the right to promote a revolution in Latin America." He accuses the United States of parachuting large quantities of arms and food to anti-Castro rebels in the Escambray Mountains.

February 14, 1961: Premier Castro declares (in a press interview) that he would like to "normalize" relations with the United States, but that this would depend on the United States ending its "direct military support" of his opponents.

February 24, 1961: U.S. State Department declares that there can be no improvement of relations between Cuba and the United States until "the Cuban people may freely choose their own destiny."

On the same day, Cuban Government transmits notes to all Latin American Governments with which Cuba maintains relations, urging them to resist any U.S. attempts to induce them to break relations with Cuba, and assuring them that Cuba does not intend to export its revolution to other Latin American countries.

Cuban Government announces administrative reorganization. A central planning junta is set up, headed by Premier Castro and with his brother, Raul (Armed Forces Minister), as vice president of the junta. Maj. Ernesto Guevara, president of the National Bank of Cuba, is given effective control over Cuba's economy by his appointment as head of a new Ministry of Industry, which will direct a 4-year industrialization plan. New Ministries of Foreign Trade and Interior Commerce are also established.

February 26, 1961: Government sources in Havana declare that the rebel movement in the Escambray Mountains has been crushed.

March 1, 1961: El Salvador announces it has severed relations with Cuba, effective January 25. El Salvador is the eighth nation of the Western Hemisphere to sever relations with Cuba.

March 22, 1961: Anti-Castro Cuban exile groups in the United States announce formation of a "Revolutionary Council" headed by Dr. José Miró Cardona, who was the first Premier of the Castro regime in Cuba. The Council issues a statement calling on Cubans "to overthrow the Communist tyranny."

March 29, 1961: U.S. Congress agrees to extend the President's authority to prohibit Cuban sugar imports until June 30, 1962, and to share its quota among other foreign and domestic producers.

April 3, 1961: U.S. State Department issues pamphlet on Cuba which declares: "We call once again on the Castro regime to sever the links with the international Communist movement, to return to the original purposes which brought so many gallant men together in the Sierra Maestra, and to restore the integrity of the Cuban revolution. If this call is unheeded, we are confident that the Cuban people, with their passion for liberty, will continue to strive for a free Cuba."

April 5, 1961: Foreign Minister Raul Roa (in a press interview in New York) denounces the State Department's pamphlet on Cuba as a "formalization of the undeclared war which the United States is making against us." He also accuses the United States of arming and training in Florida and Guatemala a "so-called liberation army of 4,000 to 5,000 counterrevolutionaries, mercenaries and adventurers."

April 8, 1961: Dr. José Miró Cardona, head of the Cuban Revoluntionary Council, issues a statement (in New York), calling all Cubans to arms to overthrow the regime of Premier Fidel Castro. He declares that the revolt must come from within the country.

April 12, 1961: President Kennedy declares (at a press conference) that U.S. Armed Forces will not intervene "under any conditions" in Cuba, and that the U.S. Government "will do everything it possibly can to make sure that there are no Americans involved in any actions inside Cuba." He says that he would be opposed to any attempt by Cuban exiles to mount an anti-Castro offensive from the United States.

April 15, 1961: Three Cuban military air bases are attacked by three bombers manned by anti-Castro personnel. Seven Cuban militiamen are reported killed and 47 wounded. An arms dump is hit at Camp Libertad near Havana. One of the rebel pilots lands at Miami International Airport, and declares (in a statement issued to the press) that the three planes belonged to the Cuban Air Force and were manned by Cuban pilots who defected from the Cuban Air Force.

On the same day, Premier Castro orders a general mobilization of the armed forces and civilian militia. In a communique issued after the bombing attack, he declares: "Our country has been the victim of a criminal imperialist aggression which violates all norms of international law. If this air attack is a prelude to an invasion, the country, on a war basis, will resist and destroy with an iron hand any force which attempts to disembark upon our land."

At an emergency session of the U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee, Foreign Minister Raul Roa accuses the United States of having instigated the bombing attack on Cuba. He denies that the pilots defected from the Cuban Air Force and asserts that they were "mercenaries bought by the United States." U.S. delegate to the U.N., Adlai E. Stevenson, denies the Cuban accusations, and reasserts that the United States will not intervene in Cuba. Soviet Delegate Valerian A. Zorin expresses "deep indignation" over the "barbarian attacks" launched against Cuba by the United States.

April 16, 1961: Premier Castro accuses the United States of responsibility for the air raid on Cuba and of deliberately trying to deceive world opinion by declaring that the fliers were defectors. He challenges President Kennedy to present before the U.N. the fliers who bombed Cuba.

On the same day, the United States grants political asylum to the three fliers, but the identity and whereabouts of the three men are kept secret.

April 17, 1961: Invasion of Cuba by anti-Castro forces begins. Rebel troops land on the southern coast in Las Villas Province. Rebel landings are also reported in Oriente Province in the southeast and in Pinar del Rio Province in the extreme west.

U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk (at a press conference in Washington) expresses the sympathy of the American people for the anti-Castro movement, but reiterates that U.S. forces will not intervene in Cuba.

In the U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee, Foreign Minister Raul Roa declares that Cuba has been invaded "by a force of mercenaries, organized, financed, and armed by the Government of the United States." He says that the attacks were launched from the United States and Guatemala. Both countries deny this assertion.

President of the Cuban Revolutionary Council, Dr. José Miró Cardona, issues a statement in New York, calling on "freedom-loving peoples" of the Western Hemisphere to support the attack on Cuba.

April 18, 1961: Soviet Premier Khrushchev sends a message to President Kennedy in which he charges the United States with responsibility for the invasion of Cuba. He warns that the Soviet Union will "render the Cuban people and their government all necessary assistance in beating back the armed attack on Cuba."

On the same day, President Kennedy sends a reply to Khrushchev in which he states: "I have previously stated and I repeat now that the United States intends no armed intervention in Cuba. In the event of any military intervention by outside force we will immediately honor our obligations under the inter-American system to protect this hemisphere against external aggression. I have taken careful note of your statement that the events in Cuba might affect peace in all parts of the world. I trust that this does not mean that the Soviet Government, using the situation in Cuba as a pretext, is planning to inflame other areas of the world. I would like to think that your government has too great a sense of responsibility to embark on any enterprise so dangerous to general peace. I believe that you should recognize that free peoples in all parts of the world do not accept the claim of historical inevitability for Communist revolution. The great revolution in the history of man, past, present, and future, is the revolution of those determined to be free."

April 19, 1961: Cuban rebel invading forces give up their beachhead on the southern coast of Cuba, in an attempt to join guerrillas in the nearby Escambray Mountains. Rebel communique announces that the invaders have suffered "tragic losses" while being attacked by "Soviet tanks and artillery [and] Russian Mig aircraft."

April 20, 1961: President Kennedy declares (in a speech to the American Society of Newspaper Editors) that U.S. "restraint is not inexhaustible," and that the United States does not intend to abandon Cuba to communism. He says: "Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of non-action; if the Nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration, then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are the security of our Nation."

On the same day, April 20, Prime Minister Nehru of India accuses United States (in a statement in the Indian Parliament) of having encouraged the invasion of Cuba.

April 21, 1961: U.N. General Assembly's Political Committee adopts (by a vote of 61 to 27 with 10 abstentions) a resolution sponsored by seven Latin American Nations (Argentina, Chile, Colombia, Honduras, Panama, Uruguay, and Venezuela) which calls on members of the Organization of American States "to lend their assistance with a view to achieving a settlement [of the United States-Cuban crisis] by peaceful means." The 7-power proposal is supported by the United States, its Western European allies, most of the Latin American States, and 15 Afro-Asian States. The only two Latin American countries to vote against it are Cuba and Mexico. The committee also endorses (by a vote of 42 to 31 with 25 abstentions) a Mexican proposal which would call on all states to "insure that their territories and resources are not used to promote a civil war in Cuba."

April 22, 1961: U.N. General Assembly eliminates the reference to the OAS in the 7-power resolution, and approves a resolution (by a vote of 59 to 13 with 24 abstentions) which calls on all U.N. member states "to take such peaceful action as is open to them to remove existing tensions" between Cuba and the United States.

April 22, 1961: Former President Eisenhower confers (at Camp David, Md.) with President Kennedy on the Cuban situation. Eisenhower says to newsmen after the meeting: "I am all in favor of the United States supporting the man who has to carry the responsibility for our foreign affairs."

On the same day (April 22), Soviet Premier Khrushchev sends President Kennedy a reply to Kennedy's message on the Cuban situation. Khrushchev declares that in spite of all official U.S. denials, "it has now been proved beyond doubt that it was precisely the United States that prepared the intervention [in Cuba], financed the invasion and transported the gangs of mercenaries, which invaded the territory of Cuba. U.S. Armed Forces also took a direct part in the realization of the gangster attack on Cuba. American bombers and fighters supported the operations of mercenaries who landed on Cuban territory, and took part in military operations against the armed forces of the lawful government and the people of Cuba."

April 23, 1961: Premier Fidel Castro (in a 4½-hour television speech in Havana, his first public appearance since the invasion of April 17) declares that no clemency will be shown to the 458 rebel prisoners captured in the April 17 landings, unless the United States ceases its aid to Cuban rebels. He warns the United States that if it tries to intervene directly in Cuba, "a conflagration of incalculable proportions" will be started which will be the "beginning of the end of the Yankee empire." Castro says: "We shall not fight alone."

April 24, 1961: U.S. Presidential Press Secretary Pierre Salinger declares (in a statement to the press) that President Kennedy assumes "sole responsibility" for the U.S. role in the action against Cuba.

On the same day, Honduras becomes the eighth Latin American State to sever diplomatic relations with Cuba.

April 26, 1961: Inter-American Defense Board (composed of military representatives of the 21 American Republics) votes to bar the Cuban representative from all secret sessions of the Board and to deny him access to all classified documents dealing with hemispheric defense plans, "as long as there exists the present evident alliance of Cuba with the Soviet bloc." The ban (proposed by the United States) is approved by a vote of 12 to 1 (Cuba) with 4 abstentions (Chile, Ecuador, Mexico, Venezuela) and one vote reserved (Brazil).

April 30, 1961: State Department advises all U.S. citizens in Cuba to leave the island.

May 1, 1961: Premier Castro in a May Day speech in Havana declared Cuba a Socialist nation and said there would be no more elections. He asserted that henceforth his revolutionary government would rely on the direct backing of the people as expressed in such demonstrations as the May Day rally.

On the same day Secretary of State Dean Rusk told the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs that the United States had no plans now "to proceed in any way in armed intervention in Cuba" but if the Castro regime engaged in acts of aggression this country "will defend itself."

May 2, 1961: U.S. State Department described Cuba as a full-fledged member of the Communist bloc. The statement said: "Let there be no confusion regarding Castro's use of the word "Socialist" instead of "Communist." The use of the word "Socialist," in fact, meant that "Castro considers Cuba further along the Communist road than other countries in the bloc."

May 3, 1961: Twenty-two rebels, including Capt. Manuel Artime, a leader of the April 17 invasion attempt, were captured by Cuban Government troops. The Government announced that this brought the number of captured rebels to 1,122.

May 5, 1961: An anti-Castro Cuban volunteer declared that the Central Intelligence Agency had held him and 16 others prisoner and incommunicado for 11 weeks before and during last month's abortive invasion.

May 9, 1961: Cuban Revolutionary Council declares that its forces in last month's action had been "overcome by Soviet tanks and Migs; that is to say, by the Russian Empire," and that it was "preparing new plans" to win its fight.

May 17, 1961: Premier Castro offers to exchange his prisoners of the April 17 invasion of Cuba for 500 bulldozers from the United States, or else they would be sentenced to hard labor. "Of course," Castro said, "those among them who have committed murder cannot be exchanged for anything."

The Cuban Revolutionary Council called on the United States and Latin America to "take effective action" under inter-American pacts to support the council's efforts to overthrow Premier Castro.

On the same day, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a resolution declaring Cuba to be a "clear and present danger" to this hemisphere and urged the Organization of American States to take collective action against Castro.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1961

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, with each new morning with its unfinished tasks there dawns the sweet consciousness—we are with Thee. We come not so much to seek Thee as to open our faltering lives in penitence and deep need to Thy everwaiting strength.

In all the deliberations that center in this Chamber save those who here speak and act for the Nation from substituting quick and undisciplined judgments for the ripened wisdom which has been enriched by the experience of the past.

May our own lives, freed of pettiness and prejudice and radiant with good will which leaps all barriers to brotherhood, be fit channels through which Thy saving grace may flow for the healing of the nations. We ask it in the name of the Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 23, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION ON ACTIVITIES UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration of that Department on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from January 1, 1961, through March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF WAR CLAIMS ACT OF 1948, RELATING TO COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN WORLD WAR II LOSSES

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DETERMINATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS OF AMERICAN NATIONALS SETTLED BY THE UNITED STATES-POLISH CLAIMS AGREEMENT

A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4126, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO COMPENSATION TO PRISON INMATES FOR CERTAIN INJURIES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIAL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a cablegram, in the nature of a memorial, signed by Eduardo Flores, Rafael Quinonez a De Angel, Benito Cabrear, and Damian Ballesteros, of San Juan, Puerto Rico, relating to the rights of voters in Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 (Rept. No. 287); and

S. 1941. A bill to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 288).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1953. A bill to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code; and

S. 1954. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. STENNIS (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. HILL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1955. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot, or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. STENNIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, Mr. BEALL, Mr. PROUTY, and Mr. MILLER):

S. 1956. A bill to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall not be less than 3,000 officers and members; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1957. A bill to provide for the transfer of the Spring Wheat Quality Laboratory located at Beltsville, Md., to South Dakota State College, Brookings, S. Dak.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 1958. A bill for the relief of James Miller Wolfert and Manuel Miller Wolfert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ENFORCEMENT OF CONSTITUTION AND LAWS FOR PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, and Mr. CLARK) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) concerning the enforcement in certain States of the Constitution and laws for the protection of individual rights, which was ordered to lie over one day, under the rule.

(See the above concurrent resolution, printed in full, when submitted by Mr. JAVITS, which appears under a separate heading.)

HANDLING OF FEDERAL JUVENILE DELINQUENTS AND YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two amendments to title 18 of the United States Code relating to the treatment of juvenile delinquents.

The enlightened approach of the Federal Government to the problem of juvenile delinquency has set a commendable and realistic standard for the entire country.

Much of the success of the Federal program has been due to its flexibility in the treatment of offenders. The Youth Correction Act and the Juvenile Delinquency Act reflect the now accepted concept that criminal behavior of youths present different and individual problems which can best be handled by laws emphasizing rehabilitation rather than punishment.

It is understandable that any legislation dealing directly with human behavior should not be considered final. Continuous reevaluation and improve-

ment based upon experience are necessary to secure maximum benefit from the program.

Efforts under these Federal laws have clearly demonstrated a need for the two amendments I introduce today.

The first of the two proposals would amend the Youth Corrections Act to make consistent the treatment of youth offenders on probation with that of youths committed to Federal institutions.

Under section 5021 of title 18, a committed youth who is unconditionally discharged before the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed upon him automatically has his conviction set aside. No such provision exists for the youth who is released from probation. His conviction remains on the record until the original sentence expires. The law, as it stands now, discriminates against the youth on probation who is generally charged with a lesser offense.

I think section 5021 represents an important factor in the treatment of youthful offenders. It provides an additional incentive for maintaining good behavior by holding out to the youth an opportunity to clear his record.

Passage of this amendment would extend this opportunity to youths on probation and, by so doing, remove an inequity in the law.

The second proposal would amend section 751 of title 18 to provide a penalty for juveniles who escape or attempt to escape from custody.

Section 751 now provides stiff penalties for persons escaping or attempting to escape after a conviction or an arrest on a charge of felony and lesser penalties for those charged with misdemeanors.

Under the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act a juvenile is not considered subject to criminal proceedings and therefore provisions of the Escape Act do not apply to juveniles.

A juvenile, as far as legal punishment is concerned, has nothing to lose by trying to escape. Unfortunately, many police officers and guards have sustained serious injuries at the hands of youths bent on escape.

The amendment would close this loophole by making juveniles who escape or attempt to escape from custody liable to prosecution under the Escape Act, but the maximum penalty would be 1 year imprisonment or $1,000 fine or both rather than the 5-year maximum of section 751.

The two amendments, when considered together, suggest the attitude of the Federal Government to juvenile delinquency. For those youths who demonstrate a willingness to help themselves, every reasonable opportunity is afforded to assist them in making a new start. But for those youths who refuse to respond to help, as in the case of escapees, some punishment is necessary and justified.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. DODD, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1953. A bill to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code; and

S. 1954. A bill to amend chapter 35 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to the escape or attempted escape of juvenile delinquents.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

John O. Garaas, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney, district of North Dakota, term of 4 years, vice Robert Vogel.

Adam J. Walsh, of Maine, to be U.S. marshal, district of Maine, term of 4 years, vice Harry W. Pinkham.

James H. Dillon, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Wisconsin, term of 4 years, vice Lyle F. Milligan.

Gibson Greer Ezell, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of Georgia, term of 4 years, vice William K. Holt, Jr.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Wednesday, May 31, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF EXECUTIVE SESSION BY FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE WITH VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will hear the Vice President discuss his recent world trip in closed, executive session in the committee room, F–53, Capitol, tomorrow afternoon, Thursday, at 3:30 o'clock. All Senators are invited to attend and take part in the meeting. I hope they will come.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

Address by Senator HARTKE delivered before Indiana Academic Advisory Council at Indianapolis, Ind., May 20, 1961.

CUBA

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the atmosphere in Washington, both inside and outside this Chamber, has recently been full of sound, fury, and oratory with respect to our policy toward Cuba. At the moment we are engaged in loud talk about the desirability of entering into an arrangement with the Cuban dictator for the exchange of prisoners for tractors. I suggest that in recent days more heat than light has been cast on that subject.

This morning, there appears in the Washington Post an editorial entitled "Blood Bargaining," which stresses the importance of making every effort in a calm and dispassionate way to set the record clear in regard to the nature of the proposed bargain. The editorial suggests that hot words would play into Castro's hands, in an argument which this country could not win.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLOOD BARGAINING

Let no one underestimate Fidel Castro's craft in exacting every last drop of advantage in a propaganda battle. Since Castro's original offer to "exchange" prisoners for tractors put his regime in an ugly light, he now denounces us for using his terminology and insists that the tractors are simply an "indemnification."

But the fact is that this country has some responsibility for the lives of the 1,200 luckless invaders now in Castro's hands. If they were to be executed—as Castro darkly hints—it might blacken the Cuban regime's reputation, but at a price far too cruel to pay. It is necessary to swallow a little pride in the hope that lives may be saved, and that the ultimate moral victory will go to those who value men more than machines.

Eleanor Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther have undertaken a humanitarian task in raising funds for the unhappy transaction. It would be a fine gesture if leaders all through the Western Hemisphere were to unite in the effort. The world ought to know that this is a matter that transcends government and reaches directly to the people themselves.

Every effort ought to be made, in a calm and dispassionate way, to set the record clear as to the nature of the bargain. But hot words would play into Castro's hand in an argument which this country could not win.

Mr. CLARK. This business about the tractors and the prisoners is, to my way of thinking, only a digression with respect to the important debate on our Cuban policy. It occurs to me that in this debate far too little attention has been paid to the necessity for the United States to keep its international obligations and far too little attention has been paid to the importance of having the United States keep its treaties and observe the rule of law. We talk about the importance of the rule of law; but we tend to ignore it when it is not to our advantage.

In the May 13 issue of the Saturday Review, there was published a guest editorial entitled "The Cuba Incident and the Rule of Law." The author of the editorial is an able Republican, Mr. Arthur Larson, who served with distinction for President Eisenhower in various capacities during the late administration. The editorial points out that the Cuba incident which resulted in disaster was a clear violation, insofar as the United States was concerned, of both our

international commitments and our domestic criminal statutes which prohibit in no uncertain terms what we very clearly did.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CUBA INCIDENT AND THE RULE OF LAW

(By Arthur Larson)

In the first detailed expose of what went on behind closed doors before the decision on the Cuban enterprise was made, Wallace Carroll recounted in more than three full New York Times columns the many elements that were discussed and weighed: the intelligence estimates, the chances of success, the possible effect on American prestige, the matter of timing, and so on. At almost the end of the article, after a reference to the recruiting, training, and financing of invasion troops in the United States, there followed this sentence: "Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy and Abram J. Chayes, State Department's legal adviser, checked the laws covering such activities and raised questions about their legality." This is one of the very few references to law to be found in the millions of words that have been written about the Cuban incident.

Now that the enterprise has miscarried, the reaction of the American people, official and unofficial, follows the same pattern: the timing was bad; the intelligence work was bad; the failure to do an all-out job was bad; the effect on American prestige was bad. It is time someone said plainly—and not just as an incidental afterthought—that the whole affair was a flagrant violation of law.

Take a look at the Federal criminal statute quoted on this page, and at the passage from Habana Treaty—which under article VI of our Constitution is, with the Constitution and statutes, the "supreme law of the land." Then recall that only a few weeks ago we were watching on television the marching drills of recruits and the activities of enlistment centers, and reading in our papers illustrated accounts of the open recruiting, financing, and training of these forces in several centers on the soil of the United States. I do not presume to discuss alleged active aid by governmental agencies; mere governmental tolerance of such activities on our soil is illegal in itself; affirmative governmental participation would sharply increase the gravity of the offense.

What has gone wrong in this land that prides itself on being the guardian of the rule of law?

Are these laws out of date? No. There are 10 pages of notes of decided cases following the statute first cited. The noninterference principle stated in the other quotations on this page has been restated in a number of subsequent treaties and declarations made by the American Republics, including the Bogotá and Caracas actions designed to provide, through the Organization of American States, procedures for this very problem. The same principle has been applied by actions of the General Assembly to actual cases, such as the actions in 1948 and 1949 condemning aid by Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia to Greek guerillas.

Are these laws more legal technicalities? They are not. We are not dealing here with the fringes of international law and conduct. This is the very heart of the matter: the integrity of national states; the right of freedom from interference in domestic affairs; the illegality of force in international relations.

Are we justified in our conduct because of a threat to our security? There are five ways in which our security could be threatened:

1. By a direct aggressive assault by Castro upon the United States. No responsible person seriously believes that this is a genuine danger. In any real showdown, one wave of planes from the aircraft carrier *Saratoga* could destroy Cuba in a matter of minutes.

2. By subversive activities aimed at the United States. We have been dealing with such activities for years by much bigger and more expert practitioners.

3. By direct aggressive assault by Castro upon other Latin American countries. In such an event, force can be met with force with complete legality under the United Nations Charter. Collective measures under the Bogotá Pact and the Caracas Declaration would be in order, and our assistance would earn us the support rather than the fears of our Latin American neighbors.

4. By subversive activities aimed at Latin American countries. These countries have been dealing with subversive plots throughout their history under their own laws. Here again, we can give our help by operating through the channels of the OAS, the U.N., and the various treaties and declarations aimed at collective action against such subversion.

5. By the gradual rise of pro-Castro, pro-Communist, anti-American sentiment throughout Latin America. This is the real threat, the new threat. The surest way to exacerbate this threat is to become committed to a policy of "bringing down Castro" quickly by whatever amount of American intervention is necessary. We must not forget that throughout Latin American history the specter of interventionism has always taken the form of the fear of Yankee interventionism. The fear of Communist interventionism is only a few years old. The older fear runs very deep, and lies just under the surface. If we begin to act too imperiously and unilaterally, this fear could easily become once more the main force of Latin American politics, and could overwhelm the competing new force of anti-communism and anti-Castroism. On the other hand, the surest way to defeat this threat and enhance our security is to press forward vigorously with constructive programs of economic development, to attune our policies and direct our attention to the lively and discontented new elements in these countries—the students, intellectuals, and young professional people who hold the key to the future and who should be our strongest allies, to insist at every point on strengthening and utilizing the OAS and other agreed collective measures, and above all to make respect for the national integrity of our neighbors the main theme of our policy.

Finally, there is the tu quoque argument, perhaps the commonest of all. The Communists do it; therefore we not only may do it but must do it. If we ever succumb to that poisonous doctrine we are finished. It would be a poor sort of victory to become, in the process of winning, the very thing we are struggling against. We have our own objectives, and our own methods of reaching them. We seek—in company with most people everywhere, including those of Latin America—a world that orders its affairs and settles its disputes under law, that respects the self-determination of nations, and that bans resort to force and subversion whether by friend or enemy.

We have been admonished to learn some "useful lessons" from the Cuban experience. Perhaps the most useful lesson is this: We do not get rid of violence by emulating violence. We do not build a world of law by flouting law when it gets in the way of our sympathies, no matter how strong and well founded those sympathies may be. The way to build the world we want, in short, is to be ourselves.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call the attention of my colleagues to the importance of keeping a clear head in connection with our Cuba policy, the importance of cooperating with our Latin American neighbors, and the importance of not giving the Soviet Union and the Chinese Communists an opportunity to charge us with being treaty violators and violators of our own statutes who fail to comply with the rule of law for ourselves, while we piously demand that others keep their treaty obligations.

LACK OF ATTRACTIVENESS OF TEACHING AS A PROFESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this morning I read in the Washington Post an article entitled "Ten Straight A High School Seniors Admit They're a Little Bit Dizzy." The article refers to 10 seniors at the Arlington, Va., Wakefield High School, who yesterday were honored in ceremonies at the school.

I wish to read one paragraph of the article, because it relates to the bill we are debating and on which we are going to take affirmative action:

> Only one girl, Barbara Anderson, plans to study education and to become a teacher. Three other girls—Alice Mattice, Stephanie Duke, and Janice Niblett—said they had considered teaching, but were dissuaded because of salaries. Several boys said flatly they didn't think they could live on teacher pay.

Mr. President, these 10 students are the top students in one of the finest high schools in this metropolitan area; and of the 10, only 1 says she plans to be a teacher. Three of the other young women have been dissuaded from becoming teachers because of the low salaries and the poor economic conditions; and all the boys in the group say they could not live on a teacher's salary.

I believe this article points up the issue we now face in connection with Federal aid to education. I happened to notice the article as I was coming to the Capitol this morning; and if ever there was a cogent argument in favor of providing more help to education, it is the article to which I have just referred.

THE CAPITOL TERRACES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, every once in a while one notices in the morning press something which attracts his attention.

I have noticed, around the Capitol, the beautiful terraces. The majority leader saw to it that the grounds around the Capitol were at least brought back to reasonable shape, so they will be attractive.

However, around the Capitol are beautiful terraces which are unused. Apparently we lack some of the appreciation of beauty which is so widely developed among other peoples. Can we imagine that a Parisian would permit these beautiful terraces to be unused? Here they are; but on them one does not

find even a bench, a table, or a chair. In fact, these beautiful terraces around the Capitol could well be used for what some of our colleagues have been talking about—namely, sidewalk cafes. It is very difficult for tourists to find in and around the Capitol adequate places where they can eat and rest; but right here, on both sides of the Capitol, around the Senate wing and the House wing, are very beautiful terraces which, with but little change in terms of their covering, could be made most useful, with the addition of tables, benches, canopies, umbrellas, and with the provision of some good service, which I believe we might be able to provide by means of a catering service. Thus, in addition to having the pleasure of outdoor recreation and outdoor eating, we could also make available to the citizenry who pay for this Capitol an opportunity to have a very satisfying and beautiful experience.

Mr. President, I believe that the two items I have submitted this morning—one in regard to the situation in the field of education, and the other in regard to the need to develop beauty around the Capitol—help to begin our day fairly well.

RANSOM OF CUBAN HOSTAGES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to briefly comment on the activities of the volunteer committee, headed by Milton Eisenhower, Walter Reuther, and Mrs. Roosevelt, which is trying to raise $15 million to provide 500 tractors as a ransom for the Cuban freedom fighters.

I believe that our Government should call an immediate halt to the activities of this committee and remind its leaders that we have an administration and a Congress for the making of foreign policy and for deciding whether or not the American people will pay tribute to the Cuban Communist dictator.

There are two fundamental questions involved here:

First, shall we submit to blackmail by the Communists?

Second, shall we permit volunteer groups of private citizens to meddle in delicate matters of foreign policy?

On the first point, I believe that the American people must, as a matter of principle, oppose the paying of tribute to Castro or anyone else, however laudable its immediate aim may be.

There are 1 billion hostages in the Communist prison house of nations. We ought to be thinking about them every day of our lives. We ought to be formulating our policies and shaping our programs to bring about their eventual freedom. Our failure to pursue such policies cannot be redeemed by an impetuous, sentimental, token response to one aspect of a vast problem.

For many years, I have been concerned with the problem of John Downey, a young man from New Britain, Conn., who has been imprisoned by the Chinese Communists throughout that period. There have been many others, including that saintly American, Bishop James E. Walsh, who have been thrown into Communist prisons, and there is today a large number of American citizens in Castro's jails.

We must be concerned with all of these tragic cases, but our concern must be expressed not in the easy payment of a tyrant's ransom, but in the dearer coinage of national policies that will put these tyrants out of business and begin to redeem the freedom of all men.

Our national concern for the plight of the Cubans and for the safety of the Cuban freedom fighters should have been evidenced by effective help on the beachhead to enable their just revolution to succeed. Having failed that test, we are now asked to render ourselves absurd and ridiculous by crawling to Castro and by making of our country the foil for his propaganda efforts.

By paying Castro's price for a thousand good men, we only give him the means to strengthen his enslavement of 6 million others.

More regrettably, if this voluntary committee is permitted to carry out its plan, the American people will, for the first time to my knowledge, be making use of ransom and tribute as an instrument of policy. If we start to pay tribute now for 1,000 of the 1 billion Communist hostages, where will it stop?

For many years the United States has tolerated the spectacle of Cyrus Eaton and others parading around the world engaging in discussions with Communist leaders, to the embarrassment and detriment of the United States. We have endured other troublesome harassments, such as the refusal of longshoremen, for their own political reasons, to unload this or that foreign ship, thus creating international incidents.

The Reuther-Roosevelt-Milton Eisenhower committee again poses the problem, and I think the time has come for us to face up to it.

Private citizens and private groups must not be allowed to interfere with the conduct of our international affairs. The attempt of private citizens to pay a foreign dictator for the release of foreign nationals captured during an insurrection is so clear a case of interference in the lawful jurisdiction of our Government that it simply cannot be tolerated.

This is irresponsible meddling, and this fact cannot be altered by the humanitarian aims of the enterprise.

If this committee is not in violation of the letter of the Logan Act, it is surely in violation of its spirit, and I believe this incident should furnish the impetus to Congress for the drafting of a new Logan Act, an act equal to the task of controlling the activities of a rash of self-appointed emissaries without portfolio.

The situation is further complicated by reports today that the Internal Revenue Service may grant tax deductions to those who contribute to the ransom fund. This can only have the effect of furnishing a semblance of official sanction to the committee. If the U.S. Government wants to submit to blackmail by Fidel Castro, let it try to do so through official channels, where it will be promptly and properly repudiated by the Congress and the people.

I feel quite certain the U.S. Government is not a silent partner in this endeavor, but the situation is by now so confused that I feel it is mandatory for the State Department to issue a statement repudiating the efforts of the ransom committee and calling for a halt to its activities.

DETENTION OF MOISE TSHOMBE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, earlier in the month I expressed my disapproval of the seizure of Moise Tshombe, one of the leaders of the Congo, while he was attending a peace conference under a pledge of safe conduct. There have been hints, particularly from United Nations sources, that this seizure might be used to compel Kasavubu and Tshombe to make some agreement with respect to the future of that unhappy state, the Congo; but, without regard to the attempts to justify it, any man with a sense of fairplay will denounce this arrest, while Tshombe was traveling under the white flag, as a most reprehensible act.

I have expressed my great disappointment that the United Nations, which protested so loudly at the assassination of Patrice Lumumba, has not likewise protested this illegal and immoral act of seizing Tshombe while he was under the white flag.

As I have stated before, I have been amazed that there has been so little interest generated by this dastardly act. The United Nations passed a resolution condemning the murder of Lumumba, and properly so, but they apparently have taken no serious steps to try to secure the release of Tshombe. Both Tshombe and Lumumba had been critical of the United Nations, so we must look further to find the reason for the difference in approach by officials of the United Nations.

I have two editorials that I wish to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. Both of these editorials, one in the New York Times and the other in the Savannah Morning News, ask the question, What would have happened if Premier Gizenga, successor of Lumumba, had been seized under similar conditions? Both point out there would have been demonstrations in every capital of the world. When the Communists demonstrated, the United Nations condemned. Tshombe has been strongly anticommunistic and is therefore expendable.

This double standard of morality, if persisted in by the United Nations, will destroy the usefulness of that body in settling disputes at the conference table, and we are likely to have a great many which should be settled at the conference table before the birth pains of the emerging new nations are ended.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of the editorials to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 9, 1961]

TREACHEROUS ACT

When Moise Tshombe, leader of Katanga, traveled to Coquilhatville last month to

confer with Leopoldville officials on the Congo's future status, he came as the leader of the richest, most independent province in the divided African state. Now, in one of those fantastic developments that we have to expect in the Congo, he stands under arrest and accused of high treason.

Mr. Tshombe, who has adamantly refused to cooperate with the U.N. or other Congo leaders, should nevertheless have been able to count on the immunities covering any participant in a political conference. His abrupt seizure by Leopoldville officials who are dissatisfied with his bargaining attitude was a treacherous act which the unpopularity of Mr. Tshombe outside Katanga in no way excuses.

The United Nations has asked President Kasavubu to adhere to the principles of "fair treatment and due process of law" with regard to Mr. Tshombe. One can imagine what an uproar would have been created in many quarters if Premier Gizenga of secessionist Stanleyville had been similarly seized. The United Nations has the duty to insist on Tshombe's release, remembering that the principles of "fair treatment and due process" apply to those with few outside friends as well as to those with many.

[From the Savannah Morning News, May 11, 1961]

WHERE ARE THE DEMONSTRATIONS?

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL took the floor of the Senate this week to attack the detention of Moise Tshombe, doughty boss of the Congo's Katanga Province.

Tshombe may be so guilty of crimes that the United Nations should arrest him, Senator RUSSELL declared, but his seizure at the Congo political conference constitutes breach of a promise of safe conduct.

Few other voices have been raised to protest the seizure of Tshombe, even though he faces possible execution. This seems strange in view of the uproar raised when Patrice Lumumba underwent the same experience.

Where are the demonstrators now? Why aren't mobs in cities around the globe astir? Why doesn't the Soviet Union protest? Why are all the neutrals silent? Isn't Tshombe as much a victim as Patrice Lumumba?

The arrest of Moise Tshombe is but another chapter in the Congo's brutal political struggle. Its participants recognize no rules, and Americans are at a loss when they seek to judge the actions of the Congolese by accepted standards.

It was at the hands of Moise Tshombe, it has been charged, that Patrice Lumumba met his death. This is the grave accusation lodged against the Katanga leader. The charge of "treason" which has been leveled against him means only that he does not agree with his captors.

So why no demonstrations in defense of Moise Tshombe? The cases are almost the same, except that Tshombe's record is perhaps a bit the cleaner, ugly though it may be.

Could it be that the difference lies in their attitude toward communism? Whatever else Moise Tshombe may be, he is not pro-Communist. Patrice Lumumba was.

It doesn't take involved reasoning to draw a deduction from that. The Communists aren't concerned about Moise Tshombe's fate, so there are no demonstrations. But what if the prisoner held by the Central Government happened to be Antoine Gazenga, the pro-Red successor to Patrice Lumumba? Would there be silence then? There would not.

PROTECTION OF INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of these brief remarks, I shall send to the desk a concurrent resolution on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and myself and ask for its immediate consideration.

I have advised those Senators who I thought might have an interest in this concurrent resolution to be in the Chamber this morning, and I am hopeful they are.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution which I shall send to the desk in a few minutes concerns itself with the situation of the President of the United States in respect of Alabama, where he has been compelled by circumstances in that State to take action of the highest order, in terms of the executive power, in sending a large number of U.S. marshals into that State in order to protect the rights of citizens of the United States.

Mr. President, this is a pretty serious situation, and it is time that the attention of the whole country be called to it most markedly. Interstate bus segregation is an evil—that is a word, incidentally, used by the New York Times—and in illegal tradition. U.S. citizens have a legal right to unsegregated bus transportation and to be carried physically in buses from one State to another.

The State authorities cannot be excused from failure to protect citizens in their rights, not only as citizens of their States, but as citizens of the United States.

We have had the spectacle of a personal representative of the United States, Mr. Seigenthaler, of the Department of Justice, lying on the streets of a city in Alabama unconscious, as a result of mob action.

Mr. President, I am a lawyer. There are many lawyers in the Senate. Provocation is no defense to a charge of committing serious crime. All the talk about provocation omits the cardinal fact that the people allegedly provoking are engaged in perfectly legal acts, while they who react with violence are engaged in entirely illegal acts.

Mr. President, the President of the United States took the only action he could take, in view of the law and the Constitution and the failure or refusal of State officials to act. On that score we are left in no doubt. The Attorney General of the United States, in a communication sent to me, and I assume sent to most other Senators, said, in respect to the Governor of the State of Alabama:

> Therefore, although I strongly believe that law enforcement matters should be handled by local authorities whenever possible, now not being even able to reach you to learn what steps you intend to take, we have no alternative but to order the following action—

And he then specifies the action.

As reported in this morning's newspapers, the Attorney General has sent a reply to Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives from Alabama in which he says practically the same thing; that he did his utmost to get action from the State authorities.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. President, the President should have asked Congress for legislation on civil rights. I have been very ardent in that cause. But for this situation the President needs no legislation. He is entitled to know that the country is with him.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution I now submit, for myself and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], for which I ask immediate consideration, is an effort to inform the President that the country is with him in the making of this very serious decision.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I object to consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may the concurrent resolution be stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States be supported in measures to enforce the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted thereunder for the protection of individual rights, in such States where citizens of the United States may be deprived of their rights under the Constitution and such laws, or jeopardized in the enjoyment thereof, by virtue of the actions of citizens of any State, or by virtue of the actions or failures to act of the public authorities charged with the enforcement of the laws in such State.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say a few words about this matter.

No one has been more saddened by the tragic occurrences of the last several days in the South than the Senator from Georgia. I have deplored all the acts of violence, not only because they were against the law, but also because they ran counter to the best interests of the people of the South—and I refer now to the white people of the South—whose interests have been at stake in the legislative battles we have waged on this floor.

Mr. President, the people of Alabama made a mistake when they permitted themselves to be provoked into violence. The so-called freedom riders, I understand, had no difficulty anywhere they traveled until they did associate young white girls with Negro males, and that did bring forth these lawless acts. I deplore every one of them even though I realize the extent of the provocation. But it should have been recognized that the CORE organization was determined to provoke violence and then demand the intervention of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, while coming to the Senate this morning, I happened to hear on the radio that a man named Rock-

well, I believe, had invaded the city of New Orleans with a group of Nazis. Frankly, I did not know we had any Nazis in this country at this time.

It was not charged that this group had committed any illegal acts, but it was stated on this morning's radio news that the police force of New Orleans, at the instruction of the governing body there, had stopped the bus and compelled the occupants to cover up all the incendiary signs which were attached to the bus before they were permitted to proceed.

Mr. President, we do not want to have to have any double standard of political morality. We should consider the resolution, to determine if it would not be appropriate to affix an amendment which would commend and congratulate the mayor of New Orleans and the authorities of that city generally for their handling of the Rockwell incident and in any other cases where the governing authorities have enforced the peace.

Of course, it is a rather absurd position for the Senate to undertake to commend the President of the United States for undertaking to enforce what he regards as the law. That is his duty. That is what he is sworn to do.

I should like to consider other aspects of this concurrent resolution, so I therefore object to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The concurrent resolution will be received and will go over 1 day, under the rule.

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was ordered to lie over 1 day, under the rule.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD sundry articles and other data from which I have read with respect to the resolution.

There being no objection, the letter, telegram, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1961.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of the telegram which I sent to Governor Patterson of Alabama on Saturday, May 20, informing him of the reasons why it was necessary to send U.S. deputy marshals to Montgomery to maintain peace and order and protect interstate travel and commerce.

The action was taken pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 333, which provides that—

"The President, by using the militia or the armed forces, or both or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination * * *."

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
May 20, 1961.

Gov. JOHN PATTERSON,
Montgomery, Ala.:

As you know, since early this last week I have been deeply concerned about the situation in Alabama. From my conversation with you on Monday and numerous conversations that I and my associates here had with your aids, you have been aware of the concern with which we have regarded this very explosive situation. Since the destruction of the bus on Sunday and the interference of interstate travel you have been made aware of our clear responsibility in this area. The President himself when he was unable to reach you Friday made this clear to the Lieutenant Governor and pointed out that the Federal Government has the responsibility to guarantee safe passage in interstate commerce and that free travel had not been possible for 5 days in Alabama. The President hoped that the government of Alabama would restore the situation without the need for action by Federal authorities.

You then requested that the President send a personal representative to discuss the matter with you. As you know, Mr. Seigenthaler of this office met with you last evening and in your presence talked to me on the telephone. He told me that you wanted to assure the President and the Federal Government that you had the will, the force, the men, and the equipment to fully protect everyone in Alabama.

Mr. Seigenthaler assured you that the Federal Government was willing to provide marshals and any other assistance in order to assure that interstate commerce was unimpeded. You stated that this was unnecessary and that you and the local authorities would be completely able to handle every contingency. You suggested that we notify the Greyhound Bus Co. that this guarantee had been given. It was based on this assurance of safe conduct that the students boarded the bus in Birmingham on their trip to Montgomery. These students boarded the bus this morning. They arrived in Montgomery and were attacked and beaten by a mob. Prior to their arrival we took the additional precautionary step of having the FBI notify the police department that these students were coming and asked the police to take all necessary steps for their protection. The FBI was informed and in turn notified us that all necessary steps had been taken and that no action on our part was necessary. As a matter of fact, no police were present. However, an armed mob was. Several of the travelers were severely beaten. The President's personal representative, Mr. Seigenthaler, who attempted to rescue a young white girl, who was being attacked by the mob, was knocked to the ground and left unconscious in the street.

Once again I have tried to reach you by telephone to discuss this matter with you. I was informed that you were out of town and no one knew when you would return or where you were. Therefore, although I strongly believe that law enforcement matters should be handled by local authorities whenever possible, now not being even able to reach you to learn what steps you intend to take we have no alternative but to order the following action:

1. I am asking the U.S. court in Montgomery to enjoin the Ku Klux Klan, the National States Rights Party, certain individuals and all persons acting in concert with them, from interfering with peaceful interstate travel by buses.

2. I am arranging for the FBI to send in an extra team to intensify its investigation of the incident in Montgomery and the other events this past week in which the Federal Government has jurisdiction.

3. I am also arranging for U.S. officers to begin to assist State and local authorities in the protection of persons and property and vehicles in Alabama.

Mr. Byron White, the Deputy Attorney General, will be in charge and will be in touch with your office as well as the local authorities.

I trust we will have your cooperation and the cooperation of local authorities.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1961]

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S REPLY TO CONGRESSMEN

(Following is the text of a telegram sent yesterday by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to Alabama Representatives and Senators who asked the Justice Department to withdraw Federal marshals from the State.)

Thank you for your telegram of this afternoon. U.S. deputy marshals were sent to the State of Alabama only as a last resort. The action was taken with great reluctance.

Information came to the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice a week ago Sunday that there would be violence in Birmingham, Ala. The Birmingham police and local authorities were informed. Despite this advance information, no police were present at the bus terminal. A number of the passengers were attacked and beaten severely by an uncontrolled mob. Another bus traveling in interstate commerce was attacked, burned, and a number of passengers badly beaten and injured.

The following day, Monday, I requested Governor Patterson to provide protection for buses traveling through the State of Alabama. The Governor granted that request and said the buses would be protected. However, later Monday afternoon, he changed his position.

Following these events, the situation slowly deteriorated over the next few days. I made numerous attempts to get in touch with Governor Patterson to discuss the situation with him. All of these attempts were unsuccessful, and I was informed that the Governor was out of town and unavailable.

On Friday noon, realizing that the situation was becoming more critical, the President attempted to call Governor Patterson. The President was told the Governor was out of town and could not be reached.

Sometime later, an intermediary for the Governor called and said the Governor would like to meet with a personal representative of the President to discuss the situation in Alabama. The President designated John Seigenthaler of my staff, and Mr. Seigenthaler met with Governor Patterson for 2 hours on Friday evening in Montgomery, Ala. Governor Patterson stated emphatically to Mr. Seigenthaler that no help was needed to protect the buses traveling through Alabama and that the State would maintain law and order.

You state in your telegram that Governor Patterson informed you yesterday that the State of Alabama has the "means, ability, and the will to keep the peace without outside help." These are virtually the same words that Governor Patterson used to Mr. Seigenthaler on Friday evening. Twelve hours later, Mr. Seigenthaler was lying unconscious in a street in Montgomery after having attempted to rescue a young girl from another armed mob. I am, therefore, not quite as impressed with these words of assurance as I might otherwise be.

Furthermore, prior to this riot, the local police as well as the other law-enforcement authorities were informed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation that there was a strong possibility of violence at the bus station in Montgomery. Federal authorities were assured that the local officials had the means, the ability and the will to handle the situation and that Federal help was unnecessary.

No police were present at the time of the riot Saturday. They arrived only after the damage was done.

It was only after all of these events that the decision was made to send deputy marshals into Alabama to assist local law-enforcement officials.

In this connection, for several hours Saturday after the riot, I attempted to contact Governor Patterson to find out what steps he intended to take. After I could not reach him, the marshals were dispatched.

On Sunday evening a mob advanced on the First Baptist Church in Montgomery, where a large group of Negroes were holding a meeting. It is clear from newspaper reports and from the investigation conducted in the last 36 hours that had it not been for the presence of the marshals, there would have been an extremely bloody and costly riot.

Newspaper reporters, who were present, stated that if the marshals had not been present the church would have been burned to the ground with great loss of life.

Shortly before this riot took place, Governor Patterson stated publicly the situation was peaceful in Montgomery and in Alabama and that local law-enforcement officials had the situation well in hand. Once again, this was hardly a correct appraisal of the situation when we consider that within a few hours after making that announcement, he called out the Alabama National Guard.

It should also be pointed out that the National Guard officers, as well as the officers of the State police, requested and received the help and assistance of U.S. marshals for the rest of the night and there has been a close cooperative effort since that time.

What is needed now is action on the part of Governor Patterson and local law-enforcement officers, not merely words of intention.

I assure you that we have no intention of permitting the marshals to remain in Alabama a minute longer than is necessary. With your assistance and cooperation I would hope that they could be withdrawn at an early date.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 23, 1961]

TRAGEDY IN ALABAMA

(By Walter Lippmann)

The disorders in Alabama are tragic and ominous. For they raise questions which elsewhere in the world have proved to be insoluble by rational political means.

What has happened in Alabama is that into the long controversy over civil rights which has been waged for a century in Congress, in the courts, in the press, there has in recent times been added direct action on which human lives are staked.

What had been a movement of gradual reform is showing unmistakable signs of turning into a movement of physical confrontation, with all the dire possibilities of reprisal and counterreprisal.

Federal law is being nullified by State laws which contradict it and by overwhelming white sentiment which does not recognize it. Nullification exists by the failure of the State authorities to enforce Federal law and by the abdication of local authorities to mobs.

We are witnessing a nonviolent rebellion against this nullification, nonviolent in that the agitators are unarmed and passive. This rebellion marks a lessening of hope and faith in the processes of the courts, of elections, of Congress, and of education. It is influenced, no doubt, by the demonstrations in Africa that white domination can be ended by agitation and rebellion. We must recognize the grim fact that we have no immunity here. It would be vain for anyone to expect that there can be a quick and easy end to the kind of courage and determination which has been shown in the bus rides and in the lunch counter sit-ins. No one should expect this kind of thing to disappear leaving everything as it was before.

The Nation is at the beginning of an experience which will test profoundly our political capacity. We must begin, of course, with a firm determination that we will not surrender the problem to the mob. While the issue posed by the bus riders is one of wisdom as well as of law, there is no doubt at all that their ride into Birmingham and Montgomery was lawful.

There is no doubt that the Governor of Alabama and the local law enforcement officers failed to prevent mobs from depriving the bus riders of their lawful rights. The authority of the law must, therefore, be vindicated, and the Attorney General has acted swiftly and boldly to do just that.

But that is only the beginning of the story. The administration and the country are compelled to face the problem of direct action as a method of promoting civil rights. This is a real and pressing problem. For it is evident that after the lawful rights of the bus riders have been vindicated by the Federal marshals, the Federal Government will almost certainly be in a position where it may be called upon to intervene whenever and wherever someone chooses to make a physical demonstration against the nullification of civil rights. The question is what kind of precedent is to be established by the sending of the Federal marshals. The matter cannot be left at the point where the Federal Government is in duty bound to protect those whose actions it cannot advise, guide, and control.

It follows, so it seems to me, that the administration will have to have a thorough discussion with the leaders of the direct action movement. It must do this before the incipient rebellion gets out of hand. For while agitation cannot, and should not, be suppressed, it cannot be left unlimited and uncontrolled. If this rule is established, it may provide a basis from which it is not unreasonable to hope that the administration can talk seriously with the responsible leaders of the South—talk to them about measures to reduce and eliminate the publicly degrading forms of segregation.

In this, as in so much of our troubled world, the central issue is whether the reasonable men can collect the moral, the intellectual and the physical force to control and subdue the extremists and the violent. The issue is very much in doubt. For the good rhetoric and the good tunes are with the impatient and the passionate and the violent.

But since across the generations we have managed to become at least partially civilized, we are entitled to believe that the last word is with reason.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 24, 1961]

ALABAMA RIOTING—THE LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

(By Roscoe Drummond)

Every State, every community, every law enforcement officer, every citizen everywhere in the United States has something to learn from the disgraceful and degrading mob violence in Alabama against white and Negro youths who were riding a desegregated bus in interstate travel.

The United States is increasingly determined that all citizens shall have total protection in the exercise of all civil rights and equal access to all public facilities.

There is no basis for condoning, whatever the reason, the failure of Alabama local and State police to maintain public order. They knew that the unsegregated bus riders were arriving in Montgomery. Gov. John Patterson said the police would guarantee against mob action. They didn't; the mob was on hand; the police were not—until it was too late.

The unsegregated bus riders were exercising a constitutional civil right guaranteed to all citizens and specifically upheld by the Supreme Court.

If the bus riders are constitutionally right, if Governor Patterson and the Alabama police are constitutionally wrong, and if mob violence is a crime against everybody, what, then, can be usefully learned from this painful sequence of events? I believe these are the lessons:

Isn't it time for responsible southern leaders in the States and in Congress to put their influence behind respect for law instead of their personal views of what the law should be? The able and far-seeing Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., of North Carolina, is doing just that when he said this week that southerners who commit wrongs against Negroes (or permit them to be committed) hurt the cause of all who want to see an orderly test of the constitutional issues.

The time is at hand for other southern leaders to rally behind the constructive stand of men like Senator ERVIN.

The political and civil leaders of Alabama have not acted wisely, have not served their own best interests or those of the Nation. The unsegregated bus riders are violating no law. In engaging in interstate travel, they were exercising a constitutional right. They may be doing it to provoke an incident, they are certainly doing it to call national attention to this right. What, then, is the wise and prudent and practical response to such an affair? Surely it is to pay it no attention. Let them ride, as they did in Georgia—and by so doing there wasn't an ugly headline—or incident—in a hundred miles.

Other Governors should be able to learn a lesson from Governor Patterson. His duty was to maintain public order. Instead, he publicly excoriated the bus riders and thereby invited the mob action he was pledged to avert. He said the police would maintain order, but they were absent when needed. Is the Governor best serving his State by making martyrs out of the bus riders, by forcing the Attorney General to send in armed marshals, and by allowing incidents which add pressure for more stringent Federal measures?

Every citizen should exercise every civil right as needed. I can well understand that those who have long been denied civil rights equality feel they must press their case to make their deserved gains more rapidly. I cannot escape the conviction that the "freedom riders" might accomplish more in a different direction. For example, if these young men and women had organized to get all qualified Negroes on the registration rolls of these States they have been riding through, would this not be of more service to the people they are trying to help?

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1961]

ALABAMA, U.S.A.

Once again the Federal Government has been compelled to move into a State to maintain law and order and to protect the constitutional rights of American citizens subjected to mob violence. Four years ago, President Eisenhower was forced to intervene with paratroopers in Little Rock. Now President Kennedy has found it necessary to send armed Federal marshals to Montgomery, where the Federal Government is being challenged by State authorities.

This deplorable train of events adds a tinge of irony to the Nation's observance of the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. It can only deal a new blow to American prestige and especially to our foreign policy dedicated to the promotion of human rights and human equality irrespective of class, color or creed. Little Rock became a byword in international discourse and Montgomery may now join it in that unenviable distinction. The saving grace is that the Federal Government is acting promptly and decisively to defend these rights.

The issue in Montgomery and in Birmingham is not school segregation, as in Little Rock. It is the right of American citizens, white and Negro alike, to travel in safety in interstate commerce, without being segregated in contravention of the Constitution. This right is now being tested by the so-called freedom riders, a racially mixed group consisting primarily of stu-

dents, who are waging their campaign for civil rights in the South in a Gandhian spirit of idealism and of nonviolent resistance to an evil tradition. But it is also being waged with loud advance publicity and in deliberate defiance of State laws and local customs. There can be no question that in the freedom riders' completely legal action there is an element of incitement and provocation in regions of high racial tension.

There can also be no question, however, of the freedom riders' constitutional right to do what they are doing, nor—and this is the key point—of the duty and responsibility of the city and State authorities to protect them. The freedom riders are acting in accordance with the law and they are doing what they are doing frankly to test that law.

Governor Patterson himself acknowledges the State's responsibility to cope with violence, but he has only exacerbated the situation by denouncing the freedom riders as rabble rousers, by threatening to arrest the Federal marshals and by obtaining an injunction in State courts in conflict with a Federal injunction. He has put the State of Alabama in direct opposition to the Government and the Constitution of the United States.

The issue between the Federal and the State authorities is clearly joined. There can be no doubt which authority will and must prevail.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from New York for a moment.

I should like to have the permission of the Senator to associate myself as a cosponsor of the resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

Mr. President, I commend my good friend the Senator from Georgia for the temperate position he has taken in the Senate, both today and earlier, with respect to a situation which I know must grieve him deeply. No one can condone what took place in Alabama. It has seemed to me important that we should stand behind the President with a united voice. The Senator from Georgia has been temperate and has been wise in his comments. I hope that after the Senator gives the resolution further consideration, he will feel free to support it.

The damage which is done in this body by statements of those who represent a tiny minority of the people of the United States is incalculable in terms of our foreign policy as well as in terms of our domestic policy.

I hope that we can deal with this matter calmly and judiciously and with maturity.

The point must be made—and the point must be made without equivocation—that the law of the land is going to be enforced all over the land, and that there can be no condoning of mob violence, whether it takes place by the advocates of a fascist group headed by Mr. Rockwell or by those who attempt by force to prevent the freedom riders from exercising their full constitutional rights.

I am sure I speak for the Senator from New York as well as for myself—the Senator is in the Chamber and can speak for himself—when I say that all types of violations of the law by those opposed to the law of the land are equally despicable and should equally be deplored.

I think it is of the greatest importance that this body, to the extent it is possible, present a unanimous front in support of the President of the United States, in support of law and order, in support of the right of all Americans to speak their piece without violence, and, at the same time, the right of all Americans to move freely between States, as they have every right to do under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield to my friend from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair wishes to invite attention of Senators to the fact that the Senate is operating under a 3-minute rule.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to yield the floor to permit my friend from New York to proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. I say to the Senator that I welcome his cosponsoring of the resolution. I hope other Senators will do so.

I, too, feel that the Senator from Georgia is deeply distressed about this matter. I know he is devoted to law and order, as we all are. I have talked to him, and I know he is.

The only reason for not having the resolution laid on the table is that the practical effect would be, if that were done, to take away the opportunity for considering it in a summary way, which I thought was necessary.

Finally, of course it is correct to say that the President has a duty to enforce the laws, as the Senator from Georgia said. We all know it is pretty unusual to send a large number of marshals into a State. I thought the President would have some satisfaction in knowing that the Congress was with him.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, while I appreciate the kind words both Senators have spoken, I do not wish to leave either Senator under any misapprehension as to my views on the question of compulsory integration of the races in any public place. I am unalterably opposed to forcible integration and intermingling of the races.

I believe, however, that violence on the part of those living in a community is the very worst way to go about gaining support for our efforts to manage our our affairs. I would hope that the army of Federal officers dispatched to Alabama may be withdrawn.

I do not think this resolution is going to do any good if it is enacted or even debated. I think it will do harm. It may be helpful, in a political sense to those who represent some of the larger communities of the Nation, but it is not going to help restore peace and good will in the areas where these tragic events have been happening.

Let there be no doubt as to my position. I believe that the decisions of the Supreme Court striking down local laws and forcing commingling of the races in the South to be extra legal judicial determinations—I regard these decisions as abortions and perversions of the Constitution of the United States. But I do not think that acts of violence such as those that occurred in the State of Alabama will cure the situation and regain the rights of the States to handle their own affairs.

THE IMPROVED BILL TO AID EDUCATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the day the bill we are now debating, S. 1021, was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I took the floor of the Senate to call attention to the importance of this legislation.

Now, after the long days of hearings and careful analysis of issues and facts before the Education Subcommittee and the full Senate committee, I wish to pay sincere tribute to the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and his able colleagues on the committee for the fine work they have done in bringing this School Assistance Act of 1961 to the floor of the Senate. I congratulate the entire committee for having accomplished a most difficult and important task with distinction. The Nation is indebted to Senator MORSE and to the members and staff assistants of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for their contribution to the schools and the children of America.

On February 28 of this year, when S. 1021 was introduced in the Senate, I stated my conviction that democracy and education are one and inseparable, and my further conviction that Federal assistance to the Nation's public schools is a vital necessity.

At that time it was, however, my duty to point out to the Senate that S. 1021, as introduced, would be far from adequate to meet the needs of my State. The formula for allocation of funds in the original bill, combined with the proposed drastic cuts in the impacted area program, would have actually resulted in a loss to Alaska of nearly $70,000 as compared with amounts received by my State under the impacted area program, alone, in the past fiscal year.

Subsequently, I testified before the Education Subcommittee, again pointing out the importance to Alaska and the Nation of enactment of a good aid to education bill and with a better formula to establish Alaska's share. At the time I gave this testimony, I was assisted, as I had been in the preparation of my statement, by the valuable work of Dr. George Rogers, a distinguished economist who is a member of the faculty of the University of Alaska, and the author of an important book on the economy of southeastern Alaska—"Alaska in

Transition." I had asked President William R. Wood of the University of Alaska to release Dr. Rogers to come to Washington and work on the problem of an adequate formula for Alaska's participation in the Federal aid to education bill. And I also requested President George E. Smith of the State board of education to make the funds for Dr. Rogers' visit available. I would, at this time, pay tribute to Dr. Rogers, to President Wood of the University of Alaska, and to the Alaska State Board of Education and its president, Mr. George E. Smith, for making it possible for Dr. Rogers to come to Washington and serve as a consultant on the School Assistance Act.

It was Dr. Rogers who, upon analysis of the formula contained in the original bill, pointed out that the proposal for allocation of funds to the States failed to take account of relative differences in expenditures for education, which are measurable, and which make a great deal of difference in the kind of education which can be provided in the different States.

For Alaska, this is especially important.

Under the bill, as introduced, Alaska would have been treated in the same fashion as the wealthy industrial giants of the Northeast—New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts—a status that perhaps, flattered Alaska, but did not reflect the economic facts of life. This resulted from a formula based on State income, divided by numbers of students in attendance in public schools. Not taking into account real differences which exist between the States in the costs of school construction and maintenance as well as the cost of teacher salaries, this formula failed completely to meet the true costs of education in Alaska.

The National Education Association is the authority for a statement made by the Alaska State Board of Education that the per pupil cost of education in Alaska is the highest in the Nation. The State board of education tells us that in a State where there is now a need for construction of 369 new classrooms, at a cost of $44 a square foot, the allocation we would have received under the original bill would have built only 14 such classrooms. The cost of educating Alaskan children is far beyond that in other States. Our great distances make it necessary to spend far more than most States for transportation of pupils to schools. One out of every $10 appropriated by the State for education must be spent for this.

An exceptional case demonstrating the high costs of Alaskan education is that of the delivery of fuel oil to the village of Anaktuvuk Pass, which cannot be reached by highway, and where the citizenry is completely dependent upon air transportation for communication. The cost, this year, of delivering 75 drums of oil to Anaktuvuk Pass was $6,300, or $233 per student.

The need for recognition of high costs of education in Alaska was also brought to the attention of the Education Subcommittee by my distinguished colleague [Mr. BARTLETT], who, in a memorandum to the subcommitt[illegible] demonstrated the high costs of scho[illegible]onstruction in our State by reference to costs of construction under the federally impacted area program. It was Senator BARTLETT who made the suggestion, adopted by the committee, that the cost of construction under Public Law 815 be used as a means of measuring the difference in these costs in Alaska as compared with the other States.

This useful proposal of Senator BARTLETT which, combined with the efforts based on Dr. Rogers' work, resulted in the recommendation of the committee in the bill, as reported, that, in States where the cost of education exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of two or more as determined on the basis of an index of school construction costs under Public Law 815, or on the basis of other related data, there shall be assigned an arbitrary allotment ratio of 0.50. This proposal, coupled with the increased authorization recommended by the committee, will, I believe, tend to meet the requirements of Alaska far better than the provisions of the bill as first introduced. The net result is that the sums originally slated for Alaska are now in the revised version of the bill, doubled.

Again, I express my appreciation to Senator MORSE and the members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for their sympathetic concern with the need for an amendment of the formula proposed in S. 1021 as introduced to give Alaska an equitable share of the authorization.

I am also gratified that the committee reported a bill which restored the cuts in the impacted-area assistance which has meant so much to the schools of the Nation. In my State this form of Federal aid to education is vitally important to the operation of the schools. As most of Alaska may be described as federally impacted, there is no State having a greater need for Federal assistance in operating schools where the rate of attendance of children of military personnel is very high.

Mr. President, there will be no more important legislation than the School Assistance Act before the Senate at this session of Congress. I am happy, indeed, that, at long last, we shall see the enactment of legislation to provide Federal assistance for the schools of the Nation. I have long believed this is the only way in which our deficiency in classrooms can be remedied and that our schoolteachers can be adequately rewarded for their services.

I look forward to an increase in the strength of our Nation that will follow the increase in the value of our human resources accruing from the passage of this bill.

CASTRO, BULLDOZERS, AND PRISONERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the morning newspaper tells us that a committee has been set up to collect the means for paying Communist Dictator Fidel Castro the blackmail in bulldozers which he is demanding as the price of 1,214 lives. I have no objection to having the citizens of this country do whatever they want to do about the arrogant, insulting demand made by Castro in an attempt to rub our noses in the fiasco of an American-directed invasion failure—so long as it is done voluntarily, and without Government sanction. However, I do resent the attempt on the part of the leaders of this bulldozer committee to convince the American people that yielding to Communist demands is "the way to smash communism." This is precisely what has been wrong with our attitude. We have yielded and yielded and yielded. We have yielded so much that there is not much more to give—at least, not in terms of freedom's real estate throughout the world.

There is one important point to remember about paying "blackmail," and that is that it never ends, once it starts, because the blackmailer is never satisfied. Castro is a good example. Even now he is threatening to change the terms of his offer. He does not like the word "exchange," and insists that any transaction be regarded in the light of "indemnification" for war damages. He does not want the Cubans-in-exile to have any part in the deal. He wants only a certain type of bulldozer. This is only the beginning of his fresh demands.

Undoubtedly there will be more, now that he knows there is a tendency in this country to give in. We shall be lucky if he does not wind up demanding 500 hydrogen bombs, instead of bulldozers.

Mr. President, I suggest that there is something entirely degrading in the picture of the United States of America reduced to the point where she must trade material goods for human lives. If that were carried to its logical conclusion, we could reach the point where even American lives would become a negotiable commodity in the cold war, with Communist tyrants rating them in terms of so many electric razors per man. I say this is nothing for any group of Americans to rush into blindly—without carefully considering where it might lead.

WORD FROM CUBA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks, a page from the Culver Alumnus, touching on the experience of one of the alumni of that school.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORD FROM CUBA

Until recently, Culver has attracted a fairly large number of students from Cuba in both the winter and summer schools. The knowledge and understanding that has grown for more than a half-century between cadets of the two countries has been instrumental in the fine relationships between the United States and Cuba. It also has brought to most Culver men a particular affection toward Cuba and Cuban citizens.

We are all aware of the horrible tragedy that has befallen our Cuban alumni and patrons in having their country seized by the Communists. Many of them are giving their lives in fighting Communist tyranny. In so doing, they are fighting not only for their own country but the United States and all freemen everywhere.

I have received many letters recently from Cuban alumni and patrons. One of the most poignant is from Jorge Silva, a 1926 graduate of the summer schools and the father of two winter school alumni. It is the most eloquent and passionate statement I have seen from a tortured man fighting for freedom. I reprint excerpts from his April 26 letter because I think it is important to all Culver men to know Mr. Silva's thoughts in this emotion-laden period for him.

"This letter is to inform you and the academy that my two sons Jorge (1959) and Mario (1961) together with other Culver men were in the U.S. endorsed invasion attempt on Cuba during the past week. Jorge is a captive, and Mario is missing.

"It is my firm belief, and this is what I want you to know and the world to know, that all of us who once believed in the greatness of the United States of America feel that they and all of us have been the victims of gross high official treason.

"The only reason why I allowed them to go was that they had an ideal and I could not stop them and that we were told they would be backed to the end by the U.S. Government and its Armed Forces if necessary. We believed this because we know that this fight is not for Cuba or the Cubans. It is a fight for the very life of all Americans.

"I am sure that by the time you read this, in private or to the corps of cadets, they will have been executed."

I firmly believe that the United States is in its most critical period in history. I also believe we are losing the fight to communism by our unwillingness as a people to face up to the situation. The times call for cool thinking, moral courage, a better understanding of the implications of communism, the willingness on the part of each of us to sacrifice, and dynamic action to save our country and Western civilization from succumbing to communism by default.

We at Culver are doing everything in our power—which admittedly is small to face up to the Communist peril by making ourselves and Culver cadets aware of their heritage and the threat communism poses to it. We recently had a 2-day convocation on communism participated in by three nationally known authorities on the subject and led by Dr. Fred C. Schwarz, president of the Christian Anti-Communist Crusade. We are teaching in history courses and America's democratic heritage course the principles of freedom and the necessity for preserving them. But this is not enough. Americans everywhere must face up to the situation.

I pray to God that Mario and Jorge Silva and all other Cuban sons of Culver will live through this calamity and soon will rejoin us as freemen.

DELMAR T. SPIVEY,
Superintendent.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask the Chair to lay down the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER obtained the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of having a quorum call?

Mr. GOLDWATER. With the understanding that the time for such quorum call will not come out of the allotted time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize a unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask unanimous consent that the time for the call of the quorum will not be taken from the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. With the understanding that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] will not lose his right to the floor, and that the time consumed for the quorum call will not be taken out of the allotted time, the request of the Senator from Minnesota is agreed to, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a statement? I shall take the time out of the time allotted to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask to yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

FOOD FOR PEACE IN THE FIRST 4 MONTHS OF THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at a time when our attention has been directed to global crises, I feel that some of the areas of more positive accomplishments may have been overlooked. For that reason, I think it appropriate to review, and to pay tribute to, the remarkable strides made by the food for peace program.

One of the most gratifying records of progress during the first 4 months of the new administration has been made by the food for peace program—a humanitarian program and a powerful instrument of our foreign policy.

A hundred days—using that term symbolically, or these 4 months—is not a long time for giving new impetus and orientation to a worldwide program. Yet, in that short time, George McGovern, Special Assistant to the President and Food for Peace Director, has demonstrated a remarkable ability to implement the President's request of January 24 for vigorous and constructive use of our agricultural abundance. As a result, I am pleased to note that more food will be shipped to hungry millions during the calendar year 1961 than has been shipped during any other single year since the enactment of Public Law 480 in 1954. Even more significant is the remarkable shift in emphasis to more constructive uses of food, including the integration of food in the economic development of the recipient countries. This basic shift in concept of the food for peace program is supported and acclaimed both here and abroad.

It was then an emphasis upon the use of food for economic development in the needy countries that was the main emphasis of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations when it considered the food-for-peace program a little over a year and a half ago.

During the first 120 days, approximately 3 million tons, or about one quarter billion dollars worth of food has been shipped under title I of Public Law 480. The tonnage and dollar figures are impressive, but it is more meaningful to say that because of the shipments, countless millions of human beings will no longer drag out their lives with hunger as their constant companion.

Also, during the 120-day period, 6 new agreements have been signed with 12 countries for agricultural commodities with an export value of $188 million. In February, Mr. McGovern headed a special mission to Brazil. At that time he conducted preliminary negotiations to provide Brazil with 37 million bushels of wheat valued at $70 million. The success of this initial mission is dramatic testimony to the effectiveness of our food-for-peace director, and the meaningfulness of our food-for-peace program. As Senators know, the agreement with Brazil has now been consummated, and, might I add, the so-called surplus of wheat, which seems to be ever present in the thinking of our people, is proving to be one of the great assets of our foreign economic policy.

The food for peace director strongly supports the use of food to help the developing countries help themselves. He has therefore placed greater emphasis on title II operations under Public Law 480 which offers the greatest potential for expanding assistance to the hungry and for self-help economic growth. Under Mr. McGovern's direction, and with the wholehearted cooperation of the Secretary of Agriculture, the food for peace staff is making every effort to develop school lunch and institutional food programs and self-help programs supported by food as a part of the wage cost.

The school lunch program in many of these areas is a sure way of bringing young people to the schools, and in that way combat illiteracy. Therefore, with the program we not only build the

health of people, but also help in education and enlightenment.

In this connection, a title II agreement has been made with the Government of Morocco to supply 200,000 tons of wheat to finance a $14.3 million work mobilization program. U.S. wheat will be used to pay about half of the workers' wages and to buy tools and equipment needed to construct roads, schools, hospitals, sanitation facilities, reforestation, and better land development. The Moroccan food for peace economic agreement is the largest ever made under Public Law 480 and supports President Kennedy's inaugural pledge to help developing nations help themselves.

I have said many times that we can convert wheat into hospitals, we can convert wheat and corn into education and into schools; and we can convert it into health. We know it is being done.

I am pleased to add that tentative agreements for similar economic development projects have been made with six other countries—Dahomey, Eritrea, Greece, Indonesia, Iran, and Taiwan. Also, I have been advised that at least 20 other countries have indicated interest in food-economic-assistance programs and every effort will be made to help them.

Another highly significant phase of the food for peace program which is also receiving new emphasis is the voluntary relief agency program of our churches and CARE under title III Public Law 480. During the first 120 days of the administration, two and a quarter billion pounds of food have been approved for distribution during the next 12 months. This includes nonfat dried milk, fats and oils, flour, cornmeal, wheat, and corn. Distribution of the food will be made by 20 U.S. voluntary agencies and the United Nations Children's Fund. This distribution of food is benefiting more than 50 million people in 93 countries and territories around the world. At a recent White House meeting, and after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the food for peace director informed the heads of voluntary agencies that they can expect an additional 110 million pounds of nonfat dried milk, making a total of 560 million pounds of nonfat dried milk available to the agencies during the coming fiscal year.

In addition, the voluntary agencies have received assurance that they can expect 100 million pounds of fats and oils not previously available to them during the balance of this calendar year. Bulgur wheat has now been made available to the voluntary agencies for the first time. I have long been an advocate of this nutritious product. Not only is it adaptable for wide distribution, but it is one other important use for American wheat.

Another area for which Mr. McGovern has developed plans for emphasis is section 303 of title III, Public Law 480, which provides for bartering or exchanging agricultural commodities for useful materials. Such materials include bauxite, chromite, manganese ore, asbestos, and platinum. Since President Kennedy's inauguration, there have been 19 such transactions, totaling $58,417,885. Even more impressive is word received from the food for peace director that barter offers are now under consideration for transactions with a dollar value of almost $95 million. This exchange of food for useful material with adequate safeguards of normal marketing is a reasonable and practical program that benefits both us and our friends abroad.

In all this planning, the importance of developing a multilateral approach to world hunger through the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has not been forgotten. President Kennedy has announced that the United States will make an initial $40 million worth of food available to the FAO. This food, combined with contributions from other countries, is to be used to establish a worldwide food reserve and is the most significant action taken by the U.S. Government to strengthen FAO activities since that Organization was established in 1945.

If the food for peace program is to achieve maximum effectiveness, the public must be kept fully informed of its programs as well as its objectives. In line with this, President Kennedy has formed an American Food for Peace Council, to be co-chaired by James A. Michener, Pulitzer Prize author and Mrs. Raymond B. Clapper, a longtime representative of CARE. The Council will assist in developing public understanding of world hunger and dramatize both the U.S. food for peace program and the United Nations' freedom from hunger campaign. Other members of the Council include outstanding men and women from all walks of life. In addition, a total of 72 organizations have been asked to name a representative to the Council.

I ask unanimous consent that a release dated May 6 from the White House announcing the appointment of the members of the Council, and the list of organizations invited to designate representatives for membership on the Council, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Saturday, May 6, 1961.

President John F. Kennedy today announced the appointment of the members of the American Food for Peace Council. The American Food for Peace Council is a group of outstanding men and women who will provide citizen leadership for both the U.S. food for peace program and the freedom from hunger campaign of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. The Council will serve a threefold purpose in: (1) counseling with the Nation's Food for Peace Director, George McGovern, (2) developing public information on world hunger, and (3) enlisting support for the attack on world hunger.

Cochairmen for the Council will be Pulitzer Prise-winning Author James A. Michener and Mrs. Raymond Clapper, widow of the famed World War II war correspondent.

James A. Michener, Honolulu, Hawaii: Mr. Michener is the well-known author of "Tales of the South Pacific" for which he received the Pulitzer Prize in 1947. A graduate of Swarthmore College, he has also studied and lectured extensively at universities in the United States and in Europe. During World War II, he served with the U.S. Naval Reserve on active duty in the South Pacific. A prolific author, Mr. Michener has also held posts as associate editor of the Macmillan Co., and as member of the Advisory Committee on the Arts of the U.S. Department of State.

Mrs. Raymond Clapper, Washington, D.C.: Mrs. Clapper is a staff consultant and member of the board of directors of CARE, Inc. Until recently she was assistant executive director of CARE and traveled widely throughout the world supervising food distribution and all types of CARE projects. Mrs. Clapper has also established herself as a writer, radio commentator, and lecturer. She attended the University of Kansas and the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy. Mrs. Clapper was formerly director of the house service department of the foreign division of the American Red Cross. She is currently serving on the board of directors of the Committee for International Economic Growth.

The following citizens have accepted membership on the American Food for Peace Council:

Marian Anderson, Danbury, Conn.: Miss Anderson is a leading American contralto who received her musical education in Philadelphia, New York, and abroad. She was U.S. Delegate to the 13th General Assembly of the United Nations.

Dwayne O. Andreas, Excelsior, Minn.: Mr. Andreas is a food products manufacturing executive. He is chairman of the board of Honeymead Products Co.; president of the Interoceanic Commodities Corp.; executive vice president of the Grain Terminal Association; and a member of the Soybean and Flax Industry Advisory Committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He attended Wheaton College.

Yul Brynner, Norwalk, Conn.: Mr. Brynner is an actor who received his education at the Sorbonne. He first appeared on the stage in Paris, making his American debut in 1940. He received an Academy Award in 1957 for his role in the motion picture "The King and I." During World War II he served the Office of War Information as a French language radio commentator.

Clark M. Clifford, Washington, D.C.: Mr. Clifford is an attorney who served President Kennedy as a special adviser before the inauguration. During the Truman administration, he served as special counsel to the President (1946–50). He was a captain in the USNR in World War II and was naval aide to the President in 1946. He received the Naval Commendation Ribbon. Mr. Clifford is currently senior partner of the Washington law firm of Clifford & Miller. He received his law degree at Washington University, St. Louis.

Dr. Dorothy Ferebee, Washington, D.C.: Dr. Ferebee is director of the health service at Howard University and past president of the National Council of Negro Women. She is currently representing the United States at the All-Africa Women's Conference for Girl Scouts and Girl Guides at Makere College, Uganda, Africa.

Raymond C. Firestone, Akron, Ohio: Mr. Firestone is president of the Firestone Tire & Rubber Co. He is chairman of the Future Farmers of America Foundation. During World War II, he served as a major in the USAF. He is a graduate of Princeton University.

Dr. Luther H. Foster, Tuskegee Institute, Ala.: Dr. Foster has served as president of Tuskegee Institute since 1953. He is a graduate of Virginia State College, and received his Ph. D. degree at the University of Chicago. Dr. Foster was appointed U.S. representative in 1954 to a Commission To Study Rural Higher Education in India. In 1960 he

was a member of the White House Conference on Children and Youth.

Dr. John A. Hannah, East Lansing, Mich.: Dr. Hannah is president of Michigan State University.

Clifford R. Hope, Garden City, Kans.: Mr. Hope is a former Member of Congress from Kansas who served as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture. He was congressional adviser of the U.S. delegation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, and is currently president, Great Plains Wheat, Inc.

Danny Kaye, Beverly Hills, Calif.: Mr. Kaye is a well-known actor and comedian who has taken an active part as Ambassador at Large for the United Nations Children's Fund. He is currently en route to the Far East to make appearances on behalf of UNICEF.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, New York City: Mrs. Lasker is the cofounder of the Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation. She is president of the board of trustees of the Museum of Modern Art, and a member of the executive committee of the American Cancer Society. She is a graduate of Radcliffe College.

Murray D. Lincoln, Columbus, Ohio: Mr. Lincoln is president of Nationwide Insurance of Columbus, Ohio. He is currently chairman of the board of CARE, Inc., and served for many years as its president. Mr. Lincoln is a member of the executive committee of the U.S. Committee for the U.N., and formerly served on the U.N. Advisory Council. He is also president of the Cooperative League of the United States and a delegate to the International Cooperative Alliance. Mr. Lincoln is a graduate of the University of Massachusetts.

Mrs. Florence Stephenson Mahoney, Washington, D.C.: Mrs. Mahoney is a journalist who is a member of the Washington Bureau of the James M. Cox Newspapers. She serves on the Arthritis and Metabolic Disease Council of the National Institutes of Health, and formerly for 4 years was a member of the Advisory Committee for Women in the Armed Services. Mrs. Mahoney is currently a member of the board of governors of the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans., and co-chairman of the National and International Committees Against Mental Illness.

Robert Nathan, Washington, D.C.: Mr. Nathan is a prominent economic consultant. He was named 1 of 10 outstanding young men in the United States by the Junior Chamber of Commerce. He is the author of numerous works including "Mobilizing for Abundance."

Stephen Pace, Americus, Ga.: Mr. Pace served for 14 years as a Member of Congress, 12 years on the House Agricultural Committee. He retired voluntarily in 1951.

Drew Pearson, Washington, D.C.: Mr. Pearson is a newspaper correspondent whose column "Washington Merry-Go-Round" has been widely published in the press since 1931. He was formerly a Director for the American Friends Service Committee in Serbia, Montenegro and Albania (1919–21). An author and magazine contributor, Mr. Pearson is a graduate of Swarthmore College.

Right Rev. James A. Pike, San Francisco, Calif.: Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of California, he is a widely traveled author and lecturer.

Arthur C. Ringland, Chevy Chase, Md.: Mr. Ringland served on the staff of the American Relief Administration under former President Herbert Hoover. He has also been an official of both the U.S. Department of State and the Department of Agriculture, and was formerly Executive Director of the President's War Relief Control Board.

Carroll P. Streeter, Philadelphia, Pa.: Mr. Streeter is editor of the Farm Journal and is a frequent contributor to national magazines on agricultural topics.

Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio: Mr. Taft is chairman of the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. He is the former president of the Federal Council of Churches, general counsel of the Committee for a National Trade Policy. Mr. Taft is the son of former President William Howard Taft.

Jesse Tapp, Los Angeles, Calif.: Mr. Tapp is chairman of the board of directors of the Bank of America. For many years he was an official of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Harold A. Vogel, Washington, D.C.: Mr. Vogel is regional representative for North America of the Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. He is a graduate of the University of Minnesota and was formerly professor of agricultural economics at the University of Idaho. He was secretary of the United Nations FAO Conference in Hot Springs, Va., in 1943.

The following organizations have been invited to designate representatives for membership on the American Food For Peace Council:

Advertising Council, American Agricultural Editors Association, American Association of Agricultural College Editors, American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, American Association for the United Nations, American Association of University Women, American Council on Education, American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organizations, American Feed Manufacturers Association, American Friends Service Committee, American Institute of Nutrition, American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, American Merchant Marine Institute, American National Red Cross, American Newspaper Guild, American Newspaper Publishers Association, American Petroleum Institute, American School Food Service Association, American Seed Trade Association, American Wheat Institute, Association of Junior Leagues of America.

Boy Scouts of America, Brookings Institute.

CARE, Inc., Catholic Relief Services, NCWC, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Child Welfare League of America, Church World Service, Cooperative League of the U.S.A., Committee for International Economic Growth, Community Development Foundation.

Dairy Society International.

Farm Equipment Institute, Four-H Clubs, Future Farmers of America (FFA), Future Homemakers of America (FHA).

General Federation of Women's Clubs, Girl Scouts of America, Grocery Manufacturers of America.

League of Women Voters of the United States, Lutheran World Relief.

Mennonite Central Committee.

Motion Picture Association of America.

National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council, National Association of Broadcasters, National Association of Television and Radio Farm Directors, National Canners Association, National Council of Farmer Cooperatives, National Education Association, National Farmers Union, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, National Grange, National Plant Food Institute, National Social Welfare Assembly, Newspaper Farm Editors Association.

Public Affairs Institute.

Unitarian Service Committee.

U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Vegetable Growers Association of America.

Seventh Day Adventist Welfare Service.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Ford Foundation.

Kellogg (W.K.) Foundation.

Rockefeller Foundation.

Twentieth Century Fund.

Civitan International.

Kiwanis International.

Lions International.

Optimist International.

Rotary International.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the food for peace program has all the ingredients for amazing success. The outstanding progress of this program during the first 4 months convinces me anew of its worth as a humanitarian instrument in the cause of peace and freedom. The food for peace program is a tribute to the abundant production of the American farmer and the desire of President Kennedy and the American people to share that abundance abroad.

Mr. McGovern has ably demonstrated that he is a wise, sensitive, and imaginative administrator. The food for peace program, in its first 120 days, has exemplified the new attitudes and program of action that characterizes the new administration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles and editorials on the food for peace program be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 12, 1961]

DON'T CUT CROPS WHILE WORLD STARVES

(By Winzola McLendon)

Eleanor Roosevelt yesterday, questioned the right of the United States to curtail agricultural production when a third of the world is going hungry.

Speaking at a luncheon meeting of the Naval Officers' Wives (NOW) Club in the Blue Room of the Shoreham Hotel, Mrs. Roosevelt told 500 service wives that the time has come for American women to face the world as it is today.

There are no more domestic problems, she said. "Almost everything we do has repercussions and effects on the world." Then she gave as an example of a domestic problem turned international, the curtailment of crop production.

Every time she visits a country which can't produce enough food for its people, Mrs. Roosevelt said, she is asked why land here is idle when other people are hungry.

"Women should think about it. You know how you'd feel if your child went to bed hungry," she told the peripatetic service wives—who, she said, have the greatest opportunity to help change the thinking of the Nation.

She warned that some people "don't like to face the fact that with the changes that come (to the world) we must be prepared to face new solutions * * *. The world moves much faster and the old rules won't work."

Discussing international relations, Mrs. Roosevelt said the United States must do two things to combat communistic influences in the world.

Show the world what we really believe in, and prove that we are giving the people a life worth living—and know how to do it better than the Soviet people.

Help take care of the material well-being of the people of the world. "If you are hungry, ideals seem not too important."

Mrs. Roosevelt—who spent Wednesday night here—came to the luncheon with her hostess, Mrs. Eugene Meyer. Immediately following her talk, she dashed off to catch a plane for Milwaukee.

Sharing the head table with Mrs. Roosevelt during the luncheon were Mrs. Robert S. McNamara, wife of the Secretary of Defense; Mrs. Paul B. Fay, Jr., whose husband is Under Secretary of the Navy; and the wives of two Assistant Secretaries, Mrs. James H. Wakelin, Jr., and Mrs. Kenneth E. BeLieu.

Then there were Mrs. Arleigh Burke, wife of the Chief of Naval Operations, who has been honorary president of the NOW club since its founding; Mrs. James Russell, wife of the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations; and Mrs. John Crumpacker, senior hostess of the luncheon and wife of the Paymaster General of the Navy.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 1, 1961]

PUT OUR FOOD TO WORK FOR PEACE

The recommendation by George S. McGovern, director of the food for peace program, that the United States undertake a dramatic expansion of its effort to use the great American food surpluses to help underdeveloped countries is the best kind of advice President Kennedy could receive.

The Inquirer believes that there is no greater contribution this Nation could make to world peace than to feed the hungry, both at home and abroad.

The new administration has wasted no time in demonstrating its sympathy for this aim on the domestic front. It should move with equal decision to put the Nation's wasting wealth of foodstuffs to work in service of humanity beyond our borders.

This is not a simple matter, it is true. The United States has had a program for using surplus foods to feed the needy in foreign lands for some years, and it has run into a host of human problems. In at least 18 countries of some 90 that have been helped since 1958, commodities have been distributed to ineligible recipients, sold on the black market, stolen or diverted to animal feed. Furthermore, great care is necessary to avoid unloading foodstuffs in such a way as to unsettle established markets or to discourage local food production.

But these are problems which can be solved, not easily, perhaps, but surely, if the will and determination is great enough. The real danger is in magnifying them out of proportion to their real worth.

The opportunity for the United States to lead free peoples everywhere in a global war on hunger is unparalleled. Agriculture is the key to the fight against famine. And it is in agriculture above all else that the superiority of U.S. technology over that of totalitarian governments is clearest.

We should drive that point home, not only because it is true and because it serves the purposes of the West, but because it is right that we should do so. It is, in fact, the most serious kind of reflection on U.S. moral values that we have tolerated for so long the hoarding of precious foodstuffs while so many people the world over die of hunger.

The need to put our vast food resources to constructive uses in service of mankind, instead of paying exorbitantly to let them waste in costly warehouses, is one of the most urgent foreign relations problems facing the United States. Of course, it is true that needy countries are usually no more able to provide for preparation, transportation, and distribution of donated food than to pay for the training, tools, and other means to produce it themselves.

But wouldn't it be far better for the United States to use tax funds for such purposes than exclusively for paying pointless storage costs? We share Director McGovern's conviction that U.S. food riches should be used as the basic capital to build up the underdeveloped areas of the world.

The difficulty, we realize, is to translate the idea into practical accomplishment. We do not know, even now, to what extent Mr. McGovern has spelled out the details of his proposal. We hope, however, that he has gone just as far as is necessary to take the food-for-peace effort out of the token classification in which it has languished for so long. President Kennedy and Congress should back him to the limit in achieving that end.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1961]

FOOD FOR DEVELOPMENT

Food for Peace Director George McGovern has shown a thoroughly realistic appreciation of the potentialities and pitfalls of the program he controls. Food cannot be a substitute for capital and technical assistance to other countries, but it can be a valuable supplement and stimulus to development. There is a good case for coordinating food for peace closely with other aspects of assistance in the new aid agency, but the program ought not to be downgraded in the process. We hope that the expansion which Mr. McGovern has recommended will be approved by the President and Congress.

Actually, the appropriations for this program are in considerable measure a bookkeeping transaction. The warehousing, transportation and administrative costs are real, but the food itself already has been purchased by the Government. There is no prospect that much more of it, particularly such commodities as wheat, can be sold for dollars. Disposal through the food for peace program can represent a saving in storage costs.

Of course food for peace must be more than famine relief. Such relief is welcome in disaster situations, but it makes no permanent contribution to the welfare of a country. The seeming official indifference to hunger in some countries often is less a reflection of cynicism than a realization that the only real help lies in improved domestic productivity and opportunity.

But hunger relief is only one aspect of a program in which there are enormous possibilities for using food productively. Transactions for local currency can free foreign exchange for developmental purposes. School lunch programs can improve nutrition and, eventually, productivity. Donated food, sold at token prices, can finance handling and distribution costs. Other proceeds can be directed into housing, land reform and resettlement projects. Animal feed can contribute to improve local agriculture.

Some changes from past procedures under Public Law 480 may be desirable. In most instances it is sound policy for both the recipient country and the recipient individual to pay something for reasons of pride; and the United States quite properly uses part of the funds thus generated for its own purposes in the countries concerned. But local currencies accumulated under such sales sometimes have become a source of friction because of requirements that the value be maintained when funds are lent back to the governments.

In countries ravaged by inflation this is a real inhibition. There is a strong argument for flexibility that would permit long-term no-interest loans without maintenance of value, and even grants for specific projects.

Effective planning in beneficiary countries is the real key to success of food-for-peace operations. Need cannot be allowed to become blackmail against the United States; the willingness to work out cooperative developmental plans ought to be one criterion of eligibility.

All of this involves some psychological changes in attitudes. Abroad it is necessary to persuade governments that food can contribute constructively to economic development and is not merely American dumping or an attempt to disrupt other markets. Mr. McGovern, who is a wise and sensitive observer, made considerable headway in this respect in Latin America; India and Pakistan have long since understood the economic value of food.

At home it is necessary to convince Americans that abundance is an asset rather than a curse, and that the food-for-peace program offers a challenge as well as an outlet for humanitarian impulses. We suspect, in this connection, that Americans do not require very much persuading and that few programs will be more popular.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator, and I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. WILEY. I have been very much interested in the remarks this morning of the Senator from Minnesota. I have received a great many letters complaining about the vast amount of foreign aid we have given. The correspondents assume it is all in cash. I am wondering if the Senator could get a breakdown, first, of the amount in dollars that we have given in cash; second, the amount in dollars of what the Senator now suggests in foreign aid by way of food—wheat and milk and the other food products; third, those items in dollars that we manufacture in this country for other lands and in the manufacturing of which we provide the labor in this country. That is under the mutual assistance program.

I feel that if we could get these statistics, it would bring quite a bit of understanding to the people who think that all we are doing is handing out money. Of course there is some money that we must account for, in connection with projects like those in India, for example, but even in such instances materiel is manufactured by labor in this country. I believe that if we could get those figures it would throw a little light in this very murky situation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has made a very worthwhile and important request. I shall be pleased to see to it that the figures he has asked for are made available. I will do this as soon as the agencies of the executive branch have fulfilled the request on the statistical information.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DODD in the chair). The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the primary purpose of my amendment is to preclude the use of funds which the bill makes available for the payment of teachers' salaries. Because of the adoption of the Prouty amendment, I ask unanimous consent that if my amendment is adopted the necessary technical changes in the Prouty amendment be made to insure that it does not permit the payment of teachers' salaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I believe I correctly understood the Senator to request that he wishes to modify the pending amendment to insure that the Prouty amendment does not authorize the payment of teachers' salaries. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not exactly. I asked unanimous consent that if my amendment prevails, the necessary technical changes be made to make certain that the language of the Prouty amendment will not allow the payment of teachers' salaries.

It is never an easy task to stand up and advocate that we not pay attention at the Federal level to salaries that should be adjusted at the State level. It is very much like speaking out against mother love. One does not usually do it.

I have a strong feeling that if the Federal Government is charged with the responsibility of paying the salaries of teachers, we will in effect have put the greatest weapon for the control of education into the hands of the Federal Government that we could. Certainly money and the control of money create the greatest evil in our midst today. If there were one thing I would advocate if I wanted to get control of anything, whether it be schools, business, or any other organization, it would be to achieve control of the salaries. I would want to be able to tell the worker, "You will make this much" or "You will not make this much," depending on what he would do. So, consistent with my position concerning the whole theme of Federal aid to education, because the controls which are and must be contained in the act, and which it is admitted are in the act—and it is admitted by Members of Congress must be included in any Federal aid program—I protest the inclusion of the salaries of teachers in a Federal aid bill. I believe the greatest opposition to the measure in the House will come from the inclusion of the salaries of teachers.

As stated in the minority views, the strongest and most vocal push for the committee bill, and for Federal aid to education in general, comes, and has always come, from the professional educationists. The citizens and taxpayers of the United States have given not the slightest indication that they want this legislation. Those who truly represent the people of the United States in the local communities and the States, have either expressed opposition to such Federal aid or have refrained from supporting it. Local school boards, State legislatures, mayors, and Governors overwhelmingly want no part of these proposals, but their voices have been drowned out by the raucous clamor coming from the bureaucrats of the National Education Association and its attendant satellites. What is most interesting is that despite its huge membership of more than 700,000 teachers, the spokesmen for the NEA on many, perhaps most issues, do not truly reflect the sentiments of their own members.

This organization, which through its bureaucracy, has always spearheaded the drive for Federal aid to education, has also been primarily responsible for the low estate to which the quality of precollege education has fallen. It has preached the gospel of "progressive education" for many decades and through its control of the top echelons in our various educational systems, has succeeded in debasing American primary and secondary education in many sections of the country. Fortunately, their members, the teachers themselves, have increasingly evinced their lack of enthusiasm for NEA educational philosophy. And this distrust of their organizational leadership by the working rank and file of the teaching profession, has manifested itself in an equally unenthusiastic attitude toward Federal aid to education.

The amendment which I offered last night and which was defeated rather soundly on the floor contained a section pertaining to quality in education. I was interested to hear what the distinguished Senator from Oregon said about that portion of my amendment, because he saw in it a direct reference to higher education—college and university education—but saw no reference to high school education, when the entire weight of that portion of the amendment bore only on high schools.

I have commented here that the quality of education in the United States has declined, not at the college or university level, because I believe we have colleges and universities which are comparable with, if not better than, those to be found anywhere else in the world. It is the quality of the product reaching college which is the problem that faces the educational system of America.

The scholarship scheme which was contained in my amendment would have imposed very rigid requirements. I suggest 1,000 scholarships, not 18,000 or 20,000 or 25,000, because I am one who does not feel that everybody will go to college. However, I believe everyone who wishes to go to college should have a means of doing so.

My amendment provided, for example, that a high school student, before he could qualify under the amendment, would have to write a theme and translate it into a foreign language; would have to translate a theme written in a foreign language into English; would have to be subjected to 4 years of English, 4 years of mathematics, 4 years of a foreign language, and 2 years of science. In other words, the student would have to get back to the learning of the three R's, "readin', writin', and 'rithmetic." I do not like to use the expression "get back" but it is necessary to do so. So that the high school students, when they go to college, will not have to take special courses in reading, special courses in writing, special courses in English composition. When they went to college, they would know what they wanted to study and what professions they want to enter, and could pursue their courses without having to attend college for 2 or 3 years to determine if they even wanted to remain in college.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the bill for the majority, mistakenly concluded that my amendment, which was intended to improve education in high schools, was one which pertained to colleges.

A weakness in our system is that we are concerned more with money than we are with quality. There is not a need for more money; there is a need for more education for the money we are spending. I do not believe many Senators would argue against that statement. We should take the chrome plate away from the schools, use old-fashioned paint, and get to work on the job of educating our children.

Despite all of the efforts of the National Education Association over a period of many years, it has hitherto failed to secure passage of a Federal aid bill. The chances to achieve this objective have become smaller and smaller as the States and local communities have demonstrated, particularly during the past 5 years, not only their desire but their ability to meet their own school needs without Federal aid. Tremendous sums have been expended by the States and localities during that period for expanding their educational facilities, at a rate far in excess of projected future needs. The classroom shortage is diminishing rapidly, as is the shortage of qualified teachers. Teachers' salaries have risen steadily, and pupil enrollment will decline sharply in the next decade.

In the face of these developments, the NEA, if it were to have any chance to achieve its goal, had to find some way to enlist the support of its own members in behalf of Federal aid to education. The NEA and its allies have seen their "crisis" selling point melt away in the face of determined and effective local and State educational efforts. Hence, it is now attempting to give new stimuli to its crusade, and secure fresh support, by adding new and appealing handout items to its list of problems allegedly requiring Federal aid for solution.

The chief bait which the NEA is now dangling before its members is the demand for Federal funds to be used to pay teachers' salaries. This demand is supported by the administration and is included in the committee bill despite the statistical evidence that there is no problem of teachers' salaries requiring a national solution. If this provision is adopted, there is no reason why a similar demand should not be made, and granted, for Federal aid in behalf of local policemen, firemen, sanitation employees, local park attendants, tax collectors, and other municipal and local government functionaries too numerous to mention.

It is plain that the provision granting funds for teachers' salaries is primarily designed to enlist the support of the working teachers for the objectives of their nonteaching bureaucratic leaders—Federal participation in education, which both traditionally and constitutionally has always been a matter of exclusive State and local concern.

The assertion that an adequate supply of properly qualified teachers cannot be attracted to the profession because of the present low level of teachers' salaries simply will not bear examination. The figures indicate the contrary.

Over the past 30 years, the number of employees in all forms of public education increased 140 percent while employment in private industry rose by only 45 percent. Teaching staffs in public schools have grown proportionately faster than pupil enrollment, and the number of pupils per teacher has been steadily reduced. Since 1900, the pupil-teacher ratio has fallen from 35.6 pupils per teacher to 24.4. In the last 7 years alone, pupil enrollment has increased only 29 percent while the number of qualified teachers has risen by 40 percent.

When we look at the prospects for the future supply of teachers, the outlook is highly favorable. If the percentage of college students planning to become teachers merely remains stationary over the next 10 years, the number of newly graduated teachers will nevertheless almost double. But during the same period the increase in pupil enrollment will be only half of what it has been during the past 10 years. A study made during the past year by the California Department of Education concludes that the supply of teachers in that State will far exceed the demand before we reach 1970, and without any Federal aid.

Much has been said about the inadequate earnings of teachers. But the figures show that during the past 30 years—1929–1959—teachers' salaries rose by 106 percent, compared to 91 percent for all persons working for wages and salaries, and only 73 percent for Federal Government civilian employees. I should also like to point out that a huge proportion of our public schoolteachers, particularly those in the elementary schools, are women, and that women teachers average higher earnings than other women college graduates or professional workers. Furthermore, despite contrary impressions, dropouts among teachers, in order to enter other occupations, occur largely among male teachers, and the rate is extremely low among the female members of the profession. Their dropouts are primarily for domestic and family reasons, not for the purpose of securing more attractive jobs.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, I am opposed to the bill and the principles on which it is based. But I have no illusions that my opposition will be successful. I am convinced, however, that regardless of whatever specious justification there may be for Federal aid for school construction, there is none for Federal aid for teachers' salaries. If we adopt such a proposal, it will become a permanent Federal program. Do Members of this body really believe that once teachers' salaries are increased through the use of Federal funds, it will ever be possible to terminate such grants, thereby reducing teachers' salaries? It simply could not be done; and henceforth teachers will look to the Federal Government to achieve their personal goals, and will not look to their State governments and local school boards. If this is not a giant step in the federalization of our precollege educational system, then language has lost its meaning and facts have become fiction.

Mr. President, as I pointed out at the outset of my remarks, it is in this feature that we find the greatest opportunity for the exercise of control. It is all very well to say that the money can be given to the States and the States can do with it what they will. But last night I pointed out numerous controls with which the States must comply before they will be able to receive the funds; and it is not beyond the realm of imagination to think that a day might come when the wrong kind of persons might hold administrative positions in the Government, and controls might be exercised in regard to how the salaries of the teachers were to be paid, how the teachers would have to qualify in order to achieve advancement, and what would determine the level of their salaries.

I suggest that all these are best determined at the local level, where local conditions can best be taken into consideration, and where local standards of living and local costs of living can also best be taken into consideration.

Mr. President, I do not attempt to justify the salaries which some of the States pay their teachers; but I maintain that this is a problem of the individual States, not a problem of the Federal Goverment.

From an examination of the salaries paid to teachers in the period 1958–1961, I find that some of the States do pay low salaries to their teachers; and I believe it incumbent upon all of us to urge our friends in those States to see to it that teachers are properly recognized. But in many States which can ill afford to pay higher salaries, higher salaries are paid.

I have often spoken of the situation in our State. I am happy to say that in Arizona the average teacher's salary is $5,830. Although that may not seem large, when we hear of hourly rates of pay of $2.50 and $3, and particularly when we hear that workers in Cape Canaveral who actually do not work are being paid $700 a week, the salaries paid to teachers in Arizona are comparable to the salaries paid to other workers in the United States.

I think my colleagues will be interested in examining a comparison between the salaries paid to teachers and the salaries paid to other wage earners in the country. I hold in my hand such a table, prepared by the National Education Association; and I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 35.—*Average annual salaries of instructional staff, average effective buying income of consumer spending units, and average weekly earnings of manufacturing employees, by State, and in comparison with national averages*

State	Estimated average salary of teachers						Income per consumer spending unit, 1959		Average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing, SS 1959	
	Amount			Index, U.S. average as 100.0						
	1958–59	1959–60	1960–61	1958–59	1959–60	1960–61	Amount	Index	Amount	Index
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
50 States and District of Columbia	$4,939	$5,159	$5,389	100.0	100.0	100.0	$5,633	100.0	$89.47	100.0
Alabama	3,420	[1] 3,795	[1] 3,900	69.2	73.6	72.4	4,416	78.4	74.21	82.9
Alaska	6,500	[1] 6,600	[1] 6,700	131.6	127.9	124.3	4,603	81.7		
Arizona	5,318	5,600	5,830	107.7	108.5	108.2	5,198	92.3	98.09	109.6
Arkansas	3,350	[1] 3,400	[1] 3,600	67.8	65.9	66.8	4,043	71.8	61.86	69.1
California	6,050	6,509	6,900	122.5	126.2	128.0	6,118	108.6	101.71	113.7
Colorado	4,845	5,036	5,350	98.1	97.6	99.3	5,602	99.4	95.71	107.0
Connecticut	5,600	5,913	6,150	113.4	114.6	114.1	7,462	132.5	93.11	104.1
Delaware	5,575	5,700	5,900	112.9	110.5	109.5	7,342	130.3	89.78	100.3
Florida	5,028	5,008	5,050	101.8	97.1	93.7	4,960	88.1	73.51	82.2
Georgia	3,750	3,904	4,200	75.9	75.7	77.9	4,483	79.6	64.88	72.5
Hawaii	4,596	5,560	5,740	93.1	107.8	106.5	5,266	93.5		
Idaho	[1] 4,200	4,440	[1] 4,575	85.0	86.1	84.9	5,273	93.6	90.01	100.6
Illinois	5,250	5,650	5,950	106.3	109.5	110.4	6,660	118.2	96.66	108.0
Indiana	5,142	5,510	5,760	104.1	106.8	106.9	5,373	95.4	100.37	112.2
Iowa	4,368	4,458	4,661	88.4	86.4	86.5	5,126	91.0	93.22	104.2
Kansas	4,268	4,536	4,750	86.4	87.9	88.1	5,259	93.4	93.72	104.7
Kentucky	3,340	3,359	4,231	67.6	65.1	78.5	4,282	76.0	83.02	92.8
Louisiana	4,725	4,946	5,250	95.7	95.9	97.4	4,807	85.3	85.08	95.1
Maine	[1] 3,950	4,061	[1] 4,300	80.0	78.7	79.8	4,945	87.8	69.19	77.8

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 35.—*Average annual salaries of instructional staff, average effective buying income of consumer spending units, and average weekly earnings of manufacturing employees, by State, and in comparison with national averages*—Continued

State	Estimated average salary of teachers						Income per consumer spending unit, 1959		Average weekly earnings of production workers in manufacturing, SS 1959	
	Amount			Index, U.S. average as 100.0						
	1958–59	1959–60	1960–61	1958–59	1959–60	1960–61	Amount	Index	Amount	Index
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
Maryland	$5,273	$5,607	$5,905	106.8	108.7	109.6	$6,139	109.0	$86.32	98.7
Massachusetts	5,025	5,400	5,600	101.7	104.7	103.9	6,276	111.4	80.93	90.5
Michigan	5,700	5,900	6,125	115.4	114.4	113.7	6,121	108.7	108.71	121.5
Minnesota	5,140	5,240	5,440	104.1	101.6	100.9	5,510	97.8	92.01	102.8
Mississippi	3,186	3,280	3,560	64.5	63.6	66.1	3,630	64.4	60.64	67.8
Missouri	4,386	4,537	4,800	88.4	87.9	89.1	5,173	91.8	85.11	95.1
Montana	4,450	[1] 4,650	4,750	90.1	90.1	88.1	5,236	93.0	94.17	105.3
Nebraska	3,625	3,950	4,140	73.4	76.6	76.8	5,123	90.9	84.80	94.8
Nevada	5,314	5,737	6,000	107.6	111.2	111.3	5,586	98.3	107.68	120.4
New Hampshire	4,221	4,431	4,651	85.5	85.9	86.3	5,247	93.1	69.26	77.4
New Jersey	5,650	5,870	6,065	114.4	113.8	112.5	6,756	119.9	92.45	103.3
New Mexico	5,250	5,325	5,500	106.3	103.2	102.1	5,225	92.8	83.23	93.0
New York	6,300	6,300	6,400	127.6	122.1	118.8	6,856	121.7	87.71	98.0
North Carolina	3,900	4,100	4,250	79.0	79.5	78.9	4,400	78.1	61.20	68.4
North Dakota	3,600	3,900	4,000	72.9	75.6	74.2	5,067	90.0	81.65	91.3
Ohio	[1] 4,975	5,301	5,570	100.7	102.8	103.4	5,802	103.0	102.82	114.9
Oklahoma	4,646	4,702	4,910	94.1	92.9	91.1	4,885	86.7	85.70	95.8
Oregon	5,199	5,500	5,700	105.3	106.6	105.8	5,281	93.8	96.36	107.7
Pennsylvania	5,180	5,300	5,450	104.9	102.7	101.1	5,743	102.0	88.70	99.1
Rhode Island	5,000	5,486	5,700	101.2	106.3	105.8	5,394	95.8	74.03	82.7
South Carolina	3,340	3,408	3,775	67.6	66.1	70.1	3,938	69.9	61.61	68.9
South Dakota	[1] 3,475	3,675	3,750	70.4	71.2	69.6	4,705	83.5	90.32	100.9
Tennessee	3,538	3,818	4,110	71.6	74.0	76.3	4,440	78.8	71.46	79.9
Texas	4,604	4,611	4,665	93.2	89.4	86.6	4,923	87.4	89.02	99.5
Utah	4,809	5,025	5,120	97.4	97.4	95.0	5,641	100.1	93.60	104.6
Vermont	4,135	4,315	4,525	83.7	83.6	84.0	5,059	89.8	74.76	83.6
Virginia	4,058	4,312	4,500	82.2	83.6	83.5	4,927	87.5	69.02	77.1
Washington	5,320	5,585	5,735	107.7	108.3	106.4	5,316	94.4	98.81	110.4
West Virginia	3,730	3,952	4,100	75.5	76.6	76.1	4,846	86.0	92.43	103.3
Wisconsin	4,896	5,015	5,175	99.1	97.2	96.0	5,423	96.3	94.55	105.7
Wyoming	[1] 4,550	4,940	5,100	92.1	95.8	94.6	5,288	93.9	94.22	105.3

[1] NEA estimates.

Sources:
Cols. 2 through 4 from National Education Association, Research Division. Estimates of School Statistics. Research Report 1959–R23 and Research Report 1960–R15. Washington, D.C.: the Association, December 1959 and December 1960.
Cols. 5 through 7, 9, and 11 calculated by NEA Research Division.
Col. 8 from "Survey of Buying Power." Sales Management 84: 802; July 10, 1960 Copyright 1960, Sales Management Survey of Buying Power; further reproduction not licensed.
Col. 10 from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. Employment and Earnings (annual supplement issue) 6: 110, 123–26; May 1960.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have no further comments to make on this matter at the present time. Possibly the acting floor leader will wish to ask some questions about the amendment; and at this time I am glad to defer to him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes from the time available to Senators who are in opposition to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in my judgment the most important part of the pending bill is that which allots money to the States for the purpose of increasing the salaries of teachers.

Competent educators, including many who have no connection whatever with the National Education Association, have long told me, and have convinced me, that the order of priority for the improvement of the educational system in our Nation should be as follows: first, to assure substantial increases in teachers' salaries, from grade school through graduate school; second, to provide funds for the construction of academic facilities, from grade school through graduate school; and, third, to provide adequate scholarships and loans, so that no competent American boys or girls will fail to have an opportunity to obtain the education to which their abilities entitle them.

The sad fact is clear—despite the protestations to the contrary by my friend, the Senator from Arizona—that we are not presently recruiting in the teaching profession the high level young people who graduate from our colleges, although their recruitment is essential if we are to keep our teaching profession at the level necessary in order to make it possible to provide a first-class education to the youth of America.

One of the difficulties with the present low level of teachers' salaries across the country is that the salaries are so low that a fair share of the brighter boys and girls is not going into the teaching profession, and many of those who do go into it do not remain in it very long.

Last night, the Senate had under consideration an amendment to increase the allotment for the District of Columbia. I am happy to note that the amendment was adopted. In the course of the debate, I pointed out that 29.4 percent of all teachers presently teaching in the District of Columbia public schools are not fully certificated. I hold no brief for some of the requirements in some of the States for teacher certification. On the other hand, I think it must be clear that, generally speaking, a noncertificated teacher is not fully qualified; and the fact that almost one-third of the teachers in the District of Columbia public schools are not fully certificated is almost entirely due to the fact that the District of Columbia school system is not able to pay salaries sufficiently high to attract fully certificated teachers.

There are actually, of course, not enough fully certificated teachers to go around; and hence those school systems which are stuck on a low salary level are the ones that get shortchanged on certificated teachers.

I have in my hand a table prepared by the Office of Education dealing with the percentage of beginning teachers leaving education after their first year, designated by salary and by sex. The year covered is 1956–57. There may have been some small improvement since that time, but I am confident that any improvement is minimal.

I ask unanimous consent that the table may appear in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percent of 1956–57 beginning teachers leaving education after their first year, by salary and sex

Salary interval	Total	Men	Women
$4,000 and over	10	9	12
$3,500 to $3,999	12	11	13
$3,000 to $3,499	15	14	15
$2,500 to $2,999	18	17	18
Under $2,500	17	22	16

Source: Office of Education "Followup Study of Beginning Teachers."

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the table shows that even among teachers with salaries in excess of $4,000, 10 percent leave the profession after their first year. When the salary drops, as I regret to say it does in some school districts, to under $2,500, the percentage increases

to 17. Among men the percentage increases to 22.

Mr. President, we have in this record abundant evidence of the need for increasing teachers' salaries. Perhaps the best terse statement appears on page 94 of the hearings, in the statement of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Ribicoff, wherein he said:

In order to have professionally qualified and competent teachers throughout our public schools, we are going to have to provide salaries that are competitive with those in other occupations requiring equivalent training and experience. Inadequate salaries for instructional personnel are a primary deterrent to the recruitment and retention of highly qualified persons to staff our public elementary and secondary schools.

In order to keep from losing ground on the basis of present qualification standards, the States and local school districts will be hard pressed in face of the need for increased numbers of teachers. To raise qualification standards in a tight market for personnel with high professional training—and we should raise such standards—will require substantial improvement in the level of teachers' compensation.

While the States and localities must bear the main burden of such increase, the Federal Government can and should make a substantial contribution to assist the States and local communities in meeting their goals. Moreover, we must make it possible for our public elementary and secondary schools to bring the present instructional staff up to the requisite standards as promptly as possible. The 90,000 teachers now in our classrooms who fail to meet full professional certification requirements must be assisted to meet these requirements as promptly as possible.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which appears in a memorandum of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare entitled "Ten-Year Aims in Education—Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools," the table being headed "Annual earnings in certain professional-semiprofessional occupations, scattered studies of nationwide samples, 1951 through 1958," be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 6.—*Annual earnings in certain professional and semiprofessional occupations—Scattered studies of nationwide samples, 1951–58*

Occupation and type of information [1]	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Instructional staff: Mean salary for calendar year	$3,235	$3,485	$3,615	$3,865	$4,020	$4,220	$4,475	$4,730
Classroom teachers: Mean salary for calendar year	3,138	3,380	3,507	3,749	3,899	4,093	4,341	4,590
Biologists:								
Median income	5,400				6,275			
Median salary, with Ph. D					6,750		8,400	
Chemists: Median income	5,500							
Economists:								
Median salary		6,500						
Median income		7,400						
Median salary, men		6,600						
Median salary, women		5,900						
Engineers: Median income			6,500			7,750		8,750
Geologists:								
Median salary					7,250			
Median income	6,200							
Median salary, without Ph. D					7,150			
Median salary, with Ph. D					7,675			
Medical laboratory technicians (college degree not required): Median salary			3,300–3,600					4,469
Nurses: Mean salary, public health staff (local official health units)	3,100		3,400	3,662	3,700			4,301
Physicists:								
Median income	6,100							
Median salary					7,275			
Median salary, without Ph. D					6,600			
Median salary, with Ph. D					7,850			
Psychologists: Median salary	5,700				5,850			
Median salary, men	6,200							
Median salary, women	4,600							
Median salary, without Ph. D					4,975			
Median salary, with Ph. D				7,800	6,600			
Scientists: [2]								
Median salary					6,525			
Median salary, without Ph. D					6,125			
Median salary, with Ph. D					7,000			
Social agency case worker: Median salary	3,361	3,591	3,828	3,954		4,389	4,740	

[1] Sources of data are the following: Biologists: National Science Foundation, (1) "Manpower Resources in the Biological Sciences," 1955, pp. 48, 49, 53; (2) "Scientific Manpower Bulletin," Bull. 56. No. 21, p. 7. Also, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Occupational Outlook Handbook," 1957, p. 140; 1959, p. 141. Chemists: National Scientific Register, "Information Bulletin," (Bull. 1, No. 5, 1952), p. 4. Economists: U.S. Department of Labor, "Personnel Resources in the Social Sciences and Humanities" (Bull. 1169), pp. 116, 120, 122. Engineers: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, "Occupational Outlook Quarterly," vol. 3, No. 2 (Bull. 29, May 1959). Geologists: National Science Foundation, (1) "Manpower Resources in the Earth Sciences," pp. 41, 43; (2) Scientific Manpower Bulletin (Bull. 56, No. 21), p. 7. Medical Laboratory technicians: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1957, p. 84; 1959, p. 74. Nurses: (1) American Nurses Association, "Facts About Nursing, 1955–56," pp. 124–45; (2) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1959, p. 57. Physicists: (1) National Scientific Register, Information Bulletin (Bull. 6, 1952), p. 2; (2) U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1957, p. 123. Psychologists: (1) National Science Foundation, Scientific Manpower Bulletin (Bull. 56, No. 21), p. 7; (2) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Outlook Handbook, 1957, p. 192; (3) National Scientific Register, Information Bulletin (Bull. 1, No 5), 1952, p. 4, Scientists (grouped data): National Science Foundation, Scientific Manpower Bulletin (Bull. 56, No. 21) p. 7. Social agency caseworkers: Family Service Association of America.

[2] 7 fields grouped together; astronomers, biologists, geologists, mathematicians, meteorologists, physicists, and psychologists.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table, also prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Staff Indexes for the Public Schools," showing percentages of teachers serving in public schools, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Staff indexes for the public schools

State	Estimated enrollment per member of the instructional staff, 1960–61	Enrollment per classroom teacher, 1960–61	Teachers with substandard credentials, 1960–61		Percent of elementary teachers with 4 or more years of college preparation 1958–59
			Number	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
50 States, District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	23.8	25.9	94,599	6.6	75
Alabama	28.4	29.8	2,227	8.4	83
Alaska	22.1	23.8	71	3.9	86
Arizona	24.9	27.4	51	.5	98
Arkansas	26.7	28.1	2,214	14.7	71
California	25.4	28.1	11,000	9.2	91
Colorado	21.8	23.5	184	1.1	84
Connecticut	22.1	24.0	1,700	8.5	84
Delaware	21.2	22.3	529	14.3	81
Florida	23.4	26.3	493	1.3	98
Georgia	27.0	28.4	196	.6	(1)
Hawaii	26.3	29.2	50	1.0	77
Idaho	23.8	25.0	1,449	22.8	(1)
Illinois	22.3	24.2	5,735	8.0	74
Indiana	25.4	28.1	3,000	8.6	80
Iowa	20.4	22.0	320	1.2	28
Kansas	20.1	21.5	0	0	66
Kentucky	24.5	26.3	2,965	12.6	48
Louisiana	25.1	26.8	1,650	6.2	86
Maine	24.3	25.0	379	4.6	39
Maryland	24.1	25.8	6,200	26.4	74
Massachusetts	21.7	23.6	1,150	3.2	(1)
Michigan	24.2	26.3	8,353	13.1	(1)
Minnesota	22.5	23.8	517	1.8	(1)
Mississippi	28.8	30.8	588	3.1	67
Missouri	25.1	27.4	149	.5	76

See footnote at end of table.

Staff indexes for the public schools—Continued

State	Estimated enrollment per member of the instructional staff, 1960–61	Enrollment per classroom teacher, 1960–61	Teachers with substandard credentials, 1960–61		Percent of elementary teachers with 4 or more years of college preparation, 1958–59
			Number	Percent	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Montana	19.5	21.3	270	3.9	42
Nebraska	19.2	20.4	566	4.1	28
Nevada	21.6	23.6	0	0	69
New Hampshire	23.1	23.5	450	10.0	48
New Jersey	21.5	22.8	6,180	13.4	(1)
New Mexico	23.1	24.3	173	1.9	96
New York	21.0	23.3	5,850	4.9	(1)
North Carolina	27.4	29.4	1,690	4.5	93
North Dakota	17.6	18.4	34	.5	15
Ohio	24.2	26.5	4,951	6.7	67
Oklahoma	24.5	26.6	0	0	100
Oregon	22.1	22.7	1,959	11.5	81
Pennsylvania	23.4	26.1	965	1.3	(1)
Rhode Island	22.3	25.6	346	6.6	(1)
South Carolina	26.9	27.9	33	.2	87
South Dakota	17.6	19.5	339	4.4	12
Tennessee	24.3	26.8	1,075	3.6	67
Texas	24.4	26.7	6,500	8.1	96
Utah	25.0	27.9	404	4.7	92
Vermont	22.3	24.1	326	10.5	47
Virginia	24.0	25.9	2,116	6.5	62
Washington	23.4	26.0	2,100	8.5	83
West Virginia	25.0	26.8	1,129	6.9	68
Wisconsin	23.8	25.0	1,000	3.5	86
Wyoming	18.9	19.9	626	15.8	57
District of Columbia	25.2	27.8	1,300	29.7	85
Guam	24.4	26.9	66	13.	(1)
Puerto Rico	37.1	41.7	2,981	21.8	22
Virgin Islands	27.2	29.7	0	0	(1)

[1] Not available.

Source: Cols. 2 and 3 derived from table on enrollments, instructional staff, and classroom teachers; cols. 4 and 5 from Office of Education fall survey; col. 6 from NEA Research Bulletin 1959–R4.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, not only has Secretary Ribicoff strongly advocated the inclusion of increases in teachers' salaries as an objective of this bill, but the President of the United States made it very clear, in his earlier message on the subject of education, that this, too, was one of his objectives.

I think we must appreciate, as we move toward a vote on this measure, that the Kennedy administration is deeply committed to including teachers' salaries as one of the major objectives of the bill, and in my judgment rightly so.

Mr. President, it has been my privilege for the last year and 3 months to serve as a member of the Governor's Commission on Education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. That commission did not include on it a single professional educator, although we did have the advice of many professional educators, including such distinguished men who have given their lives to the problem as former president James B. Conant, of Harvard University. The commission was a composite of businessmen, labor leaders, civic leaders from women's and men's groups, and, frankly, politicians, including the junior Senator from Pennsylvania and myself and a number of members of the Pennsylvania State Legislature. It also included members of the judiciary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

That commission labored long and hard, and it has recently presented to the Governor a comprehensive plan for the complete overhauling of education in the Commonwealth. One of the commission's most important recommendations was that over the period of the next 10 years, and beginning immediately, teachers' salaries should be substantially raised. I quote from the report:

Teachers' salaries are too low. There is no better way to raise them than to guarantee district officials the fiscal resources with which to do so.

Then there is included a long argument as to a detailed and somewhat complicated method by which local school districts would be encouraged to come pretty close to doubling teachers' salaries during the next 10 years.

The program recommended by the Commission would call for doubling expenditures by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania during the next 10 years. The proposal has gone to the legislature. We can be hopeful that a good part of it will be enacted into law, but the fiscal strain which this proposed program will place on our local and State tax resources should not and cannot be overestimated. In my pragmatic judgment, it will be more likely than not that the full program of the Commission will not be enacted into law by our legislature and signed by the Governor because of the fact that the tax burden which it would impose would be heavier than the elected representatives of our people are going to be prepared to enact.

Interesting in connection with his report is the comment on Federal aid, and I should like to read it into the RECORD:

The committee recognizes that within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania there are some school districts which are economically unable to support a minimum adequate program for education of our younger citizens without State aid. We also recognize that among the 50 States there are also some which are economically unable to support a minimum adequate program without additional Federal aid. Pennsylvania does not belong to this group, nevertheless we urge the Governor to support Federal aid for school construction, higher educational academic facilities, teachers salaries and scholarships, provided that it requires State and local governments to maintain and increase their support of education; it allocates Federal funds to each of the 50 States in such a way as to equalize educational opportunity without unduly penalizing the wealthy States; and provided it is flexible enough to permit the funds to be paid into each State's education subsidy fund where such a fund exists, for distribution under a subsidy plan which includes an equalization factor.

Federal aid should not be used in Pennsylvania to reduce either State or local effort. It should be a welcome addition to the minimum program recommended in this report.

Mr. President, the commissioner of education for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has testified—and has told me privately—that from 80 to 90 percent of the funds which would be provided under the terms of the bill for Pennsylvania would be used to increase teachers' salaries, in order to assure the Commonwealth a competent and proper flow of ability into the teaching profession.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

In my judgment, not only for my State but also for the 49 other States and the other geographical areas which are included under the terms of the bill, the most important single factor in the bill is the authorization to the States to use the money to increase teachers' salaries.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I hope very much that when we vote on the amendment the Senate will reject it by a large majority.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senator from Oregon I yield myself 1 additional minute so that I may answer a question by my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I have listened to the Senator's remarks and enjoyed them. I am one who feels, from my correspondence, that the people are money conscious. Is there available a table which shows the total taxes raised in the States by the States and the total amount the Federal Government collects from the States? Does the Senator see what I am getting at?

Mr. CLARK. I see what the Senator is getting at, but with all due deference

to my good friend from Wisconsin I would suggest this is not a profitable avenue to explore, because what we are thinking about is not the taxes imposed on the States but the taxes imposed on the people, the taxes imposed on corporations, the taxes imposed through excise duties on luxury goods. I say to the Senator that, in my judgment, the line which he is following will not be a very profitable one.

I do not know whether the Senator from Oregon has tables which would satisfy the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 more minute.

A member of the staff has handed me a publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, a source which I think is not particularly favorable to the bill, which appears to contain pertinent information.

Mr. Lee advises me that the data which my friend seeks can be found on pages 247, 252, 344, 345, and 346 of the hearings.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the data be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the data were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 30.—*How States would fare during fiscal 1962 under the administration's proposed "School Assistance Act of 1961" for public school construction and teachers' salaries, S. 1021–H.R. 4970*

State	Federal allotment	Estimated taxpayments	Net "aid" received from other States	Net "aid" paid to other States	State	Federal allotment	Estimated taxpayments	Net "aid" received from other States	Net "aid" paid to other States
Alabama	$19,691,602	$6,530,000	$13,161,602		Nevada	$952,274	$1,400,000		$447,726
Alaska	555,000	730,000		$175,000	New Hampshire	1,734,218	2,200,000		465,782
Arizona	6,260,276	3,800,000	2,460,276		New Jersey	14,400,000	28,970,000		14,570,000
Arkansas	10,538,844	3,130,000	7,408,844		New Mexico	5,275,194	2,460,000	$2,815,194	
California	52,733,321	72,990,000		20,256,679	New York	37,650,000	91,110,000		53,460,000
Colorado	7,157,176	6,260,000	897,176		North Carolina	27,905,485	9,190,000	18,715,485	
Connecticut	6,600,000	14,450,000		7,850,000	North Dakota	3,100,067	1,270,000	1,830,067	
Delaware	1,155,000	3,730,000		2,575,000	Ohio	28,735,988	38,490,000		9,754,012
Florida	19,120,968	16,720,000	2,400,968		Oklahoma	11,951,838	6,190,000	5,761,838	
Georgia	22,014,247	8,860,000	13,154,247		Oregon	7,095,843	6,330,000	765,843	
Hawaii	3,121,256	2,000,000	1,121,256		Pennsylvania	26,880,000	46,290,000		19,410,000
Idaho	3,760,723	1,800,000	1,960,723		Rhode Island	1,800,000	3,530,000		1,730,000
Illinois	23,310,000	47,750,000		24,440,000	South Carolina	15,228,456	4,060,000	11,168,456	
Indiana	16,956,529	15,180,000	1,776,529		South Dakota	3,262,057	1,330,000	1,932,057	
Iowa	11,280,457	7,920,000	3,360,457		Tennessee	19,542,885	7,930,000	11,612,885	
Kansas	9,445,918	6,390,000	3,055,918		Texas	40,262,707	28,840,000	11,422,707	
Kentucky	14,583,887	6,990,000	7,593,887		Utah	5,778,627	2,400,000	3,378,627	
Louisiana	15,034,329	7,920,000	7,114,329		Vermont	1,459,990	1,130,000	329,990	
Maine	4,125,926	2,860,000	1,265,926		Virginia	17,846,093	11,320,000	6,526,093	
Maryland	8,976,670	12,790,000		3,813,330	Washington	11,408,373	10,860,000	548,373	
Massachusetts	11,790,000	23,110,000		11,320,000	West Virginia	10,658,865	4,530,000	6,128,865	
Michigan	27,070,253	29,770,000		2,699,747	Wisconsin	11,615,012	13,790,000		2,174,988
Minnesota	13,062,937	10,720,000	2,342,937		Wyoming	1,541,357	1,070,000	471,357	
Mississippi	14,687,634	3,000,000	11,687,634		District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	16,394,549	4,600,000	11,794,549	
Missouri	12,246,806	15,250,000		3,003,192					
Montana	2,919,012	1,860,000	1,059,012		Total	666,000,000	666,000,000		
Nebraska	5,321,259	4,200,000	1,121,259						

Source of data: Col. 1, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other columns computed by Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

TABLE 31.—*How States would fare during fiscal year 1963 under the administration's proposed "School Assistance Act of 1961" for school construction and teachers' salaries*

State	Federal allotment	Estimated tax-payments	Net "aid" received from other States	Net "aid" paid to other States	State	Federal allotment	Estimated tax-payments	Net "aid" received from other States	Net "aid" paid to other States
Alabama	$22,583,245	$7,510,000	$15,073,245		Nevada	$1,174,979	$1,610,000		$435,021
Alaska	645,000	840,000		$195,000	New Hampshire	2,035,633	2,530,000		494,367
Arizona	7,619,234	4,370,000	3,249,234		New Jersey	14,985,000	33,320,000		18,335,000
Arkansas	11,874,571	3,600,000	8,274,571		New Mexico	6,263,277	2,830,000	$3,433,277	
California	64,313,909	83,950,000		19,636,091	New York	38,715,000	104,790,000		66,075,000
Colorado	8,608,311	7,200,000	1,408,311		North Carolina	32,093,440	10,570,000	21,523,440	
Connecticut	6,960,000	16,620,000		9,660,000	North Dakota	3,558,869	1,460,000	2,098,869	
Delaware	1,215,000	4,290,000		3,075,000	Ohio	33,879,936	44,270,000		10,390,064
Florida	23,494,752	19,230,000	4,264,752		Oklahoma	13,723,715	7,120,000	6,603,713	
Georgia	25,488,608	10,190,000	15,298,608		Oregon	8,356,592	7,280,000	1,076,592	
Hawaii	3,711,812	2,300,000	1,411,812		Pennsylvania	30,986,280	53,240,000		22,253,720
Idaho	4,339,907	2,070,000	2,269,907		Rhode Island	1,845,000	4,060,000		2,215,000
Illinois	24,000,000	54,920,000		30,920,000	South Carolina	17,537,616	4,670,000	12,867,616	
Indiana	19,671,096	17,460,000	2,211,096		South Dakota	3,796,681	1,530,000	2,266,681	
Iowa	13,016,980	9,110,000	3,906,980		Tennessee	22,526,242	9,110,000	13,416,242	
Kansas	11,033,685	7,350,000	3,683,685		Texas	47,368,850	33,170,000	14,198,850	
Kentucky	16,838,833	8,040,000	8,598,833		Utah	6,725,922	2,760,000	3,965,922	
Louisiana	17,525,905	9,120,000	8,405,905		Vermont	1,638,770	1,300,000	338,770	
Maine	4,750,680	3,290,000	1,460,680		Virginia	20,821,009	13,020,000	7,801,009	
Maryland	10,773,691	14,710,000		3,936,309	Washington	13,486,454	12,490,000	996,454	
Massachusetts	12,990,000	26,580,000		14,490,000	West Virginia	12,110,817	5,210,000	6,900,817	
Michigan	32,079,528	34,240,000		2,160,472	Wisconsin	13,630,448	15,860,000		2,229,552
Minnesota	15,270,830	12,330,000	2,940,830		Wyoming	1,803,631	1,230,000	573,631	
Mississippi	16,255,415	3,450,000	12,805,415		District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	19,306,402	5,290,000	14,016,402	
Missouri	14,064,931	17,540,000		3,475,069					
Montana	3,419,626	2,140,000	1,279,626		Total	766,000,000	766,000,000		
Nebraska	6,129,038	4,830,000	1,299,038						

Source of data: Col. 1, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other columns computed by Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

TABLE 32.—*How States would fare during fiscal year 1964 under the administration's proposed "School Assistance Act of 1961" for school construction and teachers' salaries*

State	Federal allotment	Estimated taxpayments	Net "aid" received from other States	Net "aid" paid to other States
Alabama	$25,327,454	$8,490,000	$16,837,454	
Alaska	750,000	950,000		$200,000
Arizona	9,043,884	4,949,000	4,103,884	
Arkansas	13,101,790	4,070,000	9,031,790	
California	76,414,133	94,910,000		18,495,867
Colorado	10,074,516	8,140,000	1,934,516	
Connecticut	7,305,000	18,790,000		11,485,000
Delaware	1,290,000	4,850,000		3,560,000
Florida	28,120,464	21,740,000	6,380,464	
Georgia	28,859,731	11,520,000	17,339,731	
Hawaii	4,285,832	2,600,000	1,685,832	
Idaho	4,872,393	2,340,000	2,532,393	
Illinois	24,780,000	62,090,000		37,310,000
Indiana	22,317,020	19,740,000	2,577,020	
Iowa	14,680,475	10,300,000	4,380,475	
Kansas	12,613,723	8,310,000	4,303,723	
Kentucky	18,558,615	9,090,000	9,468,615	
Louisiana	19,997,176	10,300,000	9,697,176	
Maine	5,326,446	3,720,000	1,606,446	
Maryland	12,629,855	16,630,000		4,000,145
Massachusetts	13,273,515	30,050,000		16,776,485
Michigan	37,150,155	38,710,000		1,559,845
Minnesota	17,445,053	13,940,000	3,505,053	
Mississippi	17,565,544	3,900,000	13,665,544	
Missouri	15,795,929	19,830,000		4,034,071
Montana	3,920,101	2,420,000	1,500,101	
Nebraska	6,912,416	5,460,000	1,452,416	
Nevada	$1,411,359	$1,820,000		$408,641
New Hampshire	2,337,963	2,860,000		522,037
New Jersey	15,555,000	37,670,000		22,115,000
New Mexico	7,302,037	3,200,000	$4,102,037	
New York	39,735,000	118,470,000		78,735,000
North Carolina	36,142,562	11,950,000	24,192,562	
North Dakota	3,969,490	1,650,000	2,319,490	
Ohio	39,031,368	50,050,000		11,018,632
Oklahoma	15,400,110	8,050,000	7,350,110	
Oregon	9,601,681	8,230,000	1,371,681	
Pennsylvania	34,942,097	60,190,000		25,247,903
Rhode Island	1,974,787	4,590,000		2,615,213
South Carolina	19,776,441	5,280,000	14,496,441	
South Dakota	4,295,246	1,730,000	2,565,246	
Tennessee	25,390,845	10,310,000	15,080,845	
Texas	54,438,623	37,500,000	16,938,623	
Utah	7,662,943	3,120,000	4,542,943	
Vermont	1,827,851	1,470,000	357,851	
Virginia	23,746,498	14,720,000	9,026,498	
Washington	15,567,293	14,120,000	1,447,293	
West Virginia	13,443,253	5,890,000	7,553,253	
Wisconsin	15,650,932	17,930,000		2,279,068
Wyoming	2,065,380	1,390,000	675,380	
District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	22,320,021	5,980,000	16,340,021	
Total	866,000,000	866,000,000		

Source of data: Col. 1, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Other columns computed by Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Per capita State tax collections, 1960

1. Hawaii	$200.26
2. Washington	162.82
3. Delaware	159.80
4. Nevada	154.10
5. Louisiana	139.99
6. California	136.99
7. New Mexico	130.52
8. Arizona	127.41
9. Wyoming	126.58
10. Alaska	120.98
11. Oklahoma	119.55
12. Oregon	118.39
13. New York	117.74
14. Michigan	117.50
15. Utah	116.65
16. Vermont	112.10
17. Maryland	111.74
18. Colorado	110.43
19. Wisconsin	108.45
20. Florida	106.77
21. Idaho	104.09
22. Minnesota	103.77
23. Rhode Island	102.27
24. North Carolina	101.37
25. South Carolina	99.60
26. West Virginia	97.36
27. Iowa	96.91
28. Montana	96.88
29. North Dakota	96.87
30. Massachusetts	96.01
31. Kansas	94.88
32. Connecticut	94.61
33. Georgia	94.37
34. Pennsylvania	91.60
35. Ohio	90.46
36. Maine	90.37
37. Mississippi	89.74
38. Arkansas	89.26
39. Indiana	86.20
40. Tennessee	86.13
41. Alabama	84.49
42. Illinois	83.59
43. Texas	81.98
44. South Dakota	78.06
45. Kentucky	75.77
46. Virginia	74.72
47. Missouri	72.89
48. New Hampshire	69.50
49. Nebraska	64.97
50. New Jersey	60.47
50 States	101.72

State tax collections per $100 of personal income, 1959

1. Hawaii	$8.64
2. Louisiana	8.37
3. Mississippi	7.24
4. New Mexico	6.75
5. Washington	6.57
6. Arkansas	6.30
7. Oklahoma	6.19
8. South Carolina	6.18
9. North Dakota	6.03
10. North Carolina	5.87
11. Vermont	5.60
12. Georgia	5.55
13. Arizona	5.41
14. Alabama	5.35
15. Wyoming	5.31
16. West Virginia	5.29
17. Tennessee	5.24
18. Delaware	5.16
19. Nevada	5.15
20. Utah	5.12
21. Florida	5.09
22. South Dakota	4.94
23. Colorado	4.89
24. Idaho	4.85
25. Maine	4.74
26. Minnesota	4.71
27. Kansas	4.70
28. Kentucky	4.69
29. Iowa	4.65
30. Wisconsin	4.63
31. Michigan	4.61
32. Oregon	4.59
33. Montana	4.58
34. California	4.44
35. Maryland	4.38
36. Alaska	4.32
37. Rhode Island	4.31
38. Indiana	3.91
39. Texas	3.90
40. Massachusetts	3.88
41. Virginia	3.83
42. Pennsylvania	3.65
43. New York	3.52
44. Ohio	3.27
45. Connecticut	3.17
46. New Hampshire	3.16
47. Missouri	3.13
48. Nebraska	3.05
49. Illinois	2.89
50. New Jersey	2.18
50 States	4.20

Per capita Federal individual income and employment taxes, 1960

1. Delaware	$667
2. New York	532
3. Colorado	487
4. Illinois	411
5. Connecticut	395
6. Maryland and D.C	381
7. California	366
8. Michigan	352
9. Ohio	340
10. Nevada	335
11. Massachusetts	333
12. Pennsylvania	331
13. Missouri	302
14. New Jersey	287
15. Rhode Island	285
16. Washington and Alaska	272
17. Minnesota	262
18. Nebraska	259
19. Indiana	255
20. Oregon	247
21. Hawaii	239
22. Wisconsin	238
23. New Hampshire	221
24. Oklahoma	211
25. Texas	208
26. Kansas	205
27. Wyoming	202
28. Utah	199
29. Florida	190
30. Arizona	189
31. Iowa	187
32. New Mexico	186
33. Idaho	181
34. Montana	173
35. Virginia	173
36. Vermont	171
37. Georgia	164
38. Maine	162
39. Louisiana	154
40. Tennessee	145
41. North Carolina	140
42. South Dakota	139
43. North Dakota	134
44. Kentucky	133
45. Alabama	130
46. West Virginia	123
47. South Carolina	99
48. Arkansas	96
49. Mississippi	75
Puerto Rico	10

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself not more than 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank my wonderful colleague and helpmate on my subcommittee, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], for taking over the leadership on the bill during my absence from the floor. I was called off the floor. I never hesitate to go off the floor when the Senator from Pennsylvania is on the floor, because I know any matter will be very well taken care of by my colleague in my absence.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. His absence from the floor gave me an opportunity to sound off which I might not otherwise have had, and I enjoyed it.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator know that any time he wishes to make a contribution to the debate I shall be glad to yield to him.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to vote against the Goldwater amendment for several reasons.

We have heard much talk for a long time in the Senate, for years, about the dangers of Federal control over education. We have assured the American people time and time again that no such danger in fact exists, because of the guarantees we have written into every Federal aid to education bill, beginning with the famous Taft bill of 1947, and including the Thomas-Taft bill of 1949. Every Federal aid to education bill I have introduced since the great loss caused by the death of former Senator Taft has included such provisions. And so have those offered by other Senators.

I reiterate that what we propose to do is to make Federal money available to help the boys and girls of this country develop to the maximum extent possible their intellectual potentials. We would authorize the commingling of Federal money with State money, and would clearly give State authorities complete control over the money to be spent by the State authorities in accordance with State education policy. I do not know how one could give a greater guarantee.

As Bob Taft used to point out, if anyone has some stronger language than that, let it be offered and it will be written into the bill. It cannot be done, because that language contains the strongest possible guarantee.

My good friend from Arizona completely disagrees with me on my next observation but even my good friend from Arizona cannot successfully rebut it. He can argue against it, but that does not mean he can successfully rebut it.

We have spent hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of Federal money on the school systems of this country for decades. We have done this, though most people do not know it. We have contributed Federal money under the Morrill Act, which was signed by Abraham Lincoln, and under various acts to provide aid to the States.

My friend from Arizona does not think that there has been Federal aid to education. We disagree. There has been a great deal of Federal aid to education. The money has been spent by the State authorities, as shown by the information the Senator from Indiana put in the RECORD yesterday, without Federal interference. The Senator put that in the RECORD by way of a questionnaire which was sent to school administrators in Indiana. Without exception, those administrators answered that the money had not come to them with any Federal interference at all. Of course, there were certain standards provided in the acts, as to the expenditure of the money for specific purposes.

Now we consider a general Federal aid-to-education bill. As I have said, we are already aiding about one-third of the school population of the United States in elementary and secondary schools. I am not worried about doing the same for the other two-thirds, in a general aid-to-education bill.

What is the guarantee in the general bill? We could not have it any broader than is contained in the Prouty amendment. My friend from Arizona now proposes a change in the Prouty amendment. The Prouty amendment made an addition to the bill. I supported it, because I think it adds to the bill by strengthening the assurance of no Federal control over education.

What would the Prouty amendment do? The amendment provides, in effect, that when the money goes to a school district the school district can spend the money for any purpose to further the educational processes of the school, whether it is to pay janitors, to buy microscopes, to buy chemicals for the chemistry laboratory, or to pay for general maintenance of the school. The amendment provides that the money shall be part and parcel of commingled State and Federal funds, for the operation of the school.

The Senator from Arizona would have us say to the State, "We will give you Federal money, but we will tell you you cannot use it for anything but school construction. You cannot use it for teachers' salaries. You cannot use it for anything else."

The great exponent of no Federal control himself proposes an amendment which is based upon Federal dictation, which is based upon the principle of saying to the States, "You can take this money, but cannot use it for teachers' salaries."

There are some schools in this country in regard to which the teachers' salaries are the item of greatest need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

It may be that there are some places in the country where blackboards are the immediate need of the small local school. It may be that funds for a chemistry laboratory or for equipment are the greatest need in some schools. What we say is, "We will leave it up to the school administrators to buy what they need and to spend the money according to the need, on the basis of their own judgment."

That is the test, I say most respectfully and good naturedly, as to whether we really believe in eliminating Federal control.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table entitled "Projected New Demands for Classroom Teachers Based on Growth in Enrollments and Replacement Needs, Regular Public Schools of 48 States and the District of Columbia: 1954–55 to 1968–69." The table was prepared on February 22 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Projected new demand for classroom teachers based on growth in enrollments and replacement needs, regular public schools of 48 States and the District of Columbia: 1954–55 to 1968–69

School year	New demand		
	Total	Replacement [1]	Growth [2]
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1954–55	164,401	111,805	52,596
1955–56	170,135	117,538	52,597
1956–57	180,808	123,271	57,537
1957–58	178,928	129,543	49,385
1958–59	190,077	134,926	55,151
Total	884,349	617,083	267,266
Mean	176,870	123,417	53,453
1959–60	199,937	140,937	59,000
1960–61	200,368	147,368	53,000
1961–62	193,145	153,145	40,000
1962–63	208,505	157,505	51,000
1963–64	215,064	163,064	52,000
Total	1,017,019	762,019	255,000
Mean	203,404	152,404	51,000
1964–65	220,732	168,732	52,000
1965–66	188,400	174,400	14,000
1966–67	199,926	175,926	24,000
1967–68	204,542	178,542	26,000
1968–69	209,376	181,376	28,000
Total	1,022,976	878,976	144,000
Mean	204,595	175,795	28,800

[1] Replacement of teachers leaving the profession was computed as 10.9 percent of those the previous year. Base figures for 1954–55 replacements are as follows: col. 2—1,026,734; col. 3—655,934; col. 4—369,800.

[2] Derived from table on projected total demand for instructional staff in the regular public schools of 48 States and District of Columbia: 1949–50 to 1968–69—DHEW:OE:ESB Feb. 22, 1961.

NOTE.—Detail does not necessarily add to total because of rounding.

Mr. MORSE. That table leaves no room for doubt that one of the greatest needs of the public schools in this country is teachers, not only in numbers, but also teachers with improved training as well. Many thousands of teachers who are teaching in our schools today are not accredited teachers. They do not meet the standards of accreditation that are required by the States. But we have no others, and we are greatly indebted to those uncertified teachers. If we did not

have them, we would not have any teachers at all.

Why do we have so many uncertified teachers? Teachers in some parts of the country do not receive adequate pay in comparison with what they could get in other fields and professions. I do not know whether it is true in the office of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] or the offices of other Senators, but I know that in my office it is necessary—and I am glad to do it because of the high competency of the workers there—to pay some secretaries, women assistants and stenographers in my office considerably more than thousands and thousands of schoolteachers in this country receive. Those workers in my office earn what they are paid. But many schoolteachers earn much more than what they are paid.

Speaking for a moment to Senators as parents, I ask, Who are our teachers? In a real sense they are foster parents. For many weeks of the year and hours of the day they are doing our job of parenthood by helping us to raise our children to become fine citizens.

I close by reading the testimony of a teacher which appears on page 927 of the hearings. I believe it is very sound and good testimony. It is testimony that I think helps my case:

As a classroom teacher and as a member of the American Federation of Teachers I am well aware that the strength or weakness of a school system is determined largely by the strength of the classroom teacher. Buildings, equipment, and a good administration are all important, but in the final analysis the schools are measured by the strength of the classroom teachers.

It is the feeling in Oregon that Federal aid is needed most urgently to raise teachers' salaries. The situation is already a critical one. Oregon needs to keep the good teachers it has, and it needs to attract to its classrooms the superior college graduates.

That is the testimony of Miss Phyllis Hutchison, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, Portland, Oreg. She goes on to discuss the loss of many teachers in Oregon to other States, particularly California.

I do not blame California for taking our good teachers and paying them more money. But I wish we could pay them more so that California would not get them. Many teachers go into California and they are lost; to whom? They are lost to the boys and girls of Oregon. That is a sad loss, and one that we should try to avoid. The bill will help us avoid it, because our bill would make it possible for State educational authorities to use funds provided under the bill in accordance with the needs of schools, and not in accordance with the dictation of the Federal Government as to limitations for which the money could be spent.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Oregon for the splendid defense he is making of that portion of President Kennedy's bill which deals with teachers' salaries. It has come to my attention that in connection with the debate on S. 8 last year, the question of the comparable salaries of teachers and those in other and somewhat similar professions was raised.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that it would be interesting to refer to that information at this point. In 1958 a Census Bureau survey of income in 18 professions showed that the average earnings of public school instructional personnel was $4,827 a year, while the average earnings of the other 17 recognized professions was $9,439, or almost double the amount earned by the teachers.

Listen to the earnings in other professions in which comparable educational requirements are necessary in order to enter: Physicians and surgeons, dentists, lawyers, judges, osteopaths, architects, engineers, veterinarians, natural science, editors and reporters, foresters, social science, pharmacists, chemists, social welfare work, librarians, clergy, dietitians, and nutritionists. Is it not absurd that men and women charged with the vital duty of instructing the youth of America in a free society should be so underpaid? Is it any wonder that in view of this fact there is at present a shortage of almost 200,000 qualified teachers? It occurs to me that this comparison between what our teachers are being paid and the earnings of those in many other professions is pertinent in connection with this debate.

Mr. MORSE. It is very pertinent. Has the Senator requested that the full table be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. CLARK. The information is not in the form of a table.

Mr. MORSE. Unless the Senator from Arizona cuts me up so much in reply that I shall have to take additional time to bind up the wounds, I shall be ready to yield back the remainder of my time. I yield the floor for the time being.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have no intention of cutting, but if the truth cuts, I suggest that the Senator from Oregon had better reserve some time for reply. I will try to refute some of the statements made in answer to my opening remarks.

First, my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon, has tried to imply that I am now in favor of Federal controls. Nothing could be further from the truth. I will try to eliminate from the bill any such provision, if we must have a Federal aid-to-education bill. The Senator knows that I contend we do not have to have any. But if we have to have one, I shall endeavor to eliminate the Federal Government's responsibility for paying part or all of teachers' salaries, because I feel in such provision would lie the greatest danger of control should the Federal Government ever come to the point of trying to control completely the school systems.

The Senator from Oregon complained about teachers moving from Oregon to California. Under the original bill, which has not been made much different by amendment, California teachers would receive $360 more a year if 90 percent of the funds were allocated for teachers' salaries. Oregon would receive $363 more. So I believe the outflow of teachers to California from Oregon, if money is the reason, will continue unless we can devise some special formula whereby Oregon would raise its standards up to those of California.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. How do we know that California would spend the money for teachers' salaries?

Mr. GOLDWATER. We must assume that California would do so, because I do not know that she would use it on construction. California is one of those States that are better off in the field of school construction. As I said last night, Indiana would receive $68 million under the bill, and yet there is no classroom shortage in Indiana. The teachers' salaries that are paid in that State are $350 above the national average. So they will probably use the entire amount to increase teachers' salaries.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not mean to continue to interrupt. I wish to make this observation. If the Senator from Arizona will talk to the Senators from California, they will tell him that they are very much concerned about the daily influx of population into California and the resulting pressure that influx will produce on their schools in the near future.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Arizona knows well about that situation, because we are growing faster than California. We have been able to keep ahead of our school needs. I should like to get at some of the figures I have, which I think will refute the position that my friend from Pennsylvania took in relation to the need for teachers. The instructional staff in 1960 and 1961 is 1,526,079. If we subtract from that figure the teachers who do not have full certification, 93,917, we have a total certified staff of 1,432,162, which is an increase of 40 percent over 1953–54.

Pupil enrollment for the same period shows an increase of 29 percent. Therefore the teachers have kept ahead of the students. If it is argued that we need more of them in the same time, the number of pupils per certificated teacher has dropped from 28.4 to 26 in the same period, which is a drop of 2.4 pupils per classroom.

The outlook for teacher supply is highly favorable. The percentage of college students who prepare for a teacher's certificate rose from 21 percent in 1948 to 31 percent in 1955, and has since been stable at that level. The number of bachelors' and first professional college degrees is projected to rise sharply during the 1960's. The Office of Education in its projection of earned degrees to 1969–70, indicates that there

were 387,000 earned college degrees in 1958–59, and estimates 703,000 for 1968–69, an expected increase of 82 percent in the 10-year period.

If the percentage of college students seeking a teaching career remains stable over the next decade, the number of newly graduated teachers will almost double. The enrollment increase will be far less. The school age group which increased 46 percent between 1950 and 1960 is projected to grow only 20 percent between 1960 and 1970.

In the publication "Research Report," showing estimates of school statistics, 1960–61, prepared by the Research Division of the National Education Association, there is printed a table entitled "Estimated Number of Instructional Staff Members in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1960–61." The total number of these staff members is estimated to be 1,526,079.

The number of teachers leaving the teaching profession in the same period is estimated to be 126,665, or 8.3 percent of the total teaching staff.

There were 387,000 earned college degrees in 1958–59. If there is going to be only 8.3 percent of the teaching staff of this country leaving in 1960–61, I cannot follow the argument of my friend from Pennsylvania that we are not producing enough teachers to fill the gap. This is not even a normal turnover for business. An 8.3-percent dropout is very low. In my own business, I wish that I could maintain that low a figure. It is probably lower than in any profession or business that one could find, or at least any one that comes to mind quickly.

I ask unanimous consent that table No. 5, appearing on page 23 of the publication I have referred to and table No. 7, appearing on page 25 of the same publication be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—*Estimated number of instructional staff members in public elementary and secondary schools, 1960–61*

State	Classroom teachers						Total classroom teachers	Principals and supervisors	Other instructional staff	Total
	Elementary school			Secondary school						
	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women	Total				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
50 States and the District of Columbia	125,477	731,876	857,353	285,632	265,977	551,609	1,408,962	84,546	32,571	1,526,079
Alabama	[1] 900	[1] 14,775	[1] 15,675	[1] 4,790	[1] 7,030	[1] 11,820	[1] 27,495	[1] 1,205	----------	[1] 28,700
Alaska	[1] 340	[1] 1,010	[1] 1,350	[1] 230	[1] 245	[1] 475	[1] 1,825	[1] 135	----------	[1] 1,960
Arizona	2,281	6,840	9,121	1,903	1,074	3,067	12,188	548	130	12,866
Arkansas	571	7,446	8,017	2,808	3,670	6,478	14,495	555	25	15,075
California	15,500	59,000	74,500	29,250	15,500	44,750	119,250	8,500	4,150	131,900
Colorado	2,800	6,500	9,300	3,300	3,800	7,100	16,400	1,400	200	18,000
Connecticut	2,025	9,725	11,750	4,300	3,300	7,600	19,350	1,200	1,225	21,775
Delaware	257	1,720	1,977	975	736	1,711	3,688	190	----------	3,878
Florida	2,204	19,167	21,371	8,199	8,563	16,762	38,133	1,891	1,808	41,832
Georgia	1,642	19,690	21,332	5,175	6,988	12,163	33,495	1,075	425	34,995
Hawaii	160	2,740	2,900	850	1,150	2,000	4,900	290	310	5,500
Idaho	500	3,000	3,500	1,500	1,300	2,800	6,300	375	----------	6,675
Illinois	10,130	38,978	49,108	11,937	11,069	23,006	72,114	3,887	2,119	78,120
Indiana	4,360	17,441	21,801	8,720	5,814	14,534	36,335	1,990	375	38,700
Iowa	900	14,003	14,903	6,843	4,518	11,361	26,264	1,839	221	28,324
Kansas	1,784	10,956	12,740	4,521	3,552	8,073	20,813	2,190	700	23,703
Kentucky	1,950	13,780	15,730	3,470	4,299	7,769	23,499	1,286	425	25,210
Louisiana	1,722	14,234	15,956	4,551	6,091	10,642	26,598	1,750	105	28,453
Maine	705	4,904	5,609	1,386	1,180	2,566	8,175	180	80	8,435
Maryland	1,280	11,025	12,305	5,518	5,697	11,215	23,520	1,540	170	25,230
Massachusetts	2,700	17,840	20,540	8,230	6,700	14,930	35,470	2,680	520	38,670
Michigan	[1] 5,500	[1] 32,000	[1] 37,500	[1] 16,500	[1] 10,576	[1] 27,076	64,576	3,000	2,000	69,576
Minnesota	3,080	12,320	15,400	6,300	7,050	13,350	28,750	1,400	650	30,800
Mississippi	650	9,969	10,619	3,175	4,206	7,381	18,000	1,200	----------	19,200
Missouri	2,850	18,430	21,280	5,020	4,720	9,740	31,020	1,760	----------	32,780
Montana	[1] 750	[1] 3,729	4,479	[1] 1,520	[1] 880	2,400	6,879	600	40	7,519
Nebraska	445	9,150	9,595	2,360	2,080	4,440	14,035	550	150	14,735
Nevada	286	1,400	1,686	620	413	1,033	2,719	190	75	2,984
New Hampshire	330	2,219	2,549	904	767	1,671	4,220	210	148	4,578
New Jersey	7,100	21,180	28,280	9,035	9,035	18,070	46,350	2,200	600	49,150
New Mexico	831	4,200	5,031	2,230	1,690	3,920	8,951	595	111	9,657
New York	7,300	58,800	66,100	28,100	25,900	54,000	120,100	7,700	4,800	132,600
North Carolina	3,411	23,500	26,911	4,330	6,217	10,547	37,458	2,149	473	40,080
North Dakota	500	4,000	4,500	1,280	850	2,130	6,630	220	150	7,000
Ohio	[1] 6,650	[1] 36,300	[1] 42,350	[1] 18,900	[1] 14,325	[1] 33,225	[1] 75,575	[1] 4,996	----------	80,571
Oklahoma	2,500	9,220	11,720	4,200	4,770	8,970	20,690	1,235	75	22,000
Oregon	3,780	7,337	11,117	2,585	2,031	4,616	15,733	1,028	767	17,528
Pennsylvania	4,844	33,511	38,355	18,512	17,786	36,298	74,653	4,212	4,525	83,390
Rhode Island	[1] 310	[1] 2,434	[1] 2,744	[1] 1,380	1,355	[1] 2,735	[1] 5,479	389	[1] 172	6,040
South Carolina	785	11,800	12,585	2,840	5,465	8,305	20,890	600	105	21,595
South Dakota	500	5,300	5,800	1,020	800	2,420	8,280	175	40	8,495
Tennessee	2,158	17,723	19,881	2,935	4,565	7,500	27,381	2,150	----------	29,531
Texas	7,630	47,300	54,930	11,760	14,720	26,480	81,410	4,740	1,900	88,050
Utah	900	3,600	4,500	2,480	1,220	3,700	8,200	580	390	9,170
Vermont	170	1,886	2,056	535	475	1,010	3,066	95	200	3,361
Virginia	1,100	18,200	19,300	4,400	7,400	11,800	31,100	2,600	----------	33,700
Washington	2,410	11,900	14,310	4,400	5,390	9,790	24,100	1,400	1,750	27,250
West Virginia	970	8,260	9,230	2,530	3,660	6,190	15,420	1,825	180	17,425
Wisconsin	3,000	16,900	19,900	5,275	3,775	9,050	28,950	1,550	----------	30,500
Wyoming	416	2,091	2,507	750	408	1,158	3,665	220	103	3,988
District of Columbia	150	2,443	2,593	610	1,172	1,782	4,375	271	179	4,825

[1] Estimated by NEA Research Division.

TABLE 7.—*Estimated number of public elementary and secondary school instructional staff leaving public school employment, 1959–60 and 1960–61*

State	1959–60 [1]					1960–61 [1]				
	Instructional staff leaving positions [2]		Those leaving for old-age or disability retirement			Instructional staff leaving positions [2]		Those leaving for old-age or disability retirement		
	Number	Percent of total instructional staff	Number	Percent of total instructional staff	Percent of total leaving positions	Number	Percent of total instructional staff	Number	Percent of total instructional staff	Percent of total leaving positions
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
50 States and District of Columbia (estimated) [4]	124,520	8.5				126,665	8.3			
Total of those reporting	[5] 119,535	[5] 8.5	[5] 18,622	[5] 1.3	[5] 15.6	[6] 119,297	[6] 8.3	[7] 19,341	[7] 1.4	[7] 16.3
Alabama [8]										
Alaska [8]										
Arizona	1,200	10.2	110	.9	9.2	1,375	10.7	125	1.0	9.1
Arkansas	1,416	9.4	220	1.5	15.5	1,384	9.2	224	1.5	16.2
California	9,050	7.4	2,050	1.7	22.7	9,300	7.1	2,150	1.6	23.1
Colorado	1,900	11.1	200	1.2	10.5	2,100	11.7	300	1.7	14.3
Connecticut	1,904	9.0	253	1.2	13.3	1,900	8.7	260	1.2	13.7
Delaware	475	13.1	[9]			495	12.8	[9]		
Florida	3,839	9.9	440	1.1	11.5	4,100	9.8	470	1.1	11.5
Georgia	5,797	17.1	428	1.3	7.4	5,500	15.7	500	1.4	9.1
Hawaii	788	15.0	83	1.6	10.5	800	14.5	80	1.5	10.0
Idaho	1,081	17.2	93	1.5	8.6	1,100	16.8	100	1.5	9.1
Illinois	2,975	3.9	1,254	1.7	42.2	3,128	4.0	1,322	1.7	42.3
Indiana	2,500	6.7	700	1.9	28.0	2,500	6.5	650	1.7	26.0
Iowa [8]										
Kansas [8]	1,920	8.3	172	.7	9.0	1,940	8.2	175	.7	9.0
Kentucky	2,073	8.5	259	1.1	12.5	2,000	7.9	300	1.2	15.0
Louisiana	1,708	6.3	183	.7	10.7	1,750	6.2	195	.7	11.1
Maine	800	9.7	200	2.4	25.0	830	9.8	210	2.5	25.3
Maryland	3,480	14.7	220	.9	6.3	[9]				
Massachusetts	3,001	8.0	531	1.4	17.7	3,150	8.1	530	1.4	16.8
Michigan	6,969	10.7	975	1.5	14.0	7,232	10.4	1,012	1.5	14.0
Minnesota	3,200	10.8	250	.8	7.8	3,300	10.7	275	.9	8.3
Mississippi	1,387	7.4	202	1.1	14.6	1,180	6.0	200	1.0	17.4
Missouri	4,850	15.2	345	1.1	7.1	4,859	14.8	345	1.1	7.1
Montana	1,000	13.5	84	1.1	8.4	1,000	13.3	90	1.2	9.0
Nebraska	2,175	15.1	150	1.0	6.9	2,100	14.3	150	1.0	7.1
Nevada	507	18.4	20	.7	3.9	520	17.4	25	.8	4.8
New Hampshire	500	11.4	50	1.1	10.0	525	11.5	60	1.3	11.4
New Jersey	4,905	10.5	869	1.9	17.7	5,000	10.2	860	1.7	17.2
New Mexico	950	10.5	120	1.3	12.6	980	10.1	125	1.3	12.8
New York	7,300	5.7	2,200	1.7	30.1	7,500	5.7	2,250	1.7	30.0
North Carolina	2,325	5.9	170	.4	7.3	2,350	5.9	180	.4	7.7
North Dakota	275	9.9	35	.5	12.7	340	4.9	40	.6	11.8
Ohio	7,226	9.5	867	1.1	12.0	7,490	9.3	940	1.2	12.6
Oklahoma	1,979	9.2	384	1.8	19.4	1,905	8.7	405	1.8	21.3
Oregon	1,040	6.0	210	1.2	20.2	1,052	6.0	213	1.2	20.2
Pennsylvania	4,633	5.7	1,078	1.3	23.3	4,720	5.7	1,100	1.3	23.3
Rhode Island [8]										
South Carolina	901	4.3	280	1.3	31.1	1,881	8.7	375	1.7	19.9
South Dakota	1,375	16.5	75	.9	5.5	1,350	15.9	75	.9	5.6
Tennessee	2,800	9.7	280	1.0	10.0	2,850	9.7	300	1.0	10.5
Texas	4,786	5.6	1,102	1.3	23.0	4,898	5.6	1,150	1.3	23.5
Utah	855	9.6	119	1.3	13.9	905	9.9	127	1.4	14.0
Vermont	384	11.7	36	1.1	9.4	375	11.2	40	1.2	10.7
Virginia	4,124	12.6	309	.9	7.5	4,300	12.8	325	1.0	7.6
Washington	2,500	9.5	400	1.5	16.0	2,550	9.4	440	1.6	17.3
West Virginia	1,450	8.4	245	1.4	16.9	1,500	8.6	250	1.4	16.7
Wisconsin	2,500	8.4	210	.7	8.4	2,550	8.4	230	.8	9.0
Wyoming	470	12.0	53	1.4	11.3	510	12.8	60	1.5	11.8
District of Columbia	262	5.7	108	2.3	41.2	262	5.4	108	2.2	41.2

[1] Between the beginning of the school year in September 1959 and the beginning of the school year in September 1960.
[2] Includes only those members of the instructional staff who drop out of public elementary and secondary school employment in the various States. Does not include those shifting positions within each State.
[3] Between the beginning of the school year in September 1960 and the beginning of the school year in September 1961.
[4] These estimated totals are obtained by applying to all States the ratios found in those reporting. In using these estimated totals, it should be kept in mind that they include those who move to other States and continue in public elementary and secondary school employment.
[5] Total for 46 States and District of Columbia.
[6] Total for 45 States and District of Columbia.
[7] Total for 44 States and District of Columbia.
[8] Data not available.
[9] Partially estimated.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the argument is made that higher salaries will bring more people into the teaching profession. I do not uphold the salaries that are paid in some of our States. I think they are too low. However, I think it is up to the States to take care of that matter. It is not up to the Federal Government. As I said earlier, if it is proper for the Federal Government to increase the pay of teachers at the local level, it is also proper for the Government to take care of policemen, firemen, tax collectors, city auditors, mayors, or any other person occupying similar positions in local communities.

I say the local communities have taken care of this situation and have done a good job of it through the years, when we consider the high rate of Federal taxation with which they have been burdened.

Again, Mr. President, I do not condone the salaries that are paid in some of our States. Table No. 31 printed at page 41 of the National Education Association's research report, 1961–R 4, gives some comparisons of the average annual earnings of teachers and certain other groups, from 1929 forward. The table shows that the average estimated salary for teachers in 1960 was $5,236. Persons working for wages and salary had an average salary, in 1960, of $4,374. Of course I will admit that not all of these people are college graduates. At the same time one would be surprised to see how many college graduates work for wages and are not in professions. Employees in manufacturing had an average salary in 1960 of $5,359. Civilian employees in the Federal Government had an average salary in 1959 of $5,682. Those are the latest figures available. It is true that teachers on the average are at the low end of the totem pole, but it is not true to say that the difference is astronomical as between teachers and other persons. It is not something that could not be adjusted if the localities took it into their minds to do it.

Pennsylvania, for example, in 1960, had an average teacher's salary of

$5,409, which represents a 96 percent increase in 10 years. If we look at the figures for New York, which is the acknowledged leader in education in this country, we find that it pays $6,400, which represents an increase of 51 percent in the last 10 years.

Mr. President, one thing which my friends on the other side of the aisle do not seem to know or understand is that salary is not the motivation of most people when they seek employment. If that were true, if the accumulation of material wealth were the only objective, we would not have people going into the ministry; we would not have them going into the teaching profession, or into the military. Everyone would be aiming at the highest paid jobs. I have found this to be true all my life. Salary is not the original motivation of a man or woman who seeks employment. People believe they can do a job in life in a particular field. I might suggest that there are many dedicated politicians in this country—not necessarily at our level—who could certainly do much better if they were to practice law or medicine or work as laborers, or whatever it was they did before they got into politics at the county or State level.

My friend the Senator from Oregon keeps saying that there are no controls in the bill. One of the requirements in the bill is that the local effort must remain at the level of the previous year. That is a control. If they do that, local communities will not be able to reduce taxes at the local level. Therefore, the bill cannot be offered to the local people as a tax reduction idea. They must keep the level up. In fact, if we read the bill closely we find that they must increase it as the national average increases.

Again we find controls in the bill. What the bill will do will be to allow the States who have not met their educational requirements in the past to continue to dog it, to use an old Army phrase, to not do the job, and have the other States do as they have done for the last 30 years, to pay for those States' deficiencies. The time is long past when we should encourage those States to keep providing inferior education and inferior operation in this field in those States because they refuse to operate schools at the proper level.

As I said at the outset, the provision to pay teachers' salaries represents the most dangerous part of the bill. It offers control, whether it be written into the bill or not, because in the future there can come a time when this provision can be used as a weapon of power. I know that the distinguished Senator who now occupies the chair [Mr. METCALF] discussed this matter with me when he appeared before the committee. He recognized, as I recognize, that there is control in the bill. I will read from the record.

Senator GOLDWATER. There are controls in these bills.

Senator METCALF. I agree there are controls.

Senator GOLDWATER. There have to be. I think you have to agree with that.

Senator METCALF. I agree. I think we are in accord.

I know that my good friend from Oregon believes there are no controls. There is a beautiful paragraph in the bill which says that. However, I enumerated last night a number of controls which say to the States to do that or to do this or to do the other, and that the Commissioner is the final judge.

Of course, an appeal can be taken to the courts, but there are controls in the bill. It is time that we stop trying to fool the public about that. I do not believe we can write a bill in which there are no controls.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, it has been said many times that the only way we can judge the future is by studying the past. For many years the Federal Government has been paying a portion of the salary of the Smith-Hughes instructors. There are many controls over the Smith-Hughes teachers. The Federal Government determines how many classes a teacher must handle, the size of the classes, the size of the class room; and even, in one instance, the Federal Government dictated the type of flooring that should be in that portion of the school where the Smith-Hughes program was carried on.

We have this very real problem. Many superintendents of schools will say that when they are laboring with the difficult problem of crowded schools and heavy workloads for teachers, they cannot turn to the Smith-Hughes teachers and ask them to take an extra class; that that load must be placed on other teachers because of Federal controls. Most of those controls were never written into the statute, but they are added to year after year, and the Federal Government supplies the money.

I think the tragedy of this entire legislation is that it marks the beginning of the end of the control of education by the parents of the Nation; and if the parents are not interested in the children, who on earth can be? A few years from now, if the bill as reported by the committee shall pass, our schools will be run by a bureau elected by no one and responsible to no one and will be far beyond the reach of the parents and the other fine citizens in the communities who furnish the leadership to run good schools.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his comment. He has stated what will inevitably happen. When the Federal Government gives money, the Federal Government must have a control.

We have heard references to Public Law 874 and Public Law 815. They are not Federal aid to education programs; they are, in effect, payments for contracts. They pay for the teaching after the teaching has been done. They recognize that where the Federal Government has caused an impact and has dislocated the tax structure of a community, the Federal Government has a responsibility to pay money in lieu of taxes. Of course, the Federal Government cannot be taxed; if it could, those two public laws would not be necessary. We who live in the West experience that situation in connection with the national parks and the large defense establishments, where normally operating school districts are suddenly confronted with the problem of educating thousands of additional students but have no way to tax the factory or the installation which has caused the impact.

I have used the illustration of the Howard Hughes plant which was built in Tucson. There the school district was in good shape. All of a sudden the influx of thousands of new children caused a problem for the school district, which it has not been able to solve, even under Public Law 875 and Public Law 815. It has been able to get some funds, but not enough. The Federal Government recognizes that it ought to pay some of the expense because it has placed a burden upon the facilities of the local taxpayers. But that is not Federal aid to education.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his observation.

If 90 percent of the allotments under S. 1021 were used for the increase of salaries of teachers throughout the country, there would still be some very low-paid teachers. This estimate was before adjustments were made, but it will be found to be pretty accurate. So if the condition is to be corrected through the use of Federal money, I do not know why the proponents of the bill really do not go whole hog and increase the salaries of teachers to the level where they honestly feel they should be.

Simply raising the salaries of teachers in Mississippi to $4,200 a year will not bring those salaries up to an astronomical level. If the salaries of teachers in Alabama are raised to $4,538 a year, certainly that will not bring them up to the level which one sitting in the Senate would believe to be fair.

While it sounds good, fine, and humane to say that salaries will be raised, I suggest we do a proper job of it, not merely a halfway job. Let us quit kidding the teachers to believe they will make a lot more money under the Federal program. They will not. If we would let the States continue as they have, we would find that salaries would be increased in the future as they have been in the past. In the last 30 years there has been an increase of 114 percent in the salaries of teachers all across the country. In some States the increase has gone as high as 240 percent. In another State there has been an increase of 227 percent. The salaries of teachers are adjusting themselves. I maintain there is no need for the Federal Government to move into this particular part of education.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to add.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield back my time. Before doing so, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD certain excerpts from the hearings which relate to the Thorndike-Hagen

study on teachers. The complete study appears in the hearing record.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT FROM THORNDIKE-HAGEN STUDY

In the median income, the researchers report the classroom teachers fell well below all the other groups. Those who left teaching surpassed them by more than 25 percent. At the upper end of the range, the discrepancy becomes even more marked. Only one teacher in 247 reported a monthly income of $800, while 20 percent of the group of ex-teachers reported incomes of this size.

Those men who had gotten into administrative work in the schools fared somewhat better. Their median income was nearly the same as that of the men who had left teaching, but they, too, showed a deficiency in top-income jobs.

When college teachers are compared with ex-college teachers, the financial disparity is equally marked. Those who had left college teaching reported incomes averaging 25 percent higher than those who stayed on as college teachers.

It is true in this case also that the difference is most marked at the upper end of the scale.

Since these are perhaps the most academic and intellectual tests in our battery, Thorndike and Hagen note it appears that those who are academically more capable and talented tend to drop out of teaching, and that those who remained as classroom teachers in the elementary and secondary schools were the least capable members of the original group.

TABLE 3.—*Monthly income reported by different occupational groups*

Monthly income	Classroom teachers	Administrators	Ex-classroom teachers	College teachers	Ex-college teachers
$1,500 and over			4	1	4
$1,000 to $1,495		5	10	2	2
$900 to $995		0	3	1	4
$800 to $895	1	7	14	5	4
$700 to $795	2	13	16	10	4
$600 to $695	21	39	34	20	4
$500 to $595	76	34	35	25	0
$400 to $495	103	19	22	9	0
$300 to $395	35	4	12	4	2
Under $300	9	2	3	0	1
Not reported	3	3	19	2	4
Median	$475	$605	$610	$600	$835

INCOME

Table 3 provides information on income for the members of the different subgroups as reported in 1959. A few individuals in each group failed to report their income, and the numbers of these are indicated in the table. In those cases in which teachers received only 9 or 10 monthly pay checks, their pay was prorated over the 12-month period. Approximate median incomes are shown at the bottom of the table.

In median income, the classroom teachers fell well below all the other groups. Those who had left teaching surpassed them by more than 25 percent. At the upper end of the range, the discrepancy becomes even more marked. Only one teacher in 247 reported a monthly income of $800, while 20 percent of the group of ex-teachers reported incomes of this size. Those men who had gotten into administrative work in the schools fared somewhat better. Their median income was nearly the same as that of the men who had left teaching, but they too showed a deficiency in top-income jobs.

When college teachers are compared with ex-college teachers, the financial disparity is equally marked. Those who had left college teaching reported incomes averaging 25 percent higher than those who stayed on as college teachers. It is true in this case also that the difference is most marked at the upper end of the scale.

SUMMARY

A study was made of 250 classroom teachers, 126 school administrators, 82 college teachers, 172 ex-schoolteachers and 28 ex-college teachers, all of whom had taken a common battery of aptitude tests in the Air Force in 1943. It was found that those who left public school teaching had been significantly superior to those who were still classroom teachers on tests of reading comprehension, arithmetic reasoning, and mathematics. There was a suggestion of similar differences between those who had left and those who had remained in college teaching. The higher ability of the nonteachers was paralleled by higher income.

The primary dissatisfaction of the teacher group was with pay. Other focal points of concern were inadequate status, duties other than teaching, and lack of interest by pupils. The general pattern of concerns and satisfactions was much the same for the different teacher groups, and was not related to intellectual ability as indicated by 1943 test results.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do both Senators yield back the time under their control?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Not at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators request that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield back all except 3 minutes of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MORSE. I yield back all my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arizona has 3 minutes remaining under his control.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time available on the amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. [Putting the question.]

The "noes" seem to have it, the "noes" have it, and the amendment is rejected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Arizona ready with his next amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I regret that I am not, Mr. President; I am waiting for a study which I hoped would be ready at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I wonder if the majority leader could give us some indication as to what the pending business is and what the plans are for today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that there are several amendments to be offered, one by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], another one by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], another one by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and I believe one by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE]. That is my understanding as to the amendments to be considered for the rest of the day.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask that my amendments be submitted to the Senate for consideration and read at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 3, lines 1 through 12, to restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

On page 3, beginning on line 17 through line 24 on page 4, to restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

On page 5, beginning in line 1, through "and (iii)" in line 4, to delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "and".

On page 5, lines 22 and 23, to restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

On page 6, lines 7 and 8, to restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

On page 6, lines 12 through 18, to restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

On page 8, lines 12 through 14, to restore the matter proposed to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

On page 9, lines 3 through 9, to delete the matter proposed to be inserted by the committee amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished acting minority leader, the author of the amendment, and other Senators, I wish to propound a unanimous consent request that an hour be allotted for consideration of the Lausche amendment, with 45 minutes allocated to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and 15 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment, if adopted, will restore the formula of making the monetary distribution to the States in conformity with the formula recommended by the President in his original bill. In the recommendation of the President the amount that he suggested for the first year of operation was in the neighborhood of about $650 million.

One of the factors embodied in the formula determining what amounts would go to the different States dealt with the method of making the count of pupils who are to be considered. The President recommended that only those pupils between the ages of 5 and 17 attending the public schools be counted. He impliedly, though not expressly, indicated that the pupils attending parochial schools should not be included in the count.

I suppose we ought to ponder for a moment, and ask, Why did the President suggest that only the public school pupils and not the parochial school pupils be counted?

Admittedly, the bill before us is a bill to authorize the collection of money from all citizens of the country—for the money to be brought to Washington and then sent back to the States—for the purpose of aiding in the financial problems of operating and building the public schools. Aid to public schools is the purpose of the bill. Even though there was a desire to give aid to the parochial schools directly, under the Constitution it cannot be done.

On this last statement there may be some disagreement, but in my opinion, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, direct aid to parochial schools cannot be given under the present provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

In my opinion, the President was correct from a legal standpoint and otherwise in declaring impliedly that since the bill contemplates supplying money for the operation of public schools only the public school pupils ought to be counted.

The committee decided to cast aside the recommendation of the President and decided to amend his formula by stating that in making the count not only the pupils of the public schools but also those of the parochial schools should be counted.

Let us look to see what is the situation throughout the country with respect to attendance in the various schools. In the country 13½ percent of the children are attending parochial schools, according to an HEW report for 1957–58, the latest available. This means 86½ percent of the children are attending the public schools. The proponents of the amendment state that for the allocation of Federal aid the 13½ percent of the children who will receive no benefit from the allocation ought to be counted for the distribution to the various States of the country.

Ohio has 16 percent of its children in parochial schools. Rhode Island has 27 percent. New York has 23 percent. Pennsylvania has 22 percent. Those are the States with high percentages. There are other States with low percentages. North Carolina has 1.1 percent. South Carolina has 2.1 percent. Tennessee has 3.6 percent. Virginia has 5.5 percent. West Virginia has 3.1 percent. Alaska has 4.4 percent.

I point out those figures to establish the marked disparity which exists among the several States in regard to the proportion of children attending parochial schools as distinguished from those attending public schools.

One might ask, What is the reason for the proposed change in the count, asking that there be covered not only the children attending public schools, but also the children attending parochial schools? Frankly, I cannot see any legitimate rational, logical explanation for the action taken by the committee.

Why, in a public school aid bill, has the committee resolved there should be counted the pupils attending the parochial schools?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I commend the Senator for offering the amendment. Ordinarily, one might say there is always room for a difference of opinion—and there probably is now—but it seems to me this is an amendment the reason for which is almost irrefutable.

I should like to ask the Senator a question. It is my understanding that it has been suggested, either by the leadership of the Congress or by the administration, that if this Federal aid-to-education bill is enacted without any provision for pupils in nonpublic schools of all kinds, there may be subsequently passed legislation to take care of such pupils either with loans or in some other way. If that be the case, though now we are asked to count pupils in parochial and nonpublic schools in determining allocations to the States although these pupils would receive no benefit if subsequent legislation should be passed in their favor, then those pupils would be counted twice, would they not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not know about any proposal to provide either direct or indirect aid to the parochial schools. Without in any way committing myself to the merits of the proposal, if that is done it will be thoroughly obvious the children will be counted twice.

Mr. COTTON. I was not attempting to speak for anybody, but it has been rumored, it has been in the press, and it is to a certain extent an open secret that if the bill before us is enacted there will come to us later a bill to provide some way of doing something for the children of parochial schools, either under the National Defense Education Act, through scholarships, or by some other method. That is purely rumor. The fact remains that if such a thing were done, and if this bill which includes a count of the entire school population is passed, an injustice will be taking place today in counting the pupils when they derive no benefit and, by the attempt to readjust, the pupils would be counted twice; is that not correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is thoroughly apparent the pupils would be counted twice.

Mr. COTTON. If the amendment of the Senator is agreed to—I commend the Senator, and I support his amendment—so that the allocation will take into consideration only pupils in the public schools, because the public schools are the schools to benefit, is the Senator's amendment so drafted that it will reduce the full amount proportionately, because of the pupils in nonpublic schools who will not be taken into consideration?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes, it is so drafted. The President's recommendation, covering his formula, was for approximately $650 million for the first year. When the formula of the President was rejected and that of the committee substituted, the money required increased to about $850 million. I have changed the method of making the count to conform with the President's recommendation and have brought down the recommended amount from $850 million to the original approximately $650 million.

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator will permit me to make one more observation, I think his amendment is vitally necessary to the bill. There is a feeling which exists in this country that if the

bill is passed in the form the committee reported it, based upon the entire school age population with a certain segment of the children deriving no benefit, the bill will result in allocations to the States being out of focus, and will rise up to haunt us.

It would serve to muddy the waters and promote more religious controversy and ill feeling. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio is, in my opinion, the fairest and most necessary amendment that has been offered to the bill. I congratulate him. I cannot see any reason why any Senator would vote against the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If there is fairness in the proposal I have made, it results from the fact that the proposal is logical. When aid is given to public schools, only the children in the public schools should be counted and not those in the parochial schools. If in a subsequent bill it is intended to give aid to parochial schools, only the children of the parochial schools ought to be counted and not those in the public schools. The fallacy and the weakness of the committee recommendation is shown in the fact that for 3 days the committee has been arguing that the bill is undoubtedly a public school aid bill. We have guarded against bringing the needs of parochial schools into the question. We have not wanted the subject of religion to be injected into it. For 3 days I have listened to that argument. But while the argument is being made, we have before us the proposal that in making the count provided in the bill, we should not only count the pupils in public schools but also those attending the schools of the Lutheran, the Catholic, the Episcopalian, and other churches.

Mr. COTTON. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio would restore the bill to what the President of the United States asked for, would it not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Exactly. My amendment is drawn in conformity with the recommendation of the President.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have a schedule showing the allotment of money under his amendment among the different States?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have a schedule, which appears on page 344 of the hearings. It is the schedule that was submitted to the committee covering the calculations made under the President's recommendation. The schedule shows that under the President's bill the State of Pennsylvania would receive $26 million and pay $46 million. It would pay out $19 million more than it would receive.

I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania how the recommendation of the committee changed those figures?

Mr. CLARK. It substantially increased the payment of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Page 4 of the committee report will show that point.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is raised $15 million, I believe.

Mr. CLARK. The correct figure under the committee bill for Pennsylvania is $44,026,417.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the committee bill, Pennsylvania would receive $26 million and pay in $46 million, I believe.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The State of Pennsylvania would pay $19 million more than it would receive. Under the recommendation of the committee it would receive $15 million more than it would pay in.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Would not the table entitled "Estimated Tax Payments" be the same under either amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amount would go up.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from Ohio is speaking in terms of estimated tax payments—and the Senator has referred to the table on page 344 of the hearings—the estimated tax payments, if the figure means anything—and I contend it means nothing—would be the same under the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as it would under the committee amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. CLARK. Why not?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under my amendment the State would pay in $46 million——

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Under the committee proposal it would pay $59 million.

Mr. CLARK. I wonder where the difference arises.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The difference results because costs are increased through the additional $200 million authorization required under the committee bill above what would be required under the President's recommendation.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator is saying is that because the bill provides more money, the estimated tax payment for every State would be increased proportionately over what it would be under the committee bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I believe such a result is axiomatic.

Mr. CLARK. My objection to using the so-called estimated tax payments, which I have made several times during the course of the debate, is that they are really meaningless because it is not the State that makes the payments. It is the people within the State who make the payments. It is also the people within the State who make the tax payments in accordance with the Federal tax system, which means that there is a heavy payment by corporations, a heavy payment by relatively wealthy individuals, and somewhat less heavy payments out of income by the poorer families in the country.

I do not think we get anywhere when we start to talk about how much a State would pay out and how much a State would receive. This is a national program. I realize that my friend has the right to make the argument which he has made. I will not try to shut him up. However, I suggest that, as my friend the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made an elaborate argument last night along the same lines that my friend from Ohio is stating now, I do not think it makes any sense.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Pennsylvania obviously is concerned about how much the State of Pennsylvania will pay in and how much it will receive back. Until this time I had not raised such a question at all. The Senator from Pennsylvania started to ask me how much Pennsylvania would receive back and how much it would pay in. I therefore suggest to the Senator from Pennsylvania that deep in his mind, he is considering that fact, while superficially he is making the argument that we should reject as a ground for the bill the measure of how much is paid in and how much is returned to a State.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I yield to no man in my admiration for the Senator from Ohio as a great political leader. I did not know until this minute that he was also an accomplished psychiatrist, able to read my subconscious mind as well as my conscious mind. I assure him that I shall be happy to lie down on a couch in front of him someday to see where we get.

I reiterate that, while I do not know what is in my subconscious mind, I do know what is in my conscious mind. And my conscious mind is deeply interested in the contribution that Pennsylvania will receive under the proposed legislation, and is not a bit interested in a so-called table, the validity of which I deny, showing how much would go out of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The question is a national question, involving national tax policy. I know that my friend from Ohio disagrees, but I also know—and I can tell by the smile on his fine face—that he takes my comments in good part.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield first to the Senator from Delaware and then I shall yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. First, with reference to the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania, I think his subconscious mind is floating up to where we can all read it without his lying on a couch.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The deeds of the Senator from Pennsylvania in a measure belie his words.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. As the Senator pointed out, he was very much interested in how much Pennsylvania would receive. I do not quite see how he can reconcile his interest in what Pennsylvania would get out of the proposed legislation and yet express such a complete lack of concern as to where the money would come from to pay the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may enlighten the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. I point out that, in the figures showing the breakdown of the amounts paid to the various States, the amount of the employment tax has been deducted from that computation. It should not be included, because the employment tax goes into a trust fund and should not be counted in the mathematical computation.

By the same token, corporate taxes are eliminated from the computation, because corporate taxes are paid at central points but earned all over the country. The Senator from Pennsylvania may not be interested in the tax burden on the citizens of Pennsylvania, but I am interested in the tax burden being borne by the people of Delaware, particularly when I find that the State of Delaware is being taxed toward the support of the educational system of Pennsylvania; then I am very much interested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Pennsylvania will get $15 million more under the committee recommendation. I wonder whether that might not have some influence on him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may reply?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Ohio apparently does not want me to answer him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may we have the time charged to the proponents?

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that further colloquy between the Senator from Ohio and myself be charged against the time of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am sorry, but I have only 15 minutes remaining. I have been very generous already. I have yielded 45 minutes so far.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the Senator from Pennsylvania beats me, he will have to beat me on Morse's time, not on Lausche's time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK. We will beat the Senator soundly; much to my regret, however.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is because some minds are impervious to intellectual reasoning. However, no one will ever convince me that in allocating money to public schools it is right and just to count the number of students who are attending Episcopalian, Lutheran, and Catholic schools.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, there has been so much discussion of psychiatric interpretations that I would like to put in the RECORD what I understand is the plan which is proposed for the cutting up of the Federal money pie. In other words, it is proposed to cut a slice of the pie for each child in a State regardless of whether the child attends public school or parochial school or private school, and the only difference is that it does not permit the child who goes to the parochial or private school to eat his slice of the pie. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct. Then salt is being rubbed into the wound of those children. You say to them, "We will count you in getting the money for the State, but we will not allow you to use any part of it."

Mr. MORSE. That sounds like a rather salty pie.

Mr. HOLLAND. The slice of pie that is cut for the child attending a private or parochial school is not permitted to go to that child's table, but only to the table of the child that goes to a public school. Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, to add insult to injury, these do-gooder friends of ours who sponsor the bill say, "We will make this right, because we are going to let the children who go to parochial school and to private school get a loan a little later with which to buy a piece of the pie, so they will not go hungry." Is that correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is correct. When that is done, those children are counted twice. They will be counted for the purpose of giving money to the public schools; then they will be counted again in the making of the loans to the private and parochial schools, which again is wrong.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have come to the Chamber late during this discussion because I was attending to other business. Do I understand the Senator's amendment would cut back the amount of money provided by $256 million to the original request and also eliminate the private school children from being counted in the total number of children used as a basis for the amount of money that would go to any one State? In Massachusetts more than 22 percent of the children attend private schools. That is why I am interested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Massachusetts has stated accurately the purpose of my amendment. It is, first, to reduce the amount to the figure recommended by the President. Second, it would prohibit the counting of children who go to parochial and private schools in the total number of children that allegedly but falsely are said to be going to the public schools.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is the argument which is made by the Senator from Ohio going to result in the Senator from Massachusetts casting his vote against the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will not change my position on the bill, but I intend to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Before the Senator from Massachusetts does that, may I point out that the State of Massachusetts under the committee's bill will get $14 million more than it will get under my recommendation, because in the committee formula the children who attend parochial and private schools are included. In my opinion that is not just.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Massachusetts puts in $2 for every dollar it gets back.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I did not know that. If that is so, Massachusetts is in a worse position than the State of Ohio.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. There is another clearly distinguishable line of thought running through this whole discussion. The Senator from Ohio made a valid point when he said that the Senator from Pennsylvania justifies the citizens of his State paying a large amount of money into the Federal Treasury and getting little back with a sweep of the arm and saying this is a national program. We have nationalized unemployment compensation. We are about to nationalize medical care. We now nationalize our schools. We have nationalized wages and hours. The Senate should be conscious of that fact. That is the very point that ought to beat this type of legislation. We should not nationalize our schools. We should not nationalize unemployment compensation. We should not nationalize wages and hours. We should not nationalize medicine.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It strikes me that the Senator from Ohio is engaged in a very noble effort, to eliminate the hastily prepared formula which was reported by the committee. The amendment would restore, as I understand it, the carefully worked out formula sent to us originally by President Kennedy. Am I correct?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct. Is there any difference of opinion between the proponents of the committee amendment in that regard?

Mr. KEATING. My question is whether the Lausche amendment would restore the formula originally sent to us by President Kennedy?

Mr. MORSE. That is my understanding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Then we are in agreement.

Mr. KEATING. Personally, I believe that the Cooper-Javits substitute formula represented the fairest division of funds among the States. However, in the face of its defeat, I certainly prefer the administration's formula as sent to us by the President over the Morse formula in S. 1021. I have had a great deal of mail saying "Please support President Kennedy's formula. Please support his bill." The bill that has been reported by the committee is not the bill sent to us by the President. It has been drastically changed. It is ironic that on the one hand the advocates of the bill point to the President's vigorous support of Federal aid to education and on the other hand they disregard the formula which was recommended by him and

sent to Congress, but ignored by the committee and now resurrected in the Lausche amendment. The advocates of the committee formula and the pork barrel approach in that formula, giving to the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare one-third of the additional aid of about $200 million, certainly present a position unacceptable to me.

Eight of the ten lowest income States receive a smaller percentage share of aid under the committee bill than under the President's plan. In other words, if the total appropriations had not been increased by nearly $200 million, these poorer States would have ended up actually with less assistance in dollars and cents than under the President's plan. The overall increase has the effect of lifting the payments to many States in the easily calculated dollar shares but reducing the less easily calculated percentage share. We are grateful to the Senator from Delaware for discussing the percentage shifts yesterday.

Mr. PRESIDENT. The defects of the present formula have been talked about, and I shall not discuss them any further, though clearly, for whatever reason, some States have benefited substantially from the change in formula.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Which are the States?

Mr. KEATING. They were stated by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] yesterday. He cited the additional amounts of money which would go to the various States as a result of the action taken by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I would ask him to fill in the record on that point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I placed those figures in the RECORD yesterday. I do not have all of them at my fingertips now. However, one State received an increased additional allotment of 90 percent. The great State which is represented by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] received an increase of 65 percent as a result of the additional allotment. By comparison, Delaware received an increase of 7 percent. I am not a member of the committee. [Laughter.]

The District of Columbia, which has no Representative in Congress, got a 4-percent increase of the additional $250 million pie.

Mr. KEATING. If I may summarize, of the additional $200 million, nearly one-third will go to the States represented by the Democratic members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall not get into a discussion on that point. I shall let the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] answer in his own time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I think that is an unfair argument. It reflects against the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], who is a member of the committee. I have heard no suggestion from him that this formula was offered because any of its benefits would flow to the States represented by members of the committee.

The fact is that this is the formula for which most Senators who are now Members of the Senate voted last year. It is the formula which was included in S. 8. There is nothing new about the formula. We did not hear it charged last year that any Senator was asking for the formula because he was a member of the committee and the formula might benefit his State.

I give my word of honor that I did not have the slightest idea what the effect of the formula would be on my State. It turns out that it will not be very much. It is not a question of what the effect will be on any State, whether the State is represented by a member of the committee or not. The question is: Is this a fair formula? I shall discuss that question later when I reply to the Senator from Ohio. However, I will file my caveat and say that I simply do not believe Senators really mean to leave the record in a position to reflect that their colleagues in the Senate, simply because they are members of the committee, sat down and tried to figure out a formula which would be beneficial to their States, and therefore were in a position to vote for that formula. I say to the distinguished junior Senator from New York that that simply was not a part of our motivation at all. If it was, then we are dishonorable men; and I do not believe the Senator from New York wishes to leave the impression that we are dishonorable men.

Mr. KEATING. I do not present any implication that they are dishonorable, and I ask the Senator from Oregon to withdraw that description, because he leaves the implication that New York State benefits by the change in the formula. New York does not benefit by it. Moreover, although the senior Senator from New York is a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare—in fact, a very active and distinguished member—he and other Republican members of the Education Subcommittee voted against the committee formula and for the President's formula, now embodied in the Lausche amendment.

Mr. MORSE. All I am pointing out is that New York State is represented by a member of the committee; and if he had thought for a moment that there was any such motivation as the statement of the junior Senator from New York seems to imply, that the committee was acting as a result of a dishonorable motivation, I do not know of anyone who would have gone to work quicker in the committee than the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. It was not in any way a part of the motivation of any member of the committee. I rise only to defend the honor of the committee.

Mr. KEATING. The honor of the committee was not attacked. I was simply calling attention to the facts in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio as to which States would benefit under this plan. It may be a pure coincidence that the result is as the statistics show.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to repeat the story told in the law books concerning defendant X, who three times was charged with shooting the same man. At the first trial, he was acquitted. Following the second trial for shooting the same man, the defendant was again acquitted, on the ground that the shooting was accidental. So he hit the man a third time, saying that it was accidental. Finally, it was said, "It is funny that he happened accidentally to hit the same man three times in succession."

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator from Ohio yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Have the yeas and nays been ordered on this amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last year this subject was opened by me at the end of the consideration of the bill. Not enough was known about it, and I could not even get a yea-and-nay vote on the proposal last year.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 6 minutes remaining; the opposition has 15 minutes left.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like the Senate to know what my procedure will be. I shall yield 6 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for an extraneous matter. As a matter of courtesy, I think he is entitled to that much time. However, I can yield only 6 minutes because the debate on the amendment will require me to take the remainder of my 15 minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his uniform courtesy and unvarying consideration in yielding to me, especially at this time. I shall endeavor to take less than 6 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I now yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

PROSCRIPTION OF TRAVEL IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE FOR PURPOSES OF INCITING TO RIOT

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference, out of order, a bill to amend title XVIII, chapter 54, of the United States Code, making it a Federal criminal offense to travel in interstate commerce with the intent, first, to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or, second, to violate any law

of any State, territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1955) to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot, or committing other unlawful acts, introduced by Mr. STENNIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after chapter 53 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 54—INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TRAVEL IN FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSES

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate or foreign commerce with the intent (1) to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or (2) to violate any law of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. Nothing in this section shall be construed in anywise to limit the exercise of jurisdiction by any such State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession over any crime or offense committed therein or cognizable under the laws thereof."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the bill is introduced on behalf of myself, my colleagues, the distinguished senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the distinguished Senators from Alabama [Mr. HILL and Mr. SPARKMAN], the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The proposed Federal statute finds well-established precedent in the common law of States of the United States. Among others, I cite Perkins on Criminal Law, page 348, paragraph numbered 5, which reads as follows:

> Inciting to riot is the employment of words or other means intended and calculated to provoke a riot. Signs, actions and movements may be just as effective for this purpose as the use of inflammatory language. It is a common-law misdemeanor and if a riot results the inciter is guilty of the riot itself, even if not present when it occurs.

I refer, further, to the Pennsylvania case of *Commonwealth* v. *Frankfeld* (173 Atlantic 834), decided in 1934. In that case, the court said:

> While inciting to riot is not a statutory offense in this State, it is clearly an offense at common law, and has always been so recognized in Pennsylvania.

In another Pennsylvania case—*Commonwealth* v. *Apriceno* (198 Atlantic, 515 at 517), the court said:

> Inciting to riot, means such a course of conduct, by the use of words, signs, or language, or any other means by which one can be urged on to action, as would naturally lead or urge other men to engage in entering upon conduct which completed would make a riot. If any man or set of men should combine and arrange to so agitate the community to such a pitch that the natural and to be expected result of such agitation would be a riot, that would be inciting to riot, an offense at the common law.

In *Commonwealth* v. *Spartaco* (104 Pa. Super. Ct. 1, 7, 158 A. 623, 626), Judge Keller, speaking for the court, said:

> Inciting to riot, from the very sense of the language used, means such a course of conduct, by the use of words, signs or language, or any other means by which one can be urged on to action, as would naturally lead, or urge other men to engage in or enter upon conduct which, if completed, would make a riot. * * *

Mr. President, I refer to the common-law background and basis for a statute of this kind, in order to show that it is well established in American jurisprudence that in the absence of Federal common law on criminal offenses, a statute is necessary in order to cover such a matter as a Federal crime.

Mr. President, this statute is intended to cover all cases anywhere, in any area of the United States, of the type of the so-called freedom riders, or any other group, whose mission and purposes tend to incite riot.

As to the so-called freedom riders, it is well known that this trip originated far from the South, and had as its announced purpose a trip through several States where local statutes would be violated; but, even more grievously, the purpose was that the feelings and emotions would be aroused, and the habits and customs of the local people flouted. Pictures and news items were sent out, in advance, announcing the purpose of the trip. The fact that resentment was aroused is not unusual, but was to be expected; and in fact, this was the intent of the players and actors in this unhappy excursion. This journey was planned to make and to arouse trouble; and that is exactly what happened, as will always be the case in such instances.

Such missions and incidents can serve no good purpose, while they are certain to create many bad and unwholesome situations. Instead of being encouraged by groups, and cast into the political arena, to be made a political issue, they should be made a violation of the criminal statutes. Thus, the rights of all would be protected and determined in a judicial manner.

Another outstanding illustration of what can happen and what is already happening is the mission of Rockwell and his group, who openly call themselves the "hate group," saying they are anti-Jewish and anti-integration. Today, they are riding the highways of southern Louisiana, according to published reports, with inciting banners displayed on the outside of their bus. Most probably, they were or will be stopped by the authorities in Louisiana, and stripped of these banners. But with the same reason and logic of the freedom riders, the Rockwell group could well claim they are merely exercising their constitutional rights.

The net results of the Rockwell group, however, will be the same as those of the freedom riders—that is, stirring up strife and enmity which can lead only to lawlessness and the unlawful use of force. This statute is designed to curb just such incidents.

Another illustration occurred recently in New York City. Mayor Wagner very properly refused a permit to the same Rockwell, who then was wanting to defend and proclaim the Nazi point of view in New York City, where such statements were certain to be resented by all, particularly by the Jewish population of that city. Thus, his action there would have tended to incite to riot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield 2 minutes from the time under my control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to help the Senator from Mississippi in every way I can, but my time is very limited.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, were I to try to assemble members of any group and lead the group into other areas of the Nation for the purpose of arousing the feelings and natural resentment of the people there, then I could expect nothing less than trouble. And, in fact, to undertake such a venture would be courting trouble on my part. For instance, should a group of members of the Ku Klux Klan assemble in some populous city of the Nation, and parade there in their robes, in the vicinity of any particular group, there would be a natural resentment on the part of the offended group to the point of violence. Such resentment would be only natural, and should be prevented. It is the purpose of this statute to prevent such occurrences in interstate commerce.

An individual may have a naked right to parade in the street in front of the residence of a personal enemy; but when he does so and arouses the resentment of this enemy and his family, provoking them to violence, he has gone far beyond any right that he may have, and has converted it into a positive wrong. For the benefit of the public good, this individual would be and should be restrained. Such is the purpose of this statute which I introduce.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, let me ask what is on the banners displayed by the group which now is moving into Mississippi?

Mr. STENNIS. According to the morning radio, as well as other reports I have heard, the banners displayed on the outside of the bus of the Rockwell group were substantially as follows: "Hate Jewish Communism—Hate Integration."

Mr. LAUSCHE. Those banners were displayed on the truck or bus used by that group, were they?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes—this morning, moving into southern Louisiana.

The first group I mentioned went from Birmingham, through Mississippi, and into New Orleans, this morning. The report further stated that the police stopped the Rockwell group and forced the group to remove those banners from the bus.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a newspaper dispatch from New Orleans and an article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, May 23, 1961]

RIGHTS AND INCITEMENT TO RIOT: JOURNEY OF FREEDOM RIDERS IN ALABAMA VIEWED AS VIOLATION OF CONSTITUTION

(By David Lawrence)

There is a constitutional right to free speech, but—as the Supreme Court has said, "there is no right falsely to cry 'fire' in a crowded theater."

There is a constitutional right to demonstrate, but not a right to provoke or incite people to riot.

There is a constitutional right to assemble in a hall to espouse any cause, but not a right to organize a sit-in demonstration for the express purpose of using private property—against the wishes of the owners—to stir up passions and create incidents of disorder.

For decades now the American people have been denouncing lynch rule and mob action, and the cry has been for adherence to constitutional law and the orderly procedures of the courts.

But what happened in Alabama over the weekend reveals clearly that incitement to riot is the fundamental cause of the trouble. Mayor Robert Wagner of New York, not many months ago, rightly refused to give a permit to a rabble rouser who wanted to defend the Nazi point of view at meetings in the heart of the metropolis, where the bulk of the population was bound to resent such statements and perhaps be stimulated to mob action.

It was all very well for civic groups later to argue that a permit should have been granted by the mayor and that the champion of Nazi doctrines had a right to free speech, but the mayor knew what the consequences would be and acted wisely. Alabama's attorney general has just told the same rabble rouser to keep out of the State.

Today the Federal Government under the Kennedy administration has made the same mistake at Montgomery as did the Eisenhower administration at Little Rock. Both refused to let local authorities deal with the situation. The more than 400 Federal marshals fully armed, who were mobilized in Montgomery last Sunday were, as Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, says, hardly different from Federal troops.

There are, of course, plenty of legalisms involved. At Little Rock the Governor of Arkansas ordered out the National Guard to prevent mob violence around the school. But the Federal Government construed this as an impediment to the enforcement of a Federal court order on desegregation of public schools.

In Alabama a court order issued by an Alabama State judge had called on the so-called freedom riders to abstain from their demonstrations on buses which had been advertised in advance and were certain to stir up trouble. Notwithstanding the existence of this State court order, the Federal Government intervened with Federal marshals, claiming that law and order had broken down.

Indeed, an 1871 Federal statute was cited by the U.S. Department of Justice as authority for the step though this law specifically refers to Federal intervention only where there is insurrection or domestic violence due to a refusal or inability of a State to grant protection. It can hardly be said that the action of a mob, even though some negligence is temporarily displayed by local police, constitutes such an insurrection in a constitutional sense. On the contrary, the Governor of Alabama recognized the right of the bus to engage in interstate travel and the right of passengers on the bus to be protected. Just how this gets to be insurrection is hard to understand. Neither the Governor nor the legislature requested the Federal intervention as the Constitution prescribes must be done when domestic violence develops beyond the State's control.

It is true that the U.S. Attorney General and the Governor of Alabama discussed beforehand the events leading up to the crisis on Saturday, but this does not justify Federal intervention any more than it justifies mob action. Unless the regular processes of the law are permitted to take their course, the whole thing just becomes an emotional spectacle with politics and the bid for votes in the populous Northern States playing its part, both under a Democratic and a Republican national administration.

If, as Supreme Court decisions in the past have indicated, there is a right of any citizen to travel through a State or inside a State without color discrimination on vehicles of transportation, the proper course for the aggrieved parties is to apply for court orders. Long drawn out as the cases might be, the necessary court support would be forthcoming and arrests for contempt for violating court orders would follow as a routine procedure.

To say that "all this takes too much time," and that "we have waited long enough" is exactly what the mobsters used to argue passionately as they prepared to lynch a rapist. The cry was then heard: "He's guilty anyhow, why wait for the courts."

Unfortunately, the 14th amendment, under which "equal protection of the law" has been fostered, was itself ratified at the point of the bayonet when, 3 years after the Civil War was over, the Southern States were coerced—by militiamen sitting in the State legislatures—into ratifying the amendment. The Constitution itself prescribes a proper method of ratification, and the present generation is suffering 100 years later the consequences of the disregard of the Constitution in the period immediately after the Civil War. The Supreme Court has ruled on many 14th amendment cases but has consistently refused to pass upon any case involving the legality of the ratification of the 14th amendment itself.

NEW ORLEANS TOUR BEGUN BY ROCKWELL

NEW ORLEANS, May 23.—George Lincoln Rockwell, self-proclaimed fuehrer of the American Nazi Party, flew into New Orleans today to lead a hate campaign against Negroes and Jews.

He said he and 10 of his "storm troopers" would demonstrate here against the NAACP, the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), and "Exodus," a film opening Wednesday night which depicts the Jewish struggle to create Israel.

His khaki-shirted "storm troopers" were scheduled to arrive here later, traveling in a car and a Volkswagen bus.

Rockwell claimed here during a brief press conference at the airport that his troops have been greeted as liberators on their southern tour.

Louisiana Gov. Jimmie H. Davis said he did not welcome the Nazi Party into the State any more than he did the freedom riders. Last night he issued a statement urging both groups to stay out of Louisiana.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to reply to my friend, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. It is always delightful when progress is made; and this morning we made some remarkable progress in the course of the debate, because now a group of Republicans have assured us that they really want to support the President of the United States. I am not surprised at that, of course. In addition, the Senator from Ohio, a Democrat, also wants to support the President of the United States. So there is more and more support for the Kennedy bill.

I wish to say to the Senator from Ohio that I am glad to state for whom I speak. On this occasion I speak for the President of the United States. That is quite an experience for me; I have not had that pleasure since 1952.

This morning I talked to the President in regard to this subject matter; the Senator from Ohio has my assurance that I am presenting the Kennedy bill, which is the committee bill; my Republican friends who wish to support the President may be assured that if they wish to support him, they should support the committee bill, the Morse-Thompson bill—I being its sponsor in the Senate, and Representative THOMPSON being its sponsor in the House of Representatives; and the Morse-Thompson bill is now the Kennedy bill.

Now I shall pull aside the curtains for a moment, in order to state how the bill came into being.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me.

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to assure the Senator from Oregon that if I thought the President was wrong, I would be opposing him. But I am glad he is right in this instance, because his judgment conforms with mine.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, no; I wish to make clear that the President of the United States supports the measure reported from the committee. The Senator from Ohio is offering as a substitute the original bill which came down here.

Let me state briefly the background of this matter. Even after the introduction of the bill, we had a whole series of conferences at the White House, at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in the committee rooms, and in the office of the majority leader of the Senate [Mr. MANSFIELD]; I was privileged thereafter to bring to the floor of the Senate the administration bill. This is the administration bill, as of this moment.

So when the Senator from Ohio seeks to give the impression that he is the one who now is supporting the President on the matter of the formula, the Senator from Ohio is mistaken. I am presenting

the President's view, and am privileged and honored to do so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a very brief question at this point?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If this bill is the Kennedy bill, what was the bill the Senator from Oregon first introduced?

Mr. MORSE. It was the first administration bill. But the administration follows where the facts lead; and when we finished presenting the facts to the administration, in the series of conferences, the administration supported this bill.

What is the bill? Its formula is identical to that in the bill which Senator Kennedy, of Massachusetts, voted for last year, here on the floor of the Senate; I refer to the bill known as S. 8. That is the bill; and when we concluded our discussions of this matter with the administration, we convinced the administration that this is a better formula than the one first proposed.

That is the history of this bill. It has a long history, and it has been given careful consideration by the administration; and I am very proud to present it to the Senate, rather than the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BUTLER. I am sure that the Senator from Oregon, being a careful man, weighed carefully the words he used when he said that as of this time it is the Kennedy bill.

Mr. MORSE. Well, we are about to vote for the bill; and this morning I discussed this with the President.

Mr. BUTLER. I believe the Senator from Oregon used the words "at this point."

Mr. MORSE. I wish to assure the Senator that the President is convinced, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare also is convinced.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield briefly to me?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot yield further; the time available to me is extremely limited.

I wish to make clear that this bill is the same as S. 8, which was debated thoroughly on this floor last year. So this formula is not a new one.

Furthermore, what we are offering is an equalization bill. But what the Senator from Ohio is offering is not necessarily an equalization bill. That is why we pointed out to the administration, in the conferences, that that was the great weakness of their bill, in that it could violate the great principle of equalization, which is so essential if we are to have a fair and an equitable bill.

So I say, Mr. President, that under the Lausche proposal—not under the administration bill, but under the Lausche amendment—unless the full appropriation of the $666 million authorization is provided by the Appropriations Committee, there will be less than the degree of equalization contemplated, because, under that proposal, each State is just entitled to $15 per student on the basis of average daily attendance. That minimum could easily use up the amount appropriated and leave nothing for equalization.

And that average daily attendance gimmick is one of the great weaknesses of the Lausche amendment, because the records in the various school districts of the country are kept quite differently. They are not reliable figures.

When we deal with the total school population in ages 5 to 7, then we have a fixed figure which can be determined with much greater accuracy than can the average daily attendance. That fact is important from the standpoint of the equalization principle.

I wish to point out to the Senators from New York that it has been said here this morning that New York would not benefit from the administration bill. The contrary happens to be the fact. There was an attempt to give the impression this morning, and it is a wrong impression, that members of the committee proposed this formula because States of members of the committee would benefit in contrast with other States. I think I have answered that implication by giving Senators my word of honor that not the slightest motivation of that type went into the formula of the bill. We have in the present bill the formula of last year.

When it is said that New York does not benefit under the formula, I point out that, under the Lausche proposal, New York would get $15 per child, in average daily attendance, at public school, for each year of the 3 years. Under the bill we are now offering the Senate, New York would get $16.20 per public school child, an increase of $1.20 per child in each of the 3 years.

In other words, New York would get, under the Lausche proposal, $116,100,000.

Under the Morse proposal, New York would get $121,957,140.

Yet the argument has been made here this morning in an attempt to give the impression that we have dealt unfairly with New York and other States because some States represented by the members of the committee get more. Let the RECORD show that New York gets more, too. It gets more to the tune of $5 million under the Morse bill over what it would get under the Lausche proposal.

We have offered the Senate a bill which, in all its major principles, once passed the Senate, namely, S. 8 of last year. It is a bill which carries in it the principle of fair and consistent equalization, no matter what percentage of the authorization is appropriated.

It is a bill which the administration now supports enthusiastically. It is a bill which will do the job that I have pleaded for in speech after speech in the course of the debate. I close the argument with the same plea, that if Senators really want to do something to help the boys and girls of the elementary and secondary schools of this country, the two-thirds who are not now being helped with Federal aid, they should vote for the committee bill. It is a fair bill. It is a bill that is approved by the educators of the country.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the New York Times of today, May 24, 1961, signed by Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers, in support of the Morse-Thompson bill, and in support of the formula of this bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS FORMULA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In your otherwise superb editorial of May 16 you referred to a "serious flaw" in the formula for distribution of Federal funds to the States under the education bill now being considered in the Senate. This should not be considered a flaw, but rather a highly desirable change.

Use of Census Bureau statistics of school-age population in the formula is objective and fair to all States. Average daily attendance could not be.

Average daily attendance, as computed in each classroom and summarized in local school districts and in State departments of education, varies considerably from State to State and is used in no more than 30 States. Under these circumstances the Federal Government would be forced to impose a new record system on the States through regulations defining average daily attendance uniformly for all. The States using average daily membership would be forced to use a system generally considered inferior.

Furthermore, even if uniformity were federally prescribed, true objectivity would still be lacking. This is because average daily attendance provides a Federal fiscal incentive to cheat in keeping attendance records, regardless of definition. School-age population eliminates this incentive along with the federally required bookwork.

It is also important that the formula treat all public school taxpayers fairly in each State and relatively among the States. School-age population will benefit all taxpayers in States with large private school pupil populations, thus lightening the relative tax burden of the parents of private school pupils as well as that of many taxpayers without children in school.

This is fair, and is one of the reasons why both the House and Senate committees have agreed to use school-age population.

The Senate committee has offset the advantage that school-age population brings to such States as New York, Connecticut, and New Jersey by increasing the equalization factor based on relative per capita income. This favors southern and other less wealthy States.

EDGAR FULLER,
Executive Secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers.
Washington, May 16, 1961.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have reached the point where again I say, "Your honor, I rest." I am perfectly willing to rest on the case we have made in support of the administration bill, and I speak for the administration in saying this is the administration bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Has the time of the Senator from Oregon entirely expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. I owe the Senator an apology.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, with regard to what the author of the bill has said, I merely point out that last year, when the President was a member of the Senate, his views were not in accord with those that I expressed last year. When he became President, he subscribed to the view that parochial school children should not be counted in arriving at the aggregate number of children to be benefited through aid to public schools. Now, I understand, based on what the Senator from Oregon has said, that the President has changed his mind. It means that he had one view last year, another view when the bill was presented, and has still another view today.

My views have not been changed on the question. They are identical today with what they were a year ago. I merely wish to repeat that to me it is not proper, in giving aid to public schools to count, in the number of children who are to be helped, children of the Lutheran and Episcopalian and Catholic schools, when they will receive no benefit from the bill.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. For the sake of the record, I want to correct an implication which may have been left by the chairman of the subcommittee in my previous colloquy, and if I am wrong, he will correct me——

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have very little time left.

Mr. KEATING. I am informed that my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] voted against the formula in the bill, as did all the Republican members of the committee.

Mr. MORSE. I only said that if there had been any motivation of trying to get more money for some States because members of the committee were from those States, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], would have been the first to take us to task. I just give the Senator my word that did not happen.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, who has the floor and whose time are we running on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us get some time on the bill. Senators have talked me out of time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have no time on the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to say that I am amazed by the unwillingness or inability of the mind of the Senator from Oregon to accept this highly moral and intellectual argument that I have made in support of my amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on this one occasion, without a precedent being set, the time on the amendment may be extended for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I merely want to state for the RECORD, so the RECORD will be clear that, first, I oppose the committee formula. I will support the Lausche amendment, because it is more in line with the Cooper-Javits amendment.

Second, I never made the point, and I do not make it now—it is unthinkable—that the vote of any Senator on the committee was influenced by the way his State was treated in the formula. I hope Senators will not let that element intrude on their votes on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendments has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] is detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 32, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 50]

YEAS—32

Allott	Curtis	Lausche
Beall	Dirksen	Miller
Bennett	Dodd	Mundt
Boggs	Douglas	Saltonstall
Bridges	Dworshak	Schoeppel
Butler	Eastland	Scott
Capehart	Goldwater	Stennis
Case, N.J.	Holland	Thurmond
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Javits	Young, Ohio
Cotton	Keating	

NAYS—61

Aiken	Burdick	Cannon
Bartlett	Byrd, Va.	Carroll
Bible	Byrd, W.Va.	Church
Clark	Kerr	Pastore
Ellender	Kuchel	Pell
Engle	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Ervin	Long, Hawaii	Proxmire
Fong	Long, La.	Randolph
Fulbright	Magnuson	Robertson
Gore	Mansfield	Russell
Gruening	McCarthy	Smathers
Hart	McClellan	Smith, Mass.
Hartke	McGee	Smith, Maine
Hayden	McNamara	Sparkman
Hickey	Metcalf	Symington
Hill	Monroney	Talmadge
Humphrey	Morse	Wiley
Jackson	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Johnston	Muskie	Yarborough
Jordan	Neuberger	Young, N. Dak.
Kefauver		

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Carlson	Morton
Blakley	Chavez	
Bush	Hickenlooper	

So Mr. LAUSCHE's amendments were rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I offer up my amendments designated "5–16–61–F."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the word "SCHOOL" and insert in lieu thereof the word "EDUCATIONAL".

On page 1, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the word "School" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Educational".

On page 2, line 8, after the word "opportunities", it is proposed to insert the phrase "and to provide loans for the construction of private, nonprofit elementary and secondary school facilities".

On page 2, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the word "public".

On page 2, line 22, it is proposed to insert "(a)" after "SEC. 104.".

On page 3, after line 7, it is proposed to insert the following:

(b) There is further authorized to be appropriated for the purposes set forth in section 114 of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, $104,993,392; for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, $117,167,300; and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, $128,756,445; which sums shall represent the product of the number of children in average daily attendance in private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, as determined by the Commissioner, multiplied by the average amount expended per child in public schools in accordance with the provisions of this title.

On page 20, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

LOANS FOR PRIVATE, NONPROFIT ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

SEC. 114. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 104(b) shall be used for making loans to private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools in each State for constructing school facilities. Any such loan—

(1) shall be made upon application containing such information as may be deemed necessary by the Commissioner;

(2) shall be subject to such conditions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States;

(3) may be in an amount not exceeding the total construction cost, as determined by the Commissioner, and shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Commissioner which shall be not more than the higher of (A) 2¾ per centum per annum, or (B) the total of one-quarter of 1 per centum per annum added to the average annual interest rate on all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the date on which the contract for the loan is made and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum; and

(4) shall mature and be repayable on such date as may be agreed to by the Commissioner and the borrower, but such date shall not be more than forty years after the date on which such loans were made.

(b) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 104(b) for the purposes set forth in subsection (a) hereof shall be awarded by the Commissioner for use by qualifying institutions in each State in accordance with the following formula:

The Commissioner shall reserve a sum for use in each State which shall equal the product of the number of children in average daily attendance in qualifying private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools, as determined by the Commissioner, multiplied by the State's allotment ratio as determined under section 105 of this title, provided that if any part of the fund reserved for use within a given State in accordance with the purposes of this section shall remain unused at the end of the fiscal year, it shall be made available for use by institutions in other States at the discretion of the Commissioner. Such sums shall be over and above the sums duly appropriated in the succeeding fiscal year, and may be made available without regard to the ratio herein set forth.

On page 20, line 5, it is proposed to redesignate section 114 as section 115.

On page 21, line 15, after the word "schools", it is proposed to insert the following: "or private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools".

On page 22, after line 10, it is proposed to insert the following:

(12) The term "private, nonprofit elementary and secondary school" means an educational organization described in section 503(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 which is entitled to exemption from income tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, before Senators depart, I announce that the amendments pertain to loans to private and parochial schools for building only. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] and the author of the amendments, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request that 2 hours be allotted for the consideration of the amendments, 1 hour to be controlled by the Senator from Arizona and 1 hour to be controlled by the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, several controversial subjects always arise whenever Federal aid to education is seriously considered. One of these is the question of providing loans for private, nonprofit elementary and secondary schools for the construction of classrooms and other instructional facilities.

The acceptance of my amendment would completely dissipate the heat generated by this controversial hot potato. Inasmuch as no Federal funds would be used for local education purposes, there would be no need for the so-called parochial school amendment.

First, title I of S. 991, providing a national merit scholarship program, would be open to all students regardless of the school attended. Parochial and other private nonprofit school students would be eligible to compete for these scholarships on the same terms and conditions as students attending public secondary schools.

Second, title II of S. 991, providing a tax credit to homeowners for that portion of their real property tax used for public school purposes would be available to all taxpayers whether or not their children attended public, parochial, or other private nonprofit schools.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Do I correctly understand from the Senator's description that the amendments deal only with school construction?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct; only loans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Only loans. Do the amendments contemplate that full repayment of such loans would be made at a rate of interest which would be without loss to the Government?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I cannot quote exactly what the President said, but his meaning was that he thought that any transfer of funds that was in the nature of a gift or a grant would be unconstitutional, but he thought that an objection on the ground of unconstitutionality would not necessarily apply to loans which contemplated full repayment.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct in his recollection of what the President said. In fact, there has never been any court decision on grants or loans to private or parochial schools. We have assumed, because of the separation-of-church-and-state doctrine of the Constitution that grants would be unconstitutional. However, that question has never been tested. There has been nothing at all on the subject of loans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would this provision be comparable to loans which have been made to many colleges throughout the country for dormitories?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Yes. I will catalog as completely as I can the grants and loans of surplus property and other property during the course of my remarks. This has been done for many years. I see no reason why it cannot be done at this time under the present bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe the clarification of the intent of the amendment is helpful to me, and I hope it is helpful to other Senators also. If it is on all fours with what we have been doing in making loans for dormitories to privately supported colleges and schools, it would seem to me that if we did it in those instances, and no constitutional question has arisen in connection with those instances, no constitutional question should arise here either.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I believe that if the Federal Government has an obligation to help strengthen our educational system, then it has an obligation to consider that educational system as a whole.

I have already made clear my general views on Federal aid to education during the debate on the bill before us. Although I favor Federal assistance for school construction when it is made available in such a way as to encourage real action and responsibility by the States and localities, I am against large-scale, permanent-type, across-the-board grant aid. But Federal involvement is only justifiable in response to a national need for educational excellence. Private and parochial schools are just as concerned with the purpose of competently preparing America's youth for the future as are public schools, and this category of institution cannot just be overlooked as we attempt to improve the overall nature of America's educational resources.

According to statistics made available by the U.S. Office of Education, over 22 percent of the students enrolled in primary and secondary schools in Massachusetts in the school year 1957–58 were attending nonpublic institutions. Since the child enrolled in a private school is just as important—and just as valuable—to the future of America as any other child, I do not feel that it is fair for them not to benefit, through certain kinds of aid programs, from the Federal Government's return of tax money their parents have helped to supply.

I definitely do not feel this way about al programs of Federal school aid. I believe that certain kinds of aid for nonpublic schools would be in violation of the separation of church and State principles of the first amendment. But loan aid, and in this case loan aid primarily for school construction, I do not believe to be unconstitutional.

For 11 years the Federal Government has provided loans for college housing construction to private and church-related institutions of higher education. The constitutionality of this program has

not been questioned, and that being so, I believe that the same kind of aid at the primary and secondary school level is also constitutional. There are other examples of similar kinds of aid presently in effect, such as the lending of Federal money under the National Defense Education Act to buy equipment for the teaching of science and mathematics in private and parochial schools. A 21-page Department of Health, Education, and Welfare memorandum dated March 28, 1961, entitled "Federal Programs Under Which Institutions With Religious Affiliation Receive Federal Funds Through Grants or Loans" gives a thorough listing of such assistance.

For these reasons, I shall vote in favor of the Goldwater amendment.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I wish to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Arizona for submitting his amendment, and to assure him that it will have my enthusiastic support.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, I felt obliged to offer the amendment. I am sure the Senator is well aware of my position on the legislation proposed. I am opposed to Federal aid to education. I am convinced that such aid constitutes an improper exercise of Federal power.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am a Catholic parent and send my children to Catholic schools. In that capacity, I should like to ask the Senator this question. If his amendment is adopted, will he vote for the bill?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe that I will vote for the bill, to be honest with the Senator.

Mr. MUSKIE. So, in effect, the amendment permits the Senator to oppose Federal aid for both public and private school. Is that correct?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I oppose Federal aid to education—period.

However, if we are going to have a bill, and if it is the sense of Congress that we must have the pending bill, then I believe in all fairness my amendment must be included in it. I have offered two other amendments, with the same attitude, that if we are going to have a bill, in good sense and in good morals we must include these groups as well as any other groups.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am sure the Senator appreciates the fact that as a Catholic I am more directly involved in this highly emotional and explosive issue than he is.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would beg to differ with the Senator. When we refer to parochial schools, we do not mean only Catholic schools. I am an Episcopalian, and I support many Episcopalian schools. The amendment would apply to Episcopalian schools, to Baptist schools, to Methodist schools, and to schools of all denominations.

Mr. MUSKIE. Does the Senator believe that Federal aid should not be granted to any school?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not believe that Federal aid should be granted to any school. Again, if we are going to have a bill, and it seems that we are going to have a bill, it is only fair that all schools have the assurance of availability of the money provided in loan form.

Mr. MUSKIE. I understand that to be the Senator's position. However, I believe it is fair to suggest that his position puts him in the position of opposing Federal aid for groups which are not now included in the bill. Therefore, he is in the position of opposing more groups than are included in the present program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I can see nothing inconsistent in my position. I have done the same thing on numerous occasions in respect to bills I have opposed. I believe it is a matter of fairness that is involved in the amendment. It is not a question of being for or against any group. It is a matter of fairness. We take money in the form of income taxes from all people, and then we say we cannot give it back to some of these people who support their own schools. I believe that is morally wrong. I merely want to get the question answered.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am not suggesting that the Senator is inconsistent. I wish to point out that by raising this issue on the floor, whatever it does to the Senator's or other religious groups, so far as I am concerned, and so far as people in my position are concerned, this plunges us into a highly emotional and explosive controversy in which we would prefer not to become involved. Many people believe this is an issue which is of sufficient importance to be handled independently on its own merits. Therefore, I wished to make it clear that the Senator's position does place him, not in the position of providing Federal aid for private schools, but of opposing Federal aid for private schools. I believe that ought to be made clear. If his position were otherwise—if his position were that he desired to permit Federal aid for private schools, that would be one thing, but if he is successful in his present effort, he will be in the position of opposing Federal aid for private schools. I believe that ought to be made clear on the record. That is my only purpose.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe the Senator voted for the National Defense Education Act. If he did, he voted for fellowships to be granted to students attending theological seminaries. Thus, under that act, the Federal Government may grant funds to help train ministers of religion. I shall point out in the course of my remarks the inconsistencies in this field. To my knowledge, the Federal Government has been engaged in giving aid to private and parochial schools for the last 16 years. There has never been a question raised about it.

The Senator from Maine wishes to talk about this subject at a different time. An attempt will be made, if my amendment fails, to attach this proposal to the National Defense Education Act. I can see no difference between attaching it to that act and attaching it to this bill. It will have to be voted on some time. We might as well vote on it now and ascertain the sense of the Senate. If my amendment fails, it will come to the floor attached to the amendment to the National Defense Education Act. So the Senator from Maine will be faced with the dilemma of having to make up his mind either this week or within the next 2 weeks. I simply think it is right that we talk about it now.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I think there is a law of survival on the Senate floor; that is, to develop a facility to so distort one's inconsistencies that they appear to be consistencies. I feel certain that the proposed law is one of which we all take advantage from time to time.

I do not suggest that the Senator abandon his amendment or that he ought to accept my ideas, whatever they may be, as to strategy or tactics. I am quite aware that the issue raised by the Senator's amendment poses a dilemma for me whenever it arises. My only purpose in rising at this time is to clarify the Senator's position, so that I may understand and the country may understand the relationship between the Senator's amendment and the very explosive issue which is involved.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Maine has done the Senate a favor in explaining my position, although I thought my position was pretty well known on this subject. I have talked against such an effort ever since I became a Member of the Senate, and shall continue to do so. However, when the Senate is considering passing legislation with which I do not agree, I certainly feel it is my duty to have the legislation as near perfection as possible, so far as I am concerned, when it leaves the floor. I do not think we are being fair to the people of the country when we take money from all of them and then refuse to give it back in the form of loans, not grants, to some of them. That is the whole purpose of my amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator's record suggests, certainly, that he always does his duty as he sees it. I would not want my remarks to be interpreted as suggesting anything to the contrary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, those parents who by choice elect to send their children to schools other than the free public schools would receive the benefits of this tax credit so long as their property tax was used for support of the local public school system.

Third, title III of S. 991, providing tax relief for families with children attending college, would apply to all families regardless of whether the college or institution of higher learning that the child attended is public or private, sectarian or secular.

Thus, no feature of my proposal can be regarded as aiding or assisting one group or segment of society to the disadvantage or detriment of any other. All students, and their parents alike would share in the benefits of this program without discrimination or restriction.

I am sure the Senate is well aware of my position on this legislation. I am opposed to Federal aid to education. I am convinced that the granting of such aid constitutes an improper exercise of

Federal power, and an extension of Federal control into an area which the framers of the Constitution clearly left to the States. But if the Congress does enact a program of Federal school aid, it is my belief that private as well as public schools should receive funds. The parents of children who attend private and parochial schools not only pay taxes for the support of our public schools, but in addition, out of their own pockets, pay to maintain a huge and acceptable educational establishment which supplements our system of public education.

The President's message on Federal aid to education contained the following statement:

> In accordance with the clear prohibition of the Constitution no elementary or secondary school funds are allocated for constructing church schools or paying church school teachers' salaries.

This statement, so unequivocal in tone, immediately aroused such a storm of protest from so many quarters that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with the assistance of the Department of Justice, was called upon to draft a legal memorandum which would establish a justification for the President's statement.

In the summary of conclusions with respect to elementary and secondary schools, the memorandum makes the assertion that across-the-board grants to church schools may not be made. Furthermore, since a loan is a grant of credit, and when made at a rate of interest below what is normally available to the borrower, it constitutes a grant of the interest payments which are saved. Therefore, according to the memorandum, across-the-board loans to church schools are equally invalid.

Support for these statements on the constitutionality of grants or loans to church-related schools is derived from the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1), *McCollum* v. *Board of Education* (333 U.S. 203), and *Zorach* v. *Clauson* (342 U.S. 306).

In the Everson case, the Supreme Court decided that a State law, which reimbursed parents for the bus fare paid by them for public transportation of their children to parochial as well as public schools, did not violate the first amendment to the Constitution.

The Supreme Court in the McCollum case held that the first amendment to the Constitution prohibits the use of public school facilities for religious instruction on a released-time basis. Subsequently, in the Zorach case, the Supreme Court decided that a voluntary released-time program conducted off public school premises, was constitutional.

Based on these three Supreme Court decisions, together with obiter dictum and various quotations taken from the minority dissents, the memorandum comes to the conclusion that—

> Grants for assistance in the construction of general school facilities and for increasing teachers' salaries, to be administered by governmental agencies and made available directly to sectarian schools, are the clear case of what is proscribed by the Constitution.

It should be noted there that the substitution of the word "loans" for "grants" in the above quotation would not in any way change the conclusion reached by the memorandum inasmuch as the memorandum itself makes no distinction between loans and grants.

After a careful reading of the memorandum and the relevant Supreme Court decisions, I find myself in complete disagreement with the position taken by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that grants or loans to church-related schools would be unconstitutional. I am unable to reach such a conclusion especially in view of the precedents cited by the memorandum.

The most important characteristic of a statute providing benefits to a class or group is whether or not there is present a legitimate public concern. In the Everson case, the Supreme Court found such a public concern in the transportation of children to and from public and parochial schools. Reimbursement of parents for the costs incurred in sending their children to nonprofit parochial schools was considered to be in line with the State's desire to assure these children, as well as children in public schools, a safe means of transportation to their schools. Contrary to the minority opinion, the statute was not construed to be in support of a particular religion or religious activities. Only a short time ago, the U.S. Supreme Court declined to reexamine the doctrine laid down in the Everson case—decided in 1947—and dismissed an appeal from the Supreme Court of Connecticut because no substantial Federal question was involved.

The Illinois statute, in the McCollum case, was struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court because public school facilities were used solely for religious instruction. The Court found that there was no public purpose involved except to assist and support religious education. The language of the McCollum decision, however, can be validly interpreted to mean that a legitimate public purpose coupled with an incidental religious or sectarian aspect would not run counter to any constitutional prohibition.

In the absence of any clear-cut precedents, we must of necessity look to past congressional actions in order to aid us, as legislators, in formulating a policy with regard to any assistance we may give to parochial and other nonprofit elementary and secondary schools as part of a general Federal aid-to-education proposal.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as a part of its memorandum on the constitutionality of loans or grants to private nonprofit schools, submitted a summary of Federal programs under which institutions with religious affiliation receive Federal funds through grants or loans. The various Federal programs are considerable in number but I shall refer to only two—the National Defense Education Act and the surplus property utilization program.

Mr. President, I have before me a publication of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which was issued under date of March 28 of this year. It is entitled "Federal Programs Under Which Institutions With Religious Affiliation Receive Federal Funds Through Grants or Loans." Seventeen different laws allow this, and the number of separate provisions in those laws totals 41.

As I said in the colloquy in which I was just engaged with the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], my amendment proposes nothing new. Congress has been acting in this manner for a long time, under many laws and many provisions of laws.

Mr. President, so that all Senators might have the benefit of this publication, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has placed in the RECORD a compilation of grants and loans, as prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I came into the Chamber after the Senator had started his address and had offered his amendment. Does his amendment include both grants and loans?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No; my amendment includes only loans for construction purposes, and the loans are to be paid back in full.

Mr. MUNDT. How about the interest rate? Is there a concealed subsidy of any kind in the interest rate, or is it the prevailing rate the Government has to pay?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It is the prevailing rate the Government has to pay.

Mr. MUNDT. So the Senator's amendment does not provide for any element of grant?

Mr. GOLDWATER. It does not. If that were not true, it would be in effect a grant.

Mr. MUNDT. And then there would be a constitutional question of Federal aid to private schools.

But if the amendment amounts purely to a loan, to be reimbursed in full, including the interest the Government has to pay, it would seem that it is more closely analogous to the type of loans we have been making for the construction of dormitories in private colleges and institutions, except the amendment would extend the formula to include secondary schools.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is correct. We have been doing this for years, and now we merely wish to extend the benefits of that act to these institutions.

Mr. MUNDT. I realize that we have also been engaged for years in a twilight area of grants, as well as loans. Since the memorandum covered both, I wished to understand whether the amendment covered both or whether the amendment is strictly limited to fully reimbursable loans, including the interest.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from South Dakota is entirely correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from South Dakota has opened a field of inquiry which I should like to discuss. Does the Senator from Arizona, or the Senator from South Dakota consider that the question of whether a loan or a grant is to be made is of significance as far as constitutionality is concerned?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Personally, I do not. But because some questions have been raised on the grant aspect, I did not wish to get into that matter; and therefore I approached this subject from the loan basis. There has been no court decision, so far as I know, on the matter of loans, rather than grants; all this is merely hearsay.

Mr. COOPER. I wish to point out that the purpose is to use public funds. The purpose is important—not the fact that a loan is made. In my judgment, the making of a loan makes no difference at all; it is the purpose of the loan which must be considered.

I know there is a wide variety of opinion in regard to the use of public funds to assist nonpublic schools. The courts have not yet clearly stated the dividing line.

My judgment is that the appropriation of public funds to private or parochial schools for their general purposes is invalid under the first amendment to the Constitution.

And I believe it a mistake to hold that the question of whether public money is loaned and bears interest has anything at all to do with this problem.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky; but the difficulty is that other members of the subcommittee and the full committee do not hold that opinion. They say that grants are unconstitutional. So I did not wish to raise that question here on the floor, because there has been no clear decision on that point, other than what we as individuals think; and that situation confuses the matter even more. So this amendment relates only to loans, inasmuch as no constitutional question thus is raised.

Mr. COOPER. The controlling consideration is the purpose—the nature of the action taken—not whether a loan or a grant is made.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I think that is correct. That is why I believe the entire approach can be termed unconstitutional. However, I am not the Supreme Court.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I think this question was opened for general, public debate by the statement the President made when he commented on this phase of the Educational Assistance Act. He drew this sharp distinction.

It is true that lawyers disagree in regard to this matter. In fact, I imagine that in the great State of Kentucky some lawyers would disagree with the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], who himself is a distinguished lawyer.

However, it seems to me this question does exist. It was referred to by the President, in the statement he made; and certainly this phase of the matter is frequently referred to in connection with this subject—namely, that when a grant is made, certainly there is Federal support of the group or institution to which the grant is made. But a loan is quite a different matter. If the loan is an honest one, if it is the kind of loan that the Senator from Arizona has been describing, and if the interest paid is to be reimbursed in full and if the principal is to be reimbursed in full, then it really amounts to a banking matter, similar to a situation in which a bank makes a loan on which interest is paid, and later on the entire principal is paid or collected. All that is considerably different from the making of a grant or a handout which never is to be recaptured.

Certainly the impact on the Federal Treasury is different; and I believe that any court of law would have to recognize the distinction and the difference—namely, that one will be recaptured, whereas the other will be donated and gone forever, and the recipient can always hold it, and never will have to repay it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, for the purpose of this report, the most relevant provision of the National Defense Education Act is title III, providing loans to nonprofit elementary and secondary schools for the purchase of equipment for use in teaching science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages.

As I stated earlier, the National Defense Education Act also contains a provision for the granting of fellowships, for various studies in theological seminaries, regardless of what religion is being studied. This is as direct an approach as any I can think of between the Government and a church. Yet that has never been questioned.

While the National Defense Education Act has not been judicially interpreted, the Department's memorandum makes the categorical statement that—

> We believe such loans are constitutional because the connection between loans for such purposes and the religious functions of a sectarian school seems to be nonexistent or minimal.

In effect, it is conceded that loans—or grants—to parochial and other nonprofit schools would meet no constitutional barrier where the religious or sectarian function was not present or was present only to a small degree. I am unable to distinguish between the assistance given to parochial schools under the National Defense Education Act, which the memorandum believes to be constitutional, and the assistance to parochial schools provided by my amendment, which the memorandum has no doubt would be found by the Supreme Court to be unconstitutional. If the constitutionality of providing Federal assistance to church-related schools depends on the extent to which the specific objectives of the statute are unrelated to or are remote from the religious aspects of sectarian education, then the parallel between loans for equipment authorized by the National Defense Education Act and loans or grants for parochial and nonprofit schools for classroom construction as part of a general Federal aid to education proposal becomes quite clear. Both of these provisions carry out a legitimate public purpose as part of an overall program of advancing the educational opportunities of our children. Even where this assistance is made available to sectarian schools, it is made in behalf of the general educational aspects of the school, and not in behalf of the religious aspects. The legislation containing provisions discussed herein makes it abundantly clear that the purpose of the legislation is to promote education. It makes no more sense to say that the purpose of granting assistance to church-related schools is to promote and support a religion or a religious institution than to say that the purpose of Federal aid for the construction of classrooms is to support and maintain the building trades by providing more work for their members.

We have an admission on the part of the memorandum which finally gets to the heart of the matter. Whether the Federal Government should provide assistance to church-related schools is not a question of constitutionality; it is a question of policy. Discussing the surplus property utilization program, the memorandum states:

> In most such cases, however, the property disposed of did not directly benefit the religious programs and training in sectarian schools. In any event the general language, the long history in similar preceding programs, and the legislative acquiescence in such disposal make quite clear the intention of Congress that sectarian institutions not be excluded altogether from the benefits of the program.

To state that disposal of Federal surplus property to sectarian institutions and national defense loans to parochial schools for the purchase of equipment are valid exercises of congressional authority because such assistance can be divorced from the religious aspects of the schools and then to argue that Federal assistance for parochial school construction is so completely interwoven with the sectarian education taught in these schools as to render such assistance unconstitutional is completely self-contradictory. If the sectarian provisions of the National Defense Education Act and the surplus property utilization program can be defended by the Department's memorandum as within constitutional boundaries, then assuredly it necessarily follows that assistance to church-related schools within a general Federal aid to education proposal must likewise be viewed as complying with the constitutional prohibitions of the first amendment.

The basic arguments advanced by the memorandum to support the constitutional validity of direct assistance to sectarian institutions of higher learning

are in turn compelling arguments in support of assistance to sectarian elementary and secondary schools.

Commenting on the administration's request for direct loans and grants to institutions of higher learning, including sectarian colleges and universities, the memorandum states, "If the public purpose is to be achieved at all, it can only be achieved by a general expansion of private as well as public colleges, of sectarian as well as secular ones." I am in complete agreement with this statement that the public purpose can only be achieved by giving assistance to all colleges, public and private, sectarian and secular. But cannot this statement also be applied to assistance to elementary and secondary schools, public and private, sectarian and secular? I have no doubt that it can.

The HEW memorandum also states:

> More important are the distinctive factors present in American higher education; the fact that the connection between religion and education is less apparent and that religious indoctrination is less pervasive in a sectarian college curriculum * * *.

Even if this statement were true, this is a mighty weak peg on which to hang a distinction between lower and higher sectarian educational assistance. Where the question of constitutionality is involved. What the conclusion of the memorandum boils down to is a matter of degree. Federal assistance to sectarian colleges and universities cannot be justified on the basis that the connection between religion and education is less apparent and less pervasive than that in sectarian elementary and secondary schools. To do so would scrap the constitutional argument whether the assistance to sectarian schools was in furtherance of a legitimate public purpose or support of religion, and rely on the degree of the connection between religion and education as the determining factor.

The declared purpose of the committee bill, among others, is to provide Federal grants to local education agencies for the construction of classrooms in order to substantially improve the quality of public elementary and secondary education and to reduce inequalities of educational opportunities within and between the States. The amendment I am now proposing to the committee bill will carry out this congressional intent with respect to parochial and other private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools. The broad public purpose of the committee bill is designed to assist and improve education. This same purpose is carried out in my amendment by assisting sectarian and private schools as schools and not as religious institutions. I urge the Senate to adopt this amendment.

Mr. President, I have done a little study on the whole matter, which I should like to make available to my colleagues by reading a little into the RECORD and inserting what I am unable to get into the RECORD without reading.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this time, and I mention that I have a minute from the time in opposition to the amendment, in order that I may state my position? Is it convenient to do so?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Surely.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, by arrangement with the majority leader, I yield myself 1 minute from time in opposition to the amendment, and ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona will not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the committee I took the position that this question is again one of the passage of the bill, as to whether we should deal with this matter in the bill, and upon the very distinct understanding that we have a good-faith obligation to deal with this whole question in respect of the National Defense Education Act, which I am confident, in good faith, the subcommittee of which I am a member, and the committee, will proceed forthwith to bring to the floor.

It is upon that basis, and recognizing and stating a good-faith obligation to those who deeply believe that there should be aid to private and parochial schools, that I shall find it necessary to vote against the amendment.

I am very hopeful my study of the law and the facts will enable me in good conscience to support, in reference to the National Defense Education Act, a measure which will give complete justice and accommodation to the very evident and just needs of the private and parochial schools of the country.

I am grateful to the Senator from Arizona for having yielded to me.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am grateful for what my colleague on the committee has just offered. I think he, in effect, recognizes that my approach is a constitutional one. I think he disagrees with me only in that this is the wrong vehicle to which to attach the proposal. I can see no difference between putting it in this bill or in the National Defense Education Act, or any other bill that comes through pertaining to education.

I think it is recognized that, if this provision is in the bill, it may cause the President some embarrassment; but if it is going to cause the President any embarrassment, it is going to cause him embarrassment in any bill.

I do not think much of an argument can be made, with all due respect to the Senator from New York, against placing this amendment in the bill now, instead of waiting until next week or the week after, and going through the same performance in another education bill. That is the reason why I brought it up today.

Mr. President, I have mentioned that we have been engaged in the business of giving aid to private and parochial schools for years. I do not know how far back it goes, but up to 1959, there had been 2,356 cases in which property had been given to public and nonpublic bodies. Of this number 1,884 went to States, counties, cities, and other political subdivisions, or about 79.97 percent. The other 20.03 percent went to church sponsored cases and to private cases. Sixty-three percent of the 20 percent went to church sponsored cases or institutions, and 36.7 percent to other private institutions.

Breaking this down into the 20 percent of nonprofit institutions, there are 140 cases involving the Catholic schools, 54 cases involving the Seventh Day Adventists, 26 cases involving the Baptists, 20 cases involving the Methodists, and 59 cases involving other institutions of learning connected with religious groups. This represents a grant of $2,836,000 in fair value of land and buildings to schools of religious affiliation out of a total outright grant of $53,347,337 in fair value of land and buildings made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the Surplus Property Act. Two million, twenty-five thousand dollars worth was granted to schools of Protestant affiliations and $811,000 worth was granted to schools of Catholic affiliation.

I should like to go through a few of these items, so Senators will have some idea as to what we have been doing. I shall refer to items in several States.

In Arkansas, Camp Joseph T. Robinson was given to the Central Baptist College. The fair value was $302,025. The acquisition cost was $1,989,207. This was to be used for a college.

Again in Arkansas, the Southern Baptist College got the Walnut Ridge Air Base. This had an acquisition cost of $1,493,552 and a fair value of $436,351 and was to be used for a college.

In the State of California, the Sherman Institute of the Bureau of Indian Affairs was given to the St. Thomas School. This did not have much value, about $2,200, and was to be used for faculty housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator yield so that the Senate may receive a message from the House of Representatives?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 316) providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 25, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III; and

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES ON THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me, with the time to be taken from the opposition, for consideration of a resolution?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 316.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 316) was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 25, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 316) was considered and agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. FRANZ MEYERS, PRESIDENT OF THE GERMAN BUNDESRAT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are privileged today to have in our midst, as our guests on the floor, Dr. Franz Meyers, President of the German Bundesrat, accompanied by Mr. Franz Krapf, Minister of the German Embassy, Prof. Dr. Erich Kordt, Mr. Swidbert Schnippenkoetter, counselor of the German Embassy, Mr. Herbert Weil, first secretary of the German Embassy, and Mr. Hans-Georg Wieck, second secretary, German Embassy.

Dr. Meyers is one of the great statesmen of Europe. He has honored us by his presence in our committee room and by having lunch with us today.

I hold in my hand a biographical sketch showing the various positions he held before he became President of the Bundesrat. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON FRANZ MEYERS

Born on Moenchengladbach on July 31, 1908. Married.

Elementary school, secondary school, study of law at the Universities of Freiburg and Cologne. Junior barrister, 1931. Doctor's degree in law, 1933. Assistant judge, 1934. Lawyer, 1935.

During the Second World War, captain of No. 104 Artillery Regiment of the 102d Silesian Division on the Russian front.

Member of the Christian Democratic Union since 1948. Lord mayor of Moenchengladbach from February 1952 to October 1952. Minister of the Interior in North Rhine-Westphalia from May 25, 1952 to February 28, 1956. Minister President of North Rhine-Westphalia since July 21, 1958. Member of the German Bundestag (federal parliament) from September 15, 1957, to August 29, 1958. Member of the Landtag (state parliament) of North Rhine-Westphalia since July 5, 1950.

President of the German Bundesrat (Federal Council, the legislative institution representing the federal states) since October 28, 1960.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask all Senators to join with me in greeting Dr. Meyers. [Applause, Senators rising.]

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in the State of Connecticut, St. Bridget's Church School got some property called Elmwood Acres, which had an acquisition cost of $50,536 and a fair value of $24,550, to be used for an elementary school.

Again in Connecticut, the St. Maurice R. C. Church School got some property under the name of White Oaks, which had an acquisition cost of $40,347 and a fair value of $28,043, to be used for a junior high school.

In the State of Georgia, Fort Oglethorpe went to the Redemptorist Fathers. It had an acquisition cost of $99,876 and a fair value of $18,500, and was to be used as a parochial school.

In Massachusetts, the Nitre Depot was obtained by the Immaculate Conception Church School. It had an acquisition cost of $44,400 and a fair value of $40,000, and was to be used for a parochial school.

In Michigan, the St. Francis of Assisi Congregation obtained a National Guard transfer of a fair value of $2,420, to be used for a teacherage and school site.

In the State of Missouri several items are listed. The General Council Assembly of God in four cases received from the O'Reilly General Hospital different properties to be used for college purposes.

The St. Agnes High School obtained property from the O'Reilly General Hospital which had an acquisition cost of $34,000 and a fair value of $45,900, to be used as a high school.

In New Mexico, the Bruns General Hospital was obtained by St. Michael's College, to be used as a college.

In New York, the Bishop Duffy High School obtained property from the Niagara Falls PHA project, for use as a high school.

In Pennsylvania, the Catholic Diocese of Harrisburg obtained property from the Veterans' Administration hospital site, to be used as an elementary school site.

Again in Pennsylvania, the St. John Bosco School received property under the name of Lacey Park, to be used for a playground.

Skipping to Texas, portions of Camp Bowie went to the Howard Payne College, a Baptist college. This property had an acquisition cost of $180,716 and a fair value of $61,670. It was to be used as a college.

In the State of Washington, the Northwest Bible College obtained property under the name of Stewart Heights project, to be used as a college site.

St. Patrick's School in Washington obtained from the Veterans' Administration hospital some property to be used for a parochial high school.

Mr. President, I skipped my own State inadvertently. The American Institute of Foreign Trade, which is a private school, obtained Thunderbird Auxiliary Field No. 1 for college purposes.

The Thunderbird Field No. 2 was obtained by the Arizona Conference Corporation of Seventh Day Adventists, to be used for vocational training.

Returning to the State of Washington, the Seattle Christian School Association obtained property under the name of Michigan Street Dorms as a site for an elementary and high school.

There are many more instances to be seen as we go through the later reports and bring them up to date.

Returning to the State of New Mexico, the Brethren Navajo Mission Board, a Methodist school, obtained property from the Kirtland Air Force Base, for operation of a school.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona if he will accept a modification to his amendment. If he will do so, I shall ask for a modification to provide that on page 2, line 22, strike the semicolon, and insert the following:

and the school applying for the loan does not, in fact, practice discrimination in its entrance requirements on the basis of race or color;

That would prevent a circumventing of the Supreme Court decisions. If the Senator has no objection to the amendment, since I understand the yeas and nays have been ordered, I should like to have the modification made to the Senator's amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be so modified.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I shall be happy to accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Does the Senator ask unanimous consent to modify his amendment?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike the semicolon on page 2, line 22, and to insert the following:

And the school applying for the loan does not, in fact, practice discrimination in its entrance requirements on the basis of race or color.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, is the modification so ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In Maryland, St. Stephens Schools obtained property

from the North Severn housing area for school purposes.

In Oklahoma, St. Gregory's College obtained property from the Old Shawnee Agency for school purposes.

I could continue reading these cases. There are many. Undoubtedly there will be many more in the future. I merely wished to establish, by reading a few of these instances from the testimony supplied me by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under their regular reports entitled "Transfers of Real Property for Health and Education by Individual Transactions," the fact that our Government is daily engaged in the practice of supporting private, parochial, and public schools with surplus property.

If this practice had been unconstitutional, I am sure that long ago someone would have challenged it. I am sure that every Senator at one time or another—perhaps more than once—engaged in the task of obtaining for schools in his State, property that is surplus to the Government's uses. I myself have done so. I might say I would so engage myself in the obtaining of surplus property for any educational institution.

In other words, I see no valid argument to be presented against making loans to private and parochial schools that are to be paid back in full at the going interest rate.

I conclude by referring to a point my friend the Senator from Maine mentioned. I am afraid that too many Senators have the same idea, which is that a parochial school is a Catholic school. Every denomination that I know of conducts schools somewhere. I am an Episcopalian, and I support or help to support several schools around this country. I am sure that members of various denominations in this body lend their support to the extent that they can do so to the institutions conducted by their own churches.

I can see no reason why we should delay action on this amendment. If the amendment is voted down today, the same precise amendment will come up in the consideration of the National Defense Education bill, because such action has been announced. We must expect that the bill will come from the committee of which I am a member with that amendment attached to it.

We shall have to face up to this question sooner or later. I think it is much wiser to face up to the subject sooner than to try to put it off indefinitely. If the entire approach of Federal aid to education is correct—though I do not think it is correct—and if it is the express will of Congress that the people of the country shall not be permitted to take care of the education of their own children, I think it would be definitely right, both morally and constitutionally, to include in the bill a provision for loans to private and parochial schools at the elementary and high school level.

I reserve what time I have remaining to answer whatever rebuttal there may be.

EXHIBIT 1

FEDERAL PROGRAMS UNDER WHICH INSTITUTIONS WITH RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION RECEIVE FEDERAL FUNDS THROUGH GRANTS OR LOANS

Attached is a description of Federal programs under which educational institutions with religious affiliation receive Federal funds through grants or loans. Following should be kept in mind in using this material:

1. Payments to institutions for which the United States receives a quid pro quo in a proprietary sense are outside the scope of the attached listing. However, Federal programs are so diverse that a clear line in this respect is not always possible, and many programs, not listed here because the Federal Government receives such a quid pro quo, are frequently of benefit to institutions.[1]

2. Programs to pay institutions for training Government civilian or military personnel are not included here. See, for example, 5 U.S.C. 2301 for a Government-wide employees' training program.

3. Except as noted under item 3 of the description of programs of the State Department, and in the case of payments for the education of Indian children, institutions with religious affiliation participate in all of the programs listed.[2]

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF EDUCATION

A. National Defense Education Act Programs

1. National Defense Student Loan Program (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 201 *et seq.*; 20 U.S.C. 421 *et seq.*)

Funds are made available by the Commissioner of Education under title II of the National Defense Education Act to enable public and private, nonprofit institutions of higher education to make low-interest loans to needy students.

The Federal Government advances up to 90 percent of the capital needed for a loan fund at an institution.[3] In any fiscal year, the Federal capital contribution at any institution may not exceed $250,000. The loan to an individual student may not exceed $1,000 for a fiscal year and no student may borrow more than $5,000 for all years. Special consideration must be given in providing loans to students with superior academic backgrounds who express a desire to teach in elementary or secondary schools (not necessarily those which are public) and students with strong academic backgrounds in science, mathematics, engineering, or a modern foreign language, but other students may also receive loans. Each note must provide that up to 10 percent of the loan (plus interest) will be canceled for each year of service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school, but not more than 50 percent of a loan can be canceled in this manner.

2. National Defense Fellowships (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 404; 20 U.S.C. 464)

Graduate programs in institutions of higher education are given quotas by the Commissioner of Education for the award of graduate fellowships. The Commissioner awards 1,500 fellowships per year for periods of study in such programs, not in excess of 3 academic years. The individual receiving the fellowship receives $2,000 to $2,400 per year, depending on the year of study, plus an allowance for dependents. In addition, the institution which the individual attends receives the portion of the cost attributable to such individual's study not to exceed $2,500 per fellowship holder per academic year.

3. Loans to Nonprofit Private Schools (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 305; 20 U.S.C. 445)

Title III of NDEA is designed to strengthen science, mathematics and modern foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. The title contains provisions for grants to strengthen State supervisory services for public elementary and secondary schools and for grants to enable public elementary and secondary schools to acquire science, mathematics and modern foreign language equipment (and to remodel space used for such equipment.).

Twelve percent of each appropriation for the acquisition of science, mathematics, or foreign language equipment (or minor remodeling of space for such equipment) is required to be allotted by the Commissioner of Education for loans to private, nonprofit, elementary and secondary schools. Affiliation or non-affiliation with a religious organization is immaterial. The loans are authorized to enable the borrowing school to acquire equipment of the types referred to above (and do minor remodeling) and must bear interest at ¼ of 1 percent above the current average yield on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 percent. Such loans must mature within 10 years.

4. Testing Students in Secondary Schools (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 504 (b); 20 U.S.C. 484(b))

Under title V of the National Defense Education Act, grants to State educational agencies may be used, among other things, for testing students in secondary schools, public, or private. The Federal participation through the State grant is one-half the cost of such testing. The section cited above provides that in any State with an approved State plan which is not authorized by law to pay for the cost of testing students in one or more secondary schools, the Commissioner of Education shall arrange for the testing of such students and pay one-half the cost thereof (for the first fiscal year of the program the payment for testing was the full cost). In carrying out this provision during the 1960–61 school year, the Commissioner arranged for testing students in private secondary schools of 40 States. (For purposes of the act the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia and Guam are treated as States.)

[1] 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893 provides that authority to contract for basic scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education shall be deemed authority to make grants for that purpose. Furthermore, authority to make grants or contracts for basic or applied research at such institutions provides authority to vest in the institution title to equipment purchased with grant or contract funds, without further obligation to the Government.

[2] No statute has been found where authority to deal with nonpublic institutions excludes dealing with those with religious affiliation except 25 U.S.C. 278, 279. That law declares "the settled policy of the Government to make no appropriation whatever out of the Treasury of the United States for education of Indian children in any sectarian school." Subsistence and clothing are provided for some children in such schools.

25 U.S.C. 280 authorized the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent to religious organizations for lands used by them prior to September 21, 1922, for mission or school purposes.

[3] The Commissioner may make loans to institutions to help them finance their required 10 percent advance to the loan fund, where such funds cannot be secured from non-Federal sources upon terms and conditions deemed reasonable by the Commissioner. The term is up to 15 years with interest at such rate as the Commissioner determines will cover all costs to the Government, including probable losses.

The provision for the Commissioner to arrange testing was inserted in the law because of the knowledge that in some States the State educational agency would not have authority to make payments toward the testing of students in nonpublic schools, particularly those with religious affiliation.

5. Institutes for Training Secondary School Counselors and Institutes for Training Modern Foreign Language Teachers (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), secs. 511, 611; 20 U.S.C. 491, 521)

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract with institutions of higher education for summer and regular academic year training programs to improve the qualifications of counselors in secondary schools and modern foreign language teachers. The teachers from public, sectarian, or any other types of private schools receive the opportunity for training without tuition costs. However, the act authorizes the Commissioner to pay a stipend for subsistence only to those who are to teach in public schools.

Although the instruction is conducted under a "contractual" arrangement pursuant to statute, it is included in this listing because the effect is very similar to that of a grant. The contract finances educational services by which the participating institutions serve a segment of people whom it would be their normal function to train.

6. Language and Area Centers (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 601(a); 20 U.S.C. 511(a))

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to arrange through "contracts" with institutions of higher education for the establishment and operation by them of centers for the teaching of certain modern foreign languages and studies related to the cultures in which such languages are used. The languages are confined to those for which trained individuals are needed in business, government, or education. While the statute authorizes only "contracts" for payment of one-half the cost, the program has all the earmarks of a grant situation.

7. Language Fellowships (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 601(b); 20 U.S.C. 511(b))

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to pay stipends to individuals undergoing advanced training in any modern foreign language with respect to which he determines there is a special need in business, government, or education. No payment is made to the institutions of higher education, although the stipend is so computed as to include an amount which will enable the individual to meet his tuition and subsistence needs.

8. Foreign Language Research (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 602; 20 U.S.C. 512)

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract for studies and surveys relating to the need for improved instruction in modern foreign languages and research in effective methods of improving such instruction. While the statute provides for a contractual arrangement, the program has many of the attributes of a grant situation.

9. Research and Experimentation in More Effective Utilization of Television, Radio, Motion Pictures, and Related Media (NDEA (Public Law 85–864), sec. 702; 20 U.S.C. 542)

In carrying out his authorization to make grants or contracts for research, experimentation, and dissemination of information in the development of methods for utilizing new media of communication for educational purposes, the Commissioner of Education has frequently paid for research, experimentation and dissemination activities of institutions of higher education without regard to religious affiliation.

B. Grants for teaching in the education of mentally retarded children (Public Law 85–926, sec. 1, as amended by Public Law 86–158 at 73 Stat. 346 (20 U.S.C. 611))

The Commissioner of Education makes grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher education to assist them in providing training of teachers in fields related to the education of mentally retarded children. These grants may be used both in connection with the costs of instruction and for establishing and maintaining fellowships. This is a new program under which grants have been made to only 19 institutions. One of these is known to have religious affiliation.

C. Cooperative research on problems in education (Public Law 531, 83d Cong., sec. 1; 20 U.S.C. 311)

The Commissioner of Education is authorized to contract or make other jointly financed cooperative arrangements with institutions of higher education for studies and research on problems in education. In practice all arrangements have been made through contract. The program is listed here, however, because it has many of the attributes of a grant situation.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

A. Health research project grants (PHS Act, sec. 301(d); 42 U.S.C. 241(d) Public Law 660, 84th Cong.; 33 U.S.C. 467, et. seq. Public Law 159, 84th Cong.; 42 U.S.C. 1857, et seq.)

Grants are authorized to defray the cost of research projects relating to the causes, prevention, treatment, or control of the physical and mental diseases and impairments of man, and also relating to the cause, control, and prevention of air and water pollution.[4]

B. Construction of hospitals and other medical facilities (PHS Act, title VI; 42 U.S.C. 291, et seq.)

Grants are authorized to meet from one-third to two-thirds the cost of construction of general hospitals and other medical facilities. Such other facilities include hospital-related housing for nurses and nursing homes.

C. Construction of health research facilities (PHS Act, title VII; 42 U.S.C. 292, et seq.)

Grants are authorized to meet up to 50 percent of the cost of construction, remodeling, or equipping of facilities for the conduct of research in the sciences related to health.

D. Categorical training grants and traineeships (PHS Act, secs. 403, 412, 422, 433(a) and 303; 42 U.S.C. 283a, 287a, 288a, 289c and 242a)

Grants may be made to training institutions to meet the costs of providing specialized, technical or advanced training with respect to particular diseases of public health significance (cancer, heart disease, mental health, etc.) or with respect to air or water pollution (42 U.S.C. 1857; 33 U.S.C. 466). One example of such grants were those by the National Institute of Mental Health to schools of divinity of the three major faiths to develop on a 5-year "pilot" basis improved instruction in mental health. Authority is also provided for awarding traineeships to individuals, selected either by the training school or by the Public Health Service, to provide them subsistence support and expenses during their period of categorical training (42 C.F.R., parts 63 and 64).

E. Research fellowship grants and awards (PHS Act, secs. 301(c), 433(a); 42 U.S.C. 241(c), 289c)

Authority is provided to award fellowships to individuals selected by the Service, or to make grants to institutions to permit them to award fellowships, for the purpose of providing subsistence support and expenses to an individual in his conduct of research or in his acquisition of research training (42 C.F.R., part 61).

F. Traineeships for professional public health personnel (PHS Act, sec. 306, 42 U.S.C. 242d)

Authority is provided for awards either directly to individuals or by means of grants to the training institution to cover the cost of the individual's tuition, fees and subsistence during his graduate or specialized training in public health for physicians, engineers, nurses, and other professional health personnel.

G. Advanced training of professional nurses (PHS Act, sec. 307; 42 U.S.C. 242e)

Authority is provided for the award of traineeships by grants to training institutions to cover the cost of tuition, fees, stipends, and allowances of professional nurses being trained to teach or to serve in an administrative or supervisory capacity.

H. Project grants for graduating training in public health (PHS Act, sec. 309; 42 U.S.C. 242g)

Project grants are authorized to be awarded to schools of public health, nursing, or engineering to meet the costs of graduate or specialized training in public health for nurses or engineers and for the purpose of strengthening or expanding graduate public health training in such schools.

I. Indian health—aid in construction of community hospitals (Public Law 85–151; 42 U.S.C. 2005)

Grants are authorized to aid in the construction of community hospitals based on the proportion of construction costs attributable to the health needs of the Indians in the community.

J. Cancer control grants (Public Law 86–703)

Under authority of the current Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act (Public Law 86–703), grants are made to hospitals, universities, or other such institutions, for the conduct of cancer prevention, control, and eradication programs.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

A. Grants for research, demonstration and training projects related to vocational rehabilitation (Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 565, 83d Cong.), sec. 4(a); 29 U.S.C. 34(a))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit organizations for paying a part of the cost of projects for research and demonstrations in the field of vocational rehabilitation and training of individuals in professional fields which provide services to physically handicapped individuals. Many of the grants for research and demonstration are made to institutions of higher education, and most of the grants for training are made to such institutions. The training grants include an amount to enable the institutions to pay stipends to persons in training.

[4] A recent amendment (Public Law 86–798) has also authorized the use of up to 15 percent of the amounts appropriated for health research projects for grants to nonprofit universities or other institutions for the general support of their health research and research training programs. While no such grants have yet been made, present plans are to make awards without regard to the religious affiliation of the grantees.

B. Vocational rehabilitation fellowships (Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 565, 83d Cong.), sec. 7(a)(3); 29 U.S.C. 37(a)(3))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide training in technical matters relating to vocational rehabilitation services, including the establishment and maintenance of research fellowships with stipends and allowances. Pursuant to this a limited number of research fellowships are awarded for study and research at various institutions of higher education.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

A. Cooperative research or demonstration projects (sec. 1110 of the Social Security Act, as added by sec. 331 of Public Law 880, 84th Cong.; 42 U.S.C. 1310)

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to or contracts with public and other nonprofit organizations for paying part of the cost of research or demonstration projects relating to public welfare and social security matters. While the enabling legislation was effective for fiscal year 1957, appropriations were first available to carry out this program during the 1961 fiscal year. $350,000 has been made available for this purpose, and it is anticipated that one-third to one-half of that amount will be for financing projects at institutions of higher education. In the approval of such projects no distinction is made because of religious affiliation of an institution.

B. Children's bureau—special projects relating to crippled children and maternal and child health services (secs. 502(b) and 512(b) of the Social Security Act, as amended by secs. 707(b)(1)(A) and 707(b)(2)(A) of Public Law 86–778; 42 U.S.C. 702(b) and 712(b))

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants to State health agencies and nonprofit institutions of higher education for special projects in the field of services for crippled children and maternal and child health. Up to now such projects have been financed by State agencies as the result of receiving grants from the Federal Government. In the future, however, grants will be made directly from the Federal Government, and no distinction is planned with respect to sectarian institutions.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE OF FIELD ADMINISTRATION

Surplus property utilization program (Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.), as amended, secs. 203(j) and 203(k); 40 U.S.C. 484 (j) and (k))

Under these provisions the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to allocate surplus personal property for transfer by the Administrator of General Services to State agencies for distribution to educational, health, and civil defense organizations. Surplus real estate assigned by the General Services Administrator is transferred by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for educational and public health purposes at a public benefit discount which can be as much as 100 percent of the appraised fair value. The institutions which receive real and personal property include public and private nonprofit elementary and secondary schools and institutions of higher education.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Aid for nuclear equipment and loan of nuclear materials to colleges (Atomic Energy Act of 1946 (Public Law 585, 79th Cong.), as amended, secs. 3(a), 5(c)(2); 42 U.S.C. 2051, 2111)

The Atomic Energy Commission operates a variety of programs under which support is given for activities in institutions of higher education. For purposes of this listing these programs are grouped as follows:

1. Special fellowships for study at institutions of higher education under which payments are made to individuals to cover tuition and subsistence costs for students in nuclear science and engineering and for graduate work in the atomic energy aspects of the life sciences.

2. Grants to institutions to enable them to acquire: (a) nuclear laboratory equipment; (b) research reactors; and (c) teaching aids and laboratory equipment for radioisotope technology.

3. Loans of materials for instruction in nuclear fields and for research reactors.

4. Support of research in institutions of higher education through grants or contracts in various fields involving atomic energy.

5. Summer institutes in institutions of higher education to train teachers in various fields relating to atomic energy. Instructional costs are defrayed by the Atomic Energy Commission; stipends to teachers, who may be from schools with religious affiliation are paid by the National Science Foundation. (cf. NDEA counseling and foreign language institutes where, because of statute, stipends are paid only to public school teachers.)

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A. Vocational rehabilitation (veterans' benefits (Public Law 85–857), Chap. 31, secs. 1503, 1504; 38 U.S.C. 1503, 3504)

Training is purchased from educational institutions of all types, including those with sectarian affiliation, for the rehabilitation of war veterans with service-connected disabilities. In addition, a subsistence allowance is paid the veteran.

B. Educational benefits for World War II and Korean veterans (veterans' benefits (Public Law 85–857), Chap. 33, sec. 1601 et seq.; 38 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.)

Educational benefits for veterans of World War II were included in Public Law 346, 78th Congress. Under the original arrangement, a tuition payment was made directly to the school which the veteran attended, and this could include a theological school. In addition, a subsistence payment was made to the veteran. The arrangement for payment of tuition directly to the school was changed by Public Law 550, 82d Congress, which authorized a payment to the veteran and left it to him to take care of any tuition charges. The program for World War II veterans ended in July 1956, except for a small number of persons who were entitled to training benefits beyond that date. The present program authorized by Public Law 85–857 provides for an education and training allowance directly to the veteran. Small allowances are paid to each educational institution to reimburse it for the cost of making required reports to the Veterans' Administration regarding the veterans in attendance. (38 U.S.C. 1645.)

C. War orphans educational assistance (Veterans' benefits (Public Law 85–857), Chap. 35, secs. 1701 et seq.; 38 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.)

This program provides educational opportunities for children of wartime veterans who died from a service-incurred disease or injury. The student must be pursuing an approved program of education in an institution of higher education or in a vocational school below the college level. Payments are made directly to the student to meet in part the expense of his tuition and subsistence. The Veterans' Administrator is required to pay each educational institution $1 per month for each eligible person enrolled to assist in defraying the cost of preparing and submitting reports (38 U.S.C. 1765).

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

(National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (Public Law 507, 81st Cong.) secs. 3(a)(2), (3), (4) and (b), 11(c) and 14, as amended by Public Law 85–510, sec. 2 and Public Law 86–232, sec. 1; 42 U.S.C. 1862(a), (2), (3), (4) and (b), 1870(c) and 1872a (b))

Pursuant to broad statutory authorizations to foster research and education in scientific fields, the National Science Foundation provides the following support for activities in institutions of higher education:

1. Fellowships for various types of graduate studies include allowance for tuition and subsistence and permit study at any accredited nonprofit institution of higher education in the United States or abroad.

2. Summer, academic year and in-service institutes are financed at institutions of higher education through stipend and tuition payments to improve the qualifications of high school and college teachers in science and mathematics. Stipends are paid without regard to the fact that the teacher is from a school with religious affiliation. (Cf. NDEA counseling and foreign language institutes (p. 4, supra) where, because of statute, stipends are paid only to public school teachers.)

3. Special projects in science education are financed to provide the experimental testing and development of promising new ideas for the improvement of science instruction.

4. Programs are financed to improve course content and supplementary teaching aids in science.

5. Grants are made for basic research in the sciences, including funds for the use of graduate students as research assistants.

STATE DEPARTMENT

The State Department supports educational activities to a considerable extent by a variety of programs for international exchange, improvement of cultural relationships and rendering of technical assistance to foreign countries. Basically, under the programs, students from this country are permitted to attend educational institutions abroad and students from foreign countries are permitted to attend educational institutions in this country. In either case payments are made to cover the cost of instruction and subsistence. For the education of foreign students in this country, the State Department makes contractual arrangements with the Institute of International Education, a private nonprofit organization in New York City, which in turn sponsors and makes specific arrangements for educating the foreign students. Training for a profession in religion is not financed but schools with religious affiliation are used. In performing this service IEE gives financial aid to the students to cover tuition and other related student costs.

The State Department has also made direct financial arrangements with universities and charitable organizations in this country to provide student leader seminars, high school training for teenagers, and English language classes for foreign students. In addition, the State Department has a variety of exchange and other educational programs by which foreign individuals are able to study in this country with the assistance of other Government agencies and private educational organizations. Examples of programs are:

1. U.S. information and educational exchange programs, 22 U.S.C. 1991, et seq.

2. Technical cooperation with foreign countries. 22 U.S.C. 1891, et seq.

Under title 22, section 1448, United States Code, a program has been implemented for technical cooperation in the form of assistance to schools abroad founded or sponsored by citizens of the United States and serving

as demonstration centers for methods and practices employed in the United States in certain areas of training. A specific limitation of this program established by the State Department is that no funds may be channeled to a school operated under religious auspices.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The Department of Defense has a number of training and research programs which finance activities at institutions of higher education. Research contracts fall under the procurement authority of each of the three branches of the Armed Forces. Thus, research is supported because of benefits to be received by the Defense Department and training is paid for because it improves the qualifications of military and civilian personnel. Such arrangements have also been made on a great basis to institutions pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1891–93, which specifies that the authority to contract for certain scientific research at nonprofit institutions of higher education shall be deemed to be authority to make grants.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Business management research (Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–699), sec. 602(c); 15 U.S.C. 636(d))

The Small Business Administration is authorized to make grants to various organizations including colleges, universities, and schools of business for research in the field of business management and finance.

Grants have been made in prior years including those to institutions with religious affiliation. No funds are available to conduct this activity for the 1961 fiscal year.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A. National school lunch program (National School Lunch Act (Public Law 396, 79th Cong.), as amended; 42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.)

The purpose of this program is to improve the health and well-being of the Nation's children by providing funds and foods to States and territories for use in serving nutritious midday meals to children attending schools of high school grade and less. The Federal assistance is through payments to the educational agency of each State which then channels the aid to participating schools. However, title 42, section 1759, United States Code, provides that in any State where the State educational agency is not permitted by law to disburse the funds to nonprofit schools they shall be disbursed directly to such schools for program purposes. In more than half of the States the educational agency has considered that it could not make the funds available to nonprofit private schools and as a result in those States the Secretary of Agriculture makes funds available directly to such nonprofit schools, including those with religious affiliation.

B. Special milk program (Agricultural Act of 1954 (Public Law 690, 83d Cong.), sec. 204(b); 7 U.S.C. 1446(c))

Under this program funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation are used to increase the consumption of fluid milk by children in nonprofit schools of high school grade and under, in nonprofit nursery schools, child care centers, etc. devoted to the care and training of children.

C. Forestry research (Public Law 466, 70th Cong., sec. 1; 16 U.S.C. 581)

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to conduct research relating to reforestation and forest products through arrangements with outside organizations. A part of this program is conducted through cooperative arrangements with colleges and universities, and at least one such arrangement has been made with a university with religious affiliation.

D. Use of national forests (30 Stat. 36; 55th Cong.; 16 U.S.C. 479)

The act of June 4, 1897, cited above, authorizes a group of persons residing in the vicinity of national forests to occupy not exceeding two acres of forest land for the erection of a school and not exceeding one acre for the erection of a church. One hundred and sixty-three schools were on forest land on June 30, 1959. Information is not available as to possible religious affiliation, but it is believed that few if any of such schools have religious affiliation. There is, however, no rule to prevent erection of a school because of such affiliation.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—UNIVERSITY RESEARCH PROGRAM

(National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (Public Law 85–568), sec. 203(b)(5); 42 U.S.C. 2473(b)(5))

Research is conducted through contract with institutions of higher education in matters within the scope of interest of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The agency has also made grants to institutions with religious affiliation pursuant to the provision of 42 U.S.C. 1891–1893, which provides that authority to contract with institutions of higher education for certain types of research shall also include the authority to make grants.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—EDUCATION OF INDIAN CHILDREN

Title 25, section 278, United States Code, declares it "to be the settled policy of the Government to make no appropriation whatever out of the Treasury of the United States for education of Indian children in any sectarian school." (See *Quick Bear* v. *Leupp* (1908), 210 U.S. 50, holding that a similar prohibition did not apply to an appropriation from funds held by the United States in trust for a tribe.) Title 25, section 297, United States Code, authorizes the Secretary to provide Indian children in missions with the rations and clothing to which they would be entitled under treaty stipulations if living with their parents.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs arranges for the placement of Indian children in schools with religious affiliation only because of special circumstances. In such cases they make no payment toward instructional costs but do use welfare funds to pay the institution for other needs of the children.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—COLLEGE HOUSING LOAN PROGRAM

(Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, 81st Cong.), sec. 401 et seq.; 12 U.S.C. 1749)

The Housing and Home Finance Administrator is authorized to make construction loans to assist public and private nonprofit institutions offering at least a 2-year program of higher education and public and private nonprofit hospitals operating student nurse or internship programs so that they may provide new or improved housing and other related facilities (such as dining rooms, student centers, and infirmaries) for students and faculties. Under this program, loans are made only where the institution is unable to secure funds for such purposes from other sources upon equally favorable terms and conditions. The loans can cover up to the full cost of construction and have a maturity of up to 50 years, with interest one-fourth percent above the average interest rate on all outstanding Federal obligations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, some weeks ago the President sent to Congress a special message on aid to education. Pursuant to the message, a subcommittee under the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has had bills under intensive consideration for some time. These bills are receiving additional study in the full committee under the chairmanship of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. One of them is now before us and it is anticipated that his Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will report others to the Senate.

I have the deepest respect for the specialized knowledge of the members of the committee. All the legislation which they will offer to the Senate will be most carefully designed both in the light of the President's message and of their independent judgment. As majority leader, therefore, I shall be guided heavily by the committee's recommendations on these questions of Federal aid to education.

It seems to me appropriate at this time, however, to bring to the attention of the Senate certain personal observations on the current course of public discussion of this issue. I speak now as one Senator from the State of Montana, as one Senator of the United States.

I am disturbed, Mr. President, by the possibility that in this current discussion we may be in the process of obscuring the very practical and immediate problems which confront the Nation with respect to education. We may be doing so as a result of a fixation on peripheral issues which, however, important in themselves, do not bring us to the heart of the question.

It is all very well to pursue ad infinitum the great legal and philosophical questions of church and State in a Nation such as ours; these questions do have some implications for the measure now under consideration. It is all very well to probe the great social questions of integration; these, too, also touch on the measure under consideration. While we are doing so, however, let us not lose sight of this reality: Millions of young people face a shortage of first-rate basic educational facilities in this country and continuing inequities of opportunity for the development of their capacities through higher education. They face these shortages and inequities irrespective of their race or religion. The loss to these young people is occurring now, while this debate is in progress. And the loss will intensify until remedial Federal action begins at some specific point, at some specific time. In short, there are stark and tangible facts relating to the condition of education as a whole in this Nation, regardless of religious or racial questions. They cannot be ignored. We must not permit them to be overlooked or obscured.

It was to such facts that the President addressed his messages. It is to such facts which I am confident the committee and, I would hope the Senate, will address preponderant attention.

Here are some of these facts, these stark and tangible facts:

First. There are not enough classrooms in the Nation to house at adequate modern standards, all the young people now in primary and secondary schools. The best available estimate of the shortage today is close to 150,000 classrooms. The dismal promise is that this shortage will continue unless more is done than is now being done to remedy it.

Second. There is a serious shortage of trained, qualified teachers to staff the primary and secondary schools of the Nation, and salary scales apparently have a great deal to do with the failure of the teaching profession to attract sufficient recruits. The probability is that the shortage will grow unless more is done than is now being done to remedy it.

Third. A large part of the physical facilities—the lecture halls, the laboratories, the libraries and so forth—of our institutions of higher and specialized learning are obsolete, many even to the point of constituting a safety hazard. The rate of new construction of these facilities is far from adequate for replacement, let alone sufficient to take care of the 1 million additional students which these institutions will be called upon to carry within the next 5 years.

Fourth. An inadequacy of personal financial resources coupled with an inadequacy of scholarships and other forms of outside assistance prevents, each year, somewhere between 60,000 and 100,000 high school graduates of outstanding promise from going on to college, let alone what must be an enormous number of ordinary qualified students.

It is possible, I suppose, to say that these facts are of little significance. It is possible to say that it does not matter a great deal that young people may be crowded into ancient buildings on a two- or three-shift basis, in classroom numbers beyond the capacity of the teachers to teach effectively. It is possible to say that a bright boy or girl will learn even if he or she is taught by those who are not qualified to teach. It is possible to say that colleges can hold their classes under the old elm tree or in the soda shop if there are no lecture halls or laboratories and it will not much matter. It is possible to say that we have always had bright young people who worked their way through school or managed to make their way in the world even if they did not have the money to go to college and the Nation has somehow got along. One can always find examples to support these conclusions. I dare say we have some living testimony to them right here in the Senate.

Yes, Mr. President, it is possible to say all of these things and to say them in good conscience. But it is not possible to say them in good conscience and, at the same time, to say that we hold to the principle of equitable educational opportunity for all American boys and girls.

It is not possible to say them and to say, at the same time, that this Nation is doing what it must do to maintain its position or even its credibility as a land of hope and promise in the contemporary world. It is not possible to say them and to say, at the same time, that we are going to raise or even to hold our standards of living and our tradition of progress amid the complex and growing problems of civilized existence.

Mr. President, it has been fashionable of late to calculate where we stand in relation to the Russians as a means of focusing attention on the problem of education in this Nation. Undoubtedly, we shall hear more of these educational mathematics now that we and the Russians have put a man in space. Nevertheless, I shall not play, in the Senate, a numbers game of how many this, that, or the other graduates we must produce to keep up with or stay ahead of the Soviet Union.

If we will act in this matter only out of fear of the progress of others rather than on inner national impulse, if we are not prompted to do what must be done by what we see in our own neighborhoods, rather than by what we see thousands of miles away, then we shall merit the shame, the derision, or whatever other dire fate may be implied by being on the wrong end of still another international gap.

For my part, I have no desire to see one school built in this Nation merely because the Russians might soon build two. But I have a deep desire to see flourish many schools, excellent schools, everywhere in this Nation because of the implications to the freedom, the progress, and the dignity of the Nation in the modern world, of an inadequate, incomplete, ineffective, or inconsequential educational experience on the part of our young people. I have a deep desire to see young people educated to their fullest capacity, not in order that we may count more graduates than the Russians but because it is to the individual benefit of our young people and to the Nation's benefit. I have a deep desire to see it because the exigencies of life now and in the decades ahead demand that our resources of human intelligence be trained and utilized to the full if a decent life in freedom is, indeed, to be possible at all.

In short, Mr. President, I suggest that it is not how we stand in relation to Russia that matters so much but how we stand in relation to our own ideals and needs. In this perspective the basic issue we must face in considering the legislation now before the Senate reduces itself to these two questions: Is an ample and reasonably equitable opportunity for education, for each young person in whatever geographic or financial station that chance may place him, a proper objective of American society? Indeed, can the Nation afford any other objective?

If this objective is regarded as neither desirable nor necessary, that is one thing. Some might so see it and, therefore, promptly dismiss the issue. But among the great majority of Americans, I believe, this objective is espoused. Unless it were, it would be hard to understand why the President, as his predecessor did before him, would see fit to address a message to the Congress on the question of Federal aid to education. Unless it were, the question would hardly be a matter for serious consideration by the Senate at this time; and, let me add, it is a matter of most serious consideration at this time.

But even as most Senators and most people in the United States may embrace the objective as both necessary and desirable, I am sure many look to its achievement by ways other than those recommended by the President. Certainly, there is room for debate and discussion here. I would express the hope, however, that such debate and discussion will be based upon national fact and not fiction, on national reality and not national nostalgia.

One fact, one reality we have got to face is that States and localities and families do not have equal financial capacity even if they might have the willingness to support the cost of full and equitable educational opportunity for all young people. Some States and localities have more financial resources than others. Some States and localities pay more heed to these matters than others. It is as simple as that. As a result, there are millions of American boys and girls whose educational start is poor and inadequate for no other reason than that of a chance location in one place instead of another.

One need not search for scapegoats to blame for this fact. While the reasons are complex, for the most part, they are inherent in the uneven growth of the Nation. They are inherent in the vastly expanded costs of modern education. They are inherent in the changing nature of American society and the world which has elevated education to a key position in the pursuit of happiness by individuals and the pursuit of progress by nations.

We cannot turn back the clock in the educational aspect of our national life without turning it back in all. We cannot move education back into the little red school house while the rest of society is moving into skyscrapers.

We no longer say to the States, as once we did, Mr. President, raise your militia on your own for the Federal Government can have no part of it. We no longer say to the States, as once we did, worry alone about the condition of your farmers, your businesses, your unemployed, for the Federal Government can have no part of it. As it is with the militia, with the farmers, with business, with the unemployed and countless other aspects of our society, so, too, is it with education.

We can no longer say to the States and localities, as once we did, worry about education by yourselves. The realities of contemporary life do not permit us to do so.

I know my faith is well founded when I say further that the Senate will not be swerved from its responsibilities in this matter by peripheral issues of religion and race. It is not difficult to sense the churning of these fervent issues just below the surface of the present debate on school aid.

If there is one responsibility above all others which confronts the committee and the Senate, it is to see to it that these passions do not inhibit us from action. Our responsibility is to design bills which, while they do not ignore the special viewpoints of religion or race, at the same time, do not permit these passion-packed factors to overwhelm what can be done now, what must be done now to improve the educational structure of the Nation.

We shall be in a better position to act in that fashion if we examine and grasp the full purport of the President's messages on education. Dissect this message

and it is clear that his proposals fall into several major categories.

The first is a program of Federal grants to the States totaling more than $2 billion over a 3-year period. These funds would be used for the construction of public primary and secondary schools and, for improving teachers' salaries as each State may determine.

The second is a program of Federal long-term low-interest loans for the renovation and construction of the laboratories, classrooms, libraries and so forth of the Nation's colleges. The amount involved is $300 million a year over a 5-year period and both public and private institutions of higher learning would be eligible. Related to this program is another for extension of the program for the construction of housing for college students and faculties. This second undertaking would provide $250 million a year for 5 years to be used for long-term low-interest loans to both private and public institutions.

The third major feature of the President's proposal is a program to provide additional Federal scholarships for needy students during the next 5 years. These scholarships will be administered by the States and students who receive them will be free to attend any college, public, private or religious.

The fourth is his separate communication calling for the extension with changes of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. This law, as the Senate knows, provides among other things grants to public schools and loans to private schools to improve the facilities for offering training in such defense-related subjects as foreign languages, mathematics, science and so forth.

There are other elements in the President's proposals on education. The four which I have just enumerated, however, are the most significant. And of these four, the second, third, and fourth features involving higher education and defense-related aid to all primary and secondary schools have not become entangled in any major way in the discussion of either the issue of separation of church and state or that of integration. However, if the debate on the floor takes its tone from the emphasis which has been given to these questions in recent public discussion, the possibility undoubtedly is present that all forms of aid to all schools may be jeopardized. These peripheral issues were not raised by what the President has proposed but by what he did not propose. The President's concern with public primary and secondary education is not such as to hurt any group but merely to improve the public school system in the Nation. Beyond mere improvement, what may well be involved in his proposals is the development of a modern public school system worthy of the name in many parts of the Nation.

Aside from questions of religion and race, there is undoubtedly a segment of opinion which does not care at all what happens to the public school systems of the Nation. There is another which is deeply concerned. There is still another, which may be concerned but not enough to have the Federal Government act to alleviate the situation. In short, there is a complex spectrum of opinion on this question—quite apart from issues of race and religion. In any action the Senate takes, it must examine and weigh the shadings of this spectrum. Will we now compound this complexity by introducing into the present proposal before us questions of race and religion?

We will not do so if we mean to act effectively on the state of education in the Nation. If improvements in the public school system are necessary and desirable, they are necessary and desirable in their own right. From a national viewpoint they do not become more or less necessary and desirable on the basis of whether or not private or parochial schools are also improved.

In short, Mr. President, what I would suggest is that the issue of Federal aid for improving the public schools stand on its own merit and be faced by the Senate at this time and disposed of on its own merit. Let us vote this aid for the public schools or not, as we see fit, but let us vote on the realities of the state of public education in this Nation and not on the basis of other matters, however important they may be in themselves.

Let me say that I appreciate the problems which confront religious and other private schools. Surely they face the same rising costs of construction and maintenance. Surely they have to contend with overcrowding and the problems of replacement and expansion of facilities. Surely parents of children in these private and religious schools not only pay a share of the costs of public education in their States and localities but also costs of the private and religious schools. One can recognize the significant contribution of these schools to American life without automatically placing them in the same category as public schools. That is not to say they are inferior or superior. They are simply different, if for no other reason than that their very being is associated with, and depends upon, particular groups and particular concepts.

It would be my hope, therefore, that we will have the opportunity to consider the question of aid to private schools in another manner and in other legislation than the proposal now before us. That would be the just, the decent, the fair way to face up to it.

Personally, I can see much merit in the extension of constitutionally permissible aid to religious and private schools. But I can see no merit whatsoever in the concept that unless such aid is extended then it is better that other schools decay. That course is the course of disunity. Who gains if all colleges are not rehabilitated and expanded by Federal aid? Who gains if scholarships are not made available by the Federal Government to all deserving students? Who gains if the public primary and secondary schools of the Nation decay? Who gains if facilities in all schools for the encouragement of effective teaching of defense-related subjects are not provided?

I do not think anyone gains but I am certain that millions of individuals will lose—individuals of all races and religions—and I am certain that the Nation will suffer the most unhappy consequences.

One may ask still another question: Who gains if the parochial and private elementary and high schools are not aided by the Federal Government the same as are the public schools? Let us face that question but let us face it on its own merits as a question of national policy.

Much is lost if instead of this straightforward approach we continue on the recent course of the debate which may well lead via the exacerbation of racial and religious sentiments to a dead end for all aid to education. That is what I hope we shall avoid. That is what I know the committee is trying to avoid. That is what this Senate must avoid, as we value our children's future and the Nation's future.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I congratulate and highly commend the distinguished majority leader for the magnificent speech, unanswerable in its logic, which he has just delivered in the Senate. The highest tribute I can pay to the majority leader is to tell him now that his speech is my answer to the proponent of the amendment. I simply make this added comment: I have said from the beginning that we are seeking to have the Senate pass a public school bill. I am offering a public school bill. The Morse-Thompson bill is a public school bill.

As soon as the Senate disposes of this bill, the Subcommittee on Education will proceed with what we call markup sessions, that is, meetings in executive sessions, on the various proposals in connection with National Defense Education Act. I think there is no doubt that our considerations in connection with the National Defense Education Act will involve some proposed amendment which, for special educational purposes, will seek to provide money to private schools for special defense-related purposes, as is already the case. Congress has established the principle of assistance for special educational purposes incurred in preparing the Nation better to increase its strength and defend the security of the country.

It is my opinion, as one who has long stood for Federal interest-bearing loans to private schools, that the interest charge should meet the cost of the use of the money. It should not be commercial interest, because commercial interest includes a profit; and in my judgment it would not be fitting for the Federal Government to seek to make a profit at the expense of private schools. However, I believe it is sound public policy and in the interest of the welfare of the country to assist the nonreligious activities of private schools by providing interest-bearing loans. But that is another subject matter. In our judgment, it should not become involved in this bill. We should carry forward our original intention to pass, in connection with S. 1021, a public school bill only.

Mr. President, with these comments, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I join with the majority leader and the chairman of the subcommittee in opposition to the pending amendment.

On March 29 of this year, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and I introduced S. 1482 for the purpose of making loans available to private schools under provisions which would require a test of the constitutionality of the bill. The bill also would prohibit any aid to schools which practiced racial segregation. Since that time, much water has gone over the dam. We have been persuaded that we could make available to private schools through the National Defense Education Act, more reasonably and with a better chance of passage, that aid which we both believe such schools are entitled to than by the procedure which we originally advocated in S. 1482. When S. 1482 was introduced, I stated that it would permit the President's program to be considered on its own merits, and that a program for nonpublic school construction loans should be considered on its own merits. Thus it would be unnecessary to interject in the debate on the public school aid construction bill any consideration concerning the church-state controversy. I still hold to that view.

In my judgment, the pending amendment is defective in that it fails to make any provision for constitutional tests. I believe it is unwise because it unnecessarily injects the church-state controversy into a public school bill debate, from which that controversy should be excluded.

I hope all Senators will vote against the amendment. I join with the majority leader and the Senator from Oregon in assuring the Senate that the committee will do its very best—and I think its best will be good enough—to make certain that the Senate will have an opportunity in the near future to vote on a bill to provide loans in aid of private schools.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Senator from Pennsylvania spoke for me as well as for himself in the comments he just made.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Arizona, I shall say that I am very happy to have the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] constitute my reply in opposition to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

I am willing, at the convenience of the Senator from Arizona, to yield back the rest of my time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have possibly 5 minutes remaining. I do not think I shall use all of that time.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an excerpt from a statement prepared by John A. O'Brien, Ph. D., of the University of Notre Dame, which appears on page A3616 of the daily RECORD of May 22, 1961.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How many students are enrolled in Catholic schools?

A total of 5,663,648 students in 13,961 schools. Of these, 321,000 are in 267 colleges and universities, 41,871 in 537 seminaries, 886,295 in 2,433 high schools, and 4,414,482 in 10,724 elementary schools. They are taught by 168,677 full-time teachers, and the operating costs per year amount to about $2.3 billion. Approximately the same number of Catholic students are also enrolled in public schools. In many large cities a substantial percentage of the total school enrollment is in Catholic schools: Examples: Chicago, 34 percent; Philadelphia, 39 percent; Pittsburgh, 42 percent.

What is the enrollment in other church-supported schools?

About 400,000 students. Lutherans have 180,000 students in approximately 1,500 schools, including 30 high schools. Episcopalians have 480 schools with a total enrollment of 37,000. Other denominations have about 200,000 students in their schools.

How many are enrolled in other private schools?

About 900,000 students. This makes a total of about 6.8 million students in parochial and other private schools, about one-fifth the number in public schools.

Do these private schools greatly reduce school taxes?

Yes. The average annual cost for the education of a pupil in a public elementary and secondary school is $496, and for a college or university student is $1,414.05. This means that Catholics alone, by bearing the whole cost of educating 5,300,777 elementary and high school pupils and 321,000 college and university students, reduce the public school tax by $3,083,095,442.

If we add the savings effected by the education of the 400,000 students in other church-supported schools and 900,000 in other private schools, the educational tax bill of the general public is reduced more than another billion—a total savings well in excess of $4 billion. This means that the educational outlay of the family sending its children to the public school is reduced about $100 per year.

Do parents who send their children to private, nonprofit schools pay a second school tax?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have a few comments to make in rebuttal. The distinguished majority leader has advised us not to be concerned with peripheral issues. I do not think that 15 percent of the school population is a segment we can ignore. I do not believe we can sweep it under the rug and say, "Don't worry, boys. We will not take care of you this time; but the next time around, in about 10 days or 2 weeks, we will vote opposite to the way in which we will vote today."

For the life of me, I cannot understand how a Senator who votes against my amendment today will be able to vote for precisely the same provision in a bill which will come before the Senate within the next several weeks. To do so, I suggest, is the height of inconsistency. It would indicate to me, if I were an observer on the outside, that something was phony about the whole approach, that we do not want to take the chance of paying attention to the private and parochial schools now simply because some persons might argue that to do so might hinder the passage of the bill.

I cannot understand how the President in good conscience can accept a Federal aid to private and parochial schools amendment attached as a rider to another bill, but say he cannot sign the pending bill with this amendment attached to it.

Frankly, the arguments, are now reduced to one: Do not do anything to disturb this bill, regardless of how good it is or regardless of how logical it is. We must pass a Federal aid to education bill.

Mr. President, I do not believe the majority of the American people hold with that idea. I think they believe they are capable of assuming the responsibility of educating their own children, whether that responsibility falls within the public schools or within the private and parochial schools, under whatever religion they might be conducted.

I close by restating that it is a great mystery to me to understand how some Senators can vote against an amendment this week and in favor of it the next time it comes around. It indicates to me that there must be something wrong with this approach; otherwise the proponents of the bill would not fear the inclusion of private and parochial schools, because they have admitted that they have introduced a bill to do just that. I suggest that we do it now and save the Senate, the Senate reporters, and the rest of the Senate staff much time in this Chamber and save a lot of words from banging up against the ceiling and coming back again.

Let us get on with the job of providing aid for private and parochial schools now. Let us not put it off any longer.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All remaining time has been yielded back.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I now move that the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Oregon to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on the pending question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GOLDWATER. A "nay" vote would be in support of my position. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendments of the Senator from Arizona. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 25, as follows:

[No. 51]

YEAS—66

Allott	Hartke	Morse
Bartlett	Hayden	Morton
Bennett	Hill	Moss
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Hruska	Neuberger
Butler	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W.Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnston	Russell
Capehart	Jordan	Schoeppel
Carroll	Kefauver	Smathers
Church	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clark	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Stennis
Curtis	Magnuson	Symington
Dworshak	Mansfield	Talmadge
Eastland	McClellan	Thurmond
Ellender	McGee	Wiley
Engle	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	Metcalf	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Miller	Yarborough
Gruening	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NAYS—25

Aiken	Douglas	Mundt
Beall	Fong	Pastore
Boggs	Goldwater	Pell
Bridges	Hart	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Hickey	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Keating	Scott
Cotton	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Dirksen	Lausche	
Dodd	Long, La.	

NOT VOTING—9

Anderson	Carlson	Hickenlooper
Blakley	Chavez	McCarthy
Bush	Gore	Young, N. Dak.

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. GOLDWATER's amendments was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5-16-61—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out title I of the bill and to insert the following:

TITLE I—ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1961

Short title

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1961".

Definitions

SEC. 102. For purposes of this title—

(a) The term "elementary and secondary education" does not include any education below the kindergarten level or above the twelfth grade.

(b) The term "Federal income taxes" means—

(1) the income taxes imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (including payments of estimated tax under sections 6153 and 6154 of such Code);

(2) the withholding taxes imposed by chapter 3 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the income of nonresident alien individuals and foreign corporations and on tax-free covenant bonds; and

(3) the withholding tax on wages of individuals imposed by chapter 24 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

(c) The term "school-age population" means, with respect to each State, that part of the population of such State which is between the ages of 5 and 17 years, both inclusive, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of data furnished by the Department of Commerce for the most recent year for which satisfactory data is available with respect to that part of the population of all States which is between such ages.

(d) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(e) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

(f) The term "State educational agency" means, with respect to each State, the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for State supervision of elementary and secondary education, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

Authorization of appropriations for payments to States

SEC. 103. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, for the making of payments to the States as provided in section 104 of this title, an amount equal to 1 percent of the Federal income taxes collected in the States during the preceding fiscal year.

(b) For purposes of this title, the amount of Federal income taxes collected in the States during any fiscal year is an amount equal to—

(1) the total amount of Federal income taxes collected in the States during such fiscal year, reduced by

(2) the total amount of credits allowed and refunds paid during such fiscal year with respect to overpayments of Federal income taxes during such fiscal year or any preceding fiscal year.

Payments to States for elementary and secondary education

SEC. 104. (a) Subject to the provisions of subsections (b) and (c), the Secretary shall pay to each State, as soon as practicable after the enactment of each Act making appropriations pursuant to the authorization contained in section 103(a), an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount appropriated in such Act pursuant to such authorization as the school-age population of such State bears to the school-age population of all the States.

(b) The amount of payments to which a State is entitled under subsection (a) during any fiscal year shall be reduced by an amount equal to the sum of—

(1) that portion of any payment made to such State under subsection (a) during the preceding fiscal year, or during any prior fiscal year (unless reduction therefor under this subsection has previously been made), which the Secretary determines, on the basis of reports submitted by the State educational agency under section 105(a), was used for any purpose other than elementary or secondary education, and

(2) that portion of any payment made to such State under subsection (a) during the preceding year, or during any prior fiscal year, which is unexpended at the close of the preceding fiscal year and which the State educational agency does not certify under section 105(b) will be used exclusively for purposes of elementary and secondary education.

(c) The Secretary shall pay to each State only that portion of each payment to which such State is entitled under the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) as the State educational agency of such State certifies will be used in such State during the fiscal year in which such amount is paid and in succeeding fiscal years exclusively for purposes of elementary and secondary education.

Reports by State educational agencies

SEC. 105. (a) The State educational agency of each State shall, on or before September 1 of each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the first payment to such State is made under section 104(a), submit a report to the Secretary setting forth—

(1) the amount of the payments received by the State under this title during the preceding fiscal year, or during any prior fiscal year, which was used in the State during the preceding fiscal year exclusively for purposes of elementary and secondary education, and

(2) the amount of the payments received by the State under this title during the preceding fiscal year, or during any prior fiscal year, which, at the close of the preceding fiscal year, has not been expended.

(b) The State educational agency shall, in submitting each report under subsection (a), certify to the Secretary what portion of any payment received by the State under this title which remains unexpended at the close of the preceding fiscal year will be used in such State, during the fiscal year in which such report is submitted or during succeeding fiscal years, exclusively for purposes of elementary and secondary education.

Authorization of appropriations for administration

SEC. 106. There is authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such sum as may be necessary to administer the provisions of this title.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the amendment is printed and

has been on the desks of Senators for several days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise for two purposes.

First, I wish to notify Senators there will be a joint meeting of the two Houses in the Hall of the House of Representatives tomorrow at 12:30. The concurrent resolution providing for the meeting has been agreed to by both Houses, and Senators should be on notice.

Secondly, I have consulted with the distinguished minority leader, with the Senator who offered the amendment, and the Senator in charge of the bill before the Senate, and I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request which meets with the approval of them all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 1 hour and 15 minutes be allotted for consideration of the Case of South Dakota amendment, with 1 hour to be under the jurisdiction of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and 15 minutes to be under the jurisdiction of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, while Senators are in the Chamber, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, on the desks of Senators I have had placed a 1-page memorandum which analyzes the amendment which I am offering and states what it would do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 15 minutes. I wish to start by reading the memorandum, and then I shall take up in some detail several of its points.

The amendment proposes that an amount of money equal to 1 percent of the income tax receipts, both corporate and personal, be available for appropriation to the States for the purpose of helping with elementary and secondary education. Under the terms of the amendment it would return this money to the States on the basis of the number of children of school age, 5 to 17 inclusive.

Under the amendment the cost to the Treasury would be within the budget as originally submitted as the administration bill. One percent of the income tax receipts for 1962 is estimated to be $664 million.

The cost to the Federal Treasury would be 1 percent of the amount estimated to be taken in as receipts from the income tax, both corporate and personal. Because of the very nature of the amendment, there would be no Federal controls. The State would certify that the money would be spent for elementary or secondary education, and once each year the State would certify with respect to any unspent money that might be in the fund. But as to equalization—a word which has been used in the Senate during the debate a great deal—the only equalization proposed by the amendment would be that which comes from dividing 1 percent of the total income tax receipts on the basis of the number of children of school age.

The measure of the need would be the number of children in each State in relation to the total number of children of school age in the entire United States. A child is a child whether he lives in Arizona, Alabama or Michigan, and regardless of his color, heritage, or anything else. A child between 5 and 17 years of age would be in need of education.

These are the advantages, as I see them, of my proposal over the committee bill:

First, it would count every child all the time—for though absent today, he may be present or in the public schools tomorrow.

Second, it would save the Treasury approximately $200 million and stay within the budget. The committee bill would exceed the budget by almost $200 million and would require more Federal employees to administer it. The amendment I have suggested would not require the addition of a single employee to the Federal payroll, and all that would be necessary to compute the amount to be appropriated would be to place a decimal point in the total amount of the tax receipts from the income taxes. All that would be necessary to apportion the amount would be to apply a divider between the total number of children in the several States and the number of children in an individual State.

Third, there would be no possibility of juggling in the administration or of logrolling in the modifications of the distribution formula.

I hope that when the chairman of the subcommittee handling the bill returns to the floor, he will take note of the fact that in my presentation I am not suggesting any modification of the formula used in the committee bill. But I shall suggest, as earnestly as I can, that the very fact that the subcommittee changed the formula from the basis that was originally used in the bill introduced by the Senator from Oregon effected very different results. The fact that there would be different results, when applied to various States, as a result of tinkering with the formula is evidence of the built-in character of inequity in the formula utilized by the committee bill, as amended.

Fourth; the amendment would automatically adjust to population and income changes. If the population rises, the school population will go up. If the income tax receipts go up, the amount available for appropriation will consequently go up, but within the 1 percent permitted.

Fifth, States would spend their allotments for elementary and secondary education as they, closest to the needs, might determine.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Are there any strings attached, so far as the amendment is concerned, as to how the money shall be used, provided it is used for education?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; provided it is used for elementary and secondary education.

Mr. COTTON. I am not raising the question as to what the courts might rule but as far as the Senator's amendment is concerned if a State at present by State law backed by public opinion is furnishing transportation or other services to nonpublic school pupils, would there be anything in this amendment which would stop that practice?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Not if the transportation is for elementary and secondary school children.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the Senator, and I congratulate him for offering his amendment. It takes many of the harassing questions out of the bill. It removes the danger of Federal control and is completely fair.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. I especially appreciate his statement, because he presented an amendment earlier which had many of these same virtues. His amendment approached the problem from the angle of making available the receipts from the cigarette tax, or a portion of them. The Senator has studied this question, and I appreciate his comment very much.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The comment of the Senator from New Hampshire causes me to indicate for the RECORD that our very splendid colleague from South Dakota came before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and discussed his proposal before the committee. He did it then in a very candid manner and to a very knowledgeable degree, as he is doing in the Senate today. Although formal reply on behalf of the committee's position will be made by the floor manager, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] I wish to say that we in committee were very desirous, as was indicated during the period that our colleague spoke, of listening carefully to the formula presented by the esteemed Senator from South Dakota. His presentation then as now merits the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the Senator from West Virginia for his remarks. I may say at this point that I appreciated the opportunity which was afforded me to go before the committee when it was in executive session. The committee had completed its hearings prior to the time that I drafted my amendment. Consequently, there was no opportunity to present it before the committee while they were conducting hearings. They did accord me the courtesy of explaining it to them in executive session before they marked up the committee bill.

I wish to deal briefly with what the provisions of the amendment would mean

so far as the several States are concerned. On the 18th of May of this year, at page 8363 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I inserted a table which showed the estimated allotment to the several States under the various proposals. I ask unanimous consent that that table may appear at this point in my remarks, with the column relating to the Cotton amendment being deleted, to leave the other four columns. I call attention to the fact that there was one typographical error made in the heading over the column relating to the Case amendment. That column was headed by the abbreviation "Ind." which stands for "individual." It was interpreted by the printer to read "industrial." That heading should be "Individual and Corporate Income Tax," rather than "Industrial."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated allotments to States under various proposals

[Dollar amounts in millions]

State	Number of school-age children in each State (age 5 to 17)	Case amendment (1 percent of total individual and corporate income taxes)	Administration proposal (direct Treasury appropriation)	S. 1021 as reported (direct Treasury appropriation)	State	Number of school-age children in each State (age 5 to 17)	Case amendment (1 percent of total individual and corporate income taxes)	Administration proposal (direct Treasury appropriation)	S. 1021 as reported (direct Treasury appropriation)
Totals	45,723,000	$664	$666	$850	Montana	187,000	$2.7	$2.9	$3.9
					Nebraska	370,000	5.4	5.3	7.4
Alabama	933,000	13.6	19.7	24.0	Nevada	69,000	1.0	1.0	1.0
Alaska	58,000	.8	.6	1.1	New Hampshire	141,000	2.0	1.7	2.7
Arizona	321,000	3.7	6.3	7.4	New Jersey	1,352,000	19.6	14.4	16.6
Arkansas	505,000	7.3	10.5	12.9	New Mexico	266,000	3.9	5.3	6.4
California	3,540,000	51.4	57.7	46.2	New York	3,715,000	53.9	37.7	40.7
Colorado	451,000	6.5	7.2	8.9	North Carolina	1,299,000	18.9	27.9	33.8
Connecticut	556,000	8.1	6.6	5.2	North Dakota	185,000	2.7	3.1	4.6
Delaware	111,000	1.6	1.2	1.2	Ohio	2,408,000	35.0	28.7	39.5
District of Columbia	180,000	2.6	1.6	1.6	Oklahoma	581,000	8.4	12.0	12.6
Florida	1,049,000	15.2	19.1	21.9	Oregon	458,000	6.7	7.1	9.0
Georgia	1,116,000	16.2	22.0	28.0	Pennsylvania	2,686,000	39.0	26.9	44.0
Hawaii	173,000	2.5	3.1	3.7	Rhode Island	201,000	2.9	1.8	3.4
Idaho	188,000	2.7	3.8	4.4	South Carolina	749,000	10.9	15.2	20.4
Illinois	2,384,000	34.6	23.3	31.5	South Dakota	194,000	2.9	3.3	4.5
Indiana	1,201,000	17.4	17.0	22.8	Tennessee	953,000	13.9	19.5	23.5
Iowa	713,000	10.4	11.3	14.4	Texas	2,636,000	38.3	40.3	58.1
Kansas	552,000	8.0	9.4	11.1	Utah	264,000	3.8	5.8	6.3
Kentucky	854,000	12.4	14.6	21.4	Vermont	99,000	1.4	1.5	2.1
Louisiana	921,000	13.4	15.0	22.2	Virginia	1,048,000	15.2	17.8	23.8
Maine	243,000	3.5	4.1	5.2	Washington	722,000	10.5	11.4	13.0
Maryland	768,000	11.2	9.0	13.7	West Virginia	551,000	8.0	10.7	12.9
Massachusetts	1,127,000	16.4	11.8	14.8	Wisconsin	1,016,000	14.8	11.6	20.0
Michigan	2,100,000	30.5	27.1	38.0	Wyoming	91,000	1.3	1.5	1.8
Minnesota	891,000	12.9	13.1	18.4	Guam	19,000	.3		.5
Mississippi	666,000	9.7	14.7	17.5	Puerto Rico	823,000	11.9		21.1
Missouri	1,029,000	14.9	12.2	18.5	Virgin Islands	10,000	.1		.3

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reference to the table will show clearly the number of school children in the United States, the number in each State, and the amount that would be received under the amendment which is now pending, the amount that would be received under the so-called administration proposal, and the amount that would be received under S. 1021 as reported by the committee.

Senators will note that the total number of school-age children in the United States is 45,723,000. The total amount of money available for appropriation under the amendment presented would be $664 million. The original administration proposal was $666 million. That is substantially the same amount. So my amendment would be $2 million less than the original administration proposal, and it is clearly within the budget.

The bill reported by the committee would propose an expenditure of $850 million, almost $200 million more, and quite close to $200 million more when there is added to it the amount of the additional expenditure necessary to meet the so-called District of Columbia amendment, which was added yesterday.

The table will speak for itself as to each State. However, Senators examining it will find that a fair distribution is provided because the distribution is entirely upon the basis of the number of children in each State.

The amount under S. 1021 is somewhat larger, primarily in total amount, because of the fact that the formula used requires almost $200 million more to administer it and to make the allocations. So that the individual States will get a part of that extra $200 million.

The amendment I have offered would mean that about $15 would be paid to each State for every child 5 to 17 years of age. It would mean more than that, of course, when figured in terms of those attending the public schools.

Mr. President, I would point out that the amendment completely avoids the possibility of violating the constitutional restrictions on aid to parochial schools; yet it does afford relief to the hard-pressed local property taxpayer who may be supporting both public and parochial schools.

There are States in which are located districts where the number of children attending parochial schools or private schools is as large or nearly as large as the number attending public schools.

The taxpayers of those particular communities have a heavy burden. They provide taxes necessary to support the public schools. In addition, they pay the tuition or other expenses for their children attending private schools. The amendment provides no money directly for parochial schools, but it does mean that the money would be available to the State as if the parochial school children were attending public schools. I believe this is justified on two grounds. First, the child who is in parochial school today may be in public school tomorrow. The buildings and facilities of the school must be developed on that possibility. Second, this is a matter of equity. If some of the children are being given their education in a private school, to that extent there is some relief of the burden on the public. Therefore it seems to me that we are justified in counting all the children in the distribution. There will be some relief, of course, if the local tax burden is not as large as it would otherwise be, and there would be some relief for all the taxpayers.

Without any vestige of Federal control, the taxpayers can get back into their school district some of the money they send to Washington, and there can be no brokerage or leakage in the trip.

Mr. President, the thing that concerns many of the people in my State, and I know in many other States, is the fear that whenever we make any program of appropriation available for distribution to the States there will be some change between what they have to pay into the Treasury and what they get back. They suspect that there will be additional administration costs and that there will be additional employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield myself 10 additional minutes. The amendment requires no additional employees. There is no way in which there could be any brokerage charge.

Without any complex formula, without any rigging or juggling to estimate high income or low income, this returns to States where earned a share of the

corporate income tax sent to the home office. The school districts where corporate income is earned are entitled to share in the tax on the incomes their patronage produces.

Madam President, I have in my hand a report dated July 29, 1959, and reissued May 12, 1960, by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. It was prepared in response to specific requests from the New York State delegation in the House of Representatives. The report is entitled "Federal Taxation and Expenditures in the Several States." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two tables which appear in the report. The first is table No. 5, which appears on page 16 of the report, and is headed "Estimated Percentage of Federal Tax Revenues by State of Origin Compared With Similar Estimates in Other Reports of the Actual Collections in Each State for Fiscal 1958."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE V.—*Estimated percentage of Federal tax revenues by State of origin compared with similar estimates in other reports and with actual collections in each State, fiscal 1958*

State	This report's estimate by State of origin	Estimate based on actual collections	Estimates by State of origin in other reports	
			Council of State Chambers of Commerce [1]	Tax Foundation [2]
Alabama	1.04	0.62	0.94	0.98
Arizona	.57	.30	.52	.51
Arkansas	.54	.23	.44	.47
California	10.08	8.47	10.27	10.50
Colorado	.95	1.12	.95	.89
Connecticut	2.05	1.74	2.25	2.17
Delaware	.55	.97	.59	.57
District of Columbia	.70	[3]	.66	.72
Florida	2.64	1.38	2.29	2.06
Georgia	1.45	1.06	1.25	1.35
Idaho	.31	.17	.26	.26
Illinois	6.95	8.07	7.28	7.01
Indiana	2.33	2.23	2.40	2.40
Iowa	1.27	.78	1.16	1.15
Kansas	1.00	.68	.93	.97
Kentucky	1.11	1.91	1.04	1.11
Louisiana	1.27	.89	1.22	1.19
Maine	.47	.24	.42	.42
Maryland	1.80	[3]	1.88	1.90
Massachusetts	3.39	2.77	3.53	3.58
Michigan	4.71	7.72	4.98	4.95
Minnesota	1.72	1.55	1.65	1.64
Mississippi	.51	.22	.42	.45
Missouri	2.42	2.36	2.31	2.39
Montana	.34	.18	.30	.31
Nebraska	.69	.55	.65	.62
Nevada	.22	.14	.21	.20
New Hampshire	.33	.19	.32	.32
New Jersey	4.02	3.00	4.22	4.16
New Mexico	.37	.20	.35	.34
New York	13.28	19.52	13.68	13.57
North Carolina	1.60	2.32	1.31	1.42
North Dakota	.25	.12	.19	.20
Ohio	5.83	6.66	6.16	6.15
Oklahoma	1.02	1.01	.91	.94
Oregon	.93	.59	.91	.93
Pennsylvania	7.00	7.27	7.21	7.06
Rhode Island	.53	.39	.56	.57
South Carolina	.70	.36	.60	.64
South Dakota	.25	.11	.22	.22
Tennessee	1.29	.77	1.15	1.18
Texas	4.58	3.39	4.28	4.32
Utah	.38	.25	.35	.36
Vermont	.20	.10	.18	.18
Virginia	1.73	1.56	1.66	1.74
Washington	1.55	1.12	1.55	1.55
West Virginia	.78	.42	.76	.75
Wisconsin	2.12	1.82	2.08	2.05
Wyoming	.19	.09	.17	.17
48 States and District of Columbia	100.00	100.00	99.62	99.61
Alaska	.09	.05	.09	.10
Hawaii	.29	.21	.29	.29
Total	100.38	100.26	100.00	100.00

[1] The Council of State Chambers of Commerce estimates are reported in a mimeographed release of that organization entitled "Allocation of the Federal Tax Burden to the States" (1959). In making its allocation, which is exclusively on a percentage basis, the council has excluded employment taxes, motor vehicle fuel taxes and certain other highway user taxes which are earmarked for specific purposes and transferred to Treasury trust fund accounts.

[2] The Tax Foundation estimates are reported in its publication, Facts and Figures on Government Finance, 1958–59, p. 110. The allocation formula used is explained in the foundation's research aid No. 3 entitled "Allocating the Federal Tax Burden Among the States" (1957).

[3] The Internal Revenue Service combines its collections for Maryland and the District of Columbia. For Maryland and the District as a unit the figure is 2.35 percent.

TABLE III.—*Estimated Federal tax revenues by State of origin, fiscal 1958*

[In millions of dollars]

State	Individual income taxes	Employment taxes	Corporate income taxes	Excises and customs	Estate and gift taxes	Total taxes
Alabama	364.6	97.0	185.0	141.8	6.8	795.2
Arizona	195.9	47.2	110.0	74.9	3.2	431.3
Arkansas	189.4	52.7	102.5	78.7	6.1	409.5
California	3,606.0	803.9	1,952.1	1,143.1	166.1	7,671.2
Colorado	322.1	85.0	188.6	117.9	9.8	723.4
Connecticut	682.8	145.1	500.5	192.0	42.5	1,562.8
Delaware	165.8	35.2	169.4	36.3	10.4	417.2
District of Columbia	229.0	51.0	152.3	92.6	9.6	534.4
Florida	740.2	209.6	662.6	354.7	37.2	2,004.5
Georgia	475.5	140.0	278.1	195.9	12.3	1,101.7
Idaho	98.4	30.8	61.6	40.8	2.3	234.0
Illinois	2,563.8	620.6	1,277.0	737.2	90.1	5,288.7
Indiana	861.2	199.4	409.7	280.2	24.9	1,775.3
Iowa	414.2	125.8	242.2	167.4	16.2	965.9
Kansas	347.0	89.2	177.4	135.0	12.6	761.2
Kentucky	384.1	94.0	205.2	152.0	8.8	844.2
Louisiana	451.5	104.4	217.5	182.4	10.6	966.4
Maine	144.3	39.3	107.8	62.0	5.7	359.0
Maryland	684.2	137.7	326.9	202.4	21.2	1,372.4
Massachusetts	1,129.5	272.5	773.0	346.1	53.9	2,575.0
Michigan	1,753.3	432.5	831.0	518.7	44.6	3,580.0
Minnesota	567.0	165.3	338.7	221.8	12.6	1,305.4
Mississippi	155.8	50.4	103.1	73.0	2.7	385.0
Missouri	787.2	224.7	492.9	303.9	30.8	1,839.6
Montana	111.7	31.8	60.4	47.7	3.0	254.6
Nebraska	215.4	70.2	133.8	94.9	7.9	522.2
Nevada	69.0	16.4	35.8	38.1	6.9	166.2
New Hampshire	103.1	26.4	73.5	44.0	3.4	250.5
New Jersey	1,424.6	297.8	828.3	445.2	57.7	3,053.7
New Mexico	129.3	32.6	59.8	55.7	2.6	280.1
New York	4,420.5	1,818.8	2,968.5	1,238.2	291.8	10,100.7
North Carolina	806.8	152.0	326.6	219.0	14.8	1,219.3
North Dakota	73.2	27.5	45.9	41.6	1.3	189.5
Ohio	2,165.6	500.0	1,061.4	642.4	67.3	4,436.7
Oklahoma	356.9	96.4	194.0	115.7	9.7	772.8
Oregon	331.6	88.0	169.0	119.4	7.7	710.7
Pennsylvania	2,415.4	604.1	1,514.6	696.9	96.1	5,325.1
Rhode Island	177.7	41.9	119.1	58.4	8.9	405.9
South Carolina	229.6	63.5	127.3	102.6	5.7	528.6
South Dakota	73.4	26.4	48.3	44.6	0.9	193.6
Tennessee	453.8	117.6	232.7	164.8	12.5	981.4
Texas	1,618.3	395.0	801.5	590.6	78.5	3,483.8
Utah	141.1	33.9	68.3	45.9	1.9	291.1
Vermont	55.4	16.5	50.3	25.8	3.0	151.0
Virginia	583.5	135.5	341.8	240.4	16.7	1,317.9
Washington	570.7	138.6	269.0	175.7	25.4	1,179.3
West Virginia	284.6	65.1	143.3	92.4	5.9	591.3
Wisconsin	715.2	189.1	431.6	257.3	18.0	1,611.3
Wyoming	64.6	16.3	34.3	25.7	1.7	142.6
48 States and District of Columbia	34,583.7	8,612.7	20,004.2	11,472.1	1,390.8	76,063.4
Alaska	29.4	7.6	14.6	13.9	.2	65.6
Hawaii	110.8	20.5	55.3	84.2	2.0	222.8
Total	34,723.8	8,640.8	20,074.1	11,570.3	1,392.9	76,351.8

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, this particular report has four columns. The first column contains an estimate by the State of origin of the amount of Federal tax revenues. The second column gives an estimate based upon actual collections. The third and fourth columns show estimates in other reports, the first being by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, the second being by the Tax Foundation. A few illustrations from the table will make clear the significance of the report.

For example, Delaware is credited, on the basis of actual collections, with providing 0.97 percent of the Federal tax revenue. But the study determined that only 0.55 percent of the revenues credited to Delaware were earned in that State. In other words, the difference between 0.55 and 0.97 percent, or 0.42 percent, credited to Delaware under ordinary definitions of income was earned in other States.

The figure of 0.55 percent used by the Legislative Reference Service compares fairly closely with the 0.57 percent of the Tax Foundation.

Many States have been spoken of as rich States or high-income States. Actually they are high-income States because the tax receipts credited to them resulted from earnings in other States of the Union.

The State of New York is said to be a high-income State and is credited with providing 19.52 percent of the Federal tax revenues. Yet the study made by the Legislative Reference Service shows that New York State did not earn 19.52 percent of the Federal tax revenues; it earned only 13.28 percent.

The Senator from West Virginia would like to have the figure for his State. West Virginia is credited with supplying only 0.42 percent of the total Federal tax revenues; but 0.78 percent of the total Federal revenues was earned in West Virginia. The figure of 0.78 percent was supplied by the Legislative Reference Service; a figure of 0.76 percent was supplied by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce; and a figure of 0.75 percent was supplied by the Tax Foundation.

So I think that is a fairly accurate figure.

It may safely be said that West Virginia provides 0.75 percent of the Federal tax revenues. Yet in all the references West Virginia is said to be a low-income State because the taxes credited to West Virginia amounted to only 0.42 percent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The figures which have been presented in reference to West Virginia are valid. Very frankly, we in West Virginia are often not only chagrined but also deeply concerned by the picture of a State which within its boundaries produces wealth for other States, yet has leveled at it again and again the charge of coming to the Federal Government and receiving these moneys from appropriations at the national level.

The Senator now speaking, Madam President, implies no criticism of the relationship between the State of West Virginia and the out-of-State corporations which are engaged in operations there. We are well aware of the contributions which such companies have made and continue to make toward the economic and industrial advancement of our State.

But that which does concern the Senator from West Virginia is a valid perception of the relationship between the State of West Virginia and the Federal Treasury. More specifically, the Senator refers to the widely held but erroneous idea that the channel of revenue flows only from Washington to West Virginia and not in the opposite direction also. As demonstrated by the statistics offered by my able colleague from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the corporate activities within West Virginia produce almost twice the tax revenues that are actually credited to West Virginia, revenues which are created by the people and the resources of our State. In this respect, the record of West Virginia, still largely a rural State, needs no apology.

The presentation by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is correct and is supported by figures which have been carefully compiled from three independent sources. The figures indicate that West Virginia produces revenues for companies in States, which are then credited to the tax revenues of the State or States where the companies are incorporated. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator is correct. Consider my own State of South Dakota. South Dakota is credited with providing only 0.11 percent of the Federal tax revenues. Yet the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in response to the request of the New York delegation in the House of Representatives, shows that actually South Dakota produces and earns 0.25 percent of the Federal tax revenues. That is, more than twice the amount of Federal tax revenue actually earned and produced in South Dakota as compared with the amount with which that State is credited. The figure of 0.25 percent is supported by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce by a 0.22-percent figure, which is exactly double the 0.11-percent figure which is credited to South Dakota.

In view of the fact that the distinguished lady from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is occupying the chair, she might be interested in the figures relating to her State. Oregon is credited, on the basis of actual collections, with 0.59 percent of Federal tax revenues. Actually, 0.93 percent of Federal tax revenues has its origin and is earned in Oregon, the difference being between 0.59 and 0.93 percent.

In other words, any attempt to label Oregon, West Virginia, South Dakota, Nebraska, or any other State as a low-income State on the basis of taxes credited to that State is fallacious because those States provide the business which makes the income of the corporations who pay their taxes in the States of their headquarters or home offices.

Let me illustrate. In South Dakota the principal gasoline companies are Standard Oil Co. of Indiana, Texaco, Phillips 66, and the Old White Eagle. Not one of those corporations pays its corporate income tax in South Dakota. They pay that tax at the home office of the corporation.

A large amount of farm machinery is purchased in my State. Much of it is manufactured by John Deere, in Illinois; by Minneapolis-Moline, in Minnesota; by Allis Chalmers, in Wisconsin; or by International Harvester, in Indiana. The corporation income tax of those companies is credited to the States of manufacture, regardless of the amount of machinery which may be sold in South Dakota.

Michigan is a good illustration.

Will the Senator from Nebraska tell us whether any automobiles are manufactured in Nebraska?

Mr. CURTIS. No; motor scooters, which are much better and provide economical transportation, are manufactured in Nebraska. They are carrying a great portion of the U.S. mails. However, I must admit that outside of the hotrod clubs no automobiles are manufactured in Nebraska.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have been in Nebraska many times and have seen there numerous automobiles manufactured by Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler. I suspect that the prices charged Nebraska farmers and the people in the cities and towns of Nebraska for those automobiles contribute to the profits of Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors, although those corporations pay their income taxes in Michigan. So while the income tax is credited to Michigan, Nebraska is shown as having a lower income and Michigan a higher income. Let us check that out.

Michigan is credited, based on actual collections, with providing 7.72 percent of the total Federal income tax revenues. But on the basis of earnings actually originating in Michigan, that State, according to the Legislative Reference Service, earns only 4.71 percent—4.71 percent earned, but 7.72 percent credited.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The time the Senator from South Dakota has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I could go on, through the entire gamut of activities—life insurance, fire insurance, casualty insurance, railroads, and the meatpacking industries. Practically all these activities are carried on by large corporations whose corporate income taxes are credited back to the home-office States. That is why in this amendment I propose that 1 percent of the receipts from the corporate income taxes as well as 1 percent from the personal income taxes be part of the yardstick by which to measure the amount of money which would be available for these purposes.

I have stressed this point, Madam President, because my amendment is not an amendment for Federal aid in the sense of a gift by Uncle Sam. My amendment calls for self-help by returning to the States, to be used for the purposes of education, 1 percent of the income taxes the people and the corporations pay.

Madam President, in concluding my remarks at this time, I wish to ask a question: How could one justify—as the amended committee bill would do—paying $9.26 per child to Connecticut, but $17.06 per child to the neighboring State of Rhode Island; or how could one justify paying, under the committee bill, as amended, $11.98 to the State of New Jersey, but paying $10.90 to the neighboring State of New York; or how could one justify the payment of $22.16 per child to Vermont, but only $19.47 per child to New Hampshire; or how could one justify paying $13.11 per child to Illinois and $18.75 per child to Indiana; or, more personally, how could the committee justify the payment of $23.60 per child to South Dakota and $25.20 per child to North Dakota; or how could the committee justify the payment of $17.73 per child to the State of Washington and $19.49 per child to the State of Oregon?

The answer must be that by means of any formula which permits juggling and tinkering with the national and State incomes, almost any result that anyone might want in his most fantastic imaginings can be produced.

Madam President, the simple, sound way to help hard-pressed school supporters in every State is to let them have a share—to let them have 1 percent, as I have suggested—of the total receipts from the Federal income taxes on both personal incomes and corporate incomes, allotted on the basis of the number of children of school age.

No one can tinker in any way with that apportionment; and the so-called equalization and controls would be left to the States, within which the needs of the districts vary more than do the needs vary among the States.

Madam President, this is the way to help education without having Federal control.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two tables prepared by the Research Division of the National Education Association. One is marked No. 39 and appears on page 26 of the report. It is headed "State and Local Property Tax Collections Per $100 of Personal Income, 1959." The other table is No. 55 and is entitled "Public School Revenue From State and Local Sources, 1959–60, as Percent of Personal Income, 1959."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State and local property tax collections per $100 of personal income, 1959

1. South Dakota	$6.82
2. Montana	6.41
3. North Dakota	6.09
4. Kansas	5.99
5. Minnesota	5.72
6. Nebraska	5.64
7. Wyoming	5.53
8. Vermont	5.50
9. Massachusetts	5.33
10. New Hampshire	5.23
11. Wisconsin	5.13
12. Iowa	5.11
13. Colorado	5.04
14. New Jersey	4.98
15. Idaho	4.85
16. Arizona	4.80
17. Maine	4.77
18. California	4.67
19. Oregon	4.59
20. New York	4.55
21. Michigan	4.50
22. Indiana	4.26
23. Utah	4.10
24. Rhode Island	4.09
25. Connecticut	3.85
26. Texas	3.76
27. Ohio	3.65
28. Illinois	3.50
29. Nevada	3.38
30. Florida	3.33
31. Maryland	3.28
32. Missouri	2.97
33. Oklahoma	2.91
34. Mississippi	2.90
35. Washington	2.82
36. Kentucky	2.75
37. Pennsylvania	2.67
38. Virginia	2.66
39. Tennessee	2.54
40. Georgia	2.53
41. Louisiana	2.51
42. Arkansas	2.46
43. North Carolina	2.32
44. West Virginia	2.20
45. New Mexico	2.17
46. South Carolina	2.01
47. Alabama	1.58
48. Delaware	1.32
49. Alaska	1.29
49 States and District of Columbia	3.93

Public school revenue from State and local sources, 1959–60, as percent of personal income, 1959

	Percent
1. Utah	5.6
2. Montana	5.4
3. Louisiana	5.1
4. Wyoming	4.8
5. South Dakota	4.7
6. Minnesota	4.5
7. Oregon	4.5
8. North Dakota	4.4
9. Arizona	4.3
10. Michigan	4.1
11. South Carolina	4.1
12. Colorado	4.0
13. New Mexico	4.0
14. North Carolina	3.9
15. Oklahoma	3.9
16. Washington	3.9
17. Kansas	3.8
18. Iowa	3.7
19. Mississippi	3.7
20. Arkansas	3.6
21. Hawaii	3.6
22. Idaho	3.6
23. Indiana	3.6
24. Vermont	3.6
25. Alaska	3.5
26. California	3.5
27. Florida	3.5
28. Maine	3.5
29. New York	3.5
30. West Virginia	3.5
31. Georgia	3.4
32. Ohio	3.4
33. Tennessee	3.4
34. Texas	3.4
35. Alabama	3.3
36. New Jersey	3.3
37. Wisconsin	3.3
38. Nebraska	3.2
39. Maryland	3.1
40. Illinois	3.0
41. Nevada	3.0
42. New Hampshire	3.0
43. Pennsylvania	3.0
44. Kentucky	2.9
45. Rhode Island	2.9
46. Virginia	2.9
47. Connecticut	2.8
48. Delaware	2.8
49. Missouri	2.8
50. Massachusetts	2.3
50 States and District of Columbia	3.5

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time the Senator from South Dakota has yielded to himself has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me and under my control.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, I rise to speak on the bill itself. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed without having the time I use charged to the time available to either side in connection with the so-called Case amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, I do not propose to object; but I wish to inquire what the time limitation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 30 minutes remaining; the Senator from Oregon has 15 minutes remaining on the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota. No limitation of time on the bill has been entered.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Nebraska is agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam President, shortly the Senate will vote on a bill which will make permanent a program of Federal support for public education. Today we can temporize about an allegedly modest 3-year program; we can temporize about Federal funds for segregated school systems; we can temporize about deficit spending. We can close our eyes to stark reality, because a militant and zealous majority of this body is committed to the proposition that the Federal Government will be all things to all people.

Practically all the Members of this body have witnessed, during their service, other temporary Federal programs. Do Senators remember the Marshall plan? It was to be a 5-year program to rebuild our war-torn allies. Today it is a permanent fixture in our foreign policy.

I am sure that none of us is beguiled by the 3-year term of this proposed aid. If any of us is, let him be reminded that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has already stated that 3 years will not do the job.

If any of us wants to simper along with the rosy notion that Federal aid is not a precedent to Federal control, let us look at the degree of control attached to any other Federal grant. Examine the administration of the Smith-Hughes Act and study its regulations. Examine the statements of educators, who say, in effect, that aid is needed in order to elevate educational standards. How do we measure the achievement of these standards without control?

An editorial from the School Administrator's Journal, Overview, in the issue for November 1960, gives a fairly good summary view of the position of educators who favor Federal aid:

> The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education. By the end of the 20th century we should be far along the road toward this goal. There will be much travail, dissension, and heated debate concerning the wisdom of traveling this road. There will be many regrets, many cherished viewpoints which will have to be given up or changed. For instance, the long-held views that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policy should be made by local units of government will have to go. The growing dependence of the Nation upon education will tip the scales overwhelmingly for a national system of education.

Recently the Wall Street Journal published a very appropriately captioned editorial entitled "Hypocrisy on the Schools." It summarizes what we have heard repeatedly, that school expenditures have increased from $6 to $16.4 billion in 10 years, that funds increased 153 percent while enrollment increased 44 percent; that teachers' salaries increased 74 percent in this decade; that classrooms are being built annually, without Federal funds, at a rate 10 percent greater than that rate recommended by the U.S. Office of Education. In fact, local responsibility is underwriting the needs of public education at a growth rate in excess of a comparable rate in any other public function.

These facts fall away from ears which are deaf or unwilling. A majority is zealously bent on this course, and nothing—no reason, no logic—can prevail against it.

Perhaps we have become imbued with the fallacy that fiscal responsibility at the Federal level is attended by a different system of economics than attends fiscal responsibility at local and State levels. Perhaps we fail to be impressed by a Federal debt of $290 billion, by a deficit this year of several billions. Whether or not we are impressed, we must live with these facts. Those of us who can rationalize the enactment of this program notwithstanding the current fiscal picture will give great service if they can project our economic pattern 10 or 20 years and arrive at a point when we can recoup Federal fiscal responsibility.

It is deeply regrettable that proponents of this bill see the needs of education solved only by Federal grants in a year of deficit. The record before us does not suggest the exploration of any alternative. This suggests a paramount desire of Congress to give another bounty, a desire which is compelled by fact to fly in the face of reason or responsibility.

Thirty years ago the Federal Government collected about one out of every three revenue dollars. Today it collects three out of four revenue dollars. The Federal Government has preempted the revenue field; yet the source of revenue—Federal, State, and local—is the same taxpayer. We have witnessed several attempts to give, free of strings, a Federal contribution to the States. All attempts have been beaten down. All these proposals retained the granting of funds, annually, by the Federal Government.

Many of us in the minority party are characterized by the liberals as "aginners." We are castigated for a lack of constructive alternatives. If we demonstrate concern over growing Federal dominance and mounting deficit, we are not attuned to the times. Lest I be so characterized, let me suggest an objective which I devoutly hope can be explored during the 3-year course of this alleged temporary aid program.

The Federal excise tax on tobacco produces $2 billion annually. Ninety-six percent of it comes from an 8-cent-per-pack excise on cigarettes. Consumption of cigarettes is amazingly uniform in comparison to population of the several States. Forty-six of the fifty States now collect a State excise on cigarettes. The collection machinery is practically established. We have collected a tobacco tax varying since colonial times—we have collected it consistently since 1868. Tobacco excise was made permanent at a time when it, liquor excise, and customs duties practically underwrote the cost of Federal Government. If a need for public education can be shown to compel additional areas of support, why not release this area to the several States free of Federal direction or supervision? Let the Federal Government give up this tax and let the States impose, collect, and spend the proceeds of this tax for education. Again, I hope this method can be thoroughly explored within the next 2 years.

My opposition to a federalized system of education has not abated during these debates. The singleness of purpose manifest by proponents of this measure is consistent with the ever-expanding Federal assumption of all responsibilities, of all problems. The trend is well established; the ultimate is obvious. In 1932 the Federal Government contributed $222 million to total State revenues of $2,541 million—less than 10 percent. In 1959, the Federal Government contributed $5.9 billion to total State revenues of $29.1 billion—more than 20 perecnt. So, my colleagues, we know where we are going. With complete awareness of all the facts we are assuming another Federal responsibility, under deficit financing. We are superimposing on local teachers, local administrators, and the civic-minded citizens who serve on our local school boards the beneficence and omnipotence of a spendthrift Federal Government.

Madam President, when it is proposed to finance education by deficit spending, we propose to charge our children for their education, because it will be future taxpayers who will pay the debt and the interest charged thereon. Let us not, as politicians, mortgage the future and require the children to pay for their education so that we can appear to be giving something for nothing.

I yield the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, again I desire to make a request, and that is to obtain information as to how much time for debate remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has 30 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Oregon 15 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the Senator from South Dakota wishes to reserve some time in which to respond to whatever members of the committee may say on the proposal, but there are two additional tables I want to place in the RECORD. I shall ask permission to put them in the RECORD, and then I shall discuss them briefly.

I yield myself 5 minutes.

I have in my hand the rankings for these States for 1959 as provided in the report of the Research Division, National Education Association, Research Report 1961–R1. I have already placed in the RECORD tables 39 and 55.

I should also like to place in the RECORD, and ask unanimous consent to do so, table 58, headed "State and Local Tax Revenue—Fiscal 1959—as Percent of Personal Income in 1959," and table 59, headed "State and Local Property Tax Collections—Fiscal 1959—as Percent of Personal Income in 1959."

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

State and local tax revenue (fiscal 1959) as percent of personal income in 1959

	Percent
1. South Dakota	12.3
2. North Dakota	12.0
3. Vermont	11.3
4. Louisiana	11.2
5. Montana	11.0
6. Kansas	10.7
7. Mississippi	10.6
8. Minnesota	10.3
9. Wyoming	10.1
10. Colorado	10.0
11. Iowa	10.0
12. Arizona	9.6
13. Idaho	9.6
14. California	9.5
15. Maine	9.5
16. Washington	9.5
17. Wisconsin	9.5
18. Oregon	9.4
19. Utah	9.4
20. Massachusetts	9.3
21. Oklahoma	9.3
22. New York	9.2
23. Nevada	9.1
24. New Mexico	9.1
25. Arkansas	9.0
26. Florida	9.0
27. Michigan	9.0
28. Rhode Island	8.5
29. Georgia	8.4
30. South Carolina	8.4
31. New Hampshire	8.3
32. Nebraska	8.2
33. North Carolina	8.2
34. Tennessee	8.2
35. Indiana	8.1
36. Maryland	7.9
37. Texas	7.8
38. West Virginia	7.8
39. Alabama	7.7

State and local tax revenue (fiscal 1959) as percent of personal income in 1959—Con.

	Percent
40. New Jersey	7.7
41. Kentucky	7.6
42. Pennsylvania	7.2
43. Connecticut	7.1
44. Ohio	7.1
45. Illinois	7.0
46. Virginia	7.0
47. Missouri	6.6
48. Delaware	6.5
49. Alaska	6.1
49 States and District of Columbia	8.5

State and local property tax collections (fiscal 1959) as percent of personal income in 1959

	Percent
1. South Dakota	6.8
2. Montana	6.4
3. North Dakota	6.1
4. Kansas	6.0
5. Minnesota	5.7
6. Nebraska	5.6
7. Vermont	5.5
8. Wyoming	5.5
9. Massachusetts	5.3
10. New Hampshire	5.2
11. Iowa	5.1
12. Wisconsin	5.1
13. Colorado	5.0
14. New Jersey	5.0
15. Idaho	4.9
16. Arizona	4.8
17. Maine	4.8
18. California	4.7
19. Oregon	4.6
20. Michigan	4.5
21. New York	4.5
22. Indiana	4.3
23. Rhode Island	4.1
24. Utah	4.1
25. Connecticut	3.8
26. Texas	3.8
27. Ohio	3.6
28. Illinois	3.5
29. Nevada	3.4
30. Florida	3.3
31. Maryland	3.3
32. Missouri	3.0
33. Mississippi	2.9
34. Oklahoma	2.9
35. Washington	2.8
36. Kentucky	2.7
37. Pennsylvania	2.7
38. Virginia	2.7
39. Arkansas	2.5
40. Georgia	2.5
41. Louisiana	2.5
42. Tennessee	2.5
43. North Carolina	2.3
44. New Mexico	2.2
45. West Virginia	2.2
46. South Carolina	2.0
47. Alabama	1.6
48. Alaska	1.3
49. Delaware	1.3
49 States and District of Columbia	3.9

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, these tables are significant because they show what a State like South Dakota is doing at the present time. Table 39 shows that South Dakota was No. 1 among all the States in tax collections per $100 of personal income in 1959. State and personal property tax collections amounted to $6.82 out of every $100 of personal income. Montana was second with $6.41. North Dakota was third with $6.09. The average for 49 States and the District of Columbia was $3.93.

It will be seen that we are approaching twice the amount of the average of the States of the Union in the percentage collected per $100 of personal income.

Table 55, which I have placed in the RECORD, shows public school revenue from State and local sources for 1959–61 as percentage of personal income.

Utah led the list, with 5.6 percent. Montana was second, with 5.4 percent. Louisiana was third, with 5.1 percent. Wyoming was fourth, with 4.8 percent. South Dakota was fifth, with 4.7 percent.

The average for 50 States and the District of Columbia was 3.5 percent; that is, 3.5 percent of the personal income went to public school revenue from State and local sources, on the average, for all the States and the District of Columbia. In South Dakota the percentage was 4.7 percent, half again as much as the average.

The States to which I have been referring have been taxing themselves and have not been given credit or recognition in the general debate. In table 58, which shows the State and local tax revenue in 1959 as a percent of personal income in 1959, again we find that South Dakota provided the highest amount of revenue through State and local taxes as a percent of personal income. South Dakota was first with 12.3 percent. North Dakota was second with 12 percent. Vermont was third, with 11.3 percent. The average for 49 States and the District of Columbia was 8.5 percent.

Table 59 deals with State and local property tax collections as percent of personal income. South Dakota again was first with 6.8 percent, as compared to a national average of 3.9 percent.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, will my colleague return to the first table and, for the RECORD, include the figure for West Virginia, along with the figures for the other States to which he invited our attention?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator refers to the amount being put into schools?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am happy to do so. Table 55 shows that West Virginia gave 3.5 percent of personal income for public school revenues from State and local sources. That happens to be exactly the national average. The national average was 3.5 percent. West Virginia provided 3.5 percent. That was also the amount provided by the State of New York, by the State of Maine, by the State of Florida, by the State of California, and by the State of Alaska.

I think it is highly significant to note that West Virginia, which has been labeled as a low-income State, is trying as best she can to meet her educational needs and is contributing to public school revenues exactly as much in terms of percent of personal income as the State of New York, as the State of California, or as the State of Florida. Those three States I think the public generally considers to be rich States. West Virginia, about which we have heard so much, from her hard-earned dollars contributes as much to education from personal income, percentagewise, as is contributed by the States of New York, Florida, and California, all of which are at the national average.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 5 minutes allotted to the Senator from South Dakota have expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Madam President, speaking for West Virginians, we are grateful the Senator from South Dakota has indicated that the citizenry of our State are not only conscious of their responsibilities in reference to the use of money for educational purposes but also have a very keen appreciation of the necessity for giving to our greatest natural resource, the youth of our State, the best in educational facilities from the standpoint of physical plant and the very best possible from the standpoint of teacher contributions, through devoted and inspired instruction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional minute yielded by the Senator from South Dakota has expired.

The Senator from South Dakota has 24 minutes remaining, and the Senator from Oregon has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota would authorize an appropriation of 1 percent of the net Federal income tax collections to be paid to the States—including the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands—on the basis of the ratio of State's school-age population to school-age population of all the States.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks a table entitled "Estimated Allotments to States Under the Provisions of Case of South Dakota Amendment to S. 1021, Fiscal Year 1962."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Estimated allotments to States under the provisions of Case of South Dakota amendment to S. 1021 (5–16–61—C), fiscal year 1962

State	Projected school-age (5 to 17, inclusive) population, July 1, 1960 (thousands)	Amount per State
(1)	(2)	(3)
Total	45,831	[1] $630,000,000
Alabama	899	12,357,793
Alaska	60	824,769
Arizona	339	4,659,946
Arkansas	463	6,364,469
California	3,712	51,025,724
Colorado	466	6,405,708
Connecticut	563	7,739,085
Delaware	117	1,608,300
Florida	1,136	15,615,631
Georgia	1,095	15,052,039
Hawaii	172	2,364,339
Idaho	185	2,543,039
Illinois	2,404	33,045,755
Indiana	1,215	16,701,578
Iowa	705	9,691,039
Kansas	550	7,560,385
Kentucky	828	11,381,816

[1] 1 percent of the net amount of Federal individual and corporate income tax collections is estimated to be $630,000,000.

Estimated allotments to States under the provisions of Case of South Dakota amendment to S. 1021 (5-16-61—C) fiscal year 1962—Continued

State	Projected school-age (5 to 17, inclusive) population, July 1, 1960 (thousands)	Amount per State
(1)	(2)	(3)
Louisiana	912	$12,536,493
Maine	237	3,257,839
Maryland	794	10,914,447
Massachusetts	1,105	15,189,501
Michigan	2,149	29,540,485
Minnesota	890	12,234,077
Mississippi	629	8,646,331
Missouri	1,024	14,076,062
Montana	187	2,570,531
Nebraska	367	5,044,839
Nevada	76	1,044,708
New Hampshire	140	1,924,462
New Jersey	1,385	19,038,423
New Mexico	263	3,615,239
New York	3,729	51,259,409
North Carolina	1,278	17,567,585
North Dakota	180	2,474,308
Ohio	2,446	33,623,093
Oklahoma	560	7,697,846
Oregon	464	6,378,216
Pennsylvania	2,658	36,537,278
Rhode Island	201	2,762,977
South Carolina	734	10,089,677
South Dakota	189	2,598,023
Tennessee	930	12,783,924
Texas	2,659	36,551,024
Utah	267	3,670,223
Vermont	94	1,292,139
Virginia	1,051	14,447,208
Washington	732	10,062,185
West Virginia	525	7,216,731
Wisconsin	1,021	14,034,824
Wyoming	90	1,237,154
District of Columbia	169	2,323,100
Guam	18	247,431
Puerto Rico	759	10,433,331
Virgin Islands	10	137,462

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, the committee and the administration are opposed to this amendment for the following reasons:

First. The amendment fails to limit the uses of Federal funds by the States in a manner similar to that provided in the committee bill. I also invite to the attention of Senators the fact that the amendment does not define "elementary and secondary education" as being that which in the committee bill is limited to that which is provided by the public school systems of the States.

It would appear, therefore, that congressional intent could be construed as authorizing Federal aid to private and church-related school systems.

As I have said, it should also be noted that the amendment offers no assurance that the money will be used to improve educational opportunities by construction of schools, better salaries for teachers, and improved operation. If the amendment were to be adopted Federal aid money could be used for any purpose which could be remotely related to educational purposes at the elementary and secondary level.

Second. The amendment does not take into account, in the distribution of Federal funds to the States, the relative fiscal capacities of the States. I point out also that, in the opinion of the committee, the equalization features of the committee reported bill cannot be found in the proposed amendment.

Third. The safeguards in the committee reported bill which may be found in section 110(a)(3), which were designed to assure that priority in the allocation of Federal funds be given to the neediest districts in the States, are not to be found in the Case amendment. The lack of such language would defeat an important principle of the administration bill designed to assist in the equalization within each of the States of educational opportunities for the boys and girls of each State.

Fourth. I point out to the Senate that the language contained in the amendment on page 6, section 106(b) states:

> The determination of whether moneys paid to a State under this title are used, or will be used, exclusively for purposes of elementary and secondary education shall be made by the State educational agency and shall not be subject to review or audit by any officer or employee of the United States or by any court of the United States.

The inclusion in a Federal aid bill of the language I have just brought to the attention of the Senate would be a severe blow to the fiscal integrity of the Federal educational aid program, since there could be no review to assure that the money advanced by the Federal Government was in fact being used for educational purposes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to finish my statement. It is very brief.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason I should like to have the Senator yield is that as I offered the amendment today I did not leave that particular section in the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator did leave it in?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not. It was pointed out to me there was no possibility for Federal control, so I left that section out and renumbered the following section.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator. I shall be glad to eliminate that point from my opposition.

Finally, Madam President, I come to my last point. The Case of South Dakota amendment, in a manner similar to those amendments previously rejected by the Senate earlier in the debate which were offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] seeks to incorporate into statute language the principle that the States have a proprietary interest in moneys collected by the Federal Government under the Internal Revenue Code.

For all these reasons, the committee recommends strongly against the adoption of the Case of South Dakota amendment.

To sum up, Madam President, the committee opposes the Case of South Dakota amendment, since first, it does not specify clearly that Federal grant aid shall go only to public schools; second, the amendment does not take into account the relative fiscal capacity of the States to support public education as it has no equalization formula for allocation of funds among the States; third, the amendment makes no provision for priority of Federal aid funds to districts within a State which have greatest need; and fourth, the amendment would subvert our Federal tax system by recognizing a proprietary interest by the States in Federal revenues.

It is my hope that the Senate will support the committee and the administration by rejecting the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The amendment involves, in my judgment, another tax remission program, against which we have already spoken, in our opposition to the Blakley, Proxmire, and Cotton amendments.

We have a bill that has been thoroughly considered by the committee. The bill has received the endorsement and support of one educational expert and authority after another. The bill emphasizes the basic principle of equalization which, in my judgment, really could be said to be the heart of the bill. I think it would be jeopardized by the Case amendment. I sincerely hope that the Senate will support the committee and reject the Case amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that on page 5, line 13, of my amendment, at the end of the line, to strike the period and add the words "but shall withhold for no other purpose."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The modification is to clarify a point which was raised in discussion personally with me by the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] who thought the language would be clarifying as to the intent of the amendment as a whole. I thank Senators for permitting that clause to be inserted in the amendment at this time.

Madam President, in response to the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, he has said that equalization is at the heart of the committee proposal. "Equalization at the heart of the committee proposal" means that what the committee seeks to do is to control the flow of educational funds in the country. I do not shrink from the suggestion that my amendment would declare a State interest in the amount of money collected in the Federal income tax.

I regret that the Senator from Oregon was called away from the floor when I earlier remarked that the State does have an interest in the corporate tax which is earned in each State but yet credited to the home office State of the corporation.

I assume that States in which corporations earn their taxes ought to have a share of the corporate income tax returned to such State for educational purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the view of the Senator from South Dakota is as he has stated. I completely disagree with that view. It makes no difference whether the tax is a corporation tax or an individual tax. The fact that the tax

is a tax collected by the Federal Government for Federal purposes is the point. After all, in this respect the corporation is a U.S. citizen as much as an individual is. The tax is levied upon U.S. citizens, individual or corporate, for purposes of the United States.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, a great change has occurred in our country in the past 25 years. I have seen it, and the Senator from Oregon has seen it. He has seen a transformation from the time when businesses in small towns were home owned. We had the village blacksmith and the home-owned grocery store. Today, in place of those stores and shops, we have service stations owned by corporations or leased from major oil companies. We have grocery stores, organized in chain fashion, which pay their corporate income taxes in the States in which their home offices are located. I wonder about the future of the small communities.

The tables I have submitted for printing in the RECORD show that on the question of percentage of personal income devoted to purposes of education, the so-called low income States are far ahead of the so-called rich States. The burdened taxpayers in the small communities are entitled to have returned to the States a portion of the corporate income tax earned and taken away from them. A system is developing in this country under which the major supplies and major services required in the States are provided by absentee corporate ownership. The people in the States are being put in the position of those who at one time lived under the feudal system. Today the corporation has become the feudal lord, receiving its tribute from the small communities, and sending it to the States of their home offices.

For that reason I believe the States have a proprietary interest and a right to share in the corporate income tax. For that reason my amendment includes corporation as well as personal income tax in setting forth a State's share.

Madam President, may I ask how much time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How much time has the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 9 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from South Dakota wish some of my time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; I should be happy to have the Senator from Oregon use some of his time, if he desires.

Mr. MORSE. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, Madam President, I shall use some more of my time. I am glad the Senator from Oregon is present, because I wish to ask him some questions.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be glad to yield the Senator my 9 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Perhaps we will not need it.

Under the committee bill, how does the committee justify the payment to Connecticut of $9.26 per child and to neighboring Rhode Island the payment of $17.06 per child?

Mr. MORSE. The amounts work out that way by applying the formula to the wealth of the States in respect to their school-age population.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does the Senator justify the payment of $22.16 per child to Vermont and only $19.41 per child to New Hampshire, which is a neighboring State?

Mr. MORSE. My answer is the same. The formula operates in that way, when the operative facts are applied to the standards of the formula.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does the Senator justify the payment of $17.73 per child to Washington and $19.49 to Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. The same answer. That is the relative difference in the wealth of the two States in terms of their school-age population.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How does the Senator justify the payment of $11.98 per child to New Jersey and $10.90 per child to neighboring New York?

Mr. MORSE. We could go through the entire list of States and make any combination we might wish for comparison. We start with a formula, and that is the way the formula works out. We start with a formula that we are satisfied is fair and equitable. It provides for reasonable equalization based on the ability of States to pay in accordance with their wealth and school population.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator from Oregon really believe that Rhode Island has so inferior an ability to pay that it calls for $17.06 per child to be paid to that State as compared with $9.26 for Connecticut?

Mr. MORSE. That is what the formula shows.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has not the line of my questioning suggested any doubt to the Senator from Oregon as to the validity of the formula?

Mr. MORSE. None at all.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator believe it is a perfect formula?

Mr. MORSE. Nothing is perfect. I have yet to see a perfect formula. But I think it is fair, just, and equitable.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the Senator has that belief, why did he agree yesterday to the amendment offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania that the $9.26 provided for the District of Columbia under the formula should be doubled?

Mr. MORSE. I said that nothing is perfect. To demonstrate how fair the committee attempted to be, we considered the subject. We had the benefit of expert after expert. We had the benefit of advice from the Bureau of the Budget and educational authorities. We found a disparity in Alaska. So what did we do?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Their share was increased 62 percent.

Mr. MORSE. We adopted an amendment after there had been thorough consideration by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare with regard to Alaska.

The Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG] brought in an amendment dealing with American Samoa. After further study we decided that the allocation to Samoa should be corrected, and we adopted an amendment relating to Samoa.

We considered the problem of the District of Columbia. We have been open to proof that there are any other defects in the Committee amendment, and we are satisfied that there are not. We think the amendment is fair and equitable, and we submit it to the Senate.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the debate on May 18 the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] had printed in the RECORD at page 8356 an article by David S. Broder. The article had been published in the Washington Evening Star on May 15. The article analyzed the changes that were made by the committee when it changed from the formula in the bill as originally introduced to the bill as reported. In his review of that action Mr. Broder pointed out that the changing of the formula to which the Senator from Oregon has alluded resulted in Rhode Island's benefiting by an increase of 48 percent, the figure for Connecticut was reduced by 38 percent. The result was $9.26 per child in Connecticut against $17.06 per child in neighboring Rhode Island. Even that change, increasing Rhode Island's index by 48 percent and reducing Connecticut's by 38 percent, with the resultant difference of $17.06 for Rhode Island as against $9.26 for Connecticut, does not shake the Senator's confidence in the perfection of his formula?

Mr. MORSE. We debated that formula last year. The same formula was adopted last year. This is the S. 8 formula. We had the benefit of consideration of it again this year. The committee came to the same conclusion. I do not know anything could have been more carefully considered. We believe it to be fair and equitable.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President——

Mr. MORSE. Is my cross-examination over?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The cross-examination is over. I hope that the Senator has some assurance left as to his faith in his formula. The more we go into it the less faith I have in it. It seems to me that the simple thing to do is to go back to counting the schoolchildren. Why do we have schools? Why do we have education? Because of the child. The simple and logical thing to do is to say that in Arizona or in Connecticut or in Rhode Island or Alabama or in Washington or in Oregon or in South Dakota a child is a child. If the Federal Government is going to provide aid to the taxpayers to help meet the education of the child, why not treat all children alike by adopting the proposal I have suggested? We would pay the same amount for each child under that proposal. We would count all the children, divide the amount to be appropriated by their number, and multiply that figure by the number of children in a given State and in that way determine the allocation for that State.

WELCOME TO VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON HIS RETURN FROM ABROAD

Mr. MORSE. I see that our distinguished Vice President has returned to the floor of the Senate after his great trip of statesmanship in many parts of the world. I welcome him back to the floor of the Senate. I am very glad to have him here this afternoon because in case we have a tie vote I will need his support. I will go over to him shortly to lobby him. Seriously, though, I am delighted to have the Vice President return after a very safe and a dedicated public service journey in behalf of his country.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wish to join in what the Senator has said. We on this side of the aisle, too, Mr. Vice President, have followed your travels with interest and have applauded the dignified but friendly way in which you have carried the message of our country's good will and helpfulness to the far parts of the world.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I desire to join other Senators in complimenting the Vice President upon the successful completion of a long and arduous mission. Those of us who are privileged to work closely with our distinguished Vice President and to know his lovely wife, have always known him to be capable of fulfilling with dignity and effectiveness any assignment, no matter how difficult it may be. I am sure that the mission they have made to southeast Asia and other parts of the world has been of tremendous benefit in advancing the foreign policy of the United States. I am indeed happy to welcome him and his lady upon their safe return.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, I am delighted to join in the welcome home greetings to our distinguished and beloved Vice President. Wherever he goes he makes friends. He has a natural charm and personality which attracts the enthusiasm and admiration of people in other countries as well as at home. There is an aura of America about him which gives a good and cheerful and heartwarming impression, and which will remain with the people of Asia and elsewhere. In his personality he reflects those things which are so much to our advantage, namely, that we are a friendly people, that we do not carry hatreds or mistrusts or fears or chauvinism or enmities or envy in our dealings with the other people of the world. Therefore, as an ambassador of peace, I say again, Mr. Vice President, we are glad when you make these trips, and we are always glad to have you home.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Madam President, it was my privilege, as I pointed out to the Senate about 10 days ago, to accompany the Vice President on the first leg and to me the most important leg of his trip, and that was his visit to the new State of Hawaii. His reception there and the comments he made and the friendly atmosphere were indicative of his entire trip. The thing that impressed me in Hawaii was the friendliness of the people, the complete lack of any show of partisanship whatever in connection with his visit, and the very remarkable endorsement he gave to what in a peculiar way is his own child, in the dedicatory services of breaking ground in connection with the East-West Center. I wish to join the other Senators in their complimentary remarks and expression of friendship.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I wish to join in this welcome to our former distinguished colleague and the Vice President of the United States on his return from a remarkable journey around the globe. We are all happy to have him back. We are particularly happy over the good effects that his trip appears to have achieved. It is always heartening to every American to read of the ovations given in foreign lands to a distinguished representative of our Government. This news is particularly welcome when we reflect that many times these demonstrations have taken place in countries which are on the very threshold of the Communist world. We have clear evidence from the Vice President's trip that when the Communists have not taken the trouble to stir up their professional agitators, the welcome given by the people of Asia to a leader of the American Government is genuinely warm and enthusiastic. We are pleased, too, by the unequivocal manner in which the Vice President placed the strength and honor of the United States behind these Asian nations which are struggling against the dark clouds of communism that hover along their borders. The potential aggressors of the Far East have been given fair warning of the resistance which will await them if they should persist in their foolish imperialistic expansion.

I know that our distinguished Vice President will take no offense whatever in my remark that this is the finest example of what has become known in this country as personal diplomacy, about which we have already heard a great deal and will probably hear a great deal more in the future. I hope all of it is as good as that practiced by our distinguished Vice President.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I should like to join my colleagues in commending the Vice President upon his work during his recent trip to Asia. We owe him gratitude for the contributions he has made to our country's position during this trip.

I spent a year and a half in Asia. From that experience, as I read about the Vice President's trip and the reception given him, I knew that he had established a rapport with the people and with the leaders of their governments.

I do not know the substance of his conversations with the heads of governments or the commitments which were made on behalf of the United States. All of us know that in the long run, it will be the action taken by the United States that will carry meaning to the people of the countries the Vice President visited.

But even so, the Vice President accomplished much for our country on his trip. His work promises even greater undertakings on his part for our country in the future.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I am willing to waive the rest of my time if the Senator from Oregon is also willing to do so, and to have the roll called.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 61, as follows:

[No. 52]

YEAS—30

Beall	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Eastland	Russell
Boggs	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bridges	Holland	Smathers
Butler	Hruska	Stennis
Capehart	Keating	Talmadge
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Thurmond
Cotton	Long, La.	Wiley
Curtis	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	Miller	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—61

Aiken	Case, N.J.	Fong
Allott	Church	Fulbright
Bartlett	Clark	Gruening
Bible	Cooper	Hart
Burdick	Dodd	Hartke
Byrd, Va.	Douglas	Hayden
Byrd, W.Va.	Ellender	Hickey
Cannon	Engle	Hill
Carroll	Ervin	Humphrey

Jackson	McNamara	Robertson
Javits	Metcalf	Saltonstall
Johnston	Monroney	Scott
Jordan	Morse	Smith, Mass.
Kefauver	Morton	Smith, Maine
Kerr	Moss	Sparkman
Kuchel	Muskie	Symington
Long, Mo.	Neuberger	Williams, N.J.
Long, Hawaii	Pastore	Yarborough
Magnuson	Pell	Young, Ohio
Mansfield	Proxmire	
McGee	Randolph	

NOT VOTING—9

Anderson	Carlson	Hickenlooper
Blakley	Chavez	McCarthy
Bush	Gore	Prouty

So the amendment of Mr. CASE of South Dakota was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was rejected be reconsidered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1961, RELATING TO NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 172)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961, relative to the reorganization of the National Labor Relations Board. Since the message has been read in the House of Representatives, it will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and referred to the appropriate committee. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The message, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the National Labor Relations Board.

This Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961, to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the National Labor Relations Board.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Board, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Board, individual Board members, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Board members from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Board as a whole the right to review any such decision, report, or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervenor demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Board the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Board, for mandatory review of any such decision, report, or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Board less one member.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 24, 1961.*

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I send to the desk an amendment, for myself and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 3, lines 1 through 5, to restore the matter to be stricken by the committee amendment and delete the matter to be inserted by the committee amendment; namely, on page 3, line 4, to strike out "and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, $850,000,000," and to insert in lieu thereof "$666,000,000, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1962, $766,000,000, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1963, $866,000,000."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consulting with the various interested parties, I should like to propound an unanimous-consent request, to the effect that 45 minutes be allocated to the Cooper-Javits amendment, 30 minutes to be under the control of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and 15 minutes under the control of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, the amendment can be very quickly explained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May the Chair inquire how much time the Senator yields himself?

Mr. COOPER. Fifteen minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, the amendment can be very quickly explained. Its purpose is to reduce the authorization from the $2,550 million proposed by the committee bill to the amount which was recommended by the President. That amount was $2,298 million. The reduction in the authorization would be $252 million, if our amendment is adopted.

This amendment is in some respects similar to the amendment offered earlier today by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. But there is this difference: The amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio would have reduced the authorization, and would have returned to the original formula of allocation proposed by the President. The Senate has voted twice upon the formula. Last Friday the Senate defeated the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and by me proposing a formula different in philosophy from the committee bill; and today the Senate defeated the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who proposed that the Senate return to the formula prescribed in the bill sent up to the Congress by the President.

The amendment which we have offered would not change the formula in the bill. Its sole purpose is to reduce the authorization by $252 million, to the exact figure proposed by the President.

Why do we make this proposal? I say, first, as a matter of principle, we still contend that the formula of allocation proposed by the committee bill is not grounded on the criteria of need, or the effort the States make. It is not the best formula, it is an untried formula. In the next 3 years, we will find out how the formula works. Let us test it within the terms of the authorization proposed by the President—a sum $252 million smaller than the authorization in the bill.

A second argument for our amendment, one which does not require a great deal of explanation, is that it would save $252 million. I do not have to prove to the Senate, I think, my devotion throughout the years to a Federal aid to education bill. But we are entering into a new field. I think it is reasonable to say that the $2,298,000,000 proposed by the President can be just as effective in the next 3 years as the $2,550,000,000 proposed by the committee.

I make one other argument, and then I close, because there is no use debating at great length on the amendment. Tomorrow the President will come before a joint session of Congress and ask for additional funds for the defense and space program. The increases may be

essential, in the long run, they may not be more essential than the improvement of education in the United States, because our ability to defend ourselves, our ability to progress, will depend upon the knowledge, and creativity of the men and women of this country, and for the great part educated men and women. But at this time, as we embark upon a new program, I think it reasonable to hold to the figures which were proposed by the President, particularly when we take into consideration that the additional sum of $252 million was added by the committee on the last day, in its consideration of the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am honored to join the Senator in this amendment. The Senator has just mentioned what seems to me to be the best argument for the amendment. I hope I may have the attention of Senators who are for the bill, because it is said that the formula which is in the bill now is the formula of the administration. The administration adopted it. The administration, in calculating what was a balanced allocation of the resources for this purpose of Federal aid to education, arrived at a figure, and that administration was devoted to Federal aid to education just as the Senator from Kentucky and I have been. Nevertheless, in order to put in the bill a figure which the Senator is proposing, we can make a choice. The committee took the choice of adding $252 million and then dividing that amount under a new formula. But the committee picked the figure. I think we have a right to say that the administration, after making a careful study of what is necessary for this purpose, arrived at a figure, and we ought to stand for that figure if we are to have financial prudence.

I hope the friends of the bill will vote for the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I thank the Senator. He has made a compelling and effective argument. Senators who believe in a Federal aid to education bill ought to take into consideration the fact that the administration and, after many weeks of consideration, proposed to the Congress a bill authorizing $252 million less than the committee bill.

Some statements have been made upon the floor indicating that the committee enlarged the authorization to increase the allotments to States represented by members of the committee. I do not believe this to be true. I do not believe that personal interest led to the increase in authorization. I have complete confidence in the chairman of the subcommittee, Senator MORSE, and its members. I do say, however, that the effect of adding $252 million to a bill provides increases to a large number of States, many of which are not making the effort that they ought to make. The fault lies in the bad formula and the arbitrary addition of $252 million on the last day of the committee work.

If the amendment which the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I have proposed is adopted, it will reduce the amounts allocated to the States, over a period of 3 years, by about 10 percent per State. It will not interfere with the proportional allocations to the States.

It will save $252 million. It will not damage the formula which has been supported so strongly by the majority, even though we do not agree with its rationale.

Madam President, for the reasons I have stated, I ask the Senate to accept the amendment. I see no reason at all why the Senate should not reduce the amount of the authorization by $252 million to the exact sum proposed by the President.

Mr. MORSE. Do the Senators from Kentucky and New York wish to have me use some time now?

Mr. COOPER. I have concluded, but I would like to reserve 5 minutes' time.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I urge the Senate to reject the Cooper-Javits amendment. As floor leader of the bill, after consultation with the experts on the staff to whom I shall always be indebted for their wonderful service during this debate, I find this a very disrupting amendment with respect to the objectives of the bill.

As Senators know, the Senate defeated the Cooper-Javits formula the other day. The Cooper-Javits formula was geared to a $666 million authorization. The Senators now seek to return to the amount of $666 million, but without changing the formula.

In reply I say that the formula we have adopted, after a thorough briefing by experts in regard to the equities of the formula, with an authorization of $850 million, is a formula which does justice to a group of States the Senator from Kentucky probably had in mind.

Senators will recall that in my remarks against the Cooper-Javits formula the other day I pointed out what we considered to be the inequities of the effects on a group of the so-called middle States—Washington, Oregon, Montana, Minnesota, Oklahoma, Kansas, Iowa, Wisconsin—States which are making a remarkably fine effort in support of their schools. In fact, those States are paying more on the basis of their ability to pay than some of our richer States are paying.

When we use $850 million, Madam President, and consider the distribution under the formula, we are advised there is the highest degree of equalization and equitable justice to these States. If we use a lower figure, we shall start to work a good many inequities.

The amount to be authorized in the bill is important to the fair operation of the formula.

Last year when we were dealing with the same formula—and there is not one whit of difference between the formula used this year and the formula used in S. 8, which the Senate adopted last year—our figure was $916 million for each of 2 years instead of the $850 million for each of 3 years used this year. Senators might ask, "Why did you take less this year than last year?" It is because we conferred with the experts. We said, "We wish to use the minimum figure which we are satisfied will do the greatest amount of justice to all States concerned." Our advice was that $850 million for 3 years would do the job, but that if we provided less we would start being unfair to some of the States, which would then get less money.

My next point, Madam President, is a question. About what are we quibbling—$200 million—$250 million?

That is the difference between the formula and the figure now proposed by my good friends from Kentucky and New York. It is proposed to take $250 million away from the schoolchildren of America under the terms of the bill. $250 million is to be the goal of the great economy drive on the floor of the Senate this afternoon by my good friends from Kentucky and New York, at the expense of the boys and girls of this country whom we have demonstrated, if we have demonstrated anything in this debate, are sorely in need of more and not less educational effort in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

If my good friends from Kentucky and New York wish to join with me in an economy drive, I shall welcome them with open arms, but we should not do it at the expense of the children in the secondary and elementary schools of this country.

We should do it in those places in the national budget where we can find shocking waste. There is not a Senator in this Chamber who does not know there is shocking waste in a good many parts of the Federal budget. Two hundred fifty million dollars? I plead with the Senators from New York and Kentucky to join with me in a drive not to cut $250 million but to cut $2 billion from the waste which can be found in our whole defense and foreign aid program. By eliminating that waste, we can end up with a stronger America and a stronger defense.

Madam President, I wish we could get so much concerned about a lot of waste which goes into Federal aid to education abroad. The American taxpayers do not realize the millions and millions and millions of dollars of our money being spent supposedly for educational assistance abroad.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations and as chairman of one of its subcommittees which has something to do with analyzing and surveying the results of some of those expenditures, I know that a lot of the money is being wasted in our programs abroad.

I plead for some control as we consider this bill. I say to my friends from New York and Kentucky, "Let us join together. We have always supported Federal aid to education, all three of us. Let us join together to give this program a 3-year trial period."

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] says we should try the program

out for 3 years on the basis of $666 million, and then see what we ought to do at the end of 3 years. I plead with the Senator. I say, "Come on over and join with me in trying out the program for 3 years at the rate of $850 million for these little boys and girls. Do not make your saving there. You two are great humanitarians. I am surprised that you have left me on this great humanitarian question."

Here we are, representing ourselves to the American people as three constitutional liberals. What has happened to our liberality? Liberality, after all, has to be measured in terms of putting ideals to work. This is a great ideal. I do not want to have the Senators leave me. Let us not in any way cut down on this ideal.

Let us, the three of us, stand together for $850 million per year. That is the cost, $850 million. Are the children worth it? Do not put a price tag on them. Do Senators wish to say that they will take $250 million from the children? They do not mean to do that.

Madam President, I close. I yield back my remaining time.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I am surprised by the remarks of the Senator from Oregon. I must say I would be more impressed by his argument if the Senator and his committee had not suddenly rediscovered their idealism on the last night the committee met, The committee met for weeks, and stuck to the President's recommendation for an authorization of $2,298 million but on the last day the committee met, or the last night, the idealism asserted itself and it was increased to $2,500 million. The humanitarian feeling for the children swept the hearts of the committee members and in the last hours, they boosted the figure by $252 million. I say this in all friendship to my good friend Senator MORSE, for we have fought together for the schools since 1947.

We support the principle of Federal aid to education. But it was an arbitrary decision at the last minute, to add $252 million. Let us be sensible. Let us return to the authorization the President recommended, one which the committee and the subcommittee accepted until the last day. This amount was accepted by the subcommittee. It was voted tentatively by the full committee.

I suggest that we return to commonsense and reduce the amount of the bill by $252 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I think the Senator from Oregon gave us the key to his thinking when he used the word "liberality" instead of the word "liberalism." That point was something very secret in his heart that just came out. We are supposed to be inspired with liberalism but not with liberality at the expense of the taxpayer. It is all right to be liberal ourselves, but not at the expense of the taxpayers. I yield to no one in my evaluation of education. And I appreciate the good humor and warmth with which the Senator referred to the worth of education. Its worth is as many billions of dollars as there are. I am not trying to put a price tag on education. Nor would the amount appropriated be the total bill for the country, which comes to many billions of dollars.

Involved is a question of incentive and supplement. It is a question of the allocation of our resources, which we all know, whether we are liberal or not, are not limitless. The Federal Government itself, as the seat of authority, would allocate what it thought would be a fair amount of our resources.

This will probably be the last opportunity which the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] and I will have to speak on this subject before the bill is voted upon. We seek to bring the bill back to a fundamental rationale of the allocation of our resources. Not only American youth, but also the American old people, American middle-aged people, American security, and American resources are worth everything we can spend on them. With that argument where would we stop?

The Senator from Kentucky and I say that if we are to allocate our resources, we should allot them in the manner in which the central source of authority suggests that we allocate the funds. We urge that the amendment be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I look at the Senators from Kentucky and New York and listen to their voices, I cannot conclude that they are the Simon Legrees that they have been described to be. It appears to me that they are both possessed of a very warm attitude and a purpose to help. I think that they are possessed of mercy, charity, and humanitarian qualities, and not devoid of those qualities, as suggested in the light, humorous, and well-intentioned manner of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 59, as follows:

[No. 53]

YEAS—30

Allott	Curtis	Lausche
Beall	Dirksen	Miller
Bennett	Dodd	Morton
Boggs	Dworshak	Mundt
Butler	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Schoeppel
Capehart	Hruska	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Javits	Thurmond
Cooper	Keating	Williams, Del.
Cotton	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—59

Aiken	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hickey	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Johnston	Proxmire
Carroll	Jordan	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Russell
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Maine
Eastland	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Fong	McGee	Wiley
Fulbright	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Morse	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Carlson	McCarthy
Blakley	Chavez	Prouty
Bridges	Gore	Robertson
Bush	Hickenlooper	

So the amendment offered by Mr. COOPER, for himself and Mr. JAVITS, was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, without losing the floor?

Mr. TALMADGE. I shall be delighted to yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to query the majority leader with respect to the program for the rest of the day and also as to what he contemplates for tomorrow and the remainder of the week, if he knows at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, it is hoped that the Senate will remain in session tonight until the third reading of the bill has been reached. Very soon, the Talmadge amendment will be made the pending business. Other amendments may or may not be offered. If any Senator wishes to speak on the bill if and after the third reading has been reached, he may do so this evening or wait until tomorrow, when general debate on the bill will take place.

After discussing the subject with the distinguished minority leader, it is the hope of the leadership that it will be possible to bring the bill to a vote tomorrow, to the end that Senators will be able to perform Memorial Day duties, including the making of speeches, during a period extending until Wednesday next.

The Senate will meet on Monday for the purpose of considering measures on the calendar to which there is no objection. The Senate may meet on Friday to enable Senators who wish to do so to make speeches. However, no business will be transacted on Friday if the pending business is concluded by tomorrow.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, would the Senator from Montana estimate that the bill might be passed by 5 or 6 o'clock tomorrow afternoon?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope that by 5 or 6 o'clock, or thereabouts, it will be possible to bring the aid-to-education bill to a vote.

Madam President, with the consent of the distinguished Senator from Georgia, I submit an order and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That beginning at 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 25, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] concerning the enforcement in certain States of the Constitution and laws for the protection of individual rights: *Provided*, That if a vote has not been reached in one hour, the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar: *Provided further*, That the time be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, the leadership has sought to touch all bases concerning the proposed unanimous-consent request. I hope the Senate will give its approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is entered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senate for its consideration, and I thank the Senator from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I submit a modification of my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modification of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 20, it is proposed to strike the period and insert the following:

or withhold any funds, authorized under this act, from any State education agency which has complied with the provisions of this act.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield, so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, on this amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with interested Senators I desire to propound another unanimous-consent request, namely, that an hour and a half be allotted to the Talmadge amendment, 1 hour to be under the control of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and one-half hour to be under the control of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I yield myself as much time as I may require to complete my statement.

Madam President, in his message of February 20 recommending the enactment of the proposed legislation now pending, President Kennedy stated:

Education must remain a matter of State and local control, and higher education a matter of individual choice.

He further declared at his press conference of March 8:

I do not think that there is anything more important than to have good schools, well-trained, competent teachers.

In an appearance on Meet the Press on February 19, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff said:

Education is one of the greatest needs facing our country. I am passionately committed to education for every boy and girl in the United States of America. We have many problems facing this country—agricultural surpluses, civil rights, and the question of segregation and desegregation. But it would be a great tragedy for America if we tried to string all of these problems together on one string of beads and try to solve them in one package, and I think it would be a tragedy for education if we insisted that we solve every problem facing this country on the back of education, because this would do no good for education and wouldn't solve the problems of segregation.

The Washington Post, in its issue of March 9, reported on Secretary Ribicoff's testimony before the Senate Education Subcommittee as follows:

Any attempt to withhold Federal funds from schools practicing racial segregation "would definitely weaken prospects for the legislation," Ribicoff said.

Congress should be given the opportunity to take a "clean and clear-cut vote—are you or are you not in favor of Federal aid to education?" Ribicoff declared.

Madam President, I am in complete accord with both President Kennedy and Secretary Ribicoff on all counts.

I agree that the education of the young people of America is of paramount importance.

I agree that control of public education must be retained on the State and local levels.

I agree that it would be tragic to attempt to use education as a vehicle for solving other problems.

I agree that the injection of extraneous issues by either addition or omission will jeopardize the prospects for passage of this bill.

For those reasons, Madam President, I am offering my amendment to uphold the President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in what they are endeavoring to accomplish for the benefit of present and future generations.

It is true that the bill as it is before the Senate prohibits all departments, agencies, officers, and employees of the Federal Government from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over the administration and operation of public schools.

That is fine as far as it goes, but it does not quite get to the heart of the matter.

Control in any governmental undertaking ultimately is exercised by the hand which controls the purse.

In this case the power of the purse is in the hands of the Federal Government. And there is nothing in this bill to safeguard against abuse of that power to impose by indirection the very same controls which are prohibited by direction.

All my amendment would do, Madam President, would be to expand the prohibitions presently in the bill to specify that no department, agency, officer, or employee of the Federal Government could for any reason withhold any of the funds for which it provides.

That, Madam President, is in keeping with the express wishes of the President and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That, Madam President, is in accord with the will of the majority of the people of the State of Georgia, as expressed by their elected officials and through resolutions adopted by the general assembly, the State board of education, the county commissioners' association,

and various responsible civic, social, church, and educational organizations.

The State of Georgia and its schools need the funds which would be provided by this bill—particularly so in providing long-overdue and much-needed salary increases for teachers and school administrators.

But among all Georgians there is a fear that unless the specific prohibition against Federal controls is accompanied by an equally specific prohibition against the withholding of Federal funds, the bill could turn out to be a Trojan horse which would disrupt, rather than promote educational progress in our State.

Georgians, Madam President, generally favor Federal aid to education, if it can be had without controls of any degree and without the threat that at some later date funds might be withheld by some bureaucrat, for any unspecified reason.

Madam President, with the adoption of the amendment I have proposed, I can give my support to this legislation. Without it, I shall be compelled in good conscience to vote against it.

My hope and my plea, Madam President, are that this Senate will give substance to the wishes of the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and all the other responsible leaders and educators who, in the words of Secretary Ribicoff, want a program of Federal assistance to education without one shred of Federal control.

Madam President, I have been the Governor of my State, and as Governor was the sole director of the State budget. In that capacity I learned that the power to withhold or to grant funds is the most complete power which can be vested in any official on any level of government. The power to withhold funds is the power to control not only of the policies of government, but even those of individuals. An employer can control his employee through his power to cut off the worker's salary or to discharge him. Thereby the employer can control the actions of his employee.

Thus, it is fundamental that he who controls the purse strings of a governmental agency, in the final analysis, controls the policies of that agency. And I do not want to see a situation arise wherein any Federal bureaucrat at any time in the future can send for a superintendent of public schools whether from Hawaii, Oregon, Alaska, or any other State and threaten him by saying, "I am going to scan your school budget very carefully next time," and then give him a veiled hint about what policies he should follow to prevent that budget from being cut.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Does not the Senator from Georgia think the bill contains a definite prohibition of the thing to which the Senator from Georgia has referred, and will actually prevent it?

Mr. TALMADGE. I believe the bill is fine so far as it goes. But it does not reach the heart of the matter, namely, whether the funds can be withheld or denied.

Mr. GRUENING. But the bill provides:

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

It seems to me that is very specific.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is splendid so far as it goes; but it does not also state "or withhold funds from any of the 50 States." That is what I am seeking to have written into this measure. If the Senator from Alaska shares my view, I hope he will support my amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. I can see no objection to the amendment. I think it unnecessary, but I shall be happy to support it.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am grateful to the Senator from Alaska, and I commend him for his support of this worthy amendment.

Madam President, I concur in the point of the Senator from Alaska that there can be no objection to the amendment, unless someone wishes to vest in some Federal official the power to exercise such control over the public schools of the individual States.

Madam President, if we do not wish to have the schools of our country federalized, it is vitally important that the control of them be retained on the State and local levels.

Madam President, the vote on this amendment will serve as a test of the sincerity of all those who say they wish to advance the cause of education in our country with this bill.

Rejection of this amendment, Madam President, could be interpreted as no less than a declaration that this is a bill which aims, not to help, but to control education in the United States.

Madam President, I am delighted to yield 15 minutes to the able and distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who has done an outstanding job of promoting the cause of Federal aid to education both in the House of Representatives and since he has been a Member of the Senate.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, I wish to compliment the Senator from Georgia for his very fine, moderate, and statesmanlike statement in support of his amendment; and I am proud to be associated with the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], in supporting this amendment.

During the course of this debate I have been impressed by the fact that at one time or another every Member of this body has voted in support of the sovereign power of the Federal Government to support education. Sometimes Senators voted, in the course of voting on amendments such as the Cotton amendment or the Case amendment, for an apportionment of the taxes collected by the Federal Government. On other occasions Senators have voted for amendments which would provide for direct grants. At one time or another during the debate every Member of the Senate has declared that the Federal Government does have an obligation to support education. This is in the traditional American pattern.

The educational obligation of the Federal Government is older than our Republic. But the educational obligations of the three levels of government are entirely different; and at each level we must have an understanding of what the responsibilities are.

While we have had Federal aid to education since before our Republic was established, we have also a tradition that the local school board, the local administration, will have power to have control of the educational management of those schools, so they will be responsive to the democratic public will or the popular needs and the aspirations of the people of those communities.

The 40-odd thousand school districts of this Nation have made a contribution to the educational system of America and given us a flexibility, an authority, and a power that is unique among the governments of the world. It is this democratic system of local administration, local control, and local authority of the school boards that has kept our educational system powerful and strong, and that will preserve us from any encroachments by any foreign ideology.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the able Senator agree with me that national control of schools under Hitler in Germany and under Mussolini in Italy did as much to advance totalitarianism as any other thing that happened in those countries?

Mr. METCALF. I not only agree, but that was the point I was trying to make; and the Senator from Georgia has made it much more eloquently and succinctly than I. Federalization of the schools cannot happen so long as there is local autonomy in the 40,000 school districts and local control by the local school boards.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. Forgetting for the moment the amendment which is under discussion, is there any reason why any funds should be withheld from the State under the bill?

Mr. METCALF. As I read section 103, I am in complete accord with the Senator from Alaska that funds cannot be withheld in operations under the bill. Under the provision of section 103, funds cannot be withheld. The provision reads:

No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

I say to the Senator from Colorado, if that be true, why not make it crystal clear? Why not adopt the amendment of the Senator from Georgia? Time after time we have heard on this floor

the statement attributed to the late Senator Taft, that—

> If you can make it better, if you can make it clearer, if you can clarify it, if you can make it stronger, show me the way.

The Senator from Georgia has shown the way. He has specifically proposed to say, "You shall not withhold funds."

Mr. CARROLL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. METCALF. Gladly.

Mr. CARROLL. Let us assume that a situation arose in a State in which the funds created by the provisions of the bill were being used for a purpose not covered by the provisions of the bill. Could they then be withheld?

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield in order that I may answer the question?

Mr. METCALF. Gladly.

Mr. TALMADGE. I read the amendment, as modified, for the Senator:

> or withhold any funds, authorized under this act, from any State education agency which has complied with the provisions of this act.

So the answer to the Senator's question is, of course, "No." There must be compliance with all the provisions of the act.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, forgetting about the amendment, I ask a specific question on the bill generally. Previously, I propounded a question to the Senator from Oregon as to whether, for example, if a State board of education had a policy which was contrary to that of a county or a school district, the question could arise. Let us use the State of Virginia as an example. In some counties in Virginia there is a policy which differs from that of the State board of education. I think the record will show that the Senator from Oregon responded at that time that, even in such a case, there could be no withholding of funds, although I think the bill contains a provision that a hearing could be given to the local district by the State board of education. Still, nowhere along the line would there be any withholding of funds.

I assume if the moneys were being used outside the intent or purpose of the bill, if there were a foreign purpose which did not follow the spirit, intent, and purpose of the law, there could be a withholding of funds.

Mr. METCALF. I believe that is the reason why the Senator from Georgia modified his amendment. Suppose there were a withholding of funds for some purpose. Suppose, for example, funds were withheld as the result of a violation of the Davis-Bacon provisions of the bill, or funds were withheld because somebody had not filed a proper application or had not made a proper report. Then there could be a withholding of funds, but only in that instance; and then, of course, there would be an appeal, as the Senator has pointed out.

The point which I think is so important is that we are constantly being told that when one holds the purse strings then he has control of the educational facilities and educational administration. For example, I have had constantly thrown at me the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn*, in 317 United States, 111, at 131, where appears the language:

> It is hardly lack of due process for the Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

So why not say there will not be the power to withhold funds? So why not specifically say there will be no right to withhold funds if the right instructors are not hired or fired; or a certain accreditation standard is not maintained; or basic educational philosophies are not followed; such as traditional or progressive or conservative educational programs, in the schools?

Those are matters which are traditionally within the prerogative of the local boards of education. Local authority is what we are fighting for. Why not say the Commissioner of Education does not have power to withhold funds if certain human relationships are violated?

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The able Senator from Montana is a student of this legislation and has given a great deal of time and study to it. What he has been saying is that rather than have anyone seek to interpret what the legislative intent was by what a Senator has said in debate on the floor to establish the legislative history, we should place in the bill by this amendment a specific provision showing what our intent is, so that it could not possibly be misunderstood; but it still would not change any of the provisions of this bill. Is that correct?

Mr. METCALF. Yes. In my analysis and interpretation of section 103 of the bill as written, I am in complete accord with what the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said in the letter to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], which has been placed in the RECORD. That letter says he cannot withhold funds. I do not want any misunderstanding about the debate on this amendment, any more than I want any misunderstanding about the debate on the Thurmond amendment. A vote for the amendment or a vote against the amendment, in my opinion, will not be a mandate on the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold funds; because most of us are in agreement that there is no such power and that the Secretary may not withhold funds under any circumstances.

Mr. CARROLL. This is one of the danger spots we ought to point out. I thought the distinguished Senator from Oregon had clearly established the record by the letter which was put in the RECORD during these days of debate.

Now an amendment is proposed. If the amendment is voted down, what will be the state of the record? I think the Senator from Montana has said that such action would have no bearing one way or the other so far as legislative intent is concerned.

Mr. METCALF. I think the proponents of withholding funds will get scant comfort from the debate when the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Alaska have said this amendment is not needed because there is no power to withhold funds, and when the Senator from Montana says that in his opinion there is no power to withhold funds. Why not make the situation crystal clear by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. CARROLL. Madam President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I say to the able Senator from Montana and to the Senator from Georgia that I agree entirely with the concept of which we have spoken and the legislative intent and purpose. We do not desire Federal bureaucratic control over local school districts or over State boards of education. We are not for that at all.

I am not quite sure I shall go along with the amendment. I should like to think about it a bit. I think it is surplusage. The Senator thinks it would strengthen his hand. I am not yet convinced. However, I am convinced of the basic argument and the basic philosophical concept of the bill.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Colorado a question?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. JORDAN. What harm would it do to have the amendment in the bill?

Mr. CARROLL. It is only that about which we have spoken. If we should unanimously agree to the amendment, we could say it would support or lend strength to the legislative intent. If the amendment should be defeated, that might weaken the legislative intent. This is why I have spoken—to say that, whether the amendment is agreed to or rejected, we still intend what we intend.

Mr. JORDAN. I think it is well to spell it out. Then we shall know. We shall not have to guess about the matter in 10 years, or even 2 years from now.

Mr. CARROLL. I respect the Senator's view, and there is always merit in his position.

Mr. HART. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a question of the sponsor of the amendment?

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for that purpose?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to try to answer any questions my colleagues may have.

Mr. HART. I intrude at this time because of an obligation which requires me to leave the Chamber shortly.

If the amendment is agreed to, or if the amendment is not attached to the bill when it becomes law, will the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare be obliged to disburse funds to a State even though in the State there is a school district which is out of compliance with the court order?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Secretary himself, in the letter which has been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a number of times at the request of the able Senator from Oregon, who is the floor manager for the bill, stated that he did not regard himself to have such power.

What I seek to do by the amendment is to assure that the new program we are authorizing does not create a future czar of education sitting in Washington, D.C., with the power to control the educational policies of the States through the power to grant or withhold funds.

Mr. HART. The purpose of the amendment is to make very clear to any succeeding Secretary that by the language of the amendment, we have adopted the interpretation of the present Secretary with respect to the bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. Exactly. It is to nail down the point forever and, to borrow from the language of Thomas Jefferson, to bind it down with chains.

Mr. HART. The Senator from Georgia has resolved in my mind how I should vote on the amendment. I do not wish, by agreement to the amendment, to bind the hands of the Secretary with respect to that very question. Therefore, I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from Montana desire additional time?

Mr. METCALF. I should like to continue for a moment.

Madam President, earlier in the day the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] put into the RECORD a colloquy which he and I had in the committee in regard to Federal control under Public Laws 815 and 874. I agree, as I agreed with the Senator in the committee, that there are controls, but those are not controls over education. There is no more control over education in the bill than there is in a highway bill. There are certain controls, such as the Davis-Bacon Act provisions, which we put in all such bills. What we fear is control over education at the local level. No such control is provided in the bill before us.

A few years ago, in 1957, I served on a committee of the House which was studying Public Law 874. Representative FRELINGHUYSEN asked the representative of the National Chamber of Commerce:

> I would like to see any testimony to that point. I have never heard any testimony from any school district, from any State, or from any responsible organization that there has been Federal control of our schools as a result of Public Laws 815 and 874.

At the conclusion of the hearing the chairman said:

> Early in the course of your appearance Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN suggested that he would like to have a single instance of where you knew of any detrimental Federal control resulting from Public Law 815 or 874. I have listened carefully to your testimony and I have not heard you meet that challenge. If you or Mr. Harmon—

An accompanying witness—

> have any such information of any instance of that sort, I wish that, for the enlightenment of the present occupant of the chair, you would submit it for the committee.

The witness said:

> Fine. I will be happy to do that at some later time.

The record was not closed, yet not a single iota of evidence has ever been submitted.

I wish to point out that the things we fear are interference with the hiring and firing of administrators and teachers, interference with the determination of basic educational policies, interference with curricula policies, interference with classroom procedures, interference with use of school facilities, interference with extracurricular activities. We wish to make it clear to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the Commissioner of Education, or to any other official on the Federal level, that he shall not have the power to withhold funds for any of those reasons, and that the traditional control over education which rests at the local school district shall be maintained.

The amendment would do exactly that. In my opinion, it would merely clarify what is the basic law. I see no reason why the amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. TALMADGE. I compliment the distinguished Senator from Montana on his able speech. I now yield 10 minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment, the senior Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Madam President, Federal aid to education is a subject we have been discussing and have had under consideration for many years in the United States.

I remember that in 1937, 24 years ago, at the Governors' conference in Atlantic City, I was assigned to lead the discussion on the question of Federal aid to education. I recall very distinctly that at that time every Governor was in favor of Federal aid to education, provided controls were left entirely within the States. I think if the Governors of the United States today could be assured the control over schools under Federal aid to education would be left in the States, they would be almost unanimous in support of it.

All of the letters I get which oppose Federal aid to education base the opposition upon the fear that the Federal Government will take over control of the schools within the States.

What would the amendment do? Many Senators say, "This is already protected."

Let us read the section in the bill and the amendment.

Section 103 reads as follows:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

It would seem that such language would tie it down to a certain extent, but nothing is said in regard to withholding of funds. The only thing we would do is strike out the period and add the words "or withhold any funds authorized under this act, from any State educational agency which is in compliance with the provisions of this act."

In my judgment that language would tie it down, and no funds could be withheld, provided the provisions of the bill were carried out.

The President of the United States of America has declared that he has no intention of exercising control of any form over the schools. He stated in his message to the Congress of the United States on Monday, February 20, 1961, that "education must remain a matter of State and local control and higher education a matter of individual preference."

I do not think any Member of this august body would disagree with that statement. I do not think there is a Senator who could not applaud this statement. From the testimony before the House Committee on Education and Labor, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff stated virtually the same thing. In answer to a question by one of the committee members he said:

> It is my feeling that there is so deep in the American philosophy the feeling that the States and localities should be in control of education that this is now and always will be an overwhelming factor and the Federal Government never flies in the face of overwhelming opinion and in the face of public philosophy. This is the philosophy.

In addition, Secretary Ribicoff wrote the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], a letter which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 22, 1961, on page 8522, as follows:

> We have a telephone inquiry from your office on the question whether under the school assistance act of 1961, proposed by the administration and introduced as title I of S. 1021, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.
>
> In my opinion, neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority.

Mr. President, I could not agree more with the statements of Secretary Ribicoff. But this is the opinion of Secretary Ribicoff, who may not be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the life of this act, which is for 3 years.

Some subsequent Secreary could have a different opinion and, therefore, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and I have offered this amendment to confirm, uphold, and spell out for the future the opinions of the present administration. We are all in agreement that funds could not be withheld, and that no officer, agency, or other instrument of the Federal Government can interfere with the use of these funds on the local State level. So there should be no objection to this amendment.

The bill itself in section 103 attempts to incorporate this philosophy that the State and local governments alone should exercise control over the schools. However, while section 103 precludes control by any Federal officer, there is no provision that funds shall not be withheld from participating schools at the whim of administrators.

Many Members of this body think section 103 would preclude an administrator from withholding funds since that is a very effective way of controlling policy; and section 103 does attempt to preclude Federal control. However,

other Members of this body do not feel so sure that this section would preclude withholding of funds.

All of us know that withholding of funds as a practical matter is one of the most effective ways of exercising control over our school system.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] on May 22 stated to this body that under the provisions of the bill, no Federal funds can be withheld from segregated schools. The Senator from Oregon made this statement in response to an inquiry from the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and went so far as to specify, "not from public schools in the South." This should justify even more the attachment of the Talmadge-Johnston amendment to this bill to avoid any confusion or misconceptions in the future as to the intent of Congress.

Since this body strongly desires to see the control of our schools remain in the hands of our State and local governments, then I see absolutely no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. The amendment clarifies that this form of control shall not be utilized.

As has already been pointed out on the floor of the Senate, this amendment is only an additional guarantee that there will be no Federal control. As I have already stated the overwhelming feeling of this body is that there shall be no Federal control over our school system. Consequently, as I have just stated, there is no valid reason why this amendment should not be adopted.

While there is no valid reason why this amendment should not be passed, I regret to say that many people think it cannot pass merely because it is being introduced and cosponsored by southerners.

It would be a disgrace to the American democratic form of government if the U.S. Senate were to defeat this amendment solely on the prejudicial basis that it was offered by southern Senators.

I can think of nothing more tragic than the picture of the U.S. Government blackmailing local school boards by denying funds for education to little schoolchildren because of some bureaucratic ruling.

To prevent such an insidious form of Federal control from ever rearing its ugly head, I earnestly solicit the passage of this amendment for the good of all 50 of our great States, and their schools.

I believe in education. I realize that we need better education in the United States. I feel that the Federal Government, if properly regulated, ought to help the schools of our Nation. The only thing I fear is Federal control of our school system. If the amendment is agreed to, I shall vote for the bill. But if the amendment is not agreed to, I do not see how I can vote for the bill, because a guarantee would not be put into the bill prohibiting the withholding of funds. Such withholding of funds is the most powerful way of enforcing their way of thinking available to the Federal Government.

I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment in order that we may be able to do what we know is needed. The salaries of teachers need to be increased, and I fear that a great many States are not in a position to tax their people additionally without placing a great burden upon themselves to do so.

The same point is evident with respect to school construction throughout the Nation.

I hope the amendment will pass.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. How much time does the Senator from Pennsylvania desire?

Mr. SCOTT. 5 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. The amendment is brief, and it is as drastic as it is brief. The amendment would prohibit the withholding of any funds by the Federal Government and its agencies to any State for any reason whatsoever. It would therefore seem to prohibit the establishment of a standard.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on my time?

Mr. SCOTT. I have not had an opportunity to develop my thought, but I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that the amendment has been modified so that funds could be withheld if there was failure to comply with the provisions of the act.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Senator for further confusing me. That leads us back, of course, to what the bill intends, as to whether there is compliance. Nevertheless it does not relieve my state of confusion, because what I have in mind is to assure, if we can, the education of all our children, with equal treatment under the law, with compliance with the decisions of our courts, and in accord with the statutes. I am afraid that even with the modification the amendment runs counter to what we sought to accomplish in the Bush-Scott amendment. It runs so much counter to it that if I had a compass my amendment would point in one direction and the Senator's amendment, I fear, would point in a diametrically opposite direction. It is, in fact, the exact contradiction of what some of us sought to achieve in the amendment in which I was interested and which I supported so strongly.

I believe that the Commissioner of Education ought to be left free to comply not only with the statute law of our land, but also with the decisions of the Supreme Court. Whether or not we agree with those decisions—and some of us do and some do not—I am afraid that the pending amendment would in effect operate to repeal in some degree, and so far as the bill is concerned, the solemn adjudication of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Therefore, because I think such an amendment would be a liability and a further impediment to the bill I may have great difficulty in supporting it, and may, in fact, be obliged to oppose it upon further consideration between now and the time of passage. The bill is already filled with new additions at variance with the concept of the original simple school construction bills. Nevertheless, so far as possible, I would like to see the bill afford equal treatment, and be as all-inclusive as possible. I would like to see it abide not only by the statutory laws of the land, but also by the interpretations of our courts. Therefore, Madam President, I oppose the amendment and I hope it will not be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I intended to yield some time to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK]. But I will speak briefly in my own time. I am opposed to the Talmadge amendment, and urge its defeat. I wish to give my reasons, as follows:

At the very outset of our consideration of the bill—and I am not talking about the debate in the Senate, but about the conferences on the bill even preceding the hearings on it—I made very clear to private school groups, to public school groups, to civil rights groups, and to anti-civil-rights groups, that I would do all within my power to pilot through the Senate a bill that did not have attached to it any private school amendment or any civil rights amendment. I have done my best to keep the faith.

I have the greatest respect for the Senator for Georgia, as he well knows, and have no question as to his motivation. But in my judgment the adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Georgia would cause great injury to the bill from the standpoint of its future in the legislative process. We would never be able to avoid the allegation, if it were adopted, that it has civil rights connotations. We would never be able to convince those who are very much concerned with giving life and effect and meaning to the 14th amendment that the inclusion of the amendment might possibly make it more difficult to carry out the 14th amendment from the standpoint, not of constitutional rights under it, but from the standpoint of administrative processes in effectuating such constitutional rights.

Although my friend from Georgia disagrees with me, in my opinion the amendment has many of the aspects, at least in its psychological connotations, of the Powell amendment in reverse. The best thing one can say for the Talmadge amendment is that it is surplusage. If it is surplusage there is no justification for voting for it.

The worst one can say for it is that it would throw a roadblock in the way of establishing the principle of Federal aid to education on the statute books of the country.

It would create difficulty for me, as the floor leader in the Senate, in future conferences. It would create great difficulties for the Representative from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, in the House of Representatives in connection with getting the bill through the committee and through the House.

I am glad that my friend the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] is in the Chamber. He heard me say this, in effect, in conversations: "Do not give me

the argument, 'if it is not needed and if it is surplusage, what is wrong with adopting it?'" There are a great many things wrong with adopting it from the standpoint of the effect it would have on men's minds in connection with further steps which must be taken in respect to passing a Federal aid-to-education bill.

The Senator from Georgia has made his point. He has made his record. The position the Senator from Georgia has taken undoubtedly has led to our obtaining from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the letter which is already printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I refer to it again in the RECORD of May 18. It is addressed to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and reads as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, May 17, 1961.

Hon. WINSTON L. PROUTY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROUTY: We have a telephone inquiry from your office on the question whether under the School Assistance Act of 1961, proposed by the administration and introduced as title I of S. 1021, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.

In my opinion neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority.

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Secretary.

If I understand the present position of the Senator from Georgia, it is, in effect—I do not quote him exactly, but I am sure I correctly interpret his meaning—"That is all right for Ribicoff, but there will be other Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and I want to take care of them right now."

This is not the place to do it. If the Senator from Georgia is interested in civil rights legislation, he ought to be offering his amendment to the civil rights law, not to the education bill.

Let us place on the statute books the principle of Federal aid to education, unencumbered by any of the amendments to which I have referred as crippling amendments. My friend from Georgia does not agree that his amendment is a crippling amendment. I believe it is. It is a crippling amendment from the standpoint of the confidence and support we must have in order to carry the bill successfully through the House and the conference.

The Senator from Georgia has introduced a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States repealing the 14th amendment. I do not believe the 14th amendment ought to be repealed.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from Oregon is mistaken in what he has said about the 14th amendment. I have offered an amendment to the Constitution to have the 14th amendment mean what it meant on the morning of May 17, 1954.

Mr. MORSE. I accept the correction. However, I believe my interpretation of the effect of that proposal would be the repeal of the 14th amendment, at least as it applies to education.

When the Senator takes that approach in regard to the 14th amendment, he recognizes that we are dealing with a constitutional question, not a legislative problem. I respectfully say that the Senator from Georgia ought to make his approach to the whole problem by way of the Constitution. If he wishes to make a legislative approach, it ought to be by way of amendment of the existing civil rights law.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Why would this be construed as a civil rights amendment when it seeks merely to carry out what Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Ribicoff says will be his policy now?

Mr. MORSE. It could be construed as a civil rights amendment because human beings are human beings and because people have very strong feelings about the whole subject. It is certainly being offered with a civil rights purpose in mind. As the Senator knows, I have been doing my very best to avoid arousing those feelings in connection with this bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator from Oregon has been very effective in that respect.

Mr. MORSE. I have been seeking to have the bill passed without having the feelings of the pro- or anti-private school people aroused to the point where the bill will be damaged. I have also sought to prevent the development of a psychological situation in which people concerned with civil rights and segregation will become involved in a controversy which will damage the prospects for the passage of the bill.

I cannot be more frank, can I? As the Senator in charge of the bill, I cannot state more frankly what my problems are.

At best, the amendment is not needed. If it is not needed, why complicate an already complex situation in regard to Federal aid to education?

I simply plead that we already have in the bill section 106, which makes it perfectly clear that there can be no Federal control of education. We have a letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which expresses that view. Why not wait? Let us first see if anyone gets hurt. I do not believe there is any danger of anyone getting hurt from the point of view of the Senator from Georgia.

Southern States benefit more per child than any other section of the country under this bill. They need to improve their education opportunities for all their children, and helping them do so is a primary purpose of the measure.

If a future Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare does not follow the law, Congress has ways of making certain that that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare will be required to conform with congressional intent. We know what congressional intent is. Congress has many checks and controls over Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Do not propose on this bill an amendment which, in my judgment, will endanger the whole future of this great and noble cause—and it is a noble cause. It is the cause of seeking to place on the statute books Federal aid to education.

The Senator from Georgia has made all the case he needs to make in order to make it perfectly clear to his constituents and the Nation where he stands on the matter of civil rights and that he does not hold the point of view, for example, of the Senator from Oregon and the rest of us who are ready to act with the Senator from Georgia in regard to legislation on opposite sides of the issue of amending the existing civil rights laws.

I simply say, as I close my argument, that I do not care how this amendment is clothed; I do not care what is said in rationalizing or trying to explain the amendment; it will be interpreted as a civil rights amendment which will give aid, support, and assistance to those who stand for a policy of segregation in this country. In my opinion, the amendment has no place in the bill. The Senator from Georgia ought to wait and take up the question in connection with a civil rights bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I must keep a commitment with the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield time to him, but I do not wish to offend the Senator from Illinois by not yielding to him. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has 17 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I do not wish the Senator from Oregon, who is in charge of the bill, to minimize the importance of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I shall vote against the bill and I shall vote against the amendment, but I point out that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported a bill authorizing funds, for a 3-year period, in excess of $2,500 million.

The amendment provides that where there is compliance with the provisions of the act, the money shall not be denied to any educational State agency. Another bill might be passed in this Congress, or it might be passed in the next Congress; but the Senator will have virtually closed the door against the dispensing of money if this kind of interdiction is placed in the bill. I do not want to see that happen. Do not minimize it: This is one of the most important amendments that has been offered to the bill. In my considered judgment, civil rights or no civil rights, this amendment contains dynamite. Do not forget: It will apply for 3 years unless Congress changes it; and if Congress comes forward with a proposal with respect to integration and segregation, what can we say to Senators who voted

for the bill, when they stand up and protest, and say in good faith, "We voted for it because the Talmadge amendment was in it, but now you are changing the rules of the game a year or so after the bill became effective"?

I assure the Senator this is an important amendment; it is not surplusage. It is here for a purpose. While I am against the bill on principle, I do not wish to see Congress tie its own hands in this fashion.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I deeply appreciate the help which the Senator from Illinois has been to me.

Madam President, 5 minutes for the Senator from Pennsylvania and 5 minutes for the Senator from New York are my present commitments. I yield first to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I shall not discuss the pending amendment except to say that I agree with everything the Senator from Oregon has said. In my judgment, the amendment at best is surplusage. At worst, it may well be a requirement for an executive officer to do an unconstitutional act in the interest of maintaining a segregated system of schools. I hope all Senators who desire to see a good bill passed and who are anxious to have the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to schools carried out will vote to defeat the amendment.

I shall use the remainder of my time to controvert some statements made in the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], whom I have notified that I was about to make these comments, whose office I have called, and on whose desk I have placed a note.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have sent for the Senator from Delaware. He was most anxious to be on the floor when the Senator from Pennsylvania made his remarks.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, would the Senator from New York be willing to use his 5 minutes now? I shall be willing to use my time after he has concluded. The minority leader has advised me that the Senator from Delaware desires to be on the floor when I make my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to remind the Senator from Oregon that he has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. MORSE. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. First, I believe the amendment is a prosegregation amendment. Therefore, to lay on with an even hand, when the time is proper, I shall move to table the amendment, which is precisely what was done to the Bush amendment.

Second, the Senator from Illinois is absolutely correct. This is a critically important amendment which will break the bill, but the back of the bill can be broken just as effectively by those who are against prosegregation amendments as it can be by those who are against antisegregation amendments. Indeed, the majority for the bill is built upon those who are against the prosegregation amendment. The minority, I believe, will be found to be on the side of those who are against antisegregation amendments.

So the death of the bill will be guaranteed far more surely by adopting the Talmadge amendment than it would have been by adopting the Bush amendment. Why? Because it is a quite different thing to be Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for the time being and give a legal opinion on a certain situation. I may not agree with the opinion at all. I may be able to argue about it. The Supreme Court may reverse itself on the Mellon case and allow taxpayers' suits.

I believe it would be unconstitutional if any President should or could give money to a school district in contempt of a court order to desegregate. That is my belief; I am entitled to it. But to nail that viewpoint down in the law and say, "This is the way it shall be," tends to give a mandatory direction to the President as a matter of law.

Madam President, I do not believe a Federal aid to education bill is worth that, much as I believe in it. And I believe that the majority of Senators who favor the bill will surely kill the amendment, for that reason. So the amendment is a critically important one.

As the Senator from Illinois said, regardless of whether one favors the bill or is opposed to the bill, Senators surely do not wish to favor locking it up in this way.

So I hope the Senate will vote in favor of the motion to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Has all available time been used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 20 minutes remaining; the Senator from Oregon has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am somewhat embarrassed, Madam President, because I realize that the Senator from Pennsylvania wishes to speak briefly at this time, and it is desirable that some time be made available to him.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, it will be satisfactory to the Senator from Georgia and to me if the present agreement is modified so as to allow an additional 5 minutes, to be available at this time to the Senator from Pennsylvania, who wishes to discuss a matter extraneous to the Talmadge amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very good.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

ALLOTMENTS TO PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, let me say to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that since I have only 5 minutes, I shall have to proceed without interruption; and thereafter he can reply in his own time, in the following 5 minutes.

Madam President, last night the Senator from Delaware made some statements for the RECORD which I am sure were inadvertently incorrect. At this time I should like to correct them, because they have a bearing on the status of my State in connection with the allotment of Federal funds.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for yesterday shows, on page 8654, that the Senator from Delaware said that Pennsylvania and its Senator, meaning me, had succeeded in getting a 65-percent increase in the allotment for Pennsylvania under the present committee bill, as opposed to the administration bill; and on page 8654 of the RECORD for yesterday the Senator from Delaware stated substantially the same thing, although then he said the increase was 63 percent. This morning the Senator from Delaware referred to the same allotment, but stated the figure was 60 percent. Now the Senator from Delaware is getting closer to the truth. The actual amount is 42 percent, as will be seen from the figures I shall now cite.

Under the present bill, Pennsylvania will receive $44,026,417 each year, for 3 years, or a total of $132,079,251.

Under the administration bill, Pennsylvania will receive, on the basis of a sliding scale, a total, for 3 years, of $92,808,377. The difference between the two is $39,270,874 or 42 percent, not 60 percent, not 63 percent, not 65 percent.

Last night the Senator from Delaware took refuge, in connection with the debate on the District of Columbia amendment, in a series of tables which appear on pages 344, 345, and 346 of the hearings, and also in some table which he tells me he prepared himself, which appear at the bottom of page 8658 of the RECORD, and which purport to show how much money each State will pay out in connection with this Federal aid-to-education bill; and then he contrasted those figures with the amounts which each State will receive under the bill. Those figures were prepared initially by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. In my judgment, they are based on sand, not on rock; and they are surely unreliable, because the premises upon which they were prepared are incorrect, and therefore the conclusion drawn from those premises are incorrect. I suggest that any conclusions drawn from them, as regards the amount which any particular State will receive, when compared with the amount the State will pay, are entirely incorrect.

Madam President, our concern should be in regard to the education of the schoolchildren of the Nation; and we should consider this matter on a national basis, not on a State basis.

In addition, the Senator from Delaware undertook to chastise me, because he said that on another occasion I pleaded that Pennsylvania was poor. That was a little while ago, when we were debating unemployment compensation. The Senator from Delaware said that now, when we are really rich,

we should not ask for so much money by means of this Federal aid-to-education bill.

I must say, Madam President, that the two situations are so entirely different that no analogy can properly be drawn from them at all. Pennsylvania has a very large amount of unemployment; and we maintain that the employees in Pennsylvania are entitled to the unemployment relief which is made available under the legislation Congress enacted, and thus are entitled to be helped by employers throughout the Nation.

The situation in the instant case is entirely different, for the measure now under debate in the Senate deals with helping on a national basis with the education of the children of the United States. So I do not believe any valid comparison can be made or that any valid analogy can be drawn by referring to each of these two measures, and I do not believe that any conclusions based on such an argument should have much weight.

Finally, Madam President, the Senator from Delaware placed in the RECORD figures showing that the per capita debt on Delaware was substantially greater than the per capita debt of Pennsylvania. Unfortunately, the Senator from Delaware used figures based on only the State debt, but not including the local debt. If the local debt is also included, the figures will be found to be much different.

Pennsylvania's gross debt figure of $1,278 million for 1959—thus making Pennsylvania 16th in per capita debt ranking—includes $403 million of the turnpike authority debt. Pennsylvania's local debt total in 1959 was $2,810 million. Pennsylvania's State and local debt that year totaled $4,080 million. Delaware's total State and local debt in 1959 was $293 million—thus indicating that the debt of Pennsylvania was substantially in excess of that of Delaware.

I make these comments, not out of any criticism of my friend, the Senator from Delaware, who certainly has every right to quote any statistics he wishes, but merely in order to set the RECORD straight for future reference.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Madam President, it is not too often that I find myself in agreement with the Senator from Pennsylvania. He has taken exception to some of the figures I placed in the RECORD. I shall not apologize for using those figures or for placing them in the RECORD. Mathematically they are correct.

The Senator from Pennsylvania wished to know the source of the figures. I now state the source of the figures. The figures incorporated in the RECORD yesterday as to the State gross debt, by States, were compiled by the Department of Commerce, and those figures are reprinted in the book published by the Tax Foundation, on page 211 of its 1960–61 edition. They are Department of Commerce figures.

All I say is that, with all due respect to the Senator from Pennsylvania, I have more confidence in the figures of the Department of Commerce than I have in the figures he compiled.

As to the benefits accruing to Pennsylvania, the Senator from Pennsylvania says I was in error when I said that under the formula used in connection with the committee bill, Pennsylvania got a 65-percent increase in the additional $200 million allocation.

Under the administration's bill, Pennsylvania would have received $26,880,000 the first year.

Under the bill reported by the committee, of which the Senator from Pennsylvania is a member, Pennsylvania would receive $44,026,417. Those figures can be found on page 344 of the committee hearings and on page 4 of the committee's report. That increase amounts to $17,146,417, and it is an increase of 64 percent—which, of course, is exactly what I said before.

The Senator from Pennsylvania points out that the committee bill was a 3-year bill under which Pennsylvania would receive $44,026,417, and that therefore the figure should be multiplied by 3, which would show that Pennsylvania would receive $132 million. The Senator from Pennsylvania points out that the bill which was before the committee was also a 3-year bill, but that the bill the administration sent to the committee allowed for a graduated increase from year to year.

Certainly this program which allows x amount per pupil will increase each year as the school population increases. Surely, even the Senator from Pennsylvania can recognize that fact of life.

I wish to point out to the Senator from Pennsylvania—although of course he knows his State better than I do—that during the next 3 years some increase in population will occur in Pennsylvania. Pennsylvania will not stand still in population from the date the bill is enacted until the 3-year program under the bill is completed. Under the bill which now is before us Pennsylvania will collect $16.56 per pupil over this 3-year period, and the total amount will certainly increase as the number of students increase.

The Senator from Pennsylvania uses figures which are based on the assumption that there will be exactly the same number of students in Pennsylvania this year, next year, and the following year, and he makes no allowance whatever for the population increase. Surely he is not so naive as to think that the school population in Pennsylvania will stand still. If he does think so, why does he ask for funds for additional classrooms?

The administration's bill allowed—correctly—for approximately 200,000 additional students each year and computed the cost accordingly. But the Senator from Pennsylvania eliminates that fact of life. His computation is based on the false assumption that there will be no increase in the school population in Pennsylvania during the 3-year period. Certainly the amount which Pennsylvania will collect 3 years from now will be more than the amount which Pennsylvania will receive now.

I repeat, the State of Pennsylvania, under this additional $200 million allocation will receive a 64-percent increase. The District of Columbia will receive an increase of 4 percent. The State of Delaware will receive an increase of 7 percent.

I shall never speak disparagingly of Pennsylvania. I have great respect for our neighboring State of Pennsylvania. In fact, I have more confidence in the State of Pennsylvania than apparently the Senator from Pennsylvania does. I have confidence that the State of Pennsylvania, with all its wealth, is able to finance its own educational system and its own unemployment problems without asking for relief from Delaware and the other States.

Yet we find that just 3 months ago, as I pointed out last night, the State of Pennsylvania was classifying itself as a poor State in order to enable it to receive Federal grants in solving its unemployment problems. Then the Senator from Pennsylvania was appealing to States in the South to send money up to the North to help underwrite their unemployment problems. As a result, the State of Pennsylvania under a bill passed here last March benefited to the extent of $14.3 million from Georgia, Mississippi, Arkansas, and South Carolina. All of those States were then paying extra money to support what was described at that time as the poor State of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, the able and distinguished Senator from Oregon is one of the best and most eloquent lawyers I know, but he is trying to argue north and south at the same time. On the one hand, he says the amendment I have offered is complete surplusage. On the other hand he contends I am trying to repeal the 14th amendment. He made both arguments at the same time and with equal fervor and I must admit that it was one of the most interesting performances I have witnessed since becoming a Member of the U.S. Senate.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon has given many of his students advice similar to what I received in law school.

A teacher told me:

> When you go out and practice law, if you do not have the law on your side, argue the facts. If you do not have the facts on your side, argue the law. If you do not have the facts or the law on your side, then give the prosecutor hell and confuse the issue.

That is exactly what the able Senator from Oregon has been attempting to do. He has been trying to confuse the issue by saying this amendment is surplusage, is meaningless, and is premature; and by contending that, if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare takes any such action, we can correct it later.

I am sure the able Senator from Oregon has heard another old adage about not waiting to lock the barn door until after the horse is gone.

That is what the Senator from Georgia is trying to do. He merely is trying to write into the language of the bill what the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare says is his understanding of the situation now. I quote

from his famous letter as printed a number of times in the RECORD:

We have a telephone inquiry from your office on the question whether under the School Assistance Act of 1961, proposed by the administrator and introduced as title I of S. 1021, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or the Commissioner of Education could withhold funds from any State because of segregation in schools within that State.

In my opinion neither the Secretary nor the Commissioner would have such authority.

Sincerely,

———— ————,
Secretary.

There is no signature. I assume the letter was signed, but there is no signature on the line.

Mr. MORSE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I give the Senator my assurance that the original letter was signed by Abraham Ribicoff.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to hear that. I had assumed he had signed the letter, but every time I have seen it in print, the signature has been missing.

I am sure the Secretary signed it and means to do what he says in it. But I think it would be a grave mistake to begin a program of Federal aid to education relying only on a letter from only one Secretary to safeguard against the whims and caprices of unbound future Secretaries. In my judgment if this bill is enacted, it will be a $10 billion program within the course of 10 to 15 years.

A Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare administering a program of such magnitude well could make State and local school superintendents, education board members come running to Washington for his succor and his favor. That is a power that ought not to be possessed by any man on the face of the earth, including the President of the United States.

The arguments against my amendment have been nothing less than amazing. On the one hand, it is said to be surplusage—an unnecessary, useless appendage. On the other hand, it is said that it goes to the extent of ripping out the 14th amendment of the Constitution. The civil rights issue and everything else that could be brought up to confuse Members of the Senate have been injected.

What are the facts? Let us go back to the bill. Section 103, beginning on line 15, on page 2 of the bill, has a wonderful statement which seeks to vest the absolute control of education in the States. It goes into elaborate detail with every assurance but the one that counts; that is, who controls the money.

I have had some little experience in government and have participated in politics since my boyhood days. I have seen politicians go before highway boards and plead for roads. I have seen legislators go before Governors and plead for an allocation of funds. I know that the control of government, at whatever level it may be, is vested in the hands of him who controls the purse. When that purse is in the control of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, he becomes a superdirector of education in the United States; and the tentacles of his power will reach throughout this land of ours—all the way from Hawaii to Puerto Rico, from Alaska to the Everglades of Florida. I do not think that kind of power should be vested in an appointive official in Washington, D.C.

What would my amendment do? It is the simplest thing on earth. It merely takes the language which the committee wrote—excellent language so far as it goes—and adds these words: "or withhold any funds, authorized under this act, from any State education agency which has complied with the provisions of this act."

What is wrong with that? It merely says, if Congress is to authorize the money, the Secretary must give it; that he does not have the power to withhold it; that he does not have the power to take it away.

Any Senator who votes against this amendment must, in all fairness, confess that he wants power vested in the Secretary to control education through his control of the purse.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TALMADGE. First, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. While I do not wish to embarrass any Federal official by what I am about to say, I am sure the Senator is familiar with the so-called suitable home provision on Federal grants-in-aid to dependent children. About 11 States have such provisions in their laws. Louisiana, because of such a provision, was threatened by the Federal Government with a cutoff on Federal aid for the welfare or benefit of dependent children.

For the benefit of the Senator, I shall state that in negotiations on the problem a responsible Federal official informed the Senator from Louisiana that even though he thought the Federal Government was wrong, and even though he had been advised in close quarters behind the scenes that it was thought to be wrong, for political advantage it was not felt that Federal officials could change their position, and that the State would be well advised to yield, because the State would have no standing to sue in court for a Federal grant.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am not at all surprised by what the Senator says. I shall tell the Senator what the late great Franklin D. Roosevelt told my father, when he was President of the United States and my father was Governor of Georgia. There was some difficulty about State highway funds allocated to Georgia. The Georgia Highway Board wished to locate a road where it thought the road should be built, and the Federal Bureau of Roads had a different idea about the matter. My father went to see the President of the United States, and the President told my father that when he was Governor of New York the Federal Bureau of Roads made him locate a highway in the State of New York contrary to where the State Highway Board of New York wanted the highway to go.

That is the type of thing I am seeking to prevent by my amendment. I want to see control retained in the State and local school boards and officials—not in the hands of some bureaucrat who would use the power to call up Governors and tell them, "You do thus and so, or I will cut your water off."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator well knows the problems which are involved. In law and honor and precedent, in the Senate debates and in the debates in the House of Representatives, at times, even though everyone agrees that a person is right, he cannot get into court to have his case tried. I assume that is the kind of thing the Senator is trying to correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator from New York desire to propound a question?

Mr. KEATING. I do.

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and our distinguished colleagues from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and Montana [Mr. METCALF] have said that the Secretary would not have power to withhold funds. If that is true, why is there any necessity to agree to the amendment?

Mr. TALMADGE. Why not write it into the law, if the Secretary says that? I believe in the principles of Thomas Jefferson, who said, in essence, to trust no man, but bind him down with chains of the Constitution.

Mr. KEATING. I do not agree with that interpretation.

Mr. TALMADGE. I did not expect the Senator would.

Mr. KEATING. The Senators and the Secretary say that will be the law. If it will be the law, there is no necessity for the amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. What the Senator from Georgia is trying to do, by the amendment, is to assure that the law will be administered on the State and local levels.

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my friend.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator from New York and I had a discussion the other night. The Senator from New York does not agree with the opinion expressed in the letter sent by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

I believe that as the bill is written, without the Senator's amendment, there is no power to withhold funds. I see no reason why we should not add the amendment to make it crystal clear that the Secretary has no power to withhold funds.

The Senator from Oregon takes the same position, that there is no power to withhold funds, but says that the amendment represents surplusage.

We have the argument, also, that the amendment might impair passage of the bill, and so forth. That is the same argument which was advanced against the Bush amendment, the so-called Powell-type amendment.

Most of us are in agreement, I think the RECORD should show, whether we vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia or not, that the Secretary does not have power to withhold funds under any circumstances, in view of the way section 103 is written. Whichever way Senators vote on the Talmadge amendment, it will not be a mandate to the Secretary to withhold funds.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Montana for that purpose.

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield to to my friend.

Mr. KEATING. Is it not a fact that the views of the Senator from Montana have changed since he debated exactly the opposite way when he was a Member of the House of Representatives?

Mr. METCALF. I say to the Senator from New York that when we were Members of the House of Representatives we might have had one view which might have changed when we became Senators, but that is not true in this case.

Mr. KEATING. Will the Senator yield for a correction?

Mr. METCALF. I should be glad to have the Senator read to me the statement I made as a Member of the House, in order that I may distinguish it.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the most beautiful of Shakespeare's sonnets opens with the lines:

When to the sessions of sweet silent thought I summon up remembrance of things past.

In the course of last Thursday's debate, while listening to the distinguished Senator from Montana, I found myself in a session of sweet silent thought that did, in fact, summon up remembrance of things past. Specifically, I seemed to recall an earlier address in the House of Representatives wherein the then Representative METCALF made a vigorous statement which was, to say the least, not consonant with the position he most recently assumed. In fact, the Senator delivered a speech in the House on this subject on February 6, 1956, and said:

The Supreme Court has made it clear that the courts will enforce the constitutional requirement of nonsegregation without the necessity of further legislation. This provision is a self-executing one soundly based on constitutional doctrine and cannot be circumvented by inaction on the part of Congress.

The Senator disagreed with the view that an administrative agency charged with distributing Federal funds could—and I shall now quote—"close its eyes to open defiance to the Constitution of the United States and continue to pay out money to States who are in open and flagrant defiance until directed to do otherwise by Congress."

That was the same issue. The then Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had written a letter, though not as strong as the letter we are presently considering, indicating he did not have the power to withhold funds from segregated schools in most cases. The Senator then took the position that the Secretary had a perfect right to withhold the funds.

Mr. METCALF. But we did not have section 103. We did not have the provision spelled out.

I am delighted the Senator from New York has brought that subject up, because this is the very point I wished to make. With section 103, whether the amendment is agreed to or not, there is not a mandate on the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold funds. A vote either for the amendment or against the amendment is not a vote upon the interpretation in the letter which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wrote to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY].

I am convinced, I say to the Senator from New York, that in regard to Public Law 874, Public Law 815, the school lunch program, the Vocational Education Act, the Smith-Hughes Act, and all the other educational programs we have, which do not have the saving clause found in section 103, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has the power to withhold funds. That is why I suggested the other day that the Senator from Connecticut should offer his amendment to Public Laws 815 and 874 rather than to this new program.

This is a special bill, for a special law. The provision is spelled out. We are all in agreement—at least, most of us are in agreement—that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare does not have the power to withhold funds. I think the RECORD should make that clear during the debate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. METCALF. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator said, in the debate:

"I shall never concede——"

"Never" is the word used. It is always a dangerous word to use.

Mr. METCALF. It certainly is.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator said:

I shall never concede that the enforcement of the great provisions of the Constitution, the liberties guaranteed in the Bill of Rights, and the 14th amendment are not effective until there is a specific legislative enactment by the Congress.

The legislative branch of Government cannot by refusal or failure to act deprive citizens of rights and privileges guaranteed by the Constitution. It is the duty of the executive branch to enforce these provisions of the Constitution in every law. These self-executing provisions of the Constitution are implicit in every law enacted by Congress and it is unnecessary to specially mention them in legislation affecting the subjects in which these constitutional principles are involved. Without further congressional action it becomes the duty of the Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Attorney General of the United States to enforce the equal protection and due process clauses of the Constitution as soon as clarified by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Mr. METCALF. Oh, there is still the power in the Federal court, under the decisions of the Supreme Court in the segregation cases, to enforce the constitutional provisions for desegregation, whether a cent of Federal money goes to the school district or not.

That is a different question. The Senator from Oregon has brought out time and time again that the question of segregation or desegregation should not be dragged into this debate. It is a matter that the courts are handling in a process of deliberate speed. Of course, rights under the 14th amendment are inherent in any legislation. But the power to withhold funds is specifically prohibited in section 103.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we have only 1 minute remaining and I should like to reserve that time.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the able Senator for his great contribution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Georgia for, in my judgment, helping to prove my case. I think it is perfectly clear that the Senator from Georgia wishes to get the amendment in the bill because he thinks it may be of help in future litigation. I do not have a crystal ball. I cannot see what may happen in the future. But the amendment would be a great psychological block to the passage of the bill. I will try to be frank with the Senate in regard to this point. I have received two calls during the past hour from Members of the House of Representatives who are very much interested in the bill, pointing out that the amendment would be very much misunderstood in the House, and that we would find ourselves in difficulty on the House side with respect to the amendment because of the interpretation that adheres to its purpose.

One of the finest supporters of Federal aid to education in the Senate told me within the last 5 minutes that he could not possibly support the bill—and he has always supported Federal aid to education—if the amendment were in the bill, because the amendment would be very much misunderstood throughout the country.

I urge again that supporters of this measure remain in a position where we can keep faith with those to whom we said, "This bill is confined to public school aid. It will not include an amendment for private school aid; nor a Powell amendment." As manager of the bill I cannot give any support to an amendment to the bill that would be helpful to the segregational point of view, either.

I am ready to yield back the remainder of my time, after which, when all time has been yielded back, I will move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield myself the final minute.

It is most unusual to debate psychological values rather than the merits of the amendment. I try to vote on the merits of an issue rather than on the basis of psychology. I feel strongly that all issues ought to be determined on their merits, regardless of what the psychological situation may be.

I conclude by saying that the amendment would do nothing except make

certain that the proposed legislation will be administered in accordance with the laws that Congress makes, and that appropriations made by Congress will be paid to the States in full and without fail.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, has all time either expired or been yielded back?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the amendment of the Senator from Georgia be laid on the table.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to lay on the table the modified amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] for himself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 30, as follows:

[No. 54]

YEAS—61

Aiken	Curtis	Long, Hawaii
Allott	Dirksen	Magnuson
Bartlett	Dodd	McGee
Beall	Douglas	McNamara
Bennett	Dworshak	Miller
Bible	Engle	Monroney
Boggs	Fong	Morse
Bridges	Goldwater	Morton
Burdick	Hart	Moss
Byrd, W.Va.	Hartke	Mundt
Cannon	Hayden	Muskie
Capehart	Humphrey	Neuberger
Carroll	Jackson	Pastore
Case, N.J.	Javits	Pell
Church	Keating	Proxmire
Clark	Kuchel	Randolph
Cooper	Lausche	Saltonstall
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Scott
Smith, Mass.	Wiley	Williams, Del.
Smith, Maine	Williams, N.J.	Young, Ohio
Symington		

NAYS—30

Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston	Schoeppel
Eastland	Jordan	Smathers
Ellender	Kefauver	Sparkman
Ervin	Kerr	Stennis
Fulbright	Long, La.	Talmadge
Gruening	Mansfield	Thurmond
Hickey	McClellan	Yarborough
Hill	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—9

Anderson	Carlson	Hickenlooper
Blakley	Chavez	McCarthy
Bush	Gore	Prouty

So Mr. MORSE's motion to lay on the table the modified amendment, offered by Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. JOHNSTON), was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

THE RACE PROBLEM

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the tragic events of the past few days have provided a field day for South-baiters, for racist politicians, and for opportunists of one kind or another, and they have taken full advantage of it. Oftimes those who demand tolerance from the South are most intolerant in their criticism.

It is refreshing to find one voice which is attempting to deal with this subject objectively. An editorial entitled "Montgomery and the World," published in today's Wall Street Journal, is, in my opinion, an objective editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTGOMERY AND THE WORLD

There is, surely, plenty of blame to go around for the Montgomery racial disorders. But we should like to enter a dissent to the increasingly prevalent notion that the United States as a whole deserves all this criticism, at home and abroad, for mismanaging its racial problems.

In this particular case the trouble was deliberately provoked. The so-called freedom riders went looking for trouble, in one of the most likely parts of the South, and they found it. The local and State authorities failed, in the beginning at least, in their duties to prevent violence and maintain law and order.

That was said to require Federal intervention, and perhaps it did. But the present administration sometimes seems almost as zealous in this matter as some of the agitators. It seems to believe that by fast, firm action it can clear up this whole question of segregation in the near future.

If that is indeed the view at the Justice Department, we fear it is an illusion. The Supreme Court school decision of 1954, whatever one may think of it otherwise, undertook to upset a social pattern of long duration. The consequences have been coming ever since, and the only sure thing is that the troubles will keep coming.

But all that does not, in our opinion, properly make the United States an object of scorn in its own eyes and the world's. We are dealing here with a collision of cultures, with elemental emotions, instincts and attitudes which cannot be waved away with court orders or U.S. marshals or promptly solved in any simple fashion. And we would just like to know what society, ever, faced with such a problem, has dealt with it any better or nearly as well.

Let's consider a few cases in the world today—not to justify the United States by pointing a finger at others, but simply to keep this complex matter in some kind of perspective.

There are, for instance, the emerging nations of Africa, so perturbed about America's race problems. Yet they themselves exhibit racism in reverse. Native politicians in Kenya, heading toward independence, want to drive out or submerge the whites and Asians who built the place for them. That is perhaps their business, but it hardly suggests they have found the secret of a harmonious multiracial society.

Throughout the vast backward areas of the nonwhite world, in fact, prejudice, discrimination, segregation are the custom. It's hard to think of a more thoroughly segregated setup than India's caste system.

Then there is the sanctimonious Soviet Union; to be sure, it does not have a Negro problem, but it holds many Asiatics, among others, in thrall and follows a quasi-official policy of anti-Semitism.

Even the civilized nations across the Atlantic are not successful at coping with the race problem when the problem arises—as it has in Britain. For most of them, of course, the problem has not arisen in any important degree, and therefore it is all the easier to deliver lectures on inequality in the United States.

The truth is that progress toward equality under the law—before as well as after 1954—is one of the more remarkable achievements of America, in view of its singularly difficult situation in this respect. Today compromises on the schools are taking shape in many areas of the South. Long and involved litigation, which itself dissipates passions, frequently results in a measure of desegregation not satisfactory to either side, but not intolerable either. Where there is any community will to accept change, the Federal courts have generally been understanding.

None of this excuses the mess in Montgomery; it does not mean all Americans are going to love each other any time soon. But the broad record of progress ought to be remembered once in a while in the midst of all the talk of the damage we are causing ourselves and our image abroad.

CASTRO, CUBANS, AND TRACTORS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last night in a colloquy with the Senator from Colorado some question arose about editorials in New York newspapers concerning what is variously called Operation Tractors or Operation Rescue, with respect to the Cuban patriots held by Castro.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the editorials to which I referred last night, as well as other editorials which have since come to hand on this subject. Also I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement made today on the same subject by the President of the United States.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, May 23, 1961]

MEN AND TRACTORS

Fidel Castro's offer to trade prisoners of war for tractors has evoked many strange sounds. There are those who say it is immoral to engage in such barter. There are others who say we will simply be playing into a devious propaganda design.

We are unimpressed by these nervous warnings. After all, the invasion did fail; our bargaining power is limited. If we can salvage the lives of worthy men captured on a Cuban beachhead, that is humanity's gain. The terms of the transaction may seem vulgar and materialistic but they cannot be lightly turned aside. In a sense we must be grateful for this chance to prove we regard each individual life as precious.

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1961]

RANSOMING CASTRO'S PRISONERS

Characteristically, totalitarian dictators of the left or the right have shown a callous disregard of human life, tending to treat it as an expandable commodity useful as a policy instrument as it may be needed. Thus Fidel Castro was acting in a well-defined, if hardly creditable, tradition when he made his proposal to trade the 1,000 rebel prisoners he holds for 500 bulldozers. The parallel with the Hitlerite regime's offer during World War II to trade Hungarian Jews for trucks comes quickly to mind.

Premier Castro's propaganda purpose in making this offer is plain. He would like the world to view him as a magnanimous victor willing to spare the lives of his enemies in return for machinery needed to build Cuba's peaceful economy. In this way he hopes to soften the political impact of the Cuban exiles' oppositon to him. We doubt, however, that many will be taken in by this effort to put a propaganda varnish on what is essentially a piece of political blackmail.

Paying ransom to a totalitarian dictator is distasteful under any circumstances. But in this case such natural distaste must be balanced against the humanitarian consideration that only in this way can the imprisoned rebels be saved from what would otherwise be a very bleak future as Castro's prisoners, or perhaps from death at the hands of his firing squads. We can understand and sympathize with those Americans who, moved by such humanitarian considerations, are now trying to collect the needed ransom money to liberate the prisoners. The State Department has also approved this effort which is probably the only practical line of action open at the moment, distasteful as it is.

[From the New York Journal-American, May 23, 1961]

WORTH THE PRICE

Blackmail though it is, New Yorkers are unselfishly digging down to help raise the ransom Fidel Castro has demanded for return of his 1,200 Cuban war prisoners.

This is right in the humane tradition of a great city which has always responded generously to relieve human suffering.

Cardinal Spellman, in the charitable custom of his church, has donated $5,000 toward the purchase of the 500 bulldozers or tractors which Castro has set as his price to liberate the freedom fighters.

And now a 50-man committee, representing this community's leadership and including Mayor Robert Wagner, Senator Jacob Javits and William Randolph Hearst, Jr., the editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, has been formed to direct the fund raising.

We are confident the committee will succeed in this humanitarian mission. Our only fear is that Castro may choose now to weasel out of the exchange he had so tauntingly proposed. He is quibbling about semantics—he insists we call it "indemnification."

To those who hesitate to contribute lest their action be construed as surrender to Castro, we say: The saving of lives—heroic ones in this case—transcends technicalities.

BLOOD BARGAINING

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1961]

Let no one underestimate Fidel Castro's craft in exacting every last drop of advantage in a propaganda battle. Since Castro's original offer to exchange prisoners for tractors put his regime in an ugly light, he now denounces us for using his terminology and insists that the tractors are simply an indemnification.

But the fact is that this country has some responsibility for the lives of the 1,200 luckless invaders now in Castro's hands. If they were to be executed—as Castro darkly hints—it might blacken the Cuban regime's reputation, but at a price far too cruel to pay. It is necessary to swallow a little pride in the hope that lives may be saved, and that the ultimate moral victory will go to those who value men more than machines.

Eleanor Roosevelt, Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther have undertaken a humanitarian task in raising funds for the unhappy transaction. It would be a fine gesture if leaders all through the Western Hemisphere were to unite in the effort. The world ought to know that this is a matter that transcends government and reaches directly to the people themselves.

Every effort ought to be made, in a calm and dispassionate way, to set the record clear as to the nature of the bargain. But hot words would play into Castro's hand in an argument which this country could not win.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The tractors-for-freedom movement is a wholly private humanitarian movement aimed at saving the lives of several hundred men. It is supported by free men and women throughout the Americas.

When Fidel Castro first made his offer to exchange the lives and liberty of 1,200 prisoners for 500 agricultural tractors, the American people responded with characteristic compassion. A number of private committees were organized to raise the necessary funds, and many private citizens, in this country and throughout the hemisphere, inquired as to where they could contribute. My concern was to help make certain that a single, representative group of citizens headed this effort in the United States. And I am grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for their leadership.

The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, inasmuch as it covers only negotiations "in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States"; that tax exemption is granted as a matter of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba, and would thus be granted for a humanitarian shipment of farm implements.

While this Government is thus putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort, I hope that all citizens will contribute what they can. If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help. I happen to feel deeply that all who fight for freedom—particularly in our hemisphere—are our brothers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to review for the RECORD and for Senators what has happened today in respect to the Castro tractor situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was desired to transact some business. I really usurped the position of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], who wished to offer an amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I thought the Senator from Montana had the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I had it, but only temporarily and by the grace of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Iowa wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to set the RECORD straight at the moment concerning what has happened with respect to the Cuban situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the President of the United States has today said that he asked certain citizens to serve as a committee. Second, the President stated that he was acting as a private individual and not acting in his capacity as President of the United States. Third, he said to the world that the contributions to the tractor fund would be tax-exempt contributions, meaning that one could deduct such contributions from his income tax. Fourth, the President said to the world today that this action was not a violation of the Logan Act.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a contribution to a Communist dictator is deductible from income taxes paid in the United States. It is inconceivable to me that anyone would expect a tax exemption for a contribution in the form of blackmail to a Communist dictator.

I disagree 100 percent with the view that it is not a violation of the Logan Act to supply tractors to Castro, as has been discussed on the floor of the Senate. My best authority for that statement is the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, who a year ago explained to the Senate exactly the meaning of the Logan Act.

I should like to have some Senator defend on the floor of the Senate the position of the President of the United States in respect to permitting Castro to blackmail the United States and thus set a precedent for every other little dictator and other little countries to blackmail the United States.

I want some Senator on the floor of the Senate, first, to defend the ruling of

the President of the United States that such a contribution is tax deductible; second, to deny that it is not a violation of the Logan Act; third, to maintain that the President is acting as a private individual in appointing the committee and asking it to serve as private individuals and not in behalf of the President of the United States.

I want some Senator to defend that action. I think it is an unpardonable sin. I think this is a regrettable situation and that the Nation will live to regret the action which is being taken at the moment.

I want Senators to tell us that southern Florida will not be wrecked as a result of these actions. I want someone to defend the actions of the President of the United States.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the the Senator yield for one comment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For one comment? Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. I assure the distinguished Senator from Indiana that Florida has no ghost towns and is not likely to have any. The Bureau of the Census advised the Senators from Florida officially on Saturday that Florida's population has just passed the 5 million mark.

As usual, the Senator from Indiana, in his excitement, has let his extravagance overshadow the facts. Miami has between 30,000 and 40,000 Cuban refugees, which is as close to a quarter of a million as we can get.

So far as we in Florida are concerned—and that is the point to which I shall address myself—if the Senator from Indiana is as badly off on all the other facts which he has recited as he is on his facts relating to Florida, he is in a hopeless situation and had better make a fresh start.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the able Senator from Florida deny that the Cuban exiles are taking the jobs of the citizens of Florida at much lower wages than they are entitled to receive?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the interest of expediting the business at hand, I hope the favor done me by the Senator from Iowa will be rewarded by his being recognized, because he was on his feet before I was.

Mr. President, in response to what the Senator from Indiana said, permit me to state that the President needs no defense from anyone for his actions; but if anything needs to be said, it will be said in due time.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hesitate at this late hour to take up the time of the Senate.

During the debate on the pending bill almost every feature in connection with Federal aid to education has been discussed, except one, which I believe is sufficiently important to warrant the offering of an amendment in connection with it. So I offer an amendment which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to amend title I by adding the following section:

> There is authorized to be appropriated for administering the provisions of this Act during the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, not in excess of $1,000,000 for any such year.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have discussed this question with the Senator from Iowa and also with the Senator from Oregon. I believe they will agree to the allowance of 5 minutes to each side, and then to have the vote taken, with the yeas and nays, as ordered.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that on this amendment, 5 minutes be allowed to each side—or a total of 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the reason for offering the amendment is that there is always much concern among the people of the country about the administrative costs of these measures. I do not need to remind the Senate that today we hear many stories to the effect that for every dollar of tax money that goes intc Washington, about 50 cents comes back.

Some assurance was given with respect to this measure, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, during the hearings. As appears on page 157, he said:

> I have tried to estimate what the cost of this program would be administratively, and it is our best estimate * * * that it will be about one-tenth of 1 percent.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] added to that assurance, last evening, when he said, as shown at pages 8684–8685 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> It is the most economical way of collecting taxes so far as administrative costs are concerned for school purposes that we could have provided. That is borne out further by the testimony of Secretary Ribicoff, which is found at page 157 of the hearings, when the question was raised as to what the administrative cost of the bill would be.
>
> The Secretary said: "So when you consider a program such as this where the administrative cost would be some one-tenth of 1 percent, I do not believe that that is an excessive administrative cost."
>
> Neither do I, Mr. President.

Mr. President, one-tenth of 1 percent of the $850 million a year would be $850,000. My amendment provides for a little leeway; it provides for a top limit of $1 million. Surely if we are ever going to hold down the administrative costs, we should do so in the case of an aid to education bill.

I cannot support the pending bill; but if it becomes law, the very least which I believe should be done is to assure to the children who will be benefited by means of the bill that the least amount of administrative cost will be incurred in connection with its administration. That is the reason for this amendment.

I sincerely hope the distinguished Senator from Oregon will accept the amendment, which is in line with the assurance he gave the Senate last evening. In fact, the amendment goes beyond that assurance, because the amendment provides for up to $1 million of authorization for the administration of this measure.

At this time I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to reject the amendment; and in this connection I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who is not only a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but also is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

This amendment seeks—without any assurance at all in regard to the necessary administrative expenditures in connection with the act—to say to the Appropriations Committee, "You cannot pay any attention to the evidence you receive; in any event, you are limited to $1 million."

Certainly under the practices of the Senate the checks on the administrators are to be applied by the Appropriations Committee, after giving full consideration to the subject, rather than applied by the Senate as a whole. Otherwise, we will have the Senate as a whole invade the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committee.

In connection with the amendment, let us consider the record.

As first introduced, it was believed that the total administrative expenditures of the measure for the so-called first year—which actually would be only a part of the fiscal year—would be $683,000; in 1963, $1,022,000; and in the third year—the last year of full operations under the act, unless it is extended—$1,077,000; and for 1965, when the operations in connection with the act would be cleaned up, after the act went out of existence, $594,000; and in 1966, $64,000.

This is no longer a $666 million authorization. It is an $850 million authorization.

On the basis of the $666 million authorization, the figures which were presented were that in two of the years the administrative costs would be a little more than $1 million—in 1 year, $1,077,000; and in the other year, $1,022,000. Those are not excessively high costs.

It is true that in the course of the testimony, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare stated, in answer to a question and not in the course of a prepared statement,

that he estimated that the cost would be approximately one-tenth of 1 percent.

What we want to do is see to it that when the bill is enacted, it will be properly administered. In my judgment, that calls for careful consideration by the Appropriations Committee, on the basis of the evidence and the facts which are submitted to the committee by whatever administration may be in office at that time.

This amendment would result in a very unfortunate procedure. In other words, after the bill was enacted, the administrative costs would be limited to this fixed figure, which is simply pulled out of the air. Frankly, the Senator from Iowa—and I speak most respectfully of him—has not had presented to him any evidence or data, and he has not had an opportunity to hold a hearing, on the basis of which witnesses could testify in regard to what the administrative costs should be. I am not sure whether the Senator from Iowa himself would vote for either more or less administrative expenditures, after such a hearing.

Again, I speak most kindly and most respectfully when I say that this is another case of an amendment which is offered by a Member who is very frank and sincere in his entire approach to this question, but who states that in any event he will not vote for the bill.

I believe we should wait until we see what the administration presents to the Appropriations Committee as to the cost of the administration of the act.

I sincerely hope that in the last minutes before the third reading of the bill, and when no real evidence in connection with the amendment has been taken and no real consideration has been given as to what would be the fair amount of the administrative costs, the Senate will not vote to encumber the measure by the adoption of an amendment of this type.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in reply to the statement the Senator from Oregon made when he said the amendment would take away some of the authority and power of the Appropriations Committee, let me say that I would hesitate very greatly to propose that that be done, except for the fact that the Congress itself has seen fit to do so on many occasions, not the least of which is, in the case of the Federal Highway Program Act, specifically section 104, title II of the United States Code. So there is nothing unusual about this proposal, except I think it is done only in the case of important matters. I suggest that there is nothing more important than to assure the children who are going to be the recipients of these benefits that they will get the maximum amount of money with the least amount of administrative cost.

I have made no study of how much the administration cost will be, but I feel quite confident that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has done so; and I am sure the Senator from Oregon recognized that he had done so when he said, last night, he had estimated it would be one-tenth of 1 percent.

I recognize the need for some leeway. That is why the amount is fixed at $1 million. It seems to me that if we cannot administer the act for $1 million, there is something wrong.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have complete confidence in our Appropriations Committee. When the requests go to the Appropriations Committee, the committee will know what the administrative cost is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I was about to ask about the order of business.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I withdraw the objection.

ORDER TO ADJOURN TO 9:55 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the inquiry of the Senator, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourn to meet at 9:55 tomorrow morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished majority leader why 9:55?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Under the agreement entered into pertaining to the Javits resolution, debate on it will start at 10 o'clock, and convening at 9:55 will allow time for a prayer, meditation, and a short quorum call.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, during this week I found it necessary to object to committees sitting during the Senate sessions. Now that we have reached the stage of the third reading of the bill, there will be no objection, so far as I am concerned, starting tomorrow, if committees desire to meet during the time when the Senate is in session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I express my appreciation to the distinguished minority leader. I hope all committees will take notice of his statement

ANNOUNCEMENT OF TALK BY VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON BEFORE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE AT 3:30 P.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in that connection, I think I should announce, in behalf of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that Vice President JOHNSON will appear in Room F-53, the Foreign Relations Committee Room, tomorrow afternoon at 3:30. Senators are invited to come and listen to him report about the Vice President's trip to the southeastern Asian part of the globe, as well as to ask questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What time will the Senate go to the House to hear the President?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate will leave its Chamber at 12:15 p.m. because the joint session will begin at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. HOLLAND. Has the Senator any information as to how long that occasion may require?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should say half an hour.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay," and the Senator from Georgia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 55]

YEAS—24

Allott	Dirksen	Miller
Bennett	Dworshak	Morton
Boggs	Eastland	Saltonstall
Butler	Fong	Schoeppel
Capehart	Goldwater	Scott
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Thurmond
Cotton	Kuchel	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—63

Aiken	Hayden	Morse
Bartlett	Hickey	Moss
Beall	Hill	Mundt
Bible	Holland	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Pell
Cannon	Johnston	Proxmire
Carroll	Jordan	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Keating	Robertson
Church	Kerr	Smathers
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Long, La.	Sparkman
Ellender	Magnuson	Stennis
Engle	Mansfield	Symington
Ervin	McClellan	Talmadge
Fulbright	McGee	Wiley
Gruening	McNamara	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hartke	Monroney	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—13

Anderson	Chavez	McCarthy
Blakley	Cooper	Prouty
Bridges	Gore	Russell
Bush	Hickenlooper	
Carlson	Kefauver	

So Mr. MILLER's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1021) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

NAVY DEPARTMENT SYSTEM OF SELECTION OF NAVAL RESERVE ADMIRALS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, yesterday I made a statement on the floor of the Senate with respect to the failure of the Navy Department to respond to questions I had raised a month ago on the action of the Secretary of the Navy in vetoing and overruling in one instance the action of the Captain Non Continuation Board and granting a reprieve to one Naval Reserve captain who had been selected for being "plucked out" and forced into involuntary retirement.

On April 19, 1961, when I first raised questions about this 1 exception made by the Secretary of the Navy out of the 500 Naval Reserve captains selected for being "plucked out" and forced into involuntary retirement, the Chief of Naval Personnel in a letter to me on April 25, 1961, in defending and standing firm in support of the sole exception, stated among other things:

> You commented upon the Secretary of the Navy's exception in which he reversed his action of approval on the Mobilization Disposition Board's recommendation in the case of one officer who was not recommended for continuation in an active status. From my discussion with the Secretary, it is my understanding that his action was based on his own personal knowledge of the specific potential value to the Navy of the one officer in question.

It was clear from that letter that the Secretary of the Navy and the Navy Department fully and firmly intended to stand by, and continue, that sole exception made by the Navy Department. So I then asked for the record of the Naval Reserve captain receiving that special exception by the Secretary of the Navy. And yesterday, when nearly a month had passed and I had not received a response to my inquiry, I made the statement on the Senate floor concerning the matter.

In less than 24 hours after my Senate speech, a report came from the Navy Department on the part of the Chief of Naval Personnel, in which the Chief of Naval Personnel reported that the Secretary of the Navy had made a reversal of the decision in the case of the sole exception granted and had ordered it canceled.

This report was in the form of a letter delivered to my office at noon today and which stated in part:

> The Secretary of the Navy made this exception shortly after the Board's recommendations were brought to his attention. It is my understanding that the action he took was based on his conviction at that time that there was specific retention value to the Navy of the officer in question.
>
> The Secretary of the Navy has since reviewed the entire subject of captain continuation in the Naval Reserve * * * As a result of his review, the Secretary of the Navy has directed that there be no further exceptions to the recommendations submitted by this Board and, further, that the exception made in the one case be canceled.
>
> In the light of the action cited above, it would appear that the need for answers to the specific questions listed in your letter has effectively been overtaken by events.

Mr. President, what has happened is clear from the chronology of this case. On April 19, 1961, I raised questions about the one exception made by the Secretary of the Navy. Six days later, on April 25, 1961, the Chief of Naval Personnel wrote me a letter stating in substance that the Secretary of the Navy intended to stand firm on this one exception that he had made on the basis of the Secretary's "own personal knowledge."

On that date I then wrote a letter asking for specific information in this one exception made by the Secretary of the Navy. When more than 4 weeks had passed—when almost a month had passed—and I had not received answers to my questions, I then took the Senate floor and made a speech on this matter in which I stated that I would ask the Senate Armed Services Committee to make a full investigation of the matter.

In less than 24 hours after I made that speech, two significant things happened. First, a reply was finally delivered to my office. Second, the Secretary of the Navy decided to reverse himself—and to cancel the exception that he had made—and more significantly, the exception that he had decided to stand by very firmly back in April when I had raised questions on that exception.

It appears now—after I have taken this matter to the floor of the Senate—that the Secretary of the Navy has had second thoughts on this matter and has finally decided that my questions were fully justified and that his previous decision was in error.

It was either this or the fact that the Department of the Navy preferred not to answer my questions rather than to stand by the original decision of the Secretary of the Navy—for the letter of the Chief of Naval Personnel today states:

> In light of the action cited above, it would appear that the need for answers to the specific questions listed in your letter has effectively been overtaken by events.

Mr. President, I am gratified that the Navy Department has finally seen the light. But I am disturbed with the implications of my experience in this matter. They can be summarized as follows:

First. That at times it becomes necessary to take the Senate floor to get an answer from the Navy Department on an inquiry.

Second. That the Navy Department will reverse a decision rather than answer questions.

Third. That it becomes necessary to dig so deeply and fight so hard to get the Navy Department to take corrective action on Naval Reserve matters.

This experience greatly disturbs me. Is this case representative of what we are to expect of the Navy Department? If so, I shudder to think of what is happening on matters of far greater magnitude.

CASTRO, CUBA, TRACTORS, AND BLACKMAIL

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I read an article written by Robert C. Ruark, published in Miami, Fla., May 24:

> Of all the immoral aspects of our fearful muddling in the Cuban chamber of horrors, it seems to me the so-called humanitarian response to Castro's obscene proposition to trade human flesh for tractors is the most frightening index yet to what's wrong with America at the moment.
>
> This independent effort of Bill Pawley and Mrs. Roosevelt and Milton Eisenhower and Walter Reuther and Cardinal Spellman to raise money to cooperate with Castro in his inhumanely outrageous blackmail scheme does nothing to mark us noble. It merely puts us on Castro's level and compounds the felony.
>
> If the State Department does not flatly forbid the consummation of this deal, it might as well knock off the sanctions against Cuba and admit that the bearded buffoon is no longer a buffoon at all, but a shrewd and powerful man who has defeated America almost without firing a shot.
>
> This bow to blackmail is meddling in Government policy, pure and simple. It should not be legal for private citizens to deal with a hostile Government which should be overthrown—unless it overthrows us. Charity and humanitarianism is one thing—weakness and stupidity and meddlesome nullification of your country's policy is another, and I don't care what names are mixed up in it. It is as morally wrong to accede to criminal proposition as it is to make the proposition.
>
> There are some instances in which morality takes precedence over softheaded individual interference with governmental policy. In any war a civilian who did business with the enemy would likely be shot or

imprisoned as a traitor. We are at war with Castro's Cuba.

I repeat that statement:

In any war a civilian who did business with the enemy would likely be shot or imprisoned as a traitor. We are at war with Castro's Cuba.

We paid for a silly invasion in which a lot of people were killed, and now we want to buy back bodies with some lousy tractors out of private purses so that what currently passes for a State Department can turn its head from the deal and disclaim involvement.

We have been blackmailed in various ways for so long that they do not bother to blackmail us in terms of countries and billions of dollars anymore. We have now degenerated to peanuts-and-pennies in our deals. I suppose, in future, if Castro sends us a few heads or hands, as the Arabs used to, we will work up a thriving trade in second-hand cars and old TV sets in return for somebody's sisters.

I hold in my hand the Baltimore Sun for Wednesday morning, May 24, 1961, handed to me by the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER].

The headline on the article is "Tractor Idea Is Defended, But Dr. Eisenhower Likens Swap to Kidnap Ransom."

The article states:

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, cochairman of a drive to raise $15 million for tractors to be used for repatriation of more than 1,200 Cuban rebels, yesterday likened the exchange to that of a mother paying ransom to regain her kidnaped child.

I ask Senators to think of that. He likened the exchange to that of a mother paying ransom to regain her kidnaped child.

The brother of the former President Dwight D. Eisenhower, told a press conference here he was saddened and surprised at criticism of the venture expressed by members of his own party. Dr. Eisenhower is a Republican.

A drive to raise money for the tractors and bulldozers stems from a bid by Cuban Premier Fidel Castro to exchange 1,214 prisoners which he captured during the recent Cuban invasion for 500 heavy-duty tractors costing about $34,000 apiece.

CITES CENTRAL PROBLEM

Eisenhower expressed the hope that the criticism will not impede the committee's efforts.

"By whatever name you call it," he said, "the central problem is 1,214 decent people."

Dictator Castro has already told us that as a result of the so-called invasion he had imprisoned, not 1,214, but 200,000 Cubans. If we are going to be blackmailed into trading 500 heavy-duty tractors for 1,214 so-called prisoners, why do we not say to Castro, "Release the entire 200,000." Why do we pick out the 1,214?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Has anyone ever told us how many real American citizens Castro has in jail?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think anyone has, but I assume he has a number.

Mr. BENNETT. As illustrated in the story of a mother ransoming her daughter, should we not be more concerned with getting Americans out of Castro's jails than in getting Cubans out of Castro's jails?

Mr. CAPEHART. I think so, but nothing has been done about that situation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. It has been reported that a tax deduction will be given for contributions to this scheme. Can the distinguished Senator from Indiana tell the Senate who made that statement?

Mr. CAPEHART. That a tax deduction would be given?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. According to the ticker tape, I understand the President of the United States made that statement today.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the President of the United States contend that such is the law now, or is it his contention that by Presidential edict and announcement he can term what is taxable and what is not?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think such is the law. I cannot answer the Senator's second question. It would amaze me to learn that through blackmail a payment of $40 million on tractors for a Communist country would be tax deductible. When did communism become a charitable institution?

Mr. CURTIS. Has anything been published concerning the negotiations to the effect that Americans will be released?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer that question. I do not know.

Mr. CURTIS. There has been nothing published?

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not know. I know that Castro has bragged about the fact that he imprisoned 200,000 people when the so-called invasion took place.

Mr. CURTIS. How many has Castro shot without trial?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot answer that question. But he has bragged about the fact that he has shot many. I wish I could tell the Senator.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can the Senator understand the President when he said that the U.S. Government is not a party to the negotiations, in view of the fact that the President himself set up the three-person committee and then asked that tax exemption be given to the proposed blackmail?

Mr. CAPEHART. I can only answer that question by saying, "How naive does the President think the people of the United States and the world are?" The President has acted. He stated that he was going to see that an export license would be issued. Yet he has stated that he is acting as a private individual.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The President of the United States cannot act as a private individual except in his own church.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course he cannot.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Any more than the Senator from Indiana or I could any longer act as private individuals after we were elected U.S. Senators.

May I call to the attention of the Senator from Indiana article II, section 2, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the United States concerning the powers of the President:

He shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

I suggest to my friend from Indiana that if this arrangement is a treaty, it is a blackmail treaty. The President has not asked the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States and, so far as I know, he has not conferred with anyone except Arthur Schlesinger.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am sure he has conferred with him.

Mr. GOLDWATER. He would have to.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. Here is a deal between the United States Government and the Cuban Government, headed by Castro, an admitted Communist. Yet the President of the United States said that in recommending that the committee raise the required $20 million or $40 million, whatever the amount is, for 500 tractors, he is dealing as a private individual.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree with the Senator from Indiana that the President cannot act as a private citizen. When he speaks, he speaks as the President of the United States. When he spoke today, he committed our Government, our Republic, to subject itself on its humble knees to the blackmail of this bearded giant Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe the President likewise said that contributions would be tax deductible, and that he would like to have an export license to ship the tractors to Cuba. They are not farm tractors; they are commercial tractors, the kind used to move dirt and perform construction work.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes, I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not wish to detain the Senator, but in his remarks today the President said:

If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help.

I might suggest to our President that we have some prisoners in totalitarian prison camps, and they have been there for a long time. I have not seen anything done with respect to them. I do not remember the details—I am looking them up—but I can recall that on the floor of the Senate a number of years ago a Senator attempted the same kind of negotiations, and all hell fell on his shoulders, as I think it should fall on the shoulders of the President.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. The only difference between the cases is that the boys who are now in totalitarian prisons are Americans drafted under an act of the Congress of the United States. That is the difference. We know who they are; we

know where they are; and this great Government does nothing about getting them back.

Mr. CAPEHART. So far we have talked only about 1,214 prisoners, while we know that Castro has in prisons in Cuba men who were just as much freedom fighters as the 1,214. To take Castro at his own word, they number 200,000.

About 10 days before the so-called invasion the President of the United States made a statement that we would have nothing to do with the invasion.

If we had nothing to do with the invasion, then why are we so concerned at the moment? Mr. Castro has told us that he wants the 500 tractors as indemnity for the damage that the United States did during the invasion. That is Castro's point of view. There is no question that in Castro's mind but what he is representing the communist government of Cuba. Yet today the President of the United States, if I understand the releases properly, has said—and if I misunderstood his statement I will be happy to correct the RECORD—that he is acting as a private individual. He said that he did ask the committee members to form the committee, and that their endeavor would be tax exempt. It is reported in the newspapers that he would see that an export license is issued.

On the other hand, we have a prohibition against shipping to Castro any materials other than some foodstuffs and medical supplies.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator has emphasized several times that the President stated in a press release, which has been read on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Indiana, that the President said he was acting as a private individual. Can the Senator from Indiana tell the Senator from South Dakota whether or not it was the President's position that he was acting as a private individual when he formed a committee to secure contributions to this fund, that the money collected would be tax exempt and, if so, how a private individual could make such a wholesale promise?

Mr. CAPEHART. I cannot read the President's mind in that respect. There is no way in the world that a President can act as a private individual, particularly concerning problems that have to do with two nations, because the Constitution states that the President of the United States has complete charge of foreign affairs.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Has the Senator ever heard of an individual citizen of the United States granting an export license on material that can be used for purposes of making war against the United States?

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I never have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as part of my remarks an article published in the Baltimore Sun, issue of Wednesday morning, May 24, 1961, reporting the statement of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRACTOR IDEA IS DEFENDED: BUT DR. EISENHOWER LIKENS SWAP TO KIDNAP RANSOM

Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, cochairman of a drive to raise $15 million for tractors to be used for repatriation of more than 1,200 Cuban rebels, yesterday likened the exchange to that of a mother paying ransom to regain her kidnaped child.

The brother of the former President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, told a press conference here he was saddened and surprised at criticism of the venture expressed by members of his own party. Dr. Eisenhower is a Republican.

A drive to raise money for the tractors and bulldozers stems from a bid by Cuban Premier Fidel Castro to exchange 1,214 prisoners which he captured during the recent Cuban invasion for 500 heavy-duty tractors costing about $34,000 apiece.

CITES CENTRAL PROBLEM

Eisenhower expressed the hope that the criticism will not impede the committee's efforts.

"By whatever name you call it," he said, "the central problem is 1,214 decent people."

The Johns Hopkins University president said the committee sent telegrams to 50 leaders of industry, labor and cultural life throughout the country asking their participation. He said he had not yet had a chance to talk to former President Eisenhower about contributing to the campaign.

Although he said he appreciated the flood of telegrams, phone calls, and contributions which had been sent him, he requested all contributors to send their money to "Tractors for Freedom," Detroit, Mich. He said all such contributions would be tax exempt and that the fundraising was sanctioned by the Government.

Enumerating his reasons for joining the group, the Hopkins president said he had done so for three reasons:

1. It is a bipartisan effort.

2. No matter how angry one may be about some elements going on there (Cuba), 1,214 human beings are involved and I don't see how Americans can refuse a call for help.

3. I am absolutely certain that the response in Latin America to any such exchange will be good.

Mr. CAPEHART. Furthermore, I wish to say for the RECORD that there is no question that Milton Eisenhower is a Republican. Hence, I am not playing partisan politics with this subject. I am 100 percent opposed to this proposal. It is morally wrong. I shall fight it as long as I have breath left in me. What we are doing will be a precedent that will haunt us for many years to come. Dr. Eisenhower compared this transaction with a mother whose child had been kidnapped. Those 1,214 men knew what they were doing. They were fighting for their own country. They are Cubans, not Americans. We are talking about a dictator, a Communist, who has told us that his nation is a Communist nation and that he will destroy us.

He has said, "I will release these people if you will give us 500 tractors." He was not referring to farm tractors, but the kind of tractors that can be used to build missile bases and to build roads and do construction work.

Unless we are all wrong about communism—and I have heard about it on the floor of the Senate for 17 years—they are out to destroy us. They are out to kill us. They did us irreparable harm in the Korean war. Yet we are saying to Castro, "We are going to help you."

I want no part of it. I hope the American people will rise up and put a stop to it. I feel sorry for those who have advised the President of the United States on this matter and I am apprehensive about what he is doing.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is a distinguished businessman and a substantial taxpayer. Perhaps he can help me write an answer to a letter I received from a South Dakota farmer today, dealing with this subject. He writes that he noticed that the President had said—or perhaps it was the Internal Revenue Service—that a ruling had been made that contributions to this committee would be tax exempt, and that the President, acting as a private citizen, said that he had waived the taxes on this project, and my constituent would like to know how a private individual can waive a magic wand and decide that the taxes in this case would be waived because the tractors are to be sent to Cuba.

Therefore my farmer friend wants to know whether the President could wave both wands and make a tractor that the farmer has to buy tax exempt also, so that he can use that tractor on his farm in South Dakota.

Mr. CAPEHART. There would be more reason for granting a tax exemption in the case referred to by the Senator.

Mr. MUNDT. In other words, how can we make a tractor that is shipped to a Communist country tax exempt if a farmer in South Dakota who buys a tractor to use on his farm must pay taxes on the money he uses to buy a tractor for use on his farm? Can the Senator give me any solace that I can pass on to the farmer in South Dakota?

Mr. CAPEHART. No, I cannot help the Senator on that question. I do not know.

Mr. MUNDT. Perhaps if we were sending cash to Castro, the Internal Revenue Service might consider the cash as being tax exempt. So far as the tractors are concerned, I cannot see any reason why we should discriminate against an American farmer in behalf of Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. The whole thing to me is ridiculous.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I believe terms like "silly" and "ridiculous" should not be used in a case like this. It is much too serious. The Senate should very seriously consider the subject. Historically we have formed foreign policy by the Executive working with the advice and consent of the Senate. Yet here we are forming foreign policy by a personal committee appointed by the President. He tells us about it now. I do not know that he has ever denied it. Perhaps he

was never asked about it. He has admitted today that he has formed this three-person committee to develop foreign policy.

Is there any reason why we should not form a Capehart-Goldwater-Mundt committee to go to China to exchange solid gold Cadillacs for people the Chinese are holding, or go to Laos to free some Lao? To me this is a very serious and dangerous day in our history. I believe that our children and grandchildren will rue the day that the Senate of the United States allowed this to happen without challenging the President of the United States for usurping constitutional powers.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree with the Senator. I have said repeatedly on the floor of the Senate and to the press that I believe the President is violating the Logan Act in this particular instance.

If any Senator can condone what is happening, I wish he would rise and do so. If any Senator will condone what is happening, I wish he would do so.

The President of the United States is subject to human error. He will make mistakes. He cannot help making mistakes. No man can handle the responsibilities of the President of the United States without making mistakes. In this instance he has made a mistake. It seems to me the best thing he can do, for the American people and the world, and as a leader of the free world, is to admit that he has made a mistake, and view Mr. Castro in his just regards.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest this afternoon to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana and other Senators. At least a dozen times the Senator from Indiana has asked for someone to stand up and, in effect, be counted. He has asked for people outside the Chamber to do the same thing. I am willing to stand up and be counted on the side of the President of the United States. The President of the United States is charged under the Constitution with the conduct of our foreign policy.

It is true that a group of private American citizens has endeavored to show up Fidel Castro's cynicism. That is exactly what it is. The group has shown him up with great effect throughout Latin America. If my memory serves me correctly, even in the great Republic of Brazil a newspaper has seen fit to offer one tractor in exchange for 4 prisoners. I believe that this group of private citizens is attempting to do something which will save the Freedom Fighters who were captured by Castro in the ill-fated invasion of Cuba. The U.S. Government, rightly or wrongly, did not prevent those men from invading their homeland in an attempt to regain its freedom.

The only question facing the Government now is: Should we prevent a private group in their humanitarian efforts to free these prisoners? Are we to place tractors above men? Are we to place cynicism above humanity? Are we to criticize rather than show a little kindness, a little understanding, a little brotherliness toward people who were attempting to do what they thought was right with aid from the United States?

The U.S. Government is not paying ransom or tribute or blackmail.

Why should the Government place any obstacles in the way of the private committee which is seeking to do something of a humanitarian nature, seeking to perform a good which will benefit the United States in the eyes of mankind the world over? Who are we to criticize the private citizens who are seeking to raise money for the purpose of doing good by returning the Cuban prisoners to their freedom and their families? What will happen if they fail? What will happen to the 10 Cuban prisoners whom Mr. Castro sent to Florida, and who have 1 week in which to reach an agreement, at the end of which time they must return to Cuba? What will they return to? What will be the fate of the 1,240 Cuban prisoners whom they represent?

I wish we would think this problem through. I wish we would not become so emotional as to forget the facts of life as they are, but would recognize that this is an extremely difficult, delicate, and dangerous situation. Instead of criticizing the President of the United States, we should be upholding his hand, because he is not the President of a political party; he is the President of all the people of the country, and his burdens are terrible. Why should we tear this man down? We served with him in this Chamber for 8 years. We know the kind of man he is. We know the troubles which beset him. We know he is doing his very best to face up to them and to try to bring about a solution, not only in the interest of the people of the United States, but in the interest of the people of the entire world.

I have heard hardly a word in this Chamber in behalf of the President of the United States, a man who has been in office less than 5 months, and who already is beginning to feel the barbs and the arrows of partisan attack. We ought to be big enough to understand what confronts him. Instead of criticizing him, we ought to give him our full and wholehearted support.

Oh, yes; questions have been raised about the Logan Act. Questions have been raised about export licenses. Questions have been raised about tax exemption. Concerning tax exemption, which seems to be a favorite topic, tax exemptions are always granted to any charitable organization engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees or in other humanitarian work. Why should anyone seek to make an exception in this case? The lives of men are at stake, and what may well be at stake is the future of the United States in this hemisphere. I do not underestimate Mr. Castro. He is one of the shrewdest, most ruthless men in the world today. Do not take my word for it. Go back to the record. Since he came into power on January 1, 1959, the record will show just how smart, how shrewd, how ruthless, how deadly he is.

Every American and every other free man is interested in the fate of those who are now held as prisoners by the Government of Cuba. Besides being entitled to elemental human rights and to fair and just treatment legally, they are also certainly entitled to due consideration as Cubans by the present Government of Cuba. It is important to understand that in the strict sense they are not prisoners of war; they are prisoners of a civil war in which they risked their lives to bring a greater measure of freedom and democracy to their country and, by the same token, had they succeeded, to our other neighbors in this hemisphere.

If the Government of Cuba is afraid to give those prisoners their freedom; if it is so unsure about the loyalty of the Cuban people that it is fearful of releasing the prisoners and letting them choose whether they should remain in Cuba or continue to live in exile, this is even further proof that the Government of Cuba is not a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Nothing, in fact, better indicates the betrayal of the high ideals of the Cuban revolution than the callous treatment of human life and human values represented by the proposal of Premier Castro to exchange prisoners—men—for machines. Nothing demonstrates better the inhuman, undemocratic nature of the Castro regime than the offer to trade fellow Cubans for tractors.

It behooves Premier Castro to recall that his own life was spared early in his career because he was afforded the protection of basic human rights, but he now seems to have forgotten that making such a proposal. How far he has departed from his own promise of a new life for the Cuban people, which would not only provide public order, peace, freedom, and protection of individual rights, but also result in the fulfillment of international commitments.

In proposing to trade men for machines, he has offered further evidence not only of his betrayal of the ideals of the Cuban revolution, but of his unwillingness even to abide by the most common rules of civilized intercourse. It has been stated that the response by a committee of leading American citizens to the exchange offer constitutes behavior which is unworthy of Americans. It has been said that they are being blackmailed into making the exchange, and it has been said, indirectly, that the Government of the United States has been blackmailed into making the exchange. It has even been suggested that the members of the committee are not within their rights in agreeing to the exchange. Whatever one may think of the wisdom of responding to the exchange offer in this fashion, it would certainly appear to be within the rights of private citizens to organize such a committee and to arrange with the prisoners themselves for the exchange.

Rather than constituting blackmail, Castro's action can be considered a form of extortion which reflects the callous inhumanity of the Castro regime. Whether American citizens are wise in taking this course is not for me to pretend to judge, but I am certain of the humanitarian motives which led them to act as they have.

Castro is willing to trade men for machines. Distinguished Americans have invited other Americans to join with them in trading machines for men. They value life. Castro obviously values machines above life. The committee of Americans wishes to save the lives of these courageous men. They want to prevent the bloody tribunals which have been used by the Castro regime as a substitute for justice.

I hope Senators will never forget the more than 600 Cubans who were executed by being sent to the wall in the early days after the farcical trials of the present regime of Mr. Castro.

The fact that these Americans are willing to raise money to buy tractors in exchange for redeeming the lives of men who otherwise would be exposed to the cruel and primitive treatment of the Cuban Government does not reflect on them; it reflects on Fidel Castro and the Cuban Government, who are willing to trade human beings as commodities in international commerce.

Questions have also been raised about the relationship of the U.S. Government to the action of this committee. The President has made it clear that the Government should not be involved and is not involved in the action of the committee. This is surely a wise position. At the same time, it would not be desirable for the Government to seek to prevent the private action which is within the rights of those taking the action. It has been suggested that members of the committee should have consulted with the Department of State in the course of organizing the committee. This is entirely reasonable, and it is to be hoped that such consultations were held. It has also been suggested, however, that unless the Department of State approved, the committee should not have been organized. This concept, if carried to its logical conclusion, would prevent private activities of any sort which might not be approved by the Government, and sanction only those private activities which had the stamp of Government approval. This would be a highly unfortunate and undesirable condition.

One of the hazards as well as one of the blessings of democracy is the freedom of individuals and groups to engage in activities relating to our foreign relations, so long as they are within the legitimate limits set by law. Since in this case there does not seem to be any conflict with the law, it is not reasonable or correct to suggest that the committee should have been approved by the Department of State before it was organized. The very nature of its mission would have made this not only unlikely but undesirable. It may be that the Department of State has certain reservations about the exchange, but it would not be wise for the Government to seek to prevent a legitimate private activity, even if it does not wholly approve of such activities.

BROADER IMPLICATIONS OF THE CASTRO PROPOSAL AND OF OUR RELATIONS WITH CUBA

First. It should be made clear that the United States welcomes genuine progress in Cuba for the benefit of the people of Cuba, not just economic progress, but also social and political progress, as well. Tractors are needed to aid in the economic development of Cuba; and if the regime of Fidel Castro had not forfeited its good will in the United States, it would very likely be receiving economic aid of this nature today. But under the totalitarian system which has been instituted in Cuba, tractors will never bring to the people of Cuba the conditions of life which they need and deserve. So long as they are deprived of even the most basic right in a democratic society—the right to vote—economic development will not bring the better life which the revolution had promised to produce.

As was recently said by one of the great democratic liberals of Latin America, Victor Raúl Haya de la Torre, of Peru:

> We cannot confuse that which was idealistic, authentic, and just in the beginning of the Cuban revolution with the surrender, submission, and homage to something which is anti-American and totalitarian and which is opposed to the traditional sense of our ideal of bread with freedom.

Second. The Cuban revolution has devoured many of its children. The list of those who have been executed or exiled continues to grow. In its defiance of the principles it once espoused, and of the great declarations of Santiago, San Jose, and the Treaty of Rio, as well as the Charter of the Organization of American States, the Cuban Government has turned a hope into a threat to the whole hemisphere.

Third. The United States continues to support the fundamental human rights and basic human needs of the Cuban people, and their legitimate aspirations for a better life. It shall continue to work toward an improvement in the situation in Cuba, with respect to these matters, despite the attempts by the Castro government to turn the Cuban people against those who have traditionally been their friends. Despite the provocation and denial of human rights represented by the proposed exchange, the U.S. Government and the people of the United States will remain ready to renew their association with the people of Cuba on the basis of respect for human rights and for common principles of international law.

If my colleagues have not already done so, I hope they will look at the picture of the 10 Cuban hostages who now are in this country, speaking in behalf of approximately 1,240 of their comrades who are incarcerated in Cuban prisons. I ask my colleagues to examine their hearts and their consciences. I ask them to place themselves in the position of the President of the United States; and then, after they do so, to ask themselves this one question: "What would I do if the responsibility were mine, and what is the alternative?"

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the majority leader that I am more proud of him now than ever before—and I have always been very proud of him. I congratulate him for the very moving and courageous speech he has just made in the Senate. He has raised some issues which we must face in the days immediately ahead.

As to the question of supporting the President, the President has now made the official statement of policy, and the President must be supported in carrying out his policy. This does not mean that the policy is not subject to further change. But the situation tonight is quite different from the situation this time last night, because some of us were trying to learn, had a right to try to learn, what the official policy of the White House was. Today the White House and the State Department have made clear that the so-called Reuther-Roosevelt-Eisenhower committee was an official committee from the beginning, in the sense that from the very beginning it was acting with the full knowledge and approval of the administration. In his usual forthright, honest, and courageous way, the President has made that clear to the American people. That makes quite a difference to me, as compared to the situation which we understood to exist as of yesterday; namely, that a volunteer committee had proceeded to follow a course of action which was bound to involve the foreign policy of our country. There is no way to escape that.

Although honest men may differ, in my judgment, no committee—neither this committee nor any other committee—has a right to proceed to form itself into a foreign relations body that involves the rights and interests of the 180 million American people in respect to the relationship of this Republic to the rest of the world. That is why I was heard to say before—and I continue to stand on that statement—that, in my judgment, we must not permit voluntary committees to follow that course of action.

There is no question about the humanitarian aspects of the situation; there is no question about the high motives of the President of the United States. There is no question that the President, in taking the position he is taking, has shown to the world, as the Senator from Montana has pointed out, the kind of cynic and irresponsible person in world affairs Fidel Castro is.

Now that the situation has been made much clearer by the President—and I assume that it will be made even clearer tomorrow, when he speaks to the Congress and to the entire Nation—another question also to be considered is what we need to do from now on.

I do not think this problem could possibly be limited to an issue between the United States and Cuba. Regardless of whether we act now through an official volunteer committee whose humanitarian purposes have White House approval or whether we proceed through any other medium, the Cuban problem is no longer a United States problem. That has been true from the beginning. Instead, it is a problem of the Western Hemisphere.

It is a problem of the Western Hemisphere. I want to say, as I said in another quarter earlier today, that, in my

judgment, the sooner we get the problem involving the prisoners, as well as other problems involving Cuba, into the forum of the Organization of American States, the better.

It is of the utmost importance that we recognize before the world that it is not appropriate for us alone to determine the solution of the Communist problem, which has been created by Fidel Castro in the Western Hemisphere. So far as I am concerned, from the standpoint of our national policy, I suggest that what we ought to be urging is that our friends in the Organization of American States convene in an extraordinary session of that organization at once, and that we say we are perfectly willing to lay this whole question before the Organization of American States for solution.

I would be perfectly willing to have this official committee appointed as our representatives to the Organization of American States. In what? Oh, it is an ugly term in the minds of many. In negotiations, through the Organization of American States, with Cuba. In my judgment, we can hope for no possible success in the honor of our country, or to the credit of our country, or to peace, by trying to carry on negotiations with Castro through a volunteer committee, now made official.

We do not have diplomatic relations with Cuba. I do not think they should have been broken. I said that the other night. We cannot follow a course of action, no matter if it is clothed in the words of humanitarianism, by way of subterfuge, in connection with attempted negotiation or back-door negotiations with Castro.

It must be done now through the procedures of a charter on which is found the signature of the United States, the signature of Cuba, and the signatures of 19 other members of the Organization of American States.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, my suggestion, for whatever it is worth, is that we bring this problem before the forum of the Organization of American States, to see what that forum can do in regard to the negotiations for the settlement of the prisoner problem, and many other problems. The prisoner problem is only one of the problems that may arise to plague the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

I stand, with the majority leader, shoulder to shoulder with the President. That does not mean I entirely approve of the course of action which has been taken in respect to this problem. I happen to believe that in the beginning the President was given bad advice. I think he had better take a look at the adviser. But that stage is behind us now. The welfare of the country calls on us to rally behind our President and to see what we can do, through the Organization of American States, to devise a program which will make it possible for all the American nations to join in dealing with Castro. The President has indicated that we are willing to enter into negotiations in regard to this subject.

I have stated my position. I shall await, with great interest, and with prayers on my lips, the means of arriving at a peaceful way to handle this problem.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to review, in an unemotional way, a few facts. First, is there anyone who believes that Khrushchev and communism and Castro are not out to destroy the American system of government, to destroy America, and, if necessary, go to war? Is there anyone who feels any more sorry for these Cubans who are in prison—the 1,214 of them—than they do for the American boys who tonight are in prison in Red China, or the one American boy who is imprisoned in Russia, and other Americans who have been imprisoned?

Is there anyone here naive enough to believe that he wants these tractors—he specified model and make—for any other purpose than, in the first place, to embarrass the United States before the world, by resorting to blackmailing the United States, and, in the second place, to build missile and other types of military bases?

Is there anyone here so naive to believe for a moment that Castro is not taking his orders from Moscow?

Is there any Senator so naive as to believe Mr. Castro means any good by these proposals?

Are we against communism or are we for it?

We are members of the Organization of American States. We have been saying that we cannot do certain things in Cuba, that we cannot stop Mr. Castro, because we are members of the Organization of American States. We say that the OAS will object, and that we have got to get their permission. Why did we not invite them in on this project?

Is there anyone here naive enough to believe that the President did not suggest that the committee do this? The President admitted it in a press release. Is there anyone here naive enough to believe the President did not say the contributions would be tax exempt, and that he would give an export license to ship these tractors to Cuba, when we have at the moment a prohibition against shipping to Cuba anything which could be used for war purposes?

Is there anyone who will deny those facts?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me finish.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator had asked a question, because I wanted to answer some of the allegations he has made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am taking no longer than the Senator from Oregon took for his remarks.

Mr. Khrushchev has told us our children will live under communism. Mr. Castro has told the world that he is a Communist and that his nation is communistic. He has expropriated billions of dollars worth of American property. He took over a $150 million nickel mine in Cuba owned by the American Government.

There are those who say we have got to exchange 500 heavy duty tractors for 1,214 prisoners—not American prisoners, but Cuban prisoners.

If I were the President and I were making the deal, I would say, "All right. We will give you the 500 tractors if you will release the 200,000 prisoners you have." But why pick out 1,200? Castro will reply, "I have 1,200 more Cuban nationals who took part in the attempted revolution. He has told us that after the attempted revolution he put 200,000 persons in jail. What is the difference between the 200,000 he put in jail at that time and the 1,214 we are talking about?

I said a moment ago I think the President and this committee are making a mistake. I said they are human beings and they are entitled to make mistakes. The only reason why I have been standing on the floor tonight and the last few days is that I think it is a terrible mistake. I think a precedent is being set that in the years and months to come will tempt every little dictator and nation to blackmail the United States.

There comes a time in every man's life, as there does in a nation's life, when a man must stand up for his honor. I think honor is at stake. I think this transaction is 100 percent blackmail. I think we are violating the law by doing what we are attempting.

I would be more amenable toward what we are doing if the executive branch would say that we have an obligation to these 1,240 or more people, and if the executive branch would deal directly with the Government of Cuba. But, rather, the President says, "I am a private individual. I make this recommendation, not as the President of the United States, but as a private individual."

Who in the world is so naive as to believe that we can handle this problem with Castro except as one government to another?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have the greatest respect for the able Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will answer that question.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not question the Senator's motives. I merely want the Senator to deal in this instance with facts.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well. May I ask the Senator if it is not true that diplomatic relations with the Cuban Government have been broken?

There is no diplomatic relationship between the two governments at the present time. The Swiss are serving as agents for diplomatic relationships between the two governments.

So far as Mr. Castro himself is concerned, I have yet to hear a good word spoken in his behalf on the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. CAPEHART. I agree 100 percent with the able Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When we speak of some 1,240 prisoners, and what our interest is, I assume our interest is in the fact that they were a part of an invasion force, trained either in this country or somewhere close to it, and thereby a certain obligation has been created, which in effect sets them apart.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It sets them apart from the 200,000 or 300,000 prisoners.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. We had the word of the President of the United States, in a press conference a couple of weeks before this happened, that the United States was taking no part in the invasion, directly or indirectly, and that we had nothing to do with it. That is the impression he left with me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. CAPEHART. Did he or did he not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. He affirmed that we would not intervene.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator will understand I am not speaking politically. I think it has been admitted that under the previous administration training camps were set up for the purpose of training these individuals.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the purpose of training them to invade Cuba.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct. I do not know why the President of the United States would deny it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know that he did deny it. All I can go on is the newspaper reports to this effect. I think the story I mentioned was given out at Gettysburg a few months ago.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. In response to the suggestion that, after all, these 1,240 prisoners are in a separate status because they are in Cuba as the result of the invasion, we can think back to the events of the week before the invasion, when the President declared that America would not intervene, that America would not be guilty of aggression. Then came the actual invasion. Following the invasion was the official declaration by the President that he assumed full responsibility.

The question was asked a little while ago, "What would you do if you were in the President's position?"

I should like to pose a question. The men who are involved are 1,240 criminals, by Cuban law. These men are criminals because they shot at Cuban troops. They are criminals because they violated the laws of Cuba. They are in jail for that. The proposal is made, "Give us tractors and we will release these men."

If it be said that those men are in a special category because they are in Cuba by reason of the invasion, and that the President of the United States took full personal and official responsibility for the occasion, then I say in order to be consistent the President should take official responsibility for it. To say at this late hour, "It is a personal, private citizen who is now talking, who wants to buy tractors to trade for 1,240 people who are there," it seems to me shows at least a lack of consistency.

Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in my opinion the Senator from Nebraska has, in effect, brushed off 1,242 or 1,243 Cubans who are prisoners because of the invasion. I do not think we should treat them in that fashion. I think we have an interest in their welfare.

I think what the civilian group is attempting to do is based on humanitarian interests and desires. If we forget these 1,242 prisoners we say, in effect, to the 10 who came to plead for them—we say to the 1,242 and to the 10—"To the wall."

I hope Senators will believe me when I say that hundreds in Cuba have already gone to the wall since Mr. Castro came into power 2 years and 5 or 6 months ago.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Nebraska has not said, "To the wall" to these 1,240 men.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has referred to them as criminals.

Mr. HRUSKA. They are criminals in the eyes of the Cubans. The only thing which sets them apart and makes them of interest to us is the acknowledgment by the President of the United States that he takes full responsibility for their being in Cuba. In effect, that is what is meant.

I would not say "To the wall" to them, but I say that if there is any intervention on the part of the President it should not be as a private citizen and as a personal matter, after he has taken action as an official of the United States, as its Chief Executive, in order to get them in the predicament in which they now find themselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does the Senator advocate recognition of Cuba again?

Mr. HRUSKA. Not at all. There are other matters with respect to which we approach Cuba. How is it done. It is done through the regularly designated alternate diplomatic source.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Through the Swiss.

Mr. HRUSKA. Those channels are resorted to. Why can they not be resorted to for this purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. Surely.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I was asking the majority leader to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to reply to the Senator first.

I suppose we could carry on activities from this end through the Swiss Embassy or the Swiss Minister, as we have done in the case of other matters, in getting Americans out of Cuba.

I suppose we could work through the Organization of American States, as suggested by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I think there may be merit to the suggestions, although each presents certain difficulties.

It may well be that instead of a private group of citizens engaging in accumulating tractors of various kinds to exchange for prisoners it would be better if some organization or some system were established whereby negotiations could be carried on to bring about the release of these men through the Organization of American States. I cannot judge, on the basis of a floor debate, the merits of such a suggestion.

All I can say is that the President of the United States has been placed by events in a very embarrassing, delicate, and dangerous position.

So far as I am concerned—and I would say this about a Republican President, as I have on other occasions—the President of the United States will have my full support, because he is confronted not alone with difficulties in Cuba but with difficulties all over the world. What we ought to do is to develop a sense of understanding and tolerance for this man with whom we served, for this man whom we know, for this man who was elected by the American people to lead all of us for the next 4 years.

We can find fault with any man with whom we wish to find fault. Even Senators are not perfect.

I ask my colleagues to display a little tolerance and a little understanding. Instead of criticizing the President day in and day out, give him the support which he so badly needs at this time. I hope Senators will believe me when I say that if they do so they will be doing their country more good than by criticizing the President day in and day out.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope I never live to see the day when I shall fail as a U.S. Senator, elected by the people of my State, to criticize a President, whether he be of my party or of the opposite party, if I think he is wrong.

I do not think we could maintain a representative form of government—a democracy in America—if U.S. Senators were denied the right to criticize the President of the United States. If such were the case, we would have a dictatorship.

I know some people would like to have us refrain from criticism. I have not in the past hesitated to criticize a Republican President, and I do not today hesitate to criticize a Democratic President. I have made the statement several times tonight that the President of the United States is a human being. He will make mistakes. Those around him will make mistakes. I think what he is doing is a terrible mistake. I would like to give him an opportunity to correct that mistake.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How?

Mr. CAPEHART. Very simple. In the first place, he should never have recognized Mr. Castro when he spoke about 500 tractors being exchanged for prisoners.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The President has never recognized Mr. Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. What?

Mr. MANSFIELD. He has never recognized Mr. Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. Only today the President admitted that he had called the three people whose names have been mentioned and asked them to be members of a committee to raise funds in the United States for 500 tractors to be exchanged for prisoners.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is news to me, and I do not believe it is an accurate statement of the facts.

Mr. CAPEHART. That report was on the tickertape.

Mr. MANSFIELD. His relations with the committee do not imply recognition of Castro.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not recognition of Castro, but the President asked private citizens to form a committee to do business with Mr. Castro. How else will they get 500 tractors to Cuba to secure the release of the 1,214 prisoners if they do not do business with Mr. Castro?

I say that if we are going to deal with Castro, let us have the President of the United States deal with him, and let us deal with him in a way in which he ought to be dealt with. He, as a Communist, is trying to blackmail us, and he is out to destroy the American system of government. He would build missile bases that could kill American boys and girls.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would the Senator from Indiana do if he were in the White House? I should like to have his suggestions.

Mr. CAPEHART. First, I certainly would not agree to the tractor deal. I would pay no attention to Mr. Castro's suggestion that 500 tractors be exchanged for 1,214 prisoners. Further, if I had made this mistake and saw American people rising up against it, I would correct it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. How?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would dismiss the committee, and say to Mr. Castro, if he made the request official, that we have no interest in the proposal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What would happen to the 1,214 prisoners?

Mr. CAPEHART. What will happen to the remaining 198,786 prisoners down there? Let us take that point into consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am talking about the 1,214 prisoners who are under consideration.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am talking about 198,786 prisoners. I am talking about the Americans, who are in prison in Red China and the one who is in prison in Russia. I am talking about all of them, and I am thinking in terms of future generations. Any dictator could steal from the United States and arrest some U.S. citizens and say to the United States, "You give us so many tractors, or so much of this or that, and we will release them." I am thinking of future generations. The Congress had better start talking and thinking about future generations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 99 other Senators in this body likewise are thinking about future generations as well as the present generation. There are 99 other Senators who are equally troubled as is the Senator from Indiana concerning events which are happening throughout the world.

But again I return to my basic question. If the Senator from Indiana happened to occupy the White House and this situation arose, what would he do? What is the alternative which the President faces?

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me answer that question.

First, when Mr. Castro expropriated $150 million of American property, including the Nicaro nickel mine in Cuba, I would have sent the U.S. forces to recover it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What else would the Senator from Indiana do?

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me read this statement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask the Senator to answer the question and then he can read the statement. First, he would send in the Army. Then I suppose he would send in the Marine Corps, then the Navy, and the Air Force. What would be the next step?

Mr. CAPEHART. I would do whatever is necessary. If it meant sending in the Marines, the Navy, or the Army, I would do whatever would be necessary to keep Russia from establishing a satellite nation in Cuba and building air bases, missile bases, and submarine bases. I would do whatever was necesary, even if it means going to war, because if we do not do so, sooner or later we may be at war. That is exactly what I would do, and I state it in straight language.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is, if anything, frank. He said very forthrightly that on the basis of expropriation, which would include private holdings as well as the Government-operated Nicaro nickel mine, he would favor armed intervention. Is that the answer to the situation confronted by the free world in Cuba?

Mr. CAPEHART. What other answer is there? Are we for communism or are we against it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know of no Senator who is in favor of communism, but that is quite beside the point. There have been resolutions passed in this body time after time, which express unanimously the feeling of the Senate toward communism. I trust there is no doubt about that in anyone's mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. I read a statement from the ticker tape:

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy today asked public contributions to the tractors-for-prisoners exchange with Fidel Castro, and disclosed he helped organize the private citizens committee which is raising funds for the deal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is wrong with that action?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. The President of the United States should be handling this situation——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has yielded to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I have a question of the Senator from Montana. At the present time the Eichmann trial is in progress in Israel. A great deal of debate has taken place in that trial concerning whether at one period during World War II Eichmann would have saved the lives of many Jews if he could have traded them for trucks. There is a dispute about whether he could have traded the trucks or whether the Allied Nations would trade the trucks.

My question to the distinguished majority leader is this: Is it not the moral judgment of the world today that if the opportunity were offered to trade trucks for the lives of Jews who were being exterminated by a dictator, even during a shooting war, the lives of such Jews should have been saved by the trading of the trucks? Is that not the moral judgment of the civilized world today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe such would be the consensus, and I believe there is a parallel between the case of Eichmann and the Jews, and the case of Castro and the Cuban prisoners of war.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished majority leader this further question: If we were to stand by while these 1,214 men, who were armed by the United States, were stood up against a wall and shot, does the majority leader not think that the moral judgment of the world would be against us for permitting such shooting if we could have prevented it?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the difficult situation in which we find ourselves, I believe that if something untoward should develop in the situation, we should have something on our consciences to live with.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask the distinguished majority leader whether he thinks the moral judgment of the world will place the blood and lives of these 1,214 men in importance above an internal domestic tax regulation of the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree. I thank the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have asked the distinguished majority leader to yield for two purposes: First, I wish to commend him for a splendid, logical, reasonable, sensible, and compassionate statement.

Second, I wish to say to Senators who are asking who will defend the President's actions or will speak up for the President, that other Senators will do so, and I am one of those Senators.

Mr. President, it is quite obvious that it would be the desire of the American people to save the lives of all prisoners under all dictators. This is one of the purposes of our foreign policy—at least one of them—as well as to liberate these prisoners in the world who have been enslaved by dictators. That is one of the principal objectives of this Nation. I do not believe it is a cogent or con-

vincing argument to say, "If we can save 1,200, what about the other 200,000?" It seems to me it is much more important for us to want to save all, but if we can save 1,200, that is a moral thing to do.

Mr. Castro is a diabolically clever man, as the majority leader has said, and is a very cynical man, playing loosely with the lives of human beings. He released 10 prisoners as hostages conditionally. They are not here as a part of the Cuban diplomatic service, negotiating with the U.S. diplomatic service. They are here to remind us that there are prisoners in the prison cells in Cuba that can be let out if certain things are done. It is not what we would like. Of course it is not. In fact, we have been going through some painful days on this whole Cuban situation. I have been one of the critics of the manner in which the situation was handled. But I do not believe we answer these arguments by standing up and yelling "Communist! Blackmail! Castro!" and then repeating it, "Blackmail! Castro! Communist!" That is not the answer. It seems to me the answer at this moment is to try to find a way of saving lives. I would say that even if only one life were involved, possibly we have an opportunity to do something. We may save more than 1,200 lives.

The President of the United States did not say that he was acting as a private citizen. Let us keep the record clear. I have the text of the President's statement. What he said is in the text of this statement. The President made no reference at all to his position as a private citizen. He is not a private citizen. He is the President of this great Republic. What the President of the United States said was this:

> The tractors-for-freedom movement is a wholly private humanitarian movement aimed at saving the lives of several hundred men. It is supported by free men and women throughout the Americas.
>
> * * * * *
>
> My concern was to help make certain that a single, representative group of citizens headed this effort in the United States. And I am grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for their leadership.
>
> The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

Who said that the President might have been acting as a private citizen? It was a press agent at the White House, Mr. Hatcher. I quote from a United Press dispatch on the ticker:

> Hatcher said Kennedy's connection with the arrangement was as a private citizen.

A pressman can speak for a President, as in this instance, but a pressman does not necessarily speak the words of the President. The President's words are in the text. At the conclusion of my remarks I will ask that the entire text of the President's statement be placed in the RECORD.

Let me say to the eternal credit of the President of the United States that he feels a moral obligation. It is a fact that this Government did train those people. We know it. The American people will be respected all the more in the world if we act responsibly, out of a sense of humanity, in this unhappy matter. I suggest to my colleagues that during the past week we have seen pictures on the front pages of American newspapers of another freedom fighter, a young man with a battered and bloody face, the victim of brutality, vulgarity, violence, and disorder. It might not be a bad news story to go out throughout the world that the citizenry of this country was sufficiently concerned with human life to put forth private contributions and private efforts, with the endorsement and moral support of the President of the United States, in an attempt to save these men in Cuba. I do not want on my hands the fact that I failed to do what I could have done when the opportunity was given.

I did not have anything to say as a Senator or as a citizen about the action that took place when the invasion forces went to Cuba. However, I have something to say now about how we can redeem and remove from the prisons in Cuba at least some members of that invasion force and bring them back home. I do not believe that America shows itself to be cowardly by doing what is right. The world needs a little love. It would not hurt to have some in Congress too. The world has had a stomach full of hate, and it has chronic indigestion. I suggest that the world needs a little example of compassion and mercy. I do not believe it makes us look weak. The man who looks silly and weak, and the country that looks bad, are the man and country responsible for incarcerating these people, and the dictator who imprisons these people and plays loosely with them.

I do not want to be told, when we stand up like this, that we are appeasing or paying a blackmailer. I do not consider it to be blackmail at all. I consider this an opportunity to undo a wrong. This is an opportunity to save some lives. The Scriptures are filled with examples of lives being saved. So is the history book of this Nation.

I heard what was said about prisoners in China and in Russia. I wish China would say tonight that we can have our Americans back for some tractors. Are we going to go to war for that too? Is that the only answer some people have? Is the only answer they have: make war? I wish we could get some of our airmen out of Soviet Union prisons for some tractors. I am frank to tell the Senate that I would be willing to help raise the money to bring about that result.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire UPI dispatch, containing the text of the President's statement, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The tractors-for-freedom movement is a wholly private humanitarian movement aimed at saving the lives of several hundred men. It is supported by free men and women throughout the Americas.
>
> When Fidel Castro first made his offer to exchange the lives and liberty of 1,200 prisoners for 500 agricultural tractors, the American people responded with characteristic compassion. A number of private committees were organized to raise the necessary funds, and many private citizens, in this country and throughout the hemisphere, inquired as to where they could contribute. My concern was to help make certain that a single representative group of citizens headed this effort in the United States. And I am grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for their leadership.
>
> The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.
>
> Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, inasmuch as it covers only negotiations in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States; that tax exemption is granted as a matter of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba, and would thus be granted for a humanitarian shipment of farm implements.
>
> While this Government is thus putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort, I hope that all citizens will contribute what they can. If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help. I happen to feel deeply that all who fight for freedom—particularly in our hemisphere—are our brothers.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not want on my hands the responsibility for giving Castro 500 construction tractors with which to build missile bases and airports from which to attack the United States. That is exactly what he wants those tractors for, and for no other purpose, because he has designated the model he wants. He has designated the number he wants and the manufacturer. Those designations are big tractors for the purpose of moving earth and for construction. They are not farm tractors, as some would like to have people in the United States believe.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we are going to make available to Mr. Castro are farm tractors. That is the first point. Whether Mr. Castro will deal on that basis or not, I do not know.

Mr. CAPEHART. How does the Senator know that?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I know it because that is what the President of the United States has said .

Mr. CAPEHART. The President of the United States has said no such thing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not impressed by the silly argument that the only way Castro can get those tractors is to get them from the United States. I have the feeling that Russia also has some tractors. If the Soviet Union is willing to put Migs in Cuba, it might be willing

to put some tractors over there also with which to build military bases. Castro does not need American tractors with which to build the bases. I am sure the Senator is not trying to frighten the United States with Cuba's military power. We have bases on the border of the Soviet Union. We have missile bases and air bases on the border of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union is not likely to say tomorrow, "We are going to go to war." When that is said, there may be a few more pale faces around this place.

That will be a sad day. The tractors which are being talked about now will not mean the difference between life and death to this Republic. Czechoslovakia has tractors; and they work. Russia has tractors; and they work. The Russians know how to deliver them. They have delivered tanks and Migs; they will be able to deliver tractors. Let us not buy this buncombe, this demogogic argument.

Mr. Castro tried to make political propaganda and put us on the spot. He thought we would say no. He thought we would say no, and then his firing squad would go to work. He thought the men who have been sent to America would not get tractors in exchange for lives.

We have called his cynical bluff through some humane American citizens. Eleanor Roosevelt needs no defense in this body. Walter Reuther is a great American and a great leader. Dr. Milton Eisenhower is the brother of the former President of the United States and a distinguished American. These great people did not need to be coached by anybody. They are good Americans. Their patriotism is beyond contest. I do not believe they are engaged in helping Castro to build missile bases. I do not believe they are engaged in a game of blackmail. I know they are not Communists. They are patriotic, dedicated, God-fearing, God-loving, people-loving Americans.

The President of the United States has some help in this body. We are not about to run when someone rises and yells "Communists, Communists; Castro, Castro; blackmail, blackmail."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I had not intended to take part in this discussion because I have another matter I wish to mention. However, in view of the fact that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] issued a public challenge to anyone who would stand up and defend the President of the United States, I cannot refrain from declaring where I stand. I stand behind the President of the United States.

As one goes along in life, one becomes more and more convinced that the presumption is always on the side of mercy, compassion, and helpfulness. Sometimes excessive mercy may lead one astray; but the overriding principle always should be to try to save life, to try to reduce cruelty, to try to reduce pain. That is the proper course. The people who instinctively respond and try to help people are, to my mind, the best Christians and have, in the long run, the most constructive influence.

I am very glad that these three American citizens took up the cause of trying to save the lives of more than 1,200 men. I am very glad the President of the United States encouraged them. We should be proud of these people. I think that when the Senator from Indiana and other Senators read the text of their remarks—and I hope they will not be changed—they will be somewhat ashamed of what they said tonight.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to know what the able Senator from Illinois means by his statement that he hopes the remarks will not be changed. I think that is a reflection upon the integrity of another Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana well knows that upon occasion there has been an exchange of personalities between the Senator from Indiana and other Members of this body, and that the Senator from Indiana has then proposed that the exchanges be expunged. He knows that. That occurred once in my own case; it also occurred in connection with a colloquy between the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Indiana.

I do not wish to be led into a diversion. What I am saying, fundamentally, is that we should not be ashamed of being merciful, and we should defend those who are merciful.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. My observation has been—and I shall say this as unemotionally as I can—that during the past 30 years those who have taken such a position toward communism throughout the world have failed. We have lost lives in Korea; we are now indulging in a cold war; we know that the head of the Soviet Communist Government has told us he will destroy us and that our grandchildren will live under communism. Yet every day in the Senate Members say that we must do certain things, such as the action which is now proposed, in order to stop communism; if we do not, it will destroy America.

When will we get to the point where we will quit listening to those who have been appeasers over the years; those who made the Yalta and Teheran Agreement; and those who were responsible for recognizing Soviet Russia in 1933, as President Roosevelt did? At that time, he was fearful that Russia would not keep its word, so he had them write a letter—and to what avail?

I, for one, will not listen any more to the appeasers. I will not listen any more to those who tell us we must be soft and must do this and the other thing; that we have to be kind to those who tell the American people to their teeth that they will be destroyed. I am not about to give Mr. Castro, Mr. Khrushchev's puppet in Cuba, 500 tractors to build construction projects to destroy America. The Senator from Illinois can do it if he wants, but I will not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana is a master of confusion.

Mr. CAPEHART. I was under the impression that what I said was very direct and to the point. I did not intend to mince any words.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Indiana is a master of confusion. He is trying to say that anyone who attempts to save 1,200 lives is thereby appeasing communism. No such thing. As a matter of fact, in the Civil War—and the incident came up again and again—Lincoln was asked to shoot Confederate prisoners because certain atrocities had been committed against Union soldiers in the South. Great pressure was brought to bear upon Lincoln to shoot Confederate soldiers in reprisal, as a means of getting an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. But Lincoln refused to do so. After the passage of almost 100 years, we realize that Lincoln was right and that those who urged that he adopt a policy of vengeance were wrong. Similarly in this matter, I see nothing wrong in trying to save 1,240 lives.

That is all I wish to say on this subject. I do not believe the people who have formed the committee and the President should be subjected to the attack and the scorn which the Senator from Indiana has heaped upon them. As I have said, I had not intended to get into the dispute; but since I was here and since the Senator from Indiana laid down an open challenge to anyone who supported the President to get up and defend him, I felt that if I did not rise and speak these few words, I would be regarded, by implication, as not defending the President and not defending the committee.

FULL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOR NEGROES AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Post, Mr. Walter Lippmann discussed in his column the very serious problems of the incidents and disorders in Alabama. In particular, Mr. Lippmann indicated that what has been a passive movement on the part of American Negroes to gain their rights has now shown "unmistakable signs of turning into a movement of physical confrontation, with all the dire possibilities of reprisal and counterreprisal."

I think all of us know that where a community will not willingly grant American citizens their rights under the Constitution, in that community there will ultimately be resistance and more direct action.

While I do not often indulge in the practice of reprinting in the RECORD my own statements, I think that it is fair to say that some of us were correct in predicting the result which has now come about, in part, because of the absence of action by Congress to make it possible for Negroes and other minority groups in the United States to gain their full constitutional rights.

In 1956 a small group of six Senators, of which I was one, made an abortive attempt to have the Senate consider civil rights legislation and especially to pass legislation to enforce the 14th amendment of the Constitution which grants

to Negroes and other groups the equal protection of the laws. Again in 1957 and in 1960 Congress refused to pass legislation to enforce the equal protection guarantee to American citizens under the 14th amendment.

As I said in 1956:

I do not believe the American people can permanently postpone dealing with this issue.

But, Mr. President, we, here in this quiet and, as I said, sometimes pleasant club, have postponed dealing with this issue. The consequences are that many Negro Americans are now asserting their right to live as equals under the Constitution by nonviolent action.

As Mr. Lippmann said yesterday, and as I inferred in 1956, the fault lies not only with the laws and the practices of a particular State or community; it lies also with us who have refused to act, who have delayed and postponed, and who have been unable because of the rules of the Senate and the nature of our institution to come to grips with this problem.

I claim no gift of omniscience for having said then that the kinds of events which are happening today would take place if we failed to do our duty. To my mind this was clear for all to see. But the events of the present make it even more important that we act soon to guarantee the rights of all of our citizens to the equal protection of the laws, for time is running out and the future may end in disaster if we fail to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a statement I made on the Senate floor on July 25, 1956—almost 5 years ago—in which I predicted such events as we have seen if we failed to act, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 25, 1956]

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we pierce behind the complex rules and procedures, we know, as men, that the rules of the Senate have been very skillfully devised to prevent any action on civil rights which is obnoxious to the Members from the South who sit in the U.S. Senate.

A complex of rules for this purpose has been built up over the years, carefully guarded, carefully defended—the provisions that the Senate can be recessed rather than adjourned, so that the introduction of bills and resolutions and motions to discharge, and reports, as of right, can be shut off in what would otherwise have been the morning hour; the provisions for motions to proceed to consideration of a bill being subject to unlimited debate, and requiring cloture motions to secure a vote for that; and the provisions for unlimited debate when the bill comes up. The severe restrictions upon cloture is another set of fortresses. A combined Republican and southern majority fastened those rules on the Senate still more firmly in 1949 when, I am sorry to say, the then minority leader joined with the Members of the South to make the application of cloture still more difficult.

* * * * *

I think it is now clear, from our experience of yesterday, when a motion which would have permitted us to propose action was defeated by the crushing vote of 76 to 6, that it will be impossible, under the rules of the Senate, with the present temper of the southern Senators, and with the temper of the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and with the present attitudes of the real leaders of both political parties, ever to bring a civil rights measure of any real substance to a vote in this body. Pale imitations may be offered by the political leaders to clear their skirts but it has now been demonstrated that no real improvement can be made.

I think the course which the Senate has followed will probably prevent the American people, in a legislative fashion, from ever proceeding to defend the rights of the Negro minority in this country.

I say that with great sadness, but I think it is a fact. Many persons may exult over this tendency. I do not.

I say that great wrongs are perpetrated upon the Negroes of this country, in all sections of the country. Sometimes those wrongs are perpetrated legally. Sometimes they are perpetrated outside the law, by the coercion exercised upon Negroes to prevent them from voting, and in various other ways. They are discriminated against in employment and in housing. They are discriminated against so far as schooling is concerned. They are discriminated against in voting which frequently they can only do at the peril of their lives. They are not assured of a fair trial and frequently do not receive it. I regard all this as a great blot upon the American people, and as unworthy of the ideals upon which this Republic was founded. It is in the deepest sense of the term un-Christian.

I want to say that the Senate of the United States, along with all the other matters with which it has to deal, has in this matter a heavy burden upon its conscience.

I think as a result of the disillusioning experience we have gone through that practically there is very little we can do. The Negroes of this Nation are subjected, in many quarters, to great economic and physical pressure and are deprived of their basic rights under the Constitution. The rules of the Senate are so devised that we cannot act to defend them, and thus our legislative action in their protection will be almost impossible.

* * * * *

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe the American people can permanently postpone dealing with this issue. But the Members of the Senate who are in this quiet, and at times pleasant, club cannot hope to escape the scrutiny of the public opinion, not only of this country, but of the world.

I have probably not been very skillful in the efforts which I have made to bring this matter to a vote. I have tried my best but I know that at on at least two occasions I have been outwitted by the very able field generals on the opposing side. I make no protestations of personal virtue. I believe we must seek to right the great wrongs we have inflicted upon the Negro people if we are to escape the judgment of a just God. I do not question the motives of those, however, who have taken a contrary position. I merely say this is an issue which will weigh not only upon the conscience of the country, but upon the conscience of the Senate.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 27, 1956]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as this legislative waif is at last permitted to enter the parliamentary halls when it is too late for it to have any future, its dying eyes can perhaps look up at the walls of the Senate and see the otherwise invisible but no less real inscription which men have placed there for all civil rights measures: "Abandon hope all ye who enter here."

For how much longer will the Senate and the country permit manmade rules to prevent us from even considering measures which the vast majority of the people desire?

NBC WHITE PAPER ON THE RAILROADS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last night a great many people undoubtedly saw NBC's white paper on the railroad problem. In response to this first major attempt on the part of television to deal with a critical national problem, I hesitate to make any comments that might be construed as critical of the program. It was, after all, probably the first time that many people have been given a glimpse of a problem that threatens to affect us very seriously in both our pocketbooks and our standards of urban living.

There are several points which I should like to make on the program, because it touches on legislation I have introduced, and I want to make sure that there is no confusion about the purposes of this legislation.

First, the NBC show dealt at length with the national shrinkage of railroad passenger travel under the impact of the automobile and the airplane. The show carried us back to the heyday of railroad travel, the glamour of riding the 20th Century Limited from New York to Chicago, and contrasted that bygone era with the often unglamorous, uncomfortable, and inconvenient intercity railroad passenger service being provided today.

It is extremely important, in my view, that the problem of intercity passenger service be separated from the problem of urban commuter service.

While there may be question as to the need for intercity railroad passenger service, there can be no question about the continuing and growing need to maintain and improve the urban mass transportation service now being provided, generally at a loss, by the railroads.

I do not know of any transportation expert who would disagree with that general proposition.

Yet time and again people confuse the two problems, and conclude that because the need for one service is declining, neither service is worth preserving.

This attitude is often compounded by a superficial interpretation of the statistics on the number of people being served by the commuter railroads in the urban areas.

In New Jersey, only about 75,000 people use the railroads to get to work in New York, out of a total population of 4½ million people living in the northern New Jersey region. Why should the public spend substantial sums of money to serve the pleasure and convenience of a relatively small proportion of the population?

The answer is that the pleasure and convenience of these people are not the primary issue. The issue is the consequence to the economic viability of the

entire New York region if these rail commuters are forced into their automobiles for the journey to work because the railroads are financially unable to provide the service. It does not take much imagination to contemplate what the consequences would be if 75,000 or even 50,000 more cars were to try to get through the Holland and the Lincoln Tunnels each day. It does not take much imagination to contemplate how much more difficult and expensive the parking problem would become. What concerns me is, not so much the convenience of the 75,000 rail commuters, but the devastating economic effect they would have on the entire region in terms of the additional demands that would occur—if the rail service is lost—for more highways, more traffic control, more street maintenance, in addition to the increased number of traffic accidents, more time and wages lost in traffic jams, more parking facilities, more business lost in downtown areas, because of congestion, and more frayed nerves.

The same problem affects nearly every urban and metropolitan area in the Nation.

Another point raised during the show that sometimes is used to downgrade the wisdom of providing assistance for mass transportation is the quality of railroad management. They were accused of moral deterioration by one commuter, of disregard for the public, and of a lack of enterprise and initiative, particularly in the field of research.

I am sure both railroad management and railroad labor deserve their share of criticism for the problems that exist today. But this criticism, no matter how valid, sidesteps the basic issue: Are the railroads providing an essential service in moving people in urban areas, and can we afford to let this service go under?

For reasons I have already indicated, the answer to the last question is manifestly "No." The alternatives are simply too costly. We just cannot sit around and moan over railroad mismanagement or labor featherbedding or other similar problems. We must preserve this commuter service, through actions by all levels of government, for each day of delay brings only further deterioration of service.

Finally, the white paper, in emphasizing the problems of the railroads, did not deal with another fundamentally important part of the problem—the need to come to grips with the whole range of factors affecting public acceptance of mass transportation. It is essential that rail commuter service be preserved, modernized, and improved. Huge investments have already been made in rights-of-way and other facilities and equipment. We shall be throwing away this investment at our peril if we allow the present situation to continue, as Los Angeles is painfully learning now, after it had permitted the abandonment of an extensive rail system.

At the same time, however, our primary concern should be with factors that actually motivate people. These may or may not be modern commuter cars or air-conditioned buses.

Perhaps the single most important inducement to using mass transportation facilities would be the construction of fringe-area parking facilities, so that people could park and ride commuter, transit, or bus service to work, instead of choking the roads and making life impossible for everyone by driving all the way to work.

We need to deal with all the factors affecting mass transportation travel, and they include fare levels, frequency of service, speed of service, reliability of schedules, the condition of the rolling stock, the availability of fringe-area parking, and the availability of adequate transfer and feeder service.

The bill I have introduced, with 18 of my colleagues, which recently was incorporated into the general housing bill, S. 1922, as reported by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, provides the assistance necessary to test the whole range of these factors, as well as to provide some assistance to help preserve existing essential service. It provides as much flexibility as our cities and urban areas need in coming to grips with the problem. The bill is not limited to aid for the railroads, or for bus companies, or for parking facilities. It embraces them all.

In conclusion, let me say again that I have raised these points to supplement the NBC white paper, which performed an extremely valuable service in awakening people to the growing crisis in urban traffic congestion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the script of this show be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with this morning's commentary by New York Times television columnist Jack Gould.

There being no objection, the article and the script were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1961]

TELEVISION: FLAGGING DOWN THE TRAINS; NBC OFFERS WHITE PAPER ON RAILROADS

(By Jack Gould)

The faded romance of the railroad steam engine chugging majestically across the countryside and the urgent anguish of the commuter yearning to get home on time were among the elements in the National Broadcasting Co.'s fascinating diagnosis of rail transportation last night. The filmed program, another in the "NBC White Paper" series, was presented over channel 4.

The offering, for which Chet Huntley was the narrator, was a comprehensive analysis of the history of railroading—from its glorious days as the mainstay of national travel to a system of orphan shuttles, deserted rights-of-way and endless hand-wringing.

Yet the program's conclusion held out hope for both the sentimental railroad buff and the hardy suburbanite: add a few million more cars to the turnpikes, freeways and parking lots and the much-maligned railroad will have to be rediscovered to assure human survival.

"Railroads: End of the Line?" the inspired handiwork of Arthur Zegart and Al Wasserman, opened with a group of individuals most deserving of compassionate solicitude: the nonpartisan New Frontiersmen who ride the New Haven. Witnesses interviewed on a Westport-to-New York conveyance ran off the list of the familiar difficulties to be found at home: wives weary of waiting and hot martinis.

From that bit of stark realism the show recounted many sequences of superb nostalgia.

Next the grim chronology of upward of 5,000 trains being taken out of service while the full effects of Henry Ford's tinkering with a carburetor for the masses changed a country. Abandoned stations, ripped up tracks and the delightful dining cars of yesteryear were shown.

Both sides of the argument over railroad management were posed. There were charges that financiers were milking the wreckage, as well as allegations that governments have a handout to airplanes and trucks while scorning the rails which were heavily taxed.

Yet NBC did not merely accent the negative; it seems there is an area where patronizing a commuter train is not a form of primitive calisthenics. Also other communities proposed to do something about the barbaric internment involved in using a car during the rush hours.

The Chicago & North Western Railroad, serving Chicago, was shown as a commuter line that had new cars, ran on time, made a profit and was enjoying a rise in patronage. The ambitious plans of San Francisco to cover its metropolitan area with a rapid transit system also were explained. And Lewis Mumford, analyzing the city commuter problem from the comfort of his country place, said the current strategy of dismantling railroads so later they would have to be reinvented did not speak well for the efficacy of today's planning.

Mr. Huntley ended the presentation with the observation that until now primary attention has been focused on how to find parking space for more automobiles rather than on the functional problem of transporting people. If future chaos is to be avoided, there is a need for some present sense in handling passengers in and out of big cities. In its noble plea one can only hope that NBC has more success than the captive on the 5:11.

NBC WHITE PAPER NO. 6: "RAILROADS: END OF THE LINE?"

(Narrated by Chet Huntley)

Broadcast Tuesday, May 23, 1961, 10 to 11 p.m., e.d.t.

Executive producer: Irving Gitlin.

Producer: Al Wasserman.

Associate producer-director: Arthur Zegart.

Written by Arthur Zegart and Al Wasserman.

COMMUTER. We're so accustomed to dirty windows, we're not interested in washed windows. If they'd only do one single thing. Give us a certainty that we'd get to New York on time and get home on time, we'd settle for—that's all we're asking. Is that asking too much?

Senator WILLIAMS. You start, for example, with the commuter himself. His sole objective really is to maintain the present service that he has or see it improved somewhat. You take the rail facility or the rapid transit system, its sole objective, of course, is to make money, and if a rail line—a commuter service—isn't making money, their sole objective is to discontinue or abandon. So, you start with a conflict, and who's going to resolve this conflict?

Mr. PERLMAN. Under the free-enterprise system, profit is not a dirty word, and profit is the only way that the free-enterprise system finds methods of survival for business. So, we feel an obligation to the public to render this service, but we feel an obligation on the part of the public to pay the cost of that service.

Mr. MUMFORD. Not all of railroading is profitable, but all of it is necessary for public convenience, and therefore, either through railroad management itself, or through the aid and intervention—and per-

haps the ownership—by the State, the railroad has to perform its entire service, not just the part that it would like to perform, at the maximum amount of profit.

Senator MAGNUSON. Now you might ask, Why is the U.S. Government interested in the private operation of a railroad? Well, they're interested for many, many reasons. First of all, we have kept—this is the only country in the world which hasn't nationalized this form of transportation. And we want to keep it that way. We want to keep it private enterprise, and, therefore, we have a big stake in keeping the railroads operating.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the Government is worried about keeping the railroads running, so are the railroaders themselves. Only a short while ago, it would have been inconceivable to find the president of a railroad on a mock campaign train drumming up popular support. Yet here on this train there are no less than five of them trying to reach the public with a message about an industry in trouble.

Mr. BARRIGER. The reason why we appear before you today to ask your support is in order to prevent the nationalization of railroads. If Congress does not give railroads equality of competitive opportunity, nationalization of railroads, in my opinion, is inevitable. You know what the consequences of that will be. It will inject a massive dose of socialism into the national political economy and topple our American private enterprise system with it. That is one of the reasons, in addition to that of much better railroad service, why we have—why we are justified in asking for—and expecting—your support.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Quite possibly, the rails have meant more to me personally than to most Americans. My father was a railroad man on the Northern Pacific; I was actually born in the depot at Cardwell, Mont., and spent most of my boyhood around the tracks. I didn't realize it then, but I was growing up in the twilight of the American passenger railroad. The great rail monopoly of passenger transportation was in the process of being destroyed forever. Most people, of course, are aware that there has been a radical change in the relationship between Americans and their railroads—but relatively few people are aware of the extent of this change or of the fundamental nature of its implications.

We'll begin this NBC white paper in a moment, following this message.

* * * * *

Mr. HUNTLEY. Our story of the plight of the American passenger train begins in the yards of the New Haven Railroad at 6:30 in the morning.

TRAIN ANNOUNCER. The 6:55 train to Grand Central New York, track 8, stopping at Milford, Stratford, Bridgeport, Westport, and Saugatuck, Norwalk, and South Norwalk, 125th Street, Grand Central, New York.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The first American passenger proudly boarded a steam train in 1830. Since that time, there have been obvious changes—not the least of which is the change in what the railroad means both to those who ride it—and to those who work it.

CONDUCTOR. You know at one time when you and I first hired out here railroading was a family affair. We knew the big officials. They were men who started here and grew up with the railroad; and they had a pride and they had an understanding of our troubles and our conditions; and they knew railroading; but today, you take in the past 15 years, you're only a stepchild and so's the railroad. You've had four or five different administrations there and I don't know how much basic interest they have or thoughtfulness for the public or you and I or the operation of the railroad.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the railroad appears to be not particularly interested in the public, the public on its part seems indifferent to the railroads, at least if we look at figures.

Fewer Americans ride the trains today than at any time since 1885.

The typical railroad passenger today is the commuter. He numbers 60 percent of all people who ride the trains and as such represents the bulk of the passenger problem faced by the railroads. Passenger service in the main does not pay—short-run peakloads followed by long idle periods, inefficient equipment, higher taxes than other forms of public transport, rising costs for labor and materials, all add to the passenger headache. That headache strikes the commuter with the special force—and he reacts.

Mr. CALLOWAY. We are riding on basically the same kind of equipment that took Lincoln back to Springfield to be buried on.

Mr. MANVILLE. Do you know that in 1902, a friend of mine was doing some research, in 1902—that's 60 years ago—a train got from Bridgeport to New York in 1 hour and 10 minutes. Today with jet airplanes and the rest of it, the New Haven takes an hour and a half. Same distance.

Mr. CALLOWAY. You don't know whether the train is going to be late in the morning, every morning. Of course it isn't. Sometimes it is on time in the morning, but you never know whether it is going to be on time or whether it is going to be late. The same thing in the evening. You don't know whether your 6:02 is going to pull out at 6:02 or whether it is going to pull out at 8:30.

Mr. MANVILLE. Listen, we don't even know when it's on time any more, frankly.

Mr. CALLOWAY. And you get a lot of by-products from this that are very bad. I mean, your wife is, let's say, meeting you at the station. She doesn't know. She can sit there an hour and—unless she's lucky—she will never hear if the train is late, or why it is. What happened. And it makes a great deal of anxiety on the part of the women and some, I suppose, on the part of the children.

Mr. MANVILLE. It is the absolute uncertainty that drives everybody nuts. You know, during the war, the best way to keep the enemy tortured, as they will, was to say nothing and to leave them not knowing what is going on instead of giving them the certainty that a guy had been shot down or killed or not killed. I mean, this is more torture than anything else. Without exaggerating too much, our families never know.

Mr. CALLOWAY. And they don't know when there is an accident, they don't know if there is a fire in the tunnel, nobody tells them anything. It is the anxiety on the other end. I don't know what these people do with small children. What do the women do when they hear that a train is delayed for an hour or 2 hours or 3 hours or 4 hours or 5 hours, as it was the other night? What do they do?

Mr. MANVILLE. I'll tell you frankly what they do. They've just given up expecting to eat with their daddies and frankly the kids really show it when you get home. If you don't get home until 9 or 10, they are a mess the next morning, and this goes on 5 days a week. This is exactly what happens.

Mr. KELLY. Time after time when we are stalled on the tracks, we've been through it two or three times in the past 2 weeks, and left there sitting for an hour or 2 hours or more, it almost seems that the crews go out of their way to keep us from receiving any information as to the cause of the delay at all. They actually go and hide in the closets, it seems like.

Mr. MANVILLE. The problem is, even right now in talking about it, we are assuming the fact that breakdowns are normal, that fires are normal, that uncertainty is normal. Why should we accept the fact? Why should we accept the fact that breakdowns are a normal part of running a railroad? I mean we've gotten so used to this horrible delay that we are beginning to talk, well, we've got delays, let's just hear about it.

Mr. KELLY. The New Haven has me conditioned to the point where I would accept a warm car in the winter and a cool one in the summer, and a bench—if it would run on time. That's all I want. And a car that will get me to work on time, and I'll stand literally, or I'll sit on the floor. That's the kind of thing they want.

Mr. ZEGART. Well, if life is so difficult, why don't you live in town?

Mr. MANVILLE. Well, I'd say in our case that is the lesser of two evils. We have to put up with the physical discomfort, leastways we feel that it is important to our children and that is why we are living out here. The education of our children, the climate in which they live—we like the town very much, all of us. I remember one day last summer when we were stalled for change, no air conditioning, we had a hermetically sealed car, we all were absolutely sweltering and we were stalled someplace out in the open sunshine for about 1½ hours and one of the boys on the train, I'll never forget, he said—we all were perspiring, and just dying there, and baking like sardines—"But it's so good for the children."

Mr. ZEGART. What about the railroad itself? What sense do you get out of the railroad coping with this?

Mr. KELLY. I might address myself to that. It's a very frustrating and discouraging picture. Of course, there are evidences of the morale of the railroad which, shall we say, speaks down to the commuters because so many times recently I've had the feeling that the commuter is a person who was left right smack at the bottom of the barrel and I can't explain that. We are considered last in order of importance.

Mr. MANVILLE. I frankly feel that there is a moral deterioration at the top that is reflected in the devil take the note toward the commuter. They don't realize, or refuse to realize, that outside of their bond values and stock values or whatever values they call it down there, the lifeline to our livelihoods and the lifeline which is a connection between New York and our children is just something that is unimportant. This is basically the problem. It is the moral disintegration of the people at the top.

Mr. ZEGART. They say they're broke. This line is broke.

Mr. CALLOWAY. No question about it.

Mr. HUNTLEY. If the passenger is unhappy with the railroad, the railroad has its own problems. It is fighting for survival.

This is a parade of New Haven Railroad employees in Boston, Mass., demonstrating in support of the management of their railroad in an appeal to the State legislature for tax relief. Tax relief—and possibly subsidy—is the New Haven's only hope for, unlike other railroads, its profits from hauling freight do not cover its losses in hauling people.

Mr. ALPERT. Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, my name is George Alpert; I am president of the New Haven Railroad and I appear here in favor of this bill for tax relief. The New Haven Railroad, which has served this area for over a century and a quarter, is in very serious trouble. The patient is sick and there are a number of doctors around who don't seem to know what the ailment is or certainly don't demonstrate any appreciation of it, but are quick to prescribe cures.

The plight of the railroads in America has been the subject of many studies. Studies by congressional committees, by the ICC, by the Department of Commerce on various occasions, and the point of all these studies

has been that there have been great changes in the railroad business in the last quarter of a century or so: the railroads are no longer monopolies. Much of our freight business has gone to the highway; much of our passenger business has gone to the highway and to the air.

Passenger operation, whatever form of transportation you may use, whether it's rail, whether it's rapid transit, whether it's airlines, is a deficit operation. Because of this passenger deficit, ever since I have been president of the railroad, we have been working against a deadline. There hasn't been a day when we could rest comfortably that we were going to survive until the next week.

I have campaigned now for over 5 years—I have been president since January of 1956—and I have campaigned all during that time for equal treatment on every level of government with other forms of transportation. I ask for no gift. I ask for no giveaway. I ask for no favor. I ask for no special privilege. All I ask for is equality. All the railroads need—all we ask—is equal treatment with other forms of transportation. We're entitled to no more. And I can say to you very frankly that we expect no less. If the railroads have outlived their usefulness, if we are to go the way of the covered wagon, well let's call it a day. Let's relegate the railroad to the Smithsonian Institution and have less talk about the necessity for service.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The ceremonial driving of a final spike in an earlier happier day for railroads was the symbol of the opening of a continent. The growing network of rails spanned the country, and raised insignificant hamlets like Chicago and San Francisco into great cities. Wherever the railroad went, there went the flow of American expansion.

The great trains ran everywhere—by the turn of the century there was hardly a community in America more than 20 miles from a railroad station. The stations themselves were more than just stopping places for trains. They brought the world to our doorsteps in the persons of elegant gentry dismounting from the spittooned splendor of the parlor cars—and, if a railroad station was an entrance, it was also a gateway. The trains almost demanded that we use them to move out over the old boundaries—and, as we did so, a collection of small provinces became joined into a great nation. In many ways, the steam locomotive and its train of cars are a more accurate symbol for the growth and development of America than the covered wagon.

For most of the 19th and well into the 20th century, there was a romantic attachment between Americans and their railroads. There was no love lost on the big corporations that owned, manipulated and exploited them—that cast the railroads into the role of inconstant and overbearing suitors. The love affair was between people and trains. Thomas Wolfe captured the mood of America when he wrote:

"Brother, have you heard the thunder of the fast express? The names of the mighty rails that bind the Nation, the wheeled thunder of the names that net the continent: the Pennsylvania, the Union Pacific, the Santa Fe, the Baltimore & Ohio, the Chicago & North Western, the Southern, the Louisiana & Northern, the Seaboard, the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul, the Lackawanna, the New York, New Haven & Hartford, the Florida East Coast, the Rock Island, and the Denver & Rio Grande.

"Brother, the names of the engines, the engineers, and the sleeping cars: the great engines of the Pacific type, the articulated Mallets with three sets of eight-yoked driving wheels, the 400-ton thunderbolts with J. T. Cline, T. J. MacRae, and the demon hawk eyes of H. D. Campbell on the rails. Trains cross the continent in a swirl of dust and thunder, the leaves fly down the tracks behind them: the great trains cleave through gulch and gully, they rumble with spoked thunder on the bridges over the brown wash of mighty rivers, they toil through hills, they skirt the rough brown stubble of shorn fields, they whip past empty stations in the little towns and their great stride pounds its even pulse across America."

Today, the great days are over; this is one of the famous trains of the American past on its last run: the Nelly Bly. The Nelly went into service in 1887 as a fast express between New York and Atlantic City.

In her prime, the Nelly Bly often hauled over 500 vacationers in 17 coaches and 2 diners—but in her last days her 2 remaining coaches averaged but 12 people.

[Singing.]

"Nelly Bly, Nelly Bly, never give a sigh,
Never let a teardrop in the corner of your eye.
Nelly Bly sings a song like a turtle dove.
You heard it in the pasture and you heard it in the grove.

"Hey Nelly, Ho Nelly, listen love to me.
I'll play for you and sing for you
A dulcem melody.

"Hey Nelly, Ho Nelly, listen love to me.
I'll play for you and sing for you
A dulcem melody."

Mr. HUNTLEY. The Nelly Bly is one of more than 5,000 trains that have vanished forever from the American landscape. Gone, probably forever, are the Hustler, the Royal Blue, the Honeymoon Express, the Gulf Coast Rebel, the State of Maine and dozens like them.

There are no passenger trains at all on the Lehigh Valley, the Maine Central, the Tennessee Central, the St. Louis Southwestern, the Norfolk Southern, the Western Maryland, and many others.

The little branch lines have almost completely dried up, and so have some of the main lines: you cannot ride the railroad to Bangor, Maine; to Bennington or Manchester, Vt.; to Ithaca, N.Y.; Annapolis, Md.; to Gettysburg, Pa.; or to hundreds of communities like them.

Passenger service has even dried up in whole States, most notably Maine, which has no trains at all between its cities. South Dakota is in a similar position and so are portions of other States. Indeed the great days are over.

It has been said that if American passenger trains continue to disappear at their present rate, there will be none left by 1970. However that may be, many experts agree that the decline of the passenger railroad is of considerably more than sentimental significance, particularly to the two-thirds of the American people living in our urban areas.

We will examine this growing transportation crisis after this message.

Passenger railroads are disappearing—of that there can be no doubt. But the question might legitimately be asked: who needs them? To get the answer, we are going to several places around the country where the impact of this question is being felt. We start in the past, here in Pennsylvania Station, with a trip from New York to Chicago.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Thirty years ago, traveling to Chicago on the Broadway Limited from Pennsylvania Station or on the 20th Century from Grand Central was an experience in luxury. Leaving at 6 p.m., and arriving at 9 the next morning, these were the most famous and glamorous trains in the world. On board, a variety of personal services was available—barbershop, manicurist, hairdresser, and a dozen other special attentions matched only by the finest hotels.

Even President Franklin Delano Roosevelt was said to have remarked that, to him, the ultimate in gracious living was to ride in a pullman—and especially to sit in the dining car and watch the scenery go by while being served in front of a snowy white tablecloth. Today, the trains still run from New York to Chicago. The red carpet is gone for passengers coming aboard the 20th Century. It is still considered a good train, and some of the old niceties are still observed. But, for many of the people to whom the ride was once a thrill, the feeling is no longer the same—nor is the reason for being there.

PASSENGER. Well, I travel, I'm on this train because the weather canceled me out of an airplane ride—which is quicker to Chicago, so I could be rested for tomorrow. I travel all over the country and find that an airplane, in spite of weather, gets me there faster and more comfortably.

Mr. ZEGART. For you two men this is emergency travel.

PASSENGER. It's emergency travel for me.

PASSENGER. Normally I wouldn't be aboard this thing. I would much prefer being on a plane because you could be there in 2 hours and get a good night's rest at the hotel, whereas aboard the train, I know I won't sleep all night.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The decline of the passenger train was inevitable—the jet is faster and more glamorous, the automobile more convenient. But there are many who feel that the railroad industry itself—labor as well as management—contributed to that decline.

FEMALE PASSENGER. Oh, I think the service in the train is good. The service I find inconvenient is the way you have to get your tickets. When we anticipated taking this trip, we went to our agent, travel agent, in New Rochelle, and said, "We want to go on the 20th Century to Chicago on Sunday night." And he said, "Oh, we can't sell you tickets for that, you have to go directly to the railroad." Well, we phoned the railroad, and I must say the gentleman was very accommodating on the other end, but it meant that we had to make a trip into New York on a day prior to our taking off—so that turned out to be a great inconvenience.

PASSENGER. Well, I don't want to be critical of the railroad, but I called the station a number of times just to try to get a reservation, and I thought maybe they had gone out of business because it was so long before we got an answer. Finally someone—and really it was an inconvenience. Now, you don't get that kind of a setup with the airplanes because they are really alert, alive and active, and looking for business. The railroads seem to be somewhat indifferent as to whether people are going to patronize them or not. I think there has to be a resurgence in spirit and service and in many other directions. That's one of the reasons that I believe the railroads really have been hit.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Prof. Stanley Berge of Northwestern University, a specialist in transportation.

Professor BERGE. I look at management of different kinds of transportation. My job is to teach business administration as it applies to the transportation industry. It does rather surprise me to see the contrasts in the managerial techniques employed by railroads, airlines, motor carriers, and so forth. I do think that if I could make one constructive suggestion to the railroad industry, it would be that they use more long-term planning than they do now. I think that some railroads have long-term planning and research, actually going on full time. Other railroads are sort of leading—are sort of in the dark from day to day. They are planning for next week—but not for 10 years from now. What I would like to see on

every railroad is a vice president in charge of 1980.

Mr. HUNTLEY. George Cahill, a railroad labor union official—

Mr. CAHILL. If certain heads of the railroads would realize that they're now in a competitive form of industry and they have to go and compete with other forms of transportation like they have in years gone by—I think this would be a much better place to work. Such as we have them, every so often they become economy minded and the first thing they do is take off a train. When you take off a train, you lose business. Some of the reasons for this diminishing passenger service and freight business is because certain financier have come into this industry and have tried to milk it instead of trying to improve the business.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Lewis Mumford, a noted pioneer in urban and regional planning—

Mr. MUMFORD. First of all, the railroad has been unprogressive in its technological development—they introduced the streamlined train in the 1930's, but the streamlined locomotive had already been invented in 1865 and it took them all that time to realize that there was a technological advantage in streamlining, and so they have been very slow and the unions have been slow too in adapting themselves to the new conditions, they need a more flexible service, they shouldn't have to run a 10-car train when they only need a 3-car train, they should, if they have a more flexible service and fewer passengers, run more trains and less cars, instead of fewer trains and more cars. There are a hundred ways in which they have gone to sleep on the job and they needed a jolt to wake them up and frankly this jolt has been so severe it looks as though it might kill them.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the powerful Senate Commerce Committee—

Senator MAGNUSON. It has been said that railroad management is bad. Now just where you point your finger, to what president, or what railroad, is a difficult thing. It would be like me going by an unpainted house—a rundown house—and I might suggest the management is bad inside but I don't know whether the wife didn't want to spend the money for the paint or the husband could have been out of a job and didn't have the money to paint. Now this is the problem that you run into. The railroads can do a lot though, I think, in saying to themselves and making a decision that they are going to; that passenger traffic, passenger trains are still a part of the railroad system; still necessary in the United States; that not continue with the philosophy that passenger traffic is something we want to get rid of, because freight is the big bulk of their revenue. In other words just cast it aside, and once they make up their collective minds to that, they're going to do something about it themselves. And the Government's going to aid them.

Mr. HUNTLEY. One railroad that seems to have made up its collective mind to do something about passenger service is the Chicago & North Western. It is providing the passengers on its 3 Chicago commuter lines with some 200 new trains of an advanced design which are both more efficient and more comfortable than the equipment they replaced.

FEMALE PASSENGER. The way it used to be we were late in the morning, usually a half an hour; in the evening we were much later, often 40 minutes, 50 minutes, 60 minutes; now we are not only on time, but we are usually 2 minutes ahead of time in Chicago every morning. Of course, another thing that impresses me is the clean cars; now I can even wear a white coat to work.

FEMALE PASSENGER. And we don't get wet when it rains, either. The windows used to stick—we couldn't get them open, then we couldn't get them closed, and it was—what it was doing outside, it did inside too.

MALE PASSENGER. The windows would rattle, the birds would practically fly through the train when it stopped at a station—as a matter of fact, it was very unpleasant.

PASSENGER. Occasionally a rock. [Laughter.]

PASSENGER. Art here has been riding for 39 years so he probably knows more of the facts.

PASSENGER. I started at Irving Park about 39 years ago and then we moved to Park Ridge and I rode from Park Ridge and then to Burlington but I have seen a conversion of—oh, from the wooden coaches to a steel coach, and then to those with the dome roofs, but they can't compare with this new coach that they now have; it has good lighting and good air.

As far as the service is concerned, you have a train running every hour—both ways—on the Wisconsin Division that I know of and I believe for one my wife has taken the train in the last several weeks over and above a comparison of some time ago when she used to drive in all the time, just for the convenience of it. It's true that there are local stops all up and down the line, up until about 4:30 in the afternoon, when the expresses start running for long-distance commuters, but for the most part I think that you'll find the gals—especially during the winter time, on account of weather—are starting to take the train into town to do a little shopping instead of getting into the car and driving over to the various shopping centers.

PASSENGER. If you're gonna take the car in the morning, where are you gonna park? Parking in the loop—it's a premium—it's very expensive—it's terrific to get in—you drive all over trying to get a parking space—even in the city parking lots.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Despite the highway beside its tracks, the Chicago & North Western's commuter traffic continues to increase, a source of some satisfaction to its chairman, Ben W. Heineman.

Mr. HEINEMAN. In 1956, when new management came to this railroad, we had a fairly typical commuter problem: we had steam engines, we had dirty and old coaches, and our suburban schedules were not completely reliable. We concluded that we were going to have to put this service on a basis that would enable it to compete with new expressways which were then being planned or constructed. We also needed the assistance of regulatory commissions in giving management freedom, or relative freedom, to undertake these necessary changes. We obtained this from our regulatory commission here in Illinois and on the basis of that we went ahead, we purchased some $43 million worth of new equipment, we modernized it completely, with air-conditioned modern cars, push-pull equipment of the new design. And today we believe that we have some 40,000 satisfied commuters each day, each way, that we have made a contribution to the community, and in addition, we have converted losses of some $2½ million a year from our suburban operations to a very small profit.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Today, in sharp distinction to the rest of the Nation's railroads, the Chicago & North Western carries more passengers into the city than at any time in its 113-year history. To the multitudes in other large cities, who fight their way in and out every day in increasing numbers, the experience of the Chicago & North Western suggests at least a partial answer to what has become a major transportation problem. Among those who have been concerned in this problem is HARRISON WILLIAMS, U.S. Senator from New Jersey.

Senator WILLIAMS. Certainly it is true that we face a desperate crisis in transportation in our country today. Right now two-thirds of the people in this country are living in metropolitan areas. It soon will be 75 percent of our people are living in metropolitan areas. Twice a day, in these metropolitan areas, everybody's going the same place—they're going to work from home in the morning, and then from work to home in the evening—and we know that because we have not met the problem of moving these people efficiently, effectively, we have got ourselves in a state of paralysis. Out of traffic jams alone in this country today we lose from $5 billion to $6 billion a year. We used to move people rather effectively on rails all over the country. Out in Los Angeles they used to have the interurban. In New York, New Jersey, we used to have efficient mass-transit on commuter railroads but throughout the country we see a deterioration has set in ever since World War II; and rail lines have been abandoned or service has been discontinued or has been set back; and we have, as a nation, tried to meet our metropolitan transit rush-peak hours through the automobile and on the highway.

Mr. HUNTLEY. This is Los Angeles, Calif., the city which more than any other has come to rely on the automobile and the highway.

Governor Edmund Brown—

Governor BROWN. Well, here in Los Angeles, you see all these automobiles one right after another, bumper to bumper, and we're trying to do the best we can. We have the best freeway system in the entire United States, but it just isn't enough. We're going to have 5 million more people and then think what the situation will be here with 5 million more automobiles, and we have one automobile for almost every person in the State. Think what the situation will be when that happens.

We have a budget here in this State of $2,600 million. A third of it goes into freeways, city and county roads, just to take care of these people, and we have other great needs.

Eighty percent of them have one person in the car, maybe ninety percent. It means congestion, bumper-to-bumber traffic, slowness in getting to work, delays, vexations, having to leave an hour—and in some cases an hour and a half—from their homes to get where they want to go. It just means locked up in a car an hour in the morning, an hour at night, it means accidents, highways, congestion in the courts due to traffic accidents, it's just not good living in this modern day.

You understand, too, when you build a freeway, an eight-lane freeway, you have to take all sorts of land off the tax rolls; you have to take buildings and homes and take them away, and these are off the tax rolls which increases the taxes on the houses that are left. All of these automobiles have to park someplace; they are put into parking lots that don't produce as much money in taxes as a fine building, or a department store, all of this has a countereffect on the financing of a city or county. It has an effect on the taxes that each individual pays. It has a destructive effect in every way and we must do something about it.

We have to have a system of interlocking mass rail transportation moving in the areas where people want to go. They will still have to use their automobiles, but if we have fast, comfortable and expeditious mass rail transportation, speedy, getting them there quickly, then we'll begin to make some progress in this area and people will begin to live again. It actually means freedom of the individual, freedom to do some of the things that a free citizen wants to do with his life; he doesn't want to be caged in an automobile 2 hours of every day of his life; he might just as well be in jail as be moving in an automobile 2 hours of every day of his life.

Mr. HUNTLEY. Ironically, Los Angeles once had a flourishing system of rail transportation—the 900 red cars of the Pacific Electric Railway running over 1,100 miles of track that made up the most complete network of interurban electric railway service in the country. But one by one as highways grew, the rail lines vanished. Only a few weeks ago, the red car line running from Long Beach to Los Angeles was closed down. It was the first line in the system, and the last to go—and this is its final run.

CONDUCTOR. I sure hate that they're discontinuing these red cars here. People wanted rapid transit and they had it—and now its sure a shame that they're going off.

PASSENGER. All this has got to go for progress but I think that it's a mistake because the bus has got to run on the freeway and the roads and the cars here have their right of way right on through to the beach.

PASSENGER. I'm an engineer and I've made an extensive study of rapid transit systems and the biggest mistake was when they first abandoned the Glendale-Burbank line. And let these rights-of-way revert. Now it's going to be terrifically expensive to ever get adequate rights-of-way for an efficient transportation system.

PASSENGER. It almost sends a chill up my spine to think that this is the end and that there will be no more in the future.

Mr. HUNTLEY. At his home in Amenia, N.Y., Lewis Mumford reflects on transportation and people.

Mr. MUMFORD. The average man hasn't very much choice left in the world and therefore anything that gives him a slight amount of choice he regards as important for his well-being. And I think he still feels that the motorcar gives him more freedom than he gets on the public transportation system. In the beginning, I think the automobile was not really a symbol of liberation but was a fact of liberation and it was a wonderful thing if you owned a car and could go out over the bumpy dirt roads into the country than to have advantages that you'd only dreamed about before. As a symbol of liberation, the automobile still remains; as a fact it has become just the opposite of what the dream meant it to be.

Mr. ZEGART. What are the consequences? Where are we headed? Are we still seeing all the dimensions of where we're going if this kind of thing persists?

Mr. MUMFORD. No; I don't think we have even begun to see the dimensions because we are allowing our cities, for example, to be scattered over hundreds of square miles and people are attempting to—without realizing what they're doing—to keep up a very complex and closely interrelated civilization with very primitive facilities. Our facilities are getting more and more primitive every day. The local facilities, while the large-scale facilities are becoming more technologically refined and more elegant, the jetplane will get our letters across the continent in 6 hours but the Post Office Department, using its motortrucks, takes 2 days to get them up from New York. People don't realize that we've gone backward incredibly during the last 50 years in all our local facilities. What we need is a balanced system of transportation, one which would take care of all our transportation needs; which goes beyond the use of the motorcar alone, which goes beyond the use of the private vehicle alone. We need public transportation; we need private transportation; we need the pedestrian; we need the motor road; we need the railroads; we need the plane, and we need the jetplane. But we mustn't think purely in terms of speed or purely in terms of popularity. We are treating a railroad system as if it were a disposable container we have stopped drinking from for the moment and we're letting it go. But it's very likely that within another 10 years we will have to reinvent the railroad system in order to perform the functions that no other form of transportation does. And when we do it, we'll do it at a colossal cost compared to the cost of keeping up the present system.

Mr. HUNTLEY. One city that is proposing, in effect, to reinvent the railroad is San Francisco. An ambitious and far-ranging plan, costing over a billion dollars and involving five counties, goes before the voters next year.

General Manager John Peirce, of the Bay Area Rapid Transit District——

Mr. PEIRCE. We in the San Francisco Bay area are planning a regional system of rail rapid transit to relieve the growing problem of traffic congestion. Traffic congestion today is very difficult and very serious. Our principal concern is what is going to happen 10 or 20 or 30 years from today as our population doubles or trebles. Now, in this rapid transit system that we are planning, the key link in the system is an underwater tube connecting downtown San Francisco with downtown Oakland.

Now, this tube will pass under the existing Oakland-San Francisco Bay Bridge. It'll be approximately 4 miles in length and through the use of this means, high-speed trains will be able to travel at top speeds of 80 miles an hour connecting the two principal cities in this area and this distance can be bridged in about 8 minutes. At the present time, with traffic congestion at it is, it takes approximately 45 minutes during congested hours or rush hours to bridge this same distance. When this line reaches Oakland, one branch will go north to Richmond and the University of California; another line will go easterly in the Contra Costa County and a third line will go south toward San Jose.

Now, coming back to San Francisco, to the south will be a line going down the peninsula towards San Jose and eventually reaching San Jose. Then to the north a line will go across the Golden Gate Bridge into Marin County. Now, that bridge is at the present time a vehicular bridge, but we propose to build a lower deck to accommodate these high-speed trains. I'd like to point out that part of these lines will be below ground in subways, part will be at grade—but grade separated—and a part will be on graceful aerial structures, attractive to the eye and practically noiseless, without any interference from surface traffic and without contributing surface congestion.

So there you have a five-county regional system of rail rapid transit capable of moving vast numbers of people economically, efficiently, and in competition with the automobile, and that is the secret of success, because if we do not plan a facility that will lure people out of their automobiles they may continue to use those automobiles to the extent that they possibly can. So this is the obvious answer, and we are confident that in the next 10 years when this system is built, we will have something that will indicate to metropolitan America an answer to traffic congestion which has arisen out of the popularity of the automobile.

Mr. HUNTLEY. While San Francisco's ambitious transit plan represents the possibilities of tomorrow, this is the reality of today—not building, but dismantling.

This is the burial of passenger service on the West Shore Division of the New York Central Railroad, a once flourishing commuter line serving New York City, which gradually surrendered over the years to the automobile.

Four former passenger conductors recall the circumstances of its departure.

FIRST CONDUCTOR. The railroad was selling the commuters down the river. These commuters would ask their friends to ride this railroad and their friends would say, "What?" They'd be delayed, they'd be held up by a freight train, they would—the railroad did nothing in the past 15 years to encourage commuting travel. They would—did everything in their power to ruin commuting travel and abolish and take off trains, in the past 15 years.

SECOND CONDUCTOR. A lot of these passengers, I knew their families, I knew their wives, I knew their children when they went to work. The children I used to take to school on the trains. These men eventually, these schoolchildren, eventually became commuters and they complained, told me their problems, that they didn't get to work. But instead of meeting this competition, so-called competition, and trying to make the railroad more efficient, they just ignored these people.

THIRD CONDUCTOR. I don't say they'd all quit at once, but you'd lose 5 or 6 this month and 10 next month and the first you know the train was gone, the people were gone.

Mr. HUNTLEY. The employees of the division feel that discontinuing the West Shore line was a mistake, and so, apparently, does the president of the railroad itself, Alfred Perlman.

Mr. PERLMAN. I have said right along that New York is committing suicide. There are eight different authorities just to handle vehicular traffic in the metropolitan area. No one of whom reports to another. This is chaotic here. I agree with you that this is crazy but as a man who must report to my board of directors and say, "Can I spend a hundred million dollars on commuter cars," when the State says I can't make a profit, this is a different thing. But all I'm saying is, from the standpoint of the city itself—where there isn't a coordinated plan on where to use rubber, where to use air, where to use steel, rail, in their best functions—I just think it's stupid.

Mr. HUNTLEY. It would seem that there is indeed something irrational about a situation in which a railroad discontinues a service because it is losing money—rips up the rails and sells the stations—while its president agrees that the abandoned line could perform a vital function for the people of a major city. And yet this is not surprising.

As a recent report made for the Senate committee stated: "The problems of the commuter railroad are not an isolated disease; they are symptoms of deep-seated deficiencies in urban transportation. Instead of having planned and coordinated systems for moving people by public and private means, we have a jumble of bits and pieces, all built without planning and without rational integration and coordination of services. The basic function of urban transportation systems is to move people; the basic function of cities is to provide a place for people to live and work with comfort and convenience. We have tended to lose sight of these fundamentals in the auto age and have concentrated on moving and storing vehicles to the exclusion of analyzing the functional transportation problem and taking appropriate action."

We began this NBC white paper with railroads and we find that we have ended with cities. Primarily, this is where the future of the passenger railroad seems to lie. The problem is to insure that future by making some sense in the present.

This is Chet Huntley.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is a commonplace of the current debate on Federal assistance to education that the question before us

is, not whether there shall be Federal assistance, but of what kind. Many speakers on the floor and before the subcommittee have stressed the multitude of educational and quasi-educational programs in which the Federal Government has had a direct interest since the founding of the Republic. We are all aware of the action by the Federal Government which reserved one section in every township for the endowment of schools in the territories, a program which began in 1785. Over the following century and a half the Federal Government has had an interest in many educational programs, the earliest of which supported education connected with the common defense. The establishment of the Military Academy at West Point in 1802, and subsequent Academy programs in other services, the education of the civilian population during the Second World War, were other programs relating to the national defense. The culmination of this effort came with the passage of the 1958 National Defense Education Act. The Federal Government has supported education efforts in special Federal jurisdictions dating from assistance to the District of Columbia in 1804, and extended in a number of areas as military posts, Indian reservations, national parks, and outlying possessions.

In addition to the early land grants, the Morrill Act of 1862 provided Federal land grants to assist and support colleges teaching agriculture, engineering, and the natural sciences. That program has now, of course, extended to some 68 major universities and colleges, and is an accepted and highly valuable adjunct to our education effort. Then, too, there is in existence a program of Federal assistance to vocational education in the public schools, and Federal educational activities were carried on in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps, which came into being in 1937. Of course, the Serviceman's Readjustment Act, the so-called GI bill of rights, dates from 1944; and under it practically every veteran was eligible for education benefits of unprecedented scope. The so-called impacted areas legislation of 1950 is another major Federal education program which has now been in operation for a decade. Thus, the Federal Government clearly has had an interest in education and a deep commitment to education as long as this Nation has existed. The principle, as we have heard repeatedly in this debate, is not new; and to those who argue that previous Federal programs have been of little significance, allow me to cite a study undertaken last year by the Library of Congress for the House Committee on Education and Labor. Cautioning that it is impossible to obtain precise figures for total Federal expenditures in 1960 for educational or quasi-educational purposes, the Library reaches a figure slightly less than $4 billion. Regardless of the reliability of the total figure, its magnitude indicates clearly that our Federal Government has made a heavy commitment to the principle of Federal assistance.

Surely the early land ordinance and the Morrill Act represented national efforts to meet the national education challenges as they then existed. In the ongoing processes of defining our education goals and problems, a new note of urgency appeared soon after the end of the Second World War, when it soon became apparent that America as a world leader was engaged in an all-out ideological and economic struggle with the Soviet Union. Many Americans saw clearly the close relationship between education and our national survival. Their feeling was expressed well by President Truman in 1949, when he said:

> Education is our first line of defense. In the conflict of principle and policy which divides the world today, America's hope, our hope and the hope of the world is in education—education is the most important task before us.

This perception of the vital role of education today was accompanied by the continuing, deepening concern with which we perceived the advances within the Soviet Union. The then Commissioner of Education, Mr. Lawrence Derthick, reported, after the visit of a group of American educators to Russia in 1958, that—

> What we have seen has amazed us in one outstanding particular. We were simply not prepared for the degree to which the U.S.S.R., as a nation, is committed to education as a means of national advancement. Everywhere we saw indication after indication of what we could only conclude amounted to a total commitment to education.

Then the first Russian sputnik soared aloft in October 1957. This and continuing Soviet scientific advancement led to a spurt of activity and reevaluation of education in the Nation and in Congress. In the 85th Congress alone, 1,500 bills relating at least partially to education were introduced. One product of that activity, of course—and our most concrete response to Soviet challenges—was the National Defense Education Act.

But long before the passage of that act, and with increasing persistence in the recent past, we have heard expressed a concern that our Federal interest in education not be restricted to our national defense or be viewed as simply a strategy of the cold war.

For many years now evidence has been growing that our national needs in the field of education are so intimately tied with our entire national life that it is imperative that we, too, make that total commitment to education. In a persuasive and eloquent foreword to the Ford Foundation Annual Report of 1958–59, Dr. Henry T. Heald had this to say about education:

> What makes education the medium for attainment of the goals of a free society? First, it develops skills to run our enormously intricate economic, social, and political machinery. It also explores ways of solving problems arising from juvenile delinquency, automation, exploding urban growth, and strained community facilities. And it equips the individual to extend his ken beyond his grasp, and beyond his everyday work, the circle of this family and acquaintances, his prejudices and self-interests. Education should encourage both selfishness—responsibility to one's fellow men—and consciousness of self—in the sense of a lifelong effort toward the fullest development of one's own talents and potentialities.
>
> In view of its unmistakable social utility, and what ought to be its pervasiveness in the lives of individuals, it is incongruous that education should be regarded as a special problem on the American scene. It is, rather, the base from which all important problems are to be attacked.

From the noble perspective of this characterization of education it is clear that the legislation now before Congress, while of critical importance to the Nation, is yet only a beginning. Hopefully it is a beginning which will stimulate a broader public understanding of the need, which will lead to increased activity and effort in every State and locality, which will spur higher standards of teaching and more imaginative solutions to the entire range of our educational problems.

Should the Congress of the United States adopt a meaningful and effective bill to provide for the strengthening of general education throughout the Nation, then I take it this achievement in itself will take on an unusual significance—a significance not lost on the Soviet Union. Nor will its significance be lost on Americans who yearn for national greatness. It will not be lost on all those throughout the world who look to America with mixed hope and trepidation. In so doing, we shall make a start on a number of problems, some of which are only dimly seen at present, and none of which can be met effectively without a total effort extending far beyond this Federal assistance.

But the rapid changes of the past decades have brought such problems increasingly and imperatively to our attention. In a number of areas it is clear that immediate solutions are in order. One such problem is the growing need to conserve our human resources. Over the last century we have manifested our concern to conserve our fuels, our wildlife, our forests, and our fields. Recently, we have started to realize that our vast metropolitan communities represent a natural resource that must be husbanded.

When a young boy or a young girl is, by reason of color, doomed to receive only a second-rate education, or an education which forces the following of a narrowly restrictive career, or perhaps prepares for no career, there is a real waste of a priceless human resource. When a young person grows up in a family or in an area that is economically depressed or when the family is spiritually or culturally depressed and cannot raise the child's eyes to the wider horizons of our national life, there is a tragic waste of vital human resources.

In recent years, Congress has reflected our Nation's increasing concern for the national resources represented by our aged and aging citizens—a population group that is growing, whose ranks are increased by progressively younger retirement ages and who suffer from increasingly stringent rules against employing those above age 40. How much thought have we given to education for men and women who reach age 50 or 60, or to making places for them in business or professional endeavors? How much

thought have we given to helping them achieve the needed educational resources which would make the transition from one job to another at an older age something more than the empty and often fruitless search which so often is the case today? More important, how well have our systems of primary and secondary education provided a firm foundation in knowledge and self-discipline which will provide the basis for the older person to combat perhaps the greatest problem of the aged—boredom and the sense of being unwanted.

Persons with physical handicaps, who cannot find satisfactory employment, and qualified women who unsuccessfully seek positions from which women are excluded, represent potential wastes of human resources.

As we once with profligate carelessness ignored the steady drain of our natural resources, we have too frequently ignored the drain of these more precious resources. That such a waste should take place in a democracy whose highest values are the worth and the intrinsic value of every individual is more than simply ironical.

Mr. President, I think the passage of this bill will serve notice on the world that America is moving forward to deal with the complex problems that the 20th century has brought in its train. I have suggested that conservation of human resources is one such problem. Of no less concern to the Nation and to our educators should be the problem of educating for the many—and often bewildering—needs of our rapidly changing and increasingly complex social, technical, and economic institutions. The landmark in this entire field, the Rockefeller 1958 report on education, defines the problem as follows:

> One of the striking features of contemporary life is the growing range and complexity of the tasks on which our social organization depends. This is dramatically apparent in science but is no less a reality in nearly every field of endeavor. It can be seen in the ever-increasing range of skills demanded of the doctor, the teacher, the government administrator, the labor leader, and the business executive.
>
> The reasons are not far to seek. They lie in the explosive rate of technological change and the increasing complexity of our social organization. Not only are the tasks that must be performed to keep our society functioning ever more intricate and demanding, they are constantly changing in character. As a result, we are experiencing a great variety of shortages of human resources in fields requiring high competence and extended training. We are having to become more and more concerned with seeking and cultivating talent. We have become more conscious of the strategic importance of education in our society.

There are many today, for instance, who see in the increasing number of "hard-core" unemployment this very problem amply demonstrated. They cite the fact that in March of this year the unemployment rate of unskilled workers stood at 19 percent, and that of the semiskilled at 12 percent. These compare to 9 percent among skilled workers, 5 percent among clerical employees, and less than 2 percent for technical workers. Is this a temporary problem? I read now from the May 3 issue of the Wall Street Journal:

> "We have found that the unemployment rate among young people who dropped out of school before getting their diplomas is, on the average, about double that among those who finished high school," says Malcolm L. Denise, Ford Motor's vice president in charge of labor relations, "the uneducated worker is a handicapped worker in the truest sense of the word."
>
> A New York employment agency comments: "It boils down to this: Most of the high school dropouts can qualify only for unskilled jobs. That's the group where unemployment already is highest. At the same time employers are upgrading fast in the quality of workers they want and figuring out new ways to do away with low-level jobs."
>
> The Labor Department expects 26 million persons, age 14 to 24, will enter the labor force in the 1960's. That's almost 40 percent more young workers than entered the labor market in the 1950's. Some 70 percent of the new young workers in the 1960's will be high school graduates or better, up from 60 percent in the preceding decade. But, at a time when more employers are requiring job applicants to have at least a high school diploma, 7.5 million or 30 percent of the young people entering the labor force during the 1960's will not have completed high school, the Labor Department estimates. Some 2.5 million of these won't even have a grade school education.

Mr. President, I have talked of the absolutely imperative need to conserve our human resources, and of the compelling need to relate our educational programs to the needs of a social, economic, and technical society, daily growing more complex, more interrelated, daily demanding higher standards of education. In my judgment, there is growing awareness of these problems, which call for our best efforts and our most imaginative solutions. I have suggested that the passage of this historic legislation in itself will symbolize our national willingness to come to grips with these matters.

Parenthetically, I must state my conviction that the record written by the Education Subcommittee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished and dedicated senior Senator from Oregon, will add significantly to that awareness. The record is lucid, detailed, and penetrating. It comprises a compendium of America's best thought in this field. It has played a vital role in moving toward the final passage of this epochal legislation.

Senator MORSE and his associates and Secretary Ribicoff and his staff have earned the deep gratitude of all who support this vital program.

As the discussion of the administration's school bill has gone forward this year, I have found that many of the objections raised against the bill are of ancient lineage—arguments we have all heard propounded for many years. I find something reassuring in this, a sense that no matter what changes take place in a changing world, no matter what crises shake the entire human community, or no matter what new needs or what new hopes, appear, the arguments in opposition to Federal aid to education at last remain stable and unshaken. In my State, for instance, the school discussion has led to the refurbishing of the argument which many of our tax-conscious friends like to promulgate: That under an equalization grant formula, the States which enjoy a higher per capita income are penalized. I sometimes wonder whether the local affiliates of these tax groups exert the same dedicated efforts to bring this message to their membership in the low-income States.

In any case, a few words on this subject seem in order, because in my State, and, I presume, in several other relatively high income States, this argument has been heard with frequency and at length. It seems to me, Mr. President, that many news sources who bring a sophisticated and critical view to other areas of our national life seem to retain a childlike simplicity in dealing with the stories conscientiously forwarded to them by the tax groups. Clearly the story is not as simple as the tax folks say it is; and certainly the basic argument—always implied, never fully expressed—that States should receive funds in direct ratio to the Federal tax revenue they collect, can only, with the utmost charity, be called oversimplified.

We have heard the argument: a percentage figure representing each State's proportionate contribution in Federal taxes is applied to the total Federal grant assistance received by all States. The percentage each State is allegedly entitled to, on the basis of its proportionate tax contribution, is then applied to the total grant figure. Then comes the climactic finding: the so-called poorer States receive proportionately more than their alleged share, and the so-called rich States receive less. Let me hasten to say that the tax groups have always, to my knowledge, used accurate figures; and the formula they used for allocating Federal tax income among the States seems about as good as any other that can be devised in an area where one simply cannot accurately identify the source of all receipts. No, the trouble is not the figures used; it is the procedure of blindly taking a part of the total story, and excluding everything else. To divorce a tax structure from the program is meaningless. The tax structure exists because of the national needs the program is trying to meet. We might as well try to understand nutrition by consulting the prices on a menu. Tax structures are of obvious importance in meaningful discussions of national needs, but to discuss only the tax structure means that any such discussion will be meaningless.

Certainly one of the functions of education is to encourage among young and growing minds an attitude of careful reasoning and of objective consideration of all the facts. An education that is not aimed toward liberation of the individual from the tyranny of the mythologies which so many are so willing to impress upon the receptive mind, is not entitled to the name of education. Perhaps the things that have been said in opposition to the education bill are the best arguments we could cite for the need for a

more intensified, more imaginative, more disciplined, and more comprehensive educational effort.

Even if the discussion is limited only to Federal grants, the argument does not hold water. What State would like to qualify for more grant assistance under the Federal program of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the permanently and totally disabled, aid to the blind, services for crippled children, child welfare services? Grants to my State of New Jersey for these programs are less than the average State's per capita grant. They could increase that grant—by encouraging more human misery. Needless to say, I know my State can always use less of these kinds of grants.

But what the tax folks seldom report is the total impact of Federal programs on any given State. It happens, for instance, that my State of New Jersey received, in 1958, $1,057,900,000 in military procurements, substantially above the national average. Its assistance from the Small Business Administration ranks substantially above average. An industrialized State such as New Jersey benefits uniquely from all the Federal programs that provide assistance to business; for instance, the many programs of the Business and Defense Services Administration and the Office of Business Economics.

An industrialized State and its economy are vitally concerned with research. The work done by the National Bureau of Standards in developing methods of measurement and instrumentation and the work of the National Science Foundation, and the Atomic Energy Commission in the fields of research, fellowship, and assistance programs are today major factors in industrial States, and make disproportionate contributions to such State and their industries and citizens.

In fact, every operating component of the Federal Government has an impact on our States. In the fiscal year 1958, a total of $80,490 million was expended by the Federal Government in the various States, according to an authoritative study by the Library of Congress. That study earmarked $76,063 million in Federal tax receipts by States. The expenditures in the States averaged $233 for each $1,000 in personal income, for the Nation at large. In my State, the figure was $204—not an outrageous disparity. Federal tax collections average $220 per $1,000 of personal income, throughout all the States. Interestingly enough, my State contributed less than that amount—an average of $217. In short, the total figures indicate that the so-called rich States benefit directly and specifically from Federal programs, and within a range that is much narrower than for grant programs alone.

But even if so-called State tax burdens and expenditures matched perfectly, dollar for dollar, about all one could conclude was that the national interest had been totally lost sight of in the process.

This bill, Mr. President, aims at strengthening an America whose strength lies in its 50 States. It aims at benefiting the education of our young people, whose needs and aspirations have little to do with the States in which they happen to live.

Perhaps the most concise summary of the virtues of the grant that is tailored to meet varying conditions can be found in the report to President Eisenhower, made in 1955 by the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It says:

> Where aid is determined to be necessary, the National Government's conditional grants represent a basically sound technique, despite their piecemeal development and hodgepodge appearance. It is the only technique that is in any sense self-limiting, both as to objectives and amounts of expenditure and as to the extent and nature of national control. When Federal aid is directed toward specific activities, it is possible to observe the effects of each grant, to evaluate the progress of aided activities, and to relate the amount of financial assistance to needs. There is more assurance that Federal funds will be used to promote the Nation's primary interests. Finally, the direct control exercised by the National Government is confined to limited and well-defined governmental activities, leaving other areas of State and local responsibility relatively unaffected.

That is the case for flexible grant programs, and the case is a good one. I am convinced that all Americans who understand the issue and who want to understand it see this program as the single feasible method of dealing with a complex of problems on which such work is now too long delayed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, although I have urged the recognition of the national interest in several areas, and have discussed the question of States' equity, I must emphasize my conviction that, in the final analysis, Federal aid to education must be reflected in the individual classrooms. Whether a Federal aid program will be successful, whether it will act as the catalyst that leads to a renewed national effort, ultimately depends upon the teachers and on the children being taught. Despite the complexities of many aspects of this issue, the end result desired is clear: It is a program in which a respected, imaginative, and talented teacher teaches a child who wants to learn and is free to learn.

That child is the focus of our effort—an effort which I have not seen better expressed than in the Rockefeller report, which says:

> A democracy is the only form of society that puts at the very top of its agenda the opportunity of the individual to develop his potentialities. It is the declared enemy of every condition that stunts the intellectual, moral, and spiritual growth of the individual. No society has ever fully succeeded in living up to the stern ideals that a free people set themselves. But only a free society can even address itself to that demanding task.
>
> It is in this context that we consider the subject of individual excellence. To be sure, conditions in the world require that we think in terms of our performance as a Nation. But in its deepest sense our concern for human excellence is a reflection of our ideal of the overriding importance of human dignity. It is not a means but an end. It expresses our notion of what constitutes a good life and our ultimate values.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is with some trepidation that I presume to undertake to address the Senate at this late hour. However, I shall do so in the desire to expedite the transaction of the business of the Senate on tomorrow.

PROGRESS AND STATE OF EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Mr. President, the first general Federal aid to education bill was introduced in 1870. Since then, numerous bills of this sort have been introduced in both Houses of Congress.

All of them have been rejected by Congress as unneeded and unwise. America chose to go forward under the independent school district system, together with a measure of State participation, as it exists today.

Under this plan, the Nation has fashioned and developed a splendid educational system. It is not perfect. It is not even adequate. It can be improved a great deal. It should be expanded and brought up considerably. But when we say that improvements and expansion are needed, it does not necessarily follow that Federal aid is the route by which this should be done.

In fact, I rise in opposition to the present bill, and with the hope that it will be rejected for the same historical reasons that heretofore have prevailed—namely, that it is unneeded and unwise.

In spite of the heavy load placed on our schools during the past 15 years, they have made tremendous strides toward eliminating whatever educational deficiences may have existed. The demands have been made most severe because of a tremendous population growth, a large shifting of school population, changes in teaching methods, and an even greater shifting of the courses taught.

This challenge has been met by the local communities by accepting the responsibility that is rightfully theirs for improving educational operations and bringing them up to an adequate level.

President Kennedy stated in his message to Congress on education, on February 20:

> Our progress in education over the last generations has been substantial. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competency than any country on earth. One-fourth of our total population is enrolled in our schools and colleges. This year $26 billion will be spent on education alone * * *.

Again, I want to say that this does not mean that further improvements cannot be made. It does not mean that greater expansion is not needed. In fact, both are necessary; and we must constantly strive for greater excellence and for even more effective educational methods and plans.

However, the President's statement definitely indicates that our position and progress have been very good indeed; and certainly we find them a source of pride in the present system, which historically has been accepted as the proper one for the educational field.

SO-CALLED UNMET NEEDS

Many volumes have been published and many orations have been delivered

on the subject of the unmet needs in education.

Upon reading the facts and figures which are purported to prove this point, the speakers and the writers inform us that only from Federal aid can we obtain any improvement. No reference is made to what the people have been doing for themselves and for their schools, or to the vast progress made in the last 15 years and the successful meeting of the school crises since World War II ended.

My purpose in these remarks is to discuss briefly, first, the proposition that all our needs in the field of education can be met properly and effectively by our present system; and, second, the proposition that the proposals contained in S. 1021 are unwise, and should not be enacted into law.

WHAT THE BILL PROVIDES

Senate bill 1021, as reported by the committee, authorizes Federal grants to States for public grade schools and high schools, for the payment of teachers' salaries, for the building of public school facilities, and for special educational projects. It calls for $850 million a year, for 3 years.

The division of this money among the States is to be made by means of a very complicated formula, based on the number of schoolchildren 5 to 17 years of age, inclusive, and on the State's total personal income per school-age child.

In order to receive the full benefits, a State must maintain at least its present level of school expenditures, and as time goes on the State will be required to increase its own expenditures. Each State must use 10 percent of its Federal allotment to pay part of the costs of "pilot demonstrations or experimental projects of local educational agencies." A detailed description of such experimental projects is set out in the bill.

In order to qualify for an allotment, each State must file an application, to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, and must make and continue certain assurances, specifications, criteria, procedures, and so forth, which are described in greater detail in about three printed pages of the bill.

There are other projects, but the foregoing are the highlights.

WHAT ARE PRESENT NEEDS?

Before considering the vices attaching to the program of federalizing our schools, I should like to inquire into the represented inadequacies of our schools and the capabilities of our independent school districts to met them.

FUTURE CLASSROOM NEEDS

In his February message on education, President Kennedy stated:

> In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years.

The President's recommendation will more than take care of classroom needs, in view of downward population trends.

It is now clear that the worst of the population bulge is over. In the 1950's there was a 44-percent increase in enrollment. In the 1960's, it is scheduled to decrease 20 percent.

Hence, the President's goal is well within the proven capabilities of our present fashion of handling schoolroom construction.

The fact is that during the past 5 years, the new classrooms put in use have averaged 70,000 a year, or 10,000 a year more than the average which President Kennedy says will be necessary during the 1960's. For the entire decade 1950 to 1960, this average was 60,000 new classrooms a year.

The 1950's were years of a spectacular expansion of school-age population. Yet the load was well handled by the independent and local school districts. And there is no indication of a slowdown. In fact, the U.S. Department of Commerce estimates that school construction will increase by 8 percent in 1961, over that in 1960. This estimate is based upon the number of school bonds voted and on other factors which in the past have proved reliable. It is reported that in 1960–61, a record high of more than $3 billion in capital outlay will be reached.

For the past 5 years, the enrollment increase in the public schools was about 1.2 million each year.

After 1965, the increase each year will be reduced by one-half; in other words, the increase will be about 600,000 a year—not because the entering classes will be smaller, but because the difference between the size of the entering classes and the size of the graduating classes will be less and less, as the war and the postwar babies start to graduate.

Recently, there has been much scare talk about classroom needs. Efforts have been made to build up a hysteria on the basis of "a population explosion."

For example, in 1954 the U.S. Commissioner of Education testified before a congressiona' committee that the total shortage of classrooms was 370,000. Other officials predicted it would rise to about 600,000 within 3 years.

The present figure for 1960, as stated by the Office of Education, is 142,000 rooms; but even this figure is seriously challenged as inaccurate and too high.

In any event, the Bureau of Census population projections prove that the worst of the big enrollment expansion in public schools is almost over. The growth will now be on a lesser scale. The classroom shortage "scare" is over, too.

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS—THE PRESENT NON-FEDERAL SYSTEM CAN PROVIDE THESE NEEDS

The present non-Federal system has been meeting its classroom requirements even when they have been at a much higher level than the future level. Moreover, if left alone, the present system will continue to do so.

Querulous, uncertain voices complain that local school districts will not be able to keep it up; that their resources are depleted and worn out; and that their tax limits have been reached or exceeded. Such statements are part of an unwarranted effort to downgrade the capabilities of a system which has raised America to first place in the educational world, and has maintained it there consistently and successfully. Let us consider three items in this regard.

First, the cry of "wolf" has been heard before; for example, in May 1955, the Secretary of the California Teachers Association testified before the House Committee on Labor and Education that "from all sources something over a billion dollars must be spent on school buildings in California by 1960 * * * even the fabulous wealth of California will be unequal to the responsibilities placed upon it." But the record shows that in the school years from 1955–56 to 1959–60, the expenditures for public school construction in California amounted to $2.1 billion. This figure does not take into account the expenditures for the construction of private and parochial schools, in which 10 percent of California's children who attend elementary schools and high schools are educated.

Second, just a little over a year ago the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducted a survey among chief State school officers. It found that only 237 school districts out of 42,000 were reported as having exhausted their legal taxing capacity, as needing classrooms, and as having no access to funds. Most of these were small districts. No attempt was made to verify their reports; but even at full face value no critical situation can be built on the statistics that out of 42,000 school districts only 237 reported unfavorably in this regard. And even if the number were larger, the obvious solution would be to devise a means whereby those in proven need can be helped without dragging the entire American school system into the toils of federalization.

And, third, in the past decade the outlay for education in America at all levels has been almost trebled. This is from a figure of $8.8 billion in 1949–50 to $26 billion in the year 1960–61.

In adjusted dollars, this means an expenditure of almost 2½ times as much on education for about 55 percent more students. Student enrollments rose in that same period from 31.3 million to 48.6 million.

That decade of the 1950's witnessed an increase in our total national population of 29 million—from 150 million to 179 million—and an increase of gross national product from about $285 billion to over $500 billion.

To those who wonder about the ability of the independent school districts to continue to provide for their own—and most of the doubters are scouts in the army of the New Frontier—it should be said that they ought to be of stout heart and good cheer. The population continues to grow. The gross national product is getting stronger by the day. Its latest stage was an annual rate of $525 billion reported only in this past week. Certainly, if the doubters have the same degree of faith and enthusiasm in national affairs under New Frontier influences as they have been speaking about it, they would do well to quickly drop this talk about a wornout, depleted, and exhausted independent school district system.

The State and local governments are better able to finance schools than the debt-ridden Federal Government, with its $288 billion debt. Frankly, at the rate the New Frontier seeks to spend the Nation's substance, there is every indication that the State and local governments will continue to be in better financial shape than the Federal Government to build the classrooms which the future America will need.

TEACHER SUPPLY

There has been much discussion about teacher shortages, their low salaries, and other points in regard to instructional staffs. Much confusion has crept into the picture by statistics which have been released by various organizations and Government agencies.

The fact is, however, that the great postwar increase in enrollment in the 1950's was more than matched by an increase in the number of school teachers and instructors.

The NEA "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960–61" shows that pupil enrollment jumped 29 percent from 1953–54 to 1960–61.

This increase was more than met by a 40-percent gain in teachers with full certificates in that same period. See page 656, Senate hearings.

Figures in table form on this point read as follows:

	School year 1953–54	School year 1960–61	Increase or decrease (−)
			Percent
Pupil enrollment	28,916,703	37,244,284	29
Full certificate teachers	1,019,450	1,432,162	40
Pupils per teacher	28.4	26.0	−2.4

FUTURE TEACHER SUPPLY

If the present percentage of college students taking up teaching will be maintained, colleges will soon be training more teachers than can be placed.

The U.S. Office of Education recently issued a report "Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69"—page 657, Senate hearings.

Among other things, it showed that the yearly increase in instructional staff in the public schools for the past 5 years averaged 60,000. But the required yearly increase between 1965 and 1969 will average only 25,000. This is because of the great cut in annual enrollment increase to which I have already referred. The "Staffing and Constructing" report cites this cut as follows: from an enrollment increase averaging 1,207,000 annually between 1955 and 1961, to an average of 589,000 between 1965 and 1969.

But the further report is that the output of college graduates will vastly increase, from an average gain of 336,000 per year in the last 5 years to an average annual gain of 594,000 between 1965 and 1969.

The NEA in its "Teacher Supply and Demand Report for 1956" predicted an end to the teacher shortage by the early 1960's. This prediction has just been reached. It is only a short time when the problem will probably change to that of trying to find positions for all teacher graduates.

WHAT ABOUT TEACHERS' PAY?

The growing number of qualified applicants for teachers' positions is sound proof that the level of pay has been raised in recent years to a point of attractiveness—certainly, enough attractiveness to recruit and retain the vast teaching force which is necessary to take care of the increased pupil load.

The National Education Association's "Estimate of School Statistics, 1960–61" reports a 66 percent increase in teachers' salaries from the year 1952–53 and 1960–61—from $3,554 to $5,389. In the decade ending this latter year, the national average per capita income was raised 30 percent.

Again, this does not mean that the problem is solved. We would not want to oversimplify a very complex problem having many ramifications resulting from the different types of school teachers, the many geographic and economic regions involved, and so on. But it does mean that, without Federal funds, vast improvement has been made. It does mean that school boards the Nation over are making a successful effort to improve a situation which is very vital to attaining greater excellence in our schools.

They will be better able to pursue this goal unfettered by the Federal management which would certainly follow if Federal funds are allowed to pay teachers' salaries.

FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION

Virtually everyone who advocates this type of measure emphatically disowns and repudiates the idea of favoring a law which would embrace Federal management or control of schools.

In order to allegedly guarantee that no such control would come about, the bill as reported by the committee contained section 103, which reads:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

But to attempt exclusion of Federal control is a vain gesture indeed. There are many reasons for this. Only a few will be suggested here.

First. It is just as easy to repeal section 103 as it is to enact it. It is even easier to amend it by way of exception or proviso.

Second. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 103, part 5, page 6348, the late Representative John Lesinski, Sr., then chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee stated:

> It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid bill which will not contain a great deal of Federal control over local school systems. I am convinced, after the hard study we have put to the question, that no acceptable bill preventing Federal domination of local schools can be drawn. I reluctantly come to the conclusion, but I had to face the facts.

Third. The reasoning and the inevitability of control is well reflected in the statement by John J. Tigert, former U.S. Commissioner of Education, as found on page 671 of the Senate hearings:

> Reason and experience both indicate that Federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising Federal control and supervision, even then there is considerable waste. * * * If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

Virtually every other program of Federal grants contains elements of Federal control. This one will be no different.

Oftentimes the Smith-Hughes Act is cited as an instance where there is no control, and therefore it is a good precedent of 40 years standing upon which to base hope that in our case there will not be any Federal control.

This alleged absence of control and interference by the Federal Government in the vocational, homemaking, and agricultural law is wishful thinking.

The Senate hearings for July 16, 1958, at page 63–64 contain the testimony of Alan P. Burkhardt, then superintendent of Norfolk Public Schools in Norfolk, Nebr. He is a very outstanding educator, with as splendid a record as ever a teacher compiled in a lifetime. He is a man of sound judgment and of eminent fairness, as well as great competence. In brief, he testified that the State department of education received Federal aid of about 27 or 28 percent of the teachers' salaries in those two departments—vocational agriculture and home economics. However, in order to get this, it is necessary to do certain things, and the list is long:

Acceptance and adoption of the course of study specified by the Federal Government.

Permission for inspection by State employees who received part of their money from the Federal Government.

Hiring of teachers whose qualifications and specifications are approved by the State department and the Federal Government.

Sending teachers to conferences designated by those authorities.

If night classes are taught, they must operate by the rules and prescriptions of the Federal and State departments.

The length of periods of recital are prescribed, a fact which is not true in any other field.

The size of the classrooms and the shops are prescribed, as well as the type of equipment, and even the type of floors in the rooms.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this testimony be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Washington, D.C.:

I have always been opposed to Federal aid for schools or education in any form. I am

opposed to general aid, and also opposed to the present bill which calls for aid for school construction purposes. It's my feeling that the communities of Nebraska and, for that matter, of the entire United States are better able to build their own school buildings than is Uncle Sam. There isn't a school district in the United States in as bad shape, financially, as the Federal Government. Furthermore, if we ever accept aid from Washington, we will have to expect to accept accompanying control. Contrary to what some people try to say, there is no such thing as Federal aid without Federal control.

A good example is in the field of vocational agriculture and home economics. We receive Federal aid through the State department of education in the amount of about 27 or 28 percent of the teachers' salaries in these two departments. In order to get this money we have to accept and adopt the course of study outlined and specified by the Federal Government, through the State department. We have to permit inspection trips by State employees who receive part of their money from the Federal Government. We have to hire teachers whose qualifications are approved by the same groups. We have to send our teachers to conferences designated by those authorities. If we have night classes, they have to be operated according to the rules of the Federal and State departments. In other words, we are perfectly able to work out our own course of study in all other fields, including science, mathematics, English, and other technical fields because we don't get any Federal aid—but, because we get Federal aid for agriculture and home economics, we have to accept courses of study worked out by other people. We, also, have to accept supervision from the outside in those fields, while in every other field we are trusted to do our own supervision. Other examples of control in these fields are these: We are told how long our periods of recitation have to be—that's not true in any other field; we are told how large the classrooms and the shops have to be, what type of equipment we have to have, even the type of floor in the rooms. We are told about how much money to spend per student. We are not allowed to use the teachers in those departments in any other fields, except home economics or agriculture. If we do, we lose our aid money.

If all the above doesn't constitute control from Washington, then at least it's a reasonable facsimile thereof. The school lunch program, veterans' aid for college students, etc., are all examples of aid with control. There is no such thing as aid without control and, for that matter, there probably should be control with aid. My whole story is that we don't need the aid, and since we don't need it, why should we ask for it and then give up local control of the schools in the process?

ALLEN P. BURKHARDT,
Superintendent, Norfolk Public Schools, Norfolk, Nebr.

Mr. HRUSKA. The fourth reason why Federal control cannot be shut out of an act of this kind is found in the National Defense Education Act, which is less than 3 years old. It is referred to in the Senate hearings, at page 548. It has to do with the testimony relating to the experience of Prof. Claude J. Bartlett, assistant professor of psychology at George Peabody College for Teachers, at Nashville, Tenn.

I ask unanimous consent that the excerpt from the hearings to which I have referred, appearing at page 548 and extending over to page 549, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To illustrate I would like to refer to the experience of Prof. Claude J. Bartlett, assistant professor of psychology at George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn., in which he describes the fate of two guidance and counseling institutes set up under title V of the National Defense Education Act. Professor Bartlett participated in both and was the director of one.

Professor Bartlett points out the following Federal controls and their consequences:

1. In one institute the standards of admission for students were lowered as a result of pressure from the Federal Government. The result was the acceptance of many persons who were of questionable ability.

2. Based on the experiences in its first institute, changes in the operations of the second institute were deemed desirable. Nevertheless the Office of Education refused to permit changes in the plan of operation even though the changes did not affect the cost of the institute as specified in the contract. Thus, the Federal Government dictated curriculum and administration of the institute as well as financial arrangements.

3. When the contract setting up the institute was signed, the director of the college's child study center was named acting director of the institute. When the college sought to substitute a permanent director to permit the acting director to return to his regular duties elsewhere, the Federal Government refused to allow the change in directorship, thus interfering with the operation of the college.

4. The Office of Education insisted that all of the students of the second institute be recruited before authorization for establishing it had even been completed.

As a result of these difficulties, the college chose to cancel the contract for the institute rather than submit to bureaucratic whims emanating from Washington.

Mr. HRUSKA. I do not cite these examples under the Smith-Hughes Act and the National Defense Education Act primarily for the purpose of pointing out the control and supervision which were demonstrated in that instance. My purpose at this time, is to show that, regardless of the necessity or wisdom or virtue of doing those things that may be necessary by way of control and supervision, there is the jarring reality of Federal control as it existed in both of those instances. They are proof that Federal control cannot be kept out.

The fifth reason why Federal control cannot be shut out of a measure of this type, S. 1021, is found within the bill itself. In fact, the language of the bill negates section 103 by itself.

Section 103 reads:

no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school,

And so forth. That fact is quite evident from two standpoints.

When we come to section 109 as reported from the committee we find immediatley, that of the allotment given to each State, each State would be obliged to use 10 percent for the purpose of—

Paying part of the costs of the pilot, demonstration, or experimental projects of local education agencies, and other public agencies or institutions operating a public school, which, in the determination of the State agency, are designed to meet public school problems or to develop or evaluate public school programs of a special or unique nature.

So we start with section 103, which provides that no agency, no official, no employee, or administrator shall exercise any control.

Further along, in express terms, there was the requirement that at least 10 percent of the allotment to each State must be used for the designated purpose. Perhaps it is a good purpose. I do not doubt that it is a good purpose. The point is that the State is deprived of its freedom of choice for either doing on an annual basis what is stated in that section or not doing it. That is control.

When we refer to section 110 of the bill, commencing at page 13, as the bill was reported by the committee, we find there set out in great detail the application which each State must prepare, file, and deliver to the U.S. Commissioner of Education. We find that when the application is finished, it must contain certain assurances, certain specifications, certain criteria and procedures, certain reports, and certain fiscal control and fund accounting procedures which cover, in printed material, some three printed pages and are contained in some nine separate subparagraphs.

I say again that the bill and the provisions of the bill negate the idea, the language, and the intendment of section 103, which declare that Federal control by any agency, by any official, or by any department of education is prohibited.

In summary, I should like to pose a question. What is the real and ultimate objective of the pending bill? In all fairness we ask, Is the objective to distribute, as the bill purports to do, $850 million a year for 3 years, pursuant to a highly complicated and, in the judgment of some, a very unfair formula of apportionment? Is that the purpose?

Consider that the national annual budget for elementary and secondary public education is of the order of $16 billion. It has been that large for a number of years. The total is constantly increasing.

The total yearly allotment to be provided under the terms of the pending bill is $850 million, or about 5 percent of the annual national budget for this type of education. Certainly, 5 percent is not very much. It is not very substantial. It will not correct all the things which the advocates of the proposed legislation say are wrong with our educational system.

However, the contribution of 5 percent is enough upon which to base great influence and control by the Federal agencies over the local school systems.

Let us go a step further. The bill provides for a term of 3 years and for a total expenditure of $2½ billion. Will the program stop in 3 years? No one should be that naive. There never has

been a program put before the Congress to start in this manner, with a stated term of years, which has stopped at the end of the designated term of years.

A second question is, Will the program stop at $850 million a year? Already many statements have been made by the enthusiasts for this type of legislation that this is but a beginning, and a moderate beginning. In keeping with other measures of similar type which have been advocated under the present administration, the byword, the word of the day is, "But this is only a moderate beginning," or "This is only a moderate plan." That is the description which has been attributed to this particular piece of proposed legislation.

As time goes on the amount will not be even $2½ billion a year, but will be many times that amount in not too distant the future.

The larger the amount becomes, the greater the allocation to any one State, the greater the degree, the greater the scope, the greater the depth of Federal control and management of the school systems.

Obviously, the real and ultimate objective of the pending bill is to have centered in Washington, D.C., the type of agency and a sufficient quantity of appropriated funds to base on firm ground complete control in the Capital City of the United States of America over the Nation's educational system.

I come back to the original premise. The ground upon which previous general Federal aid-to-education bills have been rejected in the past nine decades is that they were not necessary. The proposed act is unnecessary. The other proposals were unwise. This proposed act is unwise.

It is my hope that there will be a rejection of the bill when it is finally voted upon by this body, and later on by the other body.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CASTRO, CUBANS, AND TRACTORS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I, too, rise to join those who support the President. I wish to be counted among those who support him. I do so with perhaps some temerity, in view of the lucidity of the remarks of my more senior colleagues, but I feel called upon to comment on Castro's offer to return 1,240 prisoners for 500 tractors.

This offer has, understandably, caused mixed emotions—blackmail, ransom, or what one wishes to call it, it is distasteful. On balance, though, I rise today in support of the efforts to raise funds for the tractors, efforts which have received the blessings of our President, on whose shoulders falls the primary responsibility for the conduct of our foreign affairs.

First. From a positive viewpoint, the response of American citizens to the plight of our Cuban brothers has once again stressed the concern of us Americans, of a democracy like ours, with individual human lives. This is where the Communists show themselves in their true colors. Human life to them is instrumental to the attainment of their ends, and human beings merely serve the government to further its aggrandizement and power. With us, the Government serves the individual, and human lives are treated dearly.

Second. The whiplash of world public opinion has already caught up with Castro's shortsighted and stupid gesture in launching this idea in the first place.

I quote from some newspaper articles recently published in Latin America.

The newspaper La Capital, in Argentina, stated:

> The incredible proposition has again shaken the free world with its brutality and utilitarianism, freed of any human feeling.

The famous newspaper La Prensa, of Buenos Aires, stated:

> In Cuba there are no gas chambers in use, but they have been replaced with the execution wall.

In Brazil the Diario Carioca, a leading liberal daily, stated:

> The ransom operation now being negotiated in Washington reveals in all its hideousness the inhuman nature of the Cuban revolution.

Also in Rio de Janeiro, O Globo stated:

> Hitler wanted to trade Jews for trucks but Castro wants to trade Cubans for tractors. It may be that this shows progress or superiority of communism, or "socialism"—as the Cuban regime prefers to be called in order to create confusion—over nazism, but we can't see any.

In addition, Mr. President, the front pages of many newspapers in Latin America are themselves launching appeals for tractors to release the Cuban freedom fighters. And, in doing this, they underline the crass materialism of the Communists. How would it look if we, who were responsible for placing these Cuban men in their present plight, backed away from them and left the burden on our fellow Americans to the south?

In this connection there is a particular American obligation. Our country was involved in the plans of the Freedom Fighters. It seems to me that we still have an obligation to the men involved.

I was on the Hungarian border when the Hungarian Freedom Fighters streamed across there, and remember how they believed the United States bore a special responsibility for their uprising through the encouragement they had received from Radio Free Europe. American public opinion responded magnificently to help them. Even more directly in Cuba, we were responsible for an abortive uprising.

I believe that when the dust is settled on the exchange for tractors for human lives, we will have seen a mature, religious democracy taking the lead in accepting the challenge and turning the threat of a barbarous and imperialistic opponent. And the more our friends to the south of our border join with us in this effort, the more progressive and wise and humanitarian we all will show ourselves, and the more glaring and worse will be the light in which Castro finds himself.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILLS INTRODUCED

Additional bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1959. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Mullen; and

S. 1960. A bill for the relief of John P. Vournas, John I. Vournas, and Guss I. Vournas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 1961. A bill for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT TO 9:55 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 9:55 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 9 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, May 25, 1961, at 9:55 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 24, 1961:

U.S. ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Dr. Walter Adams, of Michigan, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1964, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified, vice Arthur Hollis Edens.

Dr. Mabel M. Smythe, of New York, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1964, and until her successor has been appointed and qualified, vice Anna L. Rose Hawkes.

U.S. MARSHALS

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California, vice Frank O. Bell.

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California, vice Robert W. Ware.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Frank W. Wilson, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Tennessee, vice Leslie R. Darr, retired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Revelation 19: 5: *And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye His servants, and ye that fear Him, both small and great.*

Almighty and merciful God, to whose might and mercy there are no limits, grant that in our moments of prayer and meditation we may gain a more vivid sense of Thee and a finer perception of the moral and spiritual values.

May we belong to that community and company of noble men and women who are praying and laboring for a loftier type of civilization and giving themselves royally to the task of serving weary and heavy-laden humanity.

Inspire us to be coworkers with all who are the messengers of peace and good will and be eager to share our blessings with the multitudes who are hungry and homeless and groping their way in the darkness of despair and defeatism.

Gird us with a faith that foresees, amid the struggle and stress of moral conflict, the ultimate triumph of righteousness and the overthrow of all that is evil.

Hear us in the name of the Captain of our salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

OFFICIAL REGISTER OF UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide for the publication of the Official Register of the U.S. Civil Service. The effect of this bill will be to direct the Civil Service Commission to resume the annual publication of this valuable publication.

Publication of the Official Register was canceled last year by means of an amendment to the 1961 Independent Offices Appropriations Act. The amendment withheld $30,000 for printing the Register and also repealed the basic authority under which it had been published. The Register had previously been published annually for 144 years.

I have received complaints about the discontinuance of this from public officials, newsmen, and others who have found it to be of considerable value to them in the performance of their services. It is also extremely useful in a Congressman's office, and I do not believe that the approval of this rider to last year's appropriations act was justified.

There is no other practicable way to determine the correct names of Federal officials, their salaries, job titles and departments, and the State and congressional district origin of the appointee. The discontinuance of the Register means that this information is now either out of date or almost impossible to obtain. The constant turnover in personnel virtually requires that this publication be published on an annual basis. My bill provides that the Register shall show a full and complete list of all persons occupying administrative and supervisory positions in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Government, including the District of Columbia, in connection with which salaries are paid from the Treasury of the United States.

I hope that this bill can receive early consideration.

SUPERIOR SERVICE AWARD

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to a fine young woman and constituent, Miss Marjorie Mason, who has devoted her energies to serving her country and serving it well.

The great Second District of Illinois was signally honored yesterday when at the elaborate services of the Department of Agriculture Miss Mason was awarded the Superior Service Award "for planning, directing, and training a large number of employees of the Evanston CSS Commodity Office in electronic accounting machine operations, including leadership and direction in assisting management to open and operate a subkey-punch office." She was one of only 93, nationwide, to receive this rare distinction of outstanding ability, and the Second District is indeed proud.

Miss Mason's contributions as an employee and above all as a citizen of these United States, furnish a good example of what President Kennedy meant in his inaugural address when he said: "Ask not what your country can do—ask what you can do for your country."

MILLIONS FOR DEFENSE, BUT NOT ONE CENT FOR TRIBUTE

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, in the context of certain weasel words being said about tractors by certain modern-day Americans, I think it appropriate to recall a certain statement made in June 1798, by an American of an earlier and possibly more virile era of our history. An era in which the United States of America, even though a very young and struggling country, even though surrounded by many powerful enemies, was proud of its purpose, zealous of its freedoms, uncowed by threats and courageous in its determination for justice.

The statement I am about to recall was made as a toast at a dinner given by the Congress of the United States at Philadelphia on June 18, 1798, in honor of John Marshall on his return from France.

Marshall and Elbridge Gerry had been sent to France to help Charles Pinckney reach an agreement with the French Government. Talleyrand's agents told the Americans they would have to pay a bribe of $250,000 before Pinckney would be allowed to see the French statesman. The Americans roundly refused and Congress promptly abrogated the French-American Treaty on which the ink was hardly dry. It became known as the XYZ affair, the letters indicating the three unnamed French officials who solicited the bribe.

A then Member of this very body, the Honorable Robert Goodloe Harper, a Member of Congress from South Carolina, presented as his toast Pinckney's reputed reply to the bribe solicitation: "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

THE PRESENT-DAY STATUS OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the American Negro has made more progress up the economic ladder in the last 100 years than any other race—white, yellow, or red—ever made in 1,000 years of history. From a condition of absolute slavery 100 years ago, the American Negro has risen to the point where he now fares better than many Europeans, better than any other members of the Negro race anywhere—better paid, better housed, and better educated. From slavery, ignorance, and life in primitive shacks, to an economic status superior to the average Frenchman, the average Italian, and the average citizen of West Germany, the American Negro has traveled upward with seven-league boots.

Today the 19 million American Negroes have a total yearly income of more than $20 billion. This means, on an average, more than $1,000 a year for every Negro man, woman, and child in the country. When we compare this with an average of $650 per person per year in Western Europe; with an average of $850 per person per year in France and Western Germany; and with an average of $1,000 per person per year in Great Britain, our American Negro is comparatively well off.

Mr. Speaker, in 1958 the American Negro who worked a full year earned

a median income of $3,308, meaning that half the Negro workers received more than this and half received less. That is more than the $2,234 that the average worker in Great Britain receives, and more than four times the estimated $800 that the average worker in the Soviet Union receives.

Twenty years ago the median income for the American Negro was $639, less than one-fourth what he receives today. Evolution, not revolution has brought about this remarkable change in the status of the American Negro. Why interfere with the natural evolutionary process?

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 300) providing for the consideration of S. 1852, a bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 63]

Alford	Edmondson	Multer
Anfuso	Fascell	O'Neill
Battin	Gray	Passman
Beckworth	Hagan, Ga.	Price
Belcher	Halleck	Riley
Blitch	Healey	Roberts
Bonner	Holifield	Rostenkowski
Bromwell	Hull	Saund
Brooks, Tex.	Johnson, Wis.	Schadeberg
Buckley	Jones, Mo.	Scherer
Celler	Kilburn	Shelley
Coad	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Colmer	Kluczynski	Teague, Tex.
Cooley	McDowell	Thompson, La.
Davis, Tenn.	McSween	Tupper
Dawson	Marshall	Walter
Dent	Moulder	Whitten

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may have permission to sit in executive session during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], and now yield 3 minutes to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the great Members of Congress, who served in this body and also served in the other body, and is now Vice President of the United States, has just arrived back from a very important trip abroad in a vitally important area of the world.

When the President sent LYNDON JOHNSON on this trip I knew that he had sent a representative of our country who would make a profoundly favorable impression and who would convey to our friends and to the peoples of other countries in no unmistakable manner the strength and the personality of America.

LYNDON JOHNSON and Mrs. Johnson and their party arrived back this morning. You and I and others have followed the details of this trip through the newspapers, and we know the arduous journey he underwent, we know the great strain it must have been upon him, not only mentally but physically.

I had the pleasure of listening to a short briefing he gave the President this morning, and the report he made was one of the finest I have ever heard. In a matter of 10 minutes he made a report that conveyed a picture to those who were there that they clearly understood.

I admired former President Eisenhower, as everyone knew. I might have disagreed with him occasionally, but I admired him. Without regard to political party, we have a great pride in Americans who serve our country in an outstanding manner. We in the House naturally have a pride in LYNDON JOHNSON because his public career in the Congress of the United States started here. He was then elected to the other, coordinate and coequal branch of Congress, and then he was elected Vice President of the United States.

He performed his mission with outstanding ability. His leadership and his ability clearly shows that, on any mission to which he might be assigned or sent on in the future by the President, America will be ably and effectively represented. I might say the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN] was present at this briefing which, incidentally, was not scheduled or arranged in advance, but simply came quickly and informally about as a result of our going down there to meet the Vice President upon his return. I am confident I speak the sentiments of all of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, in congratulating Vice President JOHNSON for a task well done and telling Mrs. Johnson and the Vice President how glad we are to have them back with us again.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 300 provides for the consideration of S. 1852, a bill to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. The resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

S. 1852 would authorize appropriations in fiscal year 1962 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in the total amount of $12,499,800,000.

We are all keenly aware of the heavy burden the defense program places on the American taxpayer. Every endeavor has been made to make savings wherever possible by eliminating programs and activities no longer deemed essential. Further, these actions are just the beginning of efforts to achieve a more efficient and effective Defense Establishment.

The problem of deterring an all-out nuclear war has been greatly complicated by the introduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles into the arsenal of our major adversary in the world struggle. Only a year or so ago the principal general war threat to our security was a surprise attack by large numbers of nuclear-armed manned bombers. A year or two from now our principal concern will be a surprise attack by large numbers of nuclear-armed ICBM's.

The problem of securing our strategic deterrent forces against a large-scale manned bomber attack was acute several years ago; it is still serious today, but it pales by comparison with the problem of defending against an ICBM attack.

Today our strategic forces are fully adequate to carry out their assigned tasks. But as our principal antagonists acquire a large and ready force of ICBM's which could be launched with little or no warning, the problem of preventing the destruction of our forces on the ground becomes much more difficult. Essentially, there are two major approaches available to us: first, develop forces which can be launched within the expected period of tactical warning; second, develop forces which can ride out a massive ICBM attack.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 300.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, this authorization comes before us under an open rule providing

2 hours of general debate, as has been well explained by my colleague from New York. The bill authorizes appropriations for aircrafts, missiles, and naval vessels and it is the largest such appropriation that has ever been brought before the House of Representatives. My colleague has given the exact figure, but to put it in the vernacular, it is actually $12½ billion. We know that the bill has received the most careful study and painstaking analysis by our great Armed Services Committee. We also know that it is impossible for us to go into all the details and all the specialties that are found and studied in writing such a piece of legislation. So, Mr. Speaker, this is, no doubt, something that we have got to take on trust; and may I say that we are very happy and glad that we can do just that, having the faith that we have in this great committee and realizing that a full and detailed explanation will be given to us in the course of the general debate.

At this time while we may regret the necessity of spending such vast sums for defense, we know that this is necessary. We also know that modern weapons are something which must be left to the specialists and not be tinkered with by amateurs for any reason whatsoever. This has been done, and we believe that the armed might of the United States will prove to be a powerful deterrent to any nation which would consider attacking us.

It is most obvious that in making possible this huge appropriation, the Congress is merely doing its duty, which it has always done in the past, which it will do in the present, and which I am very sure, Mr. Speaker, it will do in the future.

I urge the adoption of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the distinguished majority leader if he wishes me to yield him some time?

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS MAY 25, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have talked with some of my Republican friends. I am sure the gentlewoman from New York knows to what I refer. I wonder if the gentlewoman from New York would assume the responsibility for her side, being the acting minority leader.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am acquainted with the matter. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 316

Resolved, That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 25, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon, for the purpose of receiving such communications as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The resolution was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT MISSILES AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time at the moment.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday there appeared in a column of a metropolitan newspaper a discussion between others and myself as to whether the Congress should recess this summer and come back in the fall. In that article there was ascribed to me a statement which I did not make. In particular it was stated that I referred to our distinguished Speaker as a "crusty old bachelor."

Believe me, I hold our Speaker in high regard. I never would even think a thought that would refer to him in such a light.

I do not know how this came about—I am terribly shocked that my name is ascribed to it. I do, however, believe it would be in the best interest of the Congress to recess in the summer and come back in the fall, but what differences there may be between the Speaker and myself should not come down to the point of name calling.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, during the course of today's debate I shall attempt to prove this syllogism.

First, competent naval experts have gradually and definitely over a period of years recommended the need for a strength of 45 Polaris submarines with the later boats to be procured on a 1 per month schedule.

Second, S. 1852, as presently written, may curtail this program and will certainly delay it by building in a Polaris delivery gap.

Therefore, S. 1852 should be amended to include additional Polaris submarine authorization.

Because time is limited I must prove this syllogism on the installment plan. Under time allotted me in debate on the rule I shall prove the first point, which I repeat—competent naval experts have gradually and definitely over a period of years recommended the need for a strength of 45 Polaris submarines.

Some will say that we have never committed ourselves to the acquisition of more than 29 Polaris submarines. This is correct in the sense that we have not authorized more than 29. Nor could we have intelligently authorized the full program until after we had the chance to see the system in operation. Since the *George Washington* went to sea in late 1960, we have now our first opportunity to act with sureness.

But all testimony before Congress, committees, and all public statements by competent naval authorities have been based on a proposed end strength of 45 boats.

Listen to the words of our experts and note how the figure of 45 gradually became the target at which they were shooting. On January 30, 1959, the Christian Science Monitor reports an interview with Adm. William F. Raborn who has headed the team responsible for the development of the fleet ballistic missile system. In this interview, Admiral Raborn said:

Upwards of 50 (Polaris submarines) would be a most significant force.

The Washington Post of August 24, 1959, reports a suggestion by Vice Adm. Wallace M. Beakley, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Operations and Readiness, in which he stated that the Navy proposes to keep its new Polaris ballistic missile submarine fleet relatively small, totaling only about 40 boats. Please note that this is the smallest number of submarines publicly mentioned by a Navy official.

On November 2, 1959, Jack Raymond of the New York Times reported a request by the Defense Department for a tripled appropriation for the Polaris program.

Ultimately—

He said—

the Navy hopes to have 40 or 45 such submarines.

On February 6, 1960, the Washington Post reported testimony by Adm. Arleigh A. Burke in which he announced his intention of asking for a billion dollar boost in the defense budget to build 6 more Polaris submarines. The article by John G. Norris said, "the Navy has said that 45 such subs would provide an indestructible deterrent force."

On a television show on February 22, 1960, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, asked Admiral Burke, "and you think—and I agree with you—that we ought to get 45 as quick as we can get the money appropriated and the submarines built. Is that about right?" Admiral Burke answered, "Yes."

In the hearings before a Government Operations subcommittee held on March 30 and 31, 1960, Admiral Raborn inserted a statement at page 196 of the hearings which analyzes the cost of the fleet ballistic missile system. The cost analysis is based upon a program of 45 submarines. At three specific points the number 45 is mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, under my unanimous consent request. I shall include this cost analysis at this point as a part of my remarks:

ANTICIPATED COST OF A POLARIS MISSILE ON STATION

1. Weapon system research, test, development, and production costs for $8.645 billion for a 45-SSB(N) program. This includes almost $2 billion for weapon system development from the beginning of the program in 1955.

It is emphasized that the costs are based on hard-cost information resulting from almost 4 years of experience. Specifically, these costs include in their entirety:

1. Weapons system research, test, development and production costs for the missile, fire control, navigation, communication, and launching for a 1,500-nautical-mile system.
2. Construction of submarines, installing equipment, and checking out the operation of the submarine-weapon system.
3. Maintenance and operational training of Navy personnel.
4. Constructing submarine tenders, equipping them, and verifying their suitable operability.
5. Construction and equipping of the overall system production facilities including buildings, production and inspection tooling, maintenance facilities, etc.
6. Necessary operational support facilities such as the Naval Weapons Annex (the missile outloading facility), crew team trainers, special communications stations, etc.
7. Pay of personnel and material required to manage the overall FBM system.
8. Manufacture checkout and assembly of 16 missiles for each of the 45 submarines.
9. Manufacture of spare sets of missiles for the submarines for support purposes.
10. Spare parts for the entire system plus setting up issuing stations.
11. Tools and equipment to provide weapons system overhaul capability to Navy yards.

In summary, these figures represent total costs incurred to bring this missile system into being in its entirety. There are no hidden costs.

The studies referred to in the first paragraph reflected procurement of 1,005 missiles. Dividing 1,005 into $8.645 billion, the cost per Polaris missile comes out at $8.6 million each. Assuming ship-fill missiles only, 45 times 16 equals 720 missiles, the cost per missile in each SSB(N) tube is $12 million. Subtracting costs to develop and bring into operation the first 9 FBM weapon systems, the cost per missile in each tube for the remaining 36 submarines is $8.8 million.

Polaris is conservatively funded. Prorated costs for a 45-boat capability over an indefinite period of useful life (15 years and more) $1 billion per year.

This includes:

(1) Replacement of missiles at 5-year intervals;

(2) R. & D. for longer range missiles and for future changes as may be required to keep it effective with time;

(3) Replacement of submarines at end of useful life;

(4) Normal operating expenses; and

(5) Other items such as support now budgeted under Polaris.

On page 198 of the same hearings, Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, refers in two instances to a program of 45 submarines.

In the October 3, 1960, issue of U.S. News & World Report, Admiral Burke was asked:

How many of the Polaris submarines will you have eventually?

His answer was:

I can't say precisely what the final figure will be. We are talking about a total of 45.

On October 27, 1960, Mr. Jack Raymond wrote an article in the New York Times announcing that the submarine *George Washington* would begin sea duty by November 15. In the last paragraph of the article, Mr. Raymond says:

The *George Washington* is the first of a planned fleet of 45 fleet ballistic missile systems.

In the November 7, 1960, issue of Missiles and Rockets, an article by James Baar states that the Honorable CLARENCE CANNON, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, wants the Navy to complete a fleet of 45 Polaris submarines. Once again we see the regularly recurring figure of 45.

An article by Darrell Garwood of UPI which appeared in the Washington Post for February 5, 1961, announces President Kennedy's decision to speed up the construction of five Polaris submarines. The article says:

The President's goal is to maintain a fleet of 45 Polaris subs on permanent patrol of the Atlantic and Pacific.

At page 314 part V, of the Appropriations Committee hearings for 1960, Admiral Raborn had this to say on April 6, 1959:

I think the reason that the Navy originally recommended we go ahead faster in the 1960 program and 1961, was to reduce the gap between ready-for-sea dates, operational dates of the submarines. Presently there will be a gap between submarines being built in the 1960 program and 1961 program. We could reduce that roughly half if we had gone ahead faster and here again, speaking to a large number of submarines, in order to have an orderly program in the number of submarines at sea, 45 is the number that it looks like we could keep where we would have an adequate number at sea constantly and on station. * * * This would allow us to keep an adequate percentage on station at all times and the others would be in overhaul, training, or in transit to and from launch stations.

At page 339, part VI, of the Appropriations Committee hearings for 1961, the testimony for March 16, 1960, provides another instance where a high naval official recommends a 45-boat program. He is Vice Adm. J. T. Hayward, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Development. Admiral Hayward recommended a 45-boat program and submitted the following which is found at page 339 of the hearings.

Mr. Speaker, under my unanimous-consent request, already approved, I shall include this portion of the hearings as a part of my remarks:

Admiral HAYWARD. Mr. Ford, they asked me what it would cost to carry this to the 45-boat program, and I gave them the cost by year, and what we would have. This letter to the Secretary of Defense modified my letter and put it in package alternatives similar to the earlier committee request.

Mr. MAHON. Make all of this available to the committee in the hearings or otherwise.

(The information requested follows:)

	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Fiscal year 1962	Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964
SSBN	-------	9	12	12	3
LLT	-------	12	12	3	-------
SCN	$116.9	$765.4	-------	-------	-------
PAMN	-------	50.6	-------	-------	-------
OPN	-------	35.3	-------	-------	-------
R.D.T. & E	5.0	104.3	-------	-------	-------
O. & M	23.3	4.5	-------	-------	-------
Subtotal	145.2	960.1	-------	-------	-------
MCON	-------	5.1	-------	-------	-------
Total	[1] 145.2	[2] 965.2	$2,344.5	$2,119.6	$636.2

[1] Addition required above present fiscal year 1960 funds.
[2] Addition required above $952.2 in President's budget now before the Congress.

1. This funding plan for a 45 SSBN program completely funds the initial investment cost (including the cost to develop a 2300 NM missile). This amount is $6,210.6 million in addition to the $3,694.6 million which has been programed to date including the fiscal year 1961 budget now before the Congress.

While Rear Adm. Hyman G. Rickover does not mention a specific number of submarines except to say that we do not need hundreds of Polaris boats, the following excerpts from his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 10, 1960, are interesting.

On page 173, Admiral Rickover says:

If the Russians wished, they could in 5 years or so have more nuclear-powered submarines than we have, if they make up their minds to build them on a priority basis.

Later on the same page, the Admiral says:

In my opinion, we are frittering away a lead in perhaps the only weapons system in which we are ahead. We are not taking advantage of our lead by building enough nuclear submarines at the present time. That is my personal opinion.

Throughout these quotations and hearings, the constant recurrence of the number "45" is not happenstance nor mere coincidence. It is clear-cut evidence that all thinking of competent military experts has been toward the eventual construction of 45 fleet ballistic missile submarines.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN].

Mr. SEELY-BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] and I would like to state that in my judgment no 11 words ever included in a national defense authorization bill ever were more important than the 11 words which, under the amendment, would be added to the bill on page 2, line 8.

The amendment authorizes an additional $697,500,000 for the acquisition of additional Polaris submarines.

The Polaris, officially the Fleet Ballistic Missile System, is our most thoroughly tested and proven deterrent weapon.

It is a weapon our enemies do not have. It is a weapon that can be used effectively in any part of the world.

No one has any doubts about the effectiveness of the Fleet Ballistic Missile System. The Navy already has a program which calls for the construction of 45 additional submarines to operate this system.

President Kennedy, in his Defense budget message to the Congress on March 28:

I strongly recommend that the Polaris program be greatly expanded and accelerated.

His acceleration direction to the Department of Defense calls for 10 Polaris submarines in fiscal 1962, and for adding 5 more to the program for the 1961 fiscal period. Beginning in June 1963, the President's program calls for the delivery of 1 submarine a month, or 12 a year.

Of the submarines to carry and fire the Polaris, the President said:

> The sooner they are on station, the safer they will be.

Well, what are we waiting for, then, Mr. Speaker, since nobody disputes such a statement by the President.

You cannot buy a Polaris submarine like you can buy a pound of butter, or even the latest model automobile. It requires 3½ years of leadtime to secure delivery of just the reactor for a Polaris submarine.

Ships must be authorized before money can be appropriated to construct them. This is quite clearly stated in section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959. Even the purchase of long leadtime components requires authorization of the ship in which they will be used.

Since the acceleration in the Polaris program directed by the President calls for completion of the 29th submarine by November 1964, it is obvious that an orderly continuation of the 45-boat program on the previously planned 1-per-month schedule requires additional authorization in this bill.

Failure to authorize now will mean a Polaris gap of a full year. If we do not authorize, as proposed by this amendment, we will have lost all of the advantage for our national defense sought by the Kennedy acceleration.

Authorization does not spend money. The money has to be appropriated each year. Authorization is an insurance policy which assures the gains in Polaris strength that the administration and the American people want, and will save us from a weakness in this part of our defense posture in the years ahead.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 5 OF 1961—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 172)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the National Labor Relations Board.

This Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961, to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the National Labor Relations Board.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Board, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Board, individual Board members, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Board members from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Board as a whole the right to review any such decision, report or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervener demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Board the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Board, for mandatory review of any such decision, report or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Board less one member.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 24, 1961.*

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 1852, with Mr. KARSTEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include certain facts with reference to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, as stated by the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY], this is the largest authorization bill ever presented to the Congress. It involves an authorization for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in the amount of $12,368,000,000. The Senate version of this bill is $12,499,800,000, which is $131,800,000 more than the House bill.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time, I shall offer an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the House bill. The reason I will do this is the fact that the Senate bill has passed and we shall use that one in conference.

The basis of the authorization is section 412 of Public Law 86–149. That law reads as follows:

> No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

Section 412 is a forward and very important step in the right direction.

The objective of 412 was to have an authorization that could itemize and designate as far as possible the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

Heretofore the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels was based upon very broad authority—indeed, so broad as to be virtually meaningless in the sense that we normally use the word "authority."

For example, the Air Force under the law has a ceiling authorization to procure 24,000 serviceable aircraft; under another law, the Navy has a ceiling permitting it to keep 15,000 aircraft in service; the Navy has had a very large amount of tonnage available to it ever since the Vinson-Trammel Act of 1934.

Up to this time, the Departments merely had to request and obtain appropriations for the procurement of these items under these very broad authorities.

I am afraid that the end result of this procedure was that members of the Appropriations Committee were the only ones in the Congress who actually had very much knowledge of the tremendous programs and expenditures which the Congress was called upon to pass on each year.

It is my hope that section 412 has called a halt to this situation. If it did

nothing else, it brought 37 more Members of the House into the heretofore exclusive area of knowledge of these very large programs.

But, it is my intention, and the intention of the Armed Services Committee, to have section 412 mean a great deal more than merely bringing the members of the Committee into this area of knowledge.

It is our firm intention that this law will mean that the Members of the House itself will have the very maximum amount of information which is possible to reveal concerning these programs, and be afforded some opportunity to express agreement or disagreement with the course being pursued in our defensive and offensive capabilities.

Now, all that is preliminary to the bill itself, but I felt that some background of this nature would be helpful, and I hope it has been.

H.R. 6151

When the bill was first sent to the Congress on January 3 by the Eisenhower administration it called for $10,572,181,000. After a reexamination by the Kennedy administration, it was increased by $1,402,619,000. The committee added $393,200,000 and that makes a total of $12,368,000,000.

I particularly want to invite your attention to the table set out on page 7 of the report—entitled "Progress of Program." From that table you will see, broken down by service and again by aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, the development of this program from the January budget of the previous administration to the bill as you have it before you today.

Now, that is the progress of the bill. Of course, it is understood that the total budget requested by the Kennedy administration for defense is $43,794,345,000. Of this total amount, however, only the $12,368,000,000 comes under section 412 and therefore under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee.

UNOBLIGATED BALANCES

I want to mention a matter not directly related to the bill—and that is the unobligated and unexpended balances which will be carried over into fiscal year 1962.

I have made a close study of these balances. I find that on June 30, 1961, the Department will have about $5 billion unobligated and $25 billion unexpended.

Little attention need be directed at the unexpended balance since this money must be used to pay legal contractural obligations. My study shows that a level of about $25 billion unexpended is normal with the size of the present defense program.

I believe, however, that the $5 billion which will be unobligated on June 30, 1961, requires some explanation. It is in five parts: $319 million represents money which helps finance the 1962 program and programs under way but for which contracts have not been let; $548 million: this is for military construction. It relates to approved projects for which contracts will not be let by June 30; $255 million: this is already applied by the Department to reduce the 1962 appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels; $839 million: this again is for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels.

It represents fully funded long leadtime items for which obligation of funds was not required during fiscal 1961 but will be required in later years; $3.1 billion: this covers programs for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for which procurement action has been initiated but for which contracts will not be awarded on June 30.

Let me say that my investigation established to my satisfaction that these funds are properly programed to meet valid needs and that these unobligated funds in no way diminishes the need for this bill.

HEARINGS

There are two sets of hearings on this bill. One of them is the hearings which we held on our defense posture and the other on the actual procurement items which are in the bill.

The committee had them printed separately in order that they could be used and studied with greater ease because of the separation of broad policy considerations on the one hand, and the precise items proposed for procurement on the other.

The hearings started on February 23, 1961, and we held our last hearing on May 4, 1961. That was a total of 38 hearings. This was probably the best hearings the committee ever had. They were well attended by Members all the time and the entire membership showed a keen interest in every phase of the bill. I want to thank all Members publicly for their attendance and for their contribution in reaching a unanimous decision in regard to this bill.

Naturally, the printed hearings, and to a great extent the report, too, have had much material deleted or omitted on the basis of security.

Indeed, there was so much classified information in the hearings that they were given two complete reviews by the Department of Defense before they could be printed. I can assure you, however, that they still embody a great deal of very valuable information.

In the report, too, we have tried to deal with every major area of interest in as clear and complete a manner as is possible, due consideration again being given to security.

I do not need to tell you that if there are any matters of particular interest to any Member which cannot be discussed during the debate, I will be most happy to go over the matter in private with you, Mr. Chairman, or any of the Members of the House.

I would like to point out that pages 11 through 32 of the report provides very valuable information on all of the many changes which were made in the program by the present administration. For example, it explains why the bill is in the form that it is rather than on a line item basis.

These pages deal with subjects such as "Deterring Nuclear War," "The Polaris Submarine Program," "Changes in the Minuteman Program," and in the "Titan Program," where we stand with respect to the B–70, why the nuclear airplane was dropped from the program, and so forth and so on.

I will not go into all of these individual subjects at this time but they are clearly set out on those pages of the report and have headings which make them easy to find.

Now, I would like to take up the programs of each of the military departments. Just before I do that, I would like to point out that starting on page 71 of the report is an appendix which sets out a description of all of the missiles and rockets used by the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. It also tells which of these is operational today and which are in various stages of research and development.

Attached to my remarks is a complete description, including the military characteristics, of each and every aircraft and missile which would be authorized for procurement by this bill. I intend to file this material as part of my remarks in order that it will appear in the RECORD on tomorrow.

I would like to make specific note of the fact that although this list is very complete and contains a great deal of information, there is not one word of classified information in it. I had this very carefully checked with the military departments and with Mr. McNamara's own office.

All of this information has been released on a number of occasions before and is well known to those with interest in the various missile and rocket programs of the departments.

ARMY

Now, let us look at the Army program. It starts on page 32.

At the bottom of page 32, you will see that in the case of aircraft, the bill calls for $211 million. This money will be used to purchase airplanes of the following designations. With respect to each aircraft, I am mentioning the page of the report which describes the particular aircraft: Seminole, 34; Mohawk, 33; Caribou, 33; Iroquois, 33; Chinook, 33.

The last two of these, the Iroquois and the Chinook, are helicopters.

Sometimes the question arises: Why does the Army need to have aircraft, since the Air Force provides the close ground support for the troops in battle, and also provides the transportation of troops from one place to another?

Well, the answer to this is that the aircraft which the Army has and the aircraft which they will be purchasing under the authority of this bill are small aircraft used for transporting commanders from unit to unit, maintaining liaison between various elements of the Army in the field, reconnaissance, evacuation of the wounded, and transporting small numbers of soldiers from time to time but always within the battlefield area.

There is absolutely no duplication between the Army and Air Force so far as aircraft is concerned. The Army needs the aircraft for its limited air requirements and the Air Force has its aircraft both for itself and to assist the Army in

well defined ways. There is no duplication at all here.

Then on page 32, you will see that $550,800,000 in the bill will be used to purchase missiles. Before mentioning the individual missiles which would be procured under this bill, I would like to point out that the appendix to the report which begins on page 71 shows that the Army has 14 guided missiles of which 8 are operational. It also shows that the Army has two rockets both of which are operational.

Now, these are the missiles which would be purchased under this bill. Again, I will mention a page number which refers to the place where the particular missile is described in the report: Nike-Hercules, 34; Hawk, 34; Redeye, 34; Honest John, 34; Little John, 34; Antitank, 34; Sergeant, 34; Pershing, 34.

Of course, there is a great deal of information about these aircraft and missiles which is not set out in the report because this would involve revealing classified information.

But you can be sure that during the hearings, each member of the committee had presented to him the complete classified description of each of the missiles and aircraft, its capabilities, how it would be used, and even what the comparable weapons are that our enemies have or are developing.

We had detailed lists of the numbers of each one to be purchased, how much each one would cost, and we examined very closely into every detail of the program. The hearings, even with a very great amount of information cut out of them, reveal how closely the committee went into all of these matters.

Today the size of the Army is 870,000 people. 5,000 men are being added to the Army for a new total of 875,000.

So, the total for Army aircraft is $211,000,000 and the total for missiles is $550,800,000. This is a grand total of $761,800,000 for the Army. The Senate bill is for exactly the same amount for the Army.

ARMY MODERNIZATION

At this point I feel that I must digress, in some degree, to discuss a matter of immediate importance—the modernization of the U.S. Army.

First, let me emphasize that our Army is not a second-rate force. On the contrary, it is a highly trained force, with high morale. But, it is the size of the Army, the weapons with which it is armed, and its mobility, that causes my continuing concern.

On June 30, 1956, we had an Army of about 1.1 million men. We sustained that force until 1957. Then the real decline started. Secretary of Defense Wilson ordered a 100,000 reduction in our Armed Forces, and the Army was required to absorb half of that. When rumors persisted that there would be additional cuts, I had a talk with Secretary Wilson just before the Congress adjourned in 1957. He confirmed the rumors that he planned a further cut in the Army. I did my best to hold the line for an Army of 950,000. In any event, I hoped that it would not be cut below 925,000. But, the Congress had scarcely returned home following adjournment of the first session in 1957 when another 100,000 cut was ordered. Again the Army was ordered to absorb half of that cut. So, the Army started on down to a strength of 900,000 by June 30, 1958. Then, to further compound our difficulties, a further cut of 100,000 was ordered, with the Army again being required to absorb one-half of that cut. That would have taken the Army down to 850,000 by June 30, 1958.

Secretary Wilson finally concluded he had gone too far and restored 20,000. That simply meant that in fiscal 1959 the Army was reduced from 900,000 down to 870,000. That is the strength which the Army had on January 1, 1961.

On April 29, 1958, I expressed these facts, with many more details, to the chairman of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], urging his assistance in holding the Army at a strength of 925,000. While that result was not accomplished, I want to very clearly say that I have no criticism whatsoever of Mr. MAHON.

It is apparent to all of us that the Congress cannot unilaterally impose its will upon the executive branch in matters of this nature. We can authorize and appropriate to whatever extent we may wish, but the concurrence of the executive branch is an essential requirement to the accomplishment of a congressional decision of this nature. In that case the executive branch did not agree. So, the Army went on down to 870,000. But, it is pertinent to note that the reduction in its capability was not accompanied by any reduction whatsoever in the Army's mission or the multitude of military requirements imposed upon it.

From a standpoint of weapons and equipment, the Army has suffered a similar fate. To be sure, our Army is well equipped with weapons of World War II type. But the real modernization of Army weapons which is required, and which has been accomplished for the ground forces of our principal enemy, has proceeded at a snail's pace.

As you know, President Kennedy has already ordered an increase of 5,000 in Army strength, with 3,000 of that total being allocated to special forces, or what is better described as guerrilla warfare units. In addition, the President has added $109 million to the Army budget for the procurement of weapons. I applaud both of these actions. But, I have the continuing conviction that this can only be the beginning of the real modernization which is required for our Army.

Since the new administration assumed office I have discussed this matter with Secretary McNamara. In addition, I have forwarded to him a written recommendation on weapons modernization. I have also made those views known at other high places in the Government. And I am pleased to note, that this whole matter is now under urgent study. We have reason to hope and believe that specific recommendations from the executive branch will be forthcoming in the relatively near future.

Unfortunately, the series of actions which have brought the Army to its current status have occurred over a period of years, and their ultimate impact has escaped most people. Nevertheless, the unfortunate results are now on our doorstep. We must face up to them and stand ready to do something about them.

Unfortunately, if the unanimous membership of the Congress should today rise in full support of legislation to accomplish all of the objectives needed to modernize our Army, and if that action were totally approved by the President, we would not have accomplished our objective. We would have simply taken the first step required in such an accomplishment.

It takes time to train troops and it takes time to produce weapons. So, the best thing that we could possibly do would be to start. For my part, I want to start and I am ready to start. But an undertaking of this magnitude must be in cooperation with the Chief Executive. So, I anxiously await his recommendations in this vital area of national defense. While I await these recommendations, I do not shirk my own responsibility. I stand for an Army of at least 925,000, and a greatly accelerated program of weapons modernization.

The bill now under debate does not deal with personnel, and such a bill does not and cannot include an authorization for many of the weapons which would be required. But, I can no longer delay an expression of my convictions. I know that the action that I recommend would cost money. It would cost from $350 million to $400 million annually for the additional personnel. It would cost an additional $600 million annually for weapons modernization. But, we had just as well understand here and now that we have a price to pay. It is up to us to determine whether it will be in money, or in blood, lives, and freedom.

NAVY

Now, the Navy and Marine Corps program is really in two parts. The first part covers aircraft and missiles and you will find the list of the aircraft and missiles on pages 34 and 35.

The Navy and Marine Corps propose to acquire the following aircraft, costing $1,585,600,000—House report page number: Skyhawk, 37; Intruder, 37; Phantom, 36; Crusader, 36; Seasprite, 36; HSS–2, 36; HUS–1, 37; Orion, 37; Tracker, 36; Hawkeye, 37; HR(x), 37; Saberliner, 37.

On page 35 you will also see the list of Navy missiles costing $606,400,000 and the Marine Corps missiles totaling $27 million.

The Navy and Marine Corps missiles to be procured under this bill are as follows—House report page number: Sparrow III, 38; Sidewinder 1C, 38; Terrier, 38; Tartar, 38; Talos, 38; Bullpup, 38; Regulus I, 38; Subroc, 38; Polaris, 38; Hawk, 38; Redeye, 38.

On page 75 of the report you will see that the Navy has 12 missiles of which 7 are operational and 4 rockets—all of which are operational.

You will also see that the Marine Corps has seven guided missiles of which

five are operational. The Marine Corps also has two rockets—both of which are operational.

As I did with respect to the Army aircraft and missiles, I noted the page on which each of these items is described. And I repeat that, although there is fairly substantial information in the report concerning each of the missiles and aircraft to be procured, the committee went into the question of altitude, speed, unit cost, who manufactures the particular aircraft or missile, and all that kind of business. We got to know everything about every one of them. And as I indicated before, never in the history of the Armed Services Committee has there been a hearing as complete, as revealing and as rewarding as these hearings were.

So, that is a total of $1,585,600,000 for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft; $633,400,000 for Navy and Marine Corps missiles. These amounts are the same as those contained in the Senate bill.

NAVAL VESSELS

Now, I want to deal with the Navy ships which is the second part of the Navy program I referred to. This part of the program starts on page 39. At the top of page 39 you will see a summary which shows that new construction will cost $2,336,595,000, conversions will cost $227,585,000, and so forth. The total new authorization for naval vessels is $2,925 million.

The bill as reported out by the Committee on Armed Services authorizes an appropriation of $2,925 million to support the shipbuilding program recommended for the U.S. Navy for fiscal year 1962.

The authorization approved by the committee endorses, with only minor modification, the shipbuilding program proposed by the Defense Department for fiscal year 1962.

The program recommended by the Defense Department would have required $2,915 million in authorizations, whereas the committee increased this amount by $10 million to defray the additional cost involved in substituting two nuclear powered guided missile frigates for three of the seven conventionally powered guided missile frigates originally proposed by the Defense Department.

The committee action would authorize a fiscal 1962 shipbuilding program for the U.S. Navy consisting of (a) 35 new ships, including 6 guided missile frigates, 2 of which will be nuclear powered—House report, page 43; 10 Polaris firing submarines and 3 attack submarines, all 13 will be nuclear powered, page 43; 3 escort ships, page 44; 3 guided missile escort ships, page 44; 3 amphibious transports, dock, page 44; 1 amphibious assault ship, page 44; 1 combat store ship, page 44; 1 hydrofoil research ship, page 44; 2 oceanographic research ships, page 45; 1 surveying ship, page 45; and 1 Polaris submarine tender, page 45; (b) 16 service and landing craft of various types, page 45; (c) modernization and conversion of 22 other ships including 14 active fleet World War II destroyers, page 46; 6 active fleet World War II submarines, page 46; a Victory ship hull conversion to a missile range instrumentation ship, page 46; and the conversion of an escort carrier hull to a major communications relay ship, page 46.

In the event any Member desires more specific detail in respect to the cost and characteristics of the vessels scheduled for construction or conversion in the fiscal year 1962 program, such detail information is available in the committee report in the section concerned with "Naval Vessels."

In addition to the foregoing authorization for new construction and modernization of naval vessels, the figure of $2,925 million includes authorization for the appropriation of $469,320,000 to replace funds used to accelerate the Polaris program—House Report, page 39.

As you will recall, five Polaris submarines originally planned for inclusion in the fiscal year 1962 program were contracted for in fiscal year 1961 pursuant to President Kennedy's direction. This acceleration of the Polaris program necessitated, among other things, the utilization of $469,320,000 of unobligated funds from other ship accounts authorized and appropriated for in previous years. Therefore, it will now be necessary to replace these funds so as to permit the continuation of shipbuilding programs authorized in previous years.

Finally, this legislation would authorize the appropriation of $44,400,000 for purposes of advance procurement for long leadtime items for ships planned for inclusion in the fiscal year 1963 shipbuilding program.

These include: (a) Nuclear components for 2 nuclear powered attack submarines; (b) fire control and electronics equipment components for 7 submarine conversions; and (c) ASW, communications, and electrical components for 14 destroyer conversions.

In summary, the program authorized by the committee represents a total cost of $3,077,900,000. However, previously authorized assets representing advance funding from fiscal year 1961 in the amount of $152,900,000 reduces the requirement of new obligational authority required to be provided by the Congress for the fiscal year 1962 program to a net new authorization of $2,925 million. Therefore, this is the figure reported out and recommended by the Committee on Armed Services to support the fiscal year 1962 shipbuilding program of the Department of the Navy.

POLARIS

The Polaris program is, of course, of particlar interest to the Congress and therefore I feel it necessary to discuss it in particular detail. As you are aware, the present shipbuilding program undertaken by the Navy includes the construction of 19 new nuclear powered Polaris firing submarines. This figure of 19 includes 5 originally planned for the fiscal year 1962 program but which were accelerated and started in fiscal year 1961.

Two of these Polaris submarines are now operational and one more is ready for sea, out of five that have now been launched.

The fiscal year 1962 shipbuilding program as recommended by the Department of Defense and supported by the Committee on Armed Services would provide for 10 additional Polaris submarines. Thus, a total of 29 Polaris firing submarines would be authorized through the fiscal year 1962 shipbuilding program.

Under the program recommended by the President, Polaris submarines are now scheduled to be delivered at the rate of one a month compared with the previous rate of only five per year. This accelerated schedule of construction will permit a force of 29 Polaris submarines to be completed about 2 years earlier than would have been possible under the previously established 5-a-year-rate schedule. Under the new scheduling, the 29 Polaris submarines will have been completed in 1964 as opposed to 1967.

Secretary of Defense McNamara has advised the Committee on Armed Services that no decision has been made as to whether or not additional Polaris firing submarines will be required beyond the 29 recommended for the fiscal year 1962 shipbuilding program.

As pointed out by the Secretary of Defense, the decision to build additional Polaris firing submarines beyond the 29 largely depends upon the future assessment of our total nuclear missile capability.

The Polaris firing submarine is, for practical purposes, nothing more than a movable and mobile platform for firing a ballistic missile. Therefore, the number of Polaris firing submarines required to provide us with the deterrent capability necessary for the future must necessarily include consideration of the ballistic missile capability available in our Atlas, Titan, and Minuteman bases.

It would be totally unrealistic to arbitrarily establish a future requirement for additional Polaris firing submarines without giving appropriate consideration to our other related ballistic missile capabilities.

We must maintain, now and in the future, the proper number and mix of weapons systems capable of delivering a nuclear warhead. The Polaris firing submarine represents only one of a number of weapons systems capable of delivering a nuclear warhead. Therefore, I believe that additional Polaris firing submarines should be authorized only if future circumstances indicate a requirement beyond the 29 presently recommended for construction.

NUCLEAR POWERED SURFACE SHIPS

I wish also to point out that the Committee on Armed Services has included in the proposed fiscal year 1962 shipbuilding program an authorization for the construction of two nuclear powered surface vessels in lieu of three conventional types recommended by the Defense Department.

The action of the committee reflects its belief that future combatant surface ship construction should place increased emphasis on the advantage of nuclear propulsion as opposed to conventional propulsion.

Testimony received by the committee indicates that the cost of constructing a nuclear powered ship has been reduced significantly over the years so that today the cost of a nuclear powered vessel, as compared to a conventional type, represents a ratio of approximately 1½ to 1. That is, a nuclear propelled craft will cost approximately one-third to one-half more than a conventional vessel. However, this cost difference is significantly reduced by the fact that the cost of nuclear fuel is included in the original construction cost of the nuclear vessel whereas the fuel cost of operating a conventional vessel with oil is not reflected in its construction cost.

I am told that the nuclear cores for each of the nuclear powered vessels represents a cost of approximately $8 million. Thus, in the last analysis the cost of a nuclear powered guided missile frigate will be approximately $103 million as contrasted to $71 million for a conventionally powered ship of this type.

Another related cost consideration which cannot be accurately assessed is the fact that nuclear powered vessels do not require support craft such as oilers to provide them with logistic support.

Of course, these elements which relate only to cost are actually secondary to the prime consideration, and that is how nuclear power improves the capability of the ship itself. With its great range, which is 50 to 60 times that of a conventionally powered ship, it can range the seas, hide out, and appear as a single fighting unit at any point on the oceans of the world. It is not always tailed and trailed with other craft making repairs and furnishing it with oil and generally giving away its location and cutting down on its efficiency as a fighting ship.

We cannot indulge ourselves with the luxury of second-class naval vessels and consequently, notwithstanding the additional cost involved, I am convinced that future shipbuilding must include a significantly larger percentage of nuclear propelled surface craft.

At the present time, we have only three nuclear powered surface vessels authorized. These include an aircraft carrier, a cruiser, and a destroyer. It is apparent that we need more of these vessels in the future.

Therefore, our committee has recommended that the Navy substitute two nuclear powered guided missile frigates for three of the seven conventional types recommended for construction by the Defense Department.

I am happy to advise that this change is acceptable to the Secretary of Defense who has advised me that he intends to give increased attention to the need for additional nuclear powered surface vessels for future shipbuilding programs.

The personnel strength in the Navy today is 625,000. To this number, there will be added 3,000—a grand total of 628,000, in the Navy.

The personnel strength of the Marine Corps today is 175,000. The President's program will add 3,000 more men—for a grand total of 178,000 in the Marine Corps.

This means that the total of the Navy and Marine Corps together will be 806,000.

So, in summary of the Navy and Marine Corps, and including all aircraft, missiles, and vessels, the Navy and Marine Corps has a total of $5,144 million in this bill which is $10 million more than the Senate version.

AIR FORCE

As in the case of the Army and the Navy, the Air Force program is set out in brief fashion on page 59. There you will see that the Air Force is acquiring the following aircraft at a cost of $3,670,200,000.

I would like to mention again that I have appended to my remarks a complete list of all of the Air Force aircraft and missiles to be procured under this bill. This list, which will appear in the RECORD, describes each of these aircraft and missiles and shows their military characteristics.

The aircraft to be procured for the Air Force under this bill, as I say, totals $3,670,200,000 and are as follows—House report page number: KC–135, 60; F–105D, 60; T–38, T–39, T–40, 61; GARS, 61; Rf–105, 62; RC–130, 62; C–130E, 62; C–141, 62.

I should add to this list, of course, the B–52 and B–58 bombers which are the subject of a committee amendment and which I will deal with in just a moment.

The Air Force, as is shown on page 59, is acquiring missiles at a cost of $2,792 million. These missiles are as follows—House report page number: Atlas, 63; Titan, 63; Minuteman, 63; Hound Dog, 64; Bullpup, 64; Drone, 64.

Let me refer briefly to the size of the Air Force. The Air Force today has 822,000 people. This will be increased by 2,000 for a grand total of 824,000 in the Air Force.

BOMBERS

I would like to speak a moment about bombers generally. Now, the Air Force today has three kinds of bombers—B–47; B–52; and B–58.

The largest number of bombers are in the B–47 category.

We do, however, have a substantial number of B–52's with more of them still coming off the lines. However, the last B–52 which has been ordered by the Air Force will be delivered in August of 1962 and the last B–58 will be delivered to the Air Force in October of 1962.

The committee became very concerned during the hearings about the fact that the B–47's were going to be phased out over the next several years and that the B–52 and B–58 would stop coming off the assembly lines in August and October of next year.

Now, we are sure that the ICBM will turn out to be a really effective weapon at some time in the future. But the committee was not satisfied that we should place our whole reliance on ICBM's at this time or in the near future.

So, we added $337 million to the bill for the procurement of bombers. The way we did it was to add the money in the appropriate place and also added the following language:

Provided, however, That $337,000,000 of the foregoing $3,670,200,000 is authorized only for the procurement of B–52 and/or B–58 bomber aircraft.

Now, of course, the committee does not intend to say whether they are to be B–52's or B–58's. The Air Force can use this authority in any way that it feels will best fit the needs of the country.

Because this whole matter is so important, you will note that the committee report devotes a good bit of space to it starting on page 2.

I would like to quote from this portion of the report because I think it sets out very well the thinking of the committee in making the change it did. The report states in part that—

The committee has added $337 million to permit the procurement of B–52 and/or B–58 bombers.

Our recent history in the field of offensive weapons development has placed heavy stress upon the intercontinental ballistic missile.

The committee considers it reasonable to believe that the offensive capability of this country, and of the enemy, will ultimately rest with ICBM's.

During the committee's extended hearings, both on posture and procurement, there slowly developed among the Members of the committee a perceptible hesitancy in placing complete confidence and dependence in the ICBM for now or the near future.

Without in any way intending to minimize the importance of the intercontinental ballistic missile, and with full realization that it may represent our highest order of deterrent and offensive capability at some time in the future, the committee has posed the question to itself and poses the question to the House: Are we proceeding too rapidly in the area of what is essentially an unknown weapon at the cost of weapons whose capabilities are tried and known?

The current plans of the Department of Defense are headed toward the ultimate elimination of bomber aircraft. Even within the next few years there will be a substantial decline in the number of bombers.

The bomber is a vehicle of known capability for the carrying of weapons of many kinds. In one way or another, every weapon in the inventory of the world today has been carried, has been used, and has worked when carried by bomber aircraft.

The intercontinental ballistic missile has two modes: Go or not go. The bomber aircraft has an almost infinite variety of modes. It can go, it cannot go, it can go part way and wait, it can go part way and turn around; it can proceed or not proceed in any fashion whatsoever since it is at all times under the intelligent control of a human being.

Is it not entirely possible, indeed hopeful, that nuclear weapons might by international agreement be outlawed at some time in the future?

Would not at that time the nation who possesses a conventional capability be in a virtually absolute position with respect to his enemies?

Also—and this is a thought which to the knowledge of the committee has not been stressed in the past—who knows whether an intercontinental ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead will actually work? Each of the constituent elements has been tested, it is true. Each of them, however, has not been tested under circumstances which would be attendant upon the firing of such a missile in anger.

By this the committee means an intercontinental ballistic missile will carry its nuclear warhead to great heights, subjecting it to intense cold. It then will arch down and upon reentering the earth's atmosphere subject the nuclear warhead to intense heat.

Who knows what will happen to the many delicate mechanisms involved in the nuclear warhead as it is subjected to these two extremes of temperature?

The committee is so strong in its belief that the bomber concept should not be relegated at this time to a place of relative unimportance in our total defense picture that it specifically discussed this matter with the Secretary of Defense and, happily, found that the Secretary was in substantial agreement with the committee position.

By this the committee does not wish to imply that the Secretary of Defense agreed that authority for bombers should be added to the bill. Indeed, it was his position that bombers should not be added to the bill since, in his opinion, a decision in this respect could wait until next year.

Questioning of the Secretary revealed that once a bomber assembly line is stopped, which under current plans will be August 1962 in the case of the B–52, and October 1962 in the case of the B–58, it will cost many millions of dollars to start it rolling again.

The committee is so convinced that the bomber will continue to play a very important part in our offensive and deterrent capabilities for such a time into the future that it believes that an insurance policy of $337 million for which bombers can be procured is far better than an attitude of vacillation or hesitancy which could cause the expenditure of many millions in restoring the assembly line for which expenditure few, if any, bombers would be procured.

It will be noted that the committee in addition to changing the money figure for Air Force aircraft also added language, as follows:

"Provided, however, That $337 million of the foregoing $3,670,200,000 is authorized only for the procurement of B–52 and/or B–58 bomber aircraft."

The purpose of this language is obvious. It expresses in clear and unambiguous fashion the committee's belief that authority should be readily available for the continuation of bomber procurement. The existence of this authority will permit the granting of appropriations sufficient in amount and appropriate in time to insure that the bomber assembly lines will not be stopped because of the lack of proper authority to proceed with bomber production beyond the dates set out above.

Now, that's the story—and I think a sound one—behind the biggest change which we made in the bill.

Here—in the Air Force title of the bill—the difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is rather large. The Senate added $525 million for Air Force bombers but made no other change in the bill.

In the Air Force, the House bill added $337 million for bombers, $21.2 million for turbofan engines, $25 million for three special air mission aircraft.

I will deal with each of these House changes at this time.

We added $25 million for three special mission aircraft which are urgently needed for the special squadron for the Military Air Transport Service and the reasons behind this change are set out on page 2 of the report.

We also added $21.2 million to permit the installation of fan engines on the last 15C–135 aircraft which are now being procured. This will permit these cargo airplanes to use shorter runways for takeoff and landing and will permit them to fly much greater distances. The details of this change are set out at the bottom of page 1 of the report.

The $10 million for the substitution of two nuclear frigates for three conventional ones I have already discussed.

So, the totals of the bill, by Department, are as follows:

Army: $761,800,000; the Senate bill is the same.

Navy: $5,144 million; the Senate bill is $10 million less which reflects the change made by the House with respect to the frigates.

Air Force: $6,462,200,000, the Senate bill is $6,604 million—a difference of $141,800,000—and I described this difference a moment ago.

The grand total of the House bill is $12,368 million.

The grand total of the Senate bill is $12,499,800,000—which makes the Senate bill $131,800,000 more than the House bill.

I would like to make a few concluding remarks which I think are of great importance.

Our military forces are strong. They are well equipped and they are capable of carrying out their missions. Make no mistake about this. We are in good shape in our Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. They are powerful and they can do their job. But we do not stay strong or grow strong by standing still.

Our potential adversary is not standing still. He is developing new weapons and better weapons all the time. We must not only stay even with him—we must go beyond him. For it is only in this way that we can maintain the freedom of our people, preserve the freedom of our friends who are free today and, hopefully, assist in the achievement of freedom of those who are not free.

This bill is a large one. It is the largest authorization bill ever submitted to the Congress. It is, therefore, pertinent to note that the President made special mention of the fact that his defense program was not based upon arbitrary budget ceilings but was based, rather, on military requirements.

President Kennedy in his inaugural address said so well:

Only when our arms are sufficient beyond doubt can we be certain beyond doubt that they will never be employed.

I submit this: The bill you have before you, H.R. 6151, is a major step toward making our arms sufficient beyond doubt, and its passage an assurance that beyond doubt they will never be employed.

Mr. Chairman, I now would like to describe all of the missiles and aircraft of the military departments. Here is how they line up:

ARMY

Aircraft: L–23F Seminole, AO–1 Mohawk, AC–1 Caribou, HU–1B Iroquois, HC–1B Chinook.

Missiles: Nike-Hercules, Hawk, Redeye, Honest John, Little John, Antitank, Sergeant, Pershing.

ARMY MISSILE AND AIRCRAFT PROGRAM

The details of the Army's aircraft and missile programs on an item by item basis, beginning with the aircraft program, follow:

Five types of aircraft: In fiscal year 1962, the Army plans to procure five types of aircraft. These are the Iroquois, Chinook, Caribou, Mohawk, and Seminole. It plans a gradual increase in its air mobility capability over the 9-year span 1961–70. A discussion of each of these aircraft follows.

ARMY AIRCRAFT

Iroquois: The HU–1B Iroquois, produced by the Bell Helicopter Corp. of Fort Worth, Tex., is a low-silhouette, high-performance helicopter, powered by a single gas turbine engine. It provides tactical mobility for combat troops, supplies, and battlefield evacuation.

Chinook: The Chinook HC–1B helicopter is a product of the Vertol Division of Boeing Aircraft Corp. of Morton, Pa. It is a newly developed craft still under test and designed for primary use as a vertical lift transport for troops, supplies and weapons in the combat zone. The Chinook will be all metal; it will have tandem rotors powered by two turbine engines and will provide a 3-ton lift capability.

Caribou: The AC–1 Caribou is built by the DeHavilland Ltd. of Canada. This aircraft meets an urgent Army requirement for a modern battlefield short takeoff and landing—STOL—aircraft which can move troops, weapons, equipment and supplies rapidly within the combat zone.

Mohawk: Next in the Army's new family of aircraft is the AO–1 Mohawk combat surveillance airplane. It is made by Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. of Bethpage, Long Island, N.Y. This aircraft is an all metal, midwing monoplane, powered by two gas turbo-prop engines, and manned by a crew of two. It is capable of operating from small unimproved areas.

Seminole: The last aircraft to be discussed is the L–23F Seminole, a utility-transport airplane which is produced by Beech Aircraft Corp. of Wichita, Kans. It is an all metal, low-wing monoplane, powered by two piston type engines. This craft is essentially commercial or "off-the-shelf" procurement with military radios added. It is a command aircraft used additionally for transition training.

ARMY MISSILES

Hawk: The Hawk missile system is required to provide the field Army with a low altitude defense against aircraft.

Nike-Hercules: The next system, the Nike-Hercules, is an air-defense missile system required for the defense of critical installations and population centers in the United States, elements of the field Army, and key oversea installations.

Redeye: The Redeye is a new missile system. This item will provide close-in protection against low-flying aircraft.

Antitank guided missile: Switching to the surface-to-surface missile systems, the first discussed is the antitank guided missile. This is a lightweight, man-transportable system required to provide for defense of combat units against tanks. It will also have an additional capability against hard-point targets such as bunkers.

Honest John: The Honest John provides the bulk of the Army's current capability for division and short-range

corps nuclear fire support. It also provides an impressive high explosive capability. This system is simple, rugged and reliable and is especially adapted for operations within the field Army.

Little John: Little John is a lightweight general support free rocket system required for units which need a high degree of mobility such as airborne units.

Pershing: The Pershing is a solid propellant, inertially guided missile system required to provide long-range, high-yield nuclear fire support for the field Army.

Sergeant: Sergeant is a solid propellant, inertially guided missile system required to provide long-range nuclear fire support.

And now the Navy, Mr. Chairman:

NAVY

Aircraft: A4D–5 Skyhawk, A2F–1 Intruder, F4H–1 Phantom, F8U–2N Crusader, HU2K–1 Seasprite, HSS–2, HUS–1, P3V–1 Orion, S2F–3 Tracker, W2F–1 Hawkeye, HR(x), T–39 Saberliner.

Missiles: Sparrow III, Sidewinder 1C, Terrier, Tartar, Talos, Bullpup, Regulus I, Subroc, Polaris, Hawk, Redeye.

The following major aircraft models have been introduced or are scheduled for introduction to the fleet during fiscal year 1961:

F8U–2N: The F8U–2N is a high performance, supersonic, limited all-weather carrier fighter. This aircraft is an improved version of the F8U–2 aircraft. Its relatively low cost permits the Navy to obtain a greater total number of fighters within the funds available.

F4H–1: The F4H–1 is a twin engine, all-weather, supersonic carrier fighter, believed superior in performance to any in the world. This aircraft can deliver atomic weapons and conventional bombs as a fighter-bomber. It incorporates the latest developments for the use of air-to-air missiles.

A3J–1: The A3J–1 is an all-weather, supersonic, carrier-based, heavy attack aircraft. It is powered by two jet engines with afterburners, and is configured with an inertial bombing navigation system. This aircraft is designed to carry conventional or nuclear weapons internally.

S2F–3: The S2F–3 is a carrier-based ASW aircraft powered by two reciprocating engines. It differs basically from earlier models in that it is configured with improved and more sophisticated ASW detecting and tracking equipment, has greater range and on-station endurance.

HSS–2: The HSS–2 is an all-weather, carrier-based ASW helicopter. It is powered by twin turbine engines, has improved detection and attack capabilities, and has an additional capability for amphibious operations.

HU2K–1: The HU2K–1 is a carrier-based search and rescue helicopter powered by a single turbine engine. The greater range and increased lifting ability of the HU2K–1 will provide the fleet with a search and rescue capability which will be much improved over that provided by earlier aircraft. The HU2K–1 is equipped with emergency flotation gear.

FISCAL YEAR 1962 PROCUREMENT

The aircraft in the fiscal year 1962 procurement program include the F4H–1, F8U–2N, HU2K–1, and S2F–3, previously described. In addition, the following major types will be bought:

A4D Skyhawk: A new model of the A4D Skyhawk, the A4D–5, which will have a lighter, more economical and more powerful engine. This plane will have better speed, range, and combat ceiling than its predecessor models. Its relative low cost is a factor in obtaining badly needed increased procurement quantities.

A2F Intruder: A new jet attack aircraft designed for all-weather penetration of enemy territory for nuclear or conventional attack, and close support of troops. It is subsonic, long range, and has excellent weapons-carrying capability.

P3V Orion: A new four engine, turboprop, land-based plane for ASW. It will replace the P2V Neptune and will be fitted with the latest airborne antisubmarine systems, including magnetic anomoly detection (MAD) equipment, homing torpedoes, and nuclear depth bombs.

W2F: An entirely new carrier-based early warning and interceptor control aircraft. This plane will provide an airborne detection capability against low flying aircraft and a capability to control intercepts in an entirely new order of performance.

HUS–1 and HRB–1: Marine Corps vertical assault needs are being met by procurement of the HUS–1 troop carrying helicopter and the Vertol HRB–1, a follow-on of the HUS with improved load capacity.

A small number of T–39 jet trainers are being procured for economical training of pilots and radar operators in intercept fundamentals, thus decreasing the need to use high performance aircraft for this purpose.

The Navy's new and improved aircraft fulfill requirements for superior military operating characteristics, and incorporate the finest equipment.

NAVY MISSILES

The Navy now has a large and growing number of ships and aircraft configured to deliver guided missiles. Within available Navy resources, guided missiles have been installed in ships and aircraft as fast as possible. The Navy has concentrated on a small number of types, avoiding undue diversification.

Missile procurement for fiscal year 1962 will provide as large a buy of missiles of all types as is practicable, commensurate with the balance of programs. Additional Polaris and Bullpup missiles will be provided by the amended budget request.

Sidewinder: In the air-to-air category, the Navy's Sidewinder 1C is a new greatly improved development of the earlier Sidewinder which has been basic Navy fighter armament for several years. It will be made in a heat-homing version and radar-homing, all-weather version.

Sparrow III: Sparrow III is an all-weather, radar-homing type with a range greater than Sidewinder. It is the only known air-to-air missile which can successfully attack a jet target head-on.

Bullpup: The Navy's one air-to-surface missile, Bullpup, is an accurate, reliable, relatively inexpensive missile. It is excellent for close support of troops.

Surface-to-air missiles are essential for anti-air warfare. In combination with interceptor aircraft, they enable naval forces to overcome the threat of enemy air opposition and to clear the way for offensive strikes. The Navy has a family of three surface-to-air missiles suited to various sizes of ships.

Talos: Talos is a ramjet missile for cruisers. It has a range of over 50 miles and can carry either a nuclear or conventional warhead.

Terrier: Terrier is about half the weight of Talos, has a range in excess of 10 miles. It is suitable for cruisers, carriers, and frigates. It also offers a choice of warheads.

Tartar: Tartar is designed for destroyers, escorts, and as a secondary battery in cruisers.

Subroc: Subroc is a long-range antisubmarine missile designed to be launched from a standard submarine 21-inch torpedo tube, programing from underwater to air to underwater.

Regulus: Regulus is an air-breathing surface-to-surface missile installed in specially configured cruisers and submarines. It can carry a nuclear warhead several hundred miles at high subsonic speed. Regulus is in the fleet but no longer in production.

Polaris: Polaris, the Navy's inertially guided, submarine launched, ballistic missile will be described separately.

These are the guided missiles in the fleet today and which will provide the backbone of the Navy's missile capability for some years in the future. Increased numbers are required to outfit new and modernized ships and planes as they join the fleet.

And last, Mr. Chairman, the Air Force:

AIR FORCE

Aircraft: B–52 bomber, B–58 bomber, KC–135 jet tanker, F–105D tactical fighter, T–38 jet supersonic trainer, T–39 jet utility trainer, T–40 mission support, GAR's guided air-to-air rockets, B–70 supersonic strategic bomber, RF–105 tactical reconnaissance, RC–130 mapping and charting, C–130E turboprop strategic airlift transport, C–141 MATS modernization.

Missiles: SM–65 Atlas strategic ICBM, SM–68 Titan strategic ICBM, SM–80 Minuteman strategic ICBM, GAM–77 Hound Dog air launched strategic missile, GAM–83 Bullpup air launched missile, TGAM–83 Bullpup trainer, Q–2C Drone.

AIR FORCE AIRCRAFT

KC–135: The Department requested authorization of continued procurement of KC–135 jet tanker aircraft. Adequate tanker support is essential to certain tactics dictated by increasingly effective enemy defenses. The use of modern jet tankers in lieu of the old propeller-driven KC–97's also allows greater latitude in the recovery of strike aircraft which is essential to follow-on missions. Further

procurement of KC–135's will be necessary in subsequent years in order to meet force objectives for support of both strategic and tactical forces.

F–105: Continued procurement of the F–105 tactical fighter-bomber was also included in the authorization request. This airplane replaces obsolete tactical fighters and bombers which do not have the performance or firepower essential for combat in the mid-1960's. Furthermore, our older fighters have a very limited ability to deliver weapons under adverse weather conditions. Prompt modernization of the tactical fighter forces is essential. As the F–105 enters the inventory the variety of types of tactical aircraft will be reduced with corresponding savings in logistical support. The F–105 will be assigned to oversea as well as to continental forces. Those based in the United States will be part of the composite air strike force which has been organized for rapid deployment to trouble spots throughout the world.

T–38: The T–38 is a relatively small, lightweight trainer, capable of supersonic speeds. It has a maximum speed of mach 1.24 (830 miles per hour), is capable of operating up to 50,000 feet, and lands at only 130 miles per hour. Inherent in the design of the aircraft are the maximum possible provisions for safety of flight, ease of maintenance, and economy of operation. The T–38 replaces aging T–33's as a pilot trainer in the basic flying schools, and will eliminate the disparity in performance and handling characteristics which exist between the present trainer and the first-line tactical aircraft of the 1960–70 time period.

T–39: The T–39 is required in support of several specialized training courses. For example, instrument pilot instructors for tactical multiengine aircraft will be trained in the T–39. A special configuration will be used for training pilots on the complex armament system used in the F–105 fighter. The T–39, with a speed of 505 miles per hour, will be used to provide jet training for pilots and other crew members.

In addition, the T–39 is required to replace obsolete aircraft in the mission support fleet.

T–40: The T–40 is also required for modernization of the mission support fleet. Mission support includes a wide variety of flying tasks which directly support the primary mission of a major unit. It provides the capability to fill unexpected gaps in supply and maintenance processes, and for quick, on-the-spot response to problems whenever and wherever they arise. Such support is essential to effective management of the Air Force's day-to-day operations. The T–39 has been programed for the mission support fleet to the maximum extent possible. However, that aircraft is simply not large enough to carry all the required loads. Therefore, the T–40 is needed, in lesser numbers, for use where the T–39 will not suffice in size, or where use of the T–40 would be more economical.

Guided air rockets: There was some doubt as to whether guided aircraft rockets—GAR's—are missiles within the meaning of section 412(b) or simply ammunition-type items under the Air Force concept of planning and programing. However, since these, as well as a number of other items clearly not subject to section 412(b) under a strict interpretation were included in the amount of authorization sought, the distinction became academic. The committee, therefore, examined into the need for these weapons, just as it did in the case of the aircraft which carry and launch them.

The several GAR's were developed as a result of the need to counter the greater speeds and altitudes of enemy aircraft, and to enable our interceptors to destroy these aircraft under all weather conditions. The GAR's are guided to their targets either by radar or infrared seekers. The target is picked up by the interceptor's fire control system and when the interceptor is in the proper position, the rockets are launched. The radar or infrared seeker in the missile then homes in on the target. GAR's with high explosive warheads detonate upon contact with an enemy bomber; those with nuclear warheads are detonated by proximity fuses when they get near the bomber.

The GAR–3A uses a radar target seeker and carries a high explosive warhead, and is carried by the F–106 interceptor. The GAR–4A is similar to the 3A but uses an infrared seeker. It is also carried by the F–106 interceptor. The GAR–11 uses a radar seeker, but carries a nuclear warhead.

The committee approved the authorization request for these rockets, which substantially buys out the presently programed requirements.

RF–105/RC–130: Funds were included in the authorization request for advanced buy of long leadtime components for the RF–105—the reconnaissance version of the F–105 tactical fighter-bomber—and the RC–130, a C–130 transport specially configured and equipped for the air photographic and charting service. No aircraft of these types are to be procured in the fiscal year 1962 program.

C–130E: The C–130E aircraft, with its versatile load carrying capabilities and performance characteristics, is ideally suited to many and varied mission requirements. Cabin pressurization permits operation at optimum altitudes, resulting in a range of 3,250 nautical miles with a 35,000-pound payload. As a transport, it can be configured to carry 92 troops, 64 paratroopers, or 70 litter patients. The C–130E can operate from hastily prepared landing sites, and from dirt, gravel, or sand areas in support of Army assault operations. As the C–130E phases into troop carrier units, C–130B aircraft will be reassigned to the assault mission role, replacing obsolescent C–123 aircraft.

C–141: As in the case of the B–70, the C–141, being still in the development stage, is not technically included within the purview of section 412(b). However, its inclusion in the program for which authorization was sought brought it under the committee's cognizance.

To satisfy the intent of presidentially approved courses of action regarding the national airlift posture, the design philosophy of this new transport is directed toward satisfaction of military requirements and the needs of commercial carriers. Procurement of this optimum cargo aircraft for the civil reserve fleet will greatly strengthen the national airlift capability.

AIR FORCE MISSILES

Atlas: The Atlas missile provided the first U.S. operational ICBM capability in September of 1959. This missile's range and accuracy have been demonstrated very satisfactorily. The later models of the Atlas incorporate an all-inertial guidance system, which eliminates the complex ground guidance equipment. The Atlas "F" incorporates a further improved launcher configuration, being stored in a silo launcher. The authorization requested for fiscal year 1962 substantially completes the funding of the approved Atlas force objective.

Titan: The Titan missile initially was intended as a backup to the Atlas, to insure attainment of an ICBM operational capability at the earliest possible date. It has since been continued as a complementary system toward that end. There are two models of the Titan, differing as to guidance systems and storability of propellants. Both are required, however, in addition to the Atlas, in order that we may attain the necessary ICBM strength at the earliest possible date. The two systems are not competitive or duplicative, to the extent that we did not have either one, the other program would have had to be increased.

Minuteman: The Minuteman will provide a more simple, easier maintained, less complex, more reliable, more accurate, easier to produce, and less costly missile. It is a simple, solid-fueled missile, which can be maintained on the alert in large numbers and held ever ready for action at a moment's notice. It is not competitive with, or duplicative of, the Atlas or Titan. Each has its carefully prescribed role.

Originally planned to be deployed in both fixed and mobile configurations, the Minuteman was the missile planned for the greatest quantity production as the backbone of our ICBM force. Now it has been decided to increase the fixed deployment, while deferring the mobile version pending further research and development.

Hound Dog: The Hound Dog is an air-to-surface missile to be carried by the B–52. There are many advantages in carrying missiles on our strategic bombers. Most important, bomber firepower is increased. Additionally, the missiles are able to attack heavily defended targets and to destroy enemy defenses ahead of the bombers.

The Hound Dog protects our substantial national investment in the B–52 fleet. It not only insures the continued effectiveness of the B–52 in the face of continually improving enemy defenses, but also increases the capability of these aircraft to deliver multiple warheads on target. For a minimum expenditure of

funds, we are able to compound considerably the enemy's problems of defense by confronting him with a completely new, high-speed, high-altitude threat.

Bullpup: The Bullpup is a tactical air-to-surface missile which fills the need for an extremely accurate missile for the destruction of pinpoint targets in support of the Army. Such a missile, with a considerable range, reduces the vulnerability of the attacking aircraft to enemy defenses, and assures the destruction of military targets with a minimum number of sorties. The Bullpup, which was developed by the Navy, is used by the F–100 and F–105 aircraft. It can be fitted with either a nuclear or a conventional warhead.

Q–2C Drone: The final item in the Air Force procurement budget is the Q–2C target drone. This target is required to test weapon systems which use surface-to-air or air-to-air missiles, and for the training of operational units equipped with these systems. It is a relatively lightweight drone which can be launched either from an aircraft or from the ground. It is designed to cruise at speeds up to 520 knots and at altitudes up to 50,000 feet. The drone is recoverable by parachute on command. It is equipped with scoring devices to measure accurately the miss distance between a missile and the drone.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to my colleague with pleasure.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to commend the gentleman for his statement and make this observation, that certainly not in my time and I suspect throughout the long and distinguished career of the gentleman from Georgia has he seen a bill, authorizing the spending of so much money, with so little printed material by way of justification.

Mr. VINSON. May I say I was somewhat disturbed by the length of the report. It is about 100 pages long. I hope every Member of the Congress will read it because this is a very important bill. You will know something, about every aspect of the bill, after reading the report, that is anything you may not have obtained already from my remarks after reading the report you will know something about the line item, even the $43 billion that will come in the appropriation bill. But the bill, of course, deals only with a part of it—$12 billion plus.

Mr. GROSS. And the hearings were most extensive.

Mr. VINSON. We had long hearings, 38 of them. They filled two volumes. The Committee on the Armed Services is the largest legislative committee in the House. We have 37 members. We started this hearing in February and finished it in May. Never before in the 25 years it has been my privilege to have been chairman of the committee have I seen such attendance. Nearly every member of the committee was there every day. In all my long years of service as chairman of a committee I have never found Members more inquisitive. From the beginning to the end they wanted to know everything. They were informed day in and day out with testimony, pictures on screens showing the different types of missiles, the type of modern battlefield, and everything else. I am trying to get across in this statement, and in the report the same kind of information and give it to the House that the 37 members of the Armed Services Committee obtained in its 38 hearings.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I am going to accept the gentleman's explanation of what information was revealed. I can accept that on faith.

Mr. VINSON. And even we are accepting some of the statements of qualified men from the Department on faith also.

Mr. GROSS. Of course we have to do that for we see page after page where there were deletions.

Mr. VINSON. Of course we have to do that.

Mr. GROSS. And I understand why. Certainly, the gentleman is too sensible to criticize the committee for not revealing confidential matters. I will say to the gentleman and other Members interested in these matters: just go over to the office of the Armed Services Committee, and Mr. Smart, Mr. Blandford, Mr. Kelleher, or Mr. Slatinshek will give them all the information they want. Of course, it is classified information. We will try to answer right now any questions that we can, for we want the Members to know just exactly where this Congress stands on trying to build the country's defenses along proper lines.

Another question. I believe you stated that the bill provided for an increase in armed services personnel of 13,000.

Mr. VINSON. No; that was developed in the hearings. I merely referred to it because it is an important change in the total defense program, but, being a personnel matter, it is not in this bill. The Appropriations Committee has ample authority and does not have to have authorization to increase the size of the armed services.

Mr. GROSS. You are saying, however, that there will be a 13,000 increase in the armed services; that is uniformed personnel.

Mr. VINSON. That is right, exactly.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman, How many civilian employees are going to be necessary to back up this additional number of military?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman, not a single one.

Mr. GROSS. I sincerely hope the gentleman is right.

Mr. VINSON. I am absolutely certain, because this is the type of mission that must be done by the military, and the military alone, not by civilians. For example, and it is just one example, we will have to train more men for the Polaris submarines.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WRIGHT. I should like to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia and the distinguished members of his committee for the painstaking care with which they have approached this very difficult job, and in particular for the courage and the wisdom which I am convinced they have displayed and for their suggestion for a continuation of the manned bomber program, the B–58 bomber. This is a supersonic aircraft, the fastest aircraft we have and I think it is a very wise thing to continue the program.

Mr. VINSON. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for the excellent job he has done. It is my intention to support this entire bill.

I have one question in mind that I thought possibly the chairman might be able to answer. The Navy has a policy of only awarding contracts to private yards for the construction of the Polaris type submarine, in a restricted number of yards. In 1959 the Navy Department invited the shipyard at Quincy, Mass., to bid on the Polaris submarine. The shipyard has built submarines in the past, they are experienced in nuclear-powered work. I was wondering if the Navy has given the gentleman any indication that they might change this policy of not inviting the Fore River Shipyard to bid?

Mr. VINSON. The policy was written some years ago, and adopted by the Congress, that wherever possible shipbuilding should be divided between Government yards and private yards. We always try to follow that as much as possible. As far as the Polaris submarines are concerned, we are building 14 right now. Six of them are being built by the Electric Boat Co. at Groton, Conn., a private shipyard. No doubt that is the reason the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. BROWN], was so prompt in supporting the building of six more. Five at the Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News, Va., another private shipyard; and two at the Navy Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif. That would also indicate the reason behind the enthusiasm for building more out there. Also one is being built at Portsmouth, Va. There are the 14.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I was interested in the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa as to whether the gentleman from Georgia ever remembered of a bill with this amount of money in it in the history of the Congress. I think the chairman has refreshed our minds on this. If I remember right, about 2 or 3 months before the victory in World War II, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services appeared in the well of the House with a piece of legislation that was passed unanimously by the House providing funds for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force involving $31 billion. Am I right?

Mr. VINSON. I have been privileged to present many large bills. I thought this was the largest. But all of these bills involve great programs and do cost a great deal of money. The two-ocean Navy might have cost more.

Mr. MADDEN. Am I correct in my statement?

Mr. VINSON. I am sure the gentleman is correct in his recollection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. VINSON] has presented a very full and comprehensive explanation of what is embodied in the bill (H.R. 6151) presently before us. He has explained, somewhat in detail insofar as security considerations permit, not only what is proposed but also the underlying facts and factors that entered into our committee's conclusions.

There is very little that I can add without being unnecessarily repetitious. There are, however, certain points with respect to this bill specifically and our national defense program generally that I believe should be emphasized. If anything I have to say relative to our national defense posture and plans serves any purpose, I hope I may contribute to discouraging rash statements that are from time to time made concerning our defense status.

National defense must never be made a partisan political issue. That has been, and continues to be, the consistent position of the Members of my side of the aisle. It has been our position when we controlled the administration and the Congress. It has been our position when we controlled the administration and not the Congress. It is our position today when we control neither the administration nor the Congress. We hold firm to the conviction that the political fortunes of any one of us, or of our party, are secondary to our national security on which depends the fortunes of all.

I call your special attention to the fact that this bill, authorizing the huge expenditure of $12,368 million for the procurement of major defense weapons, is reported to you from our Committee on Armed Services without a dissenting vote. What we have before us constitutes the unanimous—37 ayes and no nays—opinion of the committee as to our defense needs.

This is one of the reasons why I take such great pride in being a member of the Armed Services Committee. Whatever we recommend to you with respect to our national defense is, as in this instance, invariably a recommendation that represents the unanimous conclusion of the committee. And I can assure you we arrive at our conclusions only after both extensive and intensive study of every phase of our defense structure and strategy.

The two volumes of hearings themselves bespeak the exhaustiveness and the diligence of the 37 members of the committee in our study of our defense posture today and plans for tomorrow. We are determined to be fully prepared, today and tomorrow, for any emergency whatever, whenever, and however it may arise as a threat to our security.

The two volumes of the printed hearings do not tell the whole story of our committee study that brings this bill before the House. Much of the information presented to us has been deliberately and wisely deleted from the printed hearings. We were given this information that we may better evaluate what we have and what we need. We certainly do not want our potential enemies to have such information for evaluation.

Of course, there were differences of opinion among the respective members of the committee in their individual evaluation of strategy, weapons, organization, and the countless facets of our national defense. As a matter of fact, there are honest differences among the military experts themselves on various aspects of our defense. That there are these differences is understandable—indeed, a healthy situation. No one of us, civilian or military, is so omnipotent that he can foresee what may develop internationally in a diplomatic or military sense. Each day brings new developments in foreign relations and new technological developments in military weapons.

Whatever differences we have are differences of detail or emphasis. They are not irreconcilable differences because we are united on our objectives—to defend freedom—and united on the basic principles.

Interestingly enough the bill before us makes no substantial change from the defense program enunciated and developed under the leadership of President Eisenhower. Following World War II we proceeded to demobilize, failing to recognize that Communist Russia became our military ally not in the cause of freedom but rather an ally that she might thereby serve her own cause of world conquest. The outbreak of the Korean war brought us to a national awareness of how stupid we had been and how weak we were.

That is not the situation today, and we are determined it shall not be the situation tomorrow. We proceeded to build up our whole defense stature, and we made tremendous progress in the development of new weapons, of which missiles and the Polaris atomic submarines are notable examples. We have sought to have a deterrent force, so devastating in destructive power that no one would dare attack us. We have also sought to have and maintain a defense that is flexible, whereby we can move anywhere, everywhere, at any time to carry the fight to the aggressor.

We have such a defense—strong, well-balanced, and flexible. We have a national defense second to none. Let no one say differently. Those who do, do not know whereof they speak. With such irresponsible talk, largely for political purposes, they encourage aggression by our potential enemies and discourage our allies in our cooperative defense of freedom. Much that we have heard during the last few years about this gap or that gap between Russia and the United States in certain weapons, causes us to gasp to think that such statements, obviously politically motivated, would be made by people having responsible positions. It must always be borne in mind that an effective defense is based on many kinds of weapons, not just one, and must always be subject to adjustment.

Because of the need for flexibility, and at the same time for the Congress to exercise fully its constitutional responsibilities in defense matters, we have given the Department of Defense the authority to make adjustments in this program before us as changing circumstances may dictate. But the Committee on Armed Services will scrutinize every proposed change, and will have the power to modify and, if necessary, veto any change that may be proposed.

Before concluding, I wish to take note of one very important aspect of our defense organization. Out of the Cuban affair much ado has been made as to what factors and persons influenced the President in the decision. I wish to say that I personally do not share the point of view of those who are critical of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A distinction must be made between what is a national policy decision, involving political, geographic, economic, ideological, and any number of facts and factors, of which military is but one consideration. The primary responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is in military matters, adjusting military strategy in accordance with what the civil policy in foreign relations has been determined to be.

Over the years I have come in close contact with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Whatever one may think of any one of them individually, jointly they have never been wanting in making military decisions and developing effective plans in conformity with national policy formulated by the administration in conjunction with the Congress.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the respective Departments, appeared before our committee. This bill is the result of our deliberations. For the most part it follows their recommendations, but it is also the product of the committee's own deliberations.

As I previously stated, we have a national defense second to none. This bill will make certain we will continue to have such a defense. I hope the House will unanimously pass it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman referred to the gap, or possible gap, in missiles or in military ability as reflected in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I hope the gentleman will agree with me, however, that we do have a gap, a gap in our ability to cope with situations such as those in Cuba and Laos and to cope with communism; that it is not only by the spending of huge sums, as in this bill, that we can cope with those situations, but that we must somehow do better as far as general intelligence and administration leadership are concerned and other matters than military weapons

that have to do with the vital security of our Nation.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, in its recent hearings the Armed Services Committee received by far the most detailed information it has ever had on the posture and on the equipment needs of the armed services. For the first time the committee has been able to relate the costs of major weapons systems to other budget categories and to make a comprehensive evaluation of the authorizations being requested.

Members of this House have been informed of the unanimous recommendations of the committee and of the reasons therefor. I am sure that a very important factor in our action was the emphasis that the Secretary of Defense placed on the many studies made and they are continuing to make on the Defense Establishment.

We were told by Secretary McNamara that the Department had conducted a preliminary reappraisal of our defense posture and that a more thorough review is currently underway. He said that his proposals for changes in the January budget deal only with the most urgent and important problem areas where action at this session of the Congress would significantly improve our defense posture in the near future. As we know, these desired changes amount to almost $2 billion, of which almost 90 percent is for the Navy and the Air Force, principally for long-range ballistic missiles and their launching facilities.

I would like to impress upon this body that, in fact, urgent needs of the Army are not being taken care of by H.R. 6151. No doubt the Secretary of Defense is giving these deficiencies his earnest attention and perhaps in time he will have further proposals to make in this area. But to prevent any present misunderstanding, and to fire the enthusiasm of this body for more rapid progress, let me review briefly the great difference between what the Army has testified it needs and what we are considering in this authorization bill.

Our committee, of course, was given a thorough briefing on Army requirements. Our deliberations, however, were limited to the authorization of certain specified types of equipment for the services. For the Army we considered only aircraft and missiles. These categories amounted to only $761.8 million of the $1,957 million which was requested by the administration for the procurement of Army weapons and equipment, and this entire amount was recommended by the committee for favorable action by the House. Of this $761.8 million, $211 million would go for Army aircraft, that is, smaller planes for purely Army missions such as reconnaissance and the movement of limited quantities of men and supplies. The remainder, or $550.8 million, is for Army missiles to be used in air defense, for antitank protection, and to provide more effective support for combat units through increased range and firepower.

Now let us consider minimum requirements. First, let us take personnel. You will observe that there is no personnel authorization in this measure; H.R. 6151 deals only with the authorization of appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels as required by section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149. However, the President has asked in his budget message that the Army be increased by 5,000 men—to a total of 875,000.

In other words, there is to be a modest expansion in Army Special Forces, and the addition of a battle group to the understrength division in Hawaii, as well as another company for the battle group in Panama. Overall, the need for another STRAC division, for filling up divisions in Korea, for replacing missing support units, and for reinforcement of our forward-deployed airborne units still remains unfilled.

As I mentioned previously, the revised budget request contains $1.957 billion for the procurement of all types of Army equipment. It is true that this is $109 million above the January budget. Army testimony made it abundantly clear, however, that this amount permits little progress toward the degree of equipment modernization that is so badly needed. About $1.5 billion is required each year merely to replace wear-out and obsolescence, and to meet fixed costs such as shipping charges. Only the increment above $1.5 billion can be used to expedite the modernization of the Army's $13 billion inventory. In this day of rapid technological advance and accelerating obsolescence, this rate of replacement simply will not do. If the situation is not improved, the qualitative and quantitative deficiencies now existing in Army equipment will only grow more acute.

In sum, the organic capabilities of the Army are not yet being improved appreciably. Substantial increases are being proposed for strategic weapons systems and commendable increases are being recommended in airlift, space projects, and tactical fighters. But do not let us overlook—and I am certain the Secretary of Defense cannot for long continue to overlook—the longstanding and ever more urgent needs of the Army.

Basic to several programs for strategic weapons is the idea of retaining options, the capability to change direction quickly at a later date. May I submit that an equally important option is the ability to counter and defeat all types of limited conflicts without using strategic nuclear weapons. This is the primary function of the Army and to do this job quickly and effectively the Army too requires strengthening—strengthening in manpower and strengthening in material. Action toward this end has been too long delayed, in my opinion; the international situation is deteriorating too quickly to permit yet another year to go by before significant improvements are undertaken.

For this reason I urge my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to consider this matter with sympathy and to provide the added resources so necessary to form a powerful Army equal to any task.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily approve S. 1852 with one exception.

I object to the fact that S. 1852 builds in a Polaris gap of 1 year. In plain unadulterated language, this will be the result unless the bill authorizes additional Polaris submarines.

The Nation heartily approved when President Kennedy asked for acceleration through the 29th boat. This was a dramatic announcement which caused those who believe in the fleet ballistic missile concept to sit back and relax.

But beneath the dramatics of the acceleration announcement, there is a fact which has not been publicized; in fact it has been hidden. Here is that fact: S. 1852 will decelerate the Polaris program recommended by naval experts by the same amount as it has been accelerated. A look at a few simple facts will prove my point.

The 29th and last Polaris submarine authorized in this bill will be ready for sea by November 1964. It will be operational some 4 to 5 months later.

Now look at what happens to the next, or the 30th, submarine if S. 1852 becomes law. It requires approximately 42 months leadtime to secure delivery of the reactor and other components for a Polaris submarine. In other words, a boat must be authorized and the long leadtime items purchased 42 months before it can be ready for sea. I remind you that this bill does not authorize anything beyond the 29th boat.

We will not consider another authorization bill until about 1 year from now. Before the reactor and other long leadtime items can be even ordered for the 30th boat, it must be authorized. Add the 42 months leadtime to the date when we will consider an authorization bill next year and the earliest the 30th boat can be ready for sea is November or December 1965.

This is a Polaris gap of at least 1 year. This is a deceleration which cancels out the Kennedy acceleration.

This is like carefully nurturing a crop through a long and difficult growing year and then picking only part of the crop. True, you might get another crop next year, but you will never regain what you failed to pick this year.

Our President has recommended long-range planning in the field of foreign aid He has recommended that a continuity of policy must be assured to allow effective planning. Planning for our national defense should also be long range. We cannot allow procurement of important items like Polaris submarines to progress in gasps, fits, and spurts. We cannot allow a year's Polaris gap.

During debate on the rule I cited a wealth of official and unofficial statements by naval experts over a long period of time in support of my premise that these experts have gradually and definitely recommended a fleet of 45

Polaris submarines. It can best be summarized with this quotation by Admiral Raborn:

Forty-five is the number that it looks like we could keep where we would have an adequate number at sea and constantly on station.

I believe I have proven that 45 is not a dream figure which has occurred by happenstance or coincidence.

It is important to note at this time that all preliminary planning for this program has been to eventually reach the production schedule of one submarine per month. It can be presumed that once this schedule was reached, it should logically be continued until the full number of planned boats were constructed.

Now without a single word of testimony having been given to the Congress in support of a different policy than that which has been gradually and definitely recommended, we will disrupt that one per month schedule and build in a 1-year gap in delivery.

We all know of the sorry state of the shipbuilding business in this country. Major shipyards are going out of business each year because, among other reasons, we are not providing a steady flow of shipbuilding. To maintain their high overhead, these yards cannot operate with a flurry of orders one year and a dearth the next year. This Polaris gap will not help us to maintain a healthy shipbuilding industry.

I am sure Congress does not wish to give the impression to the public that we are renouncing expert opinion regarding the necessity for 45 boats nor do we wish to give the impression that we endorse the achievement of a 1-per-month schedule followed by a 12-month interruption. I am sure the Department of Defense does not wish to create this impression.

It is clear that the long leadtime items cannot be acquired under the terms of section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959 for any boats except those authorized in this bill.

I expect the allegation to be made that we can continue beyond the 29th boat without interrupting the delivery schedule. I expect that reprograming procedures or supplemental authorization will be offered as devices which could prevent interruption. That allegation, if it is made, is not supported by the facts.

On page 1454 of the hearings on H.R. 6151 for April 14, 1961, the following interchange occurred between myself and Admirals Beakley and James:

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to ask, if it is appropriate at this time: We have accelerated the full 29 fleet ballistic missile submarines by 2 years. All well and good, but our eventual program, as I understand it, is for 45. Is there anything as a request for fiscal 1962 for the long leadtime components of the ships or the boats beyond 29 and up to 45?

Admiral JAMES. No.

Admiral BEAKLEY. There is not at this time.

Mr. GUBSER. Well, Admiral, now we had hoped to build these on a schedule of 10 per year?

Admiral JAMES. Right.

Mr. GUBSER. Now if we are to maintain that 10 per year beyond the 29th boat, should not there be an authorization for long leadtime components in fiscal year 1962? Isn't that necessary?

Admiral BEAKLEY. I will let Admiral James speak to this, if I may.

Admiral JAMES. If there are to be ships beyond the 29th boat, the answer is "Yes."

Mr. GUBSER. In other words, if we don't authorize additional long leadtime components in fiscal year 1962, the schedule beyond the 29th boat is not at all sure.

Admiral JAMES. That is correct, sir.

On page 1474 of the hearings, the same point is further clarified by Admiral James. I quote another interchange at that page:

Mr. GUBSER. Do you need additional authorization in this bill to maintain—that is, to purchase long leadtime items, so that you can maintain—a construction schedule of 10 per year beyond the 29th boat?

Admiral JAMES. Yes, sir.

Later, on the same page, Admiral James said in a response to Mr. Smart, the committee counsel:

If there were more boats that were to be built—that is, there was a 30th, or 35 to 45 boats—there would be a requirement in this budget for long leadtime items on the critical items, such as the nuclear reactors and some of the other propulsion systems.

Now let me quote the greatest authority of them all. On page 1475, Chairman VINSON, whose knowledge of military affairs is exceeded by no other Member, said the committee counsel was absolutely correct when he said, as paraphrased by the Honorable SAMUEL STRATTON—

that you could not use any money for additional submarines unless the submarines were specifically authorized.

On the same page, the chairman said in response to Mr. STRATTON that if we wanted to fund additional leadtime items for submarines above the 29, and I quote: "You would have to authorize more submarines."

On page 1476, the chairman said once again, after a discussion of the effect of the brandnew section 412(b):

You can't increase the authorization for long leadtime items until there has been an authorization for the ship. The ship is the basis of it.

The chairman does not play fast and loose with words. His words do not flow from inexperience.

During the so-called posture hearings of the Committee on Armed Services, the question was raised on page 928 as to the legality of full funding of five submarines when only the long leadtime items had been authorized in law. It was agreed that tonnage authorization of these boats existed under the terms of the Vinson-Trammel Act of 1934. Then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said, "this would be the last time, in view of 412, it could be done." Chairman Vinson replied, "That is right."

Later on page 932, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], one of the most brilliant and analytical lawyers I have ever known, said:

So even though we and the Appropriations Committee are both thoroughly convinced that these (five boats) have been authorized within the meaning of 412, out of abundance of precaution, we should specifically authorize them.

And the committee did authorize them for the second time.

Mr. Chairman, here we acted, "out of abundance of precaution" to reauthorize boats for which the long leadtime items had already been funded before section 412 took effect. Can anyone contend that reprograming would allow future funding for boats beyond No. 29 in the absence of specific authorization? If we are to be consistent, they cannot properly contend it.

Any member of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations will tell you that any reprograming beyond the 29th boat can only be done at the expense of other authorized items. In this case, because of the nature of the long leadtime items involved, it would be necessarily be at the expense of attack submarines which we desperately need. In fact, I would go so far as to predict that naval officials have so testified this year before the Appropriations Subcommittee. Since writing these remarks Secretary McNamara has admitted it.

Furthermore, if reprograming could take care of submarines beyond No. 29, why was not the same argument used by the Armed Services Committee with respect to the procurement of B–52 and B–58 bombers? The administration had not requested authorization but the committee wanted to be sure that we were not phasing out the "manned bomber" concept. So they authorized manned bombers. If reprograming was a sure device, why did they specifically authorize? The answer is clear—"reprograming is not at all sure."

At page 1688 of the hearings Secretary Hitch was discussing a paper laid before the committee which outlined reprograming procedures. He said, that under the provisions of this paper "we could reprogram funds necessary to handle the long leadtime items—for manned bombers.

And the reply from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] was:

If your reprograming procedures are written on that theory, I don't see how we can agree to it, sir.

On the same page Chairman VINSON said:

You see, Mr. KILDAY's argument is this: There are no B–52's or B–58's authorized under the date of this law. And if you don't have any authorization, you can't reprogram.

The next day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] said:

What section 412(b) does is to effect the appropriation of funds.

It says:

No funds may be appropriated after December 31, 1960, to or for the use of any armed force of the United States for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, or naval vessels, unless the appropriation of such fund has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

So the question is not the possibility of delegating the responsibility to the Secretary, but what we must have is an authorization on the statute book which will support an appropriation.

On page 1700 Mr. KILDAY said:

The thing I hope we will avoid in using 412 is to never authorize by type or equivalent things of that kind, because then you completely emasculate 412.

On the next page he states that not to specify a type of plane would abrogate the provision of 412.

I know what the chairman would say at this time if I were to yield. But when the coon is all alone against an army of lawyers he'd better stay out of a tree and keep going. The chairman would say that the previous authorizations for ships listed on page 47 of the committee report would allow reprograming. He would quote the language on page 48 of the report about previous authorization. But this is tricky language. All it says is that the Navy would have to charge new authorization against those already existing.

Look to the words of section 412(b). It says in effect that no funds can be appropriated for any vessel after December 31, 1960, for the procurement of naval vessels, unless the appropriation has been authorized by legislation enacted after such date.

Section 412(b) did not specifically repeal existing statutory authorizations but the rule is that unrepealed authorization shall be given construction not inconsistent with subsequent enactments. How then could you reprogram and appropriate money for anything which has not been authorized after December 31, 1960. To do so would be to violate a duly passed law which has never been repealed. Report language cannot repeal a law nor should the Secretary of Defense be allowed to violate or circumvent statutory law.

I expect the allegation to be made that we can continue beyond the 29th boat by the device known as supplemental authorization. Of course, this is true but we cannot use this device without building in a "Polaris delivery gap" of at least 9 months and a resort to procurement in "fits, gasps, and spurts."

The earliest Congress could consider a supplemental authorization bill would be January 3, 1962. I know you will agree when I say that if action on this bill were complete and the supplemental appropriation bill were complete by February of 1962 this would be unprecedented speed and an alltime record. Now look at the "Polaris delivery gap" this would create.

If the funds were available in February 1962. the earliest the 30th Polaris submarine could be ready for sea would be August of 1965 with a delivery gap of 9 months. If the date were March, the gap would be 10 months. If it were May of 1962—and this is more reasonable—the gap would be a full 12 months. Is this orderly long-range planning? Does it make sense to expand our production facilities to "one per month" and then cut it off for a full year? Is not this procurement in "fits," "gasps," and "spurts"?

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it is clear that the long leadtime items cannot be acquired under the terms of section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959 for any boats except those authorized in this bill.

It is clear that if a one-per-month schedule is to be maintained, the long leadtime items for the 30th and succeeding boats must be funded in fiscal year 1962. Without authorization in S. 1852, they cannot be funded in fiscal year 1962.

Therefore, no matter how we look at it, and no matter how much we point with pride to the Kennedy acceleration, we will have a Polaris delivery gap of 1 year and a disruption of the one-per-month schedule.

During the hearings on H.R. 6151, there was much concern expressed over the fact that no authorization for new manned bombers was requested. The entire committee, including myself, felt that failure to authorize additional bombers could be interpreted as the total adoption by the Congress of the missile concept and the final rejection of the bomber concept. A great deal of concern was expressed that assembly lines manufacturing the B–52 and B–58 bombers would be closed down and that orderly procurement would stop. As a result, we authorized additional bombers.

Although it is true that S. 1852 does contain authorization for more Polaris submarines while the original bill contained no authorization for bombers, the two situations are comparable insofar as the maintenance of orderly production is concerned. Achieving the one-per-month schedule of Polaris deliveries and then stopping it for 1 year does as much violence to the orderly production of ships as no new authorization would have done for bombers. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the same argument successfully applied for bombers should be applied for Polaris submarines.

I do not wish to tie the present administration to the policy of its predecessors, nor to the previous planning of naval experts. But additional authorization of six Polaris submarines in S. 1852 will not do this. It only provides insurance against delay while the new administration is determining its own policy regarding the number of submarines we should eventually build. The funding of long leadtime items in fiscal year 1962 could not possibly be a waste even if the decision was finally made to terminate the Polaris program at the 29th boat. The items are identical with those which can be used in other nuclear submarines. The administration would not be committed to request funding nor would the Appropriations Committee be committed to granting it. It would merely be an insurance policy which would preserve the gains of the Kennedy acceleration without building in the deceleration presently contained in S. 1852.

I am not enough of an expert to say how many of these submarines should be built. But in the absence of testimony to the contrary, I must accept the clear case which has been built over the years for a fleet of 45. I have every hope that the present Secretary of Defense will see the wisdom in the program recommended by experts and eventually recommend such a fleet. But, in the meantime, we should not tie his hands so that he is forced to lose a full year in achieving his recommendation when he makes it.

I only recommend additional authorization. Without it we cannot achieve a strength of 45 boats without the loss of a year's time. With the authorization we do not procure a single item which will be wasted. My plea is for time which, once lost, can never be regained.

Long-range planning is essential for our Defense Establishment. Let us not plan in fits, jumps, and spurts. Let us give the Department of Defense the chance to continue orderly procurement. We must authorize six additional fleet ballistic missile submarines in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment authorizing six additional Polaris submarines.

The issues involved in my amendment are quite clear.

First of all, do we want a Polaris gap of 1 year?

Secondly, will we nullify a dramatic acceleration with a 1-year deceleration?

Thirdly, when there is no risk of waste, can we afford not to be sure?

And lastly, are we going to allow an interruption of 1 full year in the orderly procurement schedule we have fought so hard to achieve?

At the appropriate time, I earnestly hope the House will support my amendment.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this important legislation. I cannot improve on the excellent explanation of this legislation already provided the House by my distinguished chairman and my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee.

However, I feel it most important that the Members of this body comprehend, in proper perspective, the great need for building an increased number of modern naval vessels.

In order to carry out our assigned commitments in a cold war, and respond in a timely and effective manner in a limited or general war, it has been determined through careful study that our Navy requires a minimum of 817 ships.

Our ships are deployed in four fleets. Two of these, the 6th and 7th, are on the flanks of the Soviet bloc. They present our allies and the Communists with tangible evidence of our capability and determination to resist aggression. They possess the flexibility to respond promptly to general war, and to control the initial stages of a limited war. The 1st and 2d Fleets are ready to deal with threats in other parts of the world, and to back up or reinforce the 6th and 7th Fleets, if necessary. The geography of the situation, together with the logistic requirements, make the number of ships required to perform these tasks irreducible.

OBSOLESCENCE

Now, we have today an active fleet of 817 ships. However, as each day passes these 817 ships are growing older—70 percent of them are of World War II

vintage—and the usable number and type of ships in the Reserve Fleet with which we could augment them in case of open hostilities is dwindling rapidly. This is due not only to their age, but to the fact that technological advances have progressed to a point where vital modern equipment can no longer be installed in these old hulls and perform satisfactorily.

This brings us face to face with a situation that can be postponed no longer—that is, we cannot maintain a fleet that is becoming obsolescent at an accelerating rate that has now exceeded 60 ships per year, by replacing them at an average rate of 22 ships per year. This, unfortunately, has been the average since the end of hostilities in Korea.

I am happy to see that the current shipbuilding program proposed by the Defense Department for fiscal year 1962 reflects a growing awareness of the necessity of accelerating our shipbuilding program.

The program, as recommended by Defense, included 36 new ships and 22 conversions.

Now, conversion of existing naval vessels will modernize them and extend their useful life at least 5 to 8 years. Therefore, this supplements the new ship construction program and is, consequently, an important adjunct in maintaining a modern fleet. However, we cannot ignore the hard fact that despite our best efforts, certain technological changes in electronics, armament, and nuclear propulsion place very definite limitations on our ability to modernize these older naval vessels.

Therefore, we can only have a truly modern fleet by ultimately replacing our older naval vessels with new ships with hulls configured to accept these new technological advances so essential in modern warfare.

This brings us to the subject of nuclear propulsion.

Apparently, for reasons of dollar economy, the Defense Department has been reluctant to incorporate nuclear propulsion plants in any of the combatant surface vessels recommended for construction for the fiscal year 1962 program.

The Committee on Armed Services has therefore taken the initiative and recommended that at least two of these vessels programed for construction in fiscal year 1962 be nuclear powered.

I need not review the advantages of nuclear power in a surface naval vessel. You are aware of them. However, if any Member desires to inform himself more completely on this subject, I urge that he review the committee hearings on this bill. Pages 1466 to 1471 carry an excellent discussion on the subject of nuclear propulsion in surface ships.

Nuclear propulsion for surface combatant naval vessels in the 8,000-ton class and above is now not only practical but absolutely essential in new ship construction.

Since the advent of mechanical propulsion plants in naval vessels, ships have been freed from the uncertainty of dependence on the wind and the weather for motive power.

However, this advantage has been significantly reduced by the constant requirement for fuel—be it coal or oil. Thus, the range and endurance of naval vessels has, in a special sense, actually been reduced since the development of mechanical propulsion.

Today, this inhibiting characteristic of mechancial propulsion has been eliminated by the development of nuclear power, and once again ships will be capable of ranging the oceans of the world with practically no limitation on their endurance.

We are a maritime Nation.

We must control the seas to continue to survive.

We must therefore have in being the most modern naval vessels it is possible to build.

The Pentagon seems to have ignored these facts of life.

I hope that the action of the Committee on Armed Services and the House of Representatives in directing that at least two of the new surface ships be nuclear powered, will result in a new awareness of the critical need for the development of a nuclear powered Navy.

To build large new conventionally powered ships now is tantamount to building wooden ships after the great advantages of steel have been convincingly demonstrated; therefore, it is my firm belief that from now on all new combatant ships of 8,000 tons or more must be nuclear powered.

In order to achieve these goals—maintain a fleet equal to the task of safeguarding the present, build a modern nuclear fleet capable of meeting the projected requirements of the future, and, at the same time, keeping pace with scientific advancements—it becomes readily apparent that it is going to take expenditures, right now and for the next 7 to 10 years, that are far greater than the amount we have been spending for shipbuilding since Korea. To delay any longer may prove disastrous, for to have a second-rate fleet while we occupy our present position in the world, is unthinkable.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. In recommending that two new surface-type vessels be nuclear powered, may I ask the gentleman if the committee has increased its authorization to take care of the additional cost of such propulsion?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. We authorized $10 million to take care of the cost of construction of the two nuclear-powered frigates.

Mr. HOSMER. I am delighted to know that, because I believe the Navy would like to have every one of its new ships nuclear powered, but is unable to do so within the range of expenditures it is allowed. In other words, it has to use conventional power in order to get enough ships to take care of even the minimum necessities for fleet replacements.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the answer to the gentleman is that the House Committee on Armed Services has recommended to this body that from now on any ship constructed by the Navy of 8,000 tons or more should be nuclear powered. In recognition of that policy, I feel sure that the House Committee on Armed Services will continue to authorize the necessary money to cover the cost.

Mr. HOSMER. I think the committee deserves congratulations for their step. I am certain that in the overall it will result in a saving because these ships with nuclear power will not only be more effective but more efficiently operated.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I think the gentleman knows that recently we had to use the *Sea Wolf* in the South Atlantic to locate the Portuguese passenger ship that was in the hands of pirates. Because this submarine had unlimited cruising capability, being nuclear powered, it was sent up there to locate and track down the Portuguese passenger vessel. This is a good demonstration of what you can do with nuclear power against conventionally powered ships.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS], a member of the committee.

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Chairman, seldom in our legislative history has any committee accomplished such a monumental task in so short a period of time as has the Committee on Armed Services in the preparation of H.R. 6151. Under section 412(b) of Public Law 86–149, enacted last year, a complete review of every major weapons program was absolutely essential in order that the necessary authorizations could be recommended as a basis for future defense appropriations.

Chairman VINSON brought to this arduous task the full force of his leadership and the sum of his vast experiences.

While it is axiomatic in weapons that we always have too many during peacetime, and never enough when at war, the Nation must maintain a well-balanced defense against the threat of both nuclear and conventional attacks.

The principal change, both in money and weapons, made by the committee in the Department of Defense requests, is the addition of $337 million for the procurement of B–52 and B–58 bombers. I strongly urge the Congress to approve this addition. Both of these bombers have demonstrated their effectiveness, and we should not allow their assembly lines to close down next year for two very important reasons:

First, it will cost needless millions to start them up again as I am sure would be done. Second, while I do not share the doubts expressed in the report about the effectiveness of ICBM's, there does not seem to me any real prospect of a nuclear war because of the deterrent effect of our known capability to overkill any nation or group of nations in the world. This means we must have manned bombers of the highest quality for use in the situations that now exist, or seem likely in the future, which may involve our Armed Forces. Should threats to our security arise in such areas as Cuba, the Congo, Laos, South

Vietnam, and elsewhere, they will be met by bombers and not by ICBM's.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I regard this authorization for the continued procurement and improvement of B–52 and B–58 bombers to be of the most vital significance to our defenses. Though a nuclear disarmament agreement now seems most unlikely, it might be accomplished in the next year or two. Such an agreement would further increase our dependence on conventional manned aircraft.

Every weapon and expenditure in this bill, and every one left out of it, has had the most careful and conscientious committee consideration without regard to partisanship or selfish interest.

The Nation needs a balanced arsenal of weapons for its defense and H.R. 6151 provides such an arsenal. I strongly urge the House to approve it without additions or deletions.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time so that I may direct a question to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. I wonder just what is the impact of certain language in the report in respect to the B–47 bomber program. We all realize, of course, the B–47 does not hold the same posture in our defense picture that it did a few years ago. Are we to conclude, however, from this language that the B–47 program phasing out has been lengthened?

Mr. VINSON. I will say to the gentleman that at the conference with the Secretary, which was attended by various members of the Committee on Armed Services, the Secretary was given the benefit of our views, which was to the effect that he should not expedite too rapidly the phasing out of the B–47. It is going to be a very, very gradual approach to the ultimate phasing out.

Mr. AVERY. Then, if I might interpret the gentleman's remarks, the B–47 will continue to play a substantial role especially in our ground alert program?

Mr. VINSON. I can answer the gentleman this way. If the gentleman from Kansas is a Member of Congress for the number of years that the B–47 is used, he will be here several more terms.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, as my distinguished chairman has indicated, the committee has added $25 million to this bill to permit the procurement of three long-range jets for the Special Air Mission Squadron of MATS and $21.2 million for installation of turbofan engines on 15 C–135 aircraft now being procured for MATS. Before discussing the need for these items, I would first like to review the past efforts of this body to modernize the airlift forces.

The 86th Congress, recognizing the potential gap in modernization of airlift forces, appropriated $200 million for interim modernization of the airlift forces. These funds are being used to procure C–135 and C–130E aircraft. Thirty C–135 jet aircraft which is the cargo version of the SAC KC–135 tanker have been ordered. The Air Force expects to receive delivery of the first C–135 next month and the total by August 1962. Sixteen C–130E aircraft, the long-range version of the C–130, have been ordered and a program objective of 50 has been established for MATS. This will require an add-on buy of 34 C–130E's from fiscal year 1962 funds to complete this program. The first delivery of the C–130E is planned for March 1962 and the last of the 50 in March 1963. The C–135 and C–130E will greatly improve the airlift capability. For example, 20 MATS aircraft performed the Chilean airlift in 10 days whereas 10 C–135 cargo transports could have done this job on a productivity basis in 3 days. The C–135 aircraft with straight jet engines, however, presents an operational problem. The excessive runway distances required to land and take off with substantial payloads limits the effectiveness of this aircraft.

This is the reason your committee has added $21.2 million to this bill for turbofan engines. If this aircraft was equipped with a turbofan engine, the number of existing airfields it could use in Africa, the Middle East, and southeast Asia would be greatly increased. The fan engine will also permit a significant increase in payloads to these same areas. The engine also operates at a reduced noise level and will result in increased productivity and greatly reduced fuel consumption, particularly at long ranges. Adoption of the fan version will result in considerable savings to the Government over the period of years these aircraft will be in use. Using Chile, for instance, there are only eight airfields 6,000 feet or longer. The C–135 could land a full payload in any one of the eight airfields with turbofan engines. With the jet engine presently installed, only one runway could be used with full payload.

The procurement of three long-range jets for the Special Air Mission Squadron will inaugurate an orderly modernization program for the SAM fleet. The present fleet is composed of six VC–121A's—early model Constellations—three VC–118's — DS–6's — one VC–121E—Super-Connie—and three 4-engine jet VC–137's—Boeing 707's. Although the VC–121E and the three jets continue to be useful to the SAM requirement, the nine DC–6 and Connie aircraft are 10 to 13 years old and urgently need replacement.

The fleet is assigned the responsibility of providing airlift of the President, his staff, Members of Congress, and the highest level Government officials travelling to foreign destinations. A review of commitments made to the SAM fleet discloses a rapidly increasing utilization of the three jet aircraft assigned. This is due to the correspondingly increased value of the time of SAM fleet passengers. The missions requiring satisfaction by jet transportation overtax the capability of the three jets now assigned.

Each year's continued use of the obsolescent, conventionally powered aircraft reflects a trend of spiraling maintenance costs and an increasing frequency of component failures. Not only is the use of mechanically marginal, obsolescent equipment difficulties, but there is incurred an alarming rate of increased cost of logistic support, operation, and maintenance. For example, C–121A parts are no longer obtainable from production-line sources because commercial carriers no longer use this type of aircraft. Consequently, required parts must be hand tooled, which is expensive.

Operational experience shows that economy and effectiveness of the long-range fleet requires aircraft capable of nonstop, transatlantic flights and possessing performance characteristics which permit takeoff and landing from runways no longer than 6,000 feet. Turbofan powered versions of either DC–8, 707 120–B or Convair 990 are capable of this performance.

The majority of the aircraft of the SAM fleet do not compare favorably with the equipment being used to transport the representatives of other governments. Improvement of the U.S. national prestige would be well served by assigning to SAM, aircraft which more properly represent the status of American aircraft manufacturing and technological progress.

As to the future, the Air Force recognized the requirement for an advanced strategic transport aircraft, and, in conjunction with the other Services and the Federal Aviation Agency, has formulated a requirement for an advanced cargo transport, which will have a nonstop capability over either ocean. This is the C–141, formerly called the SOR 182 aircraft. The Department of Defense approved the SOR 182 approach to the strategic airlift modernization and $30 million, the amount that could be utilized effectively, has been applied from the funds Congress provided to initiate development. As you know, contractor source selection has been completed and Lockheed Aircraft Corp. was announced as winning this competition on March 13, 1961. First delivery of an operational C–141 aircraft to MATS is expected in fiscal year 1965. Thus, a long-range modernization program, to support general and limited war requirements, is firmly established. In addition to the military airlift modernization program, it is hoped that civil airlines will purchase the C–141 aircraft. This would improve the CRAF cargo capability and, in turn, the augmentation capability of the strategic airlift of MATS.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HIESTAND] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I am much impressed with the statement of

the distinguished chairman and members of the Armed Services Committee and this general proposal. It is a tremendous program but it is tremendously worthwhile.

I am especially impressed, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has seen fit to recommend a balanced program rather than putting all of our eggs in one basket, the missile basket.

We are proud of the great progress in missile research development and success. But we must agree that missiles as weapons have not yet been proven.

Mr. Chairman, there are many types of proven successful warfare and weapons besides bombing, and there are other types of weapons to deliver bombs successfully besides missiles.

The manned bomber, Mr. Chairman, is still our best and best proven weapon. Moreover it is constantly usable whereas a missile once used is expended, and must be, at colossal expense replaced not once but hundreds and thousands of times. I am informed our recent successful satellite putting a man into space and back cost over $400 million.

The proposal is to extend the use of and postpone closing out date of the B–47 and the B–52 and again to program the B–58, and we are for it.

But, Mr. Chairman, many of us believe we at the same time must go the whole way and push the greatest of them all, the great B–70 Valkyrie.

The B–70 so far surpasses anything yet imagined that it hardly seems safe to settle for less than the best.

The B–70 is not only a terrific bomber, faster than anything yet planned, over 2,000 miles per hour, flying higher than any ship yet. It can deliver not only bombs with greater weight and accuracy than ever yet.

It is more than a bomber. It can be a transport delivering troops and equipment suddenly to the key and critical spots. In the brushfire wars of the future it can prove a quick and sudden snuff out. It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that we would only need to snuff out one such war and we would never be faced with another.

Large as the expense would be, Mr. Chairman, it is far less than the vast sums we are now putting into missiles with all their unreliability and their unproven ability.

The B–70 is recallable. Launched and underway at the first alarm they can be recalled if the alarm proves false.

The B–70 is unstoppable, due to its altitude and speed and the fact that it is a movable launching pad whose course can be instantly altered. Its great load-carrying ability enables it to carry any size weapon.

The B–70 can be a replaceable first stage of a satellite thus the tremendous cost thereof can be saved.

Mr. Chairman, for this and other reasons, I plead for the restoration of the full B–70 program.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, favorable action today on S. 1852 by the House will represent another essential step forward in the strengthening and diversification of our Armed Forces. We must move ahead in the vital mission of increasing the capabilities and efficiency of the Armed Forces to successfully meet any threat to the peace and security of this Nation.

There is growing awareness among the citizens of our country regarding the importance of investing increased sums in a sound defense system as a bulwark against further Communist encroachments. My mail, and I am sure that of most Members, reflects the readiness of the American people to make the necessary investments and sacrifices toward the continued development of this Nation's military programs.

In the area of defense U.S. citizens certainly do not want to be second best. Indeed, we cannot afford to be second.

Significantly, George Washington, almost 178 years ago, prophetically enunciated a defense policy which is most appropriate for our consideration today. He stated:

> There is a rank due to the United States among nations, which will be withheld, if not absolutely lost, by the reputation of weakness. If we desire to avoid insult, we must be able to repel it; if we desire to secure peace, one of the most powerful instruments of our rising prosperity, it must be known that we are at all times ready for war.

It is especially reassuring in examination of this bill to note that the distinguished members of the House Armed Services Committee and those of the other body have recommended a policy decision of retaining proven manned bombers as part of our Nation's defense arsenal.

Less than 2 weeks ago I called the attention of the House to the importance of maintaining a proven and flexible global deterrent such as the B–52 bomber in the face of multiplying crises which we face around the globe.

This bill provides authorization for continued development and production of nuclear weapons and missiles; but it also provides authorization for the Secretary of Defense to keep our bomber production lines going to insure that we have a diversified arsenal including missiles and bombers.

While I do not profess to be a military expert in any sense of the word, it does appear to me that in the Strategic Air Command we have a capable aerospace force of missiles and manned bombers and it represents our Nation's most effective deterrent to war.

Missiles, because of their range and speed, will be effective deterrents to enemy aggression. So, too, will manned jet bombers because they can be recalled once launched and they can be diverted from one target to another should the need arise.

Recent technological developments have broadened the capabilities of the B–52 global bomber. The B–52 now is equipped to carry airbreathing Hound Dog missiles. The air-launched Hound Dog can be fired at a target hundreds of miles away, permitting the bomber to either return to its home base or proceed to another target.

The B–52 also will be capable of launching the Skybolt ballistic missile at multiple targets as far as 1,000 miles away, making it unnecessary for the bomber to penetrate heavily defended, hostile territory.

It is evident that the B–52 remains the most versatile long-range manned bomber in the Strategic Air Command at the present time. It is reassuring that this bill recognizes the importance of continuing production of this weapon beyond the present cutoff date of August 1962.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and ask that the bill now be read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1962 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: For the Army, $211,000,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,585,600,000; for the Air Force $3,812,000,000, of which amount $525,000,000 is authorized only for the procurement of long-range manned aircraft for the Strategic Air Command.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, $550,800,000; for the Navy, $606,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $27,000,000; for the Air Force, $2,792,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,915,000,000.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 1852 and substitute therefor the following: "That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1962 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"AIRCRAFT

"For aircraft: For the Army, $211,000,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,585,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,670,200,000; *Provided, however,* That $337,000,000 of the foregoing $3,670,200,000 is authorized only for the procurement of B–52 and/or B–58 bomber aircraft.

"MISSILES

"For missiles: For the Army, $550,800,000; for the Navy, $606,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $27,000,000; for the Air Force, $2,792,000,000.

"NAVAL VESSELS

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,925,000,000."

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GUBSER. I have an amendment to S. 1852. I would appreciate it if the Chair would advise me as to the proper time to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may offer it now or wait until a later stage.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GUBSER: On page 2, line 8, immediately after "$2,915,000,000" insert the following: "Plus an additional $697,500,000 for the acquisition of an additional six SSB (N) submarines."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUBSER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. In view of the fact that the gentleman has already had 16 minutes would he indicate how many minutes he wants on this particular amendment, just on this one?

Mr. GUBSER. I would say to the distinguished chairman that I have been recognized for 5 minutes, but it is not my intention to utilize more than 3.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of that I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. This is just on this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. On this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. VINSON. My request limits it to this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Will that close debate on the entire bill?

The CHAIRMAN. This applies only to the Gubser amendment.

Mr. VINSON. It does not close debate on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been well debated and it is not my intention to prolong the debate except to emphasize several points which have previously been made.

First, the question has been raised as to why these naval officers who have recommended a program of 45 were not able to convince the previous administration. The answer is simply because of the fact that the *George Washington*, our first operational Polaris submarine, did not go to sea until November 15. Second, this is the first time that the Congress has been able to make a decision on this program with an operational submarine in being, and to benefit from the information that we have gained from its operation.

Secretary Gates, in the Appropriations Committee hearings last year said that if the *George Washington* trials were successful he would—I quote—"have no hesitancy whatsoever" in accelerating the program.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a partisan matter, and the present occupant of the well of the House has never considered it as such. I am not attempting to saddle Secretary McNamara with the decision of his predecessors, nor would this amendment so saddle him. He admits that he is currently studying the ultimate objectives of the Polaris program. This is right, this is proper.

But if he should decide to continue beyond No. 29—and by his own words, this is a possibility—should we by the terms of S. 1852, build in an automatic and an inevitable disruption of the orderly program schedule which we will achieve under the Kennedy acceleration of one submarine per month?

We do not obligate the Secretary to build these submarines. We do not obligate the Appropriations Committee to approve their findings. We only make it possible.

Remember that we have a new law. We have 412(b). Under the terms of that law we cannot, by Chairman VINSON's own words appearing in the hearings, authorize long leadtime items unless you have the ship authorization, because "the ship is the basis of the appropriation."

All we are asking for is an insurance policy so that if Secretary McNamara, in his wisdom, decides to go ahead beyond No. 29, we will not force him to lose time which can never be regained. The Polaris system is our only present operational deterrent system, with the exception of the Atlas. Should we now when we have this in being, when we can keep it coming into our inventory, build in a 1-year delivery gap? I say we should not. We do not obligate the Congress to vote a single dime, nor do we obligate the administration to ask for it.

On that basis, Mr. Chairman, I request support for my amendment.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. Chairman, I trust this amendment will not be adopted. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. OSMERS] stated a moment ago that this bill had been well and thoroughly considered in the committee and it represents a balanced program for these authorizations.

This is the first time that the Congress has had the responsibility of authorizing aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels in many years. I do recall that some 22 years ago we did authorize items of this kind, but we got away from that. We are now getting back to it, and I trust that what we do will be a meaningful and a purposeful thing. I hope that it will be a responsible authorization written only after very careful consideration within the Committee.

This amendment was offered in committee when we were considering this bill, and it lost by a vote of 25 to 3. So it is quite evident that the vast majority of the gentlemen on my left who serve on the Committee on Armed Services, considering this amendment in committee, rejected it.

I would like to read to you from a letter addressed to our chairman by Secretary McNamara, under date of May 10. I am not going to read all of it. I will read a portion of it, as follows:

Although some naval officers have recommended an ultimate program of 45 boats, there has never been Department of Defense approval for this number. In fact, the previous administration had not approved more than 24—19 fully funded and 5 partially funded boats. We have increased this number to 29—all fully funded. As to the future, no decision has been made by this administration that there will be only 29 boats in the program and this question is part of the study which is now underway covering the entire field of requirements for strategic delivery systems. If it is determined that the program should be enlarged beyond 29 boats, necessary action can be taken either by reprograming, if this meets with the approval of appropriate committees of the Congress, or by requesting supplemental authorizations and appropriations. We will make certain that construction schedules as extended, will not be disrupted by failure to make timely provision for necessary long leadtime items.

There is the commitment of the Secretary of Defense.

I call your attention also to that portion of the hearings appearing on page 1605, where the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and also a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, propounded this question to Admiral Rickover—and I do not think I have to convince you that Admiral Rickover is a nuclear enthusiast:

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Now, Admiral, is it not true we are going all out for Polaris-type submarines at the neglect of attack-type submarines?

Admiral RICKOVER. That is right, sir.

Then there is further discussion that you can read on page 1605 with reference to going all out for Polaris submarines at the expense of the nuclear attack-type submarines. It is clear from the testimony on page 1605 that in the opinion of Admiral Rickover and the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Polaris program has been pursued in such fashion as to place the attack-type submarine program in a position far lower than it should occupy. This bill contains, as it is now, an authorization of over $44 million for long lead time items. Eleven million dollars of that is for the nuclear attack-type submarine. The long lead time item, of course, is the reactor, the powerplant of the submarine. Remember, the Polaris submarine has limitations in its use. It is essentially a vehicle for the launching of the Polaris missile and it is not intended to be a participant in anti-submarine warfare.

We have a powerful force, as you will discover on page 1473 of the hearings. These 10 new that are authorized now will give us a total of 29, carrying 464 ballistic missiles. These 29 submarines will have the capability of launching 464 ballistic missiles.

I assure you that the committee has given this matter very careful consideration, indeed. The program is adequate.

Let us make the authorization by the Congress a truly meaningful thing by rejecting this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GUBSER and Mr. KILDAY.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 58, noes 105.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on his amendment.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I have offered a substitute to the Senate bill. The substitute is the exact language of the House bill. There is a difference of $131.8 million between the two bills. In other words, the Senate bill carries $131.8 million more than the House bill.

I ask that my amendment substituting the House bill for the Senate bill be adopted.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as one Member of the House I hope that never again will I be confronted with the necessity of voting on a bill authorizing the expenditure of $12 to $13 billion with as limited knowledge as I have as to what this money will be spent for. It is impossible for the average, garden variety, Member of the House to know a great deal about the justifications for this huge expenditure because on page after page of the hearings the questions and answers are deleted for security reasons. So we have all too little to go on. I will vote for this bill, but at the same time I am going to hope for the best and fear the worst.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Here is the situation. Heretofore, the Committee on Appropriations has been bringing in an appropriation bill, very much like this bill. Now you have an opportunity, as does the House, to get even more information. In other words, you get the information twice. You get it from the Committee on Armed Services first and then you get it from the Committee on Appropriations. Naturally, neither we nor the Committee on Appropriations can include in the hearings all of the details concerning the characteristics and the cost of these weapons. But every particle of that information is in the Committee on Armed Services and I publicly here state on the floor, on my responsibility as chairman, that any Member who wants to get the detailed information can get it if he will come to the committee.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the statement of the gentleman, but I doubt that very many Members of the House are going to have the time to go to the committee and get the information that has been deleted for security reasons, and they could not use it if they did.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman previously used a good expression which I should like to repeat in view of his statement; that is, have faith and confidence in the 37 men who brought in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. That is the reason why I am going to vote for the bill. Since this bill deals with ships, missiles, weapons, and so on, and so forth, I should like to say, in view of the Kennedy fiasco in Cuba, that I have never seen an explanation of what weapons were used by the Castro forces to sink the communications ship, an American-built freighter, that was used in support of the invasion forces. Can the gentleman shed any light on that?

Mr. VINSON. I regret I am in complete ignorance on the matter, as the gentleman's question would indicate he is. I know absolutely nothing in the world about it.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman from Georgia and Members of the House that I hope that after certain persons get through trading tractors for Cubans they do not start trading Polaris submarines for Cubans.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill, too, and I hope that better and more effective results will be forthcoming.

I express my feeling today, and I know it is that of a lot of others, in a little jingle entitled "Just Lousing It Up":

> We have loused up in Laos.
> We have loused up in Cuba.
> We have loused up in Alabama, too.
> But cheer up my friends.
> All is not lost.
> We have Eleanor and Walter
> To pull us through.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KARSTEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the armed forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 300, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, on final passage, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, answered "present" 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[No. 64]

YEAS—402

Abbitt	Dole	Jones, Ala.
Abernethy	Dominick	Judd
Adair	Donohue	Karsten
Addabbo	Dooley	Karth
Addonizio	Dorn	Kastenmeier
Albert	Dowdy	Kearns
Alexander	Downing	Kee
Alger	Doyle	Keith
Andersen, Minn.	Dulski	Kelly
Andrews	Durno	Keogh
Anfuso	Dwyer	Kilday
Arends	Edmondson	Kilgore
Ashbrook	Elliott	King, Calif.
Ashley	Ellsworth	King, N.Y.
Ashmore	Everett	King, Utah
Aspinall	Evins	Kirwan
Auchincloss	Fallon	Kitchin
Avery	Farbstein	Klucznynski
Ayres	Fascell	Knox
Bailey	Feighan	Kornegay
Baker	Fenton	Kowalski
Baldwin	Findley	Kunkel
Baring	Finnegan	Kyl
Barrett	Fino	Laird
Barry	Fisher	Landrum
Bass, N.H.	Flood	Lane
Bass, Tenn.	Flynt	Langen
Bates	Ford	Lankford
Becker	Forrester	Latta
Beermann	Fountain	Lennon
Bell	Frazier	Lesinski
Bennett, Fla.	Frelinghuysen	Libonati
Bennett, Mich.	Friedel	Lindsay
Berry	Fulton	Lipscomb
Betts	Gallagher	Loser
Blatnik	Garland	McCormack
Boggs	Garmatz	McCulloch
Boland	Gary	McDonough
Bolling	Gathings	McDowell
Bolton	Gavin	McFall
Bow	Giaimo	McIntire
Boykin	Gilbert	McMillan
Brademas	Glenn	McVey
Bray	Goodell	Macdonald
Breeding	Goodling	MacGregor
Brewster	Granahan	Machrowicz
Brooks, La.	Grant	Mack
Broomfield	Gray	Madden
Brown	Green, Oreg.	Magnuson
Broyhill	Green, Pa.	Mahon
Bruce	Griffin	Mailliard
Burke, Ky.	Griffiths	Martin, Mass.
Burke, Mass.	Gross	Martin, Nebr.
Burleson	Gubser	Mason
Byrne, Pa.	Hagan, Ga.	Mathias
Byrnes, Wis.	Hagen, Calif.	Matthews
Cahill	Haley	May
Cannon	Hall	Meader
Carey	Halpern	Merrow
Casey	Hansen	Michel
Cederberg	Harding	Miller, Clem
Celler	Hardy	Miller, George P.
Chamberlain	Harris	Miller, N.Y.
Chelf	Harrison, Va.	Milliken
Chenoweth	Harrison, Wyo.	Mills
Chiperfield	Harsha	Minshall
Church	Harvey, Ind.	Moeller
Clancy	Harvey, Mich.	Monagan
Clark	Hays	Montoya
Coad	Healey	Moore
Cohelan	Hébert	Moorehead, Ohio
Collier	Hechler	Moorhead, Pa.
Conte	Hemphill	Morgan
Cook	Henderson	Morris
Corbett	Herlong	Morrison
Corman	Hiestand	Morse
Cramer	Hoeven	Mosher
Cunningham	Hoffman, Ill.	Moss
Curtin	Hoffman, Mich.	Multer
Curtis, Mass.	Holland	Murphy
Curtis, Mo.	Holtzman	Murray
Daddario	Horan	Natcher
Dague	Hosmer	Nelsen
Daniels	Huddleston	Nix
Davis, James C.	Hull	Norblad
Davis, John W.	Ichord, Mo.	Norrell
Dawson	Ikard, Tex.	Nygaard
Delaney	Inouye	O'Brien, Ill.
Denton	Jarman	O'Brien, N.Y.
Derounian	Jennings	O'Hara, Ill.
Derwinski	Jensen	O'Hara, Mich.
Devine	Joelsen	O'Konski
Diggs	Johansen	Olsen
Dingell	Johnson, Calif.	O'Neill
	Johnson, Md.	
	Jonas	

Osmers	Ryan	Thomas
Ostertag	St. George	Thompson, N.J.
Passman	St. Germain	Thompson, Tex.
Patman	Santangelo	Thomson, Wis.
Pelly	Saund	Thornberry
Perkins	Saylor	Toll
Peterson	Schenck	Tollefson
Pfost	Schneebeli	Tuck
Philbin	Schweiker	Tupper
Pike	Schwengel	Udall
Pilcher	Scott	Ullman
Pillion	Scranton	Utt
Pirnie	Seely-Brown	Vanik
Poage	Selden	Van Pelt
Poff	Shelley	Van Zandt
Powell	Sheppard	Vinson
Pucinski	Shipley	Wallhauser
Quie	Short	Walter
Rabaut	Shriver	Watts
Rains	Sibal	Weaver
Randall	Sikes	Weis
Ray	Siler	Westland
Reece	Sisk	Whalley
Reifel	Slack	Wharton
Reuss	Smith, Calif.	Whitener
Rhodes, Ariz.	Smith, Iowa	Wickersham
Rhodes, Pa.	Smith, Va.	Widnall
Riehlman	Spence	Williams
Rivers, Alaska	Springer	Willis
Rivers, S.C.	Stafford	Wilson, Calif.
Robison	Staggers	Wilson, Ind.
Rodino	Steed	Winstead
Rogers, Colo.	Stephens	Wright
Rogers, Fla.	Stratton	Yates
Rogers, Tex.	Stubblefield	Young
Rooney	Sullivan	Younger
Roosevelt	Taber	Zablocki
Roudebush	Taylor	Zelenko
Rousselot	Teague, Calif.	
Rutherford	Teague, Tex.	

NAYS—0

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—0

NOT VOTING—34

Alford	Cooley	Moulder
Anderson, Ill.	Davis, Tenn.	Price
Battin	Dent	Riley
Beckworth	Fogarty	Roberts
Belcher	Halleck	Rostenkowski
Blitch	Holifield	Schadeberg
Bonner	Johnson, Wis.	Scherer
Bromwell	Jones, Mo.	Smith, Miss.
Brooks, Tex.	Kilburn	Thompson, La.
Buckley	McSween	Trimble
Colmer	Marshall	Whitten

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Price with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Bromwell.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Battin.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Schadeberg.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 6151) was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 316

Concurrent resolution providing that the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Thursday, May 25, 1961, at 12:30 o'clock in the afternoon.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor have until midnight Monday to file reports on H.R. 7215, the bill on higher education, and H.R. 7300, the bill on Federal aid to education.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 299 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH]; and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on the annual authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The amount requested in the bill is $1,376,900,000. I know of no controversy over this rule and therefore reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING], this rule provides for 2 hours of general debate. It is an open rule. The request is for $1,376,900,000. The only comments I can bring to you other than that are those set forth in the supplemental views of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] and the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS], where they indicate that this authorization is some $141,600,000 above the request and as to that amount of money they do not feel that it was accompanied by reasonably detailed plans for expenditure.

Other than that, I know of no opposition to the rule. I have no requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6874, with Mr. WATTS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill H.R. 6874, constitutes the annual authorization bill for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In short, it is known as the annual space bill.

This year the bill carries with it a total authorization of $1,376,900,000. The bill itself is divided into four sections. The first section relates to salaries and expenses, the second section relates to construction, and the third section relates to construction of facilities matters.

The bill represents the carrying forward of our national space program, which in turn represents one of the strongest weapons America possesses in its ideological struggle with communism for the mind of man. I know this is a rather soaring type of statement, Mr. Chairman, but nonetheless it is true.

I know that every Member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics is convinced that a great deal more depends upon the success of our national space program than a simple race for scientific achievement between the United States and Russia. Right now the esteem in which the United States is held in the eyes of the world is dependent upon what we do in space as it is dependent upon few other areas of national endeavor. This is so whether we like it or not. The security of our Nation, in fact, our very survival, our economic and material well-being, depend in no small degree on what we are able to accomplish in this space program. This is true of both the civilian and military aspects of the space program.

The bill before you represents the civilian side, and its approval we believe is consequently very essential. The total amount to be authorized under this bill is $1,376,900,000. In general categories, salaries and expenses represent $199,286,000. The research and development phase of the program, which is the largest part of the bill, is $1,023,539,000. The construction of facilities and new construction in the bill runs to $139,075,000. The emergency construction of facilities in the bill is $15 million.

Mr. Chairman, for the fiscal year 1961 Congress authorized the Space Agency, and that was last year, actually $970 million. We appropriated in the course of the year $964 million, leaving a bal-

ance authorized but unappropriated of about $6 million.

Thus it is clear that this year's authorization bill represents a markup from a year ago of something like 40 percent.

On the other hand, the program outlined by this bill represents merely the long-range and relatively conservative continuation of NASA's announced 10-year program.

In other words, this bill represents roughly one-tenth of the 10-year program of NASA in space.

We believe the amounts contained in the bill are the minimum amounts needed to carry out the national space program, as authorized by the administration and by the previous administration. The money does not in any sense represent a crash program or even what most knowledgeable people believe must be spent, if the United States is to become a leader in all phases of the space effort.

In this connection, I might say, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen and ladies of this committee, that there are statements made in the press and generally that tomorrow there will be recommendations by the President, from the executive branch of the Government, for a considerably larger sum. But in this bill, we gave the NASA Agency every dollar which the NASA Agency presented to the budget and which was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. But, we went further than that. We gave them $126,600,000 more and we did it on the basis that these were the needs that they presented to the Bureau of the Budget, but because of a money shortage at that particular time, they were reduced to this extent. Therefore, we restored $126 million on various projects, each one of which was separately and individually justified by the NASA Agency before the committee took action in restoring those items to this bill.

So the bill does represent the full recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget plus this additional amount, every portion of which was justified by the needs of NASA on its 10-year program.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, a Member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. McCORMACK. Bearing on the statement just made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the best evidence of the good judgment and foresight of the chairman and members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics as to the increase of $126 million is the fact, according to the newspapers and according to information I have, that part of the President's message tomorrow, when he appears in joint session, will be in connection with increased authorizations and appropriations in the field of outer space. That clearly shows the judgment of the chairman and members of the committee is sound and that they were looking to the future. I want to congratulate my friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, on the outstanding job he is doing as chairman of this very important committee. I think I know something about it because I was chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration. I also want to congratulate the members of the committee without regard to party, of course, it is a great committee and each member is dedicated to service on that committee. I was off the committee for 4 or 5 months as the result of a situation which has been much misunderstood. The facts are that when we made the Democratic committee assignments in January, one of the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics was elected to the Committee on Banking and Currency on the Democratic side. In the meanwhile, the Democratic committee on committees filled his vacancy, and I think one or two other vacancies on the Democratic side. The next day the displaced member telephoned me when he found out that both the Committee on Science and Astronautics and the Committee on Banking and Currency were major committees, and that he preferred to stay on the Committee on Science and Astronautics, and that he was very much distressed. Rather than ask the Democratic committee on committees to unseat one of the new Democratic members whom they had voted on just a day or so before, and since I was a member of that committee, I asked that my name be taken off the committee so that the gentleman who had been assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency could come back to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. In that way none of the new members who had been elected the day before to the committee would have to be taken off the committee.

I thought it was the decent thing to do. I am very glad the leadership on both sides, excluding myself and the members, increased the committee so that I could go back there. I am very happy and proud to serve on this committee. The members are dedicated.

This field is of vital importance. I am particularly interested because I think I played an important part in the introduction and the voting out of the Rules Committee the resolution establishing the Standing Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Read the reports of this committee. They are ahead of the Executive. This committee believes not in catching up with the Soviet Union, because we know we will never catch up, because if it takes 4 or 5 years to catch up on booster strength where are the Soviets going to be at that time? They are not going to stand still during the next 4 or 5 years. This committee stands not for catching up—but for surpassing. We know that it can be done. We know that America has the brains, we know America has the facilities, and we know that what is necessary is the coordination of the great brains we have in America and the facilities.

While this legislative committee can call attention to and urge and discuss, it rests with the executive branch of the Government to employ the means, the measures, and the opportunities that will bring about a coordination of the brains and facilities we have in America. This committee is rendering an inestimable service to our country and to the world with the sound actions and judgment of the chairman and the members; and, disregarding myself now as a member of the committee, I want to extend my congratulations to the chairman and all the members of the committee. They are entitled not only to congratulations but also to the thanks of the American people.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I want to thank the majority leader very much for his fine words; and let me say that the gentleman did not have to explain how he returned to our committee, because I want to assure the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], our majority leader, that the entire committee was delighted when we learned the gentleman wished to return to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. We felt as though it were a homecoming. This includes sentiment on both sides of the aisle.

When the majority leader was chairman of the select committee and I sat beside him I felt his strength, his ability, and his judgment as it was made part and parcel of the space program of the United States of America. We have him back now to add to our strong committee. We on both sides are pleased to have him. Likewise, we are delighted to have the former Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], who has been most cooperative and most helpful. We are happy that he is a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. First, I would like to express my appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for his fine tribute to our great majority leader, one of the greatest men ever to have served in this body, throughout all its history. I know every Member is pleased that he is to continue the great work he started as chairman of the select committee by becoming a member of the standing committee. I also want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the committee and all members of his committee for their fine work.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Is it not the policy of this great committee, as expressed in this bill and other actions, that the United States of America will be second to none in the field of astronautics?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is correct.

Mr. ALBERT. Second to none in the effort it is going to make?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think every member of the committee feels that there is no room for thinking of second place for the United States of America in any part of the space program; and if we are going to make an effort in space at all we should make an effort which will be sufficient to put our country in the leadership in every fundamental phase of this space effort.

I want to say again that sometimes I am amazed at the versatility of our majority leader when he leaves the affairs

of the House and returns to the committee with equal ability, taking up the affairs of state, and giving up for the moment the affairs of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I hope the gentleman will yield for a word of appreciation, not only for a fine report but also for the gentleman's thoughtfulness with regard to the House membership in making available the films that were taken inside the space capsule last week. That was informative to every Member of the House to have the opportunity to see them, and we appreciate it very much.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman is very kind, and I thank him.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. I served on the select committee under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. It was a very rewarding experience. It covers a big area, but it is not big enough for politics as yet. In the select committee, as well as in the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the permanent committee, these has been a minimum of political jockeying and political advantage taken by anybody. There has been a maximum of hard, diligent work. I, too, am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is back on the committee, because he certainly showed in the Eisenhower administration, when the messages came up here as to the method of administration in space and how the NASA agency was to be set up, a tendency to cooperate with President Eisenhower rather than raising an issue, although there was some disagreement. Under the circumstances, I think it is fine that the committee has been able to come up with a well-prepared report, and I congratulate the chairman of that committee and the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I thank the gentleman for his fine remarks.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 6874 represents the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget and the recommendation of NASA.

There is only one exception, and that is in reference to solid fuels. There the committee in its judgment added $10 million for the purpose of further research in solid fuels. We did that only after hearing from industry, from NASA, the Defense Department, and from other witnesses. The committee, I think unanimously—I may be wrong—supported that. We had a feeling that we ought to go faster in reference to the research and development of solid fuels. We felt there was a real economy that could be effected by going faster in this particular field of research; therefore, we added in that particular instance $10 million, which amount was over and above that recommended by the Budget or by NASA.

The amounts of the increases involved are as follows: Sounding rockets, an increase of $2 million; scientific satellites, an increase of $13 million; meteorological satellites, an increase of $12 million; Project Apollo, manned exploration of the moon, an increase of $42.6 million; launch vehicle technology, an increase of $8 million; solid propulsion, an increase of $15 million; electric propulsion, an increase of $2.9 million; Project Rover, the nuclear rocket development—that is so important to the space program—an increase of $8.5 million.

Mr. Chairman, that in substance is the bill that we present to you today. In presenting it to you we say that this bill will keep us abreast of space development competitively with the Soviet Union. We hear rumors that additional funds will be requested. We will give those additional requests careful consideration, because I say there is no place in this universe for a second position for the United States of America in space.

Mr. Chairman, to take a chance with second place is taking a chance with the very survival of our country and free institutions.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we have a good many requests for time, so we will keep the time short today.

The only conflict in the committee is whether the original NASA budget request, as approved by the Bureau of the Budget, of $1,250,300,000 will be authorized or whether the original NASA request under President Kennedy's budget amounting to $1,417,821,000 shall be reduced to $1,376,900,000. The committee has recommended to you less than the National Aeronautics and Space Administration originally requested for fiscal 1962, but we recommend to you $126.6 million above the Bureau of the Budget figure.

This $1,376,900,000 that the committee had recommended is divided as follows: Salaries and expenses, $199,286,000; research and development, $1,023,539,000; construction of facilities, $139,075,000.

If you will look on page 2 of the bill, you will find listed the facilities that come under NASA jurisdiction. Remember that this is a peacetime program and that those are the facilities over which we have jurisdiction, under the authorizing committee, which is the Committee on Science and Astronautics: Langley Research Center, Hampton, Va.; Ames Research Center, Moffet Field, Calif.; Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio; Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Md.; Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Va.; Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, Calif.; Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala.;—That is the old Redstone Arsenal and is under Von Braun—Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla.—this installation is partly supported by money from NASA, but as you know, the Air Force runs that installation, Pacific Missile Range, Point Arguello, Calif. NASA again supplies part of the money for certain specific programs, but that too, as you know, is run jointly by the Air Force and the Navy.

There are other locations for nuclear rocket testing, that includes maintenance and facilities. We are spending $15 million on those.

We have other locations that are called tracking facilities. We have to buy land. We have to build propulsion development facilities there for sounding rockets development and provide for damage, repair, and construction. Likewise, we have a facility requirement for planning and designing structures not otherwise provided for. This has been funded by $5 million.

We do have in here a provision for the construction of emergency facilities under section 3 of the act for $15 million. The $1,235 million figure actually has this $15 million added to it, so the total NASA request is really $1,250 million which the Bureau of the Budget approved.

Let us determine what changes the committee made. I would like to emphasize that all the increases made, except in the case of solid propulsion, were made in direct conformance with the original NASA request of the Bureau of the Budget and the long-range planning of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In the field of solid propulsion, the current 1961 fiscal budget provided $3.1 million for that particular purpose. The Kennedy administration budget had increased it by $5 million to a total of $8.1 million.

My own amendment increased that figure by $10 million to $18.1 million. The reason for that is to launch a research and development program to catch up with the Russian development of large-sized boosters. Propellant fuel contractors testified before the committee that this area was not adequately supported, especially since the 1961 budget provided $68 million for liquid fuel research and development. If you want to catch up with Russia I hope you will support the committee on the extra $10 million.

Certain committee members, such as the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO] wanted to propose an amendment for $50 million for solid fuel research and development. Some of us felt that amount was a little too high as a beginning. If we start with a moderate initial increase we will better progress and achieve more efficient results. Actually, both Congressmen ANFUSO and KING had introduced separate bills for a $30-million increase in solid fuel propulsion research and development.

Mr. Chairman, may I enumerate various figures to indicate where the committee increased funds. For sounding rockets, we provided an increase from $7 million to $9 million. These are rockets that go up vertically, straight up, out to a distance of one earth radius or 4,000 miles into space.

For scientific satellites, we provide an increase from $64,700,000 to $77,700,000.

For meteorological satellites, we provide an increase from $28,200,000 to $40,200,000. This increase will permit the launching of two additional Tiros weather satellites and thus give the United States continuous weather observations from satellites during 1962.

This is important to our farm areas, our coastal areas, and our areas along our rivers and streams. Anyone interested in farms, in the shore line, in the sea, in the Great Lakes, or in flood control, anyone interested in hurricane warnings or storm warnings of any type, should certainly favor this particular program. We look ahead to the time when we will probably be able to give weather predictions of great accuracy for 30 days in advance.

For Project Apollo, which will probably have three men in a capsule orbit the moon, to begin with, and some time later, make a soft landing there, we provide an increase from $29,500,000 to $72,100,000. Without this increase, Project Apollo, which carries the U.S. hope for manned lunar observations and explorations, can be expected to fall badly behind schedule. The testimony before our committee strongly supported this view.

We feel that crucial, high-speed reentry tests should be vigorously conducted and that we should immediately go ahead on these tests. We need investigation in life sciences to insure that manned missions are successful and the men are protected. These two items without committee support would have to be abandoned for the time being under the current budget.

On the item of launch vehicle technology, we provide an increase from $15 million to $23 million. The additional money here will permit the development of new in-orbit rendezvous techniques for refueling of spacecraft, and advances in the development of maneuverable spacecraft. This is one of the most important programs we can support from the point of view of U.S. defense. The country that first has maneuverable space vehicles can destroy any city around the world within a 5-minute period, if it is used for military purposes.

Without this money, testing will be retarded. This is important not only for civilian but also for military purposes.

For electric propulsion, we provide an increase from $6,800,000 to $9,700,000. The additional money here will permit the purchase of launch vehicles for testing ion and arc-jet engines, which are so important to ultimate long range interplanetary travel, under space flight conditions. They have a very small booster potential, but they are very fine for maneuvering vehicles in space. Unless we have these vehicles, we cannot go ahead with that testing program.

If we are going ahead on interplanetary travel we must then have the electric propulsion systems and ion engines.

For nuclear systems technology, we have increased that from $28 million to $36.5 million. This additional amount is to advance Project Rover, and it is to put the nuclear rocket development into the hardware stage. The success of U.S. long-range space exploration will be dependent on nuclear projects such as the Project Rover rocket program.

Our trouble is that Russia is ahead of us, we must say very definitely, in the development of large boosters, but they are chemical boosters. They are liquid-type boosters, which are of the current generation of vehicles. If we want to leapfrog the Russians the thing for us to do is give the full amount requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $51.5 million, instead of accepting the cut of the Kennedy administration down to $28 million.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] has joined with me in writing the President on this matter. I include a copy of our letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We are writing to you to recommend strongly for your consideration the placing of an immediate DX priority, the highest national priority, on the Rover nuclear engine program for space flight.

We feel that this is an urgent matter that should be called particularly to your attention. As the basic propulsion system of the future in space, adequate leadtime for this vast program requires immediate action to make sure that facilities, reactors, engines, components, and research and development can be planned and prepared in advance.

Adequate propulsion is the solution to the big booster problem. This is an immediate necessity in our U.S. program for space flight and space exploration as well as the development of space platforms, space laboratories, and maneuverable vehicles in space. Our long term U.S. programs require nuclear propulsion as the basic foundation for progress.

With highest and personal regards,

JAMES G. FULTON.
ALPHONZO BELL.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, our former Speaker [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, having served since its inception on this very important committee, I do not feel I want to permit the bill to pass without joining in expressing the privilege and pleasure of the whole committee that our majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] has rejoined the committee. We knew he was happy to come back, and he will continue, as he has in years past, to help us to develop a program that I believe is very helpful to the country. His contributions to the Space Committee have been tremendous.

May I also congratulate the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] and the other members of the committee. I have been here for 37 years, and I have never seen more dedicated service than the members have devoted to this subject. Let me say, too, that the subject is one that is very difficult and very technical. It requires great study. That it has had. Above all, what impressed me was the fact that there was no partisanship displayed in this committee in any instance. We all had, on both sides, but one purpose, and that was to do what was best for America and for the development of science.

As to this particular bill, we have exceeded the amount that was recommended in the budget figure, but we have not gone beyond that which the NASA officials believe is necessary for the progress of America in the field of space. When we deal with the conquest of space we deal with something of vital importance. We are dealing with legislation that may well determine the future fate of America and the world. I think this committee with its dedication to this subject, as it has already demonstrated, has the ability to handle it. America is fast catching up with Russia in its struggle to reveal the secrets of the worlds beyond. I congratulate the members of the committee on the bill. They have shown a real intention of keeping America in front.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman for his fine and kind remarks. May I say that it has been a real honor and pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], in aiming a new generation out into space. They have been here a long time, and they have been most helpful in getting us off the ground, off the pad, and up into space. On this "Big Booster Committee," as we call it, both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] are the biggest boosters we have.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not know of two men more dedicated to progress in space, more men who have been as long in the House of Representatives as they have, yet who are as young in this job as they are. Certainly, it has been most pleasant to work with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]. I personally have gone to him time and time again with matters that I am sure required time and attention on his part. He has responded without fail in every instance for the best interest of the United States of America.

Mr. FULTON. In closing, may I say that I want to thank the Chairman for his statement in this respect, and I join with him.

May I say, in further comment about this committee, that the committee members have visited our space facilities and installations time after time. We have followed the Mercury program, the man-in-space program, very carefully.

We have learned about space and the methods and equipment being developed, as well as research in space. We have spent hour after hour in hearings, I would say that if there is any committee in the Congress, excepting the Committee on Ways and Means or the Committee on Appropriations, that has spent any more time in hearings, I would like to know about it.

It does mean we fellows and our first lady in space, Congresswoman WEIS of New York, have given dedicated service.

If you would like to come to the committee meetings or contact anyone of us, we would be glad to give you the details of many of these programs which, because of security reasons, we cannot give publicly. I am glad to be associated with everyone on this committee because it really has been a privilege to find people so interested in the research and development and movement of science in space and, in astronautics, and as well as here on the earth.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my public approval of H.R. 6874, and to speak briefly with reference to the provisions of the bill authorizing the salaries and expenses portion of the budget for fiscal year 1962. I am chairman of the subcommittee assigned the review of this portion of the bill, and after several days of hearings during which a detailed explanation and justification for the salaries and expenses items were given by the NASA witnesses, I am satisfied that the requests for funds here are both reasonable and commensurate with the progress anticipated as a result of this authorization bill.

Although the salaries and expenses portion of this bill is composed of seven object items calling for a total estimated requirement of $199,286,000, approximately 82 percent is found in one item, namely, personal services and benefits. The budget proposes a staffing level of 18,422 employees. This is an increase of 1,929 employees over the number estimated for the 1961 fiscal year. The bill does not call for additional excepted positions but calls for only such increased staffing as is necessary to fulfill the missions of the various centers as required by the increased funding. I would like to call your attention to the fact that of this increase, three of NASA's centers—namely, Goddard and Marshall Space Flight Centers and Langley Research Center—and the NASA headquarters itself will require approximately 85 percent of the new staffing. This year's budget finds an overall increase in the activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and as the programing increases so must the business activity of the Administration. The increase in personnel at NASA headquarters is not necessary only to provide an adequate staff to plan, coordinate, and direct the technical aspects of the program functions of NASA itself, but is necessary also to provide the technical capability essential to high-level coordination of the NASA effort with relation to the work of other Government agencies and the scientific community in general.

The installation requiring the largest single increase in personnel is the Goddard Space Flight Center, and this installation firmly establishes a requirement of 760 additional employees. Goddard has the responsibility for maintaining the worldwide tracking network for both manned and unmanned satellite tracking. It is also assigned the responsibility for development of all earth-orbiting spacecraft and for the manned satellite program of NASA. This includes the development of sounding rockets, probes into near space, scientific earth satellites, applications satellites to provide advance in technology in such areas as weather prediction and communications and other areas that have practical applications in the not-too-distant future.

The major areas of responsibility of the Goddard Center requiring additional personnel are as follows: 253 employees in the Manned Satellite Group to meet the heavy operational schedule of the Mercury program and to analyze the results for future manned space flights; 138 employees for the Tracking and Data Systems areas, to meet the increased operational responsibilities due to the more numerous and more complex space flights and to provide for increased data acquisition, reduction and analysis. Some additional 56 employees are requested in the business administration and management functions, all related to the additional contracts which are required by virtue of the accelerated space programs.

The Marshall Space Flight Center is presently charged with the management responsibility for the Saturn and Centaur vehicle development programs, procurement and launching of the operational Mercury-Redstone and Agena B launching vehicles, and the development of the million-and-a-half-pound thrust F–1 engine and the 200,000-pound-thrust J–2 engine. The planned expansion and acceleration of program activity in the 1962 fiscal year will require a net increase of 449 employees at the Marshall Space Flight Center.

Of this net increase of 449 employees, 292 are required in the Vehicle Development area. Technical direction of project management capabilities must be increased here as a result of accelerated program activity and to meet the requirements of the tight schedule established for Saturn, Centaur and Agena. A number of major contracts have been executed by the Marshall Center for the design, development and integration of Saturn stages and the Centaur engine and stages, and for the procurement of Agena B launching vehicles. The management of these contracts establishes an increase in the requirements for professional and project-management type personnel. Additional personnel are likewise required for the technical supervision of such contracts and for an advance in in-house technology, which supports the contractor effort and forms a base of knowledge on which the development of the advanced vehicles can rest.

The bill provides an increase of funds for the Apollo project and other missions of the Space Task Group. It is estimated that to pursue the program called for here by the increased funding 300 additional personnel will be required. The Space Task Group will be carried as a separate research center beginning with fiscal year 1962 and its work will be done in coordination with the Goddard Space Flight Center and Langley Research Center.

The other large object items under the salaries and expenses portion of the bill are rent, communications and utilities, in the amount of $27,344,000, and travel and transportation of persons in the amount of $8,632,000. Of the request for rents, communications and utilities, 68 percent, or $18,917,000 is set aside for rent. Of this amount all but $556,000 is requested for the rental of electronic equipment required for data reduction, analytical computations and business operation machinery. I might add that the $556,000 represents rent for buildings and land use at the Marshall and Goddard centers pending the completion of structures at these installations which have been previously authorized. In view of the apparently large figure required for rental of computer equipment, I would be remiss were I not to direct your attention to the fact that such use is economically sound.

The rental of costly, highly technical, sensitive computer equipment is far more economical than outright purchase. This is true because the rapid, significant advances in the development of computer systems to provide equipment for high-speed operation with greater capacity establishes the precedent that it is more economical to rent such equipment rather than procure same by direct purchase. Electronic computing equipment is used at each of the research centers as well as at Wallops Island and the NASA headquarters. The funding estimates for this item are based on the use of such equipment under a three-shift operational plan. Under such rental agreements, rental costs are materially reduced. This secures the most advantageous use of the latest equipment under the most economical arrangement.

Other items in this category include communications and utilities. These reflect an increase over the current fiscal year. The amounts requested for long-distance toll charges comprise the largest portion of the funding request for communication. This is obviously for the reason that the execution of the agency's missions requires constant communication with other Government agencies and with the scientific community in coordinating programs of mutual interest. Long-distance telephone communications are also involved in resolving technical difficulties in launching-preparatory operations and in maintaining a constant contact with the global tracking stations during the immediate postlaunch period of programed space launches.

I would like to add one word of support for the $8,632,000 requirement for travel and transportation of persons. The estimates for fiscal year 1962 are an increase of $2,558,000 over the 1961 needs. It should be stated here that the amount authorized in 1961 created limitations on travel and imposed a heavy handicap on the accomplishment of the agency's program objectives. Approximately 80 percent of the increase requested this year is required for directing and coordinating the program functions and for travel to launching sites

and global tracking stations. An analysis of the types of services to which this object item applies indicates that the largest item is for travel in connection with the coordinating of program activities with other Government contractors and the scientific community. NASA's program is worldwide. Travel is a very necessary item for the supervision and inspection of the global tracking stations and the constantly required supervision and inspection of launching sites and industrial complexes doing contract work for NASA.

Let me add that each item under this portion of the budget has been reviewed by my subcommittee. Although I have just referred to only some of the major items, I am of the opinion that each item was fully spoken to by the agency witnesses, that each request was fully justified and that the salaries and expenses portion of the NASA budget is in line with the other portions of the authorization bill.

In closing let me add a word of praise for our distinguished chairman, the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS. Because of his leadership, the committee has accomplished a great deal in a very short time. All members and our staff members are dedicated to their job and have shown great vision in a period in our history where time is definitely not on our side. They had the foresight to advance programs vital to our national security even before direct recommendations were made by the administration.

We were all very much gratified, therefore, when President Kennedy and other responsible members of this administration acknowledged and supported our efforts.

Like all other committees, I believe the Congress can be proud of the fairly new House Science and Astronautics Committee.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH].

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6874, a bill authorizing appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It is a great pleasure to serve on this committee and to be associated with these outstanding Members of the House who have been mentioned by previous speakers. I feel the committee has done a splendid job on this bill, and I want to commend the chairman for his leadership in bringing this bill to the floor.

This bill authorizes $1,376 million for the next fiscal year. I submit that it is impossible for members of the committee, or of the House, to have the scientific and technical knowledge of this entire program to be able to determine exactly how much money is needed for research and development in the next fiscal year. The committee is recommending less than NASA asked for, but more than the Budget approved. Everyone wants to be certain that the program has sufficient funds for next year, but there can be honest disagreement as to just how much money is necessary.

I am personally supporting the amount recommended by the committee. In my opinion this will give NASA the necessary funds to carry on an effective program for the next fiscal year.

I also want to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Scientific Training and Facilities. I am pleased to serve on this committee, as I did during the last Congress. The chairman has been most diligent in seeking all of the information available concerning the many facilities for which funds were requested.

Just last week we had before our committee the National Science Board which governs the National Science Foundation. We had the presidents of some of the leading universities in this country, and other educational leaders, all of whom are recognized as experts in their respective fields.

It was one of the most impressive groups that has appeared before our committee. The Chairman of the Board was Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president of the Rockefeller Institute and President of the National Academy of Sciences. I asked Dr. Bronk this question:

> We hear so much talk and speculation about the comparative achievements and present status of the United States and Russia in the space field: What is your opinion as to how we stand at this time?

Dr. Bronk replied that in his opinion the United States was ahead of the Russians in most phases of our space program. He mentioned that the Russians had been more spectacular in their achievements, and were ahead in the heavy thrust field. However, he commented that in many of the other areas we had accomplished more than the Russians.

I was very much impressed with the answer of Dr. Bronk, and I am sure other members of the committee were equally impressed. I think the opinion of Dr. Bronk is entitled to great weight in view of his position. He certainly has the opportunity to observe what we are doing in our space efforts, and I am sure gave the committee his frank and unbiased opinion.

I was very happy to get this reply from Dr. Bronk and I thought it would be of interest to the Members to know that we are making such splendid progress in the space field.

We provide $74,245,000 in this bill for the Mercury project, which is the project to put a man in orbit. We authorize the sum of $224,160,000 for the Saturn project, which will develop 1,500,000 pounds of thrust. This will enable us to excel the Russians in placing heavy payloads in orbit. I am not sure that the Russians are now developing this amount of thrust, and with the completion of the Saturn project there will be no question of our superiority in this field.

Both the Mercury and Saturn projects have the highest priority. We are anxious to see both of these projects completed at the earliest possible date.

We were disappointed when the Russians won the race and was the first Nation to put a man in orbit. Their success was due largely to the fact that they have concentrated on the heavy thrust, which I have mentioned above. We did not consider such a program essential to our military needs, and as a result the Russians have been able to put heavier payloads into orbit. With the completion of the Saturn project this will no longer be true.

We were thrilled recently when Commander Shepard became the first American to enter outer space and return. This indicates that we are getting close to the time when we will also be able to place a man in orbit. It is my opinion, based on information received by our committee, that we will put a man in orbit this year.

I have no sympathy for those who constantly seek to downgrade everything we are doing in the space effort, and at the same time upgrade the Russian effort. I think the United States will be the first to put a communications satellite in operation. We will lead the way in other peaceful uses of outer space, and at the same time be ready with our military weapons, including intercontinental ballistic missiles and rockets.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the passage of this bill, which will authorize the funds necessary for us to continue our space program, which is essential to the survival of our Nation.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN].

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the program for fiscal 1962 submitted to our committee by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the bill before us providing the money for carrying out that program have my full support.

It is good in a way that we are considering the authorization bill for NASA at this time. We are still close enough to our recent Mercury-Redstone success to feel the warm glow of satisfaction with that phase of our space exploration program, yet we are far enough away to view that success in its proper perspective and to realize the tremendous challenge that lies ahead in this field. We have taken an important, but small, step down a long, long road.

The NASA authorization bill is unlike the others that this body considers, in that it deals primarily with the unknown. Seventy-four percent of the funds in this bill are for research and development. Most of this money will go for purposes of discovery in areas that heretofore have been beyond man's reach, not for application to tried-and-true programs and not for projects where success is reasonably certain or where results can quickly be seen.

Your support of this program requires faith in the capabilities of our scientists and administrators, and in the judgment of your committee.

This faith has been demonstrated in the past, and it goes without saying that it has been singularly rewarded by developments of recent weeks.

I think it is imperative that explicit recognition be given the fact that we are engaged in a space race with the Soviet Union. Not to so recognize would be to ignore reality. The basic question to be resolved, as I see it, is whether we can run such a race with victory as our goal

by proceeding with this venture in orderly and precise fashion, and keeping it in proper balance in relation to the multitude of other demands on our society, or whether we can only run the race in such a manner that the cost of winning might well overshadow the psychological and scientific gains that would accompany the victory, and, in that event, whether the venture would be worthwhile.

Whichever way the matter is resolved, if we make the effort necessary to wage a successful race it will cost us much more than the $1,376,900,000 we consider here today. In my estimation we will have to spend at least $3 billion a year, maybe more, for the next 10 years. In fact, we consider this bill today with the knowledge that the administration will request, either today or tomorrow, an additional half billion dollars for the space program.

These authorization requests are made to obtain the funds required to implement our plans for the coming year, consistent with the long-range objectives of the 10-year national space program outlined to Congress last year. The program during the past year has been a substantial success. NASA reached every one of its specific objectives, the last of which was the Mercury-Redstone suborbital flight.

We have an ambitious space program outlined for the years ahead, and it is vitally necessary to begin laying the groundwork at this time for many of our future efforts. Sometimes it is necessary to begin major developments months, even years, in advance of actual space flights.

Nearly one-third of the budget up for consideration here today is required for a major effort in the development of suitable launch vehicles of steadily increasing capacity. This has been one of our competitive weak points as far as the space race is concerned. We have really been bucking the tide because of the U.S.S.R.'s great thrust advantage. The extra money, and particularly the time, we have spent to refine and miniaturize our instrumentation have been costly to us. The Soviets have not been faced with this problem. As I say, a great percentage of these funds will go to improve our booster capability.

I would like to call your attention to several of the programs which I feel are of particular importance. The committee has recommended the expenditure of $40,200,000 for providing a worldwide meteorological satellite capability. This holds great portent for the good of mankind.

It will mean putting up a system of stabilized satellites for 500- to 1,000-mile polar orbits, and stationary satellites for 22,000-mile equatorial orbits. It will require the development of a variety of scientific equipment for acquiring and transmitting meteorological information to the United States.

The benefits to be derived from such a system are numerous: Protection of life and property from weather disasters; safeguarding transportation; crop planning, control and protection; industrial planning of weather-dependent products, outdoor enterprises, and heating and cooling loads; convenience in planning personal activities; eventual limited weather modification and control; and good will in return for providing current global meteorological data to other nations.

I might add that there is considerable potential here as far as the military is concerned.

Formulation of the operational concepts and the preliminary planning are now underway. This program was begun with Tiros I and Tiros II and will continue with the launching of a third Tiros in the next fiscal year. This will be followed by the launchings of the earth-stabilized, polar-orbiting Nimbus, and by the stationary satellite Aeros.

The committee has recommended $44,600,000 for another project offering tangible benefits to mankind—a worldwide system of communications satellites. There is a great potential utility in satellites as relay stations in worldwide communications systems.

We have already had remarkable success with the Echo I passive communications satellite, and the potential of active communications systems has been adequately indicated. NASA hopes to prove its feasibility and suitability for civilian application at an early date.

The active communications satellite holds the promise of new and reliable links in long distance, transoceanic telephonic and telegraphic communications as well as new means for intercontinental radio and television services.

Also recommended is $74,245,000 for Project Mercury. Lengthy discourse on the potential and the accomplishments of Mercury is hardly necessary at this point. This project is moving rapidly toward the point in time when our first manned orbital flight will be an accomplished fact.

Mercury's eventual successor, Project Apollo, will receive $72,100,000 under this authorization. Apollo will give us the ability to conduct a manned lunar exploration and to place a manned scientific laboratory into earth orbit. Apollo will be a versatile vehicle that will enable man to accomplish important functions in space.

The committee has recommended $18,100,000 for further research into the utilization of solid-propellant engines. Solid-propellant rockets have many potential advantages in that they are simple in design, they are easily and safely shipped, they are economical, they can be stored for extended periods of time and remain ready for immediate use, and they are highly reliable.

Also included in this sum is the investigation of the engineering feasibility and probable development cost of solid rocket motors with thrust levels of 1 to 2 million pounds.

We have also recommended $36,500,000 for nuclear systems technology. In my estimation this important area holds considerable potential. Because of the high specific impulse inherent in the nuclear rocket engine, long-range missions involving large payloads may be accomplished with lighter and simpler vehicles.

The largest, and one of the most important, single items under research and development is $224,160,000 for Saturn. Saturn is now proceeding at full tilt, carrying the highest national priority. It will be capable of sending large payloads into interplanetary space and will send three to five man crews into earth orbit. The Saturn first stage will generate 1,500,000 pounds of thrust and will give us a truly heavy booster capability for the first time.

There are many other programs covered in this bill. I have just touched on a few. They are all necessary parts of a highly coordinated and interrelated program of development. This is not a haphazard venture, lacking effective coordination. Nothing in this bill today represents what is commonly termed a "crash" program. We are not rushing into anything blindly. These programs are constructive and they have certainly been justified to my satisfaction. They represent responsible and calculated efforts at vital achievements in space technology.

We are providing a very minimum for the successful conduct of our space program. I urge your support of this authorizing legislation.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the present bill calls for $1,376,900,000. This is $141,600,000 more than the request submitted to the committee by NASA.

Mr. Chairman, I can subscribe to what my colleagues have all said about the desirability of being first in space and about the desirability of maintaining the dignity of this country in this field, but I want to point out to you that money alone is not the criterion of the progress of this program. And, I do not think that laymen are capable of estimating the amount of money that is necessary in this program or that by adding money to the program that has not been requested nor, in my estimation, been fully justified, is serving this country or serving the space program. I submit to you that the additional $141.6 million here requested was not supported by documents furnished by NASA or documents approved by the scientists and engineers in whose custody we have put this program.

Surely, in our experience, we realize that no agency of Government ever gets enough money, and it is quite easy to ask one of these gentlemen when he comes before you whether he could use more money, but I have yet on this committee or other committees on which I have served that have approved authorization bills ever had a member of such an agency say "No, we do not need more money; we cannot use more money." But, we are not dealing with merchandise that you can go into the store and buy, that you can take off the shelf. The things that we are buying here are experimental, the things that must be developed, and these can be developed with celerity. But, a crash program—and that, I am afraid, is what the committee

is recommending here—has never proven valuable or never served this country well in war or in peace. We are pioneering in new fields. We are going over a strange territory, and we must calculate our course carefully lest in our anxiety to reach our goal we become diverted from the true course and waste our energy and our efforts and our goods and thwart the very thing we want to accomplish. This was the case in the old days in the West when people, in an effort to get to the goldfields early, took short cuts. They generally ended up lost on the desert where they left their goods and their bones.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair count for a quorum?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, no point of order that a quorum is not present has been made. I ask for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thought that the gentleman from Michigan made the point of order that a quorum was not present.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, he just called attention to something. He did not make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] may proceed.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the hard working members of this committee, although I may differ with them on the manner in which we approach this bill. I question no one's motive, but I feel that you cannot pull off the top of your hat figures for money or estimates for money to develop big boosters when no one has seen a big booster and no member of this Committee is competent to define one, let alone tell you what it is. Surely, I can tell you that it is one of 1½ million pounds thrust. You might be interested to know that we have no instrument of measurement in the United States, at the Bureau of Standards at the present time that can measure more than 100,000 pounds. This is one of the deficiencies that exist, and if you think I am wrong, go to any of the laboratories throughout the country, and find one.

It is easy to talk the patois of science but perhaps the patois of science is just as bad as having no knowledge of science. So it was for these reasons that I was constrained to sign the report giving supplemental views on this bill.

I am just as interested and just as dedicated as any man on this committee or in this House in getting on with this program. We in the United States have made great progress. We are far ahead of Russia; not in the so-called big booster class, as you have been told; but who discovered the Van Allen ion bands? A great breakthrough? Through our space probes, through the analyses that have been made of the data that we have brought back, from satellites that have been up for 6 months to a year and that are still giving us critical data from outer space, we have correlated more data than any country in the world. But, again, we are pioneering in a new field. We are in a field where we can move with celerity, but we cannot move with haste, when the hysteria and the competitive spirit to be ahead of the other fellow may lose the race for us. And I speak seriously to you when I say that. Here is a place where we must weigh the facts. We have the greatest scientists, the men who head NASA, Mr. Webb, Dr. Dryden, the engineers and scientists associated with them, the people in the Navy, the people in the Air Force, the people in the Army, the members of our universities who serve as consultants to NASA, and so forth. American industry has done a fine job, but money alone is not the answer.

We can ruin this program, we can ruin our position in the world, if we seem to think that we can buy our way with money through these programs. I urge that celerity and solid thought be used in going ahead.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. I had not anticipated he was going to yield time to me.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Louisiana how many new employees are going to be added to the payroll of the Federal Government if this bill is passed. The report indicates several hundred will be put on the payroll.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will refer to the report on page 2 he will find it gives an itemized list of the total number of additional employees, with the breakdown. The total number is 1,929.

Mr. GROSS. Did I hear the gentleman correctly—1,929 new, additional employees?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. They are from various areas throughout the country. They are not here in Washington, D.C. There are 167 at NASA headquarters in Washington, D.C. There are some in California, some in Ohio, and down in Virginia, but the gentleman will find them all on page 2 of the report.

Mr. GROSS. It does not make so much difference where they are, they are still going to have to be paid for by the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The gentleman had that thought in mind, and I thought he would be interested in knowing where they are. They are not all in Washington, D.C.

Mr. GROSS. I am more interested in knowing what will happen to the taxpayers of the country. We were told that the appropriation bill for the Health, Education, and Welfare Department would put 3,400 more employees on the payroll. When is this business going to end?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not know of any program more important to our survival than this program. If the gentleman is going to worry about the taxpayers after this Nation is destroyed and the people are gone, I can understand his concern, but if you want to get ahead of Russia and protect our people from devastation caused by space efforts, you have to pay for it, that is all.

Mr. GROSS. I am for a space program; do not misunderstand me, but I can also envisage the United States of America being destroyed from within. I think the gentleman can, too, upon sober reflection. I see you have $8,632,000 for travel and transportation of persons. That is a lot of money to spend on travel and transportation of persons, in my book. I wonder whether this program is getting out of hand?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, the program is not. Most of this program in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was taken over from other agencies. It was simply a transfer of employees, and the employees' setups and installations. That is the way NASA was put together. NASA has a relatively small amount of new facilities and a relatively small number of new employees. They were accumulated from other agencies. That is the way NASA was made up. First there was NACA, and then NASA took over the employees of NACA.

Mr. GROSS. That may be true, but I am looking at the money for the travel and transportation of persons, $8.6 million. That is a lot of money for travel.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Considering the percentage it is not out of line. I will say to the gentleman there is a good deal of travel concerned with this. From Huntsville, Ala., for instance, down to Cape Canaveral, there is a great deal of travel involved. There is a good deal of travel. There is some travel from the headquarters here to the plants in Ohio and California.

Mr. GROSS. This does not include the travel expenses of your committee; does it?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The committee's traveling expenses, I will say to my distinguished friend, have been negligible.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what you mean by negligible, but the question I asked was—this does not include the expenses of the committee; does it?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. No, it does not include the expenses.

Mr. GROSS. All right, then, so we can add that to the $8.6 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will say to the gentleman, I do not think the committee has incurred any appreciable expenses for travel this year. We have been here in Washington.

Mr. GROSS. I am not being critical of that. What I am trying to say is, I am afraid this space program is getting ballooned out of shape.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH].

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to state my support of H.R. 6874, and to enlarge upon part of what has already been said by the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman BROOKS of the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

May I first say, however, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, I do this on a very friendly basis, I disagree with the statement and conclusions drawn by the

gentleman from Colorado, my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CHENOWETH] when he addressed himself to the leadership of the United States of America in the field of space. I think I recall, upon his asking that question and other questions of similar nature by other members of the committee, I believe I recall that the answer to the question was that insofar as the overall scientific spectrum was concerned in this area, the United States of America was superior on the overall scientific basis and superior to Russia, but insofar as the specific space program was concerned, the United States of America was not superior to the Russian effort, and I did think, Mr. Chairman, that observation should be made for the RECORD.

Subcommittee No. 4, of which I am chairman, held hearings on a number of items which appear in NASA's research and development program for the forthcoming fiscal year. The specific items which were considered by my subcommittee are entitled: "Space Craft Technology," "Space Power Technology," "Space Vehicles," "Scout," "Delta," "Centaur," "Saturn," "Vega," and "Tracking and Data Acquisition." The combined cost of these areas in the space program amount to $341,645,000 for fiscal year 1962 as compared to $240,139,000 in the same respective areas for fiscal year 1961.

I might say to you that it has not been a consideration of this committee to spend as much money as they could spend. This committee has in all instances viewed and scrutinized very carefully the requests for funds by the NASA organization, and we have only allowed increases in the areas where we have felt it was absolutely necessary to put the United States of America first because there are no prizes for second place in the race for space.

All of these areas, Mr. Chairman, and all of these programs are extremely important. But, I should like to address myself to two of the above research and development items for which NASA has made its largest request for funds for fiscal year 1962. These are the Centaur and Saturn programs, both of which are considered by NASA to be of fundamental importance to the overall program for the next several years.

The Centaur vehicle is composed of an Atlas first stage and a new second stage which will use for the first time in any vehicle, liquid hydrogen and liquid oxygen as propellants. It will be a very high performance launch vehicle which will have capabilities beyond any other current liquid chemical vehicle known today. Centaur will meet the need for payload carrying capacity of 4¼ tons in a low earth orbit compared to 5,000 pounds or 2½-ton capability of the Atlas-Agena B vehicle. No other vehicle currently in existence or under development can perform this major role in space. The amount requested by NASA for authorization for fiscal year 1962, and approved by the subcommittee, and subsequently by the full committee, is $56,400,000. The Centaur involves an extremely important engine development and is predicted to become a workhorse engine in the next few years. The same engine will be used in upper stages in the Saturn vehicle, to which we have attached many of our hopes for a successful space program in the sixties.

The other program about which I would like to make a brief comment is the Saturn vehicle development. NASA has requested $224,160,000 for this program for the fiscal year 1962. These funds will be used in the future development of the Nation's biggest multipurpose vehicle system. The Saturn vehicle will permit the United States to lift large payloads from the earth and send them into interplanetary space, and put even larger payloads with crews of three to five men into orbits near the earth. It will be a very versatile vehicle for it uses the "building-block" approach for the upper stages in order to achieve a variety of configurations and capabilities.

The Saturn development program has the highest national priority. There are two configurations now planned: The C–1, which will have three stages and is scheduled to be ready in 1964, and the C–2, which will have two, three, or four stages and is scheduled to be ready in 1965.

Due to recent events, the subcommittee explored the possibility of accelerating the Saturn program by authorizing additional funds for fiscal year 1962. However, testimony was received from NASA officials which indicates that the expenditure of vast additional sums at this stage in the development program would not significantly speed up the Saturn program. Accordingly, the subcommittee approved the amount requested by NASA.

Mr. Chairman, the members of Subcommittee No. 4; and the full committee in general, all expressed the wish that something could be done to step up the pace of developments in our Nation's space program. There was unanimous approval of NASA's request for funds for each of the items in the research and development program which were considered by Subcommittee No. 4. I am sure I speak for all the members of the subcommittee when I say that the request made by NASA for these items are reasonable and proper.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I wish to devote my allotted time to a very strong support for the passage of H.R. 6874. I may say at the outset that although this bill calls for what would appear to be an extraordinarily large sum of money for one agency—a large sum, one might say, for one field of endeavor—a large sum for the promotion of one program, the space program, the national space effort, nevertheless, let me call to your attention that in terms of gross national product this figure is relatively insignificant. Much has been said as to whether or not this country is in a race with Russia in the space sciences. Many people have reportedly stated that we were behind Russia in the development of large space boosters. Technicians would have us know that the large booster is required for the glamorous programing of space events, and it has been repeatedly said that you cannot make up time that has passed, for it is time lost. Only through the expenditure of increased funding may it be possible for this country to gain any on the Soviets.

According to the best information, I am advised that the Soviets are putting about 2 percent of their gross national product into their space effort. While it is true that it is very difficult to correlate this in terms of equivalent dollars, it would agree that this is certainly indicative of the national attitude and the national effort. In contrast with the Russian percentage, we are putting less than one-half of 1 percent of the U.S. gross national product into our space effort, and we include here both the civilian and the military program. I suggest to you that were we to advance our program on a basis comparable to the financial commitment of the Soviets it would find this country involved in some $10 billion a year. Therefore, I am of the opinion that we can well afford to spend the funds requested in this bill, that we can well afford to pursue the programs in a manner called for by the expenditure of these funds, that we can well afford to go ahead with our space program with the expenditure of funds commensurate with the progress that we desire in order to achieve parity and even surpass the Soviets.

At the present time our space exploration program has two principal features: First, use of interim capabilities created on a short-term basis for the limited uses permitted, and second, preparation of more versatile and powerful equipment to carry us into a further program for long-distance space exploration. The money required in this authorization bill before us is simply a step-by-step orderly progression of the NASA's 10-year program and both of these principal features of space exploration will receive their just share of the funds. Now both of these activities are essential. If we were to refrain from use of the interim vehicles and concentrate only on the long-term preparation for the future we would not only jeopardize our position internationally, but technically we would probably miss some of the scientific factors which may well be of great significance in guiding the future of our space activities.

The Soviet achievements are spectacular. Aside from their scientific merit, they focus the attention of the world on the Soviet Union. To those who have looked to us almost unquestioningly for leadership, they are bound to bring doubts and uncertainties as to the current quality and validity of that leadership.

There is no denying that the Russian successes in space have hit our prestige hard. But total success without some failures is contrary to scientific experience. And this is the part of the Rus-

sian space program that goes unpublicized.

The Soviets have managed to convince many, even in the relatively sophisticated Western nations, and certainly in the less industrially developed nations, that Russian achievements in space are the true measure of scientific and technological advancement and thus the measure of the strength of a culture. Achievements in space appear to have made more credible Soviet statements in other fields—economic, political, and ideological.

The Soviet propaganda drive is especially impressive to the people of nations with little industry or technology of their own. Millions are taking the technological accomplishments the Russians publicize so well and effectively as models for their own ambitions. Not knowing fully how these advances were made, they reason that the Russian peasant hoisted himself by his bootstraps in less than a lifetime, lifting himself to technological peaks in all areas. Uncritically they wonder if other marginal peoples might not be well advised to step in quietly along behind the Communist bandwagon in the hope of being swept on to Utopia, overnight, and practically painlessly.

That, in essence, is the international problem we face. To counter the spreading Communist influence that is based on Soviet space accomplishments, it is imperative that the United States pursue its own space program actively, effectively, and with all the ingenuity we can muster.

As you know, the field of space research is a costly one. Like research in atomic energy, space experiments make use of complicated, delicate, and expensive equipment—and most of it is destroyed in the few minutes needed to place a satellite in orbit or to accelerate a probe to speeds high enough to escape into space. No single company or group of companies could justify the enormous investment required to carry out such a program. Thus there is no alternative to governmental control and funding.

We cannot measure faith in terms of dollars or millions of dollars. It is something within ourselves—in the way a nation of free men attacks and solves problems. A democracy achieves leadership largely through the industry and ingenuity of individuals who, although working as teams, approach a challenge as a personal matter.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. WEIS].

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, the senior members of the Science and Astronautics Committee have covered in some detail the specific items contained in this year's NASA appropriations authorization bill, and I wish only to add several general comments and to mention one particular aspect of our space program which seems to me to be of particular importance.

First, however, I want to compliment our committee chairman, Representative OVERTON BROOKS, for the thoroughly competent and effective manner in which he conducted the hearings relating to this legislation. It is a great privilege and pleasure to serve on a committee which is headed by such a dedicated and hardworking public servant.

With regard to the bill itself, the dollar amounts authorized for the various NASA programs represent the combined best judgment of the members of our committee and the leading spokesmen from the agency as to the amount of money that can effectively be put to use by NASA during the coming fiscal year. In several instances the committee has increased the funds to be made available during fiscal 1962; in no instance has the committee reduced the amounts requested by the agency to carry on its work. This is, I think, indicative of the committee's collective sense of urgency with regard to this country's space program and of its willingness to cooperate to the fullest extent with the administration in moving essential programs forward at the fastest possible pace.

Virtually every witness who appeared before the committee during the course of the extended hearings which were held on this bill was asked the same question: "Could you effectively use more money than you have requested." Almost without exception the reply was that the money contained in the request was all that could be spent productively. In those few cases in which more money did seem desirable, the committee moved immediately to make it available.

I emphasize this point for two reasons. First, to indicate clearly that this committee—and I am sure our view is shared by a great majority in the Congress—stands ready to authorize the expenditure of whatever sums of money are necessary to carry forward an overall space program of whatever magnitude is necessary to achieve the twin goals of guaranteeing the Nation's security and of assuring America's preeminence in the field of space exploration. My second reason for emphasizing this point is that it has been reliably reported in the press this morning that the President is planning to urge upon the Nation a "crash program" to make America first with a man on the moon. I have no desire to prejudge the President's proposal, but on the basis of the testimony presented to our committee by the Nation's leading scientists, there is considerable question that expenditures of vast sums of money will, in fact, significantly reduce the time necessary to accomplish a successful lunar shot. I hope and trust that sufficient attention will be given to the counsel of these scientists and that billions of dollars will not be spent wastefully in a vain attempt to enhance American prestige. Particularly this should be avoided if it will mean any delay whatsoever in the other vitally important facets of our space effort.

One of these which seems to me to be of particular importance is the communications satellite program, by means of which the entire world could be linked in a single high-speed communications system.

An operational communications satellite system would provide instantaneous telephone service to all parts of the world, and television, now rather narrowly limited by the need for frequent microwave relay stations, could be transmitted on a worldwide basis. Such a system has possibilities which challenge the imagination, and their realization would be a tremendous step forward in the all-important communications field. For the United States to make such a communications system available to the world would be a most significant and worthwhile achievement, and I have been urging a rapid speedup in the communications satellite program.

In particular, I have suggested that NASA officially invite the participation of private industry in the development of such a program and that it encourage the investment of private capital in the Nation's space activities.

Many of our space activities must of necessity be carried on primarily as government projects, but this is one area of space development in which private enterprise has already indicated the ability and the willingness to take the reins and move forward quickly, and I hope they will be given the opportunity to do so.

Several of the Nation's leading companies, leaders in the communications field, have already come forward with an offer to the Government in which they have proposed to make a worldwide communications system operational in 1964 at their own expense, and I am extremely hopeful that the President, and through him the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, will give their approval in the very near future.

I am convinced that improved communications between all nations will bring about much better understanding among nations and greatly enhance the cause of peace, and when this can be done in the best traditions of American private enterprise I think we should move forward with it at the fastest possible speed. This is an area in which we seem to be far ahead of the Soviet Union now and I believe that with proper emphasis from the administration we are in a position to score an extremely significant "first" in a field which can be of immense value to the entire world.

One final word about our various space programs, Mr. Chairman. We have been in the Space Age for only a very short time and we are just now still on the threshold of a vast and largely unknown universe.

Of necessity we must probe in many directions and not all of our activities will be productive. We will be spending in the future much larger sums of money than we are dealing with today, and I have no doubt that these sums will be fully justified. Every one of the scientific disciplines is already coming into play and much greater efforts will be called for as we begin to unlock the really great mysteries of the universe. It is imperative that we approach the exploration of space with the sense of urgency that it deserves, but that we also maintain a sense of perspective and that we allow our efforts to be determined by rational scientific considerations and not by the propaganda efforts of other nations.

I believe that the committee has done so in the submission of this legislation to the House, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman I rise for the twofold purpose of advocating approval of H.R. 6874 and placing particular emphasis on that aspect of the bill which deals with a $51½ million allocation for research and development in the field of nuclear propulsion.

This allocation request is made up of a $15 million proposed expenditure for construction and facilities of Project Rover as described on pages 74 and 75 of the report; and

A $36½ million expenditure for the testing of nuclear and electric vehicles, propellants, and engines as described on pages 42 and 43 of the report.

Of this total, $28 million represents a budget request which I believe to be noncontroversial. That is, an allocation originally submitted by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Science and Astronautics Committee.

The additional $23½ million was the subject of discussion both at the Bureau of the Budget and at the Science and Astronautics Committee and it is for this reason that I am focusing attention on it now.

After receiving the original National Aeronautics and Space Administration's request for $51½ million, the Bureau of the Budget eliminated the $15 million construction and facilities request for Project Rover and cut $8½ million from the $36½ million general testing request.

The reasoning of the Budget Bureau was that these funds would only be used if certain tests now being conducted proved successful and that, therefore, it would be more prudent to wait until events justified the allocation than to allocate on the presumption of success.

The countering argument originally advanced by NASA and upheld by the Science and Astronautics Committee after listening to a number of expert witnesses was that in the event of success the necessity of having to reapply for an additional budget allocation would bring about delays, loss of leadtime, and upset schedules in a program vital to the future of the United States. Simply stated, we did not believe that we could afford not to gamble on success.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that I would by both voting record and background be classed as an economic conservative. I will normally support the Bureau of the Budget when it cuts the allocation requests of Government agencies. But, in this particular case, I believe that the evaluation of time made by NASA and by the Committee on Science and Astronautics is wiser, more realistic, and more appropriate to the needs of our Nation than is the evaluation of time placed on this particular project by the Bureau of the Budget. I have joined with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] in writing to the President urging the highest possible priority be given this development—see letter inserted in remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. Horner, Associate Administrator, NASA, before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, early in February 1960, stated that an appropriations cut by Congress of $18½ million in the R. & D. funds caused NASA to reduce the funds for the F–1 or the NOVA engine program by $6 million with a resultant delay of 12 to 18 months.

The practice of carrying on parallel projects to expedite and guarantee continuity of programs is common both in business and government. The concurrent development of the Polaris submarine and the Polaris missile is a notable example of congressional wisdom in guarding against delays and securing the greatest possible time advantage from success by anticipatory financing.

Whether we see our space program as a matter of national defense, as a matter of scientific research and development, as a matter of international prestige, or as the great adventure of our age, we know that the people of the United States are demanding that this country pass Russia and become No. 1 in space.

Many experts, capable of assessing our relative technical experience and skill in nuclear science, believe that our unquestioned superiority in space may come during the period of the inevitable switch over by the United States and Russia to forms of nuclear propulsion in rocket engines.

It is for this reason that I submit that we must place an extraordinary value on time on a matter so profoundly important to all of us. It is on this basis that I urge my colleagues to express themselves in support of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's request and of the Science and Astronautics Committee and affirm the $51½ million covering that section of H.R. 6874 concerned with nuclear propulsion.

Likewise, Mr. Chairman, I express my endorsement of the entire bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman, a new Member, on his maiden speech in Congress. It was well thought out, it had good material, and it was right to the point.

Secondly, may I compliment the gentleman from California on his activity and his vigor in getting the nuclear rotor rocket program underway so that America not only will be equal to Russia but will leapfrog the Soviet efforts in space. This is the kind of effort we need on the Science and Space Committee, and I welcome him to the committee.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for those very kind remarks.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise to discuss briefly the portions of this authorization voted to life sciences aspects of the space program. I was disturbed a year ago when I first inquired into the proposal because of the evident intent of NASA to establish a fifth functional division of its agency to carry on bioscientific research.

I was aware at the time that such biomedical studies are being conducted by a number of governmental agencies. The Senate Committee on Government Operations has since filed a most complete report on the scope of biomedical research. More specifically, an outstanding handbook on space research in the life sciences has been compiled by Dr. Earl W. Lindveit for the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences indicating many of the facilities available for such research.

Late last fall I did an extensive survey of such space-related scientific research in the military and nonmilitary departments of Government. I have filed my report with the Committee on Science and Astronautics. I have made it a point to question witnesses before our committee regarding efforts to coordinate such research and to determine a definite need for any proposals.

In connection with this particular authorization, I was pleased when a subcommittee under the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] was designated to examine the field of biomedical research. It seems to me that NASA witnesses before this subcommittee for the first time made a very clear exposition of their plans and showed that we are well on the road to better organization that will guarantee efficient and economical research in these areas.

In that connection I should like to quote briefly from the letter to the Speaker from James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, dated May 12, 1961. Mr. Webb reported to the Speaker:

> The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is undertaking a research program requiring physiological and behavioral data on chimpanzees. The research contracts proposed to carry out the program will require the construction of research and maintenance facilities for animals. The most practical and economical way to provide the necessary facilities is through augmentation of the aeromedical field laboratory, Holloman Air Force Base, N. Mex.

I am happy that this specific action shows that the Space Administration is looking closely at the possibility of using existing facilities before it recommends new ones. Earlier Mr. Webb had canceled plans proposed by NASA in the original space budget to built a new vivarium elsewhere.

I believe that the life sciences portion of the NASA authorization is most important in our research program. Now that we are assured that every effort has been made to avoid duplication, I am of the opinion that this program as submitted deserves our full support.

The importance of such biomedical research is amply recognized by the medical profession. Dr. E. Vincent Askey, president of the American Medical Association, expressed it well when he issued the following statement on the successful flight of Comdr. Alan Shepard,

the first American astronaut, and I quote:

> The medical profession is thrilled by the news that an American has soared into space and returned safely. Doctors are proud of the role they have played in making such a historic achievement possible. Of great significance to earthbound man is the intensive research on the vital systems—including the heart, circulation, and respiratory mechanism—that preceded the flight. From the demands for better knowledge about the physical makeup of humans and what is required to help them survive in the hostile environment of space will come medical benefits for all mankind.

We are already reaping benefits from the medical aspects of our space program. So, I may say, is the Soviet Union, which feels, according to an article in Pravda, that—

> man's entry into space will extend immeasurably the boundaries of our knowledge and will enrich immeasurably our science and culture.

In testimony before the Teague subcommittee, Brig. Gen. Don Flickinger, the head of the Air Force's space life sciences program, has said:

> People who are aware of "our present state of the art" in the space life sciences are shocked by the progress exhibited by the Russians in the earth orbital flight of Yuri Gagarin.

While recognizing that the Russians are active in this field, I believe we can be proud of what we have already done over the years in our space medical research. As man travels higher, faster, and farther, he undergoes new tests and extremes of conditions. Our programs of biological research have taught us much that we can regard as dividends with respect to health problems.

For instance, scientists have discovered that a fuel employed in the missile program—hydrazine—has applications useful in the treatment of mental illnesses and tuberculosis. Because astronauts must face belts of radiation, the Army has been doing some work on antiradiation pills which may be of benefit. There is also a means of rapidly lowering blood temperature in operations, and a small efficient valve which could replace the valve in a human heart.

I believe that the Space Administration needs the capacity to do research essential to the vigorous prosecution of our space effort. The bill which we have before us outlines a detailed and practical plan for fundamental research in satellites and space probes which can produce most valuable information. I heartily endorse this aspect of our space program and have been assured that it will be carried out with a constant awareness of a need to coordinate and direct all research to avoid unnecessary duplication in man-hours or in expensive facilities.

What we learn will be of benefit to medicine and to mankind. This space research has a magnificent opportunity to contribute to the extension of man's frontiers of knowledge.

I also support the other items included in H.R. 6874 as submitted by the Honorable OVERTON BROOKS, chairman of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, first I want to say I deplore the hasty and almost casual manner in which this bill is now being considered. Here we are at a late hour with a very few Members on the floor and with an inadequate opportunity to debate what is one of the most important problems facing this country today, namely, what should be our space program for 1962. I regret that I feel constrained to cut my remarks short. For this reason, because I know the pressure is on to adjourn this afternoon, I want to summarize my position only very briefly and my reasons for associating myself with the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] when we signed the minority report of the committee.

We have several authorization figures on our space program for 1962. We have the Eisenhower budget figure, totaling $1.109 billion. We have the Kennedy budget figures of $1.250 billion. We have the figures which were requested by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration totaling $1.376 billion. This is the figure from which our committee operated. And then I am told, Mr. Chairman, that tomorrow the President is going to submit a new set of figures which will be roughly $500 million more than his previous budget figure of $1.250 billion.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will yield, the original NASA request was $1.417 billion, and the Budget Bureau brought it down to $1,235,300,000.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I think I am right, but we do not have time to go into detail on that.

Now let it be made clear that I am not opposed to the authorization and appropriation of adequate and liberal funds for the support of our national space program. I am ready at all times to vote for any sums that have been properly explained and justified. However, Mr. Chairman, I deplore the hasty and precipitous manner in which these funds were authorized by the Space Committee. In my opinion, none of the increases over the budget figures were adequately explained or justified in sufficient detail.

We started our hearings shortly after Gagarin's orbital flight around the world.

They were conducted in an atmosphere of panic, almost hysteria. I had the feeling most of the committee was in a mood to approve almost any figure on a crash program basis. This is a most unwise and most unsound approach.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have profound respect for the gentleman's opinion and I know he wants to be accurate, but I would call the gentleman's attention to the fact that we had 40 days of hearings on this bill. We had actually 8 days of hearings on the increases over and above those recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, but which were approved by NASA. There were 8 solid days of hearings. In addition to that, we had hearings of the subcommittees on one of which, of course, the gentleman from New Hampshire serves, with reference to various portions of the bill. So, there was not much haste in 40 days of hearings that we had, and the 8 days when we considered each item over and above that which was recommended by the Budget

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I respectfully differ from my chairman; we have had a lot of hearings, but only a few were actually on these authorization figures before us today.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The subcommittee which I have the honor to chairman only had 1 day in which to complete its work which, in my estimation, was entirely inadequate.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, let me give just two examples of the hasty consideration of this committee. Take the figures on solid fuel propulsion.

The Kennedy budget figure was $3,100,000. The NASA request figure was $8,100,000. The committee's figure was $18,100,000. Why the extra $10 million? I could find no justification for that. It could have been $20 million or $30 million or $50 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. General Ostrander who is with NASA appeared before the committee. The record shows when he was asked, that NASA needed $10 million additional so the committee put that in and that is how it is there. He represented NASA and is a high official in NASA. Furthermore, he is an expert of no mean ability.

Mr. BASS of New Hampshire. I respectfully differ from my chairman. The testimony on the amount to be authorized for solid fuel propulsion was based almost entirely on the testimony of officials from private concerns manufacturing solid propellants. These people were sincere, but they nevertheless had a self-interest in getting the committee to approve a big figure.

Perhaps you saw yesterday an article in the Washington Star reporting on the committee hearing concerning the orbital rendezvous project. There the NASA witness as well as one of the committee members apparently did not even know the committee had already granted the full NASA request on that particular project, rather than the Budget figure.

This is just an example of the hasty and precipitous manner in which the committee considered this bill when some of its members did not even know afterward what the committee had done.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I feel that the wise and sound approach to this whole program is to do what our committee did last year, and that is authorize the full 1962 budget figure. That represents a sound, carefully planned, and yet ambitious space program. We must not be panicked into a crash program hastily put together. This can be very wasteful of our resources, possibly disastrous in bringing more failures, and is the surest way to stay behind the Russians in this space race. Let us hope that the Appropriations Committee, and later the House, will more fully and carefully consider the amount to be spent by NASA in 1962 than did our committee and the House today.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the question of limiting the time of debate has been raised. Let me assure you I shall try hard not to use the full 5 minutes.

However, I join with the gentleman from New Hampshire in deploring the rushing through of a bill just because it is a late hour in the day, involving over a billion dollars. The suggestion has been made that there was lack of time devoted to this bill in committee. I will have to differ with that viewpoint and say that there were 40 days devoted to hearings. As a new member of the committee I can assure every Member here that a great deal of time was given to the consideration of this bill by the full committee.

The gentleman from Iowa a moment ago asked a question about the $8 million for travel expenses. I would call his attention to page 9 of the report and remind him that the great bulk of travel expense is caused by the fact that NASA's operations are spread all over the world, necessitating the transportation not only of technical personnel but also of medical personnel, as well as the transportation of things all over the world to dozens of tracking stations. This is a worldwide operation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. But the total expenditure is not for the transportation of persons; it says "persons and things."

Mr. RANDALL. Page 10 of the report goes into that quite thoroughly: $740,000 is requested for the transportation of things. This item pertains largely to the shipment of personal property of NASA and personal property of new employees being shipped to their initial duty stations and also for transportation of certain employees which of necessity must be continuously transferred between NASA installations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me how many planes this space organization operates?

Mr. FULTON. May I answer that?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. They have one plane for personnel, and they do not own it.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 6874 and at the expense of some repetition, I do not think it would be out of order to repeat again for the RECORD the figures that we are talking about here today.

First. NASA originally requested of the Bureau of the Budget about $1,400 million.

Second. The Bureau of the Budget, however, approved only about $1,250 million.

Third. Our committee, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, approved about $1,375 million.

So that there may be no mistake about it and so that it may be utterly clear in the RECORD, I think that we should again emphasize and point out, as was substantiated and backed up by all NASA witnesses, that the amounts approved by the committee will only meet the requirements of the 10-year plan currently governing NASA's space program. Even with these increased amounts, there is but little provision to provide greater capability to accelerate very significantly our space program.

All of the changes which were made by the committee were made after long and extensive hearings, many briefings, and literally hundreds of witnesses, and I am sure that every member of the committee can assure each Member of this House that any increase in funds by the committee is but the committee's response to what it believes to be the vital need for urgency in our space program.

If you will study the report, you will note that on pages 84 and 85 are those changes made by the committee and you will observe that, with the one exception of the case of increase in funds for the study of solid propellants, all increases were made in conformity with long-range planning by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. To put the matter very simply the committee action restores money cut purely for budgetary reasons. As one who attended most of the hearings on this bill, H.R. 6874, which is the bill to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, that each item of these increases was investigated by the committee and furthermore has been justified by the technical authorities.

So that it may appear very clearly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I think we should enumerate again the categories in which the committee approved increases:

First. Sounding rockets—an increase of $2 million.

Second. Scientific satellites—an inincrease of $13 million.

Third. Meteorological satellites—an increase of $12 million; and if I may digress for just a moment, when we speak of the practical value of space exploration, there is nothing more practical or nothing more valuable than additional Tiros weather satellites which would give our country continuous weather observation during the entire calendar year of 1962 as a result of this increased appropriation.

Fourth. Project Apollo: This was an increase of about $43 million for man lunar observation and exploration. Without this increase, we could be expected to fall badly behind schedule for the reason that life sciences investigations and high speed reentry tests would have to be slowed down or abandoned.

Fifth. Launching vehicle techniques—an increase of only $8 million which will permit further development in-orbit rendezvous techniques and for refueling spacecraft. This could have peaceful value but it is also tremendously important as a possible military use.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, may I just take a further second to say that reference was made in previous remarks by other Members about the increase in amounts for solid propellants. True, there is an increase in the budget for solid propellants. We heard witnesses from contracting firms and research firms who simply suggested or asserted they could do thus and so. Whether or not they can live up to their claims is yet unknown. They were speaking in terms of pounds of thrust. The liquid propellant people have been talking about a million and a half and maybe 250,000 additional pounds of thrust for the upper stages. Their claims were made on a speculative basis, but they told us they could get a pound thrust of several million pounds. They gave us the one hope in all the hearings of the possibility of leapfrogging the Russians.

Let us say that in only a $3 million total budget for solid propellants you cannot make a very good investigation in terms of proving or disproving these assertions of the solid propellant advocates.

The committee increased recommended appropriations for solid propulsion to $18 million, for in the opinion of a number of members of the committee this offered the one opportunity, the one chance to help out in our biggest lag and that is in booster capacity. Certainly it is in a way a chance we are taking. But this is the only large or substantial increase in the authorization. Nonetheless it is a chance we have to take if we are going to try for a real leap ahead and perhaps go out in front of the Soviets.

Unlike two of my colleagues, I did not introduce a bill specifically calling for the authorization of additional funds for solid propellants but I am convinced that this may well be the one area of activity in which our country can move ahead the fastest in the race for space. Originally $3 million of research funds were allocated for solid fuel propellants prior to action by the committee which increased that amount by $15 million. It appears that the Soviets have a superiority in booster capacity to launch

their space vehicles. They can deliver more measured pound thrusts to carry a bigger and greater payload into space than is possible in our present space efforts. Now, we have had witnesses from research firms before our committee that say they can increase several fold the propulsion thrust of the liquid propulsion method, that is, the hydrogen oxygen engine.

On the other hand, solid propellant advocates speak of the development of booster capacity or a thrust in terms of several million pounds of thrust or many times the capacity of that now possible by the use of liquid propellants. Solid propellant rockets have many potential advantages from a manufacturing and logistic point of view:

First. Solid propellant motors are very simple in design. They have no complicated components or moving parts.

Second. These loading motors may be prepared at the manufacturing plant and shipped easily and safely by common carrier without any further "load" or preparation at the launching site.

Third. These propellants are nondestructive and noncorrosive and most important are nonexplosive and equally important can be made from material easily available in large quantities at a low price and by a basically simple process.

Fourth. After the motors have been loaded they can be stored on the ground for long periods of time and remain ready for immediate use without further preparation.

All in all, the solid rocket or rather the solid propellant for any booster engine enjoys low manufacturing cost and what many of us believe a high reliability in operation. Many of us felt at first that we had only the word of the contractor or the manufacturers of solid propellants in support of our contention of the superiority of solid propellants, but as additional witnesses from firms from both coasts appeared before our committee some of us became convinced there should be a greater authorization for solid propulsion because if the assertions of these witnesses were correct, as I have said before, it would give us an opportunity to increase several times fold the thrust in terms of poundage in our booster or launching vehicles. Certainly, for $3 million or the Bureau of the Budget's figure we could not take a very good look at the assertions of these manufacturers. This increased appropriation will give us an opportunity to exploit to the very greatest advantage all of the very excellent characteristics of a solid propellant rocket.

The local press indicated in this morning's paper that the President now believes our country must get into the space race all of the way to get out, and that his decision will be to give it all this Nation has. Accordingly there may be other authorization bills to come before this House before it adjourns but you have here today the beginning of a stronger program in space and we have here very modest increases which should be overwhelmingly approved by this body today.

Mr. Chairman, the acceleration of the space program and our space achievements is not simply of great value, it is of immeasurable value and will have an immeasurable effect on our national prestige and, if you please, our national security. World leadership in space is not simply a matter of first order but of paramount importance if the United States is to be successful in this effort to preserve world peace.

This bill which is not increased in any large magnitude simply goes along with the 10-year program of NASA and not very much more. It is but another step in the program planned when NASA was established.

While this authorization bill undoubtedly contains large sums which will ultimately be for the benefit and advantage of the military and thus much of the money will be spent just as much in the interest of defense as if it were in the Department of Defense appropriation, yet, at the same time this bill is another step and probably the most important step to be made by this the 87th Congress in achieving our national objective to explore space for peaceful purposes and bring the benefits of such research and development to practical reality and thereby benefit all mankind in a peaceful world.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman on his excellent speech and his fine cooperation. He has made a good member of the committee; he is a hardworking member, and we are glad to have him.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the question comes up with reference to these budget figures for solid propulsion for the fiscal years 1961 and 1962 approved by the Budget for solid propulsion. As of January 16, 1961, there is a figure of $3.1 million. The amended budget request by NASA, March 17, 1961, was $8.1 million. The amount allowed by the Bureau of the Budget on March 28, 1961, $3.1 million for solid fuel propulsion. That was a cutback of $5 million on the NASA amended budget request of March 17, 1961. The committee went back to the figure of $8.1 million, the NASA request, and then added another $10 million on my amendment, making the total committee figure for solid propulsion $18.1 million. I believe this is necessary because even in the current fiscal year there is $68 million for liquid fuel propulsion. We certainly should have a more proportionate approach.

Adm. W. F. Raborn, Director, Special Projects Office, Department of the Navy, who is in charge of the Polaris solid fuel propulsion vehicle, before the Committee on Science and Astronautics on February 4, 1959, stated that the Polaris project was a bold strikeout in solid propellant developments while the rest of the national effort was being channeled into the liquid fuel path. He stated further that this two-pronged approach was a gamble that paid off handsomely.

If we in the United States want to equal or exceed the Russians in space, we need not only the liquid fuel propulsion but also the solid fuel approach, and likewise we should have the nuclear and the electric propulsion fuel as further approaches in the future for operating vehicles in space.

I would like to comment further on the supplemental views as contained in the committee report. There is really not a difference of $141,600,000 between the committee approach and the two members filing supplemental views. There is only $126,600,000 difference. The $15 million for emergency construction of facilities is in each of the figures. So that our new figure of the committee of $1,376,900,000 is simply an increase of the Bureau of the Budget figure of $1,250,300,000.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I would like to make the statement that we miss the gentleman sorely on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but we are so happy he is doing such a good job on the other committee.

Mr. FULTON. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to add my support for H.R. 6874. I also want to commend the distinguished chairman of the Science and Astronautics Committee, the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished former Speaker of the House for their invaluable contribution to the committee; it has been a privilege to serve with them. I believe that this bill represents the least that we in the United States must do if we are going to have a worthwhile space program.

Admittedly, Mr. Chairman, this program costs money. In that connection, I would point out two things. First, if we carry out the space program on a halfhearted basis we may as well abandon it from a political point of view; there is no point in being "too little and too late" indefinitely and permitting the Soviet Union to reap the entire political harvest of space exploration. Secondly, if we approach the program in earnest and accomplish what our free society is capable of doing with it, the rewards are apt to be incalculable.

I favor the second approach. Our national prestige is tightly interwoven with the space program.

Mr. Chairman, let me say a special word about one area of this bill—the area for which our committee authorized the greatest increase in funds—Project Apollo.

In March the National Aeronautics and Space Administration went on record as needing $79.7 million in order to go forward with its plans for Apollo.

Only $29.5 million was approved by the Bureau of the Budget. After extensive examination of the matter, the Committee on Science and Astronautics has approved the additional $50.2 million—$42.6 million for research and development, $5 million for tracking facilities, and $2.6 million for staffing.

Why an increase of this magnitude?

Project Apollo carries a very large share of the hopes and aspirations of the entire free world. Apollo is the American concept of the way to explore the moon through human observation—first by instrumented test vehicles, then by manned vehicles orbiting the moon, and finally by a manned landing on the moon. It is the space vehicle which, in the foreseeable future, offers promise of the greatest practical reward—both in terms of national stature and in terms of scientific achievement and the acquisition of human knowledge. Apollo is our entry in the race for the exploration of the moon.

Yet without the increase we are making here for Apollo, we will be funding this critical program at only one-third the amount necessary to move it rapidly ahead.

Does this make sense?

The decision has been made by the administration to speed up the Saturn, Centaur, and Rover booster programs—specifically for the purpose of making Apollo possible, among other things. But if we do not provide the additional money included here for Apollo's spacecraft and flight technology, the years 1963 to 1967 may find us with a fine family of high-thrust space rockets—but no useful payload for them to boost. At least no manned payload to the moon.

Initial efforts have been made to establish the long-range objectives of advanced man-in-space flights and the rational steps which must be taken to extend manned space flight capabilities beyond those developed to date in the Nation's space programs. Preliminary efforts have been directed to the analysis of specific flight missions and of associated vehicle requirements and concepts that will meet basic objectives while reducing technological uncertainties and long-range cost factors. Analytical and experimental investigations are being undertaken at NASA centers. Wind tunnel and free-flight model tests are being made to determine the aerodynamic, stability, loads, and heating characteristics of possible spacecraft configurations. Corresponding investigations are being undertaken in the areas of structures and heating protection, space navigation, stabilization, flight dynamic control, and landing and recovery. This work has permitted formulation of general guidelines for proceeding with the detailed development of the Apollo program.

Such development, however, requires research of a very high order and with long leadtimes. Most important—problems of reentry into the earth's atmosphere and of the life science technology connected with the Apollo effort are extremely difficult. Yet, testimony before our committee disclosed that this authorization is necessary to begin to solve them.

We must begin. In my view we have no alternative. Our only hope of it and of surpassing the Soviet Union in the Lunar League rests with Apollo.

We must press forward with this program with the utmost urgency to insure the preeminence of the United States in space.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FULTON. I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his fine work as a member of the committee. He has been one of the hard workers and has been nonpartisan. It is fine to have a new member such as the gentleman on that committee.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I will place in the RECORD at this time a skeleton outline of the meetings of the committee beginning February 16, 1961, day by day and time by time, through May 5 of this year, totaling 40 committee meetings, in addition to subcommittee meetings, to show how much time has actually been spent on this particular bill. Most of it was in the full committee, where everyone was present and able to participate.

Mr. Chairman, in doing so, I want to pay particular tribute to the subcommittees. We turned this bill over to three subcommittees, giving them one-fourth of the bill each. The remaining fourth remained in the full committee. In addition to the work of the full committee, they also handled the bill in the subcommittees. So, I can say this advisedly, I do not believe any bill has ever been more carefully considered than his bill has before it came to a vote before the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

The material referred to is as follows:

HEARINGS HELD BY THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, 1961

February 15: Soviet Venus shot; satellite-missile network.

February 16, 17, 20, 22: Research and development in Department of Defense.

February 27, 28, and March 1, 6, 7: Project Rover.

March 2, 3: Panel on Science and Technology.

March 6, 7, 8, 10: Space propulsion technology.

March 13, 14, 22, 23: NASA authorization for fiscal year 1962, H.R. 3238.

April 10, 11, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 24, and May 1, 3, 4: NASA authorization for fiscal year 1962, H.R. 6029.

May 5: NASA authorization for fiscal year 1962, H.R. 6874.

Summary: 16 days public hearings on authorization bill; 4 days executive session on authorization bill; 12 days public hearings on special parts of programs contained in bill. Total 32 days plus 8 days subcommittees—40 days.

March 17, 18, 20, 21, 23: Department of Defense directive, "Defense Space Interest."

April 12: Amendment of Space Act re Space Council, H.R. 6169.

April 13: Soviet man-in-space shot.

April 26: Foreign space activities.

May 8, 9, 10: Commercial communications satellite systems.

May 11, 12: Role of National Bureau of Standards in space program.

May 15, 16: Equatorial launch sites and mobile sea launch capability.

SUBCOMMITTEE HEARINGS

Subcommittee No. 1

April 21: H.R. 6029, construction of facilities.

Subcommittee No. 3

March 28, 29: H.R. 1.

April 19, 20, 25, 27: H.R. 6029, salaries and expenses.

Subcommittee No. 4

April 19, 20: H.R. 6029, research and development.

Special subcommittee

May 4: H.R. 6029, life sciences.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have had a part in the hearings on H.R. 6874 as a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. I am pleased to add my voice in support of the passage of this bill.

While I know there are those who would make it appear that space exploration is far too costly, there are those who would want you to believe that there is nothing to be gained through the space sciences. There are those who would want you to curtail and hold to a minimum space activity. I frankly wish that each and every one of you had been able to witness the Mercury-Redstone III suborbital shot with Comdr. Alan Shepard aboard the capsule. What an awesome sight as the Redstone missile rose majestically on high until finally it began its programing downrange.

Too much has been said of late that we are behind the Soviets, too loud has been the cry that we are second to the Soviets in a space race, and too long has been the criticism that there has been no sense of urgency in our space program. But let me assure you that never was there a more dedicated group than those scientists and engineers working in that recent suborbital Mercury shot. Great was the sense of satisfaction of a job well done. Spontaneous was the reaction that this was the step needed, that this is the answer to catching Russia, if such be the case of a race, and that this is surely the next step up to the restoration of the prestige of our great country, if such has been lowered. H.R. 6874 does not call for a tremendous expenditure when examined in light of the national gross product of our great country. H.R. 6874 is merely the orderly proceeding of another year under the 10-year plan under the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And here let me assure you, my colleagues, that this bill contains no unnecessary funds, but rather this bill supplies the requirements as set out by our space leaders to do the job that will be commensurate with a speeded program, that will place us in front not only in miniaturization and other fields of skilled technological development but in the field of big boosters as well and ultimately in front where space exploration is concerned.

I am not fearful of supporting this bill even considering the amount of money involved, and I have no hesitancy in urging your support, for certainly all of us desire to see America foremost in space,

and this bill is a necessary steppingstone in that direction.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, we are at a critical point in our space program. After several years of preliminary work, both we and the Russians have proved that man can survive and work and space. Now is the time we must decide whether we are going to hold our own as a major and vital force in the world, or whether we are going to abdicate leadership—leadership on the whole new frontier of space, and in the revolutionary scientific advances which are linked with its development.

It should not be necessary to develop in detail what the general reasons are for the importance of space. In a few words, the effort to enter space and what we will learn in doing this will transform our science, engineering, and industry. Space will open up an extension of geography of unforeseeable importance. A strong space program will be important to our stature in the world, not as a propaganda stunt but as a symbol of prestige and respect for the general capabilities it proves. And, though we hope that space will be used for peaceful purposes, any failure on our part to develop the ability to move where we wish in space and do what we wish could outflank and outmode all meaningful defense of this Nation against the aggressive acts of the Soviet Union.

I sincerely hope that the Members do not succumb to a feeling of complacency because of the magnificent flight made by Comdr. Alan Shepard. Those of us who have followed Project Mercury closely know that it represents the most complex technical undertaking in the history of this Nation. The program when completed will have cost about half a billion dollars, and it has been conducted with the utmost sense of urgency with the highest assignable national priority. This flight and the orbital flights to come do not represent only a few brief minutes of glory purchased at a great price by the taxpayers. Instead they represent the assembly into a successful system of the most incredibly complicated and cleverly planned tasks we have ever undertaken. And they will represent only the first halting steps into a new age of human progress our children may come to accept as commonplace.

Project Mercury has had to combine in perfect balance many elements: A dangerously explosive rocket system made reliable enough to carry a man; a worldwide effective system of specialized radio links coupled with high quality radars and fast responding computers. It has included a host of sensing and guiding devices which only a few yesterdays ago would have been virtually beyond imagination. No matter how the rocket turns or is stressed, these devices must know accurately where it is going, whether it is pitching, rolling, or yawing, which way it must point for reentry, and whether there is a need for emergency escape by the pilot in fractions of a second. Amazing new materials have been needed to keep the pilot from having his ship reenter as a blazing ball of white fire, burned to a cinder. It must come in where expected, lowered gently by a parachute, after withstanding great heat. And through all of this the Project Mercury capsule must support the life of the man in the face of unknown hazards from high accelerations, weightlessness, sensory confusion, space radiation, noise, vibration, and heat. The blend of all these accomplishments cannot be regarded as matter of fact, or available off-the-shelf simply at a price in dollars. We are extremely fortunate to have worked so hard and to have attained this success in so short a time.

During the course of the authorization hearings on the NASA funding request, I served as chairman of a subcommittee on the life sciences. This is the NASA label for the work of preparing for manned space flight, for study of the effects of space on all living materials, and for the study of potential life on other worlds. As a result of the detailed examination which my colleagues and I made of this area, I wish to convey in as simple terms as possible a little bit of the sense of excitement and of urgency which we feel about this part of the NASA program.

An example of how much there is to learn, and the great needs appeared in testimony before the subcommittee: One vital bit of information about an astronaut in flight is a measure of his blood pressure on a continuing basis. We are all familiar with the blood pressure device used by a doctor in a medical exam, but the problem of attaining continuous, automatic reporting is much greater. It was only 2 weeks before Commander Shepard made his flight that finally a device was invented and perfected which would perform this job in a satisfactory manner. Yet such development had been pursued aggressively over the past several years. You can see the implications of such an automatic device for heart patients and others in special situations if such information can be read continuously and fed by radio to a monitoring computer.

Even with the great urgency of Project Mercury, the ability to send Commander Shepard on his flight did not grow just from this emergency project. It is the outcome of years of painstaking aviation and space medicine research, work which is difficult to hurry, but now woefully inadequate for the greater demands of the near future. One recalls over the years the high altitude balloon flights to a near space environment in which men have gathered experience. The same week that the Mercury shot was a success one scientist gave his life, after setting a world altitude balloon record. The tremendously complex X–15 aircraft has flown over 3,000 miles per hour, and through this experience, our pilots are learning to maneuver in space, and to make gliding reentries red hot back into the atmosphere. We are learning about the interaction between the man and his machine and instruments in space through the X–15.

Through years of experimentation on the giant human centrifuge at Johnsville, Pa., we were able to design a couch, a correct position, and instrument controls which carried Commander Shepard through high gravity loads which would kill a man under uncontrolled circumstances. Although we do not all expect to ride in contour couches, this research will nonetheless pay off in safer automobiles and even in aircraft from which the passengers have a chance to walk away after many kinds of crashes.

In order to travel through space, we must overcome the radiation of the Van Allen belt and the great solar flares which periodically flood all of space at least this close to the sun with lethal particles. This research is teaching us things about shielding which were not known previously, and invisible force fields may be wrapped around a future spaceship like a magic cloak to protect against these deadly rays. We are already developing in our laboratories new drugs which greatly increase human resistance to the effects of radiation. One does not have to strain to see the implications which these successes can have for the survival of our people at a time when the threat of nuclear war hangs over us with its deadly fallout.

Another area about which we have a great amount to learn is the psychological effects of weightlessness, isolation from familiar things, loss of sense of direction, and loneliness which may come in space. This research can be explored in part on Earth, and is very necessary if space flights are to be successful. This, too, has great application on Earth. Our probing of the nature of man's mind necessary to this research is very likely to enhance our ability to cure mental illness, and better yet, detect its onset and prevent it from becoming acute.

For the longer space flights only a few years away, we will not be able to rely upon tanks of oxygen and supplies of already prepared food. Research is underway to find a means for renewing air supply, recovering water, and reprocessing food almost indefinitely. In other words, we are seeking the ability to create in miniature the same kind of closed cycle world in the spaceship that we have on a larger scale on Earth. Plants take up the carbon dioxide men and animals breathe out, and return new oxygen. Plants translate sunlight, water, and carbon dioxide into food. Research on algae, a microscopic water plant, and on tiny shrimps which can be carried into space will do more than make long-distance space flight possible. It has promise of opening the door to the secrets of food production capable of keeping pace with the tremendous increase in world population. And some of this research even offers the possibility of transforming the atmosphere and temperature of Venus so that a later generation of Earthmen may have a whole new world to colonize.

Space biology, including the study of life on other planets may sound like only a scientific pastime. But it is more than that. It could be vital to all human life. We may learn to unlock the secret of life itself. We may also learn to prevent the accidental disastrous release of an alien germ on Earth brought back through carelessness on some returning space probe. The return of probes with

samples from other worlds is years closer than manned expeditions to such places.

These illustrations are offered to demonstrate that what we do for space flight is closely related to medical progress here on Earth. Someone may suggest that the same money could be put into ordinary medical research. But this is not a complete answer. For one thing, in science, necessity is the mother of invention, and we are inventing and also discovering things in the space program which might be much slower in coming even if they were sought directly. But more to the point, there are compelling reasons why we must be able to put man into space in person, and not rely on instruments alone.

A human pilot can react to situations and take corrective action for many kinds of problems better than any machine yet invented. Think how slowly our modern jet aircraft would be coming along even in this age if we were trying to develop them only using mechanical autopilots instead of test pilots. Man in a spaceship will be able with even a few instruments to observe and interpret things on Earth and on distant bodies which machines and remote circuit television sets cannot do.

Even with the very good televisions of the future, consider the problem of steering an automatic tank across the surface of the Moon from a television console here on Earth. Because it takes 2½ seconds for signals to flash from the Moon to Earth and back, the controller on Earth would find it most difficult to steer and maneuver mechanical tools at that distance with an insurmountable timelag.

And what will our remote controlled robot explorer on the surface of the Moon do with its limited abilities if, at the same time, a space-suited Soviet explorer can walk up to it and disable it? This is not science fiction. This could be a reality before another 10 years have passed. We do not know in what specific ways this ability to travel will be important to our military security although studies imply it will be important. But unless we have the capacity to do this for scientific and other purposes, we might find out too late that we had missed the means to maneuver in space, to assemble large and complex payloads in orbit, to maintain electronic gear in big space communications satellites plagued by circuit failures. And this could be tragic militarily as well as scientifically.

Other members of the committee have stressed the extreme urgency of developing better space propulsion, an area we know is now dominated by the Soviet Union. This need is urgent and real. At the same time, it was brought out most clearly to my subcommittee that propulsion will by itself not solve our problems of spacelag. Propulsion must be combined with a total vehicle and with advanced payloads to be lifted into space, including all that is needed to sustain human life and keep the men functioning effectively.

Despite the great strides we have made and the work we are doing, these efforts will be dwarfed by what lies ahead. Leadtimes are difficult if not impossible to compress. Invention cannot be made according to a timetable. We must support the broad spectrum of space research in the life sciences area now at a good level in order to move on from the work on Project Mercury to the follow-on Apollo and Dyna-Soar and even more advanced systems.

This work is not cheap in dollars, but it is only a small percentage of what we are prepared to commit to propulsion, and it is equally vital to our longrun success.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my reasons for having supported H.R. 6874, a bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, and construction of facilities.

Although not a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the evidence presented in the lengthy committee hearings and the detailed committee report indicates that the many programs of NASA are being conducted with the utmost urgency in relation with a well-balanced, thoroughly integrated and coordinated plan.

At this point, perhaps it would be helpful if I submitted a brief table which clearly indicates that, even in the wake of recent events, the authorizations agreed upon by the committee appear to be a reasonable compromise between the President's and NASA's budget requests:

NASA new obligational authority, fiscal 1962

[In millions of dollars]

	Kennedy budget	NASA request	H.R. 6874
Salaries and expenses	196,686	209,510	199,286
Research and development	919,539	1,056,309	1,023,539
Construction of facilities	119,075	152,002	[1] 154,075
Total	1,235,300	1,417,821	1,376,900

[1] Includes $15,000 for emergency construction of facilities.

But even with the broad, bipartisan congressional support for this bill, underlined as it was by an unusual degree of public understanding and support, we have no cause to rest.

It was developed at the hearings that Russia is reported to have set her sights on 1967 as the year for her first lunar landing, the 50th anniversary of the Communist revolution. The corresponding timetable for the United States has set the period 1969–70 as the target date. Officials of NASA have testified that a crash program of sufficient magnitude to close this gap would entail an annual expenditure of $4 billion to $5 billion a year—many times our current expenditures.

Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Associate Administrator of NASA, when recently questioned as to whether the United States could undertake such a program acceleration, said "I certainly don't feel this is an impossible objective. If as a matter of national policy this is felt to be a requirement, I would be the first to review it wholeheartedly and see what it would take to do the job. My estimate at this moment is that the goal may very well be achievable."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the choice is basically one of national goals. Do we as a nation want to increase our civilian space effort from about 1.5 percent to approximately 6 percent of our entire budget in an effort to match Russian space objectives by 1967? The choice will not be easy, but make it we must.

In this connection, it is perhaps significant and reassuring that H.R. 6874 earmarks nearly three-fourths of its total authorizations for research and development activities. If we decide to greatly accelerate our space program, this current emphasis on research and development should make any such transition much easier and less costly.

If distribution of personnel in our space program is any criterion, a comparison with Russia, recently published by Missiles and Rockets magazine, would indicate that we might be in a position to move rather rapidly into a crash program if and when we so decide. The table follows:

Distribution of personnel

	U.S.S.R.	*United States*
Basic and applied research	140,000	60,000
Development	100,000	300,000
Design	170,000	100,000
Production	260,000	200,000
Total	670,000	660,000

The largest single project authorization under the research and development section of this bill is for Project Saturn. When operational, the first stage concept, based on the utilization of multiple off-the-shelf engines, will obtain a thrust of 1,500,000 pounds; this will greatly decrease, if not eliminate, the present thrust gap with Russia. The planned launch schedule for the 10 Saturn development vehicles is 1 in calendar year 1961, 2 in 1962, 5 in 1963, and 2 in 1964.

Since the Saturn booster is being developed at Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Ala., and will be launched at the Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Fla., means of transporting this space vehicle had to be developed. Because the Saturn vehicle dimensions exceed existing land bridge clearances, it was determined early in the Saturn program that barge transportation would be used. A contract has been let for the design and fabrication of the first barge and this will authorize funds for a second.

It is my understanding that a test barge run was made recently with a dummy Saturn and that the barge negotiated our inland waterway system from Huntsville to the gulf without incident, only to collide with a ship in New Orleans Harbor. As a member of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, I hope the officials of NASA in charge of this operation will let us know if they encounter any difficulties on our inland waterway system. It was just a little

over a year ago that our committee was informed by military people that the bridge clearances on our Interstate Highway System were not sufficiently high to permit the easy passage of Atlas missiles being transported by trucks. This we were told only after thousands of bridges had been planned and constructed. Mr. Speaker, I would hate to see our Saturn program slowed down because of any similar lack of communication between our space and river engineering people.

As I have stated at the outset of my remarks, I support the provisions of H.R. 6874. I think it presents a balanced program of development that varies only slightly with that requested by both the previous and present administrations and the original request submitted to Congress by NASA. I support this bill, however, with the knowledge that circumstances may warrant a complete reappraisal of our timetable of development at any time.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as I urge my colleagues to enact this authorization, I want to stress that I am not satisfied that the program goes far enough.

As I have said many times in committee, I am not satisfied that the program projected by this legislation will actually keep us in the space race.

True, this bill has gone beyond the President's original requests and stepped up the program in several areas. Yet, if the American people are truly serious in their hope and desire to overtake the Russians and recapture the lead in space exploration, or if they simply expect the American effort to fall no further behind the Soviet program, our program should go still further than this legislation takes it.

It is generally understood that the President will present new requests on the space program to the Congress tomorrow, and these requests have been scaled upward by more than $500 million.

Soon after this Congress convened, I became firmly convinced that the current program and the program as projected in the original NASA requests for fiscal 1962 offered no hope of overtaking the Russians, and very probably would let this country slip even further behind in the space race.

I saw then, too, that the current program almost totally neglected the one best hope of making early gains in the space race. That hope was research and development of solid-fuel boosters, for which NASA requested only $3.1 million.

I wrote the President to plead for an expanded space effort that gave greater emphasis to solid-fuel propulsion, which had been successfully demonstrated in the Minuteman tests and in other solid-fuel military missiles. That letter follows:

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The American people are being misled by official talk about the space race. They have the feeling this country is in a race with the Russians to reach the moon. The race is a fiction—because we are not in it.

Given all the facts, our people would, I believe, strongly desire that we match or outdistance the Russians in Space. The prospect that the Russians will dominate space and control the moon represents the greatest potential threat to sovereignty which this country has ever faced.

Our people, however, are not looking at all of the facts. We have fired dozens of space probes with the obvious hope that our numerical showing would partially offset the impact on global opinion of the spectacular Russian achievements. But it has also given our people a sense of false security, the feeling that this country is keeping pace. We are not now keeping pace.

I strongly and respectfully urge that you ask the Budget Director to compile immediately budget estimates on space exploration which will actually put this country in the race and keep it there.

You have already made some impressive strides in streamlining the Federal program. The costs of a realistic, accelerated space program could very well be covered by economies in the total defense picture. The 43-plus billion dollars we are spending annually for current security will not insure long-range security, unless our basic space effort thwarts the threat of space dominance by the Communist foe.

Armed with realistic budget estimates, you would be wise, I feel, to take the case to the people. This could be the most historic move of your administration.

Sincerely,

DAVID S. KING,
Member of Congress.

I was grateful to be granted a personal conference on my request by the NASA Administrator, James E. Webb. The President manifested his own interest and concern through participation in the aforesaid conference by Director of the Budget David Elliot Bell and the President's scientific adviser, Dr. Jerome Weisner.

I also stressed the need for the increased effort in solid fuels in personal conferences with Secretary of the Air Force Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of Navy John B. Connally, and the Director of NASA's launch vehicle program, Maj. Gen. Don R. Ostrander.

To stress my concern to the Congress, I introduced a bill to increase the authorization for research and development of solid-fuel boosters to $30 million.

As the committee was marking up the authorization bill, I formally offered an amendment to increase the item for solid fuels to $50 million. In the action that followed, the committee agreed to increase the item by $15 million.

Although a step in the right direction, the $15 million increase is not an adequate figure. I remain convinced that my $50 million request is realistic.

I am confident that my position will be more than vindicated by the President's message tomorrow. I believe he will stress an accelerated effort on solid fuels, and I look forward to his message with great anticipation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for the fiscal year 1962 the sum of $1,376,900,000, as follows:

(a) For "Salaries and expenses", $199,286,000.

(b) For "Research and development", $1,023,539,000.

(c) For "Construction of facilities", $139,075,000, as follows:

(1) Langley Research Center, Hampton, Virginia, $3,980,000.

(2) Ames Research Center, Moffet Field, California, $5,680,000.

(3) Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio, $3,590,000.

(4) Goddard Space Flight Center, Greenbelt, Maryland, $9,212,000.

(5) Wallops Station, Wallops Island, Virginia, $6,313,000.

(6) Jet Propulsion Laboratory, Pasadena, California, $3,642,000.

(7) Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, Alabama, $12,891,000.

(8) Atlantic Missile Range, Cape Canaveral, Florida, $49,583,000.

(9) Pacific Missile Range, Point Arguello, California, $998,000.

(10) At locations to be determined, for nuclear rocket test and maintenance facilities, $15,000,000.

(11) Various locations: Tracking facilities, including land acquisition; propulsion development facilities; sounding rocket facilities; and damages repair construction, $23,186,000.

(12) Facility planning and design not otherwise provided for, $5,000,000.

(d) For emergency "Construction of facilities", in accordance with the provisions of section 3, $15,000,000.

(e) Appropriations for "Research and development" may be used for any items of a capital nature (other than acquisition of land) which may be required for the performance of research and development contracts: *Provided,* That none of the funds appropriated for "Research and development" pursuant to this Act may be used for construction of any major facility, the estimated cost of which, including collateral equipment, exceeds $250,000, unless the Administrator or his designee notifies the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate of the nature, location, and estimated cost of such facility.

(f) When so specified in an appropriation Act any amount appropriated for "Research and development" and for "Construction of facilities" may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(g) Appropriations other than "Construction of facilities" may be used, but not to exceed $20,000, for scientific consultations or extraordinary expenses upon the approval or authority of the Administrator and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 2. Authorization is hereby granted whereby any of the amounts prescribed in subparagraphs (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (8), (9), (10), (11), or (12) of subsection 1(c) may, in the discretion of the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, be varied upward 5 per centum to meet unusual cost variations, but the total cost of all work authorized under such subparagraphs shall not exceed a total of $139,075,000.

SEC. 3. The sum authorized by subsection 1(d) for emergency "Construction of facilities", and any amount, not to exceed $5,000,000 of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection 1(c) hereof, shall be available for expenditure to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations if (1) the Administrator determines such action to be necessary because of changes in the national program of aeronautical and space activities or new scientific or engineering developments and (2) he determines that deferral of such action until the enactment of the next authorization Act would be inconsistent

with the interest of the Nation in aeronautical and space activities. The funds so made available may be expended to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment. No portion of such sums may be obligated for expenditure or expended to construct, expand, or modify laboratories and other installations until the Administrator or his deisgnee has transmitted to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives and to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences of the Senate a written report containing a full and complete statement concerning (1) the nature of such construction, expansion, or modification, (2) the cost thereof, including the cost of any real estate action pertaining thereto, and (3) reason why such construction, expansion, or modification is necessary in the national interest. No such funds may be used for any construction, expansion, or modification if authorization for such construction, expansion, or modification previously has been denied by the Congress.

Mr. FULTON (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Page 4, after line 2, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Sums authorized by any of the provisions of this Act may, in the discretion of the Administrator, be used to defray the cost of security investigations of personnel of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; but the total of the sums authorized by provisions other than section 1(a) which may be so used shall not exceed $2,000,000."

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply does this: It does not increase the amount of the authorization 1 penny, but it does permit NASA to use certain funds available for speeding up our security program. When NASA took over the personnel in Huntsville, Ala., from the Army, NASA found 4,200 employees had not been cleared for security purposes. At this time 3,800 remain not cleared for security. This permits the NASA agency to use not to exceed $2 million for the purpose of clearing these people for security. The amendment was framed by the NASA agency; it was presented to the committee, and it was unanimously approved by the committee. So, I move its adoption.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I join with the chairman in recommending the passage of this amendment. First, it is necessary to clear these people working on highly classified security projects. Secondly, we have not had the money to do it quickly enough and consequently they were not cleared. Thirdly, in the interest of U.S. security, we certainly should have this money available for transfer. There is no further money put in the program, but there is this authority for the administrator to use it for security purposes.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It does not involve 1 additional dollar.

Mr. FULTON. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask some member of the committee if this authorization bill picks up a pretty substantial expenditure accruing from the work stoppages and wildcat strikes at certain test and production sites? Will that be taken care of in this authorization bill?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I have a detailed explanation of that situation. That comes from NASA in a letter of May 24, 1961, signed by James E. Webb, Administrator. I cannot go into details to explain the situation but the sum total of what he says in this letter, which I am going to ask to be placed in the RECORD at the appropriate time, is that the space program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has not been as of this date retarded or held up or delayed by labor strikes or labor disorders.

Mr. GROSS. That report certainly will fly in the face of evidence obtained by investigations conducted by Members of the other body.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I do not think so. There is this about it. I assume the gentleman has reference to the situation at Cape Canaveral.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, and elsewhere.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That work, done at Cape Canaveral, is done by the armed services. Cape Canaveral is an installation of the Air Force. NASA comes to Cape Canaveral as a tenant of the Air Force. NASA does have some work at Cape Canaveral, but most of the work is done by the Air Force. It so happened that in the lone instance where NASA had labor trouble, the time lost or consumed which was 14 days, did not hold up the program, the space program. That is the explanation by Mr. Webb, the Administrator, in this letter which I intend to place in the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I may say to the Members of the House that with the passage of the preceding bill which called for an authorization to spend $12,300 million, and with the passage of this bill calling for $1,300 million, we really will put the taxpayers of the United States on the launching pad this afternoon. This is a pretty fast spending in a period of about 4 hours. If the President, as is reported, is coming over here tomorrow to ask for another $500 million for this program, plus probably $5 or $6 billion for the foreign giveaway program, the taxpayers are going to be in orbit by this time tomorrow night.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, surely.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I might say in addition, because the gentleman asked me a question with reference to the labor situation, that NASA has given us a copy of its regulations which prevent the payment of the inordinately high rates that the gentleman probably has read about and had in mind in the course of his remarks. These regulations do not sanction the payment of those rates, and no contract of NASA will permit those types of pay schedules which the gentleman probably read about from the Senate hearings.

Mr. GROSS. The contracts may not provide for those schedules of pay, but the question is, Have they been paid excessively and to what extent? Have they been paid straight time and the overtime to the extent shown by the investigations in the other body?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. That is one thing I am glad the gentleman brought out, because the regulations of NASA provide against overtime, but where overtime is indicated they prefer hiring additional men to avoid the additional payment for overtime.

Mr. GROSS. I had hoped that the gentleman would get into this subject earlier this afternoon. As far as I am concerned, that would have been much more appreciated than the backscratching that has been going on in this debate.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. It will all be in the RECORD tomorrow.

(The material referred to is as follows:)

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

Hon. OVERTON BROOKS,
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astronautics, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This replies to your letter of May 18, 1961, asking us to indicate areas in which the program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration has been affected by labor disputes and practices. From a report of an investigation initiated to assist in answering your letter, the following is quoted:

"It cannot be said that NASA's program has been unaffected by labor practices and disputes. An example of this is the situation that developed in the making of cable connections for the Project Mercury ground communication system. NASA officials have, however, recognized and endeavored to keep in proper perspective both sides of the labor problem and have acted quickly and effectively where necessary to prevent delay in the space effort.

"There have been two principal areas of concern. In the operation of the Saturn program, there is a Civil Service NASA launch team which at some point must take over from construction workers who work for building contractors at the Saturn launch complexes at Cape Canaveral. The building trades unionists threatened to strike late last summer if the NASA team took over at the point NASA officials considered proper and which was provided for in the contract, and to avoid the strike NASA ordered its team off the job and initiated negotiations. The talks were unsuccessful and NASA, after most careful study, concluded that it had to order its team into

the area or delay the launch program. NASA did put its own people on the work on November 14, 1960, and on that date the building trades union struck in a labor stoppage that lasted 14 days until November 28, 1960.

"In this 14-day period, NASA filed charges with the National Labor Relations Board charging the unions with unfair labor practices. Action of the National Labor Relations Board was suspended pending the outcome of a special investigation and report to the Secretary of Labor of a committee comprised of representatives of the Department of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Labor, and the unions. During the period of this investigation, the unions agreed to go back to work. The recommendations of this committee were unanimously agreed to by all members and indicated an acceptance of NASA's basic operational requirements. Since this time, there has been relative stability in connection with the Saturn work at Cape Canaveral.

"The above situation involved a jurisdictional dispute. The second of the serious problems which has been encountered relates to overtime pay. NASA took over from the Department of Defense responsibility for certain complexes at Cape Canaveral on July 1, 1960. From the beginning, it was recognized that certain labor practices applicable to the building trades and relating to overtime pay would have to be controlled if NASA's launch activities were not to be impaired or excessively costly. This was particularly necessary at Canaveral where many of NASA's contracts are administered by the Air Force or by the Army Corps of Engineers. The necessary action on overtime pay was accomplished through the development and promulgation, in coordination with the Department of Defense, of a NASA overtime pay policy (copy attached) designed to eliminate abuses such as those which have recently been given extensive publicity.

"The above cases represent the only labor situations in which NASA has been presented with serious threats to its national program. These did not cause any slippage or postponements in the NASA Canaveral booster program. The Saturn launch program, for example, is on schedule and, as indicated earlier, the Mercury man-in-space shot were not delayed by labor troubles. It is true, however, that delays attributable to labor troubles, at least in connection with Saturn launch complex 34, have used up all of the time built into the Saturn program for essential research and development contingencies and emergencies. If further delays are encountered program slippage is probable.

"While, as is inevitable in new programs such as those involved in the space effort, there have been other work stoppages and misunderstandings, these have been of short duration—a day or so—and we have been able to dispose of them quickly and fairly."

I hope this report will give you the information you need.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,
Administrator.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The question comes up specifically, were there any delays in the NASA programs because of labor trouble, and the answer to that is no, there were not. Mr. Webb stated as of today in a written message both to the chairman and myself as follows:

The above cases represent the only labor situations in which NASA has been presented with serious threats to its national program. These did not cause any slippage or postponements in the NASA Canaveral booster program. The Saturn launch program, for example, is on schedule and, as indicated earlier, the Mercury man-in-space shots were not delayed by labor troubles.

Under those circumstances you would say, How much trouble has there been in various instances? The answer to that by Mr. Webb, Director of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, is this:

While, as is inevitable in new programs such as those involved in the space effort, there have been other work stoppages and misunderstandings, these have been of short duration—a day or so—and we have been able to dispose of them quickly and fairly.

The House should remember this is the civilian space program and that most of our programs of research and development are in various agencies and locations other than under the Air Force, the Army, or the Navy. For example, on page 8 of the report you will find where our chief work is done on research and development: NASA Headquarters in Washington; Langley Center; Ames Center; Lewis Center; Flight Center; Goddard Center; Wallops Station; Marshall Center; western office; AEC–NASA Nuclear Office; Life Science Facility; and Space Task Group.

This is the space program, and it is a pleasure to report to you that it is moving on schedule for civilian purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WATTS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 299, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

KHRUSHCHEV AND KENNEDY

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, since President Kennedy assumed office Premier Khrushchev has tried to wreck the United Nations by seeking to dissolve the office of Secretary-General. He has virtually taken over the Castro government in Cuba, just 90 miles off the U.S. coast. Khrushchev has refused to cooperate with the U.N. in the Congo. He has masterminded the sorry turn of events in Laos. He makes no secret that the next Soviet drive will be against Berlin.

Now we are told that Mr. Kennedy is going to Vienna in a few days to warn Mr. Khrushchev against going too far.

This raises many interesting immediate questions which I may discuss on another occasion. A broader question I wish to discuss today is: Why has Khrushchev pressed Kennedy so very hard from the very start of his administration? Since the Soviets do not act on impulse, there must be a logical reason. Some ascribe it to extreme overconfidence, even megalomania, in the wake of the U.S.S.R.'s space shots. It goes deeper.

During the campaign Mr. Kennedy said he was willing to express "regrets" to the Soviet Government over the U–2 incident. This was widely interpreted at the time to mean he was ready to apologize even though this might make it appear he was repudiating an act of necessity to protect the American people against surprise attack. At least it became public knowledge that Kennedy would assume the Presidency dedicated to exploring every possibility for agreement with the Soviets. Most of the intimate Kennedy advisers are known to favor a soft policy and to believe that the Soviets really want significant agreement with this country. Why should Khrushchev make it hard for Kennedy to move this way? Presumably Khrushchev would have something to gain under circumstances of cooperation, at least initially, whether or not he really wants any kind of agreement.

To further support such reasoning, Mr. Pierre Salinger and others have intimated Kennedy is at heart a resolute, courageous man who might get tough despite the softness of key advisers if pressed too hard or too fast. Additionally, the country has a long established history of suddenly losing patience

after repeated affronts and taking unexpected, violent, and purposeful action to unify itself and instill a will to win. Other provocateurs have learned this to their sorrow, as Khrushchev must well know.

Why should he risk awakening a sleeping tiger? Maybe it is because he sees no tiger at all, only talk. Maybe he sees not marching men, only Viennese waltzers.

Khrushchev and his advisers have access to complete and detailed information about America and Americans gleaned from our public press and from infiltrators, sympathizers or fuzzy thinkers in every important area of our society. It is illogical to assume that the FBI has them all under control.

The Soviets have, from their earliest history, demonstrated unequaled mastery of mass psychology as a weapon to destroy the will and determination to resist of intended victims. They are competent judges of a country's mood, the qualities of its leaders and the implications of these to them. Communists are accustomed automatically to thinking in terms of relative power, whether it be on a personal or on an international basis. They are skilled judges of total power.

Surely the Soviet experts have for many years made very careful, continuous, and probably accurate appraisals of the strength and weakness of their foremost opponent. Undoubtedly these have taken into account all available current information coupled with historical studies of past American reactions to various stimuli. We know the Soviets are meticulous and careful in matters of such importance. We have no example of their being far wrong as yet. Undoubtedly Khrushchev follows such analyses very closely.

In contrast, the United States has no infiltrators of significance inside the U.S.S.R. The U–2 flights have stopped. There is little open literature. What there is appears in Russian which few Americans even in our Government read in thorough analysis. Soviet literature printed in English is carefully aimed at specific targets and often is calculated to conceal rather than to reveal.

Furthermore, Americans, including most of those who comprise our Government, are not accustomed to assessing national and international power relationships. Unfortunately, this is particularly true of otherwise able persons who are brought in to high positions in Government by the process of appointments to the Cabinet and other major positions in the wake of a change of administrations. Perhaps amongst our professional military people, who in recent years have been given considerable training in these areas under enlightened policies established by the services themselves, is the greatest body of competence on these subjects. However, under policies of the Kennedy administration which effectively muzzle their voices, members of the military are no longer permitted to share their informed estimates and educated opinions with the public and its representatives in the Congress. Additionally, their advice seems to be little sought by the civilian administrators high in the hierarchy of policy decision.

Consequently, it is highly probable that the Soviets analyze relative strengths and weaknesses, ours as well as theirs, much more accurately than we do and that they rely heavily upon such careful estimates in making critical decisions.

Throughout their history the Soviets have consistently avoided any really serious risks, even at the price of temporary withdrawals from time to time in the face of superior force and determination. Such avoidance of risk is, in fact, a fundamental tenet of Marxist-Leninist dialectical materialism. If this is still a guiding Soviet principle, and there is no indication they have suddenly abandoned it, then the current Khrushchev boldness and unremitting pressure upon a young and untested President must involve no serious risks in Soviet calculations.

Important gains might come by such unremitting pressures in terms of progressive Communist takeovers in Laos, Cuba, and other vulnerable areas. By such nibbling conquests they may logically expect to isolate and weaken their prime opponent so greatly that they can surely win with acceptable losses when and if America decides to fight militarily for its own survival. Nonmilitary conquest is conquest as surely as is military conquest, and the risks and effort involved are less. This is particularly true when nonmilitary conflict is being conducted against an enemy who seems oblivious to the nature and extent of such conflict, the means of conducting it, or even that it is being waged. Khrushchev might also calculate that immediate and continuous pressure might cause hasty and ill-considered actions by a young and untried President accustomed to wealth and easy living.

We Americans like to think that because we possess considerable nuclear retaliatory hardware in the form of manned aircraft and ballistics missile weapons systems that the Soviets think they would incur serious risks by pressing so soon and seriously. Apparently they do not think so. Apparently they do not think so because they judge our determination to utilize such hardware is weak, rather than that the hardware is ineffectual per se. On another occasion I plan to discuss this particular point in greater detail.

At least, they can be sure, almost to the point of certainty, that we will not start a war under present circumstances and provocations. Khrushchev may well conclude that Kennedy's patience will never reach exhaustion to the point of decisive action. He may well conclude that even if it is close to exhaustion, the hardening point can be seen approaching with sufficient warning for him to relax the pressure, if relaxation is then called for, in his opinion. It is extremely unlikely that any statement by Mr. Kennedy to Mr. Khrushchev at Vienna will amount to a signal to the latter by the former that such hardening point is in the offing. The Communists have a commonsense tendency to read their signals from deeds, not from words. Since Mr. Kennedy's words in Vienna will no doubt be futile, what loss might be involved to the United States in addition to the monetary cost of the trip? Put another way, what does Mr. Khrushchev stand to gain?

He is an old hand at summitry and a master at bending such occasions to the advantage of the Communists. Whether, on these particular occasions, he has been smiling or frowning or alternating between each, he has seldom returned to Moscow with a net loss but often with a net gain. Undoubtedly the minimum net gain he seeks at Vienna is a tacit ratification of Communist advances in Cuba and Laos in return for delaying a decision on Berlin if he is called upon for even that amount of concession. Postponement of the Berlin issue has been used as the Communist stake on the summit table to advantage before. It is to be hoped that at Vienna Mr. Kennedy will exhibit the qualities Mr. Salinger indicates he possesses. It would appear that such display is vitally essential to the future of our Nation.

EXPORT CREDIT GUARANTEES

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation designed to provide an improved and expanded program of export credit guarantees, competitive with the guarantee programs which are available to exporters of other great trading nations, our competitors in the free world market, either from their governments or from private enterprise.

Perhaps the most important provision of this bill is the specific authority it extends to the Export-Import Bank to add new kinds of coverage, including export credit guarantees against both commercial and political risks in both short- and medium-term transactions.

The bill contains a number of other provisions which seek to expand and accelerate export promotion services on a broad front. First, to achieve improved coordination of Government programs, it establishes an inter-agency Council for Export Promotion.

Second, it authorizes and directs the Department of State to undertake market surveys and other commercial research in foreign countries and disseminate information gained thereby to American businesses. It would also allow the Department of State to engage in institutional advertising for American exports, general and specific, in foreign media and, in cooperation with the Department of Commerce, to set up U.S. trade information centers at permanent and temporary trade fairs in other countries.

Third, the bill would authorize and direct the Department of Commerce to expand export services in its field offices and increase the number of these offices. This Department is also called upon to insert export promotion advertising in

American media and to set up permanent trade centers abroad for the exhibition of U.S. goods.

Fourth, the bill would establish in the Small Business Administration a new division, the Foreign Trade Division, to render explicit services to the small businessman newly entering or considering the entry of foreign markets.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as I suggested earlier, is to provide a coordinated and augmented program of Government action to assist U.S. manufacturers and businessmen to recognize and develop export markets. I hope that it will receive prompt consideration.

THE NEED FOR EXPANDED SUGAR PRODUCTION FOR AMERICAN FARMERS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks in the body of the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I introduced H.R. 7223, to extend the Sugar Act for 5 years and to establish new basic domestic quotas from which our American farmers could vastly increase sugar production.

My bill is based on proposal Z which has met with general acceptance in many segments of the domestic sugar industry including new grower areas of the State of Washington.

While this legislation is not complete in every respect, it can serve as a vehicle in consideration of the many controversial aspects of the entire sugar production problem. As an example, the matter of foreign quotas is still to be worked out, and other matters of interest and concern to the domestic industry may need further attention.

The bill would extend the law to December 31, 1966, and would establish new basic quotas on the basis of a consumption estimate level of 9,600,000 tons, the anticipated actual consumption for 1962.

New basic quotas for domestic areas, under terms of the legislation, are as follows:

Area	Short tons, raw value
Domestic beet sugar	2,600,000
Mainland cane sugar	850,000
Hawaii	1,150,000
Puerto Rico	1,200,000
Virgin Islands	15,000

This bill would allocate to domestic areas 75 percent of the national consumption growth over the 9,600,000-ton consumption estimate level, reserving 25 percent for foreign countries. The first 525,000 tons of the domestic share of growth would be divided 75 percent to domestic beet and 25 percent to mainland cane.

Regarding acreage for new growers, whenever restrictive proportionate shares are in effect for the domestic beet sugar area, 75 percent of the permitted acreage in excess of 1 million acres (plus the acreage utilized by new growers under this provision in prior years) will be made available to new producers of sugar beets to the extent that facilities for processing are available. This provision is calculated to provide for the entry of new growers to the extent that processing facilities, under the quotas anticipated may become available, and at the same time to protect both the present growers and future new growers. A new grower in 1 year becomes in effect an old grower the next year and the acreage he utilizes is added to the 1 million-acre base.

Mr. Speaker, I withheld introduction of specific legislation until testimony of new and old sugarbeet growers in the recent 2-day House Agriculture Committee hearing was completed and could be analyzed. It is clear from committee testimony that American farmers have a right to expect that Congress will allow them to produce more of America's sugar supply. The testimony is overwhelmingly in favor of taking care of our American farmers first, before we look elsewhere for our supplies of sugar. This valued cash crop will do much to raise farm income, will ease the taxpayer burden, will assure a stable supply of sugar in the Nation, and will stimulate the entire American economy.

No foreign nation can be expected to lose respect for America for taking care of our own people before we turn to them for additional sugar needs. The longer we delay in passage of a new and long-term Sugar Act the longer it will be before factories can be constructed to process the potential sugar crop.

I have asked the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee to request from the Department of Agriculture its views on H.R. 7223, and I am hopeful that the departmental report will be forthcoming as soon as possible so that the administration position regarding an increase in the domestic production of sugar will be clear and there will be no doubt about the administration's willingness to allow American farmers to help themselves and their Nation.

NOTORIOUS OVERSEAS WEEKLY ATTACKS ANTICOMMUNIST PRO-BLUE AMERICANISM PROGRAM OF GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the recent attack upon Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker, formerly commander of our 24th Infantry Division in Germany, by the publication Overseas Weekly, has naturally aroused much interest. It has given rise to many inquiries concerning the allegations directed at General Walker, and in turn has caused many of us to probe into the activities and the motives of the general's accuser, the Overseas Weekly.

Today I wish to discuss the character and validity of the charges, and the character and quality of the accuser. Because of the publicity of the incident and the importance of the issue, it is felt that the public should be as fully informed as possible regarding the facts in the case.

From inquiries and documented evidence, I am convinced the charges are unfounded and actually constitute a bold and brazen attempt by a salacious tabloid newspaper to smear one of our most respected combat officers.

WHO IS GENERAL WALKER?

To begin with, who is Maj. Gen. Walker? He was born in Center Point, Kerr County, Tex., 50 years ago. His mother and a brother still reside there. He graduated from West Point in 1931. He has to his credit a distinguished combat record. The general commanded the 2d Division Artillery at Heartbreak Ridge in some of the hardest fighting against the Communists in Korea, when it fired a record of 22,000 rounds every 24 hours for 14 days. And he served with distinction at Anzio and Cassino in World War II.

General Walker's awards include the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with an oak leaf cluster, the French Croix de Guerre, the Combat Infantryman's Badge and the Legion of Merit.

He served as commander of the Arkansas Military District in 1957, during the Little Rock incident, and in October of 1959 was assigned to the command of the 24th Division.

Aside from his military record, General Walker is known for his militant opposition to communism. He is a firm and outspoken exponent of Americanism. He is a student of history and an authority on the devious workings and objectives of the Communist conspiracy. The general senses an obligation to inculcate his troops with patriotism and with an understanding of their mission in the service, and also an understanding of the perils posed by the Communist conspiracy.

It will be recalled that many of the defections in the Korean war were traceable to lack of indoctrination of the troops in Americanism and the aims and objectives of the Reds. It was the general's zeal in attempting to prevent that condition among the troops in the 24th Division that led to the career assassination attempt against him by the Overseas Weekly.

In addition, General Walker is known for his desire to surround the GIs under his command with a climate of morality and clean living. Many of the troops are away from their home environments for the first time, and General Walker has shown a keen awareness of this fact in his efforts to provide for them the protection that every father and mother would want them to have.

OVERSEAS WEEKLY PROTESTS

In his active program in pursuance of these objectives, General Walker seems to have run into a conflict with the notorious Overseas Weekly, a tabloid that is published and sold chiefly on our military bases in Europe.

The basis for the attack by the Weekly seems to have stemmed from the undertaking of an Americanism program by

General Walker among his troops, in connection with which he featured an exposure of the techniques and goals of communism.

Last October General Walker initiated what was known as the pro-blue program. Its purpose was to carry out the objectives to which I have already referred. The program was in accord with Army regulations and within the scope of official directives. It appears to have been consistent with regulations and directives from the Department of the Army, from USAREUR, and from the 7th Army in Germany which prompted it.

The propriety of initiating this Americanism program has wide support. The need and justification for it was cited in a speech by Mr. Frank Barnett, director of research, the Richardson Foundation, Inc., before the officer students of the Army Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, a few weeks ago, later placed in the March issue of "Military Review"—official Army magazine.

After discussing the cold war and Communist goals, Mr. Barnett stated:

For all these reasons, it is clear that the U.S. military—with its disciplined organization, training methods, and civilian contacts through ROTC, Reserves, and industry—can and must help others to wage nonmilitary warfare * * *. The free world needs guidance from its own professional students of strategy, tactics, and conflict.

The Army has recently published a position paper on cold war intelligence, Classified Army Regulation 515–1, titled, "Collateral Activities, Army Cold War Activities (U)," dated March 29, 1961. This AR defines troop information objectives and actions to be achieved in instructing American troops in cold war principles. It appears that the subject matter, methods, techniques, and precepts contained in AR 515–1 closely parallel those propounded by Mr. Barnett in his address to the Command and General Staff College. And this regulation very strongly reinforces the principles contained in the 24th Infantry Division pro-blue program.

THE PRO-BLUE PROGRAM

The pro-blue program simply teaches the soldier his American citizenship and it outlines the scope of communism and how it operates against the United States.

Maj. Arch E. Roberts drafted the original plan. I have sought and obtained information from him regarding it. In a recent letter to me he stated:

By way of introduction let me say that as Special Project Officer, 24th Infantry Division I, at the direction of Gen. Edwin A. Walker, then 24th Infantry Division Commander, prepared the division citizenship-in-service program and the subsequent, and enlarged, division pro-blue program which has come to be an issue of some note in Europe and in the United States.

A copy of the original draft was sent to me and I have examined it in detail. Most of it appears to have been incorporated in the final version. Excerpts from the official directives which established the 24th Division pro-blue program, follows:

II. OBJECTIVES

1. Communism.

(a) External: To orient military personnel and their dependents in the scope of world communism by studying the philosophy, objectives and imperialistic expansion of communism following World War II.

(b) Internal: To educate military personnel and their dependents in the technique of Communist infiltration, subversion and propaganda in influencing legal governments, seizing power, then ruling through brutality and fear.

(c) Military: To instruct military personnel and their dependents in the recognition of overt and covert Communist methodology in their attempt to subvert military morale, espirit, prestige and leadership.

2. American Citizenship.

(a) Origins of American culture: To appraise military personnel and their dependents of their personal stake in American political philosophy, the American concept of individual rights and freedoms, and the demand for individual belief, sacrifice and honor.

(b) The American military moral heritage: To motivate military personnel and their dependents in adherence to American moral forces and the precepts of individual dignity, the preciousness of every human soul, and the obligations of the conscientious citizen to his God, to his country, and to himself.

(c) Politics, U.S.A.: To inform military personnel and their dependents of the power of the American citizen as a unique political force, to study the structure of local, State, and national political organizations, to review methods of assessing issues and candidates, to examine the techniques of Socialist Communist action, and to note how the American citizen can exert his power in the fight for freedom.

(d) Morale and mission: To indoctrinate military personnel in those aspects of body, mind, and spirit which have a material bearing on morale and mission in the 24th Infantry Division, to examine physiological and psychological factors which affect individual, unit, and division efficiency, i.e., morbidity, serious incidents, and court-martial, to create aggressive, disciplined, and spiritually motivated fighters for freedom.

The directive then outlines the mechanics of putting the pro-blue program into effect. This includes group instruction, the orientation of better communication, improved German-American relations, and the use of such publications as Taro Leaf, the division's paper, Army Times, Stars and Stripes, AFN Munich, and other media available through Army public information channels.

OVERSEAS WEEKLY AND JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

While this highly laudable program was in effect and apparently functioning successfully it was suddenly attacked by the Overseas Weekly. Thanks to the fertility of its imagination, the weekly decided the pro-blue program was nothing but a John Birch Society indoctrination plan. News stories to that effect were wired and radioed back to the States. In the April 16, 1961, issue of the Weekly there appeared an article headlined "Military Channels Used To Push Birch Ideas." The article follows:

AUGSBURG.—For the past year the 24th Infantry Division has been exposed to a propaganda barrage on the philosophy of the controversial John Birch Society. The principles of the ultraconservative, self-styled anti-Communist society have been published to the 13,000 men and 10,000 dependents of the division by its special warfare office which directs the pro-blue program.

The special warfare office and the pro-blue campaign were established by the division commander, Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker at a meeting last October 15.

Following the publication of that story General Walker was ordered by President Kennedy transferred from his post of Division Commander of the 24th Infantry Division in Germany to the U.S. Army Headquarters in Heidelberg, and an investigation of the charges was ordered. That investigation is presently being conducted by Lt. Gen. Frederic J. Brown, acting inspector general.

In the report on the incident reaching New York papers it was said that General Walker had instituted a special troop-indoctrination program using materials and publications of the John Birch Society. In reporting on General Walker's relief from command the New York Times on April 18 included the following:

In its report last week, "The Overseas Weekly" said that a "special warfare office" had been established within the division last October to conduct a "pro-blue" campaign. It said that the campaign was designed, in the general's words, to present "a positive approach toward the defeat of open Communist subversion of the American way of life." The name of the Birch Society's basic book of principles is the Blue Book.

Thus, Overseas Weekly very cleverly by innuendo attempted to leave the impression that the pro-blue program was, somehow, affiliated with the John Birch Society which uses a blue book.

In its attempt to prove its point, the Weekly, according to a story which appeared in the April 14 issue of the New York Herald Tribune, stated that "copies of a book by the society's founder, Robert Welch, Jr., 'The Life of John Birch,' have been distributed to all company and battery day rooms in the division."

This is more of the Weekly's innuendo. The fact is that the book on the life of John Birch has nothing whatever to do with the John Birch Society. It is simply the story of the murder of an American officer by Chinese Communists at the end of World War II. Moreover, Overseas Weekly in its desperation failed to mention the fact that the Birch book was but one of a number of anti-Communist publications made available to the troops. About other publications so distributed were "The Masters of Deceit," by J. Edgar Hoover; "A Guide to Anti-Communist Action," by Anthony T. Bouscaren; "The Techniques of Soviet Propaganda," prepared by the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate; "Techniques of Communism," by Louis F. Budenz; "In Every War But One," by Eugene Kinhead; "The Pentagon Case," by Col. Victor J. Fox; and "The Story of Mary Liu," by Richard Hunter.

In addition, I am informed that recently the authoritative speech entitled

"A Proposal for Political Warfare," by Frank Barnett, to which I have already referred, was distributed to the troops.

If, as Overseas Weekly contends, the distribution of this material, and the discussion of the political philosophy contained in them, constitutes the promotion of the John Birch Society aims; and if, as the Weekly further contends, the 24th Division "pro-blue" program is engaged in the dissemination of the society's basic principles, then it would appear that every one in the service should investigate the principles and techniques of the John Birch Society since they appear to parallel the political philosophy, and the instructions, disseminated by official military authorities since the end of World War II.

When asked about the Weekly charges, General Walker on April 14 stated that the "pro-blue" program was "not associated or affiliated with any organization or society. It is designed to develop the understanding of American military and civil heritage, and the tactics and objectives of those enemies who would destroy us."

Major Roberts, who as projects officer for the 24th Division drafted the "pro-blue" program, says at that time he had never even heard of the John Birch Society. Major Roberts reports that in a meeting with General Walker last October while the program was being formulated, the general stated that he did not care what the men and officers called this new program, just so they understood that it was to be anti-Red. Walker then noted that it would be alright with him if, to emphasize the anti-Red concept, they identified it in their minds as "pro-blue." It may be noted that the Navy and Air Force each have blue books used in their personnel training.

MOTIVES OF OVERSEAS WEEKLY

It thus appearing that there is no relationship between the "pro-blue" program and the John Birch Society, the question arises: What was the motive behind the attack launched against General Walker by the Overseas Weekly? One motive may be found in a paragraph carried in the New York Herald Tribune of April 17, which reads:

> General Walker and the Overseas Weekly have been feuding since the general banned one of the newspaper's reporters from the 24th Division installations.

That story referred to action taken against a reporter on the Overseas Weekly by the name of Siegfried Naujocks. The latter, who continues as a Weekly reporter, is a native of Danzig, Poland, and is now in Germany on a German passport. I understand he once worked in the propaganda ministry of the Nazis but was later shipped to the Eastern Front.

Naujocks was caught in the act of seeking a pipeline into the command headquarters for the purpose of obtaining information which he meant to use to smear General Walker, and after admitting his guilt he was barred from further use of the bases under Walker's command.

That incident seems to have hurt the feelings of the chief owner and publisher of the Overseas Weekly, a Mrs. Marion von Rospach. And a little later she came out with the charges against General Walker who had expelled her ace reporter.

QUESTIONABLE REPUTATION OF OVERSEAS WEEKLY

Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Rospach charges are apparently spurious and phony gives rise to a question of the character and policies of the Overseas Weekly. A recent Army Times editorial on the Walker case contains this comment:

> We don't think much of the Overseas Weekly. Called the Oversexed Weekly by the troops, it has been termed "subversive to the command"—by an admitted adherent of General Walker—"since it carries news calculated to destroy unit loyalty, smear noncommissioned leaders, and assist anti-American forces in their campaign to disunite NATO by portraying the American soldier as rowdy, disorderly, dishonest, and immoral."

General Walker himself, who should be in a position to know whereof he speaks, has described the Weekly as immoral, unscrupulous, incompetent, and destructive.

Lt. Gen. Charles I. Bolte, commanding general of the Army in Europe in 1953, banned the Overseas Weekly as unfit for American servicemen.

General Bolte has recently said that Mrs. von Rospach visited him in Heidelberg, Germany, with her lawyers, and that he agreed to reinstate the paper if it were cleaned up.

From looking at some of the issues of the tabloid it is easy for one to understand General Bolte's concern and why he would not allow the paper on military installations until a promise was made that it would be "cleaned up." Leads to stories in the paper often carried on the front page are lurid. "Model Won't Rest on Her Laurels," is an example. The first and last pages usually feature a large photo of a nearly-nude.

Another issue carried a full story on publication of Ladies Directory, listing "play-for-pay gals" by name and address in the Soho district in London, hinged on a court proceeding which occurred after issuance of the directory.

Still another provides the readers with information that one Martha Watts had written a 235-page book on "The Men in My Life," published in London, including the news that its author had been convicted 400 times for soliciting as a prostitute. Another carried a story on the British strippers in the Soho district, with explicit details as to clubs, extent of stripping, and the like.

A prominent story from Oversea's London correspondent contains a three-column headline, "Under-Counter Gal Book Center of United Kingdom Controversy."

These are but a few of hundreds of examples that could be cited to illustrate the chief characteristics of the Overseas Weekly. I would not contend that Mrs. von Rospach is not within her legal rights in publishing what she does. I do not know. My purpose is to illustrate the type of paper she chooses to publish. Apparently it sells because I understand she has made a lot of money out of this enterprise.

Many complain that the paper overemphasizes derelictions of GI's, and by following a consistent policy in that regard the effect is to place all troops in a generally bad light in the eyes of Europeans. Crime, sex, and debauchery are prominently portrayed. "Bamberg Citizens Groaning About New GI Incidents," one typical headline proclaims. Another says "Bamberg Madam Took Advantage of Girls, GI's."

It is this type of publication that is credited with causing one of our great combat soldiers, General Walker, to be relieved of his command. Surely this mistake will be rectified as a result of the investigation of Overseas Weekly's charges. Today of all times we need to reward rather than penalize those who preach patriotism and who expose the evils of our mortal enemy—communism. From all evidence available it would seem that the "pro-blue" program, or something very similar to it, should be adopted as a model for use in all our military installations all over the world. And General Walker should be given appropriate official recognition for having initiated it.

OVERSEAS WEEKLY SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

There appears to be ample reason why the Department of Defense should initiate an investigation of Overseas Weekly and its publishers. It is widely alleged that the paper is having an adverse effect upon our position in the NATO setup, and tends to have a demoralizing effect on the troops who read its issues over a period of time. Editorial motivations should be carefully studied and evaluated. Such an investigation could determine more accurately the question of whether this or any other similar publication should have official accreditation to do business on Government bases.

Mr. Speaker, the Walker case involves serious business—very serious business. Here is involved a man whose reputation as a combat leader was earned on the field of battle in the midst of hot warfare. This man's heroic achievements have earned for him the plaudits and recognition of a grateful Nation.

Surely General Walker's military career is not to be jeopardized now by unfounded and insignificant charges made by a highly questionable get-rich-quick tabloid publication—the notorious Overseas Weekly.

PROPOSED SPECIAL HOUSE COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, next week President Kennedy will face Soviet Dictator Khrushchev at a summit conference. All Americans fervently desire

the President to speak from a position of strength and firmness. We, as Members of the House, want President Kennedy to know that he carries the hopes of America and the entire free world, and he certainly has the support of Congress as he attempts to develop an effective foreign policy against Soviet financed and directed worldwide Communist activity.

We realize as observers of recent history and students of Soviet Russian diplomatic history that the so-called summit conferences, starting with President Roosevelt's meetings with Stalin at Tehran and Yalta, continuing with President Truman's meeting with Stalin at Potsdam, on through President Eisenhower's meetings with Khrushchev, have resulted in the United States being outmaneuvered diplomatically if for no other reason than we have trusted the Communist rulers while they see fit to break every pledge and commitment that they give. This cannot happen again. That is why I call to the attention of the President the fact that the House of Representatives is ready, willing, and able to cooperate with him to generate for this country a sustained foreign policy counteroffensive against the hypocrisy of the Soviet Union and its illegitimate empire.

I certainly hope that in the preliminary negotiations and preparations for this meeting we have not already made concessions or are about to make concessions that will be used to the advantage of the Soviets in world affairs. Only an inferior nation makes concessions at a conference. A nation such as the United States, honest and fearless in its conduct of international relations, need not be blackmailed or coerced into any improper concessions to the sinister forces that oppose us throughout the world.

My purpose, Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House this afternoon, is to call to the attention of all the Members the willingness and determination of the Republican Members of the House to strengthen the hand of the President, to strengthen the officials of our State Department, and to strengthen the position of our Ambassador to the United Nations by cooperating in the creation of the Special House Committee on Captive Nations. Many of the Members recall, I am sure, the previous occasions when I have addressed myself to the formation of this committee. Our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], has addressed you on the same subject on numerous instances. The very fact that the House in this bipartisan spirit has discussed and is processing the creation of this committee should invigorate any faint hearts that may beat in our State Department ranks. The House Rules Committee has before it various resolutions authorizing this Special Committee on Captive Nations. It is my hope that we would move as swiftly as possible in authorizing this committee so that its merits, practicality and usefulness to our President, State Department, and United Nations Ambassador may be realized at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD, I wish to insert a statement of policy that was approved by the House Republican Policy Committee yesterday in support of my resolution to create a Special House Committee on Captive Nations:

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE

The Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives urges the adoption of House Resolution 267 providing for the creation of a bipartisan congressional committee to be known as the Special Committee on the Captive Nations.

1. The primary issue of our times is the struggle between atheistic, totalitarian, imperialist Communist slavery and the libertarian governments of the free world.

2. The nature of this struggle is primarily psycho-political and the Soviet Union depends heavily upon propaganda as it wages its campaign of subversion and aggression. This propaganda is based upon the demonstrably false promise that world communism seeks to liberate the peoples of developing nations from colonialism and imperialism.

3. This fallacious promise can be effectively countered by the assembling and forthright utilization of all the truths and facts pertaining to the enslaved condition of Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, mainland China, Cossackia, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Idel-Ural, Latvia, Lithuania, North Korea, North Vietnam, Poland, Rumania, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, and other subjugated nations.

4. The Soviet Union has displayed to all the world its profound fear of growing free world knowledge of and interest in its brutal suppression of the people of these captive nations.

5. The captive nations constitute a primary deterrent against a hot global war and further overt aggression by the Soviet and Chinese Reds as well as a positive means for the advancement of world freedom in this psycho-political struggle.

6. The President and the Department of State will draw needed strength in this struggle from a continuing exposé of Soviet imperialism.

I wish to point out that the following Republican House Members have introduced similar resolutions: Mr. AYRES, Mr. BOW, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. CHURCH, Mr. COLLIER, Mr. CONTE, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mrs. DWYER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. MILLER of New York, Mr. SCRANTON, Mr. SIBAL, and Mr. WALLHAUSER.

In the last few months, I have been in communication with organizations representing various nationality groups in the United States who maintain an interest in the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain. They are all in basic agreement that this committee would be a practical, helpful instrument of the House and assure us of their ability and willingness to cooperate in the work of the committee.

We are all in agreement, I trust, that the House should do all within its power to expose the Soviet hypocrisy of which I speak. The colonial Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should receive the scrutiny of peoples of the free world, and this committee, as I have indicated on so many occasions, would be ideally equipped to put the spotlight on this circumstance, with the facts and information that could be obtained.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the propaganda statements of the Soviet Union exaggerating the political, economic, and social problems here in the United States. They seek to portray the United States in a most untruthful light, deliberately exaggerating the problems which we acknowledge are ours and are working steadily to overcome.

The Soviet Union is the greatest prison camp the world has ever seen. The Russian people themselves are prisoners of their own Government. Actually, they belong to the Government. Their Government does not truly serve them. There is discrimination in the Soviet Union against minority racial groups. There is discrimination by the Soviet Union against the Moslem, Christian, and Hebrew religions. There is discrimination in the Soviet Union against minority nationalities. There is naturally not only discrimination but complete deprival of human rights for anyone disagreeing with Communist ideology.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to compliment the gentleman on bringing this matter to the attention of the House, particularly at this time. We all remember that some 2 years ago when the Congress of the United States passed a resolution establishing Captive Nations Week that it made a very profound impression on the Kremlin and on Mr. Khrushchev himself who was exposed to our merriment at the time he came over here on his famous tour of the United States. I think it is equally true that at this particular moment just previous to our President's making his trip to Europe and meeting with Mr. Khrushchev that the Congress should again take unto themselves the opportunity of making this very profound commitment by establishing the Captive Nations Committee so it will be very clear not only to Mr. Khrushchev but also to all the peoples behind the Iron Curtain that this Nation and this body are as interested as ever in them and in their ultimate freedom. Again I compliment the gentleman on bringing it to us at this time. I sincerely hope the House of Representatives will pass the resolution indicative of this and establish the Captive Nations Committee.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I also realize that the gentleman was with our State Department before coming to Congress, and likewise recall that he was very active in the Captive Nations Week commemoration this past year. We also remember the efforts of our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] in the development of this committee. I certainly hope the world will recognize the complete bipartisanship and spirit with which we enter the formation of this committee which I hope will soon come.

Mr. SCRANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I yield.

Mr. SCRANTON. Certainly the most important phase of this would be the bipartisanship which has been made

very clear here in this body by the extreme effort of Members on both sides of this aisle who support the establishment of this committee which now seems more important than at any other time in this session of Congress.

Mr. DERWINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the House Special Committee on Captive Nations could quickly, effectively, convincingly expose all of these things within the Soviet Union, and therefore, as I have indicated to you on many occasions, turn the spotlight on the inner weaknesses of the Soviet monster and provide us and the peoples of the free world with the counteroffensive emphasis by which we will bring about the restoration of freedom to the captive nations now under Soviet and Chinese Red control and to the nationalities within these countries who wish to achieve proper national recognition and freedoms, and the Russian and Chinese people themselves will one day enjoy the fruits of freedom. This Special Committee on Captive Nations is a small step toward this ultimate goal. The road will be long and troublesome, but the goal is clear.

We, as Members of this freely elected House, cannot shirk our responsibility. We must lend our effective efforts in this cause, and I reemphasize, we will have the cooperation and appreciation of President Kennedy and his State Department.

GARY COOPER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, Montanans are proud of a great American whose motion picture career always offered wholesome entertainment for men, women, and children. We in Montana have always been proud that a native of our State, by being himself, will always be remembered as one of America's finest actors.

An article on Mr. Cooper follows:

When Gary Cooper first heard that he was going to die of cancer, he took it silently and bravely and then consoled the young doctor who had to break the first such tragic disclosure of his own career.

"I have never seen such courage in a man," Dr. Rex Kennamer said Sunday. "It was the first time I ever had to go through this myself and I guess Gary sensed it.

"He didn't say anything when I told him. He never even flinched. I left and later got a phone call from him:

"'Young fellow, I know you were a little nervous about telling me the news. I just want you to know that I appreciate it. Thanks for telling me.'"

Cooper, Hollywood's most enduring star, died Saturday at his Holmby Hills home in West Los Angeles. He was just 6 days past his 60th birthday.

The funeral rites will be Tuesday morning at the Roman Catholic Church of the Good Shepherd in Beverly Hills. Solemn requiem high mass will be sung by Rt. Rev. Msgr. Daniel Sullivan, the priest who attended Cooper in his fatal illness.

The Most Reverend Timothy Manning, auxiliary bishop of Los Angeles, is expected to give the eulogy. Pallbearers will be close friends, Jimmy Stewart, Jack Benny, Director Henry Hathaway, and Producers Jerry Wald, William Goetz, and Charles Feldman.

The doctor said Mrs. Cooper knew her husband had terminal cancer last December. Cooper was told 2 months ago.

Asked if Cooper knew he had cancer the night the Friars tossed a testimonial for him on January 8, the doctor said "No."

By ironic coincidence, Cooper that night used the line that the late Lou Gehrig uttered at the 1941 Yankee Stadium tribute when the famed first baseman knew he was going to die.

"Am I the luckiest guy alive tonight? Yep."

Cooper, of course, played Gehrig, in "The Pride of the Yankees," one of the most memorable of all his heroic screen portrayals.

But no movie script ever matched the courage that Cooper displayed during his fight with the onrush of death.

Monsignor Sullivan said he talked with Cooper as late as Friday when he gave him holy communion.

"He was not depressed. He was the same Cooper that all the world knows and loves. I have never seen such courage, such faith. It impressed me.

"He truly was a great man."

Cooper cheered his wife, Rocky, and their daughter, Maria, in the last days.

"It's God's will," he told them. Both, as a result, were able to take the final agony bravely.

One daily visitor to the home said: "It was hard to believe that a man was dying in that house. It was filled with sunshine—and Coop himself spread most of it."

About a year after Cooper's conversion to Catholicism in 1959, I asked him how he was getting along with his new religion.

"Well," he drawled, "I wouldn't exactly say I was a pillar of the church."

But that was characteristic downrating of Cooper by Cooper.

Monsignor Sullivan commented: "His faith can serve as a lesson to all of us. He had great faith and so do his wife and daughter. It is what sustained all of them during this sadness."

Cooper's final days were cheered by thousands upon thousands of letters and telegrams from all over the world.

"There were no crackpot letters among them. They were honest outpourings of the heart from people who loved this man although they had never seen him except on the screen. They were magnificent letters," said the cleric. Dr. Kennamer echoed Monsignor Sullivan's comment about the letters.

Among the letters was one from Queen Elizabeth of England. President Kennedy phoned the actor and talked to him for 6 or 7 minutes.

Mrs. Cooper asked that gifts in lieu of flowers be sent to the Sloan-Kettering Institute of Cancer Research in New York City.

The casket will remain sealed, by wishes of the family who want the actor remembered as his friends saw him in life.

There was also a cable from Pope John XXIII which expressed his deep sorrow over the family's loss and offered them a benediction to comfort them.

Honorary pallbearers at the private rites Tuesday will include old friends, Ernest Hemingway, too ill himself to attend; John Wayne, Henry Ford II, Bing Crosby, who named his eldest son after Coop; Burt Lancaster, Peter Lawford, Tony Curtis, Dick Powell, Walter Brennan, William Wyler, David O. Selznick, Billy Wilder, Kirk Douglas, Danny Kaye, Samuel Goldwyn, and Fred Zinneman.

Goldwyn had cast Cooper in his first featured role in 1926, "The Winning of Barbara Worth." Zinneman directed him in "High Noon," the picture that won him his second best actor Oscar. His first had come as "Sergeant York."

Cooper was not only Hollywood's most enduring star but also its most beloved.

In 35 years of stardom in Hollywood, Cooper never had an enemy. For any man, that is a supreme legacy. In this celluloid jungle, it's a miracle.

THE FLOATING MEDICAL CENTER, "HOPE"

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for more than 6 months now the American people have been represented in southeast Asia—Indonesia to be specific—by the most unique form of people-to-people aid that has ever been conceived. This aid, which comes directly from all facets of American life, from individuals, from our vast complex of business and industry, from our great labor movement and with the blessing of our Government, is in the form of a great white floating medical center. It is in fact a ship, a ship called *Hope*, which is bringing to peoples far less fortunate than we here at home, hope in the field of medicine and health that they have never had before from any person or nation.

This vessel, Mr. Speaker, has shown the people of that important area of the world—where we are this very minute fighting a cold war that is beginning to sizzle—that all American aid is not in the form of guns and ammunition—and that the American people want to help them to help themselves. This ship *Hope*—a floating medical center—is staffed with American doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists and medical technicians who are proving to the people of the newly developing nations that all Americans are not necessarily "ugly." They are proving that America is compassionate—that America is a nation of free people who want to share their knowledge and their experiences with other people.

This ship *Hope* is the main vehicle of an organization called Project Hope, whose aim is to help the medical people in other nations to further their knowledge of the more complex means and experiences of today's medicine and health. The objective of Project Hope is not necessarily to being a floating hospital to these nations.

Mr. Speaker, from my State of Massachusetts we have several men and women serving aboard the *Hope* ship and I take this time to commend these brave and dedicated people for giving up the comparative comforts of their homes and their families, for leaving good paying positions and medical practices to help other people to help themselves. These people from my State, and those from the other States of our great Nation who are serving, who have served and who will serve aboard the *Hope*, should receive the thanks of all Americans.

I want to thank those from my State. I am proud of them, and I am sure that every one of my distinguished colleagues is proud of those from his State serving with Hope. Coming from Massachusetts are: Miss Ruth L. Currie, nurse, Acton; Miss Carol Czerapowicz, X-ray technician, Northhampton; Dr. Richard O. Elliott, who I am proud to say is senior medical officer aboard the *Hope*, South Duxbury; Miss Ann O'Brien, X-ray technician, Holyoke; Dr. Arnold J. Smoller, general practitioner, Boston; Dr. Marion E. Weir, pediatrician, Auburndale; Priscilla D. Strong, nurse anesthetist, Pittsfield; and Mary Ann Rowack, nurse, Cambridge.

The *Hope* vessel arrived in Djakarta, capital of Indonesia, in mid-October of last year on its maiden voyage. And when it leaves Indonesia at the end of May, it is going to visit another nation which has asked for its help—South Vietnam—where even today we are confronted firsthand with the problems of international communism. The impact that the vessel, its concept and the Americans aboard has made for our Nation in Indonesia is not counted in dollars and cents, but rather in the friendship and better understanding that *Hope* has engendered.

Recently Mr. Nugroho, Chargé d'Affaires of the Indonesian Embassy here in Washington, wrote to Dr. William B. Walsh, founder and president of Project Hope and the People-to-People Health Foundation, Inc.:

> You have my sincere congratulations on the outstanding success Project Hope has proved to be and my best wishes for its continued success. I should once again like to express my thanks for the great service this project has rendered to Indonesia and its people. I am sure that the generous assistance and the friendliness of all the medical personnel aboard the SS *Hope* will long be remembered and appreciated by my countrymen.

And recently when President Sukarno visited with President Kennedy, the two heads of state emphasized the need of further cooperation such as Project Hope has provided. In their joint communique they said:

> Both Presidents expressed gratification at the high degree of cooperation between their countries and noted, in illustration, the successful visit to Indonesia of the hospital ship, the SS *Hope*, sponsored by the People-to-People Health Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, what good will, what tremendous understanding of America and Americans we could gain in other areas of the world with additional Hope vessels, manned and staffed by our American medical diplomats. Dr. Walsh wishes to outfit two more Hope vessels from the Navy hospital ships that are in mothballs. One of these ships would be for Africa and the other for South America, while the *Hope I* would remain in Southeast Asia and that area of the world. He deserves our full support.

The people of Massachusetts are now conducting a statewide drive to raise funds to aid Project Hope. And I want to thank personally everyone connected with this drive and every one of my fellow Bay Staters who helps Hope by contributing whatever he can afford. In this respect I ask that following my remarks an editorial from the Quincy Patriot-Ledger be inserted in the RECORD.

I cannot emphasize strongly enough the need for all Americans to give their support to Project Hope so that this most unique and worthwhile human venture can continue and expand.

God bless the men and women aboard the *Hope* ship.

HELPING PROJECT HOPE

America's floating medical school, SS *Hope*, is fulfilling a unique mission of good will and human betterment. It deserves the full support of every American. This month's campaign for money in Massachusetts is not only for the maintenance of the ship which is already in service in Indonesia, but will help build up funds for the outfitting of other ships to pursue the same mission throughout the world.

In Indonesia, SS *Hope* is providing courses in the most modern medical techniques for the country's doctors and nurses. In the process of teaching American medical science, the personnel of the ship treat many of Indonesia's sick. The work has won the praise and thanks of Indonesians, among them President Sukarno.

Project Hope is privately supported and nonprofit. It is founded on belief in cooperative efforts by the people of different nations to improve the lot of mankind.

More and more the United States is realizing the shortcomings of handouts of any kind. The aid which is most beneficial must be some form of self-help. And that can be combined with a sharing of new knowledge, new techniques and new equipment through undertakings like Project Hope.

We urge full support of Project Hope as the campaign this month goes forward. Contributions can be addressed to John E. Carlson, Jr., Treasurer, Massachusetts Committee of Project Hope, Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Boston, Mass.

AMPLIFICATION OF DISSENTING VIEWS ON ALASKA RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION REPORT TO THE CONGRESS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska Rail and Highway Commission, established by Public Law 884 of the 84th Congress, has completed its studies and will shortly submit its final report to the Congress and not later than June 30, 1961, the authorized existence of the Commission will expire.

On May 14, 1960, I was appointed to the Commission by President Eisenhower to fill the vacancy caused by the death of the Honorable Russell V. Mack, and, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say it has been not alone an honor but also a real pleasure to serve with the able and distinguished members of the Commission.

While I found myself not fully in agreement with the final conclusions of my fellow members, nevertheless, I feel the economic study and forecast of growth in the report of the Commission constitute a valuable source of data for sound future development and coordination of the interstate and international facilities connecting Alaska and the 48 continental States.

Because I filed individual dissenting views to the Commission's conclusions I have felt it appropriate by this statement to outline the basis of my reasoning and to explain my thinking more fully than I did in the bare expression of views in the Commission report.

I expressed strong opposition to the expenditure of public funds to construct an extension of the Government-owned Alaska railroad to the Alaska-Canada border in competition with privately owned transportation. Also, I said such a recommendation for a rail extension was arrived at by the Commission without study of its adverse effect on Alaska's coastal communities and areas outside the Alaska rail belt.

The Battelle Memorial Institute under contract with the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission submitted its preliminary report under date of October 31, 1960, following research and study which had been in progress for well over a year. The Battelle Memorial Institute is widely recognized as a highly competent organization for the purposes of such studies, and of unquestioned integrity. Its report did not recommend construction of a railroad to connect Alaska with the 48 contiguous States.

Under date of March 8, 1961, a report was submitted to the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission by Mr. D. J. Smith, General Manager of the Alaska Railroad, which recommended that the U.S. Government construct a railroad from a point on the existing Alaska Railroad known as Rex to Whitehorse in Yukon territory, Canada, in direct contradiction to the Battelle report. Mr. Smith at that time had been connected with the Alaska Railroad for a total of 6 months, and had prepared and submitted his report on less than 1 month's notice, differing in his conclusion from the conclusion reached by Battelle after a study of well over 1 year.

Mr. Smith's recommendation would have had the U.S. Government finance and build a rail line for a distance of 680 miles, of which 300 miles would be in Canadian territory. Mr. Smith's recommendation pointed out certain indirect benefits which might result, but did not mention that any indirect benefits for the 300 miles in Canada would accrue to Canada rather than to the United States which would finance the railroad.

The International Rail and Highway Commission noted this fallacy in Mr. Smith's recommendation, and it is now recommending to the Congress construc-

tion of a rail line for some 380 miles from Rex, Alaska, to a point on the Alaska-Yukon boundary.

This recommendation, with which I disagree, is based on three major assumptions:

First. That a rail link will be built through Canada from the existing railhead to a connection on the Yukon-Alaska boundary.

Second. That some 150,000 tons of traffic per year would be available via such a rail link to and from Alaska.

Third. That a rate structure could be anticipated which would be advantageous to shippers in the State of Alaska.

There is no justification, in my opinion, for the first assumption. On page VII–26 of the Battelle report the possibility of building the Pacific Northern Railway by the Wenner-Gren interests is discussed, stating:

> The Pacific Northern Railway is planned to extend from the vicinity of Summit Lake near Prince George, B.C., to the Yukon border in the vicinity of Gladys Lake.

It is further stated:

> Authorities associated with this project are divided in opinion as to the basis for extension; some believe in extension at a steady rate per year, others are more of a "build and wait for developments" principle.

In a letter dated January 5 addressed to the Commission, Battelle stated:

> We feel that revision of the paragraph on page VII–26 is not necessary or advisable.

Battelle also reports—page VIII–4—that press reports indicate the Wenner-Gren interests have "obtained approval of the Canadian Government to survey a line through Yukon territory to the Alaska border." There has been no indication that actual construction of such a line is contemplated now or in the foreseeable future. Since there is no evidence that Canadian interests, either private or government, are seriously considering construction of a rail line from the existing railhead in British Columbia to the Alaska-Yukon boundary, it follows that the rail line proposed from a point on the Alaska Railroad known as Rex to the Alaska-Yukon boundary would literally be a "railroad to nowhere," serving no purpose.

Mr. Smith's second assumption that such a railroad, if built, would have available to it some 150,000 tons of traffic per year moving to or from Alaska appears to be based entirely on a survey said to have been made by Canadian National Railways. Mr. Smith's report does not mention the fact that this Canadian National Survey was in connection with the possibility of establishing a car barge ferry to operate under a foreign flag between Prince Rupert, British Columbia, Ketchikan, Alaska, and Seward, Alaska. Details of this survey have not been made available and no assumption of any such volume of traffic is justified until the full details of the survey have been carefully studied. It appears highly doubtful that such volume would actually materialize in such form as to permit recovery of out-of-pocket costs by such a rail link as Mr. Smith has proposed. Mr. Smith's report states in part—page 4.

> The 150,000 tons indicated is a minor portion of the tonnage presently moving through the Puget Sound gateway and other west coast ports to Alaska. The total of this dry cargo tonnage is indicated by the Battelle report to be in the neighborhood of 450,000 tons per year (table VII–2 of the report).

Table VII–2 of the Battelle report pertains to traffics to and from all sections of Alaska and not only to that section which would be served by any rail line, and furthermore does not contain any indication of tonnage in the vicinity of 450,000 tons. For profitable operation such tonnage would have to be available in carload lots, reasonably spread throughout the year, comprising commodities which would support a profitable rate structure. There is no indication that any investigation has been made by Mr. Smith of any of these factors. There is every indication that the figure of 150,000 tons is at best an informed guess.

Mr. Smith's third assumption is that a rate structure favorable to Alaska shippers-consignees would be established via such a rail line. He bases this assumption on the premise that transcontinental rail rates are now equalized as between Seattle and Prince Rupert—which is true in many cases—that the existing rail line to Prince Rupert passes through Prince George, British Columbia—which is true—that Prince Rupert is 469 miles west of Prince George; and that therefore rail rates to a point—which he calls point A—would be equalized with Prince Rupert, Seattle, etc. This assumption cannot be supported by any accepted method of ratemaking utilized by Canadian or U.S. railroads. Transcontinental rail lines have equalized rates as between not only Prince Rupert and Seattle, but also Portland, San Francisco, Los Angeles, etc. Such equalization has been made not on any mileage basis but solely because of competition between ocean terminals and for no other reason. At the hypothetical point A no such competitive situation would or could exist. Furthermore point A would involve transportation over 469 miles of a privately owned railroad not yet built—and construction of which is highly doubtful. Mr. Smith therefore apparently assumes that either this privately owned Pacific Northern Railway would be agreeable to carrying such tonnage free of all charge, or that the transcontinental rail lines (in this case limited for all practical purposes to the Canadian National Railways) would be agreeable to paying to Pacific Northern Railway out of Canadian National's already depressed transcontinental rate an amount sufficient to compensate them for at least their out-of-pocket costs, and probably fully distributed costs. Barring the remote possibility that the transcontinental rail lines, particularly Canadian National, would indicate some interest in such a theory of ratemaking, the entire assumption should be completely disregarded. As a result of the so-called Export Rate Case before the Interstate Commerce Commission, Alaskans should be well aware of the reluctance of transcontinental railroads to publish general rate reductions unless dictated by competitive factors, and should also be aware of the position of the Interstate Commerce Commission in supporting such ratemaking theories.

Aside from the unfounded assumptions mentioned above, there are other points of great interest in this proposal. It should be noted that there is a very strong and vocal feeling primarily among truck operators in Alaska that the Alaska Railroad is now competing unfairly with private enterprise, based on the fact that the railroad is Government-owned, Government-financed, pays no taxes, and is free from Federal regulation whereas truckers competing for the same cargo must pay all taxes, comply with all safety regulations, and submit to the stringent regulation of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is now suggested that the proposed rail line might incur an operating loss of some $500,000 per year, and it is definitely proposed that no consideration be given to amortization of building costs or recovery of interest—all of which amounts to an enormous Government subsidy. Therefore, the proposed rail line would greatly compound the competition of Government with privately owned trucklines.

It should also be noted, to which I expressed earlier opposition, that this Government-owned and Government-subsidized railroad would compete actively and unfairly with privately owned, nonsubsidized water carriers serving Alaska. The difficulties already confronting such carriers have reached such proportions that they have been the subject of studies and hearings by congressional committees, during which the many suggestions received included proposals that subsidies should be given to vessel operators in the noncontiguous domestic trades, including Alaska. Also it has been brought out that the Federal Government is proposing to acquire a larger vessel to replace its present MV *North Star* in serving civilian activities in Alaska, thus increasing Government competition with private enterprise. The continuing growth of Federal Government transportation activities in Alaska—including the proposed rail line—seems completely incompatible with President Kennedy's action in ordering the suspension of service by the Government-owned Panama Steamship Line in April of this year.

The cost of the proposed Rex-Yukon boundary rail line is estimated at $114 million, which of course is nothing but an estimate, resulting from no study as to route or terrain to be encountered, and should be taken as nothing but a possible minimum figure.

No consideration has been given, as I pointed out to the Commission, to the effect of the railroad on existing water carriers serving the trade and operating as private enterprise free of all subsidy, nor has consideration been given to any proposals which include the State-owned ferry system now authorized by the Alaska Legislature and which will provide frequent ferry service between Prince Rupert, British Columbia, and Haines-Skagway, Alaska, via intermediate ports; and no consideration has been

given to proposals for through rates or through service via water carriers in connection with U.S. transcontinental rail lines.

The proposal would react to the detriment of not only water carriers serving the Alaska trade, but also to the detriment of U.S. transcontinental rail lines, since cargo moving to Alaska destinations would of necessity be offered as long haul traffic to Canadian National Railways. U.S. rail lines would find themselves out of business insofar as Alaska was concerned.

The proposal ignores the fact that although the Alaska Railroad has been in existence for some 35 years, comparatively few consignees in the "rail belt" have plants located on rail sidings. For this reason it has been necessary to truck cargo from rail yards to consignee's door. Existing water carrier service, in cooperation with the present Alaska Railroad, has minimized this problem through extensive use of containers which can be transferred to wheels in Alaska and moved to destination. Whether the railroad now proposed could compete in providing such piggyback service for the long haul involved appears questionable.

In discussing the benefits, direct or indirect, which might accrue to Alaska from such a rail line, it has not been pointed out that such a rail line, even with the existing Alaska Railroad, could serve only a limited area of the 49th State and could be of no value to such major cities as Ketchikan, Juneau, Sitka, Cordova, Kodiak, and Nome. These cities and the surrounding areas would remain dependent on water carriers, and might be subjected to increased transportation costs if the rail line "skimmed the cream" of water carrier revenues by attracting cargo destined to the "rail belt."

Some stress has been laid on the value of "opening up the country." The only new country involved in the route proposed by Mr. Smith is approximately 100 miles between Rex and the Delta River—and a considerable portion of this mileage traverses an Army artillery range. The balance of the route to the Yukon boundary parallels the Alaska Highway—already opened more effectively than can be done by the railroad.

Mr. Speaker, the argument was heard by the Commission that the expenditure of public funds would be offset by increased values of lands and resources along the railroad. As I see it, this proposed rail extension would pass through uninhabited wastelands where for 50 years prospectors have failed to find minerals and where timber is sparse.

I must say I find it difficult to comprehend where any increase in values will accrue to offset the cost and annual loss of the railroad. On the other hand, I do envisage there would be a serious loss of values in existing tidewater communities and cities outside the rail belt. Diminished water transportation, as a result of a subsidized Government owned competitive facility could have dire effects on all ports of Alaska and likewise to California, Oregon, and Washington cities that have maritime industries and established supply businesses.

The Battelle Memorial Institute recommendation, calling for a system of highways to tidewater, on the other hand, did make a lot of sense. The economy of Alaska and its future development calls for cheaper transportation and lower freight rates. The reason existing costs of transportation are high is because cargo to Alaska greatly exceeds the volume of cargo from Alaska. A shipper must pay to maintain almost empty ships at times returning from Alaska to Seattle. When more raw materials and other tonnage are generated for these scheduled return voyages from Alaska, and only then, freight rates can be reduced.

A rail line would cut down the available tonnage in both directions and a reduction in water sailings would be necessary. Meanwhile, only one steamship company serving Alaska on a regular scheduled basis has been able to stay in business. Over the years many lines have tried but have been forced to give up. The present unsubsidized taxpaying company serving Alaska has been unable to earn a reasonable return on its investment. It needs all the help the people of Alaska can give it. Many Alaska towns have been served by it at a loss.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, as I see it, is not an expenditure of public funds to create a subsidized competitive Government facility. That, in my opinion, would mean termination of privately owned water transportation on a regularly scheduled basis. That would mean not only the end of the steamship service, but, worse than that, the eventual death and disappearance of many fine Alaska towns that depend on water transportation.

Mr. Speaker, mine may be wishful thinking. The congressional district that I have the honor to represent, of course, has a vast stake in the manner in which transportation develops between the State of Alaska and the 48 continental States. A Government-subsidized rail link could change the business pattern and harm existing business supply relationships and payrolls in my area. I admit that.

Furthermore, let me hasten to add in all frankness that the people of Alaska have every right to sever past ties with Seattle and Puget Sound, if it is economically advantageous for them to do so. All I would reserve, Mr. Speaker, from the people of Alaska is any right to claim use of public funds and Federal subsidy to prevail over private investment.

Alaska is establishing a new State ferry. Private enterprise could not finance such a facility. That use of State funds is right and proper and I support it.

And, speaking of a ferry, I would have hoped the Commission might have studied the feasibility of a railroad car ferry to operate from Seattle along the inland waterway to Skagway and, indeed, why not to Seward and there connect with railheads? Such a railroad ferry would serve the pulpmills at Ketchikan and Sitka.

The Alaska Steamship Co.'s study of a sea train should have been considered by the Commission.

From such a study a water carrier and the several transcontinental railroads entering Seattle and perhaps also other rail lines might consider organizing jointly such a train-ferry system. Of course, it may be that such a plan is not feasible. I certainly am not the one to say what the best solution is. All I can urge is an answer within the framework of a program that would protect as much as possible each of the communities and existing facilities and business interests of Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, this statement, I believe, explains my dissenting views to the recommendations of the Alaska Rail and Highway Commission's report. I hope the Congress will not act to implement the report without careful consideration of the adverse aspects of this situation. All rail service to Alaska sounds like progress, but to me it is economically wrong and morally wrong, besides.

Mr. Speaker, this concludes my remarks covering amplification of my dissenting views on the Alaska Rail and Highway Commission report.

THE CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1961

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been in session since January 3. Taking out Saturdays and Sundays, there were 99 days on which sessions could have been held, but, including today, only 75 legislative days have been recorded. During this same period, the House Committee on Agriculture held 91 separate meetings on 61 different days, or 38 days less than the total number available.

The great Agriculture Committee, under the chairmanship of HAROLD COOLEY, has considered many subjects this year which are of some interest to American agriculture. Hearings have been held on the extension of the Wool Act; Mexican farm labor; the feedgrains bills, to name just a few. But with all this activity, not a moment has been devoted to the very important subject of conservation reserve, a subject that most certainly is important to agriculture as well as in the public interest. A bill, H.R. 4267, sometimes referred to as the "Cropland Adjustment Act of 1961," and a companion bill, S. 1643, were submitted to the Congress by my colleagues and myself on February 13, last. This will be referred to again later.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, and for the balance of this week, the House Committee on Agriculture is focusing its at-

tention on the omnibus farm bill which was apparently concocted and brought forth by a Willard Cochrane, former professor of agricultural economics at the University of Minnesota, and his boss, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman. This bill which, among other things, advocates the formation of enough special commodity committees that could fill most of the meeting halls in the Capital City—if they all met at once—does not, so far as I am able to find, include a line about the important business of retiring farm acreage. A very sound and acceptable means of bringing about a better balance of supply and demand for wheat and certain other grains. Earlier, in my speech of April 20, this rather pointed omission in the new farm bill was called to your attention.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 20, I presented documentary evidence that most of the leading national farm organizations "professed a desire for proper use and preservation of our land and water resources." Since the opening of the 87th Congress, at least one of these national groups—the American Farm Bureau Federation—has made its voice heard on the subject. In polling the other organizations, prior to the preparation of this statement, I learned that one group put all its eggs in Mr. Freeman's basket; one is waiting to be called to testify, and the remaining group wants to see how Mr. Freeman makes out before the House and the Senate. "If the administration bill passes," a spokesman said, "any attempts at separate legislation for a conservation reserve bill will be dead for this session. On the other hand," he said, "if the Secretary flunks out, another bill on agriculture should most certainly be considered."

It is my considered judgment, gentlemen, if the administration is successful in getting the legislation it is asking for, the American farmer will be dangling precariously from dead center. He will be pelted from both sides by committees, and left to stew in a pot of apathy and in a jungle of confusion. How can we, with a clear conscience, stand idly by and let our farmers and our whole Nation suffer at the hands of such quackery. It is my conviction all of us should know, that we have, and always will, depend upon the great productivity of our land to fill not only our own stomachs, but also have the capacity, if not a commitment, to help ease the hunger pangs of a multitude of friends in less fortunate lands.

This administration seems to be in a terrible hurry. They appear to be trying to accomplish in 100 days what may take a full presidential term of 1,469 days. Right answers, if they are to weather the stormy test of these times, are not that easy to come by. But the administration seems to be undaunted in its quest for expediency and speed. Here is a beaut which came off Mr. Freeman's launching pad on April 20, 1 day short of his first 3 months in office. In announcing the "First Comprehensive Study of the World Food Gap" the Secretary proudly said:

> Although the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been appraising food balances of some countries for 15 years, this report—prepared under the leadership of a special task force—is the first effort to measure the extent of world food needs.

Let us pause here briefly to catch my breath. The calendar count shows that Mr. Freeman became the 90-day wonder of President Kennedy's first 100 days—a great accomplishment. Believe me, that is a pretty fast game of ball.

Feeding ourselves and our friends abroad is a very serious business. Here at home, with the exception of certain segments of our population, we are eating better and living better than any time in our history. Food costs are low, according to reliable reports from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, taking about a fifth of our take-home pay; a decade ago it was one-fourth of the take-home pay. That is better than any other country you can name. The variety and the nutrient value is greater, also. Although we are eating and living well, we seem to have the capacity of producing more of some items than we can consume at home. We export about one-fifth of our total farm production, but the remainder is bursting our grain elevators and warehouses. We look to needy people, both here and abroad, as an outlet for our abundance. After all, is it not less costly in the long run to give away the food we do not need than to pay storage charges? This may be true, but what lies ahead? Once we start to feed the world's hungry hordes will we not be committed to continue in the future?

Please do not get me wrong. I am for using our surplus commodities to best advantage, and one of these is to help others who are less fortunate. What I have in mind is that the rate of population of the United States and the world is on the uptrend. We start to solve a surplus problem by giving away overproduction, but what happens when we come out even? Do we stop shipping food to our friends abroad, or do we increase our farm production on a wartime basis to help fulfill our commitments?

Land and water are two of our most priceless possessions. Both should be used with the greatest regard for both present and future needs. As a people we are a most kind and generous lot. Once we make a commitment to help our foreign neighbors we do not want to let them down. On the other hand, we do not wish to let our own people down by overextending our commitments at the expense of our generosity. The answer must be found somewhere in the middle ground—while we are closing the gap between what we produce and what we can consume and sell abroad, other nations which are now receiving our gratuities should be helped toward building and maintaining a greater economic stability. As we follow this middle course we should, and must, give more serious attention to gradually retiring unneeded farm acreage as an investment in the future—for our betterment and the betterment of the world at large. Presented here is such a plan:

To assist growers of feed grains, wheat, soybeans, and flax in adjusting production to market needs and provide for an orderly liquidation of Government surpluses, I favor a properly designed and administered cropland adjustment program.

My recommendations for such a program have been introduced in both Houses of the Congress and are now pending in the form of H.R. 4267 and S. 1246.

The cropland adjustment program proposes to remove a basic cause of continuing low farm income by starting an immediate reduction of the agricultural productive plant to a size which will better fit farm output to market needs and open the way to orderly liquidation of accumulated Government stocks. It provides for voluntary participation by producers of all crops but requires producers who wish to qualify for price support on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax to participate. Greatest emphasis is placed on the retirement of land from wheat and feed grains as these crops—and particularly wheat—are the ones with the most serious surplus problems.

Specifically, the bills recommend a temporary program which provides that:

First. The Secretary of Agriculture shall determine annually the overall acreage adjustment of feed grains, wheat, soybeans, and flax necessary to bring production in line with anticipated disappearance. The Secretary shall also establish annually the percentage of cropland which must be placed under contract to qualify for price support on these commodities.

Second. To be eligible for price supports on wheat, feed grains, soybeans, and flax, producers must participate in the cropland adjustment program. Cropland already in a retirement program shall be counted in determining compliance with this requirement. Producers of other commodities may also participate—whole farm participation should be encouraged. Any cropland retired under the program in excess of the minimum requirement for price support must be placed under contract for at least 3 years.

Third. Cropland adjustment payments shall be made at a level which will encourage sufficient voluntary participation to attain the desired adjustment.

Fourth. Adjustment payments may be made in cash or in kind. Emphasis should be placed on payment in kind, with care to minimize disturbance of the market price structure for grain.

Fifth. Cropland retired under this program must be in addition to land normally left idle or fallowed.

Sixth. Acreage retired under the program may not be harvested or grazed.

Seventh. A maximum limit shall be placed on the percentage of cropland acreage that may be retired in any county after allowing for the minimum acreage required for price support. Acreage retired under previous programs shall not prevent participation in the annual adjustment programs.

Eighth. Wheat acreage allotments shall be terminated.

Ninth. The price support level on corn shall be related to the average price

received by farmers during the immediately preceding 3 years. The support levels for other feed grains and wheat shall be comparable to the level for corn with adjustments for differences in weight, nutritive value, buyer preference, and supply-demand conditions.

Tenth. Adequate measures shall be taken to protect farmers from the competition of Commodity Credit Corporation sales from accumulated stocks.

Table I shows the output-use picture of wheat and feed grains in recent years and current carryovers.

TABLE I.—*Average output, disappearance, and carryover of wheat and feed grains, 5 crop years, 1956–60*

Crop	Average production	Average use [1]	Production as percentage of use	Estimated 1961 carryover	Estimated 1961 carryover as percentage of 1960–61 use
Wheat ..... million bushels	1,181	1,099	107	1,485	124
Corn ..... do	3,862	3,697	104	2,000	48
Sorghum grain ..... do	521	397	131	700	135
4 feed grains [2] ..... million tons	152.5	145.0	105	84.4	53

[1] Including exports. [2] Includes corn, sorghum grain, oats, and barley.

Assuming that market growth over the next few years will be at least proportional to output growth due to improving yields per acre, a reduction in output of 5 to 8 percent would just about balance current production with current market needs. Any output reduction in excess of this amount would provide opportunity to start liquidation of Government stocks; however, experience with past land retirement efforts, indicates that the percentage cut in acreage would have to be substantially larger than the indicated percentage reduction in output in order to balance supplies with demand.

Table II shows approximate cropland acreage nationally, how the acreage is currently being used, and what the status of land devoted to specified crops would be under the proposed adjustment program.

TABLE II.—*U.S. cropland acreage by principal uses*

[Cropland grouped by principal use in thousands of planted acres]

Group A. To be supported (without acreage controls): [1] (Producers of these commodities desiring price support must participate in the proposed cropland adjustment program.)	
Corn, all	82,906
Wheat, all [2]	55,633
Oats, barley, rye	52,177
Sorghum, for grain	15,444
Soybeans, for beans	23,516
Flax, all	3,527
Subtotal, group A	233,203
Group B. To be supported (with acreage controls): [1] (Participation in the proposed cropland adjustment program is not required for price support on these commodities.)	
Cotton	16,068
Rice	1,614
Peanuts	1,579
Tobacco	1,144
Subtotal, group B	20,405
Group C. Other crops and uses: [2]	
Conservation reserve	[4] 28,432
Hay, cropland pasture, other crops, fallow, idle, failure, etc.	177,600
Total cropland, all uses [3]	459,649

[1] Planted acreage for 1960 as reported by USDA.
[2] Currently supported and controlled, but controls to be terminated under Farm Bureau proposal.
[3] 1954 U.S. Census of Agriculture. Data now used by USDA in land retirement computations. New census data to be available in about 6 months.
[4] Under contract in 1960.

Under the Cropland Adjustment Act all land listed in table II under groups A, B, and C—except for an amount in group C equal to that which is customarily summer fallowed or left idle—would be eligible for the land retirement program on a voluntary basis.

The acreage allotments applicable to crops listed in group B would not be affected by the cropland adjustment program; however farmers entering the program to qualify for price supports on a grain or oilseed crop would be required to retire a designated percentage of their total cropland. For example, if producers should be required to retire 15 percent of their cropland to qualify for price supports on a grain or oilseed crop, a producer with 200 acres of cropland would be required to retire 30 acres even though he might have a 25-acre cotton allotment. If such a producer wished to ignore the program he could still get price support on his cotton by complying with his cotton allotment, but he would be ineligible for support on grain and oilseed crops.

The cropland adjustment program is designed to achieve needed adjustments in grain production on a basis consistent with individual choice in a market system. Under such an approach it is essential that support prices be consistent with production objectives. This means that price supports should facilitate orderly marketing rather than fix prices at artificial levels.

Wheat allotments and quotas would be terminated. The support price for wheat would be based on the national average support price for corn with adjustments for differences in weight per bushel, nutritive value, buyer preference, and supply-demand conditions. Thus, all grains would be given comparable treatment and the individual farmer would be free to decide what grains he will produce—subject to the requirement that he must retire a percentage of his cropland to qualify for price support on wheat, corn, oats, barley, grain sorghums, rye, soybeans, and flax. The amount of land a producer must retire to qualify for price support would be based on his total acreage of cropland—and not on his production history—so the inequities associated with historic bases would be avoided. Surplus wheat could enter the feed market on a fair competitive basis; but market demand for millable wheat should cause average prices to exceed the support level.

To protect producers of the commodities affected by this program from competitive Government sales, the prices at which the CCC can sell accumulated stocks for unrestricted use should be substantially higher than current support prices.

THE LAW OF CRIMES AND THE LAW OF WELFARE

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, recently there has come to my attention an address entitled "The Law of Crimes and the Law of Welfare," delivered by Dr. Jacobus tenBroek, on February 7, 1961, before a meeting of region 2 of the California Social Welfare Workers Organization.

Dr. tenBroek, scholar and author, college administrator and college professor, nationally known authority both on constitutional law and social welfare—this man, though blind since the age of 14—is not alone a distinguished citizen of California, he is truly a great and distinguished American.

With five earned degrees in the fields of political science and law, principal author of three major works—the most recent of which is "Hope Deferred, Public Welfare and the Blind"—and more than 60 monographs and articles on social and legal problems of our times, and for more than 10 years a member of California's Board of Social Welfare—Dr. tenBroek is eminently qualified to discuss the subject of his address: the law of crimes and the law of welfare.

It is my belief that the social welfare programs of California are the finest in the Nation due in no small measure to the contribution this man has made in the formulation of policies as a member, and now chairman, of the California Social Welfare Board.

Believing that programs of social welfare should provide not only for the merest bodily needs of society's disadvantaged citizens, but that such programs should offer a means and a way toward helping these unfortunate people—unfortunate more often through circumstances beyond their control—to return to full and equal participation in the life of their community—this remarkable man has worked tirelessly to translate his enlightened social philosophy into laws, policies and programs not only in California but also throughout the Nation.

Dr. tenBroek's keen understanding and limitless labors have not been confined by the borders of our native State. Leader, and principal founder, of the National Federation of the Blind—the largest nationwide organization with a membership primarily of blind people—Dr. tenBroek, only president of the Na-

tional Federation of the Blind since its founding in 1940, has appeared before legislative committees in many States, and, for the past 20 years, has become a familiar and highly respected witness before committees of the Congress as he has spoken in support of legislative proposals which would repudiate the social welfare concepts inherited from the Elizabethan poor laws and replace them with the enlightened social thinking of our own day and time.

The address follows:

THE LAW OF CRIMES AND THE LAW OF WELFARE

(An address by Prof. Jacobus tenBroek, chairman, State social welfare board, before region 2, California Social Welfare Workers Organization, February 7, 1961)

Effective March 10, 1960, there appeared this language in the ordinance books of one of our California counties:

"The board of supervisors do ordain as follows:

"SEC. 1. No person shall resort to any any office building, or to any room used or occupied in connection with or under the same management as any cafe, restaurant, soft drink parlor, liquor establishment, or similar business, or to any public park, or to any of the buildings therein, or to any vacant lot, or to any room, roominghouse, lodginghouse, residence, apartment house, hotel, house trailer, street, or sidewalk for the purpose of having sexual intercourse with a person to whom he or she is not married."

The attached sanctions were a $500 fine and/or 6 months in jail.

The coverage of this ordinance is comprehensive. All conceivable places in town, city, and park are on the list of possible locations. Only the fields and irrigation ditches of the surrounding countryside are forgotten—and moving cars on the open highway. Equally engulfing are the elements of the crime. The city fathers were not content with prohibiting the commission of the act itself. Resorting to the specified places for the purpose of committing the act was made the crime. Nor need the purpose be shared by both parties. An intent in the mind of one of them is sufficient. In this county, it would appear, a gleam in the eye of youth, summer or winter, or the lightly turning fancy in the spring, is no mere topic of song, jest or poem. It is a heading on the arrest blotter of the district attorney's office.

Almost needless to say, the application of the ordinance is not so sweeping as its geography and psychology. Quite the contrary. Its application is selective and discriminatory. Only ANC mothers and those found with them know its penal sanctions. The methods of enforcement are those associated with the law of crimes. Investigation on nothing more than suspicion or gossip, detectives operating in teams, night raids, simultaneous approaches to the back and front of the house, guns conspicuously displayed on hips, unceremonious entry, inmates interrogated at length and notes taken, the entire house searched without any particular care to secure permission, men and sometimes ANC mothers arrested and hauled off to jail—all of this in the presence of the children to many of whom the episode must come as a frightening and even traumatic experience—all of this, too, in the presence of the constitutions of the State and the Nation providing for the rights of individuals, the equal protection of the laws, and the privacy and security of residents in their persons, houses, papers, and effects.

In another California county, the district attorney lodged fraud and theft charges against two ANC mothers, the one for having a man in her home while receiving aid and the other for not reporting accurately the address in Mexico of her common-law husband. The man in the home in the first case was also prosecuted for nonsupport of two of the children. After conviction or pleas of guilty, all three were placed on probation. They were ordered as a condition of probation not to indulge in extramarital relationships. All three were later jailed for violating this condition.

The district court of appeals, and later the State supreme court, held that one of the ANC mothers had been denied her constitutional right to counsel. The district court of appeals emphatically rejected the plea of the district attorney that the court should "tolerate * * * an undefined degree of laxity" in applying constitutional standards in these cases. "When essential constitutional rights are in issue," said the court, "the petty offender * * * is the equal of any other citizen, and entitled to the full protection of the Constitution, not just to a part of that protection, grudgingly given and imperfectly applied * * *. The accused who stands before a justice court for sentencing does not thereby become a second-class citizen, entitled only to second-class justice."

These three persons whose private lives and intimate relationships received the searching scrutiny of penal officials and obsessed attention of the press and public were not only poor and uneducated, but they were members of a minority group. They were Mexican-Americans. Marriage is a conception of the law and mores. What is within or without wedlock, therefore, depends upon the law of marriage. In Mexico, free unions are legal marriages. They are the form of marriage of the poor, the rural, and the young. They account for one-fifth of Mexican marriages. When the crops improve, religious and civil ceremonies are often added.

This same district attorney has required an ANC mother to submit to a lie detector test regarding her relations with men. This he defined as a phase of the cooperation with law-enforcement officers prescribed by the welfare and institutions code. He thus made submission to the lie detector test a condition of eligibility for aid to needy children, despite the fact that no such condition is laid down in the statute or the rules and regulations established by the only agency authorized to do so—despite the fact, too, that the courts uniformly refuse to accept lie detector evidence coercively secured. The lie detector is a device of criminal law and criminal investigations. Mandatory submission to it is a clear invasion of the right to privacy.

Another California county has adopted a new plan of administration of the ANC program. Under it a special ANC review unit is installed in the office of the district attorney. The district attorney is assigned sweeping new powers. He is actually to determine eligibility for ANC. The director of public welfare must refer every aid applicant immediately to the district attorney, and must also submit for the district attorney's review all information gathered and decisions reached. The welfare department is limited to tentative decisions even in areas completely and exclusively in its province. The director of public welfare must deny applications or terminate aid in all cases in which the district attorney considers that the client is not cooperating. Under this plan, in short, the administration of welfare in the county is effectually handed over to the district attorney, with the welfare director acting simply as a subordinate arm of his office. The State Department, being a department of social welfare and not a department of police, has declared this plan both illegal and violative of basic concepts of welfare.

Finally, in the same county, the district attorney developed another plan. He would charge ANC mothers, as well as fathers, with nonsupport of their children. If the mother pleaded not guilty, she would be convicted and jailed. If she pleaded guilty, as the judge advised her to do, she would be placed on probation—on condition either that she receive no further aid or that she receive it on terms laid down by the judge. In one case, an ANC mother came into court not as a defendant but as a witness in her husband's nonsupport trial. Then and there a charge of nonsupport was filed against her. She immediately entered a plea of guilty and was promptly sentenced, according to the transcript, "to serve 60 days in custody of the sheriff" of the county, which sentence was suspended on condition that defendant remove her two children from the relief rolls within 30 days. The husband, meanwhile, was released unconditionally.

In another case, an ANC mother was charged with nonsupport, pleaded guilty and waived time for sentencing on the same day. Sentence of 90 days was suspended on condition that she pay $56 a month to the county to remove one of her children from the relief rolls as long as the child's father carried out the order of the court to pay that amount to her for the child's support.

Thus a county district attorney and a municipal court judge have invoked the penal code and the sanctions of the law of crimes to solve at a stroke the human and social problems of welfare. Under pain of punishment and imprisonment they have forced eligible mothers to get off the relief rolls and go to work—without regard for conditions of health or ability to work, or the need of the children for the presence of their mother, or proper provision for the children's care, or any other consideration of welfare.

What is the proper relationship between the law of crimes and the law of welfare? Are they, as the foregoing illustrations would seem to suggest, one and the same? Or are they, as I shall seek to demonstrate, radically different in conception and purpose—so different as to be mutually exclusive?

What, to begin with, is a "crime"? However variously it has been defined by different cultures, or even by different schools within the same culture, a crime is regarded as a harmful or injurious act knowingly and deliberately committed. But this is not quite enough. According to Blackstone, the act must be more than injurious: it must be "of a deeper and more atrocious dye." Sir Fitzjames Stephens emphasizes "the evil tendency of such violation, as regards the community at large." Not every intentional offense or injury, then, is a crime. Many deliberate and harmful acts are penalized merely by civil sanctions, by reprimands, fines or damages. Neither the nature of the act itself, nor the presence of deliberate intent, suffices to give it the dimensions of a crime. What makes an act a crime is the punishment ordained for it. In effect the punishment is the crime. That the punishment should fit the crime, or that the crime should justify its punishment, misses the point. The social definition of a crime is the punishment prescribed.

The very concept of crime is indistinguishable from the idea of punishment. What follows from a criminal act, in any modern society, is organized pursuit and apprehension, arrest and investigation, trial and conviction, denial of freedom and suspension of rights—in short, the whole book of penal sanctions and retaliations.

I do not dispute this conventional code of crime-and-punishment. Whatever its specific weaknesses or actual barbarities, it is doubtless true that society has a right and obligation to protect itself and its members against injurious actions; and that the police

force, with all its faults, is a necessary line of defense. In other words, there is a legitimate and proper field, however circumscribed, for the law of crimes and the stern machinery of enforcement which it carries in its train.

What then, on the other hand, is the law of public welfare? It is quite literally the recognition by society of a responsibility for the welfare of those of its citizens who are in need. The concept of "need" is relative and flexible, as well as ambiguous. In a time of disaster, all the citizens of a community may be in need. Even in a period of "normalcy" and general affluence, large numbers of our citizens are unmistakably in need: among them are the disabled and chronically ill, the penurious old and the orphaned young, the emotionally disturbed and the economically dislocated, those who are shut in and those who have been shut out. It is the fundamental postulate of the welfare creed that need is not a crime, and that the needy as such are neither sinners nor delinquents.

The law of welfare is closely intertwined with this developing concept of need. The modern welfare system which finds its central expression in our programs of social security acknowledges a responsibility not only for the elementary needs of food and shelter, of existence and subsistence. In its explicit commitment to self-support and self-care on the part of recipients of public assistance, its recognizes as of equal value the social, personal and family needs of self-sufficiency and self-respect, of economic opportunity and strengthened family life. It is aimed not only at helping people in need, but at helping them out of it. The law of welfare is geared in principle to incentive and productivity, to personal rehabilitation and revival. It is in fact less a program of relief, although it is that too, than a program of recovery.

The modern law of public welfare is, to be sure, an outgrowth of the venerable tradition of private charity. But this historical derivation is not very enlightening. It is a little like saying that democracy is an outgrowth of the feudal system which preceded it. Between feudalism and democracy there intervened an age of enlightenment. Between the charity of the poor laws and the welfare of the Social Security Act there intervened a movement both humanitarian and equalitarian, in short, an age of democracy.

There was a time, almost within living memory, when the law of welfare, or more accurately of charity, and the law of crimes were indeed one and the same. Scarcely a century ago, in our land of Puritan theology and rugged individualism, poverty could still be regarded as a sin, and any abnormality, whether physical or mental, as possession by the devil. The constitution of North Carolina in 1862 contained these words: "To know the right but still the wrong to pursue, proceeds from a perverse will brought about by the seductions of the evil one." There was in those days, as a recent author has reminded us, "no scientifically defined method of dealing with people in trouble * * *. These individuals were reflecting the evil and sinfulness inherent in human nature, and the only way to remove evil and sinfulness was through pain and punishment."

Among the numerous and motley recipients of private aid, long after the establishment of private aid in the charity organization societies, there were two distinct and carefully segregated classes: those who were deserving and those who were undeserving.

Among the undeserving were all who were the victims of their own vices—those who stood in need not so much of charity as of correction. The major organization in the field, well into our own century, was the National Board of Charities and Corrections. And corrected the victims were—most notoriously of all through the institution of the almshouse or workhouse, whose inmates at the turn of the century comprised, according to a classic description, a very heterogeneous mass, representing almost every kind of human distress. Old veterans of labor worn out by many years of ill-requited toil, alongside of wornout veterans of dissipation, the victims of their own vices; the crippled and the sick; the insane; the blind; deaf-mutes; feeble-minded and epileptic; people with all kinds of chronic diseases; unmarried mothers with their babies; short-term prisoners; thieves, no longer physically capable of crime; wornout prostitutes, etc.; and along with all these, little orphaned or deserted children, and a few people of better birth and breeding reduced to poverty in old age by some financial disaster, often through no fault of their own.

Thus was the law of welfare, in its infancy, all but indistinguishable from the law of crimes. All these social problems and human bondages which we now recognize to have been associated with the great impersonal forces of dislocation and depression, industrial revolution and urban movement, social conflict and race hatred—all of these were once perceived in the narrow focus of personal character, as evidences of weakness if not of wickedness, of irresponsibility if not outright corruption. In the eyes of the law—the criminal law—there were no problems of society to be solved but only individual wrongs to be righted, personal sins of commission to be expiated and corrected. And the proper corrective, in all cases, was some form of punishment.

A striking illustration of this punitive approach to problems of economic, social, and moral origin, is to be seen in the legal proscription of vagrancy—as historically applied to those with neither definite domicile nor visible means of support. At various times in the past (and in the present), as one modern authority tells us, "A wide variety of homeless and migratory persons were considered to be vagrants: prostitutes, streetwalkers, mendicants, beggars, pilgrims, wandering bards, scholars, itinerant tradesmen, mountebanks, street fakers, strangers, aliens, hoboes, tramps, bums, loiterers, blind, handicapped, and indigent persons, as well as drunk and disorderly individuals. "These," concludes our authority, "were the motley representatives of social displacement (uprooting) and mobility." They were, in short, the victims of upheaval, not the upheavers. The law of crimes, incapable of comprehending let alone of apprehending the real culprits, could only make scapegoats of its victims.

Nor was it only poverty and homelessness—the nomad and the vagabond—which were sought to be scourged from the earth by the punitive law of crimes. The apocalyptic Four Horsemen themselves—famine, war, pestilence, and death—were somehow to be banished by coercive enactment and enforcement. Edward III, through the infamous Statute of Labourers, tried valiantly in the 14th century to reverse the effects of the Black Death and halt the tide of economic and social change. With the population of Europe nearly cut in half by the plague, the resulting shortage of labor threatened to bring about a decent wage; but the criminal law knew how to deal with such crimes. The Statute of Labourers, prodded by a landed nobility intent on returning to the static conditions of feudal vassalage, laid down the following injunctions: "Every person able in body under the age of 60 years, not having to live on, being required, shall be bound to serve him that doth require him, or else committed to the gaol, until he find surety to serve. . . . If a workman or servant depart from service before the time agreed upon, he shall be imprisoned. . . . The old wages, and no more, shall be given to servants. . . . If any artificer or workman take more wages than were wont to be paid, he shall be committed to the gaol. . . . Victuals shall be sold at reasonable prices. . . . No person shall give any thing to a beggar that is able to labour [i.e., those] rather willing to beg in idleness, than by labour to get their living."

Thus the king and his lords saw vagrancy and movement, wages and prices, the shortage of labor and the surplusage of beggars, all as one problem, to be dealt with in one law and solved by one corrective: that of punishment. Of this classic effort to incriminate the forces of nature and history—to rein in the Four Horsemen at a single command—Bishop Stubbs was to comment some centuries later: "The great pestilence fell like a season of blight, but worse than the pestilence was the statute of labourers." Almost immediately the criminal statute was found impossible to enforce; and so another dose of punishment was prescribed the following year, in the form of a second Statute of Labourers. The upshot of the effort is history: rising unrest, resistance, and finally rebellion—in the shape of the Great Revolt of 1381.

Just as the law of crimes has failed through the centuries to deter the forces of social and economic change, so has it failed to correct and reform the moral conduct of men. Little need be said of the notorious excesses of the Puritan criminal code, through whose agency moral inhibitions were turned into sadistic exhibitions. But it is worth recalling that this sweeping effort to impose a rigid standard of conduct down to the last detail of private life and personal habit, on pain of the most cruel and unusual punishments—including the burning of deviant females at the stake—failed utterly in its aim. For a complete account of the success of the criminal law in suppressing fornication, I refer you to the two volumes of the Kinsey reports.

Against all these human ills and accidents of fortune—moral, social, and economic—the law of crimes has ever raised its arm. It has sought not to help but to chastise; not to cure but to suppress; not to understand but to punish. Until very recently it had the whole field exclusively to itself: poverty, immorality, abnormality, illegitimacy, transiency, nonconformity, all were the unchallenged subjects of the law of crimes.

And what has been the result? Have the crises of economic calamity, social change, and personal misery been stamped out by punitive legislation? Have the handicapped and indigent, the uprooted and rejected, the truant and vagrant, learned their lesson and been chastened in their ways? The record could not be more clear. By every index of psychic and social measurement, these problems have multiplied and worsened under the whip of penal sanctions and the threat of punishment. Men have not been, and cannot ever be, driven to their salvation—moral, social, or economic—by the exercise of the stocks, the pillory, the lash, the brand, the fetter, the gag, the whipping post, the wheelbarrow, the workhouse, nor the penitentiary.

Gradually over the past hundred years, another kind of law has arisen to contest the field with the law of crimes. The new law of welfare comes armed with the implements of science, the attributes of scholarship, and the spirit of democracy; but it still fights an uphill battle. The heritage of centuries under the old law of crime and punishment cannot be dissolved in a year or a generation. Nor is its erosion a steady and consistent process; for in periods of rapid change and instability, such as those we face today, the ancient attitudes are

quickly activated—and the impulse to punish gains the ascendancy.

Thus it is today in our own State. The rising demand in California for punitive and repressive administration of the welfare laws—expressed in the increasing intervention of district attorneys and law-enforcement agencies—is to be understood largely as a defensive reflex. The State finds itself confronted with a welfare problem of mounting and acute proportions which springs from our exploding and shifting population, from the irregular and insecure employment of many of our industries, from the disproportionate increment of minority groups whose ways of life and patterns of behavior seem by the standards of conventional society rudely deviant and nonconformist. Accordingly we are faced with disorganized families and unadjusted persons, with rising illegitimacy and parental default, with all the bitter fruits of poverty and ignorance—and, most galling of all, to some, with resistance and ingratitude on the part of many who fall within the categories of our welfare programs.

In the face of so complex and troublesome a situation, it is a sore temptation to seek a scapegoat—to chastise those who slip and punish those who fall. The easiest way to dispose of the problem, when it arises in a specific case, appears to be not to call in the welfare worker but to call the police.

I have already cited a number of examples of the recent resurgence within the welfare field of the punitive law of crimes. It may be well to give some attention also to its theoretical side: to what may be called the theory of welfare crime and punishment. That theory has been given a very full and articulate expression in recent testimony before a factfinding committee of the State senate. The speaker was a county district attorney; the subject was "California's Aid to Needy Children" program.

To begin with, the district attorney found the prospects of this program quite discouraging, not because it was doing too little to aid needy children, but because it was doing too much. Nowhere in his lengthy testimony did this agent of law enforcement emphasize the needs of deprived children; instead he spoke of immorality, of crime, and of punishment. The whole public enterprise of welfare, and in particular of ANC, was to him an exhibition of moral decline involving an active encouragement of illegitimacy and vice, the breakup of the family unit and the collapse of the character of the individual through handouts from the State. The district attorney saw the effort to aid needy children through their parents and relatives not as a humanitarian venture but as the provision of an unrestricted breeding-ground for the promiscuous and parasitic. Indeed, the program was described as "a social monster [threatening] the moral and financial well-being of the citizenry of this State." The way out of this "miasma of immorality" was forthrightly stated: "The legislature must immediately assume its responsibilities by curtailing the power of welfare administrative agencies, [by] the development of legislation adequate to permit solid enforcement, and finally [by providing] the investigative and prosecution facilities for effective control."

Here then is the legal theory of welfare crime and punishment. Not only are the recipients of aid as a group assumed to be unworthy, deceitful, and parasitic but the sins of the parents are to be visited upon the children, in the form of denial of relief. The very effort to assist the distressed and demoralized toward a constructive solution of their problems, to help repair broken homes and restore broken lives, is itself immoral and monstrous, as well as, of course, financially extravagant. The obvious remedy, the simple and classic solution, is to disarm and discredit the welfare worker and arm the prosecutor and policeman to the teeth: to arrest, to raid, to threaten, to crack down, to punish.

The modern law of welfare is the outgrowth of steady evolution both within the law itself and in the attitudes of society toward the perplexities of poverty and deprivation. There is more to ANC, as there is more to social security, than a stopgap effort to alleviate gross conditions of hunger and exposure. The constructive goal is to increase the opportunities of seriously disadvantaged children for something approaching a normal family life and for those ordinary actions and transactions which lead to maturity and responsibility.

The most striking and illuminating fact which emerges from the history of ANC in California is its direct and intimate relationship to unemployment. When unemployment rises, so does the caseload; when jobs are plentiful, the roster is accordingly reduced. The immediate problem which the program faces, then, is simply economic: it is a need for jobs. But that problem is not only economic but social and cultural as well. For another basic fact about the program is that Negro and Spanish-American recipients together account for 60 percent of the present caseload. Any adequate program of welfare must confront the conditions which underlie these facts: conditions of inequality, of absence of skill and training, of social marginality and of psychological instability, of divergent cultural patterns and mores, and of foreclosed opportunities. These are the people affected first and worst by any drop in employment. They are commonly the least skilled and the least schooled. They are the prime targets of prejudice, discrimination, and alienation. And, finally, they are the inheritors of cultural patterns and styles of family life frequently at variance with the behavioral codes from which our laws are fashioned.

Given these basic and overriding facts, the wonder is not that there have been instances of delinquency and default on the part of welfare clients, but that there have been so few. Even where these derelictions have occurred, fewer still fall within the rigorous definition of fraud under the law of crimes. It goes without saying that where deliberate collusion and willful falsification to commit a fraud have taken place, the individuals responsible must answer for their act in the same manner and in the same degree as others in similar situations. But there are two sides to this constitutional coin: equal protection of the laws requires that welfare offenders and their children not be singled out for special punishments or made the victims of discriminatory ordinances designed and executed peculiarly for them.

Equal protection of the law, the right to privacy, the right of self-expression, of voluntary movement, of personal liberty, of human dignity—it is of these essential elements, these articles of democratic faith, that the modern philosophy of welfare is composed. In the end the commitment to welfare goals is no more than a rededication to those humane aspirations, that optimistic faith in the potential of man, which our Bill of Rights embodies. Viewed in the light of this honorable lineage, there is nothing obscure or mysterious about the conflict between the law of welfare and the law of crimes. For the latter, with its accouterments of power and psychology of coercion, has always been at odds with the spirit of liberal democracy. The great events in the history of the evolution of our form of Government have been the moments of successful challenge of the police power: the Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, the protection of habeas corpus, the presumption of innocence, the right of trial, the slow accretion of barriers against searches and seizures, arbitrary arrest and invasion of privacy. These are the cornerstones of the civilized structure we inhabit today—whose newest expression is the modern law of welfare. But the law of crimes has ever displayed an irresistible tendency to tear that structure down, or, failing that, to blight and stunt its further growth. The Constitution of the United States, and the constitutions of our several States, are replete with recognitions of this inveterate tendency of the police power, and with systematic efforts to limit its aggressive ambition.

Here are a few of the protections which our constitutions have interposed between the citizen and the coercive powers of the State: the freedoms of speech and the press, of religious belief, of petition and assembly; the right not to be deprived of life, liberty, and property without due process of law; the right to a speedy and fair trial; the right to counsel, and the right of immunity from compulsory self-incrimination; the right of habeas corpus; the right of immunity from peonage and slavery; the right to be immune from double jeopardy, and from bills of attainder; the right to inspect and use documents; the freedom from arbitrary arrest; the right to the aid of favorable witnesses and to confront opposing witnesses; the right to bail; the right of the people to be secure in their persons, papers, houses, and effects; the right of immunity from unreasonable searches and seizures; the right of immunity from cruel and unusual punishments; the right of privacy.

These are the rights of all citizens: of the poor and troubled as well as the comfortable, of the petty offender as well as the corporation president. They are not to be relaxed. They are not to be grudgingly given and imperfectly applied with respect to any groups in our society. The accused who stands before a justice court for sentencing does not thereby become a second-class citizen entitled only to second-class justice.

Whenever these constitutional protections are relaxed—when the police become the State, or when the law of crimes supersedes the civil law and the law of welfare—we take a long step backward into that age of darkness and repression whose appropriate symbols are the debtors' prison and the Tower of London, Bedlam and Devils' Island, exile, deportation, and transportation. For the entire vast complex of human problems involved in poverty, bewilderment and vice, the law of crimes has ever prescribed the same corrective, varying only in degree: That of suppression and detention. The law of welfare prescribes the opposite: Liberation, opportunity, and incentive. In the modern perspective of welfare, there is no single or simple solution to all the ills that flesh is heir to, but there is a singular purpose and a common denominator. Economic problems of poverty and unemployment require economic measures, democratically devised and fairly executed. Social problems of inequality and instability require social planning and legislation, as specific or broad-scaled as the need to be met. Moral problems and problems of the mores require education and assimilation.

The common denominator which underlies all these diverse issues and methods of treatment is to be seen in America's second proclamation of emancipation—issued a generation ago by Franklin Delano Roosevelt. It consisted of "Four Freedoms: The first is freedom of speech and expression—everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way—everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want—everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear—anywhere in the world."

That is the heart of the democratic creed, of the American spirit, and of the emerging law of welfare.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act and to amend section 5 of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933.

This bill is siimlar to one introduced in the other body by the distinguished Senator from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS.

Last year the Congress expressed its sense in this matter in its consideration of the mutual security authorization bill. It urged then that the Development Loan Fund be utilized to encourage low-cost housing projects in the underdeveloped nations. Unfortunately, not enough has been done to get such a program underway.

The proposed bill would set up an International Home Loan Bank which would serve institutions whose main purpose would be to encourage savings and finance home ownership in other countries. The bank would also assist in setting up savings and loan associations in countries whose economic system is deficient in the apparatus necessary for capital formation.

Funds for the International Home Loan Bank would be raised from public and private subscriptions and from investments in its stocks and shares by thrift institutions in the United States. These institutions would invest in shares, accounts, deposits, and the certificates of indebtedness, of thrift and home financing associations outside the United States and in the International Home Loan Bank itself.

Capital starvation has long been a factor in the retarded economic development of these countries, particularly in South America.

Without question we in the United States must take the initiative in helping these nations obtain the capital for a proper, orderly development of an increasingly useful economic expansion. It has been known for a long time that the political instability of many Latin American nations is largely a result of the absence of a true homeowning middle class. An extension to Latin America of the principle of massive capital accumulation through a system of savings and home financing is one of the most important ways we can assist the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations to a better standard of living. It is clear to me that a free people who own their own lands and homes have a stake in the preservation of democratic society.

A bulwark against Communist expansion, however, is—and should be—an additional consideration. However, it should not obscure our primary purpose which is to provide a better way of life for our neighbors. The United States is, in fact, the leader of the Western World and that leadership bears a responsibility toward those who need and want our help.

The merits of this bill are great and I hope that each Member of this body will give it careful scrutiny. When they have done so I am certain that they will agree that it is one of the most important steps we can take for the future of freedom and democracy.

CONTROLS ON RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, last February 20, Stephen F. Dunn, president of National Coal Association, testifying at a hearing before the Secretary of the Interior, warned that the United States might be faced with a serious energy gap in a national emergency unless controls on residual oil imports are tightened. He reviewed the prevailing world oil surplus and explained that one reason for it is Russia's campaign to penetrate energy markets of free nations, a situation which Mr. Dunn called exceedingly dangerous because it tends to place reliance upon a most unreliable source of energy.

Mr. Dunn spoke in Chicago last week and repeated the admonition. The following news report appeared in the Journal of Commerce on May 19.

[From the Journal of Commerce, May 19, 1961]

COAL MAN HITS THE RISING TIDE OF RED OIL IMPORTS

CHICAGO.—Russian oil imports are creating "fuel uncertainties" in the free world, Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, declared here.

"The Kremlin is effectively destroying the fuel self-sufficiency of nations outside the Soviet orbit," Mr. Dunn told the National Fuel Credit Association. "If the trend continues, both oil and coal industries of non-Communist nations will begin to reel under the impact of the rising tide of Russian oil."

A delegate to the recent tripartite technical conference of representatives of coal-producing countries at Geneva, Switzerland, Mr. Dunn said that the Russian export program—coupled with oil surplus production in the Middle East and South America—is "choking off" coal capacity that will be needed in an international emergency. He urged the U.S. Government to "take the lead" in imposing "necessary" restrictions on imports of residual oil.

TANKER INVASION CITED

"Unless domestic fuel production is protected against the invasion of tankers carrying flags of every description, including the hammer and sickle, a dangerous energy gap will develop in the midst of the most energetic mobilization program in peacetime history," he warned.

Sales of Russian oil to non-Communist countries were up one-third last year over 1959 and shipments are continuing to increase, Mr. Dunn said. He added that new pipelines, including one with the largest diameter of any long-distance line in the world, are being rushed to completion to carry "increasingly greater" volumes to free world markets.

"When Castro expropriated American refineries, Soviet crude was brought in for processing," Mr. Dunn continued. "Russia is 'swapping' oil for Cuba's sugar, Brazil's coffee, and Argentina's beef."

Mr. Speaker, Russian oil is posing a threat to the defense of the free world. If the Soviet succeeds in seizing a greater number of markets in Europe, South America, and Asia, the Kremlin could eventually be able to determine both the economic and military future of affected countries. The coal industry is no longer the lone voice seeking to alert the United States and our allies to this increasingly precarious matter. On Tuesday of this week Mr. Albert L. Nickerson, president of the Socony Mobil Oil Co., predicted Russian oil exports to the free world will rise to 1 million barrels per day by 1970—more than double the 1960 rates. Mr. Nickerson observed:

Dependence on Russian oil can increase with time. For this reason, the nations that are increasing their purchases of Russian oil would be well advised to consider carefully how heavily dependent they wish to be on an oil supply that may at any moment, be interrupted for political motives.

Mr. Nickerson explained that Russia is capturing outside fuel markets by offering oil at phenomenally low prices. As Mr. Dunn has pointed out previously, Mr. Nickerson said that the Russians offer their product at rates far below those charged to their own satellite countries.

From the standpoint of competitive markets, the Dutch-Anglo-American oil producers have no opportunity whatsoever to meet Soviet prices if Khrushchev and his comrades are determined to undersell their crude oil and its products. In a totalitarian state, cost of supplies, operations, and transportation need not reflect the selling price of a product. The masters in Moscow do not concern themselves with fair wages or similar factors that must be taken into account under a free economy.

The answer to the Russian plan to flood the free world with Red oil must come in the form of a survival plan to be subscribed to by every nation that is determined to escape economic and/or military domination by the Communist conspiracy. America must take the lead in setting up protective barriers against a peril that, even in its infancy, is reaching serious proportions. It is high time that the State Department step into the picture.

Russia is in the process of completing a pipeline that will feed vast volumes of Red crude into Italy for refining and distribution. Another pipeline, referred to by Mr. Dunn as the largest in diameter of any line in the world, will move crude from the Communist producing fields into East Germany for both satellite consumption and for dumping into the fuel markets of Western Europe. If our

friends abroad are willing to make themselves dependent upon a source of energy that lies far behind the Iron Curtain, then it is time for a reeassessment of our foreign policy, for once the major portion of a nation's fuel supply comes from the Russian sphere of influence, economic and military survival will depend largely upon the whims of the Kremlin leaders. Energy for powerplants, manufacturing firms, and military arsenals in nations which have thus far been able to remain outside the Red orbit would be subject to cutoff by the mere turn of a wheel at the order of a commissar.

Ceylon is the latest nation reported to be ready to make a deal with Russia for oil supplies. The team of experts from that country scheduled to visit Moscow in the weeks ahead should be prevailed upon to sit with diplomats of the free world before concluding any such agreements. It is time that we talk cold turkey with them before their goose is cooked under fires of Red oil. The same standard should apply to every other country involved in this new Russian scheme.

It is also appropriate that we take a new look at our own energy cupboards. For the United States to place too much reliance upon fuel that must be shipped over ocean highways is not in keeping with national safety requirements. For years mountainous seas of foreign residual oil have been deluging the fuel markets of our east coast. Some of the customers are electric generating stations. Others are producing and processing industries vital to America's defense mechanism. Should these supplies be cut off, how would the energy gap be closed? During World War II, when enemy submarines disrupted tanker traffic between the gulf coast and New York and New England, factories, schools, office buildings, and hospitals were dark and cold until coal came to the rescue. Such conditions should not and need not be permitted to develop again. Mines in West Virginia are down and mine workers are unemployed. There is too much foreign residual oil coming into our domestic markets. Railroad cars are in disuse and many suppliers and equipment manufacturers have gone out of business in consequence.

Now that the Russian oil campaign has been uncovered and the danger signal hoisted, the United States should act swiftly to reinvigorate its own fuel producing industries, and at the same time begin to shore up a defense for our friends elsewhere in the world against this ominous encroachment by the Reds. The first step calls for a cutback in residual oil imports. The second step demands frank discussions with those nations which the Kremlin has targeted for eventual destruction through dependence on Red oil.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALFORD (at the request of Mr. MILLS) for today, May 24, on account of death in family.

To Mr. TRIMBLE (at the request of Mr. MILLS) from May 24, 1961, through May 26, 1961, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. FISHER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 10 minutes, on Monday, May 29, 1961, and also on Wednesday, May 31, 1961.

Mr. OLSEN (at the request of Mr. MCCORMACK), for 10 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. PELLY to address the House, for 25 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) to address the House, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHENCK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 30 minutes, on May 25.

Mr. MCCORMACK, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. RYAN), for 5 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WHITENER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana to include a letter in his remarks in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana to revise and extend his remarks on the Science and Astronautics bill, and to include certain material.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

MRS. GRANAHAN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KING of New York.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. CONTE.

Mr. WALLHAUSER.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RYAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOWNING.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. EVINS.

Mr. BOYKIN.

Mr. DADDARIO.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 306. An act to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III.

H.J. Res. 398. An act authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 25, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

948. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

949. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

950. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the annual report of tort claims paid by the Department of State during calendar year 1960, pursuant to the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U.S.C. 2673); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

951. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

952. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 9, 1961, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on an interim report on hurricane survey of Fernandina Beach, Fla., authorized by Public Law 71, 84th Congress, approved June 15, 1955 (H. Doc. No. 173); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 2585. A bill relating to the credits against the employment tax in the case of certain successor employers; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HOLIFIELD: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H.R. 7209. A bill to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 133. An act giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States; without amendment (Rept. No. 427). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6835. A bill to simplify the payment of certain miscellaneous judgments and the payment of certain compromise settlements; without amendment (Rept. No. 428). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABERNETHY (by request):

H.R. 7265. A bill to amend the code of law for the District of Columbia so as to provide a new basis for determining certain marital property rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 7266. A bill to encourage and promote the expansion through private enterprise of domestic exports in world markets; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7267. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mineowners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H.R. 7268. A bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a member of a church whose doctrines forbid participation in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program may elect to have any of his employment or self-employment excluded from coverage under such program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 7269. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in major disasters; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7270. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code with respect to Indian reservation roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7271. A bill to provide an exemption from participation in the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program for individuals who are opposed to participation in such program on grounds of conscience or religious belief; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 7272. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code to provide for payment for unused compensatory time owing to deceased postal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7273. A bill to authorize Government agencies to provide quarters, household furniture and equipment, utilities, subsistence, and laundry service to civilian officers and employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7274. A bill to provide that the retailers excise tax on jewelry and related items shall not apply to articles sold at retail for less than $5; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 7275. A bill to authorize the use of surplus grain by the States for emergency use in the feeding of resident game birds and other wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7276. A bill to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to caretakers in the employ of the National Guard or Air National Guard of a State, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. INOUYE:

H.R. 7277. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow the standard deduction in the case of certain departing aliens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7278. A bill to amend the act of June 5, 1952, so as to remove certain restrictions on the real property conveyed to the Territory of Hawaii by the United States under authority of such act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 7279. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act relative to hearings concerning the lawfulness of new rate schedules; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7280. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Elmer E. Ellsworth National Monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 7281. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an individual a deduction from gross income for tuition paid by him for his own education or for the education of other individuals at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H.R. 7282. A bill to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7283. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7284. A bill to provide for the establishment of a soil and water conservation research field station; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7285. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of 300 years of operation of hotels in America, and the 50th annual convention of the American Hotel Association; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7286. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a water carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of or an interest in another so engaged so that all modes of transportation may have equal opportunity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7287. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of an air carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein, so that all modes of transportation may have equal opportunity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7288. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to remove certain restrictions as to persons who may engage in the business of a motor carrier and upon the issuance of certificates or approvals for engaging in such business or acquiring control of another engaged therein, so that all modes of transportation may have equal opportunity; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 7289. A bill to provide for increases in the uniform allowances of Government employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7290. A bill to amend section 541 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increased pension for widows of World War I, World War II, or Korean conflict veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 7291. A bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7292. A bill to provide for the publication of the Official Register of the U.S. Civil Service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SANTANGELO:

H.R. 7293. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of professional engineering, physical science, and related positions in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SIBAL:

H.R. 7294. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of certain contributions to nonprofit medical research organizations and to provide exemptions for certain excise taxes for such organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of Virginia:

H.R. 7295. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, to provide a deduction for railroad grade crossing expenditures undertaken for the public's safety and convenience at the direction of a governmental authority; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7296. A bill to establish equitable railroad freight rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7297. A bill to amend sections 216(c) and 305(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the establishment of through routes and joint rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7298. A bill to amend section 2(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to members of the crews of certain fishing vessels; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7299. A bill to provide a program of tax adjustment for small business and for persons engaged in small business; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7300. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for public elementary and secondary schools, to amend Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7301. A bill to amend section 407 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7302. A bill to clarify the powers of the Civil Aeronautics Board in respect of consolidation of certain proceedings; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7303. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, so as to authorize the imposition of civil penalties in certain cases; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7304. A bill relating to the use of Civil Aeronautics Board records and testimony of Board personnel regarding aircraft accidents; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7305. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the separation of subsidy and airmail rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7306. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to prohibit certain practices regarding passenger ticket sales and reservations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7307. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7308. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to regulate the depreciation accounting of air carriers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7309. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to provide for the regulation of rates and practices of air carriers and foreign air carriers in foreign air transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7310. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, in order to (1) assure for the Civil Aeronautics Board independent participation and representation in court proceedings, (2) provide for review of nonhearing Board determinations in the courts of appeals, and (3) clarify present provisions concerning the time for seeking judicial review; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 7311. A bill to exempt certain personnel employed without compensation by the House Committee on the Judiciary from certain provisions of the conflict of interest statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 7312. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 7313. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 7314. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON:

H.R. 7315. A bill to increase rates of death compensation payable under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7316. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

H.R. 7317. A bill relating to the deduction for income tax purposes of contributions to charitable organizations whose sole purpose is making distributions to other charitable organizations, contributions to which by individuals are deductible within the 30-percent limitation of adjusted gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7318. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 7319. A bill relating to the application of the terms "gross income from mining" and "ordinary treatment processes normally applied by mine owners or operators in order to obtain the commercially marketable mineral product or products" to certain clays and shale for taxable years beginning before December 14, 1959; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 7320. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.J. Res. 433. Joint resolution authorizing the State of Arizona to place in the Statuary Hall collection at the U.S. Capitol the statue of Eusebio Francisco Kino; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.J. Res. 434. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. Con. Res. 317. Concurrent resolution launching an international communication satellite called Star of Hope, to transmit messages of peace and brotherhood to the world in all major languages; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Con. Res. 318. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, the President should transfer to the Department of Defense functions of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARRY:

H. Con. Res. 319. Concurrent resolution authorizing a summer recess for the 1st session of the 87th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRUCE:

H. Res. 310. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. Res. 311. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 312. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H. Res. 313. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H. Res. 314. Resolution relating to exchange of Cuban prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H. Res. 315. Resolution relating to exchange of Cuban prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H. Res. 316. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN:

H.R. 7321. A bill for the relief of Eden Lane Lederer and Betty Lane Lederer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN (by request):

H.R. 7322. A bill for the relief of Donald and Dee Tjiong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 7323. A bill for the relief of Gaetano Fuccio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7324. A bill for the relief of Cecelia Costa Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 7325. A bill for the relief of Jacob Zelig Goldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 7326. A bill for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot Carpenter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 7327. A bill for the relief of Maxine Angela Lazarus and Barbara Theresa Lazarus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H.R. 7328. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Simpson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7329. A bill for the relief of Nora Pattison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 7330. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eleonora Vasconi (nee Trentanove); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 7331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Teru Namba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 7332. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

159. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Frances W. Hoffman, National Society Daughters of Colonial Wars, Raleigh, N.C., transmitting various resolutions adopted at the annual assembly of the National Society Daughters of Colonial Wars, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Bill To Establish the Elmer T. Ellsworth National Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLETON J. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide for the establishment of the Elmer T. Ellsworth National Monument at Mechanicville, N.Y.

A monument such as this seems especially appropriate to this brilliant young American who was the first Union officer killed in the Civil War. His sudden death in Alexandria, Va., on May 24, 1861, just one century ago, is now regarded as a martyrdom and his name has been meritorious enrolled upon the list of our country's greatest patriots.

Elmer T. Ellsworth was born on April 11, 1837, in the village of Malta, N.Y. He attended the public schools at Mechanicville and after leaving school at an early age, he went to New York City to find employment. From New York, he traveled to Chicago where he became a lawyer's clerk, studied law, and later became a partner in a patent-soliciting business.

While practicing law in Chicago, Ellsworth was asked to become captain of the National Guard Cadets, a military company of volunteers who were in danger of disbanding due to lack of leadership. Ellsworth's life ambition was to become a military leader and he organized the cadets under a new title, "The U.S. Zouave Cadets," which he patterned after a Berber military corps organized by the French in Algeria in 1831. His aim was to induce a military spirit among Americans to increase the efficiency of the Nation's militia. The exhibitions given by the Zouave Cadets attracted considerable attention in Chicago and they became well-known throughout the country while making exhibition tours in many large cities.

When Ellsworth returned to Chicago in 1860, from an exhibition tour of eastern cities, he entered the law office of Abraham Lincoln as a clerk and devoted himself principally to the presidential campaign of that year. He later accompanied the President-elect to Washington and at this time proposed to President Lincoln the formation of a militia bureau, with himself as its chief. From this proposal, developed today's National Guard Bureau in the Departments of the Army and the Air Force.

The Civil War broke out while Ellsworth was awaiting the outcome of his proposal for a militia bureau. He went to New York and immediately recruited a volunteer regiment of Zouaves from the New York City Fire Department. When Lincoln issued his appeal for 75,000 troops, Ellsworth and his volunteer "Fire" Zouaves were ready to be sworn in. They arrived in Washington on April 29 and were quartered in the House of Representatives. In a ceremony at the east front of the Capitol on May 7, 1861, the regiment was sworn into Federal service and became officially known as the 11th New York Volunteer Infantry.

On May 23, when Virginia cast its fateful vote to secede from the Union, it meant that Union troops were immediately to occupy Alexandria. Ellsworth and his "Fire" Zouaves embarked down the Potomac on May 24 for his rendezvous with death. As his regiment landed in Alexandria, they saw a large Confederate flag flying from a pole on top of a hotel named the Marshal House. Determined to remove the flag, Ellsworth went to the roof of the hotel and as he descended the stairs with the flag in his arms, he was shot and killed by the hotel proprietor.

His death, being the first of note to occur in the war, produced a profound sensation throughout the country. His body lay in state in the White House, was taken to New York City by special train, and from there escorted to Albany and Mechanicville, where he is now buried.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I have introduced today is not only for the preservation of Elmer T. Ellsworth's home in Mechanicville, N.Y., but to also memorialize the birthplace of our Nation's first Civil War casualty.

Sale of Surplus Cotton Owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK, our distinguished majority leader, has introduced a bill, H.R. 6783, to provide for the sale of surplus cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation at such prices as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine in order to allow the U.S. cotton textile industry to regain the level of exports of cotton products during the period 1947–52.

This bill, if enacted, will do much to alleviate the distressing situation existing in the textile industry by reason of the so-called two-price cotton system which prevails today. The principle of the bill is in line with the seven-point program announced recently by the President for the relief of the textile industry.

The bill deserves the support of every Member of the House who is interested in protecting the jobs of the people who are employed in this country in the great textile industry. Mr. MCCORMACK has had correspondence recently with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce with respect to his measure. With the thought that my colleagues in the House might like to read the correspondence he has had with these officials I request that a copy of a letter from Mr. MCCORMACK to the Secretary of Commerce, dated May 15, 1961, and the reply thereto from the Secretary dated May 19, 1961, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with a copy of Mr. MCCORMACK's letter of May 23, 1961, to the Secretary of Agriculture:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., May 15, 1961.

Hon. LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY HODGES: I noted in the newspaper recently that President Kennedy is taking steps to try and meet the problems of the textile industry of our country, and that in connection with the same he has appointed a Cabinet Committee, of which you are the chairman. From the newspaper item that I read, this committee has suggested to the President a program of assistance to this industry and is giving further consideration to this important matter.

Several years ago I introduced a bill which I thought was a fair one, but with reference to which no action was taken. I have again introduced the bill, H.R. 6783, a copy of which I herewith enclose, which touches one phase only of the problem in the field of textiles, but which I consider to be an important one. I think the passage of this bill would be of material help to the textile industry. I have always felt that it was a fair one.

I am respectfully forwarding the within copy of the bill that I have introduced for the information of yourself and your associates on the committee. I have written to Chairman COOLEY of the House committee, urging early and favorable action. I think that he and the members of the committee are waiting to find out what legislation will be recommended by the committee of which you are chairman. I think the within bill should receive favorable consideration by you and the other members of your committee.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MCCORMACK: Thank you so much for your good letter of May 15, 1961, about your bill to provide for the sale of surplus cotton owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation at such prices as the Secretary of Agriculture may determine to allow the U.S. cotton textile industry to regain the level of exports of cotton products during the period 1947–52.

This is a most interesting bill, indeed, and is along similar lines to the thinking which the President's Textile Committee has had.

As you know, this committee made a verbal report to the President and based on it the President announced a seven-point program. One of these points was for the Secretary of Agriculture to advise him with respect to the elimination of the so-called two-price cotton system. The textile industry should

not be discriminated against by paying higher prices for cotton than that at which foreign importers of cotton are permitted to buy.

We are now waiting a report on this matter from the Secretary of Agriculture, which I hope will be forthcoming shortly. As soon as it is, I will be happy to advise you.

Obviously, legislation will be necessary to change this two-price system.

Thank you so much for your fine cooperation in this matter which is so important to one of our vital national industries.

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1961.

Hon. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
U.S. Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY FREEMAN: Under date of May 15 I wrote to Secretary Hodges in relation to H.R. 6783, which I have introduced, copy of which I herewith enclose. My letter to Secretary Hodges (in connection with this bill) will also constitute a part of this letter to you in conveying to you my thoughts in connection with such proposed legislation. You will note that this bill is nothing new in my mind; I introduced a similar bill several years ago.

Under date of May 19 I received a letter from Secretary Hodges in which he says, in part, "This is a most interesting bill, indeed, and is along similar lines to the thinking which the President's Textile Committee has had."

Secretary Hodges also said, in connection with the President's announced seven-point program, "One of these points was for the Secretary of Agriculture to advise him with respect to the elimination of the so-called two-price cotton system. The textile industry should not be discriminated against by paying higher prices for cotton than that at which foreign importers of cotton are permitted to buy."

Secretary Hodges further said in his communication of May 19, "We are now awaiting a report on this matter from the Secretary of Agriculture, which I hope will be forthcoming shortly. As soon as it is, I will be happy to advise you. Obviously, legislation will be necessary to change this two-price system."

I sincerely hope that action on this matter, particularly in connection with H.R. 6783, will be rapid and that you will quickly make a report to the committee on my bill.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. MCCORMACK.

Castro Hopes To Get Aid From U.N. Special Fund If Ransom Fails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if Castro's plot to get technical aid through ransom fails, he has another more civilized method in reserve. He hopes to get $1.1 million from the U.N. special fund, a technical aid fund to which the United States has pledged 40 percent.

The U.N. special fund is set up according to the basic framework for international loans. Requests are granted by a two-thirds vote of the governing council. The Cuban application lists a need for $763,500 for experts and consultants, $200,000 for equipment, and $50,000 for fellowships.

Mr. Speaker, several times I have protested this matter to the State Department with the hope that the request would be denied. A vote on this measure is due in the United Nations this afternoon. At this time I am sure that the membership of this body joins me in the hope that the U.S. delegation will prevent this grant of 440,000 U.S. dollars to Communist Cuba.

Address by Hon. Vance Hartke, of Indiana, Before Indiana Academic Advisory Council

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Saturday the distinguished junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] met in Indianapolis with the Indiana Academic Advisory Council for the first time. This group, organized by the Senator from Indiana, is composed of college professors from 25 colleges and universities in Indiana. Their purpose is to advise and counsel the Senator and to do research for him.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARTKE's opening remarks to the first meeting of the Indiana Academic Council be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPENING STATEMENT BY SENATOR VANCE HARTKE TO IAAC MEETING, INDIANAPOLIS, MAY 20, 1961

I want to welcome you here to the first meeting of the Indiana Academic Advisory Council. Thank you all for coming. This is, of course, a pioneer meeting of a pioneer group. I believe the meeting will be successful. I am certain that the council will make significant contributions as a group.

You may ask: Why such a meeting? Why such an organization of educators and scholars? The answer is a simple one. We need it.

America today faces a great challenge. In recent months we have come to the realization of the gravity of the times and the challenge. To survive as a free society, is is imperative that we make use of all the resources of our Nation. Since it is a challenge of culture, of thought and social philosophy, intellectual resources have become armaments.

We have seen that the battles of the cold war are being won and lost with ideas. The battlefields of the struggle are the minds of men the world over.

The challenges to our Nation are very real. We must, on one hand, develop our domestic society to provide jobs, goods, health, and happiness for an ever-increasing population. We must develop an educational system which can provide sufficiently for the coming generations of Americans in an evermore complex society. And we must do this in a world divided by philosophies of government where millions of people are having a 20th century world thrust into their semi-civilized lives.

To succeed in meeting these challenges, America needs the best minds, the best ideas, and the best analyses of the problems we face. That is the purpose of this council. I represent more than 4 million Hoosiers in the U.S. Senate. There with 99 others, we daily decide issues which determine the course of the free world.

It would be presumptuous indeed to represent without seeking the best source of counsel available. Your studies, your interests, your ideas can be contributions to the Nation's future if they are properly directed and acknowledged. That is the purpose of this council, to give you an outlet for meaningful ideas and considerate reflection.

The course of the legislative process dictates a regimentation of thought and efforts. It allows little time for free thinking and reflection. We become involved with techniques and details and have little time for consideration of theory and broad goals.

In the academic life, you have more time to develop ideas and theories and to make careful analysis of alternative courses. It is in this manner that I believe that you can make great contributions to the future of the American free society.

I am at once asking your help and offering you an opportunity to become active and influential in the conduct of our Government.

We have in Indiana many fine and respected institutions of higher learning. In this council we have represented more than 20 of these institutions. I am hopeful that soon the number of individuals and institutions will swell. The problems America faces are vast and there is a place for everyone who wants to contribute toward their solution. I am confident that the Indiana Academic Advisory Council can someday become recognized and respected as one of the important, vital sources of significant thought in America. I am confident that, in time, ideas which are spawned in meetings like this one will become the basis for legislation to be considered in the Congress.

As a group, the resources are many and varied. Working together, where possible, can result in individual and common benefits.

As you have been advised, we will divide into three discussion groups to consider individual areas of the one problem: The future of the American free society. We have prepared a general outline in each of the three areas setting forth some questions which seem from the vantage place of the Congress to be most important for your consideration. We do not want to bind you to the consideration of only these points or all of these points.

I would like to introduce the three discussion leaders:

Prof. Raymond P. Kent, professor of finance and business economics at the University of Notre Dame will lead the discussion on the domestic economy.

Dr. Robert P. Bell, head of the department of business education of Ball State Teachers College will head the discussion group on our education system.

And Dr. Joseph E. Hoskins, professor of political science at Earlham College will lead the consideration of our conduct of world affairs.

I want to emphasize my hopes that your discussions will proceed as free as possible.

Do not temper your considerations, comments or conclusions because of my personal political philosophy, party or legislative program. I want your ideas and reasoning.

I ask only that your considerations involve one aspect. How will the topic of discussion relate to the future of the free society? When we meet to consider the reports of the various discussion groups, I hope we will be able to come up with some explanations of why conclusions, or programs, or ideas will contribute to the future of the free society.

One of the great problems in selling our system is rationally justifying it to other societies. The why of the question has become more and more important. And, I am afraid, many times we are forced to use empty cliches when logical answers are needed. So, be thinking, if you will, of how to justify our society, our philosophy of government and our social system in terms of scholarly, irrefutable, logical explanations.

We want to follow the timing of the agenda as closely as possible. I intend only to be an observer in your discussions. If there are procedural questions, I will try to be helpful, but please do not ask me to become involved in your discourse.

Address by Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Tennessee and the district I have the honor to represent in the Congress were privileged and honored to have Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall as our visitor recently when he addressed the joint meeting of the Elk River Development Association and the Tennessee River Tributaries Association in Fayetteville.

Secretary Udall delivered a most forceful and significant address, and I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Udall's speech be reproduced in the RECORD.

Secretary Udall's address follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. STEWART L. UDALL, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, AT THE TENNESSEE RIVER TRIBUTARIES ASSOCIATION AND ELK RIVER DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION, FAYETTEVILLE, TENN., MAY 12, 1961

You do me a unique honor in asking me to talk with you about development of water resources. You were in the front lines of the long battle for water development in this region when I was a schoolboy in a little Arizona ranch town. You were among the first "New Frontiersmen" because you were pioneers in a coordinated, comprehensive river development plan. To all of you residents of the Tennessee Valley, the subject of water and its planned control and use is far from novel.

I understand your valleywide association is only slightly more than a year old. You can accomplish much through joint and coordinated action, and you hold it within your power to be of considerable assistance to the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. You are holding fast to the original brilliant concept of TVA. You well realize that we can no longer afford to be piecemeal in our development of water resources. We must devise plans which will transcend the interests of individual localities or agencies, and which will conform to a broad plan of integrated development of all the resources of a great watershed. This is no time for standpatters, it is no time for the overly cautious approach to resource development—it is a time for broad-gaged planning and bold action. President Kennedy has told us, "Failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever."

Years ago you and other farsighted men set the pattern. You saw the opportunities available in harnessing the mighty Tennessee and making it work for mankind. In so doing, you made the three letters TVA synonymous with the idea of overall basin development.

It wasn't a simple matter. I'm sure many of you vividly remember the slow and often disappointing struggle which you underwent before TVA became a reality. Perhaps by now, though, that stirring story is "old hat" to some of your neighbors in this valley. I know that you here tonight, representing various area development associations, have not forgotten and will not forget.

The world outside this beautiful valley of yours continues to hold up TVA as a shining example of the best that man can accomplish in utilizing nature. Just 6 days ago, the Christian Science Monitor carried a long story about the Cauca Valley Corporation, a new river development effort in the South American nation of Colombia. It quoted the English-speaking general manager of the CVC as saying, "We think we are admirably suited for a TVA-type development." It isn't the admittedly great water development works of Russia that these South Americans look to as a guide—it is your own, our own, TVA. And so it goes, everywhere in the free world. Do not, yourselves, become immune to the great accomplishments around you.

Not all of the development of the Tennessee River region is to be spoken of in the past tense. Part of the job still remains to be done. I'm sure you recall the words of the late George Norris who said in his autobiography that—"This program of controlling the surplus floodwaters of the great Mississippi Valley by storage in natural reservoirs situated on the main stream and along the tributaries is an immense one. It may never be fulfilled. That depends entirely upon the vision of the American people. It will require a vast amount of money to complete it; it will take years of planning and of labor to meet fully all of its factors; and yet it offers the only promise discovered by men for the effective control of floods and efficient conservation of natural resources."

Yes, you have begun to make real use of your river system—but you've only begun, as George Norris foresaw. Now you face the challenge of continuing with his great vision—yes, and that of many others as well. You who continue to hold to the vision, you who still have the evangelist's fervor and the salesman's persistence, must work together with the officials of the TVA to complete this project that is of great importance to all America. One of the dreams that you in the Southeast have long held is that of joining the Tennessee and the Tombigbee to cut off 600 miles of the long water journey from your ports to the gulf. The TVA itself was one such a "pipedream"—who knows, perhaps your later effort will be crowned with success. Certainly, this administration favors a stepped up program of long-range planning now in the resources field.

You leaders realize, too, that river development doesn't necessarily mean great power dams or navigation channels on every watercourse. You realize that some areas of this vast river basin are best suited for recreation development, others are promising for intensive agricultural undertakings, such as your growing poultry industry, or timber production, and some spots are best retained for the benefit of wildlife. There's room on the big Tennessee and its tributaries for all kinds of development. Not every mile of the system can be developed as a new Pittsburgh—just as not every mile can be drained farmland, a river park or a wildlife refuge. But every mile can be developed in some manner, with due consideration for economics and always with a progressive and far-sighted standard of feasibility that holds great faith in the future.

Listen again to George Norris' words: "Every drop of water that falls from the heavens to the earth beneath should perform its proper share of preserving the blessing God intends to bestow upon His people." Every drop of water in this watershed can be made to work, over and over again, and it must be done. The important thing, it seems to me, is to develop this homeland of yours that the natural resources so abundant here are utilized and conserved in the highest and best manner appropriate to the overall concept of basin development.

All of us in the Kennedy administration were enthused and challenged by the precedent-setting special message of the President concerning natural resources. Here was given all of us a blueprint for the construction of an integrated program for the wise conservation and use of our natural resources. If that stirring message could be summarized in only two words, I believe those words would be, "Think big."

We must all think big and act in accord with that thought. Here we can see that even George Norris, who thought some of the biggest thoughts ever to burst forth in the U.S. Senate, didn't think big enough. George Norris almost overlooked one of the primary items in the Tennessee River development—the recreation potential of water. Recreation is a latecomer on the list of benefits of comprehensive river development, and certainly we cannot blame the founding fathers of TVA for initially paying it little heed. But now, in a Nation of rising wages and increasing leisure time, recreational use of the TVA facilities is growing at an astonishing rate. Americans have discovered that yours is one of the most diverse and enjoyable outdoor recreation areas in our Nation. I'm told that an average of $8½ million worth of new recreation facilities is added each year at the reservoirs of the TVA. In addition to a total governmental recreation investment here of $120 million, there has been nearly an equal amount in private recreation investments such as cottages and resorts. You have close to 50,000 boats on your river system. Think what all this already means to the economy of your valley. Think what more it will mean in the years immediately ahead.

Everywhere in the United States recreation is becoming big business. We're going to have to think and act mighty big if we meet the pent-up recreation demand.

We in the Department of the Interior have taken this recreation boom, and the President's message, to heart. We are embarking on some big planning for recreation development throughout the United States. We feel that this is the moment of decision. What we do, or don't do, in the next 10 years will set the character of this Nation for generations to come. America's open space is disappearing rapidly at a time when all signs point to mounting demands for parks, parkways, recreation areas and wildlife refuges. We need open space in which to find outdoor enjoyment and refreshment of mind, body and spirit.

To meet this need we are laying plans for a program without parallel in our history.

Because much of this recreational development is of national impact, we want the Federal Government to take the lead in a program we're calling Parks for America. And we want to encourage local areas and States to do more through a cooperative effort. Only a few areas and a few States, notably New York and California, are keeping up or vigorously attempting to keep up with the mounting demand.

This generation, as we see it, has a "last chance" opportunity to save perhaps 15 or 20 million acres for national parks, another 2½ million acres for national recreation areas, more than a million acres for national parkways and scenic roads such as your Natchez Trace, 4½ million acres for wildlife refuge areas. The program will be costly, but every year we delay the costs will rise. Fortunately, much land we propose to retain as open space already is in public ownership. But, for 4.6 million acres of privately held land that we foresee as national park lands, the estimated cost has doubled in the past 10 years and is expected to nearly double again in the next 10. Make no mistake about it, if we do not act now the opportunity will vanish. What we save in the next 10 years may well be all we will ever have the chance to save.

These aren't the only ways in which we are undertaking to implement the natural resources program outlined by President Kennedy. We hold uppermost his warning that "Our Nation has been blessed with a bountiful supply of water; but it is not a blessing we can regard with complacency." In all those areas wherein we have primary responsibility for multiple-purpose water development we are hard at work drawing up plans for a resumption of the effort that shriveled into near nothingness during the past 8 years. In this we have as a shining example the transformation wrought in hydroelectric power production and consumption by your TVA. That transformation brought you from an area of relatively little electric use to one in which electric power consumption is nearly twice the per capita average for the rest of the Nation.

Too, we accept the goal of developing comprehensive river basin plans during the decade of the sixties, so that all parts of our country can follow the steps to progress that you have made.

And we share with others in the Government a concern that a major breakthrough be made, and made soon, on the growing problem of cleaning up our streams. Conserved water will be of little use if it is polluted water. No longer can we rely on the adage that "dilution is the solution to pollution." Something more, something positive, must be done. We face the imminent peril of having our major rivers become thousand-mile sewers.

No longer is water pollution a problem of a few metropolitan areas; it is a problem nationwide in scope. To meet it we must spend twice as much on municipal waste treatment plants as we now do. The administration's program for a grant-in-aid system to help communities meet this problem is the start. With its adoption perhaps I won't have to inhale the stench of the Potomac when I drive home on a hot day. Perhaps we will close out the business I read about recently in a magazine—the business some private enterpriser started on the Missouri River. He skims and sells the grease from the surface of the broad Missouri.

Already the Secretary of Agriculture and I are working together in another area to which the President directed his attention. Together we are formulating a comprehensive Federal recreational lands program and working to eliminate conflicts in fish and wildlife programs so that an increased and improved wildlife conservation effort may be made. If this takes some knocking together of a few bureaucratic heads, then Secretary Freeman and I are ready to do it.

I hope it goes without saying that in all these various fields of natural resource planning and development the Federal Government does not desire to move ahead alone. Nor does it expect to. We are heeding President Kennedy's view that only through the fullest participation and cooperation of State and local government and private industry can this task be done wisely and effectively. It's up to you folks just as much as it is to us. Resource development is a must—a natural, if you'll permit the pun. With our soaring population we are facing what I call the quite crisis. For all its quietness, this crisis in the field of resource development is just as real as the one we face in world affairs. America has the ability to meet this crisis—we aren't a poor Nation. Just a small part of the money we now spend on pointed-toed shoes and overpublicized gimmicks can have a beneficial effect for many generations if we direct the money into public investment. As progressive conservationists concerned with the efficient development of our Nation our job is cut out for us.

I'm sure I could do not better than to end with the closing words of the President's natural resources message: "The task is large but it will be done."

People-to-People Fellowship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the people-to-people program of the United States has no more enthusiastic center than my home town and the capital of Connecticut. This year, in another demonstration of community support for the exchange of peoples between countries, they have banded behind the selection of Dr. and Mrs. Robert E. Dunn of West Hartford, who will shortly depart for a stay in Birmingham, England.

The Dunns will leave Bradley Field by jet clipper on June 6 for London. In Birmingham, they will be the guests of the Birmingham Mail, and I have been assured by Kenneth B. Atkinson, our consul in Birmingham, that a full program has been arranged by the Birmingham sponsors for their visit.

In Hartford, the Dunns will be honored at a farewell luncheon on June 2. Meanwhile the community is planning for a visit in September from winners of the Birmingham contest. More than 150 clubs, organizations, and schools in the Greater Hartford area sent in suggestions and entries in selection of the Greater Hartford couple and showed great enthusiasm in the program.

Helping the program in Hartford throughout its search for representatives has been the Hartford Courant, the Nation's oldest newspaper of continuous circulation. The Courant will be host to the Birmingham couple in the fall, and its own cooperation with the Birmingham Mail is an excellent example of people-to-people relations in itself.

The two people who will be going to Birmingham as representatives of this country are outstanding. Dr. Dunn has been there before—he holds a special certificate from the Institute of Birmingham which he won while he was on a Rotary Foundation travel and study fellowship.

He is now vice principal of William Hall High School in West Hartford and has held that responsible assignment for 4 years. He met his wife while they were undergraduates at Bates College in Maine. He earned his master's and doctor's degrees at the University of Connecticut and was married 3 years ago. Mrs. Dunn, who teaches third grade at Braeburn School, West Hartford, holds a master's degree at the University of Hartford.

Their application for the people-to-people fellowship was sponsored by fellow teachers at Hall High and Braeburn as well as the Hall Parent-Teacher Association and the West Hartford and East Hartford Rotary Clubs.

I am sure they will make outstanding representatives of the American way of life in their visit to Birmingham and England. Looking over their schedule, I note that they have a rigorous time planned and I hope it will be a wonderful one for them and their country.

In exchange, a Birmingham wholesale merchant and his wife will be coming to Hartford for 2 weeks in September. He wanted to be a schoolteacher but the death of his father at an early age led to his becoming an insurance clerk. He served with the RAF in World War II and has had a most varied career.

I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to this remarkable and energetic example of a venture in international understanding; congratulate those who worked long and hard to make it a success and wish the best of luck to the ambassadors of good will who have been chosen.

Infiltration of Youth Organizations a Major Objective of the Communist Party

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in testimony just released by the House Appropriations Committee, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has warned that infiltration of youth organizations is one of the major objectives of the Communist Party today.

Parents, educators, clergymen—all who work with youth—and the youth themselves, should take careful note of this warning. Hoover's statement is not the only evidence that Communists are now making a concerted drive to win youth to their cause or dupe them into aiding it.

When representatives of 81 Communist Parties met in Moscow last November, work among youth was stressed as a most important phase of Communist activity. Khrushchev himself reminded Communists in all parts of the world of this in a major speech delivered on January 6. He said in this speech:

> Young people can be a powerful revolutionary force. No political party can so attract the youth as the Communists—the most revolutionary of all parties, and the youth delight in revolutionary action.

At its last convention in December 1959 the U.S. Communist Party adopted a resolution on youth activity which declared that "the youth membership of our party is growing faster than any other section, multiplying in some areas as much as tenfold in the past 2 years."

The same resolution stated:

> Truly, youth represents the future of the party * * * to work among youth is to work for the future.

Party members were told in the resolution that they were to give first attention to infiltrating existing youth organizations. They were informed that the party must begin laying the groundwork for the formation in the near future of a national Marxist youth organization. As you perhaps know, a preparatory conference for establishing such a group was held in Chicago at the end of last December.

This is a challenge to our youth and to all American adults as well. The true nature and history of communism—and of our own country—must be shown to our youth. Then they will not fall for the sugar-coated poison of Moscow.

Mr. Hoover testified that he saw a very healthy sign in the fact that some young people are beginning to realize that communism is not all it has been portrayed to be. We must make this more than a sign. We must make it a fact known to all young Americans.

This is the challenge the American people face today.

The Cold Fury of Hate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, events crowd in upon us and some of them make us weep for the depravities of mankind. How many beasts walk the earth in human form?

Earlier this month, we marked the 13th anniversary of the founding of Israel as an independent nation. On May 14, it was exactly 13 years since the day that the people of Israel proclaimed their freedom, and President Harry S. Truman immediately announced that our Government was recognizing the Government of Israel, in culmination of one of the most dramatic incidents of national courage ever demonstrated by any people.

Every American of good will, and every person of good will in the world, applauded the success of the Jewish people of Israel in establishing their own country in fulfillment of Biblical prophecy. While millions of people were aware of the courage and drive and the resourcefulness which went into the Israeli drive for independence, the stark background of events which provided the motivation for the final push was not really known or even guessed at.

We had read and heard much about the bestiality of the Nazi regime. The international trials of war criminals after the end of World War II brought out many of the facts, and sickened decent people everywhere.

DID WE FORGET TOO SOON?

Either we forgot too quickly, or else perhaps many of the horrors of the postwar trials could not be fully reported in those days because of the tremendous press of other earth-shaking news crowding onto the front pages following the end of World War II. In any event, the trial now taking place in Israel of the infamous Nazi who directed the liquidation of the Jewish people of Europe—and of many people of non-Jewish heritage who were also marked for extinction—has finally brought to public attention the extent and the depths of depravity of the hate mongers who followed the Hitler banner.

One cannot read the reports of the Eichmann trial without shock and despair over the aberrations of the human mind which too often show up in violence directed at minority groups.

TERROR IN THE UNITED STATES, TOO

And one cannot read the reports of violence in and around the bus terminals of Alabama these days without being reminded of Nazi terror and violence and human depravity.

It is perhaps fitting that the self-styled leader of the American Nazi Party has led a tiny band of followers in a symbolic hate ride into Alabama. If nothing else could bring the Hitler past to mind, this episode should do it.

Mr. Speaker, as a partisan of President Kennedy, my comments about the prompt and decisive actions of his administration in moving into the situation in Alabama might appear to be politically motivated. Therefore, in order to demonstrate that there is no partisanship in upholding decency, I submit for inclusion as part of my remarks a hard-hitting but objective editorial on the Alabama riots from one of the most Republican of newspapers in this country, the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The editorial, from the Inquirer of Monday, May 22, is as follows:

DESPICABLE, INTOLERABLE MOB RULE

The Government and people of the United States must never yield to the unreasoning force of a hate-driven, bigoted, riotous mob in Montgomery, Ala., or anywhere else in the country.

Disgraceful, unconscionable acts of racial violence on the streets of Montgomery over the weekend were a manifestation of inhumanity that cannot be tolerated in a nation dedicated to the dignity and liberty of the individual.

The Kennedy administration has properly and lawfully intervened on the side of justice—in fulfillment of constitutional obligations and moral duties.

Almost as outrageous as the attacks by the mob is the failure of public officials in the city of Montgomery and the State of Alabama to exercise fundamental functions of law enforcement.

When the freedom riders arrived in Montgomery, however questionable their methods may be, it was the duty of the police to take appropriate precautions to prevent violence. After violence erupted it was their duty to restore order and aid the injured.

The police made no satisfactory effort in this direction either before or after the mob exploded.

It should be noted that the victims of the mob's wrath included not only freedom riders, who are challenging the practice of racial segregation on buses, but other persons also. Negro pedestrians in the vicinity were attacked without provocation.

Moreover, the injured received no medical attention for hours in some cases while police made absurd excuses.

The dispatch of additional U.S. marshals to Alabama by Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy, with the approval of President Kennedy, is a move to strengthen law-enforcement capabilities of the Federal Government in an area where strengthening obviously is needed.

At issue is not Federal infringement upon local or State police power, as some Alabamans would have us believe, but the duty of the Federal Government to safeguard citizens whose lives and liberties are jeopardized by the inability or unwillingness of local and State police power to function.

The best way for Governor Patterson of Alabama to preserve State rights is to carry out State responsibilities. One important responsibility is the use of police power impartially for the protection and safety of all people regardless of race.

President Kennedy's message calling on State and municipal officials and the general public in Alabama to prevent and avoid "further outbreaks of violence" should be heeded by all concerned.

We hope the Justice Department backs up its latest denunciation of the Ku Klux Klan with vigorous on-the-scene efforts to curb vicious hate-mongers who incite mob action.

State and Federal court injunctions issued in the wake of the riots in Montgomery are the opening guns of what may be a lengthy legal battle in the courts, which is where the battle should be fought. But there should be no delays in the enforcement of law and order and the protection of the rights and safety of all citizens.

The lawless, merciless mob respects no rights—Federal, State, or individual. The violence in Alabama is a shameful episode—acts of desperation by misguided men who talk blandly of "their rights" while inflicting indefensible wrongs upon others.

The Public Opposes Federal Subsidies for Teachers' Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the House Education and Labor Committee today approved a bill which authorizes the Federal Government to spend roughly $2½ billion over the next

3 years to help in the construction of public school classrooms, and to improve the pay of the Nation's teachers.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this bill is defective in many respects. Especially objectionable is the bill's failure to discriminate between two quite different problems, toward which the Federal Government may well be said to have quite different responsibilities. It is one thing for Washington to help construct a building, and quite another for us to determine what is an adequate salary for a teacher in our public school system.

I am glad to say, Mr. Speaker, that the public appears to discriminate between these two types of programs.

In a questionnaire I recently sent to my constituents, I asked for their opinions on various subjects. On the question, "Do you favor Federal aid for school construction?" 55 percent answered "yes," while 40 percent were opposed and 5 percent had no opinion. On the question, "Do you favor Federal aid for teachers' salaries?" only 29 percent answered "yes," 64 percent were opposed, and 7 percent had no opinion.

Almost 8,000 people returned the questionnaire. This is a 40 percent return, the highest I have ever received in a poll of my constituents. This interest is heartening. So too is the unwillingness of the public to support ill-advised programs such as Federal subsidies for our Nation's teachers.

The final results of my questionnaire are as follows:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Federal aid for school construction?	55	40	5
2. Federal aid for teachers' salaries?	29	64	7
3. Federal scholarships for higher education?	50	32	9
4. Replacing the electoral college with direct vote?	79	14	7
5. Medical care for the aged tied to social security?	53	39	8
6. Increasing minimum wage to $1.25 an hour?	49	41	10
7. Broadening scope of minimum wage coverage?	52	27	21
8. Federal aid for commuter railroads?	39	45	16
9. Construction of a jet airport in Morris County?	19	65	16
10. Establishment of a Peace Corps?	52	28	20

The Need for Middle Income Housing in My District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of a statement which I have submitted to the New York City Planning Commission dealing with a subject of vital interest to the people of my district, particularly those living in the Williamsburg section. There is a crying need for middle income housing in Williamsburg, and my plea is directed to the commission to provide such housing before the area is depleted of many of its fine families.

My statement reads as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION BY HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO, OF NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 1961

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the commission, the city of New York is composed of many neighborhoods and communities, rich in history and tradition in their own right. The area which we now call Williamsburg was itself a city in 1852. As the Congressman of the area involved in these proceedings permit me to say a few words in its behalf. The community of Williamsburg was established in 1792 by a merchant named Richard M. Woodhill who planned it as a residential development. Mr. Woodhill named the community after Col. Jonathan Williams, a distinguished citizen of the United States. Colonel Williams had a distinguished career as an engineer and the surveyor who laid out the roads for this community; as secretary to Benjamin Franklin; as commander at West Point and superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy; and concluded his career as a Member of the 14th Congress of the United States who died in office in 1815. Colonel Williams set up the forts and defenses for New York and in this period surveyed the area now known as Williamsburg.

The community of Williamsburg had difficulty in becoming established but in the 1800's the advent of the Wallabout and Newton Turnpike made commuting to Williamsburg easier and the community entered upon a period of rapid growth. By 1827 the community had prospered to the point where it was incorporated as a village by act of the legislature. On January 1, 1852, Williamsburg, now a thriving community, received a city charter. The new city prospered and lasted for a period of 2 years when it became a ward of the city of Brooklyn.

Over the years, the Williamsburg section has not suffered industrially. The proximity of Williamsburg to bridges, freight terminals, and marine facilities along the East River led early to the establishment of factories, lofts, and warehouses which have been maintained. Among the better known plants in the area are the F & M Schaefer Brewing Co., Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., Liebmann Breweries, Inc., Charles Pfizer Drug Co., Socony Mobil Oil Co. refinery and several other large plants.

The most serious problem which has faced this community has been a depletion of responsible citizenry. Williamsburg increased in population at the turn of the century when Jewish immigrants settled there to be near their brethren on Manhattan's lower East Side. They moved into the area in great numbers after the opening of the Williamsburg Bridge in 1903 and were followed by other immigrant families of Italian extraction. After the holocaust of World War II, 15,000 orthodox Jewish refugees from Nazi persecution settled in Williamsburg. The advent of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway cut a winding path through most of Williamsburg uprooting thousands of these people.

In the past 15 years there has been a decided population shift. What was once a community with a substantial middle-class citizenry has begun to change in both the ethnic and socio-economic character of the population.

An increase in industrialization has been partially responsible for this population trend but the real answer lies in the fact that the majority of housing facilities in this community are 60 years of age or over and the housing developments constructed in the past 15 years have been geared to those in the lowest socio-economic class. Thus, thousands have been displaced and more than 20,000 persons in the lowest economic classification have moved into the community, all of whom have made good citizens, by the way.

The result of this trend may best be pointed up by the comment of Leila Morgan, executive secretary of the district's health committee, who as early as November of 1954 was quoted in the press as saying: "Our leadership in the health committee keeps moving away. All our chairmen move to Queens, Westchester, and the suburbs."

Here lies the answer to many of the serious social problems that affect the Borough of Brooklyn. Let us never forget that it was a responsible middle class that expanded undeveloped land into a thriving community and thence into a flourishing city. It is this kind of citizenry we must rely on to lead in community activities. Time and again sociological studies have been made and whether it be juvenile delinquency or better housekeeping facilities in the city, all studies will agree that it is community leadership which provides the only answer to this problem. Those in the lowest economic strata of our society are burdened with the chores of earning their bread. These are the families where both parents work. These are the families where children are unsupervised, where there is no time for participation in the religious, cultural, and civic activities of the community.

The exodus of the old citizens of Williamsburg into the suburbs and even neighboring States must be stopped. These people whose roots lie in Williamsburg; who have over the years been the leaders in community activities should not be displaced. And, these are the very vital reasons why I appear here today to implore this commission to act promptly in establishing middle income housing for the leaders of Williamsburg who may be scattered to the suburbs and other States.

Gentlemen, I know this community and have been proud to represent it in the Halls of Congress for almost 9 years. The people of Williamsburg are honest, industrious, hard-working citizens who have a proud tradition fostered over many years which they wish to sustain. I ask you to permit them to remain. I implore you to take action so that the great cultural and religious traditions that have evolved from our Jewish community over the past two decades and have achieved worldwide recognition, may be continued. I beseech you on behalf of the other old and established elements in our community who wish to remain and continue their religious, charitable and community service. Do not let these people go. Stop this mass exodus.

I look forward to a revival of civic activities in Williamsburg. I look forward to an integrated community where those in the lowest socio-economic level may live in peace and harmony with the older elements in the community who are granted access to this middle income housing. Then, Williamsburg will have the leadership necessary to guide the less fortunate and actively participate on the local level in programs of rehabilitation and assistance that will permit the community to act as it has in the past in meeting and solving its own problems.

In conclusion, permit me to thank Chairman Felt and all of the members of this commission for their study and considerate judgment of this very important situation.

Your prompt action in facilitating the erection of such housing will mean that this proud section of Brooklyn will once again flourish and assume even greater responsibilities for which we can all be proud. I congratulate you in advance for establishing a better Williamsburg which means a better Brooklyn and a better city of New York.

To Gale H. Wilcox, for Heroism Far Above the Call of Duty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, "A greater gift hath no man than to lay down his life for a friend." Gale H. Wilcox, district park ranger in the Grand Teton National Park who had served his Nation for nearly 25 years, was given the Department of the Interior's Valor Award, posthumously, for sacrificing his life to save another's. At the 25th Honor Award Convocation, his widow received the Department's recognition, reserved for employees who demonstrate unusual courage involving a high degree of personal risk in the face of danger, whether or not it be in the line of duty. Also, recently, the Carnegie Hero Fund Commission presented him, posthumously, its bronze medal for heroism.

Under any circumstances and at any time a human being makes this sacrifice, it is worthy of continuing commendation and public notice. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the citation of the Department of the Interior:

CITATION FOR VALOR AWARD, GALE H. WILCOX, FOR COURAGEOUS ACTION IN THE FACE OF DEATH

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington.

While on ski patrol with two other park rangers in Grand Teton National Park on March 9, 1960, District Park Ranger Wilcox lost his life after breaking through the ice on Jackson Lake during an attempt to rescue one of his companions. Mr. Wilcox and Assistant Chief Ranger Stanley H. Spurgeon had skied, one at a time, across the ice-covered channel when Ranger John Fonda, who followed them, broke through the ice. Although he could not swim, Mr. Wilcox joined his companion in an attempt to get Mr. Fonda to safety. Rescue efforts failed when the ice ledge broke, plunging all of them into the icy water. Mr. Wilcox, valiantly and heroically, tried to save Mr. Fonda until he became exhausted and had to be dragged from the water by Mr. Spurgeon. The exertion and exposure proved to be more than Mr. Wilcox could physically withstand, and he advanced into a state of shock from which he did not recover. For heroism and courage far beyond the call of duty in an effort to save the life of a fellow worker, resulting in the loss of his own life, Mr. Wilcox is granted, posthumously, the Valor Award of the Department of the Interior.

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Protection of Marine Mammals on the High Seas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very informative statement presented by my good friend and colleague, Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, in behalf of his bill, H.R. 777, to provide for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. SAYLOR. I am John P. Saylor, Representative from the 22d District of Pennsylvania, and the author of a bill which Chairman BOYKIN has been kind enough to schedule for hearing this morning, H.R. 777, a bill to provide for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes.

I want to say to the members of this committee that I appreciate your having scheduled this bill and having scheduled it at a time when it was possible for me to be here as a witness.

Many years ago, when I began to read of the accounts of what was happening to our polar bear and to our walrus and the sea otter under the guise of sportsmanship, I became gravely concerned because all of the information that was made available to me indicated that it was not sportsmanship but in a sense ruthless slaughter. I was brought up by a father who believed that his sons should be taught to hunt and fish, and also brought up with the idea that, if you hunted and fished, it was to your advantage to match your skills against nature and, being given the undue advantage of having a gun or the latest in fishing equipment, you should more than be able to match your skills against nature.

Finding out that many people were going hunting polar bears by ruthlessly killing them from the air with rifles and never attempting to go back and pick up the carcass except to write and say that they had flown 130 miles out over the ice barrier north of Alaska, that they had succeeded in killing two or three polar bear or at least left trails of blood and finding that on many occasions people went out in the same plane or in another plane and reported back that they had killed several walrus and made no attempt whatsoever to recover them, this under the guise of sportsmanship, bothered me and many years before Alaska became a State I took the matter up with the Department of Fish and Wildlife downtown and had them draft a bill to protect in some way these marine mammals which are rapidly disappearing.

It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that I am extremely grateful this morning for this opportunity to testify on behalf of H.R. 777 which I introduced on the third day of January of this year which will provide for the protection of three important and rather unique marine mammals.

As I say, I am pleased to have sponsored this legislation which is vital to the improved management of the polar bears, the walrus, and sea otters. Its enactment is of importance not only to Alaskans, whose interests I have consistently supported, but it is also in my opinion vital to the welfare of the people of the United States in general.

A primary consideration of the drafting of this legislation is the international character of these three marine mammals, especially the polar bears and the walrus. The range of the polar bear, for example, encompass hundreds of thousands of square miles of the north polar basin. The animals contribute to the existence of native villages, and they are taken by either or both natives and sport hunters in Canada, Russia, United States, Norway, Denmark (Greenland), and Sweden.

The Pacific walrus migrates in and out of the territorial waters of the United States and Russia and the high seas. Polar bears wander all over the international ice fields.

The language in H.R. 777 that relates to proposed authority for the Federal Government "on and along the coast of the United States" was inserted with the idea of providing a single jurisdiction of responsibility. The benefits and savings that come from eliminating duplication in manpower and equipment are obvious. It is not my intention to seek to usurp the prerogatives of the new State of Alaska in the management of natural resources that are resident within its boundaries. It is a reasonable expectation that the appropriate Alaskan agency will continue to devote its most intensive effort to the resource problems that are of its greatest magnitude and concern. My intention is to assist them in accomplishing this and not to take away any responsibility that already is theirs.

You men might recall that, when the Alaskan statehood bill was passed, Alaska was the only State that was ever admitted to the Union that was not given complete jurisdiction over its fish and wildlife resources. The bill admitting Alaska to the sisterhood of States specifically provided that the Department of the Interior should continue to have jurisdiction over the fish and wildlife resources of this new State until the Department of the Interior was satisfied that the new State was in a position to handle its own natural resources.

After a series of conferences between the officials of the new State of Alaska and the Department of the Interior, the Department of the Interior passed over to the new State of Alaska jurisdiction over its fish and wildlife resources and that State now enjoys the same privilege that all of the other States of the Union do.

The proper application of the responsibility vested by H.R. 777 would provide maximum opportunity for the exchange of personnel, equipment, knowledge, and experience between the State and the Federal agencies in the improved management of these marine mammals. The predominate distribution and use of these natural resources is international. It is my hope that this legislation will assist the Alaskan program and that it will be bolstered and improved through the provision of a working authority for the study and wise management of these animals in international waters. Only the Federal Government can work out agreements with other nations for the overall benefit of these international resources.

Sport hunters, in their pursuit of polar bear trophies, go considerable distances over international waters. The hunting is done almost exclusively from the air, and the pilot-guides fly their clients as far as 160 miles out over the pack ice in search of this big white mammal. Most of the walrus are also taken outside of the territorial waters. It is entirely possible for a person to go onto

the high seas and take and process walrus, without once touching shore in Alaska.

The life history of the sea otter is fairly well known and the animals have benefited from protection for years which was provided, I am happy to report to this committee, by its predecessor somewhere around the turn of the century. Their number is now believed to be satisfactory, and the resource appears secure after having risen from a point of virtual extinction in the early part of this century. The fur of the sea otter is extremely valuable, and the comparative quality of other furs is rated against that of the sea otter. Perhaps limited harvests of sea otter may again become a possibility, but we must be sure that the resource is not jeopardized.

Little is known about the life history of walrus, and much less of the polar bear. Speculation about the welfare of these two species has been expressed many times. The Copenhagen meeting of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature in 1956 expressed the concern of scientists from all over the world about the status and future welfare of polar bears and walrus.

The Canadians for several years have prohibited the taking of polar bears by white hunters. Canadian natives are believed to kill about 400–500 animals a year, more than half of the total world take. Figures on the world harvest of polar bears are included in the reprint "Status and Management of the Polar Bear and Pacific Walrus," which I would ask to have included as a part of your files. This was a report that was issued by Robert F. Scott, Karl W. Kenyon, John L. Buckley, and Sigurd T. Olson in conjunction with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries. This reprint presents much timely information about these animals, their status, and the many management problems that have arisen.

Remote native villages along the arctic coast of Alaska derive a substantial part of their annual income from providing services and supplies to sport hunters who go there from all parts of the world in quest of the polar bear. It was estimated in 1957 that the nonresident polar bear hunters spent on an average of $2,000 apiece in a trip to kill one of these or acquire one of these trophies. This excludes the transportation and other costs borne by the shooters in traveling to and coming from Alaska. The hunting of bear by the white man is done almost exclusively from the air. The flying presents many hazards to the small aircraft, and when there are mishaps the task of rescuing the stranded hunters falls to the Federal Government, the Coast Guard, and the military from its establishments.

Natives of at least two Alaskan villages, Diomede Island and King Island, get their major subsistence from the walrus. The animals provide needed food both for humans and their dogs. The hides are used in covering boats, and the ivory is worked into implements and artifacts of considerable commercial value. Most of the animals are taken in international waters. Villagers on St. Lawrence Island also depend on the walrus, but not as intensively as the natives in the other islands.

The reprint that I have submitted notes that about half of the walrus killed are not retrieved. The total yearly kill by inhabitants of Alaska and Siberia is placed at about 10,500 animals, or 23 percent of the estimated population. The walrus population is believed to increase at about 11 percent per year under conditions where the animals are not hunted. This means that the annual kill is roughly twice the replacement. How long can this resource exist under such a situation without some protection?

Many conservationists throughout the circumpolar region share my conviction that an essential first step toward providing protection for polar bears and walrus rests on the provision of international protection such as suggested by H.R. 777.

These are changing times, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, and it is not appropriate, in my thinking, that any past inequities of Federal control of these resources, or the limited purview and financial means of the new State of Alaska, should be cited as a means of discounting the advisability of enacting H.R. 777. These marine mammals are in remote international waters only where the conscience of man stands between their preservation or extinction. Little is known about their basic biology, their needs, and the total numbers of the animals from which these kills are being made. Steps must be taken so that the subsistence and economy of dependent Alaskans can be protected.

Objections that may be imposed to H.R. 777 by a State whose waters constitute a mere fraction of the immense natural range of these nomadic animals should not be construed as a rejection of the principles that are involved. The wide-ranging movements of these animals and what happens to them while they are beyond the authority of Alaska, can and will have a direct influence on their ultimate use and contribution to persons operating within or beyond the boundary of Alaska. I wish to reiterate that most of the animals taken by residents and nonresidents are in international waters.

If we have erred in the management of these valuable resources in the past, and that is what most persons believe is the case, the blame can be placed on the fact that the United States has put off this vital decision for too long. I propose that we take this necessary step now, for the benefit of both the marine mammal resources and for the interest of all the people of the United States and for the people of the world who are interested in conserving these species.

I might say, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that, as controversial as this legislation might become, I am happy to report that since the original bill was drafted a favorable report was received from the Department of the Interior and the other departments of Government; and that not only the past administration but the present administration has reported that they are in favor of the enactment of this legislation.

I want to thank the members of this committee for the opportunity to appear and testify.

Good Old Days in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, many of us talk about the weather, but nobody does anything about it. In the same manner, many of us talk about the "good old days," but nobody ever does anything to bring them back—that is nobody, except good old Brooklyn, N.Y.

Here we are discussing today such matters as aircraft missiles and appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to launch more and newer satellites into space, men in space, trips to the moon, which only a few short years ago seemed fantastic and almost impossible.

But in Brooklyn today they are turning the clock back to the good old days, the days of bustles and bows, the Keystone cops, and the horse-drawn trolley car. That "garden spot of the world" known as Greenpoint, located in my congressional district in Brooklyn, is today beginning its annual celebration of the good old days in an effort to recapture some of the spirit and the gayety of those carefree days of our grandfathers and grandmothers.

On Greenpoint's streets, beginning at 7 o'clock this evening, the folks will be wearing the fashions of yesteryear. The stores will be decorated to look like the oldtime stores. A cavalcade will make its way through the streets. A barbershop quartet will sing such delightful favorites from grandpa's hit parade as "Sweet Adeline," "Genevieve," and "I'll Take You Home Again, Kathleen." Of course, Miss America of 1895 will be there. There will be free rides on the pony-drawn Toonerville Trolley. There will also be clowns galore, horseless carriages, and prizes for novel ideas to bring back the old days.

Mr. Speaker, I am torn betwixt and between. I know I should be in Brooklyn today with my constituents, reliving the good old days and partaking of all the fun and excitement. But duty calls in Washington and I must help "mind the store" here in these crucial days. So while my heart is in Brooklyn, my place is here. We may not be able to bring back the good old days for good, but if we succeed in achieving true peace for the world, perhaps future generations will someday think of our days, too, as the good old days.

Postmaster General Wrong on Postal Guidelines Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy and considerable argument both pro and con ever since the so-called guidelines regulations were introduced into the Post Office operations under Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield. As you know, these same regulations have been continued under Postmaster General J. Edward Day.

No responsible person will quarrel with the primary purpose of the "guidelines" system, which is to speed up production in the working of the mail. There is, however, considerable disagreement as to whether the system has actually accomplished this purpose. There can be no question with regard to the demoralizing

effect the system has on the morale of the postal employees.

In discussing this aspect of the regulations with representatives of the Allied Postal Clerks Union of Greater Seattle, a recent statement by Postmaster General J. Edward Day was brought to my attention. Mr. Day expressed extreme skepticism with regard to the extent of employee objection to the guidelines system, as reported to him by the leaders of the employee organizations. He indicated that these objections were greatly exaggerated.

Acting on my suggestion, the guidelines committee of the Seattle Postal Union undertook a simple ballot survey, to ascertain the rank and file opinion with regard to the guidelines system. The results of this poll are included with my remarks and certainly do not support the Postmaster General's skeptical attitude with regard to employee acceptance of these regulations:

SEATTLE POSTAL UNION OFFICIAL GUIDELINES SURVEY BALLOT

Postmaster General J. Edward Day recently made the statement that "it is questionable if the rank and file employees object to the (guidelines) system anywhere near to the degree as purported by the leaders of employee organizations."

1. Are you in favor of guidelines?

Yes, 6; no, 292.

American Seapower: A Great Speech by Hon. Herbert C. Bonner, on Maritime Day 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, May 22, I had the privilege of hearing a great address by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Hon. HERBERT C. BONNER, delivered at Fort Eustis, Va., at a joint meeting of the National Defense Transportation Association and the Propeller Club, Port of Newport News, in observance of National Maritime Day.

The theme of Congressman BONNER'S speech, American seapower, brought the subject of our total maritime posture more clearly into proper focus and perspective than any statement I have ever heard or read.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of every Member of Congress the thoughtful and penetrating remarks of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in his splendid and timely address on our dependence as a maritime nation upon seapower in its commercial and naval entirety. We must not forget, in our preoccupation with outer space, that the destiny of the world we live in can be determined on the seas which comprise some three-quarters of the earth's surface.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of Chairman BONNER'S great speech:

It is an honor and a great pleasure to be here at Fort Eustis to observe National Maritime Day at the joint meeting of the Propeller Club, Port of Newport News, and the National Defense Transportation Association.

I think it is particularly auspicious that this meeting should be held here at Fort Eustis, the splendid transportation training command center of the Army. The atmosphere of the occasion is further enhanced by the 344 merchant vessels of the National Defense Reserve Fleet lying at anchor only a few yards away in the James River. And down the stream, only a few miles away, stand the facilities of the great Newport News Shipbuilding & Drydock Co., bulwark of this Nation's waterborne military and commercial might for 75 years.

Most of you have heard Maritime Day speeches before.

Frequently they consist of fine phrases of praise—pleasant to the ears of members of the merchant shipping fraternity. Much is said about the "fourth arm of defense" in a context which makes it sound terribly important and able to function alone in the welfare of our country.

Here at Fort Eustis, enjoying the hospitality of the Army, and in the presence of the National Defense Transportation Association, composed as it is of representatives of all forms of transportation, I am going to speak on seapower, a subject which involves all who are here tonight—in time of peace and in time of war.

I would like to discuss American seapower in its total sense, and its importance to our future. For, more than ever today, we are a maritime Nation dependent upon our seapower in its commercial and naval entirety.

"Seapower," as I am speaking of it, is not merely Polaris submarines or 33-knot liners.

As Adm. Arleigh Burke, our great Chief of Naval Operations, stated only a month ago: "* * * seapower relies on far more than ships and weapons systems. Our capability to exert effective naval power when and where we need it rests on our natural assets of geography and material resources. It depends too on our shipbuilding capacity and it rests very heavily on the technical and design skills of our naval engineers. Seapower includes all those things which enable a nation to use the sea advantageously during peace or war."

And he might well have added: "The concerted, continued, and dedicated cooperation of the men who man the ships and handle them at portside."

We tend to take our maritime position for granted, but we do so at our peril. We must rid ourselves of the myopia of recent years which placed the expediencies of bookkeeping above national maritime strength and which made the accountant the prime arbiter of the policies governing the sinews of our seapower.

We must insure that in the immediate years ahead we not only overcome the effects on our maritime posture of past neglect and shortsightedness, but that we push forward our maritime frontiers. We must proceed without delay in modernizing and strengthening our U.S. merchant marine. We must move ahead, to gain maximum effectiveness and efficiency from the new technologies.

We must aggressively compete for trade—the trade which provides the basic link of common interest between us and our allies, and the undecided nations of the world. The volume of this trade will expand in the years ahead and means must be found to insure that our merchant marine carries a sharply increased portion of it.

It is not only our commercial interest and balance of payments that are affected.

In our struggle with the Communist world, trade is a key factor—a potent weapon for the side which will effectively use it. We want the future to see our products, moving in American merchant ships under the shield of the Navy of the United States. Our trade, made possible by our seapower, can and must be the means of lifting up the undeveloped nations.

The Russians, though late to arrive on the maritime scene, have long been experts in political penetration. They fully understand the importance in the world struggle of trade and mercantile seapower.

Soviet expansion, in both naval and merchant fleets shows their determination to replace us as the foremost in overall seapower. The primary position given to submarines in the growing Soviet Navy openly shows an intention to strive mightily to cut our sea links of trade and supply in time of war. Growing emphasis on merchant shipping shows the value the Soviets place on world trade for attaining their objectives short of open war.

Russia now has a merchant marine of about 850 ships—over 4½ million deadweight tons. Her satellites provide an additional 200 ships, totaling 1¼ million tons. This fleet is steadily expanding, through building in Soviet bloc shipyards and purchases from the free world.

An Associated Press dispatch of May 10 quoted the chairman of the Russian Shipbuilding Ministry as saying that the demand of the Soviet merchant marine is increasing so rapidly that Soviet shipyards no longer can fully cope with it and that by 1965 the volume of Soviet seaborne freightage will almost triple compared with 1958.

He added that in view of this, various ships are under construction for the Soviet Union in Poland, Finland, Denmark, East Germany, West Germany, Holland, Japan, and other countries.

I might note that the Soviet Union has pioneered the development of nuclear icebreakers—a field which we have neglected, strangely enough, considering that we face Siberia across the Arctic Basin. Their large and powerful atomic icebreaker *Lenin* has been in operation for more than 2 years now while our small fleet of war-built icebreaking vessels are obsolescent and wearing out.

Russia knows how to use newly acquired maritime power. The Red flag is showing all over the world—of course, with a heavy emphasis on the ports of the small nations they wish to penetrate.

Soviet ships and trade are vital and integral parts of the Communist economic offensive.

In countries where reserves of hard currencies are limited, Communist willingness to supply and deliver Iron Curtain products and pick up the exchange material, all for barter, has been very successful. Russian petroleum, Polish fishing boats, and East German machine tools move over the world, implementing about 100 barter treaties signed with non-Communist countries. We have only to look, from Florida, 90 miles south, to Cuba, to see a textbook example of Communist penetration leaning heavily on the effective use of mercantile seapower.

Thus, the Soviet merchant fleet acts as a political weapon of national trade. Russia's merchant marine is free of such hindrances as the necessity to make a financial profit. Political profits are the objective. The future could well see them concentrating shipping on a few trade routes to haul free world cargoes at some financial loss to them

perhaps—but an irretrievable political loss to us.

These grim facts provide ample reason why we must revitalize our position of primacy at sea and restore it in such clear degree that no doubt will exist anywhere that the United States and the free world control the sealanes under all conditions.

There must be no doubt that we can carry the trade, and our goods and our ideas to all the nations.

There must be no doubt that, if need be, we can strike at will in a controlled and limited manner from the seas, with shattering promptitude. There must be no doubt that we can apply the most precisely tailored degree of force—naval force capable of appearing without warning, and remaining indefinitely to strike or threaten. There must, further, be the certainty in the minds of our friends and those who are not our friends, that our Polaris ballistic missile submarines, are there at sea, invisible and unfindable.

In these future years, I believe that we must have a much closer degree of coordination of maritime and naval policies.

This is of the greatest importance.

Never before has there been such a degree of interdependence between our naval power and the strength of our merchant marine.

It is a task of naval power to protect and control the sealanes in the face of potentially the most massive submarine threat of our experience. It is the job of the merchant marine to bring in the vast quantities of raw materials—imports such as metals, ores, and petroleum—which are now vital to our national strength and warmaking ability.

But, consider the degree of our present vulnerability: Over 1½ million barrels of petroleum per day are imported by ship—less than 5 percent of it in ships flying the U.S. flag. About 99,000 tons of iron ore are daily imported in ships, nearly all under foreign flags. There are, of course, other critical items: The raw materials for the space age must be imported into the United States by ship. In a very real sense, our lack of capacity to carry our own vital imports may be our exposed jugular.

Our capacity to project our limited war force needs a well-balanced naval-military force working closely with a modern, effective merchant marine, active and in being.

Do not be misled to believe that sealift, meaning the movement of troops and military material by sea, is obsolete.

There is, of course, no substitute for adequate airlift. Its ability to rapidly move a few thousand troops and their light equipment is invaluable.

But when divisions and armies are to be moved, sealift can accomplish the job more rapidly and of course much more efficiently, both in terms of military effectiveness—as troops arrive concurrently with their heavy equipment—and in terms of resources expended. This can be done with ships of 15 to 20 knots, such as our reserve fleet transports and our older cargo ships.

A more spectacular statement of sealift capability is the fact that one ship like the 33-knot *United States*, or her authorized but as yet unbuilt superliner sistership, can carry a full division of troops and much of their equipment from New York to Europe in less than 5 days and to the Middle East in 6½ days. In doing this, she would carry her own fuel for the round trip, plus a large margin.

Only ships—and I mean large numbers of them—can supply the equipment, food, ammunition, and fuel for a limited war of even moderate size. A considerable part of the tanker requirement would be devoted to the supply of fuel for the aircraft of the very vital airlift. And mistake it not, airlift cannot function without these tankers—or without the prepositioned staging bases which must be supplied by merchant shipping.

The American merchant ships to do the job—the passenger ships, the cargo ships and tankers—must be modern, fast, and of the highest quality. More than that, they must be in being and actively employed. This means that if they are to be ready to serve in an emergency, they must be built, manned, and gainfully employed before the emergency.

We do not have ships of the needed quality now except in limited numbers.

Only 13 percent of our active merchant tonnage is 6 years old or less, but 75 percent is over 14 years old.

To make up for past neglect, the replacement rate on our berth line cargo and passenger ships must be increased from the current 14 per year up to the 25 or more envisaged in the 1936 act. Modern thinking on limited war heavily underlines the importance of ships in being.

Here we may close the circle of this interdependence of seapower.

If these ships of our merchant fleet are built, manned, and employed, they will be spearheading our trade, performing the vital mission of expanding our seapower through economic means, as well as being ready for emergency use.

The years ahead are filled with challenge for this Nation, and the way ahead is far from clear. This is particularly so in the future of our maritime position—our total seapower. Yet, the opportunities ahead are vast—and it is of extreme importance that we make the most of them.

We must revitalize our seapower in its entirety, and bring about the closest coordination of its elements.

We, as a maritime nation, must determine realistically, what appropriate portion of the national budget should be allocated to the strengthening of our merchant marine. We must create the domestic climate of intraindustry cooperation in which the merchant marine can thrive.

We must expand our trade for its political as well as its economic value to us—and we must greatly increase the proportion of it that our own ships carry.

We must make our maritime power the instrument with which we can help the undeveloped and undecided nations to achieve their aspirations.

We must insure the continuation of the flow of imported materials vital to us by decreasing our dependence upon foreign-flag shipping in this regard.

We must insure our ability to carry such quarrels as may be forced upon us to the shores of our adversaries by maintaining well-balanced naval and military forces supported by an adequate, modern, and commercially viable merchant marine.

It is from the sea that we will realize our ultimate victory.

Thank you.

Senator Keating Delivers Strong Speech on Combating Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 24, 1961

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] recently delivered an address at the 200th anniversary dinner of St. John's Lodge No. 1 of the Free and Accepted Masons in Newark, N.J. As a member of this historic lodge, I was particularly pleased with Senator KEATING's strong remarks about the need for continued vigilance against the international Communist conspiracy.

The Senator from New York also advanced a novel and ingenious plan for the issuance of Government space bonds—somewhat like savings and war bonds—to help finance the terribly expensive space program our Nation must undertake in the days ahead.

Because there is much good food for thought in this address, it deserves wide circulation, and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

SENATOR KEATING DELIVERS STRONG SPEECH ON COMBATING COMMUNISM

Mr. Chairman, brothers of St. John's Lodge No. 1, it is a profound source of pleasure to me to be in your good and fraternal company tonight.

* * * * * *

We live today in an age of peril. The values we hold dear, the concepts we hold dear, the very freedom we hold dear—all are being challenged on a massive scale, on a global scale. Peril is not a new and strange condition in the life of the Masonic Order. Throughout our long and honorable history we have stood many a time on the ramparts of freedom—and many a time our brothers have been in the forefront of the drive to roll back the surging lines of tyranny. The battlefields of America's past have seen this spirit of patriotism translated by our brothers into deeds of high courage, and, so often, into the ultimate sacrifice that is the last full measure of devotion. The valor of our brothers, in all the services, in all the wars, should remain for each of us a heritage of pride and glory the real consequences of war are present.

Yes, danger has been a familiar face in our history—but always a foredoomed face—because the valor of American hearts, the power of American arms crushed danger to earth.

Tonight, as I speak to you, danger stalks the world once more. It is not dressed in uniform. It is not the same face of danger we have met so many times before—at Valley Forge—across the no man's land of France—on the beaches of Italy—in the Coral Sea and on the Pacific islands—in the forest of Bastogne—or on Pork Chop Hill in Korea.

The enemy who now confronts us fights with a new kind of arsenal—a new kind of tactics—a new kind of grand strategy, but if the conventional trappings of war are absent, the real consequences of war are present.

Throughout military history the end objective of the use of arms has always been to seize territory. Today, territory is a secondary consideration. The prime objective is to seize minds and hearts—to occupy, if you will, mental and spiritual objectives. Once this is done—once the infiltration has succeeded—territory does not have to be captured in the military sense. It falls like a tree whose force and substance have been sapped away by armies of termites.

This is the kind of warfare that communism is waging today. It is not a shadow war. It is as real as the loss of freedom is real. You do not learn its outcome in the shouts of victorious armies. You learn of it in the silence of imprisoned men, of captive nations, as the symbolic Iron Curtain

falls to signal the end of freedom's drama—falls silently, fatefully, across the world.

And now it has fallen closer to us—a scant 90 miles from our shores—for the darkness of tyranny has closed over little Cuba. If we think of freedom as a homeland—the mother country of our free society—that homeland, that mother country is shrinking before our eyes. A slow shrinkage, but a continuing and fateful shrinkage, as communism trickles its Red stain across new frontiers, spreading to new areas, poisoning, paralyzing, and destroying freedom as it goes.

The greatest irony of modern history is that communism uses the very hope of liberty—the very slogans and language of liberty.

The vicious technique is to take honest words and make liars out of them. What for example, is truth in Russia? It is anything that conforms to the preestablished party line. When truth can't fit this line, it automatically becomes a lie—a capitalist lie, of course. And what is peace in the Communist translation? Peace is a condition of no opposition to communism. When the Soviets have overrun and manacled a nation then the climate of peace has been established.

The dove of peace is a Russian symbol—but you know and I know that if a real dove of peace flew over the Kremlin he'd probably be shot down for violating the airspace over Russia.

Thus, too, the nations of the West are branded colonialist powers—branded that by a power that snatches nations as a wolf snatches sheep. And in China, the government is called the people's government—which is tantamount to saying that a zoo belongs to the animals that live there.

I find it especially appropriate in these perilous days when the fate of our Nation, the fate of freedom itself are at stake in the world that I should speak before this gathering of my Masonic brethren. For our entire history, our essence, our purposes exemplify not only the spirit of free men in a free society, but the vigilance to preserve that freedom and the strength to defend it when it is threatened or attacked.

It can well be said that the Masonic Order runs like a red vein of courage through the marble of our Nation's history—from the remote founding of our beloved country to the actuality of this hour, this minute, in the life story of America.

Today, perhaps, above all previous times of danger, Masonry finds itself summoned to cope with a challenge to all the values—spiritual, moral, social—that it has traditionally held sacred, that it has instinctively defended.

What is imperatively called for in our time is a vivid awareness of the fact of danger, of its presence, of its growing challenge—and it is here that our great brotherhood can, through its individual members, in all areas of our free world, alert their friends, their fellow citizens, their communities, to the tremendous implications of the history that is being written before our eyes.

Geography used to be a study for children. Today it should be a study for each of us. On the world map the areas of a dehumanized, despiritualized society are growing ominously, spilling over frontiers, enguifing new populations.

It is an insidious advance—slow, silent, but measurable by the miles it encroaches, by the lives it controls, by the lights it extinguishes in the hearts and minds of men.

The hour is late, too late for apathy, yet apathy is all around us. For too many Americans confuse material well-being with national security. They seem to assume that, like labor-saving devices, freedom-preserving devices are items available at a price.

Associated with this apathy is a kind of spiritual depression, induced by Communist successes. We can better realize the extent of this spiritual depression when we consider the tremendous sense of elation that the man-in-space success evoked throughout our land.

America's first man-in-space shot was a resounding success. It was a shot heard around the world.

But we must not delude ourselves. The Soviet Union is still ahead of us in outer space and by a substantial margin. Later this very month the Russian rocket fired from an orbiting satellite may come within hailing distance of Venus. The United States still has a long way to go in outer space. And the price is going to be high.

It will cost in the neighborhood of $40 billion to send an astronaut to the moon. That means about $225 for every man, woman and child in the United States.

There can be no doubt that this money is essential to get American space programs off the ground. President Kennedy declared in his press conference last week that he was going to ask the Congress to appropriate even more.

Here is a proposal for raising the financial thrust that America needs in space and rocketry. It's through a new bond issue. Good ideas you know, even now, can come from Yale as well as Harvard, and this idea was brought to my attention by a Yale student, from Douglaston, N.Y., who has thoughtfully outlined some of the reasons supporting his proposal.

I have studied his suggestion, canvassed it among my colleagues, and I think it has real merit.

I propose that in addition to seeking a regular appropriation, the administration take advantage of national interest and enthusiasm in this field, and that the administration call upon Americans to make some of these sacrifices that we have heard about. I propose that the administration offer long term, nominal interest bonds—not war bonds, not liberty bonds, not savings bonds but space bonds.

These bonds could be offered on the same terms as series E savings bonds. Their appeal would be tremendous.

Instead of taking tax money from those who could afford it least, the space bonds would enable those who have funds available to invest where it is most needed—in our country's future. Instead of swelling speculation on the stock market, these funds would go directly into the Nation's economy, creating new space achievements and incidentally new jobs. The technical aspects of such a bond offering will require careful study and planning, of course. I have already written to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon asking whether he believes the program would be feasible and how it could be worked out.

Among those who, I am sure would volunteer to purchase the first offering are the workers at various rocket and missile centers who have been picking up bigger pay checks than the Secretary of Defense for overtime work. If space funds come directly from patriotic buyers of space bonds, rather than through the cumbersome Federal appropriations process, it might well be there would be more effort and less featherbedding at these installations.

In short, I do not believe that American people are unwilling to make the sacrifices needed to put this country ahead in space. They just have not been asked to do so.

"Buy a space bond" should be America's motto for the sixties. This is more than just a fund raising program. It is an appeal to the country to put America ahead in space. No longer is the sky the limit. We must set our sights right now—for the moon.

Masonry is in the full spirit of its historic role in our history when it raises its voice to remind our people that freedom is not an heirloom but a vulnerable possession—a jewel that can be lost as well as found, and that will inevitably be lost if there is no one to stand guard over it.

Masonry can be—should be—one of the Paul Reveres of our day—a day that agonizingly calls for minutemen of freedom. We cannot ride through the country, pointing to a real enemy behind us. We cannot ask citizens to listen for the trumpets and the shellfire. That is what makes the challenge to us the greater.

The task force of Masonry must alert our Nation to the silent, but no less deadly weapons by which the enemies of freedom push forward across the world. It must dramatize the nature of the conflict. It must illuminate and educate. It must fight apathy for the enemy it is. It must rouse from the slumber of indifference that great body of citizens who do not believe in danger until they hear a siren, or until they are shot at.

* * * * *

I am sure that each of you has been impressed, as I have by one fact that is basic to the whole pattern of Communist conquest. It is what I might call the "global confidence game" whereby the Reds set themselves up as the friends, the benefactors, yes, the liberators of the peoples upon whom they prey.

Cuba is a recent and striking example of this fixed game where the dealer ends up with all the cards.

Now this is a situation that calls for more than the wringing of hands, and the question: "Why don't these people see that they are not getting freedom, but only tyranny dressed up to look like freedom?"

Let us rather ask ourselves—as the leading free Nation of the world—if it isn't about time that we took the words and phrases we use so glibly—freedom—the dignity of man, spiritual values, human rights—and made them more living, more meaningful, more propagated, more real to the millions of people who are called upon to make a choice between the false face of liberty and the true face of liberty. We Americans have a tremendous export business in things—but only a trickle of export in values. We are better known in many countries for our machines than for what we stand for, what we believe in, what makes us proud to be Americans.

In a word, we are better known for what America makes than for what makes America. This is wrong. It is bad. It is dangerous. We're in a life-and-death game where to come in second is not to come in at all. We must realize this fact. We must recast our thinking about the awesome responsibilities of leadership in a world that is being shaped and dominated by our enemies.

This, indeed, is a time for greatness. In the past no body of Americans has responded to the call more quickly, more wholeheartedly, more valorously, than the Masonic Order, one of the great cornerstones of the building of our Nation, one of the great pillars of its moral strength.

I am confident—supremely confident—that we shall accept the challenge that history throws down to us in these days of destiny—that we will help to rouse and revitalize the spirit of this Nation—that we will make freedom a cause, not merely a slogan, that we will turn the searchlight of vigilance on the face of danger so that its menace may be clear to all. And finally, I am confident that we shall look upon our beloved country not as a legacy left to us in perpetuity by heroes, but as our solemn trust for which generations to come will hold us accountable.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 9: 6: *His name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.*

O Thou blessed and eternal God, we rejoice that Thy divine wisdom and power are abundantly sufficient for our many needs.

Bless us with a loyalty that never wavers and a courage that never falters as we seek to fulfill the high and holy mission with which we have been intrusted.

We humbly confess that our finite minds do not know how to read and interpret rightly the signs and events of these days but may we believe that it is our highest wisdom to trust Thee and not be afraid.

Inspire and guide with Thy holy spirit our President, our Speaker, and the Members of Congress in their deep concern for the security of our beloved country and the welfare of humanity.

Grant that they may perceive clearly what is needed and champion courageously what is right as they seek to mobilize our material and spiritual resources to meet the desperate needs and longings of our day and generation.

Hear us as we earnestly beseech Thee that mankind may be filled with a passionate yearning to promote the spirit of friendship and unity among all the members of the human family.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we offer our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROGRAM AND THE CHILEAN RECONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PASSMAN, GARY, CANNON, TABER, and FORD.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 316 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. On the part of the House the Chair appoints as members of the committee to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber: the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. MCCORMACK; the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WALTER; the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HALLECK; and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On the part of the Senate the Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. HUMPHREY; the Senator from Florida, Mr. SMATHERS; the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DIRKSEN; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; and the Senator from New Hampshire, Mr. BRIDGES.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m. the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk. [Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure, the high privilege, and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States. [Applause, the Members rising.]

URGENT NATIONAL NEEDS—ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 174)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Vice President, my copartners in Government, and ladies and gentlemen: The Constitution imposes upon me the obligation to from time to time give to the Congress information on the state of the Union. While this has traditionally been interpreted as an annual affair, this tradition has been broken in extraordinary times.

These are extraordinary times. We face an extraordinary challenge. But our strength as well as our convictions have imposed upon this Nation the role of leader in freedom's cause. We face opportunities and adversaries that do not wait for annual addresses or fiscal years. This Nation is engaged in a long and exacting test of the future of freedom—a test which may well continue for decades to come. Our strength as well as our convictions have imposed upon this Nation the role of leader in freedom's cause.

No role in history could be more difficult or more important. It is not a negative or defensive role—it is a great positive adventure. We stand for freedom. That is our conviction for ourselves, that is our only commitment to others. No friend, no neutral, and no adversary should think otherwise. We are not against any man, or any nation, or any system, except as it is hostile to freedom. Nor am I here to present a new military doctrine bearing any one name or aimed at any one area. I am here to promote the freedom doctrine.

The great battleground for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the whole southern half of the globe—Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East—the lands of the rising peoples. Their revolution, the greatest in human history, is one of peace and hope for freedom and equality, for order and independence. They seek an end to injustice, tyranny, and exploitation. More than an end, they seek a beginning. And theirs is a revolution which we would support regardless of the cold war, and regardless of which political or economic route they choose to freedom.

For the adversaries of freedom did not create this revolution; nor did they create the conditions which compel it. But they are seeking to ride the crest of its wave, to capture it for themselves.

Yet their aggression is more often concealed than open. They have fired no missiles; and their troops are seldom seen. They send arms, agitators, aid, technicians and propaganda to every troubled area. But where fighting is required, it is usually done by others, by guerrillas striking at night, by assassins striking alone, assassins who have taken the lives of 4,000 civil officers in the last

12 months in Vietnam, by subversives and saboteurs and insurrectionists, who in some cases control whole areas inside of independent nations.

They possess a powerful intercontinental striking force, large forces for conventional war, a well-trained underground in nearly every country, the power to conscript talent and manpower for any purpose, the capacity for quick decisions, a closed society without dissent or free information, and long experience in the techniques of violence and subversion. They make the most of their scientific successes, their economic progress and their pose as a foe of colonialism and friend of popular revolution. They prey on unstable or unpopular governments, unsealed or unknown boundaries, unfilled hopes, convulsive change, massive poverty, illiteracy, unrest, and frustration.

With these formidable weapons, the adversaries of freedom plan to consolidate their territory, to exploit, to control, and finally to destroy the hopes of the world's newest nations, and they have ambition to do it before the end of this decade. It is a contest of will and purpose as well as force and violence, a battle for minds and souls as well as lives and territory. In that contest we cannot stand aside.

We stand, as we have always stood, from our earliest beginning, for the independence and equality of nations.

We stand for a world of peace under law. We stand for the democratic revolution of social progress. We stand for diversity, honest disagreements, and mutual respect. This Nation was born of revolution and raised in freedom. And we do not intend to leave an open road to despotism.

But the facts of the matter are that we in the West have not yet sufficiently mobilized our resources, demonstrated our aims, or inspired and supported the necessary spirit of local reform to help these new revolutions find success in constructive pursuits. Too often we have accepted a merely defensive role. Too often we have let ourselves appear as friends of the status quo, and the status quo may be $50 a year. Meanwhile the pressures of the totalitarian conspiracy mount higher every day, as one nation after another, by internal more often than external means, finds its freedom under attack.

There is no single simple policy with which to meet this challenge. Experience has taught us that no one nation has the power or the wisdom to solve all the problems of the world or manage all its revolutionary tides; that extending our commitments does not always increase our security; that any initiative carries with it the risk of temporary defeat; that nuclear weapons cannot prevent subversion; that no free peoples can be kept free without will and energy of their own, and that no two nations or situations are exactly alike.

Yet there is much we can do and must do. The proposals I bring before you today are numerous and varied. They arise from the host of special opportunities and dangers which have become increasingly clear in recent months. Taken together, I believe that they mark another step forward in our effort as a people. Taken together they will help advance our own progress, encourage our friends, and strengthen the opportunities for freedom and peace. I am here to ask the help of this Congress for freedom and peace. I am here to ask the help of this Congress and the Nation in approving these necessary measures.

The ultimate source of our national strength is the quality and vitality of our own society. To sustain new efforts in world affairs and space, to demonstrate to all the success of freedom's way, and to meet the needs of our own citizens when we are assisting others, we need a growing, prosperous nation. I am not requesting additional taxes to finance the very urgent requests I am making today—for our present tax structure and resources are more than sufficient to support them without a budget deficit if our economy moves ahead. But we must make full use of our resources—human, scientific, and material—giving priority to our most urgent national needs.

The first and basic task confronting the Nation this year was to turn recession into recovery. An affirmative anti-recession program, initiated with your cooperation, supported the natural forces in the private sector; and our economy is now enjoying renewed confidence and energy. The recession has been halted. Recovery is underway. [Applause.]

But the task of abating unemployment and achieving a full use of our resources remains a serious challenge. Large-scale unemployment during a recession is bad enough—a large-scale unemployment during recovery is intolerable to a free economy. It is a major social evil; it is a source of national weakness. It will persist even as the Nation's output surpasses previous achievements, as I believe will be seen in the coming months.

The Government must consider additional long-range measures to curb this unemployment and increase our economic growth, if we are to sustain our full role as world leaders. Measures to aid the unemployed, and to employ our youth usefully, will be submitted shortly. I would stress one measure in particular today—a measure of special importance in meeting the occupational demands of new American leadership in space, aid, trade, and defense.

I am therefore transmitting to the Congress a new manpower development and training program, to train or retrain several hundred thousand workers, particularly in those areas where we have seen critical unemployment as a result of technological factors, in new occupational skills over a 4-year period, in order to replace those skills made obsolete by automation and industrial change with the new skills which new processes demand. Supplementing current public and private training and education programs, such a measure, including subsistence and relocation allowance for the long-term unemployed, is a positive answer to the challenge of technology.

In addition, full recovery and economic growth require sustained increases in investment, and these in turn depend on favorable monetary and credit conditions as well as the enactment of the investment tax credit incentive plan which I earlier submitted to the Congress. The lending capacity of the Small Business Administration should be increased; and Federal action can help reduce the cost of the homebuyer's mortgage. Beyond this, the full financial influence of the Government must continue to be exerted in the direction of general credit ease and further monetary growth while the economy is recovering. Some further downward adjustments in interest rates, particularly those which have been slow to adjust in the recent recession, are clearly desirable; and certainly to increase them would choke off recovery.

These expansionary measures at a time of unemployment, unused capacity and stable price levels, are not inflationary. This is important, for we have made great strides in restoring world confidence in the dollar, halting the outflow of gold and improving our balance of payments. During the last 2 months, our gold stocks actually increased by $17 million, compared to a loss of $635 million during the last 2 months of 1960. We must maintain this progress—and this will require the cooperation and self-restraint of everyone. As recovery progresses, there will be temptations to seek unjustified price and wage increases. These we cannot afford. They would only handicap our efforts to compete abroad and to achieve full recovery here at home. Labor and management must—and I am confident that they will—pursue responsible wage and price policies in these critical times. I look to the President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy to give a strong lead in this direction.

Moreover, if the budget deficit now increased by the needs of our security is to be held within manageable proportions, if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar, it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds or programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget—to end the postal deficit through increased rates, a deficit, incidentally, which exceeds the fiscal year 1962 cost of all the space and defense measures I am submitting today—to provide full pay-as-you-build highway financing, and to close those tax loopholes earlier specified. Our security and progress cannot be cheaply purchased; and their price must be found in what we all forgo as well as what we all must pay.

I stress the strength of our economy because it is essential to our strength as a nation. And what is true in our case is true of other countries. Their strength in the struggle for freedom depends on the strength of their economic and social progress. Their ability to resist imperialism from without and subversion from within depends in large measure upon their capacity for orderly political and economic growth.

This is particularly true in those less-developed countries that have become the great arena of struggle. And that is why our response to their danger must be essentially constructive. We want to generate hope in those countries. We want to help them modernize their societies, broaden human opportunity, and stand as equal partners in the community of free nations. We would be badly mistaken to consider their problems in military terms alone.

For no amount of arms and armies can help stabilize those governments which are unable or unwilling to achieve social reform and economic development. Military pacts cannot help nations whose social injustice and economic chaos invite insurgency and penetration and subversion. The most skillful counterguerrilla efforts available cannot succeed where the local population is too caught up in its own misery to be concerned about the advance of communism. We would be badly mistaken to consider these problems in military terms with all the people. But for those who share this view we stand ready now, as we have in the past, to provide generously of our skills, or our capital, and of our food to assist the peoples of the less-developed nations to reach their goals in freedom, and to help them before they are engulfed in crisis.

On the other hand, no amount of subversive activity can corrupt a nation working with confidence for a better society, under leadership it trusts, and with increasing participation by all in the benefits of new development.

This is our concept. We stand ready now to provide generously of our skills, our capital, and our food to assist the peoples of the less-developed nations to reach their goals, and to help them before they are engulfed in crisis.

This is also our great opportunity in 1961. If we grasp it, then subversion to prevent its successes exposed as an unjustifiable attempt to keep these nations from being either free or equal. But if we do not pursue it, the bankruptcy of unstable governments and unfulfilled hopes will surely lead to a series of totalitarian receiverships.

Earlier in the year, I outlined to the Congress a new program for aiding emerging nations; and it is my intention to transmit shortly draft legislation to implement this program, to establish a new Act for International Development (AID), and to add to the figures previously requested, in view of the swift pace of critical events, an additional $250 million for a Presidential contingency fund, to be used only upon a Presidential determination in each case, with regular and complete reports to the Congress in each case when there is a sudden and extraordinary drain upon our regular funds which we cannot foresee, as illustrated by recent events in southeast Asia which makes necessary the use of this emergency reserve.

I make this additional request because of my conviction that in these uncertain times we must have the flexibility to respond to new, but as yet unknown, crises and opportunities. The total amount requested—now raised to $2.65 billion—is both minimal and crucial. I do not see how anyone who is concerned about the growing threats to freedom around the world—and who is asking what more we can do—can weaken or oppose the single most important program available for building the frontiers of freedom.

Our hopes for the Latin American Alliance for Progress—our hopes for improving the excellent start toward planned development that has been made in a number of countries—our hopes for frustrating alien propaganda and subversion by creating a climate for peaceful progress—and our hopes for convincing the other industrialized nations to increase their role in this endeavor—all depend upon Congress enacting the full amount of funds and, of equal importance, the long-term borrowing authority which I have requested.

Let me stress there are many bright spots in this picture. With the very convincing help of the Congress, the Latin American Alliance for Progress is about to be launched successfully. Our great partner to the north, who received my wife and me so generously, is indicating renewed interest. Our good neighbors to the south are making major strides to build the bulwarks of freedom—economic and social progress—against the further encroachment of communism. Other less-developed nations are recognizing the need for greater effort and reform on their own behalf—and other NATO allies are indicating their willingness to help make this decade of progress a turning point. There is much to be done—but we are not alone.

All that I have said makes it clear that we are engaged in a worldwide struggle to preserve and promote the ideals we share with all mankind, or have alien ideals forced upon us. That struggle has highlighted the role of the U.S. Information Agency, our primary organ for disseminating information overseas. This activity assumes critical importance at different times and in different places and we must be able to respond quickly. It is essential that the funds previously requested for this effort be not only approved in full, but increased to total just over $121 million.

This new request is for additional radio and television in Latin America and southeast Asia. These tools are particularly effective in the cities and villages of those great continents as a means of reaching millions of uncertain peoples to tell them of our confidence in freedom. In Latin America, we are proposing to increase our Spanish and Portuguese broadcasts to a total of 154 hours a week, compared to 42 today—none of which is in Portuguese, the language of about one-third of the people of South America. The Soviets, Red Chinese, and satellites already broadcast into Latin America more than 134 hours a week in Spanish and Portuguese. Communist China alone does more public information broadcasting in our own hemisphere than we do. Moreover, powerful propaganda broadcasts from Havana, now heard throughout Latin America, are encouraging new revolutions in several countries; and our efforts to isolate and counter this menace require increased efforts to convey throughout the Americas the true nature of Communist objectives in this hemisphere. To strengthen all of Latin America, we need the widest possible appreciation of our Alianza para Progreso, and its meaning to poverty stricken peoples.

Similarly, in Laos, Vietnam, Cambodia, and Thailand, we must communicate our determination and support to those upon whom our hopes for resisting the Communist tide in that continent must ultimately rest. Our interest is solely in the truth—the truth that will make men free.

But while we talk of sharing and building and the competition of ideas, others talk of arms and threaten war. So we have learned to keep our defenses strong—and to cooperate with others in a partnership of self-defense. The events of recent weeks have caused us to look anew at these efforts.

1. The center of freedom's defense is our network of world alliances, extending from NATO, approved by a Democratic President and a Republican Congress, to SEATO, approved by a Republican President and a Democratic Congress. These alliances were constructed in the 1940's and 1950's—it is our task in the 1960's to strengthen them.

To meet the changing conditions of power, we have endorsed an increased emphasis on NATO conventional strength. At the same time we are affirming our conviction that the NATO nuclear deterrent must also be kept strong. I have made clear our intention to commit to the NATO command, for this purpose, the five Polaris submarines originally suggested by President Eisenhower, with the possibility of more to come. Our will and our capacity to resist all types of aggression in the NATO treaty area should be clear beyond possibility of miscalculation; and if they so remain, I am certain there will be no such attack.

2. A major part of our partnership for self-defense is the military assistance program. The defense of freedom must rest upon effective combining of the efforts of local forces with our own plans and assistance. In areas directly threatened by overt invasion, local forces must have the capacity to hold back an aggressor until help can be provided. And the main burden of local defense against local attack, subversion, insurrection, or guerrilla warfare must of necessity rest on local forces. Where these forces have the necessary will and capacity to cope with such threats, our intervention is rarely necessary or helpful. Where the will is present and only capacity is lacking, our military assistance program can be of help.

But this program, like economic assistance, needs a new emphasis. It cannot be extended without regard to the social, political, and military reforms essential to internal respect and stability. The equipment and training provided must be tailored to legitimate local needs and to our own foreign and military policies, not to our supply of military stocks or a local leader's desire for

military display. And military assistance can, in addition to its military purposes, make a contribution to economic progress. The domestic works of our own Army Engineers are an example of the role which military forces in the emerging countries can play in village development, sanitation, and roadbuilding. Thus, while kept separate from economic assistance, this program must be closely coordinated with it under our Ambassadors abroad.

In an earlier message, I requested $1.6 billion for military assistance, stating that this would maintain existing force levels, but that I could not foresee how much more might prove to be required. It is now clear that this is not enough—that many countries need increased mobility, modernization, and paramilitary equipment—and that others must increase their capability to work effectively with outside forces dispatched to help them in an emergency. The present crisis in southeast Asia, on which the Vice President has made a valuable report—the rising threat of communism in Latin America—the increasing arms traffic in Africa—and all the new pressures on every nation found on the map by tracing your finger along the borders of the Communist bloc in Asia and the Middle East—all make clear the dimension of our needs.

I therefore request the Congress to provide a total of $1.885 billion for military assistance in the coming fiscal year—an amount less than that requested a year ago—but a minimum which must be assured if we are to help those nations make secure their independence. This must be prudently and wisely spent—and that will be our common endeavor. But let me say again that military and economic assistance has been a heavy burden on our citizens for a long time; and I recognize the strong pressures against it; but this battle is far from over. It is reaching its most crucial stage and I believe we should participate in it. We cannot merely state our opposition to totalitarianism without paying the price of helping those now under the greatest pressures.

VI. OUR OWN MILITARY AND INTELLIGENCE SHIELD

In line with these developments, I have directed a further reinforcement of our own capacity to deter or resist nonnuclear aggression. Our nuclear strength and our deterrent capacity are adequately safeguarded by what I have requested in an earlier message; and if their strength and invulnerability are maintained, and if the Western alliance remains resolute and united, there will be no general nuclear attack. Even in the conventional field, with one exception, I find no present need for large new levies of men. What is needed is rather a change of position to give us still further increases in our flexibility, our adaptability, and our readiness. Therefore:

(1) First, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to undertake a complete reorganization and modernization of the Army's divisional structure, to increase its nonnuclear firepower, to improve its tactical mobility in any environment, to insure its flexibility to meet any direct or indirect threat, to facilitate its coordination with our major allies, and to provide modern mechanized divisions in Europe and new airborne brigades in both the Pacific and Europe.

(2) Second, I am asking the Congress for an additional $100 million to begin the procurement task necessary to reequip this new Army structure with the most modern materiel. New helicopters, new armored personnel carriers, and new howitzers, for example, must be obtained now. These funds will be added to those already requested or reprogramed from other sources.

(3) Third, I am directing the Secretary of Defense to expand rapidly and substantially the orientation of existing forces for the conduct of nonnuclear war, paramilitary operations, and sublimited or unconventional wars. He assures me that, by reprograming existing funds as permitted by law, over $100 million can be directed to this objective without additional appropriations this year. These funds will be used for accelerating the purchase of new nonnuclear weapons and equipment, increasing air and amphibious lift capacity, and so deploying forces and equipment that they can be quickly moved to meet any outbreak of trouble.

In addition, our special forces and unconventional warfare units will be increased and reoriented. Throughout the services new emphasis must be placed on the special skills and languages which are required to work with local populations in all the social, economic, psychological, governmental, and other efforts that are short of open conflict but necessary to counter Communist-sponsored guerrillas or insurgents.

(4) Fourth, the Army is developing plans to make possible a much more rapid deployment of a major portion of its highly trained Reserve Forces. When these plans are completed and the Reserve is strengthened, two combat-equipped divisions, plus their supporting forces, a total of 89,000 men, could be ready in an emergency for operations with but 3 weeks' notice—2 more divisions with but 5 weeks' notice—and 6 additional divisions and their supporting forces, making a total of 10 divisions, could be deployable with less than 8 weeks' notice. In short, these new plans will allow us to almost double the combat power of the Army in less than 2 months, compared to the nearly 9 months heretofore required.

(5) Fifth, to enhance the already formidable ability of the Marine Corps to respond to limited war emergencies, I am asking the Congress for $60 million to increase Marine Corps strength to 190,000 men. This will increase the initial impact and staying power of our three Marine divisions and three air wings, and provide a trained nucleus for further immediate expansion, if necessary for self-defense.

(6) Finally, to cite one other area of activities that are both legitimate and necessary as a means of self-defense in an age of hidden perils, our whole intelligence effort must be reviewed, and its coordination with other elements of policy assured. This is not a matter on which public discussion is useful, nor are current studies completed. But the Congress and the American people are entitled to know that we will institute whatever new organization, policies, and control are necessary to insure the maximum coordination and use of all political, economic, and psychological resources in the attainment of our objectives.

CIVIL DEFENSE

One major element of the national security program which this Nation has never squarely faced up to is civil defense. This problem arises not from present trends but from past inaction. In the past decade we have intermittently considered a variety of programs, but we have never adopted a consistent policy. Public considerations have been largely characterized by apathy, indifference and skepticism; while, at the same time, many of the civil defense plans proposed have been so far reaching or unrealistic that they have not gained essential support.

This administration has been looking very hard at exactly what civil defense can and cannot do. It cannot be obtained cheaply. It cannot give an assurance of blast protection that will be proof against surprise attack or guaranteed against obsolescence or destruction. And it cannot deter a nuclear attack.

We will deter an enemy from making a nuclear attack only if our retaliatory power is so strong and so invulnerable that he knows he would be destroyed by our response. [Applause.] If we have that strength, civil defense is not needed to deter an attack. If we should ever lack it, civil defense would not be an adequate substitute.

But this deterrent concept assumes rational calculations by rational men. And the history of this planet is sufficient to remind us of the possibilities of an irrational attack, a miscalculation, an accidental war which cannot be either foreseen or deterred. The nature of modern warfare heightens these possibilities. It is on this basis that civil defense can readily be justified—as insurance for the civilian population in the event of such a miscalculation. It is insurance we trust will never be needed—but insurance which we could never forgive ourselves for forgoing in the event of catastrophe.

Once the validity of this concept is recognized, there is no point in delaying the initiation of a nationwide long-range program of identifying present fallout shelter capacity and providing shelter in new and existing structures. Such a program would protect millions of people against the hazards of radioactive fallout in the event of a large-scale nuclear attack. To assure effective use of these shelters, additional measures will be required for warning, training, radiological monitoring, and stockpiling of food and medicines. And effective performance of the entire program requires not only new legislative authority and more funds, but also sound organizational arrangements.

(1) Therefore, under the authority vested in me by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1958, I am assigning responsibility for this program to the top civilian authority already responsible for continental defense, the Secretary of Defense. It is important that this function remain civilian in nature and leadership; and this feature will not be changed. Responsibilities for preparedness programs in connection with health, food, manpower, transportation, and other needs in the event of an attack will be assigned to the appropriate department and agency heads, all of whom will work with State and local agencies. For their role remains an essential one.

(2) The Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will be reconstituted as a small staff agency to assist me in the coordination of these functions. To more accurately describe its role, its title should be changed to the "Office of Emergency Planning."

(3) As soon as those newly charged with these responsibilities have prepared new authorization and appropriation requests, such requests will be transmitted to the Congress for a much-strengthened Federal-State civil defense program. Such a program will provide Federal funds for identifying fallout shelter capacity in existing structures, and it will include, where appropriate, incorporation of shelter in Federal buildings, new requirements for shelter in buildings constructed with Federal financial assistance, and matching grants and other incentives for constructing shelter in State and local government and private buildings.

Federal appropriations for civil defense in fiscal 1962 under this program will in all likelihood be more than triple the pending budget requests; and they will increase sharply in subsequent years. Financial participation will also be required from State and local governments and from private citizens. But no insurance is cost free; and every American citizen and his community must decide for themselves whether this form of survival insurance justifies the expenditure of effort, time, and money. For myself, I am convinced that it does.

DISARMAMENT

I cannot end this discussion of defense and armaments without emphasizing our strongest hope: the creation of an orderly world where disarmament will be possible. [Applause.] Our arms do not prepare for war—they are efforts to discourage and resist the adventures of others that could end in war.

That is why it is consistent with these efforts that we continue to press for properly safeguarded disarmament measures. At Geneva, in cooperation with the United Kingdom, we have put forward concrete proposals to make clear our wish to meet the Soviets halfway in an effective nuclear test ban treaty—the first significant step toward disarmament. Up to now, their response has not been what we hoped; but Mr. Dean returned last night to Geneva, and we intend to go the last mile in patience to secure this gain if we can. [Applause.]

Meanwhile, we are determined to keep disarmament high on our agenda—to make an intensified effort to develop acceptable political and technical alternatives to the present arms race. To this end I soon shall send to the Congress a measure to establish a strengthened and enlarged Disarmament Administration. Such an agency can intensify and improve our studies and research on this problem, looking forward to the day when reason will prevail, and all nations of the world will be prepared to accept a realistic and safeguarded disarmament in a world of law.

SPACE

Finally, if we are to win the battle that is going on around the world between freedom and tyranny, if we are to win the battle for men's minds, the dramatic achievements in space which occurred in recent weeks should have made clear to us all, as did the sputnik in 1957, the impact of this adventure on the minds of men everywhere who are attempting to make a determination of which road they should take. Since early in my term our efforts in space have been under review. With the advice of the Vice President, who is Chairman of the National Space Council, we have examined where we are strong and where we are not, where we may succeed and where we may not. Now it is time to take longer strides—time for a great new American enterprise—time for this Nation to take a clearly leading role in space achievement which in many ways may hold the key to our future on earth. [Applause.]

I believe we possess all the resources and all the talents necessary. But the facts of the matter are that we have never made the national decisions or marshaled the national resources required for such leadership. We have never specified long-range goals on an urgent time schedule, or managed our resources and our time so as to insure their fulfillment.

Recognizing the headstart obtained by the Soviets with their large rocket engines, which gives them many months of leadtime, and recognizing the likelihood that they will exploit this lead for some time to come in still more impressive successes, we nevertheless are required to make new efforts on our own. For while we cannot guarantee that we shall one day be first, we can guarantee that any failure to make this effort will find us last. [Applause.] We take an additional risk by making it in full view of the world—but as shown by the feat of Astronaut Shepard, this very risk enhances our stature when we are successful. But this is not merely a race. Space is open to us now; and our eagerness to share its meaning is not governed by the efforts of others. We go into space because whatever mankind must undertake, freemen must fully share. [Applause.]

I therefore ask the Congress, above and beyond the increases I have earlier requested for space activities, to provide the funds which are needed to meet the following national goals:

First, I believe that this Nation should commit itself to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the moon and returning him safely to earth. No single space project in this period will be more exciting, or more impressive to mankind, or more important for the long-range exploration of space; and none will be so difficult or expensive to accomplish. Including necessary supporting research, this objective will require an additional $531 million this year and still higher sums in the future. We propose to accelerate development of the appropriate lunar spacecraft. We propose to develop alternate liquid and solid fuel boosters much larger than any now being developed, until certain which is superior. We propose additional funds for other engine development and for unmanned explorations—explorations which are particularly important for one purpose which this Nation will never overlook: the survival of the man who first makes this daring flight. But in a very real sense, it will not be one man going to the moon—we make this judgment affirmatively—it will be an entire nation. For all of us must work to put him there.

Second, an additional $23 million, together with $7 million already available, will accelerate development of the Rover nuclear rocket. This is a technological enterprise in which we are well on the way to striking progress, and which gives promise of some day providing a means for even more exciting and ambitious exploration of space, perhaps beyond the moon, perhaps to the very ends of the solar system itself.

Third, an additional $50 million will make the most of our present leadership by accelerating the use of space satellites for worldwide communications. When we have put into space a system that will enable people in remote areas of the earth to exchange messages, hold conversations, and eventually see television programs, we will have achieved a success as beneficial as it will be striking.

Fourth, an additional $75 million—of which $53 million is for the Weather Bureau—will help give us at the earliest possible time a satellite system for worldwide weather observation. Such a system will be of inestimable commercial and scientific value; and the information it provides will be made freely available to all the nations of the world.

Let it be clear—and this is a judgment which the Members of the Congress must finally make—let it be clear that I am asking the Congress and the country to accept a firm commitment to a new course of action—a course which will last for many years and carry very heavy costs, $531 million in the fiscal year 1962 and an estimated $7–9 billion additional over the next 5 years. If we are to go only halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, in my judgment it would be better not to go at all. This is a choice which this country must make, and I am confident that under the leadership of the Space Committees of the Congress and the Appropriations Committees you will consider the matter carefully. It is a most important decision that we make as a nation; but all of you have lived through

the last 4 years and have seen the significance of space and the adventures in space, and no one can predict with certainty what the ultimate meaning will be of the mastery of space. I believe we should go to the moon. But I think every citizen of this country as well as the Members of Congress should consider the matter carefully in making their judgment, to which we have given attention over many weeks and months, as it is a heavy burden; and there is no sense in agreeing, or desiring, that the United States take an affirmative position in outer space unless we are prepared to do the work and bear the burdens to make it successful. If we are not, we should decide today. [Applause.]

Let me stress also that more money alone will not do the job. This decision demands a major national commitment of scientific and technical manpower, material and facilities, and the possibility of their diversion from other important activities where they are already thinly spread. It means a degree of dedication, organization, and discipline which have not always characterized our research and development efforts. It means we cannot afford undue work stoppages, inflated costs of material or talent, wasteful interagency rivalries, or a high turnover of key personnel.

New objectives and new money cannot solve these problems. They could, in fact, aggravate them further—unless every scientist, every engineer, every serviceman, every technician, contractor, and civil servant involved gives his personal pledge that this Nation will move forward, with the full speed of freedom, in the exciting adventure of space.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion let me emphasize one point. It is not a pleasure for any President of the United States, as I am sure it was not a pleasure for my predecessor, to come before the Congress and ask for new appropriations which place burdens on our people. I came to this conclusion with some reluctance. But in my judgment this is a most serious time in the life of our country and in the life of freedom around the globe, and it is the obligation of the President of the United States to at least make his recommendation to the Members of the Congress so that they can reach their own conclusions with that judgment before them. You must decide yourselves, as I have decided; and I am confident that whether you finally decide in the way that I have decided or not, that your judgment, as my judgment, will be reached on what is in the best interests of our country. [Applause.]

In conclusion, let me emphasize one further point, that we are determined as a nation in 1961 that freedom shall survive and succeed, and whatever the peril and setbacks we have some very large advantages.

The first is the simple fact that we are on the side of liberty—and, since the beginning of history, liberty has been winning out all over the globe. [Applause.]

A second great asset is that we are not alone. We have friends and allies all over the world who share our devotion to freedom. [Applause.] May I cite as a symbol of traditional and effective friendship the great ally I am about to visit—France. I look forward to my visit to France, and to my discussion with the great captain of the Western World, President de Gaulle, as a meeting of particular significance, permitting the kind of close and ranging consultation which will strength both our countries and serve their common purposes of worldwide peace and liberty. [Applause.] Such serious conversations do not require a pale unanimity—they are rather the instruments of trust and understanding over a long road.

A third asset is our desire for peace. It is sincere and I believe the world knows it. We are proving it in our patience at the test-ban table, and we are proving it in the U.N. where our efforts have been directed toward maintaining that organization's usefulness as a protector of the independent or small nations. [Applause.] In these and other instances the response of our opponents has not been encouraging.

Yet it is important that they should know that our patience at the bargaining table is nearly inexhaustible, though our credulity is limited—that our hopes for peace are unfailing, while our determination to protect our security is resolute. For these reasons I have long thought it wise to meet with the Soviet Premier for a personal exchange of views. A meeting in Vienna next month turned out to be convenient for us both; and the Austrian Government has kindly made us welcome. No formal agenda is planned and no negotiations will be undertaken; but we will make clear that America's enduring concern is for both peace and freedom [applause]—that we are anxious to live in harmony with the Russian people—that we seek no conquests, no satellites, no riches—and that we seek only the day when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war anymore" [applause].

Finally, our greatest asset in this struggle is the American people—their willingness to pay the price for these programs—to understand and accept a long struggle—to share their resources with other less fortunate peoples—to meet the tax levels and close the tax loopholes I have requested—to exercise self-restraint instead of pushing up wages or prices, or overproducing certain crops, or spreading military secrets, or urging unessential expenditures or improper monopolies or harmful work stoppages—to serve in the Peace Corps or the armed services or the Federal civil service, or the Congress—to strive for excellence in their schools, in their cities and in their physical fitness and that of their children—to take part in civil defense—to pay higher postal rates, higher payroll taxes and higher teachers' salaries in order to strengthen our society—to show friendship to students and visitors from other lands who, after visiting us, go back in many cases to be the future leaders of their country, with an image of America; and I want that image, and I know you do, to be affirmative and positive. And finally, to practice democracy at home, in all States, with all races, to respect each other and to protect the constitutional rights of all citizens. [Applause.]

I have not asked for a single program which did not cause one or all Americans some inconvenience, or some hardship, or some sacrifice. But they have responded—and you in the Congress have responded to your duty—and I feel confident in asking today for a similar response to these new and larger demands. It is heartening to know, as I journey abroad, that our country is united in its commitment to freedom—and is ready to do its duty. [Applause, the Members rising.]

At 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m. the President, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m. the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The President's message will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess until 2:30 o'clock p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports on H.R. 6269, H.R. 7148, H.R. 2417 and H.R. 879.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

STOP BULLDOZERS TO COMMUNIST CASTRO

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a House resolution which would place this House on record as opposing the shipment of any equipment to Communist Cuba. I hope this House will follow the sentiments of the majority of the American people and oppose without compromise this blackmail. With communism knocking at the door of the United States the American people are now looking to Congress to save this Nation and the Western Hemisphere from complete Communist domination.

Mr. Speaker, our people are shocked and disturbed as never before in modern history over this fantastic and unbelievable proposal to strengthen our enemy with our own money and equipment. They are shocked even further by the suggestion that those contributing to Castro's support would be guaranteed Government tax exemption for such contributions.

Our Government leaders do not learn by experience. They make the same mistakes over and over again. With our gifts of trucks and mechanized equipment we enabled Russia to occupy and hold all of central Europe in slavery. It was British and French appeasement of the raving Hitler that gave him the time to build up his bloody and ruthless war machine. Some of the countries he later attacked even loaned him money and equipment. We have helped nation after nation only to see them join Russia and her growing list of satellites. We sent Japan the scrap iron which killed thousands of our American servicemen. Bulldozers, trucks, helium, and all such material will definitely help Castro in his wild ambitions to conquer militarily and by subversion all of southern and central America. This equipment will unquestionably enable him to build airfields, military highways, missile bases, and launching ramps with which someday to hit the civilian populations of New Orleans, Mobile, Miami, Jacksonville, and other great cities. Our Government helped Castro into power. Our Government helped him strengthen his position by the weak, unsupported April 17 invasion, and now we propose to give him the military strength to advance against our Nation and our Western allies. We should prevent any group in America by any means from shipping anything to Castro that will enable him to strengthen his Communist position economically, militarily, or otherwise.

I hope this House will adopt this resolution before it is too late. We cannot, we must not reward Communist blackmail.

ACTION NEARS ON LEAD-ZINC SMALL PRODUCERS BILL

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, Chairman Aspinall of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has authorized further hearings by the Mines and Mining Subcommittee on the lead and zinc small producers bill, on June 16th.

It is my earnest hope, as chairman of the subcommittee and a sponsor of H.R. 84 on this subject, that it will be possible on that date to receive a favorable administration report and to complete subcommittee action on the measure.

While the administration has not yet announced its position, it is a matter of record that President Kennedy supported an identical proposal while serving in the other body in the 86th Congress, and publicly deplored the bill's veto after its passage by Congress last year.

With strong bipartisan support in both this House and the other body, there is good reason to hope that action is nearing in this Congress upon this life-or-death legislation for thousands of American miners.

THE LATE DAVID LYNN

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, David Lynn, who served as Architect of the Capitol from 1923 to 1954, died today after a short illness. Prior to his service as Architect, Mr. Lynn served for 22 years under previous architects, Edward Clark and Elliott Woods.

Mr. Lynn was appointed Architect of the Capitol by President Coolidge on August 22, 1923. He came from an old family, of Frederick and Allegany Counties, Md., who for many generations had been distinguished in the judicial, military, business and social life of the State. His great, great grandfather, Judge David Lynn, was one of the three Commissioners appointed in 1751 to lay out the town of Georgetown.

Mr. Lynn was born in Wheeling, W. Va., November 10, 1873; was educated in public schools of Cumberland and the Allegany County Academy. He entered the Office of the Architect of the Capitol on July 1, 1901 during the tenure of Edward Clark as Architect. He was appointed the seventh Architect of the Capitol, following the death of Elliott Woods.

During his tenure as Architect, there were constructed and added to the buildings in the Leglisative and Judicial groups, the New House Office Building, the First Street wing of the Senate Office Building, the U.S. Supreme Court Building, the central refrigeration plant and other additions to the Capitol Power-plant, the annex and addition to the Main Library of Congress Building, and the legislative garage.

During his tenure, the 62 acres of land lying immediately north of Constitution Avenue were acquired and developed as part of the Capitol Grounds park area; the Capitol, Senate, and House Office Buildings were completely air conditioned; the roofs over the Senate and House wings of the Capitol were reconstructed and the interiors of the House and Senate Chambers were remodeled; the terraces of the Capitol Building were reconstructed.

The U.S. Botanic Garden was relocated to its present site and the New Conservatory was constructed and the grounds developed under his direction.

In connection with construction projects, Mr. Lynn served as a member of the Commission for Enlarging the Capitol Grounds; the U.S. Supreme Court Building Commission; the Joint Commission to acquire a site and additional buildings for the Library of Congress; and was a member of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia and Alley Dwelling Authority.

He served as Acting Director of the United States Botanic Garden from 1934 to 1954.

Mr. Lynn retired as Architect of the Capitol on September 30, 1954. Until his death, he continued to reside at his residence, 3700 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Those of us who knew Dave Lynn will always remember him as a man dedicated to his work, a gentleman, and a man of fine, sweet character and ennobling state of mind.

To his loved ones left behind I extend my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the former Speaker of the House of Representatives [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] in expressing my sincere regrets at the death of David Lynn. For over 50 years he was a valued, trusted, and able employee of the Capitol.

During his tenure of office he was able to expand not only the buildings and accommodations of the Capitol itself, but of the Capitol grounds as well. His work was exceptionally good. He was a gentleman in every sense of the word and was genuinely respected. He was first appointed by Calvin Coolidge. He had a long record as Assistant Architect previous to his promotion to the chief position.

We dislike to see a man of the distinction and integrity of Dave Lynn pass away, but that is life. It comes to all. I want to extend my deepest sympathy to his family and his many friends in this their hour of sorrow. A really great American has passed away.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which

to extend their remarks in relation to our late friend, David Lynn.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

FURNISHING INFORMATION TO THE POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 301 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1986) to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the Act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 301 provides for the consideration of H.R. 1986, to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter. The resolution provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1986 is to repeal what the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service calls obsolete, unworkable, and unnecessary provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 which purport to give the Postmaster General access to rail rates for carrying express matter in order to compare them with rail rates for carrying non-first-class mail and authorize the Postmaster General to reduce rail rates for such mail to the level of the express rail rates if the express rail rates so determined are lower.

According to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, this legislation will remove a serious impediment to the continuance of a valuable public service rendered by the only remaining private enterprise facility for the rapid and economical transportation throughout the United States of shipments for which express service is desired by the shipping public.

The committee further urges that it is increasingly evident that prompt enactment of H.R. 1986 is imperative if the American public is to be assured the benefits of adequate rapid-service express shipping facilities.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule and urge the adoption of H. Res. 301 in order that the House may consider H.R. 1986 as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I know of no opposition to the rule and therefore reserve the balance of my time, I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Texas has just stated, House Resolution 301 makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 1986 under an open rule, with 1 hour of general debate. This legislation will remove a serious impediment to the continuance of a valuable public service rendered by the only remaining private enterprise facility for rapid and economical transportation throughout the United States of shipments for which express service is desired by the shipping public.

The express service referred to is the American Railway Express which, I understand, is a cooperative effort of all the railroads in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there was no opposition to the granting of this rule when that question was before that body. I understand that there was no minority report filed against the bill by the Legislative Committee, although I have been informed an amendment may be offered to the measure under general debate.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the majority leader if he will inform us as to the program for the balance of this week, and for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the disposition of this bill, if the rule is adopted, there will be no further business this week. However, there is the possibility of a conference report later on in the day.

As I understand, the conference report has been agreed upon and we are in hopes it will come in today so that we can dispose of it. It is the intention, of course, on Monday next to adjourn from Monday until the following Thursday. In other words, there will be no business on Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday. On Thursday there will be the State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriation bill for 1962.

I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later, and conference reports may be brought up at any time.

If the conference report comes in today and is disposed of, then we will go over from today until Monday and from Monday next until Thursday, but I will not make that unanimous-consent request now, until we find out what happens to the bill that is in conference.

Mr. ARENDS. What is that conference report?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the bill carrying $600 million in connection with Latin America. The Senate added an amendment limiting it to 8 percent.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the majority leader a question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea when we are going to get the "granddaddy" of them all, the foreign giveaway authorization bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. A very important bill in connection with our defense is the one to which the gentleman is referring. I am unable to answer the question now with any degree of definiteness.

Mr. GROSS. I would hope that we could get the authorization bill and then the appropriation bill in such time that we would not have to consider the conference report on the appropriation for the foreign giveaway at 2 o'clock in the morning. I would hope that for a change this would not be the situation this year. Let us have some opportunity to know what is in the conference report.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, the gentleman from Massachusetts cannot admit the premise of the gentleman's observation. I shall not contradict the gentleman, but I do not admit the premise. However, we always try to conduct matters so that the situation as stated by the gentleman, if ever correct, would never happen.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for those words. I do not know exactly what they mean, but I thank him.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1986) to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the

furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1986 with Mr. SISK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1986 is based on official recommendations of the Interstate Commerce Commission in the Commission's last three annual reports to the Congress and is distinctly in the public interest. It is also recommended by Chairman OREN HARRIS of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, who has sponsored an identical bill, H.R. 5600.

H.R. 1986 will repeal an obsolete, unworkable, and unnecessary provision enacted 45 years ago as part of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916. The provision authorizes the Postmaster General to request from the Interstate Commerce Commission information on rail rates for transporting express matter and, in effect, to equalize payments for rail transportation of mail—other than first class—with such rates.

This provision has never once been applied and, in fact, cannot be applied. The Interstate Commerce Commission has so ruled three times—in 1949, 1954, and 1959—in response to requests from the Postmaster General. But it stands as a very serious impediment to the continued existence of a valuable public transportation service rendered by private enterprise.

This public transportation service is the Railway Express Agency—the sole remaining private enterprise facility for the rapid and economical transportation throughout the United States of shipments for which express service is desired by the shipping public.

The whole purpose of the 1916 provision was based upon rates paid by express companies for railway transportation of their shipments. There were then seven independent express companies dealing with the railroads substantially as other shippers did. That is, the express companies paid rates for the transportation of their shipments over railroad lines.

Conditions under which the 1916 provision was enacted were far different than those obtaining today. All of the independent express companies long since have vanished from the picture. There is now only one express facility—the Railway Express Agency—and it is not an independent entity as were the express companies operating in 1916. Railway Express Agency was created in 1929 by the major railroads of the United States—under strong Federal urging—as a consolidated railroad-owned facility to provide express service over railroad lines. The consolidation and operations thereunder were governed by a standard agreement, including an arrangement for pooling revenues and incomes.

Under this pooling arrangement, in view of competitive conditions and the prospect of loss operations, no rates could be fixed by the railroads for the transportation of express shipments. Instead, the standard agreement provided that Railway Express Agency would accept shipments from the public at competitive rates, collect its revenues, pay all expenses for terminal operations and pickup and delivery services, and turn over to the participating carriers whatever amounts remained.

This standard agreement continued for a number of years, but in recent years the resulting losses to the railroads have become so heavy that they can no longer afford to sponsor the express operation under the agreement. The express company has been unable to pay the railroads their bare out-of-pocket costs of carrying express shipments from city to city. In fact, for several years past Railway Express has not even been able to meet all of its own direct costs.

The Interstate Commerce Commission at one time required Railway Express Agency to report revenues paid to the railroads and made the information available to the Postmaster General during the 5-year period 1950 to 1955. The Post Office Department in 1955 agreed that the requirement should be discontinued. This strongly substantiates the position taken by the Interstate Commerce Commission and its recommendation for enactment of H.R. 1986.

Complete hearings were held by our subcommittees, both last year—on a similar bill—and this year. Many organizations and associations representing the shipping public strongly support the legislation and urge its early enactment. A number of these organizations submitted carefully considered resolutions in favor of H.R. 1986, which are included in the printed record of hearings.

Failure to enact H.R. 1986 seriously threatens the continued existence of the fine and valuable public service rendered by Railway Express Agency as a part of our private enterprise system. The railroads can no longer continue to absorb heavy losses from operation of the agency each year. Nor can they safely enter into a proposed new contract with Railway Express Agency, providing for further reorganization and maximum improvements in efficiency and economy of operation, unless H.R. 1986 is enacted.

If the 1916 provision remains on the statute books, the railroads will always face the threat that they may be forced to reduce their rates for transporting parcel post to the low level at which they must maintain their charges to Railway Express Agency if the agency is to continue as a private enterprise. If this were to occur—that is, if the railroads were forced to so greatly reduce their parcel post rates—they would have no alternative but to close up Railway Express Agency. They could not afford the tremendous losses which would result from carrying parcel post at less than cost.

It seems to me that H.R. 1986 gives us a rare opportunity in this day and age. We have the chance to preserve a very important public transportation service for the people of this country and it will not require the spending of $1 of the taxpayers' money. We have only to remove an unnecessary legislative obstacle from the path of its development.

One thing should be clearly understood. Enactment of H.R. 1986 will cause no additional cost to the Government or the users of the mails. Amounts paid the railroads for transporting mail are within the complete control of the Interstate Commerce Commission, as they have been for many years, and enactment of H.R. 1986 will not interfere with that control. The Commission, in its sound discretion, will always have the right to consider conditions relating to the transportation of express matter when it is fixing rates for the transportation of mail. It does not need, and should not be burdened with, an arbitrary and wholly unnecessary statutory provision such as the one to be repealed by H.R. 1986.

In this connection, the committee report spells out the desirability of full disclosure of all pertinent railway express revenue and rate information for the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Post Office Department, and the public after enactment of H.R. 1986. We have full assurance from representatives of the Railway Express Agency, in the printed record of hearings, that all such pertinent information will be made available.

In the judgment of our committee, it is distinctly in the public interest that H.R. 1986 be enacted to assure the public the continued benefits of a nationwide railway express service operating as a self-sustaining private enterprise.

I strongly urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today H.R. 1986 which the Post Office Committee, of which I am a member, feels to be an essential piece of legislation. If we do not pass this bill today there is a real possibility that it may mean the end of Railway Express, the only remaining private enterprise facility for express service for the shipping public throughout the country.

If the provisions of section 557, to be repealed by this bill, were to be enforced it might very well critically reduce the postal revenues of the railroads. This our railroads could not afford. Therefore they might be forced to abolish REA rather than incur such a loss. In addition there is a plan which it is hoped will be put in operation July 1 of this year that will place REA on a profit and loss basis. In the judgment of the committee this is necessary to assure the efficient and economical operation required to preserve the business. This

change, essential to the survival of REA, cannot be made if this bill is not passed.

Under the present system of operation of the railroad, with the Railway Express as a pooled subsidiary, the competitive rate situation envisaged when this law was first passed in 1916, simply does not exist. Since the situation has changed so completely, the law instead of benefiting the public is now merely a dead letter and an anachronism. REA cannot compete with the Post Office on terms of equality.

The Post Office Department pays no interest on debt.

The Post Office Department pays no charge for borrowed vehicles.

The Post Office Department does not need to obtain truck rights.

The Post Office Department is not regulated by the 50 States.

The Post Office Department is not subject to strikes or work stoppages interrupting the service.

The Post Office Department has space priority and can control rail service.

The Post Office Department makes no payment for loss and damage except on insured parcels, for which an extra charge is made.

Parcel post does not handle certain costly commodities.

The Post Office Department has no worries about bankruptcy or liquidation. In spite of what the law says, as a practical matter, it does not even have to operate without a loss.

The Post Office Department receives extensive terminal and en route services from railroads which are furnished by REA at its own expense.

The Post Office Department pays railroads only for "space used" in the line haul; express pays for "space assigned."

The Post Office Department pays no taxes of any kind.

The Post Office Department pays no fees for licenses or permits.

The Post Office Department is in the Federal Government retirement plan, rather than the more costly social security or railroad retirement systems.

The enactment of this bill will result in no additional cost for the Government. It is essential to the survival of a private railway express in the United States. It is supported by the great majority of those concerned. I urge this House to vote for the passage of H.R. 1986.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. I understand that the Postmaster has voiced opposition to this program, is that correct?

Mr. BARRY. According to my understanding, the Postmaster is not in favor of this legislation.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. The report would indicate that the Department is opposed to the legislation.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DULSKI. The Postmaster has only a slight objection to it, but he has had the same objection for the last 45 years.

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Can the gentleman tell me whether the authority given the Postmaster in this legislation has ever been used by him?

Mr. BARRY. No. The authority has never been used since the bill was enacted in 1916.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARRY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is a member of the subcommitte that considered this legislation, he has gone into it very thoroughly, and I want to compliment him on the fine presentation he has made. I want to associate myself with the remarks he has made on this bill. It is something that should have been enacted long ago if we are going to save a great industry. I hope all of the members of the committee will listen to the debate carefully and that the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to serve as chairman of the subcommittee which considered H.R. 1986 and reported it favorably to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. I believe I am correct in saying that all but one of the seven members of the subcommittee favor this legislation.

The purpose is simply to strike from the law an obsolete provision which, regardless of the soundness of its intent when enacted 45 years ago, today is worse than useless—it is damaging. The provision in question has never once been applied during its 45-year history. Indeed, since 1928 there has been no way to apply it. The Interstate Commerce Commission, as the agency directly concerned, has asked for repeal of the provision in each of its last three annual reports to the Congress.

I will not review the very comprehensive record in detail. I will simply emphasize certain important points. First of all, as the record shows, the provision in question has never been used and there is no reasonable prospect that it can be used. Certainly, there is no justification for keeping useless language on the statute books.

Secondly, no one can be hurt by repeal of the 1916 provision. Not 1 cent will be added to postal costs of operation, to expenses of mail users, or to the taxpayers' burden. All too seldom do we have the opportunity to consider beneficial legislation that has no cost.

Finally, enactment of H.R. 1986 is necessary to remove a serious and unjustified impediment to the continued operation of a valuable public service rendered by private enterprise.

We do not here have the usual case of a statute which has grown old but does no harm. This 1916 statute is more like the ship which sinks in the channel. It not only is no good to anybody, it is a downright menace to navigation. This old statute, which never has and never can be used, is a menace to those who are trying desperately to navigate the Railway Express Agency out of a great crisis. But it is worse than useless when viewed in the light of present and future public service requirements.

Conditions in the 120-year-old express business had deteriorated by 1958 to the point where the railroads were suffering $40 million annual losses on express service. Obviously, with competition facing the railroads in every aspect of their business, they could not go on absorbing such losses. They prepared to liquidate the express company. This country was about to lose an essential service and 37,000 employees were about to become unemployed. This near tragedy was averted. By drastic measures and revisions of the terms of the express contracts with the railroads and the airlines, the express business was continued for a trial period. We are fast approaching the end of that trial. It has been singularly successful. Wise, dedicated men have exerted tremendous effort to insure the continued availability of express service to the people of this country. The single barrier to the successful launching upon a new era is the obsolete legislation which our committee has recommended we repeal.

The plan which has been devised for gradual reinvigoration of this old company provides for the payment of a basic amount to the railroads for services rendered and then a distribution of any remaining amount after all expenses on a 50–50 basis between the express company and its railroad owners. I doubt whether this arrangement, even if it were put into effect, would be such as to permit the application of the statute in question any more than the present arrangement will permit such application. The owners of the agency cannot take the risk, however, that someone would attempt to apply the statute to the new arrangement. They cannot risk having their mail revenues reduced below the reasonable level fixed by the ICC while they are trying to breathe new life into the express company. They will sacrifice the company before they will take that risk, and I do not blame them.

There is one aspect of the hearings on this matter which I believe was most unusual. We have here a bill which is really a very special type of legislation in that it directly affects only one company in our vast country. One would scarcely expect such a bill to call forth broad public interest and support, but that is just what has happened here. This bill has the unqualified endorsement of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Industrial Traffic League, the National Retail Merchants Association, the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, the Transportation Association of America, the Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, the Air Transport Association, the Associations of American Railroads and American Short Line Railroads, and seven shippers' advisory boards representing every section of this country.

Our subcommittee received presentations from all of these sources and also from those who appeared in opposition.

The opposition was largely limited to the competitors of the Express Company. We reviewed all of these expressions and carefully considered all of the possible ramifications of this bill. On the basis of my study of the matter, I unreservedly recommend the adoption of H.R. 1986. I am convinced that it is in the best interests of the American people.

One last point should be reemphasized. The repeal of this unused legislation can hurt no one, including the postal service. The rates for the transportation of mail are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission at a reasonable level. They are subject to review at any time. The Commission can take into consideration any relevant matters when it is determining the proper level for mail rates—including amounts received by the railroads for the transportation of express. There is no chance of the postal service being unfairly dealt with by the railroads.

We really have only one decision to make here and that is whether we will remove the blockage in the channel which impedes the progress of a rejuvenated company. Refusal to do so will cut the American people off from an enterprise which has been an important part of American transportation since the days of the stagecoach, and which has an equally important role to play in the space age to come.

I strongly urge that the House approve H.R. 1986.

Did the gentleman from Connecticut desire me to yield?

Mr. MONAGAN. The gentleman answered the question I was going to ask about how the rates are set. They are now set by the ICC, as I understand.

Mr. DULSKI. That is true.

Mr. MONAGAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, regardless of whether this bill should or should not pass, and regardless of my opinion of it, I do think that we ought to make the record very clear as regards the position of the administration.

On page 13 of the report, in a letter to the chairman of our committee, the Postmaster General states:

> This Department opposes the enactment of this bill.

And then over on page 14 of the report he concludes by saying:

> In these circumstances, the Department cannot support the proposal to repeal a provision of law designed by the Congress to provide a means for avoiding discriminatory rates for the transportation of mail by railroad which are in excess of those applicable to comparable commercial shipments.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> J. EDWARD DAY,
> *Postmaster General.*

I hope that answers the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that the Parcel Post Association opposes this legislation?

Mr. CORBETT. I am told that the answer is in the affirmative. I did not serve on the subcommittee. I do not know.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that the parcel post program is associated in part with the Post Office Department?

Mr. CORBETT. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that the parcel post business is in competition with the Railway Express business?

Mr. CORBETT. I would hardly say that. What has happened over the years is that when one charge is made for similar parcels to the Railway Express, then a different charge is made to the Post Office Department. This is because the old law, the law which I assume is going to be repealed, stated that the facts and figures as to what the Railway Express pays ought to be made available to the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Post Office Department because of our law requiring that the Postmaster General maintain parcel post rates at or about the break-even point.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, but they do not ask them to maintain rates that are below cost, do they?

Mr. CORBETT. They are supposed to say within 4 percent of the average cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that Congress some years ago passed Public Law 199, which permitted the express company to skim the cream off the top of the Parcel Post Service.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. May I point out that when Congress had before it Public Law 199 it allowed the express company to skim the cream off the top of the express business.

Mr. GROSS. Of the express business or the parcel post business?

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The parcel post business. Definite promises were made by the express company that if this was repealed they would maintain the service. I do not know how it is in other parts of the country, but if you want to send a package of over 20 pounds now that cannot go into parcel post in my part of the country you have to travel miles to an express office. It is true they will tell you they will send a truck over to pick it up, but——

Mr. CORBETT. I cannot yield further because I have run out of time. I took the time only to correct the record, not to get into an argument.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I just wanted the record to show the facts.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER].

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I served as a member of the subcommittee which held hearings on this legislation and I want to commend the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], and all members of the subcommittee for their very conscientious and diligent attention to this important measure.

I must confess that I experienced considerable difficulty—and perhaps this was shared by other members—in gaining a grasp of the complexities of our vast transportation system as they are involved in this legislation. After extensive hearings, during which all parties at interest were given full opportunity to express their views and were subjected to intensive examination by the members, I concluded that the legislation is meritorious, will not cost the Government or the mail users any money, and should be enacted to remove a serious impediment to the continuance of a valuable private transportation enterprise—the Railway Express Agency.

Summed up as briefly as possible, there seem to me to be two fundamental questions involved. One, What has section 557 of the statute books accomplished in 45 years; and, two, What would be the effect if this bill is passed and the section repealed?

The answer to question No. 1 is that absolutely nothing has been accomplished by the passage of this section. Others have explained its purpose and its ineffectiveness. In this connection, I was struck by the fact that, since its enactment in 1916, no affirmative action has been taken by the postal establishment to obtain the benefits that supposedly were intended to accrue to the postal service when the legislation was enacted in 1916. One would reasonably expect, after the Interstate Commerce Commission had ruled that the provisions of section 557 contained no mandate for the Commission to set up rates and that, in effect, the 1916 provisions were impossible of application, that the postal establishment should have recommended official legislative action to the Congress to strengthen or implement the provisions of section 557. But, so far as I have been able to determine, this has not been done, and I believe this weakens the position of the Post Office Department in opposing H.R. 1986.

Question No. 2, relating to what the effect will be if section 557 is repealed, as applied to the cost of parcel post service to the Government or to the taxpayer is that, in my judgment, supported by much testimony on the record, there will be no effect.

All rail rates for mail are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the basis of cost plus 3 percent on investment. Section 557 is not required to insure reasonable railroad rates for the transportation of such mail, and I believe that the Post Office Department has fair and ample protection because of the authority of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I find that the overwhelming weight of direct and

factual evidence presented for our consideration strongly supports the recommendation of the committee, that enactment of H.R. 1986 is desirable to remove an obsolete and useless provision from the statute books and to clear the way for modernization of the essential public transportation service now available only through the Railway Express Agency.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON].

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I too served as a member of the special subcommittee which considered this legislation and which reported it favorably to the full committee after we had held complete and detailed hearings and received the views of all of the interested parties.

Our chairman and other members who have spoken have very well expressed and explained the provisions of H.R. 1986 and the unusual merit of this legislation. The distinguished gentleman from New York has been most helpful and has pointed out some of the great differences between the parcel post service of the Post Office Department and the express service performed by the Railway Express Agencies. These differences, I believe, have created the conditions which make the provisions which are to be repealed by the bill before us today useless in the system of our laws in the United States. The most obvious difference, of course, is that the postal service is operated by the Government while the Railway Express is supported by private capital. The Post Office Department, as the gentleman pointed out, pays no taxes and pays no license or other fees. It pays no interest on debt. It is not regulated by every State in which it operates. Most importantly, it seems to me, from the viewpoint of the consideration of the specific bill before us, and the provisions of the 1916 law which will be repealed, are the substantial differences in the services performed by the railroads for the mail traffic and for express traffic. The Post Office Department has the right, and we know they exercise that right, to demand priority of space, and control the railway service to meet these requirements.

In short, there are so many differences between the services performed by the Post Office Department and by the railroads through the Railway Express that there seems to be no justification for the 1916 provisions which have never been used and have never been effective.

As the gentleman pointed out, just 2 short years ago the Railway Express Agency, the employer of 32,000 persons, was on the verge of liquidation or nationalization. The situation at that time was so bad that Resolution 8 was introduced in the Senate in 1959 and hearings held, looking to the nationalization of the express business. We came close at that point of having further serious Government encroachment into the business of transportation. Through ingenuity and determination and sound management and reorganization, which is the keystone of any successful private enterprise, the Railway Express thus far has averted this catastrophe. A complex plan for reorganization of the express company was carefully worked out. They assured us it stands ready to go forward. Labor and management have worked together in this plan for the future. They have told us the only barrier to this progress is the threat that this 45-year-old law poses for the railroads in their attempt to reorganize the express company.

In my opinion this 1916 statute would probably be inapplicable even if the reorganization were to proceed without pause. But the railroads themselves are in too precarious a financial position to risk substantial reduction in revenues. I don't think I would take such a risk if I were a railroad official, and I don't believe they should be expected to do so.

We should not discourage this commendable effort to preserve the valuable public service rendered by the express business in the ranks of private enterprise. We can and should encourage it and render badly needed assistance by removing a serious impediment through enactment of H.R. 1986.

I strongly urge that the House approve this legislation as reported by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who is ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill under consideration, H.R. 1986, in its present form. This legislation was considered by a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and, following hearings, the subcommittee amended the bill in order to make it more palatable to the American people. But I regret to say that the recommendations of the subcommittee were not followed by the full committee and the subcommittee amendment was eliminated from the bill. At an appropriate time I shall offer this amendment, and I hope the Members will carefully consider the issues involved and give their approval to its adoption.

I might explain that I offered the amendment in the subcommittee, a two-part amendment, one amendment being the amendment which I will offer and explain later; the other amendment amended the Postal Policy Act. I have dropped that amendment.

When my amendment, the two-part amendment, was not accepted, I voted "present" on the bill in the subcommittee, reserving the right to offer the amendment in the full committee or bring it to the House floor.

The subcommittee then adopted the first part of my amendment and brought it to the full committee. It was only 24 hours later that a majority of the subcommittee members reversed their votes and with the greatest of ease repudiated their action. Why, I do not know. I leave it to your conjecture.

This legislation is being considered at a time when the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is considering an increase in postal rates recommended by the administration. There is a direct relationship between H.R. 1986 and the postal rate increase legislation.

What is proposed to be done by the bill under consideration today is to strike a provision from the law which has existed since 1916 that affords protection to the Post Office Department in connection with its payments for the transportation of non-first-class mail to the railroads.

Mr. Chairman, I desire that any remarks which I make on this legislation shall not be construed to be in opposition to payments which are now made to the railroads by the Post Office Department for the movement of mail. It is not my desire to see these payments reduced. However, I do believe that in accordance with the 1916 law, which is sought to be repealed here, the American people are entitled to know how much more is paid the railroads by the Post Office Department than is paid to the railroads by the Railway Express Agency for the movement of similar weight commodities.

Those who know this subject intimately have estimated that the difference between the Railway Express Agency payments to the railroads and what the Post Office Department pays the railroads for similar movements is somewhere between $50 and $100 million annually. It is my view that the American people are entitled to know how much this difference is exactly.

I would like to call the attention of the Members to page 196 of the hearings on this legislation which contain a colloquy between Mr. H. W. Brawley, now Deputy Postmaster General, and Mr. Maurice Stans, who was Deputy Postmaster General in the Eisenhower administration. Mr. Brawley, at the time this colloquy took place, was the chief counsel for the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The colloquy follows:

Mr. BRAWLEY. Do you believe after working at this thing for 4 years that there is any substance of facts in this statement that they [the railroads] probably are overcharging the Post Office Department if you compare it to the charges they make to the Railway Express Agencies?

Mr. STANS. I would like to answer in this way, that they are obviously getting more from us for carrying the mails.

Mr. BRAWLEY. If the Interstate Commerce Commission would grant petition how much do you think it would save the Post Office Department currently?

Mr. STANS. It would be considerable. I would have to make some computations, but it would be a very considerable amount of money.

Mr. BRAWLEY. Apparently close to the hundred million?

Mr. STANS. I would not be surprised.

In addition, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, told the Senate on May 13, 1957, that the overpayment by the Post Office Department to the railroads for the transportation of non-first-class mail amounted to about $100 million a year. Again, let me stress I do not desire to see the railroads suffer by the loss of any of this payment but I believe that Congress should not completely abandon

this policy of public information which is in the national interest.

While I recognize the strong contentions of the formidable proponents of this legislation, including the distinguished chairman of our committee and others, yet what I propose would not injure the purpose of this bill, but would strengthen it by retaining a safeguard which Congress wisely provided when the Railway Mail Pay Act was approved.

Our subcommittee has heard a great number of witnesses, in connection with this legislation. The bill is opposed by the Post Office Department this year as it was last year. It is opposed by the truck and bus industries. It is opposed by the parcel post users and freight forwarders, whose concern was to make certain that the American public pays the lowest cost for the movement of commodities. On the other hand, the supporters of the legislation are the Railway Express Agency and the railroads and the Interstate Commerce Commission. It is quite understandable why the railroads and the Railway Express Agency approve the bill. They have selfish reasons. The Railway Express Agency is completing a contract with the railroads by which the Express Agency will become a separate and independent operation. Thus, under this new contract the law which is sought to be repealed would become meaningful and the excess cost of transportation paid by the Post Office Department over the transportation costs of the Railway Express Agency would become identifiable. The provisions of the Railway Express Agency contract state clearly that the contract will not be effective unless H.R. 1986 is enacted. This special interest legislation is only justifiable, in my opinion, if some measure of protection is afforded the American public as I propose to accomplish in my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues not to be deluded by specious arguments presented by the proponents of this bill. They say its enactment is advisable by reason of the fact that the law is obsolete and that it is meaningless and that it cannot be enforced. Do not be misled. I am certain that the Railway Express Agency would not seek the enactment of this bill if present law were as meaningless and obsolete and unenforcible as they state. Of course, it has meaning and the single fact that it does have justification is the very reason why they seek to have it repealed.

The testimony of witnesses who appeared before our committee this year and last year is replete with statements showing why this repeal legislation is inadvisable without proper amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Moore says in his statement:

"The Post Office Department is at a loss to understand why the railroads and the Express Agency persist in their attempts to conceal the rates received by the railroads for the transportation of express."

Mr. MOORE. That is exactly our position, Mr. GROSS. We we feel that the purpose of section 557, which is sought to be repealed here, was to provide the Postmaster General with sufficient information upon which to compare the rates for the movement of express and the rates for comparable movement of mail, which I tried to show at the present time I believe in line-haul movements are comparable.

Mr. GROSS. Is this considered to be none of your business, or why are you denied the information?

Mr. MOORE. I think the Interstate Commerce Commission would have to answer that question as to why they denied it. I think Mr. Warburton has mentioned in some detail why we understand they have denied it. But the fact is they have not implemented the mandate of the Congress in connection with section 557.

Mr. Chairman, all sorts of dire predictions have been made as to what will happen if this legislation fails of enactment. Indeed, it might well fail of enactment by reason of the Post Office Department's strong opposition. Even if the bill in its present form is approved by the Congress, there is every reason to believe that the President will veto it because it is strongly opposed by a member of his Cabinet, Postmaster General Day. Mr. Chairman, I implore my colleagues not to approve the bill in its present form while it faces the constant threat of veto.

I propose, therefore, to afford some measure of protection by offering an amendment which reads as follows:

Page 2, immediately following line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the repeal of existing law made by the first section of this Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall determine annually the amount of revenue paid to the railroad companies by the Post Office Department during the immediately preceding twelve months which is in excess of the amount which such Department would have paid to such railroad companies if the rates of payment for mail matter other than first-class matter had been established at rates the same as those prescribed for express companies."

The purpose of this amendment is to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine annually the amount of revenue paid the railroads by the Post Office Department which is in excess of the amount which the Post Office Department would have paid to the railroads if the rates of payment for mail matter had been established at rates the same as those prescribed for the Railway Express Agency.

The amendment does not require the Postmaster General to reduce his payments to the railroads. It does not make mandatory any action by the Interstate Commerce Commission on the Post Office Department except to provide information to the American people as to the difference between the amounts paid the railroads by the Post Office Department and the amounts paid the railroads by the Railway Express Agency. What could be more reasonable? The amendment does not affect the completion of the agreement between the Railway Express Agency and the railroads. It does not prevent the Railway Express Agency from continuing to operate on an efficient and businesslike basis. It would seem to me that the Railway Express Agency and the railroads would support this amendment. In fact, when it was offered in the subcommittee it was approved overwhelmingly.

Another important fact which, Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will understand is that our committee presently is conducting hearings on postal rate increase legislation and what we do here today will have a direct effect on how much additional revenue will be required in that bill. It is my view that a majority of the Members of Congress are not anxious to vote for an increase in postal rates—particularly in an amount that is excessive. If it were established that $100 million was the amount of excess payment to the railroads by the Post Office Department, it would simply mean that the Department would require $100 million less in revenue from the rate bill now pending in our committee.

I hold the same opinion as many of my colleagues concerning the failure to establish full and complete public service costs for the Post Office Department before a rate bill is given serious consideration. If the Members approve H.R. 1986 in its present form without my amendment they are compounding a grave error which may cost the users of the mail several hundred million dollars in violation of the provisions of the Postal Policy Act of 1958.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to give careful consideration and thought to this matter. The issues are not simply as cut and dried as you might be led to believe. In my opinion, you can satisfy the desires of the Railway Express Agency and the railroads and at the same time approve an amendment which will protect the interests of the American people and the users of the mail all the way from the first-class housewife user to the third-class users who support their small businesses by direct mail advertising.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN].

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak briefly in favor of this bill because I believe it is of the greatest importance to the people of this country and especially to the 32,000 employees of the Railway Express and their families.

Ever since I can remember, I have been close to the Railway Express Agency. I have known many of its employees and I know them to be a most earnest and devoted group. They have dedicated their lives to this work. The average employee with that company has been with it for 21 years. It would indeed be tragic if a useless statute were to be permitted to deprive these people of their livelihood.

Just 2 years ago all of them were living under the constant threat that tomorrow their company would be no more. Their fears were justified. No company has ever come closer to the precipice without falling over. This near-miss was not the fault of the employees, but they would have been the greatest losers. Thank goodness this tragedy did not occur. Bold new courses were charted and one and all set out to steer this company to successful operation. The results

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

have been truly amazing, and you can see it on the faces of the people in Railway Express. They have a new hope. They even have a new name—"REA Express." They need only the repeal of an outmoded statute to permit them to be on their way. I recommend that we approve H.R. 1986 and give them an opportunity to demonstrate that they can operate a successful enterprise by the normal standards of American business.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 1986, a bill to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter.

The unanimous report of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service points out clearly that the purpose of this legislation is to repeal certain obsolete, unworkable, and unnecessary provisions of section 5 of the Railway Mail Pay Act of 1916 which purport to give the Postmaster General access to rail rates for carrying express matter in order to compare them with rail rates for carrying non-first-class mail and authorize the Postmaster General to reduce rail rates for such mail to the level of the express rail rates if the express rail rates so determined are lower.

Mr. Chairman, the Railway Express Agency performs a valuable public service and it is the only remaining private enterprise facility for the rapid and economical transportation throughout the Nation of shipments for which express service is desired by the shipping public. I urge the House to pass this bill which would remove a serious impediment to the continuance of the Railway Express Agency's public service.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby repealed that portion of section 5 of the Act of July 28, 1916 (39 Stat. 428), which reads as follows: "The Postmaster General shall, from time to time, request information from the Interstate Commerce Commission as to the revenue received by railroad companies from express companies for services rendered in the transportation of express matter, and may, in his discretion, arrange for the transportation of mail matter other than of the first class at rates not exceeding those so ascertained and reported to him, and it shall be the duty of the railroad companies to carry such mail matter at such rates fixed by the Postmaster General."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, immediately following line 5, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the repeal of existing law made by the first section of this Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall determine annually the amount of revenue paid to the railroad companies by the Post Office Department during the immediately preceding twelve months which is in excess of the amount which such department would have paid to such railroad companies if the rates of payment for mail matter other than first-class matter had been established at rates the same as those prescribed for express companies.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I should like to read a brief colloquy in support of my amendment that occurred when the Postmaster General appeared before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the first day of the hearings on the pending postal rate bill. I said to the Postmaster General:

Now you come up here with a figure of $62,700,000 as the total charge for public service. You can call it a subsidy, public service, or anything you want. It seems to me that there is a charge that ought to go into public service if it is a subsidy, and my contention with respect to that bill [H.R. 1986] is to get it out where the Congress can see it. I am not opposed to subsidizing the railroads if that be necessary, through the Post Office Department or anywhere else, but I want it out where we can identify it and I don't want it to be charged, if that be true, to the users of the mail.

And Mr. Day, the Postmaster General, responded by saying this:

I couldn't agree with you more. We are very anxious to get those figures as to what the actual discrepancy may be between the charges to the Express Agency and the charges to the Post Office Department but we have been consistently told that those figures are not available * * * and I would think that probably the only way to get the figures is for the congressional committee that has interest and responsibility in that area to insist that they be given such figures.

That is precisely what my amendment would do.

The subcommittee in its original report said this:

Although the provisions of section 557 of the 1916 act are useless and should be repealed, in the judgment of the subcommittee it is in the public interest to write into the law a new provision as a replacement which will provide an effective aid to the postal service and the shipping public with respect to the relationship of rail rates for carrying parcel post and express matter.

This was the original report of the subcommittee to the full committee, and it deals exactly with the same amendment I am asking you to approve.

The subcommittee report goes on to say:

Accordingly, the subcommittee recommends that the committee approve the amendment shown in italic type in the committee print on each Member's desk. This amendment is consistent with present and reasonably foreseeable future operations of the railroads and the Railway Express Agency, as well as the postal service. Its enactment will assure a ready, convenient, and useful means for the Interstate Commerce Commission to obtain meaningful data and information with respect to the payments made by the Railway Express Agency, either as fixed rates or otherwise, to the railroads for carrying express matter. Such data and information, in turn, will for the first time establish an effective means of comparison between rail charges for carrying express matter and rail charges for carrying parcel post.

That is all I am asking you to do, what the subcommittee originally recommended to the full committee, and bring this problem out in the daylight rather than try to deal with it in the dark.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. Is the full force of the gentleman's amendment to make available information only? In no way would it affect the rates paid by anyone to the railways?

Mr. GROSS. Exactly.

Mr. CORBETT. I think the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. MURRAY. This is the same amendment that was offered before our committee?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MURRAY. It was voted down 2 to 1.

Mr. GROSS. I do not recall the vote. But there could be no better argument for my amendment than the original report of the subcommittee to the full committee from which I have just read. How and why the field was reversed in a matter of 24 hours I do not know. I should like some day to have an explanation for this mysterious procedure and the reasons for it.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with the right of the people of this country to know whether their Government is paying out $100 million a year more than others are paying for the transportation of similar things. I sincerely believe it is in the interests of those who pay the bills to have this information and I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there is a very good reason why the bill was changed overnight. It is because we were informed by the Interstate Commerce Commission that any such amendment as this would be unworkable, just as the law has been unworkable for many, many years. It is just a bogey that is being placed here before you. It is not enforceable. It cannot be done. It is in the letter from the ICC which was received by the subcommittee following their final action. When it was received and discussed in the full committee, then the full committee saw the light and decided that this amendment was not a good amendment.

I might say that the railroads are burdened with all kinds of rules and regulations now. This is one of the things we ought to be concerned about. We ought to be for a bill getting rid of some of these regulations and allowing them to do business as an ordinary industry should. This amendment would put an additional burden on them, an additional regulation, even though it is unworkable. There may be somebody in the administrative branch who may take a liking to trying to force some investigative or regulatory machinery upon the railroads.

I do not think we ought to regulate them any more. They are regulated to death.

The main thing I wanted to say is that the committee did reject the amendment. The Interstate Commerce Commission has said it is unworkable. This is in a communication under date of May 4 of this year. So I say the amendment ought to be defeated and the bill ought to be passed.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HENDERSON. The gentleman will recall that in the subcommittee on which we both served the amendment as adopted by the subcommittee was not the full amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

I oppose the passage, or the recommendation of the final amendment as it was adopted. In the full committee the amendment of the subcommittee was stricken. Is that not correct? Does the gentleman recall that that is the fact? At that time it was my position, and I repeat it for the benefit of the Members, that the amendment now proposed to this bill, it seems to me, does nothing more than rewrite into law, the provisions of the 1916 law, which it is the purpose of the pending bill to eliminate from the law, since it has not been used for 45 years. I do not have any argument with the gentleman who sponsors the amendment so far as the objectives of his amendment are concerned, but it seems to me if the enactment of the pending bill, H.R. 1986, is proper, then the amendment now offered is not appropriate. If we are going to leave the 1916 law on the books and vote down H.R. 1986, then we ought to put that 45-year-old law into effect.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman is absolutely right. We might as well leave the legislation on the books as it is now if we are going to adopt this amendment. I am quite surprised that the gentleman from Iowa, whom I know so well, and realizing the philosophy to which the gentleman preaches, would want this further regulation on private industry.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

This amendment is both unnecessary and undesirable. It is identical to an amendment that was considered by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee and voted down by a 2 to 1 majority. It would create an administrative monstrosity by directing the Interstate Commerce Commission to perform burdensome and expensive tasks that would accomplish nothing at all.

The official report of the Interstate Commerce Commission opposed the amendment when it was before our committee in these words:

> The proposed amendment, like the present provisions of the act, would require a determination by the Commission based on "rates * * * prescribed for express companies." As we have stated before, rates, as such, are not now prescribed as between railroad companies and the Express Agency. It is our understanding that under the proposed new contract services performed by the railroads for the Express Agency will still not be performed entirely on a basis of prescribed rates. The Commission, therefore, would still be in the same position, i.e., it would be impossible, if our understanding is correct, for us to make the determination required by the proposed amendment.
>
> We recommend that the proposed amendment not be adopted.

The Post Office Department also submitted an adverse report on the amendment.

It is clear, from these reports of the Department and the agency directly concerned, that the amendment would result in useless expense to the Government and would have no effect on postal costs for the transportation of mail. The postal service is fully protected, in the rates it pays for rail transportation of mail, by other provisions of law administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I strongly recommend that the amendment be voted down.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset the Interstate Commerce Commission recommended this legislation. It was included in their annual report. It was sent to our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and I introduced the original bill at the request of the Commission. The Speaker appropriately referred it to the great Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think we should understand just what we are dealing with here before we make matters much worse than what they are.

As I understand the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, whom I of course highly respect and whose views I respect—and I know the gentleman from Iowa studies these matters before taking a position on them—as I understand the gentleman's amendment it would not affect the action of the committee in repealing this provision of section 5. Is that right?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. In other words, you would repeal section 5 but you would then by your amendment provide section 2 which you have read. Is that correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is right, to close the void, so that we can look over the shoulders of some people and find out what is going on.

Mr. HARRIS. I respectfully suggest it would be far worse than it is now.

Let me explain. In the first place, this provision of law was adopted by the Congress in 1916. There was no competition at that time; the railroads had all the business; there was no other way, and they thought it was necessary to do what? For the Postmaster General to tell the railroads that they had to carry the mails at a certain price set by the Postmaster General that did not exceed a rate that was reported by the Interstate Commerce Commission. Just figure that one out.

Obviously, it has never been used. But a situation developed over the years, and in 1928 by the pressure from the Federal Government the railroads organized the Railway Express Agency. That was a separate entity controlled by the railroads which the railroads had to support and have had to support ever since. It is not a profit or loss organization.

If you believe in free enterprise, then you will vote for this bill as reported by the committee.

All the bill would do would be to require the Railway Express Agency for the first time in the existence of the organization to get itself on a sound business operation. If it does not it is going to deteriorate more; it is simply going to become no organization at all, and there will be no service. I say the gentleman's amendment will do nothing but make the present situation worse than it has been for the last 40 years.

I think the amendment should be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 14, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SISK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1986) to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter, pursuant to House Resolution 301, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. In its present form, I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. GROSS moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1986 to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with instructions to report the bill back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:
>
> "Page 2, immediately following line 5, insert the following:
>
> " 'SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the repeal of existing law made by the first section of this Act, the Interstate Commerce Commission shall determine annually the amount of revenue paid to the railroad companies by the Post Office Department during the immediately preceding twelve months which is in excess of the amount which such department would have paid to such railroad companies if the rates of payment for mail matter other than first-class matter had been

established at rates the same as those prescribed for express companies.' "

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" had it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 16, nays 347, answered "present" 0, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—16

Bailey	Hall	Miller, George P.
Bow	Horan	Passman
Corbett	Hosmer	Ray
Dingell	Joelsen	Yates
Gross	Johansen	
Hagen, Calif.	Kyl	

NAYS—347

Abbitt	Conte	Griffiths
Abernethy	Cook	Gubser
Adair	Corman	Hagan, Ga.
Addabbo	Cramer	Haley
Addonizio	Cunningham	Halleck
Alger	Curtis, Mass.	Halpern
Andersen, Minn.	Curtis, Mo.	Hansen
Andrews	Daddario	Harding
Anfuso	Dague	Hardy
Arends	Daniels	Harris
Ashbrook	Davis, James C.	Harrison, Wyo.
Ashley	Davis, John W.	Harsha
Ashmore	Delaney	Harvey, Mich.
Aspinall	Denton	Hays
Avery	Derwinski	Healey
Ayres	Dole	Hébert
Baker	Dominick	Hechler
Baldwin	Donohue	Henderson
Barrett	Dooley	Hiestand
Barry	Dorn	Hoeven
Bass, N.H.	Dowdy	Hoffman, Ill.
Bass, Tenn.	Downing	Holland
Bates	Doyle	Holtzman
Battin	Dulski	Huddleston
Becker	Durno	Hull
Beermann	Dwyer	Ichord, Mo.
Bell	Edmondson	Inouye
Bennett, Fla.	Elliott	Jarman
Bennett, Mich.	Ellsworth	Jennings
Berry	Everett	Jensen
Betts	Evins	Johnson, Calif.
Blatnik	Fallon	Johnson, Md.
Boland	Farbstein	Jonas
Bolton	Fascell	Judd
Boykin	Feighan	Karsten
Brademas	Fenton	Karth
Bray	Findley	Kastenmeier
Breeding	Finnegan	Kearns
Brewster	Fisher	Kee
Brooks, La.	Flood	Keith
Brooks, Tex.	Flynt	Kelly
Broomfield	Ford	Kilday
Brown	Forrester	Kilgore
Broyhill	Fountain	King, Calif.
Bruce	Frazier	King, N.Y.
Burke, Ky.	Frelinghuysen	King, Utah
Burke, Mass.	Friedel	Kirwan
Burleson	Fulton	Kitchin
Byrne, Pa.	Gallagher	Kluczynski
Byrnes, Wis.	Garland	Kornegay
Cahill	Garmatz	Kowalski
Cannon	Gary	Kunkel
Carey	Gathings	Laird
Casey	Gavin	Lane
Cederberg	Giaimo	Langen
Celler	Gilbert	Lankford
Chamberlain	Glenn	Latta
Chelf	Goodell	Lennon
Chenoweth	Goodling	Lesinski
Chiperfield	Granahan	Libonati
Church	Grant	Lindsay
Clancy	Gray	Lipscomb
Clark	Green, Oreg.	Loser
Coad	Green, Pa.	McCormack
Cohelan	Griffin	McCulloch
McDonough	Perkins	Sisk
McFall	Peterson	Slack
McIntire	Pfost	Smith, Calif.
McMillan	Philbin	Smith, Iowa
McVey	Pike	Spence
Macdonald	Pillion	Springer
MacGregor	Pirnie	Stafford
Machrowicz	Poage	Staggers
Mack	Poff	Steed
Madden	Powell	Stephens
Magnuson	Pucinski	Stratton
Mahon	Quie	Stubblefield
Mailliard	Rabaut	Sullivan
Martin, Mass.	Rains	Taber
Martin, Nebr.	Randall	Taylor
Mathias	Reece	Teague, Calif.
Matthews	Reifel	Teague, Tex.
Meader	Reuss	Thomas
Merrow	Rhodes, Ariz.	Thompson, La.
Michel	Rhodes, Pa.	Thompson, Tex.
Miller, Clem	Rivers, Alaska	Thomson, Wis.
Milliken	Rivers, S.C.	Thornberry
Mills	Robison	Toll
Minshall	Rogers, Colo.	Tollefson
Monagan	Rogers, Fla.	Tuck
Montoya	Rogers, Tex.	Tupper
Moore	Rooney	Udall
Morehead, Ohio	Roosevelt	Ullman
Moorhead, Pa.	Roudebush	Utt
Morgan	Rousselot	Vanik
Morris	Rutherford	Van Pelt
Morrison	Ryan	Van Zandt
Morse	St. George	Wallhauser
Mosher	St. Germain	Walter
Multer	Santangelo	Watts
Murphy	Saund	Weaver
Murray	Saylor	Weis
Natcher	Schadeberg	Whalley
Nelsen	Schenck	Wharton
Nix	Schneebeli	Whitener
Norblad	Schweiker	Wickersham
Norrell	Schwengel	Widnall
Nygaard	Scott	Williams
O'Brien, Ill.	Scranton	Willis
O'Hara, Ill.	Seely-Brown	Wilson, Calif.
O'Hara, Mich.	Selden	Wilson, Ind.
Olsen	Shelley	Winstead
O'Neill	Shipley	Wright
Osmers	Shriver	Younger
Patman	Sibal	Zablocki
Pelly	Siler	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—0

NOT VOTING—72

Albert	Fino	Moulder
Alexander	Fogarty	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alford	Harrison, Va.	O'Konski
Anderson, Ill.	Harvey, Ind.	Ostertag
Auchincloss	Hemphill	Pilcher
Baring	Herlong	Price
Beckworth	Hoffman, Mich.	Riehlman
Belcher	Holifield	Riley
Blitch	Ikard, Tex.	Roberts
Boggs	Johnson, Wis.	Rodino
Bolling	Jones, Ala.	Rostenkowski
Bonner	Jones, Mo.	Scherer
Bromwell	Keogh	Sheppard
Buckley	Kilburn	Short
Collier	Knox	Sikes
Colmer	Landrum	Smith, Miss.
Cooley	McDowell	Smith, Va.
Curtin	McSween	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Tenn.	Marshall	Trimble
Dawson	Mason	Vinson
Dent	May	Westland
Derounian	Miller, N.Y.	Whitten
Devine	Moeller	Young
Diggs	Moss	Zelenko

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Johnson of Wisconsin with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Short.
Mr. Hemphill with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Price with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Harvey of Indiana.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Brownell.
Mr. Young with Mr. Ostertag.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Trimble with Mr. Scherer.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Auchincloss.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Curtin.
Mr. Riley with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Riehlman.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Bonner with Mrs. May.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INTER-AMERICAN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) "making appropriations for the Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program, and the Chilean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 1.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
LISTER HILL,
HUBERT HUMPHREY,
STYLES BRIDGES,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518), making appropriations for the Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program and the Chilean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to such amendment, namely:

The amendment is reported in disagreement. A motion will be made to recede and concur with an amendment.

The conferees direct that quarterly reports be made to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House by the President or such officer as he may designate, showing

loans made and rates of interest charged thereon.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
J. VAUGHAN GARY,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN TABER,
GERALD R. FORD, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: page 2, line 7, insert: "*Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at an interest rate in excess of eight per centum per annum."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PASSMAN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made."

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the amendment speaks for itself. Those who understand the House version of the bill, as well as what effect the amendment will have, should be, in my opinion, satisfied with the conference report.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does that mean that the interest rate is practically unlimited except as to the interest rate in the various countries?

Mr. PASSMAN. The interest rates in all of these countries are a part of their economy. What we are doing is giving them the right to charge up to, but not in excess of, the prevailing interest rates in their countries.

Mr. GROSS. This bill still contains $600 million, is that correct?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. One hundred million dollars for Chile in earthquake relief and $500 million for general South American aid?

Mr. PASSMAN. That is correct.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There is nothing in here relating to the $600 million that could be changed.

Mr. PASSMAN. There is $500 million in the Latin American package for the social reform program, and there is $100 million for earthquake disaster rehabilitation in Chile. The Chilean loan is made by our Government and is repayable to our Government. It has nothing to do with the $500 million in the Latin American special assistance program of social reform and economic development.

Mr. GROSS. How much now have we dispensed, if the gentleman can give us figures, on foreign aid, on foreign giveaways, in the present fiscal year by this Government?

Mr. PASSMAN. Is the gentleman's question intended to be directed to a determination of the amount of the requests submitted to the Congress?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I was going to ask what were the requests we have up to today.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is my understanding that the original budget request for the so-called mutual security program was for $4 billion. In addition to that sum, the President today requested an additional $535 million, using round figures. The Latin American social reform and economic-aid package and the $100 million for Chile total $600 million, bringing the aggregate requests to $5,135 million. But, we are dealing here with requests, and not with actual appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. But there is not very much doubt but that the money will be obtained through appropriations?

Mr. PASSMAN. I can speak only for the gentleman from Louisiana. Reviewing the bills considered during the past 6 years, there is a sizable difference between the amount requested and the amount appropriated in every instance. It is my belief that the same type of situation will prevail again this year.

Mr. GROSS. I know what the position of the gentleman from Louisiana has been, and I hope in light of this message we got today he will continue the position he has taken in the past and try to reduce, at least to some extent.

Mr. PASSMAN. I can assure the gentleman that we hope to make a substantial reduction, and one which the administration also will recognize as being prudent and fiscally sound.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman have any idea where President Kennedy expects to get this $535 million that he called for in his message today?

Mr. PASSMAN. I, myself, should like to ask where he would expect to get the $4 billion-plus previously requested.

Mr. GROSS. He said he is against a tax increase now.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. From reading the RECORD made on the floor of the other body, it was indicated that interest rates as high as 18 to 20 percent would be charged on money that was made available under this act. Does the gentleman have any information as to whether that is correct, and how will this changed language in the conference report affect it, if that is the case?

Mr. PASSMAN. Many of our own States—rather, in fact, probably most of our States—permit interest rates that are in excess of some of the interest rates charged in Latin America. It depends upon whether the borrower is dealing with a bank, a finance company, or a loan company; whether it is a lump-sum repayment loan or whether it is on an installment basis. A study of the records will verify that probably most of the States of our Union permit interest rates in excess of those charged in Latin America.

Mr. GRIFFIN. We are talking about money made available for housing, for instance, Federal funds. We certainly put on an interest ceiling which is much below the 8 percent.

Mr. PASSMAN. I understand that most of these funds will go out to the individual, who may want to put an addition to his home or to use the funds for other constructive purposes. This program is intended to help all the people. Much of the money will go from the Inter-American Development Bank to small business, credit unions, and so forth, and they, in turn, will make loans to their customers, to make money available to purchase the goods and services needed. Many of those institutions now pay up to 18 percent interest on the money that their own people invest in their associations. So, we are leaving it up to the Inter-American Development Bank to prevent interest rates that are higher than the rates charged in the country which is receiving the money.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman's answer is not entirely satisfactory, but I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DERWINSKI. As I read the language, I take it from the gentleman's statement that we are not actually being told if any of these countries do have legal limitations on interest rates.

Mr. PASSMAN. As far as I know, every country in Latin America has ceilings on interest rates. Offhand, I can name only three or four:

For example, Argentina, bank loans, 10 percent; mortgages, 12 percent; development loans, 8 percent.

Bolivia, bank loans, commercial, 21 percent; industrial, 18 percent.

Colombia, maximum rate, 18 percent.

Chile, maximum rate, 24 percent.

Mr. DERWINSKI. The gentleman will correct me if I am wrong, but is it not true that the reason we have to provide this program for Latin America is because of the great disparity in wealth, the great mass of poor people and the handful of wealthy people? As I see this bill, the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, because you are going to pass the high interest rates onto the poor man.

Mr. PASSMAN. We are dealing with a trust fund to be administered by the Inter-American Development Bank. There are different conditions in the various countries. Many of the savings and loan associations must attract capital from their customers in order to have surplus money, and they pay 15 and 16

and sometimes 18 percent for that money. This is a condition that has developed over a number of years. So, we have placed in the conference report language to the effect that they will not charge excessive rates, or, rather, that they will not charge rates higher than the prevailing legal rate of the country. We could hardly go any further than that.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. Has the gentleman any indication of what countries in Latin America are going to participate in this loan?

What I am trying to find out is this. We know that $100 million is going to Chile; but with respect to the $500 million, has the gentleman any idea where it may be expended?

Mr. PASSMAN. There are about 17 countries which would be eligible to borrow money from the Inter-American Development Bank. We do not know just which of those countries will actually receive funds. But 17 of them will be eligible.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. I understand that if this conference report is adopted we will be putting up $394 million for the Inter-American Development Bank, to be loaned to lending institutions in the Latin American countries, and that some of them may be permitted to charge individual borrowers as much as 21 percent.

Mr. PASSMAN. It all depends on the legal rate prevailing in the country. There are, as you are aware, different conditions in different Latin American countries, and the conditions there are, of course, different from the conditions here. As a matter of information, from this $500 million package, $394 million goes to the Inter-American Development Bank, $6 million goes to the Pan American Union, which is the administrative arm of the Organization of American States, and $100 million is going to the ICA.

Mr. JONAS. At any rate, it may be said that we are not giving a great deal of help to a poor peasant in some South American country if he has to pay 21 percent interest; is that right?

Mr. PASSMAN. I do not know; but I do know that in one of our own States an interest charge up to 42 percent is permitted. I know of another State which permits interest charges up to 36 percent. So, frankly, I do not think we are in a particularly strong position to be lecturing people of other countries about their interest rates.

Mr. JONAS. We have a usury rate of 6 percent in my State.

Mr. PASSMAN. I shall, if it is desired, insert in the RECORD a table showing the interest rates prevailing at this time in each State of our Union.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. So far as the interest rate is concerned that will not make any direct difference to the American taxpayers because we are not going to get the money back anyway; is that so?

Mr. PASSMAN. The gentleman is correct. The witnesses made it clear that in all probability none of the money will come back to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PASSMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Can the gentleman inform me what rate of interest the United States is going to charge the financial institutions in South America for the money?

Mr. PASSMAN. That matter will be worked out by our State Department. This money, the $394 million, is being used to set up a revolving fund through the Inter-American Development Bank. This is a contribution we are making; literally, a gift or a grant. It is not really intended that any of it will ever come back to the U.S. Treasury.

Mr. McDONOUGH. There is no assurance that the money will be paid back?

Mr. PASSMAN. No; it was stated in the beginning by the witnesses that it was not intended that the money would come back to the U.S. Treasury. The hope is that it will serve to improve living conditions and strengthen the economy of the recipient Latin American countries.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF A U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE AND A TRAVEL ADVISORY BOARD

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARRIS, MACK, DINGELL, HEMPHILL, BENNETT of Michigan, GLENN, and CURTIN.

AMERICAN SECURITY COUNCIL URGES END TO GENEVA TEST-BAN NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the top-level civilian National Strategy Committee's first recommendations to President Kennedy urge that atomic test-ban negotiations at Geneva be discontinued and that underground nuclear tests be resumed immediately.

The recommendations came from a special 16-page report authorized by committee members and sent to the President by Committee Chairman Loyd Wright, previously Chairman of the bipartisan Commission on Government Security formed by Congress, and past president of the American Bar Association, who said the recommendations were the first of many the committee would send to the White House, Congress, and the public on key issues of national security.

The National Strategy Committee was formed recently by the American Security Council of Chicago to prepare detailed studies and recommendations on key issues of vital interest to all Americans. Its next report will deal with the dangers of admitting Red China to the United Nations and will be ready in a few weeks.

The following distinguished Americans are members of the committee:

Lt. Gen. Edward M. Almond, U.S. Army, retired; former Chief of Staff of the VI Army Corps; and former Commandant of the Army War College.

Adm. Ben Moreell, U.S. Navy, retired; former chairman of the board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.; and now chairman, Americans for Constitutional Action.

Adm. Arthur W. Radford, U.S. Navy, retired; former Chief of Naval Operations; and Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, 1953–57.

Adm. Felix B. Stump, U.S. Navy, retired; former commander in chief, Pacific; and now vice chairman, Freedoms Foundation.

Rear Adm. Chester C. Ward, U.S. Navy, retired; former Judge Advocate General of the Navy; and former professor of international law at George Washington University.

Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired; former Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; and former commanding general, Sixth Army.

The committee arrived at the following conclusions after studying 2½ years of proceedings and results of the test-ban negotiations:

First. The Soviets are not interested in negotiating. The only agreements they have made have been made on their own terms. They have deliberately prolonged the conference because we agreed to suspend our tests as long as the negotiations were in progress.

Second. The United Kingdom has not been too effective because it continually has been after us to make additional concessions toward Soviet positions.

Third. Some American scientists have not been too effective as far as the negotiations are concerned. They have given negotiators inaccurate, hasty and ill-considered advice. For example, they

said they had developed a control system to detect any nuclear explosion over 2 kilotons being made by foreign powers. Tests have proven this is not so.

Fourth. On the home front, national security considerations have, for the most part, been disregarded in the almost frantic effort to secure an agreement with the Soviet Union on their terms.

Because of these developments, the committee said, four definite conditions now exist which directly relate to our survival and which lead it to make its recommendations:

First. Progress in the development of U.S. nuclear weapons technology, defensive as well as offensive, has been brought to a virtual halt. For all practical purposes, U.S. competence in this vital area of national defense remains at the October 1958 level.

Second. Since it is impossible with present techniques to detect underground tests in the lower yield ranges or tests in outer space, it would be dangerous for the United States to assume that the Soviet Union may not have made important advances in nuclear weapons technology during this period. These advances could have a crucial effect on the relative power position of the United States and the U.S.S.R.

Third. The U.S. offer to refrain voluntarily from any underground tests for another 3 years from the date of signature of the test-ban treaty while the three powers carry out an agreed joint research program for seismic improvements and peaceful uses, would, if accepted, only perpetuate the current situation which is clearly prejudicial to the security of the United States.

Fourth. The present prohibition on all U.S. nuclear weapons tests amounts to a unilateral, unpoliced moratorium which is not in the national interest.

On this basis it specifically recommended:

First. The current test-ban negotiations be discontinued and an orderly program of underground and outer space tests which would not contaminate the earth's atmosphere be started without further delay.

Second. Any future international discussions of a nuclear test-ban be resumed only as an integral part of a broader arms control negotiation and then only with the clear understanding that the U.S. test program will not be impaired by any moratorium arrangement during the course of the negotiations.

As to the National Strategy Committee and its sponsor, the American Security Council, outside the Government itself, there is no group of men better qualified to review national security matters and make considered recommendations on the subjects.

These men have spent their careers in the service of their country and their background and training has not only exposed them to the full spectrum of international communism, but has provided them with intimate knowledge of the organization, capabilities, and limitations of our National Defense Establishment.

The American Security Council, in forming and sponsoring the committee, will be of utmost service to the country if the committee's recommendations are given the attention they merit.

The council, a bipartisan not-for-profit association, consists of over 2,500 member organizations including every type of business, newspapers, universities, and other institutions throughout the United States. Its primary service is gathering, correlating, and disseminating factual information about Communist strategy and tactics to members and a variety of organizations and individuals.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY URGES CLOSING OF SPACE GAP

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I arise to applaud the proposals which the President has just made to the Congress and the American people to put this country back in the space race.

In my experience in the Congress this is the first time, I believe, that the White House has really faced up to the hard realities of the space race.

For almost 4 years now, our people and their leaders in the administration and the Congress have been fretting and talking about the space gap and about closing the space gap. We established a new agency to run the space program; we have supported the program with increasingly large appropriations. We are designing and building some big boosters which eventually will carry our astronauts far into space.

But the evidence has shown our current effort is not closing the gap.

The President has now put the whole program, and the contest in space, in the perspective which it has long needed.

In the decisive manner which has become the trademark of his work, the President has identified and isolated the relevant questions, and he has spelled out the objectives which he believes will satisfy those questions. He has offered proposals and made requests which will achieve those objectives.

As a first objective, he has said this country does want to get to the moon.

More important, he has said we want to get to the moon within a specified period of time, with the implicit hope that we will beat the Russians to it and thereby regain the leadership we once held in space technology.

And, still more important, he has frankly told us what we may expect to pay to achieve this goal. Besides making additional requests for the next fiscal year, he has spelled out the costs, and the sacrifices, we must expect in the next 5 years.

In effect, he has asked the American people to meet the space challenge.

He has given the Nation a definite target. He has stated in clear terms where, in his best judgment, our effort should be headed.

A courageous leader, under our system, may pick a target; and the President has picked the target. But the Nation must hit the target. The Congress and the people must accept the target, and then must shoot hard enough to hit it.

This is the challenge he has given the Nation.

I was impressed with this challenge more than 2 years ago, soon after I began working in the Space Committee, and I have been pursuing that challenge with growing intensity over the last 2 years.

The President has said, and I quote:

> If we were to go only halfway, or reduce our sights in the face of difficulty, it would be better not to go at all.

I share that conviction with all of my heart. I want him to know that I accept his challenge, and I will work with renewed vigor to support a program that will put us in the race and keep us in the race.

At the same time, I want to stress, as the President has, that money alone will not win the contest. We must be selective. As we pursue new programs, or pursue with greater intensity those programs which promise the most certain gains, we must prune out the programs which are yielding only meager gains. We also must show a competitive attitude. I know, from the volumes of testimony which the Space Committee has received, that we have been too complacent.

Too many programs have been pursued, and are being pursued, with a 5-day-a-week, business-as-usual attitude. This is where the people themselves can help most. This contest will be waged with only as much spirit as the people will put into it.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 29, AND FROM MONDAY UNTIL THURSDAY, JUNE 1

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next, and when it adjourns on Monday next, it adjourn until the following Thursday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

NEW AIRCRAFT, MISSILES AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to hail the unanimous passage yesterday by the House of Representatives of the authorization bill for new aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the 1962 fiscal year. The fact that the authorization of a sum in excess of $12 billion passed without a single dissenting vote should prove to the rest of the world that Democrats and Republicans alike are determined that we will be ready for any eventuality that may occur.

We have shown any potential enemy that politics in our Nation stops at the ocean's edge. No foreign power dares now to hope that the United States will ever be divided in the momentous responsibility of meeting our defense needs.

It is especially fitting that as Memorial Day approaches, we have kept faith with our war dead by showing our willingness to face our duty to do everything to keep our country strong. I am sure we will do everything that might further be required to assure our security.

CASTRO REQUEST FOR $1.1 MILLION U.N. DOLLARS APPROVED

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Fidel Castro was successful in getting $1.1 million dollars from the United Nations for the purposes of improving the technological level of Cuba. The United Nations Special Fund supposedly is set up to award loans for technical improvements without political considerations entering into the decisions. However, this loan has great political considerations—the United States paid 40 percent of it.

Loan applications are subject to a two-third vote of the Governing Council. The voting nations are almost entirely U.S. allies or sympathetic with the Western Hemisphere. Yet despite the efforts of the U.S. delegation, the loan was granted with remarkably large consent. The reason for this shocking turn seems difficult to understand.

With the idea that political considerations were unethical to use in their argument, the U.S. delegation presented a broad, highly documented report of Castro's present technological condition. The Cuban request listed the following needs: First, $763,500 for experts and consultants; second, $200,000 for equipment; and third, $50,000 for fellowships.

The United States challenged the Cuban request on the grounds that it has not cooperated with the world organization, has misused its natural resources as demonstrated by its wanton slaughter of livestock, and must not need too many experts and consultants as there are already over 300 Soviet and Peiping operatives in Cuba now.

Mr. Speaker, this decision yesterday appalled me, as I am sure it did the rest of the Congress. Castro may use this money to feed and clothe the Communist experts he has featherbedded, buy more tractors to add to those he hopes to get in exchange for his fellow countrymen, and send impressionable young Cuban students abroad for a thorough exposure to the curriculums offered at Peiping University.

We must develop a coordinated policy in this country. We must begin to act with some semblance of purpose, in contrast to our present and past policy on Cuba, which presents an unbelievable paradox. On one hand we have withdrawn diplomatic relations, stopped most exports, branded Castro's government as Communist, supported free Cubans in their efforts of liberation. On the other hand we are still permitting Cuban imports into this country, giving Castro more U.S. dollars, permitting foodstuffs, lard, helium gas, and many other items to be exported to Cuba. Now our Government has, in effect, contributed $400,000 to Communist Cuba through the United Nations. Surely this policy cannot continue if we expect to advance freedom full speed.

THE GOLDEN WINGS OF THE NAVY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in a year which marks the 50th anniversary of the naval air arm, and in a month when we commemorate Armed Forces Week, I desire to address this honorable body on the subject of the heroic role of U.S. naval aviation in our history.

The event which signaled the birth of U.S. naval aviation took place in San Francisco Bay early in 1911, when a young civilian pilot, Eugene Ely, flying a Curtiss biplane, landed on and took off from an improvised flight deck erected on the U.S.S. *Pennsylvania*. This event added a new dimension to the traditional concept of seapower. Henceforth, aircraft would not be restricted to fixed, land bound airfields, but would operate from moving bases anywhere on the world's oceans.

In commenting on Ely's landing aboard the *Pennsylvania*, the San Francisco Examiner on January 19, 1911, stated:

> Eugene Ely's success in San Francisco Harbor yesterday was epoch making. It changed in an instant the whole theory of naval warfare. In a single spectacular flight, Ely convinced the admiralties of the world that the aeroplane must be a necessary part of naval equipment in the future.

This statement was quite prophetic, because few observers at the time anticipated the magnitude of naval aviation which developed during the next 50 years. Fewer still could have predicted the influence that naval aviation would exert on our national military posture.

A few months after that first successful flight, the Navy purchased its first airplanes; two from the Wright Brothers and one from Glen Curtiss. The first three Navy pilots, Lts. T. G. Ellyson, John Rogers, and John H. Towers were taught flying by the planemakers themselves. The following year the marines sent two officers—Lts. A. H. Cunningham and B. L. Smith—to Curtiss for flight schooling. Today the Navy has in its pilot training program, over 3,000 students.

By 1914, aviation had gained public as well as congressional interest, and Secretary of the Navy Daniels had decided "that the science of aerial navigation—must form a large part of our naval forces for offensive and defensive operations" and that "we should take our proper place with other nations and fully recognize the value of aeronautics in preparing for war." Accordingly, an organizational change placed aviation in the Office of Operations under Adm. Bradley Fiske. Unique among many fine officers of his time, Admiral Fiske's sympathetic interest assured an opportunity for air enthusiasts to plan and to boost this concept of seapower.

In 1916 as the Nation began preparing for war—Congress voted increased funds for naval aviation and created the Naval Reserve Flying Corps which attracted men whose names are now well known: Robert A. Lovett, F. T. Davison, David S. Ingalls, Artemus L. Gates, and James F. Forrestal, all of whom won their wings during World War I and later occupied responsible Government positions in our national defense organization.

During the First World War, naval aviation experienced rapid growth. Both aviation personnel and aircraft—mostly patrol type seaplanes, were considerably increased. The most promising technical development was the long-range flying boat found to be so necessary in antisubmarine warfare. Later, improved versions of the World War I types set overwater flight records and brought Navy pilots Towers, Read, Richardson, and Mitcher to public attention. During World War II, the Korean war, and even now, the flying boat—the PBM—constitutes a significant part of our antisubmarine force.

The flying marines also took an active, though limited, part in World War I. Upon their arrival in France, their eagerness to get into the fray was blunted by only one drawback—they had no airplanes. Undaunted they made the rounds of allied squadrons begging for flights. Their exploits in the air tell their own success story—one incident stands out as typically marine—a lone "Devilbird," Lt. Everett Brewer, surrounded a flight of 15 Fokkers and shot down 3 before a machinegun would force him to break off. In 1919 during action against the Cacos in Haiti, Marine Lt. Lawson Anderson rigged a rifle sight to his plane, stuffed a bomb in a gunnysack and made the first dive-bombing attack in history.

The first decade of naval aviation was spent in perfecting seaplanes and in testing catapults on various combatant ships. During this time the development

of a dependable aircraft carrier was uppermost in naval aviation planning. In 1922 the first American carrier, the U.S.S. *Langley*, was commissioned. A new and formidable force was beginning to take shape.

The period 1925 to 1935 is often referred to as the "golden decade" of naval aviation. The carriers, *Saratoga*, *Lexington*, and *Ranger* joined the fleet—dive bombers and torpedo planes were perfected—and the first fighter plane with retractable landing wheels—the FF–1—joined the fleet. Perhaps the most dramatic event in the history of aviation strategy took place in Washington, D.C., in 1925. The memorable "Billy Mitchell Controversy," involving the role of aviation in national defense, reached the point where a high level decision was needed. President Wilson appointed a board headed by widely respected Dwight W. Morrow to recommend a basic aviation policy for the United States. Membership included the distinguished CARL VINSON of Georgia. Rear Adm. William A. Moffett expertly represented the Navy during these hearings. Within the Navy itself there was no doubt that aviation was and would continue to be an integral part of seapower—but its exact role was the subject of heated discussions—Admiral Moffett, an officer of unclouded vision, foresaw that the Navy's responsibility for control of the seas, would require an aviation arm integral with surface forces to establish security in the airspace over naval and marine forces and over our seaborne commerce. He accurately visualized the aircraft carrier as the capital ship of the future.

The Morrow Board's far-reaching recommendation established a pattern for U.S. aviation that produced a working relationship among the armed services, civil aviation and the aircraft industry. There is no doubt that the Morrow Board strengthened naval aviation. The violent attacks on the Navy had been felt down to the smallest unit and had precipitated a general rededication to the principles and ideals which had guided our Navy for so long.

Recalling this controversy in naval history is important for two reasons: First, we should occasionally be reminded that for many years organized groups—many composed of patriotic and sincere Americans—have been working diligently to shape our national defense posture into a single inflexible strategy. We must be alert to any desire to concentrate military power in a single force. We must continue to encourage, and insist upon, a flexible strategy which can respond in different ways to the requirements of the Nation's weapons policies. Secondly, this controversy pointed up that the requirements for a balanced military force are inherent in air, land, and sea environments. The fact that environment can determine the utilization of a weapon must be appreciated. A scientific breakthrough might have direct application in a sea environment, but the same discovery might have little practical utilization in the air. There may be no possible use of a particular weapon in land warfare, but its rejection for possible use at sea or in the air must be avoided. The history of naval aviation gives concrete evidence of how technical skill and responsible management, working within the sea environment, successfully advanced and integrated aviation with the fleet and made a major contribution to our national defense.

During the years immediately preceding World War II, naval aviation demonstrated it could do more than serve as eyes for the fleet. Fleet exercises conducted off the California coast proved conclusively that carrier planes could project devastating power far inland from floating bases at sea. These exercises, in which Admirals Reeves, King, and Halsey had responsible roles, established carriers as the Navy's principal offensive weapon.

After the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor the Navy's battleship fleet was almost completely immobilized—there was no choice—the carriers had to become the spearhead of the U.S. Navy offensive power. The Japanese were first checked in the Coral Sea; then at Midway; they were rolled back at Guadalcanal and finally lost the initiative as U.S. naval carrier forces unleashed their growing strength across the central Pacific from New Guinea to Japan. Naval aviators Halsey, Mitscher, and Reeves again became the public image of carrier power and new names, O'Hare, McCampbell, Foss, and Boyington, gained laurels for their daring exploits in the air.

But any review of accomplishments by carrier forces should not obscure the contributions of other vital elements of naval aviation. The Marines accounted for one-fourth of all Japanese planes lost to our naval aviation. They developed a system of tactical ground support—still the model for this oft-neglected but vital adjunct to land warfare. The escort carriers forced submarines from convoy lanes, and pinned them down where they could not operate against our lifelines to Europe. The patrol planes ran the gamut from fierce action over enemy territory to monotonous patrols over an endless sea; the blimps ceaselessly patrolled the convoy routes—all these represent naval aviation.

With the war won and demobilization proceeding swiftly, naval forces were reduced to accommodate the needs of a Nation at peace. The National Defense Act of 1947 established the Department of Defense and the Air Force emerged as a separate service. The following year bitter controversy—reminiscent of the 1925 Morrow Board hearings—between the services over service unification and the future role of military air power drew national attention. Disagreements were sharpened by the reductions in the annual defense budget, but the salient point of the controversy hinged on the adoption of a national military policy. The Navy stood for a balanced strategy—for forces responsive to the needs of our country and the free world, forces capable of countering aggression on both a limited and general level. The Air Force stressed the massive retaliation strategy, based on one weapon, the atom bomb carried by the B–36 bomber—one neat package for quick and easy victory. The Russians had not yet exploded their first A-bomb. To a people fed up with 4 long years of war, it was a comforting solution. In support of this new strategy, Defense Secretary Johnson's first move was to halt the construction of the carrier U.S.S. *United States*—the first carrier to be laid down after World War II. It appeared that the U.S. Navy was about to be sacrificed for the "more bang for the buck" philosophy.

But in July 1950, this philosophy was shaken by the beginning of a new war in the remote new Republic of South Korea.

The United States was actually unprepared for a war, but moved swiftly, nevertheless, to prevent Communist seizure of this independent country. Naval forces, though small, responded quickly and effectively. Naval air power operating from its mobile carrier bases off the Korea coast played havoc with Communist supply and communications lines—naval air gave General MacArthur the flexibility needed for the end run Inchon Landing—the move which turned the tide in favor of United Nations forces.

This conflict proved that the single inflexible strategy of retaliation could not adjust to counteract Communist moves against the free nations bordering the Soviet domain. Subsequent Communist probes around the perimeter of Asia and Europe forced a reevaluation of our national strategy. The Communist scheme of encroachment, infiltration, and pressure continued and precipitated evacuation of the Tachen Islands in 1955; the Lebanon and Formosa crises in 1958. In each of these areas, U.S. naval forces on the scene, spearheaded by fast carrier forces, have confined possible explosive situations to local incidents. Right now the Pacific Fleet is standing off the coast of Thailand and Vietnam to support U.S. national policy.

Perhaps the most significant influence on naval aviation since World War II has been the technological breakthrough which has completely revolutionized our potentials of power and speed.

The Navy completed the transition from propeller to jet aircraft just after the Korean war. These new aircraft were heavier and landed faster than their displaced predecessors, so World War II carriers had to be altered to handle them. It was found that these old hulls could be altered only within specific size and weight limits—after this, no more adaptations were possible. In addition, these ships had already begun to show signs of old age, and under the severe demands of the newer aircraft, the aging process was accelerated. The only answer was new carriers, constructed to handle the high performance aircraft. The first of the *Forrestal* supercarriers was introduced into the fleet in 1956 and four more have been added since. Three more, including the nuclear powered *Enterprise*, are under construction.

Carrier improvements were made to increase flight safety and efficiency, such as the angled deck and the more powerful steam catapult. Improved long range communications and special electronics equipment provide faster and more effective flight control. Navy aircraft can now carry a wide assortment of nuclear or conventional weapons farther and faster than ever before. A few months ago a new altitude record for combat loaded aircraft was set by a Navy A3J—Vigilante—and only recently a Navy Phantom II set a closed course speed record of 1,390 miles per hour. Navy aircraft, though built under design restrictions imposed by carrier operations, have consistently held international performance records. Just yesterday, May 24, 1961, the Navy won new laurels by receiving the Bendix Trophy for a new transcontinental speed record set between Los Angeles and New York. A Navy Phantom fighter plane, piloted by Lt. Richard F. Gordon with Radar Intercept Officer Bobby R. Young made the 2,500-mile flight in 2 hours and 47 minutes, breaking a record which had just been set a few minutes earlier by Navy pilot Lt. Comdr. L. R. Lamoreaux and Radar Intercept Officer Lt. Thomas J. Johnson. These officers are to be highly commended for their accomplishment.

My State of California has played an important role in the development of naval aviation. With the landing of Ely on the U.S.S. *Pennsylvania* in San Francisco Bay, naval aviation was born, and with the advent of the Navy's aviation program extensive facilities were developed on the west coast, including Terminal Island, San Pedro, and San Clemente Island. The two major centers of new air power were located at Alameda and San Diego.

In 1923 the development of the facilities at Alameda were recommended and this installation is now of gigantic proportions. It was formally commissioned on November 1, 1940. The Alameda Naval Air Station has had a brilliant record of supplementing the needs of naval aviation during World War II, the Korean war, and during the Pacific crises which have arisen during the past decade. The military and civilian personnel have served with distinction and honor.

At the present time, the many thousands of employees, both civilian and military, make the installation one of the largest employers in the Bay area. Now, as the Navy expands into the use of missiles, Alameda Naval Air Station is becoming an important link in the installation and servicing of these weapons aboard our ships. The overall 28 years of achievements of this base are quite outstanding and it will go down in the annals of naval history as one of the most important links in the U.S. Navy's air armor.

In 1932, Congress authorized the establishment of the facility at the southern end of San Francisco Bay near Sunnyvale, which is now named Moffett Field.

California now has nine commissioned air installations being used for support of fleet aviation, and seven others that support reserve and other types of naval aviation activity. Only recently has the Navy augmented its facilities in California by the opening of a new master jet fleet support air station in the San Joaquin Valley at Lemoore.

The history of naval aviation has been short, but glorious. It has been one that California has been intimately and materially involved with. My State can justifiably take great pride in having contributed to the success and present strength of this formidable and versatile force for freedom in the world today.

Of course, this review has been merely a thumbnail sketch. To naval aviation pioneers of the past for whom this year is the 50th anniversary, we owe the lessons which should help to shape our future programs.

First, it is abundantly clear that each service must develop its own weapons systems to fit its responsibilities within its own operational environment. The use of a new innovation, such as the airplane was, in its earlier days, cannot be anticipated. The services must have the freedom to develop and the freedom to choose the way in which they provide for national security with their basic mission. If the Navy had been denied the freedom to develop carrier aircraft we would not have had any significant opposition to the Japanese offensive. If the Navy had not had the freedom to develop ballistic missiles, we would not now have the Polaris, the only invulnerable operational deterrent in our national arsenal.

The second lesson we can learn, and it is partly related to the first, is that not all Americans have or even desire a clear understanding of how the Navy contributes to the security of the United States. The Navy's functions are unlike those of the Air Force or the Army. The Air Force is usually associated with a single weapon strategy; namely, the delivery of high-yield nuclear bombs. The Army is also concerned with a single, but decisive strategy, the occupation of land area. The Navy's functions are that it must exploit the sea to the fullest so that the Army and the Air Force can better perform their tasks. Additionally, the Navy provides, independently, a power base for our trade and commerce and for the whole gamut of diplomatic actions and cold war policies. The Navy has never limited itself to a single weapon, or a single strategy. It provides the means to project any degree of power from the broad expanses of the seas, utilizing many weapons and providing a unique flexibility with alternate strategies. It is not difficult to grasp the significance of seapower, but this significance must be more widely understood and adequately supported if seapower is to be utilized to its optimum potential.

In 1775 when our country was fighting for its right to exist independently, John Adams wrote the commissioning document for the brig *Lexington*. This document stated in part:

> Neither nature nor art have partitioned the seas into empires. The treasures of the oceans belong to all free men. Upon this ultimate foundation do I build and go forward to fortify free men's rights.

As long as Khrushchev and the Communist Party aim to control free men everywhere, there is no question in my mind that seapower will continue to play a decisive role in resisting this aggression. To the vocal minority, who feel that seapower is no longer a vital force in international affairs—that the ICBM and the nuclear bomb have displaced naval forces as instruments of national power—to this group—there are clear and straightforward answers.

If by seapower we mean the ability to keep cargo-laden ships moving between the nations of the free world; the ability to control the war at sea, and make naval power felt far from its point of origin; the ability to provide flexibility of response in the right amount at the right time and place with a wide selection of weapons; the ability to launch attacks against the periphery of land masses; the ability to position measured forces near tension areas without stepping on friendly or neutral political toes—if these then are the capabilities required in our time, then there is no doubt that seapower, with its integral naval aviation, will continue indispensable to the destiny of the free world.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ECONOMIC STABILITY OR IRRESPONSIBLE WASTEFULNESS—WHICH SHALL IT BE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SCHENCK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, a thermometer is a very important device for the measurement of the temperature in its vicinity. It goes up or down with conditions as they vary from time to time—in other words it just goes along and faithfully records the results. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, a thermostat seeks to control the conditions and environment of the area in which it is located. Each of us, Mr. Speaker, can well ask ourselves a very pertinent question, Are we just thermometers going along with conditions as they occur, or are we thermostats who regulate our personal actions within the policies, principles, and standards we have set for ourselves?

Each of us has, or will have, grandchildren or loved ones, and one of our greatest ambitions and purposes should be to assure an opportunity for these generations to come to know the joy and privilege of the American way of life as we have known it.

All too many of us, Mr. Speaker, have taken for granted the very precious freedoms, privileges, and opportunities provided for us under the Constitution of the United States. Our apparent willingness at times to compromise these sound principles for some imaginary or temporary advantage is much too high a price to saddle upon future generations. Although it is late, much later than many think or realize, we must all do some sound, sincere, and dedicated thinking and planning so that the principles which have made our Nation the greatest place in the world in which to

live will remain so for our children and our children's children.

Our Nation, Mr. Speaker, must, of course, and in spite of the tremendous costs, maintain a strong and adequate defense for our own protection during these times of worldwide tensions. We must also maintain essential services to make sure all our citizens are healthy, strong, and well trained. Requirements to obtain these objectives change rapidly and we must be ready to meet these challenges as they occur. Yet in all these matters we must continually strive for economy and efficiency consistent with our needs if we are to remain economically strong.

The economic stability of our Nation, Mr. Speaker, for both the present and the future, is of particular importance to each of us as individuals and is completely essential if our Nation is to remain strong and able in the face of rapidly changing worldwide conditions. The strength, wealth, and ability of our Nation are the sum total of the strength, wealth, and ability of all our citizens. The wealth and resources of our United States are tremendous and yet they are not without limitation. Just as individuals can spend themselves into bankruptcy so can our Nation spend itself into bankruptcy. No one seems to know this better than Nikita Khrushchev. Through constant Communist pressures, our Nation is forced to spend more and more. Khrushchev does not want a hot war because he knows Russia will be completely destroyed. Therefore, Khrushchev keeps cold war pressures on constantly throughout the world in the full expectation that this will force our Nation further and further toward socialism and bankruptcy. Thus the Communists, Mr. Speaker, are fully convinced that their ideology will eventually succeed and they will be able to take us over lock, stock, and barrel, without any of our resources being damaged by war. Khrushchev's often repeated statement, "your grandchildren will live under communism," is not an idle threat from his point of view. The only hope for our Nation lies in our ability to be completely strong militarily and at the same time remain economically and morally strong and sound. To do this we must continuously strive for the greatest possible degree of economy and efficiency in our Federal Government, reserving for the States and local communities those functions which, in accordance with the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, can be done best and most economically by them.

It might be useful, Mr. Speaker, to take just a quick glance at the budget as originally presented for the fiscal year beginning July 1, bearing in mind that these requests will be increased substantially by recommendations already made by President Kennedy for greatly expanded and entirely new Federal programs. Major national security expenditures will require some 57 to 60 percent of the budget; interest alone on our present national debt of $287 billion requires 11 percent; already existing programs of benefits for veterans require 6 percent; agriculture programs already existing require 6 percent; all other operations and departments require 18 percent. This not only does not provide for a reduction in our national debt, but indicates that expenditures will be more than $3,000 million above income even with the present high Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, where does all this money come from? Fifty-five percent comes from Federal individual income taxes; 25 percent from corporation taxes, but these become a part of the price of all products and are, therefore, also paid by purchasers; 12 percent are Federal excise taxes which are also paid by individuals. Thus only 8 percent of the cost of our Federal Government comes from all other receipts.

Why all folks in general do not realize that the money to pay for any and all programs and services of government must first come from each of us in the form of taxes continues to be a mystery to me. Mr. Speaker, current expenditures of our Federal Government are at the annual rate of $82 billion and are rapidly increasing. This means that all of us in just the third district alone are paying more than $330 million a year—about $240 million in Montgomery County and about $90 million in Butler County—to pay the present annual cost of just our Federal Government alone and this cost will undoubtedly increase substantially. In addition, of course, all of these very same people must also pay all local, school, and State taxes.

Mr. Speaker, many of the expanded and new Federal programs already recommended by President Kennedy have considerable merit but they will cost additional and tremendous sums of money. Obviously it would be completely wrong, improper, and irresponsible to appropriate Federal taxpayers' money for any purpose without safeguards to guarantee its proper expenditure. Thus Federal controls are both unavoidable and inevitable regardless of provisions or assurances to the contrary. Our Nation is fast becoming a nation of government by official edict and order established almost entirely by politically appointed bureaucrats who are responsible to no one except to the person who appointed them. This is wrong, Mr. Speaker, regardless of the political party under which the appointments are made. After a legislative measure is approved by the Congress and signed into law by the President the vast army of bureaucrats then go into action. It is the bureaucrats who determine the rules and regulations and it is they who administer and enforce these same rules and regulations. There is no appeal from the rules and regulations and the enforcement of them by these politically appointed bureaucrats except through the courts, which is frequently a very expensive and long drawn out procedure.

Thus many of our freedoms, privileges, and opportunities provided for us in the Constitution of the United States and which all too many of us have taken for granted, Mr. Speaker, are slowly but just as surely being taken away. This does not mean that all bureaucrats and the rules and regulations they promulgate are all bad but it should serve to warn each of us, Mr. Speaker, that the continuing growth of unbridled controls exercised by our Federal Government over the lives and daily actions of each of us only speeds the day toward complete socialism in an increasingly larger and more powerful Federal Government centralized in Washington. Power over people begets more and more power and becomes self perpetuating.

Mr. Speaker, the only cure for this very dangerous trend away from our American way of life as we have known it is an upsurge of public opinion and action before it is too late. The larger and more expensive our Federal Government becomes the less tax resources remain to properly finance the operations of our local and State governments and school districts. The trend of local communities, school districts, and State governments through their officials to obtain more and more Federal assistance compounds these problems and only weakens still further these very important units of government. A very wise person once said, "a government strong enough to give its people everything they want is also powerful enough to take away everything they have."

It is much later than we think or realize, Mr. Speaker. The trend toward socialism already has a running start and the pace is increasing. The only way it can be slowed up, stopped, or reversed is by making our views heard. We shall continue to have good government at all levels only so long as large numbers of people maintain an active interest in the affairs of government.

How can we be most effective?

First, we must keep ourselves well informed. We can do this in any number of ways and there are many sources of information. Thoughtfully reading news stories and editorial comments in our local newspapers and magazines is one excellent source. Let the editors know you want this kind of vitally important news. Thoughtfully listening to radio and television newscasts and reports is another source. Libraries have many excellent up-to-date reports and books. It is fun to have pleasant social evenings with one's friends and neighbors but an occasional discussion of current events and problems is also not only stimulating but it is also helpful to learn the points of view and opinions of others.

Second, we can and should discuss our views with officials of our local communities, school districts, county governments, State governments, and the Federal Government. We should ask questions of these officials because they have sources of information available in the daily course of their responsibilities and duties which are not readily available to the average citizen. We should let our local, school, county, and State officials know we realize fully that Federal aid is not free but on the contrary is much more expensive to each of us. In addition it adds more and more controls which are not in the best interest of our local operations. Officials of all local subdivisions of our Federal Government should be made fully aware of our personal disapproval of any efforts on their part to secure Federal aid for local government projects and local schools.

Every thinking American, Mr. Speaker, fully recognizes the need and value of Federal leadership and information in many matters of special interest to every citizen in connection with the operations and functions of local government. Such knowledge and the free availability and exchange of such information can be of lasting and helpful benefit to each State and local community. It is much more helpful and wise, however, Mr. Speaker, if local communities and their leadership are encouraged to use their own needs and resources, in the light of information available to them, to meet their own problems. Only through taking full advantage of the stature and ability of local community leaders and their elected officials can our great Nation achieve the highest potential of which it is capable.

Third, we should write to our Congressmen and Senators. We should give them the benefit of our personal views and opinions while at the same time recognizing that they have a great deal of information available upon which they can base their judgment and decisions. We should not hesitate to write to them and commend them when we feel they have had the courage to make sound judgment and decisions in the face of other pressures. We should also not hesitate to write to them and express our frank displeasure if we are convinced they have sacrificed and compromised sound principles for the sake of political expediency or in the hope of being reelected.

Fourth, we should have no hesitancy in writing to President Kennedy personally so that he and his advisers will know how we each feel on these many matters which affect each of us in such personal ways.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we should remember the admonition of President Kennedy in his inaugural address on January 20, 1961, when he said, in part, "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

MR. KENNEDY, MR. KHRUSHCHEV, VIENNA, AND THE A-TEST BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, during his campaign, Mr. Kennedy indicated he would give the Soviets a reasonable time to show good faith and negotiate a nuclear test ban. Presumably if they did not so negotiate, the Geneva talks were to be ended and the United States pursue its own necessary course. Over 4 months have passed since Mr. Kennedy was inaugurated, no progress has been made at Geneva and, it seems clear, a reasonable time has passed. In terms of "ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country" I suggest that for the good of the country Mr. Kennedy should take the initiative and end these fruitless talks, rather than talk about prolonging them as he did earlier today.

The existing situation with respect to nuclear testing is highly favorable to the Soviets in the following respects:

First, they have on their side a preponderance, or at least the articulate majority, of misinformed, almost hysterical world opinion on nuclear weapons and their testing. This gives them great propaganda gains by dragging out the test negotiations indefinitely. Such tactics have extended far beyond the testing issue to now make the ownership, let alone the testing or use, of any nuclear weapons fair game for Communist propagandists. This has long been a major Communist objective.

Second, the Soviets are free to test surreptitiously almost at will without detection while we are stopped, thus offering an opportunity to surpass our nuclear capability by an unknown magnitude. There is no significant detection system for even the larger clandestinely conducted Soviet tests. The Soviets can easily verify that we have stopped testing by information from their many infiltrators and conscientious Western scientists who would leak any attempt at clandestine U.S. testing.

Third, even if the Soviets have not taken advantage of their freedom to develop and test new nuclear weapons, by accepting the nuclear weapons status quo they have been able to free resources and valuable scientific talent from nuclear efforts and employ them on accelerated missile and space efforts, all to the West's disadvantage.

Four, there are presently no foreign inspectors inside the U.S.S.R. For as long as the negotiations drag on there is no chance of them getting there. The U.S.S.R. is a closed society, always has been. The longer it can remain so, the better off it is for them. This is a strong reason for them to stall, stall, stall when it comes to any agreement which might open up that country, even the slightest.

Fifth, by holding constantly the popular side on the nuclear testing issue, the Soviets encourage a defensive inferiority complex in Western statesmen who do not understand the basic fact that the moral question involved is not the weapons with which the West must stock its arsenals to preserve its freedom and guarantee its survival, but the immorality of not doing what must be done to save Western civilization from the onslaughts of international communism.

This confusion respecting moralities is a great help to the Soviets in other areas as well as in the nuclear testing area.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I have listened to the gentleman's fine dissertation with great interest. I wonder if the gentleman would not clarify something. It is my impression and understanding that it was President Eisenhower who ordered an end to nuclear testing some 3 or 3½ years ago. Is the gentleman suggesting that after a little more than a hundred days Mr. Kennedy is to reverse and rescind the policy without giving him at least a chance to show what he can do with it?

Mr. HOSMER. I am suggesting that Mr. Kennedy himself during the campaign stated that he would make an honest effort to obtain agreement at Geneva, and if the effort failed then he would end the negotiations.

I am suggesting that a considerable time has passed and it has resulted in nothing. Therefore it is now time for Mr. Kennedy to initiate action. If the gentleman will permit me, I will detail the reasons therefor.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I certainly congratulate the gentleman on his approach, but I am just wondering whether the gentleman is not expecting the President to move too fast in view of the fact that Mr. Eisenhower ended the testing 3½ years ago but did not succeed in getting an agreement out of the conference.

Mr. HOSMER. The voluntary moratorium was announced by President Eisenhower on October 28, 1958, in conjunction with the arrangements for nuclear talks in Geneva and in a climate in which it appeared that honest negotiations toward a fair and effective agreement with self-enforcing mechanisms was to be made at Geneva and that within a reasonable time the matter would be concluded in the form of a formal treaty. That expectation did not come to be; and at the time of the initiation we were in the midst of presidential campaigns last year. It was impossible because the new President would be coming in and exercising responsibility after January 20 of this year to decide in the matter of major change in the policy. I think that both parties agreed at least tacitly that the situation should persist, and I say tacitly because both candidates discussed this at length during their campaigns, that this situation would persist into future negotiation.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes, the President has made that clear as late as this afternoon, that our patience is not inexhaustible in this field. But I do think that in all fairness we certainly should not criticize Mr. Kennedy for trying to accomplish something in slightly more than 90 days, or 120 days, something which the previous administration did not accomplish in 3½ years. I think in all fairness and sincerity President Kennedy should be given a fair chance to accomplish his goal.

Mr. HOSMER. I am afraid the gentleman has contradicted himself in his statement, because he was just saying it was impossible to deal with the Soviets at the conference table, and then he is asking for more time.

Now, sir, I will proceed, and then we can discuss this later. I want to get to the subject, Mr. Speaker.

Each day's delay with the test ban conference is a day closer to the convening of the general conference on disarmament scheduled for July.

If the highly controversial test-ban issue can be kept alive, then incorporated into the highly controversial disarma-

ment conference, it will guarantee that nothing will come out of either parley that in any way impedes the Soviets' ambition for world domination.

In face of these advantages, if the Soviets should break off the talks, in the sense that they offered no concessions whatever and in effect encourage the resumption of U.S. tests, the significance of this would be startling. It would mean that they are so very confident of their power, regardless of what the United States does, that their present advantages in this area no longer seem important. This would mark a significant and ominous change in Soviet thought and tactics. They have never previously abandoned a clear advantage through indifference. It is certain they would not do so in this case. Such action on their part would simply mean they calculate they can do just about what they please without incurring any serious risks of effective opposition from the United States in particular or the free world in general.

Even though the Soviets may so calculate at this point, it still is probable they will find greater advantage in pursuing another course of action. The logic of this derives from the statement I made yesterday to this body and which ties in directly with the forthcoming meeting between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy in Vienna.

Yesterday I asserted: First, that the Soviets are keen students and competent judges of a country's mood, the qualities of its leaders and the implications of these to them; second, that for many years Soviet experts have made very careful, continuous and probably accurate appraisals of the strengths and weaknesses of the United States, their foremost opponent; third, that from the day of Mr. Kennedy's inauguration they have pressed him very hard, and, since the Soviets do not act on impulse, there must be a logical reason.

I also indicated yesterday that Khrushchev, being an old hand at summitry, would not expect to leave Vienna without some substantial gains. I mentioned the possibility he would expect to obtain a tacit ratification of Communist advances in Cuba, Laos, and elsewhere in return for delaying a crisis over Berlin for a while. Today I will discuss another, much more likely gain, which Khrushchev probably seeks from the Vienna meeting.

Recollect the advantages to the Soviets from keeping the test ban discussions going that I have mentioned.

Recollect public statements by former Atomic Energy Commissioner Thomas E. Murray, hinting at an entire new family of nuclear weapons in the offing which will give the nation first developing them a very, very, substantial superiority—a superiority which, if possessed as a monopoly by the Soviet Union, might well render Western Europe and other vital free world areas indefensible and make the possibilities for nuclear blackmail by the Kremlin unlimited.

Next recollect that the Soviets very closely observed last fall's presidential campaign. It exhibited a mood of the United States of impatience with the long drawn-out test ban talks. Both candidates reflected this mood by promising, if elected, to make a last try at an enforceable agreement; and if the effort failed, to lift the voluntarily imposed U.S. nuclear test moratorium and end the Geneva talks.

Thus even before voting on election day named the new President, the Soviets had judged what his course would be and had a fairly accurate appraisal that without some concessions on their part the test ban talks would be ended and the considerable advantages they gain from them terminated.

The Soviet experts also have known for a long time that any treaty which might come out of Geneva would have to be ratified by the U.S. Senate; and that the continuing mood of that body has been against approving any treaty which fails to nail down and specify with reasonable clarity self-enforcing mechanisms, including inspection and control procedures, sufficient to give reasonable assurance of Soviet compliance with the treaty.

The Soviets were thus confronted with two problems in prolonging their advantages from continued Geneva talks: First, to overcome the country's mood against delays; and second, to overcome Senate resistance to a loosely drawn treaty. These problems were apparent to them early last fall. They have had a long time to work out their solutions. In contrast, Mr. Kennedy has had little time—a few weeks at the most. He has been engaged in all the other problems of setting up a new administration.

Unquestionably the Soviets have logically reasoned that the solution to these two problems involved pressing the new President hard from the beginning—Laos, Cuba, the U.N., the Congo—place him in a bad light, make it really necessary for him to pull something out of the hat to regain prestige abroad, at home, and with respect to his political party. Also it would be logical for them to make the new and untenable demands they have made since the test ban talks resumed in March in order later to back down from them by way of supposed, but illusory, concessions.

After this softening up and stage setting, the next logical step for Khrushchev and company would be to suggest quietly, through diplomatic channels, a meeting between the two heads of state. But in the face of Mr. Kennedy's campaign promise not to engage in summitry without proper preliminary meetings between Foreign Ministers and lesser lights to determine areas of possible agreement, some sweetener would be needed. Some kind of concession must be offered, something Mr. Kennedy badly needs to carry home from Vienna.

The concession? Easy. Back down from numerous untenable demands which have been made for this very purpose and which cost nothing by way of really substantive changes in the Soviet position.

Concessions, which coming in the nick of time, can be propagandized as proof positive of Mr. Khrushchev's and communism's alleged love of peace, and which give him, for nothing, a nice, fat prize to take home.

Concessions which will make the new President appear to have succeeded where others have failed and thus build his prestige.

Concessions accepted by the President which the Senate, with its strong majority of members of the President's own political party, could hardly repudiate by dogged insistence on adequate self-enforcing mechanisms in any resulting treaty.

Concessions which need not necessarily speed the pace of negotiations to a very large degree, just keep them alive.

Concessions which, even if finally resulting in an agreement, still need not result in any significant opening of the Iron Curtain and change in the U.S.S.R.'s closed society status for years because inherent in them will be possibilities for interminable delays when it comes to putting them in treaty language, further agreements to be negotiated on the infinite details involved and many other dilatory possibilities.

And, most importantly for the U.S.S.R. and for international communism: Concessions which will give their scientists the time secretly to develop and surreptitiously to test the new family of nuclear weapons—achieve the technological breakthrough—which will tip the balance of power decisively in favor of the Soviet bloc.

Mr. Kennedy's multiple references to the Geneva test ban talks and assertion that our patience at the bargaining table is nearly inexhaustible during his message to the Congress earlier today is ominous in this regard. The message has heightened my fear and the belief that Mr. Khrushchev has offered and Mr. Kennedy has accepted certain so-called test talk concessions which will be announced at Vienna and which will eventually prove disastrous to the United States and to the entire free world. I sincerely believe Mr. Kennedy's clear duty to the Nation is not to take such a course, is to end these talks, and is to announce resumption of U.S. testing; that the time to execute that duty is now, before he takes the boobytrapped road to Vienna which well may end at history's most gigantic and deadly Trojan horse.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to say that I deeply appreciate the gentleman's discussion of this subject. It is quite evident that he has given much thought and careful study to the subject.

I think it is indeed fortunate for us and for our country that he has taken the lead in this matter in such a fine manner.

I would like to ask the gentleman a question to bring out another viewpoint that I feel is important for us to consider, and that is this. Is it not true

that Mr. Khrushchev's objective continually is to gain prestige for himself, for his system and his ideals?

Mr. HOSMER. That is part of the mythology of achieving the Communist goal of world domination in which the methods may range anywhere from the most peaceful to the most violent. In other words, they select out at the particular time, in accordance with the principles of Marxist-Leninist dialectic materialism the degree of violence which they will use to pursue their ultimate objective, depending upon what the circumstances of the moment will tolerate, and whether it is well to change their doctrine of proceeding with less violence at any one moment, or to proceed with more violence.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And is it not also true that he seeks continually opportunities to downgrade the free society that we represent; and if he can gain the world stage by bringing the President into his presence, in this kind of situation, he will take full advantage of it?

Mr. HOSMER. That is quite right; that is the other side of the coin.

Incidentally, it is interesting to recognize that this worldwide propaganda with respect to nuclear weapons has proceeded from the Soviet Union ever since 1945 when the United States exploded its first nuclear weapon. In the period roughly 1945–52 the basis of that propaganda was negatory; in other words, it was aimed at creating world public opinion which was so antagonistic to the use of the weapon that by the force of that public opinion the United States would be denied the use of the weapon. In the meantime they, themselves, could proceed to develop nuclear weaponry on their own. As a matter of fact, they rejected the Baruch plan, which was a bold move on our part to internationalize all technical know-how and all nuclear material. They rejected it because they knew that internationalized, they themselves would not be able to obtain nuclear weapons. So they rejected it and proceeded in their laboratories and now they have acquired nuclear capabilities themselves. But they have kept up the propaganda drumfire since then, because it is still important to them to have the force of public opinion working on the free world, and against the free world's using the kind of weapons that it must use in order to equate its manpower with the vastly greater manpower available to the Soviet bloc for use in conventional types of conflict.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOSMER. I am glad to yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to point out that the present Secretary of State has an article in a recent issue of a national magazine in which he rather questions the idea of summitry on the part of our Chief Executive. I have not had the opportunity to read the article thoroughly, I just scanned it, but if the gentleman has read it he knows that he used somewhat the same argument. Therefore I suggest that perhaps this administration ought to listen to some of its own talents, to some of its own people who have had much more experience in this field than he has.

Mr. HOSMER. The article was written last year, prior to his appointment as Secretary of State. He was not only against summitry but he stated that it was better for the Secretary of State of the United States not to go traveling around the world; that he should base his operations in Washington and run the State Department from here. The Secretary of State apparently has changed his views, on that at least, since he has taken office. Mr. Kennedy's idea was not to go to a summit conference without adequate preparation by lesser lights in that Department. Now he is going out there. He has apparently changed.

So we are not getting exactly what we expected, according to the words of these people prior to the time they took office.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has demonstrated in his remarks a remarkable depth of understanding of the full treachery of the Soviet mind. I certainly wish to associate myself with the gentleman's remarks in evaluating Khrushchev's deception. There is no question in my mind that the Soviet Union has used these conferences and various other techniques to further their ultimate plans for conquest of the world. But I do think the gentleman has underestimated the full determination of Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States, in dealing fairly. The President today, unlike any message we have had in this House since the end of the war, stated in no uncertain terms that he is going to the meeting in Vienna with no agenda. There is going to be no dicussion of treaties or agreements. The meeting is merely a courtesy call, a meeting of two heads of state. He wants to emphasize to Mr. Khrushchev at this brief meeting America's determination to stand up for the dignity and rights of man.

The gentleman has mentioned someone's speaking of summitry. This is a meeting that among other things was recommended and suggested by the former Vice President, Mr. Nixon.

Very recently, a few weeks ago in Chicago, he stated that the two heads of government ought to meet. Frankly, if the President is going to Vienna it is certainly in keeping with a suggestion made by the former Vice President, Mr. Nixon himself, who is today, I believe, the titular head of the Republican Party.

Mr. HOSMER. I thank the gentleman for the nice words he said at the beginning. I recall to him that yesterday I said this about the President, that Mr. Pierre Salinger and others have intimated that Mr. Kennedy is at heart a resolute and courageous man. But I also suggested this, that if Mr. Kennedy is going to Vienna to warn Mr. Khrushchev against going too far he is wasting his time, because the Soviets do not read their signals from words but only from deeds. Mr. Kennedy's time in that respect might much better be consumed in a very, very important job that needs to be done, which he failed to mention in speaking of the very many other things to do when he spoke to us, and that is the organization of the United States of America and the free world to engage upon the kind of nonmilitary conflict we are in.

For instance, the President asked us for $250 million for a contingency fund, yet as I listened to his message the question repeatedly came to my mind that certainly such a fund could be well spent, could be effectively utilized, in opposing the Communist maneuvers in the nonmilitary conflict. But in this message so far the President has not convinced me that he understands the nature of the conflict sufficiently as the means of carrying it on to the extent that this money could be placed in his hands with confidence that it would accomplish the purpose for which it was asked. Until Mr. Kennedy does the job of organization for the conduct of a nonmilitary war and has as efficient an organization as we have for the conduct of military war we still will not be able to meet the challenges against us.

Particularly in his message today I noticed he said that we must do things here and there and the other place, and where must we be doing them? In the areas of the free world where the Communists are making their progress. Why the purely defensive psychology and philosophy? The Communists have divided the world into two areas, a war zone and a peace zone. The peace zone is Iron Curtain territory and the war zone is all the rest of the world. One of their major tenets is that the war is to be conducted in our territory.

Now, if we were to win every battle that they force upon us we can no more than break even under those conditions. Unless we carry this conflict back into their peace zone we can never win, and we can never terminate it. That is what I am asking the President of the United States to do. That is what the American people, as a matter of fact, and you and I both know when we speak to them—they know there is something wrong—they do not know what it is—they are waiting, desperately waiting, for someone to come up and say, "This is what is wrong." We need to organize and fight this new kind of war which we have not had experience with before, and in which the Soviets have had 40 years of leadtime in fighting, and which we need to know about in order to win.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. And our candidate for President had some pretty sound ideas in this regard, and he spoke very eloquently in the campaign about it, and those ideas need to be listened to.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. BELL. I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman on the remarks he has made, and associate myself with his views. I would like to ask the gentleman this one question:

Is it not also true that the test ban may be adversely affecting the potentials

of our country in the field of nuclear propulsion, in the area of working toward outer space on which the President expressed himself as being vitally concerned?

Mr. HOSMER. The gentleman, who is a very respected member of the Space Committee, well knows the answer to that, and he is referring to the Project Orion which involves the use of nuclear explosives as distinguished from rocketry in the space effort.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I believe the gentleman has again demonstrated his very, very deep understanding of the Communist conspiracy. I only hope after listening to the gentleman's remarks that when the President's very dramatic program, which he outlined to the Congress today to meet this worldwide Communist conspiracy head-on, comes before the Congress, I honestly hope that we will be able to put party labels aside and put partisan considerations aside and get behind our President because I believe President Kennedy has given us a program that will lead to the survival of freedom in this country.

I wish to congratulate the gentleman for his very keen understanding of this Communist conspiracy. But I do think within the framework that the President outlined today we can meet that challenge and survive.

Mr. HOSMER. I think my dispute with you, sir, would be that the program the President outlined today is partial, it is a program of bits and pieces—it is not tied together as an integrated whole which can be operated, orchestrated and coordinated and timed to produce the victory that the American people so desperately want, and which the free world so desperately needs and, yes, that those who yearn for freedom, and there are millions behind the Iron Curtain, look to us in their hope for that freedom.

IOWA PLAN FOR GROWTH IN HIGHER EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHWENGEL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first I want to comment on the dissertation and eloquent statement presented by the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER]. I want to associate myself completely with his observations and findings, and his study and the presentation that he has made of it.

I want to add further that I have in the past supported mutual security programs and those programs that are designed to bring about a better understanding among the freedom-loving and peace-loving peoples of the world, and to enhance the cause of freedom everywhere.

I have been aware of some shortcomings that we have been responsible for, and I have tried to be helpful in every instance to make adjustments and corrections that were necessary. I here again today pledge my support to the President—and I think he is right. I was impressed in some respects with his presentation today, and I have received some messages with misgivings.

I am not in complete agreement with the advisability of going to a summit. Some say this is not a summit. I think it will be accepted as a summit meeting by most of the world. The eyes of the world would be upon what happens there, watching closely. I hope it turns out for the best. I have some misgivings about it, but most of all I am concerned today about the cost of this program that is being offered. I want to suggest that there is a right and a wrong way to do the right thing in all these important problems that we have before us, and I want to suggest that to finance the cost of this whole program at the expense of the little fellow is wrong. We should find some other way, some better way to pay for the program that must be paid for in some way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to a subject I have referred to earlier as the Iowa plan for growth and progress in higher education.

Last week I took the floor to discuss generally the subject of Federal aid to education and aid to higher education in particular. I indicated to the House that I had introduced some legislation which I considered the first phase of an "Iowa Plan for Growth and Progress in Higher Education." A plan that would have a salutary effect on resolving at least some of the problems that have presented themselves to those interested in education and especially to the students who desire the advantage of higher education; an advantage that is not only of interest and value to each student as he makes plans to prepare himself for the future but is of great value to our Nation as we make plans to contend with the great challenge that is being presented in this new atomic space age in which we live.

Mr. Speaker, today I take the floor again to indicate my interest and concern for the problems in the field of education and to remind my colleagues again that the suggestions that our study and research have revealed are the proper approach to the solution of these problems. An approach that in the long run will not only serve to make it easier for more boys and girls to attend colleges, but will serve to extend opportunities and make it easier to obtain the great goals of equality and liberty that remain as a great challenge for our people, our system of free enterprise and our country.

Mr. Speaker, as we contemplate the situation that exists in the world and indeed within our own boundaries as a nation, it is plain to see that misunderstanding, lack of understanding and an appeal to the passions of our people are having far too much influence in determining our national character and it is leaving us with an image that is very undesirable as we contend with the great overriding issue of peace and good will which is needed more today than ever before in the history of the human family. The one great answer, if not the principal answer, to all of these problems is education.

Somewhere it is written:

> The great end of education is to discipline rather than to furnish the mind; to train it to the use of its own powers, rather than fill it with the accumulations of others.

I think there is abundant evidence that we in this country and especially the great leaders of the world need to note this admonition.

Sir Alfred Zimmern reminds us:

> All true educators since the time of Socrates and Plato have agreed that the primary object of education is the attainment of inner harmony, or, to put it into more up-to-date language, the integration of the personality. Without such an integration, learning is no more than a collection of scraps, and the accumulation of knowledge becomes a danger to mental health.

As we reflect on the temper of world leaders it is quite evident that this admonition is very worth while to ponder on today.

We have found, also, in our research, that as we look at the future it is necessary to give more opportunities to more of our people. We need to offer a plan to make it easier for a much larger percentage of high school graduates to have the advantage of higher education. This suggested legislation, if passed, could be invaluable to many families as they plan the education for their children.

Having this in mind, as I indicated earlier, we have introduced three bills to secure an increased income tax exemption or a tax credit for college educational expenses. If any one of these bills are passed it will serve to encourage many thousands more of our high school graduates to go to college.

One of the bills would increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 for each full-time student, taxpayer, spouse, or dependent paying the expenses at any institution of higher learning. A proportionate deduction would be available to part-time students.

The other two bills would authorize a tax credit for certain educational expenses. One would permit a credit up to $100 for each full-time student and a proportionate deduction for part-time students. The other bill would allow a credit of $100 for full-time students who had expenses of $500 or more for a school year or one-fifth of the exact amount when the expenses are less than $500.

In all of the bills, approved expenses are listed as amounts paid for tuition, fees, charges, and required textbooks, and for board, lodging, and transportation for those students living away from home.

The definition of a full-time student is the historic one for tax purposes. The status of a part-time student and the amount of his exemption or credit would be determined by a special committee named by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Today I take the floor again to discuss in particular the second of the three bills which I have introduced providing for a tax law change that will encourage students and/or their families to take advantage of an opportunity to receive training or education in college.

In my speech concering the first of these proposals I tried to point out the need for this tax relief. I have some additional information on this subject which should further point out why this relief is so badly needed.

As I indicated earlier, the basic research for this material has been done by my research team of college students in the law school at the State University of Iowa. The work of this team has been ably supervised and directed by Dr. Deil Wright, of the department of political science at the university. The present members of this fine research team, of which I am very proud, are Robert Downer, of Newton, Iowa; Tom Scheuerman, formerly of Rock Island, Ill., now residing in Iowa City, Iowa; and Ivan Ackerman, of Allison, Iowa.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has computed the average costs to students for the 1960–61 school year. Tuition averages $179 for State or municipally supported institutions and $676 for private colleges and universities. Room costs at public institutions average $187 and $189, respectively, for men and women, and at private institutions these costs averaged $216 for men and $231 for women. For food at publicly supported institutions the costs averaged $383 for men and $379 for women, while at privately supported colleges the average costs were $404 for men and $436 for women. The total averages of these three items at the Nation's tax-supported colleges and universities are $749 for men and $747 for women, while at their privately financed counterparts these figures amount to $1,296 for men and $1,343 for women.

These are by no means the average total amounts spent by each student per year to obtain a college education, however. Books, laundry, clothing, and other miscellaneous expenses swell these averages to $1,450 for students attending tax-supported institutions of higher learning in their home State of residence. For those attending private colleges the average swells to $2,475 for men and $2,530 for women.

Per capita income figures show that many families who currently have children in colleges and universities cannot afford these high costs. For example, the Bureau of Business and Economic Research at the State University of Iowa made a survey in 1959 of the finances of students attending the three State-supported colleges and universities in Iowa—the State University of Iowa, Iowa State University, and Iowa State Teachers College. This report showed the average adjusted gross income of families with a member or members attending one of these three institutions was $5,500 per year, or the same as the adjusted average gross income of all Iowa families. However, the average family in the State contained 3.49 persons at that time, where the average family in the State, with students attending one of these three institutions, contained 5.15 persons. Thus, the per capita income in families as a whole in the State was $1,576, as compared with only $1,068 for families with members in one of these institutions. The report further showed that 28 percent of these families had more than one child in college at that time, and that the families average contributions amounted to 43 percent of the student's yearly expenses.

The second proposal for tax relief to students or their parents which I have introduced is based on a tax credit, rather than a tax deduction or exemption. My research team's findings, with which I agree, feel that a tax credit is more advantageous to the solution of this particular problem, for the reason that the lower-income families are the ones most in need of this tax aid, and by using a tax credit each family with a student in college, will have his Federal income tax obligation credited with an equal amount.

In this proposal a tax credit of $100 would be granted for the expenses which each college student incurred up to $100 for tuition, fees, books, and necessary supplies, such as those needed by medical, dental, or engineering students.

This proposal would not take $100 off the tax bill of part-time students, but it would materially aid them. Presently, a great many students are enrolled part-time in our colleges and universities, primarily because they cannot afford to attend college on a full-time basis. These, in most instances, would be the students who need this benefit the most. They are delaying their education for a number of years in many cases because of the pressing nature of their financial obligations, and thus they are delayed in reaching their full potential income. This will more than offset any tax benefit which they might obtain from remaining in college for a longer period.

This plan would also encourage those persons with bachelor's degrees to further their educations part time by seeking masters or doctoral degrees. It seems to me that this is an important aspect of this plan which should not be overlooked.

The way in which part-time students would be aided by this plan is that 20 semester hours per year would be enough to be classified as a full-time student for the purposes of this bill. Anyone with less than 20 hours of credit in 1 year would be entitled to $5 of tax credit for each semester hour of credit gained in college classes.

This plan would not completely answer the problem of those students who cannot afford to attend college, but it will be helpful. The $100 benefit that students or their parents would receive from this would, in many instances, pay a semester's tuition, a month's room and board, or for other necessary expenses. Often the lack of such a seemingly small amount as $100 will force a student to drop out of school for a semester, due to the inability to pay pressing bills. The aid given to these students alone makes this plan worthy of enactment.

My research team feels that another advantage of this plan is the simplicity with which it would be administered. Taxpayers, they point out, would not need to keep records of all money spent for tuition, fees, room, board, books, and supplies, but would only take the amount of credit to which they were entitled, corresponding to the number of semester hours taken during the year. In the case of an audit of the taxpayer's returns he would need only a simple statement from the registrar of the college or university stating how many hours of credit had been received by that person during the particular year.

This is the type of plan which we feel we must have to ease the financial burden borne by our college students and their parents. Each student obtaining a college education is better equipped to serve our Nation. It is our duty to see to it that their full potential is realized.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON CAPTIVE NATIONS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. DWYER] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the most tragic fact in the world today is the necessity to formalize the existence of the captive nations.

If we look at a map of the world we will see the reason why. Through the eyes of political freedom we will see one huge area of the globe separate and distinct from all the rest, surrounded and shut off, in effect, by an Iron Curtain through which none of the winds of freedom are permitted to penetrate.

This area extends eastward from East Germany, embracing the countries of eastern Europe and the regions of European Russia, across the vastness of Asia, down into southeast Asia as far as North Vietnam, and across the China Sea to North Korea. It is an area of many countries and cultures and peoples.

In the colors of political freedom, this large section of the map is painted red—red for the color of international communism, red for the color of the blood shed in defense of lost freedoms.

These are the captive nations. Their many hundreds of millions of people are the captive peoples.

Since 1917, when Communist revolutionaries seized control of the Moscow Government, the process of Communist subjugation has continued. One by one, nations have fallen to the twin weapons of communism: internal subversion and external force. In place of the national independence which they destroyed, the Soviet Russian-Communist China partnership has instituted the most ruthless tyranny the world has even known. In exchange for personal freedom, Moscow and Peiping have substituted godless slavery. Forced-labor camps and death have been the rewards of those who fought to preserve their freedom.

This is a grim and disheartening picture. But it is a picture from which we must not look away. It is a picture which must be imprinted indelibly in our minds. The lessons taught by Communist butchery in the Ukraine, by Communist treachery in Poland, by Communist massacre in Hungary, and by Communist

invasion and aggression in China, Korea, and Tibet must be learned well and never forgotten.

This is the purpose of House Resolution 267. This is also the reason why the Congress in 1959 authorized the designation of the third week in July of each year as "Captive Nations Week." Through both means, we of the free world can direct constant attention to Communist tyranny and provide continuous study of the problems and the diplomatic opportunities created by this gigantic conspiracy against free people.

This purpose will be well served if we take advantage of the priceless opportunity which free men have to reexamine our position in the world, to sharpen our vision of reality, to strengthen our resolve, and to equip ourselves militarily, economically, and spiritually for the continuing struggle between freedom and totalitarianism.

It is a struggle we must wage on all the frontiers of the world. Free men and free nations must be first in conquering the challenges of science and of outer space. Free men and free nations must be first in extending the means to less privileged people to share in the prosperity and the plenty which modern technology has made possible. Free men and free nations must be first in wiping out social and racial and religious discrimination and in welcoming all peoples as a matter of fundamental justice into the brotherhood of men and nations. And free men and free nations must be first in protecting liberty from the insidious subversion of communism and from the constant threat of Communist military aggression.

But, above all, free men and free nations must make their devotion to freedom real and meaningful to all peoples. We cannot afford merely to preach freedom and fail to promote it and protect it wherever possible. The world will follow the banners of freedom only when free men and free nations make it clear beyond a shadow of a doubt that we are willing to work, fight, and sacrifice in behalf of freedom for all people in all parts of the world.

Freedom and justice and peace—these three are the inseparable causes for which we must stand. As justice is the foundation of freedom, so is freedom the only possible basis of true peace. We cannot have one without the other two. Together they constitute the most glorious cause for which men have ever fought.

So it is that here today we owe it to ourselves and to our own freedom, and to our brothers who have lost their freedom, to rededicate ourselves to the cause of freedom and justice and peace throughout the world. The whole world looks to us for the leadership and the sense of direction and the unwavering resolution which can bring our cause alive and rekindle in the hearts of people everywhere the hope and assurance of freedom and justice and true peace.

This is the moral of the captive nations resolution. This is the great issue of our time.

INCOME TAX RELIEF TO DU PONT STOCKHOLDERS UPON DIVESTITURE OF GENERAL MOTORS STOCK

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the proposed bill I am offering today is intended to differentiate between those that purposely intend to circumvent existing law and those interests that have sustained a normal growth due to skilled management and observance of the public interest, and as a result have gained the confidence of investors.

The Du Pont Co. supplied gunpowder to the Continental Army of George Washington, and since these early days of our country, and under the competitive system of our economy and due to fine management has outstanding success. Many thousands of investors large and small having confidence in this good management of Du Pont are partial with due regard to existing law, purchase of its shares.

The hairsplitting legal decision of the Supreme Court, in which the Justices were almost equally divided on the question involved may play directly into the hands of those who question the morality of our capitalistic system, and certainly will shake the confidence of investors in general.

The Du Pont Co. in its growth, and with due regard to existing laws, purchased shares of General Motors Co. during the period of the First World War, and has held them as an asset ever since. It is not contended that the Du Pont should not now divest itself of these shares, under rules and regulations of the Court. Such divestiture should take into full account the effect upon the national economy and the innocent stockholders of the company, particularly at a time when the country is emerging from a depression and a large unemployment exists.

The proposed bill if enacted will not only simplify the divestiture of General Motors Co. stock by Du Pont, but will protect many thousands of innocent stockholders of that company from a punitive fine, which itself is unconstitutional under the 8th amendment of the Constitution of the United States which reads "Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted."

If an innocent stockholder of Du Pont is forced to receive shares of General Motors Co., due to the recent decision of the Supreme Court, as income on which the stockholder must pay an income tax, instead of a return of capital, it is an excessive fine and punishes a citizen in an unusual manner.

The payment of any tax upon a repayment of capital to a stockholder is unusual. Such repayment dilutes the value of the parent company by the value of the asset delivered and the stockholder of the parent company upon sale or transfer of his share or shares should be subject to a capital gains tax on the difference between the market value of the Du Pont shares on the date of the Supreme Court's decision and their value after adjustment by delivery of the General Motors Co. stock. The proposed bill contemplates such corrective legislation to employ the capital gains tax rather than the punitive income tax or fine upon a stockholder of Du Pont Co.

SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today proposed legislation to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, in order to provide increased domestic sugarbeet acreage, to assure an ample and stable supply of sugar at reasonable price, and to extend the provisions of the act for 4 years. As the Members of the House know, the Sugar Act is scheduled to expire on June 30 of next year, and it is imperative, in my opinion, that it be extended during this session of Congress and extended in such a manner as to give a substantial increase to the domestic sugarbeet areas.

I believe it is imperative that the act be extended during this session in order to give both producers and processors opportunity to prepare for the increased quotas which should be forthcoming. If this is not done, we will find ourselves, almost certainly, in the same situation which has plagued the consideration of Sugar Act extensions during both this and the previous Congress. That is, we will find ourselves with insufficient time to give proper consideration to the act, and will thus be forced to make some inadequate, stopgap decision. Surely we have ample time during the remainder of this session to give the domestic producer the consideration which he deserves and for which he has patiently waited. This will not only provide for a proper consideration of his case, but will, as noted above, give him ample time to prepare for increased production.

I believe increased domestic beet production is imperative for several reasons:

First. The American farmer deserves to produce a larger share of the sugar consumed in this country. He has a difficult time understanding why, with the cost-price squeeze and the other problems facing American agriculture, he is not given the opportunity to produce a larger share of a cash crop which has proven to be extremely lucrative. In addition to providing the farmer and our agricultural communities with the increased income they so badly need,

increased domestic production of sugarbeets would be a relief to the taxpayers as well. In our Red River Valley area of northwestern Minnesota and eastern North Dakota, for example, every additional acre planted to sugarbeets will mean almost invariably two less acres planted to crops which are in surplus.

Second. The American farmer has the desire and the ability to produce a greater share of this country's sugar needs. This was amply proven at the recent hearings of the House Committee on Agriculture, when farmers, agriculturalists, and legislators from Midwestern, Southwestern, and Western areas presented carefully detailed testimony substantiating both the desire and the ability of American farmers to economically grow high quality sugarbeets. As a case in point, the fine testimony presented by several representatives of the various sugarbeet development associations in the congressional district which I have the privilege of serving showed that all that is needed to increase sugarbeet production in our Red River Valley of the North is the authority to do so. This is a proven beet-producing area, with three processing plants already in existence. Beets have been grown in the valley for over 35 years, and for almost that long, farmers have been expressing their desire for increased acreage. Climate, soil, water, and the many other factors affecting sugarbeet production are all ideal, as proven by the outstanding production record of the area to date, and all that is needed for increases is for Congress to give the authority.

Third. The expressed purpose of the Sugar Act is to insure that American consumers will have an adequate supply of sugar at a reasonable cost, and the domestic areas are able to fulfill this purpose far more adequately than any other area. The recent tragic events in Cuba show how quickly a major foreign supplier of sugar can cease to fulfill its obligations under the act. This problem would be alleviated in the domestic areas, where a stable sugar supply would be assured. As to cost, and once again using the Red River Valley of the north as an example, studies and research have shown this Minnesota-North Dakota area to be one of the most economical for the production of sugar. Add to this the high quality of the product, and you have further reason for increasing the domestic quotas.

Fourth. Termination of the Cuban quota and the increasing consumptive needs of the American people very simply mean that this Nation must provide for increased supply. In the light of the above reasons, I submit that our domestic areas should be the source of this supply.

The bill which I have proposed today is designed to carry out this objective, and to substantiate the testimony given before the Agriculture Committee at its recent hearings. It is estimated that the provisions of this bill would increase the domestic sugarbeet quota by more than 800,000 tons in 1962, increasing by 1966 to an annual quota well in excess of 1 million tons larger than the present quota.

It will accomplish this by awarding to the domestic beet-producing areas a share of the quota formerly supplied by Cuba, by increasing from 55 to 100 percent the amount of the annual consumptive increases going to domestic producers, and by a distribution of the deficits which it is expected will be forthcoming from other producing areas.

Several other features of the bill should be mentioned also:

First. The increased domestic beet quota provided in the bill will accommodate at least four or five new processing plants throughout the Nation. In addition to an increase in farm income, therefore, the bill would also mean increased income in the towns and cities in agricultural areas, increased employment, and the many other desirable results which accrue from the establishment of new industry.

Second. Continuous growth and expansion are provided for both new and old growers.

Third. The bill takes nothing away from any foreign country, other than the provisions which are already in effect for Cuba and the Dominican Republic.

Fourth. The President and the State Department retain their control over the foreign quotas, so as to make provision for the relationship between the Sugar Act and this Nation's foreign policy.

These are but some of the main features of the bill. The reasons given above in favor of its enactment, together with the testimony presented to the Agriculture Committee recently, reemphasize the need for recognition by the Department of Agriculture, the House Agriculture Committee, and the committee's chairman of the desire and ability of the American farmer to produce a larger share of the country's sugar needs.

We have had little encouragement along these lines recently. The Department has been silent on what its sugar policy will be, and the chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, as reported in the May 19 issue of the Journal of Commerce, has said he looks with little favor on expansion of the domestic industry's sugar quota. In the light of the present problems besetting American agriculture and the opportunity for improvement which the production of sugarbeets offers, it is hard for me to understand either of these attitudes. As spokesmen for the farmer and his interests, it would seem to me that the Department, the committee, and its chairman would be in the forefront of those working for expanded production of sugarbeets by American farmers.

It is certainly my hope that they will assume this responsibility immediately, and that Congress will look with favor on the proposal which I have made today.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I was absent yesterday when the House voted on S. 1852 authorizing appropriations for aircraft, missiles and naval vessels for the Armed Forces. My absence was due to a trip I took to my district, at my own expense, and if I had been present I would have voted in favor of this bill. I think without question, in our troubled times we must use our facilities to provide for our common defense and to do so with reason and dispatch. From a reading of the RECORD covering the debate on this bill it appears the Armed Services Committee did an excellent job in going over the requested appropriations.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION WITH PRIVATE INDUSTRY—THE PRESIDENT'S STAND ON THE PANAMA CANAL STEAMSHIP LINE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I feel that praise is due President Kennedy for his reaffirming the action of the Eisenhower administration ordering the Panama Canal Steamship Line to discontinue all of its commercial activities.

The significance of this order goes far beyond the actual termination of the Panama Canal Line's competition with private enterprise. Here is a longstanding example of Government competition with private enterprise wherein the Government activity was not only in competition with private shipping lines and private airlines but duplicated in great part other military sea transport services of the Government.

Its operation and participation in commercial services was a flagrant violation of the principle that the Government should not operate business-type enterprises that could be effectively performed by private industry.

This question of Government-operated business-type enterprises—commercial-industrial activities—has long been of great concern to the Congress. As early as 1933 a special committee of the House of Representatives reported that the problem of Government competition with private industry had reached alarming proportions.

Of course, Government competition has increased manyfold since 1933 and numerous congressional committees have continued to express the concern of the Congress. For example, part II of the 1960 report of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business on "Use of Government-Owned Facilities in Competition with Private Commercial Refriger-

ated Warehouses" concluded that its findings were typical of many examples of continued Government competition with private enterprise which have been condemned by congressional committees, the Hoover Commission, and the President himself.

In line with the far-reaching recommendations of the Hoover Commission for eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities, which are competitive with private enterprise, President Eisenhower in 1955 directed that—

> The Federal Government will not start or carry on any commercial activity to provide a service or product for its own use if such product or service can be procured from private enterprise through ordinary channels.

That program was carried forward under a series of guidelines published by the Bureau of the Budget that required all agency heads to report on, and evaluate against established standards, their activities of a commercial-industrial nature.

Under this program, the Department of Defense alone identified 5,000 such commercial-industrial activities. Of that number, only 450 activities have been discontinued or are scheduled to be discontinued.

I would urge upon the President, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of Defense that an aggressive program to eliminate such Government competition could have far-reaching benefits as a stimulant to private industry, in broadening the tax base and as a means of effecting efficiencies and economy without in any way affecting the national security or any essential governmental function.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA DELIVERED AT TAXPAYERS' EXPENSE BY THE U.S. POST OFFICE AS A RESULT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ORDER

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, many people have been disturbed over President Kennedy's reversal of former President Eisenhower's position that Communist propaganda shipments into this country should be prohibited. I join in expressing equal concern.

The Communists are now taking full advantage of the open-door policy for Communist propaganda which resulted from President Kennedy's order of March 17, 1961, in which he called a halt to Government interception of Communist propaganda mailed from behind the Iron Curtain. The White House at that time—after having been in office for less than 2 months—said an administration review of the program, which has been in effect since 1948, has disclosed that it "serves no useful intelligence function at the present time." In addition, the White House said that Secretary of State Dean Rusk has been concerned about the program in view of "efforts to improve cultural exchanges with Communist countries."

The Post Office Department has estimated that it has seized some 15 million newspapers, magazines, books, and similar types of mail coming into this country from Communist dominated nations.

The program aroused a protest recently from Soviet newsmen in this country who complained of delays in receiving their publications. It also has aroused complaints from American addresses, including scholarly institutions, which have use for the Iron Curtain publications.

The Linn's Weekly Stamp News recently carried a reprint of the March 21, 1961, issue of Christian Economics, which discussed the results of the President's order permitting the Communists to ship free of charge unlimited quantities of such propaganda material, obviously at taxpayers' expense.

I commend the article to my colleagues for their consideration:

FOR MOSCOW: COMMIES BRUTALLY ABUSE U.S. COURTESY LAW WHICH EXTENDS THEM FREE SECOND-CLASS MAIL

(By Lawrence Sullivan)

High school and college students throughout the United States are richly supplied with Communist youth literature which is delivered free of charge by the U.S. Post Office. This report, from the House Committee on Un-American Activities, has alerted educators once more to the tide of ever more aggressive student leadership in pro-Communist demonstrations throughout the country.

When Moscow determines upon a new propaganda drive aimed at U.S. students it ships over its "educational literature" in ton lots to U.S. ports of entry, already addressed individually. Uncle Sam then distributes the Moscow periodicals free anywhere in the 50 States and the territories.

"Every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications," the committee's report said. (Communist Training Operations, pt. 2; GPO, Washington, October 12, 1960, p. 1327.)

Our own Bureau of Customs made a 12-month spot check of Moscow's training literature through New Orleans. It counted at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States.

Each package contained 5 to 15 different publications on youth leadership for communism.

New Orleans is one of the lesser ports of entry from the standpoint of Communist propaganda. A heavier volume of this material is coming into the United States via approximately 40 other ports of entry.

The endless lists of U.S. students are compiled and addressed through the World Federation of Democratic Youth, a pro-Communist transmission-belt organization in London; and by the International Union of Students in Prague, Czechoslovakia.

Both of these major international Communist-controlled youth organizations publish at least 40 periodicals, which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges. * * * None of these publications bears labeling as Communist propaganda, in accordance with requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In one recent year 7 million pieces of such Communist literature were cleared through New York, and tons more through San Franscisco, Seattle, Baltimore, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, and New Orleans. Every Russian, Polish, or Czech ship touching a U.S. port brings its quota of Red educational literature for domestic free mailing. During 1 week last year the San Francisco Post Office cleared 17½ tons of postage-free Red propaganda to U.S. addresses.

"It is frustrating and disappointing to see the sanctity of the mails abused," said Chief Postal Inspector David H. Stephens before the House Appropriations Committee, "In this country we are governed largely by the sanctity of the seal of mails, a tradition which has served us well, and I would hate to see it weakened."

Congressman FRANK T. BOW, Republican, of Ohio, a ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, disagrees:

"No other country in the free world permits Moscow's propaganda to be delivered at the expense of its own taxpayers," said Congressman Bow. "Many countries refuse to let such subversive material in under any circumstances. Instead of increasing postage rates at home, why not start on budget-balancing in the Post Office by refusing to distribute this Communist propaganda free of charge?"

In a few cases, when non-Communist ships are available, foreign postage pays for fetching the Russian literature to our ports of entry. But at shipside U.S.A. the mail is handed over to the U.S. Post Office. The entire cost of distribution and delivery to any address in the United States, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Guam, is borne by the U.S. Post Office.

"This propaganda is unsolicited," Congressman Bow continued. "Much of it is addressed to colleges and student groups throughout the United States. Under the Foreign Agents Registration Act all of this stuff is supposed to be labeled 'political propaganda,' but none of it is.

"The only way to discover propaganda is to open the literature and study it for subversive content. Of course, if the Russian packets are never opened, there would be no way to determine the content to be 'political propaganda'."

Not even first-class mail from the United States to Russia is delivered without being opened and examined in Moscow. Every piece of mail is read carefully for content. That which is approved is forwarded to the addressee. That which is not deemed in the Russian national interest is thrown into the trash. The U.S. mailer is not even notified that his mail will not be delivered. Much of the "pen-pal" mail sent by American youth to Russian teenagers under the Washington-Moscow cultural exchange agreement is never delivered in Russia, but all Russian letters are delivered here.

Our U.S. law extends to Communist countries free second-class mailing privileges anywhere in our national territory. Section 226, title 39, of the United States Code provides these preferential postage rates "* * * for the dissemination of information of a public character, or devoted to literature, the sciences, arts, or some special industry."

Never has any U.S. Government agency compiled for Congress a statement showing the total annual tonnage of incoming Communist propaganda distributed free, nor even an official guess of the total cost of this subsidy to the Kremlin's "special industry" mail.

"Does not commonsense dictate the complete elimination of all postal subsidies for Communist propaganda before American readers are taxed further for their own daily, weekly, or monthly publication?" Congressman Bow asks.

"I think the flow of propaganda material into this country is a very serious matter, indeed," said Chief Postal Inspector David H. Stephens before the Appropriations Committee (p. 162). "I am sure you know that

the Government is limited as to what it can do to combat this influence with respect to denying use of the mails to the senders of this material."

The Supreme Court has ruled in several controlling cases that the doctrine of "clear and present danger" from Red propaganda does not apply to mere advocacy of Communist principles, but applies only when specific overt acts of sabotage, subversion, or revolution are at hand to offer "a clear and present danger" to the national security.

Congressman JOHN R. PILLION, of Lackawanna, N.Y., pressed Inspector Stephens on the matter of incoming Red propaganda.

"Actually, if you had a great bundle of propaganda, no matter how vicious, coming from Red China or Moscow, and if I were to receive it in New York City or San Francisco and you attempted to investigate it, under the Supreme Court decision would you say you have the power to take that propaganda material away from me?"

Inspector Stephens answered: "I would say in this country, No." (P. 164.)

"So when we talk about using our law enforcement machinery to stop Communist propaganda, you are helpless, and your hands are tied completely under the decisions of the Supreme Court today; is that correct?"

"That is correct," replied Chief Inspector Stephens, "and I might say that living with it from day to day is a very frustrating experience."

"Could this situation be corrected by legislation?" queried Congressman OTTO E. PASSMAN, of Monroe, La., "or would it require a constitutional amendment to offset these rulings of the Supreme Court in order to give you power to seize this Communist propaganda?"

This urgent question is now under crash study, both in the General Counsel's Office in the Post Office and by constitutional experts in the House and Senate.

Meanwhile, the Kremlin's youth-training literature continues to flow inward daily by the ton.

At the same time the United States of America through its U.S. Information Agency, is spending an average of $110 million a year the world around in news, radio, library, and TV operations calculated to defeat Moscow's unrelenting propaganda drive against freedom.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may have until midnight tonight to file reports on the following bills: H.R. 5343, H.R. 6243, H.R. 6691, and H.R. 6834.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

HOW WHEAT FARMERS WOULD ADJUST TO DIFFERENT PROGRAMS

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. BREEDING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of this body a publication just released. It is entitled "How Wheat Farmers Would Adjust to Different Programs." This is Research Report No. 52, published by the Department of Agriculture.

This publication presents a technical study of the effect or the present program and five other different types of wheat programs on wheat producers. It is my understanding that this work was started about a year ago in the Department in an effort to determine in an unbiased, nonpolitical manner what effect each of the several different proposals for solving the wheat problem would have on the wheat producers.

The six different types of programs studied are—

(a) The present allotment program.

(b) A program having allotments 25 percent less than current allotments, with price supports at 85 percent of parity.

(c) A program having allotments 20 percent greater than current allotments, with price supports at 65 percent of parity.

(d) A bushel control program limiting marketings for food and export, at a price for domestic food wheat at about $2.35 per bushel, exports at 65 percent of parity, and other wheat sold at feed grain prices, coupled with a 20-percent land retirement program.

(e) A bushel control program with wheat for domestic food priced at 90 percent of parity, and all other wheat at $1.25 per bushel.

(f) No control program, and no price supports.

The results of this study are of extreme interest to me, and should be the concern of every Member of this body, as we soon will be forced to deal with this wheat problem. None of the hypothetical programs in this study exactly parallel any of the proposals which currently are being considered, but they are similar enough to provide a basis for sound judgment.

Program (b) is similar to the emergency wheat program passed by the last Congress and vetoed by Mr. Eisenhower. Program (d) is similar to the one developed by the National Association of Wheat Growers, the National Grange, and the National Farmers Union. Program (f) is similar to that advocated so vociferously by the Farm Bureau.

In all eight of the wheat producing areas studied, the bushel control program (d) would result in less total grain being produced than any of the other programs. This is a very important consideration; as with any wheat program we enact, we must also recognize its impact on the production of other grain crops. As a general rule, the next most effective method for reducing total grain production was no controls.

But that is only one side of the coin. The other is how does each program affect producer's net income. In six of the eight areas, this same bushel control program results in the highest net return to the farm, and in every area, the no control program results in the lowest net income on the farm.

These are only some of the highlights of this very important study. I commend the Department of Agriculture for providing such factual information, and I urge every interested Member to study it.

THE CHALLENGE OF WORLD COMMUNISM

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy in his message to the Congress of May 25 recalled the United States to the same spirit of freedom which inspired our beginnings in 1776.

The President pointed out that the great battleground for the defense and expansion of freedom today is the whole southern half of the globe—Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Middle East. The enemies of freedom seek to extend their new and relentless form of totalitarian imperialism:

CONCEALED AGGRESSION

Their aggression is more often concealed than open. They have fired no missiles; and their troops are seldom seen. They send arms, agitators, aid, technicians, and propaganda to every troubled area. But where fighting is required, it is usually done by others—by guerrillas striking at night, by assassins striking alone, by subversives and saboteurs and insurrectionists, who in some cases control whole areas inside of independent nations.

They possess a powerful intercontinental striking force, large forces for conventional war, a well-trained underground in nearly every country, the power to conscript talent and manpower for any purpose, the capacity for quick decisions, a closed society without dissent or free information, and long experience in the techniques of violence and subversion. They make the most of their scientific successes, their economic progress, and their pose as a foe of colonialism and friend of popular revolution. They prey on unstable or unpopular governments, unsealed or unknown boundaries, unfulfilled hopes, convulsive change, massive poverty, illiteracy, unrest, and frustration.

With these formidable weapons, the adversaries of freedom plan to consolidate their territory—to exploit, to control, and finally to destroy the hopes of the world's newest nations. It is a contest of will and purpose as well as force and violence—a battle for minds and souls as well as lives and territory. And in that contest, we cannot stand aside.

The aims of the leaders of world communism are no secret. Two recent Communist manifestos set forth these aims for all to see. The first is the statement of Communist leaders from 81 countries in Moscow in November 1960. The second is Khrushchev's speech of January 6, 1961.

The language of the two documents is repetitious and muddy; "imperialist" and "warmonger" describe anyone who opposes communism. But from the two manifestos emerge four major trends of Communist thought. We can ignore them at our peril.

PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE

First. Peaceful coexistence has lost its ordinary live-and-let-live meaning, and instead masks the Communists' strategy for world domination. This is clear from the two manifestos:

January 6, 1961: Peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems does not

mean reconciliation between the Socialist and bourgeois ideologies. On the contrary, it implies an intensification of the struggle of the working class and of all Communist Parties for the triumph of Socialist ideas. Now that there is a mighty Socialist camp with powerful armed forces, the peoples can undoubtedly prevent war and thus ensure peaceful coexistence provided they rally all their forces for active struggle against the bellicose imperialists. Scolding will not halt the imperialist adventurers. There is only one way they can be curbed: steady strengthening of the economic, political and military power of the Socialist countries, vigorous consolidation and reinforcement of the world revolutionary movement.

November 1960: The policy of peaceful coexistence is a policy of mobilizing the masses and launching vigorous action against the enemies of peace. The coexistence of states with different social systems is a form of class struggle between socialism and capitalism. It implies intensification of the struggle of the working class, of all the Communist Parties, for the triumph of Socialist ideas.

WARS OF LIBERATION

Second. Moscow and Peiping, while theoretically opposed to war, ardently support Communist-inspired "wars of liberation." Again, the two manifestos:

January 6, 1961: Now about national liberation wars. Recent examples of wars of this kind are the armed struggle waged by the people of Vietnam or the present war of the Algerian people, which is now in its seventh year. Such wars are not only justified, they are inevitable. The Communists support just wars of this kind wholeheartedly and without reservations and they march in the van of the peoples fighting for liberation.

November 1960: The national liberation movement is striking blows at imperialism and accelerating social progress. At present, Asia, Africa, and Latin America are the most important centers of the revolutionary struggle against imperialism. Communists have always recognized the progressive revolutionary significance of national liberation wars; they are the most active champions of national independence.

U.S. IMPERIALISM

Third. Moscow and Peiping both consider the United States their real enemy. The manifestos:

January 6, 1961: I should like to deal with the prospects of the further development of the general crisis of capitalism. Capitalism has suffered irretrievable losses.

The strongest capitalist country has been affected by the general crisis more than any other capitalist country. Since the war the United States with its frequency of economic shocks, has already experienced three slumps. The imperialist powers, above all the United States, are doing their utmost to harness the countries that have cast off the colonial yoke to their system and thereby strengthen the position of world capitalism.

November 1960: The world capitalist system is going through an intense process of disintegration and decay. Its contradictions have been accelerated by the development of monopoly capitalism into state monopoly capitalism. The decay of capitalism is particularly marked in the United States of America, the chief imperialist country of today. The most developed capitalist country has become a country of the most distorted, militarized economy. More than any other country the United States drains Asia, and especially Latin America of their riches, holding up their progress. U.S. capitalist penetration is increasing in Africa. U.S. imperialism has become the biggest international exploiter.

RUSSIAN-CHINESE UNITY

Fourth. It would be a mistake for the West to bank on any Russian-Chinese split. Because the Kremlin sometimes sounds more moderate than saber-rattling Peiping, some have hoped for a split between the two chief Communist powers which might somehow make the world safer for us. While Moscow sometimes "speaks softly," while Peiping always "carries a big stick," the two Communist states need each other: China needs Russian industrial and military help; Russia needs China as a propaganda triumph and as a foothold to spread communism throughout Asia. The two statements echo the unity theme:

January 6, 1961: The rise of growing numbers of nations through revolution provides most favorable conditions for an unprecedented extension of the sphere of influence of Marxist-Leninist ideas.

November 1960: The Socialist countries and the Socialist camp as a whole owe their achievements to the proper application of the general objective laws governing Socialist construction, with due regard to the historical peculiarities of each country, and to the interests of the entire Socialist system. They owe them to the efforts of the peoples of those countries and above all to the fraternal, internationalist assistance from the Soviet Union.

What does all this mean? It means that from Laos to Iraq, from Vietnam to Cuba, in Berlin and at the United Nations, we can expect Communist terrorism, infiltration, guerrilla wars, economic aid, political subversion, threat of Soviet rockets. To meet this worldwide threat, America must make an effort more sustained and more vigorous than at any time in our history.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

President Kennedy has laid out a positive course for us to follow to meet the challenge. Included are recommendations for economic and social progress at home and abroad, for communicating our devotion to freedom throughout the world, for strengthening the military and intelligence shield of ourselves and our allies, for a meaningful program of civil defense, and for space exploration.

Finally—

Says the President—

our greatest asset in this struggle is the American people—their willingness to pay the price for these programs—to understand and accept a long struggle—to share their resources with other less fortunate peoples—to meet the tax levels and close the tax loopholes I have requested—to exercise self-restraint instead of pushing up wages or prices, or overproducing certain crops, or spreading military secrets, or urging unessential expenditures or improper monopolies or harmful work stoppages—to serve in the Peace Corps or the armed services or the Federal Civil Service—to strive for excellence in their schools, in their cities and in their physical fitness—to take part in civil defense—to pay higher postal rates, higher payroll taxes, and higher teachers salaries, in order to strengthen our society—to show friendship to students and visitors from other lands—and, finally, to practice democracy at home, in all States, with all races, to respect each other and to protect the constitutional rights of all citizens.

RESPECT FOR EACH OTHER

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that the great majority of the American people are willing to make the sacrifices, exercise the self-control, and pay each other the respect that the President has called for. Those who would sow division and discord at home are but a tiny minority. They would do well to read President Kennedy's answer to the question at his April 22 press conference as to how he felt about the John Birch Society:

Well, I don't think that their judgments are based on accurate information of the kinds of challenges that we face. I think we face an extremely serious and intensified struggle with the Communists. But I am not sure that the John Birch Society is wrestling with the real problems which are created by the Communist advance around the world.

I would hope that all those who are strongly concerned about it would address themselves to the kinds of problems which are created by Laos, Vietnam, by internal subversion, by the desperate life lived by so many people in this hemisphere and in other places which the Communists exploit.

These are the kinds of problems we are dealing with. I said something about them yesterday. The use which the Communists make of democratic freedoms and the success which they are able to—once they have seized power—maintain their power against dissent.

This seems to me to be the problem. We have talked about and read stories of 7,000 to 15,000 guerrillas operating in Vietnam, killing 2,000 civil officers a year and 2,000 police officers a year—4,000.

Now, there has been an election in Vietnam in which 75 percent of the people, or 80 percent, endorse the Government, and yet we read how Vietnam is in danger because of guerrilla operations carried on by this small, well-disciplined, well-supplied, across-the-border group of guerrillas.

How we fight that kind of a problem which is going to be with us all through this decade, seems to me to be one of the great problems now before the United States. And I would hope all those who are concerned about the advance of communism would face that problem and not concern themselves with the loyalty of President Eisenhower, President Truman, or Mrs. (Franklin D.) Roosevelt or myself or someone else.

RACIAL AGITATORS INCITE RIOTS AND VIOLENCE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WINSTEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to note that the Attorney General has called for an end to the trips being made by the so-called freedom riders; however, it is most unfortunate that he did not use his talents of persuasion and the powers of his office to dissuade this group from ever embarking on their journey of agitation.

In a letter to the Attorney General, our most able colleague, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Hon.

RALPH J. SCOTT, has set forth the illegality and subversive purpose of the so-called freedom riders.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include Representative SCOTT's letter:

MAY 22, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT F. KENNEDY,
Attorney General of the United States,
Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KENNEDY: I note with approval your public appeal for a return to reason in dealing with the racial tensions and violence in Alabama, triggered by two or more small groups of so-called freedom riders.

While the freedom riders have already done great and perhaps irreparable damage to the cause of better race relations, further violence and increased tension may be avoided by discontinuing ventures into the South by such groups, when it is well known beforehand that resentment, tension, and violence may be the result. Though it may rightly be said that all citizens have a constitutional right to travel by interstate transportation facilities, it is certainly not reasonable or wise for organized groups such as the freedom riders to widely publicize and enter upon a venture in effect amounting to an invasion of an area where it is known that such concerted action will meet bitter resentment, if not violent resistance.

The freedom riders, in my opinion, have been morally, if not legally, guilty of a breach of the peace in Alabama by voluntarily engaging in acts they had every reason to believe would incite riotious conduct. The ventures of the freedom riders were instigated by the Committee on Racial Equality, operating out of New York. Their common and stated purpose was to challenge and break down State segregation laws in bus terminals. If such laws are unconstitutional and invalid, they cannot be so declared by an organized group of citizens. Only the courts can invalidate existing State laws. Therefore, the stated purpose of the freedom riders to challenge and break down State segregation laws was itself unlawful. Their group constituted an "assembly" within the meaning of the law on riot. Having assembled for the purpose of breaking State segregation laws, and voluntarily, in concert, after being warned against violence, having gone to a place where they expected resistance, brings them well within the common law definition of "riot."

If the Federal Government has authority to protect passengers lawfully traveling by interstate transportation, then it would seem that it would also have authority to restrain an unlawful assembly from interstate travel by bus for the purpose of challenging or breaking down State laws. State segregation laws pertaining to bus terminals are valid until legally set aside and they cannot be invalidated by a group of freedom riders.

I question their good faith and intentions and strongly suspect that many, if not all of them, were simply out on an expense-paid lark seeking the publicity of martyrdom they correctly guessed that a prejudiced press would give them. Groups so motivated will never be able to make any contribution to the cause of better race relations.

Reports in the press indicate an intention on the part of these groups of freedom riders to continue their inflaming ventures. Nothing of a constructive nature can thus be accomplished, while increased bitterness, tension, and violence will be thereby encouraged. I was alarmed by the public statement of an Assistant U.S. Attorney General that "there are other pending movements of bus passengers which might provoke more racial violence here." Since your Department has prior knowledge of plans for other similar excursions into the South, I urge you to take action to prevent them.

In the interest of good order in the South, I sincerely hope those in positions of authority, including yourself, and the people or groups responsible for the organization and actions of the freedom riders, will use their influence to have these provocative ventures discontinued. This would seem to me a very simple way to meet your appeal for a return to reason. And I can think of no other method through which good order may be immediately achieved.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

RALPH J. SCOTT.

GOLD, THE DOLLAR, AND CONFIDENCE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, my bill, H.R. 6900, to repeal the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve obligations, has brought a considerable number of inquiries to our colleagues. Some of it no doubt was caused by the syndicated column of George E. Sokolsky entitled "Who's Behind Move To Kill Our Dollar?"

The article appeared on May 17, 1961, as follows:

WHO'S BEHIND MOVE TO KILL OUR DOLLAR?

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When the House of Morgan abdicated its leadership of the American financial world in 1929, no other leadership appeared. J. P. Morgan, the elder, was essentially a patriot and therefore his first concern was the maintenance of the status of the American dollar throughout the world. No banker in this country has succeeded to his position of leadership. We may have been regarded as not too bright by Britain and German bankers, but our money was sound because it was secured by gold.

Today, all sorts of fantastic ideas come out of the banking world—ideas which one might expect from someone who is taking Economics I from a Keynesian professor at Harvard. These ideas have culminated in the inflationary bill which is now being proposed in Congress that would take all the gold coverage off the American dollar and leave it nothing more than a scrap of paper.

The proposal of Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon to change the gold law is an easy way out of our gold problem. We lack gold; therefore abolish gold. This is an easy solution to the shift in the balance of international settlements, and as this subject is not romantic and not easy to understand, the great minds who turn corners on two wheels believe that they can solve a difficult problem by running away from it.

What they seek to do is to remove all metallic security of the dollar, to leave it a scrap of paper as valuable as the faith in trade, commerce, economic stability may at any time be. It is often said that fiat money is based upon confidence in the country which issues it. This is economic bushwa, to use an accurate expression, because fiat money is based not on love of country but on the economics of the moment.

Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of Brooklyn, has introduced a measure in Congress which, it is said, has Secretary Dillon's support, which will shift our currency from having a 25 percent gold support to being fiat money; that is, money with no gold or silver support whatsoever.

The reason that, for three decades, a world in revolution has accepted the American dollar as the most valuable currency is that it has a gold protection while other moneys were just printed paper. Now that Great Britain, West Germany, France, and Soviet Russia have obtained enough gold to set up reserves, along comes this proposal to knock down the value and respectability of the American dollar.

It is expected that the removal of the gold reserve will strengthen the dollar, when actually it will destroy confidence in the dollar which has steadily been losing confidence. What does that mean?

Money possesses only such values as acceptability gives it. In a word, if you want to buy a banana, you expect to pay, let us say, 1 cent. You discover that you are being charged 5 cents. You pay. Then you are charged 25 cents or even a dollar. You reject the bananas. Let them rot. The reason you will not pay the high price for bananas is that they seem not to be worth that much to you. The vendor, however, will not accept 1 or 5 cents for the banana because the money is no good. He doubts whether he should accept 25 cents or a dollar because that too is of uncertain value.

Finally, he says that he will give you a banana if you give him your necktie or handkerchief. That is called barter, a very primitive system, often employed by savages and sometimes by so-called civilized peoples who have things but no acceptable money. The result of barter is that the people at home go hungry in order that the nation as a whole may get something it needs. Soviet Russia, for instance, in the 1920's and early 1930's, bartered butter for iron ore. The Russian people were deprived of butter so that they might have iron ore. But the United States, where money was fairly good, possessed both butter and iron ore.

The Multer bill was not prepared by Congressman MULTER, who, while a fine man, is not an economist and has never claimed to be one. The bill was prepared by bankers and Keynesian economists. They ought to come out in the open so that we might know who seeks to kill our money.

On May 24 I wrote to Mr. Sokolsky as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

Mr. GEORGE E. SOKOLSKY,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR GEORGE: I have read your column "Who's Behind the Move To Kill Our Dollar?"

I appreciate the kindly way in which you referred to me.

You are right that I am not an economist, yet I do pretend to know something about our economy. At the same time, although I am not a banker, I do pretend to know something about banking.

Without intending to be, you have been unfair to me and to any number of fine bankers, economists, and businessmen.

I am prepared to concede that we may be wrong. I will not concede, however, that all of the people who approve the principle proposed by H.R. 6900, are anything but good Americans, who have the interest of their country at heart. This goes for the President's task force on the economic situation and balance of payments, headed by Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; the vast majority of the members of the committee for economic development's research and policy committee, headed by T. V. Houser, former chairman of Sears, Roebuck & Co.;

John J. McCloy, chairman of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Henry C. Alexander, chairman of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.; Roy L. Reierson, senior vice president and chief economist of the Bankers Trust Co.; and many other respected businessmen, present and former Government officials, economists, and bankers of both political parties, conservatives as well as liberals, all of whom have advocated repeal of the 25-percent gold reserve requirement at the propitious time. I think the most favorable time may well be now.

Our experience over the last 27 years raises serious questions whether the 25 percent gold reserve requirement serves any useful purpose. Assume that we continue it. Do you suggest that we liquidate the Federal Reserve notes? If so, will we give the first in line all of the gold? Or will we say, for every $5 Federal Reserve note that is presented we will deliver $1.25 in gold? Whichever we do, what will the recipient do with this gold when the law requires him then to turn it back to the Government? And when he turns it back to the Government what will the Government give him in exchange for it? A negotiable receipt? And for how much?

When you deposit money in a bank, if its accounts are insured, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures the deposits only up to $10,000 in each account. The insurance is backed by the surplus funds held by FDIC and the assets of the insured institutions. (Most, but not all, banks insure their accounts.)

On the other hand, your Federal Reserve note (most of our currency) is guaranteed not only by the surplus and assets of our Federal Reserve banks (they are all owned by the U.S. Government) but, in addition, are backed by every dollar of assets of the U.S. Government. Those assets are many times more than enough to meet all the obligations of the Federal Reserve banks. The 25-percent gold reserve is not needed to make up any possible deficit.

The full faith and credit of the U.S. Government is more than a philosophic concept. I look upon it as a guarantee that as long as there is a free world the United States of America will never default on its obligations. I for one, as an American, do not require my Government to back up its guarantee with a gold reserve.

Please take the time to read the obligation set forth on the currency in your pocket.

Some bills read: "Silver Certificate—this certifies that there is on deposit in the Treasury of the United States of America five (or some other figure) dollars in silver payable to the bearer on demand." To be valid they must be signed by the Treasurer of the United States and by the Secretary of the Treasury. They also bear an inscription: "This certificate is legal tender for all debts, public and private."

Now take a Federal Reserve note. It reads: "The United States of America will pay to the bearer on demand five (or some other figure) dollars." To be valid it must also be signed by the Treasurer of the United States and by the Secretary of the Treasury. It, too, bears an inscription which reads: "This note is legal tender for all debts, public and private, and redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury, or at any Federal Reserve bank."

There is not a single reference to gold on any of our currency. Even if we had a 100 percent gold reserve, not a dollar of our currency is redeemable in gold.

The U.S. dollar has been the respected medium of exchange the world over for years and will continue so. In most countries throughout the world, it is acceptable and interchangeable for the local currency. In many places it is the only currency in use and in a larger number of countries, it is more desirable than the local currency.

If you had a substantial sum of gold, coin or bullion, where would you put it for safe keeping? In a vault in the United States of America or in a vault in an Iron Curtain country or in a vault in a country that at any time, without notice, might be taken over and subjugated by the Communists?

There is no safer place for it than the United States of America. As long as there is a free world, there will be no safer place.

Every country, every banker, every economist, every militarist, every realist, knows the accuracy of that statement.

That is why the loose talk about the inflow and the outflow of gold has been so confusing.

Little or no gold has left our shores or the vaults of the Federal Reserve banks. It is the foreign claims against this gold that have fluctuated.

Gold produces no income as a medium of exchange and as such is a nonearning asset. If its only use is to serve as a guarantee of redeemability of some of our currency, which cannot be redeemed for gold in any event, a gold reserve serves no purpose.

You mention in the same paragraph love of country and confidence in it. There is no economic relationship between the two. Many a person who loves his country has no confidence in it, its officialdom, or its economics. The Communist has no love for our country but he would love to take over its economy. No one knows better than you that the motivating force of communism, despite its protestations to the contrary, is its love of power based on a lust to acquire all capital goods, including gold.

Who tells you that our "dollar has been steadily losing confidence?" I have traveled the world over, talking to bankers, economists, businessmen, and government officials. I have neither heard nor seen any evidence of loss of confidence in our dollar.

The run on gold last year in London, pushing the price up to $40 an ounce, was caused by the speculators' confidence in the American dollar. They planned to force us to raise the price of gold to maintain confidence in the dollar. We did maintain confidence in the dollar by sitting tight. The speculators were burned to the extent of $5 an ounce (we will never know for how many ounces) because our confidence in the dollar did not need to be bolstered by a stock of gold.

You properly say "money possesses only such values as acceptability gives it."

Money is a medium of exchange. The value of a medium of exchange, whether gold, silver, or currency, being dependent on acceptability will vary in accordance with confidence. Confidence in what? Not confidence that the paper or the metal is available but confidence in what and how much can be obtained in exchange for it.

When you transact business other than by barter you deal by and with credit.

Credit is faith—confidence.

When gold is taken in exchange for anything it is because of credit, i.e., confidence in its value.

The same goes for currency including Federal Reserve bank notes.

The same goes for a check issued by a nonbanker on a bank account.

The same goes for one's oral or written promise to pay for what is received, without giving gold or money or a note in exchange.

I get paid by check issued by the good, old U.S.A. Its promise to pay is good. I do not rush to the Treasury and demand gold or silver. I might cash it and get currency—silver certificates or Federal Reserve notes.

Again neither I, nor anyone I give them to, rushes off to the Treasury and demands silver or gold.

We are all content with the promise of our Government to pay. Not because we have confidence in the dollar nor even in the value of the gold or the silver that may or may not be in the Government's coffers. We credit—we believe in our Government. We have confidence in it and in its ability to pay. We have confidence that as long as there is a free America, there will never be a default in its promises.

This matter deserves the most thorough, serious, and constructive consideration, without emotion, and without proponents or opponents insisting only their views are correct.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ABRAHAM J. MULTER.

I hope that my letter will be helpful to our colleagues in answering their mail.

There is no question in my mind that the confidence of the world in the ability of the United States to meet its obligations will not be affected by the passage of H.R. 6900.

"I AM GLASS"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker—

I am created of the admixture of earth's minerals, formed by the alchemy of time;

I am born transformed in the blazing heat of the fiery furnace;

In molten mass I am tediously fashioned by the hand of cunning artisan—or fed into the maw of intricate machine;

I assume 10,000 hues of all the spectrum—either transparent, translucent, or opaque—upon my maker's will;

I can masquerade as ruby—emerald—topaz—moonstone; and all the other precious jewels of man;

But frivolous baubles are not my aspiration—I serve 10 million purposes in as many different places, forms, and ways;

My duties are unnumbered—infinite; pay heed to my utility.

—George J. Overmyer.

Glass is a most stubborn and unmanageable substance. It yields to only one master—fire. In the heat of the furnace it becomes as soft and pliable as the lightest down, only to reassume its original characteristics when cooled. And therein lies its serviceability to modern man and its adaptability for so many purposes. But it has taken thousands of years of experimentation and of thoughtful planning to subdue glass and make it man's obedient servant. Glassworkers are among earth's most ancient artisans, going back side by side with their rivals, the potterymakers, to a time when all craftsmanship originated, a time beyond the reach of history. The basic material of the potterymaker was clay, while the basic material of the glass industry is sand, and both are humble materials existing in abundant supplies in many areas and regions. From the standpoint of modern chemistry, sand is the more durable and unchangeable of the two materials. It is composed of the elements oxygen and silicon in unvarying proportions, and it withstands all attacks of nature to break it down into something simpler as the years and the centuries glide by.

Pottery itself is indebted to glass for the glaze which covers up its porosity, and makes it capable of holding fluids. But it was a long while before man found this out.

Glassmakers probably existed at least 15,000 years before Christ. Probably we should call them glassworkers, for they did not manufacture glass, but worked the glass they found in nature. The earliest glassworkers satisfied two distinct needs, the need for weapons and the need for ornaments. Nature itself manufactured the glass. One form in which it was manufactured naturally is the substance we call obsidian, whose origin is volcanic. It was discovered early in time that obsidian could readily be broken into sharp, elongated pieces. These were used as spearheads, arrowheads, knife blades and razors. Pieces of obsidian were the traditional tools of sacrifice to the gods. Even after steel was invented, obsidian knives were used in sacrifice, the steel being regarded as an impure and hence profane substance. In all countries where pointed weapons were used, including the Americas, these weapons were headed with shaped slivers of obsidian. It was the job of a glassworker to shape the arrowheads and spearheads, and his was indeed a toilsome and tedious task, but one of incalculable value to his countrymen.

Natural glass also existed in the form of fused silicon resulting from intensely hot fires accidentally set ablaze by lightning or from fires kindled by man. The glass formed by these processes tended to be globular in shape, and often they were brilliantly colored by impurities. The color and the smoothness of the exterior made them suitable for ornaments. Many thousands of years ago workmen were engaged in the task of finding these beads, polishing them carefully and shaping them somewhat to the needs of their customers. They were highly valued as amulets, or charms. Actual glassmaking in the form of glaze on pottery is believed to have been employed in Egypt by 12000 B.C. Green glaze was applied to powdered quartz, a still more advanced form of glassmaking, about 9000 B.C. The oldest known piece of glass deliberately manufactured is a molten amulet of deep lapis lazuli color, dated about 7000 B.C. But it was still a long while before glass came into use as a commodity for the masses. For some four or five millenia, glassworkers were engaged in the task of finding or molding glass beads and other trinkets, shaping and polishing them toilsomely. Only the wealthy could afford such baubles.

Just when it became known that one of the most important properties of glass is its ability to hold liquids without damage to the liquid or to the container is not recorded. At some time in the distant past this fact struck the mind of some curious individual, possibly induced by observation of the usefulness of glaze on pottery. But there was still the job of finding a way of making a hollow receptacle of such a difficult substance as glass. Suddenly, apparently about 2500 B.C., a method was discovered. Babylonia is given the credit of being the birthplace of glass containers. However, the process soon spread to Egypt, where it was developed to a high degree of perfection. The method used consisted in covering the end of a spindle with a core of sand held together by some light adhesive, the core being in the shape of the interior of the desired vessel. A mass of viscous glass was then prepared in a suitable furnace. A thread of glass was pulled from the molten mass and wrapped round and round the sand core as the spindle was revolved. Before the spun glass could cool it was rolled on a flat surface until the threads fused together, making a watertight exterior. More threads were wound around until the object was of the desired thickness. Decorations of different colored glass were added as fancy and skill dictated. When all was completed, the structure was permitted to cool. The spindle could then be drawn out of the neck, and the sand core emptied out. This necessarily left the interior somewhat rough but still adequate for the material it was destined to contain.

The color of the glass thus formed depended on the source of the sand from which it was made. Different impurities in the sand produced different colors, and the primitive workmen did not know how to remove these impurities. The colors most common were blue, green, a greenish black, yellow, and something approaching a white. The body of the vessel was ordinarily a darker colored material, with the decorations in white or yellow. Or the reverse use of colors might appear. Very much later in time it was discovered that manganese could be used to dissolve some of the impurities and thus produce more or less clear or transparent glass. But at this period there was very little demand for clear glass. Its use in windows, optical instruments, and the many other purposes served by modern glass was far in the future. The glass vessels produced by the core process were still largely ornamental. They were used mainly to hold unguents, oil, cosmetics, and the like.

For the use of these aids to beauty is also exceedingly ancient. As might be expected, the female of the species was most addicted to ointments, salves, and creams, sometimes highly perfumed. The males were not altogether lacking in vanity. Athletes annointed their bodies liberally with oil previous to exercise, for various reasons, some having to do with an improvement in their performance. In wrestling, for instance, a well-oiled body presented a difficult object to hold. The glass vessels produced by the core method became known as containers of unguents, "unguentaria," they were called. Both the unguents and the containers were still luxury objects, unavailable to all except the wealthy.

Egypt manufactured these unguentaria in considerable quantity, some of them for export. They gradually spread all around the Mediterranean. In some areas their import was opposed by statesmen and philosophers as symbols of luxury and decadence. In Greece, both Solon and Socrates tried to exclude such objects, of course to no avail. People have never willingly deprived themselves of luxuries, no matter how great the consequent loss of strength and vigor. The epithet, "effeminate," has never been successful as a scare word.

For about a thousand years Egypt persisted as the preeminent manufacturer and exporter of luxury glassware. Then, suddenly, the manufacture seemed to cease. Decline coincided with a period of political and social troubles in the country. The glass industry appears to be quite sensitive to national economic and political conditions. In periods of prosperity and progress, glass production flourishes; in periods of depression and warfare, production declines. This is due partly to the fragile nature of the material, to its early association with ideas of luxury, and to the fact that the skilled artisans necessary for its production are otherwise engaged. For a time, knowledge of glassmaking seemed almost lost. But as the political fortunes of Egypt revived, manufacture was resumed and trade again increased. By this time, other nations had learned the art. In Crete, in Greece, in southeast Europe, and in Sicily numerous factories sprang up. The shape and the decoration of glass articles in these areas was influenced by Greek ideas of artistic design and workmanship. As in other matters, they lead us closer to the modern age.

Our knowledge of ancient glass is of course derived from objects found in tombs and other monuments of antiquity. The ease with which glass was shattered makes these relics somewhat scarcer than other more durable objects. Students of archeology are able to date finds with reasonable accuracy, and we can trace the development of the glassmaking art through its various periods. One remarkable thing about this development is that it was so slow over so long a period of time. For a period running from roughly 2500 B.C. to about 500 B.C., glassmakers seemed to improve their skill, their imagination, and their artistic sense only to a slight degree. Glass experts today distinguish four general types of production, differing from each other only in minor details.

The most numerous type was what are now called alabastrons. This name is also applied to small vessels carved from the mineral alabaster. This material is easily worked by suitable tools, and was in general use in ancient times, though it suffers from the disadvantage that it is stained by substances placed in it. It is not known whether the word, alabastron, was applied to the unguents originally, or whether it was a name for the container, whether made of alabaster or glass. It is interesting to speculate whether the alabaster box which Mary broke to annoint the feet of Jesus was of genuine alabaster or a product of Egyptian glass factories. Either container would have been equally costly.

The alabastrons, or alabastroi, to use the Greek plural, were small slender vessels some 4 or 5 inches in height. They were made of various colored materials, brown-violet, blue, greenish or greenish-black, and yellow. Body was made of one color and decorations of a

contrasting color. There was a narrow neck with a flaring, outturned rim. Generally there are two handles on the body, small and earshaped, with holes which could be threaded by a cord for suspension of the flask. The method of manufacture made it difficult to produce a base or bottom on which the vessel could be placed. Instead a ring, often of metal, was provided in which the object could be placed. Decorations were inlaid in crisscross patterns and festoons, covering the body.

Another type of vessel was the amphoriskoi. These were shorter and broader, and they tend to follow a fixed style of color and ornamentation, the latter often in the form of broad belts around the body. This type had a small foot on which the vessel could rest precariously. It was provided with true carrying handles, starting at the body and ending at the top of the small neck. The early glassmakers evidently did not trust the weight of their products to glass handles fused to the body. They reinforced their handles with metal tubes. But the vessels were not intended to be suspended from a cord, and hence were not easily carried about from place to place.

Still another type was the arayballoi, which were more nearly spherical in shape. The handles were again of the ear pattern, with holes for a cord, and with curious projections and decorations on the handle itself. Comparatively few of this type have been found.

Finally we have the true juglike vessel. These were somewhat larger, and seem to have been used mainly by athletes and physical exercise devotees to contain oil rather than cosmetics. They are found mingled with masculine bones in the graves which have been excavated. They were shaped with three lips to facilitate pouring, and with large handles. Some of them were provided with projecting feet to permit stability when put down. The ornamentation was various and became bolder and more imaginative after 400 B.C., when Greek influence became important. The Greeks also seem responsible for an adaptation of the pug to the bowl or goblet form, which could be done by cutting off the top of the jug, leaving a roughly hemispherical drinking glass. Thus was the original purpose of glass perverted from a container of precious unguents to an instrument useful in everyday life. And that, of course, brings us to the dawn of the modern era in glassmaking.

About that time also a slightly improved process of shaping glass was invented. It was called the millefiori method. The procedure was to place a number of comparatively long glass tubes side by side and fuse them together under heat. Larger vessels were possible, and shapes could be varied to suit needs and tastes. But in 200 or 300 years the millefiori process was outdated. Somebody found out that glass could be melted and blown into form and shape. And that was the death knell of the ancient glass industry. The technological unemployment resulting is difficult to measure or imagine. A whole industry was dislocated. Its purpose in life, to provide dainty toys for the idle rich, was destroyed. An entirely new industry, devoted to the common good, took its place, but with new technicians and employing new skills. After about 100 B.C., sand-core glass vanished from the marts of trade, and your predecessors started the vast development of glass production and glass use which may someday bring in the age of glass to displace the age of metals.

It seems to be fair to say that the modern glass industry has solved, or is solving, every problem that is placed before it, except one. That is, what to do with broken, useless glass. As you melt mountains of sand into glass, the customer uses it and throws it away, the trash collector hauls it off and buries it in some glass cemetery. There it accumulates and rests unchanged by the centuries and the elements. No moth or worm doth corrupt and resolve the substance into its constituent elements to be reborn in the crucible of time in fairer form or shape. Is it possible that some traveler 10 million years hence, from some far-distant galaxy shall accidentally stumble upon a long-dead earth, and conclude that it was originally constituted wholly of glass?

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ALFORD (at the request of Mr. MILLS), for today, May 25, 1961, on account of death in family.

Mr. KNOX (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for 2 weeks on account of illness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. KITCHIN), for today, May 25, 1961, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER, for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BAILEY, for 5 minutes today.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan, for 10 minutes, on Monday, May 29, Thursday, June 1, and Monday, June 5, and to revise and extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. SCHWENGEL (at the request of Mr. LANGEN), for 30 minutes today.

Mr. STAGGERS (at the request of Mr. CORMAN), for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission, to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. SCHENCK, to revise and extend his remarks made in his special order, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. CELLER.

Mr. KOWALSKI.

Mr. CLARK.

Mr. COAD.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 29, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

953. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code relating to funds received by the Post Office Department from payments for damage to personal property, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

954. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated September 29, 1960, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Big South Fork, Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn., requested by resolutions of the Committees on Public Works, U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, adopted March 12, 1949, and April 18, 1951 (H. Doc. No. 175); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with five illustrations.

955. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for the operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the corporation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

956. A letter from the Chairman, Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, transmitting the final report of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, pursuant to Public Law 884, 84th Congress (H. Doc. No. 176); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 429). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4750. A bill to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 430). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PASSMAN: Committee of conference. H.R. 6518. A bill making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 431). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORRESTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6691. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 432). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 5343. A bill to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6243. A bill extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 6634. A bill to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7333. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, for the purpose of facilitating the prompt and orderly conduct of the business of the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7334. A bill to establish Regional Public Park at Oak Ridge, Tenn.; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H.R. 7335. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide that marketing agencies acting in good faith shall not be liable for selling livestock mortgaged under the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act until the Secretary has exhausted his civil remedies against the mortgagor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7336. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to certain producers of oysters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FENTON:

H.R. 7337. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7338. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 7339. A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall hold any other public office or position and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7340. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarship grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7341. A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7342. A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7343. A bill to amend sections 216(c) and 305(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the establishment of through routes and joint rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 7344. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at a parochial or private elementary or secondary school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7345. A bill to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 7346. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.R. 7347. A bill to carry into effect a provision of the Convention of Paris for the Protection of Industrial Property as revised at Lisbon, Portugal, October 31, 1958; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7348. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock and dispositions of property made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MASON:

H.R. 7349. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that certain distributions of stock made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as dividend distributions but shall be treated as a return of basis and result in gain only to the extent basis of the underlying stock is exceeded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of New York (by request):

H.R. 7350. A bill to amend section 8c(2) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933) as amended, and as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide for the removal of the regional restriction on apples eligible for marketing orders and to make all apples, both for fresh fruit sale and for processing, eligible for marketing orders, but providing that apple products which are canned or frozen are not so eligible; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 7351. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7352. A bill to authorize a 3-year program to assist States in meeting the costs of providing education to their children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 7353. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 7354. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 7355. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 439 Members beginning with the the 88th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 7356. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain members of the uniformed services shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States after engaging in any activity or conduct, while a prisoner of war, which results in the giving of aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ABERNETHY:

H.R. 7357. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain members of the uniformed services shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States after engaging in any activity or conduct, while a prisoner of war, which results in giving of aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7358. A bill to amend section 4126 of title 18, United States Code, with respect to compensation to prison inmates for injuries incurred in the course of employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 7359. A bill to amend section 90 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide for a new division within the northern judicial district of the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 7360. A bill to retrocede to North Carolina jurisdiction over the southern, eastbound lanes of North Carolina Highway 24, and the eastern, northbound lanes of U.S. Highway 17, as these highways traverse and parallel Camp Lejeune, N.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7361. A bill to amend the act of October 30, 1951, by placing an annual limitation on publishers' second-class mail subsidies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 435. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 436. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the centennial of the establishment of the national system of land-grant universities and colleges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H. Res. 317. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DORN:

H. Res. 318. Resolution prohibiting the shipment of equipment to Cuba; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. Res. 319. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives on the recommendations of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SISK:

H. Res. 320. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives on the recommendations of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for a survey of Apalachee Bay area into Spring Creek; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to grant Federal aid or assistance to urban, metropolitan, and publicly owned mass transportation facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the recognition of Federal employee unions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7362. A bill for the relief of Rodolfo Micaletti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 7363. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain land to the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Inc. (a New York corporation); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN:

H.R. 7364. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in property in South Carolina to the record owners of the surface of that property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7365. A bill for the relief of Herbert B. Shorter, Sr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7366. A bill for the relief of Lem Hong and May Hong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 7367. A bill for the relief of Roberto Castillo Garza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 7368. A bill for the relief of Urszula and Bogumil Dronka Getris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 7369. A bill for the relief of Gerda Godin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 7370. A bill for the relief of Jerzy Bielecki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1961

The Senate met at 9:55 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, who art above all and in all: We seek Thee as our fathers before us have sought Thee in every generation.

Amid all the subtle dangers that beset us, save us from the fatal folly of attempting to rely upon our own strength.

Gird us with Thy might, that the strain of these days may not break our spirits when deluded men who have not Thee in awe imagine vain things. May no denials of human freedom now loose in the world intimidate our souls.

When the problems which front us seem insoluble, when the very principles for which brave men have died are betrayed, when the seamless robe of world unity is rent in twain, when even the shining river of our dreams seems to sink into the sands of futility, still may we labor on, serene and confident that Thy sure victory cometh in the morning, when we shall see that these clouds are lies and that the blue sky is the truth.

We bring our morning prayer in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 24, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6874) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, at 10 o'clock the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25. Debate will be limited to 1 hour; and if a vote has not been reached in 1 hour, the resolution will be placed on the calendar.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have asked the majority leader to give me 3 minutes in order that I may comment on a matter of personal privilege.

Time magazine in its issue of May 5, 1961, published a completely false article about the senior Senator from Oregon. It is one which obviously was designed to damage me. That is characteristic of the editorial policy of Time magazine toward me and has been for some time, for reasons well recognized on the floor of the Senate. This particular article is, of course, being picked up by my opposition press in Oregon. The article seeks to give the impression that the senior Senator from Oregon has had a break with the President of the United States and therefore cannot be of help to Oregon with the Kennedy administration.

To the opposition press in Oregon, I say: Ask the President, and you will

find that there is not only a close, warm personal friendship existing between the senior Senator from Oregon and the President, but that the senior Senator from Oregon enjoys the complete confidence and respect of the President of the United States. It is also well known in the Senate and in the White House that I am devoted to the President and can be counted upon to help him in every way that I can. The President does not expect or want any Senator to follow him blindly. He wants our honest differences if we disagree on some issue. I am proud of the President's statesmanship and I am proud to be on his team.

On May 4, 1961, I replied to the Time magazine article in a letter to Time magazine, a letter which Time has not seen fit to publish in its magazine—again, for obvious reasons. Time magazine does not want to have the truth about the senior Senator from Oregon known. I said to the editor:

SIR: In the May 5 issue of Time magazine, there appears an item which reads as follows:

"THE MORSE THAT ROARED

" 'Who does that pip-squeak think he is?' raged Oregon's Democratic Senator WAYNE MORSE about John F. Kennedy to friends on the Senate floor. What angered MORSE was that Kennedy had failed to reverse a recent order by the Eisenhower administration that shifted a regional office of the Post Office Department from Portland to rival Seattle without first consulting him. 'Kennedy is not going to get my support until I get some satisfaction,' said MORSE. Soon after, MORSE postponed Education and Labor Committee hearings on a Kennedy-backed education bill."

I wish to advise you that there is not a word of truth in the article. I have long since become accustomed to being lied about by Time magazine, but the President of the United States is entitled to more accurate reporting.

Very truly yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

On May 4, I sent to the President a letter which reads as follows:

The Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing a copy of a letter I have written to the editor of Time magazine.

I resent not only the complete falsehood in the Time magazine article, but I deeply resent the injustice that the article does to you, as well as to me.

Yours respectfully,

WAYNE MORSE.

I may say that in a telephone conversation with the President, he made it perfectly clear to me that he knew at the time he read the article that there was no basis of fact in it. He made clear that knowing me as he did through our close association in the Senate that I had not made any such remark about him.

Under date of May 8, 1961, I received from Time magazine a letter saying that they were referring my letter to the editors. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIME,
New York, N.Y., May 8, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: Your comment has been received and is being forwarded to the editorial department so that the editors may see it. You will hear from us again at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

GWYNETH KAHN
(For the editors).

Subsequently, I received a very interesting reply from Time magazine. It reads as follows:

On receipt of your letter we asked our correspondent to recheck the incident about you (Time, May 5) and he tells us that not only does his source, who was within earshot of the conversation, confirm Time's reporting but also that several other Senate staff members were very much aware of your displeasure with the President and the Postmaster General.

Since one often does not remember precisely what one has said in spirited, informal conversation, it is unfortunately true that a printed version may come as an unpleasant surprise. We can, however, assure you that both at the time the story went to press and now on rechecking we have made every effort to be accurate.

That is a very interesting reply. It is a confession and avoidance reply. It is a confession that the attack on me was based upon hearsay gossip and not on direct evidence. Time magazine knows that its reporter never checked the gossip smear of me by coming to me and asking me directly if I ever made such a statement. If Time magazine were a responsible periodical it would have at least checked its gossip story with me. However, that would be expecting too much from Time magazine.

The reply of Time is an avoidance of its journalistic ethical responsibility by shifting to an unknown gossiper the blame for the smear against me.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 10 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) concerning the enforcement in certain States of the Constitution and laws for the protection of individual rights.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 more minute to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute from the allocated time.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I replied to Time magazine, as follows:

In reply to your letter of May 5, I wish to reaffirm that the story which you published in the May 5 issue of Time magazine was completely false. I shall now discuss it on the floor of the Senate and make clear to the Senate that your story was false.

I was very much displeased with the action that the Postmaster General took in regard to the removal of the Regional Post Office from Portland to Seattle, but I at no time spoke disparagingly of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I close by saying that if any Senate staff member made any such statement about me as reported in Time magazine, that staff member lied. If a Time magazine correspondent in the Press Gallery made such a report about me to Time magazine, that correspondent lied. At no time did I speak disparagingly of the President of the United States in regard to the removal of the Regional Post Office from Portland to Seattle. I think those who know me know I do not disagree over an issue on that basis.

I made very clear to the Postmaster General that I thought he was mistaken in his decision. But at no time did I speak disparagingly of the President of the United States, nor will I.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, in order to corroborate what the Senator from Oregon has just stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know that the relationship of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] with the President is most cordial, and that the support of the Senator from Oregon of the President's program is uniformly loyal and devoted. I think there is ample proof of that, if proof is needed, in the floor leadership and the managing by the Senator from Oregon of the aid-to-education bill, which the Senate has considered during the past 7 or 8 days.

The record will speak for itself; but again I wish to corroborate what the Senator from Oregon has just now stated about his support of and his close and friendly relationship with the President of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 39, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO CERTAIN FUNDS RECEIVED BY POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 39 of the United States Code relating to funds received by the Post Office Department from payments for damage to personal property, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO GRANT FEDERAL AID OR ASSISTANCE TO URBAN, METROPOLITAN, AND PUBLICLY OWNED MASS TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Document 345 now pending before Congress, or other legislation to grant Federal aid or assistance to urban, metropolitan, and publicly owned mass transportation facilities by granting or providing Federal assistance for the purchase of passenger equipment and the purchase or acquisition by publicly owned authorities of rights-of-way and for the installation, construction, and improvement of said rights-of-way, so as to provide expanded facilities to meet the mass transportation needs of the urban and metropolitan areas of this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the house of representatives, May 2, 1961.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Adopted by the senate in concurrence May 4, 1961.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 16

"To His Excellency the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

"Whereas congenial labor management conditions are more and more considered an essential part of our economic system; and

"Whereas provision for this relationship between personnel and management is provided in nearly all labor laws and certainly all labor contracts; and

"Whereas there exists no vehicle for this purpose in the relations between the various department heads of the Federal Government and its employees; and

"Whereas bills have been introduced in the Congress to accomplish this purpose: now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring):

"1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to support in substance legislation providing for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances.

"2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate, Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

"Adopted by house April 20, 1961.

"FRANK L. ROBERTS,
"Chief Clerk of House.

"ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
"Speaker of House.

"Adopted by senate May 8, 1961.

"HARRY D. BOIVIN,
"President of Senate."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 2260

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for a survey of Apalachee Bay area into Spring Creek

"Whereas the area from the mouth of Spring Creek to the intercoastal waterway has numerous sand bars and other obstructions; and

"Whereas these obstructions make navigation extremely difficult; and

"Whereas Wakulla County would benefit greatly in both tourist and commercial traffic if it were possible to navigate into the mouth of Spring Creek; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide sufficient moneys to make a survey of the Apalachee Bay area from the intercoastal waterway into the mouth of Spring Creek; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives."

A telegram in the nature of a memorial, signed by Rev. Leo C. Pollack, of Arcadia, Wis., remonstrating against the location in the United States of fronts and councils of following countries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) concerning the enforcement in certain States of the Constitution and laws for the protection of individual rights.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have submitted, together with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, which expresses as the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States be supported in measures to enforce the Constitution and laws of the United States enacted for the protection of individual rights.

Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes in this debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the reason for submitting the resolution is well known; it was to support the action of the President in taking the great responsibility of sending U.S. marshals into Alabama in order to enforce the laws of the United States.

The parliamentary practice under which I have proceeded is designed to avoid the reference of this resolution to a committee, and is designed to obtain a vote on the resolution, if at all possible, this morning—inasmuch as consideration of the resolution on yesterday was objected to, under the rule—or, at worst, to have the resolution placed directly on the calendar, so it may be called up on motion, instead of finding a pigeonhole in which it could be conveniently forgotten, in a committee to which it might have been referred. So at the very least we shall have on the calendar a resolution pertaining to very critical current events, and available to be called up as the situation may indicate that to be required.

Mr. President, this resolution relates to a very serious situation for what occurred in Alabama, and what has occurred this morning in Mississippi, reflect the existence of a situation which has existed all the time, notwithstanding the laws and the Constitution of the United States. The only difference between the situation the day before yesderday and the situation yesterday and today is that we now see that it exists, instead of its just existing while we, as a nation, averted our gaze from it. The averting of our gaze from it is, in my opinion, an indication of a very serious national deficiency, and will affect most seriously and adversely our standing in the country and in the world.

When some persons in Alabama took violence into their own hands, in order to prevent other Americans from enjoying their constitutional rights, there was displayed the hard core of the problem, which is the rule of law, and nothing less. The rule of law must be asserted. It is high time that those who have been engaged in violence and mob action in the South, and their friends and those who refrain from taking action or refuse to take action—even those in the highest places, up to the Governor of a State—understand that the doctrine of nullification, which is all that such persons are preaching and acting on, 100 years after the Civil War ended, cannot be tolerated, under either State law or State authorities.

The words "with all deliberate speed"—to use the words used by the Supreme Court in the desegregation cases—apply in this instance, too, as regards the enjoyment of all the rights guaranteed by the Constitution.

This is no light matter, because not only does it represent a direct violation of law by mobs, but it could represent a direct violation of law by the highest authorities of the individual States concerned.

Let us remember that the courts have held that a Governor can be enjoined from taking any act which would lead to violation of the civil rights guaranteed in our country.

On that subject I cite specifically title X, United States Code, section 333, entitled "Interference with State and Federal Law." I should like to read it into

the RECORD, for after citing this, we need no other argument:

§ 333. INTERFERENCE WITH STATE AND FEDERAL LAW.

The President, by using the militia or the Armed Forces, or both, or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination, or conspiracy, if it—

(1) so hinders the execution of the laws of that State and of the United States within the State, that any part or class of its people is deprived of a right, privilige, immunity, or protection named in the Constitution and secured by law, and the constituted authorities of that State are unable, fail, or refuse to protect that right, privilege, or immunity, or to give that protection, or—

As they did in the case of Alabama—

(2) opposes or obstructs the execution of the laws of the United States or impedes the course of justice under those laws.

And then the statute goes on to say:

In any situation covered by clause (1), the State shall be considered to have denied the equal protection of the laws secured by the Constitution.

Mr. President, we have a case specifically on the issue of whether a Governor may be enjoined. It is a very important Supreme Court case—that of *Sterling* v. *Constantin* (287 U.S. 378). The Court said:

The Governor of the State, in this respect—

Relating to the enforcement of such laws—

is in no different position from that of other State officials.

Let us understand clearly—and I believe that those who are called moderates in the South do understand clearly—that what happens when there are law violations of this character which receive sanction, either express or implied, by the so-called respectable people in and out of the Government, is endemic in a society. There cannot be a healthy body politic if there is such mob rule. The people in the States themselves must know in their hearts that such activity by individuals never can be confined to precise limits, not even to race matters. This situation is about to color the entire life of the State and to jeopardize the rights of all the people in it.

Obviously, if there is to be rule by violence or the force of mobs, it can seriously affect matters of race, creed, color, or any other matter which a mob, as either a majority or a minority, does not like.

So when we fight on the floor of the Senate—as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and I and so many of our colleagues are doing in connection with these matters—we fight not only in connection with racial matters, to enforce the Constitution and civil rights, but we also fight for the very prevalence of law and order; and no section of the country believes in it more thoroughly than does the South.

The President has taken historic action in sending the marshals there. He is facing very much the same situation now that he faced in Mississippi, because again there are acts which I believe are completely unlawful; I refer to the arrest of persons who walked into what is called a white waiting room in Mississippi.

We have adequate authority for that in Boynton against Virginia, one of the leading cases in the U.S. Supreme Court, decided in December 1960. The Court specifically said that terminals and restaurant facilities and services available to interstate passengers as a regular part of the transportation are just as much protected by the laws against discrimination as the transportation itself.

So this resolution could be very pertinent tomorrow, as it is today, in respect of what happened in Mississippi just yesterday.

Mr. President, that is the situation at home. There is one other point I should like to make before I leave the subject and go into the foreign aspects of the problem, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who has been such a great hero in this whole field.

The argument is made that the bus riders—the so-called freedom riders—are provoking somebody into violence. Since when can it be said, anywhere in American jurisprudence or American practice or American life, that a person is provoking another one, when that person is performing perfectly legal acts, while the person supposedly provoked is performing perfectly illegal acts?

The law of the United States is, clearly and without question, that bus transportation cannot be segregated; and segregation is not only illegal, but evil. That is the word used in an editorial of the New York Times the other day. These riders, who are doing what is permitted by the law, are the respectable people. The people who are attacking them violently are the people who are outrageously violating the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Yet, we are told that those outrageously violating the law are being provoked. If any one of the Senators who make that point were a Supreme Court judge, or even the least judge in terms of our judicial system, let us say a criminal court judge, would he pay any attention to a criminal who said, "He provoked me" or "He thumbed his nose at me?" This is nonsense. All of us, as lawyers and judges, have been through that for years and years.

The resolution which was introduced yesterday by myself and a number of our distinguished colleagues may be accused of throwing more dust in the air, but it certainly is not dust through which the clear sight of the law cannot see. For the law, the Constitution, and all human experience, certainly demonstrate that what we are seeing is the suppression of the laws and the violation of the Constitution which has been endemic and under which people have suffered for decades. It has now come to light, and it is time that the people looked at it in the light.

Finally, to conclude, on the critical point of the country's complacence or willingness to avert its gaze in other days, it cannot do so today, because it jeopardizes its own security and the security of the whole free world. People like myself have said that over and over again.

The overwhelming majority of the people who will rule in the world, perhaps not during our time, but certainly during our children's time and their children's time, and who will determine whether we will be free, are people whose skins are black, brown, and yellow.

If we need further evidence of that fact, listen to what the head of the U.S. Information Agency, Edward Murrow, said recently:

To some of us the picture of a burning bus in Alabama may merely represent the speed and competence of a photographer, but to those of us in the U.S. Information Agency it means that picture will be front-page tomorrow all the way from Manila to Rabat.

Mr. DOUGLAS rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 8 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, no one can add anything to the law, the logic, and the morals laid down in the speech of the Senator from New York. He made it perfectly clear that the so-called freedom riders are merely exercising their constitutional right, which has been confirmed repeatedly by the U.S. Supreme Court in the Henderson, Morgan, Boynton, and other cases, to travel in an unsegregated fashion, not only between States but within a State. This right, according to the recent Boynton decision, extends not merely to the process of travel itself, but also to the waiting rooms and restaurants in the terminal stations. The freedom riders were therefore proceeding constitutionally as well as peacefully.

It certainly follows that it is the legal duty of the Federal Government to protect American citizens in these rights when they are threatened either by mobs or by State action or inaction which attempts to deny to individuals the protection of the Federal Constitution as embodied in the 5th and 14th amendments and in the act of 1871.

The President of the United States and the Attorney General, could not, in good conscience, have done anything other than what they did. Had they remained silent, had they stood aside and allowed the local mobs to beat up these men and women, had they abdicated to State and local governments which would not do their duty, then the Federal Government would have been the tacit ally and the silent partner in the unfortunate

happenings which developed. This was something which the traditions of this country could not tolerate. The one redeeming feature of the whole unfortunate situation is the fact that the Federal Government did try to step in and protect these men and women.

I want to say a few words, in conclusion, about these so-called freedom riders themselves. They have been attacked on the ground that they are "stirring up trouble." They did not come to attack anyone. They came peacefully to carry out Federal law. They have not attacked anyone, nor have the participants in the so-called sit-ins. The philosophy behind this movement—nonviolent resistance—is modeled upon the teachings and practices of Mahatma Ghandi in India. We rightly admire Ghandi, for he won independence for the people of India by his practice of civil disobedience. He and his followers practiced nonviolent resistance to the unjust laws of British India. The freedom riders were practicing a nonviolent protest in support of the American Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court. They were protesting peacefully and without violence against social practices, local ordinances and State laws which violated the Constitution. They have been attacked but they have not struck back. They have instead preached love and sympathy for those who have abused them.

I have known men who were in the British Army and who, under orders, reluctantly shot down Indians when they were peacefully demonstrating, but who were later so conscience smitten that they resigned their commissions and left military life. Ghandi appealed to the conscience of the British people and to the conscience of the world; and his followers, by abstaining from violence, ultimately won independence for India.

A few years ago, Negro people of Montgomery, Ala., led by Martin Luther King and Reverend Abernathy, adopted the philosophy of Ghandi, which, I may say, is parallel to the philosophy of Jesus and based in part upon the sermon, On the Mount, as well as on the teachings of Buddha—"Resist not evil. Do good to those who injure you. If slapped upon one cheek, turn the other. Do not hate. Walk the second mile. Conquer not by physical resistance, but by love."

It is extraordinary that the Negro race, which has been so abused by the white race in the North as well as in the South, has thus far exhibited great patience, true forbearance, and a Ghandian attitude in word and conduct.

What infuriated the baser elements among the British population in India against Ghandi was that he was so clearly their moral superior. This was the last thing they could stand. Perhaps this same resentment is at work here.

Mr. President, I am not certain how long this Ghandian movement can continue to be the controlling force among the members of the Negro race unless it is met with sympathy, help, and understanding from the white race. There is already a rival movement sweeping through sections of the Negro population; namely, the so-called Black Muslim movement, which preaches hatred and defiance of the whites, which says that the whites cannot be moved by pity or by compassion, and that ultimately, exactly as force and oppression have been wreaked upon the blacks, so the blacks, in revenge, must use similar tactics upon the whites.

There is being shown at this very moment in New York, a play written by the Frenchman, Genet, which preaches exactly that doctrine with terrific and terrifying force.

So, my friends, the white race is on trial, very seriously on trial. America is on trial. We in the Senate and the Congress are on trial. I thank the Lord that the President of the United States and the Attorney General have proved worthy of this occasion. We should give them our support, and not our opposition.

I hope the Senators will excuse me if I close on a personal and minor note. It is sometimes said that it is very easy to defend the rights of people far away and to ignore abuses close at home. I think we in the North who feel very keenly on these matters do have an obligation to speak out against similar practices—even though they may be more veiled—which occur in our own communities. Ten years ago in Cicero, Ill., a mob attacked a Negro family which was moving into a white community. The National Guard had to be called out. I can only say, without indulging in self-righteousness, that at that time I felt it my duty to rise on the floor of the Senate and to denounce the action of the white mob in my own State. I am sure that my colleagues who feel as I do in this matter take a similar position. For our principles are not parochial or sectional but universal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Illinois 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York yields another minute.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not know whether it will be possible under the rules of the Senate for us to take action upon the resolution, but I think we ought to take the matter very seriously to our consciences. We should do everything to protect and to defend the Constitution of the United States and the rights of citizens under it and to uphold the actions in this matter of the President and of the Attorney General.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana yields 10 minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the resolution before this body cannot be considered in the abstract, but must be weighed in the light of recent events and existing circumstances in order to determine the consequences which would flow from a favorable consideration of it. I am convinced that Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 would not only not contribute to the prevention of violence, but, indeed, might well contribute to the incitement of further trouble.

In the first place, such a step by the Senate would be unprecedented. Although it is far from a source of pride to any American, we have experienced during our history, even in recent years, the outbreak of lawlessness and mob violence from time to time in various States of many sections of our country. Some of these regrettable incidents occurred from racial differences, and by no means have these been confined to the Southern States. Other instances of violence, occasionally attended by what was apparently a complete breakdown in law and order, have been occasioned by differences between labor and management. On most of these occasions, the Chief Executive of the United States has refrained from direct intervention, which is not only in accord with the Constitution, but also with previous expressions of this body. I remind the Senate that in 1957 the Senate rejected a proposal to authorize the President to use armed intervention in the States in such situations by a unanimous vote of 90 to 0.

Unfortunately, a President did undertake armed intervention once previously in recent years and created a blot on American history which will not soon be expunged. It is to the credit of the Senate that no such resolution as Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 was either introduced or considered at that time.

The recent difficulties in Alabama, at which this resolution is undeniably directed, have to some extent subsided. The President has contributed to the easing of tensions by withdrawing the Federal forces. The Attorney General himself has stated that the State authorities are maintaining order. In view of these circumstances, favorable consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25 could contribute nothing to the maintenance of law and order, but it well might, and probably would, give aid, comfort, and encouragement to the self-styled freedom riders and other agitators who seem bent on inciting violence at all costs. They continue to flow into the Southern States from places far removed, not for the purpose of interstate travel, but to create incidents which can contribute nothing to improved race relations, but which will most certainly further heighten the tensions and passions which already have been incited.

Above all, it is imperative that we keep in mind that the difficulties which have been experienced and the violence which has occurred were a direct result of the premeditated and deliberate agitation of persons who sought to create incidents which would focus attention on racial differences. The conduct of the self-styled freedom riders is lawless and malicious. Just as no American from the South, North, East, or West can condone the violence which occurred, no American can condone the instigation of such violence nor encourage it as this resolution would do.

Mr. President, it is a common thing for outsiders to jump on the South. I should like to remind those who do so that all the violence has not occurred in the South. Some violence has occurred there, and this I and other Senators, I am sure, regret, but there are other parts of the country in which violence has occurred, too.

I hold in my hand a clipping entitled "Terrorism in New York; Law and Order Break Down." That occurrence was not in the South; it was in the North. I shall not take time to read the entire article, but it states that law and order broke down in New York, and that terrorism prevailed there.

I hold in my hand another clipping which states: "Throng of New Yorkers Beat New York Officers." Where did that incident occur? In the South? No. In the North? Yes.

I am a believer in this country—North, East, South, and West—being unified, and not arraying one section against another. I remind the American people today that it was not the southerners who created this incident. The South did not instigate the current trouble. The instigation was at the hands of those who came from afar for that purpose.

Incident after incident has occurred in the big cities of the North, but they have generated little excitement from national officers or news media.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The concurrent resolution refers only to States in which citizens of the United States may be deprived of their rights under the Constitution and laws. Does the Senator recognize, in view of extensive violence which has occurred in our National Capital, that probably we ought to include the District of Columbia in the same category with other States?

Mr. THURMOND. I think the able and distinguished Senator from Idaho has put his finger on a very sensitive point. I know of no place in the Nation where there has been more heinous crime, accompanied by the inability of local authorities to cope with it, than in the Capital of the United States. This crime does not occur in Southern States, but right under the noses of National officers.

I hold in my hand another clipping that reads as follows: "Police in Brooklyn Shoot Two Negroes, Setting Off Mauling Demonstration by 1,000 Persons."

Mr. President, where did that incident occur? Did it occur in Alabama or some Southern State? No, it occurred in the North.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I hold in my hand another clipping. Incidentally, these clippings are available to Senators or to the press, if they wish to see them. They are available to those who are supporting the resolution being debated. I shall be pleased to have them read the clippings if they care to do so.

I hold in my hand another clipping that reads as follows: "Near Riot of White-Negroes Broken Up." That clipping comes from where? The South? No, it is datelined Buffalo, N.Y.

I shall not take time to go into the details, but I invite the attention of Senators and the American people to the fact that some of those whose hearts are bleeding so badly have situations at their own doorsteps that ought to be cleaned up first before they attempt to castigate the South. The maintenance of law and order, just as charity, should begin at home.

I hold in my hand another clipping, the subject of which is, "Angry Negroes Attack Police in New York." That is another instance concerning which, if time permitted, I would go into details, but I shall read only the first paragraph:

An angry, shouting mob attacked two detectives Sunday who were trying to take a Negro man and woman into custody on an East Bronx Street.

I hold in my hand another clipping entitled "Long Violent Summer Draws to Close in New York, Leaving Sad Record of Youth Gang Warfare and Death." Where did that incident occur? Not in a southern State, but in New York.

I hold in my hands another clipping, entitled "Policeman Battles Gang in New York." I shall read only the first paragraph:

A policeman battled an organized teenage gang, a mauling mob of 300 persons, tonight before he got help from another policeman and arrested the gang's president and war counselor.

Does it seem possible that these incidents occurred in the North? From the statements and actions of some people who propose such action as is contemplated by Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, one would think that everything in the North is perfectly pure. One would be led to believe that everything has been purified in the North and that there is no crime there.

There is more violence more often in other parts of the country than there is in the South.

I hold in my hands another clipping, entitled "'Keep Out of Schools,' New York Toughs Warn Police," from the Washington Post and Times Herald.

I shall read only the first paragraph:

Teenage terrorists today defied police trying to stamp out a wave of juvenile violence that has included the rape of three girls and led to the suicide of a junior high school principal.

Where did that incident occur? In the South? No. In the North? Yes. Where? In New York City.

I hold in my hands yet another clipping, entitled "White Students Mauled by Negroes as Climax to Racial Unrest in New York."

I shall read only the first paragraph:

A group of Negro teenagers mauled a number of white high school students on a Brooklyn elevated train Thursday in climax to 2 days of racial unrest at the school.

There is no mention of any call for Federal intervention or Federal marshals to stop the bloodshed and restore order. Could it be because the occurrence was in the North and not the South?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I could go on. I have stacks of such clippings before me, not only from the State of New York, but from Illinois and other States, which, if time permitted, I would read. My time has expired, but if any Senator wants to see them, I have available an infinite number of such reports.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two editorials from the State, an ably edited newspaper in Columbia, S.C., and one from the responsible and excellent newspaper, the Florence (S.C.) Morning News, all of which are enlightening, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Columbia (S.C.) The State, May 23, 1961]

SHOULD STAND FIRM—THE CHALLENGE TO THE STATES

A difficult day for relationships between the President, on the one hand, and the Governors of some southern States is fatefully at hand.

President Kennedy has, in effect, reprimanded Governor Patterson of Alabama in the eruptions there. And the Federal administration dispatched the first assistant attorney general to Montgomery grimly to set forth its position of positive and determined intervention.

Here indeed is the possibly decisive confrontation involving the States and the central power. Here is the prelude to the stern imposition of Federal force. What must have been the thoughts of southern newspapermen as they heard the historic exchange between the Federal assistant attorney general and Governor Patterson.

The Governor of Alabama stood firm, and as this is written still stands for the rights of his State. He deserves the plaudits and support of the other southern Governors, of the southern citizenry, of all who still believe in local self-government, of all everywhere who would limit the exercise of Federal force to those powers set forth in the Constitution.

The reprimand from President Kennedy is to be found in his telegram of Friday. In this message he, in effect, dressed down Governor Patterson for what occurred at Montgomery and reminded the Governor of Mr. Patterson's promise to preserve law and order.

The Federal action in this case of premeditated troublemaking on the part of the invading integrationist party unquestionably has deeply imprinted itself in the minds of the other Governors of the South. If Governor Patterson does not weaken, he will have set the pattern for the heads of the other States of the South.

This clash between Federal and State power takes a terribly disturbing form since it comes from a background of the current concept of a strong Presidency. One does not see it as a separate act, but as one of a series, in various fields, reflecting this condition of freshly conceived Federal power.

Governors of Southern States stand challenged by the Washington position of super-

seding authority. They are challenged not to bend, but to contend for the rights of the States.

It is not important that most of the southern Governors supported Mr. Kennedy, or indeed, relevant who is President at the moment. What is important is that the States demonstrate their own capacity to restore order when such disturbances occur, and that the Federal authority grant the States reasonable opportunity to do so. Alabama moved quickly to do so.

One cannot escape the conviction that the Federal officials, men with a feel of extraordinary power born in 1961, intervened almost eagerly. That is the crux of the matter, the factor which casts a shadow over the future.

The Federal intervention at Little Rock under the orders of then President Eisenhower was equally abhorrent to those who believe in local self-government, but does not purify what has occurred in the Montgomery case.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) State, May 22, 1961]

BLIGHT BEYOND DIXIE—THE ERUPTION IN ALABAMA

The composed southerner deplores the violence at Montgomery. First, he is a mature and civilized man who accurately evaluates peace everywhere. Second, he knows such eruptions as that which occurred at Montgomery are used unfairly to portray all southerners as bigots, racists, and rabble.

But this same southerner equally deplores the deliberately provocative invasion which came out of the North. It would have been better if sincere integrationists in the North had used their influence to have recalled this expedition in its earlier stages, just as it would have been better had the people of Montgomery restrained their resentment and their tempers.

The recalling of the expedition would have restored the process of court action for integration as the only action, and would have prevented the breach of the peace. It would also have relieved the President of the United States of the responsibility he had assumed in giving Federal protection to the members of the invading group. Likewise, the avoidance of violence in Alabama would have left the President free to focus his mind on the world problems which are paramount. But restraining an invaded State would always be more difficult than the recalling of a small group, bent upon disturbing the peace.

If it should be maintained that the forces of integration in the North, including the top personnel of the Federal Government, lacked the power to stop or recall the invading band, then the powers of persuasion were stifled by the weakness of a will which give clandestine support to the venture. And such a will casts a reflection upon the proper course, which is through the courts and which to date has been an unfailingly successful one for integration, doubtless satisfactory to the normally patient but apparently insufficient to the impetuous and the reckless.

Although most southerners believe the Supreme Court to have been wrong in its conclusions, they recognize the right of the integrationists to resort to the courts. And that having been done, one is mystified that the intelligent among them do not reject the supplementary tactic of forays into the South by such a group as that which encountered violence in Alabama.

The failure of rational integrationists of influence in the North to have acted against the invaders and thereby to have prevented the trouble which inevitably developed is a blight on their composure and good sense.

[From the Florence Morning News, May 24, 1961]

FEDERAL VOICES ARE STRANGELY SILENT

All the action of the Federal Government up until now has been against the mobs who attacked the freedom riders.

None has been taken against those who deliberately planned this excursion, advertised it extensively in advance, and consciously sought, there is reason to believe, to provoke violence in order to focus national attention upon the race controversy.

If their action was not an overt action of law violation, when viewed in the light of the events in Alabama, they are clearly an accessory to the fact. And if that accessory relationship is not close enough to justify legal action, it certainly justifies moral persuasion on the part of Federal authorities, including President Kennedy himself, to discourage actions which, by their very nature, are dangerous to the peace.

Federal authorities have a duty to advise freedom riders and other agitators that what is legal is not always expedient, and that unwise action works against the very objectives sought.

This is an area in which Federal voices have been strangely silent. In their silence, they demonstrate not only moral neglect but an astounding lack of understanding of the southern problem.

This does not detract from the ugliness of the mob violence which flared in Alabama, or from the responsibility of local and State authorities to keep the peace whatever the pressures. But it does emphasize that calmness, sanity, resolution, and understanding are required on both State and national levels.

On the side of the State government it requires that good influence be used to suppress the agitators. If this had been done in the case of the freedom riders, the Nation might have been saved the Alabama riots.

On the side of the State government and local citizens and law enforcement, two cardinal points should be kept in focus:

1. To preserve the peace, the law must be upheld, and surrender to or participate in mob action is the destruction of orderly, organized society.

2. Violence serves the agitators. It promotes their cause. Regardless of how the story ends in Alabama, the freedom riders have scored a victory. The mobsters played into their hands.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have only 15 minutes remaining on this side. I would appreciate it if the other side would allocate a little time, and then I intend to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] 5 minutes, and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] 10 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to support the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] by urging passage of the resolution. The Senator from Illinois mentioned the driving psychological forces of the freedom riders. He talked about the dedication of the freedom riders to the philosophy of Ghandi. He pointed out that there was also a danger that other psychological forces, such as the Moslem philosophy, and the Communist totalitarianism, may become involved.

But I think the most important driving philosophical force that is involved in the educational program of the freedom riders and the sit-in groups is their faith in Christianity to the point of Christian martyrdom.

The psychology of martyrdom is a very interesting subject as we study its manifestations throughout history. A great spirit of martyrdom is to be found within the manifestations and the application of the Jewish religion throughout history. Interestingly, when people believe in one God, they are perfectly willing many times to make whatever sacrifice is necessary in order to keep faith in the teachings of the religion symbolized by that God. That has been typical of millions of Jews throughout the history of mankind. It is also true of Christian martyrdom. As we study the motivation of this great educational force which is now loose in this country in the form of freedom riders and sit-in demonstrators, we see among them dedicated Christians who believe that it is their Christian obligation to put into practice the teachings of Christ.

Mr. President, it is not possible to study this movement without recognizing that it is Christianity put to practice. Because there are certain implications contained in the speech made by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, I wish to emphasize that the resolution offered by Senators JAVITS, DOUGLAS, and CLARK is universal, not sectional, in its coverage. The resolution speaks for the carrying out of the constitutional guarantees for all citizens in all parts of the United States.

The churches of America which do not countenance this great drive of Christian martyrdom should have black crepe put on their doors until those churches themselves proceed to practice within their sanctums the teachings of Christ the Lord. Basic in those teachings is the tenet that in the sight of God all men are equal and all men are the children of God.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. We have now reached the place where from the standpoint of world judgment on the United States we no longer can pretend to be a God-fearing nation, believing in one God, unless we practice our religious principles.

The resolution in a very real sense is a resolution which calls upon us to put the principles of the Constitution into practice and by so doing we also will be putting into practice our religious faith. Those who would deny first-class citizenship rights to the Negroes of America must suffer increasing pains of conscience and they witness the increasing manifestations of Christian martyrdom on the part of increasing numbers of nonviolent Christian crusaders among Negro and white people in the United States who are determined to end race discrimination in our country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the pending concurrent resolution states that—

It is the sense of Congress that the President of the United States be supported in

measures to enforce the Constitution of the United States and the laws enacted thereunder for the protection of individual rights, in such States where citizens of the United States may be deprived of their rights under the Constitution and such laws, or jeopardized in the enjoyment thereof, by virtue of the actions of citizens of any State, or by virtue of the actions or failure to act of the public authorities charged with the enforcement of the laws of such States.

The resolution says nothing about any section of the country. It does not single out the South. It covers the entire country. It does not condone or encourage violence. It is not tenable to suggest that it does. It merely supports the President in his efforts to support the clearly established civil rights of all Americans—white and Negro alike—which were violated in Alabama and are now being violated in Mississippi.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter which has been addressed to me—and I assume to other Senators also—by the Attorney General of the United States, and the text of a telegram which the Attorney General sent to Governor Patterson, of Alabama.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1961.

Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a copy of the telegram which I sent to Governor Patterson of Alabama on Saturday, May 20, informing him of the reasons why it was necessary to send U.S. deputy marshals to Montgomery to maintain peace and order and protect interstate travel and commerce.

The action was taken pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 333 which provides that:

"The President, by using the militia or the Armed Forces, or both or by any other means, shall take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection, domestic violence, unlawful combination."

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1961.

GOV. JOHN PATTERSON,
Montgomery, Ala.:

As you know, since early this last week I have been deeply concerned about the situation in Alabama. From my conversation with you on Monday and numerous conversations that I and my associates here had with your aides, you have been aware of the concern with which we have regarded this very explosive situation. Since the destruction of the bus on Sunday and the interference of interstate travel you have been made aware of our clear responsibility in this area. The President himself when he was unable to reach you Friday made this clear to the Lieutenant Governor and pointed out that the Federal Government has the responsibility to guarantee safe passage in interstate commerce and that free travel had not been possible for 5 days in Alabama. The President hoped that the government of Alabama would restore the situation without the need for action by Federal authorities.

You then requested that the President send a personal representative to discuss the matter with you. As you know, Mr. Seigenthaler of this office met with you last evening and in your presence talked to me on the telephone. He told me that you wanted to assure the President and the Federal Government that you had the will, the force, the men, and the equipment to fully protect everyone in Alabama.

Mr. Seigenthaler assured you that the Federal Government was willing to provide marshals and any other assistance in order to assure that interstate commerce was unimpeded. You stated that this was unnecessary and that you and the local authorities would be completely able to handle every contingency. You suggested that we notify the Greyhound Bus Co. that this guarantee had been given. It was based on this assurance of safe conduct that the students boarded the bus in Birmingham on their trip to Montgomery. These students boarded the bus this morning. They arrived in Montgomery and were attacked and beaten by a mob. Prior to their arrival we took the additional precautionary step of having the FBI notify the police department that these students were coming and asked the police to take all necessary steps for their protection. The FBI was informed and in turn notified us that all necessary steps had been taken and that no action on our part was necessary. As a matter of fact, no police were present. However, an armed mob was. Several of the travelers were severely beaten. The President's personal representative, Mr. Seigenthaler, who attempted to rescue a young white girl, who was being attacked by the mob, was knocked to the ground and left unconscious in the street.

Once again I have tried to reach you by telephone to discuss this matter with you. I was informed that you were out of town and no one knew when you would return or where you were. Therefore, although I strongly believe that law enforcement matters should be handled by local authorities whenever possible, now not being even able to reach you to learn what steps you intend to take we have no alternative but to order the following action:

1. I am asking the U.S. court in Montgomery to enjoin the Ku Klux Klan, the National States Rights Party, certain individuals and all persons acting in concert with them, from interfering with peaceful interstate travel by buses.

2. I am arranging for the FBI to send in an extra team to intensify its investigation of the incident in Montgomery and the other events this past week in which the Federal Government has jurisdiction.

3. I am also arranging for U.S. officers to begin to assist State and local authorities in the protection of persons and property and vehicles in Alabama.

Mr. Byron White, the Deputy Attorney General, will be in charge and will be in touch with your office as well as the local authorities.

I trust we will have your cooperation and the cooperation of local authorities.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the impact of the happenings in Alabama and Mississippi on our foreign policy is incalculable. The picture of the burning bus in Alabama and accompanying news stories are on the front page of most of the newspapers from the cape to Cairo, from Kamchatka to Karachi, from Oslo to Istanbul.

Senators will search their own consciences as to the position they will take on this resolution. I am the guardian only of my own. I am compelled to support the resolution.

There is no doubt, in my judgment, that in the Senate at least 80 Senators, if they had an opportunity to do so, would support the resolution if it were brought to a vote; but the resolution cannot be brought to a vote under the present rules of the Senate.

These rules must be changed. The rules of the Senate must be changed, Mr. President, so that a majority of the Members of the Senate can act expeditiously when a majority of the Senators are ready for action.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield the remainder of the time in opposition to the resolution to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. First, before I speak on the pending resolution, I wish to compliment the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for the very masterful way in which he handled the education bill on the floor. He and I disagreed on many of the major parts of the bill, but he made a splendid presentation of the proponents' side of the subject, and he handled himself in excellent fashion. I am not overquick to compliment anyone. However, I do wish to compliment the Senator from Oregon on the way he handled himself and in the way he presented the matter on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as a Senator from Mississippi I submit that it is very unfortunate to hear State officials who are doing everything they possibly can do to uphold Federal law and State law castigated on the floor of the Senate. With all deference to the Senator from New York, it is unfortunate that he should accuse my State of trying to invoke the doctrine of nullification. It is not doing that at all. Governor Ross Barnett of Mississippi and all other officials of the State, including mayors of the cities involved, have done everything they possibly could do to maintain complete order, quiet and calm, to protect anyone who has come to the State, whatever his mission may be. There has been no disorder in my State. Unfortunately, some did occur elsewhere. Instead of being criticized, these officials should be publicly commended.

We have here a picture of a few people who are acting for a very small minority of colored people. They are being pictured as a group who in a very peaceful way are trying to travel through the South. Mr. President, some of this group of so-called freedom riders had their photographs taken here in Washington. Some of these people met in Washington. They sent out advance notice. They did what they could, aided and abetted by others who were misguided, to stir up strife and enmity and in creating strife in advance in the areas in the South where they were going.

I have a very few remarks to make on this subject, because time is limited. It is tragic to me that we should be debating a subject like this at the same time that we are sending emissaries all over the world seeking alliances, seeking peace, and seeking ways to restrain those

who would attack us and undermine our philosophy of government.

The Vice President has been to Asia. The President of the United States addresses Congress today. We have emissaries all over the world on missions of many kinds. At the same time here in America we are encouraging minority groups who do not represent the best thinking of the Negro race or any other group. They go out and stir up strife and discord and enmity. We encourage these people by giving this resolution, with all deference to its authors, time for debate. In my humble opinion, under the conditions which exist today, the most charitable thing I can say about the resolution under debate is that it is a political move, pure and simple, a far-reaching political move. There is no sympathy for those in the great Southland who actually are trying to meet the conditions under the most adverse conditions imaginable.

This freedom rider group has already announced that they are setting up operational headquarters at Montgomery, Ala. They plan to spread out from there and carry out their mission. The morning's News carries an article from New Orleans, La., about another group, the Rockwell group, which is going around the country with banners flying on the buses and reading: "Hate the Jew. Hate the Negro. Hate Integration. Hate Everybody." They openly call themselves a Hate Group. Thus one group spawns another. Soon there will be others.

I have before me a UPI dispatch from New Orleans, La., dated yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORLEANS JAILS NAZIS FOR MARCHING

NEW ORLEANS, May 24.—Police hauled in nine Nazi storm troopers and their self-proclaimed fuehrer, George Lincoln Rockwell, tonight as they tried to picket the movie "Exodus" with signs reading "America for whites, Africa for blacks, and gas chamber for traitors."

Police also drove them away from their planned picketing of an NAACP membership rally tonight.

Officers took the troops and Rockwell to first district police headquarters. No charges were filed against them, but a police spokesman said they probably would be booked for violation of a statute outlawing any act which might alarm the public.

The Nazi troopers, all wearing swastika armbands and khaki uniforms, braved a driving rain and unsympathetic police to demonstrate against the Jews and the Negroes. Rockwell and his young followers arrived here yesterday on what they dubbed a "hate tour."

One of the troopers was arrested earlier today when the group's bus had an accident as it tried to elude a police patrol car.

In addition to the arrests, other frustrations have piled up for the group. So far, they've been booted out of their motel, kept out of a State park where they planned to prepare their picket signs, and twice been drenched by Louisiana downpours.

To add to their woes, the manager of the civic theater where "Exodus" is playing reported a good crowd, despite the rain and the pickets.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall read one paragraph from the article:

The Nazi troopers, all wearing swastika arm bands and khaki uniforms, braved a driving rain and unsympathetic police to demonstrate against the Jews and the Negroes. Rockwell and his young followers arrived here yesterday on what they dubbed a "hate tour."

The Rockwell group are traveling through the great area of the country where I come from and where I was reared. I never heard the phrase "Hate the Jew" until I was a grown man, a college graduate, and had traveled in other parts of the country. I heard that term applied for the first time on the Eastern Seaboard. Yet that kind of junk is sent on us down in the South. And at the same time some Senators want resolutions passed on the floor of the Senate, in effect, condemning the South.

What should be offered are resolutions of encouragement and confidence; resolutions encouraging officers and the people who are trying to cope with the conditions of hate generated by outsiders with which we are faced in the South, rather than condemning us and resurrecting the century-old word charges of "nullificationists." They are trying to discredit us.

Thank God, things are quiet and calm in Mississippi as of now. I have not had a chance to make a personal telephone call there this morning, but I know that is so, because if it were not, the newscasts on the television and radio and articles in the newspapers would be telling us bad news if any existed.

So we need expressions of confidence and encouragement. The situation is being dealt with well as of now, considering what we are confronted with in the form of this group. But we need sympathy and understanding.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] made a very good point a moment ago. I have spent most of my life in the South. I have never yet slept or had to leave my family behind a locked door. But in Washington—and I am not one to discredit the great Capital City of our Nation—I do not dare leave my family unprotected, even in the morning hours. When I leave home early, even in the open daylight, I leave them behind locked doors. The reason is obvious—the terrorism which is constantly taking place here.

What the Senate—and especially the Senators who have submitted the resolution—should be doing is to take the lead in commending, instead of condemning, those officers and people who are coping with these terrible conditions generated by the so-called freedom group and hate groups.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have listened with the greatest of interest to the arguments which have been made in opposition to the resolution. Before dealing with them, I desire to pay my respects and appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who was a leader in this fight long before I ever got into it, or even into public life; to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is in exactly the same category; and to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is more of my vintage in terms of public life, for their support in what is always a trying and sometimes emotional issue.

But with all due deference to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], for whom I have the greatest regard as a lawyer and a man—and I should also like to emphasize my respect for every State and National official in authority—the fundamental point is this: No matter how many crimes may be committed in the North, no matter how much sympathy and understanding the people of the South are entitled to for what is by now an almost age-old load which they carry, the idea that there has to be a separation of the races is a blight on the social system, as one Senator has called it. The fact is that this whole current runs against the times, and the times simply cannot stand it.

Even if we tolerated it at home, we cannot tolerate it as an element of the foreign policy of the United States, for it, and it alone, could defeat everything else we are trying to do. So while these voices are charming, genial, and interesting, nevertheless they are voices of the past. We are here arguing for what must be done in order to live in a working world.

The big difference between what happened in States like those we are discussing today and what happens in Northern States is that in the one place the whole public morality, the whole public law, the entire action of public officials and the action of society condemns segregation and discrimination. It deals with them even to the extent of quelling riots, but it condemns them. It does not accept or tolerate them. Whereas, on the other side, we are told that the kind of quiet which comes because we let things alone is the better way in society. Yet that is a situation which our country cannot tolerate, especially in its position of exposure to the whole world today. That is the difference.

We do not read about any Governor in the North who opposes the Attorney General. This is the Attorney General's comment on why marshals had to be sent into Alabama:

Therefore, although I strongly believe that law enforcement matters should be handled by local authorities whenever possible, now not being even able to reach you to learn what steps you intend to take, we have no alternative but to order the following action—

That is the difference between the two kinds of law and administration. It brings us to the present situation. The purpose of my resolution, in which I have been joined by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], is threefold. If there is nothing else I do before the resolution goes to the calendar, I should like to make it clear, first, that a climate must be created in which elements in the South which want to obey

the Constitution and are law abiding have assurance that they will not be intimidated by reason of the fact that the laws of the United States are not being applied; second, that the President can be courageous; that, notwithstanding the denunciation by Senators on the floor, a President of the United States has great support if he seeks to enforce the laws of the United States to protect the rights of citizens in any State. Think of it: One hundred years after the Civil War, freedom riders—and I hold no brief for them; that is not necessary for this argument—were arrested because they went into a white waiting room in Mississippi. Certainly, it is quiet in Mississippi. It is also quiet in a prison. It is also quiet in a tomb. That is not the test of whether there is a society which is composed of free men, as it should be, by all our religious faiths; men who are equal and dignified, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] so eloquently described it. So my second purpose is to show that the President, if he proceeds in a way which is necessary—and this was necessary—to enforce the laws of the United States has the support of the great bulk of the country.

The third purpose is to demonstrate that we need a leader as well as action by individuals.

I end upon this note: One of the elements of the climate which has been set here is attributable to the fact that the administration has backed away from asking Congress to pass a law on civil rights. I have said before, and I say again, appeasement in these situations, for any purpose, whether it concerns a "must" program or anything else, will not work. Congress must be a party to the activity. The Attorney General must be given the right to institute suits under the much maligned Part III. It is up to Congress to act.

Finally, I hope the President will do what he said in the campaign he would do, namely, call the southern Governors and leaders into the White House——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order. Under the order, the time allotted for the consideration of the resolution has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I hope the President will call the leaders of the South into the White House and tell them what he personally thinks about the enforcement of the laws of the Nation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a point of order. The time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the resolution, under the agreement, will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. Res. 149. Resolution to establish a West Virginia Week in commemoration of its 98th anniversary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 5954. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 289).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1962. A bill for the relief of Kenneth David Wooden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1963. A bill to extend to employees subject to the Classification Act of 1949 the benefits of salary increases in connection with the protection of basic compensation rates from the effects of downgrading actions, to provide salary protection for postal field service employees in certain cases of reduction in salary standing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1964. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain land to the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Inc. (a New York corporation); to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BEALL, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. SMATHERS):

S. 1965. A bill to establish a Peace By Investment Corporation, and for other related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1966. A bill for the relief of James Nenow; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1967. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chien Li Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1968. A bill for the relief of Dr. G. L. Clifton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1969. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1970. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward V. Amason; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE of New Jersey:

S. 1971. A bill for the relief of Mirielle and Robert Guzelbahar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1972. A bill for the relief of Ourania Nicolaou Papanikolaou Asilanaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.J. Res. 93. Joint resolution to extend through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON):

S.J. Res. 94. Joint resolution designating the 1st day of July in each year as Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Missouri when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. BARTLETT) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 151) to express the sense of the Senate on recommendations of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

LEASE OF CERTAIN LAND TO NAVY YARD BOYS' CLUB, INC.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would permit the Navy Yard Boys' Club of Brooklyn to build new permanent quarters on U.S. property in the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

The bill, which is also being introduced in the House by Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat of Brooklyn, would authorize the Navy to lease a half-acre of land to the Boys' Club for $1 per year for a period of 99 years.

The Navy Yard Boys' Club over the past 34 years has established an extraordinary record as a stabilizing influence in the community. Its work has been applauded by civic, social, and religious leaders. It is imperative that its work be continued and expanded.

The Boys' Club is now using a public school building as its quarters on a temporary basis. The need for permanent quarters with modern facilities is emphasized by the fact that the boy population of the area has grown to more than 6,000 as the result of the erection of two low-cost housing projects in the neighborhood.

Brooklyn Navy Yard officials have indicated that they have no objection to making the land available to the Boys' Club.

I am informed that the Charles Hayden Foundation of New York City has made a grant of $225,000 to the club for building new quarters; and the club has undertaken a campaign to raise an equal amount.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a statement be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1964) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lease certain land to the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Inc. (a New York corporation), introduced

by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to lease, for a term of ninety-nine years, the land described in subsection (b) of this section to the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Incorporated (a New York corporation), for use by such corporation as a site on which to establish a boys' club. Such lease shall expressly provide that (1) in the event such land is used for any purpose other than a situs for the facilities and activities of a boys' club, the lease may be terminated at the option of the Secretary of the Navy; and (2) such corporation shall pay as consideration for such lease an amount equal to one dollar.

(b) The land authorized to be leased under subsection (a) of this section is described as follows:

Beginning at the point of intersection of the south boundary line of the New York Naval Shipyard on Flushing Avenue, and the west boundary line of the New York Naval Shipyard, on Navy Street, said point being located north 9442.76 feet and west 3622.43 feet of the Prospect Water Tower Station, as established by the Greater New York Triangulation Survey; thence proceeding along the west boundary line of the New York Naval Shipyard N. 2°57'05" E., 312.05 feet to a point on the extended line of a fire wall, in Building No. 16 of the New York Naval Shipyard; thence along the line of the fire wall in Building No. 16 S. 86°59'34" E., 69.66 feet to a point on the easterly face of Building No. 16; thence along the easterly line of Building No. 16 S. 2°55'5", 311.97 feet to the south boundary line of the New York Naval Shipyard; thence along the south boundary line of the New York Naval Shipyard N. 87°03'41" W., 69.78 feet to the point of beginning, containing 0.50 acres.

SEC. 2. Except as otherwise provided in the first section of this Act, the terms and conditions of the lease authorized by such section shall be as prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy after consultation with the President of the Navy Yard Boys' Club, Incorporated.

The statement presented by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

NAVY YARD BOYS' CLUB HISTORY

The Navy Yard Boys' Club, a nonsectarian, philanthropic institution, was incorporated under the membership corporation law in the State of New York on May 17, 1935.

The Boys' Club is a fully affiliated member of the Boys' Clubs of America, incorporated August 6, 1956, by the Congress of the United States (36 U.S.C. 691), for the purpose of promoting "the health, social, educational, vocational, and character development of boys throughout the United States of America."

The Navy Yard Boys' Club was originally incorporated as the Boys' Club, Navy Yard District, Inc., to accomplish the following objects:

"To provide and furnish a place of amusement, entertainment, and recreational facilities for boys who have not the means to pay dues in other clubs or associations, residing in that section of the Borough of Brooklyn, city of New York, known as the Navy Yard District, as well as to provide such other facilities which have for their end the formation of character and American citizenship.

From the date of its incorporation in 1935, and up to 1945, the club occupied and used a building located in the Navy Yard District on Nassau Street, Brooklyn, which was owned by the Brooklyn Community Center, a philanthropic organization, which leased this property to the boys' club at a nominal annual rental.

In 1945 the Boys' Club moved its center of activities to 193 York Street, Brooklyn, which is in the Navy yard district where it occupied a former church building owned by the Brooklyn City Mission, a religious corporation which leased this property to the Boys' Club for a stipulated annual rental of $1.

In the year 1952, the Brooklyn City Mission, in conjunction with other religious groups undertook to erect and maintain a new community church in the Navy yard district. Its contribution to this effort was to be the proceeds of sale of the premises occupied by the Boys' Club at 193 York Street.

The Brooklyn City Mission had a bona fide offer of $45,000 for this property but in recognition of the valuable contribution made by the Boys' Club in the proper training and development of boys in this congested area, and being desirous that this work should be continued, elected to sell the property to the Boys' Club at a price of $35,000 which amount the Boys' Club paid under a mutually agreeable low cost financial arrangement.

This property soon became inadequate to properly handle an expanded membership and the age and plan of the building made the cost of modernization prohibitive. The situation was further complicated when, in the summer of 1959, definite physical weakness in the structure made it necessary to vacate it.

Thereupon temporary accommodations were obtained through the cooperation of the Board of Education of the City of New York at Public School No. 287 located in the same area. These accommodations were made available to the club with the understanding that it was on a temporary basis only and subject to cancellation, if required, by the board of education.

At about the time these arrangements were made, the Charles Hayden Foundation, of 25 Broad Street, New York City, made a grant of $225,000 to the Boys' Club for the purpose of building new, permanent quarters, conditioned, however, upon a like sum being raised by the Boys' Club. For the purpose of determining a proper central location a broad survey was made of the entire navy yard district with the advice and cooperation of Hon. John Cashmore, president of the Borough of Brooklyn and his chief engineer, Charles Reidel.

At this point it was determined that the increasing need for Boys' Club activities resulting from the erection of two low-cost housing projects in the neighborhood required a larger plot and modern facilities more centrally located.

Information was received in February 1960 that the New York Naval Shipyard was not using and had no plans to use an old brick and wooden warehouse located on the southwest corner of the land. This is a plot 69.78 by 312.05 feet, irregular, on the northeast corner of Navy Street and Flushing Avenue.

The size is ideal for the construction of a modern Boys' Club and the location is the best possible to care for a boy population in excess of 6,000 in the area.

The record established by the Boys' Club over the past 34 years has been applauded by civic, social and religious leaders as a stabilizing influence in this area and the need for its continued operation is indeed imperative.

PROPOSED PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and Senators BEALL, HARTKE, and SMATHERS, as cosponsors, a bill that would permit millions of small investors to buy a share in peace.

The bill would establish a "Peace by Investment Corporation" that would expand by billions of dollars the flow of private U.S. investments in economic development projects located in the underdeveloped areas of the free world. The unique feature of the bill is that the corporation would obtain its investment funds primarily from millions of small investors, who would, in effect, be buying a share in peace.

The new bill is a complete reworking and comprehensive improvement of earlier proposals, based upon additional study and consultation in the United States and other continents during the past 2 years. The financial and economic basis for the bill is principally the work of Benjamin A. Javits, my brother, well-known lawyer and author, who for many years has written extensively on the subject, and Leon H. Keyserling, well-known economist and former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Under the terms of the legislation introduced today, initial and temporary capital funds for the Peace by Investment Corporation, totaling $100 million, would be subscribed to by the U.S. Government through the Treasury. During the first 6 years of its operations, to obtain added funds for its investment purposes, the Corporation would also be authorized to borrow from the Treasury in amounts not exceeding $125 million in any one year, and in an aggregate outstanding amount not exceeding $600 million. During this initial period, the Corporation would function as an agency of the United States. But upon retirement of the basic portion of the original investment in the project by the Treasury, the Corporation would go through an orderly transition from an agency of the United States to private operations and management.

The bill contains provisions for the retirement of these initial subscriptions and borrowings with earnings in investments and with permanent capital funds obtained by offering stock for public sale, predominantly to small investors, at a price yielding $5 per share of the Corporation. The issuance of this stock would be authorized by the bill in a total amount of $15 billion, not more than half of which could be during the first 6 years of the operation of the Peace by Investment Corporation.

The plan also includes an insurance feature, designed to protect investment on a sound actuarial basis against certain types of risk.

The recent establishment of the Peace Corps reflects growing realization that governments and diplomatic relations alone cannot bring enduring peace, without the consolidation and expansion of people-to-people relationships. Economic relationships are fundamental to human relationships, and private economic endeavors are inseparable from systems of human freedom. This measure is designed to establish and expand people-to-people relationships in the economic field; to encourage an expanded

flow of private capital investment from the United States into economically sound enterprises in underdeveloped areas of the world in the interest of world peace through mutual economic progress; to enlarge the number of private investors participating in this flow of capital so as to forge more direct links among the peoples of the world; to reduce gradually thereby the need for U.S. public investment and grants overseas; to help redirect the total flow of capital from the United States so that increasing portions of this total flow go to the underdeveloped areas, and thus be in better harmony with the domestic economic needs of the United States and the effective management of its international balance-of-payments problems.

The onrushing Soviet economic challenge underscores a fact which has been evident since the end of World War II—that our own national and economic security depends upon our willingness and ability to play a substantial economic role in the advancement of industrialization, agricultural productivity, and living standards which are now so abysmally low in many areas of the free and noncommitted world. Undoubtedly, public funds from the United States, from other countries and from international agencies, will need to be continued for some years, and even enlarged. But it is obvious that the flow of private capital needs to be expanded enormously in the years ahead, if a stable productive structure is to be built on the foundations created with the help of public funds.

Equally important as the economic factors are the political and social factors. By demonstrating throughout the world, not only that we in the United States can help to make responsible sovereign governments work for the benefit of free peoples everywhere, but also that we can help to make responsible private enterprise work for the benefit of free peoples everywhere, we may by precept and example enlarge the appeal of our admixture of private enterprise and government in other areas of the world. And by making it possible for other peoples to rise out of starvation or deprivation to a degree of production which will make further improvement in living standards increasingly feasible through their own efforts, we shall have gotten closer to the heart of the problem of peace.

Further, the sound and expanding opening up of the trade and market opportunities which will result from an improved technology in the underdeveloped areas can make an immense contribution to our own long-range economic advancement at a steady growth rate, with beneficent consequences in the form of business and farm prosperity, increased job opportunities, and better living standards right here in the United States.

The basic criteria for the entire investment program contained in the bill require that the Peace by Investment Corporation make these findings:

First. That each specific investment is in furtherance of an undertaking which is economically sound, actually or potentially profitable, and consistent with the sound, long-range economic development of the country in which it is located;

Second. That the country in which the undertaking is located shall have had full information with respect to it and opportunity to express a judgment as to its desirability;

Third. That the investment is not in competition with nor duplicative of other private investment programs or other public programs of the United States or of international agencies which give reasonable promise of accomplishing comparable results in accord with the purpose of this act;

Fourth. That each investment, taking into account the country in which it is located, is in accord with the general international economic and political policies of the United States;

Fifth. That the investment program in general is consistent with the short-range and long-range policy of the United States to maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power within the domestic economy;

Sixth. That the investment program in general is consistent with the short-range and long-range need of the United States to maintain a satisfactory balance of payments position; and

Seventh. That the investment program in general, and in its specific applications, is mutually beneficial to the country to which the investment flows and country from which it emanates, taking into account not only purely economic considerations but also consideration of human improvement under free institutions.

Mr. President, on April 18, the Honorable Norman Manley, Q.C., Premier of Jamaica, addressed a National Press Club luncheon here, in Washington. Several of the excellent points which he made in the course of his remarks have a particular bearing on the need for and the purposes of the Peace by Investment Corporation which this legislation would establish.

I believe that Premier Manley is one of the most effective and one of the truest friends of democratic institutions in those areas of the world which are struggling to raise the standards of life among their people. He is leading his people to economic development along democratic paths. He is not interested in exploring the tragic possibilities of economic growth through Communist, totalitarian means or through dangerous liaison with the Soviet bloc.

He needs our support. His words speak for themselves, Mr. President. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill and excerpts from his remarks printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and excerpts will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1965) to establish a Peace by Investment Corporation, and for other related purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

GENERAL PURPOSES

SEC. 1. The recent establishment of the "Peace Corps" reflects growing realization that governments and diplomatic relations alone cannot bring enduring peace, without the consolidation and expansion of people-to-people relationships. Economic relationships are fundamental to human relationships, and private economic endeavors are inseparable from systems of human freedom. This measure is designed to establish and expand people-to-people relationships in the economic field; to encourage an expanded flow of private capital investment from the United States into economically sound enterprises in underdeveloped areas of the world in the interest of world peace through mutual economic progress; to enlarge the number of private investors participating in this flow of capital so as to forge more direct links among the peoples of the world; to reduce gradually thereby the need for United States public investment and grants overseas; to help redirect the total flow of capital from the United States so that increasing portions of this total flow go to the underdeveloped areas, and thus be in better harmony with the domestic economic needs of the United States and the effective management of its international balance of payments problems.

PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION: BASIC FUNCTIONS

SEC. 2. There is hereby established a Peace by Investment Corporation (hereinafter referred to as the Corporation) with the following basic functions in accord with the purposes of this Act:

(1) As an equity investment agency, to purchase the securities and obligations of, or make loans to (a) any underdeveloped country or political subdivisions thereof, (b) any public agency or instrumentality of any such country, or (c) any private or semi-private firm, corporation, or association doing or intending to do business wholly or mainly in any such country or countries for the purpose of financing or assisting in financing any undertaking to expand such industrial, mining, construction, or agricultural activity in such country or countries as will, in the judgment of the Corporation, further the purposes of this Act;

(2) As an investment trust, to purchase minor stock interests in enterprises in the United States already in being under effective management and engaged substantially in investment in underdeveloped countries, to the extent that such purchases are clearly desirable in conducting the financial functions of the Corporation on a sound and prudent basis;

(3) To establish an insurance system, on an actuarially sound basis including such premiums as are required, designed to protect all or part of the outstanding investments under paragraph (1) of this section against loss arising from any cause, including but not limited to political or military events;

(4) To establish a second insurance system (distinct from that pursuant to paragraph (3) of this section), on an actuarially sound basis including such premiums as are required, designed to protect against loss for specified causes, not including mismanagement, all or part of the outstanding investments of private investors (other than the Corporation) in any undertaking eligible for financial assistance under paragraph (1) of this section).

BASIC CRITERIA FOR INVESTMENT PROGRAM

SEC. 3. In carrying forward the investment program pursuant to paragraph (1) of section 2 of this Act, the Corporation shall be guided by these basic criteria, and shall make appropriate findings accordingly:

(1) That each specific investment is in furtherance of an undertaking which is economically sound, actually or potentially profitable, and consistent with the sound long-range economic development of the country in which it is located;

(2) That the country in which the undertaking is located shall have had full information with respect to it and opportunity to express a judgment as to its desirability;

(3) That the investment is not in competition with nor duplicative of other private investment programs or other public programs of the United States or of international agencies which give reasonable promise of accomplishing comparable results in accord with the purposes of this Act;

(4) That each investment, taking into account the country in which it is located, is in accord with the general international economic and political policies of the United States;

(5) That the investment program in general is consistent with the short-range and long-range policy of the United States to maintain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power within the domestic economy;

(6) That the investment program in general is consistent with the short-range and long-range need of the United States to maintain a satisfactory balance of payments position;

(7) That the investment program in general, and in its specific applications, is mutually beneficial to the country to which the investment flows and country from which it emanates, taking into account not only purely economic considerations but also consideration of human improvement under free institutions.

BASIC FINANCING OF PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Corporation shall have a capital stock consisting in part of one hundred shares of par value of $1,000,000 per share of class A stock, which shall be the only stock of the Corporation having voting power so long as any of it is outstanding. This class A stock shall be subscribed to by the United States Government. The Secretary of the Treasury shall use the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, for the purpose of such subscriptions, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such subscription. Payment under this paragraph to the Corporation for the subscription of the United States and repayments thereof shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States. Certificates evidencing stock ownership by the United States shall be issued by the Corporation to the President of the United States or to such other person or persons as he may designate from time to time. Neither the provisions of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended, nor the provisions of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended, shall apply to the Corporation or to the original issue of its securities while class A stock is outstanding.

(b) The Corporation is authorized to increase its capital stock by offering for public sale 3,000,000,000 shares of class B stock at par value of $5,000 per share. This stock shall be placed on public sale to net the Corporation $5,000 per share, with an override not exceeding $0.30 per share to cover distribution costs: *Provided,* that not more than 1,500,000,000 shares of this class B stock in the aggregate, nor more than 500,000,000 shares in any one year, shall be sold so long as the Corporation remains an agency of the United States as provided in section 5(a) of this Act. The Corporation, with approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall by regulation determine the maximum amount of such class B stock which may be held at any time by any individual, and the maximum amount which may be held at any time by business enterprises and other organizations of various types and sizes.

(c) The Corporation is authorized to issue from time to time, for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, its notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations: *Provided,* That the issue of such obligations shall not exceed $125,000,000 in any one year, nor shall the aggregate amount of such obligations outstanding at any one time exceed $600,000,000, nor shall any such obligations be issued more than six years from the date of the first issue, nor shall any such obligations be issued except so long as the Corporation remains an agency of the United States as provided in section 5(a) of this Act. Such obligations shall have such varied maturities, not in excess of twenty years, as may be determined by the Corporation with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, with periodic retirement of each obligation commencing in the first year subsequent to its original issue: *Provided,* That any such obligations may be retired at the option of the Corporation before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated therein. Each obligation purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury shall, so long as the Corporation remains an agency of the United States, bear interest at a rate determined by the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such obligation; and when the Corporation is no longer an agency of the United States, as provided in section 6 of this Act, each such obligation shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per centun per annum. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized for the purpose of this subsection to use as a public-debt transaction the proceeds of any securities issued after July 31, 1945, under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act and extended to include such purpose. Payment by the Treasury under this subsection of the purchase price of such obligations of the Corporation and repayment thereof by the Corporation shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(d) One-fifth of the proceeds of the sale of class B stock issued under subsection (b) of this section shall be set aside by the Corporation in a special fund to be established by the Corporation. This special fund shall be utilized (1) to retire fully, within a period of six years or less from the initial issuance of such class B stock, the class A stock of the Corporation issued under subsection (a) of this section, and (2) to retire fully the obligation issued under subsection (c) of this section in accord with the terms of retirement contained in such obligations. This special fund shall be invested or reinvested by the Corporation in interest-bearing obligations of the United States or in obligations guaranteed as to interest and principal by the United States. *Provided,* that when the class A stock of the Corporation and the obligations issued under subsection (c) of this section shall have been retired in full, any balance remaining in this special fund shall be merged with other funds of the Corporation obtained through the sale of class B stock and shall thereupon be available for the general purposes of this Act.

(e) Except as otherwise provided in this section, all funds available to the Corporation pursuant to this section, and as earnings from its operations, shall be available for its general purposes under this Act.

INITIAL MANAGEMENT OF PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION

SEC. 5. (a) Until the conditions set forth in Section 6 of this Act are fully met, the Corporation shall be an independent agency of the United States.

(b) The management of the Corporation during its existence as an agency of the United States shall consist of a Board of Directors (herein referred to as the Board), composed of (1) five members appointed from private life by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall collectively possess broad experience in various areas of economic endeavor; (2) the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Commerce, and the Secretary of Labor, to serve ex officio; (3) four members to be appointed by the President from various United States agencies concerned with international economic development; and (4) a President and Executive Vice President of the Corporation as set forth below, who may be appointed from private life or from public service. All members, except those serving ex officio, shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(c) The Board shall elect a Chairman from among its members. Any vacancy in the Board shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment. A majority of the Directors shall constitute a quorum, and action shall be taken only by a majority vote of those present.

(d) The Board shall designate an executive committee of seven members, not more than two of whom (exclusive of the President and Executive Vice President of the Corporation) shall be members appointed from private life. The executive committee shall perform the functions and exercise the powers of the Board at such times and to such extent as shall be provided in the by-laws of the Corporation.

(e) Members of the Board appointed from private life shall receive $_____ per diem when engaged in the actual performance of their duties, plus reimbursement for necessary travel, subsistence, and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

(f) There shall be a President of the Corporation, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary at the rate of $_____ per annum, and who shall serve as chief executive officer of the Corporation, as a member of the executive committee, and as a member of the Board. The President of the Corporation shall, in accordance with the bylaws, appoint such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of the business of the Corporation, define their duties, and fix their compensation.

(g) There shall be an Executive Vice President of the Corporation, to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive a salary at the rate of $_____ per annum. The Executive Vice President shall serve as President of the Corporation during the absence or disability of the President thereof or in the event of a vacancy in such office.

(h) No director, officer, attorney, agent, or employee of the Corporation shall in any manner, directly or indirectly, participate in the deliberation upon or the determination of any question affecting his personal interests, or the interests of any government, corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly personally interested.

(i) The President may also appoint an advisory committee to the Board, composed of individuals drawn from private and public life outside of the United States, who need not be citizens nor residents of the United States.

TRANSFER OF PEACE BY INVESTMENT CORPORATION TO PRIVATE OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

SEC. 6. (a) When the class A stock of the Corporation has been retired in full within the period of six years or less provided in Section 4(d) of this Act, the Board shall transmit to the President of the United States, for submission to the Congress, recommendations for such legislation as may be necessary to provide for the orderly transition of the Corporation from any agency of the United States to a corporation under private ownership and management, including (1) appropriate provision for transfer to the owners of the outstanding class B stock of the Corporation the assets and liabilities of the Corporation, (2) appropriate provision for vesting in such owners of class B stock the exclusive voting power of the Corporation originally vested in the owners of class A stock, with each owner of class B stock being thereupon entitled to one vote per share, and (3) such additional provisions as may be necessary to protect any outstanding investments in the Corporation by the United States: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the President, may defer submission to the Congress for the purpose of the transition pursuant to this section if he finds that an insufficient portion of the obligations purchased by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to Section 4(c) of this Act have been retired to justify the transfer of the Corporation from public to private ownership and management.

(b) In connection with such transfer, a complete and final accounting shall be made by the Corporation and the Government, at which time the Government shall receive reasonable compensation for all Government services rendered the Corporation.

GENERAL CORPORATE POWERS AND DUTIES

SEC. 7. (a) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this Act the Corporation shall have succession in its corporate name; may adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; may sue and be sued in its corporate name; may adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and the powers vested in it may be exercised; may make and carry out such contracts and agreements as are necessary and advisable in the conduct of its business, and may purchase, discount, rediscount, sell, and negotiate (with or without its endorsement or guarantee) and guarantee notes, drafts, checks, bills of exchange, acceptances, including bankers' acceptances, cable transfers, and other evidences of indebtedness in carrying out its functions under this Act; may appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as may be necessary for the conduct of its business, without regard to the civil service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, define their authority and duties, delegate to them such powers vested in the Corporation as may be necessary, require bonds of such of them as may be desirable, and fix the penalties and pay the premiums of such bonds; may assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions as shall be determined reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security held by the Corporation in connection with the payment of loans or other obligations, and collect or compromise all obligations held by the Corporation; may set up or engage such subsidiary agencies in the United States or in underdeveloped countries as will facilitate the business of the Corporation and may enable such subsidiary agencies to sell class B stock or to sell their own stock for the purpose of buying class B stock; may acquire by purchase, lease, or donations such real property or any interest therein, and may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of such real property, as may be necessary for the conduct of its business; shall determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the provisions of this Act, and provisions of law specifically applicable to Government corporations; may pay dividends on class B stock out of profits or other earnings; shall be entitled to the use of the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as may be applicable to the executive departments of the United States Government until such time as it ceases to be an agency of the United States; and shall be subject to Federal taxation from the time that it ceases to be an agency of the United States. The foregoing enumeration of powers shall not be deemed to exclude other lawful powers necessary to the purposes of the Corporation.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 955 of title 18, United States Code, any person, including any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, may upon proper authorization act for or participate with the Corporation in any operation or transaction engaged in by the Corporation.

(c) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 846), is amended by inserting after "Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation" the words "World Development Corporation."

PENAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 8. (a) All general penal statutes relating to the larceny, embezzlement, or conversion of public moneys or property of the United States shall apply to the moneys and property of the Corporation.

(b) Any person who, with intent to defraud the Corporation, or to deceive any director, officer, or employee of the Corporation or any officer or employee of the United States, makes false entry in any book of the Corporation, or makes false report or statement for the Corporation, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

(c) Any person who shall receive any compensation, rebate, or reward, or shall enter into any conspiracy, collusion, or agreement, express or implied, with intent to defraud the Corporation or wrongfully and unlawfully to defeat its purposes, shall, on conviction thereof, be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

REPORTS AND STUDIES

SEC. 9. The Corporation shall submit to the President for transmission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session, a complete and detailed annual report of its operations under this Act.

SEC. 10. The Corporation, immediately upon its establishment, shall commence studies of additional measures, including tax measures, which would further promote the flow of private capital from the United States to underdeveloped areas of the world and be consistent with the economic and financial policies of the United States. Such studies shall be amplified in the light of the experience of the Corporation. As soon as practicable, and not later than three years after the establishment of the Corporation, it shall prepare for transmission to the Congress the initial results of such studies, including legislative recommendations.

CITATION

SEC. 11. This Act may be cited as the "Peace by Investment Corporation Act of _____."

The excerpts presented by Mr. JAVITS are as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE NORMAN MANLEY, Q.C., PREMIER OF JAMAICA, AT THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 18, 1961

We make the maximum effort to develop ourselves out of our own resources. We do not come asking for gifts. We are prepared to depend on progress for loans of money. We do not ask for money to be spent to defend ourselves by trying to build some dams against communism, and as far as there are Communist forces in the West Indies, we can take care of them. All we ask is to be allowed to develop fast enough and we know exactly what to do with them and how to do it.

We do not ask for money to build our forces to stem revolutions. All we want is sound business deals, and we will guarantee payment a hundred percent.

We look forward to the sort of help we can get from your international lending agencies, which I am glad to see your Government proposes to reorganize and streamline, because I confess for myself that I have been bewildered to know how to find my way through the maze of those agencies.

We in Jamaica are the first colony of our type to go to the money market in New York and borrow money on Jamaican bonds which we are selling with a premium paying over 7 percent. Good money, gentlemen, good money. You come and help us set up industry; you invest in our gorgeous climate with your tourist trade.

I hope that some day some sort of new agency will be created in the Americas * * * with some assurance or guarantee from the Government for small funds that people would like to invest to help underdeveloped countries so long as they were sure the development was secure, because there must be thousands of people, who under the crisis of the Caribbean and who under the crisis of Latin America, would be willing to do something to contribute to development properly conceived in those fields.

As far as we are concerned, we welcome those who come in to help us. We have no fear of economic domination. Money is money, and investment is investment. We welcome it. All we ask is a chance to prove to the world what a country like ours, made up of all sorts of people, beset by every sort of problem of economic difficulty, all we ask is to be given a chance to prove that we can do the job and to become a living example to the world that there is not only one road for underdeveloped countries, but another road, the road of freedom, democracy, and observance of the rule of law and the rights of humanity.

Mr. JAVITS subsequently said: Madam President, earlier today I introduced a bill called the "Peace by Investment Bill," the development of a concept of my brother, Benjamin Javits, and Leon Keyserling, the former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. This will give an opportunity to the private economy to bring into the development of the underdeveloped areas billions of dollars of U.S. private investment raised from people who will each be buying a share for peace.

Madam President, it is unfortunate that the bill is introduced on a day when we have had a speech by the President and other controversies, so that perhaps it may be overlooked, because it is one of the most significant, one of the most bright, and one of the most initiative-producing ideas I have yet seen in the field of foreign economic policy, in which

I have been ardently engaged ever since 1945. I commend this to my colleagues very much. The bill is sponsored by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and me. I hope very much it will have early attention by the committee to which it is referred.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO SUPPLEMENTAL AIR CARRIERS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Civil Aeronautics Board, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a statement of purpose of the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement of purpose of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1969) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The statement of purpose and need presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROPOSED LEGISLATION

(A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes)

The Board, on January 28, 1959, in the Large Irregular Air Carrier Investigation, docket 5132, issued temporary certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental air service to a number of air carriers found by the Board to be fit to receive them. Under these certificates, supplemental air carriers were authorized to conduct without reference to any specified terminal or intermediate points not more than 10 flights carrying individually ticketed passengers or individually waybilled property in the same direction between any single pair of points in any calendar month, and to render unlimited planeload charter services. This authorization was limited to interstate air transportation. It was the latest step in the development of this industry which was originally known as "large irregular air carriers."

A number of air carriers certificated to render route type service petitioned the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit for review of the Board's order and opinion of January 28, 1959. On April 7, 1960, the court rendered its decision in *United States Lines et al.* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (278 F. 2d 446), in which it found that the Board's action in certificating supplemental air carrier operations was legally deficient in three respects:

"1. The certificates issued by the Board do not specify the terminal and intermediate points between which air transportation is authorized but grant a blanket authorization to operate between any two points in the United States.

"2. The certificates issued by the Board contain a limitation of 10 flights per month in the same direction between the same two points. In the opinion of the court, this limitation was in violation of Section 401(e) of the act which provides: "No term, condition, or limitation of a certificate shall restrict the right of an air carrier to add to or change schedules * * *.

"3. In referring to the determination of fitness required by Section 401(d) of the act, the court pointed out (one judge dissenting) that the Board gave the same nationwide cargo and passenger authority to each of the applicants to which it issued certificates. The court stated that in many instances the prior operations of the individual applicants had been small or specialized and that their financial resources were inadequate for the newly authorized operations. It would thus appear that the court's standard of fitness that each carrier must establish would be greater than that found by the Board to be necessary for supplemental service."

As a stopgap measure to avoid immediate cessation of the supplemental air carrier industry, the Congress enacted P.L. 86-661, approved July 14, 1960. Under this legislation the Board is given temporary authority to permit supplemental air carriers to conduct operations for 20 months. However, legislation of a more permanent nature is needed if there is to be any assurance that the supplemental air carrier industry is to continue in existence.

The Board has found that the supplemental air carriers have performed a useful public service and has a definite place and role in meeting this Nation's air transportation needs. There can be no doubt that the continued existence of the irregular air carrier fleet is of real value in terms of national defense, and it is evident that the future ability of the irregular air carriers to serve the military, as they are doing now and have done so ably in the past, depends upon their ability to operate their planes in commercial activities when not engaged in service for the military.

The Board recommends changes in the law as follows:

1. The law should be made clear that a carrier may request, and be authorized to perform, limited services supplemental to those furnished by the regular air carriers, and the Board should be expressly authorized to issue certificates of public convenience and necessity for supplemental service containing limitations on the type and extent of service authorized.

2. The Board should be authorized to grant a blanket authorization without having to designate specific points.

3. The present stringent requirement of fitness should be reduced so that only general findings of fitness need be made for supplemental service.

4. Statutory operating rights should be granted to the existing holders of supplemental air carrier certificates in the nature of a "grandfather" provision, thus assuring the continuity of operations presently being conducted by the supplemental air carriers.

The draft bill attached has been prepared to carry out these recommendations.

EXTENSION OF U.S. CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution proposing to extend for 5 months the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO.

During the 86th Congress, a law—Public Law 86-719—was enacted to establish a Citizens Commission for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The purpose would be to authorize citizens to confer unofficially on ways and means to promote greater cooperation among the members of the alliance.

The law, enacted on September 7, 1960, provided for a year and a half of work, to be terminated on January 31, 1962.

Unfortunately, the 1960 national election and installation of a new administration resulted in a considerable delay in the appointment of the membership of the Commission. Consequently, it was not possible to hold the first organization meeting before April 8, 1961.

Unless the life of the Commission is extended, its working time will be seriously curtailed.

To better enable the Commission to carry out its purposes, I am introducing a joint resolution to extend the life of the Commission for a 5-month period—until June 30, 1962.

Internation conferences among the members of NATO on a nonofficial level offer, I believe, real promise for closer political, social, economic, cultural cooperation, as well as opportunity to make a greater contribution to security, progress, and peace.

I am very hopeful that out of such conferences can come ideas and recommendations that can bind the alliance more strongly together to benefit member countries, separately and collectively, and to better fulfill the overall objectives of NATO.

The extension of the life of the Commission would, in my judgment, serve our national interest and the cause of peace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 93) to extend through June 30, 1962, the life of the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

DESIGNATION OF 1ST DAY OF JULY IN EACH YEAR AS "TOM SAWYER DAY, U.S.A."

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a Missouri writer, Samuel L. Clemens, better known as Mark Twain, brought laughter to this Nation at a time when it needed the release from tension which only humor can bring.

Soon, the entire world was benefiting from Mark Twain's warmly human stories.

Then came the story of Tom Sawyer, which put into words of lasting feeling that period of discovery and glorious adventure known as boyhood.

We should honor this great American author and his lasting literary creation of American boyhood.

The very distinguished dean of the Missouri congressional delegation [Mr. CANNON] has introduced a resolution in the House of Representatives similar to the one I am about to send to the desk.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution designating the

1st day of July in each year as "Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 94) designating the 1st day of July in each year as "Tom Sawyer Day, U.S.A." introduced by Mr. LONG of Missouri (for himself and Mr. SYMINGTON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RULES FOR INSTALLATION, INSPECTION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF RAILROAD EQUIPMENT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] may be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1669) to provide that the Interstate Commerce Commission shall prescribe rules, standards, and instructions for the installation, inspection, maintenance, and repair of certain parts on railroad cars, and to require carriers by railroad to maintain tracks, bridges, roadbed, and permanent structures for the support of way, trackage, and traffic in safe and suitable condition, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators DOUGLAS, HART, HUMPHREY, KUCHEL, MOSS, and SMITH of Maine may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1670) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, so as to strengthen and improve the national transportation system, insure the protection of the public interest, and for other purposes, the next time the bill is printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY—AMENDMENTS TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION WITH TURKEY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain amendments to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy With the Government of the Republic of Turkey, with accompanying correspondence. The original agreement was approved by the President on May 3, 1955. The amendments provide that the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission may sell or lease additional amounts of material to Turkey, including 15 kilograms of uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U^{235}. The Commission may, in its discretion, make all or part of these 15 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in research and test reactors and reactor experiments.

Other highlights of these amendments include provisions for the transfer of other radioactive materials in connection with defined research projects. In addition, these amendments provide for certain safeguards to assure that the materials furnished under the agreement will not be devoted to nonpeaceful purposes. Finally, both parties reaffirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency and agree to consult with each other to determine in what respects the Agency may participate in carrying out the provisions of this agreement for cooperation.

These documents, which were received by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on April 27, 1961, came before the Joint Committee in accordance with the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1961.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation With the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed amendment; and

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorizing its execution.

The amendment, which has been negotiated pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would modify the agreement for cooperation signed by the Government of the United States and the Government of the Turkish Republic on June 10, 1955. This amendment was requested by the Turks primarily to obtain 90 percent enriched fuel for use in a research reactor being constructed in Turkey by an American firm. Major features are summarized below.

The existing agreement provides that the Commission will lease to the Government of the Turkish Republic, as fuel for research reactors, up to 6 kilograms of contained U^{235}, in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U^{235}, unless the Commission shall specify that a greater quantity of such material may be transferred.

Article II of the amendment provides that the Commission may sell or lease, as may be agreed, a net amount of 15 kilograms of uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U^{235}, except as noted below, for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments. The Commission, at its discretion, may make all or a portion of the 15 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in the foregoing facilities, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U^{235} in uranium. In addition, article II provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed either in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} transferred to the Government of the Turkish Republic for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel is radioactively cooling or in transit, or, subject to Commission approval, is being reprocessed in Turkey.

Article III of the amendment provides for the transfer to Turkey of source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct materials, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes in connection with defined research projects on an as-may-be-agreed basis. The original amendment did not provide for the transfer of such materials.

Article IV of the amendment incorporates several provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes.

In article V of the amendment the parties affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency and agree to consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of the Agreement for Cooperation to provide for Agency participation in activities such as the administration of safeguards.

The amendment will enter into force when the two Governments have exchanged written notifications that their respective statutory and constitutional requirements have been fulfilled.

Sincerely yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1961.

Hon. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SEABORG: Under date of March 17, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission has recommended that I approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The amendment would modify the agreement for cooperation signed by the Government of the United States and the Government of the Turkish Republic on June 10, 1955.

Among other things, the amendment provides that the Commission may sell or lease, as may be agreed, a net amount of 15 kilograms of uranium enriched up to 20 percent (in the isotope U^{235}, except as noted below, for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments. The Commission, at its discretion, may make all or a portion of the 15 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in the foregoing facilities, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U^{235} in uranium. It also provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed either in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotopes U^{235} transferred to the Government of the Turkish Republic for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus

such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel is radioactively cooling or in transit or, subject to Commission approval, is being reprocessed in Turkey.

The amendment further permits the transfer of quantities of special nuclear materials, including U^{235}, U^{233}, and plutonium, on an as-may-be-agreed basis, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy other than fueling reactors and reactor experiments.

The amendment also contains several provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. Finally, the amendment contains a provision whereby the parties affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency and agree to consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of the agreement for cooperation in view of the establishment of the Agency.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

(a) Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States.

(b) Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United Sates of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic enclosed with your letter of March 17.

(c) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment for the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The amendment, which has been negotiated pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, would modify the agreement for cooperation signed by the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic on June 10, 1955.

Turkey is one of the 38 countries with which the United States has bilateral agreements for cooperation in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The existing Turkish agreement, like the agreement with Ireland, an amendment to which you recently approved, permits the lease to the Government of the Turkish Republic by the Commission of a modest quantity of uranium enriched up to 20 percent in U^{235} for fueling research reactors, provides for the exchange of unclassified information in connection with research reactors and the use of radioisotopes, and enables private individuals and organizations in the United States to provide services and materials to Turkey in these areas.

Turkey's principal interest in concluding the enclosed proposed amendment is to enable it to obtain uranium enriched up to 90 percent in U^{235}, in place of the 20 percent enriched material now provided for, to fuel a research reactor under construction by an American firm in Turkey. U.S. policy permitting the transfer of material enriched up to 90 percent in U^{235} abroad for use in research reactors was adopted following conclusion of the original Turkish agreement and has been incorporated into agreements with several other cooperating countries. This change was adopted since uranium of this enrichment can have distinct technical and economic advantages over 20 percent enriched material as fuel in such facilities. Associated with the transfer of 90 percent enriched material are comprehensive controls and safeguards which are designed to assure that the material is used only for peaceful purposes.

In addition to providing for the transfer of 90 percent fuel and the associated controls and safeguards, the amendment also incorporates other provisions which have become standard in our bilateral agreements since the original Turkish agreement was signed. Major features of the amendment are summarized below:

Article II of the amendment provides that the Commission may sell or lease, as may be agreed, a net amount of 15 kilograms of uranium enriched up to 20 percent in the isotope U^{235}, except as noted below, for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments. The Commission, at its discretion, may make all or a portion of the 15 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in the foregoing facilities, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of contained U^{235} in uranium.

Article III includes provisions for the transfer to Turkey, on an as-may-be-agreed basis, of reactor materials, including special nuclear materials, for research purposes other than fueling reactors and reactor experiments, if such materials are not available commercially.

The provisions setting forth the comprehensive controls and safeguards, noted above, are contained in article IV of the amendment.

In article V of the amendment the parties affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency and agree to consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of the agreement for cooperation to provide for Agency participation in activities such as the administration of safeguards.

After you have approved and authorized the execution of the proposed amendment, and made the determination referred to above, the amendment will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic and placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE TURKISH REPUBLIC CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on June 10, 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"),

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article I of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the limitations of Article V, the Parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

"1. Design, construction and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

"2. Health and safety problems related to operation and use of research reactors.

"3. The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

"B. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this Agreement shall be the responsibility of the Party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating Party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE II

Article II of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Commission will sell or lease, as may be agreed, to the Government of the Turkish Republic, uranium enriched up to 20 per cent in the isotope U^{235}, except as otherwise provided in paragraph C of this Article, in such quantities as may be agreed, in accordance with the terms, conditions, and delivery schedules set forth in contracts, for fueling defined research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments which the Government of the Turkish Republic, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct and which are constructed in Turkey and as required in experiments related thereto; provided, however, that the net amount of any uranium sold or leased under this Article during the period of this Agreement shall not at any time exceed 15 kilograms of the isotope U^{235} contained in such uranium. This net amount shall be the gross quantity of such contained U^{235} in uranium sold or leased to the Government of the Turkish Republic during the period of this Agreement less the quantity of such contained U^{235} in recoverable uranium which has been resold or otherwise returned to the Government of the United States of America during the period of this Agreement or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the Government of the United States of America.

"B. Within the limitations contained in paragraph A of this Article, the quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} transferred by the Commission under this Article and in the custody of the Government of the Turkish Republic shall not at any time be in excess of the quantity necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Turkish Republic or persons under its jurisdiction construct and fuel with uranium received from the United States of America, as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors or reactor experiments while replaced fuel is radioactively cooling, is in transit, or, subject to the provisions of paragraph E of this Article, is being reprocessed in Turkey, it being the intent of the Commission to make

possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

"C. The Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make all or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material available as uranium enriched up to ninety per cent (90%) in the isotope U^{235} for use in research reactors, materials testing reactors, and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 8 kilograms of the isotope U^{235} contained in such uranium.

"D. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Turkish Republic may distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} to authorized users in Turkey, the Government of the Turkish Republic will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235} which is purchased from the Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States of America are permitted to acquire title in the United States of America to uranium enriched in the isotope U^{235}.

"E. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel shall not be altered after its removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

"F. Special nuclear material produced in any part of fuel leased hereunder as a result of irradiation processes shall be for the account of the Government of the Turkish Republic and after reprocessing as provided in paragraph E of this Article, shall be returned to the Government of the Turkish Republic, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to that Government, unless the Government of the United States of America shall exercise the option, which is hereby granted, to retain, with appropriate credit to the Government of the Turkish Republic, any such special nuclear material which is in excess of the needs of Turkey for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

"G. With respect to any special nuclear material not subject to the option referred to in paragraph F of this Article and produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States of America which is in excess of the need of Turkey for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organization in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

"H. Some atomic energy materials which the Commission may provide in accordance with this agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Turkish Republic the Government of the Turkish Republic shall bear all responsibility, in so far as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any source or special nuclear material, or other reactor materials, which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of the Turkish Republic or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Turkish Republic shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such source or special nuclear material, or other reactor materials, after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Turkish Republic or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE III

Article III of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the Turkish Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Turkey. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

"B. Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy and under the limitations set forth in Article V, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct materials, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the Turkish Republic by the Commission for research purposes other than fueling reactors and reactor experiments in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially."

ARTICLE IV

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Turkish Republic pursuant to this Agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

"B. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this Agreement are supplanted, as provided in Article VI bis, by safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, shall have the following rights:

"1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

(i) reactor and

(ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are to be made available to the Government of the Turkish Republic or persons under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission.

"2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Turkish Republic or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

(i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission,

(ii) reactors,

(iii) any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provision of this subparagraph B2 will apply,

(a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such material; and

(b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Turkish Republic or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guaranties set forth in Article VII;

"3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph B2 of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Turkey and which is not purchased or retained by the Government of the United States of America pursuant to Article II, paragraph F and paragraph G(a) of this Agreement, transferred pursuant to Article II, paragraph G(b) of this Agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

"4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Turkish Republic, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Turkish Republic, shall have access in Turkey to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph B2 of this Article to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

"5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this Article, or the guaranties set forth in Article VII, and the failure of the Government of the Turkish Republic to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph B2 of this Article;

"6. To consult with the Government of the Turkish Republic in the matter of health and safety.

"C. The Government of the Turkish Republic undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article."

ARTICLE V

The following new Article is added directly after Article VI of the Agreement for Cooperation:

"ARTICLE VI bis

"The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Turkish Republic affirm their common interest in the International Atomic Energy Agency and to this end:

"(a) The Parties will consult with each other, upon the request of either Party, to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this Agreement. In particular, the Parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the Agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the Agency in connection with similar assist-

ance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the Agency.

"(b) In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided for in subparagraph (a) of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event this Agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Turkish Republic shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE VI

This Amendment shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 27th day of April 1961.

For the Government of the United States of America:

PHILLIPS TALBOT.
GLENN T. SEABORG.

For the Government of the Turkish Republic:

B. USAKLIGIL.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement by him before the Senate Committee on Finance in support of House bill 6027, dealing with a provision for voluntary retirement at age 62.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Excerpts from remarks by him prepared for delivery on the dedication of the new technical service laboratory of Standard Lime & Cement Co., Martinsburg, W. Va., May 25, 1961.

By Mr. CANNON:

Book review on the recently published book "Buy Now, Pay Later," by Hillel Black, and reviewed by Senator PROXMIRE.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to say a few words about the aid to education bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me, if it is understood that in doing so he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois proceeds, will he yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1021 be laid before the Senate, so that the Senate may resume its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before I address myself to the aid-to-education bill, I should like to ask the majority leader about the program tomorrow, and whether any substantive or controversial legislation will be considered, and whether there is any likelihood or rollcall votes tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question asked by the distinguished minority leader, let me say it is hoped that the Senate will vote today on the aid-to-education bill, S. 1021. If that is done—and we shall try to remain in session until it is done—it is the intention of the leadership to have the Senate go over until tomorrow, on which day items on the calendar to which there is no objection will be considered. Certain Senators have indicated that at that time they would like to make speeches on taxation and other subjects.

There will be no rollcall votes tomorrow, and it is the intention, at the conclusion of the business of the Senate tomorrow, to have the Senate go over until the following Monday. On that day, Monday, there will be no formal business, no votes. It is anticipated that then the Senate will go over until Wednesday or possibly Thursday.

I think tentatively I can state that a week from Friday the Senate will take up the housing bill. I have discussed this matter with the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] and the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

I hope that if this course is agreeable, in the intervening period, some Senators will get a well-deserved rest and some committees will be able to make up for lost time. I hope that what I am now stating tentatively will turn out, tonight, to be the fact.

Mr. President, to repeat: If the Senate takes final action today on the aid-to-education bill, there will be no rollcall votes before late next week, at the earliest; and I would ask Senators and committees to proceed accordingly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his statement, and I trust that will be made manifest to all Members of the Senate.

ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in connection with this program, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the morning business, there be a call of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 231, House bill 6094, to amend the Unemployment Act of 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as a member of the committee which reported the aid-to-education bill, I wish to state that the record will show that in the committee there were two votes against reporting the bill. One of those votes was mine; the other was that of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER].

I am opposed to the bill on principle; and before the debate concludes, I wish to be certain that I make my views manifest and explain why I take that position.

First, let me say that I think of the old preacher in the Old Testament—Ecclesiastes—who uttered a great bit of wisdom, centuries ago. He said:

> The thing that hath been, it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done: and there is no new thing under the sun.

Mr. President, this bill indicates that there is no new thing under the sun, because the first aid-to-education bill was introduced in Congress in the year 1870, some 91 years ago; and the agitation for the enactment of such a bill has continued ever since then. I may say that is not far short of a century ago; and it indicates the continuing pressures on the part of persons who would intrude the Federal Government deeper and deeper into a field of this kind—and, for that matter, into other fields, as well.

There were intense debates in the period from 1870 until 1890 as continuing bills, of which there were literally dozens, were introduced in the House and the Senate. In some cases, the Senate approved. In other cases, the House approved. But at no time was there a concurrence of the House and the Senate with respect to an aid-to-education bill, whether it dealt with construction or for any other purpose.

Then there came a period of 30 years, between 1890 and 1920, when there was less interest in the matter, and probably so because there was a tremendous increase in the amount of funds that were devoted to this purpose by the localities, the school districts, and the States.

It is rather interesting to note that as early as 1886, when Woodrow Wilson was probably still on the faculty at the University of Princeton, one of these

bills was being rather roundly discussed. I think the RECORD ought to show what the distinguished professor, later president of the university, later Governor of his State, and later President of the United States, had to say. His remarks appear on page 622 of the hearings, and I read one excerpt. He said:

> It was evident that no increase in the State appropriation for public education would be voted as long as there was the least prospect of aid from Washington. There was deliberate determination to enjoy the easy position of a beneficiary of the National Government to the fullest possible extent, rather than to be independent and support a good school system by its own unaided efforts.

Mr. President, there was a great liberal. There was a great Democratic President, in the days when he was deeply immersed in the educational field, who indicated only too well that when the Federal Government intrudes itself into this picture, the net result will be that the States and localities will rest upon their oars and let the Federal Government undertake the whole job.

Mr. President, since 1870 there have been at least 100 Federal aid programs, of one kind or another, proposed. They dealt with nearly every subject under the sun. But the interesting thing is that in all of this period, going back 90 years, there have been no aid programs for schools enacted. That fact indicates how deeply, not only the Congress, but the people, felt upon this issue.

Incidentally, as I think of grants-in-aid, they have tripled every 10 years since 1940. Now if we add a program for aid to schools, and that same formula persists in the future, the impact upon the Federal budget and the tax structure of the Federal Government will be an astonishing burden before we get through.

It has been argued, in connection with this bill, that we have aided schools in other respects before. But I doubt very much whether those arguments will stand up in any respect as they relate to the bill which is presently before us. Take, for instance, the question of land-grant colleges. Attempts were made to indicate that is a sample of Federal aid to education. The suggestion came as early as 1850 that the land-grant colleges were too academic in their curricula and that therefore they should go in more for agriculture and the mechanic arts. So a bill was introduced and finally passed in 1859. It was vetoed by President Buchanan, and the veto message appears in the hearings. It is, by all odds, one of the most vigorous veto messages and one of the most all-inclusive I have ever seen. But even in 1859, just before the Civil War, President Buchanan would have nothing to do with land-grant colleges and the intrusion of the Federal Government in that field.

The bill was resubmitted in 1862. That was when Abraham Lincoln was President of the United States. It was in wartime, and there was a shortage of manpower. There was a demand for greater emphasis on agriculture and the mechanic arts, certainly in the North, and I would suppose in the South, although they could probably not share in it at the time. So without too much ceremony, and with very little discussion, the land-grant college bill finally went through.

When all is said and done, it involves, even as of today, only $5 million, which is a drop in the bucket compared to the bill before us. Here is a grant program in which the U.S. Government will spend $2½ billion in a period of 3 years. I trust there is no one in this Chamber so naive as to believe that is where it is going to stop. This is just a beginning, and year after year it will snowball, it will increase, it will expand, other items will be added; and it will be interesting to see what will happen to this measure, if ever enacted into law, 10 years hence.

Second, it has been pointed out that Federal aid is as old as the Constitution, if not older. It is rather interesting how these singular ideas are bandied about when they are a departure from the historical facts.

In 1780 the Congress asked the States to re-cede to the Federal Government the western lands they claimed. Seven States did so. Then a question arose as to what to do with the lands, after the Federal Government retrieved title to the lands. There were no buyers. The lands could not be sold. Someone hit upon the happy idea that the lands should be given away. That was tried. Actually, a billion or more acres were given away. Some 70 million acres were given ostensibly—I emphasize the word "ostensibly"—to schools. This included in fact, section 16 in every township. But if one goes back to examine the debates with respect to the bill one discovers that the lawmakers scarcely mentioned education.

That is not of interest to them. They knew that 98 percent of all the people, and that meant 98 percent of all the schoolchildren, lived east of the Allegheny and Appalachian Mountains, not west. There were only a few people west of the mountain areas. What those men wished to do, if they could, by the giveaway program, was to lure more settlers—to lure more new frontiersmen west of the Allegheny and the Appalachian Mountains. That is how they hit upon the deal, and they had very little interest in trying to tie it up to education.

That idea persisted as late as 1787, when Congress uttered the Ordinance of 1787, for the guidance of that huge Northwest Territory of which my own State was a part.

The amazing thing is that in the same year, 1787, when the Northwest Ordinance was finally passed, the Constitution of the United States was formulated. How singular, when people try to tie the idea of education to it, that nothing was heard of education in the debates in the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Nothing was said about it, and the makers of the Constitution carefully and religiously abstained from any mention of education in the Constitution of the United States.

When it is said that Federal aid is as old as the Constitution, this has no regard for the basic historical facts which are involved, and is nothing more than a superficial opinion which is not borne out by history.

It is argued that the impacted area bill, to take care of schools in the areas which have the children of soldiers who have to go to school, is a case in point. It is not a case in point at all, for a very good reason. The Federal Government went into certain areas and there, by declarations of taking, preempted land for a cantonment, for a campsite, for a military installation, for a factory or for an enterprise to manufacture the instrumentalities of war. Since the land was taken, this removed that much land from the tax rolls of the community and of the county, and thereby diminished the revenues not only of the county and of the community but also of the school district in the area as well. Something had to be done. If local schools were to accept the children of soldiers and the children of Federal civilian workers, then in all equity and in all conscience it was necessary for the Federal Government to take some action. What it did, in the bill relating to impacted areas, was to make available financial help in lieu of the taxes which were lost. That was the basic consideration involved. Who shall argue, in the face of that, that it was an aid-to-education proposal?

It has been pointed out that we aid the vocational courses in schools over the country and, very notably, agricultural schools. The fact of the matter is that the first aid to vocational schools was enacted by the Congress a few weeks after we got into World War I. As a result, there was a clamor that more emphasis should be placed upon the things which might be conducive to the training of youngsters, who might become of greater value to the war effort. It was a war measure.

I point out parenthetically that it was a control measure. I reread the language of the act of 1916. The Congress specifically spelled out what the schools would have to do with respect to curriculums. It was a control measure.

The bill before us contains a paragraph which abjures in solemn terms all control and all intention to control, but the vocational aid bill was a control-of-curriculums bill, as surely as the English language can express it.

It was pointed out that a few months after Sputnik began to excite the imagination and to cause some concern, we passed the National Defense Education Act. What did we do? The great cry was for more scientific talent. The great cry was for people who would devote themselves to the languages, to physics, to mathematics, to science. That was a curriculums control measure, no less, born out of an incident which, in my judgment, cannot be so considered when we have before us a general support bill for aid to education.

At no point, Mr. President, in all the recitals or in all the exhibits which have been presented, has anyone come forth

with a clear-cut item of past history to support the fact that the Federal Government has gone in for general school support before and that school aid is as old as the Constitution. That is simply one of those manufactured cliches which under no circumstances will hold water. It is a tribute to our careless examination of what the history books really indicate.

I thought those items ought to be disposed of first, since Senators have talked about the various acts upon the statute books, seeking to indicate there is ample authority or ample evidence to indicate the Federal Government's interest in the field, and that the Federal Government has followed this kind of course before.

In 90 years the Congress has always resisted a so-called general support to education bill; but it is before us, and I am opposed to it. There are reasons for being opposed to it.

The first reason I cite, Mr. President, is the controls which can be found in the bill itself. One need only go into the provisions of section 110, which deals with the applications to be submitted by the State agencies, to show that control begins at once.

Oh, I know how lightly the argument has been thrown off on the grounds that what I refer to as controls are only directions which one cannot escape and which are not actually controls at all.

I suggest that Senators look at section 110, which deals with the form and the content of the applications that must come from State educational agencies if they want some of the money that is authorized, and I presume will be appropriated under the bill. The language speaks for itself. It requires no interpretation. It requires no amplification on my part. I merely read it. Section 110(a) provides:

> A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit—

It does not state "may submit." The State "shall submit." That language is a mandatory admonition to the State—

> through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which—

Then follows whole series of criteria. What is the first one? The application would not be considered unless the State provided assurance that it was the sole agency. So we say to the State, "There must be a single agency through which all these applications must be funneled."

The second provision is that States must specify the proportion that will be expended for public school teachers' salaries and construction of public school facilities.

There has been a great deal of discussion about the modification of that provision. There was no intent to hold the States too strictly to the line. But that is the question we are voting on. So the State shall specify how much is for teachers' salaries; how much for construction; and how much for other purposes. If that is not a control direction, I have never seen one.

The third requirement is that the application must contain criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds the neediest shall have priority. Who shall determine which schools are the neediest? A school board may have one idea; a State agency may have another. But some facts must be adduced, and if the school board or school district has agreed, a review principle is provided, and a State agency cannot deny the right to have the application reviewed. If that is not a species of control, I have never seen it.

Then the application must set forth—

> The criteria and procedures, consistent with the purposes of section 109, on the basis of which local education agency projects under such section will be approved by the State education agency;

That provision contains a variety of elements. If that is not a type of control, I have never seen it.

The fifth point requires that there be assurance, which must be solemnly written into the application, that—

> Every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency.

The Federal Government would mandate that agency to provide a hearing and a review for a local school board. If that is not an intrusion into State affairs, I have never seen it.

Then there is an accounting provision and a good many others that I could allude to.

How naive can we be when we say in pious and solemn terms that section 102 recites the fact that there shall be no Federal control? It is rather interesting language. I wonder why the committee did not merely say, "In the administration of this title there shall be no direction, control, or supervision of any kind whatsoever," and let it go at that. That is not what the bill provides. Section 103 provides:

> No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

We think we can nail it down by language, and things pop up that we never quite imagine. Yesterday the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] attempted to add a proviso that no withholding of funds should obtain under any obligation under this act. The proposed amendment raised a very curious question. The bill would authorize funds for 3 years. Then we must appropriate accordingly. What will happen in 3 years? Many things. What will happen in the field of civil rights? What will happen as to integration and segregation? Who shall say? But when we have nailed it down and the bill provides:

> No funds shall be withheld that are authorized under the provisions of this act.

We shall have locked the door. I think a pretty good case could be made against any proposed legislation that might be subsequently introduced to deal not only with the segregation and integration issue, but also with other issues that may not be presently foreseen. So I am against the bill because I do not believe that language will stop control. I do not believe it will stop the nationalization of the school systems of the country before we get through.

Finally, the bill starts with controls. So let no one be under any delusion as to what will happen once the venture is made.

In order to clinch that point, I refer my colleagues to the language that appears on page 626 of the hearings. Here are some selected references to Federal school control and a national system of education. First, there is a quotation from an editorial published in "The Nation's Schools," issue of September 1960, as follows:

> There's something quite naive in the way we school people talk about Federal control of education. Some of us seem to think that Federal influence on education can be prevented simply by stating that it shall not exist.
>
> The next time someone tells you that he is absolutely opposed to Federal control of education, ask him to define what he means by control. What is it? How does it operate? How does it grow?
>
> Federal direction is inherent in any Federal law or any Federal court decision pertaining to education. This is true, even if Congress delegates to the States the administration of a Federal grant.

The school people are not fooled, Mr. President. It is astonishing to hear these arguments we have heard on the floor, that here is pious, pontifical language which securely closes the door on Federal control. The school people have been speaking out on this matter themselves. I quote from another school magazine called Overview, of November 1960. What does it say? I will read only one sentence. I believe that is enough:

> The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education.

It is not necessary to read any more. Anyone who is curious about it will find that quotation on page 626 of the hearings. There is another quotation, on page 627. It is by Theodore Brameld, professor of education, Boston University. He says:

> The National Government should exercise the same authority over the spending of school funds as it does in other areas; otherwise, there would always be the danger of Federal money being squandered by dominant minorities in States or localities.

Control of funds, and how they should be spent. If this is not control, then I do not know the meaning of the word "control."

Here is still another quotation from a great educator, John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, in a speech before the National War College. The preceding President appointed Mr. Hannah Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission. He said that education must be "a primary instrument of national policy."

There are other quotations, from Harold W. Stoke, president of Queens College; Mr. H. Thomas James, of the School of Education, Stanford University.

I had better give the country the benefit of the whole quotation. He said:

> As the States have denied, first to the family, and then to local communities, the right to make decisions on education contrary to State-defined policy, so the Nation may be expected to deny to the States the right to make decisions on educational policy that are not in accord with the emerging national policy for education.

There are others. I need not read any more. However, if they do not clinch this matter of what the ultimate objective is, namely Federal control of education, and education as an instrumentality of national policy, then all I can say is those who read this and still disbelieve are beyond redemption. I use that expression in the most refined sense.

So I summarize at this point to say that what is before us is not new. It has been here for 90 years or more.

There is nothing in the arguments which have been advanced that the Federal Government has immersed itself in this field of aid to education. All one needs to do is to look at the qualifying circumstances. There are controls already in the bill. The basic objective finally is to give the Federal Government control over the educational system and make it an instrument of national policy.

Here is a partisan note that I must intrude—and yet it is not so badly partisan. I was thinking about our National Republican Convention in Chicago in 1960. I have served on resolutions committees of national conventions for years, first in one capacity and then in another. There are a great many subcommittees, and I have served as chairman of some of these subcommittees, once on civil rights. In that connection my recommendation was adopted by the full committee and it was transmitted finally to the convention as such, and it was adopted by the convention.

But, Mr. President, I notice that delegates try not to make too much of these arguments. When it is pointed out that this was subscribed to by the Republican Party in solemn conclave in 1956 and 1960, the president of a western university went to the trouble of polling every delegate who attended the convention in Chicago in 1960. There were 1,331 delegates. He polled them on two questions: Did they favor salaries for teachers in a Federal aid bill? The answer was: Yea, 3 percent; nay, 96 percent. Then he polled them on this question: Are they interested in Federal aid for classroom construction? The answer was: Yea, 18 percent; nay, 81 percent. There is the story.

Far be it from me to reflect upon the solemn deliberations of the party and the convention in which I had a modest part. However, so often these things do not come fully to the attention of the delegates. Time is of the essence. We have to move forward with a great party platform. There is the usual timidity on the part of the delegates who do not want to provoke a floor fight.

But when they got back there and took count of themselves, here was what they said on the question. So when someone rises up to say to me, "Your party endorsed it," well, I can only say that here is a very careful poll, and the delegates themselves, certainly in the light of hindsight, were absolutely opposed both to Federal aid for teachers' salaries and Federal aid for construction.

The third reason for opposition to the bill is that when all is said and done it is only a token. The present expenditures for education are in the range of $16 billion per year. The additional amounts proposed in the pending bill for the 3-year period are only of token size and would have only a modest impact. The best authorities in this field insist that gradually local and State appropriations and expenditures for this purpose will gradually increase. The greatest authority in the school field—in fact, the one man who could speak with authority and who came before the committee—indicated that the school districts could take care of themselves, and he anticipated on a historical basis that the $16 billion in expenditures at the local level could be expected gradually to increase to $24 billion and then perhaps to $31 billion. At the local level the States can do this job pretty well for themselves, and so can the local districts.

There is one interesting feature in connection with this question. I mentioned that Roger Freeman is the one man who has devoted many years to this matter and is the one who could speak with authority about it. All one has to do is to consult the witness list which appears in the front of the hearings. It merits a careful examination. So I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table of contents of the hearings because it makes good reading.

There being no objection, the index was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTENTS

Text of:	Page
S. 8	2
Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	29
S. 57	6
Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	30
S. 293	9
Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	34
S. 433	9
S. 723	11
S. 991	14
Report of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	35
S. 1021	19
Report of the Department of the Interior	37
Report of the Department of Labor	39
S. 1078	27
S. 1109	28
Report of the Bureau of the Budget	28

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES

March 8, 1961

Fulbright, Hon. J. W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Arkansas	56
Cotton, Hon. Norris, a U.S. Senator from the State of New Hampshire	83

CONTENTS—Continued

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued

March 8, 1961—Continued

	Page
Ribicoff, Abraham, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, accompanied by: Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary-designate, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Sterling M. McMurrin, Commissioner-designate of Education; Ralph Flynt, Assistant Commissioner for Legislative and Program Development, Office of Education; Dr. Kenneth A. Simon, analytical statistician of the Reference, Estimates, and Projection Section, Office of Education; Dr. Rall Q. Grigsby, Commissioner for School Assistance in federally affected areas; and B. Alden Lillywhite, Associate Director, Division of School Assistance in federally affected areas	91
March 9, 1961	
Bartlett, Hon. E. L., a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska	179
Carr, Dr. William G., executive secretary, National Education Association, accompanied by Dr. Sam M. Lambert, director, research division	190
Lambert, Dr. Sam M., director, research division, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.	270
Fuller, Dr. Edgar, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers	299
Afternoon Session	
Willias, Dr. Benjamin C., president-elect of the American Association of School Administration, and superintendent of schools, Chicago, Ill., accompanied by Dr. Philip J. Hickey, superintendent of instruction, St. Louis, Mo	327
Schertler, Leon A., representing Electronic Teaching Laboratories, Inc.	331
Hecht, George J., chairman of the American Parents Committee, Inc.	335
Watson, Dr. K. Brantley, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America	338
Lutz, Dr. Harley, Government finance consultant, National Association of Manufacturers	373
Schoemann, Peter T., vice president, and chairman of the education committee, American Federation of Labor, accompanied by Andrews J. Biemiller, director of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations	389
Bull, Mr. Fred L., national chairman of legislation, National Congress, Parent-Teachers Association, accompanied by Mrs. Gray	400
March 10, 1961	
Metcalf, Hon. Lee, a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana	410
Barkhurst, W. Ted, assistant superintendent of schools, Great Falls, Mont	411
Lindahl, Dean, State administrator of Public Laws 815 and 874, State department of public instruction, Helena, Mont	423
Mitchell, Clarence, director, Washington Bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People	426
Root, Margaret, executive secretary of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers	440
Pincus, Celia, president of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers	446
Kampelman, Max M., counsel for the American Jewish Congress, accompanied by Joseph B. Robison	456

CONTENTS—Continued

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued

March 10, 1961—Continued

	Page
Carlson, C. E., executive director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs	472
Afternoon Session	
Lowell, C. Stanley, associate director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State	483
Blanshard, Mrs. Paul, executive director, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Science	496
La Driere, David L., president, accompanied by Glen Andreas, vice president, and Francis Brown, vice president, Citizens for Educational Freedom	501
Bell, Mrs. Alison, legislative staff, American Association of University Women	505
Mercano, Hipolito, grand master of the Masonic Lodge, Puerto Rico	508
Little, M. V., consultant to Americans Unlimited and other organizations	517
Mercano, Hipolito, grand master of Masonic Lodge, Puerto Rico (recalled)	523
March 13, 1961	
Meyer, Agnes E	527
Goldwater, Hon. Barry, a U.S. Senator from the State of Arizona	538
Metcalf, Hon. Lee, a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana	560
Cooper, Hon. John Sherman, a U.S. Senator from the State of Kentucky	580
Afternoon Session	
Freeman, Roger A., research associate, Institute for Studies in Federalism, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif	620
Engle, Hon. Clair, a U.S. Senator from the State of California	682
Proxmire, Hon. William, a U.S. Senator from the State of Wisconsin	686
O'Brien, Father William, S.J., assistant professor of government and constitutional law, Georgetown University	701
Shore, Frederick, administrative assistant, East Meadow Public Schools, Nassau County, Long Island, N.Y.	717
March 14, 1961	
Gruening, Hon. Ernest, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska, accompanied by George Rogers, professor of economics, University of Alaska	731
Rose, Oscar V., superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla.; Dr. Ralph Dallard, superintendent of schools, San Diego, Calif.; and Walter McKee, superintendent of schools, Montgomery, Ala	773
Rose, Oscar V., superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla	807
Borchardt, Selma, national vice president, American Federation of Teachers	815
Swainson, Hon. John B., Governor of the State of Michigan, accompanied by Lynn M. Bartlett, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Michigan, and Hon. Philip A. Hart, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan	822
Hochberg, Samuel, deputy president, United Federation of Teachers, local No. 2, American Federation of Teachers	858
Hilton, Dr. David, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, Detroit, Mich	860
Megel, Carl J., president, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, Chicago, Ill	922

CONTENTS—Continued

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF WITNESSES—continued

March 14, 1961—Continued

	Page
Hutchison, Phillys, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, Portland, Oreg	926
Hochwalt, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G., director, National Catholic Welfare Conference	933
Afternoon Session	
White, Don, executive vice president, National Audio-Visual Association, Fairfax, Va	939
Boehm, Charles H., superintendent of public instruction, Pennsylvania	941
Martin, David B. H., Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	953
Hill, W. W., Jr., on behalf of the Member State Chambers of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce; accompanied by Robert Gresham, assistant research director	960
March 15, 1961	
Hayes, Dr. John Cornelius, president, National Council of Catholic Men, accompanied by William R. Considine, director, legal department, National Catholic Welfare Conference	969
Lamberth, Edwin L., superintendent, Norfolk City Public Schools, Norfolk, Va	984
Krettek, Mrs. Germaine, director, Washington office, American Library Association	991
Feldman, J. Arnold, executive director, American Veterans' Committee	996
Long, Hon. Oren E., a U.S. Senator from the State of Hawaii	1007
March 20, 1961	
Neuberger, Hon. Maurine, a U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon	1013
Knoff, Dr. Gerald E., executive secretary, Division of Christian Education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States	1015
Murch, James DeForest, chairman, Commission on Evangelical Action, National Association of Evangelicals	1026
Van Deusen, Dr. Robert E., Washington secretary, Division of Public Relations, National Lutheran Council	1029
Zagri, Sidney, legislative counsel, International Brotherhood of Teamsters	1049
McDiarmid, Mrs. Hugh, member, General Assembly of Virginia, representing Fairfax County	1060
Walker, Robert B., assistant superintendent of schools, Fairfax County, Va	1063
STATEMENTS	
American Civil Liberties Union, New York City, prepared statement	1303
American Jewish Committee, prepared statement	1205
Bamberger, Rabbi Bernard J., president, Central Conference of American Rabbis, prepared statement	1206
Barkhurst, W. Ted, assistant superintendent of schools, Great Falls, Mont.	411
Bartlett, Hon. E. L., a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska	179
Bartlett, Lynn M., State superintendent of public instruction, Michigan	826
Bell, Mrs. Alison, legislative staff, American Association of University Women	505
Blanshard, Mrs. Paul, executive director, Unitarian Fellowship for Social Science	496
Boehm, Dr. Charles H., superintendent of public instruction, Pennsylvania, prepared statement	941, 956

CONTENTS—Continued

STATEMENTS—continued

	Page
Borchardt, Selma, national vice president, American Federation of Teachers	815
Bull, Mrs. Fred L., national chairman of legislation, National Congress, Parent-Teachers Association, accompanied by Mrs. Gray	400
Carlson, C. E., executive director, Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs	472
Carr, Dr. William G., executive secretary, National Education Association, accompanied by Dr. Sam M. Lambert, director, research division	190
Citizens for Educational Freedom, Wisconsin chapters, prepared statement	1253
Clayman, Jacob, administrative director, industrial union department, AFL–CIO, prepared statement	1165
Colborn, Fern M., secretary for social education, National Federation of Settlements and Neighborhood Centers, prepared statement	1147
Cooper, Hon. John Sherman, a U.S. Senator from the State of Kentucky	580
Cotton, Hon. Norris, a U.S. Senator from the State of New Hampshire	83
Dallard, Ralph, superintendent of schools, San Diego, Calif., prepared statement	790
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, prepared statement	998
District of Columbia Education Association, Washington, D.C., prepared statement	1281
Federal impact and burden, Hardin County Board of Education, Elizabethtown, Ky., prepared statement	720
Engle, Hon. Clair, a U.S. Senator from the State of California	682
Feldman, J. Arnold, executive director, American Veterans' Committee	996
Freeman, Roger A., research associate, Institute for Studies in Federalism, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif	620
Prepared statement	649
Fulbright, Hon. J. W., a U.S. Senator from the State of Arkansas	56
Fuller, Dr. Edgar, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers	299
Prepared statement	319
Goldwater, Hon. Barry, a U.S. Senator from the State of Arizona	538
Gruening, Hon. Ernest, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska, accompanied by George Rogers, professor of economics, University of Alaska	731
Hardin County Board of Education, Elizabethtown, Ky., statement of Federal impact and burden	720
Hays, Dr. John Cornelius, president, National Council of Catholic Men, accompanied by William R. Considine, director, legal department, National Catholic Welfare Conference	969
Hecht, George J., chairman, American Parents Committee, Inc	335
Hill, Dr. W. W., Jr., State chamber of commerce	960
Prepared statement	964
Hilton, Dr. David, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, Detroit, Mich	860
Hochberg, Samuel, deputy president, United Federation of Teachers, Local No. 2, American Federation of Teachers	858
Hochwalt, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Frederick G., director, National Catholic Welfare Conference	933
Hutchison, Phillys, vice president, American Federation of Teachers, Portland, Oreg	926
Prepared statement	928

CONTENTS—Continued

STATEMENTS—continued

Page

Kampelman, Max M., counsel for the American Jewish Congress, accompanied by Joseph B. Robison 456
Knoff, Dr. Gerald E., executive secretary, division of christian education, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States 1015
Prepared statement and addendum 1022
Krettek, Mrs. Germaine, director, Washington office, American Library Association 991
La Driere, David L., president, accompanied by Glen Andreas, vice president and Francis Brown, vice president, Citizens for Educational Freedom 501
Lambert, Dr. Sam M., director, research division, National Education Association, Washington, D.C. 270
Lamberth, Edwin L., superintendent, Norfolk City Public Schools, Norfolk, Va 984
Lindahl, Dean, State administrator of Public Laws 815 and 874, State department of public instruction, Helena, Mont 423
Little, M. V., consultant to Americans Unlimited and other organizations 517
Prepared statement 512
Supplemental statement 513
Long, Hon. Oren E., a U.S. Senator from the State of Hawaii 1007
Prepared statement 1010
Lowell, C. Stanley, associate director of Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State 483
Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, St. Louis, Mo., prepared statement 1211
Lutz, Dr. Harley, Government finance consultant, National Association of Manufacturers 373
McDiarmid, Mrs. Hugh, member, General Assembly of Virginia, representing Fairfax County 1060
Mercano Hipolito, grand master of the Masonic Lodge, Puerto Rico 505
(Recalled) 523
Martin, David, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 953
Mayer, Vera Waltman, general secretary, National Consumers League, prepared statement 1306
Megel, Carl J., president, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, Chicago, Ill 922
Metcalf, Hon. Lee, a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana 410, 560
Meyer, Agnes E 527
Mitchell, Clarence, director, Washington bureau, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People 426
Murch, James DeForest, chairman, Commission on Evangelical Action, National Association of Evangelicals 1026
National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D.C., prepared statement 1283
National Lutheran Council at Detroit, Mich., January 31–February 3, 1961, entitled "Church Hospitals and the Hill-Burton Act," prepared statement 1044
Neuberger, Hon. Maurine, a U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon 1013
O'Brien, Father William, S.J., assistant professor of government and constitutional law, Georgetown University 701
Pincus, Celia, president of the Philadelphia Federation of Teachers 446
Prepared statement 454
Proxmire, Hon. William, a U.S. Senator from the State of Wisconsin 686

CONTENTS—Continued

STATEMENTS—continued

Page

Ribicoff, Abraham A., Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, accompanied by Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary-designate, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Sterling M. McMurrin, Commissioner-designate of Education; Ralph Flynt, Assistant Commissioner for Legislative and Program Development, Office of Education; Dr. Kenneth A. Simon, Analytical Statistician of the Reference, Estimates, and Projection Section, Office of Education; Dr. Rall Q. Grigsby, Commissioner for School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas; and B. Alden Lillywhite, Associate Director, Division of School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas 91
Root, Margaret, executive secretary of the Pennsylvania Federation of Teachers 440
Prepared statement 444
Rose, Oscar V., superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla 773
Prepared statement 810
Rose, Oscar V., superintendent of schools, Midwest City, Okla.; Dr. Ralph Dallard, superintendent of schools, San Diego, Calif.; and Walter McKee, superintendent of schools, Montgomery, Ala 807
Saginaw, Mich., Board of Education, prepared statement 1300
Schertler, Leon A., representing Electronic Teaching Laboratories, Inc 331
Schoemann, Peter T., vice president, and chairman of the Education Committee, American Federation of Labor, accompanied by Andrews J. Biemiller, director of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations 389
Seventh-Day Adventist Church, prepared statement 1218
Sharpe, D. R., prepared statement 1313
Sherer, Rabbi Morris, executive vice president, Agudath Israel of America, prepared statement 1303
Shore, Frederick, administrative assistant, East Meadow Public Schools, Nassau County, Long Island, N.Y. 717
Storper, Bernard S., Long Island City, N.Y., prepared statement 1313
Swainson, Hon. John B., Governor of the State of Michigan, accompanied by Lynn M. Bartlett, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Michigan; and Hon. Philip A. Hart, a U.S. Senator from the State of Michigan 822
Thomas, Norman, prepared statement 1095
United Christian Missionary Society, prepared statement 1220
Van Deusen, Dr. Robert E., Washington secretary, division of public relations, National Lutheran Council 1029
Walker, Robert B., assistant superintendent of schools, Fairfax County, Va 1063
Watson, Dr. K. Brantley, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America 338
White, Don, executive vice president, National Audio-Visual Association, Fairfax, Va 939
Supplementary statement 1316
Willis, Dr. Benjamin C., president-elect of the American Association of School Administration, and superintendent of schools, Chicago, Ill.; accompanied by Dr. Philip J. Hickey, superintendent of instruction, St. Louis, Mo 327
Zagri, Sidney, legislative counsel, International Brotherhood of Teamsters 1049

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Page

Amendment intended to be proposed by Senator Gruening to S. 1021 737
Amendments to S. 1021, a bill to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education 689
Analysis of the receipts and expenditures of the Michigan public schools for 1959–60 831
Articles entitled:
"A Statement of Policy," by the General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church 1214
"Does Public Aid to Sectarian Schools Violate the Separation Principle?" by Clarence E. Mershon, Troutdale, Oreg 1082
"Federal Aid to Education and Religious Liberty," by Joseph F. Costanza, S.J 1098
"Fairfax 'Overbuilds,' Now Has Spare School," from the Washington Star of February 22, 1961 987
"Historical Justification for Federal Aid to Education," by American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO 865
"How To Hurt Both Religion and Education," by James Reston, in the New York Times of March 10, 1961 499
"Men Teachers and Ex-Teachers: Some Attitudes and Traits," by Robert L. Thorndike and Elizabeth Hagen, Teachers College, Columbia University 60
"Smartest Teachers? They Quit Teaching," by Erwin Knoll, from the Washington Post of January 8, 1961 71
"Three Rulings Cited To Back Kennedy School Stand," by Miriam Ottenberg in the Washington Sunday Star of March 19, 1961 1020
"The Cardinal's Statement," from the New York Times of March 14, 1961 769
"Today and Tomorrow," by Walter Lippmann, from the Washington Post of March 14, 1961 770
Comparison of estimated allotments for fiscal year 1964 under S. 1021 (Morse bill) proposed School Assistance Act of 1961, based upon attendance at public elementary and secondary schools and school-age (5 to 17 inclusive) population 228
Comparison of proposals for Federal grants for public elementary and secondary schools 214
Compilation figures from Office of Education Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56, quoted by Senator Goldwater 589
Compilation of:
Public Law 815, 81st Congress, as amended 601
Public Law 874, 81st Congress, as amended 610
Editorials from the Washington Post of—
March 9, 1960, entitled "Appeal to Reason" 498
March 10, 1960, entitled "Motive and Criticism" 498
Federal programs under which institutions with religious affiliations receive Federal funds through grants or loans 139
Hypothetical effect on salaries of instructional staff if all States used 90 percent of their allotments under S. 1021 to increase salaries of instructional staff 174
Inquiry by Dr. Fuller to 35 individuals and the replies from same 304

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—continued

Page

Letters and telegrams from—
Alaska State Board of Education, Hon. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, telegram inserted by Senator Gruening 733
Alcott, Chauncey G., president, board of school directors, Hanover, Pa., to Senator Morse, dated March 14, 1961 1311
Allott, Hon. Gordon, a U.S. Senator from the State of Colorado to Senator Hill, containing letter from Robert H. Johnson, superintendent, Jefferson County public schools, Lakewood, Colo 723
Bailey, Nathan, president, Christian and Missionary Alliance, New York City, to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1219
Barnes, D. Keith, M.D., Davis County Health Department, Kaysville, Utah, to Senator Bennett, dated March 14, 1961 1144
Barlett, Hon. E. L., a Senator from the State of Alaska, to Senator Morse, containing a supplementary memorandum 1180
Bemis, Maynard, executive secretary Phi Delta Kappa, Bloomington, Ind., to Senator Morse, containing copy of board's statement of position 1308
Benner, Lester C., general superintendent, Churches of Christ in Christian Union, to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1208
Biondolille, Gabriel, College of Our Lady of the Ozarks, Carthage, Mo., to the subcommittee, dated March 17, 1961 1278
Bittner, Mark R., National Council of Real Estate Taxpayers, Allentown, Pa., to Senator Morse 1290
Brandt, Henry, president, Evangelical Mennonite Brethern Conference, Omaha, Nebr., to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1209
Brother Anthony Frederick, S.M., chairman, Department of English, National Council of Teachers of English, to Senator Morse, dated March 29, 1961 1291
Brother Raymond Fleck, C.S.C., St. Edwards University, Austin, Tex., to Senator Morse, dated March 15, 1961 1297
Burkhardt, Frederick, president, American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y., to Senator Morse 1148
Bush, Hon. Prescott, a U.S. Senator from Connecticut, to Senator Morse, dated March 10, 1961, with attachments 1072
Calvert, Gordon L., Investment Bankers Association of America, Washington, D.C., to Senator Morse, containing statement 1150
Carling, Daniel F., Potter Township School District, Monaca, Pa., to Senator Morse, dated March 7, 1961 723
Cohen, Wilbur J., Assistant Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to Senator Morse, dated April 7, 1961 761, 767
Dunn, Harvey E., president, Grant District Teacher's Association, Del Paso Heights, Calif., to Senator Morse, dated March 17, 1961 1288
Eggers, Ben, executive secretary of parish education, Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, Kansas district, to Senator Morse, dated March 14, 1961 1213

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—continued

Page

Letters and telegrams from—Continued
Ewart, William J., president, Elementary Class Room Teachers Association of the District of Columbia, telegram to Senator Morse 1288
Faugmeier, Robert A., national director, United Christian Missionary Society, Indianapolis, Ind., to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1219
Flemming, Hon. Arthur S., Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to Clarence Mitchell, NAACP 439
Frantz, Roy O., president, National School Boards Association, Evanston, Ill., to Senator Morse, March 10, 1961 728
Frantz, Roy O., president, National School Boards Association, Evanston, Ill., telegram to Senator Hill 1292
Freeman, Roger A., Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., to Senator Morse, containing appendixes A–G 625
Frizzell, Rev. John R., Jr., rector, St. St. Alban's Episcopal Church, Annandale, Va., to Senator Morse, dated March 15, 1961 1208
Fuller, Edgar, executive secretary, Council of Chief State School Officers, letter containing questionnaire to 35 chief State school officers and their replies 304
Gavin, Evelyn M., L.H.S., Third Order of Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Scapular Bureau, New York City, to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1218
Gellhorn, Walter, Betts professor of law, Columbia University, New York City, to Senator Morse, dated March 20, 1961 1279
Givler, Mrs. Homer M., Kansas Baptist Woman's Mission Society, Kansas City, Kans., to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1207
Graham, C. V., president, Center Stake of Zion, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Independence, Mo., to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1207
Groff, Clarence, acting chairman, Sidney Deanery, Council of Catholic Men, to the subcommittee, dated March 29, 1961 1217
Gruening, Hon. Ernest, a U.S. Senator from the State of Alaska, to Senator Morse, dated March 16, 1961, containing remarks from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "A Better Formula for the Allocation of Federal Funds for Education" 1182
Dated March 15, 1961, containing statement of Dr. George W. Rogers 1076
Hamilton, Thomas J., chairman, NCAA Fitness Committee, Athletic Association of Western Universities, San Francisco, Calif., to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1278
Harman, Rev. Robert J., minister, Hope Presbyterian Church, Watertown, N.Y., to Senator Morse, dated March 24, 1961 1253
Harmelink, Ray J., associate general secretary, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., to Senator Morse, dated—
March 16, 1961 1096
March 24, 1961 1220
Harris, Herbert E., II, president, Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations, to Senator Morse, dated April 5, 1961 1299

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—continued

Page

Letters and telegrams from—Continued
Harris, Sterling R., superintendent of schools, Tooele, Utah, to Senator Bennett, dated March 14, 1961 1146
Holt, G. Harold, superintendent, Davis County school district, Farmington, Utah, dated March 16, 1961 1144
Hoyt, Joseph W., temporary president, AFGE Local 2024, Kittery, Maine, to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1305
Hummon, Serge F., secretary, Board of Home Missions, Congregational and Christian Churches, New York City, to Senator Morse, dated April 2, 1961 1208
Hymes, Mrs. Charles, national president, National Council of Jewish Women, New York, N.Y., to Senator Morse, dated March 13, 1961, containing statement 1079
Isbill, O. Ralph, general officer, Open Bible Standard Churches, Inc., Des Moines, Iowa, to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1217
Jackson, Hon. Henry M., a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington, to Senator Morse, dated March 13, 1961, with atachments 1069
Jageman, James E., superintendent, Knob Noster Public Schools, Knob Noster, Mo., to Senators Symington and Long, dated March 15, 1961 1299
Johnston, Hon. Olin D., a U.S. Senator from South Carolina, to Senator Morse dated March 13, 1961 1071
Kaminetsky, Dr. Joseph, national director, Torah Umesorah, New York City, to Senator Morse 1179
Keiller, James A., president, International Pentecostal Assemblies, Atlanta, Ga., to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1210
Kelley, Dean M., executive secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ, to Senator Morse, dated April 3, 1961 1217
Kirk, Russell, Mecosta, Mich., to Senator Morse, containing his biography and an article entitled "Do We Want Federal Subsidies for the Schools?" 1157
Lambert, Sam M., director, research division, National Education Association, dated March 24, 1961, to Senator Morse 204
Lehman, Rev. Glen A., national executive secretary, Independent Fundamental Churches of America, Chicago, Ill., to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1209
Leskes, Theodore, director, legal division, American Jewish Committee, to Senator Morse, dated March 22, 1961 1204
Logan, William B., president, American Vocational Association, Inc., to Senator Hill, dated April 5, 1961 1276
Long, Hon. Edward V., a U.S. Senator from the State of Missouri, to Senator Morse, dated April 4, 1961 1200
Long, Hamilton A., New York City, to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1312
Lyle, Dorothy, president, American Home Economics Association, telegram to Senator Morse, dated March 27, 1961 1276
Lynn, John C., legislative director, American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington, D.C., to Senator Morse, containing statement 1169

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—continued

Page

Letters and telegrams from—Continued
McCormack, Hon. John W., a Representative from the State of Massachusetts, to Senator Morse, dated—
March 28, 1961 1202
March 29, 1961 1203
McDonough, James R., executive secretary, Hawaii Education Association, Honolulu, to Senator Morse, dated April 3, 1961, containing resolution adopted March 29, 1961 1289
McFeely, Elizabeth K., special services deputy, superintendent of schools, Alameda County, Calif., to Senator Morse, March 21, 1961, containing resolution adopted March 17, 1961 1298
McMahon, Joseph H., New York City, to Senator Morse, containing statement signed by various individuals 1309
Magliolo, Andrew J., M.D., Dickinson, Tex., to Senator Morse, dated March 14, 1961 1302
Mark, Ruth, president, PTA, Public School 61, New York, to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 21, 1961 1294
Martin, Samuel E., county superintendent, Seneca County schools, Tiffin, Ohio, to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 3, 1961 722
Mays, Floyd R., Jr., M.D., Medical Arts Clinic Hospital, Big Spring, Tex., to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 20, 1961 1302
Melvin, Billy A., executive secretary, National Association of Free Will Baptists, Nashville, Tenn., Mar. 22, 1961 1213
Metcalf, Hon. Lee, a U.S. Senator from the State of Montana, to Senator Morse, enclosing a letter from Harry H. Cloke, principal, Lame Deer Public Schools, Lame Deer, Mont 569
To Senator Morse, dated Mar. 20, 1961, containing a letter from Ruth Putz, superintendent of schools, Valley County, Mont 565
Miles, Clarence R., manager, legislative department, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, containing attachments to Senator Morse 355
Miller, Arthur L., executive secretary, Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod, St. Louis, Mo., to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 22, 1961 1211
Mitchell, Clarence, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 10, 1961, containing statement of Roy Wilkins, executive secretary, NAACP 1080
Mitchell, Clarence, director, Washington Bureau, NAACP, telegram dated Aug. 29, 1960, and letters dated Nov. 8, 1960, to Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 437
Mitchell, Glenn F., superintendent, Madison Public Schools, Madison, Kans., to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 17, 1961 1289
Mondy, J. L., executive secretary, General Association of General Baptists, Poplar Bluff, Mo., telegram to Senator Morse, dated Mar. 22, 1961 1209
Morse, Hon. Wayne, to Senator Mansfield, Representative Rayburn, Senator Humphrey, and Representative McCormack, dated Mar. 14, 1961 983
Morse, Hon Wayne, to Dean Katz, Professor Howe, and Professor Sutherland, and replies thereto 705

Letters and telegrams from—Continued
Mortola, Edward J., president, Pace College, New York City, to Senator Keating, dated March 10, 1961 1293
Newman, Chas. C., superintendent of schools, Paxton, Ill., to Senator Morse 722
Nichols, William B., president, Public Education Association, New York City, to Senator Morse, dated March 28, 1961, containing prepared statement 1295
Nolan, Robert L., M.D., Oakland, Calif., to Senator Hill
Norby, Theo J., commissioner, Alaska State Department of Education, to Senator Bartlett, dated March 8, 1961 189
O'Connor, Warren B., secretary, Citizens for Educational Freedom, Hales Corner, Wis., to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1253
Oklahoma County Republican Women's Club, Oklahoma City, Okla., to Senator Morse, dated March 7, 1961 722
Pelissier, Charlotte N., legislative chairman, American Association of University Women, to Senator Morse, dated March 18, 1961 1302
Pell, Hon. Claiborne, a U.S. Senator from Rhode Island, to Senator Morse, dated March 10, 1961, with attachments 1074
Phillips, Ferman, president, National Association of Secretaries of State Teachers' Associations, to Senator Morse, dated March 9, 1961, containing a prepared statement 404
Raymond, Thelma M., secretary, Classroom Teachers Council, District of Columbia, telegram to Senator Morse 1288
Regan, Robert, Jr., director, general board of the Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, to Senator Morse 1149
Regner, Rabbi Sidney L., executive vice president, Central Conference of American Rabbis, to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1206
Rehberg, Jane A., president, Michigan Federation of Teachers, Detroit, Mich., to Senator Morse, dated March 6, 1961 1078
Rehberg, Jane A., president, Michigan Federation of Teachers, telegram to Dr. David Hilton 863
Reichert, Ivan, president, Argonia Local Teachers Association, Argonia, Kans., to Senator Morse, dated March 17, 1961 1289
Reuss, Carl F., director, American Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minn., to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1210
Reuter, George S., Jr., research director, American Federation of Teachers, to Senator Morse, dated April 3, 1961 1260
Ribicoff, Hon. Abraham, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare:
Dated March 28, 1961, to Senator Morse 110
Dated April 18, 1961, to Senator Hill 1321
Riegle, H. Edgar, district superintendent, Gettysburg Joint School System, Gettysburg, Pa., to Senator Clark 1146
Rinta, Eugene F., executive director, Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Washington, D.C., to Senator Morse, dated March 20, 1961 967
Riordan, Mary Ellen, president, Detroit Federation of Teachers, telegram to Dr. David Hilton 863

Letters and telegrams from—Continued
Rose, Herbert H., secretary, Ministerial Association, Livingston, N.J. telegram to Senator Morse, dated March 16, 1961 1213
Rosine, Don, Indio Faculty Club, Indio, Calif., to Senator Morse, dated March 26, 1961 1290
Ross, Roy G., general secretary, National Council of the Churches of Christ, New York City, to Senator Morse, dated March 13, 1961 1215
Ryan, Aileen B., assemblywoman, State of New York, to Senator Morse, dated March 28, 1961 1204
Samuel, Helen E., executive secretary, District of Columbia Education Association, to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1281
Schell, Steven R., Associated Students, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg., dated February 8, 1961, to Senator Morse 52
Schiotz, Fredrik A., American Lutheran Church, Minneapolis, Minn., to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1210
Scott, Chas. W. H., assistant general superintendent, General Council of the Assemblies of God, Springfield, Mo., to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1209
Sharpe, D. R., 48th Assembly District, Democratic Council, Los Angeles County, to Senator Morse, dated March 20, 1961 1312
Shaw, R. Harland, Free World Committee, Chicago, Ill., to Senator Morse, dated March 24, 1961 1305
Shemin, Henry, president Erasmus Hall High School, New York City, telegram to Senator Morse 1294
Sherer, Rabbi Morris, executive vice president, Agudath Israel of America, New York City, to Congressman McCormack, dated March 27, 1961 1202
Siegman, Joseph, chairman, legislative committee, Pennsylvania State Education Association, Harrisburg, Pa., to Senator Morse, dated March 21, 1961 1294
Slocum, James F., superintendent, Minot Public Schools, Minot, N. Dak., to Senator Young, dated March 23, 1961 1201
Stackhouse, William R., area representative, United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., Kansas City, Mo., to Senator Morse, dated March 31, 1961 1253
Stahl, Steve, chairman, National Taxpayers Conference, Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, Oklahoma City, Okla., March 9, 1961 728
Stausbury, Eugene P., president, Board of Education, Saginaw, Mich., to the committee, dated March 15, 1961 1081
Stevenson, Margaret, executive secretary, Department of Classroom Teachers, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1291
Stovall, Travis, superintendent, Clovis Municipal Schools, Clovis, N. Mex., to Senator Morse, dated March 14, 1961 1293
Sullivan, Dan J., president, New York Chapter, Citizens for Educational Freedom New York City, to Senator Morse, March 23, 1961, containing petition signed by various persons 1255
Synan, Joseph A., bishop, Pentecostal Holiness Church, Hopewell, Va., to Senator Morse, dated March 23, 1961 1218

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—continued

Page

Letters and telegrams from—Continued
Talbot, Mary N., secretary, Riverton Teachers Association, Riverton, Kans., telegram to Senator Morse... 1297
Taylor, A. G., president, Charlottesville-Albemarle Ministerial Association, Charlottesville, Va., to Senator Morse, dated April 2, 1961.... 1207
Thorson, Arne, superintendent, Riverdale Public Schools, Riverdale, N. Dak., to Senator Young, dated March 30, 1961.... 1202
Thurmond, Hon. Strom, a U.S. Senator from South Carolina, to Senator Morse, dated March 15, 1961... 1075
Tuttle, Edward M., School Board Leadership in America, to Senator Morse, dated March 17, 1961..... 1297
van der Haag, Ernest, professor of social philosophy, New York University, to Senator Morse, containing statement.... 1155
Ward, A. Dudley, associate general secretary, General Board of Christian Social Concerns of the Methodist Church, to Senator Hill, dated March 30, 1961.... 1213
Weymouth (Mass.) Teachers Association, telegram to Senator Morse... 1294
Wheat, Willis J., president, Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, Oklahoma City, Okla., to Senator Morse, March 9, 1961.... 724
White, Don, executive vice president, National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., Fairfax, Va., to Senator Morse, March 30, 1961.... 1258
Wyrick, Rex R., superintendent, Warrensburg Public Schools, Warrensburg, Mo., to Senator Long, dated March 27, 1961.... 1200
Young, Hon. Milton R., a Senator from the State of North Dakota, to—
Senator Hill, dated March 28, 1961.. 1200
Senator Morse, dated April 3, 1961.. 1201
Memorandum entitled "Estimated Amount of School Revenue Which Would Be Derived From Federal Property if Taxable by Federally Affected School Districts".... 415
Memorandum on the constitutional authority of the Congress to enact S. 1021.... 111
Memorandum on the impact of the first amendment to the Constitution upon Federal aid to education.... 113
Memorandum submitted by Dr. William G. Carr, National Education Association.... 192
Memorandum submitted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, entitled "Statement Regarding Method of Allocating Funds Among the States Under Title I of S. 1021"... 205
Memorandum submitted by Carlisle P. Runge, Assistant Secretary of Defense.... 1320
Official statement entitled "The Church and the Public Schools," approved by the 169th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.... 1223
Preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 2 cents of Federal tax on cigarettes were returned to the States.... 86
Pronouncement entitled "Public Funds for Public Schools," adopted by the National Council of the Churches of Christ.... 475, 1025
Proposed amendment to S. 815, submitted by Senator Metcalf.... 417
Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State, rebuttal statement of Msgr. Frederick G. Hochwalt.... 1259

CONTENTS—Continued

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION—continued

Page

Publication entitled "Some Constitutional Prohibitions Against Financial Aid to Private Schools," by the American Federation of Teachers.... 1261
Release from the Department of Political Science, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.... 220
Remarks by Senator Cooper in the Senate, January 31, 1961, entitled "Educational Opportunities of 1961".... 591
Remarks by Senator Gruening in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 31, 1961, entitled "Federal Action for Education Requested by President Kennedy Is Essential".... 742
Remarks by Senator Morse re President Kennedy's special message entitled "Federal Aid to Education," from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 20, 1961.... 40
Resolution adopted by the general assembly of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., March 9, 1961... 1096
Resolution adopted by the Orange County, Va., Board of Supervisors.... 1300
Resolutions and legislative policies adopted by the Council of Chief State School Officers annual meeting, Santa Fe, N. Mex., November 18, 1960.... 325
Speech by former Congressman Barden.. 559
Statement regarding legislative background of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 and evidence of congressional intent as to permanent or temporary nature of these programs.. 396
Statement regarding current needs for Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 compared to the need for these programs when these two laws were enacted.... 418
Statement regarding survey of borrowed-up districts.... 164
Statements analyzing the criticism of Senators Gruening, Metcalf, Engle, and Long of Hawaii.... 754
Summary of proposed amendments to Federal impact area laws..... 31, 100
Survey of teachers' salaries in districts of over 10,000 population, September 1960.... 880

TABLES AND CHARTS

Table 1. Total of State and local tax collections per $100 of personal income, 1951.... 54
Table 2. Preliminary estimate of annual receipts per State if 2 cents of the Federal tax on each package of cigarettes were returned to the States, as proposed in S. 293.... 86
Table 3. Estimated allotments to States under S. 1021 (fiscal years 1962–64).... 97
Table 4. Summary of Public Law 874 estimated entitlements, by State, under existing law and proposed amendments.... 104
Table 5. Summary of Public Law 815 estimated entitlements, by State, under existing law.... 105
Table 6. School expenditures per pupil (by State).... 107
Table 7. Personal income per pupil (by State).... 108
Table 7a. Summary table: Survey of public school classroom shortages in the fall of 1951 in borrowed-up districts.... 167
Table 8. Selected characteristics of borrowed-up school districts with classroom shortages: Fall 1951 (by State).... 168
Table 9. Hypothetical effect on salaries of instructional staff if all States used 90 percent of their allotments under S. 1021 to increase salaries of instructional staff, fiscal year 1962.... 174

CONTENTS—Continued

TABLES AND CHARTS—continued

Page

Table 10. Internal Revenue Service: Cost, tax collections, employees, and U.S. population since 1866.... 195
Table 11. State administration costs of collecting $100 of sales and use tax revenues, selected States, fiscal year 1955.... 197
Table 12. Federal administration and research expenditures as a percentage of grant expenditures for Federal aid programs to State and local governments, fiscal years 1956–58.... 198
Table 13. Formula change with change in "spreader factor".... 204
Table 14. Nonpublic school enrollment as percent of total enrollment in elementary and secondary schools, 1955–56.... 225
Table 15. Enrollment in full-time public and nonpublic elementary and secondary regular day schools, by State, 1957–58.... 226
Table 16. Comparison of estimated allotments for fiscal year 1964 under S. 1021 based on ADA and school-age population.... 228
Table 17. Tables showing rankings of the States, 1961 (index, p. 230).... 229–266
Table 18. Level of school completed by persons 25 years old and older and 25 to 29 years old, 1940–59.... 271
Table 19. Lifetime income (earnings) for males in selected age groups by years of school completed, United States, 1939, 1946, 1949, 1956, and 1958.... 272
Table 20. Total expenditures per pupil in ADA 1949–50 and 1959–60 in current and constant prices.... 274
Table 21. Percent of selective service registrants failing the mental test, 1959.... 275
Table 22. Importance of selected characteristics in future determination of low income population.... 276
Table 23. Public school enrollments and related figures, 20 largest cities.. 284
Table 24. State and local tax collections per $100 of personal income 1951.... 287
Table 25. Average tax burden per family, by level of income, 1958.... 288
Table 26. Taxes as a percentage of total income, by source and by income class, calendar 1958.... 289
Table 27. Teachers' salaries and school construction: Approximate allocations under S. 1021 for 1960–61 and 1962–63, estimated expenditures in 1960–61 and allocations under S. 1021 a percent of 1960–61 expenditures... 290
Table 28. Approximate allocations under S. 1021 for special educational projects (10 percent of State allocation for 1961–62).... 292
Table 29. Graph: Elementary and secondary classrooms constructed 1919–60.... 342
Table 30. How States would fare during fiscal year 1962 net "aid" received versus net "aid" paid.... 344
Table 31. How States would fare during fiscal year 1963 net "aid" versus net "aid" paid.... 345
Table 32. How States would fare during fiscal year 1964 net "aid" versus net "aid" paid out.... 346
Table 33. Graph: Regional per capita personal income as percent of continental United States per capita income.... 347
Table 34. Upward trend in classroom salaries.... 376
Table 35. Teachers' salaries versus school construction needs..... 405–406
Table 36. Number of children counted for payment under sections of Public Law 815, 1950–62.... 422

CONTENTS—Continued

TABLES AND CHARTS—continued

	Page
Table 37. Appropriations for Public Law 815, fiscal years 1951–61	422
Table 38. Increase in number of federally connected children in ADA and costs per child in eligible school districts under Public Law 874, fiscal years 1951–62	422
Table 39. Number of Federal properties and number of acres claimed by applicants under Public Law 874, as amended, fiscal years 1952–60	423
Table 40. Actual and estimated expenditures for national defense, commerce, housing, space technology, and natural resources, fiscal years 1959–62	423
Table 41. Vote of Southern States on Powell amendment and on final passage of school construction amendment	428
Table 42. Tables relating to local contribution rate under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, Montana School Districts	570–575
Table 43. Educational expenditures and enrollment, 1940–60	590
Table 44. Expenditures for education as percent of national income, 1890–1960	590
Table 45. Educational expenditures, corporate net profits, and national income, 1929 and 1959	591
Table 46. Cooper bill: Estimated State allotments per child	596
Table 47. Cooper bill: Estimated State allotments 1st through 4th year	597
Table 48. State comparison, income, public school pupils and current expenditures	598
Table 49. Public school revenues as a percentage of national income (1945–61)	620, 650
Table 50. 1960 bond elections, elementary and secondary schools, by State	630
Table 51. Failures in Armed Forces tests and school expenditures	641
Table 52. Employment in public education and in private industries, 1929 and 1959	656
Table 53. Enrollment and teachers in public schools, 1900 and 1961	656
Table 54. Enrollment and teachers in the public schools, 1953–54 and 1960–61	656
Table 55. Number of earned college degrees, 1958–59, 1968–69	657
Table 56. Earnings of teachers and other groups, 1929 and 1959	657
Table 57. Educational expenditures and enrollments, 1940–61 (public and nonpublic, elementary, secondary, and higher)	658
Table 58. Expenditures for education as a percentage of national income, 1890–1961 (all levels, public and private)	658
Table 59. School revenues and State support in selected years, 1890–1960	659
Table 60. Sources of school revenues, 1959–60	660
Table 61. Federal grants-in-aid to State and local governments, in selected years, 1922–60	660
Table 62. Rates of increase in Federal and State—local revenues in peacetime periods, 1902–59	661
Table 63. Sources of public school revenue in 1958	662
Table 64. Tax collections in the United States 1932, 1940, 1959	663
Table 65. Increase in tax collections (National, State, local) 1944–59	664
Table 66. Summary of effects of Public Law 874, New York State, 1960	718
Table 67. Comparable data concerning public schools of Oklahoma 1909–10 to 1960–61	726
Table 68. Sources of revenue and amount collected from each source by the common schools of Oklahoma for fiscal years 1951–60	727
Table 69. School expenditures by "poor" States	729
Table 70. Comparison of State allotments under School Assistance Act of 1961 (S. 1021) and amendments proposed by Senator Ernest Gruening	738
Table 71. State allotment ratios under amendment proposed, School Assistance Act of 1961	739
Table 72. Data for estimating unadjusted State allotments under amendments proposed to the School Assistance Act of 1961	740
Table 73. Data for estimating adjusted State allocation under amendments proposed by Senator Ernest Gruening to the School Assistance Act of 1961	741
Table 74. December average retail prices of 40 items in 9 Alaska cities, compared with Seattle and the United States	749
Table 75. Assistance for payments to school districts, federally affected areas, Public Law 874, as amended, fiscal year 1962	757
Table 76. Assistance for school construction, federally affected areas, Public Law 815, as amended, fiscal year 1962	758
Table 77. Difference in total estimated requirements, with percentage reduction factor for payments to school districts (Public Law 874) and construction grants (Public Law 815) under laws presently in effect extended without amendments, and total estimated requirements (Public Laws 815 and 874) under proposed extension with amendments, S. 1021 and H.R. 4970, fiscal year 1962	759
Table 78. Comparison of estimated reductions under titles II and III with increases under title I of S. 1021, by States, fiscal year 1962	760
Table 79. Estimated allotment under S. 1021 and proposed amendment (Gruening)	765
Table 80. Allotment under S. 1021, with alternate minimum grant based on current expenditure per pupil, fiscal year 1962	766
Table 81. Assistance for school construction, federally affected areas, Public Law 815, as amended, fiscal year 1962 (by State)	778
Table 82. Assistance for payments to school districts, federally affected areas, Public Law 874, as amended, fiscal year 1962	779
Table 83. Estimated allotments to States under the proposed administration School Assistance Act of 1961, fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964	780
Table 84. The effect of a 50-percent reduction of payment for B category children in section 3(b) of Public Law 874 on applicant districts in California (based on 1959–60 data)	795–803
Table 85. The effect of eliminating B category children from section 3(b) of Public Law 874 on applicant district in California (based on 1959–60 data)	804
Table 86. Summary by counties of average daily attendance reported by applicants under Public Law 874, 1958–59	805
Table 87. San Diego Unified School District, summary of federally connected pupils under Public Law 874	806
Table 88. Growth of average daily attendance of federally connected pupils and total statewide average daily attendance, 1950–51—1959–60	806
Table 89. San Diego Unified School District: Summary of Federal properties listed on RSF–1, 1960–61	806
Table 90. Loss to selected States, effect of section 3(b) amendments, Public Law 874	814
Table 91. Summary of entitlements to Michigan school districts under Public Laws 815 and 874 for the years 1950 through 1960	829
Table 92. Analysis of receipts and expenditures of the Michigan public schools	831–855
Table 93. Family incomes after Federal income taxes	883
Table 94. State and local tax burden of selected taxes, family of four, $5,000 income	884
Table 95. Summary of general wage changes, 1959	886
Table 96. Fringe benefits for teachers	889
Table 97. Summary of minimum wage laws for certificated teachers	891
Table 98. Salary schedules in cities over 400,000, September 1960	895
Table 99. Salary schedules of teachers in cities over 10,000 population, September 1960	896
Table 100. Analysis of Public Law 874 eligibility in the State of Washington including potential loss if proposed amendments are approved (1961–62 estimate). Summary by congressional districts	1071
Table 101. Effect of titles II and III amendments on selected Connecticut towns	1073
Table 102. Percent of Federal impact, 1951–61, selected counties, Utah	1145
Table 103. Elementary and secondary school bonds sold, 1960	1154
Table 104. Enrollment and teachers in the public schools 1900–61	1172
Table 105. College degrees and college graduate teachers, 1957–58 and 1968–69	1173
Table 106. Increase in public school enrollment for preceding year and graduation of new teachers, 1958–59 and 1969–70	1173
Table 107. State of Alaska: Assistance to school districts, impacted areas, fiscal year 1962	1181
Table 108. Estimated State per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities, 1959	1182
Table 109. Comparison of State allotments under School Assistance Act of 1961 (S. 1021) and amendments proposed by Senator Gruening	1188
Table 110. State allotment ratios under Gruening amendments to S. 1021	1189
Table 111. Data for estimating unadjusted State allotments under proposed Gruening amendments to S. 1021	1190
Table 112. Data for estimating adjusted State allocations under amendments proposed by Senator Gruening to S. 1021	1191
Table 113. Current expenditures by purpose, per pupil expenditures, and average salaries of instructional staff in full time public elementary and secondary day schools, by State: 1957–58	1192
Table 114. Income tables, Alaska income and population, 1950–59	1195
Table 115. Personal income: Major sources, by States, 1957	1196

CONTENTS—Continued

TABLES AND CHARTS—continued

Page

Table 116. Comparison of total appropriations for the District of Columbia with the total appropriations for public schools, 1949–60 1283
Table 117. Trends in population in 20 largest cities and related metropolitan areas 1284
Table 118. Effective buying income, 20 largest cities 1285
Table 119. Effective buying income per capita, 20 largest cities 1285
Table 120. Retail sales, 20 largest cities 1286
Table 121. Retail sales per capita, 20 largest cities 1286
Table 122. Public school enrollments and related figures, 20 largest cities 1287
Table 123. Employment opportunities in various occupational groups and educational level 1307
Table 124. Effect of reduced percentage payments to Idaho Public Law 874 applicants for 3b1 and 3b2 students as proposed in S. 1021 1315
Table 125. Number and percent of eligible applicants in fiscal year 1950 by proportion of Federal payments (Public Law 874) to total current expenditures of the applicant district 1319
Table 126. Information regarding number of federally connected children in and Federal payments under Public Law 874 to Arlington County, Va 1320
Table 127. Information regarding total attendance, total operating costs, and costs per pupil attendance of federally connected children and Federal entitlement under Public Law 874 and the percentage of total operating costs from Federal funds under Public Law 874 by State for the 1959 fiscal year 1324–1325
Table 128. Public Law 874 applicant school districts eligible in fiscal year 1960 that would have been ineligible if the minimum eligibility requirements had been 4-, 5-, or 6-percent accumulative totals, by State 1326–1327
Table 129. Reduction in number of eligible districts, eligible attendance, and entitlement if 4-percent eligibility requirement had been in effect during 1960, by State 1328–1329
Fall 1960 statistics on enrollment, teachers, and schoolhousing in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools, by States (table) Facing 298

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I can understand people who emotionally and romantically think this is a great business. But we are dealing with millions of dollars; and once that threshhold has been crossed, what will subsequent Congresses do, and how far shall we go? I have an idea, after a long experience in legislative halls, having seen the mushrooming of these functions once they have been undertaken, that we can almost predict what will happen to this program. The billions which will be added will be an onus.

When I say that the school districts and the States can finance themselves, I turn to the table on page 630 of the hearings, which indicates the number of school-bond issues which were approved in 1960. The voters went to the polls, and 1,188 bond issues for schools were approved for a total of $1,762 million. The number which were disapproved was 353, for a total of $401 million. Does that indicate whether there is an abiding and intense interest in education at the local level? It is most definitely there, and the voters have expressed themselves on these issues. The figures speak for themselves.

The percentage of bond issues approved was 81.4 percent on the basis of the dollars involved, and 77.1 percent on the basis of the number of bond issues. So three-quarters of the bond issues in number and four-fifths of the bond issues in terms of dollars were approved by the voters in 1960.

With respect to the first month in 1961, the only figures available as of now indicate that the number had increased by another 19 percent. Who can stand up in the face of actuality and in the face of unrepudiated facts and say that the local districts and the people at the grassroots are not doing their work?

The next reason I assign is: Give the bill a chance, and after a while, notwithstanding all the amazing formulas, it will take a book of logarithms, a knowledge of trigonometry, and a slide rule to comprehend that little by little, and despite a definition of school index and effort, and so forth, the States will wait to see whether there is not more and more largess to be had from the Federal Treasury. If Senators want something explicit on that point, let me read a reference to a statement by the distinguished Governor Lawrence, of Pennsylvania, on that subject. It appears at page 622 of the hearings:

> In Pennsylvania, Governor Lawrence holds off proposing any substantial increase in State aid for schools in the new budget; he looks instead to Congress to authorize Federal educational grants for States.

What Governor would not, if he could, protect his budget, when he knows that all he has to do is to look at the great white illumined dome in Washington and say, "From this cometh my succor and my assistance."

Here was a Governor who was honorable enough to express himself in that way.

So the bill will destroy initiative; I have not the slightest doubt about it. It is instinctive in humankind. That probably will be one of the side effects, as the druggists say, if and when the bill is enacted.

I go further. This was the very thing on which Woodrow Wilson commented in 1886, when he said:

> It was evident that no increase in the State appropriation for public education would be voted as long as there was the least prospect of aid from Washington. * * * (There was) deliberate determination to enjoy the easy position of a beneficiary of the National Government to the fullest possible extent, rather than to be independent and support a good school system by its own unaided efforts.

It is fair to assume that Federal aid, instead of being an addition to State expenditures, will become a substitute for State expenditures. Oh, I know there are administrators who will measure the State index effort and all the other complicated terms; but how much will they ultimately amount to when the pressures are on and when the political pressure gets a chance to vent itself? They will not mean too much.

I said this was, after all, token assistance. Let us see. Let us divide the aid which will go to the States and assume they will spend half of it for schoolrooms and the other half for teachers' salaries. If that be the case, approximately 7,500 classrooms a year will be built. What is that? The people now, without Federal aid, are building 70,000 classrooms a year. So here comes a dubious venture which would add 10 percent to the number of classrooms, if these allegations can be taken at face value. But I have grave doubts about it. But at its very best, it will probably amount to 10 percent of what is being done at the present time.

Then comes the argument that the bill will elevate the general tone of the instructional staff, the teaching corps throughout the country, if something is done in the field of salaries. It has been pointed out that they lag so far behind. I had planned to interpose in the colloquy the other day between the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] when there was a series of questions. The question always begins, "Is it not true?" Of course, one invites the answer. Then, "Is it not a fact," and the answer is invited. Well, I do not know. I simply look at the book for the answer, and here it is. It has been carefully documented. If anyone is curious about it, let him look at page 631 of the hearings. Here are the facts as submitted to the committee. With respect to salaries for female teachers and other professional workers who have had 4 years of college, the salary given is $3,533; for public school teahcers, it is $3,680. So there is a disparity, roughly, of $140 on the side of the teachers who have had 4 years of college. They are ahead of the professional workers.

In the case of those who have had 5 or more years of college, the salary of professional workers is given as $4,612 a year; for teachers, $4,925. The average on the side of the teachers is $300 higher than for the professional workers who have had 5 years of college work.

No one ever says anything about adjusting the figures with respect to the length of time one has devoted to the job; but if earnings are compared according to the length of time one has worked, here is the picture. For public school teachers, number of weeks worked in 1958, 27 to 47, the salary would have been $4,032. If they worked more than 48 weeks, the salary would have been $4,418.

Professional workers in nonschool jobs: If they are considered on the same basis, for the same number of weeks of work, their salaries, in the case of 27 to 47 weeks, would have been $2,267, or $1,765 a year less than the salaries of the teachers.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of that study and the documented record, who can so naively complain that we must do this because the teachers are behind in the salary list? If they are in

any given State, of course that is a State matter, and should be handled at that level.

Mr. President, I am opposed to the bill also for the following reason: Percentagewise, there will be an enrollment decline from now on. We have gotten over the war baby peak; and we can anticipate that although the population will increase and although the number of school children will increase, percentagewise the increase will be smaller. If we continue to build schools at the rate at which we have been building them, there will not only be enough classrooms, but it is possible that at some point in the future, not too many years hence, there might be an oversupply of classrooms. Here is a figure: that in the 1950's, the enrollment increase, percentagewise—and I have to accentuate that, so that no one will mistake the meaning of my remarks—was 46 percent; enrollment increases during the 1960's—1960–70—will be 20 percent, according to the Bureau of the Census projections. If that continues, what will be the answer? In that event there will be enough classrooms and there will be enough teachers.

Mr. President, it is amazing that authentic figures about the classroom situation are so difficult to procure. I cite the following from page 643 of the committee hearing:

> It was in 1954 that the Commissioner of Education testified that the classroom shortage totaled 370,000 classrooms; and about a year later the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare stated that the shortage would rise to 600,000 within 3 years.
>
> Well, actually the most recent figure which the Office of Education has put out is 142,000, which is 228,000 less than a mere 6 years ago.

In short, Mr. President, that figure was that the classroom shortage then was 142,000—not 370,000, not 600,000. One hundred and forty two thousand is a long way from the figures we were given not only in 1954 but also in the period following that year.

So, Mr. President, that number of classrooms—and I have my fingers crossed as to whether that is an adequate figure and an accurate figure, knowing that there are no common standards for reporting classrooms and their use in the respective States—simply means that the figures which have been supplied to us from time to time are of doubtful authenticity; and thus I am inclined to consider the private exploration which has been made, which shows that we are meeting this situation in a grand fashion.

Furthermore, the Office of Education had to report that, as stated in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> In the past 4 years the number of classrooms in use has increased 251,000. Now, the number required to take care of the additional enrollment in that time, which was 4.8 million, would have been 170,000 which means that the net increase in classrooms that were available for the reduction of shortages was 81,000.

Mr. President, statistics are wonderful things. It simply depends on where one sits and how one uses them.

Some observation was made to the effect that we are way behind the Soviet Union, and that should inspire fear, dread, and misgivings, and we should ladle out Federal largess in order to meet that situation. It was said that the Soviet Union has claimed that since the war they built enough classrooms for 9 million children. What did we do? We built enough classrooms for 20 million children—more than twice as many.

The Budget Bureau had its own doubts about these classroom shortage figures, and it made a field survey. But it has never been satisfied with the figures that have come before it.

Mr. President, there are so many things to say, but I know that I am now close to the time when I must conclude this discourse.

But there is one other thing I must say—namely, that in a short time we shall listen to the President; and I apprehend—without knowing—that he may talk about the fevers in the world and about the need for more funds in the field of space and the need for more funds for this, that, and the other thing. I couple that with a statement made last Friday night, in New York, by the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Elmer B. Staats, when he addressed the Business Advisory Council. I talked to him only this morning, and the figure does not appear in his manuscript. It was given in a response made to a question which was asked. He said that the deficit in the fiscal year 1961 will probably be twice what the President indicated to the Congress; and that would mean a budget deficit, in the current fiscal year, not of $2,300 million, but of $5,500 million or more; and there will be an even greater deficit in the following year.

So I survey the bills that are in the making and the demands that are going to be made, and then there occurs to me the old question, "Is it guns and butter, or is it guns or butter?"

If the world situation is as feverish as is intimated from time to time to the various congressional committees, how far do we go in fields of policy and expenditure where we should not venture, since the defense of the country, our national security, is the first consideration—for without national security there can be no individual security and no individual freedom. So we had better be giving thought to the appropriation bills and the authorizations which are building up these built-in increases in the budget; and this is one good way to start.

No need has been demonstrated, in any of the testimony, for the bill that is before us. In addition, we have the fact that we had better "mind our knitting" if in Laos, in Vietnam, in the Congo, in Cuba, in Latin America, in East Berlin, in Iran, and elsewhere, the situation is so sensitive and so fraught with danger that the taxpayers of the country will be called upon for larger and larger outlays for our security. There had better be a point at which we cut back, and I can think of no better point in the whole field at which to do so than to reject the bill before us, because it is unnecessary. The case has not been made. We may need the money necessary to implement it for other purposes far more important than those described in the bill.

Mr. President, I could go on and amplify the case, but I see no further point in it. I sincerely hope the Senate will give serious thought to what I have urged.

I add one point in conclusion. If there is any Senator on this floor who thinks $2,500 million is the limit for this bill, oh, what a tragic illusion that will prove to be. The distinguished Presiding Officer who sits in the chair today [Mr. METCALF]—and I am sure he does not mind my referring to him—was the coauthor of a bill called the Murray-Metcalf bill. What did it call for? It went, for that period of years, to $11.4 billion. As I recall, it tailed off at $5 billion a year. So let there be no mistake as to what we are doing today. We are opening the door. Then the millions will flow freely, because how can a political body finally withstand the pressures?

This, I think, is the time to stand up and be counted, in the durable and basic interest of the country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I intend to speak on the bill, but because of the lateness of the hour and the coming joint session, I would like to yield for insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator to make it very brief?

Mr. McGEE. Yes. At what time is the Senate to go to the joint session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Now.

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, without the Senator's losing his right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed in a body to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of hearing a message from the President of the United States.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 316, the Senate, preceded by the Secretary (Felton M. Johnston), the Sergeant at Arms (Joseph C. Duke), the Vice President, and the President pro tempore, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the purpose of attending the joint session to hear the address to be delivered by the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy.

(For the address delivered by the President of the United States, see pp. 8877–8883 of the House proceedings in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The Senate returned to its Chamber at 1 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. METCALF in the chair).

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall be brief. First, I ask unanimous consent that a statement that I made on the floor of the Senate on February 4, 1960, when a comparable bill was before the Senate last year, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall be brief. I had not intended to make any remarks on this measure; I had fully desired and expected to support the bill as it was reported by the committee. I would still be happy to do so.

However, I cannot vote for the bill with the provisions which it now contains. I shall be compelled, reluctantly, therefore, to cast my vote against its passage.

In my judgment, the situation in this country with respect to our schools does justify Federal aid to schools in the construction of the physical plants, the thousands of additional classrooms which are so greatly needed and necessary. Such aid could be given, Mr. President, without destroying the integrity of local government and without surrendering the control of our public school system as it was established and as it has traditionally existed and been operated from its founding. We could give aid to schools in that fashion without placing in jeopardy the operation and management of our schools, without running any risk of the control and government of our school affairs being transmitted from the local jurisdictions that now have authority over our school system to a central power located in the National Capital, because I sense—yes, more, Mr. President, because I am convinced beyond any doubt—that the minute the Federal Government provides aid for the operation and management of schools by making available funds for the payment of teachers' salaries and other administrative expense, immediately the Federal Government puts itself in position, and the local government surrenders to the Federal Government the power to exercise control and domination over the school system.

He who controls the purse strings becomes the master; and we cannot escape it. The Federal Government can aid in the building of a physical plant, and that is over and done with; but it cannot supply the money from year to year for the support, management, and operation without usurping the whole governmental authority and power that is now reposed in the State, county, municipality, and local school district.

That is the direction we are taking. That is why I cannot vote for this bill as now amended by the Monroney proposal.

Somebody has said, "Well, there is a 2-year limitation" on this authorization. There is, but it means absolutely nothing. We all know that teachers are underpaid. There is a responsibility upon us as citizens, and upon the State and local governments, to increase their pay commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. But, Mr. President, this is the wrong way to do it.

When this bill becomes law—if it does—and an appropriation is made to carry out the expenditures it authorizes, local school districts' school boards will immediately make contracts with schoolteachers on the basis of the anticipated revenues to be derived from the Federal Government by reason of this enactment. Should that mean, on the basis of the bill as it now stands, an increase in salaries for schoolteachers of some $300 to $500 a year, it follows that contracts will be made by the local board or Government authority with those teachers for another year, on that basis.

Once that is started, once the process is put in motion, we will not be able to stop it. If 2 years from now we undertake to stop it, the charge will be made that the Federal Government is breaching confidence, breaking faith, and repudiating its solemn and moral obligation. Mr. President, we have heard such charges made on this floor already with respect to the national highway program. It will be contended, again and again, that we have obligated the Federal Government to do it. The States and local school districts will claim they put their faith and trust in the Federal Government; that they were assured this was a national policy and the aid would be continued. They will assert, and truthfully so, that they made their plans and commitments accordingly.

Mr. President, what does that mean? Let no Senator vote for this bill thinking this program will be only temporary. It will not be. It is to become a fixed, continuing national policy. Maybe that is what some Senators want. If Senators want that, then let them vote for it. But let no Senator vote for it with the idea that it is only for a temporary period of 2 years. It will be of indefinite duration. It will be in perpetuity. What does it mean? It means 2 years from now, 3 years from now, 4 years from now, we will have put upon us pressures to make other provisions in the law which are not now in the pending bill. Conditions will be placed in the law that a school district or a State will not be eligible to participate in this program and receive these funds except, unless, and until it meets certain standards and conditions that the amended law will impose or administrative edict will require.

Do not, I say to my southern friends, vote for this measure with any thought that the segregation issue is not involved. We may just as well be frank about it and understand it. It is not openly present here at the moment, but let no one vote for this bill under any illusion or false conception that that issue is being bypassed. It is not. That issue cannot be evaded. We cannot escape it. In due time it will be here to haunt us. Just one simple amendment, Mr. President, to this bill can be made, one sentence added, saying: *"Provided,* That no State or school district that practices or permits segregation of the races in the public schools shall be eligible to receive any of the financial aid herein provided."

That is all that will be needed to compel integration. I am talking now to my colleagues of the South who I know entertain the same views I do. Once the contracts are made by the local school authorities, Mr. President, on the basis of the anticipated Federal aid in support of and to pay the increased salaries to teachers, it will be too late to turn back. We will have gone too far. Our southern schools will not then be able to say, "No." They will have no alternative except to integrate or lose their share of these Federal funds.

No doubt some believe in integration. I have no quarrel with them, if that is what they honestly believe. That is their right. But I entertain a different belief. I believe in local self-government. I believe where the people want integration they should have a right to practice it. But I also believe with an abiding conviction that those who want to segregate have an inherent and constitutional right to do so. I believe the people have a right, as they have had from the very beginning of our Government, to choose the kind of school system they want and are willing to administer and support. I believe those rights should be held inviolate and preserved.

I make this statement because if and when this issue should arise some 2 or 3 years from now, it shall not plague me. I shall not then feel that I invited it by voting for this bill. I shall not obligate myself to accept it under those terms. I shall not, as their representative, commit the people of my State to accept it under those terms. I am not voting on this measure under any mistaken apprehension about the consequences. I know what the consequences will be if this bill should be enacted into law.

Mr. President, it gives me great concern to put this Government of ours further and further in debt. I know some think our national debt of some $300 billion is inconsequential. They scoff at the idea of a balanced budget. But I am disturbed about it. Just as certain as there is the day of judgment, just as surely is there a time of accountability in the fiscal affairs of any government. That time is rapidly approaching for us. We will have to meet it.

I have heard the statement made on the floor during this debate that Americans spend more money for cigarettes than they spend for education, and that they spend more money for liquor than they spend for education. Other similar comparisons have been made, I agree. But, Mr. President, who spends that money? It is the citizens of this country who spend the money, and they are free men and women. If they think more of the pleasure of a cigarette or a cocktail than they do about educating their children, then they will spend their money that way. They are Americans, and they are free. If collectively our citizens so indulge and pursue that course to the neglect of providing ample and necessary educational opportunities and facilities, then a tragic destiny is likely in store for us—and I doubt that any amount or manner of Federal aid will save us from it.

We should spend more on education. I am perfectly willing to do so. I am willing to have the Federal Government help equalize educational opportunities by bearing some of the expense of building the physical plants. It is said, "Well, a plant, a schoolroom, is no good without a teacher." That is true, Mr. President, but if the little school district which needs a new building can get $500,000 from the Federal Government to help pay the cost of construction of the building, the same school district will have released to it for other use the revenues it would have had to obligate and apply for the liquidation of the debt incurred by the construction cost. Those revenues will then be available to raise the salaries of teachers.

Thus the original bill would help increase the salaries of teachers. It should be

passed. I favor it. But, Mr. President, I am not going down the road of surrender and capitulation with regard to the inherrent duty and constitutional right under our system of government of the local school districts and the local people having their public school systems operate in the manner they desire. I am not ready to surrender that for a mess of dubious pottage.

Mr. President, our country is blessed. We are blessed with wealth. We are blessed with abundant resources. We can have the kind and quality of educational system we want. We can have an adequate educational system when we want it and are willing to pay for it. When we are ready to place the value of that system above the value we are placing on some of the other things for which we spend our money then we can have all that we now need and profess to want.

Mr. President, if every time there is a need for something in this country we run to the Federal Government and continue to pyramid the national debt, we can also have a bankrupt Treasury and an insolvent Government. I shudder to think of what will happen to our school system and what will happen to our liberties and to our security if we ever permit that to occur.

I wish I might have the privilege of voting for the bill which was reported by the committee. I am very apprehensive—and I say this for the RECORD—that what is about to occur here in the Senate will mean no school aid at all of any kind. I say this to those who are really interested in the children, who are really interested in education and the building up of a better school system, and the providing of aid which will afford some relief in this present distressing situation.

I am not sure that by the course which is being pursued we are best serving the cause and the purpose desired. I rather think what is being done here will defeat the aid which we would get under the terms of the original bill. I think what is occurring will mean no aid, or aid deferred, and perhaps long deferred.

I should like to see the bill pass in its original form. I should like to have us make that start, which I think would be somewhat substantial, toward relieving existing conditions.

Mr. President, there ought to be a consciousness on the part of the people of the country that if we want education and want the best we have to be willing to pay for it. There are times when we have to make a choice between things which are pleasant and delightful which we might desire, and those which we really need in order to meet the obligations of citizenship which are upon us.

Mr. President, I am not unmindful that political expediency suggests, if not dictates, the propriety of supporting Federal aid for education. I should like to support the right kind of a bill and see it enacted into law, but I shall not be a party to destroying the integrity of State and local government in the affairs and management of our public school system in this country.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On February 4, 1960, as shown by the RECORD, I stated my objections to this type of legislation. Everything I said about the bill at that time, all my reasons for not supporting it then, hold true now. Every reason that I gave then I would state again today in opposition to the pending measure. The situation has not changed since that date with respect to the need for this type of legislation, except that now the need is less than it was a year ago. States and local communities are endeavoring, with success, to meet the school needs of their areas, and Federal aid and assistance of the proposed character are not imperative at all under present conditions.

What I said then applies now: Our public schools will be dominated and controlled by Federal power and authority if we succumb to this proposal to have the Federal Government pay a substantial part of the operating expenses of our public schools. In my opinion if we pass the bill, it will mark the beginning of the end of the public school system, controlled by local authority, as we have known it in the past.

Those who believe in Federal Government control, domination, power and centralized government will enthusiastically support the bill, because it is a step in that direction. I do not subscribe to that kind of government, and therefore I shall oppose it.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, section II of the minority views that appear in the report on the bill, beginning on page 18, and extending down to the first part of page 24 of the minority views filed by members of the committee.

There being no objection, the minority views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF THE BASIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE BILL

1. ARE OUR SCHOOLS INADEQUATELY FINANCED?

The answer to that question is "no." In the past 20 years, enrollment in educational institutions of all kinds and at all levels increased 57 percent while total educational expenditures increased 642 percent. Although prices more than doubled during this period, the increase in educational expenditures of 642 percent would still have been 257 percent if computed in dollars of constant purchasing power, as compared with the 57-percent increase in pupil enrollment, a ratio of almost 5 to 1.[1]

If we look at the share of the national income being spent for education we find a similar upward trend. In 1890, 1.4 percent of the national income was spent on education. In 1913 it was 2.2 percent, in 1930, 3.7 percent, in 1950, 4 percent, in 1956, 5.1 percent, in 1960, 6 percent. Thus the percentage of the national income going to education has multiplied more than four times since 1890 and increased 50 percent between 1950 and 1960.[2] It is also not without significance, that according to UNESCO figures, almost all other countries of the world allocate a smaller percentage of their national income to education, and that the Soviet Union, whose national income is far smaller than ours, spends no greater proportion on education than we do, erroneous assertions to the contrary notwithstanding.

Growth in our total educational expenditures has outdistanced the advance in both business profits and living standards. Thus between 1929 and 1958 expenditures for education grew 580 percent, corporate net profits, 129 percent. As a percentage of national income, corporate profits dropped sharply from 9.4 to 5.2 percent, while the percentage for educational expenditures rose from 3.7 to 6 percent for the same period.[3]

When we turn to the public elementary and secondary schools, attendance at which has been declining in proportion to our population growth, while college and private school attendance has been increasing, we find that the rate of expenditure has gone up more rapidly than the living standards of our people. Over the past 30 years, per capita expenditures for personal consumption have increased 57 percent, while public school expenditures per pupil have risen 166 percent, both ratios being measured identically in constant dollars.[4] And while this development was taking place public school expenditures were far outstripping public school enrollments in the rapidity of their increase. Thus, from 1900 to 1961, enrollment multiplied 2.4 times, whereas school expenditures per pupil, on the average and in constant dollars, have doubled about every 20 years, and the current school expenditures per pupil have multiplied 8.4 times in terms of the same constant dollar, an increase more than 3½ times as great as the increase in enrollment.[5]

When we examine the population projections made by the Bureau of the Census, the evidence indicates that the peak of educational needs in terms of population growth has already been reached, and that this ratio will decline during the next decade. The school-age group (those between 5 and 17 years of age) increased 46 percent between 1950 and 1960. It is estimated that for the next 10-year period (1960 to 1970), this rate of increase will be cut in half, shrinking to about 20 percent.[6]

2. HOW LARGE IS THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE?

The size of the classroom shortage has been a major issue in the continuing debate on Federal aid to education. Figures on classroom shortages issued by the Office of Education show a shortage of 250,000 in 1950, 312,000 in 1953, 370,000 in 1954, 159,000 in 1956, 142,300 in 1957, 141,900 in 1958, 132,400 in the fall of 1959, and 142,100 in the fall of 1960. It we take these figures at face value, they indicate a reduction in the classroom shortage from 370,000 to 142,100 between 1954 and 1960 without the benefit of a Federal-aid program.[7]

There is, however, some doubt about the accuracy of classroom shortage figures. In March 1955 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare testified before a congressional committee that a revision of estimates placed the expected shortage in 1959–60 at 176,000 instead of the 407,000 he had estimated a few months earlier. Actually, the report issued in the fall of 1960 placed the figure at only 142,100. These estimates are usually based on statistics prepared by the school authorities in each State; there are no national standards, and many believe they reflect the subjective attitudes of the compilers rather than any actual classroom situation. For example, two neighboring States with roughly similar classroom situations, and great similarities in other im-

[1] U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56"; "Progress of Public Education in the U.S.A., 1959–60"; releases of Aug. 28, 1959, and Aug. 14, 1960.

[2] Roger A. Freeman, "Financing of the Public Schools, Vol. I: School Needs in the Decade Ahead (1958)," p. 5.

[3] U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56"; "Progress of Public Education in the U.S.A., 1958–59"; U.S. Department of Commerce, Survey of Current Business, July 1959.

[4] "Economic Report of the President," January 1961; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; National Education Association, "Status and Trends, 1959"; "Estimates of School Statistics."

[5] U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56"; National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960–61."

[6] U.S. Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, Series P–25, No. 187.

[7] Various reports, Office of Education.

portant respects—Wisconsin and Minnesota—reported classroom shortages of 3,941 and 310, respectively. The disparity is so great as to raise serious doubts about the objectivity of many of these estimates.

At any rate, a comparison of the inventory contained in the long-range phase of the school facilities survey of 1954 with the autumn 1959 survey shows that in those 5 years enrollment increased 20 percent, number of classrooms 30 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom was reduced by 2½ from 30.6 to 28.1.

President Kennedy in his education message asserted that classroom needs for the coming 10-year period between 1960 and 1970 will be 600,000. This averages out to 60,000 classrooms per year.[8] However, figures released by the Office of Education disclose that between 1956 and 1961, a total of 349,300 classrooms were built for an annual average of 69,860, or almost 10,000 per year more than the yearly average asked for by the President. Assuming these estimates to be reasonably accurate, it is as plain as a pikestaff that to take care of all estimated classroom needs for the next decade it will not be necessary to maintain even the annual volume of school construction that was completed in the average of the past 5 years by the States and localities acting without benefit of a Federal grant-in-aid program.[9]

3. HOW SERIOUS IS THE TEACHER SHORTAGE?

Here again we are confronted with highly suspect statistics. Thus, on August 30, 1959, the Office of Education reported a shortage of 195,000 qualified teachers. But in 1953, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare had estimated that the teacher shortage would be 292,000 by the fall of 1960. These huge disparities between projected estimates and actual future developments are common in the discussions of the issue.[10] They indicate to us that much of the so-called data consists of poetry and propaganda rather than objective research. At any rate, even if we use these dubious statistics, they point only to the conclusion that the so-called need for Federal aid-to-education has been exaggerated by its proponents. As a matter of fact, the 1959 report on teacher shortages was so severely criticized that the Office of Education omitted a reference to the teacher shortage in its regular report in the autumn of 1960.

Actually, the figures seem to indicate that education has made great strides in meeting its manpower needs. Over the past 30 years, the number of employees in all forms of public education, both lower and higher, increased 140 percent while employment in private industry rose by only 45 percent; but enrollment in public education rose at the same rate as the population of the United States as a whole—45 percent.[11]

Our public schools have increased their teaching staff proportionately faster than enrollment and the number of pupils per teacher has been consistently reduced. Since 1900, the number of public school pupils rose 140 percent, the number of teachers 250 percent, and the pupil-teacher ratio was reduced by 11.2, from 35.6 pupils per teacher to 24.4 for 1960–61. Even if we take the figures for the last 7 years alone, the number of pupils increased 29 percent, the number of qualified teachers increased 40 percent and the pupil-teacher ratio declined by 2.4 pupils per teacher (from 28.4 to 26).[12]

At this point we cannot resist a further illustration or two of the unreliability of the figures emanating from some of the most active and articulate proponents of Federal aid to education. Thus, in a release dated August 28, 1958, the Office of Education estimated the number of qualified teachers in 1958–59 at 1,334,800 and the shortage at 132,200. A year later, on August 30, 1959, it reported the number of qualified teachers in the same years (1958–59) to have been 1,400,700 or 65,900 higher than previously estimated. But strangely enough, instead of reducing the shortage correspondingly by 65,900, it increased it retroactively by 49,800—from 132,200 to 182,000. In that very same report (August 30, 1959) in which it raised its estimate of qualified teachers for 1958–59 to 1,400,700, it estimated for the next year, 1959–60, a supply of 1,368,000 qualified teachers, a decline of 32,700. But in the December 1959 issue of its magazine School Life the Office of Education reported that the number of qualified teachers had risen during the same year (between 1958–59 and 1959–60) by 55,200. Thus one report suggests a decline of more than 32,000, another from the same source, an increase of more than 55,000.

When we come to the question of the future supply of teachers the outlook is highly favorable. If the percentage of college students seeking a teaching career merely remains stable over the next decade, the number of newly graduated teachers will almost double. But pupil enrollment will be far less, for as we have pointed out it will be only about 20 percent as compared with 46 percent during the last decade.[13]

Much has been said about the inadequate earnings of the teacher. But these judgments must remain subjective unless they are based on comparisons with earnings of other segments of our population. The figures show that during the past 30 years (1929–59) teachers' salaries have more than kept pace with the other working elements of our population. In that period, teachers' salaries rose by 106 percent as compared to 91 percent for all persons working for wages and salaries and only 73 percent for Federal Government civilian employees. It should also be emphasized that a huge proportion of our public school teachers are women, and all the surveys on the subject have shown that women teachers average higher earnings than other women college graduates or professional workers.[14]

4. CAN STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CONTINUE TO FINANCE THE SCHOOLS?

In December 1959, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducted a telegraphic canvass among chief State school officers, 45 of whom replied. Fifteen of the States reported having districts which, although needing additional classrooms, had reached their borrowing limits and had no access to other funds. There were 237 such districts, most of them small, out of a national total of over 40,000—a showing that only one-half of 1 percent of all the school districts in the Nation legally lacked financial means to build needed schools. Despite the heavy burden of Federal taxation, the States and local communities, as we have shown, have done magnificently in meeting their own school needs. The sales of State and local bonds have been at a high level for the past several years, and the overwhelming majority of them are being approved by the votes of the citizens in the States and localities.[15] If the heavy yoke of Federal taxation were eased, there can be no doubt that the States and local community would not only be able, but would be most willing to increase both their taxes and expenditures for all public services including education.

5. INEQUITIES AND INCONSISTENCIES IN THE COMMITTEE BILL

It is plain that, judged by any of the relevant criteria, which we have set forth above, there is no "crisis in education" and no justification for extending the activities of the Central Government into that area as the committee bill would do. But even apart from the lack of need for legislation of this type, the proposed measure is self-contradictory in important respects, inequitable in its allocation of benefits, and in a number of instances fails to achieve the President's stated objective of giving the greatest aid to those who need it most.

The high-income States who will pay the largest shares of the cost of the program and receive the smallest allocations, which in many instances are considerably smaller than the amounts they pay out, are precisely the States in which most of the increase in school enrollment has taken place. The low-income States who will contribute least to financing the program and receive far larger sums in their allocations have had the smallest growth in pupil enrollment. Thus four-fifths of the increase in school enrollment between 1955 and 1970 has and will occur in States with above-average per capita income; but only 6 percent of the enrollment increase will be in the 12 lowest income States.

We need to illustrate only a few of these inequities. According to the Office of Education's 1960 survey, New York State had a net schoolroom need of about 10,200. Texas needed a net of 809. During the 3-year program under the committee bill, New York State, although paying far more than Texas in financing the program, will receive considerably less in allocation although its classroom needs are 12 times as great. Wyoming, according to this same survey, will have a net shortage of 22 classrooms but will receive the relatively enormous allocation of almost $5½ million. And finally, Indiana, which according to the official Office of Education surveys, needed 1,505 classrooms in 1959 and 1,321 in 1960 and which more than kept abreast by scheduling the completion of 2,000 classrooms in 1959–60 and 2,152 more in 1960–61, will get more than $68 million under the committee bill, although it actually has more classrooms than the surveys indicate that it needs. It should be added that the average teacher salary in Indiana is also $370 above the national average.

Thus, it is plain, that the operation of the bill's allocation formula is unfair. It appears to us to have been concocted simply with an eye to the unjust results which it actually would achieve, and with little or no concern for equity and fairness.

---

[8] Paper presented to American Statistical Association on Dec. 30, 1959, by Louis H. Conger, Educational Statistics Branch, Office of Education.

[9] "Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69," Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Jan. 19, 1961.

[10] National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1959–60," pp. 10 and 11; U.S. Office of Education, release of Aug. 30, 1959, and earlier releases.

[11] U.S. Department of Commerce, "National Income," 1954 edition; "Survey of Current Business," July 1960.

[12] U.S. Office of Education, "Statistical Summary of Education, 1955–56"; National Education Association, "Estimates of School Statistics, 1960–61."

[13] Office of Education, "Projection of Earned Degrees to 1969–70"; "Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69."

[14] Survey of Current Business, July 1960; National Education Association, "Economic Status of Teachers in 1959–60."

[15] U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Historical Summary of Governmental Finances in the United States"; "Governmental Finances in 1959, 1960."

We would like to make this further comment. The loud fanfares which have accompanied the bill are quite misleading. Many have been led to believe that the bill will add substantially to our educational resources. This is utterly inaccurate. The total amount of aid for public schools which it would provide is about 4 percent of what the States and localities will themselves spend on education during the same period even if they do not increase their own efforts by a single penny. And when we compare this additional 4 percent with the 16 percent by which the States and localities have during the past 5 years exceeded the rate of construction of classrooms asked for by the President for the next 10 years, it becomes apparent that the committee bill will add little to improving our school facilities. But there is no doubt that it will do much to further impair the strength of our constitutional State-Federal system.

Those who speak for the administration in behalf of this bill are equally self-contradictory in its support. Thus, during the interrogation of Secretary Ribicoff when he appeared before the Senate subcommittee to support the administration bill, he admitted that the States and localities had made enormous expenditures for education during the past 10 years. But he insisted that that was precisely what caused the problem requiring Federal educational grants to the States for its solution, and indicated that the States and localities couldn't be expected to continue to maintain such efforts. He said:

"Now you have had the fantastic commitments by the States and the local communities in their State and local debt requirements, their expenditures and the increase of taxes. I think that is the reason why we are here now, because of that large increase in the past decade.[36]

He referred to this increase as "indigestible economically" by many of the localities.

But the committee bill, like the administration bill, specifically provides that as a condition of receiving its benefits in full, the States must maintain, at the very least, their present level of school expenditures, and as we read the bill, they are actually required to increase these expenditures.

It necessarily follows therefore that Secretary Ribicoff's implication that the bill would to some degree relieve the States of the needs for continuing to make the enormous educational efforts of the past few years is quite inaccurate. To the contrary it will add to those burdens if they are to secure the full benefits the bill provides.

Again, Secretary Ribicoff was asked the following question:

"Now, Mr. Secretary, if all the States and local communities were able to finance their own educational development, in other words if the problem were not a financial one, but rather an unwillingness on their part to expand or improve their education facilities to the degree you regard as necessary, would you still favor a program of Federal aid to education?"

The Secretary replied:

"Personally, if I thought that every community and every State could do their own I would not".[37]

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have stated my reasons. My action is not necessarily popular politically. I know that. I knew that last year when I took the position I assumed at that time. But we have listened to a rather stirring appeal in a message from the President of the United States, alerting and acquainting us with world conditions, the problems that we face, and the crisis that has engulfed us. I say there are responsibilities inherent in the bill which belong primarily to the States, and if we are to fight a totalitarian system, let us make our system of State sovereignty work.

The action proposed would tend to tear down our system. In my opinion, the enactment of the bill would do it great damage and irreparable harm.

I conclude by saying that it is time for all of us, in the face of world conditions today, to rise above temporary or immediate political considerations or advantage and try to vote on problems as important as the one before us, in the interest of the security and welfare of our country and the preservation of the liberties of our people.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senate has before it a bill calling for a program of massive Federal aid to local elementary and secondary education, in which it is proposed that the Federal Government undertake great new responsibilities in an area of our citizens' lives which has traditionally been reserved to the States and local communities. It is on this subject of Federal aid to education that I would like to speak at this time.

I have always taken the position that our education system should be strengthened wherever possible, and as a taxpayer I have been perfectly willing to pay whatever taxes are necessary to support our school system. However, I feel very strongly that public education is something that must continue to be financed and directed by the State and local communities.

There is not a Member of this body who does not agree on the desirability of an improved education system. We are all aware of the tremendous strides that have been made in science in recent years and the vastly growing need for more scientists and engineers. I am sure that we would agree, also, that too many of our youngsters leave school these days without having obtained a good knowledge of such basic subjects as reading, spelling, composition, arithmetic, history, and literature.

There are shortcomings in American education today; that is granted by virtually everyone who has concerned himself with this subject at all. And I am equally certain that the vast majority of our citizens not only recognize that we are not perfect in elementary and secondary education, but agree with the need to move forward and make vitally needed improvements in those areas which are found lacking.

The answer that we hear for these problems, however, has an all too familiar ring about it. It is that we should simply begin another new massive Federal program, pour billions of dollars somewhere, and another problem will be solved. The argument has much appeal to it, but unfortunately the majority of its appeal is purely emotional, not logical.

President Kennedy, in outlining his program for Federal aid to education, used such telling arguments as these:

> The quality of the students depends in large measure on both the quality and the relative quantity of teachers and facilities. * * * Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. * * * The human mind is our fundamental resource.

And so on. Who among us can quarrel with such glowing rhetoric? Every one of those statements by the President is, of course, true. Certainly we want, we need, and I am certain that we shall have, the very best in education for our children.

But where in those high sounding phrases is the basis for the conclusion that is drawn from them? If the quality of our students does in fact depend—as of course it does—on the quality and relative quantity of teachers and facilities, how does one arrive at the conclusion that this requires a massive Federal aid program?

If in fact our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education—which no one disputes—how can we conclude from that that the only way to attain such a desirable goal is to have the Federal Government do it?

If it is true that the human mind is our fundamental resource, surely this cannot be considered a new discovery. If such is true now, then it has always been true, and it would seem that that fundamental resource has been developed reasonably well up until now without the assistance of the Federal Government.

In his message on education, President Kennedy had this to say:

> Our progress in education over the last generation has been substantial. We are educating a greater proportion of our youth to a higher degree of competency than any other country on earth. One-fourth of our total population is enrolled in our schools and colleges. This year $26 billion will be spent on education alone.

After hearing such a statement from the President of the United States, one would logically think that the States and local communities have, in fact, done a pretty good job, and on the basis of what the President has told us there would clearly be no reason at all for the Federal Government to involve itself in this area in which such fine progress is being made.

But strangely enough, that is not the conclusion that is drawn by the President. He has told us, in effect, that since the States and local communities have done such a good job we must now have the Federal Government expand its already overexpanded field of activity and offer aid to the States.

However, nowhere in all of this confused welter of rhetoric and high-flown phrases is there a single hint of how money from the Federal Treasury will

[36] Public School Assistance Act of 1961, hearings before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, 87th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 159–160.

[37] Ibid, p. 159.

accomplish the new standard of excellence in education.

Some years ago we were being told that the Federal Government simply had to enter the field of elementary and secondary education financing because the States and local communities were not doing enough. There was a huge shortage of classrooms; we did not have enough teachers; teachers were underpaid; and besides the States and local districts did not have enough money—nor could they get it—to correct these shortcomings.

Well, despite the perennial bait of financial assistance from the Federal Government, which would be along at any moment to save us, the people went right ahead and did the job themselves. Testimony before the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this year shows that in the past 20 years, while enrollment in our schools increased 56 percent, expenditures rose 642 percent. Our people have spent an ever increasing proportion of the national income for education, despite constantly reiterated statements that it cannot be done.

We are told that there is a serious shortage of classrooms and that, naturally, it will take a massive program of Federal money to solve that problem.

In his message on education, the President told the Congress that a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years. That was the figure used, too, by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, when he testified before the Education Subcommittee in March. But neither President Kennedy nor Secretary Ribicoff told the Senate how fast we are currently building classrooms. They did not tell the Senate that the States and local communities—without a huge program of Federal aid—are now constructing classrooms at a rate of nearly 70,000 per year, or in excess of the stated need.

Secretary Ribicoff's Office of Education states that we have a current shortage of 142,160 classrooms, but he also states that during the 1960–61 school year 69,553 instruction rooms are scheduled for completion and that during 1959–60 school year a total of 69,400 instruction rooms were completed. At this rate, at the end of the 10-year period we will have 100,000 more classrooms than even recommended by the President. Is it not proper to ask, then, where the emergency is here?

The second major argument in favor of a Federal aid-to-education program concerns both the quantity of teachers and the salaries that they are paid.

But again, let us find out what the progress has been without any Federal aid-to-education program.

The National Education Association, long a proponent of massive Federal intervention in the public school area, states in its publication, Estimates of School Statistics, 1960–61, that the public school instructional staff has increased by 39 percent since the 1953–54 school year, while pupil enrollment has gone up only 29 percent. And while the number of teachers who are teaching without full certificates has increased in absolute numbers during that 7-year period, the percentage increase of 19 percent is markedly below the increase of the overall instructional staff.

The result of this improvement—all without Federal aid—is that the number of pupils for each certified teacher has been reduced from 28.4 in 1953–54 to 26 in 1960–61, a decrease of 2.4 pupils per teacher.

Again, it would seem that the progress being made at the local level is admirable and should not only be allowed to continue, but should be encouraged.

There is another aspect of this teacher-pupil ratio that should be considered, and that is the prospect for the future. The Office of Education indicates that there were 378,000 earned college degrees in 1958–59 and estimates 703,000 for the school year 1968–69, or an expected increase of 82 percent in that 10-year period. At the same time, it is expected that the rate of increase in school enrollment will decline, now that the great bulk of the huge postwar population increase has gone through the schools.

Mr. Roger Freeman, research associate at the Institute for Studies in Federalism, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., whose intensive studies in the field of education clearly mark him as an expert, told the Senate Education Subcommittee that during the 1950's, the increase in enrollment was 46 percent and in the 1960's, the increase will be only 20 percent. He goes on to say that in the years between 1965 and 1969, the average required increase will be 25,000 teachers, less than half as many as required in the past 5 years.

As I mentioned earlier, we all agree that too many of our teachers may be underpaid, but should we rush headlong into a great new program in which the Federal Government begins to take over the responsibility of paying teachers' salaries?

It would seem that while many teachers are still not receiving as much money as many people feel that they should receive, certainly their rate of increase, particularly in more recent years, has been commendable. It has been accomplished without Federal aid to education, and there is every reason to believe that it would continue in the same direction.

We have heard, too, that the Federal Government must undertake to finance the schools because there are some school districts somewhere which are no longer able to bear the burden. We are being asked to aim a shotgun at a target which, if it actually exists, requires not a broadside, but a pinpoint.

That the States and local communities have done an excellent job in financing elementary and secondary education should by now be evident from the foregoing facts. But perhaps it would be well to pull this all together and see what has been done in total since the beginning of World War II—without Federal aid to education.

Figures released by the Office of Education show that there has been the enormous increase of 642 percent in expenditures for all public and nonpublic schools at all levels between 1940 and 1960. Think of it. An increase in expenditures of 642 percent while enrollment climbed only 57 percent. Can any fair-minded observer call that a lack of effort or of ability? We hear that we are not devoting enough of the national income to education. Maybe not. But education certainly has been consuming an increasing proportion of the national income since the turn of the century. Back in 1890, only 1.4 percent of the national income went for education. By 1960 the figure had more than quadrupled—we are now devoting 6 percent of our national income to education. And even that figure of 6 percent represents a 50-percent increase since 1950, which is the decade during which the greatest and most prolonged cries for Federal aid were heard.

It may next be asked if it is true that certain school districts have reached the point where they can no longer support their school systems adequately. About the only information we have on that score is the hurry-up canvass by telegraph made by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in December 1959. That report showed that of more than 40,000 school districts in the Nation, only 237—about one-half of 1 percent of the total—claimed they were in a position where they had no funds and could borrow no more.

A consideration of a State's ability to provide for its own education needs must be explored on at least two other fronts. First of all, is it true that the local communities are failing to provide for their schools? Figures prepared by the Investment Bankers Association of America and supplied to the Education Subcommittee would not bear out that contention. Those figures show that in 1960, 81.4 percent of the value of bond issues placed before the voters of this country were approved at the polls; local citizens last year voted to bond themselves for an additional $1,762,821,000; sales of elementary and secondary school bonds totaled $2,183,870,000 in 1960, an increase of 13 percent over 1959. In addition, sales of such bonds in January 1961, totaled over $305 million, the largest amount of school bonds ever sold in a single month.

Surely these actions cannot be construed as a lack of interest on the part of local citizens. The story is pretty much the same over the past 5 years. With the exception of 1956, each year since that time has seen sales of State and local bonds for all purposes top the $7-billion mark, clearly no indication of an unwillingness on the part of the taxpayers to foot the bill for improvements they consider worthy.

As I pointed out earlier, the proposals for Federal aid to education that are before us carry no distinction between those school districts which may honestly need help and those which obviously do not. If Federal assistance to education in certain areas were being advanced on the premise that those areas of our country, after making every effort possible to support their education systems, were still

unable to uphold our national standards, I would be willing to support Federal assistance in those specific areas. But certainly that is a far cry from any Federal aid to education proposal which has ever been advanced to the Congress or from the one presently pending.

Under the present bill, Federal assistance is granted to every school district in the United States. And that brings me to my second point on which this question of financial need and effort needs to be explored. Many of the States which will receive generous sums under the proposed bill have the ability to do more for their education system than they are presently doing.

For example: the State of Texas, which certainly has some citizens who are financially able to contribute toward the support of their schools, has no individual income tax, no tax on corporations operating in that State, and no general sales tax. Yet Texas, which thus far is not taxing its own citizens, would, under the committee's proposal, receive $58,063,833 per year and in turn would pay into the Federal Treasury only $36,805,000 as its contribution through Federal taxes. In addition, Texas collected $182 million last year in severance tax on oil. This tax in turn is passed on to all gas and oil consumers in the United States. Surely Texas can afford to support its own education system. It should be noted also that Texas has a per capita State gross debt of only $33.94.

On the other hand, our own State of Delaware has the highest per capita gross State debt of any State in the Union—$463.35 per person. Much of this debt represents our endeavor to support our own education system, and, in addition, in Delaware we levy an individual income tax on our citizens, an inheritance tax, and a tax on corporations doing business in the State. Yet under this bill, Delaware would get the second lowest per pupil allotment of any State, or a total of only $1,239,501 per year against which we would pay into the Federal Treasury under the same bill $5,100,000. The extra money which we would be paying into the Treasury would go to support the education systems of Texas and many other States which have thus far been unwilling to levy individual and corporate taxes on their citizens to support their own schools.

As further evidence of the disparity of this bill, I mention the case of the State of Florida. Florida under the committee bill would get an annual payment of $21,923,016. However, the citizens of the State of Florida would pay in through Federal income taxes toward the financing of this bill only $17,508,333. Yet Florida is a State which does not have any State income tax, nor do they have any State inheritance taxes, nor do their corporations pay income taxes.

I fully recognize that it is the business of Texas and Florida alone as to whether or not they impose individual income taxes or corporation taxes. However, it becomes the business of Delaware citizens when those other States, through failure to finance their own education systems, ask other States to help them. As if this were not enough, Florida is circulating attractive booklets to all the residents of the northern States urging that those citizens renounce their citizenship in Delaware, Pennsylvania, et cetera, and establish residence in the great State of Florida, where they will be free from income and inheritance taxes.

As we lose our wealthy citizens, those left must pick up the additional tax load and now, through Federal aid to education are being asked to tax further our remaining citizens to finance the education systems in States which are offering these attractions to our citizens and manufacturing plants.

To point out just how far this Federal aid to education goes in the redistribution of the tax money of the American people, I call attention to the fact that our own neighboring State of Pennsylvania, which surely cannot be classified as one of the poorer States, would, under the committee bill, be getting $16.56 per pupil during the next 3-year period, as compared to $10.59 per Delaware pupil. The State of Pennsylvania is another State which does not have any individual income taxes.

Again I ask why should we levy a further tax upon the citizens of the State of Delaware to finance the education system in Pennsylvania? We are already paying a high rate of State income taxes, a high rate of corporation taxes, and have the highest per capita gross debt of any State in the Union. Yet there are those who want us to burden further the citizens of Delaware with taxes to support the education systems of all these other States.

I wish to touch on one more aspect of this whole matter, Mr. President, and that concerns a point which has perhaps caused as much reluctance to enact such a program before this time as any other single factor. I am referring to the question of Federal control of our schools.

Much has been said on both sides of this question, which in itself demonstrates how deeply the fear of a centralized control of public schools dwells in the minds of the people of this country.

I fully recognize that those who endorse this program of Federal aid to education are trying in the proposed bills to eliminate any element of Federal control. However, the historical record has been that, in every instance in which there has been an element of Federal aid through grants, there has been an element of Federal control. In a test case in 1942, the Supreme Court ruled that not only did Congress have the right to control that which it subsidizes, but that it had a responsibility to exercise control over all expenditures it underwrote.

No stronger argument against a program such as this has been given than that given by the late Senator Robert A. Taft when he said:

> Our schools are one of the few remaining bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise. They should remain so.

Mr. Taft further stated:

> We cannot give Federal aid to education without the Government controlling education.

Former President Eisenhower, on October 16, 1948, said he was opposed to Federal aid to education:

> So long as there is one single iota of Federal control coming with it * * * and * * * the Federal Government has no right to take tax out of our pockets and then give it back to us without some form of supervision.

A study of the history of many of the dictatorships shows that they expanded their power over the people by first taking control of the education systems. In Germany under Hitler, this worked to the extent that in some instances the children under the doctrines being taught by the state at times turned against their own parents.

Mussolini used the control of the youth as the background of his dictatorship, and in Russia today the children are being taught what the government dictates.

Again, I emphasize that I do not question the motives of this administration or any preceding administration which has endorsed Federal aid to education, but we never know when, at some future date, we may have in the White House a man who would exercise such controls.

I realize that this bill has in it a section which specifically states that there shall be no Federal control over the administration or operation of any school or school system. But who among us is so naive as to believe that an increasing degree of Federal controls will not follow the adoption of such a program?

The fact of the matter is that there are already built-in controls in the bill now before us.

Mr. Roger Freeman, whose testimony before the Senate Education Subcommittee is something that every American who is interested in the future of public education in this country should read, supplied the subcommittee with some interesting and very revealing statements on this question of a national system of education, which would have its beginnings in the passage of this bill.

Mr. Freeman said:

> John A. Hannah, president of Michigan State University, in a speech before the National War College, presented the case for national direction of education on the premise that education must be a primary instrument of national policy.
>
> Harold W. Stoke, president of Queens College, declared that "this is not Federal aid to education; it is the Federal creation of education. * * * Here is no Federal aid to education, here is Federal education for purposes distinctly national. * * *"
>
> Lester S. Vanderwert, dean of the College of Education, Northeastern University, demanded "that the myth of popular control of school programs should be exploded." Presenting a bill of particulars against the locally controlled system, he proposed that national guidelines be developed and control be placed in the hands of professional educators. State boards of education should be retained, but composed of classroom teachers who would have to work closely with a national board.

Van Cleve Morris, of the School of Education, Rutgers University, blamed educational shortcomings on "our historical love affair with what might be called grassroots-ism in American education."

He suggested "a gradual weakening of local autonomy over the school and a gradual emergence of control mechanisms that are not so socially and politically proximate to the educational worker * * * we should hope in the years to come to erect new agencies of control which would oversee the work of the educational profession at a little greater distance than is now the case."

There are more such statements, but these should be sufficient to indicate the trend of thinking of many of our leading educators. Make no mistake about it, they consider this legislation as merely the beginning.

We should perhaps stop before acting on this bill and ask ourselves very seriously whether we are now prepared to make our State governments merely administrative offices of the Federal Government. It is long past time when we should ask what we believe to be the rightful future role of our 50 States. And we may as well be honest with ourselves, for in passing this legislation we would have taken one more great step in the direction of the dissolution of our States as the political entities that we know them to be today.

We are told by the proponents of this legislation that the educational fabric of our Nation needs strengthening. I agree that it does. But, Mr. President, the educational fabric of our country is not only made up of new classrooms, fancy buildings, and higher teachers' salaries, desirable though they may be. These things in and of themselves do not guarantee the education of a child.

It seems to me that the greatest need in our education system today is a strong, burning curiosity on the part of our children. More than anything else, they need to have instilled in them the desire to learn, to seek out for themselves, and to acquire knowledge.

This entire concept of massive infusions of Federal aid is in itself symptomatic of the state of our thinking. How are our children ever to acquire the curiosity essential to increased learning if they are constantly being told that there is no reason for them to do anything? How do they become inventive, from where do they acquire traits of self-reliance and imagination if they are taught to look to Washington for the solution to all their problems?

How can we expect our children to grow up to be intelligent, thinking, reliable adults when we constantly drill into their minds the fallacious doctrine that for anything to be done right it must be done by the Federal Government?

It seems clear to me that the solutions that are proposed to somewhat imaginary problems and the manner in which such action is justified are in themselves the keys to the cause of the problem which is said to exist. So long as we hear pleas for more and more Federal intervention into purely local matters, so long as we continue to move Government further and further from the people of this country, just so long will our educational fabric and individual incentive continue to deteriorate.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, the objectives of S. 1021, as set forth in the Declaration of Purpose, are noble. Certainly, needed school facilities should be constructed and additional teachers that may be needed should be hired. These teachers should be paid adequate salaries.

I am in full accord with those who seek to improve the quality of our educational system. I do not understand, however, why a Federal aid program is necessary to achieve these goals.

We have been told that the States are unable to build the classrooms that will be required in the next decade. We are told that the States are faced with financial difficulties which will make it impossible to hire additional teachers and pay them adequate salaries. Finally, it is suggested—and I quote from the committee report:

That it is essential to the general welfare and security of the United States that the Federal Government promptly undertake to provide an increased share of the national resources for our school systems.

To sum it up, we are asked to believe that the public education system of the United States is faltering—that unless the Federal Government intervenes, we will be faced with an educational depression.

I do not accept these pessimistic predictions. On the contrary, I choose to evaluate the ability of the States on the basis of the available data on past performance.

I will admit that the statistics relating to classroom and teacher shortages are open to question. Yet we must have some basis upon which to justify this program. I shall accept the figures offered by the U.S. Office of Education.

In 1953, the Commissioner of Education reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. A year later this estimate rose to 370,000 with predictions that further increases in the classroom shortage were expected. While these statistics were being compiled, the States managed to construct classrooms at an average rate of almost 70,000 per year, thus exceeding the goal set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By the fall of 1960, the classroom shortage had been reduced to 142,100.

In order to offset this magnificent record, proponents of this bill contend that the States cannot continue to finance the educational needs of the 1960's and therefore Federal aid is essential. Once again, the record reveals otherwise as the taxpayers of America continue to approve school bonds to improve educational facilities. But, even if we accept this contention, this bill offers no relief. In order to receive its full entitlement, each State must maintain a minimum effort based on the average State effort over the three preceding fiscal years.

This simply means that the States must maintain their present level of progress. I believe they will meet their educational needs without the coercion of the Federal Government and notwithstanding the pessimism of those who support this bill.

In staffing our public schools, the States have also proven their ability to proceed without Federal Aid. Since 1900, public school enrollment increased by 140 percent while the number of teachers rose by 250 percent. We now have one teacher per 24.4 pupils whereas in 1900 one teacher served 35.6 pupils. At the same time teachers' salaries have more than kept pace with those of other wage earners. Again, the record fails to justify Federal intervention.

In praising the States for their efforts in meeting the educational needs of the Nation, I take special pride in the progress made in my own State of Maryland. Since 1950, the number of pupils in Maryland public schools has increased by 70 percent while the number of teachers increased by 90 percent. During this same period, teachers' salaries have been increased by 63.8 percent. Maryland's average salary of classroom teachers is now $5,680 per year. Maryland thus ranks 11th in the Nation in the payment of teachers. We are spending $415 per pupil in average daily attendance. This is above the national average and represents an increase of 86.9 percent during the past 10 years.

It has not been easy for Maryland to meet these educational needs. It will not be easy for us to meet future needs. But we are prepared to meet them—that is, if the Federal Government will hold the line and not require Maryland taxpayers to finance a national program which will cost $1 for every 75 cents received from Washington.

I have no illusions that this bill will be defeated nor that it will be improved by the adoption of worthy amendments. Nevertheless, I deem it to be the duty of those who oppose S. 1021 to point out the shortcomings of this bill and support amendments to improve the bill. It has been implied, during the debate, that opponents of the bill should not offer amendments if they are not prepared to support the final product. I sincerely hope that the time will never arrive when any Senator must forfeit his right to amend pending legislation merely because he intends to oppose final passage of the legislation.

Accepting the fact that this bill will pass, I wish to comment on some of the more glaring inequities and shortcomings of S. 1021.

Returning to the declaration of purpose, we find it to be the intent of Congress that "inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced." This bill endorses a principle of equal opportunity in education while permitting Federal funds to be used to support segregated schools—an activity clearly in violation of the Constitution.

An amendment to prohibit such use of Federal funds was rejected by the proponents of S. 1021 on the grounds that it was not germane to this bill and that it would jeopardize the benefits which would accrue to the little boys and girls

of America. I would remind the proponents of this bill that there are thousands of Negro boys and girls who are entitled to equal educational opportunities. It is about time that we stop treating the Negro as a problem unrelated to the issues which affect the American people. It is about time that we lay aside the cloak of expediency and give something more than lipservice to those principles which we claim to endorse.

I sincerely believe that government should not do for the people that which the people can do for themselves. I believe that government which is closest to the people is best. For these reasons, I am opposed to shifting the responsibility for educating our youth from the local school districts to the States or the Federal Government.

None of us are so naive as to believe that the program we initiate today will end after the expiration of 3 years. On the contrary, this is just the beginning. As the program progresses, it will be necessary to set additional standards and controls. Ultimately, the Federal Government will assume the responsibility for educating our youth. If I may engage in the game of foretelling the future, I predict that it will not be long before we are asked to approve the establishment of a Department of Education.

I oppose this shift of responsibility. I do not share the lack of faith and trust of those who contend that the parents of America will not demand and provide the best possible education for their children.

Finally, I would address myself to titles II and III of S. 1021, which extend Public Laws 815 and 874. If we are to talk about germaneness, then I submit that these titles have no place in this bill. The impacted areas legislation was not enacted to improve the educational standards of this Nation. Rather, the purpose of these laws is to compensate the States for land taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government. If not for these Federal activities, this land would represent a lucrative source of revenue far in excess of the payments now being received. I support the continuation of these programs. However, I shall not trade my vote on this issue, important as it may be, for the acceptance of a Federal aid program which I know to be unjustified and inherently wrong.

Federal aid to education is not a new concept. It has come before the Congress periodically since 1871. Each time voices of pessimism warned of the collapse of our educational system. Each time these warnings were proved to be wrong as the States met current needs with positive action. I am confident that the needs of the future will be met by the States with equal determination.

CASTRO'S CIVILIAN PRISONERS

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, last night there occurred a colloquy on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself about the anti-Castro fighters for whom a private U.S. committee is negotiating to free. During the colloquy I suggested that perhaps in addition to taking whatever action was advisable on the military prisoners, in line with a humanitarian viewpoint we ought to give some thought to the 150,000 political prisoners who now languish in Cuban jails.

It seemed to me at that time, as we were discussing the subject on the floor of the Senate, that whatever action was taken by a private group, more intelligent and effective action could be taken by either a committee of the United Nations or a committee of the Organization of American States or by the International Red Cross or by any other group or mechanism which could help free some of the larger group of people who are being held as political prisoners in the prisons of Cuba.

I read from a New York Times editorial of today, May 25, entitled "Castro's Civilian Prisoners." I will read only a section of the editorial. It is vitally important:

> While international efforts are being made for the release of over 1,200 military prisoners in Cuba, the world must not forget the civilians incarcerated by Premier Fidel Castro's regime.
>
> Newsmen have estimated that 200,000 men and women were rounded up after the unsuccessful landing in April.

Think of that, Mr. President. If the news report is true, 200,000 men and women were rounded up.

> Exiles talk of 5,000 persons penned in a 150-seat theater in Havana, 19 dying the first day. Relatives in many cases have been unable to learn whether vanished kin are in custody. Only slowly have any of those confined in the latest roundup been winning release. Other political prisoners are reported to have been held without trial for months. Summary executions have been rumored.
>
> There was a time when Fidel Castro was himself a rebel against the Fulgencio Batista government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the colloquy which occurred on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Florida and myself.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I do not have the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have the floor; and I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy may continue, but that time required for it be not charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this is a very important subject. I know the able Senator from Florida has studied it very carefully. Will he inform us as nearly as he is able to, based on what he has been able to learn from the press and in other ways, how many prisoners are being held in Cuba, today, by Castro?

Mr. SMATHERS. Over and above the so-called freedom fighters?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes, the 1,200.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over and above the 1,271, my information is—although I cannot vouch for its authenticity—that in the neighborhood of 100,000 people are being held.

Mr. CARROLL. A few days ago I read in the newspapers that the estimated number was 147,000. However, whether it be 100,000 or 50,000——

Mr. SMATHERS. The information is that on the night of the revolution, Castro picked up 147,000 or 157,000. Since then, approximately 50,000 have been released; but 100,000 are still incarcerated in theaters and in pens of all kinds, under the most terrible conditions imaginable.

Mr. CARROLL. In order to be conservative, let us say that the number still held by Castro is only 50,000. But regardless of the exact number of prisoners Castro still holds, certainly the negotiations are most important, for they involve thousands of people. So if the Government of the United States has to negotiate on this basis, let the negotiations be across the board.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not disagree with the Senator. I merely say I do not think the Government, itself, is in a position to become involved in this particular matter. The whole burden of what I was trying to say is that citizens' groups do a much more effective job. I understand the Government has taken no particular position with respect to this question, and I hope that will continue to be the case; but I agree that we ought to try to have every prisoner in Cuba released, and, for that matter, anywhere else. There are three boys in Ecuador who need to be released.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator not say that, if we are to negotiate for 1,271 prisoners, we should talk about all the people who are now in prisons, whether it be done by private groups, or by a commission of the Government, or by the U.S. Government?

Mr. SMATHERS. I could not disagree with the Senator. Certainly, we want to see that all people who are incarcerated wrongly are freed. Certainly, there are some in Cuba. Certainly, if we are to try to free 1,200, we ought to try to free more. Certainly, we should try to free Cuba. Certainly, we should try to get rid of communism there.

Mr. CARROLL. Emphasis has been placed on some 1,200 people. Some persons call it a ransom, some call it backmail, to exchange machines for men. What about the thousands who languish in the jails of Cuba? It seems to me, they also represent a proper basis for negotiation.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial which appeared in the New York Times may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTRO'S CIVILIAN PRISONERS

While international efforts are being made for the release or over 1,200 military prisoners in Cuba, the world must not forget the civilians incarcerated by Premier Fidel Castro's regime.

Newsmen have estimated that 200,000 men and women were rounded up after the unsuccessful landing in April. Exiles talk of 5,000 persons penned in a 150-seat theater in Havana, 19 dying the first day. Relatives in many cases have been unable to learn whether vanished kin are in custody. Only slowly have any of those confined in the latest roundup been winning release. Other political prisoners are reported to have been

held without trial for months. Summary executions have been rumored.

There was a time when Fidel Castro was himself a rebel against the Fulgencio Batista government.

Then Dr. Castro was declaring in a broadcast of August 21, 1958: "The victories we have won in arms, without murdering, torturing, or even questioning the enemy, show that attacking human dignity can never be justified."

Then he was arguing: "If in any war cruelty is stupid, it never is so much so as in a civil war, where the fighters will have to live together some day and the victors will find themselves before the children, wives, and mothers of the victims."

Then he was insisting: "The example that our combatants are giving must be held up as an edifying stimulus for our future generations, as against the shameful and depressing examples given by the murderers and torturers of the dictatorship."

In those rebel days, Fidel Castro was calling for the International Committee of the Red Cross to take over prisoners and to provide medicines. He was proud that on July 24, 1958, his rebels had released 253 captured Batista troops to an International Red Cross delegate, and 169 more to the Cuban Red Cross a few days later.

This would be the time once again to invoke the International Red Cross—or an inter-American governmental committee or a United Nations mission—to alleviate conditions of detainees, to report lists to families, to press for respect for the universal declaration of human rights.

Article 9 of that declaration states: "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile." Article 10 says: "Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

This should be a cause for the United States and the governments of the Western Hemisphere, in particular, as well as for those governments that sought so ardently for human rights for the late Premier Patrice Lumumba of the Congo. If Dr. Castro should see fit to regard the International Red Cross in the same humanitarian light as he did his own revolt, it would be an advance for human rights—and for Cuba.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to read again briefly from the editorial. After outlining three or four important factors, it states:

This would be the time once again to invoke the international Red Cross—or an inter-American governmental committee or a United Nations mission—to alleviate conditions of detainees, to report lists to families, to press for respect for the universal declaration of human rights.

Article 9 of the declaration states: "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile." Article 10 says: "Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

I do not profess to be an expert in these matters, but it seems to me that the purport of the editorial and the discussion we had the other night is nothing more than the application of commonsense. The President said that he looks upon these men as brothers. Are the 150,000 people who languish in jails anything less than our brothers and sisters?

Therefore, when we talk about this private group functioning, I say let them go ahead. Let them exchange tractors. However, I advocate we take an additional step, but not by private groups. I advocate that through the Organization of American States or through the United Nations or through an international organization like the Red Cross, an immediate, continuing and unrelenting effort be made to free the 150,000 civilian prisoners who languish in jails in Cuba. Let us hear an answer from Castro on this to the people of Latin America. Let him attempt to answer it to the peoples of the world.

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish at this time to make only two comments on the President's message. The first is to remark on the extraordinary range of subjects which he discussed. There is scarcely an aspect of our national security that did not receive attention in the course of his address; yet no one could say that his remarks were disparate or unrelated to a sense of the totality of the struggle that faces us.

I can recall few speeches in the past decades that have more clearly and forcefully demonstrated the complexity of the issues before us, or the interdependence of our foreign and domestic responsibilities.

My second comment is that the President showed throughout his address his profound sense of optimism that we can expect to meet the great changes before us. I share his optimism, and I honor him for his faith in Congress and in the American people. He has presented us the picture as he sees it, and he has laid before us a program by which we can act responsibly, as befits a leader of the Western World.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this is a proud and hopeful moment for those who have supported education legislation in the past decade. On occasion, during this period, it has appeared that Congress might agree on a bill to assist American public schools in their struggle to provide a first-class education for our rapidly expanding school-age population; but a variety of obstacles, including the threat of a Presidential veto, has prevented its enactment.

No doubt, difficulties are still in the way and much work needs to be done before the bill can be sent to the White House. But for the first time the prospects of accomplishment are bright. There is broad and vigorous support for the bill in both Houses, and the President of the United States has long since identified an aid-to-education bill as a vital part of his program for America.

I think it is appropriate for me now to commend the work of those who have brought the bill to fruition in the Senate. Few matters come before this body which arouse as many controversies, both general and particular, as does an aid-to-education bill.

Feelings run deep, as indeed they should, when the Senate deals with so fundamental a part of the national life. It is therefore necessary that the leadership and floor management of the bill be in the hands of Senators who have examined every aspect of Federal aid to education, who are familiar with alternative proposals, and who can articulate the committee's position fairly and thoroughly. I believe every Senator, whether he supports or opposes the bill, can agree that such leadership was offered by the able Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] during the debate on S. 1021.

In fact, it is my opinion that the management of the bill by the senior Senator from Oregon was among the most effective, enlightened, and fair in recent Senate history. He was indefatigable; he was obliging; and he gave us a standard of sheer competence that is in the highest traditions of Senate debate. We have long known the Senator from Oregon as an astute and resourceful advocate for humane causes, but his performance in leading the fight for an aid-to-education bill, both in his subcommittee and on the Senate floor, set a new mark of excellence. I take this opportunity to express my very deep gratitude and admiration for him.

Of course, he did not do the job alone; he had with him, on his subcommittee, a group of able and dedicated Senators who devoted long hours to the disposition of this infinitely complicated matter. He had the great chairman of the full committee, an unwavering friend of American education, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], all of them veterans of the long campaign to shore up our elementary and secondary schools, all of them willing and able to undertake the challenge once again.

They were ably aided by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], all of whom did their full share in bringing this proposal through the committee and the Senate.

I desire to commend, as well, the minority members of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. The Senator from Arizona, although he profoundly disagreed with the philosophy behind S. 1021, was never an obstructionist during its consideration.

Also, great credit for their understanding should go to the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the distinguished junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], both of whom made great contributions to the progress of the bill.

I wish to interject a personal note in these commendations, Mr. President. It is a source of profound satisfaction to me that I am associated with LEE METCALF in representing the State of Montana.

I do not believe there is an abler or more diligent Member of the Senate. I know there is no one who has given more of himself to the passage of an education bill. His counsel and friendship have been invaluable to me.

Finally, Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the excellent staff work that has been evident throughout this debate—particularly to John Forsythe and Charles Lee of the committee staff, to Benjamin Read of Senator CLARK's staff, to Michael Bernstein and Roy Hurley of the minority staff, and to the HEW consultants who have been unfailingly helpful to the committee and the Senate.

Again I extend my thanks and appreciation not only to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon and the members of his subcommittee and the full committee, but also to all Senators who participated in the debate. They were cooperative. They did what they could, in spite of their personal feelings, to bring about the passage of the bill. It is because of this collective action and collective understanding that shortly the Senate will be able to vote on its passage.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I associate myself with the majority leader's words of commendation concerning those who were associated with the consideration of the bill, and in particular with his tribute to the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his able management of a most difficult bill, and the adroit, skillful, and patient way in which he guided it to the point where it is now ready for passage.

I desire to express my support of S. 1021 with particular reference to the alleged risk of Federal control. To me, the most significant and practical indicator respecting the likelihood of Federal control is the history of the operation in my own State of Public Laws 815 and 874, providing assistance for public school operating expenses and construction in federally impacted areas.

Nevada has had Federal assistance to individual school districts for 11 years. More than $12 million of Federal funds have been administered to districts in the State under these programs, more than half of this amount being used for teachers' salaries and the rest for operating expenses.

I have been unable to find a single instance over this period of Federal domination, interference, or control, a fear voiced by some Senators during the debate on the bill. This is true in spite of the fact that under the federally impacted area programs the Office of Education deals directly with local school districts. I have spoken particularly with those in authority in the school systems of my State relative to the effects of the bill on their operations.

It seems to me important to recognize that under the program proposed in S. 1021, the Federal grants would be made to State education agencies and by them to local school districts. There will be no direct dealings by the Federal Government with local school districts, under the bill.

However, under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, the federally impacted areas laws, there have been no problems arise in my State of Nevada—nor in any other State so far as I have been informed, insofar as improper Federal domination, dictation, or unwarranted control.

Public Laws 815 and 874 both contain provisions similar to that of section 103 of the present bill, prohibiting the exercise of any Federal direction over local personnel, curriculum, or programs of instruction in the administration of the grants authorized. I see no provision or circumstance in connection with the present bill which would make this injunction any less effective in the proposed general public school support program than it has been in the program for school assistance to federally affected school districts over the past 11 years.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall give the bill my support, and trust that Congress will adopt it. However, I shall watch closely its administration should final enactment be carried out, to assure that Federal domination and control will not infringe on the time-honored prerogative of sovereign States over local control of personnel, curriculum, or programs of instruction.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise in support of the School Assistance Act of 1961, S. 1021, the Federal aid to education legislation, as approved in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee by a vote of 12 to 2, and now under final consideration here in the Senate. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the measure, and to be present in the Senate when this important bill will be overwhelmingly approved by the Senate.

There is widespread agreement among all Americans on the vital need to provide the very best possible education for our young people. In my own travels around Minnesota and throughout the Nation, I have heard again and again about the financial troubles of school systems which are simply unable to cope with the demands of their communities for topnotch education at the primary school and secondary school levels.

Yesterday I cited for the record one of the reasons why I favored the proposed legislation. My statement appears on page 8710 of the RECORD. I had read an article published in the Washington Post concerning 10 straight A, high school students who were graduating with honors. Of the 10, only 1 signified a willingness or a desire to be a teacher. The remainder gave as their reasons for not selecting the teaching profession the inadequate income of that profession.

The President's message today on the space program surely emphasizes the importance of this legislation. We cannot have a program of expanded activity in the scientific field of outer space exploration without improving the basic structure of our elementary school and secondary school education. It is ridiculous to talk about spending billions of dollars for space research unless we are able to provide from our society the scientists and the technicians that such research requires.

Mr. President, we have also heard a great deal about sacrifice. I call attention to some figures which will show whether we are sacrificing for education.

Mr. President, in the period 1959–60, the most recent period for which we have complete statistics, the total spending in our country on both public and private elementary schools and secondary schools was $18,315 million. It is estimated that in 1960–61 that total will be approximately $20 billion.

In 1959–60—the most recent period for which we have complete figures of this sort—the total expenditures on alcohol, tobacco, cosmetics, and movies came to $20,600 million. Thus, it now is evident that we spent $2,285 million more for alcohol, cosmetics, tobacco, and motion pictures than we spent on all public, private, and parochial schools in our country. So, Mr. President, let no one tell me that under those conditions we are sacrificing for education.

To be exact, we spent $9,600 million on alcohol, $7 billion on tobacco, and $2,700 million on cosmetics—$9,600 million on alcohol, in an attempt to make us feel better than we really do; $7 billion on tobacco, in an attempt to tranquilize our nerves; and $2,700 million on cosmetics, in an effort to look better.

I suggest that a little improvement of the mind might be in order, in addition to the expenditures made for the items to which I have just now referred.

LOCAL EFFORTS FOR SCHOOLS

Our States and local school districts have made valiant efforts to improve the education available to America's young people.

Our States and local school districts have struggled valiantly to raise the money needed to build better schools, to expand existing schools, and to raise teachers' salaries to levels in keeping with their professional work and their responsibilities.

But already many of these States and local communities have exhausted the limited revenue available to them for support of their schools. The taxing power of these communities is generally limited to the property tax.

Unfortunately, revenue from the property tax fails to rise as rapidly as a community's population and income rise. Furthermore, the property tax is regressive. The burden of this tax is greater on low- and middle-income families than it is on their wealthier neighbor.

At present, approximately 56 percent of all funds for education come from local communities, about 40 percent comes from the States, and only 4 percent comes from the Federal Government.

I should also like to point out that Federal tax revenues have increased 85 percent since 1945, but State and local tax revenues have risen more than 220 percent.

LOCAL DEBT RISES

From 1946 to 1959, the Federal debt rose only 6 percent, while the indebtedness of the States and local communities rose 300 percent.

These figures make it only too clear that our States and local school districts have tried hard to keep up with the growing demands put upon them since the end of World War II. They have often gotten themselves into serious financial trouble in order to meet the educational needs of America's children. Many school districts are at their bonded debt limit. They cannot borrow money to build classrooms or to improve their existing facilities, and their income is limited by the rigid property tax base.

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID NEEDED

The Federal Government has a far more flexible and equitable tax base in personal and corporate income. Therefore, Federal aid to education will help shift the financing of education to a more reasonable and equitable basis.

It will relate school financing more closely to a basic principle of our tax system, the principle that the tax burden should be distributed, so far as possible, in accordance with the ability to pay taxes.

In view of the superior tax resources of the Federal Government, there is no question that Federal aid is the best source for the money needed to help in ending our long-continued school crisis of overcrowded classrooms and underpaid teachers.

Our democracy depends on the existence of a well educated, well informed citizenry; and we would need better educated citizens—better trained teachers, scientists, engineers, artists, businessmen, skilled workers, and civic leaders—even if our democratic way of life were not threatened by aggressive communism.

To produce citizens mentally equipped to meet the social and technological challenges of the space age, we need outstanding, well-paid teachers and well-equipped classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and health facilities in every school community throughout our country.

OVERCROWDED CLASSROOMS

At the beginning of the current school year, more than 36 million children were enrolled in America's public elementary and secondary schools with a combined classroom teaching staff of some 1,400,000 teachers.

But almost 2 million of these children are trying to get their education in schools and classrooms crowded beyond normal capacity. In spite of continuing classroom construction financed at the local level, we are still short more than 140,000 classrooms.

And the shortage of qualified teachers will continue until there is a decent beginning salary and reasonable expectation for better salaries for all schoolteachers. A 1958 survey showed the average salary for engineers was $9,647, but the average salary for teachers was only $4,827. After 10 years, the engineer is getting 67 percent more than his starting salary, but the teacher, after 10 years, is getting only 49 percent more than his starting salary.

TEACHERS SUBSIDIZE SCHOOLS

I do not know how we expect to recruit men and women for the teaching profession if this situation continues. Certainly it is unfair to compel America's dedicated, hard-working schoolteachers to subsidize our educational system by consistently paying them less than they deserve and could easily get in another line of work.

As a cosponsor of S. 1021, I endorse enthusiastically this revised version. It has been carefully worked out after public hearings and most detailed study in the committee.

OUTLINE OF THE BILL

Let me outline briefly the main features of this bill.

Federal grants totaling $850 million a year are authorized for payments to the States. The States could then use these funds to help build public school facilities, to help pay teachers' salaries, and for special demonstration or experimental education projects approved by the State education agencies.

The allotment of Federal funds among the States follows an equalization formula based on the relative number of children aged 5 to 17 and on relative income per school-age child. This is basically the same formula approved by the Senate last year when we passed a similar Federal aid-to-education program

The bill is designed to make sure that State and local support for public school financing will be maintained by providing for a reduction in the second and third year of the allotment for any State which fails to keep up its school support effort.

PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Unlike the original version of S. 1021, the present version wisely provides for a 3-year extension of Public Laws 815 and 874, the existing programs of Federal aid to education in federally impacted school districts overburdened by children of military personnel or defense workers.

However, the Commissioner of Education is directed to prepare a report for Congress by January 1, 1963, on the relation between payments under title I of this measure and payments under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874.

The aid to impacted school districts program has been an outstanding success during the past 10 years, and the revised version of S. 1021 very properly continues this program pending a determination of its role within the general program of Federal aid to education. Since the beginning of this program in 1950, Congress has appropriated $1,825 million, almost $2 billion, through fiscal 1961, and this money has been spent wisely and well for construction and maintenance in crowded schools near defense plants or military posts.

I have always had a deep interest in the program of Federal aid to impacted school districts, for it was my privilege to sponsor this legislation in the Senate and to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on School Construction during the 81st Congress. The contribution to school construction and maintenance under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 has been most gratifying to me.

MINNESOTA BENEFITS

Assuming appropriation of the full amount authorized, Minnesota would get $18,395,829 for fiscal 1962—an average of $20.67 per school age child, or about $2 more than the national average of $18.54 per school age child.

FEDERAL CONTROL PROHIBITED

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to comment on the provision in this legislation which specifically prohibits Federal control. Here is the language in section 103:

> In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

There has not been the slightest hint of Federal control over the school districts which have participated in the aid to impacted areas program, and I am confident that we shall find that the same situation will prevail under the program authorized by the pending legislation.

The program we have before us in the pending legislation is long overdue and is far from overgenerous.

Let us hope this effort at the national level will evoke enthusiasm and action at the State and local level to expand teaching facilities, to raise teachers' salaries, and generally to upgrade the quality of American elementary and high school education.

Finally, Mr. President, let me repeat that, in my opinion, this program can and will be administered without any Federal interference. Throughout the debate we have cited Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 as classic examples of what can be done without interference.

In addition, I desire to commend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] for his outstanding leadership and management in connection with this bill.

I also wish to commend each and every member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and permit me also to commend, in particular, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who is now our Presiding Officer, just as I certainly wish to commend, also, in all sincerity, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader, who has done so much to put this bill through the Senate.

The efforts of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the efforts of the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the efforts of the subcommittee and the majority leader, are all worthy of our highest commendation.

ACTIVITIES IN THE SOUTHERN STATES

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. I must ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to excuse me, for I have two speeches to make. Thereafter, I shall be glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi declines to yield at this time.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the agent provocateurs who have descended upon the Southern States in the name of "peace riders" were sent for the sole purpose of stirring up discord, strife, and violence. "Peace riders" is a revered Communist term, an old Communist technique. The movement was masterminded and directed by an organization known as the Congress of Racial Equality, called CORE. This organization is the war department of those who sell hate, collect donations, and sow the seeds of discord in this country. Since its inception, its creed has been lawlessness and its tactics have followed the pattern set by Communist agitators the world over.

Prior to the sit-in demonstrations that started in the Southern States in 1960, CORE confined its activities to cities in the North and border States, and received little public notice. With the advent of the lawless sit-in, it moved in and took over the direction of the whole movement. Steve Allen signed a recent fund raising letter given wide circulation by CORE; and in it he said, in part:

> How did the sit-ins, first tried by CORE in 1942 and used every year since, suddenly become southwide? How do the students think of their movement? To give you a personal, first-hand understanding I am enclosing a copy of "Sit-ins: the Students Report," with a foreword by Lillian Smith and six student articles from representative movements across the South.

In my judgment, one of its objectives is to manufacture incidents, and thus raise money, from the dupes, for the international Communist conspiracy.

The booklet attached to the letter contains the maudlin stories of the student trespassers that were trained by CORE, and were arrested in various cities in the South when they violated the law by trespassing on private property. As Allen points out, the foreword of the pamphlet is written by Lillian Smith, the leading white Southern integrationist, a member of the advisory committee of CORE, and the author of the most abominable book written in the 20th century, the miscegenation novel "Strange Fruit." Lillian Smith has also been associated with numerous organizations and activities cited as being Communist or Communist fronts.

I submit that when a person belongs to a large number of Communist-front organizations that follow the policies of the international Communist conspiracy, that person is aiding and abetting the Communist movement in the world—a movement which, if not halted, will result in a blood bath in our own country, because the United States will fight, if necessary, in order to prevent Communist domination of our country.

The "freedom ride" planned by CORE, and commenced in Washington on May 4, was the master effort of this organization. I have been informed that it was devised deliberately as a prelude to various high-level meetings in Europe, as a propaganda method to embarrass the Government of the United States in the handling of international affairs. Certainly those participating in the ride have been guilty of such practices of embarrassment, many times in the past.

Long before the bus reached Alabama, certain members thereon were involved in instances of violence. The Washington Evening Star of Monday, May 15, 1961, reports that at Rock Hill, S.C., two men were beaten, and that one of them was Albert Bigelow, 55, the former Navy captain who ran afoul of the law when he attempted to sail a ketch into the Pacific Ocean Lucifer Testing Area, in 1958, to protest the nuclear bomb test. The same news story reports that a day later, at Winnsboro, S.C., one Thomas, a Howard University student, and James Peck, 47, of New York City, were charged with trespassing when they attempted to eat at a roadside restaurant. Strange as it may seem, this selfsame Peck was also aboard the ketch in the Pacific Ocean when it ran afoul of the law attempting to sail into the nuclear testing area in 1958. Peck was the first "hero" of the "freedom ride." He came back from Birmingham parading the bandages and stitches received in the altercation that took place at the bus station.

It must be admitted that this is the closest that Peck ever came to "warfare" of any kind. According to a recent news story in the New York Herald Tribune, in World War II, when Peck was called up in the draft, he declared himself a conscientious objector. Unlike most conscientious objectors at that time, he would not become a medic, nor would he agree to take part in other noncombat activities connected with the military. As a result, he spent 3 years in the Federal prison at Danbury, Conn. He first became associated with the Congress of Racial Equality in 1946.

The Herald Tribune's story reports that in 1949 Peck chained himself to a railing in the White House and staged a sitdown strike, which was ended by Secret Service agents.

Peck was arrested in Nevada in 1957, along with others, for trying to force their way through the gate of an Atomic Energy Commission proving ground, allegedly in the cause of pacifism.

The next year Peck was again under arrest, this time as a member of the crew of the ketch previously mentioned in the nuclear testing area of the Pacific.

There are strong indications that Peck was associated with the Committee for Nonviolent Action, which conducted demonstrations against the Polaris building shipyards of the Electric Boat Co. in Groton, Conn.

Mr. President, do I have to say more to show that this man, the leader of CORE, is disloyal to his country? Well, I am going to give more.

Back on August 31, 1947, Peck was arrested at Cliffside Park, N.J., and charged with disorderly conduct. In July and August of that year he was active in demonstrations charging racial discrimination at Palisades Park and Cliffside Park, N.J.

The Communist paper Peoples' World of July 23, 1960, reports that a certain Jim Peck was scheduled to lead a 2-day conference of opponents of the death penalty in the Chessman case.

While the current letterheads of CORE do not carry the name of James Peck, reference to those used in 1956 indicate that his title was "editor" of a publication called Corelator, which was the official publication of this organization.

Mr. President, in my judgment, this man is a Communist agitator and organizer of the most dangerous kind.

CORE could not rely on "student trainees" for the master "freedom ride." Its core were its own agent provocateurs with the longest possible record of experience in activities inimical to the security and welfare of the United States.

Mr. President, it is incredible that the American people can be humbugged and deceived by an organization such as this.

I have another letter mailed by CORE on February 16, 1956. It describes what I mentioned at the outset in regard to CORE's original activities in northern and border cities in this language. It reads:

> In the cities where CORE has operated, advances toward integration have occurred. In recent years, the border cities, St. Louis and Baltimore, have seen dramatic CORE victories. The method works. When I first joined CORE's advisory committee years ago, I could not have foretold that the ratio of success to failure would be so high.

This letter is signed by one A. J. Muste, who is still active on the advisory committee of CORE. Who is A. J. Muste?

In 1957 A. J. Muste got up a delegation for the purpose of observing the procedures of the Communist Party's 16th National Convention on February 9 to 12. J. Edgar Hoover said:

> The Communists boasted of having impartial observers cover the convention. However, most of these so-called impartial observers were handpicked before the convention started and were reportedly headed by A. J. Muste, who has long fronted for Communists. * * * Muste's report on the convention was biased, as could be expected.

Those are the words of the great Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. Who wants further proof of the Communist origin of this group that wants to plant discord in this country on the very eve of international conferences which mean so much to the welfare of future generations of Americans?

Muste has been connected or associated with no less than 32 Communist-front organizations or activities. A more complete story of his relation to

banning nuclear weapons tests and his activities in relationship to the Communist conspiracy will be found in material which I shall ask to have printed in the RECORD. If the American people had to depend on pacifists like Peck and Muste for the defense and security of this country, there would be no country—only a Russian satellite.

Mr. President, in further examining the individuals who make up the advisory committee of the "War Department for Racial Agitation," we find a close interrelationship to the NAACP. Allen Knight Chalmers, longtime national treasurer and member of the board of directors of the NAACP, is on the advisory committee of CORE. A report of the House Un-American Activities Committee on Chalmers' connections with organizations or activities connected with the Communist conspiracy is included, and I ask unanimous consent that several inserts bearing on this subject may be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Dr. Algernon D. Black, longtime member of the national board of directors of the NAACP, is also a member of the advisory committee of CORE. Dr. Black's record, as revealed by the House Un-American Activities Committee, is replete with connections in organizations and activities connected with the Communist conspiracy. The long record of Dr. Algernon D. Black, is revealed by the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this record be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, Earl B. Dickerson, onetime national vice president and a member of the national legal committee of the NAACP, is also listed as a member of the advisory committee of CORE. The long record of Earl Dickerson's affiliation with Communists or Communist-front activities is available from official sources. I ask unanimous consent that this record be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, A. Phillip Randolph, longtime vice president of the NAACP, is also a member of the advisory committee of CORE. Randolph's record, as revealed by the records of the House Un-American Activities Committee, is also available from official records. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. EASTLAND. This list, Mr. President, is sufficient to illustrate the nature of the interlocking directorate and that the interlockers have also been connected with many organizations and groups other than CORE and the Communist movement.

Mr. President, it is interesting to compare the advisory committee of CORE as it existed in 1956 and its makeup in 1960 and 1961. As long as CORE was confining its activities to northern and border cities, it is a fair inference that certain classes of agitators were indifferent to its operation. When it moved into the South, Martin Luther King and Ralph Abernathy, the two preachers who have been in the forefront in agitating violence against the white people, joined hands with the masterminds of CORE in organizing the freedom riders and became members of CORE's advisory committee. One might say that Martin Luther King took over where CORE left off—or has CORE left off? At least King attempts to claim credit for the organization of parties for the subsequent buses.

Martin Luther King and Abernathy are one of a kind with the so-called Reverend Elton Cox, one of the original freedom riders. He is the person who, when arriving in New Orleans, called for "marry-ins—racial intermarriage—because love is colorblind anyway." Mr. President, no language on earth is more intended to incite and foment violence in Southern areas, or in any area, than is this.

James Peck held a press conference at the office of Charles S. Zimmerman, vice president of the International Ladies' Garment Workers Union, 218 West 40th Street, when he returned from Birmingham. Also present at that press conference was Henry Thomas, the 19-year-old Negro boy who was arrested with Peck at Winnsboro, S.C., charged with trespassing when they attempted to eat at a roadside restaurant. Charles S. Zimmerman is a member of the advisory committee of CORE. The record of Charles Zimmerman's association with Communist-front activities will appear at a later point in my remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the record be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, since CORE has started directing its operations into the southern areas of the United States, other leaders in organized labor have joined the directorate of CORE. Foremost among these is Walter P. Reuther. Reuther has spent years trying to obtain respectability since those days in 1934 when he and his brother worked in an industrial plant in Russia. The words that they transmitted back to the United States in a letter which appeared in the August 14, 1948, issue of the Saturday Evening Post are well worth repeating today. The letter ended with the statement:

Carry on the fight for a Soviet America.

Mr. President, that is what CORE is doing today. It is carrying on the fight for a Soviet America.

The portions of the letter as appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 2, 1955, will be attached at the end of my remarks, along with a report of the House Un-American Activities Committee in regard to Reuther's association and affiliations with Communist or Communist-front activities in the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the letter and the report be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 6.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, other members of the advisory committee of CORE who have been listed at one time or another as being connected with front organizations of various kinds and character are: Roger N. Baldwin, Lillian Smith, Ronald B. Gittelsohn, Ira DeA. Reid, and Goodwin Watson.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the record of their association with Communist-front activities be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 7.)

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, is any further proof necessary to establish that the "freedom riders" have been sent into the South with the deliberate intent of fomenting and provoking violations of the laws of the States which they intended to visit and did visit? If these be pacifists, it is a tragic commentary on our times that the Governors of Alabama and Mississippi have to call out the 31st National Guard Division, members of which have been in the forefront in sacrificing their lives in the valiant defense of this country in Korea, in World War II and in World War I, to defend—and protect—these self-proclaimed pacifists from violence. No area on the face of the earth has more demonstrated its ability to maintain peace and domestic tranquillity than the Southern States of our country. In spite of outside agitation, the harmonious relationship, the mutual affection that today exists there between the white and colored races is more marked than it is in any other area on the face of this earth where the black and white races live together.

Mr. President, the day has come when these agent provocateurs must be stopped.

The day has come, Mr. President, when the Communist movement must be stopped, and this is part of the Communist movement inside the United States.

Mr. President, I salute the Governor and the officials of my State for the

prompt, efficient, and peaceful treatment that they extended to these riders who entered the State of Mississippi for the deliberate purpose of violating the laws of Mississippi and fomenting strife and discord.

I salute the people of Mississippi for their courage, their intelligence, and their patience. This is the first time they have come face to face with the worldwide Communist conspiracy. They have acted well.

I ask unanimous consent that certain documents bearing on the Communist record of people to whom I have referred be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 8.)

EXHIBIT 1

ALLAN KNIGHT CHALMERS

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Allan Knight Chalmers, national treasurer, member of the board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In connection with his public testimony on August 17 and 18, 1937, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, Mr. Walter S. Steele furnished additional information which was printed in the hearings following his testimony and from which the reference below is taken:

"A good example of one of the united fronts in the United States is the Scottsboro Defense Committee * * *. The national chairman of this committee is the Reverend Allan Knight Chalmers, head of the Church League for Industrial Democracy; member of the advisory board of the National Religion and Labor Foundation; executive committee of the War Registers League; sponsor of the Emergency Peace Campaign, and a member of the sponsoring committee for the testimonial dinner given in honor of Norman Thomas in 1936." (Public hearings, vol. 1, p. 626.)

Except for the Scottsboro Defense Committee, none of these organizations has been cited in any manner either by the Committee on Un-American Activities or the Attorney General of the United States. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Scottsboro Defense Committee as a Communist-front organization in reports of January 3, 1939 (p. 82), and March 29, 1944 (p. 177).

Rev. Allan Knight Chalmers was listed among the sponsors of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights in the program of that conference held February 12, 1940. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (report of March 29, 1944, pp. 96, 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities cited it as being among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law" (report of September 2, 1947, p. 3).

A leaflet entitled "Protestantism Answers Hate" contains the name of Dr. Allan Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle, New York, in a list of sponsors of the call to a dinner forum in New York City, February 25, 1941, under auspices of Protestant Digest Associates. The Protestant Digest was cited by the special committee as "a magazine which has faithfully propagated the Communist Party line * * *." (Rept. 1311 of March 29, 1944.)

EXHIBIT 2

ALGERNON D. BLACK

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Dr. Algernon D. Black, national board of directors, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

Dr. Algernon D. Black was one of the sponsors of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace, arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, March 25–27, 1949 (conference program, p. 12, and conference call). The Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 2), announced that he was a member of the program committee of that conference. Speaking of peace, edited report of the conference, March 25, 26, 27, 1949, listed Algernon Black as a speaker on "A Warning Against Sectarian Prejudice," and gave biographical data concerning him (pp. 121, 139).

In 1948 and 1949, Dr. Black signed statements of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions (Daily Worker, Dec. 29, 1948, p. 2; letterhead received in January 1949; New York Star of Jan. 4, 1949, p. 9, an advertisement). He spoke before the group in February 1949 (Daily Worker, Feb. 28, 1949, p. 2).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions and held in New York City on March 25, 26, and 27, 1949. April 26, 1950, cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the Committee on Un-American Activities cited the scientific and cultural conference as actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations.

The call to a national conference on American policy in China and the Far East, held in January 1948, included the name of Dr. Algernon Black in the list of sponsors (Call, January 23–25, 1948, New York City); the conference was called by the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy. In the December 1949–January 1950 issue of Far East Spotlight, which is the official organ of the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy, Dr. Black answered a questionnaire issued by that committee, favoring recognition of the Chinese Communist government.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy as a Communist organization in a letter furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

The Daily Worker of June 21, 1948, reported that Algernon D. Black had signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, calling for a conference with the Soviet Union; he signed an appeal of the same organization to the United States Government to end the cold war and arrange a conference with the Soviet Union (leaflet entitled "End the Cold War—Get Together for Peace" which was dated December 1948); he signed a statement in praise of Henry Wallace's open letter to Stalin (May 1948), as shown in the pamphlet How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace (p. 9), prepared and released by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian."

Dr. Black contributed an article to the pamphlet We Hold These Truths (p. 22), which was issued by the League of American Writers. He was named as a member of the executive committee of Film Audiences for Democracy in the June 1939 issue of Film Survey, official organ of Film Audiences, cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (Rept. 1311, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 150).

The Attorney General cited the League of American Writers as subversive and Communist in letters furnished the Loyalty Review Board and released to the press by the U.S. Civil Service Commission June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as "founded under Communist auspices in 1935 * * * in 1939 * * * began openly to follow the Communist Party line as dictated by the foreign policy of the Soviet Union." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7685 and 7686.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its reports of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), June 25, 1942 (p. 19), and March 29, 1944 (p. 48), cited the League of American Writers as a Communist front organization.

A letterhead of the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Congressman Vito Marcantonio, dated October 3, 1936, listed the name of Algernon D. Black as a member of that committee. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 122), cited the nonpartisan committee for the reelection of Vito Marcantonio as a Communist-front organization.

Algernon Black was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "Presenting the American Student Union." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated January 3, 1939 (p. 80), cited the American Student Union as a Communist-front organization.

A letterhead of the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York, dated May 11, 1946, listed the name of Algernon Black as one of the public sponsors of that organization. The Attorney General cited the Veterans Against Discrimination of Civil Rights Congress of New York as subversive in a letter released December 4, 1947; included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Mr. Black signed an open letter of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the booklet 600 Prominent Americans (p. 16). The Attorney General cited the National Federation as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948;

redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the organization previously as "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 50), cited the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties as "one of the viciously subversive organizations of the Communist Party." The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the National Federation as among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

The printed program of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights, February 12, 1940, reveals the name of Algernon D. Black as vice chairman of the group. A letterhead of the American Russian Institute, received July 26, 1949, contains the name of Dr. Black as a member of the interchurch committee of that institute. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 96 and 129), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights as a Communist front organization. The Attorney General cited the American Russian Institute as a Communist organization in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

Dr. Black was a member of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy (letterheads dated March 13, 1931, and February 21, 1938); and described as a representative individual in a booklet entitled "These Americans Say" which was published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as a Communist front organization. The Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

In a pamphlet entitled "News You Don't Get" (dated November 15, 1958), Algernon Black was named as one of those who signed the call to a Conference on Pan-American Democracy; a letterhead of the organization dated November 16, 1938, named him as one of the sponsors of the Conference. The Attorney General cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the Conference on Pan-American Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

Algernon Black signed a declaration of the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee honoring Dimitrov, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943 (p. 40). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 112 and 156), cited the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Dr. Black signed an open letter in defense of Harry Bridges. (See Daily Worker of July 19, 1942, p. 4.) Letterheads of the Citizens Victory Committee for Harry Bridges dated June 8, 1943, and January 10, 1944, listed Algernon Black as a committee member or sponsor of that group. The open letter in defense of Harry Bridges was cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 87, 112, 129, 166). The Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 90 and 94), cited the Citizens' Committee for Harry Bridges as a Communist-front organization.

The Daily Worker of March 29, 1951 (p. 9), reported that Dr. Algernon D. Black signed a letter of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born attacking the McCarran Act. Algernon D. Black was shown as a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born in the Daily Worker, April 4, 1951 (p. 8), a leaflet: "Call—Mass Meeting and Conference," October 27, 1951, Dearborn, Mich., and a photostatic copy of an undated letterhead of the 20th anniversary national conference * * *, U. E. Hall, Chicago, Ill. (December 8-9, 1951). The Daily Worker of August 10, 1950 (p. 5), reported that Dr. Algernon Black signed a statement of the American Committee against denaturalization.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letter released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

On June 13, 1949, the Daily Worker reported that Dr. Black was one of the sponsors of an organization formed to oppose the Mundt-Nixon anti-Communist bill; a press release of the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, dated June 15, 1949, revealed the same information. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee to Defeat the Mundt Bill, dated January 2, 1951, cited that organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

A letterhead of the Voice of Freedom Committee dated June 16, 1947, listed Algernon D. Black as a sponsor of that organization. An invitation to a dinner held under auspices of the group, January 21, 1948, listed him as a member of the dinner committee. He signed a petition of the organization as shown by a leaflet published by the Voice of Freedom Committee. The Attorney General included the Voice of Freedom Committee on his April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated.

Algernon D. Black, New York Ethical Culture Society, signed an open letter of the Conference on Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact to Senators and Congressmen urging defeat of President Truman's arms program, as shown by a letterhead dated August 21, 1949.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951 (p. 56), cited the Conference for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact as a meeting called by the Daily Worker in July 1949, to be held in Washington, D.C., and as having been instigated by Communists in the United States (who) did their part in the Moscow campaign.

The Daily Worker of December 10, 1952 (p. 4), listed Dr. Algernon D. Black as a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act.

EXHIBIT 3

EARL B. DICKERSON

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: Earl B. Dickerson, national board of directors, national legal committee, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

According to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1949 (p. 9), Earl Dickerson, attorney, Illinois, was one of the signers of a statement defending the 12 Communist leaders. He signed a statement in behalf of the attorneys in the Communist cases as shown by the July 31, 1950, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 9). This same information was shown in the February 1, 1960, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 3). As shown by the Daily People's World of May 12, 1950 (p. 12), Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a statement to the United Nations in behalf of the Communist cases.

Earl B. Dickerson protested approval of the Smith Act by the Supreme Court as "having a disastrous impact upon * * * struggle of Negro people" (Daily Worker, October 1, 1951, p. 1). He filed a petition with the clerk of the U.S. Supreme Court supporting the pending application for a hearing on the constitutionality of the Smith Act as shown by the Daily Worker, October 4, 1951 (p. 15). Mr. Dickerson was identified in this source as a Negro attorney in Illinois. He spoke against the Smith Act according to the February 12, 1952, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3), and was coauthor of a memorandum to the Supreme Court "on the menace of the Smith Act to the Negro people" (Daily People's World, July 15, 1952, p. 1). Earl B. Dickerson, president, National Lawyers Guild, Chicago, was a signer of an appeal to President Truman requesting amnesty for leaders of the Communist Party convicted under the Smith Act (Daily Worker, December 10, 1952, p. 4). As shown by the Daily Worker, December 29, 1953 (p. 8) and the Worker, January 3, 1954 (p. 6), Earl B. Dickerson was one of 39 prominent Midwest citizens staging a plea for Christmas amnesty for Communist leaders convicted under the Smith Act, which was wired to President Eisenhower. He was one of the initiators of an appeal for reduced bail for Claude Lightfoot, Illinois Communist leader, indicted under a section of the Smith Act, as shown by the September 12, 1954, issue of the Worker (p. 16).

According to the December 25, 1952, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 8), Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of an open letter to President Truman asking clemency for the Rosenbergs. The Daily People's World of March 13, 1953 (p. 3), reported that Earl B. Dickerson contributed a statement to the pamphlet, The Negro People Speak Out on the Rosenbergs, distributed by volunteers for the East Bay Committee To Save the Rosenbergs, Oakland, Calif.

Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of an appeal to the Greek Government protesting the court-martial of Greek maritime unionists as shown by the Daily Worker, August 19, 1952 (p. 1).

Earl B. Dickerson was listed in the spring 1943 (p. 22) and fall session 1943 (p. 27) catalogs of the Abraham Lincoln School as a member of the board of directors. He was named in the same source as a guest lecturer at the school (p. 19).

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Abraham Lincoln School as an adjunct of the Communist Party in a letter to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947. The Attorney General redesignated the school April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the Abraham Lincoln School as successor of the Workers School as a Communist educational medium in Chicago.

A pamphlet entitled "For a New Africa" (containing the proceedings of the conference on Africa, New York, April 14, 1944) names Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Negro Congress.

The National Negro Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes."

He was a member of the Council on African Affairs, as shown in a pamphlet entitled "8 Million Demand Freedom," and the pamphlet For a New Africa (p. 36). Earl B. Dickerson is listed as a member of the Council on African Affairs in a leaflet, issued by the organization, The Job To Be Done, a leaflet entitled "What of Africa's Place in Tomorrow's World?" a pamphlet entitled "Seeing Is Believing" (1947), and a letterhead of the group, dated May 17, 1945, and a pamphlet, Africa in the War.

The Attorney General cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

The name of Earl Dickerson, of 35 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill., appears on a 1939 membership list of the National Lawyers' Guild on file with this committee. In 1949 he was president of the Chicago chapter of the guild and chairman at a meeting on anti-Communist legislation, as shown in the Daily Worker of March 15, 1949 (p. 6); in the same year he attacked the Marshall plan as shown in the Daily Worker of July 19, 1949 (p. 5), in which source he was identified as president of the Chicago chapter of the guild; he participated in a discussion entitled "Status of Civil Liberties," fifth annual convention, National Lawyers' Guild, Book-Cadillac Hotel, Detroit, Mich., May 29–June 1, 1941, as shown by the convention program printed in Convention News, May 1941 (p. 2), published by the guild. This same Convention News (pp. 3 and 4) listed him as a member of the convention nominations committee of the fifth national convention of the National Lawyers' Guild. He submitted a report of the guild, denouncing lynching and discrimination, as shown in the Daily Worker, November 30, 1942 (p. 1). As shown by the October 15, 1951, issue of the Daily Worker (p. 1), Earl B. Dickerson was president of the Chicago chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild; he spoke at the national convention of the organization in Chicago. The October 18, 1951, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson was elected president of the National Lawyers' Guild. He was shown as president of the National Lawyers' Guild in the Daily Worker, January 25, 1952 (p. 1), and February 20, 1953 (p. 6), and the Daily People's World, January 25, 1952 (p. 8). The January 18, 1952, issue of the Daily People's World (p. 3) reported that Earl B. Dickerson was to speak on the Smith Act, the Constitution, and You, at a gathering of the San Francisco chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild on February 1, 1952. The Daily Worker of February 24, 1953 (p. 6), reported that Earl Dickerson, president on the National Lawyers' Guild, addressed the annual convention of the group held February 20–23, at the Park-Sheraton Hotel, New York City, and stated that "a new foreign policy is needed if the drive against liberties is to be halted." The Daily People's World of July 6, 1953 (p. 3), announced that he was to be honored by the Los Angeles-Hollywood chapter of the National Lawyers' Guild at a luncheon. The Daily Worker of August 28, 1953 (p. 2), reported that Earl B. Dickerson, president of the National Lawyers' Guild, issued a statement opposing the American Bar Association's call for disbarment of Communist lawyers. As shown by the September 6, 1953, issue of the Worker (p. 6), Earl Dickerson protested the placing of the National Lawyers' Guild on the list of subversive organizations by the Attorney General.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 149), cited the National Lawyers' Guild as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Lawyers' Guild, September 17, 1950, cited the group as a Communist front which "is the foremost legal bulwark of the Communist Party, its front organizations, and controlled unions" and which "since its inception has never failed to rally to the legal defense of the Communist Party and individual members thereof, including known espionage agents."

One Earl Dickerson (with no middle initial shown) spoke at the morning session of the Congress on Civil Rights which was held in Detroit, Mich., April 27–28, 1946, as shown in the program, Congress on Civil Rights (p. 1): Earl B. Dickerson signed a statement of the Civil Rights Congress which was in defense of Gerhart Eisler, according to the Daily Worker of February 28, 1947 (p. 2); he was one of the sponsors of the National Emergency Conference for Civil Rights which was held in New York City on July 19, 1948, according to the Daily Worker of July 12, 1948 (p. 4); a photostat of a letterhead of the Civil Rights Congress, Illinois, dated December 18, 1948, listed Earl Dickerson as a sponsor. As shown by the Daily Worker of November 1, 1950 (p. 4), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. A handbill, Dodge Local 3 Supports FEPC Rally, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of those who would speak at a rally to be held under partial auspices of the Civil Rights Congress of Michigan on April 16, 1950.

The Attorney General cited the Civil Rights Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 2 and 19), cited the Civil Rights Congress as an organization formed in April 1946 as a merger of two other Communist-front organizations (International Labor Defense and the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties); "dedicated not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it."

According to the printed program of the Cultural and Scientific Conference for World Peace (p. 14), Earl B. Dickerson was one of the sponsors of this conference which was held in New York City, March 27–28, 1949, under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions; he signed a statement of the council which was reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 14, 1949 (p. 9620). Earl B. Dickerson was a signer of a Resolution Against Atomic Weapons as shown by a mimeographed list of signers attached to a letterhead of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions dated July 28, 1950. Mr. Dickerson signed a statement to the American people, "We uphold the right of all citizens to speak for peace," released by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown by the handbill, "Halt the Defamers Who Call Peace Un-American." He spoke at a conference on equal rights for Negroes in the arts held by the New York Council of the National Council of the Arts, New York City, November 10, 1951, according to the November 7, 1951 (p. 3), and November 14, 1951 (p. 7), issues of the Daily Worker. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1952 (p. 3), listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the endorsers of the national council resolution calling for a hearing of Tunisia's demands in the United Nations. He spoke at a conference for equal rights for Negroes in the arts, sciences, and professions held by the Southern California Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, on June 14, 1952, in Los Angeles (Daily Worker, June 20, 1952, p. 7).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace, April 19, 1949 (p. 2), cited the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions as a Communist-front organization. In this same report the committee cited the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

Earl B. Dickerson was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown by letterheads of the group dated February 26, 1946, February 3, 1948, May 18, 1951, and January 5, 1953. He signed an open letter of the organization to President Truman on Franco Spain as shown by a letterhead and mimeographed letter of April 28, 1949. He signed a petition of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee to President Truman "to bar military aid to or alliance with Fascist Spain" as shown by a mimeographed petition, attached to a letterhead of the group dated May 18, 1951.

The Attorney General cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 174), cited the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee as a Communist-front organization.

Mr. Dickerson was chairman of the Illinois Legislative and Defense Committee of the International Labor Defense, as shown in Equal Justice, September 1939 (p. 3). He spoke before the International Labor Defense, together with Earl Browder, according to the Daily Worker of October 1, 1942 (p. 5); October 6, 1942 (p. 5); and October 11, 1942 (p. 3). The pamphlet Victory in Oklahoma, October 1943, back cover, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a member of the National Committee of the International Labor Defense.

The Attorney General cited the International Labor Defense as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited

previously by the Attorney General as the "legal arm of the Communist Party." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687.) The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (pp. 1 and 2), cited the International Labor Defense as "part of an international network of organizations for the defense of Communist lawbreakers."

Earl B. Dickerson was a speaker at the Conference on Constitutional Liberties, the founding conference of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, as shown in the printed program, Call to a Conference, page 2, June 7, 1940.

The Attorney General cited the Conference on Constitutional Liberties in America as a conference as a result of which was established the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties, "part of what Lenin called the solar system of organizations, ostensibly having no connection with the Communist Party, by which Communists attempt to create sympathizers and supporters of their program" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 102), cited the conference as "an important part of the solar system of the Communist Party's front organizations."

The program and call to a national conference of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, held in Cleveland, Ohio, October 25 and 26, 1947, listed Earl B. Dickerson as one of the sponsors of the conference; he was one of the sponsors of the sixth national conference, which was held in Cleveland, May 9 and 10, 1942, as shown in a leaflet of the conference, page 4. In the latter source, Mr. Dickerson was identified as a member of the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practices. Earl Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as shown by a 1950 letterhead, an undated letterhead (received for files, July 11, 1950), an undated letterhead (distributing a speech of Abner Green at the conference of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born of Dec. 2–3, 1950), and a letterhead of the Midwest Committee for Protection of Foreign Born (Apr. 30, 1951). Mr. Dickerson, identified as president of the Chicago Urban League, was a sponsor of a dinner given by the Midwest Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born for Pearl Hart (Daily Worker, Apr. 6, 1950, p. 4). A letterhead of the sixth annual conference of the Midwest Committee for the Protection of the Foreign Born dated May 16, 1954, Chicago, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor.

The Attorney General cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155), cited the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States."

In 1942 Earl B. Dickerson was a patron of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on a letterhead of the congress dated October 27, 1942; he was named in Soviet Russia Today (December 1942 issue, p. 42) as one of the sponsors of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship; the call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943, listed Earl B. Dickerson among the sponsors. He signed a statement of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, praising Wallace's open letter to Stalin, May 1948, as shown in a pamphlet, How To End the Cold War and Build the Peace, page 9. He was identified in the last-named source as an attorney at law, Chicago. A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the Chicago Council of American-Soviet Friendship dated September 17, 1951, listed Earl B. Dickerson as a sponsor of that group. A photostat of a letter of the national council dated March 19, 1952, listed Mr. Dickerson as a sponsor.

The Attorney General cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948, redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 156), cited the national council as "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian."

The Daily Worker of October 21, 1942 (p. 1), named Earl B. Dickerson among the list of members of the National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching. He signed an appeal to lift the Spanish embargo, which appeal was made by the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, according to the Daily Worker of February 8, 1939 (p. 2). He contributed to the June 22, 1943, issue of New Masses (p. 9). He signed a petition of the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder, as shown in an official leaflet of the organization.

The National Emergency Committee To Stop Lynching was cited by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as a Negro Communist-front organization, whose secretary was Ferdinand C. Smith, high in the circles of the Communist Party (report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 180).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 180), cited the Negro People's Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy as a Communist-front organization.

New Masses was cited as a Communist periodical by the Attorney General (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7688), and the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report, Mar. 29, 1955, pp. 48 and 75).

The Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder was cited as Communist by the Attorney General in a letter dated April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7687). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 6 and 55), cited the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder as follows: When Earl Browder (then general secretary, Communist Party) was in Atlanta Penitentiary serving a sentence involving his fraudulent passports, the Communist Party's front which agitated for his release was known as the Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder.

An open letter demanding discharge of Communist Party defendants in Fulton and Livingston Counties contained the name of Earl E. Dickerson in the list of persons who signed according to the Daily Worker of September 24, 1940, page 5. He was attorney for Eugene Dennis, general secretary, Communist Party, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 19, 1947, page 7, being identified in this source as a former member of the city council, Chicago. Reference to Earl Dickerson as attorney for Eugene Dennis appears in the Worker, November 30, 1947, page 4; the Daily Worker of January 15, 1948, page 5; and the Daily Worker of October 27, 1948, page 10, in which source he is identified as a Negro leader, of Chicago.

Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the American Peace Crusade, Illinois assembly, as shown by a letterhead dated April 12, 1951, the Illinois Peace Crusade, May 1951 (p. 4), and a photostat of a letterhead dated June 21, 1952. He was a sponsor of the American People's Congress and Exposition for Peace, held by the American Peace Crusade in Chicago, Ill., June 29, 30, and July 1, 1951, as shown by a leaflet. An Invitation to American Labor To Participate in a Peace Congress, the Call to the American People's Congress, and the leaflet, American People's Congress * * * Invite You To Participate in a National Peace Competition, June 29, 1951, Chicago, Ill. He was a sponsor of a contest held by the American Peace Crusade for songs, essays, and paintings advancing the theme of world peace as reported in the Daily Worker, May 1, 1951 (p. 11).

The Attorney General included the American Peace Crusade on his January 22, 1954, list of organizations designated pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its statement issued on the March of Treason, February 19, 1951, and report on the Communist Peace Offensive April 1, 1951 (p. 51), cited the American Peace Crusade as an organization which the Communists established as a new instrument for their peace offensive in the United States and which was heralded by the Daily Worker with the usual bold headlines reserved for projects in line with the Communist objectives.

Masses and Mainstream for February 1952 (pp. 52–56) listed Earl B. Dickerson as coauthor of an amici curiae brief to the Supreme Court supporting an appeal for rehearing of its decision upholding the Smith Act, dated September 27, 1951.

According to the April 30, 1950, issue of the Worker (p. 15), Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the Midcentury Conference for Peace, cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities at a meeting held in Chicago, May 29 and 30, 1950, by the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact and as having been "aimed at assembling as many gullible persons, as possible under Communist direction and turning them into a vast soundingboard for Communist propaganda" (report on Communist peace offensive, April 1, 1951, p. 58).

Earl B. Dickerson was a sponsor of the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill as shown by the pamphlet, Hey, Brother, There's a Law Against You (p. 2); a release of June 15, 1949 (p. 2), and a photostat of a letterhead dated May 5, 1950. He signed a statement of the organization according to the Daily Worker of April 3, 1950 (p. 4).

The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report on the National Committee To Defeat the Mundt Bill, December 7, 1950, cited the organization as "a registered lobbying organization which has carried out the objectives of the Communist Party in its fight against antisubversive legislation."

Earl B. Dickerson signed a letter defending the 12 Communist leaders, as shown on a letterhead, dated January 7, 1949; he later signed a statement asking for the release of the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 8, 1949 (p. 6). He signed a brief on behalf of the attorneys who represented the Communist leaders, as shown in the Daily Worker of November 2, 1949 (p. 2); he signed a statement on behalf of the attorneys, as shown in the Daily Worker of December 7, 1949 (p. 5); he represented the attorneys, who represented the 11 Communist leaders, according to the Daily Worker of January 24, 1950 (p. 3).

EXHIBIT 4

A. PHILIP RANDOLPH

FEBRUARY 13, 1956.

Subject: A. Philip Randolph, national vice president, NAACP, 1954.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual.

This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

The Daily Worker of September 12, 1950 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph, president, AFL Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, opposed the jailing of the Communist leaders.

The Attorney General of the United States reported that A. Philip Randolph, president of the National Negro Congress, refused to run in April 1940 "on the ground that it was 'deliberately packed with Communists and Congress of Industrial Organizations members who were either Communists or sympathizers with Communists'" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688).

Walter S. Steele, in testimony in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 21, 1947 (p. 92), referred to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"A. Philip Randolph, one-time president of the National Negro Congress, resigned his position because of the Communist control thereof. At the time of his resignation, at a meeting held in Washington, D.C., he charged that the congress was controlled by the Communist Party, through which he found it was chiefly financed."

George K. Hunton testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 13, 1949 (p. 451), concerning the Communist infiltration of the National Negro Congress with reference to A. Philip Randolph as follows:

"In the National Negro Congress they did make progress. That was a sound, constructive organization started about 10 years ago. It was a good organization, with a sound, constructive program, and the Commies moved in, and within a year and a half the white Communist members completely outnumbered the Negro members and took over. Be it said to his credit that the then president, A. Philip Randolph, roundly denounced them and then resigned, and said no longer would the National Negro Congress represent the feeling of the Negro people who organized it * * *."

Manning Johnson testified in public hearings, Committee on Un-American Activities, July 14, 1949, as follows concerning the National Negro Congress and A. Philip Randolph:

"Mr. TAVENNER. What was the relationship of that commission (Negro Commission of the Communist Party) to the American Negro Labor Congress, the League of Struggle for Negro Rights, and the National Negro Congress?

"Mr. JOHNSON. The Negro League was formed by the Communist Party, and its program was identical with the program of the Communist Party for the Negro.

"The majority of members of the American Negro Labor Congress were Communists or fellow travelers. It is a very narrow, sectarian organization, and the party decided to change its name and broaden its activities, so the name was changed to the League of Struggle for Negro Rights. * * *

"The League of Struggle for Negro Rights was never successful in penetrating any broad sections of the Negro people. It remained a very narrow and sectarian organization. So the party, after having received the open letter, which was really drawn in Moscow and called for breaking away from narrow organizations, in line with this open letter, at a meeting of the national committee which, as I recall, was in the latter part of 1934 or early part of 1935, we discussed the general situation among Negroes, and the conclusion was that there was considerable unrest among them and that the time was historically right for the formation of a broad and all-inclusive organization.

"As a result of that discussion and that conclusion, the national committee of the party, upon the recommendation of one of the members of the Negro commission present at that meeting, decided to set up the National Negro Congress. The national committee gave James W. Ford the responsibility, along with the Negro commission of the national committee, to form that congress.

"We were fishing around for someone to head the congress, and we found there was no finer person to get who was not a member of the party than A. Philip Randolph. He was approached and agreed.

* * * * *

"The third—and fatal—National Negro Congress was held in Washington, D.C. The Communists had become so drunk with power, and they felt they had such strong control over the congress, that they thought they could walk roughshod over the liberals, and they antagonized A. Philip Randolph and he began to fight James W. Ford and others.

"James W. Ford and others insisted I fight A. Philip Randolph, and I refused to do so, and at that time I predicted they were on the road to breaking up the congress.

"The fight widened to such an extent that Randolph began to speak openly against Communist domination. I used to wonder how Randolph could be so naive as to not know it was a Communist-front organization.

"Before the third congress met, we got wind that Randolph was going to resign. We had Communists go to that congress representing various paper organizations so as to give them control in voting.

"When Randolph saw the congress was packed with Communists, Randolph resigned and walked out * * *." (Pp. 510–512.)

A. Philip Randolph supported a statement to Congress issued by the American League Against War and Fascism against neutrality measures as reported by the Daily Worker of February 27, 1937 (p. 2). The Daily Worker of April 22, 1938 (p. 2), reported that A. Philip Randolph was one of the signers of a letter urging open hearings on the Neutrality Act which was sent to Congress under auspices of the American League for Peace and Democracy. A. Philip Randolph was nominated as a member of the National Labor Committee of the American League for Peace and Democracy at the American Congress for Peace and Democracy held in Washington, D.C., January 6–8, 1939, as shown by the pamphlet. "7½ Million * * *" (p. 32). Letterheads of the China Aid Council of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated May 18, 1938, and June 11, 1938, name him as a sponsor of the council. He was a sponsor of the Easter drive of the China Aid Council of the American League * * *, as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 2). A photostatic copy of a letterhead of the American League for Peace and Democracy dated April 6, 1939, listed A. Philip Randolph as a national sponsor of that organization.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the American League Against War and Fascism as subversive and Communist in letters to the Loyalty Review Board, released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948. The organization was redesignated by the Attorney General April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450, and included it on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list of organizations previously designated. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front organization (in re Harry Bridges, May 28, 1942, p. 10). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report dated March 29, 1944 (p. 53), cited the American League Against War and Fascism as "organized at the First United States Congress Against War which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. Four years later at Pittsburgh, November 26–28, 1937, the name of the organization was changed to the American League for Peace and Democracy. * * * It remained as completely under the control of Communists when the name was changed as it had been before."

The Attorney General cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as subversive and Communist in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The Attorney General cited the group previously as established in the United States in 1937 as successor to the American League Against War and Fascism "in an effort to create public sentiment on behalf of a foreign policy adapted to the interests of the Soviet Union. * * * The American League for Peace and Democracy * * * was designed to conceal Communist, control, in accordance with the new tactics of the Communist International" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7663 and 7684). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (pp. 69–71), cited the American League for Peace and Democracy as "the largest of the Communist-front movements in the United States."

A letterhead of the organization, Commonwealth College, dated January 1, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the National Advisory Committee. He endorsed the reorganization plan of Commonwealth College, as shown by the August 15, 1937, issue of Fortnightly, a publication of the college (p. 3).

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited Commonwealth College as a Communist enterprise in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 76 and 167). The Attorney General cited the Commonwealth College as Communist in a letter released April 27, 1949; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list.

An undated leaflet of the League for Mutual Aid listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the executive committee of that organization. He was a guest of honor at the 17th annual dinner of the League for Mutual Aid held February 1, 1937, as shown by New Masses, January 26, 1937 (p. 37).

The League for Mutual Aid was cited as a Communist enterprise by the special Committee on Un-American Activities in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 76).

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown by letterheads of the organization dated July 6, 1938, and February 2, 1939. The Daily Worker of June 2, 1938 (p. 5), reported that A. Philip Randolph was a supporter of a meeting of the Medical Bureau * * *.

"In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations." Among these was the Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy. (Special Committee on Un-American Activities, report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 82.)

New masses for October 26, 1937 (p. 11), reported that A. Philip Randolph was chairman of the National Negro Congress. A. Philip Randolph was president of the National Negro Congress, as shown by the Daily Worker of January 1, 1938 (p. 4), January 13, 1938 (p. 3), April 19, 1938 (p. 3), and the pamphlet, Second National Negro Congress, October 1937. He was president of the Third National Negro Congress, as reported by the June 1940 issue of the Communist (p. 548). The official proceedings of the 1936 National Negro Congress (p. 41), listed A. Philip Randolph as a member of the

national executive council of the organization. He spoke at a gathering of the congress, as reported by the Daily Worker of March 8, 1938 (p. 3). The Daily Worker of February 15, 1938 (p. 7), reported that A. Philip Randolph contributed to the official proceedings of the Second National Negro Congress.

The Attorney General cited the National Negro Congress as subversive and Communist in letters released December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, and included on the April 1, 1954, consolidated list. The organization was cited previously by the Attorney General as a Communist-front group (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, pp. 7687 and 7688). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1939 (p. 81), cited the National Negro Congress as "the Communist-front movement in the United States among Negroes * * *."

A. Philip Randolph was a consultant of the Panel on Citizenship and Civil Liberties of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, as shown by an official report of the organization, dated April 19–21, 1942. The call to the second conference, Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1940, listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of that conference.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 147), cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist front which received money from the Robert Marshall Foundation, one of the principal sources of funds by which many Communist fronts operate. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of June 12, 1947, cited the Southern Conference for Human Welfare as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States."

The Daily Worker, issues of March 28, 1938 (p. 3), and April 4, 1938 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a sponsor of the World Youth Congress. The special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 183), cited the World Youth Congress as a Communist conference held in the summer of 1938 at Vassar College.

A. Phillip Randolph signed a petition of the American Friends of Spanish Democracy to lift the arms embargo as shown by the Daily Worker of April 8, 1938 (p. 4). The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 82), cited the American Friends of Spanish Democracy as follows: "In 1937–38, the Communist Party threw itself wholeheartedly into the campaign for the support of the Spanish Loyalist cause, recruiting men and organizing multifarious so-called relief organizations * * * such as * * * American Friends of Spanish Democracy."

A. Philip Randolph is listed as a sponsor on a letterhead of the American Relief Ship for Spain dated September 3, 1938. The American Relief Ship for Spain was cited as "one of the several Communist Party front enterprises which raised funds for Loyalist Spain (or rather raised funds for the Communist end of that civil war)." (Special Committee on Un-American Activities Report, Mar. 29, 1944, p. 102).

The proceedings of the Congress of Youth of the American Youth Congress, July 1–5, 1939 (p. 3), listed A. Philip Randolph as a signer of the call to the congress.

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Conference on Pan-American Democracy (letterhead, Nov. 16, 1938). The booklet, These Americans Say, published by the Coordinating Committee To Lift the Embargo, named him as a representative individual. He was a sponsor of the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights (program of conference, Feb. 12, 1940).

The Conference on Pan-American Democracy (known also as Council for Pan-American Democracy) was cited as subversive and Communist by the Attorney General in letters released June 1 and September 21, 1948; redesignated April 27, 1953, pursuant to Executive Order No. 10450. The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 161 and 164), cited the organization as a Communist front which defended Carlos Luiz Prestes, a Brazilian Communist leader and former member of the executive committee of the Communist International.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of March 29, 1944 (pp. 137 and 138), cited the Coordinating Committee To Lift the (Spanish) Embargo as one of a number of front organizations set up during the Spanish civil war by the Communist Party in the United States and through which the party carried on a great deal of agitation.

The Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights was cited as a Communist front which was succeeded by the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 96 and 129). The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of September 2, 1947 (p. 3), cited the Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights among a "maze of organizations" which were "spawned for the alleged purpose of defending civil liberties in general, but actually intended to protect Communist subversion from any penalties under the law."

A. Philip Randolph was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown by the back cover of a pamphlet, Children in Concentration Camps. He signed the call to a United May Day Conference, according to the Daily Worker of March 17, 1937 (p. 4). An undated letterhead of the United May Day Committee listed him as chairman.

The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Campaign as a Communist-front organization (report, Jan. 3, 1940, p. 9).

The United May Day Conference was cited as "engineered by the Communist Party for its 1937 May Day demonstrations" and also organized by the party in 1938 (special committee report, Mar. 29, 1944, pp. 124 and 139).

The Attorney General cited the United May Day Committee as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks "to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means." (Letter released Dec. 4, 1947; redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on the Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated list.)

The Daily Worker of January 23, 1937 (p. 3), announced that A. Philip Randolph was scheduled to speak at the Southern Negro Youth Congress, Richmond, Va., February 12–14. "The People Versus H.C.L." listed him as a sponsor of the Consumers National Federation. He was shown as a sponsor of the Public Use of Arts Committee on an undated letterhead of that organization.

The Southern Negro Youth Congress was cited as subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means. (Attorney General, letter released Dec. 4, 1947; redesignated Apr. 27, 1953, and included on Apr. 1, 1954, consolidated list.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of January 3, 1940 (p. 9), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as a Communist-front organization. The Committee on Un-American Activities, in its report of April 17, 1947 (p. 14), cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League.

The Consumers National Federation was cited as a Communist-front group by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 155).

Public Use of the Arts Committee was cited as a Communist front by the special committee in its report of March 29, 1944 (p. 112).

EXHIBIT 5

CHARLES S. ZIMMERMAN

Member, Advisory Committee, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE).

Identified as secretary-manager, Local 22, ILGWU. Sponsor, National Anti-War Congress, May 1938, auspices of Keep America Out of War Committee.

Ed. B. "Rev. Age" Communist Party of U.S.A.

National Executive Commission, Am. League Against War and Fascism, 1935.[1]

Signer of "Golden Bk." for Russia (Daily Worker, Oct. 8, 1937, p. 5).

Res. Com't. People's Congress for Democracy and Peace, 1938.[2]

Governing Commission, Keep America Out of War Congress, 1939.

Sponsor, Fourth Annual Conference American Commission for Protection of Foreign Born, March 1940.[3]

Eulogized Russia (Soviet Russia Today, November 1935, p. 49).[3]

State Executive Commission (New York), American Labor Party, 1938, Communist Party candidate, fifth assembly district, Bronx, N.Y. (Daily Worker, Oct. 14, 1925).

Sponsor, Spanish Refugee Aid, Inc.

Identified as manager, AFL International Ladies' Garment Workers, Local 22. Statement protesting proposal to outlaw Communist Party (Daily Worker, Mar. 13, 1947, p. 4).

Protested proposal to outlaw Communist Party. (Daily Worker, Mar. 13, 1947, p. 1).

Presiding Commissioner, 3d U.S. Congress Against War and Fascism, 1936 (proceedings of Congress, p. 19).[1]

EXHIBIT 6

Walter and his brother Victor went to Europe in 1933. There, while working and studying in an industrial plant in Russia, on January 20 of 1934, they wrote a letter to close friends in Detroit, a copy of which was published in the August 14, 1948, issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

Among other things, the letter stated:

"What you have written concerning the strikes and the general labor unrest in Detroit, plus what we have learned from other sources of the rising discontent of the American workers, makes us long for the moment to be back with you in the frontlines of the struggle; however, the daily inspiration that is ours as we work side by side with our Russian comrades in our factory, the thought that we are actually helping to build a society that will forever end the exploitation of man by man, the thought that what we are building will be for the benefit and enjoyment of the working class, not only of Russia, but the entire world, is the compensation we receive for our temporary absence from the struggle in the United States.

---

[1] The Attorney General's list.

[2] California Committee on Un-American Activities.

[3] House Un-American Activities Committee.

And let no one tell you that we are not on the road to socialism in the Soviet Union. Let no one say that the workers in the U.S.S.R. are not on the road to security, enlightenment and happiness."

The factory in which they worked was described as "the largest and most modern in Europe, and we have seen them all; there are no pictures of Fords and Rockefellers, or Roosevelts, and Mellon. No such parasites, but rather huge pictures of Lenin, etc., greet the workers' eyes on ever side. Red banners with slogans "Workers of the World Unite" are draped across the craneways. Little red flags fly from the tops of presses, drill presses, lathes, kellers, etc. Such a sight you have never seen before. Women and men work side by side—the women with their red cloth about their heads, the men with their fur hats. We work here 7 hours per day, 5 days a week (our week here is 6 days long). At noon we all eat in a large factory restaurant where wholesome plain food is served. A workers' band furnishes music to us from an adjoining room while we have dinner. For the remainder of our 1-hour lunch period we adjourn to the Red Corner recreation where workers play games, read papers and magazines or technical books or merely sit, smoke, and chat. Such a fine spirit of comradeship you have never before witnessed in your life. Superintendent leaders and ordinary workers are all alike. If you saw our superintendent as he walks through the shop greeting workers with 'Hello Comrade' you could not distinguish him from any other worker."

Further praising the Russian thinking and methods, the letter ends with the statement: "Carry on the fight for a Soviet America."

WALTER P. REUTHER

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning Walter P. Reuther. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by this committee nor findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual referred to is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

In testimony of Mr. John P. Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor, given before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, August 13, 1938, we find:

"Mr. FREY. These are the 280-odd members of the Communist Party who are now or have been on CIO organization payrolls. There are one or two who have not been on the payroll, but I will call attention to them. If it is the committee's desire, I will read all these names and turn them over. They are all numbered '1,' '2,' '3,' * * * and so forth; and I will comment on those which are of a more interesting or important character.

"135. Walter Reuther, Detroit, Mich.: He is one of the leaders of Automobile Workers Union, and President Martin has preferred charges against him. He has been to Russia several times and made reports as a result (public hearings, vol. 1, pp. 112 and 116).

"134. Walter Reuther, Detroit, Mich.: This fellow is one of the leaders of the Auto Workers Union and President Martin has preferred charges against him. He visited Soviet Russia and sent back a letter to this country which included the following paragraph: 'Carry on the fight for a Soviet America' (public hearings, vol. 1, p. 125.)

"Mr. FREY. There are two disrupting factors in the automobile workers at the present time. One consists of the bulk of the membership who very much resent the Communist control that was secured of national officers. The other is an internal fight between two factions of the Community Party. With that I do not want to deal. All that I desire to call your attention to is a complete report of their last meeting, which I am submitting—my report of what went on.

"Before the United Automobile Workers Union Convention opened in Milwaukee, the Communist Party members held a faction meeting or caucus at Eagles Hall in that city. There were present at this caucus Wyndham Mortimer, Ed Hall, Walter Reuther, and about 90 delegates to the convention who were actual Communist Party members. Also present were William Weinstone, Michigan secretary of the Communist Party; Jack Stachel, of New York" (ibid., p. 248).

Mr. Frey also submitted a report of the Second Annual Convention, United Automobile Workers of America, from which the following excerpts were taken:

"Since Martin controlled a majority of the delegates to the convention, which he had lined up before the opening day, Lovestone advised a drive to eliminate the regular Communist Party members in the leadership of the so-called unity faction, led by Vice Presidents Wyndham Mortimer, of Flint, Mich.; Ed Hall, of Milwaukee, Wis.; and Walter Reuther, head of the west side local of the union in Detroit. Lovestone's policy was to eliminate Mortimer, Hall, and Reuther and thus strengthen the position of the Trotskyist group behind Martin. There is no question that Martin and Frankensteen, influenced by Lovestone, were prepared to clean house of the Communist group, and it is equally true that up to a month before the convention the Mortimer-Hall-Reuther faction was trying to get rid of President Martin.

"When President Martin, much to the surprise of John L. Lewis and the Mortimer-Hall-Reuther faction, lined up a majority of the delegates to the convention, the latter faction was forced to change its policies. As stated before, the Mortimer-Hall-Reuther faction is Communist-controlled but disguised that fact by calling themselves the unity group, as, under the guise of unity, they thought they could save their own necks and possibly build a fire under Martin during the course of the convention.

"Mortimer, Hall, and Reuther worked closely with Gra Cassaway, a personal representative of John L. Lewis; Ray Edmundson, president of the Illinois district of the United Mine Workers and CIO director in that State, and David Dubinsky, a president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. On the evening of August 25, Charles S. Zimmerman, president of the powerful New York Local No. 22 of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union and a leading Trotskyite and follower of Lovestone, arrived in Milwaukee to use his influence on Dubinsky.

"On the same day (Wednesday), a load of Communist leaders came from Chicago, among them Joe Weber, a Steel Workers organizing committee organizer in South Chicago; Harry Shaw and Jack Johnstone, who had in the interim returned to Chicago. Upon arrival of the Chicago group, another Communist Party caucus was called, to which only the top elements were invited. Those present were Jack Stachel, Roy Hudson, William Weinstone, Ned Sparks, Wyndham Mortimer, Ed Hall, Walter Reuther, and B. K. Gebert" (public hearings, vol. 1, pp. 248–251).

Mr. Frey continued with his testimony as follows:

"The only material in connection with the automobile workers union which I want to file with the committee is a publication known as the Great Sitdown Strike. It was prepared by William Weinstone, who is a member of the central committee. He has an impressive record. His name is William Wolf Weinstone, and he is district organizer of district No. 7, Communist Party, headquarters, Detroit. He has had direct charge of party activities within the Auto Workers Union from the beginning. Among those reporting to him are Maurice Sugar, who is the counsel for one group of the auto workers, and has been a candidate for office in Detroit on the Communist ticket; also active with him are Roy Reuther, Walter Reuther, William Raymond, and Wyndham Mortimer" (ibid., p. 255).

In the information submitted by Mr. Walter S. Steele, chairman of the American Coalition Committee on National Security representing various organizations, in connection with his testimony given before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in public hearings, August 17, 1938, the following reference was made to Walter Reuther:

"Among those sending greetings to the Second National Negro Congress were Walter Reuther, communistic president of Local 174 of the United Auto Workers Association" (ibid., pp. 625 and 626).

In testimony given by Mr. John D. McGillis, secretary, Detroit Council 305, Knights of Columbus, given before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in public hearings on October 11, 1938, it was shown that Doctors Landrum and Shafarman of Detroit gave physical examinations to members of the Communist Party, who were able to pay for such examinations, but, instead, billed the city of Detroit. These examinations were in connection with recruiting for Loyalist Spain, and in some cases the doctors "have given them to other people prominent in communistic activities in Detroit." Among the latter, Mr. McGillis listed "Walter Reuther and his wife" (public hearings, vol. 2, pp. 1239, 1247–1248).

On October 12, 1938, Sgt. Harry Mikuliak, Detroit Police Department, testified before the special committee and made the following reference to Walter Reuther:

"Walter P. Reuther is president of the West Side Local 174, and he signs this TB test stating that he could not afford to pay for the examination" (ibid., p. 1286). Sergeant Mikuliak's testimony referred to the same matter as that referred to in the testimony of John D. McGillis quoted above.

In testimony of Mr. Clyde Morrow, a Ford Motor Co. employee, given in public hearings before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities on October 21, 1938, the following reference was made to Walter P. Reuther:

"Mr. MORROW. Mr. Martin, in his haste to get the automobile workers organized, went out and hired Communist members to do it. I think Martin thought he could use them 3 or 4 months and get rid of them.

"The CHAIRMAN. And they have gotten to the point where they might get rid of him?

"Mr. MORROW. That is right. They might get rid of Martin the way it looks to me. I hope not.

"The CHAIRMAN. Why cannot the international officers get rid of these men?

"Mr. MORROW. Here is the setup in Detroit. I only speak for Detroit because that is all I know about in Michigan. The international union has fired many Communist Party organizers. Now, what happens to them when Martin fires them? We have three or four 'Red' locals in Detroit, local 155, which is a haven for discharged officers, and when they are discharged by Martin these 'Red' locals immediately hire them as their financial secretaries, or recording secretaries, or organizers. Local 174 is what I would call an old soldiers' home for discharged Communist Party members whom Martin has fired. They are immediately taken in by the Communists in charge of their locals, such as Loyd Jones and Walter Reuther, and people like that." (Ibid., pp. 1652–1653.)

The following excerpts from the testimony of John M. Barringer, city manager

and director of publicity of Flint, Mich., given in public hearings, October 21, 1938, before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities concern the sitdown strike at the Chevrolet Motor Co., December 3, 1936:

"Mr. MOSIER. What part would you say that members of the Communist Party, Socialist Party, or the leftwing group of the Socialist Party played in that strike?

"Mr. BARRINGER. They played a very prominent part. We came in contact in every trouble with the Reuther brothers, Travis, and men of that sort.

"Mr. MOSIER. They were men you knew, and while you could not prove they were members of the Communist Party, you knew they were in sympathy with them.

"Mr. BARRINGER. That is right" (public hearings, vol. 2, p. 1682).

Mr. J. B. Matthews, testifying before the special committee on November 7, 1938, made the following reference to Walter Reuther:

"Mr. MATTHEWS. I had personal contacts with all three of the Reuther brothers, who have been prominent in the automobile workers union—Walter, Victor, and Roy. The night that Walter and Victor Reuther sailed for Russia many years ago, I had dinner with them and saw them off, and had some contact with them while they were in Russia and subsequent to their return. I do not know what their exact political connections are at the present time. I only know that their ideology, if I may be permitted to use the word here, is Communist" (public hearings, vol. 3, p. 2188).

In testimony given by Mr. Zygmond Dobrzynski, a member of the U.A.W., given before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in public hearings, November 14, 1938, the following reference was made to Walter Reuther:

"The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Dobrzynski, I believe you were testifying before lunch with reference to the conference or conversation you had with Mr. Weinstone. Did those conversations take place in his office?

"Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; they took place in the Communist Party headquarters. He also mentioned the Reuther brothers, Victor, Walter, and Roy, as workers with him. He stated, of course, that they were members of the Socialist Party, and not of the Communist Party, but that on certain policies they worked in conjunction with each other.

"The CHAIRMAN. You say he mentioned Roy, Victor, and Walter Reuther?

"Mr. DOBRZYNSKI. Yes, sir; as workers with him in the union on certain policies. He stated to me that they were not members of the Communist Party, but were members of the Socialist Party" (ibid., pp. 2219–2221).

A report of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce entitled, "Communists Within the Labor Movement," which was inserted in the record in connection with the testimony of Dr. Emerson Schmidt in public hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities on March 26, 1947, contains the following reference to Walter Reuther:

"Gains or even demands made in one section of the A.F. of L., or the CIO, tend to repeat themselves elsewhere. It must be remembered that the labor movement is intensely political. If non-Communist leaders do not gain as much as their opponents, they may soon find themselves with an active Communist opposition in their own union. The opposition makes capital of the reasonable demands of the honest leadership. Hence, irresponsibility in labor tends to become infectious.

"An illustration of this analysis can be found in the policies of Walter Reuther. In the political struggles of labor, Reuther is considered a leader of the anti-Communist bloc. But at the same time, he is head of a union which has a powerful Communist minority. He faces sabotage, not only from this clique, but also from the national headquarters of the CIO. Communist influences there have persuaded the top leadership that Reuther is a threat to their positions. As a result, Reuther faces an alternative; he must either be aggressive or retire in favor of some Communist dupe. This explains in part the conflict in his public statements. On the one hand, he may favor increased labor productivity and decry inflationary wage rises. On the other hand, he makes wage demands which cannot be other than inflationary" (public hearings on H.R. 1884 and H.R. 2122, Mar. 24–28, 1947, p. 173).

Further references to Walter Reuther occur in the committee's hearings regarding communism in labor unions during testimony of Leon E. Venne and Walter Peterson on February 27, 1947, as follows:

"Mr. STRIPLING. Just a moment, Mr. Venne. In connection with the strike, Mr. Chairman, I would like for the record to show the attitude of the now president of the United Automobile Workers with reference to this local.

"The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?

"Mr. STRIPLING. Walter P. Reuther. In a newspaper article which appeared in the Buffalo Courier-Express on August 5, 1941, Walter P. Reuther charged that the Allis-Chalmers local was 'dominated by political racketeers of Communist stripe.' He described a local 248 election as 'the worst kind of strong-armed political racketeering' (p. 36).

"Mr. VENNE. I believe that labor, in order to make any of the gains that labor must make, must clean house, and it doesn't start at the bottom, but it starts at the top. We see in Allis-Chalmers today a situation that has come about through political maneuvering of two people who want the same job in the United Automobile Workers of America, namely, Walter Reuther and R. J. Thomas. R. J. Thomas is now using the Allis-Chalmers strike to insure that at the next convention he will have 87 votes to cast in favor of his presidency. R. J. Thomas—I mean, R. J. Thomas—belongs to the leftwing bloc in the international. While I don't pretend to call him a Communist, he accepts their support (p. 48).

"Mr. VENNE. The International—I mean, local 248—is exonerated from paying per capita tax to the international union while a strike is in progress. On April 29, the day the strike was called, local 248 had 87 votes at the international convention—that is, they have a vote for every one of the members. They will still carry that 87 votes at the convention that is to be held; I believe it is in September.

"Providing that—I am getting ahead of myself.

"The constitution of the United Auto Workers states that a per capita tax will be based on a period of 1 year preceding 60 days from the convention date, which means that if the strike continues to approximately June 31, then local 248 will carry 87 votes to support R. J. Thomas in his fight against Walter Reuther; whereas, if the strike was settled, say, today, we will have to figure some months on an 87 basis and some months at possibly—I would state that if the strike were settled, today the members of local 248 would drop to an alltime low or probably 2,000 to 3,000 on the outside, and probably less.

"The CHAIRMAN. Then, Mr. Venne, do you mean to imply that the real purpose of this strike is to determine the national leadership between Reuther and Thomas?

"Mr. VENNE. I will put it this way, sir; the continuation of this strike—the continuance of the strike is due to the—rests on the political angle of the international fight for the presidency of the U.A.W. of America" (p. 48).

Mr. Venne's testimony was followed by that of Mr. Walter Peterson of Allis-Chalmers, in which he referred to Walter Reuther, as follows:

"Mr. STRIPLING. Did you hear the testimony of the preceding witness, Mr. Venne?

"Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. What do you have to say concerning his testimony about the 87 votes?

"Mr. PETERSON. That is right. If the strike is prolonged until June 1947, which would be about 60 days before the date of the convention, local 248 would still carry 87 votes; and if the strike was settled before that, they would lose approximately, about 30 votes.

"Mr. MUNDT. You mean they would lose about 60 votes?

"Mr. PETERSON. They would lose about 60 votes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Have you made any effort to oust the Communists—as a member of good standing?

"Mr. PETERSON. Yes; we did. We have been in and out of this fight practically since 1939. In 1941, I had much correspondence with CLARE HOFFMAN. We already knew about it.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Did you ever communicate with any of the international officers of the union?

"Mr. PETERSON. I did.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Did you communicate with them? Who did you communicate with?

"Mr. PETERSON. I communicated with Mr. Reuther and Mr. Murray both.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Walter Reuther?

"Mr. PETERSON. Yes.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Did you get any response?

"Mr. PETERSON. No. This dates back to last September 1946. There was about four or five of us from our department who got together and talked things over and we gradually expanded. * * * We decided at last that there was no way we could beat them but by going on the other side of the fence and withdrawing our support from the union, which we did. There was at that time about 3,000 of us that went in and more workers came in right along and in the latter part of November we had repudiation cards printed. * * *

"Mr. STRIPLING. How many members of local 248 signed such a card?

"Mr. PETERSON. We had approximately—at the time we sent the petition in, we had 2,600 of those cards signed.

"Mr. STRIPLING. Where did you send the petition?

"Mr. PETERSON. We sent it to Mr. Reuther—one to Mr. Reuther and one to Mr. Murray.

"Mr. STRIPLING. And you received no reply from them?

"Mr. PETERSON. We received no reply whatsoever. * * * It happened that on December 8, Walter Reuther was in town, was in Milwaukee, and we made an attempt to contact him. I had tried to contact him all that day at different points around town. I knew where he was and failed to make connections. When the rioting happened on this Monday, we put out a call for a special meeting for that evening. * * *

"During the course of the meeting I stated the fact that Reuther was in town the day before and failed to notify us or get in touch with us, and I failed to contact him, and what happened that day out at the plant.

"We took that for his answer to our demands" (public hearings regarding communism in labor unions in the United States, Feb. 27; July 23, 24, and 25, 1947, pp. 36, 48, 51–52).

The Daily Worker of September 4, 1937 (p. 8), contained a picture of the three Reuther brothers, above the following caption: "Three militant members of the unity

caucus of the United Auto Workers Union are Roy, Victor, and Walter Reuther, the latter also a member of the International Executive Board of the union. These brothers played a prominent part in the Milwaukee convention. They are champions of the united front within the Socialist Party and are opponents of Trotskyism as a counter-revolutionary movement."

EXHIBIT 7

ROGER N. BALDWIN

Member, National Committee for Justice in Columbia, Tenn., 1947 (pamphlet, "Terror in Tennessee").

American Committee Opposed to Alien Registration, 1930.

Board of Director, American Funds for Public Service, 1930.

National Committee All A. Anti-Imperialist League.[1]

Vice Chairman Anti-Imperialist League of United States.[1]

Labor Defense Council.[2]

National Committee To Aid Striking Miners Fighting Starvation, 1931.

National Committee, The International Workers Aid, 1931.

Advisory Board, Russian Reconstruction Farms, 1926.

New York Committee for Progressive Miners Relief, 1932.

Arrangements Committee, U.S. Congress Against War, 1933.[1]

American Committee for Struggle Against War, 1933.[2]

Endorser, First National Convention, Friends of Soviet Union, 1934.

Supporter, National Committee to Aid Victims of German Fascism, 1934.[2]

Advisory Board, American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, 1935.[1]

National Congress for Unemployed and Social Insurance, Washington, D.C., January 1935.[2]

National Bureau, American League Against War and Fascism, 1935.[1]

Chairman, Executive Committee, Political Prisoners Bail Fund, 1935.

Contributor, "Soviet Russia Today," 1935.[2]

Speaker for I.L.D., in defense of Scottsboro Boys, 1935.[1]

Advisory Council, Book Union, 1935.[2]

Advisory Committee, Commonwealth College, 1935–36.[1]

Scottsboro Defense Committee.[2]

Member, League for Mutual Aid, 1936.

Vice Chairman, United Citizens Committee for the American League Against War and Fascism, 1936.[1]

Sponsor, American Friends of Spanish Democracy, 1936–38.[2]

Advisory Board, American Student Union, 1937.[2]

Sponsor, mass celebration in honor of "Mother" Bloor, 1937.

Supporter, American Youth Congress, 1937.[1]

Eulogized Russia on 20th anniversary ("Soviet Russia Today", Dec. 1937, p. 34).[2]

Speaker, The Group (Group Theater), 1937 (handbill) (21—Communist Movements—Cultural).[2]

Speaker at United Anti-Nazi meeting, Yorkville, N.Y. (Daily Worker, May 14, 1938, p. 2.)

Marcus Graham Freedom of the Press Committee, 1938.

Nominating Committee, People's Congress for Democracy and Peace, 1938.

American Congress of Peace and Democracy, 1939.[1]

Civil Rights Commission, American League for Peace and Democracy, 1939.[1]

Sponsor, National Sharecroppers Week, 1939, auspices Southern Tenant Farmers Union.

Board of Sponsors, American Guild for German Cultural Freedom, 1940.

Attended IWO "Stop Dies" rally, New York City, 1940 (10th anniversary issue, "Fraternal Outlook").[1]

Called for freedom of Earl Browder (Washington Post, May 11, 1942, page advertisement).

Washington Citizens' Committee To Free Earl Browder (Washington News, May 12, 1942).[1]

Sponsor, Lynn Committee To Abolish Segregation in the Armed Forces, 1944.

Article, "New Masses," May 20, 1947, page 3.

Committee, Refugees Defense Committee, 1947 (letterhead).

Protested Communist arrest for election frauds, Chicago (Daily Worker, Sept. 24, 1940, p. 5) 29–13.

A leader in CORE (Congress of Racial Equality). (People's World, Oct. 18, 1958, p. 7.)

Asked to testify for "4 Calif. Smith Act Victims" (Daily Worker, July 7, 1952, p. 2).

On program of conference auspices American Forum for Socialist Education. (Daily Worker, Nov. 4, 1957, p. 3.)

Roger N. Baldwin, NAACP Committee of One Hundred:

1. All-America Anti-Imperialist League—member of national committee—letterhead, April 11, 1928.[1]

2. American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, supporter of Coller bill—Daily Worker, April 11, 1938, page 5.[1]

3. American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born—member of advisory board—letterhead, January 1940.[1]

4. American Committee for Struggle Against War—member—Struggle Against War, June 1933, page 2.[2]

5. American Congress for Peace and Democracy—endorser—call, January 6–8, 1939.[2]

6. American Friends of the Chinese People—participant in mass meeting—New Masses, October 5, 1937, page 30.[3]

7. American Friends of Spanish Democracy—member of executive committee—letterhead, February 21, 1938.[2]

8. American Fund for Public Service—member of board of directors—appendix IX, page 384.[2]

9. American League for Peace and Democracy—endorser of conference—Daily Worker, January 11, 1938, page 2.[1]

10. American League for Peace and Democracy—member of national committee—letterhead, July 12, 1939.[1]

11. American League Against War and Fascism—contributor to Fight—Fight, November 1933, page 10; September 1937, page 18.[1]

12. American League Against War and Fascism—member of national bureau—Fight, April 1934, page 14.[1]

13. American League Against War and Fascism—member of national executive committee—letterhead, August 22, 1935.[1]

14. American League Against War and Fascism—speaker at conference—Daily Worker, February 27, 1937, page 2.[1]

15. American League Against War and Fascism—participant in mass meeting—New Masses, October 5, 1937, page 30.[1]

16. American Student Union—member of sponsoring committee—Student Advocate, February 1937, page 2.[2]

17. American Student Union—speaker at fourth national convention—Student Almanac, 1939, page 32.[2]

18. American Youth Congress—member of national advisory committee—pamphlet, 1936; letterhead, July 4, 1937.[1]

19. Anti-Nazi Federation of New York—U.S.A. supporter—letterhead, 1940.

20. Book Union—advisory council member—letterhead, undated.[2]

21. Chicago Sobell Committee—signer of scroll presented to Urey at dinner, February 12, 1955—House committee report, "Trial by Treason," page 124.

22. Citizens Committee To Free Earl Browder—appealed to President Roosevelt on behalf of Browder—leaflet, 1942.[1]

23. Committee To Aid the Striking Fleischer Artists—affiliated with—letterhead, undated.

24. Consumers National Federation—sponsor—pamphlet, December 11–12, 1937.[2]

25. Friends of the Soviet Union—member of reception committee—letterhead, September 1929.[1]

26. Friends of the Soviet Union—contributor to "Soviet Russia Today"—September 1934, page 11.[1]

27. Frontier Films—member of advisory board—letterhead, undated.[2]

28. Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights—speaker at conference—program, February 12, 1940.[2]

29. Henri Barbusse Memorial Committee—chairman—New Masses, September 29, 1936, page 31.

30. International Labor Defense—speaker—New Masses, April 2, 1935, page 46.[1]

31. International Workers Order—speaker at rally—Fraternal Outlook, June–July 1940, page 15.[1]

32. Joint Committee for the Defense of the Brazilian People—signer of cable—appendix IX, page 949.[2]

33. Labor Defense Council—member of national executive committee—Voice of Labor, October 20, 1922, page 12.[2]

34. Labor Defense Council—committee member—letterhead, April 6, 1923.[2]

35. Medical Bureau, American Friends of Spanish Democracy—member of executive committee—letterhead, November 18, 1936.[2]

36. Medical Bureau and North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy—member of executive board—booklet, 1938.[1]

37. Mother Bloor Celebration Committee—sponsor of banquet; sent greetings—program, January 24, 1936, pages 7, 9.

38. National Committee To Aid Victims of German Fascism—U.S.A., supporter—letterhead, July 3, 1934.[2]

39. National Committee Friends of the Soviet Union—endorser of—Soviet Russia Today, December 1933, p. 17.[1]

40. National Committee To Aid Striking Miners Fighting Starvation—sponsor—letterhead, January 30, 1933.

41. National Congress of Unemployment and Social Insurance—sponsor—leaflet, January 5–7, 1935.[2]

42. National Mooney Council of Action—member—Daily Worker, May 12, 1933, page 2.

43. National People's Committee Against Hearst—member—letterhead, March 16, 1937.[2]

44. National Scottsboro Action Committee—member of executive committee—Daily Worker, May 3, 1933, page 2.[2]

45. National Student League—signer of call for support—Daily Worker, September 28, 1932, page 2.[1]

---

[1] The Attorney General's list.
[2] House Un-American Activities Committee.
[3] California Committee on Un-American Activities.

[1] The Attorney General's list.
[2] House Un-American Activities Committee.
[3] California Committee on Un-American Activities.

[1] The Attorney General's list.
[2] House Un-American Activities Committee.
[3] California Committee on Un-American Activities.

46. New Masses—contributor—New Masses, April 2, 1935, page 13; November 16, 1937, page 20.[1]

47. New Masses—sent letter—New Masses, May 13, 1941, page 23; August 26, 1947, page 17.

48. New York Professional Workers Conference on Social Insurance—speaker—leaflet, December 20, 1934.

49. New York Tom Mooney Committee—sponsor—letterhead, June 5, 1939.[2]

50. North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy—sponsor—New Masses, September 28, 1937, page 28.[1]

51. People's Congress for Democracy and Peace—member of national bureau—letterhead, November 3, 1937.[2]

52. Political Prisoners Bail Fund Committee—trustee—letterhead, January 18, 1935.

53. Prisoners Relief Fund of International Labor Defense—member—leaflet, undated.[1]

54. Protest Against Verdict of Guilty in Case of 11 Communist Leaders—spoke out against verdict—Worker, October 30, 1949, page 3.

55. Russian Reconstruction Farms—member of advisory board—letterhead, March 20, 1926.[2]

56. Supports Dissenting Opinions of Black and Douglas Toward Smith Act—statement—Masses and Mainstream, August 1951, page 14.

57. Testimonial Dinner to Carol King—sent message—Lamp, April 1948, page 4.

58. U.S. Congress Against War—member of arrangements committee—letterhead, November 1, 1933.[1]

LILLIAN SMITH

Member, Advisory Committee, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE). Editor, South Today, Georgia. Author, "Strange Fruit." National Citizens' Political Action Committee (Daily Worker, July 15, 1944, p. 4).

While attending American Peace Mobilization meeting, New York City, April 6, 1941, signed petition demanding freedom of Earl Browder (Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, p. 2).[1]

Lillian Smith, NAACP Committee of One Hundred.

1. American Peace Mobilization—signer of petition to free Browder—Daily Worker, May 2, 1941, page 2.[1]

2. Committee for Equal Justice for Mrs. Recy Taylor, an auxiliary of International Labor Defense—sponsor—booklet, August 1945.

3. Emergency Peace Mobilization—affiliated with—appendix IX, page 692.[1]

4. National Citizens Political Action Committee—member—official list, August 28, 1944.

5. National Council of American-Soviet Friendship—speaker—Worker, November 19, 1944, page 2.[1]

6. South Today—editor—National Citizens Political Action Committee official list, August 28, 1944.

7. Southern Conference for Human Welfare—consultant—official report, 1942.[2]

ROLAND B. GITTELSOHN

Information from the files of the Committee on Un-American Activities, U.S. House of Representatives

MAY 7, 1959.

For: Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND.
Subject: Roland B. Gittelsohn.

This committee makes no evaluation in this report. The following is only a compilation of recorded public material contained in our files and should not be construed as representing the results of any investigation or finding by the committee. The fact that the committee has information as set forth below on the subject of this report is not per se an indication that this individual, organization, or publication is subversive, unless specifically stated.

Symbols in parenthesis after the name of any organization or publication mentioned herein indicate that the organization or publication has been cited as being subversive by one or more Federal authorities. The name of each agency is denoted by a capital letter, as follows: A—Attorney General of the United States; C—Committee on Un-American Activities; I—Internal Security Subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee; J—Senate Judiciary Committee; and, S—Subversives Activities Control Board. The numerals after each letter represent the year in which that agency first cited the organization or publication. (For more complete information on citations, see this committee's "Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications.")

As shown on their letterhead dated August 3, 1939, Rabbi Roland B. Gittelsohn was a sponsor of the Refugee Scholarship and Peace Campaign (C–1944) of the American League for Peace and Democracy (C–1939; A–1942; I–1956).

A news release of the Mid-Century Conference for Peace (C–1951; I–1956), dated May 8, 1950, listed Rabbi R. B. Gittelsohn (on page 2) among the religious leaders who supported the appeal for special peace sermons made by Rev. Halford E. Luccock and Rabbi Edward E. Klein. Rabbi Gittelsohn's address was shown as Rockville Centre, N.Y.

EXHIBIT 8

IRA D'A. REID

OCTOBER 24, 1955.

For: Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND, U.S. Senator.
Subject: Dr. Ira DeA. Reid.

The public records, files, and publications of this committee contain the following information concerning the subject individual. This report should not be construed as representing the results of an investigation by or findings of this committee. It should be noted that the individual is not necessarily a Communist, a Communist sympathizer, or a fellow traveler unless otherwise indicated.

On April 17, 1943, the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born entertained at a United Nations in America dinner in New York City, as "a tribute to the contributions of the foreign born to America." The invitation and program of the dinner announced that Dr. Ira DeA. Reid would participate in the program by giving a testimonial to Franz Boas, identified by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities as "a noted Communist fellow traveler," (Report 1311 of the special committee on * * * dated Mar. 29, 1944.) In the same report, the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States"; the Attorney General of the United States cited the American Committee * * * as subversive and Communist (press releases of June 1 and Sept. 21, 1948; included on consolidated list released Apr. 1, 1954.)

The Daily Worker of April 26, 1947, reported that Dr. Ira DeA. Reid had forwarded to the Council on African Affairs in New York his protest of the action by the Albany (N.Y.) city administration in refusing to permit Paul Robeson to hold a concert in the Albany public schools. The attorney general cited the Council on African Affairs as subversive and Communist (press releases of Dec. 4, 1947, and Sept. 21, 1948).

A leaflet of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare entitled "The South Is Closer Than You Think," named Dr. Ira DeA. Reid as a member of that organization's executive board; he participated in the program of the Second Southern Conference for Human Welfare, April 14–16, 1941, as shown on the call to that conference. The Southern Conference * * * has been cited by the Committee on Un-American Activities as a Communist-front organization "which seeks to attract southern liberals on the basis of its seeming interest in the problems of the South" although its "professed interest in southern welfare is simply an expedient for larger aims serving the Soviet Union and its subservient Communist Party in the United States." (Report dated June 12, 1947, on the Southern Conference for * * *.)

Dr. Ira DeA. Reid was a member of the advisory board of the Southern Negro Youth Congress, as shown on a page from a leaflet published by the organization and letterheads of the group dated June 12, 1947 and August 11, 1947. The Attorney General cited the Southern Negro Youth Congress as "subversive and among the affiliates and committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A., which seek to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means" (press release of December 4, 1947). The group was also cited as a Communist-front organization by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (report of January 3, 1940); and as "surreptitiously controlled" by the Young Communist League. (Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities dated April 17, 1947.)

A letterhead of the U.S. Congress Against War, dated November 1, 1933, contained the name of Ira DeA. Reid in a list of members of the arrangements committee; he was identified with the League for Industrial Democracy. The American League Against War and Fascism was organized at the First U.S. Congress Against War and Fascism which was held in New York City, September 29 to October 1, 1933. "The program of the first congress called for the end of the Roosevelt policies of imperialism and for the support of the peace policies of the Soviet Union, for opposition to all attempts to weaken the Soviet Union." (The Attorney General of the United States, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Sept. 24, 1942, p. 7683.) The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the congress as "completely under the control of the Communist Party" (a report dated March 29, 1944).

On April 26, 1948, the Daily Worker reported that "the Jefferson School (of Social Science) board of trustees hailed the statement of American educators protesting to President Truman and Attorney General Clark the blacklisting of the Jefferson School and other educational institutions. The educators' statement was regarded as a 'welcome contribution to sanity' by the Jefferson School board, Prof. Lyman Bradley, chairman of the board, told the Daily Worker.

"The board lauded the statement's signers as 'educators of courage and conviction who refuse to be intimidated by the current hysteria emanating from Washington and who express their devotion to the ideals of democratic education by supporting the right of labor and of Marxists to conduct schools for the teaching of their views without threat or intimidation.'

"The statement of the board followed a report from Professor Bradley on the protest letter which had been sponsored by 12 prominent educators and sent to a selected list of college and university professors throughout the country. The open letter was signed by 153 professors from more than 60 institutions of higher learning." In the list of persons who signed the open letter was the name of Ira DeA. Reid, identified as chairman, sociology department, Atlanta University and director, People's College at Atlanta.

---

[1] The Attorney General's list.
[2] House Un-American Activities Committee.

The Attorney General of the United States cited the Jefferson School of Social Science as an "adjunct of the Communist Party" (press release of December 4, 1947; included on consolidated list released April 1, 1954); the special committee cited it as follows in a report of March 29, 1944: "At the beginning of the present year, the old Communist Party Workers School and the School for Democracy were merged into the Jefferson School of Social Science."

In a leaflet of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions entitled "To Safeguard These Rights * * *," the name of Ira DeA. Reid appears in a list of sponsors of a conference arranged by the Bureau on Academic Freedom of the National Council, October 9–10, 1948; in the same source, he was identified with Haverford College. He spoke at the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace which was held under the auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, as shown by the conference program; the same source revealed that he was one of the sponsors of that conference, as did the Daily Worker of February 21, 1949 (p. 2); the conference was held in New York City March 25–27, 1949. He spoke at a rally on academic freedom, arranged by the national council, on behalf of teachers who had been dismissed (see advertisement in the New York Star of Oct. 8, 1948, p. 10).

In a Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace which was prepared and released by the Committee on Un-American Activities April 26, 1950, the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions was cited as a Communist-front organization; in the same review, the Scientific and Cultural Conference was cited as a Communist front which "was actually a supermobilization of the inveterate wheelhorses and supporters of the Communist Party and its auxiliary organizations."

On December 23, 1952, Mr. Louis Francis Budenz, member of the faculty of Fordham University and Seton Hall University, appeared under subpena before the Select Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives. At that time Mr. Budenz gave the following testimony concerning the subject individual:

"Dr. Ira Reid, my impression is I've met him as a Communist, but I do know definitely, and can state here, that official communications from Stachel and Jerome, Trachtenberg, have definitely identified Dr. Reid as a Communist."

Later, on December 30, 1952, Dr. Reid appeared before the same committee, at his own request, for the purpose of giving him an opportunity to make a statement with reference to Mr. Budenz' testimony presented under oath. Dr. Reid identified himself as "Ira D. A. Reid, 2 College Lane, Haverford, Pa., professor of sociology at Haverford College." Dr. Reid stated for the record that "I am not a Communist, I have never been a Communist, and therefore regard that as a deliberate untruth as advanced by Mr. Budenz.

"It is true that I was a fellow of the general education board in 1933–34, receiving a fellowship that enabled me to complete my residence work at Columbia University. I was vouched for that fellowship by the man who was my college president, a very estimable person, the late John Hope, who wanted me to come to Atlanta to teach. After completing that work in residence at Columbia University, I went to Atlanta, Ga., and began teaching at Atlanta University.

"The one occasion when I was very certain that Communist influence was being brought to bear on the conference held in New York in 1949, I resigned from the program, and we did not appear. That has been thrown up against me several times and offered as proof that I was a Communist. I think as a preliminary statement, Mr. Counsel, that is what I wish to make."

Dr. Reid denied knowing Mr. Budenz, Mr. Jerome, and Mr. Stachel. Then committee counsel asked two or three questions of Dr. Reid, as follows:

"Mr. KEELE. * * * Did you sign a petition of the citizens committee to free Earl Browder?

"Mr. REID. No, sir. I have submitted to another branch of the Government a statement, duly affirmed, to that effect.

"Mr. KEELE. Did you sign a letter defending the Jefferson School of Social Science?

"Mr. REID. No, sir. As I have also stated, I know nothing about the Jefferson School of Social Science.

"Mr. KEELE. Were you a member of the executive board of the Southern Conference for Human Welfare?

"Mr. REID. Yes, I was, and during the time that I was a member of that organization, it was a forthright, democratic, good organization, in which a number of us who were interested in the South believed and cooperated, and when it no longer seemed to serve that end, numbers of us pulled out. I, for one, did, and enabled and worked for the setting up of the Southern Regional Council in Atlanta, Ga., with a number of others of the forward-looking people in the South."

Committee counsel then questioned Dr. Reid concerning a testimonial he made to Franz Boaz at the United Nations in America dinner held under the auspices of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born, New York City, April 17, 1943, and Dr. Reid answered him as follows:

"Yes, I wrote a testimonial to that meeting. I see now that the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born—I knew that committee only in two ways: One, when I was working on my dissertation, the office provided me with some material. Franz Boaz was a former teacher of mine at Columbia University, and I sent a letter of comment on his skill and my appreciation of him as a teacher, which I would have done again and again and again. I do not regard that as a subversive activity."

When questioned about a statement of the Council for African Affairs which Dr. Reid was alleged to have signed, he made the following statement:

"I have been interested in the Council for African Affairs, because it was one source from which you could get materials on Africa. I do not remember signing a statement. I may have. If so, it was about problems in Africa. But it was not in any connection with anything that might have been called subversive. It was in the province of darker peoples throughout the world, I suppose."

In connection with the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace and the sponsoring organization, National Council for the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, Dr. Reid told that committee that "I spoke at that conference on the subject, I think, of race discrimination, and academic freedom. I have sent to the Government a copy of that speech, and it was that conference that led to my being asked to speak at the cultural, whatever the meeting was, that was held the next year, and it was only then that I realized that there were connections that were regarded as subversive. Therefore, I did not appear at the other. I did appear and speak at the council on academic freedom at that time on the subject of race discrimination." Dr. Reid further told the committee that he did not appear at the Scientific and Cultural Conference in New York City, March 25–27, 1949; that he sent a telegram stating his reasons for not appearing, saying "that I did not believe in the things which it seemed to be sponsoring."

During the same testimony, Dr. Reid told the committee that he knew nothing about his name appearing on a letterhead of the United States Congress Against War in a list of members of their arrangements committee. Dr. Reid testified that in June and August of 1947, he had left the South and was no longer there. "I had been a member of the advisory committee of the Southern Negro Youth Congress" he told the committee, and "many of us in Negro education in the South were interested in it. We came into it under very, oh, reliable auspices, and I served in those purposes. And it was not until years later that there was any discovery that there was any sort of Communist influence in it. I resigned from that group. I do not remember the exact time, the cause was, I told the director at the time that I did not approve of the methods that were being used in the South, and I thought that they were exploiting Negro youth by so doing it. And I was never called upon to do anything more, although the names may have remained on the letterhead."

References to and excerpts from testimony of Mr. Budenz and Dr. Reid may be found in printed Hearings Before the Select Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House of Representatives, 82d Congress, 2d session, pages 715 and 729, respectively.

GOODWIN WATSON

Member, advisory committee, Congress of Racial Equality (CORE).

PROF. GOODWIN WATSON

Conference on Equal Rights for Negroes in the Arts, held Saturday at the Pythianon, West 70th Street. Wide Discrimination Against Negroes in Art, Science, etc. (Daily Worker, Nov. 14, 1951, p. 7.)

Conference on Equal Rights for Negroes in the Arts, Science, and Professions. (Daily Worker, Nov. 9, 1951, p. 8.)

GOODWIN B. WATSON, PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, TEACHERS COLLEGE

Clipping: "Schools Failing, Educators Charge." (New York Times, Feb. 15, 1937.)

Clipping: "Educator Assails Capitalist Ideas." (Washington Star, Feb. 23, 1934.)

Clipping: "Class War on the Campus." (American Mercury, Apr. 1937.)

Signer, petition urging discontinuance of Dies committee. (Daily Worker, Jan. 8, 1940, p. 4.)

Signer, letter to President Roosevelt protesting attacks upon Veterans of Abraham Lincoln Brigade. (Daily Worker, Feb. 21, 1940, p. 4.)[1]

Signer, letter to Dies committee, sponsored by American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, denouncing proposal to investigate political and social affiliations of authors of textbooks. (Daily Worker, Apr. 8, 1940, p. 2.)[2]

Sponsor, Committee of One Thousand To Abolish House Committee on Un-American Activities Committee, 1948. (Letterhead.)

Writer for Wallace, 1948.

GOODWIN WATSON, PROFESSOR, SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Stated that "The point of Russian education is to give everybody the kind of education that makes him stand on his tiptoes and stretch himself to the utmost." (Worker, Nov. 9, 1958, p. 8.)

Goodwin Watson (professor, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City).

Signer, statement released by Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact, 1950 (letterhead).[3]

One of 83 signers of open letter to the American people for the Bill of Rights, released by Americans for Traditional Liberties. (Daily Worker, Sept. 26, 1955, p. 4.)

---

[1] The Attorney General's list.

[2] House Un-American Activities Committee.

Charged with championing the "objectives of the Communist conspiracy" by the Americanism Commission of the Westchester County American Legion. Part-time consultant, Guidance Center of New Rochelle, N.Y. (New York Times, Mar. 6, 1954, p. 22). See also his record published in the Firing Line of April 15, 1954, official organ of the American Legion.

Kerr subcommittee of Congress upholds finding of Committee on Un-American Activities that Goodwin Watson is unfit for Federal employment. (New York Times, Apr. 15, 1943.)

Member of the program committee of the Committee for Peaceful Alternatives to the Atlantic Pact (HUAC, report on the Communist peace offensive, pp. 143, 145).[1]

Signer of petition to President Truman for amnesty for convicted Communist leaders (Daily Worker, issued during August 1952).

Endorsed the International Workers Order ("Action for Unity" by Goodwin Watson, p. 22).[1]

Endorsed the National Negro Congress ("Action for Unity" by Goodwin Watson, p. 9).[1]

Endorsed the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties ("Action for Unity" by Goodwin Watson, p. 12).[1]

Endorsed the People's Institute for Applied Religion ("Action for Unity" by Goodwin Watson, pp. 125 and 126).[1]

For further endorsements of Communist fronts by Goodwin Watson, see his book, "Action for Unity."

A. J. MUSTE

Senate civil rights hearings, 1959.

Nuclear-weapons tests and A. J. Muste: For centuries, pacifists of many kinds have conducted their propaganda campaigns around the horror of war. To the actualities of war, which are bad enough, pacifists have added their own particular speculations: namely, that the next war would spell the end of civilization.

In the present era, Communists have found pacifists activity and propaganda very much to their liking. As long as such activity affects only the peoples of non-Communist countries, Communists would like to see pacifism become the dominant mood throughout the so-called free world. Toward this end, Communists and pro-Communists give all the encouragement possible to every pacifist organization that sentimental clergymen may wish to set up in the United States.

Among the thousands of Protestant clergymen who have joined or otherwise supported the long list of Communist peace fronts during the past 40 years, one name stands out above all the others; namely, A. J. Muste. This Holland-born Presbyterian clergyman and agitator, now in his 75th year, is the undisputed dean of American leftwing activity. Muste was a delegate to the Fifth World Order Study Conference at Cleveland. Muste's credentials, if he has any, are his life-long dedication to undermining the security of his adopted land.

Two years ago, A. J. Muste got up a delegation for the purpose of "observing" the procedures of the Communist Party's 16th National Convention, February 9–12, 1957. The press was barred from the deliberations of the leading Communists, but Muste and his fellow "observers" were cordially welcomed. In their formal report to the American people, Muste's delegation found "that the sessions of the convention were democratically conducted." Whether the Communist conspirators conspired democratically or undemocratically is about as important as the color of their hair—except to the mentality of an A. J. Muste.

The work of the Muste delegation drew the following comment from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover:

"The Communists boasted of having 'impartial observers' cover the convention. However, most of these so-called impartial observers were handpicked before the convention started and were reportedly headed by A. J. Muste, who has long fronted for Communists * * *. Muste's report on the convention was biased, as could be expected."

A. J. Muste has described his recent activity in the following words: "Thus in this summer of 1957 I am occupied with problems relating to the attitude of the churches toward nuclear war * * *."

Muste has been highly successful in recruiting outstanding Protestant clergymen for agitation on the subject of nuclear weapons. The following delegates to the Fifth World Order Study Conference have been involved in this type of agitation: John C. Bennett, Harold A. Bosley, Roy Burkhart, Edwin T. Dahlberg, Ralph D. Hyslop, Homer A. Jack, Louis H. Lammert, Paul L. Lehmann, John A. Mackay, Robert W. Moon, G. Bromley Oxnam, W. Harold Row, Culbert Rutenber, Walter W. Sikes, B. Julian Smith, Ralph W. Sockman, Carl D. Soule, Alfred W. Swan, and Daniel E. Taylor. To this list must be added the name of the Quaker layman, Clarence E. Pickett.

Fellowship of Reconciliation: The largest leftwing pacifist group in the United States is the Fellowship of Reconciliation. For years, A. J. Muste was the executive secretary of this organization.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation claims to have been the parent of many leftwing organizations which have worked to further the interests of the Communist conspiracy in the United States. In its official history, the fellowship has the following to say about itself: "Out of its activities and the concerns of its members and committees have grown such diverse organizations as the National Conference of Christians and Jews, the American Civil Liberties Union, the Religion and Labor Foundation, the Workers Defense League, the Committee on Militarism in Education, the Congress on Racial Equality, the National Council Against Conscription, the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, the Church Peace Mission, and most recently, the American Committee on Africa."

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is officially on record as urging its members to join "political movements which aim at the replacement of private capitalism by a system of collective ownership." This broad category is enough to include the Communist movement as well as the Socialist.

The current and official apparatus of the fellowship was well represented in the composition of the Cleveland Conference of the National Council of Churches. From the early years of the Federal Council of Churches, its personnel was extensively interlocked with that of the Fellowship of Reconciliation.

The following delegates who were present at the Cleveland Conference are currently listed as officially connected with the Fellowship of Reconciliation (FOR) in the latter's publications.

Hiel D. Bollinger, accredited representative of the Fellowship of Methodist Pacifists to the FOR.

Harold A. Bosley, member of the FOR advisory council.

Charles F. Boss, member of the FOR advisory council.

Edwin T. Dahlberg, member of the FOR advisory council.

Barton Hunter, accredited representative of the Disciples Peace Fellowship to the FOR.

Jameson Jones, editorial contributor of Fellowship, official magazine of the FOR.

A. J. Muste, secretary emeritus of the FOR.

Clarence E. Pickett, member of the FOR advisory council, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize.

Culbert G. Rutenber, member of the FOR national council.

John M. Swomley, Jr., corecretary of the FOR.

Herman Will, Jr., member of the FOR national council.

Church Peace Mission and the Cleveland Conference: The Church Peace Mission, currently headed by A. J. Muste, was represented at the Cleveland Conference in the following delegates:

John C. Bennett, dean of Union Theological Seminary.

Harold A. Bosley, Methodist Church.

Edwin T. Dahlberg, president of the National Council of Churches.

Milton H. Hadley, Five Years Meeting of Friends.

Ralph D. Hyslop, Union Theological Seminary.

Louis H. Lammert, Evangelical and Reformed Church.

Paul L. Lehmann, Harvard Divinity School.

John A. Mackay, former moderator, Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

Robert W. Moon, Methodist Church.

A. J. Muste, secretary emeritus, Fellowship of Reconciliation.

Clarence E. Pickett, former head, American Friends Service Committee.

W. Harold Row, Church of the Brethren.

Culbert G. Rutenber, American Baptist Convention.

J. Harold Sherk, National Service Board for Religious Objectors.

Walter W. Sikes, Disciples of Christ.

Bishop B. Julian Smith, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church.

Ralph W. Sockman, Methodist Church.

John M. Swomley, Jr., Methodist Church.

Herman Will, Jr., Methodist Church.

The Church Peace Mission has been specially involved with the question of nuclear-weapons tests.

1. American Forum for Socialist Education—chairman—New York Times, May 13, 1957, page 12; Daily Worker, May 13, 1957, page 1; National Guardian, February 3, 1958, page 1.

2. Appeal for Amnesty for Eleven Communist Party Leaders—signer—press release, January 13, 1953.

3. Bronx Socialist Forum—speaker—National Guardian, February 3, 1958, page 11.

4. Christmas Amnesty Plea for Communists Convicted Under the Smith Act—initiator—New York Times, December 21, 1955, page 20.

5. Church Peace Mission—signer of statement on nuclear weapons tests—press release, December 2, 1957.

6. Church Peace Mission Statement Calling for Cancellation of Nuclear Tests—signer—press release, April 21, 1958.

7. Clemency Appeal for Green and Winston—signer—New York Post, September 23, 1958.

8. Committee on Militarism in Education—member of national council—letterhead, October 1, 1935.

9. Committee for Socialist Unity—speaker at United Socialist Rally for May Day—Daily Worker, April 30, 1957, page 8.

10. Consumers National Federation—sponsor—program, December 11–12, 1937.

11. Dissent—contributing editor—letterhead, May 1958.

12. Fellowship of Reconciliation—speaker at forum—Daily Worker, May 29, 1956, page 1.

13. Fellowship of Reconciliation—secretary emeritus—letterhead, January 1958.

14. First U.S. Congress Against War, 1932—member of arrangements committee—Massachusetts hearings, page 464.

[1] The Attorney General's list.

15. Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy—sponsor—leaflet, April 14, 1958.

16. Greater New York Emergency Conference on Inalienable Rights—speaker—program, February 12, 1940.

17. Melish Brief Amici Curiae—signer—U.S. Supreme Court, January 11, 1951.

18. Militant Labor Forum—speaker—National Guardian, March 3, 1958, page 10.

19. National Associates—sponsor of dinner-forum—program, May 25, 1952.

20. National Committee To Aid Victims of German Fascism—chairman—letterhead, July 3, 1934.

21. National Committee To Secure Justice in the Rosenberg Case—appealed for clemency—leaflet, 1953.

22. National Scottsboro Action Committee—member of executive committee—Daily Worker, May 3, 1933, page 2.

23. New York Committee for the Harold Davies MP Meeting—sponsor; speaker—letterhead, September 11, 1958.

24. New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy—speaker—leaflet, April 11-19, 1958.

25. Petition to Congress to eliminate the House Committee on Un-American Activities—signer—Washington Post and Times Herald, January 7, 1959, page A8.

26. Rosenberg clemency appeal—signer of appeal to President Truman—Daily Worker, January 13, 1953, page 2.

27. Scottsboro Unity Defense Committee—participated in meeting—Daily Worker, April 18, 1933, page 2.

28. Socialist Unity Forum—speaker at symposium—Worker, January 13, 1957, page 15.

29. Statement by non-Communist observers at Communist Party Convention, stating that the convention was democratically run and assailing Eastland committee—signer—Daily Worker, February 25, 1957, page 1.

30. Symposium on socialism in America—participated in—Worker, August 26, 1956, page 4.

31. United States Congress Against War—member of arrangements committee—letterhead of National Organizing Committee, November 1, 1933.

32. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom—signer of open letter asking President Eisenhower to call off H-bomb tests—New York Times, May 7, 1956, page 21; Daily Worker, May 8, 1956, pages 1, 8.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I take this opportunity to congratulate the able and distinguished Senator from Mississippi, who is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the U.S. Senate, for the valuable information he has brought to Senators and to the American people on this very timely and pertinent topic.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank my distinguished friend from South Carolina.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary, by special resolution, has been instructed to investigate the Communist conspiracy in our country and the administration of the Internal Security Act. From investigation and examination of the facts and records there can be little doubt, in my judgment, but that this group is an arm of the Communist conspiracy. They are agents of worldwide communism, who sow strife and discord in this country. A Communist movement must live with decisions that must be made by our Government. They desire to hurt our Government in the eyes of countries in other parts of the world who do not realize what the real conditions in the Southern States are.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I am opposed to title I of S. 1021, to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for primary and secondary education. My opposition to this legislation is based on many grounds, all of which I propose to develop during the course of this debate. But it is well to start with the elemental proposition that the $80 billion annually required to sustain the expenditures of the Federal Government is not money that is manufactured or created by the Government. Government is parasitic in form and sustains itself only by levying tribute in the form of taxes on the income and wealth of the individual citizens. The reach of Federal taxation is uniform against the 50 States and the countless local communities and school districts that have the honor and responsibility of supplying educational facilities to the children of this Nation. All this character of legislation can possibly do is to force citizens to transfer their dollars from local and State control to that of the Federal Treasury and then receive them back in a greater or lesser degree with this joker attached—that is, that what the Federal Government finances it is inevitable that it will eventually control.

Pious claims of limited programs, States rights, and no strings attached are repudiated by the experience of history. Just consider for a moment the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which devised and prepared this latest program and would be charged with its administration. This Department did not even exist until April 1, 1953. While it is true that it did incorporate many old agencies and bureaus, many of which render useful and valuable service, its growth has been gigantean. In the last fiscal year its operation budget amounted to $3,515,872,000. This contrasts with $1,920 million that was required in 1953 to operate the Department. During the fiscal year of 1960 the average number of employees totaled 62,958.

I propose to show during the course of my remarks that this agency of the Government has been both ready, willing, and anxious to enter the field of direct control and supervision of the operation of public school systems in the Southern States.

Before turning to some of the details of the proposed legislation, I would like to point up more of the fundamental issues that are involved in this attempt of the Federal Government to invade a new field of public assistance. Those of us who believe deeply and sincerely in the concept of States rights, under which certain limited and specific powers are delegated to the Federal Government where all others are reserved to the States and the people, have justifiably become increasingly alarmed that we are entering the twilight of State sovereignty without any definite changes in the language of the Constitution of the United States. The increasing and erosive usurpation of power on the part of the Federal establishment through the combined legislative, executive, and judicial branches of the Federal Government has diminished and debilitated the powers of the States. Education is one area which, up until this time, State and local authorities have had the sole control and operational responsibility without interference from the Congress of the United States. It is one of the saddest commentaries of the mid-20th century that the same character of restraint has not been exercised by the judicial branch of our Federal Government.

Mr. President, in all sincerity I say that neither the Founding Fathers of this country nor the Constitution of the United States contemplates that the citizens of 50 States in these United States be pressed together in one conglomerate mass, but when this Congress starts funneling money into the educational facilities of the countless school districts of these United States, this is going to be the inevitable result—one conglomerate mass of people. There are those equalitarians amongst us who full well realize that in order to achieve the purpose of a totally centralized government in this country, the first step must inevitably be to take the child away from the family and make him the ward of the state through a universalized system of public education. Control of our school system under the present scheme is founded in the citizens of the local community. Even though the several States participate in the educational program to a greater or lesser degree, the foundation rock of control still resides with the members of the local school boards and trustees. Control of public education must be retained at this level and it cannot be if we now open the door to gradual federalization.

S. 1021 is heralded as a modest bill. It is proposed to allot to the States $2,550 million at the rate of $850 million per year for 3 years. This Federal assistance is to apply for teachers' salaries, classroom construction, and special projects in our public elementary and secondary schools. If the public school system of this country is in such a deplorable condition, of what substantial assistance can $850 million a year spread over a period of 3 years be to operational costs in excess of more than $16 billion a year which is now expended by the States and local communities to operate these schools? Whether the money is expended on teachers' salaries, classroom construction, or special projects, it is purely and simply the concerted effort on the part of proponents of Federal aid to education to crack the door and

make this Federal assistance a reality so the cornucopia of the Federal Treasury can be opened wider and wider in subsequent years.

Mr. President, I come from a State that would receive as much under the terms of this bill on a per student basis as any other State in the Union. Mississippi's allotted share amounts to $27.79 per pupil. At the bottom of the scale there is one State and the District of Columbia that will receive only $9.26 per pupil over the 3-year period.

Other low States are New York, $10.90 per pupil; Delaware, $10.59; New Jersey, $11.98; California, $12.45; Illinois, $13.11; Massachusetts, $13.38; and Nevada, $13.65 per pupil. The original bill regarding allotments was changed to delete subsections providing for a $15 minimum allotment per public school pupil, and the formula was further broadened to include all school-age children—5 to 17 years. The committee modified the allotment formula in order to achieve an equalization ratio of 3 to 1, regardless of the amount appropriated.

I do not pretend to understand the need and necessity for this elaborate system of formulistic allocation of funds. I was opposed to the way the bill was originally drafted just as much as I am opposed to it in its present form even though the per pupil allotment in the State of Mississippi was considerably higher under the bill as introduced.

Mississippi is one of the States that was not satisfied with its public school system and the token of its dissatisfaction is reflected in the remarkable and phenomenal strides that have been made by the State in the field of public education over the last decade. This has been done without the aid and assistance of the Federal Government and the citizens of Mississippi have cheerfully contributed a greater proportion of their tax dollar per $100 per capita wealth to the cause of public education than have the citizens of any other State in the United States. In 1951 there were 2,094 school districts, with 3,884 schools located in those districts throughout the State of Mississippi, 1,409 of those schools were one-room schools. There were 4,387 classrooms which were entirely unsatisfactory. Some were not owned by the districts, but by churches, and so forth. There were 2,000 classrooms in the State that had an average of 40 or more students per room. These classrooms were located in and near the cities. Some of the school buildings in the State had empty classrooms, due to the fact that people were moving from rural areas into or near the cities. It was estimated that approximately 6,600 classrooms would be needed before the 1959 school year in order to replace unsatisfactory classrooms and to provide for increased attendance in urban areas.

In 1953 the legislature passed laws that provided for a complete reorganization of school districts in the State. All districts were abolished. A survey was made of each county and districts had to be reorganized prior to July 1, 1957. The district reorganization was completed in June 1957, and now there are 150 school districts in the State. This means that from the standpoint of school operation Mississippi reduced its number of districts in a period of 6 years from 2,094 to 150. Proponents of the Federal aid program cry out that one of the great uses this money can be put to is the reduction of the existing number of school districts in the separate States and the reorganization of these districts into economical operational entities. What is urged now for other States has been achieved in Mississippi and without Federal aid.

The original reorganizational law in Mississippi provided that each school district would receive $12 per child in average daily attendance and an additional $3 for each Negro child in average daily attendance until 1964 for the construction of school buildings. The State provides $6,660,000 annually from sales tax collections to finance the program, and the law sets a limit of $80 million in bonds that may be outstanding at any one time. Districts are required to submit long-range plans for needed school construction. These plans indicate the number of satisfactory classrooms available for the children of each race, the number that are to be constructed for each race, and the total number that will be available for each race when the plan is completed.

After the reorganization of the districts went into effect, the greatest need was for Negro school facilities. In approving applications for school construction the commission takes into consideration the equality of facilities and for that reason in many cases Negro school buildings were constructed first. Square feet per student in elementary schools was limited to 65 feet and in secondary schools to 85 feet. The cost per square foot was limited to $7.50. Mississippi can build superior schools under a $7.50 per square foot limitation. An elementary school constructed entirely with State funds was required to use a cafetorium rather than a cafeteria and an auditorium. This is a plan that might well be followed everywhere because it certainly works very satisfactorily in our State. A secondary school was required to use a combination auditorium-gymnasium rather than an auditorium and gymnasium. Buildings had to be insured for their full insurable value and, for that reason, buildings have had to be fire resistant.

From 1946 through 1954 the State of Mississippi spent approximately $75 million for school construction. Since reorganization, the State has approved approximately $85 million in State funds, and local districts have issued bonds for more than $60 million. Some districts have added local funds to State funds in order to provide a better type of building or in order to provide additional facilities. Approximately 4,750 classrooms have been completed with State aid since reorganization and approximately 1,000 are now under construction. More than 40 percent of the children in the State of Mississippi are now attending schools in buildings that have been constructed since World War II. There are 17,000 satisfactory classrooms in the right location. It is estimated that 2,000 additional classrooms are needed at this time, and they will be provided.

This great school building and replacement program represents an honest and sincere attempt on the part of the people of Mississippi to provide adequate educational facilities for all the children of the State. Less than 30 percent of the entire amount has been expended for the benefit of white school children while more than 70 percent has been utilized to supply or replace classrooms for Negro children. The ratio of these expenditures between white and Negro children becomes even more marked when the average daily attendance is taken into consideration. Average daily attendance is the base upon which all school operations are founded.

Since the school year of 1954–55, this is a statistical record of average daily attendance:

Average daily attendance

	White	*Negro*
1954–55	237,865	204,826
1955–56	240,346	203,188
1956–57	241,889	207,004
1957–58	242,413	201,756
1958–59	256,468	216,562

Since the school year 1941–42, the average salary of white classroom teachers has increased from $735.39 for a school year to $3,362.61 in 1958–59. The average salary for Negro classroom teachers has increased from $232.93 in 1941–42 to $2,677.50 in 1958–59. The discrepancy between the present average salary of Negro and white teachers is not to be found in the base pay. It arises from the fact that certain achievements in teacher preparation such as a master's degree and summer work in normals and universities permits a teacher to obtain a higher base pay than those with just the primary certificate. In the primary, elementary, and secondary system of schools in Mississippi there are a total of 10,277 white teachers and 7,217 Negro teachers.

For the school year 1958–59, the expenditures for public education in Mississippi amounted to $88,920,254. Of this total the State contributed $48,176,795; textbooks—State, $1,120,328; local communities contributed, $37,861,150; Federal Government, $1,761,980.

State expenditures for the support of primary and secondary public education have increased from $5,950,000 for 1941–42 to the more than $48 million for the 1958–59 year.

Most of that has gone for Negro education.

To compare the progress that is being made in Mississippi schools with the schools in other States we find that in 1949–50, total expenditure per pupil in everyday attendance was $86.40. This increased per pupil by 1959–60 to $289.60, a percentagewise increase of 235.2 percent. The closest States to Mississippi in percentage of increase are more than 100 points behind.

The entire picture of school expenditures in the so-called poor States of the United States is most illuminating. The

27 poorer States in the Nation—those with less than $2,000 per capita per personal income in 1950 increased school operating expenditures from $585,263,319 in 1941 to $3,291,902,681 in 1950. This is an increase of 562 percent and in two States the increase exceeds 1,000 percent. I ask unanimous consent that the chart reflecting school expenditures in the so-called poor States be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 69.—*School expenditures by "poor" States* [1]

State	Current expenditures (excluding interest and capital outlay)			Increase from 1940 to 1960	Percent of increase
	1940–41 [2]	1951–52 [2]	1959–60 [2]		
Kansas	$28,483,642	$70,000,000	$155,000,000	$126,516,358	444.17
Nebraska	18,345,957	44,200,000	82,000,000	63,654,043	346.96
Florida	20,081,241	89,387,941	260,965,000	240,883,759	1,199.55
Minnesota	46,033,791	127,505,500	251,300,000	205,266,209	445.90
Arizona	8,510,619	33,875,900	99,655,000	91,144,381	1,070.95
Montana	10,454,376	28,531,309	[4] 55,800,000	45,345,624	433.75
Iowa	38,059,231	105,000,000	200,000,000	161,940,769	425.50
Texas	78,537,608	253,033,439	599,570,000	521,032,392	663.42
Utah	9,889,088	28,300,000	72,886,000	62,996,912	637.03
New Mexico	8,542,462	28,330,000	71,500,000	62,957,538	736.99
Virginia	24,442,447	85,000,000	196,414,000	171,971,553	703.58
Vermont	4,799,601	12,405,325	21,387,000	16,587,399	345.60
Oklahoma	30,972,567	87,850,534	150,500,000	119,527,433	385.91
Idaho	8,422,606	22,500,000	40,937,000	32,514,394	386.04
Maine	9,436,217	24,622,536	56,300,000	46,863,783	496.64
West Virginia	26,555,339	68,162,876	103,101,000	76,545,661	288.25
Louisiana	23,332,825	94,013,005	230,895,000	207,562,175	889.57
Georgia	24,585,021	93,000,000	184,375,000	159,489,979	640.91
North Dakota	8,577,217	23,468,295	42,400,000	33,822,783	394.33
Tennessee	24,494,306	79,100,000	160,000,000	135,505,694	553.21
Kentucky	23,915,355	67,000,000	120,876,000	96,960,645	405.43
North Carolina	34,491,163	121,090,987	230,000,000	195,508,837	566.84
South Dakota	11,848,029	26,857,969	46,000,000	34,151,971	288.25
Alabama	20,445,590	[4] 67,000,000	[4] 152,000,000	131,554,410	643.44
South Carolina	16,060,356	59,107,584	110,000,000	93,939,644	584.92
Arkansas	11,677,741	[4] 38,300,000	83,541,000	71,863,259	615.39
Mississippi	13,968,924	40,880,488	99,764,000	85,795,076	614.18
Total	585,263,319	1,818,523,688	3,877,166,000	3,291,902,681	562.47

[1] Includes all States with per capita personal income under $2,000 in 1959.
[2] By David T. Blose, U.S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D.C.
[3] Research Division, National Education Association.
[4] National Education Association Research Division estimates.

Source: Oklahoma Public Expenditures Council, March 1961.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, this is a record of achievement in which these States can take justifiable pride, and insofar as my own State is concerned, if the Federal Government would only leave us alone I can assure you that it will continue to make this kind and character of progress.

Neither the language of the U.S. Constitution nor the Founding Fathers of this country ever intended for public education to be in the province of the Federal Government. At the time of the Revolution, education was recognized as being a necessary foundation stone upon which a free republic and an enlightened civilized country should be built, but it was further recognized that children were first and foremost members of a family group and that the responsibility for education lay with the family and the local community.

The obligation of the States toward education was recognized even before the inception of the United States. Thomas Jefferson submitted a bill to establish a general system of free public schools at the first session of the Virginia Legislature after the Declaration of Independence—1779—and drafted a similar proposal 40 years later—September 9, 1817. Much further back there was an act of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in regard to education, as early as 1647. The oldest State constitution in effect today, that of Massachusetts, adopted in 1780, provides that:

It shall be the duty of legislatures and magistrates, in all future periods of this Commonwealth, to cherish the interests of literature and the sciences, and all seminars of them, especially the University of Cambridge, public schools and grammar schools in the towns. * * *

Carter Davidson, a president of Union College and a profound student in the field of education, made this comment about the attitudes of the members of the Constitutional Convention. He said:

Education was not left out of the Constitution of the United States because nobody thought about education. I can't believe that the gentlemen who attended the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia in 1787, including men like Franklin and Madison and others, who were very conscious of education in their own lives and the life of the Nation, left out education just because they didn't think of it. I believe it was omitted because they felt this was one of the concerns that must be left at the grass roots level; therefore, it is the States, the local governments, and private philantrophy which were intended to be the support of education in America.

The constitution of the State of Alaska, ratified by Congress on July 7, 1958, provides:

The schools and colleges provided for in this act shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, or its governmental subdivisions, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted herein for educational purposes shall be used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, college or university.

A substantially similar provision has been a part of the admission act of every new State since South Dakota was admitted on November 2, 1889.

In view of the omnivorous growth and development of the Federal Government and the direction, control, and administration it has now extended into so many areas of the political, economic and even social life of the citizenry, it is ridiculous for proponents of Federal aid to education to argue that the Northwest Ordinance of 1785, which authorized land grants for school purposes, is even remotely a precedent for this present proposed plan of Federal assistance to education. The history of the disposal of federally owned lands is most interesting. At the end of the Revolutionary War and the creation of the United States, the United States owned no land. The Thirteen States held all nonappropriated lands, including claims to the unsettled areas west of the Appalachian Mountains.

As Hibbard points out in his book on public land policies, Jefferson and others were trying to devise a means of attracting pioneers to move west and settle the virgin lands. A resolution was offered and passed in the Continental Congress calling on the States to donate their western lands to the Confederation. Seven of the Original Thirteen States which owned western lands; namely, New York, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Massachusetts, and Connecticut ceded, between 1781 and 1802, about 268 million acres. Congress considered numerous plans of inducing families to migrate to the west to lands which were then hard of access, dangerous, and of doubtful value. Attempts were made to sell land, but they brought few buyers. As Marion Clawson reports in "Uncle Sam's Acres," there simply was no real market for Federal lands in this period. There were then devised over a period of years the systems whereby homesteads were granted, military bounties were given, and other methods were devised to make the occupancy of these lands attractive to settlers. One of these methods was reserving the 16th section of every township for the maintenance of public schools within the same township. The very character of the reservation emphasizes the degree wherein Congress recognized that public education was tied irrevocably to the local community. The increase or profit off of an area of land 1 square mile was restricted to the use of the 36-square-mile township.

The Original States of the Union, with the addition of five others, Kentucky, Tennessee, Maine, Texas, and Vermont, had no public lands and did not get the benefit of this Federal bounty. The areas in which school land grants were made available contained a bare 1.5 percent of the American people in 1800. H. C. Taylor, writing in the "Educational Significance of the Early Federal Land Ordinances," remarks:

There seems to have been no clear consciousness on the part of the committee or of Congress of the full significance of this educational provision. Apparently, it was viewed only as a selling point for the dis-

posal of the western lands in compact settlements. The thought of laying a permanent foundation for a public school system seems not to have entered into the discussion of the matter.

Approximately 77,500,000 acres of land were eventually granted to the States for public school purposes under the 16th section reservation.

In all, more than 1,031 million acres of public lands were disposed of in the following manner:

	Million Acres
Homesteads	285
States, for schools and other purposes	185
Railroad construction	131
Military bounties and private claims	95
Timber and stone grants	35
Cash and miscellaneous	300

It is interesting to see that the railroads of this country received 53½ million acres more than did the townships in the 16th section grants.

I do not see how even those with the most vivid imagination could characterize this activity on the part of the Federal Government with any intent to enter the field of general assistance to public education at either the primary, secondary, or higher education level. Just as the Government wanted railroads built, it wanted vacant land occupied, and a source of income to a township for public education was certainly an inducement for settlers to buy or homestead within a township.

The land-grant college program has never grown to any proportions. After almost 100 years, it totals less than 10 million out of over 5 billion annually outlayed for higher education. Historically, it is interesting to note that President Buchanan vetoed the original act, stating that:

> Congress does not possess the power to appropriate money in the Treasury, raised by taxes on the people of the United States, for the purpose of educating the people of the respective States.

The Morrill Act was originally suggested and approved not for the support of higher education, but because Congress was not satisfied with the curriculum of existing colleges which primarily offered classical and cultural programs. Grants were offered to the States for the establishment and maintenance of colleges for the agricultural and mechanical arts. The law specified the broad type of curriculum and the class of students served.

When the original act was resubmitted and passed, it was during the Civil War, and a provision was added for mandatory military training.

In the past, as it is today, land grant funds account for only a small fraction of the revenues of benefiting institutions. This is the only reason that these grants have not led to Federal control and administration of the educational institutions.

The Smith-Hughes Act was enacted in 1917, just prior to the entry of the United States into World War I, and for the same reason that the Morrill Act was adopted: Congress was not satisfied with the curricula that concentrated too much on academic subjects. Federal funds were approved for the teaching of certain vocational skills, particularly in fields in which the conduct of the war demanded greater production, such as defense industries and agriculture.

All of us who come from agricultural areas of the United States must admit that the Smith-Hughes program has achieved many of the worthwhile purposes for which it was established. It is my firm conviction that the program would have achieved far greater results had it not been for the extreme degree of Federal control that has been exercised in the administration of the program.

Regulations and controls in vocational education are detailed, cumbersome, and strict. The amount involved equals only a fraction of 1 percent of all public school expenditures. Arthur B. Moehlman, in his book "School Administration," describes Federal control of vocational education as follows:

> The Federal authority dominates and approves even the minute details of the State programs, controls the majority of State directors who in turn exercise a degree of State supervision over community programs totally foreign to the American concept of community competence to manage its own education affairs. The centralization of educational authority in Washington under the operation of the vocational acts is an exceedingly dangerous tendency which if not checked will result in the extension of Federal control to other aspects of public instruction.

In a later edition of this same book Mr. Moehlman said:

> One of the worst outcomes of federally dominated public education is that since the teaching profession has gradually adjusted to these conditions, new executive controls patterned on the vocational pattern will be extended to other areas of elementary-secondary education, and the integrity of public education as a State function will be seriously imperiled.

Just as the Morrill Act and the Smith-Hughes Act were war measures, the GI educational plan was also the result of a great World War, wherein the Federal Government was repaying a debt and obligation that it owed to its young manhood who served in and survived the conflict. This prgoram involves specific grants to individuals, and there could be no possible reason or justification for Federal interference in the field of public education generally.

It is the cold war that has increased agitation for additional grants for special purposes, such as those contained in the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The avowed intention of this act is to compete with Russia in scientific achievements. The preamble declares the purpose to be to meet the present emergency in national defense. Although scheduled to expire in 4 years, this program, like all others instituted by the Federal Government, will probably be continued on a permanent basis. It is my sincere conviction that we can never compete with Russia in any field where we attempt to emulate in the free world techniques employed by a Communist state. If the framework of republican government in this country has any meaning at all, free people must continue to compete with everyone in a free society. If States are to be obliterated and the political, economic, and social life of this country is to be dictated and controlled by the Central Government, we will be no longer a free people under the structure of government now devised by the Constitution of the United States. The greatest tragedy of the 20th century is that the basic structure of government is being changed by judicial decrees and constitutional interpretations of Federal power that are absolutely contrary not only to the written word but the intent and meaning of the Constitution as it was written by our forefathers and adopted by the people.

Not only does the 10th amendment reserve to the States and the people thereof the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, but the 9th amendment, which has received so little attention either in judicial decision or political discussion, is even more significant, in view of the present debate on Federal assistance to education. It provides that—

> The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Nothing can be closer to the rights of the people at the level of the grassroots than their complete control of education, be it public or private. That the people are beginning to have an innate fear and distrust even today of public education is indicated by the enormous growth of private schools throughout the United States. Over the past 20 years, while enrollment in public schools has grown 42 percent, in the same time period private enrollment has jumped 147 percent. If the present course and tendencies now inherent in the attitude of the Federal Government to public education in the States is not reversed, a 147 percent growth in the enrollment of students in private educational institutions is minuscule compared to what is going to happen.

Mr. President, I mention these distasteful subjects because the presently pending bill on Federal assistance to public education is a threshold measure—an instrument by which the door can be cracked and the dike can be penetrated so that a trickle will flow in an area and over ground not yet covered by the Federal goliath. Involved herein far more than Federal expenditures, as important as they are, is principle—principles that challenge the foundation of our structure of government. This is the hour, the time, and the place where those who believe that there are some powers left to the States and the people should stand up and be counted, and counted in opposition to the proposed bill.

Mr. President, I have said before, and I repeat, and will repeat again, and again, and again, that pious denials in proposed legislation of any intent for the Federal Government to control and administer the funds therein being appropriated, are as meaningless as any words that could ever be written. Even philanthropic institutions that make grants for various purposes are inevitably going

to put strings on the money that they give away. They would be foolish if they did not. As far as the Federal Government is concerned, the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized this as an elementary proposition in those vast areas of our economic life where Federal moneys subsidized private or public activity. As early as 1942 the Supreme Court of the United States stated in the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U.S. 111):

> It is hardly lack of due process for Government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

While I personally have many differences, at least with the presently constituted Supreme Court, it is difficult for anyone to quarrel with this very elementary statement by the Supreme Court. It is in line with commonsense and human experience.

We now have a bill that proposes to grant Federal funds to primary and secondary public education institutions for school construction, teachers salaries, and special projects. These three fields open wide the door for the form and character of Federal supervision and control in every school district in the United States.

One witness testifying against the bill suggested a few of the areas of control involved would be policy decisions and controls affecting the training and licensing of teachers, pay scales for teachers and administrators, school district organization, a national school board, compulsory kindergarten and nurseries, compulsory driver education, standards for school buildings and buses, and federally approved curriculums and textbooks. This list could be extended ad infinitum. No amount of policy declarations can destroy the validity of the Supreme Court's pronouncement that the Government can regulate that which it subsidizes.

All of us might agree that social security which is also administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a beneficial program, but who among us can help but mourn for the sad experience of the Mennonite brethren in Pennsylvania who ask nothing and want nothing from the Federal Government but to follow their conscience and the dictates of their religion, being hounded, harassed, and bankrupt by tax collectors seeking to force them to participate in a program that will support someone else and of which they want no part. Where will the family be if the tentacles of Federal control over public education reach to the point where these Mennonites now find themselves enmeshed in the social security laws?

I am not alone in charging that it is impossible for the Federal Government to enter the field of assistance to education without exercising over this field an ever-increasing degree of control, supervision, and standardization. A former Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said:

> An Anglo-Saxon rubric of responsible government, reiterated in the sacred document of free government, is that along with the granting of supply (appropriations in today's language) goes responsibility for how the money is spent.

To depart from this rubric, to give grants in aid to any function, including higher education, would in the long run defeat self-government as certainly as would the future neglect of higher education. No one responsible for higher education and believing in its importance to the preservation of self-government would demand funds on his own terms.

The Nation's Schools in describing the trend said:

> The Federal pattern for the future may be more earmarked legislation, like the National Defense Educational Act, rather than broad general grants to the States. Congress seldom releases money to schools or to any other agency, without asserting some control over how it is spent.

The presently proposed bill completely reverses this described policy of earmarked legislation and moves head on into general grants to the States, teachers salaries, school construction, and special projects.

A former Commissioner of Education argues in effect that if you do not have Federal control accompanying Federal aid you will not improve the character and quality of education. He says:

> On the one hand we have presented to us arguments indicating that there will be no Federal control accompanying Federal aid. Alongside we find evidence showing the inadequacy and inequality of education in States able to support a good educational program and evidence of inefficient or inadequate efforts by the States to eradicate inequality and inefficiency within their borders. If there is to be little or no Federal control accompanying Federal aid, what right have we to expect a major improvement of the education within States under the same leadership as they now have? Thus, if Federal aid is to bring about better schools it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control.

What answer can the proponents of this present bill give to this former U.S. Commissioner's testimony. If the presently proposed grants can achieve a major improvement of education within the States without Federal controls then for what purpose are they made? The question answers itself. We are all told to beware of Greeks bearing gifts. This is a gift that would simply stick the finger to the flypaper. After the contact is first made nature will take care of itself and the web will be spun to completely enmesh the local school districts into the skein of Federal control.

On the simple point of raising teachers salaries, if the increased portion of the salary made possible by Federal aid was removed after 3 years, would it be supplied by the local district or would the intolerable pressure require that the Federal Government repeat the appropriation? There is no doubt about what the teachers would expect. Secretary Ribicoff, testifying before the House subcommittee on the proposed bill, had the figures that would demonstrate how much various States could raise the salaries of their teachers by applying the proceeds of the allotment for this purpose. For instance, as to New Jersey, he said New Jersey could raise every teacher $264 a year and added:

> Now $264 a year for a teacher is a lot of money.

A few others he quoted are:

> You take Arkansas. It could raise the average salary by $600 a year; Georgia, $574 a year; Louisiana, $476. The State of Maine $440. In other words, this is a substantial increase. Minnesota could go $382; New York, $265; and North Carolina, $626.

Let us reverse this coin and take the attitude of teachers toward the receipt of these salary increases from the Federal Government. The deputy president of the United Federation of Teachers, Local No. 2, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, testifying before the House subcommittee, who lives and teaches in the State of New York said it was his opinion that the amount then in the bill would provide a teacher increase in the neighborhood of $500 per teacher, per year, for 3 years. He said that was better than nothing and was most desirable. He was asked this question:

> What should the Federal role be, if any, to the general subsidy for teachers? How effective would it be? Will it result in the relaxation of the effort which perhaps is not being made in your State, or which might not be made if there is a Federal program?

He replied:

> If it were to provide $300 this year, $400 next year, and $500 the next year.

Significantly he stops at 3 years. Who is to take care of him and all the other teachers for the fourth year? The Federal Government is not in that picture now but it goes without saying that if we pass this bill Congress will then be in the middle of the fourth year. It is always easier to start a subsidy than it is to stop it; and when the time comes that the Federal Government starts paying teachers salaries it will have just as much to say about the rate of pay as it is now saying in the Davis-Bacon Act in regard to the application of minimum wages to be paid by contractors for laborers working on school construction projects financed by the fund. This condition provides:

> All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors, in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in a locality to be determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended * * *.

The condition further provides that—

> the State education agency of each State shall take such steps as shall be necessary to assure that the wage standard required above shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project.

If the Federal Government is going to put out part of the money, is it not just as reasonable that it control the minimum that should be paid to a teacher as it is to control the minimums that will be paid to laborers and mechanics?

Educational theorists do not hesitate to assert the direction they want to see taken in the field of public education. Prof. H. Thomas James, of the School of Education, Stanford University, says:

As the States have denied first to the family, and then to local communities, the right to make decisions on education contrary to State defined policy, so the Nation may be expected to deny to the States the right to make decisions on educational policy that are not in accord with the emerging national policy for education.

Van Clive Norris, School of Education, Rutgers University, blamed educational shortcomings on our historical love affair with what might be called "grassroot-ism" in American education. He suggested:

A gradual weakening of our local autonomy over the school and a gradual emergence of control mechanisms that are not so socially and politically proximate to the educational worker * * * we should hope in future years to come to erect new agencies of control which would oversee the work of the educational profession at a little greater distance than is now the case.

I do not believe that there are a handful of parents in the United States today—at least none who have a sense of responsibility to their children—who would want to see a nationalized system of education in this country. Hitler demonstrated what could be done with a nationalized system of education that took the child away from the parent and made him a creature of the State. Nazi totalitarianism would have been impossible had he not been able to take over the mind of the German child. The frightening thing about the German experience is the short period of time in which he achieved this nefarious purpose. Never let it be said that it cannot happen here. Any child who is made a creature of the state, and this has certainly been demonstrated also in Russia, can be molded into the slave of the state. The historic reason for leaving the field of public education at the grassroots of the family and local community is as valid today as it was when this policy was adopted as the foundation of the Republic.

For my colleagues on the other side of the aisle I would like to call attention to the remarks of the late beloved former Senator Taft on the subject of Federal aid in the field of education. Speaking against the teachers salary bill that was most seriously advocated and debated in the Senate in October of 1943, he said:

The intrusion of the Federal Government into the field of education is one which threatens more than any other intrusion the control of the thoughts of the people in the localities. Education is something the people are interested in having complete control over at home.

At another point he added:

Of course, education is not a Federal function. There is nothing in the Constitution of the United States which makes it so. On the other hand, all State constitutions contain educational clauses. The practice for 150 years has established education as a State and local function, and it has been carried out by State and local governments. We meet exactly the same character of us all year after year and decade after decade. The answers are always the same and those answers are the heart of the eternal verities. They made this country what it is today. If we destroy these fundamental divisions of government we destroy our country as we have known it.

A former chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the late Representative John Lesinski, Sr., stated:

It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid bill which will not contain a great deal of Federal control over local school assistance. * * * I am convinced, after the hard study we have put to the question, that no acceptable bill preventing Federal domination of local schools can be drawn. I reluctantly come to the conclusion, but I had to face the facts.

John J. Tigert, a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, expressed his opinion as to what would happen with a grant-in-aid Federal program in this language:

Reason and experience both indicate that Federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising Federal control and supervision, even then there is considerable waste. * * * If we embark upon a program turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance, and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

While I might disagree with this distinguished former Commissioner of Education as to the degree of waste and inefficiency that might be involved in the expenditure of Federal funds for educational purposes, I do not doubt but what the then Commissioner of Education would decide that there was waste and inefficiency, and that the only alternative was for him to take over the control of the program.

Woodrow Wilson was not only one of our greatest Presidents, but as a professor of government, and a political scientist, no student or commentator has ever been more accurate and precise in his comments on the development of the American political system. As an educator, as well as a great statesman, his views more than any other should be taken as authoritative when considering the field of education in its relation to Government. In his great and monumental work "Constitutional Government," he said:

There can, I suppose, be little doubt that it is due to the moral influences of this policy that the States are now turning to the common Government for aid in such things as education. Expecting to be helped, they will not help themselves. Certain it is that there is more than one State which, though abundantly able to pay for an educational system of the greatest efficiency, fails to do so, and contents itself with imperfect temporary makeshifts because there are immense surpluses every year in the National Treasury which, rumor and unauthorized promises say, may be distributed amongst the States in aid of education. If the Federal Government were more careful to keep apart from every strictly local scheme of improvement, this culpable and demoralizing policy could scarcely live. States would cease to wish, because they would cease to hope, to be stipendiaries of the Union, and would address themselves with diligence to their proper duties, with much more benefit to themselves and to the Federal system.

Wilson was writing of a day when surpluses existed in the Federal Treasury. We are living in a day of deficits and a public debt so enormous imagination cannot conceive its extent.

The States asking for this program are asking that new funds be supplied from an agency that is bankrupt by every standard recognized in the law merchant. Fortunately for us and the people, as a sovereign, it can withstand bankruptcy for an unlimited time.

Mr. President, this portion of my remarks has been devoted to the inevitability of Federal control of public education if general grants are allocated to the States as proposed in the pending legislation. Over and above, or I should say within the broad framework of Federal control and administration of public education generally, we who live in the southern areas of the United States are faced with still another aspect of control and supervision, which is a fact, not theory.

The judicial branch is as much a part of our National Government as are the executive and legislative branches. Since the Supreme Court's decision in the case of Brown against Topeka, rendered on May 17, 1954, U.S. district courts have been taking over, or at least attempting to take over, the entire administration of school districts and school systems where actions have been brought under the Brown doctrine. Chief Justice Warren said in a companion case rendered on the same day that the equal-protection clause of the 14th amendment prohibits States from maintaining racially segregated public schools. Implementation of this fundamentally unconstitutional decision by U.S. district judges has led to fantastic results. These results have not been confined to the Southern States. Let me read some portions of the opinion by U.S. District Judge Irving R. Kaufman in the New Rochelle, N.Y., school case:

I find that the Board of Education of New Rochelle, prior to 1949, intentionally created Lincoln School as a racially segregated school, and has not, since then, acted in good faith to implement desegregation as required by the 14th amendment; and that the conduct of the board of education even since 1949 has been motivated by the purposeful desire of maintaining the Lincoln School as a racially segregated school.

The years between 1949 and 1960 have been 11 years of agitation for New Rochelle. For 11 years, responsible civic-minded organizations and groups have urged that something be done to correct the Lincoln situation; for 11 years the board has discussed the problem, hired experts, made surveys, and constantly reiterated its belief in racial equality and the necessity for equal opportunities.

But, in these 11 years, it has taken no action whatsoever to alter the racial imbalance in the Lincoln School. It has met the problem with mere words, barren of meaning, for they were never followed by deeds.

This judge's condemnation of the Board of Education of New Rochelle is fantastic. He goes back to 1949, 5 years before the Brown decision, to set a time where he accuses the board of intentionally creating Lincoln School as a racially segregated school. He then reasons that the Brown decision was not necessarily a decision on the cases then before the court and the facts therein delineated but says it "was a lesson in democracy, directed to the public at large and more particularly to those responsible for the operation of the schools." He said:

It imposed a legal and moral obligation upon officials who had created or maintained segregated schools to undo the damage which they had fostered.

Mr. President, this language admits on its face that the Brown decision was judicial legislation, a fact that we have charged time and time again in challenging the basic unconstitutionality of the decision.

Again, the judge averts to 1949 when he says:

The freeze placed by the board in 1949 on the already gerrymandered boundaries of the Lincoln district remained unchanged, despite 11 years of public agitation, pleas, and advice from distinguished educators and sociologists. And, what is more, the board has not evidenced any intention to change its policies in the future.

This, if you please, still refers to school boundaries that were legally set by a school board in the year 1949.

The judge avers:

Principles long accepted by psychologists and sociologists were given the stature of the law of the land.

In many previous speeches I have analyzed and exposed the pseudoscientific authorities upon which the Supreme Court purported to rely as a foundation for its destruction of the separate but equal doctrine. Carleton Putnam in his book "Race and Reason, a Yankee View," approached his study of these pseudoscientific authorities from a different angle, but his conclusions are no less devastating than those I reached. He said that at the outset he went to the Library of Congress and studied the decision and the briefs of the parties. He also carefully noted the footnotes to the Court's decision, and observed the names of the individuals and organizations who wrote the briefs. He concluded that the argument that modern anthropology had exploded observation, experience, and all past research required serious review, and, as he says:

Accordingly I began reading again in the Boas school of anthropology. Boas, I knew, was considered the founder of the modern vogue, and I deliberately began studying his books before learning, from people who had known him over many years, the facts about Franz Boas himself—his minority group background, his arrival from Germany in 1886, his association with Columbia in 1896, his earlier nonequalitarian views on race, his change of heart in the late 1920's (the date will have significance later), the names of his students—Herskovits, Klineberg, Ashley Montagu—the nature of his department at Columbia, the influence in it of an instructor named Weltfish who later publicly announced that she had evidence to prove that the United States had used germ warfare in Korea, and the reorganization of the department by Ralph Linton who was brought in from Wisconsin after Boas died. Linton dismissed all of Boas' appointees who had no tenure and Columbia finally dropped Weltfish on a charge of "too long" tenure.

I read Boas before learning these things because I wanted to approach his ideas with an impartial mind, on their merits and not on the merits or demerits of the author. Yet page by page my amazement grew. Here was clever and insidious propaganda posing in the name of science, fruitless efforts at proof of unprovable theories. I went on to Herskovits and others until the pattern began to repeat itself, the slippery techniques in evading the main issues, the prolix diversions, the sound without the substance. Was it possible that a whole generation of Americans had been taken in by such writing as this? My wife and I began to read seriously and earnestly—after a few evenings we found ourselves laughing out loud.

Still I was not satisfied. Surely there must be some explanation. It was hardly possible that schools were being closed in Virginia, men threatened with jail in Ohio, on the basis of a hoax as transparent as this. Were there no professional scientists in America who saw what I saw?

By mail, by telephone, and finally by personal visits, north and south, I found professional scientists aplenty who saw what I saw. And I discovered something else. One prizewinning northern scientist whom I visited at his home in a northern city asked me, after I had been seated a few minutes in his living room, whether I was sure I had not been followed. Another disclosed in the privacy of his study that he had evidence he was being checked by mulattoes at his lectures. All, when first approached, were hesitant, withdrawn and fearful, and the reason was not far to seek. Their employers on whom their livelihood depended—the universities, the museums, the foundations—were either controlled by equalitarians or were intimidated by the race taboo. The scientists whom these institutions employed, if they were ever to hint at the truth, must do so deviously, under wraps, over wraps, half seeming to say the opposite.

But as they grew to know me they gave me the facts without varnish. In long conversations and letters they provided the confirmation I needed. Many were internationally known. Some had received the highest prizes. Any public official who will guarantee their livelihood can get their names from me, on one condition—that the scientists themselves agree.

I do not hold a brief for or against the attitude of these men. Most of them expressed their reluctance in terms of a temporary condition. One was about to publish a book and he felt it more important in the long run to keep the track clear for the book than to declare his position now. Another had a confidential assignment for his State that he must first perform. Another said, "I cannot commit academic suicide. I still have work to do. But when I retire——" Another was simply "biding his time." How much of this was rationalization, arising from a timidity that ought to be overcome, I would not venture to say. It was easy enough for me, a man entirely independent of control, to speak—indeed it made my obligation unavoidable. It was less easy for them.

A second element in the situation soon dawned on me. The difficulty was compounding itself. The South instinctively saw the real issue, yet it had been told so often that what it saw did not exist that it had almost come to believe it. In this respect the South was in an identical trance with the North but, as happens in such cases, it could not actually be brought to destroy itself. It fought the trance with a counterillusion. It clung to the hope that the Constitution could save it—that States rights was its best defense. I was soon to learn how profound this counterillusion was. From Governors to lawyers in the street I received the same despairing protest—"What else is left?" There seemed to be an agreement among public officials that race should no longer even be mentioned. Among the few northern defenders of the South the same defeatism existed. Feverish talk about the validity of the 14th amendment went on, up north, down south, while no one challenged the assumption at the root of the whole trouble—the validity of Boas.

In his book he destroys and disproves any possible validity for the Boas school and its adherents, who were uniformly cited by the Supreme Court as the principles Judge Kaufman says were given the stature of the law of the land. Judge Kaufman then held:

That the Board of Education of New Rochelle, by its conduct in the years prior to 1949, created and established the Lincoln School as a segregated, Negro school. Thus formulated, the present case falls squarely within the plain meaning of the Brown decision.

As a matter of fact, at the time this case was heard, according to Judge Kaufman, 94 percent of the students were Negroes, rather than 100 percent. White children living in this school district were required to attend Lincoln School. So, Judge Kaufman reasons that the 94-to-6 ratio also violates the 14th amendment and the Brown principles because the contention of the board "misconstrues the underlying premise of the Brown rationale. That opinion, while dealing with a State-maintained dual system of education, was premised on the factual conclusion that a segregated education created and maintained by official acts had a detrimental and deleterious effect on the educational and mental development of the minority group children."

He reasoned that "in a community such as New Rochelle, the presence of some 29 white children certainly does not afford the 454 Negro children in the school the educational and social contacts and interaction envisioned by Brown."

He concluded that "the Constitution imposed upon the board the duty to end segregation, in good faith, and with all deliberate speed. It is patently clear that this obligation has not been fulfilled."

Then, in projecting himself into the middle of the New Rochelle School Board, he concludes that "the neighborhood school policy certainly is not sacrosanct. It is valid only insofar as it is operated within the confines established by the Constitution. It cannot be used as an instrument to confine Negroes within an area artificially delineated in the first instance by official acts. If it is so used, the Constitution has been violated and the courts must intervene."

I do not know what the population of New Rochelle, N.Y., may be or how this population is divided between Negro and white children. I suppose if the judge is going to use a slide rule he will simply abolish the neighborhood school policy and require this school board to fill every school in the exact proportion that there are Negro and white children under the jurisdiction of the board. Whatever his blueprint may be, he concluded his opinion by ordering the board to present to the court, on or before April 14, 1961, a plan for desegregation in accordance with this opinion. I am sure the board and patrons of the New Rochelle schools would be the first to admit that the Federal Government has taken a definite hand in the control, operation, and direction of its public school system. Judge Kaufman offers no other basis for stocking the school with children other than that of color, in equal proportion.

Our colleague of Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] attached this opinion to his remarks of March 24, 1961, when he introduced S. 1434, a bill providing for the desegregation of all school districts in the United States wherein both white and Negro children may reside. There is a marked similarity between S. 1434 and the provisions of S. 1817, a bill introduced in the Senate by Senator CLARK on May 8, 1961, entitled "Public School Desegregation Act."

Since I have mentioned these desegregation bills, I will explore this area from a standpoint of legislative proposals before returning to the court decision.

Secretary Ribicoff, in testifying on the presently proposed legislation before the House subcommittee, said:

> Now, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, keep this in mind: This is a States rights bill. This money will go to the State. The State will make the decision.

In 1959 Secretary Ribicoff's predecessor in office, Secretary Flemming, evidenced a marked concern for State school assistance in the South when he testified before the House Judiciary Committee on title VII of the then proposed Civil Rights Act of 1959. He said:

> The decisions of the Supreme Court holding racial segregation in the public schools to be unconstitutional established the task of public school desegregation as the responsibility of those States which previously required or permitted racial segregation in their school systems. The States and localities had been operating their schools in reliance upon earlier Supreme Court rulings that public segregation was lawful, provided that separate but equal facilities were maintained.
>
> Now, in making the transition to a desegregated public school system in accordance with constitutional requirements, these States and their communities may, in varying degrees, experience temporary but real financial and educational burdens. Significant problems of organization, transportation, curriculum planning, and school community relationships may arise. Intensive efforts may be required at the State and local levels to assure that the transition is made in a sound and orderly manner.

What problems did he say were involved, Mr. President? "Problems of organization, transportation, curriculum planning, and school community relationships may arise." If this is what the Federal Government proposes to do, how deeply can it get in the operation of local public school systems? Decisions in these areas are the veritable heart of the public school system. Of course the Secretary says that he wants to assist, not direct, so he adds that the Federal Government can supply both the personnel and the money to do the job. This is his language:

> This Department, as the Federal agency charged with national responsibilities in the field of education, has a special concern with such problems. We believe that citizens and leaders dealing with them should be able to obtain assistance from the Federal Government in developing programs of transition and in meeting the problems arising from the transition. The legislation recommended by the President in title VII would authorize this kind of affirmative help when it is requested.
>
> Under the bill, the Federal Goverment would be authorized to make grants-in-aid to share half of the cost of additional and special educational services which desegregation programs may require. For example, State departments of education will undoubtedly be called upon by their local districts to provide leadership help in one form of statewide studies, professional consultative and advisory services, local and regional conferences and workshops, and the development of curriculum materials.
>
> Again, a local school system initiating a program of desegregation may in many cases find it desirable to employ staff members with special responsibility for developing the program, creating community understanding of its aims and approaches, and working with the parents and children affected. These staff members might include an assistant to the superintendent of schools, perhaps visiting teachers, and specialists in various fields—specialists who would deal with such matters as statistics and their interpretation, counseling and guidance, human relations, inservice training of teachers, and school social work. The actual pattern of organization and services in an individual school district would, of course, depend on its particular needs.

Substantially the same provisions contained in the old proposed title VII, which was deleted by the House Judiciary Committee, reappeared in S. 1817 of the present Congress. When and if Secretary Ribicoff appears before either a House or Senate committee to testify on this bill, is he going to say:

> Now, as far as the Federal Government is concerned, keep this in mind: This is a States rights bill.

Mr. President, if this situation were not so deadly serious it would be ludicrous. The technical assistance and financial aid bill for desegregated schools in the present Congress goes far beyond that that was presented and rejected by the 86th Congress. It starts with a definition:

> Desegregation is achieved only when race or color is completely eliminated as a factor in assigning students to public schools.

It requires every school district in which white and Negro children live to adopt a desegregation plan and file it within 180 days after the enactment of the act with the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. If no plan is filed or if the plan as filed is not satisfactory to achieve the first step in integration not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year, then the Attorney General is authorized to institute, in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief against the school board or its successor. When the court finds that the school board has not desegregated in accordance with the act, it must require the school board or its successor to adopt a plan, or to implement the plan which was adopted, or to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate. Nothing that was dreamed up or enacted during the Reconstruction era could possibly reach the peak of coercive vindictiveness that is proposed in this bill. It is not going to pass. I am using it purely for the purpose of illustrating the illusion of thinking that it is possible to have Federal assistance to public education in the States and local communities without the corollary of Federal control and direction.

The judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government are creating sufficient turmoil and havoc in the area of public education without the need of any assistance from the legislative branch. Some time ago I read the statement of the Chief Justice as to the extent of the meaning inherent in the Brown decision. One of the defendants in this original case of Brown against the Board of Education of Topeka and others was the County School Board of Prince Edward County, Va. The conclusion that Justice Warren reached was:

> We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of "separate but equal" has no place.

Then to repeat the language that I previously quoted used in the companion case of Bowling against Sharp, he said:

> We have this day held that the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment prohibits the States from maintaining racially segregated public schools.

The law-abiding people of Prince Edward County, Va., bowed to this decree. They did not violate its terms. They held no public school.

Yet today we are confronted with the anomalous situation of the executive branch of the Government attempting to intervene in an action which was clearly laid at rest when the defendant, Prince Edward County School Board, abandoned public schools. The sovereign power of the United States of America has now injected itself into this case. Attempts to join the sovereign State of Virginia, among many others, has new defendants, and in (d) of its prayer for relief, prays that the U.S. district court, in an order—

> Enjoining the State, the State board of education, the State superintendent of public instruction, and the State comptroller, from approving, paying, or issuing warrants for the payment of any funds of the State, or the maintenance or operation of public schools anywhere in Virginia for so long and during such a period as the public schools of Prince Edward County are closed

and a system of public free schools is not maintained within the county.

The petition of the Government to intervene in this case, join the additional defendants and present its evidence as a basis for the relief sought, is now awaiting disposition in the U.S. district court. And as important as this matter is, not only to the State of Virginia, but to all States where there may live white and Negro students in the same school district, I do not think it appropriate to try the issue in advance. It is used as an illustration of how the compounding of an original wrong, the basic decision of the Supreme Court in the Brown against Topeka case can be compounded to such a degree that the Government would seek to penalize the entire public educational system of the State of Virginia to achieve a purpose that was illegal and unconstitutional in its inception. I will ask this question. If the Government achieved the ultimate relief it prayed for it would not only be controlling public education in the State of Virginia, but would abolish it entirely.

Mr. President, in Federal legislation generally the voice of the siren has been sung to the South many, many times. There is no talk today about the Powell amendment. In fact, its author is the sponsor of the administration's bill in the House of Representatives. The Powell amendment, if it were added to the present impending legislation would deny the delegation of any of these funds to school districts maintaining racially segregated schools. Now the proponents of Federal assistance to education are deadly serious and they are willing to play practical politics to the same degree it was played when the original House act of 1949 was adopted.

An interesting colloquy occurred during the hearings on the nomination of Robert C. Weaver to be Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator, in regard to the history of the Housing Act of 1949. The Powell amendment of 1949 was known as the Bricker amendment. Senator SPARKMAN said to Mr. Weaver:

You will recall that the Senate took a very practical viewpoint on this—that if that amendment should go in it would mean the killing of the housing program. This was on the enactment of the program originally.

The one who led the fight against that amendment was my esteemed friend on the left here, Senator DOUGLAS, and he was quite realistic.

In fact, if it would not consume the time of the committee, I would read some of the things——

Senator DOUGLAS. Go ahead.

Senator SPARKMAN. I was going to say it would take too much time.

Senator DOUGLAS. Since the issue has been raised, I would appreciate it if you would. If you do not, I will.

Senator SPARKMAN. I will certainly offer them for the record.

Senator DOUGLAS. No; please read them now.

Senator SPARKMAN. All right.

Senator DOUGLAS. If you do not read the appropriate passages, I will select them.

Senator SPARKMAN. I will. I quote:

"Mr. DOUGLAS. What would happen if we voted for and hence adopted the Bricker amendment? The answer is very simple. It would inevitably defeat the whole housing bill itself. I think every Member present in this Chamber knows that to be a fact, and knows why it is so. But it needs to be made plain to the people of the country.

"In the first place, it would compel virtually all of the some 30 southern and border State Senators to vote against the housing bill as a whole, once this amendment were included in it."

I said we took a realistic approach, and we did, and we might as well be realistic now.

We know that ordinarily we are able to get public housing through the Senate, but in the House we know that the margin is very, very close.

In fact, Congressman RAINS, the chairman of the Housing Subcommittee, told me a few days ago that his margin there now was five votes.

There are a good many southern Members who vote for public housing—

Senator DOUGLAS. Let it be recognized that the southern Senators and Congressmen have a great deal of political weight in the Congress of the United States.

Senator SPARKMAN. I am not arguing about that. I am just talking about votes.

Senator DOUGLAS. All right.

Senator SPARKMAN. And particularly in the House.

And so Senator DOUGLAS was being quite realistic.

I am not reading this in any effort to rib him at all—

Senator DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Senator SPARKMAN. I know his viewpoint quite well. And I think he acted as a statesman that day. He did a wonderful job and defeated the amendment.

Senator DOUGLAS. I got the housing bill through.

Senator SPARKMAN. That is right.

Senator DOUGLAS. It gave me some uneasy moments afterward.

Senator SPARKMAN. He says, talking about the southern Members:

"Many of them would do this with a heavy heart, for they believe in this bill and want to see it passed. But their sentiments and those of the people whom they represent are so intense on this question that if the choice is presented between added housing with the abolition of segregation in the housing projects of the South and no housing at all, they will choose no housing.

"We may deplore their feelings, as I personally do, but let us judge not, lest we ourselves be judged.

"Let me emphasize the fact that from all I can learn, a large majority of the southern Senators are in favor of the bill in the present form without the Bricker amendment. The senior Senator from Louisiana, Mr. ELLENDER, has for years been one of the leading sponsors of this bill.

"In the present session perhaps its two most vigorous and intelligent champions have been the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Maybank, and the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama, Mr. SPARKMAN.

"Thank you.

"As a humble member of the Banking and Currency Committee with those Senators I want to pay tribute to the devotion and public spirit with which they have fought for this measure.

"If the Bricker amendment is not included, they and a large majority of their southern and border colleagues will vote for the measure, and enable it with northern and western help to pass. But if the Bricker amendment is adopted, then all of them will move to the opposition."

Then there were some questions and answers, and finally he said this:

"We, therefore, have the choice of voting for the Bricker amendment prohibiting segregation in public housing everywhere and thereby killing the whole program of voting it down, enabling the act to be passed, the slums to be cleared, and the 810,000 dwellings to be constructed, and then let the localities themselves decide this question of segregation in public housing."

Later on he said:

"Personally I do not believe in segregation; but I also know that the Southern States are firmly committed to that principle, and I do not want at this time to disrupt the United States of America, during a period of grave national crisis, when we are being threatened by the police state, in order to force upon them what I believe to be correct."

I could go on and read other excerpts.

Senator DOUGLAS. Pretty good. Go ahead.

Senator SPARKMAN. It is one of the finest arguments I ever heard the Senator from Illinois make and one of the most effective may I say. He carried the day.

"Let me point out that of the approximately 140,000 units constructed by the Federal Housing Authority, I believe exclusive of those originally built by the Public Works, 46,000 are now occupied by Negroes, or one-third of the total, despite the fact that Negroes form one-tenth of the population; and in virtually every southern city that I know of dwellings have been constructed for Negroes."

And then later he said: "Then, Mr. President, I would reply to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I do know of that statement—"

Senator HUMPHREY had asked him if he knew of a statement that had been made by the National Council of Negro Women—"which has been issued by the National Council of Negro Women under date of April 12. The president of that organization is Mrs. Mary McLeod Bethune, certainly one of the leading Negro women of the country. Mrs. Bethune says their organization is opposed to the so-called Bricker amendment because they believe it would kill the housing program."

Senator DOUGLAS called attention to the telegrams that had been received from other organizations opposing this.

Let me read a little something here if I may.

I find that Senator DOUGLAS yielded to the Senator from Alabama, and I said this:

"The question has been repeatedly put to the Senator from Illinois with reference to the defeat of housing if the Bricker amendment should be adopted, and reference has been made, apparently, to the question of defeating the bill. What I want to ask the Senator from Illinois is this. It is true, is it not, that no housing project is to be imposed upon any city or any local housing authority but it is to be placed there only upon application of the local authority?"

Senator DOUGLAS said, "That is correct."

And then I ask further:

"Is it not merely good practical sense, which we might as well recognize right here that if the bill should pass and become law with an antisegregation amendment in it, no city or town in southern States, where segregation is the custom and tradition, and, in most of those States a part of the law, would have any housing project applied for; and is it not also a fact that the South is the place in which the Negroes most need housing?"

Then I want to read this delightful statement by the Senator from Illinois:

"The Senator from Alabama, as always, states the case accurately and with precision."

Senator DOUGLAS. I would amend that. "Almost always."

Senator SPARKMAN. Then I said:

"It is not true, then, for all practical purposes, public housing, certainly so far as the Negro is concerned, would be defeated, bill or no bill, law or no law?"

Senator DOUGLAS said, "That is correct."

History repeats itself. An attempt is now being made to obtain threshold legislation, but insofar as public schools are concerned, the situation is far different from what it was in public housing in 1949. The South will not be given such a long breathing period where Federal assistance to public education is concerned. In fact, arguments are being advanced that what Federal assistance for public education is now being extended to southern States should be withheld until such time as the schools are integrated. There was called to my attention a brochure by the legislative reference service of the Library of Congress. It is entitled, "The Power of the President to Withhold Federal Funds from Educational Institutions Which Discriminate Among Students or Kinds of Race." This remarkable document was prepared by one, Vincent A. Doyle, legislative attorney, American law division, under the date of March 10, 1961. Mr. Doyle seems to adhere to the conviction that the Supreme Court has the power to legislate and that its decisions in specific cases have all the sweep and dignity of a statute enacted by this Congress. He concludes:

All provisions of Federal, State, or local law requiring, or permitting, racial discrimination in public education must yield to the fundamental principle that such discrimination is unconstitutional."

Without any statutory guidelines there can be no per se definition of what constitute racial discrimination until such time as the Court has under its consideration a state of facts, a controversy recognized by article III of our Constitution.

The pertinent provision provides that the judicial power shall extend to all cases in law and equity arising under this Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their authority; to all cases affecting Ambassadors, and so forth. The novel theory that a court decides anything other than law of a case is one that never received any universal acceptance prior to the decision in Brown against Topeka. I deny that a Supreme Court decision can give the President of the United States a mandate to do anything other than that involved in the parties or subject matter that is before the Court in any given case. I say this because this memorandum reaches a conclusion that the President himself has the power to withhold payments to States for the support of public segregated educational institutions.

This brochure does illustrate just another one of the many areas where the executive branch of the Federal Government is being asked and encouraged to interfere not only with the operation of the public school systems in the South but in every area where public moneys are appropriated by Congress and expended in the States by one or another of the executive departments.

There is a three-judge court sitting on a school case in Louisiana that threatens to go further in tampering with public school systems in the South than could have been dreamed of at the time the Supreme Court rendered the original decision in the Brown case. The court has done an unprecedented thing. It has posed two questions to the attorneys general of our 50 States and asked that they reply to them in order to aid and assist the court in arriving at its decision. If the answers of the attorneys general were in the affirmative and if the court attempted to write an opinion based upon those affirmative answers, a republican form of government would be forever denied to the several States and the people thereof. The two questions were these:

1. Would the abandonment of a State's public school system deprive children of rights guaranteed by the 14th amendment's due process or equal protection clauses?

2. Would the answer be the same if the abandonment were on a local option basis after a vote of the electorate authorizing county school authorities to close public schools?

Mr. President, if the day comes in this country when Federal judges appointed to office on a life tenure can deny to the people at the level of the local community and the State the inherent right to exercise the franchise in any way they see fit, then the State has no republican form of government. It becomes, in fact, an oligarchy, completely controlled and dominated by a judge who, in the alleged exercise of judicial power, arrogates unto himself not only the powers delegated by the Federal and State Constitutions to the respective judicial, legislative and executive branches of the government, but the sovereignty vested in and retained by the people. Thus the court threatens to supplant State legislatures, local school boards and, finally, the people themselves. Is it any wonder that many of us look askance at any proposed Federal assistance to public education?

In the early part of 1961, the Civil Rights Commission forwarded to the President and to the Congress a so-called report on Equal Protection of the Laws in Public Higher Education. The findings and recommendations contained in this report, if implemented, would place the Federal Government in the middle of the operation and control of institutions of higher education. Let me read you the first recommendation:

1. Therefore, the Commission recommends that the Federal Government, either by executive or, if necessary, by congressional action, take such measures as may be required to assure that funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education are disbursed only to such publicly controlled institutions of higher education as do not discriminate on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Here again we find an assumption that the executive branch of the Government might be able to take some action in withholding Federal funds without any legislative warrant being given to it by the Congress. This is a peculiarly significant assumption insofar as institutions of higher education are concerned, because the Morrill Acts which have been enacted by this Congress and are still on the statute books specifically provide for separate but equal facilities being supplied to white and Negro students by the funds authorized under the land-grant programs.

At least Vice Chairman Storey had some reservations in regard to executive or administrative action to implement this recommendation. In his concurring statement he says:

This recommendation seems to assume that executive or administrative action to withhold such funds might be proper under some existing laws because broad powers are conferred upon some agencies or officials without legislative prohibition of such administrative action. Strong arguments can be made for the opposite point of view, namely, that had Congress intended to curtail the distribution of Federal funds to institutions which discriminate in admission policies, it would have delegated such powers expressly and would have set forth specifically the conditions under which such funds should be withheld. It is reasonable to conclude that not having delegated such power Congress did not intend it to be assumed or exercised.

And Commissioner Rankin, in his concurring statement, says, in part:

I must express my concern that this recommendation, if put into effect in an immediate and drastic fashion, would be interpreted by many citizens as a punitive measure rather than one in support of proper constitutional objectives. I am interested in promoting sound public education; I seek compliance with the Constitution, not the imposition of penalties. Additionally, if the conditioning of Federal funds were to result in widespread refusal to accept Federal assistance, those who would suffer would not be those who made the decision but the students who directly or indirectly benefit from Federal grants-in-aid to education.

I, therefore, concur in this recommendation in principle but could not support certain procedures that would, in my mind, be unwise means of implementation.

Commissioner Doyle E. Carlton dissented from the first recommendation, stating:

As to recommendation No. 1, it is my opinion that this objective will not be attained by any action which has the effect of withholding public funds from institutions that do not conform to a Federal pattern. The withholding of such funds is to me unsound from a political, governmental and moral standpoint. I cannot approve the withholding of money, coming as it does to the Federal Government from the taxpayers of the several States, as a club to forge any fixed pattern set forth by a Federal agency. Such action would impede rather than advance public higher education. It would also create resentment and ill will to the injury of both races. Progress can be made on the basis of good will without such arbitrary action.

But it must be concluded that a majority of the Commission are actually

recommending to the President that he here and now, by either executive or administrative action, withhold all funds under the various programs of Federal assistance to higher education where either the administrator or the executive reaches the conclusion that discrimination on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin exist.

In the second recommendation the Commission wants to take away from a local Federal district judge the power to resolve factual issues regarding the denial of equal protection of the laws. As presently constituted, these courts can only sit when a constitutional issue is involved. The bare bone of the recommendation states:

> Therefore, the Commission recommends that Congress consider the advisability of authorizing the use of three-judge courts under section 2284 of the United States Judicial Code (U.S.C., title 28) to cases presenting a substantial factual issue as to whether persons are being denied equal protection of the laws with respect to public education.

Both Vice Chairman Storey and Commissioner Carlton dissent. Vice Chairman Storey says he well appreciates the fact that what the Commission is trying to do in this recommendation is to change the character of jurisdiction vested by statute in district courts to get the school cases before a three-judge court where the duly constituted United States district judge will be denied the power and right to hear and determine the facts in any given situation.

Finally, the Commission recommends that the Federal Government sponsor in the several States educational programs designed to assist public school teachers and students of native talent and ability who are handicapped professionally or scholastically as a result of inferior educational opportunity and training.

Mr. President, I do not propose at this time to argue the demerits of this report by the Civil Rights Commission on equal protection of the laws in public higher education. I am using the recommendations of this Commission to show the degree in which it desires the Federal Government to tamper with the operation of public education in the junior colleges and universities of this country.

Mr. President, I am in complete agreement with the conclusions reached in the minority views on the report accompanying S. 1021. These conclusions stated:

> We are of the opinion that there is no "crisis in education" as claimed by the supporters of the committee bill. Judging by all the relevant criteria, statistical and otherwise, as provided by the bill's proponents themselves, we can find not the slightest justification for extending the activities of the Central Government into the field of education which, both traditionally and constitutionally, has been the exclusive domain of the States and the localities.

Conclusions reached on the basis of statistical data by the proponents and opponents of Federal assistance to public education are so diverse that it is bewildering for one not intimately connected with the field of public education to make heads or tails of the meaning. This is true both in the field of alleged classroom shortage and on the question of teacher shortage and salaries for teachers. According to the figures of the U.S. Department of Education, a tremendous reduction must have been made in classroom shortage over the period from 1950 to 1960. The shortages, as reflected by these figures, were 250,000 in 1950, 312,000 in 1953, 370,000 in 1954, 159,000 in 1956, 142,300 in 1957, 141,900 in 1958, 132,400 in the fall of 1959, and 142,100 in the fall of 1960. This would indicate a reduction from 370,000 in 1954 to 142,100 in 1960. This reduction was achieved by State and local effort alone.

President Kennedy, in presenting the present program to Congress, indicated a need for around 60,000 classrooms a year for the next 10 years. This 60,000 figure is approximately the same figure that was claimed to be needed 10 years ago. For the last 5-year period the States have averaged construction of almost 70,000 classrooms per year. Even without Federal aid, the States would, on this basis, exceed what the President said was required by 10,000 a year, if they maintain the present construction rate.

Dr. Roger A. Freeman, research associate, Institute for Studies in Federalism, Claremont Men's College, Claremont, Calif., testified before the Senate subcommittee considering S. 1021. His knowledge of the field of public education is wide and comprehensive and his book "Taxes for the Schools" is one of the most definitive publications that has ever been made in studying and analyzing public education. The following is his analysis of the so-called classroom shortage:

> It was in 1954 that the Commissioner of Education testified that the classroom shortage totaled 370,000 classrooms; and about a year later the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare stated that the shortage would rise to 600,000 within 3 years.
>
> Well, actually the most recent figure which the Office of Education has put out is 142,000, which is 370,000 less than a mere 6 years ago.
>
> But even the new figure is not reliable, as is quite evident from a detailed analysis. The estimate has changed so much from year to year and from State to State that I doubt if very much reliance can be placed upon it.
>
> One statement was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD just about a month ago, which quoted figures of the U.S. Office of Education, and said about this: "In the past 4 years the number of classrooms in use has increased 251,000. Now, the number required to take care of the additional enrollment in that time, which was 4.8 million, would have been 170,000 which means that the net increase in classrooms that were available for the reduction of shortages was 81,000."
>
> But the shortage reports of the Office of Education in the meantime were reduced by only 17,000, and what has happened is this, sir: That some of the States, several each year, have reevaluated their needs and have, in some years, increased their shortages by 5,000 or 10,000 classrooms.
>
> On the average during the past 4 years, the reevaluations have upped the shortage by about 16,000 classrooms each year.
>
> On this basis, obviously we could go on indefinitely to have a big shortage. It seems to me that this game of shortage reports and of construction is somewhat like greyhounds chasing a mechanical hare; the mechanical hare always stays ahead.
>
> The fact is that over the past 10 years States and communities have built over 600,000 classrooms; that the added enrollment required 400,000 classrooms, which means that about 200,000 classrooms were available for, first, the reduction of shortages or class sizes and, second, for the replacement of obsolete or old buildings.
>
> It seems to me that this record is a vivid testimony to the faith of the American people in education. They have voted in thousands of elections for higher taxes and for school-bond issues.
>
> To give you just one comparison, the Russians, who usually do not understate their claims, I would say, have claimed that since the war they have built classrooms for 9 million children.
>
> In the United States we have built public classrooms for close to 20 million, and private classrooms for another 1½ to 2 million children, and we have fewer people in the United States than there are in the Soviet Union. So I think we are doing quite well as far as classroom construction is concerned.
>
> Much confusion has existed about the so-called shortages and they were very seriously questioned by the examiners of the Bureau of the Budget who went on a field trip just about a year ago to nine States and came back with a report that questioned some of the claims. More recently they also questioned the current report that winds up with 142,000 shortage. That report was completed last December 1.
>
> The Bureau of the Budget objected to it, and the Secretary of HEW held it up until the last day that he was in office, January 19, and then released it. The former Secretary, of course, is the one to whom I refer.
>
> However, I believe that the outlook in classroom construction is quite simple and does not require very complicated mathematics.
>
> The President, in his education message on February 20 said that to take care of all the needs there ought to be built 600,000 classrooms in the next 10 years, that is, over 60,000 a year.
>
> I may mention here, Mr. Chairman, that in a book which I wrote 3 years ago I came up with exactly that figure.
>
> In the past 5 years States and communities have been building an average of 70,000 classrooms a year, which simply means that the present volume of construction will not have to be maintained through the 1960's, it can actually decline very materially, and still provide all the classrooms which the schools will need to meet all reasonable demands.
>
> Moreover, there is no sign or indication of a decline in school construction. Quite the contrary. The year 1960 established a new alltime record both in the volume and the approval percentage of school bond issues, $1.8 billion, an 81 percent approval.
>
> Now this, I think, refutes the statements that have been made about a taxpayers' revolt. There is no such thing as a taxpayers' revolt, surprising as it might seem.
>
> The Department of Commerce has estimated that public educational construction in 1961 will increase 8 percent over 1960 and, in fact, in January, which is the only month for which we have figures so far, they just came out last week, public educational construction was up 19 percent over the corresponding period a year ago.

So, in other words, there is no indication of a decline in school construction, although somewhere along the line in the 1960's school construction will decline, simply because annual enrollment increases will be cut in half, and there is no question about it, according to the projection of the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

A careful examination of all the testimony by the proponents of this proposed bill cannot refute the conclusions that are reached by Dr. Freeman in regard to classroom construction. I know of no better authority than Dr. Freeman to quote on the question of teacher shortages. He says:

The Office of Education used to issue statements every year on the size of the teacher shortage. In 1953, it was placed at 72,000, and in 1959 it was placed at 195,000.

At that point the criticism became so severe and, in fact, I would say so sarcastic, that last year the Office did not publish any statement of the teacher shortage, and simply left a white sheet in that place where in the past the teacher shortage used to be reported.

The available statistics indicate that, on the whole, education has done far better than any other sector of the economy in terms of manpower.

The one comparison I have here in my testimony compares the increase in employment in (a) public education and (b) in private industry.

Public education in that case includes both higher and lower, because these statistics of the Department of Commerce do not have a breakdown between higher and lower. Here are the figures over the past 30 years.

The increase in employment in public education was 140 percent. In private industry the increase was 45 percent; and I would like to mention that the increase in the population of the United States over that period was 45 percent, exactly the same as the increase in enrollment in public education.

Now, if we view the public schools excluding higher education, you will find that consistently over the period which we can follow, which is back to 1900, proportionately more teachers were added to the payroll than students. Over the period from 1900 to 1961 the increase in enrollment was 150 percent, and the increase in teachers was 250 percent.

To be specific, the pupil-teacher ratio which in 1900 stood at 35.6, in 1930 was at 29.2, and in 1961, in the current school year, according to estimates of the National Education Association, is 24.4.

If you only take the past several years and include only the teachers who have certificates, eliminating the so-called substandard teachers, you have this picture; that is the period over which, according to the Office of Education, the teacher shortage increased so tremendously.

The increase in the number of certificated teachers was 40 percent, and in pupil enrollment 29 percent.

The number of pupils per certificated teacher declined by 2.4; in other words, it was reduced from 28.4 to 26.

What the pupil-teacher ratio should be is a matter of opinion. There have been close to 200 research studies undertaken over the years, many of which tried to prove that children learn more in small classes than in large.

However, the studies were unable to prove this. In fact, the majority of studies, to everybody's surprise, and they were objective studies undertaken by researchers, seemed to indicate the opposite, for some reason, the reason for which I do not know.

The children in the larger classes actually had progressed more in terms of skills and knowledge.

The detail and the proof of this is in a book, "School Needs in the Decade Ahead," which I wrote 3 years ago. The facts are largely taken from the Encyclopedia of Educational Research, which is a big volume, and I do not want to quote any more, but the data are available if you wish them.

Now, coming to the outlook for the teachers' supply, we find it to be favorable for a very simple reason: The percentage of college students who prepare for teachers' certificates has risen from 21 percent in 1948 to 32 percent in 1955, and has since remained stable.

The number of bachelors' and first professional college degrees is projected by the Office of Education almost to double over the next 10 years, the reason being, of course, that the war babies now are getting to be of college age, as you know.

To be quite specific, the number of earned college degrees was estimated at 387,000 in the year 1959, and at 703,000 in the year 1969. That is an increase of 82 percent. So if the percentages of college students going into teaching just remains the same—in the past it has increased, but supposing it remains the same—it would be increasing the number of newly graduated teachers by 82 percent.

But I would like to remind you that over the same period the enrollment increases will be cut in half. During the 1950's, the increase in enrollment was 46 percent and in the 1960's, the increase will only be 20 percent.

The Office of Education about 2 months ago issued a major report on "Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools." In that report it estimated that over the past 5 years the annual required increase in instructional staff in the public schools averaged 60,000 per year.

In the years between 1965 and 1969, the average required increase will be 25,000 teachers, less than half as many as in the past 5 years.

So what we are facing through the 1960's is a doubling of the new supply and a halving of the requirements for additional teachers.

In other words, it seems to me what we are facing by the late 1960's is not a shortage but a surplus of teachers.

Mr. President, as to teachers' pay, the Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor, in 1956, conducted a survey of women school teachers and other female professional workers of women college graduates of 1955. The report indicated that the average woman college graduate of 1955 earned $3,141 annually, and that the average pay was, for teachers, $3,197; for all others $3,047. The teachers were thus $150 a year ahead of their college classmates.

The U.S. Bureau of the Census prepared a tabulation of its 1958 survey for the National Education Association, comparing the income of male and female teachers with professional workers outside the schools. The results were published in an NEA report, "Economic Status of Teachers in 1959–60." The significant data are: Median annual money earnings of female professional, technical, and kindred workers: All workers, $3,126; instructional staff in public schools, $3,748; and, professional workers in nonschool jobs, $2,619. No data are shown for the latter category according to length of college attendance. But such data are shown for all professional workers and for public schoolteachers, as follows:

	4 years college	5 or more years college
All professional workers	$3,533	$4,612
Public schoolteachers	3,680	4,925

If earnings are compared according to the length of time worked, the picture appears as follows:

	Number of weeks worked in 1958	
	27 to 47	48 or more
Public schoolteachers	$4,032	$4,418
Professional workers in nonschool jobs	2,267	3,658

It is apparent that women in professional occupations earn considerably higher salaries in public schoolteaching than in other types of jobs, and that on the basis of time worked their advantage is very substantial.

Dr. Freeman, in criticizing generally grant-type bills, such as S. 1021, charges that this character of legislation would shift control of education from where it is presently located, with the State legislatures, Governors, boards of education, communities, and parents, to the State departments of education; that it would greatly strengthen the State departments of education versus the general State and local authorities. While developing this point in his testimony, he added:

Some people believe that a shift toward professional control of education is desirable, necessary or inevitable, and again I would like to quote to you from the School Administrator's Journal Overview, which editorialized in November 1960:

"The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education * * *. The long-held view that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policies should be made by local units of government will have to go * * *. The national welfare demands a national system of education."

He added, in response to a question from Senator DIRKSEN:

I could quote to you, Senator, many statements which are exactly along the same line, which point out that what is really aimed for here is the establishment of a national system of education.

Such statements are usually not made in presentations to the Senate or to the House. But when the professors of education and the school administrators speak to each other, they talk in a different language. In fact, they make fun of what they call the "grassrootism" in American education.

I would be very happy to supply additional quotes, dozens of them, from professors of education, from educational administrators along the same lines.

A few of these quotas which he did supply follow:

From the Nation's Schools, September 1960; editorial, "It Is Federal Control":

There's something quite naive in the way we school people talk about Federal control

of education. Some of us seem to think that Federal influence on education can be prevented simply by stating that it shall not exist.

The next time someone tells you that he is absolutely opposed to Federal control of education, ask him to define what he means by control. What is it? How does it operate? How does it grow?

Federal direction is inherent in any Federal law or any Federal court decision pertaining to education. This is true, even if Congress delegates to the States the administration of a Federal grant.

From Overview, November 1960, "A National System of Education":

The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education. By the end of the 20th century we should be far along the road toward this goal. There will be much travail, dissension, and heated debate concerning the wisdom of traveling this road. There will be many regrets, many cherished viewpoints which will have to be given up or changed. For instance, the long held views that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policy should be made by local units of government will have to go. The growing dependence of the Nation upon education will tip the scales overwhelmingly for a national system of education.

* * * * *

As I see it, then, the national welfare demands a national system of education. The growing complexity of national and international problems which require solution makes mandatory a high degree of educational efficiency which can only be achieved by making education a national enterprise.

Theodore Brameld, professor of education, Boston University, "Toward a Reconstructed Philosophy of Education," New York, Holt, 1956, from a passage entitled, "The Bugaboo of Federal Control":

The National Government should exercise the same authority over the spending of school funds as it does in other areas; otherwise there would always be the danger of Federal money being squandered by dominant minorities in States or localities. The spending of Federal funds already provided for education in specific fields (notably through the Smith-Hughes law, providing for agricultural, industrial, and home economics education) is controlled by definite requirements which, although sometimes annoying certainly have not given rise to wholesale corruption or rigidity of educational practice. It is equally consistent to insist upon a working synthesis between Federal aid and control with regard to general education.

Mr. President, I deny that our system of education, either public or private, has failed in the United States because it has been decentralized to the level of local control. No single factor has made a greater contribution to the growth and development of these United States than has that of our system of education. Destroy States and the local communities; destroy our system of competitive free enterprise; nationalize and standardize our public school system and you will at that time achieve the destruction of these United States, and the name of our country could well be changed to "The United State."

Mr. President, in my country we used to have all day meetings, with lunch on the ground. One of the choicest dishes served was the delectable, delightful and delicious watermelon. Have you ever tried to take a knife and make each slice of watermelon come out in geometrically perfect divisions? The attempts to devise so-called allocation formulas for this school assistance bill reminds me of putting the knife to the watermelon. It is impossible to devise any formula that will achieve an equitable result. You must invariably take something from one person and give it to the other. While I am fundamentally opposed to any formula and any Federal taxation for the purpose of distributing money to the States and local communities to support public education, I have considered the formulas that have been devised and the one now before this Senate with a great deal of interest. Any way you attempt to cut the melon, it just does not make sense.

The melon must be cut so 50 States, the District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands get their proportionate share of the fruit. A chart has been prepared which shows the allotment to each of the States and the estimated tax payments that will be made by the citizens of that particular State to supply the needed funds to the Treasury for distribution. Sixteen States will pay into the Federal Treasury money in excess of that which they will receive back in a Federal allotment. Leading the list is the State of New York. Its share of the melon will be an allotment of $40,652,380 per year. To receive this money, the people of this State will pay into the Federal Treasury $116,280,000. The excess of New York money, $75,627,620, will be redivided elsewhere. The people of the State of California will pay in $46,929,643 annually in excess of that which they will receive back, which, incidentally, just balances out $46,230,357. They will be giving $2 for $1. Illinois' contribution to her sister States will amount to $29,428,133 per year. The people of New Jersey will be hooked for $20,382,729. Next in line is Pennsylvania, $15,048,583. Massachusetts' share will be $14,705,249. The tribute of the people of Connecticut will amount to $13,229,460. For some reason which I have not stopped to analyze, the great State of Michigan will contribute only $66,299, while its sister State of Ohio kicks in $9,612,107. The smaller States which will also contribute to a greater or lesser degree are Delaware, Maryland, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Rhode Island, and Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the table showing how the States will fare during fiscal year 1962 under the School Assistance Act of 1961, S. 1021, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

How States would fare during fiscal year 1962 under the School Assistance Act of 1961, S. 1021, as reported by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

State	Federal allotment	Estimated taxpayments	Net aid received from other States	Net aid paid to other States	State	Federal allotment	Estimated taxpayments	Net aid received from other States	Net aid paid to other States
Alabama	$24,005,156	$8,330,000	$15,675,156		New Hampshire	$2,726,162	$2,805,000		$78,838
Alaska	1,111,660	935,000	176,660		New Jersey	16,592,271	36,975,000		20,382,729
Arizona	7,405,140	4,845,000	2,560,140		New Mexico	6,370,666	3,145,000	$3,225,666	
Arkansas	12,867,468	3,995,000	8,872,468		New York	40,652,380	116,280,000		75,627,620
California	46,230,357	93,160,000		$46,929,643	North Carolina	33,751,156	11,730,000	22,021,156	
Colorado	8,896,358	7,990,000	906,358		North Dakota	4,535,574	1,615,000	2,920,574	
Connecticut	5,215,540	18,445,000		13,229,460	Ohio	39,517,893	49,130,000		9,612,107
Delaware	1,239,501	4,760,000		3,520,499	Oklahoma	12,602,078	7,905,000	4,697,078	
Florida	21,923,016	21,335,000	588,016		Oregon	9,042,171	8,075,000	967,171	
Georgia	28,045,856	11,305,000	16,740,856		Pennsylvania	44,026,417	59,075,000		15,048,583
Hawaii	3,739,229	2,550,000	1,189,329		Rhode Island	3,433,585	4,505,000		1,071,415
Idaho	4,408,622	2,295,000	2,113,622		South Carolina	20,398,967	5,185,000	15,213,967	
Illinois	31,516,867	60,945,000		29,428,133	South Dakota	4,459,796	1,700,000	2,759,796	
Indiana	22,781,255	19,380,000	3,401,255		Tennessee	23,526,845	10,115,000	13,411,845	
Iowa	14,386,515	10,115,000	4,271,515		Texas	58,063,833	36,805,000	21,258,833	
Kansas	11,111,415	8,160,000	2,951,415		Utah	6,321,123	3,060,000	3,261,123	
Kentucky	21,409,762	8,925,000	12,480,762		Vermont	2,083,288	1,445,000	638,288	
Louisiana	22,202,969	10,115,000	12,087,969		Virginia	23,803,278	14,450,000	9,353,278	
Maine	5,175,297	3,655,000	1,520,297		Washington	12,976,374	13,855,000		878,626
Maryland	13,681,203	16,320,000		2,638,797	West Virginia	12,913,602	5,780,000	7,133,602	
Massachusetts	14,789,751	29,495,000		14,705,249	Wisconsin	20,021,484	17,595,000	2,426,484	
Michigan	37,928,701	37,995,000		66,299	Wyoming	1,793,553	1,360,000	433,553	
Minnesota	18,395,829	13,685,000	4,710,829		District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	23,632,045	5,865,000	17,767,045	
Mississippi	17,480,858	3,825,000	13,655,858						
Missouri	18,520,779	19,465,000		944,221					
Montana	3,888,736	2,380,000	1,508,736						
Nebraska	7,357,227	5,355,000	2,002,227						
Nevada	1,040,292	1,785,000		744,708	Total	850,000,000	850,000,000		

Source of data: Col. 1, S. Rept. 255, "School Assistance Act of 1961." Other columns computed by Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Mr. EASTLAND. The 1960 census gives Florida a population of 4,951,560 people. The State of Texas grew to a total of 9,579,677. I know that the good people of Florida will be either flattered or chagrined at the comparison the School Assistance Act of 1961 makes between these two great States. The formula makes Florida more or less self-sufficient. Her share of the Federal school allotment would be $21,923,016, while her citizens would contribute in taxes to pay for this $21,335,000. Since it is always better to come out a little ahead than to lose, the $588,016 received net as aid from other States should be appreciated, but in comparing Florida with the State of Texas the formula says that Texas' share of the allotment will amount to $58,063,833. The citizens of Texas will contribute in estimated tax payments $36,805,000 of this allotment. The balance of $21,258,833 will be contributed to poor Texas by the other States of the Union. Other States in the South that will receive a lion's share of tax money contributed by other States are North Carolina, with an allotment of $33,751,156 and estimated tax payments of $11,730,000, resulting in a contribution by other States of $22,021,156, and Georgia, who is next in line. The citizens of Georgia would pay $11,305,000 for an allotment of $28,045,856, the difference in their favor being $16,740,856. South Carolina would receive $15,213,967 more than it would pay into the fund. Alabama would receive $15,675,156 in excess of estimated tax payments. Mississippi's net aid from other States—or should I say the 16 States—would amount to $13,655,858. Arkansas is the lowest State in bounty to be received. The net aid to this State amounts to only $8,872,468.

Mr. President, applying such a formula is the absolute in arbitrariness and capriciousness. Classroom shortage in New York is demonstrated to be far greater than that in Texas. The 1960 survey of the Office of Education alleged that New York had a net schoolroom need of about 10,200 classrooms. The need in Texas was a net of 809 rooms. Wyoming, according to the Office of Education, would have a net shortage of 22 classrooms. Wyoming's share of the proposed Federal allotment is $1,793,553. Indiana, which, according to the Office of Education surveys, needed 1,505 classrooms in 1959 and 1,321 in 1960 and which more than kept abreast by scheduling the completion of 2,000 classrooms in 1959–60 and 2,152 more in 1960–61, will get more than $22,780,000 annually under the committee bill. In addition to the lack of classroom shortage, the average teacher's salary in Indiana is $307 above the national average. Incidentally, Indiana will receive back $3,401,255 more than its estimated tax payments will be against the allotment.

Mr. President, these figures illustrate once again that the great mistake being made by this Congress is to even consider entering the field of public assistance to public education throughout the States. Both in principle and in application it is contrary to every conception of an area in which the Federal Government should concern itself.

Mr. President, the argument has been advanced that the moneys expended by the Federal Government under Public Laws 815 and 874, which are extended by titles II and III of S. 1021, constitute Federal grants to support public education. These laws were designed to provide that the Federal Government carry its fair share of the tax burden to support public schools in areas where federally owned and operated installations placed a heavy burden on local communities. Fundamentally, they are no more and no less than laws which provide for payments in lieu of taxes against federally owned property located within a State or local community. This is a character of obligation upon which there is a moral and equitable obligation for the Federal Government to contribute its fair share of the cost of educating the children in the impacted communities. I deny that payments under these laws are in any sense either a grant or a gift. They represent an obligation that is recognized on the part of the Congress.

Attempts to obtain Federal aid to public education by way of outright grants from the Federal Government to the States and local communities are like waves that flow in from the sea. Each time the proponents seek to drive the wave farther and farther up the beach. To this point in the history of our country the States and local governments have not been inundated by the waves. Every attempt to pass this character of legislation has been successfully resisted. In the almost 19 years that I have been in the U.S. Senate, the presently proposed legislation appears to have more congressional support than did any previous proposal. This legislation is just as bad in its principle and proposed application as was any other bill that was considered and defeated by this Congress. In many of its aspects it is worse, because it enters the field of teachers' salaries and special projects, which can cover a world of Federal evils.

There was never a time in our history when the energies of Congress and the Federal Government should be more directed and devoted to its constitutional functions of providing for the common defense and carrying out the other specific injunctions of our Constitution where the powers were delegated by the States to the Central Government. If we are to win the cold war, the strategy and tactics which can best be employed would be for the Federal Government to adequately perform the function delegated to it by the Constitution, and leave to the States and the people those manifold and diverse activities that, in the nature of our Government, can be best performed by no other. I urge the defeat of S. 1021.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President——

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Wyoming. I shall be brief.

I rise to express my views with reference to the bill now before the Senate, and on which the Senate will vote this afternoon. I regret that I cannot support this measure. I have an abiding conviction and belief that the responsibility is one that belongs to the States and localities. The sums of money that would be allotted to the respective States seem to me to be allotted in such fashion that I believe it would be unfair to many States that have been taking care of their educational needs and responsibilities.

Furthermore, I adhere to the minority views with respect to this measure. I do not share the optimistic views of many Senators who feel that there will be no Federal interference or control in the administration of the aid-to-education measure in the years ahead.

Frankly, I have no quarrel with Senators who disagree with my views upon this important measure. I have supported Federal assistance to schools and educational institutions in the military-impacted areas. I thought then, and still think, that that work is an important responsibility of the Federal Government, especially in the fields of military defense preparation activities. I have heretofore supported the use of Federal funds for educational purposes, and have believed that we should approach the use of Federal funds on long-term arrangements or agreements to assist certain areas of educational activity by way of the construction of school facilities.

But the bill would go far beyond that point in a great many respects. I am unwilling to weaken the authority of the citizen in his community. I wanted to make my views known on this important piece of proposed legislation.

I have received numerous communications in the form of telegrams and letters requesting me not to support the measure. Those communications have come from people in my own State of Kansas. It has been my privilege to work in the educational field, from the standpoint of an official of a school board, for a good many years and in a number of capacities. I have a great desire to assist the educational activities, not only of my own State, but of other States.

Finally, I believe education is a cardinal responsibility of the communities and the States and as we go down the road I believe that we shall find that we shall have given up something that we might wish that we had not surrendered so willingly in the enactment of the proposed legislation.

I thank the Senator from Wyoming for his courtesy in yielding to me.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to the question before the Senate at the present time—the Federal aid-to-education bill. I do so after a considerable delay and plenty of time to reflect on what to say. At 11:30 this morning I arrived prepared to make these remarks for the RECORD and the Senate, but a number of events transpired in the meantime, including important announcements from Senators

and addresses of one sort or another. I have a commitment very early this afternoon. Therefore I prefer not to yield to any more of my colleagues until I finish my remarks.

The significance of the question of education was brought into proper perspective in President Kennedy's stirring message to Congress a short while ago. When he was talking about the extraordinary times and the extraordinary challenge which we face, he was measuring the magnitude of the problem and capturing the sense of urgency that engulfs us all, whether we speak of outer space or of education.

I know of no proposed legislation pending before the Senate or that we have enacted this year that can match the national mobilization of educational effort as our greatest, most enduring resource to meet the need of the times.

I believe it is not without significance that most of the rest of the world is not only stirring, but driving with the impetus of their new-found power in the pursuit of education. When I have traveled in the Soviet Union I have been struck by the drive among the people there to try to gain knowledge. Long lines are queued in front of libraries where the people can obtain books. The precedence they accord to educational questions over others of a more material nature demonstrates that they have sought in many ways to put first things first.

In parts of the heavily populated sections of the globe, such as south Asia, one is struck by the numbers of people crowded into the very simplest little corrals, or what we would call one-room schools, seeking learning. The people in Africa gather in groups in their grass huts, or sit in the open bush, in the pursuit of the same goal.

All I am saying today is that more than ever before in the history of man, peoples everywhere—whether they be Americans, Europeans, Asians, or Africans—have recognized the power of knowledge and intend to arm themsleves with it to the hilt.

It is not without significance at this moment that the eyes of the world are very largely fixed upon the United States. I say "largely" because in this Republic of ours we have pioneered in one of the great mass experiments in group education, or public education. In our demonstrated historical faith in that pursuit, through this keystone in the arch of our free society, we have held before the rest of the world a goal which they hope to attain in their own right.

Since the days of Horace Mann and his followers, who inspired the American Nation to the principle of free education, times have changed. What passed for a successful American school and what served as a successful American educational process in 1840 is no longer adequate today. If history teaches nothing else, it teaches the inevitability of change. We cannot address ourselves to the problems of today with yesterday's answers. We have to see that our institutions, our schools and our minds are attuned to the speed of the times, to the urgency of the times, to the harshness of reality, and to the answers of our times. This means it is no longer sufficient for us to dare to suggest that education is a teacher at one end of a log and a boy at the other. That would be ideal if there were not people in the world, if there were not forces let loose in the world beyond the control of even Republicans and Democrats. These forces of change exist in the shape of hopes and impatient aspirations which we have tried to meet and hope to channel and seek to direct, if at all possible.

These are the considerations that prompt us to take a new look, a changed appraisal of our whole educational endeavor.

I need not mention what has happened to our own geographical separation. Whereas we once had a little red schoolhouse, isolated in a small community, whose impact was limited to that little community, there is no longer any area of our country that can isolate itself even from its neighbors, let alone from the rest of the world.

This means that what happens in Spotted Horse and Coyote Springs makes a difference even to people in the far corners of our own country and in the world at large.

It is imperative that we try to build new standards and new goals in order to measure our own real capability in the realm of education.

What it comes down to is asking ourselves the central question: While we have given service to education, while we have taken credit for sponsoring this as an enterprise of our own Republic, are we willing to believe in it? Will we pursue the truth no matter where it may lead?

I say the time has come for us to ask ourselves that question, because of the attitude of our citizens in all parts of the country who seem fearful lest we get too much knowledge, lest we acquire too much education, lest we break through too many barriers. We must be ready to answer that question yes, that we believe in the principle of education. We must address our whole program of action, and our national effort to think in terms quite beyond the realm of learning and knowledge. If knowledge be power, as I firmly believe, then it is time for us to pursue in a national way our endeavor toward that conviction.

The time is at hand to act, because the problem requires a national effort even above and beyond the local effort in its urgency. This does not mean national or Federal control.

We found under our Articles of Confederation, when we had large dreams of the excessiveness of local control, when we had hoped that the individual alone could conduct himself in such a way as to defend his best interests, that the forces of change, through selfishness and through outside threats to the security in that colonial area, required us as colonists to address ourselves to the question of unity. We said, "United we stand, divided we fall." We found that by joining forces we could acquire a capability which alone we could not muster. The time has come to weigh the urgency and the scope of the task ahead.

No longer can the State of Wyoming or the State of Pennsylvania carry the burden of educating the people of the United States alone. It is not enough to say that students in Wyoming have the best possible form of education. Wyoming educated students cannot alone carry the burden of the high level of national educational needs.

If we could isolate my State, or the State of the distinguished Senator from Montana, who now occupies the Chair [Mr. METCALF] and who has been a leader in this great fight for the education bill, and if it were possible to surround a State with some kind of enforceable barricade, that would keep others out, and its own students in, it could be argued that it would be possible that we could conduct our educational system within State lines. Unfortunately, of the people that we educate in my State, at least half of them will end up in some other State of the Union It means that our population is made up in part by those who come from elsewhere.

This means that it is folly for anyone to talk about trying to isolate the question of paying for education within the boundaries of a State. We must look up. We must face the job. We must tackle the problem that faces us at the present time. Whether the state of our schools is urgently critical at the present moment seems not to be a matter of great division among us. The division among those who have been opposing the bill is over the question: how urgent is it, how serious it is? We are quarreling over facts, but no one denies that we are behind in classrooms. No one denies that we are behind in teachers. We quibble whether we are behind by 100,000 or 200,000 classrooms. The point is we are behind and we are not closing the gap. It is not sufficient for us to say at any time that we are almost there. We are not almost there if we still fall short of the goal.

We were almost there in the early space race, but we had not completely closed the gap. The gap is in danger of widening.

I have had personal occasion to experience, as I am sure some of my colleagues have, the pressure of congestion in classrooms. When we agree to address an individual classroom, we now find that we must give the same speech twice or three times, because the school is forced to go on two shifts or even three shifts, in order to get the children into the classroom and exposed to learning. This is more often the case than not across the length and breath of our land. Likewise, as one who can be permitted to reflect as a teacher, I think that it is well to remember that teachers are people. It has apparently been assumed during some of the debate on the bill that teachers do not live on money, that they live on inspiration.

Mr. President, I know of many teachers who are the most inspired and dedicated individuals this country will ever have, but I also know that the grocer will

not take their inspiration and dedication as payment of their bills at the end of the month. I also know that one cannot pay his rent with dedication; he must pay it with money.

To me, it is a curious thing that some Members of the Senate who are distinguished businessmen would never propose to run a successful business enterprise by saying to those whom they had hired, "I will not pay you very much because you will be dedicated and inspired." The whole guts of our enterprise system has been to measure and to reward the caliber of work with a suitable monetary return. Has great genius in American industry been commanded by inspiration? Not at all; it has been rewarded by handsome salaries, a cut in the proceeds or the profits of the firm, and a number of other similar economic inducements.

The teachers of America are no different from other persons, except that instead of the handling or balancing of books or the making of a dollar of profit, they are handling the minds and souls and character fiber of the children of the Nation. If we wish to equate in terms of importance of service rendered, we will have to concoct another standard in attempting to measure adequately the whole extent of that reward.

This is why I was moved to interrupt a series of commitments with the schools of Wyoming and fly back from my State to participate yesterday in the consideration of the question of teachers' salaries. The time has come when we must pay, and pay properly, for the kind of service and responsibility which we thrust upon the teachers of America.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in the Senator's absence, I received unanimous-consent agreement that I would not have to yield any further.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he completes his speech?

Mr. McGEE. Before I give up the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. I have an engagement to fill.

Mr. McGEE. I had a commitment to yield to the Senator before.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming extend the same courtesy to me?

Mr. McGEE. Yes; and also to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], since he also has made a request.

The question arises, likewise, beyond that of classrooms and schools. The magnitude of the burden is manifested in one other sense. I am a graduate of a teachers' college, and I am very proud of it. But I was trained and educated in what is called the small generation. There were not very many of us in the middle 1930's. Yet we are the ones—even though I have betrayed the profession and gone on to other employment—who are being asked to train and educate the big generations of the 1950's and 1960's. The question is not alone trying to attract only the dedicated individuals who find their way into the classrooms, but to attract a massive enough group, in large enough numbers, who meet high enough standards to represent the caliber of excellence we have a right to expect in this pursuit.

It is not without point, in my judgment, to suggest that beyond the scope of this particular bill, is that of our higher educational institutions in the land, because they are the ones upon which the impact of the masses coming up through the ranks will be felt first.

The colleges of America, if they are simply to put roofs over the heads of the students who will be on the campuses within the next 5 or 6 years will have to build more buildings in the next 4 or 5 years than all the campuses of America have built in the last 200 years. This, again, is talking facts. It is talking the harsh truth of trying to educate the teeming millions in our land, leaving out of the picture for the moment those who come from other lands.

All this brings to the center of our consideration the question of cost. Cost is the sobering thing for all of us. I happen to believe with those who say that we can afford the things we will, but we must set our priorities in order. We must put first things first.

I am not satisfied with those who would deal only with numbers and say we are not so far behind as we could be, that we are not so short as we might be, because what we must determine is how we can get where we have a right to be.

Instead of being told that it will cost $2,500,000, and probably more, for the next few years, let us ask ourselves, What must we do in order to meet our target? What must we give up? What must we achieve in this greatest potential that a free people ever had? If we ask that question first and are not afraid of the answer, we are more properly approaching the question of cost.

Who bothered to ask about cost when Mr. Hitler attacked us and when Mr. Togo and Mr. Mussolini later entered the picture? Urgency was conspicuous and obvious, in the sheer political and military sense. But now we seem reluctant to ask the same kind of question? What must we do? is the question we ought to be willing to face up to, and to which we should accept the answer and for which we should make the sacrifice.

In the matter of cost, I sometimes lose my patience with those who tell us we might save a little more here by taking a chance; that we might cut some off there because we just might not need it. We heard this morning on the floor that the chances are the situation may not be as bad as we are afraid it will be 10 years from now. Suppose those prophets are correct. Suppose we reach 1970 having too much education. What will have been the consequence of our tackling the question according to the size which we think it demands right now? The consequence will be that the people of the Nation will be more educated than they might have needed to be under whatever standards are set up. But suppose the prophets are wrong. If they are wrong, then we have had it. If we are wrong in prophesying that we will not need so much as we fear we will, then we will have forfeited that one strength, that one bastion of freedom to which we are dedicated—the freedom to pursue knowledge wherever it may lead us.

Education is the great backbone of a free people. This, it seems to me, is the gamble we must take. We must decide which gamble we can afford to take—the chance of being wrong by going too far with too much education, or the chance of being wrong because we had too little education.

I think, given those alternatives and measuring those risks, we have to use the kind of approach that the bill envisages and which the President of the United States has spelled out for the people of the Nation to accept.

The Department of Defense has had no great difficulty in getting adequate appropriations from time to time. The President asked us only this morning for large new appropriations in certain specialized areas of the Department of Defense. I intend to vote for them. I think it is desperately urgent that we do so. But I say that is the same kind of standard we must equate with our educational processes. We must ask what we must pay, and we must find ways to mobilize our resources in order to pay.

I think they are within our means. We must be determined to make the necessary sacrifices.

A question was asked on the floor this morning whether we had to choose between guns and butter; whether it should not be guns or butter. I say the choice is more central than that. It is a question of guns and brains. We can live without butter, with all due respect to the dairy States, but we cannot survive without brains. That is why it is imperative that we put first things first. As we launch ourselves into outer space, as we make our new targets of achievement toward the moon, with the great cost that will entail, it will require an ever-increasing level of educational capability to keep the pace with the times.

But while we seek to win the moon, we dare not lose the earth; and thus we must devote our immediate energies, our immediate determination, and our immediate drive to keeping America free.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Wyoming for having yielded to me, and I shall be relatively brief. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may follow those that are to be made by the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is some expectation that a final vote will occur today on the pending bill. Whether that happens or whether the vote comes later, it is my intention to vote for the committee bill.

I am not one who from the outset was strongly in favor of Federal aid to education. On the contrary, I had substantial doubts about the wisdom of such

a course. I was won over to the contrary opinion only after much study. After my initial conversion, I endorsed the proposal of Federal financial assistance for schoolroom construction. But even so I did not believe that Federal aid should go for teachers' salaries. Finally, however, upon the weight of the evidence presented, it seemed clear to me that if we are to put our educational system in a position where it ought to be, such Federal aid was essential. Therefore, I propose to vote for the committee bill.

There was a time, and it was not too long ago, when all of us instinctively believed that everything we did in America was the very best. We are not so sure in these later, trying days. We thought, and certainly with some justification, that we had a splendid educational system.

However, I have here some figures compiled by the National Education Association, which reveal that as recently as 1950 10 States of the United States had 5 percent or more of their population altogether unable to read or to write. That situation needs correction, no matter from what source the money comes to correct it.

I could not close without a few words of commendation for the committee, particularly the members of the subcommittee. From my own knowledge I know how faithfully and how long and how usefully they worked upon this important and intricate legislation. Perhaps it would be appropriate for me especially to say that the senior Senator from Oregon has done a simply magnificent job in the floor leadership of this bill. I have never seen, during my comparatively brief time in the Senate, a finer example of good leadership in respect to a major piece of legislation.

My colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and I went before the subcommittee in reference to some special problems we had in Alaska. The members of the subcommittee were kind and courteous and helpful. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to have a statement I have prepared in connection with the Alaska situation printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BARTLETT

The average cost of building a school classroom in Alaska is $89,000. On the average in the United States, two classrooms could be built at this cost and there would remain a balance of $2,000 with which two teachers might be given salary increases.

In Alaska there is a classroom deficit which would not be met at a cost less than $20 million. Furthermore, were construction of these needed facilities undertaken today, they would not, when completed, meet the needs of Alaska's children. For the Alaska population is growing very rapidly. During the last 10 years the census report shows that there has been an increase in Alaska population exceeding 75 percent. This may be compared with the national increase in population reported at approximately 18½ percent.

Equally significant in terms of new school requirements, the median age in Alaska is 23.3, or more than 6 years younger than the national median age, 29.5. Although census material is not available for such a comparison during the earlier years of Alaska history, information which is available indicates that during this short period the Alaska population has transformed from one with an unusually high median age to its present low age level.

This is not all that may be learned about the constantly growing need in Alaska for new school facilities. Alaska has a ratio of schoolchildren to adults which is approximately double that which exists on the average in other States. Each Alaska taxpayer must, therefore, individually pay the cost of educating twice as many children, per capita, than is the usual or average case in the other States.

Add to these peculiarities in population distribution and growth the unusual cost of education in Alaska and it becomes clear that few of the generalizations which may be made about administering schools in the other States are necessarily accurate when applied in Alaska.

For example, more than one-fourth of the children who attend elementary school in Alaska are educated in one-room school houses which accommodate fewer than 20 students each. Also, one-third of all Alaska secondary schools have an enrollment of fewer than 40 students.

The per-student cost of operating these small units would be unusually high even without the problems of weather encountered in many areas of Alaska. But with these problems, along with factors of isolation and high cost transportation, the Alaska per-student school costs sometimes reach extraordinarily high levels.

As a single example, I call to the attention of the Senate that last year the Alaska Department of Education paid more than $6,000 for fuel oil delivered to heat a single Alaska school. The per-student cost of the oil—which had a delivery price exceeding $1.40 per gallon—was $233. Unusual though this example may be, it is indicative of the variety and burden of costs which attend Alaska education and which probably have no parallel in other States.

Mr. President, I have by no means exhausted the list of expenses which Alaskans must underwrite to provide an adequate school system for their children. Alaska schoolteachers receive salaries which are far above average. And yet, in terms of the cost of living they remain underpaid.

The list could continue almost indefinitely but my point is made. I desire to present to the Senate only a few of the facts which were brought to the attention of the Subcommittee on Education and which provided the basis for the special high-cost area language in the reported bill.

The language which the committee included in S. 1021 to provide an arbitrary allotment ratio of 0.50 for States in which educational costs are double the national median would qualify Alaska for an annual payment of approximately $1.2 million.

Had the amendment not been adopted by the subcommittee, Alaska would have received about half this amount under the provisions of the otherwise amended bill. I am grateful to the members of the subcommittee, the representatives of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the members of the professional committee staff for the consideration which was extended me and others who testified about the particular problems in Alaska. The inclusion of this provision in the reported bill gives proof of the care and responsive attention with which every provision of S. 1021 was reviewed and, when found necessary, altered by the committee.

I support S. 1021 as it has been reported to the Senate by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I believe that the committee has acted wisely in its amendments to both title I which establishes a general program of school aid and to title II of the bill which provides a continuance of the existing program of aid to federally impacted school areas.

The title II amendments included by the committee will continue for 3 years payment to school districts for providing a free public education to children with whole or partial Federal connection.

The committee has handled this matter with fairness and wisdom. While retaining benefits at the level provided in existing law, the committee has recommended only a 3-year extension of the program. This will allow the Office of Education a period of time during which a study of the entire Federal impaction program might be undertaken to determine what changes, if any, should be made in the future. In this respect, as in every other, I am in agreement with the recommendations of the committee.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had further disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. GARY, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TABER, and Mr. FORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to the death, yesterday, of a very distinguished former Member of this body, the Honorable George Wharton Pepper, who, at age 94, has passed away after many, many years of great, distinguished, and sensitive service to his fellow men.

Senator Pepper served as a Member of this body from January 1922 to March 3, 1927. He was a most distinguished member of our bar association, founder of the American Law Institute, prominent for over half a century in public and professional activities, famous as a constitutional lawyer, and one who rendered important services to the Protestant Episcopal Church, of which he was a leading layman.

Senator Pepper completed the unexpired term of Senator Boies Penrose. Senator Pepper himself was generally regarded as a Republican conservative, whose conservatism, however, was tempered by his Victorian sense of liberalism and a willingness to adapt to the ever-changing scene in the 20th century.

He was ever a kindly man. Some among the Senate staff will recall that from his own pocket, Senator Pepper provided the means with which to furnish the Senate pages a baseball team with uniforms.

His entire life was filled with instances of kindness and generosity to others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the

RECORD an article, published in the Philadelphia Inquirer, on Senator Pepper's death.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE WHARTON PEPPER DIES—FORMER SENATOR, LEADER IN LAW

George Wharton Pepper, a former U.S. Senator and a leader of the Pennsylvania legal profession for more than half a century, died Wednesday in his home after a long illness.

He was 94 March 16 and lived on White Horse Road in Devon.

Mr. Pepper had been confined to his home since June 1958, when he suffered the first of a series of strokes. He died at 12:45 a.m.

His long and varied career included success in many fields—law, politics, education, the church, and civic affairs.

But he strayed from the legal profession only twice during his life—for World War I service and to take appointment in 1922 to the Senate. Elected later to fill the balance of a term left by the death of Senator Boies Penrose, he was defeated when he sought reelection.

He was senior partner in the firm of Pepper, Hamilton & Scheetz. Seldom did he miss a day at the office until 1955, when he broke his hip in an accident. After that he still worked, though confined to a wheel chair.

The erect, mustachioed attorney was equally at home before the U.S. Supreme Court (where he was still arguing cases at the age of 80) or building a log cabin at his Maine retreat (which he did, starting, as he quipped, "with an ax and a tree").

Mr. Pepper's public spirit made him a constant occupant of the Philadelphia and national limelights, both as a critic of the passing scene and as an elder statesman whose advice was sought by officials.

In 1944 he summed up his life and thoughts in a best-selling autobiography entitled "Philadelphia Lawyer." At least one critic commented that Mr. Pepper's political philosophy roughly paralleled that of Grover Cleveland.

Mr. Pepper first won acclaim as a legal scholar and teacher. A native Philadelphian who received his early schooling from the tutoring of his mother, he was graduated from the University of Pennsylvania and its law school with honors.

He combined a private practice with a teaching position at the law school until 1911. At the same time he and William Draper Lewis combined on a monumental, 23-volume "Digest of Decisions and Encyclopedia of Pennsylvania Law," covering court decisions and statutes from 1754. The "Pepper and Lewis Digest" was a must in the office of every Pennsylvania lawyer.

This scholarship Mr. Pepper combined with a love of sports and the outdoors that continued for many years. He played football and basketball and ran track at the university and later was a director of its athletic association.

At the time of his death Mr. Pepper was senior life trustee of the University of Pennsylvania and since 1960 had been emeritus life trustee.

FOR PREPAREDNESS

The early years of the First World War found him a champion of preparedness. He toured the country for Gen. Leonard Wood's efforts to build an army, then went into service at the age of 48 as a private. He rose to the rank of sergeant in the 9th Regiment before the United States entered the war.

The Commonwealth claimed his administrative abilities then. He was made chairman of the State public safety and defense committee, through which every governmental department functioned in Pennsylvania.

OPPOSED TO LEAGUE

The end of the war found him back on the rostrum again, this time in opposition to any entanglement with the League of Nations.

About the same time two matters more closely identified with his own interests cropped up to claim his attention. He set to work as a member of the commission appointed to revise the State constitution. And he also set about the cleansing of baseball as the leading U.S. sport.

ADVISED ON BASEBALL

Bribery of members of the Chicago White Sox during the 1919 World Series sent magnates scurrying to Mr. Pepper for advice. Together with U.S. District Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis he devised reorganization plans for baseball—including establishment of the commissioner's office—that restored the sport to public favor.

He was offered the position—at a reported salary of $100,000 annually. But Mr. Pepper declined, concentrating on rebuilding his legal practice.

SENT TO CAPITAL

Upon the death of Senator Penrose, Gov. William C. Sproul picked Mr. Pepper to represent Pennsylvania in Washington. He won the subsequent election for the balance of the term which expired in 1924. His authoritative knowledge of law—both domestic and international—brought Mr. Pepper more committee seats than the average freshman Senator. He was also selected Republican National Committee man from Pennsylvania and a delegate-at-large to the 1924 national convention.

Thrown into a three-way race in the 1926 Republican primary, Mr. Pepper lost to the late William S. Vare, who later defeated the Democratic nominee, William B. Wilson. In an ensuing investigation on election finances, Mr. Vare was denied his seat.

Mr. Pepper never entered active politics again.

BATTLED FOR PUC

Once again he turned to private law practice and civic leadership. His clients included some of the Nation's biggest corporations and most powerful individuals. But Mr. Pepper never allowed self-interest to interfere with what he considered justice.

For example, he battled for the establishment of the State public utility commission, which was opposed by many powerful business interests.

On another occasion he braved opposition of religious groups and came out openly against the Sunday blue law.

"Why should men of affairs be free to play golf or tennis on Sunday, while the same privilege is denied others who would like to play baseball that day?" he questioned.

GIVEN MANY HONORS

Awards and honorary degrees—more than a dozen of them—showered upon Mr. Pepper throughout his life. In 1954 his long service to Philadelphia was recognized when he was named recipient of the Philadelphia Award, established under the will of the late Edward Bok. He gave the $10,000 cash grant that goes with the award to charity.

He was one of the organizers of the American Law Institute set up in 1923 as a permanent agency for the improvement of the law. He served as institute president from 1936 until 1947. He was among the first to be awarded the American Bar Association Medal, the highest honor the ABA can bestow.

In 1948 he was one of the leaders in the founding of the Greater Philadelphia movement as a means of developing and improving governmental, industrial and health conditions in the Philadelphia metropolitan area.

PROMINENT LAYMAN

One of the Episcopal Church's most prominent laymen, Mr. Pepper wrote religious books for both young and old, including "Analytical Index to the Book of Common Prayer."

Mr. Pepper served as vestryman of St. Mark's Church, 1625 Locust Street, for more than 60 years and he was a rector's warden from 1918 to 1953.

Mr. Pepper also had been a trustee of the Carnegie Institute, regent of the Smithsonian Institution, fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and a member of the American Philosophical Society. His clubs included the Racquet, University, Merion Cricket, and the Cavendish and University Clubs in London.

Mr. Pepper's wife, the former Miss Charlotte Root Fisher, died in 1952. He is survived by a daughter, Mrs. F. E. Newbold, of Fox Creek Farm, Devon, and eight grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held at 2 p.m., Friday in St. Mark's Church. Burial will be in Old St. David's Churchyard in Wayne.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the biographical sketch of Senator Pepper which appears in the "Biographical Directory of the American Congress."

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pepper, George Wharton, a Senator from Pennsylvania; born in Philadelphia, Pa., March 16, 1867; prepared privately for college; was graduated from the literary department of the University of Pennsylvania at Philadelphia in 1887 and from the law department in 1889; was admitted to the bar in 1889 and commenced practice in Philadelphia, Pa.; Algernon Sydney Biddle professor of law in the University of Pennsylvania 1894–1910 and trustee of the university since 1911; participated in the movement for national preparedness in 1914; Lyman Beecher lecturer at Yale University in 1915; member of the Provisional Training Regiment at Plattsburg in 1915 and 1916 and chairman of the Pennsylvania Council of National Defense, 1917–19; member of the commission on constitutional revision in Pennsylvania in 1920 and 1921; appointed as a Republican and subsequently elected to the U.S. Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Boies Penrose and served from January 9, 1922, to March 3, 1927; unsuccessful candidate for renomination in 1926; Republican national committeeman 1922–28; delegate to the Republican National Convention in 1924 at Cleveland, Ohio, which nominated the presidential ticket of Coolidge and Dawes; resumed the practice of law in Philadelphia, Pa., and was a resident of that city.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I could not refrain from testifying to the greatness of the late Honorable George Wharton Pepper, who has passed on.

As a young man, it was my privilege to serve on the staff of a Senate committee when Senator George Wharton Pepper was a Member of this body. I wish to give personal testimony to his greatness and to his kindliness. No one realizes more keenly the real measure of men than do those who serve in subordinate capacities under them, because the attitude of a man toward his subordinates always reveals the real measure of his character, his kindness, and his gentlemanly qualities.

No finer gentleman ever served in this body than George Wharton Pepper; no greater lawyer ever served here. It was an inspiration to me, as a young man, to see him and to know him; and I join the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania in expressing the great sense of loss this country may well feel in the passing of this gentleman, whose entire life was a monument to all that is best in the character and in the services of a great American statesman.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. President, I have never known a kindlier man or more beloved man than the famous author of "A Philadelphia Lawyer," the late George Wharton Pepper.

MONTANA SINGERS SCORE HIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, three young Montana men have scored a big success in the entertainment world. The Three Young Men, as they are known professionally, have made the big time in the New York nightclub circuit in a relatively short time. All three are graduates of Montana State University, at Missoula, Mont. Dick Riddle comes from Libby, Pat Fox from Hardin, and Bob Ruby's home is in Billings.

The trio will be leaving New York soon on a tour of the country. I wish them every success. Montana is indeed proud of these young musicians from the Treasure State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a feature article published in the Great Falls Tribune of May 7, 1961. I might also point out that the writer of the article is also a Montanan: Norma Beatty, of Helena, who has been doing public relations work and writing in New York City for the past several years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, May 7, 1961]

MONTANA SINGERS SCORE HIT

(By Norma Beatty)

NEW YORK.—A vocal trio from Montana, "The Three Young Men," is singing to capacity crowds at Julius Monk's Downstairs at the Upstairs in New York City.

The trio, comprised of Dick Riddle, Libby; Pat Fox, Hardin, and Bob Ruby, Billings, made its successful debut last month at the popular Manhattan nightclub. They are scheduled to appear at the club for 4 more weeks.

The trio has broken many precedents in the entertainment field, the first one being the amazingly short time in which their big breaks have come.

The three Montanans arrived in New York last November and within 5 months had been signed to a 5-year contract by Career Management, Inc., an affiliate of Frank Music Corp., one of the top three show music publishers, and to a 4-week contract at the Downstairs at the Upstairs. Their option recently was picked up for 4 more weeks at the club. Their nightclub debut drew raves from music reviewers and columnists of the New York press, Variety and the New Yorker.

At the moment they are planning their first record and are sorting out numerous offers they have received to perform in other clubs, including the new Playboy Club in Miami and the Crystal Palace in St. Louis.

Before they received their contracts, the boys worked at temporary office jobs and Pat also made music commercials for radio. They appeared in guest spots at two Manhattan nightclubs and sang at numerous parties given by their friends. Every spare minute was spent practicing their musical arrangements. To relax, they played Monopoly in their small Greenwich Village apartment.

They have fond memories of their opening night when several of their Montana friends living in New York hired a Rolls Royce, complete with chauffeur, built-in bar and telephone, to drive them to the club. They were driven around Central Park for an hour before the show, a good tranquilizer to calm opening night jitters.

Their initial success in New York is a realization of a 5-year dream which the boys have had ever since they first made close harmony together as Sigma Nu fraternity brothers at Montana State University. Appearing under the name of Campus Capers, the boys performed for numerous university functions and entertained throughout Montana as well as in neighboring States.

Because they graduated 1 year apart, they made a pact while still in college that after each finished his tour of duty in the service, they would get together again and pursue their career as a vocal group. So that they would get out of the service at the same time, Pat Fox, who graduated in 1957, joined the Navy for 3 years; Dick Riddle, a 1958 graduate, joined the Army for 2 years and Bob Ruby, a 1959 graduate, joined the Air Force for 1 year.

In the fall of 1960, with their service behind them, the boys laid plans for coming to New York. For 2 months they worked on their repertoire of musical numbers. In November, after much rigid practice, they decided they were ready.

They admit now they were awed by the prospect of trying to start at the top but "after such a long time, we knew we could not wait any longer to try our luck in New York," Dick said.

"We were fully aware of what a tough place New York is to get a lucky break in," Pat continued. "We set for ourselves a 6-month deadline and if we didn't make it by then, we said we would pack up and go home."

Bob Ruby shudders at the thought of what they would have really done if things hadn't happened the way they did before their deadline. "It would have been hard to keep that agreement," he said. "We had so much at stake and it would have been a big disappointment to have left."

With their feet firmly planted in the open door of success, the boys admit that they have been incredibly lucky and above all have been in the right place at the right time which has helped them make the essential contacts so necessary in the upredictable entertainment field.

All three are good musicians, able to read music and play the piano. They make their own arrangements and offer a varied selection from show tunes to novelty numbers and folk songs. Dick is the baritone of the group and also plays the piano, which is their only accompaniment. Pat sings high tenor and Bob sings low tenor, although their arrangements call for interchanging the parts quite often.

One of the biggest dilemmas in becoming a vocal group was to find a name. Julius Monk, impresario of the Downstairs at the Upstairs, finally gave them the name under which they are now singing. Several years ago, Mr. Monk named another vocal group which made its debut at his club. They went on to win fame and fortune as "The Four Lads." With their own clean-cut fresh approach and entirely new singing style, "The Three Young Men" hope to do the same.

HARRY C. BURKE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, few employees of the Congress have served Members so long and so faithfully and well as Harry C. Burke, clerk of enrolled bills in the Senate. He has been one of our mainstays for many years, and I am sure that Members, veterans and newcomers alike, appreciate the service he has performed.

Attention was called to his long service in an article by Lawrence Fernsworth, Washington correspondent for the Concord Daily Monitor, Concord, N.H., in the issue of Friday, May 19, 1961. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BURKE ON HILL FOR 53 YEARS—NASHUAN COLLECTS "NAMES" TO CERTIFY LEGISLATION IS PASSED

(By Lawrence Fernsworth)

WASHINGTON, May 19.—New Hampshire's Harry Burke is a landmark figure on Capitol Hill and especially on the Senate side of the Capitol Building. Fifty-three years ago he came to Washington as a $30-a-month messenger with which sum plus another $30 a month received from his father, he balanced his budget.

Even if there had been a Model-T in those days he wouldn't have been able to finance the buying of one. But in that respect things have changed too. Although his work as Senate enrolling clerk keeps him right busy, he has time to keep abreast of the doings of the New Hampshire folk in the Capital City and as such to officiate as treasurer of the Washington New Hampshire Society.

A day or two ago, Burke's long and continuing tour of duty as a Senate functionary was featured in a news sheet issued regularly from the office of Senator "BOB" KERR of Oklahoma.

"Harry Burke," it said, "has been coming to work long before the T-bird (the kind of car he currently drives) or even the model-T—was all the rage. For 53 years Harry has been one of the backstagers who keeps the Senate flying on its unique course. And for the same period he has been one of America's outstanding pigeon racers.

"YOUNGEST" EVER

"Harry is the youngest man ever to work 53 years on the Hill. Mrs. Burke is still his 'bride' after rearing him four daughters and a son. They are postgraduate high school sweethearts.

"But Burke's job is collecting autographs. He has to seek down and get the signatures of the two men who can officially declare that the legislation has passed Congress. His main targets are the Vice President and the Speaker of the House, but sometimes he has to settle for the President pro tempore. If these key leaders are out of town it is his job to locate them and 'pen' them down.

"A measure that has passed both Houses is 'enrolled' before it is taken to the White House by Harry. He is one of the few men who makes darned certain that the enrolled bill is dotted and crossed as Congress meant it.

"The veteran Senatesider is a native of Nashua, N.H., and he has always re-

mained active in the affairs of the Granite State. A young Senate clerk he worked with in the 1920's is now Senator NORRIS COTTON.

"The pruning knife of time has hacked at Harry a little, but it hasn't begun to cut him down. Except for hair pigment and a slight stoop, he resembles the young Harry Burke pictured in a photograph of the Senate baseball team of 1910. The treasured photo is always nearby.

"Senators and staffers all aren't just wild about Harry, but he's one of the easiest fellows on the Hill to take."

Such is what Senator KERR's newssheet calls the Kerr-ent status of New Hampshire's and the Senate's Harry Burke.

SENATOR HRUSKA'S TIMELY ADVICE

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I was much pleased to note in a recent edition of the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader a front-page editorial commending the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA] for his excellent statement before this body on May 4 dealing with the Communist campaign for the young minds of the world.

The Senator from Nebraska has demonstrated over the years his thorough understanding of the Communist menace, and his remarks of May 4 were in line with his consistently sound approach to this international conspiracy.

I am gratified that the Senator's statement received recognition in this outstanding editorial. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Senator HRUSKA's Timely Advice," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HRUSKA'S TIMELY ADVICE

A timely reminder that we are now at war with Soviet Russia was sounded in the U.S. Senate on May 4 when Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, warned that the Communist campaign to win the minds of the world's youth is now in full progress in educational institutions.

Calling specific attention to facts on Communist action in the world's schools as documented by the inspector general of the Central Intelligence Agency, Senator HRUSKA warned his colleagues that they should not harbor the illusion that Communist efforts in education are confined to countries within the Red bloc. He said:

"Throughout the world there is ample evidence that the Communists are determined to win the youth as the first step in winning the world. * * * Lenin wrote: 'Give us the child for 8 years, and it will be a Bolshevik forever.' (Lenin) also noted: 'He who has youth, has the future.'"

"There is no doubt," the Nebraska Republican emphasized, "that the United States is a major target of this Communist offensive in education." One need only consider the Communist-inspired riots of May 1960 in San Francisco and the subsequent supporting of the rioters by students and others to realize the seriousness of the problem Senator HRUSKA outlined when he recalled to mind the recent statement of Gus Hall, general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, that there is a "mushrooming of Marxist—and Socialist—oriented groups on the campuses in all parts" of the United States.

President Clark Kerr, of the University of California, told newsmen recently that although he could not pinpoint Communists as the organizers of pro-Castro rallies, it was obvious to him that an apparatus was used to bring about "the very quick organization that took place." President Kerr was referring specifically to the pro-Castro demonstrations by students of several colleges in the San Francisco area following the invasion landings in Cuba by anti-Communist forces.

"This did not just happen," the UCLA president declared.

Edward Pauling, chairman of the California State Board of Regents, told newsmen that it appears UCLA has been selected by the Soviet Union for exploitation "because of UCLA's important contributions to national defense—notably in the field of nuclear physics." "The Soviet Union," Pauling said, "is trying to exploit the university's name in every possible way to give its subversive movement among students a national forum."

The San Francisco area demonstrations present an ugly picture of the kind of Communist activity in education to which Senator Hruska refers.

After describing the techniques by which the Communists force and induce teachers to toe the ideological line, Senator HRUSKA emphasized that one of the ways that the free world can meet the challenge of the Communist offensive in education is by giving American students "more education on the whole history of the Communist movement."

"We should not be afraid to teach the subject," HRUSKA said.

We sincerely hope that Senator HRUSKA's timely advice will be considered by our lawmakers in Concord when they give consideration to Senator Laurier Lamontagne's bill to require New Hampshire public high schools to teach a course on the dangers of communism.

SACRIFICES IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, an article, entitled "In the Name of Sacrifice," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of May 18, is, in my judgment, an excellent reflection of the views of many American people toward the administration's plea for personal sacrifice and its subsequent actions along this line. I believe a very important point is contained in the concluding paragraph of this column, which states:

When sacrifices are plainly called for to protect the Nation, Americans will do their part as they always have. But when "sacrifices" merely amount to endless doles to various voting groups, Americans have every right to question and resist them.

I hope that the future will see less doles and more sacrifices in the name of strengthening America and the free world.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this outstanding column from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NAME OF SACRIFICE

President Kennedy, throughout his campaign and the first 4 months of his administration, has repeatedly called upon Americans to make sacrifices in the national interest. His pleas have almost always been stated in general terms, but he has now offered some specifics.

In a letter to a New York newspaper, Mr. Kennedy listed a series of particular sacrifices he has requested. Among them are: A leaner defense apparatus by closing down unneeded bases; more foreign aid; volunteers for the Peace Corps; a maintenance of present corporation and excise tax rates; a higher social security tax; a reduction in duty-free goods brought back from overseas; more farm controls; increased local efforts to improve schools and urban neighborhoods; and the support of the country for the President's decisions in foreign affairs.

Thus far, the President said, Americans have resisted his call for sacrifices and he seems puzzled about it. But an examination of those "sacrifice" requests shows they are something of a mixed bag.

Certainly, for instance, a leaner defense establishment is desirable if it saves money without reducing our military strength. If vote-conscious Congressmen refuse to go along with the closing of unneeded bases then the fault would seem to lie with the Government and not the people.

As for the Peace Corps, the President need have little fear there'll be a shortage of volunteers. A collegian almost isn't a collegian if he doesn't want to see the world. But the question remains of how much good a young American can do among the uncivilized tribes of the earth.

When it comes to the citizens backing the President in his difficult foreign policy decisions, there is also little problem. If anything, Americans seem to want stronger leadership in dealing with international cutthroats and fewer proclamations.

Beyond these things, Mr. Kennedy wants the people in the name of sacrifice to support vast new public spending of all sorts.

He wants more foreign aid, despite the fact that we have poured untold millions into southeast Asia to little avail. Cuba got plenty, too. Can we count on India in a showdown? We rebuilt Japan and then a U.S. President was advised—for his personal safety—not to visit Tokyo. Unstable Latin American countries not only demand American money, but they want it on their own terms. Does Moscow worry because the United States is helping to support the Communist dictatorships in Poland and Yugoslavia? We doubt it.

In connection with foreign aid also, the United States has a serious balance-of-payments problem. But is the administration correct in attacking it by restricting the amount of duty-free goods a tourist can bring back from abroad? This would seem like bailing out a boat with an eye dropper while continuing to fill the bilge with the firehose of foreign aid.

More farm controls and spending is the President's answer to the mess that has been created by the same kind of controls over many decades. Such controls clearly don't work while they hobble the farmer, raise the price of food, and cost the taxpayers a large fortune.

The White House is anxious for cities and towns to get to work and improve their schools and slum areas, even though more progress has been made in building new schools and cleaning up cities in the last decade than in any similar period in our history. Yet the Government wants to move in and take over. Is it any wonder localities may be hesitant about continuing to help themselves?

With all this new spending in the offing, it's no surprise the Chief Executive seeks to maintain the present rates of corporation taxes. In other words, he wants to continue to drain the investment capital without which the economy cannot grow. Yet economic growth has always been one of his big talking points.

Throughout all these vast spending and economy-drugging schemes, moreover, is the

danger of inflation. And inflation is especially hard on those who can afford to sacrifice no more.

Thus, when the Federal Government asks the people to make sacrifices, it should take note of the nature of the sacrifices and their likely result. Three times in the last 44 years Americans have sent sons, fathers, and husbands to the ends of the earth to battle strange enemies. Every stub of every paycheck is a reminder of how much they are sacrificing to finance the spending of the men in Washington.

When sacrifices are plainly called for to protect the Nation, Americans will do their part as they always have. But when "sacrifices" merely amount to endless doles to various voting groups, Americans have every right to question and resist them.

MAJ. GEN. EDWIN A. WALKER

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week I spoke in some detail about the ousting of Maj. Gen. Edwin A. Walker from his command in Germany.

At that time I inserted in the RECORD excellent editorials from the Manchester Union Leader and the Arkansas Democrat dealing with this subject. I have since read another fine commentary on this situation which I feel is worthy of widespread attention.

I refer to an editorial in the Richmond News Leader, which was recently reprinted in the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this editorial, entitled "General Walker Called on Carpet," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TALKS TOUGH ABOUT COMMUNISM—GENERAL WALKER CALLED ON CARPET

He was born in Center Point, Tex., in 1909. He grew up tall and straight, a boy 6 feet 3, who loved horses and soldiering. He went to a military school in New Mexico, finished at West Point in 1931, and plunged at once into the disciplined routine of a professional soldier in peacetime.

He was at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii when the Germans went into Poland. Brought back to the States, he participated in the swift transformation of the old horse-drawn units into sleek mechanized divisions. But he had qualities too vital to be squandered in artillery logistics. Commando. That was his art. He became commanding officer of an outfit deceptively known as the First Special Service Force, a crack team of Canadian and American soldiers unafraid of hand-to-hand combat. He had to learn to use a parachute. "How do you put this thing on?" he asked a sergeant. And 5 minutes later he jumped.

He and his men fought their way up the Italian peninsula. Anzio. The Aleutians. Ski fighting in Norway, and a string of decorations to show for it: Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Croix de Guerre, Order of the British Empire.

Briefly, peacetime again: Two years at Fort Sill, then a tour of duty in Washington, a stint at Sam Houston. But he was a fighter, not a diplomat: They sent him to Benning as assistant commander of the Army's toughest fighters, the Rangers. Then came Korea, command of an infantry regiment, the exhausting, maddening business of fighting an enemy but never quite defeating him.

ADVISER TO CHIANG

Back to Fort Bragg, then again to the Far East as senior adviser to Chiang's Chinese National Army; back again to Schofield; and in a fateful, routine transfer, in August of 1957, to Little Rock, Ark. He was to command the Arkansas Military District. It should have been an easy post.

That was the last time Maj. Gen. Edwin Anderson Walker figured very prominently in the news—the last time, until recently. After Little Rock, he had been sent to Germany as commanding officer of the 24th Division. There he found the same softness, the same purposelessness, that hundreds of other professional soldiers have found in youngsters raised on the milktoast liberalism that passes for education these days.

TOUGH ON COMMUNISM

So he began to talk tough about communism, and what it is, and how the enemy conceals himself in an ambush of gauzy falsehood. He spoke to his troops of gullible, delicate men, safe at home in soft chairs, polishing their fingernails and coughing gently at strong language.

He spoke bluntly of these influential people, the anti-anti-Communists whose gentle creed is that we must never be beastly to the Reds, the shrill and mocking men who deride patriotism as superpatriotism and love of country as distasteful and embarrassing. His object was to give his troops a new and vital approach toward anti-communism • • • a positive approach toward the defeat of Communist subversion of the American way of life. He invited some hard, knowledgeable anti-Communists to speak: Edward C. Bundy and Willi Schlamm. He minced no words himself: Dean Acheson, he said, was "definitely pink."

All this appeared in a paper known as the Overseas Weekly, and how it appeared, with sneers, and contemptible little quotes out of context, and a self-righteous editorial along with it. And most disgraceful of all: General Walker had made use of some material from the John Birch Society.

General Walker then was called on the carpet by the commanding general of the 7th Army. He was asked for a full explanation. The New York Herald Tribune blasted him in a lead editorial, published also in foreign editions. Any military indoctrination program, said the supercilious Tribune, "is an extremely delicate operation, particularly when it is directed toward those who would be in the front lines if any Communist aggression developed in Europe. It is repugnant to both the American military and civil heritage to use Army authority in an attempt to shape the political thinking of enlisted men."

Maj. Gen. Edward Anderson Walker, soldier, was suspended from his command. He is not yet 52. He is at the peak of his career as a combat-hardened officer. And the little, soft, spineless parasites of the liberal left have got him. Thirty years as a first-class fighting man. And what price glory?

FEDERAL DICTATION OF BROADCASTING

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I am always distressed by reports of Government interference in the American free enterprise system and, of late, it seems that very few industries can escape the clutching hands of Federal bureaucracy.

One of the more recent threats of Federal control on private enterprise was directed at the television industry by Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton N. Minow. According to newspaper reports, the FCC Chairman has implied that TV stations may lose their licenses unless they knuckle under to his programing formula.

Like any other television viewer, I enjoy some programs and I dislike others, but I certainly have no wish to see the shows I dislike banned from presentation by a directive from Washington. Obviously, somebody in America likes them or they would not be able to retain a sponsor.

Television is still a relatively new medium. It has made significant strides toward superior programing in recent years. There is still room for improvement, of course, but I am for letting the industry map these improvements with encouragement rather than interference from Federal officials.

In this connection, I wish to commend to my colleagues an excellent column written by David Lawrence dealing with this subject, which appeared in the May 18 edition of the Washington Evening Star. I ask unanimous consent that this provocative commentary be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL DICTATION OF BROADCASTING—UNITED STATES SCORED AS MOVING TOWARD CONTROL WHILE OTHER FREE NATIONS DISCARD IT

(By David Lawrence)

At a time when the entire world, with the exception of the Communist-bloc countries, is moving away from government control and state monopoly in television broadcasting, the United States under the Kennedy administration is moving toward Government dictation.

This may be due to the lack of business background among high officials inside the administration here, and particularly it may be due to the failure of the new chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton N. Minow, to understand the private enterprise system as it relates to broadcasting.

For, when Mr. Minow says he wishes the broadcasting stations to alter their programs so as to cater more to the cultural and educational side, he fails to understand that radio and television are supported by the efforts of American businesses to get sales for their products. The sponsors of TV programs pay large sums not only to cover the expense of the mechanical facilities of a broadcasting company but also the entire cost of actors, writers, technicians, producers and other personnel.

The companies which spend their money to sponsor programs naturally want sales so as to pay their own costs of production and their employees. The whole national output of $500 billion a year is directly related to how many and what kind of products will be bought by the public.

Television and radio go to a large degree to what is termed a "mass audience." The sellers of products want as many potential purchasers as possible to listen to their messages. There are, of course, some companies whose sales messages are of interest to a limited group, and this includes what is known as goodwill or institutional or financial advertising. But, critics of television programs do not understand that for the most part, the companies that use television are interested in reaching the maximum number of listeners.

So, when a Government official comes along and says, in effect, that these companies should content themselves with smaller numbers of listeners, this is tantamount to saying that the advertisers should be content with a lack of effective results and should take the losses flowing from such a curtailed sales effort.

Unless, of course, private sponsors are willing to buy time for programs that will bring to them sales results to justify their expenditures, the television and radio stations will lose money and the Government will have to subsidize them. This means political control and Government interference with the operations of private business.

Interestingly enough, Great Britain, which started out with a government-owned and government-controlled television network, without any advertising now is confronted with the full-fledged competition of a privately established network which not only takes advertising, but today have the bigger audiences.

These programs are very much like American TV—in fact, some of the most popular are reruns of American TV shows. The same thing is happening in Canada, in Japan, in Mexico, and in Latin America.

So it is surprising to see the head of the FCC in this country trying to turn the clock back. For it is inevitable that, if his threat is fulfilled—to take away station licenses unless they conform to his rules as to the programs that shall be broadcast—then television in America will be paralyzed.

Somehow many theorists who get into Government do not understand the workings of the free-enterprise system. Also, some people who have been applauding Mr. Minow's program do not realize that time cannot be paid for by the television companies themselves but only by the advertisers who are willing to buy time. And why should the latter spend their sales money to cater to a minority of listeners when they can alternatively use those same funds in newspapers, magazines, direct-by-mail, billboards, and other forms of advertising available to them and puff their wares as much as they please?

Mr. Minow has brought consternation to the whole television industry by his threat to use the Government's licensing power to discipline radio and television stations. For they themselves have no control over the money the advertisers want to spend for programs which can interest the maximum number of people.

Not everybody who watches a television show pays attention to sales messages any more than ads in newspapers or magazines are read by 100 percent of the readers. But, as the late Albert D. Lasker, the great genius of modern advertising, once jestingly said to this correspondent: "We don't pay for our ads in unopened magazines. We only pay for our ads in those magazines that are opened and read and get us results."

The Government cannot guarantee sales results to the advertisers if it starts to insist upon programs that will satisfy the few rather than the many. The answer to the demands for cultural and informative programs is to present some, of course, on the national networks as is already being done by those advertisers who sponsor them. But there cannot be an end on television to crime shows, westerns and stories of the ingenuity of detectives, any more than there can be a burning of books dealing with those same subjects.

The real answer to the cries of the eggheads and highbrows is to establish separate networks subsidized by the Government—if no other way can be found to finance them. But no advertiser will spend his money wastefully. He will spend it only to get results in sales.

PROBLEMS OF THE UNEMPLOYED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Scripps Howard newspapers are carrying a series of articles on the problem of the unemployed in America. This series, written by their labor writer, Dickson Preston, traces the cause of the human suffering it so well describes and analyzes the causes and suggested solutions.

Mr. Preston, a native son of Indiana, has made a great contribution to the public knowledge of this situation by these articles. I ask unanimous consent to have the first of this four-part series inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I intend to insert the remaining articles and to comment at length on them and the problem with which they deal at some time in the future.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR JOBS HAVE VANISHED—THE HARD CORE UNEMPLOYED—THEY HAUNT YOUR DREAMS

(You see defeat in their faces. You hear their bitter griping, their woeful excuses. Americans out of a job—and there are 5 million of them—while our great industrial machine grows steadily more efficient and productive. Automation, or just human, individual reasons; or is a lot of their trouble the result of unemployment relief programs that don't face up realistically to the problem? Scripps-Hovard's labor writer Dickson Preston has been talking to scores of the hard-core idle in big production centers, and tells their diverse stories in a series of four articles, "Our Jobs Have Vanished," starting today.)

(By Dickson Preston)

At a scarred desk in a Pittsburgh employment office, Lawrence A. Kannagiser stared at his strong, capable, and now unproductive hands.

"They closed the plant down for good," he said. "On my 51st birthday, last June 9. I'd been there 20 years. I've only found 1 day's work since."

In Detroit's mammoth Cobo Hall, where the United Auto Workers were holding a convention, it was the same story.

"Four years ago," said Leonard Hermon, "the company employed 138 cutters in the shop where I worked. Then they brought in a machine that replaced 125 of us.

"What's going to happen to me now? Nothing. I'm 59 years old, you know."

SUM-UP

Bill Maniaci, only 38 but also a member of the unhappy fraternity of the unemployed, summed up his problem this way:

"I've tried all over to get a job but my trouble is I can't pass a physical. I had a heart attack 3 years ago."

Then there was Welder Jim Chiodi of Coraopolis, Pa., who said: "I saw the handwriting on the wall when they started to bring in those automatic welding machines. So I spent $1,200 of my savings on a course in hotel management. Now I can't even get a hotel job if I work for free."

And Louisa Joba of Detroit, who worked for a glass company which moved out of town—and who hasn't worked since. "Like a dumbbell," she said, "I quit school in the 12th grade. I was in too big a hurry to get married."

THE PICTURE

There they are. Five out of 5 million Americans who have no jobs. Five out of nearly a million who have been unemployed 6 months or more. Five to stand for what Washington experts like to call the "hard core" or "structurally" unemployed—the men and women whose jobs have vanished and who may never find regular work again.

In nearly every city, their ranks are growing steadily.

There were, the records show, 1.7 million jobless at the peak of prosperity in 1953; 2.8 million in the boom of 1956; 3.6 million a year ago. When this recession ends, economists say we'll be lucky if the figure doesn't top 4 million.

Talk to these "hard core" unemployed, as I have been doing recently, and they will haunt your dreams. For they are not just people out of a job. They are the culls of the labor force—the old, the ill, the not-very-bright, the unskilled, unschooled, unwanted. In the bright new world of the 1960's, there's likely to be no place for them.

And many of them know it. It shows in their defeated faces, in the bitter things they say.

NIGHTMARISH

Hermon, for instance, told me of the "nightmare" of standing in line waiting to be processed for relief. He made clear it was the worst moment of his life. And he added bitterly that he had been "tossed on the scrap heap of automation."

(He probably has reason to feel that way. The UAW estimates there are 165,000 former auto workers whom the industry will never need again.)

Maniaci, angry at what he considers unjustified auto assembly line speedups, said: "The working man just isn't considered as good as a machine. If a machine breaks down they come running. If a man breaks down they just haul him out and don't even replace him. They make others absorb his work."

And Kannagiser thought social security should start at 50. "Sixty-two, that's no good," he said. "What am I supposed to do for the next 10 years?"

YEARS AND YEARS

Most of them worked steadily—and productively—for many years. Kannagiser, for instance, had 20 years' seniority at Crucible Steel's park works in Pittsburgh when the company closed it down as obsolete a year ago. Others told me proudly, "I worked 5 days a week all through the big depression," or "I've always had a job until now."

But no more. And today's jobs, as Labor Secretary Arthur Goldberg has said, are going to the young, the bright, the skilled, the educated.

Probably it has to be that way. An efficient industrial machine—which the country must have to compete in tomorrow's world—can only be operated with efficient workers.

But that doesn't solve the problem of what happens to the growing number of men and women who don't fit in.

DOLE ISN'T THE ANSWER

In gathering the material for his four article series, the first article of which appears here, Mr. Preston set out only to find how the so-called hard core of the jobless are living, what happened to their jobs and what they have to say about it. He doesn't suggest any answers, but the stories of these men suggest some of the things wrong with the general approach to the problem.

Unemployment compensation, even extended, is not an answer. Make-work jobs are no answer. Even retraining is an answer only in some instances.

These are the men whose jobs, in most cases, are gone forever. Their qualifications for work are obsolete. This is the price, perhaps, of great technological improvements, of new products. Automation is the popular

villain, but not necessarily the true cause of all this.

While there are 5 million unemployed there are jobs going begging.

Northwestern University has just finished a survey of firms planning to hire college graduates next month. While the survey showed a 6-percent increase in the demand for graduate engineers, it showed a drop of 3.2 percent in nontechnical jobs. There is the gist of the story.

Mr. Preston's articles dramatically illustrate the plight of the man out of work. This is a problem which threatens to stay with us for a long time to come. It deserves the thoughtful concern of industry, unions and all others. There obviously is no single panacea, but we can't go on always merely keeping these people on a dole.

U.S. SENATE GIVES RECOGNITION TO WEST VIRGINIA WEEK AND TO THE COMMEMORATION OF THE 98TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE STATE

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I report Senate Resolution 149, to commemorate the 98th anniversary of the creation of the State of West Virginia, which has been cleared by the leadership on both sides. My granddaddy and other relatives fought against what was done, but I am glad to report the resolution today. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution submitted by the West Virginia Senators [Mr. RANDOLPH and Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the week of June 18–24 be set aside as West Virginia Week in commemoration of the State's ninety-eighth anniversary and in recognition of the continuing contributions of West Virginia to the strength of this National Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, that resolution came before a subcommittee consisting of myself, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING]. It has our full and unequivocal approval.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on behalf of West Virginians I am grateful to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and his colleagues, to the very able majority and minority leaders, and to the genial and accommodating senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], who so generously yielded time for these remarks. They have been most cooperative and helpful in bringing Senate Resolution 149 before the Senate for consideration and adoption at this time.

In the presentation of this resolution, I have been joined by my colleague from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

We felt it particularly appropriate this year, during observances being held commemorating the centennial anniversary of the Civil War, to call attention to the fact that the State of West Virginia, born of the tragic conflict of the War Between the States, observes on June 20 of this year the 98th anniversary of its creation as a State by order of a proclamation by President Lincoln.

Then, too, West Virginia provides an actual and symbolic link between the North and South, and during the years of America's westward expansion was a main artery of trade and commerce between the eastern seaboard and the western frontiers.

Our State occupies a vital role in providing fuels and timber for American industry, and a vast modern industrial and chemical complex has been created within our Ohio and Kanawha Valleys. Also, West Virginia has maintained an important position in American glass, pottery, and ceramics industries.

It is appropriate to point out, also, that the citizens of West Virginia are now engaged in an ambitious cooperative program of revitalizing the economy of their State, and modernizing and beautifying their communities, farms, and highways to enhance the natural grandeur of the West Virginia scenery for the benefit of all.

During the week of June 18 through 24, West Virginians, under the leadership of my longtime esteemed friend, Phil Conley, and the Education Foundation, will make an active and intense effort through all media of communication to focus attention upon programs of revivifying the social, cultural, and economic conditions of our State.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is fitting that the Senate of the United States should resolve that the week of June 18 through 24 be set aside as "West Virginia Week" in commemoration of the State's 98th anniversary and in recognition of the continuing contributions of West Virginia to the strength of this National Union.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

THE CONSTITUTION OF LIBERTY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD comments on and excerpts from "The Constitution of Liberty," the author being Dr. F. A. Hayek, a distinguished student of public affairs.

Recently it was my privilege to attend a meeting of the Yosemite Conversation Club at Yosemite National Park, and a most interesting discussion was led by Mr. H. Oehlmann, executive vice president of the Yosemite Park & Curry Co.

I was so impressed that I asked Mr. Oehlmann to prepare a condensation of Dr. Hayek's philosophy for insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMENTS ON AND EXCERPTS FROM "THE CONSTITUTION OF LIBERTY"

(By F. A. Hayek)

"The Constitution of Liberty" is divided into three parts. Part I is entitled "The Value of Freedom." Part II is "Freedom and the Law." Part III is "Freedom in the Welfare State." Part II is omitted from this summary for lack of space. Some readers justifiably may consider it the most important part of the book, but it is deleted here in favor of the philosophical discussion of individual liberty in part I and the timely consideration of specific aspects of the welfare state in part III. Moreover, the importance of rules of law is inherent in the author's entire presentation.

1. LIBERTY AND LIBERTIES

The author's definition of liberty or freedom is "that condition of men in which coercion of some by others is reduced as much as possible in society."

Freedom "presupposes the existence of a known sphere in which circumstances cannot be shaped by another person."

2. THE CREATIVE POWERS OF A FREE CIVILIZATION

"Civilization begins when the individual * * * can make use of more knowledge than he has himself acquired." Hayek warns against confusing conscious knowledge with the growth of civilization, as such growth actually is the result of previous adaptations and the elimination of inappropriate conduct.

"The case for individual freedom rests chiefly on the recognition of the inevitable ignorance of all of us concerning a great many of the factors on which the achievement of our ends and welfare depends." "Liberty is essential in order to leave room for the unforeseeable." "It is because freedom means the renunciation of direct control of individual efforts that a free society can make use of so much more knowledge than the wisest ruler could comprehend."

While the importance of freedom of thought is readily apparent (e.g., scientific research) there is insufficient recognition of the body of knowledge that has been acquired by freedom of action. "It is not only in his knowledge, but in his aims and values that man is the creature of civilization. These values are created and altered by the same evolutionary forces that have produced our intelligence."

The author discusses competition and organization. Organization is a powerful means of achieving progress. The exponent of liberty has a quarrel only with "all-exclusive, privileged, monopolistic organization, against the use of coercion to prevent others from trying to do better."

3. THE COMMONSENSE OF PROGRESS

After mentioning what he calls "the fashionable disillusionment about progress," Hayek proceeds to demonstrate its essential character.

He points out that "the history of civilization is the account of a progress which, in the short space of less than 8,000 years, has created nearly all that we regard as characteristic of human life." All this happened after more than half a million years of man's existence as a wandering hunter. It is absurd to consider this a result of insight into any laws of evolution.

Progress depends upon inequality. "The ambitions of the many will always be determined by what is as yet accessible only to the few." The rapid advance we have come to expect "cannot proceed on a uniform front but must take place in echelon fashion, with some far ahead of the rest." Hayek quotes the statement of the sociologist G. Tarde that "the luxuries of today are the necessities of tomorrow."

As a society grows wealthier through such progress the time lag is reduced. The inequalities are less than between the hungry and the well fed, or between the ill clad and the well dressed than between varying degrees of what would have been luxuries for anyone a few years earlier. And as this process continues there grows a greater

tendency to provide more goods and services for a constantly increasing mass market.

Deliberate attempts to redistribute wealth on egalitarian principles are detrimental to progress. Hayek contrasts the relative stagnation of formerly rich, but now welfare-oriented states like Britain and the Scandinavian countries with the dynamism, competitiveness and rapid progress of free enterprise states like West Germany, Belgium, and Italy.

Hayek warns that the so-called underdeveloped countries will not permit the West to stagnate in safety. He says that "the consequences of past progress; namely, worldwide extension of rapid and easy communication of knowledge and ambitions—have largely deprived us of the choice as to whether we want continued rapid progress." "At this moment, when the greater part of mankind has only just awakened to the possibility of abolishing starvation, filth, and disease and as a first reaction has begun to increase in number at a frightening rate, even a small decline in our rate of advance may be fatal to us."

4. FREEDOM, REASON, AND TRADITION

Hayek traces historically the British and French traditions of freedom and deplores the fact that the differences between them are less well understood today than a hundred years ago. In defining the contrast of the two traditions Hayek quotes the British historian, J. S. Talmon, as follows: "One finds the essence of freedom in spontaneity and the absence of coercion, the other believes it to be realized only in the pursuit of an absolute collective purpose;" and one stands for organic, slow, half-conscious growth, the other for doctrinaire deliberateness; one for trial and error procedure, the other for an enforced solely valid pattern." Hayek agrees with Talmon that the second view, i.e. the French tradition, has become the origin of totalitarian democracy.

"None of these conclusions are arguments against the use of reason, but only arguments against such uses as require any exclusive and coercive powers of government."

5. RESPONSIBILITY AND FREEDOM

"Liberty and responsibility are inseparable."

Acceptance of this belief has declined and "responsibility has become an unpopular concept." Liberty and responsibility are complementary because "the argument for liberty can apply only to those who can be held responsible."

Pursuit of the individual's aims, whether approved or disapproved by his fellows must be permissible so long as he does not encroach upon the "private spheres" of others.

"The burden of choice that freedom imposes" under the changed conditions of the modern world is a source of wide dissatisfaction. Hayek develops the theme that present day complexities make the disciplines more difficult, and that the size and mobility of urban populations have destroyed the familiar associations which lent a sense of security. These changed conditions encouraged further "the increased demand for protection and security from the impersonal power of the state."

6. EQUALITY, VALUE, AND MERIT

"I have no respect for the passion for equality, which seems to me merely idealizing envy."—Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.

"Equality of the general rules of law and conduct is the only kind of equality conducive to liberty and the only equality we can secure without destroying liberty." "* * * if the result of individual liberty did not demonstrate that some manners of living are more successful than others, much of the case for it would vanish."

Hayek stresses the fact of native inequality among individuals and deals effectively with the "hallowed phrase" that "all men are born equal." He says "We do not object to equality as such. It merely happens to be the case that a demand for equality is the professed motive of most of those who desire to impose upon society a preconceived pattern of distribution."

Criticism by reformers is directed mainly against the inequalities produced by family, inheritance, and education, and Hayek treats them in succession. As for the family, he points out the "curious contrast between the esteem most people profess for the institution and their dislike of the fact that being born into a particular family should confer upon a person certain advantages."

Secondly, there is no reason to limit this transmission to "morals, taste, and knowledge." There is, of course, neither greater merit nor any greater injustice involved in some people being born to wealthy parents than in others being born to kind and intelligent parents." Inheritance has now given way to education as the focus of "equalitarian agitation."

The author proceeds to attack the argument for applying standards of merit. He says "It would probably contribute more to human happiness if, instead of trying to make remuneration correspond to merit, we made clearer how uncertain is the connection between value and merit."

7. MAJORITY RULE

The theme of this chapter is the need for liberalism (in the classic, not the modern sense) to defend itself against the dangers of current majority opinions. "Liberalism is a doctrine about what the law ought to be, democracy a doctrine about the manner determining what will be the law." "The dogmatic Democrat feels, in particular, that any current majority ought to have the right to decide what powers it has and how to exercise them, while the liberal regards it as important that the power of any temporary majority be limited by long-term principles." "There is no reason why there should not be things which nobody has the power to do."

"Majority decisions tell us what people want at the moment, but not what it would be in their interest to want if they were better informed." "Advance consists in the few convincing the many. New views must appear somewhere before they become majority views."

"The resolutions of a majority are not the place to look for such superior wisdom which, in a certain sense, the products of spontaneous social growth may possess." "Majority decisions are peculiarly liable, if not guided by accepted common principles, to produce overall results that nobody wanted."

"Changes in political and social beliefs necessarily proceed at any one time at many different levels. We must conceive of the process * * * as filtering slowly from the top of a pyramid, where the higher levels represent greater generality and abstraction and not necessarily greater wisdom."

"If politics is the art of the possible, political philosophy is the art of making politically possible the seemingly impossible." The political philosopher "will often serve democracy best by opposing the will of the majority."

"Once it is generally accepted that majority decisions can merely indicate ends, and the pursuit of them is to be left to the discretion of the administrators, it will soon be believed also that almost any means to pursue those ends are legitimate."

"Significantly enough, we find * * * that most supporters of unlimited democracy soon become defenders of arbitrariness." "If it is to survive, democracy must learn that it is not the fountainhead of justice."

8. EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE

The author points out that the ideals and principles discussed so far were developed in a society where formers of opinion were independents rather than employed persons, as is now the case. The aims, interests, and views of the presently employed majority are so different as to threaten freedom.

"When an employed majority determines legislation and policy, conditions will tend to be adapted to the standards of that group and become less favorable to the independent." "Taxation comes to be based on a conception of income which is essentially that of the employee. The paternalistic provisions of the social services are tailored almost exclusively to his requirements." "The fact that most people must earn their living does not make it less desirable that some should not have to, that a few be able to pursue aims which the rest do not appreciate."

The almost complete disappearance of the class of gentlemen scholars of earlier years, such as Darwin, Macauley, Grote, Lubbock, Motley, Henry Adams, Tocqueville, and Schliemann, "has produced a situation in which the propertied class, now almost exclusively a business group, lacks intellectual leadership and even a coherent and defensible philosophy of life."

17. THE DECLINE OF SOCIALISM AND THE RISE OF THE WELFARE STATE

This chapter is headed by a quotation from Associate Justice Louis Brandeis:

"Experience should teach us to be most on our guard to protect liberty when the Government's purposes are beneficent. Men born to freedom are naturally alert to repel invasion of their liberty by evil-minded rulers. The greatest dangers to liberty lurk in insidious encroachment by men of zeal, well meaning but without understanding."

In the last decade socialism as a method has collapsed. The ultimate aim of "social justice" remains the same, but the socialist parties are bankrupt of ideas and are seeking new means to hold their following.

Hayek proceeds to relate that while socialist methods are largely discredited, the aim of "social justice" by further redistribution of incomes remains unabated. We are perhaps in greater danger because "Unlike socialism, the conception of the welfare state has no precise meaning." "The kind of welfare state that aims at 'social justice' and becomes 'primarily a redistributor of goods' * * * is bound to lead back to socialism and its coercive and essentially arbitrary methods."

The welfare state inevitably leads to the expansion of administrative agencies and their dispensation of administrative law. "The same reasons that generally make the impatient reformer wish to organize such services in the form of government monopolies lead him to believe also that the authorities in charge should be given wide discretionary powers over the individual."

18. LABOR UNIONS AND EMPLOYMENT

As may be expected, Hayek considers the problems occasioned by the privileged position of labor unions as among the most damaging consequences of departure from the "rules of law" and among the most serious threats to a free society. "The present coercive powers of unions rest chiefly on the use of methods which would not be tolerated for any other purpose and which are opposed to the protection of the individual's private sphere." Hayek insists that this situation must be changed if society is to remain free and if the unions, in fact, are to escape complete domination and regulation by the state.

We need to return in this field "to the principles of the rule of law and to their consistent application by legisltaive and executive authorities."

19. SOCIAL SECURITY

Under the heading there is a quotation from the London "Economist":

"The doctrine of the safety net, to catch those who fall, has been made meaningless by the doctrine of fair shares for those of us who are able to stand."

Hayek recognizes the greater need and propriety in a complex and wealthy state "to provide for the extreme needs of old age, unemployment, sickness, etc.," even when individuals could and should have made such provision themselves. It is when there is compulsion to monopolize all these services in a unitary apparatus of the state that liberty suffers. He also raises serious questions whether the workers who are paying the taxes would do so voluntarily if the choice were put to them directly.

Hayek cites the "extreme complexity and consequent incomprehensibility of social security" as additional hazards to a free society.

Minimum provision invariably gives way to adequate provision. The author warns seriously that "the present system brings increasing benefits to ever larger numbers of recipients, all provided by the taxes of a diminishing proportion of workers." Unfortunately, the political appeal of increased social security is irresistible to the office-seekers.

20. TAXATION AND REDISTRIBUTION

Hayek considers it unfortunate that "redistribution by progressive taxation has come to be almost universally regarded as just."

The assurance of early advocates of progressive taxation was that, of course, the whole proposal would be highly unfair if not kept within moderate limits. The author laments the effect of progressive taxation on incentive, but regrets it even more as a misdirection of resources. The so-called exhaustion of investment opportunities is due largely to a fiscal policy which eliminates a wide range of opportunities that private capital might profitably undertake.

The wage concept of the wage-earning majority is "meaningless for men whose task it is to administer resources at their own risk and responsibility and whose main aim is to increase the resources under their control out of their own earnings."

The author concludes the chapter without much optimism but with the suggestion that we need "a principle that will limit the maximum rate of direct taxation in some relation to the total burden of taxation."

21. THE MONETARY FRAMEWORK

At the head of the chapter is a quotation from John Maynard Keynes as follows:

"There is no subtler, no surer way of overturning the existing basis of society than to debauch the currency. The process engages all the hidden processes of economic law on the side of destruction, and does it in a manner which not one man in a million is able to diagnose."

Hayek's own opening sentence reads: "The experience of the last 50 years has taught most people the importance of a stable monetary system."

Since money has greater effect on the market than do commodities "it is important that the rate at which money is spent should not fluctuate unduly." "With government in control of monetary policy, the chief threat in this field has become inflation." Hayek points to the vicious fact that "it is even more true that it was the effects of inflation that strengthened the demand for welfare measures. Governments have successively extricated themselves from current political difficulties by debasing the value of money." Inflation "is particularly dangerous because the harmful aftereffects of even small doses of inflation can be staved off only by large doses of inflation."

Hayek suggests that it would be well to have "some mechanical rule which aims at what is desirable in the long run and ties the hands of authority in its short-term decisions."

The author concludes this chapter with the observation that: "It is no accident that inflationary policies are generally advocated by those who want more government control"—but they are not the only ones. "There is perhaps nothing more disheartening than the fact that there are still so many intelligent and informed people * * * who are induced by the immediate benefits of an expansionist policy to support what, in the long run, must destroy the foundations of a free society."

22. HOUSING AND TOWN PLANNING

"Civilization as we know it is inseparable from urban life." "Yet the advantages of city life * * * are bought at great cost." "Moreover, the costs involved in large numbers living in great density * * * do not necessarily or automatically fall on those who cause them but may have to be borne by all."

The author cites the paralyzing consequences of rent ceilings, which were first imposed as emergency measures in Europe in World War I. "Any fixing of rents below the market price inevitably perpetuates the housing shortage."

Now, in addition to rent control "public housing or building subsidies have come to be accepted as a permanent part of the welfare state. It is little understood that, unless very carefully limited in scope and method, such efforts are likely to produce results very similar to those of rent restriction."

In discussing slums Hayek states the problem clearly thus: "If we want to abolish the slums, we must choose one of two alternatives: we must either prevent these people (the tenants) from taking advantage of what to them is part of their opportunity, by removing the cheap but squalid dwellings from where their earning opportunities lie, and effectively squeeze them out of the cities by insisting on certain minimum standards for all town dwellings; or we must provide them with better facilities at a price which does not cover costs and thus subsidize both their staying in the city and the movement into the city of more people of the same kind."

23. AGRICULTURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

This chapter begins with a characteristically lucid explanation of the farm problem, which is sufficiently familiar to us. If left alone it is a simple redistribution of land use and manpower, but everywhere government has interferred.

The author believes that "There are few developments which give one so much cause for doubt concerning the ability of democratic government to act rationally or to pursue any intelligent designs, once it throws principles to the wind and undertakes to assure the status of particular groups."

In commenting on resources, Hayek recognizes that different types present different problems, but he rejects the idea that "the community has a greater interest in and foreknowledge of the future than the individuals."

He concludes this chapter with the observation that it is quite appropriate for the Federal Government to provide for "recreation, or the preservation of natural beauty or of historical sites or places of scientific interest, etc." so long as "the taxpayer knows the full extent of the bill he will have to foot and has the last word in the decision."

24. EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

Hayek declares that compulsory education up to a certain minimum standard is desirable and that "democracy is not likely to work with a partly illiterate people." But the author promptly warns us that "The very magnitude of the power over men's minds that a highly centralized and government-dominated system of education places in the hands of the authorities ought to make one hesitate before accepting it too readily."

"The greatest dangers to freedom are likely to come from the development of psychological techniques which may soon give us far greater power than we ever had to shape men's minds deliberately."

A "difficult problem is how much education is to be provided at public expense and for whom such education is to be provided beyond the minimum assured to all." The author proceeds to demonstrate the difficulties. There is a strong case for concentrating "on the higher education of a small elite, which today would mean increasing that part of the population getting the most advanced type of education rather than prolonging education for large numbers. Yet, with Government education, this would not seem practicable in a democracy, nor would it be desirable that authority should determine who is to get such an education."

The author makes no pretense of offering ready solutions for the problems of selection. But he is keenly apprehensive of the results of widespread tendencies to apply egalitarian standards in the field of education.

Hayek reminds us again that "Nowhere is freedom more important than where our ignorance is greatest—at the boundaries of knowledge."

He concludes this chapter and the book by quoting the words of Wilhelm von Humboldt, which John Stuart Mill put in front of his essay "On Liberty": "The grand, the leading principle, toward which every argument in these pages directly converges, is the absolute and essential importance of human development in its richest diversity."

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I have come to the conclusion that I must oppose the pending bill in its present form. I would like to make entirely clear that in so opposing I do not say that our school systems are doing all that they should for our children; that we should maintain the status quo, or that we should not attempt to offer greater opportunities for a better education, better facilities for all of our children. Indeed, quite obviously, the future leadership of our country will depend on the skill, intellect, and preparedness of all of our present and future student generations.

But, Mr. President, I do not feel that the end which the proponents of this legislation wish to reach justifies the means they have used in attempting to reach that end.

Some provisions of the bill and some of the omissions in the bill are entirely unacceptable to me.

I have always felt that the granting of Federal funds for school construction was acceptable and in the national interest. This bill has been so loaded with authorizations for many other purposes as to stray far beyond the original purpose for which it was proposed. For example, the bill would now permit payments for fuel and electricity, for the

services performed about the school grounds, such as chalking the marks on the football field and the purchase of school athletic uniforms and equipment, and no one knows how much more.

We have heard the hue and cry for more classrooms for our students, and I surely will not dispute that in some States there surely is such a need. But the testimony of Charles H. Boehm, superintendent of public instruction for Pennsylvania, before the Education Subcommittee, for example, indicates that the major portion of Pennsylvania's allocations would not be applied to school construction at all.

So, Mr. President, it is obvious that the main concern is not for the construction of students' classrooms but is politically motivated to relieve local governments of their obligations.

I would like to point out a further objection I have to the bill as it now is before the Senate for consideration.

For the life of me I cannot understand how we in the Senate can authorize the appropriation of Federal dollars for projects that are not for the use of all our children. Enough has been said on this subject already, but I cannot let this opportunity pass without stating my objections to this avoidance of congressional responsibility.

Every day we read in the papers what this administration is doing for all the people of this country. Every day we hear in the halls of Congress how the so-called "liberal" majority protects the welfare of all the people. And yet, here we have the administration and its spokesmen in Congress asking all of its citizens and their representatives to support a program that only part of them can enjoy.

I must add that I haven't heard of late, "What can I do for my country?"

Has the philosophy of the end justifies the means become the byword for congressional action? If it has in some areas, I hope that the majority of the Congress will uphold the principles which would benefit all the people rather than just some or most of the people.

As you know, Mr. President, I supported and helped draft the Bush amendment which, unfortunately was defeated by a vote of 61 to 25. This amendment would have authorized the Commissioner of Education to withhold Federal funds from States which were not proceeding in good faith to comply with the desegregation decisions of the Supreme Court. This proposal was faithfully promised by both political parties in their campaign platforms. I might add that 54 of these votes were cast by the majority party which played a different tune during the recent political campaign. As I said in the course of my remarks, it was not that the music was a little out of tune but, rather, the band has stopped playing. The promise of the majority party proved to be mere campaign oratory.

Mr. President, this was a moral issue which, in the present state of our times and in view of the continuing concern which we should feel as to the rights of human beings and the dignity of individuals, warranted favorable consideration by this body. For the life of me I could not understand what was wrong with stating that the Commissioner of Education, in allocating funds in any State, should comply with the law.

This was not a harsh amendment which States proceeding in good faith could not live with. This amendment simply directed that evidence of good faith and honorable intent be shown. Through the use of the word "proceeding" some evidence of forward action, some will to comply with the decisions of our courts, was all that would have been required.

The argument was used that, if the amendment as introduced and modified by the senior Senator of Connecticut, was adopted, a number of school districts which were doing their best to comply with the Supreme Court decision would be penalized. My senior colleague from Pennsylvania introduced in the RECORD a table taken from the December 1960 issue of the Southern School News. This table shows the number of school districts desegregated, among other details. A study of this chart reveals that 10 of the States that would receive the most dollars over and above their estimated tax payment have a total of 3,048 school districts. Only 168 of these districts have desegregated. Also, Mr. President, 130 of these districts are in 1 State which has 1,531 districts. Thus, in the other 9 States, we have only 38 of 1,517 districts desegregated.

What does this amount to when we count the children? Well, Mr. President, we find that in these 10 States we have a total of 2,461,198 Negro children enrolled in elementary and secondary school. Of this total, we have only 4,249 Negro children allowed to go to school with white children. If we exclude the State with the larger number of districts desegregated, we find that only 749 Negro children out of 2,203,263 enrolled Negro children enjoy the same privileges as all children enjoy in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, in view of these figures, the rights of millions of children are forfeited because of the argument that 0.034 percent of such children now enjoy equal privileges under the law.

Mr. President, another plank of the Democratic platform questionably titled "The Rights of Man" has been cast aside.

Another argument was used against this amendment along the line that if adopted it would defeat the Federal aid bill. Why would it defeat the bill? Was it because the amendment was unacceptable to the members of the Republican Party? I need only to point out, Mr. President, that the members of the party whose platform was titled "The Rights of Man" cast 54 of 61 votes against the amendment. It is clear, Mr. President, that the amendment was unacceptable to the Democratic National Party, not because it would defeat the school bill, but for other quite obvious reasons involving the compromise of human rights for pragmatic political considerations.

Mr. President, recently the National School Boards Association went on record opposing "further extension of Federal aid to education until the school boards of America express the need for such funds." This forthright action was taken by representatives of local school boards all over Pennsylvania and the Nation. Who is better qualified than our school directors at the local level to determine whether the intervention of the Federal Government, as here provided, is really needed?

Finally, as an elected official of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, I must do my best to represent the best interests of the people of Pennsylvania, as well as of the Nation as a whole.

It is for this reason that I carefully studied the report of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee on this bill. At this point, Mr. President, I would like to call attention to page 3 of the committee report in which the majority states:

> It [the committee] recognizes the financial difficulties with which many of our States and communities are faced, and it has given heed to the legitimate fears of State and local governments that the sharply increased taxation at the local level needed to finance public education might result in industry outflow.

Now, Mr. President, this section of the report is most interesting in that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania has lost considerable industry in recent years. This industry in the most part has moved to States with a lower tax rate based on lower assessments. Does the majority report wish to imply that if such States should have to raise their low tax rates they might suffer an outflow of industry? Where? To what States? Have not these States with a low tax rate attracted industry away from our Commonwealth for that very reason? If such States should raise their property taxes to provide education equal to that in Pennsylvania for their children, would Pennsylvania industry then find moving to such States so inviting?

I do not feel, Mr. President, that the taxpayers of Pennsylvania should be called upon to finance industry "tax havens" at a cost of causing further unemployment and loss of revenues.

Nor should Pennsylvania taxes be used to finance segregated school systems.

Mr. President, we recently passed a depressed area bill in this body. I supported this legislation after advocating action in this area for many years. My Commonwealth has seven areas classified as major depressed areas. It has 10 smaller areas which would qualify under the depressed area bill. I recently supported the extended unemployment compensation program so as to alleviate the hardships suffered by the unemployed in Pennsylvania, as well as elsewhere. I recently supported the minimum wage bill not only for the purpose of raising the wage scale but as well to equalize wages throughout the country so that our industry might not find moving from Pennsylvania as attractive as before, when lower wages were in existence in other parts of the country.

I was elected to represent the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, not to rubberstamp programs that would take money from the citizens of Pennsylvania to help other States, which, in turn, because of this help, could maintain low taxes and entice Pennsylvania industry for that reason. I am by no means overlooking my responsibility to the Nation as a whole, but I am beginning to think that the day of the "free ride" by some of our States should at least be slowed down if not stopped.

We saw a move on this floor last week to put a provision in this bill that would have left no question on whether funds could be used for segregated schools. I feel that the theory of "having one's cake and eating it, too" is a fine idea but not with the taxpayers' money.

In endorsing the administration's program on Federal aid, the Pennsylvania superintendent of public instruction said, and I quote—page 942, hearings:

> Pennsylvania takes the position that even though it does not benefit by this provision that this is a National program and not one designed for States with special ability.

This, I could endorse if all the States were doing what they could under reasonable tax rates for the education of all of their children. Does Mr. Boehm say that Pennsylvania is a State of "special ability." A State with approximately 16 depressed areas; a State which my colleague, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, estimated at the time of extended unemployment compensation hearings as having 544,000 unemployed. This is among the highest ratio of unemployed in the country.

Mr. President, under the committee bill, the hearings developed that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would receive a total of $132,079,251 for three years, or $16.56 per school age child. Only eight States and the District of Columbia receive less per school age child than would Pennsylvania; now we have doubled the amount for the District of Columbia.

In the meantime, Pennsylvania would be paying out approximately $180 million in taxes under this program. In checking the chart on page 346 of the hearings, I find under the column headed "Net aid received from other States," "Pennsylvania—None." Yet, Mr. President, 33 of the 50 States received such aid ranging from approximately $1.06 million to approximately $72 million, which would be the amount that North Carolina would benefit over and above its own estimated taxpayments. In checking the State of Georgia, I find that it would receive approximately $51 million over and above its estimated taxpayments. Mississippi was not to be denied, as we find that she would receive approximately $39 million. And Alabama, the site of so much recent unrest, would receive approximately $48 million over and above its estimated taxpayments. Under the proper circumstances I think the people of Pennsylvania, as hard pressed as they are, would be willing to lend a helping hand to her sister States, but then I find that the depressed State of Pennsylvania is called upon to help the "poor" State of Texas. A check reveals that this "poor" State, the home of natural gas and oil wells, would receive $49 million. This, Mr. President, was the final frosting on the cake, or sweetening of the bill.

Mr. President, under the column "Net aid paid to other States," not one of the above-mentioned States is credited with 1 cent of aid to their sister States.

Mr. President, the argument is used that many of these so-called poorer States are spending a higher percentage on education than some of their sister States with "special ability," whatever that term really means. But these percentages do not take into consideration that real property in many of the so-called poorer States enjoys a low tax rate. For example, in 1956—the last year for which the Bureau of the Census provided figures—it was estimated that one of these States had $4.2 billion in estimated market value taxable real property. Of this amount, only $302 million was taxed, an assessment rate of 7.2 percent of the real market value. The national average of the assessed value to real market value was 30.4 percent. Mr. President, Pennsylvania's percentage was 32.5 percent—higher in our cities—but a check reveals that, of the nine States that benefit most from this bill in dollar amount, only one is above the national average and five are below 20 percent of assessed value to real market value.

Mr. President, in my years in the House and the Senate, I have quite often voted for nationwide programs. I have not voted simply on a sectional basis or for sectional reasons, but I have tried to protect the interest of the people of Pennsylvania and, at the same time, where reasonably justified, to benefit all of the people of all of the country; but there are instances, such as this bill, which would deprive Pennsylvania of tax resources without the sort of national benefit its sponsors claim for it.

Thus, Mr. President, in representing Pennsylvania, I feel I would be doing a grave injustice to the people of my Commonwealth to call upon them to shoulder a greater tax burden at this time.

I wish the bill provided for building classrooms for all the students in our country on a basis of reasonable fair sharing of the burden by the several States.

It does not.

I shall, therefore, vote against the bill.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, during the almost 7 years that I have been in the Congress, I have always supported Federal aid to education. I have favored Federal assistance in improving education in this country, and would be happy to vote for any bill which aided education effectively and equitably.

Therefore, it is with deep reluctance that I must vote against the pending bill, for reasons which I shall briefly describe.

First, the bill brutally discriminates against Connecticut by placing our State at the bottom of the list in aid received, though it is at the top of the list in taxes paid to pay for the aid. During the 3-year life of the law, the people of Connecticut will be taxed about $55 million to pay the costs. But our State will receive a mere $15 million in aid. Thus, for the taxpayers of Connecticut, the bill means only a $40 million subsidy to pay for education in other States.

Second, the proposed legislation in the long run will damage education in Connecticut and in some other States rather than help it. The aid our State receives, $5 million a year, will amount to about 3 percent of our total State educational effort. This insignificant amount will not build schools in Connecticut, nor will it raise teachers' salaries.

But the increase in Federal taxation which this bill will require will make Connecticut taxpayers less able and less willing to pay higher local and State taxes for education. They cannot do anything about the Federal taxation which takes almost $4 from them for every dollar of educational aid received. But they can and probably will express their frustration by voting against local school budgets and school bond referendums. This is the inevitable result of forcing the people of a few States to carry burdens that should be borne by all States.

Third, this bill offends justice by including private and parochial school children in the formula which determines the amount of aid going to public schools. Under this bill, the Federal Government is saying to the parents of several million children in private and parochial schools, "We are going to give your State so many dollars a year for every child in a private or parochial school. But we have made sure that not a penny of this aid can be used for education in these schools.

Mr. President, so long as these children are excluded from the bill, it is an offense against logic and justice to count them only for purposes of increasing the aid which goes to public schools.

Fourth, I oppose this bill because the Prouty amendment transformed it from an emergency measure designed to deal with a temporary shortage of classrooms and teachers into a permanent general aid to education bill under which the Federal Government will assume such purely local responsibilities as the lighting and heating of schools, the care of lawns, and the providing of chalk and erasers. Thus, Federal money will be used, not to remove educational deficiencies, but to pay for trivialities and routine expenses which are local obligations, if local government is to mean anything.

In summary, I oppose this bill because in my judgment it is not an aid to education bill at all. It is a tax redistribution bill. It will do little to improve education in America. Instead it will tend to transfer the burden of paying for education from local government to the Federal Government. And it will do so under an unjust formula which will force the few States which are already doing an adequate

job for their children to foot the bill for education in the rest of the country.

For these reasons I oppose the passage of this bill and will vote against it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in the RECORD a statement which I made on May 18 in support of the Javits-Cooper amendment, and remarks which I made on May 23 against the Prouty amendment. The defeat of the Javits-Cooper amendment, and the adoption of the Prouty amendment, led to my decision to oppose this legislation.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD IN SUPPORT OF JAVITS-COOPER AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL MADE ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1961

I am a supporter of the Javits-Cooper amendment. I support it because it provides a far more acceptable formula for distributing Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries than the committee bill.

I was led to this position, first, by the problem of my own State of Connecticut and, second, by my concern for the national picture.

The committee bill provides only $9.26 for each Connecticut school age child, the lowest amount granted to any State under the committee bill. At the present time, the average educational expenditure per child in Connecticut is around $420. Action pending before the State legislature will raise that figure to about $450 and local action in many of our 169 communities will raise that figure closer to the $500 mark.

Against these figures, the $9.26 per school age child provided by the committee bill is insignificant. It will scarcely make a dent in the educational problem of Connecticut. And to get this marginal aid, the taxpayers of Connecticut will be required to spend several dollars in Federal taxes for each dollar of aid they receive.

As a small sweetener, the committee bill permits private and parochial school children, which number about 18 percent of Connecticut's school population, to be counted for Federal aid purposes. The private and parochial schools, of course, will not receive this money. Their children will merely be used as justification for raising the total which goes to the public schools.

This violates basic equity, since it provides Federal money to States for financing education for which the States bear no expense. And it adds insult to injury to parents of private and parochial school children who not only receive no aid but also find their great effort and sacrifice recognized only as a basis for increased aid to public schools.

Under the committee bill, Connecticut is at the bottom of the list in aid received, and at the top of the list in taxes paid to finance this aid.

Connecticut, though it has many serious economic problems and around 80,000 unemployed, ranks as the most prosperous State in the Union. I am, of course, happy about this. Our relative prosperity does not arise because we have any unusual natural resources. We have practically no natural resources. The prosperity of Connecticut has been built over long decades by the thrift, ingenuity, know-how, and hard work of its people. And, frankly, our people are getting a little tired of having their achievement used as a basis for discrimination in a variety of Federal programs.

I have voted on occasion for programs which tax Connecticut citizens disproportionately for the benefit of other sections of the country. I have done it because this is one country, one people, with one common cause. I believe that when we help Americans anywhere, if the program is reasonable, we help Americans everywhere.

Because of Connecticut's high standing in personal income, the people of our State stand to be taxed more for Federal programs than any other State. There are many programs of vital interest to the Nation, such as conservation, agriculture, public power, reclamation, irrigation, and others which by their nature have little application to Connecticut. Yet we are willing to support these programs with our tax dollars because they are important to the Nation, and Connecticut is a part of the Nation.

But we have before us today a problem which does apply to Connecticut. Our State, like other States, needs help in the field of education and it is entitled to get that help on an equal basis with other States.

Even if the allowance per school child was the same in every State, Connecticut would still be giving more than it gets because of its high income position. But on top of this inherent disproportion, there has been added a discriminatory formula under which Connecticut receives the least though it pays the most. This is unfair.

The Javits-Cooper amendment provides a reasonable formula for dealing fairly with all States and dealing adequately at the same time with the national interest. It provides a basic payment of $20 per pupil to all States. It does not abuse commonsense by paying the public school system for the expenses borne by private and parochial schools. And for the several States which, because of their relative poverty, have special educational problems, the amendment provides extra money.

This is a formula that I can support. Under it, Connecticut would receive almost $8.4 million as opposed to the $5.2 million under the committee bill. And as a matter of principle, it would treat Connecticut on an equal basis with most other States, making special allowances for the grave problems of the States least able to help themselves.

I congratulate my colleagues for offering this amendment and I am privileged to join with them in its support.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE MAY 23 OPPOSING THE PROUTY AMENDMENT

Mr. DODD. I find myself in very considerable agreement with the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has pretty well expressed my own views.

I am opposed to the pending amendment. It would transform the present aid to education bill from a program aimed at two particular emergencies, the shortage of classrooms and the shortage of teachers, into a general aid to education bill that would be used to finance everything from cutting grass in front of the school to replacing wornout light bulbs.

I oppose this amendment on practical and philosophic grounds. The bill reported out by the committee is a very modest bill in comparison to the total educational need. Its impact upon my State would be an addition of about 3 percent to the total amount spent for education, and there is no State where the impact would be greater than about 12 percent.

Thus, if the bill is to be at all effective, and if these modest amounts are not to be merely melted into the general education fund where their impact will be negligible, the Federal money provided must be aimed at certain limited objectives. This money can be effectively used to finance the building of schools that might otherwise not be built. It can be effectively used in raising the salaries of teachers in the poorer school districts to a higher level. But to attempt to do more with this limited Federal aid would only dilute the program and spread it so thin as to destroy its purpose.

My second objection is on the ground of public philosophy. The committee bill, however inequitable some of its provisions may be, does not violate the principle that education is primarily a local responsibility. Rather, it acknowledges that temporary emergency conditions exist and that Federal help is required to meet specific problems that are presently beyond the means of local governments.

The classroom shortage, for instance, was brought about by an abnormally low school building program during 15 years of depression and war from 1930 to 1945, followed by an unusually high birth rate from 1945 on. Federal aid for school construction is aimed at restoring the balance and when it is restored, it is my hope that this part of the program will come to an end. But the pending amendment would use Federal funds to finance routine maintenance costs, the heating and lighting of schools, the upkeep of school grounds, and all the other normal day-to-day expenses. These expenses are clearly the obligation of local and State authorities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would like to direct the question also to other Senators who have participated in the discussion. What would prevent a local school board from using its normal appropriation of moneys to hire teachers and then to substitute reduction through the use of funds which it would get from the Federal Government, ultimately putting itself in the identical position that it occupied before it received Federal aid? What is there in the bill in that regard?

Mr. CLARK. I would like to answer that question, if the Senator from Connecticut will permit me to do so.

Mr. DODD. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK. We would have to rely for control on the State educational authority, which in my State would be effective. It might not be as effective elsewhere. However, so far as the Federal Government is concerned, if the Prouty amendment is adopted, there will be no control at all. Without the Prouty amendment, there would be maintained the three purposes, with certification that the money is being used for those purposes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. However, the certification could be made that the money was being spent for one of those three purposes, without the establishment of the fact that the Federal money had been used to supplement the moneys that have been expended before the Federal money was granted. The local moneys could be diverted to such operations as are contemplated by the Prouty amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, there is the maintenance of effort clause in the bill, which would still be in the law.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator.

Mr. DODD. I wish to complete my statement.

Somewhere we must draw the line as to what local and State governments must do for themselves and what they can legitimately expect the Federal Government to help them to do. The pending amendment would transform the most basic and fundamental of local responsibilities into an obligation of the Federal Government. I cannot support this concept, and I therefore oppose the amendment.

I have been informed by the able Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] that he has received a wire from Connecticut's Commissioner of Education William J. Sanders, expressing support of the Prouty amendment. Commissioner Sanders is an extremely able and knowledgeable educator and I can well understand the desire of any commissioner to use these Federal funds as he thinks they ought to be used, without any restrictions. But I do not believe the Federal Government should finance purely local obligations and I think the majority of the people of Connecticut share this view. I hope this amendment will be defeated.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to commend the Senator from Connecticut for his remarks.

I find myself very much in the same position he occupies. I should like to have the Senate have before it a Federal-aid-to-education bill that I could support. I should like to support the principle of the pending bill; but I cannot support a bill which is so unfair to my State, as it is likewise unfair to the State of the Senator who just now has spoken.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HOLLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand several Senators desire me to yield briefly.

I first yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

ADDRESS BY DR. JAMES B. CONANT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address by Dr. John B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University and former U.S. Ambassador to Germany, before the opening meeting yesterday of the National Committee on Children and Youth in Washington, D.C. His remarks on this subject are very enlightening, and I urge all of my colleagues in the Congress to read the article "Social Dynamite in Our Large Cities."

Dr. Conant's speech has eloquently reinforced the findings and conclusions of the Senate Subcommittee to Investigate Juvenile Delinquency over the past 7 years. We, too, have witnessed the deprived youth in the slum areas of our large cities with no hope of ever escaping the circumstances which, until now, prevented them from obtaining a minimum education, a decent job, and an equal status with other citizens of the United States. As we have observed, and as Dr. Conant has so correctly pointed out, it is a problem which demands immediate social planning on a broad basis if we are not to lose the minds of these young people to the promises of others who would subvert our way of life.

In our reports on youth employment and delinquency and education and delinquency, we have continuously alerted the Congress to the dangers involved when 19 million of our citizens are relegated to ghetto existences and subjected to the severest kinds of social pressures, prejudices, and policies.

Throughout the years, the committee has recognized the importance of combining a sound youth employment program with our educational system, and during the past year we have gathered a wealth of information in these areas which we will share with the administration in the development of its various antidelinquency programs. It is, indeed, heartening to me to see such high-level activity in the Federal Government, and, as described in our most recent hearing, the subcommittee has "long been a voice crying in the wilderness" in its attempts to alert the people and the Congress of the United States to what Dr. Conant refers to as this social dynamite that has been developing in our large urban areas for the past decade.

I ask unanimous consent to have Dr. Conant's address printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL DYNAMITE IN OUR LARGE CITIES

(Speech by James B. Conant before the Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas, sponsored by the National Committee for Children and Youth, Wednesday, May 24, 1961, in Washington, D.C.)

I appreciate the opportunity of serving as keynote speaker and chairman of this workshop Conference on Unemployed, Out-of-School Youth in Urban Areas sponsored by the National Committee for Children and Youth. It is a sobering responsibility. I make this statement principally because I am convinced that the problem you ladies and gentlemen are here to discuss poses a serious threat to our free society. I submit that the existence in the slums of our large cities of thousands of youth ages 16–21, who are both out of school and out of work is an explosive situation. It is social dynamite.

In preparation for this conference, a few special studies were conducted in slum areas of large cities to find out what the facts really were. In a slum section composed almost entirely of Negroes in one of our largest cities the following situation was found. A total of 59 percent of the male youth between the ages of 16 and 21 were out of school and unemployed. They were roaming the streets. Of the boys who graduated from high school, 48 percent were unemployed in contrast to 63 percent of the boys who had dropped out of school. In short, two-thirds of the male dropouts did not have jobs and about half of the high school graduates did not have jobs. In such a situation, a pupil may well ask, Why bother to stay in school when graduation for half the boys opens onto a dead-end street?

An even worse state of affairs was found in another special study in a different city. In a slum area of 125,000 people, mostly Negro, a sampling of the youth population shows that roughly 70 percent of the boys and girls ages 16 to 21 are out of school and unemployed. When one stops to consider that the total population in this district is equal to that of a good-sized independent city, the magnitude of the problem is appalling and the challenge of our society is clear.

I do not have to remind this audience of the fact that the fate of freedom in the world hangs very much in balance. Our success against the spread of communism in no small measure depends upon the successful operation of our own free society. To my mind, there is no question that a healthy body politic necessitates a sound economy and high employment. The history of communism shows that it feeds upon discontented, frustrated, unemployed people. The present unemployment rate nationwide is roughly 7 percent for all age brackets, but unemployment among youth under 20 years of age is 18 percent, or nearly three times greater than the nationwide rate of all workers. These young people are my chief concern, especially when they are pocketed together in large numbers within the confines of the big-city slums. What can words like "freedom," "liberty," and "equality of opportunity" mean to these young people? With what kind of zeal and dedication can we expect them to withstand the relentless pressures of communism? How well prepared are they to face the struggle that shows no signs of abating?

In a slum area where over half the male youth are unemployed and out of school we are allowing a grave danger to the stability of our society to develop. A youth who has dropped out of school and never has had a full-time job is not likely to become a constructive citizen of his community. Quite the contrary. As a frustrated individual he is likely to be antisocial and rebellious. Some of this group of youth will end as juvenile delinquents. No one would claim that providing full employment for youth in the large cities would automatically banish juvenile delinquency, for we all realize that the causes of this problem are complex and there is no one solution. However, I suggest that full employment would have a highly salutary effect. Moreover, I offer the following hypothesis for professional social workers and sociologists to demolish; namely, that the correlation between desirable social attitudes (including attitudes of youth) and job opportunities are far higher than between the former and housing conditions, as measured by plumbing facilities, heating, and space per family.

Leaving juvenile delinquency aside, the existence of gangs of unemployed out-of-school youth in some neighborhoods of our large cities creates social problems acute enough by themselves. The adverse influence of the "street" is largely a consequence of the existence of these gangs. I doubt if anyone familiar with a slum district would deny that, if all the male youth by some miracle were to find employment, the social climate would change dramatically for the better. Some juvenile delinquents would remain, gangs might not wholly disappear, but the whole attitude of the neighborhood would alter in such a way as to make more effective the teacher in every classroom.

Unemployment is bad anywhere. Adult unemployment is grievous because it usually involves the loss of support for an entire family. In rural areas, towns and small cities, one might say that solving the unemployment of adults has the top priority; unemployment of youth may be pushed aside by some people as relatively unimportant. But in the slums of the largest cities I would say the drastic reduction of unemployment of male youth under age 21 is a greater need.

Consider for a moment the longrun consequence of persistent failure of underprivileged youth to find work. Leaving aside the human tragedies involved in each individual instance and looking at the matter solely in terms of the welfare of our free society, one sees the special position of the large-city slums. The boys brought up in slum neighborhoods, even if they came to the big city from the country as children, are conditioned to street life with all that this life implies. Out of work and out of school since they turned 16, these youth behave in ways that may have serious political conse-

quences; similar behavior of youth in smaller cities would be far less serious. It is a matter of geography in the last analysis. Three factors are significant: First, the total size of the group of youth to whom I am referring—the larger the group, the more dangerous; second, the density of the population—the number of frustrated youth per block; third, the isolation of the inhabitants from other kinds of people and other sorts of streets and houses.

If one compares the slum areas in the largest cities with similar districts in small cities, the difference as regards those three factors is clearly evident. The youth in the big-city slums dwells in the midst of a mammoth social complex. The surrounding city extends for blocks and blocks. The business and industrial areas hem in the impoverished youth. In the case of the Negro, added to all the negative influences of a slum is the absence of any evidence that there is a pathway out. In spite of the high mobility of the family unit or perhaps because of it, a tone is set by constant talk and the prevailing attitude of the older people. And the tone is not one to encourage education or stimulate ambition. The unemployed floaters on the street are walking evidence to all the youth that nothing can be accomplished through education, that the door of the neighborhood schoolhouse indeed opens on a dead end street.

Let me emphasize that, in my opinion, there is no reason why this should be the case. I know there are those who maintain that, on the average, Negro children are inferior to white children in academic ability. I have seen no evidence to support any such contention. In considering the relative abilities of whites and Negroes, let us examine the situation in an all-white slum in a city of considerable size. A careful study of a group of children in grade 4 of one such school showed that their average achievement level was a full year below their grade placement—a typical situation in any slum area.

What the teachers in this school have to contend with is shown by a report from the principal. Perhaps the greatest handicap to good schoolwork is the high mobility of the white population in the area. In this school mobility is very high; it is not uncommon in similar schools to have a turnover of the entire enrollment in 1 school year.

The principal writes, "When a residential area composed of large, old homes formerly occupied by owners and single family groups changes, economically and socially conditions of general deterioration begin. Absentee owners rent the property by single rooms or small so-called apartments of two or three rooms to large families. * * * Such conditions attract transients (who either cannot or will not qualify for supervised low income housing), the unemployed, the unskilled and unschooled, and the distressed families whose breadwinners have either just been committed to prisons or mental institutions or who have but recently been released from such. The only possession most of these families have is children. * * * In such an environment all forms of evil flourish—the peddling of dope, drunkenness, disease, accidents, truancies, physical, mental and moral handicaps, sex perversions involving children. * * *

"The parents of at least one-third of the children are either in penal institutions, are on probation, or have prison records. At least 100 children are on probation to the juvenile court. There has not been a day since I've been at the school that there has not been one or more children in detention at the juvenile court * * *.

"Less than 10 percent of the children have private doctors or dentists. A dental examination of 900 children in the fall of 1959 reveals only 44 free of cavities. The eyes of every child in the school were examined and about 300 showed some vision defects, and 30 had such serious vision loss that they were referred for partial seeing teaching. At least one-third of the children are on welfare rolls or are recipients of very small social security and/or veteran benefits checks. In many cases, however, the neediest children * * * are those who cannot qualify for any dependency grant.

"Unless a school is able to educate its children so they may become competent and responsible citizens its work is a temporary stop-gap that relieves immediate suffering only. Although the school is the only organization that has instruction as its primary responsibility, when a noble hearted teacher faces a barefoot, hungry, sick, distressed child, the result is an endless chain of efforts to relieve such a child.

"We realize that little or nothing can be done for or with the parents of the children who face such serious problems in their homes. These problems directly affect the child's health, attendance, emotional and personal adjustment, his learning and his progress (or lack of it) in every respect. In all probability at least one-half of our children will be school dropouts. In our opinion the children need, desperately—for desirable development, in addition to good schools—good homes, churches, and communities."

I am quoting from an official report which, in acknowledging the generally low achievement of the white children in this school, makes the interesting statement that "There is no reason to believe that these students as a group are inherently or genetically less capable than average students, but apparently because of some types of experiences in their lives they have been unable to develop their intellectual skills." The belief expressed in the first part of this sentence can hardly be based on anything firmer than an assumption as to the genetic uniformity of white children whose ancestors have for several generations lived in the United States. Such an assumption, of course, leaves out of account the possibility of a selective process occurring over the generations as some tended to move to one type of occupation and settle in one type of community. However, since I see no way of investigating the role of selective migration, I would be inclined to let the assumption stand unchallenged. Only I should argue strongly that to date we have no evidence to indicate that the assumption should not be broadened to include both white and Negro students.

For all the contrary evidence, namely, the poor work in school and low scores on tests made by Negroes, is based to a large degree on the performance of children in what are essentially slum conditions. Consequently, I start with the belief that, given a satisfactory socioeconomic background and educational opportunity, Negro children can be just as successful in academic work as any other group. You are all aware of the dramatic success that has been achieved in more than one instance in raising the aspirations and achievement levels of slum children.

The difference between the Negro slum of today and the slums of the northern seaport cities of 60 years ago is a difference that deserves attention. The worries I have expressed about the continuation of present conditions may appear to be neutralized by contemplating the record of the past. Big cities have always had slums. In the United States it has been possible for people to raise themselves by their own bootstraps in the course of a generation. Why be alarmed about the present situation. Such a complacent projection of the past into the obscure future is fallacious for several reasons. First and foremost is the fact that in the past most of the inhabitants of slums were recently arrived white foreign immigrants. They knew that their predecessors for generations had worked their way out of poverty in the cities. They were convinced that they could do likewise. The almost complete lack of such conviction—a consequence of the tragic story of the Negro in the United States—is the outstanding characteristic of youth in the Negro slum. Secondly, a foreign immigrant came from an impoverished but stable society, for the most part a peasant society with its own ancient mores. The pride of family and often strong church connections were social cement that kept the slums from being complete social jungles in spite of the fact that the dwelling conditions were often far worse than they are today.

Lastly, for most of the period of our history, labor shortages rather than labor surpluses were characteristic. Particularly, unskilled laborers were in demand. When this was not so, namely, in the depression years, organized society had to step in on a large scale to bolster up the tottering social structure. Today, automation has affected the whole employment scene; there is much less demand for unskilled labor. Racial discrimination makes unemployment chronic for the Negro male North and South. In short, neither in terms of the kinds of people involved nor in terms of the economic and social setting is there much resemblance between the slum districts of 1900 and those which are the sore spots of our modern cities.

What was especially shocking to me in my visits to the large cities in the last school year was the discovery that the employment of youth is literally nobody's affair. To be sure, there are groups concerned with various aspects of the problem, but no single agency in any of the cities has the data as to the unemployment picture in that city. There is little up-to-date information about youth unemployment even citywide and only the estimate of school people about the slum neighborhoods. Seldom are figures available to distinguish between the unemployed who are high school graduates and those who have dropped out of school before completing the 12th grade. Most important, it is not possible to say with any accuracy how the unemployed youth are distributed among various neighborhoods. There is much to be done in the gathering of reliable statistics. The problem of unemployed youth in the large cities is in no small part a Negro problem. We do not facilitate its solution by trying to find phrases to hide this fact. And it is largely a Negro problem in the North because of the discrimination practiced quietly but extensively by employers and labor unions. In an effort to overcome this unjust and nationally dangerous discrimination, people must not shrink from publishing statistics, unpleasant as they may be. How can we improve a situation if we are deprived of knowledge of what the situation really is? And it is my hope that in this conference this problem of setting forth the facts will be thoroughly explored in a spirit of good will.

At this point I imagine many of you who are well aware of the nature of the appalling problems in the big cities are wondering just how I became concerned about the social problems of the big city. Therefore, I thought I might take a few moments to explain my interest and to describe briefly the situations I found which have caused my great concern.

The subject of my first report, "The American High School Today," was the widely comprehensive high school found in independent cities that were not part of a large metropolitan complex. Aside from some short comments, I ignored both suburban

schools and big-city schools, both of which by my definition tend not to be widely comprehensive because they often do not include a wide variety of elective programs. In the college-oriented suburb there is not likely to be interest in vocational programs, and in the big cities the existence of separate vocational schools also means a restriction of the elective program in the general high school. However, in conjunction with my study last year of junior high school education, I decided to take a more detailed look at schools in metropolitan areas—at schools in slums and suburbs, if you will. In the large metropolitan areas of New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Chicago, St. Louis, one has no difficulty in locating examples of both. In some cases 20 minutes' drive will enable a person to go from one to the other. A visit to the high school serving each community will open the eyes of a visitor to the complexities of American public education. Their basic problems are quite unalike, and these differences spring from the differences in the nature of the families being served. One lesson to be drawn from visiting a well-to-do suburb and a slum is all important for understanding American public education. That lesson is that to a large degree what a school should do and can do is determined by the status and ambitions of the majority of the families within the community. I drew this conclusion after either my staff or I had visited metropolitan schools in and around many of the largest cities in the Nation—New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Baltimore, St. Louis.

In the suburban high school from which 80 percent or more of the graduates enter some sort of college the problems are the mirror image of those in the city slums, where as many as half the students drop out of school prior to graduation. The task with which the school people must struggle in the city slum is, on the one hand, how to prepare the youth for getting and keeping a job as soon as he or she leaves school and, on the other hand, to encourage those who have academic talent to aim at a profession through higher education. The task thus stated seems simple. In fact, as you all know, the difficulties are enormous. The improvement of conditions in the slums is only in part a school problem, but the role of the schools is of the utmost importance. I am not nearly so concerned about the plight of the suburban parents whose offspring are at present having difficulty finding places in prestige colleges as I am about the plight of parents in the slums whose children drop out of school or graduate without prospects of employment. The latter is a much more serious social phenomenon, and too little attention has been paid to it.

Visits to a wealthy surburb and impoverished slums only a few minutes away jolt one's notions of the meaning of equality of opportunity. On the one hand, there is likely to be a spacious, modern school staffed by as many as 70 professionals for 1,000 pupils; on the other hand, one finds a crowded, often dilapidated and unattractive school staffed by 40 professionals for 1,000 pupils. Expenditure per pupil in the wealthy suburban school is likely to be over $1,000; often it is less than half that in the slum school. To my mind, in view of the problems one finds, conditions in the slum school necessitate more staff and more money than in the suburban school.

Leaving aside the suburban communities, I would like now to point up some of my observations in the large cities, especially in the slums, where my staff and I made special efforts to visit schools. In each of the cities we visited, one can find neighborhoods composed of various minority groups. Many of these are areas now designated as "culturally deprived," or "culturally different" but which in my youth would have been more simply designated as "slums." The schools serving such neighborhoods have to be visited in order for one to understand the nature of the tasks which the teachers face.

The slum areas of certain big northern cities are today largely inhabited by Negroes who have recently moved from the South hoping to improve their lot. The economic changes in the South which have forced this migration are too well known to require elaboration. The Negro is being displaced as a farm laborer, and, being unable because of discrimination to obtain other employment in the section where he was born, he becomes a migrant headed north. Between 1950 and 1960 the proportion of Negroes living in the South dropped from 60 percent to 52 percent. St. Louis is said to be the first stopping point for many who make the journey, though the school people in Chicago, Detroit, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, or New York indicate that their problems with the recently arrived Negroes from the South are quite as great as those which confront their colleagues in St. Louis. New York State now has the largest Negro population of any State in the Union.

The growth of Negro slums in big cities is alarming. I wish that I could do more than direct attention. For without being an alarmist, I must say that when one considers the total situation that has been developing in the Negro slums since World War II, one has reason to worry about the future. The building up of a mass of unemployed and frustrated Negro youth in congested areas of a city is a social phenomenon that may be compared to the piling up of inflammable material in an empty building in a city block. Potentialities for trouble—indeed, possibilities of disaster—are surely there.

Let me start by describing a slum that might be in any one of several of the large cities I have visited. The inhabitants are all Negroes and with few exceptions have entered the city from a State in the Deep South anywhere from the last month to the last 3 years. Even the elementary schools serving this neighborhood are plagued by the mobility of the families. Often the composition of a grade will alter so rapidly that a teacher will find at the end of a school year that she is teaching but few pupils who started with her in the fall. In one school, I recall the principal stating that a teacher absent more than one week will have difficulty recognizing her class when she returns. The mothers move with their offspring from room to room from month to month and in so doing often go from one elementary school district to another; I am told that resident tenements look more like transient hotels. I write mothers advisedly, since in one neighborhood, by no means the worst I have seen, a questionnaire sent out by the school authorities indicated that about a third of the pupils come from family units (one hesitates to use the word home) which had no father, stepfather, or male guardian. Less than 1 percent of the parents graduated from college; 10 percent of the parents graduated from high school; only 33 percent completed the elementary school; and another 32 percent did not go that far. Contrast the situation in which a third of the parents have not completed elementary school with that in a high-income suburb where as many as 90 percent of the parents have bachelor's degrees, if not graduate degrees.

These Negro slums seem to vary considerably as regards the social mores. In some there are very bad gangs with gang warfare among the boys. There are also vicious fights outside of school between girls. The condition in one such neighborhood was summed up to one of my staff by a principal of a junior high school who said even he was shocked by the answers to a questionnaire to the girls which asked what was their biggest problem. The majority replied to the effect that their biggest problem was getting from the street into their apartment without being molested in the hallway of the tenement. He went on to say that the area had a set of social customs of its own. The streets are full of unemployed men who hang around and prey on the girls. The women are the centers of the family and as a rule are extremely loyal to the children. The men, on the other hand, are floaters. Similar reports from principals and teachers can be heard by the attentive and sympathetic visitor to the Negro slums of any one of several cities.

I have so far referred only to white and Negro slums. In addition, a few words are necessary to point out that in some cities, New York in particular, there are slum areas inhabited by recent arrivals from Puerto Rico. In these sections, the problems are similar to those I have described but complicated by the difference in language. Unlike the American Negro from the South, these recent arrivals bring with them a set of social mores closely associated with their own methods of communication. At the same time, they often, if not always, come with children whose schooling has been bad. Clearly the problem of teaching these Puerto Rican children involves both a reading problem and a problem of teaching a foreign language. These problems are so special I shall not attempt to discuss them here. One hardly needs to point out that the existence of these problems adds one more complication to the tasks confronting the administrators and teachers in New York City schools. Add to these tasks the possibilities of interracial hostility and gang warfare between Negroes and Puerto Ricans and the resentment of both toward the whites and one has a veritable witches' brew which comes to boil with unsavory vehemence in certain schools in certain areas—particularly in the junior high school years. The amazing feature of the whole situation is that pupils make any progress in schools in certain areas of the city.

One only needs to visit the type of school I am now describing to be convinced that the nature of the community largely determines what goes on in the school. Therefore, to attempt to divorce the school from the community is to engage in unrealistic thinking, which might lead to policies that could wreak havoc with the school and the lives of children. The community and the school are inseparable. For example, I have walked through school corridors in slum areas and, looking into classrooms, have seen children asleep with their heads on their hands. Is this situation the result of poor teachers without either disciplinary control or teaching ability? No, the children asleep at their desks have been up all night with no place to sleep or else subject to unbelievable family fights and horrors through the night. Checking into one case, a principal told one of my staff that after climbing six flights of a tenement he found the boy's home—one filthy room with a bed, a light bulb, and a sink. In the room lived the boy's mother and her four children. I might add that it is not unusual for teachers in these schools to take home with them children with little or no place to go at night. I would ask suburban parents to ponder the contrast between the lives and the education of their children and the lives and education of the boys and girls in the schools I have been describing. It is after visits to schools like these that I grow impatient with both critics and defenders of public education who ignore the realities of school situations to engage in fruitless debate about educational philosophy, purposes, and the like.

I use the phrase "social attitudes," including attitudes of youth, to try and sum up my impressions of what I have heard so often from the teachers in grades 1 to 8 in slum neighborhoods. As one teacher said to me, "We do quite well with these children in the lower grades. Each of us is, for the few hours of the school day, an acceptable substitute for the mother. But when they reach about 10, 11, or 12 years of age, we lose them. At that time the 'street' takes over. In terms of schoolwork, progress ceases; indeed, many pupils begin to go backward in their studies." What can be done to offset the demoralizing attitude of "the street" in the worst of the slums? Not much that lies within the province of the school authorities alone. Here is where the social agency people, the juvenile court people, the churches—all the various groups represented at this conference come into the picture.

This last thought leads me to say that thus far I have spoken in negative terms for the most part, describing my own sense of shock at the slum conditions in our large cities, especially as these conditions relate to education and employment. So important are these problems that in putting together a final report for the Carnegie Corp. I decided to publish a small book that will contrast the wealthy suburban schools and the slum schools. In this small volume I shall try to create a set of anxious thoughts in the minds of conscientious citizens who while living in the suburbs may work in the cities. I wish that I had many more constructive proposals to make than I now have, and I am hoping that this conference, composed of people thoroughly familiar with slum problems, will come up with positive, constructive ideas that will lead to solutions.

There are clearly many areas of concern. Among the more important are racial discrimination; employment practices of labor and management; Federal-State laws including insurance rates and wage scales; lack of jobs, as well as changing types of employment because of automation and the necessity for more highly skilled workers; the role of the schools in preparing youth for employment, especially average and below-average youth, and in helping them make the transition from school to work; the coordination of the efforts of the schools, the employers and labor unions, and the various community agencies that have a hand in promoting youth welfare; the role of the public sector of the economy at the local, State, and Federal level in providing employment if the private sector of the economy is unable to do so. All of these questions are complex and controversial but will, I sincerely hope, be thoroughly aired at the various workshop meetings in this conference.

In closing, I should like to express my own views on a very few of the subjects just mentioned about which I feel strongly. In the first place, there are those who would say that what goes on in the schools should not have any direct connection with the community or the employment situation. I completely reject this idea. The school, the community, and the employment picture are and should be closely tied together. I am not impressed by the holding power of a school as a criterion of its quality, but neither am I impressed by the argument that a boy who fails to get along in school ought to drop out. It all depends. The situation in which a boy drops out of school only to roam the streets is quite different from the situation in which a boy drops out and finds satisfactory employment. Full-time schooling for certain youths through grade 12 may be good or bad depending upon the employment picture. What goes on in the school ought to be conditioned in large measure by the nature of the families being served, the vocational plans and aspirations of the students, and employment opportunities.

To sum up, I submit that in a heavily urbanized and industrialized free society the educational experience of youths should fit their subsequent employment. This should be so whether a boy drops out of school in grade 10, after graduation from high school, or after graduation from college or university. In any case, there should be a smooth transition from full-time schooling to a full-time job.

This is an ideal situation admittedly and one which is at present approached only in the learned professions and in a few instances the occupations for which undergraduate college courses provide the necessary training. In the case of the learned professions, those in charge of the last stage in the educational journey—the professors of law, of medicine, and those who direct the research of candidates for the Ph. D.—have usually a sense of responsibility for their students based on their own passionate interest in promoting the best interests of their profession. Graduates of some undergraduate professional courses in some institutions are also often assisted in finding employment. Engineering is perhaps the best example. With the present shortage of teachers, professors of education have no difficulty in finding jobs for their students. While the universities or colleges do not accept responsibility for the placement of their graduates, many, if not all, spend time and money in helping the young man or woman to find a job. In many cases the subsequent career is followed with interest and assistance is provided in reemployment. Sixty years ago the situation was very different. Concern with placement of college and university graduates was a product of the depression years. The change, I believe, has been important and in the best interests of both the individual and society. For the college graduate who has received a general or liberal education without majority in a professional or semiprofessional field, many difficulties of finding a suitable job will remain. Still, by and large, one can say at the college and university level a considerable fraction of the youth involved make a smooth transition from education to a job.

When we examine the situation at the high school level, we find quite a different state of affairs. Although in many high schools a half or more of the graduates seek employment immediately on graduation, only in a few cities does one find an effective placement service. And I make this statement without intending any reproach to either social agencies or to guidance counselors. The obligations of the school should not end when the student either drops out of school or graduates. At that point the cumulative record folder concerning a student's educational career is usually brought to an end. It should not be. To my mind, guidance officers, especially in the large cities, ought to be given the responsibility for following the post-high school careers of youth from the time they leave school until they are 21 years of age. Since compulsory attendance usually ends at age 16, this means responsibility for the guidance of youth ages 16 to 21 who are out of school and either employed or unemployed. It is with the unemployed out-of-school youth that I am especially concerned—especially the boys, for whom the unemployment problem is more severe than for girls. This expansion of the school's function will cost money and will mean additional staff—at least a doubling of the guidance staff in most of the large cities; but the expense is necessary, for vocational and educational guidance must be a continuing process to help assure a smooth transition from school to the world of work. The present abrupt break between the two is unfortunate. What I have in mind suggests, of course, a much closer relationship than now exists between school, employers, and labor unions, as well as social agencies and employment offices.

There is no question that the school people in the large cities face a gigantic task in their efforts to prepare youth from impoverished homes for useful lives as responsible citizens and productive workers. I have the heartiest respect for the dedicated men and women who with limited means and facilities are doing the best job they can to overcome the adverse influence of the home and street in the big-city slum. As one of my associates who had spent the best years of his life as principal of a suburban public high school put it, "I visited junior high schools in New York City in some of the worst areas. I expected to find blackboard jungles; instead I found schools with high moral, tight discipline, imaginative principals and teachers." My own visits were largely confined to similar schools in Chicago, Detroit, and St. Louis, and my admiration for what is being done in those cities is equal to that of my colleague for what he saw in New York City.

Not that all problems have been solved. Far from it, as you all know. Reading is the essential tool for success in school and on the job, and although in this area much has been done, much remains to be done, particularly with respect to gaining the interest of the parents in the success of their children, reducing class size, and providing for more remedial reading teachers. Decentralized administration in the big cities is surely a step in the right direction by bringing the schools closer to the people. A new look is needed at vocational programs, especially for the below-average students who are rejected by the vocational people and academic people alike. Much remains to be done for the future dropout to ease the break between school and job. It appears that the only jobs available for unskilled workers in the decade ahead will be in service occupations, a fact of considerable importance in educational planning.

As you all know better than I, many of the large cities have made attempts to prepare these youths for work. Adult education courses, work-study programs of various sorts—these are all evidence of a continuing interest of the schools in furthering educational opportunities for out-of-school youth and ought to be expanded. Finally, I have been told many times that an important obstacle in improving the education of slum children is the fact that the teachers who may have taught in schools for a number of years with a certain kind of student body suddenly find themselves engulfed by slum children whom they do not understand and for whom they fail to recognize the need for changes in the curriculum. In many cases, a reeducation of the teachers becomes necessary.

In short, there is much that schools are doing but much more that they should do. Money in many instances is the key—remedial reading teachers, smaller classes, guidance counselors cost money. I have already noted the vast disproportion between the amount spent per pupil in the wealthy suburbs and that spent in the slums of the big city.

But even if the schools were to improve their services drastically, there would still remain what seems to me the crux of the situation—the presence or absence of employment opportunity. Whereas I have indicated my conviction that the problems of Negro education are no different from those of all underprivileged socioeconomic groups, the problems of Negro employment are distinctly different. The enforcement of antidiscrimination laws has proved a most difficult undertaking. I have heard it said that only those projects which are supported by

public funds can really be operated on a truly nondiscriminatory basis. Therefore, it seems to me that unless local management and labor take up the challenge, it may be necessary for Congress to appropriate funds for public work programs to alleviate the problem of unemployment among youth 16 to 21 in the large cities.

In view of the past discriminatory employment practices by both management and labor, action at the Federal level may become a necessity. Even if there were no discrimination, it might become a necessity if the private sector of the economy is unable to provide sufficient jobs.

In conclusion, let me repeat my sense of shock as I contemplate conditions in our big cities with respect to youth in slum neighborhoods. The problems are the result of a social situation the roots of which run back to the days of slavery and the result of an economic problem which is in part a reflection of the total unemployment situation and in part a result of racial discrimination among labor unions and employers. To improve the work of the slum schools requires an improvement in the lives of the families who inhabit these slums, but without a drastic change in the employment prospects for urban Negro youth, relatively little can be accomplished. I close by urging that our large city problems be analyzed in far more detail than in the past and with a far greater degree of frankness. Neighborhood by neighborhood we need to know the facts, and when these facts indicate a dangerous social situation the American people should be prepared to take drastic measures before it is too late. I wish this conference all success as it tackles this extremely urgent and perplexing problem of unemployed, out-of-school youth in our large cities.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield now to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the President of the United States today delivered a message to a joint session of this Congress. I can subscribe substantially to all that he recommended, and do so with great enthusiasm. Moreover, I believe I shall find no difficulty in implementing, by my action, his recommendations. I do have some doubt about the great need, within 10 years, to put a man on the moon and bring him back. I am not sure that objective has the vitality which has been ascribed to it.

The President, however, among other things, said:

> It will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds to programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

I merely want to point out that, in the consideration of the bill now pending before this body, we have added the cost of $250 million over the expenditure recommended by the President when he sent his message to Congress on the type of bill he wanted passed in order to aid education.

If by deed we want to carry out what the President recommended by word, we can save $250 million by doing what the President suggested in his message 3 months ago.

I recognize that the Senator from Oregon claims the President changed his mind between the time he made his recommendation and submitted the bill and the time the committee acted on it. I think perhaps the President was persuaded and begged to change his judgment to conform to that of the committee.

We can save $250 million by following what the President said:

> I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds to programs, desirable as they may be.

My final hope is that, if the additional $250 million is in the bill when it comes out of both Houses and goes to the President, he will veto it, under the declaration that it does not conform with what he recommended in his message and in his bill, and that the Congress added funds to the program in excess of what he recommended.

Finally, I remind the Senate what the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] said the other day—it was only in the last few hours of the assembly of the committee that the thought was evolved that the $250 million would be added and that children in the parochial schools would be counted together with those in the public schools, using that count as the basis for making the allocation, even though not 1 penny will go to the parochial school pupils.

Finally, I say to the parochial school students, understand that this Congress has counted you—16 percent of the school population between the ages of 5 and 17—to fix the amount that will be paid to the States. Parochial school pupils, you may think that, because you are counted, you are going to get a part of this money. Do not be beguiled. You have been used as the basis to increase the allocation, without your getting 1 penny of it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I desire to take only half a minute to say to my dear friend from Ohio that something tells me he is not going to vote for the bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am not.

Mr. MORSE. As an old teacher, whenever any student flunked my course, I thought it was my failure more than his. I am so sorry we have not been able to be better teachers so the Senator from Ohio would get a passing grade in the seminar which has been in progress here.

With respect to what the Senator from Ohio has said, I merely wish to say that the President is a keen student. It did not take him long, after he looked at the facts, to recognize how right we were in our recommendations with regard to changing the bill. I am pleased to tell the Senator we have the enthusiastic support of this bill by that honor student in this seminar. I want to relieve the Senator from Ohio of any hope, if he has any hope, that the bill is going to be vetoed if the Congress has the good judgment to pass it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I reply?

Mr. MORSE. I always give my students an opportunity to reply.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have great regard for the Senator from Oregon. He was the dean of a law school and a teacher of pupils, and my understanding has always been——

Mr. MORSE. I feel it coming——

Mr. LAUSCHE. That a person occupying that lofty position would be receptive to arguments that are logical and sound; but I cannot convince the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from Oregon is wrong and the Senator from Ohio is right.

I finally conclude—peculiarly, perhaps—by saying that, inasmuch as the dean has not been able to accept logic, I wonder if he was a dean.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. There is no question about the Senator being my student. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, I wish to yield now to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HICKEY], who has a few questions to ask in a colloquy with me for the purpose of establishing the legislative history in the RECORD.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, I wish to propound a few questions to the Senator from Oregon so that, as he has indicated, some legislative history can exist.

Am I correct in understanding that the bill would authorize a program of outright grants of Federal funds to all the States for the support of their public elementary and secondary schools?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKEY. Then, so I may understand it correctly, does this bill require any matching or other contribution of funds by the States as a condition precedent to their receipt of Federal funds providing for aid for their public schools under the bill?

Mr. MORSE. The answer is "No." This bill provides for the payment to States of Federal funds for the support of public elementary and secondary schools. It contains no provision requiring States to match the funds to which they are entitled in their allotment. The bill does contain provisions relating to the maintenance and improvement of support for public school financing in section 106. However, these are not what we consider State matching requirements. All payments to the States provided for in the bill would be outright grants, with no matching State fund requirements attaching thereto.

Mr. HICKEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senators are very welcome.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with the same understanding I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I wish to conclude my argument with respect to Federal aid

to public schools, the bill upon which we shall vote today. I expect to vote for the bill. I have discussed it at great length in the days we have been debating the bill and amendments to the bill.

I sum up my argument as follows:

First, it is in the overall interest to help meet a demonstrated need. In that regard, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an analysis and figures of need, from Social Life for January 1961, based on official figures of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From School Life, January 1961]

ENROLLMENT, TEACHERS, AND SCHOOLHOUSING [1]

Every year the Office of Education publishes data gathered from State departments of education on selected basic items of information about the public elementary and secondary schools in the United States. This year's report, which summarizes the fall 1960 survey, is being issued in February. National totals in the report are for the 50 States and the District of Columbia. The Office believes that the reporting this year is on a sounder basis than ever before: in most instances, the figures supplied by the States were based on answers to questionnaires completed by local school systems, rather than on State estimates, as they more often were in the past.

Some of the facts reported by the States for the fall of 1960 are these:

Pupil enrollments: 36.3 million pupils were enrolled—24.5 million in elementary schools and 11.8 million in secondary schools. Altogether this was an increase of 1.1 million, or 3.2 percent, over the fall of 1959.

Classroom teachers: 1,410,000 classroom teachers (counting both full-time and part-time teachers) were employed, 861,000 in the elementary schools and 549,000 in the secondary. This was an overall gain of 55,500, or 4 percent, over the 1959 total.

Substandard credentials: 91,500 teachers had substandard credentials—a decrease of 5,500, or 5.6 percent, from the year before. The percentage of all teachers with such credentials also fell, from 7.2 percent in 1959 to 6.5 percent in 1960. Most of these teachers were in the elementary schools—67,200, compared to 24,300 in the secondary.

Instruction rooms completed: 69,400 classrooms were completed during 1959–60; this figure, which includes both new construction and rooms converted from other uses, is approximately the same as the number for 1958–59, but below the peak of 72,000 completed in 1957–58.

Instruction rooms under construction: 69,600 classrooms are scheduled for completion in 1960–61. This is somewhat better than the 69,400 rooms completed in 1959–60, but something less than the average of 70,000 for the 5-year period ending with 1960–61.

Instruction rooms abandoned: 17,800 classrooms were abandoned during 1959–60, partly because districts were reorganized and consolidated, partly because buildings became obsolete. In the year before the figure was 16,400.

Pupils in excess of capacity: 1,868,000 pupils were in excess of normal capacity, an increase of 122,000 over the number in the fall of 1959. In 36 States and the District of Columbia 685,000 pupils were on curtailed or half-day sessions. About half of the 685,000 are included among the pupils reported as being in excess of normal capacity.

Classroom shortage: 142,100 additional instruction rooms were needed in the fall of 1960—6,900 more than the 135,200 needed the year before (the total shortage of 132,400 reported in the fall of 1959 was revised to 135,200 after 5 States sent in revised figures). The shortage for the fall of 1960 consisted of 66,100 classrooms needed to accommodate pupils in excess of normal capacity and 76,000 to replace unsatisfactory facilities.

[1] Figures given here are from Office of Education Circular No. 634, "Fall 1960 Statistics on Enrollment, Teachers, and Schoolhousing," by Samuel Schloss and Carol Joy Hobson. It will be available from the Office of Education in February.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, Madam President, there would be no Federal control over local educational systems under the terms of the bill. We fought that issue out thoroughly. I believe there will not be control. I shall certainly reserve the right to fight against it if any evidence of it appears.

Third, I do not agree with the opinion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as to the use of any of this money for school districts which are in direct defiance of the constitutional mandate for desegregation of schools involving also court orders which may be outstanding against those districts. I feel perfectly free to fight against that. I am confident I am correct as to the law, and that the Attorney General will take that view of the law, and therefore I do not consider this to be a reason to vote against the bill.

Fourth, I think we have a good faith obligation to the parochial and private schools, to the parents and teachers involved, to enact legislation tailored to their needs based on the National Defense Education Act. As one member of the Subcommittee on Education and of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I shall devote every talent I have to bringing about that result very promptly upon the heels of enactment of the bill before the Senate for Federal aid to education.

I think the national interest is such that we have all had to weigh many points of view and many ideas, as I have said a number of times before, in order to keep our eyes on the main point, which is, at long last, crowning with success the effort for Federal aid to education, so essential to the national interest.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] and I have completed a report on 2 years' work on the Alaska International Highway and Rail Commission. The Commission is scheduled to expire today. We wish to submit our official report to the Vice President, to the Speaker, and to the Congress. This will be one of the few Federal commissions to expire on time. I am sure the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] will applaud that accomplishment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I am in sympathy with the objectives of the distinguished Senator, but I have already declined to yield to the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] when he requested 10 minutes, on the ground that I am forced to decline to yield freely to many Senators unless they would be very brief. Unless the Senator from New York will relieve me from that situation, I am without authority to proceed in this regard.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I appreciate the courtesy of my friend from Florida. I should like to have 5 minutes, if the Senator could afford to yield that much time to me. I would not wish to have any commitment the Senator might make to me interfere with such an urgent request as the one my friend from Washington has, and I leave it to the Senator's discretion whether he feels he can yield to me for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, I see that I am losing again, so I yield to the Senator from Washington to present his important report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

REPORT OF ALASKA INTERNATIONAL RAIL AND HIGHWAY COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, we shall not take more time than is necessary, but this matter is urgent.

Today, as Chairman of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, I am submitting to the Vice President and to the Speaker of the House the final report on this very important matter concerning the transportation requirements for the growth of Northwest North America.

I am glad the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] is the Presiding Officer at this time, because I know of no one who was more helpful or more concerned about the problems of the economy, the natural resources, and transportation development of the great north country than our friend Dick Neuberger, who helped us considerably.

I wish to read the letter of transmittal of the report, so that it will be clear in the RECORD:

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith the final report of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission. This report is submitted to the Congress in accordance with the provisions of Public Law 884 of the 84th Congress, as amended.

The Commission was directed to make a thorough and complete study of additional rail and highway transport facilities connecting the United States with Central Alaska to determine, first, economic and military advantages; second, the most feasible and direct routes relating to the economic benefits; to the 48 continental United States, Canada, and the new State of Alaska; and, third, the most feasible feeder rail and highway routes connecting coastal ports with these facilities. The Commission was directed to give particular attention to the feasibility of rail and highway facilities between the northwest region of the 48 States and Alaska, and to report to the Congress the results of its studies no later than June 1, 1961. The report includes recommendations of routes and facilities determined most feasible and beneficial, with estimates

of construction costs and economic benefits to the United States, Canada, and Alaska, as provided in the act.

Detailed economic studies conducted by direction of the Commission analyze location, availability, and extent of natural resources. The report forecasts resource and industrial development which may reasonably be expected during the next two decades, including a review of world markets and competitive sources of these products.

Since the study involved substantial areas within Canada, the Commission is fully aware of the need for consultation with officials of the Government of Canada. Recommendations include suggestions to the Congress that the Secretary of State be directed to initiate negotiations with the Government of Canada and the Secretary of Commerce be directed to establish a technical staff in the office of the Under Secretary for Transportation, leading to the achievement of the objectives set forth in this report. Specific projects for consideration during negotiations should include exploration of methods to insure growth of the merchant marine of both countries; the construction of a coordinated hard-surfaced highway system to serve Alaska, British Columbia, and the Yukon and provide a second and shorter highway between the Pacific Northwest region of Alaska; and, the extension of the Alaska Railroad to the Yukon border to connect with a Canadian railway at the border and provide a link to the continental rail network.

This report was submitted by me as Chairman, to the Speaker and to the Vice President. Distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, other members of the Commission, are presenting this report in the House today.

As its final act, the Commission decided to submit a resolution, which, in effect, would not continue the life of the Commission but would provide that the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of other appropriate agencies take such actions as may be necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in the Commission's report, to establish a technical staff in the office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Transportation and to implement the results by negotiations with the Government of Canada, recommending to the Congress such proposed legislation as may be necessary to bring the countries together on this vital program.

Therefore, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution to express the sense of the Senate on recommendations of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 151) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that in order to carry out the recommendations of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, established by Public Law 884, Eighty-fourth Congress, in its report dated May 15, 1961, the President should (1) direct the Secretary of State to negotiate with the Government of Canada for the purpose of establishing a coordinated water, rail, and highway development program in northwest North America to provide economic, civil defense, and military benefits to both the United States and Canada, as recommended by such Commission, and (2) direct the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior and the heads of other appropriate agencies to take such action as may be necessary to achieve the objectives set forth in the Commission report, including establishment of a technical staff in the office of the Under Secretary of Commerce for transportation, implementation of the results of negotiations with the Government of Canada, and recommending to Congress necessary legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Madam President, the report was unanimous with two exceptions. My distinguished friend and colleague, THOMAS M. PELLY, Representative from the State of Washington, also a member of the Commission, registered a dissent as to the recommendation of a portion of the Commission's report. In recommending a rail link by the Commission, he said:

I must register dissent from the recommendations of the Commission adopted at the meeting of May 3, 1961.

In this connection, I wish to record my views strongly opposing the expenditure of public funds to construct an extension of the Government-owned Alaska Railroad to the Alaska-Canada border.

Rather, I support the conclusions of the Battelle Memorial Institute, arrived at after careful lengthy study for the Commission, in favor of a system of highways in Alaska connection with tidewater.

The recommending of a rail link by the Commission was arrived at without due and proper study of the adverse effect of Government-owned railroad competition on other forms of privately owned transportation.

Also, and of even greater concern to me, would be the adverse effect of a rail extension on Alaska's coastal communities and areas outside of the so-called rail belt, which stand to suffer diminished or complete loss of scheduled steamship service.

In my opinion the nature and extent of this adverse effect should be analyzed before making a recommendation favoring an extension of the Government railroad which the Battelle Report has said was not economically feasible.

Therefore, pending such further study, I am compelled to disagree with the recommendation for negotiation with Canada and likewise setting up a technical staff to implement this report.

As Chairman, I made the following statement, which in effect is a statement of individual views on the question of the rail connection:

I am inclined to give weight to Congressman PELLY's individual views relating to the extension of the Government-owned Alaska Railroad to the Canadian border. I feel that a railway connection between the Alaska Railroad and the continental rail network will be accomplished ultimately and that a rail link is essential for the comprehensive development of Pacific-North American transportation.

However, I do agree with Mr. PELLY to the extent that the recommendations in the Battelle report which favor an integrated system of highways connecting with tidewater should have priority in our efforts to reach our ultimate goal.

A series of recommendations was made to the Congress. As I have said, this report was the result of approximately 2 years of study. We established the services of the Battelle Memorial Institute, which went into the economic requirements, priorities, and feasibilities of this great new pioneer area. I believe that anyone will find it excellent reading. I think the conclusions are even a little bit conservative as to what can be done in this so-called new frontier.

Since we began the report, Alaska has become a State, which makes it all the more important that both the United States and Canada pay attention to this important subject.

I had the privilege of being Chairman of a similar Commission in the 1930's prior to World War II. A counterpart Commission was appointed in Canada. We had many meetings and did a great deal of work on this subject with the U.S. Army Engineers, the Canadian engineers, and others, and we recommended a highway to Alaska. There was some dispute as to the route at the time, but World War II broke out, and the International Joint Commission decided to build a highway to Alaska, which is now the highway system that is well known to most of us in both countries.

This report is a supplemental report to integrate that entire area and to provide a sketch of the much needed transportation for the tidewater of Alaska, or what we call the Panhandle in our country, the southeastern portion. The report goes into great detail regarding the possibility of development of this vast reservoir of natural resources that exist in what is the only real frontier, resourcewise, known to us on the whole North American Continent.

Madam President, I submit this report with great pleasure. The distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and three representatives in the House of Representatives are also members of the Commission. There are other interested individuals, including representatives from the State Department, the Army Engineers, and the Department of Commerce, all of whom perform yeoman work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Before I take my seat, I wish to pay tribute to our fine executive secretary, Carl L. Junge, who did most of the work for us. The amount of time he spent and the work he did were of inestimable value to the whole Commission. I compliment all members of the Commission. This is one Commission that has concluded its work on time.

Mr. BARTLETT. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Alaska for a brief statement.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Senator is most gracious, and my statement will be brief. I am glad to be able to be present in the Chamber, as I know the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is also, as the chairman submits the final report of the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission.

Madam President, I wish to say three things. First, the senior Senator from

Washington has been entirely too modest in referring to his past activities in connection with a transportation system to Alaska. His efforts have been continuous and effective for more than a quarter of a century, and much of what we have by way of transportation today is the result of his effort. On behalf of Alaskans I desire to pay him tribute.

Second, I recall ever so well a day in November 1942, when, in company with Richard S. Neuberger of the Northwest Service Command, I was at Kluane Lake, north of Whitehorse, when the Alaska Railroad was dedicated. I am particularly happy that on this occasion, when the final report of the Commission is presented, his successor in office, bearing his name, occupies the chair.

Third, and finally, I have a profound conviction that if the recommendations can be carried through, the empire of the Northwest, to which the senior Senator from Washington has referred, will be truly opened for economic development, and for settlement, and its riches can be exploited under proper conditions.

In connection with this report it must be emphasized that all these routes are international in character. They will come into being only through agreement between the United States and Canada. We are not trying to impose anything on Canada. We wish to negotiate.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that the Senator from Colorado is also a member of the Commission now making a report?

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to him for a brief statement.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Madam President, I have one or two points to make concerning the report. First, I think the Chairman of the Commission deserves a great deal of credit for many things—for the way he has carried on this project, for the fact that the work has been concluded within the prescribed time, and for the fact that the work is outstanding.

With respect to the report as a whole, from time to time there will be disagreement as to some phases of the report. Economic conditions, perhaps military conditions, and geographical conditions may change. But I believe the report contains what the Commission has set out to find. Findings of fact are set out upon which future action concerning railroads and highway transportation can be planned for this great area.

That objective is what we set out to reach. I am sure the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Interior, and such other agencies as may have to act in this field will find in the report every reasonable fact and assumption to begin to transpose the report into action. We all hope for such action.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is welcome.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator from Florida.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam President, not long ago I heard a Senator say that he regretted that he could not support the proposed legislation. I am not in that position. I cannot support the proposed legislation and would not support it. I do not feel that it is at all necessary to make any apology for being against the proposed legislation and all other measures of this type.

Madam President, there are appealing features in the bill for which I would have been glad to vote if they had been separately presented. One of them is the defense-impacted school program, which I shall mention later. That is a part of the bait that has been added by the sponsors of the bill. The trouble is that they are added to a principal program which would provide that the common public schools and the public secondary schools of the Nation would be given very large Federal grants by way of increasing their revenue for school building and for school operation, including teachers' salaries and for school operation under an amendment which has been adopted on the floor, which includes other things, from athletic coaches up and down the line, to cover every conceivable sort of expense in the operation in the public school system.

I am out of sympathy with the idea of the Federal Government authorizing such an expenditure of about $2.5 billion, and I am against the Federal Government taking over responsibility for the operation of our public school system. I see the handwriting on the wall in this program, which certainly will lead, in my judgment, to Federal control, as much Federal control as any Federal Government may want to exercise over the public school system of every State in the Nation and over every detail of the operation of every public school at the common school and secondary school level.

I believe very strongly that since the beginning of this country the matter of education of our children when they are young so far as the public is concerned, has been primarily a matter to be determined in the homes from which the children come, in the communities where they are raised, and at the highest level in the States of which they are citizens.

The Federal Constitution is silent on the question. Up to this time the Federal Constitution has not been interpreted so as to bring the Federal Government properly into the common school effort. I for one do not want to see this entering wedge on a very large basis of some $2.5 billion of Federal money contributed for the operation of the public schools throughout the Nation.

The schools were never intended to be under Federal control. In their very nature they are close to the home and community and State, and should be kept so. I believe that was the contemplation of the Founding Fathers, and it has certainly been the contemplation of the fathers and mothers from that time until now. I do not want to see that philosophy changed by the passage of the pending bill. I do not want to see the Federal Government placed in control of our public school system.

Senators say no control is provided for in the bill. However, certain controls are mentioned in the bill. Beyond that, my point is that control down to any level that may be desired at any time by any Federal Government will be exercised. My experience in government, which has lasted over a good many years, has conclusively indicated that the government that pays the bill can, if it so desires, control the operations, and in most respects it soon wants to control the operations and soon does so. I remember that when I was chairman of my local school board in my hometown, schools were supported in the main by local school districts and by the counties. Then there came a demand that the State make a contribution. That contribution by the State has now become by all means the larger part of the operating cost of the schools. As I expected at the beginning, control of the school systems has largely gone to Tallahassee, the State capital. It is not possible to build a school building without getting the approval of the architect in Tallahassee. We cannot have a program of any sort without having approval at the State level. The fact remains that the supervisors who come from Tallahassee are much more in control of the structure of the public schools in my State than is anyone else on the local level or on the county level. The reason for it is just as clear as can be. It is that the State is supplying most of the money now for the schools.

I have noted, likewise, that whereas citizens once liked to go to the polls to vote onto themselves the highest millage possible for local support of the schools, they have forgotten how to do it. They try to get by with the smallest millage possible, because they have found that the system at the State level and the State appropriations at the State level will take care of them. Therefore, they try to minimize the contribution out of their own pockets. That is only human.

No one can make me believe that the citizens of this Nation or those who are in Government on the Federal official level will ever care to let the present authorization and eventual appropriation of $2.5 billion, much less the larger amount which will follow, go without control by the Federal Government of the expenditure of that fund. The Federal Government is invited to come in and take over. I have not seen any level of government willing to resist

temptation very long to come over and control it. That is what we are asking for when we pass this kind of legislation. Financing means control, and Federal financing will mean Federal control. Public servants on the Federal level who would appropriate large sums of Federal money without seeing to it that the expenditures of those funds is safeguarded and supervised, would not be true to their oath or faithful to their trust.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator from Florida believe that it will not be long before a limitation will be placed on appropriation bills, and these funds will only go to integrated schools?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is likely true. However, under the thinking of the authors of the bill, such express provision would not be necessary to bring about integration, because of the construction of the law which the U.S. Supreme Court has already made. I shall read into the RECORD statements by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] on that point.

Mr. EASTLAND. I agree. I believe this is a school integration bill. Fundamentally it will lead to that. Nevertheless, does not the Senator think that shortly a limitation will be placed on the appropriations which must be made each year, which will limit the funds to integrated schools?

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly agree with the Senator that a strong effort will be made in that direction. To go further than the Senator has gone, I fear that under the present construction of the law and the Constitution by the Supreme Court of the United States, regardless of the contents of the law, the very result which the Senator states will follow.

Mr. EASTLAND. Then when the school system of a State is dependent on Federal funds, and the funds are cut off unless the schools are integrated, that State will be in mighty bad shape.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course that will be the case. Whenever revenue upon which a school or any other public agency is dependent for its operating costs is cut off, particularly if it is cut off without notice, without legislative hearing, but instead as a result of court action or of executive action—and there well might be such action in this case—the result is very hurtful to the agency.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator from Florida believe it will mean that unless a school integrates the races, Federal funds will be cut off?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that is within the minds of those who are the sponsors of the bill. Let me read into the RECORD now the statements made during the debate by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] was in a colloquy with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], who asked:

> Is it the Senator's opinion that if the bill is passed in its present form without amendment, it would be impossible for the Federal Government to withhold aid from States regardless of the situation in such States regarding segregation?

To that question the Senator from New York made this reply:

> It is not my belief that it would be impossible to withhold. I do not believe that the bill carries that kind of mandate.

Later the Senator from New York said:

> I do not introduce the school desegregation question into this argument, even by my present assertion of legislative history. I merely wish to say that in my judgment, as a lawyer, the bill does not make the President of the United States distribute the money to every school district without regard to any law or fundamental Executive authority of the President.

A little further the Senator from New York said:

> I wish to make it clear in the legislative history—and the Senator who is in charge of the bill is on the floor—that there is nothing in the bill which is in derogation of the fundamental authority of the President of the United States to enforce all the laws of the United States. I stand on that.

The Senator from New York was making it very clear that, in his opinion, whether the bill was passed or not and regardless of whether it had in it the amendment which was then pending, the present decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States make it possible for the President to withhold funds and for funds otherwise to be withheld under court decisions.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. I can tell the Senator from Florida that throughout this debate the State of Mississippi has been cited as an example of the need for Federal aid to education. On behalf of the State of Mississippi, I will state that we pay our own school bills. We have a fine school system, and we will not accept Federal aid.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am certain the Senator is stating what is the sentiment in his own State. I think it is a very sound sentiment, based upon the desire of its people to have local self-government and to retain the control of their local schools. I approve and appreciate that philosophy.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the distinguished Senator realize that when the Federal Government controls the school system of this country, there will follow an indoctrination course, and that the form of our Government will be changed?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not certain of that; but certainly a road would be open for exactly that kind of experience to be sustained.

Mr. EASTLAND. That is what the Senator from Mississippi believes. That is why I oppose the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I oppose the bill for the reasons mentioned by the Senator from Mississippi and for other reasons which I think are equally powerful. I am trying now to state them for the RECORD. I thank the Senator from Mississippi for advancing his opinions.

Further in the statement from which I was quoting appears a statement by the principal sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. There are several statements, but I shall quote only two of them. The first reads:

> Certainly it is evident that the absence of a general Federal aid to education program has not stayed the hand of the Department of Justice in expressing its interest in segregation matters within the States. If no school bill is passed, the Department of Justice will still continue to intervene where it believes the Constitution calls for intervention.
>
> The enactment of the bill without the Thurmond amendment or the Powell amendment will not change the obligation of the Department of Justice or of the Federal courts to continue their present policy with respect to school desegregation.

Then the Senator in charge of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], made this statement:

> In my judgment, one facet of the Thurmond amendment—

The amendment which was pending at the time—

> really is an attempt to direct the President of the United States or the executive branch of the Government in the execution of their constitutional duties. That cannot be done by legislation. That constitutional duty rests upon the executive branch of the Government. Whether we pass school legislation or do not pass school legislation, that constitutional obligation will not be changed one iota.

Mr. President, many things have been said by both the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in the course of the debate with which I do not agree. However, I certainly agree with the statement—which I believe is a correct one—that the present legislation is subject in all respects to Executive action or to court action, based upon the present opinion and decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, concerning certain aspects of segregated education. In my judgment, there is no doubt at all that a citizen can go to court or a State could go to court, or the President, acting upon his own authority, and being later upheld by court action, could withhold an appropriation from any State or any school which was designated to receive the payment, by reason of the fact that segregation was involved. However, that has not been, by any means, the whole or even the principal part of my objection.

I object to the Federal Government having the say about education in the common-school system. It is too far from the communities where the children live. It is too far from the homes where the ambitions for those children exist. It is too far from the type of life which is sought to be served by those children when they are educated.

Aside from that, the Federal Government is already too overloaded and too much bogged down in all its obligations, both domestic and foreign, to wish upon

it the responsibility for the handling of the public school affairs of the Nation which I think would devolve upon it, beyond any question at all, if the philosophy of the bill were followed. If the bill is passed and placed into effect, I suspect the philosophy of the bill will be followed in greater measure in the future than it is through the bill.

The population of the United States is now greater than 180 million. The scope of the Nation's geography runs from Maine to Hawaii and from Alaska to Florida. The country is vastly greater and vastly more diverse in its type of citizenship and its community problems and home problems than was the case in the beginning. Besides that, it is vastly bigger, so as to make the job of supervising, controlling, and managing the school system of the Nation a Herculean effort, one which I certainly do not wish to place upon Congress and the Federal Government, and one which, if so placed, will result in a great disservice to the school systems of the Nation.

My second point is that Federal financing such as is provided in the bill is not necessary. As a matter of fact, the States are in a much stronger position than is the Federal Government to operate the schools or to operate any other local enterprise of this kind. The Federal indebtedness is now around $290 billion. Many States do not have any State indebtedness. My State is one of those States; there are many others. I simply call attention to the fact that not only are the States in a stronger position to handle their own school problems, but they are in a better position to do so if the borrowing of money is involved—and it certainly is involved on the Federal level—by reason of the fact that State bonds and local bonds are not subject to income tax. The bonds are issued only by strong taxing authorities, such as the States are, and they can be sold at highly advantageous rates which are not now available in many instances, to the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, anyone who thinks that Federal financing is necessary, simply has not looked at the picture, but has, indeed, been one of the ardent disciples of Federal control, of more centralized government, seeming to believe that merely by dumping these problems or any other problems of government on the Federal Government, it will be possible to find solutions which will be likely to be better than the solutions which otherwise would be found.

Mr. President, to the contrary, we shall have, instead, worse solutions; and I know that the distinguished Senator now presiding over this body, the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], has already learned that his own people and, for that matter, the people of every other State and every other community, feel less responsible or less careful about the handling, the management, and the expenditure of money which comes from a higher level of government, and which, somehow or other, they think did not come out of their own pockets—although it happens that it did come out of their pockets.

So far as Florida is concerned, Florida would pay about as much as it would receive under this program. I think that money, if raised from our State locally—if it were needed—would be expended much more carefully and much more frugally if it came directly out of the pockets of the citizens of Florida and then were expended directly by those who have to go to the people every 2 years or every 4 years, for election or defeat, depending on the kind of job they have done. I believe that locally raised moneys are regarded, and always will be regarded, as funds which will be more carefully safeguarded than moneys which come from some extraneous source, even though all citizens have contributed to the raising of that money.

Florida will receive approximately $21 million, under this law. That represents substantially 5 percent of the school budget of Florida, not including the budget for the universities, the colleges, and the junior colleges of Florida, but including only the Florida primary schools and secondary schools. The total school bill of the State of Florida at this time is almost exactly $400 million—that is to say, from State sources and from local sources; and the $21 million is just a hair over 5 percent of that total. Anyone who thinks there would be any great difficulty in raising $21 million from a State which has no indebtedness, and has not probed many sources of revenue, if the State found it was necessary to do so in order to continue to operate its schools, has simply had an experience much different from the experience I have had in State government and in local government. I believe it would be a very simple matter to raise that additional fund through local taxation; and I believe that the real question is what is needed. As to that question, I am perfectly willing to have the school authorities in my own State and in my own county and in my own district and the legislature and the Governor of my State have primary responsibility for determining what is needed for the proper operation of the schools in my State.

Mr. President, it so happens that here in the Senate we find a peculiar complex which makes us think we know better what our constituents need—or, at least, very many of us have this complex. I call it a Messianic complex. It becomes rather funny when we dissect it and analyze it. My home is approximately 1,000 miles from Washington, and the home of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], who now occupies the chair, is perhaps 2,000 miles away from the Nation's Capital. Is it possible that a man who is sent to Washington, from his distant home can become better educated and better trained in analyzing the educational needs of his constituents than he was before he reached Washington, D.C.? I think the State legislators, who live among the people of their State and who spend much more of their time with them than I am able to do, and whose children attend school there, and who are in constant contact with that problem, have a considerably better understanding of what is needed than I could have, while I am here in the Nation's Capital.

When I was chairman of my school trustees, at home, I thought I knew fairly well what was needed in that school—inasmuch as I had taught school for several years and have always been a kind of teacher, as I am told often here in the Senate. It seems to me that at that time I was fairly close to the problem and was able to understand it. In those days my understanding was reflected almost entirely in the millage which was voted locally in the district and in the county and in the small amount of aid which we received from the State. I do not think I was a better school official than the school officials who now serve there; and I give them credit for knowing a great deal about what the needs of those schools are and for knowing much more than I know or much more than my able associates in the Senate know about the needs of those schools.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I know that my State is an aggressive State and is a progressive State, and I know it is very ambitious as regards the field of education, and I know that the Florida school officials and the people of Florida are trying very hard to give the children who live in Florida the benefit of the best possible education which can be had anywhere, and I am willing to let those schools be compared with any schools to be found anywhere else.

Mr. President, I do not believe I can adopt the philosophy that it is proper for me to acquire the Messianic complex to which I referred a moment ago, and to say to the people of Florida, "I believe I know more about your schools than you do, and I believe Members of Congress who come from distant States know more about your schools than you do," because if our form of government means anything, it can still be properly described in the words used long ago by Thomas Jefferson:

> That government is best which is closest to the people, and that government is best which governs least.

I believe that at the national level that is particularly true, inasmuch as today we are saddled with such enormous problems, worldwide in scope, which are making many of us even more gray haired than we were when we first came here.

Mr. President, I was among the group of Senators who earlier today went to the Hall of the House of Representatives and heard the message delivered by our President, who told us what he thought we needed to do today, in the perilous times in which we are living. I wish to call the attention of the Senators who now are with me in the Senate Chamber that I thought anyone who listened to that message from the President heard enough to keep him scratching his head for at least a year or two in an effort to determine what should be done in defense of our country and for the security of our country and for the doing on behalf of our country those things which need to be done.

Yet here it is proposed to enlarge our Federal responsibility in ways which were not even dreamed of in the days when our country was relatively small in size and our population not great, and to impose upon the Central Government the responsibility—and it will be that, soon, if this bill is passed—of operating, in large part, the public school system of this Nation.

Mr. President, I have been in government for a long time—perhaps 40 years. I have never yet seen one departure from the rule that when one gives money for a local enterprise, very soon he is going to control it. When I became Governor of my State, the Federal Government had just taken over the financing of the welfare department and other departments of our State government, insofar as paying the salaries, in major part, was concerned. I found very soon that, along with that Federal money, which we accepted, we accepted the responsibility to operate what they called the merit system in connection with the personnel in those offices. I found out very soon that that particular merit system put a premium on mediocrity, instead of permitting me to operate those branches of our Government by picking people whom I knew to be good people to run them. My hands were tied by supervision and control from far away Washington, by people who had not the faintest idea of the personalities and qualities of those who had to perform the important duties of operating those agencies of government.

I have seen no exception made to the rule that control of activities goes to the place where the financing is.

Mr. President, this is just the beginning. The admission of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] that, in the very first instance, regardless of what we put in this bill, the operations of the Federal laws will be such as to cover the question of segregation, along with other questions which were not mentioned, shows rather clearly that Federal control is one of the things which will follow, and which I believe to be one of the objectives of those ardent disciples of centralized government who are asking that our Central Government take over the control of our school systems.

The third point which I make is this: This program will, in my humble opinion, create the deepest kind of bitterness between groups of good citizens in our country, and establish that bitterness as a way of life among them, at the very time when the unity of our people is of the greatest consequence it has ever been in time of peace in all the history of our Nation.

Why is that? It is because there is implicit in this legislation a discrimination against millions of children who are American children, with exactly the same heritage that every other child has. That discrimination is implicit in this bill, and then is augmented and increased by the mode of distribution provided in the bill.

Why do I say it is implicit? It is implicit because, under our Constitution, as I believe it provides, we cannot make the benefits of this bill apply to the children who attend the religious and private schools of our Nation, but must, instead, confine our beneficence and our grants to those children who go to the public schools.

This is no time to argue the reasons for that, but I think there is no Member of the Senate who does not believe that there is implicit in this question the necessity of making the grants go only to the children who attend the public schools.

There are some who seem to think that it is only those who go to Catholic schools who are involved in this problem—and they are the major group; but there are so many private schools that are also affected that I thought it might be interesting to comment that a considerable number of private schools exist within my own knowledge that are maintained by other denominations which are not Catholic.

Right here in the city of Washington, and in the adjoining city of Alexandria, there is an Episcopal high school maintained by that denomination. In the city of Jacksonville, one of our great cities in Florida, which I know pretty well, I know of two schools, and there may be others, which are maintained by churches for the education of their children. I do not mean their religious education; I mean the all-around education of their children. One is the Riverside Presbyterian Church of Jacksonville, Fla., and the second is the Berea Baptist Church of that city.

Right here in Washington we have one example, of many that exist throughout the Nation, of a school maintained by the Society of Friends for the education of children of that religion and of other children who may be sent there. I am thinking of the Sidwell Friends School. There are numerous other illustrations of such church-sponsored schools I could give.

I have mentioned these because I do not want my remarks at this stage to be regarded as referring solely to those millions of people who belong to the Catholic Church, which is a great church, and who in many instances send their children, by their own preference, to the so-called parochial schools.

Every church has the right to maintain such schools, and many churches do maintain them. Since the decision of 1954 and since the different U.S. Supreme Court opinions on the segregation question, the number of such schools has multiplied greatly, and I predict it will multiply even more.

So what we are talking about now is discrimination against people who belong to various churches, who, for reasons sufficient to themselves, and which they think have to do with the ultimate best welfare of their children, send their children to schools maintained by their churches.

In my judgment, Mr. President, that discrimination is unavoidable under the bill, because the Constitution so provides. Why should it so provide? I doubt if the framers of that particular part of the Constitution which is in question here were even thinking about schools, but at any rate, they felt that the division between the State and religious institutions was sound, and they made it, and I think it applies in this case.

So, in the first instance, that discrimination is unavoidable and would have to exist in many cases and as to millions of children. This bill would multiply that discrimination, and would add insult to injury, if I can use those words, and I think they are proper words, by providing another detail in the distribution of the funds which is particularly discriminatory against the children who attend that kind of school.

What is that provision? It is the provision in the bill, adopted within the last few hours of its consideration by a majority of the committee, and over the opposition of other members of the committee, which, for the purpose of distributing Federal funds to the States, counts and includes the children who go to parochial and other religious and private schools—in short, counts all children—with full knowledge of the fact that, in spite of the fact that the amount to be assigned or the total going to the State is going to be increased by the presence of those children in those schools, but that nevertheless those very children are to be precluded and prohibited from receiving benefits under grants to the States.

Mr. President, on the floor yesterday, I tried to make this a simple matter by commenting it looked to me to be this kind of a situation: That when the Federal pie was being cut up a slice was provided for every child, regardless of whether he went to a public school, a private school, a parochial or religious school, with full knowledge of the fact that all the slices cut for the children not in public schools would go as largess and a bonus to the children who were in the public schools.

Mr. President, that is adding insult to injury. That is piling discrimination on discrimination. There is no way to avoid that conclusion.

I have been impressed with the fact that in order to justify the inclusion of all the children it was thought necessary to add about $200 million to the total amount, which represents the pieces of pie which were cut from Federal finance for the children who had not been in the computation under the bill the way the President sent it to Congress but who were added to the computation by the majority of the committee at the time and in the way I have mentioned.

Mr. President, it is not for me to comment on the objectives and motives of Senators who made that decision and who reported the bill in that form, but I wish to comment upon what the result will be.

I have heard a great deal of very pious protestations before the Senate to the effect that the bill is primarily designed to help schools in the States with small income which are not able to run good schools, and with particular reference to the Southern States, which seem to be particularly, in the minds of some, the beneficiaries of this proposed system. Mr. President, instead of being beneficiaries of the system, the Southern

States will be hurt very badly by the inclusion of all the children from the religious, parochial, and private schools in all the States in the Nation, for the simple reason that most children in the South go to public schools and most children in the South belong to the religious faiths which send children to public schools.

Mr. President, I have taken some percentage figures from a Catholic publication, to show the percentage of Catholic people in various States. This does not state the number of children, but states the percentage of Catholic citizens in every State in the Union. The figures are taken from the 1960 National Catholic Almanac. I first ask unanimous consent that the compilation be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Percentage of Catholics in each State (as of Jan. 1, 1959)

	Percent
New England States	48.15
Maine	27.39
New Hampshire	38.14
Vermont	32.32
Massachusetts	52.80
Rhode Island	61.27
Connecticut	47.23
Middle Atlantic States	35.01
New York	35.30
New Jersey	42.88
Pennsylvania	30.85
South Atlantic States	6.11
Delaware	11.68
Maryland	23.85
District of Columbia	18.66
Virginia	3.99
West Virginia	4.47
North Carolina	.87
South Carolina	1.31
Georgia	1.54
Florida	8.63
East North Central States	25.45
Ohio	21.39
Indiana	14.84
Illinois	33.48
Michigan	23.77
Wisconsin	32.01
East South Central States	4.44
Kentucky	9.81
Tennessee	2.06
Alabama	3.17
Mississippi	2.85
West North Central States	19.12
Minnesota	27.72
Iowa	16.19
Nebraska	17.74
Missouri	17.72
North Dakota	23.16
South Dakota	19.31
Kansas	12.77
West South Central States	17.56
Arkansas	2.44
Louisiana	35.21
Oklahoma	4.27
Texas	18.06
Mountain States	19.05
Montana	22.79
Idaho	6.00
Wyoming	16.13
Colorado	18.39
New Mexico	45.49
Arizona	20.96
Utah	4.35
Nevada	18.86
Pacific States	18.83
Washington	12.31
Oregon	8.77
California	21.22
Alaska	15.78
Hawaii (Honolulu diocese only)	31.53

Source: 1960 National Catholic Almanac.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that instead of being particularly kindly to the States in the South, States which have been recited as those so badly needing the program—which will get it whether they wish to have it or not, under this same messianic complex I have mentioned—these are the States which will be worst hurt by the following of this philosophy, which I think piles discrimination on discrimination.

First, the percentage of Catholic population in the six New England States is 48.15 percent, according to the National Catholic Almanac. The figures vary from 27.39 percent for the State of Maine to 61.27 percent for the State of Rhode Island.

The Middle Atlantic States are New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The Catholic population in these States is 35.01 percent, ranging from a minimum of 30.85 percent in Pennsylvania to a maximum of 42.88 percent in New Jersey.

The South Atlantic States include most of the South, and the Catholic population in this region is 6.11 percent. I remind Senators that this 6.11 percent contrasts with 35.01 percent in the Middle Atlantic States, 48.15 percent in the New England States, and 61.27 percent in the State of Rhode Island. The State in this region with the largest Catholic population in the South is Maryland, which has 23.85 percent. The State with the smallest Catholic population is North Carolina, with 0.87 percent. The other States have varying percentages.

Some of the States are the same States which the sponsors of the bill have repeatedly, in the course of the argument, said they were seeking to especially help under the terms of the bill.

For instance, only 1.31 percent of the people of the great State of South Carolina are Catholic people.

The great State of Georgia has only 1.54 percent of the people of the Catholic faith.

Mr. President, I could go on through the list of the States, which show the situation as I have described it.

The next grouping is for the East North Central States, the old States of the Northwest Territory. Those five States have a Catholic population of 25.45 percent.

The East South Central States are Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, and Mississippi. Two of those are States which the sponsors of the bill have said will be particularly helped by passage of the bill. The Catholic population in the East South Central States is 4.44 percent. In the State of Alabama 3.17 percent of the citizens are Catholic, and in Mississippi only 2.85 percent of the citizens are Catholic.

Mr. President, there has been a whole lot of real "guff" in the debate, with statements and announcements made with messianic importance, "Yes; the bill is set up to help those States which need it most particularly." At times the speakers even name the States. I well remember that the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina have been among the States named.

Yet, Mr. President, when we consider a State like Connecticut, which is at the very top of the totem pole, with the finest schools in the Nation, which would get the least help under the President's proposal, that State has 47.23 percent Catholic citizens.

Mr. President, I shall not burden the RECORD by going much further in this regard. I simply recite the information for the RECORD for the great State of Arkansas, another State which has been named. I think it is rather unkind for people to name great States which are doing the best job they can for their people, and in most instances taxing their people much more heavily, on a percentage basis, than the richer States. We were going to do a great job for these States. In Arkansas the percentage of Catholic people is only 2.44 percent.

This argument will not stand up. It has been referred to as hogwash. There has been a great sales program based on the argument that the bill is designed to help those who need help badly. In the last few hours of the meeting of the able committee, for some reason which I am sure was considered right, it was decided best to change the formula that the President had recommended, under which not only the children in the public schools would be counted, but the count would be made in such a way as to include all the children in all the schools.

There is no basis on which we could call the bill fair or righteous. I am very sure those who designed it thought that it was fair and righteous. I am not talking about individuals; I am talking about the proposed law. As I see it, the proposed law is a monstrosity, because instead of being fair among the people of our Nation, it would greatly discriminate against millions of children and their parents. Whether any of us thinks so now or not, the proposed legislation would be a pregnant source of the greatest bitterness. It would be the greatest divisive force between groups of people in our Nation that we have ever seen. We could not avoid the problem if we tried, because we propose to tax all the people for the benefit of the children in the public schools only, which is bad enough, but it would be required by law. Then to make a bad matter infinitely worse, we propose in the law to count all the children for the purpose of the allotment to States, and then divide that allotment only among the public school children.

Not only will children who go to private and religious schools not receive their slice of the pie, but also those who sponsored the bill on the floor have actually gone so far as to add insult to injury. They have said they will come along in a few days with another bill which will provide a slice of pie, after all, for the children in the parochial and other private schools. The bill would provide, however, that the private schools could only borrow the money, and that it must be repaid, principal and interest.

How many different kinds of discrimination is it necessary to set up in a bill of this kind without people knowing that

it will cause bitterness of the worst sort—and very properly so—because great groups of children will be left out, and because great groups of good people who are taxpayers, will be left out.

Discussion has freely taken place in this Chamber that the bill has been drawn so as to take the best care of those States that are least able to take care of their own problems. The addition of all children in the count, without allowing for any participation in the fund by the parochial schools, would badly hurt the very States that are in a worse situation and have found it most difficult to maintain the school system that they need.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The implication has been given the Senate that the only way equity could be achieved in developing a formula would be to count the parochial school children as well as the public school children. I would like to have the Senator from Florida express his view about the legitimacy of the argument that the only way equity could be achieved would be to count the parochial school students together with the public school enrollment for the formula in the distribution of the money. On its face, what does such argument look like?

Mr. HOLLAND. On its face, that kind of argument would not hold up a minute.

When the argument is measured against the fact, its ridiculousness is revealed. Instead of being necessary, it is most unfair and discriminatory in its operation. If the Senator from Ohio had been present in the Chamber when I asked to have printed in the RECORD a list of States showing, for example, the percentage of Catholic people in each of the States, he would have found that some of the States that have the highest level of support for their own schools, and need the least help from elsewhere, are the ones that have the largest percentage of Catholic people and Catholic children. Therefore, my answer would be that the argument is more of the hogwash that has been so frequently heard in the entire debate. The real meaning of the debate is that there is a certain number of dedicated people who conscientiously believe—and I do not see how they could so believe but they do—that the best solution of every public problem is to throw it over to Washington and put it in the care of the Central Government. Then the problem will be best handled.

We have never had a more glaring example of the inappropriateness, inadequacy, and falsity of such an argument than we have at present.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It seems to me that when we hear the argument that the only way equity could be achieved would be to include in the count the parochial school students, it is an affront to intelligence. It would be like saying "2 and 2 is 5," and then proceeding to try to prove it. Tragically, the ratio has been proved to be 60 as against 30, I believe, in dealing with the propriety of counting the parochial school children in the program.

I cannot understand the argument that to achieve equity the students of parochial schools must be counted. To me it seems to have no relationship to the problem. Countless other methods could have been devised under which there would have been equity.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The way to have provided equity would have been to count the children who would be included in the distribution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Surely. When aid is given to public schools, it is given to public school children. But the committee has the audacity to say, "We will count the students of Lutheran, Catholic, Episcopalian, and Presbyterian schools, together with the children in the public schools, to determine the number of students that will be placed in the formula."

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. We would be saying that we cut a slice of pie for every child, but we warn the children who attend a parochial school and other religious and private schools, "You are going to have to sit and see someone else eat your slice of pie."

To carry the problem further, we say, "A little later we will allow you a slice of pie by lending you enough money from Federal sources, provided you agree to repay the loan, principal and interest, so that you can buy your slice of pie."

If such a process is right, if it is fairplay and decent, then my education has been hopelessly neglected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The problem goes a step beyond what the Senator has pointed out. The parochial school pupils are counted in the total count. We would give them nothing. But we would make their parents pay additional amounts because their pupils have been included in the count. Salt is thereby rubbed into the wound. Impliedly we would tell them, "We are giving you something." We are not giving them anything. We are making them pay more under a fraudulent formula that would be adopted.

Mr. HOLLAND. We would lend back a part of their money to them, with the understanding that they would repay it, principal and interest, and be allowed in the meantime to buy a little bit of pie and consume it. The whole thing is wrong, and completely unfair. This is only my own opinion and I do not reflect upon any other Senator. I would feel that I was misrepresenting every man, woman, and child in the State of Florida if I were to allow myself to vote for a proposal which is so shot through with discrimination on discrimination on discrimination, and which has been accompanied by statements on the floor that we are trying to help some of the States neighboring to Florida, which does not happen to be in need of help. However, we have an interest in our neighboring States, and in every other State of the Union.

I see present in the Chamber the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. I take this occasion to thank him, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], for having done their level best to devise a more decent formula, and to eliminate from the computation children who are to be deprived of any participation. The RECORD will show that I voted for both of those provisions with the Senator from New York and the Senator from Kentucky. My hat is off to them. We are greatly indebted to the Senator from New York for relating in the RECORD, where all can read and see just as long as this Nation lasts, that this change in base from the President's bill to the committee bill was made following a little caucus that was held beforehand by a majority of the committee in the closing hours of the discussion, which resulted not only in adding all the children who are not to participate in the distribution but also adding some $200 million to the pot.

The two Senators made a real contribution. I believe the Senator from New York spoke of the fact that this provision was put in to sweeten the bill for somebody. I do not know for whom it was sweetened. I certainly would not say that it was sweetened for large areas of the country where only a few children go to parochial schools, to religious schools, or to private schools. It would be much more likely to have been intended to sweeten the attitude of Senators coming from States having from 40 to 60 percent Catholic children within their States.

So far as I am concerned, this is not a religious argument. One of my reasons for opposing the bill is that under the Constitution one cannot help discriminate if a general aid to education bill is passed, because under the Constitution, as I view it, and as I interpret and understand it, we cannot give money from the public purse to go to all children, even those who attend religious and private schools. That is one of the reasons I must oppose the bill.

When we add to that the other discrimination, it becomes intolerable. The odor of the bill will go out all over the Nation when it is passed. Mark my prediction, there will be more bitterness between groups of our people resulting from the bill than has been this case in connection with any legislation which has been passed by Congress in modern times, or even at any time in our Nation. On the very face of it, the bill grossly discriminates, and then piles discrimination on discrimination.

The Senator from New York said that certain provisions were put in the bill to sweeten it. I appreciate his mentioning that point. The Senator from New York and I do not often agree, but when we do, we really agree. I am with him on this issue. I also agreed to a great extent with the Senator from Kentucky

[Mr. COOPER] when he said that the form in which the bill had come from the committee made a grab bag of it, whereby certain States would grab more out than was allowed to others. I thought that was a real contribution to the debate. That will not help the people of this Nation to come to any conclusion other than that this is discriminatory legislation. It certainly is. It is unfair as between States and between people and their children.

Another sweetening went into the bill which I do not believe was mentioned by my distinguished friend from New York. I think it is worth referring to. Senators will remember that as the bill came from the President it would have seriously reduced assistance for the so-called defense-impacted schools. There are many areas in this Nation, some in my State where the children who were brought in by the defense forces and by the contractors who are working for the defense forces have become the major part of the school load in the school districts. It is only decent and fair for Uncle Sam to meet that part of the load in large part and certainly in the main; and it has been regarded as good philosophy in Congress ever since the situation was created during the war.

The President's bill provided a number of severe reductions in the programs for defense-impacted schools. Many Senators, including the Senator from Florida, made it plain that they felt that was a fair charge that Uncle Sam was declining to pay. Provisions extending these programs without change were put in evidently with the idea of inducing Senators to vote for the main purpose of the bill, regardless of how much they disliked it, merely because there is impact money in it for their own States and their own people.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. Is it not fair to say that this particular action was the opposite of sweetening, and that it was a club to be used over the heads of Senators like the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Utah, who have more or less the same problem, to force us into line?

Mr. HOLLAND. In its origin it was, I will agree. The committee found that certain Senators felt that Uncle Sam should continue to do his duty in this field by taking care of at least a large part of the expense of the local school systems, particularly when he took land from the tax rolls, as was the case in some of the counties in my State. The committee then decided, in order to make the bill a little more appealing to Senators in whose States there were large defense installations, to change the President's recommendation. They did change it, not only to restore it, but to continue it for 3 years.

Let us put some specifics into the arguments on this point. With reference to Public Law 815, which is one of the two public laws having to do with the defense-impacted areas, section 5(a)(2) is the one that authorizes construction assistance at the rate of 50 percent, computed by a certain formula, of the number of children whose parents are employed on Federal property but live off such property.

The President's program would have reduced that percentage from 50 percent to 25 percent, meaning that the local governments would have had to put up 75 percent, computed under the formula, and the Federal Government 25 percent, instead of the 50–50 division which had been in effect for so many years.

One of the sweetening processes in the course of the determinations of the committee was to restore the previous level of 50 percent, and to extend it for 3 years without change.

I do not know what the Senator from New York meant when he used the word "sweetening." But we in Florida, who raise a good deal of sugarcane and have other products which are sweet, would be inclined to say—and I do now say—that that was one of the sweetening processes in connection with reporting the bill. I resent it.

Section 5(a)(3) of Public Law 815 provides for Federal construction assistance for school districts on account of increases in the number of children whose parents move into the school districts to work for Federal contractors. That applies in areas around Washington and in some other areas in the Nation.

The President's proposal would have eliminated that section entirely. However, in the process of sweetening the bill the committee proceeded not only to reinstate that section, but to extend it for 3 years.

Again basing my statement upon my limited experience with sweetening materials, I should say this was a very distinct sweetening of the bill. I resent it.

Public Law 874, which is the other law of this kind, has section 4(a), which authorizes Federal operation and maintenance assistance for school districts on account of increases in the number of children whose parents move into school districts to work for Federal contractors.

The President's program would have eliminated that section. The committee in its wisdom, and in connection with what I think was a sweetening process, proceeded to restore that section to the bill and to extend it for 3 years without change. I think these are almost callous actions. I think they show on their face what they are. They are efforts to make Senators vote for the very thing which they do not like, and which they resent with all their might.

In general, the Federal aid to public schools bill is merely an effort to provide assistance for the States. I will tell the Senate how the Senator from Florida reacts. He would like to vote for the "federally impacted" sections of the bill. He voted for them before, and would like to vote them again. But he will not vote for the bill merely by reason of their inclusion.

There is still ample time for the reenactment of those two measures as separate legislation. Separate bills have been in the Senate and the House since shortly after the convening of this session early in January to do just that. So it is very evident that what has been done has been an effort to force Senators whose States have many defense installations to support the bill, or else be held not to have done the things which their school authorities back home were asking them to do.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment.

I have enough confidence in both the intelligence and the patriotism of the school officials back home to believe that they will not only understand my vote against the bill in the way it has been placed before us, but will warmly approve my action and will agree with me that the proper course would have been to report the proposed legislation separately, as it has always been considered before, and to pass it on its own merits.

I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I appreciate the careful explanation the Senator from Florida has given of the dilemma in which many Senators are being placed by reason of the inclusion of certain features in the bill. I introduced a bill to continue Public Law 815 and Public Law 874 independently of any action on the pending bill. Having taken that action, I shall be very happy to stand with the Senator from Florida and vote against the bill, in spite of the fact that I may be charged with having assisted in the scuttling of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, or rather charged with having turned my back on the proposed legislation which I introduced.

I think this bill is a combination of the stick and the sweetening. I am very sorry these particular provisions were included in the bill before us.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Utah. I should have called his name, because I knew he had introduced such proposed legislation, but I was fearful that I might omit the names of other Senators—and there are a number of them—who have introduced separate bills of the type mentioned by the Senator from Utah. Probably every one of those Senators could stand in his home State upon the fact that he has done his best to renew that legislation by itself, as should be done, and not to encumber it with a proposal which in his heart and conscience he believes to be hurtful to his people and to all the country.

Mr. President, it seems to me there has not been so mischievous a proposal introduced in the Senate this year or, for that matter, in all the 15 years I have served in the Senate. The Senate has frequently considered measures for public school support at Federal expense, but I do not believe there has ever been introduced a bill in which as many carrots on a stick have been held out to try to get support; in which as much sweetening has existed and has had to be admitted, because the record shows it; and in connection with which there has been such apparent resort to grab-bag tactics, as was described by the able Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

While the Senator from Kentucky was necessarily absent from the Chamber a few moments ago, I paid tribute to him for suggesting the other day what I believe is so true, namely, that the bill contains all the aspects of a grab-bag, considering the treatment it has received from the committee which reported the bill.

I have done everything I could in the course of the debate by voting for corrective amendments or amendments which I thought provided more nearly fair treatment. This is the first time I have spoken on the bill. But I was not content to have the bill pass without stating my opinion that it is a monstrous thing and violates every principle of fairplay. I think it was created by minds who seem to think that pouring our problems into Washington and putting them in the Central Government is the ultimate solution of all problems.

Whether we wish to believe it or not, the country is in critical times. There is not time enough for any conscientious Senator to give to his committee duties all the attention they require. There is not sufficient time for Senators to obtain the information they should have concerning important bills upon which they must vote.

We are in the midst of critical problems at home, in the Western Hemisphere, and throughout the world. As I said a while ago, we heard the President, for whom I know every Senator would wish to give everything he has in the way of support, so far as his conscience and convictions permit, outline a large number of problems which he says press so heavily upon our Nation.

Here it is proposed to create an establishment which not only has taken much of the valuable time of Congress and will take more, but which, if it is passed, will place upon us annual duties in connection with trying as best we can to supervise—and we will have to do that with the amount of money which is involved—the appropriations which we make to the school systems of the States. We put upon our people something which will divide them as surely and as bitterly as it is possible for them to be divided at a time when it is so necessary that all Americans be thinking together and working together for the salvation of this great country, which means much not only to our own families and our children, but to everyone who loves the cause of freedom throughout the world.

We are severely handicapping ourselves by the consideration and, more particularly, by the passage, of such legislation as this. I wish I could believe that the Senate in its wisdom would reject it by a tremendous vote.

I shall, of course, vote against the bill.

Mr. BENNETT obtained the floor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah be so kind as to yield briefly to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY PRESENTS VIGOROUS AND VITAL MESSAGE—LETTER ON NEED FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION INDICATES SCOPE OF PROGRAMS IN PENDING PROPOSALS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Congress and the Nation—indeed, the nations of the world—today received from the President of the United States a most courageous, forthright, and inspiring message. It was a thoroughly commendable and timely sequel to President Kennedy's widely acclaimed inaugural address. I have no doubt but that the Congress and the citizens of the United States will be appropriately and affirmatively responsive.

I wish especially to applaud the President's declaration that, on behalf of this country, at the forthcoming meeting in Vienna with Premier Khrushchev—

> We will make clear that America's enduring concern is for both freedom and peace—that we are anxious to live in harmony with the Russian people—that we seek no conquests, no satellites, no riches—and that we seek only the day when "nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

On this occasion, however, I desire to direct attention primarily to the President's cogent discussion of economic and social progress at home.

I concur fully with his pertinent assertion that—

> The ultimate source of our national strength is the quality and vitality of our own society. To sustain new efforts in world affairs and space—to demonstrate to all the success of freedom's way—and to meet the needs of our own citizens when we are assisting others—we need a growing, prosperous nation. We must make full use of our resources—human, scientific, and material—giving priority to our most urgent national needs.

It was heartening to have Presidential assurance that "the recession has been halted—recovery is underway." It was sobering, however, to have heard him state so properly:

> But the task of abating unemployment and achieving a full use of our resources remains a serious challenge. Large-scale unemployment during a recession is bad enough—large-scale unemployment during recovery is intolerable to a free economy. It is a major social evil; it is a source of national weakness. It will persist even as the Nation's output surpasses previous achievements, as I believe will be seen in the coming months.
>
> The Government must consider additional long-range measures to curb this unemployment and increase our economic growth, if we are to sustain our full role as world leaders.

As a Senator from West Virginia, as a member of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and its Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower, and as a legislator who has persistently and devotedly proposed and supported measures for the acceleration of employment through programs of public works at the State and local levels, measures for useful employment of our youth in conservation practices and on conservation projects, and measures for the training and retraining of the Nation's manpower—especially the unemployed segment of our labor force—I was especially encouraged by these passages from the President's message:

> Measures to aid the unemployed, and to employ our jobless youth usefully, will be submitted shortly. I would stress one measure in particular today—a measure of special importance in meeting the occupational demands of new American leadership in space, aid, trade, and defense.
>
> I am transmitting to the Congress a new manpower development and training program, to train or retrain several hundred thousand workers in new occupational skills over a 4-year period, in order to replace those skills made obsolete by automation and industrial change with the new skills which new processes demand. Supplementing current public and private training and education programs, such a measure, including subsistence and relocation allowances for the long-term unemployed, is a positive answer to the challenge of technology.

In this connection, I make note of the fact that I forwarded to President Kennedy on May 22, 1961, a letter in which I urged his favorable consideration of certain pending legislation in the fields of governmental activity referred to in the passages of his message quoted above. I am pleased that our Chief Executive embraced in his message much the same thinking which was the basis of my May 22 communication to him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks, the text of that letter to President Kennedy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
May 22, 1961.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am confident that the area redevelopment program will ultimately prove to be a means by which improvement will develop with respect to the economic status of many chronic labor surplus sections of our country. In some instances this effort can have an early salutary effect, but we are aware that the redevelopment program is designed principally as a means through which a long-range attack may be made upon the problems of communities and areas in which conditions of technological change have brought about debilitating economic and sociological consequences.

But, as you and many others in public life have cautioned, the area redevelopment program is only one means to the end result which must be attained as rapidly as possible; namely, a general stimulation of the economy and reduction of unemployment to a more tolerable level.

Consistent with these objectives, and in order to accelerate their attainment, I urge that, in your forthcoming message to the Congress on the state of the economy, you especially recommend three programs along lines set forth in legislative proposals pending in the 87th Congress:

(1) A measure for emergency employment acceleration through Federal grant participation in a program of public works by State and local governments, with the Federal Government share to be 45 percent of the construction costs of approved projects and

with project priority to be given to those which can be initiated in 90 days and completed within a year. Senator CLARK of Pennsylvania has introduced and is presently holding hearings on such a measure which Senator PELL of Rhode Island and I cosponor.

(2) A comprehensive measure for retraining of the unemployed to supplement present inadequate programs and to augment the vocational training aspects of the Area Redevelopment Act. Senator CLARK likewise has introduced appropriate legislation in this field and I am privileged to be a cosponsor. Significant hearings already have been held and others are planned for the near future.

(3) A program for the establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps under a plan generally paralleling the highly useful and thoroughly successful Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. You will recall, of course, that the Senate passed legislation in August 1960, with your valuable assistance, which would have created a Youth Conservation Corps. The chief sponsor of the YCC legislation in the 86th Congress was Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and that able legislator and advocate of worthwhile programs has again introduced a similar bill in the Senate this year. Again, I am privileged to be a cosponsor, with other Senators.

Faithfully yours,

JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courtesy in yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 610) to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States by providing for the establishment of a U.S. Travel Service within the Department of Commerce and a Travel Advisory Board, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MACK, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HEMPHILL, Mr. BENNETT of Michigan, Mr. GLENN, and Mr. CURTIN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the Inter-American Social and Economic Cooperation Program and the Chilean Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I believe that the education of American youth is one of our chief sources of strength for the future and is our chief source of protection against the inroads of communism. It does not follow from this basic philosophy, however, that we need a program of Federal aid to education. If Federal aid can be justified at all, the best premise is that there is involved an essential need which cannot be supplied by the State or local community. This test should be carefully weighed with respect to education, since our traditional pattern is to handle education at the local level. Nothing in the Constitution grants this function to the Federal Government. It rightfully belongs to the State and local governments. I think the record is clear that totalitarian governments seek first to control the education of their citizens. Let us not let that happen here.

Are we failing to meet our education needs at the local level? After making a detailed study of the statistics, I am convinced that we are not failing. For example, over the past decade 1950–60, the number of pupils has increased 44 percent, but our instructional staff increased by 52 percent, and therefore the number of children compared to teachers has declined from 27.8 to 26.4. Over the same period, total expenditures for public elementary and secondary schools rose by more than 150 percent. Over the past two decades, enrollment in education institutions of all kinds increased 57 percent, while total educational expenditures increased 642 percent. After adjustments for price increases, the real increase in school expenditures is still 257 percent, or five times as great as the increase in pupil enrollment.

We hear a great deal about the "classroom shortage." Just how serious is this shortage?

First, I should like to observe that we should be wary of statistics on classroom shortages. Estimates are usually based on annual reports tabulated by State school offices or on questionnaires mailed to each State department of education. Often the replies will reflect ambitions, rather than the demonstrated needs of the States for school facilities. Also, problems often arise with respect to classification of facilities. Often general use rooms are used as instructional rooms, but these are not included with official reports. And there are other problems.

The gathering of school statistics is much easier in Utah than in most other States, because of relatively close-knit school units and because of excellent reporting and statistical facilities. But even for Utah, the data shown have often been completely invalid.

For example, Circular No. 490, issued by the U.S. Office of Education, indicated that Utah was constructing only 124 new classrooms during the 1956–57 school year. Data published shortly thereafter by the Utah State school office reported that 345 new classrooms were completed for use during the 1956–57 school year.

The U.S. Office of Education data were later extensively used in congressional debate of the proposal for Federal aid for school building construction. Utah was cited as one of the States in the Nation failing to meet the school-construction needs, whereas the fact of the matter was, and is, that Utah is one of the top States in terms of effort and progress to meet school-construction requirements. The U.S. Office of Education figure for Utah classroom construction for 1956–57 was less than one-third the actual figure, and the error was compounded by using that figure as the basis for a 5-year projection of the school building outlook in Utah.

But if we assume that the figures on which we are making our policy decisions are completely accurate, just how serious is the schoolroom shortage shown to be?

A comparison of an inventory of school facilities made by the U.S. Office of Education in 1954, when compared with a 1959 survey made by the same source, shows that in those 5 years, enrollment increased 20 percent while the number of classrooms increased 30 percent. The number of pupils per classroom was thus reduced by 2½ points from 30.6 to 28.1.

President Kennedy, in his education message on February 20, 1961, stated that classrooms needs for the coming 10-year period between 1960 and 1970 will be 600,000. This averages 60,000 classrooms a year. However, figures released by the Office of Education disclose that between 1956 and 1961, a total of 349,300 classrooms were built, or an annual average of 69,860. This is 10,000 a year more than the yearly average asked for by the President, and without the benefit of Federal aid.

It seems strange to me that the thunder for Federal aid has been stepped up at the same time that the gap between our needs and our available classrooms is narrowed.

The clamor for Federal aid to education implies that the State and local governments cannot meet their needs themselves. This is not true. Let me observe in general, first, that the local governments could better meet their needs if we would reduce the flow of tax funds to the Federal Government, and would leave local governments greater freedom to adjust their own tax structures to meet their own needs. This would call for restraint at the Federal level; but I fear that too many have developed the notion that there is something magic about Federal taxing powers, as opposed to State and local taxing powers. The argument is made that the graduated income tax imposed by the Federal Government is more fair and equitable than the sales and property and other taxes imposed by State and local governments. Many State governments also have graduated income taxes. But the impression given—that most of the Federal revenues come from graduated rates on rich people—is a myth. More than five-sixths of the individual income tax is derived from the basic 20 percent rate; and much or most of the corporation tax is shifted to consumers through higher prices.

In a country in which well-being is so widely distributed and income is concentrated in the middle, and where taxes

take about one-third of the people's income, the bulk of taxation—no matter how it is levied—must rest on persons in the medium brackets.

Federal graduated income tax rates are now so high—at a 91 percent marginal rate—that additional funds of substantial size cannot come from the higher brackets, but can come only from the center or lower brackets.

It seems to me that far too many statistical devices have been used to indicate the relative ability or inability of the States to meet the public responsibility for education. The advocates of centralization have done much to establish the popular notion that the States—or certain States—cannot, of and by themselves, without Federal assistance, provide for the education of their citizens.

Those who push for Federal intervention seem determined to give the State and local governments an "inferiority complex" with regard to their fiscal abilities.

In December 1959 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducted a survey of State school officers, to determine the ability to finance their needs through bonding or other means. Forty-five States replied. Fifteen reported having districts which, although needing additional classrooms, had reached their borrowing limits, and had no access to other funds. The total number of districts in all the country so involved was 237, most of them small. But when related to the national total of over 40,000 school districts, these represent only one-half of 1 percent of all the school districts in the Nation. Despite the heavy burden of Federal taxation, the States and local communities have done an excellent job in meeting their own school needs.

It seems strange to me that we would ask for Federal support of education when, as a matter of fact, our State and local governments are in much better condition fiscally than is the Federal Government.

We have nearly a $300 billion national debt, and have been adding to that debt at the average rate of $3 billion a year during the peacetime years, and, of course, much more than that during the war years. Presently, our total Government debt at all levels averages $2,000 a person. Of this amount, the Federal debt totals over $1,600 for every man, woman, and child. The average state debt is $96 a person; and the average local debt, including all school districts and special local government agencies of all types, is $268 per person, based on the latest available data as of the fiscal year 1959.

In any event, as a general rule the taxes with which to pay for education come out of the same pockets; but in the case of the Federal aid they would flow to Washington, and, after paying a bureaucratic toll, would come back to us considerably diminished. Under our traditional pattern, they flow to the State and local governments, and stay there.

I should like to call to the attention of the Congress the efforts of my own State of Utah in meeting its school needs.

Senators are undoubtedly aware that Utah is near the top among the States in its public school load. Using National Education Association figures, Utah had 26.5 percent of its total population enrolled in the public schools in 1959–1960, compared with 20.1 percent for the Nation as a whole. However, Utah's ability to support the schools, for which the standard measure is income per schoolchild, is markedly below the national average—$6,892 per schoolchild in Utah, compared with $10,614 in the United States.

Despite these facts, Utah has made an impressive record in providing funds for its public schools. Again using N.E.A. figures, Utah expenditures for current operations for 1959–60 amounted to $72,886,000, or 4.8 percent of total personal income for that year, compared with national education expenditures of 3.12 percent of total personal income. Expenditures for capital outlay and interest in Utah totaled $26,898,000, or 1.65 percent of personal income, compared with 0.87 percent of the income of the Nation devoted to education that year.

This means that if all of the States of the Nation had made an effort comparable to that made by Utah last year, an additional $5,206,792,000 would have been provided for current operations, and an additional $2,982,852,000 would have been provided for capital outlay, above that actually spent by the schools in the school year 1958–59. Total additional funds would thus have amounted to $8,189,644,000.

If this calculation is based upon State and local revenues for the public schools, the amount of additional funds that would have been provided by a national effort matching Utah's would have been $8,347,083,000. This amounts to almost 10 times the $850 million proposed in S. 1021 to be spent each year for the next 3 years.

I ask consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing these figures.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

School expenditures as percent of personal income, 1959–60 school year, Utah and United States

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Utah		U.S. total [1]	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
1959–60 data:				
Personal income	$1,626,000		$382,510,000	
Current expense	72,886	4.48	11,939,219	3.12
Capital outlay and interest	26,898	1.65	3,344,628	.87
Total	99,784	6.14	15,283,847	4.00
If United States had matched Utah effort—				
Current expense			17,146,011	
Capital outlay			6,327,480	
Total			23,473,491	
Increase if Nation were to meet Utah's effort:				
Current expense			5,206,792	
Capital outlay			2,982,852	
Total			8,189,644	

[1] Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

Based on revenue for public schools from State and local sources

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	Utah	U.S. total [1]
Personal income	$1,626,000	$382,510,000
State and local effort:		
State revenue for schools	40,555	5,424,635
Local revenue for schools	51,095	7,788,458
Total State and local	91,650	13,213,093
Percent of individual income payments	5.6365	3.4543
If United States had made same taxing effort as Utah		$21,560,176
Additional funds from State and local sources, based on Utah effort		$8,347,083

[1] Includes Alaska and Hawaii.

Source of basic data: "Estimates of School Statistics, December 1960," Research Division, National Education Association. Prepared by the Utah Foundation, May 17, 1961.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, despite Utah's recent efforts, she is not standing still. These figures were arrived at prior to actions by the Utah Legislature this year. The total State-supported school finance program was increased for the next biennium by 4.3 percent; and the legislature enacted a one-half percent increase in the sales tax, and provided that 13½ percent of that increase would be earmarked for the uniform school fund.

I was not able readily to determine whether Utah would rank first by using the measure I have just shown. These are aggregate figures for the Nation as

a whole. But a related measure—school revenues as a percentage of personal income—shows that Utah ranks first in the Nation. I assume this would be closely tied to the expenditure measure.

Because of Utah's large school-age population, compared to total population, Utah is ranked well down in the list of States, in terms of expenditure per pupil. But in terms of total school effort, compared to Utah's total income, no State is doing more.

We can, therefore, solve our school needs by asking each State to put forth an effort equivalent to that of the State of Utah.

Once I was a school teacher, and I know the struggles and problems involved in giving adequate education to our children. But I fear that in reality, we are running away from our problem, by running to Washington. As I indicated, the Constitution makes no mention of education. Since education is not among the powers expressly delegated to the United States, it follows under the 10th amendment that education belongs to the States.

What really concerns me is that the proposal for Federal aid may actually retard our educational program. The pattern in the recent past has been for State legislatures and Governors to hold back in their school spending programs, with an eye on Washington, awaiting the enactment of a general Federal-aid-to-education bill. If this bill becomes law, the pattern for the future will be for the States each year to continue to drag their feet, waiting to see what Federal funds will become available that year, before enacting their State and local taxing and expenditure programs. It is quite obvious that the States and the local governments will tend to reduce their efforts in proportion to the flow of Federal funds.

Thus, by means of this bill and other bills, we are not really stimulating education. We are merely causing the States to hold back, in the hope of substituting Federal money for State or local money. Nothing is gained. There is merely a transfer of functions to Washington.

In conclusion, I oppose this bill for four basic reasons:

First. There is no demonstrated need for Federal funds if the States would even approach the rate of contribution of my own State of Utah. As I have indicated, such a rate would bring forth 10 times the amounts proposed to be spent under this bill, and without the risk of centralization.

Second. This bill is part of an overall program which appears to have as its objective the nationalization of our society. Other recent examples in this program are: (a) The recently enacted temporary unemployment insurance program, whereby Washington will direct the flow of funds, rather than the States themselves; (b) the depressed areas bill, whereby the Federal Government is now in the business of locating industry, contrary to our traditional pattern of private decisions in industry locations; (c) the proposed change in medical care for the aged, decreasing the power of the States and increasing the power of the Federal Government in setting health care policy; (d) increased centralization and regimentation of agriculture; (e) new precedents in the forthcoming housing bill, giving the Federal Government increased control over the housing industry. And there are other examples.

Third. Though the authors of this bill have attempted to play down the possibility of Federal control over education, the history of Federal loan programs reveals that this is merely a smokescreen and that Federal controls will inevitably follow. There is a saying that "Who pays the piper calls the tune." This will be true of Federal aid to education. If anyone has doubts that this will be the case, I commend to them the remarks by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] of last Wednesday in which he pointed up provisions of S. 1021 where the Federal Government would assert its control over certain phases right from the beginning. For example, the bill places all construction projects under the restrictive measures of the Davis-Bacon Act. This means that the Secretary of Labor will determine the prevailing wage in an area and force the school districts to pay that wage to each worker on all federally aided school construction. The districts will, therefore, be prevented from attempting to complete building at minimum cost to taxpayers. Building costs will be inflated. It is a short step from this to Federal regulation of the salaries of teachers who teach in those federally aided schools.

Another section of the bill specified "that the construction will be undertaken in an economical manner and that it will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or materials." Although this may seem perfectly innocent, and even laudable, it gives the Federal Government a significant control over the architecture of our schools. The final arbiter of what is "elaborate or extravagant" would be the Federal Government, and this phrase is capable of broad interpretation. This firmly establishes Federal control of all school buildings.

Another example is the requirement that each State which receives Federal aid must set aside 10 percent of its receipts for experimental projects. These experiments may be desirable, but this is precisely the kind of Federal compulsion and control which the bill piously professes to prohibit.

Fourth. My fourth objection to this bill is that the expenditures to pay for this new Federal program, and the others outlined earlier, are to be financed primarily from increasing deficits, rather than from increased taxes. The result will be inflation with all of its attendant evils. A final tally cannot be made yet, but we can expect a deficit of more than $6 billion in the 1961 and 1962 fiscal years, and the figure will go up from there in the future years. A $1 billion Federal unemployment insurance bill has already been enacted. The education bill under consideration totals $2.6 billion. The Senate Banking Committee reported this weekend a $9 billion housing bill, including $3 billion for public housing. An $11½ billion highway bill will be up for consideration soon. Other miscellaneous bills—depressed areas, medical care for the aged, feed grains, social security benefits, and others—totaling over $5 billion, have either already been passed, or are waiting in the wings. Most of these bills represent new programs, adding to the existing spending pace for current programs.

These proposed expenditures worry me, but what worries me even more is the threat to completely change our society from its traditional pattern of State and local control of many of our basic functions to a system controlled at the Federal level. I urge Congress to reject this proposal to add education to the list.

Mr. President, Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, who is administrator of the unified school system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and president of Brigham Young University, developed a rather complete statement analysis of the figures involved in the problem of Federal aid to education.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Dr. Wilkinson may be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF DR. ERNEST L. WILKINSON, ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNIFIED SCHOOL SYSTEM OF THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS AND PRESIDENT OF BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY ON THE QUESTION OF FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, MAY 23, 1961

My name is Ernest L. Wilkinson. Scholastically I am a graduate of Brigham Young University, have a law degree from George Washington University, and received the degree of doctor of juridical science from Harvard. While I spent most of my adult life in the practice of the law, I have spent the last 10 years in the field of education. I am now the administrator of the unified school system of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. I am also president of Brigham Young University. In these two positions I am the responsible administrative officer for the following units: Brigham Young University located at Provo, Utah, which, in terms of full-time students, is the largest church-related institution of higher learning in the United States with an enrollment of around 13,000 students; Ricks College, located at Rexburg, Idaho, which is the largest church-related junior college in the country, with an enrollment of around 1,000 students; 75 religious institutes operating in connection with 75 universities and colleges located all the way from California to Florida, in which approximately 10,000 college students receive religious education and training; 141 released-time and 821 nonreleased-time religious seminaries which operate in connection with 962 high schools located all the way from California to Maryland, in which high school students receive religious education and training; and 83 religious seminaries for American Indian students maintained in connection with Indian agencies.

Summarily stated, the educational institutions which are operated by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and of

which I am the administrative officer, provide college training (in whole or part) to approximately 24,000 students and religious high school training to approximately 62,000 students. Our forecast indicates that within the next 10 years the enrollment in these institutions of higher and secondary learning will at least double.

The opinions stated herein will be strictly nonpartisan in nature, for while I was a delegate to the last two national conventions of the Republican Party and am therefore presently classified as a Republican, I at one time ran for a local political office as a Democrat. Even now, I call myself a Jeffersonian Republican because I am still faithful in my political beliefs to the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

I make this frank statement at the outset lest anyone attempt to read a political connotation into what I say, for none is intended. You will note as I proceed, for instance, that I will quote more often from leaders of the Democratic Party than from leaders of the Republican Party. My appeal is to all Members of Congress to consider the present question of Federal aid to education on the basis of the distilled wisdom of the past, and in the light of our present problems, without regard to party. The education of our children should always transcend party lines and never be the subject of partisan debate.

The board of education of the unified church school system and the board of trustees of Brigham Young University, whom I represent, oppose, as a matter of principle, any plan of general Federal aid to education, irrespective of whether that legislation permits or does not permit parochial schools to share in any Federal grants thereunder. I state this also at the outset to make it plain that our position is not dependent in any way upon whether we in our church school system would benefit by Federal legislation. We think a program of general Federal aid or support to education is unwise whether or not we would benefit therefrom.

There are at least five reasons why we are opposed to the pending proposals for Federal aid:

1. Federal aid to education is inconsistent with the traditions of our country and the spirit of our Constitution.

Our first objection is that such aid is inconsistent with the time-honored tradition of our country and the spirit of our Constitution. No one could seriously claim that our Founding Fathers ever conceived of education as being a function of the Federal Government. That activity was something clearly understood to be reserved to the several States. Jefferson, writing in 1806 on education, stated these views when he said, "I suppose an amendment to the Constitution, by consent of the States, necessary, because the objects now recommended are not among those enumerated in the Constitution, and to which it permits the public moneys to be applied" ("The Works of Thomas Jefferson," vol. 10, Paul L. Ford, editor, G. P. Putnam Sons, New York, 1905).

Admitting, however, that today the Constitution, in legal parlance, is what the members of the Supreme Court "say it is" rather than what is contained in the Constitution, or even what our constitutional fathers intended, the fact remains, in our view, that the Constitution of this country was drafted by "wise men" whom the Lord "raised up" for that very purpose. We believe in the words of Gladstone that politically speaking this Constitution is "the noblest work ever struck off by the hands of men" and that its principles should be defended and protected at all cost, not only that we as a people shall remain free, but that our example shall be followed by other nations.

Under that Constitution it cannot be denied that local support and control of education has been and is about the most cherished of governmental functions, which up to the present the States and local communities have preserved. In view of this reverence which we and all patriotic Americans have for our Constitution and the traditions which have sprung therefrom, we submit that except for some grave national emergency, which can be met in no other way, we ought not to depart from its spirit or traditional interpretation. As hereinafter stated, we do not believe that any educational emergency exists which cannot be adequately solved as it has been in the past by our traditional methods of community and State aid.

2. The kind of Federal aid proposed is unnecessary and will be of little help, while at the same time it will slow down progress now being made, and will ultimately mean a tremendous Federal appropriation.

Our second reason for being opposed to general Federal aid is that it is not necessary; further, that the kind of aid now proposed to the Congress will be of little help, while at the same time it will slow down the remarkable progress now being made by the States and local communities, and in all probability, once it gets started will mean a tremendous Federal appropriation of many, many billions of dollars.

(a) Shortage of classrooms: We understand that for at least 85 years there have been recurring efforts in the Congress to have the Federal Government adopt a general Federal aid program for the maintenance of our schools. These efforts have all failed. The present drive for such a general program gained its momentum during the 1950's in part from the unusual demand for school construction during that period, which was occasioned in turn by the very large crop of "war babies" born during the war years, but in larger part from incorrect reports of Government officials as to existing shortages of classrooms and even more incorrect estimates as to future classroom shortages. That these reports and estimates were flagrantly wrong has been demonstrated by Mr. Roger A. Freeman, who directed the research of the Education Committee of the U.S. Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1954–55, in his testimony before the subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, on March 13, 1961. We shall not repeat those facts here, but refer any person seeking the truth to the facts there adduced, which will show that the present drive for Federal aid based on classroom shortages has a completely false and misleading basis. Summarily stated, as shown by Mr. Freeman, the "incontestable fact is that over the past decade more than 600,000 classrooms were completed while the increased attendence required the addition of only 400,000. This means that over 200,000 new classrooms were made available to replace old ones and to reduce class sizes. That it was possible to accomplish this in the decade of the most rapid enrollment growth demonstrates more dramatically than words could the faith of the American people in education. This record is the result of thousands of communities voting bond issues and higher taxes year after year. It may be well to note that the new public schools, built in the postwar period, now house close to 20 million American children—compared with schools for 9 million children which—according to their own claims—the Russians built in the same span of time" (documented testimony of Roger A. Freeman as above identified).

With respect to the future, President Kennedy in his message to Congress on February 20, 1961, based on estimates of the Federal Office of Education, stated that "if every child is to have the opportunity of a full day's education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed in the next 10 years," or 60,000 classrooms per year. The fact of the matter is, however, that States and local communities have been building 70,000 classrooms each year for the last 5 years. If, therefore, the present rate of construction is continued we will build more than the number of classrooms which, according to the President's own estimate, are needed.

And the fact of the matter is that that is what is happening. The Investment Bankers of America have reported that the amount of school bonds approved in school elections in 1960 reached a new high of $1,800 million. Furthermore, January of 1960 was again eclipsed by January of 1961. The Department of Commerce has estimated that public educational construction would increase 8 percent in 1961 over 1960.

This has been made possible by the fact that very few local school districts have exhausted their bonding capacity. A survey made by the Federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare about 1½ years ago revealed that only 237 out of 40,000 school districts had exhausted their legal capacity to borrow, or slightly over one-half of 1 percent. Instead of proving that these 40,000 school districts cannot continue to assume their traditional responsibility, this survey shows that they can, and the rate at which building is going on shows that they will.

Admittedly, out of 40,000 school districts, there will be some who are lagging, particularly those who have been waiting to pass their responsibilities to the Federal Government to do their job for them. But on the whole the record has been a glorious one, and shows the fictitious and mythical basis for the present drive for general Federal aid for schoolhouse construction. To the extent there was an emergency, that emergency is past, for there will only be one-half the increase in school attendance over the next 10 years there has been in the past 10 years. If, therefore, we keep building as many classrooms as we have built over the last 10 years, we will build double the number we need for new students.

(b) Alleged shortage of teachers; ability of States to meet challenge: Having failed to make a current case for Federal aid because of classroom shortages, many professional educators and others who think they stand to gain by Federal aid, next urge that this aid is necessary in order to increase teachers salaries and avoid a teacher shortage. Our information, however, is that this is just as specious as the argument based on failure of States and communities to construct necessary classrooms.

(1) Over the last 30 years (from 1929 to 1959) the increase in salaries of school teachers was 106 percent in constant dollars. Other State and local employees had an increase of only 58 percent and Federal civilian employees of only 73 percent. ("Taxes for Schools," Roger A. Freeman, Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1960.) Had teachers salaries been tied to the Federal payroll they would not have fared as well in increases as they have; there is therefore no assurance that Federal aid would be of benefit to them in the future.

(2) The average annual salary of schoolteachers rose from $3,126 in 1950–51 to $5,389 in 1960–61, or 72.4 percent. The number of teachers with salaries below $3,500 decreased from 62 percent in 1952–53 to 9.6 percent in 1960–61, and the number with salaries of $4,500 or more rose from 13 percent to 63 percent during this same period. The significant aspect of the matter is that the teachers salaries rose sharpest in the States where they have been lowest. Between 1938 and 1954, for instance, teachers salaries rose 101 percent in dollars of constant value in the 12 lowest income States as compared with 28 percent in the 12 top income States. The differences in salaries in different parts of the country are narrowing each year.

(National Education Association, "Estimate of School Statistics," 1960–61.)

(3) School expenditures by the respective States, estimated at $16.4 billion this year, is up $1.2 billion over the previous year and $9.9 billion over 1950–51—an amazing increase of 153 percent in one decade, whereas enrollment increased only 44 percent. In addition, capital outlays for elementary and secondary school buildings, sites, and equipment are increasing at about $3 billion annually. ("Taxes for the Schools," by Roger A. Freeman, Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1960.)

(4) Over the past 20 years school enrollment grew 43 percent, but school funds increased 185 percent (in price-adjusted dollars). ("Taxes for the Schools," Roger A. Freeman, Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1960.) Looking ahead to 1970, enrollment will climb approximately 20 percent while school outlays are likely to double if current trends continue.

On the basis of the above figures the evidence is conclusive that the States have realized the need for further expenditures and have met the challenge. And because of this the alleged danger of a shortage of teachers in our elementary and secondary schools is a political myth. The percentage of all college graduates who prepare for teaching has risen from 21 percent in 1948 to 32 percent in 1959, and the number of college graduates is projected to double between 1958 and 1970. So, if the percentage of students choosing a teaching career is only maintained, we shall double the supply of new teacher graduates.

On the other hand, the annual pupil enrollment increases will shrink to half during the 1960's as compared to the previous decades. This means, then, that the demand to meet higher enrollments will be cut in half, while the supply of new teachers will double. On these facts, I submit that there is no need for any great alarm because of a teacher shortage. The percentage supply of teachers will increase, not decrease.

Facing the whole question of whether community and State governments will be able to finance our educational system in the future, the facts are that during the past years there has been a growth of gross national product of 38 percent, whereas our schools have expanded only 43 percent. During the next 10 years school enrollment is estimated to expand only 20 percent, whereas the gross national product is expected to at least equal the rate of growth witnessed the past 10 years. If, as happened during the last 10 years, under community and State support school revenues were up 152 percent in current and 98 percent in constant dollars, there is every reason to believe that they will be able to support their schools the next 10 years, when enrollment will grow only 20 percent.

(c) Alleged need for equalizing income and educational opportunity among the various States: The original plea for Federal aid was that it was needed to equalize the educational opportunities among the various States because of differences in per capita income in the States. But to the extent the present proposals return to the States the same amount of money for each pupil, Federal aid does not remedy this situation.

In the next place, it should be noted that the need for attempting to equalize the economic income of the various States is fast diminishing. Granted that at one time there was a great difference in the per capita wealth and in the economic productivity of our various States, our modern industrial development and the increasing mobility of our population is fast doing away with these differences. The fact is that the variations in capacity to pay among the States is being constantly narrowed. Between 1940 and 1953 the per capita income in the 12 top income States rose 37 percent in dollars of constant value; in the lowest income States it increased 96 percent. (In 1940 the per capita income in the highest income States was 4¾ times what it was in the lowest income States. As of 1954 there were still some States in which the per capita income was 2¾ times what it was in other States, but the margin is being constantly reduced.) (See Roger A. Freeman, "Taxes for the Schools," Institute for Social Science Research, Washington, D.C., 1960, pp. 126–142.)

Between 1940 and 1953, two-thirds of the 3.3 million increase in school-age children were concentrated in the 12 top income States; half of the lowest income States had decreases in the number of children, while the other half had only slight increases. This was due to two facts:

(1) There has been a vast migration from the poorer regions to the wealthier sections of the country.

(2) The birthrate rose almost three times faster in the high-income States than in the low-income States.

School conditions also improved much faster in low-income States.

Current school expenditures in the 12 top income States in 1953 equaled 3.4 percent of the total income after taxes; in the 12 lowest States the comparable figure was only 4.2 percent of the total income after taxes, a difference of only eight-tenths of 1 percent. Considering the fact that in the wealthier States a large percentage of students were educated in private schools, the overall educational effect was just as great in the wealthier States.

The total State and local tax burden is about the same in the high-income and the low-income States. In 1953 State and local taxes in the 12 top-income States equaled 9.4 percent of their disposable income (income after taxes), and in the 12 lowest income States 9.6 percent of their disposable income—a difference of two-tenths of 1 percent.

Further, it is quite evident that the educational dollar buys more in the low-income States, that school construction costs are lower there and that in relation to the prevailing family income level teachers in many situations are at least as well off as in the higher income States.

(d) Proposed Federal aid will be of little help: Moreover, the aid proposed in the present bills before the Congress, considering the total amount spent on education in our country, would not be of substantial help. On this subject we quote again from Mr. Freeman, considered by some to be the most eminent unbiased authority on school financing in the country today. In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, he said:

"Most of the school aid bills before the 87th Congress would allocate between $250 million and $1 billion in Federal funds annually to the States, with the typical amounts around $700 million.

"The public school budget now totals over $16 billion and is projected to rise to at least $24 billion, and possibly as much as $31 billion, by the end of the 1960's. It is apparent that the bills now under consideration would make only a minor contribution—barely more than a token—to the overall requirements of the schools and leave most of the problem of augmenting, within 10 years, school funds by between 75 and 100 percent with the States. These proposals either assume that the States have the capacity to raise, for example, $23 billion or $30 billion a year for the schools but cannot raise the 1 additional billion or they are intended as the start of a Federal program which, within a few years, will climb to between $5 and $8 billion annually."

The Federal contribution would not, therefore, go far. Again in the words of Mr. Freeman:

"If, for example, it were assumed that the funds under the President's program (S. 1021 and H.R. 4970) were divided equally between construction and teachers' salaries, the picture might be as follows: $333 million could build approximately 7,500 classrooms, or slightly more than 10 percent of the 70,000 now annually built by States and communities. If about one project in five were eligible for Federal matching many boards of education would tend to defer their building plans for 1 or several years until they too became eligible. School bond issues—now at a record high both in amount and in approval percentage—might fail more often, as many communities would be reluctant to approve proposals which carry no Federal funds.

"If the other half of the Federal appropriation were applied to teachers' salaries (thus not augmenting the number of teachers but raising their salaries) it would finance a salary increase of about $200 in the first year of the program and of another $30 in each of the 2 succeeding years. States and communities have increased teachers' salaries by an average of $230 in each of the past 8 years. Would State legislatures and communities be as willing as they have been to vote for higher taxes for raising teachers' salaries if Federal aid for that purpose were made available?"

(e) Federal appropriations will slow down State aid and support:—Out of this situation there arise two serious dangers to a general Federal-aid program for our schools. The first is that if the Federal Congress starts to appropriate money for Federal aid the States and local communities will not continue with their present sturdy effort. This danger was perceived as early as 1886 by Woodrow Wilson when Federal aid was being debated in Congress as vigorously as it is today. Of those efforts, in language especially pertinent to the situation today, he wrote:

"It was evident that no increase in the State appropriation for public education would be voted as long as there was the least prospect of aid from Washington * * * (there was) deliberate determination to enjoy the easy position of a beneficiary of the National Government to the fullest possible extent, rather than to be independent and support a good school system by its own unaided efforts."

That Wilson was a true prophet is evident from a recent news report stating that the Governor of Pennsylvania "holds off proposing any substantial increase in State aid for schools in the new budget; he looks instead to Congress to authorize Federal educational grants for States." Other Governors have made similar proposals.

The fact that Federal aid would have a demoralizing effect on State aid was recognized also by the study committee on "Federal Responsibilities in the Field of Education" in its report in 1955 to the Commission on Governmental Relations. That committee reported that Federal appropriations "may delay rather than advance school construction. Districts not eligible in 1 year may hold off their building plans on the chance of being able to buy their school houses at 50 cents on the dollar a year to two later."

The president of the National School Boards Association, Carl B. Munck, warned the members of his association against the same danger in April 1959. Said he: "The narcotic of Federal aid will become a habit for whose indulgence the victims will soon surrender that which they now so highly prize." (Carl B. Munck, "Some Thoughts on Federal Aid," School Boards, April 1959.)

(f) Once a Federal program is adopted, it will skyrocket: The second danger arising out of the present bills is that while they would do little to carry the overall cost of financing of our schools, the adoption of a Federal-aid program would be but the beginning for a continuously increased Federal-aid program for the Government. For nowhere is Shakespeare's statement as true as in Government spending that "an appetite grows by what it feeds on." This is evident from other Federal-aid programs. This annual Federal aid to States, localities, and individuals, which amounted to less than $150 million in 1930, when we really began our Federal subsidies to these entities, has now soared to over $9 billion—an increase of 60 times or 200 percent each year. It is now more than the total budget of the Federal Government in any one year prior to World War II, and to a large extent has undermined the sovereignty of the States. With our State and local communities doing as well as they are in maintaining our educational program, there is no need for a further grant-in-aid program which will further undermine the sovereignty of the States.

If experience in other fields of Federal aid to States is any criterion, the passage of a Federal-aid bill of a few billion dollars at the present time will skyrocket so that eventually the amount will run into tens of billions of dollars. In the words of one writer: "once this dam is breached, there will be no holding back the floods, * * * the Federal Government will assume an ever-growing role in education and in other State and local activities * * * in a few decades with the further growth of Central Government financing of State and local activities, nothing may be left of our Federal system of government, with its union of strong and self-propelled States except a few empty symbols and rituals and a nostalgic memory, that we shall have but one all-powerful Central Government with regional offices, which may or may not be called States." (Roger A. Freeman, "Federal Aid to Education—Boon or Bane?" American Enterprise Association, Washington, D.C., 1955, p. 3.)

3. The State governments can more easily finance our education than the Federal Government.

Our third reason for opposing the proposed Federal-aid programs is that even if they were necessary, the plain fact of the matter is that the Federal Government cannot afford to finance our educational programs nearly as easily as can the States. While the Federal indebtedness of our country is generally thought of as being in the neighborhood of $300 billion, the plain fact of the matter is that the Federal indebtedness for present and accrued liabilities totals $750 billion, which is the equivalent of $4,100 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. (Address of Hon. Maurice Stans, Director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, before the Executive Club of Chicago, January 29, 1960.) The Federal budget for 1962, which we are now facing, will probably have a deficit of over $5 billion. Indeed at the present time the interest alone on our national debt is twice the size of the entire Federal budget when Franklin Delano Roosevelt became President.

As opposed to this enormous debt and the rising crescendo of Federal obligations, the total State and local governmental indebtedness is only $62 billion and some States have no indebtedness of any kind. Further, as stated previously, even on the basis of a canvass of State superintendents of education made by the U.S. Office of Education, only one-half of 1 percent of all the school districts in the United States have reached the limit of their available bonded indebtedness for school construction. Finally, no State, acting through its legislature and authorized by its Governor's signature had ever applied to the Federal Government for such aid.

In the light of Lenin's challenge that he would cause the United States to spend itself into bankruptcy, we believe it is the height of economic folly and financial irresponsibility for our Government to now assist in fulfilling Lenin's prophecy by undertaking a program of Federal aid to education which, if it follows other Government expenditures, is certain to become a program of enormous proportions. The most startling fact that we have noted in the debate over Federal aid is that no one has come forward with any plan for financing a federally paid program without increasing the already burdensome and in some cases confiscatory taxes already levied upon the American people. In this respect governmental revenues, including income from governmental enterprises, which is rather insignificant compared with taxes, climbed from 29 percent of the national income in 1950 to 35 percent in 1959. And there are economists who state that no nation which extracts 30 percent of the national income from its people over a long period of peacetime can ever hope to survive as a free nation. In this situation and without disrespect, we think it reckless improvidence to have the Federal Government undertake the burden of financing our schools when it is now demonstrated that the States themselves are beginning to do a superlative job in meeting the educational challenge of our times.

We are aware of the argument made by some educators and others that increased school expenses if financed at the local level will force taxes up, whereas this increase in expenditures can easily be consumed in the large Federal budget. In short, that it is easier to obtain money from Washington. The theory, of course, that it will cost more tax-wise if it is paid locally than if it is paid through the Federal Government is a pure myth. The opposite is generally true. This illusion was properly characterized by President Hoover when he wrote, "Our people, under the illusion that money from Washington is pure manna, are selling right and left their birthright as freemen."

4. Federal aid would wrest control from local communities and State governments and ultimately place it in the Federal Government.

Our fourth objection to Federal aid is that it will ultimately mean Federal control. We realize that proposed legislation as drafted provides that the Federal contribution is not to do away with local control. This statement, however, is almost meaningless.

In the first place the proposed legislation contemplates that Federal aid will be administered by the Federal and the State departments of education. This administration in itself will shift the control from local school districts and State legislatures to professional departments of education of the Federal and State governments. And just as we believe in this country that "war is too dangerous to be decided upon by generals," so we believe that education is too important to be taken out of the hands of parents and local school boards and left solely in the hands of professional educators. Indispensable as are our professional educators (and God bless them for what they are doing), nevertheless, the final voice for determination of broad educational policies should still reside in the people and their chosen representatives.

In the second place, provisions in present legislation to the effect that there will be no Federal control are not binding on subsequent legislatures. Legislators and U.S. Commissioners of Education alike who have had experience with Federal aid to education have testified that you cannot have any substantial Federal grants without substantial Federal control. In 1957 the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Representative Graham Barden, declared: "You will hear it said there has not been any Federal control or interference through Public Law 815, the Federal-impacted area bill. I tell you there has been some of the most horrible illustrations of interference and wrongdoing under that bill that you can imagine, and I challenge anyone to deny that statement." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 9, p. 12483.)

Mr. Barden's predecessor as chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, the late Representative John Lesinski, Sr., also stated:

"It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid bill which will not contain a great deal of Federal control over local school systems. * * * I am convinced, after the hard study we have put to the question, that no acceptable bill preventing Federal domination of local schools can be drawn. I reluctantly came to the conclusion, but I had to face the facts" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 103, pt. 5, p. 6348.)

In 1934 a former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Dr. John Tigert wrote:

"My experience in handling Federal subsidies for education under the limited acts which are now in existence has taught me that you must have misappropriation of funds and waste * * *. Reason and experience both indicate that Federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising Federal control and supervision; even then there is considerable waste * * *. If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control (John J. Tigert, "The Real Peril of Federal Subsidies," Nation's Schools, July 1934).

This conclusion was reaffirmed by Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, in 1939, long before he became Commissioner of Education:

"If there is to be little or no Federal control accompanying Federal aid, what right have we to expect a major improvement of the education within States under the same leadership that they now have? Thus, if Federal aid is to bring about better schools, it seems apparent that there must be some Federal control (Samuel M. Brownell, "Shall It Be 'Yes' or 'No' on Federal Aid?" School and Society, vol. 49, May 27, 1939, p. 669).

In 1959, Dr. James B. Conant, former president of Harvard University, stated his belief in the likely results of Federal aid:

"To imagine that recurring appropriations of this magnitude can be made without careful budgeting on the part of the administration seems to me to be the equivalent of imagining completely irresponsible government. Careful budgeting will mean, in turn, a strong executive agency which must have access to a mass factual information about the educational situation in every State. * * * The educational committees of the House and Senate will have every reason to examine into details of curriculums and school organization, much as committees of the State legislatures now do from time to time. Certainly, a new chapter in American public education will have opened" (James Bryant Conant, "The Child, the Parent and the State," Harvard University Press, 1959, p. 56).

Admittedly, Federal control will come gradually, but we are concerned because it has been the experience of all Federal programs that it will eventually come, and if the first inch of governmental control is not worth fighting off, then the last mile will be indefensible.

5. Large Federal-aid programs will destroy local initiative and creativeness.

Finally, we object to a Federal program for schools because once the Federal Government interjects itself into a program and thereafter successively assumes more and more of the financial burden, local resourcefulness, local creativeness and local support and genius are inevitably demoralized. On this score we need to do no more than quote from former President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, in his day one of the great educators of our country:

"It is now proposed to bureaucratize and to bring into uniformity the educational system of the whole United States, while making the most solemn assurance that nothing of the kind is intended. The glory and the successes of education in the United States are due to its freedom, to its unevennesses, to its reflection of the needs and ambitions and capacities of local communities, and to its being kept in close and constant touch with the people themselves. There is not money enough in the United States, even if every dollar of it were expended on education, to produce by Federal authority or through what is naively called cooperation between the Federal Government and the several States, educational results that would be at all comparable with those that have already been reached under the free and natural system that has grown up among us. * * * It is universally acknowledged that the unhappy decline in Germany university freedom and effectiveness, and the equally unhappy subjection of the educated classes to the dictates of the political and military ruling groups, were the direct result of the highly centralized and efficient control from Berlin of the nation's schools and universities.

"For Americans now to accept oversight and direction of their tax-supported schools and colleges from Washington would mean that they had failed to learn one of the plainest and most weighty lessons of the war. It is true that education is a national problem and a national responsibility; it is also true that it has been characteristic of the American people to solve their most difficult national problems and to bear their heaviest national responsibilities through their own action in the field of liberty, rather than through the agency of organized government. Once more to tap the Federal Treasury under the guise of aiding the States, and once more to establish an army of bureaucrats in Washington and another army of inspectors roaming at large throughout the land, will not only fail to accomplish any permanent improvement in the education of our people, but it will assist in effecting so great a revolution in our American form of government as one day to endanger its perpetuity. The true path of advance in education is to be found in the direction of keeping the people's schools closely in touch with the people themselves. * * * Unless the school is both the work and the pride of the community which it serves, it is nothing."

In conclusion we appeal to the Members of Congress, in these days of national catastrophe when communism is just 90 miles off our coast, to give prime attention to our international affairs and not attempt to upset the pattern of exclusive support and control by communities and States of our educational system, a pattern that has prevailed for almost two centuries. The tyranny of socialism (creeping or galloping) and totalitarian dictatorship is all too obvious in our world of today. These ever-present forces try to sap the vitality and the independence of our local, close-to-home institutions. American education has been long predicated on the foundation of local liberty and initiative. But now we face the possible threat of further Federal involvement and control over our schools. We sincerely urge all Members of Congress to reject this threat and defeat any measure which attacks the local autonomy of our outstanding American school system, and which also may encroach further upon the spirit of our inspired Constitution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that he will not lose the floor?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. After consultation with the distinguished minority leader and other interested Senators, I wish to propound a unanimous-consent request that the debate on the bill under discussion be limited to 3 hours at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], 1 hour to be under the control of the minority leader and 2 hours to be allocated to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, again, after consultation with the minority leader, I announce for the information of Senators, when consideration of the proposal now before us is concluded, it is our purpose to take up the conference report on the inter-American aid bill, which I understand has been acted upon by the House.

ADMINISTRATION VIEWS ON THE ECONOMY

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I was interested to read in the news reports recently of Treasury Under Secretary Fowler's address before the Women's National Democratic Club in which he cited recovery in the economy and gave credit to the administration for this pickup. It is interesting to observe Mr. Fowler's statement that the pickup has been the result of "both the psychological weapons of confidence and the physical aids of money and credit to turn recession into recovery."

I detect a note of hypocrisy in this statement. We are all aware of the preachments of gloom and doom which flowed from the administration since they took office and from President-elect Kennedy and his lieutenants before they took office. I trust the American public will see through this two-faced attitude. I am sure that American businessmen are aware that President Kennedy's crying towel techniques early this year impaired business confidence. We are all aware of his state of the Union statements that "the present state of our economy is disturbing," and, further, after selecting some of the more unfavorable statistics, that "in short, the American economy is in trouble." Then he said, "forecasts of continued slack and only slightly reduced unemployment throughout 1961 and 1962 have been made with alarming unanimity." It is obvious that these gloom-and-doom statements were intended to scare up acceptance of the administration's spending proposals. As recently as his news conference on March 1 this year, President Kennedy was asked if he saw evidence that the current business depression was over. He replied:

> I think it would be premature to make a judgment that our economy is on the rise and, therefore, that there is no necessity for action. I don't take that view at all. I think all of these (Government spending) programs are needed.
>
> I am hopeful that it will be possible—I am hopeful that we will see the economy move up in the spring and summer, but we can make no predictions about it. There is not sufficient evidence at hand yet by any Government department to indicate an upturn has taken place as of today.

Now we have the administration coming forth and claiming credit for a recovery which was predicted by economists, business leaders, and labor leaders at the first of the year. For instance, J. A. Livingston, whose column appears in the Washington Post, reported last January the results of his yearend questionnaire to 62 high-ranking economists in business, labor, Government, universities, and research organizations. According to Mr. Livingston, though optimism was not unanimous, the consensus was that 1961 will be "the best year in U.S. history." Most opinions were that the upturn would come by midyear.

The National Association of Manufacturers Annual Congress of American Industry in January brought forth the consensus by the businessmen represented that 1960 was admittedly a disappointment, but 1961 will be better, with the upturn beginning as early as the first quarter for some firms. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce as early as last December predicted that, although there would be a mild downturn during the first half of 1961, the chamber was optimistic concerning the second half of the year, and predicted that the gross national product would rise to the figure of $515 billion to $520 billion by the end of the year, a higher score than the 1960's.

One administration spokesman, Secretary of Commerce Hodges, said last March in a national television interview, "I think we have reached the bottom, and I think we can start from here and move up."

It should be observed that Mr. Hodges' comment was, except for the unemployment-insurance program, made prior to any hope of the enactment of the major legislative program suggested by President Kennedy to stimulate the economy. In other words, Secretary Hodges and the economists and businessmen who at the first of the year predicted an upturn based their predictions primarily on the inherent strength of the private economy rather than on any massive Federal programs. It appears that we will have a repeat of the situation in 1958, when the Democrats were urging massive tax cuts and huge spending programs, but President Eisenhower held his ground, and the economy made its own recovery. The Democrats made the wrong diagnosis of that recession, and they have done the same this time. My only fear is that the

Kennedy program will go forward despite the upturn, and the evil of inflation will take over where the evil of unemployment leaves off.

I am pleased to see signs of optimism throughout the economy. The stock market has certainly reflected in advance the upturn which is now underway. I resent, however, the administration taking credit for this upturn. I do think that the easement of money and credit begun under the Eisenhower administration and continued by the Kennedy administration, and the step-up in Government contracts under existing defense, highway, and other programs were proper and commendable, but I cannot swallow the hypocritical statement that "the psychological weapon of confidence" was a basic tool of the administration to stimulate the economy. I am sure all of us realize that the exact opposite kind of attitude and predictions came forth from the administration during our latest mild downturn.

I would like to further observe that our economy and our system of free enterprise has its own natural adjusting qualities if untampered with by Federal intervention and if confidence, rather than gloom, can be the watchword from Washington. I again remind Mr. Kennedy of President Roosevelt's famous statement: "We have nothing to fear but fear itself."

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time on the bill is now under control. The Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am not unmindful that many consider it passé for Members of Congress to subject legislative proposals to a rigid constitutional test as a prerequisite to even a consideration of the desirability or feasibility of the particular legislative proposal. Any other course, however, inevitably leads to a larcenous breach of trust by the National Legislature. My powers of rationalization are not broad enough to attribute to a legislative violation of constitutional limitations a lesser degree of moral violation than that which would attend any other breach of trust or, for that matter, any lesser degree of criminality in an evasion of the Constitution than in an evasion of the tax laws. Accordingly, I consider it no less than a sacred obligation to subject legislation to a constitutional test; and I am convinced that S. 1021 fails to square with either the letter or the spirit of the Constitution.

Even in our contemporary age, when respect for an adherence to the Constitution are at an alltime low, it would be difficult to find anyone who would controvert the fact that the National Government, as established by the Constitution, is one of specifically delegated powers; nor have I discovered any serious assertions that the National Government was specifically delegated a power in the Constitution to engage in any activity in the field of education. The limitations on the powers of Congress are inherent in the wording of the specific delegations of power to the Congress which appear in article I, section 8, of the Constitution. Such a conclusion was not left to implication, however, for the 10th amendment specifically states that not only is the National Government limited to the powers specifically delegated, but, indeed, it reaffirmed specifically the exact entities that retained all powers not delegated. Since no power was delegated to the Congress or to the National Government, that is even remotely associated with the field of education, it is therefore incontrovertible that the power to engage in educational activities was and is vested in the States respectively, or the people.

This, for me, is sufficient to resolve all questions on Federal aid to education, for it establishes conclusively that National Government participation in the field of education violates both the word and the spirit of the Constitution.

Unfortunately, from almost the beginning of our Republic there has been a sustained effort by legal gymnasts and mental contortionists to riddle the spirit and intention of the Constitution to suit their particular immediate purposes by ignoring the spirit and intention of the whole document through the process of misconstruing words, phrases, and clauses and considering them out of the context of the entire document. By such a process have we arrived at the point where many can rationalize the existence of power by the National Government to undertake education activities by virtue of a perversion of a group of words commonly referred to as the "general welfare clause" of the Constitution.

The words which comprise the so-called general welfare clause are contained in article 1, section 8, clause 1, of the Constitution, and I quote in part:

> The Congress shall have Power to lay and Collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States.

Obviously, the so-called general welfare clause is not only not a clause, but indeed constitutes a removal and combination of selection but not contiguous words from this particular provision of the Constitution.

No one will be shocked when I say that the prevailing construction of these selected words studiously avoids any attempt or pretext at arriving at a final understanding of their derivation, their arrangement, and the events—and thereby the intentions—which occasioned their inclusion in the Constitution. Nevertheless, it is well, at least occasionally, to review the circumstances of the framing and selection of this wording, if for no reason other than to demonstrate the devious departure from the Constitution to which our national rationalization has led us.

Under the rules of the Constitutional Convention in 1787, all of the proposals presented to the Convention were in the form of resolutions. The Convention centered its deliberation around the adoption, rejection, or amendment of the various resolutions until a time when agreement had been reached on practically all matters of substance in the latter stages of the Convention. The Convention used a committee system to expedite its work. After reaching a compromise as to the basis of representation of the State in the National Legislature, the Convention referred the resolutions so far approved, all of which were in very general language, to a committee on detail composed of five members. At about the same time, the Convention referred the matters not yet in agreement to a committee composed of one delegate from each State. Subsequently, in the last few days of the Convention, the approved resolutions were referred to a committee on style which transformed the resolutions into the basic document which we know today as the Constitution.

As a result of the work of the Committee on Detail in the Constitutional Convention, the Convention adopted a recommendation of the committee that "the Legislature of the United States shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises." Subsequent to the adoption of this proposal, a serious controversy developed in the Convention concerning the power of Congress to pay the debts of the Revolutionary War, and the advisability of the General Government assuming and paying the existing debts of the several States. These questions were submitted to a special committee composed of one member from each State, who subsequently recommended the adoption of this language:

> The Legislature of the United States shall have the power to fulfill the engagements which have been entered into by Congress and to discharge as well the debts of the United States as the debts incurred by the several States during the late war, for the common defense and the general welfare.

The obvious intention of this language was to limit the assumption by the United States of the debts of the several States to those which had been incurred during the then recent Revolutionary War "for the common defense and the general welfare." It appears, however, that many of the delegates were dubious as to whether even this language would require the United States to pay the Revolutionary War debts and, therefore, adopted in lieu of the proposal by the special committee the following language:

> The Legislature shall discharge the debts and fulfill the engagements of the United States.

The records of the Convention show that this new resolution was thereafter placed in the context of the Constitution, as it then stood, prior to the taxing power clause, so that the full clause read:

> The Legislature shall fulfill the engagements and discharge the debts of the United States and shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises.

Even this language, however, was not satisfactory to the delegates, for there was objection to making it mandatory that Congress pay all of the debts of the Revolution regardless of the circumstances under which they arose or the existing status of the debts at the time Congress undertook to pay them. For that reason, a new resolution was adopted which was subsequently placed as the first clause in article VI of the Constitution, and which states:

> All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution as under the Confederation.

This effectively removed the question of payment of Revolutionary War obligations from the language previously incorporated with the taxing power delegated to Congress. As is obvious from the final draft of the Constitution, however, the Committee on Style retained in the taxing clause the phraseology earlier incorporated for the purpose of dealing with this troublesome subject.

It is quite obvious that it was the intention of the Convention, in utilizing this phraseology, to accomplish a purpose that was subsequently taken care of in another portion of the Constitution; and the troublesome language was left in the clause delegating to Congress the general power of taxation for no specific purpose. Regrettably, however, many who have sought over the years since the adoption of the Constitution to find authority for the National Government to enter new fields of endeavor have seized on this extraneous phraseology as a source of authority.

Shortly after the Constitution was adopted, the efforts to pervert this accidental phraseology became apparent. The differences as to the construction which should be placed on this language were crystallized in the writings and pronouncements of two of the delegates to the Constitutional Convention, James Madison and Alexander Hamilton. Of the two opinions as to the actual intention of the Convention, Madison's view commends itself more to objective analysis; although, admittedly, Hamilton proved to be the master rationalizer of the two. It is interesting to recall that at the Convention Madison labored throughout, and was, of all the delegates, most deserving of the appellation, "Chief Architect of the Constitution." Hamilton, on the other hand, had long since departed the Convention, and Philadelphia, when the clauses in question were adopted and the Constitution was put in its final form. Madison's construction was probably the most simply stated by another, who was no mean authority on the Constitution himself. Thomas Jefferson, who thoroughly concurred in Madison's construction, stated in his "Opinion on the Bank":

> The laying of taxes is the power, and the general welfare is the purpose for which the power is to be exercised. They (Congress) are not to lay taxes ad libitum for any purpose they please; but only to pay the debts to provide for the welfare of the Union. In like manner, they are not to do anything they please to provide for the general welfare, but only to lay taxes for that purpose.

Hamilton, to the contrary, advanced the theory that the general-welfare language gave the National Government a power to tax and spend without being limited by other granted powers. Even Hamilton expressly concurred, however, in the opinion that the Government was not given any power to make use of such spending so as to exercise any control over the people, or over anything, except in those limited areas of activity in which there were specific delegations of power to the National Government.

After avoiding the issue during all the intervening years, the Supreme Court, in 1936, in the case of U.S. against Butler, in an opinion by Justice Roberts, finally succumbed to the Hamiltonian construction as refined in the "Commentaries" of Justice Story. This, in the words of the Court, is the construction adopted:

> Since the foundation of the Nation sharp differences of opinion have persisted as to the true interpretation of the phrase. Madison asserted it amounted to no more than a reference to the other powers enumerated in the subsequent clauses of the same section; that, as the United States is a Government of limited and enumerated powers, the grant of power to tax and spend for the general national welfare must be confined to the enumerated legislative fields committed to the Congress. In this view the phrase is mere tautology, for taxation and appropriation are or may be necessary incidents of the exercise of any of the enumerated legislative powers. Hamilton, on the other hand, maintained the clause confers a power separate and distinct from those later enumerated, is not restricted in meaning by the grant of them, and Congress consequently has a substantive power to tax and to appropriate, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide for the general welfare of the United States. Each contention has had the support of those whose views are entitled to weight. This Court had noticed the question, but has never found it necessary to decide which is the true construction. Justice Story, in his "Commentaries," espouses the Hamiltonian position. We shall not review the writings of public men and commentators or discuss the legislative practice. Study of all these leads us to conclude that the reading advocated by Justice Story is the correct one. While, therefore, the power to tax is not unlimited, its confines are set in the clause which confers it, and not in those of section 8, which bestow and define the legislative powers of the Congress. It results that the power of Congress to authorize expenditure of public moneys for public purposes is not limited by the direct grants of legislative power found in the Constitution.

What has subsequently been ignored in practice, not only by the Congress, by the Executive, and indeed by the Court itself, is that the Court in the Butler case, although holding that the spending power is not limited by the specific grants of power contained in article 1, section 8, found nevertheless that the spending power was qualified by the 10th amendment, and on this ground ruled that Congress could not use moneys raised by taxation, to purchase compliance with regulations "of matters of State concern with respect to which Congress has no authority to interfere."

The Court has never attempted to impugn the rationale laid down in the Butler case, but, admittedly, in many subsequent decisions, the Court has seemingly ignored its existence insofar as the limitation on the authority of the Congress to "purchase compliance" of the States is concerned. Only Congress itself has succeeded in surpassing on the irrational side the Court's violation of this view.

Tested even under the Hamiltonian construction of the so-called general welfare clause, Federal aid to education fails miserably to come within a power authorized to be exercised by the Congress. Conceivably, there are many grants which the National Government can make, and possibly has made, in which the donation is unaccompanied by a purchased compliance of the States and the people thereof with respect to matters on which jurisdiction was reserved to the States respectively, or to the people, under the Constitution. By the nature of the limitation, however, such a grant would almost of necessity have to be a one-time donation; and conversely, it is difficult to conceive of any program of continuing grants as a condition to which Congress does not exercise regulation on the one hand, or fail in this public trust to insure the wise application of public funds on the other.

While one might well quarrel with the wisdom of the judgment of the Congress as to what is wise for the application of public funds, there is no ground for a charge that Congress, or individual Members thereof, lack diligence in attempting to insure that public funds are spent in strict accordance with their determination of what is best for the country and the people.

Proposals for Federal aid to education are almost invariably, by their very nature, regulatory and conditional. Those best designed to fit within the Hamiltonian construction of the general welfare language of the Constitution find small support in these legislative bodies. Two of the latter type proposals have been considered by both the committee and the Senate. One would operate as an income tax credit for taxes paid to State and local communities for educational purposes within limitations of amount, and by its very nature such a proposal excludes the possibility of control and regulation by National Government.

Another proposal would direct the payment by each District Director of Internal Revenue of a percentage of revenue collected within a State to that State to be used for educational purposes. Again, there is a minimum opportunity in such a proposal for the National Government to purchase compliance. Significantly, both of these proposals were rejected out of hand by the committee, and on several occasions, by the Senate when offered as amendments.

Federal aid to education is, of course, no latecomer to congressional consideration. In one form or the other, it has been before the Congress for 30 years, and many a wise legislator, as well as many less endowed, has wrestled in an attempt to resolve the conflict between

the unconstitutionality of regulation and control, and the responsibility to prevent the misuse and misapplication of public funds.

The late Congressman John Lesinski, Sr., while the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee in the House of Representatives, stated:

> It is impossible to draft a general Federal aid bill which will not contain a great deal of Federal control over local school systems. I am convinced after the hard study we have put to the question, that no acceptable bill preventing Federal domination of local schools can be drawn. I reluctantly come to the conclusion, but I had to face the facts.

S. 1021 is proof positive of the accuracy of Mr. Lesinski's conclusion. Congress has no constitutional authority to enact such a proposal.

Mr. President, I am not unaware of the diminishing realization of the necessity for a rigid Constitution and the conduct of government in conformity to its absolute terms. The type of constitution in vogue today is one which grows with the change in technology and, indeed, is so flexible as to be no constitution at all.

Our Constitution was not designed as a document of convenience, nor yet as a mere guideline for government. It was conceived as a shackle on the ambitions of officeholders and a system of fetters for those who view with lust the broad plains of expediency.

Our system of government is novel, and under close scrutiny bears little resemblance to other governments which preceded it, or for that matter, those which ostensibly embraced its mechanics but not its total safeguards in the fond hope that they might dance to the tune of individual liberty without paying the full price to the piper.

Only once in the recorded history of mankind have events conspired to bestow upon a society both an attitude of public opinion conducive to acceptance of an original philosophy of government, unimpaired by the design of a predecessor government, and also the leadership of men learned in the truths proven by the ageless but unsuccessful struggle of man to maintain his liberty against the various forms of government formerly designed. Fortunately for those who have enjoyed the fruits of the labors of these great men from the formation of our United States until the present day, those to whom we refer as our Founding Fathers not only were cognizant of the lessons of history, but also possessed the capabilities of translating their knowledge into a plan for a structure of government in which the deposit of power was on balance with the individual's ability to control it in the interest of his own protection.

Two basic and transcending facts underlay the consideration of those American patriots faced with the awesome task of devising the new government. First, they were conscious of the essentiality of some form of government possessed of a sufficient degree of power to maintain peace and tranquillity. These men were fresh in the memory of a too-weak government which they had so recently experienced in the form of a Continental Congress, which existed under the Articles of Confederation. In other words, they were conscious of the necessity of removing the government from a position of close proximity to a state of anarchism.

Secondly, they were equally impressed with the fact that "government," or the "state," was invariably the tool of tyranny and the greatest enemy of the individual's liberty. This lesson, learned from an academic consideration of history, has been indelibly impressed on their minds and hearts by despotic occupants of the British throne.

Those Americans charged in the late 1780's with the invention of a form of government were faced with the difficult and previously unaccomplished task of devising a method of balancing the surrender to the State of sufficient powers to accomplish its intended purpose, on the one hand, against the imperative need to provide protection against its transformation into a tool of tyranny to suppress individual liberty on the other.

Obviously, no single device was or is capable of providing the necessary balance. More important, but less often acknowledged by our sophisticated society of today, no combination of previously used devices was sufficient to adequately accomplish the purpose. As a consequence, the form of government they conceived was comprised of a combination of previously proven and useful safeguards and supplemental innovations specifically designed and weighted to bring the conflicting objectives into balance. Among the proven safeguards utilized was the process of subjecting those who were to exercise the power of the "state" to election at the hands of the people for a continuation of the right to wield that power; another was the utilization of a written Constitution, although they improved on this device by elevating it above the status of other laws, principally by conditioning its amendment to the most widespread approval.

These, and other tried and proven devices, contributed much to the successful accomplishment of their awesome task. It was the innovations, however, which transformed their efforts from the realm of attempts to the realm of achievement.

Foremost among the innovations were the numerous devices which can be characterized within the concept of split sovereignty. Departing from the precedent in previous governments of concentrating the necessary powers of state in a resultant all powerful sovereign, these wise benefactors of succeeding generations chose to repose varying, but lesser, degrees of power in a number of sovereigns. The division of powers was accomplished by geographic and jurisdictional circumscription.

To several sovereigns they reserved broad jurisdictional powers circumscribed by smaller geographical limitations. These were the States, in whom all sovereignty rested previously within their boundaries. To the sovereign created without geographical limitations they accomplished a delegation of jurisdictionally narrow powers, specifically enumerated. Following the concept of split sovereignty to its practical and logical conclusion, they went further and split the powers of the geographically unlimited sovereign by a division of them among the three branches which comprised that sovereign. In effect, they accomplished a division of the powers derived from the people among what were 14 sovereigns at that time. Being designed as an implementation of sound principles, rather than an expedient, the structure they erected is now comprised of 51 sovereigns—50 States and a National Government.

Anyone who pictures this structure, as originally conceived and intended, in a pyramidical design has a basic misconception of the safeguards which have provided the essence of novelty, and more importantly, the safeguards of liberty in our government. The relationship between the National Government and each of the 50 States includes no conduit of authority. There was an act of delegation of sovereign powers initially via the Constitution, and only by amendment of the Constitution—a distinct action within itself rather than a conduit—can a further exchange of power between sovereigns be accomplished consistent with the original design.

Tyrannical and despotic action can be avoided only so long as the balance between the inherent dangers in the powers reposed and the safeguards of individual liberty established is maintained. The diminution of any safeguard imperils the balance. The dissolution of any safeguard insures the lack of balance and the deprivation of individual liberty.

The process of erosion stemming from the impatience and lack of wisdom of many of those in subsequent generations has dealt harshly with the safeguards instilled in the noble institutions inaugurated by the Founding Fathers. Many of the safeguards have been reduced in weight, thereby imperiling the balance. It speaks well for the governmental system originally instituted that the form has remained fundamentally unaltered despite the pressures created by the ambitions, impatience, and stupidity of some of those who have gained positions of power in the interim. It is the substance, rather than the form, that has suffered from a continual series of unsurpations, occurring almost invariably at the national level.

The fundamental concepts which the Founding Fathers incorporated into our Constitution are as valid today as when originally set down, and there can be no question but that there is a far more pressing need for their application to our contemporary society than that of theirs; for they were men who appreciated the preciousness of liberty, and men of that generation carried the safeguards against oppression in each of their hearts. If we continue to delude ourselves, deprecating the applicability of the constitutional concept in absolute terms, it is we

who will destroy our own liberty and suffer from a fate well deserved.

I would be less than candid if I did not admit that I am aware that many differ with my conclusion as to the constitutionality of Federal aid proposals. Indeed, many who differ base their difference in interpretation on the supposition that the National Government already participates greatly in educational activities. The National and State Constitutions and the record of school support since the inception of the Republic prove that education has always been regarded as a responsibility of the States and of private groups. In spite of this, some claim that Federal aid to education is older than the Constitution. They point to the land grants first authorized by the Ordinance of 1785 as proof that the principle has long been settled; however, a review of the record shows that neither any separate action, nor the entire collection of them together, was motivated by a primary concern with public education as such. There were always other objectives for the realization of which education was utilized as a medium. It is true that the National Government over the years deeded 77 million acres to the States as an endowment for the schools. This was part of the disposition of more than 1 billion acres of the national domain to homesteaders, railroads, and other groups whom the Government encouraged to develop the West.

The Ordinance of 1785 established the rectangular survey and set aside one section in each township for the support of common schools. During the first hundred years after 1785, land was the Nation's most abundant resource, and the promotion of Western settlement was a high priority objective. The school land grants were made as an inducement to settlers who would be more willing to go west and take up land if educational facilities were in prospect to the extent that such were assured by the grants.

No grants or other benefits were provided to the 12 States where at the time more than 98 percent of all American children lived. It is inconceivable that Congress would have channeled all grants to areas where almost no American children lived, and none to sections where the children actually were, had National Government promotion and support of education been the purpose.

The land-grant colleges established by the Morrill Act of 1862 were required to provide certain subjects as a condition of the grants, chief among which was instruction and training in agriculture. In this instance, the principal objective was the improvement of farming as the main source of livelihood for western settlers. Indeed, a larger area of western lands was given to transcontinental railroads than to schools and colleges, and in this case, also, the purpose was the promotion of western settlement and national unity.

Since the first bill was introduced in 1870, hundreds of proposals to provide national support for local schools have been before the Congress. None was enacted. During the same time grants for about 1 million other State and local activities were approved by the Congress which altogether will total some $8 billion in fiscal 1962. Some of them unquestionably affect the schools, but they can by no means be called aid to education. The school lunch program, for example, is a measure to dispose of agricultural surpluses and is administered by the Department of Agriculture. Some areas get payments in lieu of taxes for communities where expanded National Government activities imposed a special burden.

Only two current programs really involve aid to education, and these are the Smith-Hughes Act for vocational training passed in 1917 and the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Both of these programs were enacted ostensibly for defense purposes, and both ostensibly aim to promote certain specified subjects on the curriculum.

The reason why Congress has never enacted a general Federal aid to education bill is because the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives in the past have realized that our schools are bulwarks of local self-government and community enterprise and that they should so remain. There is no precedent constitutionally or otherwise for the enactment of a general Federal aid to education bill such as that proposed here.

Mr. President, there are many who try to spread the responsibility of the National Government to provide a national defense into an umbrella which would justify the entry of the National Government into the field of education. No one would dispute the fact that the better the citizens of the country are educated, the stronger will be all facets of our society, including the ability to defend ourselves. Attempts to stretch the defense power of the National Government to such extremes, however, are absurd. If the power of the National Government were that all-inclusive, the General Government would be a government of general, rather than limited, jurisdiction, even if it had no other powers at all.

Consider the application of such a conception of the defense power in other fields, and the absurdity is obvious. Production is essential to national defense, so it could be controlled absolutely. Transportation is essential to defense, so it could be controlled. The physical health of the people is a matter that is vital to national defense, for sick and undernourished people are not able to contribute to national defense, so the diet of Americans could be controlled. Obviously, manpower is vital to national defense, so the National Government could prohibit and regulate measures of birth control.

If the defense power of the National Government went that far, there would be nothing worth defending, for slavery would prevail and there is nothing worse to defend against. We must be vigilant and prepared to defend our country, but it is just as imperative that in so doing, we do not ourselves destroy the very things we are preparing to defend. The worth in our society is the individual, not the state; and it is the state that should be the servant of the individual, for the individual has value in and of himself, regardless of his contribution to the state.

We must not lose sight of the fact that our educational system, unlike that of communism and socialism, is to provide the opportunity for the individual to achieve his own full and complete development to the extent his talents and disposition permit, and not to increase his potential for service to the state.

Again, I am convinced that there are many who, although troubled with the effort to square proposals for Federal aid to education with their knowledge of the constitutional limitations, are inclined to view the perversion of the Constitution as a necessity in order to meet what has been propagandized as a severe crisis in education in the United States. Even were there a crisis, it would not justify stretching and ignoring the existing constitutional limitations. If, indeed, there were a serious crisis and on the further supposition that were Federal aid to education to be the only solution to that crisis, the proper course would be to amend the Constitution to grant a specific authority to the National Government, within prescribed limitations, to deal with such crisis. These are remote suppositions, and, fortunately, there is not any need to think in terms of an amendment to the Constitution, for there is no crisis in education in the United States, although there are problems. The problems, as would be the case with a crisis, would be exaggerated and inflamed rather than solved by Federal action.

The purported crisis in education is most often pictured by the proponents of Federal aid to education as a result of financial neglect of the public schools. The argument has been heard so often that one might be inclined to give it credence, but only if one were unfamiliar with the facts. Between the school year 1939–40 and that of 1960–61, total educational expenditures for schools at all levels in the United States increased from slightly less than $3.2 billion to $26 billion, an increase of 713 percent. During the same period, enrollment increased only 64 percent. Even making allowance for the fact that the dollar depreciated by one-half, the rise in expenditures was more than 300 percent compared to an enrollment expansion of only 64 percent.

This tremendous increase in expenditure per pupil cannot be attributed solely to overall increase in national income by any stretch of the imagination, for expenditures for education as a percentage of national income have increased from 3.7 percent in 1930 to 4 percent in 1950 and 6.1 percent in 1961. The American people have loyally and faithfully supported their schools. The record of steeply increasing school revenues is nothing short of spectacular and makes no case for a general financial neglect of the schools. Other statistics invariably show the same picture. Between 1929–30 and 1960–61, public school expenditures increased 611 percent, personal consumption increased

315 percent, and corporate profits increased 177 percent. This occurred during a period when public school enrollment expanded at a slightly lower rate than the total population of the country.

These facts completely refute such propaganda as the statement of Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, printed in "Teachers for Tomorrow," who said:

To put it succinctly, in terms of every need, American schools are not holding their own. Indeed, they are repeatedly losing ground and have been doing so since about 1930.

Fallacious and misleading statements such as that of Dr. Carr are absurd and ridiculous when tested against the facts.

Proponents of Federal aid to education allege that the financial crisis they conceive to exist in the education field is most apparent in the specific areas of school construction and that through the medium of teachers' salaries is reflected a shortage of teachers. An examination of these specific aspects of financial school support completely repudiates such allegations.

Past performance, when properly interpreted, provides the best, and indeed the only, accurate gage to school needs in the future period for which Federal aid to education is proposed. In examining the performance of our school system without any general Federal aid to education, it is essential that we understand any special factors which would or might vary between the past period under examination and the future period for which we propose to plan.

The decade of the 1950's saw the most spectacular expansion of school-age population: the number of young people between 5 and 17 years of age jumped by 46 percent. The average annual increase of enrollment between the years 1955 and 1959 was 1.2 million, but the estimated average increase, based on the population census for 1960–64 shows a decline to 1.1 million, and estimates for the average annual increase during the period 1965–69 is 600,000. It is not that the entering classes will be smaller, but the difference between the entering and leaving classes will decline sharply as the war and postwar babies start to be graduated. As of now, the tidal wave has all but passed, for although the school-age population increased 46 percent in the last decade, it will increase by only 20 percent between 1960 and 1970.

When viewed in the light of the tremendous increase in enrollment which occurred during the past decade, the performance of State and local authorities without the assistance of the National Government in the construction of classrooms has been astounding and graphically illustrates, not only the ability, but also the willingness of State and local communities generally to meet the demands for new classrooms, even when the demands are at a crucial rate. The situation with respect to the accomplishments in the field of classroom construction in the past decade was succinctly and accurately summarized by Mr. Roger A. Freeman in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the Senate in March of this year. I quote from Mr. Freeman's testimony:

The Office of Education reported a classroom shortage as of the fall of 1960 of 142,100 classrooms. The report—as its predecessor a year earlier—was sharply criticized by examiners of the Bureau of the Budget, held up for some time, but finally released by the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on his last day in office, January 19, 1961. It can be better evaluated in a historical perspective.

Congress in 1950, ordered a national school facilities survey. It was undertaken at a cost of more than $5 million and reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. Then, in the fall of 1954 the U.S. Commissioner of Education testified that the shortage has grown to 370,000 and the other responsible officials predicted that it would, within 3 years, rise to 600,000.

When the White House Conference on Education soon after polled the States, it arrived at a shortage of 198,625. Finding itself under a barrage of criticism, the Office of Education revised its estimates, and its annual canvass of classroom shortages started coming down until it hit a low of 132,400 in the fall of 1959. A year later it reported a shortage of 142,100 classrooms. This was 230,000 less than had been reported 6 years earlier, and 360,000 fewer than had been predicted.

But the new figure does not seem to be any more reliable than the earlier ones. Statistics for the years 1956 and 1960 taken from the reports of the Office of Education show this 4-year comparison: Enrollment had grown 4.8 million children who required the addition of 171,000 classrooms. The number of classrooms in use—after deducting those which had been abandoned—has increased by 252,000 which left 81,000 classrooms for the reduction of shortages which existed in the fall of 1956. But the shortage reported by the Office of Education had been reduced by only 17,000. This means—and a detailed analysis confirms it—that several States had meanwhile upped their shortages by 64,000 classrooms by either raising their standards or reevaluating their needs. Actually in those 4 years enrollment had increased 15 percent, the number of classrooms in use 23 percent, and the number of pupils per classroom had declined from 29.0 to 27.1.

These figures may appear dry but they are significant. They prove that the various shortage reports are not at all internally consistent nor using standards which would permit valid comparisons from year to year and add up to a meaningful national total. They largely express the opinion of hundreds of individuals all over the country, which fluctuate from year to year, from State to State, from school district to school district.

With several reevaluations taking place each year in a number of States, the reported shortages could go up at a very rapid rate or continue to run erratically, as they have for the past decade. The Budget Bureau examiners commented correctly that these are not reports upon which valid conclusions in regard to national policies could be formed. The race between shortage reports and construction is like greyhounds chasing a mechanical hare. The hare always wins.

The incontestable fact is that over the past decade more than 600,000 classrooms were completed while the increased attendance required the addition of only 400,000. This means that over 200,000 new classrooms were made available to replace old ones and to reduce class sizes. That it was possible to accomplish this in the decade of the most rapid enrollment growth demonstrates, more dramatically than words could, the faith of the American people in education. This record is the result of thousands of communities voting bond issues and higher taxes year after year. It may be well to note that the new public schools, built in the postwar period, now house close to 20 million American children—compared with schools for 9 million children which—according to their own claims—the Russians built in the same span of time.

The statistics of the Office of Education about "children in excess of normal enrollment" are even less reliable than classroom reports, as a comparative analysis proves and as the Budget Bureau examiners found on a field inspection trip to nine States in 1960.

But to judge the outlook in the classroom situation we do not need to spend more time with these statistics—although the more closely they are analyzed, the more misleading they turn out to be.

In his education message on February 20, 1961, President Kennedy said: "In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years."

The figure of 600,000 over the next 10 years—an average of 60,000 a year—is based on estimates which the Office of Education prepared during 1960, and which accept all shortage claims at face value, regardless of their validity.

Now 60,000 classrooms a year may appear to be a big order until it is recalled that States and communities have been building 70,000 classrooms each year for the past 5 years. This means that the volume of school construction can materially decline during the 1960's and still produce all the classrooms the public schools reasonably require. The reason for this reduced need is apparent from the earlier cited enrollment projections: While in recent years 40,000 classrooms a year were needed just to house the additional enrollment, we shall need only 20,000 classrooms a year for that purpose when enrollment increases drop to half their present size in the later 1960's.

There were complaints last year from the then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and others that school construction was declining and that action was urgently called for to meet this emergency. We know now, from more recent reports of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, that school construction did not decline at all. We know also that in the school year 1959–60 the public schools had 360,000 fewer pupils but 7,000 more classrooms and 10,000 more teachers than Congress and the public were told early in 1960. The figures were quietly adjusted after the 86th Congress had adjourned.

At the present time there is no indication of a proximate decline in school building activity; quite the contrary. The Investment Bankers Association of America just reported that the amount of school bonds approved at elections and the approval percentage reached new record highs of $1.8 billion and 81 percent respectively in 1960. January 1961 again established a new record.

Because of the considerable interval between bond approval and completion of work, a high volume of school construction appears to be assured for some time to come. The Department of Commerce estimated that public educational construction would increase 8 percent in 1961 over 1960.

The so-called taxpayers' revolt belongs in the realm of fiction, as does the exhausted fiscal capacity of thousands of communities needing classrooms. The Department of

HEW conducted a telegraphic survey among chief State school officers slightly over a year ago and found that only 237 school districts were reported as having exhausted their legal capacity, needing classrooms, and having no access to funds. No attempt was made to verify the reports from the 237 districts, most of which were small. But even at that, the survey does not suggest a critical situation among the country's 40,000 school districts.

In summary, Mr. President, it is undeniable that since the end of World War II between 600,000 and 700,000 classrooms have been built. The number constructed in the last 5 years between 1956 and 1960 was 336,800. The generally accepted projection of classroom needs throughout the 1960's is 600,000 or an annual average of 60,000 new classrooms. The average annual construction for the past 5 years without Federal aid was 67,360. There are absolutely no grounds for assuming that the rate of construction by State and local authorities will decline, for the very latest figures indicated that classsroom construction is not only proceeding without decline but that the rate is increasing.

At this moment in many localities there is a classroom shortage, and indeed in many communities students are using classrooms on a double-shift basis. This problem will continue to exist to an appreciable extent, for the migration of population from central cities to suburbs with the development of new urban communities adjacent to large industrial plants and the continual shift of people from one State to another and from one community to another will continuously create shortages in some areas and surpluses in others, not only of school classrooms but all public facilities.

The attempts to show a crisis in education in terms of classroom shortage fail miserably when viewed under the illumination provided by the facts. At most, the demand for classrooms is decreasing and is already well below a rate of construction for which the States and local communities have proven their adequacy to meet and surpass.

The other area to which the proponents of Federal aid to education point for a demonstration of crisis is that of teacher supply. The facts refute a teacher shortage as emphatically as they do the allegation that there is a classroom shortage which the States cannot meet. In 1953 the U.S. Office of Education placed the teacher shortage in the public schools at 72,000 and gradually raised the estimate until it reached 190,000 in 1959. The figures released in 1959 by the Office of Education were so severely criticized that the Office of Education in its 1960 report omitted all reference to teacher shortage. The figures which were released, however, on teacher supply indicate substantial improvement over 1959 in both supply and quality. The report of the Office of Education for the fall of 1960 states in part:

> The Office of Education survey showed 1,410,000 full-time and part-time classroom teachers this fall in the Nation's public schools, 861,000 at the elementary level, and 549,000 at the secondary level. This is a gain of 55,000 or 4 percent over the 1959 total.
>
> State departments of education reported in the survey that 67,200 elementary and 24,300 secondary full-time teachers have not met full certification standards for teaching. The total of 91,500 such teachers represents a decrease of 5,500 or 5.6 percent from the number in the fall of 1959.
>
> The proportion of teachers with less than standard certificates was reduced from 7.2 percent of the Nation's total teaching staff a year ago to 6.5 percent currently.

These figures are consistent with a long-time trend as shown by Department of Commerce statistics which show that over the past 30 years, while the population and enrollment in public education rose at the same rate of 45 percent, the number of employees in public education increased 140 percent. In addition, according to figures released by the National Education Association, the number of pupils in public schools increased 29 percent while the number of certified teachers increased 40 percent. In the same period the number of pupils per certified teacher declined 2.4 percent.

The teacher shortage figures arrived at by the U.S. Office of Education were derived largely by preimposing an aimed-for more rapid cut in class size, and by omitting from the calculations a large measure of the teacher supply consisting of those who returned to the schools as instructors after engaging in occupations in other fields.

The optimum pupil-teacher ratio is quite difficult to ascertain, but judging from the shifting goals published by the U.S. Office of Education and the publications of the National Education Association, both are apparently convinced that the ratio should be reduced, despite the fact that numerous research studies have been unable to show that children learn more in small classes than in large; and, in fact, some of the results of the studies seem to point in the opposite direction. Whatever the answer may be as to the pupil-teacher ratio, it is doubtful that there will ever be complete concurrence on the answer; but in the meantime the schools have been successful in cutting class sizes and will continue to do so.

The other major fallacy which underlies the figures on teacher shortage which the Office of Education produced is apparent from their own research statistics. In projecting the teacher shortage for any given year, the Office of Education based their estimates on the assumption that the new supply of teachers for the particular school year consisted of teachers who graduated from college in the preceding academic year, about 70 percent of whom, they estimated, would enter the teaching profession, and apparently ignored those returning to the profession who had graduated in earlier years. This resulted in a discrepancy which consistently appeared in the Office of Education's figures on teacher supply estimates and subsequent actual tabulations. For instance, in the year 1955–56, the advanced estimate of supply of teachers was 1,115,700, while the actual number subsequently tabulated was 1,188,400 leaving a discrepancy of 72,700 which the Office of Education had not anticipated would be available. Similarly, the discrepancy between the estimate and actual count in 1956–57, was 57,300; in 1957–58, the discrepancy was 58,400; and in 1958–59, the difference was 65,900.

The same discrepancy in Office of Education estimates can be shown in another way. During the 4 school years, 1955–56 through 1958–59, the Office of Education estimated the supply of new teachers at 365,400. These figures would indicate that there could be only a total increase in number of teachers of 35,800; yet, an actual tally of qualified teachers in the schools shows the increase of teachers in that period to be, not 35,800, but 390,100. Obviously, an average of about 65,000 teachers were returning to the teaching profession each year, after an absence from teaching or after having graduated in a year earlier than the preceding academic year. During this entire period, the number of teachers who did not meet minimum standards continued to decrease, which proves that the gap left between Office of Education estimates and actual counts was not filled by the employment of unqualified teachers.

Actually, the outlook for teacher supply is most encouraging, particularly in terms of the number of college students who are preparing to teach and the percentage of graduating classes preparing to teach. The number of bachelor and professional college degrees are projected to rise from 387,000 in 1958–59 to 703,000 in 1968–69. The trend in the past has been for the percentage of total college students preparing to teach to remain stable, following a rise from 21 percent, in 1958, to 31 percent, in 1955. The enormous increase in enrollment in primary and secondary schools which we have experienced during the 1950's will now begin to pay dividends in teacher supply during the 1960's. The enrollment increase in primary and secondary public schools was 46 percent between 1950 and 1960, requiring an annual increase in instructional staff in the public schools which averaged 60,000; but between 1960 and 1970, the increase in enrollment is projected at only 20 percent, which will require an annual increase in instructional staff in the public schools of only 25,000 between 1965 and 1969. During this period the output of college graduates will jump from an average of 336,000 over the last 5 years to 594,000 in the last half of the 1960's.

In 1956, the National Education Association predicted an end to teacher shortage by the early 1960's; and all factual information available indicates that this prediction will be proven accurate. Within a few years, there is a strong likelihood that we shall be faced with the problem of finding jobs for all who graduate from college and are prepared to teach.

It is quite widely alleged that teachers as a group are underpaid, and that their salaries should be substantially raised. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has suggested that an increase of 50 percent in teachers' salaries between 1959 and 1964 would be in order. Such an assumption is not borne out, as a general proposition, by

figures compiled and released by the National Education Association, which can hardly be accused of attempting to undermine the teachers' efforts for higher salaries and better recognition. These figures show that during the past 30 years, teachers' salaries on the average have increased 106 percent, while the earnings of all wage and salary workers increased 91 percent; and the earnings of civilian employees of the Federal Government, 73 percent. Studies demonstrate that generally men teachers earn less than men engaged as engineers, lawyers, judges, physicians, surgeons, dentists, architects, and in similar professional capacities. The same studies show that women teachers average higher earnings than other women college graduates or professional workers. The continuation of this circumstance may be attributable to the reluctance of local school authorities to grant salary increases on a percentage basis to all teachers to the extent that the school boards appreciate the work of the good teachers. At the same time, there is widespread opposition to payment of teachers on an individual merit system, in which opposition teacher organizations strongly concur.

Mr. President, there is no crisis in our educational system. The severest test of our ability to meet a peak demand occurred in the decade between 1950 and 1960, and was adequately dealt with by the State and local communities, without general Federal aid to education. As the figures released by the U.S. Office of Education and the National Education Association clearly show, the rate of classroom construction for the 1950's will more than adequately meet the demand if continued through the 1960's; and there is no reason whatever to presume that the States and local communities cannot at least continue the present rate, if required. Similarly, as the National Education Association predicted in 1956, the scarcity of teachers which was brought about by the fluctuation in school-age population during the war years and immediately thereafter is coming to an end; and the prospect for teacher supply in the next decade is most encouraging. Generally, teachers' salaries have during the past 30 years more than kept pace with the economy.

No one denies that there are localized classroom shortages, or that in specific instances and areas there are shortages of teachers, and that the shortages are attributable to an appreciable extent to inadequate salaries. These localized deficiencies make no case for the enactment of Federal aid to education. In some instances, they are due to an overemphasis on one phase of school needs, rather than a balanced approach. Another contributing factor is the constantly shifting population. In some few areas the deficiencies are due to financial inability of the local communities or States, or their unwillingness to sacrifice to the extent necessary to provide the desirable educational opportunities.

The number of such deficiencies are constantly decreasing, and the prospect for their elimination without general Federal aid to education is favorable. The job which has been accomplished in meeting the problems of increased enrollment during the last decade attests to the ample ability of the present system of school finance to overcome the remaining deficiencies in the 1960's, when the influx of students will be at a much smaller rate of acceleration.

Undoubtedly, the next decade will require substantially increased sums for education. Recently, the President indicated in his message that $26 billion annually is now being spent on education, and most estimates concur that $12 billion additional annually will be necessary by the end of the 1960's. Certainly, if the States and local communities are expected to finance the increase to as much as $37 billion by the end of the 1960's, it would not be too much to expect them to raise an additional $1 billion, which the proponents of Federal aid to education now propose that the National Government contribute annually to the effort. If this relatively small amount is spread across the general field of public education, it will do little to help communities which find themselves in extreme circumstances from a revenue-raising standpoint. Nor would Federal aid be justified on the basis of providing incentive for additional expenditures insofar as these areas of financial incapability are concerned, for it will take additional economic resources, through industrial development or similar means, rather than incentive, to alleviate these localized problems. As the statistics conclusively prove, our educational system generally is doing surprisingly well; and it exhibits the capacity and willingness to do better in the years of relatively less stress which lie ahead.

Despite the quite reliable statistics of past performance which prove to the contrary, there are those who persist in expounding the allegation that the States cannot raise enough money to meet their educational problems in the 1960's. For instance, former NEA President W. W. Eshelman testified in 1959:

> The inadequate fiscal capacity of State and local government, the unequal capacities of the States, and the urgent requirements of national defense are among the reasons for Federal support of schools.

That States and communities lack adequate fiscal capacity and cannot expand their revenues as effectively as the Federal Government has long been asserted. A comparison of current government finances with those 20, 30, or 50 years ago shows that Federal revenues have risen at a more rapid rate than State and local income. Federal receipts expanded faster than State and local ones during time of war In the intervening peace periods State and local tax collections invariably grew more steeply. During and after World War II it was said that State and local governments would not be able to increase their sources of income very much. We know now that in the postwar period State and local taxes tripled while Federal revenues barely doubled. So it is now being asserted that States and local communities have made such an effort that they have physically exhausted their local resources. Of course, if State and local revenues had not risen so steeply, it would have been accepted as evidence that those governments just could not do it.

Sometimes a transfer of fiscal responsibility to the Federal Government is being advocated because State and local tax systems are antiquated and inflexible, and because their receipts have not risen fast enough and cannot rise fast enough. At other times we are being told that States and communities have expanded their revenues so steeply in recent years that they are virtually at the end of their financial ropes. So Federal aid may be recommended because State and local taxes have been (a) rising too slowly, (b) rising too rapidly. This seems to be a "heads I win, tails you lose," proposition.

The conclusion is inevitable that States and communities are not incapable of materially expanding their revenues, but that the advocates of governmental centralization regard it as undesirable that they do so. The real issue is not whether the States can do the job, but whether it is desirable that they retain the major financial responsibility for domestic public services instead of shifting it to Washington.

Even evidence of inadequate State and local fiscal capacity would not justify Federal aid to specific State and local activities. It could be used to make a case for channeling to the States a share of Federal tax collections—nonearmarked and unconditionally. But how can the proposition of a superior Federal taxing power be upheld in view of the fact that Federal revenues fell short of expenditures 80 percent of the time in the past 30 years? Inequality of resources among the States might conceivably have justified Federal assistance to some of the low-income States several decades ago. But developments in the past 20 to 30 years, and particularly the narrowing of the range of economic capacity, make such proposals doubtful in the setting of the 1960's.

There are others who suffer from the illusion that for some reason Federal taxes are good taxes, and State and local taxes are bad taxes, although they rarely provide a standard for their qualitative differentiations. In his book, "Taxes for the Schools," Mr. Roger A. Freeman discusses the problem of goodness or badness of taxes based on the level of the government at which they are levied. Mr. Freeman states:

> A frequently levied charge against State and local taxes, and particularly against property taxes, is that they do not expand fast enough. Senator WAYNE MORSE stated: "The income to a community from the general property tax has not reflected the rising national wealth which has boosted costs and accompanied a growing school-age population." The NEA testified: "Indeed, the financial plight of our schools is compounded by its present firm anchorage to the property taxes." Senator THOMAS J. DODD declared: "Whereas the yield from Federal income taxes and corporation taxes climbs steadily as our economy grows, the yield from property taxes is more stable." Representative Stewart L. Udall wrote: "Indeed, most of the monetary troubles of public

schools today can be traced to the fact that revenue has been tied to the property tax." Edgar Fuller said: "There is an increasingly broad gap between national income on the one hand and the tax productivity of local real estate on the other."

Such statements sound as plausible as they are contrary to fact. Property taxes tripled in the postwar period while national income and the yield of nonproperty taxes (income, sales, et cetera), merely doubled. Property tax collections lagged during the depression of the 1930's—when income tax yields dropped even more sharply—and in wartime. But they displayed an amazing growth capacity outside of wars and depressions, and school revenues have been climbing even more rapidly than property-tax collections. Such statements as "We simply cannot get much more blood out of the property tax turnip" disregard that during the 1960's over $400 billion worth of new private construction will be completed and vast areas of low-value land converted to high-value use.

When it is pointed out that property taxes, and State and local tax receipts in general, have risen faster than Federal revenues, except during wartime, it is sometimes retorted that State and local taxes are of an undesirable type. They are alleged to rest upon the poor people while Federal taxes are paid by the wealthy. To many, of course, "soaking the rich" exerts an irresistible attraction. But against this may be held that 87 percent of the Federal personal income tax is derived from the basic 20 percent rate, and only 13 percent from the progressive rates, that much or most of the corporation tax is probably shifted to consumers in the form of higher prices, and that State and local taxes are largely proportional.

In a country such as the United States where most of the income does not go to a small group at the top but to the great majority "in the middle," the bulk of the tax burden inevitably falls on this center group. It is likely that only the small groups at the extreme ends of the income scale are materially affected by a shift in the type of taxation that is used. The proposition that a major share of the taxes can be loaded unto the well-to-do is a snare and a delusion. The broad middle class bears most of the tax burden no matter how it is levied.

The assumption of broader fiscal responsibility by the Federal Government has resulted in larger budget deficits and resulting inflation—which has been called the most cruel tax because it bears more heavily on those in the low than in the high brackets. The sober and widely disliked truth is that the burden of most taxpayers can be lightened only by adjustments on the expenditure side.

Mr. President, many other approaches through propaganda are utilized in an attempt to show a crisis in our educational system. An often-used device involves a comparison of the educational product of our own system with that of our Communist enemy, the Soviet Union.

For instance, I have seen in a number of publications the assertion that Russia, with approximately the same total number of students as the United States, is now training 40 times as many students in physics as the United States; 18 times as many students in chemistry as the United States; 15 times as many students in trigonometry as the United States; 8 times as many students in foreign languages as the United States; and 4 times as many students in mathematics as the United States. The assertion is almost always so phrased as to convey the impression that the Russian system is therefore superior, and further, that the reasons for the superiority lies in a greater financial effort being exerted by the Soviet Union in the field of education. In actuality, such is not the case. If indeed the Soviet Union is training such proportionately larger percentages of those students in the fields enumerated and to an equal degree of proficiency, their success lies in some other quarter than surpassing the United States in financial effort. Available information indicates that the United States is spending three times as much per capita on education as the Soviet Union. The UNESCO report, "The Financing of Education," indicates that the Soviet Union expenditures for education equals $34.17 per capita, compared with a $103.94 per capita expenditure in the United States in 1956. Even in percentages of gross national product devoted to the education process, the United States makes a greater effort in the field of education by spending 4.3 percent of the gross national product—and this is computed for the fiscal year 1955–56—as compared to 4.1 percent of the gross national product so employed in the Soviet Union. Even these figures are favorable to the Soviet Union, as is readily evident from a consideration of the activities which are included in the expenditures to which I have referred from the Soviet Union. The "educational-cultural activities" of the Soviet Union include subsidies to finance deficits of state-controlled political rallies and rural clubs; deficits of radio, press, and television systems of the country; state-owned theaters and national symphony orchestras, public libraries, orphanages, lecture series to popularize scientific and engineering knowledge and establishments, including money which directly supports military development programs; all of which are in addition to what we normally consider the activities included in the educational field. Whatever advantage which may exist, if any, in the Soviet educational system, clearly does not stem from a superior financial investment.

I do not mean to imply that our educational system in the United States is beyond improvement, particularly from a qualitative standpoint. As a matter of fact, a study of the current educational system in the United States reveals certain deficiencies which bear no relation whatever to lack of funds. The testimony before the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee suggests the conclusion that leadership in ideas, rather than money, would best serve to improve the system for national defense needs. One of the deficiencies to which I refer is the use of so-called "progressive" education practices and concepts.

The most insidious of these concepts is that which assumes that since all men are created equal, they, therefore, have equal and identical ability. We must first recognize that we can—and at the State and local level—provide equality of opportunity for formal education. We cannot, however, provide or guarantee an equality of ability or knowledge through education; for the Creator, in His great wisdom, made no two men alike, either physically or mentally. We must, therefore, return to a recognition of individuality in the application of the educational process, rather than continue to attempt to use a common mold for all students.

Another fallacious and destructive practice identified with progressive education is that of stressing methodology at the expense of substance. This, and not the lack of funds, is, in my opinion, primarily responsible for the lack of capable teachers and professional educators. I do not believe it is possible for any person, regardless of how well versed in methods of teaching, to ignite in a student the spark of interest which is vital to true education, unless that person has an intimate knowledge of, and interest in, the substantive subject matter he seeks to teach.

Progressive education ignores the fact that it is primarily the obligation of the family, the church, and the community to teach, by example and advocacy, the art of human relations. It is the duty of the educator to train the minds of the students in order that they may reason to a sound and logical conclusion by the recognition and assimilation of factual knowledge.

Discipline is the castoff of progressive education. No amount of money can make up for the failure to teach discipline, which must be applied from without in formative years in order that it may be applied from within in mature years.

Progressive education cannot be eliminated by funds, whether from the Federal, State, or local level. National leadership, not with money but in ideas, by stressing the parental, local, and State shortcomings and responsibilities, could do much toward the solution of this problem, which is national in scope, but which is capable of solution at the local level only.

In the long run, we as legislators, must share with other national leaders the blame for a major part of our educational inadequacies. Rather than having encouraged ambition, initiative, and inventiveness, we have, by the enactment of welfare legislation and programs, encouraged indolence among the citizens of this country. So long as free enterprise was nurtured and encouraged and not unduly limited by a monstrous Federal Government, our country, including the educational system, remained strong and competitive. Free enterprise and free competition insure that one may gain in return for industry and initiative, both the respect of his fellowman and financial independence. Attempts to make the Federal Government be all things to all men, on the other hand, insure the complete mental inertia which inevitably results from the destruction of the natural rewards of industry and initiative.

Mr. President, quite obviously deficiencies as exist in our educational system are not primarily attributable to lack of financial support. Admittedly, educational efforts in the country will require substantially greater amounts of money in the coming decade; but it is significant to me that, even were the general

Federal aid to education proposals before us enacted, they would be a far cry from a solution to the financial needs of the school. At best, the proposed program would provide 3 or 4 percent of the expenditures for education which will be required during the 1960's. When this relatively small participation is viewed in terms of its potential cost, the Federal aid to education proposals are utterly foolhardy; and by cost I do not mean in terms of dollars or debt, but in cost of the local and community control of the public school programs.

The potential for shifting control from local communities which lies in Federal aid to education proposals is really dual in character. The first is less direct, and is characterized by a gradual loss of interest and initiative at the local level as financing of a particular activity is shifted to government further and further away from the individual citizen. It is the invariable consequence of every further centralization of government.

Woodrow Wilson, while still a professor, summarized this situation in the following words:

> There can, I suppose, be little doubt that it is due to the moral influences of this policy that the States are now turning to the common Government for aid in such things as education. Expecting to be helped, they will not help themselves. Certain it is that there is more than one State which, though abundantly able to pay for an educational system of the greatest efficiency, fails to do so, and contents itself with imperfect temporary makeshifts because there are immense surpluses every year in the national Treasury which, rumor and unauthorized promises say, may be distributed among the States in aid of education. If the Federal Government were more careful to keep apart from every strictly local scheme of improvement, this culpable and demoralizing policy could scarcely live. States would cease to wish, because they would cease to hope, to be stipendiaries of the Union, and would address themselves with diligence to their proper duties, with much more benefit to themselves and to the Federal system.

Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, of Washington stated in 1955 that—

> Instead of squarely facing our responsibility of paying for the things we want, we seem to be getting into a free-for-all scramble to evade the painful duty, in the hope that the squeeze may be put on somebody else. Too many still believe that we can eat our cake and have it too. This unhealthy trend is being fanned by shrewd promoters who claim that they have found the secret for which the alchemists had been seeking in vain, that they can get for us something for nothing—not by making gold but by the device of so-called Federal grants-in-aid. To the uncritical onlooker they seemed to prove their point that we can hitch on to a rainbow and ride to the sky. The most dangerous trend—harmful not only to the States but to our whole system of free government—has been this tendency to evade individual and collective responsibility. It corrupts the civic morale, and erodes the feeling of personal accountability among public officials.
>
> The demonstration of how to get the things we want in life—but which we are unwilling to pay for—by putting pressure upon our public officials, has had a poisonous influence upon the minds of many millions who became used to the idea that it was better to look for a gimmick than to labor in the sweat of one's brow. The insidious effect of a policy of always trying to get something for nothing, of searching for a way of letting somebody else get stuck for the check or for loading the cost on to a distant future may be hard to eradicate.

In the field of education, there is already in process a struggle for control of the educational system between the professional educators and the local citizens. The local citizens have maintained control primarily through the pursestrings in the hands of school boards and legislatures. If the purse-string is removed from the hands of the school boards, the lay public will thereby lose control of the schools. The matter is well summed up by Mr. Roger Freeman in his testimony before the committee:

> After all, professional administrators in the U.S. Office of Education, in State departments of education, and in local school systems belong to one close-knit, battle-hardened, national fraternity whose members have stood shoulder to shoulder in upholding each other against the "barbarians," and in defending the educational theories which have dominated the scene for over a generation. Thus, the U.S. Office of Education might find ready acceptance for its directives (labeled "guidelines") and policies among local school administrators.
>
> Some of these policies would not necessarily be in keeping with the beliefs or wishes of the lay public of what the schools should be doing and how. That is where the reinforced cooperation among the professionals at all levels would show its effectiveness in overcoming "backwoods" resistance. The influence of parents, communities, and legislatures is likely to wane if an increasing share of the funds does not depend upon their approval and is derived through "Federal aid without Federal control." Boards of education for many years have tended to concern themselves mostly with approving tax rates and bond issues and selling them to the public than with the setting of educational policies. They largely turned into ratifiers of professional proposals. Boards which tried to assert themselves against their superintendents in regard to educational policy sometimes found themselves at the receiving end of a nationally organized investigation.
>
> An editorial in "The Nation's Schools" (June 1960) referred to "the indefinable sense of uneasiness" with which some school administrators view the growing strength of school board organizations and questioned whether "the school board is to be secretly appraised as a group to be controlled or stymied." Among the fears of school administrators: "The possibility that school boards as organized groups may embark upon programs to influence school legislation in direct conflict with the goals of professional groups." Another report stated that "the deepening concern board members show for their responsibilities gives rise to a major problem. One aspect of this is the alarm with which professional educators view 'amateur' direction of school policy." A keen observer of the educational scene threatened that "local boards are in danger of voting themselves out of power, if they refuse to accept guidance from those who will increasingly map out national goals and standards."
>
> The purse strings have been the main instrument by which communities and boards of education have tried to make their influence upon school policies felt. Federal aid would make it less necessary for educational administrators to bow so low to legislators, boards, and to the lay public; it would give them more of the independence they have so long sought.
>
> The fight over Federal aid to education has been commonly viewed as a battle over money for the schools. It is conceivable that the real issue is not just money. The crucial issue may well be a power struggle over the control of the schools between the organized profession and the lay public. Federal funds would strengthen the hand of the educational bureaucracy and weaken the veto power of the communities.

Mr. Freeman makes his case well. Just as war is too vital to be left to the generals, education is too vital to be left to the professional educators.

The more direct control of education will come at the hands of National Government officials and—as is inevitably the case—will be direct and heavy-handed. In this control, lies the seed of dictatorship.

It is impossible to escape the established truth that he who pays the fiddler calls the tune. Even in programs in which the question of control by the National Government has not been raised, we find most impressive examples. The interstate highway program was undoubtedly drafted to accomplish the exclusion of control from the grantor of funds. A recent press report, however, indicated that the State of Oregon was compelled to change the color of the centerlines of its highways from yellow to white in order to be in compliance with this no-control program. The color of a highway centerline may be considered by many as a small matter, but viewed from another light, it is indicative of the extensiveness of the control which inevitably accompanies or follows any grant by the Federal Government.

Even the most superficial perception must acknowledge that control of the purse necessarily includes power over all dependent on the contents of the purse. Reliance on benevolence is no substitute for autonomy. The indivisible power of control which accompanies any subsidy was recognized and clearly enunciated by the Supreme Court in 1942 in the case of *Wickard* v. *Filburn* (317 U.S. 111), in which the Court stated:

> It is hardly lack of due process for government to regulate that which it subsidizes.

Indeed, the conscientious performance of duty by an officeholder requires no less than to insure to the best of his ability that the taxpayers' funds, once appropriated, are wisely utilized.

It has long been recognized that control would accompany grants in the field of education to as great if not greater degree than in other fields. In 1934, John W. Tigert, a former Commissioner of Education wrote—

> Reason and experience both indicate that Federal money cannot be expended wisely and efficiently except by exercising Federal control and supervision; even then there is considerable waste * * *. If we embark upon a program of turning over Federal money to schools without any strings attached, it is only a question of time until the waste, extravagance, and misuse of these funds will result in a reaction or a change. The alternative is Federal control.

In the Elementary School Journal in May 1939 Robert Murray Haig, of Columbia University, wrote:

> The demand for increased Federal participation in the support of education is accompanied by the specification that there shall be no Federal control of educational policy. At once the interesting question arises: Can any jurisdiction take responsibility for levying the taxes for any particular purpose without sooner or later being forced to take the responsibility for defending that expenditure and without being asked to answer taxpayers that the money is being spent in a proper manner * * *. No mere audit will satisfy the demand. Sooner or later the jurisdiction which imposes the taxes will exercise real control.

In 1959, James Bryant Conant, in his book, "The Child, the Parent, and the State," gave this warning on the control that would accompany Federal aid to education:

> To imagine that recurring appropriations of this magnitude can be made without careful budgeting on the part of the administration seems to me to be the equivalent of imagining completely irresponsible government. Careful budgeting will mean, in turn, a strong executive agency which must have access to a mass of factual information about the educational situation in every State * * *. The Educational Committees of the House and Senate will have every reason to examine into details of curricula and school organization, much as committees of the State legislatures now do from time to time. Certainly, a new chapter in American public education will have opened.

As I mentioned earlier, the National Government has twice enacted aid to education bills ostensibly for the purpose of improving the national defense. These two bills are specific proof that there can be no grants-in-aid to education without control by the National Government.

In 1917, the Congress passed the Smith-Hughes Act. Although it did not involve a program of grants to general education, it did authorize appropriations for grants to the specific field of vocational education. It is worthy of note that much of the impetus enabling the passage of the bill stemmed from the national peril created by the First World War. Even with regard to this program of grants to a limited area in the field of education, the question of Federal usurpation of the exclusive responsibility and obligation reserved to the States in the field of education was raised in the debate. Then, as now, the proponents of the program sincerely disclaimed any intention or purpose to inject Federal regulation or control into the operation of vocational educational programs which they sought to assist.

For instance, Senator Page, on July 24, 1916, denied such intention, and I quote from volume 53 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 11465:

> The bill does not seek to take from the States the great burden of the maintenance of schools. It does not seek to deprive the States of the privilege of proceeding in matters of education in their own way. Nothing has been more carefully safeguarded in this bill than the autonomy of the States in the matter of schools.

Mr. President, those were unquestionably sincere words, well phrased and aptly sufficient as words can be to allay the fears of those who divined the specter of Federal control lurking behind the Smith-Hughes Act. Subsequent events have refuted the words of Senator Page and confirmed the worst fears of those who saw in the well-meaning but illusory language of the Smith-Hughes Act the strong arm of centralized authority. There is now in existence a 108-page booklet of regulations propounded by the National Government with regard to the program established by the Smith-Hughes Act. That regulation is synonymous with control is attested to by no less authority on the use of verbiage than Mr. Webster himself. This precedent alone is more cogent than the assurances to the contrary of the proponents of the bill being considered. Their words bear a familiar ring of similarity to those successfully spoken by Senator Page in 1916.

The method by which control of the National Government was implemented in connection with this program was pinpointed by President Roosevelt's Advisory Committee on Education in 1938. The Committee said:

> Much of the very unwise existing Federal control over vocational education results from the fact that Federal officials have assumed the duty of determining in detail what types of education shall be considered vocational.

In this instance, under the guise of determining what should be considered "vocational," the administering officials of the National Government bureaucracy manage to completely control the curriculum content.

The staff of the Advisory Committee of 1938 described the growth of control very aptly, in these words:

> Tentative suggestions have ultimately become rules, and rules have been given the effect of the organic act itself. The specificity of details required in State plans has increased. The staff of Federal supervisors has expanded. There has been developed in the States the habit of looking more and more to the Federal officials for guidance and direction in the development of State programs.

I would remind the Senate that the program established under the Smith-Hughes Act was limited in scope to vocational subjects and involved the relatively small financial effort of about $40 million. If bureaucrats in Washington could not resist the temptation to exercise rigid control over this program, how can they be expected to resist the temptation to control such a broad and general program involving billions of dollars as that now proposed for passage.

Mr. President, just as assurances in debate from proponents of Federal aid to education that no control will be exercised by the National Government when the bill is passed are proved naive and meaningless by the example of the Smith-Hughes Act, the inclusion of language to prohibit control in the bill itself is proved just as useless and ineffective by the example of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. With regard to that measure, there were both assurances in the committee report and prohibitions of control written into the bill itself. This appeared in the report at page 5:

> The committee recognizes that the primary responsibility for a sound American educational system in the future as in the past rests with the States, the local communities, the parents, and the colleges and universities. To this end, the reported bill specifically and categorically provides that no Federal officer shall "exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution."

Mr. President, the specific provision prohibiting control which was included in the National Defense Education Act of 1958 might just as well have been left out for all the effect it had. By the very terms of the act, it was contradictory and merely served as an attempt to camouflage the very real and detailed control of education inherent in the act. Whether or not control by the National Government operates through this program is no longer a matter about which we have to rely on opinion, for the act has been in operation and we have the evidence in the form of descriptions of practices and specific events which occurred in its implementation. One of the schools which chose to participate in the programs established by the National Defense Education Act was George Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tenn. Dr. Claude J. Bartlett, assistant professor of psychology at Peabody College, had this to say about the operation of the act:

> In 1958 the Congress of this country passed the National Defense Education Act. This was an emergency act designed to build up our educational system in this country. This act has been an outstanding example of what Federal aid to education can lead to. I was directly involved in two guidance and counseling institutes (one as director) supported under title V of this act and my experiences provide some facts which offer evidence to answer the crucial question to Federal aid and control. The following incidents should help point out the consequences that can result from Federal aid to education.
>
> (a) Lowering of academic standards: In our institute last year the standards for admission of students were lowered as a result of pressure from the Federal Government. We could not find as many qualified students who were free to attend the institute as we had agreed to train in our contract with the U.S. Office of Education. The result was the acceptance of many persons into the area of guidance who were of questionable ability. This created many administrative and instructional problems with the institute, leading to less adequate training for the qualified students.
>
> (b) Stagnation of curriculum and administration: The rigidity of the Federal Government policies would not allow us the freedom to make changes in the curriculum and administration in order to improve the quality of the institute. Since the plan of operation for our second institute had to be submitted before the completion of our first institute, recommendations for change as a result of our experience were not included in our plan of operation. The U.S. Office of Education refused to permit changes in the plan of operation even though the changes did not affect the cost of the institute as

specified in the contract. Thus, the Federal Government dictated curriculum and administration of the institute as well as financial arrangements.

(c) Interference in administration of college: The policies of the Federal Government interfered with freedom of the college to appoint personnel to the staff of the institute which were in the best interests of the total operation of the college. I was appointed to direct the institute in order to permit last year's director adequate time to perform his duties as director of the child study center, a special operation of the college for many years. This person was appointed as acting director when the contract was signed, but it never was the college's intention that he would direct this year's institute, since this would have created a less efficient operation of a well-established agency of the college and community. The Federal Government refused to allow the change in directorship under the terms of the contract; thus interfering with the operation of the college.

(d) Inconsistency of the bureaucratic mind: The U.S. Office of Education stipulated that all of our students for our second institute be recruited before authorization to hold the institute had even been completed. This appears to be an outstanding example of the inconsistencies that can occur under a Federal bureaucracy.

(e) Fear of Federal power: As a result of the difficulties encountered, the college chose to cancel the contract for the institute rather than submit to the whims of a Federal bureau. The possibility of initiating action which might lead to a reduction of Federal intervention in academic matters was discussed. Although the consensus was that the action of the U.S. Office of Education was not wise, there was a great deal of reservation about taking action which might lead to less intervention by the Federal Government in academic matters. The reason for the reservation was a fear of reprisal by the Federal Government, if in the future additional funds were sought. Although all of the above incidents are examples of how Federal aid leads to Federal control of education, this last incident appears to be the key in answering the question of aid leading to control. Federal power leads to fear of that power which leads to more power. Is this a never-ending chain of events, or is there still time to stop it?

Mr. President, I would remind the Senate that Dr. Bartlett is referring to an act which contains a section entitled "Federal Control of Education Prohibited." This is section 102 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and reads as follows:

Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system.

With this pertinent example before us, how can anyone put any faith in such a patently ineffective prohibition against control, even when written into the bill? It is noteworthy that the corresponding section of S. 1021 does not purport to prohibit control by the Federal Government, for it is entitled "Assurances Against Federal Interference in Schools." I refer to section 103 of the bill, which reads as follows:

In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

This language is just as meaningless, if not more so, than section 102 of the National Defense Education Act has proved. The only insurance—and it is insurance, not assurance, that provides safety from despicable Federal control—the only insurance against Federal control is to reject categorically all proposals for Federal aid to education.

Mr. President, just as was the case with the National Defense Education Act, the so-called "no control" sections are contradictory to other provisions which set forth the programs established by the bill. S. 1021 actually contains a penalty provision for those States which do not comply with what the Congress determines to be the proper level of financial expenditures which the States and local communities should maintain in the educational field in the coming years. There is on page 5 of the committee report a paragraph in which the committee explains how the operation of the bill will require the States to increase their expenditures for education to meet minimums established in the bill on penalty of the funds authorized by this act being withheld. The report reads as follows:

The bill is designed to assure that support for public school financing from State and local sources be maintained and, if below average, improved. Provision is made for the reduction, in the second and third fiscal years, of the allotment of any State (1) whose effort in such year is below its effort in the 3 preceding years or (2) whose effort in such year fails to improve, i.e., whose effort is below its effort in the 3 preceding years plus the average rate increase in the national effort from 1956 through 1961. Such reductions may not exceed one-third of the State's allotment; and no reduction is provided on account of failure to improve effort in any year for any State whose effort exceeds the national effort for such year or whose expenditure per public school pupil for such year was 110 percent or more of the national expenditure per pupil for such year.

Mr. President, in the absence of this Federal-aid-to-education program, the people of each State have the power to determine the level of financial expenditures for education in the public schools. The proposal before us would establish a penalty of withheld funds which are collected from the people of the States through taxes, unless the people surrender their power to determine the level of expenditures by the States and local communities raised by taxes and spent by State and local officials. This, Mr. President, is control.

By no means, however, is it the only type of control written specifically into this bill. Section 112 of S. 1021 subjects any construction of school facilities utilizing any proportion of funds under this act to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act, and gives to the Secretary of Labor the power to set wages on such construction projects. Not only is this control, but it is control which, as proven by previous experience under the Davis-Bacon Act, will tremendously increase the costs of construction of school facilities to the extent that increased costs incurred thereby may well equal or surpass the Federal funds which are authorized to be disbursed under this act for such construction.

These projects are but samples of the inherent control features written into the bill. Other forms of control, such as the specification of curriculum content, the approval of textbooks, and the qualifications of teachers, will inevitably follow through the regulatory powers granted the Commissioner of Education.

Let us make no mistake about the ultimate purpose of this proposal, for it is well designed to provide the tool of implementation of a longstanding advocacy and lobbying for the establishment of Florida standards for education.

The ultimate goal of proponents of Federal aid to education was stated unequivocally in an editorial in the school administrators' journal, "Overview," in November 1960:

The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education * * * the long held views that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policy should be made by local units of government will have to go * * * the national welfare demands a national system of education.

This sentiment for a national system of education, rather than that now practiced, which is controlled by local communities and the States, is far more widely held than is generally recognized. For instance, the Hovde Committee on Education expressed this purpose in a more oblique manner; but the words of the committee reveal an identical purpose. The Hovde committee said:

The task force committee concludes that first priority should be given to a vigorous program to lift the schools to a new level of excellence.

While we all desire excellence in our educational system, such excellence cannot be acquired from the National Government; and even were the National Government to have the power to obtain a higher degree of achievement in an educational system, centralized control is too dangerous and too high a price to pay for such improvement.

Mr. President, the ultimate result of a course based on Federal aid to education is the conversion of free men and free minds to robots which serve the State rather than individuals. In a publication entitled "Education in the U.S.S.R." released in 1957 by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there appears a very concise and accurate statement of the condition to which our educational system will be reduced if we follow the path of Federal aid to education:

Soviet policy precisely enumerates the function of education in the U.S.S.R.: to serve the needs of the state. The state is preeminent. To its full development every person is expected to contribute his best efforts as his primary obligation. The growth and development of his own individuality are of secondary importance.

Mr. President, the enactment of Federal aid to education will authorize the

paving of a four-lane expressway to slavery for the American people.

There can be no question but that control will accompany any grants from the National Government to public education. Considering the overall effects of the bill, one cannot escape the conclusion that the bill provides for a minimum of additional school facilities—and, indeed, possibly a decrease in school facilities—while insuring a maximum damage through Federal control. A good illustration lies in the field of classroom construction.

The Office of Education reports classroom shortages by State, and this year reports a shortage of 142,100 classrooms throughout the country. According to the proponents of this measure, one of the principal purposes, if not the principal purpose, of this bill is to alleviate this classroom shortage. However, there is serious doubt how much, if anything, the Federal funds proposed to be authorized by S. 1021 will contribute to the elimination of whatever classroom shortage actually exists. There are different types of classrooms, and across the broad expanse of the United States the cost of a classroom varies substantially.

New York City reports that its recently completed elementary school buildings were constructed at an average cost of $1,966 per pupil. The present average size classroom in New York City is 30 pupils per room, which makes the cost of a classroom in New York City $58,980.

In Los Angeles, Calif., the average cost of elementary schools is $978.16 per pupil, and at the Los Angeles average classroom size of 35 pupils, this averages $34,236 per classroom.

In Georgia the State school building authority, which is engaged in one of the largest school-construction programs in the country, reports the average classroom cost at $13,000.

It is impossible to determine, therefore, Mr. President, what 142,100 classrooms will cost, for under the public school system now administered and financed by the States and local communities, costs vary tremendously, as is shown by the spread between the $58,980 for a classroom in New York and the $13,000 for a classroom in Georgia. There is a difference of 450 percent.

Mr. President, some of the cost differences are attributable to higher labor costs. It is reported that wage scales of the major building trade unions are 10 to 34 percent higher in New York City than in Atlanta, Ga. It is significant that almost invariably the costs of classroom construction are proportionate, at least to a major extent, to per capita income.

Upon the passage of this bill, Mr. President, a wage rate for the construction of schools which utilizes any portion of Federal funds appropriated under this bill will be set by the Secretary of Labor, by virtue of the fact that the bill is subject to the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act. Experience with the wage levels established by the Secretary of Labor under the Davis-Bacon and Walsh-Healey Acts leaves no room for doubt that the differentials in labor costs will be substantially narrowed, for the wage scales will be raised most in those States which now have the lowest classroom costs. No State will be immune from increased costs because of this provision, however, for experience has proved that under the Davis-Bacon Act maximum wages, rather than average wages, are adopted.

Neither labor costs, nor material costs, nor even climatical differences, account in whole for the tremendous variation in classroom costs across the country. The major factors are the extent to which specialized facilities and auxiliary classrooms are used, how spacious and elaborate they are, how well they are equipped, how economically they are designed, and what materials are used. These differences, Mr. President, upon the passage of this bill, are doomed to extinction. Under the provisions of the bill as it is now written, the States would have to submit to the Commissioner of Education a plan for approval. While there is an appeal to the courts from the disapproval of the Commissioner of Education of such plans, only the most naive could fail to recognize the fact that acquiescence in the preference of the Commissioner of Education on classroom design will be an easier course—and, in fact, the most often adopted course. This would be a more expedient course than the alternative of litigating the differences of classroom design, with all the attendant costs and delay.

The result will be that from Maine to Florida, and from Maryland to California, there will be a classroom design so that the conformity of appearance which marked the once familiar little red schoolhouse will once more be replaced by a school which conforms in design to all others. At least a child whose family moves from one coast to the other will feel at home in the new school, because it will be identical to the one he left.

The tragedy is that fewer classrooms by far can be built under such a system, even with tremendous Federal grants, than could be built with State and local financing and State and local control, as under the present system.

Anyone familiar with school construction, or, for that matter, with any type of public building construction, knows from experience that the higher the level of the Government exercising control of the construction, the higher will be the costs.

In the April 1956 issue of "Woman's Day," there appeared an article entitled "The Schoolhouse Fight," which described a circumstance similar to incidents which have occurred time and time again across the length and breadth of the country. The article describes how the school officials of Darien, Conn., rejected the plans for an elementary school prepared by the State which would have cost $1,615 per pupil, slightly more than the Connecticut average of $1,519 per pupil. The school was redesigned by the local school officials and constructed at a cost of $986 per pupil. According to the article, school officials, teachers, the community, and the children love the new school.

There can be no question but that the Federal-aid-to-education proposal before us, if passed, will result in control by the National Government of school design and thereby, with the assistance of the Secretary of Labor acting under the authority of the Davis-Bacon Act, school classroom costs will also be controlled; and, as with everything else with National Government controls, the costs will be controlled upward. Whatever funds trickle down from the passage of the act to the local level for school construction will in all probability be more than offset by the loss of purchasing power for classrooms of State and local money.

Mr. President, I realize that some may deny that the Federal Government will specify the classroom and school building design all across the country.

Even conceding, however, to such naive presumptions, that this control will not be immediately evident, can anyone seriously believe that after defects appear in the construction of school buildings in which Federal funds were used and complaints are raised about the quality of the resulting schools and special feature magazine articles play up those cases in which lower cost construction provides less area per pupil in the classroom—and a few cases of leaky roofs—that the National Government will refrain from stepping in and "protecting" tax funds and taxpayers by setting minimum standards of construction for all schools in which Federal funds play a part in financing? It will take only one juicy scandal to provide the pretext for the most sanctimonious Federal official to justify the immediate and forceful Federal control to prevent such future occurrences. As was stated by one able Member of this body concerning the National Defense Education Act in his minority report on the bill:

> If the camel once gets his nose in the tent, his body will soon follow.

The type of control which takes the form of dictating classroom and school design, and the damage therefrom in the form of decreased purchasing power for tax dollars appropriated for school construction—as bad as they are—are the least dangerous of the types of control which will accompany Federal aid to education, for this damage will but retard material facilities. Unfortunately, the other facets of the control to be exercised by the National Government upon passage of this act will damage a far more priceless heritage of America—the minds and patterns of thought of the youth of the country.

Mr. President, S. 1021 is so designed as to reflect some purpose other than the assistance of educational efforts, for it is by no means based on need of financial support. This can be amply illustrated by the amount of funds which would be allocated to the various States under the formula incorporated in the bill. For instance, the Office of Education reports that New York State has a net classroom need of about 10,200, and under the formula incorporated in the bill New York would receive in the first year of the bill's operation

$40,652,380. Texas is reported as needing a net of 809 classrooms, but during the first year's operation of the bill would receive $58,630,833. Thus, Texas would receive $21.84 per pupil while New York would receive $10.90 per pupil, although New York is reported as having the much greater need. Indiana, which has kept abreast of classroom construction and which now has scheduled for construction with State and local funds all the classrooms it will need, will receive $22,781,255 in the first year despite the fact that not only does Indiana not have a need for funds for additional classrooms, but also the average teacher's salary is $370 above the national average. It is obvious from a study of the formula for the allocation of funds incorporated in the bill that those States which are having the most difficulty in meeting the needs which arise from rapidly increasing enrollments are those very popular States which will pay the most and receive the least under this program. As mentioned before, the formula in no way considers either the widely varying costs of construction of classrooms or the index of cost of living, which has a material bearing on the sufficiency of teachers' salaries.

Mr. President, it should be quite clear that the program embodied in S. 1021 is not designed to meet the criterion of need; on the contrary, it proposes an arbitrary allotment of Federal funds among the States which could well encumber the efforts of States and localities to provide educational opportunity for their citizens. It seems incomprehensible that we in the Congress would knowingly ignore the spirit and the words of the Constitution and endanger the local control of schools to obtain what, at most, will be a very dubious addition to financial support of public education.

The real issue has been revealed during the debate and votes on amendments here in the Senate. We have repeatedly heard the argument that the States and local communities lacked the financial ability to provide adequate educational opportunities, but that the National Government does have the financial means to do the job. This argument ignores the fact that tax revenue of all levels of government comes from the same source—the taxpayer—and what the National Government gives it must first take. The ability of local communities and States to finance public services, including educational services, cannot be enhanced by spending of the National Government, for the funds spent must be collected from those local communities and States. The one largest encumbrance on the revenue raising ability of the local levels of government is the drain of funds from the community by taxes of the National Government. The Senate has had the opportunity to decrease the weight of that encumbrance, and indeed, to assist the States and local school districts in securing new revenues, by giving credits for local educational tax payments or by returning to the States a percentage of revenue extracted by the National Government, but it has rejected such opportunities. What can underlie the preference for Federal spending which will further curtail the revenue raising capabilities of those who now finance our educational system? The answer lies in the fact that the bill will render States and localities more dependent on the Central Government, and additional power will be centralized in Washington thereby.

Mr. President, passage of a program of general Federal aid to education would be tantamount to a vote of no confidence, both in the individuals in American society and in the concept of government under which we have progressed so magnificently in a few short centuries.

Mr. President, my vote on the question of final passage of this Federal aid to education bill shall be affirmative—for local self-government and individual liberty—and against the bill.

SPACE BONDS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KEATING. Before proceeding, I wish to comment on the President's message today.

The President's message rings like an alarm clock to awaken the Nation to urgent national needs in every field; from manpower deployment to civil defense; from disarmament to radio programs for southeast Asia; from undercover intelligence activities to outer space.

Some of these programs are clearly more urgent than others. Nearly all of them call for spending more money for every project under the sun. I certainly do not agree with the implication that the Congress should refrain from exercising its own independent judgment of the Nation's needs where changes in the budget, whether increases or decreases, may be involved. For example, both Committees on the Armed Services and both Houses of Congress have approved an additional $525 million for long-range bombers for SAC. I think this increase was well justified. Congress would be abrogating its responsibility if it did not study all these budgetary requests, old and new, with great care.

The President has also decided that within this decade America should attempt to land a man on the moon and bring him back. It is an exciting project that all Americans will have to support. The cost will be high, more than $1 billion a year for the next 5 years, more than $200 per man, woman, and child in the United States, but I am sure the country is ready to make the sacrifices that will be necessary.

Several weeks ago I proposed that the Secretary of the Treasury look into the possibility of issuing space bonds to help finance the exceedingly great cost of our country's ambitious space exploration program. Since I made the proposal I have received a great deal of support and encouragement from many different quarters. Only yesterday, Harold A. Timken, Jr., president of the National Rocket Club, launched a similar program, independently conceived, but coordinated with my proposals for series S savings bonds. These bonds could be offered on terms very similar to the present series E bonds at a nominal rate of interest. The National Rocket Club has suggested that savings stamps bearing the picture of astronaut Alan Shepard could also be made available to stimulate interest and support for scientific space research throughout the country.

Mr. President, I believe that this type of bond offering for the specific purpose of space exploration could play a very important role at this crucial stage in our Nation's space efforts.

What better way to assist in the financing of this program than through space bonds? They would represent the voluntary contribution of patriotic men, women, and children who are ready and willing to sacrifice for their country but who have not yet had an opportunity to do so directly.

I would not, of course, expect that space bonds would in any way replace the traditional appropriation procedures whereby the congressional committees study the NASA and Defense Department budgets before appropriating the necessary funds. The executive agencies involved would still work out their spending programs in coordination with the Congress, but a part, if not all, of the necessary funds could come directly from the sale of series S space bonds.

Mr. President, I have already taken up this question with the Secretary of the Treasury. This week I received a response from Mr. Joseph W. Barr, assistant to the Secretary, which was frankly very disappointing to me. Mr. Barr said in effect that space bonds were impractical because of the tremendous amount of accounting which would be required in their sale. Mr. President, I cannot believe that if the United States of America is capable of sending a man to the moon, it is not capable of devising a simple and reasonable accounting system to cover this project. It is just this kind of redtape and bureaucracy that has slowed up our space program in the past. Rarely have I received such an unimaginative response to a seriously advanced and widely supported proposal.

It is because of my firm conviction in the value and effectiveness of a U.S. space bond program that I seriously urge the Secretary of the Treasury to give personal consideration to this project. I believe it would have strong nationwide support and spur our scientists and astronauts to even greater achievement.

I hope we will not let accounting procedures keep us from reaching the moon. Some red ink may have to be used, but let it be American red ink, not Communist red, that first writes on the moon.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement made by Harold A. Timken, Jr., president of the National Rocket Club, and the letter sent by Mr. Barr,

assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HAROLD A. TIMKEN, JR., PRESIDENT, THE NATIONAL ROCKET CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 24, 1961

The United States has made its first significant step into the manned exploration of space. As magnificent an accomplishment as it was, it stands only as a small stride when compared to the efforts which must lie ahead. A race to send the first man to the moon—although not yet designated as a "race"—is beginning. It would perhaps be advisable to state that it is underway, for certainly the Soviet has already started. We enter that race a sizable step behind.

President Kennedy has asked for more money for space programs, singling out manned space flight, ultimately leading to lunar exporation. Top space experts, including Maj. Gen. John B. Medaris, U.S. Army (retired), under whose guidance America launched its first satellite, have said that we still have a chance to be first on the moon. Dr. James A. Van Allen, of the University of Iowa, calls the idea perfectly feasible technically.

The advantages to the first nation to safely place a manned space vehicle on the lunar surface are obvious. We most certainly should try and try to be first. The dollar cost of such an effort is estimated to $40 billion. This represents an outlay of $225 apiece from each man, woman, and child in this country. This, in contrast to the estimated expenditure of $2.25 each on a national per capita basis for Alan B. Shepard's 15-minute ballistic, suborbital space flight.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy called on the citizens of this Nation to ask what they, as individuals, could do for their country. We believe that we have one answer. We propose individual support of the U.S. space program by the men, women, and children of the United States. This support can range from the pennies of children to thousands of dollars.

As president of the National Rocket Club, I have suggested in a letter to the Honorable C. Douglas Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury, that a new series of savings bonds, similar to the E series, be issued as series S bonds for space. The interest, enthusiasm, and concern of the American public for our standing in the space race is clearly evident. Such a plan would enable everyone to indicate in a tangible way, his or her desire for America to gain leadership in rocketry and astronautics.

Through the use of savings stamps bearing Astronaut Alan Shepard's picture, schoolchildren could also participate. The idea could perhaps even spur some students toward a career of science and engineering, an area of education in which the Russians are making gigantic strides. Such an investment by Americans would further the economic stability and at the same time, investors would receive a fair return on their dollars. Benefits of such an idea could be manifold.

The Honorable KENNETH B. KEATING, Senator from New York, has proposed just such a plan, stating that the idea would carry tremendous appeal. Learning of the Senator's action, we have coordinated our plans with his office. Counsel which we have received from other sources indicates that the idea of a series S space bond is entirely feasible.

I am asking that you join in support of this idea. The National Rocket Club is the appropriate organization to foster such an idea and by so doing has again demonstrated its dedication to U.S. leadership in rocketry and astronautics.

I urge that you write to the Secretary of the Treasury, to Senator KEATING or to me, at the National Rocket Club, indicating your support of the space bonds program. The result could be one of the most important steps ever taken in our space venture.

The big question which we face in the few years ahead is who will be the first man to reach the moon—an American or a Russian? The answer can be predicted by the support which we, both as a nation and as individuals, are willing to invest in the space effort.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, May 19, 1961.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: On behalf of Secretary Dillon, I am replying to your letter of May 12, in which you suggest the possible desirability of offering to the public a special issue of savings bonds to be known as space bonds, the proceeds from which would be used to finance an expanded and accelerated space program.

Under present Government accounting procedures, of course, money received from the sale of savings bonds, like money received from any other Government borrowing operation, is placed in the general fund of the Treasury. There it is mingled with the Government's current revenue receipts (primarily from taxes) and is available for any expenditure of the Government authorized by the Congress. Thus, since all Government funds are commingled in the general fund it is not possible to break down any particular Government expenditure and say how much of it was financed by any particular tax receipt or any particular borrowing operation.

While a plan for permitting people to designate the particular project or projects they would like their savings bonds investments to help finance would, no doubt, have promotional value, it would also require a tremendous amount of accounting. This would be true not only for the Government but for the thousands of banks and other financial institutions who sell savings bonds for the Government without compensation, as well as for the corporations and businesses throughout the country who administer the payroll savings bonds plans as a public service at no cost to the Government. I am sure you can appreciate the importance of holding down issuing and bookkeeping costs in a nationwide voluntary program of this nature currently involving the issuance of over 85 million new bonds per year. However, in our promotional program we have been and will continue to stress in every possible way the importance of U.S. savings bonds purchases in helping to keep America militarily and economically strong.

We appreciate having the benefit of your views on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH W. BARR,
Assistant to the Secretary.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I would have liked very much to be able to support this bill. I am not opposed to the principle of Federal aid to education so long as strong provisions are made to prevent Federal control. I find those provisions adequate in this bill to insure that State and local education officials will not be interfered with.

I realize that with the Federal Government preempting an ever larger share of our tax dollars, some States and communities are not able to meet the educational demands put upon them. The rapid increase in our school-age population, and the extreme mobility of American families today put a severe strain on the State and local tax base in many areas. Federal funds can and should be used to supplement the resources of these less prosperous localities, because all America—every town and every State—should have an educational system that will prepare its children adequately to meet the challenges of the 20th century.

There are two principal reasons why I cannot support the bill as it now stands. First, the formula as devised by the committee is grossly unfair not only to my own State of New York but also to the Nation as a whole.

Frankly, I would have liked to see a Federal aid-to-education bill which did not give any funds to New York but did help only the poorest States. New Yorkers can take care of education in New York, and to date they have done a fine job in most of the tax-supported public elementary and secondary schools, as well as in a great number of private, independently supported institutions. A bill analogous to the depressed areas bill, a bill which concentrated on the neediest areas, the depressed areas of education, would to my mind have been a far better approach. Ideally, that is what we should have had.

But politically speaking, I recognize that such a bill was not possible. Unless every State got something, it would have been too difficult to gain support. So under S. 1021 all the States share a part of the Federal jackpot. What then does this mean for New York?

New Yorkers pay nearly one-fifth of the Nation's Federal taxes. New York has the highest State income tax in the country and one of the highest property tax levels in the country. New York has the highest State debt of any State in the Union—$2½ billion. New York also spends more money per pupil than any other State except New Jersey. As a result, New Yorkers are more heavily taxed than the people of any other State in the Union.

We therefore have a right to ask how our efforts are recognized and assisted in this bill. Under the present terms of the Federal-aid-to-education bill, New York State will receive $40,652,380 annually for the next 3 years. Yet New York already for 1960 pays, from local and State funds, $1.6 billion annually for current public school expenditures. In the next 3 years, the cost will rise to over $2 billion annually. In other words, this much publicized Federal assistance to education will only amount to about 2½ percent of what the people of New York are already spending. And that figure does not include even the debt funding charges which are not considered a part of current expenditures. Moreover, to get even $40 million in Federal assistance, New Yorkers will have

to pay nearly $120 million in Federal taxes. That means New York is paying about $3 to the Federal Government for every $1 it receives back.

Yet, even despite New York's position, I could still support a bill for Federal aid to education if it did provide maximum benefits to those poor States which are making a great effort in education yet simply do not have the per capita income and tax base that New York has. But who are the principal beneficiaries? Under the allotment formula devised by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the State of Texas has the highest annual allotment—$58 million. This was referred to by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND]. Yet, according to the Office of Education's 1960 survey, Texas has a net deficit of classrooms of only 809. New York had a deficit of 10,200 classrooms. That is, New York's classroom needs are 12 times as great as those of Texas. Nevertheless, under the committee bill, New York State, although altogether paying 19 percent of the overall cost, will receive $18 million less than Texas, which pays only 3 percent of the cost. In other words, inconceivable as it may be, Texas gets $18 million more for 2 million children than New York gets for 3½ million children, because Texas is allotted $21.84 per child as against New York's $10.90 per child. Moreover, Texas has no State income tax and no State sales tax. According to statistics prepared by the National Education Association, Texas ranks 29th in the Nation in per capita expenditure of State and local funds for schools and 32d in the average pay of public school teachers. Texas also receives $14 million annually from the Federal Government for schools in federally impacted areas. I do not think Texas needs any more help from New York.

After Texas, the next beneficiary is California which would be entitled to $46 million annually. This would also be in addition to the Federal funds granted for schools in federally impacted areas, which, in fiscal year 1960 amounted to $40 million. Moreover, Mr. President, as I have mentioned more than once in this body, California already gets nearly one-quarter of the Nation's defense contracts and has a sizable number of very active military installations where Federal funds are dispensed. As of 1959, the State of California had the fifth highest per capita income of any State. I do not think California needs any more help from New York.

Mr. President, I could go down the list of other prime beneficiaries from the committee formula in S. 1021. I could point out that the top eight States benefiting are, with the exception of Texas and North Carolina, among the 15 States with the highest per capita income in the country. I do not believe that States such as these—and I include New York among the eight—really need Federal aid to education as provided by this bill.

Mr. President, I have had many letters from constituents urging my support for President Kennedy's program for Federal aid to education. But this bill, S. 1021, does not represent the President's program. It is merely the program of the Democratic majority of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The formula of aid under the bill was solidly opposed by the Republican members of the committee. And we Republicans made three valiant efforts to change the formula on the floor, but we were steamrollered by the huge Democratic majority. By coincidence the formula appears to benefit the States with Democratic members on the committee at the expense of some of the lowest income States in the country.

Slightly more than one-third of the increase over the amount recommended by the President for the first year—$62.2 million of $184 million—went to the 10 States with Democrats on the committee. Among the 22 States whose share was increased by the committee formula are Alaska, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Texas, Illinois, and Virginia. Among the 26 States whose shares were trimmed are Massachusetts, Colorado, Maine, Arkansas, West Virginia, Tennessee, New Jersey, Connecticut, and New York. The new formula cut the funds for the District of Columbia, which, of course, has no Senators at all, so sharply, that an amendment was introduced and passed to correct this particularly flagrant situation.

The formula arrived at by the committee after virtually no study or consultation also counts the total number of school children in a State even though many of these children may attend private schools. Yet the private schools are denied any assistance. If private schoolchildren are not to share in this aid, they should at least not be counted in for the benefit of someone else.

I supported the Javits-Cooper substitute formula because it provided an equitable and effective approach to Federal aid to education. If it had been adopted, I would have supported this bill. As it is, I cannot support the bill because it does not meet fair standards.

Secondly, Mr. President, by the defeat of my amendment to permit a court test of the constitutionality of giving aid to States which defy the law of the land, coupled with the adamant stand taken by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that he will not withhold funds from any State, and the apparent unwillingness of the President to issue an Executive order to insure compliance with the mandate of the Supreme Court, the funds herein authorized will be used in some States deliberately to perpetuate a policy of racial segregation. The spokesmen for the majority party have insisted that under this bill no funds can be withheld from States merely because they operate segregated school systems. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has indicated that neither he nor the Commissioner of Education has the authority to withhold funds from segregated schools or school systems. I disagree with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the judgment of the majority leadership on this point. I believe that the Secretary can withhold funds from State education agencies which operate in defiance of the Constitution. I have no doubt whatsoever that, even if the Secretary will not act, the President does have the power, by Executive order, to keep funds from schools segregated by law. I sincerely hope that he will exercise that power with vigor and determination.

But in any case, Mr. President, I recognize that a final decision on the use of Federal funds to support segregated schools can only be made in the courts of the United States.

That was the reason why I sponsored an amendment which would have permitted a taxpayer to bring a suit to enjoin the Commissioner of Education from using these funds in any way which might constitute a violation of the Constitution. This amendment was rejected. In fact, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare indicated his belief that the question of the constitutionality of the proposed legislation was one of what he termed "collateral issues." As the bill now stands, there is no way in which a taxpayer, a parent, or a State can prevent the use of Federal funds to build and support segregated schools. This is true even though the Supreme Court held in Bolling against Sharpe that the Federal Government could not maintain a school system segregated by race.

In the long run, this lack of any provision for judicial review—in fact, I should say this flagrant disregard for the ruling of the Supreme Court—may do great harm not only to the cause of racial equality under the law but also to the cause of education. Schools which may be built with the funds authorized under this act and which may be earmarked for Negro students will not easily be desegregated to educate children of both races. Once a segregated pattern is established in a school constructed with these funds it will be difficult to alter that pattern. My position has been this: I do not think funds should be withheld from a State because all of the schools within that State are not thoroughly integrated, but I do believe that an incentive should have been provided for those States which are actually moving, however slowly, in the direction of compliance with the Supreme Court decision. In the absence of such a provision it is even more important to provide for some kind of judicial review.

Finally, Mr. President, just today, in a special message to Congress, the President requested the cooperation of Congress in refraining from adding more funds to programs, desirable as they may be. The present committee bill adds $252 million, or more than a quarter of a billion dollars, to the sum requested by the President. In other words, it does not follow, but violates the President's recommendations as to the amount of Federal aid needed for our educational system.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I oppose the committee bill, S. 1021. It is not the President's proposal; it does not provide for an equitable distribution of funds; and the Senate has deliberately

voted to prohibit any judicial review of its constitutionality. Frankly, the bill is very disappointing to me, and I oppose it.

Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, we have seen some interesting disregard of principle during the progress of the bill and the action taken on amendments thereto. The very Members of this body who profess so heatedly and so often their concern for giving equal opportunity to all of the people, with particular reference to minority groups, have made a remarkable record during this debate. They have deserted time and again the principles which they would have us believe are the very basis of their dedication. Principles are things we fight for, and we fight for them all the time, not merely on some occasions to the exclusion of others; that is, if they really are basic principles upon which is based a desire to aid human progress.

Let me mention a few of the instances in which the liberals have had an opportunity to fight for their principles in connection with the aid to education bill which really would have produced some results.

First. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] proposed an amendment which would have authorized the withholding of Federal funds from schools which are in violation of the Supreme Court mandate to proceed in good faith to integrate their schools. This amendment was decisively defeated by the very Senators who are the most energetic leaders in all efforts to encourage integration.

Second. Then Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] offered an amendment which would have provided an opportunity for anyone whose right to an equal education was being thwarted by use of Federal funds to appeal to the courts. This amendment, too, was decisively defeated by those who repeatedly declare their dedication to equal opportunity.

Third. I myself offered an amendment which would have assured that no schoolchild would be denied benefits by reason of his religion. Without this amendment, one-third of all the schoolchildren in our major cities and 16 percent of all the schoolchildren in the Nation are deprived of benefits under the bill. However, this amendment also was defeated overwhelmingly, and again by those who profess not only a strong belief in equal opportunity but who claim that an educational crisis exists throughout the Nation.

Mr. President, I repeat, what confuses me about these actions is the principles which were involved and which were deserted. When I hear people talk about principles, it is always my understanding that they are talking about something they feel deeply enough about to fight for. These are principles which people take unto themselves for various reasons—reasons not necessarily related to their oathbound obligation to uphold the Constitution day in and day out. But in this debate little or no consideration was accorded the fact that the Constitution gives the Federal Government no authority to interfere with the States in educational matters. The fact that the bill seriously challenges the constitutional rights of the States and local governments was passed over almost as though it did not exist. This is a principle that we are all obliged to consider.

I suggest that the only rationale that fits the manner in which the bill was handled is the desire for Federal control of the public school system. In all the hours of debate, the great need set forth by the bill's proponents was not demonstrated to exist. It was only repeated and repeated and repeated, as if the mere saying that there was a need would make it true. And now we find—as the bill is being readied for passage—that the measure bears little relationship to the need we heard so much about. For example, the Cooper-Javits amendment would have put the Federal funds in the places where the proponents said the greatest need existed, and this was promptly rejected. Instead, a formula was adopted which would authorize the expenditure of $2.5 billion in a helter-skelter, catch-as-catch-can manner.

Mr. President, I repeat that about the only thing the bill does is to establish Federal control over education, an action that does violence to the Constitution and to the traditional prerogatives of the States and local communities.

Mr. President, before the discussion on the bill is ended, I wish, in good conscience—in fact, in duty to my conscience—to pay my respects to the minority staff members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare who have contributed so much throughout these long days to our ability to present the facts as we understand them. Those men and women are: Michael J. Bernstein, Raymond D. Hurley, John D. Stringer, George Wray, Thelma Blankenship, and Carmel Giancola.

One more comment before the debate ends. I believe something happened today which has never before happened in this body, to my knowledge. I know the proponents of the bill exude confidence. I know it is, as we say in my part of the country, a lead-pipe cinch that the bill will pass. But I have never seen proponents act so quickly to have the act printed before the bill is passed. I have the act before me. It reads, at the very end:

> Passed the Senate May 25, 1961. Attest: Secretary.
>
> S. 1021, an act to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. President, I have been on frontiers all my life. I know about phony frontiers, and new frontiers, and old frontiers. I can spot a frontiersman 10 miles off. But I have never in my life known one to be so quick that he could have the act printed before the bill was passed.

I can imagine a frontiersman of old picking up the money off the crap table before the dice had even been thrown; but he would have been shot if he tried it.

Perhaps this is something new about the New Frontier. Perhaps President Kennedy has a crystal ball we do not know about. Perhaps he has looked into the crystal ball and can see all the acts Congress will pass.

If we were to visit the Government Printing Office, perhaps we might find a complete stack of the acts which will pass the Senate. If that be true, I suggest that we need not stay here any longer. We need merely find out what the Government Printing Office has printed for the New Frontier as legislation which has already passed without any action by this body.

This is indeed a strange approach. For example, I should like to know how much of the money which was asked for this morning by the President has already been appropriated. Perhaps we are wasting our time; perhaps we should go home. I often think it would do the country much more good if we did go home. But now we obviously do not need the Senate and the House, because the Government Printing Office has printed an act to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance to the States for education, and has dated it May 25, even though we have not yet passed it. But evidently we are going to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would the Senator call it, perhaps, a profile in confident anticipation? [Laughter.]

Mr. GOLDWATER. I would call it a profile in overconfidence.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the man who probably set the type. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. I want the Senator from Arizona to know my position in connection with this matter. Certainly one of the interesting things about living is the fact that one has surprises; and the information which my friend, the Senator from Arizona, has just now announced on the floor of the Senate comes as a complete surprise to the floor leader of the bill. As soon as I can reach the telephone, I shall find out about this matter.

But I will say that if what the Senator from Arizona referred to is being done, it is being done without any knowledge on the part of the floor leader of the bill and without authorization by the floor leader of the bill. So far as I am concerned, it is still in the rumor stage, although I have great confidence, of course, in the reliability of any statement made by the Senator from Arizona. However, I must confess that I know nothing about the procedure referred to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, Mr. President, let us send him a hand-embroidered copy.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Oregon, being so highly esteemed a legislator and a lawyer, would never do that. But I suggest that my friend look into this New Frontier. It seems that somewhere in the Government Printing Office there is a scout at work.

I would be happy to know what will come up next on the agenda, that has already been passed. I have some bills;

but if they have already been passed, obviously I can stay at home next week rather than come here and champion those bills here on the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Again let me say that I do not know just how all this came about; but I surmise that after the third reading of the bill last night some member of the very efficient staff of the committee or the Senate—and all of us know that the staffs are very efficient—some member of these very efficient staffs evidently realized that upon the third reading of the bill, there would be no further opportunity to amend the bill. It was undoubtedly concluded that, in view of the remarkable support which so large a number of Senators have displayed in favor of passage of the bill, throughout the procedure here in connection with it, it would do no harm to have the bill printed.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am happy to have the first copy of the bill, as thus printed, given to the one who has made its printing in this form possible. If I had the right of authorship, I would gladly autograph a copy of it for him. Perhaps he is the man who is responsible for this. Certainly the one responsible for it was not a minority member of the committee, because we on the minority side would not have had the bill printed in this way, I can assure the Senator from Oregon. We have some good bills in mind; but, as my friend well knows, ours would not provide for Federal aid to education.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot conceive of a more important bill in the interest of the welfare of the future of our country, in the entire field of education, than this one. But I shall find out what happened in connection with the printing.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield further?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In view of the fact that the bill has already been passed by the Senate, this day—for that is what the printed copy of the bill shows—probably we could proceed to take steps to vacate the order for the yeas and nays, which already has been entered, and let it go at that.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That raises an interesting point. We might move to reconsider—in view of the fact that we now have in our hands the printed copy of the bill which is marked as having been passed this day by the Senate. Obviously the New Frontier has finally accomplished something that is really new. [Laughter.] Everything else the New Frontier has proposed was tried back in the 1930's, and did not work. I remember when Mr. Wallace wrote a book entitled "The New Frontier"; and in the first few chapters he said it was necessary to change the rules of the Senate. However, he was unable to accomplish that; and later, when President Roosevelt tried to have the rules of the Senate changed, he, too, was unsuccessful.

But now it is obvious that the rules of the Senate have been changed, for we have before our own eyes very definite evidence of such an accomplishment, in view of the fact that we now have received advance copies of what the new law is to be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I point out that this practice is not an uncommon one. We have a very efficient enrolling clerk; and it is not uncommon, after the third reading of a bill, to send the bill to the Government Printing Office to be printed. Usually the bill does not lie over for 1 day but is acted on immediately after the third reading. Therefore, it is sent to the Government Printing Office, for printing in final form, following the third reading.

So all that our efficient clerk has done is to follow the bewhiskered practice of sending the bill to the Government Printing Office to be printed, following the third reading of the bill.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time yielded to the Senator from Arizona has expired.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me 5 minutes from the time under his control?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to conclude by stating that, efficient though the clerk is, I do not think he was justified in being certain that the bill would be passed by the Senate this very day, May 25. I believe it would have been better if he had not had that date included when he had the bill printed at that time.

PRIVATE COMMITTEE TO COLLECT FUNDS TO PURCHASE TRACTORS TO BE EXCHANGED FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, this morning my office was deluged with telegrams protesting the President's action in lending the prestige of his Office to the efforts of a committee of private citizens to collect funds to meet a blackmail demand from a foreign Communist dictator. I believe the unanimous tenor of these communications accurately portrays the indignation of the American people over any yielding to the infamous "tractor" demands of Fidel Castro.

Typical of these telegrams was one from Mr. Joseph Patrick, news director of radio station KRUX, in Phoenix, Ariz. The text of this telegram, which I should like to read, was in the form of an editorial broadcast by this station. I now read it:

Five bells ring on a UPI wire service teleprinter. Bulletin is double spaced between letters, a common occurrence in any newsroom—usually several times a day. The letters take form; words take on meaning, not just printed meaning but an impact that makes you wait for the upcoming words.

President Kennedy has called on the American people to contribute to the Castro tractor blackmail deal. An answer to a pressure move by a dirty, cutthroat Communist dictator is answered in the affirmative by the President of the United States. Before nuclear warfare, before aircraft were available, warbirds that so far have held even the Russian bear in check chained with fear of retaliation, another insufficient government had the gall to ask tribute from a very young United States.

An American sloop of war pulled into Tripoli Harbor, and tribute from a baby United States of America was easily viewable from shore. Open gunports in the side of the wooden vessel—the American hostages were freed.

Now, Castro's tractor blackmail is being honored with an endorsement by the President of the United States. It also became known today the President himself appointed Mrs. Roosevelt, Labor Leader Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower to the team.

Mr. President, why don't we simply offer foreign aid to Castro the way we have done to other countries who bare a few discolored, weak fangs at the United States? Why not offer civil service rights to Fidel? Why not even make a Government pension available to him if the U.S. Government would condone blackmail in the first place?

If we are going to buy the lives and the futures of Cuban nationals, why haven't we purchased the freedom of Catholic American priests? Why don't we free all those American troops still in Red Chinese prisons? Why don't we make an offer to Khrushchev—use some piece of America to barter the freedom of Americans, possibly B–29 airmen still held in parts of the Soviet Union from World War II.

Mr. President, why don't we stop backing up? Even if we don't prove anything to the rest of the world, at least prove to ourselves again we are Americans, afraid of no man or the face of God's green earth. KRUX hopes Arizonians at least will not be blackmailed by Fidel Castro.

JOE PATRICK,
News Director, KRUX.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial of Monday, May 22, from the Arizona Daily Star, entitled "Billions for Freedom; Not One Cent for Ransoms"; also a column of Tuesday, May 23, by the noted columnist, Hy Gardner.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arizona Daily Star, May 22, 1961]

BILLIONS FOR FREEDOM; NOT ONE CENT FOR RANSOMS

The offer of the Castro government of Cuba that the United States, either by its Government or people, trade 500 bulldozers for the release of a number of rebel prisoners, is one of the most insulting ever made in the historic dealings with hostages.

What it means is that supposedly we buy the release of a few prisoners for mechanical instruments or tools that would strengthen the Castro regime. That some of our do-gooder liberals have fallen for the offer is not surprising, but it is time that the people understood the seriousness of this offer.

It is brazen blackmail. It would set a precedent that would humiliate our country in the eyes of the world, if not our own people. Once established, it would soon be used more and more on some other kind of a pretext. Rich old Uncle Sam will always come across with money, or its equivalent, to buy off trouble temporarily. What a reputation to establish.

Let us remember the occasion more than 160 years ago when France was in trouble,

and asked us to keep our treaty that bound us to come to her help, in return for the help she had given us in winning our independence. We renounced the treaty. France threatened, we answered, "Millions for defense, not one cent for tribute."

Our answer in this instance should be the same. Billions for freedom, but not one cent for ransoms. Once we show to the world that we can be blackmailed, others will try it. Eventually we will have to stop it. The best way is to stop it right now.

If President Kennedy refuses to stop this incident, he will go to his conference with Khrushchev in Vienna with a greatly weakened prestige. A man like Khrushchev will scorn such a surrender as a sign of weakness, and possibly encourage him to show such contempt when he talks with our President.

This is no time for the Kennedy administration to show anything that can be interpreted as weakness.

[Hy Gardner Calling, Tuesday, May 23, 1961]

TOUCHING ALL BASES

It's an ironic coincidence that, of all things, Castro designated bulldozers as the form of ransom to free rebel prisoners. For the very name came from an old expression, predating the invention of the motorized machine, meaning bullying. You still hear it used in TV movies where the hero says to the bully, "Don't try to bulldoze me."

I suppose Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and Walter Reuther know what they're doing in supporting a public fund to subsidize the purchase of the 500 bulldozers. But if you want a private opinion we'd rather chip in our few dollars to help erect a permanent memorial on the prostrate hulk of the battleship Arizona in Pearl Harbor. I sympathize with the plight of the Cuban prisoners, but that is one of the misfortunes of war. I don't go along with blackmail; you never finish paying it and the best way to avoid it is not to start.

THE DANGER OF HOLDING CONFERENCES WITH KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on a different subject, but one which is also related to our foreign policy, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial, from the May 21 Arizona Republic, entitled "Retreat or Victory."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RETREAT OR VICTORY?

President Kennedy is climbing to the summit. Unless he intends to change radically present American foreign policy before this conference, we predict that Jack will fall down and break his crown and we'll come tumbling after. There is no reason to believe the President will not repeat the exact same experiences of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower at their various summits with Stalin and Khrushchev.

We don't know whether Khrushchev will offer the President the carrot of sweet reasonableness or the stick of threat and bluff. There may be another spirit of Vienna to replace the previous spirits of Geneva and Camp David. Or there may be another session of insults and vulgarities such as President Eisenhower suffered in silence at Paris. But it will be one or the other—unless the President intends to take the offensive to the enemy. Khrushchev is a thorough student of the Pavlovian theory of conditioned responses by giving and withholding goodies.

If the President, Adlai Stevenson (a summit fan) and Dean Rusk really believe that another test of Soviet intentions to help clear up major outstanding East-West problems will produce benefits to the United States, they are in for a disillusioning experience. If they really think that a new summit will produce any lasting agreement on any subject from disarmament to Vietnam, they have blinded themselves to the lessons of past experience. Khrushchev will, one way or the other, score another victory for communism.

After all, the President will be going to this conference after just suffering two major defeats—in Cuba and Laos. Twice he has talked tough and done nothing. Talking tough again—without making it perfectly clear that he intends to do something to back it up—will only make Khrushchev merry. What counts in dealing with Communists is action, not talk. In the past it has been they who have acted and we who have talked—and they have won and we have lost.

But suppose the President should decide to change the rules for the summit this time. Suppose he should suddenly take the diplomatic offensive against the Communist enemy.

Suppose he were to leave Stevenson, Rusk, and Bowles home and take with him to Vienna the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Lemnitzer, Admiral Burke of the Navy, General Decker of the Army, General White of the Air Force, and General Shoup of the U.S. Marines.

Then suppose the President presented Khrushchev with the following proposition: The United States will discuss outstanding differences with the Soviet Union when the Soviet Union honors its past agreements with the United States. First they must fulfill their agreement made at the first Eisenhower summit to unify Germany by free elections. Next they must honor their agreement to permit free elections in all Balkan countries and Poland. Next they must adhere to the charter of the United Nations and suspend all aid to aggressive forces seeking to overthrow established governments in Asia, the Middle East, and Europe. Next they must recognize the time-honored Monroe Doctrine and end all aid and pressure on Cuba. Next they must live up to the treaty of recognition signed by President Roosevelt and stop all aid and support of the Communist Party in the United States.

Of course, Khrushchev will not agree. But that makes no difference. He will now know our intentions. He will know we do not intend any more surrenders but do intend to force him into retreat. He will suddenly be on the diplomatic defensive for the first time since American troops landed in Lebanon.

If Khrushchev talks tough at hearing these demands, the President should treat him as Vice President Nixon treated him in Moscow—with icy politeness and uncompromising firmness. He should tell the Soviet dictator that instead of seeing communism bury us, we intend to see all captive nations free from Communist masters. He should also add that he expects to see Khrushchev's grandchildren live in freedom.

If the President of the United States, flanked by his military commanders, were to take such a position, it would electrify the world. It would light again the torch of liberty that has been smoldering in the dust since the Korean war. The hearts of the American people would be lifted in pride and courage and honor.

But this is, we expect, too much to ask of the New Frontier.

HOW NOT TO GIVE FOREIGN AID

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article from the May 16 issue of the Arizona Republic. The article is entitled "Chacon Tells How Not To Give Aid."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHACON TELLS HOW NOT TO GIVE AID

TUCSON.—The United States was told how not to disperse foreign aid yesterday.

The advice was given by Eugenio Maciel Chacon, newspaperman, printer, and farmer of Pesquerira, Brazil. He visited Tucson as a participant in the foreign leader program of the U.S. State Department.

The wrong kind of aid, he said, "Can be compared to a drunken Texas cowboy who bangs his fist on the bar and shouts 'drinks for everybody in the house—on me.'

"Some patrons who are perhaps sober, laugh and say, 'Why not; he'll never miss it. He's a fool, but it is free.'

"When foreign aid takes that turn, it winds up making enemies, not friends, for the United States.

"It is like when the drunken cowboy runs out of funds, and the patrons of his generosity turn on him, and he gets thrown out of the saloon.

"In Brazil we want a lot from the United States, but first let me tell you what we do not want.

"We don't want free spending of funds foolishly.

"We don't want charity.

"We want to be investigated just as your banker investigates you when you ask for a loan.

"We want Americans to invest wisely with us, in plants, dams, and agricultural development. We want them to make a fair profit, to get their money back, and to deal with us in a businesslike manner.

"But please, don't send us the 'drinks for everybody' types."

JACQUELINE COCHRAN

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a lecture delivered at Harvard by one of America's most famous women, Jacqueline Cochran, noted first for her ability in the air, and also noted for her ability in business.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JACQUELINE COCHRAN

You here at Harvard and I are the products of different systems of education. My school was more like Oxford. I understand at Oxford, at least for the Rhodes scholars, classrooms are pretty well dispensed with. The students are on their own absorbing knowledge from a varying array of available lecturers and then on examination day pass or fail according to their merits. Of course this may be only rumor or hearsay because I have never been to Oxford.

My school is affectionately referred to by the highbrows as collegio ictiuum durorum. My alma mater dispenses with cap and gown and books and never gives a sheepskin diploma. The motto of my school should be recited every night and sometimes more often. It is "Illegitimus Non Carborundum." We have many graduates but the number in recent years has decreased due to certain of our State laws dealing with compulsory education.

The seal of our school varied from campus to campus but always had the same three essentials: the black eye, the bloody nose and the flexed muscles.

I can tell from the look on the faces of some of you that you have forgotten your Latin. So I will tell you that collegio ictiuum durorum translates as the school of hard knocks and that illegitimus non carborundum translates as Don't let the ——— get you down.

The fact is that beyond the third grade I never attended any school except collegio ictiuum durorum. The hard way to accomplish anything seems to be somewhat in disgrace today in favor of the lush easy life. Therefore it may be presumption for me to address you. But my very old and esteemed wartime friend, General Doriot, asked for it so I am going to call the shots as I see them.

You have probably been considering such things as margin of profit. That's all very well and truly capitalistic. But if the margin disappears there is no profit to consider. At that point the spawn of Karl Marx and Lenin can shout hurrah and Khrushchev can say I told you so.

Because we must compete in international markets for the sale of a part of our manufactured goods, profits will disappear unless we keep our costs below the costs of our Communist competitors.

And it's about some of these things that I will speak today.

Back about the time President Kennedy and most of his associates in this administration were graduating from college, my husband, Floyd Odlum, delivered the commencement address at a college in Michigan. World War II was being waged and I was in England at the time flying for the British. Among other things he said, and I quote:

"The peace treaty will usher in a period of adjustment and reconstruction that will be difficult in the extreme. There will be new political philosophies. The old economic foundations upon which we relied before the war will be gone. New superstructures of society, trade, and finance will have to be built. The task will be to see that they are not built on quicksand."

I think my husband said a mouthful by the way of accurate forecast. It is evident that the population of the earth is in a state of ferment and turmoil almost to the point of explosion. Berlin, Laos, the Congo and Cuba are only current examples. We have the ferment also right here at home. Perhaps people while searching for new horizons have lost their bearings with respect to the old horizons like, for example, the Constitution of the United States. I think that Constitution embraced the right to strike out on one's own, to take a risk and to profit by such risk if the venture proves successful.

We like to glory in the fact that we are the richest Nation on earth with the highest standard of living. How did this come about and what are we doing to hold our championship? One of my fellow Alumni, a respected Democrat in his day, the late Al Smith, used to say "Let's look at the record." And that's what I propose to do right now.

This Nation of ours became the wealthiest nation with the highest standard of living because of a combination of a few things. We had immense areas of idle fertile land from which to get timber and crops and that land was available to practically any individual with initiative and enterprise enough to settle on it. Under the surface of that land we had an abundance of gold, silver, copper, iron, oil and other minerals. These resources were also available to the individual for the asking if he followed it up energetically. Along with these natural resources, we had, and above all, the energy of rugged and bold men, feeling the invigorating air of freedom and individualism in a New World. The industrial age was born when we were just moving into our prime in wide open free and individualistic America. With the natural resources at hand and the application of human energy, we formed the machines and tools and factories and we took the lead among all nations of the earth in industrial production.

You will find that the amount of mechanical energy used per capita is the true measure of each nation's standard of living. We far outstrip other nations in this respect.

But I'm very sorry to say times are changing. Our natural resources have been depleted to a great extent. Other countries now hold the lead over us as to reserves of oil, gold and some other metals, including uranium. Some other nations are increasing the use of mechanical energy per capita faster than we are. And this may become so even to a greater degree in the fairly near future because a very small amount of uranium packs a very great punch in terms of energy. Uranium is therefore cheap to transport and before very long it will be cheap to use for fuel any place on earth. The coming of the nuclear age will mean that we have lost the edge we had by way of lots of useable waterpower and an abundance of cheap coal, gas and oil to burn under the boilers.

What's more—and what is even more important—the energy drive of the American worker that made us stand out as a Nation seems to have let down. Productivity per unit of wages has decreased. That means costs of product are too high and in many instances to the point where we have priced ourselves out of the international markets, even forgetting a margin of profit.

I live in California and I recently saw on the sports page of a local paper a picture of a steel crane. The caption read: "In order to construct Dodgers' new ball park it was necessary to import a giant crane from Germany." Why was such an import necessary? We have good steel mills right here at home. Can West Germany build bigger or better cranes? The answer is "No." Can West Germany build cheaper cranes than we can. The answer is "Yes." They can do so partly because their plants are new since the war. New up-to-date plants are more efficient than old ones. Ours to a large extent are prewar vintage. They have not been replaced because under the short-sighted depreciation policy in our Federal tax law they are being depreciated over their physical life as distinct from their efficient economical life. But the answer "yes" to the question whether Germany, and for that matter Japan and some other countries, can produce cheaper rests even more so on the fact that the workman in Germany, Japan and these other countries turns out more product during his work hours. He has greater productivity.

A belief seems to have taken hold during recent years that there is merit or advantage in getting paid more for doing less. I am still not too old to fly supersonic planes and I well remember the days when I worked a 12-hour night shift in a cotton mill, 6 nights a week for $4.50. Mind you I am not arguing in favor of 12 hours or low wages. I'm only calling attention to the true meaning of the Anglo-Saxon word spelled "w-o-r-k." Whatever pay one gets in industry comes from production. Pay must in the very nature of things be related to production. Otherwise the increased pay becomes merely another temporary redistribution of wealth program. In what I have just said I must repeat that I am not suggesting the worker's hours of production or creative effort in a day or week should be lengthened or that present rates of compensation should be reduced. I am, however, arguing most strongly that, while a person is on the job he should give his best productive efforts. If he does, and all his neighbors do likewise, there will be greater production, more things to consume, and more pay to buy them with. If such increased productivity does not occur our foreign markets for surplus goods will dry up, profits will be reduced or disappear, the Government's take by way of taxes will shrink and inflation will result. Such a combination can only end in a deep readjusting depression and general catastrophe.

About 2 years ago my husband took occasion to check hourly wages and hourly output back to the turn of the century. Such a check showed clearly that whenever productivity per man-hour does not keep pace with wages there is a loss in purchasing value of the dollar almost precisely equal to the gap between hourly wages and productivity per man hour. In other words, there is inflation. No one has obtained something for nothing.

What I want to see is even higher wages combined however with greater output. Let us have more pay for more productivity.

This permanent or seemingly permanent slowdown by the American producer is multiplied in its evil effect many times over by reason of the fact most of our manufacturing is the result of factory, machines and tools. These tools, machines and buildings don't hanker after or need a 7 or 8 hour day or a 5 day week. Each time a man behind a machine idles while on the job he also causes the machine to idle and the factory to idle.

Practically all of our goods are both produced and consumed by people in the lower income brackets. This will be the case whether we have democracy or communism or any other form of government.

This brings me to the subject of government. I have regrettably noticed a definite trend in America toward a federally controlled economy and a socialized welfare state.

However, let's not get confused by words or terms.

All of us often use the words republic, democracy, socialism and communism and when we do we each have in mind a certain form of government. But most of these words are used in different senses by different peoples of the earth. We salute the flag of our "Republic" but also we refer to it as a democracy. The philosopher, Plato, some 400 years before Christ, outlined what he called a "Republic" to take the place of the democracy of Athens which he thought a complete failure. His republic to be controlled as might be assumed principally by philosophers like Plato was in fact a socialistic state with much basically in common with Russia's and China's present day communism. Karl Marx, considered the father of the current communistic ideology, used the word democracy in his writings to describe his suggested form of government. It was, he said, a democracy of the proletariat which in fact means a democracy of less than all the people. And Khrushchev today calls the Russian system democratic and our system of government imperialistic.

So we must go to the real meaning behind these terms. Socialism is nothing new. It goes back at least as far as recorded history. Plans to share the wealth, divide the property and for a few of the whole to control the rest of the people for their own good are as old as the writings of man. It has been said by experts in the field, and I believe them, that every nation of the past has had, and every present nation has, socialism interwoven in its government to a greater or lesser degree. This is certainly true in America where our Government by constitution looks after the defense, the interstate commerce and the general welfare of the people.

So what is the essential difference between American democracy and Russian communism if both are socialistic?

Well, as I understand it, the Communists eliminate private ownership of production

and distribution. They seek their ends by forcible overthrow of all existing social orders and the destruction of the economic force known as capital. Instead they form a new controlling class and organize a government not of the previous ruling class but of a new class called proletariat. This they say is a democracy formed in the image of and responsible to the working man—like Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev for instance. Instruments of production and distribution are in the hands of the State which of necessity is run by a few of the whole. According to Marxism a profit is robbery. Workers, production and government must be handled collectively. The government, which is supposed to obey the wishes of the proletariat is also supposed to act as a holding company for all means of production and distribution. However, inasmuch as the members of the Communist Party number only less than 5 percent of the Russian population, it can hardly be said that the Kremlin is responsible to the working class as a whole. Kremlin members selected by a few of the whole tell the population what is good for them and they take it and like it or else.

I say we in America are moving more and more toward a socialized State of the type extolled by Karl Marx, even though it is not coming about as the result of violent revolution. This transition is marked by lessening of State controls, by lessening of freedom of action by the people, and by the building of centralized authority in Washington represented by commissions, bureaus and agencies. These bureaucrats take control of the functions and products of industry and commerce even though perhaps not title to the plant and tools themselves. The cow is left with the owner but the milk to the extent called for by regulations is taken away. All this centralization of authority and control is supported by a high and progressive income tax which was one of the important planks in the platform of Karl Marx to bring about socialism and then communism in capitalistic countries. Remember that when your home area gets Federal funds for any purpose, the people themselves have put up that money through payment of taxes. The local areas are only getting their own money back but usually not all of it because a good rake-off on the deal is sliced off in the process of getting the taxes to Washington and then back to the crossroads of America. This rake-off is used in part to support our Government bureaucracy. That income tax is a powerful socialistic tool concerning which the people—and I mean all the people including the wage earner—should give more serious attention. The highest tax brackets provide practically no income to the Government but have immense social impacts.

Compare now with 1914 the year in which the first full year Federal income tax was paid. Suppose in that year, 1914, your father earned a gross before taxes of $12,000 a year. Such a sum at that time was adequate to house and clothe the family well, to send the children to college, and also to set aside security for old age. Today, to get the same buying power after taxes you—the son or perhaps the grandson—would have to earn $55,000 per year. That equation takes both taxes and inflation into account. The tycoon who earned $100,000 in 1914 would require the presently unheard of pay of $2,400,000 a year to have the same buying power as in 1914. No wonder we start thinking in terms of take-home pay and social security, pension plans, socialized medicine and other like things built into the fabric of a socialized welfare state. I don't see where this wage earner is benefiting from all this. Costs are going up on him as fast as his wages increase. It's like a dog chasing his own tail around a tree.

You have heard of Communists and Socialists. But have you ever heard of the Fabians? You should study about them because they are among us in plenty, even though they don't carry badges. Back about 70 or 80 years ago the Fabian Society was started in England. The Fabians basically agreed with Karl Marx. They differed from the Marxists principally in the matter of violent revolution to obtain the desired results. The Fabians believed that property owners would not realize what was happening to them if the means of production and distribution were gradually usurped through the voting process. Thus in the end the government would become the holder of production and distribution facilities and thus in theory at least would become responsive to the working classes. But things wouldn't work that way. A group of ruling politicians would take over. The Fabians were willing to accept and bore into any form of government in existence at the time and by peaceful agitation, subversion, and penetration at the polls, and with the legislators, bring about changes in the purposes of the government to make it the effective tool of the Socialists.

The Fabians made progress in America. They infiltrated both the Democratic and the Republican Parties with their ideas. Norman Thomas, for years the head of our American Socialist Party, quit running for the Presidency with the announcement that the major aims of his Socialist Party had already been achieved by the larger, older political parties.

The Fabians or the descendants of the Fabians are still at work.

Our Government is growing bigger and bigger, collecting more and more taxes, enacting more and more regulations, and intervening more and more in the economy and in people's own day-to-day activities. Let me give a nonpartisan example.

The Democratic Truman administration spent more than had been spent previously during the entire history of the United States. Then the Republican Eisenhower administration, during its two terms in office, spent more than had been spent during the previous history of the United States, including the Truman era. And so, apparently irrespective of political party the trend of taxing and spending goes on, and apparently ever upward. Our national debt is close to $300 billion. We are currently spending more than we are taking in. Inflation has been the result in the past. Inflation will continue if this trend of spending continues.

I'm not much of a political historian but I understand that when Benjamin Franklin emerged from the Constitutional Convention back in 1787 he was asked what kind of government had been drafted. His reply was "Sir, we have given the people a republic—if the people can make it work."

I'm afraid the people are not making it work. With their own money they are being bribed at the voting polls in the form of give-away programs. Democracy as a representative government is being worn away in favor of a socialistic state by a process of slow attrition.

The essence of our American system as it was conceived by our Founding Fathers was the freedom to initiate, venture, develop, and produce without interference or restraint except for safeguards to protect similar rights of others, as well as the right to enjoy the fruits of one's own labor.

A form of communism had been tried both at Jamestown, Va., by the early settlers and by the Pilgrim Fathers. Both failed because the members were more concerned with equal shares than in contributing equally.

Practically every President right down to the time of the so-called New Deal warned against giving too much power to government. George Washington said that government is not reason but force and a fearful master.

Thomas Jefferson placed economy among the highest of virtues for government and heavy public debt as contrary to independence. He said, "If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they (the people) will be happy."

Woodrow Wilson warned that "The history of liberty is the history of limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Herbert Hoover said, "Freedom conceives that the mind and spirit of man can be free only if he be free to pattern his own life, to develop his own talents, free to earn, to spend, to save, to acquire property as the security of his old age and his family."

Even Franklin Roosevelt, before he succumbed politically to the luster and trappings of the New Deal, while still Governor of New York, said, "Washington must never be permitted to interfere in those avenues of our affairs, naming specifically among other such avenues as conduct of business, of agriculture, of education, and social welfare."

And more recently President Eisenhower said, "Every step we take toward making the state the caretaker of our lives, by that much we move toward making the state our master."

Eleven years ago, John F. Kennedy, while Senator from Massachusetts, said, "Every time that we try and lift a problem to the Government, to the same extent we are sacrificing the liberties of the people."

What I want to see is a stoppage of the sacrificing of liberties of the people by return to the people of their rights to wrestle with their own problems.

The historians also tell me that James Madison, fourth President of the United States, incidentally a Princeton man, once said, "There are more instances of the abridgment of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment, than by violent and sudden usurpation."

You people probably know me best as an airplane pilot. But I have had my own cosmetics business for more than 20 years. I started it from scratch. Therefore I have learned some of the problems of business the hard way. Also my husband and I operate a large date and citrus ranch in California. I might add that it is pretty hard to make a dime either in cosmetics or farming even before taxes.

But, in addition to all this I have been in politics. I declined the Democratic Party nomination for Congress in our preponderantly Democratic district in California only to run 2 years later on the Republican ticket. I was defeated by a very narrow margin. It was rather frustrating to try and get the real issues discussed. Many votes turned on pure personalities or on things of small consequence to the Nation as a whole or even to the people of my own district. The people who have studied the consequences of any given action must get into harness to explain things to many less enlightened but honest citizens.

There was a wisecrack making the circuit 2 or 3 months ago that the best way to get to Washington is to go to Harvard and turn left.

I wish more of our people would find their way to Washington by going to Harvard and turning right.

Education is the most potent way to preserve our way of life. If control of our destiny is at the level of the voting booth then the voters must be made to realize what they are doing when they mark the ballot. And the people of this country have a right

to look upon a Harvard graduate as a citizen with superior knowledge and with power to guide and lead. That's why I am having my say to you today. I would walk across the United States on my hands and knees if it would help my country. But if I can get a few of you here to preach the brand of democracy I have talked about it beats walking on hands and knees. I'm not trying to single Harvard out. I just happen to be here.

There are many schools where the political gospel of our Founding Fathers might be reviewed and perhaps preached to the multitudes. If we have such a thing as an egghead let's have it hard boiled rather than scrambled.

I see where one of your Harvard graduates has recently recommended to Congress that in Federal tax returns the so-called three cocktail luncheons, hunting lodge, and the yacht parties be disallowed as a tax deduction. This is designed to bring in more revenue to the Treasury and in various ways to be good for the economy. I hope this charming and important graduate did not learn at Harvard the economic facts of life behind this proposal which contains some catchwords designed to sell it to his political customers. I wonder in which one of his four houses he thought out this plan, or maybe he did so while flying in his private airplane between various points of residence and work. Certainly the mathematics are wrong, the economics are wrong, and the implication that the great white father knows best about the details of business is rather apparent. It seems to overlook the mechanics that make business tick.

I think the idea in this graduate's recommendation was to limit expenses to $24 per day.

Now if the Government can tell a company that it can allow an executive or employee only up to $24 a day to spend on a business trip it can also tell that company that the allowance will only be $1 or any other figure.

I maintain that a company in business for a profit should have the right to use its own business judgment as to whether its representative will travel by bus or plane and live in flophouses, motels, or first-class hotels. I have many people on the road for me all the time. I'm the one who must meet the payroll. The business is mine. I'm the one to judge whether my traveling representatives of a first class and exclusive business will live second class and entertain second class. The few cases of abuse are trivial compared with the jolt that such a socialistic procedure would do to our Republic.

The Fuller brush man or the door-to-door cosmetics salesgirl has one reasonable standard of expenses and the man who is trying to sell a dozen $5 million airplanes or to open up a new foreign market for our domestic industry quite properly has another necessary scale. Imagine how effective I would be under the following circumstances. I go to a city to try and open a new cosmetics account. I have a well-known aviation background but I leave my plane at home in the hangar and go by train. On arrival I register into a single room in a second-class hotel. I then ask those to whom I wish to sell my products to come up to my room and have a cola with me followed by dinner at a drive-in.

What's sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. Why the cocktails and champagne at the White House? Why the very expensive planes kept available for the President as well as the Presidential yachts and Camp Davids. The answer is that they pay off in results. We don't want our Nation's Chief Executive or our other important national representatives to be second class any more than American industry wants its representatives to be second class. And we don't want—at least I don't want—the income tax law to be used as a lever to substitute the judgment of nonbusiness trained governmental employees or tax agents for the judgment of business management.

Also I think the mathematics of the proposal are wrong. Let's start with the executive who is living for the time being away from home in a two-room suite at a first-class hotel in New York. He chooses to give a lunch at the Twenty-One Club preceded by as many cocktails as the guests care to consume up to three and followed that night by a theater party for which a chauffeur-driven limousine will be necessary. Half that cost on the first go around comes out of the company after taxes and half out of the Government in loss of tax on what the regulation would consider plush or surplus cost. But now let's get to the cocktails. I myself don't believe in cocktails before lunch but that's beside the point. The point is that practically all the cost of the drinks is made up of revenue stamps that represent payment to the Government. Grain alcohol that I buy for use in cosmetics costs about $1 a gallon. Alcohol in beverages costs many times this and the difference is mostly in taxes.

But now let's get to the restaurant. It makes a profit on that lunch and pays half that profit over to the Government. The automobile company makes a profit on the car hire and pays half to the Government and the theater also pays over half its profits. And so does the hotel on its rental of the suite. When we get through with the count a lot of people have been employed in the operation and after such costs have been taken out and each has paid his tax the Government has lost very little. What little it has lost has more than been made up in the continuation with attached employment of going businesses known as hotels, restaurants, theaters and car rentals. We hear a lot about a lot of businesses living off of expense accounts. That's true and there is nothing wrong with it. Most of the people who travel and live in hotels and dine in restaurants are moving about on business and as a part of the cost of doing business. That's why we have railroads, airlines, hotels and restaurants. One might as well proclaim by tax-law that any phone call over 3 minutes or any telegram over 10 words is nondeductible because plush and unreasonable.

These are some of the ways that individual rights and freedoms are being taken away, I haven't tried to make an inventory of all such ways. Such an inventory would have to be contained in a looseleaf booklet so pages could be added and changed from week to week. Edgar Eisenhower—brother of Ike * * * inventoried a few in a speech he made almost exactly a year ago entitled "Termites in Government."

All these things move us along the controlled economy road to make for a socialistic welfare state.

The more I think about it the more I fear that unless something is done about it fairly promptly automation is likely to lead us right down the road to an extreme socialistic state.

At present when a mechanical computer goes into a single organization to take the place of dozens of clerks and accountants they find jobs elsewhere. Their ex-employer has no obligation to them beyond the usual termination pay. The Government perhaps then takes over for a short period of unemployment pay. But by this process of automation it can be foreseen that the group of employable but unemployed will keep growing. It is possible to foresee that before too long only a very few million or even only hundreds of thousands will be needed in our industrial plants. What then? Who supports these permanently unemployed? Do they get jobs driving more automatic controls? If so, the output will be tremendous assuming the availability of raw materials in the form of natural resources. Do these unemployed get paid by industrial companies who no longer use them? If so, what company pays whom. It's certain that their support must come from production. Therefore failing some workable plan industry as a whole will be taxed and the Government out of such taxes will support the employable but unemployed. I would like to see all these people capitalists in a capitalistic society rather than remittance men dependent on a dole from the politicians.

We are in an age of great scientific advance. Automation is only one of the results. The decade we are now in will probably be known as the scientific sixties. Operation Plowshare is a project for peaceful application of nuclear energy. Nuclear energy it seems can level a mountain or create a deep water port or dig another Panama Canal with just a few explosions. Men will be needed for these operations only to a small extent. The scientists who are thinking out ways to do away with the need for manpower might also think out what political and economic system will follow. This would indeed be a great present day project for Harvard.

I'm not talking about what man will do with his idle hours. That's a great study project in itself. I am talking about how man with most of his hours available for leisure is going to be supported and who is going to own the tools of production at that time.

A woman from the school of hard knocks probably should not be talking to you this way. I have posed questions I have no answers for. I only know that the machine age brought the same problems and a higher standard of living resulted. Every one of you can outdo me in logic and in an array of material bearing on the problems.

So I had better stop now and disappear quickly out one of the side doors. But I choose to stay on and listen while General Doriot completes the last class session of the present school year.

From my background of aviation I would like to make one closing remark. Since the day the Wright brothers made the first powered flight the conquest of the air has gone forward with a great rush. I have been a part of this forward rush for the last half of the period. I knew Orville Wright personally. I knew several of the men who were in that first group to fly. Now we have left the atmosphere behind and gone into space. It's very exciting. I was in the control center watching Commander Shepard 10 days ago when he became the first American into space. We can very properly glorify these astronauts who will become the Wright brothers of the new space era. We can very properly follow with intense interest the proposed exploration of the universe to solve its mysteries that are billions of years old. But the people of the earth are still pretty well earthbound. And some of these people—notably the Russians and Chinese—don't like us. I say therefore that we should not gaze into space so intently that we leave ourselves open to a knife in the back from some armed and evil prowler who has crept in our back door along the ground while we have been viewing the stars.

In the matter of conquest of the universe and the near-at-hand danger I am reminded of the drunk who was standing at the crowded bar. He first claimed he could lick anyone in the room. Receiving no response he broadened the challenge to the town, the State, and then to the world. With that a fellow standing right next to him knocked him down and roughed him up. The drunk when he recovered his speech remarked sadly

that he reckoned he had taken in too much territory in the last challenge. The moral of this is let's also be prepared to take on the fellow right next to us on earth while we are challenging the universe.

GEORGE W. MALONE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the reeds that grow along the banks of our streams wave back and forth with every breeze. They never grow very high, nor do they grow very strong, just yielding to the winds. They never contribute much either to man or to beast, for they offer no shade to the tired or inspiration to those who seek it. Some men are like the reed; they wave back and forth with every breeze, never growing high or strong nor do they ever contribute much to man. They cannot, because in their waving in every direction they have never remained still for a long enough time to be able to know what man is like and what his needs are. They offer no inspiration, for, not knowing really what they offer, there is not the strength or firmness to inspire.

However, Mr. President, the oak is very different, for this tree weathers the storms, never bending to the will of the wind, but growing strong with the strength it must have to withstand those forces. It spreads its branches, to break up the heat of the sun, so that the tired may rest under them and, in the resting, find inspiration in the firm strength of a creation of God that knew all its life its purpose, and never yielded to the forces which could have destroyed it and its usefulness.

Some men are like the oak. They grow strong through life, by resisting the temptations to be something to everyone. They grow strong by knowing where they are going and what they must do in the going. They spread the cooling shade of understanding, understanding gained by the experience gained from countless encounters with people and their problems.

A man of that sort passed away last Friday, May 19. He had been one of us during a long period of his life; and the firmness of his stands on the issues about which he felt deeply received the praise and the admiration of all, even of those who disagreed with him. When he spoke, he spoke from studied wisdom; and today and tomorrow and for all the tomorrows this wisdom will come back to us, and it will remind us—even those who disagreed—that his words were right.

One could look at him and see the physical strength developed by an active athletic life during youth, a body toughened by bodily contact, by the strain of serving his country in World War I, by the constant battle that went on daily as one tried to make progress in the early West. But while this outside manifestation of strength was being built into him, his mind was developing its ability to understand and to perceive and to place in logical written and spoken words the conclusions this mind would come to. But those indications are ever obvious in those who possess them. What is sometimes not so readily seen are the indications of inner or spiritual strength, and as this man grew, so did these most valuable traits grow. These, as we who knew him best knew, were reflected in his constant kindness, his devotion to his family and his friends. The shade of his friendship was as the shade of the oak—a spreading and cooling experience one will never forget. They were evident in his patriotic devotion to his country and for the freedoms the Republic has always stood for.

Mr. President, it is not easy to lose a man like the one I am speaking of, for there are not a great many of them living in this age of weakness and compromise. God in His wisdom had a reason for taking him, as he does for all of us when our time comes. I like to think that it was to make heaven a more pleasant place for those who are there and for those who will come later. If this be true, and I must believe it as this truth repeats itself whenever a good friend passes, then having to wait my time to see George Malone again will remove the dull nothingness of that hour and replace it with the happy thought that George and all the others will be there.

THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, one of the most disturbing developments in recent years is the criticism of the distinguished officers who are members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I have previously stated my confidence in our top military leadership and I reiterate it at this time.

I have, together with other Members of the Senate and Congress, as well as thoughtful citizens everywhere, believed that the unjustified criticism of our Joint Chiefs of Staff members is not of a constructive nature. Rather this criticism is the type that undermines confidence in our top military leadership and this undesirable result is compounded by the fact that such criticism also lowers our national prestige in the eyes of an apprehensive and watchful world.

In view of the grave concern which must be felt over these attacks on our Joint Chiefs of Staff, I invite the attention of all Members of the Senate to what I consider to be one of the most pertinent and perceptive statements yet forthcoming on this serious matter. I refer to the statement issued to the press on May 19, 1961, by the distinguished national commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Mr. Ted C. Connell, of Killeen, Tex. Commander Connell points out that he has just returned from an extensive trip to Europe in which he visited European officials and top-ranking U.S. military and diplomatic leaders. So deep was Commander Connell's concern that he issued this powerful statement in which he points out the severe damage being done to American prestige, and calls for a halt to this criticism of our Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In his statement Commander Connell pointedly asks two very profound questions which are being increasingly voiced by those who view this attack on the JCS in its full meaning. Mr. Connell asks if this criticism is a deliberate effort to undermine confidence in the JCS system in order to create a single Chief of Staff, and also if such criticism is an improper effort to invade the responsibility of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States have long taken a deep interest in national security matters. This statement by Commander Connell is another example of how the VFW with a membership of 1,300,000 overseas combat veterans, speaks with a constructive voice in matters relating to national security.

I completely concur with Commander Connell's belief that President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara should publicly state their confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Such action on the part of the President and the Secretary of Defense would have a salutary effect in preventing further erosion of confidence in our defense leadership and further damage abroad to our national prestige.

The Nation is indebted to the V.F.W. and its commander in chief for this timely statement. I strongly recommend it to the attention of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the statement by Commander Connell.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF TED C. CONNELL, NATIONAL COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES

MAY 19.—Ted C. Connell, Killeen, Tex., commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, charged Friday that criticism and innuendo of the Joint Chiefs of Staff by certain faceless Government officials with influence, but without responsibility, is having damaging effect on U.S. military leadership and prestige both at home and abroad.

In releasing his statement through VFW national headquarters here the national veterans' leader who has just returned from a 12-day swing through Europe, went on to say: "There is little doubt that this constantly implied criticism has lessened the effectiveness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The situation becomes more acute each day because the Joint Chiefs are unable to answer the criticism due to the confidential and responsible nature of their duties. I believe the time has come for President Kennedy to either put a stop to such talk or give the Joint Chiefs an opportunity to publicly state their case. Failure to do this can only be harmful to our Nation as a whole."

Commander Connell went on to ask: "I wonder if this criticism is part of a plan by certain people to attempt a breakdown in the confidence of the Joint Chiefs' system in the hope that this will ultimately lead to a single Chief of Staff: I wonder also if this criticism by faceless officials is an attempt to infringe on the responsibility of the JCS and the military leadership?"

Concluding Connell said, "I urge both President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara at this time to publicly state

their confidence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They are all dedicated and qualifed military leaders, but the support of the President and Secretary of Defense is imperative if they are to be effective."

COMMENTARY ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, in addition to the comment which has already been made concerning the message of President John F. Kennedy to Congress today, I am particularly delighted to note that the President has decided to restore $30 million which had previously been deleted by the Bureau of the Budget from the Rover nuclear propulsion program.

In the special message, the President disclosed his intention to accelerate the development of the atomic rocket. I heartily agree with this position. In fact, I felt compelled last April 19 to write to the President asking that we leave no stone unturned in grasping the opportunity afforded by Rover to leapfrog the Russians in this unique development. This program—while it has shown excellent progress in the past 5 years—had received only skimpy support from the previous administration.

Yet, this Nation pioneered atomic science and is in a position now to lead the way and be the indisputable leader of atomic space travel. The President's recommendation is an important step in this direction. I applaud him for his stand, and I am most hopeful that his appeal will be favorably received by the Congress.

Furthermore, President Kennedy, in my judgment, made a necessary and frank disclosure of America's standing in the cold war. His message concerning the dedication of our Nation to liberty and freedom cannot be repeated too often, nor can we overstress the sacrifices which each of us must be willing to take for the security of the country.

The modernization of our Armed Forces and the buildup of conventional military power to contain communism is a vital step toward achieving real security in this country. I am happy to see that the President has taken vigorous action to institute these reforms in our military posture.

All Americans, I believe, can draw inspiration from the intelligent and concise statement by the President of the goals that motivate this country and what is needed and should be expected of us all if liberty is to prevail in this world. It is my hope that Congress will see fit to assist the program of the President by appropriate legislative action.

DOLLAR GAPSMANSHIP

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD a report which was prepared for me on the possible adverse effect of the administration's proposal to cut from $500 to $100 the amount of goods returning to the United States which tourists can bring in duty free.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. "dollar gapsmanship" could backfire on both our balance of trade and our Latin American relations in several key areas.

Back in February, President Kennedy proposed to cut from $500 to $100 the amount of goods returning U.S. tourists can bring in duty-free. The $500 limit was originally set to help European economies back onto their feet. That was in the days when U.S. attention was focused on European recovery. Now administration leaders feel that Europe no longer needs help—and we need the tourists' dollars here.

But Mr. Kennedy's proposal—now formalized into H.R. 6611 just passed by the House—has poked a stick into the hornet's nest of Latin American and Caribbean economies. For the $500 tourist exemption has been a boon to south-of-the-border nations hungry to earn American tourist dollars.

Thus, amid general satisfaction with the $500 million Alliance for Progress Latin American aid bill, a discordant note was slipped into the May 15 session of the Economic Commission for Latin America. The ECLA pointed out "foreign exchange income from tourism is of vital importance for the economy of some countries of the Latin American region." They called on member states "to avoid measures which may jeopardize" the flow of tourists. The finger was pointed squarely at Uncle Sam.

To see why our hemispheric neighbors are so concerned, focus on Curacao, largest of the Netherlands Antilles. Curacao—just off the coast of Venezuela—long depended on oil refining to give it the highest standard of living in the Caribbean. With free world oil markets shrinking, Curacaoans have been counting on tourist-generated dollars to finance a new Economic Development Plan. This plan will free the island of a one-industry economy. More important is the fact that tourism is Curacao's second largest industry right now. Increasing numbers of Americans have been going to the capital city and free port of Willemstad for bargains offered by Curacao's globe-circling merchants. Several thousand Curacaoans are dependent on a tourist industry built by attracting these bargain hunters.

Despite the growing number of American tourists coming to Curacao, islanders point out the United States gets the better end of the trade. For every dollar laid out by American tourists, six dollars are spent in the United States by Curacaoans, about $250 for every man, woman, and child.

In addition to the all-important oil shipments, each year Curacao brings in $29 million of such staple American goods as Detroit cars, Louisville refrigerators, Kansas grain, and Philadelphia air conditioners. The Dutch Antilles together import about $70 million of U.S. goods each year.

These imports from the States dwarf the $5 million American tourists paid out in 1959 during their shopping tours through Curacao—generally regarded as the favorite shopping center of the tax-free Caribbean.

Curacao is thus most susceptible to the Kennedy measure. The island's Director of Economic Affairs and Development, Dr. F. P. Jansen, points out that local tourism is not "residual". Eighty-seven percent of tourist dollars are spent for goods—not hotels and services.

The proposed 80 percent cut in the tourist allowance means many of the Curacaoans now directly employed in the tourist industry may find themselves out of work. Spritzer & Fuhrmann, largest jewelry and silver merchant there, says large scale layoffs will be inevitable among their 600 employees.

With the island's second largest industry threatened and with the underpinnings of their Economic Development Plan weakened, Curacaoans are joining others in Latin America in regarding the Kennedy measure as an unreasoned or unfriendly act. They wonder if this is the United States' answer to years of friendship and heavy purchases from the North American giant.

As one leading Curacao figure exclaimed, "It makes little sense for the United States to adopt tourist policies that may bankrupt us, and then proceed to put us on American relief."

THE DRIVE TO RANSOM CASTRO CAPTIVES NEEDS HELP

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate last evening I made a brief statement in support of the effort by our fellow Americans to raise funds in an attempt to secure the freedom of 1,200 Castro prisoners. My statement yesterday contained my reasons for taking this position. However, at this time I would like to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the May 23 edition of the Providence Journal, "The Drive To Ransom Castro Captives Needs Help." It is my belief that this editorial states eloquently the reasons why the citizens of this, the world's greatest democracy, have an obligation to help liberate the unfortuante Cuban freedom fighters imprisoned by Premier Castro.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal, May 23, 1961]

THE DRIVE TO RANSOM CASTRO CAPTIVES NEEDS HELP

The voluntary campaign to raise $2 million dollars to buy the 500 tractors demanded by Premier Castro as the ransom price for the release of nearly 1,200 imprisoned Cuban rebels calls for the unstinting support of Americans.

Despite the raw cynicism of Castro's proposal, despite the distaste for a payoff to a blackmailer, the fate of the 1,200 captured anti-Castro invaders takes precedence over pride or protocol.

For many reasons, the American Government cannot participate officially in Castro's cruel game of pawns. The lives of human beings, whom Castro has condemned to what would be slave labor unless they are ransomed, cannot be equated with any number of tractors. People are not commodities to be traded, so many irreplaceable individuals for so many replaceable things—whether dollars, tractors, or trucks, the commodity that Hitler demanded to spare the lives of a million Hungarian Jews.

Although the Government has paid ransom in the past to win freedom for American citizens unjustly jailed behind the Iron Curtain, Castro's proffered deal is different in many respects. The 1,200 hostages are not American citizens. Nor are they mercenaries, as Cuban propagandists claim. They were not "bought" in the first instance to undertake to overthrow Castro, but rather were patriots, many former comrades in revolutionary arms with Castro, seeking to save their Nation from Fidelista dictatorship of the Left just as they sought before to end the military dictatorship of Batista. By the same token, this Government is precluded from taking any active role in a "trade" that would suggest Washington regards the rebel survivors now as mercenaries salvageable for a price.

But these philosophical and official considerations do not have to inhibit Americans as individuals. By their response to the fundraising appeal of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for Cuba's freedom fighters, private American citizens can demonstrate to the world that this country's vaunted concern for humanity, for individual human beings, is more than an empty phrase, more than a demagogic lure.

Indeed, there is an obligation of sorts on Americans to render what assistance they can as individuals to the imprisoned anti-Castro force. The American Government, which acts in the name of the people, has acknowledged a responsibility extending over both the present and past administrations for the failure of the Cuban rebel invasion.

The American people can make amends to the anti-Castro volunteers for whatever mistakes Washington made in its covert support of the invasion by helping to redeem at least the lives of the survivors. As distasteful as political blackmail is, the fundraising effort also gives the American people an occasion to demonstrate their friendship for the Cuban people, as distinct from the regime.

The need for funds will not stop, however, with the ransom price of 500 tractors. The men who risked their lives in the ill-starred anti-Castro invasion cannot simply be left back on the beach at Florida. As soldiers sharing this country's concern with keeping the New World free, they like the Hungarian freedom fighters have earned the help of Americans—and that means all of us—in finding jobs and accommodations until they can return to Cuba as freemen. Any money over the $2 million required for the tractors could be applied very usefully to that end.

TRIBUTE TO MINORITY STAFF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Today a compliment was paid to the staff of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and I think particularly to the majority members of the staff. I certainly concur in that compliment, because they have been kind, they have been courteous, they have been attentive, and they have been cooperative on every occasion. But I wish to pay an extraordinary compliment to the minority members of the staff, Michael Bernstein, Ray Hurley, George Wray, John Stringer, Thelma Blankenship, and Carmel Giancola.

Never have I seen more devoted staff members. Never have they put in such long hours, to make sure that the minority members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee had all the information properly digested. So today I salute them as a great staff, who have been extremely helpful on every occasion, in preparing the minority views and in exploring every other view with respect not only to the instant legislation but to all the legislation which comes before that committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join the distinguished minority leader in his compliments to the minority staff. When the vote is concluded, I shall take 2 or 3 minutes to express my appreciation to many others.

SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the last sentence in the "Declaration of purpose" of this bill reads:

> It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

In line with this policy, proponents of the bill have repeated that the real purpose of the bill is to provide equality of educational opportunity.

As is the case with so much legislation that is being proposed, one must look beyond the nice-sounding labels and lofty objectives set forth, and carefully examine the words of the particular bill under consideration to see whether in fact there has been some mislabeling; to see whether the lofty objectives will really be achieved.

Here we have a bill that is supposed to attain equality of educational opportunity for boys and girls attending public primary and secondary schools throughout the United States. How is this to be done? The answer provided by the bill is, in a nutshell, to spend $850 million a year. Nothing is said about how it is to be spent. In fact, the proponents of this bill have repeated time and again the policy set forth in section 103 of the bill; namely:

> In the administration of [the act] no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

I respectfully submit that this policy kills the purpose of the bill. Anyone in the education field will tell us that spending money is not enough; that to achieve even minimal quality of education there must be standards.

There are considerable differences in the standards established in the laws of the 50 States; and within each State there are vast differences in standards among the hundreds and thousands of school districts. Just spending more money will not assure equality of educational opportunity. Sooner or later, the standards will have to be changed. Three years from now, if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare means what he says, the Congress will be asked for a continuing annual Federal appropriation. We will not have attained equality of educational opportunity in the meantime, and if the proponents of this legislation are consistent, they will say that we must appropriate even more money than this bill calls for. Their only answer to the problem will be to spend more Federal money, and as long as this philosophy prevails, we will never achieve equality of educational opportunity. The answer to the problem of providing equality of educational opportunity in fact lies in the provision of minimal Federal standards—not in the spending of more Federal money. I think the proponents of this legislation know this, but they are afraid to include standards in this bill because they know that the people do not want the Federal Government telling them how to run their schools. They know that once Federal money comes into the States and local school districts, it will be more difficult for the people to resist imposition of Federal standards and controls.

As I have said on this floor before, I think the Senate should make up its mind what it wants to do. Either it should decide to spend millions of dollars of Federal money in a program which can never achieve equality of educational opportunity; or it should decide to include in the bill the standards that will achieve this equality. It has already decided against amendments, which I supported, to return to the States some of the revenue raised within their own borders from their own citizens to enable them to have the wherewithal to spend more money in accordance with their own standards. To me, the choice is now quite clear. A vote for this bill will be a vote to spend millions of dollars for a lofty purpose which, under this bill, will never be achieved. A vote against the bill will result in a new bill being introduced which will either actually achieve equality of educational opportunity in fact or will return to the States the revenue needed for them to fulfill their responsibilities of education in accordance with standards which their people believe to be adequate.

Another aspect of this bill which troubles me greatly is that it will result in thousands of local school budgets being drawn up on the assumption that future appropriations by Congress will be forthcoming. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has made it clear that this is what he has in mind. Some of the proponents of this legislation may feel the same way, but they are strangely silent on this point. I view with alarm such a fatalistic assumption that the State and local governments can nevermore be relied upon to fulfill their traditional role in the education of their citizens.

I am equally alarmed over the tenuousness of such an assumption. It is entirely possible, if not probable, that future appropriations will not be forthcoming. And when that situation arises, the budgets of thousands of local school districts will literally be wrecked. Such would not be true if this legislation were limited to assistance for construction. But the bill has now been

amended to cover all kinds of operating costs as well.

The logical result of this type of legislation is that under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, which the proponents of this bill rely upon as the basis therefor, it will only be a matter of time before the Federal Government will come up with Federal aid for operating costs of our mental hospitals—because, it can be argued, the Federal Government has an interest in the mental health of the Nation; and then Federal aid for operating expenses of our State colleges and universities—because, it can be argued, the Federal Government has an interest in the higher education of our young people; and then Federal aid for State prisons—because, it can be argued, the Federal Government has an interest in rehabilitation of prisoners so that they will become useful citizens; and so on. Not that these objectives are unsound. Not that the Federal Government should not be "interested" or "concerned." But this is the way toward the usurpation of all governmental functions by one, centralized, Federal Government and the destruction of our Republic.

Finally, Mr. President, our President has just called upon the Congress for action to appropriate more money—billions of dollars of it—for national defense and space activities. In the course of his speech I detected this significant warning:

> If the budget deficit now increased by the needs of our security—

And I might add also by the nondefense spending measures already proposed or passed by the Congress—

> is to be held within manageable proportions—if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar—it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds to programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

Of course, it would be helpful if the President himself, in light of the requirements outlined in his address, would request that this bill be passed over, desirable as some might consider it, in favor of fiscal integrity. It would, of course, be desirable for the proponents of this bill to themselves put it aside in favor of fiscal integrity. It would have been desirable for them to have acquiesced in the Cooper-Javits amendment to reduce the amount to that which the administration originally requested. However, I fear that the American people will instead find that the Congress will persist in doing everything all at once, talking for fiscal integrity one day and voting against fiscal integrity the next. The proponents of this proposed legislation will say that it is indispensable and that we should cut foreign aid. The proponents of foreign aid will say that the President himself has said that foreign aid is—

> the single most important program available for building the frontiers of freedom—

To quote again from the President's speech.

What will happen? We shall end up with both. We shall end up with many other so called "must" bills, and the fiscal integrity our President has called for will become only an empty platitude which our grandchildren will read about someday and say:

> Was the failure of Congress to heed the President's words the reason why we have lost our freedom?

And we, in our declining years, will have to nod our heads in agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a legislative history with reference to a letter which I have received from the National Catholic Welfare Conference, signed by William R. Consedine, director, with reference to the Prouty amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CATHOLIC
WELFARE CONFERENCE,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: On May 23, as you know, the Senate adopted the Prouty amendment to S. 1021. During debate the amendment, as submitted, was changed specifically to limit Federal funds to public elementary and secondary schools. As adopted with that amendment it has a potential threat to existing programs adopted by several States in the interests of protecting the health and welfare of children attending either public or parochial schools, programs of unquestioned constitutional validity. (Everson, Cochran, and several other cases on which I need not elaborate.)

The limitation on the use of Federal funds is cause for alarm, and we respectfully address this letter to you in explanation of our apprehensions and in the hope there may be opportunity for clarification.

The debate discloses a concern that under the Prouty amendment, as submitted, some money appropriated pursuant to the proposal could be used in State programs providing transportation of children to all schools, including children attending parochial schools. You stated on the floor that—

"Some of the representatives of educational associations have come to me and to other Senators and said that they are very much concerned that it be made perfectly certain that moneys shall be used for public elementary and secondary schools only."

Accordingly, the original Prouty amendment was amended specifically to limit Federal moneys exclusively to public school use, despite existing legislation in several States authorizing transportation and other welfare services to all children. In any of these States whether Federal and State funds may be commingled to accomplish the publicly approved purposes of providing welfare services to all children may be subject to question.

Additionally, the amendment, as adopted, provides strong Federal control. The Federal Government would be saying to the States that they may not use any money appropriated for transportation systems and other auxiliary programs which included service to students of nonpublic schools. This is not consistent with the States rights concept which characterized the Taft legislation on which the original Prouty amendment is allegedly predicated. But, on the contrary, it appears to be quite similar to the Donnell amendment to the Taft measure.

An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for May 5, 1949, indicates that Senator Donnell, of Missouri, proposed an amendment to S. 246 which would specifically limit the use of moneys to be appropriated under S. 246 to public schools, even though they had programs involving the transportation of parochial schoolchildren. The amendment was defeated by a vote of 71 to 3. A similar amendment introduced by Congressman Jacobs, on the House side in the same Congress, was decisively defeated.

This is the first time in over 20 years that an amendment of this nature has been seriously considered. Knowing your outstanding record in behalf of nondiscriminatory legislation, we do not feel that you wished to place such proscriptions on moneys to be appropriated under S. 1021.

We respectfully submit that the amendment may cause substantial confusion in the States which now provide transportation or other health and welfare services to children in private schools and might require the establishment of separate funds, one limited exclusively to State funds, in order to implement the desire of the people of that State to protect the welfare of all the children of the State whether in public or private schools.

We are certain you will accept these comments in the spirit in which submitted and appreciate fully both the basis of our concern and our doubts that either you or Senator PROUTY intended the results we fear may be possible.

With our continuing gratitude for your cosideration of our points of view, and respects, I am,

Cordially,

WILLIAM R. CONSEDINE.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the letter raises a question with regard to the effect of the Prouty amendment with respect to Federal and State funds. The writer says:

> The debate discloses a concern that under the Prouty amendment, as submitted, some money appropriated pursuant to the proposal could be used in State programs providing transportation of children to all schools including children attending parochial schools. You stated on the floor that—
>
> "Some of the representatives of educational associations have come to me and to other Senators and said that they are very much concerned that it be made perfectly certain that moneys shall be used for public elementary and secondary schools only."
>
> Accordingly, the original Prouty amendment was amended specifically to limit Federal moneys exclusively to public school use, despite existing legislation in several States authorizing transportation and other welfare services to all children. In any of these States whether Federal and State funds may be commingled to accomplish the publicly approved purposes of providing welfare services to all children may be subject to question.
>
> • • • • •
>
> We respectfully submit that the amendment may cause substantial confusion in

the States which now provide transportation or other health and welfare services to children in private schools and might require the establishment of separate funds, one limited exclusively to State funds, in order to implement the desire of the people of that State to protect the welfare of all the children of the State whether in public or private schools.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference wishes to know whether the adoption of the Prouty amendment will in any way prevent the States from spending money in the States in which by State law money now can be spent for assistance to private schools.

I wish to make it crystal clear from the standpoint of the legislative history and the legislative intent that the Prouty amendment affects only the expenditure of Federal funds and exercises no jurisdiction whatsoever over State funds. The Federal money goes to the States to be spent by the State educational authorities for public schools, but any State using State funds, for example, for transportation purposes for parochial school students can continue to use State money to transport students going to parochial schools. If any State is using any money now for textbooks for the benefit of children in parochial schools, the Prouty amendment would in no way affect the continued right of the State to do that with State money.

All the Prouty amendment will do is to make it crystal clear—this is the intent of the amendment, this is the intent of the floor leader of the bill, and this is the intent of the sponsors of the bill, based upon the legislative history I am now making—that none of the Federal money provided for in this bill can be used in any way in connection with parochial or private schools. The Prouty amendment could not possibly exercise any jurisdiction over the States with respect to the expenditure of State money.

My reply to the National Catholic Welfare Conference is to make it crystal clear that the Prouty amendment limits itself to Federal money and in no way interferes at all with the right of the States to continue to use their own money as they use it at the present time under their own State laws with respect to whatever they now spend for private schools.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I wish to have that made crystal clear, as to the legislative intent of the manager of the bill and the legislative intent of the administration and sponsors offering the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during Tuesday's debate Senator HRUSKA and later Senator GOLDWATER both asserted that Federal aid to education as proposed in the bill will lead to Federal control. By way of documentation of this assertion Senator GOLDWATER, at page 8671 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, as he had in his testimony before my subcommittee—at page 548 of the hearings—cited the alleged experience of one Professor Bartlett regarding guidance and counseling institutes held under title V of the National Defense Education Act at George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn.

Senator HRUSKA also spoke of Professor Bartlett—at page 8611 of Tuesday's RECORD and again yesterday at page 8804—though he misinterpreted the record of our hearings at page 548 as Professor Bartlett's testimony rather than Senator GOLDWATER's which referred to Professor Bartlett.

The Senators' citation of Professor Bartlett's alleged experience with these guidance and counseling institutes, as illustrations of Federal control, is unfortunate both as to facts and as to the context of the facts.

First, with respect to Professor Bartlett's allegation regarding lowered admission standards: I have here a copy of a letter to the Office of Education from President Henry H. Hill, of George Peabody College for Teachers, where the institutes in question were held, which states:

> Peabody did not lower her academic standards in order to admit students to attend the institute supported by Federal funds.

President Hill says that Professor Bartlett's contention—and I quote—"does not reflect the attitude of George Peabody College for Teachers nor of the Peabody administration. Our relations with the U.S. Office of Education and with the other departments of the Federal Government have been entirely satisfactory."

I respectfully request that this letter from which I have quoted be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE PEABODY COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS,
Nashville, Tenn., April 4, 1961.

Mr. PETER P. MUIRHEAD,
Director, Financial Aid Branch, Division of Higher Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUIRHEAD: The article by Claude J. Bartlett does not reflect the attitude of George Peabody College for Teachers nor of the Peabody administration. Our relations with the U.S. Office of Education and with other departments of the Federal Government have been entirely satisfactory.

We have had no more than the usual divergencies of opinion and minor difficulties such as those which would attend a cooperative effort between Vanderbilt University and Peabody, for example, or between Peabody and the Tennessee State Department of Education or any other reputable organization. Peabody did not lower her academic standards in order to admit students to attend the institute supported by Federal funds. All of the 38 students admitted met our admission requirements. Not all were well suited to the purposes of the institute but Peabody and not the Federal Government was responsible for recruitment, admission, and instruction.

Any criticism I have of the activities of the Federal Government will be made orally or by letter directly to the responsible authorities. As a member of the title IV selection committee I expressed myself freely to members of our committee and to staff members of the Office of Education. The chairman of this committee, Dean Henry Bent, of the University of Missouri, invited a considerable number of our critics to spend most of a day in Washington airing their criticism. This is how it ought to be done.

The institute we held was only reasonably successful and that is why we called off the second one. The fault is in the practical difficulties of staffing the institute and securing the teachers and counseling officers as students for one semester of an academic year.

Mr. Bartlett is entitled to his opinions. He is an excellent researcher but unsatisfactory in his relationships with faculty and students and neither a good recruiter nor administrator.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. HILL,
President.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Office of Education has no record that this Professor Bartlett was, as stated by the Senators from Nevada and Arizona, a director of one of the federally sponsored institutes mentioned. Hence, the authority for the charges he makes is at best subject to question.

However, I cannot resist pointing out to the Senators that to attack even categorical aid on the ground that the Federal officer administering the taxpayers' money might do his proper duty is no different in principle from attacking public services of many kinds that require proper administration.

When a Federal agency contracts with an enterprise, whether nonprofit or commercial, to provide certain services to the public or to anyone else, the Government, as the customer may properly determine, under mandate from the Congress, the terms of the purchase. The institution is not obliged to accept a student except under a contract it has freely entered into. The institution cited by the Senators entered voluntarily into a contract with the Federal Government to do certain things, and the so-called control complained of by the individual concerned, as far as any evidence given is concerned, was simply the Federal Government's seeing to it that these things were done.

I believe that the Senator from Arizona understands and agrees to this. At least this is how I construe the following statement which he made yesterday regarding the so-called controls in the National Defense Education Act.

> I agree that many, if not all, of these controls are necessary. After all, the Federal Government, when it spends huge sums of the taxpayers' money, must attach conditions and controls to see that the money is spent both properly and in accordance with the requirements of the law.

I should also like to make available to our colleagues through the RECORD a document prepared by the Office of Education which explains how a State's al-

location under the proposed bill will be affected by a change in the method of determining the number of school-children credited to each State. As you know, two principal bases for counting children or pupils have been proposed: First, the school-age population of the State, as specified in the committee bill; and second, the average daily public school attendance, as proposed in the administration's original bill, and again proposed as an amendment on the floor by the Senator from Ohio.

Many Senators have been understandably concerned about how and why their own State's allocations would be affected by the choice as between these two modes of enumeration.

Though it is evident that the key factor is the ratio between the State's average daily public school attendance and its total school-age population, the relationship is not readily apparent from the allocation formula itself. The Office of Education has prepared for us, therefore, a brief statement giving a simple approximating formula for making this comparison. I request unanimous consent to insert this document in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. I wish also in this connection to acknowledge the fine services of Drs. Louis H. Conger, Jr., Kenneth A. Simon, and their colleagues on the estimates and projections staff of the Office of Education, who have been most helpful throughout the committee deliberations and Senate debate on this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed at this point in the RECORD.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to have printed a table showing the allotments to the States under the bill in its present form.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EFFECT OF SUBSTITUTING AVERAGE DAILY ATTENDANCE IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS FOR SCHOOL-AGE POPULATION IN S. 1021 AS REPORTED OUT BY COMMITTEE

AN APPROXIMATE FORMULA

A relatively simple relationship is approximately true for a total allotment of $850 million and the statistics being used now to compute State allotments under S. 1021:

$$\frac{\text{allotment}-\text{allotment}}{\frac{p}{\text{school-age population}}} \frac{\text{ADA}}{} = \$37.06 - \$49.92 \left[\frac{\text{average daily attendance}}{\text{school-age population}}\right]$$

where allotment "p" and allotment "ADA" represent the State's allotment under S. 1021 using State population aged 5–17 and average daily attendance in public schools, respectively, in determining the number of children or students credited to a State.

The formula may be read thus:

The difference between allotments per school-age child to States under school-age population and under public school attendance (ADA) is $37.06 less $49.92 times the ratio of average daily attendance to school-age population. The result is positive if the allotment is larger under school-age population.

This formula is approximately true but not exact. Furthermore, it does not apply to States which have fixed allotment ratios, or allotment ratios affected by the limits of 0.25 and 0.75.

Estimated allotments to States under S. 1021, title I, as amended by the Senate, fiscal year 1962[1]

State (1)	Amount (2)	Amount per school age (5 to 17, inclusive) child (3)
50 States, District of Columbia, American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands	$850,000,000	$18.54
Alabama	23,961,023	26.65
Alaska	1,100,617	18.49
Arizona	7,391,526	21.80
Arkansas	12,843,811	27.74
California	46,145,364	12.43
Colorado	8,880,002	19.06
Connecticut	5,205,951	9.25
Delaware	1,237,222	10.57
Florida	21,882,711	19.26
Georgia	27,994,294	25.57
Hawaii	3,732,454	21.70
Idaho	4,400,517	23.79
Illinois	31,458,923	13.09
Indiana	22,739,372	18.72
Iowa	14,360,065	20.37
Kansas	11,090,987	20.17
Kentucky	21,370,401	25.81
Louisiana	22,162,149	24.30
Maine	5,165,783	21.80
Maryland	13,656,051	17.20
Massachusetts	14,762,560	13.36
Michigan	37,858,970	17.62
Minnesota	18,362,008	20.63
Mississippi	17,448,720	27.74
Missouri	18,486,729	18.05
Montana	3,881,587	20.76
Nebraska	7,343,701	20.01
Nevada	1,038,379	13.66
New Hampshire	2,721,150	19.44
New Jersey	16,561,767	11.96
New Mexico	6,358,953	24.18
New York	40,577,641	10.88
North Carolina	33,689,105	26.36
North Dakota	4,527,235	26.15
Ohio	39,445,240	16.13
Oklahoma	12,578,909	22.46
Oregon	9,025,547	19.45
Pennsylvania	43,945,475	16.53
Rhode Island	3,427,273	17.05
South Carolina	20,361,463	27.74
South Dakota	4,451,597	23.55
Tennessee	23,483,592	25.25
Texas	57,957,084	21.80
Utah	6,309,502	23.63
Vermont	2,079,458	22.12
Virginia	23,759,516	22.61
Washington	12,932,517	17.69
West Virginia	12,889,861	24.55
Wisconsin	19,984,675	19.57
Wyoming	1,790,255	19.89
District of Columbia	3,125,420	18.49
American Samoa	194,183	27.74
Guam	499,327	27.74
Puerto Rico	21,054,974	27.74
Virgin Islands	277,404	27.74

[1] Allotments are based upon school age (5 to 17, inclusive) population with no minimum allotment per pupil; allotment ratios with limits of 0.25 and 0.75; allotment ratios of 0.75 for American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; and allotment ratios of 0.50 for Alaska and the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, an editorial in today's New York Times entitled "Softening the School Bill" seeks to establish that the Senate weakened S. 1021 by adopting the amendment of the Senator from Vermont. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOFTENING THE SCHOOL BILL

The Senate's so-called broadening of the public school aid bill has seriously weakened the measure. Instead of limiting funds to public school construction and teachers' salaries, the bill now permits the States to apply the money also to local costs of school operation.

This amendment, sponsored by Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, is said to have been a concession to pressure by school administrators. If true, the pressure is thoroughly misguided.

Such catchall aid would make Federal funds available to help finance school transportation, custodial services, teaching materials, and school bond retirement. It could and probably would fritter away Federal funds. Instead of pushing public education toward greater excellence, as is the primary aim of the President's proposals, the money could be spent piecemeal to keep things running as usual or slightly better—and this is not good enough.

Funds for such services as bus transportation are relatively easier to raise locally. The Federal aid bill must not become an invitation to local school boards and administrators to relax their efforts. The grant of aid for operational expenses is a dangerous temptation to sit back and let Federal aid become a substitute rather than a much-needed additional source of money.

We continue to believe that the Senate ought to pass Federal aid legislation without delay, even in this new, weakened form. It must then be up to the House to shape a more straightforward bill, for construction and teachers' salaries only, so that a measure of maximum promise for better education will finally be passed in this session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont were present, I feel certain he would answer the editorial himself.

The amendment was adopted because it expands the options available to the States for using Federal funds. It strengthens our affirmation that the States are best able to determine the needs of their educational systems. In making application to the Federal Government, each State must designate the use to which the funds will be put. The same standards of maintenance of State effort will continue to apply to the maintenance and operating costs as apply to construction and to teachers' salaries; that is, State effort as a whole for the public schools must be maintained.

To the extent that the Prouty amendment expands the choices open to the States for use of Federal funds, I believe the amendment strengthens the bill.

ACTION OF OREGON LEGISLATURE

Before adjourning a few days ago, the Oregon Legislature completed action on a memorial to Congress urging the adoption of a program of Federal grants to the States to support public education.

I regret very much that I have not yet received the official text of this memorial. However, it was adopted by the State house of representatives by a vote of 31 to 29, and by the Oregon State Senate by a vote of 21 to 8.

Oregon is a middle-income State, but it is among the foremost in the extent to which it supports education out of State and local sources. We have a fine education system, yet the Oregon Legislature recognizes that it should be better and that Federal tax sources are better able to raise the necessary funds than are State and local services.

Finally, Mr. President, as we come to the end of this long road, I am sure we are all more than a little fatigued. Despite magnificent cooperation on both sides of the aisle, despite diligent attention to their homework by many

Senators, and despite excellent staff preparation all around including that of the Department of HEW, our work has been long and arduous. Sincerely held differences of opinion, deeply held beliefs, have often clashed on this floor, so that we have wisely taken ample time to have every view fairly and fully considered.

Yet, despite our fatigue, as we come to the final decision on this bill, I know too that many of us are exhilarated at the prospect of enacting this measure. The principle that we establish here today—that the Senate recognizes a Federal responsibility to see that every American boy and girl is helped to receive a decent public school education is a principle which will enable the United States to maintain its threatened freedom in the trying times that lie ahead.

By recognizing that the unformed intellects of our young people are the Nation's primary natural and national resource, by taking the modest measures encompassed in S. 1021 to protect and promote that precious resource, we are reaffirming the wisdom of our Founding Fathers who farsightedly provided public school systems in the earliest colonial days.

There surely is nothing more to be said about this measure on either side that will change the outcome of the vote on its final passage here in the Senate.

But that we have come this far with the bill still intact, after 8 days of Senate debate and after 16 rollcall votes on various amendments, indicates to me that its supporters are now going to adopt it by a large margin.

That we have come this far is a great tribute to my colleagues who have consistently supported this bill, and I want to express to them my deep appreciation. No fancy leadership could bring about this result; it has only been possible because a large body of opinion in this Chamber—a majority opinion—was determined that this aid-to-education bill would go on the books. A majority was determined that the bill shall pass, and no diversions were allowed to deflect the bill from that goal.

Thus, the leadership of the Congress, yes and in the executive branch, too, simply had to put itself at the head of this majority and stay there.

So I want to thank all in this Chamber who never lost sight of the purpose as expressed in the title of S. 1021, "a program of Federal financial assistance for education."

Some of the diversions offered were tempting. I hope and expect that soon we will explore some of these diversionary paths to their ends. Certainly the senior Senator from Oregon is just as much interested as any Member in this Chamber in the subjects of enforcing the 14th amendment, and in doing justice to our private school system.

But we recognized that we could not deal with all these problems in one measure and hope to make progress on any one of them.

I want to add that by strengthening America's public school system in this bill, we are making a great advance for the entire Nation. Let me remind my colleagues whose thoughts in the last 8 days have strayed to the school integration issue, and to the private school issue, that it is our whole Nation which will profit from this legislation in its present form.

Let us remember that no one race of Americans is going to win the contest with communism while the other race fails.

Neither is one religious faith in America going to win that contest while other religious faiths fail.

We will all together maintain freedom and leadership in the world, or we will all together come in second.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, it will not be long before an overwhelming majority of Americans will vigorously condemn the proposed legislation to authorize Federal aid for education.

During the past 10 days we have witnessed a humiliating spectacle which involves cowardly surrender to intimidation and coercion of the pressure groups and this administration.

Proponents have expressed concern for our schoolchildren and for their future welfare. I have a higher regard for the intelligence of young Americans than do the proponents of the bill, who believe that young Americans today are demanding handouts and subsidies which will destroy the safeguards they enjoy under the Constitution.

In the State of Idaho, with the exception of a few pressure groups, there is overwhelming opposition to the proposed legislation, as is indicated by a telegram I have received from Mrs. H. T. Plumb, president, Third District Idaho School Trustees Association, which represents approximately one-fourth of the population of our State.

I read the telegram, addressed to me, dated May 16, 1961:

> Perhaps you would like to use the following during floor discussion on the Federal-aid-to-educaiton bill. The third district, Idaho school trustees, comprising 11 southwestern counties adopted the following resolution May 10:
>
> "Whereas the encroachment of the Federal Government into local matters has grown into a huge bureaucracy; and
>
> "Whereas Federal appropriations eventually carries with it Federal control; and
>
> "Whereas States have been making rapid progress toward providing adequate building and curriculums and will be able to handle the situation adequately: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *"Resolved,* That the third district Idaho school trustees go on record as being opposed to further expansion of Federal aid until called for by the majority of school boards of the National School Boards Association."

Most of the newspapers in the State of Idaho have condemned this drastic proposal to permit the Federal Government to interfere with and ultimately to control education. Typical of many of the editorials which have appeared in the newspapers in Idaho is one entitled "The Federal Aid Issue," which appeared in the Idaho Daily Statesman of Boise, Idaho, Saturday, May 20. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL AID ISSUE

Argument in support of the administration's Federal aid to education bills center upon two main contentions.

One is that there is urgent need for additional school buildings and equipment that can't be met by States and communities.

The other is that because we need more teachers, who shall receive still better pay than they do today, there is no alternative to Federal intervention.

These are contentions that have been promoted so assiduously that a private polling organization employed by an eastern Congressman has reported its findings that three out of four people in that State want to see the program passed because, in their opinion, "the whole educational system should be improved in order to help the Nation keep its place in the world and stay ahead of or keep up with Russia." That, perhaps, as the pollster suggests, is a pretty fair sampling of uncritical public opinion on the subject prevailing rather generally over the country.

It deals entirely with generalities.

What's presented in this program is specific. It ought to be dealt with specifically—and not with dreamy-eyed sentimentality or profligate irresponsibility.

What it proposes is to improve the quality of the educational fare, and to make the educational opportunity available in equal portions to pupils everywhere in the land.

It's not a new concept—except that it's now applied to the country as a whole, and that's a distinct innovation.

It's a concept that's beset with difficulties, foremost among which is formula trouble that's inherent in the problem of how to parcel out this aid money to make the equalization program work.

It's a problem that so far has been skipped over lightly in the pending Federal aid to education bills, but it can't be hurdled or circumambulated, and unless it's properly solved we're in worse trouble than we would be without any outside aid money at all.

The original proposal provides for estimated grants for elementary and secondary schools totaling $2,298 million the coming 3 years. Of this amount all of Idaho would be allotted $12,800,000, which, incidentally, isn't enough money to run Boise's schools alone for 2 years.

The amount would more likely be greater than less when Congress gets through juggling the figures, but without any particular regard for local requirements that amount would be spread over the country to "improve" its educational system.

There is suggested, then, the possibility that a State with no construction needs could provide more help for its teachers than a State with serious need for classrooms, though the latter State might have equal need to pay its teachers more. So question may well be raised whether the Federal program may not, in fact, increase rather than diminish discrepancies in teacher salaries.

It's a proposal that gives rise to serious questions. Let New Jersey's Congressman PETER FRELINGHUYSEN for one ask them: If our children deserve the best—and we're

quite sure they do—does this mean that Federal responsibility is concerned? Is the best obtainable simply by the expenditure of more money? May this not necessitate better teachers? And perhaps different curriculums?

Concerning one thing about this Federal aid to education program, though there's no question at all. It leads directly—though this bill may be only a foot in the door—to Federal Government regimentation of the country's educational establishment.

The Federal Government is not going to put dollars into the construction of a schoolhouse without having a good deal to say how that schoolhouse is to be built. The Federal Government isn't about to make any substantial contribution to any teacher's salary without having a good deal to say about what teacher is to get the job, and what the teacher is to teach.

If it were to abstain from such dictation and controls it would depart radically from its established pattern in such affairs, and it might be justly charged with irresponsibility.

It's on that account that the recent district meeting of the Idaho School Trustees Association, following the lead of the national organization, has gone on record in direct opposition to any further expansion of Federal aid to education.

And it's on that account, primarily, that these Federal aid bills are encountering snags and hard sledding in the Congress.

This Federal-aid-to-education program is to be recognized for what it really is. It's not the product of any grassroots movement. It is essentially a foot-in-the-door proposal, taking advantage of everybody's concern for the best possible educational opportunity for every youngster, to advance and magnify the tricky concept that Government always knows best what to do, and so it should be given all responsibility and whatever of resources it may require to carry out its plans.

It's on that basis that this program is properly to be taken—or left alone.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, probably no other issue pending before the current Congress will generate as much emotional fervor as Federal aid to education.

The quality of our educational curriculums, the physical capabilities of our school plants and classrooms and the professional standards of our teachers all have a direct influence on the quality of the finished product—our children.

I have always felt with a sincerity of deep conviction that Federal assistance could be helpful in improving the caliber of American education, providing certain standards were met.

In view of the many programs currently in effect and historically, the principle of Federal aid to education is well established in our society. Such programs as the school lunchroom program, aid to federally impacted areas, college facilities loan programs and the GI bill have served constructively and useful purposes.

The substantive question of broad Federal aid is, What form shall it take, how general shall it be and to whom shall it go?

The legislation before the Senate has several commendable provisions, many of which I could support apart from the principal package. However, there are other aspects of the bill which, as a general omnibus school aid bill, contain such disturbing implications for our American educational system that I can not support it.

I believe that a minimum of Federal intervention is essential to the preservation of our educational system. S. 1021 goes far beyond what I consider to be appropriate limits for Federal aid, and so I shall vote against it.

The crux of the Senate debate focused on these major points:

Does Federal aid to education, as proposed in S. 1021, mean Federal control of education?

Is there now a need for the massive Federal assistance proposed by the bill for such purposes as school construction, teachers' salaries, and "special" projects?

Local autonomy in educating our children constitutes one of the last remaining areas of individual initiative in the United States. Only local people, who are familiar with their own community educational needs and capabilities, can best prescribe what is best for their children.

The National School Boards Association in opposing Federal aid said:

> It would be naive to think that it will not mean Government control.

The local communities should not be forced to abdicate their traditional responsibility in favor of centralized control by a professional Federal bureaucracy.

Federal air proponents claim there will be "no strings" attached to Federal grants. This may be true at the outset, but those who make the laws can change them, and I am fearful that once the door is edged open the ultimate fate of our educational system will be complete Federal domination.

The legislation proposes a 3-year "temporary" program. Anyone familiar with Federal bureaucracy knows that "temporary" programs eventually become permanent, and as they become permanent their operational scope gradually becomes all powerful and all inclusive.

Ours is a good and expanding educational system. Phenomenal progress has been made since the end of World War II by local and State authorities during a period of tremendous expansion of the school age population. Although Federal assistance, especially in the area of school construction, could have been extremely helpful during these crucial years, it was not forthcoming.

Local school boards, without massive Federal assistance, tackled the problem with characteristic American vigor, ingenuity and success. They have literally moved mountains to provide an educational environment conducive to maximum development of their children's educational talents. In so doing, they found that the job could be done faster, cheaper, better, and tailored to local requirements than if they had waited for the Federal dollar.

Classrooms have been constructed at a faster rate than recommended by the President, the teacher shortage is being resolved, school expenditures have been increasing in recent years at an annual rate of 15 percent, teacher salaries have been increased, and the influx of new school age children is peaking rapidly.

Problems still remain, to be sure, but they are neither as severe or widespread as in past years. Capable teachers still are not being paid what their services merit, but State and local authorities are moving ahead rapidly in this area.

One of the inherent dangers of gigantic Federal aid is the encouragement of apathy by the lure of "free money," that to pass the buck is to receive a buck. I certainly would not like to see responsible local authorities succumb to this bait by diminishing their desire to pay adequate teacher salaries, by diluting their initiative to construct adequate facilities, or in any way affecting their traditional obligation to educate their children.

Such a deterioration in local initiative could have disastrous consequences.

As we—and the Nation—listened to President Kennedy's address before a joint session of Congress earlier this afternoon, it was made crystal clear that the Federal Government will undertake future expenses of tremendous magnitude in connection with outer space programs.

I feel that, viewed in context with the additional burdens which we can expect to be assumed by the Federal Government in the future, the interests of our total national security and welfare can best be served by retaining responsibility for most health, education and welfare matters in local and State fields.

I am not often impressed by those who come from the other side of the aisle, but President Kennedy really convinced me this afternoon that the Federal Government has its hands full without assuming further responsibility in the fields of public primary and secondary education. I shall be obliged to vote against the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 8 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, if ever an issue has been thoroughly debated in the Senate, the issue of Federal aid to schools has been. Every conceivable consequence and every possible ramification has been raised both during the extensive committee hearings on school-aid proposals through the years and during the exhaustive debates on this subject.

Over the many years this issue has been before the Congress, numerous objections have been overcome as bills have been revised and refined until last year the prospects for enactment looked brighter than ever. On February 4, 1960, the Senate approved a bill providing 2 years of Federal grants to States for school construction and for teachers' salaries.

I was pleased with, and proud of, the opportunity to cast my vote for this badly needed and especially meritorious program.

As the bill was approved by the Senate and sent to the House last year, it was

a moderate bill at modest cost aimed at alleviating two pressing problems: shortage of school classrooms and facilities and shortage of qualified teachers. We were very hopeful the measure would also be endorsed by the House. But weeks and months went by without action. Then our two major political parties met in their separate national conventions and each strongly endorsed improved educational opportunities for American children.

Later, when the Congress resumed its session in August, with control of both Houses and control of all committees in the hands of the Democratic Party, which just a few days earlier had adopted a strong Federal-aid-to-education plank in its platform, it was fully expected that the House would complete action on a Federal-aid-to-education bill.

Instead, although the Democratic majority outnumbered the Republican minority by 2 to 1 in the Rules Committee, that group refused to permit the bill to come to a vote in the full House. The total membership of the House was denied its voice—and the aid-to-education bill died.

Meantime, another year of delay has ensued. And we in the Senate of the new Congress once again are considering the issue of Federal aid to schools in the 50 States.

I am confident that today the Senate will approve the pending bill. I intend to support this bill, and I would hope the Senate would enact it by a resounding vote indicating to the leadership of the House that the overwhelming sentiment of the Senate is that this bill should be passed by the Congress and enacted into law.

Senate bill 1021 as reported from the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee consists of two principal parts. Title I calls for a 3-year, $850 million program of Federal grants to States for school construction, teachers' salaries, and special educational projects. The Prouty amendment, which the Senate approved last Tuesday, expanded the purposes for which these funds may be used to include school operating and maintenance costs.

Title II as reported proposes a 3-year continuation at present levels of aid to federally impacted areas under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. The Administration had planned a sharp curtailment in such aid beginning next year.

Before discussing title I, I should like to make a few brief comments on title II. In Hawaii, more than 28 percent of our school population is attributable to the impact of Federal activities.

The administration proposal to reduce aid would mean a loss of $646,000 for operation and maintenance under Public Law 874 and a loss of $1,058,000 for construction under Public Law 815, for a total cut of $1,705,000.

In effect, this would mean a reduction of more than 28.5 percent from the current year Federal contribution to Hawaii for schoolchildren in areas of Federal activities. To reduce these funds by more than one-fourth is a severe reduction to impose in 1 year.

I commend members of the Senate committee for perceiving the drastic nature of the administration's plan to reduce school aid to States which are obliged to provide classrooms and schooling for children of Federal employees on Federal projects. What the committee recommends instead is continued Federal financial assistance pending thorough study by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare of the operation of the Federal aid to impacted areas programs and recommendations regarding future Federal action.

I most earnestly urge the Senate to sustain the Labor Committee's action on title II.

It has been argued by some that title I of S. 1021 departs radically from our basic concept of our Federal-State form of government.

I am not persuaded by arguments that Federal grants are harmful and inevitably lead to Federal domination and control, with a corresponding loss of control by State and local governments and their citizenry.

The substantial aid heretofore extended over the years by the Federal Government to schools and to students throughout the country has, without question, proved extremely beneficial. I believe our Union of States has been strengthened by these measures, rather than weakened.

A brief review of congressional acts providing assistance to States for educational purposes reveals a long history of such assistance. Even prior to the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, Congress provided by law that one section of each township shall be used for public schools. The Northwest Ordinance stated the policy of Congress that "schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

In 1862, Congress enacted the Morrill Land-Grant Act, which gave to each State for agricultural and mechanic arts schools 30,000 acres of land for every seat in Congress to which that State was entitled. The University of Hawaii, which I am proud to say I attended, is a land-grant school.

As a student at the University of Hawaii, therefore, I was a beneficiary of the Morrill Act passed by the Congress of the United States. This, therefore, makes me a product of Federal aid to education. Without such Federal assistance, perhaps I might not be here today.

In another move to aid education in the States, Congress authorized Federal moneys for States to use for practical research under the Hatch Act of 1887.

Federal grants for vocational training in public schools were approved by Congress in the well-known Smith-Hughes Act of 1917.

In 1941, Congress voted financial aid to areas throughout the Nation which experienced an influx of servicemen. This act, the Lanham Act, also provided training benefits for veterans of World War II.

Congress approved schooling for hundreds of thousands of World War II veterans throughout the entire Nation under the GI bill of rights enacted in 1944. By making training available at technical schools and colleges and universities this act enabled veterans to prepare themselves for vocations and careers. The benefit our Nation derived from this mass development of our country's brainpower is incalculable.

Unquestionably, this accounts in great measure for the tremendous economic progress of our country since World War II.

Since 1946, the Federal Government has furnished funds for school lunches for children in the States.

Since 1950, the Federal Government has underwritten loans for colleges and universities to build dormitories.

Since 1950, under Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, the Federal Government has furnished financial assistance for construction and for operation and maintenance of schools in impacted areas.

Under Public Law 815, the Federal Government has contributed almost $1 billion—$962½ million—to local school districts in federally impacted areas to be used for school construction.

Under Public Law 874, the Federal Government has, in effect, been contributing to salaries of teachers through its payments to federally impacted areas for operation and maintenance costs. Funds have been provided for 3,821 school districts under this program, in which are located some 10,200,000 schoolchildren, about one-third of all public-school children in the United States.

Just 3 years ago, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act providing scholarships and fellowships for study in science, mathematics, engineering, and modern languages. Congress also authorized in this act Federal funds for public school facilities needed for instruction in these subjects; $70 million were authorized for each of 4 fiscal years beginning with 1960 for State education agencies to buy equipment needed in connection with these subjects.

This brief listing of Federal measures extending financial assistance on a nationwide basis offers ample precedent for the pending bill. The trail has already been blazed for us. By enacting the pending bill, Congress will be following the salutary example set for us by earlier Congresses.

I would like to point out that enactment of S. 1021 does not imply criticism of State and local governments. They have performed a very commendable job of meeting post-World War II needs for schools and educational facilities. Even as we debate this bill, we pay full credit to them and to the private institutions as well which also expanded their school plants at all levels of education.

But, as a nation, we must do more.

Both opponents and proponents of Federal financial aid to schools recognize a shortage of classrooms exists.

Both opponents and proponents of Federal aid acknowledge that some school districts are too poor to provide necessary educational facilities and opportunities for their children.

Both opponents and proponents of Federal financial aid to teachers' salaries recognize that, if America is to elevate intellectual attainment to its rightful statute in our society, teachers' salaries must be sufficiently high to attract and retain capable, qualified persons.

Today it is apparent that, if America is to compete successfully with other lands who respect and encourage educational attainment, we must increase the opportunities for our young people to acquire knowledge and skills to the utmost of their ability. And we must pay our teachers salaries commensurate with their duties and with their valuable contribution to our communities.

In a world of 3 billion people, America numbers only 180 million, 6 percent of the world's population. What we lack in numbers we must make up in quality, and that quality can only come with the best educational facilities we can afford our people. This we must always do.

The need for improving our educational facilities is perhaps more urgent now than ever before.

Our society has grown more and more complex, more and more specialized and, at the same time, more and more interdependent. Studies indicate that the extent of education has a direct relationship to the earning capacity of men and women today. It also has a direct bearing on our technological achievements and economic progress as a nation. Indeed, our national security and defense in this missile and space age depend on skilled and trained men and women. Even everyday citizenship demands greater education and training.

If freedom and liberty are to endure, the utmost effort of an informed citizenry is required. An ignorant people cannot hope to make a success of self-government and representative government.

There is no doubt in my mind, Mr. President, that this Nation can afford the proposed modest program of grants. Out of an $83 billion Federal budget, we spend $44 billion a year for our Military Establishment and $4 billion more for our allies in mutual security programs. We spend $2 billion to develop our natural resources.

Surely then, this Nation can afford to spend $850 million each year for 3 years to improve our greatest resource: the youth of America.

A people that spent $18 billion in 1959 on recreation, $9½ billion on alcohol, and $7 billion on tobacco are not going to begrudge Federal spending of less than $1 billion a year for so necessary and worthy a purpose as education.

Daniel Webster once said:

> If we work upon marble, it will perish.
> If we work upon brass, time will efface it.
> If we rear temples, they will crumble to dust.
> But if we work upon men's immortal minds, if we imbue them with high principles, with the just fear of God and love of their fellow men, we engrave on those tablets something which no time can efface, and which will brighten and brighten to all eternity.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support enactment of the pending bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FONG. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have rarely heard a more eloquent, sincere and moving document than the Senator from Hawaii has just read. As the representative of our newest State, he has my congratulations, and I congratulate his State for having him in the Senate.

Mr. FONG. I thank the Senator from New York for his very complimentary remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield the remaining time on this side to the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], Hawaii [Mr. LONG], and Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am opposed to this Federal-aid-to-education bill, and I shall vote against it for four reasons:

First, it would result in Federal domination and control of public school systems throughout the United States.

The second reason is that it would result in no improvement in the quality of education to be provided in public schools.

Third, the money would be spent from so-called Federal grants, which people in the States have been led mistakenly to believe comes from some source other than their own pockets.

The fourth reason is that Federal deficits—past, present, and in the foreseeable future—have already reduced the value of our money at home, and impaired confidence in the dollar abroad.

The Federal debt now stands at $289 billion, virtually at the shooting-war peak. This is $4 billion over the permanent statutory ceiling.

A temporary $293 billion debt limit expires June 30. The Congress may expect an administration request within 30 days for an extension of the $293 billion limit.

The budget director has officially estimated that the Federal deficit this fiscal year, ending next month, will be $2.2 billion. It probably will be higher.

The Secretary of the Treasury has estimated that the Federal deficit next year will be about $4 billion. It may go closer to $5 billion.

This year's Federal deficit will be the 24th in 30 years. We have been in shooting war in only 7 of these 30 years. Big spending increases since the Korean War have been in domestic-civilian programs.

Indifference to ordinary fiscal prudence in the Federal Government has been a major factor in inflation at home and loss of confidence in the dollar overseas.

Compared with the 1939 index, the purchasing power of the dollar at home is now 46½ cents. Foreign creditors, preferring gold to American dollars, have reduced our gold supply to little more than $17 billion.

Gold has been used to back our money, but we have reached a point where serious proposals to repeal the gold backing are now under consideration by Congress.

The pending bill proposes the expenditure of $850 million a year through so-called Federal grants for public school education in States and localities.

The Federal Government gets money from the pockets of taxpayers in the States and localities and by borrowing from the public. These are the same sources used by States and localities.

Need for 60,000 additional classrooms a year is being emphasized in justification for the bill. The bill provides that when Federal money is used for this construction, Davis-Bacon wage rates shall be paid.

Davis-Bacon rates are usually metropolitan rates. To apply them elsewhere means spending more money for fewer classrooms. It makes nonessential expenditures mandatory in many areas.

A survey of representative towns and small cities across the country last month showed Davis-Bacon rates averaging more than 40 percent higher than local rates in the towns surveyed.

The bill provides further than an amount equal to 10 cents per school child may be used by State education agencies for defraying costs of administration.

Another 10 percent of the total amount authorized may be used for so-called specialized projects. Specialized projects are defined loosely enough to include boondoggle.

None of these provisions will improve the quality of education. When you analyze the purposes for which money will be spent under this bill, you necessarily conclude that the $850 million a year will be wasted insofar as educational improvement is concerned.

Not only will the money be wasted, but fundamental danger is inherent in public school subsidies. The Federal Government will usurp control of every public school system in the country.

Once enacted, these Federal school subsidies would never expire; State and local taxes to replace them could never be raised high enough to finance schools in the manner of Federal profligacy which would be established; the pressure would be for more and more Federal money.

If we submit to the Federal subsidy and control of public education established in this bill alone, the surrender to domination by the Central Government at Washington is certain to be permanent.

I know the bill says there shall be no Federal control over the schools which are to be subsidized. I know that it says the 3-year appropriations shall be provided in a manner consistent with the purposes of the bill.

I completely disagree with those who think it will prevent Federal domination in vital areas of public education. Those relying on these provisions as safeguards against Federal school control will be boobytrapped.

Language in an authorization bill such as this can not preclude limiting language in subsequent appropriation bills. This Congress can not bind another. A member of the present Cabinet cannot speak for his successors.

In fact, provisions in the bill enumerate the areas of subsidy; they authorize appropriations for the purpose; they specify initial controls. I have already noted application of Davis-Bacon wage rates as the first example.

The subsidy payments would be based on a federally prescribed formula which would emphasize so-called State effort. Before a State could receive its subsidy money it would be forced to submit a formal application to Washington for Federal approval.

A Federal bureaucrat could deny the application of any State, or if he found a State was not complying substantially with Federal demands he could reduce the subsidy payment, or require the State to repay funds already received.

The bill's formula for measuring so-called State effort is keyed to the level of State and local expenditures. As the bill was drafted no consideration of value received would be required. Probably States and localities spending the most would fare the best.

Appropriation bill provisions of a limiting nature are acceptable under parliamentary rules. Restrictive amendments to appropriation bills are common. Sooner or later restrictive amendments are certain to be offered to appropriation bills for public school subsidies.

By amendment to an appropriation bill the Federal subsidy money might be limited to those States with teacher merit systems, or vice versa or to those States with a single pay scale for members of the teaching profession, or vice versa.

By the same process, amendments to appropriation bills might limit Federal subsidy money for use in States emphasizing science courses over those in humanities, or vice versa—or in States using certain textbooks, or vice versa.

The limitation might be on a combination of such requirements. Integration is only one of numerous public school areas which pressure groups are seeking to control; but it is certain that appropriation bill amendments will be offered to withhold funds from areas where segregated schools are maintained.

Efforts have been made to force integration through Federal-aid-to-education bills for years, even in the midst of World War II. The Senate actually adopted an integration amendment to such a bill on October 20, 1943, by a vote of 40 to 37.

The amendment was offered by Senator William Langer, of North Dakota. It resulted in a successful motion to kill the bill by sending it back to the committee. The Langer amendment, as it was adopted, follows:

Provided, That there shall be no discrimination in the administration of the benefits and appropriations made under the respective provisions of this Act, or in the State funds supplemented thereby on account of race, creed, or color.

This, of course, was an amendment to an authorization bill. I cite it as a reminder that there are many who have always regarded Federal-aid-to-education legislation as a vehicle for Federal intervention in State and local school affairs.

When grants of Federal funds are involved, Federal control is inherent. It is exercised in greater degree for some programs than it is in others; and where there is an authorization bill such as this, control can be exercised just as forcefully through riders on appropriation bills as through provision in the basic bill itself.

In conclusion, I shall make six short statements.

The right to educate our children in our own way in our own communities has been among the deepest fundamentals of this Nation since its founding. I am certain that the effects of this bill ultimately will destroy this right.

If and when the quality of our education needs improvement, the parents in the communities of the States know it first and better than the centralized Federal Government can discern it.

If more money is needed to improve public education, the States and localities can raise it better and spend it more wisely than can be expected of the Federal Government. The taxes come from the people of States and localities whose children are to be educated.

Nationalization of public schools through a system of Federal subsidies is not justified by any conditions existing today in the field of American education. Nothing could be more deadening to our public school system which, to most people, is a source of pride.

I have always opposed legislation leading to the establishment of Federal control over our public school systems. Likewise, in all areas of public endeavor, I have always opposed excessive and nonessential Federal expenditures.

I oppose this bill because it is offensive in both respects. I have faith in our system of public education, as I do in our system of government, and I want both to be preserved. This bill would destroy fundamentals on which both depend.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am very pleased that we are approaching the final vote by which the Senate will once again affirm its belief that a program of Federal aid to public primary and secondary education is necessary. As a member of the Education Subcommittee, I am particularly pleased that the bill will be passed substantially in the form as reported, and as passed in the Senate last year. Of course, it is not a perfect bill, but experience has shown that this is the most practical vehicle for bringing Federal aid to the hard-pressed States in their efforts to increase the quality of education in this country.

Earlier today, we heard the President's inspiring message with its challenge to us to increase our space program and place a man on the moon by 1970. Let us remember that our space traveler of 1970, and the scientists and engineers who make his trip possible, may well be young people who are now in high school and junior high school. The funds we vote today will have a direct bearing on our scientific future, as progress in science will depend on the educational base of our primary and secondary schools. The sums called for by this bill are relatively modest compared to the direct expenditures required for a space program, but no less necessary to the success of a 10-year-or-longer scientific program.

Mr. President, we can pass no more worthy bill in the Congress than this, improving the educational opportunity of our Nation's children so that each may develop the full potential of his gifts. I urge its passage by a majority large enough to show the value we as a nation place on children and their education.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to record my support of S. 1021. My views on the urgent need for an effective program of Federal aid to education are well known. Last year it was my privilege to join with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in sponsoring his amendment to S. 8 which failed of passage by a tie vote, 44 to 44.

Since last year there has developed an even greater awareness of the need for action. This is due in large part to President Kennedy's vigorous presentation of the issue. The challenge before us here today is one of the greatest we shall face in this Congress.

Title I of S. 1021 would be a meaningful step toward an effective program of Federal aid to school construction and teachers' salaries. I hope this bill will ultimately supersede the present program of aid to federally impacted school districts.

Much of the strength of S. 1021 is due to its recognition that the impacted school aid program must be continued at present levels until the States and localities can make the adjustments necessary for gradually including this in the new program under title I of this bill.

I wish particularly to express appreciation to Chairman MORSE for supporting my request that the schools of American Samoa be brought under the provisions of S. 1021. The people of Samoa look to America for assistance in their efforts to build their society and to improve their economy. Better schools is basic in this effort. This bill will be conclusive evidence that we recognize this and that we desire to aid them in meeting their responsibilities to provide better schools for the youth of the community.

I therefore urge the passage of S. 1021 as another important milestone in the education of American youth—our most precious national asset.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, shortly the Senate will vote on one of the most important measures to come before it during this session of Congress. In fact, the institution with which the proposed legislation is concerned is the most fundamental in our democracy, the foundation of our national life.

The factor which has made Federal support for education so critical is education's role in the power struggle for survival of our free world.

I can best express the role in the form of a syllogism:

First. Education is an instrument for democracy.

Second. Education is also an instrument for communism.

Third. Education, then, is indispensable to both systems.

Fourth. Since they are competing systems, contending for supremacy, education is an instrument for power.

Our survival as a society will depend on our collective capability to meet the challenge of this power struggle; and the capability of the individual citizen to meet these demands will depend on the kind of education he or she receives.

We have reached the point where crippling amendments to the bill have been defeated. Some of these amendments raised questions which should be decided as separate issues, as, for example, loans to private schools. Others, such as the elimination of the use of Federal funds for teachers' salaries, would have seriously damaged attempts to meet a most critical need.

The present bill retains and emphasizes local control and local decision on how the money will be used.

The bill should also go a long way toward equalizing the resources of States and inevitably raise minimum standards of education to a much higher level than would otherwise be the case. It extends the principle which already applies at the State level, in Maine, where we provide general purpose State aid for schools in local communities.

Because I am most familiar with the educational problems in Maine, I am acutely aware of its need for an adequate program of Federal aid.

According to Warren G. Hill, commissioner of education for the State of Maine, the State needs 576 elementary classrooms and 317 secondary classrooms.

This does not include 240 substandard elementary classrooms and 110 substandard secondary classrooms. The cost of providing the needed additional classrooms would be $15,579,217. Replacing the 350 substandard classrooms would require expenditures of one-third more.

Maine has serious problems in attracting qualified teachers. This year the salaries of teachers are $1,100 below the national average. A total of 53.3 percent of our teachers do not have at least a bachelor's degree from an institution of higher learning. Also, more than 60 percent of our teachers are 45 years of age. This means that in the coming years we will have a serious replacement problem.

This is the situation, even though during the past 10 years Maine has ranked third among the 50 States in percentage increase in teacher's salaries.

The people of Maine are doing the best they can, even making serious sacrifices, to provide funds for education.

The per capita income of Maine residents compared with the other States is 38th, but the percentage of income being spent by our people for State and local taxes ranks them 17th. We are well above the national average.

With adverse economic conditions in Maine and with the State having other pressing governmental needs beyond education, it is impossible for Maine citizens to make a substantially greater contribution in funds for schools. State and local tax sources are stretched to the breaking point.

If the Senate votes to approve the bill before us today, Maine will receive $21.84 per school-age pupil, or a total of $5,175,297. This will be just enough, during the 3-year life of the bill, to cover the cost of the classroom needs of Maine.

Education is too basic a need for all the people of the country to be dependent upon what each State can do individually, particularly when we realize the differences in wealth from State to State.

Our goal in this society is to give each man the opportunity to develop his own capabilities, serve the state, and remain free.

We are pledged to equality of opportunity. This does not mean that each individual is entitled to, or needs, a university education. It does mean that each child is entitled to the chance to develop his skills and realize his potential as an individual.

Equal opportunity implies the elimination of geographic location or economic circumstances as barriers to education. So long as we depend on the unequal resources of the States and communities to bear the brunt of the cost of financing education, educational opportunity will be unequal.

Because a State is financially distressed is no reason to penalize its children from becoming educated. In fact, the inability to educate its youth may put a State in the position of perpetuating its economic problems.

I believe it my duty to do all in my power to help to provide the opportunity to the people of the Nation for self-development to the limits of their capabilities and for the strengthening of our society. Therefore, I support the bill. I regard it as the most important and vital single piece of proposed legislation confronting us at this session of Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have listened intently to the arguments which have been advanced both for and against Federal aid to education. I have paid particular attention to those Senators who are members of the committee delegated by this body to study this legislation. I have talked to constituents from my State of Kansas—parents, educators, school board members and businessmen. After carefully weighing all the evidence I cannot in good conscience support this measure.

Certainly, every Member of this body recognizes the fact that there are certain districts which are in need of assistance. I believe that most of us will agree that in many cases there are schoolteachers who are not adequately compensated for their services. I am sure there are those who will agree that the Federal Government has usurped from the States practically every available source from which new revenue might be secured to carry on State operations. That is why I have supported amendments to return a certain percentage of the Federal income tax collected back to the States for educational purposes.

For almost a century, we have had various proposals submitted urging Federal assistance for education in one form or another. We have made grants to promote vocational education. But the objective of this program was to strengthen a phase of the curriculum which Congress in its wisdom deemed advisable. We have granted funds to assist federally impacted school districts. But these payments were in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes.

In 1955, President Eisenhower recommended a Federal credit assistance program to assist those districts in need to meet their school construction problems. Later that measure was enlarged but the Congress did not act. Not until the Russians launched sputnik did the real drive for Federal aid for education gather momentum. And, I am fearful that if this bill is passed and we from year to year move down the road to more and more Federal control, we shall look back to the day when sputnik made "mutniks" of us all.

Mr. President, the education of our youth has always been recognized as a duty and responsibility of States and local communities. This is as it should be for so long as the training of our youth remains under the supervision and control of the States and the people on the local level—we need not fear for the future of America. But let the grasping hands of Federal bureaucracy take control, then will the foundation of the American way of life begin to crumble. It may not happen today, or tomorrow or next year, but as surely as the night follows the day it will come. For whenever Federal money has been granted—Federal control follows. In fact, I am not alone in this belief. The school administrators' journal Overview editorialized in November 1960:

> The United States is inexorably moving toward a national system of education * * * the long-held view that education is largely a personal concern and that educational policy should be made by local units of government will have to go * * * the national welfare demands a national system of education.

Mr. President, as I have listened to the arguments advanced by the proponents of this legislation, one is led to believe that either the States have been negligent in meeting their responsibilities or are not financially able to do so. For example, one of my colleagues in support of this bill said:

> But of the more than 36 million children in the public schools, there were 1,868,000 of them taught in overcrowded classrooms. Almost 2 million of our children are being housed in schools and classrooms in excess of the school plant.

He continued by saying:

> We needed last fall 142,160 more classrooms.
>
> The children who should be in these missing 140,000-plus classrooms are among the 1,868,000 children who are being cheated out of an education to which I believe they are entitled.

We might gather from these statements that our classrooms are splitting at the seams and that many children are being denied an education. What are the facts? Taking the statistics placed in the RECORD by the proponents of this bill, we find that last fall there were 1,338,560 classrooms available.

As a matter of simple arithmetic if we divide the total number of children in our grade and secondary schools by the total number of classrooms we find that last year there was available 1 classroom for 26-plus students. If we had constructed the 142,160 classrooms which my colleague indicated was needed last year it would have brought the average down to around 1 classroom for 25 students.

The record also shows that last year there were 1,409,995 teachers in our elementary and secondary schools. Again as a matter of simple arithmetic—I find that the States provided 1 teacher for every 26 students.

The facts are that during the past 10 years the States and local communities without Federal assistance have constructed more than 600,000 classrooms while the increased attendance required only 400,000 additional rooms.

President Kennedy, in his message to Congress in support of Federal aid to education stated that we would need an additional 600,000 classrooms over the next 10 years. This averages 60,000 new classrooms per year.

Yet, the National Education Association in its publication of March 1961, The Case for Federal Support of Education, states:

> For the past 5 years we have been building classrooms at the average rate of slightly less than 70,000 per year.

I submit that the States without Federal aid have been doing an adequate job.

When we come to the question of the future supply of teachers the outlook is favorable. If we can accept the statistics which have been compiled by the U.S. Office of Education in its report "Projection of Earned Degrees to 1969–70":

> If the percentage of college students who seek college degrees in teaching remains at its present level during the next 10 years, the number of graduate teachers will almost double whereas enrollment will be on the decline.

The facts are, that based on present studies we are likely to have more teachers than we can find jobs for.

Throughout this debate, it has been argued that teachers as a group are vastly underpaid—and I would be the first to admit that in some areas this may be true. But the facts are that teachers have succeeded in improving their earnings at a faster rate than other workers during the 1950's. For example:

	1950	1960	Percent increase
Teachers' salary	$3,010.00	$5,159.00	+71
Industrial workers' weekly wage	59.33	90.91	+53
Per capita personal income	1,491.00	2,249.00	+51

The dollar, meanwhile, lost 20 percent of its value but this still leaves the teachers with an improvement in their purchasing power of 40 percent during the past 10 years.

Eight years ago, two-thirds of the teachers earned less than $3,500; now two-thirds make $4,500 or more; fewer than 10 percent are paid less than $3,500.

Will the teachers be willing to permit this program if enacted into law to expire? No matter what is said, I am firmly convinced that it will become a political issue. If we establish the precedent of subsidizing teachers' salaries, where do we draw the line? Will we be asked to subsidize the salaries of municipal policemen, firemen, city and county officials?

The Treasury Department today lists 60 programs under which States and local governments get Federal grants-in-aid. In 1933 when Mr. Roosevelt became President there were five such programs costing about $100 million annually. The cost today runs between $6 and $7 billion.

We are about to add another. Who pays for it? There is no money tree in Washington. The Government has no money to give except that which it takes in taxes from the people. The simple truth is that the people of Kansas somehow will have to raise sufficient money to pay for its share of this grant. Unfortunately, the taxpayer never gets back all he pays in because administrative costs must be paid. If we are honest with ourselves we must admit that all Federal aid does in effect is to force citizens to pay more than they now are paying for education.

We are told there is no Federal control and yet under this bill a State is required to spend more each year on the State level if it is to get its share of the Federal handout.

May I again say that I understand the teachers' problems in critical areas and I am deeply sympathetic; but I also believe that education must remain the responsibility of the States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate having expired, and the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Shall the bill pass? The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. COTTON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mrs. NEUBERGER (when her name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. ROBERTSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If he were present, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. TALMADGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If he were present, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced by the

Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 56]

YEAS—49

Aiken	Hartke	Morse
Bartlett	Hayden	Moss
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Humphrey	Pastore
Byrd, W.Va.	Jackson	Pell
Cannon	Javits	Proxmire
Carroll	Jordan	Randolph
Case, N.J.	Kefauver	Smathers
Church	Kuchel	Smith, Mass.
Clark	Long, Mo.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Douglas	Magnuson	Wiley
Engle	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Fong	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Gore	Metcalf	
Hart	Monroney	

NAYS—34

Allott	Dworshak	Morton
Beall	Eastland	Mundt
Bennett	Ellender	Russell
Boggs	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickey	Schoeppel
Butler	Holland	Scott
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Stennis
Capehart	Johnston	Thurmond
Case, S.Dak.	Keating	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Lausche	Young, N.Dak.
Dirksen	Long, La.	
Dodd	Miller	

NOT VOTING—17

Anderson	Fulbright	Neuberger
Blakley	Gruening	Prouty
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Carlson	Kerr	Sparkman
Chavez	McCarthy	Talmadge
Cotton	McClellan	

So the bill (S. 1021) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "School Assistance Act of 1961."

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 102. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a three-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities, to employ needed additional public school teachers and pay them adequate salaries, to undertake special projects directed to special or unique educational problems or opportunities, and in paying other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

Assurance against Federal interference in schools

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 104. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, $850,000,000, for the purpose of making payments to State education agencies as provided in this title.

Allotment to States

SEC. 105. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the number of children of school age, and the effort for public school purposes of the respective States. A State allotment under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only). Except as provided by section 106, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 for such year as the product of—

(1) the number of children of school age in the State in the preceding fiscal year, and

(2) The State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (b)).

bears to the sum of corresponding products for all the States.

(b) for purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands), except that (i) the allotment ratio shall in no case be less than .25 or more than .75 and (ii) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75, (iii) the allotment ratio for the District of Columbia shall be .50, and (iv) the allotment ratio of any State shall be .50 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds that the cost of education in such State exceeds the median of such costs in all the States by a factor of 2 or more as determined by him on the basis of an index of the average per pupil cost of constructing minimum school facilities in the States as determined for such fiscal year under section 15(6) of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 645), or, in the Commissioner's discretion, on the basis of such index and such other statistics and data as the Commissioner shall deem adequate and appropriate.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and August 31 of such fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this title. Allotment ratios for each fiscal year shall be computed on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise such allotment ratios, and, as so revised and promulgated, such promulgation shall be equally conclusive.

(3) The term "income per child of school age" for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

SEC. 106. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, if any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 105, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2), if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year, bears to 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

(d) The sum of the reductions under this section for each fiscal year shall be reallotted by proportionately increasing the allotments under section 105 for such year of those remaining States (other than the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) whose allotments for such year have not been reduced under this section.

(e) For purposes of this section—

(1) (A) A "State's effort" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the State's expenditure per public school pupil by (ii) the income per such pupil for the State; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(B) A State's "base effort" for a fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

(C) The "income per public school pupil" for a State or for all the States for any fiscal year means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar

year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(2) (A) The "national effort" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the income per such pupil for all such States.

(B) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, by four.

(3) (A) The "public school expenditures" of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

(B) The "expenditure per public school pupil" for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

(C) The "national expenditure per public school pupil" for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

(4) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

Payment of allotments to States

SEC. 107. Payments to States which have submitted and had approved their applications under this title of Federal funds allotted to them pursuant to section 105 (as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 106 and as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the funds so allotted.

State agency administrative costs

SEC. 108. From the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106, for each fiscal year, a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) ten cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

Special educational projects

SEC. 109. Each State education agency may set aside, from the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106 for any fiscal year, an amount equal to 10 per centum of the sums so allotted to it for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, for paying part of the costs of pilot, demonstration, or experimental projects of local education agencies, and other public agencies or institutions operating a public school, which, in the determination of the State agency, are designed to meet public school problems or to develop or evaluate public school programs of a special or unique nature, including but not limited to—

(1) remedial or special instructional programs or services for pupils having special language or adjustment problems;

(2) programs or services for adapting curriculums to the needs of deprived or disadvantaged pupils;

(3) programs or services for pupils from in-migrant or unusually mobile families;

(4) programs for coordinating the school system planning and programs in the area served by the local education agency, with the planning and programs of other public or private nonprofit agencies dealing with problems related to the alleviation of the same deteriorated or depressed areas and of the families and children residing therein;

(5) programs for developing new types of elementary or secondary instruction or programing;

(6) programs for developing multipurpose uses of elementary and secondary school facilities;

(7) programs to stimulate improvements in construction, design or location of elementary and secondary school facilities;

(8) programs to encourage and stimulate educational excellence, including programs for exceptionally gifted children;

(9) programs for the improvement of instruction through the acquisition and utilization of audiovisual and other instructional materials and equipment.

State applications

SEC. 110. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which—

(1) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

(2) provides for specifying at the beginning of each fiscal year the proportion of its allotment for such year that will be expended for (A) public school teachers' salaries, (B) the construction of public school facilities, and (C) other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education; and provides that such allotment, except for sums used in accordance with sections 108 and 109, shall be used exclusively for such purposes;

(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to insure that in allocating funds received under this title (exclusive of amounts to be used for projects under section 109 and amounts to be used under section 108) to local education agencies (A) the amounts to be used for school facilities construction will be allocated within the State so that priority is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional school facilities and which are least able to finance the cost of needed school facilities, (B) the amounts to be used for teachers' salaries will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for additional teachers or increases in their teachers' salaries and which are least able to finance such costs, and (C) the amounts to be used for other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education will be allocated so that preference is given to local education agencies which, in the judgment of the State education agency, have the greatest need for assistance in paying such costs;

(4) sets forth the criteria and procedures, consistent with the purposes of section 109, on the basis of which local education agency projects under such section will be approved by the State education agency;

(5) provides assurance that every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

(6) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State and by the State to the local education agencies under this title, which procedures shall include provision for repayment to the United States of any sums received by the State from its allotment for any fiscal year under this title which are not obligated by it in accordance with the provisions of this title by the end of the fiscal year following that for which such allotment was made, or which are not expended in accordance therewith by the end of the second fiscal year following that in which they were obligated (unless such sums have been deducted from subsequent payments pursuant to section 107);

(7) provides assurance that the requirements of section 112 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this title; and

(8) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and for access by the Commissioner, upon request, to the records upon which such information is based.

(b) With respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and in the case of any State in which a State education agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of school facilities or for the payment of teachers' salaries within the entire State, within a given geographical area with the State, or with respect to particular categories of public schools, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a) with respect to funds specified for school construction or teachers' salaries, as the case may be, to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

Review of State applications

SEC. 111. (a) (1) The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 110 (a), and shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

(2) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency, finds that such agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application under section 110(a), or that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been paid, the Commissioner shall forthwith notify the State education agency, and he shall thereafter withhold further payments to the State under this title until there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, there is a repayment, or an arrangement for repayment, of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

(b) (1) A State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a) of this section may

appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State or agency is located by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(2) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Labor standards

SEC. 112. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality to be determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276c–5) for construction projects under this title, and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The State education agency of each State shall take such steps as shall be necessary to assure that the wage standards required above shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project. The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

SEC. 113. The State education agency may waive the application of section 112 in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the State education agency determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the education agency undertaking the construction.

Definitions

SEC. 114. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public schools in a city, county, township, school district, or political subdivision.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(4) The term "State education agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public schools.

(5) The term "public school pupils" means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria developed by him to assure uniform determinations for all the States.

(6) The term "public schools" means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charge to resident pupils, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education—

(a) by a State or local education agency, or

(b) if the State application approved under this title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

(7) The term "elementary and secondary education" shall not include any education provided below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12.

(8) The terms "school facilities" and "public school facilities" mean classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(9) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

(10) The term "teacher" means any member of the instructional staff of a public school as defined by the State education agency of each State.

(11) The term "teachers' salaries" means the monetary compensation paid to teachers for services rendered in connection with their employment.

(12) The term "other costs of providing public elementary and secondary education" means any maintenance and operating cost of public elementary or secondary school education.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874

Extension of temporary provisions of Public Law 815

SEC. 201. (a) The first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 633), is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1964".

(b) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "1961" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1964", and (2) by striking out "$40,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000,000".

(c) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1958–1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1961–1962".

Extension of temporary provisions of Public Law 874

SEC. 202. The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by striking out "1961" each time it appears in sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) and inserting "1964" in lieu thereof.

Extension of laws to American Samoa

SEC. 203. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time it appears in sections 3(d), 6(c), and 9(8).

(b) The Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 631–645), is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," in section 15(13).

Report of operations under these laws

SEC. 204. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before January 1, 1963, a full report of the operation of Public Laws 815 and 874, as extended by this Act, including an analysis of the relation between Federal payments under these laws and Federal payments under title I of this Act, and his recommendations as to what the future relation between these laws and that title should be if they are further extended.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. MCNAMARA. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I take this opportunity to express my appreciation on the wonderful way in which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has managed this bill, which has now been passed. This bill and similar bills have been considered by this body over a period of approximately 13 or 14 years. I believe that the excellent job the Senator from Oregon has done in managing this bill on this occasion entitles him to the gratitude of all Members of the Senate; and I wish to commend him and his associates on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for the extremely fine work they have done in connection with the passage of what I believe to be the most important bill the Senate will handle at this session.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate is ready to take up a conference report. Thereafter, I shall speak for several minutes in reference to those who, in my judgment, are really responsible for the passage of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that the bill as passed be printed?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], who has extended his congratulations to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] upon the magnificent job he has done in steering the bill through the Senate to its most successful conclusion.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not believe that any other bill handled by the Senate over a period of many years has

received the diligent attention and the splendid guidance which this bill has received from the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has constantly been in the Chamber, to give information and to discuss all points which might be raised in connection with the bill. I think the final passage by the Senate of this aid-to-education bill is largely due to his direction and to that of his associates on the committee.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to associate myself with the position taken by the various Senators who have spoken in commendation of the excellent floor leadership displayed by the able senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in connection with the handling and passage of this aid-to-education bill. For the first time in the history of our country the Congress now has an opportunity to enact a bill which will provide Federal aid to education; and no small part of the credit for that is due to the outstanding and very able leadership by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and also by those who have been associated with him. So I desire to join in the commendations of him for his dedication to this most important task.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as one who worked closely in the vineyard with the senior Senator from Oregon, both in the subcommittee and in the full committee and on the floor of the Senate, in support of the bill, I pay my tribute to a great Senator who for the first time, I believe, in his almost 18 years of service in this body, has had charge of a major piece of legislation. No one could have handled it with greater understanding or greater calm appreciation of the passions which sometimes rock this body, or with greater understanding of how well such things can be accomplished by remaining calm. Certainly the Senator from Oregon deserves the commendation of every other Member of the Senate.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, let me say, as one who has presided over the Senate during many of the hours of the debate on the aid-to-education bill which the Senate has just now passed, that I believe I can speak, from personal observation and experience, of the skill with which the bill has been handled.

So, Mr. President, on the basis of that personal observation, I join in the encomiums which have been expressed by so many Senators in commenting on the great skill displayed by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say that earlier today I expressed my thoughts in regard to the bill the Senate has just now passed—the so-called Federal-aid-to-education bill. I do not wish to repeat those statements; to do so would amount to gilding the lily.

But I desire to take this occasion to express to the entire Senate my appreciation of the excellent cooperation shown during the past 7 or 8 days in the course of our consideration of this measure.

Again I pay special tribute to the leadership and the floor managerial ability displayed by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has performed magnificently in getting through the Senate this aid-to-education bill, a measure which truly deserves the name "The Morse Bill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that the bill as passed be printed? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ALLOTMENT RATIO EQUATION USED IN S. 1021

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following the recording of the vote on S. 1021, an analysis of the allotment ratio equation used in S. 1021, and a table comparing the allotment ratios and estimated State allotments of the bill with those produced by using a true inverse proportion of each State's income per child.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

Senator JAVITS and I offered, during consideration by the Senate of S. 1021, a different method of determining the amount of Federal assistance to be extended to the public school systems of each State. I think the method Senator JAVITS and I proposed was logical, because it is based on need—and consists of adding the needs of the States rather than dividing among the States an arbitrary national appropriation.

Our proposal, using essentially the Taft formula, would have defined the Federal responsibility, limited the Federal role, set a goal for increased efforts by the States, held up a standard for basic education, and actually moved toward equality of opportunity. The administration formula does none of these things; it merely arranges the division of whatever sum is appropriated by fixing each State's percentage share of the total.

So I think there is a basic philosophical difference—a fundamental difference in approach—which reflects our attitude toward Federal grants-in-aid.

Our amendment was defeated. Therefore, it remains appropriate to examine on its own merits the allocation formula in S. 1021 as it has been passed by the Senate, for it is the heart of this bill. It is the heart of the bill not only because this bill will initiate a new Federal grant program, but also because there are very few restrictions on the use of the Federal grants by State school systems, so that the national effect of the bill will be largely determined by its allocation of funds.

For this reason, I would like to discuss briefly the bill's allocation formula—and more specifically its computation of allotment ratios for each State. I do so completely apart from the amendment Senator JAVITS and I have offered, as a matter of information and perhaps of interest.

II

The central element of the allocation formula, by which the authorization in this bill is divided among States, is the allotment ratio. The allotment ratio is an index, computed to determine the relationship between the States in sharing the total sum appropriated.

For each State, the allotment ratio is multiplied by the State's number of school-age children. The result, or product, is totaled for all the States. The percentage of that total represented by the product for each State is its share of the appropriation.

I will limit my comments at this time to the computation of the allotment ratio itself. For, aside from the number of children, the allotment ratio determines each State's allocation.

I doubt very much that the mathematical device specified by the bill, and used to produce these allotment ratios, is generally understood. In the past, it has been taken for granted. Yet, it is not simple, has not been clearly explained, and ought to be better justified.

For example, I think it is assumed, by those who have looked at it, that the allotment ratio is proportional—that is, inversely proportional—to State income per child. The distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. MORSE] has said in his explanations that the allotment ratio in the bill is inversely proportional to State income per child. But while it is related to income, it is not truly proportional to the differences in income between States.

Furthermore, the variation from a true proportion is not constant—that is, producing an evenly expanded or compressed gradation—as some may think. On the contrary, at one end of the scale, among low-income States, relative differences are diminished, while at the other end, among high-income States, they are augmented.

I have examined the formula. Its effect is this: For low-income States, the differences in income are not fully reflected, so their allotments are smaller than they would be if truly proportional to relative income. For the high-income States, on the other hand, the differences from average or national income per child are exaggerated, with the result that the allotments for these States, also, are reduced.

Curiously enough, the income range of the States is such that this mathematical exercise does not change proportionately the spread between the richest and poorest States, which is maintained at, say, 3:1. This occurs because the figures for both the low- and high-income States are held down. That 3:1 contrast between the top and bottom figures, which appears to be the only measure many look at, of course fails to describe the pattern of distribution of funds.

III

I know that the point I have raised may seem elusive—for algebra is remote to most of us now. So I will explain the allotment ratio equation, give a few examples, provide a table of hypothetical figures, and a comparison of allotment ratios.

The allotment ratio in the bill is computed in this way: State income per child is divided by national income per child, producing a percentage which indicates the State's relative income. This percentage is multiplied by 0.50, and the result subtracted from 1.

An inverse proportion, on the other hand, would be computed by simply dividing the national income per child by the State's income per child.

The introduction of the constant, from which the direct proportion is subtracted under the bill's equation, changes from a proportional relationship the pattern, if not necessarily the range, of the allotments.

For example: Indiana and Michigan have approximately the national average income per child. South Carolina and Mississippi have only half that income per child. Connecticut and New York have 1½ times the national average income per child—the precise amounts, of course, depending on the base years and definitions chosen. Therefore, (1) under a proportional formula, a State like South Carolina would receive $2 compared to $1 paid to a State like Indiana having twice the income per child of South Carolina. But under the formula in this bill, such a State would receive

only $1.50, although its income is only half the national average; and (2) a State like Delaware or New York, on a proportional basis would have an allotment ratio two-thirds that of States at the national average, which have two-thirds the income per child of Delaware and New York. But under the formula in this bill, such a State receives only 50 cents, compared to $1 for an average State.

Using these examples, I point out again that the range between 50 cents for the highest-income States and $1.50 for the lowest, under the bill's allotment ratio equation, is coincidentally 1:3—just as it is between 67 cents and $2 under a proportional equation But both the high- and low-income States have nevertheless been disadvantaged by this mathematical device, if one views the true relationship of their incomes—for the allotment ratios of the middle-income States have become a larger share of the total.

IV

I insert at this point a table of hypothetical figures, assuming $10,000 as the national average income per child. The table compares the results obtained under the bill's equation, in the first column, with a true proportion, in the second column. For convenience, neither formula was halved. Of course, no State has income more than 1½ times, or less than one-half, the national average; but this example was extended to make the effect of the mathematical device clear.

A study of this small table will, I think, make clear the operation of the bill's equation, and its difference from an inverse proportion. It also illustrates how the income relationship between all the States—including the true relationship between States within the high-income or low-income groups—can be maintained by a proportional formula.

	Bill equation relationships [1]						Proportional relationships					
	State income per child			National income per child		"Allotment ratio"	National income per child		State income per child		Inverse proportion	
	2.00 [1]	minus		$20,000	divided by	$10,000	equals	0	$10,000	divided by	$20,000	equals	0.50
	2.00	"		17,500	"	10,000	"	.25	10,000	"	17,500	"	.57
New York	2.00	"		15,000	"	10,000	"	.50	10,000	"	15,000	"	.67
	2.00	"		12,500	"	10,000	"	.75	10,000	"	12,500	"	.80
Indiana	2.00	"		10,000	"	10,000	"	1.00	10,000	"	10,000	"	1.00
	2.00	"		7,500	"	10,000	"	1.25	10,000	"	7,500	"	1.33
Mississippi	2.00	"		5,000	"	10,000	"	1.50	10,000	"	5,000	"	2.00
	2.00	"		2,500	"	10,000	"	1.75	10,000	"	2,500	"	4.00

[1] 2.00 minus the quotient of "State income per child" divided by "National income per child" is equivalent to 1.00 minus half the quotient of "State income per child" divided by "National income per child," as expressed in S. 1021. It sets the U.S. national average at 1.00, for convenient comparison with the inverse ratio.

V

If my colleagues inquire about the formula in this bill, at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the National Education Association, I am sure they will be told about "pivot points" and "spreader factors," and perhaps about other statistical mysteries (p. 204–205, hearings). However, I believe there is no particular mystery about the equation 1 minus 0.50 times the fraction representing relative State income. In casting up indexes, it is identical to 2 minus the whole fraction. This is the form I have used, because it is easier to understand.

I do not know why the figures 1 minus 0.50 are used—for this is not the way to find a reciprocal, as some assume—unless it is to make appear simple what is in fact arbitrary. Perhaps if the easier form, 2 minus the relative income, were used, questions would have arisen as to why 2, rather than 3 or 1.75, is employed.

Any such figure substituted in the bill's equation, however, not only changes the "spread," but also changes rather sharply the pattern of the distribution. Only by using the inverse proportion can the true relationship of each State, not only to the national average but to every other State, be maintained.

VI

The limitations and perhaps distortions of this mathematical device embodied in the bill's formula become apparent on examination. Subtracting the State's income ratio from a constant (in this case a constant double the value placed before the fraction) has a twofold result:

1. No State, however poor, can have an allotment ratio more than double that of States at the national average. The effect is to minimize the differences between the low-income States—so that the allotment for a very low-income State is not very different from that for a State moderately below average. In terms of educational needs, I should think this a limiting approach.

2. As fortunate States approach double the national average income, their allotment ratios rapidly go to zero. Therefore, an increase in the income of the States will disproportionately reduce their allotments. (In the event a State or the District of Columbia should have more than double the national income per child in any year, it would have a negative allotment ratio.) Of course in the bill, a floor of 0.25 is put under these allotment ratios to protect the highest income States.

VII

I am well aware that this mathematical device has been incorporated in bills for years. It has been in bills I have sponsored. Apparently, however, it has never been fully satisfactory. In the Hill-Burton formula, for example, it is squared in order to increase its weighting. At other times, as in S. 8 as reported last year, the allotment ratio was used both to compute the Federal allocation to each State, and also to fix the proportion of State matching required. Most of these manipulations are complicated, and somewhat arbitrary.

If a general gradation between all the States, such as S. 1021 now provides, is to be used for Federal grant programs which are not matched, it seems to me that the simple inverse ratio of income would be justifiable, fair, and could be more widely understood.

For anyone interested in a simpler formula, making each State's allotment truly proportional to (a) school age population, and (b) relative income per child, I include a table showing such allotment ratios, compared to the allotment ratios under S. 1021 for each State. I have also had the State dollar allotments estimated, and ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD.

This formula could be provided by using the following language in section 105(b) of Senate bill 1021:

"(1) The allotment ratio for my State shall be the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) by the income per child of school age for the State, except that (i) the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 1.50 and (ii) the allotment ratio of any State shall be 1.00 for any fiscal year if the Commissioner finds * * *" etc.

VIII

I have taken some pains to analyze the mathematical equation embodied in what is now the administration's allocation formula, because I know its effects are not widely understood. I have done so because I think it worth while, when acting on a bill as important as this one—which initiates a new program, and which incorporates a formula by which billions will be distributed—to make its central points plain to all.

Talk of formulas may appear a dull or technical subject. Nevertheless, it is obvious that many who are vitally interested in how much each State receives, and in the method of allocating funds, have not understood this formula. Perhaps for that reason it has been helpful to raise questions about its logic, its principles, and its effects.

Comparison—State allotments under (1) S. 1021 as reported and (2) using the inverse proportion of income-per-child as the "allotment ratio"

	S. 1021 as reported		Proportional formula		Percent of authorization		
	"Allotment ratio" [1]	State allotment	Inverse proportion	State allotment	S. 1021 as introduced	S. 1021 as reported	Proportional formula
Connecticut	0.5000	$5,215,540	0.662	$6,273,000	0.90	0.61	0.738
Alaska	1.0000	1,111,660	1.000	1,003,000	.08	.13	.118
Delaware	.5718	1,239,504	.700	1,377,000	.17	.15	.162
New York	.5884	40,652,380	.708	44,455,000	5.66	4.79	5.230
New Jersey	.6466	16,592,271	.739	17,229,500	2.16	1.95	2.027
California	.6722	46,280,357	.753	47,064,500	7.92	5.44	5.537
Illinois	.7076	31,516,967	.774	31,331,000	3.50	3.71	3.686

See footnote at end of table.

Comparison—State allotments under (1) S. 1021 as reported and (2) using the inverse proportion of income-per-child as the "allotment ratio"—Continued

	S. 1021 as reported		Proportional formula		Percent of authorization		
	"Allotment[1] ratio"	State allotment	Inverse proportion	State allotment	S. 1021 as introduced	S. 1021 as reported	Proportional formula
Massachusetts	.7224	$14,789,750	.783	$14,500,000	1.77	1.74	1.714
Nevada	.7388	1,040,202	.793	1,011,500	.14	.12	.119
Ohio	.8720	39,517,893	.887	36,533,000	4.31	4.65	4.298
Pennsylvania	.8940	44,026,417	.904	40,460,000	4.04	5.18	4.760
Rhode Island	.9320	3,433,585	.928	3,136,500	.27	.40	.369
Maryland	.9300	13,681,203	.935	12,503,500	1.35	1.61	1.471
Michigan	.9536	37,928,701	.955	34,352,500	4.06	4.47	4.065
Washington	.9568	12,976,374	.959	11,815,000	1.71	1.53	1.390
Missouri	.9762	18,520,779	.977	16,847,000	1.84	2.18	1.982
Indiana	1.0120	22,781,255	1.012	20,706,000	2.55	2.68	2.436
Colorado	1.0304	8,896,358	1.031	8,092,000	1.07	1.05	.952
Florida	1.0416	21,923,016	1.043	19,949,500	2.87	2.58	2.347
New Hampshire	1.0510	2,726,162	1.054	2,482,000	.26	.32	.292
Oregon	1.0518	9,042,171	1.055	8,245,000	1.07	1.06	.970
Wisconsin	1.0584	20,021,484	1.062	18,258,000	1.74	2.36	2.148
Wyoming	1.0756	1,793,553	1.082	1,640,500	.23	.21	.193
Nebraska	1.0520	7,357,227	1.089	6,732,000	.80	.87	.792
Kansas	1.0904	11,111,415	1.099	10,174,500	1.42	1.31	1.197
Iowa	1.1014	14,386,515	1.113	13,209,000	1.69	1.69	1.554
Minnesota	1.1156	18,395,829	1.131	16,949,000	1.96	2.16	1.994
Montana	1.1234	3,888,736	1.139	3,587,000	.44	.46	.422
Hawaii	1.1734	3,739,329	1.210	3,502,000	.47	.44	.412
Texas	1.1786	58,063,833	1.218	54,527,500	6.05	6.84	6.415
Maine	1.1786	5,175,297	1.218	4,862,000	.62	.61	.572
Arizona	1.1790	7,405,140	1.218	6,953,000	.94	.87	.818
Vermont	1.1972	2,083,288	1.244	1,972,000	.22	.25	.232
Oklahoma	1.2146	12,602,078	1.273	12,002,000	1.79	1.48	1.412
Virginia	1.2224	23,803,278	1.286	22,754,000	2.68	2.80	2.677
South Dakota	1.2736	4,450,796	1.377	4,386,000	.49	.52	.516
Utah	1.2778	6,321,123	1.385	6,222,000	.87	.74	.732
Idaho	1.2862	4,408,622	1.401	4,360,500	.56	.51	.513
New Mexico	1.3074	6,370,666	1.444	6,392,000	.79	.75	.752
Louisiana	1.3140	22,202,909	1.458	22,389,000	2.26	2.61	2.634
West Virginia	1.3276	12,913,602	1.487	13,141,000	1.66	1.52	1.546
North Dakota	1.3600	4,535,574	1.562	4,734,500	.47	.53	.557
Tennessee	1.3654	23,526,845	1.576	24,675,500	2.93	2.77	2.903
Georgia	1.3834	28,045,856	1.619	29,852,000	3.31	3.30	3.512
Kentucky	1.3956	21,409,762	1.654	23,000,500	2.19	2.52	2.713
North Carolina	1.4254	33,751,156	1.740	37,442,500	4.19	3.97	4.405
Alabama	1.4412	24,005,156	1.790	27,098,000	2.96	2.82	3.188
Arkansas	1.5000	12,867,468	2.002	15,606,000	1.58	1.51	1.836
South Carolina	1.5000	20,398,967	2.089	25,814,500	2.29	2.40	3.037
Mississippi	1.5000	17,480,858	2.307	26,554,000	2.21	2.06	3.124
District of Columbia	1.5000	1,565,588	.608	1,734,000	.24	.18	.204
Guam	1.5000	500,247	1.500	204,000	.05	.06	.024
Puerto Rico	1.5000	21,093,754	1.500	19,167,500	2.14	2.48	2.255
American Samoa	1.5000	194,541	1.500	178,500	----------	.02	.021
Virgin Islands	1.5000	277,915	1.500	255,000	----------	.03	.030
Total	----------	850,000,000	----------	850,000,000	100.00	100.00	100.000

States ranked by income per school-age child (U.S. equals $8,081.28).

[1] S. 1021 "allotment ratio" doubled—for direct comparison with the inverse proportion. Doubling does not change the State allotments.

S. 1021 "allotment ratio": 1.00 minus 0.50 times $\frac{\text{State income per child}}{\text{national income per child}}$

Proportional formula substitutes for above: $\frac{\text{national income per child}}{\text{State income per child}}$

INTER-AMERICAN APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? Without objection, the report is considered and agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the request of the Senator from Arizona was for the present consideration of the report. I think the Chair was a little too hasty in anticipating that a motion that the Senate agree to the report would be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request by the Senator from Arizona was for the present consideration of the report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on a certain amendment of the Senate to House bill 6518, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) entitled "An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes," and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert: ": *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, before I move the adoption of the conference report, I want to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona is speaking on agreeing to the conference report, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is necessary to get the conference report agreed to. Then the question will be on the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, has the conference report been agreed to?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, was the conference report agreed to earlier, with the exception of the provision which is in controversy?

Mr. HAYDEN. Nothing has been done. I have not moved to do anything yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report does not include the amendment that the Senator from Delaware had in the original bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I do not want us to move too fast so that we lose the step the Senator from Delaware wants to take.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Delaware will have an opportunity after I make a statement.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has a motion been made to adopt the conference report?

Mr. HAYDEN. It has not. I am going to make it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is automatic. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the Chair has stated the conference report does not include the amendment in controversy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is correct. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is customary to have the leader of the conference report heard, and I hope the Chair is not going to rule he cannot be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I was recognized, and I would like to make a statement in regard to the conference report.

The conferees met on the Williams amendment, relating to interest rates, this afternoon. Every effort was made by the managers on the part of the Senate to influence the conference to stipulate that loans, or a large percentage of the loans, were not to be made at an interest rate in excess of 8 percent per annum.

The managers on the part of the House were adamant on this matter, maintaining that it would hamstring the program at a crucial time in that area of the world.

The Senate conferees were aware of the desire on the part of the President to sign this bill into law prior to his trip abroad, which takes place in the immediate future. The House conferees stated that they would never agree to the Senate amendment. In view of this fact, the Senate conferees agreed, in order to secure passage of the bill, that the compromise language should be adopted. That compromise language is:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

Then this language was placed in the statement on the part of the managers of the House:

The conferees direct that quarterly reports be made to the Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the Foreign Affairs and Appropriations Committees of the House by the President or such officer as he may designate showing loans made and rates of interest charged thereon.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona to agree to the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, it is my understanding that after we agree to the conference report the Senator's motion will be to recede on the Senate amendment and to accept the House amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not know what the next motion will be, but the next step will be laying the amendment before the Senate.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House amendment is before the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand it, the question now is on agreeing to the House amendment, which in effect takes out the Williams amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it not true that the conference report cannot be adopted in an effective way until after the report is first adopted without the disagreed-to amendment, and then after the Senate's position has been taken on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The amendment is in disagreement. The report is in disagreement as of now, before the Senate acts on the amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk read the amendment which the conferees recommend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand the situation this amendment is in two sections. The first section provides: That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank.

The next clause is: or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

My parliamentary inquiry is this: As I interpret this amendment, the bank can elect to operate under either of these provisos, if it so desires. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is in the alternative.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the amendment is in the alternative then the bank can elect to lend the money at rates not in excess of the legal rate of interest in the country, or if it wants to go higher than the legal rate of interest in the country, as I understand the other proviso, it can lend the money at any rate of interest which the Inter-American Development Bank considers not to be excessive, even though it may be 20 or 30 percent. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will have to leave it to the Senate to interpret the amendment. The Chair cannot interpret the meaning of it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think it can be so interpreted. It reads "either/or." I discussed this matter with the Parliamentarian earlier. We want this legislative record clear whether it does or does not provide that the legal rate of interest of the country would necessarily be the ceiling. If not, then the sky is the limit. But even if it does so provide, it still raises the ceiling to the legal rates of the countries involved, which in this instance run as high as 15 percent. That is nearly double the original ceiling established in the original Senate amendment.

As I interpret the amendment, after discussing it with the Parliamentarian, the bank could lend money to these building and loan associations and then they in turn could reloan the money at rates from 12 to 15 percent, or even higher if the bank decided the rates were not excessive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair cannot make any better interpretation than can any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That merely shows the confusion of the conference report. I will say, for the benefit of the Senate, that I discussed this question with the present Parliamentarian. I discussed it with the gentleman who was acting as Parliamentarian a couple of hours ago, and both were in complete agreement that under this amendment, there will be no effective ceiling on which the money can be loaned or reloaned. It is solely at the discretion of the Inter-American Development Bank. As the Bank lends the money, it can make the rate the legal rate of interest in the country in which the money is being loaned, or if the Bank thinks the interest rate is too low it can lend it at any rate which is not considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Bank.

I recognize that there can be different interpretations, but no interpretation can be given which would prevent them from going as high as 15 percent.

I think we should understand that if we agree to the House amendment, we will in effect be rejecting the 8-percent ceiling which the Senate adopted last week. Without the Williams amendment there is no limitation.

Even if the loans were restricted to the legal interest ceiling of the country

the interest charged still could be as high as 15 percent in these Latin American countries.

As I said before, the U.S. Government is not even going to get 15 percent interest. We will loan the money at 4½ or 5 percent interest to a group operating within these countries, and under the terms of the conference report we would say, "It is all right for you to take the money which you borrow from the U.S. Government at 5 percent interest and reloan it at 12 percent or 15 percent, or, if you see fit, at 30 percent interest. There is no effective ceiling. They can loan it at any interest rate they wish, do it in the name of the U.S. Government" and then pocket the profit.

We would be damned as Shylocks for trying to exploit the people in the South American countries.

I shall be glad to yield to any member of the conference committee if he wishes at this time to put a different interpretation on the House amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CARROLL. What is the parliamentary situation? I have listened to the able Senator from Arizona. The Senator is asking for approval of a conference report; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Arizona, which was to concur in the House amendment.

Mr. CARROLL. The secondary situation is that we have the amendment of the Senator from Delaware before us; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The House amendment is an amendment to the original amendment of the Senator from Delaware, which was incorporated in the bill.

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator from Delaware will yield, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona, in view of the statements of the Senator from Delaware, about the conference report. How did the conferees meet the arguments of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment is:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

It is a double negative. Both those conditions must be met. It does not refer to one or the other, but refers to both of them.

Mr. CARROLL. It is late in the evening. We have had a hard day. We are trying to reach an understanding. We would like to support the Senator from Arizona. We wish to understand the statement and position of the Senator from Delaware.

What is the position of the able Senator from Arizona as to meeting the argument of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the Senator from Delaware to say that this language could be taken either one way or the other. My interpretation, and the idea the conferees had—I am sure this will be confirmed by other Senators—is that this is what we might call a double negative:

The funds * * * shall not be * * * loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country * * *.

It cannot be either one. It is not an "either/or" provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CARROLL. If the Senator from Delaware will yield further, the Senator from Arizona is an able Senator, with many years of service in the Senate. The Senator knows the Senate wishes to vote on the question.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. Is the Senator from Arizona satisfied that the language meets the spirit and the intent of the compromise between the House and the Senate?

Mr. HAYDEN. If that had been the case, the House would have adopted the Senate provision. They would not do so before. They would not take anything for a long time. Finally we compromised on this language.

Mr. CARROLL. Why would not the House conferees take anything, I ask the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. There were various arguments. One was that if we mentioned a rate of interest that would be the rate of interest, in the South American countries, there would not be any interest rate lower. It might be possible in some countries, it was said, to loan money at 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7 percent interest, but if we said "8 percent," that would be it.

Another argument was that the Soviet Union is supplying money in those countries at 2 or 3 percent interest. If a rate of interest were mentioned the argument would be made, among the Soviet lovers, at least, "Get your money from the Soviet Union. You can get it cheaper there than from the United States."

Mr. CARROLL. Does the Senator from Arizona believe that by his recommendation we can protect ourselves from investors who are speculators and profiteers as to interest rates?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, because I believe the management of the Bank will not permit anything of that kind.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will yield to Senators in a moment. I yielded to the Senator from Colorado.

First, I point out in answer to the remarks of the Senator from Colorado that the conferees completely eliminated, for all effective purposes, the so-called Williams amendment, which was approved by the Senate by a vote of 95 to 0. The amendment is out. Accepting the interpretation of the Senator from Arizona as to the House action, then any interest up to the legal rate of interest in these countries can be charged.

I will read to Senators some of those legal interest rates: 10 percent in Argentina; 12 percent in Brazil; 15 percent in Chile; 8 percent in Colombia; 10 percent in Ecuador; 12 percent in Paraguay; 13½ percent in Peru; and 9½ percent in Uruguay.

Those are the rates under the chairman's interpretation of the conferees' action. Those rates are outrageous.

I read the first part of the amendment:

Provided, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank * * *.

Frankly, under that language I doubt that there is any limitation.

Mr. CARROLL and Mr. JACKSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Delaware is certainly aware of what we passed, because he was the sponsor of the amendment giving the Senate's viewpoint. Specifically, in a few words, what is the disagreement of the Senator from Delaware with the recommendation of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the motion of the Senator from Arizona is agreed to the original amendment of the Senator from Delaware which placed an 8-percent ceiling on interest rates, will be completely eliminated from the bill. In place of that we shall be incorporating in the bill a provision that the funds may be loaned or reloaned at interest rates running as high as 15 percent.

The Williams amendment approved by the Senate said the interest rate should not exceed 8 percent either on the original loan or on the secondary loan. We would be better to defeat the bill than to approve such usurious rates. We will make enemies, not friends, of the people being exploited by these exorbitant rates. Remember, these loans presumably are for the little borrowers.

We were told, before the Williams amendment was adopted, in discussions with the Treasury Department, that the amendment would work. Later some questions were raised.

Yesterday, at the request of the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], a meeting was arranged with the Treasury Department representatives in his office. I believe that was at 4 o'clock yesterday afternoon. I attended that meeting. The Senator from Vermont was present. They pointed out why some in the State Department felt the amendment ought to be modified. I explained how I thought it would work and why I felt it was necessary.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? Who thought the amendment ought to be changed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The representatives of the Treasury Department said that while the State Department thought the amendment ought to be changed, they recognized the merits of my arguments and would confer with

them again and call back. They appeared to be impressed with and sympathetic to my arguments.

Mr. CARROLL. In what degree was it asked that the amendment be changed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The State Department wanted the amendment changed so that there would be no ceiling on the interest rates. I objected. I made the point that the interest rate ceiling would work in those countries because all we had to do was to adopt the same principle we have in the Farmers Home Administration, which makes certain types of loans. In Peru, where there is a 12- or 15-percent interest rate, we could set up a special investment company to finance the small homes or home mortgages. This is American money. We could say, "The money may be loaned or reloaned at rates of interest not exceeding the 8-percent ceiling. Remember, we are not going to get any of this money back, and if we furnish it the very least we can do is to control its use.

At least, if we loaned the money at a low rate of interest we would create some good will.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in just a moment. One of the representatives of the Treasury Department who was present at the meeting said:

> I think you have an excellent point. Such provision would make sure the money would go to the people. We are going back and present this case to them and see if they will not agree, then we will call you.

I have not heard from him since.

Mr. CARROLL. Do the Senate conferees, including the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], feel that there ought to be a change from the position which the Senate took a few days ago?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I do not want to recede from our position.

Mr. CARROLL. I understood that was what the Senator from Delaware said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, I did not. After the objections arose in the House we had a meeting, but when I left that meeting with the representatives of the Treasury Department I left with a clear understanding that they would call back after taking my proposal up with the Department.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator said "they." Does he mean the House or the Treasury?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Treasury Department.

So far as I am concerned, as the author of the amendment, no representative of the Treasury Department or the State Department has come to me and said, "Your amendment will not work." They have had the one conference, which I have just described. They left the conference yesterday afternoon and in effect said, "We think you have raised some excellent points. We think it will work."

A few moments ago one of the arguments against my position made on the floor of the Senate was that Russia is building up a great deal of good will in Latin American countries because Russia is lending money at rates of 2 to 3 percent to those people.

I ask the question: How are we going to offset that influence by going into the same country and charging the people 12 and 15 percent in interest rates? If we are going to put the dollars of American taxpayers into those countries, why do we not make sure that the money will go to the people in the countries at reasonable rates and not to some group in a particular country who will take our American dollars at 5 percent and use them to exploit their own people by charging rates of 12 to 15 percent?

Mr. CARROLL. I voted for the amendment of the Senator from Delaware because it appealed to me. I liked it; I liked the principle. Was the Senator from Delaware one of the conferees on the part of the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I was not. I did not know the conferees were even meeting this afternoon. The last report I had was that the departments thought that they would be able to work it out. The next thing I knew the amendment had been eliminated from the bill on the flimsy excuse that the President wants to rush the bill through in order that he can sign it before he leaves for Europe.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to propound a question to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for the purpose of determining the legislative history and the legislative intent. Is it his understanding that we would not be bound by the legal limit of interest in a given country in case a determination were made that the legal limit was excessive?

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, it would depend upon the judgment of the Bank. It does not have to go to the legal rate.

Mr. JACKSON. In other words, we could determine that, from our point of view, the maximum legal rate of interest was excessive. Therefore, a determination could be made to charge a rate lower than the legal rate on the grounds that it is excessive. Is that the interpretation of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no question on that point.

Mr. JACKSON. Is that the intent of the conferees?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Then the Senator is correct. I agree with that interpretation. There is nothing in the House amendment that provides that the rate could not go lower. By the same token, there was nothing in the Senate amendment which provided that 8 percent must be charged. A lower rate could be charged under either. The difference is that my amendment placed a much lower ceiling on these rates.

I promised to yield to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I yield to him now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, when the bill was originally before the Senate, the Senator from Delaware very properly, I think, raised the question of excessive interest rates, but he stated, and others stated that since the bill was an appropriation bill, it would not be possible to legislate on it by an amendment.

I ventured to suggest at the time the bill was before the Senate that language could be offered that would be in order if it were not legislative, that is, if it were an amendment which was written in terms of a firm limitation that would not require legislation. So I drafted an amendment and handed it to the Senator from Delaware, and he subsequently offered it. It had an absolutely flat limitation that the interest rate should not exceed 8 percent. Had the conferees agreed upon the amendment in the form in which the Senate agreed to it, or had they agreed with a change of the 8 percent to 10 percent or 12 percent or to some other fixed absolute amount so that it would not require any discretion on the part of anyone, or would not add duties to any officers of the Government, it could have been in the conference report. But under the rules of the House, very particularly, and also the rules of the Senate, legislation may not be agreed to by conferees on an appropriation bill. If it were not legislation, it could have been in the conference report.

The amendment as it came back is really legislation, because it provides some discretion on the part of the Inter-American Development Bank. So very properly, then, with the amendment in disagreement, the conferees on the part of the House went back to the House with the amendment in disagreement. It was legislative on the face of it. The record shows it was brought up for a separate vote in the House, and the House concurred by receding from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

That amendment has two phases. The first phase provides:

> The funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank, * * *.

A period could have been placed at the end of that sentence, and that would have been the only ceiling. But drafters of the House amendment did not propose to stop at that particular point. A provision was added that there may be another ceiling.

The following clause was added:

> Or higher than the legal rate of interest of the country to which the loan is made.

I submit that any fair reading and analysis of the amendment will show that there are in effect two ceilings, and that the money made available herein may not be loaned or reloaned at rates higher than either ceiling. It may not be loaned at a ceiling higher than what the Inter-American Development Bank considers to be excessive, and that might be some percentage below the legal rate of interest in a given country. If the

Inter-American Bank said that the rate was excessive, that ceiling would operate. If that ceiling did not operate, and if the Bank did not regard the legal rate as excessive, then—

> The funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates * * * higher than the legal rate of interest of the country to which the loan is made.

I submit that the only meaning of the language as agreed to by the House is that a loan may not be made at a rate higher than the legal rate of interest of the country to which it is loaned, and if the legal rate of interest is higher than the Inter-American Development Bank thinks would be excessive, the lower ceiling placed by the Inter-American Development Bank would be the one that would operate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield in a moment. I would like to make a brief comment in connection with this question.

First, in order that Senators may know that there will be a yea-and-nay vote, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota, very properly, has placed his interpretation upon the amendment. When I read the amendment as it came back, I saw that it could be interpreted in either of two ways. Such confusion should not exist on any legislative proposal. Our intent should be clear. I discussed this subject with both Parliamentarians and was advised that it could be interpreted as an alternative method.

My first point is that if the amendment can be interpreted as an alternative method by two of the best Parliamentarians in Congress, certainly the State Department, which from the beginning has not wanted a ceiling, would interpret the amendment in the most liberal manner.

My second point is this: If the conferees did not intend this method to be an alternative method, why did they not use clearer language?

The Senate amendment was clear enough. That was the trouble—it was too clear for comfort. The State Department could not find a way around the clear intent of the Senate.

I believe that even 8 percent was high. I do not understand how the State Department feels that it can make friends in Latin America by taking American taxpayer dollars and turning them over to a local group in those countries, and then allowing the group to charge 12, 15, or 20 percent in interest, pocketing the difference between these rates and the 5 percent they will pay.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe this is a parliamentary question at all. I believe it is a question of semantics. I think it is a question of interpretation of words. Senators are entitled to have an understanding in their own minds based on their own experience as to what words mean.

I completely agree with the interpretation of the words made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. It seems to me very clear that this is in the reduplicative and that it provides as follows: No loan shall be made, certainly, if the rate is more than the legal rate in the country where the loan is to be made; and beyond that, if the Board of the Bank feels that the rate is excessive, notwithstanding that legal rate in the country of the loan, even if the proposed rate is below the legal rate, it may turn it down if it thinks it is excessive.

I see no other possible interpretation of the wording. I agree completely with the junior Senator from South Dakota. I do not think this is at all a parliamentary question. The Senator from Florida understands the wording to mean that if the rate proposed is greater than the legal rate in the country of the loan, then of course it is bad, and even if it is less, if the Board of the Bank thinks it is excessive, it has a right to reject it.

I see no possible interpretation other than that. I hope that having found, as the conferees have found, that there is objection to the 8-percent rate—and, after all, we cannot expect all the countries on this continent to do business on the same basis that we do—and having found that the President is exceedingly anxious to have this question disposed of before he takes the very critical trip that is ahead of him, and having found from the report of the conferees that this is the insistence of the House—and I believe they have yielded a great deal of ground in agreeing to this wording—I hope that the conference report will be approved, and I shall so vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let me say to the Senator from Florida that even accepting the interpretation which he placed upon the language, we would be approving a 12- to 15-percent interest rate. I call attention again to the fact that the 12-percent interest rate to which I was referring is not 12 percent annually, but 1 percent a month.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That would be the legal rate. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe the basic mistake that the distinguished Senator from Delaware is making is in assuming that business is transacted in all the countries in this hemisphere as we transact it in the United States, and that the price of money is the same in all the countries of this hemisphere. That assumption is not correct.

We are hopeful of being helpful and desirous of making a helpful contribution in this field, where we will be operating jointly with other countries, in an attempt to be helpful in each of the countries; and therefore, it seems to me that the reduplicative wording which is contained in the proposed amendment is a very great improvement over the wording which the Senator from Delaware was trying to correct. I voted with him, on the basis of the information we had at the time. However, I believe that from the conference report, from what the conferees have learned since to be the method of doing business in those countries, and with respect to the local rate of interest in some of these countries, this is as far as we should go. The conferees ought to be commended.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to cast my lot with the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I believe that his language offers a ceiling, and that the language of the conferees does not offer a ceiling. The Williams amendment was proposed because the law and the custom to the south of us called for a higher rate of interest than the Senate felt ought to be paid. We brought in language to say, "We will not do this if the rate is higher than the legal rate down there. But the legal rate is high, so we will have another check on it. We will let the Board of Directors decide it."

There are seven Directors on the Board. I give them all credit for being men of integrity and good intentions. The fact remains that there are seven Directors. One of the Directors is from the United States. Six are from countries with respect to which the Senate has found that their legal rates are too high, and that there ought not to be a profit on the taxpayers' dollars.

How about the officers? The President is from Chile. The Chief of the Loan Division is from Brazil. The head of the Technical Assistance Division is from Guatemala. The Chief of the Economics Division is from Ecuador. The Acting Chief of the Engineering Division is from Chile. The Chief of the Division of Administration is from Costa Rica. In other words, the Williams amendment was necessary because the legal rates and the practices to the south of us are exorbitant.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his contribution, and he has clearly stated the reason why my amendment was so necessary.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to point out one fact to the Senator from Delaware. In the situation in which we now find ourselves, we would have been in a better position had the bill been left with the language that was in the report. That language forbade the use of any interest rate which the bank considered to be usurious. Moreover, the Bank would have been charged with the specific responsibility of shutting off all business with any group which loaned at a rate in excess of that amount.

I voted for the Senator's motion. However, I point out to him that in his case the language also had this great defect, that at 8 percent no money would have been loaned.

With respect to the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], I interpret them to mean that if the Inter-American Development

Bank does set a rate of interest, that rate of interest will be binding, but if the bank fails to set a rate of interest, the legal rate of the interest in the country in which the loan is made will be binding, and that is the limit on the interest rate on the loan.

This presents to me personally a very tough question. I raised this question in the Committee on Appropriations. The language in the report is my language. I feel very strongly about this subject. If the Inter-American Development Bank should fail to set an interest rate, the local rate of interest in the country in which the loan was made would become binding. I certainly hope that the Inter-American Development Bank would never fail to set a limit upon the interest rate.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, has provided further for quarterly reports to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and to the Appropriations Committee of the House and the Senate, in order that we may obviate the troubles that we encountered in this situation. He has told me of his difficulties with the House. I really cannot see that we can do anything but accept the report, although I think we may have to choke off someone's funds a little later.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not see why the Senate must yield on this point and give these moneylenders the authority to charge up to 15 percent on money we shall be furnishing them at 5 percent. Remember, these high interest loans will be made to these people in the name of the United States of America. I simply do not understand it. Certainly the Senate rejected that idea.

Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I was one of the conferees. The Senate conferees made a very strong fight in defense of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. The House was adamant. As did the other conferees, I signed the conference report because it was better than nothing at all. It was a considerable improvement over the House bill. However, I shall vote against adopting the conference report because I think we would be better off having no loan program at all in South America.

If we are to permit interest rates of as high as 18 percent, which was the information given the conferees, when the Russians and the Chinese are making loans at rates of from nothing to 2 or 3 percent, the United States would be far better off not to make loans at all and not get ourselves into the ridiculous position of charging these exorbitant rates or subscribing to this kind of program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the comments of the Senator. Those are the same arguments which I made yesterday in a conference with the representatives of the Treasury Department in the office of the majority leader. They concurred in that argument. They said they thought we had a valid point. They asked to be permitted to return and talk the situation over with their superiors. We left the meeting—at least, I left it—with the full understanding that we were very close to an agreement. They said, "You will be hearing from us after we have conferred with the State Department." Not one word have we heard from them since.

If the conference report is accepted, and if it is interpreted in the most strict terms, as outlined by the Senator from South Dakota, it will still be possible to lend our money to a building association at around 5 percent, and they in turn can lend it at 1 percent a month or 15 percent, on first mortgages in Latin American countries.

The Senator from Nebraska read the list of the Directors of the Bank. Two of the Directors come from Chile, a country where 15 percent is the interest rate ceiling. One comes from Ecuador, which has a 10 percent ceiling.

The other day I called attention to the fact that the United States has already arranged to lend money to one building and loan association at about 5 percent if the bill is passed. In turn, that building and loan association is planning to finance a housing development in Peru—the amount of the loans being from $3,000 to $5,000—at an interest charge of 12 percent.

Why should the United States lend its money to groups in those countries at 5 percent and then let them lend it at 12 percent to the people. The man who then borrows at these usurious rates will look upon the United States as a country which is out to exploit him. We will be looked upon as Yankee imperialists when, in fact, we will be lending the money at 5 percent and allowing someone else to put 7 percent in his pocket.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it seems to me that the Senator from Delaware received considerable support for his position in the remarks made by the President today, when the President referred to economic and social progress abroad. He stressed the fact that our help alone cannot stabilize governments which are unable or unwilling to achieve social reform and economic development themselves. He said:

> Military pacts cannot help nations whose social injustice and economic chaos invite insurgency and penetration and subversion.

The report of the Senate Appropriations Committee on the bill states:

> This imbalance in the development process has created a breeding ground for unrest as major segments of the population in Latin American countries see the benefits that economic development bring but fail to participate in those benefits. It is this unrest upon which communism is seeking to feed in order to strengthen its influence.

I have marched up the hill on this amendment with the Senator from Delaware. The amendment provides a ceiling which might somewhat shock the people of this country. However, I do not propose to march down the hill again and give up the position which we have taken.

In my conception, the proposal made by the committee does not amount to any ceiling at all. There is no limit upon the ceiling, and any amount of interest could be charged. After we have allowed the borrower to have the money, he could relend it and charge any interest he wanted to, so long as it was legal under the law of the country in which it was to be used.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from New York is correct. Even if the interest were held at the legal rate registered in a country, it could still run as high as 15 percent. I say that we will not create any good will by charging 15 percent to these people who need this assistance. Let us not lose sight of that fact.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CANNON. It seems to me the Senate has already expressed its sense that the interest rate should have a ceiling by adopting overwhelmingly the amendment of the Senator from Delaware. Now we are told by the conferees that we must either agree to the amendment as proposed or else have no bill.

I agree with a number of Senators who have said there is confusion about the amendment. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska, who believes there is no ceiling at all under the amendment. The Senator from Arizona says he believes a ceiling was intended and that both of these conditions must apply. Therefore, I believe we have possibly three alternatives:

First, we can vote against the amendment and have no bill, as the House has said.

Second, we can adopt the amendment as is and leave confusion in the minds of many Senators.

The third alternative is an amendment which I shall propose, and I ask the Senator from Arizona if he will accept it; namely, to strike the word "or" after the word "Bank" and insert in lieu thereof the words "but in no event." That would then make the intent clear, and the amendment would read:

> *Provided*, That the funds herein appropriated shall not be available to be loaned or reloaned at interest rates considered to be excessive by the Inter-American Development Bank but in no event higher than the legal rate of interest of the country in which the loan is made.

Would the Senator from Arizona be willing to accept that amendment, which would eliminate any confusion as to whether any limit at all is imposed in the amendment? If so, we would have a clear-cut proposal. We could then either vote for an amendment which would limit the interest rate at the highest base of the legal interest rate of the country concerned, or, as an alternative, we could vote against the amendment,

which would mean that there would be no bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Such a procedure would delay the bill at least until next week. The other body has adjourned until Monday. But in my mind, there is no question that two ceilings are involved. The Senator's interpretation does not add anything to the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Whichever ceiling one bumped his head on would stop him.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; either one would stop him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In either event the Senator is arguing whether we want to charge 20 percent or hold the rate down to 15 percent. Let us be realistic. Both methods are wrong. Neither of these usurious rates will create friends in any country. How can a 15-percent rate be justified?

Personally, I should prefer to have the Senate either keep the proper limitation on these rates or defeat the bill. Otherwise, we shall be saying that the United States of America will lend the money at 5 percent or 4 percent, and the borrower in South America can, in turn, lend it at rates from 12 to 15 percent.

We will end up severely condemned by these people who must borrow this money. If that is done, the little borrower will be exploited, and the exploitation will be done in the name of the United States of America. The Senate has rejected that idea. Let us stand by our position.

The people who will get the large loans in those Latin American countries are already protected. It is the little people, those who will get the small loans, who will be charged the high rates of interest.

For example, I call attention to one loan which has been made through the Development Loan Bank. The individual who secured it was big enough not to have to go to an investment company. He was able to deal directly with the U.S. Government and push the loan through one of the international banks. He was able to get $2.6 million at 5¼ percent to finance his farming operation. How small a farmer is he? He owns 2.4 million acres of land in that country; 860,568 acres are fenced for pasture land. He has a large herd of cattle—65,000 head of cattle; he is one of the largest operators in South America. He gets money at 5¼ percent.

But if the conference report is enacted and if a man in the same country who has a small farm wishes to obtain a $3,000 or $5,000 mortgage on his home or if he wishes to borrow money in order to purchase a tractor, he would pay 12 percent or more under the provisions of this conference report. Can this be defended? Is there anyone who thinks that our country can gain friends in this manner?

If Senators can justify such an arrangement, let them vote for the conference report as the Senator from Arizona has submitted it to the Senate, but I will not support such usurious rates.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the representatives of the United States on the board will be highly complimented when they read this debate, because this is the first time I ever heard any Member of the Senate accuse them of seeking to charge high interest rates. On the contrary, the charge which always has been made has been that they wished to give away the money of the United States at interest rates lower than reasonable rates.

The wording of the conference report means that the ceiling will be the legal rate in that country, and that the Board can charge any lesser rate that it may wish to charge, if the American representatives on the Board insist that the legal rate in that country is excessive.

So I hope every Senator will listen carefully as I read to the Senate a part of the report of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

> The committee also noted that loans under the trust agreement will require a two-thirds vote and that for this purpose the U.S. representative votes over 40 percent.

So that situation is now before us.

The interest rate in the country concerned is certainly to be the ceiling; and any interest rate lower than that, which the Bank may wish to charge if it thinks the ceiling rate is excessive, will become the rate to be charged; and any such interest rate must be approved by two-thirds of the Bank. There are enough American votes in the Bank to be able to prevent the charging of a rate which the United States believes to be higher than a fair rate.

Mr. President, what do we expect when we try to be helpful in connection with a joint project? This Bank—not the Fund, but the Bank—is a joint project, with directors from all these countries. So what do we expect? Do we want to be fair, or do we wish to tell the representatives of the other countries that they must comply with our way of doing business, or else they will get no good from these funds. I think the question answers itself.

I believe the conferees have done all that they can; and I hope the report will be adopted.

I believe the fact that the U.S. representatives can control the Bank loans—as is called attention to in the report of the Senate committee—answers the question beyond any caviling; and I am sure that the U.S. representatives on the Board will not feel that the Senator from Delaware and other Senators who take a similar position are congratulating them on wishing to charge more than the traffic will bear, more than a reasonable rate, more than a proper rate, when I know and all others know that that will not be the case and that the Senator from Delaware does not mean that at all.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that I have never argued that the Bank was charging interest rates that were too low. What I am complaining about is that after we loan the money at 4½ or 5 percent we shall let the groups in those countries that get the money charge 15 or 20 percent and thus profiteer on it, but in our name.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I would not wish to attempt to substitute my opinion for that of the members of the conference committee; but today I talked to the Senator from Arizona, and he said they had made great efforts to bring the conference report into line with the opinion expressed by the Senator from Delaware, but that they were unable to do so.

Nevertheless, I believe a very important principle of the foreign aid program is involved in this case. Surely if the United States provides this money, it can say to these countries that it does not expect them to charge, when they lend the money, interest rates higher than the rates we would charge. Certainly we must take that position.

But tonight I am speaking primarily in terms of the importance of the foreign aid program. The President of the United States has said that he proposes that in the future our foreign aid program be reorganized, so that it will have certain goals. A few minutes ago the Senator from New York very well said that when the President of the United States addressed the Congress today, he emphasized those goals, and stated that our foreign aid program should be reorganized and administered by means of controls, and, as he said, that the program should be used in order to promote social justice. Certainly usury does not promote social justice.

If we are going to have a foreign aid program which will mean anything, it must promote social justice; and I have stuck with the Senator from Delaware, and I shall continue to vote with him, on the proposition he has emphasized; and I shall do that with, at the same time, of course, the greatest respect for the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

I believe that our foreign aid program will quickly go down the drain and become worthless unless we do something to protect it in this way.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. First, let me say that in my opinion the language recommended for adoption can well cause doubt as regards its true meaning. I assume for the moment that it means that if the interest rate is higher than what is considered just by the Inter-American Economic and Development Fund or if it is in excess of the legal rate of interest in the country where the loan is made, the loan shall not be made. In the conference report that is stated twice in the disjunctive—and that if either one of the disjunctives is in existence, the loan cannot be made. That is the basis on which I shall approach the meaning of this measure.

Let us assume that it means that if either A or B exists, the loan cannot be made. In conformity with what the

President said today—namely, that in our foreign aid program our objective will be to aid those who show an inclination to aid themselves—if there is a country which permits the charging of 12 percent or 15 percent interest, and if the desire in that country is really to aid those who are compelled to borrow, I agree with what the Senator from Kentucky said—that when one is willing to pay 12 percent or 15 percent interest, he is willing to pay it because his back is against the wall.

Are we to gain friends in South America by letting the people there know that we have entered into a loan arrangement, with a building and loan association, which allows it to borrow our money at 5 percent, but then to charge the borrowers from 12 to 15 percent? I do not think we are: I do not think this proposal is at all in conformity with what the President says. We would be far better off—as was stated a moment ago by the Senator from North Dakota—if we did not make such a loan at all, rather than to have so large a number of persons in South America charged exorbitant rates of interest.

I believe that if we remain firm, the Latin American nations will do something about reforming their interest rates to bring them into conformity with what is reasonable and what will enable them to borrow the money that we are willing to lend.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I make this point again. As we appropriate this money it is loaned to building and loan associations, which in turn will pay us, presumably, at 5 percent and in turn lend the money out at 15 percent. But we do not get either the 5 percent, or the 15 percent. We do not collect the principal as it is paid. As the interest is paid, and as the principal is repaid the money goes into a special revolving fund to be used in those same countries over and over again until the fund is gone. So far as we are concerned when we pass the bill the $500 million is gone. It is gone so far as the taxpayers are concerned. It will be a perpetual revolving fund.

I do not understand why anyone in any of those countries would try to insist that we should lend them money at cheap rates and then let them exploit their own people by charging 12 or 15 percent interest. Why do they object to their people borrowing money at reasonable rates of interest? We are losing out today in Latin America because Russia is coming in and starting building and loan associations and lending money to people at 2 or 3 percent interest. Yet we are trying to combat that by sending money to Latin America through the building and loan associations and letting them charge 12 to 15 percent.

The Mutual Savings & Loan Association in Peru expects to borrow this money at 5 or 5¼ percent and is planning to make loans to home borrowers at 10 to 12 percent. Why should we endorse a program under which the borrower could be charged 1 percent a month, or 12 percent a year, when we are furnishing the money to the same building and loan association in that country at 3 to 5 percent?

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I want to be sure I understand the Senator. Let me say, parenthetically, I voted with the Senator on the original proposal. Is it the statement of the Senator from Delaware that the Soviet Union is going into the savings and loan associations and is making available to the people of those countries where the Soviet Union is operating, money at 2 to 3 percent?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We were told that here tonight. I have no personal information on it.

Mr. KUCHEL. Who made that statement?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not recall, but I yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]; perhaps he has the information.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The information came to the conferees that such loans were made at 2 to 3 percent.

Mr. KUCHEL. Was it Soviet Union money?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Soviet Union and Chinese Communist money.

Mr. KUCHEL. That money is now available in South American countries, on which the interest rate is 2 to 3 percent.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; and less.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That was also my understanding. They are doing that by forming their own lending agencies and making sure the money goes to the people.

I do not see why we cannot do the same. We have the Farmers Home Administration in this country which furnishes loans to farmers at 4 to 5 percent. We have the REA which furnishes loans at 2½ percent. We know these are not regular banking rates. The rates are established arbitrarily to help the farmers.

By the same token, if we are going to put up money in South and Central America, why do we not make sure our money in turn goes for the benefit of the people? If we are going to charge 3 percent or 5 percent, as we have on most of the money, why not make sure that the people who need help get the benefits.

We are not collecting the extra 12 percent, but we are charged with the responsibility of collecting it, because the man who borrows the money for his home from the Peru Savings & Loan Association at 1 percent per month in turn blames us for charging exorbitant interest rates. Instead of making friends, we are making enemies.

As I have stated before, we make low interest loans in those countries to large borrowers. One loan was made to one group who had 2.4 million acres of farmland. He borrows $2.1 million at 5¼ percent. The conferees would not bother that. He can keep on borrowing the money at low interest rates, but the little fellow in that same country, if he wants to build a home and receive the benefits of a loan on his farm, financed by the United States of America, must pay 1 percent a month, or 15 percent annually.

The Senate should reject the conference report. Let us be sure that the benefits will go to the people of the country and not to some group in that country that is going to exploit small borrowers in our name.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am afraid that if ex-President Eisenhower is listening here tonight, he may be very sorry he suggested cooperating with our Latin American neighbors. But I doubt it. There were quite a few things said here tonight that perhaps could stand correction. Before we vote on the conference report, I should like to ask the chairman of the Senate conferees two questions. One has been asked and answered several times tonight. It was answered very adequately by the Senator from South Dakota. The question is: Is it the intent of the conference committee that any of the money provided in the bill shall not be loaned or reloaned at a rate exceeding the legal rate of the country where it is loaned, or if the Bank considers that legal rate to be excessive, may reduce it to a rate it considers to be a proper rate?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is my understanding.

Mr. AIKEN. The other question is this—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise to offer an amendment—

Mr. AIKEN. Just a minute. May I finish a sentence before I am interrupted?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. AIKEN. I have another question. These loans on which excessive charges are paid in South America are not in most cases illegal rate loans. The interest rate may be 10 percent. The borrower may pay 30 percent, but that other 20 percent may be in legal service charges.

The question which I want to ask the chairman of the conferees is this: In determining whether interest rates are excessive, is the Bank expected to take service charges into consideration?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It seems to me any reasonable banker would.

Mr. AIKEN. Forty-percent charges could be paid in some South American countries without breaking the law, if they pay 10 percent in interest and 30 percent on service charges. Is it not the intention of the conferees that the Bank take that into consideration in determining whether an interest charge is excessive?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. It is the intention of the conferees that excessive interest shall not be charged.

Mr. AIKEN. These people have taken North American customs and improved upon them—or not—depending upon one's viewpoint.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to make it clear that in determining what is an excessive

rate of interest, the service charges must be taken into consideration. Otherwise, under the proposal of the House, a legal rate of interest could be charged, and the borrower could still pay three times the legal rate of interest.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sure no one has that in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that should be made clear.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield for a comment?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the record before the Appropriations Committee shows that the primary attention, in questioning State Department representatives, was not with reference to the total amount of interest to be charged but instead with reference to the amount to be charged the ultimate borrower, in excess of what the lender was charged for his funds. This was the great defect in the original amendment of the Senator from Delaware. There is no question as to what is the ultimate charge, but instead a question as to how much we allow people to overcharge the ultimate borrower.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. In my opinion, the Senator from Vermont has hit upon a vital point.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. That is the thing which concerned us. The question is not as to the ultimate rate, but as to how much we shall permit the lender to charge, by way of service charges and interest to be paid by the ultimate borrower. This is the reason for the language in the original report, to the effect that the lenders would not be able to reloan the money for sums which in the opinion of the Inter-American Development Bank could be considered usurious. That is the real question, instead of a question of the ultimate rate: What is the amount to be permitted to be charged by the original borrowing institution in reloaning to the ultimate borrower?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the Senator's courtesy in yielding to me. The Senator has touched upon what I think is the most important element.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, without the understanding that service charges shall be taken into consideration in determining a fair rate of interest, the action which we shall take, if we approve the amendment, will be rather meaningless.

I thank the Senator from Coloardo for participating in the colloquy. With the reply of the chairman of the conferees, the Senator from Arizona, it seems to me the intent of the Senate is made perfectly clear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I think the Senator is to be commended for bringing out the various facets of the question. I wish to point out that under the agreement entered into in the conference, already approved by the House, reports will have to be presented four times a year to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and the Appropriations Committees of both Houses.

I am quite sure that because of the perspicacity and determination of the Senator from Delaware the intent of the Congress is known beyond dispute. I am sure that because of the activities of the Senator from Delaware, if the proposal is agreed to by the Senate, the Senator will have performed a great service in behalf of the whole hemisphere and that one of the results will be a gradual lowering of some of the usurious interest rates in Latin America.

Mr. AIKEN. I concur in the remarks of the Senator from Montana. I agree that if it had not been for the determination of the Senator from Delaware we probably would not be in as good a position with respect to the loans to Latin-American people as we shall be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall take only 1 minute.

I thank the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Vermont. I hope some good will come from this debate because I fear that unless we place an effective ceiling on these interest rates we will not only waste the money but also lose many friends.

As I said before, interest rates will run as high as 15 percent if we adopt the conference report here tonight. We will not make any friends at such high interest rates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD immediately preceding the vote a list of the ceiling rates in the respective countries which will be approved by the Senate if it supports the conference report here tonight.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Prime loan—Commercial bank interest rates

(As reported by First National City Bank of New York to Eximbank of Washington)

	Percent
Argentina	10
Brazil	12
Chile	15
Colombia	8
Ecuador	10
Paraguay	12
Peru	13–13½
Uruguay	9½

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CANNON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, I have a live pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE]. If he were present, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Oregon would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tenessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] are detained on official business.

On this vote the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] would vote "nay," and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 26, as follows:

[No. 57]

YEAS—41

Aiken	Fulbright	Metcalf
Allott	Hart	Monroney
Bartlett	Hartke	Morse
Bible	Hayden	Morton
Bridges	Hickey	Moss
Burdick	Hill	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Pastore
Carroll	Jackson	Pell
Case, N.J.	Javits	Randolph
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Smith, Mass.
Church	Long, Mo.	Stennis
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Wiley
Engle	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McNamara	

NAYS—26

Beall	Dworshak	Mundt
Bennett	Fong	Proxmire
Boggs	Goldwater	Scott
Butler	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston	Thurmond
Cotton	Keating	Williams, Del.
Curtis	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Dirksen	Lausche	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Miller	

NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Gore	Neuberger
Blakley	Gruening	Prouty
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Cannon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Carlson	Long, La.	Smathers
Chavez	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Yarborough

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day the majority leader indicated that there would be a session tomorrow, at which time we would consider the calendar of measures to which there is no objection. I should like to know whether that is still what he proposes to do, and whether or not after the conclusion of business tomorrow he intends to have the Senate adjourn for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate has ordered that tomorrow there shall be a call of the calendar to consider items on the calendar to which there is no objection. The rest of the day will be taken up with speeches by various Members. Then it is our intention to go over from Friday until Monday, at which time no action that I know of will be taken; if it is, certainly it will be noncontroversial. It is planned to adjourn from Monday until Thursday. I suggest that Members return by Thursday, because the Senate may have legislation before it at that time which will demand close attention.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not want the RECORD to close without taking some time to express my appreciation for the wonderful assistance I received throughout the consideration of the Federal-aid-to-education bill, starting from the day the bill was referred to my Subcommittee on Education until the historic hour this evening when the bill was passed by such a fine majority of 49 to 34. Mr. Baker advises me that if all Senators had been present, the bill would have been passed by a vote of 59 to 41.

Many of my colleagues have been kind enough to express very flattering words about my work on the bill. Every Senator knows that no one person carries a bill through the Senate. The bill was carried through the Senate not by any leadership alone, but by the efforts of all who have cooperated with me and worked so hard with me from the time we first considered the bill in my subcommittee.

It is always dangerous to start thanking some persons for services rendered far beyond the line of duty, without running the risk of forgetting someone else. However, I will run that risk in order to make certain that the RECORD will show that credit is given to some to whom I shall always be indebted for their wonderful cooperation.

There would have been no chance for the passage of the bill if we had not received at all times the complete cooperation of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I am sure that few Members of the Senate fully appreciate the great help the Senator from Montana was to the boys and girls of this country in connection with the magnificent work he did in helping to clear the way for the final consideration of the bill today. In behalf of my subcommittee I say to the Senator from Montana that we thank him very much.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the incomparable Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. We all know that no matter how hard a subcommittee may work on a piece of legislation, if the subcommittee cannot receive the complete cooperation of the chairman of the full committee, any bill the subcommittee seeks to bring out is headed for rough travel through the parliamentary procedures of the Senate. The Senator from Alabama has been one of the great friends of Federal aid to education ever since I first came to the Senate, starting back in 1947, when the Senate first considered the bill that year, followed by the bill of 1949, and again last year, by S. 8. The Senator from Alabama has long been of great help in the area of Federal aid to education just as he has been one of the great proponents of Federal aid to various health and hospital projects. One of the great pieces of legislation on the statute books, known as the Hill-Burton Act, has caused us frequently to refer to LISTER HILL as probably the greatest friend the people of the country have in the Senate in connection with health legislation.

I express my sincere thanks, too, to all the members of the subcommittee. The senior member of the subcommittee is the very wonderful Senator from Michigan, PAT MCNAMARA. Never at any time during the consideration of the bill, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate, did I ask any help from Senator MCNAMARA and not get it in overflowing measure. I want him to know that I deeply appreciate his help, as I appreciate also the help of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the other Democratic members of the subcommittee.

Moreover, there would have been no chance of voting on the bill tonight if we had not had the understanding assistance—although they did not agree with us in some particulars on some parts of the bill—of every Republican member of the committee. I express my appreciation to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who voted in the subcommittee and in the full committee to report the bill.

Although he is not a member of the committee, I want to voice my thanks, also, to the Senator from Montana, LEE METCALF, who is now presiding over the Senate. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he was coauthor of the Murray-Metcalf bill, an important forerunner of the measure we have just passed.

The Senator from Montana attended our conferences with administration representatives and was of great help to us with his wise counsel. I shall always appreciate his outstanding contribution.

Even though they did not vote with us, I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. All of us know that in committee work if there is an opposition that wishes to exercise all the parliamentary weapons it can keep in its parliamentary arsenal, it is sometimes very difficult to get a bill out of subcommittee to the full committee and from the full committee to the floor of the Senate.

So I appreciate the fine, sportsmanlike cooperation we received from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because they threw no parliamen-

tary roadblocks, so to speak, in our way. They roughed us up from time to time in expressing opposition to our point of view, but that is to be expected and is a part of the parliamentary process. Not only is it their right, but I believe it is their duty to express themselves in opposition to a bill with which they do not agree.

I only regret that I was not more persuasive with them. I only regret that I was not a better teacher, because they are good students. Something was wrong with my teaching process, because they were not won over to my point of view. In addition, I thank them as individual members of the full committee.

Senators alone do not carry bills through committees or through the Senate. We would not be successful in the passage of any bill if it were not for the dedicated service which we receive from the very loyal staff members. I would not want the RECORD to close with my expression of thanks and gratitude to Senators only. I express very deep appreciation to the wonderful staff members on both sides of the table—both the majority and the minority staff members—who did such wonderful research and preparation work for the committee. They made it possible for us to meet the questions which were presented to us in the course of the debate on the basis of the facts as shown by the record of our hearings and deliberations.

So to John Forsythe, known to all of us as Jack, and who is general counsel of the committee, and really the right-hand assistant to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I express in behalf of the full committee and the subcommittee my sincere thanks.

One of the ablest research men whom I observed working in the Senate in my years of service, a keen student, a thorough preparer of material for the committee who lets no stone remain unturned in his search for answers, is Charles Lee.

To him, again in behalf of the committee, I express my appreciation. I am proud of the fact that Charles Lee holds a masters degree in political science from the University of Minnesota. He has a long record of outstanding service in my State and also has a great war record, something about which we never hear him talk. But it is a war record which is deeply moving when it is fully known. He is a resident of Portland, Oreg., and I am proud to call him a fellow Oregonian and a constituent of mine.

On the Republican side of the staff, I express my appreciation again to Mike Bernstein and Ray Hurley, who were most capable assistants, not only to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the other Republican members of the subcommittee; but who, when we sometimes needed help from them even on our side of the aisle, to check up on the material which was put into the RECORD by the Senator from Arizona, for example, always gave us whatever facts we needed in relation to the material which was being used by the Republicans. They recognized that that, too, was their duty, just as it was the duty of the representatives of the majority side of the committee.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made available to us at all times one of their experts, Mr. Dave Martin. I express the committee's appreciation for his excellent work.

Other members of the staff of the full committee assisted us. I desire to thank especially Mr. Stewart McClure, the chief clerk.

I wish to thank another research assistant, from my office, Miss Phyllis Rock.

Then we come to the floor of the Senate. We have seen these wonderful staff members assisting the members of the committee from the very beginning of the debate. I desire that the RECORD show our appreciation to Mr. Baker, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. McPherson, and all their associates on the Senate floor staff.

Nor could we have produced the bill, which I think time will prove to be a sound bill, if we had not had the cooperation of the White House staff and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I express my thanks particularly to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff and to his keen and scholarly assistant, Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen.

In my judgment, the bill never would have come to us in the acceptable form in which it was passed tonight if the White House staff, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his assistants had not been willing to meet with us frequently, sometimes at the White House, sometimes at the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, sometimes in the office of the majority leader, and sometimes in the committee room itself. On those occasions, we hammered out a bill on the basis of conscionable adjustment of those differences of opinion which develop in the consideration of a bill as complex as this bill.

One of the things of which I shall always be proud, and of which I think the committee can be proud, is that we could come to the floor of the Senate and say to the Senate, "We are presenting a bill which has the approval not only of its sponsors and those who voted to report it from committee, but also the approval of the officials of the administration."

That cannot be done frequently in the Senate. If Senators want my opinion as to one of the major reasons why it was possible to pass the bill, defeating every amendment which was offered which we wanted defeated, accepting only two amendments with which we were in complete agreement, and which we decided we wanted adopted after the bill had been reported from the committee, it was that we had the administration behind us, both at the White House level and at the level of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The RECORD should show this, because if it did not show it, I do not know how my very deep and appreciative feelings and really sentimental reaction could be made a part of this historic record.

Only part of all the nice things that have been said about the work we have done are deserved. In that connection I wish to say that a very great deal of the credit is due the chief sponsor of the bill in the House of Representatives, Representative THOMPSON of New Jersey. Today I received a call from the White House and also a call from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and was told that the administration refers to this bill as the Morse-Thompson bill—Representative Thompson, of New Jersey, having had the responsibility of the leadership on the House side, in connection with the bill.

I wish to thank the administration for what I consider to be its exceedingly generous expression. It is really a tribute due all the members of the two committees, the one in the Senate and the other in the House of Representatives.

Probably I have failed to express my appreciation to some I have overlooked; but, if so, it is certainly unintentional.

To all who have helped, I am deeply grateful; and I may say I am particularly grateful to the 48 Senators who joined me on the rollcall vote and to those who joined me on live pairs.

Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has now left the Chamber. However, earlier today he obtained a print of this bill which was made after the enrolling clerk of the Senate sent the bill to the Government Printing Office last night, after the third reading of the bill. My friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], had a little sport with me tonight, in the course of the debate; they ribbed me a little. They said that apparently a new procedure had been adopted, and indicated that perhaps I had become subject to overconfidence and had engaged in some irregularity, because today there arrived on Capitol Hill a print of Senate bill 1021 which bears the notation—"Passed the Senate May 25, 1961." They pointed out that that notation had been printed on the bill even before the bill had actually been put to a record vote in the Senate.

I did not know anything about the printing procedures; so, as the RECORD will show, I said I did not know about it; but that I would find out, and that it was not done on any orders or authorization of mine. I said I was sure it was not a substantive matter, but no doubt was one of common procedure.

Now I have ascertained the facts, and the RECORD should show them, so that those who read the RECORD will not be left in doubt, and so there wil be no question about the propriety of the course of action which was followed.

The enrolling clerk of the Senate, who has been employed by the Senate for 30 years, advises me that the procedure which was followed last night, after the third reading, in sending the bill to the Government Printing Office for printing, is a practice of 30 years' standing. I am sure that my friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will be glad

to have that enlightening information, just as I am glad to have it. They will be pleased to know that no irregularity at all was followed. The enrolling clerk of the Senate informs me that the practice is to send the bill to the Government Printing Office immediately after the third reading of the bill, so that a so-called "clean copy" of the bill can be printed. Then it can at once be placed in the hands of the legislative counsel, so that he can do his work on the bill before it goes to the House of Representatives. The enrolling clerk points out that the moment such a print of the bill is available, it is available for signature by the Secretary of the Senate. But it is signed by him only after the bill is passed by the Senate, and this printed copy is actually effective only after it has been signed by the Secretary of the Senate. Of course, the copy which the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Illinois had obtained bore no signature at all; but I imagine that the bill has now been signed and is on its way to the House of Representatives, because, after all, the bill has now been passed.

Although I imagine that much of what my two friends said was said in humor and in the process of indulging in good fun, nevertheless they made a serious point about the matter, and I wanted the RECORD to show the facts in regard to it.

OLD MISTAKE REPEATED IN CUBA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "An Old Mistake Repeated in Cuba." The article was published today in the Washington Post. The editorial note in connection with the article reads as follows:

The following analysis was prepared by an administrator in the Government who prefers to remain anonymous.

Mr. President, this is a very keen analysis. It is one with which I completely agree.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, I wish to say that I believe the writer of this analysis hit the nail right on the head, so to speak. There could not be a more perceptive or more sound analysis of the mistakes we have been making in Cuba. In short, I do not believe that the analysis which was published today in the Washington Post could be improved upon.

I hope that everyone in the administration who has anything to do with Cuban affairs will read the analysis and will take it to heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request to print the article in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 25, 1961]

AN OLD MISTAKE REPEATED IN CUBA

The invasion of Cuba failed because of a misreading of the nature of revolutions, and especially of contemporary revolutions. A genuine revolution, as distinct from the military coup so common in Latin American politics, involves far-reaching social and economic change. Such change means dispossession of the former ruling class, which naturally protests loudly and violently.

But these protests represent a minority viewpoint if the revolution has effected land distribution, social services, educational opportunities, and the like. Consequently, to accept the opposition of the dispossessed as representative of the views of an entire people, or the predominant proportion of a people, is to seriously underestimate the strength and backing of a revolution.

This may seem obvious and platitudinous, and yet this underestimation has been made of every significant revolution of modern times. For example, at the Paris Peace Conference following World War I, Lloyd George opposed Allied intervention against the Bolshevik regime in Russia on the following grounds: "The peasants accepted bolshevism for the same reason that peasants accepted it in the French Revolution, namely, that it gave them land. Is any one of the Western Allies prepared to send a million men into Russia? The mere idea of crushing bolshevism by a military force is pure madness."

Yet, this madness was pursued because of the credence given to reports of emigres and diplomats that the Soviet regime had little popular support.

The invasion of Cuba failed for the same basic reason that intervention failed against the French and Russian revolutions, that is, underestimation of the popular support for a revolutionary regime.

In recent years, some French military and political leaders have studied Mao Tse-tung's military tactics and have tried unsuccessfully to apply them in Algeria. In our own country, there are reports that Che Guevara's handbook on guerrilla warfare is being used as a possible guide for U.S. forces.

One must never forget, however, that the basic strength of the guerrilla is his revolutionary program. He is identified in the mind of the peasant as one who offers relief from a despised usurer or landlord. Without such identification at the grass roots, the guerrilla is simply a saboteur able to blow up a few installations or kill a few people, but powerless to generate widespread popular backing.

In other words, to read Che Guevara or Mao Tse-tung on guerrilla tactics and not on political and social change is to mistake technique for the underlying and determining substance.

The conclusions that may be drawn from the above are—

1. Further invasions by Cuban emigres are likely to be as futile as their first attempt. Arms from the Communist block would be part of the explanation, but by no means entirely; witness the collapse of Batista despite abundant American arms.

2. Direct American intervention will be regarded and interpreted in most of the underdeveloped and uncommitted world as corresponding to the policies of the Holy Alliance in the early 19th century. Indeed, the antagonism will be much more widespread and intense because of modern mass communication media.

3. Even if direct American intervention did not lead to international complications, it is highly probable, if not certain, that winning the battle for Cuba in this manner would mean losing the battle for Latin America. Cuba could become as serious a thorn in our side as Algeria has been for France.

Is it possible that we should talk to Castro either directly or through a third country? Is it necessary that we refrain from diplomatic trade and travel contact with Cuba?

For one reason or another, an understanding with Castro may well prove impractical. In that case we must expect the rapid development of Cuba into a Communist showplace in the Western Hemisphere. That in turn will create a situation in the Americas similar to that in Asia. Just as we now must give massive aid to India so that she will not be hopelessly surpassed by Communist China, so we will then need to give massive aid to at least certain selected Latin American countries so that they will not be surpassed by Cuba. This aid will need to be on a much larger scale than any contemplated thus far.

The basic danger in the future probably will come not from Soviet bases or Cuban agents, but from the appeal of a prosperous and growing Communist Cuban economy for the impoverished and dissatisfied Latin American peasant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE OLD SUBWAY TO THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I announce that one of the old trolleys in the old tunnel will continue in operation until at least the end of the present session.

DEATH OF DAVID LYNN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, David Lynn, who served as Architect of the Capitol from 1923 to 1954, died today, after a short illness. Prior to his service as Architect, Mr. Lynn served for 22 years under the previous Architects, Edward Clark and Elliott Woods.

Mr. Lynn was appointed Architect of the Capitol by President Coolidge on August 22, 1923. He came from an old family, of Frederick and Allegany Counties, Md., who for many generations had been distinguished in the judicial, military, business, and social life of the State. His great-great-grandfather, Judge David Lynn, was one of the three Commissioners appointed in 1751 to lay out the town of Georgetown.

Mr. Lynn was born in Wheeling, W. Va., November 10, 1873; educated in public schools of Cumberland and the Allegany County Academy. He entered the Office of the Architect of the Capitol on July 1, 1901, during the tenure of Edward Clark as Architect. He was appointed the seventh Architect of the Capitol, following the death of Elliott Woods.

During his tenure as Architect, there were constructed and added to the buildings in the legislative and judicial groups, the New House Office Building, the First Street wing of the Senate Office Building, the U.S. Supreme Court Building, the central refrigeration plant, and other additions to the Capitol powerplant, the annex and addition to the Main Library of Congress Building, and the legislative garage.

During his tenure, the 62 acres of land lying immediately north of Constitution Avenue were acquired and developed as part of the Capitol Grounds park area; the Capitol, Senate, and House Office Buildings were completely air conditioned; the roofs over the Senate and House wings of the Capitol were reconstructed, and the interiors of the House and Senate Chambers were remodeled; the terraces of the Capitol Building were reconstructed.

The U.S. Botanic Garden was relocated to its present site, and the new conservatory was constructed and the grounds developed under his direction.

In connection with construction projects, Mr. Lynn served as a member of the Commission for Enlarging the Capitol Grounds; the United States Supreme Court Building Commission; the Joint Commission to acquire a site and additional buildings for the Library of Congress; and was a member of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia and the Alley Dwelling Authority.

He served as Acting Director of the U.S. Botanic Garden, from 1934 to 1954.

Mr. Lynn retired as Architect of the Capitol on September 30, 1954. Until his death, he continued to reside at his residence, 3700 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the executive nomination on the calendar under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn, to meet on tomorrow at 12 o'clock, noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALIFORNIA'S STAKE IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Monday, in the city of San Francisco, I spoke at a Maritime Day luncheon. I ask unanimous consent that the comments I made on that occasion be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S STAKE IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

(Address by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator, at the National Maritime Day luncheon of the Propeller Club of the United States, San Francisco, Calif., Monday, May 22, 1961)

As our closest neighbor, the sea has traditionally been important to California both as a source of income and as a natural route of commerce and communication.

But, it took a war fought from two shores to open still undreamed-of maritime opportunities for us. It brought new nations into focus off our western shores. And it demonstrated to the eastern seaboard the growing industrial capability of the Pacific coast.

What has this meant for California?

It has meant the growth of a shipbuilding industry. Today, we are, indeed, a maritime State. Once content to handle repairs and conversions, we now boast 22 of the principal shipbuilding and repair yards in the country. Currently, in these yards, we are building 15 new merchcant ships—one-fifth of the nationwide total under construction.

It has meant progress for our ports. Amounts of cargo handled through our harbors are increasing. During 1960, $1¼ billion worth of goods entered our ports, $1½ billion through San Francisco Bay alone—a 33-percent increase over the previous years, I might add.

And proudly, we are keeping pace with the swelling demand. Our entire coast is bustling with new facilities.

In San Diego, we have a multimillion-dollar covered pier; in the East Bay, new containerization facilities—fully automated and the most modern of its type; in Los Angeles, new passenger facilities and a container terminal; in Sacramento, an entirely new $35 million port; in Stockton, new bulk ore and bulk grain facilities; in San Francisco, a $50 million bond issue, to put into motion a multitude of improvements.

And pointing the way to still greater progress, plans are now underway for many improvements along our coast.

We hardly realize the wealth brought to California by the maritime industries. The ramifications are, in fact, staggering.

Building and loading ships mean employment opportunities for a highly skilled labor force. Longshore industry workers alone number some 25,000 in the State. Last year, they worked 20 million man-hours. They earned in the neighborhood of $75 million, and about $42 million of that here in San Francisco. Some 12,500 Californians are on the payrolls at private shipyards in the State; and, in 1960, they earned more than $40 million. These are labor dollars that pump energy into our economy. These are dollars that purchase food and clothing, finance homes and cars, and pay taxes.

The effect on our State economy certainly does not stop here. Ships are good customers. There are a thousand and one products whose end use is found aboard American tankers, freighters and luxury liners.

Take the simple matter of light bulbs. A large freighter uses about 800 light bulbs each trip.

Or, take soap. One American line recently reported that one of its ships uses, each trip, 2,400 bars of face soap, 200 bars of lava soap, 1,200 bars of laundry soap, and 210 packages of soap powder.

Multiply this by the 1,400 American vessel arrivals in our ports. The consumption of light bulbs and soap alone is significant.

And so long as the ships continue to consume, we shall continue to supply. This goes, too, for the taxi that makes repeated trips to the docks; the retail shops that sell to the tourist and the embarking vacationer; the doctor and the lawyer who lend their talents to the maritime industry; and the banks that finance the cargo. The amount invested in ships, shoreside facilities, ship and repair yards, reaches high in the millions. Shipping is, indeed, a benefactor to the economy of our State.

This is the nuclear era, the age of outer space. We are spending, as we should be, billions of dollars to reach out to the moon and to the stars. But I suggest to the American people, and to the Government, that we do not shunt the sealanes into obscurity. That great mariner of another day, Sir Walter Raleigh, was eternally correct when he said: "Whosoever commands the sea, commands the trade; whosoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world, and consequently, the world itself."

Our country, as well as our State, is dependent on the sea, for trade and commerce, for food, and for the security of our people. The seas are our road of communications with our allies and with the newly emerging states—many of which are not far away from our own shores. Across the oceans, we move 99 percent of our foreign commerce, exclusive of our contiguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico. Our foreign commerce represents 10 percent of our gross national product, now in the proximity of $500 billion a year. And the portent for tomorrow is one of expansion. Trade will irresistibly continue and will inevitably grow.

The importance of exports cannot be overestimated. They are outlets for our industrial output. Consequently, they are an important factor in our national income. And just as significantly, they are a means of sharing our democratic way of living with new and impressionable nations.

In speaking of the importance of exports, I am delighted, at this point, to report the passage of a bill by the Senate (S. 1289), which I coauthored with Senator MAGNUSON. It eliminates the archaic and statutory oath requirement on shippers' export declarations. Though just one of the little things we so frequently overlook, it will save exporters thousands of unnecessary man-hours annually. It will also pare thousands of unnecessary dollars off our mounting export costs, which, unfortunately, overprice our goods in highly competitive world markets.

The sea road of commerce is two way. Over it comes the raw materials of the free world which we require for our own economic existence. Without vast imports of magnesium, bauxite, tin, rubber, nitrates, and iron ores, we could not produce steel nor aluminum. Without them, we could not fully fertilize our fields nor have a myriad of products upon which we have come to depend.

Let's not forget, either, that by buying the products of other nations we mutually strengthen the free world. A nation wthout outlets, particularly the single-commodity nation, is economically weak. And a nation economically weak is politically vulnerable.

In essence, our exports and imports are major tools with which we wage our defense in the cold war of economics and ideas.

American merchant ships successfully operating in peacetime trade are one of the greatest assets this Nation can possess. And because they are ready and able to serve the country at a moment's notice should the need arise, they are rightly and admirably called our fourth arm of defense. We are now living in the most dangerous world in history. Despite our fervent hopes and efforts through collective security systems to

maintain a just peace, situations may suddenly develop which will demand instant response from our shipping industry. Suez and Lebanon are two recent examples.

In the Korean war, we feverishly took 600 vessels out of mothballs to supply the United Nations' needs in that conflict. But they were old and they were slow. Meanwhile, the tempo of the times was dramatically quickened. There is, I think it fair to say, an increasingly high premium on an active merchant marine, swift and sure, to play its part in peace or in emergency.

And now Russia has recognized the truth of that maxim. In 1956, the Russians stopped producing naval surface vessels in their yards and began to build merchant ships. Russia now operates about 800 merchant ships—against our 990. And, by 1965, the Russians plan to double that figure. Their dry cargo accommodations will increase 120 percent and their tanker capacity, 80 percent. In all, they will have about 13 million tons of shipping, or about 8 percent of the world total. Last year, ship construction orders around the world declined 25 percent, but the Soviet increased its demand for new tonnage by 88 percent. And, I think the importance which international communism attaches to the sealanes of the globe is devastatingly clear in her submarine fleet of more than 500—more than Hitler had in 1939.

We need only look around us to verify Soviet ambitions to penetrate all the commercial areas of the world. Ninety miles from our shore, Russian ships are arriving in Cuba every day. One hundred percent of all petroleum products are entering Cuba in Russian tankers. Russian ships call regularly at African ports. Russian ships arrive in the ports of the Persian Gulf, in the Mediterranean Sea, and in the seas of southeast Asia. It can be clearly seen that Russia, with leaping strides in merchant shipping—not to mention her undersea craft—is emphasizing the role of seapower.

It is against the background of maritime development in the Soviet bloc that we must appraise our own situation. We face a challenge. How we meet it will determine both our commercial and naval military strength in the years to come. But we also face an opportunity, an opportunity to expand and modernize our merchant fleet, an opportunity to demonstrate a growing efficiency of that fleet to transship the wares of nations.

We must, most important, expand an adequately paced shipbuilding program. It will take the most effective teamwork between free competitive enterprise and Government to insure this Nation its needed maritime strength.

Difficulties face the fulfillment of that resolve, and some come from our own people. There are many in other parts of our land who are envious of the progress we have made on the west coast. With increasing frequency, cries of despair arise under the Capitol dome at our participation in the defense procurement program.

And in January, some of my Senate and House colleagues began to open up the sorties, which are sure to grow, in their attempt to repeal the 6-percent differential for shipbuilding on the Pacific coast.

Last week, this thin differential of necessity, which must be maintained if our Nation is to preserve its two-ocean ship construction capacity, again came under attack before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. You will recall, in 1960, this committee asked the General Accounting Office to examine material and labor costs submitted by representatives of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific coast shipyards during the last Congress.

Despite the complexity of comparing ships under construction on these diverse coasts and the problems of accounting involved, some useful insights emerged from this unbiased study. So useful, indeed, are they from our standpoint that the representative of a large east coast yard denounced the GAO opinion. He sought to undermine those aspects of its study which favored the historic quarter-century statutory differential for the west coast.

The basis for the GAO study was the actual costs over a 3-year period for 18 shipyards throughout the country (3 eastern shipyards, I might add, refused to let the accountants examine their books).

It costs more to build ships on the west coast for a variety of reasons. The GAO found that the "cost of steel plates and shapes averaged approximately 13 percent more to Pacific coast yards than to yards in other regions and the costs of most other major material components were higher in varying degrees to the Pacific coast yards than to the Atlantic coast yards." The GAO also noted that Pacific coast shipyards procure a majority of their material requirements other than steel in the eastern section of the country. And it wasn't just steel that was higher, but also cargo booms and masts by over 10 percent, hatch covers and cargo ports by almost 5 percent, and even paint by more than 5 percent. In only one category could items be purchased for less on the Pacific coast, and that was the interior communication equipment.

On labor costs, the Comptroller General added that the comparisons of average straight-time hourly wage rates for a 3-month period in 1960 "showed that the combined average rate of the Pacific coast yards was approximately 6 percent higher than the combined average rate of the Atlantic coast yards."

But even more basic is the fact that the history of awards from October 1957 through November 1960 showed that of 14 contracts for 52 ships awarded on the basis of the lowest responsible bid, only 1 contract for 4 ships was awarded to a Pacific coast yard.

Members of the Congress from the West will stand together to defend this law which is grounded on the needs of America for a proper and dispersed capacity to construct vessels to ply the seas.

We have also tried, through our construction-differential and our operating-differential subsidies, to put American ships on a parity basis with foreign vessels. American merchant trade today faces strenuous competition. On our ships are the same high standards as for all American industry, with the pay of our seamen based on an American standard of living.

In other industries, steel is an example, quotas or imposts exist, fulfilling the same purpose which the Merchant Marine Act is designed to accomplish. Its intent is to maintain a strong merchant fleet. The unpalatable and unacceptable alternative is to rely on vessels flying other flags.

In view of the fact that the American merchant marine is quantitatively and qualitatively significant for a mobilization potential, that commerce is the economic catalyst of a maritime federation of free nations, the Government has a growing responsibility to equip the American merchant marine to meet the challenges of the 1960's.

Already, our industry consists of many companies which have the traditions, know-how, skill, knowledge of foreign and domestic markets and all the essential elements to render as fine a service to importers and exporters as can be found under any flag in the world. We cannot allow this priceless asset to be outmoded through failure to keep fully abreast of foreign competition. Nor can we afford to allow the fleets of the Communist bloc to outstrip us or to outperform us on the economic battlefield that now stretches worldwide.

Since the Second World War, there have been 13 studies on maritime transportation—the most recent compiled last year by the Senate at a cost of $600,000. Now, Secretary of Commerce Hodges, fearing mediocrity in the industry, has ordered not one, but two additional studies—one on subsidies and the other on transportation. What is to be gained by the constant duplication of effort, and cost, when problems are already well studied, obvious and still unsolved—how to make trade via American ships more attractive—how to encourage American lines to build and replace their ships at home—how to encourage them to operate under the American flag?

As an American citizen and as an American Senator, I urge the executive branch of our Government to face up to the basic problems of the American maritime industry. The Congress is ready to respond to the industry's needs and to sound legislative recommendations. This is no partisan or political question. It concerns American defense and the American economy. In brief, let's cut out the words and the studies, and get down to action.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have just received from the secretary of state of Oregon, Mr. Howell Appling, Jr., House Joint Memorial 11 adopted by the Legislative Assembly of Oregon.

On behalf of my colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and myself, I ask that the text of this memorial, which relates to the development of the domestic mining and minerals industry, be set forth at this point in my remarks, and that it be considered very carefully by the appropriate committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 11

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas the development and utilization of Oregon's abundant mineral resources have always been and must continue to be bulwarks of this State's economy, providing not only a source of employment and income but also a sound base for revenue and a substantial market outlet for agricultural and manufactured products in mining areas; and

Whereas this basic and essential mining industry has for several years been confronted with adverse economic conditions so severe that many major mining enterprises in this State have been forced out of

business and many others are being reduced to the status of marginal operations; and

Whereas the cause of this serious predicament of our mining industry can be traced to governmental policy that stimulates the development and exploitation of foreign mineral resources and permits relatively free access to this low-cost foreign production by U.S. markets; and

Whereas this policy, if continued, will not only threaten the economic survival of Oregon's mineral industries but will also impose a serious handicap on our Nation's capacity for providing from domestic sources the basic requirements for national defense; and

Whereas the executive department of the Federal Government and both major political parties, as well as the Conference of Western Governors, have officially recognized the necessity for maintaining a domestic mining industry that is sufficiently progressive and vigorous to assure a minerals mobilization base adequate for national preparedness and security; and

Whereas past efforts by the Federal Government to alleviate the depressed conditions that prevail in various segments of the domestic mining industry by means of short-range programs and temporary expedients, such as stockpiling and quota limitations, have proved ineffective and inadequate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring):

1. The 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon respectfully urges that the Federal Government in the national interest foster and encourage:

(a) The development of an economically sound and stable domestic mining and minerals industry.

(b) The orderly development of domestic mineral resources and reserves necessary to assure satisfaction of industrial and security needs.

(c) Mining, mineral and metallurgical research to promote the wise and efficient use of our mineral resources.

2. The 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon recommends that this policy be implemented by:

(a) More effective enforcement of the antidumping laws.

(b) The imposition of adequate duties on metals and mineral imports, to be applied only if the price of such metals and minerals falls below the level that is required to maintain a sound and healthy domestic mining industry.

3. The secretary of state shall send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each member of the Oregon congressional delegation.

ADDITIONAL BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Additional bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1973. A bill for the relief of Evaggelos Nickoletseas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 1974. A bill for the relief of Stefan Copilu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (by request):

S. 1975. A bill for the relief of You Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 1976. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration in connection with the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. WILEY, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. LAUSCHE):

S.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General Von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of General Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADDITIONAL RESOLUTIONS

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON APPLICATION OF LOGAN ACT TO PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 152); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the provisions of section 953 of title 18, United States Code (popularly known as the Logan Act), relating to private correspondence with foreign governments, is applicable to citizens of the United States who may negotiate, without the express authority of the United States Government, with representatives of the Government of Cuba for the release of persons held in custody by that foreign government.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX EXEMPT CONTRIBUTIONS TO SECURE RELEASE OF PERSONS HELD IN CUSTODY BY GOVERNMENT OF CUBA

Mr. CAPEHART submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 153); which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that contributions or gifts made by any taxpayer to any organization to be used in securing the release of persons held in custody by the Government of Cuba do not qualify as "charitable contributions" as that term is defined in section 170(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and that therefore any such contribution or gift is not deductible in computing the taxable income of any taxpayer.

DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 17 OF EACH YEAR AS GENERAL VON STEUBEN MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in every generation, some men stand out solely because of their singular merit. So outstanding was one of our earliest citizens that the American Revolution, our War of Independence, well might not have been won without him. So outstanding was this patriot that George Washington, Father of our Country, in his final act as General of our Revolutionary Army wrote, "I wish to make use of this last moment of my public life to signify, in the strongest terms, my entire approbation of your conduct, and to express my sense of the obligations the public is under to you, for your faithful and meritorious services."

The man to whom Washington wrote was Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben.

An accomplished graduate of the military school of Frederick the Great, Baron von Steuben left his native Prussia to assist the American colonists in their struggle for freedom. So sincere was his effort that Baron von Steuben waived all claim to pay, proposing that only if his services should contribute to the eventual success of the American cause, he would then accept what compensation the Congress might grant him.

Baron von Steuben, by personally drilling a model company of 100 men who in turn drilled other companies, accomplished what is perhaps the most remarkable achievement in rapid military training in the history of the world, and, throughout the war, the Continental Army, battalion for battalion, equaled in discipline and in skill the best Army Regulars.

Through his influence in converting the American Army into an effective and highly disciplined military force, Von Steuben was an indispensable figure in the achievement of American independence. Here he performed an essential service that none of his contemporaries in America was qualified to perform.

Mr. President, I therefore introduce, for appropriate reference, Senate Joint Resolution 95 on behalf of myself and Senators WILEY, SCHOEPPEL, RANDOLPH, and CARLSON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 95) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim September 17 of each year General von Steuben Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the birth of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MIGRATORY WORKERS — EXTENSION OF TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], I ask unanimous consent that the bill which he introduced on May 23, Senate bill 1945, relating to migratory workers, be permitted to lie on the desk 1 more day, through May 26, for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS CONCERNING FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on Friday, May 26, 1961, which is tomorrow

morning, the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments will continue the hearings which began on May 23. It is considering proposed amendments to the Constitution concerning our system of Federal elections, including the nomination and election of the President and qualifications for voting. At this meeting, we will continue to hear Senators who are sponsors or cosponsors of the resolutions under consideration. The subcommittee will meet in room 457 of the Old Senate Office Building at 9:30 a.m.

I have previously announced that further hearings will be held on June 20, 21, and 22, 1961, when other Senators and witnesses will be invited to testify. These hearings have been rescheduled for June 27, 28, and 29, 1961.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 10 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 26, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 25, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Joseph S. Ammerman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Hubert I. Teitelbaum, resigned.

FISH AND WILDLIFE COMMISSION

Clarence F. Pautzke, of Washington, to be Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 25, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Provision for Voluntary Retirement at Age 62 Vitally Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, this morning I was afforded the privilege of appearing before the Senate Finance Committee, of which our esteemed Senator HARRY F. BYRD is chairman. I testified on behalf of the age 62 voluntary retirement provision in H.R. 6027. Because this legislation will likely be presented to the Senate for consideration within the very near future, I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks before the Senate Finance Committee printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD, OF WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 6027

Mr. Chairman, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before your committee in behalf of H.R. 6027. I am specifically interested in the provision, beginning on page 2 of the bill, to allow men to receive reduced benefits at age 62.

When I first came to Congress in 1953, I introduced a bill in February of that year to permit men and women to retire, on a voluntary basis, at age 60. I reintroduced this proposal in subsequent years during my service in the House of Representatives. I came to realize, however, that the time has not yet arrived when we might expect to see voluntary retirement permitted at age 60. Consequently, last year I decided to modify my proposal believing that a half loaf is better than no loaf at all. Accordingly, when H.R. 12580, the omnibus social security bill, reached the Senate last year, I submitted an amendment to allow voluntary retirement for men at age 62 with reduced benefits. I succeeded in getting 18 other Senators to cosponsor my amendment, and I appeared before your distinguished committee in behalf of the amendment. Senator KERR and Senator HARTKE and others on your committee were as interested as I in the amendment, and the Senate Finance Committee adopted it. The Senate later approved the measure, but, regrettably, the amendment was deleted in the joint Senate-House conference action.

I reintroduced my proposal to permit men to retire at age 62 shortly after we convened in January of this year, and I might say, parenthetically, that I was responsible for inclusion in the Douglas committee report to the President of the recommendation that legislation be enacted to permit such retirement at age 62. The President later announced his support, and we now have the opportunity to favorably act upon the proposal and make it become a reality.

An estimated 560,000 people can be expected to get benefits under the amendment during the first 12 months of operation. Taking into account the increase in the minimum benefit also recommended at this time, the additional benefits that would be paid out during the first 12 months to men claiming benefits before age 65 would be $440 million. There would be no level-premium cost for this proposal.

Under this proposal, a man who decides to apply on his 62d birthday can draw social security benefits equal to 80 percent of the amount he would receive were he to wait until he reached his 65th birthday. He would have the option of receiving a proportionate increase—five-ninths of 1 percent—for each month he delays retirement after age 62. For example a man entitled to a benefit of $100 per month at age 65 would receive $80 a month if he chose to retire at age 62, under my amendment. If he decides to wait until he is 63 to apply, the benefit he would receive for life would be increased to $86.67 monthly. If he applied at age 64, his monthly benefit would be $93.34.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that the provisions which were adopted into law with respect to reduced benefits for women have occasioned no administrative difficulties. In the light of the experience gained from the years in which the lowered eligibility age for women has been in effect, I think one could be confident that the adoption of the proposal would prove to be similarly beneficial and advisable. In other words, the 1956 amendment has worked out all right in the case of women, and it should prove to be the same for men. At the time the 1956 amendment was adopted, there was some skepticism about how well it would work. It was charged that the lower retirement age would encourage employers to lower the compulsory retirement age for women employees. Opponents maintained that it would discourage the continued employment of older women workers whose potential work life would thus be shortened. Experience, however, has failed to bear out these skeptical fears and the average age of retirement for women has not been lowered by the reduced annuity.

I realize that there is some question as to whether it is desirable policy for the Government to encourage early retirement when the science of geriatrics is lengthening the lifespan of men. Yet, it is my understanding that only about half of the women eligible for retirement at age 62 elected to retire when the 1956 amendment was adopted. I think we can properly assume that not so great a percentage of men would elect to retire at 62. Many of the women who took benefits in 1956 had been working during the war years and had not been working immediately before the adoption of Senator KERR's amendment. Most men will continue to work until age 65 or somewhat thereafter as long as they are physically able or as long as there is employment. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, automation is here to stay and it constitutes a growing problem with which our society is going to have to deal more and more in terms of unemployment. A recent study of automation prepared by the National Planning Association points out that, according to Census Bureau estimates, the average annual increase in the labor force is presently 700,000 to 800,000 and that, by the year 1965, it will reach the figure of 1 million or more. It is necessary then that we find new job opportunities for these younger workers who are annually entering the work force.

Additionally, the problem of changing markets poses itself in the question of whether or not the needed job opportunities will appear at the right place and at the right time. The rate of increase in employment in some of the industries now being automatized does not begin to match the increase in productivity made possible by new processes. For instance, in the chemical industry, productivity rose 53 percent between 1947 and 1954, but employment rose only 11 percent. In oil refining, output increased 22 percent since 1947, but total employment fell by 10,000. Automation has made itself felt in the mining areas of my State. Whereas only a few years ago, 135,000 miners were employed in West Virginia, today less than 40,000 are employed. A continuous mining machine operated by 6 workers will load the coal originally requiring the time and labor of 40 men. The problem is not peculiar to West Virginia. The textile and shoe work-

ers in the New England States have experienced the same sudden shift in an employment pattern which had existed for over 100 years. Further changes will create catastrophic dislocation of workers.

Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 1.7 million men who potentially would be eligible to retire at age 62 immediately if this bill is enacted as written. They would not be forced to retire. The choice would be an optional one, and it would be up to the individual. There are many—in fact, a majority, I would assume—of these men who would prefer to continue to work. Yet, on the other hand, there are some who would want to retire and who should retire. There are many individuals who are not physically able to continue working after they reach the age of 62; yet they are not disabled to the extent that they can qualify for disability benefits. This bill would permit these individuals to retire and make room for younger workers.

Mr. Chairman, this provision in the bill is of great importance to that relatively small number of men who, because of ill health, unemployment, underemployment or other personal reasons, find it impossible or ill advised to continue working until they attain the age of 65.

It is of importance to the thousands of unemployed coal miners in my State, many of whom have passed the age of 62, who are unable to find employment and who, in many instances, are physically incapable of working in the mines if jobs could be had. These individuals could elect, if they so chose, to retire, and by the provisions of this bill they and their families could have security, whereas, under present law, they must wait until they are 65 years of age to receive benefits. This bill, then, will mean a check instead of a handout, security instead of insecurity, and hope instead of despair for individuals in these circumstances. I hope that the committee will favorably report this bill and that it will leave intact section 102 which provides for a lowering of the retirement age for men.

President Garcia's Great Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I have read the recent insertion of my able and distinguished friend and colleague, Hon. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, of a timely and admirable speech of the great President of the Philippines, His Excellency Carlos P. Garcia.

I was very much impressed with this forceful address and desire to compliment President Garcia for his brilliant analysis of the world situation and his stirring appeal to the free world to join to preserve its heritage against world communism.

The great historic nation which President Garcia so ably leads and its courageous, liberty-loving people are honored and cherished by the entire American people. Our Nation is especially proud of the glorious history of the Philippines, and of the close association and loyal friendship which has continued for many years to subsist between us.

We are also proud to stand by the side of the Filipino people and their leaders and to work with them in the fateful struggle to sustain the precious values of freedom and the integrity and security of free nations in a dangerous world threatened by Communist infiltration, aggression and violence.

The message from Garcia is not only a strong statement of the aims of the free world but a great state paper and an inspiring message to the American people and all those interested in human freedom.

The Emergency Feed Grain Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I should like to include a press release from the Department of Agriculture which spells out the great success of the emergency feed grain program which passed this Congress earlier this year:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 24, 1961.

SECRETARY FREEMAN SAYS FEED GRAIN SIGN-UP IS "OVER THE TOP"

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman said today the emergency feed grain program is over the top.

"The goal the administration sought—which is to adjust production of feed grains by converting 20 percent of the acreage into sound, soil conserving practices—now has been reached," the Secretary said.

"As of last Friday, 20.6 million acres of corn and feed grain land has been signed up by almost a million farmers for soil conserving use, and the program still has nearly 2 weeks to go before it closes.

"I am pleased that the farmers have responded to the program in such a positive manner.

"It is heartening to me that the first piece of major legislation proposed by this administration, enacted by the Congress and put into immediate operation by the Department of Agriculture, has reached its goal in less than 5 months.

"This response is an expression of confidence in the action of the Congress in passage of the emergency legislation, and it fulfills the faith which this administration and the Congress placed in the farmer.

"I believe the signup, in spite of the late start, clearly indicates the support of producers for farm programs which call for farmer participation in the development of procedures by which they can cooperate together in the management of the agricultural enterprise.

"The omnibus farm bill provides farmers with such a means, and I believe the interest shown by farmers in the feed grain program is a measure of their interest in the farm legislation which the Congress is now considering."

The emergency feed grain program, now in its sixth week of operation, will continue through to the end of May. Weekly reports will be made by the Department of Agriculture as of May 26 and June 2.

The fifth weekly report on signup under the program shows 20,664,607 acres signed to be diverted from corn and grain sorghum plantings on 920,529 farms this year. This is slightly more than 20 percent of the U.S. total 1959–60 average corn and grain sorghum plantings of about 102.3 million acres.

Today's report shows an increase of 4,010,551 acres from the 16,654,056 acres diverted under the program as reported last week.

The fifth report shows that 16,775,351 acres of corn have been signed up from the 41,083,532 acres of corn base. This is slightly more than 20 percent of 1959–60 average U.S. plantings of 83,648,000 acres. On farms signed up, the total diversion continues to stay at 41 percent of the base acreage for these farms. To date, almost 50 percent of the average U.S. plantings is on farms signed up under the program.

Grain sorghum diversion is now at 3,889,256 acres, which is almost 21 percent of U.S. total sorghum plantings of 18,674,989 acres for grain. The grain sorghum base of 9,246,632 acres on farms signed is almost 50 percent of the national plantings. The 3.9 million acres is more than 42 percent of the grain sorghum acreage on signed farms.

For all farms signed, possible advance payments under provisions permitting about half of the payments to be made this spring come to about $270,663,611. While the potential total payments under the program are not being determined for these initial reports, Department officials estimate that total payments will probably be more than double the value of the advance payments.

The 1961 feed grain program provides payments to farmers in the form of certificates for diverting corn and grain sorghum acreage to conserving uses. Producers may receive grain or the cash equivalent of grain for their certificates. Diversion of corn and grain sorghum acreage from production this year is expected to achieve a better balance between production and utilization of these grains. Payments to producers will maintain their income this year.

The report shows that certificates covering about $161.4 million worth of grain had been issued to farmers under advance payment provisions. Of the $161.4 million worth of certificates issued through May 19, farmers had received about $135.7 million in cashable sight drafts from county agricultural stabilization and conservation (ASC) offices. In these instances, as provided under the program the Commodity Credit Corporation pays farmers in cashable sight drafts and then later acts as their agent in marketing the quantity of grain covered under the certificates.

Through May 19, farmers had used $131,915 worth of certificates to purchase from CCC 126,630 bushels of corn from quantities that had been under price-support loan. In addition, farmers had purchased 54,437 bushels of CCC-owned corn with $57,184 worth of certificates and 2,670 bushels of CCC-owned barley with $1,922 worth of certificates.

The following tables show sign-up figures by States. The first table shows combined figures for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the number of farms with base acreage, number of farms signed up, the total acreage to be diverted, the advance payments that can be paid this spring, the value of certificates issued, and the value of certificates cashed.

The second table shows figures separately for corn and grain sorghum. It shows the average of 1959–60 planted acreages for corn. For grain sorghum, the preliminary total base acreages are shown. This table also shows the base acreages on farms signed up and the acreage diverted on signed farms.

State	Number of farms with base acreage	Number of farms signed up	Total acreage to be diverted	Advance payments that can be paid this spring	Value of certificates issued	Value of certificates cashed
Alabama	107,983	26,586	406,945	$2,696,553	$2,435,746	$2,360,244
Arizona	2,047	724	34,425	587,175	523,788	412,746
Arkansas	16,621	3,496	46,599	573,278	525,754	497,212
California	5,549	1,575	60,506	988,427	520,569	453,658
Colorado	14,809	4,690	213,740	1,540,012	1,016,940	930,181
Connecticut	198	22	204	2,464	1,447	
Delaware	5,165	1,584	34,331	505,252	406,842	297,860
Florida	15,128	4,370	117,203	1,059,387	1,036,250	1,033,909
Georgia	53,883	9,276	243,743	1,991,644	1,709,026	1,620,475
Idaho	1,592	232	3,704	82,251	56,206	53,915
Illinois	208,448	92,769	2,047,014	35,204,349	11,921,022	9,798,765
Indiana	154,244	49,612	1,064,827	18,790,329	9,214,603	6,941,350
Iowa	195,334	102,138	2,744,078	38,909,810	15,860,149	7,583,952
Kansas	125,200	45,917	1,359,826	12,456,309	6,691,567	5,581,040
Kentucky	93,898	32,893	495,439	6,212,080	4,942,006	4,752,331
Louisiana	19,854	5,318	78,878	861,119	837,773	822,909
Maine	68	3	20			
Maryland	18,364	4,141	78,908	1,180,851	683,635	548,973
Massachusetts	14	4	58			
Michigan	93,093	22,465	412,269	5,163,341	3,749,079	2,950,561
Minnesota	126,074	52,567	1,295,822	17,836,032	15,230,932	13,925,820
Mississippi	80,402	13,429	188,069	1,959,115	1,691,466	1,685,971
Missouri	140,384	73,478	1,867,061	28,188,315	22,800,626	21,396,404
Montana	2,744	754	20,098	111,039	77,832	76,901
Nebraska	109,521	64,991	2,013,088	25,368,387	10,572,733	8,001,009
Nevada	61	7	168	1,531		
New Hampshire	4	2	45			
New Jersey	4,396	1,930	38,599	756,928	221,454	185,793
New Mexico	3,451	1,271	59,429	646,386	429,202	360,936
New York	36,202	12,544	153,191	2,540,838	2,301,623	2,523,188
North Carolina	142,390	42,633	447,672	6,440,397	6,311,069	6,155,596
North Dakota	27,546	11,964	246,210	1,088,068	955,095	829,023
Ohio	149,379	45,671	795,152	14,829,922	5,720,386	3,911,438
Oklahoma	42,924	15,842	366,346	2,190,732	1,839,815	1,740,978
Oregon	2,590	740	11,275	249,161	147,749	146,389
Pennsylvania	79,331	10,414	125,354	2,206,356	2,155,998	2,141,323
Rhode Island	9					
South Carolina	57,622	16,257	193,859	1,896,800	1,557,340	1,527,928
South Dakota	61,456	24,639	741,840	5,698,248	4,960,918	4,096,757
Tennessee	93,290	29,478	386,078	4,180,440	4,094,835	4,010,354
Texas	152,108	45,274	1,553,615	14,371,094	11,274,753	10,303,714
Utah	2,233	317	3,595	38,173	20,851	17,163
Vermont	127	22	236	3,559	1,066	461
Virginia	43,559	15,334	136,628	1,879,824	1,834,371	1,824,507
Washington	2,966	697	13,263	345,841	327,941	316,584
West Virginia	1,450	360	4,238	72,315	28,860	25,822
Wisconsin	119,640	31,700	553,797	8,863,301	4,638,177	3,737,104
Wyoming	1,588	309	7,162	96,178	87,681	84,587
U.S. total	2,614,939	920,529	20,664,607	270,663,611	161,415,175	135,665,831

State	Corn			Grain sorghum		
	1959–60 average planted acreage [1]	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted	Preliminary base acreage	Base acreage on signed farms	Acres to be diverted
Alabama	2,212,000	726,800	401,192	34,613	11,890	5,753
Arizona	35,000	1,959	828	158,208	79,451	33,597
Arkansas	390,500	76,318	40,478	33,580	14,189	6,121
California	230,000	46,533	18,944	250,794	100,222	41,562
Colorado	493,000	164,194	71,290	708,704	362,651	142,450
Connecticut	41,000	382	204			
Delaware	161,500	66,087	34,331			
Florida	600,500	265,489	115,814	4,901	1,949	1,389
Georgia	2,788,500	560,475	239,008	30,968	9,244	4,735
Idaho	81,000	6,422	3,677		62	27
Illinois	10,191,500	5,773,198	2,042,024	24,869	11,092	4,900
Indiana	5,292,500	2,251,707	1,061,470	19,100	7,955	3,357
Iowa	12,481,000	8,065,982	2,729,584	66,359	44,267	14,494
Kansas	2,032,000	858,365	374,442	5,473,200	2,473,501	985,384
Kentucky	1,779,000	818,843	488,922	27,029	12,961	6,517
Louisiana	527,500	135,369	75,855	7,430	5,963	3,023
Maine	11,000	30	20			
Maryland	506,000	160,660	78,827	910	113	81
Massachusetts	31,500	80	58			
Michigan	2,224,000	702,540	412,253		16	16
Minnesota	6,822,500	3,691,588	1,295,382		1,356	440
Mississippi	1,344,000	327,113	180,230	17,500	16,901	7,839
Missouri	4,270,000	3,260,577	1,654,399	552,273	430,896	212,662
Montana	142,000	40,854	20,098			
Nebraska	6,851,000	4,692,362	1,423,745	1,809,354	1,432,720	589,343
Nevada	4,500	247	168			
New Hampshire	11,500	46	45			
New Jersey	191,000	68,363	38,599			
New Mexico	47,000	4,721	2,656	326,575	152,498	56,773
New York	656,500	254,876	153,191			
North Carolina	1,978,000	777,398	424,536	85,000	34,250	23,136
North Dakota	1,348,500	665,063	246,062	471	377	148
Ohio	3,889,000	1,481,097	794,984	1,476	332	168
Oklahoma	270,500	64,415	40,432	1,294,000	624,727	325,914
Oregon	67,500	18,710	11,205		124	70
Pennsylvania	1,286,000	195,339	124,873	9,812	733	481
Rhode Island	6,000					
South Carolina	895,500	361,017	188,759	9,500	9,126	5,100
South Dakota	4,283,500	2,044,592	690,256	222,070	106,495	51,584
Tennessee	1,620,000	585,614	371,444	34,500	24,281	14,634
Texas	1,469,500	468,388	209,989	7,463,564	3,268,975	1,343,626
Utah	51,500	4,680	3,369	339	317	226
Vermont	59,500	255	236			
Virginia	806,000	236,385	134,470	7,890	4,261	2,158
Washington	87,000	23,424	12,031		2,389	1,232
West Virginia	148,000	6,554	4,238			
Wisconsin	2,870,500	1,114,095	553,757		99	40
Wyoming	62,000	14,326	6,976		249	186
U.S. total	83,648,000	41,083,532	16,775,351	18,674,989	9,246,632	3,889,258

[1] Planted for all purposes as published in the AMS 1960 annual summary.

National Highway Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK M. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, National Highway Week, officially proclaimed by President Kennedy for this week, May 21–27, reminds all of us that we are indeed a highway nation.

Because nearly every family owns an automobile, our lives certainly revolve around and are dependent upon its use. Through a highly organized network of highways, our goods move from farm to market, from factory to store, from dairy to doorstep. Wheels carry us to work, worship and play. They carry our children to school.

But wheels must have strips of pavement to roll over. Highways must be economical, fast, safe and efficient as are the high-powered vehicles which roll over them hour after hour, day after day, year after year.

We do not now have that kind of highway, except in fragmentary segments, such as the short completed sections of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.

National Highway Week calls our attention to the fact that too many of our present highways are obsolete, dangerous and choked with traffic. And, as traffic increases with 114 million vehicles driving 1.2 trillion miles per year by 1976, existing roads become increasingly so.

To improve our highways to a state of adequacy—not only to meet the needs of today but to carry the tremendously increased traffic loads of tomorrow—requires completion of the expanded highway program on schedule.

National Highway Week is a fitting time to bear in mind that better highways save lives, save time, and save money.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include a copy of President Kennedy's National Highway Week proclamation:

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 1, 1961.*

NATIONAL HIGHWAY WEEK, 1961—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas an adequate highway network is indispensable to traffic safety, to the growth of our economy and to the national defense; and

Whereas some 40,000 of our citizens are killed and 1,400,000 are injured every year in highway accidents; and

Whereas the orderly advancement of our expanded Federal-State highway program promises a sharp reduction in our annual waste of human and economic resources due to outmoded highways; and

Whereas the public should be reminded of the importance of completing the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways on schedule in 1972: Now, therefore, I, John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of May 21–27, 1961, as National Highway Week in recognition of the vital role of highway transportation in our way of life.

I also urge the Governors of the States to issue similar proclamations and ask the appropriate officials of the Federal and State Governments, public and private organizations, and the general public to join in observance of this significant occasion.

During this period I encourage all Americans to judge the value of highway transportation to their own activities and to our national welfare.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 29th day of April in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-one, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and eighty-fifth.

By the President:

JOHN F. KENNEDY.
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

West Virginia's Industrial Complex Strengthened by Establishment of New Technical Service Laboratory at Martinsburg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at a time when West Virginia has been the object of much consideration as an economically depressed area, I would call attention to one of the more hopeful aspects of the picture.

This morning I was to have delivered an address at the dedication of the recently completed technical service laboratory of the Standard Lime & Cement Co. at Martinsburg, W. Va. The $1¼ million laboratory, one of the finest in the industry, is the culmination of a $10 million 5-year expansion and modernization program of Standard which was inaugurated by the American-Marietta Co. after it acquired control of Standard Lime & Cement at Martinsburg.

Though Senate business has prevented my attendance at the official ceremonies of this event, I would make note of the fact that the American-Marietta investment program in Standard Lime & Cement Co. has made this old and established Martinsburg firm one of the most modern and strongly competitive producers in the industry. It has more than doubled its original capacity of 1,700,000 barrels annually, and in its new 450-foot rotary kilns it has constructed the largest moving machinery in any industry.

As a West Virginian, I express my appreciation for this acknowledgment of faith in the people and the economic potential of our State. American-Marietta, which now has operations in five West Virginia cities, is but one of many companies which will bring to our State a revitalized and diversified economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks which I prepared for delivery at the dedication ceremonies this morning be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor Golliday, President Rumford, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen, this is an auspicious moment in the economic and industrial life of Martinsburg and West Virginia. The unveiling of the dedication plaque is the culmination of 5 years of investment and an extensive modernization and expansion program in the facilities of the Standard Lime & Cement Co.

I am privileged to share your pride, not only in the complete and modern facilities of the technical service laboratory, but also in the impressive array of production equipment that Standard has brought to this area.

The American-Marietta Co., which was joined by Standard Lime & Cement in 1954, has fulfilled its pledge to supply the necessary capital to modernize and to make this established firm thoroughly competitive in the cement industry. And in so doing, it has also registered its faith in the people of this section and in the future economic and industrial development of our State. By more than doubling the original capacity of 1,700,000 barrels annually, not only has this old and reliable firm been revitalized, but it has been placed in a stronger position to supply an even larger portion of West Virginia's needs in the future.

The technical service laboratory—one of the finest and most modern in the industry—will also serve to strengthen the competitive position of Standard's other operations in West Virginia—not only in Martinsburg, but in Millville, Clarksburg, New Martinsville, and Parkersburg as well. Thus, the importance of these facilities extends well beyond this community, and beyond the 600 families supported by, and the more than $3 million contributed in payroll by Standard's operations in West Virginia.

It is important also in offering another sign of the vigor and dynamism of American enterprise. And for those of us—and there are many—who have worked to attract new capital to West Virginia, it is a vindication of our faith in the industrial potential of our State. The initiative and leadership exhibited by the management and personnel of Standard and American-Marietta are the sort that once served to place West Virginia in the vanguard of the fuels and minerals industries. I have no doubt that the same kind of leadership will bring our State to the fore once again in the future with a more diversified and firmly grounded economy.

It is worth noting, in this respect, that no matter how dynamic and forward looking our leadership at the national level, no program of national goals will be achieved if these aims are not embraced and carried forth by the actions of individual men and women at the community and local level. One of the main sources of strength of the American system of enterprise is that it offers the flexibility and freedom for such initiative to operate.

In the present instance it has served to prevent the occurrence of a serious economic void in the Martinsburg community, and it has helped to bring an established Martinsburg firm near the end of its eighth decade with renewed strength and industrial vigor.

We have good reason, therefore, to be delighted by the considerable investment in modernizing Standard's facilities here in order to provide it with a healthy and promising future—for itself, for the industry it serves and, most important, for the community of which it is such an important part. And it is my further hope that this may be seen as part of a trend of other industries to expand their facilities in the greater exploration and utilization of the rich natural resources of West Virginia.

It is almost axiomatic these days to think of our industrial development in relation to the unremitting contest between international communism and a democratic way of life. I believe we will all agree that our Nation is more secure every time a basic industry invests in new, modern plants and equipment. For, although "hot spots" will continue to flare up in the cold war, the fundamental and underlying struggle with the Soviet Union will probably remain largely political, ideological, and economic.

If this be so, a central factor in our eventual success in the conflict will be our capacity to maintain the industrial and economic development necessary to supply the increasing needs of our own people and also help bring the emergent nations into freedom and independence.

Though it is only one cement plant of the 170 in the United States, the Standard plant in Martinsburg has its part, and an important one, to contribute in this great power struggle.

It is gratifying to know, therefore, as Standard ends its eighth decade in Martinsburg, that, as a new and youthful member of the American-Marietta family of industries, it is assured more years of prosperous and productive life. This is our wish—and with it go our congratulations.

Senator Humphrey Is Absolutely Right When He Says It Is Very Difficult for Tourists (Read Constituents) To Find In and Around the Capitol Building Adequate Places Where They Can Eat and Rest. It Will Be Even More Difficult, if Not Impossible, Next March When the Small Businessmen Who Now Provide These Services Are Pushed Off Capitol Hill Under Expansion Plans Adopted Without Hearings by the Democrats in Control of the Congress. Perhaps Senator Humphrey Would Be Willing To Take the Lead in Reexamining These Expansion Plans Now, and Let These Businessmen Testify

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the other House, Senator HUMPHREY declared that "it is very difficult for tourists to find in and around the Capitol adequate places where they can eat and rest."

The solution offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was as follows:

> On both sides of the Capitol, around the Senate wing and the House wing, are very beautiful terraces which, with but little change in terms of their covering, could be made most useful, with the addition of tables, benches, canopies, umbrellas, and with the provision of some good service, which I believe we might be able to provide by means of a catering service. Thus, in addition to having the pleasure of outdoor recreation and outdoor eating, we could also make available to the citizenry who pay for this Capitol an opportunity to have a very satisfying and beautiful experience.

Senator HUMPHREY began his learned statement by asking:

> Can we imagine that a Parisian would permit these beautiful terraces to be unused? In fact, these beautiful terraces around the Capitol could well be used for what some of our colleagues have been talking about; namely, sidewalk cafes.

It is always instructive and helpful to have the advantage of a speech such as this. We can benefit greatly from it. I wonder if the learned Senator has thought of the cost of a meal to the tourists which would be provided by such a catering service as he has in mind?

How much money would the Congress be called upon to appropriate in order to provide such facilities as he has mentioned?

Would the tourists be any more welcome than they are at present in the restaurants and cafeterias which the Congress has in its charge; and has provided at great cost, here on Capitol Hill where conspicuous signs say: "For Members of Congress," "For Senators," "For Members of Congress and Employees," and so on.

What hours would the new facilities be open?

At the present time, the restaurants and cafeterias of the Congress close after lunch, but tourists who are our constituents are busy sightseeing until late in the evening.

May I call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota the House debate on May 22, this year, on the bill (H.R. 7208) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962.

It immediately becomes clear from even a quick perusal of this debate why it is that tourists, who are our constituents, find it so very difficult to locate in and around the Capitol Building adequate places where they can eat and rest.

Under expansion plans of the Congress businessmen on Capitol Hill have been the forgotten people of the Nation. They have been pushed farther and farther away from the Congress.

The Congressional Hotel was bought by the Congress for an office building and it has been in a sort of limbo for a long time.

Further, it is proposed to start clearing the residences, where tourists are welcome, in the square east of the Old House Office Building in August of this year, and the business establishments, where tourists can eat, will be demolished beginning in March of 1962.

The Congress passed the legislation authorizing these steps, and, with regard to the square east of the Old House Office Building, it is an open scandal that the residents and the businessmen there were never given an opportunity to be heard.

I include at this point an excerpt from the debate of May 22 to which I have referred:

> Mr. AVERY. I have not read the committee report, and this matter, perhaps, may have been treated in it. What is the status of what is presently known as the Congressional Hotel as far as this legislative bill is concerned?
>
> Mr. HORAN. Well, that is the property of the Congress, as you know. It has been leased to the Knott Hotel Corp. and the lease expires in about 2 years.
>
> Mr. AVERY. Well, do we have any plans for it? Why are we in the hotel business?
>
> Mr. HORAN. We are not in the hotel business. It was acquired as a part of the general expansion of the Capitol Grounds area, and within the next 2 years the decision will have to come on what disposition to make of it.
>
> Mr. AVERY. Well, if we own the hotel, we are in the hotel business, whether we are actually managing it or not. Has the final price of acquisition been definitely determined upon? As I recall, a deposit was made in the court regarding its acquisition. Has the final figure been made?
>
> Mr. HORAN. Yes; we have the final figure. I do not recall the exact amount.
>
> Mr. STEED. If memory serves me correctly, the cost of that piece of property is $1.6 million. Yes, I find the precise amount was $1,686,000. It is now in the possession of the Congress, and whatever disposition is to be made at the end of the present lease contract will remain to be made by the Congress. It was found that it would be much cheaper to permit someone to occupy the building in the interim than to maintain it on a standby basis. When the property was acquired, that had to be taken into consideration, and since it was such a fine piece of property it was felt that it should be leased until it was determined what would be the most appropriate use of it. It seemed to be too good a piece of property to be torn down. And, by doing that, we saved some $60,000 to $70,000 a year, as I recall, to maintain the building on a standby basis.
>
> Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding.
>
> Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].
>
> Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee a few questions. I understand that the gentleman from Oklahoma is not a member of the Building Commission, but I thought perhaps he could clarify or answer a question or two, if he has the information. It is my understanding that it is proposed to start clearing the residences in the square east of the Old House Office Building in August of this year and the business establishments will begin to be demolished in March of next year.
>
> Mr. STEED. That is correct. Those are the dates shown in the printed hearings.
>
> Mr. GROSS. Now, the question is this, if the gentleman can answer: Why clear this taxpaying property? Why clear out these business establishments and these residences until there is some clear use for the property?
>
> Mr. STEED. All I can tell the gentleman is this, that the House passed the bill authorizing its acquisition for addition to the Capitol Grounds, and that under that mandate the only way it can be made part of the Capitol Grounds is to clear it. What is being done was done under a legislative act. The clearing of the property is the completion of what that act of the House and the Congress authorized last year.
>
> Mr. GROSS. Will not the gentleman agree with me that there is no purpose in clearing land or property that is now paying taxes

to the District of Columbia until there is some use for that property?

Mr. STEED. Well, I am not in a position to disagree with the gentleman except to say this, and that is, under the law, within the purview of the commission in charge and not this committee, and what you and I think individually would probably have no bearing on it at this stage.

It is perfectly clear that if the small businessmen on Capitol Hill are forced off Capitol Hill they will not be on Capitol Hill to serve the tourists who are our constituents.

The way to make certain that there are adequate places available to serve the tourists who are our constituents, from any one of the 50 States, including Pennsylvania and Minnesota, is not to push the 100 small businessmen off Capitol Hill.

The core of the present difficulty is that absolutely no assurance has been given to Capitol Hill businessmen that if they did provide adequate places to eat and rest, and did make the necessary heavy investments, their property would not be taken over by Congress the day after they were opened for business, and without even having a chance to testify at hearings.

Where will the constituents of Members of Congress go to eat and rest when the small businessmen who have been courageous enough to open and maintain establishments providing these services under these conditions of continued harassment are pushed off Capitol Hill?

As I said in a speech in this House on May 18 this year, these businessmen on Capitol Hill are wonderful hosts and they make our constituents feel welcome when they come to Capitol Hill. Our constituents are not made to feel welcome in the cafeterias and restaurants of the Congress itself.

It is doubtful if the proposal by our esteemed colleague from Minnesota would actually improve the situation. The situation would be radically improved, however, if the Congress were to take the lead in encouraging the small businessmen on Capitol Hill to stay in business and assure them that they were safe from the capricious exercise by the Congress of the vast and impersonal powers of eminent domain.

I challenge Senator HUMPHREY, who has always been deeply concerned with the problems of small businessmen in all the States of our Nation, to hold hearings on this matter and invite the small businessmen of Capitol Hill to testify.

I am sure that Mr. Bassin, Mr. DeGiovanni, Mr. Palm, and their colleagues on Capitol Hill, and the larger businessmen who control the Knott Hotel Corp., are quite capable of providing adequate places where tourists can eat and rest.

All they need is the chance to do so, free from continued harassment by the Democratically controlled Congress.

Perhaps a final word on the subject might be that if the Congress is going into the hotel and restaurant business then a Parisian-style restaurant on the west front of the Capitol Building may be just what the doctor ordered.

In any event it is obvious from the record to date that the Congress can't legislate and successfully host restaurants and hotels for constituents at the same time.

The Congress—and this means the Democrats who are in charge of things at this time—must make up its mind whether to legislate or go into the hotel and restaurant business.

My own feeling is that it ought to legislate and let private businessmen run the hotel and restaurant business.

The Problems of Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, much interest has been generated by a recently published book, "Buy Now, Pay Later." It deals with the problems of credit and is authored by Hillel Black.

An introduction has been written by our colleague, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], whose work on legislation calling for truth in lending is well known to the Senate of the United States and to the country.

There appeared in the May 21 edition of the Washington Post and Times-Herald an excellent review by Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE which contains a summary of "Buy Now, Pay Later." The junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has succeeded in his review in capsulizing the importance and significant study by the author and presents an excellent case, in my judgment, in support of legislation which would require that consumers be informed of the true annual interest charge and hidden costs of their purchases.

I ask unanimous consent to have this review printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE DOLLAR DOWN—AND DOWN
(Reviewed by WILLIAM PROXMIRE)

If you are buying your home, your car, your refrigerator, have a credit card or a credit account, this book is going to shock you. It will also save you money.

By far the most dramatic economic change for the American family in the past 15 years has been its increase in debt. Since 1946, the average American family has increased its time buying (consumer credit) from $193 to $1,000. Mortgage debt has soared from $724 to more than $3,700.

This means that the typical American family today owes almost $5,000, a huge 413-percent climb in 15 years. While our family income fell short of doubling, our debt has increased an enormous fivefold.

Americans this year must work 2 months out of 12 to reimburse their creditors. Four times as many families will go bankrupt this year as 10 years ago.

In a colorful, brisk style, Hillel Black describes in "Buy Now, Pay Later" how with charge accounts, credit cards, revolving credit, instant money checking service, teenage credit accounts, Americans have speeded up this dizzying go-in-debt habit.

Black is no foe of debt. He agrees that widespread use of credit has raised our standard of living and provided more comforts and more jobs. His thesis is "that the American consumer who buys on credit is often being abused and deceived and in some instances outrageously swindled." The author abundantly and entertainingly documents this thesis. A few of his revelations:

One third of college-educated persons estimate the cost of installment credit at 6 percent. Usually it is three times that high.

Federal Reserve Chairman William McChesney Martin, perhaps the most expert man in finance in the United States, confessed to a Senate committee that he was badly confused in computing actual annual interest by present retail credit practices.

Purchases through department store or mail order installment credit require true annual interest charges ranging from 18 to 40 percent.

Borrowing from small loan companies often costs as high as 36 percent true annual interest.

True annual interest at a typical high-pressure furniture store is 60 percent.

Credit life insurance charges for identical benefits vary as much as 400 percent, depending on where you borrow. In many cases, consumers are not even told that they are sold credit life, although it is loaded into the "pack" of finance charges they have to pay.

The president of the Better Business Bureau of Greater St. Louis charges that some auto dealers hike finance charges depending on the gullibility of the customer. The finance company receives the standard payment. But the dealer has a hunting license to squeeze whatever he can out of the gullible buyer. In the past few years finance charges have jumped the fastest of all auto costs; generally, they have quadrupled.

Selling credit has become so profitable to merchants that this attitude expressed by a New Jersey car dealer is not unusual: "Cash? Let me tell you something. You couldn't buy one of our cars if you wanted to. Every car we have here is sold on time."

In a far cry from America's pioneer devotion to thrift, the go-in-debt spirit is actually promoted for teenage children in some areas through schools and PTA's. In one such area, the youngsters join a teenage credit plan and receive a charge card with the credit limit set at $25. The limit is gradually pushed up to $50 in easy stages.

This book is a telling brief for the passage by Congress this year of the Douglas truth in lending bill, which would require that consumers be told the true annual interest charge.

Proposed Mergers by Railroad Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, early this summer, the Interstate Commerce Commission will commence its deliberations upon the proposed merger of the Chesapeake & Ohio Railway Co. and of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co. It

is expected that some railroads, some transportation organizations, and various other groups from among our population will oppose this merger on grounds determined either by their own economic situations or by their view of the public interest.

I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to some of the problems of this merger as they would affect the 60,000 employees of the New York Central system, who work at their jobs across almost one-quarter of the United States.

Adherents of the merger claim savings from economies. On this point, the New York Central says that the savings will primarily come in one way:

That is by the ability of the combined system to take traffic away from other railroads in the territory.

The New York Central Railroad is the obvious prime target for the C. & O.–B. & O. raid on other freight business—the business which permits the continuation of any passenger and commuter services.

The freight traffic most susceptible to raiding by the C. & O.–B. & O. provides the backbone of Central's revenues. These revenues make it possible to provide essential Central freight and passenger service over the entire New York Central system, as well as the New York area commuter and terminal freight services. If these essential services are to be maintained, the New York Central must have the revenues which make them possible.

Thus, a C. & O.–B. & O. merger would not benefit the public through major savings achieved by eliminating duplicate facilities. There aren't that many duplicate facilities. And a C. & O.–B. & O. merger would hurt the public by depriving competitors of revenue they need to continue their freight, passenger and commuter services.

I cannot speak for the New York Central or its employees. But, what the company says here gives me deep concern.

Let us stop for a moment and translate this into human terms. Employment on the New York Central system for the past 30 years has been as follows:

Year	Employment	Index
1930	136,752	100
1935	89,711	65
1940	92,516	68
1945	124,461	91
1950	110,950	81
1955	81,552	60
1960	59,262	43

While the Congress has provided for a readjustment period, so that workers displaced by mergers cannot be laid off precipitously, this does not apply to workers displaced through loss of traffic to another line—enabled by merger to, as the New York Central says, "raid" another.

For the most part, no protection against mergers applied to the 51,688 jobs lost on the New York Central between 1950 and 1960, a fall of 46.5 percent.

Most of these 51,688 workers were breadwinners. They were earning, on the average over the 1950–60 period, perhaps $5,500 a year. Each had approximately three dependents. Thus, we have an annual average purchasing power loss of $284,284,000 and the financial support of 206,752 individuals was lost, no doubt in some cases perhaps forever. The more of this type of catastrophic loss we have, the worse our economy is bound to become. Those are facts.

Certainly at a time of economic stress like this, we should not move hastily into an action of fundamental economic importance, one which can cause even more people to lose their jobs.

It is easy enough for someone unconcerned to say that the loss of one New York Central job will mean that one B. & O. or C. & O. worker will keep his, or that a new B. & O. or C. & O. worker may be hired to replace the man who lost his job. That may sound reasonable enough to anyone with a callous attitude on humanitarian matters.

But, it does not sound good to the man who loses his job and cannot support his family. Nor does it sound good to me.

There is a better way, one which will avoid cannibalism and permit the railroads eventually to reenter their era of dynamic growth—and thus create more jobs.

That way is by developing an intelligently planned program for joining roads together into strong and stable competitive systems which will thrive, and grow, and answer the human need for more and more jobs. We must, once and for all, put behind us the mergers which typified the era of the Goulds and the Fisks.

We must move into the modern era of railroad consolidations that make sense for the worker and the general public.

This cannot be done overnight. But it affords a far better answer than hastily designed mergers aimed at the short term and the quick buck. No merger should be undertaken unless it envisions where we want our country to be economically 10 or 20 years hence, and how many new jobs that will mean to our workers and their families. Otherwise, we will destroy not only the possibility of a sound rail transportation system, but also an important part of our human capacity.

With Russia Adding to the World Oil Surplus U.S. Fuel Markets Must Be Afforded Greater Protection Against Imports

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on May 24 the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] raised a highly explosive question in calling attention to Russia's frontal attack on the world's fuel markets through price-cutting barter, threats, and other devices. It is a question with which we must come to grips as quickly as possible. It must be settled at the diplomatic level, because the Red campaign cannot be countered with improved salesmanship on the part of the free world's oil producers. No amount of improved automation will do the job. And no matter how low competitive prices might go, the Kremlin can always underbid because in a slave state any commodity can be priced according to the exclusive wishes of the tyrants at the helm.

The statement made before the Department of Interior by Stephen F. Dunn, president of the National Coal Association, last February and his address in Chicago last week should be studied carefully by every Member of Congress. I also call your attention to two documents that have been published within the past 10 days. One is "Soviet Oil in the Cold War," a study prepared by the Library of Congress at the request of a Senate Judiciary subcommittee. The other, "The Soviet 7-Year Plan, 1959–65 for Oil," produced by the U.S. Bureau of Mines, contains additional information that would serve to substantiate Mr. Dunn's warnings.

For the past 10 years I have insisted that Congress reclaim some of the authority on matters of international commerce that it has in the past relinquished to the Department of State. I have watched our domestic oil and coal industries decline in structural strength as a consequence of the surging tides of residual oil emanating in Venezuela and the Dutch West Indies.

There is no ground for controversy on the necessity of maintaining strong domestic fuel industries. Both parties have taken notice of the vital role which American producers must assume in a war emergency. The oil imports control program was established by the Republican administration as a security measure. It has been continued by the present administration without philosophical revision, although the levels of imports have been raised so high as to virtually destroy the effectiveness of the whole program. Nevertheless, acceptance of this concept—of having to protect our domestic fuel industries in the interest of national security—at least gives us a start. The White House acknowledges the importance of domestic producers. Congress concurs in the appraisal. The job before us is to determine to what extent residual oil quotas need to be reduced, and then reduce them without equivocation.

The Russian oil threat may have one wholesome effect: of goading the U.S. Government into adopting precautionary measures against a potentially fatal fuel gap among the free nations. If our alliances with non-Communist nations are to have any lasting value, it is folly to sit by and watch them stake their future on Russian oil. The Kremlin is in effect loading both barrels, then giving shotguns to our friends to play Russian roulette with national security.

To permit Red oil to crowd out the products of free nations is as suicidal

as to bank domestic steel mills in order to purchase the output of plants in the Donets Basin or in Manchuria. In an emergency, Khrushchev would merely order shipments stopped. When producing oil wells in the United States, the Middle East, and Venezuela are capped and tankers put into mothball fleets, Moscow will hold the key to complete confusion and chaos.

I commend to your consideration this quotation from "Soviet Oil in the Cold War," which has been printed for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary:

> In the course of the year 1960, Soviet production actually surpassed that of Venezuela and made further inroads on the more slowly growing rate of oil production in the United States.

Here is another excerpt:

> The dependence of any member of the NATO alliance on Russian oil in a substantial measure inevitably has a significant bearing on its position relative to the security of the Western World. With Italy becoming increasingly bound up in Soviet oil schemes, the question is bound to arise as to its probable behavior in the event of a serious crisis in the cold war.

Italy is not our only concern. The Russian oil is moving in increasingly greater volumes into other European countries, South America, Africa, and the non-Communist nations of Asia.

The Bureau of Mines report on Russia's 7-year plan states:

> Growing Russian oil exports have contributed to the world oversupply of petroleum, have forced prices down, and have taken sales from Western oil producers.

An additional consequence of the new Soviet-free world trade manipulations is that Dutch-Anglo-American oil producers and distributors in the Middle East and Venezuela must look elsewhere for market outlets. Unless adequate royalties continue to be collected by the kings, shahs, dictators, and juntas in producing lands, leases are jeopardized. For too long the fuel markets of the United States have been the dumping grounds for world surplus oil. As the Soviet menace—with distending pipelines and bulging supertankers now under construction—continues to grow, progressively more cargoes of foreign oil will be carted into our ports and offered at distress prices. Russia is capable of underbidding on oil contracts around the world; that much is clear. Until other non-Communist countries rise in patriotic resentment against Red proffers, the United States may be the sole holdout against Soviet shipments—or at least I assume that any attempt on the part of Russia to ship oil onto our shores will be rejected forthwith. For this reason our own markets will appear increasingly attractive to shippers whose Middle East and South America production is crowded out elsewhere in the world.

Congress must be ready to defend America's domestic oil and coal industries against the new threat. Meanwhile the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has begun an inquiry to determine whether the present residual oil import control program meets national security objectives. I am confident that a close study will disclose the program's weaknesses. I hope that the OCDM will recommend without hesitation that the level of imports should be lowered sharply in defense of our domestic fuel industries.

While the OCDM investigation is taking place, Congress and the State Department should concern themselves with Russia's oil offense and take every precaution, in liaison with our allies, to cope with it before it gets entirely out of control.

The Honorable Arnold Olsen, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in his most appropriate and extraordinarily informative remarks on Norwegian Independence Day—May 17—the honorable gentleman from Montana paid fitting tribute to the remarkable people of Norway. I would like to congratulate Representative OLSEN for this splendid talk and take this opportunity to thank him for the fine things he said about this gallant, gifted, hard-working, sturdy, and stouthearted people. The honorable Members of this House are always eager to hear of peoples in other lands, living in different climes and under differing types of government, but I hope I am right in saying that we are always delighted to hear about peoples whose deeds we admire, whose accomplishments in many fields of human activity have enriched Western civilization in numerous ways, and whose pioneering experiments in democratic processes of communal and national life have become models for many other countries.

The lot of the Norwegian people has been conditioned by the geography of their beautiful land, and by its invigorating and bracing climate. But these are only the physical factors, and these alone seldom determine and direct a people's destiny. In the case of these venturesome, pioneering, intelligent, and indomitable Norwegians their individualistic and freedom-loving spirit, their social-mindedness, their constant awareness that public welfare and common well-being are for the good of all concerned, these supremely admirable traits have made them what they are. Because of these fine traits, and because of their pioneering work in scientific fields, such as polar explorations, in oceanography and seamanship, and in social-educational endeavors, their great accomplishments bear no relation to their number of a mere 3 million in a world of 2,600 million people. Norwegians can always disprove the mistaken notion that bigness in size and greatness in accomplishments go hand in hand.

I can hardly improve upon what the honorable gentleman from Butte, Mont., said about Norway and the Norwegian people, and of their signal contribution especially in the field of international civil service. Incidentally, during the interwar years on the world's best known and most admired statesmen was Norway's Dr. Nansen, the foremost civil servant in the League of Nations, just as Norway's Trygve Lie was the first Secretary General of the United Nations. In conclusion I would again congratulate this fine, direct descendant of that great and gifted people, Representative OLSEN of Butte, Mont.

Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this is our Memorial Day around the world. Memorial Day, May 30, is distinctly an American institution. It is a deeply significant, sentimental custom established by our people more than 90 years ago.

The American Memorial Day is being observed in every community across our Nation, also in many foreign lands upon the high seas.

This special day is the brief moment we set aside from our busy lives to pause before the resting places of our departed loved ones—to remember them and to eulogize the honored dead. This is the day of tribute to those who live only in history.

When we have concluded our short ceremonies here and turn back to our daily tasks, we shall leave with the dead our tributes, expressed in words and with flowers. But of even greater import is the fact that we, ourselves, will have gained new spiritual and mental enlightenment through this experience.

This is not a day for sadness. In fact, when we consider all of its facets, we find that Memorial Day has great beauty and that it has truly inspiring depths.

There are the colors of our flag and flowers for the eye to admire. There are the carefully chosen words of prose, poetry, song, and prayer for the ear to hear. All these touch our hearts and minds and our conscience. They reawaken in us a new realization that we are influenced in large measure by those who have gone before us, and by their contributions to our lives.

It does not matter who we are, nor the differences between our religious thinking on racial stock. The principles represented by this Memorial Day are the same to each of us. We are all Americans. This is our special day, and here we stand together in tribute to our own national family.

Following the same line of thought, when we honor the dead we do not weigh the stations they held in life. It does

not matter whether they were rich or poor, young or old, whether they were intellectuals, craftsmen, students, or laborers. As the poet John Ingalls expressed it, in the democracy of the dead, all men at last are equal. There is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave.

In those days of combat, it did not matter who our fellow defenders were. And so it is now in our homage to them. It makes no difference whether they were native sons or the foreign born, whether they were white or black or brown, gentiles or Jews, Protestants or Catholics. In the final analysis, all that has ever counted is the fact that they were Americans and that they gave their lives in the defense of our homes and of our ideals of freedom.

Now, it may be a little difficult for us who are gathered here to realize that we are part of a vast, worldwide, commemorative service on this special day. We are but a small portion of the living who are honoring the dead. And these souls to whom we are directing our immediate attention are but a very few of the total number of American honored dead around the world.

What we are doing here is actually symbolic. Our contribution to the overall Memorial Day observance is being duplicated by millions of other people throughout our land and in several foreign countries. To make the point clear, let us consider the following facts:

There are more than 1 million names on the honor rolls of the American war dead. Those are the men who have fought and died for our country since this Nation was founded some 185 years ago.

What we say here today expresses our tribute to all of those honored ones. The praise we give the other departed war veterans of our personal acquaintance is, in reality, praise for all who have served in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

We cannot return the dead, therefore the only remaining course is to extend ourselves to them through the sincerity and beauty of our memorial services. That is what our people are doing today at home and abroad. Let us look at the whole picture for a moment.

Throughout the United States and in some 25 American military cemeteries beyond our shores, the mortal remains of some 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict are buried—or they are recorded as missing in action.

On this Memorial Day, special ceremonies are being held at 8 American military cemeteries or special memorials in France, England, and Belgium, where nearly 31,000 World War I dead are buried.

Similar services are being held for 76,000 World War II dead at 14 other American cemeteries in England, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Italy, and Tunisia.

Also, special services are being held for more than 90,000 other World War II and Korean war dead buried or recorded as missing at American cemeteries in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Philippines.

In addition, special services are being held for the war dead at the Tomb of the Unknowns and some 99,000 other war dead buried at Arlington National Cemetery, on Virginia soil, across the Potomac from Washington, D.C.

Most of these final resting places are a long way from us. But, in reality, they are very close to our hearts.

Once again we find our wonderful country faced with grave danger. There are loose in the world those forces who would destroy us.

And, even as our honored war dead were called upon to summon their last ounce of courage and endurance, we citizens of today must once again face the foe with forbearance and unswerving determination.

For if the proud heritage we cherish today is to endure, Americans again must meet the clarion call to oppose those who would doom us.

If we can but equal the qualities possessed by the men we honor here today, there is no foe we cannot conquer, no conspiracy we cannot overcome, no challenge we cannot meet.

This is the message for each of us here today as we pay honor to the departed ones of all wars. Glory to the battle dead. And honor to those who returned home and have since passed on.

Honor to the sons and to the father, to the husbands and to the brothers. Also, honor and comfort to the beloved survivors of those departed ones.

May our thoughts, our words and our deeds always fulfill the high ideals for which the brave have sacrificed. The obligation is ours to assure that the honored dead shall not have died in vain.

The Federal Trial Examiners Conference, May 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a message of greeting from President Kennedy and excerpts from the address of James M. Landis to the Conference of Trial Examiners in Washington, D.C., May 18, 1961.

The message and address follow:

I am pleased to greet on this occasion the Federal trial examiners and their guests.

One measure of the strength and vitality of government is its capacity to perform day-to-day jobs with fairness and with dispatch. In no part of the Government is this strength more subject to difficult strain and stress than in the administrative process. In few places is the efficiency and fairness of our Government more importantly or more constantly put to the test before the eyes of all our citizens.

I am conscious that the success or failure of our regulatory agencies in meeting that test falls initially, and sometimes ultimately as well, upon the hearing examiner. Matters of the greatest significance to the public and to the private interest involved are the daily subject of your work. Their disposition turns upon what you personally bring to the decisional process—upon your integrity, your ability to seek out the crucial facts, your capacity for difficult decisions, your sense of the public interest as expressed in law or regulation.

This process is, as yet, a relatively young one. In recent years the growth of regulatory functions in a context of changing economic and technological conditions has made us aware that we must reappraise our successes and our failures with honesty and objectivity. We must do what is necessary and what is right to insure that our regulatory system is efficient and fair. The reorganization plans already before Congress, and the recent establishment of the Administrative Conference of the United States evidence the interest and the determination of this administration in seeing that these goals are met.

An expectancy of change and challenge now pervades the whole administrative process. I know that the Federal trial examiners, today as in the past, will help in this job of reappraisal and reexamination and I feel sure they can and will contribute substantially to improvements in the administrative process.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

MAY 17, 1961.

EXCERPTS FROM THE ADDRESS OF JAMES M. LANDIS TO THE CONFERENCE OF FEDERAL TRIAL EXAMINERS IN WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 18, 1961

The trial or hearing examiner is, in a true sense, the core of the adjudicatory phase of the administrative process. Under the Administrative Procedure Act he is assigned the responsibility of handling the initial trial of cases required to be decided on the record—cases that can vary in importance from a few dollars to issues of great magnitude—air routes, TV licenses, rate increases, the safety of nuclear reactors as well as claims, minor and major, for compensation under the Social Security Act. The issues he tries, the evidence that he must sift, may be simple; it may also be incredibly complex. He must distinguish truth from untruth, the verity of a statistical exhibit from the tortuous testimony of experts whose conclusions are frequently not their own but those dictated by their clients. No police court judges have such extensive responsibilities. Nevertheless judges of our lesser tribunals can, if they choose to do so, effectively control the records of the cases that they are called upon to try, control the conduct of witnesses and lawyers. They can insist upon the respect that should be paid to a judge. Their decisions are frequently final, at least in minor matters committed to their jurisdiction.

This is not true of the trial examiner. His power to control the record is limited. Unable to rule with finality on many interlocutory matters, he is forced to permit expansion of records rather than their contraction. He is too often legally incapable of controlling the conduct of claimants and their lawyers. His means of compelling the production of testimony is by appeal to outside authority and never direct. His decisions are so-called initial or recommended decisions appealable as of right, no matter how inconsequential, to the agency itself.

This is a system that calls for review. It breeds delay; it involves unnecessary costs. It invites endless and time-consuming appeals. It militates against developing the stature and prestige that our judicial systems vest in the lowest of our judicial tribunals.

No simple legislative act will cure these defects. Certainly the mere provision of higher grades of compensation for our examiners will not give us more than a slight answer to the basic problems. Nor can we hope overnight to establish a system infinitely better adapted for the administration of justice, swiftly and surely, in our regulatory agencies.

But the adoption of the principles underlying the plans of reorganization recently submitted by the President to the Congress can do much to improve the system as a whole. They authorize the agencies to remold the system rather than to take it for granted. By granting at least a modicum of finality to the examiners' decisions, they will increase the examiners' responsibilities. And men, however timid, however bereft of the qualities of genius, will respond to the imposition of responsibility. The hearing examiner corps will grow with these added burdens. And under these plans wise regulations can solve the perplexing problem of interlocutory determinations. Under these plans the powers of examiners to limit records through prehearing procedures can be immeasurably strengthened and their issuance of subpenas duces tecum confirmed. At the same time, nothing is taken away from the responsibilities that rest on the agency heads themselves. The manner in which these agency heads discharge these responsibilities will, of course, be in their hands, just as the manner in which the Supreme Court of the United States discharges the responsibilities of molding the supreme law of the land has been put in the hands of that Court by the Judiciary Act of 1924.

A second potentiality of advance lies in the establishment of the Administrative Conference of the United States. Here is not merely a forum but an institution capable of continuing and sympathetic examination of the system. The possibilities of the Conference are in a true sense infinite. It can question the existing methods of recruiting and qualifying examiners, the mechanical and physical aids with which these officials should be supplied, the degree to which they should be entitled to draw upon the expertise of the agency as a whole rather than merely upon their own judgment, the canons of ethics that should govern them, and the scope of their jurisdiction confined as it is now to one agency and sometimes to a mere branch of that agency's activities. I stress this latter point because too great specialization tends toward a narrowness of outlook. It begets concern with one facet of a problem to the exclusion of the understanding that problems too often are interlocked, are what Sir Henry Mason said of our law, namely, parts of a seamless web.

A third potentiality of advance must come from the inside rather than the outside. By that I mean the trial examiners themselves. Just as the bar has concerned itself with the improvement of the techniques of the profession by the organization of such institutes, exemplified by the Practicing Law Institute of New York, the trial examiners as a corps and as a profession have a responsibility to perfect their own techniques. Institution of new as well as old examiners in such techniques as pretrial procedures, in the submission of expert evidence in documented form, in the limitation of cross-examination, in the submission of proposed findings, is essential. The experience and wisdom of those who are experienced and who possess wisdom must be imported by means still to be devised to the new recruits. I can sympathize full well with your present concern with essentially mundane matters. But you should be ready now to raise your sights. It is important to your profession and to the administrative process as a whole, that you should do so. Leadership in thought, in creative action, in professional advancement, must stem to a large degree from those who, for themselves and their inner satisfaction, would achieve it. And, I sincerely believe, that those who seek by these means to serve the public interest will in return have the support of that very interest they seek to serve. This is the ultimate reward—to do a job, better, surer and with greater firmness.

Communism at the Doorstep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a press account of a recent speech I delivered at Milford, Mass., in my district on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the local chapter, Disabled American Veterans:

REMARKS IN PART OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN SPEAKING AT THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DAV CHAPTER AT MILFORD, MASS., MAY 20, 1961

Speaking Saturday night at Milford on the occasion of the 15th anniversary celebration of the local chapter of Disabled American Veterans, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, hailing the veterans for their sacrifices and great contributions to the Nation in war and in peace, declared that the unselfish spirit and willingness to serve which they exemplified is urgently needed in these days of crisis and peril.

"The American people will never forget the great debt the Nation owes to you and your comrades," said the Clinton Congressman, "and your spirit of sacrifice and loyalty will serve as a shining example and powerful inspiration to this generation, and indeed to all Americans, to rally once again with unflinching determination to the great cause of freedom, security and enduring peace."

"It is too late to cancel out some of the mistakes in policy that have brought us to the current impasse in world affairs," said PHILBIN, "but it is imperative now that every loyal American be aroused and reawakened to the perils and dangers of the hour which confront us with such stark reality both at home and abroad."

Deploring the steady pressures, gains and continued threats of Marxist communism which has been steadily advancing throughout the world, PHILBIN said: "This dire threat is no longer remote. It is not confined alone to helpless nations of Western Europe, or to Asia, the Middle East or Africa, to Laos, Cambodia, or the Congo. It has spread, and it now exists right on our own doorstep, 90 miles from the mainland of the United States, and in accordance with the Marxist timetable it is pointing its bloody finger toward Latin America and the American Continent."

Referring to the relatively rapid spread of communism in the world, the Congressman asserted: "Communism has made these impressive gains by incessant, deceitful propaganda, cleverly engineered infiltration, the brazen employment of threats of aggression, and where the occasion demanded it, the use and support of force and violence."

"This has been possible," said PHILBIN, "because of certain mistaken diplomatic policies, the inability of the United Nations to face up realistically to the dangers, and indecision, vacillation and complacency on the part of governments and peoples of the free world, including our own. It is clear that practically the only deterrent to further aggression, territorial aggrandizement, and perhaps even resort to war itself, has been the great economic strength and most destructive military power which our own country has found it necessary to develop, and which seems unfortunately to be the only language which Communist dictators and their allies understand.

"What a great pity it is for humanity that because of the current world situation and the unwillingness of the Soviet to consult and confer in a wholehearted, honest spirit concerning grave world problems, especially the establishment of lasting peace, that the entire world is penalized and denied in large measure the golden opportunity to reap the tremendous human betterments that could be so readily derived from the remarkable advances of modern science and technology and enlightened governmental, economic and social techniques which, if properly and peacefully applied, could record unprecedented gains, prosperity and happiness for all mankind.

"But we must deal with the present realities as they are and we cannot further temporize or delay in making and implementing decisions that look to the preservation of the values of our free way of life, the security of the country and a world organized and protected for freedom and justice."

The Congressman expressed firm confidence in the preparedness and power of the national defense.

"Let no one be deceived," he said, "that we now possess great and growing military and economic strength is undeniable and this is well known to the Soviet. In the immediate time ahead that strength must and will guard the United States until the day when good will and honor and respect for international agreements and the rights of all nations can be substituted for force, violence and devastating weapon systems as the true measure of man's humanity to man and as evidence of the Soviet's unequivocal intention to seek an honest, just peace."

Touching on domestic conditions and the need for renewed devotion to the established principles and values of the Constitution and the American way of life, PHILBIN declared: "In this presently dangerous world great strength and power is most assuredly necessary, but standing by itself, this is not enough to meet and conquer our present problems.

"It is not enough for us to be strong in military and material things, though this is of utmost importance.

"We must be strong and unalterable also in the things of the spirit, because it is the spiritual values, moral principles and ethical concepts which this country has followed and defended throughout the years which are the true source of our greatness and strength. We must resolutely preserve them.

"No one can tell what the future will bring. It well may be that sacrifices and austerity will be required over a period of time to sustain free institutions. It also could be that even dedicated Marxists may, in their own interests, come to early realization that conciliation and an honest, just peace would provide a better solution to world affairs than continued methods of aggression and ultimate, widespread destruction.

"Be that as it may, this Nation must firmly resolve to pay any price necessary to defend its birthright, to work, hope and pray for peace, but be prepared to meet every challenge of those who would assail our free institutions and endanger our security.

"On the homefront, so vital to us all, the preservation of free enterprise for all the people, and the encouragement of the initiatives and incentives that are the very heart of our system, must be zealously safeguarded."

Calling for recognition of the demands of social justice, civil rights, health, education, economic and social progress and advancement, PHILBIN pleaded for the strengthening and improvement of every component of American life, the integrity of the family and the regenerative forces of the Nation.

"High levels of economic activity, social standards and broad opportunities must be insured," he said. "We must keep the huge expense of running the Government on an efficient, economical basis, truly consistent with our needs, so that the American people may be spared, where at all possible, the most burdensome taxes which in recent years have been weighing down so heavily upon them, smothering incentives, penalizing enterprise and reducing living standards. We must tirelessly and doggedly hold the line for the American way and its precious values so vital to our liberties and welfare."

The Congressman hailed President Kennedy's able, courageous approach to vexing Government problems and urged united, bipartisan support for his efforts to check communism and stabilize world peace. "The youth, vigor and spirit, and informed awareness of the President, has given fresh heart and courage to peoples everywhere," PHILBIN said. "No Chief Executive has had greater burdens and the American people must stand behind him and assist and cooperate with him as he strives to bring order and the rule of law out of the confusion, misunderstanding and perils that confront us.

"In these great tasks our beloved veterans can and will furnish the firm, loyal leadership that they have always shown.

"I heartily congratulate the chapter upon its great work and wish for you all continued good health, success and happiness in all your undertakings."

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our Salvation, may the silence of this hallowed moment our fathers set aside for the far look, lift up our hearts with the glad assurance that they that are for us are more than those that dare to defy Thy will for all mankind. To a world where evil seems so rampant may our individual contribution be a life purged of self, of all impurity and hatred, moved by compassion and by concern for all mankind.

We ask that Thy benediction and a sense of Thy guidance, a solemn realization that we are indeed our brothers' keeper, may rest upon the chosen leaders of the Nation in these tempestuous times. In our dealing with all the peoples of the world, in nations great and small, may we be so transparently just and fair that at last falsehood and every evil thing that shuns the light may be banished by the truth which makes men free.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 25, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 1986) to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 6518) making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 1986) to repeal the provisions of section 5 of the act of July 28, 1916, as amended, relating to the furnishing of information to the Postmaster General by the Interstate Commerce Commission with respect to revenue received by railroads from express companies for the transportation of express matter, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Constitutional Amendment Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY ACTS OF 1961

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS CORPORATION ACT OF 1961

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MILITARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM FOR TAIWAN

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret report on review of the military assistance program for Taiwan, dated May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the

State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

"Joint resolution relative to the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal

"Whereas there is presently pending before the Congress of the United States legislation introduced by Senators CLAIR ENGLE and THOMAS H. KUCHEL and by Congressmen HAROLD T. JOHNSON, JOHN E. MOSS, and JOHN J. MCFALL to authorize construction by the Bureau of Reclamation, as part of the Central Valley project, of both the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Folsom South Canal; and

"Whereas the multiple-purpose project of the Auburn Dam will furnish additional water which can be used in the American River watershed, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Valley, and areas to the south, and will produce additional electric power which would be available for pumping water to areas of deficiency in California's statewide water program; and

"Whereas the Folsom South Canal will serve to bring urgently needed supplemental water supplies to areas in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region and the northern San Joaquin Valley area, which supplies would be made available from storage of water in Folsom Reservoir, as supplemental by the proposed Auburn Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas both the proposed Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal are part of the California water plan and would complement the State's effort to meet the water requirement of California's rapidly expanding population: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law, at the earliest possible time, the proposed legislation to authorize the construction of the Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 30

"Whereas the State of Nebraska is deeply interested in the full development of all the multiple benefits of Missouri River improvement and control contemplated by the comprehensive Pick-Sloan plan and the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944, which require that the new reservoirs upriver be operated in such manner as to give fair recognition to all multiple uses including flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power, giving only to irrigation and domestic consumptive uses for the upriver areas priority over the other beneficial uses, and

"Whereas demands are now being made that the production of firm hydroelectric power in South Dakota be given priority in reservoir releases over other uses such as navigation and flood control and that existing plans of reservoir operation heretofore officially approved and followed be altered to accomplish this result, and

"Whereas the State of Nebraska is engaged in an all-out effort to gain new industry for Nebraska, in which effort the full development and maintenance of the navigational facilities will be of incalculable value to the State as a whole as well as Missouri River port cities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 72d session assembled:

"1. It is the sense of this legislature that such demands for priority for a sectional use and benefit are wholly unjustified and that the original multiple benefit concept for the construction and operation of the great reservoir system on the Missouri River be adhered to so that benefits therefrom may accrue along the great reaches of this river which bound and flow through this State, and the Governor and other officials of this State are urged to do everything in their power to resist any and all attempts to change or alter the original objectives which made possible the authorization and construction of these important public improvements.

"2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

"DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
"President of the Legislature.
"HUGO F. SRB,
"Clerk of the Legislature."

A resolution adopted by the second annual conference of the National Guard Association of Texas, at Austin, Tex., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide minimum maintenance strengths of the Army and Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A memorial signed by James H. Borland, Jr., and 11 other students of the State of Rhode Island, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to provide Federal aid to education; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1720. A bill to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world (Rept. No. 290).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Thomas S. Estes, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Upper Volta;

John S. Badeau, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the United Arab Republic; and

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Yemen.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably the nomination of Howard V. Morgan, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission, and I submit a report (Ex. Rept. No. 7) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and also the minority views of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Alaska, and the nomination will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii (by request):

S. 1977. A bill to amend section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam relative to the legislative branch; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LONG of Hawaii when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 1978. A bill to amend section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of such act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1979. A bill for the relief of Archie C. Fisk; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1980. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE):

S. 1981. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Ice Age National Park in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILEY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1982. A bill to supplement the Sherman Act and the Federal Trade Commission Act by prohibiting automobile manufacturers from engaging in the businesses of financing and insuring automobiles purchased by consumers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1983. A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and

social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. BEALL):

S. 1984. A bill to amend section 35 of chapter III of the Life Insurance Act for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S.J. Res. 96. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ERVIN when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A WHITE FLEET

Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CAPEHART) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 154), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that

(a) Whenever the President determines it to be in the national interest, in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and consistent with the laws of the United States, he should take such action as may be required to provide for establishment of a White Fleet designed and equipped (1) to render prompt emergency aid and assistance to peoples of the coastal regions of other nations upon the occurrence of famine, epidemic disease, earthquake, flood, hurricane, or other disaster; and (2) to carry out technical assistance and training on a continuing basis in the developing nations of the world.

(b) Such fleet should be established through the restoration to active service and the equipment of suitable vessels of the United States now mothballed in storage, such vessels to be operated by appropriate nonprofit, private, philanthropic organizations of the United States devoted to providing emergency aid and assistance to relieve human suffering.

(c) The vessels of such fleet should be suitably identified to proclaim their peaceful and beneficent purposes.

(d) Fuel and operational supplies, port, repair, and navigational facilities of the United States throughout the world should be made available to such vessels in support of their activities.

(e) Surplus food commodities of the United States should be utilized for the relief of hunger, and for furnishing medical and other supplies required for the use of the White Fleet.

(f) The cooperation of private charitable organizations of the United States should be utilized for the furnishing of clothing and other relief supplies to meet the emergency needs of inhabitants of regions to which task groups of the fleet may be directed.

AMENDMENT OF ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Organic Act of Guam, to provide for election of certain members of the territorial legislature by districts and to assure minority representation in that body.

Introduction of this proposed legislation was requested by the chairman of the Territorial Party of Guam, Carlos P. Taitano. The Territorial Party is the minority party of the island, since the other local political party there, the Popular Party, won all 21 of the seats in the Guamanian Legislature in last November's elections. Under the present organic act, which we passed in 1950, all members of the legislature are elected at large.

When the distinguished junior Senator from Alaska and I made an official inspection trip to Guam, last November, we met with leaders of the Territorial Party, as well as with those of the Popular Party. I believe that legislation along the lines of this bill would have the support of a substantial number of the people of Guam.

I confess that I do not know enough about local politics in Guam to form a conviction that this bill in its present form is necessarily desirable legislation. Certainly, the imposition, from Washington, of minority representation in the legislature is a matter that should be carefully considered before final action is taken by the Congress.

However, since the people of Guam, who are loyal, devoted American citizens, do not have any official representation here in the National Capital, I am introducing the bill, in order that the situation may be clarified by authoritative expressions of views on specific proposals.

I ask unanimous consent that this bill and an accompanying explanation of its provisions be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement of explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1977) to amend section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam relative to the legislative branch, introduced by Mr. LONG of Hawaii, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 10 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C., sec. 1423) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The legislative power of Guam, except as otherwise provided in this Act, shall be vested in a legislature, consisting of one house, to be designated as the 'Guam Legislature,' herein referred to as the Legislature. General elections to the Legislature shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, biennially in even numbered years.

"(b) On and after the second Monday in January 1963, the Legislature shall be composed of twenty-one members. The Territory of Guam is hereby divided into six legislative districts, hereinafter referred to, which districts shall be composed of the following municipal districts and villages as constituted and existing under the laws of Guam on January 1, 1961:

"First District: Comprising the village of Tamuning and the municipality of Dededo;

"Second District: Comprising the municipalities of Barrigada, Mangilao, and Yigo;

"Third District: Comprising the municipalities of Agana and Asan, Agana Heights and Mongmong, Toto, Maite;

"Fourth District: Comprising the municipality of Sinajana (Sinajana Village), and Chalan Pago and Ordot;

"Fifth District: Comprising the municipalities of Piti, Agat, Umatac, and Santa Rita; and

Sixth District: Comprising the municipalities of Yona, Talofofo, Inarajan, and Merizo.

"Two members shall be elected by the qualified electors of each of the six legislative districts. The other nine members shall be members at large and shall be elected by the qualified electors of Guam from the territory of Guam as a whole: *Provided,* That in the election of the members at large, each elector shall be entitled to vote for four candidates, and the nine candidates receiving the largest number of votes shall be declared elected.

"(c) Party nominations for members of a legislative district shall be made in such district by the qualified electors thereof who are members of the political party making such nomination and shall be in such manner as the legislature shall by law provide: *Provided,* That until the legislature shall otherwise provide such nominations shall be made by caucus. Independent candidates for members of a district, may be nominated by individual petitions signed by at least 5 percent of the qualified electors of such district, which electors shall certify therein that they have not supported or participated in this selection or nomination of another candidate for such office. Party nomination for members at large shall be made by the qualified electors of Guam who are members of the political party making such nomination and shall be made in such a manner as the legislature shall by law provide: *Provided,* That until the legislature shall otherwise provide such nominations shall be made by caucus. Independent candidates for members at large shall be nominated by petition signed by at least fifty qualified electors of Guam, which electors shall certify therein that they have not supported or participated in the selection or nomination of any candidate for a member at large. The order of the names of the candidates upon the ballot for members at large shall be determined by lot among the candidates. The Governor of Guam, or his designee, is authorized to draw for a candidate who does not appear in person or by authorized representative at the drawing of lots.

"(d) The term of office of each member of the legislature shall be for two years and shall commence on the second Monday in January following his election.

The statement of explanation presented by Mr. LONG of Hawaii is as follows:

STATEMENT OF EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND SECTION 10 OF THE ORGANIC ACT OF GUAM RELATING TO THE ELECTION OF MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATURE

Presently section 11 of the Organic Act of Guam (48 U.S.C. 1423; 64 Stat. 387) provides for the election at large from the island as a whole of the 21 members of the unicameral legislature.

The proposed bill provides for two essential points: (1) That each area or district be represented in the legislature, and (2) that there should be, in any event, minority representation.

1. Representation by districts: The proposed bill establishes six legislative districts. Two members will be elected from

each district and nine from the island at large. The six districts are comprised of municipal districts, villages, and areas which are well defined by the laws of Guam (sec. 15001.1, Government Code of Guam, 1956 supplement).

The attached map of Guam shows the proposed legislative districts and contains information showing the number of permanent residents in each of the municipalities and villages, the number of eligible voters in 1960, the number of votes cast in the 1960 general election, and the population as shown by the 1960 census. It will be noted that some villages, populationwise, are much larger than others. For instance, Santa Rita has a population of 12,126 persons, of which only 1,814 are permanent residents, with 619 eligible voters who cast a total of 519 votes in the 1960 election. In this connection, it must be realized that there are large Navy installations in the Santa Rita municipality which accounts for the large number of persons over and above the permanent residents. The same is true in regard to Yigo, which is the municipality wherein Andersen Air Force Base is located. This same situation exists in other areas and it is for this reason that the legislative districts are established on the basis of permanent residents and eligible voters instead of population, since the military personnel and their dependents do not participate in our local elections.

The 21 members of the present sixth Guam Legislature are from 13 municipalities or villages, leaving 6 municipalities or villages, with a total permanent resident population of 9,643 without representation in the legislature. In the 1960 general elections in some areas candidates of the minority party (Territorial) received more votes than the members of the majority party (Popular), but under the present law the majority of the people in these particular areas are now without representation. Thus, the Popular Party candidate, while rejected in his home area, was nevertheless elected because of his party's strength in other areas.

2. Minority representation: The proposed bill provides for minority representation by limiting, in the election of the nine members at large, each elector to voting for only four candidates. Thus, a political party can elect the 12 members from the 6 legislative districts and 4 members at large, thereby giving the party 16 members. This number would give that party complete control since only 14 votes are necessary to override a Governor's veto of any bill. Likewise, it will provide for minority party representation which is an absolute necessity in a democracy.

In the Fourth, Fifth, and now the Sixth Guam Legislature, the entire membership has been composed of members from one party. In the sixth legislature, elected in November 1960, the Popular Party received approximately 60 percent of the total vote. Thus, about 40 percent of the people of Guam have no representation in the legislature and no one to express the views of the minority.

To insure a minority representation, the proposed bill follows the general plan and method as was used in electing the members of the legislature in the Virgin Islands, and to a greater extent the method as was used in the constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Guam and the Virgin Islands are the only two organized unincorporated territories of the United States. Congress, on July 22, 1954, established such a precedent in the election of members at large in the enactment of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands and since the problems in Guam are comparable to those in the Virgin Islands in this regard, the same method should be followed.

The Congress in revising the Virgin Islands' organic act provided that the Legislature of the Virgin Islands shall be composed of 11 members, 2 senators to be elected from the district of St. Thomas, 2 from the district of St. Croix, and 1 from the district of St. John. The other six Senators are to be elected from the three islands at large, but that each elector or voter would be entitled to vote for only two of the six senators to be elected at large. The six candidates receiving the largest number of votes in the election for senators at large would be elected.

A limitation on the number of candidates that an elector could vote for is the only known and sure method by which there would be a guaranteed minority representation in the legislature. This idea is so ably expressed in Senate Report 1271 of the 83d Congress, 2d session, dated April 29, 1954, wherein it is stated:

"In elections of representatives at large, however, each Virgin Island voter would vote for more than two such representatives. This limitation is of very great importance in guaranteeing some representation to the principal minority groups residing in the islands and in balancing the geographical representation of the legislature. By restricting the number of representatives at large for whom an elector can vote to two, sizable minorities would be given some assurance of having representation in the legislature and consequently of having a voice in the affairs of the territorial government. Furthermore, the voters of St. Croix and St. John would be protected from being inevitably outvoted by the electors of the more populous St. Thomas."

This same principle was followed in general by the constitutional convention which drafted the constitution for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. This constitution was authorized by the Congress "in the nature of compact" so that the people of Puerto Rico could organize their own government. (See P.L. 600, 81st Cong. (48 U.S.C. 731b; 64 Stat. 319)). In article III of the constitution, it was provided that the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico shall be composed of two houses; a senate with 27 senators and a house of representatives with 51 representatives. The island was divided into 8 senatorial districts each electing 2 senators and 40 representative districts each electing 1 representative. In addition, 11 senators and 11 representatives are elected at large. However, no elector may vote for more than one candidate for senator and one candidate for representative to be elected at large. The constitution through a rather complicated and detailed process further provided, in order to insure minority representation, the total number of senators and representatives in the legislature may be increased so that the minority party or parties, in any event, will have a minimum of 9 senators and 17 representatives. In addition, provision was made for proportionate representation of this number if there is more than one minority party.

The Congress approved the Puerto Rican constitution on July 3, 1952, by joint resolution (66 Stat. 327). In so doing, the Congress, as well as the President found it to conform to all the requirements of the act of July 3, 1950, and the U.S. Constitution. However, the Congress did direct certain changes but fully concurred with the provision relating to article III which provided for the legislature and the method of selection of its members.

Since the Congress had dealt with this problem as it pertains to the Virgin Islands and since the people of Puerto Rico likewise felt it absolutely necessary to provide for minority representation in which position the Congress concurred, it appears advisable to follow the precedent that had heretofore been established and which the Congress in its wisdom had found to be most practical in assuring minority representations in the legislature.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 202(c) OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act, to include transfer, collection, or delivery service by motor vehicle within terminal areas incidental to interstate transportation by common carrier by water subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933.

Advancements in the methods of transporting goods by water, principally through containerization, have necessitated closer coordination between line-haul water carriers and local drayage carriers handling their traffic within port areas. Motor transportation within terminal areas of transfer, collection, or delivery is exempt under section 202(c), Interstate Commerce Act, from certification and rate regulation under part II of that act, if performed by or for railroads, water carriers, or freight forwarders subject to parts I, III, and IV of that act. Such terminal area motor transportation is regulated under the statutory provisions applicable to the line-haul transportation, of which it is an incidental part. This is done pursuant to longstanding congressional policy.

The Interstate Commerce Commission held, in Consolidated Freightways, Inc., Extension, Seattle, Wash. (74 M.C.C. 593 (1958)), that this exemption under section 202(c), Interstate Commerce Act, does not apply to motor transportation in terminal areas incidental to line-haul water transportation between Seattle, Wash., and Alaska, regulated by the Federal Maritime Board under the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933. The Commission said its decision is highly technical, and probably undesirable from a regulatory standpoint. It commented that the remedy appears to lie in additional legislation.

The Federal Maritime Board has accepted for many years water-carrier tariffs applicable to offshore domestic trades which name single factor rates, including pickup and delivery service by motor vehicle. Some confusion has arisen with respect to the status of terminal area transfer, collection, and delivery service by motor transportation conducted by or for interstate water carriers regulated by the Federal Maritime Board. In order to clarify that the same congressional policy applies to such activities within terminal areas, incidental to line-haul carriers in interstate commerce regulated by the Federal Maritime Board, as now applies under section 202(c), Interstate Commerce Act, to rail and water carriers and freight forwarders regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, section 202(c) of that act should be amended. This amendment can be accomplished by merely inserting references in section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933.

A provision should also be added to section 202(c) confirming that the Interstate Commerce Commission has exclusive jurisdiction to determine and prescribe the limits of the terminal areas to which the exemption in section 202(c) will be applicable in various situations. This will eliminate any misunderstanding as to which agency has jurisdiction over this important question.

There is no reason why the exemption in section 202(c) should be limited to transportation between the 48 contiguous States regulated by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and should not also apply to water transportation between the first 48 States and the 2 new offshore States of Alaska and Hawaii regulated by the Federal Maritime Board.

The same considerations which justify section 202(c) in its present form with respect to line-haul carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, require extension of the exemption to line-haul carriers subject to the two shipping acts. These considerations and the form of the proposed amendment have been discussed with members of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Federal Maritime Board.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1978) to amend section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of such act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ICE AGE NATIONAL PARK IN WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] and myself, a bill to establish an Ice Age National Park in Wisconsin.

The purpose would be to preserve and perpetuate a wide range of glacially created moraines.

The geological, scientific, historical, and scenic significance of these formations—including hills, valleys, rock, sand, and other formations—sculptured by glacial action—are unique and unequaled anywhere in the country. If allowed to go unprotected, the moraines would deteriorate and ultimately be lost to generations of the future.

As proposed, the bill would authorize the establishment of a national park to comprise, subject to mutually acceptable agreements by the National Park Service and State and local interests, the following area:

Eastern: Portions of the Kettle Moraine State Forest in Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, Washington, Waukesha, Jefferson, and Walworth Counties, Wis.

Central: Portions of Devils' Lake State Park in Sauk County, and nearby areas in Sauk, Columbia, Dane, and Marquette—including the John Muir Birthplace County Park—Counties, Wis.

Northwestern: Portions of Interstate Park in Polk County, Wis., and Chesago County, Minn., and nearby areas.

Connecting areas: Areas in Rock, Green, Columbia, Adams Waushara, Portage, Waupaca, Marathon, Shawano, Langlade, Lincoln, Oneida, Price, Taylor, Rusk, Chippewa, Washburn, Sawyer, Barron, Dunn, and St. Croix Counties, Wis.

Naturally, we can expect that serious questions will arise to be resolved. These include: Should the areas of the proposed park be further limited or extended? How would land areas adjacent to the park be affected? Can adequate financing be equitably obtained? How can the administrative problems best be handled?

These, and related questions, must be resolved, both in local, State, and national interests.

Following my previous introduction of a similar bill in the 86th Congress, the idea was endorsed by the Wisconsin Legislature, newspapers, and a wide variety of civic, veterans, service, and other organizations throughout the State.

In addition, I would like to pay tribute to many conservation-minded individuals supporting the project. By work, study, and promotion, these folks have helped to establish a "solid concept" for the park as well as to inspire public interest, enthusiasm, and support. The bill will be a counterpart of a measure introduced by Congressman HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat, of Wisconsin in the House of Representatives.

In my judgment, the project—of great significance to the whole State—warrants strong bipartisan support.

Annually, millions of tourists now visit our Kettle Moraine State Park which encompasses a portion of these glacially formed topographical features. The creation of a park incorporating more of the moraines—particularly areas otherwise unproductive—would be most worthwhile and could be expected to attract more tourists to visit our Badger State.

Overall, I believe the establishment of an Ice Age National Park to preserve the unique and significant moraine area would be a real boon to Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1981) to authorize the establishment of the Ice Age National Park in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. PROXMIRE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION FOR ICE AGE NATIONAL PARK.—In order to protect, preserve, and interpret the nationally significant values of Wisconsin continental glaciation, including moraines, eskers, kames, kettleholes, drumlins, swamps, lakes, and other reminders of the Ice Age, in the National Park System, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized—

(a) to plan cooperatively with State and local governments in Wisconsin for the protection and preservation of the Ice Age National Park, as hereinafter defined, and

(b) to procure, within the area designated in section 2, by purchase, gift, lease, or cooperative agreement, such lands and interest in lands as he finds to be rich in scenic, geological or historical interest, to be essentially unspoiled, and to be capable of effective administration as a comprehensive unit, although the lands need not be contiguous. Lands owned by State or local governments may be included only with the concurrence of such governments. Before any Federal land within the area designated should be transferred to the Department of the Interior for administration as part of the park, the Federal department or agency having administration over such land shall agree in advance to such transfer, and

(c) to make appropriate arrangements with State and local governments, and with private persons, for the continuation of national park activities on adjacent lands which are similar in character to national park lands, and

(d) to provide, by mutual agreement with State and local governments, fully integrated interpretive services to assist visitors to the Ice Age National Park to understand and appreciate the national significance of the most important glacial and related phenomena, and

(e) to encourage efforts by private organizations, such as the Ice Age Park and Trail Foundation, a Wisconsin nonprofit corporation, by assistance in route marking and by providing trail-side installations for public information at points of scientific interest, to provide a trail extending through the areas described in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 2. AREA OF ICE AGE NATIONAL PARK.—The Ice Age National Park shall comprise, subject to mutually acceptable agreements by the National Park Service and State and local governmental authorities, the following:

(a) EASTERN.—Portions of the Kettle Moraine State Forest in Fond du Lac, Sheboygan, Washington, Waukesha, Jefferson and Walworth Counties, Wisconsin.

(b) CENTRAL.—Portions of Devils' Lake State Park in Sauk County, and nearby areas in Sauk, Columbia, Dane and Marquette (including the John Muir Birthplace County Park) Counties, Wisconsin.

(c) NORTHWESTERN.—Portions of Interstate Park in Polk County, Wisconsin, and Chesago County, Minnesota, and nearby areas.

(d) CONNECTING AREAS.—Areas in Rock, Green, Columbia, Adams, Waushara, Portage, Waupaca, Marathon, Shawano, Langlade, Lincoln, Oneida, Price, Taylor, Rusk, Chippewa, Washburn, Sawyer, Barron, Dunn and St. Croix Counties, Wisconsin.

SEC. 3. WHEN ICE AGE NATIONAL PARK SHALL BE ESTABLISHED.—The Ice Age National Park shall be effectively established for purposes of administration when the Secretary of the Interior shall determine that sufficient lands or interests in lands have been made available, and satisfactory mutual arangements with State and local governmental authorities concluded, for effective administration as a national park. Notice of the establishment of the park shall be published in the Federal Register, and thereafter the Ice Age National Park shall be administered pursuant to the Act of August 25, 1916 (35 Stat. 535), as amended.

ADDITIONAL FOREIGN AID

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, President Kennedy's foreign aid bill.

The President's principal message on foreign aid was sent to the Congress on March 22, 1961, and has been printed as House Document No. 117. Yesterday President Kennedy, in his address to the Congress on urgent national needs, gave his reasons for adding to the sums previously requested. The President this morning has transmitted to the Congress draft legislation to carry out the new programs whose principles he has previously explained and justified. I am informed that the details of the programs—the facts, figures and precise justifications—will not be available to the committees of Congress until sometime next week.

Since the bill which I am introducing has been received only this morning, I have not had a chance to study it. I therefore reserve my right to oppose any part of it, but, of course, I shall support the President in this major effort to put greater vitality and wisdom into the oversea assistance programs of the United States.

It is my expectation that the committee will begin hearings next Wednesday, May 31, and that the first witness will be the Secretary of State.

We will then proceed during the following week—the week of June 5—to hear other executive branch witnesses. It is my hope that we may be able to receive testimony of public witnesses the week of June 12.

Mr. President, I invite Senators who are interested in the subject to attend the meeting on next Wednesday, when the Secretary of State will be present. The committee will welcome their presence so that they may hear the presentation of the administration's views.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a letter dated May 26, 1961, from President Kennedy to Vice President JOHNSON relating to this subject.

There being no objection the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 26, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for consideration by the Congress is a draft of a bill which would carry out the principal recommendations set forth in my message on foreign aid of March 22, 1961.

The legislation is drafted to provide for aid to social and economic development under an Act for International Development and to provide for military assistance under an International Peace and Security Act. It is designed to provide the concepts, the means, and the organization for programs of foreign aid attuned to the needs of the decade ahead.

The Act for International Development seeks authorization for appropriations of $1.690 billion for four major purposes:

(a) To assist and support nations whose independence or stability depends upon such help and is important to our own security;

(b) To provide for our share in certain programs under multilateral auspices;

(c) To provide grant assistance to less-developed countries primarily to assist in the development of their human resources; and

(d) To establish a Presidential Contingency Fund to meet the unpredictable exigencies with which we will doubtless be confronted during the forthcoming year.

The Act for International Development also seeks authorization by the Congress to make loans, repayable in U.S. dollars, to promote the economic development of less-developed countries and areas with emphasis upon long-term plans and programs designed to develop economic resources and increase productive capacities. For this purpose I am asking the Congress for long-term authority in the form of public debt transactions which would make available for this purpose $900 million in fiscal year 1962 and $1.6 billion in each of the following 4 years. Additionally, repayments of previous foreign loans of about $300 million annually would be made available for development lending. Authority to make firm long-term commitments is of paramount importance. Real progress in economic development cannot be achieved by annual short-term dispensations of aid and uncertainty as to future intentions. To make investments in economic development more effective, the terms and conditions of the investment should be related to the establishment of sound long-term development plans and the achievement of specific targets. While the methods proposed represent a departure from previous patterns in economic aid programs, they conform to the traditional techniques of numerous other governmental operations. These methods are essential to our new approach to development assistance and to the effectiveness of that approach.

The International Peace and Security Act will continue the program of military assistance which constitutes an integral part of our whole security and defense posture. It is essential that this program be maintained and continued in the present international climate. Appropriations will be sought to provide for the U.S. share of maintaining forces that already exist, to complete undertakings initiated in earlier years, to give increased emphasis to internal security, and to provide for a limited and selected modernization of forces in areas under particular duress. I envisage a continuous review and assessment of the needs for military assistance around the world and continuing discussions with our allies and associated nations to determine the extent to which expenditures for defense can safely be lessened. Such adjustments necessarily may not be accomplished overnight, and, in any case, neither we nor our allies can afford a relaxation in the maintenance of an effective collective deterrent to armed aggression. The increasing problems of internal security with which we are confronted reflect an expanded utilization of the technique of indirect subversion which demands new and more vigorous countermeasures if the spread of international communism is to be prevented. Assisting developing countries to create and maintain an environment of security and stability is essential to their more rapid social, economic, and political progress.

The achievement of our goals requires effective organizational arrangements to execute these programs. In this regard, section 604 of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 placed two requirements upon the President: (1) To have a study made of the functions of, and the degree of coordination among, agencies engaged in foreign economic activities, with a view to providing the most effective means for the formulation and implementation of U.S. foreign economic policies and (2) to include in his presentation of the fiscal year 1962 mutual security program to the Congress his findings and recommendations resulting from that study.

To fulfill the first requirement, at the request of the President the Bureau of the Budget conducted a study of the existing situation and prepared a descriptive and analytical staff report. That report and the results of studies initiated by this administration have been available to executive branch officials concerned with foreign economic affairs. The recommendations which follow constitute my response to the second requirement.

My decisions on foreign affairs organization are predicated on the following principles:

First. Authority for the conduct of activities which advance our foreign policy objectives should be vested in the President or other officials primarily concerned with foreign affairs.

Second. International activities of domestic agencies should be clearly either (i) necessary extensions of their normal domestic missions or (ii) undertaken on behalf of and in support of programs and objectives of the appropriate foreign affairs agencies.

These guidelines are particularly important for our foreign development assistance program. Domestic agencies can and should make a substantial contribution to the success of this program, and I will expect the foreign affairs agencies to make maximum use of their resources, skills, and experience.

My proposals for the organization and coordination of foreign aid are based also on the concepts and principles set forth in my March 22 message to the Congress—specifically, the critical necessity for unified administration and operation of foreign development assistance activities carried out in accordance with integrated country plans. These proposals will be put into effect by appropriate executive action.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Responsibility and authority for the formulation and execution of the foreign development aid programs will be assigned to a single agency—the Agency for International Development—within the Department of State. It will replace the International Cooperation Administration and the Development Loan Fund, which will be abolished. The new Agency, AID, will be headed by an Administrator of Under Secretary rank reporting directly to the Secretary of State and the President. The internal organization of AID will be geographically focused to give operational meaning to the country plan concept. Thus, the line authority will run from the Administrator to the Assistant Administrators heading four regional bureaus and, through the Ambassadors, to the Chiefs of AID missions overseas. The four Assistant Administrators will be equal in rank to the geographical Assistant Secretaries of State and will work closely with them.

The proposed rank of the AID Administrator and the relationship between AID and other elements of the Department of State highlight a fundamental fact: Economic development assistance can no longer be subordinated to, or viewed simply as a convenient tool for meeting, short-run political objectives. This is a situation we can ill afford when long-range, self-sustained economic growth of less-developed nations is our goal. Development assistance, therefore, must—and shall—take its place as a full partner in the complex of foreign policy.

The new agency will develop the full potential of the use of agricultural commodities as an instrument of development assistance. The Department of Agriculture will continue its active role in respect to commodity availability, the disposal of surplus stocks, international marketing, and the relationship of domestic agricultural

production to world food needs. In view of the interrelationship of domestic agricultural products and their use for foreign policy purposes, I shall rely on the Director of the food-for-peace program, Mr. George McGovern, to advise me in the formulation of policies for the constructive use of our agricultural abundance as well as to assist in the overall coordination of the program.

The Peace Corps, too, has a special significance in our international development efforts. It will continue as an agency within the Department of State, and its Director will have the rank of Assistant Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will establish arrangements to assure that Peace Corps activities are consistent and compatible with the country development assistance plans. These arrangements will assure that the Peace Corps activities and AID programs are brought into close relation and at the same time preserve the separate identity and the unique role and mission of the Peace Corps.

The principal assignments of authority for the administration of military assistance are satisfactory and will remain unchanged. The Department of Defense has operational responsibility for approved programs. In recognition of the fact that military assistance should clearly serve the foreign policy objectives and commitments of the United States, the Secretary of State provides continuous supervision and general direction of the program, including the determination as to whether there should be a program for a country and the value of that program.

TRADE, AID, AND FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

The self-help efforts of less-developed nations, together with coordinated external assistance from economically advanced nations, must be coupled with a constructive approach in dealing with international commodity problems and barriers to international trade. Each of these approaches is needed if the goals of economic growth and stability are to be reached.

The relationship of trade, aid, and other aspects of foreign economic policies involve the interests of many agencies of Government, particularly when both foreign and domestic economic considerations are an issue. It is, therefore, essential that interagency consultation and coordination be as meaningful and productive as possible and that the Secretary of State become the focal point of responsibility for the coordination of foreign economic policies. With these requirements in mind, I abolished the Council on Foreign Economic Policy, which had been chaired by a special assistant to the President. I have assigned the functions of the Council to the Secretary of State. I shall expect him—in facilitating executive branch coordination—to choose whatever mechanisms he finds appropriate, including the formation of interagency working groups. This assignment will strengthen the affirmative leadership role of the Secretary of State in the development and integration of foreign economic policies. I have every confidence that the views of agencies concerned will be brought to bear on such matters early and fully.

ROLE OF CHIEFS OF U.S. DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS

The Ambassador, as representative of the President and acting on his behalf, bears ultimate responsibility for activities of the United States in the country to which he is accredited. His authority will be commensurate with his major responsibilities. Presidential action has already been taken to strengthen the role of our Ambassadors, and further executive action is being undertaken to clarify their responsibility and authority.

In light of the above recommendations and in the earnest hope and expectation that the United States will meet its challenges and responsibilities in this decade of development in a forthright, affirmative manner which can engender the respect and cooperation of the community of free nations, I urge the early consideration and enactment of this legislative proposal.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1983) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION, RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment relating to the election of President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution, together with a statement in connection with it, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 96) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. ERVIN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The Executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution.

"The electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The places and manner of holding such election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may by law make or alter such regulations. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.

"Within forty-five days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President, and of all persons for whom votes were cast for Vice President, the number of votes for each, the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for Vice President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in any State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof for President as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President, and each person for whom votes were cast for Vice President in any State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof for Vice President as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for Vice President. In making the computation, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded.

"The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President, if such number is at least 40 per centum of the whole number of such electoral votes. If no person has at least 40 per centum of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those receiving electoral votes for President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. In choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number is at least 40 per centum of the whole number of such electoral votes; and if no person has at least 40 per centum of the whole number of electoral votes, then from the persons having the two highest numbers on the list of those receiving electoral votes for Vice President, the Senate shall choose the Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. No person constitutionally ineligible for the Office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an

amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

The statement presented by Mr. ERVIN is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

The proposed amendment is the same in substance as the so-called Lodge-Gossett amendment, which has been introduced in this Congress by Senator KEFAUVER (S.J. Res. 17), Senator DODD (S.J. Res. 4), and others, with the following exceptions:

1. Both the proposed amendment and the Lodge-Gossett amendment provide that voters in presidential elections in any State shall have the same qualifications as electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. In addition, the proposed amendment provides that the places and manner of holding the elections shall be determined in each State by the legislature thereof but the Congress may by law make or alter such regulations. This is identical with the provision contained in article I, section 4, of the Constitution with respect to elections of Senators and Representatives. The Lodge-Gossett amendment was silent on the matter of places and manner.

2. Under the Constitution (amendment XII) the House of Representatives elects a President where no candidate has a majority of the electoral votes. For this purpose the vote is taken by States, the delegation from each State having one vote, and a majority of the States being necessary to a choice. Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment where no candidate receives 40 percent of the electoral votes, the House and Senate acting jointly will elect the President. Each Member would have one vote and the election of the President would be by majority vote of the combined membership of the Senate and House.

The proposed amendment (although it changes the majority requirement to 40 percent) retains the present method of election of the President by the House of Representatives, with the vote being taken by States.

3. The Lodge-Gossett amendment likewise provides that where no candidate for Vice President receives 40 percent of the electoral votes, the House and Senate would elect the Vice President in the same way as provided for the President.

The proposed amendment would retain the present method of election by the Senate.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of May 23, and May 25, 1961, the names of Senators HART, PROXMIRE, DODD, CLARK, MORSE, GRUENING, KEFAUVER, CASE of New Jersey, BARTLETT, MUSKIE, LONG of Hawaii, and BURDICK were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1945) to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, to provide, in connection with the employment of workers from Mexico, protection for the employment opportunities of agricultural workers in the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MCCARTHY (for himself and other Senators) on May 23, 1961.

CAUTION AND DELIBERATION ON APPLICATIONS FOR APPROVAL OF RAILROAD MERGERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 19, 1961, the names of Senators Moss, YOUNG of North Dakota, MCCARTHY, BURDICK, BARTLETT, BIBLE, CARROLL, MCGEE, MCNAMARA, JACKSON, CHURCH, KEFAUVER, NEUBERGER, and CANNON were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 150) urging the Interstate Commerce Commission to act with extreme caution and full deliberation on applications for approval of railroad mergers in order to afford Congress time to review the problems arising from the railroad merger movement, submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and other Senators) on May 19, 1961.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON NEW FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the Committee on Foreign Relations will begin its hearings on the President's new foreign-aid program at 10 o'clock Wednesday morning, May 31, in room 4221, New Senate Office Building. Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, will be the committee's first witness.

Further scheduling of witnesses will be announced from time to time, including the dates to be set for those who will wish to testify in a public capacity.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal, northern district of California, vice Frank O. Bell.

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal, southern district of California, vice Robert W. Ware.

Joseph S. Ammerman, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney, western district of Pennsylvania, for a term of 4 years, vice Hubert I. Teitelbaum, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, June 2, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ZEBULON BAIRD VANCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on May 13, 1961, the Honorable Edwin Gill, State treasurer of North Carolina, delivered an address at the dedication of the Zebulon B. Vance birthplace on Reems Creek Road, near Weaverville, N.C. The address was on the subject "Zebulon Baird Vance—The Man." Zebulon B. Vance served with great distinction in this body as a Senator from the State of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ZEBULON BAIRD VANCE—THE MAN

(Address by Hon. Edwin Gill)

We are met here today to pay tribute to one of North Carolina's greatest sons who was born here 131 years ago. He was the most human of all our heroes, and, although he became legendary in his lifetime and assumed heroic proportions while he still walked the earth, the public image of his greatness has never obscured the man.

In this brief address, I would like for you to examine with me some of the characteristics of Zebulon Baird Vance, which endeared him to his contemporaries and which have captivated the imagination of generations since his death. As we review some of the highlights of his career and some of the facets of his personality, I know we will sense his rugged integrity, and that the nature of his greatness will become apparent.

To begin with, Zeb Vance suited the chaotic, swiftly changing times in which he lived. He did not need serenity. I suspect that he would have been quite at home in those tumultuous days when Luther and Calvin shook the world, or that he would have relished riding with either Cromwell or Washington. Many people are unable to make swift adjustments. Some are by nature happiest when things are tranquil and calm; but men like Vance appear to thrive in the midst of controversy and to have little difficulty in ordering their course in the hour of confusion and alarm.

Vance took pride in being called a rebel and reminded one and all that revolution was the ultimate reply to tyranny. In a famous address made in Boston to veterans of the Union Army in 1886, he took the traditional southern position that the South was not in rebellion; that Confederate soldiers were, therefore—in a legal sense—not rebels. He argued with force that the right to secede was reserved to the States at the time they entered the Union. But then he said: "Do not misunderstand me, I am not ashamed of the term 'rebel' in the connection with the part I bore in those events; neither are my people. I am simply pleading for historic, legal truth. The fair Goddess of Liberty was born of rebellion, and was baptized in the blood of rebels. It is the only remedy for wrong under absolute government; in all ages it has been the last hope of freedom."

Incidentally, in this Boston address, Vance charged Massachusetts with being one of the instigators of slave trade in America, and with reforming only after she had become wealthy by selling her human cargo to the South. He also charged that Massachusetts was one of the first States to advance the doctrine of secession—long before it was adopted in the South. Strange to say, these indictments were rather well received by the Yankee audience, the reason undoubtedly being that Vance laced his logic with wit and humor.

In this same address, in describing the hardships of war, he admitted that the South suffered from shortages of both food and clothing. In lighter vein, he pointed out that due to the scarcity of sugar and coffee, a substitute drink was made of parched rye, sweetened with sorghum molasses. "With a cheerful melancholy," he said, "this was spoken of as coffee, in deference to the

customs of antiquity." He made it clear, however, that during most of the war years, there was no shortage of alcoholic liquors. He said: "Corn whisky and apple brandy were both abundant and cheap. If any of my auditors happened to be in eastern North Carolina during that time he will doubtless have heartburning recollections of the apple brandy he found there." Toward the end of the war, however, Vance admitted that there was a shortage of grain for distillation, and that southern ingenuity devised alcoholic drinks made from a variety of produce—potatoes, rice, pumpkins, turnips and from domestic sugarcane called sorghum; brandy was made from persimmons. He declared that sorghum whisky was more terrible than "an army with banners."

To those who do not understand the times in which he lived, the career of Vance may be a bit bewildering. For instance, he ran for office as a Whig, and then as a Know-Nothing, and finally as a Democrat. One moment he was an ardent Union man opposed to secession, and the next he was a secessionist, pledging his loyalty to the Confederacy. And for those concerned with domestic affairs, it is of interest that Vance experienced no great difficulty in marrying first, a Presbyterian, and second, a Roman Catholic.

The truth of the matter is that Vance never made a fetish of consistency, nor was he a victim of petty prejudice. To him a political party was a means to an end, and he ultimately found in the Democratic Party an ideal instrumentality for the achievement of his great purpose. When Lincoln called for volunteers, in the tradition of Lee and many other great and good men, he knew in his heart that it was impossible for him to turn his sword against his native State. And Vance was a great lover, whether the object of his affection was a woman or his home State—and when did true love ever permit a matter of creed or political science to stand in its way?

In Vance we have an outgoing, generous, phlegmatic temperament, one that loved life and sought to be a part of it.

He was no Hamlet who debates with himself "to be or not to be." He seemed rather to rejoice in the part he was to play, going into battle with all his flags flying. Instead of whispering "to be or not to be," we hear his clear and resonant voice say, "I am."

To find the meaning of Vance's career, we must not only be aware of the chaotic times in which he lived, but of the man's towering integrity, of his loyalty to his deeply held convictions. He was throughout his entire life free from either cant or intolerance.

The people of North Carolina honored Vance more than any other man before or since. They sent him to the State legislature; they sent him to Congress; three times they elected him Governor; and four times they elected him to the U.S. Senate. But it was as Governor—war Governor—that Vance is best known and best remembered. For it was during the war years that he became associated forever with Lee and Jackson, with Beauregard and Jeb Stuart, with Pickett and Pettigrew, with all the Confederate host; it was during this fearful and bloody Civil War that Vance came closest to our people. It was during these tragic years that he took on the elements of greatness. It was as the leader of our people in that brave, gallant, and desperate hour that he assumed heroic proportions and became somewhat larger than life.

Surely no man has been Governor in more difficult and perilous times. When Vance took office, every port in North Carolina was in Union hands except Wilmington, and there was the daily threat of further invasion by Union soldiers based at New Bern.

In addition, there was wholesale resentment in North Carolina against the policy of conscription as adopted and practiced by the Richmond government, in connection with which there were a large number of desertions. Although Vance was loyal to the Confederate government, and supported the policy of conscription, when deserters were arrested and released upon the order of Chief Justice Pearson, Vance stoutly defended the action of the judiciary, and opposed the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus. He did not hesitate to exempt from conscription those persons he deemed necessary to the proper functioning of civil affairs. Vance emerged from this confused and unhappy state of affairs as an outstanding champion of civil authority in time of war. It was Vance's boast that the civil rights of his people were heard "above the sound of cannon fire."

As the war progressed, there were shortages of food, clothing, and materials of war, and it was then that Vance launched his brilliant adventure—the running of the blockade—by virtue of which the economic lifeblood of the Confederacy flowed through the port of Wilmington in exchange for our cotton. In after years, Vance took great pleasure in the success of this imaginative enterprise which was of such direct practical benefit to his own people and to the Confederate cause in general.

It has been charged by some that Zeb Vance never fully understood the overall strategy of the war as planned and executed by Jefferson Davis and Lee. In the perspective of history, it is obvious that Davis was trying desperately to weld the Southern States into an indissoluble union, and that the southern Governors, including Vance, in varying degrees, resisted these policies, looking upon the Confederacy rather as a loose combination of sovereign nations. Thus the Confederacy carried within it the seeds of its own disintegration, for it was upon the theory of States rights that the South withdrew and formed a new nation, and it was this same theory that furnished the basis of the southern Governors' opposition to the centralization of power in Richmond. If we admit that to some extent Vance did not envision the dire need for this concentration of power in order to achieve victory, we can only plead in extenuation his almost fanatical love and devotion to his own State and its people.

Vance was the greatest stump speaker that North Carolina has ever produced. With his ready wit and his intuition for audience reaction, he never failed to captivate. Since political rallies were attended almost entirely by men, much of his humor was racy and replete with jokes, many of which could hardly pass muster in the presence of ladies. Many of his best stories have been handed down in a sort of oral tradition, and it may be that with the passage of time polite society may tolerate their publication. However, I fear that his Rablaisian wit would lose a lot of its verve and gusto if reduced to the formality of the printed word. In this connection, I wish to say that, although Vance was in some respects as tender as a woman and a man whose sympathies were easily aroused, he was in every facet of his personality the most masculine of all our leaders.

He was not only physically robust, but was robust in his speech, which was redolent with the warm, hot breath of life, shot through with the dialect of the farm, the country store, and the rough and ready speech of soldiers. His pungent, colorful language won with ease the laughter and the approval of his people. It has been suggested that Vance, who was well schooled in the classics and knew how to speak with propriety and precision, often affected the language of ignorant, half-educated people. Well, what if he did? He loved them and he sought to use the language that they understood.

Let me say that the wit of Vance was not an idle, careless wit. His stories were carefully designed and directed to support the argument advanced, and we have ample evidence from the memoirs of contemporaries that his jokes usually hit the spot and accomplished their devastating effect.

As proof that Vance could speak with classic and literary accomplishment, we have his magnificent lecture "The Scattered Nation," which was an eloquent tribute to the trials and tribulations, the integrity and the courage, of the Jewish race.

In March 1864, Governor Vance visited with the North Carolina troops in the Army of northern Virginia, then in winter quarters. On this trip, he spoke on a number of occasions to our own troops as well as to thousands from other States, and we are told that Jeb Stuart was so fascinated with the Governor's message that he accompanied him on every day of his visit and heard every speech that he made. At the close of his visit, General Lee gave to Vance the supreme accolade by ordering a review in Vance's honor and in saying that the eloquence of the Governor of North Carolina was worth "50,000 men."

All of us owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Frontis W. Johnston of Davidson, who on December 4, 1953, read a paper to the State literary and historical association in Raleigh, telling of the courtship of Vance and his second wife, Mrs. Florence Steele Martin. Dr. Johnston's account of this love affair is based on an exchange of correspondence between Vance and Mrs. Martin; the language of these letters is in the romantic tradition of the 19th century; declarations of love are made with all the fervor of Victorian days.

These letters refer to a crisis precipitated by the fact that Mrs. Martin was a Roman Catholic and there were some of Vance's friends who thought his marriage to her would be a handicap in his political career. Others thought it preposterous for a man with leanings toward the Presbyterian faith to think of marrying a Roman Catholic. Vance weighed the issue carefully and consulted with friends and associates, and finally, after a "summit" conference with Cardinal Gibbons at Baltimore, brushed all objections aside and claimed Mrs. Martin for his bride. Dr. Johnston's article casts a brilliant shaft of light into the heart and mind of Vance, illuminating his very human and direct approach to life.

Zebulon B. Vance died 67 years ago, and his passing was genuinely mourned by all who knew him. National and State leaders were lavish in their praise and the people of North Carolina were not ashamed to show their grief. For Vance had identified himself with their joys and their sorrows; he had been their good companion in life and in death. He had shared the exaltation which comes with victory and had wept with them in the hour of defeat. Above all, his buoyant spirit had given them hope during the bitter aftermath of war. As the South arose from the bondage of reconstruction, Vance was in the vanguard leading North Carolinians on to a new and better life, bidding them to cherish always the heroism and the courage of the Confederacy, but at the same time urging them to give full allegiance to the Nation that was emerging united from the crucible of war.

There are those who feel that the climax of Vance's career came during the war years, and although he lived on to serve with distinction as Governor and as U.S. Senator, that everything that happened thereafter was anticlimax. With this view, I cannot agree. I am of the opinion that Vance rose to great heights of statesmanship as he endured with noble dignity the heartbreak and the sorrows of reconstruction, and then took the leadership in attempting to bind up the wounds of war, encouraging the younger

generations to eschew passion and prejudice, and to pledge wholeheartedly their allegiance to the Union. In a magnificent address entitled "The Duties of Defeat," delivered at our university in 1866, he said:

"The best test of the best heroism now is a cheerful and loyal submission to the powers and event established by our defeat and a ready obedience to the Constitution and laws of our country. Being denied the immortal distinction of dying for your country, as did your fathers and your elder brothers, you may yet rival their glory by living for it if you will live wisely, earnestly, and well.

"It is a noble thing to die for one's country; it is a higher and nobler thing to live for it."

You know, people felt an identity with this man Vance—with his faults and his virtues. They felt that they had contributed to his greatness, and that they had a right to share in his glory. They seemed to say with affection, "Vance is like us, only bigger."

In the language of the poet: "No man is an Iland—any mans death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankinde; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee." And so the people of North Carolina felt that a part of them died with Vance and that when the bell tolled for him, it tolled for all.

The process of canonizing our public heroes often dilutes their humanity and presents us with a man no more real than the marble or bronze that commemorates him. But in the case of Vance, there has been no canonization. He declines the halo and rejects the laurel wreath. He refuses to remain upon a pedestal. He still walks among us in spirit touching hands with our generation and inspiring us daily with his rugged honesty, his Spartan courage, and his buoyant, hopeful spirit.

VIEWS ON FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, apropos of the aid-to-education bill the Senate passed last night, there was published in the Pratt, Kans., Tribune of May 22 an editorial entitled "Resources Here." Because of the nature of the editorial and the matters set forth in it with reference to a typical Kansas town and community, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOURCES HERE

Pratt Board of Education members hit the nail right on the head during a discussion of Federal aid to education at a special meeting Saturday night.

The board, without a single exception, indicated that it feels we have the resources right here in Kansas to solve our education problems if we'll just do it.

The Federal aid discussion occurred when Board President Frank Smith asked the board for its help in filling out a questionnaire the president had received from the State school board association.

The Pratt board also indicated that it does not favor Federal aid for either building construction or teacher salaries and said it didn't feel the principle of Federal aid to schools was right.

If such aid is ever made available, the board members said they believe it should be administered by the State rather than the Federal Government. Opposition to a requirement that Federal aid be matched with local funds was also voiced although board members seemed to feel that if we had to have Federal aid such a practice might be helpful in preventing Kansans from having to pay in much more for Federal aid than they receive.

The board left little doubt about its feeling that it would be impossible for a local school district to use Federal money without being controlled by the Federal Government.

"We get some Federal aid now," one board member said. "Yes," replied another, "and there are controls on it."

Few will question but that something needs to be done about the Pratt school financial situation, but most persons still agree that it would be best for Kansas to try to solve their own problems before turning to the Federal Government.

PROPOSED MENOMINEE INDIAN LEGISLATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of realistic requirement for termination of Federal control over the American Indians is, I believe, a fundamental responsibility of the Congress. Unless this is done, we can expect that our Indians will face extremely difficult times ahead.

On April 30, 1961, Federal control was terminated over the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin. Prior to the termination, I joined the junior Senator from Wisconsin in a resolution to extend the time of the termination date.

At that time, it was my judgment, because of serious economic problems confronting the tribe that it would have been not only in the best interest of the Indians but the people of Wisconsin and the country, to extend Federal control until there was a solid foundation for termination.

Unfortunately, this was not done. Now, we find ourselves faced with the need of doing whatever we can to help resolve the inherent problems in this situation.

On May 9, the House of Representatives passed a bill, H.R. 4130, now on the calendar. The purpose of the bill is to furnish a moderate amount of assistance to the Menominee Tribe during the first years after termination of Federal supervision. Essentially, the bill would include:

First. Approval of a loan of $2.5 million at interest rates approximately equal to the cost of the Government borrowing the money—for expanding and modernizing tribal enterprises.

Second. Continuation of health, education, and welfare services; with an orderly system of reduction of such services until finally cut off in 1967.

Recently, also the Senate Appropriations Committee reported the bill S. 870 now on the calendar. The measure as enacted would provide less assistance to the Menominee Tribe. This would be at a substantially lower level than the measure adopted by the House of Representatives. Basically, it would provide:

First. A loan of $1.5 million for expansion and modernization of business operations and for development of travel resources.

Second. Funds for construction of sanitation facilities not to exceed $438,000.

The total amount provided by the Senate version, then, would authorize amounts not to exceed $1,938,000. By comparison the House measure would authorize an amount not to exceed $4,612,000.

During the hearings by both the Senate and House Interior Committees the testimony demonstrated that the economic resources of the tribe are definitely not adequate—by any stretch of the imagination—to meet the great demands that will be put upon them.

Even by adoption of the more liberal House bill—which I believe should be done—the Menominees will be hard put to meet their obligations.

According to termination plans, the tribe has faithfully attempted to set up machinery to handle their own affairs and to properly integrate into the social-political-economic system of Wisconsin and the country.

To accommodate the new status of the tribe the State of Wisconsin has created a 72d county.

The Congress, I believe, has a great responsibility in this matter—this is particularly true in view of the fact that it has insisted on earlier termination of Federal control over the tribe than we—members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation—or the Indians themselves, deemed advisable. Consequently we should—in my judgment—at least provide moderate assistance to enable the tribe to have an opportunity for economic security and progress.

For this purpose the House bill, H.R. 4130, affords the best opportunity.

I respectfully urge that the Senate adopt this bill.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF ESTABLISHMENT OF INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I offer my best wishes today to the Armenian-American citizens of the United States on the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the independent Republic of Armenia.

After many years of foreign domination, this Republic was established in 1917 to represent the legitimate aspirations of the free Armenian people. It became, unfortunately, within 2 years of its founding, a victim of one of the earliest acts of Soviet aggression against a free state when the Communists took over in December 1920.

A few months later the Armenians arose and threw the Communists out of the country and reestablished their Republic. This unique and successful revolution was wasted, however, when the free world was unable to support the Armenians and the Communists reinvaded the country to reestablish their domination of it. There rule has continued unbroken to this day.

In this country, the Armenians have made a substantial contribution to our culture and history. Their contributions to all aspects of civilization have received recognition in recent years in my own State of Massachusetts at Harvard University. There, a chair of Armenian studies has been established from the contributions of Armenian-Americans in all parts of the country.

Through the efforts of the National Association for Armenian Studies and Research, the university library's Armenian collection has been increased by nearly 3,000 volumes and periodicals, plans have been initiated for a World Congress on Armenian Studies and Seminars, discussions and courses have been sponsored in all parts of the country.

With the establishment of this chair of Armenian studies a comprehensive program of research in the history and culture of the Armenian people has been initiated. I feel this program will give well-deserved recognition to these people to whom our country owes so much.

I would like my colleagues to join me in extending my best wishes to the Armenian-American citizens of the United States and hope that their country will some day again regain the liberty which it so justly deserves.

THE PROPOSED NEW FARM PROGRAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a recent statement by Secretary of Agriculture Freeman to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry gives a clear and able explanation of the farm bill currently proposed by the administration.

In view of the interest in this program, the Secretary's statement might well serve as basic reading and reference on the nature of today's farm problems.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement of Secretary Freeman presented May 3 last to the Agriculture and Forestry Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, ORVILLE L. FREEMAN, ON THE AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1961, S. 1643, BEFORE THE SENATE AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY COMMITTEE, WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1961

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of this committee for the prompt scheduling of this hearing, and I should like to open the discussion of this legislation by emphasizing its urgency and its importance.

For many years you, as members of this committee, and farmers throughout the Nation have sought an answer to the farm problem. With each delay in arriving at a solution the problem becomes more difficult. I wish to state frankly that I believe our time is running out.

We can neither ask nor expect an indefinite continuation of programs and policies under which the U.S. Government pays ever-increasing amounts for stockpiles of commodities that threaten to become ever more unmanageable. Nor can we either ask or expect that the American farmer shall continue to invest his capital, his labor, his skill, and his management ability for a material reward that is not only shockingly below the national average but substantially below any accepted American standard for a minimum wage. We can no longer fail to turn the technological and scientific advance that has helped our farmers to achieve phenomenal productive success to its maximum advantage in the interest of national economic growth, prosperity, and security.

Failure to arrive at a sound and effective solution of the farm problem is now more serious than simply a postponement of the gains that we expect from a new and better program. Delay or postponement now could have disastrous results.

Farmers today constitute a shrinking minority in our population and their representation in the Congress is shrinking accordingly. If we do not, this year, arrive at a satisfactory farm program we may, in fact, pass the point of no return, beyond which we could expect only economic disaster for the farmer, and a blight on our entire economy.

Consider, for a moment, the potential consequences of our failure to enact an effective farm program. Farmers could use their tremendously increased productive capacity indiscriminately. In that event, if support programs were continued, the burden on the Federal budget would become intolerable, and the stockpiles of surplus completely unmanageable. Or—and more likely—the public would refuse to continue such supports, and prices and incomes would be driven down so low that results could be catastrophic. Millions of farmers, their incomes depressed below subsistence level, would swell the ranks of the unemployed, would crowd already crowded areas of our cities, seeking jobs. And many of them would be neither trained for jobs nor adjusted to city life. The economic problem would be complicated by the social problem.

This is not all. I should like to point out here how such a development would in the end be likely to add higher consumer food prices to its unfortunate results. Further decline in income for the family farm could lead to a corporate type agriculture controlled by outside capital. Hired labor would increasingly replace work done by the farm operator, and the costs of management, supervision and labor would go up. For one of the major reasons why the American family farm has become the most efficient agricultural producer in history is that the owner operator is on hand to do the work and to supervise the work. Neither collective farms nor large corporate landowners are able to match the efficiency that results.

If low incomes squeeze out all but a few corporate type farms, there would doubtless result the kind of supply control that would result in high prices, without regard for the public interest, or the consumer interest, or interest in our programs to expand the use of food abroad in the interest of peace and economic progress.

We deplore the collectivization of farms in a part of the world, and we seek to encourage land reform in those other areas where huge landholdings have—like the Communist collective farms—proved so inferior to our family farm economy. How ironic it would be if we allowed that family farm economy, that has proved its superiority socially as well as economically, to be destroyed for want of the tools it needs to meet conditions of today.

The family farm in this Nation has reached a pinnacle of success in its primary function, the production of an abundance of food and fiber to meet human needs. It has made this abundance available to the consumers of this Nation at a lower real cost than ever before in history. The consumer now spends about 20 percent of his disposable personal income for food, as compared with more than a fourth in 1947 (see charts 6, 7, and 8). The consumer in America works fewer hours to feed himself and his family than in any other country.

The American public should pay tribute to the farmer for this contribution to our standard of living. Even Khrushchev pays that tribute. A little over 2 weeks ago he was quoted as saying that the Soviet triumph in space "must not detract the attention of the Soviet people from other targets, and these include catching up with the United States in the standard of living."

It is essential that we sustain the kind of agricultural productivity that is the basis of this standard of living.

A. THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1961

In presenting the Agricultural Act of 1961 we view agriculture as an important part of our entire national economy and of our efforts toward national security. In recognition of this principle we have tried to incorporate in this bill several different program areas, all of which are in the interest of both better incomes for farmers and a greater utilization of our agricultural abundance to contribute to the national well-being.

One part of this bill is directed toward greater consumption of farm products—toward expanding our exports and improving our programs to meet human needs and promote economic development in the emerging nations. This is an essential part of our program to adjust our agricultural abundance to meet the needs and conditions of our times. We need to expand our exports as well as our efforts to provide an adequate nutritional base for all Americans. Thus we have included increased appropriations for the special milk program as well as an extension and improvement of Public Law 480. This expanded utilization of farm products must be taken into account in our plans for adjusting production to the quantities and kinds of agricultural products that we can use.

Another part of the bill relates to agricultural credit, and is directed toward enabling all our family farmers to benefit from the improvements contemplated in the farm program, to strengthen the position of family farmers, and to enable them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth.

Still another part emphasizes the assurance that farmers' cooperatives will have the legal protection they need to grow and prosper in our modern economy, and by that growth to enable them to make a greater contribution to the economic well-being of their members. Another extends the Wool Act for a period of 3 years.

The longest portion of the bill, title I, relates to supply adjustments and price stabilization. It provides the procedures and the machinery whereby farmers can work together, in cooperation with Government, to adjust their production to modern needs and conditions; and thereby to achieve for themselves fair incomes, as they make available to consumers adequate supplies at fair prices.

We believe that all these program areas should be treated together, as they are in this bill, for the failure to act affirmatively in any one of these areas is to cut away one important support for the total program for agriculture.

B. URGENT IMPORTANCE OF THIS LEGISLATION

I should like to present the urgent importance of this legislation from several points of view: (1) In the interest of a healthy national economy; (2) in the interest of higher farm incomes; (3) because of the impact of the technological revolution in agriculture; and (4) in the interest of both taxpayers and consumers.

1. This legislation is urgent in the interest of a healthy national economy

It should be self-evident that a stable, prosperous, and growing agricultural economy is absolutely essential to a stable, prosperous, and growing national economy. But, since this fact is not adequately recognized, I should like to review the contributions that a healthy agriculture can make to a healthy nation.

Agriculture provides a basic market for nonfarm goods and services, and there is not an industry or a person in the United States who is not touched in some way by what happens in agriculture. A survey some 5 years ago showed that farmers and their families represented a market for $40 billion of purchases from the economy. When farmers are prosperous the industries which service them benefit, and the workers employed in these industries benefit. On the other hand, disadvantaged agriculture means disadvantaged industry and unemployment. For example, farmers spend some $2½ to $3 billion annually for tractors, motor vehicles, and farm machinery. But agriculture hasn't grown in recent years, and we all know that there is distressing unemployment in our key centers of the automobile industry today.

I could recite many facts on how important agriculture and our farm people are to our everyday economic activities: that farmers consume 320 million pounds of rubber, about 9 percent of the total amount of rubber used in the United States; that farmers purchase products involving 6½ million tons of finished steel; that farmers buy 45 million tons of chemical materials; that farmers buy 18 billion gallons of petroleum, more than is used by any other single industry; that farmers use more kilowatt-hours of electricity than are used by Chicago, Detroit, Baltimore, and Houston combined.

The point I am making is that when agriculture hurts, a lot of other people hurt, whether they live and work in the small rural communities or in the big manufacturing centers far removed from the farm production line.

The farm problem is closely related to the problem of unemployment. Workers released from agriculture by technological advances have not been able to find suitable employment in the nonfarm sector, and there has been a damming up of labor with the consequent underemployment in agriculture. The low gross returns received by agricultural producers have seriously curtailed the market for machinery and equipment, lumber and construction supplies, and for operating items such as gasoline, fertilizer, and pesticides. And finally, the low and inadequate net incomes earned by farm families have restricted the market for consumer durables and convenience goods, and thus placed a brake upon the full production of these goods and services in the nonfarm sector.

A sound and prosperous agriculture is therefore essential to maximum overall economic development. We believe that the passage of the legislation here proposed, by bringing about opportunity for increased farm incomes, will make a significant contribution to the achievement in the United States of an adequate rate of economic growth.

2. This legislation is urgently needed to reverse the decline in farm income

The decline in farm income in recent years need not be spelled out for members of this committee. You are well aware of the facts. But I assure you that it needs to be presented to others. Nothing has impressed me more, during my 3 months in this office, than the extent to which the nonfarm public is unaware of the critically low level of farm income. Emphasis on surplus and subsidy has clouded the true facts.

The annual per capita income of farm people averaged $986 in 1960—only 43 percent of the average of $2,282 received by the nonfarm population. This is a substantial drop from the 1947–49 period, in which the per capita annual income of farm people was about 58 percent of the per capita nonfarm income. Thus, the disparity in income has been increasing, at the expense of the producers of our most essential human needs, at the expense of those whose productive efficiency has made us the best fed people in the world.

The charts that you find at the conclusion of this testimony help to illustrate the decline in farm income in comparison to that of the rest of the population.

Income declines over the past decade have not been the same for all classes of farms. But net income in 1960 of representative commercial poultry farms in New Jersey, of representative wheat-fallow farms in the Pacific Northwest, of representative wheat-small grain-livestock farms in the northern plains, and representative cash grain farms in the Corn Belt, all were down to between 20 and 30 percent below the 1947–49 level.

All income data indicate that farm incomes have declined in absolute terms during the 1950's, as other incomes were rising. Thus, in comparison with nonfarm incomes, the comparative position of farm incomes has worsened steadily. These declines have occurred even with the farm programs that have been in force. They are not going to improve by talking and wishing. They are going to improve only as we take positive action to raise them.

3. This legislation is essential because the technological explosion in agriculture necessitates the adjustment of supply to quantities we can use

The magnitude of the technological revolution in agriculture is too little recognized. Its consequences—for the present and for the future—are not sufficiently realized or understood.

Agricultural efficiency and productivity have advanced so rapidly during the past decade that agriculture has tripled its output per hour of labor while industry's output has only doubled. During the 1950's alone farm output increased by 28 percent while population increased only 19 percent. This increase in output has been accomplished with the use of only 2 percent more resources than were used 10 years ago. The composition of these resources has changed sharply, with about one third less labor, and 6 percent less cropland. But the use of machinery, fertilizers, pesticides, and other purchased inputs has risen sharply. Overall efficiency, in terms of output per unit of input, has gone up by 25 percent.

This technological revolution in agriculture has only just begun. Only a few of our farmers are using all of the new technology to best advantage. If all farm production in 1975 were to be carried on with only the best techniques in use in the late 1950's, not all of the cropland now in use would be needed for food and fiber production for our increased population.

Agricultural productivity can be expected to increase at an accelerated rate. Research in farm production is more extensive and more productive than ever before, and will add tremendously to our production potential in the next few years. Thus we will see a growing capacity for excess agricultural production. This capacity to produce should be fostered, but it must also be directed in the interest of both farmers and the public.

We hope to increase our utilization of agricultural products both at home and abroad. But we know that in the years immediately ahead we cannot increase their consumption enough to absorb the increasing productive capacity of our farms.

It is an economic fact that it takes only a little too much in the way of production of food to result in a sharp drop in farm prices, and hence to a farm income problem. Likewise, only a little too little in the way of food supplies leads to skyrocketing food prices and a real income squeeze on consumers, the food problem so often encountered in wartime. This is because of the inelasticity of the human stomach and the consequent inelasticity of the demand for food. The average consumer does not increase his food consumption when food prices decline, and thus blunt the price decline. Nor does he stop eating when food prices rise, and thus moderate the price rise. The average consumer goes right along eating about the same quantities of foods, and this leads to problems.

To cope with these problems in the past, we have imposed price ceilings in wartime, and placed supports or floors under farm prices during periods of surplus. But neither of these measures in themselves effectively corrects the imbalance of supplies relative to the existing demand.

Nor can the uncoordinated efforts of several million farm producers effectively correct unbalanced supply situations. The inescapable conclusion, it seems to me, is that the technological advance in agriculture demands that we provide a framework whereby these farmers may coordinate their efforts, in cooperation with Government, to adjust production to quantities we can use.

4. This legislation is urgent in the interest of taxpayers and consumers

We have heard much about the cost to the taxpayer of existing farm programs. Government costs of carrying and handling commodity stocks, including storage, transportation, and interest, have risen from $238 million in fiscal 1953 to $1 billion in the current fiscal year. The CCC investment in price support at the end of this fiscal year will be about $8.5 billion. The cost of storage is thus an immediate and pressing burden.

I believe the American taxpayer wants a food reserve sufficient to meet any possible emergency, and is willing to pay the cost of maintaining such a reserve. The American consumer does not like any prospect of food shortages that might result from an emergency, nor the sharp price increases that come with even small shortages. But the stocks now in storage, particularly in wheat and feed grains, are far in excess of those needed for an adequate reserve. As long as they exist they pose a threat to markets and to price stability, and they threaten to extend their depressing influence beyond these commodities to affect the livestock industry as well.

We cannot reduce stocks as long as the supplies that come out of inventories are more than replaced from excess current production. Each recent year has added an average of 7 million tons of feed grains to stocks. Annual additions of wheat have been about 130 million bushels. We cannot expect to reduce CCC inventories until we have legislation and programs that will effectively adjust production below total annual needs.

This is a major goal of legislation here proposed. As the programs contemplated in this bill get underway, there should be a gradual decrease in the cost of surplus storage now borne by the taxpayer.

It may be in order to note, at this point, that since the bill provides instrumentalities by which supply adjustment programs can be put into effect, but provides no such programs in itself, it is not possible to estimate how great the savings would be—this would depend entirely on how adjustment programs would get underway. Consequently, with the exception of those parts of the bill dealing with the extension of the Wool Act, the special milk program, and the food for peace program, it is impossible for either proponents or opponents to present any valid estimates of costs. It is in order to point out, however, that to the extent that programs for supply adjustment get underway under this bill, to that extent the costs of storage would be reduced.

Paradoxical as it may seem, farm programs under which supplies can be adjusted to quantities that can be used, and under which farmers can use scientific and technological improvements most economically and effectively, can benefit both producer and consumer at the same time.

I have already pointed out how shortages affect the consumer, and how instability—with farm price and income gyrations that have resulted—has alternately hurt both the consumer and the producer. I have pointed out that the kind of corporate concentration in agriculture, that could result if we allow low incomes to squeeze out the family farm system, could result in the kind of supply control that would mean high prices without regard for the public interest. I urge you to examine the charts at the conclusion of this testimony to see how well the consumer has fared, and how little of the consumer's dollar goes to the farmer.

I want to point out one further factor. Low incomes accompanied by price fluctuations and price instability add substantially to the risk of farming, and risk always increases costs. Further, the uncertainties of economic ups and downs make for an inefficient use of the productive plant the farmer has, and which he must maintain whether prices are good or bad. This, too, increases costs.

This leads to a final point with regard to the technological explosion and its effect on both farmer and consumer. Only if we put into effect a program that succeeds in adjusting production to that which we can use and that at the same time provides a fair income for the farmer, only if we thus promote economic and price stability in agriculture, only then can continued technological improvements in production be expected to result in an eventual lowering of prices to consumers while maintaining farm incomes. Without such a program the farmer must pay the costs of risk, and of the inefficient use of his productive plant. Without it he must maintain greater financial liquidity than would otherwise be the case; he must pay more for credit; he is forced to use older and less efficient methods than he would otherwise use.

Supply adjustment programs that serve to reduce extreme and uncertain price fluctuations would reduce the costs borne by the farmer. They would mean a gain in production efficiency, and this in time would mean a reduction of the per unit cost of production. This would really set the stage for both the maintenance of farm incomes and an eventual orderly lowering of prices to consumers, consistent with the march of technological advance.

Further, if American farmers have some assurance of relatively favorable incomes in the 1960's, and if we provide sound means for adjusting our production to that which can be used, farmers will be able to make the best use of technological advances to develop a highly productive and flexible agricultural plant—one capable of responding to any foreseeable food production emergency. This is the kind of agriculture we want.

C. BASIC PRINCIPLES IN PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Having emphasized the urgency of this legislation, I should like to turn to comments on its basic principles. The Agriculture Act of 1961 seeks to accomplish essential goals by means that are, on the one hand, in line with American tradition, and, on the other, adapted to meet the conditions and demands of today.

1. The principle of adjusting abundance to current domestic and foreign needs is itself in the American tradition

This Nation, historically, has sought higher standards of living. It has sought to achieve plenty. In agriculture we have succeeded to a greater extent than in any other field. But we have never sought the waste—of both natural and human resources—that occurs when we produce what cannot be used. And so we seek, at one and the same time, in this legislation to increase our utilization of farm products both at home and abroad and to adjust our productive abundance to those increased quantities. We are realistic enough to recognize that, even with an expansion of programs for increased consumption to the greatest possible extent that is consistent with sound and humane ideas and policies, we will not be able, in the years immediately ahead, to expand consumption enough to absorb all of our potential agricultural productivity. Thus, we must adjust our abundance.

2. It is likewise in the American tradition to use our abundance to meet human needs at home and abroad, and to utilize our abundance as an instrument for peace and freedom in the world

The provisions in the proposed legislation relating to agricultural trade development will enable us to step up our programs for expanding the export of food and fiber, both for dollars and for foreign currency. They will enable us to make more effective use of our food for peace.

The request for a 5-year extension is the key recommendation to make Public Law 480 a more forceful instrument in U.S. foreign relations. A long-term extension will give notice that the United States is prepared to give greater assurance of a continuing supply of agricultural commodities needed by emerging nations. Many of these countries are striving to promote economic growth through ambitious, long-term plans. A five-year extension of Public Law 480 will permit the cooperation of U.S. agricultural export programs with these development plans. It will also be an integral part of our Nation's plans to establish a national food policy and develop a world food budget—thus assuring our contribution to the world problem of more adequately feeding hungry people. As we increase our efforts for expanded utilization, and as we develop means—in cooperation with other countries—for the more effective use of greater quantities of agricultural exports, these new and increasing demands on American agriculture will have to be taken into account in the formulation of our agricultural programs at home. This is why an extension and strengthening of our food for peace program is an integral part of the Agricultural Act of 1961.

On balance, Public Law 480 has been effective within the limitations of being administered as a temporary expedient. We foresee expanded operations both at home and abroad through the amendments we propose and through executive branch decisions to use existing authorities more forcefully. Although Public Law 480 programs will be administered aggresively, the Department will continue to emphasize the sale and export of commodities on a cash dollar basis. Regular commercial sales now constitute about 70 percent of our agricultural exports. It is our intention to increase these sales along with expanded efforts under Public Law 480 concessional programs.

It is nothing new for Americans to send abroad food and fiber to meet human needs. What is new is the magnitude and supreme importance of the task today. We propose expansion of these programs both because it is the human, the generous, the American, and the right thing to do and because it is essential to our own national interest and national security.

By sound and effective programs we can help emerging nations to develop and grow, in freedom rather than under communism. We can maximize the use, to this end, of our abundance in food and fiber—a weapon in which we have unquestioned superiority. In this respect we have a superiority that is far more important to men and women today than the race for space. To billions of men and women throughout this world, the higher standards of living that can be achieved if we properly use our capacity to produce are of more direct and personal concern than the discovery of other worlds. To men and women and children who are really hungry, bread and milk at hand are more important than a star in the sky.

3. It is in the American tradition to seek to raise the economic level of all segments in our society

It is in this tradition that provisions for agricultural credit are incorporated in this bill. A number of improvements in our supervised credit program are proposed, directed toward enabling all farmers to benefit from the improvements contemplated in the farm program, toward strengthening the position of the family farmers, and toward enabling them to make their maximum contribution to the Nation's economic growth.

Under the proposed program the Farmers Home Administration could serve the full range of family farmers, including young farmers with farm background and training who are just starting out. It could do a far better job of helping farmers reorganize their farming operations and otherwise meet farm credit needs that are currently neglected. The administration of supervised farm credit would be simplified and improved. Farm management assistance would continue to be provided along with the loans, so that borrowers could get the maximum assistance out of every dollar borrowed. The FHA would continue to serve only those farmers who are unable to obtain sufficient credit from cooperative and private sources, and the legislation would in fact encourage an even greater use of credit from those sources.

Broadly speaking, the legislation would provide credit for financing farm adjustments, for enlarging and improving family farms, for acquiring farms, for making better use of water resources, for minimizing the risks in farming, for improving living conditions, and for financing modern production practices.

These improvements are especially needed under today's conditions. The low farm incomes of recent years, plus the rapidly expanding agricultural technology, have brought about a sharp increase in the demand for credit. More than ever before farmers need to make full use of all their resources, and have access to such additional resources as they may need to keep their foothold on the land. The expansion of credit accompanied by farm management assistance is well suited to the needs of the times.

The proposed legislation will also permit many of the 76 percent of the farm families, with money incomes of less than $5,000, to develop higher incomes that will contribute materially to revitalizing the economy of their towns and villages. Almost half of our farm families had incomes less than $2,500 while more than half of nonfarm families had incomes more than $5,000. The proposed credit legislation will help these farm families to join in our national growth.

Supervised credit of the type that would be authorized by this legislation can help to make the Nation's family farms so strong and so enduring that the whole rural economy will be given new strength and vigor. New life would be brought to the hundreds of once prosperous rural communities that are today literally dying.

4. The principle of equality of economic opportunity is basic to our philosophy, and this is all we are asking for the American farmer

The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who now has available to him

no means by which he can adjust his production to demand, and who, therefore, has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

It is absurd, in any consideration of a farm program, to compare the farmer with the small corner merchant.

Perhaps there should be Government action for small business, but of a different nature for a different reason. But the farmer, as a basic producer and not a retailer, can be more accurately compared with other basic producers—such as, for example, the producers of steel. Government has given to such producers the instrument of incorporation, by which they can become large enough to effectively adjust their production to quantities that can be sold profitably.

Government has likewise given to labor the instrument of collective bargaining whereby millions of individual workers—who, as individuals, would be even more helpless than the farmers—can work together to achieve a fair return for their productive activity.

To achieve economic equality, therefore, we propose programs to provide farmers with the institutional machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs, and with democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. We would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interests in this process.

By enacting the proposed legislation the Congress would establish the ground rules and guidelines under which supply adjustment programs would be developed and placed into operation. Then, whenever action is needed with regard to any commodity or group of related commodities, a committee of producers—including one consumer representative—would be selected to consult with the Secretary of Agriculture to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity.

The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. Only after such a program had been approved by the President, sanctioned by the Congress, and approved by a two-thirds vote of the producers themselves, would it become binding upon all farmers who choose to produce that commodity. The farmers who serve on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.[1]

5. The procedures provided in this bill are based on the principles of responsible, representative democracy

In recognition of this principle: (a) the farmers would be given more really effective influence over their own enterprise; (b) the Secretary of Agriculture would be responsible for providing fair administration and sound technical assistance, and for insuring that programs developed for any commodity should take into account the well-being of every branch of agriculture as well as the public interest; and (c) the policymaking function of the Congress would be emphasized.

Under this legislation the Congress and the Agriculture Committees of the Congress would be able to devote more time and attention to their highest function—the consideration of broad programs and policies in their entire implications and the determination of such policies in the public and national interest. Many of the powers that the Congress has now granted to the Secretary of Agriculture—powers to fix support levels, prescribe acreage allotments, and others—would require final approval by the Congress. This would add to the responsibilities of the Agriculture Committees the function of careful review of such programs, many of which are now put into effect by order of the Secretary without such review.

Thus, while the Congress would be relieved of the onerous burden of a detailed analysis of a multitude of separate proposals, commodity by commodity, season after season, under countless and fragmented pressures, it would have increased opportunity to exercise its highest function of policy determination, and it would exercise the continuing and final authority to determine what programs shall become the law of the land.

6. This legislation emphasizes self-help and voluntary action

I believe that the farmer advisory committees provided for in the bill will have an opportunity to exercise genuine leadership and develop economic statesmanship. They will be chosen because, taken together, they represent every group, segment, and interest that should be heard in the discussion and formulation of commodity programs, and they will therefore consider the broader implications of the policies they recommend. Charged with the responsibility of considering the interests of the farmers they represent, and facing public scrutiny and examination and approval by the Congress, they will, I am confident, once again demonstrate—as Americans have so often demonstrated—that the people themselves have the ability to consider the interest of the people as a whole. I have had experience with citizen committees and voluntary action. I know that members of these committees will recognize that they can write their own ticket only where the ticket is in the public interest and acceptable to all concerned.

The proposed legislation further recognizes the principle of self-help in its authorization of the expansion of marketing orders and agreements, as one important means available to farmers for developing and adjusting their industry. Marketing orders are truly a self-help program in that they are producer initiated, producer administered and producer financed. And, since consumer interests are adequately protected, as required under the act, this self-help approach should be highly successful with respect to many commodities.

7. Although American agriculture itself has many varying interests that are affected by different and changing conditions, they are all part of an interdependent and interrelated problem that must be treated as a whole.

In recognition of this principle, the supply adjustment features of this bill are of necessity both inclusive and flexible.

They are inclusive in that the enabling provisions of the bill can be applied to all agricultural commodities, although they need not be applied to those commodities where conditions are satisfactory, and they will not be applied where any substantial number of producers object to such application.

In emphasizing the significance of this feature it is essential to remember that this bill does not establish programs, but rather provides guidelines and procedures under which programs can be formulated. It recognizes that many producers of many commodities are satisfied with programs and conditions that now prevail, but it also recognizes that these conditions may change, and these programs may not always be satisfactory.

Recent history has demonstrated the fact that farmers who might suffer seriously from changed conditions cannot count on prompt relief by way of new appeals to the Congress for each new problem. However ready the Agriculture Committees of Congress might be, and however great the concern might be on the part of those Members of the Congress who represent farm constituencies, experience in recent years has shown that the Congress as a whole is beset with so many grave problems, and subject to so many conflicting demands and pressures, that it cannot be asked or expected to respond to each new need of each commodity that might be in trouble. Therefore, in this legislation, it is important that Congress give guidelines and directions that can be used to develop new programs if and when the need arises—subject always to the check by the Agriculture Committees and the Congress itself as to whether these guidelines and directives are followed.

In order to be inclusive, this enabling legislation must also be flexible. It is impossible, for example, to write into law a detailed formula for determining the exact size and nature of a commodity advisory committee and expect such a formula to be fair with respect to all commodities. It is equally impossible to list, in the legislation, the appropriate farm organizations that should be asked to nominate producers for selection to such committees. Such matters will of necessity depend on the commodity concerned and the area involved. To spell out such details as these would impose a rigidity that could not keep up with a rapidly changing agriculture in a rapidly changing world.

Therefore the legislation here proposed imposes on the Secretary of Agriculture the responsibility of insuring a fair representation, on these advisory committees, of those who should be represented. This responsibility may be a difficult one, but it is the kind of responsibility with which the executive branch of Government must be—and has traditionally been—entrusted.

I believe that affirmative action by the Congress on the programs we present in the Agricultural Act of 1961 would set the stage and provide the tools by which:

1. The farmers of this Nation, in cooperation with Government, can achieve incomes comparable, in terms of labor and capital and management skills invested, to those received by other Americans;

2. A healthy and increasingly efficient and productive agriculture will continue to provide an abundance of food and fiber at fair prices to the consumers;

3. Better farm incomes and a sound farm economy will contribute to economic growth and national prosperity;

4. Cost of the Federal Government can be expected to decline as programs get underway and become effective; and

5. We can achieve maximum utilization of our abundance to meet needs and promote freedom at home and abroad.

I urge you to give this bill careful study and favorable consideration.

[1] The bill provides for special authority with regard to a 1-year program for the 1962 wheat crop. Because of the pressure of time we are asking for authority to name an advisory committee without using the regularly provided nominating procedures, and to submit a 1-year wheat program to a referendum of producers without prior congressional approval. This will enable us to get the new program in operation in time for the planting of the 1962 crop of wheat.

NATIONAL SECURITY AND THE DANGER OF INFLATION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, early last month, in effort to dispel some of the pessimism about our economic position being broadcast in certain quarters, I presented a few facts to the Senate about the increase in net purchasing power during recent years.

I ask unanimous consent that my short statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT GAIN IN PER CAPITA PURCHASING POWER OVER THE PAST 30 YEARS

(Statement by Senator STUART SYMINGTON)

Many statements have been made deploring the passing of the "good old days when the dollar was worth 100 cents."

Tears have been shed about how inflation has devastated the "savings of poor widows and orphans."

There have been some painful experiences. But the facts do not support those tragedies we hear so much about.

Let's take a brief look at the extent of inflation in the past 40 years.

For 1920, the Consumer Price Index was 85.7.

Forty years later, in 1960, the same index was 126.5; an average rise in consumer prices of 40.8 points—or 1 point per year.

It is true that a dollar of income in, say, 1930, would buy more than a dollar will today.

But the point so often overlooked is the number of additional dollars the average individual now has.

Today his quantity of dollar income is so much greater that he has far more net purchasing power than before, even though his dollar is worth less.

The statistics on this latter point are interesting. Let's look at the per capita income at various dates in the past and the per capita income in 1960; and then translate those incomes into uniform dollars.

The following table shows per capita disposable personal income (income after taxes) for various years—in the dollar value of that year (current dollars) and also in 1960 dollars:

Year	Current dollars	1960 dollars
1930	604	1,131
1935	458	1,039
1940	576	1,274
1945	1,075	1,669
1950	1,369	1,676
1955	1,660	1,822
1960	1,909	1,909

The above table shows that, on the average, every man, woman, and child in the United States had 74 percent more purchasing power in 1960 than the average individual had in 1930.

Although in the last 8 years of the past 30, the rate of increase was but 1½ percent, the average annual per capita purchasing power increase for those 30 years was 2½ percent.

This analysis is based upon statistical data contained in the 1961 Economic Report of the President. That report was released January 18, 1961.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Later an editorial in the Washington Daily News and its other affiliated newspapers totally misinterpreted what I said.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial of April 17 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERY MAN A KING

Some of our far-out or what-the-hell-type economists argue a little inflation won't do us any harm, so why worry about Government deficits?

Now Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, no economist but an ex-manufacturer, has gone clear off the deep end without, apparently, even holding his nose. He implies inflation is a good thing.

Certainly prices have gone up, he says, but everybody is earning more dollars, so what difference does it make?

Well, for instance, it makes a difference to—

The aged and all others living on savings or fixed incomes. They don't have any extra dollars, just the same old number, and inflation is a vicious and unfair tax on their savings.

The unemployed who are laid off because our high price levels have limited U.S. sales in highly competitive foreign markets.

The U.S. Treasury which is spending 12 cents out of each tax dollar for interest on the debt which is the accumulation of inflation-causing Federal deficits.

The manufacturer who built up reserve in old-fashioned dollars to replace old machinery and now finds these reserves by far inadequate.

It is true that inflation has been a good thing for some people, particularly, those with the credit and know-how to cash in on it, but others have had to pay. In the apt words of Carrol M. Shanks, president of Prudential Insurance Co., "Inflation means that the standard of living of some groups is being raised by depressing the standard of living of other groups."

Among the depressed are the old folks who can't pay their medical bills, who find their social security checks a mere pittance. Powerful unions have been able to stay even—except for their unemployed—by forcing wages up and up. Schoolteachers and other professionals haven't been able to do so well. Cross off inflation and Congress could go home. Swollen prices are a basic cause of every piece of "aid" legislation now under consideration.

If piling up more inflated dollars, through the Federal deficit route, would bring prosperity, then truly every man could be a king, by act of Congress, and the late Huey Long should be memorialized as one of our far-seeing statesmen.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the misinterpretation was so complete I was not surprised to receive a memorandum about said editorial from an outstanding economist.

I ask unanimous consent that this memorandum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ECONOMIST'S MEMORANDUM TO SENATOR SYMINGTON, APRIL 20, 1961

I was astonished to read the editorial in the Washington Daily News (Apr. 17, 1961). It is based upon a misreading of your Senate floor statement.

Having misread the statement, the editorial then expresses conclusions which are irrelevant; and in that respect, irresponsible.

No implication is involved in, and no inference can properly be drawn from, your statement that "inflation is a good thing." The editorial is totally inaccurate in that regard.

You said that there have been "painful experiences" from inflation; and the figures you cited present an inflation-caused decline in purchasing power per dollar of income.

You then show that, despite this inflation, the increased number of dollars per capita income has resulted in greater purchasing power, hence a higher average standard of living.

This does not justify, or excuse, or minimize inflation. It simply presents the facts.

There are also questionable observations in the editorial not directly related to your statement. For example, "Cross off inflation and Congress could go home" is a thoroughly ill-conceived comment.

Educational needs for a rapidly expanding population, defense requirements to meet a growing Communist menace, problems of agriculture and depressed areas, etc., are but a few of the areas in which the Congress has a responsibility, whether or not there is inflation.

So also does it have a responsibility in such matters as civil rights, social security, and preservation of competitive enterprise—to name a few more.

A newspaper is, of course, entitled to express its views; and we are entitled to expect a responsible newspaper to read and report a statement accurately.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, what I presented in these brief observations about relative trends in prices and real income in the American economy during the past 30 years was the fact that, despite rises in the cost of living, the increasing productive power of the American economy has resulted in heavy real income gains for the American people.

The particular data which I used for the purposes of this illustration, data not in dispute anywhere, show that in 1960, measured in uniform 1960 dollars, the per capita disposable income—income after taxes—in the United States was 74 percent higher than it was in 1930.

There was nothing whatever in what I said which could be interpreted to carry any such implication as that I implied "inflation is a good thing."

Let the record show that I have never favored inflation by word or by deed and have always recognized the injustices which inflation inflicts upon many individuals; and also the damage it does to the national economy.

The real wealth of a nation has to do with marshaling its manpower, technology, and skills, in both private and public life, so as to advance the production of goods and services. Then this production must be utilized wisely, in accord with the great priorities of our private and public needs.

Any nation which deliberately sacrifices these objectives to protect, at all costs, the value of its currency, is risking its existence; and that is especially true with the world as it is today.

Most inflation in this country has been due first, to war; and second, to reconversion from war.

During the four decades from 1922—the first normal year after World War I—through 1960, there was almost no net change in prices if the two wartime eras in this period are excluded; and only moderate increases in prices even if the great price collapse of the depression years—1929–1933—is also excluded.

Even when these four decades are viewed as a whole, without the exclusion of any years, the average annual increase in prices has been much lower than during the previous period—1891–1922. I start with 1891 because satisfactory price data are not available for earlier years.

This does not mean that we should not have done better in containing price inflation. But it does mean that there is no justification for expanding the inflation problem to the point where no other problem is of any real importance.

The great economic problem now confronting the United States is how to increase, in major fashion, during the years ahead, the very low rate of economic growth characteristic of recent years. In that manner we could overcome the huge idleness in manpower, plant, and other productive resources which have prevented us from fulfilling our domestic tasks and meeting adequately the worldwide challenge to our existence.

Today there is a grave paradox in our economy, namely, many millions unemployed at the same time we have unprecedented prosperity. This situation must be solved. It can never be solved, however, unless and until it is faced up to.

Note in this connection that during the 1955–60 period an excessive price inflation occurred, not because our economy was attempting to do too much, but because it was doing too little.

The editorial in question speaks of the damage which inflation has done to those among the aged who live on fixed incomes.

All of us recognize this damage; and all of us worry about it. In fair perspective, however, let us also note that three or four decades ago the Nation afforded older people no systematic protection whatever.

Today most of our aged are systematically assisted under nationwide systems; and since we cannot turn the price level backward, is it not more fruitful to work on the future practicalities of these social security systems than to resist possible improvement because of damage done by inflation in the past?

Those who believe that protecting the purchasing power of the dollar will by itself cure unemployment might remember that the purchasing power of the dollar was uniquely high during the great depression.

I share the concern about the amount of tax dollars required to serve the national debt.

But the great preponderance of this debt was created during wartime. and it would have done us no good to protect the dollar by allowing the Nazis to conquer the world; and it will do us no good to protect the dollar by allowing the Communists to conquer the world.

No matter what the value of our currency, we would prefer discussing it in terms of dollars than of rubles.

Again, one of the surest roads toward reducing the burden of interest costs on the national debt is expansion, through economic growth, of the real productive output of the American economy. In that manner the national debt becomes a smaller portion of our total national production and our total national income.

This editorial also asserted that inflation during the past 30 years has decreased the purchasing power of dollars available for investment purposes.

But just as, because of the gigantic increase in the building of real wealth, per capita income of the people has grown enormously since 1930, so the real purchasing power of the income available to investors has also grown enormously.

In summary, therefore, let us set this serious problem of inflation in proper overall perspective.

We should work to protect the value of the dollar by advancing the real wealth and productive power of the Nation and its people.

The domestic situation would seem to make such a policy desirable.

The international situation would seem to make it imperative.

BANKING MONOPOLIES

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have received a letter from the bank commissioner of the State of Maine, the honorable Carleton L. Bradbury, containing his comments with reference to House Joint Resolution 375. In accordance with Mr. Bradbury's interest in this legislation, I have referred his letter to Chairman WILLIS A. ROBERTSON of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee.

I ask unanimous consent to have Commissioner Bradbury's letter and the response to this letter from Chairman ROBERTSON printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF BANKS AND BANKING,
Augusta, Maine, May 9, 1961.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: In connection with House Joint Resolution 375, introduced by Representative PATMAN, which would invoke a moratorium on bank consolidations, mergers, and acquisitions, I thought you might be interested to know that the Maine Legislature now has before it a bill pertinent to that subject. Section 5 of H.P. 459, L.D. 659, "An act revising statutes regulating branching and consolidations by banks" reads in part as follows:

"SEC. 146–B. Banking monopolies, undue concentration of banking assets: No merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of deposit liabilities shall be approved by the commissioner which would promote a banking monopoly having an undue concentration of banking assets, unless approval is necessary or advisable in the public interest."

This proposed legislation was supported before the legislature by the department of banks and banking and by the legislative and bank commissioner's advisory committees of the Maine Bankers Association and the Savings Bank Association of Maine as an effective means of controlling undue concentrations of banking assets while, at the same time, permitting those consolidations considered to be in the public interest as measured by the standards prescribed by the legislature.

As you know, in Maine we are not faced with the problem of the concentrations of banking assets which can develop when banking giants in national financial centers consolidate. We are, on the other hand, faced with the continuing problem of promoting the maintenance of sound banking service of adequate range and quality in the many relatively small communities in which the bulk of Maine's population lives.

In numerous instances in recent years small banks serving such communities have found that a consolidation of facilities with other banks, often equally small, has provided the only practical means of meeting the service standards demanded of modern banking institutions. Furthermore, all available evidence points to a continuation of this trend among our smaller institutions. In all of these consolidations in Maine, save one, the public interest was served by a strengthening and improvement of banking services. In only one case was the possibility of complete discontinuance of service involved. As I understand Representative PATMAN'S proposal, the only authorized deviation from a strict moratorium is that which would prevent a bank from actually closing its doors.

Aside from the numerous problems involved in judging under what circumstances a small country bank might or might not close its doors, it would appear that on the basis of experience in Maine, considering our small banks and small communities, it is essential that these banks continue to have the opportunity to consolidate to keep banking service modern and adequate as well as to consolidate to prevent a complete discontinuation of service. The proposal before the Maine Legislature, while clearly recording that body's disfavor of banking monopolies, is not so inflexible as to prohibit consolidations of the type described above which are believed to have, on their record, clearly promoted the public interest.

I feel that the impact of Representative PATMAN'S blanket moratorium would have a substantial adverse effect on smaller banks in this State in circumstances such as I have described above. There may well be urgent problems posed by the consolidation of the country's larger banking institutions in metropolitan centers; however, it would seem that more selective control devices should be developed to cope with these situations.

Respectfully,
CARLETON L. BRADBURY,
Bank Commissioner.

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY,
May 22, 1961.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I was very much interested to read the letter you received from Mr. Carleton L. Bradbury, bank commissioner of Maine, which you sent to me in your letter of May 11.

Mr. Bradbury's letter expresses his opposition to H.J. Res. 375, which would invoke a moratorium on bank consolidations, mergers, and acquisitions. Mr. Bradbury's opposition is based on the ground that it is, in many instances, important to Maine to permit the consolidation of two or more small banks in order to enable the banks to provide adequate service to the communities involved, particularly where the banks which seek to consolidate are too small to meet the service standards demanded of modern banking institutions.

Mr. Bradbury's letter refers to a bill now before the Maine Legislature which would read in part as follows:

"SEC. 146–B. Banking monopolies, undue concentration of banking assets: No merger, consolidation, acquisition of assets, or assumption of deposit liabilities shall be approved by the Commissioner which would

promote a banking monopoly having an undue concentration of banking assets, unless approval is necessary or advisable in the public interest."

As you will recall, the same issues raised by H.J. Res. 375 on the one hand the proposed Maine statute on the other hand were considered at length by the Congress when the bank merger bill was before the Senate in 1959 and 1960 and before the House in 1960. These same issues were also involved in 1956 in connection with Senator FULBRIGHT'S bill, S. 3911, 84th Congress, and the comparable provisions of my proposed Financial Institutions Act, S. 1451, 85th Congress, which passed the Senate but did not become law.

The principal issue is whether bank mergers and consolidations should be governed by the principles of the Clayton Act, and forbidden when they involve any diminution of competition regardless of banking factors, or whether banking, which is vested with a public interest and subject to extensive regulation, should be subject to consolidation and merger statutes which take into consideration banking factors as well as competitive factors. Related to this issue is the question whether the banking agencies should have authority to approve or disapprove bank mergers, or whether the Department of Justice or the courts should have a veto over such mergers on the basis of Clayton Act standards.

You will recall that these issues were clearly presented in 1959 by Senator O'Mahoney's amendment, which would have done substantially what H.J. Res. 375 would now do—make competitive factors controlling in the case of bank mergers. You and I were among the majority in the Senate which defeated the O'Mahoney amendment 55 to 29. You will recall that when the Senate later adopted the House amendment to the bank merger bill, it was made abundantly clear that this also provided for a decision on a consolidation or merger proposal based on banking factors in addition to competitive factors, instead of making competitive factors controlling, and also left the decision in the hands of the banking agencies instead of giving the final decision to the Department of Justice.

H.J. Res. 375, which would reverse these carefully considered decisions, would, in my judgment, not be accepted by the Banking and Currency Committee or by the Senate without very careful consideration and without a clear showing that the Congress erred in 1959 and 1960.

Mr. Bradbury's statement demonstrates the correctness of the position which you and I took in 1959 and 1960 more clearly, I think, than any other single document I have seen. It seems to me you might well consider inserting his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to make it available to all those interested in this important question.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

SETTING ASIDE OF ORDER TO CALL CALENDAR FOLLOWING MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask further unanimous consent that the agreement relating to the calendar call following the morning business be momentarily set aside for the purpose of certain insertions and statements, to be made in the RECORD, and that we then come back to it later on.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the request is agreed to.

DEATH OF DAVID LYNN, FORMER ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday a distinguished American, David Lynn, died after a short illness. Mr. Lynn, from 1923 to 1954, served as Architect of the Capitol Building in which we meet. Prior to his service as Architect, Mr. Lynn served for 22 years under the previous Architects, Edward Clark and Elliott Woods.

Mr. Lynn was appointed Architect of the Capitol by President Coolidge on August 22, 1923. He came from an old family, of Frederick and Allegany Counties, Md., who for many generations had been distinguished in the judicial, military, business, and social life of the State. His great, great grandfather, Judge David Lynn, was one of the three Commissioners appointed in 1751 to lay out the town of Georgetown.

Mr. Lynn was born in Wheeling, W. Va., November 10, 1873, and was educated in public schools of Cumberland and the Allegany County Academy. He entered the Office of the Architect of the Capitol on July 1, 1901, during the tenure of Edward Clark as Architect. He was appointed the seventh Architect of the Capitol, following the death of Elliott Woods.

During his tenure as Architect, there were constructed and added to the building in the legislative and judicial groups, the New House Office Building, the First Street wing of the Senate Office Building, the U.S. Supreme Court Building, the central refrigeration plant and other additions to the Capitol Power Plant, the annex and addition to the main Library of Congress Building, and the legislative garage.

During his tenure, the 62 acres of land lying immediately north of Constitution Avenue were acquired and developed as part of the Capitol Grounds park area; the Capitol and the Senate and House Office Buildings were completely air conditioned; the roofs over the Senate and House wings of the Capitol were reconstructed and the interiors of the House and Senate Chambers were remodeled; the terraces of the Capitol Building were reconstructed.

The U.S. Botanic Garden was relocated to its present site, and the New conservatory was constructed and the grounds developed under his direction.

In connection with construction projects, Mr. Lynn served as a member of the Commission for Enlarging the Capitol Grounds; the U.S. Supreme Court Building Commission; the Joint Commission to acquire a site and additional buildings for the Library of Congress; and was a member of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia and the Alley Dwelling Authority.

He served as Acting Director of the U.S. Botanic Garden from 1934 to 1954.

Mr. Lynn retired as Architect of the Capitol on September 30, 1954. Until his death, he continued to reside at his residence, 3700 Quebec Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

We join those who served here prior to 1954 in paying to the memory of the late Mr. Lynn our sincere respect.

My Republican leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], was a friend of Mr. Lynn throughout his life; and it is on behalf of the Republican leader of the U.S. Senate and Senators on this side of the aisle that this brief statement in tribute to a great American is made now for the RECORD.

"JUST A MINUTE, MR. PRESIDENT"

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, I took occasion to make some complimentary remarks regarding certain phases of the President's message, notably his courageous call for a sharply quickened effort in the space field.

In all candor, I must comment briefly now on his optimistic reference to the state of our economy and his implication, with which I disagree, that the affirmative antirecession program of his administration was responsible for an upsurge.

In order to be fair to the President, I quote the full text of his reference to this subject:

> The first and basic task confronting the Nation this year was to turn recession into recovery. An affirmative antirecession program, initiated with your cooperation, supported the natural forces in the private sector; and our economy is now enjoying renewed confidence and energy. The recession has been halted. Recovery is underway.

Mr. President, I am no great economist, but I can sense some "slight of hand" in this. The new administration has been in power for 6 months. We have had some troubles. We have had some successes. I shall leave that for others to evaluate, but I cannot abide by the thesis that we have had a sudden resurgence of our economy attributable to legislative and executive action by the new administration.

Our economy was on the upswing when President Kennedy came into power. The natural inherent forces of a free economy were at work.

There was a lag of at least 3 months before any economic legislation was enacted by the Congress, and then we enacted economic retreads, many of which have not yet gone into effect and several of which are not actually focused on the

problem of unemployment and economic vitality.

The President said that his first and basic task was to turn recession into recovery. Mr. President, I suppose that every new administration takes credit for all things good that happen while it is in power. Mr. Kennedy's first task, turning recession into recovery, is in this category. In the same category, I praise the President for having the sun shine and the flowers bloom and the spring season emerge upon us. We praise him also for the opening of the baseball season, the excitement of the Kentucky Derby, the melting of the snow in the Adirondacks, and the good orange crop in the great State of Florida.

Mr. President, I am not one to refuse to give the administration credit for what it does well. At the same time, I am not one to sit by and let it take credit for something it had nothing to do with. I humbly protest.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator gives the President altogether too much credit. The spring season did not emerge in time.

Mr. KEATING. It is here now.

Mr. AIKEN. It finally came.

Mr. KEATING. It is a little late.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it took a little over 100 days for it to emerge fully.

Mr. KEATING. Yes; it was after the 100 days.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate supposed to be engaged in the consideration of the calendar now?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the order of business under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of the calendar, beginning with Order No. 158, Senate Resolution 129, with the proviso that a statement will be made by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], but that no action will be taken until after the rest of the measures on the calendar to which there is no objection have been acted upon.

SIMPSON CONSTRUCTION CO.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, has the resolution, which is the first order on the calendar, been stated?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 129) relating to the bill (S. 101) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy which is being shown to me by both leaders, which enables me to attend a luncheon of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, at which I shall have the very great honor of presenting, for an award, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Nothing but that fact has justified my asking for this early handling of the resolution.

I appreciate the courtesy being extended to me in allowing me to make a brief statement.

The resolution relates to a bill (S. 101) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co.," and comes from the Committee on the Judiciary, with the proposal that the bill be referred to the Court of Claims for findings and recommendations to the committee, and not for final action.

Mr. President, this matter has been before the Court of Claims once previously. Senators will note that on page 12 of the committee report, the last page, a portion of the opinion of the Court of Claims is stated, as follows:

> On the basis of all the documents and pleadings before us, we conclude that plaintiffs did not have on file with a department or agency of the Government prior to August 15, 1945, a request for relief within the meaning of the Lucas Act. Having failed to establish this necessary jurisdictional fact, plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment is denied, their petition is dismissed, and summary judgment will be entered in favor of defendant.

In other words, the Court of Claims decided the matter wholly on the ground it did not have jurisdiction and not at all on the merits of the case.

The learned chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary invites attention to this fact in the report. I note on page 2 of the report the following language:

> The Court of Claims, however, has not ruled against the company on the merits of the case, but found that the company had failed to establish a necessary jurisdictional fact.

Therefore, the recommendation of the Committee on the Judiciary is simply that the matter be referred to the Court of Claims for a thorough investigation, and its report and recommendation to the committee.

I understand the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] has an interest in the case and desires to make some statement with reference thereto. I regret that I find it necessary to leave to keep my appointment, and I leave the matter in the hands of the Senate and the courtesy of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, Senate Resolution 129, which appears as Order No. 158 on the calendar, proposes to refer a bill, S. 101, entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co.," to the Court of Claims for findings of fact and conclusions regarding the legal or equitable rights of the claimant. I previously have asked that this matter be put over so that information regarding the ramifications of this matter could be ascertained.

S. 101 represents the only hope for relief that the claimant has, because the claimant failed to make a timely filing of its claim under the Lucas Act for alleged losses in the performance of contracts during World War II.

It is my information that heretofore no relief has been granted by Congress to claimants covered by the Lucas Act who did not make a timely filing of their claims. There are two questions raised by this matter: First, whether Congress should take favorable action on claims such as this, thus setting a precedent for numerous more claimants to seek relief; and second, whether the Court of Claims, a very busy court, should be requested to take up its time on such matters if Congress has not heretofore granted relief in this type of case. If the court spends its time on this matter only to have the Congress turn down the claim, considerable time will have been wasted. If Congress does not turn down the claim, fairness will demand favorable action on numerous other claims which are bound to be filed by those who failed to make timely filing under the Lucas Act.

The Department of Justice indicates that some 280 claims were filed under the Lucas Act and about 115 lawsuits were filed. Of the 115 lawsuits, the Department of Justice estimates that 10 to 15 percent were dismissed for failure to file proper written requests for relief. The letter also indicates that the claimant Simpson Construction Co. has asked for $244,016 from Congress, although the amount it claimed under the Lucas Act was only $126,431.18. I have received no explanation for the discrepancy. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of Justice, dated May 12, 1961, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
> *Washington, D.C., May 12, 1961.*
>
> Hon. JACK MILLER,
> *U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR MILLER: This is in further response to your letter of May 4, 1961, which was acknowledged May 6, 1961, regarding Senate Resolution 129. The resolution refers Senate bill 101 for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co. to the Court of Claims for a report. Your letter requested the best estimate this Department could make of the total number of claims falling within the scope of the Lucas Act in which there had been no timely filing (by August 14, 1945) of claims for alleged losses in the performance of contracts during World War II. You also inquired as to how many of this total would comprise cases which had previously been pursued, unsuccessfully, for relief in the Federal district courts or the Court of Claims on the theory of contract.
>
> Information in this Department indicates that about 280 claims were filed under the Lucas Act with Government agencies, and that about 115 lawsuits were instituted in the Federal district courts or the Court of Claims. Except for the lawsuits this Department does not appear to have any specific information on the questions you asked. The great bulk of the claims were presented to the Army or Navy and it is understood the Department of Defense is responding to a similar inquiry.
>
> Of the estimated 115 lawsuits we believe the number dismissed for failure to file proper written requests for relief probably

did not exceed 10 to 15 percent of the total, although it is now impossible to make a truly reliable estimate without very extensive research. In February 1950, 55 cases were pending in the Court of Claims involving over $11 million. Of these 31 involved questions as to the adequacy of the requests for relief, and the Court of Claims held many of the requests were sufficient. About 60 cases were filed in the district courts but no comparable data are available.

Although this Department has not had the opportunity to comment on the proposed bill or resolution this occasion is taken to bring to your attention some matters of particular importance with respect to the *Simpson* claim, 121 C. Cls. 506; certiorari denied, 344 U.S. 842 (1952), especially since this Department and the Civil Division would be obliged to defend any suit filed in the Court of Claims. The *Simpson* suit was instituted June 20, 1949, well within the 6-year statute of limitations (28 U.S.C. sec. 2501) so that the Court of Claims was then available to consider any claims for contractual relief as well as under the Lucas Act.

Senate 101 is not limited by its terms to the relief which the Lucas Act would have afforded. For example, the amount claimed under the Lucas Act was $126,431.18, whereas the bill is in the sum of $244,016. Moreover, the Lucas Act provided for the recovery only of net losses, and of losses sustained without fault or negligence, limitations not spelled out in the bill or resolution.

It is our experience that the merits of the claim, if any, cannot now be determined because of the lapse of approximately 17 years from the date the events occurred. As this Department in 1949 pointed out in hearings before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, 81st Congress, on S. 873 and H.R. 3436, extending the Lucas Act, the Government is faced with an exceedingly difficult and often insuperable obstacle in adequately defending stale claims as witnesses once available are scattered throughout the country, or the world. After a lapse of 17 years the difficulty is far greater as many of the Government's witnesses will no doubt be dead or unavailable, documents lost or destroyed, and a fair presentation of the Government's case, even at enormous expense is quite improbable. It is also obvious that consideration of such stale claims is a decided factor in preventing the expeditious disposition of claims that are timely presented.

In 1949 President Truman vetoed H.R. 3436, 81st Congress (96 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 12911, S. Doc. No. 203 and H. Doc. No. 629, 81st Cong.), and also H.R. 834, 81st Congress extending the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 (H. Doc. No. 253, 81st Cong., 1st sess.).

Under section 301 of Executive Order No. 9786 the General Accounting Office was to prepare a list of all claimants under the act, and under section 304 each war agency was to report to the Congress quarterly the name of each claimant to whom relief had been granted.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM H. ORRICK, JR.,
Assistant Attorney General,
Civil Division.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Department of the Army, in a letter dated May 22, 1961, sets forth that some 141 claims under the Lucas Act were denied by the Army. These totaled $18,506,789. Also that the Navy Department rejected 56 claims totaling $11 million. Whether all of these rejects or most of them were due to failure to make timely filing cannot be reasonably estimated without an inordinate amount of labor in checking each of the case files. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Department of the Army be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1961.

Hon. JACK MILLER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MILLER: This is in reply to your inquiry addressed to the Secretary of Defense requesting certain information for your consideration in connection with Senate Resolution 129 and S. 101, 87th Congress, for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co.

It is understood that the Justice Department may have some information as to cases litigated in the Federal district courts or the Court of Claims which arose out of alleged losses in the performance of contracts during World War II. Records maintained within the Defense Establishment would not contain much, if anything, of assistance insofar as litigated cases are concerned, therefore so much of your inquiry as relates thereto will not be covered by this reply.

Records immediately available within the Departments of the Army and the Navy disclose some general statistics covering the period during which each had administrative boards applying and implementing the Lucas Act between 1947 and 1951. For instance, the Department of the Army had 167 claims referred to and considered by its board as follows:

Disposed of as follows:		
Army Department claims denied	141	$18,506,789.82
Army Department claims approved (of this amount, however, only $498,209.12 was actually allowed for payment)	4	965,628.19
Army Department claims withdrawn	3	226,158.90
Claims of other agencies, in which Army Department had partial interest, considered at request of such agencies and denied	18	817,002.70
Claims of other agencies approved (of this amount, however, only $173,405.32 was actually recommended for payment)	1	496,617.19
Total	167	21,012,196.80

The Department of the Navy had 56 claims involving approximately $11 million all of which were rejected for a variety of reasons. It is understood that the individual case files are available in a repository in which they have been retired under the program of records administration. It would be a considerable task for a highly qualified clerical or legal professional staff to peruse the case files individually to obtain the specific information requested. In order to expedite a reply, the Department did not initiate such a detailed search. Furthermore, there is a reluctance to do so which may be understandable unless you deem the information to be gained thereby essential for the guidance of the Congress.

It is hoped that this reply will prove satisfactory and it is regretted that a more complete answer was not feasible.

Sincerely yours,

FRED C. WEYAND,
Brigadier General, GS, Deputy Chief of Legislative Liaison

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in a letter dated May 9, 1961, the Comptroller General pointed out that almost 300 war contract hardship claims were rejected as not meeting the criteria of the statute. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 9, 1961.

Hon. JACK MILLER,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MILLER: We have your letter of May 4, 1961, enclosing a tearsheet of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 3, 1961, and directing our attention to the colloquy on page 7075 with respect to Senate Resolution 129, relating to S. 101, entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Co."

In answer to your inquiry as to our best estimate of the total number of claims falling within the scope of the Lucas Act (60 Stat. 902) in which there had been no timely filing by August 14, 1945, of claims for war contract losses, you are advised that the records of our office do not contain the information you seek. However, your attention is invited to Senate Report No. 1632, 81st Congress, 2d session; House Report No. 2704, 81st Congress, 2d session; Senate Report 621, 83d Congress, 1st session, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 99, part 8, page 9890, wherein it was indicated that almost 300 war contract hardship claims were rejected as not meeting the criteria of the statute. By the terms of the Lucas Act and Executive Order No. 9786, dated October 5, 1946, claims filed thereunder were to be settled by the administrative agency involved. The only functions of our Office were to furnish the agency involved verification of the contracts and subcontracts shown in the claims and to ascertain whether the claimant to whom a settlement was proposed to be made was indebted to any other agency of the Government. Our records show that we were requested to report on 14 proposed settlements.

We have no information as to the total number of such claims which may have been pursued unsuccessfully before the district courts or the Court of Claims on the theory of contract. We believe that more precise information on the number of unsuccessful Lucas Act claims and litigations thereunder may be obtained, as you indicated, on the floor of the Senate on May 3, 1961, from the Department of Defense and the Department of Justice, and we note that apparently you are communicating with those Departments for that purpose.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I hesitate to cause any more time to be taken by the Court of Claims, but I am not clear as to exactly what is the policy of the Congress with respect to matters falling under the Lucas Act. It seems to me if we let the bill go through and the Court of Claims makes its finding, if the court should find there is some equity involved, and if notwithstanding the finding the Congress says specifically it will not grant relief by rejecting the claim, then we should not, in the future, refer more of the Lucas Act claims to the Court of Claims for hearing, to take up the time of the court unnecessarily.

Since I do not have a clear understanding of what is to be the policy of the Congress under the Lucas Act, I think we might let the Court of Claims consider this case, with the understanding that if the Congress rejects the claim there will be no further repetition of such

action, because there could be hundreds of such cases.

What the policy of the Congress will be with respect to relief—how much relief to provide, or whether there is to be any at all—I am not prepared to say. Under these circumstances, I withdraw any objection to consideration of the resolution, and ask that the resolution be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts in the chair). Is there objection to the consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 129) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 101) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Simpson Construction Company", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims; and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1185) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the expenditure from certain capital reserve funds of certain amounts for research, development, and design expenses, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the agreement reached I believe the call of the calendar is to begin with Calendar No. 231. I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 176, Calendar No. 177, Calendar No. 182, and Calendar No. 188 be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be passed over.

The bills passed over are as follows:

S. 1185, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the expenditure from certain capital reserve funds of certain amounts for research, development, and design expenses.

S. 1183, to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses.

S. 870, to amend the Menominee Termination Act to enable such tribe to make an orderly transition to its status after supervision ends.

H.R. 4130, to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

The bill (H.R. 6094) to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

INSUBORDINATION ON THE PART OF SOME IN THE MILITARY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate would agree that the Defense Department of the United States should be under civilian control.

In recent months it has become clear that President Kennedy and Secretary of Defense McNamara intend to adhere to that basic pillar of our Constitution; and I am sure that also holds true for most members of the military.

But it has also become clear that some members of the latter do not intend to give up to civilian authority any of the prerogatives of excess power they have been allowed to build up over the years at the expense of civilian control.

In fact there now appears to be an organized effort on the part of some of the military to attack their civilian superiors under the vicious cloak of anonymity.

This not only includes the Secretary of Defense and some of his civilian assistants, but in some cases the President himself.

As an illustration, in a magazine article last week a responsible reporter not only quotes some of the military as opposed to lower echelons of civilian authority, but lists one of their more recent attacks on the Commander in Chief, as follows:

The military men wonder how much thought went into the decisions to drop the atomic-powered plane, cut back the B–70 superbomber program, and slow up the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile project. Their bitterness is so deep that they are even ready to accept as gospel a coffee-break rumor that President Kennedy made the final decision on the B–70 and Nike-Zeus while struggling into his white tie and tails for the annual Washington Gridiron dinner last March.

Mr. President, I know from personal experience that this anonymous criticism of the President is totally false.

For what it is worth, I agree without reservation to two of those decisions by the President; and am reserving opinion on the third until more information is available.

But that is not the point.

The point is that despite world conditions being what they are today, sneaks in uniform are nevertheless putting out such anonymous attacks against the Commander in Chief.

This article continues:

The military men also are absolutely convinced that the brass had nowhere near as much to do with the Cuban fiasco as has been pictured—it was basically a civilian operation.

"Why, it's ridiculous to say that any military chief would have approved anything that silly—no air cover, no naval support, no backup," said one high Pentagon official, and cited the report that General Eisenhower himself, at Gettysburg, had said that he doubted that the Joint Chiefs could have had much of a role in the affair.

If this report is true, General Eisenhower, for whom I have the greatest respect, and/or this anonymous high Pentagon official should read the recent testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Again, however, that is not the point. The point to note is that military men of high rank, disgruntled at their slice of the pie, are now attacking the very core of the American system.

An article in the press of Monday, May 22, reads in part as follows:

He (Secretary McNamara) has come in a brief period to dominate the Military Establishment, perhaps more than any of civilian predecessors have done.

Based on the precepts of the Constitution, is it not about time?

An Associated Press story over last weekend started off:

A Navy officer, angered by efforts to blame top military men for the Cuban debacle, said today, "No military man in his right mind would have approved the plans that were carried out."

And an editor's note prefacing this article read:

What role, if any, the Joint Chiefs of Staff played in planning the ill-starred Cuban invasion is subject of capital speculation and closed sessions by a Senate subcommittee. While the full story has not been aired publicly a Navy officer told Bem Price, an Associated Press military affairs writer, that he was sick of efforts to pin the blame on the military.

Some of the statements made by this anonymous officer, as reported in this AP story, were inaccurate in implication; others were inaccurate in fact.

Now we know that the Secretary of Defense has acted about news dissemination, on at least one occasion, in a manner which justified criticism from the press. After looking into the matter, however, I am convinced that any error here was primarily the result of efforts to put a stop to the steady stream of "out of channel" stories put out by disgruntled officers anxious to portray, in the worst possible light, their opposition to the current management of the Department of Defense.

If these military men want to attack the policies of this administration, let them resign and do so openly. We can remember officers who have done just that—and the Nation respected them.

But if they stay in the chain of command, and, working anonymously with their favorite press outlets, continue these bitter attacks, it is conceivable they could destroy the substance, if not the form, of civilian control.

And in that case the Nation would be in serious trouble indeed.

What a tragedy that some of these military men have now stooped to utilizing the Cuban failure, in which they likewise bear responsibility, to carry on their fight against civilian authority, even to the point of attacking the President.

I for one do not intend to see this disloyal operation continue without the full knowledge of the American people—and that is the purpose of this statement today.

It is also made with the conviction that every Member of this body believes civilian control of the military is essential to the proper functioning of this

Government under the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished assistant majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator for his very courageous and outstanding statement as to the role of the civilian authorities over the military. I am sure that every thoughtful American is deeply concerned when there seem to be expressions of insubordination or expressions by professional military personnel of outright criticism of the Commander in Chief, whoever that Commander in Chief may be. We have seen all too much of the role of the military in world affairs. We have seen it in other parts of the world. I suggest that the Senator from Missouri has given us some good words of caution.

In the main our military has been very responsive to civilian control. Let us hope that it always will be.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation for those words of the able assistant majority leader. A very large percentage of our military personnel are performing, without fanfare, a magnificent public service. I am talking about a relatively small group who are putting their ambitions and themselves ahead of the best interests of the country.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, what the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri has said sorely needed saying, and I am glad he said it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who, as we all know, has been vitally interested in the security of our country, especially because of the location, and importance to our defenses, of the great State he represents.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. There is nothing that the Senator from Missouri has said with which anyone could disagree. In my judgment, the same situation which exists this year existed last year, when we had a different Commander in Chief. We had a little different attitude on the part of some at that time from the attitude which exists now. I agree entirely, however, with the views expressed by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from New York. Any time the military attempt to transcend the supervision of their civilian superiors, regardless of what administration is in power, a condition is created which is tragic and dangerous to the future security of our country.

AMENDMENT OF EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of House bill 6094?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6094) to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That subsection (f), of section 4, of the Employment Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1023(f)), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) To enable the Council to exercise its powers, functions, and duties under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS AND BEQUESTS FOR THE U.S. MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 880) to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this bill, which would be of assistance to the U.S. Maritime Academy at Kings Point, N.Y., meets with my wholehearted approval. I hope that it will result in an abundance of gifts to this fine institution. I ask unanimous consent to have a statement by my distinguished colleague from New York printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS REGARDING S. 880

I am happy to support the passage of this bill, S. 880, which will authorize the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy to accept gifts and bequests for the betterment of its facilities. The establishment of such a program, similar to those already permitted at Annapolis, and in existence at many private institutions, will enable graduates and friends of the Academy to acknowledge their appreciation of its work in a substantive way. Such gifts will enable the Academy to improve its facilities in ways which would not be possible with public funds, while at the same time establishing a closer relationship between the Academy and its alumni and friends.

The development of a strong and competent merchant marine is in the better interest of the United States. I believe that anything we can do to enhance this national goal will receive the wholehearted endorsement of the Congress. I know that the people of our Nation will respond generously so that the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy can continue its vital job of training officers who will maintain the merchant marine, which is the lifeline of our Nation and the free world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 880) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1126), is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new subsection (e) to read as follows:

"(e)(1) The Secretary of Commerce may accept, hold, administer, and spend gifts and bequests of personal property made on the condition that it be used for the benefit of, or for use in connection with, the United States Merchant Marine Academy. Gifts and bequests of money and the proceeds from the sales of property received as gifts shall be deposited in the Treasury in the fund called 'United States Merchant Marine Academy general gift fund'. The Secretary may disburse funds deposited under this subsection for the benefit or use of the Merchant Marine Academy subject to the terms of the gift or bequest. If a gift is made for a specific purpose and that purpose is accomplished without exhausting the entire amount of the gift, then unless the donor has manifested a different intention, the Secretary may disburse the residue of the gift for a purpose that in the judgment of the Secretary, or his delegate, is as close as practical to the specific purpose for which the gift was made.

"(2) For the purpose of Federal income, estate, and gift taxes, property that is accepted under this subsection is considered as a gift or bequest to or for the use of the United States.

"(3) Upon the request of the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury may invest, reinvest, or retain investments of money or securities comprising any part of the United States Merchant Marine Academy general gift fund in securities of the United States or in securities guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States. The interest and benefits accruing from those securities shall be deposited to the credit of the United States Merchant Marine Academy general gift fund, and may be disbursed as provided in this subsection."

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 21) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell 10 Liberty type merchant vessels to citizens of the United States for conversion into barges, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, over, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

The bill (S. 1456) to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Com-

merce was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be in the Department of Commerce, in addition to the Assistant Secretaries now provided by law, one additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed by law for Assistant Secretaries of Commerce, and shall perform such duties as the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES OF THE GOVERNMENT

The bill (S. 529) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the 'joint committee') to be composed of fourteen members as follows:

"(1) Seven members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than two weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1)(A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year underway, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grant-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a ten-year period. Upon request of the joint committee, any agency shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate estimates for proposed appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committee on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first five-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than five years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

RESTRICTION ON CONVEYANCE OF SURPLUS LAND

The bill (S. 537) to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last clause of section 13(h)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1622(h)(2)), is amended by striking out the words "it was acquired by the United States at any time subsequent to January 1, 1900", and substituting the words "its historical significance relates to a period of time within the fifty years immediately preceding the determination of suitability and desirability for such use."

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS TO WITNESSES BY CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 538) to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 486) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(i) If authorized by the Administrator, officers and employees of the General Services Administration having investigatory functions are empowered, while engaged in the performance of their duties in conducting investigations, to administer oaths to witnesses. Any statement given under oath before such officer or employee when certified to under his hand may be offered or used in any court of the United States without further proof of the identity or authority of such officer or employee, and such oath shall have like force and effect as if administered by a clerk of such court."

SCHOLARSHIPS FOR AMERICAN AND FOREIGN NATIONALS

The bill (S. 539) to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 765, 782), as amended (50 U.S.C. App., sec. 1641(b)(2)), is further amended by adding the words "or nationals" after the word "citizens" wherever it appears in such section.

PAYMENT IN ADVANCE FOR REQUIRED PUBLICATIONS

The bill (S. 540) to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 12, 1930 (46 Stat. 580), is amended by (1) inserting after the word "subscription" the words "or other", and (2) deleting the words "and other periodicals" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "periodicals, and other publications".

SEC. 2. The following parts of Acts and all amendments thereto are repealed:

(1) The proviso to the paragraph headed "General Expenses, Library" under the caption "Library, Department of Agriculture" in the Act of March 4, 1909 (35 Stat. 1054);

(2) The first proviso to the paragraph headed "Regular Supplies, Quartermaster Corps" in the Act of April 27, 1914 (38 Stat. 362);

(3) The first parenthetical phrase under the caption "Pay, Miscellaneous" in the Act of March 3, 1915 (38 Stat. 929);

(4) Section 5 of the Act of March 4, 1915 (38 Stat. 1049);

(5) The tenth paragraph under the caption "United States Veterans' Bureau" in the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 533).

APPOINTMENT OF NONUNIFORMED SPECIAL POLICEMEN

The bill (S. 541) to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 5. Officials or employees of the General Services Administration who have been duly authorized to perform investigative functions may be empowered by the Administrator of General Services, or officials of General Services Administration duly authorized by him, to act as nonuniformed special policemen in order to protect property under the charge and control of the General Services Administration and to carry firearms, whether on Federal property or in travel status. Such officials or employees who are empowered to act as nonuniformed special policemen shall have, while on real property under the charge and control of the General Services Administration, the power to enforce Federal law for the protection of persons and property and the power to enforce rules and regulations made and published for such purposes by the Administrator or duly authorized officials of the General Services Administration. Any such special policeman may make arrests without warrant for any offense committed

upon such property if he has reasonable ground to believe (1) the offense constitutes a felony under the laws of the United States, and (2) that the person to be arrested is guilty of that offense."

PAYMENTS OF DECEASED MEMBERS' FINAL ACCOUNTS

The bill (S. 649) to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased Members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 4327, and that the Senate proceed to its consideration at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4327) to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased Members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office, and that the Senate proceed to consider it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alaska?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, S. 649 will be indefinitely postponed.

USE OF SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY BY STATE DISTRIBUTION AGENCIES

The bill (S. 796) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(n) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In addition, under such cooperative agreements, and subject to such other conditions as may be imposed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, or the Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, surplus property which the Administrator may approve for donation for use in any State for purposes of education, public health, or civil defense, or for research for any such purposes, pursuant to subsection (j)(3) or (j)(4), may with the approval of the Administrator be made available to the State agency after a determination by the Secretary or the Director that such property is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective operation of the State agency in performing its functions in connection with such program. Upon a determination by the Secretary or the Director that such action is necessary to, or would facilitate, the effective use of such surplus property made available under the terms of a cooperative agreement, title thereto may with the approval of the Administrator be vested in the State agency."

HAWAII VOLCANOES NATIONAL PARK

The bill (S. 1317) to change the designation of that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Hawaii, in the State of Hawaii, to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, effective July 1, 1961, the portion of the Hawaii National Park situated on the island of Hawaii, established and administered pursuant to the Act of August 1, 1916 (39 Stat. 432), as amended and supplemented, shall be known as the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

ACCEPTANCE OF GIFTS TO REDUCE THE PUBLIC DEBT

The bill (H.R. 311) to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I send to the desk perfecting amendments to the language of the committee bill and ask Senate concurrence in the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 1, strike out "section 1" and insert "the first section of this Act".

On page 3, line 4, strike out "proceeds of the redemption, or sale, of any such gift" and insert "proceeds of such gift, or the proceeds of the redemption or sale of such gift, as the case may be".

On page 3, line 19, strike out "the Act" and insert "this Act".

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, occasionally the U.S. Goverment receives gifts of money or other property made on the condition that the gift be used to reduce the public debt. However, the Treasury Department has no specific authority to use gifts it receives in this manner, and questions could be raised by other possible claimants of the property as to whether the Government was fulfilling the conditions of the gift. The Treasury in the absence of specific directions to the contrary has been treating gifts the United States receives for the purpose of reducing the public debt as unconditional gifts and depositing them in the general fund of the Treasury.

This bill specifically authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to accept gifts of money, obligations of the United States, or other intangible personal property—such as stocks or securities—which are made on the sole condition that they are to be used to retire the public debt. In the case of the obligations of the United States, the obligations would be canceled or retired.

In the case of other intangible personal property the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to convert this property into money at the best terms available. The same authorization is also made in the case of the Administrator of General Services with respect to the gifts of property he receives. This would, of course, permit such agencies to withhold receipts from the sale of such property to the extent necessary to meet expenses attributable to such sales.

It provides for the deposit of cash gifts, or proceeds from the sale of other gifts, in a special account on the books of the Treasury, and money in this account is to be utilized to retire obligations of the United States which are part of the public debt.

The bill also provides that if any of the gifts accepted are subject to a gift or inheritance tax, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Administrator of General Services is to be authorized to pay this out of the proceeds of the gift or the proceeds received from the redemption or sale of such gift, as the case may be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DUTY-FREE IMPORTS OF PHILIPPINE TOBACCO

The bill (H.R. 4940) relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the bill H.R. 4940 would limit imports of certain Philippine tobaccos that may be charged to the United States duty-free quota, to those tobacco exports licensed by the Philippine Government for charge against the quota.

When the Philippines were granted their independence the agreement with that country called for a gradual imposition of import restrictions so that by 1974 our commercial relations will be on the same basis as with all other countries.

A duty-free quota of 6,500,000 pounds of filler and scrap tobacco was granted, this quota to be reduced year by year

until by 1974 it will cease to exist. In order to make the transition orderly, the Philippine Government has granted licenses for the export of tobaccos under that quota.

The intent of that Government has been circumvented by some who purchase Philippine tobaccos for shipment to other countries where no quota regulations exist, then transshipping that tobacco to the United States. The charge of this tobacco against the quota results in a reduction in the duty-free quantities which the licensed exporters in the Philippines might otherwise ship to the United States and enter duty free.

This practice has been upsetting to the Philippine Government and to the tobacco growers of that country as well as to the regular market in the United States. The bill would allow imports under the quota to come in only if certified and licensed by the Philippine Government for shipment under that quota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RESTORATION TO INDIAN TRIBES OF PAYMENTS OF TRIBAL TRUST FUNDS

The bill (S. 1768) to provide for the restoration to Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and the individual payments of tribal trust funds was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That unless otherwise specifically provided by law, the share of an individual member of an Indian tribe or group in a per capita or other distribution, individualization, segregation, or proration of Indian tribal or group funds held in trust by the United States, or in an annuity payment under a treaty, heretofore or hereafter authorized by law, shall be restored to tribal ownership if for any reason such share cannot be paid to the individual entitled thereto and remains unclaimed for a period of six years from the date of the administrative directive to make the payment, or one year from the date of this Act, whichever occurs later: *Provided,* That if such individual is a member of an Indian tribe or group that has no governing body recognized by the Secretary of the Interior as authorized to act on behalf of the tribe or group, such unpaid share shall be regarded as not capable of restoration to a tribal or group entity and shall be deposited in the general fund of the Treasury of the United States.

DOCUMENTATION AND INSPECTION OF VESSELS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1222) relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment, on page 1, line 8, after the word "be", to strike out "subject to inspection, solely because such vessel takes on board on the high seas and transports without charge to a port of the United States the catch of another fishing vessel of the United States" and insert "considered as engaged in the transportation of freight for hire, solely because such vessel occasionally takes on board on the high seas and transports without a monetary consideration to a port of the United States, the catch of another fishing vessel of the United States", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the laws of the United States relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States, a vessel enrolled and licensed, or licensed as a vessel of the United States to engage in the fishery, shall not be deemed to be used in employment for which not licensed, and considered as engaged in the transportation of freight for hire, solely because such vessel occasionally takes on board on the high seas and transports without a monetary consideration to a port of the United States, the catch of another fishing vessel of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PARTICIPATION BY NATIONAL GUARD IN REENACTMENT OF BATTLE OF FIRST MANASSAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1342) to provide that participation by members of the National Guard in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall be held and considered to be full-time training duty under section 503 of title 10, United States Code, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the name "Manassas", to strike out "or in any other historical reenactment, pageant, or ceremony officially sanctioned or sponsored by the Civil War Centennial Commission (pursuant to its authority under the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626)),", and on page 2, line 6, after the word "duty", to insert "under a call or order to perform training"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) any member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States who, in his status as a member of the National Guard, voluntarily participates in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall, while participating in and while proceeding directly to and from any such reenactment, pageant, or ceremony, be held and considered to be engaged in full-time training duty under a call or order to perform training under the provisions of section 503 of title 32, United States Code; but no such member shall be entitled to any pay or allowances from the Federal Government on account of his participation in any such reenactment, pageant, or ceremony.

(b) With respect to the transportation of members described in subsection (a) of this section, maximum utilization shall be made of transportation facilities issued to National Guard units by the Federal Government, and in any case in which such facilities are inadequate for such purpose, transportation facilities of the Armed Forces may be used to the extent deemed practicable by the Secretary of Defense.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to provide that participation by members of the National Guard in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall be held and considered to be full-time training duty under section 503 of title 32, United States Code, and for other purposes.

PLUMBERS UNION LOCAL NO. 12 PENSION FUND

The bill (H.R. 1877) relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments, on page 2, after line 8, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 809(d)(11) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deductions in computing gain from operations in the case of certain mutualization distributions) is amended by striking out "in 1958 and 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "in 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961".

(b) Section 809(g)(3) of such Code (relating to application of section 815 to certain mutualization distributions) is amended by striking out "in 1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "in 1959, 1960, or 1961".

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1959.

And, after line 20, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph 1102(b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1001; par. 1102), is amended by striking out "Cashmere goat," and by inserting after "other like animals" the following: "(including hair of animals like the Cashmere goat)".

(b) Paragraph 1102 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(c) Hair of the Cashmere goat, in the grease or washed, 18 cents per pound of clean content; scoured, 21 cents per pound of clean content; on the skin, 16 cents per pound of clean content; sorted, or matchings, if not scoured, 19 cents per pound of clean content."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption, on or after the date of enactment of this Act, and to articles covered by entries or withdrawals which have not been liquidated or the liquidation of which has not become final on such date of enactment.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, H.R. 1877, as passed by the House, provided for the retroactive qualification under the Internal Revenue Code of the Plumbers Union, Local No. 12, pension fund, Boston, Mass., for the period prior to June 3, 1959, the day it qualified under the Internal Revenue Code. Last

year in Public Law 86–781 and Public Law 86–779 Congress approved similar retroactive qualifications of seven other negotiated pension plans. This plan had not been brought to the attention of Congress in time to have been covered by the 1960 legislation. The bill permits contributions to the fund by employers to be deductible for Federal income tax purposes and insures tax exemption of income earned by the fund during the period mentioned.

Two amendments were added to the bill by the Committee on Finance. The first amendment, offered by Senator WILLIAMS, continues for 2 years, 1960 and 1961, the provision in the Life Insurance Company Income Tax Act of 1959 which permitted certain stock companies which had adopted a plan of mutualization prior to January 1, 1958, to deduct amounts expended in redeeming their outstanding stock from their shareholders in compliance with the plan of mutualization. It has developed that at least one such mutualized company was unable to complete its plan of mutualization within the period provided in the 1959 act. For this reason, your committee deemed it advisable to extend the period for 2 years, 1960 and 1961.

The other amendment approved by the Committee on Finance was offered by Senator MCCARTHY. It provides for reduced tariffs in the case of cashmere goat hair. The reduced tariffs provided by this bill are the same as those which were in effect under the trade agreement with Iran until the termination of that agreement. There is no known commercial production of cashmere in the United States. Further it does not appear that imported cashmere is competing with domestically produced sheep's wool and mohair. The reduced tariff provided by this amendment will apply to cashmere hair regardless of where in the world it was produced.

Mr. President, I have an amendment to the bill. The amendment is similar in purpose to the original House passed bill. It provides that the pension fund of the Composition Roofers, Damp and Waterproof Workers Association, Local Union No. 8, New York City, shall be deemed to have been qualified under the Internal Revenue Code for the period prior to November 24, 1958, the date on which it was held by the Internal Revenue Service to be qualified. Like the House version of H.R. 1877, this fund was not brought to the attention of the Congress in time to be included in the 1960 legislation. The amendment permits income-tax deduction for contributions by employers and provides tax exemption for income earned by the trust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill to add the following new section, as follows:

SEC. 4. The pension fund of the slate, tile, and roofing industry in New York City, which was created as a result of an agreement between the Composition Roofers, Damp and Waterproof Workers Association, Local Union Numbered 8, and several employer associations and other individual employers in the industry, and which has been held by the Internal Revenue Service to constitute a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and to be exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, shall be held and considered to have been a qualified trust under such section 401(a) and to be exempt from taxation under such section 501(a), for the period beginning July 1, 1957, and ending November 24, 1958, but only if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the trust has not in this period been operated in a manner which would jeopardize the interest of its beneficiaries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 pension fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, and for other purposes."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

COMMISSION ON PROBLEMS OF SMALL TOWNS AND RURAL COUNTIES

The bill (S. 1869) to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION

SECTION 1. There is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on the Problems of Small Towns and Rural Counties (a small town being designated as having a population of less than ten thousand and a rural county being designated as having a population of less than fifty thousand) hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twenty members as follows:

(1) Six appointed from the Senate by the President of the Senate, four from the majority party and two from the minority party;

(2) Six appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and two from the minority party; and

(3) Eight appointed by the President of the United States as follows:

(A) Two from among the heads of Federal departments and agencies;

(B) Two from among the Governors of States having problems affecting small towns, not more than one from the same political party;

(C) Two from among the mayors of small towns in the United States, not more than one from the same political party; and

(D) Two from among the elected officials of rural counties in the United States, not more than one from the same political party.

(b) The members of the Commission shall select a Chairman from among such members from the Congress, and a Vice Chairman from among such members from the House of Congress other than that of the Chairman.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Twelve members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall make a full and complete investigation and study of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's smalltown and rural county areas for the purpose of determining—

(1) the present and prospective needs of the Nation's smalltown and rural county areas for public services, including but not limited to planning, highways, water resources, recreation facilities, prevention of juvenile delinquency, municipal and county financing, and business expansion, including ways and means to induce new business to smalltown and rural county areas;

(2) the capabilities of State, county, and local governments to meet such needs;

(3) the extent to which the Federal Government is assisting small towns and rural counties in meeting such needs;

(4) means for improved coordination of Federal, State, county, and local policies and programs that affect small towns and rural counties;

(5) possibilities available to the Federal Government to assist small towns and rural counties economically through a wider dispersal of Government procurement operations and in the location of Federal facilities; and

(6) such other matters as may be of assistance in solving the various problems of, and promoting the social and economic well-being of, the Nation's small-town and rural county areas.

(b) The Commission shall submit to the President and to the Congress on or before February 1, 1963, its findings and recommendations; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such interim reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist six months after submission to the President of its final report and recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any two or more members thereof, may, for the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at

such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this Act; and each such department agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman, or the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(b) Members of the Commission shall receive no compensation for their services as such, but shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(d) The Commission may procure, by contract or otherwise, the services of public or private organizations or institutions.

The preamble was agreed to.

ASSISTANCE TO REPATRIATED AMERICAN NATIONALS

The bill (S. 1229) to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance and the provision of such assistance to repatriated American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act be cited as the "Emergency Repatriation Assistance Act of 1961".

DEVELOPMENT OF PLANS

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, after consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, shall develop plans and make arrangements for providing temporary assistance within the United States to United States nationals and to dependents of United States nationals, if they (1) are identified by the Department of State as having returned, or been repatriated or otherwise brought, to the United States because of the destitution of the United States national or the illness of such national or any of his dependents or because of war, threat of war, invasion, or similar crisis, and (2) are without available resources.

(b) Such plans shall include provision for reimbursement to the United States by the recipients of the temporary assistance to cover the cost thereof, except in any class or classes of cases, set forth in regulations of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"), in which, in his judgment, such cost is not readily allocable to the individual recipient, such cost is so small as to make its recovery uneconomical, or recovery of such cost is for other reasons impractical, and except in cases in which the claim for such reimbursement is waived by the Secretary, in whole or in part, for good cause determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide temporary assistance within the United States to individuals specified in section 2(a). To the extent feasible, such assistance shall be provided in accordance with the plans developed pursuant to section 2 as modified from time to time by the Secretary.

(b) The Secretary may provide such assistance directly or through utilization of the services and facilities of appropriate public or private agencies and organizations, in accordance with agreements. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not be applicable to any such agreement. An agreement with any such agency or organization under this subsection shall provide for payment to it, in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, of an amount equal to the cost to such agency or organization of carrying out the agreement. Such amount shall be determined by such statistical sampling, or other method as may be provided in the agreement.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. For purposes of this Act, the term "temporary assistance" means money payments, medical care, temporary billeting, transportation, and other goods and services necessary for the health or welfare of individuals (including guidance, counseling, and other welfare services) furnished to them within a period of not to exceed one year after the month following the month in which the recipient returns, or is repatriated or otherwise brought, as the case may be, to the United States.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare such sums as the Congress may determine for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

The bill (S. 162) creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. FONG. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. MUNDT subsequently said: Mr. President, I was in the cloakroom, answering a telephone call, at the time when Calendar No. 255, Senate bill 162, was before the Senate, during the call of the calendar. This bill proposes the creation of a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. The bill was introduced by me, with the cosponsorship of a large number of Senators on both sides of the aisle.

The bill deals with one of the most pernicious problems which confronts us on the domestic scene; it deals with probably the most repulsive and repugnant racket in this country—namely, the publication and distribution of salacious materials designed to corrupt the youth of America. This has a direct contributory influence on the great wave of juvenile delinquency which all of us deplore. I suspect that next to the narcotics racket, this one has done more to spawn criminals and to create crime than has any other influence in our country.

So, Mr. President, I regret very much that an objection was filed, so that the bill did not pass today, because time is running against us, and we cannot afford to permit lives to be ruined while Congress makes up its mind about what to do in this important field, where nothing effective has been done for some time.

At the last session, the Senate passed the bill, but did so at a very late hour in the session—in fact, so tardily that the House of Representatives did not have time to act on the bill during that session. I do not propose to let this happen again.

Therefore, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that at the next call of the calendar the bill will be passed. But if objection is then made, I now serve notice on the Senate—and in this connection I shall consult the leadership, and I am sure the leadership will cooperate—that I will then move that the bill be considered by the Senate. I feel such action on my part will be necessary to assure that the Senate can then take the time to debate the bill and to discuss the problems in connection with it, in order to be sure that passage of the bill will occur in sufficient time this year, so that Congress will not adjourn before the enactment of this important legislation.

ISSUANCE OF GOLD MEDAL TO BOB HOPE

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 88) authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency, with an amendment, on page 3, line 1, after the word "President.", to insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.", so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to present in the name of the people of the United States of America a gold medal of appropriate design to Bob Hope in recognition of his aforesaid services to his country and to the cause of world peace.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause such a medal to be struck and furnished to the President. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $2,500 for this purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MINIMUM STANDARDS OF QUALITY FOR GRAPES AND PLUMS

The bill (S. 1462) to amend the act of September 2, 1960, in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the first section of the Act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), is amended by (1) inserting "of any variety" immediately after "any grapes or plums", and (2) inserting "for such variety" immediately after "established".

SEC. 2. Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary may, by regulation, exempt from compliance with the provisions of this Act (1) any variety or varieties of grapes and plums, and (2) the shipment of such minimum quantities of grapes and plums to any foreign country as he may prescribe."

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMUNITY ACT OF 1955

The bill (S. 1622) to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955 is amended in the following respect: Amend section 53c. by striking therefrom the words "one year" and substituting in place thereof the words "ninety days".

CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES AT LOS ALAMOS COUNTY, N. MEX.

The bill (S. 1941) to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it to construct (under the applicable provisions of chapter 14 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended) community support facilities at White Rock, Los Alamos County, New Mexico, at a total cost not to exceed $300,000, and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION AND BILL PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) concerning the enforcement in certain States of the Constitution and laws for the protection of individual rights was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. MUSKIE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MUSKIE. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

That completes the call of the calendar.

IMPORTATION OF AMERICAN FARM LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the underemployment and unemployment of our domestic farmworkers are of paramount concern to our new administration. They are also of paramount concern to the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor, which has been studying these and related farmworker problems to determine the feasibility of establishing a national program to meet the critical needs in this area. My work with these problems, as chairman of this subcommittee, has convinced me that one of the most urgent problems facing agricultural workers generally, and migratory agricultural workers particularly, is the effect of the Mexican national importation program on the employment opportunities of domestic agricultural workers.

In 1951, shortly after the beginning of the Korean conflict, the Congress enacted Public Law 78, which provides for the importation of Mexican nationals for the purpose of temporary agricultural employment in the United States. Public Law 78, generally known today as the bracero program, was intended as an emergency measure to meet labor shortages during the Korean crisis. Our experience in this area strongly suggests that the efficacy of Public Law 78 in supplementing our farm labor force is far overshadowed by its limiting effect on the employment opportunities of our own domestic farmworkers. The national crisis and the resulting shortages, which Public Law 78 was designed to meet, no longer exist. But Public Law 78 continues to supplement our domestic farm labor force to a far greater extent than is now economically practical or necessary.

Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg has estimated that underemployment in rural areas is equivalent to 1,400,000 fully unemployed workers. Despite this high rate of underemployment, 315,000 Mexican nationals were imported into the United States last year under the provisions of Public Law 78. From this high rate of rural underemployment among our own citizens, it logically follows that many jobs performed by braceros could well have been performed by domestic farmworkers.

As if this situation were not in itself serious enough, we are faced with the irony that Public Law 78 gives better protection to Mexican national farm laborers than we now accord our own citizens engaged in agricultural work. The contract governing the employment of braceros provides them with workmen's compensation, free housing while at employment centers, free transportation from Mexican migrant stations to reception centers in the United States, guarantees of minimum work periods, and guarantees of wages not less than the prevailing wages paid to domestic farmworkers for similar work within the area of employment.

This extremely unfortunate and undesirable situation convinces me that Public Law 78 should not be extended unless measures are provided to prevent its effect of limiting the employment opportunities of our domestic farmworkers. I am confident that the Senate in its wisdom will arrive at a solution to the problems in this area which will be in the best intrests of all concerned.

A bill, S. 1129, closely related to the heart of this problem, is now pending before the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. This bill, which is designed to stabilize and insure an adequate, well-trained domestic farm labor force, would provide for improved programs of recruitment, transportation, and distribution of domestic agricultural workers and assurances and guarantees respecting the rights and obligations of agricultural employers and employees using the recruitment program. The creation of a more stable and efficient domestic farm labor force would have a tendency to alleviate the adverse effects of Public Law 78 on our domestic farmworkers and, in so doing, would probably decrease the need for imported Mexican farmworkers.

Because of the sensitive and complex issues which have arisen regarding Public Law 78, it was with no little interest that I noted a letter by the Honorable JEFFERY COHELAN, the distinguished Representative from California's Seventh District, which was published in the Washington Post on May 21.

In discussing the disadvantage domestic farmworkers suffer from the effects of Public Law 78, Representative COHELAN points out that—

> There is a basic inconsistency in the fact that the imported Mexican farmworkers are guaranteed wages and working conditions which our own farmworkers are not receiving.

Private individuals are also voicing concern over the undesirable effects of Public Law 78 on domestic farmworkers. Miss Fay Bennett, executive secretary of the National Sharecroppers' Fund, Inc., is one of the most interested and knowledgeable persons in the field of farm labor problems. In a letter to the New York Times dated May 11, 1961, Miss Bennett sets forth several of the adverse effects of Public Law 78, including the fact that the program has a direct, depressant effect on domestic farmworkers' wages:

> Its impact on American farmworkers, already among the lowest paid, least protected, and most underemployed members of our society, has been disastrous. In heavy bracero-using parts of Arkansas farm wages are as low as 35 cents an hour; in parts of

Texas 45 cents. Domestic farmworkers are forced to migrate to find higher wages.

That such conditions are allowed to exist is altogether inconsistent with every principle of American government. Moreover, providing foreign workers better protections than we accord American citizens raises the serious question of whether the rights and privileges of American citizenship are indeed as valuable and as meaningful as we have long voiced to ourselves and to the world.

Because the letters of Representative COHELAN and Miss Bennett highlight several of the more important aspects of the need for revision of Public Law 78, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BRACEROS PROBLEM

In his letter of May 15, my distinguished colleague, CHARLES TEAGUE of the 13th California District, defended the Mexican farm labor importation program as an antiwetback measure and a boon to the small farmers of the United States. He declared, further, that the amendments to the program proposed by the Kennedy administration—amendments designed to protect American farmworkers from unfair competition due to the mass importation of Mexican labor—are unnecessary.

Mr. TEAGUE represents a California district where braceros (imported Mexican nationals) are used in great numbers.

Although the Mexican farm labor program was not intended to displace domestic workers or to depress their wages, these results in fact have occurred. Department of Labor studies demonstrate conclusively that wages in the majority of areas where Mexican farm laborers are employed have not kept pace with the rise of farm wages nationally. In 1960 while over 300,000 Mexicans were imported into this country to work in the fields of California, Texas, New Mexico and Arkansas, thousands of American farmworkers took to the road hunting jobs which would pay a living wage.

Furthermore, there is a basic inconsistency in the fact that the imported Mexican farmworkers are guaranteed wages and working conditions which our own farmworkers are not receiving.

Mr. TEAGUE attempts to justify the program on the basis that it is an antiwetback measure. He states that if the program were terminated, Mexican workers would enter the country illegally and be employed on American farms. This is more of a threat than an argument. Mr. TEAGUE's growers are telling the U.S. Government that if it reduces the number of braceros available for work on U.S. farms, they will hire Mexicans who enter the country illegally. Turning logic upside down, Mr. TEAGUE says that the best way to cure the wetback problem is to legalize the wetbacks.

I believe that if the Immigration and Naturalization Services is not adequate to the task of policing the Mexican border, it should be strengthened. I believe further, that if growers, or any other employers, presume to break our Nation's immigration laws by harboring and trafficking in wetbacks, they should be punished under the provisions of the Wetback Control Act of 1952.

Mr. TEAGUE also contends that Public Law 78 is of inestimable help to the small farmer; indeed that many small farmers would be forced out of business if the program were terminated. On this question I would like to quote from a speech made in the House of Representatives by Representative MERWIN COAD, Democrat, of Iowa, on May 3:

"The bracero program may be of short-run value to those small growers who use Mexican labor. It is questionable, however, whether the program is beneficial in the long run to these growers. Considerable evidence has been accumulated which shows that the availability of Mexican labor causes overproduction and a resulting decline in the prices these small growers receive for their products. The large grower who is able to increase his acreage—usually at the expense of the small grower who has been forced out of business—is not affected by this decline in prices."

I am certain that Mr. TEAGUE is aware of the fact that the bracero program is of no benefit whatsoever to those small farmers who hire no labor at all (54 percent), and to those farmers who hire domestic labor exclusively (over 40 percent). Less than 2 percent of all American farmers hire Mexican labor. No doubt there are some small growers among this 2 percent but compared to the vast majority of growers who do not use foreign labor, they constitute a minuscule minority.

Finally, I would like to correct one statement made by Mr. TEAGUE. In the last paragraph of his letter he stated: "You will note the Department of Labor agrees that the legislation should be extended for 2 years."

On April 24, Secretary of Labor Goldberg, speaking for the administration, said: "It is extremely important that the administration's position be understood: We are against any extension of Public Law 78 without reform."

It would be well for the proponents of Public Law 78 to consider all the ramifications of Mr. Goldberg's statement, and all aspects of this program.

JEFFERY COHELAN,
Representative, Seventh District, California.

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1961]

HIRING MEXICAN LABOR—BILL SETTING EMPLOYMENT TERMS FOR FARMWORKERS SUPPORTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In his letter published May 9 Congressman CHARLES M. TEAGUE defended the annual importation of hundreds of thousands of Mexican farmworkers (braceros) under Public Law 78. Since Congress will soon be asked to extend this program, we should like to point out a few of its many adverse effects.

Its impact on American farmworkers, already among the lowest paid, least protected, and most underemployed members of our society, has been disastrous. In heavy bracero-using parts of Arkansas farm wages are as low as 35 cents an hour; in parts of Texas 45 cents. Domestic farmworkers are forced to migrate to find higher wages.

The program has similarly damaged the position of family farmers. Less than 2 percent of the Nation's farmers hire Mexican workers. These farmers are typically large-scale operators and their use of low-cost imported labor gives them a considerable edge over the vast majority of family farmers who hire little or no labor, because it depresses the value of the labor performed by family farmers and often causes overproduction and a resulting decline in the market prices all farmers receive.

REPORTS OF VIOLATIONS

Contrary to Mr. TEAGUE's assurance, there are many reports of violations of the contract supposed to protect the Mexican workers, such as the following incident which occurred on April 20 in Arizona:

In violation of the transportation regulations, between 150 and 199 braceros had been packed into 2 substandard trucks. When 1 truck plowed into the other, 96 of these men were seriously injured.

Some States, like Oregon and Washington, which formerly relied heavily on Mexican braceros, no longer do so. They have found that by offering better wages and conditions for domestic workers, they can attract all the domestic labor they need.

Congressman MERWIN COAD's bill (H.R. 6032) is a modest proposal. It simply provides that wages offered by farmers who hire braceros keep pace with general increases in farm wages and that American farmworkers be offered conditions that are presently guaranteed Mexican workers by law.

These reforms, endorsed by the Times in an editorial of May 3, were proposed by the Department of Labor and have the full backing of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Churches, the AFL–CIO, the National Farmers Union and others.

Nonetheless the Coad bill faces an uphill fight. It is opposed by a strong conservative Democratic-Republican coalition. Only a strong show of public support to Congress can insure its passage and the defeat of a 2-year extension without reform. Not to pass these reforms would be, in the words of Congressman COAD, "similar to the effect of a boot applied to the head of a person who, through no fault of his own, is already groveling in the dirt."

FAY BENNETT,
Executive Secretary, National Sharecroppers Fund, Inc.

FEES PROTESTED BY JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to an Associated Press article which was published in last Sunday's New York Times and which I think warrants our close scrutiny. The article reports that the fees charged by the three psychiatrists who examined Bernard Goldfine were $4,400, payable in hard cash by the taxpayers of the United States. It goes on to report that a representative of the Justice Department testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittee called this fee "outrageous."

In light of the fact that there has been relatively little real public discussion of this allegation by the Department, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at the conclusion of my remarks so that the appropriate committees of the Senate, particularly the Government Operations Committee, will be informed about this incident. The Federal Government should not overpay anybody, whether he be a workman on a missile site or a special consultant in a technical field.

One possible approach, Mr. President, would be for the Justice Department to decline to pay an apparently exorbitant bill such as that submitted by the psychiatrists who examined Mr. Goldfine. Thereupon, the appropriateness of the fees involved could be determined in the Court of Claims. I urge the Justice Department to alert other Federal agencies and Departments to this problem so that the next such bill can be singled out and pursued as a test case before the court. The taxpayers' stake in this situation warrants that it be pursued by the relevant officials and committees of the Congress in order to determine, once and for all, whether the charges made in this and similar instances are reasonable and proper. Highway robbery cannot be condoned

by the Federal Government by whomsoever committed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DOCTORS CHARGED $4,400 FOR GOLDFINE MIND TEST

WASHINGTON, May 20.—The Government is paying outrageous fees for expert witnesses, including $4,400 to the psychiatrists who examined Bernard Goldfine, the Justice Department reports.

The $4,400 went to three court-appointed psychiatrists who examined the Boston industrialist twice to see if he was competent to stand trial on income tax evasion charges, a Department spokesman told Congress.

The testimony of S. A. Andretta, Administrative Assistant Attorney General, was made public today by a House appropriation subcommittee.

"There are any number of instances where we have been charged $250 or $350 a day by psychiatrists and other experts," Mr. Andretta said. "They probably spend 1 or 2 hours in examination or 1 or 2 hours in court."

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, as in years past, it is my privilege to call attention at this time to the celebration of Armenian Independence Day.

Just 43 years ago, on May 28, 1918, the ancient and justly honored Armenian people established a free Republic in the land which they had long inhabited. History records that this laudable attempt at freedom had the support of Armenia's older sister Republic, the United States.

A little more than 2 years later, on December 2, 1920, the Republic of Armenia became the world's first victim of Communist aggression. The small nation was reduced to subject status by her neighboring giant, Soviet Russia, and remains so to this day.

However, the spirit of Armenian liberty is not dead. Many persons of Armenian descent, all over the world, continue to celebrate the brief years when the homeland was an independent member of the family of nations. We in the United States, who are well acquainted with the sterling qualities of our citizens of Armenian descent, proudly join in this tribute to the aspirations of a freedom-loving people.

AMERICAN MEDICAL CENTER AT DENVER, COLO.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is unable to be in the Chamber at this moment. On his behalf, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which the Senator from Colorado intended to make and also the text of an address delivered by Representative PETER H. DOMINICK before the annual convention of the Women's Auxiliary of the American Medical Center, in Washington, D.C., Sunday, May 21, 1961.

There being no objection, the statement and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

AMERICAN MEDICAL CENTER OF DENVER

One of the great humanitarian organizations of this country is the American Medical Center of Denver. This marvelous research and treatment center has contributed enormously to the battle against tuberculosis; its fame is international. Now, the center has trained its sights on cancer. Patients of every race, creed or color are admitted to this institution for help and treatment.

Recently, the Women's Auxiliary of the American Medical Center—ladies from all parts of the Nation—met here in Washington for their annual convention. These determined ladies have made a superior effort to raise funds for the center and its fight against cancer. Without help from organizations such as the American Cancer Society, the auxiliary has raised over $193,000 from private subscriptions so far this year, and they are still trying to raise more.

I am proud to say that $25,000 of that money came from contributions from my own State of Colorado. And, I am also proud of the very intelligent and thought-provoking address made to the ladies' convention by my great friend and most highly respected colleague, the Honorable PETER H. DOMINICK, who serves now with such outstanding distinction in the other body as the Representative from the Second District of Colorado.

ADDRESS OF HON. PETER H. DOMINICK, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TO THE ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE WOMEN'S AUXILIARY OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL CENTER, IN WASHINGTON, D.C., SUNDAY, MAY 21, 1961

Madam President and officers of the National Council of Auxiliaries, may I express my sincere appreciation to Judge and Mrs. Finesilver for arranging with Mrs. Winocur for me to be here, and to enjoy your hospitality and the opportunity to meet with the presidents of your chapters from all over the country. You and your members have made possible one of the great contributions to medical care and medical research in our Nation. I am proud of the fact that the American Medical Center is located in my district.

I am especially pleased to be afforded this opportunity to visit with you, as I feel a real identity of interest. My father worked tirelessly to revitalize and expand Roosevelt Hospital in New York City, and was instrumental in getting its famous cobalt bank for the treatment of cancer. My brother is on the board of that hospital now. I concentrated in Colorado on mental health problems, and was a member of the board of one of our first clinics, while my cousin started one of the first medical clinics in Wyoming.

In our somewhat uncertain world of politics, these great humanitarian efforts by private citizens working for the sheer pleasure of being able to contribute a chance of healing, a chance of recovery from grotesque and often fatal diseases, are often overlooked and ignored. Dr. Tom Dooley, in his book, "The Edge of Tomorrow," refers to the fellowship of pain, the bond which arises in those who have been afflicted with physical and mental suffering, and their desire to help others in the same situation. I presume that the thousands of years of suffering and persecution of the Jewish people may fall into that category for certainly in every endeavor to create conditions to alleviate suffering the Jewish people are in the forefront.

Although you do not seek such recognition (and like most others, do not receive it), all of mankind owes you a debt of gratitude for the compassion and assistance which you have made possible through voluntary efforts and charitable contributions, brains and management ability.

It is interesting to think back on the old adage that, "It is an ill wind which blows no good to some man." Many of us have felt for years that the total taxation load is so hard to bear that it makes continued progress extremely difficult—if not impossible—a little like the scene on a crowded Capitol elevator when one Congressman asked another how last year had treated him. "Best year I ever had," was the reply. Then spotting the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on the same elevator, the Congressman added: "I mean spiritually, not materially." Or, the popular statement that the most satisfying experience in present-day life next to be shot at and missed is to get an income tax refund.

But think of the charitable contributions which income taxes have made available. Almost anyone would rather make a contribution than to pay money to Uncle Sam. And I firmly believe that if gifts to charity were no longer made deductible, many of our most forward-looking religious, educational and charitable endeavors would have tough sledding.

Now, particularly impressive to me is your approach that patients can stay at the center until cured, or until the cancer has taken its final toll, and the ability which this approach gives to medical science to combine treatment and research on humans as well as laboratory animals.

The wonderful reputation which your hospital has built is worldwide—a reputation for never giving up, trying to alleviate pain and suffering where cure is impossible; while operating under a free basis, nevertheless, treating each patient as though she or he is the most important concern. It is a record of which you can most assuredly be proud.

On a different scale, we are faced with the same dread disease in world politics today—our fight against international communism. The disease strikes a weak cell, it expands and encroaches on neighboring healthy tissues, and it continues until it has riddled the body politic and destroyed the facets of mankind which are the values which we prize most.

This disease has not been stopped. It has publicly stated that it does not intend to stop until it controls all of the world function. Just as you are doing at the medical level, so are the leaders of the free world engaged in a tremendous struggle to find the means and mechanisms to offset this great scourge. It is interesting to carry the analogy still further. One of the better treatments in the cure of cancer is X-ray and cobalt ray exposure. But the problem is that the treatment itself may so weaken the patient that it is unsuccessful. We could say that threats of radiation attacks are likewise preventatives in the treatment against the world's political cancer, communism. But if the treatment is unleashed improperly, we would kill not only the disease, but the patient and probably the doctor. So we are looking for other methods. Among the methods which might prove most effective against the Communist cancer are large doses of people-to-people aid—economic assistance at the local level. Guerrilla infiltration might be used in massive doses where the disease has progressed to epidemic stages. But at all costs we must be dedicated to active opposition to Communist aggression in whatever part of the free world this disease may strike. We in the free world have a long struggle ahead, and most assuredly, unless the answer is found and proves effective, the disease may conquer the world, and all of us might fail to survive.

On the credit side over the past decade and a half we can say that we have routed

the cousins of this disease, nazism and fascism. We have revived Europe, which was very ill following this struggle. We in the United States remain strong and communism has been at least halted, and perhaps reversed in France and Italy. Japan has somewhat recovered, and Greece is still alive. But the steady encroachment and attacks continue.

A radical distinction in most countries overrun by this cancer must be made; namely, between the controlling power of communism and the vast majority of people living under it. Once a person has experienced the ravages of communism or cancer, he or she cannot cure themselves by their own bodily strength but need aid or assistance. They are ready and anxious to get help, but often under present methods, it is already too late. We must, therefore, recognize the symptoms sooner, adopt measures to throw off the danger which will kill neither the patient nor the doctor, and discover new measures to relieve the cause of this disease from already ailing bodies, or bodies politic.

As was said by Dr. Charles Malik in his great address, "Will the Future Redeem the Past?"—

"Only a believing, active, sustained, and bold looking forward to a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, and a free China is worthy of the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle. The flame of freedom must be kept burning in the soul of the oppressed. The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts."

You shall, I'm sure, with the dedication you have shown, find a way to stop the disease of cancer. So shall we, God willing, find a way to stop communism.

CRISIS—ABROAD, AT HOME, IN SPACE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Much To Be Done," published in the Washington Daily News of today, May 26, 1961. The editorial comments upon the President's second state of the Union address to Congress on yesterday. The editorial very properly calls attention to the President's request for greater expenditures on each of many projects; to the President's wish to keep the deficit to a manageable level; to his desire to maintain fiscal responsibility; and to his statement he does not want additional taxes to be imposed.

The editorial quotes the President's statement "There is much to be done," and comments upon the important but unanswered question in the President's message; namely, "Where will he get the money to pay for these programs?"

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MUCH TO BE DONE

President Kennedy's second state of the Union address to Congress was in the pattern of the first (January 30). Crisis was the main theme—abroad, at home, in space. Everywhere but in the Treasury.

The President's answer to all the problems he listed—real problems, as every American must know—chiefly was more spending. In his January 30 message, Mr. Kennedy talked of towering and unprecedented action on these problems. Now he is offering it, in dollars.

More money for space, for the Army and the Marine Corps, for the U.S. Information Agency, for foreign aid, both military and economic, for a new agency to research disarmament, for help to the unemployed for "manpower development" and more money (triple previous requests) for civil defense.

"Experience has taught us," the President said, "that no one nation has the power or the wisdom to solve all the problems of the world."

But the rest of the message said he was willing to try.

He appealed, in one paragraph, to Congress to "hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards," not to add more to his programs, "desirable as they may be." But he added to the series of earlier messages with which he has bombarded Congress, reversing this plea.

He spoke of holding the deficit to manageable proportions. Is a $3 billion deficit manageable? How manageable is the present $288 billion debt? It costs $9 billion a year—11 cents out of each tax dollar—in interest.

In his January 30 message, and several times later, Mr. Kennedy implied, at least, that he would ask no spending without proposals for raising the money. But yesterday he loosened this policy.

"I am not," he said, "requesting additional taxes to finance the very urgent requests I am making today—for our present tax structure and resources are more than sufficient to support them without a budget deficit if our economy moves ahead."

If—. At least three times the Eisenhower administration was hung up on that big "if"—running into deficits, when the "if" didn't pan out. The same thing happened in the Truman administration. We can't "if" our way into solvency.

No American questions the need for an ever-stronger defense. Not many will challenge a stepped-up program of ventures into space. The humane necessity of helping emerging nations is in our own interest, if met effectively and within our means. But can we do these things, and all the rest of the President's sweeping, complex and costly programs, too?

And do it without raising taxes?

"These are extraordinary times," said Mr. Kennedy.

The times have been "extraordinary" for 30 years. If they are more extraordinary today, it is only in degree. They are no more extraordinary than they were last January when retiring President Eisenhower warned us against the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow.

Mr. Kennedy says his "expansionary measures" are not inflationary. Spending money the Government must borrow is always inflationary.

"There is much to be done," the President said.

There is indeed, along some of the lines Mr. Kennedy cites—in welding the means of preserving the peace, maintaining our security, deterring the communist peril. But there also is much to be done which the President skipped over.

There is much to be done in stopping the monumental waste which besets the Government, especially in the military, as proved by investigations going on in Congress right now. Much to be done in reestablishing control over Government spending, and restoring the "prudence" the President lightly mentioned. Much to be done in returning perspective in Washington, in sorting out what we can and must do from what we might desire to do.

The President speaks of "sacrifice"—but not in taxes. The only alternative is sacrifice by inflation, which rots the people's dollars, and is the costliest and cruelest of all sacrifices.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION AND LAWS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, yesterday, at the beginning of the session of the Senate, the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS], from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] spoke in support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 25, a resolution concerning the enforcement of the Constitution, and laws for the protection of individual rights. Their resolution was introduced following the events which occurred recently in Alabama and Mississippi. I did not speak at the time because they were the sponsors of the resolution, and their time was limited to 1 hour. I should like to make a short statement today concerning the resolution.

I agree with the statements made by the distinguished Senators that the events which have occurred in Alabama and Mississippi are very unfortunate; their effect on world opinion will have very serious consequences.

Most important, here in our own country, riots, mobs, and violence challenge law itself. It has been disputed by some in the South that the Brown case, relating to segregation of schools, is grounded in the Constitution. I believe the Brown case is grounded in the Constitution, and that the Supreme Court, having rendered its decision, has determined the law.

But whatever may be the dispute about the Brown case, there can be no dispute that law prohibits discrimination, and guarantees equal rights in the transportation of persons in interstate commerce, and in the use of facilities in interstate commerce.

There are many factors which lead to the support of law in the United States. One is the enforcement of the law. Congress is authorized in the 14th amendment to enforce its provisions, by legislation; and the President is charged, under the Constitution, with enforcing the law. In the case of the so-called freedom riders the President has been attempting, as best he can, to fulfill his duty. But there is another factor upon which ultimate respect and support of law is based. It is consent—acceptance of law by the people. I know, because I live in a border State, a State which admittedly does not have the difficulties which obtain in the States to the south of Kentucky, that the problem of acceptance of the law in cases of discrimination is a serious one. This means that an unremitting effort must be made to secure acceptance of the law in those States. How can that be done? It is an old and difficult problem. It is difficult because it is grounded in the habits and customs of the South.

If a start is to be made toward the full acceptance of the law regarding equal rights, and against discrimination, someone must be willing to provide leadership of public opinion. The leadership should be given by the Governors of the States and, I say this with all respect, by the Members of Congress from those States. Churchmen, leaders of industry, farming, and labor in the States, should call for consent—acceptance of the law by all the people.

I urge President Kennedy upon his return from Europe, to call together in informal conference, the Governors, Members of Congress, outstanding

churchmen, and industrial farm and labor leaders from these States; and in these meetings that he will urge these State leaders in forming public opinion in their State toward the acceptance of the law, the acceptance of constitutional and legal rights. For certainly in the field of transportation in interstate commerce, there can be no question about the constitutional rights of all citizens to be free from a discrimination.

If a start can be made with the Governors, the Members of Congress, the outstanding churchmen, and the industrial leaders and labor leaders of these States, secure acceptance of the well established law against discrimination in interstate commerce—progress can be made toward the development of public opinion in the States in regard to the acceptance of nondiscrimination in other fields, including education. This may seem to be a doubtful approach, and may be regarded as too idealistic, but I do not think so, for while enforcement of law is required—consent, acceptance of law is our highest goal.

I can say with some pride about my State of Kentucky—although I admit, that Kentucky does not have the problems that are found in Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, and other Southern States—that when the decision in the Brown case was rendered, the Governor of Kentucky, the leaders of Kentucky in education, presidents of universities, industrial and labor leaders and, I may add political leaders in both the Republican Party and the Democratic Party supported the decision in the Brown case. We could have had difficulties in our State, as has been experienced in other States; but I believe that when those who had the responsibility for leadership in our State exercised it, and said, "We support the Brown case decision," it had a definite effect on the acceptance of the decision by the people of the State.

I repeat that there are many factors which enter into the development and support of the law, but two are basic in our democratic process. One is the strict enforcement of the law; the second is the continual effort to secure acceptance of the law.

It appears that the President and his Attorney General is fulfilling their duty to enforce the law. The President of the United States, with all his prestige and his leadership, should call a meeting of the Governors of the Southern States, and the leaders of those States, including, I say with deference, the Members of Congress from those States. If through such meetings they can join in greater efforts to secure greater acceptance of well-defined law, such as equal rights in interstate transportation, then we will see progress against discrimination, which exists all over our land but has been particularly brought to the public attention by the events which have occurred in recent days in certain States in the South. I say this with affection and respect for the South.

I believe unless the problem of respect and acceptance of law is met quickly we will be threatened with a breakdown of law in our country, threatened with loss of respect throughout the world, and a loss of confidence in the honesty of our country and its leaders.

Without local leadership, riots and lawlessness may continue and mock our country's freedom.

LET US BEGIN TO REFORM OUR TAX SYSTEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we all know that our present tax system has so many loopholes or "truck" holes that certain favored groups are able to escape taxation on large parts of their income. These exemptions are being steadily widened by legislation and perhaps even more by the rise of two well-paid new professions, namely, tax lawyers and tax accountants. These gentlemen help citizens to avoid and, in some cases, to evade the payment of taxes which in all good conscience they should pay. A bewildering variety of tax "gimmicks" and arguments are developed with which the revenue officials and the courts are either unable or unwilling to cope. All this has been sanctioned by sage counsel, which I have heard promulgated from this body, and from even more august quarters, that it is a patriotic duty for a citizen to pay as little in taxes as possible.

As the bolder and more expensively advised succeed in avoiding taxes, then others who have previously looked on with envy join in the race. They ask, "Why should we be left out? Taxpayers X and Y," they say, "are getting by with their tax dodges. It is only fair that we should receive equal favors." So more and more citizens and corporations become tax evaders and tax avoiders.

The revenue system consequently becomes undermined. So many are evading taxes that in order to meet the necessary expenses of government, tax rates have to be kept inordinately high. This means that the patriotic taxpayer who does not try to evade his responsibilities is compelled to bear the burdens which his less scrupulous neighbors have cast off. Because some pay less than they should, others are forced to pay more.

The important function of raising money to establish justice, provide for the common defense, and promote the general welfare, is thus degraded by being transformed into an area of self-seeking and special privilege. The whole process weakens the character of the public and breeds contempt both for human nature and for our civil institutions.

We are, in fact, going through a process in our system of taxation very similar to that which helped to cause the slow downfall of Rome, and centuries later the fall of the ancient regime in France. If not corrected, the gross and smarting injustices which are now being practiced and legalized in our tax system will seriously weaken our civilization in the stresses and strains to which it is being subjected.

Such are the reasons why some of us have been trying for years to remedy these injustices by plugging as many of the unfair loopholes as possible. We start from a very simple assumption, with which I believe few can disagree; namely, that people with equal net incomes should, in the absence of powerful overriding considerations, pay equal taxes. The question as to whether the general system of taxation over the range of incomes should be arithmetically proportional, progressive or regressive is not for the moment involved. For whatever may be the rates of taxation over the range of incomes, we are at present merely concerned that the amounts actually paid should be approximately the same for all those with the same given net incomes.

Once this is done, then incomes which now escape taxation in whole or in part will contribute in larger measure to the support of government. Total Federal revenues from a given gross national product will increase. This will, in turn, make possible some lowering of the tax rates themselves and some provision for the great needs in the fields of human welfare and national defense.

During these last 8 years, those of us who have sought to reform our tax structure have had to swim against a mighty current. For we have not only had to face the opposition of the powerful special-interest groups which now profit, both directly and indirectly, from these injustices, but we also had against us the moving forces in the previous administration. As a result, it was difficult to get adequate information with which to appeal to the conscience of the country, and impossible to muster sufficient voting strength to overcome the obstacles to tax reform which have been built into our congressional structure.

Fortunately, the new administration is changing this. It is leading the campaign for tax reform instead of opposing it. President Kennedy and Secretary Dillon are asking us to remedy some of the grossest of the injustices, and to plug some, although not all, of the loopholes.

On May 3, Secretary Dillon gave remarkably lucid and comprehensive testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in support of his proposals. This testimony, together with the supplementary exhibits which he submitted, has been printed in the form of a 295-page document which I hope every Member of Congress and every concerned citizen will not only read, but study and ponder.

As is well known, the President is asking that we, first, eliminate the abuses connected with the wholesale exemption of entertainment expenses, business gifts, and excessive travel; second, provide for the withholding of taxes on dividends and interest at the source as is now done on wages and salaries; third, reduce the special privileges given to the investment of American capital abroad; fourth, repeal the 4-percent dividend credit; fifth, remove tax favors given to increases in income derived from gains on the sale of depreciable property; sixth, effect other minor changes in the tax laws; and seventh, provide tax credits for investment in physical plant of manufacturing and allied industries. While I wish to suspend judgment for a

time on the final proposal and certain features of the sixth proposal, I most heartily and enthusiastically support the first five which, indeed, embody many of the reforms for which some of us have been laboring for many years.

But we face grave difficulties in putting these reforms into effect. The House Committee on Ways and Means has announced that it will hold hearings steadily through June 9. This will, in all probability, make it impossible for them to report out a tax revision bill for many days. During this whole time, as over 250 witnesses testify who are drawn primarily from special-interest groups opposed to the President's proposals, the propaganda against the proposals for reform will fill the newspapers and the airwaves, and are, indeed, already doing so. There is grave danger that all this will so influence public opinion as to cause the grave abuses to be neglected. The final result is likely therefore to be one more victory for the forces of special privilege.

It is highly necessary, therefore, that we should begin to discuss these issues before the Senate and the country so that we may get a more thorough understanding of the issues involved. That is why I am planning to make a series of speeches during the coming weeks on the President's tax program which I shall begin today by discussing the huge loopholes now existing in connection with entertainment, gifts, and travel. Involved in all this is also the question of timing and of parliamentary procedure. It has been the practice of the House during the last 3 years to send us the annual tax bill which extends some of the taxes on excise and corporation profits so late as to give the Senate Finance Committee little time to take evidence, revise the bill and send it to the floor for action. Both the committee and the Members of the Senate have therefore had a financially loaded pistol leveled at them. We have been told that unless we accepted the House bill, many taxes would lapse on July 1 and that financial considerations demanded that we pass the bill as submitted in order to avoid disaster. It has therefore been impossible for Members of the Senate to reform the tax structure although by several votes they have shown their desire to do so. Such amendments as have been adopted by the Senate have, moreover, almost universally been thrown out in conference. I had feared that we would be caught in a similar bind this year, namely, that such tax revision as the Ways and Means Committee decided on would be included in the tax extension bill and then rushed through at the last moment. I am now informed that it is the present intention of the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee to separate tax revision from tax extension. If this is done it will lessen this danger. But it is important that any tax revision bill should come from the House in sufficient time for us to act at this session and that we should do so. If there is no guarantee that this will be done, then it may well be necessary for us to amend the tax extension bill by including some of the more pressing tax reforms.

II. PRESENT LAW ON EXPENSE ACCOUNTS

The Internal Revenue Code does not specifically refer to expense account items. However, section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code allows as deductible all ordinary and necessary expenses incurred in carrying on a trade or business. Therefore, if expense account items can be considered as ordinary and necessary in the operation of a business, they are deductible.

Under the present administrative procedures, individual employees who make expenditures of company funds for entertainment or travel are not required to include these funds in gross income. If employees spend their own money and are reimbursed by the business firm, the employee is not required to report the expenditure for individual income tax purposes if the employee accounts to his employer for all of the expenditure.

WHY THE PRESENT LAW INVOLVES A TAX LOOPHOLE

The present law is at odds with the basic concepts of taxable income and of tax equity. This is true because it allows a certain group of taxpayers to charge off essentially personal expenditures against their taxable income. The typical taxpayer cannot deduct his personal living expenses, with certain exceptions that have been specified by the Congress. However, the administration of the tax law with respect to expense account expenditures has permitted personal deductions to be taken because they are vaguely associated with business operations.

THE COHAN CASE

One of the reasons the Internal Revenue Service has had so much difficulty in administering the law with respect to travel and entertainment is the existence of the so-called Cohan rule. This rule arose from a court case involving the celebrated Mr. George M. Cohan, the late "Yankee Doodle Dandy" of Broadway. Mr. Cohan was accustomed to living very well and entertaining lavishly. He claimed in his deductions a major portion of his entertainment expenses on the grounds that they were necessary to maintain his station in life and his position in his profession. However, he kept virtually no records to indicate who he entertained, nor what the relationship of his entertaining was to his professional work. The Internal Revenue Service denied some $22,000 in deductions on the grounds that Mr. Cohan did not substantiate these deductions. Mr. Cohan contested this decision in the courts on the grounds that it was obvious from his professional work that he had to do a considerable amount of entertaining.

In 1930, the court handed down its ruling in the case (*Cohan* v. *Commissioner*, 39 F. 2d 540 (2d Cir. 1930)). The court held that while Mr. Cohan had practically no evidence to support his $22,000 claimed deduction, the Internal Revenue Service would have to accept the fact that he had some expenditures for entertainment which were business deductions. In lieu of any better test, the court simply divided in half the amount which Mr. Cohan claimed.

The effect of this ruling has been to encourage many taxpayers to claim deductions for entertainment without adequate proof or support on the theory that the Internal Revenue Service would have to accept some portion of them. Frequently it has been alleged that some taxpayers simply inflate their claimed deductions severalfold, on the grounds that the Internal Revenue Service must allow a substantial portion of the amounts claimed, even though no proof is provided that the expenditures were made or that they were related to a business purpose. It is impossible for the Internal Revenue Service to discover all these cases, and almost impossible under the Cohan rule to deny deduction for all of the amounts claimed.

Another result of the Cohan rule has been that taxpayers in some professions are generally assumed to have deductible entertainment expenses simply by the fact that they are in particular business situations. Thus, taxpayers are again encouraged to take entertainment deductions even though the actual expenses of entertainment may not have been incurred or the entertainment may have been personal and not necessary to a business operation.

THE PROBLEM OF AUDITING

The auditing of expense account items by the Internal Revenue agents has proved to be very difficult in practice. The difficulties are of two types.

First, the determination of the facts is difficult because of imprecise record-keeping. In many cases, the only information available is a check made out to cash or a book entry for a flat dollar amount. In addition, the examining agent also has relatively few secondary sources of information or collateral evidence. The use of credit cards and hotel charge accounts does not ease this difficulty much because there is still no documentation as to whether the expenditure was for a business purpose. Entertainment expenses can be buried in many different business accounts and it is extremely difficult for an agent to discover all of these.

Second, the examining agent has a responsibility to distinguish between business and personal expenditures. In general, because of the nature of the present law, the courts have tended to allow deductions for all sorts of items of a personal nature so long as some vague relationship to the taxpayer's business could be established. Moreover, it is frequently alleged that the primary purpose of an expenditure is for business reasons even though there is a substantial personal benefit derived from the outlay. Because of these court cases, Internal Revenue agents have tended to allow many amounts which provide personal satisfaction to the individuals concerned.

In some cases, the abuse in these areas is so flagrant that it is outright fraud. However, it is difficult to secure convictions in these cases because of the heavy burden of proving a taxpayer's intent to defraud the Government.

It is impossible to determine the aggregate amount of entertainment deductions. The reason for this is that the entertainment deductions are included

under so many different taxpayer accounts. However, the Internal Revenue Service has recently conducted a sample survey which may indicate the significance of expense account deductions. The tax returns in this survey were not a random sample. They represented a selection of 38,000 returns which were to be audited during a period in late 1960. However, the returns were not selected for audit primarily because of the expectation of abuse of travel and entertainment deductions, but rather because they were in the upper income groups or for some other reason were selected audit. These returns may be indicative of returns which are intensively audited, but they are not representative samples of all tax returns.

The survey showed that in approximately one out of every two returns included in the study the deduction was decreased for changes in the travel, entertainment, or similar expenses which were claimed. Returns from businesses with receipts ranging from $25,000 to $50,000 had the highest frequency of reductions in the amounts allowed, 58 percent.

In 60 percent of all the returns in the survey which claimed deductions for yachts had to be decreased.

In 55 percent of the returns deductions or claims for resorts and apartments had to be decreased.

In 63 percent of the number of deductions disallowed and 56 percent of the total dollar amounts disallowed were considered to be personal expenses rather than business expenses.

Because of this intensive audit of only 38,000 returns, some $28.3 million of travel and entertainment deductions were disallowed. This resulted in additional revenues of $11.1 million. Another $29.5 million which was deducted by these taxpayers was found to have been unreported income rather than a proper deduction and this resulted in $8.3 million in additional taxes. Thus, $19.4 million, or almost $20 million of additional revenues was collected as a result of this intensive audit—see page 185, statement of Secretary Dillon to House Ways and Means Committee.

It is important to note that these results were obtained under the present law only because of a highly intensive audit. It is impossible for internal revenue agents to give this much time to auditing all returns for travel and entertainment deductions. Therefore, amounts will be deducted under present law which would normally not be deductible if they could be detected. In addition to this, a substantial number of essentially personal items are deductible under present law, as shown by the examples which I shall give in a few moments, and for this reason, too, the law should be changed.

The law should be changed also to make the auditing job of the internal revenue agents more effective and to eliminate many of the special privileges which are now allowed.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE LAW

President Kennedy has proposed certain changes in the present law which I believe are eminently reasonable. I shall describe here only the proposals concerning deductions for entertainment, yachts, and similar items. Under the President's proposals, expenses for entertainment would simply not be allowed as tax deductions. Entertainment in this sense would include the amusement, recreation, or pleasurable diversion of any individual. Such items as expenditures at nightclubs, theaters, country clubs, prize fights, and hunting and fishing trips would not be allowable deductions.

Let me make absolutely clear that this proposal would in no way preclude an individual from making these expenditures. The proposal means only that the Government would not foot part of the bill, 52 percent in the case of a large corporation, because Uncle Sam picks up half the check on these items. Of course, no changes would be made in existing tax law with respect to deductions for goods and services which are sold, treated as compensation, made available to the general public or attributable to an employee's recreational activity.

The President has also recommended that expenses attributed to a yacht, hunting lodge, fishing camp, resort property, or other facility generally used for pleasure, recreation, or entertainment, be disallowed if the facility is primarily used for such purposes.

I believe these proposals are desirable. They recognize the essentially personal nature of the expenditures. They place the emphasis upon the individual to decide how he wants to make his personal expenditures rather than encouraging him to make particular types of expenditures for which they are subsidized.

III. EXAMPLES

Now, Mr. President, I turn to examples of excessive deductions taken for entertainment and other expenses. I shall cite some 63 cases. There are a variety of sources for these cases and they include the public records at the Tax Court of the United States, the testimony of Secretary of the Treasury Dillon before the House Ways and Means Committee, the testimony of former Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Mr. Andrews, before the same committee, administrative cases which have been made a part of the public record, and articles from sources such as the Yale Law Review and from the Commerce Clearing House publication.

Let me first turn to a number of examples in which the claimed deductions were substantially allowed because of the weakness of the present law.

ENTERTAINMENT

The first case deals with a road building equipment company which in a 2-year period claimed over $34,000 in expenses for liquor, football tickets, parties, conventions, travel for a customer, a Christmas party, a speedboat and for a Las Vegas vacation. The amounts are staggering: over $2,000 for football tickets; $1,500 for a 2-week vacation in Las Vegas; $1,410 for a speedboat; and $13,750 for liquor. Because of the weakness in the present law, these expenses were allowed in full. I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case, taken from the testimony of Secretary Dillion, be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Road building equipment	Club expense	$6,700	$6,700		These expenses are incurred primarily by the top 3 officers of the company. In general, the club expenses are for lunches, dinners, parties, and convention expense on behalf of customers. The liquor is purchased for the bar in the office and is kept for customers who drop in. Expense for conventions are for various groups who have their conventions in the taxpayer's home city; however, a good share is for conventions that the officers attend in resort cities.
	Liquor	13,750	13,750		
	Season football tickets	2,004	2,004		
	Convention expenses	4,250	4,250		
	Convention	1,400	1,400		Expenses for tractor demonstration attended by corporate taxpayer's principal officer-shareholder and his wife. A purported business reason for the wife's travel was established based on allowance of expenses for similar travel in the past.
	Travel to construction job of one of taxpayer's customers.	2,600	2,600		Such shareholder and his wife traveled to Alaska with customer and wife. Expense of wife was allowed based on representation that customer would not go without his wife and his wife would not go without such shareholder's wife.
	Speedboat	1,410	1,410		Speedboat was used exclusively at officer-shareholder's personal cottage, yet a log was kept which showed that the boat was used solely for the pleasure and convenience of customers of the taxpayer corporation.
	Party	675	675		Christmas party given by such officer-shareholder cost $850. It was claimed that most of the guests were business customers or potential customers. Accordingly $675 of the $850 was claimed and allowed as a business expense of taxpayer.
	Las Vegas vacation	1,500	1,500		Officer-shareholder and wife accompanied customer and wife to Las Vegas for 12 days' vacation. Taxpayer paid the expense for the 4 individuals. Officer-shareholder asserted that he would not have made the trip except for business purposes and that his wife's presence was required by the customer and his wife.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is one interesting feature concerning the trip which this gentleman took to Alaska and the trip he took to Las Vegas. He is the head of a roadbuilding equipment company. He wanted to go to Alaska in order to take a customer there. The customer said he could not go without his wife. Then the wife of the customer said that she could not go unless the wife of the company representative went along. So A wanted to take B. B said, "I must take my wife." B's wife said, "I will not go unless A's wife comes along."

That plan was worked with respect to Alaska, and then it was worked for a trip to Las Vegas. Once again the company representative took the customer to Las Vegas. The customer said, "I can't go without my wife." The wife said, "I can't go unless the wife of the official comes along." So once again A took B. B said, "I won't go unless my wife goes." The wife of B said, "I won't go unless the wife of A goes."

The second case is for entertainment by an individual taxpayer who visited insurance offices. He claimed in the year 1957 some $137,500 of expenses for meals, lodging, transportation, food, and beverage, tickets, conventions, an apartment, gifts, auto rental, and so forth; $97,500 of this amount was allowed. The amount claimed included lavish entertainment at Florida vacation resorts, $6,000 for an apartment, and over $30,000 for food, beverage, and entertainment. I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case from the testimony of Secretary Dillon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business, insurance—Tax year or period, 1957

Type of expense:	Amount claimed
Meals	$25,000
Lodging	20,000
Transportation	30,000
Food and beverage for entertainment	30,000
Tickets	2,000
Conventions	1,000
Apartment	6,000
Gifts	10,500
Other	3,000
Auto	10,000
Total	137,500
Amount allowed	97,500

SUMMARY OF FACTS

Individual taxpayer travels widely while visiting insurance agency offices. At each office the taxpayer entertains office personnel lavishly for the apparent purpose of establishing good management-employee relations. Taxpayer also lavishly entertains personnel at Florida vacation resorts. The disallowance of $40,000 of expense was based on either lack of substantiation or claim stated in wrong year; it was not based on failure to establish a business relationship for the expense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is an item of $25,000 for meals in 1 year, which would be $80 a day. That is a deduction of five times the average salary of people in this country which was taken for meals alone. Lodging is listed at $20,000; transportation, $30,000; food and beverage for entertainment, $30,000; $2,000 worth of tickets; $10,500 of gifts. How generous this man was. But remember that Uncle Sam picked up 22 percent of the check. Uncle Sam was in part the unseen donor to the man who made the gifts. The shareholders contributed the remainder.

Example 3 deals with the president of a closely held corporation whose business was that of a supplier. In 3 years he claimed over $145,000 for gifts and entertainment and under the law was allowed $115,000 of this amount. His gifts included those to key employees of customers, and his entertainment expenses for 1954 alone included $7,500 at a Florida hotel; food, liquor, and cigars for his office and farm of some $5,400; cash to officers for entertainment of $8,700, and so forth. The facts indicate that he traveled extensively with officers of a customer to various plants, conventions, and on the "horse show circuit." He was a great admirer of horseflesh. He took his friends and customers to the horse shows.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case from Secretary Dillon's testimony be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Supplier	Gifts	$10,521	$10,521	1953, 1954, and 1955.	President of closely held corporate taxpayer traveled extensively with officers of a customer to various plants, conventions, and on the "horse show circuit." On these occasions he entertained officials of customer at cocktail parties, dinners, etc. Taxpayer contended that it was essential to maintain close personal relations with officers and employees of its customer. It was taxpayer's policy to give gifts to key employees of customer. Entertainment expense of $44,230 for 1954 is typical and was expended as follows: Local hotels and clubs $7,500 Out-of-town hotels and clubs 14,000 Cash to officers, entertainment 8,700 Transportation 1,000 Food, liquor, cigars for office and farm 5,400 Florida hotel expense 7,500 Most of the expenditures were made by the president of taxpayer.
		2,304	2,304		
		5,941	5,941		
	Entertainment	51,259	38,444		
		44,230	33,172		
		23,898	17,924		

Mr. DOUGLAS. Example 4 deals with a food products company which claimed and received $26,536 in deductions for a hunting trip. The deduction was allowed in full as a result of an earlier Tax Court case dealing with the same issues about which I shall later have more to say. I ask unanimous consent that this example from Mr. Dillon's testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Type of business, food products—tax year or period, 1951 and 1952

Type of expense:	Amount claimed
Hunting trip	$12,211
Do	14,325
Total	26,536
Amount allowed	12,211
Do	14,325
Total	26,536

SUMMARY OF FACTS

The trip was given considerable coverage by the newspapers. Films of the trip were exploited successfully in connection with taxpayer's business. The deduction was allowed based on decision of the Tax Court on a similar issue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Example 5 is a case of a company which processes cloth and it deals with the expenses of its president-shareholder. Deductions of $64,980 or virtually $65,000, were claimed for

such items as the president's residence—which was also said to be his business office—for entertainment, for a hotel suite, for gifts and football tickets. Almost $40,000 of this amount was allowed. The amounts for football tickets and gifts were allowed in full, and 40 percent of the costs attributed to his residence were allowed on the grounds that he entertained business guests there. I ask unanimous consent that this example from Mr. Dillon's testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Processing cloth	Residence	$21,183	$8,472	1955, 1956, and 1957.	It was determined that 40 percent of the amount paid by the corporate taxpayer to its president-shareholder was to reimburse him for entertaining business guests of the corporate taxpayer and thus was allowable. No guest register was maintained but taxpayer was able to establish that customers were entertained at the president's residence. Disallowances were based in part on lack of substantiation and in part on failure to relate some expenses to a business purpose. The expense of a hotel suite maintained by the taxpayer was allocated between business and nonbusiness use. Gifts and football tickets for taxpayer's customers were allowed in full.
	Entertainment	32,051	23,101		
	Hotel suite	7,200	3,600		
	Gifts	3,300	3,300		
	Football tickets	1,246	1,246		

Mr. DOUGLAS. Example 6 is that of a beverage manufacturer who claimed and was allowed $10,903 for entertaining customers and their wives at the Kentucky Derby. The facts speak for themselves and I ask unanimous consent that this example from the testimony of Secretary Dillon be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business, beverage manufacturer—tax year or period, Apr. 30, 1958

Type of expense:
Kentucky Derby, amount claimed.. $10,903
Amount allowed.. 10,903

SUMMARY OF FACTS

Customers and their wives are entertained by Derby parties such as breakfasts and luncheons, etc.; by furnishing box seats and tickets for the Derby; and entertainment at the Derby.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Customers and their wives were given breakfasts and luncheons. They had box seats and entertainment at the Derby. They undoubtedly thought their host was being very generous to them. But it was Uncle Sam who was picking up part of the check, and the other part was picked up by the stockholders of the company.

Example 7 is an interesting example. It is one in which a family-held ship repair corporation claimed and was allowed $23,758 for a Christmas dinner and party. I ask unanimous consent that this example from Secretary Dillon's testimony be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business, ship repair—tax year or period, 1956

Type of expense:
Christmas party amount claimed.. $23,758
Amount allowed.. 23,758

SUMMARY OF FACTS

Taxpayer is a closely held family corporation. During Christmas season of 1956 the corporation gave a dinner at a large hotel, which was attended by customers of the firm and business acquaintances of the corporate executives. The cost of the affair was allowed as deduction on the ground that the purpose for the expenditure was to create goodwill and to enhance the repute of the corporation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The sum of $23,758 was spent for a Christmas dinner to commemorate the birth of Jesus, the Saviour of mankind, whose mother, when she came to the inn, was denied entrance, and her Son was born in a manger, or stable. The founder of Christianity was born under those humble circumstances. But ostensibly to commemorate His birth this man gave a party—it must have been some party—which cost $23,758. Imagine the simplicity of that party. Then the man charged 52 percent of the cost to Uncle Sam and the rest to the stockholders.

Example 8 is one in which $1,240 was claimed and allowed in 1958 for an elk hunting trip and $3,855 in 1959 for a fishing trip. An oil refining company was allowed these amounts for the entertainment of officers and managers of various firms from which it acquired its crude oil. I ask unanimous consent that this example from Secretary Dillon's testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business: Oil refining corporation.
Tax year or period: 1958 and 1959.
Type of expense: Hunting trip—amount claimed $1,240; amount allowed $1,240.
Type of expense: Fishing trip—amount claimed, $3,855; amount allowed $3,855.
Summary of facts: Elk hunting trip for party of six. Fishing trip to Canada for party of 11. These trip expenses were incurred to entertain officers and managers of various oil and pipeline companies from which taxpayer acquired its crude oil.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Example 9 is a case in which a vice president of the American Tobacco Co., a Mr. Penn, was allowed an average of $13,000 a year for travel and entertainment. These amounts were allowed by a court because they appeared to have a "proper relationship" to the average annual salary of the vice president. I ask unanimous consent that this example be placed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the example was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Travel and entertainment: The American Tobacco Co. deducted expenditures for travel and entertainment of its vice president. These amounts averaged over $13,000 a year. The amounts were allowed as deductions simply because they seemed in "proper" relationship to the average annual salary received by that vice president [Mr. Penn] of over $450,000 (*Penn* v. *Robertson*, 29 F. Supp. 386 (M.D.N.C. 1939)).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Example 10 is a Tax Court case in which a professional actor's claim of $1,687 in entertainment expenses were disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. The Board of Tax Appeals sustained the Commissioner's decision but the circuit court reversed it and allowed the deduction on grounds that this entertainment tended to promote the taxpayer's popularity and, therefore, increased his income from acting. It is decisions such as these under the present law which have caused much of the difficulty. They clearly show the need for revision of this part of our tax code. I ask unanimous consent that this example be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the example was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business: Actor.
Type of expense: Entertainment.
Amount claimed, $1,687; amount allowed, none; allowed by courts, $1,687.
Summary of facts: Taxpayer, a professional actor, incurred expenses for theater tickets, luncheons, suppers, and other entertainment which he provided to a variety of individuals for purposes of publicity and public relations and to enable him to secure theatrical engagements more easily. The Board of Tax Appeals sustained the Commissioner's disallowance but was reversed on appeal. The circuit court noted that this entertainment tended to promote the taxpayer's popularity and thereby to increase

his income from acting; the expenses were therefore held to be ordinary and necessary. The court said "As the word 'necessary' is used here, we think it means 'appropriate' and 'helpful'" (*Blackmer* v. *Commissioner*, 70 F. 2d 255 (2d Cir. 1934)).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot express to the Senator from Illinois how delighted I am to be back with him. I completely agree with him in the position he is taking today. I wish to raise one question that is almost taboo. We do not find many politicians talking about it. I did not mean to imply that the Senator from Illinois would not do so, because I think he would agree with me immediately. He may have discussed the question before I got into the room. I refer to tax deductions in agriculture.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is a very able agriculturalist and spends his weekends plowing, sowing, and reaping.

Mr. MORSE. I do not reap much.

Mr. DOUGLAS. He is experienced in this field. I wonder if he knows illicit deductions taken by farmers.

Mr. MORSE. That is what I rise to testify about. All joking aside, there is a problem there that must be gone into, and I am perfectly willing to go into it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator refer to the horse farms that are all around the farm of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. MORSE. They do not happen to be around my farm. They are on the way to my farm. If the Senator from Illinois will ride with me someday out through the Potomac area, I will show him what I have reference to. I will take him out to where there are the working farms. When I take guests out on that highway I say to them, as I drive along, "You and I own these farms. You and I pay for these farms." That is an exaggeration, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator means that money is lost on them and is then taken as a business loss. Is that correct?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As an offset against profits.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. In that sense the Senator and I and other taxpayers make a contribution to those farms.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have wondered how they have been kept up so beautiful, with beautiful painted or whitewashed fences all around them.

Mr. MORSE. They do not whitewash the fences any more. They are painted now. In all seriousness, we have a problem there that needs to be looked into. I point out that there are legitimate expenditures which result in losses for a while, but then there are also a good many illegitimate expenditures which are deducted constantly as losses. The situation needs some clarification in the Internal Revenue Service. The straight hobby farm should not be tax deductible. I agree, and agriculturalists can make a very strong case for it, that a breeding farm, on which a wealthy breeder makes a great contribution over the years and sometimes takes 10 years to carry out a livestock breeding experiment, whether it is with cattle or horses or pigs or sheep, or any other form of livestock, is making a great contribution to American agriculture.

I recognize the fact that for a time the experiment has to be carried on at a loss. However, I wish to say respectfully—and I have taken a tax loss, legitimately, perfectly, and properly—if the farm is operated on the basis of showing no possibility of an income, then we ought to recognize it for what it is, a tax deduction loophole.

I believe the matter could be handled administratively. If it needs to be handled legislatively, I will join the Senator from Illinois in handling it legislatively. I wish to lay down two criteria, because the Senator is an expert on this subject, and I am only a student of it. I would suggest, first, that there ought to be clear proof that breeding farms are operated on the basis of at least a plan for income. One can have such a farm and continue to make a capital investment in breeding stock for a period of years, and in the long run the Government gains, because finally when the farm is stocked with the type of livestock that will give a good return, the taxes are collected on that return, and the Government comes out all right in the long run. But that situation is easy to prove. I am not talking about that type of farm. I am talking about an administrative rule that would provide a little more careful administrative check on such an operation than now apparently prevails.

Certainly the taxpayers of the country are entitled to have these farms keep themselves in operation so that after a reasonable period of loss, necessary for the establishment of a capital investment in the livestock, so that they can carry on and become a producer, it is understood those losses must stop, and that further deduction cannot be taken for losses until there is a showing that at least there has been some replenishment of the U.S. Treasury by way of taxes on the basis of income.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

Mr. MORSE. We are dealing here with a type of operation in which I agree we cannot have a strict rule of thumb. As an agriculturalist and as one who is a livestock breeder of high quality livestock, both cattle and horses, I know that too frequently some farms are operated not on the basis of really a breeding establishment, but as a tax deduction establishment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Oregon. He has suggested another loophole. I hope he will pardon me if I turn now from dry land to water, and discuss expenses for yachts and boats which have been allowed as business outlays.

YACHTS AND BOATS

I now turn to a series of cases where deductions for yachts, cabin cruisers, and boats were allowed in full or in part as a legitimate business expense. These include one case in which the courts allowed a paint manufacturer $21,000 for a cabin cruiser; a case where the manufacturer of witch hazel was allowed a deduction of $9,789 for a yacht to entertain customers and potential customers; and a case in which a brewing company claimed $5,700 in 1949 and $3,700 in 1950 for the operation and depreciation of a cabin cruiser.

In another case, an auto sales company was allowed $310 for the operation and insurance of a 42-foot cabin cruiser; in another, a manufacturer was allowed $253,000 for the expenses of a yacht; and another in which a supplier was allowed $112,000 for the expenses of a yacht, as well as additional amounts of $362,000 for a ranch-hunting lodge, and night club and other expenses.

In still other cases, a shipbuilding corporation was allowed $928,000 over a 4-year period for yachts; an exclusive sales company was allowed $8,710 for the lease of a yacht; a company in the business of selling fuel was allowed $93,000 in deductions for a yacht; a food products company which maintained a Florida residence and yacht was allowed a deduction of $23,491; and an auto dealer was allowed yacht expenses of $22,692.

In an extraordinary case, a shoe manufacturer was allowed $16,943 for a yacht which he claimed was necessary to demonstrate to customers a nonskid sole sneaker which his company manufactured.

Imagine that. Demonstrating the advantages of a sneaker on board a yacht.

In still another, a cake and cookie bakery was allowed $66,000 for a yacht on which to entertain supermarket and chainstore buyers and branch managers.

One of the most interesting cases is that in which a mortuary business was allowed $26,495 for yacht expenses to entertain visiting morticians, clergymen, and employees, plus an allowance of $2,875 for cottage expenses and entertainment, and an additional allowance of $22,630 for personal residence and entertainment.

I assume that the clergymen were entertained because it was thought that if the mortician had friendly relations with them it would build up his business and he would get more trade in having funerals referred to him which might otherwise go elsewhere.

In still other cases, a new and used car dealer was allowed $35,542 for depreciation and expenses incurred in operating a yacht on which customers were entertained and given a sales pitch while aboard; and a metals manufacturer was allowed $5,500 for yacht expenses in order to create a more intimate relationship between this corporation and its sources of supply.

In the next case, a manufacturer from a northeastern State was allowed $80,726 for a yacht which in the winter was moved to Florida and used to entertain various business associates.

In further cases, a lawyer claimed and was allowed $6,475 for a cabin cruiser as an ordinary and necessary business expense on which he entertained clients.

One can imagine the discussions of the profundities of the law which took place in that cabin cruiser.

Listen to this curious situation: An automobile dealer was allowed $18,162 for a yacht on which he provided free rides to customers when they purchased an automobile.

One would hardly think a demand for automobiles could be built up by offering water transportation, since they are, in a sense, rival methods of locomotion.

A racing handicapper claimed $150 a month for captain's pay, $65 to $75 a month for gas and oil, $550 a year for insurance, and $25 to $30 a month for food and repair of a 48-foot yacht which was docked at the Biscayne Yacht Club in Miami and which was allowed in full by the courts after parts of these and numerous other expenses were disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the details of these cases be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the details were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business: Manufacturing paints and related products.

Type of expense: Cabin cruiser.

Claimed by taxpayer, $28,039; allowed by Commissioner, $2,000; allowed by court, $21,029.

Summary of facts: Taxpayers were general partners engaged in the business of manufacturing, buying and selling paints and related products. They claimed a deduction for fiscal years 1952 and 1953 for the operating expenses and depreciation of a boat. The boat was principally used for entertaining financiers, suppliers, and other persons with whom the partnership had business dealings. It was also used for testing work in connection with marine paints and for the personal pleasure of the taxpayers and their families. The court allowed 75 percent of the boat expense as a business deduction (*Greenberg* v. *Riddell*, 4 AFTR 2d (S.D. Cal. 1959)).

Type of business: Manufacturer of witch hazel.

Type of expense: Yacht.

Claimed by taxpayer, $10,949; allowed by Commissioner, none; allowed by court, $9,789.

Summary of facts: The taxpayer, an individual engaged in manufacturing witch hazel, purchased a yacht for the entertainment of customers and potential customers. The yacht was used to encourage such persons to visit taxpayer's plant. Although the Commissioner disallowed the expenses as personal, they were for the most part allowed by the Board of Tax Appeals because of the business relationship which the taxpayer had established (*E. E. Dickinson*, 8 B.T.A. 722 (1927)).

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Manufacturer	Yacht	$272,640	$253,035	Feb. 28, 1954 Feb. 28, 1955 Feb. 28, 1956	Taxpayer, in addition to other large entertainment expenses, maintained a yacht primarily for the purpose of entertaining dealers who sell taxpayer's products. The disallowed portion of the expenses was for the estimated personal use by taxpayer's officers.
Supplier	Yacht, ranch-hunting lodges, nightclub expenses, other entertainment:				
	Yacht		111,804	1953–59	Taxpayer's stock is owned by 2 individuals. Yacht was used by company for fishing parties for customers and company personnel. Yacht expenses shown are only for 1953 and 1954; it is estimated that operating expenses, exclusive of depreciation, are $75,000 per year. Ranch properties are leased by taxpayer from stockholder and from others and are used by customers for hunting and fishing. Nightclub expense was paid by company to a club owned by stockholder to cover charges made by company executives and sales personnel ($23,000 of this amount was charged at club by stockholder). Parties are held at club during Christmas season and cost of each party ranges from $8,000 to $14,000. Each year the company finances a hunting trip to Canada for executive personnel and customers and minimum cost is $5,000 to $6,000 for a party of 8 to 12 men. Corporate expenditures which were not allowed as a deduction included over $20,000 paid for additions to personal residence of stockholder and over $9,000 for vacation trips to Europe and Africa by stockholder and family. Item of "other entertainment" represents reimbursement for travel and entertainment by stockholder.
	Lodges		116,440		
	Nightclubs		126,249		
	Other		119,647		
Shipbuilding	Yachts	292,627	211,204	1955–58	Corporation owns several yachts. One of the yachts was primarily experimental. The others were used primarily for entertaining customers and prospective customers.
		354,258	293,330		
		285,617	247,671		
		201,450	176,046		
Exclusive sales representative	Yacht and entertainment:				
	Entertainment	55,000	53,645	1959	Corporate taxpayer, a manufacturer's sales representative, leased the yacht in 1959 for $1,000 per month from a partnership consisting of 2 individuals who are officers of taxpayer. Partnership was formed in 1959 and acquired yacht in April of that year. Corporation rents the yacht back to the partnership for 2 months each year at a monthly rental of $1,250. Yacht expense and entertainment expense are incurred to maintain goodwill with customers of the taxpayer.
	Yacht	13,710	8,710		
Sale of fuel	Yacht	34,189	34,189	Sept. 30, 1957	The yacht, which was acquired by the corporate taxpayer in 1954 at a cost of $80,314, is used for sales promotion purposes. Customers and prospective customers are frequently entertained on it. When used for nonbusiness purposes, either by taxpayer's officers or by other persons, a rental charge of $250 per day is made, which is credited to the yacht expense account.
		24,063	24,063	Sept. 30, 1958	
		34,787	34,787	Sept. 30, 1959	
Food products	Yacht and resort residence	26,031	23,491	Oct. 31, 1958	Corporate taxpayer is owned by 2 individuals, is located in a Midwestern State and maintains a residence in Miami, Fla. The taxpayer established that the Florida residence is maintained for the use of personnel of customers and prospective customers and must be staffed and available for use all through the year. The taxpayer contended that the Florida residence and yacht were used to great advantage with suppliers who expedited delivery schedules, and were helpful also in persuading larger packers to place orders. A sufficient business element was considered to be present and the deduction was allowed under present law.
Automobile dealer	Yacht	(1)	22,692	1956	The taxpayer maintained a guest list record which disclosed that the yacht was used for entertainment of old customers, officials of an automobile manufacturer, automobile dealers and prospective customers.
Shoe manufacturer	do	20,907	16,943	(1)	Purpose of expenditure was stated to be the use of the boat to demonstrate to customers a nonskid sole sneaker made by taxpayer. Used at various Atlantic and gulf coast ports.
Cake and cookie bakery	do	18,000	18,000	1957–59	Taxpayer sells cakes and cookies to grocery stores. The yacht was used exclusively to entertain supermarket and chainstore buyers and branch managers on deep sea fishing trips for promotion purposes.
		22,000	22,000		
		26,000	26,000		
Mortuary business	Yacht, cottage expense and entertainment, and personal residence and entertainment:				
	Yacht	11,455	8,591	1955–57	Yacht owned by this closely held corporation was used to entertain visiting morticians, clergymen, and for meetings of employees. Taxpayer prepares and ships bodies to other areas for burial. Personal residence of principal shareholder has an office and residence is used for business meetings and entertainment of business guests.
		11,096	8,322		
		12,776	9,582		
	Cottage expense and entertainment	4,424	2,875		
	Personal residence and entertainment	12,271	7,362		
		14,686	8,811		
		10,762	6,457		

[1] Not available.

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount Claimed	Amount Allowed	Tax year or period	Summary of facts
Selling and servicing new and used cars.	Yacht	$8,337	$5,796	1955–58	Corporate taxpayer claimed 100 percent of the depreciation and expenses incurred in operating a yacht. Log records maintained were not complete. Many affidavits were submitted by customers which stated that they were guests on the boat and that they received a "sales pitch" while aboard. The taxpayer's president took the boat to Florida each year for a personal vacation which lasted about 3 months. On several of these trips the president was accompanied by a business associate and many vacationing business associates were entertained. Expenses were allowed for portion deemed attributable to business.
		17,641	12,530		
		15,282	10,270		
		10,474	6,946		
Metals manufacturing	do	7,999	5,800	1957	Boat was acquired in order to create a more intimate relationship between this corporation, through its officers, and its sources of supply. The amount allowed represented the portion spent which related to business purposes.
Manufacturer	do	13,795	13,795	Apr. 30, 1955	Corporate taxpayer, located in northeastern State, acquired the yacht in 1954 and used it during the summer predominantly for the recreation of employees. During the winter it is moved to Florida and is used to entertain various business associates, distributors, suppliers, etc., visiting there on vacation.
		32,527	32,527	Apr. 30, 1956	
		34,404	34,404	Apr. 30, 1957	
Lawyer	do	6,475	6,475	1958	The taxpayer is engaged in the litigation of claims as a specialist. In 1950 he acquired a cabin cruiser. The cost of the maintenance and operation of this boat in 1958 amount to $6,975. Of this amount the taxpayer claimed and was allowed $6,475 as an ordinary and necessary business expense on a showing that the boat was used primarily for entertaining clients and business executives for the purpose of establishing professional contacts.
Automobile dealer	do	290	0	1946–49	Corporation purchased yacht for purpose of providing free rides to customers upon purchase of an automobile. Log maintained indicated passengers were customers. No boat trips were made unless the principal stockholder was aboard. This case was settled by stipulation while in a docketed state in Tax Court.
		6,204	0		
		7,401	7,401		
		10,761	10,761		

Type of expense: Cabin cruiser.

Name of petitioner: Cleveland-Sandusky Brewing Corp., 2764 East 55th Street, Cleveland, Ohio.

Business: Brewing and selling of beer.

In this case the Commissioner conceded that the cruiser used by the petitioner was purchased for business purposes and allowed some deductions for depreciation. However, there was no proof offered to show the actual use of the yacht. The Government took the position that before its ruling should be upset, some such evidence must be offered by petitioner. There was no boat log, guest book or anyone from the boatyards to testify who could give evidence about the actual use of this cruiser.

Details of expenses: (a) Entertainment for 1949: (1) $5,079.83 for operation of a cruiser; (2) $1,642.27 as a depreciable deduction.

The Commission disallowed $2,579.83.

(b) Entertainment for 1950: (1) $2,116.86 for operation of cruiser; (2) $1,642.77 as a depreciable deduction.

The Commission disallowed $1,116.83.

No mention in the briefs of a breakdown on these expenses.

The court allowed the deductions claimed by the taxpayer in full (Cleveland-Sandusky Brewing Corp., 30 T.C. 539 (1958)).

Type of expense: Cabin cruiser.

Names of petitioners: Charles M. Kilborn and Angeline W. Kilborn.

Address: Mobile, Ala.

Business: Partners in a used car business known as "Y Auto Sales."

Petitioner in this case claimed that a cruiser was used to entertain partnership customers. However, the Government, as in the Brewing Co. case, supra, noted that petitioner had offered no evidence about its actual business use. The Government also claimed that the entertainment of used car buyers is neither common or frequent.

Details of expenses:

(1) A 42-foot cabin cruiser: (a) $755.65 for operation; (b) $236.25 for liability insurance.

This was mostly for food and gas and was disallowed by the Commission.

(2) The court found that: (a) $250 for operation; and (b) $60 for liability insurance was a business expense of the partnership.

The briefs contain no further breakdown (Charles M. Kilborn, 29 T.C. 102, docket No. 56499 (1957)).

Type of expense: Yacht and entertainment.

Name of petitioner: Charles J. McLennan.

Address of petitioner: 3008 Alhambra Circle, Coral Gables, Fla.

Business: Racing secretary and handicapper at—

(1) Hialeah Park, Fla.

(2) Havre de Grace, Md.

(3) Pimlico, Md.

(4) Suffolk Downs, Mass.

(5) Washington Park, Ill.

Petitioner's occupation is that of racing secretary and handicapper. His duties are to schedule races and to do all the handicapping of horses entered in the respective races. During 1941, he served in this capacity at five race tracks; Hialeah Park, Havre de Grace, Suffolk Downs, Washington Park, and Pimlico. While serving at Hialeah, he lived in Coral Gables, Fla.; at Pimlico, he lived at the Belview Hotel, Baltimore, Md.; at Havre de Grace, he lived at the Colonial Hotel; at Washington Park, he lived at the Olympia Fields Country Club. Upon the completion of his services at one track, he was required to travel to his new post of duty with another employer. During these tours of duty, petitioner maintained a permanent residence at Miami, Fla. Thus, the Commissioner contended that these living and traveling expenses were personal and not deductible for tax purposes.

During the year 1941, petitioner entertained numerous people, principally his business associates and newspapermen. Some of the entertainment was aboard a yacht he kept at Miami, Fla. He provided food, liquor, fish bait, and everything else required for the entertainment of his guests and quite frequently threw large parties. In addition he entertained by taking guests to dinners and to theaters. The Commissioner disallowed this claim on the grounds that to allow it would be tantamount to holding that any salaried employee might deduct the amounts expended in the entertainment of his superiors and associates for the purpose of maintaining their good will.

Petitioner had memberships in the following clubs to better enable him to entertain: Biscayne Yacht Club, Miami Springs Country Club, Cottage Park Yacht Club in Boston, the country club in Baltimore, Olympia Fields Country Club in Chicago.

Details of expenses:

(a) For hotel bills and living expenses during the taxable year 1941:

1. Chicago	$504
2. Baltimore	916
3. Boston	1,240
Total	2,660

(b) Caterer's bills:

1. Boston	110
Total	2,770

This amount was claimed as a business expense by the petitioner on his income tax return for 1941. The Commission disallowed the entire sum.

(c) Traveling expenses: (1) $640.53 for short business trips required by his duties at tracks—this was allowed by Commission; (2) $911.84 travel from one track to another—disallowed by Commission; (3) in connection with the short business trips above, petitioner incurred hotel bills of $272.63—Commission disallowed.

The total disallowance at this point is $3,954.47.

(D) Entertainment expenses for track owners, officials, and writers: (1) 48-foot yacht docked at Biscayne Yacht Club in Miami, Fla.:

(a) Captain's pay, $150 per month.

(b) Gas and oil, $65–$75 per month.

(c) Insurance, $550 per year.

(d) Food and repair, $25–$30 per month.

Petitioner claimed a deduction of necessary business expenses of $2,000. This also was disallowed by Commission.

The deductions claimed by the taxpayer were allowed in full by the court (*Charles J. McLennan*, T.C. memo. op. docket No. 4757 (June 25, 1945), par. 45, 217, P–H T.C. memo.).

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, since in case No. 6, the expense was charged as a deductible expense, Uncle Sam lost income taxes at the rate of 52 percent which otherwise he would have received on corporate profits, and the stockholders picked up the rest.

Referring to case No. 12—and I do not wish to have too much fun at the expense of morticians, because theirs is a necessary and legitimate business—in

this instance the mortuary was a closely held business and charged off a very large sum of money for yachts and entertainment.

In this connection, although on a somewhat different subject, there was the case of a mortician who tried to charge off his grocery expenses at a supermarket, when his wife went to the supermarket to buy groceries for the family. He sought to charge off the purchases as a business expense on the ground that his wife was finding favor with prospective customers.

Mr. President, can you imagine the pleasure derived by the wife of the undertaker when she went to the supermarket, met the people, and said, "Well, I am really soliciting business," and trying to get by with it? I am happy to say that they did not get by in this case.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why not get at some of the more obvious things, such as people who deduct the cost of advertising weapons which they propose to develop in the United States under cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts? They advertise the weapons, whether they will work or not, like the Flying Coffin. Those expenses are claimed as deductible on the theory that the advertising is done in order to make the stock of their companies more accessible to the general public. The whole idea is to try to put themselves in a good light with the public so that the public will use their products or services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There are so many truck holes in the tax laws that one could multiply them by the thousands. I am taking a little time this afternoon to discuss only one set of truck holes, namely, entertainment, gift, and travel expense. That is all. If the Senator from Louisiana will help me, we can go after the advertising expense, too.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope the Senator is not taking the position that one should not take advantage of these opportunities so long as they come within the law and so long as other persons are doing the same thing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may be legal, but I do not believe it is ethical to take advantage of them. However, I shall not score that point; I simply say the law ought to be changed, so that people cannot get by with doing it; that is all.

There are other cases which I regard as abuses in the use of yachts.

HUNTING AND FISHING LODGES, AND RESORT FACILITIES

The next set of cases deals with deductions which were taken and largely allowed—because of inadequacies of the present law—for hunting lodges, fishing lodges, plantation resorts, summer homes, Miami Beach residences, beach houses, luxury apartments, cottages in Canada, and duck hunting clubs.

The first is a case which went to the tax courts in which Walter O. Kraft, petitioner, who was a partner in an insurance agency, acquired a camp where he entertained prominent local officers of a bank, brewing company, steel company, and a packing company. Included as deductions were boating, fishing, poker playing, and drinking expenses at the summer house or camp. It is clear that the summer house was used in large part for his own family because there was also located there a playhouse for his daughter, a pony stall, and pigeon cabinets. The petitioner bought the camp for $8,100, sold it for $5,600, and then claimed the entire difference as a business expense. This was disallowed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but the court allowed two-thirds of the actual loss as a deduction. This case indicates that under the present law summer homes and camps used largely for personal purposes or for the entertainment of personal friends, have been treated as business expenses.

In a further case, a manufacturer was allowed a deduction of over $375,000 for the maintenance of resort facilities on a subtropical island and for airplane expenses and airplane depreciation. Fishing cruisers were maintained and air transportation was furnished the guests. The board chairman, officers of the company, and key employees and their families spent considerable time at this subtropical island.

In another case, a textile manufacturing company leased a plantation resort from a stockholder of the company for an annual rent of $1. Over a period of 4 years, the company was allowed deductions of $75,112 for the maintenance of this resort.

In a further case, an equipment manufacturer leased a hunting lodge, for which he took deductions of $75,000 in a 3-year period. In the period 1953–59, expenditures of $666,000, including the above amount, were claimed as deductions; and most of this expense was allowed under the present law.

Another manufacturing concern was allowed deductions of over $187,000 in the 3-year period 1956–58 for expenses of maintaining a hunting lodge, at which streams were stocked with trout, small game for stocking was raised by farmers, and near which a large deer preserve was provided.

In another case, a road construction company was allowed to deduct $53,000 of a claimed $77,697 for a pleasure resort, in the years 1959–60. This construction company apparently entertained the officials of Federal, State, and local governments with whom they were negotiating or attempting to secure contracts. Hunting, shooting, and fishing were provided.

I have always believed that Government officials should not accept expensive entertainment or accept expensive gifts from companies with whom they were doing business, or, indeed, from anyone.

A closely held mineral products company was allowed almost $60,000 as a deduction for the maintenance of a summer home in Maine and a residence in the Midwest, at which the principal stockholder and his wife entertained high officials of customer companies and their wives.

In a further case, a steel products company located in the Midwest established a Miami Beach residence, for the purpose of lavish entertainment, in an attempt to obtain business, so they said. They were allowed deductions of $28,706 for such items as depreciation on the residence, food, liquor, boat expenses, salaries of service employees, and entertainment. By coincidence, the two principal officers of the company and their wives were usually present at the residence when customers were entertained.

In still another case, a hosiery mill company maintained a beach house and boat, for which deductions of $58,000 were allowed in 1957 and 1958.

The next case is a very interesting one. The business is that of buying and selling corporations.

The taxpayer's purpose is to seek bargain purchases of controlling stock in other corporations. He was allowed deductions of $15,150, in the 2-year period 1956–57, for the maintenance of a resort residence and a luxury apartment. Boating, fishing, and entertainment were available at the resort. It appeared that the principal purpose of the residence and apartment was for the personal convenience, pleasure, and health of the chairman of the board; but, since under the law some of these expenses were so-called business expenses, $15,000 was allowed.

In a further case, an oil and gas company was allowed deductions of $19,737 for a lodge and boats used to entertain investors.

A company which sells steel equipment deducted $20,000 in 1958, for expenses of maintaining a large plantation and farm-type residence in a resort area, and $5,000 for a golf party for the executives of customers of the taxpayer. The total amount was allowed under the existing law.

In yet another case, a food-products company maintains a guest house in a resort area on the west coast, where it entertains brokers from the eastern part of the United States and Europe. According to the plea of the taxpayer, the brokers expect the seller to provide them a place to stay while away from home, and the guest house was established for that purpose. A total claim of $27,000 was allowed because of the loopholes in the present law.

An American coal and mining company has a cottage on a bay in Canada, which is used to entertain those connected with the ingot steel industry. In the years 1959 and 1960, a total of $22,487 was claimed as a deduction for this cottage, and the entire amount was allowed.

In the final case in this category, a consultant to a manufacturer entertained customers at a duck hunting club which he owned. He claimed, and was allowed, $4,211 as a business expense for this entertainment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a more detailed summary of each of these cases be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of expense: Vacation camp.

Names of petitioners: Walter O. Kraft and Adena L. Kraft.

Address of petitioners: Houston, Tex.

Business: Partners in an insurance agency named Cochran's Insurance Agency, specializing in fire and casualty insurance.

Petitioner owned an insurance agency and bought some property in order to entertain his business associates.

The petitioner, prior to acquiring the Clear Lake property, belonged to Manor Lake Hunting and Fishing Club, the Houston Country Club, and the Glenbrook Country Club. At these several clubs, he did extensive entertaining, but after acquiring the Clear Lake property, he withdrew from these social clubs. Many items included in the ledger account of the summer home at Clear Lake show it was used by Mr. Kraft's family, such as a playhouse for his daughter, a pony stall and pigeon cabinets. Petitioner entertained various individuals including a president of a company and, because of this, secured substantially all of his insurance. However, testimony showed that the company president and the petitioner entertained each other in their own homes. The Commissioner contended that these facts demonstrated that the camp was for personal pleasure and not a business necessity.

Customers and prospective customers were taken to the camp for entertainment which included boating, fishing, playing poker and drinking. Once a year, petitioner threw a stag party and invited such persons as the presidents and vice presidents of a brewing company, a packing company, a steel company and a bank. The Commissioner pointed out at the hearings that most of these men were close friends of petitioner and, therefore, these get togethers were for social enjoyment and not for business entertainment.

Details of expenses:

In 1935, the partnership built a camp called Clear Lake Camp to entertain insurance customers and prospective customers. Entertainment consisted of boating, eating, drinking and playing poker.

(a) Cost of camp:

Land	$3,599.24
Improvements	593.21
Furnishings	3,432.18
Water well	279.66
Water well equipment	223.25
Total	8,127.54

(b) Sold in 1944 for $5,700. For sale expense, $16.60; net selling price, $5,683.40.

(c) Petitioner claims a depreciation allowance of $976.70 which was allowed.

The total loss on sale was $1,467.44.

(d) Petitioner claimed $2,444.14 as the loss on sale which was disallowed by Commission.

(e) Court allowed $978.30 as being two-thirds of the deductible loss sustained (*Walter O. Kraft*, T.C. Memo. Op. Docket No. 14975 (June 22, 1959)).

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Manufacturer	Maintenance of resort facilities on subtropical island, airplane expense, airplane depreciation.	$353,713 90,666 20,439	$269,666 90,666 15,277	Sept. 30, 1957	Taxpayer, a domestic manufacturing corporation, owns luxurious facilities on a subtropical island. The principal use of the property is for entertainment of executives and key personnel of customer firms. Fishing cruisers are maintained and air transportation furnished guests. The chairman of the board, who is the controlling stockholder, and other employees accompanied by their families spent considerable time at island. Adjustment was made for amounts considered personal expenses of these officers and employees.
Textile Manufacturing	Plantation resort	34,258 31,950 29,022 32,924	22,839 21,300 14,511 16,462	Sept. 3, 1955 Sept. 1, 1956 Aug. 31, 1957 Aug. 30, 1958	The corporation leased a plantation from a stockholder of the corporation for an annual rental of $1. The stated purpose of the lease was to provide the corporation with a place to entertain customers and business associates. Although it appeared that some business purpose was served by the rental of the plantation, it was determined a portion of the expenditures to be personal to the stockholder. The disallowed portions of the deductions were taxed to the stockholder.
Manufacturer of equipment	Lease of hunting lodge	[1] 75,000	[1] 75,000	1956–58	Taxpayer leases a hunting lodge and duck-hunting preserve for a minimum rental of $1,800 per month. It is engaged in manufacture of equipment and has its products distributed by several firms located throughout the United States. Customers of each firm are entertained at the huntiug preserve. A log is maintained and it disclosed no personal use by stockholders. Taxpayer shares expenses of lodge with 2 other taxpayers. The total expenditure claimed for this lodge by the 3 taxpayers for the years 1953–59 is $666,000 and it appears that most of this expense was allowed.
Manufacturer	Hunting lodge	61,146 71,206 55,065	61,146 71,206 55,065	1956–58	Closely held corporate taxpayer maintains a luxurious hunting lodge which had a 1958 tax basis of over $230,000 and is constantly maintained by caretaker and wife. Streams stocked with trout, small game raised by farmers for purpose of stocking and large deer preserve. Log maintained showing names and dates representatives of customers are entertained. Lodge also used for entertainment of key personnel of taxpayer. Log indicates use by 500 to 600 persons annually.
Construction of roads	Pleasure resort	77,697	53,000	1959 and 1960	The taxpayer corporation is engaged in heavy construction and sale of construction supplies. Its customers are Federal, State, and local governments, other contractors and the general public. The taxpayer acquired a resort estate which is maintained and serviced at a cost approximating $40,000 per year. The estate has facilities for hunting, boating, and fishing. The purpose of maintaining the estate is to create good will among the various people with whom the taxpayer has business dealings and is specifically used when it is attempting to negotiate or secure a contract. The disallowance of a portion of the expense covers preferential dividends and expenses which are contrary to public policy.
Mineral products	Summer home and residence	40,256 42,858 36,696	20,128 21,429 18,348	1956–58	Closely held corporate taxpayer located in Midwest maintains a summer home in Maine and a residence in midwestern city. Principal stockholder and wife spend 2½ months each summer at the Maine home and entertain high officials (and wives) of customers. The property in Midwest is used to entertain visiting buyers and is used occasionally by president of company and his wife.
Steel products	Residence, Miami Beach	33,206	28,706	Apr. 30, 1956	The taxpayer, which is located in the Midwest, asserted that lavish entertainment is essential in obtaining business and it established a Miami residence for this purpose. The 2 principal officers and their wives are usually present at the residence when entertaining customers. Deductions allowed include depreciation on residence, food, liquor, boat expense and salaries of service employees and entertainment. Disallowance was made for amounts deemed to be personal expense.
Hosiery mill	Beach house and boat	25,367 32,713	25,367 32,713	1957–58	Expense of beach house and boat maintained by corporate taxpayer to entertain business guests was allowed in full.
Buying and selling of corporations.	Resort residence and luxury apartment.	21,399 16,478	8,559 6,591	1956–57	The corporate taxpayer's business is that of buying and selling corporations. The taxpayer seeks bargain purchases of controlling stock in other corporations. The taxpayer claims the purpose of maintaining the resort residence is to have a place available for business conferences. The resort residence has facilities for boating, fishing, and entertainment. The agent concluded that the personal convenience, pleasure, and health of the chairman of the board of the taxpayer is the principal reason for maintaining the residence and the apartment. However, the evidence did indicate that there was some entertainment expense incurred for business purposes and a portion of the expense was therefore allowed.
Oil and gas	Lodge and boat expense	23,219	19,737	1956–59	The individual taxpayers are located in a midwestern city. The lodge and boats were used to entertain investors from New York whom taxpayers sought to interest in development of oil and gas properties. Taxpayers also entertained local representatives of oil companies and drillers to encourage their participation in development of oil and gas properties.

[1] Approximate.

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Sales of steel equipment	Farm resort, golf party	$20,000 5,000	$20,000 5,000	1958	Corporate taxpayer expended $20,000 to maintain a large plantation and farm-type residence in a resort area for entertainment of top echelon executives of various large customers of taxpayer. The expenditure of $5,000 was for a golf party for executives of various customers of the taxpayer. This same situation existed in prior years and was accepted.
Food products	Guesthouse in resort area	13,500 14,300	13,500 14,300	Feb. 28, 1959 Feb. 28, 1960	Taxpayer corporation is located on west coast and most of its sales are made through brokers from the Eastern United States and Europe. While they are out on the west coast, the brokers expect the sellers to provide them a place to stay and taxpayer established that the purchase of the guesthouses was for this purpose. The taxpayer also established that the facilities were used by its sales representatives for making sales.
Coal and iron mining	Cottage in Canada	11,983 10,509	11,983 10,504	1959–60	Cottage on bay in Canada was used to entertain people connected with ingot steel industry. 87 persons were entertained in 1960.
Consultant to manufacturer	Duck hunting club	4,211	4,211	1957	Individual taxpayer served as consultant to manufacturing company with annual compensation of $25,000. Expense was incurred for entertaining customers of company at a duck hunting club owned by taxpayer.

TRAVEL, SAFARIS, AND EXPENSE-PAID VACATIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, I turn to cases which in the main involve deductions for travel.

SAFARI

The first is a very famous case and involves the travels on an African safari of Mr. O. Carlyle Brock and his wife, Emily A. Brock, who, at the time of their trip, were president and assistant treasurer of the Sanitary Farms Dairy, Inc., of Erie, Pa. I mention their names simply because this is a matter of public record. I have mentioned names only when matters of public record are involved. I have tried to preserve anonymity wherever possible. Mr. and Mrs. Brock claimed deductions of $16,816.16, between March and November of 1950, for the safari. The deductions included amounts for film, equipment, tickets, licenses, trackers, and a downpayment for a tiger hunt in India, which apparently never came off. In addition to the safari expenses, the Brocks spent some $2,428 in Europe and North Africa for expenses and stopovers in London, Paris, Rome, Cairo, and Alexandria. The Internal Revenue Commission disallowed many of these amounts, but the court allowed all of the expenditures to be deducted.

So far as is known, the Sanitary Farms Dairy did not have its sales increased as a result of the safari, but these amounts were nonetheless allowed as "ordinary and necessary" business expenses. This case certainly indicates why we need to change the law.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of expense: African safari.

Names of petitioners: (1) Sanitary Farms Dairy, Inc., (2) O. Carlyle Brock, (3) Emily A. Brock.

Address of petitioners: (1) Erie, Pa.; (2) Wesleyville, Pa.; (3) Wesleyville, Pa.

Business: Mr. and Mrs. Brock are president and assistant treasurer of the dairy corporation.

The Government contended in this case that the expedition of Mr. and Mrs. Brock to Africa on a safari was taken for their personal pleasure and enjoyment, and did not represent an ordinary business expense of the company. To support this claim, the Government showed that Brock's favorite hobbies were hunting, fishing, and photographing, and that he had hunted in Alaska, India, and South Africa prior to and subsequent to the safari in 1950. After the safari in 1950, he had also published a book entitled "The Brock Safari, 1950." The Government also showed that there was no sign around the dairy property to indicate that it contained a museum, and, further, that the trophies and employee's cafeteria were located in the same place. A significant fact was that the safari did not cause an increase in sales, or in the mailing lists of the dairy.

Details of expenses:

(a) Expenses for trip to Africa on safari in 1950:	
1. March, films	$1,069.00
2. March, equipment	504.64
3. May, tickets	4,284.60
4. June, films used	310.04
5. June, licenses and 1st payment	3,155.00
6. June, film and part payment	832.28
7. August, gas, equipment, 2d downpayment	1,288.00
8. August, extra help	680.00
9. August, trackers	225.00
10. October, moneys advanced on final payment	528.00
11. October, downpayment on tiger hunt in India	500.00
12. November, balance for safari	3,441.00
Total	16,818.16

The Commission allowed $1,200 for film and $375 for unknown item. However, the balance of $15,618.16 was disallowed.

(b) In addition to the safari expense, the petitioners spent $2,428 in Europe:	
1. London	$118
2. Paris	143
3. Rome	122
4. Cairo and Alexandria	91
Total	813
5. In June	718
In August	297
In September	310
In October	290
Total	1,615
Grand total	2,428

These expenses were allowed by the Commission on the returns but it was then argued by the Government in the Tax Court that they also were personal and not business expenses and should not be allowed. The court allowed all of these expenditures to be deducted (*Sanitary Farms Dairy, Inc.*, 25 T.C. 463, docket No. 49511 (1955)).

TRAVEL—WIFE'S EXPENSES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the next case is a Tax Court case involving a man by the name of L. L. Moorman, of Rutherfordton, N.C. He was a vice president of a corporation and spent considerable time traveling through the southern part of the United States. He took his wife on a number of trips and deducted her costs, as well as his own, on the grounds that she helped to entertain some of his business associates. Mr. Moorman spent between $12,000 and $17,000 for this travel, entertainment, and other expenses in each of the years 1949, 1950, and 1951. I ask unanimous consent that a table giving his claimed expenses be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	1949	1950	1951
1. Meals	$2,178	$2,921	$2,520
2. Hotels	895	1,323	1,337
3. Telephone and telegraph	753	803	1,139
4. Transportation	5,406	5,784	4,680
5. Supplies and miscellaneous	1,265	1,502	1,734
6. Entertainment	1,629	3,057	2,300
7. Advertising	470	1,371	1,129
8. Ben J. Kerr:			
Salary			800
Expenses			1,786
Total	12,600	16,854	17,425

[L. L. Moorman, 26 T.C. 666 (1956).]

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, under the existing law, allowed the total claim for each of these expenses except for meals and entertainment for which the Commissioner allowed only approximately one-half of these deductions. The deductions for meals and entertainment in these years were as follows:

	1949	1950	1951
Meals	$2,178.35	$2,921.52	$2,520.25
Entertainment	1,629.50	3,057.50	2,300.25

When the court reviewed the case it largely reversed the Commissioner's decision on the claims for meals and entertainment; and allowed for these two items, all but $300 per year. So virtually the entire amount was allowed as a deduction.

HONEYMOON

The next is a Tax Court case involving an Alex Silverman and his wife, Doris Silverman, from Kansas City, Mo. Mr. Silverman was an officer-director and a minority stockholder in a family corporation, and was shortly to be married. His brother, who was president-director of the corporation, suggested that Mr. Silverman's honeymoon be made part of

an alleged business trip to Europe. During the honeymoon the couple traveled through France, Italy, and Switzerland. The expenses claimed for the trip amounted to $6,408.02. When the Commissioner of Internal Revenue took exception for this deduction as a business expense for a honeymoon trip to Europe, the case was taken to court by Mr. Silverman—58–1 U.S.T.C. 9433, 253 F. 2d 849.

This is an excellent example of the workings of the Cohan rule. In this case Mr. Silverman was allowed $3,204.01 by the court, or exactly one-half of the amount claimed—in other words, 50 percent business and 50 percent personal expense.

This case emphasizes again why the present law should be changed. Virtually one-half of any expense for any purpose will, at a minimum, be allowed by the courts when a case is tested. This encourages people to claim deductions for things which properly should not be claimed and tempts people to claim more than is necessary simply because it is fairly certain that one-half the amount claimed will be allowed.

TRIP TO AUSTRALIA

The following case is a Tax Court case concerning Frank L. and June E. Kluckhohn of Minnesota—18 T.C. 892, 1952. Mr. Kluckhohn took trips around the country giving lectures. In addition he also took a trip to Australia which was not clearly associated with his lectures. He originally claimed a deduction of $2,000 but when he went to court he asked for $1,000 which was the amount that he could expect under the Cohan rule. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue had disallowed the entire amount but the court awarded Mr. Kluckhohn $700, or 70 percent of the $1,000 which he claimed even though the trip to Australia was not in any clear way associated with his lecturing.

EXPENSE-PAID VACATIONS FOR CUSTOMERS

The final case in this category deals with a taxpayer in the business of selling fuel who provided for expense-paid vacations at resort cities in Florida for the officials and employees of customers. Expenditures included those for hotels, restaurants, boat club, parties, gifts, etc. In 1958 he claimed deductions of $60,000 and was allowed deductions of $40,000.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Sale of fuel	Hotels, restaurants, boat club, parties, gifts, etc.	$60,000	$40,000	1958	The amounts claimed included expense-paid vacations for officials and employees of customers at resort cities in Florida. The taxpayer contended that such entertainment served to maintain and increase its sales volume.

GIFTS, RESIDENCES, AIRPLANES, AND OTHER DEDUCTIONS

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now turn to some cases involving gifts, residences, airplanes, and other items.

GIFTS OF MOVIE ACTRESS

The first case is that of a very famous movie actress, Olivia de Havilland.

I believe the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] introduced this case last year. The Senator from Pennsylvania has been very active in this whole matter. He has rendered invaluable service.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to congratulate the Senator from Illinois on the splendid and thoroughly documented speech which he is making. I have had the pleasure of working with the Senator from Illinois in this field ever since I came to the Senate, 5 years ago. I am most hopeful that this year our joint efforts will bear fruit. I believe the speech which the Senator from Illinois is presently making will make a very real contribution to an understanding by the Senate of the importance of the loophole problems and the necessity of closing them and the realization that a very substantial amount of extra revenue can be brought into the Treasury if we make our tax laws more equitable and reform them in the detailed way in which the Senator from Illinois has been explaining.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

I may say that Miss de Havilland is one of my favorite actresses. She is one of the most beautiful women in moving pictures. I have always admired her acting. It is with reluctance that I bring this case up. I have done so simply because it is a well known case. It was reported in the 20th volume of the Tax Court cases, at 323, and was also referred to in the Yale Law Review.

Miss de Havilland decided to give some gifts to her associates. She gave a gold necklace and gold clips worth $810 to her dress designer. She gave a silver tea set and coffeepot worth $920 to her dialog director. She gave over $1,100 in additional gifts to her business associates. She also paid over $1,200 for the services of a studio maid and approximately $33,000 to her stepfather, G. M. Fontaine, who allegedly served as her business manager. The court allowed her to deduct the gold necklace and clips and the silver tea set. In a settlement with the Internal Revenue Service, she was allowed to deduct a major portion of the other amounts. In a subsequent year she claimed deductions of over $2,700 for gifts and over $4,600 for wardrobe. Virtually all of these amounts were also allowed either by the court or the Commissioner—20 T.C. 323, 1953.

REDECORATION OF HOME AND SWIMMING POOL

The next case has to do with deductions claimed by Doughboy Industries, Inc.—that name has quite a swing to it—in which the company took a deduction of $10,000 for redecorating the first floor of the residence of its principal officer. In addition, it deducted $6,600 for a swimming pool which was adjacent to the residence. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue disallowed the amount for redecorating, and allowed only $1,650 for depreciation on the swimming pool. The jury, however, after being instructed by the court that there was nothing wrong with using a private residence for a business purpose if it was "ordinary and necessary," awarded the taxpayer 95 percent of the refunds which were claimed. It is amazing to what lengths the term "ordinary and necessary" business expense can be stretched.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Diversified manufacturing	Redecorating principal officer's residence.	$10,000	None		Taxpayer corporation reimbursed its principal shareholder-officer for a portion of the cost of refurbishing the 1st floor of his residence. Taxpayer deducted this reimbursement, contending that residence was used for entertaining customers and thus served its business purposes. The jury was instructed that there was nothing wrong with the use of a private residence for a business purpose if it was ordinary and necessary. The court said that the question for the jury was whether a business advantage was expected and whether it was realized.
	Swimming pool adjacent to residence.	$6,600	$1,650		Taxpayer also claimed depreciation on a swimming pool constructed on land which it owned. The pool was adjacent to the shareholder-officer's residence and could be entered only from that residence. The jury was instructed to find for the taxpayer if it was satisfied that, as taxpayer contended, the pool was purchased for business use and in anticipation of benefits to the business. *Doughboy Industries, Inc.* v *United States*, 4 A.F.T.R. 2d 5021 (W.D. Wis. 1959).

Allowed by court: Jury verdict in favor of taxpayer for 95 percent of refunds claimed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say I have no objection to swimming pools. I think they are valuable for the purposes of health, but I do not believe the cost of them should be tax deductible.

FALSE TEETH—ORDINARY BUSINESS DEDUCTION

Now we come to a very interesting case. The next case is one which was reported by the New York Times magazine of April 20, 1958, on pages 48 and 50. A famous movie comedian claimed the cost of a new set of teeth as a business deduction, and said he had to have these false teeth in order to be a movie comedian. So, instead of paying for them himself, he got Uncle Sam to pay 52 percent by claiming them as a business deduction. The court ruled that teeth—true or false—were necessary to his act and that the cost of replacing or repairing them constituted a legitimate deduction. Again we see to what lengths the term "ordinary and necessary" business expense can be stretched.

PRIVATE CLUBHOUSE

The following case is that of a deduction for the cost of depreciation and wages for a private clubhouse at which a transformer manufacturing company provided entertainment for its customers and prospective customers. The amount of $127,067 was both claimed and allowed in 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Transformer manufacturer	Entertainment at private clubhouse.	$127,067	$127,067	Sept. 30, 1959	These deductions consist of depreciation, wages, and other expenditures made in connection with the taxpayer corporation's private clubhouse which is used for the entertainment of customers and prospective customers.

AIRPLANE FOR CUSTOMERS OF AUTO DEALER

Mr. DOUGLAS. The final case in this group is that of an automobile dealer who successfully claimed $20,000 for a private airplane which was used for entertainment, travel, and advertising, and especially for the entertainment of customers and prospective customers. This brings up the question of how riding in an airplane would really give a customer any knowledge of why he should buy the dealer's automobiles.

The automobile dealer was making a tax deduction for using a yacht, which is certainly a rival method of transportation. Now we have the case of another man getting a deduction of $20,000 for using an airplane to demonstrate the advantages of automobile travel.

I ask unanimous consent that the details of this case be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Type of business	Type of expense	Amount		Tax year or period	Summary of facts
		Claimed	Allowed		
Auto dealer	Airplane	$20,000	$20,000		Used for entertainment, travel, advertising. Records support claimed deduction for depreciation and maintenance of airplane used in entertaining customers and prospective customers.

MORE GIFTS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, Mr. President, let me say more about the giving of gifts by companies and individuals which are charged to Uncle Sam.

Virtually every kind of item which man can conceive has, at one time or another, been given as a tax deductible gift. These include liquor, expensive foods, jewelry, flowers, leather goods, luxury items, Christmas gifts, cars, trips, furs, stock, furniture, and so forth.

In 1958 the School of Journalism at Ohio State University did a study of business gift-giving by polling the presidents of 650 of America's largest corporations. One of the questions asked was, "What is the most expensive gift—which you, personally, know about—that any company has given to gain a benefit?" Examples of their replies included:

By an appliance dealer, "A trip to Jamaica."

By an oil refiner, "Fifteen shares of stock, cost $3,500. This was given by a drilling contractor to one of our executives who had awarded him several contracts."

By a heavy-equipment manufacturer, "Cadillac to get shipping contract."

By a manufacturer in the Midwest, "I have been offered some very attractive trips for my wife and me."

By an ore producer, "Boat trips and other gifts, $4,000 to $5,000."

By a life insurance man, "Trip to Europe."

By an ore refiner, "Furnace for a brandnew house."

Another executive mentioned that he had been offered—listen to this—"the loan of a yacht, liquored, fueled, and girled."

This statement is not by a muckraker. It is a statement by an executive. He stated that he had been offered—and it is quite a comment on the morals of the times—"the loan of a yacht, liquored, fueled, and girled."

In fact, Mr. President, in the words of these 650 top executives, they had been offered everything from trinkets to Cadillacs, and more.

The items which were mentioned most often in the survey of these company presidents were hi-fi's, television sets, automobiles—with Cadillacs far outnumbering other makes—cases of whisky, fancy luggage, trips, hotel accommodations, and lavish entertainment.

What is the cost of this business gift giving which is charged to Uncle Sam? Printer's Ink estimated that the cost had risen from $200 million in 1950 to $1 billion by 1960.

Mr. George Kienzle, writing in the Reporter in 1958, quotes an estimate of $2 billion a year for Christmas presents alone.

Esquire estimates gift giving at $2.5 billion, and Fortune at $2.2 billion. The magazine Spirits—the liquor magazine—states:

Over $1 billion, or about 10 percent of all expenditures for alcoholic beverages in the United States may come out of the corporate treasury.

The article would have been somewhat more accurate if it had said that about half this amount would come out of Uncle Sam's Treasury.

Time magazine estimated:

Santas in pinstripes spend something like $1 billion on yuletide cheer; $300 million for liquor; the rest for a stockingful of loot ranging from $2.50 puddings to $2,500 pianos. Some companies spend $100,000 or more on gifts alone each Christmas (Dec. 1, 1958, p. 74).

It is not only business publications but also businessmen themselves who object to excessive gift giving. Those questioned in the Ohio State University survey, as well as those elsewhere, have used such terms in describing it as "blackmail," "outrageous," "shakedown," "sucker," "a necessary evil," "parasitic expense," "a vicious cycle," and a "bribe." This flourishes most in connection with purchasing agents.

Of those questioned in the Ohio State survey, 7 out of 10 of the big industrialists who said their companies give gifts, objected to the idea. Of these, 6 out of the 10 flatly disapproved, and 1 out of the 10 had serious misgivings.

These statements from businessmen themselves should make it abundantly clear that the President's proposal is eminently reasonable. Under it businesses would be allowed to deduct, for tax purposes, gifts in the amount of $10 per person receiving a gift per year.

In fact, this proposal would not stop companies from making gifts—small ones which are tax deductible such as pens, pencils, and so forth—but would merely limit the amount which the taxpayers would have to pay for the practice.

Generosity is an admirable virtue but it should be practiced by people themselves. We should not ask Uncle Sam to pick up half of the cost and the shareholders the rest.

Let us clean up this disgrace.

CONCLUSION

We have seen that under the present law, which allows the deduction of "ordinary and necessary" expenses related to a business activity, grossly excessive deductions for so-called business expenses have been claimed and allowed. In the examples which I have given we have seen deductions taken for club dues, pleasure trips in the United States and to Europe—including the wives of businessmen—speedboats, yachts, expense-paid vacations, football tickets, theater tickets, safaris to Africa, hunting and fishing trips, expensive jewelry, trips to the Kentucky Derby, expensive Christmas gifts and parties, Cadillacs, lodges, resorts, summer homes, repair of personal residences, honeymoons, swimming pools, and even false teeth, to name only a few of the many abuses which I have pointed out.

Because there are so many loopholes in the law, it must be changed. Moreover these legal loopholes are particularly bad because of the interpretation which the courts have placed upon the law.

Among the worst of the interpretations is probably the so-called Cohan rule which, for all practical purposes, allows a taxpayer, even in the absence of supporting evidence, to be granted at least one-half of the amounts he claims for business expenses. It seems clear from the evidence and examples that in many cases taxpayers deliberately claim twice or more than twice their actual expenditures in the certainty that they will receive at least one-half the amount, especially if the case goes to court.

This, of course, means that there are two types of abuses involved under this rule: First, since no evidence is required, virtually any expenditure can be and is claimed as a business deduction; and second, because of the 50-percent Cohan rule, deductions which are claimed are often padded. Furthermore, because of the court cases it is almost impossible for the Internal Revenue Service to successfully deny even clearly gross abuses of the privilege of deducting so-called ordinary and necessary business expenses.

A second loophole, which is also really the result of court interpretations, is the allowance of expense deductions simply because they seem in proper relationship to the salary or income of the person taking them. This means that a highly paid business executive can take as much in expense account deductions as a middle income taxpayer may earn in an entire year—simply on the grounds that they are in proper relationship to his high salary.

Why the thought has not occurred to anyone that a man with a high salary might be able to pay many of these expenses out of his own pocket is something to wonder about.

Consequently, the greater the income the greater the abuses, and, conversely, the smaller the person's income the less opportunity he has to take advantage of these loopholes and truckholes in the tax law. This is justice in reverse—it is injustice—and, as a result, those with relatively modest incomes are required to pay a heavy burden in taxes which should rightly fall on high income groups which the latter often avoid or evade.

Since the present law is obviously so inadequate the President is recommending that limits be placed on these deductions. These recommendations include:

First. Expenses for entertainment would not be allowed as a tax deduction, because they are obviously in the nature of amusement, recreation, or personal pleasure. Of course, for persons or companies who are in the business of providing entertainment, entertainment which is made available to the general public or to whole groups of employees, and so forth, would be permitted proper allowances.

Second. Expenditures for entertainment facilities would be disallowed as tax deductions. These would include expenditures for yachts, hunting lodges, fishing camps, resorts, and so forth, concerning which some of the greatest abuses have taken place.

Third. Deductions for gifts would be limited to an annual amount of $10 per recipient. This means, of course, that a business could still provide small advertising gifts such as calendars, pencils, and pens, modest Christmas gifts, and so forth, but the proposal would prohibit them from taking more costly gifts as a tax deduction for which the taxpayers of the United States in general must pay.

Of course, none of these items is outlawed in the sense that gifts cannot be given or entertainment cannot be provided. The only thing the new law would do would be to limit the amount which Uncle Sam would be required to pay. And, of coures, tax treatment of charitable institutions and charitable contributions would remain the same as in the present law.

Fourth. Club dues, including fees of social, athletic, and sporting associations, would not be allowed.

Fifth. Expenditures for food and beverages would be disallowed except when they were clearly served in connection with a business meeting and where a reasonable limit—somewhere between $4 and $7 per person—would be applied. A person can eat well on a $4 to $7 lunch.

It is not necessary to take a person to a restaurant with high prices—I hear we have one or two in this city, and that there are some in New York—at which a bill for a meal will come to $25, $30, or $50. One can get a very good lunch, I am told, for $4 to $7. Most of us probably do not pay more than one-third or one-fourth that much.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to my friend.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator know what a lunch consisting of a cup of the famous Senate bean soup, a wonderful inch-thick steak, and a slice of the delicious rum pecan pie costs?

Mr. DOUGLAS. $2.25.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a very good lunch, and has many, many calories.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. As a Senator who had the honor to serve as a member of the committee on the restaurant, I accept the implied compliment of the remarks of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have certain reservations.

Mr. President, I continue the list of recommendations.

Sixth. Legitimate travel costs would, of course, be deductible but where the travel clearly involved pleasure or a combination of business and pleasure the amounts would have to be allocated to the proper purpose.

Seventh. A deduction would be allowed for meals and lodging away from home. Under the President's proposal this would be an amount equal to twice that which is now paid to Federal Government employees when they are traveling on Government business.

I understand the House is proposing an allowance of $16 a day. If that goes through, there would be permitted $32 a day for private persons. This would provide a reasonably good room and meal, and trolley fare, for people who have to travel.

These proposals would bring some reasonableness into the present expense account racket.

Under the present law the Federal Government is an active partner in a large part of the travel entertainment and high living which goes on in the United States.

We are becoming an expense account civilization, with Uncle Sam financing more than half the cost.

One of our most distinguished business executives, Mr. Clarence Randall, wrote an article for Dunn's Review of August 1960, entitled "The Myth of the Magic Expense Account." In that article, Mr. Randall said, in part:

> Certain it is that entertaining by business in this country is now itself big business. Some companies are more widely known for their parties than they are for their products. The occasions for business entertainment range all the way from two for lunch in the executive dining room to several thousand in the ballroom of the big hotel, with name bands, and orchids flown in from Hawaii for the ladies.
>
> Gone are the days when a salesman occasionally wined and dined his favorite customer, or perhaps gave a small theater party. Nowadays, when the deal gets big enough, the company yacht weighs anchor and moves into position, the company plane takes off for a duckblind in Arkansas, or the best hotel in Miami throws open its doors

to expectant dealers for a week of continuous circus.

The distaff side is cut in, too, on both sides of the deal. How the ladies love it. With jet travel what it is, those who were getting a little tired of White Sulphur may now hope to look in on Capri or the Riviera.

The unseen partner in all this largess, of course, the man who rides the afterdeck of the company yacht, copilots the duck hunters' plane, sits by while the caviar is spooned out and the crepes suzettes are sizzling, the man who splits the check at the night spot and hands the big bill to the headwaiter, is none other than Uncle Sam.

But who are the silent underwriters of this frenetic spending? You and I, the general taxpayers. It is we who make up to the U.S. Treasury the revenue lost through expense-account deductions.

Mr. President, perhaps I could conclude at that point, but I wish to read a quotation from the well-known Mr. Lucius Beebe which I think is worth quoting. I used to admire the society columns which he wrote when they appeared in the New York papers. He has now moved west. He travels in a private railway car. I esteem his literary qualities. I have never thought of him as an ascetic, or one who was unduly concerned with economy, but in the San Francisco Chronicle for March 20 of this year, on page 36, appear some very interesting comments written by Lucius Beebe. He knows whereof he speaks, because he was the darling of cafe society for many years.

He wrote:

If the new administration in Washington would like to come by a program of readjustment which would evoke rousing cheers from all but a very small segment of the American people, it could hit upon nothing more felicitous than the often promised but never yet actually inaugurated crackdown on executive expense account.

The expense account society that has been brought into existence by the past attitude of the Treasury toward this aspect of the national business structure is not only one that costs the Federal Government a good deal of money—how much let Sylvia Porter tell you—but is a much resented affront to a great many people who are themselves unable to swell it in expensive resorts, restaurants, and foreign travel tax free and out of various corporate pockets on the slim excuse that they are doing company business.

There are precious few Americans of private means who can or will patronize restaurants where the luncheon tab for the chef's suggestion can come to $45 for two, but such plush premises as the Four Seasons in New York are jammed to the reservation desks with expense account patrons paying $200 for dinner for five.

This is the aspect of expense account civilization that is most distasteful to people of ordinary means and prudent ways with money, even if they have it in ample abundance. Probably corporate expense accounts are the greatest single inflationary agency in the entire national economy, in addition to which well-upholstered—

That is his word, not mine. He said "well upholstered"—

jerks preempting the best of everything in restaurants, theaters, night clubs, and airplanes are a damned poor advertisement for big business.

I call attention to the fact that the word "damned" is not a word that I used, but in the interest of accuracy, I felt I had to repeat it.

They make more enemies among a class of people naturally sympathetic to corporate vastness than all the radical agitators and socialists put together.

An abatement of the expense account society could win the Government wild plaudits for a great many taxpayers who, by indirection, are tired of picking up the tab every time some crumb bum with an executive title, who couldn't treat a friend to a Coke on his own money, decides he wants a week in New York with a suite at the St. Regis and ringside table at El Morocco every evening.

Mr. President, I rest my case.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the Senator has performed a very real public service in making this highly informative speech. I noted that near the beginning of his speech he described how necessary it was that we should begin to discuss these issues before the Senate and the country so that we may gain a more thorough understanding of the issues involved. I am glad to note that he is planning to make a series of speeches during the coming weeks, and I hope that he will encourage other Senators to come over and join in colloquy when he speaks on this subject. By doing so we will do our best to bring the problem to the attention of the country and thus to discount the rather frightening testimony which is being given before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, evidently in a strong effort to defeat these worthwhile reforms.

I note also that the Senator has spoken with commendation about the very different attitude of the present administration toward these problems than that of its predecessor. He and I will recall, as will the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], that last year we succeeded in closing a couple of these loopholes on the floor of the Senate, but with the adamant opposition of the Treasury, they were eliminated in conference.

I ask the Senator from Illinois, who is a valued and distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Finance, whether he has much hope that he can get these loopholes closed in the Committee on Finance, or will we again have to fight the committee on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not a prophet or the son of a prophet. I do not wish to make an estimate of what may happen. But if we do not get action in the Committee on Finance, we should make a fight on the floor.

Mr. CLARK. I hope that this year, at least, the Committee on Finance or a majority of its members will support the Kennedy administration in making these desirable reforms, and not line up with the outmoded views of the Eisenhower administration in this regard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I also very much hope so.

A subject to which I referred in a footnote in my speech, but which I now state orally, is that I have been afraid the proposed tax changes would be incorporated in a bill to extend the excise taxes or a portion of the corporate taxes. The bill would come over here so late that we would not have time adequately to discuss it. In the last 3 years we have been confronted with a fiscal pistol that has been leveled at our heads. The House would pass this measure in June. The Senate Committee on Finance would not have time to hold hearings. The bill would be sent to the Senate about the 20th of June.

The taxes expire on the 1st of July. We are told that we cannot make changes at that time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I recall very well that the procedure described has been the practice in the past. It is not in accordance with the rules of this body to criticize Members of the other body, so I shall not do so. But in the interest of fairness and decency, I think an effort should be made to get that bill over here and out of committee in plenty of time to debate it fully.

I call the Senator's attention to what he and I, and I believe others, stated on the floor last year to be the fact, and it is a fact, that these tax extensions can be made retroactive. The pistol pointed at our heads does not have any bullets in it. We could let the excise tax law expire, and have the expiration run as much as 30 days beyond the expiration, and still make the law retroactively effective. I for one do not propose to be scared by that situation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It could be done by a temporary extension also.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. We should be ready.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may be that the Ways and Means Committee will separate the two bills and send over a simple tax extension bill and then later send over a measure for a tax change.

Mr. CLARK. I would hope that they would do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would be fine to provide us with a tax change measure, so that we may have adequate opportunity to debate the measure on the floor of the Senate and to make such changes as may seem proper. If they hold back the tax change measure until late in the session, that will be almost as bad as incorporating it in the tax extension measure.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I listened with a great deal of interest to the comments of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but I should like to point out that there is increasing evidence that the legislative demands of the New Frontier administration are being readily complied with on Capitol Hill.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that we shall face in the next fiscal year a deficit of $5 to $7 billion. The Senator has been deploring the fact that the Senate and the House do not move forward in some operation to increase Federal revenue. The Senator is a member of the Committee on Finance, which I believe is composed of 11 Democrats and 6 Republicans. Is it not a fact that

the leaders of the Democratic Party, complying with the legislative dictates of the White House, could move forward, not in a month from now or next year, but immediately, to formulate legislation and to submit it to the Senate, so that we could take steps to curb these deficit inflationary trends?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First let me say that what I am trying to do is close what my colleague from Pennsylvania and others call loopholes, so that the national income from revenue can be more than it is now. That would diminish the deficit. As regards the responsibility of the Democratic Party for financial matters, we are in far better position now, because we have the actual constructive leadership of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury. So far as the political situation is concerned, both inside the Finance Committee and in the Senate as a whole, and in both the House and the Senate, the Senator from Idaho is well aware that we do not have two political parties, but four political parties. We have a group of liberal Democrats from the North and West, virtually all of the Democrats from the North and West, and we have a group of conservative Democrats largely, though not entirely, from the South. The Republicans have two political parties, a large number of conservatives, with whom I am sure the Senator from Idaho would be proud to aline himself, and a small but gallant group of liberal Republicans. As the Senator from Idaho well knows, in the past the conservative coalition has had a majority and has been able to impede and prevent effective reforms. I hope they will not be as successful this year as they have been in the past.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Idaho is aware that notwithstanding the four parties or segments which we have in the two major parties, as pointed out by the Senator from Illinois, the legislative record of this year indicates that when the pressure is on, the rollcall indicates a majority vote of about two to one. Why cannot that be translated into dynamic, effective action on the financial front, to do something more than talk about the need to increase revenues and to diminish the inevitable deficit which we face.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is why I am speaking this afternoon. I welcome the potential support of the Senator from Idaho in closing the loopholes. I am beginning to think that we will make converts.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Illinois does not have to convert the Senator from Idaho in any regard concerning the tragic effect of inflation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope he will help us on the expense accounts.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I know that the appropriations have been constantly increasing for Federal spending. Notwithstanding the fact that we have fairly good prospects in the country, and have had for many years, we are facing a deficit all the time. The Senator from Idaho realizes that the taxpayers of the country are heavily burdened. As we face the communistic threat from the Soviet dictators, and as we recognize the many problems that face us on the home front, in the interest of national survival the time has arrived when we should stop talking about stabilizing our economy and financial structure and take steps to do something about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. One of these steps would be to cure the abuses of expense accounts. I have been laboring in the same vineyard as that which the Senator from Idaho has been talking about.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, AND FROM MONDAY TO THURSDAY—LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns on Monday next it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on the following Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the benefit of the Senate, there will be no votes on Monday and certainly there will be no votes today. There may be some votes on Thursday, but if there is a disposition on the part of any Senator to become inconvenienced as a result, the distinguished minority leader and I will consider putting over rollcall votes beyond Thursday. However, negotiations are now being carried on, and it is anticipated that on Thursday the items to which objection was made on the call of the calendar today will be considered then. The first will be Calendar No. 176, S. 1185, to amend the Merchant Marine Act.

Also, Calendar No. 177, S. 1183, to amend the Merchant Marine Act.

Calendar No. 188, H.R. 4130, to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin.

Calendar No. 233, Senate Joint Resolution 21, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to sell 10 Liberty type merchant vessels to citizens of the United States for conversion into barges.

Calendar No. 261, H.R. 5954, an act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

It is anticipated, as I stated previously, that on Friday, the Senate will begin discussion of Calendar No. 252, S. 1922, a bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

I make this announcement simply to give the Senate as much advance notice as possible concerning what the program will be. There will be no votes today and no votes on Monday. There may be votes on Thursday if circumstances call for them. If a yea-and-nay vote is requested on any bill, it is anticipated that it will be possible to reach a reasonably good solution.

Furthermore, the program for Thursday depends on the touching of all bases before it becomes final.

TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR CASTRO TRACTORS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, all of us, as citizens of a free society, deplore the callous attitude of Fidel Castro and his Government toward human life. We are revolted by his offer to exchange human life for tractors. There are many ways in which we, as American citizens, may respond to this situation. One appropriate means is through the voluntary contribution program which has been undertaken under private sponsorship. The President, displaying his usual humanitarian concern, has urged Americans to contribute to this fund.

I join the President in endorsing this humanitarian approach to a very difficult and harsh problem.

At the same time, there is one point on which I must disagree with him. This disagreement is on the question of providing a tax deduction for such contributions. While such a policy may be defended as recognizing a charitable contribution, it has certain basic weaknesses.

First, the granting of a tax deduction amounts to a subsidy for the fund and immediately makes the Government a party to the program. This tends to muddy the waters as it would detract from humanitarian interests promoting such a program.

Second, the tax deduction dilutes the concept of a charitable and humanitarian contribution by making such a contribution a vehicle for reducing individual tax costs. The motives of contributors may then be treated as suspect by propagandists in other areas of the world.

Finally, since such a tax deduction would involve the Government officially, it subjects the Government to the criticism of submitting to blackmail by Castro. This is not desirable as national policy and it is not helpful in terms of world reaction. There can be no objection to the individual unselfish acts of those who wish to contribute to the saving of human lives. There can be objection to the payment of ransom by the state.

As a voluntary program, the contributions for purchase of tractors is in the best tradition of our Nation. As an official Government policy, it would be an unfortunate move, no matter how noble the motives which inspired it.

WORLD PEACE, WORLD LAW, DISARMAMENT, AND REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I shall speak for a few minutes on the general subjects of world peace, world law, disarmament, and the revision of the Charter of the United Nations.

Yesterday, in his stirring address to the joint session of Congress, the President said, in part:

> We are determined to keep disarmament high on our agenda—to make an intensified effort to develop acceptable political and technical alternatives to the present arms race.

He said further:

> We are looking forward to the day when reason will prevail, and all nations of the world will be prepared to accept a realistic and safeguarded disarmament in a world of law.

Those statements by the President received probably more applause than any other statements in the course of his address. Obviously, he speaks to the hearts and minds of the American people when he indicates his own intense interest in the only real way available to the peoples of the world to avoid destruction.

In speaking of his coming negotiations with Soviet Premier Khrushchev, the President said:

> Yet it is important that they—

Meaning the Russians—

> should know that our patience at the bargaining table is nearly inexhaustible, though our credulity is limited—that our hopes for peace are unfailing, while our determination to protect our security is resolute.

All Americans must commend the President for the frame of mind and his philosophy and outlook as he leaves our shores early next week to engage in a critical series of international conferences, first with President de Gaulle, and later with Premier Khrushchev.

My purpose in speaking today is to indicate strong support for the President and to urge that in his coming talks with Khrushchev he will clearly chart the two roads now open to the United States and to the Soviet Union, and also to hope that his message will be passed along to the Chinese Communists.

One is the easy road downhill to disaster by a continuation and acceleration of the existing arms race. The other is the long, hard, uphill road to peace, under the rule of law, with internationalization or elimination of weapons of mass destruction.

I am confident that President Kennedy will stress our ability and willingness—indeed, our will—to maintain the delicate balance of power as long as may be necessary to insure our own survival. But we can also hope that the President will put the Soviet leader on notice that the United States is in deadly earnest in its desire for general disarmament and peace under law, and that we will, in due course—and soon—present the Soviet Union and other interested nations with a detailed plan to achieve this end.

There is no greater challenge than the one voiced by the President yesterday—a challenge "to develop acceptable political and technical alternatives to the present arms race."

President Kennedy's words and deeds from the time of his inaugural message to the message he delivered to Congress yesterday indicate not only his determination to increase the power of the United States in the face of Communist threats, but also his renewed dedication to the goal of peace under law in a disarmed world.

The President's awareness of the need for our Government to offer both "the sword and the olive branch" speaks well for the talks to be held in Vienna next week. It is important that Congress should encourage the Chief Executive to proffer both to Khrushchev.

In effect, as I said, the United States and the Soviet Union are at a fork in the roads to the future. One road leads to disaster. It is the road which Soviet and Chinese intransigence, as well as fixed habits of thinking, may well force us to take. It is the road on which we are at present embarked. It is a road from which, in my judgment, we must turn back before it is too late.

The signposts on this route are erected by those who place their faith in the maintenance indefinitely of the delicate balance of terror as our only salvation. The distinguished British scientist, C. P. Snow, has estimated that it would take us about 10 years to reach its destination, which is the destruction of Western civilization.

Arms control is popular at the moment, both within and outside this body. But, in my judgment, arms control without substantial disarmament or strengthened international peace-keeping authority is but a detour on this same road to ruin. It holds no real hope of doing more than giving us a brief pause on this downhill path. Unless it is conceived of as merely the first stage of an international agreement for total and permanent controlled, multilateral disarmament, arms control holds no hope for the survival of the human race. In and of itself it is not a permanent solution to anything.

The other road is a difficult one indeed. It leads uphill. Its surface is rocky. To negotiate it in safety will require painful readjustments. However, at its end is a world of peace under law, with all weapons of mass destruction eliminated or internationalized.

If we can take this road, there is hope that a world of peace on earth, with good will toward all men, may yet come into being for our children.

The signposts on this road indicate that those who would reach its goal must stop thinking in terms of national solutions to international problems. There must be willingness to place sufficient authority in a common international authority to prevent the wars of mutual annihilation which presently threaten us from every side.

In my view, it is vitally important that the President chart clearly for the Soviet leader the pitfalls and goals of both of these routes.

To date we have spoken much about the goal of peace under law, but we have done very little indeed to indicate how we intend to get there.

There is probably far more support in the free world for making the changes in governmental organizations which will be needed than is commonly suspected in this body.

In my own travels during the last year and a half, to countries as far apart as Norway and Japan, I have found a widespread willingness among both peoples and governments to support the hard choices that would be required if we were to take the lead in offering a comprehensive plan for obtaining total and permanent controlled and inspected disarmament under the rule of law.

The March 17 communique of the British Commonwealth Prime Ministers, when meeting in London, is particularly noteworthy in this regard:

> At the appropriate (disarmament) stage, a substantial and adequately armed military force should be established, to prevent aggression and enforce observance of the disarmament agreement; and an international authority should be created, in association with the United Nations, to control this force and to insure that it is not used for any purpose inconsistent with the Charter.

What is needed—desperately needed, in my view—is that the United States of America should formulate and propose a really comprehensive and—in the President's phrase—"serious and precise" plan to achieve peace and disarmament under law.

By a serious plan, I mean a plan which unequivocally accepts what the Prime Ministers called total worldwide disarmament as its objective, and includes, as theirs did, a strong and adequately armed world police force, composed—I would add—of volunteers, not of national contingents.

Such a plan must include the most rigorous provisions for inspection, control, and delivery of all weapons of destruction. Without such inspection and without such control, the plan would, of course, be mere folly.

Our problem is to take the kind of generality which so many—including the Russians—have been talking about, and put on the bare bones of those ideas the flesh and blood and nerves required to make this a workable international agency charged with the duty of the prevention of war.

In order to be comprehensive, the plan must also include definite proposals for at least five other indispensable elements:

First. Clearly stated laws, applicable to all nations and persons, prohibiting the use of force in international relations;

Second. A world judicial, quasi-judicial, and conciliation system equipped to deal with all international disputes which threaten peace;

Third. A well-financed world development authority to mitigate the vast disparities between the "have" and the "have not" nations;

Fourth. The necessary world legislative and executive agencies worked out in such a way as to be fair to all nations; and, finally,

Fifth. An effective revenue system, without which the establishment of the other world institutions would be futile.

Mr. President, even today we see the tragic results of not having an adequate world revenue system in the United Nations. As a result of that situation, following the heavy expenditures entailed by the Congo effort, the United Nations has been threatened with bankruptcy, and several members have been unable or unwilling to make their allotted financial contributions. The Soviet bloc, while continuing to participate in the benefits of the world organization, has, nevertheless, refused to make the financial contributions necessary in order to keep it going.

So I say that this effective revenue system must be one through which world taxation can be collected by a world agency, at a world source, and so that the international agency will itself have access to the funds necessary in order to keep it in being.

It is painfully clear that the development within the United Nations framework of world executive, judicial, and legislative machinery capable of preventing war would require numerous, fundamental changes in the structures of the world organization as we know it. Perhaps these changes can be wrought by means of Charter review and revision, if we get at the job without delay. Perhaps an entirely new international peace-keeping organization, free of the impediments of a Charter drafted in the preatomic age, will be needed. But the essentials of a plan for such an organization remain the same in either instance.

Can such a plan be worked out and presented in view of proven Communist belligerence in Cuba, Laos, and elsewhere? Of course, the cynic will answer "No"; and, unfortunately, today cynicism tends to prevail. But I am confident that the President of the United States is not a cynic; and I am also confident that the men who surround him in high places have a fine and realistic understanding of the fact that cynicism will end in disaster, and that only hardheaded idealism will show us the road to salvation. I believe that such a plan can be worked out—not today, not tomorrow, not next year, but over the next decade; and I truly believe that, because when we actually consider whether there is a feasible alternative, we find that there is no feasible alternative to obtaining peace under law and disarmament at the earliest possible time. Otherwise the arms race will devour the Communists, just as it will also devour us; and the Communists must know it.

I suspect the Russians, at least, do know it. Only by proposing a plan of our own can we expose the shallowness of the Soviets' disarmament sloganeering and the dated and parochial nature of Marxism-Leninism, which has refused to acknowledge a higher authority than the Soviet State. We badly need a truly worthy long-range standard to which to repair. Only by presenting such a plan can this all-important subject be debated the world over with a view toward the formation of a consensus.

Presumably, the United States will have such a plan by August, when the general disarmament talks are scheduled to resume. I hope it is true, and that it will be a precise, specific, comprehensive, and complete plan.

The Chief Executive, I know, is receiving advice that it would be useless for the executive branch to prepare such a plan or to attempt to present or negotiate a comprehensive, general, controlled disarmament plan because the Senate will not ratify such an agreement.

I am confident this advice is wrong. I am confident this body would rise to its constitutional responsibility. I am confident that there is a substantial majority in the Senate who understand the ghastly alternatives which confront us, who would abandon our own parochialism, who would abandon our sterile looking backward to the past, and who would move forward to a new form of world organization, just as in the critical days between the time of the Articles of Confederation coming into being, in 1783, and the signing and ratification of the Constitution, some 6 years later, the Founding Fathers rose to the challenge and formed a National Union out of the 13 divisive States which were on the point of breaking up.

I am confident that our esteemed former colleague, now the President of the United States, who knows the real temper of this body and its willingness to respond to an idealistic leadership, will reject this advice. Let no one assert that the Senate of the United States will not rise to its responsibilities if a plan is offered by the Executive which provides an alternative to the arms race and the path downhill to destruction.

I hope the President will put the Soviet leader on notice that the United States is in deadly earnest about our desires for a general, complete, permanent, and controlled disarmament and peace under the rule of law, and that we will soon present Khrushchev, no later than August, with a carefully thought through detailed plan to achieve this end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks three important articles, which I commend to the attention of my colleagues: First, an editorial from the May 6, 1961, Saturday Review, written by Stuart Chase, and entitled "Principles for the Nuclear Age"; second, an article entitled "World Order: The Need for a Bold New Approach," by Grenville Clark, which is being published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science; and, finally, a most interesting book review appearing in the Saturday Review by a former Representative from Oregon, Charles O. Porter, commenting on two books, which I also commend to my colleagues, first, "The Nation's Safety and Arms Control," by Arthur T. Hadley, and the second, "Disarmament: The Challenge of the Nineteen Sixties," by James P. Warburg.

Mr. President, I am confident that my colleagues will be interested in these insertions. I urge them to read them.

I close with the hope and belief that the Senate of the United States will rise to any challenge in the field of disarmament, world peace, and world law which the President of the United States shall call upon it to meet.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Saturday Review, May 6, 1961]

PRINCIPLES FOR THE NUCLEAR AGE

(By Stuart Chase)

Certain well-established principles of atomic physics were used by the scientists of the Manhattan project to make the first atomic bomb and explode it in a New Mexico desert. On August 8, 1945, a second bomb was zeroed in on Hiroshima, and the nuclear age officially began. Einstein's short and comprehensive equation, $E=mc^2$, had been abundantly verified, together with a whole complex of technical principles.

On this hard base of theory and application, the hydrogen bomb was presently developed, while even more powerful weapons are now said to be on the drawing board. Some progress, too, has been made in the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy. The principles of the nuclear scientists are an open book, with application in terms of energy released, chain reaction, blast, heat, radiation, fallout, clearly demonstrated for all who care to examine the evidence. Any nation can now produce atomic weapons if it has the necessary industrial establishment. The nuclear age rests on thoroughly adequate foundations so far as natural science is concerned. Coincidentally, it demands social changes far more revolutionary than those following the introduction of gunpowder 500 years ago, which doomed feudalism and the armored knight. Social, political, and economic institutions have been cut adrift from their traditional moorings. Most of us, however, seem to be so many Don Quixotes, unaware that the old verities have disappeared.

The nuclear age is only in its second decade, which means that every political leader in the world has been conditioned by his education and upbringing to act in terms of prenuclear cultural habits. Every responsible observer, student, writer has been so conditioned. One must make a great effort of the imagination to grasp the realities that now circumscribe all of us. One must struggle to base his thinking on the tangible effects of $E=mc^2$, rather than on tanks, carriers, and fighter planes, and on the ideas of national interest that prevailed before 1945. One must try to judge events in a kind of planetary frame of reference, and to subordinate the national frame. The prime questions posed by the nuclear age are not the United States against Russia, or Russia against China, or communism against capitalism; the prime question is the continuity of the human race.

This requires a profound shift in one's value system, but a shift not altogether unique. Certain prophets, philosophers, and religious leaders in the past have been able to take a world view—with a good deal less in the way of tangible evidence to go on. They took it for moral reasons ("no man is an island unto himself"); we have to take it for reasons of survival.

What are some of the principles in the social field that adequately reflect the leap

from chemical to nuclear energy? What changes are now indicated in our political and economic behavior? Such questions are seldom responsibly discussed. Most of us unconsciously assume that we are still living in the pre-Hiroshima age. A report of Senator STUART SYMINGTON delivered to President-elect Kennedy in late 1960 showed that the Pentagon was preparing to fight World War III on the principles of World War II, with nuclear weaponry as a side issue. On every hand, and in all mass media, we hear earnest discussion of national security and our posture of defense. But is there any defense against ICBM's and Polaris-equipped submarines? Is there any security today except in a precarious balance of terror?

Let us begin with a few well-authenticated facts that scientists have spread upon the record, and from which there seems little hope of appeal.

1. Nuclear weapons have put warfare in a wholly new dimension; they are not just bigger and better bangs.

2. A nuclear war between the United States and Russia will kill one-quarter to one-half the population of both countries within a few days, and make their industries, transportation, and distribution systems inoperable.

3. Fallout sifting down after a nuclear war, we are told by the biologists, will affect every living person, and undermine the pool of genes upon which the future of the race depends.

4. If the arms race continues, the present superiority of the offense is likely to become more pronounced. Missiles with atomic warheads will constitute the chief striking force of the U.S.S.R., the United States, and other belligerents. No technical means are now available, or are likely to become available, to prevent enough missiles getting through to paralyze both sides.

5. Nuclear-powered submarines armed with missiles of the Polaris type are now becoming the most serious deterrent to war. Huge stockpiles of fissionable material are all but obsolete, as delivery systems become the critical factor. Of what use is a mountain of stored bombs if they cannot be delivered to the target?

From technical facts of this nature, certain conclusions emerge. These form the principles to be reckoned with in the nuclear age. The following 19, it seems to me, have impressive logical justification:

1. A war between nuclear powers cannot be won. The result will be in the nature of mutual suicide.

2. The only reasonable purpose of weapons development today is to establish an adequate deterrent against nuclear attack pending successful negotiation for disarmament. Piling up overkill is useless.

3. The danger of accident touching off nuclear war increases directly with reduction in time of delivery, with the number of states in the nuclear club, and with the number of fallible human minds concerned with the nuclear chain of command. Some 20 nations are sufficiently advanced industrially to qualify as members of the club in the next few years—especially Red China. The more members, furthermore, the less effective the deterrent system. Instead of power to destroy one potential enemy, one must be prepared for the destruction of many.

4. It seems probable that war limited to conventional (i.e., pre-Hiroshima) weapons will turn into nuclear war. The knowledge is available, and a nation in extremis can be expected to use it. Imagine Hitler with this knowledge, as Russia and the United States closed in on Germany in the spring of 1945.

5. Despite the present potential for extermination, neither the United States nor the U.S.S.R. can use its military power. The purposeful explosion of just one nuclear weapon in support of political policy anywhere is likely to bring the roof down everywhere.

6. If the arms race continues, it looks as if the oversea bases of the United States will become more of a liability than an asset, exposed as they are to elimination by a single missile. The U.S.S.R. at the same time, will have no need for a ring of satellite states, insofar as they were seized as protection against land armies such as those of Hitler in 1942. Missiles from submarines can cross Poland in something less than 5 minutes on their way to Moscow. Land barriers, like ocean barriers, are all but meaningless in the nuclear age. By the same logic, NATO has about lost its military function, in that it was set up to halt the rush of land armies from Soviet borders to the Atlantic.

7. The United States and the U.S.S.R. will be increasingly forced to use the United Nations, or some other international body, for the solution of crises otherwise insoluble. Problems of outer space, earth satellites, Antarctica, weather control come to mind. Suppose Astronaut Gagarin had come down in Western territory. Could Russia have reclaimed him and his records? There is no law covering orbiting.

This brings us to a series of principles concerned with international machinery. If war is now useless for the furthering of political objectives, and for settling disputes, what shall take its place?

8. It seems reasonably clear that both the United States and the U.S.S.R. must realize their common peril if they hope to avert it. It follows that negotiation on all levels must be unremitting, and that mutual salvos of insults are a dangerous waste of time. The two great powers will get further if they first push negotiation on those issues where their interests are already parallel, such as the banning of nuclear tests, limiting the nuclear club, reducing the economic burden of armaments.

9. It seems axiomatic that only controlled, universal disarmament, together with legal agencies to resolve conflict between nations, can make a viable world in the nuclear age. The analogy put forward by Grenville Clark is relevant: When a cow town in the American Wild West acquired a judge, a sheriff, and a jail, citizens could refrain from settling their disputes with six-shooters.

10. A warless world must have an international legislative body to promulgate the essential elements of world law. The U.N. is beginning, but needs extensive revision. Recent experiences in the Congo should prove helpful in formulating changes.

11. A warless world must have a system of world courts to adjudicate the law. We have one court now, but it is little used. We need many more, and the United States must remove the Connally reservation if such courts are to function effectively.

12. A warless world must have a world police force to implement the findings of the courts, and to break up unlawful military adventures. We now have a U.N. military force composed of national brigades, but an effective force should give allegiance to the world agency only. It should probably be composed of volunteers, as the Foreign Legion is. The ineffectiveness of the present U.N. force is shown by the conflicting national policies of the various military units in the Congo. Loyalty must run in a single direction.

13. No international machinery of this nature is workable without the cooperation of Germany and Red China, now both excluded from the U.N.

14. It seems probable that a confederation of nations rather than a formal world state is the most practical next step politically. Absolute national sovereignty as defined and practiced before Hiroshima is inoperable in the nuclear age. A confederation, however, would still permit sovereignty over large areas, economic and social.

15. In a warless world, industrial nations must make far greater efforts to raise living standards in the hungry half of the planet lest world balance be upset. Fortunately, the economic resources will be available in the $100 billion, more or less, saved when universal disarmament becomes a reality.

16. Such efforts will fail, however, whatever the funds available, unless population is held in line with the food supply. This means birth control as well as death control.

On the American domestic front, three more principles seem to be indicated:

17. With the planet faced by sudden calamity from nuclear accident as well as from formal war, questions of monetary costs, budgets, national debt, defense of the dollar abroad, while important, are minor compared with questions of negotiation, disarmament, and machinery for a viable world.

18. Complete disarmament entails the transfer of some 10 to 12 percent of U.S. manpower and resources from bombs to butter. Whether rapid or slow, the shift can hardly be made without careful advance planning. Business-as-usual cannot be expected to handle any such massive transfer.

19. It has long been noted by qualified economists that a great nation can afford anything it can produce. It may well be that financial matters in the nuclear age will have to be geared to this proposition.

The above 19 principles for coming to terms with the nuclear age are admittedly preliminary, but may serve as a basis for discussion. Corrections and refinements are doubtless in order. The outstanding principle, I believe, is the abandonment of national sovereignty as the supreme good, and the acceptance of the continuity of mankind as the supreme good, so far as life here below is concerned. As said before, this requires a great effort of the imagination. The point of view can be glimpsed perhaps by imagining the probable behavior of all nations if the planet were attacked by spaceships from Mars. We would become a solid unit against the threat of invasion. Actually, of course, a far greater threat menaces us all. It would seem that the duty of those who love their country is to work unremittingly for the security of mankind.

[To be published in the Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, July 1961]

WORLD ORDER—THE NEED FOR A BOLD NEW APPROACH

(By Grenville Clark)

In this necessarily brief article on a vast subject, I restrict myself, first, to a summary statement of what I take to be the essential elements of an effective plan for world order; and, second, to an appraisal of the practical prospects for the formulation and adoption of such a plan in the reasonably near future.

In my belief, the following are the fundamental requirements for genuine peace, as distinguished from the precarious armed truce which now prevails.

As a first basic condition, I place the definite acceptance by the governments and peoples of the leading powers of the concept that world order requires the same kind of legislative, executive, and judicial institutions on a world scale as the experience of centuries has shown to be necessary for the maintenance of internal order in local communities and within nations.

By all except the most ignorant, it is taken for granted that law and order in any community depend upon the existence of clearly stated laws against violence, upon reliable courts to interpret and apply these laws and upon efficient police forces to deter or apprehend violators thereof. Moreover, every orderly community takes it for granted that

no armed factions can be permitted. For, while the possession by individual citizens of rifles, shotguns, and pistols for purposes of sport or self-protection may be permitted, who would suppose that the maintenance within a community of organized and potentially hostile armed bands would be compatible with domestic peace?

In short, we have learned by long experience that the maintenance of domestic order within any organized society, up to and including the nation, requires not only disarmament but also legislative, executive, and judicial institutions to enact and enforce definite law against violence. And, until the obvious truth is generally accepted that world order requires corresponding world institutions, there is indeed no chance for any reliable peace on our planet.

Assuming acceptance of the concept that enforceable world law is indispensable, what are the specific requirements to that end?

I submit that nothing less is needed than a comprehensive plan including the following elements:

1. Universal and complete disarmament: By this is meant not merely arms control or the mere limitation of armaments but rather the elimination of all national armaments by every country in the world without exception, right down to the level of agreed-upon police forces for internal order only, strictly limited in number and very lightly armed, it being understood that this total disarmament must be subject at all stages to as effective an inspection system as is reasonably possible and that the accomplishment of each stage must be carefully verified before going further.

2. An adequate world police force, meaning the establishment, parallel with the disarmament process, of a strong and heavily armed force of, say, 400,000 men, composed of volunteers and not of national contingents, with careful safeguards against having any undue proportion from any nation or group of nations and in respect of command, disposition and other factors, so as to provide every possible assurance against abuse of power by this force.

3. A world judicial, quasi-judicial and conciliation system, under which imparital world tribunals would be constituted in order to provide fully adequate means for the peaceful settlement of all international disputes, in lieu of force or the threat of it.

4. World legislative and executive agencies, so constituted as to be fair to all nations and also workable in practice, the powers of these agencies to be carefully restricted to the end in view, namely, the prevention of war.

5. A world development authority, adequately financed and staffed, to mitigate the vast and excessive economic disparities between the "have" and the "have not" nations.

6. An effective world revenue system to provide reliable revenues for the maintenance of the world police force and other necessary world institutions, since without such a system the mere establishment of those institutions would be a futility.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that every one of these elements is essential. For example, disarmament alone, no matter how complete or how efficient the inspection system, could not insure peace for the reason that many pressures for change and international disputes would still continue with consequent rearming and fighting, unless prevented by a strong world police and trustworthy world tribunals. It is indeed no more sensible to expect world order without all these world institutions than it would be to expect a watch to keep time without all its essential and interrelated parts.

Turning now to the question of the practical prospects for such a program, one must recognize the formidable character of the obstacles to be surmounted.

To begin with, there is the general human tendency to resist radical change, no matter how clear the necessity; and beyond this there are specific and powerful adverse influences which cannot be ignored.

Probably the most important of these is the resistance of the military, not only in the United States but in many other nations.

In appraising this pervading military influence, it is necessary to recognize its good faith in most cases. The typical professional soldier does not deprecate disarmament because he is any less humane than the average civilian. He does so because his training and environment have irrevocably conditioned him to assume that his profession is indispensable. In consequence, it is simply too much to expect that the military profession as a whole will do otherwise than oppose or at least drag their feet in respect of all proposals for total national disarmament and all that this implies. Hence it follows that there will be no solution for the problem of world peace until the resistance of the military profession everywhere is firmly overruled.

A less important yet significant adverse influence is that of traditional diplomacy. It must be remembered that for centuries a principal function of the professional diplomat has been to deal in power politics, i.e., in such things as the making of alliances or veiled or open threats of force intended to advance the real or supposed interests of his particular country. These habits of thought are almost as difficult to shake off as those of the professional military man. Accordingly, those who seek peace through enforceable world law will do well to discount an almost certain lack of interest in many foreign offices.

In addition, there is the vested interest of the armaments industry, whose proprietors and millions of employees cannot view with complete enthusiasm the elimination of their profits and jobs—even for so great a cause as genuine peace. And perhaps most important of all is the factor of mutual fears and recriminations which as of 1961 so poison the East-West atmosphere. Unfortunately, this state of affairs is deeply rooted on both sides. It has been built up over a long period and conditions the thinking of millions of people in both East and West. There is little use in trying to assess the blame which both sides must share, and we must accept this mutually poisoned atmosphere as a fact of life which cannot be got rid of for a long time.

Taking together all these adverse factors, we have a truly formidable group of obstacles. Yet they are not so formidable, I judge, as to stand against the still stronger forces making for world order.

Of these the most powerful single force is, I suppose, the simple and natural desire of the average individual to survive. It may be arguable whether the human race is worth preserving, but the actual fact is that men and women, with few exceptions, desire to live out a normal span and even more urgently desire that their descendants shall not be prematurely cut off without a chance to experience life for good or ill.

It follows, I believe, that as the destructive power of the new weapons increases from year to year and as at the same time people become more aware that the problem of removing this danger is by no means insoluble, the pressure upon those in authority to apply themselves to the formulation of an effective plan will become irresistible within a reasonably short period.

What more definitely can be said on this all-important question of timing? Are we likely to drift along with a continued arms race for a generation or so, subject to a constant risk of catastrophe? Or have we already reached the point where the danger is sufficiently great and the remedy sufficiently understood to bring about action in the immediate future?

I suggest that the probable outcome lies between these extremes. On the one hand, the chances seem slight that the world can or will endure a continued arms race for another 30 or 40 years. But, on the other hand, it is probably too much to hope that the current effort for military dominance can be brought to an end without at least 5 years of further strain and of education concerning the requirements for genuine peace.

Accordingly, I venture the surmise that in or about 1966–67, following several years of intense negotiation accompanied by recurrent tensions and alarms, the time will be ripe for the agreed formulation by the leading powers of a comprehensive plan of the sort above summarized and its submission to all the other nations. And, once submitted after the inevitably long discussions, there is every reason to suppose that the plan will have been adopted and be in operation within a few years thereafter, say, by 1971.

I venture this judgment because by 1966–67 the frightful consequences of all-out nuclear war should have become so apparent to all that the necessary pressures for action will probably have developed. I believe, in short, that considering the speed with which the technology of destruction is developing in 1961, 5 more years of progress in this field should be enough to energize the human race into effective action for its own survival, if anything can do so.

Concerning the supply of nuclear bombs and missiles, the world's stockpile, which is fairly estimated in early 1961 as having an explosive power of 55 billion tons of TNT, will probably have increased by 1966–67, in the absence of an arms truce, to at least 70 billion tons, or about 23,000 times the explosive power of the approximately 3 million tons used by all the warring powers in all theaters in World War II. This would provide over 21 tons for each of the estimated three and a quarter billion inhabitants of the world in 1966 and should be enough to give pause to even the most belligerent.

As to the equally important factor of accuracy, it is probable that, with 5 years more of practice, it will be possible consistently to land 5-megaton ballistic missiles within half a mile of the target point even at ranges of 7,000 miles—so that there would almost literally be no point on earth which could not be reached both from the United States and the Soviet Union.

By 1966–67 also both East and West should be amply supplied with nearly invulnerable means of delivery. The United States, as we are told in the New York Times, will then have 464 long-range nuclear missiles in a fleet of 29 Polaris submarines as well as 700 to 760 fixed-site intercontinental ballistic missiles, most of them emplaced in hardened silo or concrete underground sites. All these will be in addition to great fleets of bombers, each capable of carrying a 20-megaton load of bombs. However, since two can play at this game, there is no reason why the Soviet Union should be behind in the race; and it is safe to assume that, while the bombing and submarine fleets of the Eastern allies may be much inferior to those of the West, this deficiency will be offset by even more land-based missile sites scattered throughout the vast land mass of those countries.

In the light of all these prospects, it is indeed hard to believe that the peoples will remain apathetic beyond the 1966–67 period if they can ever be moved at all to an adequate effort to save themselves.

This is especially so, I suggest, because the prospective increase in understanding as to the capacity of the race to destroy itself will probably be matched during the 1960's

by an increasing comprehension of the world institutions necessary to prevent that destruction. The study of this subject already in progress or planned should develop in many lands a considerable number of persons equipped to formulate and administer the world security organization when the time is ripe for action. Our salvation lies, I believe, in this combination of increased concern over the danger with increased understanding of the means whereby it can be removed.

With regard to this moderately optimistic view, a skeptic might well raise the question as to where the necessary governmental leadership is to come from. He might point out that during the whole 16 years since World War II, not a single government has taken the trouble to formulate a comprehensive and adequate plan for peace, and might ask: Why is there any more likelihood that any government or group of governments will provide the necessary leadership during the 1960's?

My answer is that the situation has entirely changed with the advent of ballistic missiles and their constantly increasing power and accuracy, and that under the pressure of events it is almost certain that some creative governmental leadership must soon emerge.

For such leadership, one thinks of four possible sources: the Soviet Union, a group of neutral or uncommitted nations, the British Commonwealth, and the United States.

In the case of the Soviet Union, the difficulty will certainly not be that of insufficient zeal. For I think it clear that because of Russia's appalling losses in war, no people or government in the world is more anxious for disarmament and peace. In World War II alone, the Soviet Union's loss of life was not less than 15 million, or at least 8 percent of the entire population. This loss, together with the immense losses in World War I and in the 1918–40 period, have engendered an almost desperate desire for peace among the Russian people—to which no government, however authoritarian, can be indifferent. There is, therefore, no reason to doubt the sincerity of the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament; and there is every reason to suppose that the Soviet regime will continue insistently to press proposals of this sort.

Moreover, the Soviet regime has, I believe, rendered a great service in stressing the necessity for total, rather than partial, disarmament. The trouble is, however, that the Soviet Government does not seem as yet adequately to recognize the need for a strong world police and a world judicial system as necessary conditions for the acceptance of universal and complete disarmament. Beyond this the practical fact is that the United States and some other countries have been so conditioned to suspect and fear the Soviet regime that any proposal from that source, regardless of its merit, is under a handicap from the start. While these conditions may change, the conclusion early in 1961 must be that, however welcome any constructive Soviet proposals, there are serious doubts as to whether the Soviet Union can provide the necessary leadership during the next few years.

As to the second possibility of leadership by a group of neutral and nonalined nations (such as Switzerland, Austria, Tunisia, India, Burma, Ceylon, and Mexico), the idea is both logical and attractive because proposals from such a source would avoid the prejudice likely to handicap even the best plan formulated by either of the superpowers. With this in mind, a persistent effort has already been made to induce a number of eligible neutrals to consult together on a united plan for world disarmament and world development. Despite some apparent timidity and overcaution as to stepping out into the world arena on so great a subject, this possible approach is a promising one if only some powerful personality in one of those nations will summon sufficient initiative and energy.

Still more promising is possible leadership by the British Commonwealth of Nations, since in this group of states there are combined strong motivation, mature political capacity, and immense prestige.

Concerning motivation, the United Kingdom, by reason of extreme vulnerability in a nuclear war, must surely have the strongest possible reasons to achieve complete disarmament. With 52 million people in an area of less than one-thirtieth that of the 48 contiguous States of the United States, the United Kingdom has a population density of over 550 persons per square mile, while for England and Wales alone the density is no less than 780 per square mile. Remembering that in an all-out nuclear war Britain would certainly be a prime target and open to attack by bombing planes as well as by missiles launched from submarines and from sites inside Russia, it would seem impossible to prevent almost total destruction in Britain—no matter what was done to Russia at the same time.

In these circumstances, it seems certain that no British Government can fail, under increasing popular pressure, actively to interest itself in the achievement of universal and complete disarmament. Indeed, that interest has already been shown in the striking pronouncement of the Prime Ministers of the British Commonwealth on March 17, 1961, which declared unequivocally for total worldwide disarmament and for the organization of a substantial and adequately armed international military force.

Assuming the development from this foundation of a comprehensive and adequate British plan, it would doubtless command the support of all the other nations of the Commonwealth, which means a plan proposed by 13 nations on 5 continents with a population of about 700 million. Certainly this combination of urgent motivation with great experience and prestige, makes the British Commonwealth a most promising candidate for the necessary leadership.

Concerning possible leadership by the United States, almost everything, it would seem, will turn upon the statesmanship, or lack of it, of President Kennedy. It is perfectly natural and in no way to our discredit that we in the United States simply cannot have the same intense aversion to modern war that we would have if we had suffered in the same way as Russia and the other nations which bore the brunt of World Wars I and II. Nevertheless, there is sufficient concern in the United States over the possible consequences of a general nuclear war to supply the President with the necessary support for a creative and comprehensive plan containing all the elements mentioned at the start of this article. Will President Kennedy, with the advice of John J. McCloy, his adviser on disarmament, decide to propose a great and really adequate plan for total disarmament and for the necessary institutions to make, interpret, and enforce world law? If so, his initiative would, I believe, be hailed throughout the world and would constitute the breakthrough whereby a system of enforceable world law could and would actually be achieved. As of this writing, the omens are obscure, and we can only pray that the necessary creativity and resolve will be granted to our new President.

The more one reflects on this whole problem of world order, the clearer it becomes that there certainly is an urgent need for a radically new approach—an approach which will once for all recognize the necessity for total, rather than merely partial, national disarmament and also for the simultaneous establishment of world institutions—legislative, executive, and judicial—to fulfill the same functions in respect of world order as are fulfilled by the local legislature, local police, and local courts in any orderly community. All else depends upon the general acceptance of this basic concept.

On this basis there will need to be established, along with a stage-by-stage total disarmament plan under a careful inspection system, the other five minimum world institutions essential for the prevention of war. At the risk of repetition I list them again as follows: A strong world police force composed of individual volunteers and carefully safeguarded against possible abuse of power; a world judicial, quasi-judicial, and conciliation system; adequate and carefully balanced world legislative and executive agencies; a well-financed world development authority; and a world revenue system to insure reliable financial support for the entire structure. On no lesser terms can world peace be assured, any more than domestic order can be assured without similar local and national institutions. The sooner the peoples and governments realize this simple truth, the sooner will genuine world peace be realized.

Indeed, the real question, in my view, is not as to what is needed but rather as to how and when the peoples and governments of the world can be led to formulate and put in effect the revolutionary plan which will alone suffice.

In this regard, there is a fair analogy, I believe, between the world situation in 1961 and the situation of a seriously ill but willful and obstinate man who holds back from the necessary treatment. As in the case of the world's peace problem, his trouble is entirely curable. The diagnosis is in fact perfectly clear. The patient needs a radical operation, together with a drastic reform in his old habits. And yet, because of inertia and willfulness, he procrastinates and withholds his consent. What, if anything, can change his mind before it is too late? Usually (so the surgeons say) only a series of physical and psychological shocks, combined with some comprehension by the patient of the nature of the operation and what it can do for him, will induce him to authorize it.

As I see it, very similar influences will determine the future of the world. It may well be that several more shocks will be necessary—another Congo or two, or another Cuba, or even another Korea-like war—in order further to demonstrate the risks of the arms race and the inadequacy of the United Nations. And beyond this there must be a much better understanding by the peoples and their governments of what is required by way of world institutions in order to effect a cure for the chronic dangers.

In summary: I suggest that what the whole question comes down to is whether the human race will show enough intelligence to make the required adjustment to the nuclear age. More specifically, the issue in 1961 is whether our human society is sufficiently resourceful to formulate and accept not only total worldwide national disarmament but also the other necessary world institutions which must go with it in order once and for all to abolish war.

But this question will in turn depend, I believe, not so much on mankind's inherent capacity or incapacity to adjust to the new situation but rather on whether a sufficient educational effort is made concerning the essentials for genuine peace. For while there is, I judge, no such inherent lack of capacity as to prevent solution of the problem, it will not be solved if the peoples are so

ignorant and consequently so apathetic as to permit the continued domination of military and old style diplomatic thinking.

The fact is that salvation can be found only in a truly revolutionary change in traditional thought as to the means for dealing with international disputes—a change whereby it is taken for granted that violence or the threat of it has become obsolete. And the key to such a change is, I believe, a continued and intensified process of education whereby many more people in many countries are brought to realize that only a great and comprehensive plan for enforcible world law will meet the situation.

Fortunately, this process is already well underway since, although governments have been generally neglectful, many private persons the world over have applied their minds to this problem of world peace and there now exist carefully drafted detailed plans which can be utilized for the formulation of an adequate plan. Let this material be used by those in authority and the task will appear less formidable to officials who often seem to approach the problem as if it were an unexplored field.

Some of this needed education will, as I have said, doubtless come from some new and disturbing experiences. And thus, through a combination of experience and mental effort, we can find the way to the formulation and adoption of the necessary plan.

Even so, the issue will be a close one, since the forces of habit and tradition are strong, and to break out of these chains will not be easy. As Arnold Toynbee has put it: "We shall have a hard struggle with ourselves to save ourselves from ourselves."

Nevertheless, when the various adverse and favorable factors are weighed against each other, my considered opinion is that the favorable factors will, subject to two conditions, outweigh the adverse. The first condition is the emergence of some creative and dynamic governmental leadership. The other is a sufficiently intelligent and persistent educational effort concerning the specific requirements for genuine world peace. With these conditions fulfilled, we can reasonably look forward to a new world order based upon universal and complete disarmament and enforcible world law within 10 to 15 years. Without them we can expect, and perhaps deserve, nothing better than a further period of tension and frustration under a continual risk of dire catastrophe.

No Victors, Only Victims

(By Charles O. Porter)

(Review of books entitled "Disarmament: The Challenge of the Nineteen Sixties," by James P. Warburg; and "The Nation's Safety and Arms Control," by Arthur T. Hadley)

In his inaugural address President Kennedy said, "Let both sides for the first time, formulate serious and precise proposals for the inspection and control of arms. * * *" Here was an area of grave neglect and unprecedented peril.

Except for Harold Stassen's ill-starred efforts, the Eisenhower administration did nothing substantial to advance disarmament. Along with most Americans and persons in other Western nations, they believed that disarmament was necessary, and frequently said so, but that it was not practical, which usually wasn't said.

At the 10 nations disarmament talks in Geneva last year, for example, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union bothered to ask for or to submit an agenda for the conferences, an essential procedure if you mean business, an embarrassment if you don't.

Late last summer I asked Secretary of State Christian Herter why, when we were spending $45 billion annually on armaments, there were only 29 persons in the Department of State working on disarmament. "You must be mistaken," he told me politely. "I am sure that there are at least 40."

Under the direction of John J. McCoy, Presidential adviser on disarmament, and with the close supervision of Senator Hubert Humphrey, Jerome Wiesner, McGeorge Bundy, and others, the Kennedy administration is undertaking to carry out the President's campaign pledges.

The most recent U.S. disarmament proposal, presented June 27 last year, while neither precise nor serious in the sense that our Government expected it to lead to a treaty, did reaffirm the United States commitment, which had been previously made by us and all other members of the United Nations, to general and complete disarmament under effective international control and agreed procedure for the settlement of disputes in accordance with the principles of the United Nations Charter.

It is not, however, as yet clear whether the Kennedy administration's evolving policies are aimed directly at this sort of disarmament or at what is known as arms control, which is a mutually agreed deceleration with limitations so as to make war possible again.

Two excellent books have appeared that present the two points of view. They are also interesting expositions of the current world arms situation and how it evolved. James P. Warburg, author and percipient statesman-at-large, draws on 27 years of study and involvement in public affairs in writing his 22d book, "Disarmament: The Challenge of the Nineteen Sixties." Arthur B. Hadley, an experienced journalist, consulted with many top Kennedy advisers in the course of writing "The Nation's Safety and Arms Control."

Both books ought to appeal to President Kennedy, himself, his chief advisers, and every American concerned with day after tomorrow. This is still a world of hair-trigger and massively lethal weapons, endemic cold war, and a billion people awakening from centuries of misery. Warburg and Hadley agree on the grim immediacy and the broad extent of our common peril. Hadley tells of our continuing to make nuclear warheads with ever-increasing efficiency, even though we now possess a stockpile with the total power of 35 billion tons (kilomegatons) of TNT or more than 10 tons for every person in the world.

The spread of nuclear weapons must be halted, the authors agree. They also agree that the greatest danger is from war by accident, a danger that becomes worse every day. They agree that there has been a default in leadership and that much research needs to be done so that precise plans can be devised. "There are few experts," writes Hadley, "there is no doctrine, no history, next to no research, no precedents."

Both refer to the need for public opinion to catch up with the facts about the proximity of catastrophic war but neither of them does much more than recognize the problem. Warburg declares that we can't strengthen world organization without attaining a worldwide consensus that war is useless as an instrument of national policy.

Hadley writes, "Diplomacy, research, weapon analysis, political attitudes, and Presidential decisions must all be blended successfully together." A formula is more than a list of ingredients. Both authors could have said more about how people are to be informed of their plight, its urgencies and alternatives.

Hadley is right when he says, "The resistance toward developing the A-bomb or appropriating money for foreign aid was as nothing to the resistance and suspicions toward arms control." And even more so, I add regretfully, toward disarmament. To win approval of any disarmament or arms control treaty by the U.S. Senate, the President must mobilize every resource—churches, labor unions, service clubs, women's clubs, schools, colleges, everything, as was done in 1945 to assure our participation in the United Nations.

The arms-control school, according to Warburg's analysis, believes that human nature makes war inevitable, but that it can be limited in scope and the nature of the weapons employed. The disarmament school denies that war in a thermonuclear age can be limited or controlled and asserts that abolishment of war can only be done through universal disarmament and adequately enforced world law.

Warburg writes that "not even the most powerful nation-state can any longer protect the lives, let alone the welfare of its people."

"Our vulnerable nuclear weapons and our lack of conventional forces to fight limited wars create an unstable situation," Hadley says, "Once America and the Soviet Union have gained a more secure deterrent and the U.S. capacity for nonnuclear answers is more nearly equal to that of the Soviets, the outlook for fruitful negotiations on arms control will be far brighter."

Warburg accepts arms control as a step toward disarmament, but as an end in itself he rejects it. He points out that the elusive and fragile power equilibrium could instantly be destroyed if one state switched its allegiance.

Hadley himself concedes another apparently fatal flaw in arms control when he admits that the "stable end point" sought by arms control will hold up "at least briefly." That is too modest a goal for a national security policy. The stability is unstable. Technological change, the hallmark of our age, would alter any balance.

Even if both sides of the cold war honestly tried to shape their military policies to reach stability instead of superiority, and concentrated on making their nuclear weapons secure through concealment, mobility, and hardening, and further, if the United States did develop a capacity to fight nonnuclear brush-fire wars, the question persists: How stable is an arms race where the contestants agree to tie one hand and one foot?

Not very stable, I'd say. Billions of dollars and rubles would continue to pour into arms research and development. Other means to assure victory in nonnuclear skirmishes would be sought. War is intrinsically extreme and defies limitations.

At bottom, arms control, in Warburg's view, is a theory created by wistful men who can't accept that war is obsolete but who do recognize that in war's modern form there can be no victors, only victims; and who, not without reason, question man's ability to settle disputes among nations judicially through a supranational organization.

Both disarmament and arms control entail risks far less serious than the risks we are taking right now in the arms race, but disarmament—of the sort to which we are already committed—offers the prospect of real peace, not merely a momentary stalemate in a world armed to the teeth.

Hadley properly designates one of the risks of disarmament when he harks back to the Roman praetorian guard that made and broke emperors at will. The monumental "World Peace Through World Law," by Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn, is listed in Hadley's useful bibliography and constitutes the best answer with respect to the erection of all possible safeguards. Warburg's book neatly sums up the Clark and Sohn proposals.

Arms control, says Hadley, seeks only to change a country's military policy to reduce

the likelihood and violence of war. Warburg believes that such a policy can at best achieve a breathing space. Warburg sets forth in the following words an unpalatable, almost indigestible fact which Hadley (and many others) neglect to consider: "So long as any fully sovereign national governments possess any of the weapons of the atomic age, and so long as governments retain 'sovereign right' to use war as an instrument of national policy, the survival of civilization will be threatened."

There are only two roads, not three. Disarmament is a rough road, all uphill, but it leads to genuine peace. The arms race travels at giddy speed on a smooth, downhill road leading to and over the brink of the abyss. Arms control isn't a road at all but a short, confusing detour that leads back to the other roads.

Books like these by Warburg and Hadley can help our leaders formulate the serious and precise proposals for directing the world to the right road before our luck runs out.

WELFARE EXPERTS NEEDED OVERSEAS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on May 16 it was my privilege to speak at the National Conference on Social Welfare, which was meeting in the Twin Cities of Minnesota.

In my address to the conference, I called attention to the need for welfare experts to work overseas in our Embassies and in our foreign aid program.

I ask unanimous consent that a news release about these remarks be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HUMPHREY CALLS FOR WELFARE EXPERTS TO WORK WITH AMERICAN EMBASSIES OVERSEAS

MINNEAPOLIS, May 16.—Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, tonight called for assignment of welfare experts to work overseas in American Embassies and our foreign aid program.

"Social reform and human welfare are just as important as economic progress in newly developing nations," HUMPHREY declared at the National Conference on Social Welfare.

"I want to see vigorous American participation in international welfare activities, sparked by a new Assistant Secretary for International Affairs within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"Instead of relying on military missions and diplomatic missions to fight a cold war, we should step up our mercy missions, our war against illiteracy, poverty, disease, and hunger.

"We must accelerate our efforts to help nations struggling for economic progress and social reform—not because we are fighting a cold war against communism, but because we are fighting a noble war for the progress of all mankind.

"Our foreign policy will be more effective with welfare attachés serving overseas—just as we have labor attachés, commercial attachés, and agricultural attachés—interpreting American welfare policies and advising American officials on the significance of welfare problems in foreign countries."

HUMPHREY, assistant Senate majority leader, also urged expansion of community development assistance within the International Cooperation Administration.

"By the end of this year there will be only 13 welfare experts overseas in 7 different countries. We should expand this program to help guide the revolution of rising expectations, to help meet the irrepressible demand for social reform in the emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America."

PEACE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am very pleased to see the continuing support which various voluntary and religious organizations are giving to President Kennedy's program for a Peace Corps.

In a recent edition of the Minneapolis Star, it is reported that the St. Paul, Minn., presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church had asked the church to rally to the support of the Peace Corps plan.

It is this kind of public support that is demonstrating the validity and the significance of the Peace Corps as an expression of American humanism and dedication to the welfare of peoples everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the article entitled "Presbytery Asks Peace Corps Support," appearing in the Minneapolis Star of Friday, May 19, 1961, together with an article from the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of May 21, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Minneapolis Star, May 19, 1961]

PRESBYTERY ASKS PEACE CORPS SUPPORT

(By Willmar Thorkelson)

BUFFALO, N.Y.—The St. Paul, Minn., presbytery of the United Presbyterian Church has asked the denomination to rally to the support of President Kennedy's Peace Corps plan.

The Peace Corps, it said in resolution sent to the church's general assembly here, can become a powerful weapon against war and human misery.

The presbytery called on the assembly to urge Congress to take appropriate action to implement and make effective the Peace Corps.

It also asked the church to participate in and strengthen the Peace Corps and to call attention of church members to possible opportunities for Christian service in the Peace Corps.

Action on the overture is not expected until toward the end of the 8-day assembly next week.

It also was announced here that the some 800 church youth will work in 44 countries this summer in a kind of church-sponsored "peace corps."

Among the projects which will engage the volunteers from Presbyterian and other Protestant churches will be building a rehabilitation center for narcotic addicts in Hong Kong; a maternity clinic ward in Thailand; a children's library in Kenya; and a youth camp chapel in the Transvaal.

In most cases, the youth will pay their own travel and maintenance overseas.

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune, May 21, 1961]

PEACE CORPS FOES CAN'T SLOW ITS PREPARATIONS

(By Fletcher Knebel)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy's celebrated Peace Corps is still under a full head of steam despite cracklings of alarm from some of its foes.

After a recent lull, applications of Peace Corps volunteers are rolling in at the rate of more than 100 a day, with expectations that the total will hit 10,000 by June.

The President's brother-in-law, Director Sargent Shriver, expects to announce three more Peace Corps projects in the near future to add to the assignments already announced for Colombia (roadbuilding) and Tanganyika (surveying).

The new projects are slated for the Philippines (teaching of English) and Africa, perhaps in Ghana and Nigeria.

First Peace Corps examinations will be held in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands May and June.

Minnesota towns in which exams will be given, all at post offices, are Fergus Falls, Rochester, St. Cloud, Virginia, Bemidji, and Minneapolis.

Selection of the first volunteers, 28 for Tanganyika and 64 for Colombia, are slated to be made by mid-June with summer training courses at Rutgers and another university. Selections for other projects probably will be made before July.

A site for a training center in Puerto Rico has been selected, and training there, modeled on a British system, is expected to get underway by September.

With some 8,000 applications in now, a pattern of Peace Corps enthusiasts is beginning to emerge. About a third of them are in the 22–24-year age bracket. Far more than a majority have university training. Most of the applicants list vocational skills and ability to work at a trade with their hands.

William Haddad, an assistant at Peace Corps headquarters, ran through a single day's applications—231—and made some interesting findings. Among them:

The percentage of obvious screwballs was low, 5 percent or less.

About 80 percent appeared to have the mixture of educational, physical, and vocational skills for which the Peace Corps is searching—assuming the questionnaires had been answered honestly.

A number of men making more than $10,000 a year applied and quite a large number of applicants are making upward of $6,000 a year.

A 56-year-old professor of surveying at a large eastern university offered to work at the Peace Corps scale (subsistence abroad and $75 a month to be banked pending return after 2 years) even though his daughter was in college. He proposed to use his savings to finance her education.

A husband-and-wife team from Chicago applied. He had just completed his internship as a doctor and she is a nurse. He had been a jet pilot, had put himself through college working at jobs from bartending to common labor.

A large percentage of the day's applicants had either graduated from college or were about to graduate.

The Peace Corps staff in Washington has now built up to 130 persons, admittedly large for a pilot program that envisions only about 500 to 1,000 Americans being sent out the first year.

Staffers contend, however, that no more personnel will be needed to handle the big permanent Peace Corps of some 10,000 working volunteers, financed with a $40 million annual appropriation, the proposal now before Congress.

JOBLESS YOUTH VIEWED AS SOCIAL DYNAMITE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, yesterday Dr. James B. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University, in an address before the Conference on Unemployed Out-of-School Youth, warned that the growing unemployment

among the youth of our large cities can have most grave repercussions. This illustrious educator noted that the jobless rate among such youths has reached the shocking figure of 20 percent—four times greater than the jobless rate for all workers.

Unfortunately, Mr. President, this alarming unemployment rate of American youth is not a passing problem. It will not simply vanish into thin air. This problem will be solved only if we direct our earnest attention to it and come up with concrete programs to aid these youths in obtaining gainful employment.

This is one of the reasons why I have offered legislation to establish a Youth Conservation Corps to be made up of young men to work in our Federal and State parks and forests. I am hopeful that this proposal will have the serious consideration of this Congress and that it will be enacted into law and gotten underway before we adjourn.

I predict that unless we face up to the growing problem of jobless youths and do something about it, we will reap a bitter harvest.

I ask consent that an article from last evening's Washington Star on Dr. Conant's address be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONANT VIEWS JOBLESS YOUTH AS "DYNAMITE"

(By Harvey Clew)

Dr. James B. Conant said today that unemployment among the youth of our large cities is "social dynamite" and may require a Federal program of public works to alleviate it.

The noted educator told the opening session of the Conference on Unemployed Out-of-School Youth that the jobless rate among such youths has reached about 20 percent. He characterized this as "an explosive situation. It is social dynamite."

"Unless local management and labor take up the challenge, it may be necessary for Congress to appropriate funds for public works programs to alleviate the problem of unemployment among youths 16 to 21 in the large cities," he said.

An assurance of early Government action in the youth employment field was given the conference by Labor Secretary Goldberg, one of three Cabinet members to address the group.

MESSAGE TO CONGRESS

Mr. Goldberg said President Kennedy will send a message to Congress tomorrow containing proposals for increasing employment opportunities for youths. He did not specify the message's contents, but indicated it may include something on job training as well as "some kind of program that links the energy and presently wasted manpower of unemployed young men with the needs in our natural resources and conservation programs."

Other areas suitable for Government action, he said, are better law enforcement, better job placement programs and "a stepping up of the drive on prejudicial hiring and membership policies in business and labor."

Mr. Goldberg, Attorney General Robert Kennedy and Welfare Secretary Ribicoff are members of the newly formed President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. The latter two were scheduled to address the conference this afternoon. Vice President JOHNSON will speak tonight.

Dr. Conant, president emeritus of Harvard University who is now studying American high schools for the Carnegie Foundation, is chairman of the youth conference and its keynote speaker.

AIMS TO INCREASE JOBS

Some 400 educators, social workers and labor specialists are attending the 3-day meeting at the Statler Hilton Hotel. An outgrowth of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth, its aim is to develop ways to increase employment among urban youth who have left school.

In his keynote address, Dr. Conant said unemployment among youths under 20 is four times greater than the rate for all workers. He said this has serious implications for the Nation's crime rate, the economy and the fight against communism.

He blamed the situation upon a variety of factors, but singled out the existence of large urban slums and discrimination against minority groups as the largest contributors.

"What was especially shocking to me in my visits to the large cities in the last school year was the discovery that the employment of youth is literally nobody's affair," he continued. "No single agency in any of the cities has the data as to the unemployment picture in that city."

Dr. Conant's warning was supported by another speaker, Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics for the Department of Labor, who said that this decade would see 45 million youths reaching the age group 16–20.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, let me make it quite clear that unless something is done to curb unemployment among our young people, there will be in this country a wave of juvenile crime that will get completely out of hand. Healthy, restless young people cannot be left without anything to do. I think it is a rotten shame that America can spend money for everything else except to take care of its young people.

We passed a Federal aid to education bill, which will be of help to those who are in school. But what about those who drop out of school? What about the young men and women of 17, 18, and over? What about the 19-, 20-, and 21-year-olds who are without jobs? Twenty percent of them are without jobs. Yet our parks and roads are eroded from lack of attention.

Do not tell me, Mr. President, the United States of America cannot afford to do this. The President of the United States has asked for additional funds to strengthen the national security. The first place to strengthen it is where the future brainpower and the manpower are, namely, among our young people.

I hope that we shall bestir ourselves and do something about the problem.

I say to my colleagues today, I intend to press relentlessly for this proposed legislation. I do not intend to have it on my conscience that we who live in Washington, D.C., in the comfortable surroundings of this Capital City, ignore the plight of young men and women and stand with a kind of piety, which is all too often a part of the public profile, to indicate a sense of horror and shame upon juvenile crime.

Every day the newspapers in this city tell us of the increasing tide of juvenile crime. Of course there will be juvenile crime. What are these young people to do? There is no longer wood to be put in the woodboxes, or kindling, as our grandfathers or even our fathers had the privilege to do. There are very few chores to be done around the average home, with all the automation we have.

I suggest that the only thing to do is to give these young men and women opportunities to do gainful work for their country, for their communities, and for their homes. I predict that unless we face up to this growing problem of jobless young people and do something about it, we shall reap a bitter harvest.

I can almost hear some of the self-appointed judges of humanity saying, "Look at those young people; aren't they awful?"

The young people are perfectly okay. The awful ones are the adults, who, I say, are awfully weak in coming up with programs to help the young people, awfully timid, and I add, awfully stingy in doing the job that needs to be done.

I noticed in the local newspapers that there was some talk about putting up a youth center in the Nation's Capital. I hope we will do so. What is wrong with the Nation's Capital? Young people by the thousands come to this city. There are inadequate places for them to sleep, inadequate places for them to eat, inadequate places for them to join together in fellowship and wholesome recreation.

This is the leading capital of the world, which can point with pride to a Pentagon Building filled with officers; which can point with pride to monuments to the dead, great heroes that they are; which can point with pride to Government buildings; and which can point with shame to disgraceful slums; but there is not a single youth center in the whole city for the thousands and thousands of young people who come to this city. Indeed, we need a youth center. We need one big enough to take care of the ever growing tide of young people who come from the 50 States of the Union and from many foreign countries. We need a center where these young people can learn what is going on in the city, where they can receive an orientation about the Capital City, where they can be advised as tourists, so to speak. These fine young people would like to see the Capital of our great Republic.

I think the Congress of the United States is derelict in its duty by not doing something about it. I add, the whole Government is derelict. It is about time that we took note of the fact that we live in the second half of the 20th century. People do travel. This is not a horse and buggy age. This is the age of airplanes. This is the age of rockets. This is the age of the express highway. This is the age of movement and travel.

Thank goodness, the Congress passed a bill to take care of some tourists. We hope to get tourists to come to the United States from overseas. The bill has been passed, at long last, about 20 years late. I think we have finally come to the conclusion that someone might wish to visit our country, instead of all of our people running all over the world visiting other people in other countries.

We have the greatest country on earth, and we have been trying to keep it a secret. At long last we are going to establish a travel agency. I suggest that we staff that travel agency with people who can tell those who visit what there is to see in America. I hope we can give them some indication of what to see, and that we will have people on the staff who will speak the languages of the visitors.

I wonder how many Senators have gone to Union Station to see the situation there. If one were a foreigner in Union Station, how would one ever find out how to get to the center of the city, if one could not speak English? We provide little or no services. One would think this city was Podunkville, rather than the greatest Capital City in the world.

Apparently everybody is supposed to do as we do, speak as we speak, and have available a road map of every street in Washington. Even if one had a road map, one would need a "seeing-eye dog" to find his way around some of these circles which make up the traffic pattern in Washington, D.C.

The most beautiful city in the world—and Washington, D.C., could be the most beautiful city in the world—should provide jobs for our young people. We should stop complaining about the rising tide of delinquency.

Rev. Franklin Jackson, one of the great ministers in this community, pointed out an important fact the other day when he said that people were critical of the number of delinquents among the so-called colored people, among the Negro students. He said, "Very little is done to combat this rate of delinquency in terms of opportunity."

I add that delinquency is not related particularly to race, to creed, or to national origin; it is related to social conditions. Let us clean up Washington, D.C. Let us clean up the other great cities which have delinquency. Let us build in this great city of Washington, D.C., a youth center for the thousands of young men and women who come to visit this great Capital City. Let us, above all, strengthen the tourist center we have.

Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks in a moment. I did not intend to get quite so wound up on this particular item, but as a father of a daughter and three sons I am still mindful of the fact that young people have a great place in America. Some of us in the Congress seem to forget that. We get within these walls, sealed off from the community, and think that the only problem in the world is getting a man to the moon and back, or possibly creating some fantastic new instrument of destruction. I suggest that the best way to get a man to the moon and back is to have young people with commonsense who can tell us how to get a man to the moon and back, who will not be delinquents.

We should not have juveniles in juvenile homes, in reformatories, or in jail. We should have these young men and women in schools, working on jobs, in wholesome communities. That is the burden of my argument.

THE PROPOSED FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on another subject I should like to comment publicly, as I have privately this afternoon to a number of newspapermen, in regard to the foreign aid bill the President has sent to the Congress.

It is a big foreign aid bill. It will provide $4½ billion. The President has requested $4½ billion for fiscal year 1962.

The outlines of the bill indicate there will be larger requests in the years to come.

Mr. President, I shall support the foreign aid bill. I have in the past, under previous administrations, and I shall continue to support the foreign aid program.

However, I wish to say that money is not all we need. I support the long-term financing which the President has asked. When the President was a Senator he voted for that in this body. I voted with him, as a United States Senator. I shall continue to support the program of foreign aid on a long-term basis. I submit that a year-by-year program is wasteful, leads to little or no planning, and results in mismanagement and the wasteful use of public funds.

I shall do my best, as a Senator, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, to see to it that our foreign aid program is put on a continuing, long-term basis, rather than operated as a year-by-year, hypodermic, prophylactic treatment which cures nothing. We have had enough examples of that type of program.

Having said that, Mr. President, I say that the most important feature of the President's foreign aid program is not the $1,750 million for technical assistance and economic aid. It is not $1,880 million for military assistance. It is not even the $900 million borrowing authority for the Development Loan Fund. Those are important features. They add up to $4½ billion for fiscal year 1962.

Mr. President, the most important feature is the reorganization of the foreign aid agency with a director who is competent, able, trained, and experienced, such as Mr. Labouisse, who will be the director, within the confines of the Department of State. Mr. Labouisse will be a director not only with authority to work with the Secretary of State but also with direct access to the President of the United States.

The reorganization of the foreign aid establishment is a minimum requirement for congressional support for foreign aid. I wish to say, as a loyal supporter of the administration, that we want that reorganization not merely to be on top but all the way down. I want to know what kind of people will head up these missions.

We have the responsibility of the confirmation of ambassadors. But an ambassador in many countries has less authority than does the chief of mission of the foreign aid program. Under this foreign aid program there will be an administrator in each country who will have complete authority over all of our foreign operations in that country. He will have as much or more prestige and authority than the U.S. ambassador. Of course, he will report to the ambassador, but he will be, in fact as well as in theory, the economic administrator, coordinator, and top man for American economic and foreign aid assistance in the country to which they are assigned.

If such be the case, I think we need the best talent that we can find. We do not need people who somehow or other have failed in this country and are then sent to another country. We do not need people who have proven themselves not to be too effective in this area, so they are assigned to another area.

I submit that if our country is to be asked to pay a bill of over $4 billion in foreign aid this coming year, we are entitled to have the best administrators that the country can supply. I am for paying them good money if they are good administrators, and I am for firing those who are no good. I do not mean that we should merely move them from one position to another. In this country it is difficult to dismiss someone. I think it would be revealing to dismiss some who have proven their incompetence.

It will be very difficult to get through Congress the proposed $4½ billion program. I doubt that we will be able to bring it through without some cuts. But whatever foreign aid program goes through the Congress of the United States, it will have to be administered in a frugal, prudent, and imaginative way. I want to see a foreign aid administration that is filled with its mission for cooperative assistance to nations in other parts of the world. I want to see foreign aid administrators who will see to it that foreign aid results in social, economic, and political reform. I want to see foreign aid administrators who will be able to say, "No, we think the project is unworthy or should not be undertaken."

I wish to see foreign aid mission chiefs who understand the people of the country in which they are working. I wish to see chiefs who do not live in American ghettoes, where all the Americans gather to play bridge and pinochle, and where all the Americans get together so they can eat the same kind of food. I want to see a foreign aid program through which we can learn to know the people of the countries that we seek to help.

I am a tested friend of foreign aid. I have voted for every foreign aid program since I came to the Senate in 1949.

I shall continue to vote for a foreign aid program. But I want the record unmistakably clear. I intend, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to ask the chairman of that committee to ask the Secretary of State to request the director of foreign aid to have these mission chiefs come up and consult with us. I want to know who the mission chiefs are going to be, and I want to know the kind of people they intend to hire.

Let my remarks not be misunderstood. There are many loyal, faithful, dedicated and self-sacrificing servants in the International Cooperation Administration. I want it quite clear that most of the activities of the ICA have been commendable. I want it equally clear that the overwhelming majority of the personnel have been able, competent, and trustworthy. I want it equally clear that those who are not any good should be gotten out, fired, and removed.

Such approach means we will have to look into the question with a grave and critical eye.

I have reports in my office from country after country in which foreign aid has not been properly administered. I have reports showing that American personnel overseas have not done their jobs. Those reports have been made available to departments of the Government. More of them will be made available. I shall be present at the hearings on the bill.

The request is for $4,500 million. That is a substantial sum of money.

I want to make sure that the money goes for the purposes for which it was authorized and for which we will appropriate it. For what purposes? To build the areas of freedom. President Kennedy laid down what he called the freedom doctrine. Freedom has no room for corruption. Freedom has little or no room for mismanagement. But freedom does have room for people who are willing to try in good faith and good spirit. Freedom does make room for social reform. It requires it. Freedom requires that the benefits of liberty and freedom should go clear down to the least of these—to the people, to the grassroots. Therefore, let us have it as our mission and objective that the foreign-aid program, when it is authorized and made available to this new administration, will have a new purpose, a new sense of dedication, and a new willingness to pioneer in the areas of economic improvement and social betterment. I want to make sure that we not only change the scenery on top but that we also change the whole philosophy and the whole administration from top to bottom, building areas of freedom, with social justice, as the ever commanding yardstick or measurement of our success.

I wish to make sure that those who administer the program administer it almost with a crusading zeal to accomplish our objectives. Unless we do so, we shall lose and waste money. A nation that can spend this amount of money for foreign aid can afford to make sure that what it spends is spent well and in the interest of the people.

Mr, President, I support the President's program. I hope other Senators will also do so.

I hope my remarks today will not be interpreted as being anything other than helpful and constructive to a President and to a Government that seeks to do better. That is the purpose of the New Frontier. The New Frontier requires more than only a few new people out in the front lines. It requires everyone to come with a new dedication.

LIVESTOCK PRICES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the May 15 issue of the RECORD, the distinguished junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] pointed out the seriousness of the economic situation of the sheep-raising industry and included an article from an Idaho newspaper giving an account of the local conditions of the industry, including the severe impact of imports thereon. There is another and much larger area of the livestock industry which is also in a serious economic situation. I refer to the cattle industry which last week received the lowest prices for any comparable period since 1957. The average price for slaughter steers in Sioux City was $21.80 and in Omaha $21.70 per hundredweight.

Actually, commencing a week after the new emergency feed grains bill went into effect, livestock prices have been steadily falling.

I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared in the Market News Branch, Livestock Division, Agricultural Marketing Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, showing the prices of livestock at the Chicago, Omaha, and Sioux City markets for various comparative periods for 1957 through 1961 be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Slaughter steer prices, all grades combined—Weighted average cost per 100 pounds of sales out of 1st hands

Week ended Thursday	1957			Week ended Thursday	1958			Week ended Thursday	1959			Week ended Thursday	1960			Week ended Thursday	1961		
	Chicago	Omaha	Sioux City		Chicago	Omaha	Sioux City		Chicago	Omaha	Sioux City		Chicago	Omaha	Sioux City		Chicago	Omaha	Sioux City
Mar. 14	$21.46	$20.47	$20.34	Mar 13	$27.86	$25.86	$25.60	Mar. 12	$28.23	$26.58	$26.48	Mar. 17	$27.49	$25.40	$25.84	Mar. 16	$25.34	$24.02	$23.93
21	21.69	20.96	20.74	20	28.39	26.75	26.48	19	28.24	26.26	26.27	24	27.31	25.36	25.75	23	25.00	23.61	23.70
28	21.59	20.84	20.17	27	29.10	27.70	27.03	26	28.73	26.79	26.99	31	27.53	25.82	25.95	30	25.16	23.88	24.07
Apr. 4	22.17	20.56	20.74	Apr. 3	28.53	26.78	26.24	Apr. 2	28.89	26.94	27.22	Apr. 7	27.53	25.65	26.07	Apr. 6	25.26	23.80	24.00
11	22.56	21.27	21.26	10	29.31	27.38	27.06	9	29.01	27.41	27.38	14	27.14	25.68	25.99	13	24.80	23.25	23.59
18	23.10	21.77	21.55	17	28.12	26.39	26.41	16	29.69	27.85	27.98	21	27.08	25.95	26.13	20	24.81	23.10	23.56
25	22.82	21.63	21.27	24	28.41	26.42	26.37	23	29.24	27.73	27.98	28	26.78	25.27	25.67	27	24.05	22.56	22.86
May 2	22.70	21.57	21.44	May 1	28.35	26.13	26.31	30	29.32	27.48	27.75	May 5	27.01	25.34	25.63	May 4	23.78	22.50	22.70
9	22.94	21.80	21.49	8	28.24	26.71	26.97	May 7	29.03	27.63	27.81	12	26.94	25.24	25.65	11	23.26	22.15	22.28
16	22.77	22.18	21.64	15	28.74	27.09	27.12	14	29.17	27.55	27.89	19	26.70	24.99	25.37	20	23.19	21.70	21.80

Mr. MILLER. What this means to a typical farmer can be pointed out in an example. The average weight of corn-fed steers for the period May 8 to 12, inclusive, was 1,154 pounds. These sold for an average price of $22.58 per hundredweight, or $260.57 per head. A year ago, during the same period, the average weight of corn-fed steers was 1,155 pounds. These sold for an average price of $26.65 per hundredweight, or $296.25 per head. Thus there has been a decline of $35.68 per head. When you multiply this by the number of head being sold each week in the middle west, it is clear that there is a tremendous economic loss to this area. Possibly the President thinks there has been an upturn in our economy, but I assure you that from the standpoint of the livestock and sheep-raising industry, there has been a downturn. This must not be allowed to continue.

Recently I received a suggestion from a banker long associated with the livestock industry in my area. It was his suggestion that the Federal Government purchase 5,000 steers each week for 10 weeks. Even if the Government lost $50 per head, it would amount to $2,500,000 on 50,000 head. However, by doing so the price of beef on the hoof could be raised from $2 to $3 per hundredweight, meaning $20 to $30 per head on the cattle left on the farms. With an estimated 1 million head to be marketed in the next 10 weeks, there would be a boost in the economy in the Midwest of from $20 to $30 million for an investment, by the Government, of $2,500,000. Another suggestion from one of our prominent livestock people in the Midwest is that the Government purchase beef in large quantities during a period such as this and then market it during a period of slack marketing of cattle to prevent severe market fluctuations. Many people have suggested that all meat imports be stopped. I do not profess to know the answer, but I feel certain that action of some kind is needed and needed now. Accordingly, I have written to the Secretary of Agriculture, pointing out the seriousness of the situation, the suggestions advanced above, and calling on him to take action which will see to it that the livestock industry shares in the upturn in the economy to which the President has referred.

I might add, Mr. President, that when the slaughter livestock market is depressed, the market for range cattle in other areas of the country is also depressed. We have already learned that there can be no real national economic prosperity unless a basic industry such as agriculture is also sharing in that prosperity. More money in the farmers' pockets means more money to be spent

for goods produced elsewhere throughout the Nation. All of us are hopeful that the new feed grains legislation will provide a boost in farmers' income at a reasonable cost to the taxpayers. However, the position of the livestock industry today is such that, without some further action by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the President himself—in the case of import quotas—this hope will soon be lost.

WORLD CONFIDENCE IN THE DOLLAR

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the President's special message yesterday, he stated that we have made great strides in restoring world confidence in the dollar, halting the outflow of gold and improving our balance of payments. I hope this is so. However, the President's opinion is not shared by some observers. An article of May 22 by Chester D. Tripp, appearing in Economic Trend Line Studies, points up the concern of some of the European countries over the deficit-spending policies of this administration and their adverse impact on confidence in the dollar. The article is particularly interesting in its account of how the German authorities disregarded recommendations to relax credit, go into deficit financing, and forget the value of the mark. Instead they went into a period of belt tightening with sound money as an objective. Now they have the soundest of all European economies, with practically no unemployment and a very sound currency. It seems to me that the administration ought to take a lesson from their experience. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

Also, Mr. President, tying in with the subject of world confidence in the dollar. If as the President has said, we have made such great strides in restoring world confidence in the dollar, then why, our people may ask, does the administration reportedly favor the bill introduced by Representative MULTER to end the law requiring 25 percent gold backing for U.S. currency and bank reserves? A recent article in the Wall Street Journal states that Treasury Secretary Dillon's testimony before the House next week will add up to an endorsement of the proposal. The intent of Mr. MULTER's bill, according to the Journal, is to convince financial authorities around the world that the United States would, if need be, sell them all of our $17.4 billion gold supply to maintain the value of the dollar; that we are ready to sell gold to foreign central banks and treasuries upon demand at $35 an ounce. Why do we need to convince these international bankers in this manner? If our money is sound, they would have absolutely no reason for wanting to buy gold instead of American dollars. Maybe the President is convinced that we have made great strides in restoring world confidence in the dollar, but his administration apparently does not share this conviction—otherwise there would be no need for passage of Mr. MULTER's bill. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Tripp's article and the article from the Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Economic Trend Line Studies, May 22, 1961]

A TRAVELER'S OBSERVATIONS

(By Chester D. Tripp)

It was not until I reached London that it really dawned on me that something serious was happening to the American vision. I armed myself with a number of back copies of the London Times, the Telegraph, and the Manchester Guardian. I went through their cartoons and editorials carefully and I was astounded at the implied criticism about everything that we were doing. I began to wonder whether the English press had ever been favorable to the New Frontier and carefully read a number of copies of the same papers published 60 and 90 days before.

Obviously, at first our election had been approved, not with the enthusiasm that I had encountered in the Mediterranean area, but still a strong indication that the change had been for the better. Something had happened in the period between and America was being taken lightly to say the least. Obviously several things that had happened hadn't stood the tests implied in the campaign speeches. First there was the loss of gold, then some very serious articles about what should be done about it, what was being done about it and what the results should be. Then Laos came along with no satisfactory solutions, and a few days later Cuba made the frontlines. It was very obvious from the English point of view that America had its arms around several bears, to say the least, and didn't know just what to do about it.

The whole problem was so interesting that I was able to participate in two meetings that threw some light on the subject. The first one was pretty much political, there was a small luncheon given in the House of Lords Restaurant by the leader of one of the minorities of the House of Lords. I enjoyed an active and off-the-record discussion of our position in world leadership. I might say it started with the observation from a member of the so-called Liberal Party that it seemed to him that in the last 50 years there had never been so much brainpower involved in handling the American Government's affairs and at the same time so little wisdom. In fact it seemed to me that the political view, in England, corresponded pretty closely with what I was currently reading in the English press. I can only say that from an international political point of view the vision of the New Frontier is not a happy one. To put it briefly there is a strong feeling that there are some pretty important issues on which we neither know what to do nor how to do it.

The question of our preparedness was very much on everyone's mind and it was my expressed opinion that we were much stronger than we were given credit for and were making substantial practical progress. But, at that point the question of the McClellan report on Cape Canaveral came up and the question was immediately posed, how can you make real progress, in comparison to the Russians, under such conditions?

I had one other important meeting, at least from my point of view, it involved a director of the Bank of England and officers of two of the large private banks. Generally speaking, this discussion was limited to the subject of economics—world trade, world currency values and the course of the economy in the democratic countries. Here again the English were not too enthusiastic. Take the question of the dollar gap, it was very clear that they were as much concerned about the dollar as we are. They indicated that all the central banks and the private banks had done what they could to stop the gold flow and to support the dollar. They felt that Germany had gone all out in the matter and that according to their standards the English had too, but they dwelt heavily on the fact that we too had an obligation in the matter that we were not facing up to. They were strongly of the opinion that one essential point, as far as America was concerned, was that we make some effort to balance our budget and as far as they could see we were going in just the opposite direction.

As they saw it, England had been taking painful steps to working out of a labor state while we, on the other hand, were taking substantial steps in the opposite direction. It was very clear that the policies that had been used in Germany the last few years met with their approbation even though those policies had complicated the transition that England herself was trying to make. I drew attention to the fact that we still had a favorable trade balance and that it was our giveaway that was one of our major difficulties. They all agreed that giveaway was necessary and they hoped to cooperate more than they had in the past, but they were strongly of the opinion that both England and the United States should make heroic efforts to put their own houses in order.

Politics and sound economics are uneasy bedfellows and the English are not only worrying about their own but about ours as well. I was asked if I was familiar with the report of the ECA Committee published in 1951 in connection with the reconstruction of Germany. I had never heard of it and took pains to acquaint myself. It was a 400-page document, that had been under wraps, that the Manchester Guardian had made quite a study of and I took immediate steps to try to find out what it was about. Broadly it was written from the Keynesian point of view largely by Dr. Walter Heller who is now the chief Presidential economic adviser in Washington.

It is indicated that in the opinion of this committee, Germany's only hope was to relax credit, go into deficit financing, forget the value of the mark for the minute and get going again. Fortunately, in the opinion of my guests, the German authorities disregarded the recommendations completely and went into a period of belt tightening with sound money as an objective. As a result Germany seems to have turned out to be the soundest of all European industrial economies. It has practically no unemployment, its money is at a premium and, to its own embarrassment, is attracting undue amounts of liquid capital from the less stable economies.

There is little doubt but what the economic policy of England, as presently practiced, is on the conservative side. In the last two decades they have suffered greatly from bad economic policies instituted under the Labor Party; they have made much progress and they hope to make more, but they are gravely concerned how we will handle our affairs. A sound dollar is almost as important to England and the Commonwealth as a sound pound. They are watching our moves with great interest and they don't seem to like what they see. Thanks to broad mutual efforts the run on the dollar has been, at least temporarily, stopped, but some of the best minds in England feel that it could start again if the world begins to get the idea that we are only talking about stability and doing nothing about it.

The English are not much given to pipe dreams, they criticize themselves and others quite freely but at the moment they do face the fact that unsound financial policies on

the part of the United States might have bearings 'way beyond our shores.

I left England and the European scene somewhat depressed. All the countries I visited have great problems of their own and then we have great mutual problems and one has to ask oneself, are we prepared to meet them honestly and intelligently? For the moment Europe seems to feel that we are more interested in internal politics than in facing up to our basic facts. We must try to generate a new vision of America which has slid badly in the last few months.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

BILL TO END 25 PERCENT GOLD BACKING FOR CURRENCY SLATED FOR HOUSE UNIT HEARINGS NEXT WEEK

WASHINGTON.—A new move is afoot in Congress, with the Treasury's acquiescence, to abolish the law requiring 25 percent gold backing for U.S. currency and bank reserves. The law currently ties up, in theory at least, $11 billion of Uncle Sam's total $17.4 billion gold stockpile.

Next week a House banking subcommittee begins hearings on a bill by its chairman, Representative MULTER, Democrat, of New York, to scrap the 25 percent cover rule.

His first witness, Treasury Secretary Dillon, is scheduled to testify Tuesday. Indications are the Secretary will take a delicate line adding up to an endorsement of the proposal. His testimony is expected to emphasize that the initiative stems from Congress itself, not from the administration. Nevertheless, Mr. Dillon is prepared to say that the Treasury looks with favor on the idea, and that once in the legislative machinery, it would look better to the outside world to pass the bill quickly. The Treasury wishes to avoid a protracted political fight on the measure, such as occurred on the Eisenhower administration's vain attempt to end the 4½ percent interest ceiling on new issues of Government bonds.

TO DEMONSTRATE A POINT

The intent of Representative MULTER's proposal is to convince financial authorities around the world that the United States would, if need be, sell them every scrap of its $17.4 billion gold supply to maintain the international value of the dollar. The United States currently stands ready to sell gold to foreign central banks and treasuries upon demand at $35 an ounce. Technically, however, about $11 billion of the gold stock is reserved as currency backing under the 25 percent cover. There has been some concern in Washington that if gold sales ever brought the total stock down that low, some dollar holders abroad would fear the law would compel the United States to stop selling gold. This fear was believed to have contributed to the gold speculation spree in London last fall, when the price on the private market rose above $40 an ounce.

In fact, the 25 percent cover would not necessarily tie up any of the Nation's gold. The rule can be suspended for an indefinite period by a vote of the seven Federal Reserve Board members. This escape clause in the law was the basis for President Kennedy's January 29 pledge to use all the Nation's gold reserves to defend the international value of the dollar if needed.

Policies on gold reserves vary among nations. Some countries maintain a 10 percent reserve. The Canadian dollar is not tied to gold at all, although the Dominion Government buys gold from Canadian mines.

Abolishing the 25-percent law in the United States already has been recommended by some non-Government financial experts. Henry Alexander, chairman of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, suggested such a step several months ago. Gold is useful from a worldwide economic viewpoint only for settlement of international balances, he said, and a gold reserve adds nothing to the domestic strength and stability of a nation's currency.

ADMINISTRATION SHUNS INITIATIVE

A three-man Kennedy task force headed by Allan Sproul, former president of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, said in January that arguments to remove the 25-percent rule were impressive, and that the study group would support such a move if the Government felt it necessary.

No such recommendation, however, was made by President Kennedy in his message to Congress on the balance of payments and gold problem. The administration, it appears, has been content to let the push for the move originate in Congress.

Another key witness on the Multer proposal next week will be Chairman Martin of the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Martin has in the past praised the symbolic value of the gold rule, mainly as a discipline against the unrestricted expansion of the Nation's money supply.

The rule applies to two kinds of money—Federal Reserve notes and the deposits kept on hand by the 12 Federal Reserve district banks. Federal Reserve notes are paper currency printed in denominations of $5 and up; they account for more than 85 percent of all the paper money in circulation. Federal Reserve bank deposits are funds belonging mostly to the 6,000-odd member banks of the Federal Reserve System; they keep the money on deposit with their district Federal Reserve banks as part of their legal reserves required to back up the deposits of their customers.

Such reserves govern the lending power of the commercial banks. For every dollar kept in reserve, the banks can create up to $6 or $7 in extra loans to customers. Linking the gold holdings to the reserve deposits thus indirectly limits the amount of credit banks can extend. The money supply has for many years been well below the theoretical ceiling, but supporters of the 25-percent rule argue it represents a useful reminder that credit can't be expanded indefinitely.

Mr. Martin is currently winding up a European trip, and his opinion of Representative MULTER's specific proposal is not known. Despite his regard for the usefulness of the 25-percent rule, he also has urged that the United States make it clear that it will put its entire gold stock behind the dollar's worth.

THE NEED FOR SACRIFICES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the May 17 issue of the Des Moines Register appears a discerning editorial entitled "Vagueness About Sacrifices." The editorial points out specific programs listed by the President in answer to a question about what he means by sacrifices and notes that they are not being advanced in Congress as proposals calling for sacrifice on the part of the general public. Rather they are being promoted as programs which greatly benefit specific groups.

Apparently the President gave this matter further thought prior to his special message to the Congress which he delivered yesterday. Now we are told that security and progress cannot be cheaply purchased; and their price must be found in what "we all" forgo as well as what "we all" must pay. He said:

If we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar, it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards; and I must request the cooperation of the Congress in this regard, to refrain from adding funds to programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

These are fine words. They would mean a lot more to the people of our country if the President would present Congress with a new budget, sharply curtailing his requests for adding more funds to domestic programs and presenting a program for a balanced budget with no tax increases at all except as needed for our national defense effort. What we need, Mr. President, is action as well as words. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VAGUENESS ABOUT SACRIFICES

President Kennedy has answered the request of a New York newspaper publisher that he explain in detail what sacrifices he expects of the American people.

The President's reply, rather than outlining specific sacrifices that are understandable to the American people, adds up to urging the public to support all the programs he is presenting to Congress.

The President puts it this way:

"The facts of the matter are that all the programs I am seeking to strengthen our economy, our defenses, our image abroad, our balance of payments position and our foreign policy tools—all make demands upon one or more groups of Americans, and most often upon all Americans jointly. All of them involve some effort, some inconvenience, or some sacrifice—and, indeed, they are being opposed in some quarters on that basis."

One example the President gives of opposition to programs in the national interest is a good one. He points out that proposals for terminating certain defense projects and closing a good many defense bases throughout the country are being opposed by "those who want economy practiced in some one else's community." The opposition of local communities and local citizens to abandonment of projects not essential for defense is an example of selfishness, of unwillingness to sacrifice local interest to the national welfare.

Another good example the President gives of a program which will call for sacrifice for many years to come is in foreign aid to other nations. It is well to present this as a program which is not only in the national interest but an unselfish one that calls for some sacrifice by taxpayers.

However, the domestic programs which Mr. Kennedy describes as calling for sacrifices—and which he says are "being strongly resisted by some unwilling to pay the price of national greatness"—are not all clearly recognizable as programs involving sacrifices by the people. The programs he lists include:

Continuing excise and corporation tax rates at the present level; higher taxes on trucking and jet airline companies; higher payroll taxes for improved social security, unemployment compensation and health insurance; higher postal rates; elimination of tax exempt expense accounts for such business expenses as living in yachts and hunting clubs.

The President's bill of particulars on sacrifices mentions the minimum wage legislation, cutting down on duty-free goods bought abroad by travelers, and acceptance by farmers of limitations proposed in the feed grain program. He also mentions his messages to Congress on education, urban affairs and natural resources in detailing programs which call for sacrifices. The Presi-

dent also wants businessmen and labor leaders to adopt price and wage levels consistent witr our economic goals and need to compete, which is a laudable but vague goal.

The opposition which exists to some of the programs may be due to special pressure groups. But opposition exists for other reasons, too: doubts as to whether the specific legislation will be effective and is the best way to tackle the problems involved. In some cases, they are opposed because the opponents think the basic principles are wrong or because of fears that they will weaken, rather than strengthen, the national economy.

The programs the President discussed are of varying merit and of varying degrees of importance. But it should be noted that they are not being advanced in Congress as proposals which call for sacrifice on the part of the general public. They are being promoted as programs which will greatly benefit specific groups, such as farmers or underpaid workers or the aged who need hospital care. They are also, of course, being promoted as programs which would strengthen the national economy. But the story does not come through, for most of them, that they are programs which call for sacrifice on the part of the American public. It's to be hoped that the President will be more specific.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a great deal of assurance was given by the proponents of the Federal aid to education bill that there will be no Federal control. Many who opposed this legislation believe that there will eventually be Federal control. Certainly this has been the pattern of Federal aid type legislation heretofore. In a recent issue of the Waterloo Daily Courier there appeared a well thought through editorial on this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SCHOOL AID MEANS CONTROL

The big argument in discussions of Federal aid to education is whether Federal aid means Federal control.

The answer, we think, may be found in debate on the bill itself. Proponents of giving U.S. money to the States are opposing amendments designed to prevent any grants to States which practice segregation in their public schools. But why are they opposing the amendments? Since they are heartily opposed to segregation, it is obvious that their opposition is only a tactical maneuver. For if the antisegregation amendment were adopted, southern Democrats would vote against the bill and it would be defeated. At some future date, these same legislators will vote for the control. Political necessity, if not idealism, will require them to use Federal funds to oppose segregation.

But, it will be argued, the abolition of segregation is a desirable objective. We agree; but a control is still a control. Federal aid will inevitably mean that a majority in Congress will impose controls opposed by a minority; and on the national level a minority could consist of 90 million people.

If the Senate really wanted to give Federal aid without any control, it had only to vote for the Blakley amendment which would return to each State for school purposes 2 percent of the Federal income tax paid in that State. Such an automatic return would hamper the attaching of strings to the money. But the Blakley amendment has already been defeated by a 64–30 vote.

The simple truth is that in the long run Congress cannot escape responsibility for use of the Federal money it passes out to a State. Next year it may ban any aid to a segregated school. The year following it may require instruction in the principles of the United Nations. Next it could require a loyalty oath of all teachers. Then it could compel all schools to show films depicting the accomplishments of the Federal Government in producing electric power. And ultimately a Fascist-minded administration might use the power over school finances to infiltrate the schools with outright propaganda on behalf of the group in power.

Nobody can guarantee it would not happen. The historical record indicates that it would happen.

A PLAN OF PROGRESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Lockheed Aircraft Corp. on its recent agreement, which was arrived at yesterday, aimed at providing full racial equality of employment in its many plants.

According to a news story published in this morning's Washington Post:

The company agreed to act and the Government to assist in erasing discrimination in hiring, training, and placement policies as well as in all company facilities at its nine divisions employing 60,000 workers across the country. Lockheed called it a plan for progress.

The news story notes that the President of the United States witnessed the signing of the agreement at the White House and called it a milestone in the history of civil rights.

The President went on to indicate that Lockheed's voluntary action, worked out in cooperation with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, is "setting a pattern which can open new doors and expanded employment opportunities for members of minority groups. No goal is more important."

This is a very significant development, and I wish to commend not only the Lockheed Aircraft Corp., which has huge Government contracts, but also the Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which is headed by the Vice President of the United States and by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Goldberg.

This to me is a very fine accomplishment. When voluntary action like this takes place we should salute it and commend it. As one Senator I commend the corporation and the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Lockheed Signs Plan of Progress" looking to race equality in jobs, published in this morning's Washington Post be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKHEED SIGNS PLAN OF PROGRESS—LOOKING TO RACE EQUALITY IN JOBS

(By Richard L. Lyons)

The Lockheed Aircraft Corp. and the Federal Government signed a landmark agreement yesterday aimed at providing full racial equality of employment in the plants of this largest Government contractor.

The company agreed to act and the Government to assist in erasing discrimination in hiring, training, and placement policies as well as in all company facilities as its nine divisions employing 60,000 workers across the country. Lockheed called it a "Plan for Progress."

President Kennedy witnessed the signing at the White House and called it "a milestone in the history of civil rights." He said Lockheed's voluntary action, worked out in cooperation with the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, "is setting a pattern which can open new doors and expanded employment opportunities for members of minority groups. No goal is more important."

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATED

A joint statement listing steps each will take to carry out the long-range program was signed by Lockheed's president, Courtlandt Gross, and Vice President JOHNSON, chairman of the President's Committee.

The agreement grew out of a complaint and resulting investigation during the last month that Lockheed discriminated against Negroes at its Marietta, Ga., plant where it will carry out a billion-dollar contract to build a fleet of jet cargo and troop-carrying planes to bolster the Nation's military airlift.

Shortly after the White House ceremony, JOHNSON'S Committee issued an Air Force report on the Marietta situation that read like a first-step application of the plan for progress. The Committee termed action at Marietta substantial progress.

Herbert Hill, labor secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which filed the Marietta complaint, said in New York that he hadn't seen the documents released here, but was very pleased by what he heard about them.

He said he hoped to pick up copies when he comes to Washington today to file another complaint with the committee charging racial discrimination by the Western Electric Co. at its Dallas, Tex., plant.

INTENT IS STATED

In its plan for progress Lockheed stated its intent to follow fully the national policy of equal employment opportunity and to take these specific actions:

Inform management officials of this policy and the need for progress and assign responsibility for carrying it out.

In recruiting new workers, aggressively seek out qualified professional, technical, mechanical, and clerical workers from minority groups.

Inform college placement officials and State employment agencies of its policies and request referral of qualified Negro jobseekers.

Reanalyze salaried job openings and personnel records to assure all present employees have been fairly considered for advancement.

Try to hire Negro teachers for summer orientation work to learn industry needs.

In training, support inclusion of Negroes in apprenticeship and all company training programs; secure Negro co-op trainees (part college, part work); cooperate with schools establishing desegregated vocational training programs.

Make sure that job layoffs are nondiscriminatory.

Maintain all company facilities—eating, recreation—on a desegregated basis.

TO AID RECRUITING

JOHNSON'S committee agreed to work through Federal agencies to help with recruitment, apprenticeship training, and school counseling and to try to break down segregation in southern labor unions.

At the Marietta plant, the Air Force reported, segregation has ended in work areas, cafeterias, restrooms, at drinking fountains and time clocks, and in company-sponsored recreation. The local machinists union also has been desegregated.

AUTOMATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate three articles relating to automation and unemployment. We should be gravely concerned with the continuing unemployment that exists in this country. Many responsible and informed persons have indicated that even with our economy on the move we will continue to have a serious problem of unemployment.

On May 7, the Washington Post carried an article entitled "The Anatomy of Unemployment." The author, Mr. Frank Porter, cites shifting demands of the public; geographical shifts of industry; and technological advances as the three most serious causes of unemployment. The third factor he points out as the most disquieting. This is the problem popularly known as automation, which is an advancement that has unlimited potential for benefiting the economy. On the other hand, if proper adjustments are not made, this amazing phenomenon can be the vehicle for much suffering and distress. Mr. Porter explains that in the midst of unemployment there are thousands of jobs going begging because there are not enough people with the required technical qualifications to fill them.

On Friday, May 19, an article appeared in the New York Times referring to a statement by Walter Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. He points out that the national welfare demands full employment. With this I am in full agreement, Mr. President. Walter Heller's formula for reaching full employment is to invest a great deal more of our vast resources in the development of a well-skilled and healthy labor force. This, I submit, is one of the key actions to deal with automation.

The third article I wish to call to the attention of the Senate is one which appeared in the New York Times on May 22, in which the Reverend Edward J. Hogan, assistant pastor of the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola, Park Avenue, New York City, points to the application of the principles set forth in a 70-year-old papal encyclical as the way to deal with the problem of workers displaced by automation. The good reverend concludes, in applying the encyclical, that the economy must in some way finance the period of relocation of workers who are replaced by machines.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed at this point in my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1961]

THE ANATOMY OF UNEMPLOYMENT—OUR TECHNOLOGY OUTRUNS EDUCATION

(By Frank C. Porter, staff reporter)

In the play "Tobacco Road," Jeeter Lester let a handful of arid, wornout soil trickle through his fingers.

It was worthless land, he said—couldn't even grow turnips on it any more. But it was his land, the land on which he had grown up and his daddy before him. Jeeter would be damned if he'd ever leave it.

If Jeeter Lester couldn't hoe turnips any more, what could he do? Operate a turret lathe, design missile parts, program a computer, manage a laundromat? No; none of these. He was too old to retrain for even the most simple semiskilled jobs. And, even if he were younger, the training might not take.

Most of America's 4.9 million unemployed are not Jeeter Lesters. But for a great many of them his quandary is theirs. And it illustrates the lack of human mobility and skills which underlie this Nation's chronic unemployment problem.

With most economists agreed that the recession bottomed out in February or March, the unemployment picture has brightened somewhat. The jobless total is down from 5.5 million 2 months ago, and the unemployment rate of 6.8 percent is off slightly from the 6.7 percent recorded in the recession trough.

But, no matter how bright the economic skies become, a hard core of substantial unemployment is expected to remain. After each of three preceding recessions, U.S. unemployment has leveled off on a progressively higher plateau—at approximately 2.5 percent of the labor force in 1952–53, at 3.8 in 1956–57, at about 4.7 in 1959–60.

The Kennedy administration has made unemployment countermeasure its first order of domestic business. But its approach is two-pronged. Part of today's joblessness—but only part—has been caused by the economic downturn from which we are just emerging, it believes. The remainder is chronic and the result of longer term influences.

Idle workers can be broken down into a number of groups:

Unemployables, who for various reasons—alcoholism, recurrent illness, laziness, a compulsion to punch every foreman on the nose—simply can't hold down a job for long.

The so-called frictionally unemployed—mostly those workers who are between jobs.

Cyclically unemployed—victims of the business cycle who are let go when the consumer slows his buying pace and when inflated inventories call for production cutbacks.

Those affected by a shift in demand. As the public changes its buying habits—purchasing more boats and fewer automobiles, say—a particular industry may have to lay off employees permanently by the thousands.

Those affected by a geographical shift. Textile firms, in pursuit of lower taxes and cheaper labor, deserted New England for the South, leaving thousands of unemployed in their wake.

The technologically unemployed.

The latter three factors are generally considered responsible for the bulk of chronic or structural unemployment.

And of the three, the technological factor is the most disquieting. Experts disagree over automation. Some, notably labor economists, feel that it is bringing a net decrease in the number of jobs available to industrial workers. Others insist that it will create more jobs than it destroys.

But no one can argue against its current impact. In 1947, for example, 649,000 production workers turned out 4.8 million motor vehicles; last year 612,000 workers produced 7.9 million.

Ten years ago the steel industry needed 540,000 men to produce 96.8 million tons of raw steel; last year 99.3 million tons were turned out with only 462,000 workers.

Machines will eliminate some 4 million office and clerical jobs in the next 5 years, according to a report compiled by Representative ELMER J. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, for President Kennedy last February.

Robots which will displace thousands of assembly line and packaging workers are already in production. Computers run entire oil refineries and chemical plants with only a few men needed to handle the controls.

The vending machine industry has put its ingenuity to work developing devices that eliminate theater ticket sellers, pari-mutuel window operators, department store clerks, lunch counter personnel, cashiers, mutual fund salesmen, and a great many others.

Front loaders are eliminating the man with the shovel; mechanical crop pickers are displacing field hands; bootblacks are losing out to mechanical shoe cleaners.

And yet, in the midst of all this, jobs go begging, go begging by the thousands.

A knowledgeable report by the Wall Street Journal last week told how the Illinois State Employment Service is having trouble filling eight clerical vacancies on its own staff. Its counterpart in Cleveland says it is unable to fill 1,000 jobs each month, mainly in the clerical and sales fields.

The motel industry is sounding an urgent call for at least 90,000 new employees during 1961.

The United States is short at least 250,000 auto mechanics and nobody is training anyone, the Good Car Keeping Institute complains, despite thousands of laid-off auto production workers who could easily be converted.

The fast-growing commuter services industry clamors for programers and is training high school students to relieve the shortage. In the next decade, more than 200,000 more programers will be needed, it is estimated.

The same conditions obtain in a dozen fields; in teaching, in engineering, in top-level executive positions, in sales.

The paradox is easily answerable. Most of today's unemployed are not qualified to fill the hundreds of thousands of unfilled jobs.

The Wall Street Journal offered statistics showing that the rate of unemployment among professional and technical personnel in March was only 1.6 percent, less than the amount usually attributed to frictional unemployment alone.

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1961]

HELLER URGES UNITED STATES SPUR INVESTMENT—ADVISER TO KENNEDY STRESSES USE OF HUMAN RESOURCES

President Kennedy's chief economic adviser said yesterday that the Nation should increase its investment in human as well as physical resources to attain a higher rate of economic growth.

"If we, as a people, desire to make our economy grow faster, increase our productivity, and compete more effectively in world markets, one of the things we must do is invest a larger fraction of our national output," Walter W. Heller, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, declared.

Mr. Heller urged, in particular, that greater attention be paid to intangible areas of economic growth, such as the development of a well-educated, skilled, and healthy labor force and advances in technology. He also called for an accelerated rate of investment in production facilities and a rapid return to full employment as ways of stimulating economic growth.

ROLE OF INTANGIBLES CITED

He asserted that one-half of the Nation's economic growth since the turn of the century was caused by such intangible factors as the growth of technical knowledge, the improved quality of the labor force, and economics of large-scale production as national and international markets have expanded.

"While these are all relatively abstract and invisible sources of economic growth, all of them are susceptible of deliberate cultivation, both by private initiative and by public policy," Mr. Heller declared.

The former chairman of the department of economics at the University of Minnesota spoke at the fourth annual presentation luncheon of the Loeb Awards for excellence in financial journalism. The awards are made by the University of Connecticut under a grant from the Sidney S. Loeb Memorial Foundation.

AWARD TO NEWSPAPER

The top newspaper award went to the Wall Street Journal for a series entitled "New American Millionaires," written by 14 staff members. The magazine award was presented to Leonard S. Silk, senior and economics editor of Business Week, for a special report entitled "The U.S. Finds a New Way to Grow."

Special achievement awards went to Lee M. Cohn of the Washington Star, Sidney Fish of the Journal of Commerce, Hobart Rowen and Sanford Brown of Newsweek and Tait Trussell of Nation's Business.

In his talk, Mr. Heller said that investment in new production facilities in this country had dropped to 9.5 percent of the gross national product in 1960 from 12.5 percent in 1958. By contrast, he noted, expenditures in member countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, had averaged 15.1 percent in the last 4 years.

"The President's proposed incentive tax credit, now before the Congress, is frankly a device to swing the power of the Federal tax system behind the expansion and modernization of our industrial plant," Dr. Heller declared.

VIEWS ON BUDGET

A return to full employment, he added, could lead to a "handsome budget surplus" because it would result in a sharp rise in income tax receipts. At an earlier press conference, he said that there was a prospect for a budget surplus in the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1963, but warned that it would be subject to a number of variables, including military and space expenditures and international programs.

Mr. Heller rejected charges that he and his colleagues on the Council of Economic Advisers were believers in a "stagnationist" economy. He said that such a school holds that "a private enterprise economy, once it reaches a high level of income, is incapable of rapid growth." On the contrary, he said, "our position has been that the earlier vigor can be and should be recaptured."

Mr. Heller predicted that the gross national product—the total value of all goods and services—would rise by $25 billion by the end of 1961 to a figure of about $525 billion a year. The present rate, he said, is about $50 billion a year below its full potential.

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1961]

AUTOMATION TIED TO LEO ENCYCLICAL—JESUIT ALSO APPLIES 70-YEAR DOCTRINE TO MIGRANT LABOR

A Jesuit called on Roman Catholics yesterday to apply the principles of social justice set forth in a 70-year-old papal encyclical to the present-day problem of workers' displacement by automation.

The Reverend Edward J. Hogan, an assistant pastor of the Church of St. Ignatius Loyola, Park Avenue and 84th Street, said in his sermon that "the economy must, in some way, finance the period of relocation of workers who are replaced by machinery."

Father Hogan preached on the 70th anniversary of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical "Rerum Novarum" (Of New Things) and the 30th anniversary of Pope Pius XI's "Quadragesimo Anno" (On the 40th Year).

RIGHTS OF WORKERS

"Rerum Novarum," known popularly as "On the Condition of the Working Classes," gave a moral and religious base to social questions. "Quadragesimo Anno" was a restatement in 1931 of the principles set forth in Pope Leo's letter.

Pope John XXIII said on May 14 that he had written an encyclical on the anniversary and that it would be published in a few weeks.

In Catholic terms "Rerum Novarum" is a refutation of both socialism, which advocated the abolishment of private property, and the 19th century brand of liberalism, which held that employers should be let alone by the state in their dealings with workers.

Pope Leo's letter to the Roman Catholic hierarchy proclaimed that holding property was the natural right of man. It recognized the workers' right and need to join trade unions and advocated government surveillance of industry for the general welfare.

BASTION FOR HUMANITY

Father Hogan called the two encyclicals "a fortress around which men can rally for the guidance of their fellows, and from which they can summon the world to consult for the general welfare."

He said that, in addition to automation, the situation of the migrant workers, "uneducated, wretchedly housed in shanties unable to support a permanent home," was subject to the teaching of the encyclicals.

"One of the most imperious needs is for unprejudiced equality of opportunity for all the children of God, regardless of religion or origin or race," the priest continued.

"Racial discrimination in education, housing, and job opportunity is an un-Christian insult, a denial of God-given rights, a violation of the image of God. Except in extraordinary circumstances, or when excused by helpless ignorance, it is a sin on the soul of the discriminator."

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, May 29, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of Grace and Glory, we are grateful for the cleansing ministry of memory as on the morrow the Nation turns, with countless fluttering flags, to the grassy mounds of the patriot dead.

May this sacrament of remembrance summon this land of the free to face with a new determination the never-ending struggle to maintain and preserve the freedoms which have been bought at so crimson a cost.

As even sterner tests in the agelong battle between freedom and fetters loom ahead, as the moral and material resources, vast and untapped, of this land of our hope and our prayer are mobilized at any sacrifice to stem the forces of darkness, may this realm of the free celebrate its day of gratitude with a steadfast purpose and with a grim resolution that is worthy of the past and of the promise for the future.

As never before on the national day of retrospect may the starry flag speak of strength that is increased by spending, of life that is saved by its losing, and of greatness that is measured by its serving.

In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 29, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 26, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On May 25, 1961:

S. 118. An act for the relief of Helen Irma Imhoof;

S. 126. An act for the relief of Edward W. Scott III;

S. 138. An act for the relief of Mico Delic;

S. 177. An act for the relief of Hadji Benlevi;

S. 217. An act for the relief of Alessandro Gellhorn;

S. 285. An act for the relief of Aipo Fransila Crane;

S. 292. An act for the relief of Mah Jew Ngee (also known as Peter Jew Mah);

S. 330. An act for the relief of Harry N. Kouniakis;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Haruo T. Hendricks;

S. 532. An act for the relief of Stanley Bulski (Zdzislaw Rekosz);

S. 545. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Clifford;

S. 555. An act for the relief of Nicolaos A. Papadimitriou;

S. 663. An act for the relief of Andreas Rakintozis (also known as Andreas Rakintzis or Rakajes);

S. 712. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to coin and sell duplicates in bronze of a gold medal presented to Robert Frost by the President of the United States;

S. 894. An act for the relief of Captain Ernest Mountain; and

S.J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to amend section 217 of the National Housing Act to provide an interim increase in the authorization for insurance of mortgages by the Federal Housing Administration.

May 27, 1961:

S. 104. An act to waive certain restrictions of the New Mexico Enabling Act with respect to certain sales of lands granted to the State by the United States; and to consent to an amendment of the constitution of the State of New Mexico; and

S. 1097. An act for the relief of A. E. Waterstradt.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)(4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 29, 1961.*

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR DISPENSED WITH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the Diplomatic and Foreign Service ambassadorial nominations on the calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TREATY OF AMITY AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS WITH VIETNAM—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive L, 87th Congress, 1st session, the Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations Between the United States and the Republic of Vietnam, signed at Saigon on April 3, 1961, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the treaty, together with the President's message be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a Treaty of Amity and Economic Relations Between the United States of America and the Republic of Vietnam, signed at Saigon on April 3, 1961.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 29, 1961.*

Mr. MILLER. Let me ask the distinguished Senator from Minnesota whether his request relates to all the nominations on the calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, only the diplomatic and Foreign Service Ambassadors.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the diplomatic and Foreign Service ambassadorial nominations on the calendar will be stated.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE AMBASSADORS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas S. Estes, of Maine, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of John S. Badeau, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The other nominations are to be held over, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations of Ambassadors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. With objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on Thursday the Senate will take up Calendar No. 261, House bill 5954, the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill.

It is the intention of the leadership to lay before the Senate on Friday next Calendar No. 252, Senate bill 1922, the omnibus housing bill. We shall at least make a start on that bill on Friday.

When the Senate concludes its session today, it will adjourn until Thursday, at noon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1962, FOR NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD, NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND DEPARTMENT OF LABOR (S. DOC. NO. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving increases in the amount of $1,376,000 for the National Labor Relations Board, $200,000 for the National Mediation Board, $219,342,000 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and $497,700,000 for the Department of Labor (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF MANPOWER RESOURCES

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the occupa-

tional training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AUDIT REPORT ON PANAMA CANAL COMPANY AND CANAL ZONE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of Panama Canal Company and Canal Zone Government, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE UNDER BANKRUPTCY ACT

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 18

"Concurrent resolution to authorize and request the Governor to use his good offices to secure through the department of hospitals a transfer of 500 acres of land in Belle Chasse, La., from the U.S. Government to the State of Louisiana, to be used for establishing the South Louisiana Rehabilitation and Research Center to be administered by and under the State department of hospitals.

"Whereas as an acute problem exists in the State of Louisiana in regard to the treatment and rehabilitation of mentally retarded persons, exceptional children, alcoholics, and other persons in need of special care, treatment, education, or rehabilitation; and

"Whereas one of the major problems in connection with such activities is the procurement of land of a suitable nature and at a suitable location for such purposes; and

"Whereas the U.S. Government owns a large tract of land which presently comprises the U.S. Naval Ammunition Depot in Belle Chasse, La., which land is especially suited for such purposes; and

"Whereas such land is not presently being used by the U.S. Government; and

"Whereas the State of Louisiana has immediate need of a portion of said land and could use said land for the benefit of the State and the Nation: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the senate concurring), That the Governor of the State of Louisiana be, and he is hereby authorized and requested to use his good offices to urge the Department of Hospitals of the State of Louisiana to requisition, request, apply for and by the proper and legal means secure without cost to the State of Louisiana a transfer of 500 acres of land, or a substantial portion thereof, from the tract now comprising the U.S. Naval Ammunition Depot in Belle Chasse, La., and to use said land for the purpose of establishing, at a future date, the South Louisiana Rehabilitation and Research Center for the care, treatment, education or rehabilitation of exceptional children, alcoholics and other persons in need of special care, treatment, education or rehabilitation; and be it further

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana (the senate concurring), That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the U.S. Congress, to the Governor of the State of Louisiana, and to the Louisiana Department of Hospitals.

"J. THOS. JEWELL,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"C. C. AYCOCK,
"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to request the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to study and determine the feasibility of locating a space launching facility on the island of Hawaii, State of Hawaii

"Whereas the knowledge to be obtained by the exploration of outer space is crucial to the security of the United States of America; and

"Whereas there is need for greater and faster advancement of scientific knowledge in this field; and

"Whereas the State of Hawaii through its State planning office has determined by a study entitled, 'Space Facility Capability,' dated April 1, 1960, that the island of Hawaii with its favorable altitude, whether, and location is ideally suited as a site for the establishment of a space vehicle launching facility; and

"Whereas the study proves that the location of such a launching site on the island of Hawaii, State of Hawaii, would provide the distinct advantages of:

"1. Permitting satellite firings north, south, and east from an altitude of 13,085 feet above sea level over open water for 4,500 miles thereby reducing the hazards connected with such firings and allow easier recoveries of failures of boosters;

"2. Permitting satellite firings into polar orbits or equatorial launchings from a State of the United States thereby eliminating the necessity for international negotiations with its attendant difficulties;

"3. Allowing mutually effective relations with down-range facilities of the Pacific Missile Range; and

"4. Most important of all, a community which has expressed its acceptance and wholehearted support for the location of a satellite launching base on the island of Hawaii thereby assuring the personnel of the base an atmosphere of friendliness, tolerance, and informality; and

"Whereas such a satellite launching station would be of inestimable value to the defense of the United States of America and to the economy of the State of Hawaii; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First State Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1961 (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be requested to request the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to study and determine the feasibility of locating a space launching facility on the island of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Congressman DANIEL K. INOUYE, Senator OREN E. LONG, Senator HIRAM L. FONG, and the State department of economic development.

"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"HERMAN T. F. LUM,
"Clerk, House of Representatives.
"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate.
"_____,
"Clerk of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 54

"Whereas because of their geographical location the people of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico are greatly dependent upon the ocean carriers for their exporting and importing trade; and

"Whereas the ocean carriers in the services between the mainland United States and Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico, although considered a part of the American merchant marine, are classified as domestic carriers or 'common carriers by water in interstate commerce' and are not qualified to receive any financial assistance from the Federal Government but are expected to pay their cost and earn a profit out of shipping revenues, which means that the people of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico are required to assume the great burden of cost and profit of such ocean carriers; and

"Whereas it is the policy of the United States to sustain the American merchant marine through operating and construction subsidies amounting to as much as 70 percent of wages and 50 percent of construction costs in order to enable American-flag lines to operate successfully with tariffs and other charges similar to those charged by foreign ocean carriers; and

"Whereas such a policy to sustain the American merchant marine is beneficial to all of the people of the United States of America and it is just as appropriate that the Nation as a whole pay for the maintenance of such a policy so that the cost will not disproportionately fall upon the people of Hawaii, Alaska, and Puerto Rico and other domestic shippers and their customers who pay general taxes to sustain foreign shippers of the American merchant marine; and

"Whereas the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the U.S. Congress recently held preliminary hearings on a proposal to give aid to American-flag operators in the domestic offshore trades: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1961 (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to adopt legislation granting Federal subsidies to American-flag operators in the domestic offshore trades; and be it further

"Resolved, That if such subsidies are granted, the Federal Maritime Board be requested to investigate the feasibility of admitting other subsidized carriers to the Hawaii-mainland trade; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, President of the U.S. Senate, Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Federal Maritime Board, and to the Members of the U.S. Congress from the State of Hawaii.

"W. H. HILL,
"President of the Senate.
"WILLIAM S. RICHARDSON,
"Clerk of the Senate.
"ELMER F. CRAVALHO,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"HERMAN T. F. LUM,
"Clerk, House of Representatives."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 69

"Concurrent resolution to urge the request of the United States to take action to provide for and require the investment of tidelands mineral revenues derived from operations off Louisiana shores

"Whereas hundreds of thousands of dollars of tidelands mineral revenues are presently held in escrow pending the outcome of litigation of the rights to said funds, and

"Whereas the State of Louisiana not only is being deprived of the share of said funds to which it has made legal demand, but the State also is deprived of any opportunity to derive any income from investment of such revenues: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the Senate thereof concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged and requested to take such action as is necessary to provide for and require the investment of that portion of tidelands mineral revenues held in escrow which has been or is derived from operations off Louisiana shores, in order to realize income which is being lost by allowing such funds to remain idle; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to all members of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States and to the presiding officers of the House of Representatives and of the Senate of the U.S. Congress.

"_____ _____,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"_____ _____,

"Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 54

"Concurrent resolution designed to institute a method of instruction for the youth of Louisiana in the dogmas and tenets of Americanism and to develop intelligent and aggressive opposition to communism and deep loyalty to our American political and economic system

"Whereas the totalitarianism of aggressive world communism constantly threatens the peace of the world and the continued existence of the United States of America as a free Republic composed of sovereign States; and

"Whereas it is becoming increasingly apparent that if we as a nation are to successfully combat and defeat the Communist conspiracy at home and abroad, and perpetuate and strengthen our American way of life, it is essential that every American citizen must know and understand the fundamental theories and basic principles of our American constitutional, social, economic and political system, and also, by way of contrast, the strategy, tactics, nature, effects, logistics, purposes, and principles of Communism as it actually operates in the world today; and

"Whereas it is our opinion that it is imperative that an organized and comprehensive educational effort should be promptly undertaken by every school and educational institution in the State of Louisiana and throughout the United States so that the necessary instruction and indoctrination to this end can be imparted and the present lethargy and mass ignorance of the true character and consequences of Soviet communism can be dispelled; and

"Whereas it is the belief of the Louisiana Legislature that every high school and college student in the State of Louisiana should be required to take a separate course or unit of study as a part of the regular and mandatory curriculum at some time during the latter portion of his period of high school or college studies respectively, which would not only give to each student a clear understanding of and a deep loyalty to the ideals, principles, traditions, advantages and institutions of representative democracy and free capitalism in a federation of sovereign States as established by the drafters of the Constitution of the United States; but, which would at the same time, by comparison, teach every student why communism and socialism are evil and vicious, why they destroy the freedom, well-being, dignity, and happiness of the individual, and why they are our implacable enemy, to the end that these students will understand the propaganda, and dishonesty of Soviet Russia, Red China, and the other apparatus and affiliates of organized communism and national socialism; and

"Whereas the Louisiana Legislature is convinced that a sound, comprehensive, and universal program of high school and college instruction of this scope is indispensable to an adequate national defense and is vital to assure that citizens of Louisiana in the future will be equipped to reject and intelligently argue against and destroy the lures, traps, pitfalls, lies, and propaganda of communism with reasoned conviction and loyalty based on a thorough knowledge of the concepts and fundamental element of our American system and a firm grasp of and belief in decentralized government, representative democracy, free competitive capitalism, separation of powers in government, private ownership of property and the means of production, reasonable and limited taxation, the reserved powers of the States, freedom of religion, speech, press, voting and work, individual, economic opportunity, limited powers of the Federal Government, separation of church and state, activities, and the essential features of our American economic system; and

"Whereas this program of instruction is sponsored and requested by the Louisiana State Bar Association and the Louisiana department of the American Legion: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the house of representatives and the senate concurring herein), That the State superintendent of education, the State board of education, president and board of supervisors of Louisiana State University and A. & M. College, and the governing authorities of all private and public high schools and colleges in Louisiana are hereby earnestly urged, requested, memorialized and petitioned to take prompt action to respectively:

"1. Establish a mandatory requirement that a separate, required comprehensive six (6) weeks unit of instruction be instituted in every high school in Louisiana during the 1960–61 school year, within the framework of the presently required course on American history in the eleventh (11th) or twelfth (12th) grades teaching Americanism versus communism within the scope and objectives as hereinabove described.

"2. Establish a mandatory requirement, beginning with the 1960–61 school year, that each college or university student in either his junior or senior year will be required to take a separate and comprehensive course or unit of instruction for at least ten (10) clock hours teaching Americanism versus communism within the scope and objectives as hereinabove described; and be it further

"Resolved, That we believe that these courses should be part of the regular, prescribed and required high school, college, and university curriculums and that no student should be graduated or receive a diploma from any high school, college, or university who fails to successfully complete this course or unit of instruction in Americanism versus communism; and be it further

"Resolved, That we urge the State board of education and the board of supervisors of the Louisiana State University to prepare, approve, select, or prescribe all textbooks, teachers' manuals, student work books, reference books and materials, and other things such as films, tapes, visual aids, pamphlets used in such courses or units of instruction and to supply same; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the State of Louisiana is hereby requested to mail a copy of this resolution to each newspaper, radio, and TV station in the State of Louisiana, the State superintendent of education, each member of the State board of education, the president of Louisiana State University, each member of the board of supervisors of Louisiana State University, the president of each college or university of the State of Louisiana, each parish and city superintendent of schools, each member of every parish or city school board, to the governing authorities of every private secondary school in the State of Louisiana, to the President and Vice President of the United States, to each Member of the Congress of the United States, to each judge of the Supreme Court and every district court of Louisiana, to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, attorney general and chief educational official of each State of the Union, to each of every Federal court, and to the principal of each high school in the State of Louisiana."

An act (chapter No. 236) enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"CHAPTER 236

"An act relating to the cession by the State of Minnesota to the State of North Dakota of certain parcels of real property located in Clay County, Minn.

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

"SECTION 1. [Finding.] By reason of flood control work upon the Red River of the north an avulsion has occurred leaving two parcels of land described as:

"1. That portion of government lot 2 in the northeast quarter of section 29, township 140 north, range 48 west of the fifth principal meridian, Clay County, Minn., bounded by the thread of the Red River of the north as it existed prior to January 1, 1959, and the new thread of the Red River of the north as established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under project CIVENG–21–018–59–22, containing 9.78 acres more or less; and

"2. That portion of government lot 2 in the northeast quarter of section 7, township 139 north, range 48 west of the fifth principal meridian, Clay County, Minn., bounded by the thread of the Red River of the north as it existed prior to January 1, 1959, and the new thread of the Red River of the north as established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under project CIVENG–21–018–59–22, containing 12.76 acres more or less, physically detached from the State of Minnesota and attached to the State of North Dakota.

"SEC. 2. CESSION OF LANDS.—The State of Minnesota upon passage by the Legislature of the State of North Dakota of the necessary enabling legislation accepting jurisdiction over the property described in section 1, so that said property shall be a part of the State of North Dakota, hereby agrees to the cession of said lands so that the same will no longer be a part of Minnesota.

"SEC. 3. LANDS, TITLES, RECORDS.—Nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed in such manner as to prejudice the title, right, or claim of any person to any of the lands herein involved. The register of deeds of Clay County, Minn., shall co-

operate with the register of deeds of Cass County, N. Dak., in furnishing him such records of the title, or copies thereof, to the land described in section 1, recorded in Clay County, Minn., as may be necessary. The register of deeds may make the usual charge for certified copies of records and documents if the same are required by the register of deeds of Cass County.

"SEC. 4. AGREEMENT, CONSENT OF CONGRESS.—The act of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota referred to in section 2 of this act, together with this act, shall constitute the agreement between the States of Minnesota and North Dakota. The Congress of the United States, upon passage of such acts by the respective Legislatures of the States of Minnesota and North Dakota, is petitioned, pursuant to article I, section 10, clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, to give its consent to this agreement and to amend the enabling acts of such States accordingly. The secretary of state of Minnesota shall transmit copies of this act to the presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to the several Senators and Representatives of the States of Minnesota and North Dakota in the Congress of the United States who are petitioned to take such action as they deem proper to procure the consent of the Congress of the United States to this agreement between the States of Minnesota and North Dakota.

"KARL F. ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the senate this 7th day of March 1961.

"HY TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the house of representatives this 28th day of March 1961.

"G. H. LEAHY,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved April 10, 1961.

"ELMER L. ANDERSEN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed April 11, 1961.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 24

"Whereas violence and civil disorder have been brought in recent days to our State as a result of outside conspiracies against our laws; and

"Whereas the dominant attitude of our people is one of disapproval of violence and disorder; and

"Whereas these conditions come about due to the invasion of the State by a band of irresponsibles promoting program of trespass and similar violations of local law deliberately calculated to arouse resentment, friction, and publicity; and

"Whereas this reaction has been intentionally provoked and created by a group of troublemakers professionally trained for the purpose; and

"Whereas these agitators are acquainted with the customs, traditions, laws, and feelings of the people of Alabama; and

"Whereas, with full knowledge of the possible results, a willful and deliberate scheme and conspiracy was entered into to violate local customs, traditions, and laws by outsiders; and

"Whereas this conspiracy to violate the customs, traditions, and laws of Alabama was announced and given wide publicity as to time, place, and intention; and

"Whereas the plain purpose of the intrusion of the CORE so-called freedom riders in Alabama was not to visit the State in good faith for lawful and peaceable purposes, but solely to incite breaches of the peace and bring about conditions of public unrest; and

"Whereas a principal objective of Communists and others dedicated to the destruction of the United States of America is by similar means to create disorder, public violence, and social unrest; and

"Whereas this announced and advertised intrusion into Alabama did, in fact, provoke violence, breaches of the peace and unrest in several communities in the State; and

"Whereas the President, without the request or consent of the proper officials of the State of Alabama unnecessarily sent several hundred U.S. marshals to the capital of Alabama for the stated purpose of maintaining law and order; and

"Whereas the State of Alabama has been at all times and is now fully capable of maintaining law and order in the State and fully intends so to do; and

"Whereas there have existed basic and friendly personal relations between the races in Alabama which have been progressively constructive until disrupted by professional agitators, and aggravated by the wholly unwarranted action of the Federal Government in sending 400 marshals into Alabama, impliedly sanctioning the invasion, and unless so disrupted by outsiders there is no reason why this potential understanding, good will and progress should not continue: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Alabama (both houses concurring):

"1. That the Governor of Alabama has the full support of the legislature and the people of this State in issuing the proclamation of limited martial law in Montgomery;

"2. It is the judgment of the Legislature of Alabama that the organization and action of bands or groups, for the announced and publicized purposes such as those of the recent so-called freedom riders must be regarded as willful incitation to violence and disorder and as a conspiracy against the public interest;

"3. That the public order and peace is presently being maintained and will continue to be maintained in this State by the officials of the State of Alabama;

"4. That the President of the United States is hereby requested to remove all Federal marshals and officers not at their normal stations of duty from the confines of the State of Alabama;

"5. That the President of the United States is further requested to use the power and prestige of his office to dissuade all persons and groups from deliberately taking actions calculated to cause breaches of the peace in the State of Alabama.

"6. That people and groups unfamiliar with problems in the State of Alabama lend their assistance to the people of this State in preventing the deliberate creation of conditions of unrest, violence and hatred and join with the people of Alabama in promoting the mutual interest of all of the people of this State within the framework of its customs and traditions; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of state of Alabama to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, to each Member of the U.S. Congress and to the Governors of the several States.

"VIRGI M. ASHWORTH,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"ALBERT BOUTWELL,
"President and Presiding Officer of the Senate.
"JOHN PATTERSON,
"Governor.
"OAKLEY MELTON, Jr.,
"Clerk."

A resolution adopted by the Medical Association of the State of Alabama, Montgomery, Ala., favoring the enactment of legislation to provide health and medical care for the aged; to the Committee on Finance.

AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1961—RESOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Troy Local Farmers Union, of Reno County, Kans., adopted a resolution urging approval of the pending proposed Agriculture Act of 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, the farmers net income has decreased to a disastrous low; and

Whereas, farmers are being forced from the family farms because of economic distress to join the jobless laborers in the city; and

Whereas, farmers are aware that excess production has depressed commodity prices; and

Whereas, the present farm program is outdated and inadequate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Troy Local Farmers Union of Reno County, Kans., at its regular monthly meeting, May 20, 1961, urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to carry into effect the general plan of proposed Agriculture Act of 1961 (sometimes referred to as the omnibus farm bill); and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed forthwith to our Congressman and to each of the Senators from the State of Kansas in the Congress of the United States earnestly requesting that each use his best effort to enact legislation which would carry out the purpose of this resolution.

AGRICULTURAL VIEWS OF KANSAS FARMERS UNION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Farmers Union held its first special State convention in 53 years, at McPherson, Kans., on May 20, 1961. The convention devoted considerable time to the discussion and debate on the feed grain law, recently passed; the proposed wheat programs and legislation; and the Agricultural Act of 1961, which is now before Congress.

Some excellent statements were made at the convention regarding both these pieces of legislation, and the recommendations were that Congress enact the legislation at this session, so as to provide the farmer with his fair share of the national income.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement issued by the Kansas Farmers Union be printed at this point in the RECORD, and that these remarks be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON FEED-GRAIN LAW

The Kansas Farmers' Union, meeting in its first special State convention in 53 years, at McPherson, Kans., May 20, 1961, spent

considerable time in discussion and debate on the feed-grain law recently passed, proposed wheat programs and legislation, and the Agricultural Act of 1961, now before the Congress.

It is the conclusion of this convention that the act, if enacted into law, and its separate features activated into operation, will accomplish most of the results desired in the Kansas Farmers' Union program.

Agriculture has needed for years a "kit of legislative tools" to deal with the problems which in the aggregate have become known as the farm problem. Quite often an approach is needed for each problem. The approach which will alleviate or solve one problem is not always the right approach to another problem.

Similar legislative approaches in other segments of the economy, sometimes dubbed "do it yourself," wherein legislation is passed which makes it possible for a group to tackle a problem and bring Federal law into the picture as a helping hand. This approach has proven very successful.

Farm Credit Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, oil pro ration laws, social security, unemployment insurance, State and Federal Labor Relations Acts, and numerous other permissive legislative approaches through which a group of citizens can deal with a problem are outstanding examples of the wisdom of this approach.

We recommend the act include additional safeguards for the family type farm and support levels at 100 percent of parity.

We urge the passage of the Agricultural Act of 1961.

We commend the Congress and the administration on the passage of the feed-grain law. If the Agricultural Act of 1961 cannot be passed in time for its features to be used on the 1962 wheat crop, we urge passage of legislation to idle land similar to the feed-grain bill provide for bushel allotments and raise the price of wheat.

Farming is the Nation's largest business. Farmers are $40 billion customers of industry and labor. Lack of farm income is of major concern to every American. Long-range and short-range legislation deserves the best nonpartisan study, judgment, and decision of every Member of Congress. Opposition to proposed plans should include substitute plans aimed at accomplishing the same end result as proposed plans. The problem is too serious and too far reaching for the negative approach of opposition for opposition's sake.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 128. Resolution relative to the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve (Rept. No. 291); and

S. Res. 154. Resolution relative to the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to people of other nations in case of disaster (Rept. No. 292).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 1985. A bill to prevent the receipt of pay and allowances by certain members of the Armed Forces who render aid and assistance to hostile forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1986. A bill to relieve the courts of the United States of jurisdiction to hear and determine certain claims against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1987. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. FULBRIGHT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1988. A bill to aid in the administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1989. A bill to provide for the advancement of one grade on the retired list of the Regular Army of certain officers who served as volunteers during the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DODD (for himself and Mr. EASTLAND):

S. 1990. A bill to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to further protect the internal security of the United States by providing penalties for malicious damage to certain communications facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. HART, and Mr. PELL):

S. 1991. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1992. A bill for the relief of Peter Kopanica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO "TURNCOATS"

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Supreme Court last week rendered a decision which I feel is particularly abhorrent to most Americans who have any pride at all in their country. Perhaps that decision was correct, based on the law as it exists today—and of that I am not sure—but I do not care to debate the point. I merely wish to point out that the law is deficient when it permits military back pay to be awarded to "turncoats" who act in a manner that can be classified only as treason. A partial list of the activities of the turncoats for whom the Supreme Court ruled in Bell against United States will prove to any right-thinking American that I do not exaggerate when I call their acts treasonous.

First. They were monitors of "forced study groups" of other Americans and as such distributed propaganda literature and threatened to turn in the names of prisoners who refused to read it.

Second. They made tape recordings detrimental to the United States, which were used over the camp public address system.

Third. They wore Chinese uniforms and attended meetings outside the camp.

Fourth. In some recordings which were broadcast over the Peiping radio plaintiff Bell said he was ordered to kill North Korean prisoners.

Fifth. Bell said that if given the opportunity, he would run a tank over the U.S. President's body.

Sixth. In written articles for the prison camp newspaper, for which he was paid money, Bell stated that American troops had committed atrocities and that he had personally been given orders to kill women and children and not take prisoners.

Seventh. Bell stated that if given a weapon he would fight against the United States.

Eighth. Bell sold food intended for the sick to other prisoners of war and caused one man to be bayoneted and others to be placed in solitary confinement.

Ninth. Another of the plaintiffs lived part of the time at Chinese regimental headquarters, stated he hated America, desired to study in China and to return to the United States in 5 years to help in the overthrow of the Government.

Mr. President, this is a list of activities which in my opinion should entitle these men only to the penalty for treason—not pay. It is made more appalling, however, by the fact that the record in the Court of Claims "does not disclose any suggestion whatever of brainwashing" and, as a matter of fact, "justifies the conclusion that at all times these men did these acts voluntarily for the purpose of helping themselves, in complete disregard of the effect it might have on the treatment of their fellow prisoners." Further, not one of the acts which I have listed—as well as many others that I did not list—were denied in the evidence or in the pleadings before the court. In fact, the plaintiffs admitted that they gave aid and comfort to the enemy.

In my humble opinion, Mr. President, this can lead to no other conclusion than that the plaintiffs abandoned their status as soldiers of the United States and prisoners. They essentially were not confined and the statute is, therefore, not applicable to them.

I think Chief Judge Jones of the U.S. Court of Claims in his wisdom and ever-present, clear-cut analysis of difficult legal problems summed it up as no other could. He said on page 10 of the Court of Claims opinion:

> Plaintiffs start up a difficult mountain to a summit of sheer legalism. Somewhere amid the mists and clouds along the way the spirit of the law completely disappears and its broken body lies in an unmarked spot under an avalanche of technical snow.
>
> I cannot believe that any law can be as cold and lifeless as that. The law has for its primary purpose the ends of justice; otherwise it is as useless as a child trying to grasp a handful of sunlight. The law is a living thing, is not an end in itself but a means to an end. If it fails in this one thing it fails in everything.
>
> To allow recovery in these cases would be to put a premium on dishonor and a penalty on courageous loyalty. We do not see how this court, or any court, can construe the law in such a fashion.

I agree with the Chief Judge.

As I said before, Mr. President, the law is deficient if it permits payments in

cases such as this. I am, therefore, introducing at this time two bills, which I think will correct the problem and eliminate the premium that has been placed upon dishonor.

My first bill merely amends existing law by prohibting payment in future cases to prisoners who, at any time after their capture, aid, comfort, cooperate with or give assistance to the enemy or who, in any other way, act in a manner which is inconsistent with their obligation of loyalty to the United States or their obligation as members of the armed services; or who act in a manner inconsistent with the continued health, comfort, safety, and well-being of their fellow prisoners.

My second bill is designed to prevent payment to Bell and the others who were last week favored by the Supreme Court.

First, this bill would prohibit the expenditure of any appropriated funds for the purpose of satisfying any claim "heretofore or hereafter" made by any individual who while a prisoner of war engaged in conduct evidencing disloyalty to the United States. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to determine the extent of the man's conduct.

Secondly, this bill removes from the jurisdiction of all courts of the United States all actions "heretofore or hereafter" instituted for the assertion of such claims.

Thirdly, it provides that no court shall have jurisdiction to enter in any such action a "judgment, order or decree other than an order dismissing such action."

Last, it provides that no court of the United States shall have jurisdiction to review any judgment, order, or decree entered by any other court of the United States for the dismissal of any such action.

Mr. President, there is no question in my mind as to the necessity of both these bills or as to the validity and constitutionality of the second, since the courts of the United States get their jurisdiction from the Congress. The bill has ample precedent in the form of the Norris-La Guardia Act which, among other restrictions placed upon the courts, deprived Federal district courts of jurisdiction under antitrust laws to grant injunctions against labor unions.

I sincerely hope that the committee and the Senate in their wisdom choose to act upon these bills at an early date. Disloyalty should be forcefully condemned—not paid for.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 1985. A bill to prevent the receipt of pay and allowances by certain members of the Armed Forces who render aid and assistance to hostile forces, and for other purposes.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1986. A bill to relieve the courts of the United States of jurisdiction to hear and determine certain claims against the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949, RELATING TO DETERMINATION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, dated May 23, 1961, to the Vice President in regard to it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1987) to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is further amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (f) of section 4, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(f) No remuneration on account of services rendered on behalf of any claimant in connection with any claim filed with the Commission under this title shall exceed 10 per centum of the total amount paid pursuant to any award certified under the provisions of this title, on account of such claim. Any agreement to the contrary shall be unlawful and void. Whoever, in the United States or elsewhere, demands or receives, on account of services so rendered, any remuneration in excess of the maximum permitted by this section, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both."

(2) Section 6. title I, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of United States-Polish claims arising under the Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, not later than September 30, 1965."

(3) Subsection (b) of section 7, title I, is amended by inserting "(1)" after the subsection letter and adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Treasury shall deduct from each payment into the Polish Claims Fund, created pursuant to section 8, 5 per centum thereof as reimbursement to the Government of the United States for the expenses incurred by the Commission and by the Treasury Department in the administration of this title. The amount so deducted shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of miscellaneous receipts."

(4) Paragraph (1) of subsection (c), section 7, title I, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(1) if any person to whom any payment is to be made pursuant to this title is deceased or is under a legal disability, payment shall be made to his legal representative, except that if any payment to be made is not over $1,000 and there is no qualified executor or administrator, payment may be made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto, without the necessity of compliance with the requirements of law with respect to the administration of estates."

(5) Subsection (c) of section 8, title I, is amended by inserting the phrase "paragraph (1) of" after the phrase "pursuant to" and before the words "subsection (b)".

(6) Section 8, title I, is hereby further amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(e) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, out of the sums covered into the Polish Claims Fund, to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to this title with respect to claims included within the terms of the Polish Claims Agreement of 1960 as follows and in the following order of priority:

"(1) Payment in the amount of $1,000 or in the principal amount of the award, whichever is less;

"(2) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award which shall bear to such unpaid principal balance the same proportion as the total amount in the Polish Claims Fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid principal balance of all such awards; and

"(3) Thereafter, payments from time to time on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest which shall bear to such unpaid balance of interest, the same proportion as the total amount in the Polish Claims Fund available for distribution at the time such payments are made bears to the aggregate unpaid balance of interest of all such awards."

(7) Section 302, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsections:

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to transfer the unobligated balance in the Italian Claims Fund into the War Claims Fund created under section 13 of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall cover into each of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, and Rumanian Claims Funds, such sums as may be paid by the Government of the respective country pursuant to the terms of any claims settlement agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of such country."

(8) Section 303, title III, is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of paragraph (2), and by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and immediately thereafter, the word, "and".

(9) Section 303, title III, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) pay effective compensation for the nationalization, compulsory liquidation, or other taking of property of nationals of the United States in Bulgaria, Hungary, and

Rumania, between August 9, 1955, and the effective date of the claims agreement between the respective country and the United States."

(10) Section 306, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) within thirty days after enactment of this subsection or the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever date is later, the Commission shall publish in the Federal Register the time when and the limit of time within which claims may be filed under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, which limit shall not be more than six months after such publication."

(11) Section 310, title III, is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) thereof the following paragraph:

"(6) Whenever the Commission is authorized to settle claims by the enactment of paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title with respect to Rumania, or by the execution of a claims settlement agreement with Bulgaria or Hungary, no further payments shall be authorized by the Secretary of the Treasury on account of awards certified by the Commission pursuant to paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of section 303 out of the Bulgarian, Hungarian, or Rumanian Claims Funds, as the case may be, until payments on account of awards certified pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 with respect to such Fund have been authorized in equal proportion to payments previously authorized on existing awards certified pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 303."

(12) Section 316, title III, is amended by inserting "(a)" after the section number and adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(b) The Commission shall complete its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims pursuant to paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title not later than eighteen months following the date of enactment of such paragraph, or following the enactment of legislation making appropriations to the Commission for payment of administrative expenses incurred in carrying out its functions under paragraph (4) of section 303 of this title, whichever date is later."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT
COMMISSION OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1961.

THE VICE PRESIDENT,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith in behalf of the executive branch for the consideration of the 87th Congress is the draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the timely determination of certain claims of American nationals settled by the United States-Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and for other purposes."

On July 16, 1960, the Governments of the United States and the Polish People's Republic entered into an en bloc settlement of claims of nationals of the United States against Poland for the nationalization or other taking by Poland of property and rights or interests therein; the deprivation of use or enjoyment of property; and debts of nationalized enterprises. The Polish Government agreed to pay to the U.S. Government an aggregate of $40 million in 20 equal annual installments.

Before the commencement of negotiations with the Polish Government, the Commission conducted a registration of potential claims against Poland. During 1957 and 1958, over 17,000 claims were registered with the Commission. Since the close of the registration period, the Commission has received approximately 3,000 inquiries which raises the number of potential claims to over 20,000. Thus, it appears that the Commission may have the task of developing, examining and preparing formal opinions on some 20,000 claims.

It is anticipated, of course, that the number of valid claims will be considerably less. Nevertheless, all claims filed with the Commission, whether valid or invalid, must be examined and decided by formal opinions.

The Commission started work on the Polish claims program on September 1, 1960, pursuant to title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, which established the procedures for the administration of such a claims program by the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission. Title I, however, makes no provision with respect to limiting the time within which the Commission must bring about the timely and orderly completion of the Polish claims program.

As indicated, upward of 20,000 claims may be filed. In relation to the programs previously administered by the Commission, this one could well be 13 times the size of the Yugoslav program, twice the size of the title III program, and 5 times the size of the title IV program. Four years were allowed for the completion of each of those programs. Accordingly, the Commission with some anxiety proposes that the period for processing claims against Poland be no greater than 4 years from the last day for filing claims, or September 30, 1965.

Eight other proposals are contained in the draft measure:

A. A proposal to relieve the Commission of the burden of determining attorneys' fees and to make title I consistent with the attorney fee provisions of titles III and IV of the International Claims Settlement Act.

B. A proposal to relieve the Treasury Department of extensive administrative burdens in deducting the Commission's administrative expenses from the Fund instead of from each award by the Commission.

C. A proposal to transfer the unobligated balances in the Italian Claims Fund to the War Claims Fund.

The following proposals are designed to provide for the implementation of the United States-Rumanian Claims Settlement Agreement of March 30, 1960.

D. A proposal to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to cover the payments by governments with which the United States Government concludes en bloc claims settlement agreements into the respective claims fund.

E. A proposal to provide for a new category of claims against the Rumanian Claims Fund.

F. A proposal requiring the Commission to publish notice of the program in the Federal Register.

G. A proposal providing for equitable payments on awards.

H. A proposal providing for the orderly completion of the Rumanian program.

The items covered in the draft proposal will involve little, if any, cost. In any event, the cost of effectuating any of the proposals would be borne by the claims fund concerned and not the U.S. Government.

The Commission cannot proceed in the orderly administration of the Polish and Rumanian claims programs unless the items pertaining to them are enacted. With respect to the remaining items, these are considered good administrative housekeeping which should not be left at loose ends. Moreover, it is important that this legislation be enacted promptly because on January 11, 1961, the Government of Poland made its first installment payment of $2 million. On July 1, 1960, the Government of Rumania made its first installment payment of $500,000 under the terms of the agreement of March 30, 1960.

For these reasons the Commission urges early and favorable action on the proposed bill.

Accompanying the draft bill is a section-by-section analysis of its provisions.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that it has no objection to the presentation of this proposal for consideration by the Congress and its enactment would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD D. RE,
Chairman.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Paragraph 1. (The enacting clause unnumbered.)

Section 4(f) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides for a limitation on attorney's fees of 10 percent of any payment on an award made by the Commission, but it also provides machinery authorizing the Commission to set the amount of such fee within the 10-percent limitation. Further provision is made for deduction by the Secretary of the Treasury of the amount of the fee and for payment directly to the attorney.

Because of the additional administrative burdens imposed upon the Commission and the Treasury Department through such procedures the attorney fee provisions have been considerably simplified in legislation enacted subsequent to title I of the act, namely, titles III and IV. The latter two titles provide simply that such fees shall not exceed 10 percent of any payment made on an award by the Commission, and leaves the settlement thereof to attorney and client.

Paragraph 1 of the proposed bill is designed to repeal present section 4(f) of title I, and to substitute therefor the attorney fee provisions contained in section 414 of title IV of the act.

Paragraph 2: While title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, made provision for the initiation of claims programs such as that contemplated under the Polish Claims Agreement of July 16, 1960, and authorized the Commission to set a claims filing period, it did not make provision for establishing the time limit within which the Commission should wind up its affairs in completing the program.

Accordingly, the Commission, anticipating that upward of 20,000 claims may be filed in this program, recommends in the measure that the windup date be set no earlier than 4 years from the last day for filing claims. The date thus recommended is September 30, 1965.

Paragraph 3: The various claims funds administered by the Commission have all been charged with financing the administrative expenses of the Commission. Section 7(b) of title I of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides for the deduction of 5 percent of any payment made on an award for this purpose. Legislation enacted subsequent to title I, i.e., titles III and IV, instead provides for a direct deduction of 5 percent from the respective funds for this purpose. This latter method lifts an extensive administrative burden from the Treasury Department.

It is recommended, therefore, that the cumbersome procedure of section 7(b) be repealed and provisions comparable to those of title IV be substituted.

Paragraph 4: Section 7(c)(1), title I of the International Claims Act of 1949, as amended, presently provides that payment of award be made only to the persons entitled thereto except in cases involving legal disability or death. Where the award does not exceed $500, requirements with respect to

the appointment of a qualified executor or administrator may be waived and payment made to the person or persons found by the Comptroller General to be entitled thereto.

This proposal raises the limit from an award not in excess of $500 to any payment not in excess of $1,000. This will provide for a more orderly and efficient disposal of claims falling within the provision of the act. A similar change was made regarding claims under title IV of the act against the Government of Czechoslovakia.

Paragraph 5. This proposal involves technical changes in the language of subsection C of section 8 of the act which would retain the present payment procedures with respect to claims against the Yugoslav claims fund in the event future prorated payments are made. This is accomplished by including a reference to paragraph (1) of subsection (b) of section 8, under this amendment.

Paragraph 6. This new subsection authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments on account of awards certified by the Commission with respect to claims included within the terms of the Polish Claims Agreement of 1960, and provides payment in order of priority as follows: (1) Payment in the amount of $1,000 or in the principal amount of the award, whichever is less; (2) thereafter payments on a prorated basis on account of the unpaid principal balance of each remaining award. This proration will be made on the basis of the total amount remaining in the Polish claims fund and available for distribution after initial payments have been made; (3) payments on account of the unpaid balance of each award of interest under the same proration provisions.

Under these provisions it is possible for claimants having awards less than $1,000 to receive payment in full, excuding awards of interest. Claimants who receive awards in principal amounts over $1,000 would receive additional payments on a prorated basis.

Paragraph 7. New subsection (b), section 302, title III of the act would provide for the ultimate abolition of the Italian claims fund, the Italian claims program having been completed, and provide for the transfer of the unobligated balance in the fund ($1,088,623.53) into the war claims fund. The rationale for this proposal is that after World War II the Italian Government paid to the United States Government the sum of $5 million under the Lombardo Agreement, August 14, 1947, in settlement of property damage claims not covered under the peace treaty. No reverter clause was included in the agreement.

Under the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, among other things provision was made to compensate members of our Armed Forces who were detained as prisoners of war. These benefits were paid out of the war claims fund, comprised of blocked and vested German and Japanese assets.

Commission records disclose that approximately 20,000 members of the Armed Forces were detained in or by Italy, and who received prisoner of war compensation at an average of $1,500 each. Thus, roughly $30 million of German and Japanese assets were utilized to compensate prisoners of Italy. Accordingly, it is recommended that such balances as remain in the Italian claims fund be utilized to reimburse, in some measure, the war claims fund.

Upon completion of the claims program against the Government of Rumania on August 9, 1959, the Commission has issued 498 awards in the aggregate of $84,729,291 including interest, against a fund in the amount of about $22 million. On March 30, 1960, the Governments of the United States and the Rumanian People's Republic executed an en bloc settlement of these claims of U.S. nationals upon the provision that Rumania pay to the United States an additional $2.5 million in 5 equal annual installments.

Inasmuch as the statute now provides that the Rumanian Fund shall be comprised only of sums blocked, vested and transferred by the Attorney General, the additional sums paid by Rumania cannot be covered into the Fund. New subsection (c) provides the vehicle for accomplishing this purpose.

Paragraphs 8 and 9: Paragraph 8 involves technical changes in the language of section 303, title III of the act to permit the addition of a new paragraph "(4)" as contained in the amendment under paragraph 9. The proposal under paragraph 9 makes provision for disposition of a small number of claims against Rumania, included within the agreement of March 30, 1960, which have arisen since August 9, 1955, as well as any additional similar claims which may be included within agreements the United States may make in the future with Bulgaria and Hungary. Negotiations are currently underway with Bulgaria.

Paragraph 10: This proposal requires the normal publication of the claims filing period in the Federal Register.

Paragraph 11: This proposal revamps the award payment provisions with respect to claims against Rumania or by the execution of a future claims settlement agreement with Bulgaria or Hungary in order to insure that new awardees will not obtain a pecuniary advantage over previous awardees. Awardees under the Rumanian program have received approximately 35 cents on the dollar in payments on their awards. This proposal would limit payments on new awards to a like extent, and then permit the residual balance to be distributed proportionately among all awardees.

Paragraph 12: This proposal requires the Commission to wind up its affairs in the Rumanian claims program within a period of 18 months.

THE TULE-KLAMATH WILDLIFE REFUGES: THE NEED FOR GREATER PROTECTION FOR BOTH BIRDS AND CROPS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill declaring it is the policy of the Congress to stabilize ownership of land in the Klamath Federal reclamation project in Oregon and California, as well as the administration and management of the Klamath Federal reclamation project and the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and the Tule Lake National Refuge. The purpose of this legislation is to preserve the necessary existing habitat for migratory waterfowl in the most vital single area of the Pacific Flyway, and to prevent depredations upon agricultural crops in the Pacific Coast States.

This proposal, I believe, is of importance that extends far beyond interests of the two States immediately concerned. For this reason, it is pertinent to detail a few background facts about the so-called Tule-Klamath complex.

The 35,000-acre Tule Lake Refuge and 43,930-acre Lower Klamath Refuge were created by Executive orders in 1908 and 1911. These areas accommodate the largest concentrations of birds. Two other Federal refuges are in the basin: Upper Klamath, 12,518 acres of bulrush marsh, and Clear Lake, 7,440 acres of rocky terrain and 25,300 acres of water. Both also were created by Executive order in 1911.

In the opinion of qualified specialists in the field of wildlife management, the Tule-Klamath system of refuges is the most important single waterfowl area on the continent, certainly in the United States. It is estimated that 80 percent of all waterfowl in the Pacific flyway pass through this area. Seasoned observers marvel at the concentrations of wild waterfowl which have been estimated to reach peaks of 7,500,000 birds at one time. The annual usage has been calculated as high as 240 million bird days.

While Tule-Klamath is of primary value as a resting and feeding location, it compares favorably to the best Canadian wetlands as a duck production area. Between 115,000 and 120,000 wild ducks, including important numbers of the scarce red heads and ruddy ducks, are hatched and raised at the area each year.

Large numbers of waterfowl pass through the Tule-Klamath region in the spring but the heaviest concentrations occur during a 6-week to 2-month period in the fall. The area at that time offers some of the best waterfowl hunting in the Nation. Sportsmen have plenty of room to shoot in safety without disturbing significant numbers of birds. From 1955 to 1958, the average hunter use of refuge lands was 16,900 man-days on Tule Lake and 22,125 on Lower Klamath.

The autumn, however, also is the time when grain crops are being harvested in the fertile valleys of both Oregon and California. Crop-depredation losses in central California alone have been calculated as high as $1 million for 1 year. Without the Tule-Klamath area to hold the birds, agricultural losses—particularly in rice and wheat—would be much higher.

The U.S. Government's obligations under international treaties with Canada and Mexico for the protection of migratory waterfowl along the Pacific flyway can be met only if the Tule-Klamath complex operates at maximum efficiency.

The need for stabilizing the situation is indicated by the fact that during the past 60 years the marsh and water areas in Tule and Lower Klamath Lakes have dwindled from an original 187,000 acres to only 25,000 acres, and each year additional encroachments are made upon the remnants of the waterfowl habitat or water resources essential to the birds. The recent addition of the 15,000-acre Klamath Indian Marsh has improved the nesting habitat, but the area does not produce cereal crops necessary to hold large fall and spring migrations.

Under the existing arrangement, however, the Bureau of Reclamation has primary jurisdiction over all lands and waters within the refuges. Stabilization of the area, as provided for in my bill, will permit maximum development of refuge lands, together with a minimum loss of waterfowl due to botulism, which has resulted in the loss of as many as 34,000 birds in a single year.

These lands are under reclamation withdrawal status and efforts have been

made to open some 15,000 acres of lands in the Tule Lake area to homesteading. Allegations have been made to the effect that fish and wildlife interests wish to drive farmers out of business. No farmers would be driven out; the 15,000 acres under contention already are being farmed under lease, an arrangement which would be continued. My bill, however, would preclude a homesteading "windfall" on land currently leased for barley farming on a bid basis at an average rate of $35 per acre.

This plan has been recommended or approved by the Interior Department's Advisory Committee on Fish and Wildlife, the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, the California Department of Fish and Game, the Oregon Game Commission, and many private conservation organizations, among them the National and California Wildlife Federations, the Izaak Walton League of America, and the National Audubon Society. In addition, it has the support of many conservationists, hunters, and farmers in my own State.

I am firmly convinced that these farming arrangements plus the sizable income resulting from hunter expenditures will mean more to the local citizenry than possible under any other land ownership plan. In brief, the stabilization of the refuge units made possible through the enactment of the provisions of this bill will mean more to the general public than any other arrangement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed as a part of my remarks and that it lie at the desk through June 1, for Senators who may desire to join as cosponsors.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 1988) to aid in the administration of the Tule Lake, Lower Klamath, and Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuges in Oregon and California, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to stabilize the ownership of the land in the Klamath Federal Reclamation Project, Oregon and California, as well as the administration and management of the Klamath Federal Reclamation project and the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, to preserve intact the necessary existing habitat for migratory waterfowl in this vital area of the Pacific Flyway, and to prevent depredations of migratory waterfowl on agricultural crops in the Pacific Coast States.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, all lands owned by the United States lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, the Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge, and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge are hereby dedicated to wildlife conservation, shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior primarily for waterfowl management purposes, and shall not be opened to homestead entry. The following public lands shall also be administered by the Secretary of the Interior primarily for waterfowl management purposes and shall not be opened to homestead entry: Hanks Marsh, and first form withdrawal lands (approximately 1,440 acres) in Klamath County, Oregon, living adjacent to Upper Klamath National Wildlife Refuge; White Lake in Klamath County, Oregon, and Siskiyou County, California; and thirteen tracts of land in Siskiyou County, California, lettered as tracts "A," "B," "C," "D," "E," "F," "G," "H," "I," "J," "K," "L," and "N" totaling approximately 3,292 acres, and tract "P" in Modoc County, California, containing about 10 acres, all as shown on plate 4 of the report entitled "Plan for Wildlife Use of Federal Lands in the Upper Klamath Basin, Oregon-California," dated April 1956, prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. All the above lands shall remain permanently the property of the United States.

SEC. 3. Fifty cents per acre shall be paid on all reserved public lands lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuge and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, to the counties within which such refuges are located, beginning with the fiscal year 1962: *Provided,* That the total annual payment per acre to each county shall not exceed three-fourths of the average per-acre tax levied on similar lands in private ownership in each county: *Provided further,* That no such payments shall be made which will reduce the contractual obligations of the United States with the Tulelake Irrigation District or the Klamath Drainage District.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall retain in the Bureau of Reclamation or other bureau or agency within the Department of the Interior the full authority to lease the reserved public lands lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Lower Klamath and the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges. Leases for agricultural purposes shall provide for the growing of grains, forage, and soil-building crops, except that not more than 25 percent of the leased lands may be planted to row crops.

SEC. 5. The area of the water surface of the active sumps in the Klamath project lying within the Executive order boundaries of the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge shall not be reduced by diking or any other means to less than the existing 13,000 acres.

SEC. 6. In carrying out the obligations of the United States under any migratory bird treaty, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (40 Stat. 775), as amended, or the Migratory Bird Conservation Act (45 Stat. 1222), as amended, waters under the control of the Secretary of the Interior shall be so regulated as to provide the quantity necessary (1) to maintain sump levels, as established by contractual rules and regulations, in the Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuge, and (2) to maintain the ultimate developments in the Upper and Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuges which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, will provide biologically suitable habitat for waterfowl utilization.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1961

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the retraining of unemployed workers, as recommended by the President in his message to Congress today. Joining me as cosponsors of the bill are the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who was the author of a bill on this subject introduced in the last Congress; the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; the Senators from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA and Mr. HART]; the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

The bill is a broader and modified version of the bill which I introduced in this session, S. 987, and which is cosponsored by Senators RANDOLPH, HART, PELL, and SMITH of Massachusetts.

I am indeed honored to have been selected by the President to introduce the measure, which will be referred to the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I have the honor to be the chairman of that subcommittee.

The subcommittee has already heard a number of witnesses on S. 987 and is almost at the point where we can proceed to report the retraining legislation. Hearings, including hearings on the administration bill, will be concluded next Wednesday, June 7. Secretary of Labor Goldberg will be the opening witness, at 9:30 a.m. Other persons who wish to be heard are invited to appear later on that morning.

Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study in detail the provisions of the President's bill; therefore, I would not wish to be understood as endorsing every single section or element in it. It may well be that witnesses will reveal the desirability of some changes and amendments. I am confident, however, that a training bill which will embrace the principles advocated by the President will promptly be reported by the subcommittee, will be approved by the full committee, and will be placed on the calendar for early consideration and passage.

The witnesses who testified before our subcommittee, I believe, without a single exception, supported the principle that many unemployed workers whose skills have become obsolete, because of automation or other changes in the economy, must be retrained before they can hope to be reemployed. This is particularly true of workers over 30. There was also general agreement that this is an appropriate field for Federal action.

There has been enough successful experience in several of the States, including Pennsylvania, to prove that the objective is a feasible one. Retraining does make possible the reemployment of workers who otherwise have only the slimmest chances of getting jobs. By enabling these workers to contribute to the economy, and by reducing unemployment compensation and public assistance costs, we clearly more than pay for the cost of the training.

Among the provisions of the bill on which I reserve judgment are those which would authorize a Federal contribution to the relocation of unemployed workers. As a general proposition, I support the objective of bringing industry to the communities where the unemployed live, rather than the other way about. That was the conception behind the Area Redevelopment Act, which we

passed earlier this year. To indicate the reaction of some of the people of my Commonwealth to the idea of relocation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a press release issued by the Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission and a letter I have received from the Hazleton City School Board, signed by Mr. Stewart S. Veale, secretary of the board. Their comments were based on newspaper reports to the effect that the administration was planning relocation legislation.

There being no objection, the press release and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAZLETON, PA., May 23.—Grave concern over prospects that the Federal Government may bracket an attack on chronic unemployment by planning to relocate idle workers from labor surplus areas was heard throughout northeastern Pennsylvania today.

While unconfirmed reports have leaked out of the offices of the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare that the administration was considering this "ruthless approach technique" by shifting families from one area to another, Joseph A. Loftus, in a copyrighted story in Sunday's New York Times, reported the move in the mill.

He led off, "For the first time, the Federal Government will propose an attack on the problem of chronic unemployment areas by relocating workers and their families.

"A message on the state of the economy, now in the drafting stage, will propose additionally a training and retraining program for the unemployed and for youths who have not charted a vocation or career."

Victor C. Diehm, president of the Northeast Pennsylvania Industrial Development Commission, queried Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges and William L. Batt, Jr., new Area Redevelopment Administrator, who visited northeastern Pennsylvania last week, whether it was true that the Federal Government was contemplating such a relocation plan.

Both Hodges and Batt bypassed the question, but Mr. Diehm vehemently protested the application of any such plan to northeastern Pennsylvania. He said that every chamber of commerce, every labor union, and every government group who have only sketchy knowledge of the proposal have joined in opposition to any program to recruit individuals and families for relocation with or without training.

"What the people of northeastern Pennsylvania's several labor surplus areas ask of the Federal Government is a realistic system of Federal installations and Federal contracts to take up the unemployment slack," Mr. Diehm said.

"We have the human resources—our fine people, and all of the community facilities—churches, schools, cultural activities, financial and government operations well established. If planners are to plan, let them plan to help us, not to develop some grandiose scheme that will relocate part of our population," the NPIDC president said.

"I am dispatching an invitation to Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg to come into northeastern Pennsylvania and join Gov. David L. Lawrence and ourselves for a full discussion of our jobless problem before the administration makes any announcement," Mr. Diehm said.

To further quote from the New York Times story, "To help the chronically depressed and individuals who have been hurt by advancing technology, the President is expected to ask Congress to authorize the expenditure of several hundred million dollars to move families out of these areas and to train and retrain workers.

"The Employment Service of the Labor Department and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department would administer the program. Unemployed heads of families who are capable of retraining would get the highest priority in the relocation program."

HAZLETON CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Hazleton, Pa., May 25, 1961.

Hon. JOSEPH CLARK,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CLARK: I have been requested to convey to you the opposition of the Hazleton City School Board to the proposal of the U.S. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to relocate unemployed persons from distressed areas in other areas of the Nation.

We can hardly conceive of a purportedly responsible person conjuring up a proposal of such an inhumane nature, to say nothing of the effect on the economies of the areas involved.

We have schools, hospitals, churches, stores and other business establishments which not only accomodate these people but which depend on their continuance in this community. To flood another community with them would only create additional problems there.

We do not suggest that the economies of other areas be disturbed by moving all or any part of their industries to distressed areas. Rather, when established businesses are faced with the need of expanding or establishing a branch, we recommend that such plants be located in distressed areas such as Hazleton.

You know what our Can-Do program has meant to this city and for only a fraction of the cost entailed in such a transplanting of persons as the Secretary proposed, Federal funds could make a program like our Can-Do perform miracles.

In this connection, too, we recommend that local vocational school facilities be used to retrain unemployed persons so that they may be fitted for such job opportunities as can be made available by the operation of our Can-Do and Scranton's life.

The Hazleton City School Board has long fought the problem of dwindling school enrollments (from in excess of 8,000 pupils to approximately 4,600). This loss of enrollment, coupled with increasing operating costs, has caused a staggering increase in our cost per pupil. The still further drain contemplated by the Secretary's recommendation would be a crushing blow and, doubtless, would signal the end of the very fine educational program traditionally offered in the Hazleton schools.

Therefore, we earnestly solicit your support in dissuading the Secretary from further pursuit of this most rapacious proposal.

This letter was authorized by the Hazleton City School Board meeting in special session, Tuesday evening, May 23, 1961.

Yours very truly,
STEWART S. VEALE,
Secretary.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, it is true that the President's bill contains a provision respecting the relocation of labor. My own view is that that may not be desirable, but I would wish to hear the testimony of competent witnesses before making up my mind. It may be that there are cases in which relocation may be necessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1991) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CLARK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at the next printing of the bill (S. 650) to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to permit certain new organizations to sponsor works of improvement thereunder, introduced by me on January 30, 1961, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] may be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ITEM VETO—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I desire to address a question to the distinguished Senator from New York. Do I correctly understand that the Senator introduced a joint resolution providing for the item veto on appropriation bills?

Mr. KEATING. A constitutional amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator do me the honor to permit me to become a cosponsor of his measure?

Mr. KEATING. I shall be delighted to do so.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to disapproval of items in general appropriation bills.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. I have supported the item veto proposal ever since I came to the Senate. I think it is a most desirable reform.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I am grateful to him for his willingness to join as a cosponsor of the joint resolution. I myself feel that it is the single most important step which Congress could take to effectuate greater economy and efficiency in government.

Mr. CLARK. I congratulate the Senator from New York upon the effort he is making in that regard.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from address delivered by him over Wisconsin radio stations, dealing with proposed establishment of dairy research

center at Madison, Wis., and other features of the dairy program.

Excerpts from address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, on May 28, 1961, dealing with the question of voluntary mobilization against communism.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Editorial entitled "New Electoral System," published in the Washington Post of May 29, 1961; also a statement by him before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on May 23, 1961, on the same subject.

By Mr. METCALF:

Article from Charlotte (N.C.) Observer of February 7, 1961; excerpt from CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1959; and three letters from Mr. E. S. Dillard, of Charlotte, N.C., dealing with a tax case involving certain of Mr. Dillard's deductions for charity.

FLOOD CONTROL PROJECTS IN KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the recent floodwaters on the Solomon and Saline Rivers and their tributaries in north central Kansas have caused damages that will entail millions of dollars of loss to farms, crops, homes, and highways.

These floods again demonstrate the urgency of securing Federal funds for the completion of authorized reservoirs on these streams and additional money for accelerated action on programs for watershed projects which already are planned.

The recent floods in our Kansas streams have demonstrated the value of both of these programs in the control of water runoff and the protection of our citizens from damaging floods.

The chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for Civil Works projects, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], advises me that hearings will be held on June 12 and 13 on the allocation of funds for these and other projects.

Additional funds will be needed for an expanded watershed control program, and hearings on this matter will be held later.

Early action is badly needed, and I am giving my full support to both of these programs.

CONTROL OF BILLBOARD BLIGHT

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, within the next 30 days the Congress must decide on extension of the national policy for control of billboards along the Interstate Highway System. Section 122 of the highway bill, enacted in 1958, will expire on July 1, unless action is taken before that time.

The national policy for billboard regulation emphasizes that among its purposes is the protection of the public investment in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Latest estimates indicate that investment of public funds for these roads will aggregate about $41 billion during the next decade. Thus, Mr. President, at this session we shall be making a major decision for the next generation of Americans. Those who use the highway system in the 1970's and beyond will judge the wisdom of our decision.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the Senate Public Works Committee will amend the highway bill now before it, so that the national policy for regulation of billboards will not be wiped out at the end of next month. We have a great responsibility in protecting the scenic beauty of our Nation, as well as in giving protection to the dollars spent in highway building.

Mr. President, there is every indication that a growing number of States intend to implement the national policy by adopting billboard regulation standards approved by the Secretary of Commerce. I have been advised by the Bureau of Public Roads that two States—Maryland and North Dakota—have adopted standards which fully comply with the program. Ten other States have passed legislation to comply, and are awaiting or seeking approval of the Secretary of Commerce of their regulations. These States are Wisconsin, Kentucky, Delaware, West Virginia, New York, Connecticut, Virginia, Washington, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. Unless the billboard policy is extended, these States may not have completed their qualifying efforts by June 30, and would lose the one-half of 1 percent bonus in highway funds which the States receive for carrying out the national policy.

Legislation to meet the standards is pending before legislatures in many other States. I think we must give the States every possible opportunity to qualify in the control program. Otherwise, the 41,000-mile network of roads will be doomed to eternal billboard blight.

The threat of billboard blight on the Nation's highways is emphasized in an article appearing in the current issue of the Audubon magazine, the official publication of the Audubon Society. I ask unanimous consent that the article—from the May–June 1961 issue of Audubon magazine—be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLBOARD BLIGHT THREATENS NATIONAL HIGHWAY PROGRAM

(By Gerald Krefetz)

Billboard blight, with all the unsightly effects of a disfiguring disease, is hovering ominously over the national roadbuilding program. Congress will do much to prevent this ailment, common to all new highways, if it extends a 2-year provision in the 1958 Highway Act, which expires on June 30.

Possibly by the time this magazine reaches the reader this action already may have been taken, in which case the battling billboarders will shift their efforts once again back to the various State legislatures. The 1958 2-year provision allowed States that passed some form of billboard control conforming with national standards a bonus of one-half of 1 percent of the total cost of highways built in their boundaries under the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways Act of 1956.

Since the Federal Government provides 90 percent of the cost of the highways, every State in the Union eagerly accepted the 1956 plum which allocated $25 billion for 41,000 miles of roads under a 13-year program.

While the act cleaned the prospective multilane high-speed limited-access routes of all service stations and rest stops, it neglected, however, to make any such restrictions on billboards. Congress thus attempted to correct this oversight in its 1958 Highway Act, offering an incentive program for the States. Rather than legislate direct control, a move that was fought bitterly by the billboard interests, Congress initiated the voluntary bonus system.

In order to qualify for the bonus the States have to pass legislation that bans advertising billboard signs within 660 feet of the rights-of-way. These regulations applied only to newly constructed roads, not to those already built and which are to be incorporated into the National System. The controls also do not extend to municipalities or zoned commercial and industrial areas.

The act allows businesses within 660 feet of the road to advertise themselves on their own property, provided that the signs are within 50 feet of the actual activity. Such signs are to have no moving parts, no unshielded lights, and are to be no larger than 150 square feet.

Also, information points immediately off the highways will provide directories of services, historic spots, and other pertinent information. Businesses within 12 miles of such information sites are permitted to advertise on these directories for a modest rate.

By most standards, the regulations are modest enough, covering about 65 percent of the 41,000-mile system. As it is, the 41,000 miles are a little more than 1 percent of the total national mileage of 3,450,000. On their own, some States have passed laws that are considerably more restrictive than the Federal qualifications. Nevertheless, at this writing, only Maryland has applied for the Federal bonus. Wisconsin has passed the appropriate legislation, but the law has been challenged in the State courts. Connecticut, Virginia, North Dakota, and Kentucky have also passed conforming legislation, but have made no attempt to apply for the bonus.

In the rest of the States, the billboard people have successfully thwarted legislative attempts for the movement. However, the Bureau of Roads has received proposed legislation from 30 States to determine whether their measures will qualify them for bonuses. Once this is ascertained, most of the States will try to initiate legislation and several battles royal are now brewing.

The local skirmishes are really little more than delaying actions. Billboard men see the terminal qualifying date of June 30 as the second and final victory. Their first, of course, was in getting Congress to put the whole matter of control on a local and a permissive basis. If the Federal carrot should be withdrawn on that date, States, so they reason, will have no financial incentive and little reason to control billboards.

Though the interstate network mileage is statistically insignificant, the billboard lobby has already estimated that between 15 and 20 percent of the Nation's traffic will use these roads. With this at stake the billboarders are stressing three principal lines of attack:

1. When it comes to billboard regulation all outdoor advertising agencies become strong advocates of States rights. This was the argument used so successfully in 1958 when Congress was considering the matter. Since the States own the roads, they contend (even if they are largely financed by the Federal Government) highway regulation should be an internal State issue. If the State begins to consider such regulations, however, the billboarders about-face and insist that advertising needs no outside policing since the industry had its own code of practice—a spurious argument since, traditionally, the billboard industry has fought any form of control. And Federal controls are feared more than any other, since they are likely to be more thoroughly enforced.

That the industry will police itself is dubious. When the Pennsylvania Turnpike was built, the industry promised that it

would remain free from billboards. Any motorist can evaluate these promises by a short trip on that turnpike.

2. The next line of defense holds that a landowner may do as he sees fit with his freehold. Anyone contending that there may be limits to the rights of property is accused of socialism, statism, and of undermining the capitalistic system. Actually, several State judicial decisions have found that property owners have definite responsibilities as to how they use their land. New York's appellate division last summer declared one sign so distracting to traffic safety that the superintendent of public works was granted permission to bar it along major highways through the use of easements. Other States such as Ohio, California, and Vermont use similar steps to keep their rights-of-way clear of disturbing signs.

3. The billboarders' final point is one of safety. They claim that signboards have no relation to accidents, in fact, actually prevent accidents by shocking motorists out of hypnotic trances in which some presumably fall. Motorists will doubtlessly answer that the dull banalities of most billboards are more likely to induce sleep than prevent it while others will recall that signboards have diverted attention when the driver's eyes should have been on the road.

When the billboarders claim that signboards are attacked only by aesthetes and garden club women they show symptoms of myopia to the growing ranks of the opposition including such diverse groups as State grange associations, the American Automobile Association, chapters of the American Institute of Architects, the American Society of Planning Officials, conservationists and sportsmen. Most of these individuals and organizations are not hostile to advertising per se but they are beginning to realize that outdoor advertising is not a legitimate business. It is selling something that it doesn't own—your field of vision. This was the argument of Howard Gossage, a San Francisco advertising man, carried in Harper's magazine, February 1960, a point of view strongly supported by President Carl W. Buchheister, of National Audubon Society, in the September–October 1960 issue of Audubon magazine.

The action by Congress in 1958 to provide bonuses to the States for billboard controls states that these are established "to preserve the country's scenic assets." The billboard builders have tried to counter this by saying that their signboards are superior to the scenery. Fear and uncertainty are spread through leaflets, flyers, pamphlets, and newsletters.

Oregon is a classic example of how this technique defeated an attempt to preserve Oregon highways from billboard blight. For a generation civic organizations in Oregon had attempted to push through some form of outdoor advertising regulation. Invariably, the State legislature, heavily in debt to the billboard people for strategic and cutrate sign space during election campaigns, either turned such legislation down, modified it to the point of meaninglessness, or drafted it to conform to advertising wishes.

Unable to seek redress from the legislature, civic groups initiated a petition to bring the matter before the voters on election day. The late Senator Richard Neuberger had predicated that such a referendum would be carried by a vote of 4 to 1, but during the last 2 months of the campaign the billboard firms inundated the State with leaflets that screamed in large black type: "Oregon's $176 million tourist industry would suffer heavy loss," an argument which tourists will indeed question. The leaflets were supplemented by over 400 key billboards, all similarly distorting the issue. The measure was defeated by a 2-to-1 vote.

Sworn statements later showed that the Highway Protection Committee spent about $10,000 advocating billboard control; the advertising forces spent $107,967.50. One ironic touch remains: absentee ballots cast 2 to 3 weeks before the election and before the final confusion induced by the advertisers ran 2 to 1 for billboard regulation. The tourist argument, of course, assumes that tourists and travelers will go hungry and sleepless because there is no billboard to tell them where to eat or sleep.

At this writing, the States of Washington and Pennsylvania are on the verge of passing billboard control legislation before the June 30 deadline. President Kennedy's remarks in his highway message of February 28, urging Congress to extend the bonus provision for another 4 years, acted like a spring breeze to refresh and encourage the conservation and civic groups in their battle for billboard controls. The President even suggested that the bonus be raised another one-half of 1 percent to give the States added incentive.

With such high level help our new highway system may yet be saved from billboard blight, but the fight will not be easy.

DEVELOPMENTS AT LINFIELD RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in an age when scientific progress and refinement are becoming more and more the prerogatives of the giant corporation, it is well to remember that some of our greatest achievements have enjoyed humble beginnings. In the community of McMinnville, in Oregon's lush Willamette Valley, is located the Linfield Research Institute, on the lovely campus of Linfield College. The director of the institute is Dr. Walter Dyke, one of our country's pioneers in radar research during World War II. Recently an Oregon newspaper published an article about Dr. Dyke's latest "New Frontier" scientific endeavor, field emission. According to some observers, the work now being done by Dr. Dyke and his staff may well prove to revolutionize the radiology world. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Oregonian of April 27 entitled "Peaceful McMinnville Possesses 'Bomb'" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING THE DOLLAR—PEACEFUL MCMINNVILLE POSSESSES "BOMB"

(By Gerry Pratt)

McMINNVILLE.—Southward from Portland through the full tide of a Willamette spring is McMinnville where the roadside stands have moved aside the last of the Winter Kings for boxes of fresh rhubarb and bedding flats of pansy starts and petunias.

It's a gentle, yet pregnant, setting for the small college town that harbors the industrial bomb that is in the making in McMinnville today—the Field Emission Corp. of Dr. Walter Dyke.

Here, in what was 60 days ago a Chevrolet garage, men are laying the strategy for what they believe will be the revolution of the radiology world. Their weapon, a flash X-ray device that when applied to medicine will eliminate blurred X-rays and the "take a deep breath—now hold it," of your thermal X-ray examinations of today.

The corporation's basic device has already proved its capabilities to the Ph. D.'s, and research technicians of centers like the applied physics labs of Johns Hopkins; the Naval Weapons Research Laboratory in Virginia; at DuPont in New Jersey; the Frankfort Armory in Philadelphia, and Sandia Air Corp., in New Mexico, and the list doesn't end there.

STORY HAS ONLY BEGUN

According to Sales Manager Dan Browning, the marketing story has only begun to be told. Browning, a B–52 development scientist with a master's degree in mechanical engineering, has a typically cautious engineer's approach to question of potential for the corporation's projects.

But Stan Bennett, the corporation's general manager, said of the first 2 years' operation: "Our first year earnings were able to take care of our depreciation and all of our operating expenditures. Our second year we were able to break into profit."

Bennett, with a master's in electrical engineering, and Browning, are examples of the management philosophies Dr. Dyke has put to work in field emission to answer the problems of handling such a highly technical business.

"Whether or not it is good fiscal judgment to make expenditures will depend on technical factors," he explained. "Whether it's an investment or just another expense depends on how creative it is. This you can only judge if you understand the technical aspects of the operation. What may look unjustifiable from a fiscal view, may turn out the best investment you ever made if it's technically creative, if it leads to a new product."

The challenge in that philosophy has attracted top technical men to Dyke's project. One executive said: "This is the biggest group of field emission scientists in the United States—right here."

The story of the development of Field Emission Corp. began in the years following World War II, when Dr. Dyke left his radar research work at MIT to take up a professorship in physics at Linfield. Dyke is an alumnus of Linfield, which also taught his father and his mother. The best Linfield could offer the young scientist was less than $2,500 a year. "But Walt felt he should contribute something to the school," an associate recalled, "so he came anyway."

Dyke taught, and when those he taught were ready he founded Linfield Research Institute at the college and began the basic research into the techniques of field emission, or high-speed X-rays.

After 10 years of basic research, there were 5 aimed at developing a device to put to work the research knowledge, and then in July of 1958, with no manufacturing facility to handle the project, he formed Field Emission, a closely held private corporation.

There was in the beginning a payroll of three. There are 110 today, and the feeling you get at the converted Chevrolet showroom is that this is only the skeleton of what is to come. In its 2 years of production the corporation's payroll has blossomed to between $450,000 and $500,000 a year, with products known only by model numbers among the researchers who use them.

There is the 215—a $9,000 unit for the high-velocity studies necessary for research into space and the effect of meteorite bombardings.

Then there is the 201—a $24,000 machine used in radiation damage studies of component parts. Its application in researching the effects of outer-space radiation on the mechanisms of space vehicles has been vital.

VITAL OUTER SPACE RESEARCH

Third and most recent is the 210, a $2,400 40-pound portable X-ray with the high-speed properties of field emission. There seems to be countless uses for an X-ray machine that can be carried about like a suitcase and that takes X-ray pictures without the subject so much as slowing down.

And now, under plant security that requires special admission badges for visitors, Field Emission is developing the product its scientists feel will move into the vast market of clinical X-rays. The marketing potentials of this unit when priced competitively with thermal X-ray units are astounding. One engineer, putting it mildly, said: "It's nice to have your market before you have your product."

Dyke speaks guardedly of the marketing potential, though he's proud that what has been done without a single sale in Oregon. "We bring the money in and spend it here," was his way of explaining it.

"Half of our gross income is from research project contracts," he said. "There is more basic research and more development now than we have ever had."

And to men like Browning that research and development means: "We will always have a new product."

And to McMinnville that's going to be even more important than the fresh rhubarb stands.

EXCHANGE OF TRACTORS FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on May 23 I spoke briefly on this floor in expressing my opposition to the movement, which is afoot, to proceed by private means, not through a governmental agency, to comply with Castro's proposal that he be sent 500 tractors, in exchange for 1,200 prisoners. I felt that that proposal by Castro had all the earmarks of blackmail, and that the acceptance of the proposal would constitute an abject surrender to blackmailing by this Communist dictator.

Since that time I have pondered the subject, and my conviction has become deeper that what is being done is an indefensible mistake, and in the end will cause great complications and difficulties to our Government, as follows:

First. We shall be yielding to blackmail.

Second. In yielding to the blackmail, we shall be indicating to the people of the world that we lack courage and that we run for cover when the dictator speaks.

Third. In my opinion, we shall add fuel to the condemnations and aspersions that have been made of our people in the "Ugly American."

Fourth. In these days, as we are approaching Memorial Day, which is tomorrow, Tuesday, I cannot see how we can sing the praise of and psalms to the fallen dead who gave their lives for our country while at this time we are abjectly surrendering to the blackmail of the dictator.

It is not becoming to our honor. It is not in the interest of our country. The complications and the losses that will follow in the years to come are, in my opinion, incalculable.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on May 24 I issued a statement to the papers of my State, expressing my views about the Castro proposal to exchange Cuban prisoners for tractors to be furnished from the United States. Today, I would like to make a similar statement on the subject so that it will appear in the RECORD.

I have listened to the arguments which have been made by many Senators against the Castro proposal, and I agree it deserves the fullest consideration and discussion by Members of the Congress. Castro's offer is a form of blackmail, and it shows his callous contempt for human life. And it represents the kind of contempt Castro has for the opinion and feelings of the people of our country.

Nevertheless, I believe the United States has no choice other than to provide means to secure the release of the prisoners approximately 1,200 in number, captured in the ill-fated landing. I say this because it was the final decision of the United States which sent these men into Cuba, and into captivity. Whatever arguments may be made about the deficiencies on intelligence in the CIA, and on the advice of the Department of Defense, it is correct that, finally, the President of the United States decided to give support to the Cubans who landed in Cuba.

If these men were citizens of the United States, we would have other means to secure their liberation, even, if necessary, that of physical force; but we know that our force will not be used to liberate the Cuban prisoners.

The United States bears a special responsibility toward the prisoners. It is a responsibility which arises from the decision of the U.S. Government and of the President of the United States to support the ill-fated landing which resulted in their captivity.

I have not mentioned the moral and humanitarian aspects of the problem. They are important but we are not always able to fulfill every humanitarian appeal. But in this case they have particular significance, because of the responsibility assumed by our Government in the landings.

I make one other point. As I understand, the President has been quoted as saying that he supports as a private citizen the efforts being made by the private committee to secure the release of the Cubans.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, may I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Very well.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for an additional minute.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it seems to me the provision for tax deductions to contributors and of export licenses represent a tacit official approval of tractor-prisoner exchange. In these circumstances I think it would be proper and in harmony with the facts for the President of the United States to say that he officially supports the movement. It would assure our people that the foreign policy of our country is being conducted by the President of the United States.

So I wish to summarize my points:

First, I support the proposal because the United States bears some responsibility for the landings, and I am not arguing the merits of the decision made at that time.

Second, I believe the President should say that he supports officially the private venture, for otherwise the impression may be held that our policy, and particularly our action respecting Cuba, are decided by private citizens, rather than the President of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial of the Louisville Courier-Journal of May 26, 1961, entitled "We Have a Moral Duty Toward the Captive Cubans." I think it is a good and compelling editorial.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE A MORAL DUTY TOWARD THE CAPTIVE CUBANS

Those inexorably widening ripples from the abortive Cuban invasion have not ceased to cause us trouble. The complex and mystifying tractor deal is another example.

Fidel Castro played a shrewd card when he sent a delegation of Cubans captured during the invasion to negotiate a deal by which other prisoners would be liberated in exchange for 500 tractors. Typically, Castro specified no particular number or type of prisoners, nor did he make clear what sort of tractors he would accept and for what purpose. He has talked vaguely since of an exchange of civil prisoners and his negotiators seem as much in the dark as to what may eventually come of their mission as we are.

Nevertheless we bear a grave responsibility for the plight of the captured Cubans. We trained them, armed them, disregarded their advice, and sent them to almost certain disaster. In spite of angry cries of blackmail echoing throughout Congress, we have a moral responsibility to do what we can toward saving the lives of people we led into such a mess.

It is this responsibility which seems to have led President Kennedy into further involvements with a most unsavory proposal. The thought of exchanging men's lives for machines is repugnant, but it is the lives which count; not the machines, not the thought that a tinpot dictator is laughing at our dilemma, not even the fact that he is now claiming the tractors as reparations.

THE ONLY DECENT WAY

The President apparently has attempted to handle the deal unofficially, by asking reputable citizens to serve as a fund raising committee for the tractor purchase. But it quickly became obvious that the citizens' committee could not act in a leval vacuum. It has to have legal clearance for shipment of the machines. Somebody has to reduce Castro's offhand proposal to practical terms, to arrange who will be rescued and when. Mr. Kennedy, carefully explaining that he was not offering governmental countenance to the venture, nevertheless suggested tax exemptions for donors and further aroused the ire of the men on Capitol Hill.

But cries of blackmail, condemnation of the moral tone of the proposal, and defiance of Castro simply do not discharge our obligation to people whom we encouraged in a suicidal venture. We have got to do everything humanly possible to rescue these men alive and President Kennedy is apparently trying an elaborate device by which the American people and not the American Government will pay the ransom.

Cuba so far has been an unqualified disaster to this administration. There is nothing heroic in the mopping up operations that must still be undertaken. But they are necessary and failure to go through with them would only worsen the already bruised

image of our competence and human concern that the Cuba episode presented to the world. We have already given Castro a propaganda bonus. The tractor deal is only a further installment. We might yet, if irate Congressmen have their way, repudiate it and shout defiance of our bearded taunter. But if we do this we shall look heartless as well as inept. Unpleasant as it is, the tractors for freedom committee is probably the only decent way to handle a not very decent proposition.

FORTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENT REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Sunday, May 28, marked the 43d anniversary of the establishment of the independent Republic of Armenia. This event has been observed by more than one-half million Armenian-Americans throughout our Nation.

It is a matter of history that within 2 years after the auspicious founding of the Republic, Soviet acts of aggression destroyed Armenia's fabric of democratic government.

It is also true that Armenians still long for the resurrection of a free Armenian state.

Therefore, it is appropriate on this occasion to express our sincere hopes and good wishes to our Armenian friends. Truly we hail the cultural and civic achievements of our American-Armenian organizations and look forward in friendship to the rebirth of the independent Republic of Armenia.

R. JAMES MALLOY HONORED

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it was a source of great satisfaction to me and to Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, of the First Congressional District of Colorado, to learn recently of the action of the Denver Federal Business Association in designating our mutual friend, R. James Malloy, of Denver, as "Federal Administrator of the Year."

Jim Malloy is a truly dedicated man. He has given so freely of his own time and energy to literally dozens of good causes that it would take hours to catalog them adequately. Both as an official of the Reclamation Bureau and as a private individual he is the kind of man one is proud to call a friend and fellow citizen.

It is hard to single out one achievement in a career so crowded with worthwhile endeavors, but probably the thing which stands out in my mind and that of Congressman ROGERS is the work done by Jim Malloy in developing the vast Cherry Creek flood control reservoir southeast of Denver as a recreation site.

For many months Byron and I worked with Jim to gain agreement from all the necessary authorities to impound a portion of these runoff waters as a permanent pool. At the same time, in Denver, Jim Malloy was plugging tirelessly away at the task of obtaining commitments for State development of this potentially magnificent site for boating, fishing, swimming, picnicking, camping, and similar outdoor use.

These efforts paid off splendidly. The Cherry Creek Reservoir became the first major State recreation area to be developed by the Colorado Parks and Recreation Department, in cooperation with the State game and fish department and other agencies. It has already drawn thousands of visitors. When fully developed, in a few short years, it will become a playground for hundreds of thousands of city dwellers and tourists. And if any one man deserves credit, it is Jim Malloy.

As president of the Colorado Boating Association, Jim has continued to work away at his goal of making publicly owned reservoirs available to the public for water sports. He is credited with leading the drive for an agreement by which four lakes operated by the Denver Water Board have been opened to public boating and other recreational use.

He has been a great credit to the Denver office of the Bureau of Reclamation, winning awards for efficiency; reducing waste and delay; looking diligently after the welfare of the 50 employees who work directly under him, and, in general, adding luster to the reputation of this outstanding Federal installation.

In addition to this, Jim Malloy has been a pillar of the Leyden-Chiles-Wickersham Post No. 1 of the American Legion in Denver for 16 years and has served with distinction as chairman of the post's civil-service committee, helping many veterans with their problems involving Federal employment.

His other good works and public-spirited activities are so numerous that I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the citation and nominating summary for R. James Malloy as "Federal Administrator of the Year"; a news story that appeared in the Denver Post on May 18, 1961; and portions of a letter received by me from my good friend, Mr. Marshall Reddish, vice commander of the Colorado Department of the American Legion.

There being no objection, the various items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECLAMATION OFFICIAL ADMINISTRATOR OF YEAR

A U.S. Bureau of Reclamation official, who has long been a leader in recreational development in Colorado, Thursday was honored by the Denver Federal Business Association as "Federal Administrator of the Year."

The award, presented at the association's luncheon meeting of the Denver Chamber of Commerce building, went to R. James Malloy, 811 South Gilpin Street, Chief of the Duplicating Branch of the Bureau's Division of Administrative Services.

Col. W. J. Allen, Jr., commander of the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, was installed as the new president of the association, succeeding Walter E. Elder, regional director of the U.S. Civil Service Commission.

From nominations submitted by heads of Federal agencies in Denver, the association chooses an administrator of the year on the basis of leadership in civic affairs and contribution to community welfare outside of his job.

Malloy, president of the Colorado Boating Club, was a key figure in development of Cherry Creek Reservoir as a recreation site. His activities helped lead to a new U.S. Interior Department policy of placing increasing emphasis on development of planned Federal reservoirs.

Malloy has held numerous posts and committee chairmanships in American Legion Post No. 1 and is active in many other organizations.

FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR OF THE YEAR

Annually the Denver Federal Business Association—the coordinating agency of Federal activities—solicits nominations from the heads of all Federal agencies in the Denver area for consideration of the DFBA honor award as Federal Administrator of the Year.

This annual award is given to the employee who in the opinion of the committee has given unselfishly more than the average amount of time to civic activities which improve the health, welfare, etc., of the people of this area.

The purpose of the award is to give recognition to those Federal employees, both civilian and military, who actually do participate and assist in community (civic) affairs in a very active manner above and beyond the requirements of their regular Federal employment. The Committee emphasizes that it is the civic activities that are judged and not the position or grade of the nominee.

On March 30, 1961, the Office of Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, submitted the name of R. James Malloy as that agency's candidate for the Federal Administrator of the Year award for 1961, supported by the attached justification.

This award will be presented to the successful candidate in May 1961.

NOMINATION FOR FEDERAL ADMINISTRATOR OF THE YEAR

1. DEMONSTRATED INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION IN WELFARE ACTIVITIES

His participation in welfare activities have been especially effective in the field of recreational development for the people of Colorado. He, more than any other individual in the State, deserves credit for the initiating and continuing the development of water recreational facilities throughout Colorado. These accomplishments have not been easily attained but are the result of his leadership, foresight, and zealous efforts and at considerable personal expense. The facilities resulting from these efforts have benefited and are now being enjoyed by thousands of Colorado residents, as well as its many out-State visitors. Moreover, these activities have had a nationwide impact on current and future legislation on recreational development at the State and Federal levels. Specifically, he has applied his talents, energy, and special knowledge to the following areas of recreational development:

(a) His efforts have led to the development of Cherry Creek Reservoir as a recreational site.

(b) He has personally negotiated agreements with the Denver Water Board to open four reservoirs for recreational use.

(c) In collaboration with the State director of parks and recreation he wrote Colorado's boating bill which was passed by the Colorado General Assembly in 1959.

(d) He spent several weeks with the 1960 general assembly, appearing before committees of both houses personally sponsoring to a successful conclusion house bill 37 which prohibits guns, power saws, lathes, fishing tackle, snow and water skis, boats, and all hobby equipment not used for the production of income from appearing on the tax rolls.

(e) He has been in great demand as a speaker before sporting and boating groups. In 1960 he gave talks in Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, and New Mexico and had 33 formal

speaking engagements in Colorado on recreational development activities.

(f) In March 1960, in his capacity of president of the Colorado Boating Club and representative of other outside organizations, he informed the Colorado congressional delegation, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Commissioner of Reclamation that recreational facilities on Federal reservoirs in Colorado were inadequate and that the Federal Government should develop these areas with Federal funds to accommodate today's public use requirements. The new Secretary of the Interior, in March 1961, speaking before the 26th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington, D.C., stated: "but in the past recreational values of Federal reservoirs have received altogether too little attention. It is our intention to prepare plans to fully utilize recreational opportunities of new and existing reservoirs and to seek appropriations for their development." Those close to this problem in the department of natural resources, State of Colorado, feel that the Secretary's statement is a direct result of his initiative in this respect.

2. DEMONSTRATED INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION IN CIVIC ACTIVITIES NOT DIRECTLY ASSOCIATED WITH REGULAR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

During the past 16 years he has participated in many civic and veterans' activities sponsored by the American Legion, Post No. 1, Denver, Colo. During this period he has served as chairman and/or member of the following committees: Americanism, baseball, bowling, Boy Scouts, Boys' State, budget and finance, child welfare, father and son banquet, Federal civil service, fishing derby, hospital, legislation, membership, Memorial Day, oratorical contest, publicity, Reveille newspaper, Fourth of July Salute to America, sick, tennis, Christmas Tide of Toys, United Fund, the American Legion National Convention, Denver, Colo., September 9–15, 1961.

These committee assignments have demanded much of his time, which was given freely and has benefited thousands of Colorado's youths, many of which were underprivileged. In addition, as chairman of the Legion Federal Civil Service Committee he has always found time to help and assist the many veterans with their problems and grievances related to Federal employment.

3. DEMONSTRATED INTEREST AND PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES DIRECTLY ASSOCIATED WITH REGULAR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Not applicable to nominee.

4. DEMONSTRATED LEADERSHIP QUALITIES IN WELFARE, CIVIC, CHURCH OR OTHER PUBLIC ACTIVITIES

His ability and leadership in the fields of recreational development and civic affairs have been referred to by the press on numerous occasions. Some indication of this leadership can be obtained by the following list of present and past offices which he has held:

(a) At the request of the Governor of Colorado he presently serves on the advisory council to the State park and recreational board for all recreational development for eastern Colorado and Bonny Reservoir.

(b) He serves as advisory member to the Larimer County Recreation Board for Horsetooth, Carter, and Rattlesnake Recreational Areas.

(c) He founded Sportsmen Clubs and presently is the State president of all Colorado Boating Clubs, with a membership of over 16,000.

(d) He is the legislative representative for all sportsmen groups and appears before committees of both houses of the Colorado General Assembly on parks and recreational development.

(e) He is now serving his third 3-year term on the board of directors of Post No. 1, the American Legion, Denver, Colo.

5. AWARDS OR OTHER RECOGNITION OF SERVICES OR ACTS OF SPECIAL SERVICES NOT DIRECTLY ASSOCIATED WITH REGULAR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

His activities in furthering water recreational facilities have received wide recognition both at the local and national levels. These honors have included the following:

(a) He was elected to the Denver Post Hall of Fame. His citation reads as follows: "For beginning the successful efforts to have Cherry Creek Reservoir developed as a State recreation area. Even before this project was completed (he) was working toward the opening of other recreation sites, and some of them have been or will be opened to the public soon."

(b) He has been quoted and honored by the press on many occasions.

(c) His attainments were mentioned in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by both U.S. Senators, CARROLL and ALLOTT, and Colorado Congressman BYRON ROGERS. Typical citations from the Colorado Senators read as follows: "working through private citizen organizations on his own time, (he) has devoted virtually all of his after work hours to development of new facilities for boaters, water skiers, swimmers and fisherman. Mr. President, too often the words and accomplishments of our Government employees outside of the course of their regular employment go unnoticed."

(d) He has received letters of compliment from the Commissioner of Reclamation for his recreational development activities.

(e) He has been honored by the advisory council of the state park and recreational department.

(f) He was awarded the international award from the National Outboard Association in recognition for his personal efforts toward the promotion of powerboat racing.

(g) He was awarded an honor plaque from the Rocky Mountain Marine Dealers Association in appreciation of his efforts for boating. This plaque reads as follows: "In appreciation for the personal inspiration and contribution toward accelerating the progress of establishing recreation facilities on private and public waters in the State of Colorado."

6. OTHER INFORMATION

The broad scope of his interest and activities in various welfare and civic affairs is evidenced by his membership in many worthwhile organizations.

In this connection he is not simply a "joiner" but rather takes an active and aggressive part in furthering the aims of the organizations of which he is a member or an officer. A list of these organizations follows: Reclamation Technical Club; Denver Reclamation Employee's Association; Forty and Eight, the American Legion; South Denver Civic Association; Mullen High School Alumni Men's Club; St. Vincent De Paul Men's Club; Isaac Walton League; National Motorboat Association; Colorado Wildlife Federation; National Outboard Association; Metropolitan Wildlife Association, Inc.; Outboard Boating Club of America; U.S. Coast Guard Auxiliary; founder, and present chairman, executive committee, Colorado Boating Association, encompassing 103 Colorado boat clubs; founder and president, Denver Municipal Boating Association, encompassing 9 boat clubs in the Denver metropolitan area; member of the advisory council to the State park and recreation board for recreational development in eastern Colorado areas and Bonny Reservoir; and member of board of directors, Post No. 1, the American Legion, Denver.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

A–1. Competence and efficiency reflected in outstanding accomplishments on the job: As Chief of the Duplicating Branch of the Division of Administrative Services, he has continuously demonstrated outstanding competence, efficiency, imagination, and creative ability in administering and supervising the services of the many crafts which provide a variety of duplicating services for the Bureau. As a result of these abilities, the Duplicating Branch has received a unit citation from the Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer for efficient and accurate performance and high quality of work produced under tight schedules. He has received numerous commendations from division chiefs for his cooperation and performance of duties. Through his personal efforts of keeping abreast with latest equipment and techniques applicable to the printing field, he has reduced the time required to prepare the final text and printing of engineering specifications, publications, monographs, and reports involving $300,000 to $400,000 annually for printing alone. In his daily contact with many engineers he is tactful, efficient, and helpful in finding solutions to their particular problems at a level comparable to the highest traditions of the Government service. He has always promoted the interest and welfare of his employees. In this connection, a memorandum of appreciation signed by all 50 members of his Branch expressing their appreciation for his efforts and continued interest in their welfare was forwarded through channels to the Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer. He also received commendations from the Assistant Commissioner and Chief Engineer for his Branch exceeding U.S. savings bond quotas in 1959 and 1960.

A–2. Demonstrated leadership qualities: Leadership qualities covered in A–1 above.

A–3. Participation in interdepartmental activities: Since he is in a line position as differentiated from a staff position, his participation in interdepartmental activities is very limited. However, his coordination and cooperation with other agencies in aiding, assisting, or performing a service for them have been outstanding.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF COLORADO,
May 23, 1961.

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: As vice commander, Department of Colorado, the American Legion, and also as a longtime Federal employee, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to send you information with respect to an honor which the Denver Federal Business Association has bestowed upon our mutual friend, Jim Malloy. Jim, as you may recall, is a member of our own LCW Post of the American Legion.

Jim's award was conferred at the annual award luncheon of the DFBA. The purpose of the award is to recognize employees whose services outside the requirements of their positions enhance the prestige of Government employment in the community and best exemplify the aims of the association.

We in the American Legion are very proud of Jim's award as well as of his Legion activities on a statewide basis. Those of us who are interested in reclamation in the West are also intrigued by another facet of Jim's activities which this award does not specifically recognize. I refer to the job of public relations he has done for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior in clarifying points of conflict with respect to the programs of his agency.

To my knowledge he has many times in the past appeared before large groups and defined the criteria used by the Bureau of Reclamation in designating an administering agency for Bureau reservoirs. He has pointed out and explained the responsibility of the public as well as that of his agency. These activities to which I refer were carried out on his own time and at his own personal expense.

Sincerely,

MARSHALL M. REDDISH,
Department Vice Commander.

WELCOME TO PRIME MINISTER DAVID BEN-GURION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion, of Israel, yesterday arrived in New York City, and will meet with President Kennedy.

This is a timely visit of the chief officer of one of our most vital democratic allies. Under Prime Minister Ben-Gurion's leadership, little Israel has become a powerful center of freedom and stability in the troubled Middle East. He has led his people through many crises, each of which has seemed to contribute to Israel's strength and wisdom.

Israel is still beset by many problems. The enmity of the surrounding Arab States continues unabated. The boycott of Israeli shipping through the Suez Canal has not been relaxed. There is evidence of widespread repressive measures against Jews behind the Iron Curtain which is of deep concern to all freedom-loving people.

But Israel is a nation which has given hope to millions of oppressed and beleaguered human beings. It has been able to thrive under the most severe trials and adverse conditions.

I know that Prime Minister Ben-Gurion will receive a warm welcome from all Americans. We recognize him as a trusted ally, a fearless leader, and a warm friend. We cannot help but admire the inspiration which this wise and effective statesman has given to the cause of democracy and freedom everywhere.

Mr. President, this morning's New York Herald Tribune contains a very fine editorial on the significance of Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's visit to the United States. This editorial echoes the sentiments of many of us, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 29, 1961]

MR. BEN-GURION'S WELCOME VISIT

David Ben-Gurion, Premier of Israel, is in New York this week, and a most welcome visitor he is. Mr. Ben-Gurion is here officially, or perhaps it would be better to say informally. That is, he has come to the United States (after a visit to Canada) without the panoply that would normally accompany the comings and goings of a head of government. He is going to make speeches to Israel bond rallies here and in Philadelphia and he expects to meet briefly with President Kennedy on the eve of the latter's departure for Paris and, ultimately, Vienna.

He is a remarkable figure among the leaders of the world's small nations, is David Ben-Gurion, and his stature seems to grow with the passage of years and events. He has many of the qualities of an Old Testament prophet—the resoluteness, the forthrightness, the outspokenness, and the capacity for stirring up controversy.

He comes here at a time of relative stability in the Middle East with Arab leaders prudent in deed however bellicose they remain in word. He comes, too, at a time when the world is more conscious than ever, thanks to the dreadful revelations of the Eichmann trial, of Israel's function as a haven and a hope for a people scattered and shattered by Nazi Germany. The Biblical Moses was able to see, but not to enter the Promised Land; to Ben-Gurion it has been given to actually lead those Jews who wished to go into their ancient homeland.

To strengthen Israel's cause has been Mr. Ben-Gurion's lifelong work. He and his compatriots are well aware that while their country is enjoying a respite from open attack it remains surrounded by hostility. Aside from its own military strength, one of Israel's principal reliances for peace has been the Tripartite Declaration of 1950, in which the United States, Britain, and France in effect agreed to oppose the use of force by either side in the Middle East to upset existing frontiers or armistice lines.

This pledge to resist aggression remains on the books. But Mr. Ben-Gurion would be happy to see it reaffirmed, and he would be even happier if it were subscribed to jointly by the United States and Soviet Russia. He is very likely to make this point when he sees President Kennedy, who will be talking to Mr. Khrushchev a few days later. And he may well call attention once more to the continuing Egyptian blockade of the Suez Canal in contravention of U.N. resolutions and accepted international usages.

These are serious problems and only good can come from a frank discussion of them between the two heads of government. But his immediate mission aside, it remains a pleasure to extend greetings to David Ben-Gurion as the representative of Middle East's lonely but thriving democracy, and as the dedicated leader who helped bring it into being.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHURCH BEFORE NAVAL ACADEMY FOREIGN AFFAIRS CONFERENCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the brilliant and articulate Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] made an extemporaneous speech before the Naval Academy Foreign Affairs Conference on April 27, 1961. His remarks were transcribed from a tape which was made of the speech, and I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Idaho appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would not want this occasion to pass without alluding to the fact that it is a great pleasure to be here at the Naval Academy. The first time I ever came east in 1938, I was 13 years of age. I came to see my brother graduate from the Naval Academy and he told me then, and in the years that followed, about the disciplined life he led here. So when the war came on, I enlisted at once in the Army. I hope you won't think that the same sort of judgment pervades the remarks I am about to make.

The subject tonight is "Factors Which Shape U.S. Policy in Africa and the Near East." I don't presume to know all of the factors that shape our policies in either area, but I can at least give you my judgment as to what the factors ought to be in shaping our foreign policy in Africa.

I have been on the African Subcommittee of the Senate for some few years, and recently had an opportunity to travel through 16 African countries, some 22,000 miles, during November and December of last year. That's an exciting adventure, because there are great and volcanic forces at work in Africa that are quite unprecedented in all of history.

I know of no other time in the long course of the evolutionary development of Western civilization when, in a single year, 17 nations were born. Yet in 1960, 17 African nations were born, an upheaval toward independence so mammoth that many historians have already heralded 1960 as the "African Year." This has posed a very real challenge to our foreign policy because it has added a whole new dimension to the world. Africa is coming into its own and naturally, since our policymakers have so long dealt with the world where the major decisions were made, not in Africa or in Asia, but in Europe, such as in London, in Paris, in Rome, and Berlin, it is difficult to change our perspective to the reality of a new situation in which these decisions are being made in such places as Cairo and Leopoldville. Yet this is the fact.

The new nationalism in Africa is the first thing we have to remember when it comes to the question of shaping American foreign policy. It has been difficult to adopt a new and independent posture relating to Africa because of our alliances with our traditional friends in Western Europe. Many have raised the cry that if we adopt an independent policy in Africa that would offend a NATO ally, this might contribute to the unraveling of NATO which, of course, is of central importance to our whole foreign policy. I personally have not shared this view for I think NATO stands on its own bottom. It has withstood the test of the crisis at Suez, it has withstood much dissension, and if the day should ever come when NATO is less important to West Germany or France or Portugal than it is to the United States, then NATO is no longer a shield anyway but a sieve unworthy of our national reliance. Therefore, I believe that NATO will be strengthened by wise policies from within, not unwise policies without, and that it should no longer be regarded as an excuse for not developing a new and independent posture on the part of the United States toward Africa.

Nationalism is a key to that new posture. We're a long way off from our own revolution. Yet we were the first colonies to revolt against the reign of George III. Our ardor has cooled because we've become accustomed to independence, but in Africa you can sense the excitement that is felt by people who are living in revolutionary times, and it is natural that these new governments should be rabidly anticolonial and ardently nationalist in their outlook.

There are many troubles in Africa, not alone in Algeria, which, if they persist, will become a source of major Communist infection in that part of the world. Not only in the Congo, where the U.N. presence is trying to assert control, but in Angola, in Mozambique, in Rhodesia in all likelihood, and in the Union of South Africa, there are troubles ahead. These areas are girded to resist, but the forces of nationalism are so strong on the continent that there are few observers who would disagree with me when I say that, within the next 5 years, the remnants of colonial empire will be gone in Africa and all of the continent will have gained independence. So, in formulating American policy, this is the first factor we have to keep in mind. How do we better identify the United States with what has been its historical role, a country that believed in the right of self-determination and which should have a common bond with these newly emerging countries in Africa?

The second thing to keep in mind is the factor of neutralism. These newly independent countries tend to adopt neutralist foreign policies. This is natural, I think, because neutralism is a badge of independence. We insisted upon our right to be neutral for 125 years after our own independence, and we ought not to be surprised that these new countries assert neutralism proudly because they feel this demonstrates that their independence is authentic. Moreover, we ought not to think that this

neutralism, if it is genuine, is necessarily adverse to the interests of the United States. Genuine neutrals can be a useful balance wheel in a world that has become more and more polarized between two immense powers, the United States and the Soviet Union. What we do need to fear, I think, is that these newly independent African countries might be drawn behind the Iron Curtain and, owing to Communist domination, lose their capacity to be neutral and thus become satellites of the only empire that has been created in our time—the Red empire. That is the danger we face in Africa, which our foreign policy must take into full account.

Finally, we should be mindful in Africa of the economic plight of these new countries. When we realize that less than a tenth of the people of the world live in the United States and Canada and yet have something close to two-thirds of the world's income, while more than two-thirds of the world's people live in the underdeveloped areas of the world and together have something less than 10 percent of the world's income, I think then we'll begin to understand why most people in Africa do not regard the world as divided between the Communist countries and the Western democracies, as we do, but rather regard the world as divided between the haves and the have nots. If these new independent African countries are unable to meet the expectations of their people in providing some measure of progress away from the edge of starvation, great hardship, and widespread disease, and all the other things that plague the multitudes in Africa today, then these people will turn to more extreme forms of government in their quest for a better life. Therefore, it will be necessary in the years ahead for the United States to continue its economic aid programs, because private capital, though it has invested large sums of money in countries with oil in north Africa, has not, by and large, invested in the underdeveloped countries in middle Africa or in west Africa in sufficient amount to do the job. Therefore, I think that we must extend an economic aid program, with the help of our European allies, for years to come, not with any idea that we can create in these countries an economic system like our own, for we can't, but in the knowledge that without this kind of aid, without some progress for the African people in the years ahead, it is likely that the Red flag will one day be hoisted from Cairo to Capetown.

These three factors, then, ought to shape U.S. policy in Africa. We have no guarantee that we can prevail there, but if we shape our policies wisely and understand Africa through African eyes, then at least we have a reasonable chance in the years ahead to see an independent Africa emerge, with an opportunity for free institutions to take root and grow, of the kind that we uphold and believe in so strongly. That is the challenge we face in this revolutionary era that has brought Africa to the fore as the fourth dimension in the foreign policy of the United States.

CHARGES OF PROMOTION OF SEGREGATION OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on May 18 the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota accused the Department of the Interior of promoting segregation of the American Indian.

At that time, the Senator also inserted into the RECORD an article by David Sentner in which two segregation charges were made against the Secretary of the Interior and the Interior Department. These were:

First, opposition to a so-called law-and-order measure now before the Congress, which the article contended is designed to let the States exercise more powers over law enforcement and administration on Indian reservations, and second, support for a blueprint which would make American Indians attend segregated schools on their reservations.

I am very much concerned that charges such as these be refuted and the truth made known. To do so I inquired of the Interior Department regarding these matters and received a very satisfactory reply which, I believe, completely counters any accusation that Secretary Udall and the Department are promoting segregation of the American Indian.

In fact, the very measure which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] advocates, regarding enforcement and administration of law and order on Indian reservations, might well tend to promote Indian separateness and segregation—rather than do away with it.

The law-and-order measure referred to by the Senator and Mr. Sentner apparently is S. 381, a bill pending before the Congress. S. 381 would amend the Johnson-O'Malley Act authorizing contractual payments by the Federal Government to States and local governmental agencies for Indian services in the fields of health, education, agriculture, and welfare. The S. 381 amendment would also provide a Federal subsidy for States to use in financing law enforcement on Indian reservations.

But, S. 381 would not authorize the States to exercise more law enforcement power. There presently is a statute which provides the authority to do this: It is the act of August 15, 1953—Public Law 280, 83d Congress; 67 Stat. 588—which allows States to take unilateral action to extend their laws and jurisdiction to the Indians on their reservations.

It is true that the previous administration supported a measure identical with S. 381. However the present administration saw fit to recommend against the enactment of S. 381, not because of any argument that "strong groups of Indians are against weakening the Federal Government's supervision of Indian affairs by sharing it with the States," as Mr. Sentner charges. Reference to the Department's report on the bill, dated March 21, 1961, reveals that the Department's position was not even remotely related to such a philosophy.

The Interior opposition was based on several considerations:

First. Prospects of a Federal subsidy for law enforcement under S. 381 or any similar bill might influence some States to assume jurisdiction prematurely at a time when it would not be in the best interests of either the Indians or the local law enforcement agencies.

Second. Enactment of the bill might have the undesirable tendency of perpetuating the Indian people as a special group within a State entitled to special consideration because of their racial status.

Third. Enactment would not assure that Federal funds would be available to all States having Indian reservation population. The longstanding administrative practice with respect to other Johnson-O'Malley contracts is that payments be made solely on the basis of the needs of the State.

Fourth. Ten States already have assumed jurisdiction for law enforcement on Indian reservations and they would be entitled to apply for Federal subsidies under the bill. These States now provide law enforcement to the Indian people without cost to the Federal Government. To start giving such States a subsidy at this time would be a retrogressive step in the overall program of seeing that the Indian people receive their services on the same basis as other citizens, without special treatment because of their racial status.

I want, too, to take note of the segregation charge directed by these critics against Indian schools. I assume that they prefer a practice of constructing dormitories far from the homes of Indian children whose parents live in geographically isolated all-Indian communities, for the purpose of enrolling these children in classrooms with non-Indians. I support the Indian parents in their desire to have their children educated near their homes, even though they must be educated in all-Indian classrooms because no non-Indians live geographically near enough to attend the same school. These reservation schools serve as more than just educational institutions for Indian children, important as that function is. They also fill a need for a citizenship and social center for all Indians, particularly on those reservations which are remote from other communities. This is an important added value which should be considered in weighing the merits of all-Indian schools. Is it conceivable that these critics would prefer to eliminate this so-called segregation by removing non-Indian children from their homes and housing them in dormitories in Indian communities—so that the Indian schools could be mixed?

AN OPEN LETTER TO CHAIRMAN KHRUSHCHEV

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an open letter written by the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy urging Mr. Khrushchev to reconsider the Soviet Union's demand that there be a three-man council to administer the inspection system for a nuclear-testing ban, with each council member having veto power.

I am sure that all Americans share the views expressed in this letter. None of us would support a nuclear test ban agreement if the inspection system rested on a veto. This proposal by the Soviet Union has cast a dark cloud over the talks at Geneva. Unless the Soviet Union recedes from this position it is quite apparent that no agreement can be entered into.

I hope that this letter, written by distinguished Americans who are vitally concerned about the threat of nuclear war, will be seriously considered by the Soviet Union. The stakes are high, and it would indeed be tragic if a test ban agreement could not be arrived at due to dogmatic and inflexible positions by the participants.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO CHAIRMAN KHRUSHCHEV

DEAR CHAIRMAN KHRUSHCHEV: This organization has been active in the United States in advocating a cessation of nuclear testing and in seeking agreements to put an end to the arms race.

You have said that the Soviet Union would like to agree on a first step toward eliminating the threat of a runaway arms race. In this connection, you have called for a treaty banning further nuclear weapons testing.

In particular, you have called attention to the fact that continued testing of nuclear weapons by France is a definite barrier to effective agreement.

We agree.

But there is another barrier to agreement. The Soviet representatives at Geneva, after previously agreeing to a one-man executive, have now proposed a three-man council to administer the inspection system for a nuclear-testing ban. According to the Soviet proposal, the members of this council would consist of a representative of the Communist bloc, one from the West, and a neutral. Each would have a veto over inspections or any of the operations of the council.

We believe that such a three-man council, operating with a veto, cancels out the very purpose of control.

American public opinion, in our view, would not and should not support any agreements to suspend nuclear testing if the inspection system rested on a veto.

In the United States, the test ban talks at Geneva are regarded as the proving ground for good intentions. What happens in Geneva is regarded as a key to any hopes of progress toward effective disarmament.

In the past the Soviet Union made concessions at the Geneva talks indicating a desire for agreement.

The purpose of this letter, therefore, is to emphasize the importance attached by Americans to an inspected ban on nuclear explosions, and to express the hope that the Soviet Union will reconsider, modify, or withdraw its present proposal without delay.

Sincerely,

CLARENCE PICKETT,
NORMAN COUSINS,
Cochairmen, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

FARM CREDIT EMERGENCY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in recent months this country has been faced with a wide variety of economic disruptions. Literally millions of words have been expended on various aspects of this highly unfortunate situation. Fortunately, as the President noted yesterday, significant improvement has been noted during the past several weeks, particularly in our rising level of industrial production.

However, one aspect of this economic picture which remains a serious problem is the credit emergency facing the average farmer. Although this crisis has been growing for years, it has received little notice by the general public, and the fundamental reasons for this emergency are generally not understood. Now the situation is critical. Many farmers simply cannot secure the loans they need to continue in business. Private lenders find farm operating, farm ownership, and soil and water conservation loans unattractive. The Farmers Home Administration—the Federal agency charged with providing loans under such circumstances—is unable to assist these credit-starved farmers. Why? All funds available to the FHA have been exhausted for months.

Even though FHA funds were exhausted well before the end of fiscal 1961, the Department of Agriculture has not requested an increase in loan authorizations for 1962. Since a great backlog of loan applications currently exists, it is likely that another credit shortage will develop even more rapidly in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. President, to highlight this situation further, I ask unanimous consent that my statement on the farm credit emergency recently filed with the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY BEFORE THE SENATE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUNDS FOR FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. Chairman, I wish to include in the record a statement on the farm credit emergency facing our farming population from coast to coast. Of course, I am intimately aware of the situation in Minnesota and I know that unless some relief is forthcoming in the coming fiscal year, the plight of the family farmer in my State will be a very grave one.

But this is not merely a localized condition. From coast to coast, farmers are unable to obtain necessary credit because Farmers Home Administration funds are exhausted and private lenders will not assume increased obligations at interest rates which farmers can afford. I am including in this statement a table indicating by States the applications for initial operating and farm ownership loans for fiscal 1961 through April 30, 1961. On that date FHA had 16,238 applications on hand which could not be processed due to a lack of available funds. As of March 31, 1961, FHA also had on hand 633 applications for soil and water conservation loans. It is clear that this substantial backlog in each category will consume most of the 1962 funds before the year is half over.

This emergency has been coming for a number of years. It results from a number of conditions over which the family farmer has no control. It is time we reexamined the reasons for this shortage of farm credit. It is time we moved to provide an adequate remedy.

The amount of capital that a farmer needs in order to stay in business today is staggering. Farm production expenses have risen from $6 billion to $26 billion in the last 20 years. Production expenses per farm have climbed from $1,063 to $5,794 over that same period. In other words, since 1940 farmers production expenses have increased 600 percent. The average value of productive assets per farm has also risen from $6,094 in 1940 to $34,648 in 1960, nearly another sixfold increase.

What accounts for these dramatic increases? During these years the farmer mechanized his operations; he adopted a variety of new farming techniques. While every American takes pride in the great productivity of our agricultural plant, we must also recognize that this technological revolution on the farm has radically increased the average farmers credit problems.

The cost of modernizing this operation has placed the average farmer heavily in debt. If he had any financial reserves, the cost-price squeeze has often wiped them out. Thousands of farmers face a need for continuing operations that eat up huge amounts of capital before they return a dime. Thousands face a need for further expansion of their operations, for further improvements, and for replacement of worn-out equipment. The financial condition of the family farmer has deteriorated to the point where many no longer have the equities or the margin of profit required to obtain adequate conventional financing to meet these needs.

The Farmers Home Administration was created to help farmers in difficult credit situations such as I have described. But now we find that FHA also lacks the lending resources to help the distressed family farmer. For example, take the operating loan funds. These are the funds used to buy equipment, livestock, fertilizer, and similar operating needs. The $232 million provided for this year is exhausted and it has been gone for some time. Yet $232 million is the budget estimate for next year. Since the current backlog has been estimated at $20 million, I suggest that $300 million is the minimum amount needed for fiscal 1962.

Even this figure might prove to be insufficient. I believe if farmers knew they could count upon obtaining the credit they needed from FHA, and if they knew this in the summer and fall, they would request substantially more than the present budget estimates. And these would be farmers to whom loans could be soundly made, who should stay on their farms, and who cannot get credit from other conventional sources.

A similar situation applies to farm ownership loan funds. These funds are used to develop farms, to enlarge farms, to acquire farms, and to refinance debts. The 1962 budget provides $31.9 million for farm ownership loans, the same amount as 1961. But this money was gone before the year was half over. If the entire amount could have been allocated among the States according to need, the $31.9 million would have been gone even sooner. At present there exists an authorized limit of $50 million for ownership loans. Surely this amount should be provided for 1962. If legislation now being considered is enacted to remove this $50 million ceiling, higher amounts should be seriously considered.

The current backlog of soil and water conservation loans is $3.5 million. The 1961 appropriation, $3 million, is again proposed for 1962.

Although the soil and water conservation loan program is relatively new, it has made an outstanding record. As farmers become better acquainted with the program, it is reasonable to expect increased requests for funds. I, for one, know of few situations offering more worthwhile investment opportunities than soil and water conservation. I recommend a minimum of $15 million be provided in this category.

Farmers are currently using $25 billion of Government credit from a number of sources. From this perspective, the funds requested by the Farmers Home Administration are small indeed. Moreover, the FHA loans go to family farmers and they go to those farmers most in need. The good they will do is far greater than the level of funds required to do an adequate job. I must also emphasize these funds will be repaid. The losses on previous loans are negligible.

This is a critical situation. If we can't help our family farmers get the funds they

need to continue their operations, we invite the multiplication of other problems. Our urban crisis is directly linked to the disappearance of the family farm. Unemployment, poverty, delinquency, and crime will grow as farmer after farmer leaves the soil and joins the ranks of those out of work, out of hope, and out of faith.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Applications for initial operating and farm ownership loans, 1961 fiscal year through Apr. 30

State	Operating loans		Farm ownership loans	
	Applications received (1)	Applications on hand Apr. 30, 1961 (2)	Applications received (3)	Applications on hand Apr. 30, 1961 (4)
U.S. total	58,969	6,363	17,239	9,875
Alabama	2,666	132	637	325
Alaska	121	6	4	2
Arizona	156	13	31	13
Arkansas	2,835	152	934	232
California	478	79	159	67
Colorado	508	50	186	136
Connecticut	62	13	15	5
Delaware	29	6	10	8
Florida	589	26	194	107
Georgia	1,599	136	711	561
Hawaii	94	13	23	29
Idaho	1,107	114	216	106
Illinois	1,552	210	344	148
Indiana	884	150	385	208
Iowa	2,284	291	341	190
Kansas	751	108	436	304
Kentucky	1,839	190	696	395
Louisiana	1,755	106	342	226
Maine	503	125	165	61
Maryland	260	55	41	26
Massachusetts	95	12	20	6
Michigan	1,513	241	269	135
Minnesota	2,480	359	682	263
Mississippi	2,971	241	656	407
Missouri	1,909	201	916	556
Montana	765	97	231	100
Nebraska	796	93	270	302
Nevada	79	31	17	7
New Hampshire	109	14	31	11
New Jersey	262	32	69	26
New Mexico	443	34	121	45
New York	1,570	262	350	157
North Carolina	3,473	143	1,114	717
North Dakota	1,747	288	908	751
Ohio	982	144	385	204
Oklahoma	1,717	218	499	369
Oregon	1,023	76	120	64
Pennsylvania	1,054	240	344	170
Rhode Island	33	1	8	1
South Carolina	2,142	81	377	191
South Dakota	1,103	105	278	239
Tennessee	1,555	174	741	438
Texas	5,049	192	501	388
Utah	425	107	137	102
Vermont	225	44	87	30
Virginia	920	124	405	163
Washington	1,301	108	463	187
West Virginia	735	146	323	114
Wisconsin	1,615	434	744	294
Wyoming	223	39	59	31
Puerto Rico	576	107	242	248
Virgin Islands	7	0	2	5

LATIN AMERICAN REACTION TO CUBAN SITUATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as time goes on, the wisdom of the President of the United States in supporting the exchange of Cuban prisoners for tractors through a privately organized committee becomes more and more apparent. Equally apparent is the futility of the Republican opposition to this move. I say in all fairness I do not refer to all Republicans, but only to a group which has attacked the President bitterly on the floor during the last few days.

The New York Times of Sunday contained a heartening story based on a careful survey of Latin American reaction to the President's proposal and that of the distinguished committee headed by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Mr. Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower. I think the result, in good will throughout Latin America for the United States of America, by reason of the proposed exchange, has been one of the most heartening things that has happened in recent weeks. We did suffer a setback in connection with the Cuban invasion, but this proposed exchange of prisoners for tractors is rehabilitating our position in Latin America in a way that no other recent act has done.

I heartily commend the President and the members of the committee for their courage in taking up this most worthwhile venture.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Memorial Day, 1961, holds a special significance for Americans and is the ideal time for all of us to pause for a moment and renew our pledge of allegiance to this Nation and the millions of her citizens who have made the supreme sacrifice in the cause of freedom.

This Memorial Day is especially significant because it comes at a period in our history when the United States is faced with more challenges, and, at the same time, more opportunities for achievement than ever before.

Americans have trod together a crisis-strewn path since Memorial Day, 1960. We have shared a restless and uncertain peace during the last 12 months. We have linked hands, hearts, and determination in the face of many provocations and threats from forces bent on destroying our way of life and stealing from us the freedoms and rights we enjoy as Americans.

Peace in the world is what we all hope for. The right to remain freemen in a democratic society is what we will all fight for, and if necessary, die for, as did those millions of valiant Americans to whom we pay tribute on Memorial Day.

Mr. President, tomorrow is the day when many Members of the Senate and many other governmental officials all over the Nation will be aiding citizens in many villages, towns, cities, and communities in paying tribute to the valor of Americans of past generations. I should like for us to pause a moment to remember that our President will be leaving tomorrow in his quest for freedom, peace, and security, not merely for the people of the United States, but also for all men everywhere. I know that as we pause, tomorrow will be not merely another holiday, but a day of rededication for Americans. I think the President takes with him on his trip the best wishes of all Americans that from these conferences and from the great task he has set for himself will come a more secure, a freer, and safer America, as well as a safer free world.

And so, on Memorial Day, 1961, I ask all Americans to join with me in a pledge to work harder than hard and longer than long and with a new vigor to promote the principles of freedom and democracy throughout the world.

I personally shall have the privilege of visiting tomorrow with the Maryland Civil War Centennial Commission on the battlefield of Antietam, at which Texas regiments served east of the Mississippi, and engaged in battle in September of 1862. It was Hood's Brigade of Texans, from my own State, which participated in the great struggle that day at Antietam, or Sharpsburg which saw more men lose their lives than in any other single day of the great Civil War, which so bled this country. It was that brigade which reached the deepest penetration of the Union lines, and a young lieutenant from my own hometown of Tyler, Tex., named Robert Gaston, made the deepest penetration into the Union lines. He was killed there, and his body was found farther inside the Union lines than any other Confederate soldier. As a tribute to his courage, instead of burying him in a multiple grave with the other soldiers, the Union boys in blue dug a separate hero's grave for him, in which he was buried alone. Such was the tribute valor paid to valor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be

recognized an additional 2 minutes to make a statement on the cold war GI bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the plight of the cold war veteran and the difficulties these young Americans face in readjusting to civilian life are made clear in a letter I have received from Mr. Roger W. Irving, supervisor of the institutional approval program of veterans' education for the State of Illinois.

Mr. Irving's letter gives some irrefutable reasons for enactment of S. 349, the Cold War GI bill for veterans serving in the Armed Forces after January 31, 1955, a bill which is cosponsored by the present occupant of the chair [Mr. METCALF] and 37 other Members of the Senate with me.

Mr. Irving's letter is dated May 25, 1961, and was received by me on Saturday, May 27. It is up to date, and shows the present plight of the cold war veterans.

Mr. Irving's letter reads:

> We get calls from veterans who are in need of economic assistance to complete their daily educational or training goals. These men are presently faced with returning to a society which increasingly emphasizes skilled and technically trained employees. I have noted that men looking for jobs constantly advertise in our larger newspapers, and they stipulate that they are draft-exempt, which certainly points up the seriousness of the present situation.

As the President knows, those men facing the draft usually cannot obtain employment. It is a system of enforced service in the military in more ways than one. They are forced to enter service because they are unemployable with their military obligation unfulfilled. These men, coming out of the service, having lost over 2 years each are placed in competition with those who did not serve and who have gotten seniority by not serving. The 45 percent who did serve are discriminated against by our society, and will continue to be so unfairly discriminated against until the bill is enacted giving them readjustment rights.

I wish to point out that the original GI bills were not enacted as a bonus or reward bills. They were written as readjustment bills. They state that their purpose was to enable veterans to readjust to civilian life, and that readjustment to civilian life is as important to a cold war veteran as it is to a shooting war veteran.

Mr. Irving's letter continues:

> If S. 349 should become law, most certainly a great many of the returning servicemen would use these educational benefits to obtain a higher education. However, we must never lose sight of the value of increased training below the collegiate and university level. Not all of our citizens are either economically able or intellectually capable of training in higher institutions; yet many could becomes excellent mechanics, draftsmen, and technicians if given the opportunity.

I point out in this connection that only 50 percent of the veterans who go to school go to universities. The remainder become the technicians that are so necessary to American industry. It is a serious situation if the young Americans who meet our military needs in a time of extreme crisis in the world are not provided with a readjustment program that will help them regain the time lost in military service. If these cold war veterans are to continue to help this Nation grow stronger in the face of many challenges, they must receive the education and training the times demand.

Because Mr. Irving's letter points out in such clear terms the urgent need for the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> STATE OF ILLINOIS,
> OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
> *Springfield, Ill., May 25, 1961.*
>
> Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
> *Chairman, Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.*
>
> DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We, in Illinois, would like to extend our congratulations and our sincere thanks to you for the unyielding efforts which you have made in behalf of the extension of legislation which would grant educational benefits to all those servicemen who have been in the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955.
>
> We get daily calls from veterans who are in need of economic assistance to complete their educational or training goals. No one is more aware than you of the manner in which the passage of S. 349 would alleviate the economic hardships faced by the present homecoming veterans. These men are presently faced with returning to a society which increasingly emphasizes skilled and technically trained employees. I have noted that men looking for jobs constantly advertise in our larger newspapers, and they stipulate that they are "draft exempt," which certainly points up the seriousness of the present situation.
>
> If S. 349 should become law, most certainly a great many of the returning servicemen would use these educational benefits to obtain a higher education. However, we must never lose sight of the value of increased training below the collegiate and university level. Not all of our citizens are either economically able or intellectually capable of training in higher institutions, yet many could become excellent mechanics, draftsmen, and technicians if given the opportunity.
>
> I realize that you are in complete sympathy with these problems, however, we, in Illinois, again wish to thank you for the efforts which you have extended in behalf of our cold war veterans.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> ROGER W. IRVING,
> *Supervisor, Institutional Approval Program for Veterans' Education.*

TEXAS ELECTION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the results of the special election on Saturday for U.S. Senator in Texas should not go unnoticed on the Senate floor today. The election of JOHN TOWER as the first Republican U.S. Senator from the great State of Texas since reconstruction days is a great achievement by a dedicated young American who persevered over great odds against a Democrat of great wealth. It represents the beginning of a real two-party system in what has heretofore been referred to as "the solid south." This is a healthy sign for American politics. We know that when one party is in power for too long, abuses of that power usually occur. The great Southern States of our country have, I believe, been hampered in their progress because of the nonexistence of a two-party system within their borders. It is well known that most southern Democrats are Jeffersonian Democrats who do not subscribe to the fiscal policies and centralized Federal Government policies of the National Democratic Party. Their political philosophy, especially on these points, is much nearer that of the Republican Party.

With the election of JOHN TOWER to the U.S. Senate, these loyal Americans—the Jeffersonian Democrats—may have hope that in the Republican Party they will find the principles of sound government which they believe in carried out by the election of Republicans from their States. The people of Texas are to be congratulated for their foresight and courage.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was very greatly interested in hearing the distinguished Senator from Iowa tell us what Democrats in Texas believe. I am constrained to believe that had he campaigned in Texas, or had he been a Member of this body longer, he would have been very cautious about telling what members of an opposite party believe in a State far removed from his own.

I point out that there is really no national significance in this selection, except I agree with the distinguished Senator from Iowa when he said that Senator-elect TOWER was a very vigorous and able campaigner.

There was more danger pointed up by this campaign to many Senators than the issue of Democrats and Republicans. There was a young man opposing an older man. TOWER is 35; Senator BLAKLEY is 62. That is the biggest danger posed to the Senate by this election; youth versus age.

Furthermore, Senator-elect TOWER undertook a very energetic and aggressive campaign. I do not detract from the energy and fire which he put into it. The fact that he won is largely a personal tribute to him, and to his personality, rather than to any Texas expression on national issues.

I do point out that the total vote cast in the election that was held on Saturday in Texas, according to the last returns, was less than 900,000 votes. The votes of both candidates added together were fewer than Senator-elect TOWER alone received running for the Senate last November in Texas. He received 926,000 votes last November as a candidate for U.S. Senator in Texas against Senator JOHNSON'S 1,305,000. The fact is that both candidates denounced the new President and the New Frontier, and with no candidate supporting the

national Democratic Party, the Democrats did not go to the polls and vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Texas has expired.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I ask unanimous consent that I may have 1 additional minute.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. KUCHEL. Reserving the right to object—and I will not object—I would like an opportunity when the minute is concluded to interrogate my brother from Texas for a moment or so.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I shall be glad to yield for that interrogation.

Mr. President, I point out that in the election of 1960 Vice President Nixon received 1,121,000 votes in Texas, several hundred thousand more than both candidates combined received on Saturday.

President Kennedy received 1,167,000 votes in Texas in November 1960. In the general election of 1952 Gov. Adlai Stevenson received 969,000 in Texas, while President Eisenhower received 1,102,000. So if the votes of Senators TOWER and BLAKLEY are added, both candidates received together last Saturday fewer votes than the losing candidate normally receives when a normal number of people come to the polls to vote in a presidential election in Texas.

There are over 5 million adult Texans. This year more than 2 million Texans had paid their poll taxes. Yet the campaign simply did not bring the Democratic voters to the polls, and approximately 1,100,000 Democratic voters did not vote, as contrasted with the total of fewer than 900,000, both Republicans and Democrats, who did vote.

Polls show that the popularity of President Kennedy is at an alltime high in Texas. A recent Gallup poll showed a popularity of over 80 percent. Therefore, the great majority of Democrats, having no candidate who would campaign on a platform to support the President and the Democratic Party, decided they had no one to vote for. That is the long and short of the Texas election.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes. However, I have yielded the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Senator's time has again expired.

Mr. MILLER. I ask for 1 minute.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief comment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, first, the Senator from Iowa be given 3 minutes to reply.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in reply to my friend from Texas, all I should like to say is that the figures he has presented, I am afraid, have been presented in a manner which would cast reflection upon the intelligence of the people of the State of Texas. All I was trying to do was to compliment him and his people in Texas on their intelligence, and I am sorry that he has seen fit to use figures to try to detract from the intelligence of the people of Texas, either in voting for Mr. TOWER, or in staying away from the polls so that Mr. TOWER could be elected.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to make this comment. I agree completely with everything that the Senator from Iowa has said, but I also agree with everything that the Senator from Texas has said. Why do we not leave it at that?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wholly disagree with what both the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] have said about the intelligence of the people of Texas. I think that the voters of Texas are as intelligent as voters anywhere else in the world. I object to the Senators' reflections on the people of my State. The Democrats who believed in a Democratic program had no opportunity to show their belief through voting, and I think it no adverse reflection on their intelligence that they did not vote. There was no way they could vote and vote for the President's medical care program. There was no way by which they could vote and show their support of the President's farm program. Both candidates were opposed to that program. There was no way by which they could vote for the President's program of Federal aid to education. Both candidates opposed that program. What could they do? They were caught in a dilemma. It is a reflection on the intelligence of the astute people of my State to say that the outcome reflects on the intelligence of a people who are politically conscious and aware. They were using as high an order of political intelligence in deciding whether or not to vote, as any electors do anywhere in deciding how to vote once inside the polling place.

They were disappointed people, because they had no opportunity to vote for a party whose policies met with the approval of a majority of the Democrats in Texas.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. How did it happen that they were placed in that dilemma?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. They were placed in that dilemma because there were four Democratic candidates who received 50.5 percent of the vote, and there were two candidates, opposed to the President, who received 49.5 percent of the vote. The 49.5 percent vote was split two ways, and the 50.5 percent vote was split four ways.

Mr. MILLER. Apparently the people of Texas made a little slip, in that they slipped away from intelligence in the primary campaign——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. No, no.

Mr. MILLER. And then they reverted to their intelligence during the final election.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. There was no slip in the intelligence of the people. The politicians were so anxious to get this seat in the Senate, that 70 ran for it. It was an overcrowded race. There was no reflection at all in the election on the intelligence of the people.

I would not say anything to detract from the victory of the successful candidate, the very energetic new Senator, a very popular young man. It was a personal victory on his part. Many people of Texas vote on the basis of the personality of the candidate, without regard to parties or platforms. Senator TOWER received many votes on his personality alone. I would not detract one bit from the victory of this young, energetic man. He had a great disadvantage in having the Republican Party label hung around his neck, and he overcame that disadvantage. He won a great personal victory, and I would not wish to detract from his success.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I should like to sustain the Senator from Texas with reference to the intelligence of the people of Texas. As he said, the election shows that the people are very intelligent, in that they do not bother to go to the polls when they do not have a choice. It seems to me that the result is a mark of intelligence rather than of a lack of intelligence. As I read the reports of the campaign, the Republican candidate was a stronger advocate of the record which had been made by the Democratic incumbent.

Mr. KUCHEL. First of all I would tell my able friend from Texas that I am one of those citizens who salute Texas. I salute and recognize the great things that Texans have accomplished in all their unique and intrepid history. As a matter of fact, as I have told my friend from Texas, my beloved mother was born in his State. I know something about the independence and courage and ability of the people of Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. KUCHEL. How can I dissuade myself from yielding when a Texan asks me to yield. I am happy to yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I consider it a great honor to say this to the Senator from California, and I hope he will not be embarrassed in his home State by what I am about to say. However, I must inform the Senate that the Senator from California is descended from one member of a small, gallant force of 47 men, under Lt. Dick Dowling, who held the Sabine Pass in Texas in September of 1863 in a battle against a Union force composed of a fleet of gunboats and transports and about 4,500 men. This small force of 49 sank and captured several of the gunboats, and drove the remaining Union fleet into the Gulf of Mexico in disorderly retreat. Dick Dowling's 47 Irishmen, they were called. I do not know whether the grandfather

of the Senator from California was an Irishman, but he was a captain, Confederate States of America, and member of that gallant little band in that little mud fort that sank gunboats and captured hundreds of the invading Union forces and drove the rest of them and their fleet back into the Gulf of Mexico, in one of the most brilliant actions against naval forces in the Civil War. Jefferson Davis and the Confederate Congress paid a special tribute to the Sabine Pass defenders, and the people of Texas struck a silver medal for each of the defenders, the only medal so struck in the Confederacy during the Civil War for a group of Confederate soldiers. I compliment the Senator on his distinguished ancestor, and his contribution to history.

Mr. KUCHEL. I am overwhelmed and I am grateful, and on behalf of my illustrious forebear, my grandfather, the late Capt. George Henry Bailey——

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Of the Confederate States of America.

Mr. KUCHEL. Of the Confederate States of America—on his behalf, too, I thank my friend from Texas.

Now, Mr. President, as I was going to say, on Saturday an election was held in Texas. All I know of it is that the Republican won and the Democrat lost. In this Chamber, with those of us on this side constituting a minority, it is going to be a pleasant situation in the Senate to take just one chair from the side of this great majority, represented by my friend, the acting majority leader, and move it over to this side. Whatever factors go into the election and the defeat of a candidate for the U.S. Senate, the fact remains that it is in the interest of American government to have two strong vigorous political parties represented in the Senate to debate the issues which confront us.

It is perfectly natural that there are ideological cleavages which occasionally divide us on this side of the aisle, and I am sure my friends on the Democratic side recognize also that there is that same kind of cleavage on their side of the aisle, in the nuances of political beliefs.

This is a moment of rejoicing by the Republicans in the Senate and by my party in the Nation. Whatever may have contributed to the decision last Saturday in the great State of Texas, and after all the explanations about it which will long be forthcoming, the fact remains that a Republican U.S. Senator was elected from that great State this past weekend for the first time since the days of reconstruction.

Mr. BUTLER. I wish to address my remarks to the Senator from California. The Senator said the election of Senator TOWER was a cause for rejoicing by Republicans. The Senator knows I come from a State which has a majority of almost 3 to 1 Democrats. It was a cause of great rejoicing in my State, too. I have received calls and letters and telegrams from many Democrats, who have congratulated me, for some unknown reason, on the election of Senator TOWER. I think it is a cause for national rejoicing. I would say to the Senator from Texas that I hope the Democratic Party will persist in the folly of believing that the vote in Texas does not mean anything. If they will do that, we will move a great many of the chairs over to this side of the aisle. So I would advise them to keep on thinking that the elections like the one in Texas do not mean anything. They do mean something.

Mr. HUMPHREY obtained the floor.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am not constrained to believe that there is any ban on the election of Democratic Senators in the State of Maryland any more than there is on great rejoicing in Maryland when Republicans are elected in their State.

If there is any feeling there against Democratic Senators—I hope the Senator from Maryland will pardon my statement, because I do not wish to seem immodest—I am not aware of it, because I have been invited by Marylanders to participate in the Memorial Day ceremonies at Antietam tomorrow, and I have been told that that will be the largest Memorial Day meeting in Maryland tomorrow.

Mr. BUTLER. I congratulate the Senator from Texas. The two things are entirely consistent. Marylanders know a good man when they see one.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am grateful to the Senator from Maryland for his extremely kind remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I should like to add a bit of political benediction to the sermonizing this morning. It seems to me the lesson which has been assigned for Democrats to learn—and I lay no claim to expertise on this subject—is that the Republicans have a moment of joy now and then; and anything we can do to help in that respect is agreeable to me.

It seems to me, first, that the Democrats had better learn how to unite. They surely did not learn much about that in the primaries. Second, if a Democratic candidate expects to be victorious, I suggest that he support the President of the United States and the program which the President has set forth as the administration's program. This is, in my opinion, a very popular and also constructive way to conduct a campaign. Third, I suggest that the Democratic candidate support the Democratic platform. Fourth, I suggest that the people be given a choice. Those are my suggestions for Democratic success.

We shall look forward to welcoming this new moment of joy into the Republican ranks.

THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN CONFERENCE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, one of the basic questions for determination in the forthcoming meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev is whether the Russian Premier is willing to engage responsibly in international cooperation. A case in point is the nuclear weapons test conference which has been underway in Geneva for more than 2½ years. This conference has now arrived at the primary question of the willingness or unwillingness of the Russians to accept a reliable inspection system to verify compliance with the terms of any agreement reached. This, in turn, relates to the secrecy of the Soviet society and advantages this gives them in military, paramilitary, and propaganda activities.

Unless the Russians will accept inspection to verify their compliance with an agreement on nuclear explosions, then little hope is left that they will accept the vastly more complicated system of inspection necessary for general disarmament.

Mr. President, on April 8, 1961, I cabled President Kennedy from Geneva my assessment of this issue. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a declassified version of the cablegram.

There being no objection, the text of the cablegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 8, 1961.

The U.S.S.R. delegate to the Test Ban Conference on Nuclear Weapons has demanded a veto of all decisions and operations of any verification and control body that may be agreed upon. This veto would include even all details of the budget for such an organization. There is substantial evidence—both corroborative and accumulative—that this is a high-level Communist policy decision and related to their concerted attack upon the U.N. This evidence includes the statement by Gromyko to McCloy. I recommend that the President and Macmillan consider the advisability of requiring a resolution of this demand for a veto before going ahead with what clearly appears to be a prolonged stall on the part of the U.S.S.R. regarding detailed negotiations. Why not call their hand now on this question of a veto? This demand was presented on the first day of the resumed conference. It was presented prior to the presentation of the proposals of the West. It could not have been done lightly. Maybe we should have regarded it as an estoppel there, but it seems pointless to proceed in negotiating on details if this is a firm position by the U.S.S.R. Such a provision would not only render a test treaty unworkable, unreliable, and unacceptable, it would be a clear precedent for an abortive conference on disarmament and would strengthen the U.S.S.R. attack on the U.N.

I have been happy to see the closest United Kingdom-United States teamwork that I have yet observed at this conference. These negotiations should not, in my view, be permitted to drag and merge with a wider upcoming conference on disarmament. This is particularly true if the veto demand is unresolved.

THE PASSING OF THE OLD SENATE SUBWAY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on Thursday the majority leader made a short announcement on the Senate floor which should have been received with sadness by every Member of this body. It was a simple statement that attracted no attention in the press and probably

very little here on Capitol Hill. I quote his statement in its entirety:

Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I announce that one of the old trolleys in the old tunnel will continue in operation until at least the end of the present session.

This announcement signals the end of the line for one of the most stable, reliable, and popular institutions on Capitol Hill. These remarkable old cars have seen a lot of history made in the Congress. They have performed their function well, and I, for one, am saddened and depressed to see them replaced.

I shall long remember with pleasure the swift, silent manner in which they conveyed me to and from the old office building. There was a minimum of friction and noise as they responded to the operator's gentle manipulation of the lever. There was an intimate comaraderie among the Members as they piled into or out of the open seats unhindered by doors or other obstacles arbitrarily barring the way. In short, these old cars were soothing to the jangled nerves and put the Members of this body in a friendly and amicable frame of mind when they arrived to do battle over the Nation's business.

Mr. President, I considered for some time introducing a resolution which would have insured continuation of the old system and disposition of the new one. I even went so far as to draw up a resolution which I thought was appropriate to the situation. However, since I am a realist and have participated in the legislative processes of the Senate for some time, I was forced to admit that my resolution had little or no chance of passage and that it would have been a waste of scarce tax money to introduce it and have it printed in proper form.

In order to make my views known on the demise of our old subway system, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution I prepared printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Senate is a unique institution among legislative bodies of the world and possesses a unique transportation system in keeping with the character of the Senate; and

Whereas in this era of rapid destruction of established traditions and values, it behooves us to preserve those institutions which have proven themselves with the passage of time; and

Whereas the members of the United States Senate, their staffs and visitors to the U. S. Capitol have been transported swiftly and comfortably by an efficient subway car system for forty-five years; and

Whereas these ancient subway cars have become an institution of the Senate and have been trusted servants of the Congress and the general public; and

Whereas a new system of inferior conveyances is being foisted upon the Senate and the public as a substitute for these remarkable vehicles; and

Whereas these creations are ungainly, uncomfortable, unpopular and unpredictable; and

Whereas it is suspected that the irritable, testy, acrimonious atmosphere prevailing in the Senate this session is in part induced by the jolting, jarring, nerve-racking ride to the Senatorial Chamber provided by the new subway cars; and

Whereas the new subway system cost the American taxpayers several millions of dollars; and

Whereas the new subway cars have created an additional expense burden on Senators for frequent repairs to their wives' coiffures; and

Whereas all Senators need more exercise to keep their minds and bodies in proper condition for arduous night sessions, early breakfasts with constituents, and making difficult voting decisions, and use of the old subway system would require more exercise on the part of Senators with suites in the New Senate Office Building; and

Whereas the United States Senate should frankly admit that it has made a monstrous mistake and return to the tried and true old subway system: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That (a) there is hereby created a select committee of the Senate to be known as the Save Our Subway Committee to be composed of five Senators appointed by the Vice President.

(b) This committee shall take immediate steps to insure continued operation of the traditional subway cars between the Old Senate Office Building and the Capitol.

(c) The committee will also take such steps as are necessary to discontinue the new subway system and dispose of the subway cars and related equipment as expeditiously as possible. In disposing of such cars and equipment the committee may enter into negotiations with:

(1) Disneyland;

(2) Coney Island;

(3) Any other public or privately owned amusement park;

(4) Moscow (U.S.S.R.) Subway Authority.

The committee will make every effort to recoup as much of the taxpayers' money from such sale as possible.

(d) The committee will study ways for efficient utilization of the space in the abandoned subway tunnels. Among uses to be studied it shall consider, but not be limited to, the following possibilities:

(A) Rental of office space to Members of the House of Representatives;

(B) Partitioning of the space for use as senatorial refuges from job seekers;

(C) Additional parking space for congressional employees.

(e) The committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the Senate by January 31, 1962.

CASTRO, POLITICAL PRISONERS, AND TRACTORS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not yield to any Senator during the statement I am about to make. At the conclusion of my remarks, I shall be happy to yield for questions.

Mr. President, in the annals of contemporary dictatorships, few incidents have so shocked the world and few incidents have so solidified public opinion against a dictator as has the Castro proposal to exchange the lives of political prisoners for American tractors. The outburst of editorial comment against this cruel proposal is unprecedented in terms of the condemnation of a chief of state.

While some persons in America have been content to wring their hands and cry "blackmail," others have moved with purpose and direction to call the Cuban dictator's bluff and to save lives. In so doing, a new unity of purpose is being forged among the free nations of the Western Hemisphere. No one act has before so fully crystallized the public opinion of the Western Hemisphere upon a single issue as has the Cuban dictator's incredible proposal to trade political prisoners for tractors. Castro has made a singular diplomatic blunder. In the New York Times' compilation of the reaction of the Latin American press, it was stated as follows:

In Sao Paulo—

Brazil—

the largest anti-Communist demonstration in history has occurred there. It consisted mainly of students—normally anti-American—many of whom wore prisoners' uniforms and carried signs condemning Castro. They appealed for money for tractors. Also in Sao Paulo, a woman has offered her blood to help the Cuban prisoners. In Bogotá, groups are going up to people in the street and asking to "buy a life." In Santiago and in Rio, Communist groups have actually begun to form committees condemning the committees formed to raise money for tractors.

Later in my comments, I shall place in the RECORD a full review of Latin American editorial and journalistic comment on the Castro proposal.

Castro's cynical proposal—his playing with human lives—has revealed a shocking contempt for human life on the part of the Cuban regime.

On the other hand, the bold and generous step taken by the founders of the Tractors for Freedom Committee in the United States and the outspoken support of our President have struck a deep chord of liberal humanitarianism throughout all of free Latin America. President Kennedy's popularity in Latin America is at a new high, because he has demonstrated again his great and deep concern for human life.

Castro's propaganda stunt has been turned into a political disaster for the Cuban regime. At a time when Castro's propaganda seemed to be taking hold in Latin America, one reckless statement by the Cuban dictator gave us the opportunity to dramatize and highlight the basic difference between a free society and a dictatorship. We are not talking here merely about abstract principles. We are talking about human beings, God's finest creations. There are among us those who have charged that America shows weakness because we are willing to exchange tractors for 1,200 freedom fighters. What an absurdity. A great nation like the United States demonstrates strength, not weakness, when it takes action to save human lives.

Surely there is no one who feels that Cuba under Castro or anyone else is a military threat to the United States, 35 times its population, and infinitely stronger by any measurement. That is ridiculous upon its face. Furthermore, as I said last week in the Senate, the American people know that if it were merely tractors that Castro wanted, and if tractors would be admitted as a threat to American security, the tractors are available from the So-

viet Union, from Czechoslovakia, or from other places. No, Mr. President; Castro was trying to play international politics. He was engaging in international propaganda, and it has slapped him in his face.

Our Judeo-Christian tradition, our whole democratic philosophy, calls upon us to save lives. Indeed, the central principle of freedom is that God created man in His own image, and that no man who may be saved is to be abandoned.

We build hospitals, we emphasize the relief of suffering, and we are proud of these works. Compassion is a virtue—not an evil.

Compassion is strength, not weakness. I am dismayed and shocked when I see some Americans become so swollen with false pride that they preach of "national honor" in order to block the rescue of fellow human beings.

Is it honorable to abandon these 1,200 men who are now at the mercy of the Cuban dictatorship when there is an opportunity to save them?

I would remind my brethren of the story of the Good Samaritan. I would remind them of the number who passed by that one who lay in the road, injured, and of the Good Samaritan who cared for that injured man, even though he went against the mores of his time.

I am astonished at the lack of understanding of the legal precedents for the proposal of the Tractors for Freedom Committee. The distinguished American historian, Prof. Merle Curti, of the University of Wisconsin, has stressed the long and honorable American tradition of charitable contributions to save those who suffer from war and revolution. Indeed, this is an Anglo-American tradition which goes back to the Elizabethan Statute of Charitable Uses of 1601, authorizing charity for the "relief and redemption of prisoners and captives."

Mr. President, this is a part of the very legal and moral fabric of Western civilization and of Anglo-Saxon law.

The Father of our Country, President George Washington, in 1790, obtained from the Congress funds for the relief of the victims of the revolution in Santo Domingo. Here was the first President of the United States not only personally involved in a mission of mercy and rescue, but even officially supporting a Federal appropriation for the purpose.

As Professor Curti has so ably stated, those who cry that there is no legal precedent for the indirect involvement of the U.S. Government do so from a defective knowledge of law and history.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement by Professor Curti, which was joined in by Prof. Irvin G. Willie, of the University of Wisconsin, and was reported this morning by the Associated Press, be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Opponents of the drive to exchange 500 American tractors for 1,200 prisoners held by the Cuban Government "speak from a defective knowledge of law and history" a Pulitzer Prize winning historian said today.

Dr. Merle E. Curti, in a joint statement with a faculty colleague, Irvin G. Willie of the University of Wisconsin, traced to England's Elizabethan Statute of Charitable Uses, adopted in 1601, the "release and redemption of prisoners and captives" as a valid use of charity.

The statement noted that in 1790 President George Washington obtained from Congress funds for release of victims of the revolution of Santo Domingo. It added: "Here was the Father of the Country, while he was President, not only personally involved but also supporting a Federal appropriation for the victims of a foreign revolution.

"President Kennedy has historical and legal precedent on his side in asserting that a long and American tradition stands behind the granting of charitable assistance to those who suffer in consequence of war."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I prefer to complete my remarks first, if the Senator from Kentucky will permit.

Mr. COOPER. Very well.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, Mr. President, even if there were no historical precedents to justify the action of free American citizens in voluntarily joining together for the purpose of saving these 1,200 lives, I would still be for it.

The way to establish precedent is to take action. Someone has to do it first. I favor what we are doing, because it is morally right, it is politically right, it is spiritually right. It fits in with my religious beliefs. I say that any man who reads the Scriptures and believes what he reads, cannot fail to recognize the importance of saving lives. All too often we Americans equate strength with simple brute power. I say there is strength in humility; there is strength in love; there is strength in goodness; there is strength in justice; there is strength in compassion. To my mind, the strongest man who ever lived or ever will live was the Man of Galilee; and his life was dedicated to love, compassion, justice, peace, and humility.

And to my mind, the weakest man is the brute.

I am happy to join on the side of those who believe in justice and compassion and decency.

Mr. President, at a time when disorder and violence reign widespread, when headlines scream of torture and death, the world is hungry for a reaffirmation of compassion and mercy; and I can think of no better country from which that affirmation should come than from our own beloved America. We are proud of our churches. Let us be proud not only of the physical edifices of the churches, but of their spiritual message as well. It is communism, it is dictatorship, which repudiates human values, which rejects human dignity, which uses human lives for the purposes of the state. It is communism, it is dictatorship which places false pride and arrogant power above justice and mercy.

Had we not boldly declared that human beings are worth more than tractors, we should have been no better than the cynical despot who ranks tractors above people.

Mr. President, I hear today from many voices in America that we should not be helping these prisoners, because that would somehow demean us.

I have noted that the former Vice President of the United States has charged that it was morally wrong and unwise for the United States to trade 500 tractors for 1,200 prisoners, and has urged our President to withdraw his approval of this transaction. He even went so far as to say that the freedom of 5 million Cubans could be delayed by trying to win freedom for 1,200 brave young men. This is not a fact. It is merely an assertion. It is a statement without support. We had a right to expect more from one who knows only too well the critical situation that has existed so long throughout Latin America.

Mr. Nixon is wrong on every count when he attacks the President and the Tractors for Freedom Committee. First of all, he is morally wrong. He flies squarely in the face of the whole Judeo-Christian heritage.

Secondly, he is legally wrong, and he is ranked on the wrong side from both the present President of the United States and the first President.

Third, he is politically wrong, for, as it has been so amply documented earlier today by the director of the United States Information Agency, the political reaction throughout Latin America, and indeed the whole non-Communist world, has enthusiastically supported the position of the President and the committee, and, may I say, condemned the cynical, cruel proposal and purposes of Mr. Castro.

Mr. Nixon has struck out, and it is now time that he gracefully bowed out and permitted Americans of good will to rally behind the humanitarian effort to save lives and to release freedom fighters from prison camps. I hope he will help in this effort, and I appeal to him to do so.

Those who have charged that America shows weakness because we are willing to ransom 1,200 freedom fighters cannot be serious.

Who but those who would make any attack for political purposes would make a statement like that? Who would seriously believe that America's colossal military strength is in any way threatened by the addition of 500 American tractors to the Cuban economy?

As I said Thursday, Czechoslovakian tractors can be moved into Cuba just as easily as tanks and aircraft have been moved in. It is not a question of whether or not tractors are going to be sent to Cuba.

It is a question of whether Cuban patriots are going to be permitted to rot in jail or to die before the Castro firing squads.

I think it is appropriate to ask: What do those who are critics of the proposal suggest we do? Do they suggest we ignore the Cuban patriots? Do they suggest we do nothing? Do they suggest that we stand on pride while men who trusted us die for it?

I say again that a great nation like the United States demonstrates strength,

not weakness, when it takes action to save human lives.

Mr. President, this morning at 10:30, Mr. Edward R. Murrow, Director of USIA, issued a statement which summarizes the width and the depth of support throughout the Americas for the position of the President of the United States and the Tractors for Freedom Committee.

I ask unanimous consent for the printing at this point in the RECORD of the full summary of Latin American editorial comment and Latin American cooperative efforts to supplement the United States effort to rescue the prisoners of Castro and the statement of Edward R. Murrow, Director, U.S. Information Agency.

There being no objection, the summary and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF EDWARD R. MURROW, DIRECTOR U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY, MAY 29, 1961

Perhaps I should begin by apologizing for interrupting a pleasant weekend, however, I trust that the information we have collected will not be found unpleasing.

This Agency, as is its custom, has been conducting a continuing survey of press and radio reaction to Fidel Castro's offer to exchange prisoners for tractors. It is clear that Castro has blustered his way into a major blunder. With a single utterance he has erased that narrow line of philosophy and tactics that separates communism from fascism.

Almost without exception the press and radio of the free world have drawn the obvious parallel between his proposal and that of the Germans when they offered to trade Jews for trucks. Castro revealed himself for what he is and U.S. reaction reflected what we are. Most of the free world found our response to the offer to be in accord with our heritage and tradition of regard for the individual. Castro has damaged the cause of communism. His senior partners in Moscow and Peiping have not supported him.

There is a ground swell of disgust welling up in Latin America. We have prepared for you a summary of press reaction. From both conservative and liberal newspapers, from Government figures, from committees, and voluntary groups, the comment is the same. This has been accompanied by demonstrations for freedom by students, women, legislators in favor of the United States.

Castro's offer has been called blackmail. That is a handy word, but in civilized countries censure of the act should run to the blackmailer not to the blackmailed. As Dr. Milton Eisenhower observed, a mother paying ransom to regain the life of a child is not denounced because she deals with a blackmailer. The calumny is on the head of the man perpetrating the wrong not on the wronged.

In recent days, after more than a week of hesitation, Communist radio stations are calling Castro's offer an act of humanitarianism, but the Communist press, particularly in Latin America, has maintained what can only be described as an embarrassed silence.

The U.S. Information Agency can claim no credit for this widespread response of revulsion. It was not our informational propaganda that produced the result. Such editorial reaction cannot be persuaded or purchased. The reaction in Latin America and elsewhere was the response of free men to an offer to trade men for machines. The result was predictable. Had the people of this country remained mute, the reaction would have undoubtedly been otherwise.

REACTION TO CASTRO'S PRISONERS-FOR-TRACTORS PROPOSAL

NONAMERICAN (SUMMARIZED MAY 23, 1961)

Far East

Tokyo's Mainichi Shimbun (independent), in its commentary column, called the offer fantastic. Its Washington correspondent, in a separate background story, reported: "The Castro demand reminded us of Eichmann's 'human-for-goods' demand in which he asked for 10,000 trucks in exchange for the freedom of a million Jews." "* * * this Nazi example is apparently being followed by the Castro regime."

Manila's The Manila Chronicle stated: "In these modern times we are witnessing an anachronistic spectacle in the negotiations to ransom prisoners of Fidel Castro. The bearded dictator might as well have demanded $15 million in pieces of gold. This is the cost of 500 bulldozers or tractors. The Philippine paper added: "The whole thing sounds like a page from old history."

Western Europe

Turin, Italy's left-of-center La Stampa stated: "The U.S. Government accepted Castro's cynical blackmail for humanitarian reasons."

Germany's independent Stuttgarter Nachrichten editorialized: "Cardinals, trade union leaders, Democrats, Republicans * * * let themselves be blackmailed in the interest of humanity. They do a good deed because they cannot do a better one. Unfortunately, the peoples cannot sell their tyrants for tractors."

Soviet

As far as can be ascertained, Soviet propagandists have up to now not commented on Castro's trade proposal, and Moscow might well be unwilling to handle this rather shoddy affair propagandistically until it discerns the prevailing wind of world reactions.

Despite the overall condemnation in Latin America, there have been no suggestions for an outright rejection of the Castro proposal but there have been offers by various organizations in the area to raise funds or provide tratcors.

1. Independent center Messengero of Rome headlined: "America will export tractors to Cuba to redeem anti-Castro prisoners—dramatic charges from Americans repatriated from the island against communist dictator regime. Terror in Cuba—opposition overthrown with force."

2. Paris daily Combat: "It is difficult to understand that committee composed of high American personalities is ready to collect money to make this odious deal possible. The reference to the Nazi regime has not embarrassed Castro, not even memory of famous exchange of Jews against trucks." Note: Castro's tractor proposal was widely reported in L'Humanite, Paris-Jour, France-Soir, Liberation, Monde, Figaro.

3. Brussels Labor Catholic La Cite: "Everywhere, Castro's offer is being judged severely. It reminds us of Hitler's offer to exchange Jews against trucks. In 1944, Joel Brand submitted to the Allies an exchange proposal: 1 million Jews, still alive, against 10,000 trucks. Mr. Castro is willing to remit to the Americans 1,200 prisoners in exchange for 500 tractors. In the first case, a truck was worth 10,000 human beings, in the second, 2½ human beings suffice to get a tractor. You can see it: Humanity advances with giant steps in the direction of a golden age under the sign of respect for the individual. Castro's barter proposal makes us sick by its disgusting cynicism. Human being are not machines. They have hearts, and in the hearts of these humiliated and offended people, anger is growing, it is growing, and some day, it is going to explode."

LATIN AMERICAN SUMMARY (MAY 24, 1961)
U.S. Information Agency

The extent of the adverse reaction that is sweeping Latin America can be gaged by the growing number of committees arising throughout the area for the purpose of collecting funds to purchase the tractors. To date, not counting committees formed by the Cuban exile groups, nine have been reported, including the exiled Nicaraguan revolutionary movement. O Estado de Sao Paulo, Brazil's leading daily, has offered a tractor on its own and in addition is coordinating a drive to collect further funds. In Honduras, a former Communist and Castro-supporter, Roberto Dominguez Agurcia, has formed the Frente Hondureno Pro-Liberacion de Cuba and is now engaged in a funds-for-tractors drive.

In Caracas the papers Esfera and Universal carried ads attributed to "mothers of Venezuela" asking for donations and signed "Tractors for Ransom Committee" and San Ignacio Social Christian Organization.

The reaction in the Latin American press has been extremely critical from both conservatives and liberals. The far leftist press has chosen to remain silent thus far, and has limited itself to straight wire service reporting of the offer with no editorial commentary. The following quotations are representative of the general reaction throughout Latin America:

Argentina

La Capital, Rosario (moderately liberal; a leading provincial daily): "The incredible proposition has again shaken the free world with its brutality and utilitarianism, free of any human feeling."

La Presna, Buenos Aires (liberal; the country's leading daily): "In Cuba there are no gas chambers in use; but they have been replaced with the execution wall."

La Nacion, Buenos Aires (moderately liberal; a leading daily): "In general, the proposal is a surprising recourse" which arises from "the possibility of American steps against his [Castro's] regime."

Brazil

Diario Carioca, Rio de Janeiro (liberal; a leading daily): "The ransom operation now being negotiated in Washington reveals in all its hideousness the inhuman nature of the Cuban revolution."

O Globo, Rio de Janeiro (moderately liberal; country's largest circulation: "Hitler wanted to trade Jews for trucks; Fidel Castro wants to trade Cubans for tractors. It may be that this shows progress or superiority of communism or socialism—as the Cuban regime prefers to be called in order to create confusion—over nazism, but we can't see any."

Colombia

El Espectador, Bogotá (strongly liberal; country's second largest circulation): "* * * Even though the exchange has been suggested in terms that shame humanity, we believe that it should be accepted."

La Republica, Gogota (moderately conservative; a leading daily): "Freedom will always be dear; there will always be men ready to purchase it whatever the price."

Costa Rica

La Republica, San José (Costa Rica's leading liberal daily): "Fidel Castro committed the mistake of aiming at a target that brought into action the most notable characteristic of the North American people, generosity. * * * This has always been the error of the Communists, they work on numbers and figures, and forget that there are only human beings."

Diario de Costa Rica, San José (Costa Rica's leading conservative daily): "The offer is not surprising since Castro is "possessed

by devils, a Marxist, an atheist, and inhuman.'"

Ecuador

El Telegrafo, Guayaquil (liberal; influential), kept up an editorial barrage for 3 consecutive days:

"Even though this is a filthy blackmail, I believe the sinoids should be given the machines they want because it might be that tomorrow they would want to trade Roa for a still."

"We must insure in every way that the prisoners really regain their freedom. No precaution is amiss with the bearded or barbaric Red autocrat of America."

"The baseness of the proposal made by Fidel Castro—always faithful to his code of extermination—will serve to enhance the nobility of North American democracy, because the people of the United States are ready to collect the necessary funds to purchase the 500 tractors."

Guatemala

El Imparcial, Guatemala City (liberal and often critical of the United States, a leading daily): "The totalitarian cynicism has exceeded all limits with two facts that revolt the conscience of all decent men: the first is the sordid valuation of human life made by Castro in offering to trade the prisoners for tractors, the mockery is debasing to the Cuban people and to the one who made it."

Nicaragua

La Prensa, Managua (moderately conservative, a leading daily): "It is awful to know that in this America of ours, so far removed in time and space from the Saracen coast, first to emancipate the slaves and first to claim all the freedoms, slavery has now established itself at a level much more materialistic and commercial than that known by the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians, Greeks, or Romans."

Panama

El Pais, Panama City (moderately liberal, a leading daily): "No one with a particle of respect for his own nationality could think of selling his countrymen for tools. It is paradoxical that the 'aggressors' should be the ones outdoing themselves to collect funds with which to save the lives of the Cuban citizens who are persecuted in their own country."

Peru

Ultima Hora (a leading daily, moderately conservative): "The proposal shows the false apostle in his true light. It shows him to be the vilest huckster among the agents of Soviet imperialism. As if it were not enough that he has tried to sell his country to the Moscow hierarchs, he now makes his cynical offer to trade patriots for tractors."

Uruguay

El Plata, Montevideo (Blanco Party organ, conservative, a leading daily): "One thing should have become clear * * * the Fidel Castro regime has reached a degree of degeneracy and brutality that revolts human understanding."

El Bien Publico (Catholic conservative), La Manana (moderately liberal), and El Pais (moderately conservative) all compared the Castro offer to the Eichmann exchange of Jews for trucks.

Venezuela

El Mundo, Caracas (leftist liberal, often critical of the United States). "With this offer to trade men for trucks (sic), in addition to the policy of the firing squad, Fidel Castro has enthroned antihumanism in America." (Note: A direct slap at Fidel's claim of "humanismo" for his revolution.)

COMMENT FROM WESTERN EUROPE

Vienna

Neue Tageszeitung: "The civilized world has been overcome by so many unheard of things since the end of the war that it is no longer easy today to shock it. But the Cuba 'enfant terrible' Fidel Castro has obviously succeeded in shocking the world by his amazing offer to exchange 1,200 Cuban refugees who were captured during the ill-fated invasion attempt for 500 American bulldozers * * *. For which purpose does the dictator of Cuba need 500 of these big machines? For the building of airfields and other military installations? For such a purpose he is even willing to touch dirty Yankee bills, and the committee will see to it that he gets them. Thus the whole business is rather disagreeable."

Graz

Graz Catholic Daily (Vienna): "The very same deal, though in larger proportions, had been suggested to the Western Allies by Eichmann in the final phase of World War II. Through a go-between Eichmann made the following offer to America and Britain: 1 million Jews would be saved from the extermination camps if 10,000 trucks were supplied for Hitler's armies. It is the same evil spirit that manifests itself here brutally—with Castro as well as with Eichmann, with the Fascist dictatorship as well as with the Communist people's democracy."

Stuttgart

Stuttgarter Nachrichten (independent): "Like a medieval ruler or a modern robber chief, Castro has asked for a ransom for his prisoners. He has requested 500 American tractors, most likely delivered to the door, in return for 1,200 prisoners, Cuban opponents to Castro."

Turin, Italy

La Stampa (influential, left-of-center): "U.S. Government accepted Castro's cynical blackmail for humanitarian reasons. Castro having threatened to send the political prisoners to forced labor."

Frankfurt

Frankfurter Neue Presse linked the race riots in Alabama with the Castro tractor subject, and concluded that "it is tragic that this outbreak serves to cover up the much crasser brutality of Moscow's fellow-traveler, Fidel Castro."

LATEST REACTIONS (MAY 25, 1961) TO THE TRACTOR-FOR-PEOPLE DEAL

Communist: First Communist commentary on the Cuban proposal came from Moscow and East Germany on May 24. The comment focuses on the alleged humanitarianism of Castro's exchange proposal. East Germany manages to avoid any reference to the tractor aspect, and stresses instead the fact that the exchange proposed is only another indication of the benevolent Cuban attitude toward the counterrevolutionaries and a "manifestation of the internal solidarity of the country." Moscow deplored U.S. cynicism and hypocrisy which asked average Americans to contribute a dollar toward the purchase of the bulldozers while withholding from them the fact that tens of millions of dollars will be spent to maintain counterrevolutionary forces.

Latin America: In Uruguay eight mass-circulation papers have started a fund to buy tractors. In the Brazilian state of Sao Paulo a deputy introduced a proposal in the state assembly calling for authorization for the state to buy a tractor to exchange for Cuba prisoners. And in Buenos Aires, 53 deputies of Frondizi's party condemned the exchange proposed by Castro. They submitted a draft resolution in Parliament by which the house of deputies would "condemn the inhuman policy pursued by Fidel Castro's dictatorial regime, which oppressed our sister Republic of Cuba, in its offer to exchange prisoners for tractors, thus reviving the policy pursued by Nazi totaliarianism in offering the dramatic choice of blood for trucks."

One deputy also asked the Parliament to approach all (South) American Parliaments to issue statements condemning Fidel Castro similar to the one he and his colleagues are sponsoring.

Cuba: Cuban output manifests continuing sensitivity over comparisons made between Castro's offer and Nazi tactics. It hits back both at Americans and at Cubans living abroad by trying to smear them with the label of racists and Nazis. At the same time Cuba enlarges on the theme that the Castro proposal, which at best is partial compensation for damages suffered, is "motivated by the highest standards of humanity."

FIDEL CASTRO'S BARTER PROPOSAL

A ground swell of criticism against Fidel Castro's offer to barter prisoners for tractors is rising throughout Latin America.

Newspapers of widely varying political leanings are branding the deal editorially as "inhuman," and "filthy blackmail." Numerous groups have been organized to join U.S. private efforts to raise funds for tractors.

Virtually the only oversea comment favorable to Dr. Castro's offer has come from Cuba itself, and from Communist bloc countries.

A Government-controlled station, Radio Mambi of Havana, declared that the prisoners "can only be considered as cheap merchandise, commercial objects which can be exchanged for other objects—'worm' for 'caterpillar'—because the English word 'caterpillar' means cheap worm."

In a recent Spanish language broadcast, radio Moscow referred to the offer as an act of great humanitarianism.

Here is a country-by-country roundup of reaction in the Americas.

ARGENTINA

On May 23, a group of citizens in Buenos Aires demonstrated in front of the Cuban Embassy carrying posters condemning the Castro dictatorship. The Argentine League for the Protection of Children has cabled the Cuban Government asking a cessation of hostilities.

Deputy Oscar Lopez Serrot introduced a bill in the Argentine Chamber of Deputies expressing the chamber's "repudiation of the inhuman policy of the dictatorial regime of Fidel Castro of offering an exchange of prisoners for tractors, reviving the Nazi offer of 'blood for trucks.' * * *"

The Argentine Association for the United Nations declared that "to accept today as a possible transaction the sale of lives, whether in money or in kind, signals a marked process of breakdown in the difficult fight for the recognition of the rights of man and the safeguarding of those rights. The proposal is inconceivable and unacceptable."

La Capital of Rosario declared: "The incredible proposition has again shaken the free world with its brutality and utilitarianism, free of any human feeling."

La Prensa, Buenos Aires: "The dilemma is not very different from nazism. In Cuba there are no gas chambers in use; but they have been replaced with the execution wall."

La Nacion, Buenos Aires: "* * * a surprising recourse * * *. To exchange prisoners for tractors is equivalent to subscribing to a proclamation of abomination of the human state."

BOLIVIA

Presencia, La Paz: Calling the offer "another move in Castro's tragic circus," this newspaper called on individuals to contribute toward the purchase of tractors.

Ultima Hora, La Paz: Declared Castro's offer is worse than the Nazis since "Castro is trading his own countrymen."

BRAZIL

The newspaper O Estado de Sao Paulo offered to contribute one tractor to the

fund. It said this announcement was followed immediately "by calls to the editorial office offering the most spontaneous and warm support." The newspaper added: "We understand the broad significance of the support our readers give us to be a reflection of the public opinion that at this hour is sweeping all around the Americas, and from which the Brazilian people would not be absent."

Diario Carioca, Rio de Janeiro: "The ransom operation now being negotiated in Washington reveals in all its hideousness the inhuman nature of the Cuban revolution."

O Globo, Rio de Janeiro: "Hitler wanted to trade Jews for trucks; Fidel Castro wants to trade Cubans for tractors. It may be that this shows progress or superiority of communism, of 'socialism'—as the Cuban regime prefers to be called in order to create confusion—over nazism, but we can't see any."

COLOMBIA

Colombian women have started a fund-raising campaign declaring that this occasion "offers all free people of our hemisphere the opportunity to demonstrate to the entire world our Christian sentiments and the respect that democracies hold for human life." Participants expressed hope that "all women of Latin America" would support the drive. The group said "we are ready to begin various public collections immediately, to visit industries, commerce, establishments of all kinds, to see aid large or small in the streets from all free and Christian Colombians to help buy tractors to save lives."

El Espectador, Bogotá: "Even though the exchange has been suggested in terms that shame humanity, we believe that it should be accepted." The proposal "* * * contributes to nothing beyond making more outstanding the enormous mistake made by Castro once again by assuming that with this show of 'generosity' he would lessen the unpopularity of the repressive system he instituted from the time he assumed power."

La Republica, Bogotá: "Freedom will always be dear; there will always be men ready to purchase it whatever the price."

El Tiempo, Bogotá "Fidel Castro's proposal to exchange human lives for farm implements belongs to the lowest category. A bunch of tractors are the price, according to his mentality and conscience, for the right of his war prisoners to regain freedom. In terms of manufactured iron, their patriotism and bravery in trying to liberate their country are evaluated. * * * There is no doubt that the American people will give all they can to show the world that in this continent the spirit of liberty and Christianism stands generously and with solidarity."

COSTA RICA

The manager of a radio station in San Jose, Leonel Pinto, has started a fund raising movement and has cabled Mrs. Roosevelt offering cooperation. Other press and radio people, as well as an engineer and a legislator, have joined the effort.

La Republica, San Jose: "Fidel Castro committed the mistake of aiming at a target that brought into action the most notable characteristic of the North American people, generosity. * * * This has always been the error of the Communists, they work on numbers and figures, and forget that there are only human beings."

Diairio de Costa Rica, San Jose: "We cannot ignore the unheard-of and inhuman proposal to exchange prisoners for tractors, which shows Fidel to be a monster without God or law for whom human dignity and human rights are worth no more than a cipher." (He) "is possessed by devils, a Marxist, an atheist, and inhuman."

CHILE

The Committee of Human Solidarity, composed of Chilean women, is seeking funds to help the U.S. private effort.

El Diario Ilustrado, Santiago: "The Cuban dictator, Fidel Castro, gave a fantastic demonstration this week of his totalitarian disregard for the human person."

ECUADOR

El Comercia, Quito: This newspaper published a cartoon of Fidel Castro looking through the window of a maternity ward rubbing his hands and dreaming of more tractors.

El Telegrafo, Guayaquil: "Even though this is filthy blackmail, I believe the simoids should be given the machines they want because it might be that tomorrow they would want to trade Roa for a still.

"We must insure in every way that the prisoners really regain their freedom. No precaution is amiss with the bearded or barbaric Red autocrat of America.

"The baseness of the proposal made by Fidel Castro—always faithful to his code of extermination—will serve to enhance the nobility of North American democracy, because the people of the United States are ready to collect the necessary funds to purchase the 500 tractors."

EL SALVADOR

A national committee called the Colon for Liberty has been formed to urge each Salvadorian to contribute 1 colon (currency worth about 40 cents U.S.) to the fund for tractors. Commenting on this effort, the newspaper La Prensa Grafica, of San Salvador, said: "In this way we are calling upon all Salvadorian lovers of liberty who still have faith in democratic principles to aid in liberating our Cuban brothers who have been offered in exchange for tractors, or, in other words, human beings in exchange for springs, cogwheels, nuts and bolts."

La Prensa Grafica added: "The first impression is to recall Hitler's asking for trucks in exchange for the life of Jewish prisoners, but even this case does not plumb the depths of ignominy as does that of Castro, a renegade Cuban, offering up for sale the lives of other Cubans."

GUATEMALA

The Movimiento de Liberacion Nacional, a political party, is leading fund-raising activities in which other groups including the Association of Christian Mothers are participating.

Diairio de Centro America, Guatemala City: "As Israel's prosecution against the arch-genocide Adolf Eichmann exposed the crimes of Nazism to the world, the monstrous negotiation proposed by Dr. Castro has chilled millions of freemen in all the world. The blackest crimes and the most despised evaluation of the human being has again implanted itself, this time in the hemisphere. * * *" "Castro has revived a page of current human history that humanity wishes to forget. His vile imitation of Eichmann has ended forever the little sympathy he still may have had in Latin America and Europe."

El Imparcial, Guatemala City: "The totalitarian cynicism has exceeded all limits with two facts that revolt the conscience of all decent men: the first is the sordid valuation of human life made by Castro in offering to trade the prisoners for tractors; the mockery is debasing to the Cuban people and to the one who made it."

HONDURAS

A fund-raising drive has been organized in Tegucigalpa by the Honduran Front for Cuban Liberation. This campaign is being led by Roberto Dominguez Agurcia, a one-time Communist and former leader of the pro-Castro Friends of the Cuban Revolution, who renounced both communism and Castroism last January. In a message to the U.S. committee, the Honduran group said: "In the name of the Honduran Front for Cuban Liberation we join you in the campaign for funds to rescue the prisoners of Fidel Castro. We consider continental mobilization necessary to collect funds from the people, thus interpreting the best cause that humanity can defend."

El Dia, Tegucigalpa: "It is deeply disappointing that so grotesque a traffic in human liberty should take place in a courtry of the Americas. The freedom of the heroes who braved all to save their country from oppression is worth more than that materialistic equation of half a tractor for each of the thousand fighters for democracy." After commenting on U.S. aid to the Soviet Union during World War II, it continues, "This proves that the money of the so-called 'Yankee imperialism' is not always despicable, and that, despite profound differences between the Communist and democratic doctrines, there is a greater feeling of humantarianism in the democracies for assisting peoples without distinction, than that which is sloganed by the Red governments and is spread merely for propaganda."

MEXICO

An organization of small Mexican farmers has proposed (with tongue in cheek) that Mexico send Cuba, in exchange for prisoners, some 75 Russian and Czech tractors sold to Mexico years ago which proved unusable because of lack of repair parts and inaccessibility of the mechanism.

The newspaper Excelsior of Mexico City published a cartoon showing Castro holding a fettered prisoner on the auction block saying "And for this one, 10 plows, 2 television sets, and 1 sewing machine." Cartoons of a similar vein were published in other newspapers.

Excelsior, Mexico City: "For Castro Ruz a human being has no more value than some (material) thing including something that has little value."

NICARAGUA

La Prensa, Managua: It is awful to know that in this America of ours, so far removed in time and space from the Saracen coast, first to emancipate the slaves and first to claim all the freedoms, slavery has now established itself at a level much more materialistic and commercial than that known by the Babylonians, Assyrians, Phoenicians, Greeks, or Romans."

PANAMA

The newspaper El Dia has organized a committee to raise funds "for reasons of dignity and human solidarity." Represented on the committee are El Dia, a member of the Panamanian Red Cross, the president of the Union of University Students, and a delegate of the University Students Federation of Cuba in Exile.

In an editorial on May 25, El Dia said: "No one, unless he lives in an embittered emotional state will have failed to see that Fidel Castro, under pressure of internal and external events, and especially because of the infiltration of the Communist Party into his governmental machinery, has departed more and more from his original humanist theme to fall into a dehumanizing and degrading materialistic conception of life. For it is absurd to maintain as a general principle the complete denial of a humanistic Marxism. Therefore, the Cuban leader, having been put into a frame of mind in which the political adversary has become an "inimicus," can easily and unblushingly maintain before the world that, in the middle of the 20th century, it can be held publicly and without any moral qualms that the pretty business of exchanging prisoners of war for tractors can be carried out.

How is it possible that he can have considered it fair to exchange men for things, putting the former on an equal plane with the latter? It must be that his mind, clouded by the deplorable events taking place on

the island, has retrogressed through the history of humanity to that primitive era when a prisoner of war lost his legal and, so to speak, human personality and became a slave, a mere chattel that could be negotiated. The political enemy, just as the prisoner of war who has acted under international rules, deserves to be judged with fairness and without that passion which clouds and fulls.

El Pais, Panama City: "No one with a particle of respect for his own nationality could think of selling his countrymen for tools. It is paradoxical that the aggressors should be the ones to collect funds with which to save the lives of the Cuban citizens who are persecuted in their own country."

PARAGUAY

El Pais, Asunción: The prisoners for tractors offer is a "violation of all Christian principles and of all laws in the world. * * * Now, without a blush (the Communists) demand tractors for prisoners. As in colonial times, the sale of slaves is newly resumed in the Pearl of the Antilles."

PERU

A group of secondary school students in Arequipa headed by Dante Edmundo Zegarra Lopez, 16 years old, has organized a drive for funds to send to the U.S. committee headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower.

Ultima Hora, Lima: "The boastful and spectacular Fidel Castro wants to fool the world by maintaining that the exchange of prisoners for tractors is visible proof of the human feelings of the Beardocracy. It is nothing more than political blackmail. Castro is exploiting the well-founded fear that the fighters who have fallen into his hands will be stood against the wall."

La Cronica, Lima: This newspaper on May 26 published a report that the Frente Revolucionario Democratico Cubano (Cuban Revolutionary Democratic Front) plans a public collection of funds on June 3. It added editorially: "The generosity and democratic feeling of the Peruvian people could not be missing from this humanitarian movement that is acquiring world proportions. However monstrous is the operation of exchanging men for tractors, facing facts, no one can refuse to lend his assistance to this base commerce, dictatorial and repugnant, that annuls all concepts of the dignity of man."

La Prensa, Lima, published a cartoon depicting Castro trading in human bones over the caption "Businessman of the Caribbean."

URUGUAY

A committee called "Friends of Free and Democratic Cuba" headed by Dr. Raymundo Abella has launched a nationwide campaign to raise funds for tractors. At the same time, eight Montevideo newspapers published a plea to all citizens to join in fundraising efforts. A tractor of the type desired by the Prime Minister of Cuba has been placed in the centrally located Plaza Libertad (park) as a symbol.

El Bien Publico, La Manana, and El Pais, of Montevideo, all compared the Castro offer to the Eichmann exchange of Jews for trucks.

El Plata, Montevideo: "Fidel Castro, extorting blackmail with his policy of executions and torture, as Hitler intended with the assassination of Jews, offers to free prisoners in exchange for tractors that, surely, he is badly lacking.

"One thing ought to be made clear. The regime of Fidel Castro has reached a degree of degradation and brutality repugnant to the men of the Americas. And because at the base of this brutality is a total scorn for all moral feeling for life, where neither human beings or means of action count, this regime has become a great danger, which everyone can recognize."

La Patria, Montevideo: "Castro has shown himself clearly as a trafficker in the torn flesh of his own compatriots."

VENEZUELA

Distinguished Caracas women have formed a "Tractors for Ransom Committee" to raise funds for three tractors. Other Venezuelan social and philanthropic organizations have joined in the drive. Advertisements opening the fund campaign showed a Cuban mother weeping and imploring: "Help me * * *. The life of my son depends on you. The government of Fidel Castro has asked for 500 tractors to return him to me, and I have only my life to give him."

Rafael Caldera, President of the Venezuelan Chamber of Deputies and leader of the Social Christian Party (COPEI), stated in Punto Fijo (Venezuela) that "for men of democratic convictions the life of a human being must be more important than all the machines in the world."

El Mundo, Caracas: "With this offer to trade men for trucks in addition to the policy of the firing squad, Fidel Castro has enthroned antihumanism in America."

El Mundo columnist Mariano Arcaya said: "This is the limit, we start out financing an invasion to overthrow Fidel Castro and end up by cooperating with Cuban agrarian reform." He says: "Castro has taken off his 'ruler' mask and shown his 'gangster' face. His apprenticeship in the underworld of Mexico and Colombia has served him well for he is fully informed in the ransom business, money or chattel for human lives. * * * Castro's blackmail has no parallel in history unless there is some unknown event in the life of Attila and others like him. Certainly there has been nothing like it in the modern world, and we hope that it will never happen again."

Panorama, Maracaibo: "Castro does not seem pleased to be reminded that he had a pretty savage predecessor in Eichmann, murderer of Jews who exchanged prisoners for material goods." * * * "This step by Castro recalls the era of the Barbarians who seemed by now to have disappeared from the face of the earth, since the kidnaping of people for ransom is a crime punishable in many countries by the death penalty."

FIDEL CASTRO'S BARTER PROPOSAL
(SUPPLEMENT 1)

ARGENTINA

The Independent Civic Party of Argentina has released the following statement: "In view of the contempt shown by the Government of the Cuban Socialist People's Republic [sic] for the dignity of the human person, which it has dared give a material value (corresponding to one-half of a tractor), the Independent Civic Party feels that it is a question of basic human fellowship to reiterate its complete repudiation of said regime. * * * Expresses its fervent hope that the governments of America will, at least in these tragic circumstances for our continent and all humanity, defend and take a position of clear and open opposition to the tyranny imposed upon Cuba and sustained publicly and offensively by Sino-Soviet imperialism."

La Prensa, La Nación, Correo de la Tarde, and Critica of Buenos Aires and La Capital of Rosario have unequivocally repudiated the proposed prisoners for tractors deal. Correo de la Tarde, which announced its contribution to a fund, was the most vehement denouncer of the Cuban offer.

BRAZIL

A motion was introduced in the São Paulo Municipal Chamber on May 26 asking for funds to be set aside for the city of São Paulo to buy a tractor.

O Jornal, Rio de Janeiro, on May 25, said that while it felt it was better to hand over tractors to save 1,200 Cubans from "going to the wall" (al paredón), the terrible aspect of exchanging men for machines should never be forgotten.

Jornal do Brasil, Rio de Janeiro, on May 25, editorially criticized Kennedy's asking citizens to support the bargain. While crediting Mrs. Roosevelt with human compassion, the paper said it could not support such a cold-blooded plan.

Diario de Noticias, Rio de Janeiro, of May 26, while commenting that tractors could play an important role in the structure of the Cuban economy, said the appalling thing about the proposal was that with the Socialist regime of Fidel Castro was established a table of prices for one Cuban life.

Correio da Manhã, Rio de Janeiro, on May 26, carried an uncredited brief datelined Chicago which said "indifference and boredom were the reactions observed to Kennedy's request to citizens for private support of the tractor exchange plan."

Leftist Ultima Hora, Rio de Janeiro, on May 26 used Miami, Chicago, and Washington stories critical of the Kennedy position.

O Dia, Rio de Janeiro, on May 26 prominently headlined: "North American People Receive Kennedy Exhortations With Indifference."

On May 27 a picture of Mayor Wagner driving a freedom tractor was carried on the front pages of three Rio de Janeiro morning newspapers, including leftist Ultima Hora, which captioned it: "Tractors for 'the Wall.'"

CHILE

The Chilean Association of Nongovernmental Institutions for the United Nations has affiliated with the Committee for Human Solidarity to raise funds for the tractor-prisoner exchange, calling Castro's offer "a reversal in the scale of human progress."

Prensa Latina (official Cuban news agency) newscasts are playing up internal U.S. opposition to the exchange.

COSTA RICA

The press on May 27 published a circular of the Federation of University Students of Costa Rica dated May 23 urging student federations everywhere to join the campaign in favor of tractors for prisoners and requesting special efforts to free student prisoners Alberto Muller and his brother.

ECUADOR

The president of the Quito Rotary Club has proposed to the club's directorate the organizing of a fund-raising campaign.

The Anti-Communist Front of the city of Ambato, which was formed on May 26, began that day a campaign to collect funds for "Tractors for Freedom" of the Cuban invasion prisoners. The campaign will be extended to the entire country.

EL SALVADOR

Committees called Cruzada de Colón are being set up in provincial cities to collect funds for tractors.

GUATEMALA

In addition to the Movimiento de Liberación Nacional (MLN—a political party), the following groups are participating in the "Tractors for Freedom" fund-raising drive and parade on May 29: the association of Christian Mothers, the Women's Civic Union, the National Federation for Defense Against Communism, and the Propaganda Committee of the Cuban Revolutionary Democratic Front. The Association of Christian Mothers organized a mass for the children of six Catholic parochial schools on Friday, May 26, to inaugurate the fund drive. The MLN is sending party workers to other cities to solicit funds.

Two hundred employees of the Esso Standard Oil Co. in Guatemala volunteered one quetzal ($1) each for the tractor drive.

MEXICO

Two Cuban exile groups, the Association of Merchants, Industrialists, and Professional

Men of Cuba and the Cuban Revolutionary Democratic Front, have initiated fundraising compaigns for the purchase of tractors. The press has reported that a Mexican group is also being formed.

Excelsior, Mexico City, in the Bernardo Ponce column of May 23: "In the United States several persons are giving money to buy the 500 tractors wanted by Castro Ruz to ransom 1,000 Cuban prisoners he took during the ill-fated invasion of the Antilles' largest island. We have returned to the times of the pirates of the Barbary coast. * * * The new masters of Cuba—the locals, not the Russian and Chinese 'technicians'—must be very nervous about the possibility of a meeting between Kennedy and Khrushchev in the beautiful city of Vienna. The Red dictator is quite capable of "selling" Communist Cuba for a North American withdrawal from a zone near the Russian frontier. It would not be the first time that such a deal has taken place. One might then be able to say: with the tractors you measure you shall be measured."

El Popular, Mexico City, a Marxist newspaper, in the Sadot Fabila column of May 23: "The opportunity certainly is excellent for individuals such as Ydígoras or Somoza, who clamored loudly for the lives of the defeated and captured invaders. They, and a few other tyrants, can well divest themselves of a few dollars in order to buy tractors and send them to the Pearl of the Antilles in exchange for the anti-patriotic Cubans who were trained at Yankee military bases within their countries. * * * The cries heard after the invasion had failed had the sole political objective of portraying the Cuban Government as a sanguinary regime opposed to human reason."

El Universal, Mexico City, in the Enrique Castro Farías column of May 23: "No one should be surprised about the new blackmail of the bearded tyrant of Cuba, for this is the same method applied in the country and the cities of the island during the 'liberating revolution of the hero of the Sierra Maestra.'"

La Prensa, Mexico City, of May 26, carried a signed article entitled "Tractors for Blood," which said the tractor plea was not only testimony to Castro's mental unbalance and the low esteem communism places on human life, but also to the moral bankruptcy of the West. At the same time it praised private U.S. donations for tractors as an unavoidable duty when lives are at stake.

El Universal, Mexico City, in a cartoon on May 26, showed Castro as a masked bandit holding up a Cuban prisoner and demanding "a tractor or your life."

Novedades, Mexico City, on May 26 cartooned a Cuban prisoner telling his bearded guards, "I won't swap my freedom for less than two yokes of oxen and 6 pounds of hot chiles."

NICARAGUA

The Catholic Action Society of Montelimar announced a fund collection for tractors. Dr. Andrés Largaespada, director of the Managua Cotton Cooperative, offered a used tractor. Radio Noticias' owner, Humberto Torres Molina, offered a tractor for Chester Lacayo, a Nicaraguan being held prisoner in Cuba.

La Noticia, Managua, pointing out that Castro had equated the lives of Cuban patriots with the value of tractors, said "history will guard in its pages these offenses against humanity."

La Prensa, Gráfica, Managua, commented: "Never before in America has one faced such a situation in which human life could be bought for machinery."

PERU

The Cuban Revolutionary Democratic Front's Lima branch is planning to make a public collection for tractors on June 3. The Comisión Magisterial Cubana in exile has also called for donations.

La Crónica, Lima, reported on May 26 that US$1,333 have been collected thus far toward the purchase of tractors and that a public collection would be taken up in Lima on Saturday, June 3.

La Crónica, Lima, in an editorial on May 26: "No matter how monstrous the operation of exchanging men for tractors may be, in view of our impotence to alter the facts no one can refuse to lend his support to this shameful dictatorial and revolting 'business deal,' which eliminates any concept of the dignity of man, heaps scorn on its originator, and leads the people of Peru to contribute to the rescue of the heroic patriots imprisoned for their courageous struggle to free their country, scourged by a tyrant and delivered to the voracity of the Chinese and Soviet Communists."

El Deber, Arequipa, editorialized May 23: "The tolerance of the American peoples (of a Communist Cuba) is suicide. Not only does it permit the ignominious Communist crime of traffic in human lives, but it raises the possibility that our own people may suffer equal treatment some day."

El Pueblo, Arequipa, on May 23: "Putting aside the filthiness of the Castro proposal, which causes disguest to all civilized humanity, American citizens have accepted the deal, undoubtedly because they believe a human being is worth more than any amount of machinery." Later: "With this new proof of Communist-Fidelism, which at times seems unbelievable, one can assume that every day the Cuban revolution will count on fewer adherents, and on an increasing number dedicated to fight against it."

URUGUAY

On May 24 and 25, eight leading Montevideo newspaper editors appealed for a public fundraising campaign (El Bien Público, Tribuna, La Mañana, El Debate, El Diario Español, El Diario, El Plata, and El País).

On May 25 the Friends of Cuba organization placed a tractor in a Montevideo downtown plaza in another fundraising effort.

El Día, Montevideo, of May 25: "So much human wretchedness cannot endure for long. Impelled by their unconquerable and eternal ideals, nourished by the reason and justice of its high purpose, the forces of democracy will again cause freedom, besmirched and trampled by the new barbarians eager to enslave humanity in the empire of crime, to flower."

VENEZUELA

El Mundo, Caracas, on May 26, reported that the police had taken protective measures in view of Communist and extremist threats against members of the "Tractors for Ransom Committee." On May 25 the committee sent Mr. Eleanor Roosevelt the sum of $10,875, the product of its initial collection.

La Esfera, Caracas, May 26. Columnist Martinez Suarez commented: "On the whole, this despicable trick of the Cuban dictatorship has had the virtue of stimulating throughout the free world, and especially in Latin America, an extraordinary movement of fellow feeling for the people of the island in application of the principle of respect for human life."

La Religion, Caracas, May 26. Columnist Pepe Travieso: "This exchange of human lives for tractors is so much the stuff of anecdotes, so picturesque in its innate cruelty and inhumanity, that it must serve as a permanent lesson in the true nature of those regimes founded on international communism. How can Fidel Castro and his followers invoke the principle of respect for human rights after sinking to the depths of bartering prisoners for tractors, which is the greatest blow ever struck in modern times against international law and the intrinsic worth of the individual?"

La Esfera, Caracas, May 26. Columnist Fernando Márquez Cairos: "The very fact that a group of prisoners was charged with negotiating the price of their own ransom and that of their companions in misfortune shows the contempt in which Fidel holds human dignity."

The following are two half-page notices appearing in Caracas newspapers:

In El Universal of May 26, signed by the directors of the "Tractors for Ransom Committee":

"FIDEL HAS NOT FOOLED US

"His proposal, which degrades human dignity and takes us back to the remote era of slavery and barbarity, is couched in terms that could only be conceived on the basis of the coldest Communist materialism. This materialism, which denies the existence of the soul, in fact, equates freedom and the rights of man with chattel, for which it may therefore be exchanged. But we cannot accept this thesis and, in fact, we deny it on principle. No, human lives cannot be bartered. The human life has no price."

In La Esfera of May 26:

"TRADE IN HUMANS IN THE 20TH CENTURY

"The closest precedent that can be recalled is that attempted by Eichmann, today on trial for his crimes. The Nazi proposed to exchange 1 million Jews for 10,000 trucks. Today Eichmann is facing his judges. Fidel Castro goes further and offers to exchange his fellow countrymen for tractors. The day will come when Cuba's 'Eichmann' Castro, too, will have to answer for his crimes against humanity."

WEST INDIES FEDERATION

Trinidad Guardian, Port of Spain, on May 28 in an editorial entitled "Basic Evil of Communism Revealed": "It would be the height of folly to ignore the implications of this deal. They are simply that Castro and his henchmen, as puppets of Moscow and Peiping, will stop at nothing to achieve their ends of Communist domination of this hemisphere. This threat can only be countered if those who have faith in the ideals of democracy cast off their lethargy and become aware of the seriousness of the situation. Castro's tractor deal will serve a useful purpose if, by its overt denial of all moral sense, it convinces people of the basic evil inherent in communism."

ARGENTINA

The Argentine Association for the Freedom of Culture has begun to collect funds toward the purchase of the 500 tractors. Among the persons making up the committee designated by the association to collect the funds is the director of the Buenos Aires evening daily Critica, Dr. Santiago Nudelman.

Clarin, Buenos Aires, commenting on May 28, said: "All America has arisen to 'buy' a thousand lives, in an operation which has the virtue of being honorable for the buyer and infamous for the seller."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. Murrow said, in part:

Almost without exception the press and radio of the free world have drawn the obvious parallel between his proposal and that of the Germans when they offered to trade Jews for trucks.

It should rather have read "the Nazis," when they tried to trade Jews for trucks.

Castro revealed himself for what he is and U.S. reaction reflected what we are. Most of the free world found our response to the offer to be in accord with our heritage and tradition of regard for the individual. Castro has damaged the cause of communism.

His senior partners in Moscow and Peking have not supported him.

There is a ground swell of disgust welling up in Latin America. We have prepared for you a summary of press reaction. From both conservative and liberal newspapers, from government figures, from committees and voluntary groups, the comment is the same. This has been accompanied by demonstrations for freedom by students, women, legislators in favor of the United States.

Castro's offer has been called blackmail. That is a handy word, but in civilized countries censure of the act should run to the blackmailer, not to the blackmailed. As Dr. Milton Eisenhower observed, a mother paying ransom to regain the life of a child is not denounced because she deals with a blackmailer. The calumny is on the head of the man perpetrating the wrong, not on the wronged.

Is it not interesting that in every country of the world—every free country—the criticism is not of the United States, but of Castro? Yet, here in our own midst, we see Americans criticizing the Government of the United States, and the committee.

That criticism has been properly placed by those in Latin American countries who are struggling this very hour for their freedom. By this cruel and inhuman act, Castro has possibly done more to help freedom in the Western Hemisphere than all the aid programs put together. He has revealed what really happens when dictatorship takes over. Thank God—I say that in all reverence—in America the voice was lifted which said, "We want to help those in distress. We are willing to help those who want freedom." I think by that act on the part of certain citizens we have been spared a severe judgment.

Now Mr. President, I wish to make a proposal to our Government.

I propose, Mr. President, that the essentially private effort of the Tractors for Freedom Committee become the springboard from which we launch a tremendous inter-American effort to seek the release of all political prisoners in Cuba.

I propose that the U.S. Government, as its expression of support for the committee, take the leadership in the Organization of American States, to condemn the mass arrests, imprisonments, and executions in Cuba, and to insist that the Cuban regime release all of its political prisoners.

Let us join our friends throughout the Americas in this reaffirmation of human freedom and dignity. Let us seize this opportunity, when people everywhere are gaining a new realization of the depth of Castro's cynicism, to go one step further. Let us take the moral leadership against tyranny and despotism, and against the prisons and dungeons that are such ugly reminders of despotism on the loose.

Let us join our friends to place the governments of these free peoples squarely on the side of the restoration of freedom for the people of Cuba.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Earlier in the day I made a short statement regarding the exchange of tractors for the Cuban prisoners. I am always moved by the Senator from Minnesota when he speaks of mercy and compassion, and religion, because I know they are part of his being—of his very life. He is right in saying that Castro has exposed his own callous attitude toward human life, and the callous attitude of his regime.

At the close of his remarks, the Senator from Minnesota made an interesting and valuable proposition—one which should be considered by our Government. It is that the United States, and all the American states, should urge before the world, the release of the vast number of prisoners held by Castro—held without process of law—held because they dare dissent. He has pointed out that Castro's cynical tractor-prisoner proposal calls attention to the thousands of political prisoners held by Castro.

I question one argument the Senator from Minnesota made, the argument that there is legal precedent for the United States to accept Castro's offer. He is correct in saying it is the tradition of America to help the distressed of other countries. We have given help again and again to other peoples—even our wealth and resources to wartime enemies, Germany and Japan.

But the situation under discussion differs from those cases. This is a situation in which a tyrant proposes the exchange of human beings for tractors. It is an offer of prisoners for ransom.

I do not wish to be technical, but I doubt that our humanitarian record and tradition of help to prisoners, and to the unfortunate of other countries, is a legal precedent upon which we can rely when we are asked to ransom prisoners.

I support the proposal upon moral and humanitarian grounds, but I do not know they would attach in every case. I support the proposal because the United States bears responsibility, because of its support of the landings, which led to the capture of the Cubans.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. We have a moral responsibility.

Mr. COOPER. I do not argue now the merits of the decision to support the landings. The decision was made, and our responsibility in this case arises from the decision. We helped to prepare the Cuban forces, under the administration of President Eisenhower. The preparations were continued under the administration of President Kennedy. These same forces landed in Cuba. We know that President Kennedy had to make the decision which permitted the troops to go to Cuba. Because of these facts, I consider the United States bears responsibility, and has no other proper course except to do all possible to secure the release of the prisoners.

If these men were our own citizens we could secure their release by force if we desired to do so. But we know that our forces will not be used to liberate the captured Cubans.

There is no other way at present to secure the release of those we helped send to Cuba, except through the exchange. This being true, the moral and humanitarian considerations of which the Senator from Minnesota spoke so movingly, attach in the greatest degree.

Because responsibility does attach, I see no reason for the President—if he is doing so—to support only as a private citizen the exchange. The President cannot escape being the President of the United States. He acts as the President in regard to matters which are of concern to the foreign policy of the United States. I think he should say, "As the President of the United States, I support the exchange." It is his responsibility, and it should be clear that the President, and not a private committee, guides the foreign policy of the United States.

I have great respect for the members of the committee, and for the humanitarian considerations which led them to undertake the project, but the transaction is essentially one within the scope of the conduct of the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me respond for a moment to the Senator from Kentucky, and then I shall yield.

I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his earlier statement, which was an excellent one, logical and precise. The Senator has underscored, very properly, our responsibility in this matter.

On the date of May 24 I made some comments in the Senate concerning this very matter. I read to my colleagues the following:

> Let me say to the eternal credit of the President of the United States that he feels a moral obligation. It is a fact that this Government did train those people. We know it. The American people will be respected all the more in the world if we act responsibly, out of a sense of humanity, in this unhappy matter. I suggest to my colleagues that during the past week we have seen pictures on the front pages of American newspapers of another freedom fighter, a young man with a battered and bloody face, the victim of brutality, vulgarity, violence, and disorder. It might not be a bad news story to go out throughout the world that the citizenry of this country was sufficiently concerned with human life to put forth private contributions and private efforts, with the endorsement and moral support of the President of the United States, in an attempt to save these men in Cuba. I do not want on my hands the fact that I failed to do what I could have done when the opportunity was given.

I wish to underscore this more precisely. We do have a moral responsibility. I believe the Senator is correct in stating that the President of the United States does speak as a public citizen and not as a private citizen at all times. The reference to his private capacity was not made by the President, but by one of the press secretaries at the White House, Mr. Hatcher, who is quoted as follows in the UPI dispatch on the ticker:

> Hatcher said Kennedy's connection with the arrangement was as a private citizen.

The President may make a personal contribution from his personal bank account to a committee, but I would be the last to say a man who is President can be a private citizen.

I think the Senator from Kentucky is correct. I thank the Senator for his contribution to the discussion and, more importantly, for the fact that he has spoken up. Few men in America are held in greater respect and esteem than the Senator from Kentucky. I am one who holds him in the highest of esteem, and he knows it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to discuss the Castro-tractor deal on a somewhat different basis later today.

I was impressed by the Senator's statement that he would like to use this incident as a precedent to start a worldwide program. If we are going to pay $30,000 in first-class equipment for every prisoner released, does the Senator have some estimate as to how many prisoners the Russian and Chinese Communists are holding?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator misunderstood my remarks. I said that the private efforts of this committee should serve as a springboard to take up, in the Organization of American States, a proposal, first of all, to condemn Castro and his executions, his mass arrests, and imprisonment of fellow Cubans.

Second, I said we should call upon the Cuban regime, through the Organization of American States, to release these political prisoners.

No, I am not at all proposing what the Senator suggests. Of course we would not enter into such an arrangement.

I think, with respect to these 1,200 men, there is a difference. I think the Senator from Kentucky has stated it. We have a moral responsibility because of our activities, both those of the previous administration and those of the present administration, with regard to the liberation forces—I refuse to call it an invasion force. These people were merely returning to their homeland, seeking freedom.

To contemplate a mass exchange of goods for people throughout the world would on its face be inoperative.

I think the representative press, the legislators, the public officials, the students, and the spiritual leaders of country after country in Latin America, have responded overwhelmingly to this incident. I have available a copy of a USIA survey of some of the press, radio, and television reports from Latin America, including statements of government leaders. There is an overwhelming condemnation of Castro. I say that this is the time for the Government of the United States to work with the Organization of American States to call upon the Cuban regime to release the prisoners, to condemn it for its mass executions and for the wholesale imprisonment of thousands and thousands of Cubans.

One can say, "What good will that do?" At least it will put the Organization of American States on the side of morality and decency, and it will give us a common ground upon which we can work together. We have had some difficulties in recent months, as we know, in finding areas of common agreement with our Latin American neighbors.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Can I be assured that the Senator will not support a Federal appropriation to purchase the release of prisoners in Cuba, in Russia, in China, or anywhere else?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I say to the Senator that the Senator from Minnesota is proposing no Federal appropriation. In fact, the Senator from Minnesota would have preferred that this be handled very privately, even to the point of seeing if we could do it without any special consideration from the Treasury Department. It may be necessary for the committee to have a tax-exempt status, so that contributions can be tax deductible, but I hope that in the beginning we will try to see if we can undertake the proposed transfer without it. I should like to see the American people again open up their hearts, as they do so frequently and generously.

THE CRISIS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, tomorrow the people of America observe Memorial Day, the day on which we pay tribute to those who made the supreme sacrifice in defense of our country, of all that it has stood for, of all that it holds out for future generations. This is therefore a time for solemn, prayerful reappraisal of our own conduct and the conduct of our national policy.

As we pause tomorrow at the graves of those who have fallen in the fight for freedom, let us ask ourselves: How are we measuring up to the demands of patriotism?

What are we giving to the cause of freedom?

What are we prepared to sacrifice in order that our liberty shall not be made forfeit?

What will be our response to President Kennedy's call for an increased national effort and an increased personal effort on the part of each of us?

In order to answer these questions let us look at what is happening today in the world.

If students of history were wise enough and learned enough, they could single out a particular unsolved crisis which sealed the doom of every great society and civilization of the past, a crisis of arms, or of internal politics, or of commerce, or of will, a point from which there was no return.

Contemporary events are of course more difficult to fathom and analyze than historical ones. Yet, I believe that the drama which may toll the death knell for the United States and for Western civilization is now being played out in southeast Asia.

The scene on which this crisis is unfolding is the remote and primitive kingdom of Laos. The armies involved on each side are small. The casualties can be numbered in the hundreds.

But the significance of this struggle is universal and the stakes riding upon it are unlimited.

The crisis we now face in southeast Asia has four major elements: the circumstance of geography, which forces us to compete in this area at an extreme and critical disadvantage; the tactic of guerrilla warfare, which enables a single, illiterate, half-savage guerrilla soldier to be more effective than an aircraft carrier; the tragedy of our declining prestige, by which I mean the confidence in and respect for American leadership which alone can hold together and make effective the coalition of free world powers in Asia; and finally, the enigma of our national resolve, the fundamental question—do we in America have the will to defend freedom?

For several years I have been speaking and writing about the problem of communism in Asia. Recently I completed a tour of the principal danger spots in this part of the world.

My words today are based upon one man's attempt to study this problem from afar and from close at hand and I hope that my observations can contribute something to public understanding of this question.

THE CRISIS OF GEOGRAPHY

Geography is against us in critical areas of southeast Asia. Our principal instruments of national power cannot be effectively used in key places. Our naval and air strength which has successfully shielded Taiwan and the offshore islands, though they are in the shadow of the vast Chinese Communist mainland, is ineffective in the kind of jungle warfare taking place in Laos or South Vietnam.

There are few roads suitable for mechanized armies. Most of the attributes of Western industrial society with which we are familiar and in which we can operate with confidence and skill are absent here. To succeed we must not only alter the physical aspect of our forces, but also we must alter our mental attitudes as well.

The tide of communism is creeping inexorably across southeast Asia. Laos has almost been swallowed up. If Laos goes, neighboring Cambodia will almost automatically follow and South Vietnam may be doomed. Thailand, with its 1,000 miles of frontier adjoining Laos and Cambodia, will then be immediately imperiled. If Thailand goes down, nothing can save Malaya and Singapore. When Malaya has been subjugated, Indonesia, with the largest Communist movement in the free world, will be a pushover.

With communism thus solidly entrenched in the Pacific all the way from the Arctic Circle to Indonesia, the defense of Australia and New Zealand, even with Anglo-American naval assistance, would become hazardous and difficult.

Inevitably the Philippines, South Korea, and Japan and Formosa will thus be lost and the whole Pacific will indeed become a Red ocean.

THE CRISIS OF TACTICS

To those nations of Asia which yet remain independent, communism is no abstract or distant menace. It is a grim and ever present danger, a daily com-

panion, a nightly visitor. Its instruments are terror and violence and murder.

Communist guerrilla bands range over the countryside, blowing up bridges, attacking army posts, assassinating anti-Communist mayors and rural officials, as well as soldiers, police, and peasants.

In Manila, I learned that despite the successes scored against the Communist Huk movement in a massive effort lasting more than a decade, Huk guerrilla bands are still active in several Provinces, and travel in these Provinces is severely restricted.

In Vietnam, I was told that almost 1,000 people are killed every month by terrorists and that it is unsafe to travel the roads beyond 25 miles from Saigon.

In Vientiane, the capital of Laos, I could observe myself that the main Communist forces were only 25 miles from the city, and that guerrilla bands frequently penetrated to the very suburbs.

On Sunday, May 7, I met with Vice Premier General Phoumi in Vientiane. A few days later, his chief aid was shot down in the streets of that city.

Through the persistent and merciless use of guerrilla warfare, the Communists have scored their greatest victories in Asia.

The Chinese Communist government itself had its origin as a guerrilla movement. So did the present regime in North Vietnam.

Communist guerrillas almost succeeded in seizing power in Malaya and today Lao Communists have power in their reach. The South Vietnamese Government finds itself gravely imperiled by guerrilla activities. Communist guerrillas are also active in South Korea, in the Philippines, in Burma and, to some degree, in Cambodia and Thailand.

They have scored incredible victories and they are, with few men and at an incredibly small cost to themselves, gradually destroying the remaining free nations of Asia.

They can do this because in the terrain and circumstances of southeast Asia guerrilla forces possess a tremendous advantage over regular armies.

Regular armies must guard every bridge, every railroad, every power station, every reservoir, every major factory, every government installation. They must protect the villagers and townspeople against terrorists. They must be on constant guard against ambushes, against snipers hiding along main roads and country paths. They are spread out and spread thin.

In Malaya, it took a hardened British Commonwealth army of 300,000 men, 6 years to suppress a guerrilla insurrection that never numbered more than 12,000 armed men.

In the Philippines, suppression of the Huks required a similar effort.

In South Vietnam, a well-trained army of some 120,000 men today finds itself strained to the breaking point in trying to cope with a guerrilla movement reputed to number no more than 10,000.

We are therefore faced with a crisis of tactics. If the free world can defeat guerrilla warfare only at odds of ten or twenty or thirty to one, if the Communists step up their guerrilla warfare in every country where they are now operating, if they always attack while we always defend, can anyone fail to see the ultimate outcome?

THE CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

Southeast Asia contains several independent nations which though individually unable to stand up to the Chinese Communists, combined together and acting in concert with the leadership and backing of the United States, are able to preserve their freedom. The keystone of the free alliance in Asia is, of course, confidence in the United States; confidence in its power, in its judgment, in its determination to prevent Communist domination of southeast Asia.

But when we break our commitments, when we reverse ourselves, when we act with weakness instead of strength, when we furnish vacillation instead of leadership, we contaminate and corrode the alliance and lead inevitably to its collapse.

Every man with leadership potential in southeast Asia today must think long and hard before he throws in his lot with the free world.

He must ask himself, What will happen to me, if I take up the cause of freedom, if I fight for it in government, in the classroom, in the barracks, in journalism? What will happen to me if the cause of freedom turns out to be hopeless?

Even today those who fight the Communists in Asia live in constant fear of assassination.

And should communism triumph in Laos, in south Vietnam, in Thailand, in Taiwan, or Malaya, or the Philippines, the fate of those who led the opposition will be swift and violent death or a slow and tortuous living death.

Every failure of leadership by the United States, every vacillation, every backdown costs us a host of good men who will fight for freedom if they think freedom has a fighting chance.

There is today a crisis of confidence in the United States throughout southeast Asia.

While I was in Quemoy, the commanding general there showed me some propaganda leaflets which the Communists had dropped on the island the night before I arrived. The leaflets told the Nationalist Chinese soldiers that they were serving a lost cause, and that America would abandon them just as it had abandoned the Cuban invaders on the beach.

In the Philippines, Foreign Minister Serrano described to me the gravity of the situation. He said that the Philippine people were prepared to fight and die at our side, if necessary, but that Asia cannot be defended unless the leadership comes from America.

He warned that our handling of the Laos question had already resulted in a dangerous erosion of American prestige, and that if the confidence of free Asia in the United States is ever finally shattered, it may prove impossible to organize the defense of Asia.

And so it went through interview after interview in country after country.

The chief propaganda line of the Communists is that America is "a paper tiger"; that America does not stand by its friends; that America cannot and will not fulfill its commitments. Our passive acquiescence in the Communist conquest of Laos makes this propaganda line look rather convincing.

We have, through SEATO, committed ourselves to the defense of Laos against external aggression. But when the chips were down, SEATO backed down, even though all of the Asian and Pacific member nations of SEATO urged collective action.

We have made military gestures, but gestures that are not followed by action are best not made.

We have stated repeatedly that we will not permit Laos to be swallowed up piecemeal.

But we have in fact permitted the Communists to take over area after area in Laos.

The loss of faith in the United States which is seeping through southeast Asia today, was brought home unforgettably to me by an incident which occurred in Manila when I addressed the Asian People's Anti-Communist League. Here was a vast assembly of almost 3,000 delegates and scholars from all the free parts of Asia and Africa, people who are on our side and who are actively anti-Communist. When I told them that America had learned from its mistakes, that we were now awake, that the period of blunder and slumber, of retreats and defeats, was now at an end, a wave of spontaneous laughter swept the hall, laughter at the proposition that America had awakened to the realities of the Communist danger.

I put down my manuscript at that point, Mr. President, and I said: "Let me tell you that that is the truth; we intend to move ahead."

The fact that an audience in Manila only 2 or 3 weeks ago laughed when a U.S. Senator said that the period of slumber and retreat and defeat was at an end is significant. I believe they were embarrassed because they had embarrassed me, and they became silent quickly. It was terrible evidence to me of what is happening to our reputation in that part of the world. I cabled this information to the President, since I thought he should know about it. I saw that the information reached the attention of the Vice President, who was in southeast Asia and who has made there a great contribution to the cause of freedom and the cause of the United States.

We are now going through a period in which free men of stout heart are losing hope. Their confidence in us is breached but not broken; it is not yet too late. If we act now, boldly and resolutely, all may yet be well.

But this is our last chance.

THE CRISIS OF NATIONAL RESOLVE

More important than the fact that others are losing confidence in us is the fact that we seem to be losing confidence in ourselves. It is bad enough that we

seem to others to be weak, incompetent, and irresolute. But it is many times worse to be all these things.

If we throw in the towel in Laos, following our failures in China, in Korea, and in North Vietnam, we must frankly ask ourselves if the American people and their leaders have in the past decade lost something irreplaceable: their historic vigor and courage, their national pride, their will to win.

If we surrender Laos as we appear to be doing, we are in danger of becoming habituated to defeat, dishonor, and piecemeal surrender.

When politicians cease to fear the wrath of a people that will not abide international defeat and dishonor, and begin to court a public opinion that shrinks from keeping dangerous commitments and running necessary risks, our fortunes are indeed falling and our ship is sinking.

If the United States, with its unrivaled might, with its unparalleled wealth, with its dominion over sea and air, with its heritage as the champion of freedom—if this United States and its free world allies have so diminished in spirit that they can be laid in the dust by a few thousand primitive guerrillas, then we are far down the road from which there is no return.

In right and in might, we are able to work our will on this question. Southeast Asia cannot be lost unless we will it to be lost; it cannot be saved unless we will it to be saved.

This problem, seemingly so remote and distant, will in fact be resolved here in the United States, in the Congress, in the administration and in the minds and hearts of the American people.

One more licking by the despised forces of communism in Asia will cause us not only to lose the trust of the world; it may cause us to lose all faith in ourselves.

The focal point of the struggle for southeast Asia is in Laos. It is here that we must construct and carry out our policies. It is here that we must stop the disintegration of the free world position.

HISTORY OF LAOS

America has never desired anything but a free, neutral Laos. We have sought no military commitments. But we have tried to prevent the Communists from taking over, either openly or by indirection because a Communist Laos would automatically cease to be a free, neutral Laos.

The present struggle there is not the consequence of a reflex defensive reaction by the Communists to American provocation. On the contrary, Communist aggression in Laos today represents the fruition of carefully laid plans by the Pathet Lao, its immediate masters in North Vietnam, and its ultimate masters in Moscow.

The Pathet Lao has from the beginning sought the establishment of a Communist and not a neutralist government. Like the Chinese Communists it has pursued its goal with persistence, with incredible flexibility and subtlety, with utter ruthlessness and total dedication. The Communists have suffered reverses, but they have always regrouped and counterattacked when the time was propitious. They have never admitted defeat.

In August 1953, regular Communist Viet Minh battalions invaded Laos, captured the northeastern portion of the country, and established the quisling Pathet Lao in the town of Sam Neua.

In December 1953, only a few months later, after the rainy season, the Communists renewed their military attack and succeeded in cutting Laos in half by a rapid advance to the Mekong River. They were driven back by the French.

When the Geneva Conference convened in 1954, the Communists had control of Sam Neua and Phong Saly, two small areas in northeastern Laos, but elsewhere in the country, they had no real power.

As bad as the Geneva agreement was, on the question of Laos there was no major concession and no equivocation. The agreement called for the restoration of the authority of the central government throughout the territory of Laos, and it called for the dissolution of the Pathet Lao forces and their integration into the armed forces of the Government.

The Communists have violated this agreement wholesale. That is why they now stand where they are.

First of all, the Pathet Lao continued to launch attacks on Government units in Sam Neua Province. It refused to turn over Sam Neua and Phong Saly to the administration of the royal Government unless its representatives were first included in a coalition government. And when the royal Government agreed to this position, the Pathet Lao further demanded that half of the administrative positions in Sam Neua and Phong Saly be given to their appointees.

It was on these terms that civil integration finally took place in Laos in November 1957.

From the end of 1958 the Lao Government was subject to mounting Communist pressure. In December of that year a war of nerves developed along the frontier with Communist North Vietnamese forces occupying Lao villages north of the 17th parallel.

In the summer of 1959, the Viet Minh or Communist forces stepped up their attacks against Lao garrisons, and the Government of Laos appealed to the United Nations for action. Nothing was done.

The pattern was unmistakable in 1959; and it is this same unmistakable, undeviating pattern that is at work today in Laos. The only difference is that the tempo of activity and the scale of action have been stepped up.

Why have they been stepped up? I asked that question of President Diem, when I was in his office in Saigon 2 weeks ago.

President Diem told me that in 1958 the North Vietnam Communist regime realized that it could no longer hope for economic and political collapse in South Vietnam and that acts of individual terrorism were only serving to turn the South Vietnamese people even more strongly against the Communists. In addition, the growing prosperity of South Vietnam provided a dangerous contrast with the increasing poverty of North Vietnam under communism.

The Viet Minh decided that their free neighbor had to be liquidated. The consequence of this decision was that over the course of 1959 and 1960 there was a continuous buildup in Communist guerrilla strength and activity in South Vietnam.

President Diem viewed the conquest of Laos and Cambodia as stepping stones to the conquest of Vietnam. Once they have complete political control over the frontier areas of Laos and Cambodia, the Viet Minh would be able to step up its guerrilla attacks on South Vietnam on a scale which would tax Vietnamese defense capabilities to the breaking point.

All of this has been foreseeable for a long time.

It is small comfort to me now, but the RECORD will show that in a Senate speech on September 5, 1959, I urged immediate action to cope with Communist aggression in Laos.

I asked for a speedup in deliveries of arms and equipment to the Lao Army. I said that we could not yield another foot of territory to communism anywhere in the world; that we must not wait on the Communist initiative month after month; that we take whatever measures might be necessary, not excluding armed intervention; and that we make an official irrevocable national pledge to defend Laos, whatever the cost.

Sixteen months later, when Soviet aircraft began airlifting supplies—brazenly—to the Communist forces in Vietnam, the United States had still made no irrevocable commitment to the defense of Vietnam and we had no policy ready to cope with the crisis.

And so once again the familiar pattern has been retraced. We have made brave noises, and temporized, and hoped for the best, and approved British overtures to Moscow, and made more brave noises, and temporized again. The result was bound to be disaster.

Today, 60 percent of Laos is controlled by Communist forces. The remainder of the country is dangerously infiltrated by Red guerrillas.

The people in the free areas of Laos are primitive, poor, ignorant of communism and unfamiliar with free, parliamentary traditions.

Their government is disorganized and ineffective, as would be most governments whose lands and people were torn apart by guerrilla warfare.

The Lao are just beginning to realize what Red domination would mean. Where they have been given effective leadership they have proved themselves willing to fight for their defense.

This is an important point. I asked military advisers everywhere about this. I was told that the Lao are willing to fight if they can get some equipment and some training. I heard it said on all sides; I did not hear anything to the contrary. But they must have training and the guns and materiel with which to fight. Where they have been given effective training, they have proved that

they can fight well against their Communist opponents.

The free Lao are more than a match for the Communist Lao forces, but they cannot stand up to outside Communist intervention from North Vietnam and from Russia.

Thus, the fate of this little country is in our hands and in the hands of our SEATO allies. Laos can be saved for freedom by a relatively minor effort by the United States and our SEATO partners, if we have the will to make that effort.

What, then, should we do?

A PLAN OF ACTION

Any new policy for southeast Asia must begin at the conference table in Geneva, for, sadly, that is where we now find ourselves.

We must shun any settlement involving a coalition government for Laos which includes Communist representatives, mindful that coalition governments were the Trojan horse device which led to the full communization of Russia, Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and China itself.

First, I believe that the United States, in concert with its allies, should serve notice on the Communist negotiators that the Geneva Conference affords the last opportunity for the stabilization by peaceful means of the conflict in Laos and in Asia; that we insist on a completely independent and neutral Laos which cannot be used as a base for the subversion of southeast Asia and will accept nothing less; that if the Communists do not agree to honor the terms of the 1954 Geneva agreement establishing a neutral Laos we will close the Conference permanently; and that once denied an independent Laos via the conference table we will make an inviolable commitment of our prestige and our resources to achieve an independent Laos by force of arms.

Second, SEATO must be reorganized. I recommend that SEATO invite the Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of South Vietnam to add to the ranks of SEATO their counsel, their considerable might, and their anti-Communist zeal. The ground forces of these three nations total more than 1,200,000 well-trained and well-equipped troops, ready and eager to oppose the Communists in Asia.

Third, a newly constituted SEATO should issue a proclamation of principles intended to restore the confidence of the peoples of Asia.

SEATO, led by the United States, should declare that its purpose is not the mere defense of free soil against communism, but that we stand for the extension of freedom, just as the Communists stand for the extension of communism; that all existing Communist regimes are temporary tyrannies which are at war with their own people, and which do not represent or speak for their people; that we pledge ourselves fully to the defense of Quemoy and Matsu, and of all free lands in Asia; and that we are now ready to help those forces within Communist countries which seek to drive out their Communist enslavers.

Fourth, we must immediately and sharply accelerate our programs of training and military assistance to the Lao, the South Vietnamese, and our other fighting allies in Asia.

Economic assistance that is now planned for Poland, Yugoslavia, and other Communist nations, and pro-Communist neutralist nations, should be diverted to the SEATO nations which need help and will use it to advance the cause of freedom.

Fifth, the first fruit of a revitalized policy and a reorganized SEATO should be the intervention in force in the Lao conflict by the SEATO powers, if Geneva fails. It is pretty generally agreed by military men on the scene that three divisions of Asian troops, given leadership, air support, and logistic support by the United States, could initially retake from the Communists all of the principal posts in Laos.

Sixth, we should make the hard but inevitable decision to fight fire with fire in southeast Asia, to meet the enemy on his own ground of guerrilla warfare.

Communists are always hated where they are in power.

This is one of the outstanding facts of our time. Communists are hated deeply by those who have lived under them; and I repeat this fact, surely not for rhetorical purposes, but, rather, because it is a fundamental fact we are overlooking.

In China, in North Korea, and in North Vietnam, in Tibet and in Laos, thousands of native anti-Communist guerrillas have spontaneously mounted operations against seemingly hopeless odds without help from the outside.

This too is a remarkable fact of life. Right now there are simple, poor primitive people in many parts of the world who are fighting courageously against Communist tyranny.

Three weeks ago in Vientiane, I was told that more than 6,000 Meo tribesmen had taken the field against the Lao Communists and that many thousands more, both Meo and Black Thais, were ready to fight if they were given arms.

The best way for us to stop Communist guerrilla action in Laos and in South Vietnam is to send guerrillas in force into North Vietnam, to equip and supply those patriots already in the field; to make every Communist official fear the just retribution of an outraged humanity; to make every Communist arsenal, government building, communications center, and transportation facility a target for sabotage; to provide a rallying point for the great masses of oppressed people who hate communism because they have known it.

Only when we give the Communists more trouble than they can handle at home will they cease their aggression against the outposts of freedom.

Seventh, we must state irrevocably, and mean it, that if the Communists respond to new SEATO divisions in Laos by sending in more divisions of their own, if they respond to our new offensive by a new offensive of their own, we are prepared to face a showdown with the Communist world over Laos just as we are prepared to face it over Berlin.

We must not and cannot restrict the struggle for freedom to the jungle terrain of remote places in Laos and South Vietnam. We cannot defeat the Communists by fighting on their terms, under conditions which give them every advantage and which take from us every natural advantage we possess.

If they make a major effort against us in Laos and South Vietnam we must beat them by carrying the offensive to North Vietnam, and wherever else it may become necessary.

The armies of our allies on Taiwan and in South Korea, our mighty fleets roaming Asian waters, our vast air armada sitting on bases and carriers throughout the Pacific, the combined might of our Asian friends and of Great Britain and France, must not remain idle and immobile while the battle for freedom is lost in remote jungles.

Finally, we must back up our new commitments and our new policies by a drastic increase in military spending at home. We must add billions to raise new pentomic divisions of infantry and for modernizing the equipment of our existing divisions; for bolstering our undermanned naval task forces; for creating limited war forces to complement our nuclear striking power.

Each of us is in some way a product and perhaps a victim of the atmosphere he lives in. Ours has been an atmosphere of timidity in recent years. As I read over these recommendations, I am frankly apprehensive about the public reaction to them.

The easy course for an elected official to pursue with respect to Laos is to accept defeat there, masked and sugarcoated by an agreement to establish a coalition government which everyone knows will soon become a Communist government.

When that happens, those who negotiated the agreement can express shock and horror and promise to do better next time. This has been the historic pattern in the postwar world. It has been the easy way out.

Those who preach the doctrine of softness and compromise are always able to assume for a time the mantle of peace. In the long run, of course, piecemeal surrender turns out to be the sure harbinger of war. But in the short run, those who advocate it stand upon the popular platform of "peace in our time," and those who urge firm resistance to aggression, must constantly defend themselves from the charge that they are men of war, not of peace.

I abhor war and seek peace as ardently as any man. No one has more to lose from war than I. I have six children, four of them sons who would be involved in the holocaust of general war should that dread outcome be our lot.

When I urge that we resist enemy aggression now in Laos, in Berlin, on Quemoy, or wherever it strikes, it is because I believe that this policy, and this policy alone, will save freedom and avert a general war as well.

The course which I have proposed will be very difficult for the American people to accept.

But unless the American people learn the truth now, they will not learn it until it is too late to alter the inevitable course of events.

Now we have the chance to act effectively, to stand firm on sure ground, to rally around us the united forces of all who support the just cause. But if we fail this challenge, if we shun this opportunity, tomorrow will see us alone, not united; fighting from fear, not from courage; acting from desperation, not from confidence; fighting for our lives rather than fighting for our freedom.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Senator agree that the United States and the rest of the free world should be wary of an arrangement in Laos or in any other area in which the Government or the executive commission or executive-directed agency can operate only with unanimity, particularly if one party to that organization is directed by the international Communist conspiracy?

Mr. DODD. If I correctly understand the Senator's question, and I believe I do, he is asking me whether I feel that participation by the Communists in the government of any country can be expected to result in a free government.

Mr. GORE. If I may specify, let me say that I am sure the Senator from Connecticut will recall that the Control Commission for Berlin could operate only in unanimity.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Connecticut has had experience in Germany, and I am sure he will recall our experience with the Russian veto in the Control Commission.

Mr. DODD. Yes, I do. Now I understand the Senator's point.

Mr. GORE. And the Senator from Connecticut is also aware of the use of the veto by the Soviets in the Security Council of the United Nations, I am sure.

Mr. DODD. Yes, of course.

Mr. GORE. If the Senator from Connecticut is willing to yield a little further——

Mr. DODD. Yes, I am happy to have the Senator's contributions, because I admire his thinking and I consider him an outstanding Senator who is very keenly aware of what is going on in the world. So I am pleased to hear his comments on this subject—and, indeed, on all subjects.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful to my distinguished colleague.

In the first week of April, I was a delegate, representing the U.S. Senate, to two international conferences then underway in Geneva. One was the Interparliamentary Union Council meeting. To that conference, some 40 nations sent delegates. The distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and I had the honor to represent the U.S. Senate at the conference. The Russians sent there a delegation composed of men who had achieved prominent places in their government. The head of the Soviet delegation was Mr. Poletsky, a vice chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Another member was one of the members of the Russian supreme court.

During the course of the conference, Senator Keating and I heard Mr. Poletsky deliver an envenomed attack upon the United Nations. He demanded that the Office of Secretary General be abolished, and that the position be replaced by a tripartite arrangement, with one member to represent the Western powers, one to represent the Eastern powers, and one to represent the so-called neutralist bloc; and he demanded that it operate and that the United Nations operate so as to give every country "equal rights."

The first time I heard him use the term "equal rights," I wrote it on my paper, because it was to be my lot to reply, in debate. A little later he used the same phrase a second time, and again I wrote it down—with a question mark. A third time he used the same term—"equal rights."

So in the course of the debate I asked him what the Soviet delegate intended to be the meaning of the term "equal rights." I stated that in my country and among uncounted millions of people in the world, the phrase "equal rights" had a great appeal, and I wondered whether the Soviet delegate used it with the same meaning which it had to me and to other members of free societies. I asked whether by that term he intended to mean that the United Nations should operate in such a way that each member of the United Nations would have an equal opportunity to develop a collective will and a major decision; and, if so, how more equal could countries be? Cuba has one vote; the United States has one vote; Libya, the least populous member, has one vote; India, the most populous member, has one vote. So I asked whether he meant, in fact, by his demand that each country have "equal rights," that each country should have the right to thwart the will of the other ninety-nine. I sent to Mr. Poletsky a note in which I asked him please to reply directly to me, in answering that question.

Here is his reply, as it was sent to me by note, after the delegation had conferred:

> The United Nations organization should not be used by a certain group of states which dictates now in the United Nations to the detriment of the interests of other states.

So here is an antithesis of the majority will. He does not want a group of states—and he used the word "dictates"—to arrive at a collective will, to bring about decisions in the United Nations "to the detriment of the interests of other states."

I am sure that my able colleague, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], knows that not all the decisions of the United Nations have been in concurrence with the position of the United States.

Mr. DODD. Indeed I do.

Mr. GORE. The United States has not always been in the majority.

I raised this point because throughout that conference, as the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], whom I am happy to observe in the Chamber, will testify, every Iron Curtain country delegate there—those from Poland, from Hungary, from Romania—parroted the phrases "equal rights" and "unanimous action" and the world "unanimity." So that raised in my mind a suspicion as to why they had chosen to use those particular phrases and words, so current and so meaningful in democratic societies.

The next day I went as a delegate to the conference on discontinuance of nuclear weapons tests. I found the chief Russian delegate, Mr. Tsarapkin, using the same phrase and making the same demand, although last year the Soviets, the United States, and Great Britain had agreed to have a director general, similar to the secretary general of the United Nations, to be the directing head of the International Control Commission to conduct the inspections, and to verify Soviet compliance, United States compliance, and British compliance with the terms of the proposed treaty, if one should be agreed upon. But the Soviet delegate retracted that; and he did so the very first day the conference met when negotiations were resumed in March after a recess.

I should like to point out to the Senator that the test ban conference reconvened on March 21. It reconvened with the Russian delegate in the chair, the chief delegates from each of the three countries having taken the chair in rotation to serve as chairman, as they still do. Mr. Tsarapkin opened the conference. He was well aware that the United States had a new President. He was well aware that the program had been thoroughly examined. He was well aware that the new Ambassador of the United States to the conference, Mr. Dean, had come to Geneva with explicit proposals. But before permitting Ambassador Dean to say one word, to present the first line of the detailed proposal of this country, Mr. Tsarapkin reneged on that to which he had already agreed, and demanded that the inspection and control system be operated by tripartite arrangements, which would mean be operated with unanimity, with equal rights to each State being preserved—meaning it could operate only subject to the right of Soviet veto.

Mr. DODD. This is the exercise of the veto.

Mr. GORE. I happen to have a copy of the international Communist manifesto issued in Moscow last December, which I reread; and I found these same phrases and this technique of frustration spelled out in the international Communist manifesto.

That is why I rose to ask the Senator if we should not be wary of an inspection council, a control council, a coalition government in Laos, which could operate only in unanimity.

Mr. DODD. Yes. That is an excellent point to make, because it needs to be clarified.

Mr. GORE. May I go one step further? Then I will not interrupt the Senator further.

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. GORE. That is why I said earlier today that a basic issue for determina-

tion in the Vienna conference between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev is whether the Soviet leader is willing to, or indeed has the power to, enter into responsible participation in international organizations. I do not profess to know whether the Soviet Premier is bound to the premise of the Communist manifesto. I have heard it alleged that he is. But whether he is willing to, or whether he is powerless to do so, it seems to me that this is a basic question to be determined in Vienna. Unless there is an opportunity to enter into international cooperation and collaboration with the Soviets, then the forthcoming disarmament conference is doomed. Indeed, all cooperation is doomed, because we cannot expect the American people—in my opinion, they would be unwilling to do so—to accept membership in an organization in which the Soviets can, and we know, from experience, they will, exercise the veto.

Mr. DODD. The Senator from Tennessee has pointed out an important aspect of this whole discussion. In a country like Laos, the same principle is applied. The Soviets get in. They want their way or else no way at all. If not, their way is murder, violence, and terror.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield to me?

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield to my great friend the very able Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, our distinguished friend from Connecticut has made one of the most powerful and resolute speeches—if not the most—I have ever heard in the U.S. Senate. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to comment on the speech and I wish to ask the Senator a question or two, if I may.

Mr. DODD. I am happy to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Before doing so, I should like to refer to what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said about the Interparliamentary Union conference which he and I had the honor of attending as representatives of the Senate.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the very forceful and effective way in which he answered the Soviet delegate at the meeting. Using his sharp, analytical mind with which we in the Senate are so well acquainted, the Senator from Tennessee demolished the arguments of the Soviet delegate, as any fairminded and unbiased person would agree. I heard that comment from a number of representatives of countries we look upon as neutrals.

I came away from the conference with the feeling—I have never had it so firmly before—that the Soviet Union was out to wreck the United Nations and out to wreck any other international organization in which it did not have the power of control through veto.

The function of the council of the Interparliamentary Union is to set up subjects for discussion at the annual meeting. One of the subjects proposed was how the machinery of the United Nations could be improved. My own feeling was that the Interparliamentary Union ought not to be engaged in a discussion of that subject. I voted against the resolution because although I believe the United Nations can be improved, I do not believe it is up to the Interparliamentary Union to tell the United Nations how to reform itself, any more than it would be up to the United Nations to tell the Interparliamentary Union how to operate.

The spring meeting gave me the opportunity to sit down with representatives of nine countries around a table. The nine countries represented were the Soviet Union, Poland, Yugoslavia, the United Arab Republic, Lebanon, the United Kingdom, France, Japan, and the United States.

The group involved was the working party charged with drafting a resolution. At that conference it was painfully clear what the Soviet delegates were up to. Their action bore out what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said. Everywhere we turned in that conference the same theme was evident. The Soviet group was considerably better organized than any other. All members of that delegation said the same thing. Some from freer nations had varying points of view among themselves, the Soviet representatives all had a monolithic approach to all problems.

I make my comment, first, to let the Senate know what a magnificent job the Senator from Tennessee did at that conference. Second, I comment in order to bear out his thesis with regard to the efforts of the Soviet Union to rule or ruin. That point comes back to what the distinguished Senator from Connecticut has said in his powerful speech. The same point applies to every conference in which we meet with representatives of the Communist powers.

I commend the Senator from Connecticut for the forceful manner in which he has presented the problem. It is all right to have strong talk. We must have strong talk when we are dealing with people who seek to rule the world. But it must be backed up with resolute action. We cannot first give in here and then give in there. That is the surest way to guarantee that the four sons of the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] will one day have to go off and fight, because if we keep retreating there is bound to come a time when we are backed up to a point where we cannot back up any longer—unless we hve lost all of our intestinal fortitude. I do not think we have reached that point, nor do the majority of the American people feel that way, I am sure.

That point leads me to the next question. I am not sure what the military situation is in Laos. I read articles that state that Laos is not now defensible. I believe that it was at one time. I believe that at one time we could have taken a firm position in Laos and could have succeeded in retaining it. Surely, we must take such a position in South Vietnam and in Thailand. On that point, we must not hesitate. Already, I understand, there is a strong neutralist tendency in Thailand, because of the feeling that the United States and the other free nations are slipping away and deserting that part of the world. If we allow South Vietnam and Thailand also to go down the drain—or even permit them to think we are considering such a possibility, it will be a sorry day for this country and for freedom throughout the world.

Since the Senator has recently been in the area, I ask him whether we can go a step further. Does the Senator's analysis of the situation lead him to feel that Laos itself is militarily defensible?

Mr. DODD. Yes, I do, provided we do what is necessary. As I pointed out, I believe the organization of SEATO must be improved. We must be willing to go as far as is necessary. We cannot go into a country weakly and say, "We will do this or do that," and not be willing to back up what we say. But I think an affirmative SEATO, with new members, with new resolve, with a determination to retrieve the situation in Laos, can intervene successfully and save that country.

The countries of the Far East do not want to wait until they are left alone, and until the Red tide sweeps over them one by one. I think the manpower is there. I think the will is there. I think all that the situation actually needs is some leadership. And we are the only people who can provide it. I think when we do so, we shall see a change in the situation. Laos is not lost, unless we abandon her.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the Senator feels that if these points were presented squarely and forcefully to the SEATO organization of today, that the majority in SEATO would support collective action to defend Laos?

Mr. DODD. I think so. It is the non-Pacific members of SEATO that are loath to act. The reluctance is not on the part of the countries in the immediate danger zone, but rather those outside of it that have membership in SEATO. For this reason I recommended that we in the United States furnish vigorous leadership, and that we bring into the membership of SEATO Free China and the Republic of Korea, and South Vietnam, and have them give to this organization the strength which they can contribute. Then I think we can begin to expect success.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly share the Senator's perturbation over any agreement to settle the Lao situation which would involve a coalition government with the Communists included in a strong position. We know perfectly well that in such a coalition government with Communist participation the loss of Laos would almost undoubtedly result, and probably pretty soon, because the Communist hand would show itself. Other parties would be persecuted and repressed, and would soon be driven out of existence.

Our President goes abroad, burdened with many great responsibilities. At this critical moment, he has the support of the American people and the Congress. Whether there is agreement or disagreement with this, that, or the other phase of his domestic program, we must support him in his efforts in France,

and, above all in his confrontation with the Premier of the Soviet Union.

It is my hope—and I am sure the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] feels the same way—that the preliminary conferences with other powers and the leaders of other countries will bolster rather than weaken him in his resolve to stand up to our enemies, not only in the area which the Senator has been discussing, but also in Berlin. My understanding is that there is some difference among our allies over how we should handle the Berlin situation. It is this Senator's opinion that if we try to temporize over the problem of Berlin, which is even closer to us than the Far East problems, we will again allow our cause to be weakened, our strength chipped away. We must stand firm in Berlin. We must support the West Berliners in their determination to be free. If we were to allow this outpost of freedom to be swallowed up or weakened, we would only be adding to the strength of those who would destroy us.

Mr. DODD. I thank the Senator for his most gracious compliment, which I am sure I do not deserve. I thank him particularly for his observations, which are of great value. He knows I am not being fulsome in my praise because, as I have said on many occasions, I have great respect for his intellect. I am confident that the President will defend this country's interest, and I know the Senator from New York has the same confidence.

Mr. KEATING. I have.

Mr. DODD. We have in President Kennedy a strong-minded man, a man of great courage and great intellectual ability. I think at this hour we should pray that God help him, and that our President, as he leaves to go to distant places, will have strength to carry through his very difficult mission.

I have confidence in the President. I believe that in the Senate we can best assist him by speaking frankly on these matters and by letting the President and others who serve him in the executive department know what the facts are as we see them. That is why I, on my short trip, sent messages to the President, because I thought he would want to hear what was happening where I was.

I conclude by expressing my gratitude to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Tennessee. I know of the great work both Senators have done. The American people owe them both a debt of gratitude.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to express my gratitude for the Senator's kind remarks and to join with him in his remarks about the President. We who served with him in the Senate are confident that he will stand firm. Certainly he goes abroad with the best wishes of every Member of the Senate.

THE MISSOURI BASIN

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, 16 years ago Senator James E. Murray, my illustrious predecessor in the Senate, proposed the establishment of a Missouri Valley Authority, patterned after the Tennessee Valley Authority, to develop the great Missouri river on a unified, fully integrated basis.

It is a matter of history now that his proposal was defeated, and two Bureau plans—the Corps of Army Engineers' so-called Pick plan and the Bureau of Reclamation's Sloan plan, were authorized instead. It is not my purpose in addressing the Senate today on the subject of the Missouri Basin to rekindle the flame for an MVA but to advise the Senate of the unnecessary conflicts that have arisen between the upper and lower reaches of the basin, and the critical water supply situation we face today as a result of intervening years of mismanagement of our scarce water supply.

The failure of a hasty marriage of two agency plans—the Army's Pick plan and the Bureau of Reclamation's Sloan plan—to solve the Missouri Basin water and development problems, emphasized by the dispute that is now raging, should persuade both Congress and the administration that the development of truly integrated plans for the development of every major river basin in the Nation, recommended by the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources, is an absolute necessity in the decade ahead.

In the early forties, the Corps of Army Engineers under the leadership of Gen. Lewis A. Pick developed the so-called Pick plan for flood control and a 9-foot deep flowing navigation channel in the lower Missouri River. The plan entailed the construction of huge storage dams in the upper basin, inundating 900,000 acres of our land, to provide between 50 and 60 million acre-feet of active storage—sufficient to assure adequate water for the Army's purposes through a 10-year dry cycle.

In the same period, the Bureau of Reclamation developed plans for multiple-purpose development of the upper basin in accord with its charter to irrigate and reclaim the arid and semi-arid lands of the West and to provide municipal and industrial water and hydroelectric power for agriculture, homes, and industrial use.

Serious conflict arose between proponents of the two plans for it was apparent that there was not sufficient flow in the river for both. Publicists and lobbyists for the Corps of Army Engineers plan called the Bureau of Reclamation irrigation projects infeasible. The Bureau described some of the Army dams as wasteful and unnecessary.

Behind this dispute was the fact that the two plans would require between 22 and 25 million acre-feet of water above Sioux City, Iowa, while available stream-flow records indicated that the average flow of the river at Sioux City was only 18 to 19 million acre-feet.

It was in the midst of this interagency conflict that Senator James E. Murray proposed a Missouri Valley Authority. Senator Murray believed that a truly integrated basin plan could provide navigation, flood control, irrigation, hydroelectric power—all of the benefits that both the upper and lower ends of the basin sought. He believed that navigation might be provided by means other than a flowing navigation channel, requiring a flow of 25,000 to 30,000 cubic feet of water per second at Sioux City, Iowa. He believed that power supply might be supplemented by thermal generation in the extensive lignite and coal beds of Montana, Wyoming, and the Dakotas. Senator Murray believed—and I agreed and still agree with him—that nature endows the Missouri Basin with resources to meet all the needs of the present, and a vastly expanded economy if a way could be found to develop them and overcome the selfish, short-sighted, and bureaucratic obstructionists to full development.

I believe this is true in most of the great river basins of America today if we will develop them for the public good, and not for some narrow, individual purpose, for the aggrandizement of a single public agency, or to protect the monopoly of some selfish private interest.

Confronted by the threat of a Missouri Valley Authority, the backers of the Army's Pick plan and the Bureau's Sloan plan finally realized the necessity of a truce in their war over the basin, lest both lose out to a replica of the TVA.

A great water conference was called at Chicago, Ill., on September 7 and 8, 1944.

The National Reclamation Association was there. The Mississippi Valley Association was there. The chamber of commerce and twoscore water organizations were represented. Members of the Congress were there, including Senators Eugene Millikin, of Colorado, and Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, who were opposed to a Missouri Valley Authority, but who were also deeply concerned by the demands of the navigationists for western water to support the flowing navigation channel in the lower Missouri River.

Out of the Chicago conference came an agreement between the upper and lower basin interests on the wording of the so-called O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, reserving the West's water for western uses.

The agreed-upon language, highly important today, read:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress * * * to limit the authorization and construction of navigation works to those in which a substantial benefit to navigation will be realized therefrom and which can be operated consistently with appropriate and economic use of waters of such rivers by other users.

And accordingly, it provided:

> (b) The use for navigation, in connection with the operation and maintenance of such works herein authorized for construction, of waters arising in States wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian shall be only such use as does not conflict with any beneficial consumptive use, present or future, in States lying wholly or partly west of the 98th meridian, of such waters for domestic, municipal, stock water, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes.

A month after the Chicago agreement on this language, on October 16 and 17, 1944, two representatives each of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers met in Omaha, Nebr., and those four engineers, in 2 days, performed what has sometimes been called, with tongue in cheek, the engineering miracle of our age. They made "appropriate modifications" to "eliminate

existing differences between the two—Pick and Sloan—plans," and issued a "joint engineering report" on what they described as a unified plan for the whole Missouri Basin.

James G. Patton, of the National Farmers Union, was not convinced of the miraculous nature of the performance. He characterized the Omaha meeting as a "shameless, loveless, shotgun wedding."

A half a dozen great dams have now been built in the upper Missouri River under the Pick-Sloan deal, supposedly governed by the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment. More than 50 million acre-feet of active water storage capacity has been provided.

And the great dams stand out in Montana and the Dakotas less than one-third full—far below efficient operating levels—because waterflows have not proved enough for both the Army's navigation plan and the Bureau's multiple-purpose developments, and, further, because the Corps of Army Engineers refuses to honor either the letter, the intention, or the pledges which its lobbyists, negotiators, and representatives made in Chicago and Omaha in 1944 when the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment was agreed upon to beat Senator Murray's proposed MVA.

The dams are not only far below efficient operating levels, the water behind them is being pulled lower and lower by the demands of the navigation channel.

At the end of April this year there was contained in the pools behind Canyon Ferry, Fort Peck, Garrison, Oahe, Fort Randall, and Gavins Point Dams 17.3 million acre-feet of water. I am advised that these dams have 73.8 million acre-feet total capacity and 57.4 million acre-feet active storage capacity. The 17 million acre-feet in them today is a puny puddle compared to their capacity.

It is also less water than was there at the end of April a year ago. The dams then held 21.1 million acre-feet of water—3.8 million more than this year.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table showing water impounded behind each of these dams at the end of April 1960 and April 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as as follows:

Water in storage, Missouri Basin dams

[In millions of acre-feet]

Name of dam	Capacity	Active storage space	Actual water as of end of April—	
			1961	1960
Fort Peck	19.4	14.9	6.478	7.138
Garrison	23.0	18.1	4.248	5.538
Oahe	22.5	17.0	2.495	3.192
Fort Randall	6.3	4.9	2.803	3.418
Gavins Point	.54	.38	.231	.307
Canyon Ferry	2.05	2.043	1.004	1.514
Total	73.79	53.323	17.259	21.107

Mr. METCALF. Madam President, the prospect today is for a continued pulldown of the water on which the upper basin States rely for electric energy and to which they look to for irrigation water supplies.

There is little snowpack in the upper basin this year. The Corps of Army Engineers now concede that prospects for runoff into the reservoirs are only fair.

This designation of fair runoff includes Yellowstone River, where residents now fear that the river may become virtually dry. The city of Glendice is confronted with a crisis in regard to its municipal water supply. The Yellowstone is so low that whirlpools threaten at the city water intakes in the river. These whirlpools admit air to the pipes and pumps lose their prime. Emergency steps are being taken to lower the intakes, but beyond that there is fear of the adequacy of water, at any intake level, in the months ahead.

It is now apparent that a large area in the upper Missouri Basin is confronted with a serious drought this year.

Meantime, the Corps of U.S. Army Engineers has proceeded to open up the navigation season on schedule on March 1, releasing water from the inadequate and declining reservoirs for use downstream. Up to this moment they have failed to announce any plan to shorten the navigation season.

Several weeks ago Senator MANSFIELD, Senator BURDICK, and I held a conference with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Engineers. We were told that a runoff of only 15 million acre-feet of water is anticipated at Sioux City this year and that the navigation season would be shortened. The talk was in terms of a 6- to 6½-month navigation season, instead of 8 months.

I was impressed at the time that the Corps of Engineers representative did not talk about going to a 5-month navigation season, as they assured us in a 1951 "Adequacy of Flow Report" they could do without jeopardizing the success and long term value of navigation.

Since our meeting, there has been further hedging.

The basin has been told that there is prospect of 17 million acre-feet of water yield and that runoff will be fair in the upper basin States, including runoff from the nearly dry Yellowstone River. That is like describing one meal a week as a fair diet.

There has been recent talk of delaying a decision on the actual length of the navigation season until an interagency committee on river management meets in Omaha in August, although a determination could be made at a meeting of the committee to be held Thursday and Friday of this week, June 1 and 2.

The purpose of delaying the final decision until August is, of course, transparent. The navigation season will then have run the full 5 months of the Army's minimum period. Navigationists would plead that the shippers and bargelines would have to have several weeks notice before the channel is closed. The navigationists would then have a dead cinch to have a navigation season—at the expense of the upper basin water supplies—several weeks longer than the minimum.

If decision is not made at the June 1 and 2 meeting of the Control Board on the length of the navigation season, it is my intention to request immediate congressional hearings and whatever congressional action is necessary to require the Corps of Army Engineers to honor their commitments given Senator O'Mahoney, Senator Millikin and the upper basin by them and their supporters in 1944, and to obey the law.

There is before the Attorney General of the United States today a request of the Corps of Army Engineers for an interpretation of the meaning of the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment in regard to priority of hydroelectric power generation.

The Corps has developed a legalistic theory on which to justify dishonoring and disregarding the pledge of the navigationists that upper basin uses of water should have priority. The Corps contends that the generation of hydroelectric power is not a beneficial, consumptive use of water, and therefore not protected by the amendment.

There is abundant legal authority for the contention that the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment does cover generations of hydroelectric power. I have no fear how the Attorney General is going to rule on that question, or, if it becomes necessary, what the courts will rule.

For the benefit of less legalistically minded Members of Congress and the public I would like to put in the RECORD quotations from the record of the Senate and the House debates which clearly indicate what the understanding was among the lawmakers who enacted the law—and what the commitment to the upper basin, which is being dishonored today, was, in plain English.

In arguing for authorization of the navigation channel at Senate Commerce Committee hearings in the 78th Congress, Senator Overton, of Louisiana, questioning Colonel Reber, of Army Engineers, stated a summary question in this way: I quote:

> It is the overall plan of the Army Engineers that this basin shall be further developed with dams and reservoirs on various tributaries of the Missouri River, that there will be water that will not be necessary for irrigation purposes or for generation of hydroelectric power that can be used at all times for navigation, and in the event there can be more and more water which can be released from Fort Peck Reservoir for irrigation and power purposes; is that correct?

Colonel Reber replied "That is correct, as additional storage develops."

It was clear in Senator Overton's mind, just as Senator O'Mahoney has testified recently before the Interior Committee, that it was clear in his mind at the time, that navigation was to get the use of water from the upper basin only when—and I quote his words—it "will not be necessary for irrigation purposes or for generation of hydroelectric power."

Over on the House side, there was the same clear understanding.

During floor debate on S. 35 in the House, 79th Congress, 1st session, this colloquy occurred:

> Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want to ask this specific question. What is the version of the chairman as to intrastate streams like

the Sacramento River which is entirely in one State? Does that recognize the paramount right of the State to use the water for irrigation, for instance?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas (chairman in charge of bill on the floor). Yes, sir.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And for hydroelectric development?

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes, sir; for all domestic consumption purposes. It is the way I understand the agreement between the Engineers and the reclamation authorities. May I inquire of the gentleman from Iowa if that was not his understanding of it?

Mr. JENSEN. That is as I understand it.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Texas. Yes (p. 1375).

Congressman MANSFIELD, of Texas, was floor manager of the pending bill. Congressman JENSEN, of Iowa, was the ranking Republican involved in handling the measure.

Madam President, the truth of the matter is that everyone understood the terms of the agreement until it became apparent that optimistic estimates of the available streamflow in the Missouri River—carpentered up to justify huge expenditures for a navigation channel—were probably only optimistic estimates.

Col. Jerome Locke, himself a former Army engineer, estimated in the forties that the average flow of the Missouri River at Sioux City is between 18 and 19 million acre-feet.

Since this amount of water would not support both the Pick and Sloan plans, and there were constant questions raised of the adequacy of water for the 9-foot, flowing navigation channel, the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee had an adequacy-of-flow study made which, lo and behold, found that average flow was between 24 and 25 million acre-feet—enough to make all the irrigation, navigation, and power generation plans work wonderfully.

In the absence for several years of water yields even approaching the 24 million acre-foot average predicted in the adequacy-of-flow report, the story is told in the upper basin that we are in a dry cycle and that all that is needed is one good year.

We have had it pretty dry in some areas in the upper basin for several years. But I would be reluctant to say that rainfall and water supply has been one-third deficient. As the Secretary of Agriculture knows, we have been growing about average crops of wheat and agricultural commodities in the area as a whole. Agricultural yields, compared to previous years, do not indicate that our water supply situation has varied from average nearly so much as the Corps of Army Engineers would have us believe.

But regardless of whether the real average flow of the Missouri River at Sioux City is 19 million acre-feet or 25 million acre-feet, we have at least come to a time when the upper basin is not going to accept the abnormal weather excuse for depleting the water behind the Missouri River dams, and failing to fill them to the levels required for efficient hydroelectric power generation and for irrigation.

The upper basin is not going to sit idly by and let the Corps of Army Engineers drain away our water, dishonoring the agreements written into law in the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment, which they are now attempting to subvert legalistically.

I would apologize for taking the time of the Senate on a matter of regional concern except for the fact that the Missouri Basin situation has national significance.

It should serve as a warning to upstream farmers, city dwellers, power users, and industries across the Nation to guard their interests vigilantly in the development of water resources plans or they, too, may be sold down the river.

It should serve as a reminder to those who have national responsibility that careful, unified planning of our great river basins should be gotten underway without delay before more wasteful, unworkable "shotgun wedding" arrangements are concluded which will have results as unhappy as those in Missouri Basin today.

THE ITEM VETO

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, on January 13 of this year, I introduced a resolution (S.J. Res. 31) calling for a constitutional amendment giving the President the right to veto items in appropriation measures. I have introduced similar legislation in the House and Senate for the past 11 years, but I am just a youngster in terms of item veto time.

The hassle between the Executive and the Congress over the item veto power has been going on for almost a century. I hope it will not go on for another century; for, I definitely feel that it is in the best interest of our Nation at the present moment to give this power to the President in order to discourage porkbarreling and in order to alleviate wasteful and unnecessary Federal spending.

President Eisenhower vigorously and consistently urged that the Congress give him the item veto power. Referring to the item veto, President Eisenhower termed it "one of the most important corrections that could be made in our annual expenditure program, because it would save tax dollars."

The Governors of 41 States can today veto items in appropriation bills. I ask unanimous consent that a list of these States appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ITEM VETO ON APPROPRIATION BILLS ONLY

States (41): Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska,[1] New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon,[2] Pennsylvania, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee,[3] Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, the history of the item veto dates back to the period shortly following the framing of the Constitution. With the early development of riders to appropriation measures—it was not long before the hue and cry arose to give the President an item veto.

Actually, the item veto power first appeared in the Confederate Constitution in 1861. Following the Civil War, President Grant, in a message to the Congress in 1873, said:

> Congress should authorize the Executive to approve of so much of any measure passing the two Houses of Congress as his judgment may dictate, without approving the whole, the disapproved portions to be subject to the same rules as now.

Presidents Hayes and Arthur followed suit in 1879 and 1882, respectively. The latter said:

> I commend to your careful consideration the question whether an amendment of the Federal Constitution (to allow the Executive to veto items in appropriation bills) * * * would not afford the best remedy for what is often a grave embarrassment both to Members of Congress and to the Executive, and is sometimes a serious public mischief.

Since then, every President, including President Eisenhower's two immediate predecessors, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman, have endorsed the principle of and the need for the item veto.

There is wide public support for the item veto. A Gallup poll several years ago showed 63 percent favored the item veto, while only 24 percent opposed it.

There is plenty of pressure for Federal spending both in the Congress and in the executive branch—pressures from home, pressures from abroad, pressures from Congressmen who have pet ideas, pressures because of new needs and new problems, pressures too from outer space. Many of these pressures are for good and worthwhile causes. Some are not.

When a bill goes to the White House, the President is confronted with an appropriation on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Often, by vetoing the bill because of a relatively minor item in it, he may jeopardize broader and more important proposals contained in the vetoed appropriation.

Lately, every time another member of the official family of the new administration appears before the Congress, we are told of proposed new expenditures and we are alerted to the fact that the Federal budget is liable to be even further out of kilter in the months ahead. I am frankly concerned about these projected deficits. Deficit spending is both inflationary and pound foolish.

One important way in which we can hopefully keep Federal spending in check is the adoption of the item veto. In this day and age of increased governmental

[1] Nebraska: Governor may not veto them in the budget submitted by himself after it has passed the legislature by three-fifths vote.

[2] Oregon: Governor may also veto items in new bills declaring an emergency.

[3] Tennessee: Governor may reduce or eliminate items but must give written notice either 3 days before adjournment or 1 day after bill is presented.

expenditures and expanding Federal functions, I feel strongly that every available step must be taken to see to it that our fiscal mechanisms are sound.

Madam President, there has been consistent opposition in the Congress to the item veto as an encroachment on its power over revenue matters. I do not think the item veto is as much of a danger as many imply. After all, before any money can be spent in the first place, one-half of the Members of both bodies of the Congress must approve. All the item veto says is that, on specific items to which the President is opposed, the approval of two-thirds of the Congress is necessary. This is wholly consistent with the Presidential veto power as embodied in the Constitution.

I do not know how much sentiment there presently is in the Congress in favor of the item veto. It would be interesting to know; however, I do know that one of the keys to this situation is the position of the President since the President and the Congress are presently—and may I add unhappily—in the hands of the same party.

President Kennedy's active support of the item veto would go a long way toward bringing about its enactment by the Congress. As a former member of the Congress, he is entirely familiar with the appropriations process. I am sure that in the days ahead he will face difficult decisions which the item veto power would help him to resolve, at least to the extent that he could send items back to the Congress for two-thirds approval by both bodies.

The support of President Kennedy is needed and would contribute greatly to sound, efficient management of the finances of the world's biggest business—the Government of the United States.

In this connection, Madam President, I have written to President Kennedy urging that he actively support the item veto and indicating my belief that his support would be a potent force in bringing about the adoption of this needed and important governmental reform.

Several months ago, the New York Herald Tribune ran an editorial urging President Kennedy to press for the item veto power. This is an excellent statement of the need for such authority, and I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 11, 1961]

GIVE THE PRESIDENT THE POWER OF ITEM VETO

Since 1876, Presidents have been tussling with Congress over the power of item veto; that is, the right to veto specific items in a general appropriations measure without turning down the whole bill.

There is nothing radical about the grant of such power; 80 percent of the States give it to their Governors. But Congress has steadfastly balked at giving it to the President, holding onto the general appropriations gimmick as a means of presenting the President with a take-it-or-leave-it, all-or-nothing choice.

One result is that countless pork-barrel projects get through which otherwise would not.

Without the item veto, there is no effective outside check on the mutual political back-scratching, at taxpayers' expense, which goes into congressional agreement on many an appropriations measure.

President Eisenhower repeatedly asked for item veto power, repeating the request as recently as his final budget message last month. This is not a partisan issue, as is demonstrated by Mr. Eisenhower's asking the power for his Democratic successor. It is an issue between the Executive and the legislature.

A President could abuse such power, using it arbitrarily or capriciously. But Congress would have the power to override an item veto just as it has to override any other veto. Congress would thus retain the last word, but it would be acting in full view of the public on the item in question.

President Kennedy has a lot of ambitious programs that are going to cost a lot of money. If Government revenues are to be kept in line with expenditures, he is going to need every possible weapon to keep unnecessary expenditures in line. He ought to press for the power of item veto, and Congress should take action to give it to him. If the President has the power to veto appropriations, he should have the power to veto single items as well as catchall bills.

CUBA—ANOTHER FIASCO

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, prior to the Cuban fiasco, and before I had any knowledge that the expedition was underway, one of the more responsible Republicans expressed to me great concern about information reaching him with respect to the impending undertaking at Cuba. Whether his source was classified or derived from published information, I do not know. I do know he was sincerely concerned about our Nation's interest. As a patriotic American, he expressed the hope that the President was being well advised.

Now that the whole affair is over and we can look back in retrospect, it is fairly clear that the advice given the President was awful. The entire operation had no chance of success. It provided no margin for error.

As a former officer in the amphibious service, I must say that the landing phases were clearly lacking in the basic essentials which were a part of every American landing in World War II. In other words, our planning for successful landings in wartime allowed for the possibility that half of our landing craft might be sunk and for the possibility of heavy losses in transport. Our planning always involved the possibility that the landing might be confronted with a great number of unexpected obstacles, but that the operation was to be carried out successfully regardless of losses or difficulties.

The Cuban fiasco was apparently planned on the theory that the operation would have a chance of success provided everything went right. The razor-thin margin was so precarious that unexpected opposition or a single serious accident could cause the whole undertaking to be an utter, dismal failure—which it was. As it turned out, a small amount of the opposition was enough to defeat the entire operation. With the sinking of a single ancient cargo vessel, the ammunition reserve for the operation was gone. There were no extras and no followup available.

Apparently, the decision to shave the operation to a minimum, thinner than the skin on our teeth, was advised by persons in the State Department perhaps to make our representative to the United Nations sound plausible when he argued that the United States had no responsibility for the operation.

Looking back on the matter, the United States got all the blame and none of the benefits of the $45 million investment in revolution.

The public still supports the President, and so do I, but we hope that future activities will indicate better planning. In this country, our system of government envisages that mistakes will be made, and that the President, in general, will bear the responsibility for them. Reasonable mistakes do not call for changes of administration or changes of Presidents. We expect that mistakes will be made from time to time and that he will recognize them. However, we expect that the mistakes will not be repeated, and that similar mistakes will not occur in the future.

President Eisenhower's statement, referring to bad military advice, was, I believe, leaked without his knowledge or consent. His confidential assessment of the Cuban operation appears to have been that no responsible military man who had studied the British military operation at Gallipoli as a part of his training would have counseled such an expedition as that which took place at the Bay of Pigs.

Apparently, in President Eisenhower's view, the Gallipoli expedition of His Britannic Majesty's Navy and Expeditionary Force seems to have provided a perfect pattern for the Cuban fiasco.

To be fair to President Kennedy, the Gallipoli disaster was the project of a man who later became a great wartime leader, the future Prime Minister of Great Britain, Winston Churchill. Churchill undoubtedly benefited by this mistake. During the interval between the two World Wars, he undertook to benefit by the mistakes of others, including those made in our own Civil War. He came to this country and walked over many of the major battlefields of the Civil War. During his study of our Civil War, he benefited by the mistakes of McClellan, Burnside, Hooker, Beauregard, Lee, Longstreet, and other generals. It is too bad we did not benefit from his mistake in World War I.

Mr. President, I am here advocating only that in the future and urging that we make fewer mistakes and do more things wisely than we have in the past.

As a result of what I have learned as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I am inclined to agree with the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that certain changes are indicated and are in order. For example, whoever was responsible for the advice on military planning for the Cuban operation should not be entrusted with a similar responsibility in the future.

There appears to be some doubt as to just where the responsibility is. But I must say I find myself completely unsatisfied with the testimony of General Lemnitzer—to mention only one. Of course I am not privileged to reveal the information which presently is classified top secret. But I say the military should not avail itself of a privilege which we jokingly say the doctors have—the privilege of burying their mistakes. The "top secret" stamp should not be retained too long on the document I now have before me—the investigation conducted by the Foreign Relations Committee.

I remember that I sat as a member of the committee which investigated the state of affairs during the Korean war, when General MacArthur was released from command there; and Senators will recall that 98 percent of the words uttered in the course of that investigation were immediately released to the press and to the public. In fact, perhaps it is more correct to say that 99 percent, rather than 98 percent, was released to the press and to the public, in order that the public might know what were the contending points of view and the differences between the President and General MacArthur. That was done on the belief that the public was certainly entitled to know the basic facts.

Similarly, I believe that the investigation of the disastrous U–2 incident was handled in much the same fashion, on the theory—again—that the public was entitled to know what all the facts were.

So it seems to me that we are entitled to have some changes made in at least some of the advisers, and that those who had the responsible part in advising on this fiasco should be among those among whom changes should occur.

Now we are confronted with the proposal to exchange prisoners for tractors for Castro. In my opinion, another fiasco will occur if that takes place.

Many of the revolutionaries, probably the best of them, who went ashore at the Bay of Pigs were the sons of wealthy Cuban families; and, in a number of respects, this revolution could be viewed as contrary to the American concept, in that it could be made to appear as a restoration of the wealthy to their landed estates. Many of the wealthy families in Cuba had vast amounts of currency and bank deposits in American banks and Swiss banks. Now, as the price of their attempt to recapture the island, Castro is in position to demand that they pay $15 million in first priority items of the Communist regime, as the price for the release of their sons. That would be a popular "deal" for the Communists.

Some ask:

Suppose the mercenaries return?

The answer is given by the Fidelestas:

Then we will capture them again. This time, each of them will be worth four tractors.

Incidentally, Madam President, the value of these so-called tractors is estimated to be approximately $15 million. That does not indicate that they would be small farm tractors; instead, it would seem that the tractors referred to are the heaviest American bulldozers—which can be very effective weapons of warfare. If there is any doubt about that, one needs only ask any Army engineer or any Seabee how effectively a $30,000 bulldozer—of the heaviest type—can be when used in warfare. By adding a little armor, they can practically be converted into tanks.

Madam President, blackmailers are not defeated by the payment of ransom. Wars are not won by the purchase of prisoners. Of those who advocate that the proposed transaction be carried out, I ask this question: Suppose the price were higher? Suppose—instead of $15 million in bulldozers—Castro were demanding $150 million in first-priority military equipment? Would those who favor the transaction which now is proposed be willing to pay that price? Furthermore, once such a procedure starts, where will it stop? Once our Government begins to support, with tax exemptions and other devices, measures intended to result in the liberation of prisoners from Communist jails, where will that procedure end?

A distinguished Member of this body—the Senator from Colorado—asked this question: If the proposed transaction be carried out, how about civilians? Should not something be done to obtain the release of the hundreds of thousands of civilians who have been jailed by the Castro regime in Cuba? And should we stop there? How about the freedom fighters from Hungary?

The Senator from Minnesota suggested that we should begin a move to obtain the release of all prisoners in Communist countries. That might run into millions of prisoners, and might cost hundreds of billions of dollars.

In short, where do we stop, once our Government, as a matter of official policy, undertakes to assume official responsibility for purchasing the release of prisoners held in Communist jails?

It has been suggested that we should do this because our country had some connection with the revolution which occurred. I hope our country will always use its best efforts to encourage revolution against Communist slavery throughout the world. But why should this revolution stand on a basis different from that of the others?

Madam President, whether we like it or not, we are at war—a cold war, to be sure, but a war, nevertheless. We are confronted with a brutal and calculating enemy who is willing to pay the price of victory. We must be willing to make equal sacrifice. No longer can we depend upon winning wars by overwhelming superiority of weapons. In the future, indispensable elements of our victory will be those which sustained us in the wars which occurred early in the existence of our Nation—devotion to the ideals for which we are fighting, willingness to pay a high price, in blood and sacrifice, for victory.

To make the tractors-for-prisoners deal is to set the stage for 500 celebrations—celebrations in almost every community in Cuba, over the arrival of a large American tractor to be used for the benefit of the Cuban people, as the price of our Nation's connection with the effort to overthrow the Castro government. To make this deal would be to reduce the sacrifice expected of men who are urged to fight for freedom throughout the world. The transaction proposed would make the people of our country appear before the rest of the world as people who feel that their money can spare them the cost of defeat in a military venture.

Madam President, wars are won by the kind of people who say, "Give me liberty or give me death." Wars are won by the inspirations of persons who will fight to the death and who will die in the Alamo. We would do well to stop recruiting a Peace Corps and begin recruiting a Revolutionary Corps, training young men in the ideals of democracy and genuine free competitive enterprise. Revolution in our time will prove to be a much more powerful force than evolution. At the rate things are going, it seems rather clear that the fighters are going to obtain more results than those which will be obtained by the negotiators.

As one who supported President Kennedy when he sought election, and as one who would like to get along with him, I regret to say that I personally will not contribute one copper cent to a tractors-for-prisoners deal, and I would feel compelled to urge others to give it the cold shoulder.

If someone is interested in stirring up a revolution in Cuba, or anywhere else, to throw out Communists, crooks or gangsters or grafters, and to replace them with honorable governments, dedicated to advancing the welfare of all the peoples in those nations, then I shall be glad to contribute to such efforts, and I would be delighted to see them made at any time.

Mr. GORE. Madam President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his generous references to me. I wonder whether he has done what I have done—to wit, reached conclusions, not with respect to the patriotism or dedication of certain gentlemen and their role in the ill-fated Cuban affair, but, rather, with respect to the quality of their evaluation and assessment and the advice given thereon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator from Tennessee. Understanding a little about military matters—as one who served on the Armed Services Committee and as one who served for 3 years in uniform, and having participated in some amphibious landings during World War II—I could see no merit whatever in the military judgment involved in that operation. The impression which I gained was that the military advice may have been the result of an assumption that a favorable answer was expected, and therefore given.

I find it extremely difficult to think that anyone could have seriously believed the kind of landing undertaken in Cuba could have succeeded against a determined enemy.

In positions of top responsibility, we need the kind of persons who, when they

think the President is making a mistake or believe the President is being advised poorly, will say, "Mr. President, I don't think this will work. I don't think it has a chance. I advise against it, if you want to know what I think."

We know that the kind of person who advises forcefully and vigorously in that direction is not the kind of person who gets promoted in the military. Usually, the one who gets promoted is the kind of person who goes along, sees how things are going, and keeps his mouth shut. He is oftentimes the person who gets promoted, rather than the person who speaks out. The Senator knows that.

Mr. GORE. The Senator well knows, as I do, that he and I were by no means alone in the conclusion we reached among those who either heard or have read the testimony. Nevertheless, as I understand, the President has decided that the Chiefs of Staff shall continue in their present responsibility. Under the Constitution, it is his decision.

In the exercise of the responsibility and the duty of a U.S. Senator, as I interpret them, I expressed my views both to the President and publicly. Now that the decision has been made by the President, who alone can make this decision, I only hope that those who participated in the ill-starred affair will benefit; that hereafter the evaluations will be in greater depth; that, as the Senator has said, advice will be given on a basis of realism. This is my hope. This is my belief.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, I agree with the Senator. I know that the President of the United States is a man who listens to advice. He is a reasonable man. He is a considerate man. I believe he has the perception to distinguish between good advice and poor advice. What concerns this Senator is the fear that the President is not getting enough good advice, as against poor advice, in the kind of matter to which I have made reference.

After the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, the President sought the advice of General Eisenhower and, I believe, General MacArthur—two of our recognized ablest military men—and he consulted with them. I assume there was some discussion of what had happened at the Bay of Pigs. As one person who is not privileged to have the information, I wonder if the President discussed the advisability of the bulldozer-for-prisoner proposal of Castro. They would both be well qualified to advise him on it. I would be curious to know if either one of them advised the President that we make the 500 heavy tractors available to Castro. My impression would be that the boycott of the Castro government, which has existed for some time, has been an effort to prevent that Communist government from obtaining equipment and spare parts with which to carry on its Communist program of using equipment seized from American industrialists and American-owned plants. It would be interesting to know to what extent the tractor deal would violate the embargo. I expect that making available to Castro the equipment he wants would violate the embargo to a high degree.

Mr. President, in connection with my statement, I ask unanimous consent that immediately at the close of my statement there appear in the RECORD an article published in the New York Herald Tribune on Friday, May 26, 1961, entitled "They Say in Cuba: Tractor 'Deal' a Hoax."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THEY SAY IN CUBA: TRACTOR "DEAL" A HOAX

(By Zell Rabin)

HAVANA, May 25.—After a week's travel in Cuba I have still to find a single person who took Fidel Castro's prisoners-for-tractors exchange seriously.

At first, every one regarded Castro's May 17 proposition as a huge joke.

Indeed, so lighthearted was Castro's mood that with a chuckle he included all the Spanish priests on the island in the exchange at no extra charge.

Western observers in Cuba were astonished by the American response to what everyone regarded here as nothing more than a gigantic legpull.

The view of important Western observers here is that the United States has blundered into a major propaganda defeat by accepting Castro's bizarre offer.

Many are also puzzled by the sentimentality and "dogoodism" that seems to have swept the United States when the worst possible fate for most of the prisoners, so these sources contended, was a few years of forced cane cutting or trench digging in Cuban sunshine.

The day after Castro's offer, the mood of most Cubans here was mirrored in a front page satirical article in El Mundo, the Government-controlled paper.

Urging great caution before accepting any exchange, the newspaper asked what would happen if the prisoners were again recruited, sent back to Guatemala and invaded Cuba once more.

It would follow that when they were captured a second time the invaders would be worth more than 500 tractors because they were better trained and more experienced.

On the second exchange deal with the United States, Castro could probably get 1,000 tractors for them.

If this state of affairs continued, El Mundo added, it will soon cause a serious tractor parking problem in Cuba.

Two days later Cubans were amazed to learn that the United States was seriously considering the offer. Nobody is reported to have been more surprised or pleased than Castro himself.

Castro then demonstrated that when it comes to power of positive propaganda he has few peers. Summoning his military escort, he rushed from his office to Havana Naval Hospital where the 1,200 captives are housed.

Explaining the offer to them, he quickly got the prisoners to elect a 10-man delegation to negotiate an exchange and flew them to Miami.

The delegation was ordered to wear battle dress because Castro is no slouch when it comes to spotting good news pictures, either.

When the news reached Havana that Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower had formed a committee to raise funds for tractors, Castro decided to capitalize even further on his coup.

At a trade union rally honoring him for receiving Lenin peace prize, he announced that deal was in no way to be considered as an exchange. It was, he declared, compensation for damage to Cuban property as a result of the April 17 invasion.

He warned that all negotiations would be canceled if the Americans continued to treat his offer as a prisoners exchange.

The Government-owned press quickly echoed the new line. With shrill headlines, the evening paper Combat said:

"Reparations, not exchange, is our demand to the United States."

The view in Havana is that the American acceptance of the offer meant that Castro—in eyes of the Cubans and countless Latin Americans—had clearly succeeded in establishing full U.S. responsibility for the invasion.

Western diplomats here were startled by the speed with which the United States accepted the offer when there was, in fact, no need for speed. At no time were the prisoners' lives endangered.

Castro announced 3 weeks ago that the only invaders who will be shot were those wanted for crimes during the Batista dictatorship, such as assistant police chief Ramon Calvino. The presence of Calvino, who is alleged to have personally murdered 43 Cubans, did irreparable harm to the cause of Cuban counterrevolutionaires.

Diplomats also wondered why distinguished Americans should head a fundraising committee when it would have been much wiser to have left it to prominent Cubans in exile.

They see nothing wrong with Walter Reuther sending a fat check to buy tractors, but they believe his presence as one of the heads of the committee only spotlights American collusion in the invasion at a time when it is best forgotten.

These observers believe Castro's propaganda would have been greatly minimized if the fund were sponsored by Cuban exiles.

Finally they question the composition of the invading force. Some were undoubtedly patriots who believed they were fighting to free Cuba from communism, others were bored Cubans tired of being dishwashers in Miami, still others were mercenaries who would have joined a similar venture against another country as long as the price was right.

Irrespective of the ideology of Castro's regime, they did try to overthrow a government. They gambled for highest stakes and had they won would have reaped power and great rewards.

From this viewpoint several years of forced labor is not a harsh sentence for soldiers who could be charged with high treason and shot.

The reason they were not shot, of course, is that Castro believes that there are simply too many of them. A handful of invaders would undoubtedly have been executed, but as this force is too large for Castro's firing squads, they will be traded in best proletarian fashion for tractors.

Indeed, the only ingredient really missing from this affair is an announcement that Eleanor Roosevelt will personally drive the first tractor into Havana.

She can be assured of a tremendous welcome—Castro says he needs the machines for his agrarian reform program.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND FEDERAL PATENT POLICY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Madam President, the subject of economic freedom, what it is and what it implies, is an especially important one at this time, because the value, the efficiency, the humanity of this system is being questioned and even attacked not only in those parts of the world which are hostile to us, but also in our own country. It is therefore necessary to review briefly the heritage of our free, private enterprise system.

I do not think that we can hope to understand the problems and policies of

our own day if we do not know the problems and policies out of which they grew.

I suspect that damage has been done not only to our historical culture, but also to our practical insight by an indifference to our intellectual past. Such indifference, unfortunately, has become characteristic for most of us. We have become so absorbed in our daily activities that we have been unable—and even perhaps unwilling—to concern ourselves with relating our activities to the social philosophy we profess to believe in.

It is no exaggeration to say that it is impossible to understand the evolution and the meaning of western liberal civilization without some understanding of classical political economy, by which I mean the general body of principles of governmental action or inaction regarding economic activity of the two great Scotch philosophers—David Hume and Adam Smith—and their followers.

These men and their ideas are historically important. They exercised a profound influence on the public opinion of their country in their time. They were responsible, directly or indirectly, for many far-reaching legislative and administrative changes. Even today, in innumerable ways of which we are seldom aware, their outlook continues to affect ours. It is indeed unfortunate that more of us do not have an understanding of the system which once dominated the social thought of the Western World, and which still dominates our thought in this country.

Although the English classical political economists differed on many issues, they all believed in private property and free enterprise.

If we had asked any classical economist: first, to what final end economic activity should be directed; or secondly, by what ultimate criterion its success was to be estimated, I do not think the issue would have been in doubt.

Consumption—

Said Adam Smith—

is the sole end and purpose of all production, and the interest of the producer ought to be attended to, only so far as it is necessary for promoting that of the consumer (Adam Smith, "Wealth of Nations," Cannon's edition, vol. II, p. 159).

James Mill was no less emphatic. He says—

Of the four sets of operations: Production, distribution, exchange, and consumption, which constitutes the subject of "Political Economy," the first three are means. No man produces for the sake of producing and nothing further. Distribution, in the same manner, is not performed for the sake of distribution. Things are distributed as also exchanged, to some end.

That end is consumption (James Mill: "Elements of Political Economy," third edition, p. 219).

The classical system was unequivocally opposed to any fostering of producer interest as such.

We should remember, however, that consumption is to be understood as both present consumption and consumption in the future: that is, investment.

We should also note that by consumption is meant not only the consumption of private individuals, the benefit of which is limited to themselves, but also the consumption of Government services such as defense, the benefit of which is enjoyed by all of us. From Adam Smith onward, it was recognized that such services might be "in the highest degree advantageous to a great society"—Adam Smith: in the work cited, volume II, page 214.

The great contribution of the classical economists, however, was their proposal for the achievement of this end, and for this they recommended what has been called the system of economic freedom.

Now, what do we mean by this term?

This system can be defined in this way: Given a certain framework of law and order and certain necessary governmental services, the classical economists conceived that the object of economic activity is best attained by a system of spontaneous cooperation. As consumers, the citizens should be free to buy what they please. As producers, or as laborers, they should be free to use their property or labor in ways which, in their judgment, would bring them the maximum reward in money or satisfaction. In their view it is the impersonal mechanism of the market which harmonizes the interests of the different individuals.

It follows, therefore, that a prime object of policy should be to insure the freedom of trade and industry, and to sweep away obstacles to this spontaneous cooperation where they exist.

This idea of freedom was central to the whole classical system, and it inspired their crusade against what they considered to be abuses of authority. It dictated their conception of what should be the positive functions of the State.

As I see it, the belief in the system of economic freedom rested on two bases: First, belief in the desirability of freedom of choice for the consumer; and second, belief in the effectiveness in meeting this choice, of freedom on the part of producers.

These ideas are interwoven in our subconscious thinking; they form the basis of our free, competitive enterprise system.

The first belief is simple; it is based on the view that the adult consumer is the best judge of his own interest—with some exceptions, however: the consumer, for example, must be protected from fraud—

For example, Ricardo: "Proposals for an Economical and Secure Currency: Works," edited by McCulloch, page 408. Ricardo followed Adam Smith in approving the Government stamp on plate and himself approved interference to insure the purity of drugs and the competence of doctors.

The argument for freedom of producers is more complicated. The motive for production is considered to be self-interest. But the guidance of this motive so that it conduces to the interest of the general public, is viewed as a product of the mechanism of the market and the forces of competition. The system of free markets was to be the rough discipline whereby the forces of self-interest were guided and held in check.

If we place these men in their proper historical setting, we can see that they were reformers. The system of economic freedom was not just a detached recommendation not to interfere; it was an urgent demand that what were thought to be hampering and antisocial impediments should be removed and that the immense potential of free pioneering individual initiative should be released.

The founders of our economic system were both individualists as regards ends and, with due reservation, individualists as regards means. For them an organization of production based, in the main, on private property and a competitive market was an essential complement to a system of freedom.

They did not believe that such a system was a product of nature—that it would come into being if things were just left to take their course. On the contrary, such a system can come into being only if things are not left to take their course. A conscious effort must be exerted to create the artificial environment which is necessary if it is to function properly.

The invisible hand which guides men to promote ends which are no part of their intention is not the hand of some god or some natural agency independent of human effort—but the Government. It is only through the efforts of the Government that a free market can exist.

They were against price fixing. They were against all tampering with the free movement of prices.

Adam Smith could have been reading the American papers recently when he stated that:

People of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices (Adam Smith, op. cit., book I, part II, p. 128).

Political society in the United States is founded upon distrust of concentrated power. Belief in competition is the economic corollary of the political system of checks and balances. It, too, rests upon distrust of concentrated power and upon belief in the maximum possible diffusion of rights and opportunities. We want business rivalries to supply checks and balances that limit the power of each business enterprise. Conceived as the diffusion of economic power, competition is expected to make an important contribution to personal freedom.

Now, Madam President, I have been urging that central to our democratic system in this country is this classical conception of a decentralized organization of production resting on private property and the competitive market. It is indeed unfortunate that more of us do not understand this.

Let me give you a couple of illustrations.

In the Wall Street Journal of January 10, 1961, is an article on the Government antitrust suit against 29 electrical equipment manufacturers, quoting the president of one of the companies who pleaded guilty:

No one attending the gatherings in the electrical controls industry was so stupid he didn't know the meetings were in violation of the law. But it is the only way a business can be run. It is free enterprise.

This man displays an incredible ignorance of our system of free private enterprise, and I am afraid that he is not alone in distorting our cultural heritage in order to rationalize and justify his conspiratorial activities.

This same man is also quoted as saying that our laws designed to force competition constitute Government interference.

Such disregard for precision in the use of words has made meaningless terms with political connotations. Words like "democracy," "liberal," and "conservative," "free private enterprise," and "Government intervention" have come to depend for their meaning on who uses them.

Another typical example of ignorance of our system is reported in the Wall Street Journal of January 13, 1961. A business executive states:

> I guess you'd say I believe in administered pricing. I think it was and is wrong to allocate business. But I don't think it's unethical to eliminate prices as a main competitive factor in some goods.

Here again is a businessman who does not understand how a free-private enterprise system operates. For him, economic freedom means freedom to "rook" the public. In the U.S.S.R. and in Communist China, a group of men in Moscow and Peiping decides which goods should be produced, how much and by what methods. In a free-market economy relative prices perform this allocative function. Higher profits in one industry will draw resources into that industry if there is relatively free entry. Higher prices for a product indicate that more of that product is wanted.

Allocation by price is the method of economic freedom; allocation by edict is the method of totalitarianism. As a matter of fact, because it was found almost impossible for a small group to allocate and plan the production of myriads of commodities and services, both the Soviets and the Chinese have established free markets in several sectors of the economy.

Price, therefore, performs an indispensable function in our system, the allocative function, and its limitation inevitably results in Government regulation or ownership.

Price-fixing and market allocation by private firms undermine the survival of our system. Those who engage in the activities defile the image of the free enterprise system. This is the system we are holding up to a large part of the world as a model superior to State control. In the eyes of the rest of the world we are branded as hypocrites.

Let me read a very interesting statement:

> The people, not some self-selected Government elite, decide the course of the Nation. This decentralization of power is the strength of the free society and it must be preserved.
>
> In the economic sphere, the principle of decentralized power expresses itself in the system of competitive private enterprise, operating in a basically free market. The competitive system offers many advantages that are not available to centrally controlled economies—and these advantages should be utilized in the space effort and the defense program, as well as the rest of the economy.
>
> The competitive system, with its profit and loss discipline, puts men and companies to the test as no other system does. It rewards the creative and the efficient. It penalizes the unimaginative and the inefficient. It provides an incentive for risk not only on the obvious ideas, but also on the long shots. It provides a natural and effective system for the elimination of failure, complacency, and delay. At its best, the competitive economy has a vigor, diversity, and efficiency that no controlled economy can match (Daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 2, 1960, pp. A4719–A4724, speech by Ralph J. Cordiner, delivered at Los Angeles on May 4, 1960).

These wonderful words of praise for competition could well have been spoken by the very founders of our system. But they were not.

The preceding sentiments were spoken by Mr. Ralph J. Cordiner, chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., a company which has been guilty of more antitrust violations than any other company in American history. Only recently several of its high officials, together with officials of Westinghouse, Allis Chalmers, and other companies, were sentenced to prison for their criminal acts.

Mr. Cordiner, the great champion of the free competitive private enterprise system says he knew nothing of these activities, which had been going on for many years and which pervaded so many departments. To quote Judge Ganey:

> One would be most naive indeed to believe that these violations of the law, so long persisted in, affecting so large a segment of the industry and finally, involving so many millions upon millions of dollars, were facts unknown to those responsible for the conduct of the corporation. (From text of a presentence statement made by Chief Judge J. Cullen Ganey, on February 6, 1961 in U.S. district court in the electrical equipment antitrust case. New York Times, Feb. 7, 1961, p. 26.)

To praise the free, competitive enterprise system while pulling the rug out from under it is nothing now. New "gimmicks" are constantly being devised to subvert our antitrust laws. Sometimes it is even in the name of small business, and the strategy is to nibble away at the law by allowing small businesses, through subterfuges, to conspire to fix prices and allocate markets. After that, how long will it be before the whole law itself will crumble?

Those forces, therefore, which prevent relative prices from performing their function in a free economy are subverting our economic system, and this will subtly and inevitably change our political system, for both are interrelated. The Communist forces arrayed against us will have attained their objectives without even lifting a finger.

It is interesting to note that companies which were sentenced for criminal violations of the antitrust laws are among the most important contractors with the Government for research and development. In 1960 the General Electric Co. was the fifth and Westinghouse was the tenth on the list of the largest contractors for research for the Government.

The policy by the Defense Department and other departments of the Government of relinquishing to private contractors all rights to the results of research and development financed with public funds, except for a mere license to use, is inevitably leading to greater concentration of economic power and the consequent decline of our free competitive system. The Defense Department's policy of helping huge companies to improve their already formidable patent structures at the public's expense by its very nature is destroying economic freedom.

A concrete example was found by the Comptroller General of the United States—Comptroller General's report on "Review of Administrative Management of the Ballistic Missile Program of the Department of the Air Force," pages 46–48.

As of June 1959, a particular contractor had filed applications for 95 patents, all resulting from Government-financed research and development. Out of this number, 11 applications were for inventions which the contractor himself characterized as "primary" inventions: that is, "developments believed to be sufficiently basic and important to provide a basis for a new industry or an entirely new product line; or one which may have a major effect on the expansion or conversion of an existing industry or product line."

In this case—as in many other cases—the U.S. Government has spent public funds to give one private company the power to control a whole industry—to exclude everyone it wants to exclude—to charge any price it wants to charge. This is not conducive to the equality of opportunity which competition should encourage. This is not consonant with our objective of economic freedom. I do not believe that the Government is playing its proper role as a preserver of the free, private enterprise system.

It is interesting to note that in all the discussions about Government patent policies, by the patent bar, the Defense Department, and business beneficiaries, not a single word has ever been mentioned about the possible effect of such policies on our competitive system. In hearings before my Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, Defense Department representatives stated that they had never even considered the subject.

This is cause for extreme dismay. It reveals nothing less than widespread lack of awareness, lack of responsibility, and lack of thought in the daily conduct of many business and governmental activities.

Our system of economic freedom, our free enterprise system, has been destroyed in many countries of the world. Where it still exists, it is fighting for its life.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, before the Senate adjourns, I wish to make one correction which I think is necessitated by a statement attributed to me, and which appears on the Associated Press wire service, as follows:

> WASHINGTON.—Acting with the approval of President Kennedy, Senator Humphrey said

today Richard M. Nixon is morally, legally, and politically wrong in denouncing the tractor deal to liberate captives of the Cuban refugee invasion.

I wish to make quite clear that I did not ask for the approval and applause of the President, even a President whom I fully and enthusiastically support as I do President Kennedy, nor would the President want me to do such a thing. When I speak in the Senate, Senators know that I speak for Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and my convictions and views, and I do not speak at anyone's beck and call, or speak the words of someone else.

I am hopeful that the President will find what I have said today is to his liking. I hope he will find it so much to his liking that he will approve what I said. I would not want anyone to feel, however, that the senior Senator from Minnesota addressed the Senate today because he was requested to do so or because he had a text that had been approved by the President. As a matter of fact, the text was barely completed by the time I arrived in the Senate, inasmuch as I started to write it this morning at around 10:30. The President is in Hyannis Port, Mass. I did not have an opportunity to call him and check with him. He was a little busy, also, and perhaps too busy to call and check with the senior Senator from Minnesota. This arrangement was perfectly satisfactory to both of us. I support the President, and I believe the President trusts me. On that basis I find our relationship very happy and very sound.

ECONOMIC FREEDOM AND FEDERAL PATENT POLICY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in connection with the statement I made on patent policy, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a discussion which appeared in the St. Louis Post Dispatch of Sunday, May 14, 1961. This is one of the few articles discussing the patent issue which have been made available to the general public. For the most part, the discussion of this issue has been limited to publications in which most readers would have a vested interest in continuing the private-patent-on-public-research policy—publications like the Wall Street Journal, the Patent Law Association Journal, and the Federal Bar Journal. There has been a reluctance in the press to discuss the issue for the education of the general public.

The article I referred to resulted, I believe, from public relations efforts of employees by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It is a relatively fair discussion of both sides of the issue. I commend it to the attention of Senators as being a slight pinpoint light through this blackout on the truth which the press seems to be determined to impose on this issue. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, to have the discussion printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTROVERSY OVER PATENT RIGHTS ARISING FROM RESEARCH FOR UNITED STATES—SENATOR LONG'S BILL WOULD GIVE TITLE TO GOVERNMENT—RICKOVER SUPPORTS PRINCIPLE, DEFENSE DEPARTMENT OPPOSES IT

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, May 13.—A published dialog between Vice Adm. Hyman G. Rickover and Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, has set the tone for a new effort to halt what Senator LONG calls a $3-billion-a-year patent giveaway.

When the Government buys research and development, the Senator asked, should the Government take the patent rights or let the rights for commercial applications go to the private contractor?

The admiral replied: "Where the Government bears all or nearly all of the cost, where the facilities belong to the Government and where the Government bears all the risk, the people should own the patents. The American people are spending their money for the research and development; therefore, the patents should belong to them."

Their dialog centered on a growing controversy over patent rights that arise out of Government-financed research and development. Federal financing has increased rapidly since World War II, until the Government now pays for about two-thirds of all the research and development carried on in the United States.

Defense Department policy gives the patent to the contractor, retaining for the Government only a royalty-free license for Government-financed production.

In other agencies, notably the Atomic Energy Commission and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, patents developed under contract belong to the Government. The AEC, moreover, can designate any privately developed atomic energy patent as being affected with the public interest. The commission then can use the invention or discovery and license other private users.

LONG has introduced a bill that would extend to all agencies the principle that the Government gets the patent when the Government pays for the research.

Rickover, in supporting this proposal, takes the not unusual role of bucking the Navy brass. The Navy, as well as the Defense Department itself, strongly opposes the change.

LONG's bill would establish a Federal Inventions Administration to take title to the patents and issue licenses, charging royalties payable to the Government when this is judged to be appropriate.

The Senator may be wrong in his estimate of $3 billion as the value of the commercial patent rights growing out of Government-financed research and development. But there can be no doubt that the value is considerable in view of the energy with which his proposal is being fought.

At hearings last month, a patents subcommittee heard testimony against the bill from the Defense Department, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, the National Small Businessmen's Association, the Electronics Industry Association, the American Bar Association, and the Aerospace Industries Association.

The Electronic Industry Association has mailed a letter to every Senator and Representative, opposing the Long bill and similar measures introduced by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Democrat, of Arkansas, and ABRAHAM J. MULTER, Democrat, of New York.

This circular letter raised a relatively new point, arguing that the legislation would give the Government title to property for which it had not paid. It continued:

"Research contracts usually are for hardware or engineering or scientific reports. Inventions are not contracted for, since they are coincidental to performance and rarely, if ever, can be anticipated. Whether no, one, or 10 inventions eventuate, the contract price remains the same."

This contention suggests that the proposed change might even be unconstitutional, on the ground that it would deprive persons of their property without due process of law.

Elmer J. Gorn, patent counsel for the Raytheon Co., which has profited greatly through radio tube patents developed under Government contract, says the proposed legislation "might well be a first step in the destruction of the American free enterprise system."

Gorn emphasizes commercial use of patent rights as an important motivation of firms seeking Government research and development contracts, others being patriotism, fear of public disapproval, the hope of obtaining procurement contracts, and the improvement of the contractor's scientific and engineering capability.

Other opponents of the Long bill like to think of patents as being rewards for inventors tinkering in the basement. The common practice among Government research and development contractors, however, is to require their employees to sign agreements giving the company all rights to any inventions they may make.

Rickover, in his talk with LONG, suggested that patent lawyers may be overemphasizing the present-day value of patents. He said:

"It is quite possible our industry would not be hurt very much if we restricted the items that are patentable. I believe the important factor for an industrial organization is the know-how developed by it—the trade secrets and the techniques. These are not patentable qualities. They are something inherent in a company, in its methods, in its management, the kind of machine tools it has, how it uses them, and so on."

Since Rickover does much of his work developing nuclear submarines under the AEC, with its requirement that the Government takes title to patents, LONG asked how well that system worked.

The Senator asked: "So, as far as you are concerned, you have no knowledge of any difficulty in persuading contractors to do the work for you?"

Rickover replied: "No, sir. I have difficulty keeping contractors away who are trying to persuade me to give them more work."

In a series of speeches, LONG has developed a strong case that may be sufficient to overcome the Defense Department's resistance to a change.

LONG points out that private business firms in World War II had the Government over a barrel and refused to take Government contracts unless they got all patent rights. The Senator has called this "a more extreme form of extortion."

More recently, he points out, American drug companies refused to cooperate with the Government in a cancer program unless the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare abandoned its traditional policy and gave the companies exclusive rights to everything they discovered with public funds.

LONG also has recalled that the General Electric Co. led a move last year to boycott NASA in an effort to force repeal of the NASA patent provision so that its contractors would get patent rights as in Defense Department contracts. LONG pointed out that General Electric earlier had come "running to the Government, urging it to erect

tariff walls to keep out competition so it could charge higher prices with impunity."

The same firm took a leading part in the rigging of bids, in which the Justice Department obtained convictions this year.

In hearings before Senator McCLELLAN's patents subcommittee, the Kennedy administration has presented a wide range of views. Defense is strongly against the proposed change. The AEC and the Tennessee Valley Authority supported their own patent procedures in which the Government generally takes title to patents made under Government contract, but preferred not to see authority pass to some other agency.

The Justice Department, through Assistant Attorney General Lee Loevinger, chief of the Antitrust Division, came out suddenly in favor of the proposed change.

The only Commerce Department position thus far is that there must be some middle ground and it is up to industry to find it. Presumably, some way could be worked out to give a Government contractor exclusive commercial rights to a discovery for 3 or 4 years, instead of the 17 years in the patent law, and then throw it open to everyone.

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges is under some pressure to oppose the Long proposal. A prominent industrialist is said to have wired him that the decision will show whether the Kennedy administration is going to have a partnership or a feud with business.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Monroe Morning World which indicates how completely misinformed some newspapers can be on this issue. The newspaper is published in the State of Louisiana. It apparently took a distorted report of the debate in which I participated, and wrote an editorial based on a handout, put out, I assume, under the auspices of some manufacturer-controlled association. It so completely deviates from the truth, one would wonder whether the article results from complete misinformation or a desire to misrepresent the facts.

The proposed legislation which I have introduced, to prevent private patents on public knowledge to the tune of billions of dollars every year, included language to provide that there would be established a Federal Inventions Administration, which would have the responsibility of protecting the Government's proprietary rights to research paid for with Government funds.

The Government is required under a number of laws to take the patents when the Government finances research. The Department of Agriculture is required by law to take the patents if it employs a contractor to do agricultural research. The Atomic Energy Commission must do the same. There are a number of other Federal agencies which are required to do that. In fact, there is a considerable number of them, which I shall be glad to supply for the record.

The purpose of the Government taking the patent is not to prevent knowledge from being used or to prevent the use of the patent. The purpose is to make certain that it is used to the utmost and that the information is made available generally to anyone in private enterprise who cares to use the Government patent or Government information. The Government's policy has been to license anyone without any fee or charge whatever to use the Government's patent for items developed by the Government and which are available to it.

The purpose of the Government in protecting its interest in proprietary information relates to the situation of the Government taking drawings, charts, and information with relation to new machines and new materials developed and thereby being in a position to make this information generally available to anyone who wants to use it. If the Government did not do it, then the Government might be in the unfortunate position of trying to make it possible for someone to manufacture something for which the Government had paid for all the research and know-how, without being able to make all that information available.

For example, I have heard it said that in some instances the person who worked to develop a certain type of engine on a research contract failed to get the contract for the procurement of that engine, and there was a tendency to withhold turning over to the Government or the successful negotiator all of the blueprints and drawings necessary to produce the engine. That is proprietary information. The Government is entitled to it. The purpose of the Government's taking the information is to make it possible for the Government to make the information available to others. It is not for the purpose of keeping it secret.

A witness representing the Department of Defense carrying on what I believe to be an outrageous policy of giving away private patents on public research, made it appear that the bill which I introduced would require the Government to conceal the information. The purpose of the Government taking these rights is the opposite. It is to see that the information is used and that no one hoards it to himself and keeps it secret or by patents or trade secrets or other methods prevent the information from being exploited to the benefit of 180 million Americans.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. To state the purpose of the Senator's bill, is not its purpose to make available for use by all people the patents or processes and designs that are developed through contract by the Government and with the Government on processes and operations which are essentially classified in character and on which, therefore, the average citizen or contractor has no opportunity for research and development?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is entirely correct. I heard of an example given to me which I believe to be correct. I will not give the names of the companies, because I do not have enough evidence to state it positively at this time. The story illustrates the point I have been trying to make.

One company on a research and development contract with the U.S. Government developed blueprints and a test model for the production of a certain type of engine. The company hoped it would get the Government procurement contract on a cost-plus-fixed-fee basis with a guaranteed profit. The company was disappointed. Perhaps it negotiated for too high a price or perhaps it did not have enough influence with the contracting office. At any rate, it failed to get the contract. It was told to turn the information over to another company, a very large company, which was to produce the tank engine. Although many millions of dollars were spent on the procurement contract, not a single engine produced at the plant worked efficiently and successfully.

The informal statement I have heard on this subject is that the reason why this big investment all went for naught, with the Government needing the engines in the worst kind of way, but not getting them under its procurement contract, was that the company which had researched the product did not turn over all its blueprints and drawings.

That was proprietary information. The U.S. Government had paid to create it. Under the present policy of the Department of Defense, the Government has a royalty-free license to use this information. It does not belong to the U.S. Government under the present policy. I think that policy is wrong, but that is the present policy of the administration, through the Department of Defense.

When I provide in my bill that the Government's proprietary rights should be protected by the Federal Inventions Administration, I mean that the Government, having paid for the blueprints, should have them, or at least copies of all of them. Instead of losing every nickel that was lost in trying to perfect an engine, we should remember that we paid for the research and development, the drawings, and the blueprints which could have been had.

But the Department of Defense witness has misconstrued the obvious intent of the statute. The Department of Defense witnesses should have been able to understand the language of the bill, which makes it clear that the information would be secreted and not used, but their contention was just the opposite.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that the overwhelming proportion of Department of Defense contracts are now handled on a negotiated basis?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. About 95 percent, dollarwise.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that those contracts are negotiated on the basis of insured profit upon performance of the contract?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes, they are. I have heard it argued by some businessmen that it is possible to lose money. To lose money on contracts of this sort, one would have to make a serious, inexcusable blunder such as failing to properly add up a column of figures or lose his copy of a contract and forget he ever had a contract.

Mr. GORE. As a part of the consideration of profit, is some value attached to information which rightly belongs to the Government, but which, nevertheless, is retained or may be retained by a contractor, or is it not true that the profit—the fixed fee profit—is calculated on a performance basis and that, therefore, if the contractor retains and uses for the purpose of obtaining patent rights, he receives the benefit beyond the price and the profit which is assured to him by the contractor?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what I think I can marshal a large amount of evidence to support that position. Some large companies contend that we would be required to pay for research and development if we did not throw in the big bonanza of providing patents for commercial application of everything that was developed on Government contracts. In my judgment, it would not cost 5 cents extra. Some of the very contractors who are benefiting from this policy admit that.

The reason I do not believe it would cost any more is that the fixed fee paid by the contractors of the Atomic Energy Commission and National Aeronautics and Space Administration is about the same as the fixed fee paid by the Department of Defense. There are more contractors available than there are contracts to be had. That is, there are more applicants for contracts than there are contracts available—and the applicants to whom I refer are qualified contractors.

So there is no doubt in my mind that if the policy of the Department of Defense were brought into line with that of the Atomic Energy Commission, plenty of companies would be available to do the research.

If the worst should come to the worst, if a corporation such as General Electric actually threatened a sitdown strike against the United States on research, the U.S. Government could still have its research done. The Senator from Tennessee knows this as well as I do, because in the fields where the Government has done its own research are the areas where this Nation has been most successful in staying ahead of foreign competitors. In the field of atomic energy, our best information is that we are still ahead of the Soviet Union and everyone else. The research in atomic energy was originally a Government research operation, with large contractors in the field today, the Commission is required to retain all patent rights.

Again, in the field of agriculture most of the research is Government operation; very little of it is contracted for. But wherever contracts exist, patent rights are not given away. In that field, due primarily to the Government's research, the United States is so far ahead of the Russians that it would take them years to catch up with us, even with this Nation helping them to catch up.

The Senator from Tennessee knows that in agriculture the Nation has performed far beyond the capabilities of others, due largely to the research program conducted by the U.S. Government.

Madam President, the editorial entitled "Long and Patents," to which I have previously referred, published in the Monroe, La., Morning World of May 25, 1961, illustrates how far from the real facts some newspapers will stray in seeking to defend a basically bad Federal policy.

I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LONG AND PATENTS

RUSSELL B. LONG, Louisiana's junior U.S. Senator, has never been able to get away from the idea that the Government is more important than the people. Instead of looking upon the Government as a vehicle belonging to the people, he sees it as something to which the people must be subservient.

Illustrating this, Senator LONG is now contending that his battle against some Federal agencies' policies of giving to private contractors the results of Government-financed research and development is beginning "to make headway." In other words, he is saying that he is persuading the Federal Government to withhold as much valuable information on manufacture as possible from private industry.

Government policy has become increasingly reluctant in the matter of granting patents to individuals and private companies. The whole trend seems to be to let everything be wide open for manufacture if anything of value is discovered or invented by an individual or a private concern. Now Senator LONG wants to have the Government keep secret everything it invents or have the private manufacturers pay a premium for using devices patented by the Government.

Senator LONG, who has introduced a bill requiring all Government agencies to keep patent and other rights to inventions and discoveries produced under research and development contracts paid for by the Government, cited three agencies which he said have voluntarily reversed their contracting policies in line with the provisions of his bill.

The Post Office Department, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Science Foundation have all, within the past few months, adopted a new policy to retain for the Government the rights to the processes and products developed under research and development projects.

The Senator is backing Government bossism pure and simple. In reality, the Government has no right, in a Nation which advocates free and private enterprise, to engage in any kind of competitive business or manufacturing. If it does not intend to manufacture and does not intend to let private enterprise carry on these functions, there is no reason why its inventions and discoveries should not be made available to the public. Individuals have some right to patent protection but the situation as pertains to the Government is entirely different.

Last week the junior Senator from Louisiana engaged in a debate on Government patent policy before the American Society of Chemists in Washington.

Senator LONG said: "Unless the patent policies of the Government in contracting for private research and development are revamped, the economy of our Nation will be retarded, monopolies will flourish, the consumer will pay unnecessarily high prices and our national defense may be seriously impaired."

None of these things appears to be true or logical. If all manufacturers are given the right to use discoveries and inventions made by the Government, it would be difficult to see how monopoly could result. This should bring keen competition with a consequent lowering, instead of increasing of prices. Instead of being retarded, the economy should flourish under free enterprise and free competition. Similarly, national defense could be built up at a lower cost.

Money spent by the Federal Government for invention and discoveries is money which has been paid in taxes by the people. These inventions and discoveries, therefore, should be made available for public use.

These are things which Senator LONG will never understand, however, as he has always been government-minded, instead of citizen-minded, despite the fact that the citizens are the ones who vote for him. Because he is this way, he cannot understand that what is good for the people is good for the country, nor that democracy is better than socialism and Government control.

DEATH OF THOMAS E. MURRAY, FORMER ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSIONER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, for the purpose of the official RECORD, I call attention to the death on May 26, 1961, of a great American, Mr. Thomas E. Murray. Mr. Murray formerly was an Atomic Energy Commissioner. More recently he has been a consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

In his death, the United States has lost a truly fine, devoted patriotic citizen, one who set an example of personal sacrifice, which President Kennedy has called upon Americans to make in increasing measure.

Mr. Murray left a lucrative business to become a public servant as a Commissioner of the Atomic Energy Commission. After he had served with distinction as a Commissioner, he offered his services as a consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Here was a man who had achieved outstanding success in the business world, but who decided he had something to contribute to his country. He really fulfilled the admonition of President Kennedy in his inaugural address, when the President said:

> Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country.

Thomas E. Murray asked that question of himself. He sought nothing from his country except the privilege of being an American citizen and the opportunity to live in a free country. He then asked himself what he could do for his country, and he then proceeded to devote his life in a very full and meaningful way to this country.

Mr. Murray often expressed views on the subject of nuclear testing and the possibility of a ban upon nuclear testing which were different from my views. Nevertheless, I found him to be a most constructive and remarkable person.

Madam President, Mr. Murray was a man of great faith. He was a devoted and dedicated member of his great church, the Catholic Church. He leaves his wife and seven sons. He also is survived by a brother, 4 sisters, and 43 grandchildren. Truly, this man has done great things for America. I am

honored to have the opportunity to pay tribute to him in the Senate.

I am saddened by his death, but I commend him and express what I know is the feeling of every Member of the Senate, a feeling of deep respect, gratitude, and appreciation.

I hope these words will be of some comfort to his family. I express to them on this occasion my condolences and sincere sympathy.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Thomas E. Murray Dies; Ex-AEC Commissioner," published in the Washington Star of May 27, 1961.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOMAS E. MURRAY DIES; EX-AEC COMMISSIONER

NEW YORK, May 27.—Thomas E. Murray, who turned from a lucrative business career to serve as an Atomic Energy Commissioner and later as a consultant to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, died yesterday of a heart attack in St. Luke's Hospital. He was 69.

He had been in the hospital since May 19.

Mr. Murray went into Government service after a successful career as a businessman, engineer, and inventor. He also was a leading Catholic layman.

In the latter part of his Government service, Mr. Murray became a center of controversy and often was at odds with Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

A Democrat, Mr. Murray differed with Mr. Strauss and the Eisenhower administration on atomic weapons, secrecy, and public versus private development of atomic power for peacetime purposes.

BACKED SMALLER BOMBS

Mr. Murray advocated a halt to hydrogen bomb tests, a limit to the size and number of atomic weapons stockpiled and Government development of peacetime atomic power.

He felt the administration put too much emphasis on big bombs and not enough on the smaller ones that he said would be needed in limited wars.

Mr. Murray served on the AEC from 1950, when he resigned as head of a manufacturing firm and gave up offices in several other corporations, until 1957 when he returned to private industry and assumed the consultant post with the congressional committee.

In open letters to the two presidential candidates last fall, Mr. Murray urged that the United States lift its ban on testing of nuclear weapons.

By unilaterally suspending all atomic-hydrogen tests for 2 years, the country kept itself from far-reaching nonmilitary and military progress, since nuclear technology involves incessant and rapid change, he said.

Furthermore, he suggested, there is every reason to suspect the Russians have been cheating.

FORESAW NEW WEAPON

A radically new type of nuclear weapon, a "third generation" weapon, could be developed, as different from the H-bomb as the H-bomb was from the atom bomb dropped on Hiroshima, he declared.

A native of Albany, N.Y., he was graduated from Yale University with a degree in mechanical engineering in 1911. He distinguished himself as an inventor and received more than 200 patents in his career.

After his father died in 1929, leaving an estate estimated at $10 million, Mr. Murray succeeded him as president of the Metropolitan Engineer Co., and as board chairman of Thomas E. Murray, Inc. He later organized the Murray Manufacturing Co. to make electric switches.

During World War II, he converted his plants to the production of mortar shells for the Government.

He was named receiver of the Interborough Rapid Transit Co. of New York City in 1932, and served in that capacity until the city took over the subway and elevated lines in 1940.

He leaves his wife, the former Marie Brady; seven sons, Thomas E., Jr., James B., Rev. D. Bradley Murray, Paul N., Francis B., Joseph G., and Peter D.; and four daughters, Mrs. Basil Harris, Jr., Mrs. Ralph M. O'Neil, Mrs. Thomas I. Sheridan, Jr., and Miss Margot Murray.

He also leaves a brother, 4 sisters, 43 grandchildren, and 1 great-grandchild.

CASTRO'S BLACKMAIL

Mr. CARLSON. Madam President, recently there was published in the Russell Daily News, of Russell, Kans., a very excellent editorial entitled "It Is Still Blackmail." The editorial was written by the publisher of that newspaper, Mr. Russell T. Townsley. In the editorial he discusses the present situation in regard to Castro's offer to exchange 1,200 prisoners for 500 tractors.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Russell Daily News, May 22, 1961]

IT IS STILL BLACKMAIL

Castro's offer to trade 1,200 prisoners for 500 tractors is blackmail. The fact this Nation is even considering paying tribute to the bearded traitor is unexplainable.

We can't believe the moral fiber of Americans has become so degenerate and debased that they feel it necessary to bow and beg before a petty dictator. Yet, from the names of the people who are lending their support to compound the crime, what else is there to believe?

It is hardly adequate to offer only sympathy for those being held in Cuban jails and concentration camps. Human suffering, wherever it is found, is objectionable. The freedoms of mankind should be paramount, whether they are threatened in Atlanta, Ga., Little Rock, Ark., Russia, its satellite countries, Africa or even in Cuba. Americans, dedicated to peace and freedom, have every reason to be aroused and concerned.

To confuse a conviction for ideals with paying tribute is a serious mistake, one which could cost the principles for which this Nation stands. The trade of tractors for prisoners would establish a precedent unequaled in the Nation's 185-year history. It would set a price on human life, encourage higher fees and more tribute as others find insults for which Uncle Sam is willing to pay.

As news leaks from Washington, it appears the United States had a far from passive part in the ill-fated invasion of Cuba. There's no question, now, that there's a moral obligation to do something for the victims of that fiasco. The fact remains the Cuban invasion was neither authorized, approved, nor sanctioned by the Congress. It was, and is, an extracurricular activity of Government. The ransom offer from Castro is a natural development, one which could have been expected.

The United States was wrong in lending support to a military effort beyond its control. It would be wrong to pay a tribute to Castro as a result of the first mistake.

Diplomacy which stops short of war leaves an opening of the kind upon which Castro has seized. Some day, at some point, blackmail must be stopped. And the time to stop it is before it begins.

There's no question about the value of 1,200 human lives as compared with 500 tractors. If that was all there was to it, then the trade would be cheap. Instead, this is a precedent which offers only bigger and more expensive insults in time to come.

The United States has never compromised its ethics or ideals. There is too much at stake to begin now.

An umbrella-carrying Englishman, a scant 24 years ago, showed the world the foolishness of following such a path when he returned from a conference with Adolph Hitler saying "There will be peace in our time." There was no peace then and there is no peace now to come from international blackmail.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I see that there appears to be no further Senate business. Therefore, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon on Thursday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Thursday, June 1, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29, 1961:

U.S. MARSHAL

Hugh Salter of North Carolina to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years, vice B. Ray Cohoon.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Hugh Pate Harris, O18518, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Van Hugo Bond, O18301, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Floyd Allan Hansen, O18767, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, O18129, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Frank Ruggles, O18596, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Dwight Edward Beach, O18747, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, O18755, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Teddy Hollis Sanford, O29693, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Col. Nathan Jay Roberts, O24345, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Maj. Gen. Robert John Fleming, Jr., O17095, United States Army.

Brig. Gen. Floyd Lawrence Wergeland, O19599, Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Thomas Honeycutt, O18975, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Alexander Cunningham 3d, O19579, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Francis Joseph McMorrow, O18995, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Stuart Sheets Hoff, O38766, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Alden Kingsland Sibley, O18964, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Alvin Charles Welling, O18983, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Donald Graham, O20067, Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Leonidas George Gavalas, O31569, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Joseph Caufield, O19515, United States Army.

Col. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Dudley Cole, O19749, U.S. Army.

Col. Delk McCorkle Oden, O20805, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Harold McDonald Brown, O20832, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Merlin Louis DeGuire, O19446, U.S. Army.

Col. Cornelis DeWitt Willcox Lang, O19734, U.S. Army.

Col. Nathan Jay Roberts, O24345, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Benjamin Franklin Evans, Jr., O20368, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Howard Pinkney Persons, Jr., O20167, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Kenneth Gregory Wickham, O21073, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Lloyd Elmer Fellenz, O19485, U.S. Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 29, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS

Thomas S. Estes, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Upper Volta.

Parker T. Hart, of Illinois, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Yemen.

John S. Badeau, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Republic.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 29, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

MAY 29, 1961.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Reverend H. Coleman McGehee, Jr., rector, Immanuel Church on the Hill, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless our land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion, from pride and arrogancy, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Imbue with the spirit of wisdom those to whom in Thy name we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home and that through obedience to Thy law we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness, and in the day of trouble suffer not our trust in Thee to fail—all of which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 25, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On May 25, 1961:

H.R. 1320. An act for the relief of Edward P. Wall;

H.R. 1329. An act for the relief of Kim Hyoung Geun;

H.R. 1351. An act for the relief of Danica Dopudja;

H.R. 1366. An act for the relief of Hans E. T. Hansen;

H.R. 1368. An act for the relief of Maurice Devlin;

H.R. 1397. An act for the relief of Arthur B. Tindell;

H.R. 1424. An act for the relief of Benjamin E. Campbell;

H.R. 1447. An act for the relief of Wladyslaw Figura;

H.R. 1453. An act for the relief of Mario Menna;

H.R. 1535. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;

H.R. 1896. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;

H.R. 2138. An act for the relief of Raymond G. Greenhalgh;

H.R. 2188. An act for the relief of Lt. Matthew A. Wojdak, U.S. Navy (retired);

H.R. 2331. An act for the relief of Peggy Loene Morrison;

H.R. 2681. An act for the relief of Terata Kiyoshi Johnston; and

H.R. 3842. An act for the relief of James Delbert Hodges.

On May 27, 1961:

H.J. Res. 306. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to award posthumously a medal to Dr. Thomas Anthony Dooley III;

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation;

H.R. 5571. An act to provide for the addition or additions of certain lands to the Effigy Mounds National Monument in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6100. An act to amend title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to authorize the payment of operating-differential subsidy for cruises;

H.R. 6518. An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; and

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 311. An act to authorize the acceptance by the Government of gifts to be used to reduce the public debt;

H.R. 1877. An act relating to the effective date of the qualification of Plumbers Union Local No. 12 Pension Fund as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; and

H.R. 6094. An act to amend section 4 of the Employment Act of 1946.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 529. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States;

S. 537. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the

conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes;

S. 538. An act to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses;

S. 539. An act to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended;

S. 540. An act to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes;

S. 541. An act to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint non-uniformed special policemen;

S. 796. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes;

S. 880. An act to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy;

S. 1021. An act to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education;

S. 1222. An act relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States;

S. 1229. An act to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriated American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes;

S. 1317. An act to change the designation of that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the Island of Hawaii, in the State of Hawaii, to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 1342. An act to provide that participation by members of the National Guard in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall be held and considered to be full-time training duty under section 502 of title 32, United States Code, and for other purposes;

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce;

S. 1462. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes;

S. 1622. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955;

S. 1768. An act to provide for the restoration of Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and other individual payments of tribal trust funds;

S. 1869. An act to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; and

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

MAY 26, 1961.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the authority granted on May 25, 1961, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6518) entitled "An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes"; and

That the Senate agree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to Senate amendment No. 1 to the above-entitled bill.

Respectfully yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

HOUSE BILL ENROLLED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6518. An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker on Thursday, May 25, 1961, he did on May 26, 1961, sign the following enrolled bill of the House:

H.R. 6518. An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, AND THE JUDICIARY AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H.R. 7371) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 442), which was read a first and second time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG reserved all points of order on the bill.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight Thursday, June 1, to file a report on H.R. 6028, the housing bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

TEXAS

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, never have I been so proud of Texas. The people of Texas have long insisted that not only is the State large in land area but everything in Texas and done by Texas is big and best. In good humor Texans have been chided for these boasts.

Today the people of Texas can proudly boast of their bigness as a people, and there is thunderous applause throughout the country. With the election of Republican John G. Tower to the U.S. Senate, the people of Texas have demonstrated that they are a people of independent thought and the time has come for action.

It is not easy for people to break with tradition. That is what gives this election such significance. Tower's election was their answer to President Kennedy's "ask not what your country can do for you but what you can do for the country."

They have said the best thing we can do is to make certain our country's virility and strength is conserved, not dissipated and wasted. Texas itself has decided to provide the leadership for conservatism.

It is my conviction that the election of a Republican Senator from the Democratic gibraltar of Texas expressed the conservative trend throughout the entire country. The people coolly received President Kennedy's second state of the Union message where he in substance said in terms of billions of dollars: "this is what we are going to do for you, even though you did not ask for it." The people of Texas have responded by saying at the ballot box "this is what we are going to do for our country, Mr. President, even though you did not ask for it."

Never have I been so proud of Texas.

NATIONAL PARK SEMINARY REUNION

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay a tribute to 154 fine American women who gathered in Washington last week from all corners of our great Nation to attend a reunion of the alumnae of a school that ceased to exist almost two decades ago. It is of such sentiment that the spiritual fiber of our people is woven.

National Park Seminary, beautifully located at Forest Glen, near the Nation's Capital, was perhaps the most famous of the finishing schools for young women at the close of the 19th century. The name was changed to National Park College early in the 20th century and it continued to attract to its campus young women from all sections of our Nation. Among the students were the mother and the aunt of our present Assistant Secretary of State for Africa, the former Governor of Michigan, the Honorable Mennen Williams. Irene Castle and Mrs. Marguerite Shirvin, sister of Mrs. Perle Mesta, were students there. Among the other alumnae of this famous college for young women are the wife of our colleague from and the former Governor of Wisconsin, the Honorable Vernon Wallace Thomson, and the wife of Arthur Perry, well and affectionately known on the Hill as the administrative assistant of Vice President Johnson.

In 1942, National Park College was turned over to the Federal Government, and its five administration buildings, its study structures, its dormitories and sorority houses now are occupied by the Nation's convalescent war veterans.

But in the hearts of America's girls of a past era who attended this famous school at Forest Glen, National Park College still lives. Among the 154 alumnae at the reunion last week were Miss Anna Denson, the very first girl to enroll at National Park Seminary and a member of the first graduating class in 1898, and three members of the class of 1900, Mrs. Rose Armstrong Dawson, of Rockville, Md., Mrs. Myrna Miller Seaks, of Oxford, Pa., and my 83-year-young sister, Mrs. Isabel O'Hara Yaeger, of Phoenix, Ariz.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation's Capital was honored by the presence of these fine women, keeping alive in a modern world the spirit of an era past.

VIENNA SUMMIT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I want the RECORD to show I am still against summit conferences with international gangsters, murderers, and aggressors. As a kid in 1933, I opposed the recognition of the Soviet Communist Government by President Roosevelt. I was bitterly against the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam Conferences, where the great allied victory over oppression was thrown to the winds. The RECORD will show that I opposed the Camp David and Paris meetings of President Eisenhower with Khrushchev. All of the infamous summit conferences resulted in tragic losses of free peoples and American prestige and world respect.

Following Cuba, Laos, the Congo, and Castro's blackmail, Vienna will be particularly hazardous for the United States. The Communist gangsters have all to gain and nothing to lose by summit meetings with sincere, well-meaning American Presidents. On the other hand, we have all to lose and nothing to gain. If we reach an agreement with Khrushchev, we will have nothing as he will break the agreement when it suits his plans for world conquest. He makes promises and agreements to be broken. The Communists always use summit meetings to cover up some sinister move against the free nations of the world. Summit meetings have always helped the cause of communism.

We should cease playing their game and giving them the dignity and respect they desperately seek. The United States can put world communism on the defense overnight by refusing to meet Khrushchev until he demonstrates good faith by calling off his subversion, infiltration, and Communist campaign against free peoples. We should refuse to meet this atheist dictator until he gives Poland and the captive nations their freedom.

We should announce to the world that we will not talk with Khrushchev about Berlin, Laos, Cuba, or the Congo; but we would consider meeting with him to discuss the freedom of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Rumania, North Korea, and the other captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, the President apparently will go. All we can do is wish him well and offer our prayers for his safe return.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following Members may extend their remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter—the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] in two instances.

BUY AMERICAN ACT

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, daily I become more alarmed with the policies of our Government relative to the protection of our American industry and its workers from foreign competition—this competition viewed in the light of the existing wage scale paid in the United States and in foreign countries. I wish to express my thinking concerning the Buy American Act and Executive Order No. 10582.

Congress passed the Buy American Act for certain very important and specific reasons. These were clearly brought out during the committee hearings and in the House and Senate debates on this bill. This act was vigorously supported in the House and Senate and was passed by substantial margins. House: 150 yeas; 18 nays. Senate: 41 yeas, 12 nays; 43 not voting.

What are those fundamental principles which give substance to the act today as in 1933 when it was adopted?

Mr. Speaker, Government's primary responsibility is to its own citizens. A buy-domestic policy is an affirmation of that responsibility.

The source of a government's revenues is taxes. The purchase of domestic supplies provides the jobs and the orders which its taxpayers need to help pay their taxes. In the case of some industries, Government purchases represent 50 percent or more of sales. Purchase of foreign goods operates against the interrelationship between government and its taxpayers. In today's international economic situation, it is difficult to believe that when our Federal Government awards a contract to a foreign producer, that governmental outlay will come back in full or in a significant part to American manufacturers and American labor in the form of oversea orders for American goods or services. Foreign manufacturers buy in the cheapest markets and generally from foreign producers since they are able to underbid American manufacturers. In any event, it is clear that a foreign firm that gets a Federal contract for hydraulic turbines, for example, is not going to buy a hydraulic turbine from an American producer and provide jobs so that employees of American firms may continue working.

Mr. Speaker, a government is protected by its laws when it purchases supplies from its citizens. It can bring to bear the force of its laws to enforce contracts and to recover damages. A government exposes itself to the hazards, complexities, and inadequacies of international law when it purchases goods and services from foreign suppliers.

Purchase of foreign-made goods generally involves maintenance and service complications and in some cases these complications lead directly to national defense and security risks. An entity of the British Government, the Central Electricity Authority, decided that it would limit its purchase of supplies to those produced within the United Kingdom because—

> It would be unwise for the electricity supply industry [of England and Wales] to be dependent upon foreign manufacturers for spares and maintenance.

The Central Electricity Authority has been following this policy since its creation in 1947.

Mr. Speaker, in the United States there are additional considerations which demand a firm policy of limiting Federal purchases of supplies to American manufacturers wherever possible.

Governmental purchase of foreign-made goods undermines wages and salaries in the United States. In large measure our economic development during the 20th century is based on the proposition that the more money in the hands of the many creates greater con-

suming power, more sales, additional jobs, increased prosperity, and a higher standard of living. In practice, this policy brings with it higher labor costs. In few other nations in the world is this a widely practiced concept. Until more widely accepted elsewhere in the world, the U.S. Government must be in the forefront in protecting this principle. It cannot do so by buying foreign-made goods. As a matter of fact, current Government policy of awarding a contract to a foreign manufacturer whenever the lowest American bid exceeds the lowest foreign bid by 6 percent in effect rewards foreign firms for paying low wages.

Our Federal Government has adopted a number of statutes which have served to increase wages and production costs. Included within these laws are the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act of 1936, the 8-hour law of 1912, and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. It is not within the scope of national law to impose this type of legislation on foreign producers. Our Federal Government must not continue to turn its back on its own laws by failing, as it now does, to recognize the difference between American and foreign wages in its evaluation of the reasonableness of cost of American bids.

The Buy American Act has stood the test of time. On March 3, 1961, it passed its 28th birthday. During these years it has been amended twice, in 1946 and in 1949. These amendments served to clarify and sustain the original purpose of the act. The congressional intent thus has remained unchanged.

But what of the implementation of the act? What is the nature of the rules and regulations under which the act is administered?

Mr. Speaker, since December 17, 1954, Executive Order No. 10582 and rules and regulations issued pursuant to that order control the awarding of contracts which involve the Buy American Act. A comparison of this order with the Buy American Act reveals that the order is out of harmony with the very statute it supposedly implements.

The Buy American Act states that the Federal Government should buy supplies produced in the United States and made of supplies or materials produced in the United States. It then details circumstances under which an individual contract may be awarded to a foreign producer. The Executive order, however, sets up conditions which encourage purchase of foreign goods by the Federal Government. It sets forth special circumstances by which foreign bids may be rejected and contracts awarded to American producers—this under an act which requires as its principal purpose the requirement that the Federal Government purchase American goods.

When the House of Representatives passed the Buy American Act it required that the Federal Government limit its purchase of supplies to articles which were made wholly of materials or articles mined or produced within the United States. When the measure was presented to the Senate it was recognized that there would be circumstances in which it would be impossible to be certain whether all articles and supplies purchased by the Federal Government were 100 percent of American origin and of American produced materials and supplies. Accordingly, the Senate amended the House bill by stating, as it appears in the present act, that the Federal Government shall purchase "only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been manufactured in the United States substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced, or manufactured as the case may be, in the United States."

For a number of years it was concluded that substantially all should be interpreted to mean 75 percent or more of domestic origin. Executive Order 10582 cut this percentage to 50 percent. Today articles may be 49.99 percent of foreign origin and be considered domestic articles, be considered substantially all of American origin, and be entitled to preference granted under the act. This is contrary to the intent of Congress.

A comparison of the origins of Executive Order 10582 and of the Buy American Act established basic conflicts between the purposes of the order and the act which it is to implement.

Mr. Speaker, Executive Order 10582 was issued, in part, at least, to serve purposes in conflict with the Buy American Act. On March 3, 1954, the President submitted to the Congress a message on the "Foreign Economic Policy for the United States"—House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, Document No. 360. Throughout the message repeated references were made to the need for expansion of American exports and American imports. Ways and means for achieving these goals were set forth and recommended. Regarding the Buy American Act and its implementation, the President stated the following:

BUY AMERICAN LEGISLATION

At present certain of our laws require that, in specified Federal or federally financed procurement, preference be given to domestic firms over foreign bidders. Except where considerations of national security, persistent and substantial unemployment, or encouragement of small business require otherwise, I agree with the Commission that it is improper policy, unbusinesslike procedure, and unfair to the taxpayer for the Government to pay a premium on its purchases.

I request, therefore, that legislative authority be provided to exempt from the provisions of this legislation the bidders from nations that treat our bidders on an equal basis with their own nationals. Meanwhile, the executive branch is clarifying the application of these preference principles to Government procurement. It will limit the price differential favoring domestic producers over foreign bidders to a reasonable percent, dependent upon the circumstances over and above whatever tariffs may apply. Discretionary authority, however, must be continued to permit special consideration in Government procurement for the requirements of national security, for the problems of small business, and of areas where persistent and substantial unemployment exists.

The Commission referred to in the message was the Commission on Foreign Economic Policy—the Randall Commission.

Concerning the Buy America Act, the Randall Commission stated the following:

The Buy American Act and legislative provisions of other acts containing the buy American principle should be amended to give authority to the President to exempt from the provisions of such legislation the bidders from other nations that treat our bidders on an equal basis with their own nationals. Pending such amendment, the President by Executive order should direct procurement agencies in the public interest to consider foreign bids which satisfy all other considerations on substantially the same price basis as domestic bids.

The Buy American Act was enacted in 1933 as an antidepression measure. It requires Government procurement agencies in effect to give a preference to domestic suppliers, except where such suppliers are quoting prices substantially higher than those quoted from foreign sources. It embodies a philosophy and a practice which exists in many industrial nations of the free world and which is costly to them all. Today our Government procurement alone is of an order some 40 times its dollar volume in 1933. We are fully aware of sentiment everywhere that governments should buy from those who pay their expenses. While we do not believe that foreign producers have any inherent right to supply our Government, we believe that in the total national interest the United States could well lead the way toward the elimination of such preferences on a reciprocal basis.

Executive Order 10582 does "lead the way toward elimination of such preferences"—that is preferences for domestic products in Government purchases, the same preferences which the Buy American Act was designed to establish and encourage in the United States. Executive Order 10582 encourages imports of foreign made products. It does so by following the Commission's recommendation to the President that "the President by Executive order should direct procurement agencies in the public interest to consider foreign bidders which satisfy all other considerations on substantially the same price basis as domestic bids." The Executive order provides that contracts shall be awarded to foreign producers when the bid of the low domestic bidder exceeds that of the low foreign bidder by 6 percent—this despite the fact that American wages are double, triple, and six times or more those paid overseas. The Executive order provides in section 5 for use of another differential other than the 6 percent, but places a substantial roadblock for the contracting officer and the head of the agency by requiring that:

A written report of the facts of each case in which such a determination is made shall be submitted to the President through the Director of the Bureau of the Budget by the official making the determination within 30 days thereafter.

The Executive order does encourage imports and Federal purchase of foreign made equipment by injecting the definition that a product may be considered substantially all of American origin even though it contains 49.99 percent of production materials of foreign origin.

These are not implementations of the law; they are basic amendments

achieved through Executive interpretation. They are in conflict with the letter and spirit of the Buy American Act.

Mr. Speaker, under normal circumstances one would expect that since Executive action has, in effect, amended the Buy American Act, Executive action could be used to restore the act. However, these are not normal circumstances. If President Kennedy were to take the necessary corrective action to reorder the administration and interpretation of the act, foreign governments would raise an unbelievable uproar. By analogy, one of the items on Prime Minister Harold Macmillan's agenda when he visited President Eisenhower in March 1959 was to express British concern and opposition to the awarding of a Federal contract for $1,750,000 for power equipment to an American manufacturer under the Buy American Act. This was after it had been fully established by several Federal agencies that the award was necessary in the interest of national security and related, as well, to an unemployment problem in an area of substantial labor surplus at the time. A number of similar situations have arisen during the last 10 years and each time our President and our governmental agencies are severely and bitterly criticized by foreign governments for awarding contracts to domestic manufacturers under an act which requires them to do so.

I have, therefore, proposed the bill H.R. 6265 which would amend title 3 of the act of March 3, 1933—the Buy American Act—with respect to the acquisition by the United States of articles, materials, and supplies for public use. The bill provides in part the following:

It affirms the fact that an American bid can be a reasonable price offer to our Federal Government even though it exceeds the bid of a foreign manufacturer. This is in recognition of the fact that if manpower and machine productivity are roughly equivalent, it will cost more to produce in our higher wage economy than in an economy where wages are half or considerably less than half the amount paid in the United States.

It provides that prevailing prices in the United States shall be determinant of reasonableness of cost of American bids. If American industry and labor are to have any hope of supplying our Government with the goods and services it needs, this formula must be put into effect. Without such a rule foreign producers in most countries will be able to underbid American manufacturers in any cases in which they can meet our Government's specifications.

It provides that an article may not have more than 25 percent of foreign components or foreign processing by cost or value if it is to be considered of American origin.

The text of H.R. 6265 follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of title III of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1933, as amended (41 U.S.C. 10a), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, and unless the head of the department or independent establishment concerned shall determine the cost to be unreasonable, only such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced in the United States shall be acquired for public use; and only such manufactured articles, materials, and supplies shall be acquired for public use as have been manufactured in the United States, either substantially all from articles, materials, or supplies mined or produced or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States, or, if such unmanufactured articles, materials, or supplies from which they are manufactured are not mined, produced, or manufactured in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality, then only such articles, materials, or supplies as are produced in the United States in reasonably available commercial quantities and of a satisfactory quality from such unmanufactured articles, materials, and supplies as have been mined or produced outside the United States, shall be acquired for public use. This section shall not apply with respect to articles, materials, or supplies for use outside the United States, except as provided hereafter, or if articles, materials, or supplies of the class or kind to be used are not mined, produced, or manufactured, as the case may be, in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities of a satisfactory quality.

"If the articles, materials, or supplies are acquired for use outside the United States, this section shall nevertheless apply if the logistics of spare parts and vital maintenance service required by military installations outside the United States would endanger the national security in time of national emergency because of dependence upon sources outside the United States.

"No bid or proposal price offered by or in behalf of a producer, miner, or manufacturer in the United States, exclusive or inclusive of import duty, shall be deemed unreasonable solely on the grounds that it is in excess of any bid or proposal received from foreign producers, miners, or manufacturers or their agents. No bid or proposal price shall be deemed unreasonable unless it is in excess of the prevailing prices at which the same or similar articles, materials, or supplies mined, produced or manufactured in the United States are sold at the time the bid or proposal is submitted in the ordinary course of trade in the market area where the articles, materials, or supplies for public use are to be delivered.

"In the absence of such prevailing prices, for whatever reason, in determining whether the domestic bid price is unreasonable in those instances where foreign bids are received, the domestic bid price shall be compared with the lowest foreign bid price.

"For the purposes of this Act this comparison shall be made on the basis of the differential between the average wages prevailing in the foreign industry producing the article or material or supplies involved and the corresponding or similar domestic wages. For the purposes of such wage comparison the current or most recent official wage rates as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor, shall be used. No domestic bid shall be deemed unreasonable unless it exceeds the lowest foreign bid, exclusive of duty, by a margin greater than the differential found pursuant to this section to exist between such prevailing domestic and foreign prevailing wages.

"For the purpose of this section articles, materials, and supplies shall be deemed to be manufactured or produced substantially all from domestic articles, materials, or supplies in the United States if the cost or value of foreign components or foreign processing present in the articles, materials, or supplies does not exceed 25 percent of the bid or proposal price of the article incorporating such foreign components or processing: *Provided,* That no article, materials, or supplies shall be deemed to be 'substantially all' of domestic origin if any major component is of foreign origin regardless of the ratio of the cost or value of such major component to the price of the whole unit to which the bid or proposal applies."

FEDERAL CRIME TO FIX OR RIG ATHLETIC CONTEST

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will make it a Federal crime to fix or rig any amateur or professional athletic contest. Punishment under this legislation provides for a penalty of 5 years in jail or $10,000 fine, or both.

This law is needed to punish the human termites who are corroding one of our finest and oldest traditions, the integrity of American athletics.

Hoodlums and racketeers are crossing and doublecrossing our country and our people from coast to coast, seducing our athletes to prostitute their physical prowess for their dirty dollars. They are shattering the faith of millions of American youngsters in their athletic idols and are contributing as much to juvenile delinquency as dope peddlers.

Just like insects which acquire tolerance to pesticides, the fixers have adapted their techniques in the past few years to divide their operations among the States and across the country so that no individual State law enforcement agency can fully investigate or prosecute their crimes. The reoccurrence of the recent basketball scandals, the attempt to bribe major league umpires and similar occurrences are enough reasons to enact Federal legislation with teeth in it to provide an additional effective weapon to exterminate these vermin.

I urge early and favorable consideration of this legislation by the Congress.

PERU'S ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, during my recent trip to South America, I had the privilege of visiting Peru. While in the country I took the opportunity to look into various aspects of our mission there. I would like to report some of my findings resulting from various discussions with some of our American Embassy and USOM personnel and from my own personal observations and other contacts I made while in Peru.

Perhaps at this point a brief description of the country and its problems would be enlightening.

Peru is sharply divided into three distinct zones, in which and between which communication is extremely difficult.

First. Coastal desert contains 12 percent of the area and 27 percent of the population, 17 percent in the Lima-Callao area alone, which generates about 44 percent of the national income.

Second. Mountains contain 27 percent of the area and 61 percent of the population, concentrated in the highland pla-

teaus and valleys near Lake Titicaca in southern Peru.

Third. Rain forest contains 61 percent of the area, and 12 percent of the population.

The last census was taken in Peru in 1940, when the population was reported at 6 million. A rate of growth factor of about 2.5 percent per annum has been commonly accepted as about right, and a total population figure now of about 11 million, probably low.

More than half the population is Indian, and if the mestizo is included, this figure climbs to 75 to 80 percent.

About 3 million people out of the total population participate in the money economy, and the remainder exist at the subsistence level.

The movement of people is from the mountains to the coast, and to the large coastal cities, especially Lima.

Peru's basic problem is that its population is in a largely subsistence-level agrarian economy with a tremendous element of disguised unemployment. This population is now becoming mobile with improvements in transportation and communications, and is migrating at an ever-increasing rate to the coastal cities, particularly Lima.

Employment and food supplies so far have been adequate to sustain this change in patterns of living, largely because the standard of living on Peruvian farms is generally so low that city slums are an improvement for most of the migrants.

As the migrants increase in number, and their standard of living goes up—particularly with the second generation of city dwellers—neither jobs nor food supplies are going to be available in sufficient quantity, unless Peruvian agriculture is made more efficient, and more industries, especially of the labor-intensive kinds, are established.

If the rigidities inherent in Peru's present social and economic structure frustrate the thrust of this rising middle class of city dwellers, the rigidities will be destroyed, and very likely the society along with the rigidities. The Indian mass, not revolutionary in itself, can be set in motion by this middle class in its efforts to upset the established scheme of things. Once set in motion, no one will be able to control or direct this Indian "third power," at least in the short run.

Peru is now less than 50 percent self-sufficient in food production, although this lack is compensated by its industrial agriculture in cotton, sugar, and coffee. However, the balance between supplies of food and effective demand has been maintained at the expense of declining dietary standards. If agrarian reform should result in less efficient operation of either industrial agriculture or of its—admittedly inadequate and inefficient—food production farms, the effect on Peruvian diet would be catastrophic.

In recent years, and particularly in 1960, a marked increase in investment in industry, particularly light industry, has been recorded. This trend must be encouraged.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that I have great confidence in the American team's approach to the problems of Peru. The technical cooperation program in Peru provides assistance in many fields of endeavor among which are health, agriculture and education.

Work accomplished in the aforementioned fields through the ICA program in Peru is particularly evident in the vicinity of Lima where permanent functioning public institutions have been established which are making important contributions in bettering the health, education and daily living conditions of the people of the country.

The National Institute of Occupational Health was placed under the management of the United States-Peruvian Cooperative Health Service which had the responsibility of organizing and developing a national program in this field. The United States has provided technical assistance and direction; the Government of Peru has provided the funds through a special tax on hazardous industries. The Institute now occupies a modern building equipped with adequate medical, engineering and laboratory facilities and is now completely staffed by Peruvian physicians, engineers and chemists and nurses, several of whom were trained in the United States. A well-organized program provides professional services to industries and mines for solution of occupational health and disease problems. The Institute serves as a training center for professional personnel from other Latin American countries. A bronze plaque in the building shows credit for the U.S. participation in the project.

Another institution in the public eye, the National Institute of Health, has been developed under the administrative and technical supervision of two U.S. technicians who served as directors for a total of 5 years since 1954. A U.S.-trained Peruvian director now has been appointed. The Institute is equipped to produce a variety of vaccines of high quality which are used with confidence in Peru and other countries. The Institute also assists in establishing and promoting standardization of techniques in public health, medical and hospital laboratories throughout the country and provides standardized laboratory diagnostic procedures, studies on disease control and research on community and national public health problems.

At La Molina, just outside Lima, the agricultural research station and the national school of agriculture are being assisted through an ICA contract with North Carolina State University in planning and organizing a sound system of research and experiments utilizing the results to promote the development of Peruvian agriculture. This work includes the improvement of professional standards at the station and for improvement of curriculum, teaching standards and facilities at the college in order to provide the highly trained agricultural specialists needed in Peru. Important work has been done in soils, disease resistant crops and forage crops. A cereals testing laboratory is providing important information to research workers, officials, producers, and industry.

In the field of education, an outstanding contribution by ICA has been the establishment and initial operation of the Chosica Normal School as a model to demonstrate the improvement of teacher training and to provide a source of trained teachers for the elementary, secondary and vocational schools of Peru. The school has been in operation for over 5 years and the Peruvian Government gradually absorbed within its own budget complete responsibility for its operation and staffing. In addition to the training of new teachers for the educational system, the school is active in sponsoring workshops and summer courses to upgrade teachers now in service. Its impact on the development of normal school curriculum and on the teaching proficiency in public schools has been outstanding. The United States is given full credit for its assistance, both technical and economic, by a large bronze plaque mounted at the main entrance of the school.

In the field of higher education, an outstanding example is the chemistry and instrumentation project at the University of San Marcos in Lima. As a result of this project, the department of chemistry is training graduate Peruvian chemists in modern techniques used in industries, mines, and pharmaceutical laboratories of Peru. This was accomplished through a contract with the University of New Hampshire which began late in 1955 and was completed in mid-1960. Three faculty members were trained in the United States and have returned to teach in the university while three were trained on the job at the university during the course of the contract. Here also the United States is given credit for its technical and economic assistance by a bronze plaque on the chemistry building at the university. The contract with the University of New Hampshire is one of the outstanding examples of college contracts where assistance was given, the job completed, and the contract terminated on schedule.

The Peruvians are well aware of the work done by ICA in the fields of health, agriculture, and education and it is safe to say that the Peruvians have benefited from these programs. Peruvians at all levels, from government officials to the man in the street, have in many ways expressed their appreciation of U.S. efforts in cooperating with established public institutions and in setting up new ones which assist them to help themselves to modernize their country and improve their standard of living.

ARGENTINA'S ACHIEVEMENTS

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the second meeting of the Board of Governors of the Inter-American Bank in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, I had the opportunity of visiting two other Latin American countries, Argentina and Peru. This report will deal with some of my observations resulting from discussions with our representatives in Buenos Aires as well as my other personal contacts while in Argentina. At this point, Mr. Speaker, I wish to state that we are most ably represented in

Argentina by our people in the USOM and in the Embassy.

Mr. Speaker, Argentina in 1961, after 2 years of a stabilization program based on traditionally sound economic concepts, appears to be on the verge of a true development "takeoff." It has abandoned previous reliance on state economic controls for a system based principally on free enterprise, with consequent economic and political benefits. U.S. lending agencies, the IMF and private banks have provided short term financial assistance to facilitate the transition to less rigid economic policies and to cope with interim balance of payments difficulties. Argentina is now seeking to supplement the private investment capital inflow with long term loans from traditional public and private capital sources in order to finance public service development projects.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, Argentina has turned to the United States for assistance in overcoming its deficit in technical and managerial skills.

The U.S. program in Argentina, less than 3 years old, offers an excellent example of how the United States, with a small program of technical assistance, can concentrate on a major sector of a country's economy, and working with the host country's officials, make a significant contribution to the entire economy of the nation.

While operating a number of small projects in related fields, the United States has concentrated its main effort in Argentina in a project called Operation Beef, the purpose of which is to restore the cattle industry to its former position as the leading foreign exchange earner of Argentina. To understand the significance of this operation, Mr. Speaker, one must remember that under the Peron regime—1945–55—the economy of Argentina was seriously distorted by Government fiat, and its major field of comparative advantage, the cattle industry, was made so unprofitable that meat exports declined some 62 percent on a tonnage basis from 1945 to 1954, and there occurred decline in the cattle population of the country.

This drop in export earnings affected the entire economy. The new government of President Frondizi has reversed these destructive policies, and it was he who requested the U.S. Government to assist in the rehabilitation of Argentina's cattle industry.

Working with an Argentine Government agency, CAFADE, established by President Frondizi and funded by the Argentine Government for the specific purpose of working with the United States in its technical assistance program, Operation Beef is attacking the full range of problems affecting the cattle industry, from pasture improvement to the utilization of byproducts.

Of U.S. funds, $387,000 have been budgeted for Operation Beef in the current year, and it is expected that this project will be expanded by some 20 percent in the next fiscal year. While the full effects of Operation Beef cannot be expected for perhaps 2 years, the success of the project is already in evidence. Meat exports are increasing, but more important, rapid strides are being made in the rebuilding of Argentine herds, and by 1965, estimates indicate that total meat exports—primarily to European markets—should reach 975,000 tons, an increase of over 400 percent from the low level of 1954, and some 50 percent above current levels.

Mr. Speaker, some of Argentina's achievements over the past 2 years include the following:

First. Petroleum production has increased rapidly following the signing of development contracts with private companies. In 1958, petroleum accounted for approximately one-third of Argentina's imports; in 1962 it expects to achieve self-sufficiency in petroleum production.

Second. Foreign private capital investments approved by the Government from 1959 through December 1960 exceed $300 million, more than 65 percent of which is to come from U.S. private enterprises.

Third. There has been a substantial repatriation of Argentine capital and an increased disposition to invest in domestic productive enterprises.

Fourth. The rate of inflation has been drastically curtailed. The official cost of living index rose only 12 percent in 1960 following an increase of over 100 percent in 1959. For the first time in 15 years, there were months in 1960 when declines in the index occurred.

Fifth. Industrial production, which has fallen during 1959 under the impact of stabilization measures, turned up early 1960 and has continued to improve.

Sixth. Beef production, assisted by the U.S. technical assistance program, is beginning to rise as herds are built up from the depletion experienced under the effect of inflation and of inadequate inducements for investments in livestock.

Seventh. Government employees have been reduced by 70,000 and some State functions have been transferred to private operations.

Eighth. Access to ordinary credit facilities abroad has greatly increased to the extent that now Argentina is planning to market long-term Government bonds in Europe and perhaps in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, these achievements were not attained easily or accidentally. They stemmed from the adoption at the close of 1958 of a stabilization program elaborated by the Argentine Government with the IMF. This plan called for liberalizing the economy. In the foreign trade and exchange fields it meant establishing a single free exchange and eliminating export and import controls. Internally it meant cutting back the State's encroachment into the economy and encouraging private investment both domestic and foreign. It also involved the removal of price controls on the 12 commodities still subject to ceilings in 1958, efforts to reduce Government spending and to limit deficit financing to noninflationary means and the imposition of high reserve requirements to hold down credit expansion by commercial banks.

The implementation of this program was not immediately popular. Consumption and living standards were reduced. Years of speculative activities were ended and manufacturers were forced to meet increased domestic and foreign competition. Rail and urban transport rates were raided and subsidies for petroleum and other products reduced or eliminated.

While the accomplishments, as already noted, have been substantial, Argentina still has serious problems. Real wages fell in 1959 and still have not fully recovered. Progress in improving the Government's efficiency and in turning back state enterprises to private control has been slight. The danger of renewed inflation has forced the retention of high reserve requirements for commercial banks with consequent tightness of credit. Interest rates on loans outside the banking system continue high. Special surcharges on imports have been held at a high level, and taxes are still levied on some agricultural exports. Except for wages, all these problems are related to the budget deficit which totaled approximately M$N30 billion—$360 million—in 1960. This deficit is entirely attributable to the operating losses and investment needs of the state enterprises, particularly in the railroads. While recognizing the inflationary effect of the deficit and striving to reduce it, the Government has had to initiate much needed programs for housing and roads. It has also not resolved power shortages nor achieved its goal for steel and iron ore production.

Argentina's attitude toward the Inter-American Development Bank is somewhat different from that of many other Latin American countries. It regards the Bank as an important instrumentality which, being managed by representatives of countries in the Western Hemisphere having more precise knowledge of inter-American economic and political problems, are well qualified to fulfill regional aspirations. Although it ranks on a par with Brazil as the second largest contributor to the Bank's capital, it is not likely under present circumstances to look to the Bank for important financial help. It may ask for the Bank's assistance for some development projects, in fact an interprovincial agency, the Federal Investment Council, has already approached the Bank for assistance in developing two river valleys in arid sections and making mineral surveys in the province of Missiones. It will not, however, center its expectations as to development support on the Bank. Rather Argentina's interest derives principally from its recognition that the Bank can be of great importance to other countries of Latin America. It realizes that political instability and lack of economic growth in the rest of the area is a threat to Argentina itself and that in the long run the prosperity of its neighbors will be both a stimulus and a support for Argentina's prosperity.

Argentina's views on the Social Development Fund, to be administered largely by the Inter-American Bank, are similar but for different reasons. It may be expected that Argentina will apply to the fund for support for the housing program that is just getting underway. U.S. assistance may also be requested in

this field. But in other social areas it expects to finance its own requirements, for example, in the fields of health and education. It is reluctant to burden its balance of payments with loan obligations for funds in these fields which it anticipates can be procured from local resources as economic development occurs. Nonetheless, it appreciates that other Latin American countries may be less fortunate, have greater illiteracy, more disease, less food and fewer technicians and be confronted with more difficult and urgent economic problems. It is very conscious of the fact that these problems affect the political stability and economic health of the area as a whole and that all must join in the efforts to resolve these difficulties.

Mr. Speaker, to this end, Argentina is contributing both materially and by example, and for this effort the Government and the people of Argentina are to be warmly applauded. Argentina's efforts and sacrifices have encouraging implications for all of Latin America. I congratulate and salute them for it.

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, supporters of the administration farm bill claim it will let farmers write their own programs. Nothing could be further from the truth. The effect of this bill would be to weaken, not enhance farmer influence on legislation.

Today farm laws are written by Congressmen. All farmers have the opportunity to help elect Congressmen. Under H.R. 6400, Congressmen would no longer write farm legislation. Congress would have only a 60-day veto right; and, when one considers the procedural delays that are possible, this veto right is meaningless.

The Secretary of Agriculture would write farm programs, and his power would be almost unrestrained. Farmer advisory committees would not be elected by farmers. They would be handpicked by the Secretary. They would exist, function, and have responsibility only at his pleasure.

H.R. 6400 is not a farm bill. It is a grab for Executive power unparalleled in history.

THE SENATOR GEORGE W. NORRIS NATIONAL MEMORIAL

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation which is designed to create a national memorial in honor of the late, great Senator George W. Norris of Nebraska.

The bill will authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in behalf of the people of the United States to acquire the last dwelling place of the late Senator at McCook, Nebr. This home will become the Senator George W. Norris National Memorial.

July 11, 1961, marks the 100th anniversary of the late Senator's birth and I think it only fitting and proper that the people of the United States should observe the occasion by dedicating this memorial in his honor. I am confident that the Congress will act to provide this national shrine in honor of one of the truly great men who served both in this House and in the other body.

Senator Norris was an outstanding statesman, a man of great vision and ability and, above all, a man of courage. He was a fighter for the causes which he considered just. No cause nor any man's plight was too big or too small to attract the vigorous attention of the Senator.

He was a leader in the fight for democratic control of the processes of legislation. He attacked fearlessly and with vigor the ironclad rule over the House of Representatives which had been wielded by the leadership of his time. His fearless action led to victory.

With equal courage and vigor, George W. Norris, as a Member of the Senate, led the fight to establish the orderly development of this Nation's natural resources. Until his time, these resources had been open for looting by private and specially privileged interests. Under his direction and leadership, the fight was launched to bring to all of the people the benefits to be gained from these natural resources.

Whether it was injustice to an individual or injustice to the Nation, George Norris was there fighting for right.

On July 11 the Nation will observe and commemorate the 100th anniversary of his birth. It is my sincere hope that the Congress will join in this observation by enacting this legislation and provide a national memorial in his honor.

REVOLT IN TEXAS

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, the election of John G. Tower, the new Republican Senator from Texas, is causing consternation in Democratic ranks. This Republican victory simply means that the South is on its way to the establishment of a two-party system, which is long overdue.

More particularly, the election of Mr. Tower is a stinging blow to the Kennedy administration. The people of Texas have now served notice on the administration that they do not favor the reckless spending programs of the New Frontier; the infringement of States rights by the Federal Government; and the foreign policy of appeasement which has brought the prestige of the United States to a new low all over the world.

Vice President JOHNSON must be a very unhappy man. When called upon for comment after the victory of Tower was assured, the Vice President had nothing to say. His silence is quite understandable.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 27)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read; and, by unanimous consent, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10(b)(4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 29, 1961.*

WILLIAM JOSEPH VINCENT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 177)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read; and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith, without my approval, H.R. 3498, "For the relief of William Joseph Vincent."

This bill proposes that this veteran be relieved of an obligation to repay nonservice-connected pension payments which he received while ineligible. Payments depended upon his annual compensation and he misinformed the Veterans' Administration of the amount of this compensation.

The facts were easily obtainable by the veteran. The overpayment and consequent repayment obligation resulting from the misinformation are, of course, unfortunate, but the fault was clearly that of the claimant and not of the Government.

Approval of this bill would adversely affect administration of the program of veteran benefits and seriously discriminate against thousands of other similarly situated veterans. It is important that all veterans and their dependents be similarly treated and that we preserve the integrity and impartiality which are essential. This we cannot do if we grant special privilege and favored treatment

to one or a few or allow profit from misrepresentation.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

The WHITE HOUSE, *May 26, 1961.*

THE SENATORIAL ELECTION IN TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Republicans are always hopeful, they are always optimistic. That may be due to the fact they really believe in and try to adhere to the principles written into the Constitution. Sometimes when we decide as a party to adhere to the principles of our Constitution we may win a national election and regain control of the House, which would be very, very pleasing, not only to Republican conservatives, but of great and lasting value to the party.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself questioning some of the statements just made by our leadership. For example, the Republican whip, the very, very astute politician and gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS], the gentleman who—if I might be permitted under the rules of the House to say so—ought to know better than to at this time congratulate the country upon the election of a Republican Senator from Texas. He should recall what happened in the last election at Chicago. We have a minority President, and in a way that is due partly to the final returns from Illinois, the home of our whip the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS]. We have Mr. Kennedy in the White House because of the manner of count of votes in Chicago.

Do you remember? That is a sad, sad situation. Then there were also several fast counts in some other cities. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], chairman of the conference, said something about our victory in Texas. I hope those folks on the majority side will take note. He was rejoicing because, he said, the Republicans had elected a Senator in Texas. This morning when I looked at the paper and saw that notice, I was inclined to feel encouraged. Then I remembered past experiences and especially what happened during the last election. I realized, if you will permit me to mention the fact, that they have not yet had a recount in Texas. So it would be better if we waited before we celebrate. Wait until they have a recount, because in this editorial, which I will include with my remarks, it is shown how gentlemen from Texas at one time did not have enough votes but did have a remedy. They had a recount, then the hearing before the Democratic committee, where the vote was 29 to 29 in that committee. There were no Republicans, no dirty, black, Yankee Republicans mixed up in that contest. It was a friendly Democratic contest—no holds barred. When one faction—the Johnson faction—needed a vote it sent a plane out somewhere and picked up one from somewhere and used it to give Mr. JOHNSON the nomination. That was the time Mr. Stevenson was deprived of the senatorial nomination. Read this editorial, because if a few votes are needed sometime they can be found. So I respectfully, Mr. Whip, suggest that we keep part of our celebration at least until we get the official returns, and we are sure we have elected a Republican in Texas. I hope we have. It is for the good of the country that we should, and I trust you, that is, the gentlemen from Texas, will not use any of your ingenuity, if there is anyone present here from Texas, to change that result and make it contrary to what the people of Texas really want. Let us not have a minority Senator from Texas. The last election, that was I think in November of last year, gave us a minority President.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 21 and 29, 1961, pages 4439 and 5293, will be found something about elections.

The editorial to which reference was made follows:

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Nov. 2, 1960]

JOHNSON'S FOUNDATION

What nationally prominent politician carried a precinct 765 to 60, yet when those figures proved insufficient benefited from a "correction" 4 days later that changed the results to 967 to 61, thus enabling him to be declared winner by 87 votes? LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who eliminated Coke R. Stevenson in the Texas Democratic runoff in 1948 and in subsequent party and court actions.

The Republican nominee for U.S. Senator from Texas, John G. Tower, is reminding the public of the circumstances under which his opponent, Senator JOHNSON, entered the Senate. Since JOHNSON is running for national office as well as for reelection, it is thoroughly appropriate that the story be told anywhere and everywhere in the country.

In the original Democratic primary on July 24, 1948, ex-Gov. Coke Stevenson led Representative JOHNSON by 71,460 votes. But he did not have a majority of all votes cast, so a runoff was held on August 28 between the conservative, 60-year-old Stevenson, and the 40-year-old New Deal Congressman JOHNSON. Unofficial returns as late as September 3 gave Stevenson a lead of 255 votes. But by means of such "corrections" as that from precinct 13 in Jim Wells County, described in the first paragraph, JOHNSON closed the gap.

Stevenson naturally challenged the results, especially from the counties presided over by a fabulous political boss, George Parr. Jim Wells was one of these counties; in another, Duvall, JOHNSON enjoyed the implausible margin of 4,622 to 38.

Stevenson allies got a look at some of the 200 names added in green ink to the Jim Wells County poll list, and readily ascertained that some were names on tombstones, some were of people not living in the county, and others were of people who swore they had not voted.

Stevenson took his appeal to the September 13 meeting of the Texas Democratic executive committee in Fort Worth, which deadlocked 28 to 28. Late in the afternoon, a committeeman flew in from Amarillo to break the tie in JOHNSON's favor. The next day the State convention confirmed the decision. In the face of the evidence presented, it took all the leverage that President Truman could exert in behalf of his Washington buddy JOHNSON to win this narrow victory.

Stevenson did not give up. "Some half-million good, solid Texans voted in this race for me as their Senator," he said, "and they have been defrauded and robbed. We can do nothing less than appeal to the Federal courts."

On September 15, a Federal district court judge at Fort Worth issued an injunction barring JOHNSON's name from the ballot. The judge sent agents to Jim Wells County to impound the ballot boxes, which were found to contain shredded newspapers and other debris.

Though this was a Texas contest, it was settled in Washington. On September 29, a full month after the election, Justice Hugo L. Black of the U.S. Supreme Court issued an order vacating the injunction of the Fort Worth district court. This cleared the way for JOHNSON's name to appear on the ballot. Later, the Supreme Court as a whole confirmed Black's action.

Stevenson fought on, going so far as to appeal for the election of JOHNSON's Republican opponent in the November election. But a Republican could hardly succeed where ex-Governor Stevenson had failed, though the usual Democratic margin was for once cut to two to one. The next July, a Senate committee upheld Johnson's seating, though nothing ever persuaded Stevenson that he was not entitled to be Senator from Texas.

Without George Parr and the ballot boxes of his south Texas barony, LYNDON JOHNSON rather than Coke Stevenson would have resumed the private practice of law in 1948.

KENNEDY GRAB-BAG MESSAGE ENDANGERS NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation desperately needs in its top leaders a profound understanding of the nature of the conflict that has been thrust upon us by the forces of international communism, of the means by which that conflict is being waged, of the weapons we must stock in our arsenal of nonmilitary defense, of the organization we and our free world allies must perfect to utilize them effectively, and of the strategy and tactics we must employ if we are to avoid defeat and achieve victory.

Moreover, our people must be told of these things and understand them in order to gage properly that the stakes of the conflict are freedom and national existence itself; that we are engaged in the main event, not a preliminary bout, and the loser will have no second chance; that we vitally need to develop an irrevocable determination to bring this conflict to a successful conclusion; that we must be prepared to fight military war if necessary; and that we must organize and fight nonmilitary war in terms of a major enterprise, on a scale for victory, with all the brains, resources, determination, and courage we can muster.

It would be sheer madness for this Nation to engage in military war without national strategy, without a top-level command manned by the best qualified leaders 180 million people can muster, without offenses and planned defenses, without mobilizing the national effort, and without appealing to the patriotism of the American people to work, to sweat, to sacrifice and to win. Yet, without any of these things we are engaged in a new, strange and deadly kind of nonmilitary war in which the stakes are survival and which we are not winning.

When President Kennedy announced he would speak to the Congress on urgent national needs I fervently hoped he would speak of these things. Things which the American people and men who love freedom everywhere throughout the globe so desperately yearn to hear from the mind and lips of the President of the United States of America—the one free Nation yet remaining which possesses the potential strength and latent leadership to rid our world of the sickness and slavery which the Communist conspiracy induces. As the President began his message I hoped this would be the historic moment and his the clear voice that boldly signaled the turning point toward victory in this conflict.

As he finished the message it was thrust upon me, as it must have been upon millions of thoughtful persons, that the moment had been tragically lost. Mr. Kennedy spoke of large expenditures, but only of small and piecemeal efforts. His phrases were turned well, but the substance of his thoughts about the nature of the challenge we face and what we must do to meet it revealed a childlike naivete. On almost the eve of his meeting with Khrushchev, the shrewd, seasoned, skilled manipulator of today's conflict, Mr. Kennedy publicly, before the world, exposed himself barren of the intellectual preparation he must have to meet such a man without running undue risks for our country.

I need not dwell point by point on the message to reinforce my assertions. I simply direct your attention to the totally specious reasons Mr. Kennedy gave for recommending a greater emphasis on civil defense and the wholly inadequate effort he proposes.

Mr. Kennedy stated civil defense cannot deter a nuclear attack and that the basis on which civil defense is to be justified is simply as insurance for the protection of the civilian population in the event of an irrational attack, a miscalculation, an accidental war. He asserted the deterrent concept assumes rational calculation by rational men and swept aside the strategic role of civil defense in influencing rational calculations by Soviet leaders whether or not to push the button for surprise nuclear attack. According to Mr. Kennedy, civil defense is not an element of military strategy and not a positive war-deterrent force. When a President of the United States stands before his Congress and his people and the world to mouth such nonsense it is a sad day for America.

Mr. Kennedy's conclusions on the role of civil defense are diametrically opposed to those of practically every single expert on the subject on both sides of the Iron Curtain. It is practically universally held that an extensive, well-planned, and coordinated civil defense program is an indispensable element of effective military and nonmilitary strategy in the nuclear age. Strategy which gives realistic regard to civil defense goes a long way toward removing the genocidal implications of nuclear war. It is the most forthright and convincing counter to nuclear blackmail and it is the necessary and essential complement to active deterrent in the form of retaliatory weapons systems.

Soviet nuclear weapons rattling is for the purpose of threatening damage to the United States which would be unacceptable and thereby blackmail us into concessions. The use of nuclear weapons against us would be for the purpose of inflicting damage which is unacceptable and thereby induce our defeat. In either case, the existence or nonexistence of adequate civil defense in this country would have to loom large in the rational calculations of Soviet leaders respecting the employment of such tactics. If civil defense results either in diminishing the magnitude of the blackmail threat or the damage expectable from attack itself, it would be irrational for Soviet buttonpushers to disregard its effects; therefore, such effects must be considerations in their rational calculations. For Mr. Kennedy to say otherwise creates the inference he does not know what he is talking about and, therefore, he is inadequately equipped to lead the Nation.

Let me put this proposition more graphically. Assume the U.S.S.R. has 1,000 nuclear missiles and if 75 percent get through to their targets, unacceptable damage will be inflicted. Further, assume the United States possesses antimissile missiles which will intercept and destroy 50 percent of the incoming Soviet missiles. Under these circumstances Soviet buttonpushers are deterred, since they will not accomplish their objectives and only suffer retaliation. Now suppose we do not have the antimissile missiles, but instead have sufficient civil defense to reduce by 50 percent the death and damage which these same incoming Soviet missiles can inflict. In either event the result is the same. It must be taken into consideration in rational calculations by Soviet leaders. Why Mr. Kennedy should say otherwise is simply incomprehensible. It leads to the conclusion that his understanding of today's facts of international life is incomplete and sophomoric. It is the likely conclusion Mr. Khrushchev has reached. He will no doubt govern his actions accordingly unless Mr. Kennedy rapidly sets the record straight.

For even though Mr. Kennedy may not think much of civil defense as part of national strategy and may believe it has no military implications, Mr. Khrushchev certainly thinks otherwise. Ever since he has controlled the U.S.S.R. he has backed a very strong effort to extend civil defense efforts and training against mass destruction weapons to the entire Soviet population. Claim is made to between 20 and 40 hours' instruction of every adult followed by a compulsory examination. A study made by the Library of Congress in 1959 concludes that the scope and intensity of this mass training program probably means more people have learned the fundamentals of civil defense in the Soviet Union than in any other country. Current U.S.S.R. civil defense manuals back up this estimate of intensive effort.

The Soviet civil defense organization comes under the Ministry of Internal Affairs which also has jurisdiction over fire and police departments throughout the country. It works closely with a paramilitary organization known as the Volunteer Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force, and Navy which carries out the training involved in the mass effort. In addition to training, comprehensive Soviet civil defense measures include: organization of defense units at different levels, dispersal of industry and decentralization of controls, city planning with civil defense considerations in mind, shelters, blackouts and camouflage, warning systems, protective clothing and masks, mass evacuations, first aid, improvised fallout protection and decontamination measures.

The effort which the Soviet Government has made in this direction indicates it takes a realistic attitude toward the possibility of Soviet participation in a general nuclear war. However, its objective should not be misconstrued. There is no evidence of a newly acquired benevolence toward human life in Khrushchev greater than amongst Western leaders in the ratio of Soviet to Western civil defense efforts. A characteristic of communism is callousness toward human life. Primary interest is not in saving human lives per se, but in preserving the skills, so important to Soviet industry and military strength, represented by them.

Nevertheless, assuming reasonable effectiveness of the civil defense program, the result is this: If, concurrently with a Soviet first strike, 80 percent of the 50 million people living in the largest 160 Soviet population centers are evacuated to nontarget areas with reasonable fallout protection, casualties from nuclear retaliation would be cut from 50 million to 10 million, a factor of 5.

All of which simply means the Soviet civil defense efforts which Mr. Khrushchev has dictated as part and parcel of Soviet military strategy are cutting the effectiveness of our retaliatory capabilities. At least insofar as population is concerned, by a factor which could extend up to 80 percent. How can Mr. Kennedy possibly come to Congress asking for a civil defense program and at the same time tell us it has nothing to do with military strategy and deterrence? That it is not a part of rational calculation regarding the initiation of war? That its prime value lies only in humane

considerations vis-a-vis war by accident, miscalculation, or irrationality?

Now, let us examine the extent of the civil defense program recommended by Mr. Kennedy and see if it makes any more sense than the reasons he gives. He recommends the present level of expenditure be tripled. Costed out, this means spending $312 million for all civil defense efforts of every kind during the coming year. By way of contrast, Dr. Herman Kahn of the Rand Corp., who has made an exhaustive study of nuclear attack and civil defense, several years ago suggested we should spend $200 million over a period of 2 or 3 years just on preliminary phases of a civil defense program—research, development, analysis, planning, and design.

But we need not rely solely on Kahn's figures. In 1959 the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy made a thorough study of the effects of a hypothecated 1,500-megaton nuclear attack on the United States. It was estimated that 60 million casualties would result. Some 48 million dead Americans and some 12 million injured Americans. At the same hearings a Navy scientist told the Joint Committee that single fallout shelters giving protection against nuclear radiation by a factor of 1,000 can be built at a cost of only $100 per person. These, he estimated, would be sufficient to avoid two out of every three of the hypothecated casualties. Save 32 million Americans from death and 8 million more from injury during such an attack. Furthermore, coupled with workable evacuation procedures, the 66⅔ percent casualty avoidance rate could well be upped to the 80 percent figure I estimated as effective for the Soviet civil defense program.

The total cost of such a program to protect 60 million people would be $6 billion, just about 1 year's cost of present farm subsidy programs. Since Mr. Kennedy indicated the Communists want to complete their victory in this decade, say 10 years, at the rate of $312 million annually, this would get the civil defense program just about one-half finished by the target date Mr. Kennedy suggests they are planning to take us over. I submit that the magnitude, or perhaps a better word would be "minitude," of the civil defense effort Mr. Kennedy suggests is as irrational as the reasons he gives for recommending such a program at all.

In closing I cannot refrain from posing one last question: What, in "rational calculation," is the best wisdom for America: Spending $6 billion a year on farm subsidies, or spending $6 billion a year on civil defense?

Reference is made to my remarks on May 24 and May 25 at pages 8847 and 8900 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which relate to and bear on the remarks I have made today.

FEDERAL MARSHALS TO ALABAMA

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's action in sending Federal marshals into Alabama warrants our complete support. Federal officers were sent to insure the maintenance and enforcement of Federal law. Under the circumstances no other choice could be made.

The administration has stated that an 1871 law served as the legal basis for its action. That Federal statute authorizes the President to take such measures as he considers necessary to suppress, in a State, any insurrection or domestic violence. The President's action was prompted by patent denials of the rights of citizens to travel freely and without harm. State and local authorities were apparently unwilling or unable to protect those rights.

I stand firmly in support of the action taken by the Federal Government to meet this disgraceful situation. It is now doubly clear, however, that we must have new legislation arming the Attorney General with the legal tools necessary to initiate court actions where civil rights have been violated. There is, under existing law, legal basis to prevent obstruction of interstate commerce, but the Federal Government does not have the sanctions which it ought to have in order to prevent and to punish willful denials of the right of peaceful assembly, or of free and equal access to publicly supported institutions, or other constitutionally protected rights not necessarily tied to interstate commerce.

Some time ago I introduced legislation which would authorize the Attorney General to initiate civil injunctive proceedings against persons who willfully and discriminatorily deprive any person or groups of persons of their right to the equal protection of the laws. Such proceedings could likewise prevent hindrances to Federal officials from carrying out orders of the court.

There must be no doubt or equivocation, as there is now, about the authority of the Federal Government with respect to all constitutionally protected rights.

As a member of the House Judiciary Committee, I must again request legislative action. Legislation is long overdue and we have a right to expect that the administration will support it, consistent with its platform.

TEACHERS OF THE DEAF

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, in the National Capital we have reason to be constantly aware of the great work being done in the education of the deaf. The Maryland School for the Deaf in Frederick, Md., and Gallaudet College in the District of Columbia are both adding many useful new citizens to our communities each year. But the problems of this special branch of education threaten to reduce its rewards. An attack is now being made on those problems.

On March 3, 1961, the U.S. Senate passed a bill to provide for trained teachers for children handicapped by hearing defects. Companion bills are currently pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor with no action scheduled.

Today, I have introduced a bill which is identical to the bill which passed the Senate. This bill provides for an annual payment of $1.5 million for 2 years and such other sums as may be required for an additional 8 years for educational costs and scholarships for teachers of the deaf.

The bill also establishes for a 10-year program for educational costs and scholarships for speech pathologists and audiologists at institutions of higher education that provide the comprehensive training needed to train teachers for deaf children.

I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will give early consideration to this legislation and recommend passage by the House.

It is impossible to estimate how many children would benefit by this bill. There are, however, over 26,500 students enrolled in classes for deaf persons. All of these students became deaf before they acquired language. A qualified teacher can enable these children to obtain various skills of communication due to the great ability of all these children to learn. The amount of success obtained in teaching speech skills to these children is primarily dependent on the professional ability and training of the child's teacher. In 1954, the U.S. Office of Education reported that teachers of the deaf ranked first in "difficulty of securing" and there is no indication that this need has lessened.

Current estimates place the number of individuals with significant speech and hearing impediments at 9 million. Less than one-half of the 7,000 speech pathologists and audiologists have the training necessary to be certified by a professional accrediting organization.

The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation has estimated that 27,300 competent professional teachers are needed. Twenty thousand of these are needed to train children. To train our schoolchildren alone we need to train 1,500 speech pathologists and audiologists each year for 10 years and presently we are training less than 400 per year. These numbers include teachers of the deaf only and do not include personnel needed for research nor personnel needed to train the teacher.

The bill is supported by the National Council on the Education of the Deaf. This council is made up of three organizations directly concerned with education of the deaf, the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, the Conference on Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, and the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, Inc. I hope that the House will have the opportunity to consider this bill in the near future.

WHAT POLICY WITH CUBA?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, there was a time—not long ago—when no pipsqueak dictator would have dared demand tribute from the United States.

And there was a time—not long ago—when no American would have dared suggest that we follow the shoddy road of appeasement.

But this is the era of do-gooders and fuzzy thinkers. And what a hollow mockery recent events are making of this once proud Nation.

The few short years I have been privileged to serve as a Member of Congress have filled me with growing alarm for the future of our Nation. I cannot help but echo the cry of those Americans who try to follow and understand the tortuous reasoning of our Government in foreign affairs: "What, in the name of all that is holy, is going on?"

I ask the Members of this House to stop and consider these facts:

First. For the past 6 months, perhaps longer, the Central Intelligence Agency was spending a reported $45 million to finance the abortive overthrow of Castro.

Second. Our Government is engaged in persuading our reluctant friends in the Organization of American States to impose sanctions on this bloody dictator.

Third. On May 24, 1961—just last week—the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund voted to send Castro $1,147,000 in technical aid and assistance, of which the United States voluntarily contributes 40 percent.

We spend some $45 million to overthrow Castro—and the U.N. sends him half a million dollars of our money in aid. Now, we are engaged in trying to buy back our self-respect with $15 million worth of tractors.

I am fully aware, Mr. Speaker, that this great civic effort has the backing of the President of the United States, and of many Members of Congress. I know, too, that many citizens feel that it is humane, and are willing to swallow their pride and bow to Casto's demands.

Well, I am not. And I do not think the majority of Americans are.

Such action establishes a precedent and opens the door for every smalltime dictator to demand tribute. Who will be next to levy such a demand upon this Nation?

But is it any wonder that this comic opera dictator dares to tweak the eagle's beak?

Is it any wonder that this Nation is becoming the laughingstock of the world?

Certainly, I feel sorry for the plight of the 1,200 Cubans held as prisoners. But what about the American prisoners that he holds? Or those reputed to be held by Red China or Russia? Or the property Castro seized in Cuba from Americans and American firms?

I hear no offer ringing through this land to buy tractors to free the forgotten Americans now in Communist jails. I hear of no great civic undertaking to reimburse those whose property was stolen.

I doubt that any Member of this House would dare face the disabled veterans of Korea—or those ex-prisoners of war who languished for endless months in Communist compounds—with the lame excuse that paying tribute to Castro is the humanitarian thing to do.

It would, indeed, be humane to free the Cuban people from the despot's heel. We could, if we so chose, starve him out of power. We could burn him out. Or we could blast him out.

Instead, our friends in the United Nations—whose loyalty we supposedly bought over the years with billions of taxpayers money—vote instead to try and smother him with dollars. Our dollars, I might add.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy stood before this Congress and said:

> The Congress and the American people are entitled to know that we will institute whatever new organization, policies, and control are necessary to insure the maximum coordination and use of all political, economic, and psychological resources in the attainment of our objective.

Mr. Speaker, I have faith in the ability of the President to carry out his statement to the fullest.

But let this House remember that it, too, has a responsibility to the American people. I do not believe that this Congress should sit idly by while the fate of our Nation hangs in the balance, and a handful of bureaucrats and our international friends are busy sawing at the thread.

The law of averages, Mr. Speaker, would have it that our decisions in the field of foreign affairs would be right and consistent at least half the time. I cannot believe that we are consistently wrong by accident. We have suffered constant and humiliating defeats in our cold war efforts. Our inconsistencies are beyond belief. Stop and consider:

We spend money to destroy a dictator at the same time we are spending money to support his regime in power. And as an act of contribution for our attempts to bring liberty and freedom to an enslaved people, we send him $15 million in tribute.

We are engaged in a deadly battle with communism. We spend billions to thwart its expansion. At the same time, we are sending hundreds of millions in aid to Communist nations to help them grow stronger in the battle against us.

We refuse to recognize Red China or to trade with her. Yet our closest allies—to whom we opened wide our treasury in their darkest hour of need—find the glitter of gold more rewarding than principle. They carry on a lavish and growing trade with one of our most deadly enemies.

Mr. Speaker, the alarm bells are ringing over this Nation—and the signposts of our folly are scattered over the world for all to read. I urge that the Members and appropriate committees of this Congress heed the warning and take appropriate action:

First. If there are those within the Department of State, the CIA, our United Nations delegations, our agencies, and our bureaus whose inadequate and reckless decisions are our stumbling blocks—they should be removed quickly.

Second. If there are those within our Government whose cold and calculated decisions are made with the full knowledge and intent to destroy our Nation—they should be rooted out and prosecuted.

The action taken by the United Nations Special Fund last week is one of many examples of our ridiculous policy, and of taxpayers money being used against the best interests of this Nation.

It is my intention to vigorously oppose the appropriation of funds in certain portions of the Department of State bill later this week.

When this bill is before the House, I hope to submit statistics showing the American people being bled to death to support the United Nations and a host of international groups and organizations—for we are assessed or voluntarily give far more than Russia and all of the satellites behind the Iron Curtain.

I strongly urge the appropriate committees of this Congress to investigate our entire participation and fiscal support of the U.N. and the international groups in which we participate.

The American people have a right to know why we bear 32.5 percent of the cost—while Russia and nine satellite nations are assessed 18.97 percent to support the U.N.

I urge the Members of this body to heed the warning from their constituents, who I know must share the same alarm as those I represent, and that they press for appropriate investigation by the House.

To those Americans who feel they must donate to the tribute fund to a bloody-handed dictator—I can only say that we should have learned by now that money cannot buy self-respect any more than it can buy friendship. But used in this fashion, it can buy shame for a nation, and for those Americans, who do not deserve it.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. HOSMER for 30 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS and to include an address by the Honorable WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN.

Mr. HOSMER and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ALGER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANGEN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROYHILL.

Mr. ROUSSELOT.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

Mr. GIAIMO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BOGGS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GARMATZ in two instances.

Mr. ANFUSO in two instances.

Mr. RODINO.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 529. An act to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

S. 537. An act to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944 to revise a restriction on the conveyance of surplus land for historic-monument purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 538. An act to amend section 205 of the Federal Property and Administrative services Act of 1949 to empower certain officers and employees of the General Services Administration to administer oaths to witnesses; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 539. An act to make nationals, American and foreign, eligible for certain scholarships under the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 540. An act to authorize agencies of the Government of the United States to pay in advance for required publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 541. An act to amend the act of June 1, 1948 (62 Stat. 281), to empower the Administrator of General Services to appoint nonuniformed special policemen; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 796. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the use of surplus personal property by State distribution agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S. 880. An act to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to accept gifts and bequests of personal property for the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1222. An act relating to documentation and inspection of vessels of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. 1229. An act to authorize the development of plans and arrangements for the provision of emergency assistance, and the provision of such assistance, to repatriated American nationals without available resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 1317. An act to change the designation of that portion of the Hawaii National Park on the island of Hawaii, in the State of Hawaii, to the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1342. An act to provide that participation by members of the National Guard in the reenactment of the Battle of First Manassas shall be held and considered to be full-time training duty under section 502 of title 32, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1456. An act to authorize an additional Assistant Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1462. An act to amend the act of September 2, 1960 (74 Stat. 734), in order to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to establish minimum standards of quality for any variety of grapes and plums covered by such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1622. An act to amend the Atomic Energy Community Act of 1955; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

S. 1768. An act to provide for the restoration of Indian tribes of unclaimed per capita and other individual payments of tribal trust funds; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1869. An act to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

S.J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to Bob Hope; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 26, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6518. An act making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, June 1, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

957. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Panama Canal Company and the Canal Zone Government for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1960 (H. Doc. No. 178); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

958. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

959. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

960. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

961. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1962 involving increases in the amount of $549 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, $130,898,000 for the Small Business Administration, $2,400,000 for the U.S. Information Agency, $53 million for the Department of Commerce, and $237 million for the Department of Defense—Military (H. Doc No. 179); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

962. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1961 in the amount of $40 million for the Department of Defense (H. Doc. No. 180); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

963. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 25, 1961, the following bills were reported on May 26, 1961:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 879. A bill to increase rates of wartime disability compensation by amending section 314 (a) through (j) of title 38, United States Code; with amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2417. A bill to amend sections 322 and 415 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increased benefits for parents of veterans dying from service-connected disabilities; with amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 6269. A bill to extend the provisions for benefits based on limited periods immediately following discharge from active duty after December 31, 1956, to veterans discharged before that date; without amendment (Rept. No. 438). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 7148. A bill to equalize the provisions of title 38, United States Code, relating to the transportation of the remains of veterans who die in Veterans' Administration facilities to the place of burial; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of May 24, 1961, the following bill was reported on May 26, 1961:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7215. A bill to authorize assistance to public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education in financing the construction, rehabilitation, or improvement of needed academic and related facilities, and to authorize scholarship grants for undergraduate study in such institutions; without amendment (Rept. No. 440). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted May 29, 1961]

Under clause 1 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 441. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7371. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 442). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2249. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain property in the State of California to the county of Trinity; without amendment (Rept. No. 443). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2250. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain lands in Lassen County, Calif., to the city of Susanville, Calif.; with amendment (Rept. No. 444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H.R. 7371. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7372. A bill to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world in their efforts toward economic and social development and internal and external security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 7373. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7374. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain members of the uniformed services shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States after engaging in any activity or conduct, while a prisoner of war, which results in the giving of aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7375. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a return of a surviving spouse shall be treated as a joint return without regard to the time of the death of the other spouse; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7376. A bill to make available to children who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments the specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 7377. A bill to increase the limitation on the number of positions which may be placed in the top grades of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and on the number of research and development positions of scientists and engineers for which special rates of pay are authorized; to fix the compensation of hearing examiners; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7378. A bill to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 7379. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7380. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as educational expenses to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7381. A bill to amend section 216 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to provide for the establishment of a maritime training program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SMITH of Iowa:

H.R. 7382. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to pay fair value for improvements located on railroad rights-of-way owned by bona fide lessees or permittees; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 7383. A bill to provide for a memorial to the memory of the late Senator George W. Norris, at McCook, Nebr.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ZELENKO:

H.R. 7384. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it a crime to use any instrumentality of commerce or the mails, or to travel in commerce, in order to rig or fix any amateur or professional athletic contest or event; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. Con. Res. 320. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the inaugural addresses of the Presidents as a House document and providing for additional copies; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H. Con. Res. 321. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim June 4, 1961, as a National Day of Prayer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H. Res. 321. Resolution amending clause 2(a) of rule XI and clause 4 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take action to provide for and require the investment of tidelands mineral revenues derived from operations off Louisiana shores; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to authorizing and requesting the Governor to use his good offices to secure through the department of hospitals a transfer of 500 acres of land in Belle Chasse, La., from the U.S. Government to the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging that the original multiple benefit concept for the construction and operation of the great reservoir system on the Missouri River be adhered to; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 7385. A bill for the relief of Charles Waverly Watson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7386. A bill for the relief of Nguey Don Seung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H.R. 7387. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Gardikas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Dynamic June Dairy-Month Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation—if it is to sustain an economy strong enough to meet the needs of the people and the requirements of national defense—must attempt to assure that all segments share proportionately in our national wealth.

This is true in agriculture, industry, business, the professions, and all other fields.

Over the years we have had particularly difficult problems in agriculture. Fortunately, there have been some promising signs of a moderate upturn on the horizon. However, real progress will still require a concentrated effort by the Government and the people.

In a weekend broadcast over Wisconsin radio stations, I was privileged to discuss problems—and ways to improve the outlook in one important segment of farming—that is, dairying.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, our State ranks as the No. 1 milk producer in the country—with an output of nearly 18 billion pounds annually. This great river of milk flowing to consumers in Wisconsin and elsewhere in the country, represents a great resource of physical health for the American people.

In addition, dairying also is an important industry economically. Our thousands of dairy farmers in Wisconsin and elsewhere are an important market for equipment and services; they create jobs; and otherwise stimulate new economic health. The processing and delivery of about 25 billion quarts of fresh milk annually requires an army of 200,000 milk-plant workers. In addition, 100,000 people are engaged in the manufacture of butter, cheese, dry milk, and other dairy products. The total annual payroll for dairy processing plants comes to about $1.4 billion. About 380,000 motor vehicles are used in milk transport from farms to plants and from plants to milk consumers.

In summary, the dairy industry is extremely important not only to Wisconsin but to the Nation. Consequently, an improved outlook is important for all of us.

Now what can be done?

The best way, in my judgment, to serve the public and the dairy industry is to increase the consumption of milk and other dairy foods.

Across the Nation promotional activities will put the dairy industry in the spotlight during June, Dairy Month. Some of the objectives of the program will be:

1. Sell the dairy food message to consumers, stressing that: Dairy products are a best buy for the family budget, providing about one-third of our total food needs for less than one-fourth of the total food budget;

The wide variety of dairy products, milk, butter, cheese, ice cream, and other items, add zest, color, and myriad flavors to making more exciting menus for daily meals.

2. Scuttle the outmoded idea that there is an age limit on milk consumption. The fact is that milk is a good, healthful food for all age brackets; babies, teenagers, adults, and folks in their "golden years."

3. Refute unfounded attacks on milk or the component parts of milk that may give a false impression of possible detrimental effects on human health.

4. Encourage the dairy industry in its splendid efforts at stepping up sales and promotion, as well as its outstanding attempts to bring to the public greater variety and better quality in dairy foods.

5. Encourage expansion of a program to have milk accessible in more places, including opportunity for refreshing milk breaks during working hours, so that the public has ample opportunity to drink more milk.

6. Pay tribute to the American dairy farmer for his outstanding contribution to the economy and the health of our people.

7. Better educate homemakers to the vast variety of ways in which milk and dairy products can further enrich the daily meals.

NEEDED DAIRY RESEARCH CENTER

I shall soon reintroduce my bill for establishing a dairy research center at Madison, Wis., the heart of the dairy land. What would be the goals of such a research project? To mention a few, these would include efforts to—

1. Establish an improved, better correlated program of dairy research.

2. Improve processing, packaging, refrigeration, powdering, condensing, and merchandising, to better serve and meet the modern needs of the consuming public.

3. Find new ways to utilize the components of milk for industrial purposes.

4. Combat livestock diseases.

5. Lower costs of production on dairy farms.

6. Adapt more dairy products to better meet human nutritional needs.

7. Improve markets at home and abroad.

8. Protect the dairy industry from some of the allegations now threatening it as to alleged ill effects of milk and other dairy products on human health.

9. Safeguarding the public through careful handling of antibiotics used in care of dairy herds.

10. Develop new and better ways of processing milk and other dairy products for shipping over long distances. For example, with the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the development of more new dairy products would help to meet the particular needs of people in other areas of the world, who badly need the nutritional benefits of milk and other dairy products for their daily diets.

Now, what are some of the additional steps which may be taken to improve the dairy outlook?

1. Maintain a strong dairy cooperative program.

2. Eliminate barriers to the flow of milk in interstate commerce.

3. Prevent oleo and other substitutes from usurping dairy markets.

4. Expand the use of milk-vending machines and other devices and special techniques for distributing milk products to the American people.

5. Establish realistic policies by the Food and Drug Administration to avoid public scares; but at the same time, assuring a healthful flow of dairy foods to the American public.

6. Improve educational opportunities including better libraries, extension services from local universities, and availability of publications from State and Federal departments of agriculture.

7. And, finally, I believe we must create greater opportunity in dairying to encourage young, dynamic, imaginative youth to enter the field vocationally, to further strengthen our dairy economy and provide a reservoir of rich, healthful, tasty dairy foods for the future.

Crime in the Nation's Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, at this very moment, citizens throughout this great Nation are watching with grave concern the terrible wave of crime that has been sweeping over the Nation's Capital. Tourists who ordinarily would be trouping gaily through our wide avenues and public parks, and reverently visiting our historic shrines, now look fearfully over their shoulders lest they be robbed, or slugged, or worse. Parents in the cities and towns in every one of our congressional districts may be wondering whether their children should be permitted to make a pilgrimage to Washington. Our friends abroad deplore, and our enemies take great delight in, the daily reports of vicious crimes committed on the very doorstep of this beautiful building in which this House meets.

The concern of our Nation's citizens is fully shared by us, as the representatives of the people of the United States; but we also have the responsibility for doing something about it. This is the solemn duty imposed upon the Congress by the Constitution of the United States. I am confident that we will discharge this obligation, and make the streets of Washington safe once again.

Before a subcommittee of the House Committee for the District of Columbia which is studying the problem, I recently made the suggestion that consideration should be given by that committee to establish a mandatory life sentence for fourth convictions for major crimes. This suggestion received considerable notice in the press, and as a result I have received a number of comments and suggestions by mail and telephone. In addition, as I also mentioned before the subcommittee, I have been conducting research into the problem in an attempt to better understand it and to arrive at a mature solution.

From research in recent writings on the subject, and conservations with people directly involved in our penal system, it is apparent that the trend has been away from high mandatory sentences in favor of indeterminate sentences with a relatively low minimum and a relatively high maximum sentence. The theory appears to be that a low minimum sentence encourages an inmate to comply with regulations and to cooperate in rehabilitation programs in the hope that early release may be obtained, and this is reinforced by the knowledge that failure to comply will mean long incarceration. Too high a minimum, it is argued, discourages the prisoner from trying, and prison authorities are handicapped in their rehabilitation efforts. As a corollary, a high maximum sentence gives the authorities the power to hold the obviously unreformed criminal rather than to turn him loose prematurely upon society.

Judges, too, seem to prefer a wide latitude in the range within which they may operate, and where heavy mandatory sentences are directed, as they were by the so-called Baume law in New York before it was amended, tendencies have developed to permit filing of lesser pleas as a means of avoiding the mandatory sentence. It also has been claimed that juries sometimes have failed to convict when they viewed the mandatory sentence as unjustifiably high for the specific case under consideration.

Obviously, granting this wide latitude to jurists and penologists imposes a heavy responsibility upon them to act justly to the individuals concerned and at the same time to protect society from premature release of those who are unready or unwilling to live useful crime-free lives.

The comments I have received and the research I have done to date has led me to the conclusion that I, and I believe this Congress, need to know more about how the statutes now on the books are being enforced before we attempt to add to them. It may well be that the present laws have enough teeth in them already, and that the real problem lies in

the way they are administered. After making an analysis of the District criminal code, I am inclined to think that this may indeed be true. Here is a brief summary of some of the important features of the District Code.

The following are sentences which shall be imposed for specific crimes:

Arson: Not less than 1 or more than 10 years. Assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, and so forth: Not more than 15 years. Assault with intent to commit mayhem, or with deadly weapon: Not more than 10 years. Housebreaking: Not more than 15 years. Grand larceny: Not less than 1 nor more than 10 years. Auto theft: Not more than $1,000 fine and/or 5 years. Rape: Not more than 30 years, unless the jury directs a death penalty. Robbery: Not less than 6 months nor more than 15 years.

Over and above these penalties, section 22–104 of the code provides that an additional 50 percent may be added to any fine or prison sentence for a second conviction. I am informed that this provision is seldom used in the types of cases listed above. Also, section 22–3202 provides that for any offense committed when armed with a firearm, additional sentences may be imposed as follows: For first offense, 5 years; for second offense, 10 years; for third offense, 15 years; for fourth offense, up to 30 years.

Section 24–203 of the code provides that for any felony the judge shall impose maximum sentence not to exceed that authorized for the specific offense, that the minimum shall not exceed one-third the maximum, and in the case of a life sentence the minimum shall not exceed 15 years. This section further provides that for assault with intent to rape or for armed robbery, the minimum sentence shall be not less than 2 years, and if convicted of rape, not less than 7 years if the person has previously been convicted of a crime of violence. In each case, the maximum under this section would not be less than three times the minimum imposed. Note, however, that a judge is not restricted to the 2- or 7-year minimum, but simply cannot impose a lesser sentence.

All in all, there is considerable latitude in the law for a judge to impose heavy sentences for repeat offenders, particularly for those crimes with which we are so very much concerned at this time. But over and above the question of the sentences imposed is the question as to how the Department of Corrections and the Parole Board are administering the parole laws. The Parole Board, at its discretion, can release a prisoner once he has served the minimum to which he is sentenced, but also under section 24–201c the Board can apply to the court which passed a sentence to have the minimum reduced at any time. It would be most interesting to know how much this clause is used.

I find that the chief barrier to my forming a judgment as to whether additional legislation is needed, and if so, what legislation is needed, is lack of knowledge as to how the present statutes are being carried out. I believe most, if not all of you, will agree with me that there is no point in piling law upon law, if the present laws are not being carried out.

With these thoughts in mind, I have today sent a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee of the House District Committee which is studying the problem of the crime wave. This letter makes three requests:

First. That a staff study be made of the application of the current criminal statutes for the District of Columbia which will show (a) the actual sentences imposed during the past year compared to what the statutes allow; and (b) the sentences imposed on offenders during the past year who previously have been convicted of one or more crimes, the sentences previously imposed and the actual time served on these previous sentences.

Second. That consideration be given to establishing a system whereby the above reports are made on a regular basis, perhaps quarterly, for at least the next 2 years, or until the Congress determines that less frequent reports are necessary.

Third. That public hearings be scheduled at which members of the legal profession, those engaged in various phases of penal and parole work, and others, be heard and recommendations received for resolving the problem.

It is not my intention to lay charges against any individuals nor against any group among those responsible for the administration of our criminal justice system. But it is certainly obvious that something is radically wrong somewhere, and from the above analysis of the laws, it does not seem at all certain that the fault lies entirely in them.

If the trouble lies with the administration of the present statutes, the problem will not be cleared up until the full glare of publicity permits the trouble spots to be pinpointed. While I take such reports of laxity and corruption as were made in "Washington Confidential" with a healthy grain of salt, where there is smoke there probably also is fire. If, interspersed throughout the law enforcement system, there are those who out of misguided humanitarianism, or for more culpable reasons, are contributing to the premature release of dangerous criminals to prey upon society, we must find them and stop them.

New Electoral College System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this morning's edition of the Washington Post has an interesting and informative editorial on the legislation proposing electoral college reform which is being considered presently by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

It continues to be my conviction, and this is a conviction which I know is shared by many others, that the basic weakness in our great system of government by self-determination is the fact that we utterly fail to provide an equality of voting opportunity and authority in this country. This is solely due to the perversions of original purpose which have occurred under our electoral college system through use of the so-called general-ticket, winner-take-all, block voting formula of counting votes for President and Vice President. By giving individual voters in New York State, for example, 45 votes for President while voters with the identical qualifications and abilities voting in Delaware or any of our other States having only one Member of Congress cast only three votes for President. Does any fairminded American anywhere contend that it is either fair, right, proper, or wise to continue such a thoroughly un-American disparity in the vote power which individual Americans have in electing the President of the United States?

In 1960, in the Kennedy-Nixon contest, New York State voters cast over 325 million votes in that presidential election. The fact that they were cast by only about 7 million voters serves simply to dramatize and illustrate the unjust electoral system now prevailing in the United States. It is not only unjust but it places a vast premium on corruption at the polls in our larger States and cities and it provides a perfect formula for pressure groups desiring to control or influence public policy by marshaling their forces to create topheavy majorities in the urban communities existing in the States which actually elect our presidents. It is an effective device, moreover, for preventing the Southern States and the rural States west of Chicago from having any significant influence in presidential elections—and likewise in presidential nominating conventions—and from ever electing one of their own favorite sons to the White House, except through elevation by accident of death through the Vice Presidency. It is unusual when these areas provide our country with a Vice President.

For the foregoing and other reasons, I hope this Congress approves our proposed constitutional amendment, as provided in Senate Joint Resolution 12. This so-called Mundt amendment will correct all of the existing evils in our electoral college system without creating any new evils to replace them. It maintains the existing voting strength of every State, but it equalizes the voting strength of every citizen. While it does not deal directly with the one criticism made by the Post editorial—the possibility that an occasional elector might not follow the mandate of those who elected him, a very minor addition to our amendment which I certainly would not oppose if it is felt necessary, could cover that point by binding every elector to vote in conformity with the mandate prescribed by the electoral college district which elected him. Senate Joint Resolution 12 already protects against gerrymandering by setting up new electoral college voting districts rather than using existing congressional

districts which in some instances are gerrymandered.

I ask that the Post editorial and that my statement in support of Senate Joint Resolution 12, as made before the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 23 also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Interest in the presidential electoral system is at a low ebb because the next election is 3½ years away, but this does not minimize the importance of the hearings launched by the Senate Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee. The 1960 election gave the country a pointed demonstration of some of the weaknesses of the present system for choosing the President and Vice President. Of the Democratic electors chosen at the polls, 14 in Mississippi and Alabama refused to cast their votes for the Democratic candidate, President Kennedy, and cast them instead for Senator BYRD. Many voters went to the polls not knowing whether their votes would be counted for the candidates of their party.

President Kennedy has indicated that he would like to see electors bound to vote for the candidates of the party which they represent. But the basic difficulty is the retention of electors at all in a system which is now designed to make the President, as nearly as possible, the popular choice of the people. Senator KEFAUVER is sponsoring an amendment that would abolish electors and divide the electoral vote of each State between the candidates in the same proportion as the popular vote is divided. One version of this plan was approved by the Senate in 1950. It has many virtues but has also encountered opposition on the ground that it would encourage splinter parties.

Senator MUNDT and five of his colleagues have offered a plan under which electors would continue to be chosen but largely on the basis of congressional districts. At present the winning candidate in each State claims all of that State's electoral votes. Under the Mundt plan only two electors from each State would be chosen in this way—one for each Senator. All the other electors would be winners of the popular contest in congressional districts—one for each Congressman. In other words, the so-called electoral college would reflect about the same trend as the composite vote for Members of Congress.

The weakness of this proposal is that it keeps in the system dummy electors who might be able to thwart the will of the people. It would be possible, of course, for the subcommittee to combine the best features of the Mundt resolution with the best of the Kefauver plan. Votes could be cast directly for presidential candidates. The winner in each State could take two electoral votes and in addition one electoral vote for each congressional district that he carried. But this would necessitate a better system of redistricting than most of the States now have.

There is obviously no easy answer, but there is hope that the subcommittee can work out a satisfactory electoral revision that will eliminate the existing grave defects and at the same time remain consistent with the Federal system.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, IN SUPPORT OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

Every voter in this country, whether he lives in California, Delaware, New York, or South Dakota, ought to have equal voting power when it comes to electing the President of the United States.

This is the only important respect in which our electoral college system, so called, has failed to function with fairness. With only minor changes (important though they are in effect) it has stood the practical test of time since our country was established. It has carried us through 44 presidential elections, through peace and war, from George Washington to John F. Kennedy. It was after the fourth presidential election that the 12th amendment was added to the Constitution to require presidential electors to vote specifically for President and Vice President, rather than, as the original provision provided, for two persons for President. Since then 40 presidential elections have been held. It is obvious, therefore, that any system that has functioned so well for so long should not be changed lightly. Changes proposed or made should be the absolute minimum required to bring about the desired and necessary results.

Such minimum and wholly practical changes are proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 12 which I am sponsoring together with Senators THURMOND, MCCLELLAN, HRUSKA, MORTON, and BLAKLEY. This is the old Mundt-Coudert amendment, with which most of us are familiar, with an important change, an antigerrymandering provision which corrects a wholly valid criticism of the amendment as written in 1955.

Our Founding Fathers, in the Constitutional Convention of 1787, gave long and careful consideration to the method of electing the President. At first it decided he should be elected by the Congress. Then it changed its collective mind and transferred the power of choice to an electoral college that was to be an exact counterpart of Congress with the representation of the States as units (corresponding to the Senators) as well as population of the States (corresponding to Representatives) and which should meet at the seat of Government.

Upon further consideration this plan was dropped because of the fear that the electors wouldn't travel so far for a single purpose. It took days in those times to cover distances that we span in a few hours. The convention went back to its original idea that a President should be elected by a joint session of Congress. They did this with reluctance because it ran counter to their strong beliefs in the principle of separation of powers of the executive and legislative branches of the new government.

At this point the idea developed that the electors could meet and cast their votes in their own States, and transmit the certificates of their ballots to the seat of Government.

Accordingly, the work of electing the President was divided. The convention transferred the act of voting from a joint session of Congress to electoral colleges in the several States, to results to be transmitted to the President of the Senate. It left with Congress in joint session the function of counting the certified results from the States, as would have been the case had Congress done the voting.

This plan appears in article II, section 1, of the Constitution—a part of which has been superseded by the 12th amendment:

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; but no Senator or Representative or person holding an office of trust or profit under the United States shall be appointed an elector."

The exclusion of Members of Congress and Federal officeholders is required by the cardinal principle of separation of powers.

In Senate Joint Resolution 12, the clause "in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" is eliminated. In its stead, Senate Joint Resolution 12 requires:

"The electors to which a State is entitled by virtue of its Senators shall be elected by the people thereof, and the electors to which it is entitled by virtue of its Representatives shall be elected by the people within single elector districts established by the legislature thereof; such districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in the Congress; and such districts when formed shall not be altered until another census has been taken."

It is the clause "In such manner as the legislature thereof may direct" that is the root of the present problem. Only 10 States participated in the election of our first President, George Washington. North Carolina and Rhode Island had not yet ratified the Constitution; and New York's two houses of the Legislature could not agree on who the electors should be.

No uniform method of choosing electors was followed. Electors were chosen in a variety of ways, election by legislatures, election by the people in districts and election by the people on a general ticket, which means that each voter in the State could vote for every one of the State's electors. In Massachusetts each of the eight districts chose two electors from which the legislature elected one per district and added two electors at large.

In the succeeding presidential elections, through 1832, the various methods were used with States changing from one to the other. In 1836, the general ticket system was used in every State but South Carolina, which continued to elect by the legislature through 1860.

After Washington's two elections, the Presidency was contested every 4 years on a party basis as it is today. The majority party in each State was quick to see the advantage of consolidating its electoral strength either through legislature selection or through use of the general ticket system so as to exert maximum influence in electing a President. Federalists did this where they were in control, in the New England States, for example, and the anti-Federalists, later Jefferson's Republicans, did the same thing in their States.

Since 1836, with the exception of South Carolina, there have been only three instances of departures from the general ticket system. They were Florida in 1868 and Colorado in 1876 in which the elections were by the legislature, and Michigan in 1892, when the district system with two electors at large was used.

It is extremely doubtful if any voter living today has used anything but a general ticket system in presidential elections. This use of the general ticket system in every State is largely responsible for many of the misunderstandings of the electoral college system which exist today and for much of the notion that the electors are archaic and unnecessary.

When we regard the electoral college as the exact numerical counterpart of Congress we can see readily that it combines the two principles of respresentation in our Federal Union of States. We have the Federal principle of equal representation of the States in the Senate regardless of population and, then we have the national principle of unequal representation of the States in the House of Representatives based on their unequal populations. State representation in the House in the present Congress ranges from 1 to 43.

Each citizen of each State is represented in the Senate by two Senators and in the House by one Represenative, with a few exceptions. His representation in Congress, therefore, is two parts Federal and one part national. In the electoral college, with the general ticket system in force in every State, there is no equality of citizen representation. It ranges from a high of 45 members of the electoral college for a citizen of New York to 3 for a citizen of each of the 6 States that

sent only 1 Representative to the present Congress.

Conversely, each citizen has as many votes in presidential elections as his State has members in the electoral college, because they are elected on a general ticket. In other words, when a New York voter pulls a voting machine lever for a presidential ticket he is actually casting 45 votes, one for each of 45 electors on a party slate. It may be hard to believe but there were actually more than 325 million votes cast in New York in the last presidential election by something over 7 million voters.

On the other hand the citizens of the six States which have only one Member of the House of Representatives had only three votes each in the presidential election. In my own State of South Dakota each citizen had four votes.

This tremendous disparity in voting weight between the citizens of the large States and the small States is the true source of all the valid complaints which have been made against the electoral college system. The real culprit is the use of the general ticket by every State. Of course, each State legislature could abandon the general ticket but none will without certain knowledge that all other States will abandon it at the same time. This is why a constitutional amendment is necessary to bring about a change.

There is no more justification for choosing electors on a general ticket than there is for electing a State's delegation to the House of Representatives, counterparts of electors, on a statewide, bloc basis, which is what the general ticket does. Imagine the howls of rage that would arise all over the country if a district's Representative was to be taken from it, and given to the entire State. And yet it would be just as fair to use the general ticket for Representatives as it is for their counterparts in the electoral college.

I submit that the number of persons which entitles a State to one Representative in the Congress should entitle the same group of people to one member of the electoral college.

What have been the effects of the general ticket system of choosing electors? I suggest these:

1. It excludes from the office of President of the United States all men, no matter how able and outstanding they may be, unless they come from a State with a large bloc of electoral votes.

2. By the same token the dominant forces in the large, pivotal States which are responsible for the nomination and election of our Presidents have inordinate influences at the White House and in the executive branch of our Government. A cursory reading of the major party platforms and the speeches of their presidential candidates gives proof that they are directed almost entirely at the dominant elements in these large States.

3. It invites fraud in the large States that are crucial and where the vote is expected to be close. The results in Illinois, Texas, and Missouri in the last election brought forth charges of vote frauds. The effect of such vote fraud is statewide under the general ticket. A fraudulent vote, undetected, counts just as much as a valid vote in the statewide total.

4. Although the Constitution gives each State the same numerical representation in the electoral college that it has in the whole Congress, by using the general ticket for electors, we have formed a constituency for the President which is altogether different from that which elects the Congress. The great difference between these two constituencies is that almost all Representatives are elected in single member districts while their counterparts in the electoral college are elected in multimember districts consisting of entire States. This situation permits voters of a State, voting straight party tickets, to produce one result in the electoral college and an altogether different result in the House of Representatives at the same election. The effect of all this is that we have what I have called a presidential United States of America, and a congressional United States of America that are, politically speaking, two different countries within one national boundary.

5. Many critics of the present system contend that the electoral college is an archaic institution, outmoded by our tremendous improvements in transportation and communications, and that it is incompatible with modern democratic principles. In the main, these charges are based on either a misunderstanding of the nature of the electoral college, or on deliberate intentions to change the structure of our constitutional system and change our Republic into something radically different.

6. Another criticism of the electoral college is in the contention that presidential electors are in no way bound to vote for the presidential candidate of the party on whose slate they were elected. This is coupled with the contention that the Founding Fathers intended the electors to be free agents. Both these contentions are without basis in fact. On the contrary, there is overwhelming evidence that from the very first it was clearly understood that the elector's function was to express the view of those who had chosen him.

Since 1820, a total of 14,018 presidential electors have been chosen. Of these only eight are alleged to have voted contrary to the views of those who named them. In no case did any of these votes affect the outcome of a presidential election. In 1820, one elector did not vote for James Monroe. In 1948, a Tennessee elector voted for THURMOND, the States rights candidate, instead of for President Truman, but he had announced before the election that he would do this. The last case was in the 1960 election when a Republican elector in Oklahoma voted for Senator HARRY F. BYRD instead of Richard M. Nixon.

It is said, too, that the Founding Fathers had no notion of political parties. But, in, the very first election, Alexander Hamilton, leader of the Federalists, saw to it that John Adams would not run equally with Washington, as both men were being voted for as President. In fact, Washington received 69 votes and Adams only 34.

An outstanding authority on the Constitution, the late Chief Justice Charles C. Nott, of the Court of Claims, has stated flatly that the notion that the framers of the Constitution had no plan in mind for electing a President different from that which is in force is completely in error. In the Encyclopedia Americana Judge Nott wrote:

"It is said by some of the commentators, and indeed it is now generally believed, that the electoral colleges were intended to be 'deliberative bodies.' In one sense this is true—in the legal sense. The electors are not ministerial or administrative officers; they do not perform a specific work in a way determined by higher official authority; in legal contemplation the responsibility of their action rests upon themselves. But the framers of the Constitution never supposed that the electors would disregard the political pledges upon which they were chosen, or that the American people, either directly or through their State legislatures, would blindly choose electors to evolve a President out of their inner consciousness. On the contrary, they contemplated the successful candidates receiving the votes of 'a majority of the whole number of electors,' and they required the electors to vote 'in their respective States,' and to vote on the same day. If they had framed a provision requiring all of the electors to convene at the seat of government in one body, and there in their own way and time proceed to choose a President, there would be good reason for saying that actual deliberation was intended; but they did not give to the electors one single power of attribute by virtue of which they could deliberate.

"The idea that it was ever intended that the electors should nominate the candidate for whom they themselves should vote is a myth which has been unthinkingly reiterated by most eminent writers, but which does not rest upon a single fact. * * * He who supposes that the framers (of the Constitution) intended that 13 different bodies should convene in 13 different places at one time for one object and for 1 day, and that object the selection of the executive of a nation, confesses a most superficial knowledge of the greatest constructive statesmen of their century and of the great work which they deliberately planned and built."

As originally introduced several years ago, the Mundt-Coudert amendment provided that a State's electors corresponding to its Representatives in Congress should be elected from congressional districts and the two corresponding to its Senators should be elected statewide, as Senators are elected. Critics, most of them supporters of the status quo, objected strongly and with justice that the use of congressional districts was open to criticism since in some States district lines had been unfairly drawn by whatever political party controlled the State legislature, a practice long known as gerrymandering.

To meet this criticism the amendment, as now proposed, provides for the setting up, as I have previously stated, of electoral districts to be composed of compact and contiguous territory, containing as nearly as practicable the number of persons which entitled the State to one Representative in the Congress.

Our amendment, if adopted, would require State legislatures to follow this constitutional directive. If they failed to do so Congress would have the power to step in and see to it that fair and equitable districts for electors are established.

It is altogether likely that these nongerrymandered electoral districts would at least sharply curtail the practice of setting up unfair congressional districts since it would be extremely difficult for a State legislature to justify one set of districts for electors and another for Representatives.

There is another often raised objection to the present system of electing a President. It is the provision that if no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes when they are counted in Congress that the House of Representatives shall choose immediately a President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes. The vote in such a case—the last time it occurred was in 1824—is by State; each State delegation having one vote. In the event a State's House delegation is evenly divided its vote is not recorded. A majority of the States is required for election.

The objection to this system is that it is grossly unfair to the larger States, giving New York, California, and Pennsylvania no greater voice than Alaska, Delaware, and Nevada despite the great population disparities.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 cures this situation. It provides that in the event no presidential candidate has a majority of the electoral vote that "then from the persons having the three highest numbers on the list of persons voted for as President, the Senate and the House of Representatives, assembled and voting as individual Members of one body, shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President; a quorum for such purpose shall be three-fourths of the whole number of Senators and Representatives,

and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary for a choice; if additional ballots be necessary, the choice on the fifth ballot shall be between the two persons having the highest number of votes on the fourth ballot."

The Constitution also provides that if no candidate for Vice President has a majority that the Senate shall choose him from among the two candidates with the highest electoral vote total. Senate Joint Resolution 12 provides that both Houses in joint session and voting by the head, as for President, shall select the Vice President from among the candidates with the three highest numbers of electoral votes.

Our system of electing a President has, generally speaking, served us well during the 172 years since our Republic was established. It has never failed to give us a President.

Through no fault of the Founding Fathers, it has, however, become distorted through the use of the general ticket system. Most of the framers of the Constitution, it should be pointed out, went on record favoring a district system for choosing electors, as the fairest method of expressing the popular will.

Senate Joint Resolution 12 is, in my opinion and the opinion of the many who support it, the only simple method by which each voter in every State will have the same voting weight in electing a President. It is the only one among the various electoral reform proposals which have been offered which will bring about a needed reform without a basic change in our constitutional system. It alone leaves control of the election machinery in the States, where it belongs.

It is the office and person of the elector, and nothing else, that maintains the intrastate character of presidential elections. Interstate candidacies are legally unknown and unprecedented under Constitution, and would remain so under Senate Joint Resolution 12. Now, party nominees for President and Vice President are extralegal, outside the law. They achieve constitutional status only when votes are cast for them in the electoral college. If we abandon the office and person of elector we will of necessity establish interstate candidacies which, in turn, will open the door for ultimate Federal control of elections, including the qualifications of voters. Few Americans will favor such a change.

Tax Claim of E. S. Dillard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on May 27, 1959, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article telling of a tax dispute between the Internal Revenue Service and Mr. E. S. Dillard, of Charlotte, N.C., and Lynchburg, Va., a leader of the national right to work committee.

The case involved $85,000 in bonds which Mr. Dillard had received from a money-losing venture. He donated $40,000 worth of these bonds to the Dillard Foundation and Trinity Presbyterian Church, claiming charitable deductions for the full amount.

The Government claimed the bonds were not really worth anything and that Mr. Dillard owed $6,186 in extra taxes.

The U.S. Tax Court has now ruled that the bonds were actually worth 43 cents on the dollar and disallowed the rest of Mr. Dillard's deductions for charity. Therefore, I was 43 percent wrong.

Mr. Dillard has now learned that I am a Member of the Senate and asked me to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper article reporting the outcome of this tax case. I am pleased to do this and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article which appeared in the February 7, 1961, issue of the Charlotte Observer, my previous insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1959, and Mr. Dillard's three most recent letters.

There being no objection, the various items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 27, 1959]

RIGHT-TO-WORK LAWS

(Extension of remarks of Hon. LEE METCALF, of Montana, in the House of Representatives, Wednesday, May 27, 1959)

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, twice in the past 5 years Montanans have rejected the union busting so-called right-to-work law.

Those who would weaken unions and reduce the effectiveness of collective bargaining are regrouping, apparently for another try next year.

I have a copy of a letter dated January 7, from an outfit called the National Right To Work Committee. It is an appeal for donations of $50 or more to help supply students "with factual documented informational material" to offset the "propaganda, distorting the issue," being circulated by opponents of this proposal.

The letterhead of the committee includes: E. S. Dillard, president, Old Dominion Box Co., Charlotte, N.C., past chairman of the board.

In this connection, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following article concerning Mr. Dillard in the April 19, 1959, issue of the Charlotte, N.C., Observer.

"CHARLOTTEAN IS FIGHTING BIG TAX ASSESSMENT

"(By Don Oberdorfer)

"WASHINGTON.—Charlotte businessman E. S. Dillard is fighting a Federal tax bite of $92,506 in back taxes, according to records filed in U.S. tax court here.

"Dillard, president of Old Dominion Box Co., announced the sale of two of his three Charlotte divisions to Weyerhauser Timber Co. last week.

"Records filed by Dillard, plus Internal Revenue Service judgments attached, show the big tax dispute arose after Dillard's 1954 purchase of Brown Dynalube Co., Inc., of Charlotte. The company makes lubricating equipment and planned to expand into sales to the Armed Forces.

"Dillard bought the outstanding common stock and accounts payable of the firm for $1. He advanced $1,824 to the company and accepted from the company $85,000 in face value of debenture bonds due in 20 years.

"The Government said these bonds were worth their face value and should have been reported as income. Dillard says they weren't worth anything.

"Later, E. H. Newcombe, president of the lubricating firm, asked to buy some of the bonds of the company from Dillard.

"Dillard agreed to donate $10,000 face value of the bonds to Trinity Presbyterian Church, deducting the gift from his taxes as a $10,000 contribution.

"Newcombe bought the bonds from the church for their face value, $10,000 in cash.

"The same day Dillard donated another $20,000 in bonds to Dillard Foundation, Inc., a tax-exempt charitable foundation which he incorporated. This was deducted from his taxes as a $20,000 contribution.

"About 10 months later, in the fall of 1955, Dillard donated $10,000 more in bonds to Trinity Presbyterian Church, making the usual deduction. A total of $4,500 worth of these bonds were bought for $4,500 from the church by Minor Foundation, Inc.

"This foundation was incorporated by W. T. Minor, Jr., of Charlotte, who is Dillard's tax lawyer. Minor prepared the papers which were filed here on the tax case.

"Dillard says the bonds were worth their full value when he contributed them, and deducted them as contributions, though they were worth nothing when he acquired them.

"The Government takes the opposite view. It says they were worthless when contributed (and so the tax credit for contribution has been voided) but it claims the bonds were worth full face value when acquired and should have been reported as ordinary income.

"The Tax Court judges will have to decide who was right about the value of the bonds at each point in the transaction."

[From the Charlotte Observer, Feb. 7, 1961]

DEBT REDUCED—EX-CHARLOTTEAN WINS TAX RULING

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Tax Court has ruled that E. S. Dillard, formerly of Charlotte, owes only a small part of the $92,400 claim made against him by the Internal Revenue Service.

The Dillard tax case involved $85,000 in debentures he received from Brown Dynalube Co., Inc., a money-losing venture in which Dillard was interested.

The Government claimed the bonds were worth full value and were income that should have been reported on his tax return. The Tax Court agreed with Dillard that this wasn't so.

Dillard later contributed Brown Dynalube bonds with a face value of $40,000 to Trinity Presbyterian Church and Dillard Foundation, Inc., claiming charitable deductions of this full amount.

The Government claimed Dillard owed $6,168 extra taxes on these deals because the bonds really weren't worth anything.

The Tax Court found that they were actually worth about 43 percent of their face value. It disallowed the rest of Dillard's deductions for charity. This means he will owe several thousand in extra taxes to the Internal Revenue Service unless there is further court review of the case.

MARCH 10, 1961.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On May 27, 1959, you caused to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a newspaper account of litigation in which I was involved with the Internal Revenue Service.

Your opening statements, followed by this insertion, clearly indicated that your purpose was an obvious attempt to discredit the National Right To Work Committee and me.

In view of your zeal to "call this matter to the attention of your colleagues" in the House of Representatives, I presume you want to inform them of the current status of the matter.

Accordingly, I request that you cause to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached newspaper article from the same newspaper dated February 7, 1961.

I shall appreciate your advice as to your decision with respect to this request.

Very truly yours,

E. S. DILLARD,
President.

APRIL 19, 1961.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the event you failed to receive my letter and the enclosure of March 10, 1961, I am attaching duplicates.

I will appreciate an acknowledgment of your receipt of this material, or the courtesy of a reply in some form.

Very truly yours,

E. S. DILLARD,
President.

OLD DOMINION BOX CO., INC.,
Lynchburg, Va., May 9, 1961.

The Honorable LEE METCALF,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: In view of the fact you have failed to reply to my letters of March 10 and April 19, I am sending you copies of these letters and attachments with this letter, registered, return receipt requested.

Once again, I ask you to advise me whether or not you will cause to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the attached newspaper article reporting the outcome of the tax case in question.

Very truly yours,

E. S. DILLARD,
President.

Supreme Court Orders Pay for Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, when legal precedents and reasoning will support a judgment either way, good judges have traditionally rendered that judgment which most accords with the interests of society. In short, commonsense has had a part in the development and strength of our legal system and the respect for law which characterizes our society. When this tradition is disregarded it can only result in weakening the legal system and diminishing respect for it.

Apparently the U.S. Court of Claims determined there was adequate precedent and legal reasoning to support a judgment denying Army pay to certain Korean POW's who defected to the Communists. Yet the Supreme Court of the United States has overturned that decision and ordered payments by the U.S. Government to the very persons who dishonorably turned against it. I share with the writer of the following editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Herald Express on May 25 his difficulty in understanding why the Supreme Court should render such a decision.

REWARD FOR DISHONOR

Another U.S. Supreme Court decision which will astonish many Americans has just been handed down in the case of three U.S. soldiers who were alleged to have aided the Communist side when they were captured during the Korean war.

After the war, the trio refused repatriation, preferring to remain in Red China. But after 18 months under the Red Chinese, they changed their minds and returned to the United States in 1955.

Now the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the three soldiers, former corporals who were dishonorably discharged from the Army, are entitled to their pay during the time they were prisoners of war.

The Supreme Court decision came on appeal from the U.S. Court of Claims, which had declared in its opposite decision that to grant their POW pay "would be to put a premium on dishonor and a penalty on courageous loyalty."

Arguing before the Supreme Court, George S. Leonard, attorney for the Justice Department, said that the actions of the three soldiers "appear to have amounted to the military equivalent of treason."

It often is difficult to understand the reasoning behind the High Court's decisions.

The defectors involved and the amount of American taxpayers money they will receive under this decision are as follows: Otho G. Bell, Hillsboro, Miss., $1,455; William A. Cowart, Monticello, Ark., $4,991; Lewie W. Griggs, Jacksonville, Tex., $2,810.

Address by Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, at Rededication of the Confederate Monument, Alexandria, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, it was a genuine pleasure to be in attendance on the occasion of the rededication of the Confederate Monument in Alexandria, Va., by Hon. WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, on May 24, 1961.

While in the Democratic cloakroom on the afternoon of the day the commemorative rededication ceremony was to be held, I was asked why did I have on a blue suit. I replied that I planned to hear my colleague, BRYAN DORN rededicate the Confederate Monument in Alexandria, Va., that evening. Quietude fell over the cloakroom when I announced that he was to deliver the principal speech. Then someone spoke up and said, "I don't know who dedicated the Alexandria Confederate Monument originally but it will get a good rededication tonight."

The prediction of the member in the cloakroom was fulfilled in its truest sense—BRYAN DORN delivered a masterful, a superb address. He was appropriately introduced by Hon. JOEL BROYHILL, Representative of the 10th Virginia District.

Comdr. S. Cooper Dawson of the Robert E. Lee Chapter, Sons of Confederate Veterans was chairman, who introduced Representative BROYHILL. Hon. HOWARD W. SMITH, who represented the Alexandria District with distinction for many years received a warm ovation from the large crowd in attendance. Hon. FRED SCHWENGEL, of Iowa a member of the National Civil War Centennial Commission and Hon. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Georga were also on the platform.

BRYAN DORN delivered his forceful speech with fervor and devotion. He was, no doubt, accustomed to speaking in the out-of-doors as his remarks were so well received by the audience. There are few, if any, orators of the persent day who can equal or excel BRYAN DORN.

His address follows:

ADDRESS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM JENNINGS BRYAN DORN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, MAY 24, 1961, 6:30 P.M., IN OBSERVANCE OF CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL DAY; OPENING OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION AND THE REDEDICATION OF THE CONFEDERATE MONUMENT AT PRINCE AND WASHINGTON STREETS IN ALEXANDRIA, VA.

(One hundred years ago, May 24, 1861, the 17th Virginia Regiment formed at site of monument and marched out to join army of Northern Virginia. Federal troops occupied Alexandria on same day. Seventy-two years ago, May 24, 1889, Governor Fitzhugh Lee, nephew of Robert E. Lee, made dedicatory address unveiling monument.)

Commander Dawson, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great honor to be presented to you by one of the ablest, most distinguished, and dedicated Members of the Congress, your own Hon. JOEL T. BROYHILL. I congratulate the citizens of northern Virginia on having the good judgment to send JOE BROYHILL repeatedly to the Congress.

It is an honor to share this platform with your own beloved Judge HOWARD W. SMITH who has served our entire Nation with loyalty, faithfulness, and devotion. Judge SMITH has stood like a "Stonewall" for States rights, individual liberty and the principles and ideals of our Founding Fathers. On Virginia soil, I pledge him my continuing allegiance to the great cause for which he stands—constitutional government.

We are all honored with the presence of Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL, an able and distinguished member of the National Civil War Centennial Commission, from the great State of Iowa; Congressman E. C. GATHINGS, of Arkansas, a true southerner and a member of the powerful Agriculture Committee; and my young colleague, Congressman ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR., of Georgia, a great-great nephew of the immortal Alexander H. Stephens, vice president of the Confederacy.

Commander Dawson, you and the members of the Robert E. Lee Chapter, Sons of Confederate Veterans, are to be commended for your untiring efforts to make this occasion a great success. You have been ably assisted by the charming and gracious ladies of Mary Custis Lee-17th Virginia Regiment Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.

I am glad that the Congress created the Civil War Centennial Commission to commemorate the heroic men and women who fought for the Union on one side and for the South on the other. To head this Commission no better selection could have been made than Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, the grandson of that magnanimous and able

leader to whom Lee surrendered at Appomattox. Your own distinguished former Governor and Congressman, William M. Tuck, is the Vice Chairman of the Commission. These men will lead us in the next 4 years to remember the deeds and heroism of the gallant men, both North and South. They will help us to have a better understanding of that struggle. Today, we should take these lessons of the past, learn them well, and guard our country's future.

I am proud to be a fellow Alexandrian. You are justly proud of the history, architecture, culture, and patriotism of your beautiful city. You have every right to be proud that Alexandria was the hometown of two of the greatest men ever to speak the English language, George Washington and Robert E. Lee.

One hundred years ago today the flower of the young manhood of Alexandria marched off to the west to cast its fortunes with one of the most famous armies in all of the history of the world—the Army of Northern Virginia.

This spot will always be sacred to the people of Alexandria. This ground is hallowed ground. It is historic ground. The men of the 17th Regiment marched away in the full knowledge that their homes, their firesides, their businesses, their cultured and lovely city would be in the hands of an enemy occupying force. They left in the firm conviction that they were fighting for what they believed to be right and just—States rights, local government, and individual liberty. They marched away in the belief they were fighting for the principles enunciated in the Constitution of the United States and its Bill of Rights. They were loyal, patriotic, and devoted to duty.

The men of the 17th Regiment were familiar with the heritage of Alexandria—the cradle of American liberty. They had been reared in the traditions, principles, and ideals of George Washington, the Father of our Republic. They had been as loyal to the Stars and Stripes of the United States as Washington had been to the crown and flag of England. In casting their lot with their relatives, loved ones, and local principles of government, they felt they were doing no more than the Father of our Country when he joined the cause of the Revolution. Many of these men felt that their cause was a renewal of the revolutionary struggle against autocracy and supreme governmental power. They placed upon the altar of State sovereignty "their lives, their fortunes, and sacred honor."

The men of the 17th Regiment grew up with the full understanding of the principles of Thomas Jefferson; George Mason and his incomparable Bill of Rights; James Madison, the father of the Constitution; James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine; Patrick Henry; Chief Justice John Marshall; John Randolph and countless others. They enjoyed a maximum of freedom, personal liberty, and the free enterprise opportunity system they had helped to create. This heritage, these traditions, this love of liberty was the foundation stone upon which the army of northern Virginia emblazoned its fame upon the pages of history. The leaders of this incomparable army were no less dedicated to the cause than the civilian soldier whom they commanded. Robert E. Lee, a native of Alexandria, as commander of that army gained immortal fame as a military leader and as a kindly, considerate, Christian gentleman. As a reminder of his military genius, his courage, and audacity, turn with me to the early morning of June 26, 1862. At that moment the young Confederate government was threatened with collapse. Its largest city and principal port, New Orleans, had been captured and occupied. Confederate lines of defense in the west had collapsed. The western armies retreated in confusion from Kentucky, from Tennessee, and from Shiloh deep into Mississippi. The Confederate coast was blockaded from Hampton Roads to the Mexican border. A huge, well disciplined, highly organized, and mighty Federal Army under George B. McClellan was 7 miles from downtown Richmond where they could hear the church bells on Sunday morning. Powerful Union reinforcements were poised throughout northern Virginia to strike the rear and cut off retreat from Richmond. Despair, gloom, and hopelessness gripped the Confederate government and Confederate people.

You Sons of the Confederate Veterans here in Alexandria have rightly and proudly named your camp after the intrepid leader—Robert E. Lee. This new commander refused to retreat. He seized the initiative and launched a counterblow north of Richmond on the morning of June 26. With inferior numbers, with inferior supplies, with second-rate military hardware, in approximately 2 short months from that hour of attack on June 26, his footsore and ill-clad army was crossing the Potomac while his bands played "Maryland, My Maryland." Behind him lay the victories of the Seven Days, the Relief of Richmond, Cedar Mountain, and Second Bull Run. The wreckage of Federal armies littered the Virginia countryside. He now threatened the Federal Capital. Gloom, consternation, and despair gripped the North. The South breathed a sigh of relief and the world stood in amazement, awe, and wonder. The valor and gallantry of the civilian soldier under Lee and Jackson had turned the tide of defeat and easy Federal victory into a gigantic struggle to continue for years.

The men of the 17th Regiment who formed here on that May morning 100 years ago were part of the glory, the achievement, and lasting fame of that army. The Army of Northern Virginia was never, as a unit, driven from any single battlefield in defeat. It was simply worn away by hardship, disease, and attrition until it finally surrendered at Appomattox Court House. Its accomplishments and valor became legend. Military experts from foreign nations studied its every move. Patton, MacArthur, and even Rommel of Germany became familiar with the details of its campaigns—a tribute to Lee, his gallant officers, and the civilian soldiers who followed him for 4 years.

It was my privilege 4 years ago in May to attend the unveiling of the bust of Stonewall Jackson in the Hall of Fame for great Americans at New York University. I was thrilled to see the bust of Jackson added to that of Robert E. Lee. These incomparable leaders of the Army of Northern Virginia proudly stand with the 89 greatest men in American history—an honor bestowed by the entire Nation, a tribute to their genius and the soldiers of the Confederate Army. It has been truly said they no longer belong to the people of Virginia or the people of the South, but to all of America and to the English-speaking world. Could they speak today in the Hall of Fame, they would give credit to southern manhood as exemplified in the 17th Virginia Regiment.

There has always existed a strong bond of friendship and mutual admiration between the people of Virginia and the people of South Carolina. I am proud to represent the old congressional district in this Congress once represented so ably and so well by the "father of States rights," John C. Calhoun. I am proud to represent the soil where the remains of Barnard E. Bee now rest—who gave "Stonewall" Jackson his immortal name and thrilled the South by his courage and supreme sacrifice at the First Battle of Manassas. When this handsome likeness of the Confederate soldier was dedicated to the memory of the men of the 17th Regiment on May 24, 1889, Gen. M. C. Butler of my South Carolina district sat on this platform with Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, Gov. Fitzhugh Lee, and the other distinguished guests. Gen. M. C. Butler was the youngest major general of the Confederate Army and at the time of the dedication was U.S. Senator from my native State. Senator Butler and Governor Lee did not know on that day 72 years ago that they would subsequently become major generals of volunteers in the Army of the United States during the Spanish War. In all the history of the world the story of man cannot point to a nation where men could attain high military rank in a cause against the government and yet reach the same rank in the defense of that government. Such was the spirit, devotion, and honor of Governor Lee and Senator Butler and the men whom they led.

This gives us another insight into the true character of the Confederate soldier. When the sun set on his ambitions and his hopes at Appomattox, he returned home and renewed his allegiance to the United States. His difficulties seemed insurmountable—homes destroyed, economic system wrecked, money worthless, and citizenship denied. Without aid, he tackled the task before him as resolutely as he had charged the Federal guns at Gettysburg. He succeeded in building a new South. He simply went to work and through patient, thrift, and frugality, wrote another chapter in the progress of our common Republic. He taught his children that we are one Nation, united forever.

In 1876 when the dark clouds of Reconstruction hung over the South, a disputed national election divided the American people. Revolution, war, bloodshed, and internal strife threatened our Nation. It was the loyalty, devotion, and coolness of men like Wade Hampton, M. C. Butler, and their Confederate followers who prevented further bloodshed and truly reunited our Republic. Someday historians will more fully cover this glorious chapter of American history. In 1876 the Confederate soldier fought for peace, understanding, and a united nation. In those trying days he contributed greatly to the preservation, unity, and growth of the United States.

It is fitting that we rededicate this monument today to the memory of our grandfathers, the Confederate civilian soldiers. It is proper that we rededicate it particularly to the men of the 17th Virginia Regiment, who volunteered from our historic city. We rededicate this monument today to the 97 men of Alexandria who paid the supreme sacrifice in defense of their native State. We rededicate it to those who were wounded and maimed for life. We rededicate it to those who returned and labored for peace, for the Union, and the restoration of our beautiful city. The men whom this monument honors were men who believed that each individual owes something of himself and his talents to his country, to his community, and to local and State government. In rededicating this monument, we would do well to send our children and our grandchildren here that they may emulate their gallantry, sacrifice, and devotion. Only by a study and understanding of the past can we preserve a measure of freedom and justice for the future. Yes, we rededicate this monument and ourselves to the future. May we absorb some of the devotion of these heroes and rededicate our lives to the preservation of our Nation. May we keep it strong militarily, educationally, morally, and spiritually.

Just as on May 24, 1861, our Nation today faces a great crisis. We are threatened as never before in our history since the time of Valley Forge. We are a united people today, but we face a ruthless, determined, and united enemy. These enemies, like Genghis Khan of old, are sweeping without conscience out of the Eurasian Continent aiming

a death blow at our freedoms. This bloody enemy has gained at every turn. By open conquest, by subversion, and by infiltration he marches on to victory after victory. This enemy has won at every summit conference meeting. He enters a conference with a deliberate, calculated intention to lie and deceive. This atheist enemy has made fantastic and unbelievable gains in Asia, the Middle East, the Near East, Central Europe, Africa, Cuba, and Latin America. The United States is literally under the Communist gun today. Our only foreign policy has been the spending of money, appeasement, compromise, and retreat. We are today in a position where we can retreat no further without surrendering our sovereignty and liquidating the hard-won freedoms of our people. We can no longer trust the American dollar to purchase and preserve our American freedom. We can no longer depend on summit conferences, broken promises, and compromise of principle. We must, as a nation, now face reality. We should declare a national emergency, mobilize our total resources, and assume the offensive. The threat of Communist aggression in Cuba can no longer be tolerated. This threat must be eliminated by the Armed Forces of the United States if necessary. The hour is late, the situation critical. We must, enforce the Monroe Doctrine now or we will lose all of South and Central America. With the loss of South and Central America, the Communist pincer movement aimed at the heart of the United States will be complete.

Already Communist missiles and bombers are poised in Siberia ready to strike over the North Pole. With our southern flank exposed and under Communist domination, we could no longer maintain our position as a world power. Our Government must take the lead in fanning the fires of patriotism. We must rekindle the spirit of liberty. The valor and patriotism displayed by both sides in the 1860's are needed in the 1960's. Our freedom depends on the united effort of every American citizen. It will take courage, self-sacrifice, loyalty, and devotion to duty.

Around this monument which stands between the North and the South, we might direct our attention to the great domestic problem which threatens to divide our Nation as we face the common enemy. We cannot defeat communism and totalitarianism by adopting totalitarianism. In the name of fighting communism, the Federal Government is using some of its techniques and some of its arbitrary, blatant powers. Our Nation today is still a union of states, a union of communities, a union of local governments, and a unit of individuals—each State and individual maintaining independent characteristics while bearing allegiance and loyalty to the whole. If we are to survive as a nation, the Federal Government today must respect individual rights, States rights, and long-established community customs and traditions.

The South of today is tolerant. The South of today is making fantastic progress in the field of equal rights and human understanding. The South is not making any effort to impose its traditions and customs and local statutes on other sections of the United States. The South is sponsoring no invasion of other areas of our land. The South respects the right of every community to govern at the local level. The grandsons and granddaughters of the men who wore the blue and gray in the 1860's are not engaged in agitation and destruction of our country today. Their love for this Nation, its Constitution, our individual privileges, and obligations were cemented in that fiery crucible a hundred years ago. This is the time for tolerance, unity, love, and understanding while we face the greatest danger in the history of Western civilization. Those who would invade the privacy of our time-honored, sacred institutions and travel many miles to disobey local and State laws are aiding the enemies of our great country. The agitators who leave their local duties to embark on a program of nationwide unrest and discord are compounding our problems during these critical days. Those who seek to make the United States conform to one pattern of pseudoliberal fascism are paving the way for a dictatorship and totalitarianism. Our Republic is a young Republic. It is still on trial before the eyes of the world. We must not turn our destiny over to the bigots, agitators, and pressure groups boring from within to advance their own selfish ends. Now is the time for all Americans—East, South, North, and West—to place the welfare of our country ahead of personal consideration. Now is the time for all organizations, races, and creeds to rededicate themselves first to the preservation of our Nation. Individual freedom, free local government, and the rights of our States can survive in the space age through a rededication of our allegiance to the faith of the Founding Fathers.

On this sacred ground as we commemorate the glorious deeds of our past may we rededicate and consecrate our lives forever to the freedom and independence of our beloved country. May we say with the late Senator Benjamin Hill of Georgia when he said: "He who saves his country saves all things, and all things saved will bless him. He who lets his country die lets all things die, and all things dying curse him."

Iconoclast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include Senator BARRY GOLDWATER's letter to the Washington Post—Sunday May 28, 1961—included in the RECORD. Senator GOLDWATER answers in a clear and concise manner charges made against him by the same publication.

The article follows:

ICONOCLAST

Speaking of "sleazy smears as silly as they are unfair," reference is made herewith to your editorial of May 20.

Your writer objected to my statement that "it is long past time that we satisfy the American mind about the State Department in view of the number of recent fiascoes." And, of course, in doing so he conveniently neglected the preface I made to that statement wherein I specifically said that "I am not implying that there are Communists in the State Department."

It might have helped if the Washington Post had had a reporter present when I made my remarks to the Arlington Young Republicans—a reporter competent enough to take down an entire statement rather than lifting a quote out of context—but I doubt it. Had my entire statement been reported, you would not have been able to infer that I was attacking the patriotism of State Department personnel, which I certainly was not.

I was intrigued with the Post's reference to "The misjudgments in the executive agencies which have resulted in such serious reverses in the United States of late." What are we supposed to do about these "misjudgments?" Do we ignore them merely because a Senator named McCarthy once attacked the State Department in a manner which the Post will never forgive?

I am interested in knowing just what it would take for the Post to editorially sanction an investigation into how we have been mishandling our international affairs? Do we have to wait until Khrushchev takes over all of Latin America, all of southeast Asia, all of the Middle East? Or do we have to wait until international communism engulfs the United States and the Washington Post is reduced to the last editorial it will ever write under the constitutional freedom guaranteed to the American press?

Does the Post mean to infer that because the State Department is patriotic, it is also infallible; that because it is not ruled by Communist influences, that it should not be investigated?

For some reason which I am at a loss to fathem, the Post is unduly sensitive on the subject of possible investigation of the State Department. I haven't found it equally as touchy about other departments that have come under attack, such as the CIA or the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Why?

It is academic to point out that you are out of step with the American people, who are demanding in a loud voice that our disastrous foreign policy be investigated from top to bottom. If your editorial writers would step out of their ivory white towers and get out of Washington for a time, I suggest they would find out that the people are sick to death of a steady diet of fiascoes which began at Yalta and paced the loss of Poland, China, and other important areas of the world—fiascoes which reduced victory to defeat in Korea, allowed Nasser to rise in the Middle East, made a mess of things in Laos, excused the rise of Castro's Communist regime on our doorstep and botched the Cuban invasion attempt.

No amount of Post editorializing to the effect that the State Department's role in these disasters was patriotically motivated will wipe them out or excuse them in the minds of the American people. The role of the State Department has been, at the very best, sophomoric and naive at the most critical time in our history. It deserves to be looked into thoroughly and competently.

BARRY GOLDWATER,
Senator from Arizona.

WASHINGTON.

Birthday Greetings to President Kennedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of President Kennedy's 44th birthday, I am happy to join with millions of well-wishers in this country and abroad to extend felicitations and warmest greetings to our Chief Executive. With it go my sincerest wishes that the year ahead may prove to be a year of great achievement for him and for our Nation.

It is said that every period of crisis in the Nation's history brings forth its men of great vision and ability. We are fortunate indeed to have a man of the vision and stature of President Kennedy to lead our people at this crucial period in human affairs. I feel certain that under his leadership and guidance we

can look forward to the future with courage and determination that our national goals will be achieved.

On the eve of his departure for Europe, where he is to meet with the great French statesman General de Gaulle, with Soviet Premier Khrushchev and others, we wish him godspeed and success in his endeavors in behalf of world peace. Together with these wishes, go our assurances that the American people are united behind him and fully support him in these efforts. Millions in this country will be praying for his success.

It is perhaps coincidental, but nevertheless momentous, that this mission to Europe should begin on his 44th birthday. Not many men in all of history, in all nations, have reached the pinnacle of leadership of a great nation at the age of 44. President Kennedy has emerged on the world scene as the leader of the greatest and the most powerful nation of all times at this relatively young age, and that is due to his great leadership, his ability, his understanding of world problems, and his unceasing desire to make this world a safer and a happier place for all mankind.

May the good Lord bless him and his family with many years of good health. May we be privileged to benefit of his able leadership and wise counsel in the years ahead, and may he succeed in leading our Nation from strength to strength. Let us hope that America, under President Kennedy, and the whole world, will truly enjoy genuine peace and cooperation for the welfare of all of humanity.

The Alabama Incidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the incidents which recently took place in the State of Alabama painfully reminded all of us of the vast distance we have yet to travel in quest of our goal of freedom under law. The howl of the mob in Montgomery has echoed in the homes and schools and workplaces of millions who hold liberty and justice dear. And the sound came as a strange, alien noise to minds who have long believed that we, in America, had achieved our lofty goal. I hope the millions who heard will never again drug themselves into complacency with the comforting but wholly wrong thought that "it can't happen here." It has happened here. It matters little if it was only for 1 hour, 2 hours, a day, or a night; terror walked a section of our country with the arrogance of a booted S.S. trooper. Innocent people—citizens of the United States—were beaten, punished almost to their deaths while local authority stood by and did nothing. They were not even offered the protection given a criminal when he is arrested.

I speak not as a Representative from Connecticut, but as an American. I love this land and I love its people—North and South. But I am aware that, in the past, Americans who express concern with events in the South are attacked as interlopers lacking in understanding—as if they were not Americans but alien subverters of our Republic. Therefore, let the people of Alabama describe what happened. The following words are from an editorial of the Birmingham News as reprinted in the Washington Post of May 20:

> The city of Birmingham is normally a peaceful, orderly place in which people are safe. Harrison Salisbury of the New York Times last year came to Birmingham and wrote two articles about us which said, in substance, that fear and hatred stalked our streets.
>
> The Birmingham News and others promptly challenged this assertion. The News knows Birmingham people, as others know them, and they didn't fit this definition. But yesterday, Sunday, May 14, was a day which ought to be burned into Birmingham's conscience.
>
> Fear and hatred did stalk Birmingham's streets yesterday.
>
> Fear and hatred stalked the sidewalks around the Greyhound bus terminal directly across the street from Birmingham's city hall. Fear and hatred rode around in a dozen or more automobiles loaded with men, some of whom may have been from Birmingham, others of whom positively were from other counties. License plates gave them away.
>
> In the whole general area of the city hall and the Greyhound bus terminal especially, police cars roved, in some numbers. Uniformed men were visible. Something was up. What was up was the advance on Birmingham of a group of Negroes and some whites who gave themselves the title "freedom riders."
>
> But yesterday hoodlums took over a section of Birmingham. They clustered in small groups, they drove around in cars, they all but swaggered. They were not afraid, they were sure of themselves, they knew about the freedom riders and the buses they were supposed to come in on, and they had the place staked out—both the Greyhound bus terminal and, a bit more than two blocks away, the Trailways bus terminal.
>
> Others knew this situation existed. Commissioner Eugene Connor apparently knew it. He was on duty at city hall. There were squad cars operating in the area—an area of several square blocks embracing the city hall, the Greyhound and Trailways terminals.
>
> At the Trailways terminal yesterday afternoon, with the condition above prevailing, a bus pulled in and all but in an instant a Negro was being beaten, his trousers almost torn off, a white man being beaten by a hoodlum who repeatedly smashed his face with his fist, and a Birmingham Post-Herald photographer was being pummeled by a group of white men, one of whom had a heavy instrument in a brown paper bag.
>
> But this wasn't all. The police were not visibly on hand when the Trailways terminal beatings took place. The police were not on hand when the radio-TV man was attacked. And the city hall, with police presumably on the alert, was some two blocks away.
>
> The Birmingham police department under Mr. Connor did not do what could have been done Sunday. The Birmingham News charges that the very men who did these beatings, who smashed to the concrete and kicked and battered a Post-Herald photographer, who ripped film from two cameras of the News, who in broad daylight bashed in two windows of a radio-TV news station wagon, up to an hour or more later were plainly visible, still carrying on their vicious patrol in the whole area and particularly in the Greyhound bus terminal area.
>
> Yesterday afternoon fear and hatred were on Birmingham streets. The precise location of such condition was on 19th Street between the Trailways terminal at Fourth Avenue and the Greyhound terminal at Seventh Avenue. The people, and their police, permitted that fear and hate to ride our streets.
>
> It was a rotten day for Birmingham and Alabama.

The News' condemnation of police inaction in Birmingham had little effect against the organized indifference of the Alabama government officials. The hoodlums struck again in Montgomery, the capital of the State, and law and order was again prostituted. A nation was shocked; national prestige was shamed; and the President was forced to do what Alabama authority would not do—restore peace, order, and justice under our laws. It is ironic that the very people who speak the strongest for the States right to govern are the first to shun the responsibilities that go with the right.

The Birmingham Post-Herald commented:

> The police in both cities (Birmingham and Montgomery) could have prevented the rioting or quelled it before it got out of hand. Their failure to be on the job, in uniform and in force, gave open invitation to the mob to take over. * * * Such failure (at Montgomery) left the President no choice but to dispatch Federal marshals to prevent further violence. * * * Let us not yield to the temptation to say "they got what was coming to them" and then minimize in our own minds the seriousness of the situation.

And the Birmingham News, the Cassandra who had warned of the coming storm, said:

> We, the people, asked for it. * * * As we wail in our anguish let us not forget it. We, the people, let the Governor of the great State of Alabama, John Patterson, talk for months in a manner that could easily say to the violent, the intemperate * * * that they were free to do as they pleased when it came to the hatred integrationists. We, the people, have let gangs of vicious men ride this State now for months. They (the marshals) are coming because we did not do our duty to ourselves and our proud State.

I am from the State of Connecticut, and I am also an American; and, though the News speaks of events in Alabama, I believe the term "we, the people" can also refer to "we, the people of America." For we, of the North and West, shared the slumber of the Alabama citizens. For too long we have, all of us, laid aside our efforts to "form a more perfect union, establish justice."

A year ago, Walter Lippmann wrote:

> The critical weakness of our society is that for the time being our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve. The public mood of the country is defensive, to hold on and to conserve, not to push forward and to create. We talk about ourselves as if we were a completed society, one which has achieved its purposes and has no further great business to transact.

I hope the alarm sounded by the riots in Alabama has aroused the entire Na-

tion to resume the unfinished task of perfecting our democracy. We have great things yet to do. We have schools to build, slums to clear, diseases to conquer, an enemy to resist, a universe to explore, and we cannot do these things working apart. These are giant and noble tasks and to accomplish them requires the strength of body and mind of all our people. And the talents and abilities of no one should be refused because of the color of his skin or the credo of his choice. We must, again, set out to prove to the world that brotherhood is not so wild a dream as those who profit by postponing it would have us believe.

We of the North and West do not judge the South. We need the help of the South to pursue our national goals. Therefore, we offer our arm to law-abiding citizens in the South who wish to join us in this great adventure, and we do fervently pray that such an offer will be accepted soon and by a multitude.

The voice of reason in the South is a quiet voice and perhaps we in other areas find it difficult to hear over the din of the mobs. But, the supporters of law and order and decency in the South should take note of the thunder out of Birmingham and speak up with a louder voice if they want us to hear and understand.

Ralph McGill, former editor of the Atlanta Constitution, when analyzing the school desegregation problem, found that a very large part of the current difficulty is due to the failure of southern political leadership to prepare its constituency for the changes that were coming. Former Governor McKeldin, of Maryland, noted Mr. McGill's remarks and commented that:

> Political leadership includes more than men in office and candidates for office, avowed and unavowed. Political leadership includes all persons with an appreciable influence on public opinion. Many of the most effective are not party leaders at all, but commercial and industrial leaders, educators, and professional men, especially the clergy.

We in the North are concerned; we are worried for the welfare of our Nation and all of its people. We strain our hearing for the voice of reason in the South. We look for the men of whom Governor McKeldin and Mr. McGill speak to exercise leadership, to help the southern people meet their future; we look for the men who will answer the racists, the terrorists, and the political know-nothings who lend legitimacy to violence and defenses for the mob.

We of the North are waiting for the words of responsible commercial and industrial leaders, the trade-union officials, the educators, the clergy in Alabama. The voice of responsibility, of progress must be louder in the future than it was in the past if it is to be heard above the raucous din encouraged by men like Governor Patterson.

The southern people are being cheated of their right to join with the rest of this Nation and progress. Why are so many spokesmen for the South allowed to deceive the southern people; why do they tell them that the law can be evaded, that the Constitution is a nullity; why do they tell them the will of the majority of the American people, as expressed through their National Government, can be ignored when it cannot be? Why do they preach respect for their own personal views of the law rather than for the established law itself? And when will new leaders arise to tell the southern people the truth and prepare them for the changes that are coming?

Just last year one of our distinguished former colleagues, a man whose friendship I value, Representative Erwin Mitchell, of Georgia, addressed the Seventh District Democratic Executive Committee in Rome, Ga., and he called upon the committee to join with other sections of our Nation in progressing toward greater material and spiritual wealth.

I am afraid—

The Congressman said—

> that by and large our leadership has been guilty of too much tradition and not enough vision. This is the age of rockets and nuclear power. * * * We must come of age politically. We must elect men to office who have a full consciousness of America's great reservoir of progress that is waiting to be tapped. While we should continue to treasure the past and gain experience from it, we should no longer live in it. We must have leaders that are living in the present and looking to the tomorrow.

Last year, too, Mayor William B. Hartsfield, of Atlanta, Ga., speaking at Notre Dame about the problems of school desegregation, said:

> Our chief trouble is that the best element of our State, and, indeed, of the South, has been largely silent, while the demagogs have been making political hay for many years. Therefore, we have thousands of our people who have been impressed by these demagogic arguments and their thinking must be changed. * * * They think that if they will just hold out and continue fighting, that in some way they are going to be successful in defying the highest Court in the land.

These times are crucial times for our Republic. Our way of government is being put to the extreme test by totalitarian governments throughout the world. We cannot tolerate the luxury of demagogs preaching nullification in our midst. We in the North and West are concerned, and we search, with anxiety, for the men of the South who will lead her people back into the mainstream of American life.

The words of a great Representative from the South, spoken in this very Chamber in 1874, should echo here again today.

It is time—

Said Lucius Lamar, of Mississippi—

> for a public man to try to serve the South, and not to subserve her irritated feelings.

When such a public man stands up and urges the southern people to rise out of their enslavement to blind prejudice and progress together with us toward the bright tomorrows charted by the forefathers of our Nation; when southern men of vision work to break the chains that hold the South in bondage to the past, they will have the sympathetic ear of all the good people of Connecticut and the gratitude of a nation.

A Well-Deserved Tribute to Sam Nocella

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to be able to rejoice with those persons who are successful in life and attain a high goal in their chosen fields. It is a greater pleasure, however, to be able to pay tribute to those who started at the lowest rung of the ladder and have succeeded in reaching the top. This is the case of Sam Nocella, a Baltimorean, who has been elected to the general executive board, the highest council of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

On May 20 it was my privilege to attend a testimonial dinner in his honor sponsored by the Baltimore regional joint board of that organization. On that occasion, many prominent civic and labor leaders were present. Among them were Tommy D'Alesandro, former mayor of Baltimore and now a member of the Federal Renegotiation Board; Rev. C. Lewis Robson, pastor of St. John's Methodist Church, Jacob Potofsky, and Hyman Blumberg, general president and executive vice president, respectively, of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America; and Miss Angela Bambace and Miss Sarah Barron, two Baltimoreans who have done an exceptionally fine job in their respective organizations.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to insert excerpts from the address made on that occasion by Mr. Potofsky:

> I am glad to be here tonight and to see so many employers join us in paying tribute to Sam Nocella on the occasion of his election to the general executive board. It speaks well for our labor-management relations.
>
> On behalf of the general officers and members of the general executive board I am happy to congratulate and to welcome Sam Nocella to the highest council of the Amalgamated—the general executive board.
>
> Sam served a long apprenticeship in our organization, beginning with Philadelphia where he hails from; then Easton, Pa., Red Bank, N.J., and finally Maryland, Virginia, and Pennsylvania joint board—now merging with the Baltimore joint board.
>
> This merger is a natural one. Baltimore has an honored place in the history of the Amalgamated, not only because it produced Dorothy Bellanca and Hymie Blumberg, who have done so much to advance the growth and prestige of our union, but principally because of the historic battles that took place in this city in the beginning of our history.
>
> One of the most historic of these strikes took place at the very birth of the Amalgamated in December 1914. A later struggle took place with the IWW which had joined hands with the old UGW. Those were bitter and bloody battles where the destiny of the Amalgamated was shaped.
>
> So the merger of the 46-year-old history-laden joint board of Baltimore with the comparatively young joint board comprising the Greif and Schoeneman workers not only is natural but is most desirable.
>
> In Sam Nocella, who will now head the combined joint board, we have an able, dynamic leader, experienced, dedicated to the

cause of the Amalgamated and the labor movement.

Sam represents the younger generation that is steeped in the tradition and ideals of our organization but young enough to fight vigorously for the translation of our ideals and dreams into reality. He is community minded. He is industry minded. He has learned to have a sense of responsibility and dedicated service to our membership.

Sam knows the trade. Under the tutelage of Hymie Blumberg these past few years Sam was an apt pupil. He is now well trained and able to assume the leadership of our vast membership in this area.

I am glad to note that since the merger we have organized the workers of H. L. Hartz—a good beginning. I am confident that before long there will be a 100-percent unionization in this area of all who come under our jurisdiction.

On this happy occasion I should like to take a few minutes to discuss with you not the past but the future, the challenge our Nation and the labor movement and the world is facing in the forthcoming sixties—automation, unemployment, a troubled world in a space age. Will we have the courage, the inner strength to face these challenges to our system, our way of life, and our security?

To be able to face our problems abroad we must first make sure that our problems at home are handled properly. If we have unemployment and distressed areas at home, if we have discrimination and riots in Alabama, our world has so shrunk that there are immediate repercussions abroad.

To do the job will require a strong government with a heart. Fortunately, we now have positive national leadership. In President Kennedy, whom our union helped to elect, we have a strong man at the helm of the ship of state. He has moved vigorously with Executive orders and congressional recommendations in his first few months in office to reverse the trend of recession. He moved on civil rights and equality of opportunity in hiring by establishing a special committee presided over by the Vice President.

Nothing rights itself by itself. Something needs to be done. The Government is the only agency which can do things in a big way. In these first few months the new administration has been moving in the right direction.

One of our most serious problems is that of unemployment—chronic unemployment that comes from automation. The administration recommended and Congress adopted a law to extend unemployment benefits beyond 26 weeks. The President recommended and Congress passed distressed area legislation providing $395 million for this purpose. The $1.25 minimum wage and extended coverage was passed. We in the Amalgamated have a special interest in minimum wage legislation because it will bring greater stability to our industries.

Still pending is legislation on aid to education, housing, and medical care for the aged through social security.

We have to do something to provide jobs for the young people who will be joining the labor movement. This amounts to 13 million jobs in the next 10 years. To provide jobs we must accelerate growth through public works, housing, school construction, new hospitals, roadbuilding. Growth is the only tangible answer. I have faith in the administration of President Kennedy and the men around him. I have faith in the future of our country and our system of government.

We must be strong militarily, ready for any emergency that may come. But that is not all. We must not throw our weight around but rather our abundance, not as charity but as self-help. It is the minds and hearts of the men and women we must reach both at home and abroad.

We can reach them by being good neighbors, by understanding their problems and being as helpful and friendly as we can. That is the meaning and purpose of the Peace Corps the President has proposed. It is the 1961 point 4.

In conclusion, once again congratulations to Sam Nocella. Best wishes for the success of the new merged joint board. In unity there is strength.

Let us harmoniously work together for the good of our union, the progress of our country, and the peace of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I was also privileged to say a few words on this auspicious occasion, which I am inserting:

Mr. Chairman; Reverend Robson; Tommy D'Alesandro; President Potofsky; Executive Vice President Blumberg; our esteemed guest of honor, Sam Nocella; officials of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, regional and local; other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, when President Kennedy spoke before the Canadian Parliament several days ago, he began his address with these words: "I feel that I am truly among friends."

Because of my long and close association with the Amalgamated Clothing Workers, I respectfully borrow the President's text and paraphrase just a bit and say: "I know that I am truly among friends."

Tonight, all of us associated with the great cause of labor, rejoice that one who has devoted practically his entire life's work to the industry, and in the service of the union is being accorded this deserved recognition on the occasion of his election to the general executive board of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Most of you are already familiar with Sam Nocella's outstanding record of success, and noteworthy achievements, since his first association with the men's apparel industry at the age of 9, when he served as an apprentice to a tailor. In 1919, and during the succeeding years, Sam demonstrated that he had the ability, the character, the warmth, and the know-how that enabled him to climb the ladder of responsibility that brought him to higher offices, and to membership on the general executive board for which we salute him tonight.

Sam, as a Member of Congress, and personally, I extend heartiest congratulations, and warmest greetings on this important occasion in your life. May God bless you and wife and guide you in the performance of the duties and responsibilities which are yours, for your actions will, directly and indirectly, affect the welfare and well-being of thousands of your coworkers, and their families, and the economy of our city, State, and Nation.

To the members of the labor family present here tonight, I would like to report that I have given my wholehearted support to the President's program which represents commendable, positive acts, on behalf of human and public needs. Those of us identified with the Democratic Party, have always fought for the protection of workers, and the improvement of their working and living conditions. The present administration is not unmindful of this responsibility.

All that we ask, is that we continue to be entrusted to recognize the human rights of the worker, his essential economic value and his struggle to share in the prosperity which could not exist without him. We solemnly pledge our efforts toward the fulfillment of this obligation.

On the subject of world affairs, all of us are aware that we are living during times when there is international tension challenging us at every front. Great decisions must be made, and we must keep ever alert to the dangers which would destroy our way of life.

As each day seems to bring crisis upon crisis, let us keep united, and strong in support of our President, and those charged with the responsibility of guiding the affairs and destiny of our Nation.

If sacrifices are required, and they will be required, let us make them willingly. I am sure labor will not be found wanting in this regard.

We must translate to reality, the precepts President Kennedy included in his inaugural address when he said:

"And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country" and "Let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing, and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own."

Our country's cause is labor's cause; and we tell the world that we are dedicated to the cause of seeing that the dignity of man and his basic rights are inviolable.

In conclusion, I thank you for affording me the opportunity and pleasure of joining with you in this tribute to Sam Nocella, and I express the hope that the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America will enjoy many more years of continued success.

Unity Among Postal Clerk Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the problems of public employees have commanded very special attention from me ever since my tenure of office as mayor of my home city in Omaha. Just as now in my assignment to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have a constant and primary concern for the problems of Federal employees, so too during my terms as mayor of Omaha I was deeply interested in the problems of the employees of the city of Omaha. As a result of long associations and strong friendships, I am delighted by a movement which must result in greater amity and concord among organizations speaking for post office clerks.

The National Federation of Post Office Clerks, the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen, and the United Postal Workers have already combined to form the United Federation of Post Office Clerks. The National Postal Transport Association is ready to join the combined movement and will do so provided that the membership of the National Postal Transport Association gives its consent in a referendum ballot which is to be counted on June 30, 1961.

When the National Postal Transport Association joins the combined group, the name will become the United Federation of Postal Clerks and the change will commemorate the marriage of two great organizations both of which hold charters in the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

The benefits of the amalgamation will be apparent immediately to all postal clerks and in a little while other postal and Federal employees and even Members of Congress will see the improvements resulting from the change.

The amalgamation in no way constitutes an infringement upon or a hazard to congressional relations. All of us here in the Congress of the United States have had very wholesome relations with President E. C. Hallbeck of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks who will head the combined union. We remember him best as legislative director of his union in the days before he rose to the presidency. Now we are familiar with John O'Connor who has succeeded Mr. Hallbeck as legislative director of the combined organization. Mr. Hallbeck and I have had especially warm relations in view of the fact that a brother of Mr. Hallbeck is a resident of the city of Omaha. Similarly, we are familiar with Mr. Joseph Thomas who was president of the United National Association of Post Office Craftsmen and who now assumes the position of director of organization in the combined organization.

I personally am most intimately familiar with Paul A. Nagle, who is president of the National Postal Transport Association and who is slated to become the administrative vice president of the combined union.

I got to know Paul Nagle before I became a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. In fact, even before having left Omaha to come to Washington to take my congressional seat, I talked with Mr. Adolph Dudycha who was then president of the Omaha branch of the National Postal Transport Association and Mr. Clinton Gross who is the associate national vice president of the National Postal Transport Association for the area which includes Omaha. These gentlemen have been truly gentlemanly all the time under every circumstance.

There have been times when I found it necessary to challenge the postal administration of my own Republican Party during the Eisenhower administration. On July 2, 1960, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 12595, a bill bearing my name, which directed the Postmaster General to cease and desist from his experiment in transporting ordinary first-class mail by air. The membership of the National Postal Transport Association comprises the group of postal employees which would be most adversely affected by any expansion of the so-called airlift. The present administration has said that no expansion is planned and that there may be a regrouping of segments currently in operation. My own position has remained the same. I can still see no congressional authorization for the operation, and I feel that the atmosphere should be cleared by congressional action of one type or another.

In my considered judgment the amalgamation of the postal employee organizations into one group will insure far greater job protection than would otherwise be available to the postal employees who perform service in the railway post office trains and in highway post office vehicles.

There have been other situations in which I have found it necessary to support the policy of the previous administration and to differ with Mr. Nagle and his group. Whether in difference or in agreement, we have always had the most wholesome relations and I know that postal employees everywhere will prosper if as a result of the amalgamation, this man is given a deeper and broader voice with which to plead for the welfare of the people for whom he is spokesman.

Another group of people will benefit by the combination of the postal clerks' organizations, even though they are no longer in Federal service. I am referring to the great body of retired civil servants. Mr. Nagle's group includes a substantial percentage of retired people and no one works more ardently on legislation affecting retirees than does Mr. Nagle. Consequently it can be said very directly that retirees that are not directly involved by the merger will nevertheless reap a harvest of benefits enabling their leaders to speak with more resonant voices.

We are on the threshold of a new and exciting chapter of postal employee relations. I am grateful for the opportunity to be so close an observer of the changes which are underway and which constitute a definite force for good.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 27, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 27, 1961.

The Cuban situation is getting worse by the hour. We now know the invasion attempt we denied planning was U.S. directed and failed because of our last minute withdrawal of promised air support. "At least five departments or agencies of the U.S. Government were in on the venture into Cuba, including the White House. Stories deliberately fed out to center blame on the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff were an effort to clear skirts in other directions. Military chiefs then were ordered not to talk."—U.S. News & World Report, May 29.

Earlier the President, and Adlai Stevenson in the United Nations, had denied U.S. participation in Cuban invasion plans. Then the President assured the world that we would free Cuba from communism. Although he is being counseled simultaneously to appease the Communists and to get tough, the President thus far has gone no further than to talk tough. Many in Washington, including me, still shocked at the thought of even contemplating acquiescence to Castro's blackmail effort to trade human beings for freedom, were appalled to learn that the Reuther-Roosevelt-Eisenhower committee was originated by President Kennedy. This clearly violates the law, the Logan Act, even as it violates basic morality. Further, our own partial trade embargo prohibits our shipping tractors or bulldozers. The implied admission of weakness on our part by such action will multiply the danger far beyond the lives of these prisoners. Indeed, the cost in lives later to free Cuba from communism may outnumber many times the number of prisoners now involved.

With world crises erupting so rapidly, our lack of clear foreign policy is bewildering and presents contradictions. The Vice President learned on his trip that Asian nations are unsure of the United States. Either the United States must take a firm stand or these nations will head toward communism. Even as President Kennedy says, "The United States is prepared to make any sacrifice or risk any danger necessary to block the spread of communism," we failed to support those fighting to free Cuba and indicated that we are not willing to make any sacrifice or risk any danger to block the spread of communism only 90 miles from our coast. At the same time we take a licking at Geneva when our allies won't support us. Then President Kennedy, contrary to all statements during the campaign and up to the present, indicates he will meet with Khrushchev, regardless of any precedent or development to cause reason for hope. On the contrary, every development shows that Khrushchev is fomenting trouble throughout the world. The deck is stacked against the President. Talk and debate doesn't work with Khrushchev who uses dishonesty and lies as his tools to beguile and fool. We desperately need some firm action—a blockade of Cuba would be a good start. Then we should draw a line with Russia and move in our Navy and military weapons ready to back up the tough talk. Firm action alone now can save us from world war III. Our present policy of drift and indecision is toward national suicide.

The freedom riders and the resulting riots should teach us some lessons: (1) When local law enforcement fails the Federal Government moves in; (2) Federal Government can always unilaterally take the law into its own hands; (3) those looking for trouble will find it. Intemperate do-gooders can hurt the cause of integration.

Walter Heller, President Kennedy's top economic adviser, may be pushing us backward to the inflationary practices of Federal intervention in our economy as practiced by the Truman administration. According to Heller, because of the allegedly slow rate of economic growth from 1953 through 1960, the United States faces a persistent economic slack. It follows that Government spending and other measures must take up that slack for the Nation to realize its potential growth. Taking a closer look at the statistical underpinnings of this theory, we find the Government's part of the gross national product from 1947–53 (which included the Korean war) went from $54.6 billion to $102 billion. Interestingly enough, the gross private domestic investment category of the gross national product went up from $50 billion in 1947 to over $70 billion in 1959. As for personal consumption expenditures, they rose more in the 1953–59 period than in the 1947–53 era. We had at least three times as much inflation from 1947 to 1953, so that actual growth was that much larger in the 1953–59 period. A return to the Truman inflationary period is what we are being offered. This same formula was offered Germany by some of these same economists, but the advice was spurned and West Germany has prospered beyond all expectations. Our real choice is between sound economic growth based on private enterprise and risk capital or vast, inflationary Government expansion with no firm foundation.

In the tax hearings before my Ways and Means Committee, I was able to strike a blow for the elimination of double taxation of corporations by suggesting that now is the time to stop taxing corporate income that is distributed to stockholders. The stockholders can be taxed upon their receipts. Retained earnings of both corporations and cooperatives could be taxed should distribution not be made to the stockholders or shareholders.

Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join in support of the resolution to establish a Special House Committee on Captive Nations, which is being sponsored by our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the Honorable DANIEL J. FLOOD. The resolution is now pending before the House Rules Committee, which held hearings on it recently. I trust the committee will act speedily and favorably on the measure.

I believe that it is in our national interest to provide every possible help and moral encouragement to the captive nations in their struggle to regain their national freedom, independence, and human dignity. We must give heart to these enslaved peoples by showing that they have not been forgotten during this black period in world affairs when they are enduring great mental and physical suffering. We must also provide all possible hope to them for their future survival, as nations and as individuals, so that they can reestablish and rehabilitate their national life and culture.

The peoples of the captive nations are today silenced peoples, unable to speak their minds, unable to practice their religious beliefs, and unable to live as free human beings. Their indomitable will for freedom, however, has not been crushed. They may be silent and grim today, but they are waiting patiently and hopefully for tomorrow. This patience and hope must be kept alive under all circumstances. To give up hope, to lose courage, means to lose everything.

The captive nations constitute a great symbol of mankind's struggle against its most ruthless enemy, international communism, which is seeking to subjugate and enslave all of humanity. By encouraging and aiding the captive nations to continue their gallant struggle in the face of the most difficult odds, we are maintaining and building up a great reservoir of dissatisfaction and resentment within the iron curtain countries which may some day be of invaluable help to the free world. The creation of a committee as advocated in House Resolution 211 would render great assistance to the captive nations and would serve as a powerful weapon in our hands against communism.

Needed: Greater U.S. Voluntary Mobilization Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the free world, if it is to defeat communism's efforts to conquer the world, needs to more effectively mobilize its manpower and resources.

As a leader of the free world, we have a special responsibility and challenge. Uncle Sam, of course, plays the major role in designing and executing policies to meet the Red threat to security and progress.

However, I believe that a large majority of our citizens stand ready and willing to extend more time, energy, and resources to supporting the efforts of our Nation.

Yesterday, I was privileged to make some suggestions as to how this can be done more effectively in a radio address over radio station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have the excerpts from this address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Day by day, history is being written. The tireless hand will record how well—or how poorly—we shape the events of our time and meet the challenges.

The times require that we mobilize adequately and swiftly the resources of the free world.

In this space-missile-jet-nuclear age, however, we need a Paul Revere: to gallop through the towns and countrysides of the free world; to awaken the people with the warning cry: "The Reds are Coming." How? By land and sea and air. By day and by night. Through every inroad and opening in the frontier outposts of the free world.

Despite long years of threats—and vast expansion of the Communist empire—are we really yet awake to the challenge? No. For too many Americans, communism is a thing to fight from the armchair, hurling epithets from the launching pad of the lower jaw.

Look around us. Who do we—you and I—know that is really doing anything about the threat of communism? Who is tightening his belt; working on ideas to combat this evil; dedicating more of his resources to the perpetuating of freedom and the spread of its ideas and ideals?

How many can you find? Yes, a few—but far too few.

How, then, can we—we, as patriotic Americans—do something about this grave threat to our security and progress?

By the following ways:

First, we must discard the idea that Uncle Sam, alone, can carry the fight against the Reds.

Then, we must mobilize our resources—individually and collectively—to throw the necessary brainpower, manpower, and resources into the battle against the Communists. Historically, one of the great strengths of America is the voluntary will to fight, sacrifice, and work to build a good life under a free flag, and to protect our country from its enemies.

Second, our civic, veteran, social, cultural, and, yes, religious and other organizations can—and should—reexamine the potential ways in which they might serve our national cause more effectively.

Third, we need to more greatly utilize the know-how and technology of free enterprise—for selling the ideas and ideals of freedom. This includes more effective utilization of U.S. firms operating overseas as built-in Voices of America.

Fourth, labor, also—sharing a common bond with workers around the globe—possesses an unparalleled opportunity to demonstrate how workers benefit under a free system; and how free collective bargaining can serve not only the worker but strengthen a nation.

Fifth, the creative minds—artists, writers, poets, musicians, dramatists—have a great opportunity to portray the spirit of a free people in their dedicated relentless effort to create a better life for themselves and humanity.

In addition to encouraging greater voluntary effort by our people, I believe we must also examine national policies to provide opportunity for the willing to more effectively serve their country.

This, then, is a fight for all of us. As a people, we must pool our resources, reinvigorate our patriotic spirit; and weld together our efforts and purposes in a common cause; that of survival of ourselves, of our ideals, and of freedom.

It is a time for greatness, for bravery, and for alertness.

One Hundredth Anniversary of the Unification of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, while June 2 will mark the 15th anniversary of the founding of the democratic Republic of Italy, the Italian nation, and the rest of the free world, will celebrate the gathering of the first Italian Parliament in 1861. This Parliament proclaimed the Kingdom of Italy, a number of independent states, now welded into one nation. The hopes and longing of seven centuries of Italians for unity and freedom were beginning to be fulfilled.

Influential as were the smaller independent states, the union of them into one nation increased their stature in world affairs.

It has been said, and rightly so, that the grandeur that was Rome is the glory that is Italy today. But this glory was not achieved overnight, as a result of the unification. Many major problems had to be settled: the question of authority between the church and the Government; the wide economic gap between the overpopulation among the poor farmers of the south and the wealthier, educated Italians of the industrial north, to name but a few.

The entrance of Italy into World War I was against the wishes of the majority of the people, and the close of the war and the years following found the nation in a social and economic upheaval. Retrogression of democratic principles under the Fascist regime was to be expected,

and participation in World War II left the country in a deplorable condition.

Since the close of World War II, Italy has made great strides in a closer unification of north and south, a more equitable distribution of the economic improvements; a modern nation in every sense of the word. Much of this improvement can be attributed to American aid. However, much remains to be done to bring about a stable political situation and continued economic growth. With continued help and understanding, I believe we will see rapid strides toward these goals.

The Italians who emigrated to the United States have contributed greatly to our culture, our economy, and our own national growth, and many have achieved positions of distinction and honor. It is, therefore a pleasure to join with them and the Italian nation in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the unification of Italy. We wish for that country a long, peaceful period, so that their progress may continue its rapid upward growth, and they may thus strengthen the free, democratic world.

Tribute to Julius I. Kislak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 29, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome Julius I. Kislak and his organization to the 10th Congressional District.

Mr. Kislak, a dynamic septuagenarian, has been contributing to the growth of New Jersey for 55 years as the head of J. I. Kislak, Inc., the State's largest real estate, mortgage banking, and insurance firm.

His move to 581 Broad Street in Newark—after 55 years in Hudson County—is significant. It is indicative of the resurgence of downtown Newark and the desire of big business in our State to use Newark as a home base.

Like Newark—and the rest of the 10th Congressional District—the Kislak organization is growing. And I am happy that Mr. Kislak has chosen to become a partner in this growth.

I feel that his personal ability, augmented by the hard-driving organization of more than 300 persons, will become a forceful arm in the social and economic betterment of my district and State.

We expect this from J. I., because Mr. Kislak is not the average person by any means. His exceptional real estate accomplishments have been hard won.

Mr. Kislak began his career in the home of his parents at 406 Clinton Street, Hoboken. There, in 1904, Mr. Kislak got his first taste of the real estate business.

His father was an immigrant of little means. However, he had succeeded in accumulating sufficient funds to purchase a $3,500 house in Hoboken, which he traded for five others.

Then his father took a trip to Palestine and the job of managing these units fell to the young Kislak—and so did the problem of getting new mortgages.

Soon thereafter he obtained a notary public license and then in 1906 hung out his real estate shingle over his doorstep. In 1909 he rented space in the Jersey Observer building in Hoboken.

During World War I, Mr. Kislak served as a sergeant in the Quartermaster Corps, negotiating industrial leases for the U.S. Army.

It was in the mid-1920's that Mr. Kislak moved his offices from River Street in Hoboken to Journal Square, Jersey City.

The Kislak organization, often referred to as the "department store of the real estate business," is active in chain-store leasing, shopping centers, industrial sales and leases, apartment house investments, commercial property sales, property management, homes, appraisals, mortgages and mortgage banking, general insurance and life insurance.

And Mr. Kislak, his voice booming, is still putting in 18-hour days, keeping a firm grasp on the day-to-day operation of his organization.

He is up at 6:30 daily, checking his work-filled attaché case and planning his tomorrows. His mind is sharp and quick to move on an important deal or philanthropic project.

Mr. Kislak is active in the United Jewish Appeal of Essex County, the American Jewish Committee's Institute of Human Relations, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith and the Technion Institute of Israel.

He is a member of the Newark Association of Commerce and Industry, New Jersey Historical Society, New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, and the Jersey City Chamber of Commerce.

I sincerely hope that Mr. Kislak will have many more fruitful and productive years to devote toward his family, his community, and his business.

I am confident that his energy, his talents, and his organization, will be of great benefit to the social and economic betterment of the 10th Congressional District and our great State of New Jersey.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. James A. Payne, Jr., pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Annandale, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty Governor of the Universe, who dost see without distortion and judge without prejudice the motives and deeds of individuals and nations, as the Members of this body seek today to carry out the weighty responsibilities placed upon them by the high privilege of their elected office, enable them to acknowledge honestly before Thee the frailty of all human endeavor, and so to reorient their lives to that true standard of personal character which Thou hast set forth in history that they may conduct the matters before them in accordance with Thy holy will.

Harken to us as we invoke Thy special blessing upon the journey of our President. Augment Thy gifts already bestowed upon him with the gift of Thy spirit, so that, in consultation and cooperation with the leaders of nations both friendly and hostile to our way of life, he may contribute to the easing of international tensions and to the uplifting of the peoples of the world to that state of dignity and personal worth which Thou dost intend for all mankind.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 29, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee and the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on

Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

PEACE CORPS ACT

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES AT LEWIS RESEARCH CENTER, CLEVELAND, OHIO

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, the proposed modification of its facilities at Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

ADVANCES OF PAY TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for advances of pay to members of the armed services in cases of emergency evacuation of military dependents from overseas areas, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON AIR FORCE CONTRACT WITH THE MAGNAVOX CO., FORT WAYNE, IND.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on Department of the Air Force negotiated contract AF 33 (600)—31283 to the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., for ARC–34 communications equipment; to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ADMINISTRATION OF DEPENDENTS' MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of administration of the dependents' medical care program by the Department of the Army, dated May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON BOARD FOR FUNDAMENTAL EDUCATION

A letter from Ross McCord Ice and Miller, Indianapolis, Ind., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Board for Fundamental Education, covering the calendar year ended December 31, 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGE LIMITS IN CONNECTION WITH APPOINTMENTS TO U.S. PARK POLICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT OF BOARD OF ACTUARIES OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF MANPOWER RESOURCES—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the communication from the President of the United States transmitted to the Senate on May 29, 1961, relating to the development and training of manpower resources be printed in the RECORD, together with a letter from the Secretary of Labor and a statement in explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the communication, letter and statement of explanation were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., May 29, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft of a bill designed to carry out the recommendation contained in my message of May 25 to the Congress providing for the training and retraining of several hundred thousand workers in new occupational skills over a 4-year period.

The need for prompt enactment of this legislation is clear. As I stated in my message, this measure is of special importance in abating unemployment and achieving full use of our resources, as well as in meeting the occupational demands of our Nation's expanded defense, space, aid, and trade programs.

The unemployed whose skills have been rendered obsolete by automation and other technological changes must be equipped with new skills enabling them to become productive members of our society once again. The skills of other workers must also be improved to enable them to meet the more demanding requirements of modern industry.

Also enclosed is a letter sent me by the Secretary of Labor describing the legislation more fully, and a memorandum explaining the draft bill in detail. A similar letter is being sent the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 26, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft bill relating to the training and development of the manpower resources of the Nation, and a statement explaining in some detail its purpose and provisions. As you indicated in your message of May 25 to the Congress, this legislation is of the utmost importance in dealing with the problems of unemployment and in meeting the occupational demands of the Nation.

The five titles of the bill are related, each dealing with aspects of the same broad subject matter. The bill as a whole is designed to deal with the problems presented by the large numbers of unemployed workers who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without retraining, as well as the need of the Nation to upgrade the skills of its work force so that it will be qualified for the types of jobs that are and will be available in our highly advanced industrial society.

This bill proposes to deal with these problems through the development of new and accelerated training and retraining programs designed to provide unemployed persons whose skills have become obsolete the opportunity for retraining in skills which are, or will be, in demand in the labor market. On-the-job and related training will be developed through the Department of Labor; vocational education and training through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Since the unemployed whose skills are obsolete are generally unable to undertake a training program without financial assistance, this bill authorizes Federal payment of a minimum level of income, for a maximum period of 52 weeks, to such people while they are undergoing retraining. In addition, Federal payments are authorized to finance the movement of certain unemployed workers and their families who are willing to relocate to other areas of the country where jobs have been offered to them.

Title I will enable the Secretary of Labor to review the national skill development efforts and stimulate public and private actions needed to achieve improved balance between occupational resources and requirements. It will authorize the Department of Labor to make needed studies of the problems created by automation, technological progress, and other changes in the structure of production, as well as methods of encouraging the mobility of labor.

Title II directs the Secretary of Labor to develop and encourage the development of broad and diversified on-the-job and related training and retraining programs, and encourage the development of vocational training programs. Those unemployed persons will be eligible for training under the bill who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without retraining. Other workers will also be eligible who need training and instruction in order to qualify them for the types of jobs that are and will be available in the Nation's industries. To carry out these programs, the Secretary of Labor is directed to provide appropriate methods for the selection of workers for training, for determining the skills for which they should be trained, for referral of the workers for training, and for placement services to them after they have completed their training.

Titles III and IV of the bill generally divide responsibilities for the training programs to be conducted under this bill between the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Primary responsibility for on-the-job and related training programs will rest with the Department of Labor. Primary responsibility for vocational education and training programs will rest with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Detailed provisions governing the manner in which each of the agencies shall operate in their respective spheres are set forth in the bill.

Title V contains general provisions which authorize the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, to use available services or facilities of existing Federal agencies and instrumentalities of

the Federal Government, with their consent and on a reimbursable basis.

You have directed that the present National Vocational Education Acts be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated and recommendations made for improving the programs under those acts. The administration has, therefore, already recommended to the Congress that certain vocational education programs which are about to expire be extended for a temporary period pending the receipt of these recommendations. Similar temporary authority, for a 4-year period, is provided for the programs under this bill.

Yours sincerely,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL RELATING TO THE DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING OF THE MANPOWER RESOURCES OF THE NATION

This bill is designed to provide broad and integrated programs to help workers to adjust to the problems which arise out of automation and technological change and foreign competition, as well as to provide for the effective development and use of the Nation's manpower to meet the skill requirements of the economy.

It is of preeminent importance to achieve maximum levels of employment, production and purchasing power, in accord with the national commitment set out in section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946. To achieve these goals, it is essential that there be rapid technological progress. Automation and other technological advancements are essential developments, necessary if we are to survive in a competitive world. It is the development of improved technology which holds promise for greater productivity, higher wages, and higher standards of living for the workers of this Nation.

The short-term effects of automation and technological change can impair the livelihood of individual displaced workers and can depress the economies of entire communities. The remedy, however, is not to stay the development of an improved technology. Instead, it is to find solutions for the problems which this progress creates for workers.

This bill is designed to provide some of these solutions through the development of new training and retraining programs designed to provide unemployed persons whose skills have become obsolete the opportunity for retraining in skills which are, or will be, in demand in the labor market.

This bill is also designed to permit upgrading of the skills of other workers who will have to acquire higher levels of training and education to meet the more complicated requirements of jobs that are and will be available in our highly advanced industrial society.

The objective of these proposed manpower development and training programs is to strengthen our manpower services and occupational training programs both in classrooms and on the job. They will build on the base of existing Federal-State employment service and vocational training programs and will make available additional Federal resources to supplement and improve these programs so that they may better meet national manpower needs.

Diversified types of training programs will be provided under the direction of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Maximum cooperation of all groups in the community—employers, labor, civic groups, educational institutions and others—will be enlisted in providing the facilities and services needed.

Since the persistently unemployed in need of retraining are unable to undertake a training program without financial assistance, Federal payment of a minimum level of income to trainees from this group is provided. In addition, Federal payments are authorized to finance the movement of certain unemployed workers and their families who are willing to relocate to other areas of the country where jobs are known to be available.

To further the broad training purposes of this bill, title I directs the Secretary of Labor to maintain a continuing overall review of the national skill development effort and to stimulate public and private actions needed to achieve improved balance between occupational resources and requirements as well as accelerated upgrading of skill levels generally.

Title II directs the Secretary of Labor to develop, and encourage the development of, broad and diversified on-the-job and related training and retraining programs, and encourage the development of vocational training programs, designed (1) to qualify for reemployment unemployed persons who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without retraining, and (2) to provide the training and instruction needed to upgrade the skills of other persons in the labor force to qualify them for the types of jobs that are and will be available in the Nation's industries.

To carry out these programs, the Secretary is directed to provide appropriate methods for testing, counseling, and selecting workers for occupational training, for determining the skills for which they should be trained, for referral of the workers for training, and for placement services to them after they have completed their training.

Unemployed workers who cannot secure full-time employment without retraining generally are unable to undertake a training program without financial assistance. Title II, therefore, authorizes Federal payment of a minimum level of income to individuals in this group who are selected to undergo training. This Federal allowance for full-time retraining is not to exceed the average weekly unemployment compensation paid in the State.

The allowance for unemployed individuals undergoing on-the-job training is not to exceed 50 percent of the average weekly unemployment compensation or the amount paid by the employer, whichever is the lesser, and in no case an amount which when added to the hourly wages received from an employer will bring the total weekly compensation to more than $46.

Training for reemployment could be obviated in some cases if an existing skill no longer needed in one area was transported to another. In such circumstances, it seems desirable to increase labor mobility by authorizing the Secretary of Labor to assist individuals involuntarily unemployed for 6 months or more, whose skills, while no longer useful in their present community, could be employed elsewhere, to relocate to other areas of the country where jobs are known to be available to them, by paying 50 percent of the relocation cost. The Secretary will, of course, develop appropriate standards to avoid excessive costs, possible abuses, or unnecessary relocation.

Although priority is to be given the unemployed who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment without retraining, and only this group is to be eligible for Federal allowances for training and relocation, other persons will have access to the training provided. The facilities of the Department of Labor and the training programs operated under this act are to be utilized to the maximum extent possible to help the worker whose skills are not sufficient to enable him to participate fully in the Nation's economy.

Title III of this bill directs the Secretary of Labor to encourage and develop broad on-the-job and related training programs to provide the workers who have been selected for training with the appropriate skills, and to secure the adoption of such programs through the cooperation of appropriate community groups or public or private agencies qualified to conduct such programs. In addition, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to provide such additional on-the-job and related training programs and facilities as he finds necessary.

Title III also specifies certain minimum standards for the operation and content of on-the-job or related training programs and requires the Secretary of Labor to make appropriate provision for continuous supervision of these programs to insure the quality of the training provided. The Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into an agreement with a State or with the appropriate agency of the State providing for the utilization of State services and employees to carry out the functions and duties assigned to him under title III of this bill.

Title IV of the bill directs the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to enter into agreements with the States under which the States will provide the vocational training needed to equip individuals referred by the Secretary of Labor for the occupations specified in the referral. As in title III, although priority in placement for training under title IV will be given to the unemployed, the vocational training programs operated under this title will also be available to other individuals the Secretary refers for the purpose of upgrading their skills.

The vocational training programs of title IV are to be provided through the appropriate State vocational education agencies using public facilities, but if they are not adequate, using private educational or training institutions. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall provide the needed training through public or private institutions if there is no State agreement or the State agency does not provide the training. Agreements entered into between the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the State agencies may provide for payment to the agencies of up to 100 percent of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement with respect to unemployed individuals, and up to 50 percent of the cost with respect to other individuals, and must contain provisions for reports on the attendance and performance of trainees and for continuous supervision of the training programs conducted.

Title V of the bill contains general provisions which authorize the Secretary of Labor, in order to avoid unnecessary expense and duplication of functions among Government agencies, to use the available services or facilities of existing Federal agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, with their consent and on a reimbursable basis, and authorize funds appropriated under the act to be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government.

The President has directed that the present National Vocational Education Acts be thoroughly reviewed and evaluated and recommendations made for improving these programs. The administration has therefore recommended to the Congress that certain vocational education programs which are about to expire be extended for a temporary period pending the receipt of these recommendations. Similarly, temporary authority, for a 4-year period, is requested for

the programs incorporated in titles II through IV of this bill. Titles I and V deal with general authority of a continuing nature and are thus not subject to a time limitation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 25

"Joint resolution relative to extending and expanding the school milk program

"Whereas the health, growth and physical fitness of our school children is a matter of paramount importance to the Nation; and

"Whereas milk is one of the foods most needed by school children for proper health, growth, and physical fitness; and

"Whereas in many areas of the United States children are unable to obtain sufficient milk at home for proper health, growth, and physical fitness; and

"Whereas in recognition of this need on the part of our school children for milk and the inability of many children to obtain sufficient milk, the Government of the United States has instituted and maintained a school milk program; and

"Whereas the school milk program, unless extended, will terminate on June 30 of this year and leave hundreds of thousands of our school children without its many benefits: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to extend and expand the school milk program in order that our school children will continue to receive sufficient milk for their continued health, growth, and physical fitness; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 33

"Joint resolution relative to the stockpiling of food, clothing, and medicines in appropriate areas of California

"Whereas in the event of an outbreak of major hostilities between the United States and an enemy power intent upon our destruction, the primary targets of any enemy would probably include the main centers of population in California and the major military establishments in this State; and

"Whereas for the most part, the stores of food, clothing, and medicines in California are located in or near the main centers of population of the State, the same areas that would in all likelihood be destroyed or contaminated by radioactive fallout, in the event of an attack; and

"Whereas without substantial stores of food, clothing and medicines the citizens of California cannot hope to survive an attack or to assist in the defeat of our enemies; and

"Whereas there are in the several portions of this State vast areas accessible by means of adequate roads and railway facilities, which are located at some distance from any primary target areas, out of the probable fall-out patterns; and

"Whereas the stockpiling of food, clothing, and medicines in these areas would preserve these vital items from destruction or contamination in the event of enemy attack: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to undertake the stockpiling of food, clothing, and medicines in the appropriate areas of this State in order to better prepare our citizens to survive any possible future conflict; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 37

"Joint resolution relative to securing a Nubian temple to be located in California

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the people of the world that the Aswan Dam now being constructed on the Nile River in Egypt will inundate the fabled Nubian Valley; and

"Whereas the world will, upon the completion of this work, lose the priceless treasures of early civilization including such ancient monuments as the Semna Fort (erected 2000 B.C.), Buhen Temple (erected 1500 B.C.), Abu Simbel, Gerf Hussein and Sebua Temples (erected 1300 B.C.); and

"Whereas the United Arab Republic and Sudan have launched into the tremendous task of conservation of the treasures for future generations and have offered them for sale to UNESCO and foreign nations; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, John F. Kennedy, has proposed that the U.S. Government give $10 million for the preservation of these temples; and

"Whereas Lucile Carnes, secretary of the Indio Chamber of Commerce, has initiated a program to secure one of the Nubian temples for location and preservation in Indio, Riverside County, Calif., a climate and surrounding very similar to that found in Egypt and which will lend a great deal of atmosphere and interest to those works of art; and

"Whereas Mr. John A. Wilson of the University of Chicago and executive secretary of the U.S. National Committee for the Preservation of Nubian Monuments, has shown a real interest in this movement and aided the Indio Chamber of Commerce in the project; and

"Whereas Mr. Vittorino Veronese, Director General, UNESCO, now advises that the United Arab Republic is seriously considering the offer of the Indio Chamber of Commerce; and

"Whereas this will offer a rare museum of early civilization and historical interest within our State as a cultural and educational attraction for all people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and the Congress of the United States to provide funds and institute negotiations with the appropriate agencies of the Governments of the United Arab Republic and Sudan, and with the UNESCO to the end that they try to secure for location at Indio, in the State of California, one of the Nubian temples, as a cultural and educational monument in the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 815

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to expand the Veterans' Administration's hospital facilities in the State of Florida

"Whereas there exists, at the present time, an acute shortage of beds and facilities in Veterans' Administration's hospitals in the State of Florida, and

"Whereas the acute shortage of Veterans' Administration's hospital facilities has been occasioned by the lag of new facilities in the State of Florida, behind the average across the United States, and

"Whereas the acute shortage of Veterans' Administration's hospital facilities has been further occasioned by the greatly increased veteran population in the State of Florida during recent years, and

"Whereas the people of the United States, upon learning of the plight of the veterans who so valiantly defended this great country in time of need, will desire the necessary increase of veterans' hospitals and facilities to adequately care for these deserving men: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized and respectfully urged to increase the number of beds and other facilities in the Veterans' Administration's hospitals in the State of Florida;

"That copies of this memorial be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of state of the State of Florida to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House in the U.S. Congress, to each member of the Florida delegation to the Congress of the United States, and to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration; and

"That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the Journal of both the Senate and the House of Representatives."

A resolution adopted by the Republican Committee of One Hundred, Inc. of New York City, N.Y., favoring a reaffirmation that the Monroe Doctrine is as valid and effective today as when first adopted; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Three resolutions adopted by Pennsylvania for America, in Wayne, Pa., relating to Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and the Connally reservation in regard to jurisdiction of the World Court; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A paper in the nature of a petition entitled "Statement of Principles of the Civic Institutions of Puerto Rico," asserting faith in the democratic way of life and government, and so forth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by Pennsylvania for America, in Wayne, Pa., relating to the Federal security agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WATER USES IN MISSOURI BASIN—RESOLUTION OF NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution which was passed by the Nebraska Legislature on May 23, 1961, concerning water uses in the Missouri Basin.

With the enactment of the Flood Control Act of 1944, more commonly known as the Pick-Sloan plan, it was expected

that the water resources of the Missouri River Basin would be developed in accordance with the so-called multiple-purpose concept. This concept recognized that each of the various interests such as flood control, irrigation, navigation, sanitation, domestic consumption and industrial purposes should be served by the waters of the Missouri River and that each is entitled to share in the vast potential of the river basin. These different interests are bound to conflict in certain areas, and Congress wisely foresaw that the Missouri River must be developed according to a coordinated plan in which each water use is considered in the light of the overall benefits to the entire basin.

Through the years since 1944 the multiple-purpose concept has been followed with substantial progress and benefits. However, in recent months certain groups in the Upper Missouri Valley have contended that the production of hydroelectric power should be given a priority over other beneficial uses of the river. If the demands of the power interests are met, the existing plans of reservoir operation would have to be changed with a resulting curtailment of waters available for downstream users. This would contravene the multiple-purpose concept and would cause serious damage to the downstream interests, particularly navigation. It would also have other, and sundry detrimental effects and implications.

In support of their position, the proponents of hydroelectric power place a strained interpretation on the O'Mahoney-Millikin amendment to the Flood Control Act of 1944. This raises a rather complicated technical question which I propose to analyze at length in the near future, Mr. President. At this time, I would like to say, however, that there is no sound justification for the conclusion that the production of hydroelectric power has a priority over other uses. In short, this alleged priority just does not exist.

Those of us who are interested in the entire Missouri River Basin as well as the future of the downstream interests, are seriously concerned by these proposals which threaten the orderly and effective administration of the basin in the future. The Nebraska State Legislature has recently adopted a resolution reaffirming its support of the multiple-purpose concept. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Legislative Resolution 30 be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION 30

Whereas the State of Nebraska is deeply interested in the full development of all the multiple benefits of Missouri River improvement and control contemplated by the comprehensive Pick-Sloan plan and the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944, which require that the new reservoirs upriver be operated in such manner as to give fair recognition to all multiple uses including flood control, navigation, and hydroelectric power, giving only to irrigation and domestic consumptive uses for the upriver areas to irrigation and domestic consumptive uses for the up-river areas priority over the other beneficial uses, and

Whereas demands are now being made that the production of firm hydroelectric power in South Dakota be given priority in reservoir releases over other uses such as navigation and flood control and that existing plans of reservoir operation heretofore officially approved and followed be altered to accomplish this result, and

Whereas the State of Nebraska is engaged in an all-out effort to gain new industry for Nebraska, in which effort the full development and maintenance of the navigational facilities will be of incalculable value to the State as a whole as well as Missouri River port cities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Nebraska Legislature in 72d session assembled:

1. It is the sense of this legislature that such demands for priority for a sectional use and benefit are wholly unjustified and that the original multiple benefit concept for the construction and operation of the great reservoir system on the Missouri River be adhered to so that benefits therefrom may accrue along the great reaches of this river which bound and flow through this State, and the Governor and other officials of this State are urged to do everything in their power to resist any and all attempts to change or alter the original objectives which made possible the authorization and construction of these important public improvements.

2. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States as President of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member from Nebraska in the Senate of the United States and in the House of Representatives of the United States.

DWIGHT W. BURNEY,
President of the Legislature.
HUGO F. SIB,
Clerk of the Legislature.

RECOGNITION OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEE UNIONS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Legislative Assembly of Oregon recently passed House Joint Memorial 16. This memorial supports in substance legislation providing for the recognition of Federal employee unions. I am pleased to ask unanimous consent to have the memorial and supporting correspondence inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 16

To His Excellency, the Honorable John F. Kennedy, President of the United States, and to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled:

We, your memorialists, the 51st Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent that:

Whereas congenial labor management conditions are more and more considered an essential part of our economic system; and

Whereas provision for this relationship between personnel and management is provided in nearly all labor laws and certainly all labor contracts; and

Whereas there exists no vehicle for this purpose in the relations between the various department heads of the Federal Government and its employees; and

Whereas bills have been introduced in the Congress to accomplish this purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, the Senate jointly concurring:

1. The Congress of the United States is memorialized to support in substance legislation providing for recognition of Federal employee unions and to provide procedures for the adjustment of grievances.

2. Copies of this memorial shall be sent to the President of the United States, Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate, Chief Clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to all members of the Oregon congressional delegation.

Adopted by house, April 20, 1961.

(S) FRANK L. ROBERTS,
Chief Clerk of House.
(S) ROBERT B. DUNCAN,
Speaker of House.

Adopted by senate, May 8, 1961.

(S) HARRY D. BOIVIN,
President of Senate.

OPPOSITION TO AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1961—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I have received many letters and resolutions from farm organizations in regard to the pending Agricultural Act of 1961.

The Kansas Livestock Association at a recent meeting studied the Agricultural Act of 1961 and has written its views concerning several features of it.

The membership of the Kansas Livestock Association is composed of the outstanding livestock producers in our State and their views merit serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that their statement be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION

1. Farm Advisory Committee: Farmers and stockmen are being grossly misinformed. They would be handpicked by the Secretary, serve at his pleasure and at no time would he be required to accept their counsel. Especially objectionable is the provision for appointment of nominees of appropriate farm organizations. The Secretary could choose from one of our minor organizations who represent an extremely small portion of Kansas farmers whose philosophy is and has been extremely objectionable to Kansas stockmen.

2. Throughout the act, it is repeatedly stated that the decision of the Secretary should be final and conclusive. He presumably would have had the approval of the President, however.

3. We feel that no program so extensive and vital to one of the Nation's important industries should be imposed upon us until it has positive action and approval in Congress.

4. Referendum: In certain cases the act calls for referendum of producers. The provision for these referendums is rather vague but seems to be a fraud upon the people the way they are being publicized. It is our understanding there is some gimmick involved where producers would not necessarily vote as individuals but that the Secretary would be required to consider the approval or disapproval of cooperatives as being representative of their members.

5. Checkoffs: We violently oppose compulsory Government checkoffs for advertising, promotion, etc.

6. Quotas and marketing orders: The act would make possible quotas and marketing orders on livestock producers. These have been and are being used with some very questionable degree of success with certain vegetables, fruit, and, in some cases, milk. These cover relatively small groups of producers confined to relatively small areas where special processing, packing, grading, etc., is required and is performed by the producer or the producer group. Authorities on such programs have for years pointed out that the above circumstances were practically essential for any degree of success. Livestock production, marketing, processing and distribution does not fit into such a pattern in any way whatsoever.

7. Assignment of allotments and/or quotas: This procedure can be administered and fit in with the farm program relatively easy insofar as acres are concerned, especially where only one crop, as wheat, is involved. Such an annual procedure does not adapt itself to the livestock producer. Imagine, if you can, allotting a different number of cows to a cowman each year. As we read the act, these livestock allotments would be issued to individuals, not farm or ranch units. Also, they would be transferable by sale, etc., between individuals. To anyone who knows anything about cows and people it is not difficult to foresee the development of an impossible situation.

8. Conclusion: Livestock people have their problems, some of them serious, but want no part of a Government program where it will be necessary to ask some Government official what they can do and how they can do it before they move. They want no part of it.

RESOLUTION OF GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC., RELATING TO SUGAR ACT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, when the extension of the Sugar Act was approved in the Senate on March 29, I offered an amendment which provided that preference should be given in the allocation of nonquota sugar to the countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing agricultural commodities.

This amendment to the House bill was adopted by the Senate. When the amendment was in conference and I was a member of the conference committee, there was opposition to the word "preference" by the State Department and the Department of Agriculture.

The language agreed on by the conference committee and approved by the House and Senate was that special consideration should be given in the allocation of nonquota sugar to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing agricultural commodities.

Hearings are now being held on the extension of the Sugar Act by the House Committee on Agriculture, and I have no doubt that hearings will soon be held by the Senate Finance Committee, as this act will expire within the next year.

In the assignment of sugar quotas to Western Hemisphere countries, it is important that we give some consideration to their agricultural needs as we allocate them sugar quotas and purchase their sugar.

There are several countries in the Western Hemisphere that are anxious to enter into agreements to purchase agricultural commodities, based on sugar purchases in the United States. It is my sincere hope that both the State Department and the Department of Agriculture will take advantage of this opportunity to increase agricultural exports, particularly wheat. Several Latin American countries are interested in the purchase of wheat on the basis of these agreements.

At a meeting of the board of directors of the Great Plains Wheat, Inc., in Denver, Colo., on May 24, a resolution was adopted dealing with wheat and sugar, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be made a part of these remarks and referred to the Finance Committee of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GREAT PLAINS WHEAT, INC., ADOPTED AT A REGULAR MEETING IN DENVER, COLO., MAY 24, 1961

Whereas the Congress of the United States in its recent extension of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended, provided that "special consideration" should be given in the allocation of nonquota sugar "to countries of the Western Hemisphere and to those countries purchasing United States agricultural commodities"; and

Whereas one of the purposes of the Sugar Act of 1948 is "to promote the export trade of the United States"; and

Whereas prior to the cancellation of the Cuban sugar quota, sugar was imported from Cuba, and that country and other sugar-producing countries purchased substantial quantities of agricultural commodities from the United States, thus promoting U.S. export trade; and

Whereas it has become necessary to reallocate Cuban and Dominican Republic sugar quotas to other countries; and

Whereas the purchase of imported sugar requires a substantial outflow of U.S. dollars which aggravates existing foreign exchange problems; and

Whereas Congress provided a partial solution of this problem by the provision for "special consideration" in the recent extension of the Sugar Act of 1948 as amended; and

Whereas the implementation and use of this provision would provide an immediate means of financing substantially increased sales of U.S. agricultural commodities for dollars or dollar equivalents in sugar; and

Whereas there are now countries, including Brazil, which have supplies of sugar which they are willing to exchange for surplus agricultural commodities or in the alternative are willing to use some of the exchange secured from sales of sugar to purchase surplus agricultural commodities, including wheat from the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the agencies of the U.S. Government dealing with the allocation of sugar quotas are respectfully urged to implement and carry out the intent of Congress as expressed by the provisions for special consideration in the recent extension of the Sugar Act.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 293)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Works, I submit a report on title I of the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the supplemental views of Senators COOPER, METCALF, LONG of Hawaii, MUSKIE, GRUENING, PROUTY, and SMITH of Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Michigan; and, under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1961, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance, for the consideration of title II.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated May 22, 1961, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Ernesto Flores, of New Mexico, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 50, with headquarters in Columbus, N. Mex.;

Cornelius F. Reardon, of Montana, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 33, with headquarters in Great Falls, Mont.;

A. Bayard Angle, of Florida, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 18, with headquarters in Tampa, Fla.; and

Mrs. Edna M. Scales, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 29, with headquarters in Portland, Oreg.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

S. 1993. A bill to amend the Second Washington Airport Act in order to provide for toll charges on access roads constructed for such airport; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SCHOEPPEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1994. A bill for the relief of Anna An-Hua Hsiung, Annie Chu-Hua Hsiung, Judy Jieh-Hua Hsiung, and Lulu Ku-Hua Hsiung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and Mr. GOLDWATER):

S. 1995. A bill to authorize an exchange of lands at Wupatki National Monument, Arizona, to provide access to certain ruins in the monument, to add certain federally owned lands to the monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1996. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts:

S. 1997. A bill for the relief of Talaat Moreau; and

S. 1998. A bill for the relief of Miss Antonia Muscolino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1999. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Erdelyi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT):

S. 2000. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY relating to the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2001. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James R. Westberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2002. A bill for the relief of Yun Hwa Yu; and

S. 2003. A bill for the relief of Domenico Martino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2004. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to promote the interests of the United States in international affairs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING):

S. 2005. A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall hold any other public office or position, and for other purposes; and

S. 2006. A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18 (d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. HART, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 2007. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of services performed at special places, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2008. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 561, 43 U.S.C. 615a), relating to the construction, operation and maintenance of the Spokane Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2009. A bill to provide research and technical assistance relating to the disposal of solid municipal refuse; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2010. A bill for the relief of Samuel A. Romine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BATTLE OF TIPPECANOE

Mr. HARTKE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 26), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas the State of Indiana proposes to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Tippecanoe; and

Whereas the Battle of Tippecanoe constitutes an event of great historical importance in opening the Northwest Territory for settlement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Congress of the United States join the people of Indiana in commemorating the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Tippecanoe, with celebrations being held at Battle Ground, Indiana, commencing August 17, 1961, and extending through August 20, 1961.

SEC. 2. The Congress of the United States recognizes the establishment of the Battle of Tippecanoe Sesquicentennial Committee, Inc., which has been charged with the responsibility and duty of planning the anniversary celebrations above described.

SEC. 3. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, shall be transmitted to the Governor of the State of Indiana and the Battle of Tippecanoe Sesquicentennial Committee, Incorporated.

RESOLUTION

AMENDMENT OF RULE XXV OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE, RELATING TO JURISDICTION OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. BENNETT submitted a resolution (S. Res. 155) to amend rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. BENNETT, which appears under a separate heading.)

TOLL CHARGES OF ACCESS ROADS CONSTRUCTED FOR SECOND WASHINGTON AIRPORT

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, construction of the new Dulles International Airport for the Nation's Capital is proving to be much more expensive than anticipated. According to reports of testimony given before a committee of the House, it is now expected that the new airport will cost almost double the original estimates.

Part of the trouble, of course, can be attributed to the severities of the past winter. Other increases in cost flow from an apparent change in policy on the matter of erecting hangars. The original proposal was to have the airlines build their own hangars on land leased to them by the airport. Now, apparently, the new administration prefers to complete the hangars and then lease them.

One item of expense which has had unusual magnitude from the outset is the access road.

I do not say this critically, but merely in recognition of the fact that it is going to be very expensive. But it has to be built.

I regard it as essential to smooth operation of the Capital's major international airport that people be able to get to and from it with minimum waste of time. It is simply a fact of life in this metropolitan area that 17 miles of dual lane highway running from the neighborhood of Falls Church to a point over the Loudoun County line, is going to cost a great deal of money.

The first-phase construction for the new access road runs from the airport terminal building to an intersection with the Capital Beltway and the McLean By-Pass. This construction is 14½ miles long, and has been let as five contracts. The earliest completion date for a part of the road is August of this year.

The whole of the first-phase construction is to be finished by May 1962, some 5 months before the airport itself is expected to be operational.

An interesting fact about the plans for the access road is that its interchanges at four important intersections permit travel only to and from the airport. That is, a motorist cannot drive onto the access road and leave it a few miles further on. He has to have business at the airport or else the road is of no value to him.

I understand that enough land is being acquired by the Government to permit later construction of full interchanges and additional lanes on each side of the median strip. However, there is no present plan or commitment for such additional construction.

Acquisition of land for the new Dulles access road, including the cost of relocating utilities, has cost $2,305,000. Construction of the parts of the road now under contract will cost an additional $11,964,000. This makes about $14¼ million in all saddled as a cost on the new airport.

In my judgment, the access road should be made to pay for itself. I am confident it can do so.

To that end, I now introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make the access road to Dulles International Airport a toll road, and directing the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency to set such tolls as will reimburse the Government for construction cost and pay for maintenance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1993) to amend the Second Washington Airport Act in order to provide for toll charges on access roads constructed for such airport, introduced by Mr. SCHOEPPEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

APPOINTMENT OF POSTMASTERS AT FIRST-, SECOND-, AND THIRD-CLASS POST OFFICES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a small village of 750 people in my part of the country a middle-aged widow with 3 children will lose her home this year

and her chance to send her son to college because she has lost her job. She was not dismissed on grounds of incompetence, inefficiency, insubordination, or lack of industry. She was replaced as postmistress because she was not in the inner circle of the local Democratic Party. I do not believe she was an active Republican; but when she had to compete for the job against the son of the town Democratic chairman, her party credentials were just not good enough.

That is one aspect of the post office patronage system. Another part of the picture is the burden placed on Senators and Representatives. I have received more than 2,000 letters, telegrams, and telephone calls on behalf of candidates for postmaster appointments in Wisconsin. Whatever decision is made in any case, there will be more unhappy people than happy ones, for more people will feel they have been mistreated by their Representative in Congress than will feel they have been helped by him. Or as former Postmaster General Jesse Donaldson put it, the political "adviser" on post office appointments usually creates at least 20 enemies and 1 ingrate. The time consumed by Senators, Representatives, their staffs, and the committee staffs, makes our present method of handling these appointments costly and inefficient.

It is not necessary for me to review the history of the spoils system in the United States. We have long ago turned our backs on spoils, and have accepted the merit system for the vast majority of Federal employees. In fact, the principle of competitive examination has been accepted even in the Post Office Department; but it has never worked as effectively there as it has in other Government agencies.

Because of the retention of Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation, politics still play a big role in the appointment of local postmasters.

In 1952, President Truman sent to Congress a reorganization plan which would have accomplished the step I am recommending. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee at that time reported a resolution which prevented the plan from taking effect. However, an excellent minority report was filed by the present assistant majority leader, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Humphrey, along with Senator O'Connor, and the junior Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. Monroney. They felt that the system, as it now operates, has two political effects:

> 1. Prospective applicants for postmaster positions, who are not active for the party in power, rarely bother to take examinations, since they know that regardless of their qualifications, experience, and position on the list of eligibles certified by the Civil Service Commission, they probably will not be appointed.
>
> 2. Qualified individuals within the postal service, who desire to seek in-service promotion to the position of postmaster, but who do not have the proper political affiliations or prestige of patronage, are simply barred from appointment. Thus, a postal clerk with long experience and genuine ability, who, in a similar position in another Government agency, would have an opportunity for promotion to the top of the ladder, has no opportunity for such promotion, in the absence of a change in party control.

Finally, I should like to point out that every major study of the executive branch of the Government since President Taft's Commission on Economy and Efficiency in 1912 has recommended that postmasters should be under a strict merit system. This includes President Roosevelt's Committee on Administrative Management, in 1937, and the Hoover Commission, in 1949.

Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today provides that the Postmaster General, rather than the President, shall appoint postmasters at post offices for the first, second, and third classes in the competitive civil service without term. No Senate confirmation would be required; and the law would read as follows:

> In making such appointments, no political test or qualification shall be permitted or given consideration, but such appointments shall be made solely on the basis of merit and efficiency.

Mr. President, I introduce the bill, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1996) to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STUDIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish a Government program to prepare Americans for work in international affairs at home and abroad. My plan is designed to evoke the spirit of "Go world, young man" among young Americans and to help to provide the Peace Corps with well-trained applicants. I introduce the bill with the intention that it shall be an amendment to the National Defense Education Act, which the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is now considering. I shall take occasion to present the text of the bill as an amendment to that act.

Entitled the International Affairs Study Act, the bill would provide:

First. Graduate fellowships in international affairs study at U.S. colleges and universities, with preference given to those planning to teach in this field or to seek oversea employment.

Second. Aid to colleges and universities, through grants or contracts, to help them establish or improve international affairs programs for research and training of personnel for oversea work.

Third. Stipends to gradute students for study abroad.

Fourth. Stipends to undergraduate students to help them participate in studies overseas as part of their regular college work in the United States.

Fifth. Stipends to teachers for study in the United States and abroad in various phases of international affairs and foreign languages.

This bill is an outgrowth of a Library of Congress survey of 32 universities and colleges in the United States, conducted at my request, which proved the need for expanding and improving programs in international affairs studies.

The cry today is "Go world, young man." The international programs and activities of the U.S. business community, cultural and educational institutions and the Federal Government have attained a position of primary importance to the national security and the economic and social welfare of the United States.

Our young people have already demonstrated dramatically their understanding of the spirit of "one world" by their response to the Peace Corps. So far, the Peace Corps has received 8,800 applications, but the rate of applications has been diminishing and the administration already has requests from foreign nations for 3,500 volunteers. We must encourage this spirit and make available a solid base for training the future members of the Peace Corps.

The national need for young men and women with knowledge in fields related to international affairs is not being met currently, and large-scale and long-term efforts will be required to meet the mounting needs of the future. A greater number of students, teachers, businessmen, professional people, and Government officials must be chosen for aptitude and be better prepared in special skills to deal with the international field.

The purpose of my bill is to improve and develop the facilities in institutions of higher education for the training of students and others for work abroad for private and public employers.

I am offering this bill as an amendment to the National Defense Education Act because the purpose of that act is to insure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States. The bill would amend several sections of the act in order to place greater emphasis on its international affairs purposes.

I estimate that this bill would add less than $20 million to the $211 million appropriation request for the National Defense Education Act in fiscal 1962. After the fourth year of operation, when the program would be operating fully, the cost would rise to an estimated $40 million annually.

There are now some 665,000 permanent U.S. civilian residents in foreign nations. They represent the physical presence of and the interests of our Nation abroad. More than 36,000 are in oversea posts with the State Department, ICA, and USIA. Another 125,000 perform civilian functions for other U.S. Government agencies, such as the Department of Defense and the Department of Agriculture. Others form a part of the managerial and technical personnel of some 1,500 privately owned U.S. plants and subsidiaries abroad. At least 25,000 American business people are participating in our rapidly expanding international commercial relations. Others work for international organizations, foreign business firms, philan-

thropic foundations, and in missionary activities. Americans working in foreign nations are accompanied by some 250,000 wives and dependents, whose understanding of and sympathy with indigenous surroundings must contribute greatly to our effectiveness abroad.

Serving as both a vanguard and a source of trained personnel for this group of 665,000 oversea Americans, we have 15,000 U.S. students and teachers engaged in educational activity abroad, plus a small group, numbered in the low thousands, intensively concerning themselves with the study of international affairs and foreign languages in the United States. This reservoir of talent represents less than 5 percent of the American citizens in foreign nations and less than 1 percent of the nearly 4 million students enrolling in U.S. institutions of higher education. The International Affairs Study Act should, within the next 5 years, double the number being trained annually for the task of representing the United States abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks excerpts from the survey prepared for me by the Library of Congress, as well as an editorial published in the New York Times of April 3, 1961, commenting on the survey and discussing the need for action in this field.

There being no objection, the excerpts and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS ON REPORT ON SURVEY OF SELECTED INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION WITH STUDY PROGRAMS PREPARING STUDENTS FOR WORK ABROAD

INTRODUCTION

The following report is based on a survey conducted by the Legislative Reference Service at the request of Senator JACOB K. JAVITS. In December 1959 a questionnaire was submitted to the presidents of 35 U.S. institutions of higher education, seeking information and opinions relating to the preparation of young men and women for work abroad. The responses were to provide background data for consideration of possible amendments to the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The institutions to be included in the survey were selected with the intention of getting a representation of both public and private institutions, institutions with well-developed international affairs programs and those with small or beginning programs, and institutions with a wide variety of kinds of programs, reflecting the various kinds of programs which are available in the United States.

Information was requested on such questions as the kinds of programs which are now offered in international affairs studies, the national need for persons who have specialized in these studies, needs of the institutions which have international affairs programs and of the students enrolled in them, and suggestions for improving these programs, including suggestions on how the Federal Government could assist in improving them through amendment of the National Defense Education Act.

Responses were received from 32 of the 35 institutions included in the survey. Most of the programs covered were at the postgraduate level, because U.S. institutions offer specialized international affairs programs principally to graduate students. Information on some undergraduate programs was also obtained, however. In addition, some of the questions, although directed to institutions with graduate programs, requested pertinent information and opinions on the preparation available at the undergraduate level.

Most of the institutions responded to the questionnaire with considerable thoroughness. Some, however, either could not or did not reply to all of the questions. Because of this, and because of the complexity and diversity of the information received, it was decided that for the most part the emphasis in the report should be on allowing the institutions to speak for themselves. General conclusions are made where possible, and the material has been organized with the intention of presenting as fairly and completely as possible the views of the institutions on the questions submitted to them.

Among other conclusions, the report brings out the following points: Although U.S. institutions of higher education are now offering a wide variety of international affairs and area study programs, there is considerable sentiment that these programs should be expanded and improved.

In general, it is believed that our national need for people with knowledge in fields related to international affairs is not currently being met. To meet these needs, it is suggested that more and better prepared students should be recruited, and their opportunities for learning should be improved. Respondents indicate that development of specialized programs preparing students for work abroad is most important at the graduate level, but improvements should also be made at the undergraduate level, especially in the teaching of foreign languages.

Responses to the survey indicate that the present provisions of the National Defense Education Act relating to language and area centers are of great value in assisting both new and already existing programs. There is, however, widespread interest in expanding the present scope of the act to provide greater Federal assistance, both to students and to institutions, to promote the preparation of American students planning to work abroad.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STUDIES

Kinds of programs offered

Institutions of higher education in the United States now offer a great variety of programs to students interested in preparing themselves for careers involving work abroad. Some of these programs were well established prior to World War II. For the most part, however, they are of more recent origin, and represent the greater participation by the United States in world affairs, and the growing concern with areas and peoples on all continents in the last 15 or 20 years.

Perhaps the most significant development has been in the establishment and expansion, mostly on the graduate school level, of area studies programs, which may take the form of institutes or centers, or may be only a series of courses offered on a particular country or area, without a formal designation. In addition there are schools, or departments, or programs in international affairs, which may cover a multiplicity of subjects from American foreign policy to international trade. There are also schools or programs for international business, international law, and others.

All of the institutions included in our survey offer their students some opportunity to study international affairs, used in the broadest sense. This opportunity may involve only a limited number of broad subject courses, or it may involve comprehensive study programs in a great variety of subjects. Most institutions appear to occupy a kind of middle ground between these two extremes.

ENROLLMENT IN PROGRAMS COVERED BY THE SURVEY

So far as we know, no study has been undertaken to determine the number of students enrolled in U.S. institutions of higher education who are taking programs in the general field of international affairs. Our own survey did not attempt this. We did, however, ask the institutions to give their present enrollment of students specializing in this field. On the basis of their responses, we estimate that some 3,000 postgraduate students were covered by our survey.

It must be pointed out, however, that this figure represents only what the institutions answering our survey defined as constituting study in this area, and these definitions varied. Some, for example, appeared to include all relevant studies in the field, others gave more limited responses. Some evidently included part-time students, and others did not. Most apparently did not include all or even some of their students majoring in languages, although many people would argue that these students were indeed receiving training preparatory to work abroad. In addition, one institution gave no specific enrollment figures at all, and several more gave only approximations.

Along with asking for overall enrollment figures, we requested figures showing the numbers of students specializing in various fields or area. Here again, however, the figures are incomplete, and presented in such different forms that it is difficult to draw meaningful conclusions. Generally, it can be said that more than half of the students may be identified as concentrating in some kind of area studies program. Some of the others, listed as enrolled in general international affairs programs, international economics, and so forth, may also be concentrating in study of a specific foreign area, but are not listed in this way.

THE OUTLOOK FOR STUDIES IN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Despite the wide variety of programs which U.S. institutions of higher education are developing to meet the educational demands of students planning to work abroad, most of the persons responding to our survey agree that our national requirements are not yet being met. They indicate a need not only for more students with education in international affairs, but also for better educated students. To meet these needs, they indicate that new programs will have to be developed, and existing ones improved and expanded.

LIST OF INSTITUTIONS RESPONDING TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Letter addressed to—

Nathan M. Pusey, president, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

J. L. Morrill, president, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Novice G. Fawcett, president, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Conrad A. Elvehjam, president, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Deane W. Malott, president, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Milton S. Eisenhower, president, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Hurst R. Anderson, president, American University, Washington, D.C.

Quigg Newton, president, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Carroll V. Newsom, president, New York University, New York, N.Y.

Nils Y. Wessell, president, Tufts University, Medford, Mass.

Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.

Lawrence A. Kimpton, chancellor, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Barnaby C. Keeney, president, Brown University, Providence, R.I.

Grayson Kirk, president, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Norman H. Topping, president, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Harlan H. Hatcher, president, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Glenn S. Dumke, president, San Francisco State College, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Whitney Griswold, president, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Laurence M. Gould, president, Carleton College, Northfield, Minn.

John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.

Buell G. Gallagher, president, City College, New York, N.Y.

Gaylord P. Harnwell, president, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., president, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Carl A. Sauer, president, American Institute for Foreign Trade, Thunderbird Field, Phoenix, Ariz.

Robert F. Goheen, president, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

James H. Hilton, president, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, Ames, Iowa.

Robert M. Strozier, president, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla.

Herman B. Wells, president, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

O. S. Colclough, president, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Edward B. Bunn, S.J., president, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

James Roscoe Miller, president, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

William Pearson Tolley, chancellor, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.

Response from—

E. L. Pattullo, assistant dean, faculty of arts and sciences.

Malcolm M. Wells, vice president, academic administration.

W. Todd Furniss, assistant dean, college of arts and sciences.

J. Homer Herriott, associate dean, graduate school.

Damon Hoynton, dean, graduate school.

Keith Spalding, secretary of the university.

Ernest S. Griffith, dean, school of international service.

Covering letter from Quigg Newton. Questions answered by Dean W. F. Dyde, director of the office of international education.

E. Frederic Knauth, assistant to the chancellor and executive vice president (report compiled by several professors).

Reply from Wessell.

Francis H. Heller, associate dean.

Reginald Batholomew, committee on international relations.

John K. McIntyre, assistant to the president.

Schuyler C. Wallace, director, school of international affairs.

Ross N. Berkes, director, school of international relations.

James K. Pollock, chairman, department of political science.

Charles A. McClelland, chairman, division of social science.

Hartley Simpson, dean, graduate school.

Philip H. Phenix, dean.

H. Wentworth Eldridge, chairman, international relations program.

Oscar Zeichner, assistant dean in charge of graduate studies, division of graduate studies, college of liberal arts and science.

Covering letter from Donald K. Angell, vice president, assistant to the president. Material compiled by Prof. Norman D. Palmer, chairman, international relations group committee.

Covering letter from J. L. Vaughan, provost. Material compiled by Dr. Rowland Egger, chairman, department of political science and foreign affairs.

Reply from Sauer.

Gardner Patterson, director, Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs.

Reply from Hilton.

Covering letter from M. W. Carothers, associate dean of the faculties. Questionnaire answered by Dr. Vincent V. Thursby, adviser, international affairs major.

J. W. Ashton, dean, graduate school.

A. M. Woodruff, dean, the school of government.

Dr. John F. Parr, dean, Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.

Richard C. Snyder, chairman, department of political science.

Gerard J. Mangone, director, Julian Friedman, assistant director, oversea training program, Maxwell Graduate School of Citizenship and Public Affairs.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1961]

TRAINING FOR OVERSEAS

The front pages of our newspapers are bristling these days with the names of Laos, Congo, Cuba and other trouble spots of the world. The financial pages tell of new American business developments in the Far East and in South America. This is an ever-shrinking world and the smaller it gets, the larger a problem grows. That problem is the lack of trained Americans ready to handle our Government and business interests abroad.

The need for expanded and improved training to prepare students for these tasks has been pointed up by a survey of 32 colleges and universities offering programs in international affairs. The results of the survey were published recently by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

The 28 page Senate document urges the expansion of the National Defense Education Act to provide greater Federal assistance to both students and institutions to promote the preparation of American students planning to work abroad. The survey reported that the most frequently noted failing of students applying for graduate programs in the international field was inadequate preparation in foreign languages.

Here, then, is an important challenge for our educators and legislators. The future of the United States will depend to a large extent upon the people trained to represent it in the international arenas. No effort should be spared to perfect that training.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in closing, I should like to compliment once more the persons who worked so diligently at the Legislative Reference Service in the compilation and analysis of the answers received from the 32 institutions of higher education. I believe that we are especially indebted to Mrs. Margaret Malone, whose imaginative direction is apparent throughout the survey. Also, I should like to express my thanks to the colleges and universities which supplied the thoughtful and thorough answers around which my proposed legislation took shape. It should be emphasized that the institutions of higher education surveyed and listed below are not a complete list of those offering programs of international affairs studies in the United States. The title of the survey makes that clear. It is a survey of selected institutions. I believe that an excellent cross-section of the programs in this country was covered and that the opinions expressed in the survey are representative of the needs felt by our academic community.

This formidable component of American civilian strength needs to have the right training in order to do the work which our country needs to do throughout the world, based upon the very authoritative survey to which I have just referred.

Having introduced the bill, I intend to press for its consideration before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which I am a member.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2004) to amend the National Defense Educaton Act of 1958 in order to promote the interests of the United States in international affairs, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

STATE REPRESENTATION IN FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and on behalf of my colleague, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], two bills which would assist in securing State representation in the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

At present, the Comptroller of the Currency, as the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, supposedly represents both Federal and State regulatory agencies in his supervision over the broad insurance and inspection functions of FDIC. However, because he is charged, in his chief capacity, with the supervision of the National banks only, State banks have no direct representation in the actual control of FDIC. As a result, the present arrangement results in different rules being applied to State bank and National bank members of FDIC.

The bills which we are introducing at the request of the State of New York have already been introduced in the House by Representative MULTER, of New York.

The first bill would remove the Comptroller of the Currency as head of FDIC and substitute a three-man board on which State banking interests could also be represented.

The second bill would assign to FDIC the responsibility for the approval of bank applications for State as well as National banks. At the present time, the State applications are handled either by FDIC or the Federal Reserve Board, depending on whether the State bank is a member of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the bills may be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KEATING), were received, read twice by their titles, re-

ferred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2005

A bill to provide that no member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall hold any other public office or position, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by striking the first five sentences and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors consisting of three members, all of whom shall be citizens of the United States to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the members shall be the Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Corporation and not more than two of the members of the Board shall be members of the same political party. Each such member shall hold office for a term of six years. None of the members hereafter appointed shall concurrently hold any other public office in municipal, State, or National Government or be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, or hold any office or position in any part of the Federal Reserve System. In the event of a vacancy in the office of the Chairman of the Board of Directors, and pending the appointment of his successor, the senior member of the Board shall act as Chairman. In selecting the members of the Board, the President shall have due regard to a fair representation of the various segments of the banking interests of the country."

S. 2006

A bill to amend section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the third paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U.S.C., title 12, sec. 321, third paragraph), is further amended by striking from the first sentence the words "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation," and by striking from the last sentence the word "Board" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation".

SEC. 2. Section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (U.S.C., title 12, sec. 1828(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) No insured bank shall establish and operate any new branch or move its main office or any branch unless it shall have the prior written consent of the Corporation. The Corporation may grant such consent only after an application therefor has been approved by either the Comptroller of the Currency (in the case of a national or district bank) or by the appropriate supervisory State authority (in the case of a State bank). In granting or withholding such consent the Corporation shall consider the report of investigation made by either the Comptroller of the Currency (in the case of a national or district bank) or the appropriate supervisory State authority (in the case of a State bank) in approving such new branch. The factors to be considered by the Corporation in granting or withholding its consent under this subsection shall be those enumerated in section 15 of this Act."

SEC. 3. Before acting upon any application hereunder the Corporation shall require the applicant to give appropriate public notice thereof and shall permit any other bank, or thrift, or savings institution to become a party to the proceeding and be heard in opposition thereto.

SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U.S.C., title 12, sec. 36(c), is further amended by inserting after the words "Comptroller of the Currency" in the first and second sentences thereof the following words "and subject to the provisions of section 18(d) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act".

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am happy today to join with my colleague as a cosponsor of two bills which we are introducing to change certain of the operations and modify the organizational structure of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The first of these bills would provide for State representation on the Corporation. This is a much needed innovation, and is one which has been supported by a number of States, including my own. The second bill relates to the powers of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to approve bank applications for State as well as National banks. This clarifies responsibility for such approval by clearly assigning it to the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Representative MULTER of New York, introduced similar bills in the House on January 25. I am glad today to join with my colleague and with Representative MULTER in urging prompt favorable action on these two measures.

PROPOSED LIMITATION ON SPENDING POWER

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the statement has often been made: "What you don't know won't hurt you." However, there are exceptions to this theory, and one is that Government spending which is based on a direct pipeline to the Treasury, without the scrutiny of the Appropriations Committees of Congress, hurts. This is "hidden" spending of which people are often unaware. Yet it hurts our pocketbooks, both in the form of tax drains and decreased purchasing power through inflation. It weakens our control over Government spending in general. It can result in loss of confidence in our dollar at home and abroad.

Under the rules of the Senate, exclusive jurisdiction over spending legislation rests with the Appropriations Committee. The same is true of the House of Representatives. This has been the general rule since about 1920, when these committees were given this responsibility in order to obtain better control over Government expenditures. Prior to that time, the individual committees of Congress had control over the spending authorized for the agencies or departments which came under their jurisdiction.

However, we have gradually relaxed our rules to allow certain programs to be financed outside of the normal appropriations process and have given these programs access to the "back door" of the Treasury. The most recent example is the new depressed areas program which became law in April. The administrator of that program may borrow $300 million directly from the Treasury without congressional review. This represents the most common form of back-door spending. An agency or department merely makes use of public debt receipts, and goes directly to the Federal Treasury for its funds.

Another commonly used type of back-door spending is contract authority, through which an agency is authorized to obligate funds in advance of appropriations for the various "contract" programs. This does not do away with the appropriations process, but it reduces the function of the Committee on Appropriations to one of honoring a commitment already made. No matter what the fiscal situation, the Government's contract liabilities must be honored. Annual review of the program is thereby made meaningless.

The most significant programs financed via the "back door" are the housing programs. For example, in the housing bill which is now the pending business of the Senate, S. 1922, there is authorized a total of $6 billion in programs excluding public housing, to be financed via back-door spending of two types. Treasury borrowing authorization is granted in the case of FNMA special assistance; and in the case of loans for college housing, public facilities, mass transportation, and veterans' housing. In the case of grants for the urban renewal, open space, and mass transportation programs, contract authority is given to commit the Government up to the limits of the authorizations. In the case of these latter programs the Appropriations Committee comes into the picture only in honoring these commitments, by appropriating the money to meet them.

Other important programs which have direct access to the Treasury are grants-in-aid for airports, the International Monetary Fund, the Defense Production Act, direct highway expenditures in our forests and public lands, and the National Park Service. And President Kennedy is now asking that our giant foreign aid program also be given a key to that same back door. If this trend continues, we might as well abolish the Appropriations Committee and simply issue debt receipts to any agency any time it wants them. I am not prepared to have Congress abdicate in such a manner its rightful responsibilities under article I of the Constitution, whereby Congress, not the executive branch, is given power over the public purse.

I am aware that the use of loan repayments is really no drain on the taxpayers, but the initiation of a revolving fund loan program, and its perennial annual increases in size and scope are direct drains on the Treasury beyond the careful scrutiny of our Appropriations Committees. Also it is my observation that we never seem to be satisfied to allow these revolving funds to stay at their initial levels. It seems to

be politically popular to increase these funds continually, despite loan repayments.

I am cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13, introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], which would bring all spending authorization under the jurisdiction of the Appropriations Committees and would bring them together into one bill. It would require annual spending limitations on each item. This resolution also requires concurrent consideration of the latest estimates of expected revenue at each stage of action on the omnibus bill. In a sense, the resolution I am submitting covers a phase of Senate Concurrent Resolution 13—that relating to appropriations approval of programs. However, I feel there is need for this separate bill because of the recent action in the House on a resolution sponsored by Representative PELLY, House Resolution 115, which would have accomplished the same end as the Senate resolution I am submitting today. The wording and approach differ somewhat, but the end result is the same.

Mr. PELLY's resolution was blocked in the revamped House Rules Committee by a vote of 8 to 6. It never reached a test in the House itself. Because of that action, and because Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 would have to have House approval, I feel it necessary to make an attempt to close this back door to the Treasury by the Senate. My resolution would not require House approval but would achieve the desired end by requiring at least the Senate Appropriations Committee to give its approval to any spending proposals. The resolution would amend subsection (b) of Senate rule XXV. I ask unanimous consent that the language of my resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of subsection (b) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (relating to the jurisdiction of the Committee on Appropriations) is amended to read as follows:

"1. Expenditure authorizations. As used in this paragraph the term 'expenditure authorizations' means current appropriations, permanent appropriations, contract authorizations, authorizations to expend from public or corporate debt receipts, reappropriations, reauthorizations, and any other authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States except authorizations to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States for the payment of private claims."

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. JAVITS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1726) to extend and improve the National Defense Education Act, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and ordered to be printed.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STABILIZATION OF MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I ask unanimous consent that the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1747) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States and for other purposes and that his name be listed at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, is so ordered.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION RELATING TO QUALIFICATIONS OF ELECTORS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] be added, at the next printing, to the list of cosponsors of the resolution (S.J. Res. 58), which I introduced for myself and 65 other Senators, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this makes 67 cosponsors. I do hope that we will be able to bring this matter up and passed in as quick time as possible.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, RELATING TO HEARINGS CONCERNING LAWFULNESS OF NEW RATE SCHEDULES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 23, 1961, the names of Senators METCALF, LONG of Missouri, BARTLETT, MOSS, PROXMIRE, and DOUGLAS were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1946) to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act relative to hearings concerning the lawfulness of new rate schedules, introduced by Mr. CARROLL on May 23, 1961.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nominations of Anthony B. Akers, of New York, to be Ambassador to New Zealand, and Erle Cocke, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

In accordance with the committee rule, these pending nominations may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of their receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF NEW DATE FOR HEARINGS ON REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1961, SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on May 16, I gave notice on behalf of the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency that hearings would be held on May 22 on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1961, which would affect a reorganization of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Because of various conflicts, it was not possible to hold hearings during the week of May 22, and it has become necessary to postpone the hearings until 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, June 2, 1961. The hearing will be held in room 5302, New Senate Office Building. While the hearings are being held by the Subcommittee on Securities, the members of the full Committee on Banking and Currency and the members of the Committee on Government Operations have also been invited.

These hearings have been called because the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], to whose committee were referred the reorganization plan and Senate Resolution 148, which would express disapproval of the plan, has requested the comments of the Banking and Currency Committee on the plan. The hearing will be a preliminary hearing designed to elicit information on the basis of which the Banking and Currency Committee can respond to the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ALBERT A. RIDGE, TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judi-

ciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, June 12, 1961, at 10 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Albert A. Ridge, of Missouri, to be U.S. circuit judge, eighth circuit, vice Archibald K. Gardner, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], chairman, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA].

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Hugh Salter, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of North Carolina, term of 4 years, vice B. Ray Cohoon.

Warren C. Colver, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney, district of Alaska, term of 4 years, vice George M. Yeager, resigned.

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Georgia, term of 4 years, vice William C. Calhoun, resigned.

Charles L. Goodson, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Georgia, term of 4 years, vice Charles D. Read, Jr., resigned.

Herman T. F. Lum, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney, district of Hawaii, term of 4 years, vice Louis B. Blissard.

Sylvan A. Jeppesen, of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney, district of Idaho, term of 4 years, vice Kenneth C. Bergquist.

Edward R. Phelps, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Illinois, term of 4 years, vice Harlington Wood, Jr.

Richard P. Stein, of Indiana, to be U.S. attorney, southern district of Indiana, term of 4 years, vice Don A. Tabbert.

Donald E. O'Brien, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney, northern district of Iowa, term of 4 years, vice Francis E. Van Alstine, term expired.

Joseph S. Lord III, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Pennsylvania, term of 4 years, vice Walter E. Alessandroni.

Kenneth Harwell, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney, middle district of Tennessee, term of 4 years, vice Fred Elledge, Jr.

Harry C. George, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal, eastern district of Illinois, term of 4 years, vice Vernon Woods.

Floyd Stevens, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Michigan, term of 4 years, vice Harry Jennings.

Frank W. Cotner, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal, middle district of Pennsylvania, term of 4 years, vice Oliver H. Metcalf, deceased.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, June 8, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Commencement Day address delivered by him at Shepherd College, Shepherdstown, W. Va., on May 29, 1961.

By Mr. SCOTT:

Radio broadcast by Senator BEALL over 16 Maryland radio stations, on May 18, 1961, dealing with certain reorganization plans submitted to Congress by President Kennedy.

By Mr. PASTORE:

Interview of Senator MAGNUSON on CBS program "Capitol Cloakroom," on May 18, 1961.

FEES PAID BY IRANIAN GOVERNMENT TO AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, let me respectfully invite the attention of the Senate, and particularly the attention of the Foreign Relations Committee and the Appropriations Committee, to an article entitled "Iranian Gold Mine," contained in the June 2, 1961, issue of the Washington newsletter, Human Events.

Actually, I have no evidence to support the allegations contained in this article. I have, however, determined that the Development and Resources Corp. is in fact a registered agent of the Iranian Government, and that, according to the report of the Attorney General of the United States, it has received from Iran fees which total $78 million during the period 1956 through 1960.

It occurs to me that the receipt of such fees on the part of American citizens from a country which itself has been the recipient of almost $600 million of the American taxpayers' money is significant.

I sincerely request that both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Appropriations Committee, which are duly charged with the responsibility in these matters, thoroughly investigate this particular corporation, and answer, for the benefit of all American taxpayers, some of the questions that have been raised in this article.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Human Events, June 2, 1961]

Iranian gold mine: Reports filter in from one of the largest foreign aid recipients—Iran—that all is not well with that country's government, despite mammoth handouts from Uncle Sam every year since World War II ended.

One reason why Iran may be receiving such huge sums—$588.4 million in total aid since 1956—is the Development and Resources Corp., headed by David Lilienthal, former Atomic Energy Commissioner and leading figure in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. This outfit is listed with the Justice Department as a foreign agent—or lobby for foreign interests. In every year since 1956, the Iranian Government has supplied the Development and Resources Corp. with all or most of its income from abroad. Lilienthal's firm has received fees from Iran totaling $78.3 million. This is about 13.3 percent of the entire amount of assistance the United States has given Iran during the corresponding period (1956–60).

These millions, which Lilienthal receives for promoting Iranian interests, presumably come, directly or indirectly, from the foreign aid payments which U.S. taxpayers provide.

This situation prompts several questions, such as: Isn't it unusual for a foreign agent to receive such a large sum—both in terms of dollars and percentage—from the foreign aid recipient he represents? What services does the corporation perform in the United States for the Iranian Government? How much of the $78.3 million in fees went into development projects in Iran, and how much became assets of the corporation? Does this—and possible kindred situations—call for a congressional investigation?

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT — STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on May 26, I appeared before the Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, to present testimony in behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 4, which proposes a constitutional amendment which would change the present system of electing the President and Vice President of the United States.

I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], for scheduling hearings on this subject. I am sure that these hearings will serve to reawaken national interest in electoral college reform, which was so high a few months ago, and that as a result of them, Members of the Senate will have an opportunity during this Congress to vote on this question.

Our present system for electing the President and Vice President has many defects. In my testimony last week, I tried to outline some of these defects and to point out the ways in which the constitutional amendment I have proposed will remedy them.

I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DODD BEFORE CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS SUBCOMMITTEE CONCERNING REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

The 1960 presidential election has spotlighted once again the antiquated, badly corroded, and dangerously inadequate machinery which Americans continue to use in

the election of the most important and influential officeholder in the world. The razor-thin margin dividing the popular votes received by President Kennedy and Mr. Nixon, the election of so-called unpledged electors in several Southern States, and cries of "fraud" in several pivotal States, which if proven, could have reversed the outcome of the election, have rekindled the flame of controversy over the reform of the electoral college method of electing the President of the United States. Immediately following the election and for weeks thereafter congressional mailbags bulged with letters demanding electoral college reform, and editorial comment throughout the country emphasized the need for prompt remedial action.

The glaring defects apparent in the electoral college system are no reflection on the wisdom of the Founding Fathers. The plan which they devised for the election of a Chief Executive was a compromise, designed to sell and cement the Federal system; it was tailored for a society in which rapid travel and communication was impossible, and for an electorate which was largely illiterate and uninformed. Fortunately, these conditions no longer persist. In addition, the most pernicious aspect of the present system, the so-called unit system of casting all of the electoral votes of a State en bloc for the candidate receiving a plurality in that State, was far from the original plan of the drafters of the Constitution. The constitutional authors had intended that each State should choose its most distinguished citizens as electors, and that the electors would then deliberate and vote as individuals in choosing a President. The unit rule was grafted onto the system prior to the Civil War, and has controlled every presidential election during the past 100 years. Three factors have contributed to its perpetuation: the power of State legislatures to specify the method of choosing presidential electors; the fact that a safe State under the unit rule can deliver the entire electoral vote of the State for its candidate instead of merely a large proportion thereof; and the obvious political advantage of a State employing the unit rule over States refusing to adopt it.

A number of the major objections to the present electoral college system are traceable directly to the unit rule. Under the system minority popular votes not only are not counted, but they are actually counted for the opposition. As Senator Thomas Hart Benton, of Missouri, said in 1824:

"To lose their votes is the fate of all minorities, and it is their duty to submit; but this is not a case of votes lost, but of votes taken away, added to those of the majority, and given to a person to whom the minority is opposed."

The patent unfairness of this procedure needs no further comment.

In large, pivotal States which are fairly evenly divided between the parties the unit system inflates the influence and bargaining power of splinter parties and small minority groups far beyond any legitimate weight, and invites domination of presidential campaigns by small, organized, well-disciplined pressure groups. The emphasis on large, solid blocs of electoral votes is also an invitation to fraud, since juggling of a few votes can swing the electoral votes of an entire State, and perhaps an entire election, as claimed by some Republicans in Illinois and Texas following the 1960 presidential election. This same stress on large blocs of electoral votes leads almost invariably to the selection of presidential candidates from large States, foreclosing the election of gifted men and strong leaders from less thickly populated areas. In our tense modern world, such deliberate wastage of valuable human resources is unthinkable. The winner-take-all emphasis of the unit rule has also had a severe dampening effect upon the development of a healthy two-party system in States which are clearly safe for either party. There is little incentive for the Republican Party to campaign seriously in Georgia, or for the Democratic Party to intensify its efforts in Vermont, knowing beforehand that all of the State electoral votes will be cast for the majority party regardless of the intensity and quality of their own campaign. This feeling of futility in the ranks of the minority party is matched by an air of complacent apathy within the majority party. The result is an embarrassingly small voter turnout which does nothing to enhance the picture of American democracy before our free-world friends and our Communist adversaries.

Criticism of the present electoral system is not limited to the problems created by the unit rule, however. The complications inherent in the operation of the system and the varying complexity of the ballots used for the selection of electors in many States have led the American people in increasing numbers to feel that some sleight-of-hand small print is depriving them of a direct and meaningful voice in the election of a President. Even after almost 200 years of operation, the actual mechanics of the present system are relatively unknown and misunderstood. The electorate is confounded, and to some extent frustrated, by a system which translated a 0.16-percent plurality of the popular vote into an 84-electoral-vote plurality in electing President Kennedy by an electoral count of 303 to 219 in 1960. And the fact that it remains quite possible for a President to be elected under the present system by a clear majority of electoral votes despite the fact that he actually received fewer popular votes than his opponent remains a cause of puzzlement and grave concern. More serious, however, and more blatantly unfair, is the machinery provided under the present system for resolving doubtful elections. Election of a President when no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes is thrown into the House of Representatives. Each State delegation is given one vote, regardless of the size of the State or the delegation, and the vote of evenly split delegations is not counted at all. This totally unrepresentative system can completely distort the popular will in the selection of a President, and has done so on at least one occasion in the past.

Quite clearly, these defects and criticisms are not new. Following each close and hotly contested election they have been repeated, reemphasized, and restudied, and throughout the years, a series of remedial plans have been developed. The amendment to the Constitution of the United States which I have introduced (S.J. Res. 4) is drawn from these previous proposals and represents what I believe to be the soundest approach to a difficult problem. The system which it embodies, known as the proportional distribution plan, was first introduced in Congress in 1877, and was actually passed by the Senate, in essentially its present form, in 1950. Just prior to the 1960 election, in April 1960, a Gallup poll showed 50 percent of the population favoring the proportional distribution plan, 28 percent opposed to a change, and 22 percent with no opinion. Following the election, the portion in favor of a change is almost certain to have increased significantly.

The amendment which I have introduced creates a system for the election of a President which is simple in both concept and operation, and easily understood by the average voter. Under its provisions the electoral college is abolished, but the electoral vote is retained, with each State continuing to be credited with one vote for each of its Representatives and Senators. Following a presidential election, the electoral vote in each State is apportioned among the candidates in accordance with the number of popular votes which they receive, instead of on the present winner-take-all basis. The candidate with the most electoral votes throughout the Nation is elected President if he has received at least 40 percent of the electoral votes. In the unlikely event that no candidate receives more than 40 percent of the electoral vote, the President is selected from the persons having the two highest numbers of electoral votes by the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives siting in joint session and voting individually. A majority of the votes of the combined authorized membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives is necessary for a choice.

This is a system which the American people can understand and respect. Each voter can readily see that his vote has a direct effect upon the outcome of the election, and will not and cannot be counted against the candidate of his choice. The innate fairness and equity of the system is buttressed by Gallup poll evidence of the fact that it seems fair and normal to the average citizen. The middleman elector is eliminated, together with the very real possibility of election manipulation by State legislatures. Since these bodies have complete control over the method of selection of electors, they may, if they like, choose the electors themselves, perhaps even after the election but before the electoral vote as threatened by Louisiana in the 1960 election. Death, incapacity, or disqualification of electors would no longer be a factor, and the possibility of a natural disaster preventing the casting of votes by some or all of the electors in a given State on the designated day would also be removed.

In addition to these beneficial effects, the proportional distribution system which I propose will provide a series of remedies for existing defects, and a number of advantages over existing methods, which lead me to urge strongly its immediate adoption and submission to the American people for their approval.

1. Under most circumstances the proportional distribution system will prevent election of a candidate receiving less than a plurality of the popular vote. Such an event could only occur if one candidate picked up most of his electoral votes in States where the number of voters relative to the number of electoral votes is low, and with the proportional system in effect a clean sweep of those States, of the magnitude required to bring about such a result, is highly unlikely.

2. With the elimination of the winner-take-all unit rule, the proportional distribution system would give equal weight to popular votes cast in large pivotal States and to those cast in States where one party is certain to win by a wide margin. Thus, no longer could a few votes in lower Manhattan or upstate New York tip the scales of the popular vote in New York and swing the entire electoral vote of the State to one candidate or another. Within the limits of existing inequalities in the representative weighting of the States, a few hundred votes in Manhattan, N.Y., would have exactly the same weight as an equal number of votes in Manhattan, Kans. As a result, four currently existing dangers would be removed.

First, the chance that the will of the people might be thwarted by fraudulent manipulation of the few votes necessary to shift the entire electoral vote of a closely contested, large, pivotal State would be substantially reduced. In order to influence the outcome of any but the closest of elections, fraudulent conduct would have to be of monumental proportions. Only a very few electoral votes could be influenced by the most successful and widespread fraud in any single State.

Secondly, the possibility of a storm or flood or other disaster in a local party stronghold which could affect the vote sufficiently

to tip the scales in favor of the opposite party and shift the entire electoral vote of a closely contested pivotal State would be eliminated.

Thirdly, the exaggerated influence of small, tightly knit, minority organizations and pressure groups upon the policies and activities of the major parties will be sharply curtailed. Under the proportional distribution system, the power of such groups to influence the outcome of a national election will depend solely upon their numbers and the effectiveness of their arguments upon other voters. No longer will they be able to blackmail party leaders with threats of their very real pivotal strength.

And, fourthly, the choice of presidential candidates will no longer be limited to men from the large States. With the threat of losing entire blocs of electoral votes from large pivotal States removed, party leaders will be able to consider good men from any area of the Nation, north or south, rural or urban, on the basis of merit and political appeal alone.

3. New life and vigor would almost certainly be breathed into the two-party system in America by the proportionate distribution plan. Since the number of electoral votes received by each party candidate in each State would depend entirely upon the total number of popular votes which he received in each State as compared with those received by his opponent, the plan would provide a powerful incentive for campaigning in every State, especially those presently considered as safe by either party and in which little or no campaigning is carried on under the present system. Despite the tremendous impact of radio and television on modern campaign methods, voters in relatively safe States today have little opportunity to obtain and digest accurate information on campaign issues or to personally assess the relative merits of the candidates. Under the system which I have proposed, no candidate will dare ignore any area of the country without running the risk of losing important electoral votes. This will mean, of course, that State party organizations will have to be strengthened and rebuilt and staffed with able leaders in every State in the Union. No longer will mere delivery of a majority of the popular vote in a State be considered as a successful campaign. The highest possible favorable vote, contrasted with the lowest possible adverse vote, will be the goal of every State party organization, and the competition will be tremendous. This will lead directly, of course, to an improvement in the embarrassingly small turnout of American voters at the polls in presidential elections. In selling our American form of democratic government to the uncommitted and newly formed nations of the world, it is frequently difficult to explain the fact that many Americans apparently do not care about or believe in their own governmental system enough to take part in the election of their Chief Executive. Under the proportional distribution system, the emphasis on overwhelming numbers as the basis for winning electoral votes will force political leaders to emphasize the need for getting out the vote in every campaign, and can only result in a vast improvement in the numbers of Americans participating directly in presidential elections.

The type of campaign required to win elections under this system can only be organized and carried out successfully if local workers are mobilized in force and are carefully coordinated by tightly knit national organizations. In the face of such party fronts, splinter parties will find barren ground in which to sow their seed. They will, of course, be able to pick up a few electoral votes in States where their strength can be concentrated, but their hopes of winning an election are as small or smaller under proportional distribution as they are under the present system. And the few electoral votes which they manage to win will be poor payment for the loss of the highly magnified bargaining power which they presently enjoy in the pivotal States. No longer will they be able to dictate party policy in the fields of their special interest on threat of upsetting the balance in pivotal States by throwing their small, compact, highly organized vote to the opposition. Their influence in party councils will be limited to the number of votes which they can deliver throughout the country, and to the cogency of their arguments in support of their position. Outside of party councils, their effect will be gaged solely upon their ability to convince the voters of the justice and desirability of their programs. As a result, the major parties will be freed from the disproportionate pressure which such groups now can and do apply, and will be better able to formulate distinctive national policies designed to provide for the good of the greatest majority of the people of the Nation.

4. Proportionate distribution of electoral votes in a presidential election would reflect more accurately the popular strength of the various candidates. The present system, with its winner-take-all allocation of electoral votes, carries a built-in distortion of popular support which leads to landslide election triumphs when popular support is only lukewarm. In 1912, Woodrow Wilson, with only 42 percent of the popular vote, received 84 percent of the electoral vote. In 1936, Franklin Roosevelt received 98 percent of the electoral vote on the basis of 60 percent of the popular vote. These are not isolated instances, but illustrations of the normal effect of the present system. This type of illusory electoral strength provides a questionable basis for the exercise of power, and could easily lead to an abuse of authority.

The system, once again, was not planned by the drafters of the Constitution with this effect in mind. In the interests of stability, they did provide for a slight distortion in favor of the smaller States by apportioning electoral votes on the basis of the number of representatives in both Houses of Congress. The votes corresponding to the two Senators from each State weight the scales slightly against the larger States. This advantage was probably necessary to secure the support of the smaller States for the original Constitution, and while at this point it may no longer be essential for the preservation of our Federal system, it still goes far toward prevention of feelings of dissatisfaction and injustice among the smaller States without appreciably damaging the rights or the powers of the larger States. It has therefore been retained in my proposal under the proportionate distribution plan.

5. One additional feature of the present electoral college system remains undisturbed by the amendment which I have submitted. Voter qualifications under the Constitution are left entirely within the control of the States. There is still a great enough disparity among the cultural patterns in the various States of the Union to justify retention of this authority by the States. It is still essentially a local matter. Even if this were not the case, as a matter of political reality, this is perhaps the worst time in the past half century to attempt to impose Federal controls upon voter qualifications, and any such attempt would almost certainly fail. My amendment makes no change in the present system, and leaves this power where it rightly belongs, in the hands of the States.

6. The last, and perhaps the most important, adjustment which is accomplished by the proportional distribution plan outlined in my amendment is the elimination of the grossly unfair method provided at present for the decision of elections which are thrown into the House of Representatives because no candidate receives a majority of the electoral votes. Under this antiquated system, only Representatives are permitted to vote. This means that the large delegations from States such as New York, Pennsylvania, and California carry no more weight than the delegations from Idaho, Alaska, and Rhode Island. Under such a system, the will of the people can readily be perverted, as it was in the election of 1824, when Adams was elected President by the House despite the fact that Jackson received a plurality of more than 12 percent of the popular vote. The continuing concentration of our population in large urban areas and the consequent growth in the proportionate strength of States encompassing such areas increases the blatant injustice of this system with each passing year. My amendment provides for the election of a President by both Houses of Congress, sitting jointly and voting individually, in the event that no candidate receives at least 40 percent of the popular vote. This type of vote reflects with a much greater degree of accuracy the popular will, and will result in most cases in a decision acceptable to a majority of the voters of the Nation.

These, then, are the major considerations which have led me after much deliberation to propose the serious step of amending our Constitution in order to provide a sounder method for the election of our President. I have not taken this step lightly. The proportionate distribution plan which forms the heart of my proposed amendment is not a perfect system, but its merits so far outweigh any objections which have been brought to my attention that I feel compelled to bring it before you for your consideration. The present electoral college system is grossly unfair and unduly complicated, and must be replaced at the earliest opportunity. The proportional distribution plan in my judgment, stands head and shoulders above any of the alternative solutions which have been formulated, and provides a sound, easily understood and equitably designed election plan. It is my conviction that it should be adopted, and soon. I earnestly solicit your support in this serious and important undertaking.

THOMAS E. MURRAY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Friday, Thomas E. Murray, for 9 years Atomic Energy Commissioner under President Truman and President Eisenhower, passed away, in New York. I believe that in his death, America lost one of her best and greatest sons. As a business leader, as a philanthropist, as a prolific inventor, as a distinguished scholar, as a prominent Catholic layman, and, finally, as one of our most dedicated public servants, Thomas E. Murray made many notable contributions to his country.

His honors and his good fortune he accepted humbly. But more than anything else, Thomas Murray was a moral man; indeed, I consider him one of the most intensely moral men of our time.

Thomas Murray was not a businessman who contented himself with his many directorships. He was at the same time an electrical engineer and an inventor of genius, who held more than 200 electrical and welding patents, some of which were of great importance to the American war effort.

During World War II, he converted his plants to the production of mortar shells

for the Government; and for his wartime inventions in this field he received from President Roosevelt a citation for distinguished service.

As a member of the Atomic Energy Commission, Thomas Murray's rare technological ability and fertile imagination enabled him to play a role of outstanding importance in developing the nuclear power potential of our country.

So great was the respect he commanded for his competence and integrity, that when his final term was about to expire in June 1957, the majority of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy publicly urged President Eisenhower to reappoint him. In their letter to the President, they said that Mr. Murray was primarily responsible for many Atomic Energy Commission accomplishments. They credited him with having led the way to opening up American uranium resources, starting hydrogen bomb experiments, promoting electrical power supplies for atomic plants, and building the first big industrial atomic powerplant.

But I think that history will recall that Thomas Murray's greatest contribution to his country was made after he had left the post of Atomic Energy Commissioner, when he sought to serve his country by warning against the dangers of the nuclear test ban moratorium, and by urging us to confront without hysteria, with balance, but, above all, with Christian morality, the terrible issues raised by the specter of nuclear warfare.

The final years of his life were devoted almost exclusively to an attempt to awaken his countrymen to the disaster which could come to this country from our abandonment of further development of nuclear weapons, an abandonment imposed upon us by the nuclear test ban. Thomas Murray's final published word on this subject was an article—published in the winter issue of Orbis magazine—entitled "Nuclear Testing and American Security." This is the last testament of a very great American, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUCLEAR TESTING AND AMERICAN SECURITY

(By Thomas E. Murray)

The new President of the United States, when he takes office, will immediately come face to face with one of the most vexing problems of international relations today—the problem of disarmament and arms control. Within this complex problem, the issue of nuclear test suspension has assumed a primary place—indeed, a highly dangerous place. The nuclear test policy which our Government has pursued for more than 2 years is gravely imperiling the security of the United States and its free world allies. The incoming Chief Executive cannot afford to delay a close and critical review of the American policy decision, dating to October 3, 1958, to suspend all nuclear tests—its history, its present status, its entire rationale, and its role within the wider context of arms control policy.

During the last 2 years, many Americans have labored under the impression that the United States and the Soviet Union, through their negotiators at Geneva, have been moving inexorably toward a nuclear test ban, hammering out one treaty clause after another, making an increment of progress each month toward that time when a test ban will be put into effect. This is a pernicious illusion. Actually, as far as the United States is concerned, a test ban has already been in effect for more than 2 years. The ban has been in the form of a unilateral moratorium which is all-comprehensive, admits of no exceptions, and is accompanied by no safeguards whatsoever.

The illusion has been compounded by optimistic assumptions that adequate safeguards for an absolute and permanent test ban can possibly be agreed upon through international negotiation within the foreseeable future. The fact is that such safeguards are not feasible in terms of either the present state of technology or the world political-strategic situation. It is nonsensical, therefore, to speak of a permanent test ban treaty accompanied by sufficient guarantees of compliance as though such a compact were almost within our grasp.

What is in effect today is an unpoliced and unpoliceable test ban, which bids fair to be continued indefinitely, with increasingly dangerous consequences. The temporizing attitude which has characterized the administration's test policy during the last 2 years means that the next President will face a grim battle to gain approval of a proposition which never should have been brought into question in the first place—namely, that the United States has the right, indeed, the obligation, to carry out a program of nuclear tests if this should be required for its own security and the defense of its allies.

At present, our national policy on nuclear tests is being shaped as much by our own illusions as it is by Communist propagandists, who cynically equate any proposal for test resumption with a callous indifference to the peaceful aspirations of mankind. As a matter of fact, the preservation of world peace hinges upon the maintenance of an adequate Western deterrent, and this in turn demands that the United States retain a lead in the realm of nuclear technology. It is precisely this leadership which has been called into doubt by the American unilateral moratorium. Today, we are backing into the quicksand of the most dangerous and most subtle form of unilateral disarmament—technological obsolescence.

One of the longstanding objectives of Soviet policy has been to induce the United States to acquiesce in an all-inclusive test ban which would involve a minimally effective international inspection system. The Soviets have achieved this objective by spinning out the Geneva negotiations into the third year, while retaining their own freedom to carry out clandestine nuclear testing as part of a weapons development program. It is imperative that our national policymaking in this crucial area be liberated from hostile foreign influences and be regeared instead to the essential demands of our own security, indeed of our very survival as a free people.

I

It is essential to realize that the present U.S. nuclear test policy has been, and still is, based upon a serious mistake. This mistake dates back to 1958, and must be laid to the scientific advisers of the White House as well as to the State Department policymakers who acted precipitately on the advice of those scientists. I am convinced that President Eisenhower would never have ordered the moratorium had it not been for the erroneous judgment of the scientists.

We must remember that, originally, it had been the fear of worldwide radioactive fallout—a fear exacerbated by communist propaganda—which had stirred the world public into opposition against nuclear tests and finally prompted the United States to make the trek to Geneva. The main spur to this fear was the detonation of multimegaton weapons which contaminate the atmosphere of the earth. If the motive of the United States in going to Geneva had been to allay world apprehensions—and it apparently was—then it was on this type of tests that the scientists and the policymakers should have focused their attention. The requirements of military security no longer necessitated such tests. Moreover, a ban on this kind of testing could easily have been policed; the technical apparatus was already in existence and could have been expanded quickly into an international inspection system, fully effective.

In 1958, therefore, the United States was in a position to show appropriate respect for the legitimate demands of world opinion without jeopardizing its security on the technological front. We should have proposed an agreement to stop all tests which cause atmospheric contamination, and to institute on an international basis an already proven system for policing such a ban. Mobile teams for conducting on-site inspections would not have been necessary.

The United States did not, however, press for such a practical agreement with sufficient vigor and persistence.[1] Instead, we became involved in a much more complicated and much more dangerous quest for a universal test prohibition which would outlaw all types of nuclear explosions forever—atmospheric, oceanic, underground and outer space. In this respect, we transgressed the limits of necessity. The harmful products of underground explosions can be contained in such a way as to pose no threat to human health. Furthermore, outer space tests conducted at sufficiently high altitudes can be conducted with no known danger to human life. Both underground and outer space tests were still important to improve our defensive capabilities and to enhance our overall deterrent power. It was not necessary to include them in the scope of the ban. In fact, it was essential that they be excluded.

Nevertheless, the State Department took the position that, once our scientists could postulate an inspection system which would record a nuclear explosion larger than 2 kilotons anywhere in the earthly environment, the United States could enter a total test ban agreement with equanimity. In the spring of 1958, the scientists informed the administration that they had come up with the answer. By now it is well known that the scientists had erred seriously. They had based their conclusions regarding the possibility of policing underground tests upon the results of but a single experiment—the 1.7-kiloton "Rainier" shot of September 1957, detonated deep within a mountain tunnel. This experiment had been planned well before the special committee of scientists had been established under the President's chief scientific adviser, Dr. James Killian. The "Rainier" explosion had not been planned to meet specific detection needs; the resulting data relating to detection capabilities were an almost accidental byproduct of the test. Yet, on the basis of

[1] Several months after the Geneva negotiations had started, President Eisenhower, on Apr. 13, 1959, sent a letter to the Soviet Premier proposing that the three powers agree for the time being to ban only atmospheric and underwater tests, leaving underground and outer space tests for later consideration. This was one of the most sensible moves made by the administration throughout the test ban negotiations. But after Prime Minister Macmillan suggested the quota of on-site inspections (discussed below), Khrushchev rejected the President's proposal and treated the Macmillan suggestion with decided favor. From that time on, the administration dropped the President's sound proposal of Apr. 13.

this scant evidence from a single explosion, the scientists concluded that from an analysis of wave patterns registered on seismographs they could differentiate from earthquakes nuclear blasts as small as 2 kilotons.

When this scientific information was placed before President Eisenhower, he proposed that a Geneva Conference of Technical Experts be held in the summer of 1958. It was most unfortunate that the scientists lacked the wisdom or the patience to wait a few more months before proceeding to Geneva. They were well aware that the "Hardtack" series, scheduled for September 1958, would provide them with an opportunity to verify their hypothesis before undertaking to discuss the technical details of a treaty on which the security of the free world would depend. Urged on by the State Department, American scientists went to Geneva with a proposal for a system of some 650 to 700 seismic stations around the world capable, so they thought, of detecting all underground tests above 2 kilotons.

In the summer negotiations at Geneva, our scientists were induced to retreat from their original position and accept a less comprehensive system. A joint communiqué issued on August 21, 1958, declared that it was "technically feasible to set up * * * a workable and effective control system" which would be 90 percent reliable in detecting underground tests not of 2 but of 5 kilotons or more. This system need only comprise 180 stations throughout the world, including some on the territory of each nuclear power and 10 on shipboard in the oceanic areas.

A few months later this formula had to be scrapped by our scientists. The completion of tests at Yucca Flats made it crystal clear that our scientists had ratified conclusions that were erroneous. Nuclear explosions in the "Hardtack" series appeared on some seismographs in the United States as earthquakes, instead of nuclear explosions. With the number of control points approved at Geneva, the experts had now to admit a serious blunder. It was demonstrated that the minimum size of underground tests that could readily be identified was five times greater than had originally been estimated. Still later, nuclear scientists learned that it is possible to muffle underground explosions almost beyond the range of detectability by detonating them in large, deep cavities (such as those naturally or artificially washed in salt domes) or in smaller underground holes containing pressure-absorbing substances. It is difficult to understand why the President, with this evidence before him, did not revoke the test moratorium until such time as the scientists could calculate with a reasonable degree of accuracy the full requirements of an effective inspection system. The only reason which I can adduce for his inaction is pressure from the State Department, reflecting in turn pressures from abroad.

II

For more than 2 years, the United States has adhered stubbornly to a moratorium and a test ban negotiations policy which are founded upon discredited scientific assumptions. No American military leader in possession of all the facts would ever have recommended the test moratorium or consented to it except under heavy organizational pressure. Undoubtedly, the tacit consent of the military to the imprudence of the test moratorium has been exacted through an appeal to the classic imperative of "overriding political considerations."

But has our current policy on tests been a success even from the political standpoint? Has it, for instance, convinced the Soviets of our sincere desire to brake the arms race? Has it altered their conviction, rooted deeply in their own ideology, that the capitalist camp is warmongering and intent upon destroying the socialist camp? Has it placated world opinion and convinced the peoples of our peaceful intentions? Has it offered a realistic hope of limiting the membership of the so-called nuclear club? Does it contain a real promise of opening up Soviet society? Has it contributed to a relaxation of international tensions? Has it diminished the fear of war, accidental or deliberate? Has it gained for the United States the initiative in disarmament negotiations, or helped to advance the possibility of success in other areas of negotiation? Has it reinforced the confidence of our allies in our political wisdom? The answer to all these questions is no. Our entire test policy has been demonstrably a failure. There have been no political gains to warrant the security risks which have been incurred. The argument of "overriding political considerations" simply does not stand up under scrutiny.

Our moratorium has not prevented the Communists from returning to a noticeably tougher cold war line in 1960. The mere fact that the Soviets seem to take a less dogmatic position than their Chinese partners on the question of the inevitability of war does not mean that they have really moved one inch toward genuine accommodation with the West. Not only has our moratorium failed in the bid to mellow the Kremlin, but it has not brought the United States any significant propaganda returns. Indeed, large segments of world opinion have been persuaded by the Communists to believe that Americans want controls without disarmament—one of the most singular successes scored by Soviet propaganda in the entire postwar period. Actually, the United States has already committed itself to the most drastic form of disarmament which it has ever undertaken in its history—and without the slightest semblance of controls.

One of the arguments adduced for the test ban treaty (for the sake of which the moratorium was ordered) is that it will solve the "*n*th country problem" and thereby help to prevent a future catalytic war started by a smaller nuclear power. Yet, few responsible observers can deny that the Geneva discussions have been carried on in a strange political vacuum. They have not come to grips with the difficulty of imposing a Big Three prohibition upon the half dozen or more nations which will be in a position to develop nuclear weapons during the next decade if they wish to do so. The most immediate problems focus on France and China. For a time it was assumed that, in the event of a test ban treaty, the United States would bring France into line and the Soviets would persuade the Chinese Communists to adhere to the compact. But politics is not that simple. General de Gaulle has displayed a rigid determination to create a separate national deterrent in order to enhance French international prestige.

China is expected to test a nuclear device within the year. Even the most ardent proponents of a test ban agree that the proposed inspection system would be meaningless if the vast land area of Communist China were excluded. Nevertheless, our scientists in 1958 ignored this question, and our negotiators appear no closer today to solving this dilemma. An inspection system devised largely at the insistence of the United States will not be accepted by a country which the United States, for many complex reasons, refuses to recognize and which is, if anything, even more bellicose than the U.S.S.R. The nuclear test issue is not an argument for suddenly reversing U.S. policy toward China. But the China problem is in itself a sufficient reason for the United States to reverse its nuclear test policy. It is absurd to think that we will bring the final solution of the China problem within our reach by prolonging the moratorium and the Geneva negotiations a little more—with intensified patience, sincerity and flexibility.

One of the political advantages most frequently claimed for the test ban is that internationally staffed inspection posts on Soviet soil will reduce the Soviets' secrecy complex and represent a first step toward opening the closed society of communism. There is no question that Soviet secrecy has significantly compounded the security problem of the Western allies. It is highly desirable that the Soviet Union be transformed gradually into a more open society. But since the start of the Geneva negotiations, Premier Khrushchev has consistently described the Western inspection plan as little more than a sinister scheme to organize spy rings in the Soviet Union. The atmosphere produced by such accusations has not been conducive to any agreement which would open up Soviet society.

The Russian negotiators, who had agreed 2 years ago to the establishment of 21 inspection stations on Soviet territory, began to argue during the summer of 1960 that 15 stations ought to be sufficient. In other words, they were retreating from the principle that the inspection system be used as an instrument for increasing cooperation on international arms control through a freer flow of information. But perhaps most serious of all was the alacrity with which the Soviets picked up the suggestion made by Prime Minister Macmillan for an annual quota of veto-free inspections to be carried out in each host country. The American negotiators had contended for some time that the number of on-site inspections (i.e., to check cases in which the seismic signal was ambiguous) would have to be determined by scientific criteria. They argued logically that, after the inspection system was constructed and set in operation, it might be discovered that a few dozen on-site inspections per year would be enough to guarantee effective policing, or that perhaps several hundred would be required. The Macmillan proposal, made on a trip to Moscow, and without prior consultation with President Eisenhower, called for a predetermined number of inspections, fixed by political agreement. The Soviets were quick to seize upon this proposal as a means of restricting the activities of "prying foreigners" on their soil. Premier Khrushchev has stated that he sees no need for more than a few inspections per year—probably three. The Macmillan formula, if embodied in a test ban treaty, will essentially defeat the concept of effective policing upon which the United States has insisted throughout more than a decade of disarmament negotiations.

The chances that a nuclear test ban will contribute significantly to the cause of world peace are virtually nil. Given the oppressive dangers inherent in the current world situation, an arms control plan whose initial phase involves a cessation of testing begins at the wrong end. A test ban, accompanied by a continuation of the moratorium until the inspection system has been completed (perhaps 5 or 6 years after the treaty is signed), cannot possibly furnish any adequate sense of international security against the perils of surprise attack or war by accident or miscalculation. An absolutely foolproof policing system against tests, even if it could be devised and put into effect (and it cannot), would constitute no guarantee against the continued danger of thermonuclear war for several years to come.

Certainly, the test moratorium which has been in force for more than 2 years has not led to a relaxation of international tensions, as its advocates assumed it would. If a treaty should ever be signed, it may usher in a brief euphoria, a period of friendship, good will and accommodation similar to the "Spirit of Camp David" which was dispelled

brutally by Premier Khrushchev at the abortive Paris meeting. But the United States is involved in an ideological-power contest of indefinite duration and of global dimensions. If the United States continues to let its nuclear technology rust, no one can predict what will be the state of our security and that of our allies in the next decade. A test ban treaty which does not eliminate cheating and which remains at the mercy of Soviet obstructionist tactics will not reduce tensions. Rather, as time goes on it will give rise to mounting suspicions and fear that the side which seems obsessed by the desire for strategic secrecy is trying to gain a unilateral advantage. This will be bound to have a destabilizing effect on the international situation, tightening rather than easing world tensions.

III

We frequently take pride in our operational striking power now in being, which we boast to be the most awesome ever wielded by any nation in history. But, we must ask ourselves, of what use will be all our stockpiles of weapons and our delivery systems developed during the last decade if the Soviets exploit the American test moratorium to design radically new and infinitely more awesome weapons? We would be myopic indeed to think that the world has arrived at a technological stalemate which permanently renders war unthinkable for both sides. Today, in a rapidly changing environment of pure and applied science, the notion that any weapons art can somehow be frozen is as wistful as it is naive. The patent fact is that nuclear technology is still in its infancy. In many of their public pronouncements, the Soviets indicate that they have grasped this simple truth much more clearly than have our own policymakers.

The present symbols of our military strength are the multimegaton bomb in the bay of a jet bomber and the megaton warhead on a long-range missile. Implicit in the possession of these weapons of almost limitless destructive capacity is the threat of their use. This, we hope, will effectively deter all aggression. We assume that neither party will dare use its weapons for fear of a retaliatory strike that would prove too devastating.

Our strategy of deterrence, however, could be robbed of its credibility, and therefore its effectiveness, if the Soviets were to accomplish a major breakthrough in some aspect of military technology, either offensive or defensive. Nuclear technology is still capable of significant progress, especially in the areas of tactical weapons, antimissile defenses, communications jamming, the military uses of outer space explosions, and related areas.

Until now, nuclear technology has progressed principally along one line—namely, toward massive megaton weapons of an offensive character, whose destructive capacity is completely undiscriminating. The result of a policy of stockpiling these huge weapons and of integrating them into a strategy of deterrence through the threat of mass annihilation is to jeopardize the survival not only of the material fabric of civilization, but also of the human race itself. These, however, are not the only kinds of weapons which nuclear technology can yield.

There are other practical lines of nuclear development—they lead toward the third generation weapons which are as radically different from the H-bomb as the H-bomb was from the Hiroshima-type A-bomb. These new weapons will not be larger and more efficient H-bombs, nor smaller and more efficient A-bombs. They will be weapons of a different category which, when combined with refined delivery systems, will lend themselves to strategies and tactics more narrowly military in character than those to which we have grown accustomed. They will be capable of being used without posing suicidal hazards for the nation employing them. Furthermore, compared with the nihilistic weapons systems on which we now rely, the use of the third generation nuclear weapons—or at least some of them—will be easier to justify on moral grounds.

Such new weapons of conflict—weapons which differ from those now familiar to us not merely in degree or specific type, but also in basic structural principles and operational performance—are not the remote dreams of isolated scientists. The conceptual designs for these weapons already exist in American laboratories. The possibility of their development is more realistic than was that of the H-bomb a year before its detonation. In fact, these weapons would already have been tested had it not been for the moratorium. It is no exaggeration to assert that, if the veil of nuclear secrecy could be lifted and the American public informed of all the weapons possibilities of which our nuclear scientists are aware, the popular clamor for the immediate resumption of nuclear tests would be loud and insistent.

The crucial question before us is not whether we should or should not acquire this or that specific weapon—a cluster of warheads, or an antimissile missile, or a communications-jammer, or a tactical A-weapon—however important each of these may prove to be. What should be a matter of concern to Americans is the range of scientific-technological possibilities upon which we have arbitrarily, and needlessly, turned our back.

An advocacy of the resumption of nuclear tests is by no means synonymous with the wish to see the United States produce weapons more frightful than those which are now in our stockpiles. Some of the weapons of the future which have been suggested as technologically feasible are indeed awful to contemplate.

The United States should abjure the development of weapons which could not possibly be used operationally under any circumstances and which could never be integrated into any rational military strategy or political policy. But, although the United States might wisely decide that certain types of weapons should never be developed, it cannot afford to remain blind to the possibilities now available to a power which, according to all past evidence, will not hesitate to exploit them in war or in blackmail. Surely, we cannot develop adequate defenses for the United States in the next decade unless we know all that there is to be known about the performance characteristics of new weapons which may soon be—if they are not already—in the hands of the Soviets. An up-to-date program of active and passive continental defense demands constant technological research, and research requires testing.

The primary value of testing does not lie, as the opponents of test resumption imply, merely in improving by marginal amounts the efficiency of weapons which are now in our stockpiles. If this were so, then a plausible case could be made against resumption. The main point is that the United States cannot hope to compete in the race for the technological leadership of the world if it stops testing. We cannot stay in the running if we seal off forever all avenues of nuclear investigation which entail explosions, whether they be in the earthly or the extra-terrestrial environment, irrespective of whether they are harmful to mankind, and regardless of whether they are for peaceful or military purposes.

That the Soviets can conduct crucial nuclear tests without detection has been publicly conceded by high-ranking officials of our State Department, Defense Department, and other governmental agencies. Must we await empirical evidence before being convinced that the Soviets are, indeed, carrying out clandestine tests? The Soviets' avowed aim, stated often enough by their leaders, is to beat the United States in the technological and military race. According to their own Leninist ideology, they would be guilty of criminal negligence if they were to let the opportunity afforded by the unpoliced moratorium slip by.

We know by now of the tremendous effort which the Soviets exerted in the late forties and early fifties to draw abreast of the United States in atomic and thermonuclear weapons technology. More recently, we have seen how they have striven to forge ahead in the technology of satellites, rockets, and intercontinental missiles. Is there any reason to suppose that they suddenly brought their nuclear weapons technology to a halt as of 1958? Can we stake our security on the assumption that they are not continuing research and testing to develop capabilities for disrupting the defender's communications systems; to increase the efficiency of offensive missile warheads and develop their own antimissile defenses; to improve the flexibility of small atomic weapons; and to move toward the production of the third generation of nuclear weapons?

The combination of these two factors—the possibility of achieving new breakthroughs plus the ability to carry on tests without risking detection—should constitute sufficiently compelling political proof that the Soviets are indeed exploiting the American moratorium to advance their own aims. On October 31, 1960, Charles C. Stelle, the U.S. representative at the Geneva negotiations, frankly told the Soviet delegation that "the U.S. Government would be remiss in its duty to the American people if it continued to check the development of such a major military field as nuclear weapons when it has no way of knowing what its major rival is up to in this field." He declared that the United States could not "afford to rely on Soviet assertions that the Soviet Union has in fact observed a moratorium and has not conducted any nuclear tests."

One might be excused for observing that the United States is doing precisely what its accredited representative in Geneva said that it cannot afford to do. Mr. Stelle's statement, nevertheless, was noteworthy insofar as this was presumably the first time in the Geneva talks that an American official had hinted at the necessary premise of U.S. nuclear test policy, namely, that the Soviets have in fact been testing new nuclear weapons. The United States cannot afford to dismiss as idle boasting Premier Khrushchev's mention of "fantastic new weapons" in his now famous speech of January 1960—more than one year after the de facto moratorium supposedly had gone into effect.

IV

A few American scientists have sought to impress upon the American public the apparent sincerity of Soviet scientists at Geneva in wishing an end to nuclear tests. Yet, can such subjective judgment serve as a meaningful guide to policy? Our statesmen have contended steadfastly for more than a decade that we cannot stake our national security on the mere utterances of Soviet negotiators. This is why we have always insisted arms agreement be accompanied by an effective control system. One may add parenthetically that, so long as scientists do not make policy in the Soviet Union, their apparent sincerity or insincerity is completely irrelevant to our own decisionmaking.

Some of our scientists are opposed to an open discussion of new weapons possibilities

on the grounds that such revelations would jeopardize the success of the Geneva negotiations. They view the nuclear test ban as an overriding objective to which all other considerations must be subordinated. Some of them have publicly stated that nothing must deter the Government in its endeavor to arrive at an accommodation with the Soviet Union on the cessation of tests. A sector of the scientific community seems obsessed with the belief that a treaty to end nuclear tests is the only available gateway to universal disarmament and lasting peace. This obsession, unfortunately, has been communicated to the Government. For nearly 3 years now, the test ban has been virtually the only string to our disarmament bow. If we must base our whole arms control policy upon the shaky foundation of a ban on nuclear tests, we are indeed at the end of our political and diplomatic rope.[2]

Some scientists who support a continuation of the test ban characterize appeals for resuming nuclear weapons development as "irresponsible." They take the position that no one but a nuclear physicist is qualified to debate issues of public policy in this area. This attitude is as presumptuous as it is arrogant. One need not be a nuclear physicist in order to pass judgment on essential national security requirements. All that one needs is access to the facts. If the curtain of nuclear secrecy could be raised, and if the American people could glimpse the conceptual designs of revolutionary new weapons which now exist, they would realize that our current moratorium represents to many of its adherents an escapist flight from the realities of the technological world. They would realize that the new weapons possibilities are not, as some exponents of the ban aver, a "gleam in the eye" of certain AEC scientists. Fortunately, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force have taken a more sober view of these new weapons possibilities. The three services have already arrived at the unanimous decision that a study be made, on an urgent basis, of the third generation weapons.

One cannot but recall another occasion when some of the present proponents of the test ban erred in their estimate of new weapons possibilities. A decade ago, they were profoundly wrong in their scientific estimates of both the feasibility and the practicability of developing a thermonuclear weapon. At that time, opinion within the General Advisory Committee of the AEC varied widely, but several of the scientists contended that it would take 15 or 20 years or even longer to develop an H-bomb. Yet, once the necessary resources were allocated to the task, the United States was able to detonate its first thermonuclear device less than 2 years later. In 1952, the Soviets were only about 6 months behind the United States in nuclear technology, and they were pressing hard to match and surpass us. They knew they were competing in a weapons race. Today, we do not. The proponents of the test ban who deplore the current arms race are guilty of using faulty terminology. It takes two to make a race. So far as the quality of nuclear technology is concerned, the United States has been out of the running since the moratorium went into effect in 1958.

V

The United States can continue to risk technological obsolescence only at the price of undermining the deterrent which is the sole meaningful guarantee of international peace today. If the Joint Chiefs of Staff were asked—and the American people are entitled to pose this question—whether our test policy is endangering our overall national defense posture, their answer would be yes. Our current test policy is clearly at variance with our general defense policy, which demands a relentless advance in the research and development of nuclear weaponry.

The American moratorium is at variance, also, with a basic principle of our wider disarmament policy—namely, that all arms agreements be subject to inspection and control. Our free society is open to the scrutiny of all who wish to inspect us; Communist society remains tightly sealed to the outside world. The moratorium, to the extent that it bestows clear-cut advantages upon the Soviets, militates against genuine arms control efforts on their part. By proffering to the Kremlin what it has always sought—disarmament without controls—we have relieved the Communists of the need to make at least a plausible gesture toward real negotiations. If the United States commits the supreme folly of extending the moratorium for several more years until the inspection system is set up, the death knell will be sounded on meaningful arms control. Arms control then will indeed come—but it will come on terms dictated by the Soviets, after they have demonstrated a decisive superiority in nuclear know-how.

The Geneva test ban negotiations stand today at the very center of the global strategic struggle. The Soviets sabotaged the summit meeting at Paris last May. Since then, they have scuttled the 10-nation disarmament talks, preferring to carry their disarmament campaign into the General Assembly of the United Nations where, they know as well as we, genuine negotiations are virtually impossible. Meanwhile, they have worked with skill and perseverance on the shores of Lake Geneva to set a snare for the United States. Already, we have become enmeshed to the point of near helplessness, and the Soviets have no intention of allowing us to extricate ourselves.

Perhaps the greatest single danger confronting this Nation in the area of defense technology is the prospect that the Soviets, rather than let us escape from their trap, will make a token concession and finally bind us in a formal treaty with continued moratorium. Given our present national mood, we may leap at this disarmament straw, thus forfeiting irretrievably our freedom to take steps essential to an up-to-date national security posture.

This is why it is not sufficient to advocate resumption of nuclear tests merely for purposes of improving seismic detection capabilities or exploring the peaceful applications of nuclear explosions. If we convince ourselves that these are the only justifiable purposes of conducting tests, the Soviets may generously concede and agree to cooperate in a joint testing program for seismic improvement and peaceful uses, in return for a comprehensive, permanent test ban treaty. The Soviets could then stall indefinitely on cooperative research. Counting on the fact that the development of detection techniques will lag behind discovery of disguising methods, they would be able to continue their testing programs unhampered for several years, while the hands of the United States remain tied. By the time the inspection system is installed and operating, the Soviets might very well be 7 or 8 years ahead in weapons technology.

The policy course to be pursued, therefore, seems clear. In the Geneva negotiations, the United States should return to the position contained in President Eisenhower's letter of April 13, 1959, which called for a permanent ban on atmospheric and underwater tests. This constitutes a sound and a workable approach. Meanwhile the moratorium on underground and outer space tests should be revoked immediately so that safe forms of testing can be resumed as quickly as possible. Tests should be conducted not merely to enlarge our scientific knowledge of seismic or outer space phenomena but explicitly for the purpose of advancing the technology of nuclear weapons. The penalties which the moratorium already has imposed upon our total military-technological position must be voided. Even more important, we must prevent the potentially disastrous effects of prolonging an unpoliced moratorium for several more years after the signing of a test ban treaty until a far-from-adequate inspection system has been put into effect.

At the same time that we make the necessary shift in our testing policy, we should undertake a complete review of the military and political implications of nuclear secrecy. If the elimination of nuclear secrecy is the political price which has to be paid for resuming tests, we should be willing to pay that price. I would suggest that, as we resume the tests, we invite the Soviets to witness them. The invitation would be extended without prior commitment of reciprocity from the Russians. It is not at all certain that the Soviets would accept our invitation. But our willingness to lift secrecy would make Soviet propagandists hard put to impute sinister motives to the American test resumption. Our invitation would demonstrate our overriding concern with the defensive aspects of nuclear technology. We would be saying to the Soviets, in effect, that we are less worried over their purloining our technological know-how than over the possibility that they are clandestinely developing weapons which may some day devastate our cities. Simultaneously, we could use the United Nations as an educational forum to persuade the world that the greatest threat to mankind is an armaments competition conducted in secrecy, and that the elimination of secrecy is the first step toward abolition of international distrust. The anguished cries of Communist propagandists and Western pacifists notwithstanding, a resumed program of nuclear weapons development, if handled properly, can contribute meaningfully to a sense of free world security rather than enhance morbid fears of nuclear holocaust.

Certainly, the Geneva talks should be continued. The negotiations already have yielded valuable insights into the problem of arms control, and they may yet bear good fruit, provided that both sides approach them realistically. But it is absolutely essential that the United States, in continuing the Geneva talks, back away from two positions into which it has drifted: (1) The concept of a politically fixed quota of annual on-site inspections to investigate doubtful signals; and (2) the presumption that the test ban treaty, for all practical purposes, goes into full effect as soon as it is signed through an accompanying moratorium agreement which would cover the period prior to the completion of the network of inspection stations. Neither of these positions satisfies the basic

[2] Within the last year or so, an increasing number of American strategy analysts have sounded a new note on the subject of arms control. They admit realistically that there are no prospects for disarmament as traditionally understood and as propounded by Premier Khrushchev. But they do foresee a chance that the Soviets and the United States might achieve security through the maintenance of a balanced deterrent. This would involve developing a mix of various offensive and defensive weapons to make any form of aggression, large or small, unprofitable to attempt. A variety of weapons systems, both offensive and defensive, would enhance the flexibility of the United States, permit the application of more rational strategies, and render it extremely difficult or impossible for a potential aggressor to compute victory with certainty. But such an approach to security, which has much to commend it, demands that the United States continue to make progress in the realm of nuclear weapons technology.

demands of our national security. Unless the Soviets can be persuaded to accept whatever number of on-site inspections may be deemed necessary in the light of scientific criteria, and to agree that tests will be prohibited only after they can be policed, the United States should sign no agreement whatsoever. Barring such agreement, we will have no choice but to announce frankly to the world that the Geneva test ban negotiations were, from the beginning, a tragic mistake.

The change of policy recommended here will not be popular, either at home or abroad. It will be greeted by a storm of protests. Somehow, the public has become obsessed with the idea that the stoppage of tests is the sure road to disarmament and peace, because it is the easiest issue on which to reach agreement with the Russians. This has been proved to be a profoundly false illusion. The diplomacy of disarmament, wrongly joined by us at Soviet insistence on the issue of test cessation, has reached a dead end. Nothing short of a reversal of the U.S. test policy can now salvage any promise for arms control and for international peace.

WEATHER BUREAU PRESENTS AWARDS TO 29 VOLUNTEER OBSERVERS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today the Chief of the U.S. Department of Commerce Weather Bureau, Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, announced 29 volunteer weather observer awards. The Thomas Jefferson and John Campanius Holm Awards were created by the Weather Bureau in 1959 to honor voluntary observers for outstanding achievement.

Most of these observers serve without pay; and I understand that there are some 12,000 cooperative observers throughout the United States. I am especially pleased about this year's awards, because a Montanan is a recipient of the John Campanius Holm certificate commemorating the first known systematic weather observer in the American colonies.

The posthumous award is being made to W. C. Wiggins, for more than four decades of dedicated service as voluntary weather observer at Flatwillow, Mont., ending with his death in January of this year. The citation is being presented to his son, Stanley E. Wiggins, who is carrying on his father's work in this capacity at Winnett, Mont.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the press release from the Weather Bureau announcing these awards be printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEATHER BUREAU TO PRESENT AWARDS TO 29 VOLUNTEER OBSERVERS

Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the U.S. Department of Commerce Weather Bureau, today announced that 29 volunteer weather observers will receive the Bureau's 1961 Thomas Jefferson and John Campanius Holm awards.

The Weather Bureau has more than 12,000 cooperative observers throughout the United States who make and record daily observations. The cooperative observer program has been in existence longer than the Weather Bureau itself, and many families of observers have been collecting weather data for generations. The information provided by these observers has been of inestimable value to the Nation, Dr. Reichelderfer said.

The Thomas Jefferson and John Campanius Holm awards were created by the Weather Bureau in 1959 to honor voluntary observers for outstanding achievement. Most of these observers serve without pay, although a few of them receive small payments for special assignments such as participation in the current national severe storms project.

Five observers are to receive the Thomas Jefferson Award for unusual and outstanding accomplishments in the field of meteorological observations. This award is named for Jefferson because the statesman-scientist took an almost unbroken series of weather observations from 1776 to 1816.

Thomas Jefferson Award recipients are:

Mr. Charles E. Barret, Anchorage, Ky.
[1] Dr. William B. Fulton, Dadeville, Ala.
Mr. J. Smith Lanier, West Point, Ga.
Mr. D. Paul Oswald, Chewsville, Md.
[1] Mr. Ralph E. Weber, Oakland, Md.

The John Campanius Holm certificate commemorates the first known systematic weather observer in the American Colonies. In 1664 and 1665 the Reverend Campanius made records of climate without the use of instruments, near the present site of Wilmington, Del.

Receiving the John Campanius Holm Award are:

Mrs. Lucy C. Allen, Neuse, N.C.
Mr. Robert E. Bradbury, Roberts, Ill.
Mr. L. Monroe Cason, Warrenton, Ga.
Mr. A. R. Cox, Redig, S. Dak.
Mr. Wayne W. Creasman, Tryon, N.C.
Mr. William C. Cromley, Brooklet, Ga.
Mr. Paul O. Feldrappe, Plymouth, Wis.
Mr. Ralph H. Guy, Kenton, Okla.
Rev. Plummer F. Jones, New Canton, Va.
Mr. Harry W. Knapp, Napoleon, Ohio.
Mr. Allin W. Ladd, Holyoke, Mass.
Mr. Clyde O. Laughner, Whitestown, Ind.
Mr. C. R. Lovell, Greenville, Ky.
Mr. Ernest E. Martin, Salem, Mo.
Mrs. H. F. McCall, Ulysses, Kans.
Mr. J. C. Overpeck, State University, N. Mex.
Mrs. Bessie Powe Page, Cheraw, S.C.
Mr. Edwin L. Paulson, St. Helena, Calif.
Mr. Charles M. Richardson, Willoughby, Ohio.
Mr. Joseph C. Robinson, Laketown, Utah.
Mr. C. O. Romig, Dennison, Ohio.
Mr. Frank J. Southmayd, Franklin, N.H.
Mr. R. L. Staats, Chugwater, Wyo.
[1] Mr. W. C. Wiggins, Flatwillow, Mont.

[1] Award to be posthumous.

TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a number of newspapers throughout the country and Montana paid fitting tribute to a great man upon the death, March 23, 1961, of my distinguished predecessor, former Senator James E. Murray.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a collection of editorials and articles.

There being no objection, the editorials and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Mar. 24, 1961]

SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY DIES IN BUTTE

BUTTE.—Retired U.S. Senator James E. Murray died Thursday in Butte at the home of his son, U.S. District Judge W. D. Murray. The former Senator was 84.

Murray, a liberal stalwart in the Senate more than a quarter of a century, died at 5:10 p.m.

Funeral services will be held at 10 a.m. Monday morning from the Daly-Shea Funeral Home in Butte. The cortege will proceed to the Immaculate Conception Church, where solemn requiem mass will be held at 10:30 a.m.

Burial will be in the family plot in Holy Cross Cemetery in Butte beside his widow, who preceded him in death in May 1950.

A physician said death was due to the infirmities of age. The alertness and appetite of the long-time New Dealer waned in the past week.

He had flown into Butte from Florida February 14, was hospitalized for 9 days, then taken to his son's home. While hospitalized, Murray was chipper, showing the spark reminiscent of his long political career, which brought him the title of "Montana's Mr. Democrat."

A few hours before death, Murray's son admitted the veteran Senator's health "was not good." Last rites of the Roman Catholic Church were administered Wednesday.

The veteran Democratic Senator became ill in Florida after his retirement from the Senate and asked "to come home" to Butte.

In his 25 years in the Senate, Murray was regarded as a "100 percent New Dealer." He never wavered from his party's liberal wing.

He rose by seniority to chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, where he became known as a champion of western mining interests and an advocate of reclamation, irrigation, and other natural resources development projects. He also was a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

At the time of his retirement, Murray was the fourth-ranking Senate Member from the standpoint of service and its second oldest Member. The oldest was 92-year-old Senator Theodore Francis Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island, who also retired in January.

Last April 28, the deadline for filing for reelection, Murray withdrew his candidacy, saying he had bowed to his family's request that he not seek a sixth term.

He was first elected to the Senate in 1934 to fill the unexpired term of the late Thomas J. Walsh, who was appointed U.S. Attorney General by President Franklin D. Roosevelt but who died before he could take office.

Murray was reelected in 1936, defeating T. O. Larsen; in 1942, defeating Wellington D. Rankin; in 1948, defeating Tom J. Davis, and in 1954, defeating former Congressman Wesley A. D'Ewart.

He had two close general election races—in 1942 when his margin was 1,212 votes and in 1954 when it was 1,728. His largest lead was 1934—84,304 votes.

Murray was the originator of the Small Business Committee in the Senate. As its chairman, he secured amendments to the financing of small concerns in war production of essential minerals.

A number of major laws bear Murray's name. Included are the Smaller War Plants Act, the Full Employment Act, Murray-Patman Act, and others relating to mining, agriculture, reclamation, and power development.

As chairman of the PWA advisory board in the State, before going to Washington, he urged construction of Hungry Horse Dam.

Later, as a Senator, he sponsored legislation bringing about the surveys and initial work on the dam in northwest Montana. More recently, he worked for funds to start construction of Yellowtail Dam in south-central Montana.

In the field of health, Murray either initiated or cosponsored such legislation as the Dental Research Act, the National Cancer Act, and the national heart bill. He also advocated a national system of health insurance.

Murray once said he considered the Employment Act of 1946 one of his major legislative accomplishments. This law, aimed at eliminating recurring booms and depressions, made the Government responsible for promoting maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

He sponsored the resolution, enacted in 1946, which provided for U.S. membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. In 1948 he was one of UNESCO's two official congressional advisers. Murray was a longtime advocate of a Missouri Valley Authority.

The Senator, who would have been 85 May 3, was born in Toronto, Canada. He was an 1895 graduate of St. Jerome's College in Berlin, Canada, and of the New York University Law School in 1900. He came to Butte after receiving his law degree and was admitted to the bar in Montana in 1901.

After serving as Silver Bow County attorney from 1906 to 1908, Murray went into private practice, where he gained wealth and prominence.

Murray's wife, the former Viola E. Horgan, of Memphis, Tenn., preceded him in death by many years.

In addition to Judge Murray, the former Senator is survived by four other sons, James A., a Washington, D.C., lawyer; Charles, of Washington, D.C.; Edward, of New York, and Howard, of Radersburg, Mont. Also surviving are a sister, Sister M. Ethelbert of the St. Joseph's Convent of London, Ont., and 12 grandchildren.

Murray was the second former Montana Senator to die this month. Zales N. Ecton, the first Republican Montana ever sent to the U.S. Senate by popular vote, died March 3.

Murray, aged and ill, announced his retirement last April amid one of the most bitter Democratic Senate primaries in Montana's history. Both of Montana's Democratic Congressmen, Lee Metcalf and LeRoy Anderson, were candidates, and Murray did not hide his feelings about them, charging they had cast "both personal and political loyalty to the winds."

Murray endorsed former Gov. John W. Bonner as his choice for his Senate seat.

Metcalf won the primary handily and on the eve of the general election, Murray announced his support of Metcalf, who had been regarded as Murray's protege in Congress. Metcalf won the elderly Senator's seat.

The announcement on the Senate floor of Murray's retirement brought eulogies from both sides of the aisle.

Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, Republican, of Vermont, said Murray has been one of the "most kindly, considerate" men he had ever known.

Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat of Alabama, told the Senate the Montana Democrat's decision "saddens my heart." Murray, he added, had maintained Montana's "liberalism."

On both sides of the aisle Senator after Senator praised Murray's long record as a public servant and as a man who fought for the "little people."

[From the Independent Record, Mar. 24, 1961]

LEADERS PAY TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURRAY

BUTTE.—Tributes from President Kennedy, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, Montana Congressmen, Gov. Donald G. Nutter, and Secretary of State Frank Murray came after the death of former Senator James E. Murray, who died in Butte Thursday.

Kennedy, Johnson, and Mansfield got word of Murray's death during a conference at the White House.

PRAISE FROM PRESIDENT

The President said:

"I feel a deep sense of personal loss. Senator Murray fought for much important legislation in the Senate during my association with him in that body. It was with deep grief that I heard of his death."

VICE PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Said JOHNSON:

"There was no greater man in the Senate. Senator Murray's death is a deep and personal loss to me."

SENATOR MANSFIELD

MANSFIELD, who conveyed the regrets of the President and Vice President, said:

"I never worked with a better partner than Jim Murray. He was a father, a counselor and adviser to me. He looked after the best interest of Montana and the Nation during his long, illustrious career in the Senate. His death is a great shock to me. Butte, Silver Bow County, and the Nation will mourn the passing of this great man. He contributed mightily to the welfare of our country in its most critical times."

SENATOR METCALF

Senator LEE METCALF said, "For more than 25 years Senator Murray was Montana's first citizen. He was one of the greatest humanitarians ever to sit in the U.S. Senate."

CONGRESSMAN OLSEN

Representative ARNOLD OLSEN spoke in similar manner. He said:

"I have known Senator Murray and his family as long as I can remember. I knew him when I was a small boy. I always admired him as a great leader and a great progressive for Montana and the Nation."

GOVERNOR NUTTER

Nutter said:

"We in Montana will be ever grateful for his years of public service. His many friends will mourn his passing. To members of his family, on behalf of myself and all Montanans, I extend our deepest sympathy."

STATE AUDITOR HOLMES

State Auditor John J. Holmes, like Murray, a Democrat, described the former Senator as "a very fine and great Montanan."

Murray, no relation, lauded Murray as a "true champion of and for the people." He said, "The people of Montana and the United States will miss this great humanitarian."

The State railroad and public service commission, in a prepared statement Friday said, "Murray was always for whatever was good for the people of Montana.

"Over the years he had been a tremendous help to this office when we were trying to work out our problems in Washington. He was never too busy to cooperate with us in every way."

Leo C. Graybill, Democratic national committeeman, said Montanans owe a debt of gratitude to Senator Murray.

"Since his first entry into public service on a statewide basis as WPA Director and throughout his long career in the U.S. Senate he was ever mindful of the people in his home State of Montana.

"Farmers know of his fight on their behalf when the going was toughest. He was always a friend of organized labor and of all working people. His record of service to Montana will be remembered irrespective of party," Graybill said.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Mar. 28, 1961]

SENATE HONORS MURRAY AS LIBBY DAM FATHER

HELENA.—Burial of former Senator James E. Murray, Democrat, of Montana, was noted twice in the U.S. Senate Monday: with prayer and an appropriation.

Murray, who retired last year after 26 years in the Senate, was buried in Butte, where he died Thursday.

Senate was in recess over the weekend in respect to Murray. When it met this noon, Senate Chaplain Frederick Brown Harris said a prayer for the Montanan.

Later, the Senate passed an appropriation bill containing $350,000 for planning Libby Dam, to be built on the Kootenai River in Montana.

Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, told the Senate Murray was the father of Libby Dam, having written the project authorization bill 11 years ago.

"I think this item is a fitting memorial," MANSFIELD said, "to a great Senator who advocated a great project and worked hard and constructively to get it going.

"The goal which he set is now in sight," MANSFIELD said, "and the rest of us in Montana and the Northwest will benefit because of the foresight shown by this great man."

Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, said "I think this is a wonderful step which is being taken."

Senator LEE METCALF, Democrat of Montana, said it was tragic Murray could not live to see construction of the project he fathered.

METCALF said Murray was not only an advocate of Montana water projects, but in a quarter century had fathered water resource programs for the Nation.

[From the Peoples Voice, Mar. 31, 1961]

EXIT, A GREAT MONTANAN

Senator James E. Murray, after an extended illness, passed away in Butte last Thursday at the age of 84. Thus came to a close the life of a man who had been closely associated with Montana affairs since the turn of the century, and an active architect of Montana and national progress for more than 25 years.

While, in later years, Senator Murray was best known for his continuing efforts in behalf of development and conservation of the Nation's resources as chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, his senatorial role was not of a single purpose.

From the time he first went to Washington in January 1935, he was an active partner of Franklin Roosevelt and others in pushing the New Deal. Later, he devoted his energies just as wholeheartedly in support of Harry Truman's Fair Deal.

During his 26 years in the Senate he was a consistent champion of improved working and wage standards, particularly for the unorganized, and was actively instrumental in securing enactment of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. His Full Employment Act of 1946 provided the President, for the first time, with ways and means of keeping an accurate check on the Nation's economic pulse. He worked incessantly for more and better public housing and easier financing for private homebuilding. He was one of the original sponsors of legislation to provide prepaid Federal health insurance for all Americans—a goal still denied, but nevertheless a worthwhile program that will eventually be achieved. He continually strove to improve social security, public health programs, educational standards, etc.

In a word, Senator Murray during his more than a quarter of a century in Washington, was actively identified with every major effort to improve America for the benefit of all Americans. We honor his memory by stating that in our opinion, he was the greatest Senator Montana ever sent to the Nation's Capital.—H. L. B.

[Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 25, 1961]

JAMES E. MURRAY

For 26 years, James E. Murray was a fixture in the U.S. Senate, a politician known for his steadfastness to principle and gentleness of manner. In Montana, politics can be as rugged as the terrain, but somehow Mr. Murray came through the rawest battles with

his serenity of spirit unimpaired. Although he was a millionaire, his sympathies were with the dispossessed and his voting record rarely swerved from his down-the-line New Deal convictions.

Yet the soft-spoken Montanan who died on Thursday at 84 was able to combine forthrightness and courtesy in a way that won respect if not agreement. When he retired from the Senate last year he could look back on a long and fruitful career. He was the chief sponsor of the Full Employment Act of 1946, a leading champion of conservation and of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, and an ardent supporter of a broad range of welfare measures.

His passing recalls to mind Montana's notable constellation of Democratic Senators who have left their mark in politics. There were Thomas J. Walsh, the investigator of Teapot Dome, and Burton K. Wheeler, the temperamental insurgent and one time America Firster who now practices law in Washington. And the tradition which Jim Murray so capably represented is being continued by Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf. The State's copper economy and brassy politics have been impressively productive.

[From the Western News, Mar. 30, 1961]

SENATOR MURRAY SERVED STATE AND NATION WELL

It is sometimes difficult to assess the character and accomplishments of a man who has been active in public life upon the occasion of his death. Not so with Senator James E. Murray, who passed away Thursday, March 23, at his home city of Butte. He would have been 85 years of age had he lived until May 3.

Here was a man of more than usual ability who possessed more than ordinary wealth and who used his ability and the stature he gained through a term of service extending over 26 years membership in the U.S. Senate, in behalf of the masses of mankind.

Too often when men of wealth attain power they are tempted to use it for the benefit of people similarly situated. Not so with Senator Murray. His heart was with the people.

No other Montanan who has served in the Congress has had his name attached to so many monumental legislative efforts. No other Montanan to date had so imposing a record of accomplishments. Murray was not one to avoid unpopular causes nor one who would shun the risk involved in grappling with formidable opponents. It was enough for Jim Murray to find the cause was just and favorable to the interests of the majority of Americans.

Because of his attitude in behalf of the majority of Americans Senator Murray won the implacable hatred of many powerful individuals, groups, and corporations seeking or holding special interests. Some of them went out of their way to attack him, sometimes stooping very low in such practices. It became apparent to many Montanans that Murray must be right because of who opposed him. Happily the majority of Montanans sensed that Murray was almost always right and the majority stuck with him no matter how rough was the going.

Montana has been fortunate in having a number of very able men represent the State in Congress. It is possible that some of them were more spectacular than Senator James E. Murray, but certainly none of them left a richer record of accomplishment. Really that is the measure of the public servant.

[From the St. Louis Post Dispatch]

MURRAY OF MONTANA

Senator James E. Murray, of Montana, who died recently at the age of 84, was one of the Senate's leading progressives from 1934 until his retirement early this year. He was a man of wealth who nevertheless had a great sympathy for the underdog. There have been few pieces of liberal legislation in the last quarter-century that did not have his indorsement. He supported the New Deal, the Fair Deal and measures for full employment and health insurance. For many years he was a devoted advocate of the proposed Missouri Valley Authority and of virtually every sound proposal for conserving natural resources. Liberals in and out of Congress could always count on Mr. Murray for help. It is fortunate that he was succeeded by the able LEE METCALF, his work, in a measure, will go on.

[From the Great Falls (Mont.) Tribune, Mar. 25, 1961]

MONTANA MOURNS THE PASSING OF GREAT LIBERAL LEADER

Few men have left a deeper imprint on Montana government, politics and social welfare than Senator James E. Murray who died in Butte Thursday at the age of 84. At the time of his retirement he was the fourth-ranking U.S. Senate Member, and the second oldest.

Throughout his 25 years in the Senate he was an ardent and forceful advocate of the interests of the common people. He was recognized as a leader in the cause of labor, education and small business.

He was an effective champion of western mining interests, an advocate of reclamation, irrigation and other national resource development. Many important Montana projects stand as a monument to his sponsorship and influence in these fields.

In Montana Democratic councils he was a top figure throughout his political career—an unwavering champion of the liberal New Deal philosophy. His popularity with the voters was evidenced in succeeding election contests for his Senate seat.

Aside from that, he was a kindly man whose friends were legion, even among those who disagreed sharply with his political position.

His death marks the passing of an outstanding Montana and national statesman and a great humanitarian.

[From the United Mine Workers Journal, Apr. 1, 1961]

FORMER SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

Former U.S. Senator James E. Murray, of Montana, a good friend of the UMWA and one of the pioneers of the New Deal, died March 23 in Butte, Mont., where his political career began. He was 84.

Mr. Murray, a Democrat, retired from the Senate this year after more than 25 years of service.

Upon learning of his passing, President Emeritus John L. Lewis and the UMWA's International officers—President Thomas Kennedy, Vice President W. A. Boyle and Secretary-Treasurer John Owens—sent the following telegram to Mr. Murray's son, Judge W. D. Murray at 925 West Quartz, Butte:

"The tragic news of the death of Senator James E. Murray has brought grave sorrow to the officers and members of the United Mine Workers of America. Senator Murray's brilliant and distinguished career in the U.S. Senate has been chronicled by the historians of this country and his courageous dedication to improving the welfare of the working people will long benefit the generations to come. We extend the heartfelt condolences of our membership to your family on this sad day which will long be remembered for the Nation has lost one of its leading statesmen and the United Mine Workers has lost a true friend for whom we have so much affection, gratitude, and respect."

A good friend of the coal industry and coal miners, Mr. Murray was one of the very few Senators who aided the late Senator Matthew M. Neely, Democrat of West Virginia, in guiding through the Senate both in 1940 and 1952 versions of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act.

At the time of his retirement he was chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and a high-ranking member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. His tenure in the Senate was exceeded by only three persons at that time.

It was under his guidance as chairman of the Interior Committee that the Coal Research Act was pushed through the 86th Congress.

In other fields, political projects of which Mr. Murray was particularly proud included: the Full Employment Act of 1946; health insurance financed through the Social Security System; statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, and a lifelong defense of public parks.

In the last session of Congress, the controversial Murray-Metcalf aid-to-education bill, close to that being pushed by the present administration, came to a vote in the Senate and failed to pass.

Mr. Murray was born in Canada and graduated from the New York University Law School, was admitted to the Montana bar in 1901 and since then had maintained a law practice in Butte.

Mr. Murray is survived by five sons: Federal Judge William D., Butte; Charles A., who served as his administrative assistant; James A., Edward E. and Howard A.

[From the Glendive (Mont.) Ranger, Mar. 30, 1961]

IN TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURRAY

Senator James E. Murray, who died at the age of 84 at Butte Thursday, was recognized as one of the Nation's most able leaders as he served the country in the U.S. Senate for a quarter of a century.

At his recent retirement he was a top ranking member of several important Senate committees and was second oldest from the standpoint of service.

Senator Murray, during his 25 years in the Senate, although reputed to have a personal fortune of several millions of dollars, was an advocate of much legislation for the betterment of the common folks. Always interested and a leader in the cause of the welfare and progress of sound labor programs, his unwavering attention to the need of educational facilities and advancement through Federal aid, his effort and influence in the current health enedavor made him a pioneer in working for the adoption of the Federal laws of social security, public housing and fair employment standards.

Jim Murray, a true and loyal westerner from the mining city of Butte did much during his service in the Senate to further the improvement of the State's mining industry, and was a champion of sound legislation of benefit to the farmers and ranchers of the country.

Senator Murray was a busy man in Washington with his attention to national and international programs, but his devotion to Montana affairs and his assistance to the people of his State were such that endeared him to so many, regardless of political affiliation and beliefs. He will be greatly missed by the home folks, and will long be remembered and recognized as one of America's outstanding citizens and statesmen.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Daily Times]

SENATOR MURRAY SERVED STATE

Montana kept Senator James E. Murray in the U.S. Senate 26 years, and he main-

tained a record of support of public power development which is of major interest in Montana and nearby States.

His record was that of democratic liberalism, and in his more active years he wielded potent influence in his party.

Murray, dead in Butte at 84, gave his adult life to public service, starting with the office of county attorney in 1906.

Political associates prevailed upon Murray last fall to relinquish his seat after he had announced his candidacy.

His age and his health provided the reason.

He served longer in the Senate than all but three of its present Members: BYRD of Virginia; RUSSELL of Georgia; and HAYDEN of Arizona.

Murray was one of three Montana Senators who gained national prominence. Senator Thomas J. Walsh, astute chairman of the 1932 national convention in which Franklin D. Roosevelt was nominated, accepted appointment as Attorney General, but died March 2, 1933, before taking office. Murray succeeded him.

Burton K. Wheeler served four terms as Senator, was a candidate for Vice President when Robert M. LaFollette was Progressive candidate for President, and was mentioned as a possible candidate for Vice President with Franklin D. Roosevelt when Henry Wallace got the nod and was nominated. Wheeler left the Senate in 1947.

Montana last fall elected a Democrat, Representative LEE METCALF, to succeed Senator Murray. At the same time, Montana elected a Republican Governor. Had Murray remained in the race and been elected, Montana would now have a Republican Senator through appointment. Thus Murray served his party by withdrawing, as he had served it faithfully in the Senate and in subordinate office.

MEMORIAL ON HON. SENATOR JAMES E. MURRAY

We, the South Valley County Farmers Union, in convention on this 25th day of March 1961, deem it proper and fitting that we pause momentarily to pay tribute to one of the greatest Americans of his time, Senator James E. Murray, of Montana. Time and space does not permit listing the many great things that were accomplished under his untiring leadership. It can be truly said that he gave the best years of his life to the welfare of the State of Montana and its people.

Therefore, we unanimously mourn the passing of this great American. The State of Montana and the Nation have sustained a great loss.

Let us all stand in a moment of silence as a tribute to the accomplishments for which he so rightly deserves credit.

Copies to be sent to: Montana congressional delegation, family of Senator Murray, and Montana Farmers Union.

SOUTH VALLEY COUNTY
FARMERS UNION,
MARION HELLSTERN, *Secretary*.

[From the Montana Standard, Mar. 28, 1961]

INDIAN TRIBE PAYS TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MURRAY

The family of James E. Murray, 84, former U.S. Senator from Montana, Monday received a personally delivered message from the Rocky Boy Indian Tribe of Montana.

Members of that tribe, and also of the Blackfeet Tribe, attended funeral services held here for the longtime Democratic Senator. The communication, signed by Joe Stanley, Rocky Boy Tribe, read:

"We Rocky Boy Indians made our way to here, about 210 miles, to attend this day with James E. Murray, to give him thanks for what he done for us, an Indian nation.

"We feel we owe it to him to come to his funeral for helping us out when we really needed it, for what he gave us to live on in 1956—a Federal help for our children and grandchildren. He got our tribe a sawmill for housing this past year. Ever since I saw him in Washington in 1958, I had hope for better times for the Indian people, and again in 1960.

"I know it and I see it and I really believe it—he is an honest man.

"I said to him this last time when we were leaving his office. I waited until the last and I said, 'I am glad you let us in here to talk over our problems. You are an old man now. When you leave this seat I hope God will put a man in this place who will have a heart for the Indian people like you have.'

"He sure was glad. He grabbed me by the shoulders and shook me. We talked for a long time.

"These things we will never forget as long as we live. I hope the ones that are here—his family—that they will have a good future, their children and their grandchildren.

"We always pray for that old man in our prayers, for his family and his grandchildren, his secretary, and the ones he worked with in Washington, D.C. That is the way we have been doing on the Rocky Boy Reservation and we will keep it up."

[From News for Electric Consumers, Mar. 31, 1961]

A GREAT MAN PASSES

ECIC joins in mourning the passing of Senator James E. Murray of Montana, who died March 23. He was 84 years old and had retired last year after more than 25 years in the Senate. In a special luncheon in his honor last yeaf, ECIC presented a citation to Senator Murray expressing the deep gratitude of ECIC groups for "his many contributions and his leadership in the struggle for a better life for all." The citation read, in part:

"James E. Murray has given the people of the entire Nation, as well as his State of Montana, an outstanding demonstration of the true meaning of serving the public welfare. He has provided leadership and inspiration for many of the social and economic gains which have been achieved in the past 25 years. He has been a guardian and a champion of the Nation's human and natural resources, striving throughout his distinguished career to:

"Assure all consumers of an abundant supply of low-cost electricity; harness the power of the Nation's rivers, and conserve and develop in the interests of all the people the Nation's water, mineral, forest and land resources; protect the consumer—the wage-earner, the farmer and the small businessman; improve our schools and elevate the teaching profession; advance an economy of abundance through full employment and full production; improve and protect the health of the people.

"As the sole or chief author of 65 major laws, and throughout his Senate career, James E. Murray has helped build, conserve and strengthen much that is fine in this Nation."

[From the Montana Farmers Union News]

JAMES E. MURRAY

James E. Murray, one of the outstanding figures in the history of the U.S. Senate, died at his son's home in Butte the evening of March 23. Solemn Requiem Mass was sung at Immaculate Conception Church, March 27, and burial was in Holy Cross Cemetery.

Mr. Murray was first elected to the Senate in 1934 to complete the unexpired term of the late Thomas J. Walsh, and was re-elected four times. Last April 28 he bowed out of the race for a sixth term. He would have been 85 on May 3.

The former Senator was eulogized by the President, by his colleagues of both parties, leaders of State government, and by friends and admirers throughout the Nation and the world.

Leonard Kenfield, president of Montana Farmers Union, said that "With the passing of Senator James E. Murray, one of America's great men is gone.

"He war a warm friend of the Farmers Union from his first days in the U.S. Senate in 1935 until his death. He helped us with every proposal on which we sought his aid, gladly, with vigor, and with keen understanding of farm problems.

"We are all deeply indebted to him for his lifetime of stanch devotion to improving the general welfare. Farmers, workers, small-business men and all citizens are benefiting from his achievements. Income protection, rural power and telephone cooperatives, and farm credit are among the legislative programs he faithfully supported for farm people. For the working men and women it was minimum wages and collective bargaining that he championed. He led in the establishment of the Small Business Committee of the Senate and was its first chairman," Mr. Kenfield said.

"All citizens are better off for his statesmanship in the areas of social security, health, education, and resource development. He ended a brilliant career as chairman of the important and powerful Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. He will be remembered for his important work in helping to bring into existence Federal Hungry Horse Dam in northwestern Montana and for legislation and funds for Yellowtail Dam, soon to be constructed in southeastern Montana. Several vital pieces of legislation bear his name, and among them is the Full Employmen' Act. His proposals for national health insurance, Federal aid to education and multipurpose river development are renowned benchmarks in legislative efforts.

"Although he experienced sometimes big and sometimes very narrow vote margins at the polls during his political career, Senator Murray never wavered from vigorous support of progressive and often bitterly contested measures for Montana and the Nation. He was identified during all his years in the Nation's Capital as a New Dealer."

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION ON MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to take this opportunity to review some recent developments relating to the question of mass transportation, in light of the administration's present study of the subject.

Last year the Senate passed a bill, S. 3278, whose provisions have been expanded and refined and have now been incorporated into the general housing bill, S. 1922.

Extensive hearings were held last year by both Houses and, in reporting the bill to the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee Report No. 1591, June 15, 1960, stated:

The committee believes that the urban transportation problem is of vital concern to all levels of government, and that the Federal Government must help overcome the decline and deterioration of mass transportation services. The committee believes further that the impact of the urban transportation crisis on the economic health of the metropolitan areas, on the free flow of goods in interstate commerce, and on the

Federal highway program is of such gravity as to warrant immediate Federal action.

That was a year ago. Conditions have continued to deteriorate, adding steadily to the ultimate cost of solution.

This last March the Senate Housing Subcommittee again held extensive hearings, with witnesses from all over the country, representing a wide variety of interests. These hearings are now available, and they contain a wealth of information on the subject.

At about the same time, the Regional Plan Association was completing a $50,000 study of passenger transportation in the New York metropolitan region, with particular reference to railroad commutation.

In its report to the Senate Commerce Committee, the association recommended that—

> The Federal Government should make available, at the lowest possible interest, the capital funds necessary to save and improve commuter rail service. This is far less a burden on the taxpayer than is providing alternative commuter facilities. The investment should be used as a lever to move the railroads toward a modern and efficient commuter rail system.

The association made a particularly valuable recommendation in stating that the administering agency should insist on certain standards for the equipment purchased with Federal loans, particularly interchangeability among railroads and convertibility to a technologically improved system where possible.

I think it is probably safe to say that, had the study not been primarily oriented to the problem of the commuter rails, the association would also have agreed on the need to improve the whole range of facilities necessary to achieve a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system for the urban area, including transit and bus as well as rail, together with such facilities as fringe area parking lots and coordinated terminals.

More recently, the Advisory Commission on Inter-Governmental Relations concluded a several-month study of the mass transportation problem.

The 26-member Commission, representing all levels of government from all parts of the country, made the following recommendation without dissent:

> The Commission recommends enactment of legislation by the Congress: (1) to provide grants to assist State and local governments in developing comprehensive plans for mass transportation in urban areas; (2) to underwrite special demonstration projects designed to develop and test innovations in mass transportation facilities and service arrangements; and (3) to initiate a program of long-term low interest rate loans to State and local governments for the construction and modernization of mass transportation facilities and equipment in urban areas.

As the Commission noted in its report, this recommendation represents "substantial endorsement of the objectives and major provisions of S. 345," which I introduced with 18 of my Senate colleagues.

Also, a study of National Transportation Policy by the Senate Commerce Committee's special study group, after extensively analyzing the loan guarantee program available under the Transportation Act of 1958 concluded that an attractive loan program—a loan of Federal money rather than guarantee of a private loan—must be provided so that railroad companies can put new equipment into service with minimum financial strain and that desirable terms would be 25- to 40-year amortizations and an interest rate no higher than the current average yield of similar term marketable U.S. obligations.

Finally, I should like to excerpt some comments that have been made on the subject by two men who are involved in the administration's present study, Mr. Wilfred Owen, of the Brookings Institution, now heading up the joint HHFA-Commerce task force, and Dr. Luther Gulick, president of the Institute of Public Administration, which is now undertaking a $98,000 study for the administration.

In his book "Cities in the Motor Age," Mr. Owen writes:

> It is clear that even the current extraordinary roadbuilding effort will fall short of meeting all the transport requirements of the big metropolis in rush hours. Often it seems that the more roads we build the heavier the congestion becomes. By 1975 we may find ourselves with a highway system that can handle more vehicles than ever before, yet one that will be just as overburdened as ever. The answer to the transportation problems of our densely built-up urban centers does not lie in the private car alone. It is becoming more and more difficult to acquire land for rights-of-way and parking. Any real effort to make our vertical cities completely accessible by automobile would eliminate much of the downtown development that makes access worth while.
>
> In order to preserve the core of the large city, there should be a more balanced attention to all methods of movement—and this means that an adequate public-transit system is essential. Without it the motorist in today's big city may strangle in his own congestion. Two conclusions seem warranted. First, where rapid transit lines already exist, facilities and equipment should be preserved and modernized to meet the requirements of present users. Subsidies for this purpose are warranted where they will mean a net saving in total outlays for the transport system as a whole. Some additional facilities may be warranted in densely developed central cities, but no large-scale return to rail transit is probable in view of the highly dispersed pattern of metropolitan areas. Second, since an expressway system must be built in any event to accommodate weekend and holiday traffic peaks and to meet the needs of truck transport as well, the most practical rapid transit for many communities will be the express bus operating on express highways. New techniques for vertical takeoff and landing will make air travel an important additional factor in the regional transport of the future.

While this is not the time for an exhaustive discussion of this subject, there are a few points I would like to make on Mr. Owen's statement. First, I question his skepticism about any large-scale return to rail transit. I believe such a statement can only be predicated upon the assumption that our present patterns of low-density suburban sprawl will continue and upon the assumption that new technology will not play an important role in future rail transit operations. I think, first of all, that there is a rapidly growing awareness of the need to come up with some alternative to urban sprawl, perhaps in the form of new satellite cities which would considerably improve the feasibility of expanding rail rapid transit.

But whether this development comes to pass or not, the legislation I have introduced and the provisions now incorporated in the housing bill would enable us to make a start on providing a comprehensive mass transportation system, whether it involves rail, bus, or helicopter.

Dr. Gulick, who is now heading up a $98,000 study on urban transportation for the President, testified both last year and this year on the mass transportation bills considered by the Senate Housing Subcommittee.

During the course of his testimony this March Dr. Gulick commented:

> I see in this bill the first practical step—not the last step—toward the solution of the rapidly worsening urban transportation crisis. This bill looks forward, not backward. It is not trying to save anything. It goes at the fundamentals and encourages, yes it forces, a comprehensive approach.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Conclusions and recommendations" section of the RPA study, written by Mr. Anthony Arpaia, the recommendations of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the provocative and penetrating testimony of Dr. Luther Gulick at the hearings last March be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(By Anthony F. Arpaia)

The attached study by the Regional Plan Association staff is the factual basis for my conclusions and recommendations as follows:

DESCRIPTION OF THE NEW YORK METROPOLITAN REGION

1. One-tenth of the Nation—some 16 million people—live in the 7,000-square-mile, three-State New York metropolitan region.

2. In addition to its large segment of the national population, the region is essential to the Nation because it performs important and unique services for the national economy. It is the capital of business decision-making.

3. Two of every five jobs in the region are performed in a 9-square-mile area in the southern half of Manhattan Island, New York's central business district. Its area is the size of an average American town of 20,000 people.

4. More than 3 million persons enter and leave the central business district every day. Of these, half come and go during peak rush hours, entering and leaving at about the same time because they work with each other in a complex face-to-face communications network.

THE NECESSITY OF MAINTAINING COMMUTER RAIL SERVICE

5. Some 400,000 persons working in the central business district live outside New York City. Half of these go to work on seven commuter railroads and the Hudson and Manhattan tubes (a subway system running between Newark and Manhattan).

6. Without railroads, the 200,000 commuters would have to travel on highways which are jammed during rush hours. There is no road capacity left during peak hours.

7. The cost of new expressways and river crossings to bring today's rail commuters into the Manhattan central business district by bus or car would be enormous. Once on Manhattan Island, the cars and buses would strangle normal and necessary street use. In addition, the vast stretches of costly space for extra parking and bus terminals would disrupt the economic life of the city. If the people who work in the Empire State Building drove to their jobs, it would take another Empire State Building to park their cars.

CRISIS OF COMMUTER RAILROADS

8. The physical condition of commuter railroad equipment has deteriorated seriously.

9. The region's commuter railroads are in serious financial condition.

WHY THE PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL STRUCTURE OF COMMUTING RAILROADS HAS DETERIORATED

10. Most of the non-rush-hour traffic has been lost because of changed living patterns. The railroads are left with high peaks of activity about 20 hours each week; little equipment is used to rest of the time. The 5 day workweek further shortened the rails' utilization of commuter plant and equipment.

11. Deficits caused by losing off-peak riders made it necessary for the railroads to cut maintenance and replacement of equipment and to pare schedules. Resulting passenger discomfort and inconvenience lost further off-peak business and deepened the deficit.

12. In the past, railroads made up commuter deficits from profitable freight business. The eastern railroads have had difficulties maintaining freight profits because they have relatively short hauls. Trucks provide intense competition. Recently built expressways have brought sharp cuts in railroad freight business.

13. Despite the increasing deficits, property taxes on railroads have remained high. Commuters and local groups have misunderstood the railroads' problems and so have not been enlisted in efforts to contribute to solutions of the rail commuter problem without cutting essential services.

THE REASONS FOR FEDERAL LEADERSHIP TO SAVE THE COMMUTER RAIL LINES

14. Manhattan's central business district is the nerve center of the Nation's economy because of its large role in commerce, finance and world trade. Any lessening of Manhattan's business district activities would mean a tremendous waste of capital investment, private and public.

15. Because of the national stake in maintaining Manhattan's business district as a hub of the economy, failure to act quickly on commuter problems could result in the need for more drastic Federal intervention later.

16. The Federal Government has indicated interest in an adequate transportation system for the region by heavy investment in highways—$426 million over the past 5 years. In the next 10 years, the U.S. Government is expected to spend $3 billion in the region on the interstate highway program alone.

17. As one of the region's largest employers, the Federal Government has a stake in preserving the efficiency and economy of its service and the ability of its employees to get to and from work.

18. Because the region covers parts of three States, the region's interstate transportation problem falls under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government through its constitutional powers.

19. Rail service is essential to the national security. It will be required in any national emergency to move people and goods; and it will conserve fuel, rubber, manpower and materials.

WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE

20. A major capital investment must be made to save and improve commuter rail service. Without immediate investment in equipment and facilities, operating deficits will continue to spiral upward while service declines. Eventually, if conditions continue to deteriorate, the safety of the public may be jeopardized. The background study estimates that $650 to $800 million is needed to stabilize operating costs and service and to take a step toward cutting costs and improving services.

21. New equipment should be designed so as to achieve greater operating economies and better service. This means that it should be interchangeable among railroads and convertible to what must gradually become a technologically improved system.

22. Some operating deficits are likely to continue on the commuter runs even with new equipment. The deficits must be met from some source other than railroad income.

THE FEDERAL TASK

23. The Federal Government should make available, at the lowest possible interest, the capital funds necessary to save and improve commuter rail service. This is far less a burden on the taxpayer than providing alternative commuter facilities. The investment should be used as a lever to move the railroads toward a modern and efficient commuter rail system.

24. It would be helpful also if the Federal Government would provide research funds for new equipment design. A similar procedure is embodied in the Federal highway and urban renewal programs.

25. Should the State and local governments grant tax concessions to the railroads, recommended below, the Federal Government should not dilute the concessions by maintaining full income taxes on the railroad corporations.

26. The Federal tax on passenger fares should be repealed. It was originally imposed as a World War II measure to discourage travel and is a relatively unimportant revenue source.

RESPONSIBILITY OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

27. State and local governments already have demonstrated their recognition that they have a stake in maintaining service on the commuter rail lines. It should be their responsibility to recommend the level of fares, to set standards of frequency of service, to determine type and location of passenger stations, and to make up any operating deficits.

28. The railroads should be relieved of real property taxes on commuter services.

FEDERAL MACHINERY FOR INVESTING IN RAILWAY EQUIPMENT

29. Any appropriate Federal agency could administer the proposed capital loans.

30. The agency should insist on certain standards for the equipment purchased with Federal loans, particularly interchangeability among railroads and convertibility to a technologically improved system where possible.

MACHINERY AT THE REGIONAL LEVEL

31. The Federal loans could be made directly from the Government to the railroads. However, it seems reasonable for the Federal Government to work through the State and local governments involved for two reasons:

(a) The capital investment will directly affect future operating costs and are, therefore, related to the responsibility suggested for the State and local governments of making up operating deficits.

(b) Commuter rail service affects and is affected by the whole pattern of regional development. How this development takes place is primarily a State-local concern.

32. Although a single tristate agency would represent the best medium for effectuating combined State and local participation, there are reasons for proceeding with a tristate agency or individual State agencies if necessary; otherwise the failure of legislative authorization or action by one State might delay the progress of prompt improvement to the fullest extent possible in this highly critical period.

33. The States should retain regulatory responsibility for the intrastate portions of the rail service.

ACTION LOOKING TO THE FUTURE

Action is now imperative, but it should be action that will provide permanent improvements for the region's passenger transportation system. Federal investment in suburban railroads should be regarded as an integral part of the total Federal aid effort in the region.

It is also imperative that the executive branch of the Federal Government establish appropriate machinery to coordinate all Federal programs that affect the urban area, such as highway, airport, housing, urban renewal, etc., so that these activities are effectively correlated with comprehensive metropolitan plans developed by State and local governments.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS,

Washington, D.C., May 3, 1961.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: For the past several months the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been giving attention and study to the question of mass transportation in metropolitan areas. The Commission was created by Public Law 86-380 as a continuing body made up of representatives of National, State, and local governments and the general public for the purpose of studying and making recommendations with regard to intergovernmental relations. Among other duties the Commission is charged with "making available technical assistance to the executive and legislative branches of the Federal Government in the review of proposed legislation to determine its overall effect on the Federal system; and encouraging discussion and study at an early stage of emerging public problems that are likely to require intergovernmental cooperation."

At its fifth meeting held on April 27-28, the Commission considered at length the question of Federal-State-local responsibilities with regard to mass transportation facilities and services in metropolitan areas. The resulting Commission report is being prepared for publication and will be available in a few weeks. However, since legislation on this subject is pending before the Congress, the Commission desires to make available promptly, the major points resulting from its deliberations. Consequently, there is enclosed a copy of that portion of the report which summarizes and explains the recommendations of the Commission.

Respectfully,

FRANK BANE,
Chairman.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS REGARDING MASS TRANSPORTATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

A. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE STATES

1. The Commission recommends the enactment of legislation by the States to au-

thorize local units of government within metropolitan areas to establish, in accordance with statutory requirements, service corporations or authorities for the management of areawide transportation facilities and services, such entities to have authority to borrow and to impose user charges, but with the initial establishment of any such entity being subject to voter approval on the basis of an areawide majority.[1]

The Commission has no general brief to offer either for or against direct local government provision of mass transportation. Private ownership and operation of facilities is by far the prevailing arrangement, and presumably will continue to be so. We believe policy on this matter can best be determined by the people of the area involved in the light of their particular transportation conditions and needs. The Commission does believe, however, that where those directly concerned wish to establish a governmental agency to provide public transportation in a particular metropolitan area, action on the matter should not be unduly delayed or hampered.

This is in accordance with the general philosophy that the widest possible range of potentially appropriate means should be available for meeting problems which accompany metropolitan development.

The Commission fully appreciates the various arguments which have been advanced against the use of functional authorities. These include the following: (1) It is a piecemeal approach to metropolitan problems. (2) The creation of authorities adds to the number of local units of government within the metropolitan area, of which there are already too many. (3) Authorities, being typically governed by a board of directors of private citizens appointed for staggered terms, are not directly responsive to the will of the people and to a considerable extent are beyond the reach of any one level of government. On the other hand, the Commission recognizes that the "authority" device constitutes one way of handling areawide functions within the the context of overlapping local units of government, and believes that the residents of metropolitan areas should be free to use this device if they see fit.

The Commission suggests a number of safeguards for inclusion in the kind of enabling legislation recommended above. In the first place, it is highly desirable to avoid the eventual establishment of numerous functional authorities; to that end, the enabling legislation should, where otherwise appropriate, permit the new entity to assume other areawide functions in addition to transportation, if the citizens concerned so desire.

Secondly, in order that the transportation authority be politically accountable and responsive, its initial establishment should be subject to approval of the voters of the area. It is further suggested that the board of directors of the authority be selected from among popularly elected officials of units of government making up the metropolitan area (mayors, county commissioners, city councilmen, etc.). Under such an arrangement, poor functional performance of the authority could lead to retribution at the polls for its directors.

2. The Commission recommends that the States take legislative and administrative action to extend technical and financial assistance to their metropolitan areas with regard to the planning of mass transportation facilities and services.

A small number of States, mostly in the Northeast, have already moved aggressively into the local transportation problem. Many others should do so. It is an abdication of the constitutional role of the State if it takes no action on a problem affecting its local communities when at the same time local officials of those areas are pleading with the President and the Congress for Federal financial aid. By becoming a partner with the local governments in the field of urban transportation, the State can play a vital role.

The metropolitan areas in general have within their borders sufficient administrative ability and financial resources to meet their needs; however, due to fragmentation of responsibility among various units and the lack of coincidence between service needs and tax jurisdictions, it is frequently impossible for local government to assemble effectively the technical and financial resources required for meeting the service needs of metropolitan areas residents. Since a large share of State general revenue comes from the metropolitan areas and since, in many instances, the State represents the only single force which can be brought to bear upon such areas in their entirety, it is reasonable and necessary that the State governments direct an increased share of their technical and financial resources to the problems of the metropolitan areas. The policies and activities of State highway departments, planning agencies, tax and regulatory authorities, and any special agencies having cognizance over local government and/or urban affairs all need to be marshaled and coordinated for sustained attack on the problems of urban transportation.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

1. The Commission recommends the enactment of legislation giving congressional consent in advance to compacts among two or more States for the creation of agencies to be responsible for mass transportation planning in those metropolitan areas which cross State lines.

Nearly 40 million people live in interstate metrepolitan areas. Special difficulties confront efforts to achieve coordinated handling of the public transportation requirements of such areas. No one of the State governments concerned can, in its own right, deal with the problems involved for the area as a whole. If there is to be effectiveness and continuity of planning with regard to public transportation needs in areas of this kind, the task must be handled on an interstate basis.

The device of a compact between the respective States to establish a joint agency for transportation planning is a way to meet this need on a more durable basis than is likely to be achieved through informal ad hoc cooperative arrangements between the States concerned. Article 1, section 10, of the Constitution requires congressional consent for States to enter into an interstate compact. Ordinarily, such consent is sought after particular States have initiated action toward a compact, but it is possible for congressional consent to be granted in advance to compacts dealing with a specified subject matter.

The Congress has used this approach in various fields, including crime control, airport construction, and civil defense. Where, as in the case of urban mass transportation, there is an important and definable problem on which effective joint State action needs to be expedited in numerous geographic areas, the device of advance congressional consent seems highly appropriate.

In recommending that this device be used in the present instance, the Commission contemplates that the Congress might indicate in some detail the nature of the responsibilities for transportation planning that would be handled by the compact agencies. The Commission also suggests that, in the enactment of advance consent legislation, the Congress consider providing for appropriate representation on the compact agency by the Federal Government, since past failures to integrate properly Federal highway and urban renewal planning interests with each other and with those of State and local governments have contributed significantly to the present "urban transportation problem." We do not presume that such a planning agency could or should have power to regulate either interstate or intrastate transportation, although it might properly consider and comment on the effects of existing regulation upon mass transportation within the metropolitan area.

The intent of this recommendation would be served if, instead of taking action specifically with regard to transportation-planning agencies, the Congress were to enact somewhat broader legislation to provide its advance consent to compacts between States setting up agencies charged with planning for interstate metropolitan areas on a comprehensive basis, and dealing not only with mass transportation but also with other issues of areawide significance. In the connection, legislation proposed by the administration in the fields of housing and urban renewal contains a provision for advance congressional consent to compacts directed toward urban planning in general.

2. The Commission recommends enactment of legislation by the Congress: (1) to provide grants to assist State and local governments in developing comprehensive plans for mass transportation in urban areas; (2) to underwrite special demonstration projects designed to develop and test innovations in mass transportation facilities and service arrangements; and (3) to initiate a program of long-term low interest rate loans to State and local governments for the construction and modernization of mass transportation facilities and equipment in urban areas.[2] The Commission further recommends, however, that Federal support for special demonstration projects be restricted to projects undertaken at the initiative of the administering Federal agency.

This recommendation of the Commission represents, in effect, substantial endorsement of the objectives and major provisions of S. 345, which is under consideration by the 87th Congress, and which would authorize these several types of Federal financial assistance with respect to urban mass transportation.

PLANNING

The Commission believes that Federal stimulation and assistance with respect to urban planning in general, as currently authorized by section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, is especially justified with respect to transportation planning. First, it is essential that mass transportation planning at the local level be integrated and keep pace with highway planning, which is already federally supported. The mere availability of highway planning funds should not be permitted to result in "highway dominated" transportation plans and policies in the metropolitan areas. Second, the longer State and local governments delay in the development of coordinated transportation plans in the metropolitan areas the greater will become the financial and social difficulties associated with transportation congestion, culminating no doubt in even greater pressure than at present for massive Federal assistance. In other words, since it is our view that Federal planning grants of moderate size will stimulate State and local governments to assume

[1] Mr. Burton did not concur in this recommendation.

[2] Senator MUSKIE and Congressman FOUNTAIN reserved their respective positions on this recommendation. Mr. Burton asked to be similarly recorded for the time being.

their rightful responsibilities with respect to this function, Federal expenditure for this purpose would be justified in terms of intergovernmental relations alone.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

The Commission believes there is an urgent need for the conduct of technological research in the field of mass transportation with a view to developing improved methods and equipment. In addition to the direct expenditure of Federal funds for the conduct of such research within the Federal establishment, the Commission believes that it should also be possible to use research funds in the form of grants made to State or local units of government for this purpose.

Under proposed legislation now pending before the Congress, Federal financial assistance would be made available for the conduct of particular pilot demonstration projects which the Government determines would make a significant contribution to the development of research data and information of general applicability relating to the improvement of mass transportation service and the contribution of such service toward meeting total urban transportation needs at minimum cost. Under the proposed bill, these funds could be used to test the effect of such factors as service frequencies, fare levels, availability of transfer and feeder service, availability and location of parking facilities, speed of service, condition and placement of facilities and equipment, and technological developments affecting public acceptance of mass transportation service.

The underwriting of such demonstration projects, in the opinion of the Commission, should be viewed as part of the responsibility of the National Government to undertake and support research which is urgently in the public interest but which other levels of government and private enterprise are not in a position to carry on. Moreover, such projects should be specifically focused at research and demonstration needs, rather than in any way offering a subsidy to transportation facility construction or operation, or serving as a possible alternative to borrowing for ordinary capital purposes. To assure meeting these conditions, the Commission believes that—contrary to provisions of the measure now pending in the Congress—Federal support of special demonstration projects should be undertaken solely at the initiative of the administering Federal agency.

FACILITY LOANS

The financial difficulties of urban transit systems and rail lines are well known. Many transit systems are finding that borrowing at commercial rates of interest results in debt service charges which cannot be fully recovered, in added passenger revenues and reduced maintenance costs, from the modernization undertaken. In these cases borrowing for plant modernization tends to create or increase financial losses.

Congressional sponsors of Federal lending authority for mass transportation have pointed out that private commuter carriers have been unable to utilize to any significant degree the $500 million loan guarantee program that was provided under the Transportation Act of 1958. That act guarantees commercial lenders against any losses sustained through loans to the railroad industry for capital expenditures and maintenance of property. As of July 1960, loan applications had been filed for approximately $90 million. However, only a very small proportion of the requested funds have been for the purpose of directly improving rail commuter service.

To help meet this situation, the urban transportation measure now before the Congress (S. 345) would authorize Federal loans to States or local public agencies for their financing of expenditure to acquire, contract, or improve "facilities and equipment for use, by operation or lease or otherwise, in mass transportation service in urban areas" and closely related capital outlays. The bill limits the rate of interest to the rate paid to the Treasury by the administering Federal agency plus one-fourth of 1 percent. It also specifies a maximum loan period of 50 years, and limits availability of Federal loans to those instances where funds cannot be borrowed otherwise on equally favorable terms.

With such provision of Federal loans for financing of urban mass transportation facilities at approximately the same rate of interest which the Treasury has to pay in obtaining new funds, local governments will have a new source of borrowing for this purpose, at a reasonable rate, and—if the program is kept on a businesslike basis—at no net cost to the Nation's taxpayers.

EXCERPTS FROM HEARING ON URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION—1961

Senator WILLIAMS. Our next witness is Mr. Luther Gulick, president of the Institute of Public Administration, who is becoming an annual visitor to this subcommittee.

As I suggested yesterday, Senator BUSH, our good friends who were here last year are here this year. I hope they will not have to return next year.

We are very honored to have you with us, Mr. Gulick.

STATEMENT OF LUTHER GULICK, PRESIDENT, INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Mr. GULICK. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, that is going to be my first wish.

As you know, my name is Luther Gulick. I live in New York City. I have come here on your invitation to testify in my capacity as a research director and public administrator who has been concerned with urban development and urban transportation for many years.

The Institute of Public Administration which I direct is a nonprofit, endowed, research, and educational institution established in New York City in 1906. We do not lobby for any particular bills, but when requested we consider it an obligation to present our professional views with reference to any matter of public administration or public policy which falls within our field of competence.

We have devoted a great deal of attention to urban development and metropolitan transportation. My associates and I participated in the Washington metropolitan mass transportation survey and drafted the administrative proposals and compacts adopted by the 86th Congress.

We have been similarly engaged in a number of other basic studies including the current New York staggered-hours study, and have submitted technical reports on urban transportation to Senator Magnuson's Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and are under contract similarly to the Federal Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. We deal not with the engineering specifications and operations but with the administrative, governmental, and fiscal aspects.

First let me say I endorse the bill which is now before you, S. 345. The immediate adoption of this bill is the next forward step toward a real solution of the urban transportation chaos.

In the year that has elapsed since we met here to consider the earlier draft of this bill, conditions have been getting worse. With each accident, fire, snowstorm, or strike, the situation as to transportation in and around the great cities has been deteriorating. The opening of each new throughway, tunnel, or bridge, though highly useful in itself, has served to increase the traffic, parking, and other tieups.

The current economic slump has temporarily eased some of the pressure in the more depressed areas. But with the return of high employment, and the open season for travel, vacations, weekends, and outdoor recreation, we will see this summer a new high of traffic overloads, a new high of public resentment.

With each month, the plight of the private railroad is also more precarious. We face a dangerous crisis, dangerous to the big cities and to the Nation.

The most serious difficulty is now experienced in those major urban regions which were built on a commuter rail and transit network, that is, in Boston, the tristate New York region, Philadelphia, Chicago, and San Francisco, and their environs. These cities cannot maintain their managerial, financial, commercial, industrial, and residential efficiency and viability without the rail skeleton on which they were evolved.

Senator BUSH. I am glad to see that statement, Mr. Chairman, because that is the key to this whole business as far as the East is concerned. This acknowledgment of yours that the rail skeleton is absolutely basic and vital in the tristate complex that you are speaking of.

Mr. GULICK. Senator, the cities were built on that basis. It is like a man with a skeleton. You cannot change that man without dealing with his skeleton, maintaining his skeleton.

The next point is equally important. Unless the Congress is prepared to give up national responsibility for interstate commerce and for the regulation and development of railways, airways, waterways, and interstate highways, and to turn these duties over to the States and the localities, you in Washington must recognize that the States and localities are all but powerless to meet the developing situation.

If the National Government is responsible for these elements of national life and power, you cannot escape a major involvement in finding solutions and making them effective at the local level.

The collapse of circulation today in and around the big urban centers has been created by national policies and national failures in meeting the new technological requirements created by national action as to railroads, highways, airways, ports, urban renewal, housing, mortgages, immigration, and other programs, including those which have encouraged rural populations to leave the farm and flood into the cities.

I do not conclude that the Federal Government must therefore install traffic lights in Times Square. But I do say that the Federal Government cannot stand aside now and expect the State or local governments alone to find the solutions and finance the remedial measures.

The traffic problems of the great urban centers are created largely by the acts and policies of the Federal Government. As a result, all levels of government are now fundamentally involved, Federal, State, and local.

And what is required, Mr. Chairman, is not primarily money, or more highways, more parking lots, more bypasses, or more traffic controls. What we need now is a totally new approach, with new ideas, and new powers of action. Only then will come the need for added investment and new institutional arrangements.

Let me give you some illustrations which will show you what I mean:

First are the commuter railroads. They are essential for the efficient life and work of not less than a third of the American economy. We all thought these services were part

of the national rail system into which they are tied by bands of steel. We therefore let the ICC and the rail managements worry about this public service until we have all but killed the goose that carries the commuter to work to lay the golden eggs.

In truth, we should long ago have seen what was happening. We should have regarded this commuter aspect of railroad service as primarily connected with local circulation—that is, with streets and highways, tunnels and bridges, with housing and urban renewal, with land use, planning, and zoning.

From a functional standpoint, the commuter railroads are a part of the comprehensive local circulation system and can be dealt with successfully only through area-wide systems analysis.

Second come the interstate highways. These have been laid out for long interurban and interstate movement, with an eye to the broader economy, and to defense and recreation. This was fine, but the major economic and traffic impact has been within 75 miles of the big urban areas. In most of these there was no advance awareness as to what these new national linkages would produce, and therefore no preparedness with local planning and zoning, and no accommodation to meet the new traffic potentials.

Third is air transport. The National Government, singlehanded, has converted the United States to modern air transport. The Nation did all the developmental work, designed and financed the airports, established all the controls, and subsidized the initial operations.

But here again the leadership has been too narrow. The air enthusiasts have been concerned with the gadgets, not with the total air service to the public and the Nation. Nobody is "total system minded." The public does not travel or ship by air for the fun of it any more. We want to get people and goods swiftly from center to center, from factory to factory.

In other words, we are concerned not with the flight above the clouds, but with the total trip, portal to portal.

And I do not need to point out to you that the air trip gets shorter and shorter—with the Federal Government paying most of the cost of experimental and developmental work—while the ground end of the trip gets slower and slower, because the ground trip is left to the tender mercies of the local street commissioners and traffic police.

From this point forward, more can be done for air travel and shipment by comprehensive, functional systems analysis, design, and management, including the ground components, than by any amount of space travel research.

Fourth is the breathless approach to panic solutions as to commuter railroads. Those who run the railroads are short of money; they are reported in many cases to be bankrupt. Thus they ask desperately for tax relief, spiraling and self-defeating increased rates, guaranteed loans and for subsidies from frightened legislative bodies and Governors.

Railroads seem to think that their problems are primarily money shortages. This is not the case. The trouble with the railroads is not primarily money; it is a failure to understand what is happening and what is needed as a service by urban populations.

The railroads are committing suicide because they are tied to an antiquated system, and antiquated ideas, which may have been useful two generations ago. They operate with obsolete equipment and terminals and layout, and they and the public still think in segmented terms.

They seem to believe that rail problems can be solved in terms of the railroads. This is the basic blunder. The commuter rail problems are not rail problems. They are urban problems, urban circulation problems, and can be dealt with intelligently only as part of the total circulation system and in terms of future circulation needs of the metropolitan areas.

Because of this failure of fundamental systemwide thinking, I strongly suspect that most of the money now being poured by the Federal Government, the States, and some localities into saving the railroads is being thrown down the drain. It might be justified if work were being rushed on the constructive systems analysis and on system action. Standing alone, grants and loans for the tottering railroads are a worthless gesture of panic.

On this point, a little history is worth remembering. If the same kind of psychology had been applied when the streetcars began to fail, the sailing vessels lost out to the steamships, and the tractors displaced the horse, we would still have an economy based on these antiquities, supported by Government controls and Government subsidies.

Make no mistake. Commuter services with completely separate rights-of-way, on rails, or with a similar general design, will continue to be required in cities now structured on such a circulation system and in cities like Los Angeles which have grown beyond the capacity of the paved highway and the rubbered vehicle to carry their commuter service.

Not a single mile of railroad right-of-way should be abandoned. It should be donated to or acquired by the Government. The rail system must be kept intact. But the design—equipment, terminals, and interconnections—and the management must be completely new, geared to the requirements and desires of the next generation, not to that of the past.

Fifth, and finally, let me make an observation as to the controlling principles of the new metropolitan transportation which will now be required.

The commuter system is basically a peak-load, workday operation. It should be so designed and operated. Railroad managers come before you weeping over the fact that all their business is crowded into 20 hours a week, while as much as 69 percent of their expenses are incurred in the remaining 148 hours.

Gentlemen, we have the same problem in every big building with the elevators, including this building, and have completely satisfactory solutions.

And look at the peaking problem at the consolidated rural schools, ordinary farmers, garage mechanics, and rural school board members, gentlemen, in all of your States. At the schools, ordinary farmers, garage mechanics, and rural school board members have solved this problem all over America, without the help of traffic engineers and railroadmen.

So I say again: Look at the job to be done, the whole job, solve that, and give up the effort to "save" something that is now finished.

The elevator system of a big building gives us another key lesson as we look into the future. The elevator system is the most successful circulation system developed by man. This success rests on four things:

1. Continual technical improvement of each part of the system, with prompt application of mechanical and electrical advances.

2. The elimination of needless manual labor, on the principle that such application of needless labor in mechanical work is both degrading to the labor and extremely expensive to the customer.

3. "System integration"—that is, the design and operation of the elevators as an integral part of a total system which relates the movement of persons and goods to the floor use of the total building served.

4. "Integrated financing" which finances the elevators as an integral part of the economy of which the elevator is a part.

With these four simple principles we have solved vertical transportation in the urban areas, though anyone would have thought that the vertical would be more difficult than the horizontal problem.

This brings me to the end of my testimony. I have come here to support S. 345 because I see in this bill the first practical step—not the last step—toward the solution of the rapidly worsening urban transportation crisis.

This bill looks forward, not backward. It is not trying to "save" anything. It goes at the fundamentals and encourages, yes, it forces, a comprehensive approach.

With this bill the Federal Government accepts its share of responsibility and agrees to join hands with the States and the localities in finding for each major region an appropriate approach toward constructive action.

With this bill there will emerge in each major urban area teamwork machinery with power to develop a comprehensive approach toward "systemwide operations analysis," planning, and action.

With this bill the millions of dollars now being poured into subsidies may be saved for a useful purpose and the new equipment being acquired by the railroads may be designed to work together and fit future needs.

With this bill you will encourage developmental work and practical demonstration projects along entirely new lines, geared to future transportation needs.

With this bill we will develop a general understanding of the direct connection between land uses, transportation, and zoning controls.

And, finally, with this bill you introduced the powerful influence of Federal seed money and low-interest loans and grants to hasten and coordinate State and local initiative.

This ends my statement, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WILLIAMS. This was a magnificent statement. I am sure it raises many inquiries in our minds.

Senator Bush?

Senator BUSH. Mr. Gulick, I join with the chairman in complimenting you on this statement. I think it is an excellent statement and shows a remarkable grasp of the problem which is facing us in these troubled areas.

Mr. GULICK. Thank you.

Senator BUSH. I think you are a little tough on the railroads. I think the unfortunate thing about the railroads is that they are locked into a situation, you see, and they do not really have much choice to think the way you are thinking about this problem and the way it must be thought about.

They have a frightful problem facing them every day, which is to run the railroads and transport the people with the equipment that they have, and they have been faced with competition, heavily subsidized competition, both by highways and by air. So that they find themselves in a terribly difficult position.

I agree with you, however, where you say that the Government—that is, the Federal Government, the States, and some localities—must be careful about "saving the railroads." I think some of them—and I am thinking particularly of the New Haven with which my State is involved—have come to the point where additional loans will not save it. That is not what it needs. It needs something else.

As I have said before, I think probably that can only come about with bankruptcy proceedings and the appointment of a receiver who will safeguard the situation and be able to do things with the court behind him that private management simply cannot do.

I do not look for a turn in that situation until we have the eventuality of a receiver.

Have you given that any particular thought, Mr. Gulick? Would you care to comment on that or not?

Mr. GULICK. I agree with you quite heartily. I recognize that the railroads have been in an extremely difficult situation. This involves not only the fact that they are tied into the national freight picture in a very extensive way but also that under Government regulations and controls we had first the creation of the railroads at a time when they become the target of high taxes which have lingered on through the years.

Second, they were not able to engage in research and developmental work, while the Government was financing the research and developmental work for air travel, and the motor companies through their extremely efficient structures were financing their own programs through the payments by citizens for automobiles. We were subsidizing the rights-of-way for rubber-borne vehicles.

So the railroads have been in a very difficult situation, and I am not criticizing them on that ground. What I am saying is that because of the nature of the circulation problem in the urban area the railroads cannot be expected to find the answers even for the problems of the commuter.

I think your suggestion that in certain circumstances there must be receivership and a new program is a first step. I suspect that there must also be the creation of some type of regional, governmental authority which will take over the responsibility for the development of operating plans and coordination of the various types of circulation within the metropolitan areas.

Senator BUSH. It seems to me when a road has gotten to the point where it can only be sustained by periodic loans from the Federal Government, then is the time when the Federal Government has got to step in and take charge of the situation and take responsibility for it.

Mr. GULICK. That is quite true.

Senator BUSH. I am afraid that is the situation that faces the New Haven.

Mr. GULICK. This is necessary also to preserve the Federal Government's investment in the highway system.

Senator BUSH. Yes.

Mr. GULICK. Because in these big metropolitan areas the highways are not able to perform the function for which the Federal Government has made its great investment. They are completely clogged by the peak-hour service.

This peak-hour service in urban areas must be transferred to another form of mass transportation.

Senator BUSH. I note your simile to the elevator. I think that is quite apt. We can, after all, put new elevators in an old building and renovate the service, whereas we cannot very well do that with a railroad. We cannot have that type of renovation there.

Do you not think——

Mr. GULICK. However, you can design your rail system. I was very happy to hear that the Bay Area Rapid Transit District is going to take advantage of the improvements. The cars are going to be operated as just stated more like an elevator with automatic handling of the progress of the train from station to station.

Senator WILLIAMS. Senator BUSH, that was one point I had. Those of us who work in this building might not fully understand your statement that the elevator system is the most successful circulation system developed by man. Maybe it can be, but it is not always.

Senator BUSH. It turns out to be one of the most frustrating developments sometimes in this building anyway.

Mr. GULICK. I took in too much territory.

Senator BUSH. I think I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman. It has been a very interesting bit of testimony I think.

Senator WILLIAMS. I certainly agree with that, Senator BUSH.

I would like to make one observation, Mr. Gulick. I certainly would agree with your analysis that we must think in new terms about the railroads and commutation. You suggest we should have regarded this commuter aspect of railroad service as primarily connected with local circulation. We certainly agree, and we accept this. It, however, causes certain problems.

We have no Federal program of concern for commutation, for mass transportation in our metropolitan areas. This is a new departure. It has not been accepted. We run into this kind of narrow thinking. The chamber of commerce advised us yesterday—the National Chamber of Commerce, not to be confused with the local chambers, many of whom support this concept—the National Chamber said the problem of mass urban transportation, however, is primarily local in nature. Ipso facto, they do not accept this program.

I think that probably the most efficient way of replying to that is the way you did. You affix the national responsibility for metropolitan transportation with all of the Federal impact that has brought us to where we are.

It should seem clear to anybody who reads you and comprehends you that the national responsibility is fixed because national policy has us where we are today. That is the point as I see it that you are making.

Mr. GULICK. And the national benefit. The contribution of the great metropolitan areas to the added value of American industry. The existing processes of American industry and management have turned the entire highway system, including the streets within the urban areas, into a part of the assembly line of the American economy. So that the efficiency of our urban areas is of tremendous significance to the National Government.

Senator WILLIAMS. And the failure to realize the potential efficiency in our centralized metropolitan areas in turn would put unbelievable new burdens at the national level. Is that not true?

Mr. GULICK. That is right.

Senator WILLIAMS. Unbelievable.

Mr. GULICK. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. For example, in New York City there is a proposal that is being discussed, kicked about, that would bring $52 million, is it not, to bear on the parking situation? I am sure you are familiar with that.

Mr. GULICK. Yes.

Senator WILLIAMS. Last week it was rejected by the mayor?

Mr. GULICK. No, the city planning commission rejected the three downtown garages in the center of the city.

Senator WILLIAMS. Oh. It is the mayor's program?

Mr. GULICK. No; it was presented by the traffic engineer who heads the Department of Traffic of the City of New York. All such plans are then referred to the city planning commission for screening in relation to the total master plan of the city. The planning commission rejected these three garages.

Senator WILLIAMS. We have estimates that there are 200,000 rail commuters into New York City.

Mr. GULICK. Daily.

Senator WILLIAMS. Daily. If we should lose even present rail commuter service, the impact would be unbelievable on the city of New York, would it not, in terms of highways and parking?

Mr. GULICK. It would be. The cost of taking care of a group of this sort if shifted from rails to rubber and buses, and so forth, has been variously estimated at the level of $10, $11, $12 billion—the cost of the new tunnels, bridges, highways, parking, and so forth.

For every building the size of the Empire State Building the amount of parking that would be required for people who come to work in that building, if they came by automobile, would be a building of equal size.

This would destroy the city, because it would take every other piece of property and turn it into car storage.

This is what has happened to Los Angeles. Seventy-five percent of the city is already paved and used for not too rapidly moving vehicles during the peak hours.

The modern city cannot exist—that kind of managerial city, production city cannot exist—without a framework of rapid mass transportation in the peak hours.

Senator WILLIAMS. Do you have something, Senator Bush?

Senator BUSH. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to ask Mr. Gulick this: In the event that we should have a shutdown, let's say, on the New Haven Railroad, where we have—is it 30,000 commuters a day? Is that about the right order of magnitude there?

Mr. GULICK. I thought I had the figure here. Yes, 59,000 to Weschester and Fairfield.

Senator BUSH. All right. Westchester and Fairfield. In that event, if those roads that go in through Westchester and Fairfield—there are two branches, I guess, involved in that figure? Part of that is the New York Central, is it not?

Mr. GULICK. Yes. This is not just the New Haven.

Senator BUSH. Let's just say for the purpose of my question that service was abandoned. Do you estimate that that would provide an insurmountable traffic problem immediately?

Mr. GULICK. Yes.

Senator BUSH. In other words, it would present an impossible situation immediately?

Mr. GULICK. Immediately.

Senator BUSH. It would not be something that would develop?

Mr. GULICK. Oh, no.

Senator BUSH. It would be overnight?

Mr. GULICK. It would be the next day.

Senator BUSH. My point is then that the operation of that transportation system represented by these railroads coming in there, from that standpoint is an absolute necessity.

Mr. GULICK. Yes.

Senator BUSH. And it should be approached in the light of that fact? Is that right?

Mr. GULICK. That is right.

Senator BUSH. Thank you.

Senator WILLIAMS. There is just one further point that I want to express our gratitude to you for, Dr. Gulick. That is, you have helped us deal with the misconception that some have about the scope or the goals of this bill. Many look at it as a railroad bill, a bill with loans to—this is the misconception—just prop up now existing methods of travel. It is far from that. The goal of this bill is, as you suggest, a systemwide comprehensive effort to deal with the transportation of people, a transportation related to land use as it now is, and perhaps even more important, land use as we hope it will be in the future.

I believe your statement could not be clearer or more forceful in that respect.

Senator BUSH. I am glad to hear the chairman explain his conception of the bill. I fully agree with what he said about that.

Senator WILLIAMS. Thank you again, Dr. Gulick.

FOREIGN AID POLICY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a column which appeared in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Foreign Aid Policy," written by Walter Lippmann. In it Mr. Lippmann carefully diagnoses the fundamental issues at stake in the new approach to our foreign aid program and further assesses its particular importance at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AID POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In its effect on our power and influence in the world, much the most important business before this session of Congress is foreign aid. It is an unpopular subject. But so are many other things that are important and necessary, such as paying taxes and contributing to the Community Chest. At bottom foreign aid is an obligation which the rich and powerful nations owe to the poor and weak nations. There is no escaping it. An attempt to escape it can produce only a very bad conscience at home, envy and ill will abroad.

In several messages the President has now put forth his policy and program. In the total amount of money he asks Congress to let him spend he is in substantial agreement with the last Eisenhower budget.

There is an important difference, however, in the emphasis on two crucial questions. One is the need to authorize long-range planning, instead of yearly planning as at present. The other is the desirability of giving a stable financial base to the long-range planning by granting the agency authority to borrow specific amounts from the Treasury.

At one time or another President Eisenhower endorsed both points, and in 1957 Secretary Dulles argued eloquently for them. But in 1959, in view of opposition in Congress, President Eisenhower did not fight for them.

The arguments for long-range financing derive from the practical experience of this country in dealing with the problem. Most of the arguments come down to one basic proposition. It is that the big constructive economic projects, which really develop a backward country, have to be planned, administered, carried out, and financed over a term of years. It takes more than 1 year to build roads, to make ports, to modernize agriculture, to open mines, to build factories. Indeed it can be said that projects which can be carried out by an annual appropriation are likely to be unimportant or wasteful.

If our aid is to achieve results, we must be in a position to encourage an underdeveloped country to draw up plans of capital investment which will take years to execute. Only if there exists such long-range plans can a country hope to generate the self-help which is indispensable. Indeed, students of the problem have come to realize that the country which receives the aid must play the principal part, must make much the largest contribution, in the realization of the plan. Our role is to be the catalyst, to say that we will provide x amount of dollar exchange when the undeveloped country has started a land reform program or an improvement in its educational system. But if we are not able to say with certainty how much we will contribute from year to year, we can exercise little useful influence on the development of the country.

Under the present system funds appropriated for a given fiscal year must be obligated during that year, or they revert to the Treasury. This is extremely wasteful. It leads to a scramble at the end of each fiscal year to obligate all unused funds before July 1. The more popular government programs—notably defense—are not required to do this with all their funds.

The second essential point in the administration program is that in order to give the foreign aid agency the capacity to make long-range plans, it should be given the authority to borrow from the Treasury funds according to a specified schedule and over a 5-year period. This proposal is attacked by men in Congress as back-door spending, as a way of circumventing the appropriation process.

This so-called back-door spending is not a new bright idea of the Kennedy administration. A very large number of agencies, beginning with the RFC under President Hoover, and going on to such agencies as the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, are financed by authorized borrowing from the Treasury. In this term of Congress, Treasury borrowing is provided in the depressed areas, veterans' housing, and farm-surplus-disposal bills.

The question is, Would Congress, if it authorized this kind of borrowing, lose its proper constitutional control over public money?

It can be said truthfully that it would not lose this control. For it would establish the terms of the authorization and the criteria for the use of the funds. It could at any time move to reduce or to abolish the authority to borrow. It would pass upon a budget, drawn up in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act, submitted annually to the Appropriations Committee. It would receive every 6 months a detailed report on the whole operation. It could and would investigate at home and in the country concerned. Congress would retain vast and extensive and continuing powers of control.

Congress would in short have the power to stop the whole business at the end of any fiscal year. What new thing then, it may be asked, would have happened if Treasury borrowing is authorized? While Congress would have retained the right to review, to investigate, to criticize, to reduce or to abolish, it would have granted by its own vote the power to make gentlemen's agreements over a period of 5 years. It would have approved the idea of long-range planning and would have accepted the moral commitments that are inherent in long-range planning.

All of this would be done in the open, and it would be unduly apprehensive to suspect that it would open up new opportunities for skulduggery.

NEW STUDY OF FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION VERIFIES ITS POWERS

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I also call attention to a column which appeared in this morning's Washington Post entitled "New Study of FCC Verifies Its Powers" written by Lawrence Laurent. It is a comment on a new book, which has just been published, written by Walter B. Emery, of Michigan State University. The book is entitled "Broadcasting and Government: Responsibilities and Regulations."

Because it bears upon some of the questions at issue in a recent address by the new Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Mr. Minow, I think it important that the book be laid alongside the new responsibilities and opportunities open to the FCC at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW STUDY OF FCC VERIFIES ITS POWERS

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The Federal Communications Commission used to be known as the forgotten Government agency. This was back in quieter times when the seven members of the FCC were complacent about the state of broadcasting and eager to deny any broad authority over the stations.

In recent years, however, the FCC has been one of the liveliest, busiest, and most controversial agencies. There were scandals that brought resignations from the Commission. A new attitude about the industry was developed, an attitude which reached a peak recently with Chairman Newton N. Minow's blunt accusation that the schedule was a "vast wasteland."

The FCC's new attitude and the heightened public awareness of the agency's work has given new importance to a book that was published this week. This is "Broadcasting and Government: Responsibilities and Regulations" (Michigan State University Press. $7.50). This is easily the most complete and most thoroughly documented book on the FCC's duties and powers that has ever been published.

The book is by Walter B. Emery, a man with unusual qualifications to make such a study. He came to Washington in 1934 to work on the legal staff of the newly created FCC. He left Washington for teaching jobs at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Oklahoma, and Ohio State University before returning to the FCC in 1943.

During his second term at the FCC, Emery was, successively, attorney, examiner, chief of the renewals and revocation section, and legal assistant to Chairman Paul A. Walker.

In 1952, Emery left the Government and spent the next 5 years as a general consultant for the Joint Council on Educational Television. He joined the Michigan State University faculty in 1957.

He has written, first, an excellent history of the FCC with proper emphasis on the economic and social factors of broadcasting. As a good lawyer, Emery has set out the statutory powers and functions of the FCC and has charted its organizational and administrative machinery. In turn, this has required an examination of the other agencies of Government—at all levels—which have a role in broadcasting regulations.

You can learn how to apply for a broadcasting license and you can learn the rules of good conduct in broadcasting.

Professor Emery also makes recommendations about the future of the FCC. In the heat of the present controversy, Emery's judgments about the FCC's authority over programing is worthy of notice. He writes:

"While the courts have held that under the present law the Commission does have legislative authority to consider program service in the exercise of its licensing functions, there is some vagueness and ambiguity in the wording of the statute that has been troublesome. Section 326 of the Communications Act says the Commission cannot censor programs. Well, what is censorship?

"The courts have clearly held that the term, when interpreted in connection with the provisions of the act, prohibits critical review by the FCC of particular programs carried by stations except where violation of specific laws such as indecency or lottery statutes may be involved. They have not,

however, precluded FCC review of the overall performance of a station when it comes up for renewal of its license."

RECENT EVENTS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I call attention to a series of columns which seek to interpret the brunt of recent events in the Dominican Republic, including an editorial in the Washington Post of today entitled "The End of Trujillo"; an article in the same paper by Thomas Wolfe, entitled "'Dictator' Pale Term for Trujillo"; and a column by George Southworth, which appeared in the same paper, entitled "Dictatorship of Trujillo Won't Fall Immediately."

I ask unanimous consent that these publications be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1961]

THE END OF TRUJILLO

Assassination, even of a tyrant, is repulsive to men of good conscience. Rafael Trujillo, the often bloodthirsty dictator of the Dominican Republic for 31 years, perhaps deserved his fate in an even-handed appraisal of history. But whether the murder of El Benefactor in Ciudad Trujillo means freedom for the people of the Caribbean fiefdom is a question that cannot now be answered.

Trujillo knew a great deal about assassination. The responsibility for scores of deaths, including the abduction and murder of Jesus Maria Galindez, a professor at Columbia University in New York, has been laid at his door. He had been involved in countless schemes to do away with democratic leaders in neighboring countries such as President Romulo Betancourt of Venezuela. It was a sort of poetic justice that at the time of his own demise a new plot to overthrow the Venezuelan Government, reportedly involving the use of Dominican arms by former Venezuelan Dictator Marcos Perez Jimenez, has been uncovered and quashed.

The recent history of the Dominican Republic is an almost classical study of the way in which even a professedly benevolent dictatorship tends to become oppressive. Unquestionably Trujillo did some good things for his country: he improved public facilities such as roads and sanitation, attracted industry and investment and raised the standard of living notably. But the price was the silence of the grave for all criticism or opposition.

El Benefactor's vanity grew with his personal wealth. The jails were filled to overflowing with political prisoners who had incurred his displeasure. He maintained amply financed lobbies in the United States and elsewhere which sycophantically chanted his praise, and his influence extended even to Congress.

Until the last year or so the profession of friendship with the United States had been an article of faith with Trujillo, and altogether too often this profession was accepted here as evidence of his good character. Tardily the Government here came to understand how this country's own reputation was tarnished by the association with repression. Last year, after Trujillo had been cited for numerous aggressions in the Caribbean, the United States and many other members of the Organization of American States broke diplomatic relations with him.

Thereupon followed a demonstration that tyranny knows no ideological confines. Trujillo's dictatorship had been along conservative, rightwing lines. But after the censure he and his propaganda started mouthing Communist slogans. There was considerable evidence of a tacit rapproachment with Castro in Cuba, previously a bete noire to Trujillo—thus illustrating the way in which totalitarianism of the right and left coalesces.

What comes after Trujillo is now the puzzle. The Dominican people have known no democratic institutions and precious little freedom for a generation, and all alternative leadership has been suppressed. Perhaps the army will be able to maintain stability, but the vacuum of free institutions creates a great danger. The Dominican Republic could turn toward Communist-type authoritarianism as easily as toward Western freedom. Such a twist would be a tragedy for the Dominican people, who deserve to breathe without fear. For that reason any democratic reform and effort to bring genuine representative government to the Dominican Republic will need the greatest sympathy and help.

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1961]

THE ORGANIZATION MONARCH—"DICTATOR" PALE TERM FOR TRUJILLO

(By Thomas Wolfe)

Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molina was known as a dictator. The word is too pale. The man was a sultan, a khan, a pharaoh, a totalitarian among totalitarians.

Probably no man in history ever bent a single nation more completely and personally to his own will than this Benefactor of the Fatherland, Father of the New Fatherland, restorer of financial independence and—by any of his estimated 40 titles—absolute ruler of the Dominican Republic.

Trujillo took power in the 19,000-square-mile, sugar-coffee-chocolate-producing Caribbean country and its two million people on August 16, 1930. Monarchies were already out of style. Trujillo became a monarch who rigged his country in all the trappings of democracy and socialism—and a strictly 20th century style organizational network that vied with anything produced by the great dictators of the East or West.

EERIE ATMOSPHERE

The upshot was an eerie, never-never-land atmosphere that even casual visitors felt immediately. Trujillo cooked up bogus political parties, held bogus elections, leaked out fantastic stories of intrigue and opposition, and staged mob uprisings—that always fell on the necks of his opponents.

Other foes had a way of ending up in conspicuously similar fatal accidents, often on the highway. Still others simply disappeared off the face of the earth. And from the prisons of the Dominican secret police comes stories of medieval torture and brutality.

An organizing genius, Trujillo brought spectacular economic growth to the Dominican Republic, improved standards of health and education. But his reputation for ruthlessness dogged him to the end—when he died in what he had organized so many bodyguards and spies to prevent: an assassination.

OBSERVE ORIGIN

The son of a rural postal official—Trujillo always kept the details of his upbringing vague—he began his rise to power during the American Marine occupation of Santo Domingo (the country's old name) from 1916 to 1924. The Marines admired Trujillo as a soldier and he admired the United States and American efficiency. He advanced swiftly in the army.

His military junta won out in an old-style Latin American power struggle in 1930. But he solidified his position with a swiftness and precision Latin America had never seen before.

In the wake of the country's gory political infighting, the Marines had stripped many Dominican citizens of their firearms. Trujillo completed the process and built up a high-powered counterintelligence force with four agencies. Paramount among them was the feared SIM, the Military Intelligence Service. His army became one of the biggest, best armed and most highly trained in Latin America.

Trujillo took meticulous measures to preserve his absolute control. He ceaselessly rotated the army high command and the governors of the provinces. Members of the legislature, which was little more than a camouflage for Trujillo's direct orders, handed him their signed resignations—which he could enforce when he saw fit.

TIGHT LITTLE ISLAND

Trujillo was blessed with a small, homogeneous island country having only one border—with weak, impoverished Haiti. The Dominican Republic was a tight little dictatorship that the world heard little about.

That was until 1937. Under circumstances that have never been fully cleared up, the Dominican army moved into the farm districts to the west and began driving Haitian farm laborers back into their own country. It turned into a slaughter. The number of Haitians killed has been estimated from 2,000 to 10,000.

When the news got out, Trujillo took on an international reputation he could not afford to have.

So—as in his next major crisis, the Organization of American States meeting of 1960—Trujillo formally retired from the government. But his picture remained on the walls of every store, every public building and in virtually every home.

Whoever was official leader of the land approached his presence with the humility of a satrap.

In 1952, in a typical piece of legerdemain, he installed his passive, colorless brother, Hector, as president. In 1960—just before the other 20 members of the Organization of American States broke relations with him because of the attempt on the life of Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt—he replaced Hector with another old follower, Joaquin Balaguer, who gave the news of his death.

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1961]

EL BENEFACTOR BUILT FENCES WELL—DICTATORSHIP OF TRUJILLO WON'T FALL IMMEDIATELY

(By George Southworth)

Don't look for Trujillo's dictatorship to crumble immediately with his death.

He spent 30 years building the most powerful totalitarian government that ever existed in the Western Hemisphere, and it will take time for this unbeatable political machine to disintegrate. He kept it oiled with terror and graft and very carefully selected his leaders or named them from his own family.

Remember when Dictator Anastasio Somoza was assassinated in Nicaragua in 1956? A son, Luis, took over as president and another son Tacho, took over as head of the army.

Trujillo, too, has two sons coming on strong. Maj. Gen. Ramfis Trujillo has a lot of military training and Capt. Rhademes Trujillo is politically ambitious.

Enemies of the ruthless Trujillo estimate that he stole $500 million from his private empire. He used a lot of it to maintain absolute control over his 225 million people.

Most Dominicans left on the island actually loved him because his propaganda reminded them ceaselessly that he took over their bankrupt and revolt-ridden country and brought about prosperity and peace and order.

His controlled press and radio told his subjects what he wanted them to know and nothing else. News from outside didn't come in if it said anything against "El Benefactor."

This is the reason that communism will have great difficulty gaining a foothold in the Dominican Republic even after the death of the dictator.

He hated communism with a vengeance and he taught his people to hate it also. His announced goal was always to rid his nation of poverty and to fight communism.

Trujillo played rough with his enemies and forced them to remain in exile. He put down uprisings with an iron hand. But there were plenty of Dominican exiles plotting to overthrow his government.

These exiles have been organizing in the United States, Puerto Rico, Venezuela, and Cuba. Last year he had a little political opposition at home and it was complicated by economic problems.

There was a plot to assassinate him in January 1960, by Dominicans and he jailed some 2,000 persons. He later released all except 100 who received long prison sentences.

He was a brave man, but he knew more assassination attempts were coming. He was guarded constantly and refused to eat when invited out.

There have been several attempts at invasion. The last one came from Cuba and was put down by his machete-swinging Campesinos in June of 1959.

One reason why Trujillo's enemies have not fared very well is that they, like Cuban exiles, are always at war with each other.

The closest thing to a coalition of Dominican exiles seems to be the Dominican Liberation Movement, with headquarters in New York. The principal aim of this group is to overthrow by all possible means the dictatorial regime of Trujillo.

Inside the Dominican Republic the people will mourn the death of the "great benefactor" and the monuments that he built to honor himself will remain to remind them of the good they believe he has done.

And in the presidential chair will continue to sit a man who has always been in Trujillo's shadow, President Joaquin Balaguer.

There is another popular Trujillo, the younger brother of the Generalissimo. Jose Armendaris Trujillo is a smart, tough politician and said to be ambitious.

Also sitting tight will be two more of Trujillo's top aids, Brig. Gen. Manuel de Moya, currently Dominican Ambassador to the United Nations, and Maj. Gen. Arthuro Espaillat, a West Point graduate.

It may be that these men needed Trujillo far worse than he needed them. After all, it was his personal empire. But it is likely that they will be able to lean on his reputation for awhile.

One of Trujillo's sons, his brother, or a top aid probably will try to fill the shoes of "El Benefactor" and it may be that Trujillo picked his successor in advance. He fixed everything else in this country for 30 years.

Exiles from the Dominican Republic in a dozen countries will be watching and waiting. They hope that this is the end of the Trujillo system. They want to go home. But they had better wait.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Armenians are one of the oldest peoples in the Middle East; they can trace their national origin to 1,000 years before the birth of Christ. In their ancient highland, the Biblical Garden of Eden situated within sight of Mount Ararat, they maintained their independence for centuries before the discovery of America, resisting the attacks of Asiatic invaders.

Very early in modern times Armenia was ravaged and divided among its conquerors, but the Armenian people retained a spirit of freedom and independence. Early in the First World War wholesale massacres of Armenians perpetrated by the Turks came perilously close to exterminating them as a nation. At the end of that war the surviving Armenians pulled themselves together in northeastern part of their homeland and proclaimed their national independence.

This took place on May 28, 1918. The rebirth of Armenian independence after a lapse of more than five centuries was hailed by all friends of freedom, and it was joyously welcomed by Armenians everywhere. The Government of the United States proclaimed sympathy with the newly created Republic of Armenia, and President Wilson undertook to draw its boundaries. But neither his official acts, nor all the good will in the world could save the new state from its foes.

Late in 1920 Armenia was attacked by Turkish nationalist and Russian Communist forces; early in December of that year its fate was sealed. Thus came to an end the Armenian Republic born in 1918, but this tragic event did not put an end to the aspirations of the Armenian people. At the present they are incorporated into the Soviet Union, but they still cherish their freedom and celebrate the anniversary of their Independence Day, in the hope that some day they will regain their liberty and independence.

TRIBUTE TO ORIS V. WELLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute today to a man who has rendered outstanding service to the United States, and especially to American agriculture, Mr. Oris V. Wells.

As an economist and administrator, Mr. Wells received the highest honors that the U.S. Department of Agriculture can award. Now, his rare talents will be available to the whole world as he embarks on a new career as Assistant Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. I extend to him our best wishes for success in this vital undertaking.

Mr. Wells personifies the ideal career civil servant. Individually and through the staff he directed, he has helped to supply continuity of skills and continuity of experience in support of the policies of successive administrations—without becoming a partisan advocate or opponent of any particular policy.

As coordinator of statistics throughout the U.S. Department of Agriculture, he sought to make agricultural statistics a valid currency that could be accepted and used without question by all citizens. He felt that policymakers throughout the legislative and executive branches of Government should be supplied facts and figures on which they could agree, and thereby limit their debate to the conclusions to be drawn from those facts and figures.

As Chief of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and Administrator of the Agricultural Marketing Service, he urged his subordinates to be dissatisfied with moderately good performance and recruit employees of exceptional skill.

In the administration of programs, he sought for courses of action that would benefit all segments of the population, rather than merely help one group at the expense of another. At the same time, he firmly championed the right of American farmers and ranchers to receive incomes commensurate with those received by other groups for comparable services performed.

As an administrator, he also understood and respected the historic and Constitutional relationships between the Federal Government and State and local governments, and between the various branches of the Federal Government.

Mr. Wells has devoted 32 years to analyzing the agricultural situation and directing economic, statistical, and marketing programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. He has exhibited some of the clearest thinking and most effective action among all our leaders during the trying years of the last third of a century.

He leaves on June 1 for Rome, where he will become Assistant Director-General of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in charge of Economics. In this capacity, he will direct all the economic and statistical activities of FAO.

A familiar figure on the Hill, Mr. Wells has appeared at numerous agricultural hearings. He is a good friend of the farmer and the rancher.

O. V. Wells began his career in Government in 1926 while still in college. He started out doing field work in farm management research for 40 cents an hour. At the time of his resignation, he held a grade GS–18 with a salary of $18,500.

Mr. Wells' career exemplifies not only his own diligence and ability but the opportunities afforded by the civil service system. He gained his first permanent Government job in 1929 as a junior agricultural ecenomist in the Department of Agriculture through a civil service examination.

Except for 1 year—1931–32—when he did graduate work at Harvard University on a fellowship from the Social Science Research Council, Mr. Wells continued to work for USDA, next with the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, then with the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and its successor, the Agricultural Marketing Service.

In 1941, he became Assistant Chief in charge of price and marketing work in BAE and 5 years later he was made Bureau Chief.

When the Agricultural Marketing Service was established in the reorganization of 1953, Mr. Wells was chosen to head the new agency. It was in this capacity the following year that he received from the Department of Agriculture a Distinguished Service Award for his "outstanding vision and initiative in developing and evaluating economic and statistical analyses and interpretations

for use in the development and administration of sound agricultural programs for the Nation."

Born in Slate Springs, Miss., Mr. Wells was reared in the New Mexico ranch country. He was graduated from New Mexico A. & M. College and took graduate work one term at the University of Mexico A. & M. College and took graduate work at Harvard University. He was awarded an honorary doctor of science degree by Montana State College, in 1950, and an honorary LL.D. from the New Mexico A. & M. College in 1952.

Mr. Wells is married, and has a son and a daughter.

Mr. Wells is a past president of the American Farm Economic Association and a member of the Rural Sociological Society, the American Statistical Association, the International Conference of Agricultural Economists, the American Marketing Association, and the Agricultural History Society.

He was statistical adviser to the War Food Administration in 1942–45, and was a visiting lecturer at the University of Wisconsin in 1949. He has taught in the USDA Graduate School, and has served as a member of its General Administration Board since 1946. He has also served as liaison representative, USDA, to the Food and Nutrition Board, National Research Council, since 1952; and as a member of the Board of Directors, Commodity Credit Corporation, from November 1951 to January 1961.

Mr. Wells has already rendered great service to the Food and Agriculture Organization. He was a statistical adviser to that body in 1945–46, and adviser to the U.S. delegations to FAO Conferences in 1946, 1948, 1949, 1951, 1955, and 1957, and a member of the FAO program committee from 1953 to November 1959.

No other activity is so vital to the peace and progress of mankind, to his freedom, and to his very survival, as agriculture. And in agriculture, the United States maintains its greatest technological superiority over the rest of the world. Even the Communist countries frankly urge their people to catch up with American agriculture. Our industrial and military strength could not exist side by side with our abundance and variety of consumer goods and services without this capacity to produce so much food and fiber with so few people in agriculture—less than 9 percent of our population.

When the day comes that the rest of the world has the know-how and the will to match this achievement—and to make the resulting abundance accessible to all people—men and nations will lose their chief motive for making war, hot or cold.

It is with this great possibility in mind that we congratulate both O. V. Wells and the Food and Agriculture Organization, and wish them Godspeed.

PROPOSED EXCHANGE OF TRACTORS FOR CAPTURED CUBAN INVADERS

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, perhaps no recent event has created so much indignation as the offer of Fidel Castro to trade tractors for lives. I have received many letters protesting any dealings with the Cuban dictator and I am certain that my colleagues have been similarly deluged.

As was pointed out in a recent editorial in the Cecil Whig:

> The FBI, as it deals with hundreds of cases of kidnaping every year, never recommends paying the ransom. There is just no reasonable and just way to act in good faith with criminals on their terms. Payers of ransom and blackmail always keep on paying.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial in the Cecil Whig of May 25, 1961, entitled "It's Unbelievable," be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S UNBELIEVABLE

How can we bargain in any way with Fidel Castro for the lives of the captured Cuban invaders?

The United States has been very patient with the present dictator of Cuba, giving him every opportunity to demonstrate his responsibility as the new leader of his people. After flagrant violations of international justice, we have broken diplomatic relations. This act signifies our conviction that Fidel Castro cannot be depended upon to act in good faith in any negotiations and has forfeited his right to represent his country's best interests. How then can prominent Americans with the tacit approval of our President, justify the gathering together of tractors, bulldozers, or anything else for a "deal" with Castro?

We supported the invasion of Cuba because we are convinced that Castro is a criminal whose crimes are against his own people and who has voluntarily placed himself outside the laws of international society. This makes his recent offer blackmail.

As a nation we have a history of rejecting blackmail. In 1798, when the French Government offered to stop capturing U.S. ships on the high seas in exchange for a $10 million loan, our citizens were enraged. "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute" was the cry from one end of our land to the other. Eventually France relented and agreed to a legitimate treaty.

In 1804, when the Barbary pirates captured the *Philadelphia* and demanded ransom for U.S. ships and men captured on the high seas, our country again refused. Instead, Stephen Decatur and other brave U.S. naval leaders led the attack on the pirates and blew up the *Philadelphia*. Later, the pirates were defeated in battle.

But pass up history for a moment. Let's be practical. The FBI, as it deals with hundreds of cases of kidnaping every year, never recommends paying the ransom. There is just no reasonable and just way to act in good faith with criminals on their terms. Payers of ransom and blackmail always keep on paying.

But Fidel Castro is more than a criminal with crimes against his own people. He is the announced enemy of the United States. And this makes any deal with him an act of treason since treason is "giving aid and comfort to the enemy."

The bulldozers and tractors he asks in ransom will be used to clear jet strips and missile bases from which our country may be showered with Russian-made nuclear weapons. And the lives of the 1,200 men saved in the deal may be traded for millions of lives if Khrushchev stocks the new bases with short and intermediate range missiles.

It is shocking to note that many prominent citizens of our country are urging that we demonstrate our moral responsibility to the invasion that failed by entering such a deal. It seems to us that we can best demonstrate our support of the invasion by continuing to treat Fidel Castro as the criminal and enemy he has proven himself to be.

S.S. "HOPE"—DOCTORS AND NURSES TO INDONESIA

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in a recent issue of the Baltimore News-Post Bob Considine, the well-known columnist, discussed the great white fleet of American mercy ships which will travel to underdeveloped lands around the world. As Mr. Considine pointed out:

> The zeal of these people is enormous, and their contribution to that touchy part of the world is so great that the Russians—who thought they had it made out there—are beginning to worry.

There is great hope to be found in the S.S. *Hope* and its future sister ships.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Project Hope Brings U.S. Doctors, Nurses to Indonesia," from the Baltimore News-Post of April 15, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROJECT HOPE BRINGS U.S. DOCTORS, NURSES TO INDONESIA

(By Bob Considine)

The ancient mayor of Sumbawa, an island in the Indonesian archipelago, grateful for what American doctors and nurses aboard the SS *Hope* had done for his people recently spoke as follows:

"This is the first time foreigners came to Sumbawa who did not come to steal our rice. I do not know where the United States of America is. I had not seen the flag of your country until this great white ship came to us, though I am an old man. But hear me: We will never forget you for what you have done."

The mayor was speaking to Dr. Bill Walsh, founder and president of Project Hope which, with a bit of aid from all of us, would one day send a great white fleet of American mercy ships to all underdeveloped lands—manned by volunteer U.S. doctors and nurses.

So far, there is only one ship the SS *Hope*. It is a demothballed Navy cargo ship turned into a floating hospital. Since arriving in southeast Asia last fall it has treated thousands of desperately sick persons. Its personnel has trained dozens of nurses, midwives and doctors. This is its prime mission.

Sumbawa has a population of 750,000, with 2 doctors. The day the ship arrived, after a proper advance announcement, there were 153 patients lying in the sultan's palace in drastic need of surgery. All were taken care of.

Walsh is a dynamic, good-looking product of Georgetown University's school of medicine. His elder brother delivered a child named John Fitzgerald Kennedy, Jr., at Georgetown Hospital last Thanksgiving. Project Hope originated in the Eisenhower administration as a part of the people-to-people program which was a favorite of the former President. A letter from Ike triggered the whole machinery into operation, though 27 (count them) Government agencies had to pass on the project before the ship could sail on its mission.

Doctors and nurses who volunteer to fly to southeast Asia to join the effort for a month

or two pay their own plane fare and received only bunk-and-board during their stay. Those who sign on for a year receive a small living wage, far below what they could earn in the States. But the zeal of these people is enormous, and their contribution to that touchy part of the world is so great that the Russians—who thought they had it made out there—are beginning to worry.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLIC OF ITALY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, tomorrow, June 2, is the 15th anniversary of the founding of the Italian Republic. It is a significant holiday for the 150,000 Americans of Italian descent in my State of Maryland and for Americans of Italian heritage in every State of the Union. There will be cause for double celebration tomorrow for this year is the centennial of the unification of Italy—a profound occurrence in the history of one of the most influential and historic nations in the world.

Italy has always been a symbol of soaring music and splendid art. The opera houses and art museums of the world would be bare indeed without the composers and artists of Italy. The United States, for example, has been enriched by the talents of such singers as Enrico Caruso and Mario Lanza. In fashion, in cuisine, in moving pictures, Italians have deeply affected American life.

The bonds of friendship between the United States and Italy have been forged for more than two centuries. It is a process which dates back to our earliest days when small groups of Italians joined the early explorers and settlers who landed on our shores. Those new citizens sought and found freedom of opportunity, of speech, of assembly. They and succeeding generations of Italian immigrants have made lasting contributions to our American heritage.

Mr. President, I was particularly struck by the remarks of President Giovanni Gronchi, of Italy, a few weeks ago when he launched Italy's formal celebration of the hundredth anniversary of its unification as a constitutional monarchy.

President Gronchi stressed the development of an economic democracy. He said that he looked to private initiative to bring about a richer life for all.

He said and I quote:

> There is an underlying necessity—not to be distorted by the pressure of blind or selfish interests—a moral law above cautious political concepts—which demands that liberty be accompanied by justice. And this justice must be realized by a more equal distribution of riches.

These words, Mr. President, express the hopes of every citizen of every free nation in the world—liberty with justice, prosperity for every man. They are concepts inherent in the new Republic of Italy and in the hearts and minds of every Italian.

Mr. President, I know that I speak for every Marylander when I extend congratulations to the thousands of Americans of Italian descent in the Free State upon the 15th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy.

OZARK RIVERS NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on March 20, my colleague from Missouri [Mr. LONG] and I introduced a bill (S. 1381) to provide for the establishment and development of the Ozark Rivers National Monument in Missouri.

A companion measure was introduced by Congressman RICHARD ICHORD in the House of Representatives.

There has been a great deal of support and interest expressed in Missouri, not only by the people in the area concerned, but also throughout the State and the Middle West.

The plan contained in S. 1381 will provide both development and preservation of one of the most beautiful natural areas of America.

I am hopeful that in the near future the Congress will be able to consider this proposal, one which is important to the future development of Missouri and the Middle West.

In this connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, dated March 21, 1961, and an article from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, dated May 21, 1961, with reference to the Ozark Rivers National Monument, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 21, 1961]

TREASURE OF THE OZARKS

Conservation of the Ozarks' most beautiful rivers—the Eleven Point, Jacks Fork, and Current—became a genuine expectation rather than a subject for perennial debate when Senators SYMINGTON and LONG and Representative ICHORD introduced identical bills in both branches of Congress for the establishment of the Ozark Rivers National Monument.

Broadly, the bills follow the plan evolved by the National Park Service at the request of the Missouri Legislature. They authorize $6 million for the project, more than enough to cover the $5,500,000 estimated value of private property in the area. The remainder of the land already is owned by the Federal and State Governments; and the State should gladly contribute its holdings.

The bill also calls for Federal payments in lieu of local taxes for a few years—to offset the loss of county income until new revenue is obtained from the economic development expected after the park is established. For Washington, the amount involved is relatively nominal.

Present owners will be allowed to use land for residential but not commercial purposes so long as they live. The Park Service had proposed this for farms, but the broadening of its provision is quite acceptable. All of a farm of 500 acres or less will have to be taken, instead of only a part, to avoid leaving a farmer with an inefficient bit of land.

The bill allows hunting in the area, subject to regulation by the Secretary of the Interior. This should enable the Park Service to protect park visitors, especially float fishermen, against the danger of irresponsible discharge of firearms. The bill also calls for the appointment of an 11-member citizen advisory committee, with most of its members to be residents of the region. So adequate safeguards are provided for all valid interests.

In spite of those who agree in principle that the rivers must be saved but take exception to virtually all proposals for doing so, we believe most of the Ozark people not only desire to keep the streams in their still relatively natural state, but also realize that time is running out. People elsewhere who know these clear, cool, fast-running streams and the great springs which feed them long have recognized the region as one of the scenic treasures of the Midwest. And they dread the honkytonk exploitation which grows as more and more visitors are attracted.

Only in dreams can the population be reduced to what it was when Indians roamed the time-gentled hills. In fact, better use must be made of the area for the support of its inhabitants. To do this while also preserving its semiwild character is almost magician's work. The Park Service plan provides the answer as nearly as is humanly possible. Missourians especially should support the national monument bill. It would be scandalous not to guard jealously what already is a treasure beyond price.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 21, 1961]

PARK SERVICE BACKS PROPOSAL FOR RECREATION AREA IN OZARKS—AGENCY REPORT POINTS OUT ECONOMIC BENEFITS OF 113,000-ACRE NATIONAL MONUMENT ALONG THREE RIVERS

WASHINGTON, May 20.—A proposal to establish a national recreational area in the Missouri Ozarks promises substantial economic benefits for the surrounding area and the entire State, the National Park Service reported today.

A report by the Federal agency said this conclusion was borne out both by a study of the projected Ozarks Rivers National Monument and by analysis of the economic impact of national parks and other Federal recreational units in other areas of the United States.

BILL INTRODUCED

Legislation to create the Missouri recreational area and make it part of the national park system was introduced recently in Congress. It would authorize the Federal Government to acquire 113,000 acres of land about 175 miles southwest of St. Louis in a move to preserve a rugged wilderness section of the Ozarks and the unspoiled beauty of three of Missouri's rivers, the Current, Jack's Fork and Eleven Point.

Data gathered by the Park Service indicated that the substandard economy of the Ozark region would be raised significantly as a result of the monument's expected attraction for tourists.

Spending by tourists brought to Missouri by the monument could be expected to amount to $5,500,000 annually within 5 years after establishment of the proposed recreational facility, it was estimated. The number of new tourists attributable to the monument would total 800,000 annually after 5 years, the report added.

CONSTRUCTION REQUIRED

To care for this influx of tourists, heavy construction of hotels, motels, gasoline stations and other facilities outside but close to the monument area would be required. Park Service estimates put the cost of needed facilities at $33 million.

Development on this scale would have a significant effect on tax assessments and revenues in the area. The land that would be taken off the tax rolls as a result of inclusion in the monument has an assessed valuation estimated at $1,300,000. New tourist facilities, however, would be assessed at about $10 million, leaving a net increase in valuation of nearly $9 million.

This gain is reflected in a substantial increase expected in county tax revenues.

About $45,000 in tax revenue would be lost through removal of monument lands from the tax rolls. But new tourist facilities in the area would produce $350,000 in tax income, leaving an annual gain of some $300,000, it was estimated.

Although the Park Service made no mention of State revenues, increases apparently could be expected there, too. Greater economic activity in the area should boost the yield from income and gasoline taxes and other sources of State income.

The Ozark region would benefit also from jobs created within the monument itself. It was estimated that within 5 years a staff of more than 25 persons would be required to manage the recreation area. The annual payroll would be about $140,000.

EFFECT ON REGION'S ECONOMY

The anticipated benefits resulting from creation of the monument became even more significant when viewed against the background of the present economic level of the Ozark area.

The Park Service study showed that the region is poor. In 1950 the median family income in the proposed monument area was only 42 percent of the State average. In Shannon County in the proposed monument region the level was only 37 percent of the State average, or $969.

Farming is the main source of income although the report noted that conditions are not favorable for agriculture. In 1955 the cash income of 40 percent of the farm families in the area was less than $1,000.

The economic picture is worsened by the fact that very little industrial development has taken place in the region. The report stated that in June 1959 only 27 firms, giving employment to 585 persons, were located in Carter, Oregon, Shannon, and Ripley Counties. These four counties contain about 97 percent of the proposed monument lands.

HOW OTHER AREAS HAVE FARED

The Park Service cited figures from a number of other Federal recreational areas to substantiate its claim that the Ozark Monument would produce economic growth. It pointed out that establishment of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore area in North Carolina was followed by an increase of more than 100 percent in valuation assessments in Dare County. The local tax rate was cut by one-fifth.

It reported that in the region adjacent to the seashore recreational area, business generated by tourists rose more than 150 percent in 6 years. Bank deposits doubled in the 9 years after establishment of the seashore area.

A study of the economic impact of Grand Teton National Park in Wyoming showed that valuation assessments and collections of sales and use taxes doubled in an 8-year period after the park was enlarged. In the same period population of the county in which the park is located rose 27 percent, retail sales climbed 96 percent, and bank deposits nearly doubled.

STUDIES OF TOURIST SPENDING

The importance of tourist spending in areas near national recreational facilities was shown by two other studies. One disclosed that 2,500,000 persons visited Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee and North Carolina in 1956 and spent more than $28 million in a 30-mile radius of the park.

A similar survey at Glacier National Park showed that in the year ended September 1951, tourists spent $4 million in the vicinity of the park and an additional $8 million elsewhere in Montana.

Much of the economic data concerning the Ozark region was obtained by the National Park Service from an economic study prepared for it by the University of Missouri.

Hearings were held recently in the Ozark area on the proposal to establish a national recreational monument there. There has been no action yet by Congress on the proposed legislation. The pending measure would authorize appropriation of $6 million in Federal funds to acquire land and set up the monument.

The monument would be located in narrow strips along the three rivers. Land within 2 miles of Eminence, Van Buren, and Doniphan, Mo., would be excluded.

PROBLEMS OF THE UNEMPLOYED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on May 25 I inserted in the RECORD the first of a series of four articles on the problem of the unemployed in America which were then appearing in the Scripps-Howard newspapers.

I ask unanimous consent to have the remaining three articles of this series inserted in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News]

WORKERS FIND BREAKING INTO A NEW FIELD IS MOST DIFFICULT

(By Dickson Preston, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

Eddie Williams, of Detroit, can tell you a lot about this "retraining" program the experts here in Washington say is going to solve the problems of the unemployed.

So can Howard Phillips, auto worker; Jim Chiodi, welder; Bill McClellan, steelworker.

They're four among thousands who have seen their production line jobs vanishing and taught themselves new skills—only to find that breaking into a different field isn't as simple as it seems.

Their stories are useful if only to point a warning: before we spend millions retraining factory workers for the automated world of the 1960's, we'd better make sure we know what to retrain them for.

"I took a course in auto salesmanship after I was laid off at the Ford plant," Mr. Williams told me.

"Since then, I've applied to at least 70 auto dealers in the Detroit area without success. They all say they want only experienced men."

ANOTHER REASON

Without his saying it, you knew there was another reason Eddie Williams had had trouble getting a job selling cars. He's a good salesman—as he has demonstrated in selling vacuum cleaners, radios, books, and even ice cream—but he's a Negro trying to break into what has been almost exclusively a white man's field.

Jim Chiodi didn't have that problem. He's of Italian-American background. But he ran into other problems when he decided the introduction of automatic welding equipment could be converted into an opportunity for him to fulfill a lifelong dream.

A 10-year man with a Pittsburgh-area steel fabricating firm, he survived a wave of layoffs in 1958—but a second wave got him in 1959. Altogether, 150 welders lost their jobs at this plant, he says.

After his layoff, Mr. Chiodi and his wife talked it over. They owned their home; their bills were paid; they even had a little money in the bank. So, they decided, Jim would do what he had always wanted to do—go into hotel management. After all, he was only 40, a comparatively young man.

FAMILY SAVINGS

Mr. Chiodi drew on the family savings, went to Washington, and took a course in hotel management from a widely advertised school. It cost $1,200—$400 tuition, $800 room and board.

"I passed it with flying colors," he says bitterly today. "But what good did it do? I write in every time I see an ad—but I don't even get an answer. I even went down to Florida where there are so many hotels, but I didn't get anywhere.

"So the Government says: 'The men who are out of work will just have to train themselves in something else.' So you do—and then nobody wants you. What's the sense of doing it? That's what gets me."

He looked up challengingly. I didn't have any answer.

"I'd work for 2 months for nothing just to get the experience, if I thought there'd be a job at the end of it," he said. "But you can't expect people to take training unless it leads to something."

CHANCE IN ARMY

Howard Phillips, a former die-press operator at a Detroit Chevrolet plant, found his "opportunity" in the Army. He took a course in telephone installation, and returned to civilian life proudly carrying the diploma he'd won.

What happened? At 28 he's supporting his wife and three children with $55 a week in extended unemployment compensation. Before that program took effect in April, they were on relief. He's never even heard from any of the telephone offices to which he so hopefully applied.

Bill McClellan of Pittsburgh is also just out of the Army, where he learned to operate heavy construction equipment such as bulldozers, and caterpillar tractors. As with the others, it hasn't helped him get a job.

At Pittsburgh's downtown State employment office I looked over a list of 65 jobs which are unfilled despite the area's 110,000 unemployed. They ran to such openings as—

"Summer camp cook—male—knowledge of kosher cookery."

"Beauty op.—exp.—must have Pa. beauty shop mgrs. license."

"Electronic technician—speak Spanish—experienced on aircraft."

"Auditor—No exp. needed if college degree, B-average, plus accounting major. Car required."

"Case aide—college degree, sociology—like to be around senior citizens. Must type."

And I wondered as I read the list: What kind of retraining program would fit unemployed steelworkers into jobs like these?

[From the Washington Daily News, May 25, 1961]

THERE ARE MANY FLAWS IN THE JOBLESS PAY SYSTEM

(By Dickson Preston)

"I've been lucky," said Homer Cubbage, a good-looking 20-year-old in a neat tweed jacket. Then he went on to explain.

In less than 3 years since he finished high school, Mr. Cubbage has had two jobs. The first was as an inspector in a factory in Fostoria, Ohio. When he was laid off, he drew $42 a week for 26 weeks in Ohio State unemployment compensation.

Then he moved to Pittsburgh and got a steel mill job. That, too, lasted only a few months. And Mr. Cubbage now is in the process of drawing 30 weeks at $35 from Pennsylvania—and from the Federal Government through the much-heralded extension plan.

That kind of "luck" illustrates one of the flaws in the jobless pay system for which no one has found an answer. It can become a

way of life and—for a person with not too expensive tastes—a fairly pleasant one, as I soon found out.

"Are you married or engaged?" I asked.

"No," said Mr. Cubbage with unconscious irony, "I'd like to be, but I'm paying on a car, you see."

JOB TRAINING

In the 11 months since he last worked, Mr. Cubbage has not gone back to school. If he had, his compensation would have been cut off. He has taken no job training—that, too, might have jeopardized his weekly check—but has looked faithfully, but without success, for a job. But he has given little thought to leaving Pittsburgh to seek work elsewhere. Why should he?

His story and others I ran across in talking to scores of unemployed raise serious questions about the compensation system. Among them:

Jobless pay can be a life saver to a family man. It can also be a racket. Two examples can be cited.

There was a man who explained quite frankly that he worked on Detroit's docks all summer, and then from Thanksgiving to April—while the winter freeze is on—he lives on his unemployment checks. He has been getting along nicely in this way for 5 years.

There was the woman, wife of a well-paid engineer, who has collected a weekly check since she retired as a sales clerk in a department store. She's 64. Each week, of course, she bows to formality and checks to see if any one wants to hire a 64-year-old salesclerk. No one does.

The system tends to clog the economy because it deters people from ordinary job-hunting.

"People aren't as job hungry as they used to be," said Carmen Smith, a veteran statistician in the Pittsburgh employment service.

"Twenty-five years ago, whenever a steelworker was laid off, his wife immediately went on the 'domestic help' market. You don't see that any more."

Its existence tends to keep people from moving around into other areas in search of jobs. One result: Detroit today is clogged with unemployed although it is evident thousands of them will never get auto industry jobs again. Another: Of a dozen young, single men I talked to, not one had seriously considered "hitting the road" in search of either adventure or a job.

It is, in many cases, a disguised form of charity. We are not going to solve the problems of older workers, of the unskilled and the ill trained, by longer and longer extensions of compensation. But the very fact there is jobless pay keeps us from facing up to those problems as they really are.

ROUGH SITUATION

It is a hideous thing to be out of a job, and without much prospect for work. I've seen it in the eyes of beaten men growing old but still too young to retire, in the eyes of the sick and the handicapped. But the answer is not adding more and more weeks onto extensions of jobless pay.

The truth is—we might as well acknowledge it—the country has a growing number of people who are unemployable by today's exacting standards of industrial efficiency. How many, nobody knows. But it could be 2 million or more.

They're unemployable for many reasons—too lazy, too dumb, too old, too sick. But they're unemployable, and no amount of "job retraining" or stimulation of the economy is likely to put them into jobs.

"If ever there is a big job demand again, more women are going to be moving into the labor force," Carmen Smith pointed out. They have the skills industry is looking for—nimble fingers, quick minds.

"And the dumbbell will still be out of a job."

[From the Washington Daily News, May 26, 1961]

WORKERS CLAIM THE DEMAND FOR JOBS IS LESS NOW

(By Dickson Preston)

Fire all the design engineers and outlaw machines.

Make women stay home if their husbands are working.

Cut wages and prices so management could afford to provide more jobs.

Pass laws forbidding plants to move.

These are a few of the ideas the unemployed themselves suggested when asked what should be done to create more jobs.

I talked to scores of them while surveying the problems of "hard core" unemployment in big production centers such as Detroit and Pittsburgh. And I was surprised at some of the things I learned.

EXAMPLES

For instance:

Even among people who had been jobless 2 or 3 years, not one suggested the time had come to establish a new WPA—the leaf-raking project of the 1930's depression. They were realistic in their appraisal of what the Government can do—and can't.

"Public works will help—but they're only temporary," was a typical comment. And many echoed former shipping clerk Albert Babcock of McKees Rocks, Pa., who chuckled when I asked his views and replied:

"Honest, I haven't the faintest idea. If I knew, I'd be down at Washington—not here."

Many of the unemployed have an unreasonable fear and anger against machines. All they can see is that the machines have taken their jobs. If there are advantages to an automated society, they are not evident to a man who has been displaced by it.

"Machines are taking the place of people," said Cleothe Sly, a former Chrysler production worker. "The big man is making all the money and there's nothing for the little man.

"I think they should outlaw machines. If you can't work, you can't buy cars."

Said another Chrysler worker, Howard Phillips:

"I was in hopes of a callback, but now I don't know. They keep moving in so much automation stuff. I worked on a line that took 25 to 30 men. Now they've cut it down to five."

FORCING WAGES

Next to machines (and management for bringing them in), the unemployed denounce unions for forcing wages too high. This is somewhat surprising since union leaders are highly vocal in demanding action to create more jobs.

"The unions should stop being so hard on management," said Eddie Williams, former Ford worker.

"Lower wages would mean more jobs. I'd rather see a lot of us working at $60 or $70 a week than a few at $120. The way I look at it, if I can live on $1,000 a year, the $6,000 man could live on a little less."

In Pittsburgh, former steelworker George McCary agreed.

"What would help most would be to pull wages and prices down," he said. "Wages are too high. They could have shorter hours and more jobs—but the unions want the same pay for less work. That won't help."

On the other hand, Bill Maniaci, a former United Auto Workers Union shop steward, argued that the real trouble is that the older workers won't back up their union.

"The company pulls these speedups and they tell you: 'If you don't like it, go ahead and strike,'" he said. "But the workers are too afraid for their jobs. If they would back up their union, we could get somewhere."

RESENTFUL

Unemployed women, rather than men, are the more outspoken against working wives. They resent seeing another woman on a job if her husband is employed.

"I've seen too many of them," said Louisa Joba, a former Detroit glass factory worker. "They've got everything paid for—cars, homes, and all—and still they work.

"If they have a husband working married women belong at home."

Many blame themselves for failing to get more education or take training when they had the opportunity.

"I could have taken some kind of training in GI school," said George McCary. "But I didn't know then. I thought I'd always have a job. Now I can't afford it."

"Even a high-school diploma doesn't mean much any more," said Mrs. Joba. "The jobs that are open—they call for college."

And too many for comfort just sit and stare hopelessly at a future which holds nothing for them.

As William Stewart, onetime inspector for Cadillac, put it:

"There's nothing you can do. We're just going to have less demand for people, that's all."

EXAMINATIONS FOR PEACE CORPS APPLICANTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, last Saturday, May 27, the Peace Corps held preliminary examinations for applicants at various centers across the Nation.

Many students and young people in my home State of Indiana applied and were tested. To assist the applicants and to demonstrate their support of this imaginative foreign affairs program, the 433 American Legion posts in the State of Indiana volunteered to provide transportation for the applicants to the examination sites.

This gesture on behalf of the American Legion in Indiana again demonstrates the spirit of helpfulness and national duty or this great veterans organization. I commend the Indiana American Legion and its commander, Orin Nowlin, for this project. I hope that other organizations in communities and States across the Nation will follow the lead of the American Legion in seeking to be of service to the Government and its programs.

WISCONSIN PARISH TO DO MISSIONARY WORK IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege yesterday to talk to Sargent Shriver, head of the U.S. Peace Corps, and Mr. Edwin Baley, as well as Mr. William D. Moyers.

I was very much impressed with the earnestness of all three in their approach to the problems as they see them in establishing and carrying out the objectives of the Peace Corps.

We recognize, of course, that this is not a new concept. Previously in history, there have been children's crusades; for centuries, also, missionaries have served in outposts around the world. In more recent time, we have

had student exchanges under both publicly and privately sponsored programs.

The Peace Corps, as now proposed, differs somewhat from the previous endeavors. While there are special problems involved, the corps in my judgment has a real potential for good.

In addition to the Government's efforts to bring better economic standards to less developed areas through the Peace Corps organization, we also recognize and appreciate the outstanding contributions that missionaries of religious faiths are making in certain regions of the world. I think that we should give every encouragement to these nongovernment groups to engage in human and economic betterment projects.

Recent activities in Latin America, especially, have brought to the fore the need for even greater economic and spiritual leadership to fight poverty, malnutrition and disease—the breeding grounds of communism.

It has been brought to my attention for example, that a Wauwatosa Roman Catholic church has recently aproved a program which will send volunteers from the St. Pius X Parish to selected areas of Central and South America to do missionary-type work.

I think this is a splendid example of a church group at its best—expressing its desire through positive action to help our neighbors south of the border.

I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 29, 1961, on this fine program printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOSA CATHOLIC CHURCH VOTES LATIN MISSION

Members of a Wauwatosa Roman Catholic Church Sunday approved a program which could result in a parish family being sent to South America to do missionary work.

First in the Milwaukee archdiocese to be polled, parishioners of St. Pius X Church, N. 76th and N. Wright Streets, voted 1,636 to 183 to accept in principle the program of the Papal Volunteers for Latin America (PAVLA).

The group aims at sending North American Catholic laymen to South American countries to aid them materially and spiritually, according to Dr. Richard J. Connell, member of a committee which sponsored the balloting.

Now that the parish has approved the idea, Connell said, the committee will try to raise funds to send one or more volunteers to Latin America.

He said it would also begin taking and evaluating applications.

Connell said the amount of money to be raised would not be large. He pointed out that for $2,860 an unmarried volunteer worker can be trained, sent, supported, and brought back, the total period of service being 3 years.

Many skilled persons are needed, Connell noted, including carpenters, farmers, teachers, physicians, nurses, and businessmen equipped to set up cooperatives and other economic betterment projects.

Recruits are trained in a Mexican school for 4 months in language and customs of the country they will work in, Connell explained.

He said the committee hoped to interest other Milwaukee area Catholic parishes in setting up programs for lay missionary activity.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is morning business concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. ROBERTSON obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL MINING INDUSTRY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I have been greatly impressed by a most thoughtful and discerning memorandum on the problems of economic distress in the bituminous coal mining industry, which was prepared by Mr. Philip Sporn, president of the American Electric Power Co. In his memorandum, Mr. Sporn not only points out pathways by which the distress in the bituminous coal fields can be overcome, but also offers challenging ideas for revitalizing the economies of our distressed areas—ideas which, if put into practice, could bring solid economic growth to many of our Appalachian States.

Bcause I believe Mr. Sporn's memorandum deserves the attention of Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have his remarkable paper printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM ON THE PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL MINING INDUSTRY AND THE PERSISTENT DEPRESSED ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL MINING REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

SUMMARY

Although the difficulties of the coal mining industry have contributed to and intensified the depressed economic conditions of the coal mining areas of the country, they are not the same as the depressed area problem. While aid to the coal industry would help to alleviate the severe distress in the coal mining regions, an equally important reason for assisting the coal industry is the need to assure its ability to meet an increasing share of the Nation's growing energy requirements for the next several decades.

U.S. coal consumption, together with exports, reached a peak of almost 614 million tons in 1947, but by 1960 was only slightly below 417 million tons. This sharp drop in coal consumption, together with the more than doubling in the coal output per man per day, has resulted in severe unemployment in the coal industry. The expectation of a continuation of the highly desirable advances in productivity requires substantial increases in coal production if further declines in coal mine employment are to be avoided. This will come—in time. But help is needed now.

Immediate help to the coal industry can be achieved by an increase in the demand for coal by 15 to 30 million tons per year. This can most quickly be accomplished by the following measures:

1. A strict administration of the residual oil import program. Annual residual oil imports are presently the equivalent of 30 million tons of coal. Of this amount, at least 10 million tons equivalent are being consumed in facilities capable of utilizing either coal or residual oil with present fuel-burning equipment.

2. Use by the Federal Power Commission of its regulatory powers to encourage the development of natural-gas storage facilities and to discourage the off-peak sale of natural gas at prices below average cost. Use of natural gas for electric utility generation should be discouraged where coal is an economical alternative. These steps would both prevent inroads by natural gas into coal's boiler fuel market and serve the desirable conservation function of reserving our relatively scarce supply of natural gas for higher-value use.

3. Encouragement by the Interstate Commerce Commission of more competitive ratemaking practices by the railroads to lower coal's rail transportation costs and to enhance coal's competitive market position on a delivered-cost basis. Rising transportation costs have increased the delivered cost of coal despite virtual stability in the mine price of coal in the postwar period.

4. Giving more consideration to the use of coal or electric space heating, cooking, and water heating (coal by wire) in new Government installations, public housing, and the like wherever there is a broad economic justification.

5. Exploration by the Federal Government of the possibility of providing coal to foreign nations, both allies and other non-Communist nations, to assure them an adequate energy supply in those cases where fear of energy shortage threatens to affect adversely economic development and international policy.

For the long-term enhancement of the economic position of coal, the following are recommended:

1. Investigation of the opportunities for electrification of the railroads. Electrification of commuter lines, as an integral part of an urban renewal program, should be studied as a possible starting place.

2. An expanded program for the development of processes for the production of liquid fuels and/or chemicals and char from coal should be undertaken. Private construction of prototype plants should be encouraged by a Federal Government guarantee to purchase the limited output of a small number of such plants. Similar programs have worked in the past—for example, the program to encourage exploration and development of uranium mining. In the case of combination char and chemical plants, the electric utility industry would provide a ready market for the char.

3. Establishment of a national fuels policy based on a full and careful study of the Nation's energy resources base, the long-term expansion of the demands to be placed on these resources, and of the present energy resources policies that may be in conflict with the best long-term interest of the country in assuring the availability of an adequate and economical supply of energy for the next four decades.

Giving aid to depressed areas will basically require long-term measures. Among the most promising are the following:

1. Improvement of transportation facilities by highway and waterway improvements.

2. Improvement of community facilities through a program of loans and grants.

3. Assistance by the Federal Government in local development planning.

4. Expansion of vocational training programs.

5. Reorganization of Federal Employment Service to provide improved informational services regarding employment opportunities on a regionwide and nationwide basis.

6. Financial assistance for out-migration of families or those finding employment outside depressed areas.

7. Permitting those taking on-the-job training to qualify for benefits under vocational training programs.

8. Development of industrial sites by diking rivers to protect against maximum flood levels and by leveling hilly land.

9. Exploitation of natural advantages for development of parks, national forests, and other tourist facilities, with accompanying service industries.

THE PROBLEMS OF BITUMINOUS COAL AND OF THE DEPRESSED COAL-MINING REGIONS

The difficulties of the coal-mining industry and the severe economic depression in which the coal-mining regions of the country have found themselves in the post-World War II period are closely related, but they are not identical. The economic distress of the coal-mining industry has contributed to and has intensified the depressed economic conditions of the coal regions, but the bituminous-coal industry's difficulties and their remedies are not the same as those of the severely depressed economic conditions in the coal-mining areas. Although the recovery of economic health in the coal industry can contribute significantly to an alleviation of the depressed area conditions, measures to assist the recovery of the coal industry from its present distress have a justification apart from and equal in importance with that of assistance to depressed areas.

Coal represents one of the great, important energy resources of the United States upon which this country has grown and developed to its present high level of economic welfare in the past century, and one upon which it is likely to become increasingly dependent over the next several decades. If this Nation is to have available a viable coal industry capable of supporting a skilled labor force and continued capital expenditures to increase its productivity to meet the growing demands expected to be made upon it in succeeding decades, it is essential that steps be taken to assure the industry's survival through the difficulties through which it is now passing.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF BITUMINOUS COAL MARKETS

In 1940, prior to World War II, consumption of bituminous coal in the United States was 430.9 million tons, and an additional 16.5 million tons were exported. The industry reached its peak year in 1947, when the U.S. consumption reached 544.9 million tons and the need to fill the gap left by the wartime disruption of Europe's energy industries added 68.7 million tons in exports. Since 1947, however, U.S. consumption has declined sharply and by 1960 had fallen to 380.4 million tons, while exports were only 36.5 million tons.

Most of the decline in bituminous coal consumption is accounted for by losses in two markets. Railroad consumption of coal in 1940 was 85.1 million tons; at the height of the war, in 1944, it reached a peak of 132 million tons. But with the virtual completion of the dieselization of the railroads that began at the end of World War II, railroad consumption of coal had fallen by 1960 to barely more than 2 million tons.

The second market accounting for the very large decline in coal consumption is retail deliveries, represented mostly by household use. Retail deliveries rose from 84.7 million tons in 1940 to a peak of slightly over 122 million tons in 1944; but by 1960 this market had declined to only 30.4 million tons, largely as a result of the rapid extension of natural gas pipelines after the end of World War II. The increase in the number of gas house-heating customers, from 7.4 million to 19.4 million in the decade 1949–59, clearly illustrates the shift in consumer fuel preference that has adversely affected the coal industry.

A third market in which coal use has declined sharply, although not to the extent of the declines in the railroad and retail delivery markets, has been manufacturing other than coke, steel, and cement. In 1940 this market accounted for almost 111 million tons of bituminous coal, reached a peak in 1943 of over 145 million tons, but by 1960 had fallen to only 76.5 million tons.

There are three markets in which this drastic decline in coal consumption has been resisted.

Although the cement industry is a relatively small market for coal, its coal consumption has risen substantially from a low of 3.8 million tons in 1944 to a high of 9 million tons in 1956. The 1960 figure, mainly as a result of the recession, fell slightly to 8.2 million tons. Consumption in this industry can be expected to stay around this level or to rise slightly, depending on the level of cement output.

The consumption of coal in the coke and steel industry is of course primarily dependent on the level of steel production. In the postwar period, coal consumption by this industry has fluctuated cyclically with the level of steel production, ranging from a low of 83.8 million tons in 1958 to a high of 121.6 million tons in 1953. Consumption of coal by the coke and steel industry can be expected to remain in the 100-million-ton range for the next several years.

Coal consumption by the electric utility industry has been the coal industry's strongest growth market, and the growth in consumption from slightly over 49 million tons in 1940 to almost 174 million tons in 1960 has approximately offset the loss of the railroad market. Growth in the electric utility industry consumption of bituminous coal can be expected to continue to be the major long-term growth impetus for the coal industry.

IMPROVEMENTS IN COAL MINE TECHNOLOGY

During the postwar period, when the consumption of bituminous coal was falling so very rapidly, productivity in the coal mining industry made dramatic advances. From 1947 to 1960 output per man per day more than doubled from 6.42 tons to 13.1 tons. This rapid improvement in coal mine productivity has been made possible by very large capital expenditures for modern machinery and equipment such as continuous mining machines, large mechanical stripping shovels, automatic loading machinery, shuttle conveyors, and numerous other types of automatic equipment in every phase of the coal mining operation.

The productivity gains resulting from the introduction of modern mining machinery have made possible the maintenance of a virtually stable mine price of coal in the postwar period in the face of the doubling of hourly wages for the miners and the general price inflation experienced in the United States during this period. The ability of the coal mining industry to achieve this remarkable gain in productivity (especially remarkable when compared with average productivity in England of only about one-tenth the 13.1 tons per man per day in the United States), and thus price stability, has prevented an even more disastrous deterioration in coal's competitive position than has in fact occurred. It is also worth noting that in the process of improving productivity the modern coal miner has been converted from a pick-and-shovel laborer to a highly skilled machine operator. This is a significant indication of his adaptability through training for other skilled occupations.

EMPLOYMENT IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY

The adverse effects on employment in the coal mining industry thus stem from two sources: (1) the sharp decline in production and (2) the rapid increase in productivity through mechanization. Both trends reinforced each other in exerting a severe downward pressure on coal mine employment, causing a decline from 419,200 in 1947 to 160,200 in 1960. There is every reason to hope and expect that the trend of mechanization and rising productivity in the coal industry will continue at the rates experienced thus far in the postwar period and will continue to contribute to improving coal's competitive market position. However, under such circumstances it will be necessary that coal production increase substantially simply to prevent any further declines in employment in the industry, and very rapid increases in coal production will be required to provide even moderate increases in the levels of employment.

POSSIBLE STEPS FOR IMMEDIATE HELP TO COAL

Aid to the coal industry breaks down into those things which can be done to provide immediate help and those steps which will provide assistance over the long term. Immediate help is urgently needed, and those steps which would have a beneficial impact in the shortest possible time are particularly important. Although the long-term outlook for the coal industry is optimistic, the industry must be able to survive the immediate future of the next 4 or 5 years if it is to realize its bright long-term prospects and be in a position to make the vitally important contribution to the Nation's growing energy requirements expected of it.

1. Of most immediate help would be an increase of 15 to 30 million tons in the demand for coal. Hence, of most immediate help would be a strict administration of the residual oil import program to reduce or at least prevent further inroads by residual oil imports into coal's markets on the east coast. Such imports now are the equivalent of about 30 million tons of coal, of which approximately 10 million tons equivalent are now consumed in facilities capable of switching from oil to coal instantaneously with changes in market conditions. Residual oil is almost a waste product remaining after higher value products are removed in the oil refining process. It can be priced, therefore, at whatever level is necessary to sell the available supply. Under such circumstances the imposition of import quotas is necessary to improve coal's competitive opportunities in these markets and to prevent further losses in these markets to residual oil. Perhaps even more significant than the effects on present competitive markets, the strict administration of the residual oil import quota system would serve as a clear signal to consumers that they could not without risk plan new facilities based on residual oil use and further increase this country's dependence on foreign sources of energy.

2. A second step to expand the production and consumption of coal would be for the Federal Power Commission to use its regulatory power to minimize the offpeak sale of natural gas at prices below average cost

to compete with coal. Steps should be taken to encourage the more rapid development of natural-gas storage facilities close to major gas market areas, which would itself discourage offpeak sales at excessively low prices. The FPC could also continue to utilize its powers, recently confirmed by the Supreme Court in the case of Consolidated Edison Co., to discourage the use of natural gas for electric utility generation wherever coal is an available economic alternative. Such a program would have merit apart from aid to coal in that it would preserve the relatively scarce supply of natural gas for its higher value uses.

3. While the coal industry over the last 15 years has done an excellent job of holding down the mine price of coal, the delivered cost of coal has continued to rise. Since it is necessary for coal to compete with alternative fuels on a delivered cost basis, and since railroad freight represents as much as 40 to 50 percent of the delivered cost of coal, a significant contribution could be made to the competitive position of coal if the Interstate Commerce Commission were to permit more competitive ratemaking practices by railroads for coal transportation such as special trainload rates. On the average, railroad revenue in 1947 represented 58.9 percent of the mine price of a ton of coal; by 1958 this had risen to 68.9 percent so that despite the stability in the mine price of coal in this period, the average price of coal delivered by rail rose by 24 percent. It is clear that transportation costs are an important component of the delivered cost of coal. Therefore, improvements in the transportation facilities available to move coal to market would greatly enhance coal's competitive opportunities.

A program to canalize and improve the navigability of the river systems throughout the coal mining regions would contribute markedly to expanding coal's market opportunities and would in addition make a major contribution to the economic and industrial development of these depressed areas. The time required to plan and carry through the construction of such a program is lengthy and cannot have an immediate impact except that construction, once undertaken, would offer immediate employment opportunities.

4. More consideration than has been given in the past should be given to the use of coal or electric space heating, cooking, and water heating in new Federal Government installations, public housing projects, and the like wherever they can be justified on a broad economic basis. Electric heating represents an important means for expanding coal's markets, and the sale of coal by wire represents a significant and potentially expanding contribution toward improving coal's competitive position.

5. The Federal Government should explore the possibility of providing coal to those foreign nations, both allies and other non-Communist nations, whose industrial growth may be threatened by an inadequacy in the domestic supply of energy. The coal to meet this need could be supplied at subsidized prices under a program similar to the surplus disposal program for agricultural commodities.

Only a few short years ago in a great many nations of the non-Communist world, fear was expressed that a deficiency in the supply of energy resources would inhibit industrial growth. At that time many misdirected, almost panicky, programs were undertaken for the development of nuclear electric energy generation which have since been abandoned or cut back sharply as the realization has grown that a shortage of fossil fuels is not an immediate threat. Nevertheless, there are still many countries without endemic supplies of energy in which the persistence of the concern for the future adequacy of fossil fuel supplies represents a significant influence on national policy. This is likely to be especially true in those less-developed countries which, as the drive for industrialization gains momentum, can expect to experience sharp increases in their energy requirements. The assurance of a supply of coal for the next decade, possibly the next several decades, could contribute importantly to the more confident planning of economic growth in these countries.

In the more highly industrialized countries such assurance would help materially in making possible a smoother, more economical, and less disruptive integration of nuclear power into their economies and a more rational transition over the next several decades from primary dependence on fossil fuels to a nuclear-fueled economy. Such a program would relieve some of the pressure that has compelled the consideration in some countries of expanding trade with the Soviet Union and its satellites to obtain needed energy supplies.

In short, then, the following five steps are suggested to provide immediate assistance to the bituminous coal industry:

1. Strict administration of the residual oil import program.

2. Use by the Federal Power Commission of its regulatory powers to minimize the offpeak sale of gas at below-average cost and to discourage the use of natural gas for electric utility generation where coal is an available economic alternative.

3. Encouragement by Interstate Commerce Commission of more competitive ratemaking practices by railroads hauling coal to make possible the reduction of the delivered price of coal.

4. Giving more consideration to the use of coal or electric space heating, cooking, and water heating in new Federal Government installations wherever they can be justified on a broad economic basis.

5. Exploration by the Federal Government of the possibilities of supplying coal to foreign nations, both allies and other non-Communist nations, which may be facing the threat of inadequate domestic supplies of energy. Such supplies of coal should be provided at subsidized prices under a program similar to that for the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities.

POSSIBLE STEPS FOR LONG-TERM HELP TO COAL

For the long term, there are several steps which can be taken and a number of areas which could be fruitfully investigated.

Since the expanding use of electric energy appears to be the major opportunity for expansion of coal's markets, steps should be taken to encourage greater use of electric energy wherever possible. This is vitally linked to the long-term transition in the United States to an increasingly important role for nuclear energy. Nuclear power will contribute to the Nation's energy supply principally in the form of electric energy. Therefore, it is only where the economy will be geared to utilize electric energy in place of other energy forms that nuclear power will be able to pick up the burden of our increasing energy needs. For the transition period of the next several decades, as research and development and then actual plant construction on a large scale make possible the assumption by nuclear fuel of a growing share of the national energy requirements, the conversion to electric energy utilization of a growing share of the total energy use can be promoted and accelerated on the basis of highly efficient coal-fired electric generation. Steps in this direction will make easier the introduction of nuclear power as a major component of the energy supply.

1. One such very important sector of the economy suitable for electrification that is capable of making a major contribution to an expansion of coal's market, and which at the same time would represent a significant contribution to the entire economy, is the railroad industry. Many railroads are facing severe difficulties in many parts of the country, and it is possible that some rationalization of our railroad system will become necessary and will be undertaken. In this process, attention should be given to the possibilities and opportunities through tax and other incentives to encourage and promote railroad electrification. A significant start can be made on commuter railroads to provide high-speed transportation in urban areas. Such a program could be integrated into the urban renewal program.

2. The Department of the Interior operated a coal hydrogenation research program between 1944 and 1955. This effort was abandoned and since then only a very modest program has been maintained. There has been some work in the coal industry in recent years on various processes to produce both liquid fuels and chemicals, and also processes to produce chemicals in combination with char that would be usable for electric power generation. The further development of such processes should be encouraged; a possible approach would be for the Federal Government to guarantee a market for the relatively small amount of liquid fuels that would be produced by a limited number of such plants. A similar program has successfully encouraged the exploration for and development of uranium mines. This could provide the necessary support for the construction of these plants by firms in the coal industry and the technical development of the processes. Tax and other incentives for the construction of char plants should also be considered. The electric utility industry would provide a ready market for the char that would be made available from such plants.

3. Of very great importance is the need to develop a national fuels policy based on a full and careful study of the Nation's energy resources base, the long-term expansion of the demands to be placed on these resources, and of the present energy resources policies that may be in conflict with the best long-term interest of the country in assuring the availability of an adequate and economical supply of energy for the next 4 decades. From such a careful study, guidelines for a national fuels policy should emerge that would serve to resolve contradictory and conflicting regulatory, legislative, and administrative policies with respect to our energy resources.

Such a fuels policy would assure the economic strength of all of the Nation's fuel resources, including coal, and would assure the continued abundance of energy with which this country so fortunately abounds.

THE DEPRESSED AREA PROBLEM

Although aid to the coal industry would alleviate the severe depression in coal mining areas, it would not eliminate the depressed area problem. Additional aid would still be necessary in these areas.

Even though the structural unemployment with which these depressed areas are beset stems from other than cyclical causes, recovery of the economy to full employment levels would represent a major step toward the alleviation of their difficulties. Indeed, the maintenance of a rate of economic growth adequate to sustain full employment is a prerequisite for the satisfactory solution of the depressed area problem. All suggested solutions, such as the location of new industry in depressed areas and the outmigration of labor from the depressed areas, are dependent on the maintenance of a low rate of unemployment in the country as a whole if the opportunities are to be available for the successful implementation of these solutions.

Short-term aid, such as the surplus food program, relief payments, and extended unemployment insurance, provides only temporary relief from distress. The basic solutions must be undertaken on a long-term basis. Among the more promising solutions, the following are suggested:

1. In many of the coal mining areas the inadequacy of social facilities is a major deterrent to industrial expansion. Transportation facilities in all too many communities, particularly in such mountainous areas as West Virginia and eastern Kentucky, do not provide adequate access for people and materials. A highway program which would provide access to these communities would contribute significantly to the opportunities for industrial development.

In this regard what was said earlier concerning the navigability of waterways in the region merits repetition. Canalization and improved navigability of the water systems in these regions could be a major step toward their revitalization.

2. These communities are also beset by the inadequate water and sewerage facilities, inadequate recreational facilities, deficient educational plant, deteriorated housing and shopping areas, and inadequate or nonexistent zoning regulations for the preservation of desirable industrial sites and attractive residential areas. A program of loans and grants to remove these obstacles to area development, in addition to their important contribution to the long-term solution of the problem, would also have an immediate impact on employment that would help significantly to relieve the present distressed conditions.

3. These deficiencies in community facilities must be remedied for the most part at the local level, but Federal financial assistance and community planning assistance can be extremely helpful. In many cases the long period of depression has created an atmosphere of lassitude and despair on the part of the local inhabitants which, combined with the extensive out-migration of people who otherwise might have furnished local leadership, necessitates outside stimulation to mobilize the resources of the community.

The depressed area bill passed by the Congress on April 26 is an important step in that direction. Although it has been criticized on the grounds that the amount of money involved is inadequate to do the job, its contribution lies not so much in the total sum of money, but in the availability of a relatively small amount to serve as seed money to mobilize, encourage, and stimulate local participation and to develop pilot cases to serve as examples to others. Expansion of the program in the future should be considered, if necessary, however.

4. An expansion of vocational training programs in depressed areas is urgently needed. Such a program should include the construction of vocational training facilities. Those unemployed who undertake vocational training should receive unemployment benefits, and where unemployment benefits have been exhausted those enrolled in vocational training programs should receive supplementary living allowances. As part of the vocational training program, a program of vocational guidance should be established which could guide those enrolled in the program in the choice of skills that would offer the greatest opportunity for employment.

This would not only increase the opportunities for employment after completion of the program but would result in supplying the country with people trained in skills that are in greatest need for the foreseeable future.

5. In conjunction with the vocational training effort, a reorganization of the Federal Employment Service should be undertaken. The Federal Employment Service as presently organized is utilized, for the most part, as an agency for the distribution of unemployment benefits. It should be reconstituted to supply information on job opportunities not only in the local area but regionwide and even nationwide, and steps should be taken to encourage potential employers and skilled workers to utilize, to a much greater extent than at the present time, the Federal Employment Service.

6. At the same time that efforts to improve local economic conditions are taking place it may also be necessary to encourage some out-migration. It is often difficult to induce people to change their place of residence because of a multitude of social and psychological reasons. The inability to finance such relocation compounds the difficulty. In many cases when the family wage earner does relocate, it is frequently impossible because of limited financial means for the family to move with him. The result is a breakup of the family and undesirable social consequences. A program should be undertaken to provide financial assistance to make possible family relocation for those finding employment opportunities outside the depressed areas.

7. In conjunction with the vocational training program, it should be made possible for employers who add to their employment, either by expanding existing plants or by building new plants, to train new employees on the job. These employees should be permitted to qualify for payments under the vocational training programs, which together with minimal payments by the employer during the specified training period would provide adequate living allowance. Such a program should be safeguarded from abuse by the requirement that a specified percentage of those trained under such a program be retained by the employer for a minimum length of time.

8. In some depressed areas, topography is unfavorable for industrial sites. A program to develop such sites should be undertaken. There are numerous locations along rivers where the construction of dikes to protect land from maximum flood levels would make available at relatively low cost highly desirable industrial sites. In some areas, such as West Virginia, flat land is not available in sufficient quantity. In such cases the possibility for flattening land to provide industrial sites, such as was done in the construction of the Charleston, W. Va., airport, should be considered. It is worth noting in this regard that the Netherlands have been reclaiming land from the North Sea for agricultural purposes for something over $1,500 per acre. In many parts of West Virginia, Virginia, and eastern Kentucky, industrial sites could be developed at such a level of cost, or perhaps slightly higher. Sites developed by these means could then be sold or leased at prices comparable to the value of similar industrial sites, with the Federal Government absorbing the cost of the difference between that price and the actual cost of the land development.

9. Greater effort should be made to exploit the natural advantages of the depressed areas for other than industrial purposes. Some areas, because of their mountains, forests, and lakes, may be particularly suitable for year-round vacation resorts, the establishment of national forests, and other measures to encourage tourism and the accompanying service industries. These opportunities have not been fully exploited, and the Federal Government together with local development agencies should give further consideration to the opportunities that may be present in these areas.

In summary, the following nine steps are recommended as promising significantly fruitful results in starting the depressed coal mining areas on the road to economic health:

1. Improvement of transportation facilities by highway and waterway improvements.

2. Improvement of community facilities through a program of loans and grants.

3. Assistance by the Federal Government in local development planning.

4. Expansion of vocational training programs.

5. Reorganization of Federal Employment Service to provide improved informational services regarding employment opportunities on a regionwide and nationwide basis.

6. Financial assistance for out-migration of families or those finding employment outside depressed areas.

7. Permitting those taking on-the-job training to qualify for benefits under vocational training programs.

8. Development of industrial sites by diking rivers to protect against maximum flood levels and by leveling hilly land.

9. Exploitation of natural advantages for development of parks, national forests, and other tourist facilities, with accompanying service industries.

OVERALL REMARKS ON THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEMS OF ECONOMIC DISTRESS IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL INDUSTRY AND THE PERSISTENT DEPRESSED ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN THE BITUMINOUS COAL MINING REGIONS OF THE UNITED STATES

The problems discussed in this memorandum are not new; they all have been a long time in developing. The coal problem in particular is highly complex. Not all of the picture is black, by any means—far from it. Indeed, the fact that we are today the most advanced technologic-economic society in the world is due in no small measure to the contribution, sometimes so preponderating as to render the other contributions almost negligible, that coal has made in the last century to the vast energy demands and needs of the country. Coal is in distress right now, but one of the most optimistic and encouraging items about coal is the great future that is ahead of it. If this were not so, there might be some basis for at least considering writing coal off as one of the social-economic, important phenomena or tools that has had its usefulness, which has now gone and which has to be abandoned in the inevitable march of progress toward perhaps other, and better, forms of energy.

But the case is just the reverse. The country has an acute need for coal in its future, and coal has a great future. Therefore, what we need is to make certain that coal so lives in the present that it can have this great future and that the country can have the benefit of coal in its future.

From this it follows quite naturally that the recommended steps toward the improvement of the position of coal are basically short-term steps—steps for the present—and it is believed they are all practical.

But there are long-term steps that need to be taken, and they, too, it is believed, are entirely pragmatic. But, basically, coal in the long term will be able to take care of itself.

The depressed areas also represent a problem that has been long in developing, although many of these areas did not clearly show what was happening to them only a short time ago. But even if we were not now in one of the low troughs of cyclic unemployment, many of these areas would have begun to show the bad cumulative effects of the loss of coal markets, the even greater loss of employment, and the failure over a period of many decades, in some cases going back a century, of the communities to plan for a future not entirely based on coal. With the resumption of an upswing in our economy, many of these communities will begin to look better, but they will not look enough better, because the basic conditions for a bright and stable and expanding future economy in their midst are not right. Therefore, quite naturally, many of the steps rec-

ommended are in the nature of basic steps, and at least one of the steps that is recommended, the encouragement of outmigration, is a step that helps solve the human problem but does not solve the area problem. Converting a depressed area into an uninhabited or ghost area is not a good way of solving the depressed area problem.

The steps recommended to help solve the depressed area situation independently of the coal problem, it is believed, as stated above, are pragmatic, but it does not mean they are final. We need, however, to make a quick and immediate start. In that start, some things will get done that are good. Some of them may even be mistakes, but all of them will improve the morale of the people in the areas. The power of the human spirit, when inspired by such pragmatic steps as those recommended in this memorandum, is incalculable. Once a turnabout is started, the program can be revised and reoriented in the light of experience.

On the whole, the programs discussed and recommended above represent a wide-ranging, varied attack on the depressed conditions in the coal mining regions. They are not uniformly applicable in every case and will have to be applied with a high degree of discrimination in each of the areas involved. Nevertheless, the proper time to start such a program is long past. The longer these difficulties are further neglected and the more serious these problems become, the deeper will become the despair of the local populations and the more difficult will it become to effect a remedy. But with determination and with action now, the beginnings of a solution can be effected now, and a more comprehensive solution can certainly be developed with time.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 261, H.R. 5954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5954), which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Appropriations has authorized me to present a statement in regard to the pending bill. I therefore, wish to present to the Senate, and for the permanent record, a brief summary of what is in the bill.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Treasury and Post Office Departments have the responsibility of administering a total of nearly $13.9 billion of budgeted items.

More than $8.6 billion of these items, however, are fixed and permanent indefinite appropriations which are not carried in the bill. The 1962 estimates of the Treasury Department in this category are for appropriations of $8.6 billion. Of this total, $8.5 billion is for interest on the public debt, a decrease of $400 million from the 1961 estimate.

Trust funds also are not carried in this bill. The 1962 estimate in this category is for $16.5 million. The Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, Federal disability insurance trust fund, and unemployment trust fund previously carried in the report accompanying this bill, were not included in the House report this year.

Details of the items comprising the Treasury Department's estimates for the general and special funds and the trust funds may be found in the tables included in the report accompanying this bill.

The bill which is recommended to the Senate provides total appropriations of $5,327,631,000. This amount is an increase of $45,766,000 over the House allowance, $189,881,000 over the 1961 allowance, and $44,170,000 under the estimates for 1962.

Increases over the House figure were approved by the committee on the basis of what it regarded as convincing testimony that to allow less amounts either would be false economy, because loss of essential services would outweigh the value of the attempted savings, or would seriously impair the capabilities of the agencies to perform their missions effectively and economically.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Appropriations totaling $938,981,000 are recommended in the accompanying bill for the regular annual requirements of the Treasury Department for fiscal year 1962. This is a decrease of $6.95 million in the estimates and an increase of $27,366,000 over the House allowance. The amount recommended is $71.5 million more than the 1961 allowance.

A large part of the increase mentioned was applied to the Internal Revenue Service. The committee recommended an appropriation of $456,800,000, the revised budget estimate, for salaries and expenses. This amount is $16.8 million over the House allowance. As is stated in the report, the committee was convinced by the testimony that the 1962 program, if carried out with the amount allowed, would result in an increased enforcement program and a substantial increase in the collection of additional revenue. It is estimated that the total revenue loss from the failure to report some $24.4 billion income on tax returns was at least $4 billion. The Secretary assured the committee that personnel for the 4,575 additional positions requested could be wisely recruited, properly trained, and usefully absorbed within the year, and these additional employees will be recruited from and assigned to the more than 900 field offices throughout the country.

For the Office of the Secretary, the committee recommends $4,233,000, an increase of $657,000 over 1961, and an increase of $233,000 over the House. In view of the testimony presented, the committee feels that 60 additional positions should be provided if the Secretary is to fully discharge the responsibilities of his office.

For the Division of Disbursement, Bureau of Accounts, the committee recommends $25,800,000, an increase of $1,734,000 over 1961, $400,000 under the estimate and $200,000 over the House. This Division is responsible for disbursing funds of all executive departments and agencies except Defense, the postal service, and certain Government corporations, and the sum provided over the House should strengthen the category "Personal services and employee benefits" for regular work of the Division.

For the Bureau of Customs, the committee recommends $62,650,000, the House allowance, and a decrease of $750,000 in the estimate, but $2,835,000 over 1961. In its recommendation, the committee has allowed funds for 141 additional man-years of employment over 1961 to support expanded enforcement and administrative workload, and has provided funds for the annualization of 22 positions authorized in fiscal 1961.

For the Secret Service, salaries and expenses, the committee has allowed $4.8 million, an increase of $303,000 over 1961. This is $100,000 under the estimate and $100,000 over the House. The allowance provides for an increase of 38 positions over 1961, which should strengthen the capability to curb the increase in counterfeiting and reduce the growing backlog of check and bond forgery investigations.

In connection with that increase, the committee was quite cool to a newspaper report that the Treasury Department was considering issuing new money of varied hues. The committee thought that such a program would increase counterfeiting. We were proposing to add new manpower to cope with the counterfeiting problem rather than decreasing personnel. With all due deference to the lovely Treasurer of the United States, who perhaps envisioned the beauties of pastel money, the committee felt that those who could not read enough to know the difference between a $1 bill and a $10 bill would not be too much protected if one were printed green and the other bright red, to say nothing of the expense of destroying all the present currency, making new plates, and new printing machines—a very sizable expense.

For the Bureau of the Mint, the committee recommends $6,350,000, the budget estimate. This amount is an increase of $350,000 over the House bill. For the past few years the mint has been operating with little, if any, reserve stocks and has not been able to satisfy the heavy demand for domestic coins during the period from July through December each year. With funds provided, the mint is expected to produce 3,350 million coins on a multiple-shift basis, without extensive overtime operations.

For operating expenses of the Coast Guard, the committee allowed $212 million. This is an increase of $7 million over 1961 and $4 million over the House, but a $500,000 reduction under the estimate.

The committee's recommendation should provide for most of the program increases proposed in the estimates. These estimates include operation of additional loran stations; the extension

of aids to navigation system on Federal waterways; an increased maintenance, repair, and replacement program; and extension of search and rescue and boating safety capabilities to meet the most urgent needs of the public.

The committee feels that any further reductions in this appropriation will seriously impair the Coast Guard's capabilities to perform its mission effectively and economically.

For "Acquisition, construction, and improvements" of the Coast Guard, the committee recommends $44,333,000, a reduction of $5 million in the revised estimate, but $14.3 million over 1961. This is $5.3 million over the House bill.

The Coast Guard is now operating many overage vessels and shore facilities which are unsafe, costly, obsolete, or ill suited to modern operations. These conditions manifest themselves today in vessels which are either unseaworthy or barely adequate to perform expanded and more complex missions; and in shore plants many of whose operating facilities were constructed prior to 1900 or built as World War I and II temporary facilities.

The committee's recommendation should provide for what it feels is a moderate replacement and capital improvement program.

For "Retired pay," the committee recommends $31,350,000, the budget estimate, an increase of $1.3 million over 1961, and $350,000 over the House.

The amount recommended over the House will support the planned numbers of retirement and will preclude postponement of retirements to which military members are eligible as set forth by law.

Other Treasury items included in the bill and for which there were no appeals for restoration made, appear on pages 16 and 17 of the report before the Senate.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

The committee recommends for the Post Office Department, for 1962, appropriations totaling $4,386,900,000. This is an increase of $118,261,000 over 1961; $18.4 million over the House allowance; and a decrease of $37.2 million under the estimate, which incidentally, is the largest ever submitted to the Congress for the Post Office Department.

PAYMENT FOR PUBLIC SERVICES

The committee recommends $62.7, the budget estimate, for "Payment for public services." The House disallowed this amount. The Postal Policy Act of 1958 authorizes the appropriation of such amount as Congress may deem to be attributable to the performance of public services based upon estimates submitted to the Congress. The estimates submitted are limited to two items of public services: First, the revenue loss from rate concessions on free and preferred rate mail, and second, the excess rates paid to foreign air carriers. This is merely a bookkeeping device by which the Congress will establish each year that portion of the Department's net cost to be borne by the general taxpayer and does not increase or decrease the obligational or expenditure authority of the Department.

POSTAL DEFICIT

The estimated postal deficit for 1962 is $894 million and is reduced to $831 million after deducting the $62.7 million to be charged to "Public services." The Department's rate bill now pending before Congress is based on the assumption of a $62.7 million appropriation for this item and it is well to point out that unless Congress provides for the postal rate increases recommended by the President this bill will involve a deficit of $794 million.

The committee recommends $82 million for the "Administration, regional operation, and research" item. This is the same as the House recommendation; $4,080,000 over 1961 and $6.8 million under the estimate. The committee believes that the sum allowed in the pending bill will provide for an adequate program, considering the many improvements in management and efficiency which have been brought about and which should result in a substantial reduction in regional office operating expenses. The amount recommended provides for an increase of 33 additional average positions in the inspection service over 1961.

For "Operations," the committee recommends $3,443 million, an increase of $88.4 million over 1961; a decrease of $9 million in the estimate and $9 million under the House allowance. The Department estimate was based on a 3.8 percent increase and the committee's recommendation is based on a 3.35 percent increase in mail volume. The amount recommended provides for an increase of approximately 10,962 additional man-years of employment over fiscal 1961.

The committee has deleted language included in the House bill relating to expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, as now authorized by law. By administrative action the Postmaster General now has the legal authority to issue regulations that would permit the use of the so-called simplified address for mail at all points including city delivery carrier offices. This committee does not consider that this language changes the basic law in any manner and does not in itself require the Department to make any changes in its present rules and regulations with respect to the use of the so-called simplified address for any mail, including that for Members of Congress.

For transportation, the committee recommends $591,800,000, a decrease of $1.8 million under the estimate; $1.8 million over the House and $24.2 million over 1961. The amount recommended is based on volume of mail and is in consonance with the amount recommended for operations.

For "Facilities" the committee recommends $160.1 million, a decrease of $7.6 million in the estimates and $7.6 million over the House. This appropriation provides funds for building occupancy; fuel and utilities; supplies and services and for facilities field personnel. The rent program for 1951 was $19.9 million; for 1961 it is estimated to be $62.5 million; and the 1962 estimate submitted was $79.1 million. The estimate for rents for fiscal year 1963 is tentatively projected at $100 million.

I wish to emphasize these figures, because they show what inflation has done to us in the course of the operation of the Government, and what, in my opinion, it will do even more in the future. Ten years ago we paid $19.9 million in postal rents. During the coming fiscal year we will pay $79 million. The following year we expect to pay $100 million. The committee feels that the amount allowed will provide for a moderate and adequate building occupancy program for fiscal 1962.

For "Plant and equipment" the committee recommends $110 million, the House allowance, and a decrease of $12 million under the estimate. The amount recommended provides the budget estimate for the vehicle program and the amount requested for equipment for standard improvement program. Approximately $85.5 million is allowed for the modernization program.

In both the "Administration" and "Plant and equipment" items the committee has included language requested by the Department but deleted by the House. This language permits the continuance of research and development work on several specific contracts started in prior years out of available current year funds with certain dollar limitations.

For the Tax Court, the committee recommends, $1,750,000, a decrease of $20,000 in the budget estimate. The amount recommended is the same as the House allowance and $120,000 over the 1961 appropriation.

Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee, I wish warmly to commend the other members of the subcommittee and the members of the staff for helping to prepare a bill which we can favorably recommend to the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a one-page general statement in regard to the items in the bill as reported by the committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill as recommended by the Senate committee contains a total of $5,327,631,000. This is an increase of $45,766,000 over the amount of $5,281,865,000 recommended by the House and a decrease of $44,170,000 under the budget estimate for 1962 of $5,371,801,000.

For the Treasury Department, the bill recommends appropriations of $938,981,000. This is an increase of $27,366,000 over the amount of $911,615,000 recommended by the House and a decrease of $6,950,000 under the budget estimates for 1962 of $945,931,000.

For the Post Office Department, the bill recommends an appropriation of $4,386,900,000, which is an increase of $18,400,000 over the amount of $4,368,500,000 recommended by the House and a decrease of $37,200,000 under the budget estimate for 1962 of $4,424,100,000.

For the Tax Court of the United States, the bill recommends an appropriation of $1,750,000. This is a decrease of $20,000 under the budget estimate of $1,770,000 for 1962 and the same as the amount recommended by the House.

Permanent indefinite appropriations are not carried in the bill. The 1962 estimates of the Treasury Department in this category are $8,622,132,000. This is a decrease of $419,747,000 from the 1961 estimates of $9,041,879,000. Of this total, $8,500,000,000 is for interest on the public debt, a decrease of $400 million from the 1961 estimate of $8,900,000,000.

Trust funds, also, are not carried in this bill. The 1962 estimate of the Treasury Department in this category is $16,551,000. This is an increase of $1,780,000 over the 1961 appropriation estimate of $14,771,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill thus amended be regarded for purposes of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of agreement to this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Treasury Department—Office of the Secretary—Salaries and Expenses", on page 2, line 9, to strike out "$4,000,000" and insert "$4,233,000".

Under the subhead "Salaries and Expenses, Division of Disbursement", on page 2, line 16, to strike out "$25,600,000" and insert "$25,800,000".

Under the subhead "Internal Revenue Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 3, line 24, after the word "employment", to strike out "$440,000,000" and insert "$456,800,000".

Under the subhead "United States Secret Service—Salaries and Expenses", on page 4, line 14, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$4,700,000" and insert "$4,800,000".

Under the subhead "Bureau of the Mint—Salaries and Expenses", on page 5, line 7, after the word "commission", to strike out "$6,000,000" and insert "$6,350,000".

Under the subhead "Coast Guard—Operating Expenses", on page 5, line 19, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "$208,000,000" and insert "$212,000,000".

Under the subhead "Acquisition, Construction, and Improvements", on page 7, line 2, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "$39,000,000" and insert "$44,333,000".

Under the subhead "Retired Pay", on page 7, line 8, after "1953", to strike out "$31,000,000" and insert "$31,350,000".

Under the heading "Title II—Post Office Department", on page 9, after line 17, to insert:

"CURRENT AUTHORIZATIONS OUT OF GENERAL FUND

"Payment for public services

"For payment into the postal revenues for public services, in accordance with section 104 of the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (39 U.S.C. 2303), for the loss resulting from the transmission of matter in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates, and for the additional cost of transporting mail by foreign air carriers, $62,700,000."

Under the subhead "Current Authorizations Out of Postal Fund Administration, Regional Operation, and Research", on page 10, line 20, after the word "program", to strike out "(including current increases made as a result of changes in plans in prior year contracts thereunder" and insert "(including not to exceed $3,000,000 for current increases in prior year contracts thereunder in addition to current increases made as a result of changes in plans".

Under the subhead "Operations", on page 12, line 3, after the word "law", to strike out "$3,434,000,000" and insert "$3,443,000,000", and in line 3, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "including expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, as now authorized by law".

Under the subhead "Transportation", on page 13, line 5, after the word "mail", to strike out "$590,000,000" and insert "$591,800,000".

Under the subhead "Facilities", on page 13, line 15, after the word "Government", to strike out "$152,500,000" and insert "$160,100,000".

Under the subhead "Plant and Equipment", on page 13, line 20, after the word "purposes", to strike out "including current increases made as a result of changes in plans in prior year contracts therefor" and insert "including not to exceed $3,000,000 for current increases in prior year contracts or orders therefor in addition to increases made as a result of changes in plans, $110,000,000, of which $35,000,000 shall remain available until expended".

SENATOR ELLENDER RECEIVES THE GEORGE WASHINGTON MEMORIAL AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO THE CAUSE OF WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased to report for the RECORD that our highly esteemed colleague, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] recently received from the National Rivers and Harbors Congress its George Washington Memorial Award for distinguished service to the cause of water resources development. At this organization's annual meeting on Friday, May 26, 1961, it was my great privilege as its representative to present this magnificent award to our friend and colleague.

It is not necessary for me to remind the Members of the Senate of the Herculean efforts put forth each and every year by the Senator from Louisiana in making certain that development of our Nation's water resources shall progress at optimum speed. His energy in conducting exhaustive hearings before the Public Works Subcommittee, Senate Appropriations Committee, with complete fairness and consideration to every State, has frequently been the subject of comment on the Senate floor.

Mr. President, in receiving the award, the Senator from Louisiana delivered an address which is an excellent statement of water resource development needs in our Nation today. I ask that the address be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR ALLEN J. ELLENDER, DEMOCRAT OF LOUISIANA, BEFORE THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, FRIDAY, MAY 26, 1961

It is always a pleasure to address a group dedicated to the development of our water resources. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress has the broadest base of any organization in the country devoted to resource development and, accordingly, I am particularly pleased with the opportunity to address you.

My interest in water resource development comes almost naturally. I recall as a boy the devastation wreaked by the hurricanes that periodically swept in from the gulf, spending their fury on the Louisiana coast. I have witnessed the untold losses and have come in contact with the suffering that occurred in the lower Mississippi Valley when the main stem levees broke, particularly during the flood of 1927. I claim to be an expert on the destructive forces of wind and water, and I have a healthy respect for their power. I have confidence, however, in the ability of the Corps of Engineers to design and build the engineering structures necessary to protect the valley.

The value of storage capacity already constructed and in operation on the major tributaries of the Mississippi River, together with the protection afforded by the levee system, has restored the confidence of the people in the lower valley. As a result, we have observed a tremendous industrial and agricultural expansion, which could never have occurred except for the protective works designed and constructed by the Corps of Engineers.

I believe there is one more field in which I can qualify as an expert. I refer, of course, to the benefits resulting from navigation improvements. My hometown of Houma, La., is on the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway. This waterway is a living tribute to the two men who had the vision and the determination to push the project through to a successful conclusion. I refer, of course, to Mr. C. S. E. Holland and Mr. Roy Miller, the father of Mr. Dale Miller, who badgered a reluctant Congress into providing funds for this project over a period of almost 40 years. That waterway now carries 41 million tons of freight, some 7 billion ton-miles annually—more tonnage over a greater distance than either the Kiel or the Panama Canal.

As important and impressive as those figures are, they do not reflect the most significant contribution which this waterway has made to the great gulf coast area. Without it the enormous industrial complex that has developed all along the gulf coast, including the surging chemical and petrochemical industries, would never have developed into the economic asset to that entire region that it has become.

As all of my friends know, I am a frugal man, not only with my personal funds, but also with public funds. I have supported increased appropriations for resource development, not only for Louisiana, but for all the Nation, because I have looked upon them as an investment in America's future, rather than as an extravagance.

In general, I oppose the creation of select and special committees of the Congress, because these temporary committees usually are extended from year to year, and they spend considerably more funds than originally estimated.

Such was not the case with the select committee headed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [ROBERT S. KERR]. His Select Committee on Water Resources, of which I

was a member, turned in its report without asking for an extension of time and spent only about $90,000 of the $325,000 the Senate had approved for the study. Not only that, but upon submission of the report the committee was immediately dissolved. The select committee's report is being hailed by Members of both parties in Congress and by experts in the field of water resource development as the most significant contribution ever made in this field.

As you know, the Select Committee on Water Resources held extensive hearings throughout the country and obtained information on the problems and needs of many areas, not only from the local interests, but from the various Government agencies charged with the development of relatively small segments of water resources. When we consider that the actual population of the contiguous portion of the United States in 1958 was 174 million, whereas the mean estimate of the population projection for the year 1980 is 244 million, and for 2000 it is estimated at 329 million, it is only then that we become conscious of the necessity for preserving, protecting, and developing our precious water resources.

Now what does this mean in terms of additional needs of water to sustain this great increase in population? In 1954 our daily consumption of water was 109.5 billions of gallons. For 1980, with a population of 244 million, our daily requirements are estimated to be 119.3 billion gallons, and by the year 2000 our daily consumption will aggregate 156.3 billion gallons of water. These estimates are conservative, and in order for us to develop our industries, and in order to provide our daily requirements we must begin now to implement the plans suggested in the select committee's report.

Our studies show that to meet the future needs for water supply would require a minimum expenditure of $12 billion in the next 20 years. The projection of traffic moving on our waterways shows that this commerce will double in the next 20 years and will be four times the present commerce by the year 2000. Hence, our rate of expenditures in the next 20 years to meet this need will have to be approximately double the current rate of expenditures for our water developments, which of course includes navigation, flood control and harbor development.

Our Select Committee on Water Resources has studied the water needs and problems of the country. It has developed a blueprint for the future development of our water resources. I can assure you that only by complete development can we hope to meet the water requirements which the economic growth of this country will demand in the years to come. The report of the Select Committee on Water Resources and the 32 technical papers prepared in connection therewith should be our guide in this field in the future.

It is important for the American people to realize that to a major extent their future lies in the development of their natural resources. But this is not enough. It is essential that Washington and the President recognize this need.

For 8 long years we have labored under a philosophy of no new starts; vetoes for rivers and harbors and flood control bills; and vetoes for appropriation bills that dared to provide unbudgeted new starts for resource development projects. That situation fortunately has changed. President Kennedy has challenged us all in these words from his special message to Congress on natural resources:

"This Nation has been and is now especially fortunate in the blessings [of natural resources] we have inherited. Our entire society rests upon and is dependent upon our water, our lands, our forests, and our minerals. Wise investments in our resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever. We cannot now ignore our country's need for future development. Our available water supply must be used to give maximum benefits for all purposes: Hydroelectric power, irrigation, reclamation, navigation, recreation, health, home and industry. That is the challenge."

We have a blueprint of our resources and of the problem, and a challenge from our President. There remains only the application of engineering technique and vision to conceive the projects which will be necessary to nourish our future economic growth. When faced with a stagnant economy and a declining birth rate the conservatism of the economist is needed to temper the imagination of the engineer. Conversely, in an expanding economy and with an increasing birth rate, the economy of an area develops proportionately to the boldness and the imagination of the engineer.

To the economist falls the task of applying the hard rules of economy which can turn these dreams into realities. Here again, the success or failure of a project may hinge on the vision and imagination the economist uses in his application of sound principles of economics.

For a number of years I have been appalled at the loss of valuable topsoil, the destruction of roads, sewers, intakes, bridges, pipeline crossings, and similar facilities by the forces of erosion along the banks of the Red River, as an example. My pleas to the Engineers to provide bank protection, instead of continually setting back the levees, have fallen on deaf ears. They have steadfastly maintained that under existing law they have had no alternative but to provide the setbacks in the majority of cases. The Engineers are currently engaged in preparing a review report of the Red River. In that report they will not be hampered by the restrictions of existing law. It remains to be seen whether they will have the vision and foresight to determine that in the long run, bank stabilization is more economical than repeated setbacks of levees, with the accompanying destruction of existing facilities.

I am convinced that bank stabilization is the only permanent solution to the erosion problems on the Red River. I hope that the Corps of Engineers will be the Federal agency to recognize and recommend this needed protection.

Since assuming the chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Public Works, I have recommended increased appropriations for resources development projects, not only in Louisiana but throughout the country. I have fought for some new starts in both planning and construction each year in order to maintain a well balanced construction and planning program. With constant opposition from the administration and the Bureau of the Budget, I have frequently felt that mine was a voice crying in the wilderness when I tried to point out the importance of wise investments in our future resources, if we are to continue to prosper as a nation. Today, I repeat, the picture is somewhat brighter, with a concise statement from the Senate Select Committee on Water Resources as to the need, and a direct challenge by the President of the United States to meet that need.

Another important resource field that has been given little attention is pollution abatement. Aggressive action must be taken to eliminate both manmade and natural sources of pollution if we have any hope of meeting the water requirements of our industry and population by the year 2000.

One of the serious natural pollution problems in the country affects a river flowing through my home State of Louisiana. I refer, of course, to the Red River.

The Congress has authorized a comprehensive cooperative investigation of the Arkansas-Red River problem by the Corps of Engineers and the Public Health Service. Pursuant to that authorization the Committee on Appropriations has provided funds to initiate this study as an unbudgeted item. The Arkansas-Red River pollution study by the Public Health Service and the Corps of Engineers will be directed primarily to the location and isolation of sources of natural salt pollution. Preliminary investigations have shown that the major portion of this pollution originates in relatively small areas.

For instance, one spring in particular contributes 1,000 tons of salt a day. It is apparent, therefore, that the location and isolation of these sources of pollution in Oklahoma and Kansas could change the entire quality and character of the Red River water in Louisiana.

There are still major threats, however, to certain phases of the water resource problem. I have in mind particularly navigation developments. One of the major threats to navigation is posed by the drive of the railroads to have Congress impose a user charge on waterways. During the last few years of the Eisenhower administration, the Bureau of the Budget directed the Department of Commerce to make a study of user charges. As might be expected, their report recommended the imposition of a user charge on our waterways.

During the last campaign the Democratic nominee, John F. Kennedy, was asked to express his views on the user charge question. His reply was unequivocal and forthright in rejecting any and all proposals to impose user charges. He said: "We must reject all proposals such as those of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget." This is a very positive statement. The President went on to say that "such restrictive policies could not fail to increase the Nation's transportation cost burden and to deprive shippers of the advantages and economies of low-cost water transportation of basic commodities as an important element of a coordinated national transportation system."

Later, in his message on April 13, 1961, to the Congress on Regulatory Commissions, the President stated in part:

"The Transportation Act of 1940 sought, so far as surface transportation was concerned, to describe as a goal a national policy that would give each method of transportation its appropriate role in our economy. It is disturbing, however, to note that, for example, our common carrier inland waterway traffic, our Great Lakes traffic, our intracoastal and coastal traffic, have been withering away at a pace far more rapid than appears desirable, in the light of the low-cost nature of this method of transportation and its potential role in the event of war."

An example of ruthless rate cutting engaged in by railroads was discussed by Mr. Herbert G. West, executive vice president of the Inland Empire Waterways Association, in his monthly publication, the Log, for September 1960. In that article he presents a very interesting analysis of a proposed freight rate reduction requested by the railroads for the shipment of grain moving from the interior producing points of Washington and northern Idaho to the seaports of Oregon and Washington. The requested reduction of rates amounted to approximately 24 percent. The preliminary investigation of the facts indicated that the railroads carried 88 percent of all the tonnage of grain to Pacific Northwest ports in 1955, in contrast

to 77 percent in 1959. Taking the official tonnage figures for 1959, at the new rate, in order to break even, the railroads would have to capture 93 percent of the total truck and barge haul. To handle this additional grain, 21,808 additional railroad cars would be required. It is obvious that if the railroads find it necessary to employ the use of 21,808 additional railroad cars to haul the additional tonnage of grain to bring the railroads up to the 1959 revenue figures, they will find a considerable increase in their operating costs. It is apparent that under the proposed rate schedule they would not obtain the net revenue achieved in 1959 under the former freight rate even if they should capture all of the indicated additional tonnage. This raises an important question: Why are the railroads seeking such drastic freight rate reductions on grain movements in the Pacific Northwest at this time, while at the same time they are requesting a 5-percent national increase across the board? Are their requests for reduction valid, or are they being proposed merely to eliminate truck and barge competition?

In the years ahead there will be many problems facing the waterway operators of this country. I believe it is important for every citizen to acquaint himself with the effect of navigation improvements on his own individual economy. The threat of waterway tolls has demonstrated the desirability of the waterway operators, shippers and all the industries that are dependent upon waterway development, to coordinate their efforts in a uniform program to acquaint the average citizen with the advantages he derives from waterway facilities.

As one Member of the Congress, I can assure you of my continued vigorous support of resource development programs in the United States, including the free use of our waterways.

TRIPLE CROWN OF BROADCAST JOURNALISM AWARDS RECEIVED BY STATION WTVJ OF MIAMI, FLA.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, television station WTVJ of Miami, Fla., has just won the "Triple Crown of Broadcast Journalism," which term refers to the three leading awards recognizing excellence in television news presentation. This is the first time any station in our Nation has won these three awards in a single year.

The awards are the Sigma Delta Chi Award for distinguished service in journalism-television reporting; the designation as "Newsfilm Station of the Year" by the National Press Photographers Association, University of Missouri School of Journalism, and the Encyclopaedia Britannica; and the National Headliners Club Award for consistently outstanding coverage of local news events.

Mr. President, WTVJ is Florida's oldest television station, having first gone on the air in March 1949. In 1957, WTVJ became the first television station in the Nation to embark on a program of daily broadcast editorials.

Representing the people of Florida, I am happy to congratulate this fine television station, its owner, Col. Mitchell Wolfson, and his associates and staff, on their receiving the triple crown of broadcast journalism in recognition of its excellent news coverage.

U.S. THEATER ABROAD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the importance of Federal participation in a program to help the development of our Nation's resources in the performing and visual arts becomes especially evident against the backdrop of the cold war. The international aspects of the arts in this context provide a note of urgency that we may ignore only at our peril. It is high time that we, as a people, realize that the visual and performing arts are not a luxury but a necessity in the defense of our free society at home as well as abroad.

Right now, for example, our international cultural exchange program has sent abroad the Theatre Guild American Repertory Company on a 15-week tour of Europe and the Middle East. With Helen Hayes as the leading player, this company has met with outstanding success which has enormously enhanced U.S. prestige. However, compared with the widespread and elaborate programs of the Soviet Union and Communist China in this field, our effort is very small and inadequate for our country. We need to have many more of our great figures in the theater, music, and the arts participating in our international cultural exchange program so that our country can present the cultural face abroad which befits our position as leader of the free world.

I have urged that hearings on legislation for the development of the arts be held by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the earliest possible moment so that we can move ahead with this program.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the feature article written by Richard L. Coe entitled "U.S. Troupe Passing Test," published in the Washington Post, May 21, and the comments by John Crosby entitled "Theater in a Fix," published in the New York Herald Tribune of recent date.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 21, 1961]

U.S. TROUPE PASSING TEST—PATH THROUGH EUROPE IS STREWN WITH SUCCESS FOR HELEN HAYES, AMERICAN REPERTORY COMPANY

(By Richard L. Coe)

Four weeks remain of the 15-week tour Helen Hayes has headed for the State Department in Europe, a tour which was previewed here when "The Skin of Our Teeth," "The Glass Menagerie," and "The Miracle Worker" were performed at the National a week before the Madrid opening night.

The results—to the surprise of many scoffers—have been sensational. Neither the New York Times nor Variety were wildly enthusiastic for this notion, but both these favorite journals of the theatrical profession have been printing the most laudatory stories from their correspondents abroad.

Items: The Vienna Burg Theater, which bars curtain calls, was forced to have 12 for Miss Hayes on the opening night of "The Skin of Our Teeth." Extra performances were added in Tel Aviv. Writes Vienna's Kurier critic: "One forgets a foreign language is spoken as a wave of spiritual understanding flows from stage and back." Of "The Skin of Our Teeth," the Nieuwe Rotterdamse Courant observed: "the play is a masterpiece of our era."

One could go on, for the clippings are piling up. But let us go further behind the scenes:

Prices: Despite what some have written about the difficulty and expense of nationals latching onto tickets for the brief split-week engagements of Miss Hayes' company, the record appears to be good. For instance, while the company was in Ankara the Bolshoi Ballet, without its major stars, played an opening night for $12 a ticket, whereas the Americans charged $6 top, scaling down to 62 cents. It was publicly noted that Miss Hayes is a major star, that the Bolshoi's top stars were not with the company.

In all cities from Madrid to Tel Aviv and up to Copenhagen certain sections were reserved for students only.

Naturally, in smaller theaters than Americans are used to, nothing like all who wish to see the American company can get in. This was never expected. The aim was to hit two targets, the young and the opinion makers—newspaper people, intellectuals and important locals. Sometimes these people have been guests of the resident American colony and in virtually all instances national leaders have headed audiences.

The difficulties of playing split weeks across a whole continent from North Sea to the Mediterranean can scarcely be imagined. Returned from a month with the company, producers Lawrence Langner and Armina Marshall recently confided:

"The trek has been hardest on the crews. Their work means setting up and taking down a whole production, lights included, before and after each performance. They work during the performances. It's been virtually a 20-hour day for our crews and small wonder a couple of them have collapsed. This is a job for the very young."

Gertrude Macy, general manager for ANTA, just back from a business visit with the company, literally beams at new developments for the first 6 weeks it had seemed that such hardy touring plus a plague of Middle East illnesses would demolish plans for a Latin American continuation this summer.

To make touring easier and cut expenses it would have been easy to drop Thornton Wilder's play for South America but this has never seriously been contemplated. "South America must have the same A–1 priority given Europe," the State Department and Miss Hayes' fellows agreed. It will be tough, but there'll be a 6-week lapse between the company's return to New York and its departure in August for 16 cities in 10 South American countries.

These will be: Caracas, Venezuela; Cali, Colombia; Bogotá, Colombia; Lima, Peru; Santiago, Chile; Vina del Mar, Chile; Buenos Aires, Argentina; Rosario, Argentina; Montevideo, Uruguay; São Paulo, Brazil; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; San José, Costa Rica; Guatemala City, Guatemala; Mexico City, Monterey and Guadalajara, Mexico.

This week is split between Hamburg and Rome, with Florence, Genoa, Turin and Paris to follow.

Critical receptions for the plays have been fascinatingly diverse, the way they always are.

In some places one has been a favorite, in another it has been the least admired. Germany has been intrigued with "The Skin of Our Teeth," which Germans admit to having played with gravity instead of with the

Americans' humor. German productions of the Wilder, one newsman wrote, used to last 45 minutes longer than that of the American visitors.

"The Miracle Worker," as sensational before some audiences as here, strikes others as "obvious." I've not yet read a reviewer who was not bowled over by Miss Hayes in "The Glass Menagerie" and the writers seem fully aware of this play's place in Williams' chronological record.

Differences of opinions in the notices are healthy as they are in any theater that does not rely on hit-or-miss fates. One does not want everyone to agree about everything and rave about all details. One sidelight struck me, leafing through the notices: admiration for the players' diction.

There have been any number of unseen heroes involved with this precedent-making tour, including European reporters who had once visited America under early exchange programs. They have been helpful in any number of ways. So, too, has the staff of "The Miracle Worker's" producer, Fred Coe (no relation), who chipped in extra energies when older hands faltered from illness or weariness. Fred sent his top personnel, a real and generous sacrifice, as has been his willingness to break precedent by letting a play tour while the New York run continues. Let's hope others follow suit for new plays are wanted.

While the tour still has sophisticated audiences to face, it already is clear that this venture of the President's international cultural exchange program has been a striking success. With this laudable start, the program is gaining the strength and vital aspects of continuity and preparedness.

One area of this at last is being explored through what amounts to a perceptive inspection by the troupe's advance agent, Joseph H. Salyers. He has made some fascinating discoveries about the popularity of our jazz, the value of American theatrical styles in dictatorial countries, the alertness of small, vocative groups in backward nations. His notes, too voluminous to be printed here, suggest a 20th century cultural Baedecker.

It is cheering to report that at last thousands of key people abroad are aware that the United States is not all Old West, Gangsterland, or Peyton Place.

[From the New York Herald Tribune]

THEATER IN A FIX

(By John Crosby)

The theater is truly in an awful fix. Robert Whitehead, president of the League of New York Theaters, has said: "We truly believe that additional burdens will bring about the extinction of the living theater as we have known it, perhaps as early as next season." Those are strong words and the terrible thing is that they are accurate.

Mr. Whitehead's statement was made in an effort to get Mayor Wagner to eliminate the city's 5-cent tax on theater tickets. It should be eliminated. But that wouldn't help much. If the Government clamps down on the tax-deductible theater ticket—certainly if it clamps down on the charity tax deduction, which is the theater party—the theater would truly be doomed.

Even without these disasters, the Broadway theater seems headed for extinction unless drastic changes are made—and tax eliminations won't help. Everything to do with the theater is priced too high—playwrights, actors, stagehands (especially stagehands), musicians, property, scenery, lighting, rent. Ticket prices ($7.17 for straight shows and $8.57 for musicals) are outrageous, but actually they are not half as outrageous as they ought to be for shows when straight dramas cost $125,000 and musicals cost $400,000.

Nothing should cost that much. But it will continue to be outrageously expensive to produce unless every one from musicians to actors make sacrifices, and this is about as likely as snow in July. Obviously, at current prices no one is going to take risks on Broadway, and since risk and experiment are vital steps to success—Eugene O'Neill's "Strange Interlude," Thornton Wilder's "Our Town," Rodgers and Hammerstein's "Oklahoma" were all great risks that were immensely profitable—the theater is going to decline not only in vigor but in profits.

Off Broadway is not much better and costs there, while much lower than Broadway, are still outrageous. I think genuine freshness and vigor and originality are going to have to come from out of town. All over the country, little theaters and some professional repertory theaters are springing up, thousands of them, all training actors and directors and amateur stagehands. But they're all doing "Bus Stop," or "Seven Year Itch." There's hardly a theater in America—except the Frank Lloyd Wright in Dallas, the Alley in Houston, or the Poinciana Playhouse in Palm Beach—doing new plays.

This is a pity because new plays, far from the rapacity of Broadway unions, can be tried out for next to nothing. These playhouses could nurture young playwrights as Joan Littlewood's theater workshop in England nurtured Shelagh Delaney and Brendan Behan. David Merrick has been using Paris and London stages as tryout towns for Broadway, which is why Broadway is loaded with European plays, including all the best ones. It was not so long ago that it was the other way around: All European stages from Berlin to London were loaded with American plays.

We are living in an age of increasing leisure time and the quality of our use of that time is going to be of enormous importance to our cultural growth. Are we going to be a nation of time wasters, turning on television to distract us until it's time to go to bed? I doubt that the country can stand this; in fact, I doubt that it puts up with it now. There's great cultural restlessness in America which is shown by the explosion of cultural activity from ballet companies to symphonies, concerts, little theaters, lectures, museums across the country.

Senator JAVITS has introduced a bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation, which intends, among other things, to canalize and encourage the living theater in all its forms, and I think this should be adopted. The Foundation is modeled after the British and Canadian Arts Councils, which have given much sustenance to the theaters in those countries.

Actually, the United States is the only civilized country anywhere which has given no governmental support to its theater or opera or arts. It's always been felt that these things would flourish best if the Government stayed out of them. But spoken nonmusical drama has almost expired already on Broadway.

COMMITTEE PROGRESS ON AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I have been asked to make an announcement concerning the procedure of the subcommittee with respect to the National Defense Education Act. The subcommittee met this morning to continue with the markup of the bill. We shall meet tomorrow morning at 10:30 o'clock, and we shall meet just as frequently as we can possibly arrange to have meetings to conform with the convenience of a quorum of the committee.

The Senate should know that the subcommittee has already had submitted to it a series of amendments, including one from the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] which deals with certain international education problems, and another in the form of, practically, a substitute, proposed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. I am assured that other amendments will be submitted which will expand the application of the National Defense Education Act to various activities, including private school facilities and loans to them, already authorized under the law, but pertaining in substance to an expansion of the authority already granted.

Because we wished to make certain that Senators, both members of the full committee and other Members of the Senate, were kept informed as to the procedures of the subcommittee, the subcommittee suggested this morning that I make this announcement. We adopted this morning a procedural policy that Senators who wished to have the committee consider amendments in the markup stage must submit them to the subcommittee 24 hours before the subcommittee will consider them. The reason is a very sound one. The subcommittee insists that when we proceed with amendments, we have a memorandum from our professional staff and have at least provided an opportunity to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to file with the subcommittee a statement concerning the amendments. That is the course of action we shall follow.

In the case of some amendments, such as the one offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], and two or three others, I propose to extend to the Senators who offer them the courtesy of an invitation to sit with the subcommittee for such period as they wish to explain their amendments and answer the questions of the subcommittee. Because I consider this bill to be another very important educational measure which the Senate will have to consider in the not too distant future, I desire that the preparation in the committee be so thorough that when the bill is reported to the Senate, the committee will have the answers, to the best of our ability to prepare for those answers, to any questions which Senators wish to raise on the floor of the Senate.

All of us know that the newspapers in recent days have published much information concerning the national defense education bill. Many articles have appeared, stating what the bill will or will not encompass. While there is no way of knowing at present what the bill will encompass, I give my pledge to the Senate that the subcommittee will give thorough and careful consideration to

every amendment which any Senator submits to us. Every Senator will have a full opportunity to appear before the committee in executive session and discuss his proposed amendment, whether it be an amendment which seeks to expand the National Defense Education Act in relation to private schools, or to expand it to international education problems, such as the Javits amendment proposes to do, or as the Bush amendment proposes to do in regard to its subject matter.

Mr. President, after stating that, let this RECORD show that we are not going to be able to report a national defense education bill this week. It is my hope that we shall be able to report it within the next 10 days. That, in and of itself, is a change of expectation, because previously I had announced that we would be able to report the national defense education bill within a very few days after there was action on the housing bill. But I have no control over amendments; and when I made that announcement, I did not have the slightest idea that there would be submitted to my subcommittee the number of amendments that are coming in. So to my colleagues in the Senate who are very much concerned about getting early action on the national defense education bill, I repeat my pledge: They will get that action just as fast as I can get the bill out of my subcommittee and to the full committee, and out of the full committee, consonant with thorough consideration of every amendment that is submitted to the bill. My general estimate is that probably within the next 10 days we shall be in a position to report the bill to the full committee.

CORRECTION OF THE HISS LAW

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a thoughtful and constructive editorial entitled "Correcting a Bad Law." The editorial, which was published in the Harrisburg Patriot of May 29, has to do with the so-called Hiss Act.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRECTING A BAD LAW

In one respect governments are much like individuals. Actions they take in haste and anger have a way of proving later on to be unfair and not exactly what was intended.

A 1954 law, dubbed the Hiss Act, is a case in point.

This is the legislation passed in the wake of the Alger Hiss conviction when Congress decided to deprive him and others in Government like him, of a Federal pension.

Under its terms any civil servants, Members of Congress, and servicemen who are convicted of felonies against their Government lose their pension rights. Those who plead the fifth amendment and those who were or are Communist Party members are also affected.

Sounds reasonable enough on the surface. But look what has happened as the bill's sweeping provisions have been enforced:

An Army sergeant, who pleaded guilty to unauthorized use of a Government vehicle in 1947, lost $38,992 in retirement pay.

A chief warrant officer, who was told to plead guilty to some minor offenses in exchange for a reprimand and a fine of $400, wound up losing $103,000 in possible retirement pay.

Another sergeant, court-martialed for driving a military vehicle less than a mile off his scheduled route, also forfeited more than $30,000 worth of retirement pay.

They are but a few examples of the people being caught in this loosely drawn net. They aren't traitors or proved subversives in any sense of the word.

Nor are they exceptions. It is reported that only 10 of the cases so far handled under terms of this law fall into a category where the offenses threatened national security in any way. With each passing year more retirement age Government workers are being caught in the Hiss Act trap.

President Eisenhower asked that the law be amended at the last session of Congress, but it never was. The Kennedy administration has repeated the request for an amendment.

This Hiss law should be amended so that its original intent can be carried out, penalizing only those convicted of treason and subversion. In practice, the current law has proved to be extremely harsh on Government workers convicted of lesser offenses. This is one matter that Congress, in all fairness, shouldn't be too busy to attend to before it adjourns.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION BILL—MEMORANDUM FROM ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if I may have, briefly, the attention of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum I have received from Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dealing with some tables inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Delaware during the debate on the Federal aid to education bill.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 26, 1961.

To: Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, Assistant Secretary.
From: Eugene P. McLoone, specialist, Economics of School Finance.
Subject: Response to Hon. JOSEPH S. CLARK's request for comments on the attached table.

This table compares S. 1021 which is to be financed out of general revenue with H.R. 4806 which is financed by a special levy on taxable wages. It is reasonable to expect differences in the distribution of the tax collections by States and also differences in benefits.

Column 2 is merely the allotments as calculated. The statistics in columns 2 and 3 on S. 1021 are acceptable. No completely accurate estimate exists for column 3. Estimates have been prepared at various times by different groups. The most recent summary of these is reported in "Federal-State-Local Relations," 30th report by the Committee on Government Operations, in appendix table 13, page 92. It would seem reasonable in view of the continuing interest that either the Treasury Department or the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations should prepare such estimates for a period of time, say 3 years to eliminate year-to-year fluctuations. The statistics in column 6 are accurate estimates of the Department of Labor. Column 5 figures, however, are estimates of the individual States. Footnote 2 on the table acknowledges that they are computed differently for Pennsylvania than for the other States. There may be other State-to-State differences. While the totals of columns 2 and 3 are equal, the total of column 6, "cost to States," exceeds the total of column 5, "benefits to States," by $53.7 million. This difference alone means that many additional States will have losses in column 7 than in column 4. Likewise, under H.R. 4806 the "benefits to States" are really payments to individuals for a different time period than the "cost to States." The benefits begin now; the taxes are to be collected in 1962 and 1963. Under S. 1021 the time period is the same for payments and taxes.

Both S. 1021 and H.R. 4806 recognize a national interest in all the States. S. 1021 recognizes greater needs in the poorer States and differences in need within all the States. This bill is designed to give an incentive for raising the quality of education in all the places where the need is greatest. For financing the bill, the administration position is that a modest part of the increased needs for education should come from Federal taxes, which fall less heavily on low-income groups than State and local taxes. Certain States contribute more than others because they have more persons at the upper ranges of the income scale. In 1949, the latest year for which such data are available, only 5 percent of Mississippi's families and unrelated individuals had income of $5,000 or over. In New Jersey, the proportion was 24 percent or almost five times as great. In seven States—New Jersey, Illinois, Connecticut, New York, Michigan, California, and Delaware—the proportion of families with $5,000 or more of income was four to five times that in Mississippi. Over 49 percent of the families in Mississippi had incomes of less than $1,000 in 1949. In contrast, the corresponding percentages were 15 percent for New Jersey, 16 percent for Connecticut, 18 percent for New York, and 19 percent for Delaware and Pennsylvania. Taxes in accordance with ability and expenditures in accordance with need have long been accepted principles of Government finance. It is the good of the whole which is considered.

H.R. 4806 recognizes a national interest in providing funds for persons who have exhausted their unemployment benefits. In providing a special Federal levy of fourtenths of 1 percent on federally taxable wages, Congress recognized that States needed assistance beyond that provided by the tax credit used since the inception of the program. The State reserves for unemployment compensation were dwindling. Under these circumstances, one would not expect the need for unemployment benefits to match the tax on wages. This was clear evidence that States with their own tax based on Federal tax credit could not meet the demands for unemployment compensation.

The philosophy accepted in H.R. 4806 is the same as that proposed for S. 1021. Taxes are collected on the basis of ability and funds are disbursed on basis of need. The tax-sharing basis did not work for unemployment compensation. An additional State tax might only aggravate State-to-State tax competition, industry relocation, and unemployment. Only a federally collected tax disbursed on basis of need met the situation.

[Figures in millions]

(1)	S. 1021, School Assistance Act: Benefit payments [1] (2)	Cost to State (3)	Gain or loss (4)	H.R. 4806, Unemployment Extension Act: Benefit payments [2] (5)	Cost to State [3] (6)	Gain or loss (7)
Alabama	$24.0	$8.3	+15.7	$10.0	$12.2	−2.2
Alaska	1.1	.9	+.2	2.2	1.2	+1.0
Arizona	7.4	4.8	+2.6	2.1	5.7	−3.6
Arkansas	12.8	3.9	+8.9	4.7	5.3	−.6
California	46.2	93.0	−46.8	80.0	99.4	−19.4
Colorado	8.8	7.9	+.9	2.0	8.3	−6.3
Connecticut	5.2	18.4	−13.2	18.2	18.5	−.3
Delaware	1.2	4.7	−3.5	2.0	3.2	−1.2
Florida	21.9	21.3	+.6	9.5	21.4	−11.9
Georgia	28.0	11.2	+16.8	12.0	16.7	−4.7
Hawaii	3.7	2.5	+1.2	.7	3.1	−2.4
Idaho	4.4	2.2	+2.2	1.6	2.5	−.9
Illinois	31.5	60.8	−29.3	40.0	68.6	−28.6
Indiana	22.7	19.3	+3.4	26.0	28.0	−2.0
Iowa	14.3	10.0	+4.3	3.5	10.8	−7.3
Kansas	11.1	8.1	+3.0	3.5	8.5	−5.0
Kentucky	21.4	8.9	+12.5	15.0	10.6	+4.4
Louisiana	22.2	10.0	+12.2	12.9	13.1	−.2
Maine	5.1	3.6	+1.5	2.0	4.5	−2.5
Maryland	13.6	16.2	−2.6	10.0	15.8	−5.8
Massachusetts	14.7	29.4	−14.7	30.0	34.2	−4.2
Michigan	37.9	38.0	−.1	93.0	46.6	+46.4
Minnesota	18.3	13.6	+4.7	14.4	16.0	−1.6
Mississippi	17.4	3.8	+13.6	2.2	5.7	−3.5
Missouri	18.5	19.4	−.9	11.0	23.6	−12.6
Montana	3.8	2.3	+1.5	1.1	2.6	−1.5
Nebraska	$7.3	$5.3	+2.0	$0.5	$5.2	−4.7
Nevada	1.0	1.7	−.7	2.0	2.0	
New Hampshire	2.7	2.8	−.1	.4	3.4	−8.0
New Jersey	10.5	36.9	−20.4	51.2	39.7	+11.5
New Mexico	6.3	3.1	+3.2	2.3	3.9	−1.8
New York	40.6	116.1	−75.5	170.0	119.9	+50.1
North Carolina	33.7	11.7	+22.0	7.9	10.0	−12.0
North Dakota	4.5	1.6	+2.9	.9	1.6	−.7
Ohio	39.5	49.0	−9.5	85.0	62.4	+22.6
Oklahoma	12.6	7.8	+4.8	5.8	8.9	−3.1
Oregon	9.0	8.0	+1.0	10.6	9.6	+1.0
Pennsylvania	44.0	58.9	−11.9	85.0	70.7	+14.3
Rhode Island	3.4	4.4	−1.0	5.5	5.5	
South Carolina	20.3	5.1	+15.2	7.3	9.1	−1.8
South Dakota	4.4	1.5	+2.8	.2	1.6	−1.4
Tennessee	23.5	10.1	+13.4	8.0	15.0	−7.0
Texas	58.0	36.7	+21.3	30.0	42.1	−12.1
Utah	6.3	3.0	+3.3	2.0	4.1	−2.1
Vermont	2.0	1.4	+.6	.6	1.7	−1.1
Virginia	23.8	14.4	+9.4	5.5	16.1	−10.6
Washington	12.9	13.8	−.9	8.9	15.4	−6.5
West Virginia	12.9	5.7	+7.2	9.5	8.4	+1.1
Wisconsin	20.0	17.5	+2.5	16.0	21.5	−5.5
Wyoming	1.7	1.3	+.4	1.1	1.5	−.4
District of Columbia	1.5	5.8	−4.3	2.2	5.5	−3.3

[1] Based on committee report.
[2] Excludes payments to Federal civilian employees and ex-servicemen in all States except Pennsylvania. Figures furnished by State employment security agencies.
[3] Figures furnished by Department of Labor.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the chairman of the subcommittee, who is handling the pending appropriation bill, for the splendid action which he and his subcommittee and the full committee took in restoring to this appropriation bill the sums—which were cut by the House of Representatives—intended to enable the Internal Revenue Service to hire more tax-enforcement personnel. This is either the second time or the third time that the Senator from Virginia has taken this courageous action in the interest of supporting the Treasury. The last couple of times it was the Eisenhower Treasury Department; this time it is the Kennedy Treasury Department. In both instances, the Senator from Virginia has recognized the importance of cutting down on tax chiseling, the importance of cutting down the amount of the deficit, and the importance of supporting the Internal Revenue Service when it says it can employ and can train a substantial number of additional personnel to crack down on the tax dodgers who are defrauding the Federal Government out of hundreds of millions of dollars, and also on members of the taxpaying public who, while not tax dodgers, are nonetheless just sloughing off a little bit on their fair obligations to the Government.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a letter addressed to the Senator from Virginia, under date of May 8, by nine Members of the Senate, including myself, together with an attached table.

There being no objection, the letter and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Departments of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: We support the Kennedy administration's appeal to your committee to restore in full the $16.8 million cut by the House of Representatives from the funds requested for the Internal Revenue Service to permit the employment of 2,296 additional employees. The additional revenue produced by these new employees would exceed the cost of their employment several times over.

The need for more IRS employees is demonstrable in many ways. Due in large part to unwise and uneconomic personnel cuts early in the preceding administration, there were, as you know, 7,026 (12 percent) fewer employees in IRS in 1960 than there were in 1946, although the Service collected 2½ times more revenue and handled 6 million more income tax returns in 1960 than 14 years earlier. (See attached table.)

When these statistics are considered in conjunction with the statement last year of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that $25 to $26 billion of otherwise taxable income is not reported annually in the United States at an annual revenue loss to the Federal Government of "several billion" (House hearings, 1960, p. 62), the need for greatly strengthened tax enforcement seems clear.

The present Commissioner, Mortimer M. Caplin, told the House Appropriations Subcommittee on March 8, 1961, that the Service was able to audit only 4.5 percent of the income tax returns filed in 1960. He stated: "Present audit coverage * * * is not adequate to secure the full revenue which should be reported and collected under existing revenue laws. Errors of significant amounts of money often are undetected. The inadequate coverage is known as a fact in the field—people know this and some of them will deliberately understate their income or overstate deductions. * * * Actual delinquency in filing returns * * * often goes undiscovered" (House hearings, 1961, p. 468).

If the Congress approves the full amount requested by the administration, and the Service employs all of the new employees it seeks, it would still be able to audit only 5.3 percent of all income tax returns—a percentage "much too low" in Commissioner Caplin's estimation when compared to the "optimism" audit coverage of 10 percent of all returns (Id., pp. 484, 512).

When the results of a recent IRS study showing that 62 percent of all returns examined contained deficiencies are considered, it is possible to understand the Service's estimate that the revenue return to cost ratio of audit activity is 11 to 1 (Id., pp. 476, 499).

In view of the latest estimate of the Council of Economic Advisers that there will be a $2 billion deficit in fiscal 1962, it would seem shortsighted in the extreme for Congress not to attempt to reduce the deficit substantially by approving the requested expenditure for better tax enforcement.

We are confident that when your subcommittee has considered all testimony on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill (H.R. 5954), it will recommend to the Senate the full appropriation for the Internal Revenue Service sought by the administration.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH S. CLARK, WAYNE MORSE, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, E. L. BARTLETT, FRANK CHURCH, PAT MCNAMARA, WILLIAM PROXMIRE, STUART SYMINGTON.

Fiscal year	Number of returns filed		Internal revenue collections	Average number of employees		Additional tax from enforcement		
	Individual income tax returns	Total returns		Enforcement personnel	Total personnel	World War II excess profits tax	Total, excluding World War II excess profits tax	Total
	Millions	*Millions*	*Billions*			*Millions*	*Millions*	*Millions*
1945	48.4	83.8	$43.8	19,053	49,317	$253	$669	$922
1946	46.5	81.4	40.7	23,192	54,735	417	863	1,280
1947	54.3	91.7	39.1	26,507	58,025	451	1,477	1,928
1948	54.9	93.8	41.9	21,257	50,399	585	1,312	1,897
1949	53.3	92.8	40.5	22,454	52,024	562	1,330	1,892
1950	51.7	89.3	39.0	24,775	54,411	326	1,422	1,758
1951	52.4	82.6	50.4	26,380	56,262	281	1,576	1,857
1952	54.6	89.3	65.0	26,788	56,336	202	1,638	1,840
1953	58.5	93.2	69.7	25,455	54,596	157	1,399	1,556
1954	58.5	88.9	69.9	24,551	52,726	.....	1,442	1,442
1955	57.6	88.7	66.3	23,984	51,821	.....	1,479	1,479
1956	57.9	90.2	75.1	24,027	52,682	.....	1,413	1,413
1957	59.5	93.2	80.2	23,935	53,181	.....	1,663	1,663
1958	60.0	93.5	80.0	23,712	52,508	.....	1,688	1,688
1959	59.2	92.8	79.8	22,846	51,209	.....	1,821	1,821
1960	60.5	94.4	91.8	25,198	50,994	.....	2,052	2,052
1961 (estimated)	62.5	97.0	95.7	26,673	53,314	.....	2,101	2,101
1962 (estimated)	63.6	98.7	100.0	29,533	57,889	.....	2,301	2,301

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, the first three paragraphs of a letter directed to the Senator from Virginia, dated May 6, signed by the Secretary of the Treasury. The letter appears on page 183 of the hearings.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 6, 1961.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ROBERTSON: The Treasury-Post Office Appropriations Act, 1962 (H.R. 5954), which was passed by the House on March 28, 1961, recommended appropriations for the Treasury Department totaling $911,680,000, a reduction of $34,316,000 below the amounts of the budget estimates. A detailed breakdown of these amounts by individual appropriation item is shown on the schedule attached. After careful consideration of the anticipated effects of the House action, we have determined that it will be necessary to appeal to your committee for the restoration of reductions in various appropriation items as indicated on the attached schedule.

The largest single reduction by the House was accorded the estimate for the Internal Revenue Service. The reduction of $16.8 million in this item, as explained in the report accompanying the bill, was imposed because of a view that "* * * the request for 4,575 new personnel is unrealistic and far beyond the capability of the Service to wisely recruit, properly train, and usefully absorb into the Service in any one year." Thus, the action by the House in connection with this item would seem to present a relatively narrow issue hinging on the ability of the Service to accomplish the employment goals projected in the 1962 budget estimate. On this question, our actual experience last year, further supported by recent surveys, tends to confirm our conviction that we will be able to hire and assimilate recruits in the numbers requested without sacrificing quality.

In his recent message outlining the budget and fiscal policies of the new administration, the President indicated, with respect to tax enforcement, that "I want to reemphasize my earlier request to the Congress for additional funds for the Internal Revenue Service. More and better qualified agents can both increase the collection of Federal revenues and help curb corruption in and out of Government, racketeering, and organized crime." The need for strengthening enforcement of our tax laws is so compelling that, in my view, any question concerning the available supply of capable recruits should be resolved in favor of proceeding with our expansion program as planned. You have my assurances that in doing so any steps that may be necessary will be taken to tighten our testing and selection procedures so as to prevent the acceptance of any unqualified applicants.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, finally, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table which appears on page 182 of the hearings. The table is entitled "Income Received by Individuals During 1959, Not Accounted For on Tax Returns."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Income received by individuals during 1959 not accounted for on tax returns, by type [1]

	Billion dollars
Total income not reported on tax returns	[2] 27.9
Less: Income received by individuals not required to file returns	3.5
Equals: Total reportable income not accounted for on tax returns	24.4
Dividends	.9
Interest	2.8
Annuities and pensions	.6
Business and farm profit	12.0
Wages and salaries	6.5
Other income [3]	1.6

[1] Estimates based on preliminary data.

[2] "The Federal Revenue System: Facts and Problems, 1961," p. 10 (publication of Joint Economic Committee).

[3] Unreported income from all other sources not specified, such as rents, royalties, and capital gains.

Source: Research Division, Internal Revenue Service, May 4, 1961.

With respect to the revenue effects of this underreporting, we have made estimates for some of the categories but not for all. The failures to report dividend and interest incomes were estimated to have reduced revenues by $342 and $522 million, respectively, or a total of $864 million at the 1959 income levels. Our studies in the other areas have not progressed far enough to make comparable estimates. One problem is that while this income should have been reported under the tax filing requirements, not all of the income would have been taxable even if reported. For example, some of the unreported income from businesses and farms would have been on returns which would not be taxable after allowances for deductions and exemptions. As a rough overall estimate I would say that the total revenue loss from the failure to report the $24.4 billion was at least $4 billion.

Mr. CLARK. Again, Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Virginia on the action his subcommittee took.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to express my deep appreciation of the compliment just now paid me by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania; and I wish to assure him that when this bill goes to conference, the junior Senator from Virginia, the chairman of the subcommittee, will insist upon the maintenance of the Senate's position on the restoration of this item of $16,800,000.

Mr. CLARK. I am most happy to have that assurance from my friend.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as the minority member on the Treasury-Post Office Department appropriations bill, I should like to take this opportunity today to congratulate the junior Senator from Virginia for the fine job, the fair manner in which he conducted the hearings, and the conclusions his subcommittee and the full committee arrived at in reporting the Treasury-Post Office appropriations bill.

The subcommittee hearings on H.R. 5954, a copy of which is on every Member's desk today, are conclusive evidence that the subcommittee explored all avenues and dug deeply into the items for the departments whose funds are contained in this bill.

Under the Treasury Department title of the pending bill, I want to direct the attention of every Member of this body to the fact that there was restored the reduction of $16,800,000 made by the other body, to the full budget estimate as requested by the Department. This does not mean that the Senate Appropriations Committee just rubberstamped the full request of the Department.

What the committee is trying to accomplish here is the fair and equitable review of all taxpayers' returns—both large and small.

Senators should note in the testimony divulged to our committee that statistics produced show conclusively that the Federal Government is losing several billions of dollars annually by not staffing the Internal Revenue Service properly.

Last year, so we were informed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, $25 to $26 billion of taxable income was not being reported annually.

It should be clearly understood that even with the full budget estimate allowed in this bill, and an additional 4,575 positions, this will allow the Department to audit only 5.3 percent of all income tax returns—in my judgment and in the judgment of the committee, a figure that is far too low.

When we examine the matter further, and find that a recent study made by the Internal Revenue Service showed that 62 percent of all returns examined contained deficiencies, it is proof enough that the action taken by our committee is justifiable.

It is my hope that the committee and the conferees will stand firmly on the matter when it goes to conference, and that we shall prevail in connection with this item.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I warmly thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and repeat what I previously said, namely, that I thank the members of my subcommittee for their help, because without the wise counsel and assistance of colleagues such as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], we could not bring to the floor of the Senate a bill which appropriates over $5 billion with such general approval by the Senate Members.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. President, I should like to direct some remarks to the House provision which appears on page 12 of the Senate committee print of House bill 5954, reading as follows: "including expenses of delivery to postal patrons of mail matter under congressional frank, as now authorized by law."

This language was stricken by the committee after it had deliberated on its text.

The purpose of the House amendment seems to be to express the intent of the Congress that the Postmaster General modify existing instructions to permit the use of the "simplified address" for congressional franked mail addressed to patrons in addition to those residing on a rural or star route.

The present regulations provide that mail may be addressed to a "rural or star-route boxholder" followed by either the word "local" or the name of the community. The mailer then sends a sufficient quantity so that the rural or star-route carrier just deposits one in each mailbox on his route.

In a similar manner, mail may be addressed to "postoffice boxholder" for patrons at post offices who do not have either city or village delivery service. The mailer sends the postmaster a sufficient number of copies so that one may be placed in each box.

For communities having city or village delivery service, present regulations require that the mail be addressed to the box or street address. The word "Occupant" may be used in lieu of a name, but the box number or street address must be shown. The mailer must have a mailing list showing the correct box numbers or street numbers in order to obtain delivery of this mail.

The use of the simplified address for patrons at offices having city or village delivery service is now prohibited by administrative action, as I understand, except for those served on rural or star routes. The Postmaster General now has the legal authority to permit the use of the simplified address throughout, including the city delivery. However, he has not seen fit to approve this franked mail within cities, nor the use of the simplified address within cities having delivery service to those patrons who pay for their service.

It is apparently the objective of those who seek the amendment on page 12 of the House bill to urge upon the Postmaster General, as congressional policy, that he should extend this franking privilege to city-delivered mail.

Sometimes, in an effort to justify franked mail within cities having delivered service, it is said that there is a discrimination which now exists, the discrimination being that simplified addresses are allowed in all other types of franked mail, but are not used in this instance. However, if the intention of the amendment to strike out the language, which is explained in the committee report, is carried out, a new and a more vast and a more vital discrimination will appear. There will be franked mail on a simplified basis available in cities where the mail is delivered by carriers, but the discrimination will lie in the fact that paying patrons of the post office will not have available to them the simplified addressed mail for delivery within cities. So there will be discrimination by the Post Office Department as between franked mail, which is paid in a sense, and mail for paying customers.

It was the thinking of the committee, after analyzing all the questions and the factors which go into the question, that the position which we took last year should be reiterated and should be contained anew in the report this year. That objective was accomplished not only by the language in the report, as indicated on page 11, the last paragraph, but likewise by the deletion of the language to which I have referred.

On this point it is hoped that the members of the committee will stand fast when the matter goes into conference with the Members of the House, if determined opposition develops there.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I am happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I congratulate the Senator from Nebraska and the members of the committee for striking the language on page 12. Unquestionably, the Senate last year went on record as overwhelmingly opposing the extending of this principle of franked mail. It was pointed out in the debate at that time, as the Senator has pointed out today, that such a privilege would be giving unfair advantage to Members of Congress who used the franking privilege and particularly to Members of Congress who were seeking reelection. They could in effect finance their campaigns by means of the use of the franking privilege, an advantage which the opponents for their seats in Congress would not have. It is definitely unfair from the standpoint of the opponents of those Members of Congress, and also unfair to the taxpayers who would have to pick up the bill.

At a time when we are proposing, both at the administration level and at the congressional level, that users of so-called junk mail pay higher rates than they are paying, we certainly should not extend the franking privilege on bulk mail to Members of Congress.

I congratulate the committee on its action. I certainly hope the House will sustain the Senate's position in this connection.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Delaware. I am sure the members of the committee, as well as of the subcommittee, will appreciate the support which the Senator from Delaware has expressed. We will also appreciate his support in the event we run into determined opposition in the other body.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure the Senator they will have my support.

RESIDENCE REQUIREMENTS IN ELECTIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in this age of convenient travel, brought about by our rapidly expanding economy, millions of Americans are constantly on the move. They are citizens, and the mere fact of their mobility does not lessen their interest in their country's Government.

But the fact is that an estimated 5 to 8 million persons were barred from voting in last year's presidential election for the sole reason that they were unable to meet residency requirements in the area where they were living on election day.

Without in any way interfering with the right of States and local governments to set the rules for election of their own officials, Congress could well explore the possibilities of protecting the right of these Americans to vote for the President and Vice President of the United States.

In this connection, Mr. President, my attention has been called to two thoughtful editorials on the subject. They are of particular interest in light of Senator KEATING's introduction of S.J. Res. 90, to make 90 days the maximum residency requirement for voting in presidential elections. The first editorial was published in a recent issue of the New York Daily Mirror; the second in the May 19 issue of the East St. Louis (Ill.) Evening Journal. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Mirror]

WIDEN THE FRANCHISE

Right after the national election, the subject of voting reform was hot. Then people began a 4-year forgetfulness, as they usually do.

One who did not forget, however, is Senator KENNETH KEATING, Republican, of New York, who has just introduced legislation to allow 2 days of voting for a President and Vice President. This is a reform urged by the Hearst newspapers. Ballots, under KEAT-

ING's proposal, would not be counted until the entire Nation, in all its time zones, had voted.

This looks like a good plan to us and we congratulate the Senator. It should be approved by the Congress.

But there is another area in which reform is needed. That is at the State level.

Three of our 50 States have a 2-year residence requirement for voting. Thirty-five have a 1-year requirement, and 12 have a requirement of 6 months.

Ours is a roving and volatile country in which millions are constantly on the move. This is characteristic of our changing and expanding economy. Too many Americans are deprived of the franchise just because they have moved to a place of better opportunity.

There should be a nationwide movement to liberalize State voting laws.

Wisconsin's good example might serve as a model. By special arrangement, a U.S. citizen who has been in Wisconsin for 10 days may vote a presidential ticket if he can show he was a qualified voter in the State of his prior residence.

The voting laws should not only be liberalized, but standardized as far as possible.

[From the East St. Louis (Ill.) Evening Journal]

RESIDENCE LAWS

A majority of the Nation's Governors apparently favor relaxing residency requirements for voting to serve the needs of a mobile population.

Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York, told the Senate that 26 of the 32 Governors who answered his request for comment favor a more liberal approach. The other six replies were incomplete, he said.

Five to eight million Americans, most of whom are ambitious, well-educated and anxious to improve their station in life, were unable to vote in last year's presidential election because they were ineligible under State or local residence requirements.

Illinois is only one of the offending States which disfranchises a large number of mobile Americans.

Senator KEATING said the mixture of residency laws is not only chaotic but also unjust, unreasonable, discriminatory and dangerous. States which raise legal barriers to voting, he said, have the smallest percentage turnout at elections.

The Governors who responded to his request for comment overwhelmingly felt that any changes in residency laws should be made at the State or local level. Only two favored Federal action; presumably a constitutional amendment setting forth the nationwide requirements for voting in Federal elections would be needed.

In Senator KEATING'S own State of New York, the legislature has proposals before it to change the State constitution's suffrage provisions which, if accepted, would give New York the most advanced residency requirement law in the Nation.

Most reformers would be happy to see the States take the initiative, but they should get on with it. There is no, absolutely no, reason why Illinois or any other State should impose obstacles to voting by new residents at least in the presidential elections.

Furthermore, the old concept that a residence requirement is needed to give prospective new voters time to become acquainted with local candidates and issues is thoroughly outmoded. The State of communications being what they are today, a voter can be as informed as he wants to be. It is high time State legislatures recognized this fact and acted to end denial of representation to taxation without representation of a large and valuable group of Americans.

THE FUTURE OF OUR NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the current problems to which the Kennedy administration is wisely addressing itself is the preservation of our magnificent natural heritage. This is taking place through the efforts to establish national seashores.

Recently, the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, under the distinguished chairmanship of our able colleague, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], has been conducting hearings on bills to create three great national seashores at Cape Cod, Mass.; Point Reyes, Calif., and Padre Island, Tex. It is my hope that similar additional areas will be set aside and that our national park system will be thereby and in other ways extended.

Recently, in the Atlantic Monthly, there have appeared several articles critical of our national parks policy. An admirable reply to them and a statement of national policy in regard to national parks appears in the current issue of the Atlantic Monthly written by Stewart Udall, our excellent Secretary of the Interior. It points to the interesting conflict which exists in the very legislation concerning the parks enacted by the Congress nearly half a century ago when it directed the National Park Service "to conserve the scenery * * * and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Secretary Udall gives an excellent picture of the dilemma which this somewhat contradictory mandate imposed on the Park Service and outlines the policies which he believes should be followed.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "National Parks for the Future," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PARKS FOR THE FUTURE

(By Stewart Udall)

In the summer of 1953, Bernard De Voto, the Cambridge conservationist and chronicler of the West, made his way through some 15 of our great national parks. With him traveled, figuratively speaking, some 17 million Americans who sought, with De Voto, to renew their spirits in the wild and scenic places of our land. On his return De Voto pronounced a verdict on what he had seen, and a disturbing verdict it was to all who knew his deep affection for our national parks. "Let's close the national parks," De Voto wrote caustically. "Let us, as a beginning, close Yellowstone, Yosemite, Rocky Mountain, and Grand Canyon National Parks—close them and seal them, assign the Army to patrol them, and so hold them secure for a more enlightened future."

De Voto's anger was directed at the rot, decay, and neglect he had encountered everywhere. Sewage was seeping into Yellowstone Lake, and the campgrounds of the park looked like outdoor slums because, as De Voto put it, "they are slums." On the breath-taking rim of Black Canyon of the Gunnison, the guard rails had rotted away; not one ranger was assigned to the area; and even the visitor's register had been stolen. Fire, health, and safety hazards were prevalent at every turn.

At about the same time, the Reader's Digest warned prospective visitors that "your trip is likely to be fraught with discomfort, disappointment, even danger," and Conrad Wirth, then as now the Director of the National Park Service, had to agree that "We actually get scared when we think of the bad health conditions." The Saturday Evening Post took its turn at bat and editorialized that the "great canyons, pristine lakes, and the endless beauties of nature of our national parks" were being displaced by "traffic jams on beatup highways, beer cans in the geysers, honky-tonk commercialism * * * outdoor slums."

America's glory has been its natural wonders; how, then, did we allow our national parks to suffer such disfigurement?

The answer is that up until 1941 the resources of the National Park Service, the custodian of our parks and monuments, were reasonably adequate. But, with the onset of World War II, money and manpower were cut to the bone, and when millions of Americans turned to the parks in the postwar period the rangers were overwhelmed.

In 1940 some 7 million people visited the parks. By 1953, the year of De Voto's trek, the figure had more than doubled, and the Park Service, with a smaller ranger force, had to administer 18 new areas as well.

Today, few in Washington would dispute the proposition that the esprit and dedication of the men who run the National Park Service are unexcelled in our Government. Yet the postwar years found some rangers and their families living in rat-infested shacks and paying the Government a painful percentage of their modest salaries for the privilege. Not only the parks but the morale of the men charged to conserve them had become eroded to the danger point. These were the conditions which in 1956 called into being the restoration work of Mission 66.

RESTORATION

Mission 66 was designed as a 10-year rehabilitation program to accommodate the flood tide of visitors without compromising basic conservation values. A series of master plans was developed for each of the 181 areas administered by the Park Service, and sizable appropriations were obtained from a responsive Congress to enhance maintenance and underwrite new capital improvements. Thus, a frontal attack was made on the conditions that aroused De Voto's ire and caused misgivings in his fellow Americans.

Mission 66 is now at the halfway mark; a new administration has come to power; and it is an opportune moment to review the scope of the program and assess its work.

The Park Service takes justifiable pride in maintenance systems that now protect the health and safety of park visitors. And, unquestionably, the main new capital development projects—roads, trails, campsites, interpretive exhibits—have made the parks more hospitable and have quickened appreciation of their wonders. But problems of delicate judgment have been created also.

For example, take the problem of roads. In 1924, Stephen Mather, the first Director of the Park Service, enunciated the basic guidelines: "It is not intended to have the parks gridironed with roads, but in each it is desired to make a good sensible road system so that visitors may have a chance to enjoy them. At the same time, large sections of each park will be kept in a natural wilderness state without feeder roads, and will be accessible only by trails for the horseback rider and the hiker."

CAMPSITES

In the late forties, the road systems in the parks were miserably inadequate and unsafe. However, 653 miles of existing roads have now been improved under Mission 66, while nearly 144 miles of new roads provide scenic vistas and access to new campground areas.

Camping is one of the more intimate park experiences. To encourage it, 7,000 new campsites have been created, and an additional 4,000 sites renovated. For access both to the spectacular and the humbler sites of natural beauty, 300 miles of trails have been built or improved. For many visitors, the most meaningful moments in the parks come when they join together around the fire in the evening to learn from ranger naturalists more of the natural history that surrounds them. There are now campfire circles for more than 25,000 persons, and 54 new interpretive centers to encourage the vital educational work of the Park Service.

Yet Mission 66 has inevitably evoked both praise and blame from those who love and use our parks. The truth of the matter is that in 1916 the Interior Department was pitched onto the horns of a dilemma by congressional directive to "conserve the scenery * * * and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Examining this singular congressional mandate, Wallace Stegner, the well-known novelist and conservationist, once wrote perplexedly: "Provide for use, but leave unimpaired. Use, but protect. Keep the parks primitive, but open them to millions. Make the scenery accessible with roads, trails, lookouts, but don't scar it up. Provide—invisibly—campsites for millions, lodge and motel accommodations for hundreds of thousands, and the facilities of whole towns to take care of them * * *. Protect and restore wildlife, even wolves and mountain lion, in order to keep the balance of nature, but do it in a show window where millions can thrill to see it."

Over the years, some of the wisest men in the Interior Department have wrestled with this dilemma, and it is not surprising that many policy directives have touched off controversy. There have been mistakes; I would cite Tioga Road in Yosemite and the tower on Clingman's Dome in the Great Smokies as two. But when you view the many Mission 66 projects in perspective, it is amazing that so few egregious errors have been committed.

TO USE AND YET PRESERVE

During the Kennedy administration, special care will be taken that in the planning of roads, buildings, and village developments, nature will take precedence over the needs of modern man. The Park Service cannot be too zealous in its work to maintain, and raise, the standards of the facilities and the services it provides. No road or lodging is an end in itself, but exists to enhance the value of the park it serves.

But too often critics have failed to concede that many of the wrong decisions have actually been dictated by conditions and compromises which preceded the establishment of the parks. For example, Floridians stipulated a developed area outside its heartland when they donated the land and money which led to the establishment of the Everglades National Park. And the Santa Fe Railroad and others owned land on the rim of the Grand Canyon long before it became a national park.

In my view, wise park administrators must steer judiciously between those who would ignore the park standards and those who construe each alternative according to their personal tastes. In any event, the pressure of tens of millions of people on a limited and often fragile land mass will surely grow more intense. Can our parks be both used and preserved at the same time?

The answer is, They must be if we are to keep faith with future generations and serve the men and women of today.

One concept long respected by the Park Service in its approach to the inherent dilemma has been the development within the wilderness of zones of civilization linked by roads. The result is that today 99 percent of our national parkland still enjoys wilderness status, and a visitor need only wander 200 yards off any road to enter primitive and untouched country.

In Yellowstone, our oldest and most intensively used national park, the road system has been improved to carry the hundreds of thousands of cars that use it annually, but the natural wilderness has not been penetrated 1 foot farther than when the first motorcar was admitted 45 years ago. And here it should be borne in mind that Yellowstone is nearly three times the size of Rhode Island. All too few of the millions of visitors venture beyond these paved corridors, yet the opportunity is there for anyone who wants to seize it.

Looking at the vast panorama of our parks, one is impressed by the wisdom with which the Park Service has resolved the conflict between use and conservation. There are no more zealous guardians of our places of extraordinary beauty than those who cherish the purity of our wild lands. Fortunately for all of us, each noble stand of trees, each solitary mountain promontory, each desert canyon has its devoted band of friends. And this is as it should be, because wilderness land, paradoxically, is a fragile asset.

PARKS ARE FOR PEOPLE

However, it is also plain that parks are for people, and not people for parks. And these people are entitled to what De Voto has called "amiable diversions" in keeping with the purpose of their visit and the character of the park. The test of whether to allow such diversions as winter sports, for example, should be whether participants scar the terrain. Furthermore, we must consistently ask ourselves whether a particular organized activity adds a worthwhile dimension to the purpose for which our parks were established.

This brings into focus the central domestic crisis which confronts America today, the fact that population tends to outrun space, and that the very spaciousness which has formed the face and character of our people is now threatened. The most noticeable scarcity in this society of abundance is land. The pressures on our land—especially land suitable for parks and outdoor recreation—are relentless. Another 4 million Americans will be born into this country this year. Given fair weather each day, another 300,000 acres of countryside will fall to bulldozers, cement mixers, and logging crews.

If we want to save some of this land for parks and for the enjoyment of the outdoors, we must act now. The enemy is time, not people. And time has run out for piecemeal action. The day is long past when a stroke of the pen could create new national parks out of the public domain. The time is now past when we could hoard a few more acres of park land in the West, where it is still relatively plentiful, and hope that some philanthropist would give us a little more elsewhere.

NEW NATIONAL PARKS—NOW

What is needed today, and needed urgently, is a truly national and wisely balanced program of land acquisition and park development. Last February, within a month of assuming office, President Kennedy spelled out in a message to Congress the broad goals of a national land-conservation program.

We have already come to the second phase of Mission 66. From 1956 to date, we rescued the national parks from rot and erosion; now, quickly, we must round out our park system by the inclusion of the remaining areas of exceptional scenic beauty. But new national parks are only a part of the answer to the exploding demand for outdoor recreation in all parts of the country. Our great national parks represent one of the few remaining opportunities for vacationing families to enjoy the early morning experience of the wilderness. We did not set aside our parks for casual inspection. These unique areas were meant to provide what Laurance Rockefeller has called "the cathedral experience" of nature.

Furthermore, most of our finest parks are located in the western part of the United States, a considerable distance from centers of population. Yet America's families should have opportunities for outdoor recreation within easy reach of their homes. And, properly, they should rely for such recreation on their State and local governments. State and local action to set aside land for outdoor recreation would take pressure off the national parks, but more important would be the benefits which carefully developed open land would bring to the communities themselves and to their residents.

In most areas of our country, enough land is still available if we act now. But in the heavily industrialized parts of America, the only hope of salvaging what remains lies in inspired, and inspiring, leadership from our Governors and mayors.

The challenge is a double one: to preserve the face of our country for ourselves and our children, and at the same time to provide plentiful and varied opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

I should like to see new national parks to protect such unique areas, for example, as the deep, sandstone canyons that surround Rainbow Bridge in southern Utah; the last remaining prairie lands in Kansas; Santa Cruz Island, Calif.; and the proposed Great Basin Park in Nevada. We must also move quickly to add the Great Beach and adjoining land of Cape Cod; Padre Island, Tex.; and Point Reyes to the national seashore system.

Nowhere are the opportunities for outdoor recreation more limited than in or near our cities. What little open country separates the sprawling urban complexes on the east and west coasts is being preempted by various "developments." Only bold action can save what remains. For example, at the Delaware Water Gap a magnificently varied recreation area could be created surrounding the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir. This would give nearly one-third of the Nation's population 75 miles of shore front for outdoor sports and recreation.

America's land and water are on the block. The highest bidder is seldom the wisest user. Short-term developments and short-term gains will be debited a thousandfold against the assets of future generations, whose claim on America is as valid as ours.

Some of us in Washington sense an ever-increasing interest in the land and in man's relationship to it. President Kennedy has already struck the keynote. If we seize the opportunity and act to save the spaciousness and grandeur of our land, later generations may record this period as one of the most significant in the American conservation movement.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office

Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which is at the desk, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Beginning on page 8, line 15, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the chairman of the subcommittee. The amendment would strike from the bill the provision which would allow $65,000 to be used for the further liquidation of the RFC.

In 1957 Congress passed the Reorganization Act which abolished that agency. We turned the various functions of the agency over to the Secretary of the Treasury, the administrator of the Small Business Administration, the administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the administrator of the General Services Administration. All functions of the RFC were divided among these agencies, and it was the clear intention of the Congress that the agency should be abolished and the outstanding loans liquidated by the Treasury Department.

It is absurd that we continue to provide five employees working for an agency which has been abolished for 5 years.

Mr. President, it is proposed that we continue one employee as a director for the Office of Defense Lending. We have not made any defense loans through this agency for 5 years. The agency has been dead for 5 years. We certainly do not now need a director of the Office of Defense Lending.

There is a provision to carry one attorney. I can visualize some use occasionally for an attorney for the collection of outstanding loans, which amount, incidentally, to only $7.8 million. However, surely one of the attorneys employed in the Treasury Department could be used. I do not think a special attorney to work solely on the liquidation of these old loans is needed.

After the agency was abolished in 1957 the loan examiners were eliminated on the basis that there was no need for additional loan examiners because no additional loans were to be made. There were no loan examiners for 1958–59, but we now find back on the payroll a loan examiner for the years 1960–61, and it is proposed to carry him on in 1962. What is the need for a loan examiner for an agency which has been dead 5 years and is not making loans?

In addition, there are two other employees involved, and the work of these employees to further liquidate the outstanding loans could be easily taken care of by the present employees of the Treasury Department.

Apparently the only way to abolish the agency is to take these employees off the payroll. In prior years we found this to be the only effective method. Once before it took the Congress approximately 20 years to kill the War Shipping Administration. We never did eliminate and abolish that agency until we took the employees off the payroll and stopped appropriating money for them.

There was also the U.S. Spruce Corporation, which was started in World War I to obtain spruce from Alaska for use in the construction of airplanes. Before the Corporation could begin functioning the war was over and the use for the spruce had terminated. The agency was abolished in the early 1920's. I came to Washington, D.C., in 1946, and the Corporation was still functioning as a full-fledged Corporation with three employees on the payroll.

At that time we found that the agency had only two conditional sales contracts, obtained when the agency had sold a railroad to another Government agency, with semiannual payments. There were four payments coming in annually on these two conditional sale contracts. In 1947 there was still a President of the Corporation. There was also a treasurer. There was also a Secretary. The agency had a car and a chauffeur. All of this staff was for the collection and handling of four checks per year and transmitting them to the Treasury Department.

That agency was finally abolished by striking from the appropriation bill the money to pay the salaries of the employees.

I think we should take the same action today and really put the stamp of approval upon the burial of this agency which we abolished 5 years ago.

Mr. President, I understand that the chairman of the subcommittee is willing to accept this amendment, which if approved will stop the salaries of these employees of the old RFC on June 30.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia has Scotch blood in his veins and an economy spirit in his heart, and is always pleased when the distinguished Senator from Delaware offers a proposal to save money, even though it is only $65,000 from a bill to appropriate $5,327,631,000.

Frankness compels the junior Senator from Virginia to admit, however, that he would have welcomed this type of support from his Republican colleague when the junior Senator from Virginia was fighting alone to cut down the expense of administering the liquidation of the RFC. When the Republicans took over, they asked for that purpose the sum of $2,660,275. The junior Senator from Virginia protested very vigorously, but he was overridden. In recognition of the continuing fight, we succeeded in cutting the amount down the next year to $1,485,000. At that time the junior Senator from Virginia said, "Now, the next year will have to wind this up." The next year the amount was cut to $1,060,000. The man who was put in as head of the agency was then made an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, so that he would not be standing out like a sore thumb with the expenditures.

So the junior Senator from Virginia says it is unfortunate he did not have the help of his distinguished colleague during the "big money" years. We got the amount cut down and cut down, until last year it was only $75,000. The present administration said, "We will cut that amount $10,000," so the House of Representatives took the figure, and we let it go.

Of course, when one analyzes what the money is for, it is found there is to be one Director who will get $13,700 a year and a lawyer who will get $13,700 a year. There is to be a loan examiner; and all he would have to do would be to examine the loans which have been in existence for 20 or 30 years, which are now down to $7.8 million. During fiscal 1962 86 percent of the total loans or assets since inception will be liquidated. The loan examiner would examine those loans, to see how they are coming along. He can pull the papers out and look at them.

There is also requested a stenographer at $7,500, and one typist at $4,800.

In view of the fact that the junior Senator from Virginia cannot make a justification for the expenditure which is fully satisfactory to himself, although he has no authority from his committee to accept any amendments, he will agree to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Virginia. I join in saying that the Senator has consistently over the years tried to cut down the appropriation for this item. I know the Senator was not directing his remarks to me personally because this is the third time I have offered an amendment to abolish this agency, which is still alive. The other two amendments were offered under the preceding administration, and I am still trying again here today.

I still say that an agency which was abolished 5 years ago should have been closed 5 years ago. There should be no employees on the payroll; they are not needed.

This is the third time I have offered the amendment to stop this appropriation. I hope the Senate will pass it, and I hope the conferees will stand by it. If they do not, I shall join the Senator from Virginia in asking that we further insist on the Senate amendment to abolish this agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the other members of the subcommittee and of the committee, for the splendid report which they have brought to the Senate in regard to an appropriation of some $5 billion for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for many years, I have had a great interest in the Postal Department. I am pleased to see on the floor with me today the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

We have cooperated for many years in behalf of better postal programs and better postal service. If the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee would be kind enough to yield to me for one or two questions, I would appreciate it very much.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The section of the committee report dealing with facilities recommends $160,100,000, a decrease of $7.6 million from the budget estimate for facilities.

The amount recommended is $8,478,000 under the 1961 appropriation, and $7.6 million over the House allowance. I bring up the question because I believe that the citizens of our Nation will be disappointed to find that we do not propose to build new additional postal facilities in communities where they are badly needed and would be an improvement over the old type of buildings that have existed for many years. I wonder what reason the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee can give the Senate for the reduction in the proposed figure.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The committee found that its recommendation would provide 20 major leased facilities and 50 branch offices together with 1,100 or more newly constructed leased buildings.

The committee realized that everyone would like to have a new or modern post office, as he would like to have a new home or modern equipment. As I said with respect to the item of $65,000 concerning the RFC, we felt that the amount was not a large amount, relatively, but there was a question as to whether the item ought to be included at all.

We thought that we perhaps should approach with some caution the fact that some of the money proposed to be used might be borrowed money, and perhaps we had better go slow. The House had provided much less than we did. In any event, we could not restore the amount and expect that the House would accept everything we might attempt to restore. We thought we had compromised the point, and we proposed what we hope to hold in conference. Such an amount would carry the program forward reasonably well, but not as far as many of us would like to see it go, if money were not a major consideration.

In the coming fiscal year we face a deficit of at least $4 billion. Spending schemes are pending that could increase that amount to $6 billion or $7 billion. We can talk all we please about price spirals, but, after all, it is inflation of the currency which underlies price inflation.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I readily appreciate the problem of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the committee in regard to the reduction of the fund for the construction of postal facilities. However, I wished at least to mention my concern, because our people are concerned. We have recently, in the past 8 years, engaged in the finest construction of postal facilities in this Nation. I believe our people are happy about it and proud of the buildings constructed.

The second item which I wish to mention is the committee's recommendation of $110 million—a decrease of $12 million from the budget estimate—for plant and equipment. If we do not propose to build new buildings in many of our communities, we have old buildings that need modernization, such as new lighting and air conditioning. I express my regret that we must accept a reduction in the amount for such modernization.

I appreciate also the problems of the chairman and the committee. It is not my intention, I assure the chairman, to offer any amendment, but I wished to take this opportunity to express my regret, and let the opportunity pass without noticing it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I appreciate the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Kansas, who served for many years on the Post Office Committee and knows of the needs for plant and equipment. In presenting this phase of the bill, the chairman said that the rental program for 1961 was $19 million. For 1961 it is estimated to be $62.5 million. The 1962 estimate submitted was for $79 million. For 1963, it is estimated that the amount would rise to $100 million, which shows that inflation is increasing the costs of these projects by leaps and bounds. With regard to the plant and equipment item the committee recommended $110 million, the House allowance and a decrease of $12 million in the estimate. The amount recommended provides the sums requested for the vehicle program; equipment for standard program and approximately $85.5 million for the modernization program.

Consequently we feel that for fiscal 1962 we have provided funds for a moderate and adequate program. It is not what we would like to have done if we had had plenty of money.

The chairman of the subcommittee would like to point out that in framing these recommendations he had the capable help of the senior Republican in this body and ranking minority member of the committee, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I compliment the chairman of the subcommittee for the job he did. The figures which we arrived at represent the best we could do. I would like to see larger amounts provided for some of the items, and I know that the Senator from Virignia would also. But I believe before the bill is finally enacted into law through conferences with the House, we can arrive at figures, which probably will be approximately what I personally would like to see.

The hearings were thorough and well conducted. The various phases of both the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department were thoroughly considered I believe the committee has done a good job, and that its effort is worthy of support.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The chairman of the subcommittee thanks the distinguished Senator for his complimentary words.

Mr. CARLSON. I assure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, who is the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee, and also the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], that I did not desire to offer any amendments to the bill, but I wished to call attention to two items which I believe are of great interest to the Senate and to the country.

I commend the committee for bringing into the bill an item of some public service. When the appropriation bill came from the House of Representatives not one dollar was allowed for public service. I notice from the report that the committee has included approximately $62 million for this phase.

We are faced with a postal deficit of about $900 million and I share the feeling with many that some of this so-called gap should be closed by rate adjustments. But the Post Office and Civil Service Committees of both Houses are at a complete loss to determine the amount of this gap to be covered by postal rate increases, until such time as we have a positive recognition of public service costs involved.

There has been a great deal of confusion concerning the basis on which public services should be computed. The Post Office Department, and I am afraid the Congress itself, has been persuaded to follow the "loss of revenue" concept, which means simply the additional revenues which might have been collected if the free or special postage items, as enumerated in the law, had been paying the full rates assigned to other classes. Public Law 85–426, section 214(a)(1) repealed the Kelly Act of 1930 which was the only legal basis for determining public services on a "loss of revenue" basis. The act substituted in lieu thereof the "total loss" concept and directed that such losses on nonprofit charitable mail, free in county mail, free for the blind, losses on nonpostal and special services, the star route system and third- and fourth-class post offices be set aside and charged to the general funds of the Treasury.

Since 1958 I have urged full adherence to provisions of Public Law 85–426. Title I of this law is called postal policy and section 104(a) provides certain public services, the total loss of which shall be set aside and charged to the general funds of the Treasury. Today, I do not propose to recount the long history of appropriation enactments concerned with this law, but I shall point out that at no time since 1958 has an amount been set aside for public services equal to what we contemplated in the enactment of the law. Quite frankly, after 6 years

of study and lengthy debate in both Houses, we were of the opinion that the public services of the Post Office Department, which the law clearly states should not be charged to mail users, was somewhat in the neighborhood of $250 to $300 million.

We are confronted again with a $900 million postal deficit. I think I know the tenor and temper of the Senate and the Congress, and I doubt very much that any action will be taken on the problem. But it is a serious problem, and I hope we can obtain recognition of what we believe and can demonstrate, based upon the records, is a public service of $288 million, which was placed in the record as taken from the 1958 Postal Act.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SERVICE COSTS

Congress in the 1958 Postal Act made a good start at itemizing public services. Here is the list, taken from the act,[1] with the cost of each, according to the Post Office's fiscal 1959 cost ascertainment report: [2]

[In thousands]

Category	Cost or total loss	Loss of revenue (Post Office estimate, 1961)
(1) The total loss resulting from the transmission of matter in the mails free of postage or at reduced rates * * * as provided by statute, including * * *:		
(a) Reduced rates on newspapers or periodicals of certain nonprofit organizations	$60,127	$3,094
(b) Official mail, Pan American Union, sent free	71	71
(c) Free-in-county mail (free delivery of newspapers in the county where they are published)	15,445	830
(d) Free or reduced postage on material for the blind	1,276	1,276
(e) Free mail for Pan American Union countries' diplomatic corps	49	49
(f) Publications for use of the blind at reduced rates, 4th class	69	69
(g) Free mail, Pan American Sanitary Bureau	3	3
(h) Free mail for widows of Presidents	202	202
(i) Reduced 2d-class rates for religious and classroom periodicals	3,758	224
(j) Reduced 3d-class rates for nonprofit organizations	30,600	11,558
(k) Free mailing, absentee ballots		
(l) Reduced rates for books	17,815	17,815
Reduced rates for library books	3,355	3,355
(2) Loss resulting from:		
(a) Star route services to remote homes, farms, ranches, post offices	46,863	
(b) 3d and 4th class post offices	73,871	
(3) Loss "in performing nonpostal services, such as the sale of documentary stamps for the Treasury"	18,235	
(4) Loss "incurred in performing special services such as cash on delivery, insured mail, special delivery, and money orders"	15,822	
(5) Extra cost of transporting U.S. mail by foreign air carriers at rates over those prescribed for U.S. air carriers	850	850
Total	[1] 288,411	39,396

[1] Before the 1960 10-percent pay increase bill.

Mr. CARLSON. I understand that the 1962 budget contained $62 million as the amount of public services when it was submitted to the House of Representatives by the President. The House in its action has fully deleted this amount and left the figure standing at zero. This is difficult to understand.

My personal feeling as one interested in this postal deficit that we have had for years is that if we could ever reach agreement, at least among the Congress, as to what we would determine was an allowable item for public service, I think maybe we could adjust some rates, but so far we have had this difficulty.

I appreciate the action taken by the committee in including at least $62 million. I sincerely hope we can reach some agreement on this point in order that we might at least begin to balance the intake and output of postal revenues based on the present Treasury situation.

OIL IMPORTS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I was greatly disappointed and considerably alarmed to read this morning that after a most complete and thorough hearing of the oil producers' problems, the Secretary of the Interior has ruled to take no action to help solve the dilemma in which the producers now find themselves. Secretary Udall has decided to continue the extremely high oil import program to the detriment of the oil producers of Kansas and the Nation.

As is well known to my colleagues, there is now in operation what is generally termed "the mandatory oil import program." This program was designed, in the words of the President, to—

insure a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new hemispheric reserves to replace those being depleted. The basis of the new program, like that for the voluntary program, is the certified requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States.

The program was the outgrowth of many years of careful and comprehensive study by Congress and the executive branch of Government. It has, to say the least, done a lot for the domestic oil industry; however, it must be recognized that the goals laid down by Congress and the President for this program have not been met.

Recently Tom L. Schwinn, executive vice president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association, testified at an oil imports hearing in the Department of the Interior in regard to the deteriorating position of the independent oil producer in Kansas. Annual production in the past 5 years has declined from a high of 124 million barrels to 113 million barrels. Crude oil sells for less than it did in 1957, the posted price being as low as $2.77 per barrel in some areas. In addition, wells are producing at minimum allowables, with not much apparent hope for either an increase in price or allowables under present conditions.

In short, conditions today in the domestic petroleum industry, particularly in my own State of Kansas, are more depressed than ever. For example, drilling rigs active in 1960 were at a 14-year low; and so far this year, there are less rigs active than in 1960. The number of wells drilled in 1960 was the lowest since 1952, and crude oil reserves actually went down slightly in 1960. Wildcat wells, which are really those which find the oil, are being drilled at a rate 7 percent below the dismal record of 1960, when the number of wildcat wells drilled was 26 percent below the rate in 1956—the year just prior to the finding by the President's Special Cabinet Committee that a decline in this activity "shall not be permitted." Today a further decline in the domestic exploratory activity is being permitted.

Mr. President, this is a situation that should not be allowed to continue. Everyone interested in and familiar with the oil industry in the United States must view with concern the increasing threat of expanded oil production in Russia.

Recently Mr. Ira H. Cram, an American oil man, made an extensive tour of Russia as a member of the first official delegation of American oil men to study the Russian oil industry's progress since the end of the war. Mr. Cram is a geologist and Senior Vice President of the Continental Oil Company and has participated in oil development throughout the United States, Canada, South America, and Africa. His report on the Russian oil situation, entitled "Russian Oil: New Danger for the West," was printed in the April 29, 1961, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. In this article Mr. Cram discussed the great growth and development of Russian oil and its effects on future competition for oil producing countries, with the statement that the sobering fact is that Russia is just beginning her oil development.

This fact must not be ignored by the United States as we consider future programs for oil development in the United States. The oil industry in the United States is in a depressed condition.

There are many factors which are contributing to this unhealthy situation. However, today I would like to refer to just two of these.

As is well known, shortly after the establishment of the mandatory import program, the President made an amendment in his oil import proclamation which exempts overland imports from Canada and Mexico from the mandatory program. In other words, in the

[1] Sec. 104(a), Public Law 85-426, 85th Cong.

[2] These are the latest figures available as of Mar. 1, 1960.

interest of national security, it was recognized that preferential treatment should be allowed oil imports from Canada and Mexico. It is hard to find fault with the purpose of this policy. However, as is so often the case, the beneficiaries of this policy seem to be abusing this privilege.

For example, at a time when oil production in the United States has remained flat for a period of five years, imports from Canada are rapidly increasing. Canada, whom we all recognize as a valuable friend, has increasing designs on the U.S. oil market. This is commendable from the standpoint of Canada. However, unless the brakes are placed on such imports the result would simply be that increased Canadian imports will be at the expense of our own domestic producers with no net gain in the joint security of Canada and the United States.

Earlier this year, Interior Secretary Udall took cognizance of the increased imports from Canada and declared that if such exempted imports have a marked and abrupt effect on the domestic industry such developments would call for a reconsideration of the "over-land" exemption.

Canada recently issued a statement on Canadian oil policy which laid down certain target levels for Canadian oil production—640,000 barrels daily for 1961 and 800,000 barrels daily for 1963. These target levels contemplate substantial increases of their oil exports from Canada to the United States. It is expected that Canada for 1963 would like to export to the United States 225,000 barrels of oil daily which is double the 1960 daily average shipments of 113,000 barrels daily to the United States.

In the past, Canadian crude oil has not moved into either the Detroit-Toledo area or the Chicago area. However, during the last quarter of 1960, Canadian crude oil began to move into both Detroit and Toledo refineries. During December 1960, three refineries imported 14,035 barrels daily of Canadian crude oil and thus displaced an equivalent volume of domestic crude in this area. By March 1961, imports of Canadian crude into Detroit-Toledo had increased to 24,226 barrels daily, thus further displacing domestic crude which has always served these markets.

Thus in view of the relatively flat crude oil market in the United States over the past 5 years, and the relatively small future increases that can be expected, I feel that Canada cannot expect nor be given a disproportionate share in the U.S. crude oil market.

In my opinion, two things must be done to meet this situation. Although imports from Canada should be given preferential treatment over other foreign oil, I believe that such exempt imports must be included within the total overall permissible level of imports into the United States and also I urge that Canada recognize that this preferential treatment must not be abused.

As in the case of Canada, imports from Mexico should be included in the basic overall permissible level of imports. However, in the case of Mexico, another factor has entered the picture in the last several months which calls for immediate and effective action. This special problem arises out of the fact that certain importers of Mexican oil have hit upon a method of circumventing the spirit and intent of the overland exemption authorized under the import program.

The overland exemption was written into the program in the belief that oil from Canada or Mexico coming into the United States via pipeline, rail or truck would be available during periods of emergencies. However, during the past 6 months, oil has been coming into the United States from Mexico up to 50,000 barrels per day in the following manner. The oil is brought into Brownsville, Tex., in bond—placed in trucks which haul the oil back into Mexico and then retrucked into Texas as an overland import.

In my opinion, this practice is a complete circumvention of the spirit and purpose of the overland exemption. In effect, it is just like the "unfinished oil circumvention" which broke down the voluntary crude oil import program and brought on the necessity for establishment of the mandatory program.

It is my hope that this practice will be stopped forthwith, and that it will not be permitted to break down the present program. I notice from the press that some sort of arrangement has been worked out with the people involved in this transaction whereby such imports will be held down to 30,000 barrels per day for a period of 3 years. If this be so, it would appear that our Government is giving official sanction to this circumvention and is rewarding those involved by authorizing this activity, though on a somewhat smaller scale, for another 3 years. I cannot condone this practice, and I respectfully suggest that if it is necessary to bring more oil in from Mexico, it should be authorized directly and not by giving official sanction to this current practice which is contrary to the spirit and intent of the mandatory oil import program.

I have noted from the record of the recent oil import hearings, held by the Department of the Interior, that the domestic oil industry has requested that imports into districts I–IV be reduced by some 200,000 barrels per day. I suggest that a large part of this contemplated reduction could be accomplished by carrying out the recommendations that I have set forth today and without doing violence to our friends to the north and south of us and without doing violence to any of the nations from which we receive petroleum.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that the mutual security of the United States, Canada, and Mexico require that these nations share in our oil market, but such sharing must be on a reasonable basis; and further the overland exemption must not be abused. Otherwise, the mandatory oil import program may fail to the detriment of not only U.S. producers but Mexican and Canadian producers as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement made by Mr. Tom L. Schwinn, executive vice president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association, at the oil imports hearing of the Department of the Interior on May 10 and 11, be made a part of these remarks, and also that the article entitled "Russian Oil: New Danger for the West," by Ira H. Cram, which appeared in the April 29 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY TOM L. SCHWINN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT KANSAS INDEPENDENT OIL & GAS ASSOCIATION AT OIL IMPORTS HEARING, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 10–11, 1961

My name is Tom L. Schwinn, executive vice president of the Kansas Independent Oil & Gas Association. This association consists of more than 1,000 producers, operators, royalty owners and related independent persons doing business or having oil and gas interests in Kansas.

Kansas for many years has been either the fifth or sixth largest producing State in the Nation. Last week, production averaged in excess of 322,000 barrels per day.

We wish to thank the Secretary and the Department for according us this opportunity to appear at this hearing.

In general, we wish to endorse the position of the Independent Petroleum Association of America with regard to the oil import program, adopted at its recent meeting in New Orleans. We commend that exhaustive and detailed analysis for your serious consideration.

We should like to emphasize the deteriorating position of the independent producer in Kansas. Kansas production is derived from 40,000 wells. These wells average approximately 7.7 barrels per day. There is production in 89 of the State's 105 counties. The production of oil and gas is the biggest industry in the State.

Annual production in Kansas in the past 5 years has declined from a high of 124 million barrels to 113 million barrels. Active rigs have declined even more markedly and for the past several years total annual production has exceeded discovered reserves. Yet, vast areas of the State are virtually unexplored and development drilling in the older producing areas has subsided.

Employment in the field, on the technical side and at the administrative level, is off badly. Crude sells for less than it did in 1957, the posted price being as low as $2.77 per barrel in some areas. Wells are producing at minimum allowables, with not much apparent hope for either an increase in price or allowables under present conditions.

The result of this decline is cause for grave concern by public officials, the industry; indeed, the entire State. Tax revenues for schools and general government have naturally dropped.

It is the fixed opinion of our association that the mandatory import-control program has fallen short of its stated objective of restoring vigor to the domestic producing industry.

We find that Kansas reserves of petroleum are selling at a price substantially below replacement costs. This finding was reinforced last summer by the Kansas Corporation Commission in its order shutting down fields in two counties where a further cut in the posted price of crude was instituted by one purchasing company. The commission found that sale of oil at the new depressed price constituted economic waste under our conservation statute.

We are of the further opinion that the oil-import program will not accomplish its objective until the price for Kansas crude is reasonably restored. The purchaser and refiner of crude oil have benefited very substantially from the import program. They have not, however, passed on to the crude-oil producer any portion of these benefits. It would be nonsense to say that the program has not had its benefits. It undeniably prevented the immediate liquidation of the small independent producer. Nontheless, that person today remains in a self-liquidating position as he continues to produce oil for an inadequate price that he found when costs were substantially below those of today.

As producers, we do not quarrel with the health that is evident in some segments of the industry. But it is our view that basic health and vigor in the industry, and definitely in Kansas, can only be restored from the bottom up—starting with the producer, if you please. The independents in Kansas historically find about 85 percent of the oil there. Their role in this regard is vital; nor may it be expected that they will be replaced in these endeavors once they have been eliminated.

A revitalization of the oil-producing industry in Kansas is imperative—if premature abandonment of literally thousands of stripper wells is to be avoided, and there are 24,000 of these wells in Eastern Kansas producing no more than one or two barrels per day. These wells tap millions of barrels of marginal reserves, reserves that will be lost to this Nation if inadequate crude prices make continued operation of the wells uneconomical. Today, these reserves are a part of the abundant reserve this dear country will require in its hour of need and are thus essential to national security. But even the most efficient recovery methods are largely ineffectual in the face of what is basically an inadequate price for the product. And that is not yet the end. Consider if you will, the countless secondary recovery projects that will not be initiated because of the poor economics of the situations as they arise. Price for the product is a factor in each such calculation.

We thus urge this administration to analyze the goals of the program, the administration of which this Department is charged with. The people intended to be helped by the program have been helped very little, if at all. We submit that the price for crude is the chief indicia of the problem; parenthetically, that all other factors are correlative indeed; for to whose advantage is it to produce more and more oil for a price that is ab initio inadequate?

An adequate price is necessary. No other incentive will accomplish this goal.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

RUSSIAN OIL: NEW DANGER FOR THE WEST

(By Ira H. Cram)

(An American oilman, recently in Russia, tells how the Soviets are increasing their oil production phenomenally: By copying our methods.)

Russia is developing its oil and gas resources at such a phenomenal rate of speed and has such great potential that Russian oil may be a key factor, indeed the deciding factor, in our growing economic battle with the U.S.S.R. throughout the world.

I recently made an extensive tour of Russia as a member of the first official delegation of American oilmen to study the Russian oil industry's progress since the end of the war. As a geologist and senior vice president of Continental Oil Co., I have participated in oil exploration and development throughout the United States, Canada, South America, and Africa. What I saw in Russia has made me reevaluate the entire world oil situation. Russia is in a stronger position to achieve its economic goals internally and abroad than perhaps even the Russians themselves realized until recently.

Our group's 7,350-mile tour inside Russia took us through two principal producing areas—the old Baku area on the west coast of the Caspian Sea and the new Ural-Volga area between the Ural Mountains and Kuibyshev, which now produces three-fourths of Russia's oil. We saw oil and gas fields, giant ones and small ones, onshore and offshore, fields which were hard and easy to discover. We inspected large new refineries and small old ones. We discussed management and planning with the executives in Moscow and Stalingrad. We were free to talk at length with technicians and workers wherever we went.

Our delegation was under the auspices of the State Department and the American Petroleum Institute as part of the cooperative exchange program with Russia in the scientific, technical, educational, and cultural fields. The 10 members were from 8 oil companies and the Department of the Interior and included specialists in various branches of the industry such as exploration, research, production, refining, and economics. Consequently we were able to assemble a comprehensive picture.

When we saw how the Russians are operating, we began to realize the significance of what they have accomplished since 1950. Whereas the world doubled its oil production between 1950 and 1960, Russia quadrupled its own production. In 1950 the United States was producing seven times as much oil as Russia. In 1960 our daily production of 7,032,000 barrels was less than 2½ times as much as their 2,960,000 barrels.

The Russians have achieved this advance by using almost the same technical and management methods we use. The sobering fact is that they are just beginning their oil development. Their current production of both oil and gas is just about what ours was in 1929. However, they will not have the difficulties in finding and developing additional oil and gas fields that we have had since 1929, for the simple reason they now have the benefit of most of the techniques and concepts which we have laboriously developed in the past 30 years. Furthermore, and of maximum importance, the territory in the U.S.S.R. which is favorable to the existence of oil and gas, covering at least 3 million square miles, is 70 percent larger than the "hunting grounds" of the United States including Alaska. They have just begun to explore their country. We have found all our "easy" oil and are trying to track down the elusive deposits which we hope are there, but which offer precious few clues.

The geology of Russia and the United States is strikingly similar. The Russians have the same assortment of stratigraphic and structual conditions that are responsible for so many oilfields in this country. For example, the new Ural-Volga area is west Texas and Oklahoma all over again. Geologically, from their past experience and our own, there is no reason to prevent them from achieving or exceeding the oil-production goals which I saw in every planning office and displayed on charts in every museum. If they achieve these goals, we will find them fiercely competitive in the world market by 1965.

In order to locate new oil and gas structures, they are operating more than 400 seismograph crews—about the same number as are operating in this country—and are talking about 1,200 in 1965. They are drilling wildcat wells in the wide open spaces as well as in the general vicinity of producing fields in order to increase their overall knowledge of the geology and potential of their country.

The Soviet high command at last has learned that a great number of wildcat wells must be drilled to find oil and gas in quantities sufficient to supply expanding needs—and that many of them will be dry holes. The Russian geologist is no longer haunted with the specter of Siberia if he drills a dry hole. This means that by increasing their explorations, the Russians are increasing their chances of opening up vast new reserves because they have so much promising potential oil territory. They actually have an advantage over American explorers which shows up in Soviet statistics. Between 1950 and 1958 in the United States, we drilled about eleven and a half times more feet of hole—exploratory and development—than they did, but an informed guess indicates that we blocked out only a little more than twice as much crude oil and natural gas. So, by virtue of exploring in virgin country, they added about five times more reserves per foot drilled than we did.

I had been predisposed to believe that the human factor, as the result of their political and economic system, would be a deterrent to the kind of vigorous development achieved under the American free-enterprise system. It jolted me out of my complacency to discover that the Russians are using capitalist techniques to do the job. The Russians have copied the structure of U.S. corporations to a large degree. The competitive drive and incentives are similar. The chatter in the fields, the refineries and the research laboratories is the same as it is in Texas or Oklahoma. The local area manager fights to get his budget through in Moscow just as the Denver office of my company tries to get its plans approved by the Houston management.

There are the same human-relations problems between different branches of the industry that we have. I asked the members of a central research group if they had any difficulty in selling their ideas to the men in the field. There was a grin on every face.

The Russians are dedicated to competition—not competition among industries and units within industries to capture customers, but competition among themselves to please Moscow. Collectively they are dedicated to competition with the United States in the entire field of international business.

The incentive to produce more is supplied by personal and plant medals, bonuses and pay raises. Plant bonuses are spent by the plant manager in cooperation with the labor leaders to improve the plant and the community. This stimulus is enhanced by the hope of promotion. Engineers and scientists, for example, are being promoted into managerial positions in greater numbers just as they are in the United States.

Russian devotion to education is impressive. The engineers and scientists we talked to were well trained, competent and enthusiastic. We heard much of the elaborate effort to train workers to do a better job and to fit themselves for the next rung up the ladder.

To our chagrin, we found that the average Russian oilman knows more about the latest publications on science and technology than the average American oilman. Isolated behind the Iron Curtain, they rely upon the world's literature—instead of personal contacts—and they read translations of all technical and trade journals published in every language in the free world. This has its disadvantages. A geologist asked me if a certain geophysical technique was widely used in the United States. I happened to know that he could have heard of it only by reading one article in a certain trade journal. I had the impression that he was being needled by his superior because he wasn't using this technique. Deprived of any practical interchange of ideas, how could he or his superior know that this was a somewhat experimental technique which had been tried without success?

Everywhere we went the Russians were eager to talk shop. They were as eager to learn from us as we were from them. They volunteered a great deal of general information about their own operations and, when asked about details, were generally cooperative. Occasionally they ducked certain technical questions, saying the information had not yet been published. Only in Moscow, among the high planning executives, did we encounter any skilled evasive tactics. We were told at the outset that costs and reserves were trade secrets. But these are matters which competitive American companies also try to keep to themselves. There was very little political conversation. Geologist was talking to geologist, engineer to engineer and refining expert to refining expert. In that regard, we all talked the same language.

The political level is another world, and how far apart these worlds are was illustrated in a conference with a local field manager. In discussing the difference between our economic systems, he threw up his hands and said, "How is it possible for your economy to work without national planning?" Various members of the group attempted to explain. He didn't understand it and finally said, "Let's get back to the technical rather than the economic."

We were quite unprepared for the cordiality and friendliness with which we were received everywhere. For example, we were inspecting the Syzran refinery, about 500 miles southeast of Moscow. When we returned to the plant office from the refinery, almost the entire population of the small town had gathered in front of the building. They had never seen an American before. They were smiling and talking—they simply wanted to touch us.

When we visited the Kuibyshev refinery, the manager had planned an evening entertainment to show off the recreation center. Since the refinery employs 4,500 people, the center was jammed with workers, old people, and children. It was amateur night—ballet, accordion players, singers, comedians, dance music—and I've seen a lot worse on some of our best television shows at home. During an intermission an old lady, who had been watching us intently, jumped to her feet. She was your, or my, concept of what a typical old Russian peasant woman looks like. She said something in a loud voice, laughed and sat down. While she beamed at us amiably, our interpreter informed us that she had said, "I have finally seen an American and now I can die satisfied."

Nor was this friendliness and curiosity confined to the interior. In Leningrad I was on my way to the hotel's main dining room, where our group was having dinner, when I heard music coming from another room. I detoured to see what kind of party was in progress. A nice-looking young Russian saw me at the door, greeted me in English and asked me to join the party. "Come meet my bride," he said. After I had toasted the newly married couple, he introduced me to a blonde, saying, "You two must dance." We did. There was nothing but American jazz on the record player, and the only question I was asked by the several English-speaking Russians present was, "Do you love Louis Armstrong as much as we do?"

When we had finished our tour, we were asked to report back to a meeting of the State Scientific-Technical Committee to give our impressions. W. W. Keeler, executive vice president of Phillips Petroleum Co., gave a restrained and polite general report. G. V. Aleksenko, vice chairman of the committee, thanked him and then said, "But what's the matter with us?" Keeler and the rest of us accepted the invitation. We were quite frank. They showed no resentment, but they had an excuse for everything.

Our principal criticism was the striking extravagance we saw everywhere—too many people on the job and too much idle equipment in both oilfields and refineries. For example, in two oilfields which produced less than one-third of Continental Oil Co.'s domestic production, they had more engineers than Continental has in its entire production department. The units within a Russian refinery are too numerous, too small, and located too far apart. Safety standards are less rigorous than ours—no hard hats or steel-toed shoes. Low overhead pipes, bad stairways, and a general absence of fire-fighting equipment were obvious safety hazards.

The Russians excused the excess manpower on the grounds that they are training people for the tremendous expansion being planned. More automation will be needed, too, and they are stressing its development. As for safety, they maintained their measures were adequate because of their record. But who reports the record and to whom?

The main reason for the extravagant use of people and materials seemed to me to be Government ownership and management. Such extravagance increases costs, whether measured in money or constructive work left undone. The Soviet planners have been unable to overcome the inherent inefficiencies of government ownership. In a country in a hurry, with an admitted manpower shortage, they have had to utilize the majority of their womanpower. In Russia, Rosie the Riveter is already riveting in the cold war.

In one refinery we found a woman in coveralls running one of the most modern, expensive and complicated units. George Dunham, a director of Socony Mobil and a refining expert, questioned her at length. I asked him if she knew what she was talking about, and Dunham said, "That woman knows as much about operations of that unit as any man." We have no women working in such jobs in America. In the Kuibyshev refinery 35 percent of the personnel are women. We saw women working in almost every type of job wherever we went.

We could have pointed out to the State Scientific Technical Committee that, judging by what we saw and heard, Soviet drilling, producing and refining technology is not up to our 1960 par. The technological improvements borrowed from the Western World, together with their own improvements, add up to an overall technology about as advanced as our American technology was in the mid-1940's. But what difference does this make in their skimming-of-the-cream stage? They can find, produce and refine an abundance of crude oil and natural gas by employing 1945 equipment and concepts.

What really concerned us was that after measuring our competitor's resources, ability and drive, we found them uncomfortably great. We needed to learn how Russia plans to use this strength and, more realistically, how Russia can use it. Are they going to keep it at home to build up their internal strength as we do? Or are they going to soft-pedal internal building somewhat by exporting crude oil and products in order to make economic and political hay in their satellites and in the free world?

In 1955 an exportable oil surplus was achieved, and the Russians have been increasing their exports ever since. That they intend to continue to increase their exports is clear, but the amount of increase isn't. At a conference with Evgueni Gourov, president of the Soviet agency in charge of petroleum export and import, the members of our delegation asked him what the agency's long-range export goal was. Although Gourov spoke fluent English, he had a great deal of difficulty in understanding the question, and no satisfactory answer was obtained. Nevertheless, his English was particularly clear when he stated that he did not object to competition for markets, considering it good and necessary. But he felt that some competitive methods which he had run up against were unfair. He felt that a more cooperative attitude by the international oil companies with the Soviet oil industry could be mutually beneficial. We wondered about this choice of the word "mutually."

The Soviet planners deny that they would penalize home consumption in order to expand exports. Nevertheless, they admit that they must balance economic opportunities outside the Soviet Union. Whenever the Russians use the word "economic" in this context, I also hear the word "political." Judging by the published 7-year plan—1959–1965—their idea of balance is approximately double present exports of crude oil and products to a rate of close to 900,000 barrels per day in 1965, or close to 19 percent of their crude-oil production. This amount would give them more than enough oil to become a major competitive force in world markets.

We already have proof of how the Russians capitalize on these "economic-political" opportunities. They traded oil for coffee in Brazil. They traded oil for sugar in Cuba. They are supplying oil to Iceland for fish products and to Egypt for cotton. They stand ready to trade for Indian jute, Italian pipe, Swedish timber. Nor does it necessarily have to be a barter deal. They have offered to supply the Indian Government with all its oil requirements at 20 percent less than anyone else offers. Recently they underbid American and British companies for the major share of Egypt's crude-oil business. At least some of the trades, such as those involving diesel fuel, which is scarce in Russia, must be politically inspired.

There is another side to their export story, however—consumer satisfaction. Up till now, many of the Soviet's customers have not been satisfied. Their most available export sources of crude are "problem crudes." They contain either too much sulfur or too much salt, and refineries must have special equipment to handle them. For example, Russian oil could not be refined in Brazilian refineries without damaging equipment. The first tankerful of gasoline to Cuba wouldn't run automobiles. The overall quality of their gasoline and products cannot compete currently on the world market. But this the Russians can remedy. They are actually beginning to do just that.

Can they afford this economic warfare? I estimated that their exploration and production costs have to be much higher than the costs of their chief competitors from the Middle East. However, the Russians are offering oil today on the Black Sea for $1.10 per barrel. The actual average cost, without profit, of Middle East oil laid down on the Mediterranean, a competitive point, is about $1.40 per barrel. Middle East oil is the cheapest in the world, owing to the great producing capacity of the wells. However, the big producing cost per barrel is the average 73 cents the Middle East producers must pay the sovereign as royalty. Russia doesn't have to pay itself a royalty.

Furthermore, costs are meaningless when the chief executive officer of Russia—a politician—is at the same time chief executive of all businesses in the country. He can claim a profit has been made if gains in certain segments of the business exceed losses in other areas. Furthermore, this same chief executive told U.S. Congressmen in 1955, "We value trade least for economic reasons and most for political reasons." When he juggles his bookkeeping to include political profits, he doesn't ever have to be in the red.

This lack of economic discipline is not enjoyed by the oil companies of the free world. On the contrary, these companies

are now engaged in a vigorous competitive struggle the like of which has not been seen for many a day because of an oversupply of oil in the world. This requires close adherence to economic realities. The oil companies are already sharpening their weapons in cutting operating costs, developing new technologies, researching new uses for oil at home and seeking out uses which will be of particular benefit to underdeveloped countries.

In the matter of utilization of oil and gas at home, Russia is definitely moving in our direction. They are rapidly replacing their expensive low-grade coal with much cheaper, more flexible and convenient oil and gas. In 1958 oil and gas supplied about 31 percent of their energy requirements. That's about where the United States was in 1929. By 1965 they expect almost to triple 1958 consumption of hydrocarbon energy with oil and gas supplying 50 percent of energy requirements. That's about where we were in 1948. They are moving very fast, but have a long road ahead to reach our present position. We consume about 3½ times as much energy per capita as they do, and oil and gas supply 72 percent of our energy.

The emphasis which the Russians are placing on gas is a clue to how they can satisfy both domestic and exporting goals. The more gas they use internally the more oil they will have to export. During the 1950's, due to their increased exploration, they found great new gasfields, and between 1950 and 1960 they increased their gas production eight times to almost 1,700 billion cubic feet. Our 1960 production was close to 13 trillion, approximately eight times theirs. They traded oil for Italian pipe and have laid—or are in the process of constructing—gaslines from producing areas to industrial areas all over the country. The gas is primarily used for industrial fuel. But in Moscow, for instance, there has been an increase in its use for home heating. They told us that by 1965 they expected to be producing more than three times as much gas as today.

We know that today the strength of a nation and its income per capita is directly proportional to that nation's consumption of energy, principally oil and gas. The Russians know it, too. They are on the verge of becoming as strong an oil-and-gas-energy-based economy as the United States. This will automatically bring a great improvement in their standard of living.

Everywhere we went we discovered that they seem to be more proud of their progress than we are in the United States. It is the same sort of pioneer pride of accomplishment which the bustling citizens of Denver had a half century ago, compared to settled New Yorkers. Their indoctrination of the general public is impressive. There are museums and exhibits every place, and they are well attended. Incidentally, Russia is a great country for the fellow who makes models. There are models of drilling rigs, oilfields and refineries, models of petrochemical plants—now only a gleam in the Kremlin fathers' eyes—with explanations of what they will mean to the country. There are maps showing where the oil and gas pipelines are and will be. There are charts showing their petroleum goals. The exhibits are loaded with propaganda—but they get the desired results. There is no propaganda in the amount of progress they have made to date, a fact which is a great selling point for them in touting the advantages of the Communist system in other countries.

As an American oilman, I am subject to and relish vigorous competition. We didn't invent it and have no patent on it, but it is our way of life. Being an oilman, I am a natural optimist. I have to be in order to forget the eight dry holes we drill in the United States in order to find each new field. I am confident that we American oilmen who operate abroad will be able to meet Russian competition not only in dollars and cents but in the political marketplace. However, we have been the world oil champion for so long it is tough to recognize the fact that we are scheduled for a championship match with an opponent who has copied our style, is fresh to the ring and, in some respects, may have more staying power. Furthermore, Ivan doesn't recognize the Marquis of Queensberry rules. Nor do I see any referees around with sufficient authority to call a foul.

In the final analysis perhaps the most significant finding of our studies is the realization that Russia no longer has to acquire energy by conquest. They have all the strength they need within their own borders. This makes Russia and the United States the only two great industrial nations who are in this position. This is why I believe that what the Russians are finding under their feet may be of more importance in the next decade to the outcome of the world's economic and political struggle than what they are doing in the stratosphere.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I too wish to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Treasury and Post Office Appropriations for the excellent work he has done in the preparation of the bill for consideration by the full Committee on Appropriations and in bringing it to the floor of the Senate in its present fine form.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The chairman of the subcommittee appreciates very much the Senator's kind statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I appreciate what has been done with regard to the Post Office Department. It is of great concern to all of us because it costs a great deal of money to run that Department. I am also pleased to note the statement of the committee in its report on page 14 in connection with Treasury Department's appropriation, that the expense for the interest on the public debt has decreased by $400 million. That shows that the Democrats have started immediately to cut down on some costs. We intend to go further along that line as the years pass. It cannot all be done in 1 year. I predict that next year there will be a further increase in the amount of that reduction. I commend the chairman for the $400 million reduction in interest costs this year. That is money we will not have to pay on the money we owe. It represents a substantial saving in Government expenditures.

There are provisions in the bill with which I do not thoroughly agree. I refer specifically now to the public service costs of the Post Office Department. The junior Senator from Kansas has just spoken on the same subject. I wrote a letter to the Postmaster General early this year setting forth my views in regard to public service costs in the Post Office Department.

In my estimation they amounted to somewhere between $300 million and $350 million a year. The committee in its report points out that this is merely a bookkeeping device, and that the total amount allowed this year of $62.7 million, recommended for the payment for public service, does not increase or decrease the obligation or the expenditure authority of the Post Office Department. The bill now pending before us is based on this figure of $62.7 million. The truth of the matter is that we had this matter before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service on two different occasions. First, during 1953–54, under the leadership of the chairman of the committee at that time, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], we made a study of the public service item. When the Democrats took over, and I became chairman of the committee, we made a similar study. Both studies found that the cost of public services was in the neighborhood of $300 million.

Both studies—one under Democratic leadership and the other under Republican leadership—agreed 100 percent that it was in that amount. Therefore, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is of the opinion that before we begin pointing to the deficit in the Post Office Department as $700 million or $800 million, there should be deducted some $300 million to $350 million, representing the real cost of public service activities. The balance will be the true deficit. The committee members who listened, day in and day out, week in and week out, to testimony on this subject feel that the budget of the Post Office Department should reflect the cost of these services. I could enumerate a long list of operations that the Post Office Department performs as a service to the general public, which are not of a postal nature. The Post Office Department should not be charged with a deficit in the amount with which it has been charged, when many of the things it is doing are for the public at large. The amount I have suggested should be deducted in order to show the true deficit.

Then the Post Office Department and the committees of the House and the Senate should try to balance the budget by providing appropriate adjustments in postal rates.

I commend, again, the Senator from Virginia for his work in this instance. In the hearings, he was fair to everybody. He has tried to do what he thinks is the best for the Post Office Department and the taxpayers as a whole. He is to be commended.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I deeply appreciate the kind words of the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Although I am not a member of the committee which handled the bill, I, as a Member of the

Senate, wish to thank the esteemed Senator from Virginia for his usual astute knowledge of matters in this field. I commend the Senator from Virginia, regretting only that the appropriation could not have been more in balance. But I know that he and the other members of his committee were thorough in their work in reporting the bill in the form in which it is now before the Senate. We feel perfectly safe, knowing his ability and intentions in trying to keep the expense of operating the Post Office Department to a minimum. As an individual Senator, I thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I thank the Senator from Arizona. I assure him that we shall examine the operations of both agencies very closely. Most of the expenditures are beyond our control. For instance, the operations concerning the transportation and volume of mail, the number of persons who will be required to handle it, and what amounts will have to be paid to transportation agencies for the movement of the mails, are beyond our control. But as to any items which can be controlled, the committee intends to practice the strictest type of economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 5954) was read the third time.

CLOSING TAX LOOPHOLES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, one of the parts of the President's tax message which has received much attention from Senators on the other side of the aisle is that part which pertains to the closing of the so-called tax loopholes.

I think all Senators and most other Americans realize that there are tax loopholes, and that advantage is taken of them.

There is an old saying, when people complain, that it depends on whose ox has been gored. I have a hunch that all the talk about closing loopholes depends on whose tax loopholes are being closed, or "looped."

I have received an interesting letter which was prepared in connection with the all New England birthday reception in honor of John F. Kennedy, President of the United States of America. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL NEW ENGLAND BIRTHDAY RECEPTION IN HONOR OF JOHN F. KENNEDY, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APRIL 29, 1961.

GENTLEMEN: On May 29, 1961, President John F. Kennedy will be the guest of his friends at a Presidential birthday dinner given in his honor at the Commonwealth Armory, Boston, Mass., at 7 p.m.

As a leader of Massachusetts industry, it has been suggested that you, by your attendance at the dinner, would appreciate the opportunity to demonstrate your respect and esteem for our distinguished guest on the occasion of his birthday.

Tables of 10 are available for a contribution of $1,000 and individual tickets at $100. An early response is respectfully suggested as tables and seats will be assigned on the basis of the date of return.

The encloure explains the attractive tax deduction aspect for contributors. Any contributions of $500 or more will, on request, be published in the program to comply with the tax deduction provision.

Dress is optional.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. LYNCH,
Chairman, Democratic State Committee.
HOWARD W. FITZPATRICK,
Chairman, Jefferson-Jackson Committee.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

General chairman, John M. Lynch.

Massachusetts: Howard Fitzpatrick, Elizabeth A. Stanton, John B. Hynes.

Maine: Alton E. Lessard, Richard J. Dubord, Mrs. Richard A. Kiah.

New Hampshire: J. Murray Devine, William L. Dunfey, Winifred E. Hartigan.

Vermont: Fred Fayette, William I. Ginsburg, Beatrice P. Schurman.

Rhode Island: John G. McWeeney, James H. Kiernan, Annette Cusson.

Connecticut: John M. Bailey, John M. Golden, Beatrice Holt Rosenthal.

Page ———.

President John F. Kennedy Birthday Dinner Committee,
Boston, Mass.

Contributors of $500 or more, will be allotted space for simple greetings in a souvenir program book to be distributed at the dinner. Corporations, under a Tax Court decision (*Denise Coal Co.*, 29 T.X. 528) may "deduct this amount as an advertising expense."

Will you kindly make reservations for me for the birthday reception tendered President Kennedy on May 29, 1961, at Commonwealth Armory.

Attached is my check in the amount of $ ———.

(Signature)

Table No. —.

(Address)

Contributors of $100 will be assigned one seat.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I desire to stress certain parts of the letter, to demonstrate that if tax loopholes are to be closed, we had better check with the White House. One paragraph reads:

The enclosure explains the attractive tax reduction aspect for contributors. Any contributions of $500 or more will, on request, be published in the program to comply with the tax-deduction provision.

In a box at the bottom of the letter is the following statement:

Contributors of $500 or more will be allotted space for simple greetings in a souvenir program book to be distributed at the dinner.

Mr. President, in Massachusetts it takes $500 to give a simple greeting. In Arizona, $500 would buy the whole book. I suppose in Massachusetts they simply charge a higher fee. For $500, one may say, "Happy birthday, Mr. President"; or for $500 he might say, "Happy birthday, John"; or for another $100 he might be able to say, "Happy birthday, Jack."

Before we finish talking about loopholes, I think the President should explain to his friends in Massachusetts that it is rather embarrassing to the White House and to many of his Democratic friends for them to be pleading with people to take advantage of tax loopholes.

Mr. President, I shall not dwell further upon the loopholes. I shall not even try to crawl into one myself. I might be met by a good many Massachusetts people saying, "Happy birthday, Mr. President."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object—and as the Senator knows, I shall not object—I do not want the remarks of the Senator from Arizona to be interpreted as being anti-advertising, because the Senator from Arizona is a great free enterpriser, and free enterprise rests upon advertising. I simply wish to protect the Senator from Arizona from any misunderstanding or misinterpretation of these rather socialistic remarks which might indicate that he was opposed to free enterprise.

I believe in advertising. I believe the cost of advertising ought to be deductible. I believe it ought to be deductible in Arizona and in Massachusetts. As to the rates, that is something which my free enterprise exponents, who are very adept at explaining the intricacies of free enterprise, will be better able to indicate than will the Senator from Minnesota. But I believe in free enterprise.

There is one other thing I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona, in all good humor. It is possible that the folks in Massachusetts who published the letter may have picked up an all-Republican program from the last Republican Convention, and they got an idea. I have always been suspicious of one who goes around and picks up old programs.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, happily.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I agree that it is, like all good ideas, a Republican idea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's coming around to admit that it is a good idea.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was not criticizing the idea.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I was merely suggesting that the White House might be embarrassed. I have great feeling for my friend in the White House. I do not want to have him embarrassed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I do not want him to be placed in the position of saying, "We are going to close loopholes, but this one will be left open. This one I am in favor of, to be rather honest and take a position."

But as to this being a Republican idea, we have done it for $100, but the Democrats have improved upon it by five

times as much. I wish we were that good.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arizona should stick around with us. We will make him that good. We do not want discriminatory rates as between Republicans and Democrats when it comes to programs. If the Senator wants my candid opinion, I think it is a poor way to raise finances.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am only fearful that if I stay around with the Senator from Minnesota, I will not be able to afford it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is no doubt about the ability of the Senator from Arizona to afford whatever luxury the Senator from Minnesota might be able to afford.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to participate in whatever luxury the Senator from Minnesota may provide, so long as it is not of a pharmaceutical variety.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator from Arizona began his remarks. The last statement I heard the Senator make was a statement with respect to $500. Was the Senator referring to the $500 as a fine or as a philanthropy?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Arizona would be hard put to answer that question, because I think there are some persons who feel that a fine should be imposed for being a member of the Democratic Party; but I think that that in itself is a penance.

A philanthropy? Yes, I think one might consider it as such, if he used the word "philanthropy" in its literal sense, that there are people who need help. Certainly I can think of no group in this country today which needs more help to guide it down some part or other—not all the paths—than the Democratic Party.

Mr. AIKEN. As retarded children?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, not as retarded children. They would be retarded adults. I have great faith in the children of America.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the solicitous attitude toward the Democratic Party is deeply appreciated. There is nothing like an attitude of compassion and mercy, especially when it comes from a Republican. This attitude of repentance and philosophy of conversion is something which touches my heart. I know that when he reads the words of the Senator from Arizona, the President will feel a new sense of strength and unity in our country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If I felt that that would be true, I would repeat what I have said time and again, because the President needs strength. He needs the strength of all of us.

So far as the Senator from Minnesota is concerned, he knows that his welfare is foremost in my heart at all times. We welcome him into our State every fall, so that he can get away from the rush and bustle of Washington and out into that great, free country to enjoy our sunshine, that country where we will share with him everything but our votes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is this attitude of compassion about which I have been hearing so much?

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator from Illinois, I know, was unavoidably detained. The Senator from Arizona was discussing the subject of tax loopholes and was referring to a testimonial dinner given to the President in Massachusetts the other night, on the occasion of the President's 44th birthday anniversary. The letter of invitation encouraged contributors to the dinner to take advantage of a tax loophole. I was simply pointing that out, not to condemn it, but simply to warn—probably "warn" is not the correct word—to advise with my friend in the White House and to say that when he talks about closing tax loopholes, his friends in Massachusetts should not be encouraged to widen them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that is a degree of compassion—when everyone paid $100 for the dinner?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Five hundred dollars—more compassion than we have ever sought in our lives.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, goodness. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the letter has been printed in the RECORD.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Was there no objection to the compassion, or was there no objection to the $500 dinner, or what?

Mr. GOLDWATER. No, there will be no objection to the $500 dinner. The only objection might come in connection with the inconsistency of the Democratic side, when they say to groups such as power companies that they cannot deduct their advertising expenses when they speak out against public power. That is a little inconsistency I found in the remarks of my friend, the Senator from Minnesota, when he accused me of Socialist statements against advertising. I am a great believer in advertising; I do not care how often they use my name, just so long as they spell it correctly. [Laughter.]

But I do not like to have my business told that it cannot deduct for advertising expenses which are purely advertising expenses.

I did not call the Senator's attention to it at that time; I shall discuss it at a later date.

EXCHANGE OF TRACTORS FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in connection with Castro's tractor blackmail deal, I am reminded of a time when a Member of this body attempted to negotiate with a group of Greek shipowners an agreement whereby they would not engage in trade with Iron Curtain countries. He was at the time chairman of the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee; and, as such, he was greatly concerned over the amount of commercial traffic being conducted with governments dedicated to the destruction of our way of life. Regardless of the propriety of the negotiation, it was aimed in a direction which would oppose the growth of communism, in a fashion that made sense to the American people.

But the revelation of these negotiations on the part of an official not connected with the executive branch of the Government brought a great storm of protest and a prompt official reaction. As I recall, Mr. Harold Stassen, then the U.S. mutual security director, told the subcommittee that the negotiations of its chairman, Senator McCarthy, were "in effect, undermining" Government efforts to halt Western trade to Iron Curtain nations. He later changed this, upon the advice of President Eisenhower, to say that the negotiations were "infringing" on the Government's efforts.

This might have led us to wonder, up until last week, why no one in the Government challenged Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, as members of a citizens committee set up to meet Castro's blackmail demand of tractors for lives, of undermining American foreign policy. But now we know why no one connected with the State Department or the Government raised any questions about the action of a group of private citizens in taking a hand in the conduct of foreign affairs. We find that the President himself set up this so-called nonofficial effort to satisfy the demands of the Communist dictator. The very fact that Government officials did not at least accuse the private committee of "meddling" in a matter of great importance to our standing as a Nation is proof enough that President Kennedy has lent the prestige of his office, as well as official sanction, to a venture that most Americans deplore as an out-and-out surrender by a powerful nation to a bush-league Khrushchev.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR PROUTY TO THE VERMONT STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on May 25, my colleague, the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], delivered a very thoughtful and interesting address to the Vermont State Legislature. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR WINSTON L. PROUTY TO THE VERMONT STATE LEGISLATURE MONTPELIER, VT., MAY 25, 1961

Two years ago when I addressed this Assembly the Foreign Ministers' Conference was opening in Geneva.

One year later, exactly a year ago this month, Mr. Khrushchev torpedoed the summit meeting at Paris.

Today, as we meet again, details are being arranged for a meeting of our President and the leader of the Soviet Union next month.

I would be inclined to doubt there is any connection between my visits to Montpelier and the periodic increase in world tensions. However, it is my hope that someday I may be able to address this body and be able to devote the major portion of my remarks entirely to domestic affairs. I have many thoughts concerning the internal affairs of our State and our Nation which I would like to share with you, but first things must come first, and in a time of peril no subject is more important than the security of our Nation. I must, therefore, concentrate primarily on the international situation; that is, the condition of our country in relation to the rest of the world.

I confess that I am something less than enthusiastic over the forthcoming meeting between President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev.

Everyone, I am sure, will agree that talking is to be preferred to shooting. "Let us never fear to negotiate," our President has said, and we agree. Nevertheless, we can ignore the lessons of history only at our peril. And the history of our negotiations with the Soviet Union is a flashing yellow light, warning us to proceed with caution.

Immediately following the election, Khrushchev began to create the impression he was willing and even anxious to reduce world tensions. There were some in the administration, and outside, who seemed inclined to believe him. Perhaps the leopard had changed his spots.

But while the United States and Britain were trying to bring about a cease-fire in Laos, what were the Communists up to? They used 7 weeks of pretending to consider a cease-fire in order to build up the attack on the legal Lao Government. They stalled until their armies had a stranglehold on half the country.

Now, in Geneva, they are stalling again, while they build up the guerrilla forces in South Vietnam from 3,000 to a force of over 10,000.

Now, again, we have heard threats against the security of West Berlin.

If Mr. Khrushchev wanted to reduce tensions in the world he could quickly bring about a settlement of the Lao crisis.

If Mr. Khrushchev wanted to reduce tensions in the world he could stop arming the Vietnam guerrillas.

If Mr. Khrushchev wanted to reduce tensions in the world he could quickly bring about a reasonable nuclear test-ban agreement.

If Mr. Khrushchev wanted to reduce tensions in the world he could stop the threats against West Berlin.

But he does none of these things because he believes it is to Communist advantage to increase world tensions at this time rather than to reduce them.

In such circumstances how can anyone urge anything but caution in a meeting of heads of state?

But at the same time that I urge caution, I also say that we must be prepared to negotiate. I would prefer, however, that such negotiations be carried on through regular diplomatic channels rather than through such public spectacles as summit meetings.

Meetings of heads of state are bound to raise false hopes of peace. While there is always a remote possibility that Soviet tactics may dictate a change of position on this or that particular issue, there is not the slightest possibility that Mr. Kennedy can persuade Mr. Khrushchev to renounce Communist ambitions for world domination. That central decisive issue will remain because the continued existence of free societies cannot be tolerated in the concept of an all-Red world.

Meetings of heads of state, whether it is called a summit meeting or not, especially without previous fruitful negotiations at lower levels, are bound to raise false hopes and inevitably lead to the abyss of disillusionment.

But negotiations at the diplomatic level, on limited areas of common interest, may, at least, provide us with the opportunity to demonstrate to the world our sincere desire for peace. At the same time we may be able to make clear to the non-Communist peoples where rests the blame for continuation of the cold war and the continued fear of hot war.

However, the President of the United States is the architect of our foreign policy. Since he has determined on this meeting with the Soviet head, the American people must, and will, I know, give him unalloyed support. We must back him up, not only in his search for peace, but also with a mature and knowledgeable public opinion which will, first, avoid pressure to surrender vital diplomatic positions to satisfy public demands for agreement, and secondly, which will minimize the dangers of disillusionment when results prove less than hoped for.

Since we are now committed, let us go to this meeting, but let us keep our eyes open.

Let us continue to hope for the best, but let us not be cast down if the best we can get is none too good.

If I sound skeptical of permanent solutions coming out of the meeting at Vienna, it is not because I desire peace less than others who may be more hopeful. It is only that I know peace is indivisible. And the only peace the Communists will recognize, in the long run, is the peace of death which will suffuse the world when they no longer have any opposition.

Until then, the threat of communism is going to continue and there are no signs or portents anywhere that if we shut our eyes it will go away. The conflict will continue though it may change its name and its form. Call it cold war, call it peaceful coexistence or call it hot war, as we are faced with a relentless enemy whose motivating force is, and will remain, a Communist world.

Khrushchev was not kidding when he said, "Your grandchildren will live under communism." He meant it, he believes it, his Marxian dialetical materialistic view of history tells him it is inevitable.

But that same philosophy tells him he must help history along. That is just what he has done and what he must continue to do. That is why today the Red danger is not just in Russia—it is global. It is not just military, it also has worldwide political, economic, scientific, and psychological aspects.

The points of danger are scattered over the globe and may soon even come from outside this globe.

Let us look first at Laos.

Laos may be considered a prelude to Vietnam. And if Vietnam should go the way of Laos, then SEATO could crumble and the whole southeast Asian area down to Singapore would be open to Communist penetration from both Red China and the Soviet Union.

In such a situation, how much longer could India, or Burma, or Thailand, or Cambodia, or Malaya, or even the Philippines, hold out against the pressures of Communist imperialism?

The continent of Africa is a boiling cauldron.

It is seething and churning with internal pressures which have, and which will continue to find, explosive outlets. These conditions furnish fertile soil for the spread of communism.

Cuba is a sad story. Doubtless mistakes were made. The question of our openly aiding the Cuban invaders may have been debatable but once the decision was made every effort should have been concentrated on insuring success. The debacle which resulted has cost us much in prestige and otherwise. Now, in frustration and anger some are advocating an all-out attack in force but it is doubtful that such a move could be justified in the eyes of the world at this time.

However, if Castro, with the help of the Soviet Union and Red China, continue to strengthen his military posture to the point of building missile launching pads, or if he should attempt to take over our base at Guantanamo Bay, there could be only one answer. We would have to move in, in force. I would hope we could do this in cooperation with our neighbors from the Organization of American States, for such Castro action would constitute a direct threat to all of Latin America as well as to ourselves.

Castro's offer of a deal to exchange 1,200 prisoners for 500 American tractors has exposed him before all the world as a cynical, coldblooded dictator of the Hitler stripe.

What has happened to the America that once said proudly with Pinckney, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute"? Has the Nation that threw the bribe demand of Talleyrand back in his face disappeared from the earth?

Castro's offer to exchange 1,200 prisoners for 500 American tractors has exposed him before the world as a cynical, coldblooded dictator of the Hitler stripe. Notwithstanding the humanitarian considerations involved, if we accede to the Castro proposal we shall be tossing the good name of the United States at the feet of a ruthless despot who has gained control of a small country and we would be seen by the world as a weak-kneed, spineless, and impotent people cowering—capitulating—before a mocking and shameful demand.

Who in the world would believe that a nation which prostrates itself before a petty tyrant has the courage to face up to the powerfully backed Khrushchev—or even Mao Tse-tung for that matter.

Let us tell Castro that he will not get 1 cent for tribute—let us tell him he will not get tractors, or any other form of assistance—except under certain conditions—and those conditions will be pronounced by the United States of America.

As a free people, we support genuine social, political, and economic reform wherever they may be developed, but we will not become a partner to immorality of the most sordid order.

The President, in the name of the United States, should not only ask—he should demand—as conditions to any aid we render—as a Government or as a people—that Castro—

1. Release the thousands of political prisoners now languishing in Cuban jails.

2. Permit religious and political freedom.

3. Renounce communism and deport all agents of Soviet Russia and Red China.

4. Hold an election under the supervision of representatives of the Organization of American States.

5. Make restitution on a reasonable basis for American and other foreign property expropriated by the Cuban Government.

Should Castro fulfill these conditions, we could then consider the question of economic and technological assistance.

If Castro refuses to comply, it will become unmistakably clear that he is determined to maintain Cuba as a bastion of communism in the Western Hemisphere. Such a threat to the United States as well as to all Latin American nations can and must be thoroughly checked.

Doubtless many in Latin America, who were taken in by Castro's claim to have only social-revolutionary aims, now see him in a clear white light. We certainly hope so, for in any anti-Castro move we should have the support of our Latin American neighbors.

Throughout Latin America, almost as much as in Africa, there is long-overdue need

for social development, economic progress, land settlement, public education, low-cost housing, health programs, low interest rates, and other measures to raise the general standard of living. After four centuries of conquest, colonization, and exploitation, the people of these countries are awakening to the challenge of modern life. It has been called the revolution of rising expectations.

In all these countries, the agents of communism exploit the widespread poverty, the illiteracy, the social unrest, the political instability, the absence of a solid middle class, and the chronic anti-Americanism of the people.

With Castro acting as an advance agent for communism in this hemisphere, we can expect this exploitation to be increased.

Yet, as the recent Canadian-American communique stated, we recognize that any Latin American alliance with foreign communism constitutes a direct threat to the peaceful evolution of democratic freedom and economic progress of all the nations of the Americas.

While the Senate only recently approved the spending of $500 million for the first phase of the President's "Alliance for Progress," we know now that money is not enough. The old idea of foreign aid as a means of making other countries more like us, or like us more, is no longer adequate if it ever was.

Along with our dollars, we must bring hope of a better way of life for the "campasinos"—the shirtless ones. We must help them realize their hope of acquiring the dignity of man and the brotherhood of equals.

Berlin continues to be another source of danger. Only the other day, Khrushchev again threatened to pull out. At the recent NATO meeting in Oslo, the Western Powers foresaw that before the year is up, Russia may sign a separate peace treaty with East Germany. That would turn over to the Russian puppet government of East Germany—which the West does not recognize—control of American, British, and French access routes to West Berlin.

At the Oslo meeting the NATO Powers agreed that if East Germany attempted to cut off those access routes, that attempt would be met with force in order to maintain the freedom of West Berlin's more than 2 million people.

Now South Korea, which many considered stable as to its internal government, has exploded. What effect this change will have on our relations with this country, into which we have poured so many millions of dollars, it is too early yet to be able to know. We do know, however, that for some time Korea will continue to constitute another danger point on the map of the world.

The negotiations on banning atomic tests and on disarmament blow hot and cold. If the Russians feel the need to allay suspicions, they make a minor concession. If they feel the time is ripe to get tough, they add a condition. But will they ever agree to that which is basic to any agreement to limit armaments or to refrain from testing atomic weapons; namely, a foolproof system of inspection and control? Not, it is now obvious, as long as they have something to hide.

Nevertheless, we should make one last desperate effort to persuade the Russians that it is in their own interests, as well as ours, to reach agreement on the banning of nuclear testing. Perhaps the President can convince Khrushchev of this. If this, too, fails, then I can see no course open to us but to resume the underground testing of atomic weapons, dangerous as that may be. While we have been waiting patiently for agreement, who knows how many tests the Soviets may have conducted in secret?

Perhaps at the summit meeting the President can make Khrushchev understand, despite his reported top dog feeling, that while we have repeatedly and sincerely stated that we would not take any preventive warlike actions, the patience of the American people and those of the free world is not inexhaustible. Perhaps he can make him comprehend that he is playing with fire, especially if he continues to subject the free peoples to ever-increasing pressures.

What do all these danger points add up to for you and me and the rest of us Americans? It adds up to a world in which, while hoping for the best, we must be prepared for the worst. It means that we, as a Nation and as individuals, must face up to the massive problems which confront us. These problems are not only military. They are also economic. They are also technological. They are also social. And they are also psychological.

On all these fronts, we are being challenged in a period of scientific and intellectual explosion unparalleled in human history. While it is true that in the world's population the headhunters still outnumber the scientists, those who challenge us have the human and material resources, the vitality, and the drive to surpass us. And they surely will, if we remain wedded to the status quo.

To meet a challenge of such magnitude we must be prepared to sacrifice some of our business-as-usual attitudes, some of our comfort and leisure and easygoing ways.

In his inaugural address the President eloquently said: "Ask not what America can do for you; ask rather what you can do for America." However, it has not been spelled out what sacrifices are needed. The President, by the very prestige of his position, can call on the American people and they will answer the summons. But he alone is in the position to make such a summons.

One of the most important fields in which we must make rapid progress is education. I have and I will continue to support legislation for funds for education. However, I am not one who believes we aid education simply by adding schoolrooms and raising teacher salaries. I proposed an amendment to the administration school assistance bill to enable the States to make use of Federal funds also for operating expenses or maintenance in accordance with their own needs and laws. Under Public Laws 874 and 815, the States which had crowded schools because of Government activity were able to handle Federal funds without Federal control and I believe this is the way to handle any Federal funds for education.

I am glad that the Senate saw fit to adopt, by a vote of 51 to 39, my freedom of choice amendment which, as I have said, allows the States to determine for themselves how the Federal grant money shall be spent on elementary and secondary education. Many of those who opposed the amendment apparently thought the Federal Government should determine how the money should be used.

I am also very happy that Senator AIKEN and I were able to assist actively in the defeat of a major amendment (the Cooper amendment) which would have caused a loss to Vermont of some $700,000 in Federal funds.

The Cooper amendment would have been injurious to Vermont because it failed to take into consideration that the State is one not populated, generally, by people with high personal incomes. It would have included Vermont with the wealthiest States and would have apportioned Federal funds on the same pro rata basis as the richer States.

I must admit, however, that we seem too prone to think that all we have to do to solve our problems is make another appropriation.

Without energy, will, talent, creative imagination, inspiration, and plain hard work, money will solve none of our problems.

It seems to me that in the whole fields of education—from kindergarten through graduate school—we need to revamp our aims and our methods. In the words of Education Commissioner Sterling McMurrin: "All too often we have sacrificed excellence for a large measure of mediocrity, because we have been unwilling to pay the price that excellence demands—rigor, discipline, and genuinely hard work."

And in this day and age our Nation can afford nothing less in the field of education than the pursuit of excellence.

I am not advocating, as some have done, that we scrap all courses except mathematics and science because we are in an age of scientific advancement. No; we need the humanities, too. We are not machines, we are men. And along with the knowledge of how to make and operate machines, we need to know how to appreciate the gift of life and all its wonders and how to thank the Deity for them. It is not enough to know how to make an atomic bomb. We have to know enough not to use it unless we have to.

What I am advocating is a change of attitude and direction. If education is important to our survival as a people, then we must be willing to raise the profession of teaching to the stature it deserves. Only when teaching receives the esteem of the community as an honored profession will it become attractive to enough talented and dedicated people to make a difference.

If we need more and better teaching, we also need new curricula, especially in the primary and secondary schools. I read of a school recently that concentrates on the 3 R's. It has no athletic teams, no baton twirlers, no dancing classes, and no courses in life adjustment. Its students, nevertheless, are way ahead of others of comparable age.

I believe our students are capable of doing better than they do, but most do only enough to get by because more is not demanded of them, either in school or at home. We have wasted the talent and energy of countless persons who should have been educated to higher levels of skills and knowledge. And we can ill afford such waste.

Of course, education is just one of our many problems. I wish there were time to discuss the others at equal length. However, I believe I have said enough to make it clear that we have many problems to solve and much work to do. We cannot rest on our laurels, we cannot expect the status to remain quo. We live today in a world in which the globe has become smaller because our rate of speed has become fantastically faster.

In considering the dangers which confront us we now have to think in global terms and in terms of hours instead of months or years. The next world war, if humanity is foolish enough to permit it to happen, will undoubtedly end the day it begins.

Someone has described the condition of our earth as analogous to a 25-foot cellar, three-quarters of which is flooded and the rest of which is occupied by 16 armed and hungry occupants. In this wet cellar the American occupies a dry area equivalent to a 6-by-2-foot plot on which he controls about half the food and other good things of life desperately desired by all the armed occupants of the cellar.

That is a graphic, if alarming, description of the situation we find ourselves in today. It is by no means a hopeless situation but it is one which requires, first of all, realization of our condition, and thereafter wisdom, fortitude, sacrifice, cooperation, and plenty of good hard work.

Believe me, with all its shortcomings, what we now have is worth all that and more. May God grant us all we need to preserve it.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND TAX COURT APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 5954) was passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed by Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KUCHEL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] on the handling and the management of this important appropriation bill and on the splendid work which was done by the subcommittee the Senator from Virginia headed, and also by the Senator from Virginia himself. It was a fine job; and I know I speak for the majority leader and for the entire Senate when I say, "Well done," and thank the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I appreciate those kind words.

DEMISE OF A DICTATOR

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, although no one can rejoice in an assassination, an act of political murder, the death of Trujillo may ultimately open new doors of freedom and opportunity for the long-suffering peoples of the Dominican Republic. The immediate indication is that Trujillo's lieutenants are firmly in control. Their very success in concealing the assassination for some 19 hours makes this fairly clear.

But it is certainly the hope of the people of America, and of the peoples of the whole Western Hemisphere, that a new era will be possible in the Dominican Republic, an era of increasing personal freedom and of orderly economic growth. The United States should certainly take all possible steps to encourage such an evolution and to assist it as much as can be done.

The real danger in the situation, however, seems to be that there will be created a power vacuum in which the influence and ambitions of Fidel Castro many find ample scope for troublemaking and subversion. This could take place in many different ways. The rapprochement which was becoming evident between Cuba and the Dominican Republic during the last days of Trujillo revealed most dramatically how close dictatorships can become, whether they are dictatorships of the right or of the left. A closer alliance between Castro and Trujillo's successor, combined perhaps with a somewhat different ideological pitch from the Dominicans, is not only any more inconceivable than the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact of 1939.

The other great danger, of course, is that there may develop a condition of anarchy in which Castro's trusties or Communist agents directed by Moscow may try to find a road to power for themselves. For the Dominican people this would be a worse fate than even the tyranny of Trujillo.

If there should be any move in either of these directions, if there should be any hint of further Dominican rapprochement with Castro, or if there should be any suggestion of a Fidelista or Communist movement in the Dominican Republic, it would be imperative for the Organization of American States or the United States to take a firm stand and to hold off the export of Castroism to Cuba's Dominican neighbors.

Mr. President, it would be wise to urge an immediate meeting of the Organization of American States. At such a meeting serious consideration should be given to sending a token force of the Organization of American States, to be landed in the Dominican Republic, to indicate united hemispheric interest in the establishment of a more democratic government and in orderly political and economic progress for the Dominican people. In the past the Organization of American States has condemned the Trujillo dictatorship. Now it has an unrivaled opportunity to take positive action to help stabilize the situation in this troubled country and to assist in setting up a government which will serve the true interests of the Dominican people.

PRESIDENT'S FARM BILL IN TROUBLE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an articulate and thoughtful constituent of mine, Mr. Richard C. Hayden, of Sodus Point, N.Y., has written a very persuasive letter to the editor of the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle opposing the administration's new farm program. Commenting on the already high degree of governmental control over agriculture, Mr. Hayden suggests that if other industries got this much assistance, there would be nothing left that the private citizen could do for himself.

I share the sentiments expressed by Mr. Hayden. The administration's omnibus farm bill threatens to turn over more complete power to the Secretary of Agriculture than has ever been assigned to a President, or to a member of his official family. It would take away from the Congress its constitutional and inherent authority to determine basic national policy.

Mr. President, the President's farm bill is in trouble in the Congress, and rightly so. The President has given us the knife, and now he expects us to stick it in ourselves. Understandably, the Congress is not about to comply.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that we will be able this session to focus our efforts in the Congress on sound agriculture legislation to help free the taxpayer from the huge cost of Government subsidies and to permit the farmer to stand up for himself and make his own decisions.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at the end of my remarks, a copy of the above referred to letter from Mr. Hayden, which clearly and accurately reflects the sentiments of many New Yorkers who have recently written to me strongly protesting the President's farm bill. I refer not only to consumers in urban areas, but to farmers as well. New York's agricultural community recognizes that further and more intensive governmental control is no remedy. One cannot cure a broken arm by cutting it off and giving it to someone else.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARM SUBSIDIES HIKE PRICE OF GROCERIES

President Kennedy is giving the farmers a free hand in shaping up of the so-called farm program.

The other day I read that nearby farmers were gathering to sign up for their checks for not raising corn.

If in my struggles to educate and meet the expenses of raising my four daughters I could afford a toupee I am sure it would have flipped at the disclosure of this news.

Farming today is a business like many other small enterprises. These other small enterprises stand on their own two feet, take their chances and don't expect someone to throw them life preservers every time the wind comes up. If we are going to subsidize one group let's be fair about it and subsidize everybody engaged in business.

The farm program in this country is costing 9 billion a year and I think it is high time the people took a look at this expenditure and add it to their grocery bill which is where the biggest share of it belongs.

No group of businessmen in the country receives the help in operating their enterprises that the farmer does. Newspapers, magazines, and radio are continually telling them how to operate efficiently and the Government is supporting prices or paying them not to raise certain crops. What other taxpaying businessman gets this kind of help?

If we have too many gasoline stations in any one neighborhood and the business is not there somebody folds up. The Government doesn't come running to bail him out of his troubles.

RICHARD C. HAYDEN.

UTILIZATION OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES TO ASSIST NEEDY PEOPLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 262, Senate bill 1720.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1720) to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have cleared this bill with the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER]. It is a matter which falls within the jurisdiction of that committee, as well as the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was moved out of that committee unanimously.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the bill has also been cleared with the minority. I would suggest to the acting majority leader that the appropriate portions of the report with respect to the bill be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I was about to make that request. I make that unanimous-consent request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the extract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of S. 1720 is to continue the authority contained in title II of Public Law 480 to use grants of surplus agricultural commodities for purposes of promoting economic development in underdeveloped countries. This authority is due to expire on June 30, 1961.

S. 1720 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on April 27, 1961, and considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations in executive session on May 25. The prepared statement of Herbert J. Waters, special assistant to the Director of the International Cooperation Administration, is appended to this report. The committee voted without objection to report the bill favorably to the Senate.

The committee received reports in support of S. 1720 from the Departments of State and Agriculture which are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 25, 1961.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In compliance with your request of May 4, 1961, the Department of State has reviewed S. 1720, to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world, which was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on April 27, 1961.

We fully support the purposes of this bill which would enable the administration to continue and expand the utilization of our agricultural abundance in helping needy people in the less developed countries through development programs which are not feasible under title I of the act. Food can be used for payment of wages-in-kind for labor intensive projects such as soil conservation dams, irrigation, and drainage canals, wells, roads, and other similar activities. This would relieve hunger and unemployment and at the same time contribute to economic development of the recipient country.

Provisions to carry out these purposes are contained in title II of S. 1643 introduced in response to the President's request for legislation to carry out the principal recommendations of his message to the Congress on March 16, 1961, on agriculture. The Department, therefore, recommends that consideration of S. 1720 be deferred, pending action on S. 1643.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that from the standpoint of the administration's program, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR FULBRIGHT: This is in response to your request for the comments of the Department on S. 1720, to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

S. 1720 would repeal section 601(a)(2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 which limits to June 30, 1961, an amendment of title II of Public Law 480 which broadened the authority to use commodities to meet the requirements of needy people and to promote economic development. The authority to undertake other title II programs expires on December 31, 1961.

The Department favors the purposes of S. 1720 and has recommended repeal of section 601(a)(2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 in the proposed Agricultural Act of 1961 (S. 1643). The Department proposal would also extend all title II programs through December 31, 1966.

The broadened authority of title II has been implemented by using CCC commodities as part payment of wages in localized work projects in underdeveloped areas with the remainder of the wages being paid in cash by the host government. The authority has been extremely useful in funding such projects as land clearing, irrigation and drainage ditches, feeder roads, and schools. These programs are particularly suitable for areas in Africa and the Near East where there are large numbers of people who are underemployed and underfed.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of this report from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1720) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 601(a)(2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1960 is hereby repealed.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND RAW MATERIALS RESERVE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 263, Senate Resolution 128.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 128) relative to the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that pertinent portions of the report relating to the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 128 is brief and reads as follows:

"*Resolved,* That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should explore with other nations the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve under the auspices of the United Nations and related international organizations for the purpose of acquiring and storing in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials, exclusive of minerals, with a view to their use in—

"(1) preventing extreme price fluctuations in the international market in these commodities;

"(2) preventing famine and starvation;

"(3) helping absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials (exclusive of minerals);

"(4) economic and social development programs formulated in cooperation with other appropriate international agencies.

"Participation by the United States in such an international food and raw materials reserve shall be contingent upon statutory authorization or treaty approval, as may be appropriate."

Senate Resolution 128 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY on April 27, 1961. It contains substantially the same language as that agreed to by the Senate twice before: First, as an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1956 which, however, was deleted in conference; and second, as Senate Concurrent Resolution 116, which was the result of President Eisenhower's request of August 8, 1960, for a resolution endorsing a proposal, which was subsequently presented in October 1960 to the General Assembly, to make greater use of the combined agricultural abundance of all nations to feed the hungry of the world.

On May 26, in executive session, the committee ordered the resolution reported favorably to the Senate. It was the committee's belief that the Senate's continued interest in the exploration of imaginative ways of utilizing our surplus agricultural commodities will be demonstrated by the adoption of Senate Resolution 128.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I note for the RECORD that this measure is identical with the measure which was adopted last year on the same subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is an agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 128) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President should explore with other nations the establishment of an international food and raw materials reserve under the auspices of the United Nations and related international organizations for the purpose of acquiring and storing in appropriate countries raw or processed farm products and other raw materials, exclusive of minerals, with a view to their use in—

(1) preventing extreme price fluctuations in the international market in these commodities;

(2) preventing famine and starvation;

(3) helping absorb temporary market surpluses of farm products and other raw materials (exclusive of minerals);

(4) economic and social development programs formulated in cooperation with other appropriate international agencies.

Participation by the United States in such an international food and raw materials reserve shall be contingent upon statutory authorization or treaty approval, as may be appropriate.

WHITE FLEET TO RENDER EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE IN CASE OF DISASTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 264, Senate Resolution 154.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 154) relative to the establishment of a White Fleet designed to render emergency assistance to people of other nations in case of disaster.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I know of the deep interest, and the early interest, which was manifested by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] when this fleet was created. While he is not presently in the Chamber, I think I should request for him at this point permission for him to insert a statement in the RECORD with reference to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, the Senator from Vermont is one of the prime movers in this matter. It has been my privilege to join with him as a cosponsor of the measure.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I am happy to support Senate Resolution 154, which encourages the President to establish a White Fleet for the purpose of rendering emergency aid to distressed people anywhere in the world and also to carry out technical assistance on a continuing basis in the developing nations of the world.

Last year, Mr. President, there was launched the Project Hope, a mercy ship supported by the contributions of the American people.

The success of this project has been phenomenal. Everywhere that the *Hope* has been it has lived up to its name. Grateful people from far distant places attest to this.

The sponsors of Project Hope are entitled to our deepest appreciation.

Under the White Fleet contributions of material, money, and services can still be made.

Not only will the establishment of this fleet bring with it a vast amount of good will, but it will also bring to us the satisfaction of having done a bit more to alleviate the suffering of people of other lands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a portion of the report which relates to the resolution, as well as a brief statement by me, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the extracts and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Resolution 154 reads as follows:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

"(a) Whenever the President determines it to be in the national interest, in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and consistent with the laws of the United States, he should take such action as may be required to provide for establishment of a White Fleet designed and equipped (1) to render prompt emergency aid and assistance to peoples of the coastal regions of other nations upon the occurrence of famine, epidemic disease, earthquake, flood, hurricane, or other disaster; and (2) to carry out technical assistance and training on a continuing basis in the developing nations of the world.

"(b) Such fleet should be established through the restoration to active service and the equipment of suitable vessels of the United States now mothballed in storage, such vessels to be operated by appropriate nonprofit, private, philanthropic organizations of the United States devoted to providing emergency aid and assistance to relieve human suffering.

"(c) The vessels of such fleet should be suitably identified to proclaim their peaceful and beneficent purposes.

"(d) Fuel and operational supplies, port, repair, and navigational facilities of the United States throughout the world should be made available to such vessels in support of their activities.

"(e) Surplus food commodities of the United States should be utilized for the relief of hunger, and for furnishing medical and other supplies required for the use of the White Fleet.

"(f) The cooperation of private charitable organizations of the United States should be utilized for the furnishing of clothing and other relief supplies to meet the emergency needs of inhabitants of regions to which task groups of the fleet may be directed."

S. 324 was introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CAPEHART on January 10, 1961. The committee considered the bill in executive session on May 25 and 26 and agreed to report the substance of S. 324 in the form of a Senate resolution. Authority to establish a White Fleet is already generally contained in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended.

The committee's purpose in asking the Senate to express itself in favor of such an action is to stress the Senate's belief that such an undertaking would be in the national interest, as the operation of Project Hope has clearly demonstrated.

The original sponsors together with Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CAPEHART have endorsed Senate Resolution 154, which was introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY on May 26, 1961. The committee hopes that the Senate will lend its support to this resolution.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

The Senate is being asked to consider Senate Resolution 154, a resolution designed to express the sense of the Senate that it supports the establishment by the President of a White Fleet—a force of mercy ships ready to rush assistance to disaster areas in any coastal region of the world, as well as to carry on a regular program of logistics support in the field of public health and other works of technical assistance.

The call for a White Fleet was first made in 1959, and again last year. Throughout the country, and indeed, throughout the world, interest and enthusiasm have been rising in support of the White Fleet concept.

Each year, coastal regions of the world are struck by the most terrible catastrophes—earthquakes, tidal waves, hurricanes, typhoons. And American assistance through our Armed Forces has been generously sent to assist in the rescue and rehabilitation work. Our private voluntary agencies and church groups have always rallied magnificently to bring relief to the victims of disaster.

In the great Chilean disaster of last spring, the U.S. Government joined the voluntary agencies and contingents from other nations in bringing help to the stricken Chilean people. But, as in every other disaster, what we and our friends were able to do in Chile was hastily improvised, less than we would have been able to furnish with adequate planning, and far more expensive.

I would hope, that a White Fleet Command could be established, staffed by representatives of the U.S. Government, to serve as area and local commanders in those parts of the world where disasters strike with frequency and severity. These White Fleet commanders would have the assignment of preparing contingency plans for dealing with all types of disasters and, in the event of disaster, of assuming operational control of all U.S. personnel, equipment, vehicles and ships—including specially designated vessels stationed in the area as units of the White Fleet itself.

The sponsors of the White Fleet resolution do not have in mind the creation of any large, permanent fleet of vessels, but rather the rehabilitation of a relatively small fleet of multipurpose vessels from the Navy mothball fleet, to be regularly operated largely by private voluntary organizations in missions of public health and education. It is the idea of the principal sponsor of the resolution that these vessels could be placed on permanent call by the various area White Fleet commanders, to be detached from their training missions and utilized in disaster relief when disaster strikes.

Such vessels and small craft, hopefully characterized by a distinctive color and symbol, would serve as constant reminders in the large and small ocean ports and river towns of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, of the humanitarianism of the United States.

These vessels and small craft might very well be utilized to help provide the logistics support for units of the U.S. Peace Corps, for other missions of technical assistance, and for multilateral efforts in which the United States would be joined. They could move personnel and supplies, serve as floating bases for expeditions of mercy and training working inland from the coast, and as training centers in the ports themselves.

Wherever a ship or small craft or vehicle based from a White Fleet ship would go, its distinctive insignia would represent America's continuing purpose to bring healing and enlightment to our fellow men.

And when disasters strike, as they always and regularly do, the units of the White Fleet could be pulled into action by the White Fleet commander, on schedule, on plan—integrated with the Armed Forces

units sent to serve their disaster relief missions under the local commander.

The White Fleet idea is actively under consideration in Japan, in England, in Germany, Italy, and Belgium, among others, where there is great interest in activating White Fleet units to coordinate with the American White Fleet.

I urge approval of Senate Resolution 154, and I hope that passage of this resolution will encourage the President of the United States to take active steps within his existing authority, to initiate the White Fleet Command and to outfit the first units of the White Fleet itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors of the measure be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CLARK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HART, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. PELL, and Mr. CAPEHART.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to amendment.

If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 154) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(a) Whenever the President determines it to be in the national interest, in furtherance of the foreign policy of the United States, and consistent with the laws of the United States, he should take such action as may be required to provide for establishment of a White Fleet designed and equipped (1) to render prompt emergency aid and assistance to peoples of the coastal regions of other nations upon the occurrence of famine, epidemic disease, earthquake, flood, hurricane, or other disaster; and (2) to carry out technical assistance and training on a continuing basis in the developing nations of the world.

(b) Such fleet should be established through the restoration to active service and the equipment of suitable vessels of the United States now mothballed in storage, such vessels to be operated by appropriate nonprofit, private, philanthropic organizations of the United States devoted to providing emergency aid and assistance to relieve human suffering.

(c) The vessels of such fleet should be suitably identified to proclaim their peaceful and beneficent purposes.

(d) Fuel and operational supplies, port, repair, and navigational facilities of the United States throughout the world should be made available to such vessels in support of their activities.

(e) Surplus food commodities of the United States should be utilized for the relief of hunger, and for furnishing medical and other supplies required for the use of the White Fleet.

(f) The cooperation of private charitable organizations of the United States should be utilized for the furnishing of clothing and other relief supplies to meet the emergency needs of inhabitants of regions to which task groups of the fleet may be directed.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY AMBASSADOR R. S. S. GUNEWARDENE AND MEMBERS OF THE PARLIAMENT OF CEYLON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we are honored today by the presence of distinguished members of the fellow democratic country of Ceylon. We have present on the floor, in the rear of the Chamber, the distinguished Ambassador from Ceylon, Mr. R. S. S. Gunewardene, who has represented Ceylon in the United States for a number of years.

We also have present the Honorable Charles Percival de Silva, Minister of Agriculture, leader of the House, and a Member of Parliament for Minneriya.

Also with him are his colleagues, the Honorable Sir Razik Fareed, Member of Parliament for Colombo;

The Honorable Nanayakkarapathirage Martin Perera, Member of Parliament for Yatiyantota;

The Honorable Jinadasa Don Weerasekera, Member of Parliament for Kotagala;

Mr. Ralph St. Louis Peiris Deraniyagala, Clerk of the House.

We have just had the honor of having these gentlemen to luncheon with the Committee on Foreign Relations. We are extremely pleased that they have had the opportunity to visit our Congress. We all welcome them. We look forward to our continued fine relations with them in the future as we have had in the past. [Applause, Senators rising.]

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order No. 252, Senate bill 1922. I see the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the housing bill is now the pending business. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There will be statements made in connection with that bill later. At this time I wish to proceed to another matter.

PEACE CORPS ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier today I introduced, on behalf of myself and the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the bill (S. 2000) to establish a Peace Corps of American volunteers to carry America's skills and talents and idealism abroad to help other peoples help themselves.

The word "peace" is a noble, stirring word—one that rightfully belongs to those who value human dignity and liberty. For too long we have permitted others to distort and to cheapen this word.

"Peace" is not a propaganda word. It is not merely an expression for the absence of war. Peace is an active, living concept—it carries with it the promise of broader opportunities for health, for knowledge, for self-expression among individuals and peoples.

The Peace Corps is designed to provide the framework through which America's idealism, her humanitarianism, and her generosity can find a personal expression in the task of helping to build with our own hands a better world for all mankind.

To work in a highly personal way for peace, to work for the eradication of disease, for the stamping out of illiteracy, for the elimination of hunger—this is the opportunity which volunteers for the Peace Corps have been so eagerly seeking. These men and women seek a more personal involvement in the task of building a more peaceful world than our older forms of foreign assistance could give them.

The Peace Corps volunteers are in tune with our President, who has spoken of sacrifices to be made for the welfare of our Nation. They agree with him that our American assistance programs overseas must go more directly to the heart of the matter—that they must get at the roots of turmoil and violence—which are poverty, illiteracy, disease, and hunger.

And these young men and women are eager to demonstrate that America, with all its pride and power and luxury, has a warm heart and a ready hand of fellowship.

These shirt-sleeved idealists, these working and thinking young men and women now volunteering years of their lives in the service of their country will show a face of America that too few peoples of other lands have yet seen.

A NEW EMPHASIS

In a most dramatic way, too, the Peace Corps demonstrates the renewed American intention to stake our treasure and our energies on programs that are for something, rather than against. It is not sufficient to build anti-Communist programs; this is a bankrupt policy. The President of the United States has brilliantly expressed the American will and purpose to support plans and programs that are for reform and progress and for a better life for the masses of the people.

President Kennedy has announced to the world our intention to encourage and to foster the social, economic, and political reforms that will mean better lives for the common people of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—of the whole world. The whole emphasis of the aid program is on programs which will directly benefit the families and individuals in the villages, in the cities, and in the country.

The Peace Corps will be one expression of this new, more people-oriented concept of American overseas assistance, the

act of a friendly nation interested in human progress.

Peace Corps volunteers will concentrate in several areas of effort—teaching to read and write, instructing in basic agricultural and industrial techniques, providing technical skills in sanitation, health, community development, public administration, and engineering.

They will teach. They will cure. They will build. They will seek to plant their own skills among the men and women with whom they work—thus sowing the seeds of stronger, abler societies.

In the Peace Corps the United States will be putting forth a body of men and women who represent the finest in the American tradition—highly selected, skilled, emotionally mature, yet also passionately dedicated to the principles of democracy and free institutions.

The Peace Corps will be, and should be, an elite corps, in the sense that it represents the finest of our people. We want to send out our very best, and indeed, the demands on the Peace Corps volunteers will be so extraordinary that only the very best will be able to accomplish their assignments. Yes, it should be an elite, and one in which any American will be proud to serve.

FORERUNNER EFFORTS

Other Americans have pioneered the work of the Peace Corps. Private voluntary organizations and religious groups have been doing similar work for years. The work of the corps is not new nor is its concept new. But the scope of the work is importantly new. As Justice Holmes once said in a Supreme Court decision: "A difference in degree becomes a difference in kind."

So it is with the Peace Corps. The needs of the world are so staggering that we must significantly broaden the invaluable work which has already been done by nongovernmental agencies.

One of the dynamic sources of revolution in the world today is the fact that the rich nations are getting richer and the poor nations are getting poorer. We must do all we can to lessen and to close the gap—not by pulling down the more prosperous, but by building up the less fortunate.

But in doing this more is needed than injections of cash and highlevel technical advisers. Our foreign aid money has sometimes been badly invested because, after having developed sensible and elaborate project plans, we have discovered that the operational skills to carry out the program have been lacking in the host countries. Our Peace Corps volunteers will not only provide those skills, but they will also train others in the host country in those skills, so that we can hope for a multiplier effect.

But of course these volunteers will be bringing more than their skills. In earlier programs, when we have sent people to other countries, they usually have taken their American standard of living with them. Now, for the first time, we will send relatively large numbers of talented, trained, physically fit, spiritually and mentally fit, dedicated Americans who will not simply act as high-level governmental advisers, but will press in to the more remote areas, living simply and communicating with the people in their own languages.

One very important byproduct of the Peace Corps program can be the creation of a rich and enduring mutual understanding between the people we are trying to help and ourselves.

Shortly before he left for his trip to Africa and Asia, Mr. Robert Sargent Shriver, the able Director of the Peace Corps, received the following excerpts from an article by the Vietnamese Ambassador in Washington:

> The Peace Corps is an admirable and powerful idea. It is an idea force, an idea which can move people and raise mountains. Why? Because it is based on true charity which is above all donation of one's self. That is why their effectiveness will transcend * * * will be much greater than the services they may render.

Those are eloquent words, Mr. President.

As an American, I wish to thank the Vietnamese Ambassador.

The words clearly suggest the ideal that has motivated thousands of persons to volunteer for the Peace Corps—"true charity is above all the donation of one's self."

The Peace Corps represents a giving of one's self. It represents true sacrifice, not merely the giving of money but also the giving of mind, or body, of spirit, and of ability.

Peace Corps volunteers will speak two languages—their own language and the language of the host country. But as someone has put it, they will be trilingual—they will speak the language of common concern. And I would suggest that the last language is the most important of all.

In short, they will actively demonstrate that America cares, that America's goals for the developing countries are identical with their own goals. Peace Corps volunteers will help to restore that image that belongs to us and not to the totalitarians—to Russia—that of being the world's No. 1 revolutionary power.

I was pleased the other evening when our President said that the word "revolution" did not frighten him, that he did not shake or quiver when he heard the word "revolution," for we are the revolutionaries.

But speaking the language of concern, the volunteers will show that we fully associate ourselves with the revolutionary drive for a better way of life and for a healthy, functioning body politic.

There will be other valuable by-products of this great experience. The Peace Corps would be worth while, only from the standpoint of what it will do for America, for we, as a people, are appallingly ignorant about Africa, Asia, and Latin America. With friends and relatives serving in places like Tanganyika and Colombia, we Americans will become more knowledgeable, more sensitized to the hopes, aspirations, and problems of the emerging nations.

Mr. President, today the Senate had a visit from parliamentarians from Ceylon. This visit, and others like it, bring us into closer contact with and give us a better understanding of the people of other countries, of their traditions, their institutions, their countries and their histories.

The volunteers in the Peace Corps will bring back to America a rich and rewarding understanding of the world in which we live.

This may be the greatest contribution, because if there is any one failure today in America, if there is any one weakness in America relating to our foreign policy, it is that the foreign policy comes from a Government without a full understanding either of the objectives or of the means being used to fulfill the foreign policy—and, even more significantly, a lack of understanding on the part of millions of our people as to the areas of the world to which the foreign policy is directed.

Yes, we will build up a significant reservoir of young people skilled in one of the remote languages and knowledgeable about the new areas, from which our Foreign Service, information program, and aid administration can draw for professional careerists.

The Secretary of State sees great benefits to our Nation from the establishment of a Peace Corps. This he has stated in testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations. At that time, the Secretary briefly outlined the background and the prospects for the Peace Corps as seen by the Department of State.

Mr. President, before I proceed to a discussion of the details of the bill itself, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a statement by the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, on the prospect of a permanent Peace Corps.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK

The President on March 1 sent to the Congress a message recommending the establishment of a permanent Peace Corps through which skilled American men and women could be sent overseas, either by the U.S. Government or through private organizations and institutions, to help foreign countries meet their urgent needs for trained manpower.

The Peace Corps grows out of the crying need of the underdeveloped nations for men and women to do work for which they themselves lack skilled people; to teach in their schools, to survey roads, to work in community development projects, to introduce modern methods in agriculture and sanitation, and to perform scores of other services.

In addition to this unfulfilled need, there also exists in this country a desire on the part of increasing numbers of Americans to serve abroad in the greatest task our lifetime will see, the development of some threescore nations in all parts of the world.

The idea for combining this need with this desire originated here in the Congress with Members of both Houses. This congressional interest led to the enactment of a provision in the Mutual Security Act of 1960, which called for a study of the means by which this idea could be realized.

The Peace Corps has now had 3 months of existence. In this time, a number of pilot programs have been explored and developed. Projects in Tanganyika, Colombia,

and the Philippines have already been announced, and others will be announced soon. The Peace Corps has also begun to recruit and prepare intensive training for the American men and women who will participate in these activities this year.

Practical experience thus far, the studies which have been made, and the extensive advice submitted by universities, voluntary agencies, student groups, labor unions, and business and professional organizations—all strongly supporting this new endeavor in the cause of peace—have provided the information upon which proposals for legislation may now be made.

It is intended under the proposed legislation that the Peace Corps continue as an agency in the Department of State and that it will be headed by a director who will have the rank of an Assistant Secretary of State. Mr. Robert Sargent Shriver, Jr., the Director of the Peace Corps, and others will appear before you to discuss the proposed legislation and program.

We have already found that the governments and peoples of many countries are enthusiastically receptive to the idea of help from the Peace Corps. Eager and able young Americans, men and women, are coming forward to serve.

The young men and women we send abroad will learn as much as they give. The Peace Corps offers us an opportunity to show to the peoples of the world the picture of eager, skilled, pioneering men and women willing to work hard, side by side with peoples of other lands, in common tasks. The good which can come of this—in terms of furthering world peace and understanding and making clearer to the world what the United States really is and what it sincerely desires—can be immense.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR THE CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, from the moment early last year that I first publicly discussed the idea of a Peace Corps, the reaction has been overwhelming. When Congressman HENRY REUSS and our late colleague, Senator Richard Neuberger, introduced legislation asking for a Youth Corps study, they too were deluged by a flood of favorable mail. When I introduced my Peace Corps bill last year, of the first 400 letters to reach my office—and many more came—there was only a single letter in opposition to the bill.

I am told that President Kennedy received more supporting or favorable mail on the Peace Corps during the 1960 campaign than on any other issue he raised. The Gallup poll, too, has shown an overwhelming majority of Americans favoring the Peace Corps.

A notable characteristic of the unprecedented 25,000 letters of inquiry that went to the Peace Corps is that not more than a handful asked about salary.

While there has been a certain amount of inevitable and understandable skepticism here and abroad about the Peace Corps, with the exception of the Communist press—which calls this a crafty, imperialist plot—the newspaper and public reaction has been favorable.

The New York Times called the Peace Corps "one of the most remarkable projects ever undertaken by any nation." Howard K. Smith, the noted CBS news analyst, called the Peace Corps the "most important proposal that the United States has made since the Marshall plan."

OVERSEAS REACTION

The Malaya Mail in Kuala Lumpur said:

The Peace Corps is bound to catch the imagination and is the type of move to be expected from a man who has brought a fresh and vigorous approach to national and international affairs.

The Hong Kong Tiger-Standard said:

It will benefit the United States because of the vast amount of good will and prestige it will engender. And it will benefit the world as a whole because it will help to break down the barriers that divide it.

In England, the Birmingham Post said:

The Peace Corps efforts will be expressed primarily in terms of service and comradeship rather than in terms of the almighty dollar. * * * The President's initiative should do something to destroy the image of the "Ugly American."

In describing the Peace Corps, the Voice of Ethiopia lauded "the sincerity of the United States in its efforts to promulgate policies that lead to the establishment of world peace."

In Brazil, the Jornal de Commercio applauded the idea and said that the Peace Corps would permit young Americans "to put into practice their ideas of democracy, human fraternity and the dignity of work by means of person-to-person contacts."

El Tiempo, of Colombia, called the Peace Corps "one of the most important undertaken by any nation."

In speaking to the chiefs of state of eight Asian and African countries recently visited, Mr. Shriver found a high degree of enthusiasm. Mr. Nehru of India and Mr. Nkrumah of Ghana, among others, expressed the hope that volunteers could serve in their countries. Mr. Shriver returned from his trip with requests for 3,500 Peace Corps volunteers, although probably only between 500 and 1,000 will be put in the field the first year.

It is impressive that the leaders of countries are asking for this help, and are enthusiastic in their praise of this project.

CATEGORIES OF EFFORT

There are certain clear areas of need to which the Peace Corps skills will undoubtedly be directed.

First, the volunteers will teach. Preliminary indications are that more than half of the requests will be in the teaching field. English is the primary language used in the school systems of many African countries and of some Asian countries, and there is a staggering need for teachers in those continents. It has been estimated that Africa alone needs 300,000 teachers. When the Congo—a country one-third the size of the United States—received its independence, it had a total of 19 college graduates.

Our volunteers will teach English, science and math, and other school subjects at various levels of education.

They will also teach literacy, certainly one of the desperate needs of our time. Over 60 percent of the world's peoples are functionally illiterate. No country can hope to have a sound, stable society or government unless there is a literate, well-informed electorate. No country can hope to break through the barrier to modernization unless there is a literate population. An illiterate person cannot read the simple instructions on a seed packet.

Second, they will participate in agricultural and rural development. This includes demonstration programs in animal husbandry, new farm techniques, as well as seed improvement and irrigation programs. It also includes community development, assistance in the construction of feeder roads, housing, and other small-scale public projects.

A good example is offered in the first announced project in Tanganyika. The Tanganyikan Government requested from 20 to 30 American road surveyors, engineers, and geologists. And may I say at this point, Mr. President, that the Peace Corps will never go into a country unless it is specifically requested.

In a country like Tanganyika, development of secondary roads are an absolute prerequisite for economic and social development of the country. Not only will secondary roads allow agricultural produce to flow to the population centers, but improved communication and increased travel will help break down the tribal provincialism and build up a national identity.

The Tanganyikan Government has estimated that its school system can produce only two persons in the surveyor-civil engineer category in the next 5 years. Without Peace Corps volunteers, its program would be drastically curtailed. The Tanganyikan Government is so enthusiastic about the program that it is willing to pay for a 7-week training program—which will be in addition to the American training program—which will include intensive Swahili.

Health projects form the third category. Well over 200 registered nurses have already volunteered for Peace Corps service, and there will be an ever increasing need for them, as well as for medical school graduates, public health experts, food and hygiene specialists, and sanitation engineers. The war against disease is one of the most challenging and promising struggles of our age.

We can win this war. We have the means, the equipment, the talent, and the know-how to win that war. I suggest that long before man ever gets to the moon and back, he can win the war against privation, hunger, and disease on earth, if he is willing to put the same amount of effort into the struggle.

Somehow or other we get excited about the possibilities of traveling to the moon and back. It is, indeed, an exciting prospect. But I suggest that mankind has been struggling since the first day of history to overcome hunger and disease. It seems to me that the nation which can lead humanity to that victory will be an even greater nation than the one which can pioneer the first trip to the moon and back. However, that will take determination and concentration.

The fourth objective of the Peace Corps is construction and industrial

projects. The lack of skilled manpower has been a severe bottleneck to many large-scale dam, urban development, and construction projects in the emerging nations.

One of the misconceptions is that the Peace Corps will be looking for only college graduates. That is not true. There will be a substantial need for skilled workers to teach basic industrial techniques as well as to take key roles in construction projects. Many of them will come from technical and vocational schools and from among graduates of apprentice programs. Many will have learned by actually doing. No other nation in the world has so large a skilled labor force as has the United States. Our young people are particularly well qualified in the many skills which are required for engineering and construction.

The four broad categories that I have listed are not exhaustive. For example, some governments may need public administration graduates to help in their civil service. A vast range of skills, ranging from economists and statisticians to secretaries to youth club organizers will be needed. The list is almost endless.

SELECTION OF VOLUNTEERS

The Peace Corps will be only as good as the people it puts into the field. There is a keen realization of this vital point among the able Peace Corps staff officers who are in charge of recruitment, selection, and training.

There is no room in the Peace Corps for those who want a joyride or who want to get away from it all. There is no room for those who have zeal but no talent, nor talent without zeal. There must be skill, dedication, and an emotional and intellectual maturity.

The Peace Corps will be highly selective. First, it will continue to make it clear that the work will be difficult and conditions will often be uncomfortable. This will help some applicants select themselves out of the Peace Corps.

Second, it will administer extensive and comprehensive tests to applicants. The tests will measure intelligence and learning ability, knowledge of American history, institutions and values, language aptitude or achievement, and skills and job competence. Those tests are underway right now.

In addition, there must be 5 to 10 letters of reference, a physical examination, and a board oral interview. Those who pass these tests will enter intensive training and will be carefully supervised and evaluated during the training period, particularly under conditions of stress. Those who seem unfit for the arduous job ahead will be weeded out. Further, there are provisions in the proposed legislation which will allow the Peace Corps to return home any volunteers who fail to carry out their jobs effectively or who are maladjusted. This is for the good of the person concerned and for the good of the Peace Corps.

Other standards of selection are that volunteers must be at least 18 years old—although, in practical terms, very few under 21 will be taken; they must be U.S. citizens; they must be single, or, if married, their spouses must also volunteer and qualify.

Interestingly, a substantial number of young married couples are volunteering. They must demonstrate an adaptability to new conditions and must have a suitable personality and sensitivity to others' views which will allow them to work cooperatively with others.

RESPONSE TO PEACE CORPS EXAMINATION

Mr. President, information has just come to my attention as to the examinations which have already been given.

Some serious doubts have been raised in recent months about the willingness of Americans to sacrifice comfort and convenience in the service of their country and in the interest of extending human freedom. Many leaders around the world are wondering if the people of our country have the courage, the fortitude, and the determination to give in peace, what twice this century they have given in war. If the response of American people to the Peace Corps is any indiction, those doubts have been erased. Last Saturday, about 4,000 Americans, representing many religions, many races, and many regions, took examinations to determine their qualifications for service abroad. These tests were not easy. They lasted more than 5 hours and included questions on just about everything in the book.

In Atlanta, a 60-year-old Negro postal worker and his wife were among those who took the tests. The man said, "I learned things on a south Georgia farm that might help Africans to help themselves." His wife, a former schoolteacher, said, "I was born in Liberia. I worked at a Baptist mission. I know how much good Americans can do. They know manual labor and they know how to show others to do it. In spite of what has been written about people not liking the United States, people all over the world know that America is the friend of small folks."

In Washington, a 20-year-old student and his wife said, after concluding the examination, "We want to teach overseas—not because we don't have anything to do here, but because we would like to share with others what we have learned in this country."

In New York, the Times reports that the words most frequently on the lips of men and women who took the examination were: "I am willing to go anywhere." Most of those taking the test, the New York Times said, appeared to be educated individuals. The Times told of a young married couple from Brooklyn who said they hoped to go to Africa to establish an improvisional children's theater project that would be useful both as an expression for African children and as a means of getting simple messages across to adults. The couple, who have directed a children's theater in Maine for 7 years, said they knew a Ghanaian who had successfully explained the need for water purification to many people by having the children dramatize the matter. In Minneapolis, the holder of a bachelor's degree in history said he wanted to teach in Africa because "This is a chance for Americans to really join hands with some of the other people of the world." A 40-year-old Wisconsin nurse, just back from 2 years of nursing in Guam, took the test because, "I don't want to be an Army nurse on the battlefield; I want to be a peace nurse."

A 30-year-old resident of Denver, Colo., who is about to receive a master's degree in English and has had teaching experience in high school and college, said she wanted to teach in Latin America. These are a few examples of the kind of people who faced the grueling examinations on Saturday. We should all be encouraged by the fact that although the Peace Corps is a very new organization, and although these tests were given when most colleges and universities were giving final examinations, 4,000 Americans have responded positively to the challenge of service abroad. When we realize that the Peace Corps expects to put only 500 to 1,000 volunteers in the field by the end of this year, we should all be heartened by the tremendous reservoir of dedicated and talented Americans of all ages who have stepped forward to say, "You can count on me."

TRAINING OF VOLUNTEERS

The training period will take from 3 to 6 months of the 2- to 3-year enlistment. Part of it will take place in the United States and the other part will be held in the host country or in a suitable staging area. The training will emphasize—

First. Skills and knowledge required in the project.

Second. Organizing and communicating skills.

Third. U.S. history, democratic institutions, and international relations.

Fourth. The geography, culture, and government of the host country.

Fifth. Intensive language training, when necessary, in order that the Peace Corps volunteer can communicate with the people with whom he will work.

Sixth. Physical conditioning and training in health care and personal adjustment to different environments.

Training will be conducted by Peace Corps staff experts, by area specialists from universities and colleges, and, in some cases, citizens of the countries in which Peace Corps members will serve.

LIVING CONDITIONS

A Peace Corps volunteer will live at the approximate level of his host country counterpart. That is, if a volunteer is teaching chemistry in a Nigerian high school, he will live roughly the same as a Nigerian high school teacher. It is not the intention to have him live luxuriously in plush surroundings. Yet he is not expected to live in a mud hut. Although the housing will be modest, certain basic health standards must be met.

The volunteer will receive an allowance for subsistence, food, clothing, housing, and local travel, plus enough for incidentals while serving abroad. He will be entitled to 30 days of leave a year, and he will receive a modest allowance for that. Seventy-five dollars a

month will accrue to his account, to be paid upon separation as a readjustment allowance or severance pay.

VOLUNTEER-LEADERS

Peace Corps volunteer leaders will receive somewhat higher subsistence allowances and readjustment bonuses and will be allowed to take dependents with them. It is estimated that there will be 1 volunteer leader to every 15 volunteers.

Volunteers will have no diplomatic privileges or immunities, and they will have no PX privileges. To the extent possible, they will be treated like their counterparts in the host country. They will not wear uniforms.

Service in the Peace Corps will defer members, but it will not exempt them from military service. Their draft status when they return will depend upon their age, the nature of the work they enter, and the measure of need expressed by Selective Service.

HEALTH PROTECTION

Health problems must be faced in some of the areas in which Peace Corps members will serve. In order to insure maximum health protection, a number of steps will be taken.

First, a doctor from the U.S. Government will inspect possible project areas, to make sure that there are no serious health hazards. Second, Peace Corps applicants will receive a thorough medical examination. Third, volunteers will receive all the necessary inoculations and an intensive course in health and sanitation. Fourth, before a project is approved, there must be the assurance that the Peace Corps teams will be serviced by adequate medical facilities which are not too geographically remote.

In case of injury or disability while on the job, compensation will be provided under the Federal Employees Compensation Act.

At the end of their service, Peace Corps volunteers will have the benefit of a Career Planning Board to help them continue their careers.

SELECTION OF HOST NATIONS

So far as selection of specific countries and projects are concerned, a number of criteria will be used:

First. As I mentioned before, the Peace Corps has no intention of forcing its personnel upon a particular country. First, there must be a request.

Second. An attempt will be made for a balanced distribution among geographic areas and countries.

Third. There must be a clear and obvious need.

Fourth. Recipient countries must indicate that they will undertake the measures for economic and social reform which the President so eloquently outlined in his Alliance for Progress speech.

Fifth. Peace Corps projects should at no time provide skills already prevailing in the country. In other words, we don't want to fill a job that a skilled national of the country can fill.

Sixth. The host country, so far as possible, should participate in the project and should endeavor that local counterparts carry on after the Peace Corps volunteers have left.

Seventh. There should be a significant impact upon the country in terms of psychological and educational effect and stimulation of related activities.

CHANNELING OF PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS

The Peace Corps will supply its volunteers through five channels.

One will be the private voluntary agencies. One of the essential differences between the Soviet Union and the United States is that America is not just government. Unlike Russia, America speaks with many voices. We may be thankful that America is represented not just by government, but by a healthy network of private voluntary organizations.

Thus, the private groups open a broad freeway along which Peace Corps volunteers may travel. The Peace Corps will make available volunteers to reputable and experienced private agencies, such as CARE, the Friends Service Committee, and many others, for projects that have been agreed upon by the agency, the Peace Corps, and the recipient government. In order to insure success of the projects, the Peace Corps will select private organizations which have had some years recent experience in the particular country in which the project will be placed.

Religious organizations may contract for projects, providing that they meet Peace Corps criteria and provided that no sectarian cause is furthered. There can be no proselytizing.

A second channel is through the institutions of higher learning. There is a richness of experience here, in that, already, approximately 1,000 specialists from 57 U.S. educational institutions are serving under foreign aid contracts in 36 countries. Universities with strong area specialty programs will be particularly valuable.

Furthermore, colleges are in an advantageous position to screen candidates, in that they have been able to watch the students closely over a period of 4 years.

As will be the case with the private agencies, contracts for training and research and evaluation can be contracted out to universities.

A third avenue will be the United Nations, its specialized agencies, and other multilateral bodies.

Ambassador Adlai Stevenson has proposed that the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations consider the desirability of utilizing qualified Peace Corps-type volunteers from all countries that want to make them available in the technical assistance programs of the U.N. and its related agencies.

I may add that one of the developments of the Peace Corps program thus far has been the arousing of interest in other countries for Peace Corps projects from those countries. For example, in Great Britain, in the Federal Republic of Germany, in France, in Belgium, in Holland, and in the Scandinavian countries, to mention only a few, and, I understand, in some of the Asian countries, there are already underway efforts to have Peace Corps volunteers who will be made available for work overseas in areas of need, and to work through the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

Our willingness to work through the United Nations exposes and repudiates the Communist propaganda that the Peace Corps is nothing but an imperialist plot. Of course, that charge is ridiculous on its face. Our only desire is for economic and social betterment of the developing nations, and we will work through any legitimate channel that will forward this end.

Another important argument for utilizing the United Nations agencies is that over the last decade the United Nations and related agencies have increasingly proved their operational capacity. This development has been a counterweight to the verbal battles within the United Nations. The future of the United Nations may partly depend on the extent to which the United States strengthens its technical assistance programs and makes them more effective. Particularly at the time when the Russians are trying to sterilize the United Nations, it is of piercing and vital importance that we do all we can to strengthen it.

A fourth channel for Peace Corps volunteers is through other governmental agencies, such as the Foreign aid program and USIA. For example, USIA can profitably use many more English teachers.

A fifth avenue is through direct Peace Corps-administered projects.

Finally, a word about the administration of the Peace Corps. The Peace Corps is planned as a semiautonomous agency within the Department of State. The Director will report to the Secretary of State. Various bureaus and desks in the Peace Corps will work in the closest cooperation with their counterparts in the State Department and the new International Development and Aid Administration, to coordinate Peace Corps projects. Furthermore the Peace Corps will keep USIA fully informed of its activities.

The Peace Corps, to the maximum extent possible, will utilize the facilities of the State Department and the aid administration for administrative support. This will eliminate duplication and waste.

If the Peace Corps is to recruit talented Americans with ability and high motivation, it is of supreme importance that the Corps maintain a unique identity within the State Department, rather than be simply a minor component of the whole aid administration.

When the President first announced the Peace Corps idea, it caught on because it had an identity and a vitality and a purpose of its own. That identity and the tremendous esprit de corps that the Peace Corps now enjoys and will enjoy would be minimized if the Peace Corps were to be submerged in any vast organization. Wherever Mr. Shriever went on his trip to Asia and Africa, he was warned by leaders that he should keep the Peace Corps just as President Kennedy proposed it—that it would lose its impact otherwise. This is a point that I cannot emphasize too strongly, Mr. President. The Peace Corps may look all right on the organization chart

under the aid administration, but it would not work to maximum advantage.

Finally, I want to say that the investment will be minimal. The Peace Corps which was set up under Executive Order No. 10924 will cost less than the firing of one Atlas missile.

I want my colleagues to contemplate that fact. The Peace Corps which has been set up under Executive order will cost less than the cost of firing one Atlas missile, even one that does not work. The anticipated first year's budget for the Peace Corps will cost one-tenth of 1 percent of what it will take to put a man on the moon.

Mr. President, I am intrigued by the mission of a man to the moon, but when I think of what we can do with thousands of Peace Corpsmen, volunteers serving all over the world, serving humanity on this earth, rather than trying to inquire about creatures someplace else, I am indeed enthusiastic about the possibilities of this endeavor, which will cost one-tenth of 1 percent of what it will take to put a man on the moon.

This talk of conquering outer space is challenging and exciting, and I, too, support the Nation's space effort, and I commend the President on his great proposal. But I am even more deeply interested in mastering the real terrible problems with which we live here on earth.

And to master these problems, we shall have to, figuratively—and for the volunteers of the Peace Corps, perhaps literally—get our hands dirty and our knees skinned. Peace cannot be won solely in the laboratories and university classrooms, nor in the halls of government. We must become directly, personally involved. We must be willing to work. We must be willing to take risks. We must be willing to accept the prospect of failures and even catastrophes.

If we, who have everything, demonstrate that we are willing to share not only our treasure and our know-how, but actually to share our lives with those who have had nothing, we shall recapture the leadership that we must have if the world is to be directed into the paths of peace.

Mr. President, I ask that there be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks the message by the President of the United States to the President of the Senate submitting the Peace Corps legislation, the text of the bill itself, and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

There being no objection, the message, the bill, and the analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE:

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a legislative proposal to authorize the establishment of a Peace Corps in fiscal year 1962, as I recommended on March 1, 1961. Enactment of this legislation will provide authority for the recruitment, training, and service overseas of American men and women whose skills and knowledge can contribute in a most valuable and practical way to the achievement of social and economic development goals of developing countries.

Simultaneously with my special message to the Congress of March 1, I directed the undertaking of a Peace Corps pilot program to serve as a source of information and experience in formulating plans for a more permanent organization. The Peace Corps has already announced projects to be undertaken in Tanganyika, Colombia, and the Philippines, and others will be announced soon. Progress and planning to date has confirmed that there is a genuine and immediate need in many parts of the world for skilled manpower which the Peace Corps will be able to furnish. Moreover, the governments and peoples of many developing countries have enthusiastically received the idea of a Peace Corps.

Americans as well are responding to this opportunity to serve their country. More than 8,500 Peace Corps volunteer questionnaires have been returned, and additional questionnaires are being received at a rate of more than 100 every day.

This legislative proposal requests that Congress authorize $40 million for this program for the fiscal year 1962. This should enable the Peace Corps to have 500–1,000 volunteers abroad by the end of this calendar year, to have approximately 2,700 abroad or in training by June 1962 and to provide for the training during the summer of 1962 of volunteers expected to be enrolled in June and July 1962.

Under the proposed legislation volunteers will receive a living allowance and subsistence adequate to maintain a modest standard of living overseas. In addition, their health is carefully provided for. In return for service, each volunteer will receive a modest monthly payment which, in most cases, will be accumulated to be paid upon the termination of his duty.

I have further requested the Secretary of State to establish arrangements to assure that Peace Corps activities are consistent and compatible with country development assistance plans. These arrangements will assure that the Peace Corps and the Agency for International Development programs are brought into close relationship, while at the same time preserving the separate identity and unique role of the Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps offers a special and timely opportunity to put dedicated Americans to work for the cause of world peace and human understanding. Therefore, I urge the early consideration and enactment by the Congress of the proposal.

Respectfully yours,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

TEXT OF PEACE CORPS BILL

A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Peace Corps Act."

SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF PURPOSE.—The Congress of the United States declares that it is the policy of the United States and the purpose of this Act to promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, which shall make available to interested countries and areas and to international organizations men and women of the United States qualified for service abroad to help the peoples of such countries and areas in meeting their needs for manpower; to provide broader opportunities for men and women of the United States and United States private organizations, through service abroad, to contribute actively to their country's efforts in the cause of world peace and friendship; and through the service abroad of the men and women participating in Peace Corps programs, to promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people and a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION.—(a) The President is authorized to carry out programs in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, on such terms and conditions as he may determine.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1962 not to exceed $40 million to carry out the purposes and provisions of this Act.

(c) Unexpended balances of funds made available pursuant to chapter II of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and allocated to the Peace Corps agency established within the Department of State pursuant to Executive Order No. 10924, dated March 1, 1961, are hereby authorized to be continued available for the general purposes for which appropriated, and may be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by subsection (b) of this section.

SEC. 4. DIRECTOR OF THE PEACE CORPS AND DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS.—(a) The President may appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of the Peace Corps, whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $20,000 per annum, and a Deputy Director of the Peace Corps, whose compensation shall be fixed by the President at a rate not in excess of $19,500 per annum.

(b) The President may exercise any functions vested in him by this Act through such agency or officer of the United States Government as he shall direct. The head of any agency or any officer performing functions under this Act may promulgate such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or appropriate to carry out such functions, and may delegate to any of his subordinates authority to perform any of such functions, including, if he shall so specify, the authority successively to redelegate any of such functions.

SEC. 5. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS.—(a) The President may enroll in the Peace Corps for service abroad qualified citizens and nationals of the United States (referred to in this Act as "Volunteers"). The terms and conditions of the enrollment, training, compensation, hours of work, benefits, leave, termination, and all other terms and conditions of the service of Volunteers shall be exclusively those set forth in this Act and those consistent therewith which the President may prescribe; and except as provided in this Act, Volunteers shall not be deemed officers or employees or otherwise in the service or employment of the United States for any purpose.

(b) Volunteers shall be provided with such living, travel and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President may determine, consistent with the maintenance of a decent minimum standard of living and the maintenance of health and effectiveness. Transportation and travel allowances may also be provided, in such circumstances as the President may determine, for applicants for enrollment and for former Volunteers en route to or from places of required examinations and training, and places of enrollment and termination.

(c) Volunteers shall receive termination payments at rates fixed by the President for every month of satisfactory service, as determined by the President. The termination payment of each Volunteer shall be payable at the termination of his service, or may be paid during the course of his service to the Volunteer, to members of his family or to others, under such circumstances as the President may determine. In the event of the Volunteer's death during the period of his service, the amount of any unpaid

termination payment shall be paid in accordance with subsection (f) of this section.

(d) Subject to the provisions of this subsection, Volunteers shall be deemed to be employees of the United States Government for the purposes of the Federal Employees Compensation Act (39 Stat. 742), as amended: *Provided, however,* That entitlement to disability compensation payments under that Act shall commence on the day after the date of termination of service. For the purposes of said Act,

(1) Volunteers shall be deemed to be receiving monthly pay at the rate of $450 per month and Volunteer Leaders (as defined in section 6) shall be deemed to be receiving monthly pay at the rate of $650 per month; and

(2) any injury suffered by a Volunteer during any time when he is located abroad shall be deemed to have been sustained while in the performance of his duty and any disease contacted during such time shall be deemed to have been proximately caused by his employment, unless such injury or disease is caused by willful misconduct of the Volunteer or by the Volunteer's intention to bring about the injury or death of himself or of another, or unless intoxication of the injured Volunteer is the proximate cause of the injury or death.

(e) Volunteers shall receive such health care during their service, and such health examinations and immunization preparatory to their service, as the President may deem necessary or appropriate. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, such health care, examinations and immunization may be provided for Volunteers in any facility of any agency of the United States Government, and in such cases the appropriation for maintaining and operating such facility shall be reimbursed from appropriations available under this Act.

(f) The President shall make provision for a death gratuity payment for each Volunteer in the amount of $10,000. Upon the Volunteer's death during his service, such amount, together with the amount of any unpaid termination payment under subsection (c) of this section, shall be payable to a beneficiary designated by the Volunteer, to his estate, or to his next-of-kin, under regulations prescribed by the President.

(g) Any period of service of a Volunteer under this Act shall be credited in the same manner as a like period of civilian employment under the United States Government for all purposes of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2251 *et seq.*), section 852(a)(1) of the Foreign Service Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1092(a)(1)), and every other Act establishing a retirement system for civilian employees of any United States Government agency, and, except as otherwise determined by the President, for the purpose of determining seniority, reduction in force, and layoff rights; leave entitlement and other rights and privileges based upon length of service under the laws administered by the Civil Service Commission, the Foreign Service Act, and every other Act establishing or governing terms and conditions of service of civilian employees of the United States Government: *Provided,* That service of a Volunteer shall not be credited toward completion of any probationary or trial period or completion of any service requirement for career appointment. Under such conditions as the President may determine, examinations or other prerequisites to employment established by any law administered by the Civil Service Commission may be waived for persons who have completed training under section 8(a) of this Act and have served abroad as Volunteers. For the purposes of this subsection, Volunteers and Volunteer Leaders shall be deemed to be receiving compensation during their service at the rates mentioned in subsection (d)(1) of this section.

(h) The President may detail or assign Volunteers or otherwise make them available to any entity referred to in clause (1) of section 10(a) on such terms and conditions as he may determine: *Provided, however,* That any Volunteer so detailed or assigned shall continue to be entitled to the allowances, benefits and privileges of Volunteers authorized under or pursuant to this Act.

(i) Volunteers shall be deemed employees of the United States Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and any other Federal tort liability statute.

(j) The service of a Volunteer shall be terminable at any time at the pleasure of the President.

SEC. 6. PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER LEADERS.—The President may enroll in the Peace Corps qualified citizens or nationals of the United States whose services are required for supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities in connection with programs under this Act (referred to in this Act as "Volunteer Leaders"). All of the provisions of this Act applicable to Volunteers shall be applicable to Volunteer Leaders, and the term "Volunteers" as used in this Act shall include "Volunteer Leaders": *Provided, however,* That:

(1) Members of families of Volunteer Leaders may receive such living, travel, and leave allowances, and such housing, transportation (including transportation for personal and household effects), subsistence and clothing as the President may determine;

(2) Members of the families of Volunteer Leaders accompanying them shall receive such health care as the President may determine and upon such terms as he may determine, including health care in any facility referred to in section 5(e) of this Act, subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe and subject to reimbursement of appropriations as provided in section 5(e); and

(3) Members of the families of Volunteer Leaders accompanying them shall receive such orientation, language and other training as the President may determine.

SEC. 7. PEACE CORPS STAFF.—(a) The President may employ, and may authorize any agency or officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this Act to employ, such staff personnel as the President deems necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, staff personnel shall be employed in accordance with and shall be subject to the laws applicable to personnel employed by the United States Government.

(b) Of the staff personnel employed in the United States in activities authorized by this Act, not to exceed forty may be appointed, compensated and removed without regard to the provisions of any law, of whom not to exceed thirty may be compensated at rates higher than those provided for grade 15 of the general schedule established by the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and of these not to exceed five may be compensated at a rate in excess of the highest rate provided for grades of such general schedule but not in excess of $19,000 per year: *Provided,* That staff personnel of the Peace Corps who have served therein not less than ninety days prior to appointment to one of the above positions shall be entitled to reinstatement to the position occupied at the time of such appointment or to a position of comparable grade and salary. The positions authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to those authorized by law to be filled by Presidential appointment, and in addition to the number authorized by section 505 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(c) For the purpose of performing functions under this Act outside the United States, the President may:

(1) employ or assign staff personnel, or authorize the employment or assignment of officers or employees of agencies of the United States Government, who shall receive compensation at any of the rates provided for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve and Staff under the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 et seq.), together with allowances and benefits provided for such persons by law; and persons so employed or assigned shall be entitled, except to the extent that the President may specify otherwise in cases in which the period of the employment or assignment exceeds thirty months, to the same benefits as are provided by section 528 of the Foreign Service Act for persons appointed to the Foreign Service Reserve, and the provisions of section 1005 of the Foreign Service Act shall apply in the case of such persons, except that policymaking officials shall not be subject to that part of section 1005 which prohibits political tests; and

(2) utilize, with respect to staff personnel, such authority, including authority to appoint and assign personnel for the duration of operations under this Act, contained in the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, as the President deems necessary to carry out functions under this Act. Such provisions of the Foreign Service Act as the President deems appropriate shall apply to staff personnel appointed or assigned under this paragraph, including in all cases the provisions of section 528 of that Act: *Provided, however,* That the President may by regulation make exceptions to the application of section 528 in cases in which the period of the appointment or assignment exceeds thirty months: *Provided further,* That Foreign Service Reserve officers appointed or assigned pursuant to this paragraph shall receive in-class promotions in accordance with such regulations as the President may prescribe: *And provided further,* That under this paragraph the President may initially assign staff personnel for duty within the United States for periods not to exceed one year prior to assignment for duty abroad.

(d) Notwithstanding any other law, the President may prescribe the standard of performance which staff personnel appointed pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section or section 527(c)(2) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, must maintain, and is authorized to separate staff personnel who fail to meet such standard of performance and to grant such personnel severance benefits (not to exceed 1 month's salary at the then current salary rate of such personnel for each year of service pursuant to such appointment but in no event to exceed 1 year's salary at such rate).

(e) The President may maintain special missions or staffs abroad in such countries and for such periods of time as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Each such special mission or staff shall be under the direction of a chief, who shall be appointed by the President and may, notwithstanding any other law, be removed by the President at his discretion. The chief shall be entitled to receive (1) in cases approved by the President, the same compensation and allowances as a chief of mission, class 3, or a chief of mission, class 4, within the meaning of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended, or (2) compensation, allowances and benefits applicable to persons employed or assigned in accordance with subsection (c) of this section, as the President shall determine to be appropriate. If a Foreign Service Officer shall be appointed by the President to a position under this section, the period of his service in such capacity shall be considered as constituting an

assignment for duty within the meaning of section 571 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 961), and such person shall not, by virtue of his acceptance of such an assignment, lose his status as a Foreign Service Officer.

SEC. 8. VOLUNTEER TRAINING.—(a) The President shall make provision for such training as he deems appropriate for each applicant for enrollment as a Volunteer and each enrolled Volunteer. All of the provisions of this Act applicable to Volunteers shall be applicable to applicants for enrollment during any period of training occurring prior to enrollment, and the term "Volunteers" as used in this Act shall include such applicants during any such period of training.

(b) The President may also make provision, on an advance of funds or reimbursement basis, for training for persons, other than those referred to in subsection (a) of this section, who have been selected for service abroad in programs not carried out under authority of this Act which are similar to those authorized by this Act. The provisions of section 9 of this Act shall apply, on an advance of funds or a reimbursement basis, with respect to persons while within the United States for training under authority of this subsection. Advances or reimbursements received under this subsection may be credited to the current applicable appropriation, fund or account and shall be available for the purposes for which such appropriation, fund or account is authorized to be used.

SEC. 9. PARTICIPATION OF FOREIGN NATIONALS.—The President may make provision for transportation, housing, subsistence, or per diem in lieu thereof, and health care or health and accident insurance for foreign participants in activities authorized by this Act while they are away from their homes, without regard to the provisions of any other law: *Provided, however,* That per diem in lieu of subsistence furnished to such persons shall not be at rates higher than those prescribed by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 84-885 (70 Stat. 890). Such persons shall be admitted to the United States as non-immigrants under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 101(a)(15)) for such time and under such conditions as may be prescribed by regulations promulgated jointly by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General.

SEC. 10. GENERAL POWERS AND AUTHORITIES.—(a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the President may:

(1) enter into, perform and modify contracts and agreements and otherwise cooperate with any agency of the United States Government or of any State or any subdivision thereof, international organizations and agencies, other governments and departments and agencies thereof, and educational institutions, voluntary agencies, farm organizations, labor unions, and other organizations, individuals and firms;

(2) accept in the name of the Peace Corps and employ in furtherance of the purposes of this Act (A) voluntary services notwithstanding the provisions of 31 U.S.C. 665(b), and (B) any money or property (real, personal or mixed, tangible or intangible) received by gift, devise, bequest or otherwise; and

(3) contract with individuals for personal services: *Provided,* That no such individual shall be deemed an officer or employee or otherwise in the service or employment of the United States Government for any purpose.

(b)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, whenever the President determines that it will further the purposes of this Act, the President may—

(A) settle and pay, in an amount not exceeding $2,500, any claim against the United States for loss of or damage to personal property of any Volunteer or of any Peace Corps staff personnel where such loss or damage is incident to service abroad, including loss of or damage to personal property of members of the family of any such Volunteer or staff personnel accompanying him: *Provided,* That no such claim shall be paid which shall not have been presented in writing within two years after it accrues or which shall have resulted from the negligence or other fault of the claimant or owner of the property; and

(B) settle and pay, in an amount not exceeding $15,000, any claim against the United States, or against any United States private organization or firm to which a Volunteer has been detailed or assigned, for loss of or damage to real or personal property (including loss of occupancy or use thereof) belonging to, or for personal injury or death of, any person not a citizen or resident of the United States, where such claim arises abroad out of the act or omission of any Peace Corps staff personnel, or out of the act or omission of such Volunteer, but only if such claim is presented in writing within two years after it accrues.

(2) Any amount paid in settlement of any claim under this subsection shall be accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction thereof and shall bar any further action or proceeding thereon: *Provided,* That if the President determines that a meritorious claim exists in an amount in excess of the maximum amount for which settlement is authorized in the relevant subparagraph of paragraph (1) of this subsection, he may so certify to the Congress and may submit a request that payment of such excess be authorized by the Congress.

(c) Subject to any future action of the Congress, a contract or agreement which entails commitments for the expenditure of funds available for the purposes of this Act, including commitments for the purpose of paying or providing for allowances and other benefits of Volunteers authorized by sections 5 and 6 of this Act, may extend at any time for not more than thirty-six months.

(d) Whenever the President determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of this Act,

(1) the President may exercise, in carrying out functions authorized by this Act, any authority relating to administrative or personnel functions available by law (including Appropriation Acts) to the agency primarily responsible for administering nonmilitary assistance programs under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended; and

(2) functions authorized by this Act may be performed without regard to such provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended) regulating the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts, and the expenditure of Government funds as the President may specify.

(e) The President may allocate or transfer to any agency of the United States Government all or any part of any funds available for carrying out the purposes of this Act, including any advance received by the United States from any country or international organization under authority of this Act. Such funds shall be available for obligation and expenditure for the purposes of this Act, in accordance with authority granted in this Act or under authority governing the activities of the agencies of the United States Government to which such funds are allocated or transferred.

(f) Any officer of the United States Government carrying out functions under this Act may utilize the services and facilities of, or procure commodities from, any agency of the United States Government as the President shall direct, or with the consent of the head of such agency, and funds allocated pursuant to this subsection to any such agency may be established in separate appropriation accounts on the books of the Treasury.

(g) In the case of any commodity, service, or facility procured from any agency of the United States Government under this Act, reimbursement or payment shall be made to such agency from funds available under this Act. Such reimbursement or payment shall be at replacement cost, or, if required by law, at actual cost, or at any other price authorized by law and agreed to by the owning or disposing agency. The amount of any such reimbursement or payment shall be credited to current applicable appropriations, funds, or accounts from which there may be procured replacements of similar commodities, services, or facilities, except that where such appropriations, funds, or accounts are not reimbursable except by reason of this subsection, and when the owning or disposing agency determines that such replacement is not necessary, any funds received in payment therefor shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 11. REPORTS.—The President shall transmit to the Congress, at least once in each fiscal year, a report on operations under this Act.

SEC. 12. NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL AND CAREER PLANNING BOARD.—(a) The President may appoint to membership in a board to be known as the National Advisory Council persons who are broadly representative of educational institutions, voluntary agencies, farm organizations and labor unions and other public and private organizations and groups as well as individuals interested in the programs and objectives of the Peace Corps, to advise and consult with the President with regard to policies and programs designed to further the purposes of this Act.

(b) The President may appoint to membership in a board to be known as the Career Planning Board persons especially qualified to advise and consult with the President with regard to the development of policies and programs designed to assist the future careers of Volunteers after conclusion of their service.

(c) Members of the boards referred to in this section shall serve at the pleasure of the President and meet at his call. They shall receive no compensation for their services, but members who are not officers or employees of the United States Government may each receive out of funds made available for the purposes of this Act a per diem allowance of $50 for each day spent away from his home or regular place of business for the purpose of attendance at meetings or conferences and in necessary travel, and while so engaged may be paid actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses, at the applicable rate prescribed by the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended from time to time.

SEC. 13. EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—(a) Experts and consultants, or organizations thereof, as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be employed by any agency of the United States Government for the performance of functions under this Act, and individuals so employed may be compensated at rates not in excess of $75 per diem, and while away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be paid actual travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses at the applicable rate prescribed in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as amended from time to time, while so employed: *Provided,* That contracts for such employment with such organizations may be renewed annually.

(b) Service of an individual as a member of either of the boards authorized to be established by section 12 of this Act or as

an expert or consultant under subsection (a) of this section shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, or 284 of title 18 of the United States Code, or of section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99), or of any other Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of service, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States Government, except insofar as such provisions of law may prohibit any such individual from receiving compensation in respect of any particular matter in which such individual was directly involved in the performance of such service; nor shall such service be considered as employment or holding of office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 13 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2263), section 212 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U.S.C. 59a), or any other law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

SEC. 14. DETAIL OF PERSONNEL TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—(a) In furtherance of the purposes of this Act, the head of any agency of the United States Government is authorized to detail, assign, or otherwise make available any officer or employee of his agency (i) to serve with, or as a member of, the international staff of any international organization, or (ii) to any office or position to which no compensation is attached with any foreign government or agency thereof: *Provided*, That such acceptance of such office or position shall in no case involve the taking of an oath of allegiance to another government.

(b) Any such officer or employee, while so detailed or assigned, shall be considered, for the purpose of preserving his allowances, privileges, rights, seniority, and other benefits as such, an officer or employee of the United States Government and of the agency of the United States Government from which detailed or assigned, and he shall continue to receive compensation, allowances, and benefits from funds available to that agency or made available to that agency out of funds authorized by this Act. He may also receive, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, representation allowances similar to those allowed under section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1131). The authorization of such allowances and other benefits, and the payment thereof out of any appropriations available therefor, shall be considered as meeting all of the requirements of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 70).

(c) Details or assignments may be made under this section:

(1) without reimbursement to the United States Government by the international organization or foreign government;

(2) upon agreement by the international organization or foreign government to reimburse the United States Government for compensation, travel expenses, and allowances, or any part thereof, payable to such officer or employee during the period of assignment or detail in accordance with subsection (b) of this section; and such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation, fund, or account utilized for paying such compensation, travel expenses, or allowances, or to the appropriation, fund, or account currently available for such purpose; or

(3) upon an advance of funds, property or services to the United States Government accepted with the approval of the President for specified uses in furtherance of the purposes of this Act; and funds so advanced may be established as a separate fund in the Treasury of the United States Government, to be available for the specified uses, and to be used for reimbursement of appropriations or direct expenditure subject to the provisions of this Act, any unexpended balance of such account to be returned to the international organization.

SEC. 15. UTILIZATION OF FUNDS.—(a) Funds made available for the purposes of this Act may be used for compensation, allowances and travel of staff personnel, including Foreign Service personnel whose services are utilized primarily for the purposes of this Act, for printing and binding without regard to the provisions of any other law, and for expenditures outside the United States for the procurement of supplies and services and for other administrative and operating purposes (other than compensation of personnel) without regard to such laws and regulations governing the obligation and expenditure of Government funds as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act.

(b) Funds made available for the purposes of this Act may be used to pay expenses in connection with travel abroad of Peace Corps staff personnel and, to the extent otherwise authorized by this Act, of volunteers, including travel expenses of dependents (including expenses during necessary stop-overs while engaged in such travel), and transportation of personal effects, household goods, and automobiles when any part of such travel or transportation begins in one fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that fiscal year, notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the same fiscal year, and cost of transporting to and from a place of storage, and the cost of storing automobiles of Peace Corps staff personnel when it is in the public interest or more economical to authorize storage.

(c) Funds available under this Act may be used to pay costs of training Peace Corps staff personnel employed or assigned pursuant to section 7(c)(2) of this Act (through interchange or otherwise) at any State or local unit of government, public or private nonprofit institution, trade, labor, agricultural, or scientific association or organization, or commercial firm; and the provisions of Public Law 84-918 (7 U.S.C. 1883 et seq.) may be used to carry out the foregoing authority notwithstanding that interchange of personnel may not be involved or that the training may not take place at the institutions specified in that Act. Such training shall not be considered employment or holding of office under section 62 of title 5 of the United States Code, and any payments or contributions in connection therewith may, as deemed appropriate by the head of the agency of the United States Government authorizing such training, be made by private or public sources and be accepted by any trainee, or may be accepted by and credited to the current applicable appropriation of such agency: *Provided, however*, That any such payments to an employee in the nature of compensation shall be in lieu, or in reduction, of compensation received from the United States Government.

(d) Funds available for the purposes of this Act shall be available for:

(1) rents in the District of Columbia, and for repair, alteration, and improvement of such leased properties, without regard to the limitation contained in section 322 of Public Law 72-212, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a);

(2) expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this Act, including (notwithstanding the provisions of section 9 of Public Law 60-328 (31 U.S.C. 673)) expenses in connection with meetings of persons whose employment is authorized by section 13(b) of this Act;

(3) purchase, maintenance, operation, and hire of aircraft: *Provided*, That aircraft for administrative purposes may be purchased only as specifically provided for in an appropriation or other Act;

(4) purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles: *Provided*, That the cost of each such vehicle, including exchange allowance, shall not exceed $1,800 for passenger vehicles, or $2,250 for station wagons, or $3,500 in the case of an automobile purchased for the chief of any special mission or staff outside the United States established under section 14(e) of this Act: *Provided further*, That, except as may otherwise be provided in an appropriation or other Act, passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes abroad may be purchased for replacement only and such vehicles may be exchanged or sold and replaced by an equal number of such vehicles: *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles may be purchased for use in the United States only as may be specifically provided in an appropriation or other Act;

(5) entertainment (not to exceed $5,000 in any fiscal year except as may otherwise be provided in an appropriation or other Act);

(6) exchange of funds without regard to section 3561 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 543) and loss by exchange;

(7) expenditures (not to exceed $5,000 in any fiscal year except as may otherwise be provided in an appropriation or other Act) of a confidential character other than entertainment: *Provided*, That a certificate of the amount of each such expenditure, the nature of which it is considered inadvisable to specify, shall be made by the Director of the Peace Corps or such person as he may designate, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount herein specified;

(8) insurance of official motor vehicles or aircraft acquired for use abroad;

(9) rent or lease abroad for not to exceed ten years of offices, health facilities, buildings, grounds, and living quarters, and payments therefor in advance; maintenance, furnishings, necessary repairs, improvements, and alterations to properties owned or rented by the United States Government or made available for its use abroad; and costs of fuel, water and utilities for such proper ties;

(10) expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes, or, with respect to foreign participants engaged in activities under this Act, to their former homes or places of burial, and of care and disposition of, the remains of persons or members of the families of persons who may die while such persons are away from their homes participating in activities under this Act;

(11) use in accordance with authorities of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801 *et. seq.*), not otherwise provided for; and

(12) ice and drinking water for use abroad.

SEC. 16. APPOINTMENT OF PERSONS SERVING UNDER PRIOR LAW.—(a) Under such terms and conditions as the President may prescribe, volunteer personnel who on the effective date of this Act have been engaged by contract by, or pursuant to agreement with, the Peace Corps agency established within the Department of State pursuant to Executive Order No. 10924, dated March 1, 1961, may be enrolled as Volunteers or Volunteer Leaders under this Act. Such enrollment may be made effective, for any or all purposes, as of a date prior to the effective date of this Act but not earlier than the date of final selection for service abroad of the person in question. All allowances and termination payments similar to those authorized by this Act received by any such person or by members of his family or payable with respect to any period between the effective date and the actual date of such enrollment shall be deemed for all purposes

to have been received or to be payable under the appropriate provision of this Act.

(b) Persons serving as members of the National Advisory Council and the Career Planning Board of the agency referred to in subsection (a) of this section shall be members of the National Advisory Council and the Career Planning Board, respectively, established under section 12 of this Act without appointment thereunder.

SEC. 17. USE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES.—Whenever possible, expenditures incurred in carrying out functions under this Act shall be paid for in such currency of the country or area where the expense is incurred as may be available to the United States. To that end, there may be used in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, in such amounts as the President may specify

(a) foreign currencies accruing under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, for use under section 104(e) thereof; and

(b) foreign currencies in excess of the requirements of the United States Government for the payment of its obligations abroad (as determined by the President) received by the United States Government as a result of the furnishing of nonmilitary assistance under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and Acts repealed thereby (including proceeds of sales under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended, and section 402 of Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended), or under any Act which substantially repeals the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, notwithstanding any law relating to receipts and credits accruing to the United States Government (except in the case of administrative expenses).

SEC. 18. APPLICABILITY OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT.—The Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951 (22 U.S.C. 1611 *et seq.*) shall not apply with respect to functions carried out under this Act.

SEC. 19. SEAL.—The President may adopt, alter, and use an official seal or emblem of the Peace Corps of such design as he shall determine, which shall be judicially noticed.

SEC. 20. MORATORIUM ON STUDENT LOANS.—Section 205 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (P.L. 85–864) (20 U.S.C. 425) is amended in the following respects:

(1) by deleting the word "or" immediately preceding section 205(b)(2)(A)(ii) and by adding immediately after that section the following: "or (iii) during which the borrower is in service as a Volunteer under the Peace Corps Act: *Provided*, That this clause shall apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of the Peace Corps Act only with the consent of the then obligee institution"; and

(2) by amending section 205(b)(3) to read as follows: "(3) not to exceed in the aggregate 50 per centum of any such loan (plus interest) shall be cancelled (A) for service as a full-time teacher in a public elementary or secondary school in a State, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each complete academic year of such service; and (B) for service as a Volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, at the rate of 10 per centum of the amount of such loan plus interest thereon, which was unpaid on the first day of such service, for each completed 8 months of such service;"

SEC. 21. TAXATION OF ALLOWANCES.—(a) The Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, is amended in the following respects:

(1) Section 912 of such Code relating to exemption for certain allowances is amended by adding the following new paragraph (3):

"(3) Peace Corps Allowances. In the case of Volunteers within the meaning of the Peace Corps Act and members of families of such Volunteers, amounts received as allowances under sections 5 or 6 of the Peace Corps Act (other than termination payments under section 5(c) of said Act)."

(2) Section 1303(b) of such Code relating to income from back pay is amended by adding the following new paragraph (4):

"(4) Termination payments authorized by the provisions of section 5(c) of the Peace Corps Act and received or accrued by an individual during the taxable year on account of any period of service as a Volunteer under the Peace Corps Act occurring prior to the taxable year."

(b) Termination payments authorized by section 5(c) of this Act shall not be deemed wages within the meaning of section 3401 of said Code.

SEC. 22. SOCIAL SECURITY COVERAGE.—During any period of service as a Volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, an individual shall, notwithstanding the provisions of section 210 of the Social Security Act and section 3121 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, be deemed to be performing service constituting employment for purposes of title II of such Act and chapter 21 of such Code; and, subject to the provisions of section 209(a) of such Act and section 3121(a)(1) of such Code, any such individual shall be deemed to have received wages for such service of $200 for each month during any part of which he performs such service. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3102 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the tax which would otherwise be imposed with respect to such wages under section 3101 of such Code shall not be deducted but shall be paid from funds made available for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 23. AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT.—Subsection (j) of section 3 of the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2253), is amended to read as follows:

"MILITARY SERVICE AFTER DECEMBER 1956 AND PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER SERVICE

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or section 5(g) of the Peace Corps Act, any military service (other than military service covered by military leave with pay from a civilian position) performed by an individual after December 1956 and any period of service by an individual as a Volunteer under the Peace Corps Act, shall be excluded in determining the aggregate period of service upon which an annuity payable under this chapter to such individual or to his widow or child is to be based, if such individual or widow or child is entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) at the time of such determination, to monthly old-age or survivors benefits under section 202 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 402), based on such individual's wages and self-employment income. If in the case of the individual or widow such military service or service under the Peace Corps Act is not excluded under the preceding sentence, but upon attaining retirement age (as defined in section 216(a) of the Social Security Act, as amended), he or she becomes entitled (or would upon proper application be entitled) to such benefits, the Commission shall redetermine the aggregate period of service upon which such annuity is based, effective as of the first day of the month in which he or she attains such age, so as to exclude such service. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, upon the request of the Commission, inform the Commission whether or not any such individual or widow or child is entitled at any specified time to such benefits."

SEC. 24. REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS.—(a) Any person who has completed a period of satisfactory service, as determined by the President, as a Volunteer, shall be entitled to all the reemployment rights and other benefits provided under subsections (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of section 9 of the Act of June 24, 1948, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 459) in the case of persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under the provisions of title I of that Act: *Provided*, That any such person who has not served abroad as a Volunteer shall have the reemployment rights and other benefits provided in the case of persons referred to in section 9(g)(4) of that Act.

(b) The President may render aid in the reemployment in their former positions of former Volunteers who have completed a period of satisfactory service under this Act. In rendering such aid, the President may use the then existing Federal and State agencies engaged in activities referred to in section 9(h) of said Act of June 24, 1948.

(c) Persons in service as Volunteers under this Act shall be entitled to the same rights as are accorded under section 9(i) of said Act of June 24, 1948, to persons inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under title I of said Act.

SEC. 25. DEFINITIONS.—(a) The term "abroad" means any area outside the continental United States, Alaska and Hawaii.

(b) The term "function" includes any duty, obligation, right, power, authority, responsibility, privilege, discretion, activity and program.

(c) The term "health care" includes all appropriate examinations, preventive, curative and restorative health and medical care, and supplementary services such as travel and escorts when necessary.

(d) The terms "personnel" and "staff personnel" do not include Volunteers.

(e) For the purposes of this or any other Act, the period of any individual's service as a Volunteer under this Act shall include:

(i) except for the purposes of section 5(g) of this Act, any period of training prior to enrollment as a Volunteer under this Act; and

(ii) the period between enrollment as a Volunteer and the termination of service as such Volunteer by the President or by death or resignation.

(f) The term "United States Government agency" includes any department, board, wholly or partly owned corporation, or instrumentality, commission or establishment of the United States Government.

SEC. 26. CONSTRUCTION.—If any provision of this Act or the application of any provision to any circumstances or persons shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this Act and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances or persons shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 27. EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PEACE CORPS BILL

Section 1 provides that the bill may be cited as the "Peace Corps Act."

Section 2 states the purposes of the bill. These are to promote world peace and friendship through a Peace Corps, which shall make available to interested countries and areas and to international organizations American men and women qualified for service abroad to help the peoples of such countries and areas in meeting their needs for manpower; to provide broader opportunities for Americans and American private organizations, through service abroad, to contribute actively to U.S. efforts in the cause of world peace and friendship; and through the service abroad of the men and women participating in Peace Corps programs, to promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of the American people and a better understanding of the American people on the part of the peoples served.

Section 3(a) authorizes the President to carry out programs in furtherance of the purposes stated in section 2 on such terms

and conditions as he may determine. Following the pattern of past and proposed foreign aid legislation, this bill would vest all authority and funds in the President, with power to delegate any or all functions as he sees fit.

Section 3(b) authorizes an appropriation to the President for the fiscal year 1962 of not to exceed $40 million to carry out the purposes and provisions of the bill.

Section 3(c) authorizes unexpended balances of fiscal year 1961 funds allocated to the Peace Corps to be continued available in fiscal year 1962 for the general purposes for which appropriated and to be consolidated with the appropriation authorized by section 3(b). The funds so allocated were appropriated pursuant to the first sentence of section 451(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the Mutual Security Act).

Section 4(a) authorizes the President to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a Director of the Peace Corps and a Deputy Director of the Peace Corps. The President may fix the salaries of these two officers at rates not exceeding $20,000 and $19,500 per annum respectively. The present Director of the Peace Corps occupies one of the statutory offices created by Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953, which carries a salary not in excess of $20,000. It is proposed that the reorganization plan will be repealed by the new foreign aid legislation.

Section 4(b) authorizes the President to exercise any functions vested in him by the bill through such agency or officer of the Government as he shall direct. The head of any agency or any officer performing functions delegated by the President is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations and to further delegate functions delegated to him. This subsection is analogous to section 521(a) of the Mutual Security Act.

Section 5(a) authorizes the President to enroll in the Peace Corps citizens and nationals of the United States, to be known as volunteers. It is intended that the terms and conditions of the service of Peace Corps volunteers be exclusively those stated in the bill and those consistent with the bill which the President prescribes. Because many of the statutory rules relating to persons regularly employed in Government agencies would be inappropriate or irrelevant to this new type of temporary volunteer service, this subsection provides that volunteers are not to be deemed to be officers or employees of the United States for any purpose except as provided in the bill.

Section 5(b) provides that volunteers shall be provided with such living, travel, and leave allowances and such housing, transportation, supplies, equipment, subsistence, and clothing as the President determines. It is intended that, while overseas, volunteers will be provided in cash or in kind with all necessities of life and that they will live at a level approximating their host country counterparts, but sufficient to maintain a decent minimum standard of living and to support health and effectiveness. This subsection also authorizes the furnishing of transportation and travel allowances to applicants for enrollment and former volunteers en route to or from places of enrollment and termination.

Section 5(c) provides for termination or readjustment payments to volunteers at rates fixed by the President. This payment would accumulate monthly but would normally not be paid to the volunteer until the termination of his service, as it is intended primarily to assist him in the transition back to life at home in the United States. However, in order to enable the volunteer while in service to meet important obligations, such as contribution to the education of other members of his family, payment of life insurance premiums, or emergency expenses, the President may permit a portion or all of the accrued amount of the termination payment to be disbursed while the volunteer is in service.

Section 5(d) provides that volunteers shall be treated as Government employees for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, which provides for disability compensation payments and medical care in the case of injury or disease arising out of Federal employment. For the purpose of fixing the level of disability benefits, which is related to earnings, volunteers are deemed to be receiving monthly pay at the rate of $450 per month and volunteer leaders (see sec. 6) at the rate of $650 per month. This would permit a volunteer to receive $337.50 per month and a volunteer leader to receive $487.50 per month if he became permanently totally disabled.

Where a volunteer suffers injury or illness while located in the United States, the rules applied in similar cases by the Federal Employees' Compensation Board will determine whether the illness or injury arises out of the volunteer's service. Any injury or illness occurring while the volunteer is outside the United States will be deemed to arise out of his service. Volunteers will not begin to receive disability payments so long as he is in service, since he will be provided with full medical care during that time and will continue to accrue his termination payment.

Section 5(e) authorizes the President to make provision for health examinations and immunization of volunteers preparatory to service and complete health care during service. Under regulations prescribed by the President, such examinations, immunization, and care may be provided through available medical facilities of other agencies and in such cases the agency operating the medical facility will be reimbursed from Peace Corps appropriations. Where examination, immunization or care are not furnished through other government facilities, other arrangements will be made either by the Peace Corps or, in the case of some projects administered through other agencies, by the administering agency pursuant to agreement with the Peace Corps.

Section 5(f) provides for the payment of a $10,000 death benefit to the designated beneficiary, estate, or next of kin of any volunteer who dies while in service.

Section 5(g) enables volunteers to obtain credit for the period of their volunteer service for the purposes of retirement, and also generally for the purposes of seniority, reduction in force, leave accumulation or other rights and privileges based on length of service, in the event they later become employed in any of the various Federal civilian employment systems. Under such conditions as the President shall specify, examinations and other prerequisites for admission to other Federal employment established by laws administered by the Civil Service Commission may be waived for volunteers who have successfully completed volunteer training and have served abroad.

Section 5(h) authorizes the President to detail or assign volunteers or otherwise make them available to other Government agencies, international organizations, foreign governments, private nonprofit organizations, individuals and firms. Volunteers so assigned or detailed would continue to be entitled to the benefits, allowances, and privileges provided for volunteers.

Section 5(i) provides that volunteers shall be deemed employees of the Government for the purposes of the Federal Tort Claims Act and other similar Federal claims statutes which waive the Government's immunity from suit. This means that the Government could be sued for damages for the negligent act or omission or certain other wrongful conduct of a volunteer within the United States under circumstances where the Government, if a private person, would be liable. Claims of this nature not in excess of $2,500 could be settled administratively under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

Section 5(j) authorizes the President to terminate the service of volunteer at any time at his pleasure.

Section 6 authorizes the enrollment of "volunteer leaders" in the Peace Corps Volunteer Service. Volunteer leaders would be persons, generally senior in age and experience to volunteers, who were required for supervisory or other special duties or responsibilities in the field. They would serve with volunteers and live among the host country nationals on much the same basis as volunteers, but generally on a slightly higher standard of living. They would not, however, receive compensation or fulfill the functions of regularly employed administrative personnel of the Government.

All of the provisions of the bill relating to volunteers would apply to volunteer leaders, and the term "volunteers" throughout the bill includes volunteer leaders. However, unlike volunteers, volunteer leaders might in some instances have dependent families. It would normally be preferable to send the family of a volunteer leader with him, rather than requiring a spouse or children to remain behind. Therefore the bill authorizes the provision of allowances, housing, transportation, subsistence, and clothing to families of volunteer leaders. This would also apply, during any period, such as training period, when the family might not live with the volunteer leader, or during the entire tour of duty, if the family remained at home, since the volunteer leader would not be earning a salary with which to support the family. Health care could also be provided to family members, but only while accompanying the volunteer leader. Finally, orientation, language and other training appropriate to prepare family members for overseas could be provided.

Section 7(a) authorizes the President or any agency or officer of the Government carrying out functions under the bill to employ such staff personnel as the President deems necessary to carry out the purposes and provisions of the bill. Staff personnel, unlike volunteers, would be subject to the usual rules of Government employment and to the provisions of the bill applicable to staff personnel, which are essentially the same as those applicable to personnel of ICA.

Section 7(b) authorizes employment, compensation, and removal of not more than 40 persons employed in the United States, without regard to the provisions of any law. Not more than 30 of these may be compensated at rates higher than the maximum rate of GS–15 ($15,810), of which not more than 5 may be compensated at a rate higher than the highest GS rate ($18,500), but not above $19,000 per year. The proviso gives "retreat rights" to any person removed from one of the 40 positions authorized by this subsection. This subsection is similar to section 527(b) of the Mutual Security Act, except that it waives all laws as to the employment, compensation, and removal of these top officials, and not merely the Classification Act of 1949.

Section 7(c) would give to the Peace Corps the same type of Foreign Service Act compensation and appointment authority with respect to staff personnel as has been available to ICA and its predecessor agencies. Paragraph (1) of this subsection permits persons regularly employed in the United States who have been assigned for oversea duty to be compensated at rates authorized by the Foreign Service Act and to receive Foreign Service Act allowances and benefits. Paragraph (2) of this subsection authorizes the employment and assignment of persons

for oversea service in exactly the same manner as is authorized for the State Department with respect to its Foreign Service. This includes not only compensation, allowances, and benefits, but also other personnel authority such as rotation and "selection out" authority. This subsection is the same as section 527(c) of the Mutual Security Act, except that a proviso has been added which makes clear that persons employed under this subsection may be assigned to an initial tour of duty of not more than one year within the United States.

Section 7(d) authorizes the President to prescribe performance standards for staff personnel appointed pursuant to the Foreign Service Act authority of subsection (c)(2) of this section, to separate staff personnel failing to meet such standards, and to grant limited severance benefits.

Section 7(e) provides authority for the President to maintain special missions or staffs abroad in those countries where the size or complexity of Peace Corps operations warrants them, where U.S. operations missions are not sufficiently large to form a base for Peace Corps operations, or where other special circumstances require separate Peace Corps missions. This subsection is identical to section 526 of the Mutual Security Act, except that it provides for Presidential appointment only of the chief of mission and not his deputy.

Section 8(a) authorizes the President to provide training for applicants for enrollment as volunteers and for volunteers following enrollment. During training, applicants for enrollment would be treated in all respects as volunteers and would be subject to the same conditions of service as volunteers, except that their training period would not be credited toward retirement or other benefits in other Federal services in which they may subsequently be employed (see sec. 25(e)).

Section 8(b) authorizes the President, on an advance of funds or reimbursement basis, to provide training for persons who are not applicants for enrollment in the Peace Corps but who will engage in programs similar to those carried out under the bill. This might include, for example, persons participating in Peace Corps type programs of voluntary agencies, international organizations, or other countries. On an advance of funds or reimbursement basis, the President could provide the allowances, facilities, and benefits mentioned in section 9 while such trainees were in the United States, and such persons would be admitted to the United States as nonimmigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act. The last sentence of section 8(b) provides for continued availability of advances or reimbursements received under this subsection and credit to the current applicable appropriation, fund, or account.

Section 9 authorizes the President to make provision for transportation, housing, subsistence or per diem in lieu thereof, health care or health and accident insurance for noncitizens of the United States while away from their homes participating in activities authorized by the bill within or without the United States. Such persons might include host country nationals participating with volunteers in Peace Corps projects away from their homes, or who might come to the United States to assist in furnishing training to volunteers. The allowances authorized by this section may be provided without regard to the provisions of any other law, except that per diem in lieu of subsistence could not be fixed at rates higher than those prescribed by the Secretary of State pursuant to section 12 of Public Law 885, 84th Congress (70 Stat. 890). The last sentence of section 9 provides for the admission of such foreign participants to the United States as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

Section 10(a)(1) authorizes the President, in furtherance of the purposes of the bill, to make contracts and agreements and otherwise cooperate with U.S. Government agencies, international organizations, foreign governments, private nonprofit organizations, individuals, and firms.

Section 10(a)(2) authorizes the President to accept voluntary services and gifts of money or property for the use of the Peace Corps in furtherance of the purposes of the bill. This authority is similar to authority contained in section 205(c) of the Mutual Security Act. It clarifies the Peace Corps' authority to accept gifts of money and equipment of the kind already offered to it. It would also permit contributions, for example, to establish training facilities or a model farm or a schoolhouse which might provide the framework for certain Peace Corps projects abroad.

Section 10(a)(3) authorizes personal service contracts with individuals but provides that individuals hired by contract shall not be deemed officers or employees of the Government for any purpose. With respect to operations abroad, this provision is important to avoid having to put on the Government rolls all persons who will perform personal services and is similar to the authority contained in section 537(a)(3) of the Mutual Security Act. The bill would give the Peace Corps the same authority within the United States so that persons who cannot be classified as experts or consultants and employed under section 12 of the bill may be retained for personal service functions. This might include foreign nationals employed to assist with training programs in the United States.

Section 10(b)(1) authorizes administrative settlement of two types of claims:

Paragraph (A) authorizes the President to pay up to $2,500 for loss or damage of personal property belonging to a volunteer or an employee engaged in activities authorized by the bill (including property of members of families of employees and volunteer leaders accompanying them), where such loss or damage is incident to service abroad. This would cover claims for loss or damage resulting from emergency evacuation of foreign posts, unavoidable casualty losses, and other losses incident to oversea service. The authority provided in this paragraph is similar to that provided for military personnel under 10 U.S.C. 2732, except that that provision authorizes payment up to $6,500.

Paragraph (B) authorizes the President to pay up to $15,000 for property damage or personal injury to any person not a citizen or resident of the United States where the loss or injury occurs abroad and arises out of the act or omission of a volunteer or an employee engaged in activities authorized by the bill. The authority would apply whether the claim was made against the Government or a United States private organization or firm to which the volunteer causing the loss or injury had been detailed or assigned. This authority is analogous to that granted the military departments under 10 U.S.C. 2734, which is expressly designed to maintain friendly relations abroad through prompt settlement of meritorious claims of the nature described.

Section 10(b)(2) would require, as to both categories of claims described in section 9(b)(1), that the amount offered in settlement be accepted by the claimant in full satisfaction of his claim. However, if the President determined that a meritorious claim existed in an amount larger than the maximum amount for which settlement is authorized, he might so certify to the Congress and submit a request that payment of the excess be authorized.

Section 10(c) provides that a contract or agreement may obligate funds available under the bill for a period of not more than 3 years, including funds for the purpose of paying or providing for the allowances or benefits of volunteers. Such contracts or agreements would be subject to termination if Congress terminated the program. This subsection is based upon the last sentence of section 307(a) of the Mutual Security Act, providing 3-year contract authority for technical cooperation programs.

Section 10(d)(1) provides that the President, in carrying out functions under the bill, may exercise any administrative or personnel authority available to ICA or its successor agency, whenever he determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of the bill. The bill contains the basic administrative and personnel authorities which it is now anticipated will be clearly necessary in order effectively to carry out Peace Corps programs. However, certain authorities contained in the Mutual Security Act, or which might be added in successor foreign aid legislation, may become important to the operation of the Peace Corps in the light of subsequent experience. For example, it might become desirable to utilize the authority contained in section 530(b) of the Mutual Security Act, permitting employment of persons without compensation pursuant to section 710(b) of the Defense Production Act of 1950. Section 10(d)(1) is similar to section 2(d) of Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, which established the U.S. Information Agency.

Section 10(d)(2) authorizes the President, when he determines it to be in furtherance of the purposes of the bill, to waive provisions of law (other than the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended) regulating the making, performance, amendment or modification of contracts and the expenditure of Government funds. This provision is the same as section 533 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

Section 10(e) is the same as section 522(a) of the Mutual Security Act, with minor modification. It permits funds available for the purposes of the bill to be allocated to any Government agency in connection with activities under the bill. Funds so allocated may be spent in accordance with the authority of the bill or in accordance with authority governing the activities of the agency to which the funds have been allocated.

Section 10(f) is the same as the first sentence of the Mutual Security Act, section 522(b). It authorizes any officer of the Government carrying out functions under the bill to utilize the services and facilities of other Government agencies or procure commodities from other Government agencies, either with the consent of the head of the other agency or upon direction of the President.

Section 10(g) is the same as Mutual Security Act, section 522(d), with minor modification. It provides that when commodities, services or facilities are procured from any Government agency, reimbursement to such agency shall be made from funds available under the bill, and states the manner in which the price shall be determined for purposes of reimbursement. The last sentence of this subsection describes the manner in which such reimbursements may be used by the agency furnishing the commodities, facilities or services.

Section 11 requires the President to transmit reports to Congress on operations under the bill at least once in each fiscal year.

Section 12(a) authorizes the President to appoint members of a National Advisory Council to advise and consult with him with regard to general policies and programs designed to further the purposes of the bill. The members of this Council are to be broadly representative of various public and private organizations and groups as well as

individuals interested in the programs and objectives of the Peace Corps.

Section 12(b) authorizes the President to appoint the members of a Career Planning Board to advise and consult with him with regard to the development of policies and programs designed to assist the future careers of volunteers after the conclusion of their service.

Section 12(c) provides that members of the boards referred to in sections 11(a) and 11(b) shall serve at the pleasure of the President and be at his call. It further provides that members who are not employees of the Government may receive a per diem allowance of $50 for each day spent away from their homes or regular places of business in connection with meetings or conferences of the boards, and while so engaged may receive travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations.

Section 13(a) authorizes the employment of experts and consultants and organizations thereof in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 55a, with compensation at rates not exceeding $75 per diem plus travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with the Standardized Government Travel Regulations. The proviso at the end of this subsection authorizes annual renewal of contracts with organizations of experts and consultants. This subsection is the same as section 530(a) of the Mutual Security Act.

Section 13(b) exempts experts and consultants appointed for temporary service under section 12(a) from Federal conflict of interest laws except insofar as they prohibit any individual from receiving compensation from non-Governmental sources with respect to any particular matter in which he was directly involved in the performance of his Government service. Exemption is also provided from laws governing reemployment of retired officers or employees and simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities. The same exemptions are provided for members (except regular Government employees) of the boards referred to in section 12. These exemptions are the same as those provided in section 532(a) of the Mutual Security Act for experts and consultants and members of the former International Development Advisory Board.

Section 14 authorizes the detail or assignment of staff personnel to international organizations and foreign governments. This section combines the authorities contained in sections 528 and 529 of the Mutual Security Act. The assignment or detail may be with or without reimbursement or an advance of funds from the international organization or foreign government.

Section 15(a) provides generally for administrative expenditures. It is the same as section 411(d) of the Mutual Security Act, and permits certain types of administrative expenditures abroad without regard to such laws and regulations concerning Government expenditures as may be found necessary to carry out the purposes of the act (other than laws and regulations relating to compensation of personnel).

Section 15(b) permits obligation of current fiscal year funds to pay the complete cost of travel where such travel begins in one fiscal year but will not be completed before the close of the fiscal year, notwithstanding certain Comptroller General decisions. It is similar to the first part of section 537(a)(17) of the Mutual Security Act.

Section 15(c) authorizes certain training programs for staff personnel and is identical to section 537(e) of the Mutual Security Act.

Section 15(d) contains a number of provisions authorizing specific kinds of administrative expenditures, all of which (with some modification) are authorized with respect to the foreign aid program by section 537(a) of the Mutual Security Act. Although funds may be spent generally for any administrative expenses necessary to carry out the bill, certain special statutes and decisions of the Comptroller General impose specific limitations or prohibitions which the provisions of this subsection are designed to modify or remove. Specifically, this subsection authorizes:

1. Payment of rents in the United States, for which express authorization is required by the provisions of 40 U.S.C. 34 and 40 U.S.C. 304c. Rental funds for foreign aid activities have regularly been included in the foreign aid appropriations rather than in General Services Administration appropriations, and the Mutual Security Act has long contained authority to pay rents in the District of Columbia. The extension to other parts of the United States will enable the Peace Corps to rent recruitment or training facilities outside of Washington. This paragraph also permits expenditures for repairs, alterations, and improvements to leased properties in excess of 25 percent of the first year's rent, the ceiling imposed by 40 U.S.C. 278a.

2. Expenses in connection with meetings concerned with the purposes of the bill, including meetings of experts or consultants appointed under section 13(a). This provision has been included here, as in the Mutual Security Act, in view of 31 U.S.C. 551 and 31 U.S.C. 673.

3. Purchase, maintenance, operation and hire of aircraft, for which express authorization (except in the case of hire) is required by 5 U.S.C. 78(b). However, the proviso to this paragraph would permit aircraft to be purchased for administrative purposes only as specifically provided for in an appropriation or other act.

4. Purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, for which express authorization is required by 5 U.S.C. 78(a). The first proviso to this paragraph would set cost limits for passenger motor vehicles slightly higher than those provided by 5 U.S.C. 78a–1, for the reason that, especially abroad, it will not always be possible for the Peace Corps to join in the large-scale purchasing of Government vehicles which makes lower prices possible. The second proviso specifies that, except as otherwise provided in an appropriation or other act, passenger motor vehicles for administrative purposes abroad may be purchased only for replacement. The final proviso of this paragraph prohibits purchase of passenger motor vehicles for use in the United States except as specifically provided in an appropriation or other act. Except for the first proviso, this paragraph is the same as section 537(a)(5) of the Mutual Security Act.

5. Entertainment expenses not exceeding $5,000 in any fiscal year except as may be otherwise provided in an appropriation or other act. This authority is necessary, in view of Comptroller General decisions, for purposes of paying hotel bills and other expenses classified as entertainment expenses incurred in connection with foreign participants and officials and others. Unlike the equivalent provision of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 (sec. 537(a)(6)) such expenses would not be limited to the United States.

6. Exchange of dollars for foreign currencies and the losses which sometimes result from fluctuating exchange rates, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 543. This paragraph is identical to Mutual Security Act section 537(a)(7).

7. Confidential expenditures not exceeding $5,000 in any fiscal year except as may be otherwise provided in an appropriation or other act. The Director of the Peace Corps or his designee would have to certify the amount of each such expenditure and his certification would be sufficient voucher. This paragraph is the same as Mutual Security Act section 537(a)(8) except for the amount authorized.

8. Insurance of motor vehicles and aircraft abroad. While the Government acts as a self-insurer in the United States, this is not always permissible under the laws of foreign countries, and it is often undesirable. The authority for insuring aircraft is not contained in the equivalent Mutual Security Act provision, section 537(a)(9).

9. Rental abroad for periods not exceeding 10 years of offices, health facilities, buildings, grounds, and living quarters; maintenance, equipment, furnishings, repairs, improvements, and alterations to properties owned or rented by the Government, or made available to it, and costs of fuel, water, and utilities for such properties. The authority to rent for up to 10 years and the authority to make advance payments on leases are not found in section 527(a)(10) of the Mutual Security Act, from which this paragraph is derived. These authorities are necessary where local custom calls for long-term leasing and advance payment of rents.

10. Expenses of preparing, transporting and disposition of remains of persons or members of families of persons dying away from their homes while participating in activities under the bill. This is similar to the provisions of Mutual Security Act section 537(a)(11) and to authority presently available for employees of the Government under 5 U.S.C. 103a, but would extend in this case to persons, other than employees, engaged in activities under the bill.

11. Expenses of various types authorized by the Foreign Service Act which are not authorized by other provisions of the bill. This provision is similar to Mutual Security Act section 537(a)(17).

12. Ice and drinking water for use abroad notwithstanding Comptroller General decisions requiring express authorization for this purpose.

Section 16(a) is designed to permit retroactive enrollment under the bill of volunteer personnel engaged by contract prior to enactment of the bill. This would enable those who volunteered in the early stages of the program to be placed on the same footing and receive the same benefits as those volunteering after the enactment of the authorizing legislation.

Section 16(b) avoids the necessity for appointment under section 12 of the bill of persons already serving as members of the National Advisory Council and Career Planning Board created in connection with the existing Peace Corps agency.

Section 17 directs the Peace Corps to utilize foreign currencies available to the United States to the maximum practicable extent in carrying out its programs. To that end, it authorizes the Peace Corps to utilize certain foreign currencies accruing for economic development purposes under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480) and certain foreign currencies generated by foreign assistance activities, in the same manner as proposed in the new foreign aid legislation.

Section 18 provides exemption of Peace Corps programs from the effect of the Battle Act so as to make clear that volunteers may be sent to countries where conditions do not permit the United States at this time to insist upon compliance with the Battle Act.

Section 19 authorizes the President to adopt a seal or emblem for the Peace Corps.

Section 20 makes two amendments to the student loan provisions of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. The first would suspend principal and interest payments on such loans for students during the period of their Peace Corps service. The second would provide for a partial forgiveness of student loans for persons serving in the Peace Corps

on much the same basis as is provided for persons who go into teaching.

Section 21(a) amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to exempt from Federal income tax the living and other allowances of volunteers. Termination payments would be subject to tax, but subsection (a) (2) amends the code so as to enable volunteers to avoid paying a substantially higher tax on these payments because they are received at the conclusion of their service than would be payable if they had been received during the course of their service.

Section 21 (b) exempts termination payments from the withholding provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

Section 22 provides for social security coverage of volunteers and fixes a level of compensation ($200 per month) for purposes of determining the social security tax and the benefits payable under the Social Security Act with respect to Peace Corps service. The Peace Corps would pay the full amount of the social security tax.

Section 23 contains a technical amendment to the Civil Service Retirement Act which assures that volunteers who become participants in the Civil Service Retirement System will not receive both an annuity under that system and social security benefits on account of their period of volunteer service.

Section 24(a) would give volunteers the same reemployment rights as are accorded to persons inducted under the Universal Military Training and Service Act. Persons wishing to volunteer could secure a leave of absence from their jobs for purposes of training and would be entitled to return to his job following his training period if he were not selected for immediate service abroad.

Section 24 (b) provides for the same sort of reemployment assistance for former volunteers as for inductees.

Section 24 (c) provides for absentee voting rights for volunteers on the same basis as for inductees.

Section 25 defines various terms used in the bill.

Section 26 is a standard "separability" provision.

Section 27 provides that the bill's effective date shall be the date of its enactment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD an excellent article which appeared in the May issue of the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News entitled "The Peace Corps: Promise and Potential." Harry H. Pollak, author of the article, is an AFL–CIO international representative and has been appointed as labor liaison man with the Peace Corps. Mr. Pollak emphasizes the important role which young American workers can play in this new and dynamic program. He also comments on the importance of our Peace Corps program not being solely a function of the Government, but one in which our various democratic groups, including trade unions, will take a most active role in developing projects and programs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PEACE CORPS: PROMISE AND POTENTIAL

(By Harry H. Pollak)

On March 1, 1961, the President of the United States issued an Executive order which established, on a temporary basis, the Peace Corps.

The Peace Corps is to be composed primarily of young Americans who, in a tour of service of 2 to 3 years, could supplement, but not supplant, the technical assistance programs of governmental and private organizations.

In the opinion of one of its congressional sponsors, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, the Peace Corps should be a genuine people-to-people program in which talented and dedicated young Americans by bringing special skills to the peoples of the less developed areas of the world would assist them in their struggle against poverty, disease, illiteracy and hunger.

All recruits for the Peace Corps will be volunteers. They will be drawn from the factories, the farms, and the colleges of the Nation and, after rigorous orientation and language training, be sent only where they are needed and wanted, where they can work closely with the people they assist.

ENTHUSIASTIC RESPONSE

They are to be teachers, community development workers, agricultural extension workers, sanitation workers, construction foremen and workers, medical assistants, mechanics, accountants or civil administrators. They will be social workers, librarians, vocational schoolteachers, surveyors, laboratory technicians, and—in fact—from an infinite variety of occupations. Most of them will be young, with an age span between 21 to 45 years of age, but a number of older volunteers will be employed as instructors at training centers or oversea supervisors.

The Peace Corps volunteer is expected to live on a standard similar to that of his counterpart in the host country, will get no regular salary but will receive allowances to cover the cost of clothing, housing, food, and incidental expenses. When he returns home, he will get a separation allotment based on his time overseas, which will be probably about $75 a month and will provide him with funds to live on until he obtains other employment.

American response to the Peace Corps has been highly enthusiastic and the number of volunteers who have applied for service have taxed the facilities of this new and still temporary agency—pending legislation which will make it a permanent organization.

The AFL–CIO is cooperating fully in an effort to make the Peace Corps a success. On the top-level National Advisory Council for the Peace Corps, which was named by President Kennedy, are Joseph Beirne, AFL–CIO vice president and president of the Communication Workers of America, and Cornelius J. (Neil) Haggerty, president of the AFL–CIO Building and Construction Trades Department. (In addition, this writer has been named by President George Meany as a liaison officer between the Peace Corps and the AFL–CIO.)

From the very beginning, American labor spokesmen have urged that a Peace Corps must be truly representative of American society and that it mobilize the energies, the skills of young workers in the gigantic tasks of assisting the new nations of Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East to spark their industrial revolutions.

The union schoolteacher, the mason, the carpenter, the bricklayer, the electrician, the stenographer, the printer, the newspaperman, the painter—and many others—can help. Vocational training projects, community building programs, are only part of the task. Some can work on programs and projects that are of special interest to the free trade unions.

The AFL–CIO believes that Peace Corps programs are not solely the concern of governments. Vital institutions in developing societies are the free trade unions. They should be taken into partnership, together with other democratic groups, in developing Peace Corps projects and programs. Large- or small-scale projects—Peace Corps activities or large-scale developmental programs—will have real meaning when they can be translated into terms of economic and social justice for the masses of the people.

But with all its promises and with all its potential the Peace Corps should be viewed as a frankly experimental program. There will be mistakes and difficulties not now foreseen. There will be needed vast efforts of coordination with existing facilities, in order to avoid duplication and administrative chaos. It will be essential to have some really effective training for Peace Corps recruits of all fields in the culture of other societies, and particularly about trade unions and other democratic institutions.

Peace Corps recruits, whatever their skills, should not be considered social and political automatons. They should be prepared to discuss with all the basic nature of American democracy, its emphasis on freedom, individual and national, its abhorrence of totalitarianism, red and black, and its support of social and economic justice.

American labor, with its long history of international cooperation, knows full well that a Peace Corps is not a universal patent medicine that can cure everything that ails our ravaged world. By itself, it cannot bring freedom to millions who are enslaved behind the Iron Curtain; it will not by itself solve the enormous problems of hunger and disease that afflict so many of our brethren; the hard problems, in Berlin, or Laos, or Cuba, or Moscow and Peking, or elsewhere, will still be with us.

After realistically examining its limitations as well as its potential, we can agree that the Peace Corps is a new technique in the struggle to eradicate the age-old scourges of poverty, illiteracy and disease. It is a new technique in harnessing the skills of our people in a common effort. Organized properly, administered intelligently, it should live up to its promise of utility, effectiveness and ultimate success.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that the bill, which I have introduced today on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and myself, remain at the desk until the conclusion of business on Monday of next week, so that if other Senators wish to join as cosponsors they may have the privilege of doing so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to be included as a cosponsor, if the Senator will permit me to do so.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very pleased the Senator has joined us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2000) relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Before the Senator discusses the details of the bill, I should like to commend him for the presentation he is making. I think the proposal to set up a Peace Corps is one of the most

challenging proposals which has come to us in a long, long time.

I recall that in previous Congresses the Senator from Minnesota discussed the idea of a Peace Corps. I am delighted that President Kennedy adopted the idea early; even during his presidential campaign. The President now seeks to make it a reality by recommending to Congress the enactment of a permanent program setting up a Peace Corps.

I was interested in what the Senator said about work in which the Peace Corps might engage, both in operating in a community or village, and in helping to train workers in such villages. I am sure that the Senator from Minnesota has had the privilege of visiting some of the villages in the lesser developed countries of the world and has seen the great need for this kind of work. I am sure that the Senator would agree with me that one of our finest programs, so far as foreign aid is concerned, is that which was proposed by Mr. Truman when he proposed a bold program of sharing techniques and skills with the people of the underdeveloped nations in the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do agree.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is that not what we seek to do with the Peace Corps?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Exactly. It would accomplish the purpose in depth, not only at the supervisory level, but also at the work level.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; in both training and operation.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. The program is not one merely for technical assistance, but also one for work assistance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is training and operational. The Senator has well summarized the program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Several years ago, when I was in India for the first time, I was carried into the country quite a distance from New Delhi to a native village. It was the first time I had even seen the native villages of India. I had heard how the country was building around the villages. Of course, the Senator knows how true that is.

I went through the village. It was a great experience for me. I saw the exceedingly great difficulties our country would be up against in trying to bring to that village a standard of living that we would call anything like a good or decent standard.

That evening back in New Delhi I talked with an American lady who was in India under our point 4 program. She was doing home demonstration work.

I said to her:

I visited a village today and I saw this and I saw that—

Describing to her my experiences, I said:

Tell me, how will you ever be able to reach those people?

She said:

I won't. But our hope lies in taking a girl, for example, out of that village and perhaps training her in college for this kind of work, and her return to her home village to carry on the program.

That approach seemed rather farfetched to me, and yet I realize that with slow, gradual process a great deal has been accomplished over a few years. Though I say it is "a great deal," I realize it is really small as compared with the work that remains to be done.

About 3 weeks ago I was in Korea attending an international conference on community development, which revolved around the very question about which I have spoken. I went out into the country and visited a village in which there had been some development projects. The village worker, who was a young lady trained in the manner the lady in India had suggested, and who lived in her own village, was leading the work in that village and three other villages. Under her supervision were four villages.

We were shown the different projects in which the villagers had engaged, and which were carried on as village undertakings under her leadership. All the villages were proud of their accomplishments. They were simple things. They did not require a great deal of money. For example, I saw a generating plant operated through waterpower. Not much water was available, but from this small stream the available water had been brought down to the small generating plant. Two or three small industries were operated during the daytime with that power. I remember that one plant made rope from hemp. There were two or three other plants. At night the plant would be shut down and the power would be used to light the houses in the villages.

I asked about the cost of the power, and discovered that it was amazingly low. The people of the village had contributed their labor under the leadership of the village workers, and the cost was very low.

We were then shown a kitchen which was modern from the standpoint of the villages. It was one which had utilized fuel for cooking purposes, the heat being then piped under the house so as to heat the house. There were several interesting features about the plant, one of which was that it cost only about $10 to install.

We were shown various other projects, including a sanitation project. I remember that one of the improvements in which the people took a great deal of pride in showing us was a modern latrine—a privy—that was sanitary. I remember how proud they were of that development in the village.

I could go on and name many projects of a similar nature. The standard of living of those people was being lifted through the efforts of one paid worker who had been trained by someone. I understand that the Peace Corps, as envisaged by the Senator, will accomplish that type of work; that is, members of the Corps will go out and help the people in the lesser developed countries. Is that correct?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct. I thank the Senator for his on-the-spot observation as to what can be done with this kind of practical work assistance, technical assistance, and cooperative endeavor. The Senator's observations have been extremely helpful.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Last July I was in the Philippines and visited several of the developments there. I saw the same type of work. I saw the construction of recreation centers and civic centers in which people could gather and hold social meetings and get-togethers. Such projects were in addition to other projects such as I have already described. There is a tremendous demand for that type of work in many countries of the world; and, as I see it, the purpose of the bill that the Senator from Minnesota and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations are now introducing is to help do the job along the line that President Truman suggested in his bold new program of sharing techniques with other peoples of the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I hesitate to ask the Senator to yield, because I do not want to break the continuity of the very splendid address being made by our courageous colleague. He is courageous because in all the fields of endeavor with which he has been associated in the Senate we have come to recognize not only his understanding of the measures which he sponsors, but also his determination and unqualified commitment to the causes with which he is associated.

I want the RECORD to indicate that in the presentation of this proposed legislation we are seeing affirmative action being taken, and a very positive approach to the overwhelming problems of our times.

So I again congratulate my friend from Minnesota on his approach to the difficult and complex tasks of advancing the hopes for a just and honorable peace. It is very important that we realize that we must now, rather than later, adopt affirmative methods toward the elimination of the basic causes of war, which are disease and poverty and ignorance and misunderstanding. Certainly the proposed Peace Corps, an idea developed in the alert mind of the Senator from Minnesota, in association with others who believe in this cause, embodies the kind of affirmative and positive action so desperately needed today.

It is not accidental, I believe, that the idea of our Peace Corps was the topic which most intrigued a group of young men and women from the Soviet Union whom I addressed on Capitol Hill not long ago. Whether they viewed it as a potential obstacle to Soviet influence among the less developed countries, or whether they saw it as an example the Soviet Union might emulate, I do not know. But they were most anxious to acquire greater understanding of our plans in this field.

And I have little doubt that the skills and intelligence, the humanitarianism

and the idealism of American young men and women, harnessed in this fashion, will prove to be one of the most potent of forces for peace and progress among the new and underdeveloped countries of the world.

For the skeptics among us, I would point out that this is not a completely untested idea. There are already a number of voluntary service organizations functioning in this field—among them, the International Voluntary Services, Inc.; the British organization of Voluntary Service Overseas; Operation Crossroads Africa, Inc.; and the National 4–H Club Foundation of America, which for many years has been sending American farm youths to live with farm families in other countries. According to UNESCO, there are more than 300,000 young volunteers from 41 countries now participating in some form of work camp activity.

It is appropriate that the Government of the United States take the lead in this field. For even before the publication of William James' eloquent essay, "The Moral Equivalent of War," in which the concept of a peace army was first developed, our Government launched a modest experiment at the end of the Spanish-American War. American soldiers were given the option of being demobilized and returned to the United States or staying in the Philippines to become teachers in the new educational system being established.

Many of them chose the latter course, going to the villages and living in the little one-room schoolhouses where they taught. The value of this program for the people of the Philippines and for the cause of American-Philippine friendship is a matter of record—a record which will be attested to by our good friend, Ambassador Romulo, who was one of the thousands of Filipinos who had their first teaching from such soldier teachers.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is with the greatest hope that I would urge this body to take early action to make real a vision which is held by so many people of good will, not only in America, but throughout the world.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his very gracious and kind remarks. The record should note the Senator's help in this effort on the Peace Corps. When the study program was authorized a year ago, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] was one of the Senators who encouraged the study, as did other Senators. I really believe that the Peace Corps offers to young Americans an opportunity they have long sought to demonstrate the quality of their citizenship, the quality of their character, the generosity of their spirit and, may I add, the tremendous ability and talent that is theirs. I believe that is going to be of great importance to our Nation and to the world.

THE TECHNICO PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate a copy of a letter I have received from Mr. Arthur Bronwell, president of Worcester Polytechnic Institute, of Worcester, Mass., explaining a people-to-people program which is being undertaken by a reputable businessman in the State of Rhode Island—the Presiding Officer [Mr. PELL] may well know him—Mr. Charles Morrow, vice president of the Frank Morrow Co. The program known as "Technico" is a plan to find outdated shop machinery, lathes, tools, and laboratory instruments that could be of value to trade schools in underdeveloped nations and have them shipped overseas.

What the letter from Mr. Bronwell asks is that the ICA make arrangements for transportation of a vast amount of equipment that American industry is willing to give free of charge for vocational and technical schools overseas.

I have not been able to get too much consideration of this thought, so it is my desire to have the letter placed in the RECORD. It is addressed to the Honorable Charles P. Taft. I have a copy of it. I place it in the RECORD with the hope that those responsible for our foreign aid program will read this portion of the RECORD, will take note of the letter, and will attempt to do something about it in a constructive manner.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORCESTER POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Worcester, Mass., May 19, 1961.

The Honorable CHARLES P. TAFT,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DEAR MR. TAFT: May I seek your assistance in a program which I believe has high potential as a part of our Nation's people-to-people program?

Briefly, the program known as "Technico," was initiated by an able, dedicated young businessman, Mr. Robert Morrow, vice president of the Frank Morrow Co., in Providence, R.I. Mr. Morrow's plan is to find outdated shop machinery, lathes, tools and laboratory instruments that could be of value to trade schools in underdeveloped nations and arrange to have these shipped overseas. His program has been in operation for over a year and he has personally supervised the transportation of about 200,000 pounds of machinery to schools in foreign lands.

His plan is quite simple and direct. He is making arrangements with companies or other organizations so that each cooperating American unit will accept responsibility for sending shop equipment (lathes, milling machines, laboratory equipment, etc.,) to one or more technical schools in underdeveloped countries. They will find the equipment, crate it, and transport it to the point of embarkation. For overseas shipping he will need ICA assistance. He is making certain that his cooperating American units are in competent hands.

I am personally acquainted with this program, since we have an active group of students at Worcester Polytechnic Institute who have organized teams to visit the companies in the Worcester area and scout out the equipment.

This program is on a voluntary basis. I know that Mr. Morrow has put in a good deal of his own money and has devoted a large share of personal time in developing it.

You can well imagine that Mr. Morrow is faced with some difficult buildup problems. But I am convinced that he will drive it through into a program of substantial size and accomplishment. A number of Congressmen including Senator SALTONSTALL, Senator HUMPHREY, and Congressman KOWALSKI have given him assistance in getting tax exemption.

My question to you is quite direct. The plan breaks down completely unless Mr. Morrow is able to get ICA shipping support. So far he has been able to get voluntary assistance from the shipping companies, but, as you might surmise, there is a limit to this kind of generosity. I would hope very much that you would be able to exercise your influence to get ICA acceptance of Mr. Morrow's Technico program.

This is a solid working program and Bob is the kind of dedicated person that America should back. He is assembling an advisory committee of leading businessmen to help in formulating policy. He has found that companies are eager to cooperate and willing to assume local costs. Also, he is utilizing the established services of the Near East Foundation, Asia Foundation, and International YMCA in order to get a line on the schools in underdeveloped nations and to get some assistance from their field services. By this means, he has been able to do the job in a highly creditable manner without the necessity of setting up a large organization.

I do sincerely hope that you can find a way of giving Mr. Morrow the green light insofar as ICA is concerned so that he can move rapidly ahead. You can rely upon him to achieve quality results.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR BRONWELL,
President.

FOREIGN AID POLICY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post by Walter Lippmann, entitled "Foreign Aid Policy," which gives a splendid discussion of the foreign aid message and the foreign aid bill, and its purposes, its objectives, and the changes which are involved, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 1, 1961]

FOREIGN AID POLICY

(By Walter Lippmann)

In its effect on our power and influence in the world, much the most important business before this session of Congress is foreign aid. It is an unpopular subject. But so are many other things that are important and necessary, such as paying taxes and contributing to the Community Chest. At bottom foreign aid is an obligation which the rich and powerful nations owe to the poor and weak nations. There is no escaping it. An attempt to escape it can produce only a very bad conscience at home, envy and ill-will abroad.

In several messages the President has now put forth his policy and program. In the total amount of money he asks Congress to let him spend he is in substantial agreement with the last Eisenhower budget.

There is an important difference, however, in the emphasis on two crucial questions. One is the need to authorize long-range planning, instead of yearly planning as at present. The other is the desirability of giving a stable financial base to the long-range planning by granting the agency authority to borrow specific amounts from the Treasury.

At one time or another President Eisenhower endorsed both points, and in 1957 Secretary Dulles argued eloquently for them. But in 1959, in view of opposition in Congress, President Eisenhower did not fight for them.

The arguments for long-range financing derive from the practical experience of this country in dealing with the problem. Most of the arguments come down to one basic proposition. It is that the big constructive economic projects, which really develop a backward country, have to be planned, administered, carried out and financed over a term of years. It takes more than 1 year to build roads, to make ports, to modernize agriculture, to open mines, to build factories. Indeed it can be said that projects which can be carried out by an annual appropriation are likely to be unimportant or wasteful.

If our aid is to achieve results, we must be in a position to encourage an underdeveloped country to draw up plans of capital investment which will take years to execute. Only if there exists such long-range plans can a country hope to generate the self-help which is indispensable. Indeed, students of the problem have come to realize that the country which receives the aid must play the principal part, must make much the largest contribution, in the realization of the plan. Our role is to be the catalyst, to say that we will provide x amount of dollar exchange when the underdeveloped country has started a land reform program or an improvement in its educational system. But if we are not able to say with certainty how much we will contribute from year to year, we can exercise little useful influence on the development of the country.

Under the present system funds appropriated for a given fiscal year must be obligated during that year, or they revert to the Treasury. This is extremely wasteful. It leads to a scramble at the end of each fiscal year to obligate all unused funds before July 1. The more popular Government programs—notably defense—are not required to do this with all their funds.

The second essential point in the administration program is that in order to give the foreign aid agency the capacity to make long-range plans, it should be given the authority to borrow from the Treasury funds according to a specified schedule and over a 5-year period. This proposal is attacked by men in Congress as back-door spending, as a way of circumventing the appropriation process.

This so-called back-door spending is not a new bright idea of the Kennedy administration. A very large number of agencies beginning with the RFC under President Hoover, and going on to such agencies as the Home Owners Loan Corporation, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, are financed by authorized borrowing from the Treasury. In this term of Congress, Treasury borrowing is provided in the depressed areas, veterans housing, and farm surplus disposal bills.

The question is, Would Congress, if it authorized this kind of borrowing, lose its proper constitutional control over public money?

It can be said truthfully that it would not lose this control. For it would establish the terms of the authorization and the criteria for the use of the funds. It could at any time move to reduce or to abolish the authority to borrow. It would pass upon a budget, drawn up in accordance with the Government Corporation Control Act, submitted annually to the Appropriations Committee. It would receive every 6 months a detailed report on the whole operation. It could and would investigate at home and in the country concerned. Congress would retain vast and extensive and continuing powers of control.

Congress would, in short, have the power to stop the whole business at the end of any fiscal year. What new thing then, it may be asked, would have happened if Treasury borrowing is authorized? While Congress would have retained the right to review, to investigate, to criticize, to reduce or to abolish, it would have granted by its own vote the power to make gentlemen's agreements over a period of 5 years. It would have approved the idea of long-range planning and would have accepted the moral commitments that are inherent in long-range planning.

All of this would be done in the open, and it would be unduly apprehensive to suspect that it would open up new opportunities for skulduggery.

SUPPORT OF ADMINISTRATION FARM PROPOSAL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which relates to a public opinion poll published in the Minneapolis Tribune, entitled "Administration Farm Procedure Supported," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADMINISTRATION FARM PROCEDURE SUPPORTED

Should farm legislation be drawn up by the Secretary of Agriculture, be submitted to Congress for its approval or veto, and if approved, be put to a vote of the farmers themselves?

More than 6 out of 10 Minnesotans (63 percent) questioned by the Minneapolis Tribune's Minnesota poll say such an approach to developing farm policies makes sense to them.

It also appeals to 78 percent of the farm men and women questioned in a statewide sampling.

The plan, recommended by the Kennedy administration, was described in the survey in the following manner:

"It's been proposed that the secretary of agriculture draw up a farm program for specific commodities with the help of the farmers themselves. Congress then could either accept or reject the program. If Congress acepted it, and if two-thirds of the farm producers concerned voted to accept it, then the farm program would go into effect."

(The agricultural committees in Congress currently have the proposal under study.)

After interviewers read the above statement, people were asked:

"Do you think this is a good approach or a poor approach to the farm problem?"

The replies of a balanced cross section of State residents and of city and town residents compared with farm people:

[In percent]

	All adults	City and town	Farm
Good approach	63	60	78
Poor approach	11	12	6
Other answers	1	1	1
No opinion	25	27	15
Total	100	100	100

People who think the Kennedy administration proposal for making farm policies is good, in the main, say that farmers should have a voice in the farm program, and that better farm legislation will be developed under the proposed system.

The proposal is criticized in the survey mainly on these points: (1) Farmers would tailor the program to their benefit, at the expense of other taxpayers; (2) this plan would mean more controls, whereas there should be fewer controls, or none at all.

How much control is needed for agriculture was explored in this survey question:

"When it comes to the problem of farm production and surplus crops, which direction do you think is better for the Federal Government to take—a trend toward reducing Federal controls on production and letting market conditions set the prices, or a trend toward greater controls on farm production, along with price supports and subsidies for farmers?"

Opposite points of view are shown between the farm and nonfarm people in Minnesota.

[In percent]

	All adults	City and town	Farm
Reduce Federal controls	50	52	41
Controls plus subsidies	29	25	52
Other answers	3	3	
No opinion	18	20	7
Total	100	100	100

In the State as a whole, opinions of Republican voters divide 69 percent to 15 percent for fewer controls, compared with 50 percent to 25 percent among independent voters.

Democratic-Farmer-Labor voters divide 40 percent for controls plus subsidies and 38 percent for fewer controls.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The poll shows that 78 percent of the farm people think the administration's program for agriculture is a good approach. Only 6 percent think it is a poor approach. Sixty percent of the city and town people think it is a good approach, and only 12 percent think it is a poor approach.

We have justifiable pride in the intelligence of our people, and they find the farm measures of the administration to be commendable.

A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the auditor of the city of Portland, Mr. Ray Smith, has called to my attention Resolution 28567 which was adopted by the City Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., on May 24, 1961. This resolution endorses President Kennedy's proposal for an establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be included at this point in the RECORD.

I recall that on April 18 my good friend and colleague, Senator CLARK, introduced the administration's bill, S. 1633, to authorize the establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing. For this reason it gives me special pleasure to know that the city of Portland has adopted a resolution strongly endorsing this measure.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG., *May 25, 1961.*

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I am enclosing a certified copy of Resolution 28567, adopted by the Portland City Council on May 24, 1961, endorsing legislation proposed by the President of the United States to create a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs under a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

Yours very truly,

RAY SMITH,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

OFFICE OF AUDITOR OF THE
CITY OF PORTLAND,
Portland, Oreg.

I, Ray Smith, auditor of the city of Portland, do hereby certify that I have compared the following copy of Resolution 28567, adopted by the council May 24, 1961, being, "A resolution endorsing legislation proposed by the President of the United States to create a new Federal Department of Urban Affairs under a Secretary of Cabinet rank," with the original thereof, and that the same is a full, true and correct copy of such original Resolution 28567 and of the whole thereof as the same appears on file and of record in my office, and in my care and custody.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of the city of Portland affixed this 24th day of May 1961.

[SEAL]

RAY SMITH,
Auditor of the City of Portland.
By ROLIT L. MCCOY,
Deputy.

RESOLUTION 28567

Whereas the President of the United States has introduced legislation in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives which would establish a Federal Department of Urban Affairs to be headed by a new member of the Cabinet, Secretary of Urban Affairs, whose duties among others would be to obtain coordination among other Federal activities affecting urban areas, encourage the solution of related problems through State, local, and private action, and provide for the consideration of urban problems at the national level; and

Whereas our metropolitan communities which are constantly expanding are, in many instances ringed by decay, often drab and inefficient areas, and such problems cannot always be cured by local efforts alone; and

Whereas it is of mutual interest and great importance to all cities of the United States to foster and support the legislation proposed by the President of the United States, which would create a Federal Department of Urban Affairs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Council of the City of Portland (in regular session assembled), Does, by this resolution, endorse the legislation proposed by the President of the United States which would create a new Cabinet department, Secretary of Urban Affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That the auditor of the city of Portland file certified copies of this resolution with the Honorable WAYNE MORSE and the Honorable MAURINE B. NEUBERGER, U.S. Senators from Oregon, and to the Honorable WALTER NORBLAD, the Honorable AL ULLMAN, the Honorable EDITH GREEN, and the Honorable EDWIN R. DURNO, Representatives from the State of Oregon.

Adopted by the council May 24, 1961.

RAY SMITH,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

APPOINTMENT OF GENERAL HEUSINGER AS CHAIRMAN OF THE NATO MILITARY REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on April 19, 1961, I wrote to the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, protesting the appointment of a former Nazi general by the name of Heusinger, as Chairman of the NATO Military Representatives Committee. I asked for a letter from the State Department setting forth its views on this important appointment.

Under date of May 25, 1961, I received a reply signed by Assistant Secretary of State Hays. I ask unanimous consent to have printed the State Department's reply. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed, my brief answer to Secretary Brooks Hays' letter in which brief I stated that the Department of State's rationalization is a very unconvincing explanation of this shocking appointment.

There being no objection, the correspondence was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1961.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have your letter of April 17, 1961, addressed to the Secretary concerning General Heusinger, Chairman of the NATO Military Representatives Committee.

I can assure you that the Department sympathizes deeply with those who have themselves suffered or have lost members of their families at the hands of the Nazi regime. We consider, however, that the charges made against General Heusinger are unjustified.

I should like to explain how the appointment was made. The post of Chairman of the Military Representatives Committee was held for a number of years by a Netherlands general, Lieutenant General Hasselman. Late in 1960, the post of Chairman became vacant. After careful consideration the Military Committee in Chiefs of Staff session in December of 1960, selected General Heusinger to be the Chairman of the Military Representatives Committee (the latter is in permanent session and is subordinate to the Military Committee in Chiefs of Staff session which meets periodically. The Military Committee in turn is subordinate to the North Atlantic Council). The choice was unanimous by all 14 Governments represented on the Military Committee. (Iceland having no armed forces is not a member of the Military Committee.) The Chiefs of Staff did not act in this matter on their own authority, but with the approval of their respective Governments, who in turn considered the matter carefully before providing their chiefs of staff with guidance. As you know, the Military Committee includes representatives of a number of Governments whose countries have suffered considerably at the hands of the Nazi regime. These include Greece, Italy, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Norway, Luxembourg, Denmark, and the United Kingdom. You may rest assured that these Governments did not arrive at their conclusion lightly. On the contrary, the Department considers that if there had been any question in the minds of any one or any number of these Governments that charges of war crimes against General Heusinger were in any way justified, they would not have consented to this appointment, particularly since all the Governments mentioned are democratic Governments responsible to public opinion.

The Department also considers that the appointment of a German officer to this post must be considered in the light of the present situation. As you know, it has been a fundamental tenet of U.S. foreign policy toward Germany in the postwar period to encourage the maximum integration into the Western community of nations. This policy was clearly set forth by the late Secretary Dulles when he said:

"We believe that the future is best served by encouraging the closest possible relations between Germany and other Western European countries which are peace loving and having such a close integration—military, political, economic—that independent, aggressive, nationalist action by Germany becomes as a practical matter impossible and also something that would not be desired."

Chancellor Adenauer and his Government are thoroughly dedicated to the integration of the Federal Republic, militarily, politically, and economically, into the Atlantic Community and the European integration movement. We know that General Heusinger, personally, holds the same view. The Federal Republic today makes a very substantial contribution to NATO defense. She is virtually the only European country which is almost on schedule in meeting her NATO military commitments. Moreover, she no longer receives any grant military assistance from the United States, but meets her NATO procurement requirements approved by the alliance entirely through purchases in the United States and elsewhere.

The Department considers that Germany's contribution to the allied effort is entirely in the NATO framework and amply justifies her occupying a number of important positions in the allied structure. Nonetheless, only two German officers at this time occupy such positions. One of these is General Speidel, who, in his capacity as Commander, Allied Land Forces Central Europe, is, along with eight other non-German senior allied officers on the same level, subordinate to the French Commander-in-Chief, Allied Forces Central Europe. (The latter in turn is subordinate to General Norstad.) The other is General Heusinger.

The Department believes that General Heusinger's personal background is also significant in the evaluation of his appointment. General Heusinger entered the German Army in World War I as a private. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the infantry in 1916, and shortly thereafter was taken prisoner of war by the British. He remained in the German Army after the war, was eventually assigned to staff duty, and finally rose to the position of Chief of the Plans and Operations Division of the Army's General Staff (OKH). The Army's General Staff in turn was subordinate to the General Staff of the German Armed Forces (OKW), which in turn was, of course, directed by Hitler. Despite the pressures to which all German officers were subject, General Heusinger never joined the Nazi Party, and in the end actively opposed it.

General Heusinger was a staff officer throughout World War II, and as such did not command troops.

Specifically, he did not, as charged by representatives of one group to whom we have spoken, command the so-called "Einsatzgruppen" which were responsible for the mass murders and other atrocities committed by the Nazi regime. These "Einsatzgruppen" were not a part of the army, but were under control of the SS and its chief, Heinrich Himmler. Nor did either General Heusinger or the army conduct the operation against the Warsaw ghetto. This operation was conducted under the command of an SS officer directly responsible to Himmler.

Thorough investigations by both Allied authorities after the end of World War II as well as by scholarly nongovernmental investigators into the events of World War II do not bear out any of the charges now, in 1961, being made against General Heusinger. In fact, after investigations conducted immediately after World War II had cleared Heusinger, he served as consultant to the U.S. prosecution at the Nurenberg trials. Nonetheless, the Department has carefully reviewed the material sent us by various groups expressing objection to the appointment. On the basis of this review we have concluded that this material consists entirely of either allegations which are not supported by facts, or interpretations of facts, often taken entirely out of their real context, which are not warranted.

The record shows that General Heusinger was aware of the plot being conducted by a number of German officers against Hitler over a number of years which culminated in the events of July 1944. While he was not personally involved in the details of that particular attempt and the actual placing of the bomb, he, as other German officers, was aware of the general outlines of the plot and sympathized with it. This fact became known to the Gestapo. After the attempt failed, General Heusinger was arrested, and interrogated at length in a Gestapo prison. However, the Gestapo was unable to obtain sufficient proof to implicate him in this plot and consequently he was simply dismissed from the active service at that time and spent the remaining 10 months of World War II in that status.

In considering such matters as this appointment, which relate directly to NATO, the Department is also cognizant of the primary objective of Soviet policy to disrupt and weaken the North Atlantic Alliance, the principal obstacle in the way of Soviet Communist ambitions. The Soviet Government's consistent attempts to create distrust and suspicion among members of the alliance and specific endeavors to isolate the Federal Republic from its allies have recently been manifested in an organized propaganda campaign against the Heusinger appointment.

I hope this information will help clarify the position of the Department in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary.

JUNE 1, 1961.

Hon. BROOKS HAYS,
Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Thank you very much for your letter of May 25, in regard to the appointment of General Heusinger.

Frankly, I find it very unconvincing. The United States should have been no party to such a shocking appointment.

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE MORSE.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT FOR VOTE ON S. 1922, THE HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a unanimous-consent request and ask for its immediate consideration. The request has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], with the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Banking and Currency; and with the distinguished junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], as well as with other Senators who are interested in this particular matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, June 2, 1961, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1922), debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided, further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided further,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Ordered further, That in case a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on any amendment, action on that amendment will go over until Wednesday, June 7, until after the morning business, at which time debate on each amendment will be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled under the same conditions as in the first instance, and the amendments will come up in the same order as originally presented for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the 15 minutes to be allotted on Wednesday will be on each side?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Thirty minutes on an amendment, the time to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes on each amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not understand what the clerk read about the treatment to be accorded the so-called Javits amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That part of the proposed agreement will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Except the Javits amendment, numbered 5-23-61—B, on which there shall be 3 hours.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the agreement proposed by the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement as reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That, effective on Friday, June 2, 1961, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment (except the Javits amendment, numbered 5-23-61—B, on which there shall be 3 hours), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided,* That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided, further,* That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided,* That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Ordered further, That in case a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on any amendment, action on that amendment will go over until Wednesday, June 7, until after the morning business, at which time debate on each amendment will be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled under the same conditions as in the first instance, and the amendments will come up in the same order as originally presented for consideration.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees and subcommittees which desire to do so be allowed to meet during the session of the Senate tomorrow until 12 o'clock noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, let me make an inquiry. Today is the day of the well-advertised $100 Republican dinner. It is a sellout; there is to be a full house. Some will have to appear in dinner coats, tonight. So I trust that at a reasonable hour today the Senate will adjourn, so they can be properly attired for this notable event, when we celebrate a great victory, among other things, and also extend greetings in fellowship to our former great chief, President Eisenhower.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say there will be no rollcall votes today. As a matter of fact, there will be none until Wednesday, next. It is our hope that the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] will have an opportunity to make his general remarks before he leaves for this repast, which I understand will be served this evening at $100 a plate—the same price, by the way, that the Democrats charged; and I hope the Republicans get more than we did. But it is anticipated that Republican Senators who wish to speak in the Senate today will have an opportunity to do so before 5 or 5:30 p.m., so they can be on their way by that time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hope we not only get more than the Democrats did, but that we get more for our money when we spend it. [Laughter.]

UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the unemployment figures for May, released

yesterday, confirm what many of us had feared: That, despite the recovery that is underway, we are not gaining on the unemployment problem.

Industrial production, the gross national product, and personal income have all been rising for several months. It is generally agreed that the recession hit bottom in February and that we have been experiencing a rather encouraging rate of recovery since that time. Yet unemployment has remained approximately even. On a seasonally adjusted basis, it stood at 6.8 percent of the labor force in February and 6.9 percent in May.

These figures show that our present rate of recovery has only been sufficient to absorb the normal increase in the labor force. It is not sufficient to cut into the present intolerable rate of almost 7 percent unemployment.

We are running hard just to stay in the same place. If we are to make progress, we must run a good deal harder.

And remember that a 7-percent rate of unemployment as a national average means a much higher rate in Pennsylvania, in Michigan, in Ohio, and in the manufacturing regions in general. In Pennsylvania, 1 out of 10 workers has been unemployed, on the average, ever since this recession began.

The reasons for this situation are clear. Productivity in industry is increasing faster than production. Output per worker is rising faster than total output. That can only mean fewer workers.

The mayor of a Pennsylvania city, which has an unemployment rate above 20 percent, summed it up in a single illustration. The major steel plant in that city, at the peak production a few years ago, employed 17,000 men. That plant will shortly reach the same level of production, but will employ just 11,000 men. With a few exceptions, the other 6,000 men will probably never work in steel again. Where will they be employed? Nobody has the answer.

It is the same story throughout the steel regions of Pennsylvania, and Ohio, and Indiana, and every other State that produces steel. In that one industry, an estimated quarter of a million workers have been displaced and few will ever return to the steel plants.

We know the many thousands of persons displaced by technological improvements in the coal industry. We passed a depressed areas bill largely to assist in the rehabilitation of the coal regions. On the horizon we can now see the alarming prospect of a new group of depressed areas—those cities, once among the most prosperous in the country, which have relied on manufacturing. It is significant that Detroit, our major auto center, and Pittsburgh, our leading steel center, already qualify for assistance under the area redevelopment bill. There are fewer people employed in manufacturing today than there were 10 years ago—and yet the labor force has grown by almost 10 million persons. Service occupations simply have not absorbed the increase—and now these occupations too are beginning to be hit by automation. Moreover, in the 1960's the labor force will grow half again as rapidly as in the 1950's.

The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Heller, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Martin, recently engaged in a rather abstruse debate before the Joint Economic Committee as to whether our unemployment is chiefly cyclical or chiefly structural. I am not sure that a precise answer to that question is of major importance. Certainly, the total is a compound of both types of unemployment, and to attack the problem will require a combination of two kinds of remedies.

The Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare has held a series of hearings on the general unemployment problem and on certain bills which we have before us.

Our witnesses were in general agreement that present governmental measures to deal with cyclical unemployment—in other words, measures to speed recovery through fiscal policy—are inadequate. It is my understanding that witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee took the same position.

The economists who testified before both committees said that the present outlook is for a rate of unemployment above 6 percent throughout 1961, with little prospect of getting down to 4 percent before the end of 1962. They also contended that there are steps the Government can take to speed the recovery—without fear of any significant inflation, and without incurring any risk through adding to the deficit.

Among the measures is one before our subcommittee, S. 986, which would authorize Federal aid for State and local public works.

The bill as written would authorize $500 million in Federal grants to State and local governments to cover 45 percent of the cost of capital improvements of all kinds which would represent a net increase in the level of capital expenditure of the jurisdiction concerned. Priority would be given to projects which could be put under construction within 90 days and completed within 1 year thereafter. Another $500 million would be made available if, after the initial authorization were committed, the President concluded the economy required additional stimulation. Authority to make contracts would be automatically terminated when the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment fell below 4 percent.

We have just concluded 4 days of hearings on this bill. The president of the AFL–CIO, a panel of economists, and representative spokesmen for the States, counties, and cities of America all supported a measure along the lines of S. 986. So did the Joint Economic Committee.

The witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee during the 4 days of hearings generally agreed on the following points:

First. Even with the recovery that is in prospect, unemployment will remain at unsatisfactory levels, above 6 percent during the rest of 1961 and above 4 percent during 1962.

Second. States and local communities throughout the country have a tremendous backlog of needed public works.

Third. A bill along the lines of S. 986 would serve the double purpose of stimulating the economy and helping State and local governments provide critically needed public improvements.

Some of the witnesses who supported the objectives of the bill suggested amendments to some of its specific provisions.

I turn now to a brief summary of the testimony:

Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, contended that the end of the recession does not lessen the need for S. 986. During the last 7 years, each recovery has left us with a higher proportion of unemployment. At the 1959 peak, unemployment stood at 3.8 million, or 5.5 percent of the labor force. Total employment in manufacturing, mining, agriculture, and transportation is actually shrinking and shrinking fast. No new industries that will create massive employment are in sight, and in the 1960's the labor force will increase 50 percent faster than in the 1950's. Present projections indicate we will have more unemployed in a "prosperous" December 1961 than in the recession December of 1960. A chronic unemployment rate of 6 to 7 percent and creeping upward is intolerable.

Mr. Meany termed S. 986 a necessary supplement to other administration measures, because it will take effect immediately while they will be effective later. Billions of dollars in projects are on the "shelf" ready to be put under construction, as the result of planning undertaken with Federal assistance.

He added that if unemployment is sufficiently high to permit authorizations under the terms of S. 986, then circumstances call for a budget deficit. However, if unemployment does decline rapidly, then the President could terminate the program. Moreover, S. 986 will also have value as standby authority, ready for quick use when the next recession looms. It would be an additional built-in stabilizer in the economy.

Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, a member of the Joint Economic Committee, said that the most optimistic witnesses before the Joint Economic Committee estimated that unemployment would still be 6 to 7 percent at the end of 1961, and could not be expected to reach 4 percent before the end of 1962. These estimates were predicated on the upturn that is now taking place.

The Joint Economic Committee concluded that the total effects of all the actions so far taken and proposed will be small compared to the gap between the Nation's expected economic performance and its economic potential. It recommended legislation along the lines of S. 986.

Mr. REUSS reported that a study made during the last administration showed an accumulated backlog of State and local public works needs of $160 billion. To overcome this backlog, and provide for

necessary expansion totaling about $40 billion, would require capital expenditures of $20 billion a year over the next decade. During 1960, actual expenditure reached a level of $12.5 billion.

A panel of seven economists expressed a consensus that additional fiscal measures are desirable at this time and that the additional deficit that would be incurred if S. 986 is passed is not, from an economic standpoint, a cause for serious concern.

Otto Eckstein of Harvard University said that if the gross national product reaches $520 to $535 billion by the fourth quarter, 5.5 to 6.5 percent of the labor force would still be unemployed. He considered it probable that, as has been true in most of the period since World War II, expansionary programs will be ruled out on practical grounds and therefore fiscal policy will not be pursued with sufficient vigor. With monetary policy constrained by international considerations, total economic policy will be inadequate. What people forget, Dr. Eckstein reminded us, is that there is nothing particularly practical about a condition of slack in the economy. It costs us vast amounts of current output and loss of investment, increases pressure for a shorter workweek, hardens the resistance of unions to technological innovation, and slows the rate of productivity gain that keeps our products competitive abroad.

Horace M. Gray, of the University of Illinois, stressed the imbalance between the public and private sectors of the economy. He estimated a need for $40 billion a year for 25 years in public investment, exclusive of defense, to bring the sectors into balance. He argued for a permanent comprehensive program of public investment rather than settling for a temporary emergency scheme like that proposed in S. 986. Moreover, arrangements would have to be made to finance such a program so that it would not increase deficits and thereby create more inflation.

Jewell J. Rasmussen, of the University of Utah, called S. 986 a most commendable step. The State of Utah this year could appropriate only $14.6 million of $51 million requested by the State building board, of which $20.8 million was for projects classified as critical. Many of the public facilities should have a high priority among various demands on our income.

Paul A. Samuelson, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, said that present governmental programs fall short of the optimal amount of economic effect and expressed general sympathy with S. 986. The expansion in prospect will not be so vigorous and quick as to bring us back to tolerable levels of unemployment soon enough. The rate will still be above 5 percent in the last half of 1962. The massive shift in the Federal budget during 1959–60 (from a $17 billion deficit to a $7 billion surplus over a five-quarter period, in annual rates seasonally adjusted) acted as a brake on the economy. The budget will be in balance, on an adjusted basis, at the end of this fiscal year, which could similarly abort the recovery.

In the event the optimistic forecasts prove wrong, he suggested, the bill might be enacted with a formula to trigger it in the fall if, say, unemployment remains above 6.5 percent for a specified number of months.

Gerhard Colm, of the National Planning Association, also emphasized the deficiencies in the public sector of the economy. A GNP of $525 billion in the fourth quarter would mean over 6 percent unemployment. Measures will be needed to create additional employment opportunity. In any case, a program like that of S. 986 would be useful to have on the statute books at all times as a standby antirecession measure. Because of the rapid and the automatic increase in revenues, a substantial increase in expenditures is possible without a deficit occurring under conditions of high employment. Monetary policy can offset minor misjudgments in fiscal policy.

D. Hamberg, of the University of Maryland, said that the economy needs more stimulus and this method commands praise. He felt that the measure is, in fact, too limited.

Harvey E. Brazer, of the University of Michigan, urged a variation of the local contribution according to the local rate of unemployment. Rather than abandon the bill because of the prospective deficit, he urges that revenues be increased by closing tax loopholes.

Mayor Henry Maier, of Milwaukee, on behalf of the American Municipal Association, advocated the plan outlined in S. 986 as permanent antidepression policy. There would be no time gap in Milwaukee in swinging the program into action. The city has projects totaling $35 million that could be started rapidly.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], quoted Kermit Gordon, member of the Council of Economic Advisers, as saying:

> Even with a good recovery, with a good brisk recovery from the recession, it doesn't seem very likely, I wouldn't bet, on the proposition that unemployment in the United States as a whole is going to fall below the 6 percent mark by the end of the year. In other words, we have moved up, we're turning up, the economy is moving in the right direction, but we've got a long way to go because of this accumulated slack which has developed over the years.

Senator HART said that the city of Detroit and the six metropolitan counties could place under construction within 90 days a total of $205 million in projects.

Responding to a questionnaire from the Senator, 35 Michigan cities of all sizes indicated the program would help. Of these cities, 22 have projects which clearly could be put under construction in 90 days, valued at $95 million. All of these cities could raise their share of the cost.

Gov. John B. Swainson, of Michigan, said it would be a serious error to assume that normal recovery will solve unemployment problems, and make emergency action unnecessary. Projections indicate 10 percent unemployment through 1961 in Michigan.

Mayor Joseph M. Barr, of Pittsburgh, reported that unemployment in the Pittsburgh area was 11.8 percent as of May 1 and asserted that we cannot afford to wait any longer to see if the economy will right itself.

Mayor de Lesseps S. Morrison, of New Orleans, said the bill will put people to work, pump new dollars into the economy, help to construct much needed municipal facilities which otherwise would have to be postponed indefinitely, and improve property values and thus expand the municipal tax base. New Orleans has a $6.5 million drainage project, now deferred, which could be put underway immediately. The Federal income tax from putting idle land into use would repay the Federal contribution under the bill. Other projects totaling $4 million are stalled for lack of funds.

C. D. Ward, general counsel of the National Association of County Officials, reported results of a sample poll of 65 counties showing that, with Federal aid, planned expenditures during the next year would be increased from $36 million to $136 million.

Mel F. Nielsen, supervisor of Contra Costa County, Calif., said that capital improvement needs in his county totaled $35 million in the next 5 years. S. 986 would enable the county to proceed with $1 million in public buildings, $1 million for roads, and $500,000 to $1 million for park development.

Delos Hamlin, chairman of the Oakland County, Mich., Board of Supervisors, said that a survey by the six counties in the Detroit metropolitan area revealed a need for $1.2 billion in public works. County governments do not have the financial resources to cope with the alarming inadequacy of public facilities serving the rapidly growing suburbs.

Armand H. Cote, director of the Department of Employment Security, State of Rhode Island, termed an emergency works program the State's most crying need. S. 986 would enable Rhode Island to complete within a year capital improvements now scheduled over a 5-year period. Unemployment in the State averaged 9.8 percent in the first 4 months of 1961.

William J. McSorley, of the Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO, reported that 20 percent of construction workers were unemployed in April, and that unemployment in the industry is nationwide.

Charles T. Stewart, of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the only witness opposing the bill, said that a tax cut would be preferable because private spending thus made possible would be manifestly more helpful to employment and to national welfare than public spending. He feared the bill would be used to finance make-work projects. He argued its impact might be felt during prosperity rather than recession, because of the delays in reducing the activities which it generated. He objected on principle to grants as impairing the independence of State and local governments. He also criticized a number of specific provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I had hoped that the administration would reach the conclusion that this bill would be a desirable additional stimulant to the economy, or that equally effective measures would

be taken. So far, I have been disappointed. Nevertheless, the subcommittee will invite the administration to appear, conclude the hearings, and then make our own recommendations to the full committee and to the Senate. In view of the alarming trend of unemployment, I believe that we have a duty in the legislative branch to reach our own legislative conclusions as to whether action is necessary.

Our subcommittee is also proceeding on a major measure to deal with structural unemployment. This is the President's proposal, transmitted earlier this week, to inaugurate a program of mass retraining of unemployed workers whose skills have been rendered obsolete by automation or other technological advance, or who do not have any skill at all. One of the anomalies of our ecomony is that even in the midst of a recession, with 5 million persons unemployed, some jobs are going begging. Nobody knows how many there are, or how many pay standard wages, but in any case we know that there are some good jobs that cannot be filled because qualified persons cannot be found. Hearings on this bill, and on a similar bill which I introduced earlier in this session, will be concluded next Wednesday, after which I hope we can act promptly to report a measure to the full committee and then to the Senate.

These two bills complement each other by tackling two different aspects of the unemployment problem. The public works bill would help to lift the whole economy by creating jobs, production, and purchasing power. The retraining bill would equip unemployed individuals to fill the jobs. They are companion measures. On the one hand, retraining cannot be fully effective unless an expanding economy is seeking the workers who are being trained. On the other hand, fiscal measures to expand the economy will be limited in their effect if workers do not have the skills necessary to fill the jobs created.

A third bill, which we expect to have before us soon, will tackle a second phase of structural unemployment. It will provide employment opportunities, as well as job training, for the Nation's youth—among whom the unemployment rate is dangerously high. Dr. James Bryant Conant, in a startling speech the other day, pointed out that a sample census in one large area of a big city showed that 70 percent of the young men between the ages of 16 and 21 are neither in school nor at work. This is obviously an explosive situation, which is at the heart of much of the alarming rise in juvenile delinquency and crimes committed by young men.

The subcommittee has had before it since early in the year a bill to create a Youth Conservation Corps, sponsored by the able Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and patterned on the one the Senate passed last year. The administration bill, we understand, will be somewhat broader, encompassing a wider variety of programs than the YCC alone. As soon as the administration measure is received, the subcommittee will schedule hearings, with a view to reporting out a bill by the end of June.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the stories from the Wall Street Journal and New York Times of this morning analyzing the May unemployment figures.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 1, 1961]

JOBLESSNESS FELL, EMPLOYMENT ROSE IN MAY 15 MONTH—CHANGES TERMED SEASONAL; LONG-TIME UNEMPLOYMENT NOT DROPPING, UNIT SAYS—IDLENESS IN KEY AREAS EASES

WASHINGTON.—Unemployment declined by 194,000 persons to 4,768,000 in the month to mid-May, and the number of jobholders rose by 1,044,000 to 66,778,000, the Labor Department reported. It described the changes as "about seasonal."

The employment total was the second highest for May on record, being exceeded only by that of May 1960, when it was 67,208,000.

The seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment—the percentage of the civilian labor force that is out of work—was calculated at 6.9 percent in mid-May, up from 6.8 percent a month earlier and 5.1 percent in May 1960.

STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

Dr. Seymour Wolfbein, the Department's Manpower Chief, said he saw no statistical significance in the slight increase in the joblessness rate. He did note, however, that the rate is "hanging high" for the sixth straight month. The rate rose to 6.8 percent mid-December and has varied only slightly since.

The number of workers without jobs for 15 weeks or longer fell seasonally from mid-April to 1,900,000 from 2,100,000 but the total set a postwar high for the month. Among the long-term unemployed were 900,000 workers who have been without jobs for more than 6 months.

"We are still not eating into the long-term unemployment," Dr. Wolfbein remarked.

The civilian labor force, expanding now as students begin to look for jobs, is calculated at 71.5 million, up from 70.7 million in May 1960.

EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS IMPROVE

In a separate survey of major labor markets, the Department spotted an improvement in employment conditions in most industrial areas around the Nation. It said hiring schedules indicate a continuing slight pickup in employment over the next 2 months.

The Department removed five areas from the list of places with "substantial unemployment." This cut the list to 96 areas from the record high of 101 in March and April. Reclassified from the category of substantial unemployment (6 to 8.9 percent) to that of moderate unemployment (3 to 5.9 percent) were San Francisco-Oakland, New Haven, Fort Wayne, Indianapolis and Steubenville-Weirton (Ohio-West Virginia).

Looking ahead, Government researchers predicted moderate payroll gains to July in industries producing steel, fabricated metals and electrical machinery. They reported some aircraft and auto centers anticipated payroll reductions to mid-July because of further cutbacks in manned aircraft production and the beginning of the 1962 model changeovers.

Despite anticipated job gains, unemployment also is expected to increase as students and recent graduates enter the labor market.

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1961]

JOBLESS TOTAL FALLS BUT RATE HITS 6 PERCENT

WASHINGTON.—A high unemployment rate of nearly 7 percent continued in May for the sixth straight month despite seasonal rises in jobs, the Labor Department reported today.

Between mid-April and mid-May employment rose seasonally by 1,044,000 to 66,778,000. This total was 400,000 below that for May 1960.

The number of unemployed Americans declined, also seasonally, by 194,000 to 4,768,000, as farm and construction work picked up last month.

But the seasonally adjusted unemployment rate increased from 6.8 to 6.9 percent.

Asked if these May statistics reflected any significant recovery from the recession in terms of unemployment, Seymour L. Wolfbein, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Labor, said:

"I would say no. There has not been the job recovery we've been looking for."

Mr. Wolfbein said that upturns and downturns in employment usually lagged behind similar movement in sales and production. But he emphasized that the unemployment total, despite seasonal improvement, remained at a "very high level," 1,300,000 above the total for May 1960.

Government agencies also announced the following economic developments:

Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges reported that manufacturers' inventories rose by $100 million from March to April. This increase, indicating a pickup in business, reversed a steady decline that began in September 1960.

The number of the 150 major industrial areas that have "substantial" unemployment dropped slightly from the record April total of 101 to 96 in May. The total of May 1960 was 35.

The factory layoff rate declined in April for the third successive month, especially in steel and autos. New hiring exceeded layoffs for the first time in a year, with the exception of June 1960.

LITTLE PROGRESS SEEN

Mr. Wolfbein said that if the economy had not improved, the seasonal decline in unemployment would not have occurred. However, he said, "we're really not eating into the long-term unemployed."

The number of persons jobless for 15 weeks or more declined only slightly in May from 2,128,000 to 1,915,000, Mr. Wolfbein noted, which left a record total for the month more than double the figure of a year ago.

The civilian labor force, which includes both the employed and the jobless, grew by 850,000 to 71,546,000 as farmwork expanded and students began to take nonfarm jobs for the summer.

The number of employed Americans who usually work full time but are on short workweeks dropped slightly from 2,978,000 in April to 2,833,000 in May.

Mr. Wolfbein said details of today's preliminary figures would be released next week. The details include changes in the factory workweek, a key economic indicator. Mr. Wolfbein said that employers usually got their current plant force back on a normal workweek before hiring new personnel.

If the current seasonally adjusted unemployment rate remains the same, Mr. Wolfbein said, there will be 5,500,000 unemployed in June, 5,100,000 in July, 4,500,000 in August, 4,100,000 in September and 5,600,000 next January.

PROBLEM FOR JUNE

A prime problem will come in June, he said, when 1,100,000 high school and college graduates seek permanent jobs.

Meanwhile, it was understood that the administration would postpone sending requests to Congress for a permanent Federal system of unemployment benefits, creation of an urban youth corps and an updated version of the depression-era Civilian Conservation Corps.

These proposals will await President Kennedy's return from his European trip June 6.

In its May analysis of 150 major industrial areas, the Bureau of Labor Statistics said that seasonal gains in construction and hiring in durable goods industries, including steel, had helped bolster big-city employment.

The five areas that moved from "substantial" to "moderate" unemployment categories were San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.; New Haven; Fort Wayne and Indianapolis, Ind.; and Steubenville, Ohio-Weirton, W. Va.

"Substantial unemployment" means that 6 percent or more of the local labor force cannot find jobs. "Moderate unemployment" means 3 to 5.9 percent of the local work force is idle.

Last month, as in May 1960, New York, Boston, and Atlanta remained in the "moderate" category. Newark, Chicago, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Baltimore were among the 96 areas that continued in the "substantial unemployment" class.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics said that its survey of employers' plans indicated the following trends for June and July:

A slight increase in steel employment, particularly in Baltimore, Chicago, San Francisco, and Oakland.

A similar seasonal rise in jobs in metal fabricating, especially in building products and food containers. Boston, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, St. Louis, and Youngstown were expected to show gains.

A mid-July drop in auto plant employment in several areas, including Detroit and South Bend, as companies enter the annual model changeover period. Production is now one-third below that of the period last year, and sales are 20 percent below the year ago total. A fall pickup is expected, however.

Payrolls in chemicals, petroleum, and textiles are expected to remain at or near current levels.

RUMORS OF RUSSIAN CONCESSION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there have been rumors around Washington, D.C., the past few days that Premier Khrushchev has agreed to make some sort of concession—probably with respect to the negotiations over the proposal for inspection in connection with a nuclear test ban agreement—which concession will be announced during the Vienna meeting with President Kennedy.

If, indeed, such an agreement has been reached with the Soviets, one is prompted to inquire why the agreement has not been announced to the world now, instead of waiting for the Vienna conference. If, on the other hand, no agreement of any kind has been reached, then one is prompted to inquire why the President has changed his position, which he clearly set forth during the campaign, to not meet with Mr. Khrushchev unless there were some agreements which would indicate that the meeting would have some hope of success, or useful exchange of ideas.

These questions are raised in a thought-provoking article by David Lawrence in today's issue of the Washington Evening Star, and I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENNEDY AND SUMMITRY POLICY—PRESIDENT'S VIENNA TRIP HELD REVERSAL OF HIS POSITION IN DEBATE WITH NIXON

(By David Lawrence)

Has President Kennedy gone back on his word—the promise he gave to the more than 60 million people who watched the "great debates" on television last autumn? He has made no explanation to the American people for reversing the pledge of last autumn when he said flatly he would not meet with Nikita Khrushchev unless some agreement on important subjects had been reached beforehand through diplomatic channels. If there is such an agreement now, no word about it has been given to the people of the United States.

Here is what Mr. Kennedy said in the second debate of the series with Vice President Nixon on October 7, 1960:

"On the question of the summit, I agree with the position of Mr. Nixon. I would not meet Mr. Khrushchev unless there were some agreements at the secondary level—foreign ministers or ambassadors—which would indicate that the meeting would have some hope of success, or useful exchange of ideas."

Then, in the fourth debate on October 21, 1960, Mr. Kennedy said:

"Well, I think the President of the United States last winter indicated that before he'd go to the 'summit' in May, there should be some agenda, that there should be some prior agreement. He hoped that there would be an agreement in part on disarmament. He also expressed the hope that there should be some understanding of the general situation in Berlin.

"The Soviet Union refused to agree to that, and we went to the 'summit' and it was disastrous.

"I believe we should not go to the 'summit' until there is some reason to believe that a meeting of minds can be obtained on either Berlin, outer space, or general disarmament—including nuclear testing."

Has Mr. Kennedy made some secret deal with Premier Khrushchev? No intimation of it has been given to Members of Congress, especially in any conferences with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's ranking members. There have been rumors around Washington, however, that the Communist Premier is planning to make some concession in connection with the nuclear-test negotiations in exchange for a continuance of the present moratorium on tests. One report is that he will offer to give up the veto system which Russia has insisted upon heretofore and agree to negotiate a treaty that will permit a limited form of inspection without vetoes.

Certainly, any vital change in the hitherto stagnant situation over the nuclear-test ban would be hailed as a big victory for Mr. Kennedy, and it would be inferred that some arrangement of this kind had been worked out in advance. Actually, withdrawal of the veto provision would not mean an immediate agreement on any of the other points raised in the Geneva negotiations on the nuclear-test ban. The prospect is that the conversations which have already been going on for several years would keep on for a long time to come.

Meanwhile, who gains the real victory? The Soviets have been trying to keep the United States from doing any testing. Without a formal agreement, each side is supposed to refrain from testing, but is free to resume at any time. The longer the Soviet Union can keep the United States from doing any testing, the bigger the advantage to the Communists. The scientists of the West are in disagreement as to what can or cannot be done with underground testing. Some say underground tests cannot be detected, that the Russians know this, and that they are engaged now in perfecting their methods of continuing their underground testing.

The world may never know whether a so-called nuclear test ban is being faithfully adhered to by the Russians, but it will know that the United States during the long-drawn-out negotiations has already given up precious months in which no testing has been done either underground or in the atmosphere.

What would cause great uneasiness throughout the United States would be the discovery that the Kennedy administration had entered into any secret understanding with the Communist government in Moscow in the last 3 months and that the purpose of the Vienna meeting is to consummate such a deal.

If there has really been no agreement on nuclear tests or any other subject through diplomatic channels in advance of the Kennedy-Khrushchev conference next weekend, the American people will then have a right to be told why the man who was elected President of the United States—largely by reason of the arguments presented by him in the great debates on television last autumn—went back on his promises. At least, the public is entitled to a frank explanation of the reason for the change in Mr. Kennedy's position within a period of 7 months.

SACRIFICES BY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Mr. MILLER. Also, Mr. President, I have been saying for some time that the real sacrifices which the American people will be called upon to make under the administration's program are inevitably going to be inflation or higher taxes, or both, as a result of the increased spending proposals which are being passed or proposed. Moreover, I have cautioned that the American people should not be fooled into thinking that such sacrifices are for the sake of national defense, but rather they will result largely from increased spending for nondefense measures. An excellent article by Mr. Gould Lincoln in today's Evening Star makes these points eminently clear, and I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIGGER GOVERNMENT ON THE WAY

(By Gould Lincoln)

As the program of the Kennedy administration continues to unfold, it is becoming increasingly apparent that it calls for bigger and bigger spending and bigger and bigger government. It is increasingly clear that the sacrifices which President Kennedy is demanding of the American people boil down to coughing up the people's money. Quite naturally, Mr. Kennedy and his assistants do not lay stress on bigger spending and bigger government in their comments on their program. They talk instead of the great needs of national defense—including the defense of the free world. They talk, too, of the need for billions of dollars to conquer space and send men to the moon and beyond. They talk of billions more to be loaned or given to less fortunate peoples—the latest figure for this is $7.3 billion. And

they talk of great needs for domestic improvements—$2.5 billion for public education to be distributed to the States for school construction, increases in teachers' salaries and, indeed, for any use the local school authorities may find necessary.

PURSE STRINGS NOT UNTIED

The real impact of such a program has not made itself felt, because the program has not yet gone into effect. Congress still has to untie the purse strings—about the only thing Congress seems to have left to do, as Government by Executive order continues to advance. The New Deal administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, which was quite a spender in its day, is a piker compared to the Kennedy "New Frontiers" administration. But the Kennedy administration will answer such criticism by saying that the problems are much vaster today. In a way they are, although the late President Roosevelt was faced with the problem of getting the United States back on its feet after a disastrous depression growing in the main out of the aftermath of World War I. Today the United States is not facing a deep depression—indeed, its economy has been on the upward path. The big problem for the Kennedy administration is to maintain the security of the American people and to halt the advance of international communism which is seeking control of the entire world.

Unfortunately, in the first 4 months of his term as President, Mr. Kennedy has seen an advance of international communism in the Western Hemisphere, specifically in Cuba, and in southeast Asia, specifically in Laos. And unfortunately, he has been able to do nothing about these advances. If they are not checked, the spread of the Communist influence and domination may affect other Latin American countries, and it may gobble up all of southeast Asia. It is advancing, too, toward its goals in the many newly independent countries in Africa. The U.S. Government has uttered loud protests and even threats, but it has not been effective in checking these advances.

President Kennedy is in Europe this week meeting with President Charles de Gaulle and then Russian Premier Nikita Khrushchev. He has problems to discuss with both.

One heads a friendly country; the other a government which is committed to the communization of the world, including the United States. What will come of the President's foray into personal diplomacy this country will await with the keenest hopes of success. This country needs some success in international affairs.

It undoubtedly will support President Kennedy, who is in Europe after pledging there will be no retreat from a firm intention to resist Communist aggression toward this country and toward the free world. He has further promised he will make it entirely clear to Premier Khrushchev that the Communists can touch off a third world war if they make the mistake of believing the United States will not fight. To date the Russians have continued to tie up the nuclear tests and weapons conference and the Laos conference in Geneva. This hard attitude in Geneva, on the eve of Kennedy-Khrushchev talks in Vienna is a typical Communist tactic. It looks very much as though this recalcitrance is a forerunner of a Khrushchev attempt to wring a deal out of Mr. Kennedy.

G.O.P. PREPARES ISSUES

Meanwhile, Republican leaders are building up issues which may be used against the Kennedy administration and Democratic candidates for Congress next year. They are making much of the big spending programs of the New Frontiers men, which they say will wreck the economy of the American people. They are denouncing the handling of the Cuban situation, particularly the present plan to exchange tractors for patriot rebels held by Castro, which they call "blackmail." They are beginning to ask what would have happened in Cuba, in Laos, and to the United States, had former Vice President Nixon been President instead of Mr. Kennedy—and even what the situation would be if former President Eisenhower had had another year to serve in the White House.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD of Virginia continues to warn what may happen to a country which, already having a national debt totaling $289,879,699,421 (on May 23) continues to add more billions to its budget—money which it does not have to spend. There are only two ways of meeting this financial problem—higher taxes and more taxes or more borrowing still further increasing the stupendous national debt.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I shall not take the time to talk at length now on the housing bill that is before us because I shall have several amendments to offer and shall discuss some of the most objectionable features of the bill at that time.

My purpose in making this statement is to remind Senators that we have attained the existing level of sufficient Government housing assistance on a reasonably sound basis because Senators considered the program at all times in a reasonably sound manner.

Also, at this time I add a humble caution to Senators to give careful attention to some of the provisions of this bill which I can assure Senators will be debated before the roll is called for passage.

As I wrote in the committee report, my record on housing is quite clear. I have worked with Senators on both sides of the aisle toward giving this country a good housing program in the areas where it is needed and to those who need it.

Regardless of the position I am forced to take on the bill when the vote comes for passage, I pledge my continued efforts in the future to keep Government housing within the bounds of outright assistance. At the same time, however, I pledge my opposition to housing programs that border on the fanatical.

Mr. President, the Federal Government, in concert with local governments, entered the housing assistance field many years ago by reason of a necessity which we hope and pray will never occur again.

We have been permitted by the people to remain in the housing field solely because what we have been doing has been done in sound conscience. The people will not permit any government to go beyond those limits, whether it be in housing or any other phase of their private lives.

I contend that there are provisions in the bill which go beyond conscience and border on the fanatical. I shall oppose them with all the vigor at my command.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following these remarks, 11 amendments which I propose to offer during the consideration of the housing bill. I ask that they lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and without objection, the amendments will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendments are as follows:

(AMENDMENTS BY MR. CAPEHART (FOR HIMSELF AND MR. BENNETT)

A

On page 42, between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

"LOCAL RESPONSIBILITIES

"SEC. 301. Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by—

"(1) striking out 'unless (1)' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'unless (1) the locality with respect to which an application for assistance under this title is made has had in effect for at least one year prior to the filing of such application a minimum standards housing code deemed adequate by the Administrator and which he determines has been satisfactorily enforced from the time of its adoption or for at least one year prior to the filing of such application, whichever is the lesser, (2)'; and

"(2) striking out 'and (2)' and inserting in lieu thereof 'and (3)'."

On page 42, line 21, strike out "301" and insert "302".

One page 44, line 5, strike out "302" and insert "303".

On page 45, line 4, strike out "303" and insert "304".

On page 45, line 23, strike out "304" and insert "305".

On page 47, line 12, strike out "305" and insert "306".

On page 48, line 10, strike out "306" and insert "307".

On page 48, line 15, strike out "307" and insert "308".

On page 49, line 16, strike out "308" and insert "309".

On page 50, line 9, strike out "309" and insert "310".

On page 50, line 20, strike out "310" and insert "311".

On page 54, line 5, strike out "311" and insert "312".

On page 56, line 8, strike out "312" and insert "313".

On page 58, line 2, strike out "313" and insert "314".

On page 58, line 21, strike out "314" and insert "315".

On page 58, line 22, strike out "clause (1)" and insert in lieu thereof "clause (2) (as redesignated by section 301)".

B

On page 8, line 13, strike out "interest" and insert in lieu thereof "an interest rate".

On page 8, line 15, after the parenthesis insert the following: ", uniformly established by the Commissioner for all classes of borrowers,".

On page 8, strike out line 21 and insert in lieu thereof the following: "of 1 per centum, and adding one-half of 1 per centum per annum".

C

On page 45, line 8, strike out "$4,500,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$3,800,000,000".

D

On page 15, line 8, strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,000".

On page 15, line 24, strike out "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen".

E

On page 2, line 6, strike out the quotation marks and the semicolon and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For the purposes of this section, a family shall be deemed to be a 'low or moderate income family' if the normal stable monthly income of such family does not exceed (1) an amount equal to five times the monthly payments to be made by such family for the rental of a dwelling unit in a property or project assisted under this section, or (2) an amount equal to five times the monthly amortization payments (including principal, interest, and insurance) to be assumed by such family under a mortgage insured under this section".

F

On page 64, beginning with line 22 strike out all through line 13 on page 65.

Renumber succeeding sections in title V accordingly.

G

On page 10, lines 14 and 15, strike out "any accrued interest and".

On page 19, line 10, strike out "any accrued interest,".

On page 29, line 7, strike out "any accrued interest and".

On page 74, lines 13 and 14, strike out "any accrued interest and".

H

On page 8, strike out lines 4 through 9, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(10) striking out in subsection (d)(5) the words 'forty years from the date of insurance of the mortgage or three-quarters of the Commissioner's estimate of the remaining economic life of the building improvements, whichever is the lesser' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'thirty years from the date of insurance of the mortgage or three-quarters of the Commissioner's estimate of the remaining economic life of the building improvements, whichever is the lesser: *Provided*, That any such mortgage may provide, under such regulations as the Commissioner may prescribe, that (1) during the first through the fifth years of the amortization period the level total payments of principal and interest shall not exceed an amount equal to the level total payments of principal and interest on a mortgage in the same principal amount having an amortization period of not to exceed forty years, (2) during the sixth through the tenth years of the amortization period the level total payments of principal and interest shall not exceed an amount equal to the level total payments of principal and interest on a mortgage in the same principal amount having an amortization period of not to exceed thirty years, and (3) during the balance of the amortization period the level total payments of principal and interest shall not exceed an amount equal to the level total payments of principal and interest on a mortgage in the same principal amount having an amortization period of not to exceed twenty years';"

I

On page 3, lines 20 and 21, strike out "a public body or agency,".

On page 8, strike out lines 10 through 21.

On page 8, line 22, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 9, beginning with line 6, strike out all through the period in line 20.

On page 10, line 4, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".

On page 10, beginning with the colon in line 20, strike out all through line 6, on page 11, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, line 3, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(13)".

On page 12, line 6, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, strike out lines 7 through 9.

On page 12, beginning with line 24, strike out all through line 10, on page 13.

J

On page 3, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 16, on page 6.

On page 6, line 17, strike out "(8)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

On page 7, line 15, strike out "(9)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)".

On page 8, line 4, strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(8)".

On page 8, strike out lines 10 through 21.

On page 8, line 22, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(9)".

On page 9, beginning with line 6, strike out all through the period in line 20.

On page 9, lines 21 and 22, strike out "subsection (d)(2) or (d)(4) of".

On page 10, line 4, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(10)".

On page 10, beginning with the colon in line 20, strike out all through line 6, on page 11, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, line 3, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 12, line 6, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, strike out lines 7 through 9.

On page 12, beginning with line 24, strike out all through line 10 on page 13.

On page 72, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 3 on page 73, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) Section 212 of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) "any mortgage under section 220" and inserting in lieu thereof "any loan or mortgage under section 220 or section 233".

K

On page 39, strike out lines 4 through 7, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) inserting after '*Provided*, That' in section (10)(i) the following: 'the Authority may enter into new contracts for loans and annual contributions after the date of enactment of the Housing Act of 1961 for not more than thirty-seven thousand additional units: *Provided further*, That'; and"

FEDERAL AID FOR URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I rise to report briefly on an increasingly critical problem with which the State of California, as well as many other States, is faced. It threatens to become progressively worse in future years. It threatens, furthermore, serious damage to our economy unless a solution is found. I refer to the growing problem of motor vehicle traffic congestion in our several metropolitan areas. This congestion is becoming worse each day and some day may develop into almost complete traffic strangulation.

To illustrate the long-term and spectacular growth trends in the two largest urban centers of California, I can cite actual and estimated motor vehicle and population figures in the Greater Los Angeles and San Francisco Bay areas.

In the four southern California counties comprising the Greater Los Angeles metropolitan area, population has risen from 235,820 in 1900 to 7,552,500 in 1960. A prediction of more than 17,500,000 is given for the year 2000.

In the nine-county San Francisco Bay area, the population has increased from 658,100 in 1900 to 3,639,000 in 1960. It is estimated that the number of residents will increase to over 9 million by the year 2000.

In the case of motor vehicle registration, the contrasts are still more bewildering—even though a shorter period of time is considered in the tabulation. In 1920, the Greater Los Angeles area had 224,588 motor vehicles. The total had grown to 3,805,800 by 1960. On the basis of present trends, it is predicted that the total will increase to 9,663,500 by the year 2000.

In the San Francisco area, a parallel growth is found. In 1920, there were only 146,401 registered motor vehicles, compared with 1,836,300 in 1960. A registration of 5,029,800 is anticipated for the year 2000.

These figures alone point to the dramatic growth of population in California's two great metropolitan areas and the accompanying and crushing effect of the diversion from mass transportation to an almost all-automobile society. The future trends are truly frightening in regard to the apparent number of vehicles for which ground space will have to be found if our present mode of transportation by automobile continues.

I ask unanimous consent that the population and vehicular tabulations be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KUCHEL. Curiously, there was a time when public transportation was provided almost entirely by rail transit on public streets and on private rights-of-way. In the Greater Los Angeles area, there was the Pacific Electric Railway with lines extending out from the city of Los Angeles to some 50 points in 4 different counties. It was the pride of southern California, being one of the finest interurban rapid transit systems to be found anywhere. Today, this great system of public transportation has been stamped out of existence by the convenience and popularity of the private automobile.

In the San Francisco Bay area, a similar pattern has been followed in the demise of interurban rail transportation. To the north of San Francisco in Marin County, the Northwestern Pacific Railroad commuter service has disappeared. On the east shore of San Francisco Bay, the Southern Pacific commuter service, the Key System commuter service, and the Sacramento Northern Railroad commuter service have vanished. Behind this evolvement was the advent of the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge and the Golden Gate Bridge, whereby automobiles were given direct access to San Francisco. Gradually, commuter systems together with their ferryboat connections declined in importance and finally succumbed to the competition of the individual passenger automobile. All that remains is the Southern Pacific commuter system down the peninsula south of San Francisco.

In other metropolitan areas of California, streetcars have been largely replaced by buses, which are impeded in performing an efficient job of mass public transportation because they must use highways and streets congested with individual passenger automobiles. And, each such automobile accommodates an average of 1½ persons while utilizing almost as much space as is required by a 60-passenger bus.

The same mode of competitive transportation that destroyed the Pacific Electric Railway in the Los Angeles area and four of the five commuter railroad systems in the San Francisco Bay area, namely the automobile, is now threatening to destroy itself as a convenient means of transportation in congested areas. So the circle is closing. Starting with a rail transit system which has been largely put out of business by automobiles, we now find ourselves struggling to reestablish transit facilities to save the automobile from itself.

Because of California's year-round temperate climate, its citizens have been encouraged to depend more heavily upon automobiles for their transportation than is true in most other populous States. Thus, in our State the problem of traffic congestion has been compounded. In many eastern cities the automobile did not gain such rapid headway in destroying the then existing rail transit systems such as those still operating in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Cleveland, and Chicago. Their systems are badly in need of modernization, and their inadequacy is a part of the Nation's metropolitan transportation problem. Nevertheless, they still carry a vast number of passengers which could not be handled by automobiles because of limited ground space to accommodate such vehicles on streets and in parking lots.

However, in California, the automobile has almost completely taken over the bulk of mass transportation requirements of our citizens living in metropolitan areas. This leaves but one choice: that is to reestablish rail transit facilities in anticipation of the day when our population is double that of today and the automobile will no longer be able to circulate in congested areas with any degree of freedom.

Practically every Californian realizes the seriousness of traffic congestion. And may I cite the alarm with which certain of our civic leaders are viewing this great threat to our future growth and economic development.

Recently, the president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, Mr. T. S. Petersen, a distinguished citizen of my State, in an address before the Commonwealth Club of California, commented on rapid transit's vital role in the reduction of peak-hour congestion and accidents.

Pointing out that traffic accidents in 1958 cost the Nation 37,000 lives and $5,500 million, Mr. Petersen cited the particularly hazardous conditions that exist on metropolitan roadways during what he called the commuter crush.

He continued:

> With the continuing population growth in our metropolitan areas, the congestion situation can become only worse—and not better—unless we efficiently move larger numbers of commuters. I believe this can only be accomplished through new and improved systems of public transportation which are fast, comfortable, convenient, economical and safe, according to the high standards of today.

Along this same vein, the California State Automobile Association, which is concerned with the well-being of the motoring public, has publicly announced its support of rail rapid transit development. Such mass public transportation, they claim, is necessary in order to reduce traffic congestion so that those who must use their automobiles can move about freely.

In commenting upon its support of rail rapid transit development, the president of the automobile association said:

> A modern and efficient rapid transit system will be of infinite benefit to all sections and citizens of the bay area, including the owners of motor vehicles.

In addition, responsible editorial policy almost everywhere is repeatedly calling the problem to public attention—although day-to-day observation by individual citizens demonstrates this most forcibly. Among the major newspapers which have repeatedly pointed up the need for improved mass transportation are the Sacramento Bee, the Oakland Tribune, and the Examiner, Chronicle, and News-Call Bulletin of San Francisco.

In recognition of the problem, much has been done in California both at the State and local levels to move in the direction of a solution. Let me cite a few of the significant steps already taken in this regard.

In 1951, the California Legislature created the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit Commission. Its instructions were to make a survey of the traffic congestion problem in the bay area and to develop recommendations leading to a solution. After spending some $700,000 on exhaustive engineering, financial, and economic feasibility studies, the commission in 1956 recommended the establishment of a governmental agency to finance and build an interurban system of rail rapid transit. Accordingly, the legislature in 1957 created the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, gave it taxing power, gave it access to public credit through the issuance of general obligation bonds, and directed it to proceed with the planning of such a system.

The San Francisco Rapid Transit plan will serve as a model for a new concept of travel. Its engineering plans, now completed, will serve five counties with high-speed transit. It will be a total transportation system, wisely begun with land planning. In intent, it will be fully competitive with the automobile, thereby weaning people away from automobile dependence.

The estimated cost of such a project is in excess of $1 billion. If the proposed system is not built, expenditures for freeways, bridges, and parking facilities between now and 1975 will amount to more than $1.5 billion. Thus, compared to its alternative, the figures even favor rapid transit. Furthermore, every effort will be made to finance this undertaking at the local level by means of general obligation bonds. It also is important to note that, once built, rapid transit will be considerably more than self-supporting from a standpoint of operating and maintenance costs, with surplus revenues available for a variety of uses.

To ease San Francisco's traffic congestion, the State took another important step when in 1959 it pledged surplus Bay Bridge revenues to finance the building of a transbay underwater rapid transit tube connecting downtown San Francisco with downtown Oakland. The State department of public works would build the tube at an estimated cost of $127 million. And, upon completion, it would be turned over to the rapid transit district for integration into the rest of the five-county rapid transit system.

At this point I call to your particular attention the fact that the legislation diverting motor vehicle tolls to build the rapid transit tube was approved and sponsored by the California State Automobile Association, whose principal interest is in protecting the welfare of the motoring public. It is their belief that by building the tube the utility of the Bay Bridge will be increased for motorists. It will divert surplus traffic from the bridge to rail rapid transit. Congress gave its consent to the use of tolls for this purpose and, I might add, I assisted in handling this legislation when it was before the Senate a year ago.

At the time of the establishment of the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District, the legislature established another transportation authority to give local service to the east side of San Francisco Bay. Known as the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District, this agency issued bonds by vote of its electorate; and, with this money, it has purchased the privately owned Key System and acquired a large number of new streamlined, air-conditioned buses to round out its facilities. Unlike the San Francisco Rapid Transit District, the Alameda-Contra Costa Transit District is taking over a declining private transit system, burdened with taxation and unable to maintain a high level of service, and giving it tax exemption and access to tax-supported public credit.

In southern California, the State legislature has likewise moved in the direction of improving mass public transportation through the establishment in 1957 of the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority. This agency issued revenue bonds to finance the acquisition of three privately owned transportation systems which were desirous of being relieved of the burdens imposed upon them.

While Los Angeles is known as the most freeway-minded city in the country, it is now recognized that the motor vehicle sooner or later will find itself unable to provide for the individual and mass movement of people in that area. As a result, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transit Authority has completed preliminary plans for the establishment of a 75-mile system of rail rapid transit at an estimated cost of $529 million,

which, it is hoped, will provide arterial transportation to relieve much of the growing congestion on the freeway system.

Mr. President, I know this from personal experience; I live about 25 miles from the city of Los Angeles. When I go to my home and travel down the freeway systems, I know that it is bumper-to-bumper all the way.

I have endeavored to recite the story of growing traffic congestion in the State of California, briefly tracing its history from the advent of the automobile at the turn of the century to the present day, and to outline what our State and its local communities have done so far in an attempt to work out a solution to this problem. It will be noted from my remarks that we have not been idle, that the State and its local governments are wrestling with the problem and are determined to solve it eventually, as other metropolitan areas are doing. Yet, the best of the regional plans is millions of dollars away from reality.

In my judgment, the time has come when the threatened strangulation of our great cities is no longer the sole worry of the localities themselves. The Federal Government surely must face up to the probable consequences of metropolitan decline, for much of the Nation's economic security rests on the shoulders of urban areas.

Moreover, much of the money flowing into the U.S. Treasury originates in metropolitan areas where there are great concentrations of people and great centers of manufacturing and commerce. These centers must be kept economically virile if the flow of such revenue is to be maintained at a level to secure the balancing of future Federal budgets without excessive increases in prevailing tax rates.

In a recent talk before a group of business leaders here in Washington, the President emphasized that business and government are partners in the fruits of industry. He stated:

> The complaint has also been made in business circles that the Federal Government is a "silent partner" in every corporation—taking roughly half of all net earnings. But it should also be realized that this makes business a silent partner of the Federal Government—that our revenues and thus our success are dependent upon your profits and your success—and that far from being natural enemies, Government and business are necessary allies.

To keep business healthy is just as important to the Federal Government as it is to corporation stockholders. To keep metropolitan areas in a healthy climate for business and commerce, access to and egress from these areas must be provided. A free circulation of people within these areas must be assured.

And there are many other reasons why the Federal Government should concern itself with the metropolitan traffic congestion problem. It occurs to me that part of the billions of dollars the Government is spending on interstate highways may be open to serious question because of the traffic congestion that many times piles up where such highways funnel traffic into population centers. And there is the question of national defense, involving military transportation, civilian evacuation of cities in the event of enemy attack, and the use of below-surface transit passageways as fallout shelters.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I am strongly of the belief that the time has come for Federal participation in the development of plans by the metropolitan areas of the Nation for the rebuilding of existing urban mass transportation systems, or the building of new systems where none now exist. In support of this belief, I am coauthor of the bill (S. 345) introduced by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], which is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee.

While this bill is modest in its scope, it will give to metropolitan areas an incentive in solving the traffic congestion problem. Indeed, it is a vitally important step that must be taken. And I hope it will lead the way to a fuller realization of the importance of Federal participation in the rebuilding of our great cities and in maintaining them as the sturdy backbone of the Nation's economy. No man, woman, or child, regardless of residence, will remain unaffected by our adopting a sound policy in this regard. I say this because the prosperity of the entire Nation is at stake as the result of our possible failure in this initial endeavor to head off what seems to be inevitable traffic strangulation for urban America.

Mr. President, the bill before us is proposed housing legislation. I am delighted that those who have written the proposed legislation have indicated, by amendments written into the bill, that there is a problem connected with the subject of mass transportation. I give credit to the senior Senator from Indiana for having sponsored in the Housing Act of 1961 legislation providing for a series of loans to State and local public bodies for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use in mass transportation service in urban areas.

The committee goes on to indicate that in its opinion effective transportation systems can be developed only in communities with sound and comprehensive areawide transportation plans and with financing, developmental, operating, and regulatory authority adequate to carry out such plans.

There can be no question that the future of America is directly concerned with the problem of mass transportation systems, particularly in large centers of population, where today the freeways are not keeping up with the desire of people to drive their own automobiles.

Fortunately, the bill before us recognizes that problem. I again underscore the urgent need for the Senate to give approval to the proposed legislation which I have cosponsored, to lay down, if it is enacted—as I hope it will be—an across-the-country policy of Federal incentives to State and local governments to plan for the overcoming of present problems in the transportation of people by planning for the creation and operation of new, modern mass transportation systems.

EXHIBIT 1

TABLE I.—*Population in the greater Los Angeles area and San Francisco Bay area, 1900–1960 and estimated to 2000*

Year	Greater Los Angeles area [1]	San Francisco Bay area [2]
1900	235,820	638,100
1910	629,969	925,700
1920	1,121,500	1,182,900
1930	2,542,000	1,578,000
1940	3,183,000	1,734,300
1950	4,819,600	2,681,300
1960	7,552,500	3,639,000
1970	10,671,000	4,950,000
1980	13,620,000	6,310,000
1990	15,725,000	7,715,000
2000	17,570,000	9,145,000

[1] 4 counties of Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Los Angeles.
[2] 9 counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma.

TABLE II.—*Registered motor vehicles in the greater Los Angeles area and San Francisco Bay area, 1920–60 and estimated to 2000*

Year	Greater Los Angeles area [1]	San Francisco Bay area [2]
1920	224,588	146,401
1930	989,997	478,974
1940	1,339,400	658,400
1950	2,336,700	1,110,000
1960	3,805,800	1,836,300
1970	5,869,100	2,623,500
1980	7,491,000	3,470,500
1990	8,648,800	4,243,300
2000	9,663,500	5,029,800

[1] 4 counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino.
[2] 9 counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma.

HOLLYWOOD MOTION PICTURE AND TELEVISION MUSEUM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I have the honor to report that a newsworthy conference, for the purpose of establishing the Hollywood Motion Picture and Television Museum, was held early in May in Los Angeles. The conference was called on the invitation of a friend of mine, Mr. Sol Lesser, a distinguished leader in the American motion picture industry. He is serving as chairman of the Los Angeles County commission for the project.

According to Mr. Lesser:

> This was the first time in the history of museums that the responsible leaders in public education in the community have been invited to join in the original planning of the physical facilities and in the program for the operation of a museum.

In welcoming the educational leaders to the meeting, Mr. Lesser expressed the spirit of the occasion when he stated:

> In serving our teachers, we serve our children in the schools and our students in the colleges and universities. Through them we serve the broadest interests of the home, the research units, industry, and the Nation.

The chairman of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors, Ernest E. Debs, commented on the museum project:

> Public service was the basic purpose of the board of supervisors in adopting the ordinance of July 17, 1959, creating the Hollywood Museum.
>
> The site will be on Highland Avenue opposite the Hollywood Bowl. It was selected

because it was found to be the most suitable, accessible, and advantageous to the public.

As presently planned, the museum will have exhibition galleries with special display rooms; archives and research centers; library and study facilities; a theater, sound stage, television studio, and demonstration centers for the essential arts and crafts of the motion picture and television industries; and in addition there will be suitable restaurant and parking facilities for the comfort of the public.

From an observation gallery, visitors to the museum will witness the live enactment of motion picture scenes; television programs will be produced; and there will be still other demonstrations for the entertainment and education of the visitors.

The role of the acquisition committee will assure the museum of priceless treasures and informative material recording the history, demonstrating the progress, and indicating the plans for the future of the motion picture and television industries.

The Hollywood Museum will be our tribute to the men and women who created the great motion picture and television industries, and who established Los Angeles County as the world capital of the audio-visual entertainment industries.

We owe it to the many thousands of tourists from every corner of the world, to enlighten them regarding the past, the present and the future of one of the greatest examples of American free enterprise.

We owe it to the children in our schools and to the students in our colleges that their education be enriched by the realization that they are part of the community that produces for the world, vital means of communication, entertainment, and education.

I join in the hope expressed to the assembled educators that from this conference the museum commission may gain constructive recommendations, since all concerned want the museum to be of the greatest public service, more especially in the field of education.

Comments among those attending the conference indicated the already widespread support for the museum. Dr. C. C. Trillingham, the county superintendent of schools, spoke enthusiastically on what the American communications industries and the Hollywood Museum will be able to do for educators, historically and culturally.

The University of Southern California's Prof. Frank C. Baxter, well-known member of the museum's curators' committee, praised the museum's education program and visualized it as something which through the years will be a net gain for education, television, and motion pictures.

Dr. Rudy Bretz, the director of educational television at the University of California at Los Angeles, expressed assurances of cooperation on the part of UCLA Chancellor Franklin D. Murphy and urged that the Hollywood Museum move quickly to preserve important American documentaries now being done on video tape and being erased after use at an alarming rate.

The vital contribution that the Hollywood Museum can make to teachers and pupils in many areas and the need to expand the instructional materials available to teachers, was indicated by Dr. Ellis A. Jarvis, Los Angeles City superintendent of schools.

Dr. Joseph H. Wadsworth, who is director of development at Occidental College, stated that among the many valuable services the museum could render to the community would be an annual conference for educators, at which the latest uses of television and motion pictures as aids to teachers in educational processes in all levels and fields of education could be demonstrated.

Two other university representatives, Prof. Richard D. MacCann of the cinema department of the University of Southern California and Prof. Kenneth Macgowan of the School of the Theater of the University of California at Los Angeles voiced their wholehearted approval of the program of the Hollywood Museum and the purposes of the educational conference.

Dr. George E. Dotson, assistant superintendent of the Long Beach High School District concluded that "All schoolchildren, of all ages, can benefit from this type of program."

Mr. President, in the early days of my tenure in the Senate, the great motion picture industry of California brought to my attention the fact that stored in the Library of Congress were prints of the silent picture days, the early days of the motion picture industry. Those prints constituted an important part of Americana, but they were going to waste and were deteriorating. The Senate approved an amendment to proposed legislation which was then pending, an amendment which I sponsored, to provide that the Librarian of Congress take the necessary steps to prevent the disintegration of those early day treasures which were produced in a uniquely American industry, which has gone so far and has done so much to knit the world closer together.

Mr. President, the people of the United States are proud of our great motion picture industry. They are proud to what Americans have done in the field of television. As I say, these are a part and parcel of Americana. The Government has been interested in preserving for future generations the early prints of the motion picture industry. I am glad to salute those private citizens, my fellow Californians, who are now on their way to establishing a museum dedicated to these great American institutions.

I simply wished to indicate on this occasion one other step which is being taken to preserve for future Americans the wonders of the motion picture industry in the State from which I come.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RACE VIOLENCE IN ALABAMA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Where the Blame Rests in Alabama," published in the Lee County Bulletin of Auburn, Ala., and reprinted in the Washington Post of today, June 1, 1961.

I commend the writer of the article for his citizen statesmanship.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE THE BLAME RESTS IN ALABAMA

Has everything that needs to be said about the Montgomery race riots been said? Nearly; but not everything.

It is commonly assumed everywhere that the vast majority of Alabamans are sorry about the violence. But we wonder. Too many people are saying the Negro students got what they deserved, and seem to say it in a spirit of gratification.

Most of our spokesmen—public officials and newspapers—have taken the position that the theatrics employed by the students comprised a blunder, were bound to court disaster, and we agree that they were ill advised in the choice of technique. But what about their antagonists? What about their methods? Can violence be dismissed with the excuse that the mobsters were provoked?

Even those who deplore what happened seem inclined to look at the matter with a certain detachment. The hoodlums are to blame, not us. We are embarrassed, wouldn't have had it happen for anything.

The truth is that we cannot gain much satisfaction from this view. All of us are involved, personally and corporately. Before it was too late did we say anything, take any position that would lead the gangs to believe that in Alabama the demand was for maintenance of the law, for protection of the bus riders from attack?

We say not. Rather when we did say anything or take any public position it was to encourage the extremists.

We won't stand for it, we said. Even interstate travelers will never ride the integrated bus or desegregate the waiting rooms or go to our schools. We applauded the dangerously irresponsible politicians who promised it will never happen in Alabama, even though we knew Federal law said it would. Yes, we even applauded the Governor and the Attorney General.

What right had we to expect anything except bloodshed.

We have politicians who do not condone what has happened. They too are nauseated over the brutality. But they are captives of a climate which does not permit them to speak out except that they invite retirement from public office. We feel sorry for them. They are good men. It is our fault that they are torn between saying what they ought to say and keeping quiet so they can continue in office. It is the decent white people who have not spoken for justice and law and who have left it to the radicals to create the climate which today silences the nobility and decency some of our politicians possess.

Governor Patterson might as well stop pretending to be shocked. So had some of our newspapers. They piously have talked of preserving the law while simultaneously they have assumed a most provocative position. When public officials and papers use inflammatory language, urge last-ditch stands and fighting every inch of the way, what do they expect? The hoodlums don't delineate. They take the leaders of public opinion to mean what they say when they urge resistance. Well, we've got our resistance. What a sorry mess it is.

And all this now-meaningless talk about outsiders.

Some of the colored people beaten at Montgomery are Montgomerians. All the victims are Americans.

The outsiders in this instance were young, unarmed college students who, as the mobsters knew, were pledged to nonviolence, to take it without fighting back. They acted within the law.

And what of the cry that the freedom riders got exactly what they wanted? Do the papers, police authorities, the people generally who speak this insanity really believe the young Negroes from Nashville actually wanted to have their faces beaten to a pulp, their teeth knocked out, their ribs cracked, their scalps lacerated?

And the intervention by Federal authorities which the Governor and some of the papers seem to see as one of the worst aspects of the whole sickening imbroglio. We say, thank God, for Federal action to protect those who could not protect themselves and who were not at first able to look to the State and municipal authorities for protection.

Thank goodness the metropolitan newspapers have been shocked. Too few political leaders seem to have been stirred. But perhaps the newspapers now will marshal decent, intelligent opinion. There is some evidence that the business community—already feeling the economic pinch, and sick over Alabama's failure to attract new industry while Georgia, North Carolina and other Southern States are hauling it in—will join the papers in insisting that the hatred be bridled and kept in lawful bounds.

DISARMAMENT AND TEST BANS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, two of the items which will be high on the agenda in the meeting at Vienna between our President, Mr. Kennedy, and the Soviet Premier, Mr. Khrushchev, will be disarmament and the nuclear test ban conference at Geneva. At least, all the reports to date indicate that these two world leaders will concentrate a part of their time and attention upon these all-important subjects. I wish to make a few comments about our position on these very vital subjects.

A. TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS

First. The United States now regards an agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests as an important indicator of further progress in the entire field of disarmament. I trust that the Soviet leader and his associates understand this. It is an indicator because it would show whether the Soviet Union is finally able to allow some opening up of its territory to inspection. It would indicate that some common ground does exist between the United States and the Soviet Union in trying to reduce the likelihood of war and in trying to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities to many countries.

Second. The United States, in an effort to reach agreement, has submitted its proposals on all aspects of a test ban treaty. Mr. Arthur Dean, our chief negotiator, has submitted a full draft treaty to the Soviets and to the British, at the Geneva conference, on the banning of further nuclear tests. There are now no unknowns in the U.S. position. However, the Soviet Union has not attempted to negotiate seriously regarding any treaty language. In fact, today's newspaper columns indicate that the Soviets rejected our most recent offer, which was a further compromise in an effort to reach some agreement.

Third. On a number of areas of controversy in the test ban negotiations the United States has announced positions which have moved in the direction of what the Soviet Union had asked for but a year ago. For example, they include the number of control posts. On that one issue alone, the United States has made considerable accommodation and adjustment in order to reach an agreement. We have reduced the number we requested last year, when the number was up to 50 inspections, to 21, and most recently we have offered to agree on 19 control posts. The Soviet Union will permit, thus far, only 15. Fortunately, the gap there is very small, and it might be closed by further negotiation.

As to the number of onsite inspections, the United States had asked for 20. The United States now asks for a maximum of 20 and a minimum of 12, with 1 additional inspection over 12 for each 5 unidentified earthquakes or earth tremors over 60. In other words, we have made further adjustment of our position on the subject of onsite inspections, in order to offer a more persuasive approach to the Soviet Union. But the U.S.S.R. has not changed its position at all. It is willing to permit only three onsite inspections in the Soviet Union per year. Of course, the fact that it is willing to accept any, indicates that it is willing to accept the principle of onsite inspections, which is encouraging.

The United States has moved from 27 to 36 months as the length of the moratorium on tests below the 19-kiloton threshold. The Soviet Union contends the moratorium should be 4 to 5 years. We have gone as far as 3 years. Again, this is an item which could be negotiated.

In addition the Soviets have reverted to an old position, by suggesting that regardless of the results of research, no nation should be permitted to resume underground weapons testing after the moratorium has ended. Of course, this means that the Soviets take an unrealistic position, for if the research indicates a need for underground tests in order further to develop the inspection and control position, it would seem only sensible that such be undertaken.

The United States is now willing to give the Soviets parity on the control commission which will be the governing board of the international control organization to manage the agreement and determine violations if they occur. The United States proposes that the control commission consist of four Western, four Soviet bloc, and three neutral nations. The Soviet Union has not been satisfied with this, and now asks, in addition, for a three-man administrative council to administer the control operations. One of the three would be Western, one would be from the Soviet bloc, and one would be a neutral. This new Soviet demand is part of its attack on the Secretary General of the United Nations.

It is based on the same formula that has been used by them in the Geneva conference on Laos, where the Soviet Union insisted on the right of veto over any type of control operation—which would make impossible the effective administration of the control organization, for each of the three administrators would have a veto power, which for all practical purposes could vitiate or negate any kind of effective action. Every act of administration would be subject to the possibility and probability of indefinite wrangling by the three-man council, or "Troika," as it is now being called. Finally, the Soviet demand assumes that the world is divided into three separate camps and that it is possible to find one neutral to represent all countries not allied with either the Soviet Union or the United States, and to find one person to represent all countries allied with the United States. In the present world situation these are unworkable and unwarranted assumptions.

Mr. President, I make these remarks because I believe I have earned a reputation in public life for seeking an adjustment of differences, for seeking to find in the field of nuclear-test suspension a workable and effective agreement—not an unreasonable one, but one which represents a legitimate compromise. I must say that the Soviet attitude is one of intransigence, delay, and obstruction. That attitude can result only in trouble, and obviously it will result in a failure to arrive at any agreement—a situation which makes disarmament as a subject matter almost academic.

Fourth. It is possible the Soviet Union has decided it no longer is interested in a test ban agreement. Let us hope that this is not so. Let us hope that our President can impress upon the Soviet leader the implications of a failure to agree to a workable and effective agreement. The United States has been willing to reduce its inspection requirements considerably, as scientific and technical data justified. We have been prepared to negotiate for an agreement.

We have laid our proposal on the table, for all to see and to study. There are no unknowns; there are no secrets, but if these efforts on our part produce only negative results, obstruction, resistance, and a negative reply, nuclear testing cannot be stopped. Other countries will soon test, in addition to the present membership of the nuclear club, and not only will the nuclear arms race continue, but it will flourish and it will expand.

Fifth. Several months ago, I suggested that if no agreement on a test ban treaty was reached by June of this year, the United States should resume testing underground, at least for research and peaceful purposes. I wish to say most carefully, and after great consideration, that if Mr. Khrushchev is determined not to negotiate for a test ban treaty, then President Kennedy will be required at least to give consideration to the resumption of those tests required by U.S. security or research needs. In other words, I am convinced that if the Soviets reject every reasonable proposal that we make, and if there seems to be no hope of any agreement, the President of the United

States may well be required—I do not say that he will; but he may well be required—to authorize the resumption of nuclear tests. Our Government does not want to do this. These words in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are reviewed by friend and foe alike, by the press of our Nation and also by the press of other countries, by the officials of our Government and also by the officials of other governments, both those that take a friendly attitude toward us and those that take an unfriendly attitude toward us.

I hope the Soviets will understand from these words that there is a limit to our patience, and that what we seek is a responsible, reasonable agreement. I hope the Soviet leaders will understand that their intransigence and their refusal to make any kind of concession can result only in a complete failure to make any kind of negotiation.

Mr. President, this comes from one who has walked the extra mile in the field of disarmament negotiations, and is prepared to do so again if there is a reasonable hope of any progress.

But let the Soviet leaders know that in the Senate of the United States, where support for an agreement is not easy to obtain in the first place, when the friends of a proposed agreement lose patience, and find little to encourage them, then, indeed, the possibilities of a treaty or an agreement are highly remote.

B. GENERAL DISARMAMENT

First. Soon the United States and the Soviet Union will meet in a series of bilateral talks to determine the manner in which general disarmament negotiations will be resumed. If these talks produce agreement, general disarmament negotiations will begin on or around July 31, 1961.

Second. The time has come when the United States and the Soviet Union should discuss frankly and quietly how far their armaments and armies can actually be reduced in the present situation. The Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting cannot go deeply into this question in the short time available, but at this meeting the two leaders may discuss what they think are the main obstacles to agreement and in general how they might be overcome.

Three. President Kennedy could make clear the willingness of the United States to travel far down the road to comprehensive disarmament if the Soviet Union agrees, first, to effective and reasonable control measures, and second, to strengthen the United Nations and its ability to maintain peace as national armaments are reduced. Thus far the Soviet Union has refused to limit its sovereignty in any way. It asks for a veto over any measure which could at some future point in time affect adversely a policy of the Soviet Union. The United States must continue to probe the Soviet Union to determine what, if any, areas of agreement in disarmament and keeping the peace exist.

Mr. President, I hope these words will be of some help to our President, because I know this problem weighs heavily on him. I have had the privilege of discussing some of these matters with our Chief Executive. I know our President wants a test ban agreement with sensible, reasonable, and effective controls. I repeat that we have offered many concessions. We have laid before the Soviet Union a full draft treaty. We are prepared to negotiate it. But we are not prepared to sell out or to accept a phony agreement that could only result in an increase of the tensions which exist today. The best way I know to relieve the tensions is to have an effective, workable agreement which has the possibility of enforcement and which gives a reasonable degree of effective controls.

I trust the discussions at Vienna will give at least some consideration to these very important matters.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the Senator that I have just returned from Geneva. I was there for the session which was held on last Friday and also the session which was held on Monday. I was there when Mr. Dean, our representative, laid the proposal before the conference to which the Senator has just alluded. While the formal proposal was not presented until yesterday, he made an informal presentation last Monday morning.

At that time, Mr. Tsarapkin, the chief Russian delegate, indicated that some thought and consideration would be given to the proposal; but I understand, from the reports that came back yesterday, following the filing of the proposal, Mr. Tsarapkin, without reading it or even looking at it, simply said he would have nothing to do with it; he just rejected it outright.

I have always contended that we ought to be tenacious in our negotiating on these proposals, particularly on the subject not only of the nuclear test ban but also the matter of disarmament, and, in fact, all negotiations with Russia. I have always felt that we ought to show them that we can hold out just as long as they can, in order that we might get across to the world the fact that we were willing to work hard for any move which would lead toward the establishment of a durable peace. I think we have demonstrated that fact in the negotiations.

As the Senator from Minnesota has so well pointed out, we have made reasonable concessions. For example, one of the concessions was made to meet an objection which Mr. Tsarapkin, the Russian delegate, himself proposed. He pointed out that there were more seismic disturbances in the United States than there were in the Soviet Union. Therefore, we said to him—and I think the Senator from Minnesota referred to it—that we would allow 12 inspections for the first 60 disturbances, and then 1 for each 5 after that, up to a total or maximum of 20.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That would apply to the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. That proposal was made as a result of an objection which the Russian representative himself had made. Yet when the proposal was made, he did not give it the respect of looking at it. According to the reports I have heard over the radio, they simply took it, thumbed it, and said, "We reject it."

I think the Senator is correct. We have demonstrated a tenacity of purpose that I have long felt we ought to show. We have demonstrated to the world that we are willing to make reasonable concessions. I think it becomes apparent—and I dislike to say it, but it is true—that the Soviet Union does not want a test ban agreement. It substantiates to some extent the suspicion many persons have that the Soviet Union may have been carrying on tests which we could not detect during this time, while we were banned from making tests. We are the ones who catch the short end of it.

So I think the Senator is correct in saying that, unless there is some indication on the part of the representatives of the Kremlin that they are willing to negotiate, the time is approaching when we ought to say to them, "There is no need of our staying here longer. We give notice of it to the world that we do not feel ourselves bound any more by the ban. We do not say we are going to resume in all fields and all phases of the testing, but it is up to us to decide what we are going to do."

Mr. HUMPHREY. That was the point I was trying to make.

Mr. SPARKMAN. But we become a free agent.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; we become a free agent.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We ought to make it clear to the Kremlin, the Russian Government, and the world that we still stand ready to negotiate, provided the Russians will negotiate in good faith and work toward a solution of the problems.

My brief experience in that area—and the Senator has been there on previous occasions—makes me realize even more strongly than I had ever realized before the absolute futility of efforts on our part and the part of the United Kingdom in meeting there, day after day after day, just to be met with "Nyet" from the Russian representatives.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for what he has said. I agree wholeheartedly with the statement he has made.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator. I want to add just a word. Some persons ask, "As long as you can have a moratorium on testing, Senator, as long as there seems to be no testing, why do you ask for an agreement with an inspection and control system?"

The argument from those who use this approach runs, "After all, the purpose of the agreement is to prevent tests. If there are no tests now under the moratorium, why is the agreement necessary?"

My answer is that, first of all, there may be some cheating. I do not have any reason to believe there is, nor do I

make the charge, but the Soviet Union is a secret society. It is a tightly disciplined society. The police state is its chief characteristic. It is a closed society. It is much easier to have a clandestine operation within the Soviet Union than it is within the open societies of the United States and of Great Britain. We all know that. Therefore, moratoriums lend themselves to a temptation for evasion and cheating.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we are ever going to have any general disarmament, any arms control at all, we must somewhere along the line develop, through science, through technology, through diplomacy and statesmanship, an international control and inspection system which provides some degree of freedom of movement in the respective countries for inspection purposes, with the International Control Commission not dominated by any one power. In other words, we must perfect a system which is an alternative to trust.

The Soviet Union does not trust us, and we have every reason not to trust them. The basis of what we call "mutual trust" is far too weak a reed upon which to lean. Therefore, what we seek to do is to develop through science, through technology, through statesmanship and diplomacy, through control commissions and inspections, a mechanism which will be an alternative for trust. Unless we can get the beginnings of such an inspection system which will have some freedom of movement inside the Soviet Union, then no President will negotiate and surely no Senate will ratify any treaty with the Soviet Union in the field of arms control and disarmament.

I raise my voice in an appeal for reason, in an appeal to better judgment. I ask that we stop the arms race before it stops us. When I say "us" I refer to the whole world.

If the Soviet Union has written off the possibility of any disarmament because it is riding high, because it thinks the future belongs to the Soviet Union, then let the world know that we in this country feel to the contrary. The future will not belong to the police state. The future will not belong to those who violate human rights. The future will not belong to the collectivized society, unless we let it happen.

I had the privilege once of saying to the Soviet Premier, in my long discussion with him, "We are prepared to compete." We are not only prepared to compete, but we are also prepared to compete with vitality, with vigor, and with purpose. We would like to have competition for peaceful purposes, for protection, for preservation, for helpfulness to humanity, not for its destruction.

Let there be no misunderstanding. There is no fear in our ranks. There is concern. We have deep concern for the future of humanity, but no fear. We are prepared to negotiate honorably. We are not prepared to negotiate in a manner which will result in dishonor; namely, to accept anything simply to get an agreement. Never, Mr. President.

Agreement should have a noble purpose. The purpose should be protection, safety, and peace. There should not be an agreement simply for the sake of an agreement.

I am sure our President shares these sentiments. For that reason, I have been one who has felt and has publicly stated that the President's trip to Paris and to Vienna and his visit with Premier Khrushchev I believe can be for good, because the Soviet leader will see a man of courage, of vitality, of vigor, of intelligence, and of character. He will see the modern American, the American of this generation. He will see him in the flesh. He will see his countenance and the determination on that countenance.

I am pleased. I think it will be a good day for freedom when the President of the United States sits across the table from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, because the leader of the Soviet Union will see the strength and the character, and also the decency and the sense of fair play, to be found in the American society. That will be demonstrated in the activities of, in the words of, and in the presence of our President.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION JUNE 5, 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate on Monday, June 5, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of the housing bill the number of aids allowed on the floor may be in excess by four of those permitted under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WEST VIRGINIA IS PROVING AREA FOR FEDERAL FOOD STAMP PROJECT—SECRETARY FREEMAN INAUGURATES PROGRAM TO HELP THE NEEDY

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Monday of this week at Welch, in McDowell County, W. Va., the Federal food stamp program was initiated. The first family, of approximately 2,767 families, to have received the first increment of food stamps was Mr. and Mrs. Alderson Muncy. They are the parents of 13 children. Mr. Muncy is an unemployed coal miner, and has had no regular employment for more than 1 year.

Mr. President, no one in this Chamber would say that the food stamp program will be the complete answer to the proper distribution of foodstuffs which are in the surplus stores of the Federal Government and which should be given to those within this country who can meet eligibility requirements for sustenance.

Mr. President, I say to Senators and to the people of the country, I believe the food stamp program is an attempt—and I believe it will be largely a successful one—to distribute, in an orderly and efficient manner, Government surplus commodities and other food staples to needy people of the United States of America.

Rather than have our surpluses spoil in the granaries and depots where such commodities are now kept, it is important to see that they are distributed in an equitable manner. It is necessary that these items go to the very heart of an area or a community where the people are in need.

The Baltimore Sun, a nominally conservative newspaper, in its issue of May 31 published an editorial which I believe is a very significant endorsement of the food stamp program of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD AND JOBS

When the new food-stamp plan went into effect in West Virginia over the weekend fewer takers showed up than had been expected. On the basis of earlier surplus disposal programs, the Agricultural Department had looked for some 10,000 families to qualify for food-stamp assistance. At the deadline on Friday only some 2,767 had proved need. It is early yet to generalize about the reason for this dropping away. To the extent that it represents a tightening up of eligibility rules and so a shaking off of freeloaders, it is a good sign. To the extent that the truly needy have been confused by complex eligibility rules or for other reasons have been slow to establish their true need, we may hope for more beneficiaries as the program gets underway.

Certainly the distribution of surplus foods to citizens who suffer from a genuine need for nourishment is an urgent duty. The only thing worse than rolling up farm surplus which the market will not absorb would be to hold it off from nonmarket but socially desirable consumption. To pay heavy warehousing fees on commodities rotting away in storage while unemployed Americans went semihungry would be to compound our farm follies. The great advantage of the new food-stamp plan is that like its original in the late thirties, it offers an orderly and effective method of surplus disposal at points of genuine need.

But this very virtue of the food-stamp plan should warn us against errors at the other extreme. It would be wrong to argue that since there was surplus food to donate there was less need to find work for the beneficiaries. It would be wrong to argue that since there were prospective users of surplus food, there was no need of eliminating farm surplus. The ideal must continue to be an economy in which all the food produced is purchased in the market because all the people able and willing to work have jobs and purchasing power.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I also call to the attention of the Senate an Associated Press story, which tells of the visit of the Honorable Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, Gov. W. W. Barron, of West Virginia, and Representative Elizabeth Kee, to an area of

West Virginia where unemployment exceeds 25 percent of the labor force and where there is an acute need. My colleague, Senator BYRD of West Virginia, and I had prior commitments which prevented our being with the official party. I ask unanimous consent that the article telling of that visit, and of the experience of Mr. and Mrs. Alderson Muncy and others who qualified to receive the stamps with which to purchase food at cooperating groceries be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOOD-STAMP PLAN GETS UNDERWAY IN WEST VIRGINIA—COAL MINING WELCH AREA BECOMES FIRST TESTING GROUND FOR NEW U.S. PROGRAM

WELCH, W. VA., May 29.—This depressed coal mining area today became the first testing ground for a Kennedy administration plan to take the Nation's needy off food handouts and send them to grocery stores for better diets.

Within a short time after ceremonies opening the program, several hundred families—many of whose breadwinners have been jobless for years—obtained Government food stamps.

They took them to cooperating grocers and bought a wider variety of food—and more of it—than the Government had been donating through relief agencies.

FIRST ARE PARENTS OF 13

The first to get stamps were Mr. and Mrs. Alderson Muncy, of Paynesville, parents of 13 children. A coal mine worker, Muncy has been unemployed for a year except for a few odd jobs here and there.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, flew in from Washington to get the program started and to pass out the first stamps. Also taking part were Gov. W. W. Barron and Representative ELIZABETH KEE, Democrat, of West Virginia, Congresswoman from this district.

If the stamp plan proves successful here in West Virginia's McDowell County, and in seven other areas of the country in which it will be tested for a year, it may be extended nationally.

This would give the needy—now totaling about 6 million—diets more nearly equal those of more fortunate neighbors.

FREE STAMPS

Under the plan, the needy are permitted to buy Government-issued food stamps in an amount comparable to their recent average food expenditures. They are then given free enough additional stamps to assure them a nutritional diet.

Those without any income get enough free stamps to provide the desired diet.

The direct distribution of food to the needy has been discontinued in McDowell for the duration of the food-stamp pilot project.

Foods which have been donated here and elsewhere under the direct program are flour, cornmeal, lard, dried milk, rice, butter, peanut butter, rolled oats, dried whole eggs, dried beans, and canned pork and gravy.

Under the new plan, stamps may be used to buy any domestically produced food. Excluded are imported foods such as coffee, tea, cocoa, and bananas. Stamps may not be used for alcoholic beverages or tobacco.

OTHER AREAS DUE PLAN

Other areas to which the plan will be extended between now and July 3 include Franklin County, Ill.; Floyd County, Ky.; Detroit; the Virginia-Hibbing-Nashwauk communities in northern Minnesota; Silver Bow County, Mont., San Miguel County, N. Mex., and Fayette County, Pa.

Freeman urged those directing the experimental program here—as well as those getting its benefits—to work hard to make it operate efficiently and effectively so that it might be extended nationally.

"The fundamental concern of this administration," Freeman said, "is to use the productivity of the American farmer both at home and abroad, and the pilot food-stamp projects are designed to seek out better methods of insuring that every person in need has the opportunity for an adequate diet."

The Muncy family will get $95 worth of free stamps a month. Muncy is 47, his wife 45. Their 13 children range in age from 17 months to 19 years. Six of them are in school.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I commend the Senator on his statement. More importantly, I commend him on his effort a little over a year ago in the Senate when we worked together on this plan. It was my privilege to work alongside the Senator from West Virginia for the food stamp plan. We succeeded in obtaining authorization for the plan. I believe the Senator will recall that we had quite a fight in the Senate over it. First, it was defeated, and then we brought it back for a second try, and it was adopted. In the House, I believe Representative SULLIVAN, of Missouri, was the author of the bill.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], myself, and others were cosponsors of the bill in this body.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was one of the supporters of the program. We then went to conference, and in the conference we were able to come out with a general authorization to the Department of Agriculture to establish a food stamp program. The Department was authorized to use our surplus foods, to use foods that were in abundance throughout America to feed the needy, and to use food stamps so that people would not have to walk up to a welfare depot, but rather could go into their local grocery stores and their local supermarkets and purchase, with their stamps as they could with a $5 bill, a $1 bill, or whatever currency they had available, foods that were on the list of available foods.

We waited for over a year. There was privation in America. I was in the State of West Virginia with the President of the United States during the campaign in 1960. Both of us pledged in that election campaign that when a Democrat went into the White House, these human needs would be met. Of course, I had a different idea than the present occupant of the White House had as to who would be in the White House at that time. But be that as it may, we both made this pledge not only for ourselves but for our party. Is it not interesting that the first order of President Kennedy—Executive Order No. 1—was an order to increase the distribution of surplus foods for the needy?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The next order was that the Secretary of Agriculture would immediately move into action on a food stamp plan. I hope Senators will permit this expression of some justifiable happiness and pride when I say that it was a privilege to be one of the sponsors of the food stamp plan, to vote for it, to work for it, and to be on the conference committee that enacted the proposal into law. It was a great privilege to have the Secretary of Agriculture, who is from the State of Minnesota—my lifelong personal friend, who has a big heart and a sense of compassion for his fellow men—at Welch, W. Va., on Monday of this week, present food stamp book No. 1. It was presented in the State where the President of the United States in his campaign pledged that if he were elected President, he would take this action and he would not forget the needy people or, indeed, all the people of West Virginia and of this Nation.

I am happy that the Senator from West Virginia has commented on this question because these stories go by in this day with almost little or no notice. We have Geneva, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, Laos, and Cuba to think about, and we sometimes tend to forget some of our own people. But it is an interesting, and I believe a worthy, development that the Secretary of Agriculture, a Cabinet officer, at the direction of the President, should go to the State of West Virginia, an area that is very dear to the heart of the Senators from West Virginia, to present food stamp book No. 1 to a needy family. The comment of that family was very interesting. I only paraphrase it: "We now can have a greater variety of food and do not have to be on relief."

I think that is wonderful. As one of the Senator's colleagues, I wish to salute the Senator from West Virginia for his constant vigilance for his constituents and for the welfare of the country. It has been a pleasure to be associated with him in this endeavor.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am grateful for the remarks of my colleague. Again, I appreciate the yielding, for this purpose, by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am delighted that the Senator from West Virginia brought this subject to the attention of the Senate at this time. We all read the newspaper account with a great deal of interest. I, too, thought it was most fitting that the first book should be issued in the State of West Virginia—the State whose plight had been played up during the campaign, the State that has been hurt by the disappearance of some of the industry, particularly coal mining. I know something about the problems confronting coal miners because in my State we have had similar problems in certain areas in that respect.

I have often thought with reference to the situation now that many of the programs submitted to us by the present administration are programs with a

heart in them. I think that is true with reference to the food stamp program. I think it is true with reference to the bill proposing Federal aid to education, which passed the Senate last week. I am about to start discussion of a housing bill, which I think is again a program with a heart. I think the statement is true of many programs that we are handling these days, and I rejoice in it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator very much.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before we commence the debate on the pending housing bill I should like to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the members of the full committee as well as the subcommittee, and to the staff of the full committee as well as the staff of the subcommittee, for their cooperation and diligence in preparing and reporting this bill to the Senate.

I may say that this is a big bill. Our housing bill each year is a big bill. It is by the very nature of the matter with which we are dealing a complex bill. It is one that many people find hard to understand, that is, so far as many of its features are concerned. However, I am going to try in the few remarks that I will make to outline just what the bill seeks to do. The staff of the subcommittee and of the full committee have done a tremendous job in preparing the report on the bill.

On March 9, 1961, the President sent his housing message to the Congress. This message was aimed at three basic national housing objectives. They are:

First. The renewal of our cities and the assurance of sound growth in rapidly expanding metropolitan areas;

Second. The provision of a decent home for all of our people;

Third. The encouragement of a prosperous and efficient construction industry as an essential component of general economic prosperity and growth.

While these are not necessarily new objectives, it is indeed refreshing to me and, I am sure, to others in the Senate who have led the fight for a better housed America, to know that we have an ally in the President. I believe the program proposed by the President is one for action not only in the field of housing, but also in the equally challenging field of community development.

The President's message shows that he is aware of the housing problems of this Nation and that he is willing to redeem the pledge laid down in the Housing Act of 1949 of "a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family."

On March 29, 1961, I introduced a bill, S. 1478, which was intended to implement the housing program set out in the Chief Executive's housing message.

Following my introduction of S. 1478, the Subcommittee on Housing held hearings on April 4 to 7, April 10 to 14, and April 20, 1961, to consider not only my bill, but also some 12 other housing bills and numerous other proposals then pending before the subcommittee. During these hearings, the subcommittee received oral testimony, printed statements, and other types of comments from approximately 140 people from all walks of life who are interested in housing.

Hearings also were held by the subcommittee on March 20, 21, and 22, 1961, to consider Senate bill S. 345, a bill to provide for an urban mass transportation program. Likewise, many witnesses appeared before the subcommittee to offer their proposals and to make recommendations and suggestions to establish a new Federal mass transportation program.

Printed records of these hearings are on each Senator's desk. The Senators will also find a small green book on their desks labeled "A Review of Federal Housing Programs" which contains a brief description of all the programs affected by the bill before us. I believe this can be extremely useful in giving a better understanding of the many housing programs we, in the Congress, must deal with in considering housing legislation.

Following these hearings, on April 26 and 27, the subcommittee, in executive session, considered the bills, the recommendations, and other proposals in connection with 1961 housing legislation and prepared its recommendations to the full committee. Subsequently, after sitting for 3 days in executive session the full committee reported a clean bill, S. 1922. The committee bill is the measure pending before us today.

In general, the committee bill is designed to accomplish these aims:

First. To bring about a realistic housing program for moderate-income families;

Second. To encourage the rehabilitation and improvement of existing properties by establishing a long-term, low-interest-rate improvement and rehabilitation program within the medium of FHA loan insurance;

Third. To encourage research and development and the use of advanced technology in the construction industry by permitting the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages on residential buildings which are constructed on an experimental basis with improved methods and materials;

Fourth. To initiate a new program of Federal aid to communities for the acquisition of undeveloped land for preservation and continued use as open space;

Fifth. To assist in the improvement of mass transit systems; and

Sixth. To provide continuity for various existing housing programs and to make necessary technical amendments to insure that existing housing programs better serve the housing needs of the people.

I should like to emphasize that in preparing the committee bill the subcommittee and the full committee took into consideration not only the pending measures, the testimony of witnesses appearing at the hearings, the President's housing message, and other proposals, but also the members of these committees considered the state of the national economy and the relationship of a healthy homebuilding industry to this economy.

There is concern about the state of the national economy and the continued lack of sustained vitality shown by the homebuilding industry. After having moved ahead for 3 consecutive months, private nonfarm housing starts failed to show the sharp spring upsurge that normally is associated with the month of April. As a result the seasonally adjusted annual rate slid back from a level close to 1.3 million to 1 only a shade better than 1.2 million. The committee viewed such a performance at this time as far from satisfactory, particularly in view of the needs of the national economy as well as the unmet housing needs of our Nation.

The committee believed that steps should be taken to stimulate the homebuilding industry if this Nation is, in fact, to meet housing needs of the people which will, according to all statistics thus far compiled, become more acute during the latter half of the decade.

Members of the committee are aware of some of the steps already taken by the President to alleviate the current sluggishness in the homebuilding industry and the national economy. For example, the reduced interest rate on FHA-insured mortgages, the higher price offered for mortgages by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the encouragement given by the present administration to local communities to speed up urban renewal and public housing projects, and the broadening of the public facility loan program to cover additional necessary local facilities, are showing some results in the national economy.

In addition, actions by the Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department in reducing interest rates on long-term securities, and by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in reducing interest rates on savings and loan mortgages, are showing some effect in increasing the flow of mortgage credit which should be of further help in improving the national economy and as a spur to the homebuilding industry.

Although the committee bill is not in full accord with all of the proposals of the measure originally introduced to implement the President's program, it does retain most of the principal features of that bill.

I should like further to emphasize that in preparing the committee bill, Members of the Banking and Currency Committee have been mindful of the National Housing Policy set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, more particularly that part of the policy which states:

Private enterprise shall be encouraged to serve as large a part of the total housing need as it can.

The majority of the new programs established by the committee bill would be under the administrative jurisdiction of the Federal Housing Administration. It is this agency which has, from its establishment in 1934, promoted the construction of housing through the private enterprise system.

Senators will note that the committee report—that is, Senate Report No. 281—contains individual and supplemental views from five committee members. Very candidly, I too, have not been in complete agreement with every provision contained in the committee bill. However, this bill represents the study and consideration of the majority of the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, and certainly it is a sound measure insofar as it will contribute to the continuing housing needs of the people. I believe it is a good bill.

I believe anyone reading the breakdown of the bill as I give it in my statement will come to the same conclusion. Of course I realize that there may be some divergence of opinion with reference to some of the provisions. But by and large it is a good bill, a bill that will promote decent, sanitary, and safe housing for American families.

In order that the RECORD may show the provisions of the bill in detail, I ask unanimous consent to include a section-by-section analysis of the bill at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF HOUSING ACT OF 1961, S. 1922

TITLE I—NEW HOUSING PROGRAMS

Housing for moderate-income families

Section 101: Amends section 221 of the National Housing Act to liberalize program for displaced families, and to make program available for moderate-income families.

Broadens the existing program by—

1. Permitting the section 221 program to serve "moderate-income families" in addition to "displaced families";

2. Eliminating requirement that number of FHA section 221 commitments for a given community must be predetermined and certified by the Administrator of HHFA;

3. Removing requirement that community must have "workable program" as a prerequisite for FHA section 221 mortgage insurance, except in case of limited or nonprofit or cooperative moderate-income rental housing financed under section 221(d)(3) program;

4. Removing requirement that community must formally request that the section 221 program be made available.

Market rate program; sales housing (one- to four-family dwellings): The terms and conditions for a mortgage to be eligible under the broadened sales program would be as follows:

1. The amount of the mortgage could not exceed—

		High cost area up to —
1-family	$9,000	$15,000
2-family	18,000	25,000
3-family	27,000	32,000
4-family	33,000	38,000

2. The limit on amount of mortgage based on appraised value of the dwelling would be limited to (a) 100 percent of appraised value or (b) in the case of repair and rehabilitation, the sum of the estimated cost of repair and rehabilitation and the estimated value before repair and rehabilitation. No mortgage could exceed cost of rehabilitation and refinancing, if any. No downpayment required except $200 per dwelling unit which may include settlement costs.

3. The mortgage would be required to be amortized within not more than 40 years or three-fourths of the Commissioner's estimate of the remaining economic life of the structure, whichever is lesser. The maximum interest rate would be 5 percent, except rate could be increased up to 6 percent if the Commissioner finds it necessary to meet the market.

4. Payment of claims on defaulted mortgages may cover accrued interest, if Commissioner contracts to pay claim upon assignment of mortgage to FHA.

5. The broadened program would permit the rehabilitation of existing structures for moderate-income families under the same formula as for displaced families.

6. Authority to insure mortgages for moderate-income families would terminate on July 1, 1963. There would be no termination date on the authority to insure mortgages for displaced persons.

Market rate programs; rental housing (five or more units): The terms and conditions under the broadened rental program would be the same as those for the sales housing program described above, with the following exceptions:

1. The maximum amount of mortgage could not exceed—

	Per room	*Per unit if under 4 rooms*
Garden type	$2,250	$8,500
Elevator	2,750	9,000
Increase in high cost area	1,000	-----

NOTE.—Exterior land improvements excluded in determining maximum amount of mortgage based upon per room or per unit limits.

2. The loan ratio would be based upon 90 percent of replacement cost of new construction.

3. The term of the mortgage would be prescribed by the Commissioner and such mortgage would carry an interest rate of not more than 5 percent with authority in the Commissioner to increase the maximum to 6 percent if the Commissioner finds it necessary to meet the mortgage market.

4. The program would provide for mortgage insurance on rental housing constructed by profitmaking mortgagors; the minimum number of units which could be in any project would be five.

5. The program provides for the rehabilitation of existing structures for either displaced families or moderate income families but provides that the maximum loan ratio on rehabilitated properties is to be 90 percent of rehabilitation costs plus the Commissioner's estimate of value before rehabilitation. In the case of rehabilitation, a mortgage could not exceed the cost of rehabilitation and amount, if any, required to refinance existing indebtedness.

6. This rental program for moderate-income families would terminate on July 1, 1963, but no termination date is provided for displaced families.

Below market rate program; rental housing (five or more units): Amends section 221(d)(3) to authorize the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages bearing interest at "below market rate" with a partial or no insurance premium and liberalized features for payment of insurance claims. Mortgages bearing interest at "market rate" could also be insured under the provisions of the subsection with no insurance reductions or waivers.

The terms and conditions for a mortgage to be eligible under the subsection would be as follows:

1. Eligible mortgagors participating in the program bearing interest at below market rate must be nonprofit organizations, limited dividend corporations, public bodies or agencies, or cooperatives. Such categories of eligible mortgagors could also obtain mortgage insurance under the program where the mortgage bears the market rate of interest.

2. The maximum insurable amount per room and per unit of any mortgage secured by rental housing would be the same as the amount provided in the market rate program as described above.

3. The maximum loan ratio would be 100 percent of the Commissioner's estimate of replacement cost, except in case of rehabilitation would be same as market rate program.

4. The mortgage would be required to be amortized under such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Commissioner and such mortgage could bear an interest rate at not more than 5 percent with discretionary authority in the Commissioner to increase such maximum to 6 percent; such mortgage could also bear interest at a rate of not less than the annual rate of interest determined by the Secretary of Treasury based on the average market yield on all outstanding marketable obligations.

5. The Commissioner may insure below market rate mortgages without premium charge or partial premium charge except that on mortgages which bear a market rate of interest, the Commissioner could require the regular FHA insurance premium.

6. The payment of insurance claims on defaulted mortgages could be in cash or debentures, and claims may include accrued interest as well as principal and other eligible items if mortgage is permitted to be assigned to FHA.

7. Mortgages insured bearing below market rate interest would be eligible for purchase by the FNMA even though a mortgagor may be a Federal, State, territorial, or municipal instrumentality.

8. Mortgages on rehabilitated property may be insured on the same basis as required for mortgages insured under the market rate rental program as described above.

Home improvement and rehabilitation loans

Loans in Urban Renewal Areas

Section 102(a): Adds section 220(h) to the National Housing Act to establish a new home improvement loan program for homes and multifamily structures in urban renewal areas. The terms and conditions for a loan to be eligible under the new section would be as follows:

1. The maximum loan could not exceed (a) $10,000 per family unit or estimated cost of improvement, whichever is lesser, and (b) an amount, which when added to any outstanding indebtedness relating to property being improved, would keep the total indebtedness against the property within the limits applicable to mortgages insured under the FHA section 220 program.

2. The term of the loan could not exceed 25 years, or three-fourths of the economic life of the property, whichever is less.

3. Maximum interest rates on such loans may be prescribed by the Commissioner but may not be in excess of 6 percent. Such loans may also bear service charge, appraisal, inspection, and other fees.

4. Property owners and long-term lessees in areas designated as urban renewal areas would be eligible borrowers under the program.

5. The loans authorized by the new section would have adequate security in such manner as the Commissioner may require and the Commissioner is authorized to charge an insurance premium on such loans.

6. Debentures issued on defaulted loans may include accrued interest as well as unpaid principal upon assignment to FHA.

7. Home improvement loans for structures used as rental accommodations for five or more families would be subject to cost certification provisions similar to cost

certification required by section 227 of the National Housing Act.

8. FNMA would be authorized to purchase any home improvement loans insured by the FHA.

Loans Outside Urban Renewal Areas

Section 102(b): Amends section 203 of such act to add a new subsection to establish a home improvement loan program outside urban renewal areas. The terms and conditions of the new loan program would be the same as those provided for home improvement loans "in urban renewal areas," except that loans would be limited to improvement of one- to four-family dwellings where project has been determined to be economically sound.

Housing Improvements and Rehabilitation

Section 102: Further amends section 220 of the National Housing Act to provide a new basis for determining the maximum loan ratio on rehabilitation mortgages. The new maximum loan ratio would be based on the sum of the estimated cost of repair and rehabilitation and the Commissioner's estimate of value of the property before repair and rehabilitation, but the mortgage could not exceed the cost of rehabilitation and amount, if any, required to refinance existing indebtedness.

Experimental housing mortgage insurance

Section 103: Adds a new section 233 to the National Housing Act to authorize the FHA Commissioner to make commitments to insure and to insure mortgages on properties (both sales and rental) involving uses of advanced technology in housing design, materials or construction or experimental neighborhood design, deemed significant in reducing cost or improving quality. Substitutes acceptable risk for economic soundness test for mortgages insured under this new program.

Mortgage insurance for individually owned units and multifamily projects

Section 104: Adds a new section 234 to the National Housing Act to permit mortgage insurance for individual fee simple or long-term lease ownership of a unit in a multifamily structure. Such ownership would include undivided ownership interest in common areas and facilities and the community and commercial facilities, if any, which serve the apartment building in which the individual's unit is located.

Under the new section, mortgages would be limited to owners of no more than four single-family units and only FHA multifamily projects would be eligible for condominium insurance except FHA section 213 (cooperative multifamily projects) would be excluded.

TITLE II—HOUSING FOR ELDERLY PERSONS AND LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

Housing for the elderly

Eligible Mortgagors

Section 201 (1), (2), (3), (4), and (7): amends section 202(a) (1), (2), (3), and (c) (3) of the Housing Act of 1959 to make public bodies and agencies and consumer cooperatives eligible for elderly housing direct loans.

Direct Loan Authorization

Section 201(5): Amends section 202(a)(5) of such act to increase the elderly housing direct loan authorization from $50 million to $100 million.

Limitation for Related Facilities

Section 201(6): Amends section 202(a)(6) to delete the limitation that not more than $5 million may be outstanding at any one time for related facilities.

Public housing

Eligibility Requirement for Disabled Persons

Section 202: Amends section 2 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to remove the requirement that disabled persons be at least 50 years of age in order to conform act with recent changes made in Social Security Act.

Use of Existing Dwellings

Section 203: Amends section 7 of such act so that the Housing and Home Finance Administrator and the Public Housing Commissioner shall encourage the use of existing dwellings in the undertaking and carrying out of low-rent housing projects.

Additional Subsidy for Elderly Tenants

Section 204: Amends section 10(a) of such act to permit payment of an additional annual Federal contribution of not to exceed $120 per year for each elderly family, provided such additional contribution is required in any year to avoid a deficit in low-rent project operation.

Dwelling Unit Authorization

Section 205: Amends section 10(e) of such act to make available the remaining balance of the $336 million annual contribution authorization contained in the Housing Act of 1949, which would cover approximately 100,000 units and to provide that contracts for additional units for any one State after date of enactment of the bill could not be entered into for more than 15 percent of the aggregate amount of contributions not already under contract on that date.

Greater Local Responsibility for Admission Policy

Section 206: Amends section 10(g) of such act to (1) give localities greater flexibility in shaping admission policies in such a way as to best meet their own particular local problems, and (2) permit local agencies to allow overincome tenants to continue occupancy during the period the local agency determines that the overincome family is unable to find a decent private dwelling within its financial reach if the family pays an appropriate rent.

Demonstration Programs

Section 207: Amends section 11 of such act to—

1. Give the Public Housing Commissioner discretionary authority to make grants to public or private bodies to develop and demonstrate new or improved means of providing housing and a suitable living environment for low-income persons and families and for obtaining maximum efficiency and economy in construction and management of low-rent housing.

2. Authorize appropriation of $10 million for grants for demonstration program.

Increased Cost Limits for Units for Elderly

Section 208: Amends section 15 of such act to increase the per room limitation in low-rent public housing projects in the case of Alaska and in the case of units designed for elderly persons from $2,500 to $3,000. This section would also permit capital donations and other non-Federal aid and additions to projects without the amount being charged against the room-cost limitation.

TITLE III—URBAN RENEWAL AND PLANNING

Urban renewal

Pooling Grants-in-Aid Between Projects Within Communities

Section 301: Amends section 103(a) to permit pooling of local noncash grant-in-aid credits earned in projects assisted under both the two-thirds and three-fourths formulas for Federal grants.

Incontestable Federal Obligation in Private Financing of Projects

Section 302: Amends section 102(c) of such act to directly obligate Federal Government to holder of LPA obligation where Federal loan contract is pledged (to improve marketability and reduce interest rate) and would make Federal obligation incontestable in hands of bearer of LPA obligation.

Capital Grant Authorization

Section 303: Amends section 103(b) of such act to increase capital grant authorization by $2.5 billion from $2 billion to $4.5 billion. Also reserves $50 million of this authorization for use in making grants for mass transportation demonstration projects.

Relocation Payments

Section 304: Amends section 106(f) of such act to make it clear that nonprofit organizations are eligible for relocation payments. Retains existing ceilings of $200 for individuals or families and $3,000 for business concerns or nonprofit organizations which amounts are paid entirely from Federal grants but provides that the Administrator of HHFA may permit the $200 and $3,000 ceiling to be increased in which event the excess would be added to the gross project cost and would be shared by the Federal Government and by the local government in accordance with applicable Federal-local sharing formula. Also makes it clear payments to individuals and families of fixed amount could be made in lieu of reasonable and necessary moving expenses and direct losses of property.

Financial Assistance for Displaced Business Concerns

Section 305: Amends section 7(b) of the Small Business Act to permit Small Business Administration to make loans, under the disaster loan program terms, to small businesses that have been displaced by federally assisted urban renewal projects and have suffered substantial economic injury as a result of the displacement.

State Limitation

Section 306: Amends section 106(e) of the Housing Act of 1949 to increase the amount that any one State may obtain of the capital grant authorization from 12½ percent of the total authorization, plus a portion of the $100 million reserve fund for all States exceeding the 12½ percent maximum, to 12½ percent of the total authorization, plus a portion of a $150 million reserve fund.

Resale of Property in Urban Renewal Areas for Housing Moderate Income Families

Section 307: Amends section 107 of such act to—

1. Permit urban renewal property to be made available to a limited-dividend corporation, nonprofit corporation, or association, cooperative, public body or agency, or an FHA section 221(d)(4) profitmaking rental housing mortgagor for purchase at fair value for use by purchaser in provision of moderate income rental or cooperative housing.

2. Make provision in existing law, which permits land in urban renewal areas to be sold at a reduced price for public housing purposes, applicable to urban renewal property acquired prior to September 23, 1959.

Rehabilitation

Section 308: Amends section 110(e) of such act to permit local public agencies to carry out rehabilitation demonstrations in urban renewal projects by acquiring properties, improving them for dwelling use or related facilities, and reselling them to private owners.

Increase in Nonresidential Exception

Section 309: Amends section 110(c) of such act to increase the amount of grant authorization which may be used for nonresidential purposes from 20 to 30 percent of new authority provided by this bill.

Urban Renewal Areas Involving Colleges, Universities, or Hospitals

Section 310: Rewrites section 112 of such act to allow—

1. Credit for State-licensed hospital expenditures in urban renewal areas.

2. Expenditures made by university or hospital acting through city or public corporation to be eligible as local grant-in-aid.

3. Similar expenditures made by State agency leasing properties to university or hospital to be eligible as local grant-in-aid.

4. Expenditures by institution or hospital in acquisition of property from city when not acting as urban renewal agency to be eligible as local grant-in-aid.

5. Expenditures by institution or hospital in relocating occupants being displaced from structures to be rehabilitated to be eligible as local grant-in-aid.

6. Expenditures to count if made not over 5 years prior to authorization by Housing Administrator of a loan or grant contract for the project, or if made in connection with a project for which a loan or grant contract was authorized prior to September 25, 1963, if expenditures were made not over 5 years prior to date of application for financial assistance.

Urban planning assistance

Planning Assistance

Section 311(1): Amends section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 to change the amount of grant from one-half to two-thirds of the estimated cost of the work for which the grant is made.

Section 311(2): Amends section 701 of such act to increase appropriation authorization from $20 million to $100 million.

Section 311(3): Amends section 701 of such act to extend planning to include the preparation of comprehensive mass transportation surveys to help solve problems of mass transit in urban areas.

Section 311(4): Amends section 701 of such act to permit grants to be made to interstate planning agencies formed by interstate compacts.

Historical Site in Urban Renewal Area

Section 312: Notwithstanding section 110(c)(4) of such act, permits donation of a parcel of land in urban renewal area to the James White's Fort Association in Knoxville, Tenn., if such property is restored as historical site and monument is operated on nonprofit basis.

Credit for Cost of School Construction

Section 313: Adds a provision to such act to permit the cost of school construction in a certain urban renewal project in Roanoke, Va., to be counted as a local contribution.

Technical Amendments

Section 314: (a), (b), and (c) amends sections 101(c), 102(a), and 110(c) to—

1. Make existing law clear that the workable program relates to a program for community improvement.

2. Make existing law clear that early land acquisition loans for acquisition and demolition of property may cover administration, relocation, and other costs related to the demolition and removal of structures acquired with the loans.

3. Clarify question concerning leasing of urban renewal project land.

TITLE IV—COLLEGE HOUSING, COMMUNITY FACILITIES, AND MASS TRANSPORTATION

College housing

Loan Authorization

Section 401(a): Amends section 401(d) of the Housing Act of 1952 to—

1. Increase loan authorization by $100 million upon enactment and by an additional $250 million for each of the 5 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1965.

2. Increase limitation for other educational facilities by $25 million for each of the 5 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1965.

3. Increase limitation for student nurse and intern housing at hospitals by $25 million for each of the 5 years beginning July 1, 1961, through 1965.

State Limitation

Section 401(b): Amends section 403 of such act to increase State limitation from 10 to 12½ percent of total loan authorization.

Community facilities and mass transportation

Public Facility and Mass Transportation Loans

Section 402: Amends sections 201, 202, and 203 of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (public facility loan program) to make the program applicable to the financing, acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use in mass transit systems in urban areas. This section would also increase the public facility loan revolving fund from $150 million to $300 million—$100 million of the total fund is reserved for the mass transportation loans. This section would further provide that funds for mass transportation loans shall be obtained from the Treasury at a rate not more than the average interest rate of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the borrowing.

Advances for Public Works Planning

Section 403: Amends section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954 to—

1. Increase the amount which may be advanced to any one State from 10 to 12½ percent of the aggregate amount then authorized to be appropriated.

2. Make projects eligible for planning advances which may be constructed within or over a reasonable period of time considering the nature of the project and to permit advances for areawide projects requiring a substantial period for completion.

TITLE V—AMENDMENTS TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Federal national mortgage association

Special Assistance Authorization

Section 501: Amends section 305(c) of the National Housing Act to increase FNMA special assistance authorization (Presidential allocation) by $750 million.

Section 502: Amends section 302(b) of such act to permit the maximum amount of an FHA section 213 loan purchased by the FNMA, if such mortgage is secured by a project in an urban renewal area, to be the same as the maximum amount insured by FHA. This is now permitted for loans insured under section 220.

FHA insurance programs

Expansion of Title I Home Repair and Improvement Program

Section 503(a): Amends section 2(a) of the National Housing Act to extend program for 2 years until October 1, 1963. (Present expiration date is October 1, 1961.)

FHA General Insurance Authorization

Section 503 (b) and (c): Amends section 203(a) and section 217 of such act to remove dollar ceilings on FHA's insurance authorization and provides that loans and mortgages may be insured until October 1, 1965, except for certain programs that have different termination dates.

Armed Service Housing

Section 503(d): Amends section 803(a) of such act to extend the mortgage insurance programs for Capehart military housing and housing for employees of NASA and AEC to October 1, 1962, and to increase the limitation on the number of Capehart units which may be constructed after June 30, 1959, to 37,000 (expiration date in existing law is October 1, 1961, and limitation in existing law on number of Capehart units which may be constructed is 25,000).

Authority To Reduce Insurance Premium Charge

Section 504: Amends section 203(c) of such act to give the FHA Commissioner discretion to reduce mortgage insurance premium on any program under title II of the National Housing Act to one-fourth of 1 percent per annum and permit any reduction to apply to outstanding mortgages.

Section 207 (Regular Rental) Housing Program

Section 505(1): Amends section 207 of such act to permit individuals, groups of individuals, or partnerships to be rental housing mortgagors if approved by Commissioner (in addition to those under present law).

Exterior Land Improvements

Section 505(2): Amends section 207(c)(3) of such act to permit exterior land improvements to be excluded in determining maximum amount of rental housing mortgage. (Same amendment is made by bill in FHA secs. 221, 213, and 231 programs.)

Cooperative Housing Insurance

Section 506(a)(1) and (2): Amends section 213 (b) and (d) of such act to decrease the minimum number of units in a multifamily cooperative housing project from eight to five, and to exclude exterior land improvements from determination of maximum amount of mortgage.

Section 506(a)(3): Amends section 213(h) of such act to give FHA Commissioner discretionary authority to insure additional mortgage after failure of sponsor to sell to a cooperative after such period of time as he deems appropriate.

Section 506(b): Amends section 213 of such act by adding a new subsection (j) to authorize FHA to insure supplementary cooperative loans to consumer cooperatives to provide (1) improvements or repairs, or (2) additional community facilities for a section 213 property.

Additional Mortgage Insurance on Multifamily Projects

Section 507(a): Amends section 223 of such act by adding a new subsection (c) to permit expenses of a multifamily project which exceed project income during first 2 years following final endorsement for insurance of a mortgage by FHA to be added to amount of insured mortgage.

Section 507(b): Amends section 223 of such act to permit FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages (covering housing sold by Federal, State, or local governments) under sections 220, 221, 231, or 233 in addition to those sections under present law.

Nursing Homes (Maximum Mortgage)

Section 508: Amends section 232(d) of such act to permit mortgage of 90 percent of estimated replacement cost (new construction), 90 percent of value (existing structures).

Technical and conforming amendments

Maturity Date of Home Mortgages

Section 509(a)(1): Amends section 203(b)(3) of such act to permit maturity date for home mortgages insured by the FHA to be calculated from the beginning of amortization of the mortgage.

Section 509(a)(2): Amends section 203(c) of such act to permit the FHA to pay insurance premiums with debentures which are obligations of the insurance fund or the ac-

count to which premium charges are credited.

Date of Certain Debentures

Section 509(b): Amends section 204(d) of such act to permit debentures in payment of insurance claims on loans insured under FHA sections 220, 221 and 233 programs to be dated as of the date of assignment of the mortgage or conveyance of property to Commissioner.

Conveyance of Foreclosed Properties to FHA

Section 509(c): Amends section 204(j) of such act to permit properties to be conveyed to the FHA without naming the Commissioner by name.

Expenses of FHA Statistical and Economic Surveys

Section 509(d): Amends section 209 of such act to permit FHA's statistical and economic surveys to be charged as a general expense against any insurance fund or account.

FHA Labor Standards Provision

Section 509(e): Amends section 212 of such act to make FHA labor standards provisions applicable to new home improvement loan program for multifamily housing, to moderate income rental housing program where mortgagors are cooperatives or limited profit, and to multifamily experimental housing under new section 233. (Condominiums constructed with FHA mortgage insurance would be subject to labor provisions without further amendment).

Transfer Between FHA Insurance Funds

Section 509(f): Amends section 219 of such act to permit moneys in the FHA title I insurance account and other new accounts and funds created by this bill to be transferred among the various other insurance funds, except the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund.

Payment of Insurance Claims (Section 220 Mortgages (Urban Renewal Housing))

Section 509(g): Amends section 220(f) of such act to permit Commissioner to include accrued interest and unpaid principal in FHA debentures issued in payment of claims being made on defaulted mortgages insured under section 220 and assigned to FHA after default.

Interest Rates on FHA Debentures

Section 509(h): Amends section 224 of such act to permit the interest rates of debentures for payment of claims on mortgages or loans insured under sections 220 (urban renewal housing and improvement loans), 221 (moderate income and relocation housing) and 233 (experimental housing program) to be at rates in effect at the date of their issuance if Commissioner so prescribes in insurance contract. Debentures could also bear interest at same rate as for debentures related to other loans, if Commissioner so prescribes. Interest rate on debentures related to other loans would be rate in effect on date of commitment to insure, or date loan was endorsed or initially endorsed for insurance, whichever rate is highest.

FHA Appraisals to Home Purchasers

Section 509(i): Amends section 226 of such act to confirm existing law so that FHA appraisals as required by the bill shall be furnished to home buyers and to purchasers whose mortgages are insured under the new FHA section 233 (experimental housing) program and new FHA section 234 (condominium) program.

FHA Cost Certification

Section 509(j): Amends section 227 of such act to apply cost certification requirement to new section 233 multifamily experimental housing program authorized by bill and make other conforming amendments in cost certification provisions.

Voluntary Termination of FHA Insurance on Multifamily Housing Mortgages and Loans

Section 509(k): Amends section 229 of such act to permit FHA to terminate insurance upon agreement between any mortgagor and mortgagee upon the payment of an adjusted insurance premium.

Exterior Land Improvements

Section 509(l): Amends section 231 of such act (elderly housing) to permit exterior land improvements to be excluded in determining maximum amount of mortgage.

TITLE VI—OPEN SPACE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

This title adds a new program to assist State and local governments in preserving open-space land in and around urban areas which, for economic, social, conservation, recreational, or esthetic reasons, is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas and their suburban environs.

Findings and Purpose

Section 601: Finds it to be the purpose of the Congress to help curb urban sprawl and prevent spread of blight, to encourage more economic and desirable urban development, and to help provide recreational, conservation, and scenic areas by assisting preservation of open-space land.

Federal Grants

Section 602: Provides that—

1. Housing and Home Finance Administrator authorized to contract to make grants to State and local public bodies which—

(a) Do not exceed 25 percent of total cost of acquiring land to be used as permanent open space, except grant can be up to 35 percent in case of public body which (i) exercises responsibilities for urban area as a whole, or (ii) exercises or participates in exercise of such responsibilities for all or a substantial portion of an urban area pursuant to interstate or other intergovernmental agreements; and

(b) Aggregate not more than $100 million.

2. Grants may not be used to pay development costs or State or local governmental expenses.

3. Appropriations are authorized for the payment of grants and the faith of the United States is pledged to the payment of grants for which contracts are made.

4. Administrator is required to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on general policies to be followed in reviewing applications for grants.

Planning Requirements

Section 603: Provides that—

1. Administrator must find—

(a) Proposed open space is important to execution of a comprehensive plan meeting criteria he establishes, and

(b) A program of comprehensive planning is being actively carried on.

2. Administrator shall take appropriate action to assure preservation by local governing bodies of maximum of open-space land, with minimum of cost, through use of existing public land, use of special tax, zoning and subdivision provisions, and continuation of appropriate private use of open-space land.

3. In processing applications Administrator shall consider extent of local encouragement of orderly community development and of an adequate supply of housing.

Conversions to Other Uses

Section 604: Provides that no open-space land for which grant has been made shall be converted to other uses without approval by Administrator, and his approval shall be contingent upon substitution of other open-space land.

Technical Assistance, Studies and Publication of Information

Section 605: Provides that Administrator is authorized to provide and carry out with funds appropriated for purposes.

Definitions

Section 606: Defines—1. "Open-space land" means any undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped land, including agricultural land, in or adjoining an urban area, which has (a) economic and social value as a means of shaping the character, direction, and timing of community development (b) recreational value; (c) conservation value in protecting natural resources; or (d) historic, scenic, scientific, or esthetic value.

2. "Urban area" means any area which is urban in character, including surrounding areas which form an economic and socially related region.

TITLE VII—OTHER HOUSING PROGRAMS

Farm housing

Securities on Property Under Farm Housing Program

Section 701(a): Amends section 502(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 to permit wider latitude in type of security the borrower must provide in order to obtain a loan.

Extension of Farm Housing Program (Title V, Housing Act of 1949)

Section 701 (b) and (c): Amends sections 511, 512, and 513 of the Housing Act of 1949 by extending the farm housing program for 5 years until June 30, 1966.

Home improvement loans by savings and loan associations and national banks

Authority To Make Home Improvement Loans

Sections 702 and 703: Amends section 5(c) of the Homeowners Loan Act of 1933 and section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act, respectively, to assure authority of savings and loan associations and national banks to make FHA-insured home improvement loans under the new program (sections 220(h) and 203(k) of the National Housing Act) provided by this bill, notwithstanding the fact that the loans may not be secured by a first mortgage.

Voluntary home mortgage credit program

Extension of Program

Section 704: Amends section 610(a) of the Housing Act of 1954 to extend the VHMC program until October 1, 1965. (Present expiration date is October 1, 1961.)

Lanham Act housing

Disposal of Passyunk War Housing Project

Section 705: Amends section 802(a) of the Housing Act of 1959 to extend for 1 year the period during which military personnel and civilian personnel employed in defense activities may continue to occupy the Passyunk war housing project in Philadelphia, with occupancy preferences and without regard to their income.

Veterans' Administration direct home loans

Maximum Amount of Loan

Section 706(a)(1): Amends section 1811 (d) of such title to permit VA Administrator to increase maximum from $13,500 to $15,000 in areas where climatic conditions require higher construction costs.

Formula for Determining Veteran Eligibility

Section 706(a)(2): Amends section 1811 (h) of such title to provide a period of time for eligibility equal to 10 years from date of discharge from active duty during World War II or Korean conflict (as the case may be) plus an additional 1 year for each 4 months' duty during such war or conflict.

Extension of Direct Home Loan Program

Section 706(a)(2): Amends section 1811 of such title to extend the period in which a veteran of World War II may obtain a

direct loan until July 25, 1967, and to extend the period in which a veteran of the Korean conflict may obtain such a loan until January 31, 1975.

Additional Authorization for Direct Loan

Section 706(b)(1): Amends section 1823 (a) of such title to provide for additional authorization as follows:

After enactment of this bill (4th quarter fiscal 1961)	$100,000,000
After June 30, 1961	400,000,000
After June 30, 1962	200,000,000
After June 30, 1963	150,000,000
After June 30, 1964	150,000,000
After June 30, 1965	100,000,000
After June 30, 1966	100,000,000

Administrative

Purchase of Publications

Section 707: Amends section 502 of the Housing Act of 1948 to permit the Administrator of HHFA and the heads of constituent agencies to use funds made available for salaries and expenses to purchase advance subscriptions to publications, and also purchase memberships in organizations to enable the agencies to receive or purchase scientific and other publications.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, title I of the committee bill would first establish three new programs of mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing Administration.

Section 101 of the bill would broaden the existing FHA 40-year, no-downpayment mortgage insurance program for families displaced by urban renewal and other Federal activities to include a mortgage insurance program for families of moderate income.

Let me make it absolutely clear that the 40-year, no-downpayment insurance program is not an innovation insofar as the FHA is concerned. The FHA has been insuring such mortgages under the section 221 program for some time. This section was first enacted into law by the Housing Act of 1954 during the 2d session of the 84th Congress. The committee bill proposes only to broaden the existing 221 program to cover families of moderate income.

Perhaps it would be well to explain at this point that the broadening of the section 221 program will not eliminate the provisions in existing law which make the FHA insurance available to sales and rental dwelling units for displaced families. In fact, such families under the provisions of the bill will be given priority of occupancy in housing constructed under the 221 program.

For the sake of clarity, the broadening of FHA section 221 to provide for a mortgage insurance program for families of moderate income may be broken into three parts. These are, first, a sales program which contemplates FHA insurance of 40-year, no-downpayment mortgages secured by single-family dwellings and which mortgages would bear interest at market rates; second, a rental program which contemplates FHA insurance for mortgages secured by rental properties constructed by profitmaking organizations and which mortgages would bear interest at market rates; and third, a rental program which contemplates FHA insurance for mortgages secured by rental properties constructed by a specific group of nonprofit type organizations and which mortgages would bear interest at below the market rates.

With regard to the programs which contemplate mortgages bearing interest at market rates the workable program requirement as well as the HHFA certification of the number of dwelling units to be constructed in any given area under the section 221 program would be eliminated.

In addition, in order to attract private investment capital into the programs bearing interest at the market rate, the bill would make several minor amendments pertaining to the payment of insurance claims. These amendments are, first, defaulted mortgages could be assigned—at the discretion of the FHA Commissioner—to the Agency and insurance claim could be paid without the holder of such mortgage being required, as under present law, to foreclose the mortgage and obtain possession of the property in order to convey title to the FHA; second, FHA debentures, which are issued to pay insurance claims, could bear an interest rate in effect at the time of their issuance rather than the rate in effect at the time of insurance of mortgage as under existing law; and third, accrued interest which was lost by the lender could be included in FHA debentures. Because the sales and profitmaking rental programs under the FHA section 221 program are experimental in nature, the bill would provide for a termination date of June 30, 1963.

In regard to the program which contemplates mortgages bearing interest at below the market rate, the bill would make several changes in the existing 221 program in order to make the below market rate program serve the lower moderate income family. These changes are:

First. The bill would permit public bodies and agencies, limited dividend corporations, and consumer type cooperatives to be eligible for mortgage insurance if such groups construct rental accommodations for the lower moderate income families.

Second. The bill would provide that such mortgages could bear interest at a rate of not less than the annual rate of interest determined by the Secretary of Treasury based on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States. At present such a rate would be about 3⅛ percent.

Third. The bill would permit insurance claims to be paid in either cash or debentures at the discretion of the Commissioner but in any event the payment of claim would be determined by the Commissioner at the time the mortgage was insured. In addition, as is in the case of the proposed market rate program, the bill would provide that FHA debentures issued on defaulted mortgages under the below market rate program would bear interest at the date of their issuance rather than at the date the mortgage was endorsed for insurance and, further, payment of claims could cover accrued interest lost by the lender. As in the case of the market rate programs, the bill would provide that defaulted mortgages could be assigned by the holder to the FHA without foreclosure proceedings in order to perfect title.

Fourth. The bill would provide that the Commissioner could insure mortgages on the below market rate program without premium charge or with partial premium charge.

Fifth. The bill would provide that the mortgages secured by rental accommodations for the lower moderate income family would be eligible for purchase by the FNMA under its special assistance function.

Sixth. The statutory prerequisite of a workable program and a certification by the HHFA Administrator for the number of units to be built in any given area would still be applicable to mortgages insured under the below market rate program.

Section 102 of the bill would establish a new home improvement and rehabilitation loan insurance program to be administered by the FHA. For all practical purposes this new program may be broken into two parts: first, home improvement and rehabilitation loans in urban renewal areas; and, second, loans outside urban renewal areas.

Section 102(a) of the bill would establish a home improvement loan program for homes and multifamily structures in urban renewal areas. Such loans could not exceed (a) $10,000 per family unit or the estimated cost of improvements, whichever is lesser, and (b) an amount which when added to any outstanding indebtedness relating to the property being improved would keep the total indebtedness against the property within the limits applicable to mortgages insured under the FHA section 220—urban renewal housing—program. The term of the loan could not exceed 25 years or three-fourths of the economic life of the property, whichever is the lesser. Maximum interest rate on such loans may be prescribed by the Commissioner, but may not be in excess of 6 percent. In addition, the FNMA would be authorized to purchase any home improvement loan insured by the FHA.

Section 102(b) of the bill would establish a home improvement loan program outside urban renewal areas. The terms and conditions of the new loan program would be the same as those provided for the home improvement program in urban renewal areas except that loans would be limited to improvements of one- to four-family dwellings where such housing has been determined by the Commissioner to be economically sound.

These new loan programs are to be distinguished from the existing Title I home repair and improvement program. Under the existing program, lenders are charged with the responsibility of making loans and reporting to the FHA that such loans have been made, except in cases where loans applied for are in excess of $5,000. Under these circumstances, the FHA reviews the application before the loan is approved. The bill contemplates that loans made pursuant to the new programs will be processed through the FHA the same as the Agency now processes on mortgages to be insured and, further, the bill contemplates that

the Agency will apply its regular underwriting standards to applications for loans before an FHA commitment to insure the loan is issued.

While the committee strongly supports the objectives of the new home improvement and rehabilitation program, we were concerned about the Government's risk on these loans. Consequently, the committee bill requires that adequate security will be taken in connection with these loans in such a manner as the Commissioner deems appropriate. In addition, the committee report makes it clear that any loan with a large face amount and a long maturity should be secured by a lien on the property involved. This lien may take the form of a junior lien or other liens as may be appropriate under the circumstances involved and the laws of a particular State.

Section 102 of the bill also would provide a new basis for determining the maximum loan ratio on rehabilitation mortgages under existing programs. FHA insures mortgages for loans used to finance rehabilitation of housing in urban renewal areas under section 220 and for loans used to rehabilitate housing for occupancy by displaced families under section 221.

Under the existing law, the basis for determining the maximum amount of a section 220 rehabilitation mortgage is the appraised value of the property. Under the bill the basis would be the sum of, first, the estimated cost of the rehabilitation; and, second, the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property before rehabilitation. However, in no event could the mortgage exceed the cost of rehabilitation and the amount, if any, required to refinance existing indebtedness.

Section 103 of the bill would add a new section to the National Housing Act to authorize the FHA Commissioner to insure mortgages secured by properties, both sales and rental, which are constructed utilizing advance designs and technology.

Under this new section, FHA would be authorized to insure mortgages for loans on homes or rental housing built with new and untried materials, design and construction methods and involving experimental property standards and neighborhood design. The program is designed to assist in reducing housing costs and improving housing standards. The FHA would be authorized to make investigations and analyses of data and to publish and distribute reports on this program.

A mortgage eligible under this new program could be insured if it meets requirements of the regular mortgage insurance programs, except that the property would not have to meet the economic soundness requirement. Instead, it would need to be an acceptable risk giving consideration to the need for testing advanced housing technology. Also, the Commissioner's estimate of the cost of replacing the property with a house of comparable conventional construction would be used in lieu of value for determining maximum amount of the mortgage.

Authority is provided for the Commissioner of the FHA to transfer the sum of $1 million to the experimental housing insurance fund to be used as a revolving fund to carry out the provisions of the experimental program. Although the bill does not place a limitation on the number of mortgages that may be insured under the new experimental program, the committee has made it clear in the report that mortgage insurance under the program should not be written in an aggregate amount which would result in estimated claims exceeding $1 million.

Section 104 of the bill would add another new section to the National Housing Act to permit mortgage insurance for individual fee simple or long-term lease ownership of a unit in a multifamily structure. Such ownership would include undivided ownership interest in common areas and facilities and the community and commercial facilities, if any, which serve the apartment building in which the individual's unit is located. This type of ownership is often referred to as condominium.

Under the new section, mortgages would be limited to owners of not more than four single-family units and only FHA multifamily projects would be eligible for a condominium insurance except FHA section 213—cooperative multifamily projects—would be excluded.

The maximum term of the mortgage, the interest rates, and the maximum loan-to-value ratio under this new section would be the same as those applicable to the FHA section 203—regular sales housing—program.

In addition to the new proposals which I have already discussed, the bill contains in title IV and title VI provisions for establishing two new programs that will fall within the administrative jurisdiction of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. These programs are, first, a mass transportation program; and, second, an open space and urban development program.

Section 402 of the bill broadens the public facility loan program to make it applicable to the financing acquisition, construction, and improvement of facilities and equipment for use in mass transit systems in urban areas. This section would also increase the public facilities loan fund from $150 to $300 million—$100 million of the total fund being reserved for mass transportation loans with the balance of the authorization to be used to finance the regular public facilities loan program. In addition, this section would provide that funds for mass transportation loans shall be obtained from the Treasury at a rate not more than the average interest rate of all interest-bearing obligations of the United States then forming a part of the public debt as computed at the end of the fiscal year next preceding the borrowing. Another section of the bill reserves $50 million of the urban renewal authorization for use in making grants for mass transportation demonstration projects and, in addition, the bill would amend the urban planning assistance program—section 701—to extend planning grants to include the preparation of comprehensive mass transportation surveys to help solve problems of mass transit in urban areas.

Title VI adds a new program to assist State and local governments in preserving open space land in and around urban areas which, for economic, social, conservation, recreational, or esthetic reasons, is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas and their suburban environs. Under this title the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator would be authorized to contract to make grants to State and local public bodies which do not exceed 25 percent of the total cost of acquiring land to be used as permanent open space, except grants can be up to 35 percent in the case of a public body which, first, exercises responsibility for the urban area as a whole, or, second, exercises or participates in exercise of such responsibilities for all or a substantial portion of an urban area pursuant to interstate or other intergovernmental agreement. This title of the bill also authorizes an appropriation of $100 million for grants to carry out the open space and urban development programs.

Mr. President, this, in general, concludes the description of the new programs as proposed by the committee bill. The bill, however, contains several other provisions to extend existing programs, either by providing more funds with which to carry these programs on or by extending the termination dates of such programs. The most important of these provisions are as follows:

Section 201 would increase the authority for appropriation of funds for the elderly housing direct loan program from $50 to $100 million

Section 205 would authorize the Public Housing Administration to contract for the approximately 100,000 additional dwelling units which can be financed with what remains of the annual contributions authorization of $336 million originally provided under the 1949 act.

Section 303 would increase the capital grant authorization for the urban renewal program by $2.5 billion.

Section 304 would remove the ceiling on relocation payments to families and to business establishments provided all amounts in excess of $200 for families and $3,000 for businesses, the maximum amount under existing law, are included in gross project costs and shared two-thirds by the Federal Government and one-third by localities. Amounts up to the maximum under existing law would continue to be paid out of Federal funds.

Section 311 would change the urban planning grant program—section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954—to, first, increase the Federal share of the cost of planning activity undertaken under the program from one-half to two-thirds; second, increase the authorization for appropriations for grants from $20 to $100 million; and, third, facilitate interstate planning for metropolitan areas and other urban areas crossing State boundaries.

Section 401 would provide for an immediate increase of $100 million for fiscal 1961 and increases of $250 million on July 1 of each of the 5 years 1961 through 1965 in the college housing loan authorization.

Section 501 would increase the FNMA special assistance fund by $750 million, from $950 million to $1,700 million. Most of this fund is expected to be used to finance the new program for low- and middle-income families authorized by this bill.

Section 503(a) of the bill would provide for a 2-year extension of the home repair and improvement program under title I of the National Housing Act. Under present law, the program is due to expire on October 1, 1961.

Section 503 (b) and (c) would remove the present dollar ceiling on FHA's general mortgage insurance authorization, and existing law would be amended to provide that loans on mortgages, except certain programs which have their own time limitation, may be insured until October 1, 1965.

Section 503(d) would extend the armed services mortgage insurance program until October 1, 1962, and would further amend the provision pertaining to that program to increase the number of units which could be constructed after June 30, 1959, to 37,000.

Section 701 would provide for a 4-year extension, that is until October 1, 1965, of the farm housing program as is provided in title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

Section 704 would provide for a 4-year extension of the voluntary home mortgage credit program, that is until October 1, 1965.

Section 706 would, first, establish a formula for determining the eligibility period during which veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict would be eligible to participate in the direct loan program; second, extend the direct loan program for veterans of World War II until July 25, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans until January 31, 1975; and, third, increase the VA direct loan authorization by $1.2 billion over a period of 6¼ fiscal years.

Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, I believe these are the highlights and principal provisions of S. 1922.

It is my personal view that S. 1922 is sound legislation and I am hopeful that it will receive favorable consideration by the Senate, by the House of Representatives, and will be signed into law by the President.

Mr. President, just this afternoon I read in the Evening Star an article which bears upon one provision in the bill. I believe one of the most popular programs in the field of housing over many years has been that of college housing. The bill proposes to increase the funds which will be available for college housing throughout the United States. The article in the Evening Star, on the first page of section B, is entitled "Housing Shortage Hits American U." It states that many students, particularly young women, who desired to attend American University and had paid their tuition have been given refunds accompanied by a letter stating that housing is not available; and that unless the applicants themselves could obtain housing in keeping with the rules and regulations of the university, they could not be admitted. That statement could be duplicated a hundred times or more throughout the United States.

A few months ago, I visited the land-grant college in my State, Auburn University. I was told that the university had been forced to stop taking applications for admission next September, especially the applications of young women, simply because sufficient facilities were not available.

The president of the University of Alabama was in Washington recently. He told me that the University of Alabama had to turn away a thousand students because of the lack of adequate housing. The same cry goes up from practically every college in the United States.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago that the college housing program was a popular one. That is indicated by the number of colleges which have participated in the program over the years of its existence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Housing Shortage Hits American U.," published in the Washington Evening Star of today.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING SHORTAGE HITS AMERICAN UNIVERSITY—COEDS GIVEN REFUNDS, TOLD TO FIND ROOMS

(By John Rosson)

American University is so short of student dormitories it is now in the process of refunding room deposits to coeds it planned to enroll next fall and telling them they cannot register as freshmen unless they find their own housing.

The girls, already accepted on academic qualifications, made the $75 deposits earlier this year fully expecting to attend their first classes next September. Most of them are finishing high school this month.

In a letter accompanying the refunds, the university is telling the would-be coeds they cannot enroll at all unless they find quarters off campus.

The exact number of refunds is not yet known, but the picture is made even rougher for the disappointed girls by a longstanding American University rule that freshman coeds not residing on campus must live with relatives.

RULE TO REMAIN

The rule will not be relaxed, university officials said. "We will not let them live just anywhere. If they want to attend American University they will still have to live with their parents or relatives."

The off-campus policy does not apply to male students or to sophomore, junior, and senior coeds.

At the bottom of the dorm shortage is a lack of building funds in general, a fouled-up construction schedule affecting a large addition to Hughes Hall (the on-campus girls' dormitory) and the loss next September of girls' dorm space at the new Sibley Hospital.

The resulting dormitory shortage affects even the boys.

American University, depending on the number of male and female students, assigns the buildings to either group. Next year, however, fewer of both will be living on campus than are doing so this year.

Officials explain it this way:

1. Tardiness on the part of Congress to approve college construction funds caused a long delay in construction this year of the addition to Hughes Hall. The project, now underway, will increase the hall's capacity from 350 to about 700. The delay, however, means the building will not be ready until the fall of 1962, two semesters away.

FEW LIVING ON CAMPUS

2. Sibley Hospital, where a number of coeds have been living under auspices of the university, has notified officials it will need the rooms next fall and that the students will have to leave.

Since these are girls already enrolled at American University, they have a claim on Hughes Hall before incoming coeds. The boys are cut short because some of their campus dorms will have to revert to upperclass coeds still unable to get into Hughes Hall.

In all, the university reports that only 302 women and 153 men will be living on campus next fall. The comparative figures this year are 378 women and 314 men, the number of men being cut in half. The total American University enrollment will be about 8,500.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is my personal view that in its overall form, S. 1922 is a sound bill. I hope that it will receive favorable consideration by the Senate and the House of Representatives. In that connection, that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency has reported a bill which in many respects is similar to the bill which has been reported to the Senate. I believe it is due to be called up in the House in about 2 weeks. I do not believe the conferees from the two Houses will have any difficulty in agreeing to a measure which will be signed by the President. I believe we shall have a program which will continue homebuilding for American families during the next year.

Mr. President, in connection with the article which I placed in the RECORD a few moments ago, regarding the college housing program, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list showing the participation by the various schools and colleges throughout the country in this program during the time it has been in existence.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM APPROVED LOANS BY INSTITUTION

ALABAMA

The Marion Institute, Marion.
Spring Hill College, Spring Hill.
Auburn University, Auburn.
Howard College, Birmingham.
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee.
St. Bernard College, St. Bernard.
Jacksonville State Teachers College, Jacksonville.
Alabama A. & M. College, Normal.
Troy State College, Troy.
Florence State College, Florence.
Brimingham Southern College, Birmingham.
University of Alabama (medical), Birmingham.
Huntington College, Montgomery.
University of Alabama, University.
Alabama College, Montevallo.

ALASKA

University of Alaska, College.

ARIZONA

Arizona State College, Tempe.
University of Arizona, Tucson.
Arizona State College, Flagstaff.

ARKANSAS

Ouachita Baptist College, Arkadelphia.
State A.M. & N. School, Pine Bluff.
Henderson State Teachers College, Arkadelphia.
Hendrix College, Conway.
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.
Arkansas State Teachers College, Conway.
University of Arkansas (medical), Little Rock.
Arkansas State College, State College.
Harding College, Searcy.
Arkansas Polytechnic College, Russellville.
Little Rock University, Little Rock.
Philander Smith College, Little Rock.
John Brown University, Siloam Springs.
Arkansas A. & M. College, College Heights.

CALIFORNIA

Menlo College, Menlo Park.
University of San Francisco, San Francisco.
Whittier College, Whittier.
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara.
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
Occidental College, Los Angeles.
College of the Pacific, Stockton.
University of Redlands, Redlands.
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles.
Loyola University of Los Angeles, Los Angeles.
College of the Holy Names, Oakland.
College of Notre Dame, Belmont.
LaVerne College, LaVerne.
University of California, Berkeley (six campuses).
California Western University, San Diego.
Westmont College, Santa Barbara.
California State Colleges, Sacramento (11 campuses).
Pasadena College, Pasadena.
University of California, Los Angeles.
Chapman College, Orange.
California College of Arts & Crafts, Oakland.
Stanford University, Stanford.
Los Angeles College of Optometry, Los Angeles.
St. Mary's College of California, St. Mary's College.
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco.
University of California, Galeta.
University of California, Davis.

COLORADO

Colorado School of Mines, Golden.
University of Colorado, Boulder.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
Colorado College, Colorado Springs.
Western State College, Gunnison.
Loretto Heights College, Loretto.
Colorado State College, Greeley.
Regis College, Denver.
Colorado Woman's College, Denver.
Fort Lewis A. & M. College, Durango.
University of Denver, Denver.
Adams State College, Alamosa.
Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo.

CONNECTICUT

University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport.
Yale University, New Haven.
Albertus Magnus College, New Haven.
St. Joseph College, West Hartford.
Connecticut College for Women, New London.
Wesleyan University, Middletown.
Trinity College, Hartford.

DELAWARE

University of Delaware, Newark.
Wesley College, Dover.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Georgetown University.
The American University.
Trinity College.
The Catholic University of America.
The George Washington University.
Dumbarton College.

FLORIDA

University of Florida, Gainesville.
Florida A. & M. College, Tallahassee.
University of Miami, Miami.
John B. Stetson University, Deland.
Florida Southern College, Lakeland.
Bethune-Cookman College, Daytona Beach.
Florida State University, Tallahassee.
Rollins College, Winter Park.
University of Tampa, Tampa.
University of South Florida, Tampa.

GEORGIA

Emory University, Atlanta.
Mercer University, Macon.
Morris Brown College, Atlanta.
Clark College, Atlanta.
Georgia Military College, Milledgeville.
Wesleyan College, Macon.
University of Georgia, Athens.
Georgia Teachers' College, Statesboro.
Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta.
North Georgia College, Dahlonega.
Tift College, Forsyth.
Morehouse College, Morehouse.
Gordon Military College, Barnesville.
Young Harris College, Young Harris.

HAWAII

University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

IDAHO

University of Idaho, Moscow.
The College of Idaho, Caldwell.
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa.
North Idaho Junior College, Cour d'Alene.
Boise Junior College, Boise.

ILLINOIS

Knox College, Galesburg.
Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago.
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale.
Illinois College, Jacksonville.
North Central College, Naperville.
Loyola University, Chicago.
North Park College and Theological Seminary, Chicago.
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest.
Lincoln College, Lincoln.
Quincy College and Seminary, Quincy.
Bradley University, Peoria.
University of Illinois, Urbana.
Aurora College, Aurora.
The University of Chicago, Chicago.
Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Lake Forest.
Greenville College, Greenville.
Shimer College, Mount Carroll.
Illinois State Normal University, Normal.
National College of Education, Evanston.
Western Illinois University, Macomb.
Northern Illinois University, De Kalb.
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston.
MacMurray College, Jacksonville.
Milliken University, Decatur.
Augustana College, Rock Island.
St. Xavier College, Chicago.
Monmouth College, Monmouth.
Rosary College, River Forest.
Elmhurst College, Elmhurst.
St. Procopius College, Lisle.
Mundelein College, Chicago.

INDIANA

Butler University, Indianapolis.
Anderson College and Theological Seminary, Anderson.
Indiana University, Bloomington.
St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer.
Franklin College of Indiana, Franklin.
Manchester College, North Manchester.
Earlham College, Richmond.
Taylor University, Upland.
Marion College, Marion.
Purdue University, Lafayette.
Ball State Teachers College, Muncie.
Indiana University (medical), Indianapolis.
The Vincennes University, Vincennes.
Evansville College, Evansville.
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso.
Indiana State Teachers College, Terre Haute.
University of Notre Dame du Lac, Notre Dame.

IOWA

Drake University, Des Moines.
Morningside College, Sioux City.
Iowa Wesleyan College, Mount Pleasant.
Simpson College, Indianola.
Upper Iowa University, Fayette.
Luther College, Decorah.
Waldorf College, Forest City.
Buena Vista College, Storm Lake.
Parsons College, Fairfield.
St. Ambrose College, Davenport.
Grinnell College, Grinnell.
Northwestern College, Orange City.
Coe College, Cedar Rapids.

KANSAS

Municipal University of Wichita, Wichita.
Ottawa University, Ottawa.
Baker University, Baldwin.
Sterling College, Sterling.
Kansas State College, Manhattan.
Kansas State Teachers College, Pittsburg.
University of Kansas, Lawrence.
Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina.
Fort Hays Kansas State College, Hays.
St. Benedict's College, Atchison.
Bethany College, Lindsborg.
Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia.
University of Wichita, Wichita.
The Friends University, Wichita.
The Southwestern College, Winfield.
The College of Emporia, Emporia.
Tabor College, Hillsboro.
Sacred Heart College, Wichita.
McPherson College, McPherson.
Kansas State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, Manhattan.

KENTUCKY

University of Kentucky, Lexington.
Murray State College, Murray.
Western Kentucky State College, Bowling Green.
Transylvania University, Lexington.
Georgetown College, Georgetown.
University of Louisville, Louisville.
Eastern Kentucky State College, Richmond.
Bellarmine College, Louisville.
Kentucky State College, Frankfort.
Morehead State College, Morehead.
Union College, Barbourville.
Pikeville College, Pikeville.
Centre College of Kentucky, Danville.
Nazareth College at Louisville, Louisville.

LOUISIANA

Tulane University, New Orleans.
Centenary College of Louisiana, Shreveport.
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches.
McNeese State College, Lake Charles.
Louisiana College, Pineville.
Southeastern Louisiana College, Hammond.
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston.
St. Mary's Dominican College, New Orleans.
Dillard University, New Orleans.
Grambling College, Grambling.
Southern University and A. & M. College, Baton Rouge.
Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe.
Loyola University, New Orleans.

MAINE

Nasson College, Springvale.

MARYLAND

The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
University of Maryland, College Park.
Washington College, Chestertown.
Ner Israel Rabbinical College, Baltimore.

Hood College, Frederick.
College of Notre Dame of Maryland, Baltimore.
Loyola College, Baltimore.
Mount St. Agnes College, Baltimore.

MASSACHUSETTS

Tufts College, Medford.
Brandeis University, Waltham.
Assumption College, Worcester.
Boston University, Boston.
Lesley College, Cambridge.
Bouve-Boston School, Medford.
Stonehill College, North Easton.
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester.
Clark University, Worcester.
New England Conservatory of Music, Boston.
Springfield College, Springfield.
Wheaton College, Norton.
Tufts College, Medford.
Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley.
Anna Maria College for Women, Paxton.
Merrimack College, North Andover.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
Wellesley College, Wellesley.
Dean Academy and Junior College, Franklin.
Wheelock College, Boston.
Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston.
College of the Holy Cross, Worcester.

MICHIGAN

University of Detroit, Detroit.
Hope College, Holland.
Olivet College, Olivet.
University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
Michigan State University, East Lansing.
Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti.
Marygrove College, Detroit.
Central Michigan College, Mount Pleasant.
Michigan College of Mining and Technology, Houghton.
Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.
Aquinas College, Grand Rapids.

MINNESOTA

Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter.
Concordia College, Moorhead.
Augsburg College and Theological Seminary, Minneapolis.
Bethel College and Seminary, St. Paul.
St. Olaf College, Northfield.
Macalester College, St. Paul.
Hamline University, St. Paul.
University of Minnesota, St. Paul.
University of Minnesota, Minneapolis.
University of Minnesota, Duluth.
St. Mary's College, Winona.
Carleton College, Northfield.
St. John's University, Collegeville.
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul.
College of St. Catherine, St. Paul.

MISSISSIPPI

University of Mississippi, University.
Mississippi State University, State College.
Mississippi Southern College, Hattiesburg.
Millsaps College, Jackson.
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus.
Delta State College, Cleveland.
Mississippi College, Clinton.
Alcorn A. & M. College, Lorman.
Jackson State College, Jackson.
William Carey College, Hattiesburg.

MISSOURI

University of Kansas City, Kansas City.
St. Louis University, St. Louis.
Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg.
Drury College, Springfield.
Parkhurst University, Kansas City.
University of Missouri, Columbia.
School of Mines and Metallurgy (University of Missouri), Rolla.
Park College, Parkville.
William Jewell College, Liberty.
Westminster College, Fulton.
Northwest Missouri State College, Maryville.
Webster College, Webster Groves.
William Woods College, Fulton.
Southwest Missouri State College, Springfield.
Tarkio College, Tarkio.
Northeast Missouri State Teachers College, Kirksville.
Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau.
Wentworth Military Academy, Lexington.
Washington University, St. Louis.
Cottey Junior College, Nevada.
Stephens College, Columbia.
Christian College, Columbia.
Parks College (St. Louis University), East St. Louis, Ill.
Kirksville College of Osteopathy and Surgery, Kirksville.
Maryville College of the Sacred Heart, St. Louis.
Culver-Stockton College, Canton.

MONTANA

Montana State University, Missoula.
Northern Montana College, Havre.
Eastern Montana College of Education, Billings.
Western Montana College of Education, Dillon.
Montana State College, Bozeman.
Montana School of Mines, Butte.
Northern Montana College, Havre.
Carroll College, Helena.
Rocky Mountain College, Billings.

NEBRASKA

Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.
The Creighton University, Omaha.
Nebraska Wesleyan University, Lincoln.
McCook College, McCook.
Hastings College, Hastings.
Dana College, Blair.
Midland College, Fremont.

NEVADA

University of Nevada, Reno.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Dartmouth College, Hanover.
Rivier College, Nashua.
St. Anselm's College, Manchester.
New England College, Henniker.

NEW JERSEY

Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford.
Westminster Choir College, Princeton.
Upsala College, East Orange.
Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton.
Rutgers University, New Brunswick.
Drew University, Madison.
Rider College, Trenton.
Bloomfield College and Seminary, Bloomfield.
Georgian Court College, Lakewood.
Stevens Institute of Technology, Hoboken.

NEW MEXICO

New Mexico School of Mines, Socorro.
New Mexico Highlands University, Las Vegas.
New Mexico State University, University Park.
New Mexico Western College, Silver City.
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque.
College of St. Joseph on the Rio Grande, Albuquerque.

NEW YORK

Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy.
Syracuse University, Syracuse.
St. Lawrence University, Canton.
Clarkson College of Technology, Potsdam.
St. Bonaventure University, St. Bonaventure.
Alfred University, Alfred.
New York University, New York.
Briarcliff Junior College, Briarcliff Manor.
Cazenovia Junior College, Cazenovia.
Yeshiva University, New York.
New York University-Bellevue, New York.
Manhattan College, New York.
Iona College, New Rochelle.
Russell Sage College, Troy.
Adelphi College, Garden City.
Wagner Lutheran College, Staten Island.
Colgate University, Hamilton.
Fordham University, New York.
University of Rochester, Rochester.
Elmira College, Elmira.
Hamilton College, Clinton.
Hartwick College, Oneonta.
Keuka College, Keuka Park.
Bard College, Annandale-on-Hudson.
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs.
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie.
Houghton College, Houghton.
Columbia University, New York.
St. Bernardine of Siena College, Loudonville.
University of Buffalo, Buffalo.
College of New Rochelle, New Rochelle.
Nazareth College of Rochester, Rochester.
Manhattanville College of the Sacred Heart, Purchase.
Rochester Institute of Technology, Rochester.
D'Youville College, Buffalo.
The College of Saint Rose, Albany.
Hobart College, Geneva.
Long Island University, Brooklyn.
Union College, Schenectady.
New York State Dormitory Authority, Albany (32 campuses).
C. W. Post College, Brookville.
Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville.
Barnard College, New York.
Brooklyn College Student Services Corp., Brooklyn.
Utica College (Syracuse University), Utica.
Rosary Hill College, Buffalo.
College of Mount St. Vincent, New York.
Ithaca College, Ithaca.
Fashion Institute of Technology Dormitory Authority, New York.
Briarcliff College, Briarcliff Manor.
Marist College, Poughkeepsie.
William Smith College, Geneva.

NORTH CAROLINA

Elon College, Elon College.
Campbell College, Buies Creek.
St. Mary's Junior College, Raleigh.
East Carolina College, Greenville.
North Carolina State College of A. & E., Raleigh.
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
Wingate Junior College, Wingate.
Western Carolina College, Cullowhee.
Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer.
Appalachian State Teachers College, Boone.
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory.
Louisburg College, Louisburg.
The Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, Greensboro.
Atlantic Christian College, Wilson.
Queens College, Charlotte.
Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro.
North Carolina College at Durham, Durham.
Livingstone College, Salisbury.
Bennett College, Greensboro.
Chowan College, Murfreesboro.
St. Andrews Presbyterian College, Laurinburg.
Belmont Abbey College, Belmont.

NORTH DAKOTA

Jamestown College, Jamestown.
Mayville State Teachers College, Mayville.
State Teachers College, Dickinson.
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.
State Teachers College, Minot.
North Dakota State University of Agriculture and Applied Science, Fargo.

OHIO

University of Dayton, Dayton.
Antioch College, Yellow Springs.

Xavier University, Cincinnati.
Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware.
Findlay College, Findlay.
Baldwin Wallace College, Berea.
Heidelberg College, Tiffin.
Ashland College, Ashland.
John Carroll College, Cleveland.
Oberlin College, Oberlin.
Muskingum College, New Concord.
Case Institute of Technology, Cleveland.
Wittenberg University, Springfield.
Miami University, Oxford.
Marietta College, Marietta.
University of Akron, Akron.
Hiram College, Hiram.
Central State College, Wilberforce.
The Ohio State University, Columbus.
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph.
The Defiance College, Defiance.
University of Toledo, Toledo.
Ohio Northern University, Ada.
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati.
Lake Erie College, Painesville.
Ohio University, Athens.
Kent State University, Kent.
Denison University, Granville.
Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green.
Mount Union College, Alliance.
Western Reserve University, Cleveland.
The College of Wooster, Wooster.
The College of Steubenville, Steubenville.
Otterbein College, Westerville.

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma Baptist University, Shawnee.
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater.
Oklahoma City University, Oklahoma City.
University of Oklahoma, Norman.
Phillips University, Enid.
Southwestern State College, Weatherford.
Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma City.
Northeastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Miami.
Northeastern State College, Tahlequah.
Bethany Nazarene College, Bethany.
Central State College, Edmond.
Eastern Oklahoma A. & M. College, Wilburton.
Cameron State Agricultural College, Lawton.

OREGON

Lewis and Clark College, Portland.
Reed College, Portland.
University of Portland, Portland.
Linfield College, McMinnville.
Pacific University, Forest Grove.
Eastern Oregon College, La Grande.
Southern Oregon College of Education, Ashland.
Mount Angel College, Mount Angel.
Willamette University, Salem.
George Fox College, Newberg.

PENNSYLVANIA

LaSalle College, Philadelphia.
Philadelphia Textile Institute, Philadelphia.
Villanova College, Villanova.
Duquesne University, Pittsburgh.
Allegheny College, Meadville.
Juniata College, Huntingdon.
Elizabethtown College, Elizabethtown.
Moore Institute of Applied Science and Industry, Philadelphia.
St. Francis College, Loretto.
Beaver College, Jenkintown.
Dickinson College, Carlisle.
Temple University, Philadelphia.
Lincoln University, Lincoln University.
Thiel College, Greenville.
Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster.
Lebanon Valley College, Annville.
Westminster College, New Wilmington.
Wilson College, Chambersburg.
Lycoming College, Williamsport.
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
Waynesburg College, Waynesburg.
Gettysburg College, Gettysburg.
Gannon College, Erie.
Seton Hill College, Greensburg.
Pennsylvania Military College, Chester.
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pittsburgh.
University of Scranton, Scranton.
Eastern Baptist College, St. Davids.
St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia.
Mercyhurst College, Erie.
Delaware Valley College of Science and Agriculture, Doylestown.
Moravian College, Bethlehem.
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia.
Chatham College, Pittsburgh.
Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
Muhlenberg College, Allentown.
Susquehanna University, Selinsgrove.
Geneva College, Beaver Falls.
Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh.
Villa Maria College, Erie.

PUERTO RICO

Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce.
Inter-American University, San German.
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras.

RHODE ISLAND

University of Rhode Island, Kingston.
Rhode Island School of Design, Providence.
Bryant University, Providence.
Brown University, Providence.
Rhode Island College of Education, Providence.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston.
Allen University, Columbia.
Wofford College, Spartanburg.
Columbia College, Columbia.
Newberry College, Newberry.
Furman University, Greenville.
Converse College, Spartanburg.
Presbyterian College, Clinton.
Erskine College, Due West.
Lander College, Greenwood.
Benedict College, Columbia.
College of Charleston, Charleston.
Clafiin College, Orangeburg.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Augustana College, Sioux Falls.
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell.
Southern State Teachers College, Springfield.
South Dakota School of Mines and Technology, Rapid City.
Black Hills Teachers College, Spearfish.
South Dakota State College of A. & M.A., Brookings.
University of South Dakota, Vermillion.
Northern State Teachers College, Aberdeen.
General Beadle State Teachers College, Madison.
Sioux Falls College, Sioux Falls.
Huron College, Huron.

TENNESSEE

Memphis State College, Memphis.
The Vanderbilt University, Nashville.
Tennessee A. & I. State University, Nashville.
University of Tennessee, Martin.
The Tennessee Wesleyan College, Athens.
Carson-Newman College, Jefferson City.
East Tennessee State College, Johnson City.
Tennessee Polytechnic Institute, Cookeville.
Christian Brothers College, Memphis.
The Fisk University, Nashville.
George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville.
Maryville College, Maryville.
Knoxville College, Knoxville.
Middle Tennessee State College, Murfreesboro.
Lambuth College, Jackson.
Siena College, Memphis.
University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
Bethel College, McKenzie.
Southwestern at Memphis, Memphis.

TEXAS

St. Mary's University, San Antonio.
Baylor University, Waco.
Howard Payne College, Brownwood.
Trinity University, San Antonio.
Hardin-Simmons University, Abilene.
Lamar State College of Technology, Beaumont.
Huston-Tillotson College, Austin.
University of Texas, Austin.
Abilene Christian College, Abilene.
McMurray College, Abilene.
Sam Houston State Teachers College, Huntsville.
Southern Methodist University, Dallas.
North Texas State College, Denton.
West Texas State College, Canyon.
Texas Wesleyan College, Fort Worth.
Texas Christian University, Fort Worth.
Austin College, Sherman.
Texas Technological College, Lubbock.
Texas Western College, El Paso.
Texarkana College, Texarkana.
University of Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi.
St. Edward's University, Austin.
Texas Women's University, Denton.
University of St. Thomas, Houston.
Wharton County Junior College, Wharton.
Tyler Junior College, Tyler.
Tarleton State College, Stephenville.
Our Lady of the Lake College, San Antonio.
Southwest Texas State College, San Marcos.
Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas, College Station.
Incarnate Word College, San Antonio.
San Angelo College, San Angelo.
Texas College of Arts and Industries, Kingsville.
Texas College, Tyler.
Pan American College, Edinburg.
Howard County Junior College, Big Spring.
Sacred Heart Dominican College, Houston.
Trinity University, San Antonio.
University of Dallas, Dallas.
East Texas State College, Commerce.
Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches.
South Plains College, Levelland.
Blinn College, Brenham.
Del Mar College, Corpus Christi.
St. Edward's University, Austin.
Sul Ross State College, Alpine.
Wiley College, Marshall.
Bishop College, Dallas.
Texas Southern University, Houston.
Jarvis Christian College, Hawkins.

UTAH

University of Utah, Salt Lake City.
College of Southern Utah, Cedar City.
Carbon College, Price.
Snow College, Ephraim.
Utah State University of Agriculture and Applied Sciences, Logan.
Dixie College, St. George.
Westminster College, Salt Lake City.
Weber College, Ogden.

VERMONT

Norwich University, Northfield.
Vermont Junior College, Montpelier.
Middlebury College, Middlebury.
Trinity College, Burlington.
St. Michael's College, Winooski.
University of Vermont, Burlington.
Windham College, Putney.
The Vermont College, Montpelier.

VIRGINIA

Hampton Institute, Hampton.
Medical College of Virginia, Richmond.
Emory and Henry College, Emory.
Clinch Valley College, Wise.
Roanoke College, Salem.
Bridgewater College, Bridgewater.
Virginia Union University, Richmond.

Mary Baldwin College, Staunton.
Ferrum Junior College, Ferrum.
Shenandoah College, Winchester.

WASHINGTON

University of Washington, Seattle.
College of Puget Sound, Tacoma.
Seattle University, Seattle.
Whitworth College, Spokane.
Gonzaga University, Spokane.
Seattle Pacific College, Seattle.
Pacific Lutheran College, Tacoma.
St. Martin's College, Olympia.
Washington State University, Pullman.
Western Washington College of Education, Bellingham.
Central Washington College of Education, Ellensburg.

WEST VIRGINIA

Davis and Elkins College, Elkins.
Morris Harvey College, Charleston.
Bethany College, Bethany.
Potomac State College, Keyser.
Concord College, Athens.
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon.
Alderson Broaddus College, Phillippi.
Wheeling College, Wheeling.
Fairmont State College, Fairmont.
West Liberty State College, West Liberty.
West Virginia University, Morgantown.
Shepherd College, Shepherdstown.
Marshall College, Huntington.
Glenville State College, Glenville.
West Virginia Institute of Technology, Montgomery.
Salem College, Salem.

WISCONSIN

Marquette University, Milwaukee.
St. Norbert College, West De Pere.
Carroll College, Waukesha.
Viterbo College, La Crosse.
University of Wisconsin, Madison.
Wisconsin State Colleges Building Corp., Madison (9 campuses).
Beloit College, Beloit.
Ripon College, Ripon.
Wisconsin State Colleges Building Corp., Madison (5 campuses).
Milton College, Milton.
Lawrence College, Appleton.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this program is now approximately 11 years old. Considering all the money which has been loaned under the program, totaling $1,675 million, at no time has there been a single dime of deficiency. It is a low-interest-rate program; yet the rate is compensatory to the Government. The rate is determined by a formula which provides for the cost of the money, which the Government borrows plus one-fourth of 1 percent in order to take care of the administrative expense. Therefore, I say the rate is compensatory.

I call attention to this one program, not to single it out particularly, but simply because I happened to read in the newspaper today the article with regard to college housing. I could take up each program, one by one, and, I believe, show the enthusiastic support with which each has been received throughout the country. I could also report the tremendous good which has been accomplished by having these programs in effect.

The bill provides for some new programs; but by and large the bill is a continuation of existing programs.

I hope the Senate will act favorably upon the bill and will be prepared to go to conference with the House, after the House has passed its bill, in the hope of enacting an effective program for home building during the next 12 months.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10 O'CLOCK A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Friday, June 2, 1961, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 1, 1961:

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

Henry DeWolf Smyth, of New Jersey, to be the representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, vice Paul F. Foster.

William I. Cargo, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Anthony B. Akers, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to New Zealand.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Erle Cocke, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Joseph P. Kelly, of New York to be Collector of Customs for Customs Collection District No. 10, with headquarters in New York, N.Y.

U.S. ATTORNEY

Donald E. O'Brien, of Iowa, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years, vice Francis E. Van Alstine, term expired.

Richard P. Stein, of Indiana to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years, vice Don A. Tabbert.

Charles L. Goodson, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice Charles D. Read, Jr., resigned.

Donald H. Fraser, of Georgia, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years, vice William C. Calhoun, resigned.

Warren C. Colver, of Alaska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Alaska for the term of 4 years, vice George M. Yeager, resigned.

Sidney I. Lezak, of Oregon, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Oregon for the term of 4 years, vice Clarence E. Luckey.

Joseph S. Lord III, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Walter E. Alessandroni.

Herman T. F. Lum, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years, vice Louis B. Blissard.

Sylvan A. Jeppesen, of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Idaho for the term of 4 years, vice Kenneth G. Bergquist.

Edward R. Phelps, of Illinois, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Harlington Wood, Jr.

Kenneth Harwell, of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the middle district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years, vice Fred Elledge, Jr.

Claude Vernon Spratley, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Joseph S. Bambacus.

U.S. MARSHALS

Harry C. George, of Illinois, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Illinois for the term of 4 years, vice Vernon Woods.

Charles N. Bordwine, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Peter A. Richmond.

Frank W. Cotner, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years, vice Oliver H. Metcalf, deceased.

Floyd Stevens, of Michigan, to be U.S. marshal for the western district of Michigan for the term of 4 years, vice Harry Jennings.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 1, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. MCCORMACK.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

JUNE 1, 1961.

I hereby designate the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

James 2: 17: *Faith without works is dead.*

Almighty God, our Father, in these days of crises and chaos may we manifest the spirit of God-fearing men and women who are sensitive and alert to the various challenges which modern life is continually bringing to us.

We penitently acknowledge that we are often far too self-righteously complacent when there is so much that we ought to do and can do that will prove to be of concrete and constructive value in the building of a nobler civilization.

Bless our President with Thy needed wisdom and guidance and inspire all our citizens to do something more than merely take a so-called intelligent interest in national and international affairs by reading the magazines and daily newspapers and listening to newscasters and commentators.

Grant that we may have an effective participating and contributing role in finding the right solution to the many problems in the sphere and area of human relationships.

Give us the will and the grace to live as brothers in the midst of bitter racial rancor and show forth great integrity of character when there are dangers of moral breakdown in the social order.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 29, 1961, was read and approved.

AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Appropriations Committee may have until midnight Friday to file the bill and report on the Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the appropriation bill.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday to file a report on the independent offices appropriation bill, 1962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

THE LATE HONORABLE WILLIAM A. ROWAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my sorrowful duty to announce to the House the death of the Honorable William A. Rowan, who so ably represented the Second District of Illinois in the 78th and 79th Congresses. The news of his passing yesterday morning came as a shock to the Illinois delegation. It will occasion deep grief among his former colleagues in the House, by whom he was held in deep respect and warm affection. The remains are lying at the Brown Funeral Home, 2939 East 95th Street, Chicago, and will be laid to rest with a mass Saturday morning at St. Patrick's Church in Chicago.

Bill Rowan was a man of heart and of dedication to the welfare of people. His was the stature of real statesmanship. In every activity in which his high abilities were engaged he made an enviable record. His two terms in the House were marked by outstanding accomplishment. I never have known anyone to speak of Bill Rowan except in words of admiration and affection. In Chicago and especially in the Second District, which he served with fidelity and devotion to its interest, as well as that of the Nation, he long will be remembered as a pattern of a model public servant. His example long will be an inspiration to the oncoming generations.

The Honorable William A. Rowan was born in Chicago on November 24, 1882. He was graduated from St. Patrick's Grade School and St. Patrick's High School and later attended the University of Chicago.

After graduation he was employed in a steel plant and the associations of those early years made a lasting impression on him. His interest in the steel workers and in the cause of labor remained with him throughout his brilliant career. He became associated with a daily community newspaper, the Daily Calumet, a newspaper of prestige and wide circulation, and became its city editor and later its editor. He was regarded as a newsman of the top bracket.

In 1927 he was elected alderman from the 10th ward and served in the City Council of Chicago for 15 years and until his election to Congress in November of 1942. He was ward committeeman of the 10th ward, a stout and loyal Democrat who believed with all the faith in him in the Democratic Party as the instrumentality for advancing the welfare of all the people.

He was defeated for reelection to the 80th Congress, sharing the fate of so many of his Democratic colleagues in the upset election of 1946. President Truman appointed him U.S. Comptroller of Customs at Chicago on January 21, 1947, and he served in that position during the Truman administration with the great distinction that marked all his public life.

His passing is a loss to Chicago, to Illinois, and to the Nation. To his son, who has the rich heritage of noble parents, and who bears his father's name, and to the other members of his family, I extend my deepest sympathy.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the dean of the Illinois delegation, the Honorable THOMAS J. O'BRIEN, and my colleague from Illinois, Hon. WILLIAM T. MURPHY, who served with Bill Rowan in the City Council of Chicago, and other colleagues, may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the late William Rowan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply grieved when I learned of the passing of a dear friend for many years, the Honorable William A. Rowan, who served with outstanding ability and dedication in the 78th and 79th Congresses. Bill Rowan was every inch a man. As Democratic ward committeeman in the 10th ward of Chicago and as alderman in the city council as well as during his two terms in this body and his later service as U.S. Comptroller of Customs at Chicago, he made a large contribution to his party, to his city, to his State, and to his Nation.

He was my dear and close friend. I shall miss him very much. His life was an inspiration to younger men, and his many good deeds will not be forgotten. To his son, who bears his name, to his brother who as a priest enriched the lives of the men and women and children in his parish, and to the other members of his family go the warmest sympathy of Mrs. O'Brien and of me.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sorrow I learned of the death of my very good friend William Rowan in Chicago yesterday.

It was my privilege to serve with him in the Chicago City Council for many years. In that capacity he made an outstanding record as vice chairman of the finance committee and as chairman of the committee on labor-management.

Upon leaving the council he represented the Second District in the 78th and 79th Congresses. During his service in Congress he served diligently on the District of Columbia Committee, where he displayed his great knowledge and experience in municipal affairs.

Mr. Rowan, as publisher of the Daily Calumet a community newspaper, was one of the first advocates of the St. Lawrence-Great Lakes, Mississippi, and Gulf waterway, and spent many years working for the accomplishment of this project. He sponsored the authorization for "Cal-Sag" which is part of the waterway.

He was one of the prominent political leaders in Chicago representing the 10th ward not only as alderman but as Democratic ward committeeman.

The city of Chicago has lost an outstanding citizen but we shall always cherish the memory of his many kind deeds.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS DEBATE

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on May 2, 1961, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], with characteristic incisiveness and force, summarized the key features of the current debate about interoceanic canals under the striking title of "Sea-Level Ghost Revived."

As a result of that address, the United Press International on May 7, sent out a thoughtful news story to Europe, Latin America, and Asia by Harry W. Frantz, distinguished Latin American correspondent of that news service whose writings on Western Hemispheric questions attract world attention.

In order that this latest story by Mr. Frantz on interoceanic questions may be more widely distributed in the United States and available to all agencies of our Government, I quote it as part of these remarks:

INTEROCEANIC CANALS DEBATE

(By Harry W. Frantz)

WASHINGTON.—Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD of Pennsylvania made proposals to the House of Representatives last week which framed the issues for an evolving "great debate" on the best method of forestalling

traffic congestion in the Panama Canal in the next decade.

Countering the current active agitation for construction of a sea-level canal at Panama, FLOOD told the House of Representatives that the Terminal Lake-third locks plan for conversion of the present canal would be the most practical and economic solution of the future interoceanic traffic problem.

FLOOD, who is sometimes called "the watchdog of the Panama Canal," in a statement to the House said:

"Not only is this solution (Terminal Lake-third locks) the most economic, it is the most logically developed from all significant points of view of any plan ever proposed and has been officially recognized as affording the best operational canal practicable of achievement."

He introduced a bill for the creation of a new "interoceanic canal commission" of 11 members to be appointed by the President, which would study an increase of capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal by modifying present laws to permit a summit-level terminal lake at the Pacific end.

The proposed Commission would also have authority to study a sea-level project at Panama, or an entirely new canal on another route. The Commission would submit its report to both the President and Congress within 2 years.

FLOOD's proposal stirred unusual interest in Government and diplomatic circles for several reasons:

With the change in Government at Washington, the Kennedy administration will inevitably have to reach decisions within a few years on long-term plans for handling the rapid growth of transisthmian travel; and studies already are in progress.

The concept of a sea-level canal at Panama undoubtedly has extensive support among some groups of engineers and some powerful unofficial national organizations, and has never been definitely rejected by the Government as a possible eventual solution of the canal problem.

A sea-level canal at Panama or a new transisthmian canal would raise many international questions, with the atmosphere now clouded by Communist penetration in the Caribbean area. For 5 years, FLOOD has been the most active spokesman in Congress concerning United States legal and treaty rights in the Panama Canal, and has frequently sounded warnings of the new international complications raised by the Communist challenge to the Monroe Doctrine.

In a speech to the House last week FLOOD said that a sea-level canal at Panama would plunge the U.S. Government into a measureless sea of expenses and diplomatic turmoil.

"All of this could be, and would be obviated by the major improvement of our existing canal by processing with the Terminal Lake-third locks proposal, which does not require a new treaty with Panama," he said.

FLOOD said that the Terminal Lake-third locks plan was developed in the Panama Canal organization during World War II from war-operating experience, and would make the maximum utilization of the existing waterway and the huge investment which it represents.

"For the benefit of those who may not be familiar with it," FLOOD said, I may explain that the Terminal Lake-third locks solution provides for the elimination of the serious traffic bottleneck locks at Pedro Miguel, the consolidation of all Pacific locks in three lifts near Aguadulce to correspond with the lock arrangement at Gatun, and raising the Miraflores Lake level to that of Gatun Lake so as to form a summit anchorage at the Pacific end of the canal to match the Gatun Lake at the Atlantic end.

"This plan would also provide for a set of larger locks for larger vessels and for raising the Summit Lake level a few feet to supply greater depths for navigation and more water for lockages."

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a joint resolution that would direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to make a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of the stock exchanges and of the National Association of Securities Dealers.

It is my purpose, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to start hearings on this resolution on Tuesday, June 27.

For some time I have been concerned with the widespread evidence of speculation, and of apparent manipulation in many instances, appearing in our established securities exchanges and in our over-the-counter markets. The Securities Exchange Act of 1934 provides, among other things, that the rules of both types of markets shall include rules for the expulsion, suspension, or disciplining of a member for conduct or proceeding inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade, and the act declares that the willful violation of the act or any rule or regulation issued thereunder shall be considered as conduct or proceeding inconsistent with just and equitable principles of trade.

It has seemed to me to be high time to review these rules governing the activities of the various securities markets to see whether they are adequate to protect investors, and to determine just how they are being administered by the stock exchanges and the over-the-counter association. I feel that the Securities and Exchange Commission, as an arm of the Congress, now should bring up to date and enlarge upon the study it was authorized to make some 26 years ago. For this purpose my resolution would authorize to be appropriated the sum of $750,000, with the Commission reporting to the Congress by January 3, 1963, the results of its study, with recommendations.

PROGRAM FOR BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND NEXT WEEK

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority whip if he can advise us as to the program for the balance of the week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. It is planned to adjourn over from today until Monday if the present schedule for today is completed. For next week the program is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar Day and there are five suspensions:

First. H.R. 10, Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1961.

Second. H.R. 879, veterans, increase disability compensation.

Third. H.J. Res. 225, Delaware River Basin Compact.

Fourth. H.R. 4750, increase borrowing power, Virgin Islands Corp.

Fifth. H.R. 7209, New Mexico, support facilities, Los Alamos County.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called, and we will also take up the Agriculture appropriation bill for 1962.

On Wednesday we will take up the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962, and the Roush-Chambers election case.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, the extension of Korean corporate and excise taxes, if rule is reported.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1962

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7371) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill H.R. 7371, with Mr. THORNBERRY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I should first like to express my thanks to the members of the subcommittee who heard the testimony with regard to the pending bill, for their cooperation and patience. I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]; the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]; the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]; the distinguished ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW]; the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB], and the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CEDERBERG].

I should also like to express my thanks and sincere appreciation to the executive secretary of this subcommittee who is here on the floor with this bill for the 13th consecutive year. I refer to Mr. Jay B. Howe. His assistance to the committee has been invaluable.

Mr. Chairman, the total amount recommended by the committee in the bill H.R. 7371, now before us, to provide for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the judiciary, the United States Information Agency, and the Civil Rights Commission, is $751,300,050. This is an increase of $4,925,060 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year for these agencies, but a decrease of $54,284,152 in the amount of the revised budget estimates.

The original budget estimates for the coming fiscal year were increased a total of $12,028,000 by subsequent submissions from the Bureau of the Budget.

The committee has recommended language in this bill requiring that $62,950,000 be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States.

The various departments and agencies are directed to purchase these currencies on credits whenever practicable so as to decrease the actual dollar expenditures from the Treasury by the amount of $62,950,000. This bill would require the Department of State to purchase such currencies in the amount of $41,200,000, which is over 15 percent of the total recommended for the Department of State. The bill also provides that the U.S. Information Agency purchase these currencies on credits in the amount of $21,750,000, or approximately 16 percent of the total amount contained in the bill for that Agency.

The first agency referred to in the bill is the Department of State. The total amount carried in the bill for that Department is $267,478,000, which is an increase of $2,732,246 over the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year and a reduction of $31,890,000 in the amounts of the budget estimates. However, I should like to point out that of this reduction $19,693,000 was practically automatic inasmuch as the Department requested that the item of $9,693,000 for the so-called East-West Cultural Center, to be located in Honolulu, Hawaii, be deferred at this time without prejudice.

Ten million dollars of the request for "Acquisition, operation, and maintenance of buildings abroad" was not allowed for the reason that that requested appropriation of $10 million is not presently authorized by law. The remainder, $12,197,000 of the $31,890,000 I previously referred to, is a reduction of approximately 4 percent of the total requested for the Department of State.

The first of the items for the Department of State is the largest. It is entitled "Salaries and expenses." The majority of the committee included in the bill the sum of $132 million for salaries and expenses. This amount is $4,367,000 below the amount of the revised budget estimate but is an increase of $6,735,000 over the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year. It should be noted, however, that an item which was previously carried as a separate appropriation item, to wit, "Payments to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund," amounting to $2,540,000, is now included in the "Salaries and expenses" item.

With regard to a subject which is generally misrepresented in a certain periodical and in some newspapers, to wit, representation allowances, the committee has allowed the amount of $925,000, which would be a decrease of $29,000 in the amount of the budget estimate but an increase of $53,000 over the amount appropriated for this purpose in the current fiscal year.

The principal reason for allowing this increase of $53,000 is the number of new diplomatic posts being opened in Africa and the elevation of certain posts from consulate status to Embassy status.

The next matter is entitled "Acquisition, operation and maintenance of buildings abroad." There is included in the bill the amount of $14,500,000 in two appropriation items for the acquisition, operation, and maintenance of our buildings abroad.

The total provided is $10,800,000 below the amount of the budget estimate, and is $723,000 below the sum appropriated for these purposes in the current fiscal year. I have previously referred to the reduction of $10 million in this area which was taken out by the committee for the reason that there is no authority in law therefor and, if included, would most certainly be subject to a point of order here on the floor.

I should point out that in examining the budget requests for this item the committee came across some startling instances of projects which were unrealistic and exorbitant. For instance, a project in Ankara, Turkey, where $100,000 was requested to be appropriated for the land alone for four subordinate Foreign Service officers' residences. Another example was a pretentious and costly building program at Kabul, Afghanistan.

Of the $14,500,000 allowed for acquisition, operation and maintenance of buildings abroad, the committee requires that all of it be used for the purchase of foreign currencies or credits with the exception of $900,000. So this program in the coming fiscal year would cost the American taxpayers in hard American dollars the amount of $900,000.

The amount of $1,500,000 has been included in the bill for emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service.

A total of $61,576,000 was requested for contributions to international organizations. That is the amount of the revised budget estimate, and the amount included in the bill for contributions to these organizations. The organizations are set forth in the hearings as well as in the committee report, in which report at page 5 will be found a statement as to the amounts appropriated for each of these international organizations.

The sum of $2,100,000 has been approved by a majority of the committee to provide for the missions which represent the United States in the activities of certain international organizations in which the United States participates pursuant to treaties, conventions, or specific acts of Congress. The amount allowed is $147,000 above the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year and is $90,000 below the amount of the revised budget estimate.

I should like to point out that all of the amounts included in this bill such as the one I just referred to were not satisfactory to every member of the committee. This is one instance where, in my judgment, the committee cut a bit too much. But the bill now before us represents the judgment of the majority of the committee, and with few exceptions all the members of the committee will support this bill.

With regard to expenses of international conferences and contingencies, the bill includes $1,943,000. It also includes the amount of $171,000 for the expense of the U.S. delegation to the fifth round of tariff negotiations in Geneva.

As to the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO, the committee has allowed the amount of $125,000. This is merely a reduction of $25,000 in the amount of the budget estimate.

A total of $15,727,000 is included for the three appropriation items for the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico. Included in this amount are funds for the construction of the new Rio Grande River dam, the so-called Amistad Dam.

This new international dam will be located near Del Rio, Tex., and we expect it will be as effective as was the Falcon Dam in preventing hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars of damage such as occurred during the floods of the last few years.

To move along—and I shall be glad to try to answer any questions with regard to the items for the Department of State when I have finished my general statement—I should like to say that for international educational and exchange activities there has been included a total of $33,600,000 in two appropriation items. Of this amount, $12,600,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies on credits now in the Treasury of the United States.

This is a program for which I feel the committee did not furnish enough money. But the committee had no alternative but to take out the $164,037 included in the budget estimate for exchanges with Cuba. Also with regard to this item I should point out that there was included in the budget estimate the amount of $600,000 for an activity which was previously carried in the mutual security appropriation bill. The committee has seen fit to deny the inclusion of that amount in this bill, and it is expected that it will be carried for fiscal year 1962 in the bill in which it has been carried in the past, namely, the mutual security appropriation bill.

As to the so-called Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange between East and West, to be located at Honolulu, Hawaii, as I have previously explained, the committee has not included the amount of $9,693,000 for this project for the reason that the request was withdrawn by the Department of State without prejudice. It is expected that this will be again presented to the committee and at that time the committee will have an opportunity to take testimony as to the details of the request for this $9,693,000.

Now, as to the Department of Justice, the committee was presented with a revised budget estimate totaling $298,384,000. The amounts recommended in the bill for this Department total $294,239,900. This is a reduction of $4,144,100 in the amount of the budget estimates and a decrease of $2,360,280 below the total appropriations for the Department of Justice for the current fiscal year.

In connection with legal activities and general administration it should be pointed out that the committee has provided in full a request for $540,000 "to provide additional staff in the Criminal Division to combat more effectively increasing lawlessness and to coordinate government-wide efforts against crime."

The committee has also provided 34 additional positions in the Tax Division of the Department of Justice; 9 additional positions in the Civil Division; two more positions in the Civil Rights Division; as well as $109,000 additional to cover the rising costs of appraisers and experts in condemnation cases.

As for the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, the committee has recommended the full amount requested, to wit $5,500,000.

As to U.S. attorneys and marshals the sum of $25,385,400 is provided.

The committee has again seen fit to recommend, and for the 10th consecutive year has recommended, approval of the entire amount required for the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

As for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, the committee was presented with a request in the amount of $65,360,000. The committee has allowed the amount $63,500,000 which is an increase of $613,000 over the appropriations for that important Service in the current fiscal year. The request for $1,260,000 for 21.6 miles of fence along the Mexican border has been denied.

Some years ago the Immigration and Naturalization Service was year after year in the business of building fences along the Mexican border. There came a time, approximately 10 years ago, when the Border Patrol was built up with the idea of saving money on these fences. So we had no fence work for a number of years. But last year the committee was requested for some language, some innocuous language, to be inserted in the bill, and we did insert that requested language. We were told it was for the purpose of stopping some marihuana smuggling at a particular point in the vicinity of Tia Juana. We figured the fence language would cost $35,000 or $45,000. Having included the language last year, the camel got his nose under the tent, and they came back this year, not for the money for that bit of fence near Tia Juana, but for 21½ miles of fence at a total cost of $1,260,000.

For the Federal Prison System the committee has included a total of $51,613,500 in three appropriation items for this system. This is a reduction of $1,204,500 in the amounts of the budget estimates, and a decrease of $6,756,500 below the amounts appropriated for the current fiscal year.

However, in connection with this it must be noted that in last year's budget there was a nonrecurring item of $8,875,000 for the completion of a new maximum security institution at Marion, Ill.

As to the Federal judiciary, beginning with the Supreme Court of the United States, there is included in this bill $54,497,650, which is a reduction of $1,552,552 from the requested $56,050,202.

In connection with the items for the Federal judiciary, I do not know that we need to spend too much time on them unless some Member has some questions concerning them.

The committee found abuses and extravagances with regard to the purchase of new furniture for the courts and it found abuses concerning the amounts of money spent from the Department of Justice budget for psychiatrists in connection with the examination of defendants. The details may be found in the printed hearings.

Included in travel and miscellaneous expenses for the courts was a request for $632,800 for new furniture and furnishings incident to the occupancy of some new court buildings. The committee reduced this by $232,800. The General Services Administration is now conducting a program of rehabilitation of furniture. I had a letter the other day from the Deputy Administrator of GSA indicating that as a result of certain disclosures made in testimony before the House Committee on Appropriations they have been able to save $25,000 in one item alone.

As to the U.S. Information Agency, where I feel that perhaps the Committee has cut a bit too deep, the committee has allowed an increase over the amount appropriated for that Agency in the current fiscal year. There is included in the bill a total of $134,782,500 for the six appropriation items which make up the funds for this agency. These are set forth at title 4 of the pending bill.

Once again, contrary to the impression that the American public gets from reading certain newspapers and periodicals, the committee has included every dime requested for the so-called Voice of America. But, this agency still spends costly time that should be directed toward winning the cold war overseas to blindfolding the American public in talking about Soviet jamming and mythical ideas as to how much the Soviets spend for broadcasts when the fact of the matter is that the Congress each year allows the exact full amount requested for the Voice of America.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I am pleased to yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman is making a very, very helpful statement. Now, we do not all have a chance to read the report and the hearings. There are so many things we must do. I have just counted and there are about 26 Members on the floor; I think 8 Republicans and the rest are Democrats, I assume. Is there any way of getting this information to all the Members?

Mr. ROONEY. All they have to do, I must say to my distinguished friend from Michigan, is to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD tomorrow morning, and there they can find every word that my distinguished friend says.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I know that, that is obvious, but who is going to read the RECORD?

Mr. ROONEY. Well, I thought the gentleman from Michigan was an avid reader of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But, suppose my helpful colleague does the reading.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman is referring to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] he reads everything; not only in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but he reads every word of the printed hearings before this subcommittee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is true.

Mr. ROONEY. And I commend him for it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And he advises me, too, in the morning before I come over. He does my homework. But, what about the others?

Mr. ROONEY. I was going to suggest that the report on this bill is a good place to start from.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. True.

Mr. ROONEY. And read these printed hearings. They weigh a number of pounds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since my name was brought into this.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I referred to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. But if Members rely on reading the RECORD in the morning, school will be out, will it not? I mean, this bill will be passed today, will it not?

Mr. ROONEY. That will give our distinguished friend from Michigan the whole day tomorrow to read the RECORD.

Mr. GROSS. That would be in the nature of a postmortem.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And it will be a bad day for the taxpayer.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, I do not know. I think the taxpayers' interests have been pretty well looked after in this bill, with a cut of $54,284,152 in the amount of the revised budget estimates. Does not the gentleman think so?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, I think you have done a remarkable job, but still there is so much left to be done, do you not see? If you keep on here, there will not be anything left for the home folks.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman understand that we have to have a Federal Bureau of Investigation? Does not the gentleman understand that we have to have a prison system? Does not the gentleman understand that we have to run a law office for the Government and prosecute the guilty?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do you want an answer?

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman understand we have to keep our courts open to dispense justice to the people? Does not the gentleman understand that we must be represented overseas by a Foreign Service? Does not the gentleman understand that we must broadcast—please excuse the word—propaganda to various parts of the world? The gentleman must realize these things.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you let me answer?

Mr. ROONEY. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I realize most of these things, from what the gentleman has said, are necessary, but we have them so big, do you not see; they just swallow us up.

Mr. ROONEY. Does not the gentleman understand that this is a big Government, the biggest in the world?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is a big spender, there is no question about that.

Mr. ROONEY. It certainly is, and it has been a big spender now for the last 8 or 9 years. Everything has gone up in the past 8 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And your party has been in control all the time.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no, we have not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes, you have.

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, no, we have not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You have two-thirds of the Members here.

Mr. ROONEY. When former President Eisenhower took over the administration in 1953, his Secretary of State made such drastic cuts that it cost the taxpayers in the end twice as much. He had to request the additional money the following June. You remember that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you let me answer?

Mr. ROONEY. Yes; surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, you have gotten them into such a habit that you could not break it off all at once. It would have been a shock.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not think I have that reputation. If he reads some of the newspapers, and particularly Time magazine, I wonder how the gentleman can say I have a reputation for spending money?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Like some of the rest of us, I guess; talking here on the floor.

Mr. ROONEY. I am not here every day. I have work to do in committee trying to find out what is in these big appropriation bills.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY. Surely.

Mr. GROSS. I have just read this bill forward and backward, and I cannot find money in here for toolboxes.

When we had the deficiency appropriation bill before the House, the gentleman spoke of the necessity for providing the people who travel around over the world with tools of the trade. I cannot find anything here that they can use in which to carry the tools of the trade.

Mr. ROONEY. I imagine it would not be too much to expect some of them to be carried in briefcases. You can always get a few bottles into a briefcase.

Mr. GROSS. I understand now what the gentleman meant by tools when he translates it into bottles.

Mr. ROONEY. Is that what the gentleman was getting at?

Mr. GROSS. I was not certain what the gentleman meant by tools of the trade. He never quite explained that before. Now I know, and I thank the gentleman for explaining.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, to become serious and get back to the U.S. Information Agency, I should like to point out that for a considerable number of years now the Agency has not made Voice of America broadcasts to Brazil in the Portuguese language. Year after year this committee, both on the majority and minority sides, has deplored this fact. We have deplored the fact that we have entirely too many English broadcasts all over the world. In Latin America we should have concentrated on Portuguese- and Spanish-language broadcasts. The President is sending up a supplemental appropriation request for $2.4 million for Portuguese and Spanish broadcasts to Latin America. I, for one, should like to be shown why these broadcasts could not be provided by reducing the number of hours of English broadcasts to Latin America which, from my experience, do not help us to any appreciable extent with the good will of the man in the street in that area.

Further with regard to the U.S. Information Agency, they had an examination for their so-called Foreign Service officers in January, 1960, and of the 30-odd topnotch FSO–1 officers, people who make $17,000, $18,000, $19,000, $20,000 a year with allowances, at posts abroad, six of them could not pass the examination which is set forth in the printed hearings.

This situation is deplorable. I have the greatest respect for Mr. Murrow, who is making a great personal and financial sacrifice in taking over as head of this agency. I trust that he will give enough study to this situation to rectify it. He will find out that the answer is not always more money. The answer to our problems abroad and to our problems in the Foreign Service of the United States is not more money, as was pointed out by Secretary of State Rusk in the hearings before this committee. I should like to refer to his statement which is incorporated in the committee report at page 3.

More people and more money are not the answer to every new problem. We shall strive for better utilization of available resources.

If this is done, we shall have a better Department of State and we shall have a better U.S. Information Agency.

The following table summarizes the amounts recommended in the pending bill in comparison with the corresponding budget estimates and the 1961 appropriations:

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1961	Estimates, 1962	Recommended in bill for 1962	Bill compared with—	
				1961 appropriations	1962 estimates
Department of State	$264,745,754	$299,368,000	$267,478,000	+$2,732,246	−$31,890,000
Department of Justice	296,600,180	298,384,000	294,239,900	−2,360,280	−4,144,100
The Judiciary	52,445,488	56,050,202	54,497,650	+2,052,162	−1,552,552
U.S. Information Agency	131,695,568	151,480,000	134,782,500	+3,086,932	−16,697,500
Civil Rights Commission	888,000	302,000	302,000	−586,000	
Total	746,374,990	805,584,202	751,300,050	+4,925,060	−54,284,152

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield my self such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] the chairman of this subcommittee, in saying that this bill comes to the House as a practically unanimous agreement of the subcommittee. However, as he has said, not every item has been agreed to by everyone on the committee. There are some of us who think they should have been cut deeper. There are others who think we cut some items too far, but I think as a whole it is a pretty good bill.

The gentleman from New York has conducted a very careful, thorough, and searching examination of the witnesses, his usual fine job. It has been a pleasure to serve with the other gentlemen on this committee.

It is rather a new chairman of the committee, however, in certain ways in the presentation of this bill, and that, of course, is understandable. There has been a change of complexion in these

agencies, and the gentleman has not discussed some of the matters he generally has discussed over the last 8 years. But we have presented this bill, so perhaps it becomes the responsibility of the minority to discuss some of the other matters that are in these bills.

I should like first to discuss briefly the judiciary items in the bill. The committee will recall that last year we brought out the facts of the great amount of travel by members of the Federal judiciary and showed where they were exchanging jobs back and forth from New York to California and other areas of the country. That meant very many days of travel and not too many days of trial work. We pointed out that this was a good thing, but we also pointed out that we might slow it down a little bit. Last year I am afraid we presented a travel folder for this year for some of them who had not taken advantage of it have taken advantage of it this year, as the record will show on travel.

We have now allowed 75 or 78 new Federal judges, and they probably will get on the same travel circuit that the others have. I hope that they do not. It seems to me that with the increase in the number of Federal judges that has been passed and the great expense this subcommittee will have to face up to in allowances, this question of travel ought to be cut down materially.

Also, in one of the districts in New York, where a large number of new judges have been authorized, they also have underway now and have asked for an additional system of trial examiners to take some of the load from them. That seems to be a little wasteful, that we should set this up at the same time we are setting up these new judges.

Now, as to the Justice Department, there are several items there that concern me, but it is a little like motherhood, you have got to be for it. With regard to this mobile unit the Attorney General has now set up 27 mobile lawyers, let me read to you from the justification, what it says about these lawyers:

> Twenty-seven attorneys working out of the Division will form a mobile force which can be dispatched to a particular trouble area in the field to take charge of the investigation and prosecution of notorious criminals.

It says "notorious criminals," but there is nothing in the law that limits this mobile unit to that. You have a unit that can go in and initiate an investigation and prosecution. To me this is a dangerous thing to place in the hands of an Attorney General of any party. This is an extension of what was done in the previous administration, we must admit that, and this is a beefing up of that activity.

I should like to have you read the record beginning on page 120 of the hearings as to the miserable failure these people have had in criminal cases, with dismissal after dismissal of cases where the defendants were found not guilty, or the decision was reversed. This is a dangerous thing. What concerns me is the setting up of a mobile unit so that an Attorney General, if he does not like something that is going on some place, can send out this mobile unit and take over the investigation and prosecution. It is a dangerous thing in the hands of anybody. I hope it will be carefully used. We have authorized it, but I think we should point out the possibility of what that mobile unit could be used for.

There are other items in the bill.

Of course, we want to fight gangsters and hoodlums and delinquency—juvenile delinquency. We ought to start calling it juvenile crime and we ought to begin to talk about it for what it really is and begin to handle it for what it really is.

In this bill, you will also find we are setting up some trial units, when juveniles have finished their terms, there is some special treatment that they are going to receive. This is pretty expensive. I hope it works. They have asked for four projects. I think it could have been done with one. I think this is a little overenthusiastic.

Then, of course, we have the FBI and again we have granted all the money they asked for. Certainly, a great American like J. Edgar Hoover who for 37 years has done such a magnificent job for his country. I wish you could all hear him testifying before the committee—clear, concise and with a complete command of what is going on in this agency. We have never yet in the hearings found any place where he has been wasteful of the funds allocated to him.

Mr. Chairman, of course, all of us—all Americans regardless of political party are with President Kennedy on his mission and our prayers are with him. Our prayers will be with him when he meets with Premier Khrushchev. We hope this will do some good. But, it seems to me, as we debate this bill, we ought to realize the President is now in Paris for a conference with General de Gaulle, having only recently returned from Canada where he conferred with Prime Minister Diefenbaker. He had flown to Key West to confer with the Prime Minister of Great Britain. Then he proposed to continue on to Vienna this week for meetings with Prime Minister Khrushchev, as I have mentioned. But I should like to remind you when we are talking about these various trips and these various meetings, we are talking about the same man who as a candidate for President last fall, during the period of the so-called great debates, cast aspersions upon what he called "summitry" and what his aids called "summitry." What he said at that time was this, and I quote him:

> My opponent promises, if he is successful, to go to Eastern Europe, to go, perhaps, to another summit, to go to a series of meetings around the world. If I am successful, I am going to Washington, D.C. and get this country to work.

Perhaps, when he came here to get the country to work, he found that things were not as bad as he had rather suspected they would be and the country got to work without the nostrums that he had in mind, and maybe this is the reason he changed his mind and decided now to get into the summitry which he used to laugh about. But, I would ask you—how does the Secretary of State view these events? I might recall that the Secretary of State, Mr. Rusk, told reporters it was his hope that the new administration, and I quote him:

> "that diplomatic channels can be used for serious discussions and negotiations" because he "felt that my time can be spent to best advantage here in Washington."

Now this is the man who said "Summit diplomacy is to be approached with the wariness of a prudent physician prescribing a habit-forming drug—a technique to be employed rarely and under the most exceptional circumstances, with rigorous safeguards against its becoming a debilitating or dangerous habit."

Of course, the Secretary of State can scarcely criticize the Chief Executive for engaging in summitry, because the Secretary of State is equally guilty of a change of heart about summitry.

If Mr. Rusk goes to Vienna or appears in Vienna this week and returns, he will then have traveled 63,000 miles in five oversea trips, since he assumed his duties a few months ago.

If, as I suspect, the attacks on summitry and travel by the Secretary of State were given out to be an attack against Mr. John Foster Dulles, may I point out that Mr. Rusk as Secretary of State has traveled twice as far and twice as often as Mr. Dulles did in the same length of time as Secretary of State.

I think in discussing these matters of summitry and travel the fact that there was criticism about it a few months ago is not to be overlooked in the recitation of these personal diplomats. As for the distinguished Vice President, recent events seem to indicate that he may be forming a new organization of a type which is familiar to many of us, and this would be a "Trip-a-Month Club." In April he had a week in Senegal and in Paris. In May he made an around-the-world trip. He started out to smooth the troubled waters of the Pacific and wound up taking a rest in Athens and Bermuda. I am waiting now with baited breath, as I am sure the gentleman from New York is, as to what emergency in June may call for a visit from this distinguished gentleman and his very charming wife.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I always yield to my chairman.

Mr. ROONEY. As for the Vice President's trip to Senegal I wish the distinguished gentleman from Ohio had been along.

Mr. BOW. I might say to the gentleman from New York that I wish, too, I might have been along for it would have been delightful company, I can assure you.

Mr. ROONEY. Let me finish, please. He would have found that the Vice President and his very charming wife for 6 days went 18, 20, 22 hours a day on a sincere, fruitful goodwill mission for the United States.

I had an interesting conversation only last night with the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Crockett, who accompanied the Vice President on his recent trip to southeast Asia. The same successful

things happened in the course of that trip. The Vice President gets down with the people in the street, he makes friends with everybody. This is a new kind of diplomacy. This is the kind of diplomacy that may succeed, since our old-type striped-pants approach to diplomacy has gotten us in the position we are in today.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman for his contribution; and may I say I would have been very happy to be with the gentleman and the Vice President. It would have been excellent company, I can assure the gentleman from New York.

I would recall to the gentleman's mind, however, that it was Vice President Nixon who developed that type of diplomacy. When Mr. Nixon was Vice President of the United States he made these trips to many foreign countries, mixed with the people on the streets, and shook hands with them. I did not have the pleasure of traveling with him. But during the campaign the President said, "We are going to stay at home."

You will remember that during the campaign it was said the Vice President would reorganize the Pentagon. That, however, has failed to materialize. He seems to be too busy.

May I say to my distinguished chairman that I think we can rule out South America. I have heard reports that a very distinguished Ambassador from the United Nations is going to devote the month of June to South America, so that will take care of the situation down there. All I can say is I hope Mr. Adlai Stevenson will do a better job down there than he did when informing the people of Cuba about their situation.

With all of this, one wonders whether it was really necessary to establish the new and extraordinary post of traveling Ambassador. Mr. Averill Harriman was the Ambassador who was supposed to do this traveling all over the world. I wonder what he must think when he gets to some of these places to find that either the President or the Vice President or somebody else has been there ahead of him. I wonder if he does not sometimes ask himself: Was this trip really necessary?

When we think of this diplomacy of summitry I think it just as well to stop and take a look at things.

Now I wish to talk briefly, if I may, about the United Nations.

The gentleman from New York has been concerned in the past about representation allowances and the amount of whisky that is used. He has been very good in keeping it down, as he did this year. I congratulate him for that. But an interesting thing turned up in the United Nations on our mission up to New York. This year they wanted an increase over the $17,000 they get up there for representation allowance now. Mr. Stevenson wanted to increase that by $13,000, making a total of $30,000, as I recall it. The interesting thing is that although he wanted to increase it by $13,000, the previous Ambassador to the United Nations never used all of his representation allowance. Here we are moving into more representation allowance in the United Nations. You go down through the list of representation allowances and you will find them increased, increased, increased every place you go. The answer, they say, is that the African nations are coming in, some Moslems, and others. But there are a lot of countries whose folks do not drink at all, so you do not have to worry about increases there.

Now, with reference to the USIA, the gentleman from New York very properly pointed to that situation. They are going out all over the country and telling the people of the country something about the use of their facilities. I was actually amazed when I read one of their statements in a speech made by an employee of theirs to a responsible group of people in Illinois, Chicago I believe. Why, this man went out there and said that the Soviet Union was spending $200 million a year just for jamming. We had never heard of that. I am quite sure the gentleman from New York will agree that we have never heard any such figure as $200 million for jamming. I submit to you they could not find out what it is, and certainly it is not $200 million. They say they get a figure even smaller than that for worldwide use. That is not true, because as the gentleman from New York knows, we have always allowed for the broadcasting of the Voice of America by the USIA everything they asked for. They have not been denied the funds to carry the story of the Nation wherever they went. When they use their facilities in this country to try to propagandize in order to get increased appropriations, I think they are completely out of line, and they ought to be taking their energies, and instead of trying to sell the American people on increasing their appropriation, they ought to be doing their job overseas in the area in which they are supposed to be working.

One other interesting thing we found in the USIA. That is the matter of prestige. You will also recall about the time we were talking about summitry and summit meetings there was some talk about the prestige of the United States abroad. This matter was developed in a political campaign, and this claimed lowering of prestige came about because of some of these prestige reports by the USIA through some poll they had taken, and because of this we were in an intolerable shape and we ought to get it changed. When Mr. Murrow was asked about the prestige of polls, "When did you take them, what has been done about them?" why, we found out they are going to be discontinued because the prestige polls were not accurate. I remember some of the language used was that they were not in depth and they were not accurate and they were going to cut out these prestige polls which meant so much a few months ago. This is but an interesting sidelight.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I read as best I could the hearings on this bill, and nowhere did I find any reference to the cultural officers in the USIA, and there are a number of them. I remember one in London who is being paid $18,000 or $19,000 a year, plus, of course, an allowance, which is tax free. Does the gentleman know how many cultural officers they have in the USIA and what contribution they make to any cause?

Mr. BOW. I may say to the gentleman I do not know how many we have, but I remember one very interesting thing I might point out to the gentleman about cultural officers. I found in Paris a cultural officer or employee. I asked about this fellow, and they said, "You do not have to worry about him; he is being paid by the Ambassador." "What does he do?" "He advises the Ambassador on cultural affairs." I asked, "Do you mean to tell me that the Ambassador over there has to hire his own man when we are spending millions of dollars on these cultural officers all over the world?"

But here this Ambassador was not able to depend on the man that we have over there and he went out and hired his own cultural affairs officer.

Mr. GROSS. This is on a par with the cultural officer situation in Iceland a couple of years ago.

Mr. BOW. Yes. The gentleman from New York did an excellent job on that. He found a very fine young cultural officer there.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, one who was paid $8,000 a year, and they put in a $13,000 woman, if my memory serves me correctly.

Mr. BOW. They sent another person in place and sent him down to do the other job. Those are the things we found, and those are the things I should say that disturb us.

Those are a few of the things in this bill that I felt should be pointed out to the committee today. Again, I say the bill has the support of the committee. In some places I would have cut it more; in some places the gentleman from New York would have increased it. But, the bill has the unanimous agreement of the members of the committee.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I want to congratulate my colleague from Ohio for the work he has done on this legislation, especially as a member of the House Committee on Appropriations and as a member of the subcommittee having charge of this bill. I rise, however, to ask him for some information if he can give it. As perhaps he knows, I have been named as a member of the special subcommittee of the Committee on Rules charged with the responsibility of endeavoring to determine and to recommend to the full committee and perhaps later to the House as to what type of action the House, or the House and the Senate jointly, should take in connection with the supervision of the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency and of the intelligence agency or department or division within the State Department. Our committee is getting ready to meet in the next few days. I wonder if the gentleman from Ohio can give me or give the House any idea as to how much in the way of funds

this bill carries for the use of intelligence work within the State Department; and, I mean by that, the same type of work that the Central Intelligence Agency, the G–2 division of the Army, the Office of Naval Intelligence, and so forth, do in their own respective fields.

Mr. BOW. I cannot give you offhand the figures that are used for intelligence in the State Department. There is a division there. Do we have that at the desk, the amount that is being used? I would yield to the gentleman from New York, if he can answer that question. I do not have the figures in front of me. These are not funds now appropriated to the CIA. These are funds appropriated for the intelligence division of the State Department.

Mr. BROWN. That is right.

Mr. ROONEY. There is an Office of Research and Intelligence in the State Department, as the gentleman from Ohio very well knows, and the people employed in that area are paid partly by the Department of State and previously partly by the so-called other agencies. The amount involved in fiscal 1962 was a request of $2,828,410.

Mr. BROWN. Does the gentleman believe that that actually covers the cost of all the intelligence work being done by the State Department?

Mr. ROONEY. Oh, not at all. This is only a small area of intelligence to which we are referring, and performed for other agencies of Government.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, the committee went down and reviewed some of the work being done by this group in the State Department and some of the things on which they were working. Then we went over to the FBI and made an investigation there and I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] will agree with me that we were inclined to believe the progress made by the FBI was excellent.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I believe an hour and 15 minutes is enough for lunch. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. (After counting) 41 Members are present, not a quorum.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Abernethy	Donohue	Holifield
Addonizio	Dooley	Hull
Alexander	Dulski	Inouye
Ashley	Dwyer	Jones, Ala.
Auchincloss	Fascell	Karth, Minn.
Ayres	Fino	Kearns
Barrett, Pa.	Fogarty	Kee
Barry, N.Y.	Ford	Kelly
Beermann	Fountain	Kilburn
Blitch	Garland	Kirwan
Bolling, Mo.	Gary	Kitchin
Bonner	Grant	Kluczynski
Brooks, La.	Gray	Knox
Bruce	Green, Oreg.	Kornegay
Buckley	Green, Pa.	Kowalski
Burke, Ky.	Gubser	Landrum
Celler	Hansen	Latta
Collier	Harding	Lennon
Conte	Harris	Lesinski
Cooley	Harsha	Libonati
Dawson	Hébert	Lindsay
Delaney	Hiestand	McCulloch
Diggs	Hoffman, Ill.	McSween
MacGregor	Philbin	Springer
Madden	Pilcher	Staggers
Marshall	Powell	Thompson, La.
Martin, Nebr.	Price	Thompson, N.J.
May	Randall	Tupper
Meader	Riehlman	Udall
Merrow	Rivers, S.C.	Vanik
Miller, N.Y.	Roberts	Vinson
Milliken	Rostenkowski	Watts
Moeller	Rousselot	Whalley
Morrison	St. Germain	Wharton
Moulder	Schwengel	Whitten
Nelsen	Scott	Young
O'Brien, N.Y.	Seely-Brown	Zelenko
O'Konski	Shelley	
O'Neill	Smith, Calif.	
Passman	Spence	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore having resumed the chair, Mr. THORNBERRY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 7371, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 318 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN. To continue my interrogation which was under way at the time the point of no quorum was made, we were discussing the intelligence activities within the Department of State, and were being given some information on it. I should like to ask the gentleman further if the investigation that he and his committee and other Members have made as to the intelligence activities of the State Department indicated that those activities were effective and efficient and worthwhile, or whether they found weaknesses therein.

Mr. BOW. I would say that I think some of the activities were worthwhile and there were some in which we found weaknesses. Again let me say that we later checked the FBI and found there was some apparent duplication there, but we felt that they were further advanced and doing some things, perhaps, that were more in their field than in the field of the Department of State.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. It may be that the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] has the idea that the Department of State and the Foreign Service have an intelligence activity as such. That is so insofar as it refers to a foreign officer reporting on intelligence in the ordinary course of his duties, as does the Army attaché, or Air Force attaché, or Naval attaché. But there is not in the Department of State a separate organization engaged in all fields of intelligence.

Mr. BROWN. We understand that they do not investigate muggings in Washington, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is aware of the fact that they do engage in certain intelligence activities, one way or another. I may add for the gentleman's benefit that if his committee has not studied the problem perhaps our subcommittee will.

Mr. BOW. When any Foreign Service officer makes a report to the Secretary of State he is indulging in intelligence work. He reports as to the conditions in the country. But as far as other types of intelligence such as we have heard about recently are concerned, they are not a part of the functions of the State Department.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask the gentleman this direct question, if I may: Has the gentleman's committee found any indication that any so-called intelligence agent or any person engaged in intelligence activities, that is, in the State Department, has taken any action or had taken any action in connection with the situation in Cuba?

Mr. BOW. None that I know of.

Mr. BROWN. Prior to this time?

Mr. BOW. Not that I recall.

I should like to point out before closing, and I am about to close, one other area that has disturbed me somewhat and that is the contributions being made by agencies of the United Nations to some of the countries of the world through some of the organizations. Perhaps we can go into all of these later on more in detail. I am using figures now from memory and not with the facts before me, but I am pretty close to them, I am quite sure.

There are, as you know, certain agencies of the United Nations where we make very substantial contributions to these agencies and have no control over the manner in which the money is being used. This is a matter I think the proper committees of the House should go into, and our committee perhaps at some time will go into it. I have in mind the Pan American Health Organization. We know that the United States is now contributing about 66 percent of the funds for Pan American Health. We also know that since the advent of Castro in Cuba, and particularly within the last year, they have about tripled the amount of funds going into Communist Cuba. Here we have the strange situation of 66 percent of these funds being contributed by the United States to the United Nations in connection with the Pan American Organization, and then they use these funds to further the efforts of Mr. Castro in Cuba. This is a story that I think will unfold later on and be of great interest to the members of the committee.

You also have the so-called Hoffman project. The funds there are being diverted for the use of Communist countries. We are therefore making contributions to Communist projects.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Not only that, but apparently we have no control over the assessments placed on the taxpayers of this country by the United Nations. I might also point out the uncollected

assessments of practically all these organizations. Your hearings show that there is owing to the United Nations by the member nations almost $10 million, $9,500,000. In connection with the United Nations Emergency Force the unpaid assessments total $22,714,000, UNESCO, $2,208,000, and so on down the line. I do not think there is a single organization connected with that Tower of Babel in New York that does not owe a substantial amount of money in unpaid assessments. But the taxpayers of this country pay promptly and right through the nose.

Mr. BOW. There are a large number of delinquencies in the United Nations. It should be insisted that they be collected, because these amounts are being paid by the taxpayers of the United States and they are being diverted in many instances to the Communist Party. This should be checked on carefully. When we say, "Why should we continue to contribute?" we are told we might be thrown out of these organizations. It might be good to do that in some of these organizations. It might be just as well to withdraw from some of them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. One Government official, and I cannot recall his name, who came before your committee, said it is the natural thing for the United States to put up the bulk of the money for these organizations—the natural thing for us to do.

Mr. BOW. Well, we have been doing it and it is about time we stopped it or we are going to go broke, if we do not stop.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] has consumed 34 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] may extend his remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, my work on the subcommittee on State, Justice, and Judiciary appropriations has been a satisfying experience. It is not a new experience since it was my privilege to serve on this important subcommittee in the 82d Congress during the troubled days of the Korean conflict.

President Kennedy has called this "an hour of national peril and national opportunity." He has also described for us his personal reactions upon assuming the Presidency:

> No man entering upon this office, regardless of his party, regardless of his previous service in Washington, could fail to be staggered upon learning—the harsh enormity of the trials through which we must pass in the next 4 years—each day we draw nearer the hour of maximum danger.

Responsibility for our posture in the face of this threat falls upon all of us. As elected Members of the Congress, this responsibility falls upon us in a special measure.

POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION

The very urgency that the President has continued to express concerning the role of our Government involves not only questions of policy, but questions of administration as well. Policy is not self-executing; it requires administrators and techniques of administration capable of achieving its goals.

In his first appearance before our subcommittee, Secretary of State Dean Rusk spoke this truth with admirable clarity:

> Administration must know what ends it is expected to serve; public administration, especially, must concern itself with effectiveness and efficiency, for it uses public funds and must do so in the spirit of a trust. Policy, on the other hand, cannot be successful unless the tools of policy are well designed and capable of carrying it out. Administration is the handmaiden of policy; it is not its own justification; it serves to accomplish the great national purpose we have in view. This requires that the structure and procedures of the Department of State be attuned to the central tasks of our Nation in the foreign policy field. It also means that deficiencies, waste, or failures ought not to be accepted. In critical times such as these, we cannot afford the little mistakes which impede our effort; indeed, the impact of what some might call little things can be decisive as to our success in getting on with our great national policies.

Anyone who has worked with appropriations for various agencies of government has encountered policymakers who regard administration as beneath their dignity and outside their ken. They are impatient with questions of detail and prefer to deal in the generalities of high strategy. It is refreshing, therefore, to have the Secretary of State admit to a working interest in the operations of his Department. His candor and frankness have helped to make our work less arduous and more meaningful.

TRIBUTE TO CHAIRMAN

By the same token, no man is more respected for his candor and frankness than our chairman, JOHN ROONEY. His careful and searching examination of every witness and every program is an indication both of his personal knowledge of all phases of each agency's work and his personal interest in their success. His discontent with evasion and his profound respect for ability help to make our hearings informative and useful. He is successful in eliciting the facts upon which we can make reasonable judgments in terms of both policy and administration. I know of no higher tribute to a hard-working chairman.

The courtesy shown me by the other members of the subcommittee and by our able and experienced clerk, Jay B. Howe, has made my return enjoyable and rewarding.

FACE HARD CHOICES

To realize the importance of the bill before us, we need only look to the world around us. The implementation and administration of our relations with the other nations of the world are an awesome task in these critical times. In every crisis, men have thought their own time to be a turning point in history. They have been justified, just as we are justified, in recognizing contemporary events as signposts to the future marking alternate roads. We are constantly faced with hard choices and the discouragement and frustration which must follow even temporary failures. There are no sudden and easy solutions to problems as complicated as world relations.

The exercise of patience in these long and trying years known as the cold war sometimes seems impossible. We need only consider the possible alternatives, however, to reassure us that steady and unrelenting hard work holds out the best hope. Patience is essential to carefully reasoned and intelligently augmented public policy.

HEARINGS GIVE INSIGHTS

The many facets of this day-to-day job are clearly shown in the record of our hearings. I urge members and citizens interested in the mechanics of administering foreign policy to read these hearings. Although a substantial body of testimony is off the record, our chairman has made every effort to insure inclusion of all but comments made under strictest security. A reading of the testimony provides valuable insights into both the successes and failures of programs not much publicized and sometimes less understood.

In discussing dollars and cents, we are discussing the ways and means of American foreign policy. We are discussing the men and methods used in applying this policy in every part of the world. We cannot divorce men and programs from policy and its implementation in the real world of international politics. It is for this reason that I urge a reading of the hearings by all who want to see the situation in more complete perspective.

SUFFICIENT FOR EFFICIENCY

Our chairman has ably summarized the actions of the subcommittee on the major items considered for the Department of State. As with every appropriation bill, the results represent compromise and although we may have disagreed on specific details, we bring the bill before you as our best common effort.

The total amount contained in the bill for the Department of State is $267,478,000, a reduction of $31,890,000 below the budget requests. Since some activities can be deferred and others are unauthorized, this amount will enable the Department to carry on at an efficient level of operation.

USE OF FOREIGN CREDITS

We have also recommended language in the bill requiring that $41,200,000 be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States. This will decrease the actual dollar expenditures from the Treasury by over 15 percent.

USIS HAS MAJOR ROLE

One of the major tools in implementation of American foreign policy is the

U.S. Information Service, our principal agency for disseminating information overseas. This effort began as an attempt to counter the big lie of the international Communist conspiracy.

Propaganda has always been one of the major weapons of world communism in creating unrest and division. Its aims are to convince through indoctrination, to arouse through agitation, to dictate through organization, and to undermine through exploitation. By the word of both Lenin and Stalin, crisis is a situation to be used without moral limitations.

CAMPAIGN OF TRUTH

An effective campaign of truth in response to this challenge is not an easy goal to achieve. It requires both dedication and competency, both ideals and hard work.

The new director of this program, Edward R. Murrow, summed up his view of the task in these words:

It seems to me that we must concentrate more on American ideals and less on what has come to be called the image, because in my view the image is something in which we fit, and ideals are something to which we aspire. I think we must assume the attitude that democracy is always unfinished business, and we must never take the attitude that we have reached the complete and final conclusion in all our problems, social, economic, and political.

I think we must at all times operate on the basis of truth; that we must in all media * * * be competitive; and above everything else we must strive for credibility, for believability, in order that what we say, whether by radio, print, films, or television will be believed as coming from serious sources determined to make American policy at all times intelligible and wherever possible palatable.

Mr. Murrow has our best wishes for success in the vital work he has undertaken. All of his ability and experience will be needed in the critical months ahead.

EMPHASIS ON LATIN AMERICA

Emphasis in the budget for USIS has been placed on work in Latin America, Africa, the Near East, and South Asia.

The Communist bloc is spending many millions in these areas, with special emphasis on Latin America. A very heavy Castro-Cuban effort backs up the Communist bloc using all of the traditional Communist techniques—books, films, radio, front organizations, penetration of the universities and communications media, as well as outright bribery.

Chinese Communist broadcasts in Latin America rose from 21 to 31 hours weekly during the past year. Soviet broadcasts were increased from 49 to 56 hours. Total Communist broadcasts, including satellite programs, rose from 138 to 167 hours.

During the past year, the Voice of America broadcast 14 hours a week in Spanish and none in Portuguese.

FUNDS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Our subcommittee expressed strong interest in correcting this situation and the report says:

A majority of the committee felt that with more effective and efficient use of the resources now available to this agency, together with the increase of $9,169,700, the total amount should be ample to carry on an expanded program in Africa and Latin America as well as a more creditable program in other areas of the world.

The bill includes a total of $134,782,500 under the six appropriation items covered under this program. Again, we have included language requiring that $21,750,000 be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States. This will decrease the actual dollar expenditures from the Treasury by about 16 percent.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to discuss several of the items under the Department of Justice in greater detail. The forthright testimony of Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy indicated a willingness and eagerness to become personally acquainted with the many important activities of his department. He outlined the areas of special interest to him and we wish him well in his endeavors.

LANDRUM-GRIFFIN COSTS

When the House passed on Department of Labor appropriations, I commented on the burdensome paperwork and tremendous expense involved in administration of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act—Landrum-Griffin Act—compared to the results which have been obtained. The House this year approved $5,775,000 for purposes of the act to bring the total cost to taxpayers to $13,467,000 for the 3-year period.

Labor Department witnesses told us that 10 criminal actions had resulted to date and convictions had been obtained in 6. All involved embezzlement of funds and admittedly were covered under State laws.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT PARTICIPATION

At the time, I commented that the activities of the Department of Justice would add considerably to the overall cost of this legislation. In an effort to determine the full extent of additional expenditures, I questioned the Attorney General and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation about their participation under the act.

Mr. Hoover indicated that he is not requesting additional investigative personnel at this time in the hope that any workload arising from the act can be absorbed.

The Attorney General requested that eight attorneys and supporting staff be assigned to meet the increasing workload under the Landrum-Griffin bill. The Justice Department estimates that the Labor Department will refer 220 cases for further investigation and 115 cases for analysis and determination as to prosecutive feasibility.

PROSECUTIONS DROPPED

As I stated in the House previously, the figures sometimes given on the number of alleged violations is meaningless since a great many will be dropped upon investigation. A Department of Justice witness confirmed this by saying:

We have also in many instances declined prosecution on the evidence being insufficient or not meeting the requirements of the act.

The six convictions obtained to date involved embezzlement of union funds in amounts ranging from $1,034.46 to $5,811.62. To my knowledge, embezzlement was illegal long before passage of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

CUT DUPLICATE ACTIVITY

This emphasizes again the need to reappraise legislation of this kind enacted in response to pressures and emotions that were misdirected by an intensive propaganda campaign not always concerned with the truth. Once this massive paper-shuffling operation is firmly entrenched, it will go on quietly consuming tax dollars through neglect and inertia.

The fact that the FBI has been able to absorb the additional duties assigned to it without additional funds up to this time is another indication of its efficient operation. The alarming increase in crimes throughout the Nation is one measure of the workload with which the Bureau is faced.

SERIOUS CRIMES INCREASE

During the calendar year 1959, the Nation's police reported 1,592,160 serious crimes. This is a new alltime high and is 69 percent more than in 1950 and 128 percent over 1940.

This ominous increase is continuing at a frightening pace. Preliminary crime figures for the first 9 months of 1960 show an 11-percent increase in serious crimes over the same period in 1959.

The estimated cost of crime for 1959 was a startling total of $22 billion—$128 for every man, woman, and child in the United States. For every $1 spent on education, $1.11 went to crime. For every $1 contributed to religious organizations, crime cost us $9.

DAILY CRIME RATES

During each day of 1959, the last year for which final statistics are available, there were 24 killings, 328 aggravated assaults, 41 forcible rapes, 196 robberies, and 1,105 larcenies, 1,879 burglaries, and 790 automobile thefts. I emphasize that these are daily averages for that year.

Crime is increasing at a rate four times faster than our population. Even more appalling is the tragic increase in youthful lawlessness. Arrests of young people have more than doubled since 1948 and have increased six times as fast as arrests of persons over 18 years of age.

YOUTH CRIME IS HIGH

The record of arrests is disproportionately high in certain crimes. Although youths under 18 represented only 12 percent of all arrests, they were charged with 64 percent of all auto thefts, 49 percent of all robberies. During 1959, 18,000 youths under 18 were arrested for murder, assault with weapons, forcible rape, and strong-arm robbery.

Every thinking citizen is sickened by this ugly situation when brought face to face with the facts. Too many, however, turn away on the false assumption that it will go away or that someone else will tend to it. Mr. Hoover had some harsh words on this subject which are worth repeating here today:

While the population increase is one of the factors to be considered in the rising tide of crime, in reality we can trace our

increasing crime rates today primarily to two malignant conditions—public apathy and moral deterioration.

Public apathy is a dangerous condition which attacks sensitivity to the difference between right and wrong. As long as our citizens insist upon the attitude of self-indulgence and adherence to the principle of pleasure before duty, the effectiveness of combating crime is seriously weakened.

The rising crime rate is ample evidence of the unfortunate spread of moral deterioration among the growing segments of our population. This condition not only exists within the criminal element itself, but has also corrupted millions of our nation's citizens who are willing to compromise their ideals if an easy dollar can be made.

ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSION

In addition to its broad services to local police organizations and its direct responsibility in criminal investigation and apprehension, the FBI continues to have primary responsibility in dealing with espionage and subversion under our laws.

At the center of the espionage and subversion threat is the international Communist conspiracy. Communist parties are operating legally or illegally in 86 countries around the world with a combined membership of over 36 million. They have gained control in 17 countries. Communist-bloc nations now control approximately 1 billion people, one-third of the world's inhabitants.

Only the most naive can believe that we are immune from penetration by skillful and dedicated agents of this conspiracy. While we cannot discuss our counterintelligence and counterespionage programs for obvious reasons, this vital work of the Bureau continues to deserve unstinting support.

BUREAU OF PRISONS

The tremendous increase in our crime rate necessarily causes problems for the Bureau of Prisons, another agency covered in the bill before you. For the 11th consecutive year, the average population of Federal penal and correctional institutions has shown a marked increase.

The capable and experienced director of the Bureau, Mr. James V. Bennett, is making a determined effort to cope with the ever-increasing problems of the Federal prison system. The commendable manner in which he is administering the system deserves mention.

PRISON POPULATION INCREASES

Several months ago the total prison population numbered 23,362, an increase of 789 over a year ago. The Bureau estimates an average population of 24,000 during the next fiscal year. The two institutions opened in the later summer of 1959 at Sandstone, Minn., and Lompoc, Calif., are already filled almost to capacity.

Another complicating factor is the increased length of sentences, indicating a continually more difficult group of prisoners. To this is added the problem of youthful offenders and juvenile delinquents, 5,000 of whom are now in Federal institutions. Since these young offenders offer the greatest hope for redemption and readjustment in the community, funds and efforts are rightfully being concentrated on them. An increasing number of courts are pronouncing indeterminate sentences and it is left to the Department of Justice to determine when young offenders are ready to be returned to society.

FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES

Members may be interested in the operations of Federal Prison Industries, Inc. The corporation operates industries in penal institutions to produce articles and commodities for use in the institutions and for sale to other departments and agencies of Government. At the same time, it provides an opportunity for inmates to acquire knowledge and skills that will be useful in providing them with a means of livelihood upon release.

In 1962, the corporation expects to operate 54 shops located in 24 Federal penal and correctional institutions. Sales of the products and services are restricted to the prison system and governmental agencies. Sales for the current fiscal year are estimated at $32,736,000 with estimated net earnings of $4,636,000, which revert to the U.S. Treasury. Since the beginning of the program in 1935, an estimated $49,436,000 has been paid into the Treasury after subtracting costs of the program.

FUNDS RECOMMENDED

In dealing with the overall budget of the Department of Justice, your committee is recommending $294,239,900, a reduction of $4,144,100 below the revised budget estimates.

The committee recommends a total of $127,216,000, the full amount requested, for the Federal Bureau of Investigation. This includes an increase in funds for 50 additional special agents to meet new investigative responsibilities under existing laws.

ADDITIONAL CRIMINAL STAFF

In response to a revised request from the Bureau of the Budget on March 6, 1961, the committee included $540,000 "to provide additional staff in the Criminal Division to combat more effectively increasing lawlessness and to coordinate governmentwide efforts against crime."

The report is the result of many weeks of hearings and deliberation and presents our best estimate of the funds needed to carry on essential activities in the departments concerned. With proper husbanding and better utilization of men and materials, these amounts should be ample for efficient and effective administration of the programs assigned by law.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH].

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, when earlier I asked for this time, the committee was in the midst of a very cozy consideration of this bill with only 41 Members of the House on the floor. I asked for time to speak, Mr. Chairman, because I felt compelled to put to the Congress the question which I was asked repeatedly during the 5 days that I have been home—home in a very sound, a very well-grounded, a very much disturbed and a very much worried district. The question was: What is the Congress doing to meet the situation?

I would say to the 396 Members who were not on the floor at that time that there had been an excellent exposition of this bill by both the chairman of the committee, whom I have always found to be most solicitous in his care, and also by the ranking Republican Member. We had talked about the amounts in the bill. We had talked about the agencies to carry out the spending of the amounts. But, somehow or other it seemed that we were far off the track of what needs to be said here today. As I listened, Mr. Chairman, I felt that I must suddenly be one Member on the floor of the House of Representatives stirred to voice my own fears, my concern, and my conviction that we need to dedicate ourselves today to something more than a discussion of dollars and of agencies. We listened at an earlier point to some humorous and some true political remarks. I am not going to engage in any more such remarks. I think that the condition in which this country finds itself is far too serious for mere political considerations, important though the implications may be. We heard also about trips. We heard much about the information agency.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that the American people are primarily not so much worried or concerned about where the President or the Vice President or others are going. Nor do I think that they are primarily concerned about how many people or how many dollars are provided for the U.S. Information Agency or similar agencies, although they do rightly demand economy from this Congress. What they are concerned about and I know it to be true, Mr. Chairman—is not as to where the President or any one else is going—but as to where this United States of America is going; and by the same token, their concern is not so much over how much or how our words are broadcast, but actually over what we are saying and intend to say. They are not quite sure whether the leadership knows where it is going. They are not quite sure whether what the United States may be saying, though they hope and pray so, is in line with what we have always said and what we have always stood for.

Everywhere, there seems to be trouble. The average American today picks up the paper, and is aroused by names which were unknown to him 12 months ago and which now are a part of the family breakfast table conversation. I remember when I first returned from Laos in 1953. I did not find one person with whom I discussed Laos who did not have to ask me where Laos was. They know now where Laos is. Similarly, the trouble in the Congo and elsewhere has become a subject of conversation between parent and child. The trouble in Cuba lies on the hearts and lips of everyone with whom I spoke. What are they asking? Well, they are asking first of all whether this Congress knows what is going on. Oh, yes; I was asked that. I had the feeling that I could almost, if I were not already a Member of the Congress, go out and defeat any sitting Member of this body who did not come to grips with

the main problem of how to plan successfully for our survival—and the survival of our system. Because the American people are coming to grips with the main problem—they are far ahead of us.

I remember saying during my first year in the Congress that the strength of this country lies first of all in the endemic sense and power of the principle of human freedom on which it was founded.

The American people know that strength. The American people know what it is to be free, and I think, Mr. Chairman, that they are willing to pay the price, gladly, of staying free.

At that time, I said something else: I said that the second great component of our progress has been the equally great endemic strength of a free system. Finally, I concluded however, that what had actually made this country free and kept it free was the commonsense of the American people. The commonsense of the American people is on the march today.

What are they asking us? They want a sound America, and incidentally they hope that we will not spend all the money that the administration is talking about spending. They want a strong country at home. They want the good way of life to which they have become accustomed. They want that way of life to be better and fuller for every citizen. They want something much more, Mr. Chairman. But especially they want to know that the ideals and principles in which they believe, and we believe, are the just concern of the Congress and the administration—and that we will leave no stone unturned to preserve them. They want to be assured that we are aware of the danger—and dedicated to the battle. They want to know that we are willing to pay the price, even of losing our seats if necessary, in order to meet the greatest of the problems, the problem of what is wrong with a very great country which seems to be groping for direction, which seems to be hunting for a path which it cannot quite determine. They want their great country to continue to act like a great county, as they put it. Finally, they are worried about what? About the integrity of this country. Worried by the stands we take. One day we say that as a nation we are not taking part in yielding to political blackmail by Communist Cuba—and if this seems to be political, I apologize—and then we admit that our Government has sought appointment of a committee to do what we said that we were not going to do as a government. In their commonsense attitude they think that when government says a thing, it means it. Somehow or other the people back home do know the difference between truth and half-truth. They know, too that a government cannot say that it is not in something like the Cuban failure, and then admit that we had ships offshore that escorted the Cuban patriots who sought to make the invasion. They want—and deserve—the truth.

Mr. Chairman, for the American people, I ask this vital question: Is the administration, and the Congress, facing up adequately to our basic need for survival?

Does this body sufficiently recognize that the Communist menace is not something that is playful, that we are not in a game but a battle? Particularly do we recognize that we will never win out unless we return to our commonsense, rely on our great, great "fortress" of freedom and revive our basic national integrity?

Yes, I do not think that it is a question of how many dollars we spend in this or any other bill. The committee report carries the statement by the Secretary of State that more money and more people are not the answer to our new problems. I would remind the Secretary of State that more money and more people are not the answer to our old problems either. The only answer lies in whether or not we really believe in what we say we believe in; and incidentally whether we as a Congress are making every effort to do more than "business as usual." To fail to do so invites more than lack of confidence: it might reap disaster and destruction.

Yes, the American people are asking many things. They have a right to the answer. Admittedly I am moved today because I have been home in a community where Memorial Day is a very sacred holiday. I stood yesterday before a small stone in Evanston marking the place where General MacArthur spoke after his recall from the Far East. I cannot say his words verbatim, but I cannot forget them either.

They go like this:

I do not know the dignity of these men's birth, but I do know the glory of their death. I know that they died that the United States of America and all it stands for shall not perish from this earth.

Having read those words just yesterday, I could not sit here today with 41 Members—just 41—of the House of Representatives discussing a bill to spend $750 million, without pointing out that, whether we know it or not, the American people do know that it is going to take more than dollars, more than agencies to win our battle. It is going to take a rededication, and very humbly may I say that I hope that such rededication may start with me and my colleagues in the Congress.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I could not agree more with what the gentlewoman has said this afternoon of what goes on in the minds of the people of the United States today. I think the gentlewoman has pinpointed the situation. There must be an awareness on the part of the Members of Congress today, if they have time to meet with their constituents and talk with them, of the great concern that goes on in their minds and hearts, and, as far as the country is concerned, of how it is a few steps ahead of the Congress in the deliberations that go on today.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Illinois has just said that the spending of more money and the hiring of more people is not the answer to our problems, and I heartily agree with her. Yet what we find in this bill is more money and more people. It calls for the spending of $751,300,000, an increase of almost $5 million over last year. Sure, it is below the budget estimates, but budget estimates are the asking price. The real question is: How much are we increasing expenditures? In this bill we are asked to increase expenditures over last year by almost $5 million when there ought to be a cut of several times that amount.

There is also the suggestion by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], in his earlier remarks today, that in some areas covered by this bill they are already talking in terms of deficiency appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to this wonderful thing that has spread throughout Government known as representation allowance and entertainment. This bill has more than $1 million of representation allowance in it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] has described this as "tools of the trade." A while ago, when many of you were not on the floor of the House, he identified "tools of the trade" as being something you carry around in bottles in briefcases. This is, of course, the liquor allowance.

There is $925,000 in this bill for the State Department for liquor and entertainment in this country and abroad.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Of course, the gentleman knows that that is not an accurate statement. He has just said, "There is $925,000 in this bill for the State Department for liquor." The bulk of the item is for food.

Mr. GROSS. Is for what?

Mr. ROONEY. Food, f-o-o-d.

Mr. GROSS. Well, you do not carry food around in bottles in briefcases.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will recall—and he wants to be fair about this, I am sure—he brought up the subject of toolboxes.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman wanted to know where the money was in this bill for toolboxes.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Everybody wondered what he was talking about, and then it suddenly occurred to me that he was referring to the expression "tools of the trade."

Mr. GROSS. Yes; the gentleman from New York himself coined that phrase, when a previous bill was before the House providing for liquor and entertainment.

Mr. ROONEY. And I advised the gentleman there was no money in here for tool boxes; is that not correct?

Mr. GROSS. That is right, and then you identified this commodity you talked about as something you put in bottles and carry in briefcases. There is also $60,000 for representation allowances in the international conference and contingencies item.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again at that point?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Does the gentleman realize that that is a reduction of $40,000?

Mr. GROSS. It ought to all go out. For the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO there is $1,500 for this bottled-in-bond business. For the International Education Exchange Commission, $1,000 for entertainment. I supposed it will be said that is for Coca-Cola, since it deals with education or something of that sort. And $100,000 to the USIA for this purpose. Mr. Murrow is going to do very well with this $100,000, I take it. Then, what you do not see here is an expenditure by the United Nations of $100,000 for liquid refreshment, call it whatever you want, tools of the trade. We put up one-third of that. So, when you total this thing up, this one bill, mind you, you have better than $1 million for booze and entertainment. At the proper time I propose to offer an amendment or two to cut out some of this spending. I may not get any further than I have in the past, but I can try.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the learned gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will admit I am sure, that all of the particulars in regard to this subject are succinctly set out in the printed hearings and in the committee report, and that the total amount contained in the bill for representation allowances, exclusive of the U.N., for both State Department and USIA is $1,120,250.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am glad the gentleman confirmed that it runs to better than a million dollars this year in this bill. I am glad the gentleman confirmed that, because there seemed to be some argument about it in the past; that the booze fund had hit the million dollar mark. Now I should like to ask the gentleman if there is any money in this bill for the United Nations special fund.

Mr. ROONEY. No; there is not.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, there must be administration in it for the United Nations special fund, since we are appropriating funds for the operation of the United Nations.

Mr. ROONEY. There is no money in this bill in connection with Mr. Paul Hoffman's so-called special fund.

Mr. GROSS. Where will we find that, may I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY. In the mutual security appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is aware, I assume, that only last week a loan was approved by the United Nations special fund in the amount of $1.1 million for Castro. I said "a loan," and I meant to put the word in quotation marks, because it is one of those grants that will never be paid back.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will find that the committee went into this subject quite a while ago, beginning at page 942 of the printed hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I am aware of that, but since the gentleman's committee held hearings the grant to Cuba has been made, and with the approval of Paul Hoffman.

The word from the State Department is that it finally went along because it did not want to embarrass any of our so-called friends. We put 40 percent of the money into the United Nations Special Fund and it does not make a nickel's worth of sense to me that American taxpayers put up somewhere between $400,000 and $500,000 of the money that is being handed over to Castro by the United Nations.

Incidentally, with reference to the United Nations, I obtained a copy of their telephone directory the other day. We are putting up a minimum of 32.5 percent of all the millions that go to that outfit each year. This United Nations must be a bonanza for the telephone company, because I find in their directory that they have a telephone for each of the following:

There are telephones each for the art club; the badminton club; the ballet group; the bowling league; the bridge club; the chess club; clubs general—that is the granddaddy of them all, general information on clubs; the cricket club; the dancing club; the delegates' bar—north, and the delegates' bar—south. Is it possible they have segregation there? There is a telephone for the delegates' chauffeur's lounge; and a telephone for the delegates' lounge—north and south. There are telephones for the drama group; the Esperanto club; for social matters; the flying club; folk dance club; and the gym club. There are telephones for the Italian club, and the jazz society. There are telephones for the press club; the music club; the movie club; and the Mohicans Society. There are telephones for the recreation council, the riding club; the skating club; ski club; soccer club; softball club; stamp club; and the table tennis club.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am going to talk to you for a minute or two this afternoon about some of the situations that the United States is in as a result of the spending schemes that have been thrown together in one way or another by the executive department, by all sorts of propaganda agencies and all sorts of groups, where there seems to be no sense of the value of a dollar. I came down here figuring that probably for the first couple of months or 3 months, it would be impossible for us to take a major part of the new administration's affairs apart.

I have come to the conclusion that it is now time to take them apart from stem to stern.

The bills that have gone through from the Appropriations Committee so far have not been the large bills, they have been smaller bills, bills that have not the great carrying ability that some of the bills that are coming in to you in the next 2 or 3 days will have.

This bill itself is one that, as far as I can see, is substantially below the budget. The State Department itself was put back somewhere near where it was last year. The other bills have not been treated as seriously as the State Department.

I do not know whether we are going to have to pass a resolution that will prohibit the expenditure of more funds than a specific amount which will be a great deal less than has been carried in the bills that have so far passed, or whether we will be able to get some sense out of the committee in their approach to this situation.

This year the total overall amount of the bill is $751,300,000. Last year it was $746,374,000—including the Civil Rights Commission, the Justice Department, and the U.S. Information Agency.

The USIA has not by this time gotten to the point where it is grown up, where the people who are running it have just one idea, and that is to put the United States of America across to other people. They think that if you put out something like "Hey diddle, diddle, the cat and the fiddle" or something of that sort you are doing more than if you really did something helpful. You really cannot make any headway with people who have that kind of approach. I hope this administration will turn to people who can give us a clean deal and do something that will really help the United States instead of hinder it.

I am going to be obliged to say this, but where bills are brought in here that have very substantial increases above last year's bills I shall feel obliged in the interest of the people of the United States to do the best I can to see that they do not go through the House on any such exaggerated basis.

I do not know how much support I will get in the committee, but I think it is time for the Congress to wake up and realize it is necessary that we stop spending money that we do not have. I am not going to vote for legislation that will provide for the appropriation of funds to carry out activities in other countries or for other countries which are beyond our capacity to do. I am not going to vote for them anyway unless they can make out a good clean case for the activity they have under consideration. I do not want to say this for the purpose of getting my name in print or anything of that kind, but I do want to say for the purpose of trying, if possible, to arouse the Congress to a sense of trying to cut down on these spending propositions and get this spending in hand and get it in shape so that we will not be ashamed of ourselves as we go down the street.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. I am sure the respected and learned gentleman realizes that the present budget for the Department of State is the budget of the last administration, which was prepared last summer and fall. I am sure the gentleman from New York also realizes that that budget was subsequently revised by the new Kennedy administration and that the requests now contained therein are in a lesser amount to the extent of $130,000 than the so-called Eisenhower budget for fiscal year 1962.

Mr. TABER. That, of course, is true, but I was not attempting to make a political speech here but that was because of smaller demands on the part of the United Nations. I was not trying to fasten the blame on anyone. All I have to say is that the facts are still there, and that taking these appropriations by and large, we need to do everything we can to get them into shape and get them into hand. I hope the Congress will meet its responsibility with this bill, and that it will not be loaded to the gunwales with the idea that everybody who comes in with his hat in his hand, no matter who he is, has got to have what he asks for. We must conserve our resources or else we will not be doing our duty by the man in the street back home. I have been home for 2 or 3 days now, and I know from the way the people are talking that they are disturbed about our expenditures as well as the prospect of expenditures to come. There is one thing I want to say for the Appropriations Committee—that in spite of the opposition of the Committee on Appropriations there seems to be a policy of back-door appropriations that is spread open 40 yards wide, and the thing is absolutely impossible if we are going to survive as a nation with a firm and sound financial foundation.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois on one of the finest speeches I have heard all session. Obviously, it was from the heart; certainly, it was a message that we can all well heed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a moment to talk about the extraordinary contributions made to the Congress and to the Nation by the chairman of this subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY]. I hope the Members will read the hearings; I hope they will observe the careful, painstaking, exhaustive manner in which he works day after day digging out the facts, sometimes from reluctant witnesses, about the conduct of the agencies of Government for which this subcommittee must appropriate. You can be sure that he keeps a very close check on expenditures. His has really been a great and valuable work.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that it has been brought home that this bill carries the highest percentage of cut that has been made in any bill brought to the floor in the current session of Congress. That in itself is a significant achievement; and it took place, Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that there is increased scope of work required of the agencies affected. Particularly is there increased scope of work required of the State Department.

And yet, I do not think this bill has been cut too much. The job is big. More money could be spent in doing it and possibly well spent. But money is not the whole answer to the problem; money is not going to solve the problems that are before this Nation. Something much more than money is required to restore the prestige of the United States. There must be new spirit, there must be new determination. There must be determination which I think is lacking today in all too many quarters. There is too much of business-as-usual philosophy. This Nation and the things we stand for have been losing ground for years. You know it and I know it. We may soon find ourselves backed into a corner.

The people of the United States are worried; they have a right to be worried. Before it is too late I trust the new administration will take things by the nape and shake out the indifference and the lethargy by which our foreign policy and our information programs seem to be characterized. For instance until changed by action of President Kennedy, we have been broadcasting English-language programs to Spanish and Portuguese-speaking peoples in Latin America. Ninety-nine percent of the people we need particularly to reach have not the faintest idea what they hear is all about, because they do not understand English. But all of them have heard about Castro and the way in which he is dividing up rich Yankee property among the poor people. They have not been told the facts about Castro. They do not know the poor in Cuba are getting poorer. They cannot learn it from our English language broadcasts.

Look anywhere in the world. When something happens the Communists do not like, mobs suddenly appear and stone our embassies. Yet you never hear of mobs stoning Communist embassies. Is not this situation a little strange? Strange or otherwise, it impresses a lot of neutrals.

How do you think those mobs get organized? I will tell you. They are bought and paid for at so much a head, at 20 cents or 50 cents a head, whatever the going rate per day is in that particular country. Anyone could hire the same mob for another 20 cents or 50 cents a head to go down the street and stone the Communist embassy on the same day. But we are told we must not do that sort of thing. We are told that Americans must not fight fire with fire. We have to use Marquis of Queensbury rules. That is all right if the other fellow uses rules, but in this dirty battle he does not. And while we follow the rules, he is winning the battle.

Here is another illustration. We lend, or give, money to Poland. I have favored funds for Poland, not because I like the Communist government of Poland, but because I admire the valiant and patriotic spirit of the Poles, and I have hoped in some way this spirit can be kept alive, until the Polish people are free. But now I see that Poland is giving money to Cuba. Maybe that is our money. But in any event Poland does not need ours so very much if they can afford to give money to Cuba. We give money to Poland, who gives money to Cuba, which helps to keep Cuba under Communist dictatorship. That does not make much sense either.

To correct situations like this may require considerable housecleaning. People get set in their ways, they become reluctant to adopt new methods and dismiss the old methods. But the old methods are failing this Nation; they have been failing us for years. If it takes new people right down to the foundations to get new life, new blood, into these programs, then we had better get about the job of housecleaning.

There is need for new legislation too. This committee is strictly limited in its ability to do some of the things that should be done. The United States is paying much to great a share of the cost of international organizations. This includes the U.N. and all of the subordinate world organizations to which we belong. We pay most of the bills. The amount ranges from 30 to 90 percent. The Soviets contribute little, in some instances nothing, and they circumvent and encompass our efforts and the efforts of the majority of the members of the United Nations. Yet we are bound by legislation or bound by agreement based on legislation to pay much more than our proportionate share in nearly every case. This committee cannot save a dime in such cases until the Congress unties our hands.

The American people want this Nation to get on with the job of restoring the prestige of America and of reasserting the leadership which democracy so desperately needs in the world today.

We have strong new leaders in this country. We have a President and Vice President who recognize the terrible dangers that beset the free world in so many quarters. They are working almost around the clock in their efforts to restore America's prestige and world standing. To ultimately stop the spread of communism they need more than the backing that the Congress can give them, even more than the backing the people can give them. The Congress can provide only the tools to do the job. The agencies of Government must use those tools and use them better than they have been used before in our time or we may be approaching the end of the line for this noblest experiment in democracy.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I would like to commend the gentleman for the comments he has made, particularly about the need for changes, for reorientation, for establishing the kind of changes that are needed to get our programs into the right focus. This involves changes in personnel. Does the gentleman have any suggestion by which the Congress

can be assured that those essential changes can be made?

Mr. SIKES. The Congress does not control changes in personnel. For this the Congress may be asked to provide new legislation. I trust it will take whatever proper steps are needed to expedite this process.

Mr. HARDY. The point that has bothered me so often is this: There have been examples of changes that were needed that have not been made. Wherever mistakes have been made they seem to be pyramided instead of corrected. I share the feeling which the gentleman expressed a moment ago, that we must make some changes, fundamental changes, in personnel at the working level—I am not talking about the policymakers at the top—so they can control the policies that are dictated.

Mr. SIKES. Of course the gentleman is right. There must be a change in attitude and direction all along the line.

Mr. HARDY. Unless we can find some way to rid the Department of State of those people who have been making mistake after mistake and pyramiding those mistakes on top of one another we accomplish nothing.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN].

Mr. HAGEN of California. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state a problem and ask you some questions concerning it.

H.R. 11666, the Department of Justice Appropriation Act of 1961, as it passed the House on April 13, 1960, provided—

> None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used for the compensation of commissioners appointed in lands cases under rule 71(A)(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

The conference with the Senate on this basic appropriations bill was not completed before the July recess and, therefore, a temporary appropriation measure was passed on July 2, 1960, which became Public Law 86–569. This act provided—

> Whenever the amount which would be made available or the authority which would be granted under an act listed in this subsection as passed by the House is different from that which is made available or granted under such act as passed by the Senate, the pertinent project or activity shall be continued under the lesser amount or the more restrictive authority.

It should be noted that in this instance the Senate version of the basic appropriation bill did not contain the aforementioned restrictive language with respect to payment of land commissioners.

The regular appropriation measure, after conference, was approved on August 31, 1960, becoming Public Law 86–678. Title II thereof provides that an amount shall be made available for payment of commissioners appointed in condemnation cases under rule 71(A)(h) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. This provision was effective August 31, 1960.

The Comptroller General of the United States has ruled that the August 31, 1960, act hereinbefore referred to did not cure the earlier April and July prohibitions and maintains that a statutory restriction on payment to land commissioners exists with respect to services performed during the months of July and August of 1960.

As a consequence of this position, which is supported by the Justice Department, there are many present—or former—land commissioners in many areas of the United States, who have been unable to collect payment for services rendered, often in spite of the fact that they received their appointments before all of the congressional actions referred to and the fact that their services in July and August of 1960 were a continuation of work in progress—which presumably would suffer by abandonment of a temporary character.

On the basis of this background I would appreciate answers from the gentleman from New York to these questions.

Is it not a fact that the intention of the subcommittee which your chair employed the restrictive language which I have identified solely for the purpose of discouraging the appointment of additional commissioners?

Mr. ROONEY. The restrictive language was inserted in the bill a year ago at the suggestion of the Department of Justice because of the fact that there had been abuses, and particularly in the State of California, in regard to the appointment of land commissioners by judges. It was inserted in order to save some of the taxpayers' money and to discourage such appointments.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Now, it was not the intention to interrupt the activities of existing commissioners, however.

Mr. ROONEY. No; it was not. I do not think the Congress would have any authority to do that. Certainly the subcommittee felt it had not. If the commissioners had been appointed previous to the adoption of the restrictive language, and it was properly determined that their fees were fair and reasonable, they should be paid.

Mr. HAGEN of California. Then, the proper recourse of these commissioners is in the Court of Claims where their cases would be evaluated in the light of the premises we have just discussed.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, it is to be hoped that having to go to the Court of Claims might discourage the practice that the Congress felt should be discontinued. In the case of those commissioners previously appointed, if it is determined that they are entitled to reasonable compensation, I am sure that the Court of Claims, or whatever is the proper court, would award them such compensation for their services.

Mr. HAGEN of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY].

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to the chairman of the subcommittee for yielding me this time. I merely want to ask him to explain or to help me better understand a situation that I believe is provided for indirectly in this bill. A while ago, earlier in the debate, there was discussion of certain intelligence activities within the Department of State. I should like to inquire of the gentleman how the office, which I believe Mr. Theodore Achilles has been designated to head, is to be financed, and what its functions will be.

Mr. ROONEY. Subsequent to the formulation of the instant budget, subsequent to the lengthy hearings of the subcommittee and up to the time of the committee markup of the instant bill, there was no money request presented for that office. Some weeks ago the President instructed the State Department to have a 24-hour watchguard in the Department with regard to international affairs. The gentleman to whom the gentleman from Virginia refers, Mr. Achilles, was then made the head of this around-the-clock group who are sleeping over in the State Department, practically living there, with their fingers on international affairs at every moment of the day. This was done with funds, I assume, out of the item "Salaries and expenses," in the hands of the State Department for the current fiscal year. There is no money in the bill now before us for the continuation of that operation as such in the fiscal year 1962. There are funds, however, for payment of these officers' salaries in the slots from which they have been transferred.

Mr. HARDY. Then I take it, from what the gentleman says, that there is authority in existing law for this type of operation within the Department of State?

Mr. ROONEY. Most certainly. This is a proper function of the Department of State.

Mr. HARDY. Then do I understand this office has to do with intelligence activities?

Mr. ROONEY. Loosely speaking. Again, as in the colloquy with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], it is not an intelligence organization as such, but a group to keep their fingers on the pulse of everything that is going on around the world, including intelligence, so as to be able to give a report to the White House.

Mr. HARDY. Does the gentleman know whether this office may be duplicative of or analogous to functions which are carried on in the Department of Defense or the CIA?

Mr. ROONEY. I would not expect so. This group was formed expressly at the request of the White House and is presently functioning.

Mr. HARDY. Can the gentleman tell us what Mr. Achilles' experience is that qualifies him to carry on this particular activity other than the fact that he has served as ambassador in several posts?

Mr. ROONEY. This committee does not select personnel. Mr. Achilles, I assume, was selected by the President or the Secretary of State.

Mr. HARDY. I understand that, and I would assume then that the gentleman takes the position that he has no knowledge concerning Mr. Achilles' particular qualifications.

Mr. ROONEY. I have known Mr. Achilles for many years.

Mr. HARDY. I am talking about his particular qualifications in this area.

Mr. ROONEY. It is my understanding that Mr. Achilles is a man of long and varied experience in the Foreign Service.

Mr. HARDY. I understood that. I know that he served as ambassador at a number of posts. My inquiry is directed to his particular qualifications for the specific type of work which he is now supposed to do.

Mr. ROONEY. We are never consulted about that.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman has no knowledge about it?

Mr. ROONEY. I do not say that I do not have any knowledge about it, but that we are not consulted about it. It may be one gentleman thinks that Mr. Achilles is not as competent as another thinks he is.

Mr. HARDY. I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand me. I am taking no position on it myself, but I am inquiring as to his competency in that area. The gentleman cannot answer that?

Mr. ROONEY. I will try to answer anything the gentleman will ask me.

Mr. HARDY. I said I was asking merely as to his competence in that particular area.

Mr. ROONEY. I have said previously that Mr. Achilles has had a long experience as a Foreign Service officer. Surely one would not get an accountant to do this job. You would want an experienced diplomat.

Mr. HARDY. I am not questioning the experience of Mr. Achilles as a diplomat, nor do I know of his qualification for this particular assignment. I wonder whether he has or should have some special competence for this new job.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for granting me this opportunity, and I want to commend the distinguished chairman for his work on this bill.

The hearings on this bill of course are rather lengthy, but I recommend them to the Members of the House for reading because they are very illuminating.

I was quite surprised to see that the appropriations are made for the United Nations on the basis of 32.5 percent of the total cost being paid by the United States, yet in the hearings it was revealed that the United States contributes approximately 45 percent of the total cost of the United Nations operation. It is apparent to me that we have surrendered to the United Nations our legislative authority in many instances. These sums are added through the Mutual Security and other sources, and this committee has no control over the disposition of that money, although it works very diligently on both sides of the aisle to control the expenditure of the United States taxpayers' money.

We in the House in one instance cut down the sugar quota as a reprisal against Cuba. The United Nations people then proceeded to grant better than $1,200,000 to Cuba to find some other agricultural pursuit, and we paid 40 percent of that fund. There seems to be a complete lack of communication in the State Department itself, when one hand does not seem to know what the other is doing. The chairman upon interrogation of State Department officials found that they knew nothing about this particular instance of the $1,200,000 going to Cuba, yet it had been made just a few days before. They said they were sure they would protest it, and they did protest it.

The council in the United Nations that approves this takes no vote, according to a newspaper account dated May 24. There are no votes cast in making this grant. I presume the newspaper account is correct.

I myself am opposed to our relinquishing our congressional authority over the supervision of the taxpayers' money to this extent. Foreign policy of course is a matter for the administration, but as to the actual expenditure of the money, I think this committee should have more control over the amount that goes into it and what its specific use shall be, especially when on a homefront basis we would go very carefully over any program such as this and it would not only go through several committees but it would also come under close scrutiny while it was being administered.

One last point I want to make is the attitude with reference to the delinquencies in contributions by other countries. It is stated in these hearings by one of our State Department officials that he is glad the U.S.S.R. does not make all its contributions, because if it did it would have more say in the United Nations. I do not see how we could have any less to say than we have now in making our total contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of foreign affairs

Salaries and Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Department of State, not otherwise provided for, including expenses authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801–1158), not otherwise provided for; expenses necessary to meet the responsibilities and obligations of the United States in Germany (including those arising under the supreme authority assumed by the United States on June 5, 1945, and under contractual arrangements with the Federal Republic of Germany); salary of the United States member of the Board for the Validation of German Bonds in the United States at the rate of $17,100 per annum; expenses of the National Commission on Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Cooperation as authorized by sections 3, 5, and 6 of the Act of July 30, 1946 (22 U.S.C. 287o, 287q, 287r); purchase (not to exceed five) or hire of passenger motor vehicles; printing and binding outside the continental United States without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of uniforms; payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens by contract for services abroad; refund of fees erroneously charged and paid for passports; radio communications; payment in advance for subscriptions to commercial information, telephone and similar services abroad; care and transportation of prisoners and persons declared insane; expenses, as authorized by law (18 U.S.C. 3192), of bringing to the United States from foreign countries persons charged with crime; and procurement by contract or otherwise, of services, supplies, and facilities, as follows: (1) translating, (2) analysis and tabulation of technical information, and (3) preparation of special maps, globes, and geographic aids; $132,000,000, of which not less than $15,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That passenger motor vehicles in possession of the Foreign Service abroad may be replaced in accordance with section 7 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 891), and the cost, including the exchange allowance, of each such replacement shall not exceed $3,800 in the case of the chief of mission automobile at each diplomatic mission (except that ten such vehicles may be purchased at not to exceed $7,800 each) and $1,500 in the case of all other such vehicles except station wagons.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I could have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from New York, I would like to ask a further question in the area that was developed by the gentleman from California [Mr. HAGEN]. Just why is it that everyone has zeroed in on the so-called land commissioners who have been appointed by the district court to make final settlements in certain condemnation proceedings?

Mr. ROONEY. The reason was that the situation was getting entirely out of hand. The committee was advised by the Department of Justice that the fees for certain land commissioners were out of all proportion to the amount of money they had and that certain judges in certain parts of the country were naming friends as condemnation commissioners and paying them too much of the taxpayers' money. I think that is about the sum total of it.

Mr. AVERY. I could agree with the gentleman, if that practice has been going on, certainly, it is adverse to the public interest. But, why are we penalizing the 47 other States for a practice that has been found in only one State? In the case of the judicial district of Kansas, certainly, the appointment of commissioners has worked very well. There have been no allegations of any unethical proceedings.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I will be very happy to yield.

Mr. ROONEY. During the course of this year's hearings we listened to the testimony of a certain distinguished judge whose name escapes me at the moment. I believe it was Judge Weinman of the southern district of the State of Ohio, and he testified how well his use of land commissioners was working in that State. The committee

has not selected or rejected any State or States. This came about as the result of what one might call a scandalous situation, and in order to cure that, there has been a limitation to the extent of $200,000 in this bill.

Mr. AVERY. That is exactly that to which I allude, Mr. Chairman. It appears to me you have penalized 47 other States because $200,000 is certainly not an adequate amount of money to cover the usual expenses of these commissioners.

Mr. ROONEY. How can the gentleman justify his statement that this is not an adequate amount of money? Experience shows that it certainly is adequate.

Mr. AVERY. All right, if I can ask the question in another way: How much money had the Department used before the limitation was placed on it? Maybe that would bring this into perspective so as to support what is reasonable.

Mr. ROONEY. Until the situation developed, the situation which was disclosed a year ago, there was never a use of funds which approximated the amount of money that was spent as of a year ago. Previously, there was never any trouble with regard to this. The committee inserted the language at the suggestion and with the acquiescence of the Department of Justice.

Mr. AVERY. That may very well be, but we represent the landowners as well as the public interest, and when we have a commission appointed by a court, the landowner whose property is being taken by condemnation can appear in his own behalf as a layman or as I could or any other Member who is not a lawyer. But, certainly, it seems to me when we cut down on the commission to this extent, we are, in effect, forcing the landowner to come into the district court and he must be represented by counsel, and the expenses of a court trial by jury more than offsets the cost of the commission. Does not the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. ROONEY. No, I do not agree with the gentleman's conclusion.

Mr. AVERY. Is there any evidence in the hearings—I cannot find in the hearings any evidence to support that figure at all. All I can find is that there are 9,000 more condemnation cases pending than there were a year ago. Now you are going to cut off the commission.

Mr. ROONEY. I should like to say to my distinguished friend that nobody has complained about this except the gentleman from Kansas. I just do not understand his approach to this subject. Certainly, the taxpayers have an interest in it. Certainly, it is the obligation of the Department of Justice to do things in a legal and reasonable way. The committee is following the Department of Justice, and for that matter the committee is following the majority opinion of the judiciary. We are going to take their advice rather than the advice of lawyers who are interested in making a commissioner's fee.

Mr. AVERY. It seems to me you are doing just the opposite by forcing all the owners into court where they will have to hire an attorney. I can speak from experience in the State of Kansas. The commissioners have not only saved the Government the cost of a trial, but they have permitted the landowners to retain for themselves the allowance that was made for their property rather than have to pay the cost of counsel from their readjustment. Unless there is more evidence than I can find in the hearings I certainly do not believe this limitation is realistic; I do not believe it is fair to the unwilling seller in condemnation proceedings.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY] whether or not he went through the hearings on this subject last year when the language was first inserted in the Department of Justice appropriation bill?

Mr. AVERY. In a general sort of way I did. I know the prohibition was in there last year so we could have no commissions.

Mr. ROONEY. If the gentleman will get last year's hearings and read the testimony, he will find a full explanation of the deplorable situation that arose and which caused the Department of Justice to ask the subcommittee for the restrictive language.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if a reasonable amount of money has been appropriated to the State Department for the travel of attachés and representatives of this country abroad in the proper dispatch of their duties?

Mr. ROONEY. I can advise the distinguished gentleman from California that for the current fiscal year the estimate for travel for the Department of State was in the amount of $8,442,000. The request for the coming year was $9,938,000, or almost $10 million.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. The only reason I asked this question is that I had occasion to visit the 11th Annual Astronautical Congress in Stockholm last year. While there my attention was called to a situation that I thought was unwarranted, where the scientific attaché for the United States and his staff were limited in annual travel to $700. The scientific attaché in our ministry at Stockholm covers all the Nordic countries, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland. He is in a position where he can perform a great duty. He is in a situation where he can learn scientific information seeping out under the Iron Curtain. When we send a competent man there I think we owe him sufficient means to enable him to perform his duty adequately such as visiting the countries to which he is assigned.

I want the RECORD to show that this man did not approach me; neither did the minister. Certain scientists who were at this conference, sent there by this Government, mentioned the situation to me. I mentioned it in my report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics. I am happy to know that something more nearly appropriate, although it may not be the full amount that should be given, has been allowed, and I am hopeful that there is sufficient money this year to correct the situation which has existed up to this time, which has been intolerable.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am a supporter of the USIA program. I believe in its efficiency. I am not patient over picayunish criticism, but I do not believe that where there is a waste of the taxpayers' money it should go unnoticed and I wish to commend the great chairman and the membership of this subcommittee in calling our attention to the fact that an American actress was sent abroad participating in a play in English in South America, and I think in Europe, and was paid $2,500 a week.

I listened to the moving address of the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] when she was driving home the truth that if this great Nation of ours is to be saved for future service to mankind there must be a rededication of Americans to the old-fashioned principles of Americanism. That means selfless giving of themselves, not by a few, but by all, a joint giving of time and effort and means to attain the goal of our destiny and hold strong the fortress of freedom.

I think of these young men and women, and older people too, who are going abroad in the Peace Corps to work, not for glory and for money, but as humble laborers in the vineyards of freedom.

Then I read in the committee report that an American actress, a great actress, went abroad to spread American culture and American traditions, and I presume American appreciation of the drama, not with a spirit of dedication but for $2,500 a week. I do not like that and I do not think the American people like it.

We have a wholesome respect for culture, for the arts and for the theater, but when a great actress thinks not of her country or what she can do for her country but of what her country can do for her and accepts $2,500 a week of the taxpayers' money for her contribution to better world understanding I think the taxpayers of the United States have a perfect right to question. I do not think the taxpayers like that.

Those taxpayers include many of my constituents who have not the money to pay the admission price to a legitimate theater. What do they think of $2,500 a week of their money going to pay an American actress to go to South America, appearing in a play in English in countries where the little people, the people we want to reach and to restore to them the old image of Uncle Sam, do not speak English?

I commend the great chairman and the members of the subcommittee for calling attention to this, and expressing their disapproval. It is something that I cannot condone, and I would expect my constituents who send me to Congress as their voice to disown me if I did not speak up. However much we appreciate

the theater, however much we give homage to our outstanding actors and actresses we have a right to expect them, when they go on foreign missions, to go in the spirit of the Peace Corps, of the missionaries and of the men and women in our Foreign Service, many of whom make willing sacrifice of the comforts they enjoyed at home, most of whom receive salaries barely sufficient to meet their expenses, and none of whom, including our ambassadors, receive as much in 1 month as was paid to this actress for 1 week of hard work spreading the American gospel in English in lands where only those in the upper crust understand English.

Mr. Chairman, I have the confidence that Mr. Murrow, for whom, as a commentator, I had the greatest admiration and who I believe knows people, will not continue the former practice of trying to sell in foreign lands the image of good old Uncle Sam by employing $2,500 a week salesmen. I am afraid men and women in lands where they work hard all year round and seldom, if ever, total a thousand dollars in pay for a year's work, will get the wrong idea of us.

I now turn to a pleasanter subject. During the general debate the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] made some comments concerning the foreign travel of officials of the executive branch. It so happens that today I received a letter from a constituent, Goldy G. Abraham, 5326 Cornell Avenue, Chicago, who has just returned from a visit in Brazil. I quote:

> Secretary of the Treasury Dillon was at the Hotel Trocadero, where I was stopping, and later in Brasilia. He surely was working like a beaver. I never saw a man so busy, racing around, even reading typed sheets while he ate, such a tight schedule he had, so evident from what I saw and heard.

I am happy that my constituent could see firsthand that when representatives of this administration go on foreign missions it is work, work, work. I am strictly nonpartisan in this, more so perhaps than my dear friend from Ohio was in his remarks, since Mr. Dillon was also in the last administration in a high post of authority.

Mr. Chairman, I always shall regard hard work, loyalty, humility, and self-abnegation as the most precious of American attributes. Most of our people possess those virtues. When we project them in foreign lands we project the real image of Uncle Sam. A member of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, working like a beaver, studying his papers while he ate, running at top speed from one appointment to another, all without ostentation or showoff, just an ordinary man bending to do a hard day's work, projects the real image. If he were doing it at a stipend of $2,500 a week the image would be destroyed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to complete the listing of the clubs, just to keep the record straight, in the clubby United Nations.

I am not sure where I left off when my time expired, but there is a recreation council, a riding club, a skating club, a ski club, soccer club, softball club, a stamp club, and a Taichi gymnastic club. There is a telephone for tax information. I do not know how interested the employees of the United Nations are in taxes since they are relieved of paying Federal income taxes. There is a tennis club and a worldwide club, and a telephone for who's who in the U.N., as if they do not know. It is inconceivable that each of these clubs, listed here and earlier in my remarks, should have a separate telephone, and assume there is someone to answer it.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] speaks of an actress who was paid $2,500 a week by this Government and sent abroad. I agree with him in his denunciation of this raid on our taxpayers.

But my question is, Who in this outfit sent her abroad? Who is responsible for her; how did she get that way?

That is my complaint with this bill. It is full of waste and worse. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and others have done a good job this year, as in the past, in bringing out in the hearings a lot of the skulduggery that goes on in connection with this waste of the taxpayers' money.

But this has been going on year after year and year after year, and somehow or other it appears that it is going to go on until the end of time unless somebody does something about it.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I commend my distinguished friend for all that he does and tries to do to save money, but to answer the gentleman's question a little earlier, the money from which the $2,500 a week was taken to pay the actress is the President's own special fund, and this particular lady was picked by the previous President, Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to my friend from Florida that does not make it a bit more palatable to me. I do not care whose administration she was picked in. I want to get at those who are wasting the substance of the citizens of this country and I care not whether they are Eisenhowers, Kennedys, their hirelings, or who they are. It is time to put a stop to it. All we have been doing is slapping them on the wrist. If you read these hearings you will find this thing is shot through with the hiring of consultants, with the establishment of more commissions, more consultants and advisers to decide how to spend more money.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Just to keep the record straight, these plays were sent to Europe under the auspices of the American National Theater and Academy. There is a committee in the academy that chooses these plays. Now, you ask why these things do not stop. It is just like stepping on a balloon. You keep stepping on one end and they sprout out some place else. It is about time, and I agree with the gentleman, that we stop doing some of these things. If you check the record, they are now planning to send jazz combo teams to Africa at a cost of about $200,000 next year.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I am talking about. I would like to vote for some items in this bill, but I cannot, under the circumstances, vote for any of it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I, too, want to join our friends on the majority side in commending the gentleman for the valuable work he has performed in pointing out these things, but I also want to point out that when it comes to a vote, too few vote with him.

Mr. GROSS. You are right about that. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I do not know whether the gentleman happened to see some of these plays that were picked by whatever President may have been responsible—and I agree with you it does not make any difference what President was elected—and a lot of them ought to be eliminated, but if the gentleman happened to see some of these plays that were sent over, it was a disgrace to have those things go over as representative of American culture and the American theater.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder what happened to old Tom Two Arrows. They used to send him all around the world.

Mr. ROONEY. We were not able to find him in the woodwork this time.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if there is any money in this bill—and I hope his answer will be in the negative—for the hiring of psychiatrists and psychologists to examine people.

Mr. ROONEY. Well, I expect that there is some money in this bill for that purpose. I am thinking now of the Department of Justice, the Bureau of Prisons.

Mr. GROSS. I refer to the USIA, the United Nations, and the State Department.

Mr. ROONEY. The gentleman will notice on page 17 of the committee report this language:

> The request for $172,711 for psychiatric and psychological examination of applicants and their wives has been denied.

Now, that money has been denied USIA for the reason that the Department of State, which is the parent or senior organization, does not have any such program, and the committee felt that there was no necessity for such a program in the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How much did they

spend for this purpose before you put a stop to it?

Mr. ROONEY. Some $60,000, in round figures, in the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. And they went out and hired psychiatrists?

Mr. ROONEY. We furnished all of that information in the printed hearings, the names of the psychiatrists and the amounts they received.

Mr. GROSS. Despite the fact that there are scores of psychiatrists and psychologists already on the payroll of the Government?

Mr. ROONEY. I am getting to the point where I am beginning to believe that the medical office down in the State Department is getting so large and costly, that examinations of State Department and Foreign Service personnel could just as well be handled by the Navy at Bethesda or the Army at Walter Reed.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 4,

REPRESENTATION ALLOWANCES

For representation allowances as authorized by section 901 of the Foreign Service Act of 1946 (22 U.S.C. 1131), $925,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS of Iowa: "On page 4, line 7, strike out the figure '$925,000' and insert '$400,000.'"

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is the item described as representation allowance when it is spent abroad and "entertainment allowance" when it is spent in this country. It is also known as a tool of the trade, or part of the tools of the trade. It is known by various titles; but when you shake it all down, apparently most of it is for cocktail parties. Considering the condition of the Federal Treasury, there ought to be substantial reduction in this allowance to the State Department, and a saving to the taxpayers. This can be done without injury to the United States. Mr. Chairman, I would strike out the entire $925,000 but for this year I am willing to phase it out. I contend that $400,000 is more than adequate for the State Department to spend on liquor and entertainment in 1 year. The gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] calls this sort of thing "greasing the wheels." The State Department can grease a lot of wheels for $400,000. I yield back the balance of my time and hope the committee will adopt my amendment.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is the usual amendment offered each year by the gentleman from Iowa. This has been going on for many, many years now. We used to have it offered by the dearly respected and beloved gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Ed Rees. He always offered such an amendment. Then the opposition to this particular item was inherited by our dear friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

This amount is not all for liquor; everybody here understands that. And I am sure everybody understands that the committee has cut the item as far as it could with reasonableness. Everybody understands that entertainment is a necessary prerequisite to diplomatic relations. We have it in every branch of activities in the world today. I am sure that this Committee, the Committee of the Whole, will sustain the unanimous judgment of the subcommittee and of the full Committee on Appropriations. Accordingly, the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] should be rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, whenever the consideration of these bills is before the committee always it is admitted, directly or indirectly, by majority members that some of these sums are not needed. Just listened to my very good friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] speak about the actress and the compensation she received. We heard other arguments condemning unnecessary spending.

But the voters are for continued wasteful appropriations. Home folks should watch the votes—rather than listen to the talks.

Just for once is it not possible to go along with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], as evidence not only of our good will, but of our sincerity. We acknowledge the soundness of his criticism—why not try to agree with him? Every time one of these bills comes in, Members on our side and Members on the other side commend the gentleman for his diligence, for the care he takes, and the work he does to bring these items before us. Member after Member rises and praises him for what he is doing and indicates he agrees with him, but when it comes to a vote a majority drops into line at the crack of the party whip, and on our side because it seems politically expedient at the moment.

Oh for a little courage to do the thing we know should be done.

As long as we are spreading good will all over the world, why not just now as an illustration that we have a little good will at home for a right thinking colleague go along with him and cut this appropriation, so we can tell our folks at home that once, at least, we agree with the economy advocates here in the House and will just once at least vote as we talk.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Is it not possible that this representation allowance does more good abroad than the high-priced actress did?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That may be, but is either worth the cost? I can get along here as a Member without drinking and the cocktail parties, and if I can the people who are abroad can. Have we forgotten that just a few days ago we gave the President authority to delegate authority to the State Department to fix the amount which these people who serve with the State Department should receive for expenses? As long as that is the policy, let the President, if he approves of it, fix the amount they shall spend for entertainment, not throw the responsibility back on us. The State Department does the entertaining, let it assume the responsibility—no reason why we should add an amount for entertaining to an appropriation bill. Our constituents do not believe in many of these things called entertainment. If there is to be responsibility let it rest on the administration or the State Department and not upon our shoulders when poor folks in the States whose people do not appreciate so much high-toned silk hat drinking and carousing are called upon to pay the bill. Many a wage earner, many a farmer, many a businessman can eat his supper called dinner by the State Department without a cocktail.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Evidently the administration has already given its approval to this. Remember the Palm Beach meeting?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; and I have not forgotten that one the other day. Think of it and apply it to your own business. Our constituents are going to do that. Let me state it again, we authorized the State Department, by giving the authority to the President and authorizing him to delegate it to the State Department, to let the folks in the State Department fix their own allowances for what they eat and drink and what entertainment they get. Did you ever hear of such a silly procedure? Leave it to me to fix my salary and I might ask the Government, "How much have you," and then demand "Give me $100 more than you have."

True we fix our own allowances but if we take too much the home folks will say, "We do not need you any more."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GROSS) there were—ayes 33, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES CITIZENS COMMISSION ON NATO

For necessary expenses of the United States Citizens Commission on NATO, to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1960 (74 Stat. 818), including hire of passenger motor vehicles; and printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the Act of March 1, 1919 (44 U.S.C. 111); $125,000, of which not to exceed $1,500 may be expended for entertainment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS of Iowa: "On page 7, strike out all of lines 21 through 25 and on page 8, strike all of lines 1 through 3."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I will only take a minute on this amendment.

This amendment strikes out $1,500 for entertainment for the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO. I offer this amendment because this sort of thing is creeping into every appropriation for advisory groups, advisory boards, and commissions. It is time to call a halt.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Do I understand that the gentleman's amendment strikes out the entire provision or just that particular portion?

Mr. GROSS. This strikes out the whole appropriation for the U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO because I am convinced this outfit provides no useful service. I cannot think of a better place for the taxpayers to save $125,000 than on this junketing organization.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment

Mr. Chairman, the so-called U.S. Citizens Commission for NATO was authorized by the Congress of the United States as recently as last September. The Congress authorized appropriations for its activities to the extent of $300,000. One hundred and fifty thousand dollars of this money was previously provided by the House of Representatives in the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1961. The gentleman from Iowa now seeks to vitiate all the proceedings with regard to this NATO Citizens Commission which passed the House last September by an overwhelming vote. This is not the way to do things. This committee took into consideration that, perhaps, the request was a bit too high and, therefore, reduced the amount to the extent of $25,000. I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: "On page 8, lines 2 and 3, strike all after the semicolon."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, being a realist I understand——

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment now offered by the gentleman from Michigan is the same in effect as that which was offered by the gentleman from Iowa and just defeated.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the point of order comes too late. The gentleman from Michigan had been recognized and started to speak.

The CHAIRMAN. While the point of order does come too late, the amendment does strike out language different from that stricken out by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The amendment is not the same as that offered by the gentleman from Iowa. This was intended to strike out the $1,500 for entertainment. That was all.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. BOW. As the amendment was originally offered it said "after the semicolon strike out" which would be after the $125,000, would strike out the $1,500. I want to be clear; are we striking out the $125,000 or the $1,500?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Perhaps I wrote "semicolon." It should have been "the comma."

Mr. BOW. That would be the comma after the figures $125,000?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is right. The amendment I offered was intended to apply only to the $1,500, for entertainment, that is all.

To please my friend from New York I will not argue the proposition. I heard a long, long time ago that a certain place was paved with good intentions. While that may not have been said with reference to the House I understand our intentions may be—just may be—good but we fail to follow our words with acts—votes—which carry out the expressed thought, talk economy but vote for every spending measure which comes before us.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. HARDY. Is it the gentleman's intent to use the entire $125,000 for this purpose?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I was only trying to strike out the $1,500 item.

Mr. HARDY. The gentleman from Iowa wanted to strike out the entertainment fund.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know and he did not get enough votes. All I am asking is to give us something to take back home, if we vote for this amendment, and win we can tell our people that once at least we voted to save them money, even though it was only $1,500—a grain of sand out of a hundred mile long sandy beach.

Mr. HARDY. After the semicolon it would be $125,000; after the comma, $1,500.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

International educational exchange activities

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to enable the Department of State to carry out international educational exchange activities, as authorized by the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1431–1479), and the Act of August 9, 1939 (22 U.S.C. 501), and to administer the programs authorized by section 32(b)(2) of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 1641(b)), the Act of August 24, 1949 (20 U.S.C. 222–224), and the Act of September 29, 1950 (20 U.S.C. 225), including salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801–1158); hire of passenger motor vehicles; entertainment within the United States (not to exceed $1,000); services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; $27,000,000, of which not less than $6,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $1,650,000 may be used for administrative expenses during the current fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from New York why this $1,000 for entertainment? Why is it necessary that this International Educational Exchange Activities group have $1,000 to spend for that purpose?

Mr. ROONEY. The purpose of that $1,000 is to give a lunch or luncheons to groups of foreign students who come here under the educational exchange program. This is the same matter that has been discussed between the gentleman from Iowa and I on previous occasions. This is the item where they originally requested $5,000, but a majority of the committee saw fit to cut it to $1,000, the same amount they have for this purpose in the current year.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will permit a personal reference, from the tone of the gentleman's voice I would say this is a soft touch.

Mr. ROONEY. I am very sympathetic toward this particular item.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: How did the amount get in here without some representation allowance for the International Fisheries Commission?

Here is one Commission that has been left out in the cold without any money for cocktail parties.

Mr. ROONEY. Is the learned gentleman suggesting that this very liberal spending committee outdid itself and appropriated money for entertainment where it was not requested? I cannot believe it.

Mr. GROSS. Then I notice there is an appropriation for referees, court referees.

Mr. ROONEY. That item is further on in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. I assume this will take care of the increasing number of bankruptcies in this country. I wanted to be sure there was no liquor allowance or entertainment fund for the bankruptcy referees.

Mr. ROONEY. No. I am quite sure that entertainment for referees at taxpayers' expense would be utterly illegal. There is no money for such a purpose in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. On page 34, I notice under international programs, special for-

eign currency program, there is $1,250 for representation. Why is it necessary to entertain to deal with a foreign currency program? Does this outfit deal with money, or what is the story?

Mr. ROONEY. That is $1,250 worth of wooden dollars. These are foreign currencies that are in the U.S. Treasury. They are included here in connection with their use at trade fairs, worldwide. Surely the gentleman does not think that $1,250 worth of these foreign currencies is too much for this purpose?

Mr. GROSS. I could not help but wonder about a cocktail party, or two or three, in connection with this special foreign currency program. We have to entertain in order to talk about the billions we have sent abroad; is that it?

Mr. ROONEY. When our representatives attend these international trade affairs abroad, these American businessmen we have heard about over the years, they must sit down with their counterparts from the participating nations and perhaps have a bit of schnapps and a hotdog, or something like that. This may be hard on the digestive tract but there is nothing unlawful about it.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his schnapps and hotdogs.

Mr. ROONEY. This is a modest amount for this purpose.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE ACTIVITIES (SPECIAL FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

For purchase of foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by sections 104(h), 104(j), 104(k), 104(o), and 104(p) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, as amended, to remain available until expended, $6,600,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be used for the purchase of currencies available in the Treasury for the purposes of section 104(f) of such Act unless such currencies are excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not quite sure just why this time is taken. No more than the committee is sure of the need of some of these appropriations, but I want to show my support of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], who works so hard in the interests of the taxpayer. I wish to go along with him in trying to save the taxpayers some money.

Here is this $1,000 for entertainment. The gentleman asked about that. Why?

A few days ago the gentleman was telling about the patronage some of the foreign exchange students were giving a certain business enterprise here in Washington. Did the gentleman learn from the hearings whether any of this $1,000 will go, and if so how far it will go, in providing the entertainment and what kind of entertainment the students are to receive?

Mr. GROSS. That did not call for a representation allowance. That was dealing with a house of assignation up here in Northwest Washington.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of what is this entertainment to consist? Do you know what it is to be or who is to do the entertaining?

Mr. GROSS. That was catering to foreign exchange students.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Something is said here about educational exchange activities.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that what the gentleman was referring to the other day?

Mr. GROSS. According to the story in the newspaper, it did not say anything about a representation allowance or about cocktails.

This was another item, another kind of activity involving foreign exchange students.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is the gentleman trying to get home to our constituents the point that when we are appropriating money for these various activities we also have to provide entertainment so they will accept them?

Mr. GROSS. Well, I am intrigued by this thing, because we pay these students $5, $6, and $7 a day plus tuition plus transportation to this country, and I am interested in it for that reason. Then we find them up here involved in a bawdy house deal or house of assignation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That was just a few of them.

Mr. GROSS. Well, I do not know how far it goes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I may differ with you once, I would say I do not think we ought to characterize all of them that way; just here and there may be one. The point you are trying to make and I am trying to support is that we want our home folks to know that we are not in favor of appropriations for the entertainment of all those who participate in any of these activities; is that not it?

Mr. GROSS. That is about right.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The people will know if they hear or read what the gentleman says.

The Clerk read as follows:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, ANTITRUST DIVISION

For expenses necessary for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws $5,500,000: *Provided*, That none of this appropriation shall be expended for the establishment and maintenance of permanent regional offices of the Antitrust Division.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct an inquiry to some of the committee members in regard to the salaries and expenses, general legal activities, particularly in regard to the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section within the Department of Justice. I understand, as appears on page 136 that the Attorney General has requested an increase in that appropriation above the present $1.8 million of $540,000; that the objective of it is to beef up the present existing organization which started as of March 1, 1961, when there were 12 attorneys assigned to the Area Coordination Unit of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section in the Department of Justice and 26 attorneys in the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section on March 1, 1961; that 5 have been transferred from the Internal Security Division and 2 from the Civil Rights Division and 5 from the trial staff of the Criminal Section. I understand, as appears on page 107 of the committee hearings, there is a proposal to provide for 16 additional attorneys; is that correct, in this special Anticrime, Anti-Racketeering division in the Department of Justice? I understand further that the concept is to set this Division up under a Criminal Division, under the new head of the Criminal Division, the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Miller, and therefore the Attorney General will have available at his disposal in addition to the present 26, some 16 additional special investigators or attorneys who will have the responsibilities assigned to them by the Attorney General. Is that my understanding, I ask the gentleman?

Mr. ROONEY. My attention was diverted for just a moment here at the committee table. The last I heard the gentleman ask was whether or not there were 16 additional attorneys.

Mr. CRAMER. Yes.

Mr. ROONEY. Yes, that is my understanding, 16 attorneys here in Washington split up into four geographic areas, and there will be 27 attorneys who would form a mobile force to move into a district where there might be pending a prosecution against one of the big named racketeers or hoodlums.

Mr. CRAMER. This $540,000 then adds about 16 additional personnel; is that correct?

Mr. ROONEY. No; it will add more personnel than that.

Mr. CRAMER. Twenty-seven or twenty-eight; is that correct, additional personnel?

Mr. ROONEY. That information is right here in the printed hearings.

Mr. BOW. With regard to the assignment of their responsibilities——

Mr. CRAMER. Reading from page 107, I see there are going to be 16 attorneys who will concentrate on reviewing the work product of all the interested Federal investigative agencies who are going to place added emphasis in stepped-up programs of criminal law enforcement, and submit data on known criminals on a continuing, up-to-date basis.

Also, 27 attorneys working out of the Division will form a mobile force which can be dispatched to a particular trouble area in the field to take charge of the investigation and prosecution of notorious criminals.

Therefore, there is an increase of 43 attorneys. Does anyone know how many are presently in this unit, carried over from the previous administration? There will be 43 new ones. How many have we had here before? As I understand it, the budget was about $1.8 million for this same purpose for last year.

Mr. ROONEY. Referring to page 110 of the hearings, it is my understanding that the 16 attorneys referred to by the gentleman from Florida, in addition to 14 more, make 30 additional attorneys who would be engaged in this Anti-Racketeering unit.

Mr. CRAMER. I understand that there is a substantial beefing up of this program. I am wholeheartedly in favor of a special unit properly set up for the purpose of investigating organized crime. As a matter of fact, I have introduced some legislation which is pending before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 6909 which, under title 1, sets up legislatively a unit and gives the Congress some control over it. That is the reason I raise the question. There is nothing in this bill—and obviously there could not be because it would be legislation on an appropriation bill if there were—to limit or to describe or to proscribe the activities of these 43 new attorneys that the Attorney General has suggested.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] has expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER].

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

I wonder if the chairman could indicate whether this is correct. Is it not true that there is no limiting or descriptive language anywhere in any authorizing legislation with regard to the activity of this Investigating Unit so far as the Attorney General's use of it is concerned? In other words, he can use it for any investigative purpose he sees fit, either investigations of organized crime, or anything else.

Mr. ROONEY. The Attorney General may use it only in accordance with the law of the land. And he may use it only for the purposes for which he requested the funds, against organized crime and racketeering.

The gentleman a while ago inquired with regard to the number of employees. That information is to be found at page 115 of the printed hearings. There are 47 additional people included in this $540,000 increase. Thirty of them are attorneys and the rest are clerical. The grades are set forth on that page.

Mr. CRAMER. How many are presently in the unit?

Mr. ROONEY. The present unit is the Criminal Division and the Criminal Division has been in existence for many years.

Mr. CRAMER. I mean this special organized crime group. There are 47 additional personnel requested.

Mr. ROONEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. How many were in it before?

Mr. ROONEY. This was put together with the regular funds of the Criminal Division. The extra funds for the superduper antiracketeering outfit we had for 2 years, and this additional $540,000.

Mr. CRAMER. If we are to have 47 additional employees with this $540,000 and we had $1.8 million before that, then we have many people working in this special division.

Mr. ROONEY. This is highly important work.

Mr. CRAMER. I realize that, but I would still like to know how many investigators there are and what their duties shall be.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with my distinguished colleague from Florida [Mr. CRAMER], with regard to the control of this group's activities. That is one of the things I pointed out in general debate that gave me concern. Of course, we are all anxious to make a fight against hoodlums and gangsters. There is no question about that. But to provide a mobile unit that can take over investigation and prosecution any place, under any circumstances, is a dangerous thing to put in the hands of anyone. I do not care who he is or to what party he belongs. I think the gentleman is correct. I think perhaps there should be some legislation which would take care of that; for us to put in this bill what they should or should not do would have made it subject to a point of order, for this committee has no right to write legislation into an appropriation bill.

Mr. CRAMER. That is the point I was trying to make. I thank the gentleman for clarifying it, because it is my opinion you are making this money available for this number of people, 47 new ones, and we do not know how many presently. There is no assurance Congress will have any control over it as to how this money or the personnel will be used or how the authority will be used. The Attorney General's group in this area which is a continuation of the special Antiracketeering Unit appointed under the Eisenhower administration known as the Wessel group should have their activities spelled out in authorizing legislation so that the personnel would not be dissipated and so that the personnel would be used expressly and exclusively to make this very important fight. That is the reason I introduced the bill as it is presently being considered by the Committee on the Judiciary, H.R. 6909, that would circumscribe and define the responsibilities and even give them new and specific responsibilities in assimilating information and in coordination with the local law enforcement officials in fighting organized crime.

Mr. BOW. So far as the Wessel group is concerned, I have put into the RECORD their accomplishments, which in my opinion do not make very good reading. I believe there have been some errors made by the Wessel group.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield so that I may have an opportunity to answer the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY. First I would like to get the record straight in regard to the number of employees. There are presently 180 in the Criminal Division. The instant bill would add the 47 positions the gentleman from Florida referred to a while ago, for a total of 227. This Criminal Division will handle all criminal matters including the fight against organized crime and racketeering. The gentleman mentioned the Wessel group. If he will read the testimony of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover——

Mr. CRAMER. I have read it and disagree with it. The Wessel group made recommendations to set up a permanent organized crime-fighting unit—and that is sound—and supposedly is what we are voting money for today under the new administration as well as the old.

Mr. ROONEY. And others who worked in investigative work with Mr. Wessel and his superduper group you will find that Wessel and his group did more harm than good, and wasted almost a million dollars of the taxpayers' money on the Apalachin case alone. The Wessel group broke down morale in the Department of Justice and should have been supervised by and under the orders of the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division. I hope such a situation never comes about again.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 9 of the report, down near the bottom of the page, occur these words:

> This increase will provide the $540,000 requested in House Document No. 101, dated March 6, 1961, to provide additional staff in the Criminal Division to combat more effectively increasing lawlessness and to coordinate Government-wide efforts against crime.

It is a pleasure to have an opportunity to commend the Attorney General for his effort to convict a few more racketeers and criminals. He is an able, earnest young man and when ripened by experience may be an effective power for good. You cannot always go along with him on everything. For instance, when he sends some say 400, some say 800, U.S. marshals into Alabama, to protect those who went down knowing there was violence awaiting them, his act seems to support those people who go down there to create trouble, to incite rioting. Do not misstate my position. The visit of the troublemakers was lawful in one respect. In another it was not, but it should not have been met by violence. Violence cannot always be anticipated. In Washington we had seven assaults and rapes in 6 days. Did we hear of U.S. marshals being called out? We did not.

Under the first amendment I have the legal right to say what I wish to say, but if I use unparliamentary language, here in the committee the Chairman will call me to order and I will have to quit it. If I should continue the Sergeant at Arms would probably throw me out.

When those freedom riders traveled to Alabama, what did they go for? Just to gain publicity? To establish a principle, or just to make trouble? I do not know. If the newspapers would not print their names maybe they would quit going. Assume they wished to assert a right—establish a precedent. One would have been as effective as 10; and why a mixed racial group? Why girls as well as boys? When freedom riders go down there first advertising their purpose they expected to create a riot. Some think if they did not, some would be disappointed. It does not seem quite fair to send U.S. marshals to Alabama to back them up.

I know the Attorney General wants those freedom riders to lay off for a while. I certainly hope they do. But they refuse to listen to that good advice. If they do not change their methods, which caused trouble, I hope the Attorney General will not give them any more official support. No doubt the Alabama authorities and people will permit them to make themselves look silly.

At the President's hometown of Middleburg, one Negro was served. That was the apparent end. We have read of no other visits to the eating places.

When you get to hiring new and more attorneys, as has been suggested, say yes. If I could get the ear of the Attorney General, I would suggest that he hire a few backwoods or city experienced trial attorneys who have been engaged in trial practice, a few attorneys who have prosecuted drunks and chicken thieves, and who, as the Attorney General himself in his book "The Danger Within" pointed out, if they are to prosecute for the Justice Department, would pay attention to some of the information given them.

You remember, I think it was Hoffa who was acquitted because the U.S. attorney prosecuting the case fixed the wrong date through the statements from the McClellan committee and the trial brief gave him the right date. They went ahead and tried that case on an indictment which charged the offense was committed on a certain date—which was not the correct date, when all they had to do was read that report and get the right date. Read Bob Kennedy's criticism of the district attorney in "The Enemy Within," page 318, et seq. Another thing, as long as the Attorney General is after the racketeers, I would like to see him start a little on Reuther who used so much illegal violence in Wisconsin in the Kohler strike. The McClellan Committee did a wonderful job but it did not do a complete job. There was presented to them evidence, including papers and documents, which showed that for years—now get that—for 16 or more years, and the UAW-CIO spent $12 million in that Kohler strike, Reuther under Mazey's advice and acting on that advice hired known criminals to cross State lines, go to Wisconsin and violate the law in some four hundred specific instances. On pages 277-278 of his book Bob Kennedy admits that the UAW—that is, Reuther and Mazey, and their goons—"must accept the major share of the responsibility" for what he called "mistakes" and he wrote the "record showed some eight hundred instances of violence threats, telephone calls, 75 percent of which had been directed against the non-strikers." Has he done anything about that? Does he get after Reuther for that? But when less than 50 freedom riders invade Dixie he rushes hundreds of U.S. marshals South to protect them. Why? As long as the Attorney General is after the racketeers and as long as they are so concerned about what is happening down in Alabama and in the Southern States, why do they not take some action against individuals like Reuther—the same Reuther, you remember, who wants us to bail out these prisoners down in Cuba? Does Reuther's sympathy, so-called, grow out of his training in Russia? Do you get the point? Let us not have so much discrimination in prosecutions. There is no question about the situation I have disclosed to you. It is all a matter of record. You will find support for every word of it in Kennedy's book and in the McClellan hearings if you want to go into the exhibits. Why not prosecute Reuther? Is it because Reuther supported the President during the campaign? If the President owes any obligation or did owe it, I say it has been paid a dozen times over and it is about time now that they forget this favorable discrimination and give him the same dose that they gave those guilty of violence in Alabama.

The law-abiding people of Kohler, Wis., were not protected from Reuther's goons, but the freedom riders, when their rights are ignored, get, on the orders of Atty. Gen. Robert Kennedy, the President's brother, at least 400—say 800—U.S. marshals and Whizzer White, Bob's representative, for their protection. You name the reason for the "discrimination."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said here concerning the amount of money being allocated to the Department of Justice to enforce the law. It has been brought out by the gentleman from Florida that there are approximately 43 additional personnel in the criminal division of the Department of Justice to enforce the Federal law. I believe the Attorney General requested the Committee on Appropriations for additional sums to get at the racketeering crimes. It is the desire of the Attorney General to stamp out the syndicate.

Congress is now considering at least three separate bills as requested by the administration. The gentleman from Florida recognized the need and the necessity for laws to be passed in this area. He introduced what he calls an omnibus bill which incorporates the three separate bills. These bills relate to traveling in interstate commerce and carrying on a business for the purpose of violating the laws of a particular State. It is just that simple. That is the need and that is the request. It is based upon our passing a law that will give them sufficient authority to move into this area where the racketeers move from State to State and where the racketeers are going into interstate commerce in violation not only of the Federal law but in violation of the State law. With the requested number here he hopes to eliminate crimes of racketeering. For that reason I feel that any criticism is not of failure to do anything but a request to go ahead and carry out the duties assigned to him as Attorney General of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

United States Information Agency

Salaries and Expenses

For expenses necessary to enable the United States Information Agency, as authorized by Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, and the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.), to carry out international information activities, including employment, without regard to the civil service and classification laws, of (1) persons on a temporary basis (not to exceed $120,000), (2) aliens within the United States, and (3) aliens abroad for service in the United States relating to the translation or narration of colloquial speech in foreign languages (such aliens to be investigated for such employment in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary of State and the Attorney General); travel expenses of aliens employed abroad for service in the United States and their dependents to and from the United States; salaries, expenses, and allowances of personnel and dependents as authorized by the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (22 U.S.C. 801-1158); entertainment within the United States not to exceed $500; hire of passenger motor vehicles; insurance on official motor vehicles in foreign countries; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); payment of tort claims, in the manner authorized in the first paragraph of section 2672, as amended, of title 28 of the United States Code when such claims arise in foreign countries; advance of funds notwithstanding section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; dues for library membership in organizations which issue publications to members only, or to members at a price lower than to others; employment of aliens, by contract, for service abroad; purchase of ice and drinking water abroad; payment of excise taxes on negotiable instruments abroad; cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Director may prescribe; actual expenses of preparing and transporting to their former homes the remains of persons, not United States Government employees, who may die away from their homes while participating in activities authorized under this appropriation; radio activities and acquisition and production of motion pictures and visual materials and purchase or rental of technical equipment and facilities therefor, narration, scriptwriting, translation, and engineering services, by contract or otherwise; maintenance, improvement, and repair of properties used for information activities in foreign countries; fuel and utilities for Government-owned or leased property abroad; rental or lease for periods not exceeding five years of offices, buildings, grounds, and living quarters for officers and employees engaged in informational activities abroad; travel expenses for employees attending official international conferences, without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and to the rates of per diem allowances in lieu of subsistence expenses under the Travel Expense Act of 1949, but at rates not in excess of comparable allowances approved for such conferences by the Secretary of State; and purchase of objects for presentation to foreign governments, schools, or organizations; $110,000,000, of which not less than $14,000,000 shall be used to purchase foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the Treasury of the United States: *Provided*, That not to exceed $100,000 may be used for representation abroad: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for expenses in connection with travel of personnel outside the continental United States, including travel of dependents and transportation of personal effects, household goods, or automobiles of such personnel, when any part of such travel or transportation begins in the current fiscal year pursuant to travel orders issued in that year,

notwithstanding the fact that such travel or transportation may not be completed during the current year: *Provided further*, That passenger motor vehicles used abroad exclusively for the purposes of this appropriation may be exchanged or sold, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Act of June 30, 1949 (40 U.S.C. 481(c)), and the exchange allowances or proceeds of such sales shall be available for replacement of an equal number of such vehicles and the cost, including the exchange allowance of each such replacement, except buses and station wagons, shall not exceed $1,500: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 665), the United States Information Agency is authorized, in making contracts for the use of international shortwave radio stations and facilities, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the owners and operators of said radio stations and facilities from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose against loss or damage on account of injury to persons or property arising from such use of said radio stations and facilities: *Provided further*, That existing appointments and assignments to the Foreign Service Reserve for the purposes of foreign information and educational activities which expire during the current fiscal year may be extended for a period of one year in addition to the period of appointment or assignment otherwise authorized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 32, line 3, after the comma strike out the remainder of the line and all of line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is directed to the elimination of the $100,000 representation allowance appropriation for the U.S. Information Agency. I deem this to be unfair on two counts: In the first place, there is a new Director of the U.S. Information Agency, Mr. Murrow, and I doubt that he is experienced enough to spend $100,000 on cocktail parties. In the second place, on page 30 of the bill, I note that there is a $500 appropriation for entertainment for this same Agency within the United States. I think it is unfair to the distilleries of this country to appropriate only $500 for entertainment purposes within this country, yet spend $100,000 overseas for liquor to help the distillers of foreign countries.

I did not offer an amendment to the $500 item because that is a reasonably small amount of money; and, again, I think this Agency, as with others, should be taken off the bottles gradually.

I hope you will support the amendment, give the taxpayers a break, and save them this $100,000 that will otherwise go down the drain for liquor and entertainment.

Mr. Chairman, I could support certain provisions of this bill, but I cannot do so with the United Nations and various other international organizations being provided with money far beyond reason. I cannot support a bill that provides a single dime to support those people in the United Nations who are presently engaged in giving a million dollars or more to the blackmailing, chicken-picking Castro of Cuba. I am not going to vote for a dime in any appropriation bill to support people who now, in view of the fact that the United States has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba, support a Communist dictator who has resorted to blackmail. I am not going to vote for a bill that gives aid and comfort to Castro out of the pockets of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS.

Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that we have had before us many times in the past, offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS]. The bill has previously carried $90,000 out of a total request of $135,000 of USIA for representation allowances. This year we know that the Foreign Service has had to open posts, thereby causing the USIA to also open some new posts in countries in Africa. The extra $10,000 for this purpose over and above last year should cover this situation adequately. The committee has reduced this enough when it cut from $135,000 to the $100,000 to which the pending amendment is directed.

This money is necessary. If these people are to do the job that the Congress expects of them, they could adequately use every bit of this money and use it properly. I hope they do. I see no alternative but to go along and allow the amount of $100,000 as contained on page 32 of this bill.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask that the pending amendment of the gentleman from Iowa be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, during debate on H.R. 7371, relating to appropriations for the Department of Justice and other agencies, I attempted to secure information from the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], as to the number of additional personnel contemplated for the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, as well as information as to their proposed functions. I was informed that the additional $540,000 requested by the present Attorney General as a supplemental item will add some 47 additional investigators and prosecutors under the direct supervision of the Deputy Attorney General in the Criminal Division. I was not advised as to the number of investigators and prosecutors presently being used for this purpose although it appears in the record that there is about the same number—about 40 such employees. This would bring the force to about 90.

I, as sponsor of H.R. 6909, the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1961, which includes, under title I, a provision for the establishment of an Office on Syndicated Crime in the Department of Justice, am concerned that there is no existing legislative authority prescribing the duties and responsibilities of this investigating private police force of the Attorney General. The records of the hearings indicate the intention to use the investigators in the area of syndicated or organized criminal activity. This objective is one that must be accomplished and one for which I have been fighting for some time.

However, I am concerned that there is no authorizing legislation anywhere describing the duties of this private police force or giving specific responsibilities or powers to accomplish this worthy objective. It is for this reason that I am hopeful that the Judiciary Committee and the Congress will enact title I of my bill, H.R. 6909, which will specifically describe the duties of this unit, will permit the Attorney General to correlate intelligence information through the unit and make it available, under proper procedures, to State and local authorities, as well as Federal, and will also require the cooperation of other departments in acquiring the information concerning syndicated crime activity. Even with the provisions contained in this bill, past experience of this unit, which is being beefed up with additional personnel, has proven that it is only as effective as the willingness of other departments to cooperate with it. My bill would require such cooperation and assure its effectiveness. Under the proposal to simply increase the unit staff, intelligence information is not made available to State law enforcement authorities who are anxious to join in this fight against syndicated crime.

Of equal concern is the circumstance that this additional force of investigators and prosecutors can be used for any purpose, concerning any subject under the jurisdiction of the Department of Justice—meaning the violation of any criminal laws whether related to organized crime or not. Therefore, if the Attorney General needs additional help in other fields, there is nothing to prevent him, unless he considers himself morally bound by the presentation before the Appropriations Committee, from using these men for any purpose he wishes. This is a precedent which Congress should consider most seriously. Never before has Congress given an Attorney General a private police force beyond the control of Congress and without specific legislative limitations and duties.

For these reasons I am hopeful that my bill will be enacted.

In further support of this proposition and to indicate the need for such legislation, I am taking the liberty of including the remarks of Mr. Milton R. Wessel on this subject before the Boston Bar Association at its annual meeting on May 24, 1960. His address discusses in detail the need for such a unit on organized crime with proper duties spelled out legislatively. Likewise, it shows clearly that the duties of this group should be to ferret out the big operators in syndicated crime as meeting a very definite need. Mr. Wessel, of course, headed the Special Group on Organized Crime, under the direction of Attorney General William Rogers, which was later transferred into the present existent Organized Crime and Racketeering Unit.

The information contained in these remarks is of great concern to the Congress. It also shows the fine job done by Mr. Wessel in this field, which has incidentally been ratified by the new administration in the proposal of enlarging legislation for this unit. It is my hope that Mr. Wessel's further recommendation in calling for specific legislation to meet the specific need will be adopted:

PROSECUTION OF SYNDICATED CRIME

(Address of Milton R. Wessel, Boston Bar Association, Annual Meeting May 24, 1960)

I am delighted to have the opportunity to address this important bar association, and to solicit its support for more effective action against syndicated crime in our country.

Through no fault of the thousands of dedicated law enforcement officials in the United States, legal and geographic jurisdictional limitations keep syndicated crime enforcement back in the middle ages. In comparison, organized crime since World War II has adopted the technique of the atomic age. The result is that enforcement agencies are virtually powerless to control the crime syndicates which are thriving in our midst.

The U.S. Attorney General's Special Group on Organized Crime studied this problem for 21 months, collecting intelligence from enforcement units nationwide, seeking always for the reasons why prosecutive effort was ineffective.

We found that there was a vacuum in law enforcement activities insofar as syndicated crime was concerned.

We recommended that this vacuum be filled by the creation in the Department of Justice of an Office on Syndicated Crime, whose function would be to act as the nerve center and catalyst in a Federal-State-local unified prosecutive effort against syndicated crime.

This office would achieve its objective through:

1. Coordination of prosecutive effort.

2. Modernization of enforcement techniques.

3. Easing of access to criminal intelligence.

In its brief 21 months of life our temporary task force tested its conclusions, and proved by court prosecutions of over 100 persons that its conclusions are sound.

Let me discuss these three areas of necessary enforcement activity and show to you by our own experience what can be done if the proper tools are available.

COORDINATION OF PROSECUTIVE EFFORT

Our Apalachin conspiracy prosecution is the best example of what can be done when prosecutive effort is coordinated nationwide.

The Apalachin convictions are under appeal, scheduled to be argued June 9 in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. What I will say, however, has no bearing upon the merits of that appeal, for in my judgment the importance of the Apalachin case is its example of the true unified prosecutive effort, not in substantive legal theory or approach.

Let me refresh your recollections for a moment about the Apalachin meeting. It took place on a rainy Thursday in November 1957, less than 3 weeks after the brutal slaughter of gang leader Albert Anastasia in public in a barbershop, at a time when there was much concern about the future of profitable Caribbean gambling operations, and dispute about gambling concessions generally.

Seventy-five men came from all over the United States and Cuba to the wind-swept 57-acre estate of Joseph Barbara, Sr., located on an isolated hill in the little hamlet of Apalachin, N.Y. By coming from all over the United States, I mean just that—delegates from California, Texas, Arizona, Ohio, Illinois, Florida, Missouri, and even from your home State, Massachusetts.

The 63 persons named in the indictment had a total of 151 arrests and 75 convictions, for crimes ranging all the way from gambling to narcotics and murder. In striking contrast, however, 13 of the 63 had no criminal records of any kind, and were accepted leaders in their own communities.

As some idea of the background of this syndicate, two of the persons present—Joseph Profaci and Joseph Magliocco—had attended a similar but smaller syndicate meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1928 some 30 years before. On both occasions they gave the same excuse when questioned by the police—that Profaci had a bad knee and had asked his brother-in-law, Magliocco, to drive him on a business trip, and they had just dropped in for an innocent visit.

Through hotel and motel reservations, airline and train schedules and eyewitness accounts, we established that the key conference was scheduled to take place from 12 to 1 p.m. on the afternoon of November 14. Fortunately and fortuitously, this was precisely the time when the State troopers stumbled onto the gathering.

However, this brief 1 hour executive committee meeting had been preceded by meetings of the lesser delegates during the earlier part of the week in New York, Scranton, Utica, and the Binghampton area.

Shortly after the State troopers were observed and it was ascertained that they would identify and interrogate delegates leaving the meeting, many of the most important of the delegates began running through the woods, in spite of the weather, in spite of their clothing, and in spite of their advanced years. Thus John Montana, owner of the taxi monopoly in Buffalo, and until that time considered an outstanding civic leader, was found caught on a barbed-wire fence on the other side of dense woods past the Barbara estate.

You all will recall the tremendous amount of enforcement activity which followed the Apalachin meeting. No one doubted that it was a conference of syndicate leaders at the highest level.

District attorneys, investigative agencies, legislative committees, crime commissions, special prosecutors, and economic and social agencies and authorities of all kinds went into every aspect of the case from every angle within their jurisdictions. The New York State Liquor Authority interrogated with respect to liquor licenses; the Internal Revenue Service with respect to tax violations; the Immigration Service with respect to alienage; city, State and local police with respect to a host of crimes, such as the still unsolved Anastasia murder.

These investigations, of course, resulted in many cases, such as tax and deportation charges and suspension of liquor licenses. However, it is a fact that in spite of this literally unprecedented investigative operation, covering hundreds of thousands of pages of reports and transcripts of testimony, no case could be made tying these persons together into the single syndicate operation which was clearly their crime.

I am not boasting when I say that our unit put together such a case easily. Indeed, like many on our staff, I am a civil practitioner, with little criminal experience. It took no spectacular legal brilliance, and only a few months for us to return an indictment which named these 63 persons in one overall syndicated crime conspiracy.

The reason we were able to do this where others could not, is because we were authorized to put together the previously isolated efforts of 51 Federal and 85 State and local agencies. As with a jigsaw puzzle, once these isolated pieces were joined and examined, the pattern of conspiracy emerged so clearly and definitively that we wondered why it had not been obvious from the beginning.

Anyone watching the trial saw witnesses testify from the Immigration Service, the Narcotics Bureau, the Internal Revenue Service, the FBI, the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division, from local police forces in New York, New Jersey, Dallas, Cleveland, Los Angeles, from commissions and legislative committees—even your own Bob Kennedy testified, and made a most persuasive and compelling witness.

Let me give you even simpler examples. One important syndicate leader had been free from enforcement activity most of his life. We examined one of the many documents which businessmen must file with the Government these days. On its face this disclosed that he was receiving income from a union and from an employer. This would mean nothing even to a tax agent, for many people have income from employer and union. To us, however, it could mean but one thing, a "sweetheart" contract. We knew that the person involved would not be a night watchman in a mine, as he claimed. The information was turned over to the FBI, which in short time investigated and produced conclusive evidence that this man did not work for the employer. Within a few months he was indicted and convicted of 34 separate counts of violating the Taft Hartley law.

Another example—a syndicate leader whom we knew to be the subject of an investigation by the Immigration Service based upon Polish birth, filed application with the Bureau of Mines in the Department of the Interior, for oil and gas leases. He represented himself as an American citizen by birth. Of course, the Bureau of Mines could have no way of suspecting that this statement was untrue, nor could they possibly investigate every item in each statement filed. Yet the moment we looked at the applications, we knew there were two false statements, which, by Federal statute, are felonies, punishable by 5 years imprisonment each.

American law enforcement is splintered into literally thousands of prosecuting and investigating agencies, Federal, State and local, plus special prosecutors, commissions, committees, and even civic organizations. Within the Federal Government itself, there are 94 U.S. attorneys' offices and separate divisions in the Department of Justice, each of which has some jurisdiction over syndicated crime. Yet it is a fact that nowhere in the Federal Government is there one place to which you can turn to obtain all of the prior sworn grand jury testimony by even a well-known syndicate leader such as Vito Genovese.

The Apalachin prosecution alone will not solve the syndicate crime problem, nor even seriously interfere with syndicate activities. However, it does demonstrate what can be done.

Gambling syndicates, for example, operate all over the country, being especially prevalent in certain parts of your own State. Unlike the Apalachin conspiracy which took place 2 years ago, these syndicates are operating right under your very noses. Their total "take" is astounding, probably better than half of what the Attorney General has estimated to be the national crime cost of $20 billion, and which Mr. Hoover estimates at $22 billion.

Our unit made a start at prosecuting the most important layoff operation, which permits bookies all around the country to hedge their bets and thereby guarantee profits. We called our effort Operation O:O—Organized Enforcement Against Organized Crime.

We were able to make only a start before we went out of existence—yet in one 2-day period 72 gamblers were arrested all across

the country in simultaneous crackdowns, proving the existence of the syndicate, and what can be done by coordinated enforcement activity.

I predict that with the necessary jurisdiction, 3 attorneys and 12 agents could return an important indictment naming gambling syndicate leaders across the Nation. And this could be done in 6 months, at a cost of less than $150,000 provided they are given the cooperation of Federal, State, and local agencies. This case would no more destroy gambling syndicates than the Apalachin case destroyed that syndicate, but it would again demonstrate what can be done by coordinated prosecution effort and point the way toward more effective enforcement activity.

MODERNIZATION OF ENFORCEMENT TECHNIQUE

Criminal enforcement today is still geared to crimes against person and property, which were the important syndicate crimes of the 1920's and 1930's. In this type of crime—robbery, rape, extortion—our enforcement techniques are magnificent. The FBI fingerprint files and laboratory analysis for example, are among the best in the world. I have seen hijacking cases solved and the vehicle returned even before the theft is reported.

But syndicate activity has advanced past person and property crime. Today its threat is in the much more profitable and—so far—much more secure areas of commercial crime, where the victim is actually brought into the web of the conspiracy, and made a party to the crime. To avoid enforcement activity, syndicate members employ lawyer and accountant specialists, use modern public relation techniques and avoid violence as much as possible.

Consider present crime enforcement in this connection. Even Federal agencies cannot act unless there is some evidence that a crime within their jurisdiction is involved. The Internal Revenue Service needs a tax violation; the Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Division needs an alcohol violation; even the FBI requires some evidence of a violation falling within one of the 45 statutes which limits its jurisdiction. They are often powerless where no crime is reported—as in the antitrust or gambling violation where the "victim" is a party to the crime, and cannot complain.

The result is there is no agency with the responsibility to go out and do basic investigation against a syndicate as such, even where the existence of the syndicate is as clear as it was at Apalachin. Although most agencies were willing and anxious to cooperate with our unit, only the Federal Narcotics Bureau felt that it had jurisdiction to actively assign agents to assist us in our Apalachin investigation. The others regretfully concluded that they had no jurisdiction to proceed.

It is shocking to realize that nowhere in the Federal Government is there any unit which has the responsibility and assignment of investigating syndicates and initiating enforcement against them.

Here again, when our unit commenced working in close cooperation with the Bureau of Narcotics, the yield was tremendous.

In one case we stopped a syndicate leader entering through one of the U.S. ports of entry with $200,000 in cash and $50,000 in checks received from Caribbean gambling, furnishing valuable evidence of nationwide gambling syndicate activity.

In another case, a courier from Sicily was stopped with a card index containing the names of syndicate leaders and a document which blueprinted syndicate operations and furnished many valuable leads to important prosecutions.

In another case, undercover activities by the Narcotics Bureau brought to light the order which had been issued at Apalachin directing all members of that syndicate to cease dealing in narcotics. The reasons for the order were effective narcotics enforcement and the severe penalties of the Narcotics Control Act of 1956, plus the existence of the much more secure and lucrative areas of commercial operation. These undercover activities produced positive evidence of the syndicate's activities. When the undercover agent's contact was discovered dealing in narcotics, he was murdered in typical brutal gangland fashion: two shots in the head, and 42 icepick stabs in the chest.

The system of punishment and reward is in fact the characteristic of syndicate activities. The invisible government of the underworld takes care of wives and children while members are in prison, and furnishes jobs to permit members to be paroled from jail. Even more effectively, it punishes—by murder if necessary—where anyone violates the code of conduct protecting members from the reach of law enforcement.

The new Office on Syndicated Crime should enter into these basic syndicate investigations, using the existing power of the Attorney General, and functioning largely in commercial areas such as are regulated by the Food and Drug Administration, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the SEC. These economic and social agencies are doing their best with limited budgets, and would welcome the assistance of a crime enforcement unit to help them in their important efforts to rid these areas of racketeer domination.

GREATER INTERCHANGE OF INTELLIGENCE

Finally, we found that enforcement agencies on all levels—Federal, State, and local—are hampered by a lack of adequate exchange of criminal intelligence. None of these agencies can work alone against syndicated crime—each is limited both in geographic and legal jurisdictions, while syndicated crime operates nationwide and unhampered.

Indeed, as Mr. Hoover has stated, 90 percent of crime is local, and the smaller local enforcement agencies are in greater need of aid than any other.

I do not by any means suggest the elimination of jurisdictional lines. The splintered form of American law enforcement is a great safeguard of individual freedom. Without it, we could have the National Police Force—the Gestapo—the OGPU.

What is needed is a unit which can act as a communication center or clearinghouse, through which these thousands of enforcement agencies can find and obtain assistance from each other.

Thus the police chief in Tucson, Ariz., can learn that his assistance will come from the police chief in Buffalo, or from the Federal Trade Commission.

Over and over we heard enforcement officials lament that exchange of criminal intelligence is a one-way street, and that while each was willing to give to others, no one would give anything back.

The reason for this one-way street is that the Federal Government has never accepted its responsibility to act as the catalyst to permit separate enforcement agencies across the country to work together.

RECOMMENDATION

It was our conclusion that syndicated crime enforcement should be brought up to date by the creation in the Department of Justice of an Office on Syndicated Crime, whose function would be to prosecute syndicates by bringing together the scattered forces of law enforcement; to conduct basic syndicate investigation; and to act as a nerve center, permitting communication between crime enforcement agencies across the Nation.

I believe that this unit could operate efficiently and effectively with about 40 lawyers and 75 agents and with an increase in the present Department of Justice budget of less than $1 million per year.

CONCLUSION

Every law enforcement official to whom we spoke agreed that syndicated crime was running wild and that enforcement activity is ineffective. All had suggestions, ranging from recommendations for the creation of a national crime commission and wiretapping legislation, even to modifying basic constitutional rights, such as the privilege against self-incrimination of the fifth amendment.

In our judgment the fundamental problem was not one of substantive law—it was of filling the enforcement vacuum which permits syndicated crime to flourish.

Unless and until criminal enforcement attacks the invisible government of the underworld by using the modern tools being employed so efficiently by syndicated crime, this insidious, internal cancer on our society will continue to grow and choke off our economic and social freedom.

Mr. Chairman, because the information provided by the subcommittee on the record of the Special Group on Organized Crime is not in its entirety—the group operated for only a short period of time and principally prosecuted the Apalachin case, which was reversed by a higher court after conviction in the district court—I list the group's success in cases handled by it below. I am sorry that some have attempted to belittle the efforts of this group and I trust that my remarks will clarify the record:

SPECIAL GROUP ON ORGANIZED CRIME CONVICTIONS AND INDICTMENTS RETURNED [1]

Convictions:	
Apalachin, conspiracy	[2] 20
Accardo, tax	1
Paroutian, narcotics	1
Lima, tax	1
Reina, contempt	1
Alaimo, labor	3
Curico, contempt	1
Pagano, contempt	1
Montana, perjury	1
Total	30
Indictments:	
Apalachin, conspiracy	[2] 7
Apalachin, perjury	[2] 3
Bronge, perjury	[2] 1
Carbo, conspiracy	5
Graziani, narcotics	1
LaDuca, labor	3
Total	20

[1] Does not include matters referred to other prosecutors, such as Majuni, Larasso, D'Agostino, etc.

[2] Reversed and/or dismissed.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7371) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year end-

ing June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 71, not voting 108, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—256

Adair	Carey	Feighan
Addabbo	Cederberg	Fenton
Albert	Celler	Finnegan
Andersen, Minn.	Chamberlain	Flood
Arends	Chelf	Ford
Aspinall	Chenoweth	Frelinghuysen
Auchincloss	Chiperfield	Friedel
Avery	Church	Fulton
Bailey	Clancy	Gallagher
Baldwin	Clark	Garmatz
Baring	Coad	Gavin
Barry	Cohelan	Giaimo
Bass, N.H.	Cook	Gilbert
Bass, Tenn.	Corbett	Glenn
Bates	Corman	Goodell
Battin	Cramer	Goodling
Becker	Curtin	Granahan
Beckworth	Curtis, Mass.	Griffin
Bell	Daddario	Griffiths
Blatnik	Dague	Hagen, Calif.
Boggs	Daniels	Halleck
Boland	Davis, James C.	Halpern
Bolton	Davis, Tenn.	Harding
Bow	Dent	Hardy
Brademas	Denton	Harrison, Va.
Breeding	Derounian	Harrison, Wyo.
Brewster	Dingell	Harvey, Mich.
Bromwell	Dominick	Hays
Brooks, Tex.	Downing	Healey
Broyhill	Doyle	Hébert
Burke, Ky.	Durno	Hechler
Burke, Mass.	Edmondson	Henderson
Byrne, Pa.	Elliott	Holland
Byrnes, Wis.	Ellsworth	Holtzman
Cahill	Fallon	Ichord, Mo.
Cannon	Farbstein	Ikard, Tex.
Jennings	Moorehead, Ohio	St. Germain
Jensen	Moorhead, Pa.	Santangelo
Joelsen	Morgan	Saund
Johnson, Calif.	Morris	Saylor
Johnson, Md.	Morse	Schneebeli
Johnson, Wis.	Mosher	Schweiker
Jonas	Moss	Schwengel
Jones, Mo.	Moulder	Scranton
Judd	Multer	Sheppard
Karsten	Murphy	Shipley
Kastenmeier	Natcher	Shriver
Kearns	Nix	Sibal
Keith	Norblad	Sikes
Keogh	Nygaard	Sisk
Kilday	O'Brien, Ill.	Slack
Kilgore	O'Brien, N.Y.	Smith, Iowa
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Spence
King, Utah	O'Hara, Mich.	Springer
Kirwan	Olsen	Stafford
Kowalski	Osmers	Stratton
Kunkel	Ostertag	Stubblefield
Laird	Patman	Sullivan
Lane	Pelly	Taylor
Lankford	Perkins	Teague, Calif.
Lindsay	Peterson	Teague, Tex.
Lipscomb	Pfost	Thomas
McCormack	Pike	Thompson, N.J.
McCulloch	Pirnie	Thompson, Tex.
McDonough	Poage	Thomson, Wis.
McDowell	Poff	Thornberry
McFall	Pucinski	Toll
McIntire	Quie	Tollefson
Macdonald	Rabaut	Trimble
MacGregor	Rains	Udall
Machrowicz	Reece	Ullman
Mack	Reifel	Van Pelt
Magnuson	Reuss	Van Zandt
Mahon	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wallhauser
Mailliard	Rhodes, Pa.	Walter
Martin, Mass.	Riehlman	Weaver
Mason	Riley	Whalley
Mathias	Rivers, Alaska	Whitener
Meader	Robison	Wickersham
Michel	Rodino	Widnall
Miller, Clem	Rogers, Colo.	Willis
Miller, George P.	Rooney	Wilson, Calif.
Monagan	Roosevelt	Wright
Montoya	Rutherford	Yates
Moore	Ryan	Zablocki

NAYS—71

Abbitt	Fisher	Norrell
Alford	Flynt	Pillion
Anderson, Ill.	Forrester	Ray
Andrews	Frazier	Rogers, Fla.
Ashbrook	Gathings	Rogers, Tex.
Ashmore	Gross	Roudebush
Bennett, Fla.	Hagan, Ga.	Rousselot
Bennett, Mich.	Haley	St. George
Berry	Hall	Schadeberg
Betts	Harvey, Ind.	Schenck
Bray	Hemphill	Scherer
Brown	Herlong	Selden
Bruce	Hoeven	Short
Burleson	Hoffman, Mich.	Siler
Casey	Huddleston	Smith, Calif.
Cunningham	Johansen	Smith, Miss.
Davis, John W.	King, N.Y.	Stephens
Derwinski	Kyl	Taber
Devine	Langen	Whitten
Dole	McMillan	Williams
Dorn	Matthews	Wilson, Ind.
Dowdy	Mills	Winstead
Everett	Minshall	Younger
Findley	Murray	

NOT VOTING—108

Abernethy	Donohue	Jones, Ala.
Addonizio	Dooley	Karth
Alexander	Dulski	Kee
Alger	Dwyer	Kelly
Anfuso	Evins	Kilburn
Ashley	Fascell	Kitchin
Ayres	Fino	Kluczynski
Baker	Fogarty	Knox
Barrett	Fountain	Kornegay
Beermann	Garland	Landrum
Belcher	Gary	Latta
Blitch	Grant	Lennon
Bolling	Gray	Lesinski
Bonner	Green, Oreg.	Libonati
Boykin	Green, Pa.	Loser
Brooks, La.	Gubser	McSween
Broomfield	Hansen	McVey
Buckley	Harris	Madden
Collier	Harsha	Marshall
Colmer	Hiestand	Martin, Nebr.
Conte	Hoffman, Ill.	May
Cooley	Holifield	Merrow
Curtis, Mo.	Horan	Miller, N.Y.
Dawson	Hosmer	Milliken
Delaney	Hull	Moeller
Diggs	Inouye	Morrison
Nelsen	Roberts	Tupper
O'Konski	Rostenkowski	Utt
O'Neill	Scott	Vanik
Passman	Seely-Brown	Vinson
Philbin	Shelley	Watts
Pilcher	Smith, Va.	Weis
Powell	Staggers	Westland
Price	Steed	Wharton
Randall	Thompson, La.	Young
Rivers, S.C.	Tuck	Zelenko

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Baker for, with Mr. Abernethy against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Dulski with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Moeller with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Garland.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Alger.
Mr. Price with Mr. Seely-Brown.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Powell with Mr. Ayres.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Addonizio with Mr. Nelson.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Milliken.
Mr. Fogarty with Mrs. May.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Wharton.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.
Mr. Libonati with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Merrow.
Mr. Young with Mr. Gubser.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. McVey.
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Tupper.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mrs. Weis.
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. O'Neil with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Roberts with Mr. Horan.
Mr. Fountain with Mr. Belcher.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Utt.
Mr. Watts with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Hiestand.

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed, H.R. 7371.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SABOTAGE IN NEVADA AND UTAH

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, last week certain events occurred in Nevada and

Utah which could have a very profound effect upon the security and safety of the United States. I refer specifically to the deliberate destruction of two of the main cross-country microwave radio relay stations and the destruction of a cable station on one of the main east-west cables. To date we know very little about these incidents but what we do know makes it abundantly clear that the destruction of these facilities was a deliberate act of sabotage.

The reports so far available to us indicate that the persons responsible were not mere crackpots acting on impulse, but were instead highly skilled in the use of explosives and in carrying out a detailed plan of sabotage. Some of the circuits which were disrupted as a result of these explosions were a part of our life line of defense. Some of them are a part of our intricate mechanism for detecting enemy missile and aircraft and protecting our shoreline and critical locations from them.

These acts of sabotage emphasize, if any emphasis is necessary, the vital necessity of assuring the Federal Government all the help that can be given by the Congress in preventing such acts in the future and apprehending and jailing the individuals responsible. In the last Congress I pointed out that our Federal criminal statutes do not adequately protect communications facilities. Although the protection of a Federal criminal statute applies to railroads, intrastate and foreign shipments, maritime facilities within the United States or on the high seas, and aircraft and aircraft facilities, the malicious destruction of communications equipment is not a Federal crime unless the equipment involved is either operated or controlled by the United States.

Today, most of our military and civilian defense facilities are connected to one another by private line networks which are secured from telephone and telegraph companies. These networks consist of thousands of miles of circuits. At the end of these circuits there are located radar antennas, high-speed computers, facsimile machines or telephone and telegraph equipment. In another category commercial carriers supply engineered military circuits. The Government pays monthly rental for the terminating equipment—telephone and telegraph—and the lines to the central office of the carriers. The Government pays no rental between the carriers' offices until such time as the circuits are needed. In other words these circuits are available on a standby basis to be ordered up immediately when the emergency arises. In addition to these two networks, our military and civilian defense installations are also served by regular local and long distance lines. I am advised that the facilities destroyed in Utah and Nevada carried all three types of circuits and that none of them are presently protected by a Federal statute.

Almost 2 years ago I introduced a bill—H.R. 8138, 86th Congress, 1st session—which would have provided Federal statutory protection to these circuits. It would have extended to commercially owned facilities used or useful in the military and civilian defense functions of the United States the same Federal protection now given communications equipment and circuits which are "operated or controlled by the United States." That bill was referred to the Judiciary Committee but was allowed to die in the last Congress. Almost an identical bill, S. 3560, was favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee on May 17, 1960, but it too died without any Senate action in the last session.

I have introduced my bill, now H.R. 3749, early in this session—February 2, 1961—and after the Utah and Nevada sabotage Senators DODD and EASTLAND introduced a counterpart, S. 1990, in the Senate. These are not measures born of hysteria growing out of a dramatic act of sabotage. The Department of Defense sent to the Congress in 1953 a bill designed to protect these facilities and similar measures since that time have been endorsed by the Department of Defense, the Department of Justice, the OCDM, the Atomic Energy Commission, the FCC, and the Bureau of the Budget. Had one of these measures been adopted by the Congress perhaps the dynamiting of last week never would have occurred. One horse at least may have escaped from the barn but that is no reason for not locking the barn door to protect the others or to protect the barn itself. At a time when this country is locked in deadly conflict with the forces of communism the Congress will be criminally negligent if it sits passively on its hands and fails to accord the protection of a Federal criminal law to the country's vital communications equipment.

This is not the time for further procrastination. Last year in the Senate hearings representatives of the Department of Defense and the OCDM urged in the strongest possible manner that the Congress pass this bill. The full Judiciary Committee in the other Chamber endorsed it and yet neither the House nor the Senate considered it on the floor. Fortunately, no lives were lost this time. However, if there is a recurrence resulting in the loss of life or the destruction by an enemy of whole cities, the blood of those people will certainly be on our hands if we do not act now. It is the worst kind of folly to pay for tremendous communications networks for military and civilian defense, and then almost invite the sabotage of these fa_ilities when they are vital to our national survival.

If anyone doubted the need for legislation as provided in my bill, the sabotage in Utah and Nevada should have banished those doubts. This Congress should take immediate action on H.R. 3749, and I so urge.

VIENNA—PRELUDE TO DISASTER?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the circumstances surrounding Mr. Kennedy's meeting with Mr. Khrushchev this weekend at Vienna reek with a disturbing air of calculated, secret scheming. The officially stated reasons for departing from the President's sound and widely supported views on summitry are not convincing. Reportedly the President seeks to convince Khrushchev that this country will accept no more defeats and is anxious to settle matters peaceably. Talk will not convince at the summit or anywhere else. Mr. Kennedy knows this. As for peaceable intentions and desires by the United States, they have been obvious to all the world, including Khrushchev, for years. And Mr. Kennedy knows it.

Mr. Kennedy has often and publicly stated that summitry in general is unwise and historically discredited. This summit comes in the first few months of his administration and heels on such repeated statements. It is the essence of personal diplomacy which Mr. Kennedy has so roundly criticized. Further, he also often has stated his determination to negotiate only from strength, not weakness. He goes to this summit as the underdog, fresh from an unbroken series of defeats which has reduced his own and U.S. prestige.

There are overtones of arrogance and disregard of, and contempt for, public promises and public interest. Why should Mr. Kennedy do it? Something must be up. Undoubtedly he has personal and direct assurances from Khrushchev that Vienna will make Mr. Kennedy look good. How has the stage been set? What is the bait? Why is it being offered?

The stage setting has been accomplished according to the classic Soviet Communist pattern preceding international parleys. The bait is likely to be an agreement on the long-drawn-out nuclear test ban issue. This appraisal is heightened by the lengths to which Mr. Kennedy himself dwelt on the subject during his special message to Congress last week. And, it is being offered because there are not only several advantages in it for the Kremlin, but, as well, a deadly trap for the free world.

As to the stage setting: It is a familiar and usually successful Soviet negotiating trick to make obviously excessive demands from which subsequently to recede, with propaganda credit for compromising, but without substantive cost to the U.S.S.R. Throughout the Geneva test talks, now approaching their 31st month, this trick has been employed over and over again. Over a period of months they gradually abandoned their demand for veto right by which they could block all inspections for clandestine nuclear tests. In recent weeks they suddenly reintroduce these veto demands in somewhat different form—knowing they would focus Western protest and indignation, and knowing the veto is completely unacceptable. The stage is now set for Soviet concessions on this issue with the usual relief and relaxation of many Western minds.

Another Soviet stage-setting trick is to cultivate a feeling of pessimism about

the possibility of agreement just before they intend to make agreement possible. This heightens the dramatic effect of ostensible concessions. This kind of pessimism has been manipulated around the Geneva test talks by a pattern of events which can hardly be coincidental. Some elements of the pattern are:

First. The Soviets showed coldness and indifference to Western concession offered by Mr. Dean in the first Kennedy-sponsored negotiations when the talks resumed after the U.S. election. In the last few days they turned up their noses at the Western concession reducing the number of inspections to 12 from an already unrealistically low 20 per year.

Second. The Soviets have threatened to resume testing if the United States and United Kingdom do not stop the French, well knowing neither the United States nor the United Kingdom can make them stop.

Third. Recent reintroduction of their totally unacceptable veto demands spreads puzzlement and pessimism.

Fourth. Khrushchev recently intimated to Walter Lippmann that there is little prospect of agreement on the test ban.

Fifth. A rash of rumors of recent origin say the administration is pessimistic on this issue. Mr. Kennedy is reported to have told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee he is weighing resumption of tests.

Sixth. Several recent articles by columnists operating from Geneva say prospects of agreement are dim and dwell on the horror of future nuclear developments.

Not only has pessimism been induced regarding the test talks, but it has been manipulated about East-West rapprochement ever since the Kennedy administration came to power. Mr. Khrushchev has pressed Mr. Kennedy consistently and hard, notwithstanding that the Kennedy administration took over dedicated to exploring every possible means of agreement and that many of its advisers favor a softer policy toward the Soviets. A dramatic reversal to dispel the current gloom about East-West relations using the test talks as a basis would be strictly in accord with the conditioned reflex postulates of the Russian psychologist Ivan P. Pavlov, upon which Soviet brainwashing techniques have been based and brought to perfection.

Now for the question: "Why is it being offered?" What is in it for Khrushchev and company? Here are some of the things that could be in it:

First. It would calm the uneasy U.S. stirring which is now close to the point of congealing into positive demands for effective action to stop the Communists. The American people know there is something wrong. They know something must be done. They are about to the point of losing patience and demanding effective action. This sudden congealing of U.S. opinion was the kind of thing that defeated Hitler. Khrushchev must recognize it as the greatest single threat to his designs for world conquest. Thus, he will dramatically "take off the heat" and propel us into complacency.

Second. The making of concessions, even though illusory and without real cost to the Soviets, can be propagandized to enhance the Khrushchev stature worldwide as a man who supposedly puts the interests of humanity above his own.

Third. Prolongation of the test talks, followed by a paper agreement with slipshod enforcement provisions, would guarantee no further advances in U.S. nuclear weaponry because the United States would comply. At the same time, it would give every opportunity to the U.S.S.R. for secret development and surreptitious testing of advance nuclear weapons which would give the Soviets overwhelming superiority and result in disaster for the West. Statements by former AEC Commissioner Thomas E. Murray and others relative to a new family of nuclear weapons in the offing which would give the nation developing them massive superiority; speculations about a neutron bomb, and so forth.

Fourth. The U.S.S.R.'s illusory concessions could be propagandized to the hilt as proof that nuclear weapons are "uncivilized" and thus set the stage for the Soviets next great propaganda campaign—the banning of the use of nuclear weapons by treaty. This, of course, would give the U.S.S.R. its second, nonnuclear shot at overwhelming superiority—the restoration of its massive manpower edge over the West in conventional warfare.

I am quite sure Mr. Kennedy would not go to Vienna and deliberately walk into such a trap, deliberately give such advantages to those who seek to destroy us. He undoubtedly is quite sincere in his public statements regarding his zealousness for freedom, its protection, preservation and propagation. It appears, unfortunately, that he has not learned the lessons of history, that he is unaware of these insidious techniques which I have described, in short, that he has no idea of what he is getting into; that the deck is stacked. And that it has been stacked because wishful, emotional thinking has blinded too many eyes to the realities of Communist perfidy.

There is a vast body of articulate opinion in this country and around the world that in its yearning for peace and tranquillity simply refuses to recognize that international negotiation and agreement—and the prostitution thereof—has been one of the key techniques for Communist advances. From somewhere the Committee for Sane Nuclear Policy, called by some realists the Committee for Insane Surrender, got the money to publish full-page newspaper ads around the country calling for concessions to reach agreement on the test ban talks in the so-called interest of humanity. A lot of people believe such stuff. A lot of people apparently fail to get the message from the following statement by Winston Churchill:

> If you will not fight for the right when you can easily win without bloodshed, you may have to fight when there is no hope of victory because it is better to perish than to live as slaves.

The people who have got that message, and even though their yearnings for a peaceful world are no less intense than the others, seem as a group to be less emotional and less articulate about it all. Their sickness and shock at continued deterioration of free world positions and warnings against setting ourselves up as "patsies" for the Communists at least are seldom seen in the black of newsprint of the Nation's newspapers.

The emotional and articulate ones, with their splendid abilities to make news and their wherewithal to articulate even in paid full-page ads, who feel a treaty ban on nuclear testing represents a significant step toward accommodation with the Soviets to stop the arms race and live in peace, will be able to tout the Vienna outcome as a great victory. It will appear to be a "coup" that will restore Mr. Kennedy's lost prestige, particularly in the United States and particularly because of the supposedly unexpected nature of his supposed success with the wily old Khrushchev.

But to the unemotional and inarticulate ones, who soundly reason that the treaty banning all nuclear tests is a deliberate product of Soviet intrigue for a nefarious purpose, of Western ignorance and emotional wishful thinking in nuclear matters, and of personal motivations, will see the Vienna summit as an agonizing step toward disaster for the free world and supremacy for the international Communist conspiracy.

I sincerely hope I am profoundly in error on the Vienna package. I hope Mr. Kennedy will go there, say "hello," "how are you?" and "goodby." But I am desperately afraid that will not be the case.

Reference is made to my previous remarks bearing on this subject appearing in the RECORD at pages 8847, 8900, and 9202.

REVISED PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the acting majority leader if there have been any changes in the announced program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. There has been a slight change in the program since it was announced earlier in the day.

The contested election case will be programed for Wednesday, following consideration of the independent offices appropriation bill for 1962. If a rule is reported on the Korean excise tax bill, it will be programed for Thursday.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

IMPACT OF URBAN RENEWAL PROJECTS ON OPERATORS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill to ease the impact of urban renewal projects on operators of small businesses. The bill would amend the Small Business Act to authorize loans to small business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas on the same terms now offered to businesses affected by natural disasters.

The enactment of this bill will assist directly small business concerns in urban renewal areas throughout the country. For instance, on Manhattan's West Side in my district nearly 500 businesses will be affected by the proposed West Side urban renewal project.

Under present law businesses dislocated by urban renewal may apply for loans from the Small Business Administration, but loans are granted at 5½ percent interest for 10 years. However, disaster area loans, which carry the same terms as those proposed in my bill, are offered at 3 percent interest for as long as 20 years. The bill also authorizes the appropriation of $25 million to the Small Business Administration to enable it to make such loans in the future.

Under the previous administration tight money policies hit small business hard. In its platform last year the Democratic Party pledged action to aid small business to obtain credit and equity capital at reasonable rates. This bill would be a major step toward providing for more equitable treatment of small businesses. A number of such operations on New York's West Side have already been forced out of business by urban renewal. Some of these would surely have been saved by liberal loans from the Small Business Administration.

It can be just as much a disaster for a small businessman to be dislocated by an urban renewal project as it would be if his store were wrecked by a hurricane.

PRECISION MACHINE TOOLS TO RUSSIA

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. LIPSCOMB] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, recently, in a statement to the House of Representatives which appeared in the May 17, 1961 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8272, I related to the House of Representatives that the Department of Defense had advised it had withdrawn its objection to the granting of export licenses for the shipment to Soviet Russia of precision machine tools used in the manufacture of automobiles and trucks.

To summarize briefly the problem involved, on February 6, 1961, I wrote to the Department of Defense requesting information concerning the Soviet automobile and truck industry and requesting the views of the Department in regard to a proposed export to the U.S.S.R. of transfer-type machine tools and machines used for the manufacture of gears.

A license for the shipment to the U.S.S.R. of transfer-type machine tools had been granted by the Department of Commerce in 1960. One of these authorizations was for the export of a multistation machine for machining V–8 cylinder blocks, of a value of $3,400,000, and for a multistation machine for machining V–8 cylinder heads, of a value of $1,900,000.

Briefly, these machines can mill, drill, bore, ream, tap, and so forth, aluminum castings for V–8 cylinder blocks and heads. Machines of this type can be used in the mass production of all metal manufactures, such as refrigerators, tractors, electrical motors, and so forth.

Transfer machines are thus designed to complete a series of machining operations at successive stations, and to transfer the work automatically from one station to the next. My understanding is that the Soviets are placing heavy emphasis on the production of transfer machines at the current time because they are vital in solving production problems of complex and highly specialized equipment.

The other authorization was for the export to the U.S.S.R. of six 8-spindle gear hobbing machines, with a total value of $810,000. These machines can be used in plants which manufacture gears for automobiles, trucks, tractors, and farm implements. They are a mass production machine for gears of wide application. Both spiral and straight tooth gears can be cut on these machines.

The decision by the Department of Defense is a reversal of the position taken by the Department in a letter to me dated February 23, 1961, in which the Department stated, in part, that the technology contained in the transfer machines in question produced in the United States is the most advanced in the world, that the products of these transfer-type machine tools are clearly of military value, and that receipt of this equipment by the U.S.S.R. would contribute to the Soviet military and economic potential.

Prior to, and again following, receipt of these views from the Department of Defense, on February 23, 1961, I contacted the President and the Secretary of Commerce requesting that these export licenses be canceled. On March 9, the licenses were permanently revoked.

Because in my view the shipment to the U.S.S.R. of this type of precision machine tools is contrary to the security and best interests of the United States, I wrote to the Department of Defense requesting to be advised as to what new information the Department now possesses that it did not possess earlier on which its position of February 23, 1961, was based.

For the information of the House I am setting forth the letter I received from the Department of Defense, dated February 23, 1961, which states the former position of the Department in opposition to this export; the letter from the Department of Defense dated April 24, 1961—which was received May 17, 1961—advising the Department has withdrawn its objections; my letter to the Department of May 17, 1961, requesting further information and comment on the Department's reversal of position; and the reply just received from the Department, dated May 29, 1961:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., February 23, 1961.

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: This is in reply to your letter of February 6, 1961, requesting information on the Soviet automobile and truck industry and the significance of a possible export of transfer-type machine tools to the U.S.S.R. Information available to the Department of Defense indicates that in 1960 the U.S.S.R. produced about 500,000 motor vehicles, which included 385,000 trucks and 109,000 passenger cars. By comparison, the U.S. production in 1960 was 7,820,000, of which 1,145,000 were trucks. The types produced by the U.S.S.R. range from a three-quarter-ton jeep-type vehicle to a 40-ton dump truck. About 22 percent of annual truck production goes to the armed forces. Many of the remaining vehicles are assigned mobilization designations and participate in readiness exercises. In an emergency, military requirements could be met only by withdrawing many vehicles from nonmilitary use.

The Soviet motor vehicle industry consists of 17 plants—10 producing trucks and cars, 1 specialized small car plant, and 6 bus plants. Two plants, the ZIL plant in Moscow and the GAZ plant in Gorki, are the "giants" of the industry and between them turn out 77 percent of all vehicles produced.

The U.S.S.R. is not dependent on any foreign source for motor vehicles or for components. Small numbers of trucks, buses, and cars, less than 1 percent of total production, are imported from other bloc countries, mainly from Czechoslovakia.

It is the view of the Department of Defense that:

(a) The products of these transfer-type machine tools are clearly of military value. V–8 cylinder blocks, the product of these machines, are a necessary part of engines for medium-size supply trucks and personnel carriers which are vital to logistical support to the Soviet armed forces.

(b) The technology contained in these transfer machines produced in the United States is the most advanced in the world.

(c) So far as this Department knows, the U.S.S.R. has not installed this type of machinery for manufacturing cylinder blocks and heads.

(d) The receipt of this equipment by the U.S.S.R. would contribute to the Soviet military and economic warfare potential.

Your interest is appreciated and we are glad to furnish this information.

Sincerely yours,

HAYDN WILLIAMS,
Deputy Assistant Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 24, 1961.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: Your letter of February 6, 1961, requested information possessed by the Department of Defense pertaining to the automotive and truck industry in the U.S.S.R. Our reply of February 23, 1961, set forth the facts available in the Department at that time.

Because of your continuing interest in the subject, I should inform you that the Department has withdrawn its objection to the licensing for export of certain machines for the manufacture of automobile parts. It is our judgment that the impact of denying U.S. licenses would be largely frustrated by other free world countries which permit exports to the Soviet bloc of this type of equipment.

Present information and the best obtainable judgment now support the conclusion that U.S. technology in this area is not significantly superior to that of European countries.

Sincerely,

ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

MAY 17, 1961.

Hon. ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GILPATRIC: This is in reference to your letter dated April 24, 1961, which was delivered to my office this date, May 17, 1961, advising that the Department of Defense reversed its prior position and has withdrawn its objections to the licensing for export to the U.S.S.R. of certain machine tools used in the manufacture of automobile and truck engines. You state that the Department of Defense report to me of February 23, 1961, pertaining to these machine tools, set forth facts "available to the Department at that time."

Your letter also states that "present information and the best obtainable judgment now support the conclusion that U.S. technology in this area is not significantly superior to that of European countries."

I would greatly appreciate being advised as to specifically what, if any, additional information the Department of Defense now possesses concerning United States and European machine tool technology which it did not possess on February 23, 1961, to support the conclusion that U.S. technology in this area is not significantly superior to that of European countries.

In addition, I wish to know what consideration was given to the fact that the Soviet Union can benefit from the ability of U.S. manufactures in this industry to produce with dispatch, often, I understand, allowing considerably earlier delivery dates than from companies abroad.

What consideration was given to the fact that U.S. designed and produced machine tools are especially well suited for mass production, when, as I understand it, many other machine tools from foreign suppliers are not as well suited for mass production.

I will appreciate receiving such information and comment at your early convenience.

Sincerely yours,

GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 29, 1961.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: In your letter of May 17 you asked to be advised as to specifically what, if any, information the Department of Defense now possesses concerning U.S. and European machine tool technology which it did not possess on February 23, 1961.

My letter of April 24, 1961, did not intend to convey to you that the Department of Defense had suddenly uncovered any new information regarding United States and European machine tool technology generally, although such information does become available on a more or less continuing basis. It was intended to refer only to certain machines for the manufacture of automobile parts, and more specifically for engine blocks, on a mass production basis.

The additional information regarding these machines was received from persons knowledgeable regarding automotive production and was to the effect that the output of European machines would not be of lesser quantity and quality than that of American machines to the point where a significant strategic impact on the U.S.S.R., or a marked slowing down of their planned motor transport production, would occur if U.S. licenses were denied.

The question of delivery time is a matter of some conjecture but the opinion is generally held, as of now, that delivery from U.S. sources would be earlier. On balance this aspect seemed to be of minor importance in the Department's consideration of the case.

Sincerely yours,

ROSWELL L. GILPATRIC,
Deputy Secretary of Defense.

In my statement to the House of May 17, 1961, the view was expressed that until specific information was forthcoming to justify the conclusion that European technology is equal to the U.S. technology in this area. I would be forced to conclude that no such information exists and that the Department of Defense decision was based largely on policy consideration rather than on cold, hard facts.

I find absolutely nothing in the May 29, 1961, reply from the Department of Defense which alters my conclusion in this regard.

It is important also to consider the implications of the information contained in the concluding paragraph of the May 29, 1961, reply from the Department to the effect that delivery from U.S. sources for such machinery would be earlier than from other sources. If we are indeed in a race against time with the Soviets, would not a delay in the Soviet's receiving precision machine tools of this nature be of significance, whether the delay is only a few weeks, a few months, a year, or whatever period of time it may be? I certainly believe it is significant.

When the Department of Defense notification was received to the effect that the Department had withdrawn its objection to granting of export licenses for shipment of such machines to the Soviet Union, I wrote to the Secretary of Commerce to inquire whether on the basis of this reversal export licenses for these machine tools had been reissued by the Department.

The Secretary of Commerce, in a letter dated May 24, 1961, advised that no such licenses had been reissued or newly issued. The Secretary stated however that the Department continually receives applications for export licenses for machine tools to produce automotive parts and that it would advise me should it decide export licenses should be granted for this type of equipment.

For the information of the membership of the House, I am setting forth the entire text of the letter received from the Secretary of Commerce on this matter:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

Hon. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LIPSCOMB: Thank you for your letter dated May 17, 1961, requesting that you be advised as to whether the Department of Commerce, since March 9, has reissued export licenses or issued new export licenses authorizing export to the U.S.S.R. of transfer-type machine tools used in the production of automotive cylinder blocks and heads, and machines to manufacture gears. In your letter you referred to Under Secretary Edward Gudaman's letter of March 9, advising you of the permanent revocation of those licenses, and to a letter dated April 24 from Deputy Secretary of Defense, Roswell Gilpatric, advising you that his Department had withdrawn their prior objections to the export of that equipment to the U.S.S.R. A copy of Mr. Gilpatric's letter to you was forwarded to the Department and received on the same date as your letter.

The Department of Commerce has not since March 9 reissued or newly issued export licenses authorizing the export to the Soviet Union of the equipment under question. Had we done so, we would, of course, have notified you. However, the Department continually receives export license applications for processing covering a wide variety of commodities, including machine tools for production of various automotive parts and components. If, on the basis of our review and examination of all the factors involved, we determine that an export license should be granted for the type of equipment in which you are interested, we shall advise you in accordance with your standing request.

Sincerely yours,

LUTHER H. HODGES,
Secretary of Commerce.

In concluding these remarks, I wish to make clear that in my belief it is inadvisable to license this type of machine tool for shipment to the Soviet Union. No evidence has been shown which in my view justifies a conclusion that transfer-type machines are available elsewhere comparable with the advanced U.S. manufactured transfer-type machines. Nor do I see any basis for granting any such export license as a policy matter.

Let us face up to it. The Soviets who seek these precision machines from the United States are engaged in an all-out struggle against the free world.

It is vitally important to keep in mind Soviet intentions, which were so well stated by Lenin himself, in his "Report on Concessions" delivered on the 21st of December 1920, before the All-Russian Meetings of the Soviets. In discussing

the need for machinery which could only be purchased from the West, Lenin said:

It is necessary to bribe capitalism with extra profit. Capitalism will get the extra profit—God with it (begone), with this extra profit—and we will get the basics (equipment) with the aid of which we will strengthen ourselves, will finally get up on our feet and then defeat it (capitalism) economically.

Are Lenin's views and beliefs adhered to today? They certainly are. Following is a statement made by Khrushchev as recently as January of this year in his Report on Moscow Conference of Representatives of Communist and Workers Parties:

V. I. Lenin nurtured our party in a spirit of implacable struggle against imperialism, for stable peace and friendship among all peoples. These principles have always been and continue to be the essence of our foreign policy. Our party remembers Lenin's words to the effect that while dying and disintegrating, capitalism is still capable of causing great calamities to mankind. The party always maintains the greatest vigilance regarding the danger emanating from imperialism. It nurtures the Soviet people in this spirit and does everything necessary to make it impossible for the enemy ever to catch us unawares.

I believe there is an urgent need for the Congress to concern itself with the matter of export trade control for involved are decisions of great importance to the security of our Nation and the rest of the free world. It is my belief there is need for a complete congressional reevaluation of our export control policies as would be provided under House Resolution 170, a measure I introduced and which is pending before the House.

THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, Italy will be observing the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the Italian Republic. This anniversary is of particular significance as the Italian people are also celebrating this year the centennial of Italian unification.

March 17, 1861, marked the actual beginning of today's Republic of Italy. Under the combined guidance of Garibaldi, the fighter, Cavour, the statesman, and Mazzini, the idealist, the Italian people on that day realized their long dream of a united Italy. Their long struggle against foreign invaders and corrupt rulers was rewarded with victory. For the first time since the fall of the Roman Empire the Italians were united as an independent nation.

Since the establishment of modern Italy, no period of Italian history has witnessed more dramatic changes than has the 15 years since World War II. After the establishment of the Italian Republic on June 2, 1946, the American people became naturally concerned with the Republic's welfare. One of the objectives of our postwar foreign policy was to strengthen the free world against the inroads of communism. Italy was a strategic area in this aim. The reconstruction of this economically shattered country was a task of highest priority as we well realized that a weak Italy would be a breeding ground for communism. Quickly, we provided Italy with aid to bolster her sagging economy. Although we did provide financial assistance, the chief credit for the Republic recovery, however, goes to the determination and toil of the Italian people.

This recovery was accomplished in the face of tremendous hardships. The war had disrupted the Italian economy; the best of Italian youth was lost in the war; 4 million homes were destroyed; inflation was rampant and unemployment figures were extremely high. The situation appeared hopeless, but the resolve and energy of the Italian people eventually made the infant Italian Republic economically and politically secure.

The progess made by the Italians during these 15 years has been labeled a miracle. Stimulated by American aid the Italian economy has expanded at the rate of 6 percent a year. Her national income has doubled in the last 10 years. The lira is sound and Italy enjoys a favorable balance of payments. The Budget Minister's annual report to Parliament in 1960 is indicative of this economic miracle. National income increased from $2.8 billion in 1959 to $3.1 billion in 1960. During the same period, industrial investments rose 18.2 percent, employment 10.2 percent, consumption 6.3 percent, imports 45 percent and exports 40 percent.

This economic progress was accomplished in the face of constant Communist resistance. The Italian Communist Party was constantly trying to disrupt the economy through a series of strikes and violence and trying also to destroy faith in the new democratic government. These tactics, fortunately, proved to be in vain and the forces of democracy held the line against communism. The majority of the Italian people worked diligently to put Italy back on her feet.

Nevertheless, communism is still an ever present threat. The Italian Communists are still the largest Communist Party in the free world. But the Italian Government is ever vigilant and has in the past years adopted steps to restrict their activities. These included: Strengthening the Italian police so they can deal effectively with the challenges of the Communist Party; screening personnel holding positions of responsibilities in the Government; and decreasing the hold the Communist-dominated unions have on organized labor. These policies exhibit the desire of most Italians to support a democratic form of government. In addition, they believe that continued improvement in their living conditions and the practice of political democracy itself is the best defense against communism.

In spite of these postwar problems of economic and political stability and the resulting financial burden, the Italian Government did not hesitate to pass legislation to strengthen Italy's defense posture. Naturally, domestic problems imposed limitations on Italy's capacity to build an adequate defense establishment. Consequently, the United States through the mutual defense assistance program granted Italy aid to enable her to meet her NATO commitments and to rebuild her military strength. As a result the reorganized Italian armed forces have become an effective link in the NATO chain. The vital strategic location of Italy and the strong Italian support of NATO makes her an important force for free world security. Her important role in the NATO alliance was recently emphasized by the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, when he said:

I cannot speak in Italy without first thanking the Italian Government and the Italian people for the support they have always given NATO—SHAPE is particularly grateful for Italy's contribution not only of organization and equipment, but of spirit, energy and imagination as well.

It is particularly appropriate, on this anniversary of the establishment of the Italian Republic, that we also congratulate the Italian people for the amazing progress they have made in the economic and political field as well since World War II. In addition, we should make it clear to them that we will continue to support them in their determination to remain free as we are aware that an economically strong and politically democratic Italy is essential to the security of the free world.

GEN. OMAR N. BRADLEY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, the night the President left for his historic meeting in Paris he graciously found time in his schedule to pay honor to a great American and a great American cause. A dinner salute to Gen. Omar N. Bradley was hosted by the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation. Proceeds from the dinner will be used to help achieve world peace through world health by building new cancer research facilities at hospitals and medical schools and to sponsor a worldwide fellowship program for postdoctoral training and cancer research in this country and abroad. An equal sacrifice of time was made by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON who interrupted a well-earned, if brief, rest to journey all the way to New York City to honor General Bradley and the supporters of the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation. His moving words, which closed the dinner on the highest possible level, made a deep impression on all those present and renewed the already existing warm bond of affection for him

personally. In the belief that my colleagues will be interested in the words of the President and the Vice President, they follow immediately:

THE PRESIDENT

President JOHN F. KENNEDY. Mrs. Roosevelt, General Bradley, Mayor Wagner, Vice President Johnson, Ambassador Stevenson, Mr. Baruch, my colleague, Congressman Roosevelt, ladies and gentlemen, I recognize that tonight I bear a heavy responsibility, having kept a distinguished group of Americans who paid $125 for this dinner from that dinner for an hour and 30 minutes, but I will say that, if I may quote an old East Side expression, that what you have lost on the bananas you are going to make up on the apples, because this could have been one of the longest dinners in the history of these occasions.

LYNDON is good for 45 minutes when he is given a chance; Ambassador Stevenson has been known to go for a very long time. Frank Pace has a long story to tell, and Bob Hope will, if called upon. So this might have gone to 1 or 2 in the morning, but because of my imminent journey to Paris you will be out—hungry, rather unhappy, but you will be home early tonight. It is now 1:30 in Paris, and I am due there at 10:30, and I do not believe it would be a good start to keep the general waiting, so I shall be brief.

I do not think that it is at all inappropriate that I should come from this meeting to go to see President de Gaulle and Chairman Khrushchev. The figures which disturb our lives in regard to cancer, one out of every four, or two out of every three families, are not American figures; they are the same figures that can be found in the country of General de Gaulle; they are the same statistics which will bring death in the country of Chairman Khrushchev. And therefore I feel it most appropriate to go from this dinner with a group of Americans who have given great effort to conquering this disease, to go from here on my journey across the sea.

Benjamin Franklin once said that every American has two homes, his own country and France. And I am sure that in this visit which I undertake, that I bring to France and to President de Gaulle the appreciation, the respect, and esteem of all of the people of this country, who value his courage over a period of 20 years in which he has served as one of the great leaders of the world.

I am glad to be at this dinner to pay tribute to a former comrade-in-arms of his, General Bradley, whose conduct throughout all of his life has been governed by the motto of the corps whose young men we now see with us tonight, "duty, honor, and country."

This service which he renders in this cause is only the most recent in a long series of causes, a long series of efforts he has made on behalf of our country and the free countries of the earth.

So, General, I am proud to be here tonight, to honor you, and also Mrs. Roosevelt.

She has lent her name, and her efforts, and her talents, and her generosity to so many causes, and all of us here, individually and collectively, have been the beneficiary of them one way or another.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I want to express my thanks for your invitation to me tonight. The great strength of our country is the willingness of people such as yourselves to undertake this kind of work. The Vice President and I are conscious always of the fact that we appropriate in Washington from $45 to $50 billion a year in the defense of the great Republic, and we spend a fraction of that in the fight for cancer.

If in any way it will make it possible for us to make a greater effort on this cause and no longer have to build our strength constantly, then the trip which I am about to make, the trip which the Vice President made a week ago, the trip which Ambassador Stevenson will make next week, are all worthwhile.

We go to many countries, but we sing the same song, and that is this country wants peace, and this country wants freedom. Therefore, in going tonight across the sea I recognize that all of you as citizens of this great Republic come with me. Thank you.

THE VICE PRESIDENT

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON. Mr. Hope, Mrs. Roosevelt, General Bradley, Ambassador Stevenson, Mayor Wagner, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, "First in war, first in peace, first in the hearts of his countrymen," was applied to another great American, but it applies so aptly to Gen. Omar Bradley that I just could not resist repeating it here again tonight.

I know of few citizens who have contributed so much to their country. As a tactician in time of war, as Veterans Administrator for the men who fought under him, as a peacemaker in NATO, and now as inspiration and instigator of the international drive on cancer.

Truly, I think we can say of him: "There is a soldier and a man." Listening here tonight to deeds past and present is an inspiration to everyone privileged to meet in this peaceful house with this delicious dinner. Perhaps more so to me, for only a week ago tonight I was returning from a 30,000-mile trip through six capitals of southeast Asia. I went to learn and, where possible, to guide and help.

Never have I been so conscious as tonight of the challenge which your slogan: "World Peace Through World Health," the basis of the work of the Eleanor Roosevelt Cancer Foundation, offers to mankind.

Over half the world's 2½ billion people either suffer from chronic illness or become sick annually. This vast human suffering places illness second only to hunger.

On this trip I heard no two words so often as I heard "poverty" and "disease." The countries I visited do daily battle with these two allies of communism. No one knows better than the Communists what assistance poverty and disease afford them.

In Vietnam some of the main guerrilla attacks of the Communists are made on antimalaria teams, on schools, on crops, on all the enemies of poverty and disease. The Communists foster poverty and disease to make the Vietnamese succumb to the worst disease of all, the Communist doctrine.

I was impressed with the battle which we, and which the leaders of the nations I visited, are attempting to wage against these two great tolls on human beings. And I am impressed, too, and I do not mean to be a self-righteous American, that America's greatest appeal 's her true concern, her deep concern for human beings.

In Laos, for instance, America is Dr. Dooley. In Burma, America is Dr. Gordon Seagrave. Their work survives because it has been transferred from human being to human being. Good works by good Americans—by Eleanor Roosevelt and Omar Bradley, remain on the world's honor roll no matter the political temperature of a specific country.

Less than 2 months ago in a tiny little village in Africa we talked to a tribal chief in the noonday sun. There were two words that needed no translation: "American," and "Roosevelt." This old chieftain knew them both, and knew them fondly.

You, better than anyone, Mrs. Roosevelt, can realize what it meant to me—a young congressional secretary, 30 years ago, who was inspired to public service by that same great man—what it meant to me to find a tribal chieftain in Africa 30 years later who had also been inspired.

Personal interest in persons can never be traded for statistics. This awareness is America's strength, and that is why the tide of freedom is not running out for America.

Some commentator said that I returned from my trip with a missionary zeal. Well, I confess it. I found people whose hopes are our hopes, whose efforts are bent to the same work for their people that we could help envisage. I learned that leaders who are not 100 percent that all would want them to be are generally 90 percent, and they are closer to their own people than we give them credit for being.

I met thousands, hundreds of thousands, from Saigon to Karachi, and I never looked into a single hostile eye, nor I never grasped a hostile hand, except perhaps some of our own people who never could quite understand why I would hold up their cars behind to go out and shake hands with people who lined the countryside, and who had been waiting in temperature of 110 degrees for 3, 4, and 5 hours just to look at an American.

A wise man once said, "Where danger is near, so also is salvation." It is ours if we are wise enough to find it, and I believe we will. I do not know when I have been stimulated so much to be in the presence of so many good, unselfish people.

May, in the days ahead, your contributions to the work of this kind increase. Good night, and God bless you.

JUDGMENT AVOIDANCE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to provide for the separation from the service of certain Government employees who have unpaid judgments against them.

It appears that a number of employees of the Federal Government are taking advantage of the fact that the law does not permit their salaries to be attached to pay their just debts. This, in many respects, is a wise law. It does, however, permit these people to refuse to pay judgments awarded by our courts. When such a judgment-debtor makes himself judgmentproof, he leaves the party who obtained the judgment without any legal recourse at all.

The purpose of my bill is to prevent employees of the Government from escaping the payment of final judgments by the threat of dismissal unless they make the proper arrangements in good faith for the liquidation of their just debts.

It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that no person has a right to escape payment of his lawful obligations. If he attempts to do so by making himself judgmentproof he does not deserve the respect or the confidence which, of necessity, reposes in employment by the Federal Government.

Any person who makes himself judgmentproof, for any reason whatsoever,

cannot be trusted in any department of the United States Government.

My bill provides for the dismissal of those employees having outstanding against them any unpaid final judgment who have not made satisfactory arrangements for the payment of that judgment within 30 days after such judgment becomes final or for the application of not less than 15 percent of their annual income for that purpose.

Nothing in the bill will deny to an honest debtor his right to avail himself of the privileges extended to him by the Bankruptcy Act.

Only after such judgment is satisfied would these employees be eligible for reemployment by the Federal Government. The provisions of this bill also include the employees of the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

The measures called for in my bill, Mr. Speaker, are justified by the circumstances prevailing presently. I trust that our colleagues will join me in urging early enactment of this bill.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, some people say there is something wrong with the Republican Party, and apparently there is something wrong with it, otherwise we would have elected a President and won a majority in Congress last November. In my humble judgment, we never will win either the House or elect a President until we decide to go along with the principles of the party, which experience has demonstrated to be sound. To win and protect the national welfare and keep open to all the door of opportunity we must not only go along with the principles of our party but make an aggressive fight here in Congress as well as at the polls. For my own part I would like to see our party be aggressive, insist upon our right as members of the minority party, insist that we have representation on the staff of the subcommittees as well as on the regular standing committees. On those committees we have a 4-to-6 membership. There is no reason why we should not have like representation on the staff of committees and subcommittees. For that I have contended but our leadership refuses to fight. That the public has caught on is shown by Drummond's article of the 31st, which reads:

GOP PROSPECTS—PARTY MUFFING ITS CHANCES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The Republicans are having a jolly, scrumptious, $100-a-plate dinner in Washington this week—good food, good oratory, and a good time. It will all be in the papers.

What won't be in the news dispatches is that while raising needed money, they are raising false hopes.

The Republicans are raising false hopes because the party leadership in Congress is producing no plan, no program, no purpose, and no machinery to realize their hopes.

I do not mean that Republican prospects for 1962 are bad. They are fascinatingly good. But at this stage, the Republican congressional leadership is kicking them away with both feet.

Sure, the party needs money from the $100-a-plate dinners. But money is the last thing they need. The first need—in the national interest and in their own interest—is leadership, purpose, program, and participation in the forming of Republican policy by the whole Republican delegation in Congress.

The truth is that the Republican leadership is, for the most part, persistently plodding backward.

Here's what's wrong:

1. There is no teamwork among Republicans in the House and far from enough in the Senate. The 20 new Republican Congressmen are being ignored. They are given no voice in the development of policy, no sense of participation. Talk about teamwork—there is not only no work but no team.

2. As a party the Republicans in Congress are doing little effective to show any awareness of the Nation's economic problems, any concern with the Nation's human problems. Nor do they display the capacity to keep the Kennedy administration under the lens of coherent scrutiny.

3. There is precious little articulation of Republican policy by the minority leadership primarily because there is so little Republican policy to articulate. I would not say that the climate of the Republican congressional leadership is anti-intellectual; it is just anti-idea, anti-initiative, anti-do-anything. Even when the party has a good idea—like proposing weeks ahead of President Kennedy a retraining and reallocation program to help solve chronic unemployment—there is no united voice to make it heard, no followthrough.

4. There is hardly a single committee in the House or Senate with an adequate professional staff to enable the Republicans to develop their own policies or answer the Democrats.

The Republicans have simply let themselves become the prisoners of the Democratic majority and the leadership is doing nothing to break out of this prison. In consequence the Republicans are denying themselves the machinery essential for them to do their job. (Note: The Democratic chairman of the House Labor Committee, Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, generously increased the minority staff 100 percent. This increased the Republican staff from 2 to 4 and the Democratic staff from 20 to 40, an even 50–50.)

It doesn't have to be this way. The millions of Republican voters don't want it this way. Something needs to be done soon. For example:

Bring the whole Republican membership into active and animate participation in creating party policy.

Demand that the Democrats approve adequate professional minority staffs.

Use party funds to create Republican congressional task forces to deal with economic growth, employment, civil rights, the plight of the Cuban refugees, and other vital issues.

Send these Republican task forces around the country to assess the Nation's problems at first hand, to tap men of ideas, and to show the voters that the Republican Party does care and is concerned.

Develop positive, workable programs which apply conservative principles to solving the Nation's problems, not just use conservative words as a device to neglect them.

So far the Republican leadership has just been stalling around waiting for something to happen. But, fortunately, a strong undertone of grumbling and rumbling inside the ranks of the Republicans in Congress can now be heard. This rumbling is going to get stronger. The party leadership may not like it but it will be good for the party.

"BLACKMAIL" OFFER OF CUBAN PRISONERS FOR TRACTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include letters.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have been reluctant up to this time to speak out on the "blackmail" offer of Cuban prisoners for U.S. tractors, principally because this matter lies within the scope of foreign affairs, and under the Constitution the President is charged with this responsibility.

My congressional district is very much involved in view of Fidel Castro's having specified Caterpillar tractors which are produced in Peoria, Ill. I am sure the Caterpillar Tractor Co. appreciates the free publicity given to our superior product, but there are some grave questions involved.

President Kennedy, Speaker RAYBURN, and other spokesmen for the administration have tried to make it appear as though the U.S. Government is taking no official position, declaring that the Government "is out of it and going to stay out of it." But how can this be the case when the committee appointments of those to negotiate with the Cubans were made by the President himself, and when there has been in effect an embargo on the shipment of tractors to Cuba?

Now the administration contends that since there is no embargo on medical and agricultural products that these tractors would fall within the category of the latter. There is absolutely no good grounds for taking this position. The tractors we are talking about are D–8 track-type, 23-ton machines, exclusive of any attachments.

In the first place, the Cuban economy is in a state of near collapse, and it could very well be that these 500 tractors might be just the spark needed to put them on their feet again. They are, of course, much more suited for construction of missile bases, military sites, airfields, building of dams and levees, highways, vast reclamation projects, and mining operations. Furthermore, this tractor is used as a weapons carrier and can be converted into a tank-type vehicle to repel a future invasion force.

In other words, we are not talking about the traditional row-crop type tractor used so prevalently on our farms.

In the second place, from those who have knowledge of what the Cuban econ-

omy requires, they could not possibly use the 500 tractors for agricultural purposes, and I suspect that they would be used in barter with the Soviet Union or other satellite nations for much needed machine tools, weapons, or anything of value to them. The Russians have always made a practice of getting several models of our superior machinery and then disregarding all patent laws, copying them, part for part, and reproducing them without the painstaking research and development required by the original producer.

Since these tractors obviously are not "agricultural products," it is absolutely necessary for the Government to relax its current embargo and officially give sanction to the granting of an export license for these tractors; and I would point out that Caterpillar Tractor Co. has had opportunities in the past to sell machines to the Cuban Government and have refused to do so because of the current embargo. The Caterpillar Tractor Co. is prepared to meet the requirements, but they stand to make no profit from this operation. They should not, however, be placed in the position of making the decision in this critical situation as to whether or not the tractors are actually shipped. This is the responsibility of the President, and there is no way of getting around it through intermediary committees of private individuals or catchy verbal phrases.

As I see it, the President himself will have to take affirmative action to lift the embargo. If he does not and chooses to allow them to be shipped under the guise of agricultural products, then I would be inclined to ask the Attorney General to issue an injunction; but then this might be a most touchy subject for one so closely kin to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I have received a number of communications from my constituents, many of whom are employees of Caterpillar, the largest industry in my district. These people are very concerned, as I am, that this could be only the beginning of any number of other "blackmailing" attempts, not only on the part of Castro but also those who might subscribe to this kind of action.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD a sampling of some of the letters I have received from folks in my district:

WASHINGTON, ILL., *May 28, 1961.*

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MICHEL: We think it is morally wrong for the U.S. Government or private citizens, to bargain with Cuba by sending tractors in exchange for prisoners. We would appreciate anything you can do to prevent such action.

Sincerely,

———— ————.

EAST PEORIA, ILL., *May 23, 1961.*

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: I am concerned that many persons in prominent positions seem determined to pay the blackmail demanded by Castro.

The administration has done nothing to halt the headlong rush to compromise the integrity of the United States. In fact, it appears determined to ignore laws, regulations and commonsense in its desire to pay ransom to Cuba.

It makes no difference that private individuals are buying the tractors—permission to ship them constitutes payment of blackmail by the United States. The moral fiber of this country has declined considerably since 1801, when as a new and weak Nation it went to war rather than pay tribute to pirates.

Therefore, I urge you to do everything possible to prevent the issuance of export licenses for these tractors and to prevent the export of all other materials to Cuba, including food and medicine. It is ridiculous to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

Yours very truly,

———— ————.

PEORIA, ILL., *May 28, 1961.*

Representative ROBERT MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: From what we read in the newspapers, it appears that the administration is supporting the proposed tractors-for-prisoners deal.

For a Government which is pledged to work for the downfall of Castro, it is hard to imagine a more inconsistent or illogical position. If we go through with this, and thereby immensely strengthen Castro's hold on the people and country of Cuba, we will deserve all the scorn and contempt of other nations which our ineptitude will bring upon us.

As a nation we keep wondering why things never seem to turn out as we want them to, but we deliberately throw away trump cards. Castro's obvious need for this machinery, properly exploited by competent diplomats, should win for us many genuine concessions over and above the safety of the prisoners.

I assume you are in accord with Mr. Nixon's stand, and hope you will use whatever influence you can to try to change the administration's course.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

MAY 28, 1961.

CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: I sincerely hope you will do everything in your power to block any action that will allow Fidel Castro to be given 500 tractors or anything that will help the group (Roosevelt, Reuther, and Eisenhower) to obtain funds such as tax exemptions.

We have been practicing appeasement long enough.

Thank you.

———— ————.

MAY 25, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I don't make it a habit to write my Congressman very often, but I am completely disturbed by this Cuban situation. The United States is being blackmailed and if we continue to allow this sort of thing to happen, we will be held in contempt by every nation in the world.

I think it is high time that the Congress of the United States tells the President that it does not go along with this sort of thing. You may find yourself in a difficult position to speak against the sale of tractors because apparently they want Peoria products, but certainly you can raise your voice with your colleagues and do something to reestablish the United States in a respectable position.

Very truly yours,

———— ————.

MAY 24, 1961.

Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am appalled and horrified at the thought that our Government and our State Department can seriously consider approving the trading of tractors for captured Cuban prisoners. Never before in the history of this country have we had to ransom prisoners and pay for friendship. I feel that it is high time that something is done to change the manner in which the State Department is conducting our affairs with foreign nations. Let us be realistic and put Castro in the place he so rightfully belongs. If force is necessary, let us use it and stop this Communist dictator.

I am not alone in my beliefs. In my daily work I talk to dozens of people from all walks of life, and they all feel the same way. I feel that world opinion should be considered, of course, but I believe that a strong show of force and armed intervention against Cuba would do much to restore the faith of the free people all over the world that this country is big, and strong, and brave, and willing to fight.

Let us show them that we have been pushed far enough.

Respectfully,

———— ————.

MAPLETON, ILL., *May 26, 1961.*

Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Why has President Kennedy given his approval of the drive to get tractors for Castro in trade for Cuban prisoners? Is it because the present administration has really pulled a deluxe boner? True, he says the Government will stay out of it, but he said that about the invasion. It is my opinion that those prisoners knew what they might get into before they made the invasion.

Why must our country always take the attitude that we, being a democracy, must let other countries push us around? During World War II and the Korean conflict, I made it to eight different countries, and always it was the same story, as I am sure you have heard before. As long as the GI's had plenty of money or food to give out, we were very popular. But also everyone told us, "You Americans are a very nice people, but you are too soft. You let other countries push you around."

I say this: Let this country start acting like the one it was back in the Revolutionary days. Let the world know that we don't intend to give out any guff, but we don't intend to take any, either.

Let's stop this silly tractor business and tell those Cubans that war is hell any way you look at it.

Let us pray that our country will not fall into this great mess any further.

Very sincerely yours,

———— ————.

PEKIN, ILL.

Hon. ROBERT MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thus far I feel you have ably served me and am sure you will do whatever is necessary concerning the Castro tractors-for-prisoners situation.

At a time when the free world is looking for firm leadership it should not be necessary or advisable to knuckle down to the demands of the Cuban dictator.

The Cuban rebels knew what they were doing and also the consequences. It is said that the United States advised them as to when and how to attack and this I cannot deny. However, let us not keep piling error on top of error—the aiding of the Cuban

rebels was, I feel, a mistake and to allow tractors to be given to Castro in exchange for prisoners would be a bigger mistake.

Although the funds for these tractors is to come from private sources, the effect on the watching world would be the same as if the U.S. Government footed the bill.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

PEORIA, ILL., *May 23, 1961.*

Representative ROBERT MICHEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MICHEL: I sincerely urge you to exercise all your influence to prevent our Government from lifting the Cuban embargo in order for a group of "pious" individuals to pay blackmail to Fidel Castro in return for 1,200 prisoners.

I feel great sympathy for the prisoners but not to the point to make the American people payers of blackmail.

There would be no end to our sacrifice of principle once we start. How many enemies of America hold "political prisoners" they would exchange for a few dollars or pieces of equipment.

Yours truly,

——— ———.

EDUCATION IN A FREE SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the administration's general education bill has two principal defects. First, it attempts to combine the general aid provisions and the impacted areas provisions in the same bill. These are separate problems and should not be tied together in an omnibus-type bill. The reason for combining them is very obvious. It is hoped that by doing so the general aid provisions will gain the support of those who are in favor of the impacted area provisions. I believe, however, that each is deserving of separate consideration. Moreover, the political gimmick of combining the two may well backfire. It could mean the defeat of both when I am certain that the majority of the Congress is in favor of the impacted area legislation.

The second defect is in the fact that the administration's bill grants Federal funds for both school construction and teachers' salaries. I am in favor of Federal aid to the States for school construction. The need for this type of aid has been amply demonstrated. You will recall that the Eisenhower administration sponsored a bill which would have provided funds to the States for the construction of badly needed school facilities. I am, however, opposed to granting Federal funds for teachers' salaries. I believe that this type of aid will ultimately mean Federal controls over the selection, retention, and qualifications of teachers. Perhaps these controls will not be exercised at the outset. However, as time goes by, they most certainly will be, for in every other instance expenditure of Federal funds has been closely controlled and supervised from the Federal level. There is no reason to believe that the funds appropriated for teachers' salaries will be treated any differently.

I include at this point in my remarks an excerpt from a speech by Senator HUGH SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, which illuminates this entire problem.

Speaking at commencement ceremonies of Eastern Baptist College, Senator SCOTT said on May 27, 1961:

American education needs help—in the form of money, attention and priority of goals. And although that help comes most effectively and with least danger of control when it comes from local and State levels, most of us will agree that the Federal Government has a responsibility in areas that involve the national welfare and national security.

I support Federal assistance for the construction of school buildings. I supported and voted for the National Defense Education Act which provides loans to college students, fellowships for graduate study, grants for the purchase of scientific, mathematics and language equipment in the schools and assistance for guidance programs and certain kinds of research.

But this legislation is in sharp contrast with the Federal-aid-to-education bill now being considered by Congress where the emphasis has shifted from construction, research and aid for specialized scholarships to a general catchall, pork-barrel type of bill based on highly discriminatory formulas.

This bill has been so loaded with authorizations that it strays far beyond the original purpose for which it was proposed. For example, it would now permit payments for fuel and electricity, for the services performed about the school grounds, such as chalking the marks on the football field and purchase of school athletic uniforms and equipment, and no one knows how much more.

The hearings developed that in 1 year under this bill the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania would receive a Federal allotment of about $35 million, but would be paying out more than $60 million in tax payments required by this program. We would be getting back some $25 million less than we would pay out in taxes. This is the "third dollar" theme—Pennsylvania gets $2 back out of every $3 it pays out. The third dollar is for the States whose spokesmen claim need it more than we do.

By contrast each year North Carolina would receive about $24 million more in the Federal allotment than its estimated taxes under this program; Georgia would receive about $17 million more than it paid out; Mississippi about $14 million more; and Alabama, the site of so much recent unrest, would receive about $16 million more than it paid out in taxes.

The presumption here is that our State is rich and can afford to pay out more than it receives back from the Federal Government, and that the States I have just mentioned are said to be poor and so the flow of money goes in the other direction for them.

This is indeed a bitter irony. We are a State with seven areas classified as major depressed areas. We have 10 smaller areas which would qualify under the depressed area bill which recently was enacted. And then I look at the list of Federal allocations and estimated tax payments and see that the so-called poor State of Texas, the home of natural gas and oil wells, would receive each year almost $17 million more than it pays in taxes. This was the final frosting on the cake, or sweetening of the bill.

I opposed this bill because it was heavily weighted against Pennsylvania and in favor of financing segregated school systems elsewhere, with Pennsylvania tax collections.

I believe that this legislation is faced with an additional roadblock which may, in the end, serve to defeat the entire bill. A concerted drive is being made to amend the bill so that funds will be made available to private as well as public schools. I feel that it would not only be unconstitutional to do so, but also terribly unwise. The separation of church and state is one of the cornerstones of our democracy. There is no faster way to destroy this cornerstone than to appropriate Federal funds to private schools, the majority of which are church schools.

Now, having made my position clear in this matter, I do not want to leave this subject without first commenting on what I feel is a very great problem. The private schools of the United States have made and are presently making a tremendous contribution to our overall educational program. They are desperately in need of funds so that they can maintain adequate standards. We cannot afford to stand idly by and see our private educational system deteriorate and possibly cease to exist as an important educational factor. As an expression of my deep concern and in an effort to do something concrete concerning this problem, I have introduced two bills, H.R. 5672 and H.R. 5673. These bills would, first, establish $1,000-a-year scholarships in all fields for needy students winning a national competition; second, grant taxpayers an additional deduction from taxable income for expenses incurred by him, his spouse, or his dependent or dependents while attending college; and, third, provide an optional tax credit for contributions to education which may be chosen by the taxpayer in place of the deductions now allowed. This feature extends to all taxpayers the tax advantages now available only to taxpayers in the top-income brackets who make contributions to education.

I include at this point in my remarks the text of a letter to the editor which has been published in the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, the Washington Post, and the Washington Star:

AID TO PRIVATE EDUCATION: REVISION OF TAX STRUCTURE URGED TO PROVIDE EASE OF GIVING

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

As ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am deeply interested in the entire question of Federal aid to education.

I believe that the President, having asked the Congress to provide Federal aid for public schools, should now ask the Congress to modernize the tax structure in order that citizens may more easily give financial aid to private and public educational institutions in accordance with their own wishes.

Financial support for American education has had two major aspects historically: Public support for public education through such steps as President Kennedy has proposed, and private giving for public and private education, the latter assisted by wise tax laws.

The new Democratic administration would have the Congress provide major benefits for public education, but refuses to take, at the same time, the steps necessary to provide the essential tax reforms which would make possible private giving of the magnitude required by private education at this time.

Private education is the leaven of our educational system, and democratic government

such as we have always known cannot possibly long survive if private educational institutions disappear from the American scene.

DECREASED INCENTIVE

Recently I introduced legislation, H.R. 5673, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide funds for educational purposes by providing increased incentives for private giving through the allowance of a tax credit for charitable contributions to educational institutions and to allow a deduction for tuition and other expenses incurred by a taxpayer or his spouse or dependent at an educational institution.

Under my plan every taxpayer may make gifts to education at the same cost of giving. The same status would be accorded to millions of Americans that is now provided in the Internal Revenue Code for those few Americans in the highest income group. At the present time it costs a person in the 91-percent income tax bracket only $9 to give $100 to education. It costs the rest of us, on an ascending scale, up to $80 to give $100 to education.

The Democratic Party, being the party of those solely concerned with the masses—as we are constantly reminded—should welcome and wholeheartedly support my plan.

I was highly pleased when the majority leader, Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Democrat of Massachusetts, recently praised my bill and pointed out that he had himself sponsored and worked for similar legislation since coming to the Congress.

PRESIDENT'S POSITION

At his press conference on March 15 President Kennedy was asked what his position was regarding the proposals for modernizing the tax structure to provide increased incentives for private aid to education, especially in view of the fact that His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman had endorsed the tax approach to aid education. The President replied, "I am hopeful we can get the program which we sent to the Hill out of the way. Then the Congress will have to consider what it wants to do in this other area."

If President Kennedy would take the lead now in modernizing the tax structure to aid private and public education—as he apparently is willing to do to aid business—then the present educational misunderstanding would not have a leg to stand on. I base this view on a letter I have just received from His Eminence Francis Cardinal Spellman stating that "your bill appears to be consistent with my statement of March 13."

CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

WASHINGTON, *May 1, 1961.*

The effect of these bills would be to encourage private giving to education. This giving could be to both public and private education and would be a constitutional means whereby our private schools could obtain the funds which are so absolutely essential to them. I am hopeful that these bills will serve not only to obtain the necessary funds for private education, but will also serve to remove this problem from the field of direct Federal aid to education.

I have revised my bill H.R. 5673, to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools, and to provide certain additional assistance for both public and private education on a permanent basis.

I propose to offer my revised bill, which I am introducing today, as a substitute to the administration bill H.R. 7300, when it is brought to the floor for consideration.

I include at this point an analysis of my revised measure:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1961.

To: Hon. CARROLL D. KEARNS,

From: American Law Division.

Subject: Digest of revised draft of H.R. 5673; 87th Congress.

1. Allotment formula would allot $350 million in each fiscal year, 1962, 1963, 1964, for construction of public elementary and secondary schools. Minimum allotment is $12 times number of school age (5–17) children, or an amount bearing same ratio to sum appropriated as product of number of school age children and State's allotment ratio, latter being $1 minus total of 50 cents plus quotient resulting from division of income per child by income for children of all States. Said income is total personal income per State divided by school age children.

If a State's effort for a fiscal year is not equal to the State's base effort, its allotment is reduced by the difference between the State's public school expenditures and an amount equal to State's base effort plus a further reduction bearing the same ratio to the State's allotment as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort bears to the national effort.

To receive an allotment a State must agree to distribute it solely through its education agency, expend the same solely on public school construction, demonstrate its need, and remit any unused portion of an allotment. Federal denial of an application must be preceded by notice and hearing. Also, Federal disbursement of an allotment shall cease upon discovery of any breach of condition on the part of a State, and shall not be presumed until compliance is renewed and any diverted funds repaid. All such Federal decisions are subject to judicial review.

Labor working on such federally financed construction shall be paid in conformity with Federal standards unless the latter are waived.

2. Tax credit for charitable contributions to educational institutions.

An individual may utilize as a credit the lesser of the following: (1) Such contributions multiplied by his maximum tax rate; (2) or in the case of a standard deduction or optional tax, 5 percent of adjusted gross income without regard to loss carryback; or (3) 15 percent of adjusted gross without regard to such carryback.

As to corporations, said credit is the lesser of the following: (a) Contributions multiplied by a percentage equal to the normal and surtax tax rates; or (b) 5 percent of net income compared without regard to loss carryback, Western Hemisphere corporation deductions, limitations on charitable contributions, or special corporate deductions other than corporate deductions other than for organizational expenditures.

For corporations on an accrual basis, if the contribution is made on or before the 15th day of the 3d month after the close of the tax year, its contribution may be treated as paid during the tax year.

If a corporate carryback is in excess of the aforementioned 5 percent (2) limitation, the corporation may elect to take the carryback into account in each of the 2 succeeding years, but only to the extent of the lesser of the following: (1) The excess of contributions within the 5-percent limit over the amount of contributions made in the tax year; and in the case of the first taxable year, the amount of such excess, and in the second, the portion of such excess not hitherto applied. Credits are not to result in refunds.

Educational institution means only an institution which normally maintains a regular faculty, curriculum, and body of students.

Deductible educational expenses include tuition fees, books, supplies and equipment essential for instruction, meals and lodging by those in attendance as full-time students. These deductions cannot exceed $2,000 in any 1 year; and scholarships must be subtracted therefrom.

I would also like to mention the bill H.R. 4253, which I have introduced and which would extend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 for 5 additional years. I am sure you are all familiar with the general provisions of the NDEA. However, I wonder if you know the wonderful things which this act has accomplished in less than 3 years.

Under its provisions, more than 175,000 student loans have been made, more than 57,000 projects designed to improve laboratories, special equipment and materials used in science, mathematics and modern foreign languages have been instituted, and by next fall 4,000 students will be studying under the fellowship program. The provisions of my bill would expand and improve the NDEA as well as extend its life for an additional 5 years.

I am convinced that it is in this area that Federal participation can have its greatest impact and be most successful. It is unfortunate that the Kennedy administration has decided that the NDEA should play a secondary role in the Federal aid to education program. This act has been successful, it has never been subject to a constitutional challenge, and it is the one readily available vehicle which can be used in our race with the Communists in the field of development of educational excellence. This is a race we must win, for to come in second, even a close second, may well mean the end of our civilization as we know it today.

The question of Federal aid to education is by no means new. In fact, it can be pointed out that Federal aid to education is actually older than the Constitution itself. You may know, for example, that in 1787 before the United States Constitution was ratified, the Northwest Ordinance underscored the importance of education and stated that "religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

In 1862 the Morrill Land-Grant Act granted to each State acres of public land or its equivalent in scrip to be used for the support of a college which would have as its primary purpose the teaching of branches of learning related to agriculture, mechanic arts, and military training. Subsequent legislation has increased support for land-grant colleges and universities which today represent some of our oldest and most respected institutions.

We could go on, of course, and cite other measures such as the Vocational Education Act; the National School Lunch Act and special milk program; the provisions for veterans education under two GI bills; legislation for school construction and support in federally affected areas; assistance for rural libraries; legislation on behalf of

exceptional children, and the more recently enacted National Defense Act of 1958 which I have just discussed. All of these serve to point out that there is roughly about a 170-year-old tradition of Federal grants of land and money for education. You may be interested to know, for example, that the National Education Association reports that there have been more than 160 different Federal aid laws on behalf of education passed by Congress since 1785.

Now the history of Federal aid to education which I have presented in brief serves to point out the continuous concern of the Congress with means through which the Federal Government might best provide assistance to the States for the support of their educational program. At no time in the history of the Nation has there been a greater need for Federal assistance to the States for education than at the present when State departments of education continue to report tremendous backlogs in needs for public school classroom facilities and increased numbers of qualified teachers.

In its recent report of enrollment, teachers, and schoolhousing, the U.S. Office of Education estimates that approximately 8 million pupils are affected by overcrowding, by half-day sessions, and by the use of improvised or makeshift facilities. In addition, it is reported that there are over 2 million other students estimated as housed in obsolete or otherwise inadequate buildings. Therefore, the number of pupils whose education is being impaired in varying degree by the classroom shortage is estimated to be at least 10 million. A total of 1,868,000 public school pupils are reported to be in schools in excess of normal capacity, as determined by State and local standards.

Moreover, it is reported by the Office of Education in its comprehensive study "Ten-year Aims in Education: Staffing and Constructing Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1959–69," that there is a constant demand for qualified teachers. It is stated that projections indicate that total new demand is expected to remain fairly constant over the next 10 years, fluctuating around a level of a little over 200,000 per year. Along with this fact, it may be observed that States have reported 91,500 teachers, or 6.5 percent of the total teaching staff, as holding substandard certificates. I would suppose that many of these teachers have very serious desires to do further study to fully qualify for teaching certificates, but we know that the general range of teachers' salaries often necessitates summer employment for these individuals in order to meet the cost of living, thereby removing the possibility of study for the completion of certificate standards. This is particularly true in the case of married teachers with growing families.

Now all this to me adds up to a rather vicious circle which is going to continue to go round and round unless something is done and done soon to remedy the situation. This something, which can and should be done, to my way of thinking, is a program of Federal financial support to the States for education. I think the Congress is convinced of this fact. The difficulty, of course, lies in the enactment of a program which can be most effective and meaningful while at the same time safeguarding for the States—and for you, the parents and teachers and all local citizens—the responsibility for and control over the schools. It would be a tragic epoch in the history of this great Nation if legislation on behalf of education were enacted at the Federal level which would destroy the tradition of State and local citizen responsibility for the public schools.

The Commission on National Goals in its 1960 report to President Eisenhower presented a statement about Federal aid to education which I consider to be most meaningful. The Commission stated:

> No one knows how best to design the role of the Federal Government in education. But one thing is certain: with education playing a vastly more crucial role in our national life, there is no likelihood that the Federal Government can escape greater involvement in it. Nor need we be alarmed at such involvement. Our tradition of local control in education is a healthy one, but we must not let it thwart us in accomplishing important national purposes.
>
> The urgent requirements—and opportunities—of modern life make it necessary that we handle some problems at the State and National levels, whether the field be transportation, communication, commerce, law enforcement, or education. We are facing tasks of the gravest import for our future as a Nation. Some of these tasks require long-term planning at the highest level. In such matters, we must act as a Nation.
>
> Primary responsibility for financing the schools must lie with States and local districts. But it is clear that Federal support must be increased, and so designed as to offer minimum interference with State and local autonomy, and not to undermine local incentives to raise money for schools.

I include at this point the text of my revised H.R. 5673, which I am introducing today.

The title of my revised measure, which I plan to offer as a substitute to the administration bill H.R. 7300 when it is brought to the floor for consideration, follows:

A BILL TO AUTHORIZE A 3-YEAR PROGRAM OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS, AND TO PROVIDE CERTAIN ADDITIONAL ASSISTANCE FOR BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE EDUCATION ON A PERMANENT BASIS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

SEC. 101. This title may be cited as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1961".

Declaration of purpose

SEC. 102. It is the purpose of this title to authorize a three-year program of Federal grants to States to assist their local education agencies to construct urgently needed public elementary and secondary school facilities. It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

Assurance against Federal interference in schools

SEC. 103. In the administration of this title, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 104. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without any limitation of such appropriation or condition inconsistent with or contrary to the terms or purposes of this title, for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, $350,000,000, for the purpose of making payments to State education agencies as provided in this title.

Allotments to States

SEC. 105. (a) The sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 shall be allotted among the States on the basis of the income per child of school age, the number of children of school age, and the effort for public school purposes of the respective States. A State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year shall be available for obligation by the State, in accordance with the provisions of this title, during such year and the next fiscal year (and for those two years only). Except as provided by section 106, and by subsection (b) of this section, such allotments shall be made as follows: The Commissioner shall allot to each State for each fiscal year, an amount which bears the same ratio to the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 for such year as the product of—

(1) the number of children of school age in the State in the preceding fiscal year, and

(2) the State's allotment ratio (as determined under subsection (c))

bears to the sum of corresponding products for all the States.

(b) Subject to the provisions of section 106, a State's minimum allotment for any fiscal year shall be the product of $12 multiplied by the number of children of school age in such State in the preceding fiscal year. If, for any fiscal year, the amount allotted to any State under subsection (a) is less than such State's minimum allotment, the Commissioner shall deduct from the sums appropriated pursuant to section 104 for such fiscal year, such amount as may be necessary to allot to each such State its minimum allotment for such fiscal year, and shall thereafter reallot among the remaining States and in accordance with subsection (a), the balance remaining after such deduction, and shall repeat such deductions and reallotments until, for each fiscal year, the amount allotted to each State is not less than such State's minimum allotment.

(c) For purposes of this title—

(1) The "allotment ratio" for any State shall be 1.00 less the product of (A) .50 and (B) the quotient obtained by dividing the income per child of school age for the State by the income per child of school age for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), except that the allotment ratio for Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be .75.

(2) The allotment ratios shall be promulgated by the Commissioner for each fiscal year, between July 1 and August 31 of such fiscal year, except that for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, such allotment ratios shall be promulgated as soon as possible after the enactment of this title. Allotment ratios for each fiscal year shall be computed on the basis of the average of the incomes per child of school age for the States and for all the States (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands)

for the three most recent consecutive fiscal years for which satisfactory data is available from the Department of Commerce. Such promulgation shall be conclusive for the purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise such allotment ratios, and, as so revised and promulgated, such promulgation shall be equally conclusive.

(3) The term "income per child of school age" for any fiscal year for a State or for all the States means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of children of school age in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(4) The term "child of school age" means a member of the population between the ages of five and seventeen, both inclusive.

Maintenance and improvement of State and local support for public school financing

SEC. 106. (a) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall be reduced if such State's effort for such fiscal year is not at least equal to such State's base effort for such year. The amount of such reduction shall be the difference between the State's public school expenditures in such year and the public school expenditures it would have made in such year had it exerted the State's base effort for such year.

(b) The sum otherwise allocable to any State under section 105 for any fiscal year after the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961, shall also be reduced if such State's effort for such year is not at least equal to the State's base effort for such year plus the average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five year period beginning July 1, 1956, and ending June 30, 1961. The amount of the reduction under this subsection (which shall be in addition to the reduction, of any, under subsection (a)) shall bear the same relation to the sum otherwise allocable to the State under section 105, (1) as the difference between the State's effort and the national effort for such year bears to the national effort for such year, or (2), if it would result in a smaller reduction, as the difference between the State's expenditure per public school pupil and 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year, bears to 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year. This subsection shall not apply to any State for any year for which the State's effort equaled or exceeded the national effort for such year, or the State's expenditure per public school pupil equaled or exceeded 110 per centum of the national expenditure per public school pupil for such year.

(c) The total reductions which may be made under subsections (a) and (b) from the sum otherwise allocable to a State for any fiscal year, shall not exceed one-third of such sum.

(d) For purposes of this section—

(1) (A) A "State's effort" for any State for a fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the State's expenditure per public school pupil in such fiscal year by (ii) the income per such pupil for the State for such year; except that the State's effort shall be deemed to be equal to the State's base effort and to the national effort in the case of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the District of Columbia.

(B) A State's "base effort" for a fiscal year means the average State effort over the three immediately preceding fiscal years.

(C) The "income per public school pupil" for a State or for all the States for any fiscal year means the total personal income for the State or for all the States in the calendar year ending in such fiscal year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands), respectively, divided by the number of public school pupils in the State or in all such States, respectively, in such fiscal year.

(2) (A) The "national effort" for any fiscal year is the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the expenditure per public school pupil for all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the income per such pupil for all such States for such year.

(B) The average annual rate of increase in the national effort over the five fiscal year period beginning July 1, 1956 and ending June 30, 1961, shall be determined by dividing the difference between the national effort for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, by four.

(3) (A) The "public school expenditures" of any State in any fiscal year means the total expenditures by the State and subdivisions thereof in such year for public elementary and secondary education made from funds derived from State and local sources in the State (including payments in the nature of payments in lieu of taxes from any sources).

(B) The "expenditure per public school pupil" for any State for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing the State's public school expenditures in such year by the number of its public school pupils for such year.

(C) The "national expenditure per public school pupil" for any fiscal year means the quotient obtained by dividing (i) the public school expenditures of all the States in such year (exclusive of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia) by (ii) the number of public school pupils in all such States for such year.

(4) The Commissioner's determinations of the State effort, base effort, income, public school expenditures, and expenditure per public school pupil, for any State, and his determinations of the national effort, average rate of increase, and expenditure per public school pupil, shall be conclusive for purposes of this title, except that the Commissioner may estimate and subsequently revise any such determination, and as so revised, such determination shall be equally conclusive.

Payment of allotments to States

SEC. 107. Payments to States which have submitted and had approved their applications under this title of Federal funds allotted to them pursuant to section 105 (as adjusted by the application of the provisions of section 106 and as adjusted on account of overpayments or underpayments previously made) shall be made by the Commissioner on the basis of such estimates, in such installments, and at such times, as may be reasonably required for expenditure by the States of the funds so allotted.

State agency administrative costs

SEC. 108. From the sums allotted to it under section 105, as adjusted by section 106, for each fiscal year, a State education agency may use such amount as it deems necessary for any supervision, services, and other costs of administering its activities under this title in that year, except that such amount shall not be more than whichever is the lesser of (1) 10 cents multiplied by the number of public school pupils in the State during the prior fiscal year, and (2) $150,000, except that if, for any State, such lesser amount is less than $25,000, such amount shall be increased to $25,000.

State applications

SEC. 109. (a) A State which desires to receive its allotments under this title shall submit through its State education agency an application to the Commissioner which—

(1) provides assurance that the State education agency shall be the sole agency for administering the funds received under this title;

(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State under this title will be expended solely for construction of public school facilities approved by the State education agency;

(3) sets forth criteria and procedures to assure that in allocating funds received under this title (other than amounts to be used under section 108) priority will be given to local education agencies which, upon making an effort commensurate with their economic resources, are unable, solely because of lack of such resources, to finance from the resources available to them the full cost of needed school facilities; the priority principles set forth in accordance with this paragraph shall take into account (A) the financial resources of the several local education agencies in the State, (B) the efforts which have been and are being made to meet their needs for public school facilities out of State and local funds, and (C) the urgency of their needs for public school facilities, determined according to conditions of overcrowding or lack of facilities, and the extent to which unsafe and obsolete facilities are in use;

(4) provides assurance that every local education agency whose application for funds under this title is denied, will be given an opportunity for a hearing before the State education agency;

(5) sets forth procedures for such fiscal control and fund accounting as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, funds paid to the State and by the State to the local education agencies under this title, which procedures shall include provision for repayment to the United States of any sums received by the State from its allotment for any fiscal year under this title which are not obligated by it under State law in accordance with the provisions of this title by the end of the fiscal year following that for which such allotment was made, or which are not expended in accordance therewith by the end of the second fiscal year following that in which they were obligated (unless such sums have been deducted from subsequent payments pursuant to section 107);

(6) provides assurance that the requirements of section 111 will be complied with on all construction projects in the State assisted under this title; and

(7) provides for making such reports in such form and containing such information as the Commissioner may from time to time reasonably require and for access by the Commissioner, upon request, to the records upon which such information is based.

(b) With respect to any public school operated by a public agency or institution other than a State or local education agency, and in the case of any State in which a State education agency has exclusive responsibility for financing the construction of school facilities within the entire State, within a given geographical area within the State, or with respect to particular categories of public schools, the Commissioner may modify or make inapplicable any of the provisions of subsection (a) to the extent he deems such action appropriate in the light of the special governmental or school organization of such State.

Review of State applications

SEC. 110. (a)(1) The Commissioner shall approve an application of a State which fulfills the conditions specified in section 109(a), and shall not finally disapprove a State application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency.

(2) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State education agency, finds that such agency is not complying substantially with the provisions required to be included in its application under section 109(a), or that any funds have been diverted from the purposes for which they have been paid, the Commissioner shall forthwith notify the State education agency, and he shall thereafter withold further payments to the State under this title until there is no longer any such failure to comply, or, if compliance is impossible, there is a repayment, or an arrangement for repayment, of Federal moneys which have been diverted or improperly expended.

(b)(1) A State education agency dissatisfied with a final action of the Commissioner under subsection (a) of this section may appeal to the United States district court for the district in which the capital of such State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action.

(2) Upon the filing of the petition referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. The findings of the Commissioner as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(3) The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Commissioner shall be subject to review as provided in sections 1291 and 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Labor standards

SEC. 111. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of construction work financed in whole or in part under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality to be determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a–276c–5) for construction projects under this title, and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be; but the State education agency may waive the application of this section in cases or classes of cases where laborers or mechanics, not otherwise employed at any time in the construction of the project, voluntarily donate their services for the purpose of lowering the costs of construction and the State education agency determines that any amounts saved thereby are fully credited to the education agency undertaking the construction. The State education agency of each State shall take such steps as shall be necessary to assure that the wage standards required above shall be set out in each project advertisement for bids and in each bid proposal form and shall be made a part of the contract covering the project. The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Definitions

SEC. 112. For the purposes of this title—

(1) The term "Commissioner" means the United States Commissioner of Education.

(2) The term "local education agency" means a board of education or other legally constituted local school authority having administrative control and direction of public schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(4) The term "State education agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public schools.

(5) The term "public school pupils" means pupils in average daily attendance at public schools within a State, or within all of the States, as determined by the Commissioner in accordance with criteria developed by him to assure uniform determinations for all the States.

(6) The term "public schools" means schools providing free education at public expense, under public supervision and direction and without tuition charge to resident pupils, and which is provided as elementary or secondary school education (A) by a State or local education agency, or (B) if the State application approved under this title so provides, by another State or local public agency or institution.

(7) The term "elementary and secondary education" shall not include any education provided below the kindergarten level or beyond grade 12.

(8) The terms "school facilities" and "public school facilities" mean classrooms and related facilities (including furniture, instructional materials other than textbooks, equipment, machinery, and utilities necessary or appropriate for school purposes) for public schools, and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvement) on which such facilities are constructed. Such terms shall include gymnasiums and similar facilities, except those intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

(9) The terms "construct", "constructing", and "construction" include the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities, and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

TITLE II

Sec. 201. (a) Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to educational institutions.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—At the election of the taxpayer there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter the amount determined under this section.

"(b) INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the amount allowable as a credit under this section shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(1) the amount determined by multiplying—

"(A) the amount of charitable contributions to educational institutions, by

"(B) the maximum rate of tax imposed for the taxable year by section 1 (a), or

"(2) (A) in the case of any individual who has elected to take the standard deduction provided by section 141 or to pay the optional tax imposed by section 3, 5 percent of the taxpayer's adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating, loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, or

"(B) in the case of any other such taxpayer, 15 percent of his adjusted gross income, computed without regard to any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172.

"(c) CORPORATIONS.—

"(1) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a corporation, the amount allowable as a credit under this section shall be whichever of the following is the lesser:

"(A) the amount determined by multiplying—

"(i) the amount of charitable contributions to educational institutions, by

"(ii) the percentage which equals the sum of the normal tax rate and the surtax rate prescribed by section 11 for the taxable year, or

"(B) 5 percent of the taxpayer's taxable income, computed without regard to—

"(i) section 170;

"(ii) part VIII of subchapter B (except section 248).

"(iii) any net operating loss carryback to the taxable year under section 172, and

"(iv) section 922 (special deduction for Western Hemisphere trade corporations).

"(2) CORPORATIONS ON ACCRUAL BASIS.—In the case of a corporation reporting its taxable income on the accrual basis, if—

"(A) the board of directors authorizes a charitable contribution to an educational institution during any taxable year, and

"(B) payment of such contribution is made after the close of such taxable year and on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of such taxable year,

then the taxpayer may elect to treat such contribution as paid during such taxable year.

"(3) CARRYOVER OF CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS.—Any contribution made by a corporation in the taxable year which, but for the limitation of paragraph (1)(B), would be taken into account in computing the credit under this section, shall (at the election of the taxpayer made for the taxable year) be taken into account in computing the credit under this section in each of the two succeeding taxable years, but only to the extent of the lesser of the two following amounts:

"(A) the excess of the amount of charitable contributions to educational institutions which may be taken into account in computing the credit under this section under the limitation in paragraph (1)(B) over the amount of the charitable contributions to educational institutions made in such year; and

"(B) in the case of the first succeeding taxable year, the amount of such excess contribution, and in the case of the second succeeding taxable year, the portion of such excess contribution not taken into account in the first succeeding taxable year.

"(d) EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'educational institution' has the meaning given to such term by the last sentence of section 151(e)(4).

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) AMOUNTS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.—The determination of whether or not a charitable contribution to an educational institution may be taken into account under this section, and the amount thereof, shall be made under section 170; except that in the case of an individual any such determination shall be made without regard to any election to take the standard deduction provided by section 141, or to pay the optional tax provided by section 3.

"(2) CORRELATION WITH SECTION 170.—No amount taken into account under this sec-

tion shall be allowable as a deduction under section 170. Any amount taken into account under this section shall be taken into account in computing the limitations provided in section 170(b)(1) (but not those provided in section 170(b)(2)). For purposes of provisions of law relating to amounts allowable as a deduction under section 170, any amount taken into account for purposes of this section shall be treated as an amount allowable under section 170; and any reference in any provision of law to a specific provision of section 170 shall, where appropriate, be treated as including a reference in the corresponding provision of this section. An amount shall be treated as taken into account for purposes of this section only to the extent that but for such amount, the amount allowable as a credit under this section for any taxable year would be decreased.

"(3) CREDIT NOT TO RESULT IN REFUNDS.—The credit allowed by this section shall not exceed the tax imposed by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowed by this part (other than this section and section 31).

"(4) ELECTIONS.—Any election provided by this section may be made only at such time, in such manner, and subject to such conditions designed to insure the effective correlation of this section with section 170, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulation prescribe."

(b) The table of sections for part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 39. Credit for charitable contributions to educational institutions."

(c) The second sentence of section 170(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts) is amended to read as follows: "A charitable contribution shall be allowable as a deduction (or taken into account in computing the credit under section 39) only if verified under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate."

(d) Section 170(c) of such Code is amended by striking out "For purposes of this section" and inserting in lieu thereof "For purposes of this section and section 39".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to charitable contributions made (within the meaning of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954) during taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 217 as section 218, and by inserting after section 216 the following new section:

"Sec. 217. Educational Expenses

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction the educational expenses paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year which are incurred by him, by his spouse, or by a dependent (as defined in section 152(a)).

"(b) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Educational expenses.—The term 'educational expenses' means amounts paid for—

"(A) tuition and fees required by an educational institution for attendance at such institution;

"(B) fees required by an educational institution for a course of instruction at such institution;

"(C) books, supplies, and equipment certified by an educational institution as necessary for a course of instruction at such institution; and

"(D) meals and lodging while attending an educational institution, but only if the individual for whom such amounts are paid is, at the time such expenses for meals and lodging are incurred, a full-time student at such institution or is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(2) Educational institution.—The term 'educational institution' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4)) which is accredited by a recognized national or regional accrediting agency.

"(c) LIMITATIONS.—

"(1) EXPENSES OF EACH INDIVIDUAL.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the educational expenses of any one individual paid during the taxable year only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $2,000.

"(2) SPOUSE.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the educational expenses of the spouse of the taxpayer paid during the taxable year only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(3) MEALS AND LODGING.—

"(A) FULL-TIME STUDENTS.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the educational expenses described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed—

"(i) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution away from home, $90, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an educational institution away from home, or if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution away from home; or

"(ii) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution not away from home, $45, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an institution of higher education not away from home, or, if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution not away from home.

"(B) LESS THAN FULL-TIME STUDENTS.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the educational expenses described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is not a full-time student but who is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed an amount determined under subparagraph (A) (i) or (ii), whichever is applicable, except that, for purposes of this subparagraph, there shall be substituted for $90 in subparagraph (A)(i), and for $45 in subparagraph (A)(ii), an amount which bears the same ratio to $90 or $45, as the case may be, as the number of hours in which such individual is enrolled bears to the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(C) SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), a month during which an individual attends an educational institution for less than 10 days shall be disregarded; and an individual who is attending an educational institution not away from home, but who is required by such institution to accept meals and lodging furnished by such institution, shall be treated as if he is attending an educational institution away from home. For purposes of this section, the amounts paid for meals and lodging of an individual while he is attending an educational institution not away from home shall, in the case of meals and lodging furnished to such individual by the taxpayer, be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(4) OTHER PERSONAL AND LIVING EXPENSES.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), deduction shall not be allowed under subsection (a) for any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for any personal or living expenses. In the event an amount paid as tuition or fees includes an amount for any personal or living expense (including meals or lodging) which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount paid which is attributable to such personal or living expense shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(5) TAXPAYERS HAVING SUBSTANTIAL TAXABLE INCOME.—The amount which (but for this paragraph) would be allowable as a deduction under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer (computed without regard to this section) exceeds—

"(A) $10,000, if the taxpayer is unmarried and is not a head of a household (as defined in section 1(b)(a)) for the taxable year, or is married and files a separate return for the taxable year, or

"(B) $20,000, if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return with his spouse for the taxable year, or is a head of a household or surviving spouse for the taxable year.

"(d) REDUCTION FOR CERTAIN SCHOLARSHIPS, FELLOWSHIPS, AND VETERANS' BENEFITS.—The educational expenses paid by the taxpayer with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a) shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as—

"(1) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a)(1)) which, under section 117, is not includable in gross income, or

"(2) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(e) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 217. Educational expenses.

"Sec. 218. Cross references."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

ONE-WAY STREET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I read a statement reportedly made by one of the better known U.S. Senators at a rally for the reenactment of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act on a long-term basis. This statement came to mind recently while I was rereading the Virginia Declaration of Rights as originally drawn by George Mason—the mighty weight of

the logic of these rights becoming the foundation for the Bill of Rights in our Federal Constitution:

Article 1. That all men are by nature equally free and independent, and have certain rights, of which, when they enter into a state of society, they cannot, by any compact, deprive or divest their posterity, namely, the enjoyment of life and liberty, with the means of acquiring and possessing property, and pursuing and obtaining happiness and safety. (Virginia Declaration of Rights.)

The Senator and many others in government, labor, and business, have for years violated this concept of rights to such a degree that they have become as yesterday's snows, melted and drained away. The Senator said, in defense of trade agreements that had cost the American workers and investors in the bicycle and clothespin industry their jobs and isolated industries were driven out of business, that we must maintain our foreign relations through our trade agreements and that other industries profited from their losses.

In a sense, the Senator was saying that our rights are not individual, not inherent, but are subject to curtailment, infringement, and elimination if, in so doing, somebody else benefited.

The fallacy of this type of thinking is that it violates every concept of democratic government, every concept of equality under the law and the Constitution and above all it incorporates the basic principle of totalitarian and communistic government wherein the rights of individuals are subject to the whims of individuals or groups and become in effect the sole property of government.

We cannot possibly continue this complete perversion of the whole purpose of these basic articles subscribed to, fought and bled for by our Founding Fathers.

How can Congress and the President as the elected representatives of the people decide who shall be deprived or divested of the inherent right to earn a living, to possess property or to provide for his family, its comforts and its needs?

Where in the Constitution are we, as Members of Congress, ordained with special powers to decide who shall be protected and who shall be denied protection? Who says, and where is it said, that a cotton planter, the machinemaker, or a wheatgrower shall be protected in his rights and property by depriving the glassworker, the steelworker, or the coal miner of his job?

I have always subscribed to the sincere belief that all power is vested in, and deprived from the people that elected officials are their trustees and servants and at all times subject to the people.

No man in government, no labor union leader, and no corporation president has a right to agree to any agreement which deprives a voter, a worker, or a stockholder of his liberties, his rights, his property, or his opportunity to pursue and obtain these objectives.

No commission created by Congress—and certainly not the President himself—has any constitutional privilege to sign an agreement whereby a tariff is raised on one commodity and lowered on another on the grounds that one industry or one worker is dispensable while another must prosper or that any American's rights individually—unless all Americans' rights collectively—can be negated or curtailed as a pawn or promise in our relations with other nations.

No man in Congress would stand still for one second if a bill was introduced setting aside a quota of the seats in Congress for Japan, Hong Kong, and other foreign countries, but most of us don't raise a whimper when we say to the textile companies and their workers, you must set aside so many jobs, so much profit, control your production to a certain percentage, so that a quota can be given to Japan, Hong Kong, and others.

We do not do this because we need the textiles; we can produce more textiles than we'll ever need, but we do this simply because we have to have friends.

Now you may think this is not good logic to draw this comparison, so let's go to another little setup Congress is responsible for: How would Congress react if, after setting aside a quota for our "foreign-made Congressmen" and who took their seats in the House, we passed another law stating that not only would they be paid more salary than the elected American Members but that they would not have to pay taxes on their salaries. They would be given all the services of our way of life—our schools, highways, streets, public parks, defense, police and fire protection all free but could exercise up to their quota vote all the rights previously reserved for American Congressmen.

Now, this is not so funny because the textile producer and his employees pay taxes that are used to pay subsidies and soil bank benefits to cotton growers and then have to pay a government controlled price for the same cotton that the foreign-made textiles get for 8 cents a pound less than charged to American-made textiles.

Let us see what this kind of government has done to the textile industry:

Between 1947 and 1957, 325,000 jobs disappeared in the textile industry and an additional 75,000 jobs were shipped overseas between January, 1957 and November, 1960.

Between 1947 and 1957, 710 textile mills closed their doors and from 1958 to 1960 128 more mills were closed.

At this very moment—according to one of our Members, after returning from Hong Kong recently—foundations for six enormous textile mills are under construction in Hong Kong.

If the American made textiles are in such trouble that as Senator THURMOND, on the floor of the Senate, March 21, 1961, stated, the textile employment picture is the blackest of all, and the continuing contraction of the domestic textile industry is apparent by whatever yardstick may be used, whether it be equipment in plants, employment, mill liquidation or profit. How much worse off is it going to be when all the new mills are completed in Japan, Hong Kong, Taiwan and on and on?

I disagree with my textile area colleagues who believe the quota system can be their salvation. If it is wrong to allow 35 percent of our market for foreign imports, it is just as wrong to allow 5 percent or 1 percent if the sales in our market are based on unfair and unrealistic competitive conditions.

Quotas are not the answer. Fair competition is the answer. Mandated costs placed upon American production by Government edict, directly or indirectly, are the factors that cause the flood of imports.

Some shortsighted American producers want quotas because they foolishly think this guarantees them a market in the favored countries' domestic markets. This is so unsound that the history of a single commodity ought to convince these shortsighted Americans of the weakness of the quota system.

To prove this point, in an industry that—to date—does not seem to be worried about imports from an industry-wide base, let me quote some statements from Blast, the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp.'s magazine, by the president, A. F. Franz. Mr. Franz says bluntly that American steelworkers are losing their jobs to foreign steelmakers:

IMPORTS ARE EXPORTING YOUR JOBS

The trend in steel import and export statistics for the past several years reveals disturbing evidence that foreign competition is seriously affecting the economy of America and particularly some of the smaller steel companies.

One source reports that since 1956 2 million Americans have lost their livelihood because of foreign trade exchanges. Metalworking managers are wondering where the boom promised for the 1960's has gone. Many suspect it has "gone abroad."

While American business limps along at a disappointing pace, steel mills, auto plants, and other metalworking establishments abroad are zooming ahead at almost full capacity with up-to-date mills. Foreign steel companies are supplying more goods to the world market; the United States is supplying relatively less. Our imports are high. Our exports are lagging. Our steel companies are losing business. Our workers are losing jobs. Our Government is losing tax revenues.

Never has competition been so dramatically obvious. Everywhere we look—we find steel, automobiles, machinery, hardware, appliances, housewares, toys, and other items with such bargain-promising stamps: "Made in West Germany," "Made in Japan," "Made in Belgium," or "Made in Hong Kong." These items often are made as well as ours and almost always sell for less.

WORLD STEEL PRODUCTION

Within the past 10 years the steel industry throughout the world has grown tremendously. Foreign countries have spent, and are spending, billions of dollars to expand and improve their steel production. During World War II, the European and Japanese steel industries were, in great part, destroyed, and have since been rebuilt with modern equipment, much of which was financed by the United States. Flat on their backs 15 years ago, many of their plants today are as good as our most modern installations and far superior to much of our older equipment. These foreign countries are now producing excellent products by means of efficient low-cost operations—which sell much cheaper than American-made steel products. They are becoming more competitive every day.

We no longer have the superiority in facilities that for years permitted us to pay higher wages and still produce cheaper and better steel.

Every Member should read the entire article. It can be obtained by writing the Colorado Fuel & Iron Corp., Pueblo, Colo.

One thing stands out and again proves the arguments I advanced against a 4-year long-term extension of the Reciprocal Trades Act. For instance, in the last 4 years exports dropped from 6,074,000 tons to 3,100,000 tons while imports increased from 1,388,000 tons to 3,720,000 tons.

Of this amount of imports, 2,946,000 tons were made up of the heavy, man-hour productions such as nails, wires, steel pipe, wire rods, wire rope, and so forth, while out of our exports, 2,500,000 tons was made up of flat rolled, low man-hour production and other high dollar cost items. That is why you cannot measure the damage to our economy by simply taking dollar trade balances.

We sold almost twice as many dollars worth as we imported, but the loss of man-hours and jobs was better than twice the amount gained by exports. I have said on every occasion that industrywide appraisal is not worth a fiddler's tune. It appears that this industrialist feels the same about it, for he said:

In making an appraisal of the unbalanced import-export situation our State and Federal Governments must study the impact on unemployment in individual companies—rather than on industry as a whole. What happens on a national basis is of no help to the Colorado Fuel & Iron man who loses his job in California, Colorado, New Jersey, New York, or Massachusetts.

If this does not convince the quota seekers that the only solution is to go back to the basic principle of good business and sound economy—buy what you need, sell what you do not need—nothing will.

No nation can survive building up its own competition and their guaranteeing a market for the competition by closing its own mills, paying unemployment compensation and relief, spending tax funds for rebuilding communities that have become depressed areas because of the adverse effects of imports—H.R. 5, depressed area bill, section 5 contains this provision—or trying to sell wholesale after buying retail.

The story is not yet ready to be told in all of its various phases.

As chairman of the subcommittee, set up by Chairman ADAM C. POWELL of the House Education and Labor Committee, to study the impact of imports and exports on American employment, I look with some serious doubts on the request of the Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg for a special appropriation of $100,000 for his Department to make a study of imports and exports. I believe I have every right to doubt the wisdom of duplicating the work of my subcommittee by an administrative agency headed by a very capable, yet strongly free trade advocate.

It can not be said that I have just as positive a position against free trade. The record does not prove this, but in order to make my committee study unbiased and unbossed, I asked Dr. Stanley Metzger of Georgetown University, former State Department official and member of President Kennedy's Foreign Trade Task Force and a recognized free trader, to be the special executive assistant to our committee.

Further than this, our study will be made by elected Members of Congress and the recommendations will be subject to congressional review and action. It seems strange that at this very moment, after a lapse of 11 years and the creation of a committee to study the vital problem with the support of the House and its Committee on Education and Labor that such a study should be started by the administration's Secretary of Labor.

I would suggest to Congress to reflect upon the fact that the new trade act extension comes up next year. I would also want Congress to remember that the crisis in our export and gold balances are the direct result of the false balances of 1957 caused by the closing of the Suez Canal by Nasser and the selling job of the then Eisenhower administration which mesmerized Congress into a 4-year extension. Congress cannot continue to fumble in this area.

The steel situation is no different than the textiles, glass, ceramics, toys, bikes, wood screws, watches, shoes and almost every item on the market shelf.

Speaking of shoes, here is just a capsule picture of this industry's problems with imports:

In 1950 we exported 3.7 million pairs of shoes—other than rubber—worth $12.2 million. We imported 6.1 million pairs worth $9.4 million.

In 1960 we exported 3.2 million pairs of shoes worth $10.9 million. We imported 26.6 million pairs worth $53.3 million.

In percentages, imports climbed 393 percent in 10 years while American exports dropped 22 percent.

All this proves is that we are shifting from an industrial production nation to the middleman profiteers, trading in the world market by exploiting cheap labor—a peace seeking nation which has lost sight of the fact that you cannot help others unless you are in a position to do so.

We cannot buy, beg or borrow fidelity and friendship, corporate or individual prosperity; we have to earn what we get here or abroad.

When we start our investigations, we fully intend to look into the trading rooms and marketplaces of the merchant princes and Doges of our modern worldwide Venice.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. Bow) for today, June 1, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, on Monday and Thursday next, for 15 minutes on each occasion.

Mr. MICHEL, today, for 15 minutes.

Mr. BAILEY, for 30 minutes on June 6.

Mr. KEARNS (at the request of Mr. SCHNEEBELI), for 1 hour, today.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania.

Mr. LANE in two instances, in one to include the remarks of President Kennedy at his birthday party on Monday night, last.

Mr. ROONEY, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi.

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHNEEBELI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KEARNS in two instances.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. ALGER.

Mr. GLENN.

Mr. MATHIAS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. BREWSTER.

Mrs. SULLIVAN.

Mr. ZELENKO in two instances.

Mr. ADDONIZIO.

Mr. FRIEDEL.

Mr. SANTANGELO.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. RODINO.

Mr. MONAGAN.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 5, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

964. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year 1960, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 181); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

965. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting the 39th Annual Report of the Board of Actuaries of the Civil Service Retirement System for the

fiscal year ended June 30, 1959, pursuant to section 16 of the Civil Service Retirement Act (H. Doc. No. 182); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and ordered to be printed.

966. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for advances of pay to members of the armed services in cases of emergency evacuation of military dependents from overseas areas, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

967. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report covering the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation which were transferred to the Administrator of Small Business Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1954 and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957, covering the quarterly period ending March 31, 1961, pursuant to 67 Stat. 230 and 22 F.R. 4633; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

968. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

969. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of accounting for office furniture and equipment in the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1960, pursuant to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

970. A letter to the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of start-up production costs considered in the award of the Department of the Air Force contract AF 33(600)-31283 to the Magnavox Co., Fort Wayne, Ind., for ARC-34 communication equipment, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

971. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the administration of the dependents' medical care program by the Department of the Army, pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67); to the Committee on Government Operations.

972. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, entitled, "A bill to extend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to Guam and the Virgin Islands"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

973. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to age limits in connection with appointments to the U.S. Park Police"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

974. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to change the penalty for violation of section 4(e) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act relating to the promotion of safety of life and property on islands and structures built upon submerged lands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

975. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on the modification of existing facilities at the Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio, pursuant to section 4 of the act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151, 152); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

976. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Congressional Relations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Annual Report for the Calendar Year 1960 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of grants made, pursuant to section 3 of the act of September 6, 1958, 72 Stat. 1793 (42 U.S.C. 1893); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 7300. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for public elementary and secondary schools, to amend Public Law 815 and Public Law 874, 81st Congress, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. House Resolution 303. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to Congress by the President on April 27, 1961; without amendment (Rept. No. 446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RAINS: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 6028. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 7388. A bill to provide penalties for membership in the Communist Party, and to permit the compelling of testimony relating to such membership and the granting of immunity from prosecution in connection therewith; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 7389. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase from 2 to 2½ percentum the retirement multiplication factor used in computing annuities of certain employees engaged in hazardous duties; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7390. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to impose a manufacturers excise tax on component parts of ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7391. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7392. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 7393. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide more equitable rates for the manufacturers excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7394. A bill to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7395. A bill to provide for the separation from the service of certain Government employees who have unpaid judgments against them, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7396. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 7397. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to proscribe travel in interstate or foreign commerce for purposes of inciting to riot or committing other unlawful acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7398. A bill to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030, 1039), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7399. A bill to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for the operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7400. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it unlawful to exchange property for prisoners not nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H.R. 7401. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it unlawful to exchange property for prisoners not nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H.R. 7402. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire through exchange the Great Falls property in the State of Virginia for administration as a part of the National Capital Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER (by request):

H.R. 7403. A bill to amend section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 7404. A bill to assure continued fish and wildlife benefits from the national fish and wildlife conservation areas by authorizing their appropriate incidental or secondary use for public recreation to the extent that such use is compatible with the primary purposes of such areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FORRESTER:

H.R. 7405. A bill to provide for the promulgation of rules of practice and procedure under the Bankruptcy Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7406. A bill to provide for the appointment of an Under Secretary of State

for Foreign Assistance, to bring about greater coordination in the program of foreign assistance; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H.R. 7407. A bill to amend the act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 561, 43 U.S.C. 615a), relating to the construction, operation and maintenance of the Spokane Valley project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 7408. A bill to authorize acquisition of land and improvements for the USAF Home Town News Center by lease-purchase contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7409. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Ice Age National Park in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 7410. A bill to provide for deduction in computing income taxable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of losses sustained by public transit systems in conversion from street railways to buses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 7411. A bill to provide for deduction in computing income taxable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of losses sustained by public transit systems in conversion from street railways to buses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7412. A bill to provide for deduction in computing income taxable under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 of losses sustained by public transit systems in conversion from street railways to buses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 7413. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools, and to provide certain additional assistance for both public and private education on a permanent basis; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7414. A bill to amend the act of June 6, 1924, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, to preserve housing and the many existing attractive neighborhoods in the Nation's Capital which give it stability and character, and to encourage in the District of Columbia the growing national trend toward maximum rehabilitation rather than complete clearing of blighted areas; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 7415. A bill to provide increased authorizations for the fiscal year 1963 and authorizations for fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for forest highways, forest development roads and trails, park roads and trails, Indian reservation roads, public land highways, and public land development roads and trails; to establish a Natural Resources Road Commission; to provide for a system of forest development roads and trails for utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 7416. A bill to authorize the Bureau of the Census to make appropriate reimbursements between the respective appropriations available to the Bureau, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 7417. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7418. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize loans to small-business concerns displaced from urban renewal areas on the same liberal terms as those which are applicable thereunder to disaster loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 7419. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H.R. 7420. A bill to amend section 4358 of title 39, United States Code, so as to provide rates of 1½ cents a pound for publications mailed for delivery within the county of publication, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 7421. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7422. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that Act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that Act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 7423. A bill to prohibit the employment by the United States of certain persons required to be registered as agents of foreign governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 7424. A bill to provide for an investigation and study of means of making the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway available for navigation during the entire year; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7425. A bill to provide for the publication before entry of decrees, judgments, and orders entered by consent upon the merits of civil antitrust proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7426. A bill to extend the benefits of the act of May 29, 1944, entitled "An act to provide for the recognition of the services of the civilian officials and employees, citizens of the United States, engaged in and about the construction of the Panama Canal," to certain additional civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 7427. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK:

H.J. Res. 438. Joint resolution to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 so as to authorize and direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to conduct a study and investigation of the adequacy, for the protection of investors, of the rules of national securities exchanges and national securities associations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 439. Joint resolution authorizing the State of Arizona to place in the Statuary Hall collection at the U.S. Capitol the statue of Eusebio Francisco Kino; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.J. Res. 440. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Con. Res. 322. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed trade by Cuba of prisoners for tractors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H. Con. Res. 323. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that, in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, the President should transfer to the Department of Defense functions of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Con. Res. 324. Concurrent resolution establishing a Joint Congressional Committee on National Security; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan:

H. Res. 322. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

H. Res. 323. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Banking and Currency to conduct an investigation and study of the effect of Federal airport development on public and private housing; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H. Res. 324. Resolution to establish a House Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, expressing the sense that the original multiple benefit concept for the construction and operation of the great reservoir system on the Missouri River be adhered to so that benefits therefrom may accrue along the great reaches of this river, and urging resistance to any and all attempts to change or alter the original objectives which made possible the authorization and construction of the Pick-Sloan plan and the Federal Flood Control Act of 1944; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to extending and expanding the school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to securing a Nubian Temple to be located in California; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to citing an act relating to the cessation by the State of Minnesota to the State of North Dakota of certain parcels of real property located in Clay County, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation granting Federal assistance

to American-flag operators in the domestic offshore trades; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States regarding a resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to request the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to study and determine the feasibility of locating a space launching facility on the island of Hawaii, State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expanding the Veterans' Administration hospital facilities in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO (by request):

H.R. 7428. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Vasilakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Kentucky:

H.R. 7429. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7430. A bill for the relief of Ng (Eng) Li Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DADDARIO:

H.R. 7431: A bill to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 7432. A bill for the relief of Garland G. Bishop; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7433. A bill for the relief of Herman and Marija Krajner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7434. A bill to provide for the free entry of an electron microscope for the use of the Marine Biological Laboratory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 7435. A bill for the relief of Czeslaw Bochenski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 7436. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Central Pacific Railway Co. and the Southern Pacific Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7437. A bill for the relief of Stella Rosa Merello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 7438. A bill for the relief of Anna Caporossi Crisconi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 7439. A bill to provide for the granting of retired pay to James W. Boyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H.R. 7440. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hermenegildo F. Labsan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7441. A bill for the relief of Zoltan Friedmann; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7442. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Antigoni Iatropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 7443. A bill for the relief of Gerardo P. Magcanam and Pedro F. Bantillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

160. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Maurice Brooks Gatlin, general counsel, the Caribbean Division, the Anti-Communist Committee of the Americas, New Orleans, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a redress of grievance relative to diplomatic relations between the U.S. Government and the Government of the Dominican Republic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Education To Match Our Times—Shepherd College Commencement Address Stresses Individual Responsibility and the Need for the Creative Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on May 29 to have delivered the commencement address at Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, W. Va.

This institution, which was chartered in 1872, has an enrollment of approximately 1,500 and offers the regular 4-year college courses in the liberal arts and sciences leading to the A.B. and B.S. degrees. Teacher training has been a major effort. It is typical of the many smaller colleges throughout our country which seldom make headlines in the education pages of the large metropolitan newspapers but which furnish a sound educational foundation to large numbers of our young men and women.

During recent years, under the able leadership of President Oliver S. Ikenberry, who was formerly a dean at my own alma mater of Salem College, Shepherd College has made significant progress in expanding its physical facilities and in attracting highly qualified faculty members.

The 1961 graduating class of 150, a number of whom were students of high scholarly achievement, was drawn not only from West Virginia but from the neighboring States of Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia also.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my Shepherd College commencement address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION TO MATCH OUR TIMES

(Address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, Democrat of West Virginia, Shepherd College Commencement, Shepherdstown, W. Va., May 29, 1961)

President Ikenberry, members of the faculty, honored graduates and guests, and ladies and gentlemen, the experience of commencement exercises is ever the same and yet ever new and unique.

I suppose every graduate for generations past has shared some of the same emotions of nostalgia when faced with the appraisal of the 4 years preceding, and exhilaration and perhaps some trepidation in anticipation of the years to come. And yet, for each graduate it is also a highly individualized and private experience relating to one's own desires and aspirations.

In this respect, no matter how many such occasions in which one has participated, it is always a pleasure and a benefit to share again in the sense of challenge and the drama of a beckoning world.

The very word "commencement" indicates a beginning rather than an ending, and the degree you receive today is a license to proceed on new terms rather than to retire on the old ones.

In times past, the possession of the college degree signified a kind of termination. It was assumed that the recipient, having encompassed the basic corpus of knowledge, was equipped to deal with the world of reality. And since the ultimate realities were viewed as static and eternal concepts, no fundamental reconstruction of one's knowledge would be demanded in subsequent years, but merely further refinement and acquisitions.

Never has this conception of learning been less valid than it is today. For never has the world been in such condition of constant and far-reaching flux. Acknowledgment of the primal significance of this fact must be the cornerstone of any modern philosophy of learning.

It has become a commonplace to refer to ours as a time of revolution—industrial revolution at home and political and social revolutions abroad. But underlying all these is the revolution in knowledge itself. Radio astronomy is beginning to probe the very limits of an expanding universe, while subatomic physics is breaking the formerly indivisible atom into ever more particles and subparticles.

As Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer stated several years ago regarding the revolution in scientific knowledge, "Almost every month has surprises for us in the findings about these particles. We are meeting new ones for which we are not prepared. We are learning how poorly we had identified the properties even of our old friends among them. We are seeing what a challenging job the ordering of this experience is likely to be, and what a strange world we must enter to find that order."

The firm walls which once surrounded such compartments of knowledge as biology, physics, and chemistry have yielded to interpenetration between the disciplines: we now have

biophysics, mathematical biology, geochemistry, and crystallography—to name but a few of the modern mutations. And even the once clear distinctions between life and nonlife have been thrown in question.

It is little wonder, therefore, that the average citizen, even the educated layman, responds to this upheaval in knowledge with feelings of doubt, uncertainty and confusion. This is perhaps a partial explanation for the hold which Commander Shepard and the other astronauts have upon the popular imagination. Laying aside considerations of national prestige, Shepard and his teammates have to some extent humanized an otherwise esoteric branch of scientific technology. The knowledge that a man is riding in the nose of one of those great missiles somehow brings it within the domain of our own imagination and perceptions.

Now, what bearings do these comments have upon the topic of "Education to Match Our Times"? First, they indicate that our education must be oriented toward the process of inquiry rather than the products of inquiry. For the products, the acquisitions of "factual" knowledge at one time, may be forced to yield to future conditions and refinements in the methods and techniques of investigation.

Thus, a modern education must focus upon the development of those skills and disciplines of inquiry which will serve the continued growth of the mind after the individual leaves the tutelage of formal learning. And it must also seek to instill the attitudes and habits of mind which will foster a desire for continued questioning, learning and growth.

I am not now simply paying court to a popular platitude. For learning—authentic learning—can be a painful process. And every day we encounter unnumbered examples of a person's successful resistance to the process of learning. We wear our ideas like our garments, and as with one's favorite jacket or hat, when an idea slips comfortably around the mind we hate to dispose of it.

A modern education, therefore, must be one which will prepare the individual for a world of relativities and uncertainties. We must learn to feel at home with something less than absolute certainty; we must learn to place our assurance not in a given datum of knowledge itself, but in the long-term self-corrective process of the pursuit of knowledge and the disciplines of inquiry. And we must learn to like the openness and clash of opinions in a democratic and experimental society.

Finally, an "education to match our times" must prepare us, individually and as a nation, to meet demands which are not yet identified. Today we are in need of mathematicians, physicists and engineers. But in two or three decades perhaps, especially in view of the world population explosion, our greatest needs may be for demographers, soil chemists, agronomists and marine biologists. Thus, in elementary and secondary schooling, and in our preprofessional and undergraduate education, we have need of developing those basic skills and intellectual disciplines which will provide the foundations for the professional and specialist as well as the generalist, and for a flexible reorientation of our energies as new demands arise.

I have spoken of the task of education to prepare us for a world in which our knowledge is not absolute, but relative—a world of chance and contingency and continual flux.

Yet within this world most of us, even the most intensely modern among us, experience the deeply felt need for some permanent base of reference. We cannot erect the structure of our personal lives on the shifting sands of chance. We require something of permanence and substance to give direction to our own lives. In short, we need a cause to serve, a commitment to fulfill.

The philosopher, Josiah Royce, wrote of this need in terms of a philosophy of loyalty to an ever widening community of ideals. "Let this spirit of loyalty to loyalty become universal," he stated, "and then wars will cease; for then nations, without indeed lapsing into any merely international mass, will so respect each the loyalty of the others that aggression will come to seem inhuman."

It is not a criticism of Royce to declare that this goal still pertains to an ideal realm rather than to the workings of this world. For it was his view that such an ideal goal must serve to give direction to our aspirations in this world. Nor, since he was writing at the turn of the century, can we expect him to have foreseen the new factors in the international equation introduced by the Russian revolution.

I was impressed recently with this aspect of the question when it was my occasion to be host to 16 young people from the Soviet Union who were touring Capitol Hill as part of their visit in this country under the sponsorship of the YMCA.

The group with whom I talked was composed of leaders of the Soviet age group from approximately 25 to 40 years of age—teachers, journalists, political scientists and engineers. They are young men and women whose late teens and early adult years were formed by the devastation and suffering of the war. Their point of reference, therefore, in appraising Soviet life today, is how far they have traveled, personally and nationally, from the conditions during the war and its early aftermath. Consequently, there is little to impel them to criticize the basic assumptions of Communist life.

Their commitments are supplied them by the doctrine and ideology of communism. They serve the Soviet state, the socialist revolution and the Marxist view of history. Though these goals deny much of what is most significant and precious in human values, they have sufficed to enlist the energies of an aggressive and self-confident generation of Soviet youth.

We must therefore ask ourselves what goals and values we supply which can call to their service the same qualities of determination and zeal from the citizens of our democracy. This is preeminently the task of formal education. For our schools and colleges are the principal repositories of the ideals of our society. And it is out of the processes of education itself that the individual must generate willing desire to serve and to live creatively.

This ideal, as an expression of national purpose, has been most eloquently phrased in the words of President Kennedy's inaugural address: "Let us explore the stars, conquer the deserts, eradicate disease, tap the ocean depths, and encourage the arts and commerce.

"Let both sides heed the command of Isaiah—to 'undo the heavy burdens and let the oppressed go free.'"

Many of you who have selected a career of teaching have already made this option. There are others among you who, I am confident, are destined for equally creative and rewarding careers. But for each of you, whether you enter teaching or one of the other professions, whether you go into business or on to graduate studies, there is an even more fundamental dedication which must underlie all of these.

I speak of the commitment to revolution—to the true revolution which is still the one we gave birth to 185 years ago. The true revolution is that of Thomas Jefferson, not Karl Marx—the revolution propelled by belief in the dignity and responsibility of the individual rather than the authority of the State. This is the struggle to realize the American proposition which was so clearly stated by Henry Thoreau when he wrote that "There will never be a really free and enlightened State until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly."

Thus it is that the task of education today—formal education in the schools, as well as self-education in your own lives—is to re-create the sense of individual responsibility, and this means to reestablish and rededicate our belief in man—the belief that man can control his own destiny if he will. For freedom and responsibility are but opposite handles of the same pitcher.

No one understood this better than Abraham Lincoln—who knew so much of the terror and wonder of the human soul—when, in the dreadful December of 1862, he pointed the way of duty to the Congress in these words:

"Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility."

We pray that our Nation may never again bear such a burden of dreadful conflict. Yet our times have their own peril, of equal deadliness. The measure of our own responsibility is not lessened. The daily choices, which gather as the sands in an hourglass, are just as vital in our own lives as the most momentous decisions in the affairs of state. For it is out of the web of individual actions and choices that we weave the fabric of a democratic morale.

The poet and teacher, Archibald MacLeish has addressed the question in these terms:

"What education in the free countries must drive home, if the free countries are to survive, is the conviction that we—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility. The task is in part a task beyond the power of the schools as such, for the sense of individual responsibility and power involves a sense of individual participation, and a sense of individual participation is only possible in a society in which individuals can make themselves felt directly and not through agglomerations of money or people. There must be social changes as well as educational changes. But the education changes come first. To teach men to believe in themselves therefore is to teach them responsibility and so to assure their freedom."

These are the tasks of education—to develop a sense of regard for intellectual disciplines, even when we know that our knowledge is tentative, not final, and relative, not absolute; and to provide the grounds for a moral commitment to a community of values, even when these values must ultimately rest on one's individual judgment. No other civilization has essayed such tasks. And no leader has more eloquently and concisely stated the challenge with which we are confronted than did President Woodrow Wilson, when he declared, "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it be redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ and being made free and happy by the practice which springs from that spirit. Only thus can discontent be driven out and all the shadows lifted from the road ahead."

As citizens, and as men and women of courage and conviction, we will succeed on the frontiers of the future.

Training and Retraining of Skilled Manpower—The Kennedy Plan and a Timely Editorial in the Machinist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, to those of us from highly industrialized areas of the country, particularly areas which were hard hit by unemployment in recent recessions, the President's address here last Thursday touched on a point extremely important to the future of our economy—the plan he referred to as the manpower development and training program.

After discussing the persistent pattern of unemployment, even during a period of recovery, which makes such unemployment "intolerable to a free economy," the President cited the new program he is going to recommend to Congress and said:

> Its purpose would be to train or retrain several hundred thousand workers in new occupational skills over a 4-year period, in order to replace those skills made obsolete by automation and industrial change with the new skills which new processes demand. Supplementing current public and private training and education programs, such a measure, including subsistence and relocation allowances for the long-term unemployed, is a positive answer to the challenge of technology.

DEPRESSED AREAS ACT PROVIDES FOR RETRAINING PROGRAMS

Mr. Speaker, one of the most important provisions of the Depressed Areas Act—the Area Development Act, to use the formal title—called for an extensive program of retraining in new skills for those unemployed as a result of technological change or other causes in the areas of substantial and persistent labor surplus. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I supported it. It was a good step forward. Now the President's proposal, as outlined to us in his speech Thursday, would expand this idea to help the long-term unemployed wherever they live. This is a tremendously useful idea, and one which I also support.

EDITORIAL FROM THE MACHINIST

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I read with great interest a very timely editorial appearing in the issue of May 25, 1961, of the newspaper, the Machinist, one of the best labor union newspapers published in this country, and speaking for one of the most progressive and outstanding unions in the Nation, the International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO.

This editorial points up the great need for expansion of the apprenticeship training program for machinists. Last year, it points out, only 2,779 new machinist apprentices were started on approved training programs, whereas many times that number of journeyman machinists died or retired in the same period. So, as it has for a decade, the Nation's supply of all-around journeyman machinists has dwindled.

As the editorial points out, machine operators doing a specialized job may lose out to automation or changing technology, but a trained machinist is never obsolete. I urge the officials who will work on the new Government-sponsored retraining programs to read this editorial and follow up on the useful idea it proposes, as follows:

MACHINISTS

More than 2 million young men and women will be graduating from high school next month. Many of them will be hunting their first job. Some will want to learn a trade.

The tragedy is that opportunities for apprentice training this year are few and far between. At a time when everyone agrees that we need more skills, the decline of apprentice training in industry approaches a national scandal.

Last year, for example, only 2,779 new machinist apprentices were taken on in joint labor-management programs approved by the U.S. Bureau of Apprenticeship.

Many times that number of journeymen died or retired last year. Once again, as it has every year for the past decade, the Nation's supply of all-around journeymen machinists dwindled.

Some people who have never seen a shop mistakenly believe that a machinist can be trained in a few weeks or a few months. They confuse the machinist with machine operators or specialists. A man can be trained in a few months to perform one job or operate one type of machine.

The trouble in these times is that the specialist is no sooner trained than his work is automated and his limited skill becomes obsolete.

A journeyman machinist, on the other hand, is an all-around craftsman who has learned his trade in 4 years of on-the-job training. He learns to operate every type of machine in the shop. He learns layout work and maintenance and, in some instances, cutting and welding. In addition, the machinist apprentice must take classroom instruction in mathematics, metallurgy, blueprint reading, and related subjects.

The American people have generally accepted the need for scientists to develop new ideas. We generally understand the need for engineers to adapt the new ideas to practical use. Some don't yet realize that we still need a third man, the all-around journeyman, who can take that blueprint and cold, unformed metal and machine it to a ten-thousandth or to no tolerance at all. It takes journeymen to make the experimental models and then to set up the production jobs.

So far no committee of Congress, no department of Government has shown more than a casual interest in this problem. It's an old frontier that cries for a new priority.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Founding of the Republic of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, we meet in a building that we call the Capitol in allusion to the seat of government in ancient Rome. Our Capitol is designed and built according to the principles of architecture that were formulated by Andrea Palladio of Vicenza who was born in Italy in 1518 and became one of the greatest architects of all times. When we pass through the rotunda our eyes are drawn upward to the work of Constantino Brumidi, the Italian artist, commissioned by the Congress to decorate the dome. In this Chamber of the House of Representatives the medallions bearing the faces of Gaius, Papinian, and Justinian, exponents of the Roman law, look down upon our lat rs. With all of these tangible and visible reminders of the contributions of Italy and the Italian people to the culture and civilization of the world it is trite to review the accomplishments of that great nation as it celebrates the centenary of unification and as its approaches the 15th anniversary of the Republic of Italy.

I am, however, moved to speak briefly upon those intangible benefits that have been bestowed upon the United States by her sons and daughters of Italian origin. The Taliffero family has made a distinguished record in America since colonial times. William Paca, a Maryland Governor, was one of those who pledged his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor by signing the Declaration of Independence. The role is long and the debt incalculable.

In the centennial year of the unification of Italy and tomorrow, June 2, the 15th anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy, I salute our fellow Americans who enjoy the great heritage of our sister republic and send particular greetings to the 150,000 Marylanders who join their relatives and friends in Italy in commemoration of this significant anniversary.

I particularly extend best wishes to Samuel A. Culotta, grand venerable of the Grand Lodge of the State of Maryland, and the members of the Order of Sons of Italy in America, for an inspiring and significant commemoration of June 2.

Must U.S. Funds Go to Castro's Cuba?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to a story appearing in the May 26, 1961, edition of the Washington Post under the headline "U.N. Backs Cuban Aid Despite United States." The story reported that the governing council of the U.N. Special Fund has given preliminary approval to a $3,035,600 agricultural research project for Cuba, despite reservations by the United States and with some members of the council reportedly supporting the United States reservation.

The story in the Post said that Paul G. Hoffman, American managing director of the fund, submitted the project to the 18 member governing council

along with 41 other projects calling for a total budget of $77 million with the fund to supply $34.6 million. All were approved.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following letter which I addressed to the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, on May 26, 1961, in which I urged him to use his influence to block approval of the allocation of the United Nations funds to Castro's Cuba, particularly since 40 to 45 percent of the U.N. Special Fund is provided by the United States.

My letter to Mr. Stevenson follows:

MAY 26, 1961.

The Honorable ADLAI E. STEVENSON,
U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. AMBASSADOR: I read in the morning's Washington Post that the governing council of the U.N. Special Fund had given preliminary approval to a $3,035,600 agricultural research project for Cuba.

The article went on to point out that the special fund would furnish over $1,157,600 on a matching basis with the Castro government. It also went on to assert that the United States contributes between 40 and 45 percent of the special fund.

The only indication of objection on the part of this country was the statement that there were "reservations by the United States."

Our Government has made many mistakes in relation to Cuba and the Castro government, but we certainly would compound all the others by failing to prevent this ridiculous action. Castro has clearly shown that he is anti-American and he is doing everything possible to establish a Communist beachhead in this hemisphere. For the American people to provide him with nearly a half-million dollars to help make his regime more palatable to the Cuban people would be the height of folly.

I am not sure as to the jurisdictional questions that are involved as between yourself, as Ambassador, and Mr. Hoffman, as American managing director of the Fund, but I hope that you will immediately use your influence to see to it that this project is not approved.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

Aid to Public and Private Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill to provide aid to public education by the appropriation of $350 million a year over a 3-year period for the purposes of school construction. This measure is almost identical to the bill which failed to get clearance by the House Rules Committee in 1960.

My bill would also modernize the tax laws to provide increased encouragement to private giving to both public and private education. Corporations can now contribute up to 5 percent of their gross income before taxes, and individuals up to 30 percent of gross income before taxes, for gifts to educational and religious institutions. My bill would not change this but would make it possible for the taxpayer to elect to take a tax credit as an alternative to the deductions which are presently allowed under the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Nearly 100 Members of Congress from both major political parties for a number of years have been introducing bills to aid public and private education by amending the tax laws. If the administration pressed as vigorously for tax legislation to aid education as it has pressed to provide appropriated funds totaling billions of dollars for public education the Congress would have acted on this matter months and even years ago.

Because of a failure to provide leadership in this field of tax legislation these bills have been gathering dust in the House Ways and Means Committee for years.

The administration has moved vigorously to provide tax incentives for business.

Why can tax incentives be provided business in our country and not be provided to encourage private giving to education? How can this be justified?

If my new bill succeeds, as I hope it will, public and private education will have won the greatest victory for education in the 20th century.

I propose to offer my new bill as a substitute for the administration bill, H.R. 7300, when it is brought to the House floor for consideration.

My views on education, and the text of my new bill, are set forth in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today at considerable length.

I include the text of my press release on my new education bill, as part of my remarks:

PRESS RELEASE OF REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL D. KEARNS, REPUBLICAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA

Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican, of Pennsylvania, introduced a bill today to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools, and to provide certain additional assistance for both public and private education on a permanent basis.

Title I of the bill would be known as the School Construction Assistance Act of 1961, and is almost identical to the bill which failed to get Rules Committee clearance in 1960. It would provide $350 million a year over a 3-year period.

Congressman KEARNS said today in a speech on the floor of the House that he would offer his revised measure as a substitute for the administration bill, H.R. 7300, when it was brought to the floor for consideration.

Title II of the new Kearns bill would modernize the tax laws to encourage increased private giving for public and private education at all levels.

It would also provide tax deductions for education.

Congressman KEARNS has been highly critical of the administration for its failure to recommend that the tax laws be modernized. He has stated that this has divided the American people unnecessarily.

At the present time, corporations can contribute up to 5 percent of their gross income before taxes, and individuals up to 30 percent of gross income before taxes, for gifts to educational and religious institutions.

The Kearns bill would not change this, but would only make it possible for the taxpayer to elect to take a tax credit as an alternative to the presently allowed deduction.

Congressman KEARNS said today:

"Nearly 100 Members of Congress from both parties have been introducing bills to provide aid to education by amending the tax laws. If the administration pressed as vigorously for tax legislation to aid education as it has to provide appropriated funds totaling billions of dollars the Congress would have acted on this matter months and even years ago. If my new bill succeeds, as I hope it will, public and private education will have won the greatest victory for education in the 20th century."

Abel Garner Honored by Congregation Zichron Ephraim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I take pleasure in informing the House of a significant community event which took place in New York City on April 16, 1961. On that day the Congregation Zichron Ephraim celebrated its 71st year at a dinner at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel. The guest of honor was Mr. Abel Garner, one of the civic leaders and leading philanthropists of the city, and a trustee of the congregation.

The synagogue, which is located at 163 East 67th Street, has been a leading center of Jewish spiritual life for all the years of its existence. From the day of its dedication in 1890 up to the present time, Zichron Ephraim has continued its activity in behalf of the ancient faith of Israel. For over 71 years, the synagogue has kept its doors open daily, morning to evening, for prayer and the study of the Holy Law and the traditional Jewish literature, as well as for public gatherings for social purposes or in behalf of worthy and deserving causes. It numbers among its membership some of the outstanding Jews in the city of New York. The history of the temple, and the persons associated with it through the years, is an inspiring saga of deep religious faith.

Construction of the temple started in the autumn of 1888 and continued through 1889. It was the culmination of the dream of the late Jonas Weil, its founder and first president. He and his brother, Samuel Weil, furnished the money for the construction and furnishing of that temple and they gave it the name "Congregation Zichron Ephraim" in memory of their father, Ephraim Weil. Dr. Bernard Drachman, one of the leading Orthodox spiritual leaders of his day, was the son-in-law of Jonas Weil and he was the first American born and educated Orthodox Jewish Rabbi in the United States. He served as the spiritual leader of Zichron Ephraim from its inception and until his death in 1945.

The cornerstone of that synagogue was laid on Thanksgiving Day in 1889 and was attended by many leading spiritual and communal leaders, among whom was the late Dr. H. Pereira Mendes, and Joseph Blumenthal, the president of the Jewish Theological Seminary. The architects were Schneider & Herter, German-born masters of their profession. Under their skillful direction a beautiful edifice of rare artistic design arose, and today, 71 years later, it is still considered one of the most beautiful structures devoted to Orthodox Jewish worship in the city of New York.

The character and spiritual qualities of Mr. Abel Garner are emphasized by the fact that a congregation as noble as that of Zichron Ephraim has seen fit to do him honor.

President Cannot Act as a Private Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the head of our Government and, as such, he cannot act in a private capacity. He must be President and his every word and every action is the word and action of the President, not a private citizen. In the light of this fact, President Kennedy's stand on paying blackmail to Castro for the release of prisoners is most interesting. The following statement on the President's stand is taken from the U.S. News & World Report:

KENNEDY'S STAND ON FREEDOM TRACTORS

(Full text of a statement issued by President Kennedy on May 24, 1961.)

The tractors-for-freedom movement is a wholly private humanitarian movement aimed at saving the lives of several hundred men. It is supported by free men and women throughout the Americas.

When Fidel Castro first made his offer to "exchange" the lives and liberty of 1,200 prisoners for 500 agricultural tractors, the American people responded with characteristic compassion. A number of private committees were organized to raise the necessary funds and many private citizens in this country and throughout the hemisphere, inquired as to where they could contribute. My concern was to help make certain that a single, representative group of citizens headed this effort in the United States. And I am grateful to Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for their leadership.

The U.S. Government has not been and cannot be a party to these negotiations. But when private citizens seek to help prevent suffering in other lands through voluntary contributions—which is a great American tradition—this Government should not interfere with their humanitarian efforts.

Neither law nor equity calls upon us to impose obstacles in their path as they seek to save those who fought to restore freedom in our hemisphere. I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved, inasmuch as it covers only negotiations "in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States"; that tax exemption is granted as a matter of course to any charitable organizations engaged in the rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees; and that export licenses are routinely granted for humanitarian reasons, to ship farm produce and medicines to Cuba, and would thus be granted for a humanitarian shipment of farm implements.

While this Government is thus putting forward neither obstacles nor assistance to this wholly private effort, I hope that all citizens will contribute what they can. If they were our brothers in a totalitarian prison, every American would want to help. I happen to feel deeply that all who fight for freedom—particularly in our hemisphere—are our brothers.

Reorganization Plans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a radio broadcast by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] over 16 Maryland radio stations on May 18, 1961, dealing with certain reorganization plans submitted to Congress by President Kennedy within the past couple of weeks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RADIO BROADCAST BY U.S. SENATOR J. GLENN BEALL, OF MARYLAND, OVER 16 MARYLAND RADIO STATIONS—BROADCAST TAPED AND MAILED MAY 18, 1961

Something has come up which seems to me to be a very serious matter—for it could endanger the "checks and balances" provided by the wise men who established our Government.

I refer to the reorganization plans submitted to Congress by President Kennedy within the past couple of weeks.

As you perhaps know, the procedure on any reorganization plan is simply this: the President draws up a plan and sends it to Congress; if neither the House nor the Senate acts within 60 days, the plan becomes effective. But, either House can knock it down by passing a resolution to do so. I hope the reorganization plans, recently submitted, will be rejected. I will explain my reason.

The four reorganization plans have to do with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Federal Trade Commission. The four plans are essentially identical. The four agencies involved were created by the Congress as independent agencies—to do certain needed jobs—free from pressures—free from political pressures, and free from White House pressures.

In keeping with this, we, the Congress, provided that members of these commissions were to be selected from both the parties—on a fairly even basis.

I feel that these four reorganization plans could lead away from the independence intended for these commissions—and could, in fact, give the White House virtual control over them.

When I tell you what each of the plans provides, you will see what I mean. Each plan provides, first, that functions of the Commission "with respect to hearing, determining, ordering, certifying, reporting, or otherwise acting as to work, business, or matter (that covers everything) may be delegated by the Chairman to an individual Commissioner, or, if the Chairman wishes, to an employee; each plan provides, second, that the action of the person delegated by the Chairman be deemed to be the action of the Commission; and, third, that the right to review the action can be established only by a formal vote of the members of the Commission. (Now, we, here in Washington, have found out how a Chairman can ward off a final vote on practically anything.)

In the case of the FCC, which has control over all radio and television broadcasting, it would take at least three Commissioners—in a formal meeting called by the Chairman—to get a review of some employee's decision in a case. If no review is ordered, by the required vote, then the action of the person delegated by the Chairman becomes law. In my opinion, that's putting too much power in the hands of a Commission Chairman—who is accountable to the White House.

I believe such a reorganization plan would mean endless trouble for the broadcasting industry.

The industries controlled by the other three Commissions are likewise endangered.

Now, of course no one should object to the streamlining of the work of the busy commissions—but surely a way can be found to do this without jeopardizing the rights of the public, hamstringing legitimate business, and building up too much power in the White House. I want to see the independent agencies stay independent—not start getting their orders from the President, whoever he may be.

I go along 100 percent with the Democratic Party platform of 1960 where it says: "The Democratic Party condemns the usurpation by the Executive of the powers and functions of any of the independent agencies and pledges the restoration of the independence of such agencies and the protection of their integrity of action."

There you are.

It's not a partisan matter. We must guard well against building up dictatorial power in the White House. That's why I object to the four reorganization plans submitted by President Kennedy.

Interview of Senator Magnuson on CBS Program "Capitol Cloakroom"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. PASTORE
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on May 18, 1961, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, was interviewed on the CBS program "Capitol Cloakroom."

In view of the many significant observations made by Mr. MAGNUSON on the subject of broadcasting, I ask unanimous consent to have the transcript of the program printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR MAGNUSON, DEMOCRAT, OF WASHINGTON, BY CBS NEWS CORRESPONDENTS CHARLES VON FREMD, ROBERT PIERPOINT, AND WELLS CHURCH ON CBS PROGRAM "CAPITOL CLOAKROOM"

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON, should President Kennedy go to a summit meeting?

Mr. PIERPOINT. Does our space program need more money?

Mr. CHURCH. Is the broadcasting industry fulfilling its obligation, Senator MAGNUSON?

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator Magnuson, welcome once again to "Capitol Cloakroom." Your appearance today is particularly timely, for among your important committee assignments is aeronautics and space sciences, and Alan Shepard's rocket ride has made us all space conscious these days. You are also chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which, among other things, follows the activities of the Federal regulatory agencies.

So we also want your comments on FCC Commissioner Minow's recent observations about the networks.

But the overriding news today is the apparent meeting next month in Vienna, when President Kennedy and Soviet Premier Khrushchev get together.

So let's begin with this question:

Should President Kennedy go to a summit meeting with Mr. Khrushchev?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I, of course, believe, Mr. von Fremd, that any time we can sit down with someone, we don't have too much to lose. We might be able to gain some of our objectives, particularly if the conference is prepared, the agenda, where they will discuss certain important matters and not be thrown off as to other matters that maybe cannot be solved, and get into some kind of a dispute or lack of agreement and completely miss some things where there might be an agreement.

President Kennedy is a very persuasive fellow, and a very likable fellow. And I am sure that Khrushchev will find a certain spirit of flexibility and understanding, more than he suspected he might have gotten when they set up the other summit conference, you know, that failed.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Well, Senator MAGNUSON, is it your understanding that this conference will be one where there will be a fixed agenda of certain problems to be solved, or will they simply talk over a lot of different world troubles?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, it's my understanding that they will have a pretty fixed agenda to get right at, and to see if there can be some solution to—to some of the problems we now have that are pressing and are immediate.

I don't suppose there would be any restriction or suggestion that they couldn't, after they got at these problems, to see where we could, or how it might be worked out, where they might discuss many a variety of things.

Mr. CHURCH. It seems to me, Senator MAGNUSON, that the administration appears to be going toward the idea of just general discussion at such a summit meeting, and then letting the specifics be handled by, on the ambassadorial level.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, the specifics, of course, would be the major reason for the conference. And then they would have general discussion, but surely there wouldn't be any reason to go to the ambassadorial level unless we found out, Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev found out at the original summit meeting, that there was a possibility of the ambassadors or the other level to arrive at some solution.

So therefore the whole program would have to be discussed, some of the pressing problems. I suspect Laos, Cuba, the Geneva Disarmament Conference, many of those questions that are immediately pressing—Vietnam.

Mr. VON FREMD. Well, it seems to me, Senator MAGNUSON, though, that in most of these cases, the ones you have mentioned—Cuba, Laos, Berlin, and so forth—that the lines are so tightly drawn now between the two countries that one side or the other would have to make some kind of a break, unless we were to have another stalemate.

Senator MAGNUSON. That is correct. But that break—supposing there was evidence that somebody might make a break in this particular case. That would have to come between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev, because the other level wouldn't be authorized to make those breaks.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Are you optimistic, Senator, that there actually will be breaks in some of these trouble spots?

Senator MAGNUSON. I think there will be breaks. I think sometimes that, say Mr. Khrushchev states a position and Mr. Gromyko states a position, that sometimes the details are not quite understood, and there could be an understanding of details in these particular cases that might lead to a break. And then you might go from one step to another.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Specifically on Laos, sir, which of course is the subject of another conference, the one at Geneva, is it not true that the administration has, in effect, written off Laos, and that the Geneva Conference is simply a nice way of handing it over to the Communists?

Senator MAGNUSON. I don't have that impression, that we have written off Laos. I do have an impression that we have suggested that there should be some changes maybe made in Laos to make it closer to being neutral than might have been suggested by either Mr. Kennedy in the first instance, or Mr. Khrushchev in the first instance.

Mr. PIERPOINT. We do have some hope that it will be neutral then and not immediately slide from neutralism into communism.

Senator MAGNUSON. And the two of them in a summit conference may come to some agreement to not necessarily discard the one extreme or the other extreme, but at least get them to come together toward a more neutral point in the country.

Mr. VON FREMD. On another world trouble spot, nearby Cuba, it seemed to me, Senator, after the ill-fated invasion last month, that there was a strong body of opinion here on Capitol Hill, among the legislators, that this country should use force, if necessary, to get rid of Castro and get rid of him soon. And then since then, this atmosphere seems to have subsided a bit.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think, of course, for about 48 hours following the so-called fiasco in Cuba, and the abuse that was being heaped upon the United States, to what extent we took part in it, how much prestige we lost, there was a strong feeling of resentment up here, and I'm not so sure that if somebody suggested we go down there and do something about it in a military way, that on that particular day they might have said, "All right."

But, I do think that Kennedy stopped a lot of that loosely formed opinion when he stood up and said, "I'll take the sole blame."

So we, in Congress, said, "Well, the President has assumed the blame, the sole blame; now we must sit down and let him proceed in such a way as he sees possible."

Well, now, it seems to me that no decision can be made regarding Cuba until we get the Organization of American States, at least the majority of them, or a substantial majority—I don't suppose we will ever get them all—but a substantial opinion on our side, because it might be just as ill-fated for us to go in there if all the other American states disagreed with it.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON, you are also a member of the Senate Space Committee. Certainly Commander Shepard's flight was a badly needed shot in the arm, but, as President Kennedy himself said, we have to do more. Rather than just raise the question of, Do we have adequate appropriations for our space program? I wonder what you think should be added to it to make it adequate.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, Von, of course I have handled the space appropriation in the Senate for some time now, and we have always recommended to the Senate just about what the experts down there ask for. In some instances we have prodded them a little more and said, "Well, now, can't you proceed faster if we give you more money?"

In many cases they discouraged us giving them more money because they said, "We can't proceed any faster for one reason or another," it may be personnel, it may be the following through of technological problems involved that take some time.

Now, it's my understanding that because of the success of the Mercury and Shepard's great achievement that they are going to ask us for a little more to speed up, they think now they can speed up the time of putting a man up in space, clear in orbit.

Now, if they do ask us for that, why, I am sure there would be very little opposition to the request.

Mr. PIERPOINT. How much do you think they might ask you for, Senator?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I've heard in terms $60 or $70 million more that could do the speedup in this particular project.

Mr. VON FREMD. What about some of the other programs, though, like Centaur, Saturn, looking even further ahead to Pluto and some of the others. Do you think that you are going to be asked to step up appropriations substantially in these fields? I have heard the figure of $600 million around town.

Senator MAGNUSON. I don't think so, because they feel that they are proceeding as rapidly as possible. Now, there may be some further appropriations asked by the Defense Department as the Polaris; I think we can do more on Polaris, so let's use that as an example.

But in the Space Agency itself, I think they think they are proceeding as fast as they can, and that money, extra money, wouldn't make much difference in the end result. And I think what we always ought to understand is that we—we have a 10-year program in the space scientists. We hope to come out at the end of that time with the things we want to know. We hope to come out looking as well as any other country involved, the Soviets or others, in this great new space development and space research. And sometimes it's a question of where you put the emphasis. There are so many facets to it.

Now, as we move along, we find that in one line of space activity, by the expenditure of more money, we can speed up the program. Maybe that would be completed by 7 years, but the whole program envisions a 10-year—a 10-year activity.

Russia, of course, has placed—the Soviets have placed the emphasis on rockets in space, not as much as we have on some of the other aspects of space, the scientific, pure scientific aspects.

But that's not unusual for Russia, because I think people also should realize that way back in 1900, what little scientific work they were doing in Russia under the

czars was in the rocket field. We were making automobiles, combusion engines, we were going into refrigeration and all these consumer things that make a better way of life. They weren't doing anything about that. Even farm implements we were having researched. They weren't doing anything.

But, way back in 1898, there was a major rocket society of which the Czar of Russia was the chief sponsor.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON——

Senator MAGNUSON. And then after the Germans came along, in World War II, and got into this rocket field. Naturally, they moved some of their men, some wag said the other day, I heard that—the question of whether there is a gap between the Soviets and Russia and this missile and space field is just how many Germans we got and how many they got, because they [laughter] they made practical application.

Now, Russia may be emphasizing, we don't know exactly, this particular phase. But we are hopeful that over the long pull that our achievements and our objectives will be just as sound and just as worthwhile as any other country or combination in the world.

Mr. VON FREMD. Senator MAGNUSON, you mentioned at the start of your answer to had had to prod the civilian Space Agency. that question that on occasion the Congress When you have prodded, their answer has always been this 10-year plan that you are referring to?

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. VON FREMD. And they say that it's the orderly, step-by-step, proper way of doing things.

But is it going to be good enough just to have this paper plan over a 10-year period? Isn't there any way in this entire decade that we can find some way of leapfrogging or are we just going to have to resign ourselves to Russia's continued lead?

Senator MAGNUSON. Oh, I think we can do some leapfrogging, but we'll have to change—we'll have to rearrange, you see, the priorities.

Now, world conditions or situations may dictate that we rearrange a priority, that we maybe even slow down one aspect and beef up another aspect. Now, this is where the Space Committee, and the committee I'm on, Appropriations, too, I think can contribute something to this.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Are you considering some projects like this?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think we are going to quiz them quite a bit in great detail on whether or not we can leapfrog the man in orbit, push that a little more, because of the dramatic aspects, the world, the psychological effect on the rest of the world, because it is dramatic.

Mr. PIERPOINT. When would you like to see this achieved by the United States?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I think if we can do it this year, we are in good shape. And if we can then do more about it and get the one to the moon, which is also another dramatic thing, I think it will all be helpful and then maybe we can proceed in an orderly fashion on our missile problem because as yet the relative military value of all the missiles we have, the great collection of missiles in some cases hasn't been exactly proven, whether one is better than the other, whether we should abandon one or go ahead, we have those constant arguments. And the military often changes their mind. They might be halfway in a program and decide, well, here is something new, something better, and this is the sort of guidance that we as armchair generals, as it were, could give them within the framework of what we can spend.

Mr. VON FREMD. When you sit there in the committee room and you hear all these military officials come up and testify about this program and that program and the other program, do you sometimes get the feeling that there are too many programs being put forward, that it might be better to emphasize, say, half a dozen major programs rather than going off in all directions?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, there seems to be a lot of them, when you sit there and listen to them. I mean it gets a little confusing. But I do think that there have been suggestions that we consolidate the efforts or the thinking on maybe four or five rather than all of us—a great, a great spread of this missile program. I agree with you, there is some—but sometimes a lay member who tries to look at it objectively can offer some suggestions in this space race that we have and missile race that are better than the scientist who is working on them because he gets so involved in what he is doing he sometimes loses sight of the overall.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Senator MAGNUSON, are you going to continue to support this very expensive antimissile missile program, the Nike-Zeus program?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I have had some doubts about that program, whether it's worth what we put into it. As of now, the best evidence I have that it's worthwhile to fit in at least, it may become obsolete much quicker than we imagine.

Mr. CHURCH. Senator MAGNUSON, in our business, that is the broadcasting business, you are a VIP, and it's partly because of you yourself and partly because you are chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Senator MAGNUSON. We changed the name of that, it is now the Senate Commerce Committee.

Mr. CHURCH. Senate Commerce Committee.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes, but that's only last week.

Mr. CHURCH. But it's just as important, no matter what you call it.

Mr. PIERPOINT. The news gets to us just a little late. [Laughter.]

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I asked you earlier, and I would like to hear your answer now, is the broadcasting industry fulfilling its obligations?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, as you know, Mr. Church, I have been—I have been often critical of the broadcasting industry. I have often questioned some of the things that they were doing in the way of programing or in the way of allocations. I have been critical of the FCC on some occasions. I know they have a most difficult problem. I have been critical of the FCC mainly because they have sometimes it seems to me they have failed to face up to decisions, they let them sweep them under the rug, just let them go. That was the allocation situation.

I think Mr. Minow, who made this dramatic appearance before the National Association here last week, stated a lot of things that I had been thinking about or maybe I had talked about here and there and put them together. I think it's good to have in this new industry with all its problems too, to have "a pike in the carp pond," once in a while. And, Mr. Minow surely evidenced the fact that he is going to be a pike in a carp pond.

Now, sometimes we fall into patterns in business or what seems to the people in the broadcasting business to be right to them but they fall into patterns and we drift along. I would not quite say that it was a vast wasteland. I think there are many practical problems that are involved. But programing, of course all of us want to be programers. I have my idea of what programs should be but I am not going to censure programing because the people there want to do as good a job as they can.

I think the broadcasting industry has done more in the past 2 years to become better, to fulfill their responsibility better than it did in the prior 10, and I have lived with them for—well, they made me a pioneer the other day of broadcasting, a long time, but I think they have done an excellent job in the past 2 years. But they had no place to go but up.

Now, Mr. Minow and I were suggesting that they even do better.

Mr. CHURCH. A moment ago you mentioned Mr. Minow. I thought of the column in the Washington Post by Larry Laurent.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I imagine you know him.

Senator MAGNUSON. I know him; yes.

Mr. CHURCH. The columnist.

He said that it had reached a point where anything in which the public was interested is now considered in the public interest.

Do you agree with that?

Senator MAGNUSON. You mean that the networks had reached that point?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, well, the programing people.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I have heard many people who have been in charge of programs suggest to me when we might be critical or having a discussion about it that, well, this is what the public wants. And I always have thought that that criteria, they should be leaders and not what the public wants because if that's all they get, I don't know how you know what they want. I had a long argument in many cases with some of the network people whom I know very well—somebody. I said: "You follow a pattern sometimes. If one network puts on, say, a western that the people seem to like, the other network wants to put another western on at the same time hoping they like it better. And then the third one wants to do this and then pretty soon you've got the public getting nothing but westerns. I think maybe the approach should be whether it's practical or not—I am not in the business—but whether it's practical or not; maybe they should put on a program that might not be the same or follow the leader at the same time so that the public could have some kind of a choice.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Well, Senator MAGNUSON, one thing the public has shown that it wanted was political debates.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. PIERPOINT. It certainly watched those presidential debates last year during the campaign, and I think you have got a bill that you would like to put through permanently suspending section 315.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes; 315.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Of the FCC Code. Well, that bill has never gotten out of committee and yet the public does want to see these debates. What is happening here?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, we haven't given it a high priority, timewise, because we needn't pass it until 4 years, because it only deals with the presidential candidates. But I think we'll pass it, because the public really not only enjoyed it, but I thought they thought this was a great contribution. I feel good about it because I authored the bill.

Mr. PIERPOINT. You think it will get through all right?

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes, I heard my friend, my colleague, Senator JACKSON—he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee—and MORTON, who is also on my committee, chairman of the Republican Committee, when they were asked one day who was the biggest contributor of the political parties, they said MAGNUSON was because he gave them each about a million and a half dollars worth of free time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHURCH. Senator, on this 315, you say you think we are going to—it will be passed——

Senator MAGNUSON. I am sure we can. I find that obligation——

Mr. CHURCH. Because the networks, you know, have to plan a long way ahead.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes, yes.

Mr. CHURCH. And the sooner, the quicker, I would think.

Senator MAGNUSON. I am going to try and at least get it through the Senate this session, and then see if the House will work on it.

Now, another phase, of course, our committee has been very active in educational TV, and I see that that has now passed the House, and we will have a conference or, it's out on the floor—out of the subcommittee, rather—and will pass the House, and we'll get that going.

Now, there's another thing where the—I envision we're going to have a fourth network in this country.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Government network?

Senator MAGNUSON. No. We're going to have an educational TV network. All these educational TV people are going to have a network.

Mr. PIERPOINT. But they get Government funds, won't they, under your bill?

Senator MAGNUSON. Only for the construction of some of these that haven't got off the ground, and it's only for a 2-year period.

Mr. VON FREMD. It would have to be, I would think, then, financed by the Ford Foundation or some group that saw fit; wouldn't it?

Senator MAGNUSON. Oh, by the State legislatures, the universities, private contributions, and things of that kind, because we are not using 213 of the channels that have been assigned.

Now, surprisingly, here is where the networks, I think, did a great public service. They all came out wholeheartedly and supported this educational TV, which involves channels which are worth millions, and they feel that by having that level of a fourth network, that will have a tendency to bring up the programing level of any programing on the network that is opposite to it.

Mr. VON FREMD. Thank you very much, Senator MAGNUSON, for being with us. We have touched a lot of bases and it's been fun, as it always is, to have you with us on "Capitol Cloakroom."

Baccalaureate Exercises, Northern Cambria High School, Barnesboro, Pa., May 28, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on May 28, 1961, to deliver the following address at the baccalaureate exercises of Northern Cambria High School, Barnesboro, Pa.:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE NORTHERN CAMBRIA HIGH SCHOOL BACCALAUREATE EXERCISES, BARNESBORO, PA., MAY 28, 1961

It is pleasing to have been invited to deliver the baccalaureate address incident to the Northern Cambria High School graduation exercises.

Graduation day is a momentous occasion in the life of every person who has been given the opportunity of acquiring an education.

To you members of the class of 1961 it marks the close of your high school days, and in the same breath, proclaims the commencement of a new era in your individual lives.

You young men and women have been fortunate in being reared and educated in a law-abiding community of this God-fearing Nation of free people.

You have been blessed with good parents and the advantages of a high school education.

Therefore, cherish until death the ideals and principles instilled in you by your good teachers and fond parents.

You owe a lasting debt of gratitude to your parents and a solemn duty to guard their good name.

No doubt on graduation day you are concerned with the thought of whether you will make a name for yourself.

And while you ponder over the subject I hope you will remember that the fact you live in a small town is no reason to assume you cannot ascend to a high position in life.

Many of the most successful men and women in American life were born in small communities.

They had faith in God, vision, courage, and determination, which coupled with hard work enabled them to reach their goal in life.

You members of the class of 1961, are graduating into what has been termed, because of scientific progress, "The Atomic and Space Age."

It may be wrong to speak of this particular decade as a scientific age because the impact of physics and chemistry and biology on our lives has been increasing for some time now, and will continue to increase in the future.

Scientific knowledge is growing at a tremendous rate, and if we plotted it on a line graph, the curve would be soaring toward the top of the graph.

As a matter of fact, it would be almost vertical.

Forty years hence, if some of you glance backward to the 1960's from your vantage point in the 21st century, there will probably be several memories of how primitive things were in this day and age.

Then I suppose you will launch into some reminiscences about what Pennsylvania was like when you were a youngster.

And I bet that much of what you say will sound different and strange to your grandchildren.

For that reason they may become easily bored with what you are trying to tell them, because our way of life changes quickly, and almost without being noticed.

I wonder if you have ever seen time-lapse photography.

This is where you take a picture of the same object at given intervals and then run the negatives in sequence through a projector.

It is used a good deal in photographing flowers. I think Walt Disney has employed it in his nature films quite often.

First, you would see the flower before it has begun to bloom, then slowly it begins to bloom, and finally it appears in all its color and glory.

The same type of sequence would follow, I am sure, if we had aerial photographs of Pennsylvania taken every year between 1760, for example, and 1961.

What would the finished film look like?

Well, first I suspect there wouldn't be much to notice because there would be few changes in our aerial map for the earlier periods.

Then you would begin to notice things more sharply.

Towns and cities would develop. More and more roads would be coming in, much of the timber would be coming down, automobiles would begin to appear, first in small numbers, and then by the thousands.

In other words, things would begin to look very lively.

This is exactly what science has meant to us, changes, mostly for the better, but changes nonetheless, occurring at a quicker and quicker pace.

You would see the face of Pennsylvania changing very fast.

And the same would be true of the rest of the country.

Such a film would give you some idea of the scientific pace and how it is quickening.

But such a film would by no means give you a complete picture of the information and knowledge which man has been acquiring in the last 50 years.

You all know there are countless scientific achievements, which would not be depicted on this film, for example, the vaccines which prevent infantile paralysis.

What I have just said, in perhaps a roundabout way, is that the impact of science on our lives is increasing.

Another way of illustrating this, and a graphic one it seems to me, is this:

It has been estimated, that of all the scientists who ever lived in all of recorded history, 90 percent are alive, and at work today.

I want to direct my remarks, not to this fact of the scientific revolution, but rather to its implications, what it means for you, your classmates, and for all our citizens.

MILITARY SECURITY

No doubt you are aware in these days that military power goes hand in hand with the state of a nation's scientific effort.

You have probably also noticed that the competition between the United States and the Soviet Union, in scientific and technological achievements, is carried on for propaganda purposes, as well as military.

It is for this reason that we must make certain that we are doing everything we possibly can to promote and encourage scientific investigation.

This country has every reason to be confident about our position in this scientific race.

Even the Russians appear to concede this.

Premier Khrushchev goes around the Russian countryside and industrial centers, and exhorts the workers to work harder, so that in their production of goods and agricultural products, they can overtake and surpass the United States.

This economic strength of ours is testimony to our scientific ability.

But in certain areas of activity the Russians have shown that they too can do all right.

They are reputed to be excellent physicists and mathematicians.

In some other fields, it is reported, they do not measure up.

But the first sputnik, the moon shot, the size of payload which the Russians can orbit, and the orbiting satellite with Yuri Gagarin inside, seem to me to be impressive arguments on the question of Russian know-how.

We should, therefore, take these people seriously.

I am not sure, whether you graduating seniors remember a few years back, when the argument was heard that we had nothing to fear from Moscow, because the atmosphere of the Soviet State stifled scientific enterprise.

Whether science is stifled under a Communist system of government is a hard question to answer.

The Russians apparently treat their scientists and engineers far better than the average Soviet citizen.

These people have higher salaries, more privileges, and a high place in the Soviet social system.

By the only standards they know, they are probably satisfied.

In any event, I notice that the argument I mentioned before has not been used so much lately.

I think we are becoming aware that Russian science can be a threat to us when it is used in military applications.

This puts us in the proper frame of mind, so that we can make sure we maintain our overall scientific superiority.

One of the eloquent commentators on the dangers of smugness on our part, has been Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, the father of the atomic submarine.

Here is what he wrote in the Saturday Evening Post last year, February 13, 1960:

"Russia, Japan, and other nations, which were once industrially backward, have demonstrated that the whole of the science and technology, invented by the most advanced nations, can be acquired in a relatively short period of time, given enough determination and readiness, to sacrifice present comfort for the sake of future gain.

"In consequence even the most advanced nation will not retain its headstart, unless it continues to progress faster than the rest of the world.

"A headstart can easily be lost, chiefly because it tends to breed a sense of superiority which leads to complacency and slackening of effort.

"At the same time, the enormous drive which pushes a technically backward nation ahead, is apt to give it momentum well beyond the point where it has caught up."

So if we don't get overconfident I believe that our scientific effort will be equal to whatever tasks are needed for our military security.

UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS

I have mentioned one of the implications of this scientific age, the fact that military security is closely bound up with scientific primacy.

A second implication of the scientific revolution concerns the underdeveloped countries of the world.

These countries have been called the emerging nations, or, in the terminology of the cold war, the uncommitted nations.

Here in this seventh decade of the 20th century, we are rapidly getting to the point where we will have the tools and technology to eliminate the misery of hunger where it exists in these countries, and the misery of disease where it remains unchecked.

These twin oppressors, with their soul-destroying and energy-sapping consequences, still hold sway in many areas of the globe; in our own hemisphere as well as in Asia and Africa.

Many of these peoples are restless and impatient for industrialization and progress.

This impatience, when it is combined with extreme nationalism, can lead to violence.

Often in these nations there are Communists seeking to exploit the situation and to create the chaos on which Communist-inspired movements feed.

Also, in many cases, there are local leaders, who are willing to be demagogs, to suit their own political ambitions.

So you can see, there are disturbing and dangerous possibilities in this situation, as well as its hopeful side.

Sir Charles P. Snow, the British scientist and novelist, used the following comparison in this regard:

"We are sitting like people in a smart and cozy restaurant, and we are eating comfortably, looking out of the window into the streets.

"Down on the pavement are people who are looking up at us, people who, by chance have different colored skins from ours, and are rather hungry.

"Do you wonder that they don't like us all that much?

"Do you wonder that we sometimes feel ashamed of ourselves as we look out through that plate glass?"

The restlessness of these nations with their rising expectations is one of the central facts of international life.

As I said, it has both heartening and frightening aspects.

Science has given us the know-how to eliminate hunger and raise standards of living.

But it also leads to impatience and turbulence in those nations who are now beginning to realize what they have been missing.

I hope you will be giving this whole problem your close attention during the next few years.

LEISURE TIME

Now I want to talk about one of the consequences of the scientific revolution that has nothing to do with the cold war.

In its long-term effects on our lives and our society it may be equally significant.

This is the question of leisure time, and the use we make of it.

Science has put this time on our hands and sometimes we don't seem to know what to do with it.

I don't know if this occurs to you as a problem or not; when I was younger the day never seemed to have enough hours in it.

But for many of our people, for some of our older citizens who have retired, and for persons who are chained to the routine of the 40-hour week, it seems to present real difficulties.

They have trouble keeping themselves entertained.

They are bored.

They watch television for hours and think they are having a good time.

I even think I've noticed a teenager, from time to time, wandering along with a transistor radio pressed to his ear and a vacant look on his face.

Probably the use a person makes of his leisure time should be left up to him.

Personally, I would like to see these off hours used more constructively.

As a nation we could do more serious reading than we do.

Also, I think we could do more studying, not because we're in school, but because we have come across some topic or question that looks interesting, and could prove to be fascinating if we learned more about it.

There are more and more opportunities also for getting into projects to improve our communities, meeting new friends, and exchanging ideas.

These are the types of things we could do with our leisure.

The important thing is to keep checking yourself, find out whether or not you're bored, and then take steps to change your routine and acquire a new skill or develop a new interest.

THE CITIZEN'S ROLE

A final implication of our scientific revolution is the difficulty the citizen encounters when he attempts to keep informed about his government's activities.

Who, for example, can say whether safety regulations, laid down by the Federal Aviation Agency for commercial fliers, are adequate unless he understands what the problem is?

Who can decide for himself whether he approves of our voluntary ban on nuclear testing unless he has some notion of how much radiation these tests produce and of how much radiation would be harmful in a given case?

Or, to take a third example how can we get a very good idea of what the arguments are about in the Geneva disarmament talks unless we have an idea of the actual reliability of the various inspection and control systems that have been proposed?

So the citizen's responsibility of keeping informed is a much harder task than it ever was before.

But you must perform it.

There is no other way.

Many of our newspapers and magazines do an excellent job of reporting the scientific news.

And they are devoting more of their resources to the effort of bringing this news to the reader.

And even in the drugstore these days you can purchase inexpensive paperback books in language you can understand on nuclear physics, radio astronomy, and other scientific subjects.

This is a healthy trend, in fact vital for our national life, and it is only in its beginning stages.

As time passes, it seems to me, there will be more and more demand for journalists who can bridge the gap between the activities of the scientific community and the layman's necessity for being kept informed.

Of course, as voters, you simply won't have the time to learn enough about every topic that you should know about.

All I am asking is that you avoid the attitude which some people have adopted, usually lazy people, when they say:

"This is science.

"I'm just a layman.

"This doesn't concern me, and even if it did, I probably wouldn't understand anyway."

Instead, you should have the attitude of inquiry and healthy skepticism.

Rather than labeling some question of national policy with the magic word science, so that you can ignore it with a clear conscience, your duty as voters and citizens is to keep yourself informed.

This is so whether you are a housewife, a farmer, or an electrical engineer.

What I have just said was also said by President Eisenhower in his farewell speech to the Nation January 17.

I quote:

"In holding scientific research and discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

"It is the task of statesmanship to mold, to balance, and to integrate, these and other forces, new and old, within the principles of our democratic system—ever aiming toward the supreme goals of our free society."

You young people are living in exciting times.

The Lindberghs of the present day fly in missiles at 5,000 miles per hour and the oceans they cross are oceans of space.

Nuclear submarines circle the globe without coming above the water.

Many of our achievements and prospective triumphs will be thrilling in a quieter way.

In the next decade scientists may learn the method of controlling fusion reactions so as to make energy out of the heavy hydrogen in our oceans.

Salt will be taken out of sea water and the water used to irrigate the desert.

New techniques will be developed for mining the oceans to extract valuable minerals which they contain.

And further steps will be taken to make feasible the commercial mining of low-grade ores, for other minerals the supply of which is becoming depleted.

As these big and dynamic events take place, I hope you will be alert and fascinated observers of them, not simply of a given scientific breakthrough itself, but of its meaning and prospects, for your family and your community.

I have listed some of the implications of this nuclear and space age which seem important to me:

The military dimension, the emerging nations, the wise use of this leisure time we have made for ourselves, and finally, the citizen's heightened task of keeping himself informed.

I know each of you is sincere in your desire to measure up to the responsibilities confronting you in this challenging and exciting age.

The energy and intelligence of you young Americans give me every reason to be confident.

In conclusion It has been a happy privilege to deliver your baccalaureate address.

In congratulating you upon reaching this important milestone in your lives I add the fervent wish that it may prove to be one more stepping stone on your road to future happiness and success.

Save the Children Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I take pleasure in informing the Nation of the noble work of the Save the Children Federation. This organization is fulfilling, both in letter and in spirit, the high purposes set forth in President Kennedy's inaugural address, when he said:

To those people in the huts and villages of half the globe, struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves. * * * If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich.

Save the Children Federation (SCF) is an international agency, with headquarters in Norwalk, Conn., dedicated to assisting underprivileged children, their families, and the villages in which they live, the world around. It is registered with the U.S. State Department Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid and is a member of the International Union for Child Welfare. Save the Children Federation has just entered upon its 30th year of service. It was incorporated in New York State during the depression days of 1932, when children throughout the United States were becoming the innocent victims of our economic dislocation. From the start it was made clear that the organization would be nonpolitical, nonsectarian, nonprofit, and should attempt to avoid areas of welfare activity already preempted by existing agencies.

Unlike many organizations originally similar in intent, Save the Children Federation has long since abandoned the "Lady Bountiful" approach to social work as its primary method of assistance. While the federation still carries on conventional programs of direct giving when the need is immediate or an emergency exists, it is self-help—the philosophy of helping others to help themselves—that has long been the dominant theme in the federation's work.

In its early days, one of the areas where the federation was concerned was the coal mining counties of the southern Appalachians, where the industrial crisis of 1929 had created great economic distress. The collection and distribution of used clothing was part of the federation's original effort to relieve the pressing need in the southern mountains. Later, schoolbooks and school furniture and equipment were channeled to the backwoods schools in the mountain areas. More than 100,000 school desks and 800,000 textbooks were distributed in a decade. As local school support became available from the States, this aspect of the federation's program was dropped. Today school sponsorship in the southern mountains have become community self-help programs. At present there are five SCF community counselors in 193 counties in Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and Missouri. They administer community self-help programs for schoolchildren, by which playgrounds have been cleared and built, buildings have been wired for electricity, kitchen equipment installed, and children who have been chronically undernourished now enjoy hot lunches for the first time in their school careers.

The federation's clothing program—SCF bundle days—has become an increasingly significant event. Last year 6 million boys and girls in the Nation's schools collected and sent to SCF warehouses over 2 million pounds of high-grade used clothing, much of which was made available in the southern mountains and other troubled areas to permit the ill-clad children of underprivileged areas to be warmly dressed and to go regularly to school.

In addition to the southern mountains programs, the federation has been active for years among the Indians in the American Southwest. In April 1948, the Navajo Reservation suffered one of the heaviest snowstorms in history, with vast damage to the resources of the people. The federation provided food and clothing and, later, when the emergency had been met, inaugurated a child and school sponsorship program. American Indian child sponsorships, which now aim at facilitating assimilation, are serving an important need, while American Indian self-help programs are operating successfully among the San Carlos Apaches and the Colorado River tribes, improving health procedures, social and industrial skills, especially among the teenagers. Similar programs are being carried forward among the Pima, Papago, Navajo, and Pueblo groups.

In 1940, the federation was called to service overseas. During the air attack on Britain, from $8,000 to $10,000 a week was cabled to aid in the evacuation of children from the blitzed cities. More than 11,000 British children received such direct aid from American sponsors.

At the war's close SCF extended its assistance into many of the Western countries which had suffered devastation. Thousands of children received food and clothing supplements from the federation, and almost 400 schools received material aid that contributed to their rehabilitation. With the drawing of the Iron Curtain over Eastern Europe, the federation found American sponsors ready to come to the help of thousands of refugee children in West Germany and Austria. As Greece struggled to its feet after the repulse of Communist guerrillas, SCF extended aid to Greek children. Similarly, the federation went to work in Korea after the creation of the Republic of South Korea.

Programs based on personal sponsor-child relationships continue to fill an important need. Over 7,000 American individuals and groups sponsor more than 8,000 boys and girls in many countries, maintaining continuing personal correspondence with these children and their families. The enrichment of lives on both sides of this child-sponsorship relationship has had an untold influence for good; has helped to increase the feeling of personal interest and involvement between individuals and families; has broken down barriers of language and race by the common tongue of friendship.

The emphasis of the federation has increasingly been directed to the self-help aspects of its programs. Self-help as a method of attacking the basic causes of poverty is the federation's major contribution in the field of social welfare. The self-help concept rests on the principle that people are willing to use their unemployed time, their strength, their skills, and available materials to improve the lives of their children if they are shown how this can be done without loss of dignity and without accepting charity. The federation's success has been obtained by a pooling of the skilled professional guidance of its fieldworkers, modest grants or loans where actual cash is needed, and the labor, talents, and interest of the people themselves. Here is sharing in the best sense of the word—a sharing of a mutual interest in and concern for the benefit and improvement of the lives of children. As this concept developed and evolved in actual practice it has gained increasing recognition from professionally competent leaders in social welfare. The following is typical of many significant observations:

The Secretary General of the International Union for Child Welfare, Mr. Dan Mulock Houwer, stated after attending SCF conferences and observing fieldwork of the Federation in Greece and Lebanon—

This is a revolution in social work. In the Communist countries the approach is to the mass, on the basis of mass psychology plus enforcement by the political structure. In the United States and the Western industrialized countries the approach of social work is to stimulate the realization of the latent potentialities of the individual personality. Under the SCF pattern, when the SCF community development specialist leaves, the community, stimulated and focused on the well-being of children, goes on with self-improvement projects. It does so collectively, for the individual. Therein lies the revolution.

SCF village self-help programs have been established successfully in many of the freedom-loving nations overseas including France, Greece, Lebanon, and Korea.

In Lebanon, self-help programs proved so successful that SCF has been asked to assist the Lebanese Government in training officials for its rural

rehabilitation program. Since the establishment of the State of Israel, the Federation has been helpful on a small scale with the sponsorship of schools, while a wider opportunity for service is anticipated there in the near future. Recently, the Federation has initiated pilot self-help projects in Morocco, the Philippines, and in the Cameroons in Africa. In these places the villagers, assisted by SCF's fieldworkers, donate their voluntary services to accomplish permanent improvements in their communities. Schools are improved, sanitary facilities installed, farm-to-market roads built, irrigation systems either installed or extended with resultant crop increases. Out of these improvements comes a better life for the children; better schools; better food; better health—and a new generation equipped to meet the challenge of a changing world. By taking part in self-help activities, both the parents and the children learn the American way of cooperation and individual self-reliance instead of continued dependence on charity that destroys human dignity.

Funds to carry forward the work of SCF come not only from individual contributors, but by group participation. Women's clubs, service organizations, even the crews of some of our naval ships, have joined in supporting this work. Business firms across the Nation are supporting SCF by sponsoring individual children and backing community self-help. Here is an opportunity and a challenge to American enterprise to take a truly constructive hand in basic development abroad, and one that is being accepted and used with increasing effectiveness.

We, at SCF, believe that the self-help principle should be basic to all giving as a means of achievement of the goal outlined by the President in his message and further implemented in his Peace Corps program.

It is through pooling of individual skills, sharing of labor for a common cause, proving that men of differing races, languages, and customs can work together for a mutual goal, that international good will and collective responsibility can be attained. The goal of the Federation is that of helping others to help themselves by extending the hand of friendship backed by a readiness to match effort with knowledge and means. The President's message has strengthened our hands here at the Federation and augurs well for the days that lie ahead.

Disaster for Resort Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of the Second Congressional District of New Jersey, I am quite familiar with a segment of our economy which has grown and been encouraged as a source of income to our resort areas. My district includes Atlantic City and a number of smaller seashore resorts, which depend to a great extent on convention business. This is particularly true in the off season, when the facilities such as hotels and restaurants are occupied and kept busy by conventions from all over the United States, Canada, and even the world.

These conventions draw thousands of business representatives, and they, naturally, use their expense accounts. It has been estimated that over 50 percent of the income of one of the larger hotels in Atlantic City is derived from convention people. Any curtailment of the use of an expense account will be disastrous to the economy of the New Jersey resort areas, and I must judge that the same would apply to all areas catering to this great segment of our economy—the convention business. Professional convention managers either employed by corporations or trade associations, have purposely built up the use of resorts for convention purposes because they have a captive audience and are not subject to the distractions of metropolitan areas.

Atlantic City has the largest convention hall in the world, which has just been completely renovated under a $4 million renovation program, and its floor space increased by thousands of square feet for display of merchandise and other items, which enable an industry to display its accomplishments from year to year, and enables the businessman to keep up with what is new in his line of endeavor. I have watched these conventions personally for years, and I know that they are conducted in a businesslike manner, serve a very important purpose in our domestic economy, and the time which is given to social contacts and entertainment does not detract from the serious and fruitful endeavor of the meetings and displays planned months in advance for the convention.

I cannot conceive how any restrictions on convention and business spending will produce $250 million a year in additional taxes, and such an assumption is quite unrealistic for the following reasons:

First. The money involved is earmarked for sales promotion by most business enterprise. It is unsound to think that any business would not seek to divert such earmarked funds to other areas that are deductible, such as advertising, television, et cetera. The money, thus, will not be brought down in profits to a taxable level.

Second. Such limitation will adversely affect the service industries; that is, transportation, restaurants and hotels, which are large employers. A campaign by Internal Revenue Service has already reduced spending by convention people. In this regard, in most hotels in the resort areas there has been a steady decline in profits for the last 3 years since this antibusiness campaign was started by the Internal Revenue Service. For instance, in one hotel brought to my attention, the income tax was $16,000 last year as compared to $200,000 3 years ago. It is my belief that any hope of improving the tax collections through these procedures, will be offset by the reduced taxes produced for so long by the service industries.

I take issue with the Internal Revenue Service when it says that conventions are evidence of willful extravagances and conducted in an unbusinesslike manner. I know the contrary is true from personal observation, and it will be a terrible loss to the Nation to let this segment of business, the convention business, go to pot.

Such recommendations by the Internal Revenue Department is an attempt to introduce discriminatory price fixing by limiting the amount that can be deducted for hotel rooms and meals used by business travelers, and is fundamentally unsound. If our country has reached the point in its economy where it demands price fixing and controls, then it should be across the board and not attempt it on any one industry or business, and in no event, should one segment of the economy be discriminated against as would occur under such recommendations.

The inclusion of yachts, hunting lodges, and tropical clubs as income tax deductions by an individual or corporation is wrong, and I can agree that this should not be permitted. However, I do resent the Secretary of the Treasury emphasizing these extreme tax avoiding schemes, and implying they are typical of all business expenditures. I am amazed that the Secretary of the Treasury can say that there should be a per-diem limitation applicable to business travel at $30 a day, and that he would call this realistic. I am sure that he and all other officers and employees in Government would find it very hard to get by on business travel and lodging limited to such an amount.

I am definitely opposed to any such price fixing, and this is what it will amount to, and I insist that the harm and loss to seashore resorts and other areas benefiting from convention and business travel will be a hundredfold greater than any hoped for increase in tax collection.

Delta Council Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday, May 25, at the annual meeting of the Delta Council, our distinguished colleague, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, was the featured speaker. Some 3,000 people heard Mr. COOLEY's highly important message and I think it is worthy of the attention of all the Members of Congress.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. COOLEY's address:

REMARKS OF HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY, OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, BEFORE THE DELTA COUNCIL, CLEVELAND, MISS., THURSDAY, MAY 25, 1961

I am greatly honored to be the guest of Delta Council on the occasion of your 26th annual meeting. I know of the historic significance of some of your meetings of the past and I know that the future meetings will play an important part in the history of our country.

Delta Council is a Mississippi organization, but its influence in agricultural matters is nationwide. For many years the House Committee on Agriculture has invited leaders from your organization to present their views on every type of agricultural legislation that has been before us. These recommendations have always been of great value to the committee and the Congress as a whole.

The leaders of your organization have been influential in determining policy decisions of the great agricultural organizations and the Department of Agriculture. Their knowledge of agriculture plus their national viewpoint will always give them high priority in the Nation's agricultural councils.

I will say especially that we in Washington are always pleased when B. F. Smith visits with us, to keep us abreast of the work and views of the Delta Council.

FARMERS SELF-RELIANT AND INDEPENDENT

Now, at the outset of this discussion, I would like to emphasize to you that I have been guided through all the years by a firm conviction that the farmers of America are the most independent, and the most self-reliant, of all the people in our economy and in our democratic society, and that farmers want the Government to do nothing for them that they can do for themselves.

The Delta Council is a perfect demonstration to the Nation at large of the determination of farmers and of the rest of the people in an agricultural area to do—to make do—for themselves.

By your efforts, conversely and perhaps ironically, you simultaneously have demonstrated that no matter how hard farmers may try, to the limit of their brains, in their full devotion to the land and in the expenditure of their energy, they cannot go it alone in the economic stream where our Government has provided to other areas of our economy—to industry and to labor—so many protections, so many safeguards, so many powers above the law of supply and demand. The Government has responsibility also to the farmers of America.

Everyone here knows that without the Government cotton program this rich delta spread along the great Mississippi today would be bankrupt.

Let us hold this in mind while we look backward briefly and then take a fresh look at the Nation's agriculture, and while we meditate and counsel together on the further direction we shall give our Government in the development of policies intended to afford to the farmers of this country the opportunity to share equitably in the rewards of free enterprise.

NATION UNAWARE OF FARM PLIGHT

Perhaps the deterioration of the agricultural economy in recent years needs no spelling out for you people of the Delta Council. But I am impelled to lay down a few facts and figures every time the opportunity presents itself, for it is absolutely appalling to me that the nonfarm public is almost totally unaware of the current critically low level of farm income. I am always hopeful, on occasions when I speak, that some of the truth about agriculture may seep through to our urban friends who for so long a time have heard little about agriculture that was not beclouded by emphasis upon surplus and subsidy.

Farmers' realized net income from farming in 1960 totaled only $11.6 billion, a decline of 26 percent from the 1947–49 average. In 1960 the net income per farm from farming, despite the decline in the number of farms, was 20 percent below the 1947–49 average.

These income losses resulted largely from a 12-percent reduction in average prices received by farmers from the 1947–49 average and a 20-percent rise in prices paid for items used in family living and in farm production. The parity ratio, which measures the relative price position of farmers, declined from 108 in 1947–49 to 80 in 1960, a drop of 26 percent.

City people are uninformed on the cost-price squeeze that now is strangling agriculture; indeed, many have been led to believe that farmers are getting fat on Government checks.

The decline in income, of course, has not been uniform for all crops or for all classes of farms. You people here in the Delta certainly have been more fortunate than farmers in some areas, and you have had tougher luck than some other areas.

The Delta is an agricultural region of generally rich land which normally produces yields of cotton and other adapted crops considerably above the average. It is, however, a high-cost area and in years when something less than an average crop is harvested your farmers suffer serious financial reverses.

As I recall, 1957 was such a year in the Delta. Wet weather completely prevented cotton harvest on some farms, while on practically all others the amount and quality of the harvest was poor. A serious emergency financing program developed in which both the cooperative farm credit system and the Farmers Home Administration made special efforts to supplement local credit to farmers.

I am told that many Delta farmers still have not recovered fully from the setback in 1957.

It is deeply satisfying to me that I have been able to work with you through the years in developing the farm policies, of adjusted production, price supports and reasonable credit, which have served this Delta country to weather adversity and to maintain your economy on the land.

The farmers of the Delta, the farmers of North Carolina, and the farmers of the Nation have come through some hard times together in these last few years. At times I have despaired that so many of our farmers have dwelt so constantly at the edge of insolvency and bankruptcy.

You will recall that the farm program of the 1930's brought us through the great depression. Our cotton program operated for some 22 or 23 years, to the great advantage of our cotton farmers, and at an actual profit to the Government of some $268 million. Then a low price philosophy began to dominate our farm policies, and the income of our farmers lessened year by year. At times I feared we might be without a program at all. Our profit of $268 million in the cotton program turned into a loss over the last 5 years of approximately $1,184 million.

A NEW DAY

Now there is a new day for agriculture—or perhaps I should say there is a prospect of a new day, or the possibility of a new day in agriculture.

It is not my purpose to inject politics into this discussion. I would have done with partisan politics in agriculture, now and forevermore. But the truth would not be served if I failed to emphasize to you that there is a new climate for the farmer in Washington, a new sympathy for his problems and his aspirations, and a new and dedicated determination to work with farmers in dealing with these problems.

I think that I can report to you without reservation that the farmers of America have found a true champion of their cause in Orville Freeman, who so recently became our Secretary of Agriculture. He is a student. He is able. He has the voice, the will, and the heart to speak out for farmers.

In a few short months Orville Freeman has grasped the responsibilities and intricacies of his office and he has dared to lead. In these same months he has inherited and he is now bearing the weight and the burden of all the conflicts within the ranks of agriculture and of all the prejudices against farmers that in these last few years have been engendered among our consuming friends in the cities.

You witnessed what happened when Freeman came forward with his first major legislative proposal—the feed grains bill. You no doubt grasp in the ensuing conflict on this bill a portent of troubled days, months, and perhaps years ahead.

The feed grains bill was similar in virtually all respects to legislation introduced by leaders of both political parties in the previous Congress. But when I offered this bill in the new 87th Congress as the administration-sponsored measure, party lines formed fast and hard.

Our job in the Congress is difficult enough when the facts go out to the people, but when planned and promoted misinformation and downright falsehood are used to confuse the people, then we must wonder whether the public good can be served.

While the feed grains bill was before the Congress our dairy farmers, our poultry producers, and others who use feed were told that the legislation would shoot feed prices out the roof. On the other hand, it was whispered to our farmers producing grain that the bill would knock their prices out of the bottom. Then, when those out to defeat this program couldn't find something else to say, they just yelled "socialism." I believe you know who was back of this kind of business.

In the showdown on the House floor, the bill barely survived. Only four members of the minority party voted with us. Only a last minute surge of votes by city members saved the legislation.

Thus the feed grains bill, the first great effort in agriculture by the new administration, was born and baptized in the Congress by great and bitter partisan strife, and amid confusion manufactured by the opposition. As of now it seems that this program may write one of our real success stories in dealing with farm problems. It is popular in the corn country. It will bring down our surpluses. It is improving the income of farmers.

ADMINISTRATION FARM BILL

Now let us turn briefly to the administration's general farm bill, known as the Agricultural Act of 1961.

This bill, the heart of it, seeks to provide the procedures and the machinery whereby farmers can work together, in cooperation with government, to adjust their production to modern needs and conditions; and thereby to achieve for themselves fair incomes, as they make available to consumers adequate supplies at fair prices.

It seeks to give and apply to farmers, commodity by commodity, the precise tools and principles of free enterprise that have been employed by industry since our beginning as a free people by providing the means whereby producers may fit their production to their markets and may put a price tag on their production that will represent their costs plus a reasonable profit that will support their families on an American standard of living.

Senator ELLENDER of Louisiana, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry, and I, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, introduced the administration bill.

Then the roof seemed to fall in. I never in my life have witnessed such misinformation, misrepresentation, and absolute nonsense as has been spread around the country on the intent and purpose of this proposed legislation.

Anonymous propaganda sheets have been circulated on Capitol Hill, damning the bill. In Louisiana a report was spread among warehousemen that if the bill becomes law then farmers will take their cotton out of bonded warehouses and store it on their farms. In my own State of North Carolina and in other tobacco States our farmers were served up with the appalling falsehood that if we pass this bill the tobacco allotments will no longer run to the farms, but to the producers, and tenants at any time may move to another farm and take the landowner's allotment with him.

Can you imagine the character of people in our democratic society who would use such falsehood and such tactics? There is no more probability that such things would happen under this bill than that the Congress tomorrow will enact legislation to bring about such conditions or events.

I will be the first to say to you that the administration's bill now pending in the Congress is far from perfect. No bill of such a general character can be perfect upon its introduction. This is especially true in view of the short time the administration had in which to present general farm legislation to this Congress, in time for action this year.

The proposed legislation provides that a committee of producers of a specific commodity would consult with the Secretary to develop and recommend a program for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. To become effective it would require approval by the President, sanction by the Congress, and approval by two-thirds vote of the producers.

The bill would establish agricultural procedures, not programs.

CONGRESS WILL NOT ABDICATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR AGRICULTURE

Perhaps the most serious worry about the legislation is that in its original draft it provided that any commodity program would come up to the Congress where it could be rejected, but, if not, the program then with the approval of two-thirds of the producers would become effective.

A great storm has been created around this aspect of the legislation. You perhaps have been told that the Congress is being called upon to "abdicate" its responsibilities. I point out to you that even under this original proposal the Congress could reject any commodity programs submitted to it and then proceed to legislate directly on a program for that commodity, if such was desired by the producers.

You need not fear. Congress will not abdicate its responsibility for agriculture. I assure you of this: Whatever bill is passed you people here and farmers throughout the Nation will have the same doors of Congress open to you. You will be doing business at the same store. You will be doing business with the Congress of the United States.

My concern now is that the power of propaganda, the power to misinform, the power to misrepresent, the power to confuse, has become so great in this country, where the interests of our farm people are concerned, that we may not now, or perhaps ever again, be able to write and enact sensible and sound legislation to return agriculture to a fair earning position.

I want you to take note of this. Time may be running out on the farmers of America.

It is not my fear now that the Congress will abdicate its responsibility to agriculture, but that agriculture, by yielding to the forces of misinformation, misrepresentation, and confusion, may abdicate in its opportunities—perhaps the last opportunities—to put sense and soundness into the farm economy of this country.

You are aware that we farmers represent now less than 10 percent of the population. Our strength of numbers in the Congress has waned.

COTTON IN A FARM PROGRAM

I was rather surprised earlier in the week when a prominent cotton leader stood at my desk and told me that cotton is in good shape. His inference was that any consideration of cotton need not be embraced in the new farm legislation.

The Department of Agriculture reports that domestic consumption of cotton is expected to be down about 1 million bales this year from the 9 million bales consumed last year. The per capita use of cotton in this country has dropped in the last 10 years by roughly one-fourth, in competition with synthetic fibers and materials. The Department expects our total export of cotton in 1960–61 to run about 6.5 million bales, down about 700,000 from the previous year. And adding to my concern, is the great influx of cotton textile goods from abroad. Foreign textile mills are taking great advantage of the fact that our cotton program permits the sale abroad of American produced cotton at substantially lower prices than our own mills must pay.

Not all is gloom, of course. There are many bright spots for cotton. The possibilities of research in new uses and in promotions are exciting and challenging. But does anyone here believe for a moment that our cotton problems have been solved, and we shall need no further recourse to the Government to change, revise, and improve the public policies now applicable to cotton?

Then think upon what your representatives from the cotton country will face when they again go into the House or into the Senate carrying legislation to deal with cotton alone. Cotton is a southern crop. I would not like to confront the prospects ahead if cotton were excluded from general legislation intended to enable the producers of the various commodities to deal with their problems in the years ahead.

We must think and work together on these things.

This is my message here.

Now, in closing, let me say to you that it is people like you, here in the Delta Council, that we need for leadership.

We need people like you to get the truth told.

Let us have done with bickering in this divided house of agriculture. When I come to you, or you come to me, let neither of us say to the other: I am against what you propose; but let both of us say: Come, sit down, and together we shall think out and work out the problem to be solved and the advantage to be gained by our farm people across these broad lands of ours and by this country that we love.

The Republic of Italy—15th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, many dramatic and startling changes took place in Europe as the result of the last war and since the end of that war, but one of the most welcome changes was the birth of the Republic of Italy. Fifteen years ago on June 2 the Kingdom of Italy came to an end, and the Republic of Italy was born. Even more welcome was the fact that this radical change was brought about by an orderly democratic process, by popular referendum.

Since its rise and its fast growth during that relatively short time, the Republic of Italy has had its ups and downs and faced many hardships and difficulties, especially in its early years. But the industrious and extremely hard-working people of Italy, with their devoted and dedicated leaders, have had their reward of joy and satisfaction in the strengthening of their democratic Government. Even before the formal termination of the last war, devastated and war-ravaged Italy lay prostrate at the feet of her victoricus foes. At the time she appeared to be ready prey to divisive forces and thus an easy victim of Communist ideology. Her economy, her finances, and her industry were all wrecked, and nearly everything was in disorder and chaos, everything except the robust determination of the people to face all such national calamities realistically and courageously. Fortunately, during this most critical period of Italy's recent history, two important, one might say two decisive, factors worked in Italy's favor.

The character of the people of Italy and the caliber of their leaders on the one hand, and the imaginative statesmanship displayed by American and British Governments on the other, were the two factors which saved Italy from further ravages, and were at least indirectly instrumental in bringing about the Republic of Italy.

Today, more than 16 years after the conclusion of the war in Europe, and 15 years after the birth of new Italy under the republican form of government, we can see the working of multiple forces, often working at cross purposes, and seeming to cause much confusion in which only the forces of evil and destruction would have gained had it not been for the sound and robust sense of the Italian people under coolheaded and resolute leadership. At times, even in misery, they kept faith with the ways of the West, pulled themselves together, stoutly faced and overcame both internal and external threats to their free existence.

In this terrific and relentless struggle for survival as an independent, sovereign state, the people and the Government of the United States played an important, and perhaps a decisive role. We did what we could to help the people of Italy in their period of travail and tribulation, and our moral support must have given them confidence and hope in their immense struggle. I am glad and proud to recall the financial and material aid given to Italy, first under UNRRA, then followed by the Marshall plan, the foreign aid and mutual assistance programs, technical, cultural, and military assistance plans. And in the end, we as well as others of the free West, have gained

a loyal, dependable, and devoted ally for our cause, in our common fight against Communist totalitarianism.

Different people hold different views about certain phases of recent Italian history, particularly on the recent political history of Italy, but they all have greeted with joy and jubilation the encouraging and inspiring changes that have taken place in the politics and policies of Italy under the republic form of government. The Republic of Italy has weathered numerous political, economic, and social storms, it has emerged stronger than ever, and has become a pillar of democracy in today's Europe. Its courageous leaders have defiantly ignored all threats and blandishments of powerful Communist elements from within, and they have also bravely faced even more serious totalitarian threats from without.

In the sphere of economics and finance, they have been successful in making Italy a solvent country, and have succeeded in maintaining its solvency. Even with the loss of some territory to Yugoslavia, and the inevitable overcrowding of the already densely populated country with refugees from lost areas, Italy has managed to look after the welfare of its needy citizens. In the important fields of commerce and industry the Republic has made tremendous progress. New and large chemical, oil refining and cement industries have been built, and these are being operated with power generated by hydroelectric powerplants and stations. Today Italy provides finished industrial goods of high quality to numerous countries, and its technological services are sought by many countries in the Middle East. Italy has thus successfully regained at least a part of its prewar commerce and shipping in that area of the world.

Today, 15 years after its birth, the Republic of Italy has come of age. At that early age she has attained maturity and has take her high place in the community of nations in the free world. Italy today is armed in defense of her freedom and of democracy, and has alined with Western democracies against totalitarian dictatorships. Let us all pray and hope on this 15th anniversary celebration that the Republic of Italy will grow strong and her citizens live in peace under their democratic government.

In Memory of Our Veterans Who Had a Rendezvous With Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 30, I had the privilege of participating in the Memorial Day parade and services conducted by the Unity Post No. 1570, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Queens Village Post No. 301, the American Legion, at Queens Village, N.Y. The grand marshal of the march was Alfred W. Mutz, past commander of the Unity Post. Many notables attended and the order of march included Gold Star Mothers, units from various high schools, units from various posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the American Legion, the student nurses from Creedmore State Hospital, the Knights of Columbus and other civic-minded groups.

After the march, the ceremonial took place at the Veterans' Plaza, Springfield Boulevard and Jamaica Avenue. After the invocation by Rev. Laverne Vander Hill, introductory greetings were given by Cyril J. Solan, general chairman, John Gulitti, commander, Unity Post No. 1570, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and George D. Bein, commander, Queens Village Post No. 301, American Legion. The assembly of over 2,000 were thrilled by the recitation of the poem, "In Flanders Fields," by Rosemary Shevlin, a student of Martin Van Buren High School and a recitation of "Lincoln's Gettysburg Address," by Howard Griesch of the Grace Lutheran Day School. The memorial prayer was given by Rabbi Jacob Wendroff and the benediction by Rev. James McNicholas. The placing of the wreaths, the salute to the dead, the taps and the flag raising were all in keeping with the great traditions of the Memorial Day.

The address which I delivered on this historic occasion I believe will prove of interest to the readers. My address follows:

Commanders John Gulitti, George Bein, Chairman Solan, Mr. Johnson, and members of Unity Post No. 1570 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Legionnaires, and Americans all. We gather here in reverent tribute to our honored dead. We revere them because they had a rendezvous with death so that we could have a rendezvous with life. We revere them because they gave their life so that we might live in dignity, in freedom, and in peace. To achieve this peace, we pay a terrible price. We pay in lives lost, in bodies broken, in morals shattered, in government debauched, and in our economy dislocated. We pay this high cost because we know that liberty and freedom are priceless, and peace is the desired goal of all free mankind.

We ask ourselves two questions. Do we have peace? Have the sacrifices of these honored dead been in vain? If peace is defined as the period between hot wars, then we have peace. If peace is defined as a tranquil state of affairs, then there is no peace—the only definite thing we can state is that we have an uneasy peace, and we are engaged in a cold war.

Peace is still not a reality to most of the people of this world. Suspicion, hatred, civil war, starvation, and greed ride the range of human misery as ruthlessly as when the war lords of Berlin and Tokyo dreamed of their master races. Eastern Europe is closed to Western Europe by an iron curtain of censorship. The captive nations are suffering under tyrannical dictatorship and are striving to regain their freedom and liberty.

Communist agents throughout the world, taking their orders from Moscow, are trying to seize control of governments by subversion, by infiltration, and by armaments, and make them subject to the will of the Kremlin. Laos, Communist China, and Cuba are areas in which the might of Moscow is spreading its influence.

For a long time, the American people have been realizing that tyranny is a monster most difficult to destroy. Freedom and liberty have existed for short periods of time throughout history. Ours is a nation which has lived longer in freedom than any other nation in the world. Despots have risen to make known their dreams of world dominion. They scoff at America and tell us that they will bury us. They do not believe in an America with peace and freedom and opportunity for all people. They dream of a Soviet Empire with the hammer and sickle waving in triumph over the ashes of democracy and a commissar ruling the life of every individual in the world with an iron hand. They have projected their might into orbit and into the great spaces beyond. They seek to belittle our efforts, publicized throughout the world and seen by television, to put a man into space and return safely to earth.

Of all the threats to human liberty and freedom, communism is the greatest. It feeds upon the misery of the people by its promises, it inspires sacrifices, provides concentrated educational facilities for the superior intellect, and subordinates the individual to the glorification of the state.

Hunger, unemployment, and pestilence stalk many lands in Asia, in Africa, and in South America. These conditions are conducive to communism. Many of these weakened nations have toppled before the force displayed by Communist Russia with its inexhaustive manpower and natural resources.

The picture of Russia's long stride from Czechoslovakia to China is too recent to have been dimmed in its ugly potentialities. In Korea it was brought to us in a most forceful and realistic way. Now again, in Indochina, Asia, in Laos, and in Cuba, the same tactics are used.

The American people know that the only hope of preserving human freedom, or making peace secure, lies in American national strength, and in improving the living conditions of mankind. That means strength in the faith of American ideals, strength in American economy, and finally, strength in American fighting power.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have always championed peace and freedom through strength. Despots and tyrants have only contempt for people who are so passionately devoted to peace that they foolishly never prepare to defend themselves.

We all remember the command of the dead as immortalized by John McCrae in his poem entitled "In Flanders Fields":

"We are the dead.
Take up our quarrel with the foe.
To you from falling hands we throw
The torch, be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields."

Forty-four years have passed since the dead gave us that command. Two terrible wars have scourged our Nation. The veterans of World War II and the veterans of Korea in answering the dead of World War I, promised them in these words:

"Sleep on ye brave
Your flaming torch aloft we bear.
With burning heart an oath we swear
To keep the faith, to fight it through
To crush the foe or sleep with you
In Flanders fields."

Our veterans have held high the torch of liberty. They struck down the swastika and planted high our flag over the city of Berlin. They struck down the flag of the Rising Sun and planted our Stars and Stripes on the craggy hills of Mount Suribachi. Whenever our boys have been called upon to strike down the symbol of despotism, they have done so and lifted our flag above the clear horizon.

We, as a result of our success, have become smugly complacent. Because of past victories, we feel that we can win again, and in our self-praise, the American people are becoming soft and losing sight of our ideals and our purposes.

President Kennedy understands our national purpose. He knows it, and in his inaugural address, he admonished the American people when he declared, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but ask what you can do for your country." Many other farsighted Americans understand our national purpose.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, the great jurist, once paraphrased our purposes and said, "I enjoy paying taxes because the price of civilization is the privilege of paying taxes." See what the people are doing and ask yourselves whether we are losing sight of our national purposes. Gigantic corporations and electrical businessmen fix prices, gouge their Government thereby increasing Government expenditures, and yet they complain that Government is imposing too many taxes. Businessmen take off entertainment expenditures, yet complain about high taxes. Labor leaders ask for increased wages and complain about taxes and the cost of living. Aircraft industries obtain billions of procurement contracts and refuse to pay their taxes on their excess profits. The media of communication, such as the television network, set up phony quix shows and payola and complain about unfair investigations. The newspapers disclose inadvertently Government secrets, and publicize for profit crime and lust, and complain about Government inefficiency.

In 1797 when the pirates along the Barbary Coast demanded tribute, our American envoy to France, Charles Pinckney, declared with a clear voice, "Millions for defense, but not one cent for tribute."

Contrast our present attitude toward Cuba today. When Castro asks tribute in ransom for 1,200 Cuban invaders, some so-called leaders run helter skelter to raise ransom money to pay for tractors demanded by Fidel Castro. These so-called leaders camouflage their softness with humanitarian and weasel words that ransom is an exchange of machine for men, while Castro calls these payments indemnification and reparations for invasion. This is a demonstration of humanism gone astray. Any payment made by Americans for the release of Cuban freedom fighters is blackmail and tribute. I, for one, do not approve such tribute. I believe veterans do not approve of blackmail. What has happened to the spirit of America?

Our Declaration of Independence declares that all men are created equal, and yet the citizens of Alabama stop freedom riders, white and black, from traveling through their State. Our Supreme Court in 1954 ordered desegregation and our Federal Government had to send troops into Little Rock to guarantee the safety of a few Negro children to attend school.

Today is more than a Memorial Day. It is a day of rededication to those high ideals for which those men died. While we are aware of the faults and frailties of our human makeup and the selfishness of some, let us not forget the great heart of our great American people when called upon for great causes. Sometimes we are overgenerous.

This year in Washington we have sought to help the unemployed, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to comfort the sick and the aged, to house the inadequately sheltered, to educate the youth, to provide the opportunity for the brilliant and the skilled, to attend the wounded and the disabled. We have demonstrated, and we are demonstrating, that ours is a Government which cares. Just as we have helped our own, we have shown our generosity to the peoples of Asia, Africa, and South America by helping them with funds to help themselves. Our Vice President, LYNDON JOHNSON, has reported that the peoples of Asia want, not arms but funds to help their economy. We are generous because we recognize that we are our brothers' keepers and because it is right. We know that if we cannot help the many who are poor, we cannot save the few who are rich or well off.

Remember, my friends, that our Nation has remained free because civil authority has been always superior to military authority, except in times of national emergency. Our budget provides for $47 billion for military affairs. Such great expenditures are needed for defense, but they carry with them great danger. We may be confronted by a military caste and a militaristic mentality. By the military caste I do not mean the GI, but the professional soldier. Place too much authority in the military or in one man, and we pave the road to tyranny and oppression. Deny a man equal rights before the law or deny him the protection of the Bill of Rights, and you whittle away at your own freedom. Liberty does not always die from direct attack. If liberty ever dies in America—and I hope we shall never see the day—it will die from the decay of the principles that gave it life: that is justice and equality and that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God. But we are determined to be free, and we are ready to pay the cost, however great. We shall not be stampeded by fear, prejudice, or threats. With God's grace and the support of all veterans and all men who are devoted to the principles of our Nation, our democracy will live and continue to flourish amid lawlessness and tyranny.

When we adhere to the principles of justice, equality, and brotherhood, we will have kept faith with those who died.

Memorial Day, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my remarks during the Memorial Day exercises of the American Legion Post 15, Immaculate Conception Cemetery, Lawrence, Mass., on May 30, 1961:

Even in death they are together, honored by the row on row of flags above their graves.

Here sleep the brave.

On each Memorial Day we pause, in personal recollection of many loved ones and friends who have passed away. But to these who served our country well in time of danger, we offer the prayers of a grateful Nation.

"No man lives unto himself alone." The veterans who are buried here, learned that lesson at the threshold of their manhood. In the comradeship of national service, and in supreme test of battle, they were inspired to help one another.

And when the war was over, those who came back went their separate ways, each seeking his own fulfillment—for that is the meaning of freedom to each person.

There were times, however, when they longed for the comradeship of their younger days, and wondered why this spirit that was called forth in time of emergency, could not be saved for the constructive tasks of peace.

Too often, it seemed, the opportunity for a new beginning that was won by the sacrifices of war—faded away in the careless days of peace. The purpose and the goals, both earned at such a human cost, slipped from our minds and hearts.

Have we kept faith with those who died?

Sixteen years after World War II, 16 years after the United States had become the most powerful nation in the world, we are under attack from a cunning and relentless foe. With the invisible weapons of propaganda, subversion, infiltration, science prestige, and economic pressure, communism is expanding against the frontiers of freedom.

The competition of selfish interests within the Western World has blinded them to the insidious and effective techniques of communism, and has interfered with the unified will and intelligence that is needed to reverse the spread of tyranny.

Cuba, Laos, Africa today. Where next tomorrow?

At long last we are waking up to the sober truth that "those who refuse to learn from history are condemned to repeat it."

The first lesson is: a policy of weakness and surrender of basic principles invites attack.

Another forgotten lesson warns us that freedom can never coast along—satisfied with things as they are—in a world of revolutionary ferment.

The soft years of the recent past, the complacent and self-indulgent years when leaders were reluctant to tell us of our situation, or to point out what must be done, require resolution and sacrifice to make up that loss.

President Kennedy spoke to Congress and to the American people last Friday, appealing for a multi-billion-dollar program to strengthen the United States, and to spread the freedom doctrine around the world. To many listeners it sounded like a call to arms, bringing the United States to the edge of a wartime emergency.

His purpose is to increase the power of the United States and friendly nations, and to serve notice on the Soviet Union that we will retreat no more.

As the President spoke, I felt that he was asking us to live up to our responsibilities as freemen.

As if he were saying: "Other generations of Americans did their part. We can do no less. The patriotic spirit and the patriotic efforts that are called forth in time of war are needed now to turn back the dangers that are encircling us in this age of deceptive peace."

On Memorial Day, it is our reverent custom to visit the cemeteries, and to honor by appropriate ceremonies the memory of veterans who defended our freedoms in armed combat. It is they, however, who honor us. For they knew that the victories of war could be lost in the negligence of peace.

But they had faith that we would carry on for them, and use the opportunity they had won, to expand the frontiers of freedom, until every human being would enjoy the blessings of a lasting peace.

The faces of the dead come back to life in our recollections of them, and it seems as if their courage returns to reassure and inspire us.

If they could speak to us, from eternity, I think they would tell us to take heart from the living courage of the few among us and to emulate their example. They would point to the men and women serving in our Armed Forces, to those in schools and universities and science laboratories acquiring the knowledge for progress; to men like commander Shepard who dare to explore the unknown; to those who are joining the Peace

Corps, choosing to give up the personal comforts and conveniences that they enjoy here in order to help the underprivileged of this world; to humble men and women who live the redeeming truths of religion throughout their human journey.

These are the ones—the dead remind us—who truly honor the faith to which brave men of generations past gave the last full measure of their devotion.

On Memorial Day, the spirits of the departed pray for us. They pray that we shall respond to the courage of living Americans and volunteer to work with them in the great task of making human dignity for all prevail, so that the future will be grateful to our memory for meeting the challenge of the 1960's with the valor that saved and perpetuated the priceless gift of freedom.

The Republic of Italy—Fifteenth Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, all peoples and nations suffered during the last war, and some lost most of their worldly possessions, but the people of Italy were suffering under the detested and dictatorial Fascist regime for two decades prior to that war, without losing their love for freedom and democratic government. They struggled against their dictator and his followers without success, but when the war came the Fascist regime proved its utter inability to act in the best interests of the Italian people, and when they realized that such was the case, the Fascists were turned out of office even before the end of that war, and gradually a democratic government came into being. That was done in an orderly and freely conducted election on June 2, 1946. On that day the people of Italy expressed their preference to live under a republican form of government, and thus was born the Republic of Italy 15 years ago.

Today as one looks at Italy and its government, as one surveys the attainments and accomplishments of the Italian people under that government, one cannot help but marvel at the way these people have worked and succeeded in making today's Italy not only a prosperous and progressive country but also a major force, perhaps a decisive force, in the dangerous and intense East-West struggle, an almost endless cold war that has been raging between the free West and enslaved Communist totalitarian East. As a matter of fact, and all things considered, the birth and growth, and the constant strengthening of the Republic of Italy is one of the healthiest and most hopeful signs in postwar Europe.

And the democratic government there has done remarkably well, even when working under severe handicaps. Both in internal affairs and in foreign affairs it has been eminently successful, by improving the economic and social status of citizens in the country and in enhancing Italy's prestige abroad. Today there is no question that, even though there is a large left-wing element in the country, democracy is firmly rooted on the soil of Italy. Barring some unexpected and unforeseen event, it is there to stay.

On her 15th anniversary celebration the Republic of Italy seems to be on the high road of success and triumph. It is true that many economic, social and educational reform measures which were instituted more than a decade ago have not had time to show their full beneficial results, but serious efforts are being made to narrow the gap separating the rich and the wealthy in the north from the poor and the miserable in the south including those in Sicily. Tremendous efforts are being made both by the government and private organizations to modernize the country's old industries and establish new ones in the south. Italy's rivers are most efficiently utilized for generating hydroelectric power, without robbing the farmer of water for irrigation purposes. Construction of highways and other means of transportation has been proceeding at an accelerated pace, and in this respect the country is experiencing a great boom. All these successes help Italy to cope, at least partly, with her surplus labor problem.

The way in which the Italian people have pulled themselves up from their bootstraps and within 15 years have succeeded in remaking Italy, in giving her a new and fresh lease on life is truly admirable. We greet this 15-year-old new state, one of the great powers of Europe, and welcome with joy and enthusiasm the encouraging and inspiring changes that have taken place there, especially in Italy's politics and her policies. The Republic of Italy has successfully weathered political, economic, and social storms; it has come out of numerous serious struggles unscathed, and has emerged as a pillar of democracy in today's West. Its courageous and wise leaders have defiantly ignored all threats and blandishments of powerful Communist elements from within, and they have also bravely faced even more serious totalitarian threats from without. Carefully and gradually they have laid the foundations of a democratic government in which the people exercise their supreme authority through the democratic process of voting, and by which the rule of law and equal justice is assured.

Fifteen years make a very short period of a people's history, but these last 15 years have been momentous in the history of Italian people. After enduring Fascist dictatorship for two decades and then suffering indescribable hardship in a war that brought them disaster and destruction, mostly through resolute and determined efforts they succeeded in remodeling their government, rebuilt their devastated country, have carefully husbanded their material and human resources and have become a great nation. And the 15-year old Republic of Italy, born in agonizing political, economic, social, and fiscal turmoil has in a very short time, come of age. In that early age the Republic has attained maturity. It has already taken her high place in the community of nations of the free world. In freedom's name and in defense of democracy she has armed herself against Communist totalitarianism and against all forms of dictatorships. Let us all hope and pray that this 15-year old Republic of Italy will be allowed to have peace and her gifted and gallant citizens enjoy the blessings of freedom and democracy.

Address at Memorial Day Service at the U.S. Cemetery in Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday it was my privilege to attend the impressive Memorial Day services conducted by the Philadelphia County Council of the Disabled American Veterans and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, at the U.S. National Cemetery, Limekiln Pike and Haines Street, in my congressional district in Philadelphia. Marvin Silver was the chairman of the Memorial Day committee, and Anthony P. Mortimer and Silvio D. D'Anella were cochairmen.

I was asked to speak at the services and my remarks were intended to show that disabled veterans and those who lost their lives fought for the preservation of freedom; that despite the efforts of dictators and totalitarian governments to curtail freedom, it prevails ultimately. Historical references relating to the subject were included in my talk, which is inserted below for the possible interest of Members.

ADDRESS AT MEMORIAL DAY SERVICE AT THE U.S. CEMETERY IN PHILADELPHIA

The service we are holding here in Philadelphia, in observance of Memorial Day, 1961, is no event isolated in space and time, but a dramatic symbol of the interconnection of man with man, through space, and through time. What happened here in the United States between 1861 and 1865 was a culmination of generations of social and political discord and compromise, of struggle between economic interests, and between varying moral concepts. But this culmination in violence, and in defeat of the Confederacy and victory of the Union, was no final completion or resolution of the conflict. It was an episode in a contest that stretches back in time further than recorded history, and forward into the mists of an unforeseeable future. It was an episode in a contest that spreads in space, not only over the habitable globe, but into regions beyond our atmosphere, and perhaps soon to other planets.

I do not claim that this is always a clear-cut contest, in which one side has a monopoly of virtue, and the other a monopoly of evil. You cannot recognize the good guys by such simple signs as white hats or white horses. But, for all the complications and mistiness that may sometimes perplex and bewilder the observer, there is a valid criterion by which we may justly judge the principles at stake in this contest, and aline

ourselves with the better side. This unfinished, age-old contest is one that is always concerned with some aspect of freedom. It may be the independence of a nation, as it was in the case of the American Revolution; it may be the demand of a nation for freedom to trade with other nations, and ply the seas without interference; a demand which was among the causes of the War of 1812; it may be an effort to obtain individual liberty for oppressed and enslaved men, or to obtain equality of legal treatment and political, educational, and economic well-being, as in the case of the Civil War.

Or, as in the two World Wars, it may be a struggle to prevent the nationalistic expression of aggressive nations, seeking only the glorification of their specific designs—at the expense of their neighbors.

In all these contests, freedoms have been threatened and, in some instances, temporarily withdrawn from the victims of aggression. Yet, always in the end, the freedom that once existed has been restored by those to whom its lack proved utterly intolerable.

That is the nature of freedom; to overcome tyranny in each and every instance. And if at times it appears that the tyrant has triumphed once and for all, you can rest assured that the impression is illusory. For as certainly as the sun rises every morning, freedom must of necessity prevail in the end.

This fact is one which unfortunately goes unrecognized by the traditions of those to whom military might appears as the sole governing factor in world affairs. Time and again there have appeared political leaders with grand military designs sufficient to enflame and arouse their people. Not that they limit their appeal to the force of arms alone, for indeed they speak of justice, equality and—strangely enough—freedom, itself. This from the aggressors. Yet what is meant by their terms are so far removed from literal terminology as to render their phrases contradictory in the extreme.

By justice, they mean that they be allowed to have as much or more of something than their rivals; more trade, more land, more industry, more wealth. To deny them this is unjust, they say. To require that they stand pat, on an unequal basis, is unjust. Equality is all they ask, although sometimes it would appear that equality amounts, in their view, to something in the neighborhood of 80 percent for them and 20 percent for the other powers of the earth. And freedom—what do they mean by freedom? Why, the freedom to secure the so-called justice and equality they believe themselves entitled to, without protest from any quarter.

On such grounds the tyrants and would-be tyrants of history have built their platforms and launched their campaigns since time immemorial. Unfortunately, there is always a vague semblance of truth to what they say, for, in fact, there is injustice everywhere in the world in the form of unequally divided natural resources and economic advantage.

But the tyrants seldom seem to act in the name of actual reform along this line. What they seek is generally not equality or justice, but a rearrangement of conditions so that the inequality and injustices of the future will benefit themselves rather than their rivals. And what is the first step in their so-called reform movements? Invariably, it is the same: To crush dissent within their own factions; to stamp out criticism of their methods. And as their power expands and dissent grows apace, their suppressive tactics become worse, in an effort to create a picture of uniform approval of their course.

So it was in pre-Civil War days when the powerful southern Unionist movement was crushed by the secessionist faction in the South. In 1851 the southern Unionists were strong enough to form a separate political party—the Union Party—which carried the South in the struggle over the famed Compromise of 1850. Men such as Henry Clay, of Kentucky, John Bell, and Andrew Johnson of Tennessee and Sam Houston, of Texas, were the leaders of the southern Unionist cause, and so long as free expression was permitted in the South their influence held thousands upon thousands of southerners to the Union.

But war broke out on the Kansas plains in 1854—a war between slaveholders and freemen—and from that point forward the southern Unionist cause was doomed. Why? Because the slaveholders would say they were denied equality, justice, and freedom in their struggle to extend slavery to Kansas, to California, to Oregon, and Washington territories and to all the remaining territories of the West. Such "equality, justice, and freedom" they must have or the Union must divide.

Southerns who opposed this view—be they politicians, editors or clergymen—gradually were silenced by growing secessionist power. Pro-Union sentiment became "verboten," and southerners who felt obliged to express it were compelled to leave the South. Andrew Johnson, a holdout to the end, spoke for Union in the hills of eastern Tennessee right up to the fall of Fort Sumter; but he did so in the face of mob violence and ultimately had to fight his way to Washington, virtually at pistol point.

Nor has the story of aggression changed with the passage of time, except perhaps for the worse. By now we are wholly familiar with the tactics of aggression, as evidenced by the initial conduct of its practitioners even before their aggressions begin.

What was the Nazi policy at home? To outlaw rival political parties, shut down the opposition press; to smash all minor factions, to curtail free speech, turn the schools into propaganda mills and reduce the influence of the churches.

The Communist policy? Largely the same, and with similarly devastating results. Yet what did we see in the case of Nazi Germany? A steadily advancing colossus, spreading, gorging itself, sweeping the field of free nations and carrying the day, up to a point. Yet to do so it was obliged to crush out freedom, and therein was its undoing. For freedom has a way of surviving against great odds and serious reverses; and so long as it survives in any status, it remains a force so powerful that tyranny knows no rest and the tyrant no slumber. Ultimately, the tide was turned and the colossus began to retreat until the retreat became a rout and freedom was once again restored.

Now, again we stand faced with a colossus—the sprawling giant called communism—and once again freedom is the victim. For the sake of Marxian principles and national aggrandizement the Communist powers are pushing out their tentacles in all directions, clutching, clawing at the jewels of liberty and destroying as they go. Yet that, too, is a familiar story; for it involves the suppression of free speech, free thought, free schools, and free men. And no such suppression can long prevail, any more in this era than in the past.

This, then, is the awesome atmosphere and the noble promise of Memorial Day, 1961. Again at bay and crowded by the yelping houndpack of tyranny, the democratic peoples of the world are once again girding themselves for a mighty climax in the struggle for freedom.

Here, in this heroic shrine, dedicated to the men who here reside—dedicated also to the freedoms they loved and died for—we must and shall take an oath in their name. They, in their time, gave everything in their power to protect the cause of liberty; nor did they act in vain. It is our responsibility, then, to carry on where they left off in this respect.

Not that our actions must necessarily parallel theirs; but that our will must measure up to theirs. They stood fast in the fact of aggressive bluster, knowing that to retreat meant national suicide. War was the result and lives were lost. But through the will of those who refused to yield in the eternal struggle for freedom, our freedoms were preserved.

So it may be with us—and if the test comes, I know it will not find us wanting. So also it may be that war will prove unnecessary; that China's starving millions may throw off the yoke of tyranny that chains them to an unproductive economic panacea. Nor can one expect the millions of eastern Europeans to eternally submit to an atheistic creed, when they themselves recognize the authority of the Almighty.

But be that as it may, and come what must, we shall stand ready in the crisis. That is our tradition—a tradition for which the many men, herein interred, were willing to give their lives; a tradition upon which we have built the greatest Nation yet known to man.

So long as that tradition stands, freedom shall prevail on these shores—and live in the hearts of men in every land.

The Department of the Interior Has No Place in Its Carter Barron Amphitheater Programs for the National Symphony Orchestra and Other Civic, Nonprofit Cultural Groups of the Nation's Capital

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital in 1950 observed and celebrated the sesquicentennial of its establishment as the seat of Government. In connection with, and as part of, this occasion the Congress authorized the erection of the Carter Barron Amphitheater and appropriated nearly $1 million to build it. The purpose of the Congress in creating this great cultural and artistic facility was—as the records clearly reveal—to advance the cultural, educational, and artistic growth and development of the Nation's Capital.

The Congress lodged the management of this great amphitheater in the Department of the Interior. For the full development of the aims which the Congress had in mind it would, perhaps, have been wiser to have placed the management within the Smithsonian Institution, a Federal agency concerned more directly than the Department of the Interior with the diffusion of knowledge.

I think the time has come—if it is not, indeed, long overdue—to make a study of the Carter Barron Amphitheater operation which would take into account the major summer cultural programs in other cities of the United States and in leading European cities.

The Department of the Interior's stewardship of the Carter Barron Amphitheater as a cultural facility over

the years should be subjected to a critical and searching analysis and no attempt to justify sins of omission or commission should be permitted, nor should any bureaucratic whitewash be attempted.

The major purpose of the study I propose should be to find ways to make the Carter Barron Amphitheater a far greater and much more significant educational, cultural, and artistic force in the Nation's Capital than it has ever been.

No doubt professional, commercial entertainment of the kind which the Department of the Interior presents at the Carter Barron Amphitheater, including at times, or so I am told, sick jokes and a burlesque hall type of humor which would not be permitted on the family television set has its place. However, whether that place is in this great cultural facility to the utter exclusion of the National Symphony Orchestra and other civic, nonprofit educational and cultural programs, activities, and groups would be thoroughly explored by the kind of study I have proposed. It might well be that it would be found during the course of such a study that some of these programs which are now presented at the Carter Barron Amphitheater should be presented in a privately owned theater or nightclub under commercial auspices for private profit and not be given the endorsement of the Federal Government which presentation at the Carter Barron Amphitheater implies.

Any step which the Secretary of the Interior may take to broaden, deepen, and raise the educational, cultural, and artistic level of the programs presented at the Carter Barron Amphitheater will meet with powerful and respectable support from all sections of our country from people who are fed up with the tawdry, the cheap, and the spurious values of the art factories of New York and Hollywood.

The sweep of history has made the United States the leader of the free world, and we must compete with the Soviet Union for the minds and the hearts of men everywhere in the world.

The Nation's Capital must take its rightful place beside other capital cities of the world in the support and encouragement of the fine arts.

That the Department of the Interior, in its management of the Carter Barron Amphitheater, has not been able to accommodate the National Symphony Orchestra, or even the Washington Civic Opera Co. is nothing short of preposterous. It is high time that a study was made of how such groups could use this great cultural facility in view of the statements made repeatedly by the New York Times that the Nation's Capital is a "hick town" behind even such a provincial capital as Tiflis, U.S.S.R., in its encouragement of the fine arts.

I have written the Secretary of the Interior suggesting that he create immediately an advisory panel of civic, educational, cultural, and fine arts leaders to help him develop a challenging and significant cultural and artistic program at the Carter Barron Amphitheater which would rise to the level of some of the world-famous cultural festivals in this country and in Europe.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my letter to the Secretary of the Interior:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 1, 1961.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Along with many other Members of Congress I have consistently supported measures to advance the educational and cultural life of the Nation's Capital and make our Capital City ever safer and more attractive to live in. As a member of the District of Columbia Committee it has, in fact, been my duty to do this because of the historic intent of the Congress that this great Federal City must represent the best of American life and reflect the deepest educational and cultural aspirations of the people of this Nation.

The Nation's Capital in 1950 observed and celebrated the sesquicentennial of its establishment as the seat of government. In connection with, and as part of, this occasion the Congress authorized the erection of the Carter Barron Amphitheater and appropriated nearly $1 million to build it. The purpose of the Congress in creating this great cultural and artistic facility was—as the records clearly reveal—to advance the cultural, educational, and artistic growth of the Nation's Capital. The Congress lodged the management of this amphitheater in the Department of the Interior. For the full development of the aims the Congress had in mind it would, perhaps, have been wiser to have placed the management within the Smithsonian Institution, a Federal agency concerned more directly with the diffusion of knowledge.

I think the time has come—if it is not, indeed, long overdue—to make a study of the Carter Barron Amphitheater operation which would take into account the major summer cultural programs in other U.S. cities and in leading European cities. The State Department, and our Ambassadors abroad in other countries, would be delighted to cooperate and their reports on summer cultural programs in Europe should be an important part of such a study. The Department of the Interior's stewardship of the Carter Barron Amphitheater as a cultural facility over the years should be subjected to a critical and searching analysis and no attempt to justify sins of omission or commission should be permitted. Nor should any bureaucratic whitewash be attempted. Perhaps a special advisory committee made up of educational, cultural, and fine arts experts and leaders should be set up to help you carry out the study. This would assure the public of its impartiality and the soundness of its conclusions.

The major purpose of the study I propose, which I urge you to undertake, should be to find ways to make the Carter Barron Amphitheater a far greater and much more significant educational, cultural, and artistic force in the Nation's Capital than it has ever been. Such a study should certainly show conclusively what other major cities here and abroad do toward encouraging, and developing, and assisting in the growth of their own local artistic groups, their own talented artists, their own young artists; how much "commercial talent" they import; the role of civic, nonprofit groups similar to the National Symphony Orchestra and the Washington Opera Society; and whether they import all the talent presented on their summer programs from other cities as the Department of the Interior does in its programs at the Carter Barron Amphitheater.

No doubt professional, commercial entertainment of the kind which the Department of the Interior presents at the Carter Barron Amphitheater, including at times, I am told, sick jokes and a burlesque hall type of humor which would not be permitted on the family televison set (which is significant, I think, at a time when broadcasting is being blamed by irate parents for some of the rising tide of juvenile delinquency) has its place. However, whether that place is in this great cultural facility to the utter exclusion of the National Symphony Orchestra and other civic, nonprofit educational and cultural programs, activities, and groups would be thoroughly explored by the kind of a study I have proposed. It might well be that it would be found during the course of the proposed study that some of these programs which are presented at the Carter Barron Amphitheater should be presented in a privately owned theater or nightclub under commercial auspices for private profit and not be given the endorsement of the Federal Government which presentation at the Carter Barron Amphitheater implies.

I shall now suggest some additional matters which the proposed study should cover. For instance, I find it shocking that the Department of the Interior has no place in its Carter Barron Amphitheater programs for the National Symphony Orchestra and other nonprofit cultural groups of the Nation's Capital. The National Symphony Orchestra is the only major symphony orchestra in the United States without a summer season. At the present time, the highly talented musicians of the National Symphony Orchestra must turn to other forms of employment to eke out a livelihood. Their resourcefulness in this regard is little short of amazing, though it does little to advance the cultural life of the Nation's Capital. Some of these musicians are summer salesmen, and summer guards carrying guns in Federal buildings including the Library of Congress. This situation persists year after year in the Nation's Capital without any sign that top officials of the Federal Government, who are sensitive to the cultural aspirations of people abroad in other nations, are aware of, or understand, its full implications in a world in which the United States in this cold-war period has assumed leadership of the free world.

New York City, with the solid backing of the city administration and the mayor, has its summer music programs and its free Shakespeare in Central Park. Other U.S. cities have summer programs in all of the arts, many of them free to the public or available at nominal sums. Philadelphia's Robin Hood Dell concerts are world famous, and the city of Philadelphia contributes $75,000 annually to make them possible.

The St. Louis Municipal Opera, the Hollywood Bowl concerts, the Boston Symphony Orchestra concerts at Tanglewood in Lenox, Mass., these and a hundred other famous summer music programs are in the mainstream of the tradition established by the free band concerts on the common or the courthouse square—one of the oldest and most universal of American cultural institutions.

You may rest assured, Mr. Secretary, that any step you may take to broaden, deepen, and to raise the educational and cultural and artistic level of the fare offered at the Carter Barron Amphitheater will meet with powerful and respectable support from all sections of our country from people in all walks of life who are fed up with the tawdry, the cheap, and the spurious cultural values and fare which are so easily available to them and their children. They want something better, something nobler than the art factories of New York's Broadway, and Hollywood, and radio and television offer in such massive doses. They want something

vital, alive, and close to the American dream and the American promise.

The sweep of history has made the United States the leader of the free world, and we must compete with the Soviet Union for the minds and the hearts of men everywhere in the world. The Nation's Capital must take its rightful place beside other capital cities of the world in cultural matters if we are successful to carry forward our high mission.

That the Department of the Interor, in its management of the Carter Barron Amphitheater, has not been able to accommodate the National Symphony Orchestra—or even the Washington Civic Opera Association—is nothing short of preposterous. It is high time that a study was made of how such groups could use this great cultural facility in view of the statements made repeatedly by national publications that the Nation's Capital is a "hick town" behind even such a provincial capital as Tiflis, U.S.S.R., in the fine arts.

A second step which you could take would be to create immediately an advisory panel of civic, educational, cultural, and fine arts leaders to help you develop a challenging and significant cultural and artistic program at the Carter Barron Amphitheater which would rise to the level of some of the world-famous cultural festivals in this country and in Europe. The Pablo Casals festival in Puerto Rico should be an inspiration and a guide to you in developing a major cultural program for the Nation's Capital at the Carter Barron Amphitheater and in the other facilities controlled by the Department of the Interior.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

Agawam, Mass., National Guard Armory Dedicated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, on Memorial Day, May 30, I had the distinct honor of being the guest speaker during dedication ceremonies for the new National Guard Armory to quarter company B, 1st Battle Group, 104th Infantry Regiment, 26th Yankee Division, in Agawam, Mass.

I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Agawam Armory dedication program, the history of company B, and my address:

ARMORY DEDICATION PROGRAM

Welcome address: Capt. Robert F. Sheehan.
Master of ceremonies: Maj. Arthur J. Foley.
Invocation: Rev. Benjamin M. Lockhart.
Armory history: Maj. Arthur J. Foley.
(National anthem.)

Reading the scroll: P. Sgt. E–7 Edgar J. Emmens.

Presentation of scroll: Col. George E. Young.

Comments: Frank Chriscola, Jr., chairman of board of selectmen.

Presentation of guest speaker: Maj. Gen. Thomas J. Donnelly, the adjutant general of Massachusetts.

Guest speaker: Hon. EDWARD P. BOLAND, Representative in Congress.

Benediction: Rev. John J. Mara, Jr.

HISTORY OF COMPANY B, 1ST BATTLE GROUP, 104TH INFANTRY

A backward glance through such old records as are still in existence reveals that the organization that was to become the 104th Infantry Regiment was first activated at Springfield, Mass., on November 14, 1639. This parent organization was known as the Springfield Train Band and was sort of a volunteer militia formed as a protection against warlike Indians. The Connecticut Valley at this time was populated only by a thin stream of frontier settlements branching out from the mother colony of Massachusetts Bay.

As the colonies grew in size the need of a larger military organization also grew. In March of 1663 at Northampton, Mass., the Springfield Train Band merged with military units of the surrounding territory to form the Hampshire County Regiment. Again in 1754 the name was changed, this time to the South Hampshire Regiment, and as such, fought in the Revolutionary War. In 1804 the unit was reorganized and designated the Worcester Light Infantry. After a brief tour of duty in the War of 1812, and several years of inactive service the name was, in 1840, changed to the Light Infantry Regiment, 1st Battalion, Light Infantry, 6th Brigade, 3d Division, and in 1859 to the 10th Infantry Regiment.

The regiment entered active service in 1861 at President Lincoln's first call for troops. The organization was rushed to Washington to protect the Capitol, only 25 miles away from Bull Run and a Confederate victory. Before the war ended the 10th Infantry Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteer Militia, had seven campaigns to its credit.

Peace brought reversion to State militia status and in 1878 another change in title—this time to 2d Regiment, 1st Brigade, Massachusetts Volunteer Militia.

With the sinking of the battleship *Maine* in 1898 the regiment was the first Massachusetts organization to be mustered into Federal service, the first militia regiment from a northern State to arrive in the South and the first regiment to arrive in Cuba. The organization performed with honor at El Coney, Las Grasmas, San Juan, and El Paso, and held a commanding position at Santiago when the Spanish surrendered.

On June 18, 1916, the regiment was again activated, this time to serve in the Mexican border campaign under Gen. John J. Pershing, who commended the organization for discipline, enthusiasm, and performance of duty. Three months after it returned from Mexico, the regiment was again called into active service. On August 5, 1917, it became known as the 104th Infantry Regiment, 52d Brigade, U.S. Army, and a few weeks later was incorporated into the 26th Yankee Division in preparation for oversea shipment.

On October 29, 1917, the regiment landed at Le Havre, France, and settled down to 6 months of intensive combat training in English and French methods. It first tasted combat in the Bois Brule subsector and thence went on to gain fame in Lorraine, St. Mihiel, Ile de France, Meuse Argonne, Champagne, Marne, Aisne Marne and for heroic service won the French Croix de Guerre.

After the war the 104th was reorganized as a Massachusetts National Guard regiment with regimental headquarters at Springfield, also 1st Battalion at Springfield, 2d Battalion at Holyoke, and 3d Battalion at Pittsfield. The regiment then served through the following years of peace without incident.

On January 16, 1941, Company D, along with the 104th Infantry Regiment, Massachusetts National Guard, was mobilized at Camp Edwards, Mass., as part of the training regiment to serve for 1 year. This "year" was extended when the United States went to war against the Axis power in December of that same year.

The unit did coastal patrol duty along the Atlantic seaboard until January of 1943 when it was withdrawn and reassembled at Camp Blanding, Fla.

Thence until it sailed for Europe on August 27, 1944, the men underwent intensive and realistic combat training. Finally on October 6, 1944, they moved into combat under the command of Col. Dwight T. Colley east of Arracourt. In later campaigns they went through Moncourt Woods, Benestroff, then under the command of Col. Ralph A. Palladino into Lorraine, then the "Bulge," into Germany and were in Czechoslovakia when the unconditional surrender was announced.

After returning home in 1945, this unit, with the regiment, was deactivated and returned to Massachusetts as a National Guard organization.

The regiment was granted Federal recognition as a National Guard organization in November of 1946 under the command of Col. Marshall O. Potter. The first summer encampment in 1947 was followed by three more in 1948, 1949, and 1950, all of these at Camp Edwards, Mass. Upon the retirement of Colonel Potter in 1951 Lt. Col. Benjamin E. Sullivan, commanding officer of the 2d Battalion, was appointed acting commanding officer and led the regiment through the 1951 field training at Pine Camp, N.Y. Later in the year Col. Albert L. Gramm, division inspector general, was appointed commanding officer and led the organization through the field training of 1952 at Camp Drum (Pine Camp), N.Y.

Successive encampments were held at Camp Drum, N.Y., from 1953 through 1958.

On May 1, 1959, the reorganization occurred, changing from the old triangular concept to the new pentomic battlegroups, and Company D, along with personnel assimilated from Headquarters Company, 1st Battalion, became Company B, 1st Battle Group, 104th Infantry.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND, OF MASSACHUSETTS

Major General Donnelly, Reverend Lockhart, Father Mara, Major Foley, Captain Sheehan, Selectman Criscola, officers and men of the 1st Battle Group, 104th Infantry of Massachusetts Army National Guard, my fellow Americans, may I first express my appreciation to the 1st Battle Group dedication committee for the honor you pay me in inviting me to take part in these exercises.

Then, permit me to congratulate Major General Donnelly—the adjutant general of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts—the military commander of the Massachusetts National Guard. Recently promoted to the rank of major general, he brings a proud record of accomplishment to this exalted position. To my knowledge, he is one of the few men from this area that has ever attained this rank and this tremendously responsible command. All of us are pleased with his success and wish him well in the arduous duties that are his.

This gathering and this event bespeak much more eloquently than any words of mine, the real meaning of this occasion. For these words will soon be forgotten and lost to time. But this structure we dedicate will withstand the ravages of age and weather proclaiming for untold years the reason why we gathered on this day.

One could not come here today—particularly one in a position to know—one could not come here without being mindful of the contributions—the tremendous and magnificent contributions—that the Army National Guard has made in war and peace to this country of ours.

Citizen soldiers of the National Guard have played a major role in the security and strength of our country in every emergency it has faced since colonial days. The history

of the National Guard of the United States is a vital part of the history of our Nation.

We, in Massachusetts, take pride in the fact that the slogan "Older Than Our Nation," stems from the early organization of the 182d Infantry. At the time that William Pynchon was leading and settling his people on the banks of the Connecticut River in this community in 1636, the first National Guard unit was being forged in Boston, to form the north regiment of militia in the Massachusetts Bay Colony. The 182d Infantry of the Massachusetts Army National Guard and the 101st Engineer Battalion have the longest continuous history of any military unit in the Nation.

It is no wonder that the officers and men who wear the insignia of any Massachusetts National Guard unit have a proud and noble heritage. From 6 years ago and some 38 men, this command has grown to a well organized and prideful outfit to take its place and add to the lustre of our State's National Guard.

I need not bring to those who are a part of the guard any persuasive arguments for, or any praise of, the Army National Guard of the United States. For you are familiar with anything I could produce. But the general public, unaccustomed to regular contact, too often misses the importance of this great organization to the defense posture of the Nation and, to the peaceful and law abiding existence of local areas and communities.

To operate the National Guard—the Army National Guard—costs the taxpayers of the Nation about $400 million. But think of what we get at that price. It buys two vital bodies of organized manpower for the price of one—a military organization trained to defend our country in time of emergency and a local organization, ready for immediate action when disaster strikes. It commits some 400,000 personnel into 21 infantry and 6 armored divisions plus miscellaneous battle groups, armored cavalry, and support troops.

There is no one who can question the worth of this great organization to the survival of our country. Its glorious record is emblazoned upon the pages of our history. In the three wars through which many of us have lived, the National Guard covered itself with glory.

After World War I, records of the German supreme command showed that of the eight American divisions which the Germans regarded as superior or excellent, six of those eight were National Guard divisions.

After World War II, Secretary of War Patterson paid this tribute: "The National Guard took to the field 18 infantry divisions—300,000 men. Those State troops doubled the strength of the Army at once, and their presence in the field gave the country a sense that it had passed the lowest ebb of its weakness. Nine of those divisions crossed the Atlantic to Europe and Africa and nine went to the far reaches of the Pacific. The soldiers of the guard fought in every action in which the Army participated from Bataan to Okinawa. They made a brilliant record on every fighting front. They proved once more the value of the trained citizen soldier."

We can never forget that the guard is found equal to all emergencies in times of local difficulty. Natural disasters of floods and tornadoes, with which we are so cognizant, suppression of mobs and violence, enforcement of law and preservation of order in all kinds of incidents—these local problems have been met by action of the National Guard. Without the guard the local authorities are almost helpless in the face of rising violence, panic and disaster. These internal incidents have been controlled by our militia since the beginning of our Nation. The local and national need for the guard did not spring to the foreground during the 20th century. It has existed since this Nation was founded.

The building we here dedicate today is more than brick, mortar and steel, and lumber. Breathed into it is the spirit of the guard, its grand and noble heritage.

Across this land, National Guard armories and Army Reserve centers are springing up in all types of communities. Some 2,100 new armories will be completed by the end of 1962. They will be eloquent reminders that this Nation does not intend to abandon one of its greatest strengths.

It is fitting that we dedicate this building on this Memorial Day—the 95th anniversary of the first Memorial Day—a day set aside to honor those who fell in all wars and now expanded to honor the memories of all who have passed to eternity.

It is good and proper that we remember our honored dead, and ask God to grant eternal rest to those who gave the last full measure of their devotion that this Nation might live in freedom and liberty.

Memorial Day is also a day of prayer for permanent peace.

I think it crystal clear, in the face of the dangerous threats that ebb and flow all over the globe, in Laos, the Congo, Cuba, Africa, that peace can come only through strength—strength in the faith of American ideals, strength in American economy and strength in American fighting power.

This building, I suppose, will be looked upon by the carping cynics as a monument to war.

It is nothing of the kind. In reality it is a hall of peace. For in this building, and in thousands like it throughout the country, we build our strength to maintain the peace and to prepare for any eventuality that arises. To do less would render us weak and prostrate in a world that calls for strength, sacrifice, and dedication.

We build this building, and thousands like it across our land, to keep faith with those who made the supreme sacrifice and to assure that they did not die in vain.

So we dedicate this building to the great principles of and for which the National Guard came into being. We dedicate it to the memory of those who fought in all of the Nation's struggles, and those who gave their lives to perpetuate our peace and security; we dedicate this building to the living and the yet unborn so that we and they can carry the torch that was passed to us in our day and age to keep our country strong and good.

We dedicate this building as a vehicle to help promote the welfare, happiness, and good will of the people of this good and great town of Agawam.

We dedicate this building as an instrument of strength that helps to guarantee the security and survival of this blessed United States of America.

The 100th Anniversary of Italy's Unification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL B. BREWSTER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following tribute to our friend and ally, the Republic of Italy, on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Republic, which this year coincides with the 100th anniversary of the political unification of the Italian people.

June 2, 1961, is a date which has particular significance for all freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. For, like the Fourth of July, it marks the anniversary of the political independence of a great people and the beginning of their lives under a democratic government. On June 2, 1946, the people of Italy went to the polls and by an overwhelming vote, voluntarily established the Italian Republic.

This 15th anniversary of that great day has added significance for the Italian people, because this year they are also observing the centennial anniversary of the unification of Italy. It is coincidental that this year we Americans are marking the centennial anniversary of our Civil War—a terrible and costly chapter in our history, but one from which we gained stronger unification and a new sense of national purpose.

Although modern Italy is only 100 years old, her cultural heritage is rooted in history which long antedates the discovery of America. In fact, the recognized beginning of Western civilization was during the glory and ascendancy of the Roman Empire, 2,000 years ago. Throughout the ages the Italian people have made tremendous contributions in the advancement of science, literature, music, and philosophy. Names such as da Vinci, Galileo, Garibaldi, and Michelangelo, and the histories of cities such as Florence, Rome, and Venice, are inextricably bound up in the development of the cultural and political heritage which we now strive to protect from the onslaught of international communism. In this latter struggle our friends and allies have stood like Horatio at the bridge. Italy is a vitally important partner in the NATO Alliance.

In the years since World War II, we have witnessed an amazing recovery from the ravages inflicted on Italy during the war. She has accomplished tremendous improvement in both her economic life and her political institutions and has assumed a position of leadership among the European states. In recent years, she has contributed materially to the economic integration of Europe—which is so vital to the strength of the NATO Alliance.

I am pleased to join President Kennedy and my colleagues in the Congress in extending congratulations and the wish of continued growth and prosperity to our stanch friends in the Republic of Italy.

Kennedy's Birthday Dinner in Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I

include the following remarks by President John F. Kennedy at the Commonwealth Armory in Boston, Mass., May 29, 1961, on the occasion of his 44th birthday:

Thank you, Congressman McCormack, Your Eminence, Governor Volpe, Mr. Mayor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. I first of all want to express my appreciation to our distinguished majority leader, Congressman McCormack. He and I and the leadership of the House and Senate have breakfast every Tuesday morning and what he does with me he did with President Truman and he did before that with President Roosevelt.

So Congressman McCormack has been identified with the great decisions that this country has made in the thirties, the forties, the fifties, and now the sixties and he has been a source of strength and I appreciate the support in the past and tonight.

I want to state how gratified I am that His Eminence is with us tonight. He married us, he christened my daughter, he inaugurated me, he has prayed over me and I hope he will continue to do so.

And we all pray for Governor Volpe, that now he has seen how pleasant it has been to be a Democrat, he will come over with us.

I want to express my thanks to Pat Lynch, our distinguished chairman, who undertook the responsibility of running this dinner. To Judge Mellen, to the mayor of Boston for his generous reception tonight, to the Members of Congress from our State and Senator Smith, and also to our friends from other States of New England, Senator Pastore, my friend and valued colleague; Ed Muskie, who is with us from Maine; Governor Notte from Rhode Island, Governor Dempsey from Connecticut—actually I must say that I had something to do with making Governor Dempsey the Governor of Connecticut when we brought Abe Ribicoff down to Washington. We did two good things.

Also, we don't have any Democratic Governors in New Hampshire and Vermont, but we have Representatives and we appreciate their being here.

Most of all, I want to thank all of you. I have been informed that with this dinner I am now responsible as the leader of the Democratic Party for a debt of only $1 million. Now, did anyone ever get a birthday present like that? One million dollars. I don't know—they spent it like they were sure we were going to win.

But I am most grateful to you. This has been a series of shocks which you have endured on my behalf, in 1952, in 1958, the primaries, the election, and I am sure you are wondering when it is all going to be over. But the great thing is, of course, it never ends. We will get this paid off and then we will start all over again.

This is a tremendous dinner. It is the greatest possible help to us. I want you to know that I have—even though we have many things on our mind—this on our mind, and it is on John Bailey's mind and I am greatly in your debt tonight. Thank you.

I want to also thank Mr. Frost for saying an Irish poem over us. He spoke very highly of Harvard, but I do think it appropriate to reveal that on the morning after the inaugural when he came to the White House he said, "You are something of Irish and I suppose something of Harvard. My advice to you as President is to be something of Irish." So we are going to do the best we can.

I leave tomorrow night on a trip to France. The United States is, as President de Gaulle has said, the daughter of Europe, and in a special way we have the most intimate relations with France.

Paul Revere, who is regarded as a good Yankee, was of French descent. Benjamin Franklin spent 7 years in France and played a leading role in bringing France to our assistance in a moment of need and emerged from France in 1783 bearing the treaty with the British which proclaimed us a sovereign and independent Nation.

LOOK TO FUTURE

Americans in the 19th century went back to Europe, this time on peaceful missions, and particularly to France, and gained from France some of its great understandings of the past and its view of the future.

And twice in this century Americans have gone to France, this time not on a peaceful mission, but on behalf of the new world in its efforts to redress the balance of the old, in 1917 and again in 1944.

I go to France on this occasion not in order to invoke old memories, even though those memories are important, but to look to the future of the close relationship which must exist between France and the United States if the cause of freedom in the Atlantic community is to be preserved.

And I go to pay a visit to a distinguished captain of the West, General de Gaulle, who has been involved for more than 20 years in a struggle to protect the integrity of Western Europe. And therefore I go with good wishes of all the citizens of our country as we pay a visit to an old friend.

I go also to Vienna and I know there are some Americans who wonder why I take that journey. I am only 44, but I have lived in my 44 years through three wars, the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean war.

No one can study the origin of any of those three struggles without realizing the serious miscalculations, the serious misapprehensions, about the possible actions of the other side which existed in the minds of the adversaries which helped bring about all those wars.

On the war of 1914, the Austrians gave an ultimatum to Serbia and the Russians then mobilized, and France, then in alliance with Russia, then mobilized and then the Germans mobilized, and then when the Germans saw that France and the Russians mobilized attacked through Belgium, which brought in the British.

One week before, the British would never have dreamed they would have been at war and I doubt that the French did. No one would have dreamed that 2 years later the United States would be involved in a war on the Continent.

In 1939 and 1940, after the loss of Austria and Czechoslovakia, finally the British guaranteed Poland but there is certainly some evidence that Hitler never believed that the British would have come to the assistance of Poland and he never believed that the United States would again become involved in a great struggle on the plains of Europe.

Certainly in the war of 1950 in Korea, the North Koreans never imagined that the United States would come to the assistance by warlike means of the Republic of South Korea, and we in our part did not imagine that the Chinese Communists would intervene as we approached North Korea.

Now we live in 1961, where freedom is in battle all around the globe, where the United States has intimate alliances with more than 40 countries. I see value in talking to those with whom we are allied, but I also think it valuable at a time when both sides possess weapons of destruction and annihilation that there should be understanding and communication and a firm realization of what we believe.

So I go to see Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna. I go as the leader of the greatest revolutionary country on earth.

I know that there is in some areas of the world, and even in some parts of the United States, an image of us as a fixed society. Bernard De Voto once said New England is a finished place. And some people may think that of the United States. That is not my view.

When John Quincy Adams went to call on the British Governor before the Revolution about the problems of the British here in this State, they had an amiable conversation until finally Adams mentioned the word "revolution."

Then he wrote in his diary: "It was then I saw his knees tremble." Now, our knees do not tremble at the word "revolution." We believe in it, we believe in the progress of mankind. We believe in freedom and we intend to be associated with it in the days to come.

So I come back to this old city, to express my thanks to all of you who are my oldest friends, to express my appreciation for your confidence and support tonight on past occasions, and I hope in the future.

And I carry with me a message which is written on one of our statues by a distinguished and vigorous New Englander, William Lloyd Garrison.

"I am in earnest. I will not equivocate. I will not excuse. I will not retreat a single inch. And I will be heard."

Thank you.

Fifteenth Anniversary of the Republic of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the last war caused more misery and misfortune to more human beings in more areas of the world than any previous event in human history. For some of those who survived, the end of the war brought an era of good. In Europe, two oppressive dictatorships were destroyed and democratic governments took their place. Today is the 15th anniversary of the establishment of one of those governments. And today I salute the Republic of Italy.

Born in the days of physical desolation and privation, the Republic did not spring full grown from the ashes. The very conditions under which it did take its beginnings might have been fruitful for another capture by the Communists. But the Italian people, having for the first time an opportunity to choose their governor, would not pass it by. Unemployment and hunger were accepted as temporary burdens to share a while longer; and the republican form of government was accepted as a responsibility by Italians the length of Italy. Attacked by those who sought a return to the Fascist type of rule and by those who would impose the Red rule of the left, the citizens of the new Republic persisted in their efforts to achieve a rule under law by the democratic process. The success of their efforts is recognized and acclaimed everywhere in the free world today.

While forging for themselves a new government of the people, Italians undertook great works for the people. Domestic industry has been revised. Unemployment, thought for so long to be a

national condition of fact, has been reduced, not only in the great traditional industrial area of the north, but in the southern provinces as well. Extensive public works have healed the deep wounds of war and extended to the people far more services and facilities than they ever had in low-cost housing, power, transportation, and communications. At the same time, thanks in great part to the generous aid instituted by our Marshall plan, Italy built up its industrial plant and reentered the field of world trade, so that today there is hardly a trade in which the heritage of Italian craftsmanship is not again known throughout the world. Annually, her national product continues to rise at better than a 10-percent average in the mining, textile, metallurgical, mechanical, chemical, and energy industries.

Economic progress, domestic and international, has not been accomplished in Italy by selfish, unilateral action. A respected charter member of the European Economic Community and Euratom, she has been a leader in the drive to gradually abolish tariffs among the continental countries, and to achieve for these nations full employment at decent wages. Host to the World Health Organization, Italy has also been a member of the United Nations since 1955, and was elected to the Security Council only 2 years after admittance to the U.N.

And while strengthening her economic sinews, Italy has not neglected her international military posture. With an army, air force, and navy designed to be the pivotal nucleus for Mediterranean forces of the NATO nations, she continues to build her ships and planes and armaments only in concert with NATO plans. Unlike some of our other allies, she has welcomed American forces, our bases, and our assistance, particularly with respect to training her own forces.

On all counts, what was a defeated, demoralized area but 15 years ago is now a vital, thriving nation. Led by dedicated, democratic leaders, Italy is herself an exemplary leader in the community of the free Western World.

Management and Government Must Face Up to Automation and Unemployment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago Mr. George Baldanzi, president of the United Textile Workers, delivered an address to the technical conference of the Eastern States Show of the Material Handling Institute in Philadelphia.

"Unless industry adopts an effective program to offset the impact of automation," President Baldanzi stated, "serious social consequences for which industry will have only itself to blame, will result."

Such a program, Mr. Baldanzi said, must provide at least the following:

Companywide recall rights; first hiring rights in new plants to workers laid off at less modern plants; double early retirement rights to employees thrown out of work by plant closings; much improved severance pay allowances as compensation in forced layoffs; extension of supplementary unemployment benefits in industry; vested pension rights; job protection through advance notice of technological changes; company-paid retraining.

The labor movement, Baldanzi said, will seek these protections as a very minimum because they are a matter of grim necessity for the workers and of survival for the labor movement. People, he said, are more important than machines, and the American labor movement will not—it cannot—accept a situation in which the social effects of technological improvement are ignored, and only its capacity to provide greater profits with fewer and fewer workers is the primary consideration.

On the collective bargaining front, he said, industry will continue to fight the organization of its workers only at its own peril. Unless there are successful unions, he declared, there may be social breakdown, since workers unable to solve job problems at the job level and in the uncertain days that lie ahead will be "meat for the demagog."

Baldanzi called also for acceptance of labor's growing demand for a guaranteed annual wage, which "by providing greater security, would encourage a plant's labor force to be more flexible and less insistent on rigid job classification."

SHORTER WORKWEEK

The shorter workweek—or workyear—is on the way, he also said. "Nothing can stop it, short of a hot war, and management would be well advised to negotiate in this area if it prefers gradual change to abrupt reduction."

He also called job retraining a joint responsibility in which the employer, labor and the community must share, and declared that the intelligent way is to begin now in a planned fashion before the problems of retraining become more acute.

However, he pointed out, unless there are jobs for workers who have been retrained, retraining is meaningless, and the real answer lies in steps to make jobs available to all Americans willing to work. Citing figures to show the thousands of jobs lost through automation on farms, in factories, and offices, Baldanzi said that public works and services long overdue must be undertaken now to fill the gap left by these lost jobs. There is room for both public and private action in these fields—education, hospitals, social and medical research, education, recreational facilities among them.

PROGRAM TOO MODERATE

In addition to retraining workers who are thrown out of work by automation, an equally important problem, which must also be met by whatever planning is necessary, is to equip the noncollege worker who will enter the labor market with the required skills to find work in our increasingly complex society, because America is changing in such a way and so rapidly that there will be less and less room for the unskilled worker.

Referring to the vast productive potential of America, Baldanzi declared that the expenditures of tax dollars to improve the welfare of the American people will also help to generate the momentum to get America moving. He called the Kennedy program, not too much, but too moderate, and an attempt to catch up when what is needed is a program to meet the future needs of our people. The way to make America great, he said, is to make the new technological revolution serve the people of this country, and of the entire world.

Back-Door Budget-Buster Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1961, the House Banking and Currency Committee ordered reported an omnibus housing bill, H.R. 6028, which will soon be debated on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I hope that during the debate on this bill, the Members will weigh carefully the approval of a multi-billion-dollar housing bill which represents the most glaring example of back-door spending from the Treasury that has ever been presented to the House.

The bill involves disbursements from the U.S. Treasury over a period of years aggregating $8.837 billion; $5.277 billion represents outright grants and $3.560 billion represents loans of Treasury money at submarket interest rates, rates which incidentally are less than that which must be paid by the Treasury to borrow money at comparable maturities.

Of this $8.837 billion, only $241 million is subject to the appropriations process of the Congress. Think of it, only 2.7 percent of this mammoth expenditure of $8.837 billion is subject to the control of the Appropriations Committees, and the remaining 97.3 percent will involve withdrawals from the Treasury via the "back door." This staggers the imagination.

It appears all right for the Congress to have to appropriate money before money may be expended or contractual obligations executed for missiles, aircraft, rockets, men-of-war, and the other "hardware" required by our forces. But for some strange reasons, programs such as acquiring land for parks and recreational purposes, grants for urban renewal, public housing, loans for community facilities, college housing—all seem to be surrounded by some weird bureaucratic sanctity, which in effect says to the Appropriations Committees: "This is no concern of yours."

I hope that when this housing bill comes to the floor that the Members will resist with all the indignation that they

can summon to the task this most recent and most flagrant violation of a basic constitutional principle that public moneys should not be withdrawn from the Treasury except pursuant to an appropriation made by law.

It is truly a monument to what the country can do for the people. Regrettably, it also represents a signal to the world that the United States is on the threshold of a big new spending program and that a new run on United States gold may be just over the horizon.

I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of these remarks a cost breakdown of this housing bill. Unfortunately, I was unable to use the cost estimate of the committee majority because for some strange reason, the majority party is reluctant to put a price tag on 100,000 public housing units. Because I cannot reconcile myself to this dialectical exercise in logic that these public housing units cost nothing, I have been forced to rely on the cost estimate provided, or should I say buried, in the printed hearings on the housing bill.

The cost estimate follows:

Financial impact of H.R. 6028, the Housing Act of 1961, as reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee

[In millions of dollars]

Program	Grants	Loans
Urban renewal capital grants	[1] 2,000	
Urban planning grants	[2] 30	
Permanent open land acquisition	[2] 100	
FNMA special assistance		[3] [4] 1,550
Direct loans for elderly housing		[2] 100
New authorizations for public housing and additional subsidies for elderly tenants	[1] [3] 3,146	
Community facilities		[2] 500
Public works advances		[2] 10
College housing		[3] 1,200
Farm housing		[2] 200
Farm housing research	[2] 1	
Total	5,277	3,560
Total loans and grants	8,837	

[1] Authorizes contracts pledging faith of U.S. Government. Congress is legally bound to appropriate money in future years.

[2] Appropriation by Congress necessary before contractual obligation effective.

[3] Not appropriated; Treasury withdrawals are noted as "public debt transactions."

[4] Computed as follows:

$750 million direct authorization plus
$200 million authorized and unexpended from 1958 program 10 plus
$600 million representing 4 years of repayments from FNMA liquidations portfolio of pre-1954 mortgages.

[5] Based on HHFA estimates projected over 40-year subsidy period. See pp. 118-119, House hearings, April-May 1961.

Dedication Ceremony for the U.S. Flag and the Church Flag at the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, Altoona, Pa., May 28, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 1, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to deliver the following address at the dedication ceremony for the U.S. flag and the church flag on May 28, 1961, at the Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, Altoona, Pa.:

(Address delivered by the Honorable James E. Van Zandt, Congressman, 20th District of Pennsylvania at dedication ceremony for U.S. flag and church flag, Christian and Missionary Alliance Church, Altoona, Pa., May 28, 1961.)

The simultaneous dedication today—here in this house of God—of our country's flag and of the church's flag—is a dramatic demonstration—both of the separation proper to church and state in our American form of government—and of the harmony between church and state—proper to any government of Christian people.

These separate flags indicate that we are not combining church with state.

Neither is placed above the other—but they are on a level—indicating that our religious faith is not subordinated to our political adherence—and that our national patriotism is not governed or controlled by our denominational loyalty.

These two flags are set up—not in opposition—but in a natural and harmonious alliance.

We know that the corporate political acts of our Government must be ruled by principles of morality that are basically religious—and that each person concerned in the tasks of governing—from the highest official to voting citizen—must bring his religious motivated conscience to bear upon public issues.

The saying, "God rules in the affairs of men,"—quoted by Benjamin Franklin in his appeal for prayers in the Constitutional Convention—expresses a profound and lasting truth and we will forget it at our peril.

We of the Congress of the United States followed the dictates of our own consciences—as well as the surge of popular feeling and opinion in the country—when we added the phrase, "Under God," to the Pledge of Allegiance; when we ordered that the words "In God we trust" be added to all new designs of paper currency in the United States; and when we made these words—"In God we trust"—the official motto of the United States.

We gave expression to our feeling of the intimate connection between government and religion—when we established a Prayer Room in the Capitol—in which any Member may spend such time as he wishes in prayer and meditation—communing within himself and with God—on affairs of state—as well as on personal matters.

In our churches—and in church-sponsored institutions—such as schools, scout troops, and youth organizations—we have stressed patriotism—and the development of character—that makes for good citizenship.

In these ways and in social and welfare activities—our churches have contributed to the whole of American society.

Our Government has in turn benefited the churches by providing the environment of freedom—in which alone can the churches live and operate fully.

The churches need not only freedom of religion as such, but freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the general atmosphere of intellectual freedom.

The churches need in short, the kind of surroundings that are provided by a government, based upon our fundamental American principle that power is bestowed by God upon the people, and by the people delegated to governmental authority to be wielded for the people's benefit and with regard to the rights of individuals and groups within the state.

That the church be protected in its existence—in its worship—and in its performance of civic and social tasks—is thus a part of our governmental theory.

It is equally strongly held in our governmental theory that no church be established, directly supported, or preferred over another church.

That we in the United States are preponderantly Christian is no just excuse or valid reason for governmental acts that offend adherents of other religions or tend to violate their conscientious beliefs and prescribed practices.

When these matters are brought down to particulars they often occasion acrimonious disagreement and dispute.

However, insofar as we become angry and bitter about such matters—just so far we are likely to be violating our principles as religious people, as Christians, and as Americans.

For the Golden Rule—found in varying forms in all major religions and forming the core—not only of the Sermon on the Mount, but of the entire Scripture, directs us: "Therefore, all things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

The imperative of this commandment, as applied to the church and state relationship—would certainly seem to direct a cordial willingness to discuss the matter objectively, to hear and sympathize with other people's feelings and emotional preferences—as well as their logically grounded arguments.

We are inclined to think casually of the American way as being simply the rule of the majority or, as it is sometimes put "the greatest good of the greatest number," but it is not so.

Unqualified majority rule—or democracy unrestrained by law and political processes—is a tyranny as absolute, and more invulnerable—than any autocracy.

Not even an assassin can free the country ruled over by that many-headed despot—the mob.

Therefore we protect our individuals, our minorities, our groups of all sorts, by the proclamation of a permanent principle, underlying our laws and governmental procedures that no majority may override, ignore, take away, or violate, the right of any minority—or even the right of any individual.

Our laws are made to preserve this fundamental principle to insure its operation.

The system of representation in our legislatures—the checks and balances whereby legislative, executive, and judicial branches of Government counter each other's powers—all are designed to safeguard this essential freedom, the liberty and dignity of the individual man, and his freedom from oppression by any power or combination of men.

Each one of us is a member of the whole community of America and must willingly serve the welfare and liberty of all.

We choose freely to work together to strive toward the goals of our common advantage to protect one another from the injustices and oppressions of man, and from the hardships and disasters that grow out of man's relations with his natural environment.

But we are subject to no authority on earth but those men whom we ourselves have chosen and put in office, or those whom they in turn have appointed.

These officials are the servants of the people rather than their rulers.

And each official—each governmental agency—is subject to the rule of law as is each citizen.

This law is based upon what Thomas Jefferson termed "the laws of nature and of nature's God."

In America, from the days of the founding of our Nation, each man has been subject, in the last analysis, to God alone.

During these troubled days, with international dissension increasing every hour, we need to pray fervently that Almighty God will inspire our Nation's leaders in making the

right decisions on the momentous problems affecting our national security.

This is a time when we should utter in unison the stirring prayer of Josiah Gilbert Holland:

"God give us men.
A time like this demands strong minds,
stout hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who express opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie."

Here in this holy place—we have assembled to worship God—and in so doing we manifest our dependence upon Him. We submit ourselves and all our acts to Him, asking His guidance for each one of us individually, and for the church, and the Nation—each dedicated in its own special way—to the service of God and to the care of His people.

As we dedicate the church flag and the flag of our country, we should realize the spiritual values represented by these banners since they depict our love of God, love of church, and love of country.

These flags are to be regarded with the utmost love and reverence, because they are emblems of our religious faith and of the loyalty and respect we owe our beloved country.

May each one of us return home today resolved to live out in his life the principles invoked today in the dedication of these two flags—the flag of the United States of America and the Christian flag.

If we rededicate ourselves in such a manner to these cherished principles—we will not only be paying true homage to Almighty God but we will likewise be rendering to a marked degree—our respect and devotion for the priceless heritage of American freedom.

Since we are approaching Memorial Day, it is appropriate to recall the heroic sacrifices made in defense of our flag—on the seven seas and on the battlefronts of the world.

Our honored dead made the supreme sacrifice for love of country—and in the conviction that man was made in the image of Almighty God, and thus the human dignity of mankind must never be questioned.

As we gaze upon these two flags this morning, let us appreciate their real significance, and mindful of our imperative need for God's guidance; let us from the innermost recesses of our hearts fervently utter the well-known supplication so appropriate to this occasion and particularly to this season of the year.

Lord God of hosts—be with us yet,
Lest we forget; lest we forget.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 2, 1961

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. J. J. HICKEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming.

Rev. C. Leslie Glenn, former rector of St. John's Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech Thee, as for the people of these United States in general, so especially for their Senate here and now assembled; that Thou wouldest be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavors, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessaries, for them, for us, and Thy whole church, we humbly beg in the name and mediation of Jesus Christ, our most blessed Lord and Saviour. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. J. J. HICKEY, a Senator from the State of Wyoming, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HICKEY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 1, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7371) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7371) making appropriations for the Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the new reports on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the new reports on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations of collectors of customs will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before final action is taken on these four nominations, I wish to say a personal word about Mr. Cornelius F. Reardon, of Great Falls, Mont., who, I hope, will shortly be confirmed as collector of customs for customs collection district no. 33, with headquarters in Great Falls, Mont.

Mr. Reardon is a friend of mine of 30 years standing. Previously, he served in the office for which he is now being considered. He performed outstandingly in that capacity; and I am personally delighted that this outstanding citizen of my State has been considered for this position. I express the hope that the Senate will give its unanimous approval to the nomination of Mr. Cornelius F. Reardon and the other three collectors of customs for the various States of the Union.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to these nominations?

Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these four nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the following committees and subcommittees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today:

The Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary;

The Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee;

The Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency Committee;

The Veterans Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences;

The Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

The Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary; and

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON LIQUIDATION OPERATIONS, BUSINESS AND DISASTER LOANS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the progress made in liquidating the assets formerly held by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, covering the quarterly period ended March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ACCOUNTING FOR OFFICE FURNITURE AND EQUIPMENT, BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of accounting for office furniture and equipment, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, March 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SUPPLY ACTIVITIES OF U.S. ARMY SIGNAL DEPOT, ASCOM CITY, KOREA

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of supply activities of the U.S. Army Signal Depot, ASCOM City, Korea, dated May 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT ON COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, fiscal year 1960 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PENALTY FOR VIOLATION OF OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the penalty for violation of section 4(e) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act relating to the promotion of safety of life and property on islands and structures built upon submerged lands, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE FOR CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, and so forth, were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 223

"Whereas the quality of education in a democratic nation is critical to its well-being; and

"Whereas the current shortage of teachers and the lag in school construction seriously threaten the quality of education in the United States; and

"Whereas local and State governments are unable to provide adequate finances for public education at a time when enrollments are rapidly increasing and when national survival depends on the quality of education: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the First Legislature of the State of Hawaii, regular session of 1961, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to enact legislation which will provide Federal aid to public education, leaving to States the right to determine whether such funds are to be spent for teacher salaries or for school construction; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, the Honorable OREN E. LONG, and the Honorable DANIEL K. INOUYE."

Two resolutions adopted by the Alaska Carriers Association, Inc., of Anchorage, Alaska, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 1725, to permit the establishment of through service and joint rates; and urging the enactment of legislation to provide for the regulation of the Alaska Railroad; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the east Texas delegation to the Texas Legislature, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 1817, relating to the desegregation of all public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO GRANT FEDERAL AID TO URBAN, METROPOLITAN AND PUBLICLY OWNED MASS TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges the Congress of the United States to enact Senate Document No. 345 now pending before Congress, or other legislation to grant Federal aid or assistance to urban, metropolitan, and publicly owned mass transportation facilities by granting or providing Federal assistance for the purchase of passenger equipment and the purchase or acquisition by publicly owned authorities of rights-of-way and for the installation, construction, and improvement of said rights-of-way, so as to provide expanded facilities to meet the mass transportation needs of the urban and metropolitan areas of this country; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives May 2, 1961.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"Clerk.

"Adopted by the senate in concurrence May 4, 1961.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

Resolutions of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING THE DIRECTOR OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION TO TAKE ACTION TO HALT THE FLOOD OF SURPLUS FOREIGN MILITARY RIFLES INTO THE UNITED STATES AND TO PROTECT THE DOMESTIC RIFLE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY

"Whereas an overwhelming rise in the importation of surplus foreign military rifles has occurred in the past 5 years, and the influx of said rifles has caused an alarming decline in the sale of domestic rifles, seriously affecting the rifle making industry in this country and in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and has resulted in hundreds of skilled craftsmen being forced into the ranks of the unemployed; and

"Whereas the importers of surplus foreign military rifles, pressing the advantage of the low costs of foreign labor, can convert surplus military rifles to sport or hunting rifles at a very low cost thereby placing them in a position which enables them not only to undersell but also to imperil the domestic rifle manufacturing industry: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization to take such action, including the submission of legislation to the Congress of the United States, as may be necessary to protect the domestic rifle manufacturing industry; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to Mr. Frank Ellis, Director, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Washington,

D.C., and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from this Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate May 1, 1961.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"Clerk.

"Attest:

"KEVIN H. WHITE,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, to urge the U.S. Congress to adopt S. 1571 and H.R. 6212 which would amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty on shrimps and provide for duty-free entry of unprocessed shrimps annually in an amount equal to imports of shrimps in 1960; to the Committee on Finance.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, to urge and request the Congress of the United States to take action to provide for and require the investment of tidelands mineral revenues derived from operations off Louisiana shores; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, to call upon the Louisiana delegation to Congress to oppose the appointment of Judge J. Skelly Wright to any Federal office or position of trust; and to urge and request the U.S. Senators from Louisiana to oppose the confirmation by the U.S. Senate of the nomination of Judge J. Skelly Wright to fill any Federal office or position of trust, including that of judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, to commend the Governor and the people of the State of Alabama on their fight to maintain States rights in the face of Federal intervention and like purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to a proposal before the U.S. Congress with respect to a so-called "3-year program of general Federal assistance for public elementary and secondary classroom construction and teachers' salaries"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 6345. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 294).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 2011. A bill for the relief of Nina Longfield-Smith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2012. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Moy York Che; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 2013. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock made pursuant to court orders enforcing the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. CARLSON, and Mr. KERR):

S. 2014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from the gross estate for the value of property passing to children; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2015. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for redetermination of annuities of certain reemployment annuitants; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON):

S. 2016. A bill to give to the Walker River Paiute Tribe the reserved minerals underlying its reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. BIBLE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2017. A bill for the relief of Issa M. Saah to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESERVATION OF MINERAL RIGHTS UNDER WALKER RIVER INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to give to the Walker River Paiute Tribe the reserved minerals underlying its reservation.

The Walker River Indian Reservation, Nev., consists of some 330,000 acres of land classified generally as poor, undeveloped, grazing land. Because of the climate, lack of irrigation water and potential water supply, the land cannot be improved to better the desert grazing condition.

At the present time, the tribe owns the mineral rights on some 142,503 acres and desires to secure the same rights on the balance.

Interest has been shown recently by some large mining companies in securing leases for exploration purposes on parts of the reservation. If such arrangements could be made by lease arrangements through the tribe, it would permit this activity to be carried out with the minimum of damage to the range and still permit this impoverished people to realize some economic benefit from the natural resources within its area.

This proposed legislation has been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and I urge favorable action by the committee and the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2016) to give to the Walker River Paiute Tribe the reserved minerals underlying its reservation, introduced by Mr. BIBLE (for himself and Mr. CANNON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I submit amendments, intended to be proposed by me, to the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which I ask to have printed and lie on the desk. I ask unanimous consent that a statement explaining the purpose of the amendments, be printed in the RECORD.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement presented by Mr. BUSH is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

The proposed new program for moderate-income families is in three parts.

The first two parts are sales and rental housing programs, in which mortgage interest rates are supposed to be market rates, i.e., rates which private capital would find attractive and hence avoid necessity of FNMA financing. The maximum rate is set at 5 percent, with discretion in Commissioner to go to 6 percent.

The third part of the program is a rental housing program at a subsidized interest rate (3⅛ percent at present) which FNMA would underwrite. This is described as a below-market-rate program.

The amendment is directed at the below-market-rate program. It would confine the benefit of the subsidized interest rates to families displaced by urban renewal or other governmental activity.

This amendment logically should follow the Capehart and Javits-Bush amendments in the event these amendments fail.

Mr. ROBERTSON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORTON submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

APPLICATION OF LOGAN ACT TO PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] submitted Senate Resolution 152, relating to the Logan Act. It is my understanding that the resolution was mistakenly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It should have been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. I ask

unanimous consent that the previous referral be rescinded, and that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMPROVEMENT OF USEFULNESS OF NATIONAL BANK BRANCHES IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my name included as a sponsor of S. 1771, a bill to improve the usefulness of national bank branches in foreign countries. The bill was at the desk, and I did not know the time had expired. I find the bill has gone to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am confident my request has the approval of the chairman of the committee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT BY POSTMASTER GENERAL OF CERTAIN POSTMASTERS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1996) to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of Postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices, the name of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE CONCERNING CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Claude Vernon Spratley, Jr., of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Virginia, for a term of 4 years, vice Joseph S. Bambacus.

Charles N. Bordwine, of Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, western district of Virginia, for a term of 4 years, vice Peter A. Richmond.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, June 9, 1961, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

IMPRISONMENT OF JOHN T. DOWNEY BY THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, as a sidelight on the Castro tractor-for-prisoners proposed trade, I submit, for inclusion in the RECORD an exchange of telegrams between Mrs. Mary V. Downey, of New Britain, Conn., and myself. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW BRITAIN, CONN.

Senator PRESCOTT R. BUSH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: Dismayed at official support given to exchange of Cuban Rebels yet nothing done for American citizens imprisoned in China, including my son John T. Downey.

MARY V. DOWNEY.

MAY 31, 1961.

Mrs. MARY V. DOWNEY,
New Britain, Conn.

DEAR MRS. DOWNEY: I am in complete agreement with you. Rather than accept Castro's scheming offer I should prefer to see the administration offer some tractors to Mao Tse-tung for the release of American prisoners illegally held including Jack Downey.

Kindest regards.

PRESCOTT BUSH.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, Jack Downey was taken prisoner by the Chinese Communists about 8 years ago. After extended negotiations, the Chinese Communists agreed to free Jack Downey in September of 1956 or 1957—I do not recall the exact date. But my information on this subject came at that time, and later, from Assistant Secretary of State Walter Robertson, who did his best to negotiate the freedom of Jack Downey and other prisoners then in the hands of the Chinese Communists.

After agreeing to release these men, they released a few of them, but kept three or four of them, including Jack Downey; and they have absolutely welshed on their agreement to free him and the two or three remaining prisoners who still are there.

Mrs. Downey has been to China twice, to see her son, who still is a prisoner. It is no wonder that she cannot understand why we anxiously jump at Castro's arrogant offer to trade Cuban rebels for U.S. machinery. One wonders what Mao Tse-tung's price may now be for the American boys who still are in his prisons.

Mr. President, I feel very deeply about this matter, having known Mrs. Downey for a number of years. Her son, Jack, was in college with my own son, and they were friends; and I can fully understand the depth of her feeling and her inability to understand how we can do what is now proposed to be done in dealing with Castro, but ignore the situation affecting her son, who has been imprisoned all these years by the Chinese Communists, even after they agreed to release him.

In that connection, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, two editorials from Connecticut newspapers—one from the Bridgeport Post, and one from the New Haven Register.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bridgeport Post, May 26, 1961]

TRACTOR DEAL "FOR HUMANITY"

What started out as a Castro blackmailing deal, U.S. tractors for the pirate-dictator's 1,200 prisoners, now has the blessing of President Kennedy. He refers to the movement as being "wholly humanitarian" and urges all Americans to contribute to a fund being raised privately to buy 500 tractors.

However, the Government is no party to the deal. In order not to involve his administration in any business with Castro dictatorship, the President admits that he took the initiative in inviting Mrs. Roosevelt, Walter Reuther and Milton Eisenhower to act as a fund-raising committee.

The blackmail proposal of the unpredictable, ruthless dictator, then became a program for helping freedom fighters out of a spirit of brotherly love, a private effort "in the great American tradition." It was said at the White House that the President is "likely" to make a donation, but as a private citizen. That is a fine distinction, for John F. Kennedy is President all the time and at no time while in that office does he revert to the status of private citizen.

In Cuba, word comes that the Castroites no longer regard the deal as a swap, or an exchange, but payment of indemnity by the United States for this country's part in training rebels for the ill-fated invasion. Communists the world over will use that term to degrade us and to drive our prestige even lower into the ground.

While the people of this Nation do not value their dollars or machines above the freedom of the 1,200 prisoners, the entire proposition from start to its expected completion has aroused Congressmen in both parties. Many Members are disturbed because Congress was not consulted before the President organized the private citizens' committee.

Congressmen are disturbed also because they are aware Castro can call off the deal any time he takes the notion. He has not supplied the names of the prisoners, nor has he made any arrangements for obtaining the tractors. It is a possibility, too, that he may get the implements and still hold the men.

The President has a hot potato on his hands, and political repercussions are threatening in Washington. The brewing trouble is by no means confined to Republicans. Democrats, as well, believe the President should have kept out of the picture while diplomatic proceedings were initiated on behalf of the prisoners and thousands of other persons held in Castro's jails. Mr. Kennedy, however, has his supporters, who say he has called Castro's bluff, that the humanitarian aspect outweighs all the talk of blackmail and ransom.

A trade in human lives for machines is horrible to contemplate. But our willingness to meet this demand may lead to further exploitation by Red Chinese or other Communist countries where Americans may be trapped.

Today we are paying out millions, not only for defense, but for tribute.

[From the New Haven Register, May 27, 1961]

TAXES AND TRACTORS

Before all the angles of a Tractors-for-Castro deal are worked out people are being invited to contribute to the ransom "kitty" on the assumption of a tax-free gift, and being told how, when, and where to send their money.

This is but another example of the extralegal difficulties we can get into through the present tendency in Washington to act by Presidential impulse, while bypassing Congress.

It remained for a scarred veteran of the political front, Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, to sound a warning on the tax phase of the prisoners-for-tractors business. The Internal Revenue Service will have to answer to Congress, admonishes the Sen-

ator, if it rules that these specific donations are tax deductible.

This development illustrates further what a mare's nest of confusion over Federal and private responsibility we may be getting into before this is all over.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AGRICULTURE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think it is appropriate from time to time, on the basis of departmental reports, to make manifest to the Senate and to the country what is taking place. I have particular reference to the last report, from the Department of Agriculture, with respect to prices.

I notice that the price report just issued indicates that prices received by farmers are 2 percent less than they were a year ago.

I also notice from the report on parity, that parity has dropped from 80 to 78 percent.

I also notice—and this has particular reference to my own section of the country—that corn prices have dropped 6 percent since last year, in a comparable period.

These are matters of high interest, in view of the fact that the omnibus farm bill is presently before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I apprehend that in one form or another it will be before the Senate at possibly a reasonably early date.

So this is a matter of information that I want to impart for the information of the Senate from time to time.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I think it should be mentioned that parity prices dropped 2 percent in the month of April. This is in addition to a further drop of 1 percent in the month of May. Agricultural prices are down 25 percent below the record high of 1951. It gets to be a matter of serious concern at this time, when prices farmers have to pay for commodities and services have increased. I am glad the Senator has called attention to this matter.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I trust other Senators will take this information and use it to check the report, and then make reports of their own on this highly important matter.

INTERVIEW OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], appeared on the program "Capitol Cloakroom." In the course of his appearance, he was interviewed in detail on the role of the Federal Communications Commission and the television industry. His remarks, it seems to me, are exceedingly pertinent and interesting, and I ask unanimous consent that they be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the interview was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. CHURCH. I asked you earlier, and I would like to hear your answer now, is the broadcasting industry fulfilling its obligations?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, as you know, Mr. Church, I have been—I have been often critical of the broadcasting industry. I have often questioned some of the things that they were doing in the way of programing or in the way of allocations. I have been critical of the FCC on some occasions. I know they have a most difficult problem. I have been critical of the FCC mainly because they have sometimes it seems to me they have failed to face up to decisions, they let them sweep them under the rug, just let them go. That was the allocation situation.

I think Mr. Minow, who made this dramatic appearance before the national association here last week, stated a lot of things that I had been thinking about or maybe I had talked about here and there and put them together. I think it's good to have in this new industry with all its problems too, to have "a pike in the carp pond," once in a while. And, Mr. Minow surely evidenced the fact that he is going to be a pike in a carp pond.

Now, sometimes we fall into patterns in business or what seems to the people in the broadcasting business to be right to them but they fall into patterns and we drift along. I wouldn't quite say that it was a vast wasteland. I think there are many practical problems that are involved. But programing, of course, all of us want to be programers. I have my idea of what programs should be but I am not going to censure programing because the people there want to do as good a job as they can.

I think the broadcasting industry has done more in the past 2 years to become better, to fulfill their responsibility better than it did in the prior 10, and I have lived with them for—well, they made me a pioneer the other day of broadcasting—a long time, but I think they have done an excellent job in the past 2 years. But they had no place to go but up.

Now, what Mr. Minow and I were suggesting that they may even do better.

Mr. CHURCH. A moment ago you mentioned Mr. Minow. I thought of the column in the Washington Post by Larry Laurent.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. I imagine you know him.

Senator MAGNUSON. I know him, yes.

Mr. CHURCH. The columnist.

He said that it had reached a point where anything in which the public was interested is now considered in the public interest.

Do you agree with that?

Senator MAGNUSON. You mean that the networks had reached that point?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes, well, the programing people.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, I have heard many people who have been in charge of programs suggest to me when we might be critical or having a discussion about it that, well, this is what the public wants. And I always have thought that that criteria, they should be leaders and not what the public wants because if that's all they get, I don't know how you know what they want. I had a long argument in many cases with some of the network people whom I know very well, somebody I said, you follow a pattern sometimes, if one network puts on, say, a western that the people seem to like, the other network wants to put another western on at the same time hoping they like it better. And then the third one wants to do this and then pretty soon you've got the public getting nothing but westerns. I think maybe the approach should be, whether it's practical or not, I am not in the business, but whether it's practical or not, maybe they should put on a program that might not be the same or follow the leader at the same time so that the public could have some kind of a choice.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Well, Senator Magnuson, one thing the public has shown that it wanted was political debates.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. PIERPOINT. It certainly watched those presidential debates last year during the campaign, and I think you have got a bill that you would like to put through permanently suspending section 315.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes, 315.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Of the FCC Code. Well, that bill has never gotten out of committee and yet the public does want to see these debates. What is happening here?

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, we haven't given it a high priority, timewise, because we needn't pass it until 4 years, because it only deals with the presidential candidates. But I think we'll pass it, because the public really, not only enjoyed, but I thought that they thought this was a great contribution. I feel good about it because I authored the bill.

Mr. PIERPOINT. You think it will get through all right?

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes. I heard my friend, my colleague, Senator JACKSON, he was chairman of the Democratic National Committee and MORTON, who is also on my committee, chairman of the Republican Committee, when they were asked one day who was the biggest contributor of the political parties, they said MAGNUSON was because he gave them each about a million and a half dollars' worth of free time.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CHURCH. Senator, on this 315, you say you think we are going to—it will be passed——

Senator MAGNUSON. I am sure we can. I find that obligation——

Mr. CHURCH. Because the networks, you know, have to plan a long way ahead.

Senator MAGNUSON. Yes, yes.

Mr. CHURCH. And the sooner, the quicker, I would think.

Senator MAGNUSON. I am going to try and at least get it through the Senate this session, and then see if the House will work on it.

Now, another phase, of course, our committee has been very active in educational TV, and I see that that has now passed the House, and we will have a conference or, it's out on the floor—out of subcommittee, rather—and will pass the House, and we'll get that going.

Now, there's another thing where the—I envision we're going to have a fourth network in this country.

Mr. PIERPOINT. Government network?

Senator MAGNUSON. No. We're going to have an educational TV network. All these educational TV people are going to have a network.

Mr. PIERPOINT. But they get Government funds, won't they, under your bill?

Senator MAGNUSON. Only for the construction of some of these that haven't got off the ground, and it's only for a 2-year period.

Mr. VON FREMD. It would have to be, I would think, then, financed by the Ford Foundation or some group that saw it, wouldn't it?

Senator MAGNUSON. Oh, by the State legislatures, the universities, private contributions, and things of that kind, because we are not using 213 of the channels that have been assigned.

Now, surprisingly, here is where the networks, I think, did a great public service. They all came out wholeheartedly and supported this educational TV, which involves channels which are worth millions, and they feel that by having that level of a fourth network, that will have a tendency to bring up the programing level of any programing on the network that is opposite to it.

Mr. VON FREMD. Thank you very much, Senator MAGNUSON, for being with us. We have touched a lot of bases and it's been fun, as it always is, to have you with us on "Capitol Cloakroom."

THE GOVERNMENT PATENT POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee has been holding hearings in recent days with regard to the Government patent policy. This is a very complicated issue which relates directly both to the public interest and to the rights of inventors to keep the fruits of their inventions.

America has been known for its creative genius. It is important that we help preserve it.

There are different points of view with regard to the Government patent policy. Some believe that the general public interest takes precedence and that the Government should, therefore, take the patent rights to all inventions produced by individuals or corporations under contract to the Government.

Others have claimed that while the public interests must be preserved—it is contrary to the system of free enterprise for the Government to accumulate patent rights. It has been believed of the latter group that patent rights should be kept by the inventors, while the Government merely takes a license.

I believe that these hearings of the Patent Subcommittee will help clarify the thinking in this area. Recently there has come to my attention a statement by one of the leading patent attorneys of the State of Wisconsin, William E. Van Taay, on this matter. I do not necessarily fully endorse all that is being said by Mr. Van Taay—but I do feel that his presentation makes a stimulating contribution to the discussion of the Government patent policy. I ask unanimous consent to have his statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW TO WIN THE RACE FOR AMERICA

Several bills are now pending before the present 87th Congress relative to the ownership of inventions made in the performance of federally financed contracts.

The most important of these bills are S. 1084, S. 1176, and H.R. 5804.

The enactment of these pending bills will adversely affect industry, large and small, and the public interest in that such legislation will certainly impair, if not preclude, the creation of new jobs, the expansion of employment and job security.

This analysis is presented in the belief and with faith in the ability of the Members of Congress to recognize that the passage of these bills will endanger our economy and that there is a real need to enact legislation that will help create new jobs, increase employment, and promote job security by making it possible for industry, large and small, to competitively develop and successfully market new and improved products.

However, because of the pressures that are bound to be exerted, the decisions of whether to pass or reject these pending bills will not be easy to make. Nevertheless, we all have a great deal at stake, and the correct decisions made by the Congress will mean that new jobs will be created, employment expanded, and job security promoted.

The problem is easy to understand:

In 1958, the Space Act was hustled through Congress as part of America's answer to the Russian sputniks.

A patent provision was included in the Space Act patterned after a similar provision in the Atomic Energy Act. The provisions of both acts provide that all inventions made under Government contracts with the Space Agency (NASA) or the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) become the exclusive property of the U.S. Government.

These provisions are in violent contrast to the traditional provisions of the patent laws which have provided, since the adoption of our Constitution, that inventions are and remain the exclusive property of the inventor or the person or corporation to whom the inventor may assign his ownership.

Private industry has chafed under the Atomic Energy Act and under the Space Act.

In the atomic field, the technology involved is relatively restricted, but the incentive to create new jobs, to expand employment, and to promote job security has been effectively destroyed.

In space exploration and development, almost every science and technology is called into play, but, again, the incentive to create new jobs, to expand employment, and to promote job security has also been effectively destroyed, and the detrimental impact upon the welfare of the people and our Nation has been critical and borders upon catastrophe.

The patent restrictions have hurt the space program and have hurt the atomic energy program. Companies that have developed confidential know-how and competence in special fields that would enhance development in the fields of atomic energy and space travel have been reluctant to take Government AEC and NASA contracts. They have been reluctant because the companies know that even background know-how and inventions used in performing such contracts go to the Government and then, directly or indirectly, to their competitors.

This deplorable situation has destroyed the creation of new jobs, adversely affected the expansion of employment in a time of recession and has jeopardized job security for employees.

The AEC and NASA patent policies are in sharp conflict with the patent policies of the Department of Defense and other Government agencies whereby inventions obtained under Government's contracts are owned by the inventor or his assignee with the Government automatically receiving an irrevocable, royalty-free license. This policy has encouraged the creation of new jobs, stimulated expansion of employment and afforded job security to employees.

Heretofore, the Congress has recognized—

1. That the U.S. patent system was established to encourage inventions and discoveries and the disclosure and commercial use thereof; and

2. That the general welfare and the promotion of science and the useful arts are better served by taking advantage of incentives provided by the patent system to secure industry's maximum participation in Government sponsored research and development and to achieve maximum commercial use of the resulting inventions and discoveries.

Recently, a vigorous clamor has ben set up, in and outside of Congress, for a uniform Government policy governing the ownership of inventions made in the performance of any Government contract.

However, instead of promoting a uniform policy along the lines of the Department of Defense and other governmental agencies, the advocates of uniformity are beating the drums for the automatic Government ownership of inventions along the disastrous lines followed by the AEC and NASA.

To adopt this disastrous type of uniformity of Government ownership will effectively destroy the creation of jobs, increase unemployment, and destroy the job security of employees and accomplish a result which can only be applauded by the Russians as they watch the Congress of the United States commit economic suicide.

The Federal Government is spending billions annually for research and development, but it is not true to say that the Government is "giving away" potential billions by "surrendering" patent rights to the companies that do the work. Neither is it true to say that under the patent policies of the Department of Defense and a few other Government agencies, the contracting company is given an exclusive commercial advantage.

On the contrary, under the AEC and NASA the government is "taking away" patent rights by "stripping" the companies that do Government work and placing those companies at a competitive disadvantage. In addition, job creation is ruined, employment constricted, and job security lost.

If there is to be uniformity, the ground rule should be "equitable uniformity" governing the contractual relationships between Government and industry. With "equitable uniformity" in mind, Government contracts can be divided into three types as follows: (1) Research; (2) supply; (3) development.

These three types of contracts may be described briefly as follows:

1. Research: Research is work directed toward increasing scientific knowledge or understanding of a subject being studied, and includes applying the obtained increase in said knowledge and understanding to create new products, materials, processes, methods, devices, and techniques.

Obviously, since the Government should get what it pays for, the Government should take title to inventions conceived in the performance of that part of a federally financed contract which is for basic research.

Such knowledge should be made freely available by the Government to all on a nonrestricted basis. In the words of one of our U.S. Senators, "such knowledge should be as free to all as the air we breathe" except, of course, for subject matter concerning the national security. This uniformity would constitute "equitable uniformity" for research contracts.

2. Development: Development is work done or the use of existing knowledge to modify or improve products, materials, processes, methods, devices, and techniques.

The contractor should retain title to all inventions conceived in the performance of such a Government development contract. The Government should have a free license to use the background rights necessary to use the end product.

Unless separately negotiated, no license should be acquired by the Government with respect to the contractors' inventions which are, at private expense (1) designed, engineered, tested, or used, and (2) patented or made the subject of a pending application for U.S. letters patent.

3. Supply: The contractor should retain title to all inventions conceived in the performance of a Government supply contract. The Government should receive the off-the-shelf item which it has ordered and which it has paid for, and should receive no rights other than the right to use the supplied commercial item the same as any other customer.

Certainly there can be no quarrel concerning the equity of the above-proposed uniform policy to govern the contractual relationships between Government and industry, large and small. The Government will receive the full fruits of its investments for the benefit of all the people, and industry, large and small, will receive the fruits of its investments for the benefit of all the people.

At a time when we are facing the peril of communism which threatens to engulf the entire free world, the hour for decision has now been reached when the Congress must make a bold decision to counteract the menace of communism with the potent weapon of American free enterprise.

At the present time, the system of free enterprise which made the United States

great in the past lies bound, gagged, and prostrate, while the race for space and the race for world domination are being won by the Communists.

Let us remove the chains, remove the gag, and liberate the giant of free enterprise and win the final victory for the United States and the free world.

Failure to act now is to let the Communists win by default and borders on giving the Communists aid and comfort in bringing about our self-destruction.

The Communists see chaos and ruin looming all around us and are planning to attend the burial services of the United States.

Are the Communists correct?

The Congress, and Congress alone, shall now make that decision.

REQUIREMENTS FOR PRACTICE BEFORE FEDERAL AGENCIES

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I received a communication from the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association expressing the association's concern about the many and varied requirements which a qualified attorney must meet before he is permitted to practice before the several departments and agencies of the U.S. Government.

It is the view of the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association that the Federal Government should recognize the ability of the highest courts in the various States to set standards for admitting qualified individuals into legal practice.

The Milwaukee Junior Bar Association, therefore, adopted a resolution asking adoption by the Congress of H.R. 177 and S. 1409. It reads as follows:

Resolved, That the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association, being quite concerned about the many and varied requirements which a person, who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of a State or possession of the United States, must meet before such a person is allowed to practice before several departments, boards, bureaus, and administrative agencies of the United States, hereby dedicates itself to encourage the Congress of the United States to adopt certain proposed legislation in this regard, to wit: H.R. 177 and S. 1409, the content of which is as follows:

"S. 1409

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any person who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of a State or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, shall be entitled to practice before any department, board, bureau, or administrative agency of the United States, other than the Patent Office, without the necessity of making application therefor or of showing any other qualification."

I ask unanimous consent that the copy of the letter from the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE JUNIOR BAR ASSOCIATION,
Milwaukee, Wis., May 25, 1961.

U.S. Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate Office,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The Milwaukee Junior Bar Association is very concerned about the many and varied requirements which a person, who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of a State or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia, must meet before such a person is allowed to practice before several departments, boards, bureaus, and administrative agencies of the United States.

We feel that it is necessary for the Federal Government, through legislation, to recognize the ability of the highest courts in the various States and U.S. possessions to set and maintain proper standards for admitting qualified individuals to practice law.

Certain proposed legislation in this regard has recently been brought to the attention of the Milwaukee Junior Bar. Said legislation is numbered H.R. 177 and S. 1409. A copy of S. 1409 is enclosed herein for your consideration.

I have been authorized by the Milwaukee Junior Bar to strongly urge, on its behalf, that you, as an elected representative of the State of Wisconsin, lend the weight and prestige of your office to facilitate the passage of this worthwhile legislation. Since you are a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, to which said committee this legislation has been referred, your support in this matter will be extremely helpful to the ultimate success of S. 1409.

Your comments on the merits of this legislation and an indication of your convictions concerning it will be of great interest to our group.

Kindly forward an indication of your views on this problem to the undersigned as soon as conveniently possible.

Yours very truly,

FRANKLYN M. GIMBEL,
Member.

CENTENNIAL OF THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, today is the anniversary of the founding of Italy's Republic, and I therefore wish to make a few remarks apropos of the day which means so much to the people of Italy and to Americans of Italian ancestry.

This is not only the anniversary of founding of the Republic, which took place on June 2, 1946, 15 years ago, but this year marks the centennial of the unification of Italy. One hundred years ago, when our own Nation was in the struggle between the States, the people of Italy were having their own struggle for unification. Italy was united, and 85 years later, they formed their Republic.

The relations between our country and the Italian Government have been most friendly. The international relations between our Governments have been in every way pleasant and agreeable during the time Ambassador Manlio Brosio has been his country's representative here in Washington, and I am sure that the same agreeable relationship will continue under Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea, the Italian Government's new Ambassador to Washington. We say a fond farewell to Ambassador Brosio, who has been transferred to another important post, and a welcome greeting to Ambassador Fenoaltea.

Soon after the formation of the Republic of Italy, it became a strong ally of the United States in the fight against communism, and since that time Italy has been a stanch and indispensable partner in the European recovery program and in the North Atlantic Alliance. Italy's identification with the aims of Western democracies has been reaffirmed by its leaders throughout this period. The stalwart support of NATO by Italy has been constantly evident. Indeed, our partnership with Italy is firmly rooted, as has been shown in our harmonious dealings with international issues as they arise. Furthermore, in the family of free nations, Italy has shown her sincere desire to do her part toward the solution of the world problems.

I am not, on this occasion, going into the long list of gifts which Italy has given us. That has been done on previous occasions. We are all fully aware of these things—and we are grateful to Italy.

At this time, I simply want to extend congratulations and best wishes to the Italian people and their leaders. I also want to extend congratulations and best wishes to the many Americans of Italian descent who celebrate this day.

ORATION BY WAYNE F. FISHER II

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, on April 26, 1961, Wayne F. Fisher II, of Malcolm, Nebr., a 13-year-old farm boy addressed the Nebraska Legislature. State Senator Fern Orme, of Lincoln, arranged for the appearance of this young orator. Mrs. Orme heard Wayne deliver a citizenship speech at a youth banquet and was so impressed she felt the Nebraska lawmakers should hear him.

After reading Wayne's stirring address, I believe his comments should be shared with all our citizens. I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The question that is always asked by citizenship clubs is: What is a good citizen?

It is my belief that the citizens of a country guide the destiny of the Nation. The freedoms that persons in the United States receive from the Bill of Rights belongs to all, citizens and aliens alike. But it is the faith and beliefs of the citizens that keep the spirit of this liberty alive and let aliens and themselves benefit from it.

The rights and duties of citizenship involves both civic and political rights, as well as civic and political duties. Only citizens have full political rights, or the right to take part in Government. Of this right citizens should take full opportunity.

A citizen can do much to improve his community, even if he cannot vote. He can help shape public opinion by using his freedom of speech. He can contribute to the general welfare by sacrificing personal advantages to the common good. He may become a school board member, or appear at hearings of his State legislature or help a political party. All these examples that I have mentioned have been for adults, but we as youth of this country can take part in American citizenship by obeying laws, following the rules of the game when you are playing, and being a good sport; for this primary training will shape you into citizens of tomorrow.

Democratic Government fails unless citizens show the same eagerness to serve their country that they expect the country to show them.

It is through the school that citizenship clubs seek to train young citizens to accept their responsibility.

It is for this reason that citizenship clubs have been formed.

MISSOURI COTTON PRODUCERS ANNUAL MEETING

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, one of Missouri's most important farm organizations, the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, had the honor of entertaining the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, at their annual meeting at Charleston, Mo., on May 23.

My colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG] and I had planned to attend this meeting, but were unable to do so because of the voting in the Senate that day on the education bill.

Our colleague from the other House, Hon. PAUL C. JONES, Representative from Missouri's 10th Congressional District, where the meeting was held, was present. He and others who were in attendance have reported that the Secretary presented the administration's farm proposal with the logic, clarity, and persuasiveness that is making new friends for the program each day.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Freeman's address to the Missouri Cotton Producers Association be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE THE MISSOURI COTTON PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, CHARLESTON, MO., MAY 23, 1961

This afternoon I have had a most enjoyable time meeting and talking with cotton growers, farm leaders, farmers, and some of your State legislators from both Missouri and adjacent States. I find this type of personal exchange valuable as it gives me a better insight to your problems and to the economy of your region.

I am greatly interested in cotton's problems and intensely concerned that U.S. cotton—your cotton—and U.S. producers, here and throughout the Nation, shall have a stable and prosperous future.

I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to request your cooperation and help in solving cotton's problems. I hope at the outset that none of you will conclude, because I am speaking to the Missouri Cotton Producers Association, that I consider myself an expert on cotton. I do not because I am not.

But I can assure that we will work with you in every way feasible to help cotton enlarge its markets, improve its quality, and bring to its producers a fair return.

Personally, I am tremendously interested in cotton. Here is a commodity that is deeply rooted in the history of America and of much of the world. Historians believe it has been grown in India for 3,000 years. When Columbus came to America he found cotton growing in the West Indies and on the Continent. It was one of the first crops planted by the English settlers in Jamestown. By all odds the most important vegetable fiber known to man, cotton has had more influence on history than most rulers and kings. It has shaped economic development over broad areas. The raw material of the industrial revolution in England, it changed tiny hamlets into throbbing cities. Here in the South it became and remained for decades the kingpin of the entire economy.

And here and now, in the year 1961, what happens to cotton affects the income, the prosperity, and the well-being of millions of our people.

Yet we would all agree that a permanent solution to cotton's problems still has not been found. One has only to look at the existing cotton situation to see the truth of this. And what is true of cotton is true of other commodities—and of American agriculture in general.

The producers of all farm commodities share a number of common attributes, the most striking of which is their achievement in output. At no time in the history of our civilization has one nation reached success in agricultural production even comparable to ours.

Two decades ago, the average farmworker produced enough food and fiber to support about 11 people. Today he produces enough to feed and clothe 25. The farmer has today, through a scientific and technological revolution, made it possible for 9 percent of our population to feed and clothe all others—with a substantial portion available for millions of people elsewhere in the world.

This outpouring of agricultural abundance makes for some rather sharp contrasts. Two decades ago, the average farmer produced only a third as much as he does today—and this rate of increase since 1940 has been twice as great as in industry.

And it has meant that the consumer is able to buy a balanced and varied diet for approximately one-fifth of his take-home pay—a smaller proportion than anywhere else in the world. The factory workers of today bought their food in 1960 with nearly one-third fewer hours of work than it took in 1947–49, and they ate better besides.

Yet, those individuals who have contributed to America's success in farm production, paradoxically, have not been those who have reaped the reward. To the farmer, production success has brought economic distress.

In fact, as farm output has increased in recent years, farm income has decreased—and almost in proportion.

Farm output increased about 29 percent between 1960 and the period 1947–49—but net realized farm income was 26 percent less. In just 10 years, the average net income per person for farm people has declined from about 53 percent of the average income of nonfarm people to about 43 percent—and this is income from all sources.

Now the cottongrower, like every progressive farmer throughout American agriculture, has achieved remarkable success in production. No other country can match our cotton in the amount, the varied staple lengths, and the general good quality of the crop. None can even approach the efficiency with which cotton is produced in this country.

I believe that the first step toward solving cotton's problems is the same as that for all other farm commodities: we must gain and hold public understanding and appreciation of the remarkable record which agriculture has made in becoming the No. 1 success story of this century. Then agriculture will get a sympathetic rather than a hostile ear as we seek to work out our problems.

Let us take a brief look at the challenge we find in agriculture as it particularly affects cotton.

The cotton producer, while not faced with the same degree of inelasticity in the demand for his product as other farm commodity producers, does have some particularly unique problems.

You know the inroads made into markets formerly held almost exclusively by cotton—inroads by such manmade substitute products as rayon, nylon, paper, spun glass, and others. You know the difficulties of meeting foreign competition while at the same time seeking to maintain fair prices to cotton producers here at home.

Some of the statistics which reflect these factors give us concern. Recently, some prominent cotton leaders came to my office and said that cotton is in good shape. The facts, I fear, do not bear this out.

What are the facts?

First, domestic consumption of cotton is expected to be down about 1 million bales this year from the 9 million bales consumed a year ago. The business recession of 1960 and early 1961 is partly responsible, and we expect some improvement in the coming season. But the general level of business is not the only factor.

In the last decade, the per capita use of cotton in this country dropped by roughly one-fourth. This very serious long-term element reflects the trend toward larger use of manmade fibers year after year.

A third fact of importance in the statistical picture of the cotton economy is that we expect total export of cotton in 1960–61 to run about 6.5 million bales—down about 700,000 bales from the previous year.

In total then, cotton disappearance for the 1960–61 marketing year will be about 14.5 million bales—10 percent less than in 1959–60. Since this approximately balances last year's cotton production, it means that the carryover on August 1 will remain about 7.5 million bales.

Most of this cotton will be owned by private interests. We expect government stocks to be relatively small. But while this is an improvement over the situation in the mid-50's, it is by no means a solution to the cotton problem. In fact, the existence of 5.5 million bales in private hands on August 1 may delay and reduce the disposal of the new crop.

Another statistic which adds to our concern is the sharp rise in the volume of cotton tetxiles imported into the United States with the accompanying decline in the export of domestically produced textiles. In 1950, imports of cotton textiles equaled about 83,000 bales. During 1960, about 532,000 bales of cotton were used to manufacture such imports. In the same period, cotton used in textile exports dropped from about 539,000 bales to 494,000 bales.

The simple fact is that dual prices for raw cotton encourage foreign mills to export their cotton textiles to the United States. This cuts into the market for U.S. produced textiles and causes consumption of cotton within the United States to decline.

President Kennedy, as you know, has issued a 7-point directive aimed at alleviating the problems of the textile industry. He has directed the Department of Agriculture to take a good hard look at the two-price system for cotton with a view to replacing it with something better—better for cotton and textiles alike.

We are studying this situation thoroughly in cooperation with our cotton advisers, and we hope to have recommendations to make in due time.

This involves a very difficult problem—maintaining on the one hand prices and income our farmers can live with and, on the other, keeping our cotton competitive in world markets.

I believe encouragement can be taken from the fact that the demand for cotton is elastic and that world consumption has been increasing fairly rapidly. But the cold hard statistics should serve to alert us that action is called for.

In this respect, cotton is not unique. It is the special responsibility of all of us in Agriculture to develop agricultural policies and programs which will enable us to manage and use our abundance of food and fiber so as to benefit the maximum number of people here and abroad while at the same time there is an adequate reward to those who give us this great productivity.

In the time remaining, I wish to outline the administration's program to extend some of the rewards of an abundant productivity to the farmer as well as to those who have

benefited from it in terms of higher living standards.

The first responsibility is to seek the most intelligent use of our agricultural abundance. This means that we are placing emphasis on expanding consumption of food and fiber both domestically and throughout a world with enormous unmet needs for food and fiber.

At home this program has meant a substantial expansion in the food being made available to needy families.

Since the President issued his first Executive order in January, the department has more than doubled the quantity of food for the needy while placing it in the hands of 2.5 million more people.

Within a week we shall begin a pilot food stamp program which will enable needy families living in eight communities and localities of chronic and high unemployment to purchase food required for adequate diets through regular retail channels.

In addition to these special programs, the department is adding new commodities to the school lunch program while increasing the school milk program and the amount of Federal support for both.

While seeking to follow every reasonable opportunity in this country to expand domestic consumption, we recognize that the tremendous productive success of agriculture means we can produce far larger quantities of food and fiber than are necessary to meet domestic needs.

Further, it means that we have available an enormously powerful instrument to use in assisting scores of nations which are in need of the food that can contribute so much to the health of their people and to the development of their economies.

As we are coming to realize, the programs carried out under our food-for-peace program (Public Law 480) contain the esential elements of truly great humanitarianism: They are instruments for peace and freedom in the world while they contribute at the same time to a sounder national economy at home.

We already have received from Congress the authorization to expand this program to the extent of $2 billion for the current calendar year, and yesterday I appeared before the House Agriculture Committee in support of amendments to Public Law 480 which are contained in the omnibus farm bill now before the Congress.

Under the key recommendation for a 5-year extension, Public Law 480 will become a much more forceful instrument, both in support of our farm economy and in our effort to help emerging nations develop and grow in freedom, rather than under communism.

In addition to these direct programs to step up utilization of our farm abundance, the department is placing increasing emphasis on research to develop new uses for agricultural commodities to create new markets, in human nutrition to learn more precisely the role of various foodstuffs in health and growth, and in pest eradication to help produce higher quality commodities.

The prospects, for example, are good that scientists can eventually eradicate the boll weevil. We are concentrating our efforts toward this goal in a new laboratory now nearing completion at State College, Miss.

On the product development side, many scientists in USDA research are chemists and engineers who are seeking new uses for cotton and studying ways to improve cotton products now on the marekt.

There is promise, too, that researchers can strengthen the cotton market by making improvements at critical points in the operation of gins, oil mills, and textile mills—and thus cut the cost of processing.

The emphasis on increased utilization of food and fiber, together with more stress on research, are two major efforts to develop wider markets for the products of agriculture.

A third program behind which we are marshaling every resource of the department is directed to help that segment of the farming economy which finds its troubled roots in a soil which the typical farm program does not and cannot effectively reach.

This is the rural development program. It is a special tool for reaching the areas of chronic low farm income—where resources are poor or inadequate to sustain profitable farming operations when even properous conditions prevail in agriculture.

I have established a rural development board which will focus all departmental services on a top priority basis to provide technical assistance in these rural areas and communities, and the President recently signed into law the Area Redevelopment Act which provides funds for assistance to these areas.

These funds will be used to provide low interest credit to assist rural areas to attract new industry, to construct community facilities essential to economic growth, and to assist individuals to learn new skills which will help attract new industry to rural areas.

The program also will enable the Department to better utilize its resources to assist farmers, wherever feasible, to obtain the credit, equipment, and skills which will help them make the adjustment to an efficient family-sized operation.

I should like to take this opportunity, for a moment, to clarify what we mean when we talk about the family farm. It has been subject of as many misconceptions as the Ellender-Cooley farm bill, which is designed to enhance its strength.

The family farm is a business institution in which most of the labor and most of the management is provided by the same family. Acquisition of managerial control can be acquired by any one of several forms of tenure.

Similarly, the size of the family farm or its income depends only on the amount of labor the family farm can supply and an equal—or near equal—amount of hired labor.

Within these labor and management limitations, farms of any acreage, income level, form of tenure, and any type of farming system can be classed as family farms. As the labor force of the average family farm is now approximately 1.5 man-years, the dividing line between the family and larger size operation is approximately 3 man-years.

To be adequate, a family farm should gross at least $10,000 annually and those that do are generally considered as efficient as the large-scale farming operation.

It is the family-type farm which is largely responsible for the unmatched productivity of American agriculture and, as I have said, it is to this genius of efficient operation that we direct our major concern.

It may appear to some that the efforts to seek greater utilization of food and fiber are in contradiction to parallel efforts to adjust our abundant agricultural production. I can assure you that unless a determined effort is made to adjust production to the quantities we can use as we seek to expand our use of food and fiber at home and abroad, we shall continue down the unhappy road of the past decade.

The goal of the Ellender-Cooley bill, or the Agricultural Act of 1961, is to make it possible for producers to automatically adjust their production.

The heart of the proposed legislation is an attempt to achieve economic equality for farmers on a commodity-by-commodity basis. The farmer is the only basic producer in our economy who now has available to him no means by which he can adjust production to demand, and who, therefore, has no effective means by which he can influence the economic rewards of his enterprise.

The proposed legislation would provide farmers with the machinery for coming together and developing supply adjustment programs. It would provide democratic methods for approving or rejecting such programs. And it would specifically provide safeguards for consumers' interests.

A committee of producers—including a consumer representative—would consult with the Secretary to develop and recommend a program of supply adjustment for that commodity. The Secretary would recommend a program based on these consultations. To become effective it would require approval by the President, sanction by the Congress, and approval by two-thirds vote of the producers.

Farmers serving on these commodity advisory committees would be chosen from nominees designated by farmer-elected county committees and by farm organizations.

The program offers a variety of procedures, many of which have already proved their usefulness, in order to provide a degree of flexibility which now is needed by agriculture in order to adjust to the swift changes which are common to farming in this age.

I urge you to note these important points:

The democratic procedures—farmer elected advisory committees in consultation with the Secretary consider and recommend individual commodity programs.

The safeguards—consumer representatives participate—review by the Congress—approval by two-thirds of the producers.

Note that the bill establishes agricultural procedures, not programs. The democratic process is called into play at every stage. It would mean less, not more, "Government in agriculture."

The power of the Secretary to initiate programs will be diminished rather than expanded.

The only way bad programs could be brought into being would be for the farmers to be asleep, for the Secretary of Agriculture to be dumb, for the President of the United States to be incompetent, for the Congress of the United States to be lazy, and for two-thirds of the producers to be stupid.

The new approach will give the Congress and its agricultural committees a closer, more direct relationship to agricultural programs than they now enjoy.

The Ellender-Cooley farm bill will cut the cost of Federal farm programs by helping producers bring supply into line with actual needs.

This then is the four phase approach the Kennedy administration is taking to meet the problems of American agriculture. We have an explosively productive agricultural plant. We seek to use it by every reasonable avenue, but in the process we seek also to prevent the wasteful use of our valuable human and natural resources.

It provides no permanent solution to cotton's problems, or to any commodity problem—because there is none. But it does provide a flexible series of alternatives and, in the process, an open invitation to hard work for all those concerned with the farming economy.

It is an invitation for farmers to exercise judgment, reason, and intelligence in the management of their own enterprise.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on yesterday a unanimous-consent agreement was entered, to begin at the conclusion of business under the morning hour. Is morning business concluded?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after consultation with the distinguished minority leader, in view of the fact that the chairman of the full committee did not have the opportunity, because of circumstances beyond his control, to make a speech on yesterday, I ask unanimous consent that despite the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, and apart from it, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], may be allowed 40 minutes for general discussion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I oppose the omnibus housing bill, S. 1922. It is both extravagant and inflationary.

This 89-page bill would authorize as much as $9.3 billion in additional Federal loans and grants for housing. Nearly all of that vast sum would require some kind of backdoor Treasury financing. Excluding public housing, the bill contains $6.2 billion for new and existing housing programs—only slightly less than the $6.4 billion legislated for the same existing programs ever since they were started.

Everyone recognizes the need for sound housing and better neighborhoods. These and other needs, in fact, seem almost unbounded. In contrast, Federal resources available to meet them are limited and are already strained.

Even without this bill, the budget deficit for the fiscal year 1962 will be at least $4 billion, and probably much more. Contributing to next year's deficit will be an estimated $949 million in net outlays for existing housing programs involved in this bill. Enactment of S. 1922 would further increase the budget deficit in fiscal 1962 by an estimated $462 million, or by nearly half a billion dollars more. Under these circumstances, the Federal Government should not underwrite the additional inflationary burden that this excessive housing bill could impose.

The bill contains more than $9.2 billion in loans and grants requiring some sort of backdoor Treasury financing. Approval of the bill would mean that, subject to specified limits, the Congress would lose control over the amount and timing of these back-door housing loans and grants, in some instances for as long as 40 years. This would be true, regardless of other demands upon the Federal budget and regardless of future conditions in the general economy or in the housing market.

The additional $2.5 billion in grants for urban renewal in this bill, for example, would be finally expended from 4 to 10 years hence. For public housing, the additional $3.1 billion in this bill could be laid out in annual grants of as much as $78.7 million each year until at least 2001 A.D. Already, the budget for fiscal 1962 will include $426 million in net outlays for urban renewal and public housing which will be made under previous authorizations enacted as long ago as 1937.

URBAN RENEWAL

With an additional $2.5 billion for urban renewal grants, the bill would more than double the size of the program to a total of $4.5 billion. The $2.5-billion increase, which is excessive, would take the form of contract authority, a type of back-door Treasury financing.

The bill specifies no time limit upon the commitment of these funds, although the HHFA indicated that the contract authority should cover approximately the next 4 years of operations. If so, this means that the annual rate of contracts authorized would be more than doubled—to an average of as much as $625 million a year compared with $271 million in calendar 1960, $256 million in 1959, and $227 million in 1958.

To make the urban renewal program more effective, these grants should be spread more widely by reducing the Federal share of overall renewal costs to one-half instead of two-thirds. Both the Federal and the local share should be paid in cash.

A 50–50 ratio would place Federal aid to communities for city land improvement on the same basis as Federal aid to farmers for soil conservation improvement. Payment of the local share in cash—thus excluding present noncash contributions—would assure continued community interest in urban renewal long after Federal funds were expended. It would guarantee more local interest in workable programs for community development which are now too often watered down or abandoned once Federal assistance has been obtained.

By reducing the Federal share to one-half from two-thirds, a given amount of Federal aid could be spread more widely. Alternatively, a given number of projects could be financed by reduced Federal expenditures. Under the present two-thirds Federal share, the additional $2.5 billion requested in this bill for urban renewal would finance projects with net costs of up to $3,750 million. A 50–50 grant ratio would underwrite $5 billion in urban renewal project costs, or one-third more.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Besides $2.5 billion in additional urban renewal grants, this bill would authorize $3.1 billion to expand the public housing program by approximately 100,000 units. These units would cost an average of about $14,000 each. To help pay for them, future Congresses would be bound to appropriate as much as $78.7 million over each of the next 40 years.

I oppose this additional expansion of the back-door policy housing program. We have already authorized up to $257 million a year for annual grants, and over 597,000 units will have been placed under annual contributions contracts by the middle of the year. All this has gone toward supplying subsidized housing to relatively few families at the expense of all taxpayers. According to a recent report of the Comptroller General of the United States, over $131 million was paid in annual contributions by all taxpayers in the fiscal year 1960 toward public housing programs in which about 1,825,000 persons resided, or roughly about 1 percent of the Nation's population. In fiscal 1961, more than $151 million will be required.

FORTY-YEAR, NO-EQUITY LOANS

Mr. President, I oppose the new 40-year, no-downpayment, FHA-insured loan program. The present no-equity program was designed for a few families having a strong moral claim on the Government by reason of being displaced by public action. This program has been reviewed by the Comptroller General of the United States and criticized sharply in a report dated May 1961. Nevertheless, the new program would include for 2 years on an experimental basis all low- and moderate-income families. In other words, it would take in nearly everyone.

The new no-equity program would do little to lower total monthly expenditures of home buyers, or to reduce minimum downpayments, which are now only 3 percent under the regular FHA section 203 sales housing program. Long-term borrowing outlays would actually be increased. For every $10,000 in principal loaned at 5¼-percent interest for 40 years, borrowers would repay over $13,900 in interest on loans held to maturity.

Abolishing downpayments and lengthening mortgage terms to 40 years would further reduce the rate at which home buyers save and build up a protective equity in their homes. The reduced rate of equity buildup would be reflected in lower mortgage repayments to lenders during the early years such mortgage loans were outstanding. At first, this would tend to restrict the supply of funds made available through mortgage repayments for relending at the same time the demand for funds was increased to finance a larger number of no-downpayment, 40-year loans.

The reduced rate of equity buildup would also increase the likelihood of greater loan defaults and foreclosures. This, in turn, would result in greater claims upon FHA insurance reserves. That is illustrated by the VA guaranteed home loan program, where most loans have been made without downpayments. The rate of claims paid by the VA on foreclosed no-downpayment loans has been more than double the claim rate

paid on foreclosed mortgages requiring some downpayment, according to the testimony of the Chief Benefits Director of the Veterans' Administration before the Senate Housing Subcommittee. No-downpayment, FHA-insured loans might well show a similar pattern.

Under the proposed FHA programs, increased claims upon FHA insurance reserves would be further augmented by another provision of the bill. It calls for the inclusion, for the first time, of accrued unpaid interest as a reimbursable item, in addition to unpaid principal and other eligible expenses. Still other provisions would give FHA discretionary authority to accept certain insured mortgages upon default rather than, as at present, waiting until after foreclosure. Under one program, FHA also would have the option of paying in cash or, as at present, in debentures.

These unwise changes would set precedents which the proponents of the bill would undoubtedly try to extend later to all FHA programs. We have already seen what can happen in the case of FHA section 221 loans. This was a special program originally limited to households displaced by governmental action. Under this bill it will now be applied to all so-called low- and moderate-income families, regardless of their previous housing status.

To the extent that these precedents are put into effect, they would tend to encourage unsound practices by private lenders and would increase FHA's risk of loss and its need to build up larger reserves. The Federal Government would be put squarely into the politics, as well as the economics, of handling troublesome loans.

These precedents could also place a greater burden both upon FHA insurance reserves and ultimately upon the U.S. Treasury—a burden uncertain both as to the amount and timing of expenditures. Already, the current FHA insurance reserve is "in the red" for the very program—section 221—which this bill seeks to apply to nearly all families.

How can these and similar provisions—which argue for an increase in FHA reserves to meet greater losses—be reconciled with another section of the bill which would authorize a discretionary reduction in the minimum FHA mortgage insurance premium to one-fourth of 1 percent from the present level of one-half of 1 percent?

SUBSIDIZED HOUSING

Mr. President, I oppose the "below market rate" FHA no-downpayment rental housing program in this bill. Most, if not all, subsidized loans made under this program at interest rates as low as 3⅛ percent would be purchased by FNMA. For this and other types of special assistance subject to Presidential allocation, FNMA would receive an additional $750 million, although it still has more than $190 million available under previously enacted authorizations. Nearly all this sum might be used to underwrite the new rental housing program for low and moderate income households, to be inaugurated at a time when rental vacancies average 8 percent throughout the Nation, and when the typical monthly rent asked for such vacant units is only $53.

With FNMA buying all FHA-insured loans, the program would represent an indirect Federal loan subsidy operated as if it were an ordinary private market type of activity. The program would be, in effect, public housing under a new name. FNMA would stockpile all these below-market-rate loans as long as their yields remained considerably less than returns on alternative investments in the private capital market. Already, FNMA holds $6 1 billion in its stockpile of residential mortgages.

EXCESSIVE LOAN PROGRAMS

Besides the additional $750 million for indirect Federal loans through FNMA, the bill would authorize $2,750 million for direct loans for college housing, mass transportation and other public facilities, housing for the elderly, and veterans' housing. The total of $3.5 billion in direct and indirect Federal loans, nearly all extended under a form of back-door Treasury financing, indicates how far this bill departs from the everyday operations of our private enterprise system.

In the budget for the fiscal year 1962, the administration estimates that net expenditures for nonfarm housing loans authorized under earlier legislation would come to $628 million, including both direct and indirect advances. On top of that amount, this bill would add $410 million.

HOME IMPROVEMENT LOANS

Mr. President, I oppose the new home improvement program in the bill. There is no doubt that home repairs, when economically feasible, are preferable to demolishing and rebuilding older dwellings. Repairs ordinarily cost less and help to preserve existing neighborhoods where most of our families live and where our home savings and mortgage investments are now placed.

But the provisions in the bill, authorizing no-downpayment improvement and rehabilitation loans, without specific collateral and in amounts of as much as $10,000 each for as long as 25 years, go too far. Certainly, they are well beyond the limits of the current title I FHA insured property improvement program, which would be extended under the bill for another 2 years. The title I program generally permits 3- to 5-year loans for up to $3,500—a program that has been in operation since 1934. Under it, more than 24 million loans, with net proceeds of over $13 billion, have been insured. That was a sound program. The proposed program is unsound.

If this bill were enacted, the old title I property improvement loan program, under which priavte lenders have assumed some of the risk of loss, would be supplanted, to a large extent, by the new 25-year, no-equity, no-collateral home improvement program with its more liberal terms, permitting FHA insurance of 100 percent of the loan.

COMPETING PROGRAMS

The new home improvement loan program represents but one example among several in the bill in which we are asked to extend the duration of long established Federal housing programs but at the same time to set up new or expanded programs which would compete with and to some extent supplant the current ones. As the Comptroller General of the United States suggested in a letter dated May 12, 1961, to the chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee in commenting upon the proposed Housing Act of 1961, there may also be a conflict between the new FHA section 221 no-equity program and the traditional FHA section 203 program. His letter reads in part as follows:

> FHA records show that in 1959 the typical new home insured under section 203(b) was appraised at about $14,300. We believe with the revised upper limits of section 221 program, it may in many instances supplant the section 203(b) program, FHA's permanent insurance program. In addition, since mortgages insured under section 221 may be purchased by the Federal National Mortgage Association under its special assistance program, the Federal Government may be purchasing mortgages which might otherwise have been retained in the private money market. Since all persons will be eligible to take advantage of the program (without regard to buyer's ability to qualify under other FHA programs) it will be extremely difficult to determine the real success of the program.

Still other conflicts exist in the bill. At one point, we are asked to authorize an additional $80 million for Federal grants to help finance local planning outlays. These planning expenditures would presumably be directed in part toward evolving workable programs for community development. Yet other sections of the bill would exempt the new 40-year, no-downpayment sales-housing program as well as the proposed FHA program for mortgage insurance on experimental types of housing from any requirement that they conform to such workable programs.

I am opposed to multiplying and duplicating Federal housing programs, particularly when they conflict with one another. We need greater unification—not greater multiplication—of all Federal housing programs. We also need further insight into the operations of these programs. I sincerely hope that the appropriations for research and studies in the fields of urban development and housing which the administration is said to be in the process of requesting from the Appropriations Committees of the Congress will receive sympathetic consideration. Large, continuing, and penetrating studies of existing urban development and housing programs—including both their positive and negative features—and of the real estate markets within which they operate would give us a sounder basis for determining which programs should be extended, modified, abolished, or initiated.

OPEN SPACE

Mr. President, I oppose the new open space program in this bill. It calls for $100 million in Federal grants through

backdoor Treasury financing to help communities acquire private taxable open land. This land would be used for nonproductive purposes, including so-called historical, scenic, scientific, or esthetic uses.

The new program would make the 25- to 35-percent Federal share of total land acquisition costs larger than recommended by the administration. There should be more study of this proposition before Congress decides to underwrite speculative land profits with Federal credit. The current urban renewal law deals adequately with open space.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I am particularly concerned, as I indicated before, about the built-in spending provisions of the omnibus housing bill which future Congresses will be powerless to curtail or stop. My concern is deepened by the fact that the Congress is already committed to many other similar long-term outlays.

One of the largest long-term commitments, of course, involves backdoor Treasury financing. At the end of April, more than $26.1 billion was outstanding in unused authorizations to draw funds directly from the Treasury. Housing programs accounted for a portion of this total. In future years the Congress will be obliged to provide whatever funds are necessary to underwrite net borrowings under unused authorizations. In fiscal 1960, net borrowings came to as much as $1.7 billion.

Future Congresses will also be obligated to appropriate annually whatever sums are needed for interest on the national debt. Over $9.1 billion was required in the fiscal year ended last year, plus $48 million more for administrative expenses incurred in issuing, servicing, and retiring securities and in promoting the sale of Treasury bonds. If the budget continues to be unbalanced and deficit financing further augments the national debt, future Congresses will have no choice but to appropriate more and more for interest.

Another type of built-in expenditure over which the Congress holds no real control is pensions payable to veterans. In the last fiscal year, pensions paid to living veterans for non-service-connected disability exceeded $900 million. In the current fiscal year, such pensions are expected to come to more than $1 billion. As more and more World War II and Korean veterans become pensioned as they grow older and become disabled, the annual cost of veterans' pensions which the Congress will be required to meet through appropriations will continue to rise. Other Federal programs like civil service retirement pay and unemployment compensation will impose additional demands upon direct or indirect congressional appropriations in whatever amounts are necessary to cover the Government's share of total costs.

Recently, the Congress has had under consideration several large programs which would require substantial appropriations in the near future. For example, on May 25, the Senate passed a Federal-aid-to-education bill. It would begin with an initial 3-year authorization exceeding $2.5 billion. If adopted, that program will soon cost that much per year. The same day, President Kennedy in his message on urgent national needs asked the Congress to endorse the expanded space program by agreeing to underwrite expenditures of $7 to $9 billion over the next 5 years, to send a man to the moon although the military value of such a project remains to be demonstrated.

These and other expenditure proposals, in addition to our many existing built-in spending programs, suggest a further upward trend in budget outlays. Yet instead of being alarmed at this inflationary prospect, the current impression in the Congress seems to be that the public will not object to a little creeping inflation that may result from the deficit financing necessary to underwrite the increased expenditures. The public, it is assumed, favors an increase in spending on the one hand but little or no increase in taxes on the other.

But the cruelest tax of all would be the inflation that could grow out of continued excessive deficit financing. While some persons might temporarily escape it, none could avoid the ultimate consequences of fiscal chaos if creeping inflation began to gallop. The Chinese maxim, that a journey of a thousand miles is commenced with one step, is familiar to all of us. The pending omnibus housing bill is one step in the direction of further inflation, but as I have pointed out, it is by no means the first one.

Yet the Senate Banking and Currency Committee favorably reported the bill by a 2 to 1 majority. In all probability, that vote will be a fair indication of the support the bill will receive on final passage in the Senate. As chairman of the committee that reported the bill and as one who is familiar with its provisions, I have a duty to indicate to my Senate colleagues and to all the American people what is at stake. The cost to the taxpayers of the pending bill is unnecessarily large. The Senate should adopt amendments to reduce it.

Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for having time yielded to me to make this statement on the pending bill. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to have laid before the Senate my amendment identified as 6-1-61-L, and ask that it be made the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 60, to strike out line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) striking out 'and public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State,' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'public corporations, boards, and commissions established under the laws of any State, and privately owned public utilities and cooperatives providing water service to the public at rates or charges which are subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, (1)'; and".

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. With the understanding that I do not lose the floor, I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont has control of 30 minutes on that side. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota, 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized for 3 minutes.

WHITTIER JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL LIBERTY SCROLL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in these difficult hours in which our courage and honor is being severely tested throughout the world, there are those who call for a reassessment of our goals, a review of our works, a study of our determination—a self-examination, if you please, of whether or not we have the stamina to stand up to the problems of this fateful moment in history in which communism threatens further to increase its hold on the minds of men.

The news in past weeks has not been good. And there are many of us who are not in agreement with every action which has been taken by our administration.

But let not these disagreements here at home be the foundation for misunderstanding of our purpose by those who would destroy us. In the desire for freedom Americans are united.

So, as our President prepares for his conference with Mr. Khrushchev, I would point out that if any reassessment, review or self-examination is needed, I would recommend that it be made by the Soviet dictator and that he look into our hearts, for there he will find that our dedication to the American principles of honor and justice is as steadfast today as it was in those dark wintry days of Valley Forge.

Mr. President, I am proud today, as an American and as a South Dakotan, to bring to the Members of the Senate a message of hope and courage from 591 of our fellow citizens, embodied in the liberty scroll which I hold in my hand.

It is a message that not only is a noble declaration of purpose, but is also

a shining testimonial that the rich heritage passed on to us by the signers of our Declaration of Independence will remain safe in the hands of those to whom it is entrusted in years to come, for, Mr. President, the 591 signers of this liberty scroll are the students of Whittier Junior High School in Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Mr. President, the principal of Whittier Junior High, Mr. Elton H. Bissell, has provided me with a copy of the scroll. The original has been sent to President Kennedy.

I think it is noteworthy to invite to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Bissell's comment in his letter to me concerning the scroll. He writes:

The teachers and others connected with the program were very gratified by the enthusiasm and sincerity the students exhibited during the entire proceedings. We were especially pleased to be reminded by the students that they are concerned about their Nation and its future. We are sure that what they have learned and participated in will be carried with them for many years to come.

These are the leaders of tomorrow, Mr. President, testifying today as to their dedication and love for this wonderful land of ours. I think their sentiment is that of the youth of America, and, surely, it is adequate documentation and demonstration that young America stands ready to uphold the great traditions that are ours in this Nation as they "reaffirm and repledge our loyalty and love to the United States of America."

These are words to remember from this liberty scroll of Whittier Junior High School, and I deem it a privilege to have the opportunity to read this document and make it a part of the official proceedings here today.

Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that immediately following the scroll the names of the young Americans who signed it appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the scroll and signatures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INSCRIPTION OF THE LOYALTY DAY LIBERTY SCROLL, WHITTIER JUNIOR HIGH, SIOUX FALLS PUBLIC SCHOOLS, SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK.

We want it known to all people that we will defend the principles of our beloved Nation from any and all who would attempt to destroy them.

We further state, that in our daily living we will foster loyalty by our actions and deeds. We firmly believe we owe undying allegiance to our country because—

1. Our forefathers fought for and won our freedoms to worship, speak, and think as we please, and our rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

2. Our forefathers established principles set forth in the Constitution to guarantee these freedoms.

3. Many men have given their lives preserving our liberty.

4. All of us must be aware of the threats to our freedoms and stand united against those who would destroy them.

5. Our Nation is an inspiration for those countries and peoples struggling for freedom.

6. We are proud of our country and the ideals for which it stands.

We the undersigned students of Whittier Junior High School, Sioux Falls, S. Dak., do hereby reaffirm and repledge our loyalty and love to the United States of America.

STUDENTS SIGNING LOYALTY SCROLL

Georgea Ahrenholtz, Loraine Ahrenholtz, Donald Aker, Micheal Alexander, Jack Alvey, Dale Amondson, Connie Andersen, Eloise Anderson, Griff Anderson, James Anderson, Karen Anderson, Larry Anderson, Mike Anderson, Richard Anderson, Diana Atwood, Donald Bain, Richard Baird, Donal Baker, LaRae Baker, Jim Baldwin, Marty Baldwin, Thomas Baldwin, Beverly Barrett, Susan Barrett, Daniel Barton, David Barton, Mike Bates, David Baumgard, Rose Baumgard, Larry Baumer, Barry Bayer, Cheryl Bayer, Jean Baysore, Kim Beck, Cynthia Berg, Sharon Berger, Linda Bethke, Sherry Bethke, Terry Bills, Daryl Bird, Karla Bird, Dennis Bishop, Jo Ann Bjerke, Charles Black.

Jerry Block, Gordon Boe, Jeanette Boellaard, Maudie Boese, Edward Bohlman, Susan Bohlman, Delbert Bohms, Jeanette Booth, Jeff Bork, Lorian Bornitz, Harold Bradley, Gary Brakke, David Brandsma, Bonnie Branson, Gary Brasel, Ronnie Brasel, Luetta Brewer, Barbara Briest, Mike Briest, Barbara Brown, Betty Brown, Marie Brown, Rose Brown, Barbara Brudvig, Dale Bruining, Richard Bruns, Sandra Buchholz, Roger Buckneberg, Jim Burns, Barney Cain, Agnes Cain, Nancy Callahan, Ray Campbell, Sally Campbell, John Card, Norman Card, Judy Cauthon, Kathy Cauthon, Elizabeth Centra, Kenneth Burns, Charlotte Bush, Danny Chambers, Jacqueline Chambers, Marilyn Chester.

Dennis Christensen, Donna Christensen, Harold Christensen, James Clark, Polly Clark, Sandy Clark, Sharon Clark, Connie Clyde, Dale Clyde, Darleen Clyde, Mary Collette, Larry Corria, June Craig, Phillip Crider, Delmar Crowe, Carol Crusinberry, Lee Crusinberry, John Cyronek, Richard Dahl, Mary Dargen, Mike Davidson, Larry Davis, Jackie Deal, Darlene DeBoer, Henrietta DeBoer, Judy Decker, Duane DeHeer, Mary DeReu, Terri DeWandel, Janie Dibben, David Dickens, Donald Dickens, Dana Dickey, Delores Doty, Donna Doty, Daryl DuBois, Deanna DuBois, Marcia Duty, Danny East, Danny Edwards, Dianne Eichhorn, Larry Eisenbraun, Carol Eliason, Diane Elmstrand.

Danny Erickson, Sylvia Esselink, Mary Essem, Evelyn Faber, Ronald Fahy, Scott Faragher, Frank Feltis, Fredrick Fisher, Jean Flannery, Jo Flittie, Thomas Flittie, Gwendolyn Foster, Sally Foster, Barton Fountain, Dennis Fowlds, James Fowlds, Phillip Fredrickson, Barbara Freitag, Georgia Frerichs, Margaret Frerichs, Roger Frost, Arden Fay Fueston, Donna Galbavy, John Gamberg, Charles Ganser, Phyllis Gardiner, Stephanie Garness, Steve Garritsen, Darwin Gednalske, Henry Gerike, Jerry Getman, Jerry Gibson, Diane Giedd, Kimm Gillen, Luana Gillen, Judy Gilpin, Gary Girard, Mary Kaye Graack, Edward Graham, Linda Granum, Mark Granum, Ronald Grave, Cherylyn Gray, Sandra Green.

Carol Griffith, Russel Wayne Gulbranson, Stanley Gulbrandson, Donald Gustafson, Jeanette Gustafson, Roger Gustafson, Sharyn Haack, Dennis Haan, Michael Haan, Darry Haddican, Gerald Haddican, Gloria Haddican, Lois Haddican, Scott Haggar, James Hales, Kathleen Halverson, John Hanisch, Harold Hanson, Charles Haron, David Hardie, James Harding, David Harkema, Mary Harkness, Linda Harmer, David Harms, Lorraine Harmsen, Roger Harman, Donna Hartson, Dennis Harvey, Eugene Haugstad, Richard Hawe, Janet Hayes, Dana Heater, James Heaton, Patsy Heckenliable, Ester Heen, Roxanna Heither, Rose-ellen Heksem, Nancy Helfenstine, Edna Hembree, James Hembree, Clifford Hills, Richard Hinricks, Pearl Hoekman.

Dale Wesley, Charlotte Hoffman, Harold Hollingshea, Sandra Hollingshea, Joe Hooker, Michael Hopp, Sandra Houch, William Howlett, Diana Hubbell, Shirley Huffman, Danny Isch, Elizabeth Iverson, Dennis Jackson, Byron Jaqua, Susan Jaqua, Everett Jaus Darlene Javers, Terry Jellis, Janice Jelsema, Linda Jennings, Beverly Jensen, James Jenson, Joanne Jensen, Sherry Jensen, John Johns, LeRoy Johnson, Richard Johnson, Robert Johnson, Annice Jones, Dale Joneson, Lana Joneson, Michael Joneson, Virginia Jorgenson, Danny Jorgenson, Pamela Julius, Dennis Kadinger, Sharon Kadinger, Laura Kamben, Mark Kangas, Annajoyce Keizer, Henrietta Keyman, Patsy Kibbee, Wanda Killen.

Dianna Kimball, Frank King, Judy Kirbach, Dennis Klitzke, Mildred Knauer, Kathleen Knopf, Arthur Koenekamp, Curtis Koepp, Lana Koepp, Priscilla Koepp, Thomas Kolb, Rite Kolbrek, Sharon Kosberg, Sharon Krohn, Larry Krueger, David Krumbach, Duane Krumbach, Angela Kuper, Susan Kupper, Dennis Kutil, Rose Ann Kutil, Michael Knusela, Sharon Kvam, Billy Laird, Judy Laird, Larry Lambert, James Landman, Jim Lang, Lawrence Lang, Everette Lanpher, Donna Larson, James Larson, Laura Larson, Linda Larson, Michael Larson, Sharon Larson, Barbara Laur, Blanche Lawhead, Merwin Lawrence, Paula Jo Lawrence, Alvin Lee, Karla Leithoff, Donald Letcher, Alma Leu, Daryl Nagel, Jim Namanny, Eleanor Nelson.

James Lewis, LeRoy Liesenger, Jerry Lips, Kathy Litz, LeAnne Lorenz, Sharon Lorenz, Stephen Lorenzen, Larry Lowe, David Madsen, Walter Mager, Marie Mainolfi, Thomas Malone, Marcia Maluchnik, James Marsh, Frances Martin, Francis Martin, Robert Martin, Barbara Matthies, Henry Matthies, David Mavity, Mary Mennenga, Doug Meyer, Harlan Meyer, Janet Meyer, Carol Meyerink, Diane Meyerink, Terry Middlen, Audrey Mielitz, Gregory Miller, Lloydine Miller, Mary Miller, Sandra Miller, Larry Mofle, Steven Monrad, Gloria Moore, Marjorie Morris, Susan Moxnes, Colleen Mriden, Dorothy Munce, Elroy Munce, James Munce, Nolene Myers, Joan McCaffrey, Steve McCaulley, Sheldon McConniel, Danny McDonald, Judith McKercher.

Gladys Nelson, Nancy Nelson, Shirley Nelson, Byron Nesheim, Donna Ness, Harold Ness, Allen Nessan, Kandie Nickelson, Malcolm Nickelson, Barbara Nieber, Sandra Nieber, Sharon Noteboom, Michael Nowka, Larry Oakley, Karen Oberg, Patty Oberg, Clifford O'Connor, Dennis Ogdie, Richard Ogdie, Carolyn Olen, Betty Olson, Diana Olson, Gregory Olson, Larry Olson, Patricia Olson, Stanley Olson, Linda Olstad, Landis Osterberg, Sheryl Ostgaard, Peggy Paetow, Rita Paetow, Dianne Paulson, Judy Paulson, Thomas Paulson, Michael Pesicka, Patsy Pesicka, Tommy Peters, Marlene Peterson, Millie Peterson, Rita Peterson, Frances Pickering, Pat Pickering, Mark Porter, Michael Potter, Edward Powderly, Patty Ann Powderly.

Patricia Preston, Charles Pugh, Twila Pulford, Sharon Quigley, JoAnn Questad, Ronald Raabe, Clarence Raile, Robert Redmond, David Reents, Mary Regas, Olympia Regas, John Reiter, Leonard Reiter, Shirley Rensburger, Ronald Renspie, Ronnie Reylats, Roger Reynolds, Maurida Richard, Carol Richmond, Marty Ridenour, Timothy Riley, Douglas Rima, Linda Ring, Lynn Rolfson, Maryls Rolfson, Kathleen Rollinger, Nikolaj Romanowski, Duane Rosheim, Donald Rote, Michael Rothenbuehler, Vickie Rubin, Gail Runge, Karen Runge, Karla Runge, Judy Rush, Connie Russell, Lawrence Russo, Judy St. Clair, Armond Sailer, Jimmie Sargent, Karen Saxer, Margaret Schave, Michael Schave, Cheryl Schmeyer, Nancy Schroer, Bonnie Schutt, Robert Selig, Donna Severson.

Edward Shafer, William Shaff, Craig Shav, Wayne Sherwood, Kenneth Shoop, Micheal Shoop, Walter Sichmeller, Billy Simon, Paul Simonson, Candice Skillman, Miles Skillman,

Carol Skinlo, Constance Smith, Gerald Smith, Noreen Smith, Rollie Smith, Sandra Smith, Marlene Smithback, Robert Snapp, Jeanne Sneller, Dennis Snelling, Stephen Sona, Kathy Sowell, Roger Sowell, Marilyn Spicer, Rickford Standing, Donald Stansbury, Victor Stellow, Fred Steineke, John Stengle, Linda Stengle, Robert Sterner, Dennis Stoakes, Rosalie Stoakes, David Storevik, Donald Storgarrd, Billie Story, Janice Story, Patricia Stovall, Terry Strum, Roger Sunde, Carol Sundermann, Janice Sundermann, Carol Sundet, Sheryl Sundet, Linda Swiden, Virgil Taber, Tommie Tamblyn.

Rita Taylor, Roger Taylor, Gloria Tebben, Larry Tebben, Janet Theel, Robert Thesenvitz, Gary Thie, Gary Thomas, Larry Thompson, Louise Thompson, Richard Thompson, Robert Thompson, Sandra Thompson, Linda Thoreson, Sandra Thosren, Carl Thorne, Connie Thorne, James Thorne, Judy Tilden, Larry Tilden, Kent Todd, Diane Tordoff, Otis Torkelson, Mary Toussaint, Diana Tracy, Sandra Trumbull, Cheryl Turner, Jennifer Uithoven, John Uithoven, Beverly VanBerkum, Renae Vanderlinde, Eugene VanDiepen, David VanMiddendorp, Donald VanMiddendrop, Gale VanRegenmorter, Gary VanRegenmorter, Ellen Vassar, Darrell Venenga, Larry Venenga, Sadie Venenga, Barbara Vickney, Robert Vickney, Sharol Viereck, Gary Voight, Steve Waggoner, Thomas Waggoner, Janette Wagner, Sharon Wallenberg.

Donna Wallenstein, Larry Wallenstein, Bruce Wallin, Leonard Wallin, Jessica Walls, Judith Walls, Dennis Wardlow, Nancy Wardlow, Duane Waring, Rita Warring, Pamela Watne, Thomas Wehling, Susan Weinstein, David Wentzel, Bob Wesdorp, Terry Wessel, Ronnie Westlund, Peggy White, Carol Wibeto, David Wibeto, Douglas Wierenga, Gary Wiese, Barbara Wilking, Frank Willard, Larry Willer, David Williams, Diana Wills, Dean Wilson, Warren Wintrode, Cheryl Wise, Roger Wiswell, Charles Witt, Anna Wodzinski, Betty Wolf, Jerry Wolff, Michael Wosje, Wayne Yarrow, Charlotte Yesda, Larry Zierath, Richard Zirpel, Robert Ziske, Bill Ziske, Ronnie Zucker.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on official business for the first 3 days of next week.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as may be necessary to explain my amendment, now pending.

Mr. President, the amendment is the result of information which I have received from the Honorable Charles R. Ross, chairman of the Vermont Public Service Board, who has brought to my attention a serious situation in the State of Vermont with respect to the problem of securing adequate financing for some 59 small, privately owned water companies.

I am sure similar situations must prevail in many other States. These companies are, in a very real sense, utilities. They are subject to regulation by the Vermont Public Service Board. In addition, there are three water cooperatives providing the same service for their members in the rural communities in which they are located.

A look at the financial record of these companies will show that their owners are not trying to get rich through this kind of enterprise. But they are providing a vital service. In nearly every case this is a very necessary community service.

Mr. Ross tells me that some of these companies are in urgent need of additional capital to make the necessary improvements to provide adequate service. Local banks and other sources of capital refuse to make any additional loans and, in one case cited by Mr. Ross, the company must amortize its small loans now outstanding over a period of 10 years.

It would seem to be extremely unrealistic to require an individual owner to furnish equity capital for utility improvements in a water system of this kind.

In one Vermont town a small system has been condemned because of lead contamination. A retired man owns the company, but he cannot get financing to lay a new system, so the customers may have to drill their own wells. Another company, with more than 300 customers, is in urgent need of additional capital to make essential improvements but private financing cannot be obtained.

It is essential that these companies be assisted in their efforts to serve their customers, and also be prepared to extend their lines and bring water to additional customers in the normal course of community development.

In other words, the community development cannot take place without the water system, and the water system cannot be put on a profitable basis without the community development. It is another case of whether the hen or the egg comes first; one is vital to the other, of course.

A listing of these companies, showing their revenues, expenses, and net income, among other basic financial data, was made by the Vermont Public Service Board last November.

Only seven of these companies gross more than $10,000 annually, and the net income of these companies ranges between $1,770 and $7,851. Of the seven, the highest customer load is 767; the lowest is 286. The remaining private water companies in Vermont are much smaller, mostly netting profits that can be spelled out in two or three figures. Aside from these seven, none has a gross in excess of $6,000.

Under existing law, these companies and the three Vermont cooperatives cannot qualify for public facility loans. The Housing and Home Finance Agency is only authorized to make loans to State and municipal agencies.

The situation in Vermont, in regard to our water companies, would appear to be unique in the national picture, but I feel there are several other States in the same or a similar situation. The amendment I propose to the housing bill would give relief to the Vermont water companies in regard to the situation which exists in Vermont. As I say, I am satisfied there are other States—there must be many other States—in the same or similar situation.

The change I propose would amend section 202(a) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 by including, in the authority of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the power to make loans to privately owned public utilities and cooperatives providing water service to the public at rates or charges which are subject to regulation by a State regulatory body.

I hope that this amendment will be accepted. It will be simple change in the law. It will create no abuse. It will only assist Vermont's small water companies and water cooperatives in their work, which is essential to the development of our rural communities.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have looked over the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont, and I have briefly discussed it with him. I should like to ask the Senator two or three questions in order to make certain that my understanding of the proposal is correct.

Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment would apply only to utilities? The Senator uses the terms "utilities" and "cooperatives," I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And then uses the term "providing water service."

I should like to be certain that the term "providing water service" applies both to the word "utilities" and to the word "cooperatives." In other words, I wish to be certain the Senator from Vermont is not trying to cover any type of utility other than water service companies.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is entirely correct. I believe that a company which provides water service to a community in my State is a public utility. At least it reports to the public service commission. Its rates come under the jurisdiction of the public service commission. In offering the amendment it is certainly not my intention to make any public utilities, other than those that provide water services to communities, eligible for loans.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The term "public utility" is a rather broad term, and could cover telephone companies.

Mr. AIKEN. It covers some rather important enterprises.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The term could cover electric and telephone companies and other companies of that kind. I wanted to be certain that the limiting term "providing water service" would apply only to the type of utility that the Senator is trying to reach, which is a company that provides water service.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree completely with the Senator from Alabama, who is the chairman of the subcommittee. It is my purpose to cover only utilities that are providing water service, and only the water service which is being provided by those utilities. I am inter-

ested in making the meaning absolutely clear, because I realize that a slip of type or the addition of a comma here and there would give the amendment a different meaning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wanted to be certain that such was the intention of the Senator. I think that a fair interpretation of the law would be as the Senator described, although a question might arise. As the Senator said, if there should be some slip in printing, the provision might become applicable to all utilities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I will, but first I wish to make a statement. The situation is not unique so far as Vermont is concerned. While it is true that in my State practically all the water service companies are municipal bodies—and I believe the great majority of them throughout the country are—there are private companies in the State of Alabama, but they are all regulated by the public service commission in our State. So the proposed amendment would apply to my State, and I am sure it would apply to other States.

Mr. AIKEN. The amendment is not intended to apply to loans for the extension of telephone service or electric lines, because provision is already made for such loans through other laws. The amendment would apply only to the making of loans for providing water service to communities.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the Senator's amendment contemplates making eligible for loans privately owned public utilities and cooperatives providing water service to the public, which companies do not now receive the benefits provided in the Community Facilities Act. Is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. It is intended to provide loans for maintenance and extension, or providing water service to communities, and is not intended to cover other public utility services.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The provisions of the amendment would make the modified law applicable throughout the whole country, and not merely in the State of Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct. The situation may be a little accentuated in the State of Vermont. Many small water companies were organized because someone had had to provide water for a community. In most cases they are making virtually no progress in their endeavor. They come under the jurisdiction of the Vermont Public Service Board, however, so far as their rate structure is concerned. As I have pointed out, sometimes they are ordered, perhaps by the board of health, to make changes in their system. They do not have the necessary money to make such changes. Nevertheless, communities must have that type of service if they are to develop and grow as our small communities in Vermont are now doing.

While I have in mind the situation in the State of Vermont, I am satisfied that there must be many other States in which the same situation prevails.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To clarify for the RECORD the context of the Community Facilities Act, it provides predominantly for the making of loans; but it does contain some provisions for the making of grants; does it not?

Mr. AIKEN. Not for this purpose.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. The Senator has in mind another provision, which provides grants to urban communities for planning purposes only.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment, however, contemplates no gifts or grants to private utilities or cooperatives. It would authorize the making of loans.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And such loans would be confined to utilities and cooperatives which provide water service, but would not deal with telephone companies, electric companies, or otherwise.

Mr. AIKEN. That is the intention of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont discuss a bit further the provisions of other laws which deal with loans to cooperatives? A moment ago he stated that other laws deal with telephone and other utility companies.

Mr. AIKEN. I would prefer to have the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] discuss the subject of telephones and the extension of rural electric lines, because he is a specialist in the field.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Vermont is most modest; but his statement gives me the opportunity to say that the Senator from Vermont is one of the founders and writers of the law that provides service under the Rural Electrification Act. The law provides for loans for rural electrification. Later, by an amendment that was authored by my colleague from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and of which I believe the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] was a cosponsor, the terms of the act were extended to cover rural telephones. I presume that is the law which the Senator from Vermont had in mind. As I said, the Senator from Vermont was one of those most responsible for that act being placed on the statute books originally. He has certainly been one of its strong defenders through the years, and it has been a wonderful privilege to work with him.

Mr. AIKEN. The difference is that, insofar as the Electrification Administration is concerned, practically all loans are made to cooperative organizations.

The loans under the rural telephone program——

Mr. SPARKMAN. They may be made to either type of utility.

Mr. AIKEN. In the northeastern part of the country they are nearly all made to privately owned telephone systems.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe that situation would be true generally throughout the country, although they may be made to either.

Mr. AIKEN. The rural electrification loans could have been made to privately owned companies, but those companies did not see fit to avail themselves of the opportunity. Therefore, all the REA loans are made to cooperative organizations.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe some private companies used REA loans for the purpose of making extensions of the rural sections.

Mr. AIKEN. They may have, but they have been doing it with regard to telephone systems.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is my understanding correct, that there are already in existence laws that authorize the making of loans to rural electric companies and to telephone companies, both private and public?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment would authorize the making of loans to water service companies.

Mr. AIKEN. To private and cooperative companies. In the large cities and towns almost invariably the water system is owned by the public or the city anyway.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Such systems are already covered under the law.

Mr. AIKEN. They are already covered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the interest rate which private companies would be required to pay under the amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I am unable to answer that question. I refer the Senator's question to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot give the interest rate accurately at this moment, but it is approximately 4⅛ percent and fully compensatory to the Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is fully compensatory to the Government?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it set up under a formula?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. That is to be found in section 203 of the act, as follows:

> Such notes or other obligations shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities as of the last day of the month preceding the issuance of such notes or other obligations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The interest provision on these loans would be different from the interest provision on the FHA loans?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it be different from the interest provisions on the telephone loans?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; because that rate is the same as the REA rate. It is different from the formula with which the Senator is familiar, for college housing loans, which, as the Senator knows, is based upon the average rate that the Government must pay on all outstanding obligations, plus one-quarter of 1 percent for administrative expenses.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the interest rate on REA loans now? Is it 2 percent?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The REA rate has always been 2 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. This would be 4⅜ percent, by the application of the present formula?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that a very useful little book is on the desk of each Senator. It is entitled "Housing Legislation of 1961—Review of Federal Housing Programs." It contains a brief explanation of all housing programs under the Federal Government. I am quoting from page 103 of the book, with reference to interest rates:

The Administrator has established basic interest rates of 4⅛ percent for general obligation bonds and 4⅜ percent for revenue bonds or other types of obligations, effective February 2, 1961.

Mr. GRUENING. From what page is the Senator reading now?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Page 103 of the small green book. The small green books do not seem to be on the Senators' desks. They are supposed to be. There are supposed to be two books on every Senator's desk; one is the hearings, and the other the small book to which I am referring now. It was prepared by the subcommittee and covers the various housing laws. The books are being distributed now.

These basic rates apply to issues having a maturity period of 30 years or more; one-eighth of 1 percent is deducted for each full 5-year reduction from the 30-year period.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If we lend at 2 percent to rural electric companies and to telephone companies, is there not the danger that the water companies—that is, privately owned water companies—will come and ask that we lend to them at 2 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. I would very much doubt it. The rate of 2 percent for rural electric loans was fixed to enable them to extend into areas where it would be economically infeasible to extend at the regular rate of interest. It is true that many REA loans have gone into what was called skim-milk territory. These communities have been built up, and there is now a controversy as to whether or not the rate should be changed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. If the amendment is adopted, is there any contemplation of their later coming in and asking that the rate of interest be set at 2 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. I would say not; certainly definitely not on my part.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would say that the committee would not look with favor on it. The 2-percent interest rate for REA was set in 1935. I believe that is the date. It may have been 1934.

Mr. AIKEN. It was many years ago.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The REA Act was passed in 1935. The rate was purposely set at a subsidy rate for the purpose of pushing these lines out into areas that private companies had not found feasible to enter. Based upon the statement I have made, we need not fear ever having an application made. The low rate of interest has been in effect for 26 years, and so far as I know, no request has ever been made for that interest rate on any kind of Government loan.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am delighted to hear both Senators state that they would not subscribe to any effort to have the interest rate set at something less than what would be reimbursable to the Government when it has to borrow money.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would subscribe to that statement. I do not know, but perhaps the Senator may have been a member of the Banking and Currency Committee when the interest rate under the public facility loan program was set. The Senator was at one time a member of the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. At any rate, we set it at what we considered to be an absolutely fair rate to the Government, which was reasonable to permit small towns and communities to be able to support these loans.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I do not suppose there is any estimate in existence of the calls that would be made for loans to help these water companies, is there?

Mr. AIKEN. I would expect that they would be rather few, because as a community grows, and gets large enough, it goes in for a municipal system. It is the small communities, of no more than a dozen or 100 houses, which are having trouble right now. Banks are not interested in making these loans, because it would take a long time to pay the loans off, and the banks can get more for their money in other investments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am satisfied with the amendment. I know of no opposition to it. I am glad to accept it. I ask that the Chair state the question.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Do both Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield back the remainder of my time, and I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6-1-61-M."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 59, line —, insert the following:

FELLOWSHIPS FOR CITY PLANNING AND URBAN STUDIES

SEC. 315. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 annually, for a three-year period commencing on July 1, 1961, to be used by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for the purpose of providing fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists as provided below. Persons shall be selected for such fellowships solely on the basis of ability. Fellowships shall be solely for training in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields (including architecture, civil engineering, economics, municipal finance, public administration, and sociology), which programs are oriented to training for careers in city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal, and community development. The Administrator shall, in the administration of this section, consult with, and secure the advice of, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes in support of the amendment.

Mr. President, this amendment would authorize to be appropriated not to exceed $500,000 annually, for a 3-year period, for the purpose of providing fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians and specialists. These persons would be selected on the basis of ability to be trained solely in public and private nonprofit institutions of higher education having programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields. The amendment has the same purpose as section 708 of S. 57, the housing bill of 1959, which was passed by the Senate but failed of passage in the House of Representatives.

One of the crying needs for personnel in our increasingly urban civilization is in the field of city planning and related fields, such as housing, urban renewal, and the like. At the present time, some 300 technical positions in city and regional planning are unfilled. This is because there simply is not a sufficient number of persons who are qualified to fill them. This shortage arises, in part, from the newness of the field and, in part, from the competition of fellowships for graduate training in older fields, such as medicine, mathematics, physics, and chemistry. Only about 30 schools offer degrees in planning, and they are turning out about 200 graduate students this year. Most of these schools could expand their enrollments substantially, and other institutions might be willing to initiate graduate programs in planning and related fields.

The need for trained personnel in these fields will increase significantly. The President's legislative program for housing and community development will involve about $3,500 million of Federal funds and a significant amount of local matching funds. The Federal Government, then, has a vital concern with the availability of trained personnel at the local, State, and Federal levels of government.

The rate of urban renewal activity may well double, and it is likely that there will be new programs for the preservation of open space. The problems of urban transportation, which are dealt with for the first time in this bill, are bound to involve increasing Federal attention.

To administer these programs effectively at all levels, it is essential to have a substantial increase in the number of trained technicians. To meet this vital need, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator would, under my amendment, be authorized to undertake a program of fellowships to be financed with appropriated funds. The fellowships would be provided for graduate training in the field of city planning and in related fields, such as architecture, civil engineering, economics, municipal finance, public administration, and sociology. Accredited public and private nonprofit institutions eligible to partici-

pate in the program would be those having recognized programs in one or more of these fields oriented to training for careers in city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal, and community development.

Fellowship grants would be limited to graduate students and generally would be of not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years duration. The grants would probably range up to $2,000 to $3,000 an academic year. The recipients of these grants would be selected solely on the basis of their ability.

In determining which schools would be eligible, how the students would be selected, the amount of the grants, and the conditions surrounding the provision of such grants, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator would consult with and secure the advice of the Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the recognized educational and professional associations in these fields.

It may be asked why this amendment is not included in the bill as it comes to the floor; and it may also be asked why this amendment is not incorporated in either the bill to extend the National Defense Education Act or in the higher education bill which shortly will come before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for hearing and consideration. The answer to the first question is that this provision was omitted from the housing bill in the erroneous belief that it might be better to try to include it in one of the two educational bills. In large part, this was my fault because, as a member of the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that perhaps this scholarship proposal should be included in the education bill instead of being handled, as last year, in the housing bill. But the staff and other Senators on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare held rather to the view that special scholarships in particular fields could best be considered in bills dealing with those fields, rather than in a general education bill. This is the way in which scholarships in scientific fields have long been handled.

By the time I was able to report back to the Senator from Alabama that it seemed wiser to handle these scholarships in the housing bill, that bill was out of the committee. So at his suggestion I have prepared this amendment, which I hope he will be in a position to accept.

The amendment which I am now offering is, in fact, originally the brain child of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who first presented it to the Subcommittee on Housing.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Do I correctly understand the purpose of the amendment to be the training of city planners in a field where there is not a sufficient number of such qualified persons?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRUENING. This is of great interest to us in Alaska, because Alaska has some young communities which are expanding. As so frequently happens, particularly on the frontier, they are expanding in a rather haphazard, helter-skelter fashion. It is obvious that city planning by competent professional city planners would be highly useful to such communities. Therefore, with Alaska's needs in mind, I am very much in favor of the amendment, if it can be usefully made applicable to my State.

Could the Senator from Pennsylvania tell me, for instance, how the University of Alaska, which is greatly concerned with the development of our young State, and destined to play an important part in assisting that development, might be included in the program? I am certain that the university authorities would be interested to know.

Mr. CLARK. I think the University of Alaska would have to provide—and for all I know, it may do so now—graduate training leading to a graduate degree in city planning, a degree which young men and women would receive upon completing their fellowships.

Mr. GRUENING. Assuming the University of Alaska has not made this preparation—because, after all, it is still a relatively youthful institution—I am interested in knowing how it could enter this field properly and render the service in community planning which would be useful and needed in Alaska.

Mr. CLARK. My suggestion—and it is a suggestion off the top of my head—is that the Senator from Alaska and other fine citizens of Alaska who are interested in this field should, perhaps, select half a dozen young men and women who have a high standing in the University of Alaska and apply for them, or have them apply, for graduate fellowships under this proposal, and attend institutions, of which there are, I think, 30, where proper instruction is given. Then they should return to Alaska and start a department of this kind in the University of Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Pennsylvania; I shall follow it up. For instance, in connection with the development of Alaska's big oil boom, communities in the Kenai Peninsula, such as Kenai and Soldatna, are expanding rapidly, but they are without any professional city planning. Pretty soon they will be in a situation in which they will have wished they had planned more carefully in the beginning. It seems to me that the experts who could be trained by such a program as is contemplated by the Senator from Pennsylvania and sought by his amendment would be very helpful in Alaska and in the other 49 States, as well.

Mr. CLARK. I am very much interested in the Senator's comments, because his State is a rapidly developing one for which the future is rosy. A similar situation exists in Venezuela, where the discovery of vast new oilfields has called for the creation of a new city of somewhat more than 60,000 persons. But Venezuela has no city planners. So Venezuela has contracted with the joint urban study center created by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University to furnish city planners to enable the new city to be created without the headaches which are always the result of helter-skelter, unplanned growth. Perhaps the Senator from Alaska would be interested in that matter.

Mr. GRUENING. I would be very much interested in such developments. As I have said we have a similar situation in the Kenai Peninsula, where the cities of Kenai and Soldatna are mushrooming and booming because of the development of new oil wells; and in that situation, such a study and the providing of expert city planning would be very useful. So I shall be glad to look further into it.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. As I understand, the Senator's amendment contemplates authorizing the appropriation of not to exceed $500,000 annually, for a 3-year period, beginning July 1, 1961, to be used for the purpose of providing fellowships for the graduate training of professional city planning and urban and housing technicians.

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. On page 2 of the Senator's amendment we find the following:

> Solely for * * * graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields (including architecture, civil engineering, economics, municipal finance, public administration, and sociology)—

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator from Ohio should read further, as follows:

> which programs are oriented to training for careers in city and regional planning, housing, urban renewal, and community development.

In other words, the fellowships or grants, in connection with those provisions, must be oriented to, and must be a part of, training for careers in city and regional planning. I am sure that the Senator from Ohio, as a result of his service as Governor of Ohio and earlier as mayor of Cleveland, knows the necessity for a really good city planner to have some knowledge of the other areas.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; and I am glad to say that I established a city planning commission. But I did not envision the employment of sociologists, municipal finance men, public administration persons, and students in economics.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, let me interrupt the Senator from Ohio, in order to suggest the intention of this amendment, and I should like to make this part of the legislative history of the amendment: The studies in these related fields would be part of the course leading toward a concentrated degree in city planning; but these are peripheral areas about which a trained city planner has to know something if he is to be any good. I wish to make it very clear indeed that the matter included in parentheses in the amendment is not intended to be interpreted, and I do not believe it can properly be interpreted, as authorizing fellowships in these particular fields, divorced from the area of city planning.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, if I may continue briefly, let me say there is in the record of the hearings considerable testimony in support of the fellowships provided by this amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Pennsylvania state where that is to be found in the record?

Mr. CLARK. I call the attention of Senators to page 593, a part of the testimony of Harold Wise, chairman of the Legislative Committee of the American Institute of Planners, wherein in his fifth paragraph he discusses this scholarship question in much the same terms in which I have already discussed it.

Let me also refer the Senator from Ohio and other Senators to a letter which appears on page 600 of the hearings. The letter is addressed to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and is signed by Mr. Corwin R. Mocine, president of the American Institute of Planners.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF PLANNERS,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1961.

Re Housing Act of 1961 S. 1478.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing, U.S. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: In furtherance of our oral testimony before your committee, we would like to submit the following for your consideration:

EDUCATION

We continue to be most concerned about the shortage of trained and experienced personnel in the fields of urban and metropolitan planning (including research and teaching positions), urban renewal, community development, and other related fields and professions.

We foresee that the programs now in operation and needed to prepare adequately for the coming expansion of our population in urban communities and to relieve oppressive conditions in our distressed urban blighted areas will not be carried out successfully unless a greater supply of people are available in the public service professions.

While we cannot speak for the quantitative needs of other professions, we believe that the annual supply of professional planners trained in our graduate schools needs to be approximately double the current output of about 200.

We also know that there is widespread interest in urban planning as a professional career, but that promising candidates are often unable to afford the expense of the 2-year postgraduate course. There are relatively few scholarships available, as is also true in certain other public service professions.

We submit the following list of needs as expressing some of the problems involved in developing an adequate professional planning educational system.

SOME NEEDS IN SUPPORT OF PLANNING EDUCATION

1. Fellowship funds are needed to encourage high caliber students to enter the field and to help reduce the manpower problem. No highly qualified candidate for graduate study in planning should have to forego the training because of financial need. In other public service professions (such as public health and social work) the need for federally financed fellowships has been recognized, and today practically all the graduate students enrolled in these two programs throughout the country benefit from Federal fellowship grants.

2. Selecting students: Tests need to be devised to assist the planning schools in the selection of students, and to make sure these fellowship funds are to be well spent. There are no adequate tests at present. A substantial sum should be made available for this purpose and some agency such as the Educational Testing Service commissioned to develop tests which would attempt to identify the attitudes and aptitudes the planning schools should be seeking in the recruitment of students.

3. Improvement of instruction: Funds are needed to facilitate improvement of instruction within the planning schools. Most planning schools are relatively new and understaffed. Many are in somewhat isolated locations and seldom benefit from the stimulation brought about by visiting professors, lecturers, and distinguished practitioners. Inadequate travel budgets at most planning schools provide little opportunity for visits to other schools, or for attending national or regional meetings where problems of planning education are discussed.

Teachers in planning schools need to compare notes and approaches relating to instruction in a variety of subjects, and need travel grants to this end.

Summer seminars are needed to bring together the outstanding teachers of planning-related subjects along with representatives of interested planning schools to discuss course content, problems, and approaches. Summer salaries as well as stipends to cover travel and subsistence would be needed to insure optimum attendance of teachers and students in such an undertaking. Such seminars could be held over a period of several years to permit discussions in depth on such subjects as theory and history one summer, land economics and transportation another summer, etc.

Roving professorships are needed, whereby distinguished scholars and practitioners (in the pay of the Federal Government) would be made available, for a semester, on application to any planning school requesting such assistance, on the basis of demonstrated need. In this way the scarce resources in this new profession could be shared by a number of institutions.

Visiting lecturers on specific subjects from this and other countries are needed. They could be centrally selected and rotated to the educational institutions that can gain the most from them.

RESEARCH

We also continue to be appalled at the lack of support for basic and applied research to contribute insight and factual data to our housing and urban programs, except in certain problem-oriented, functional programs in the health and highway fields.

We support a strong and continued program of research and a strengthening of the role of our colleges and universities in serving this vital need.

URBAN RENEWAL POLICY

The lack of research material and data on the subject inhibits a fully adequate evaluation of the urban renewal program. Nevertheless, some guidelines are necessary to establish objectives and mark progress.

Following 2 years of intensive committee study and discussion, the board of governors of the American Institute of Planners adopted a policy statement in July 1959, with regard to urban renewal. This statement is enclosed as attachment No. 1.

We thank your committee for its interest and its diligence in the program.

Very truly yours,

CORWIN R. MOCINE,
President.

A STATEMENT OF POLICY ON URBAN RENEWAL[1]

This statement assesses the current urban renewal program, its strength and weaknesses, from the viewpoint of objectives stated in the National Housing Act of 1949. The comprehensiveness of the renewal program, the workable program concept, the relation to the Federal highway program, and the scale and continuity of the program are evaluated. The need for nonurban and fringe area renewal, the role of urban design, and the need for research are discussed. Seven policy recommendations are set forth to correct present weaknesses and strengthen the program. This statement of policy is the third one issued on the subject of redevelopment and renewal, by the AIP, since the spring of 1948. The changing concepts resulting from experience with the operation of this program make such continuous appraisal desirable. The statement was adopted by the AIP in July 1959.

THE OBJECTIVES OF URBAN RENEWAL

The basic objective of urban renewal is the improvement of the environment as it affects the urban inhabitant.

The ultimate objectives of the national program of urban renewal are well stated in the preamble of the National Housing Act of 1949. That act defined the objective as "the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and suitable living environment for every American family, thus contributing

---

[1] Adopted by the board of governors, July 29, 1959.

Committee members submitting the final report were William F. Lipman, James R. McCarthy, Olney G. Smith, Sydney Williams, and Corwin R. Mocine, chairman. The original committee chairman, George A. Duggar, resigned owing to absence from the country. Numerous helpful comments were received from workshop participants at the annual meeting of the institute held in New York on October 1958, and during the succeeding year from chapter corresponding members, and others.

This policy committee was one of seven national policy committees authorized by the board of governors in October 1957.

This policy statement supercedes and replaces the earlier AIP policy statement, "Statement of Principles for Federal Urban Redevelopment Legislation," spring 1918; "Statement of Policy on Urban Redevelopment," December 1953.

to the development and redevelopment of communities and to the advancement of the growth, wealth, and security of the Nation * * * and to an economy of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

The immediate objective of urban renewal is to reduce blight. Title I of the 1949 act, relating to slum clearance and urban redevelopment, provided a method by which this objective could be brought within reach. By making Federal grants available it filled the gap which had made State enabling legislation largely inoperative. Federal grants and loans were made part of a system of public and private, Federal, State, and local cooperation for action in blighted areas and areas threatened by blight.

THE CURRENT PROGRAM, ITS STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

More comprehensive program

The objectives of urban renewal, as have been stated, are the improvement of the urban environment through the elimination of blight and the carrying out of a comprehensive urban plan. Urban renewal is the coordinated application of all municipal powers on an area basis for the execution of a master plan. The current program falls short of the objective in several important respects. First, the Federal legislation—and therefore the majority of action programs—is limited in housing. Important areas of the community are thus left without an effective means for improvement, and a spotty and unrelated program is the result. Blight and obsolescence attack the total fabric of the community and are not limited to any one category of land use. A fully effective program to eliminate blight must, therefore, be able to attack blight wherever it exists without being hampered by artificial and arbitrary limitations on the kinds of areas which can be treated.

The workable program

The Federal requirement of a workable program for the prevention of blight as a prerequisite to Federal aid for project activity is a sound one. It recognizes that if the program is to be successful, all the resources of the community—both public and private—must be effectively utilized. Again, the program often falls short of this goal. Many communities are failing to integrate fully urban renewal into the activities of local government; the Federal Government also fails to carry out its own sound philosophy. Thus we see communities spending vast sums on limited project areas which are not fundamentally related to a comprehensive plan. In other cities, clearance and rebuilding are going ahead in small areas while a lack of code enforcement and poor municipal housekeeping permit much larger areas to continue to deteriorate. A third weakness is seen in the community where renewal is not properly related to activities of the older and more traditional departments of municipal government. At a minimum, this means a waste of scarce local resources, in that local improvements are not employed as contributions to renewal. At worst, the whole future of a renewed area may be endangered through the action of another department of local government or of a State or county government—as, for instance, when the subsequent construction of a freeway or an airport destroys the amenity of a residential area.

Relation to the highway program

This raises the subject of the relation of the urban renewal program to the Federal highway program. These are two federally instigated programs which hold the potential of a massive and permanent effect upon the form of American cities and metropolitan areas. Except for the coordination which may be supplied at the local level, however, each one is apparently operating entirely independently of the other. With a recognition of their interdependence and a clear policy at the Federal level, each of these programs could act to complement and strengthen the other. This mutual support can range all the way from urban renewal assistance in right-of-way acquisition, and the use of right-of-way clearance to eliminate blighted structures at the most elementary level, to a carefully planned and programed employment of freeway location and redevelopment activity to recast and improve the development pattern in large sections of cities and metropolitan areas. Such imaginative and constructive joint use of the highway and urban renewal programs will only become general when there is a clear statement of Federal policy, when procedures and governmental review encourage cooperative action, and when local government recognizes the great potentialities which exist and prepares strong and meaningful general plans designed to make full use of these tremendous development tools.

The lack of a firm policy statement at the Federal level interrelating the highway and urban renewal programs undoubtedly stems from the fragmented approach of the Federal Government to local problems. It seems certain that maximum coordination, and therefore maximum efficiency and results, will only be attained when there is a Cabinet-level department in the National Government responsible for leadership, research, assistance, and coordination in seeking solutions to the many problems of the country's urban communities.

While we are on the subject of the highway program, we cannot avoid a mention of the financial resources that have been committed to it as contrasted with the support for renewal. The highway program has been enormously increased. Failure to increase urban renewal outlays as fast as those for highways argues either that the accumulated problems of urban blight are of a lesser scale than the problems of highway deficiency, or that we admit of a sudden shift in our sense of values as between ease in mobility and decency in occupancy.

Scale and continuity of program

The urban renewal program has suffered, particularly during the past 2 years, from inadequate appropriations, uncertainty as to its future, and failure of the administration to enunciate a clear and continuing policy. The magnitude of the problem in most American cities, the difficult task of providing for relocation without causing community dislocation and great human misery, and the limited financial resources which most cities can devote to the program, mean that renewal must be a long-range program conducted slowly and carefully over a period of years. The general neighborhood renewal plan technique, which Congress has wisely provided, encourages cities to plan and schedule project activity as much as 10 years in advance. The prospective authorization of citywide renewal programing will strengthen long-range planning for renewal. The refusal of the administration to commit funds or even to spell out a policy of support on a long-range basis, however, makes this advance planning uncertain or even futile. In order to take full advantage of urban renewal, as we have pointed out, cities must make great efforts in many directions—including recasting of codes and ordinances, reorganization of existing governmental structure, major investments of time and money in general and detailed planning, and careful integration of public works programs, municipal budgets, and bonded debt programs. Cities cannot be expected to undertake such expensive, difficult, and revolutionary actions in the face of the present Federal ambivalence as to the future of the program. Twenty years of experience has shown that, unaided, the cities are financially incapable of dealing with urban blight except on a totally inadequate scale. If we are to accomplish the objective of a decent, safe, and sanitary home for every American family, assistance from a higher level of government must be adequate and continuous. The Federal Government has initiated the program and has encouraged cities to undertake it. This responsibility cannot now be shifted to some other level of government. In fact, to achieve a satisfactory progress in urban renewal, every level of government will have to increase its efforts.

The appropriate scale and pace for an expanded urban renewal program needs to take account of the fact that America is rapidly becoming a country of metropolitan areas.

America's domestic and foreign economies rely upon the efficiency of the great urban plant contained within these areas. Their people and their housing and community facilities are the mainspring of our national efforts in both peace and war. Accordingly, the health of these areas, in terms of urban living conditions, is vital to our national welfare.

The dimensions of a national urban renewal program must be set in terms of metropolitan housing and transportation requirements, together with the anciliary public works programs attendant upon proper metropolitan functioning. There is simply no lesser strategy possible if we are interested in survival.

The much greater priority in disposition of our national resources accorded to metropolitan renewal must be matched by efforts on a similar scale at the State and local levels. The States, in particular, must put much greater legal power and financial resources at the disposal of metropolitan renewal efforts. Cities and counties must face up to the responsibilities as well as the prerogatives of local autonomy in such matters as code enforcement, standards of development, and programing of public works. Those local jurisdictions which cooperate in metropolitan efforts should be boldly aided; those which resist or obstruct areawide efforts must be coerced.

Need for nonurban and fringe-area renewal

The necessarily enlarged program of metropolitan renewal should not obscure the fact that a substantial amount of renewal is required at the unincorporated fringes of today's metropolitan areas and in the nearby hinterlands which will become the urbanized areas of the next decade.

Past and present renewal programs have ignored the reality of nonurban slums and blight. They have similarly ignored the fact that vastly increased mobility, accessibility, and the general increase in population have created for many rural areas the most pressing developmental and renewal problems.

These rural areas often serve great metropolitan populations as seasonal recreational reservoirs, without the year-round tax base to support needed facilities and planning to accommodate such use. Such areas also often contain the irreplaceable soil, water, and forest resources upon which the national interest, in the final analysis, depends.

Unregulated developments not only blights in advance the preurban hinterland, but may also seriously disrupt the natural regime upon which water supplies and similar resources depend. Conservation in the renewal sense of the word, therefore, cannot be restricted to urban neighborhoods. The apparatus of renewal must be refashioned to serve the demands of nonmetropolitan, even nonurban, regions. Further, these demands and their solutions cannot longer be accorded greatly lowered priority by administrators and planners with an urban bias. It

is true, however, that a tremendous flow of Federal funds now support the rural economy. The persistence of rural blight in the face of these expenditures argues for the reorientation of existing rural programs and their expansion to now untouched problems. Thus we could begin to cope with rural blight without further diluting the already inadequate support for urban renewal by the attempt to stretch it over all the rural areas of the Nation.

Urban design in renewal

Disorderly appearance is a recognized symptom of urban blight. Many parts of contemporary urban communities are as deficient by esthetic standards as they are when measured by social, economic, and functional standards. Urban ugliness is a liability to those who live, visit, and invest in urban areas. Improvement of the appearance of urban areas is thus a significant objective of urban renewal. Renewal offers an opportunity to secure superior urban design when relatively large areas of land are improved under coordinated design leadership and relatively uniform site and building controls.

Large-scale developers are making increasing use of architectural services, and are insisting upon the inclusion of architectural control in their disposition contracts. Renewal agencies have an even greater responsibility to the community, both in insisting on site design and architecture of superior quality in renewal plans, and in including architectural controls to guide the work of individual developers.

Unfortunately, urban renewal, even when large-scale clearance and redevelopment is included, does not necessarily insure improved urban appearance. Even where the project is economically sound, poor site planning and architecture is possible. Even good project design, if insensitive to the scale, color, and three-dimensional pattern of surrounding areas, may be destructive of the appearance of the city as a whole. Thus, urban renewal is faced with unique design challenges and responsibilities.

Naturally, urban renewal should utilize to the utmost modern advances in site planning and architecture. At the same time, the design of an urban renewal project should enhance, rather than weaken, the esthetic values inherent in the traditional structure of the surrounding city. Lastly, the design of the project should contribute to the development of an intelligible visual design for the entire urban complex. Members of the planning profession have the inescapable responsibility for preparing general urban design plans into which precise urban renewal plans can be fitted. They must insist on attention to the visual implications of project proposals, commencing at the preliminary planning stage; on a much higher order of design from both redevelopers and public authorities; and finally, on a much greater awareness by participating citizens of the benefits to be derived from conscious attention to urban appearance.

The need for research

The institute favors greatly augmented research on urban renewal, in the conviction that research will "pay off" in urban renewal no less than in rockets or automobiles.

1. A basis must be laid for better analysis of just what costs and benefits, in the broadest sense, are flowing from urban renewal activities; this analysis should distinguish and compare the many approaches which are emerging in this rapidly changing field. Even more important, systematic study and research is needed in order to determine more clearly what should be done.

2. Great systems and chains of cities are the hallmark of this age, throughout much of the world. Sporadic interchange of ideas, experience, and of personnel trained in urban development and urban renewal between a few countries of the Atlantic community is not sufficient to provide planners with the main elements of what current world urbanization is teaching. The most critical problems of urban development and the most interesting experimentation may occur outside our own country, and almost any country may be the scene of it. The institute stands ready to support greatly improved interchange of ideas, to examine into the best methods to accomplish this, and to work with other organizations to this end.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE AIP

In order to achieve an urban renewal program adequate to its high purposes and to correct the deficiencies discussed above, the following specific recommendations constitute the policy of the AIP:

1. Federal and State legislation should be broadened to allow urban renewal to attack blight wherever it is found without arbitrary limitations as to the existing or future land use.

2. The concept of the workable program should be retained and strengthened to insure that the total resources of the community are employed in the urban renewal program both to prevent and to eliminate blight, and that urban renewal is constructively related to the total urban and metropolitan complex through the instrumentality of a sound and comprehensive general plan.

3. Federal and State legislation should make specific provision and requirement for the integration of renewal with all other applicable public works programs, particularly the tremendous Federal highway program. Attainment of this objective will also depend upon improved cooperation between State and local authorities in the planning and construction of highway projects.

4. Federal support for renewal should be continued, increased, and given continuity, and State and local support increased, in order that urban renewal can become in fact what it has been in theory—a long-range, continuing program, adequate to meet the tremendous challenge of urban and metropolitan blight.

5. Although urban renewal is by definition an urban program, its scope should be broadened to enable it to accomplish vital conservation in nonurban areas and in the preurban fringes of metropolitan areas. This widening of scope should not, however, weaken the financial support for the existing urban program.

6. Urban general plans must include elements concerned with urban design to serve as guides for the more specific design of renewal and redevelopment projects in order that such activities may make a positive contribution to the visual enhancement of the total urban scene.

7. In order that we may bring a deeper and clearer understanding to the task of renewing and redeveloping our cities and metropolitan areas, urban research should be materially increased and an active and well-organized program should be established for exchange of information and experience with all other countries of the world.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I have received from William L. C. Wheaton, director of the Institute of Urban Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and one of the outstanding experts in the entire area of housing, urban redevelopment, and city planning, a copy of a letter which he wrote under date of May 10, to Mr. Robert C. Weaver, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Wheaton to Mr. Weaver be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 10, 1961.

Mr. ROBERT C. WEAVER,
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: My associates in Washington have recently expressed concern that the administration appears to be reluctant to give firm support to the proposal for a special program of fellowships in graduate instruction in city planning. They tell me that the Senate committee continues to be sympathetic to a proposition which the Senate has already passed; and that there is sympathy on the House side too, which should make such legislation possible this year—with administration support. I appreciate the tactical and jurisdictional difficulties in the House. May I, for this reason, make my reasoning perfectly clear and explicit?

The need for special scholarship aid for city planning arises directly from Federal-grant programs. HHFA proposes to spend $10 to $20 million per year in 701 grants. It proposes to spend $600 million per year in renewal grants of which 2 up to 3 percent will normally go for planning, or, let's say, $10 million. Coordination with highway planning in urban areas may involve a planning expenditure of one-half percent in such areas—another $10 million per year. Workable program and the like add to the local needs. Of course, these are just Federal aid programs. In almost every case, these are matched by local governments with other directly and indirectly generated demands for planning services. If we were to add up the needs generated by other Federal programs, we would probably get a much larger planning expenditure requirement.

In most city planning operations, we can expect $1 out of $4 to be for professionally trained people. At such a ratio, the U.S. Government is generating a demand for professional city planning work of $88 million per year or more from three specific programs. If planners' average salaries were $8,000, we might say that this demand was for an additional thousand planners.

As against this need, the schools are now turning out approximately 200 students a year. It would take 5 years for them to meet needs generated in 1 year. An inevitable result is that planning work is done by architects and engineers and other persons with only indirect preparation. We can be sure that the money will be used, whether well or poorly. The schools have a capacity to turn out more students. There are now 30 schools offering degrees in city planning; they could readily turn out 400–500 people per year if they could finance the students. They cannot get students in considerable degree because other fields offer more money for graduate scholarships. About 300 scholarships a year would fill up the present school capacity and probably generate additional equivalent capacity. It might well result in a doubling of present enrollments.

There is no serious issue over who administers a scholarship program. It is essential, however, that the program be earmarked for city planning and closely related types of graduate work. A general scholarship program for the social sciences will not meet the need. Out of every general scholarship program, about one applicant in a thousand will be a city planning applicant. I don't believe that city planning applicants are any better or any worse than those in other fields, but ratios of students in other fields to students in city planning suggest that it would be necessary for the Federal Government to offer 300,000 scholarships or more in order to get 300 graduate students

in city planning. It might be educating 700 sociologists and 10,000 physical educationists (I offer no comment on the merits) a year in order to produce 300 needed city planners. This doesn't make sense. As I understand it, HEW doesn't like to administer special purpose programs, except in health or education. The simplest way to meet this need, which is small but vital, is to authorize a special 5-year emergency program, have the HHFA receive the authority and the funds, and to have the program administered either by HEW as a special purpose program, or by HHFA directly.

As for the final issue, the scope of the program, I have argued this in terms of city planning; but there are other needs nearly as urgent. I would adhere to the existing legislative purposes. Congress has affirmed needs for housing, planning workable programs. We have a shortage of people in these fields defined by section 701; city planning, housing, urban renewal, community organization, municipal administration, and public financial programing. This spells out a range of disciplines, all of which are in short supply with low volumes of graduate students. I'd guess that 1,000 scholarships a year in these fields would meet the need. They would probably end up divided about evenly between city planning schools, public administration schools, and social work schools. If a few land economists sneaked in, everyone would be delighted.

Legislatively, I think that this might be accomplished by getting the words "graduate training" into any of the program authorizations: Section 701, section 314, the new experimental grant program. It isn't, now, a large enough requirement to justify a special authorization. It should be viewed as an incident to the grants, but be administered on an individual competition basis, with individual choice of school. A willful administrator could have this rolling well in 90 days, and even the most cautious bureaucrat, drawing on N.D.E.A. experience would be in full operation by September 1962. Can't we get this rolling this year, so that you won't face a continuing shortage of operating people in the field in 1964–65?

Cordially,

WILLIAM L. C. WHEATON.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, if I may now have the attention of the Senator from Alabama, I wonder whether he is in a position to tell me whether he will accept this amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] will have some remarks to make on the amendment, and certainly I should like to hear from him.

Mr. CLARK. Would the Senator from Ohio care to take some time in opposition to the amendment? I ask just because the time available to me is running short.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am not at all sure that the Senator from Ohio is opposed to the amendment—after the explanation the Senator from Pennsylvania has given of the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. We had a colloquy on the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; and I thought the explanation given by the Senator from Pennsylvania probably satisfied the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be indeed flattered if it has.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield further, I may say that the thought occurred to me that when the Senate adopted the amendment on two or three different occasions—and one such amendment was proposed when the Senator from Ohio was a member of the subcommittee—the amendment was in rather simple language.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I am not in opposition to the amendment. If the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] wishes to use the time available to the opposition, I shall be glad to defer to him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I cannot subscribe to the amendment.

I think the suggestion originally made was a good one, namely, that the scholarship or fellowship subject shall be dealt with by one committee, instead of having scholarships proliferated in many, many separate bills.

But when many separate groups handle such matters, the consequence is that when fellowships of this type are provided by means of a bill of this type, a complete understanding of what is being done is practically incapable of being attained. Instead of looking to one bill in which fellowships are dealt with, it is necessary to look into bills dealing with very specialized fields, in order to see whether arrangements have been made in a particular field to provide fellowships for the particular function envisioned.

I simply cannot bring myself to the point of view that in our country we cannot induce American citizens to study in preparation for highly paid jobs which are to become available unless we provide them with funds for such study.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In just one moment. The amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania provides that the fellowship shall be only for graduate work. The provision would comprehend that the particular individual had taken his normal course and was in the position of functioning in the field in which he had studied.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. I think the amendment contemplates that the applicant for a fellowship would have received his baccalaureate and had decided to continue his studies.

I make the suggestion, with which I hope the Senator will not disagree, that financial difficulties make it very difficult indeed for many young men and women to continue graduate work, whether it be in law, medicine, public health, science, or whatever it may be, for occupations which are very much in the national interest. That is why we have had scholarship programs of long standing in the fields administered by the National Science Foundation, in the field of public health, and in modern languages, mathematics, and science under the National Defense Education Act.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. There are not too many of them. I was originally in favor of considering all scholarships together in a general education bill referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; but heads that I suspect were wiser than mine felt we should continue the traditional method of dealing with them separately. I somewhat reluctantly agreed, because I think there is much merit in the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am grateful for the contribution the Senator has made, but I feel he has made a point which I have in mind. That is, in all these new fields of operation, if initially there is a provision for scholarships, those scholarships will become proliferated.

I am inclined to the belief that there are available in our universities at the present time, basically—except for the training of planners—adequate facilities and opportunities to train architects, civil engineers, economists, municipal finance men, public administrators, and sociologists.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is quite correct. I agree with him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But I realize there is a qualification that the courses must be oriented toward training for careers in city and regional planning.

Mr. CLARK. Actually, there is conferred a special degree of master of city planning, as well as doctor of city planning, which is an advance degree.

One of the great problems facing the American system, I believe, is the staffing of freedom, that is, assuring trained personnel where they are needed to best serve the continuation of the American way of life under freedom. We must assure that foreign and domestic problems alike are dealt with by the best trained minds we can get.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think there is great strength in what the Senator from Pennsylvania has said, except that I do not agree with him in his argument that the way to awaken in our youth a purpose and desire to improve themselves educationally is to provide them with Federal money for postgraduate scholarships and otherwise. We have provided scholarships in a substantial degree under several methods. I think we will see from now on, each year, the parade of the establishment of new types of scholarships such as those comprehended in the amendment.

Unless we induce our youth to recognize the value of preparing themselves to fight the economic problems of life through means other than the granting of money out of the Federal Treasury, I think we are going to have great difficulty ahead. I cannot believe we cannot awaken in our youth, with our many institutions of higher learning, both on the local level and on the State level, the importance of trying to gain an education and that the only way they will be induced to do so will be by saying, "Well, here is a new field. We will provide scholarships on the Federal level." I cannot subscribe to that philosophy.

I am going to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment, I may say.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senator from Ohio can see his way clear to go along with the amendment. So far as I am concerned, I would be glad to see the language simplified, in order to remove some of the fears the Senator from Ohio has expressed.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In just a moment.

Mr. CLARK. I was just going to suggest eliminating some language.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Suppose we hold that matter up for the time being.

Mr. CLARK. Very well.

Mr. SPARKMAN. This is a relatively new program for city rebuilding. In fact, we have waited rather late to start it. The Senator knows that to be true. A great many of our cities have deteriorated. On the other hand, new areas have been building up. In the last 10 years, and I am sure it will continue, there has been a big migration from the rural areas to the towns, and from the towns to the suburban areas. The question of planning has become a real problem. It has been particularly difficult for, shall I say, the smaller cities to obtain adequate planning advice and help.

A limited number of persons are qualified in this field. By the way, the sad part of the story is that there is a severely limited number of institutions that give an opportunity for students to study in this field. I believe I have seen the figure that the annual output of city planners is about 200.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We need more.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct. There are 300 city planning positions going begging right now because nobody is available to fill the jobs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have received letters about the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is that not a sad commentary, when we are speaking about depressions and of people who would like to have jobs and we are asked to open the spigot of the Federal Treasury to stimulate the economy?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is said on the floor of the Senate that there are 300 jobs, which have salaries attached to them of perhaps $17,000, $18,000, or $20,000 a year, and qualified people to fill them are not available.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is a sad commentary, but not upon the basis upon which the Senator places it. The sad commentary is that the people who are qualified to fill these jobs simply are not available.

What did we do in the National Defense Education Act? We recognized the problems so far as science is concerned, in regard to physics and mathematics and other courses. In those fields we felt trained men and women were essential to national defense. We provided for scholarships.

I would have put the provision in the bill which I introduced this year, except, as the Senator has said, the Senator from Pennsylvania and I talked over the problem and he agreed to offer an amendment in the education subcommittee.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It was felt by the committee, as I understand the situation, that the provision did not belong in that particular bill. We would have brought it up in the committee except for that. I, therefore, suggested that the Senator offer the amendment on the floor of the Senate.

I hope very much the Senator from Ohio will permit the amendment to be agreed to.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, do I control the time in opposition?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What are the normal salaries for such jobs? Am I correct in saying the salaries are about $18,000 or $20,000 a year?

Mr. CLARK. In city planning?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Those are pretty high figures. It depends upon the size and, to some extent, upon the wealth of the city. I think I am correct in saying that the chief of the city planning commission in Philadelphia receives about $22,500 a year, but he has a big staff. There are many graduate city planners working for him at salaries of from $8,000 to $10,000 a year.

I say to my friend from Ohio, if he will indulge me another minute, that there is no shortage in his profession and mine; there is no shortage of lawyers. We do not have to provide Federal scholarships to get people to go to law schools. We do not have to provide Federal scholarships to get people to go to graduate business schools. Graduates of law schools are immediately offered positions at good salaries, so that they can anticipate making very excellent incomes for their lifetimes. The same is true with respect to people who are going into business.

However, the areas about which we are now talking, which to my way of thinking—and I believe to the way of thinking of my friend from Ohio—are as important to the flowering of American civilization as the other professions, are getting short changed.

Mr. LAUSCHE. There is a scarcity of nurses, a scarcity of engineers, a scarcity of scientists, a scarcity of doctors, a scarcity of city planners; and, according to the implications of the amendment, a scarcity of sociologists, of architects, of public administrators and of municipal finance people. The language says that the programs shall be oriented in favor of planning.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. LAUSCHE. To me this discloses something vitally wrong.

Mr. CLARK. With American civilization.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Something vitally wrong in regard to the failure of students to desire to take those courses. It may be that we have set up a system in our economy so that a person can drive a truck and, because of the control of some people in the trucking industry, earn more money than a planner can earn.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator is quite correct. Our problem is that the rewards in certain professions are too great and the punishment is not enough, while the rewards in other professions are too little and the punishment is too great. This is an effort, in a single field, to help remedy the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall not at this time withdraw the statement I made about a yea-and-nay vote. I should like to think about the problem and talk it over with some colleagues. It may be that I shall later change my mind.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If it would be satisfying to the Senator, or even if the Senator insists on a yea-and-nay vote, it will be my purpose to offer an amendment, unless the Senator from Pennsylvania offers it.

Mr. CLARK. I was going to suggest a modification.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amendment would comply with the provision the Senate passed 2 or 3 years ago. I have the language before me.

Mr. CLARK. I was going to suggest striking out the language in the parentheses on page 2.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think that language ought to go out.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That could be done, or the language heretofore passed could be offered. I think the language within the parentheses ought to be taken out.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. Do I have the right to modify my own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to modify his own amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Madam President, I modify my amendment by eliminating the language within the parentheses on lines 3 through 5 of page 2 of the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania a question.

Would that eliminate scholarships for city finance, sociology, architecture, civil engineering, and things having relationship to city planning?

Mr. CLARK. The modification would eliminate any possibility that such fellowships might have been granted under the terms of the bill. It was never my intention that they should be. The modification would make that crystal clear.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Ohio, the language would then read "programs of graduate study in the field of city planning or in related fields, which programs are oriented to training for careers in city and regional planning," and so forth.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I still shall ask for a yea-and-nay vote if the amendment is to go forward at this time, but I should like to discuss it with some of my colleagues.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, I wish to use the remainder of my time to discuss the Federal highway program.

Madam President, this Congress will be remiss in its duties and responsibilities to the citizenry, especially to the millions who travel and pay for our expanding Federal highway system, if it fails to extend for another 2 years that period in which the several States may qualify themselves to receive the one-half of 1 percent bonus for uniform compliance in regulating billboards within the vicinity of these highways.

I have been informed that the House-passed highway bill does not include language for an extension, and that the Senate Committee has failed to provide such an extension.

There are now pending before the legislative bodies of a dozen or more States bills which, if enacted into law, will permit these States to receive this compliance bonus. Drafting of these bills, steering them through committees, and all the other legislative details have required much time and effort. Favorable action on these pending bills is anticipated before adjournment of those legislative bodies.

Madam President, for the Congress to fail to extend this expiration date for a reasonable period of time will likely nullify the efforts of these State legislative bodies which have been acting in good faith and with the expectancy that the Congress would not renege on its previous commitment.

Aside from the repudiation by Congress of its formerly stated policy to the States expressing desire to cooperate and receive this one-half of 1 percent bonus, the big and most conspicuous betrayal would be to the user public which would be forced to drive over modern highways literally walled in between rows and rows of distracting signs and billboards offering for sale everything from soup to nuts.

A modern Federal highway system was never meant to be an advertising medium and for Congress to permit it to be so used would be an affront upon the intelligence, privileges, and expectations of the millions of user citizens.

When those who use the Federal highway system traverse Ohio, I want them to be able to view with pleasure the beautiful countryside with its wooded hills and rich farmlands; I also want them to see the tall corn growing in Illinois, the scenic mountain beauties of the New England States and also of the Northwest, and the broad prairies of the Midwest. That is what the American motorist wants, is willing to pay for, and expects.

Madam President, in his message to the Congress on February 28 in reference to billboard control, President Kennedy said:

> I urge the Congress to extend this billboard control section for 4 more years.

The billboard lobbies have had their say. They represent a tiny but aggressive segment of our economy. I now speak in behalf of the public not only in Ohio but also in the remaining 49 States when I urge the Congress to restore the language in section 122 of the act of 1958 which would continue for at least another 2 years the one-half of 1 percent bonus to States desiring to cooperate in uniform compliance of billboard regulations.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from Ohio has indicated that he may ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment. Under the unanimous-consent request agreed to yesterday, no yea-and-nay votes will be taken until Wednesday. Would it be in order to lay aside further consideration of the amendment until Tuesday or Wednesday at which time the Senator from Ohio could make his request for a yea-and-nay vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that such a request would be in order.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I move that the amendment be laid aside for further consideration later.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I offer a brief technical amendment which I send to the desk and ask to be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, between lines 16 and 17 add the following:

> (f) Section 203(b) is amended by adding the word "be" immediately following "which may."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the amendment would correct a purely typographical error that was made some time ago. However, I seek control of the time in favor of the amendment, and I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS].

THE NEED FOR MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Madam President, I would like to say a few words on the provisions now in the housing bill, S. 1922, relating to mass transportation.

I was very pleased by the action of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee when it incorporated into the general housing bill the major provisions of the bill, S. 345, I introduced earlier this year with 18 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

The mass transportation provisions of the housing bill would:

First. Broaden the 701 urban planning programs to permit the use of part of the $100 million authorization for comprehensive mass transportation surveys and planning.

Second. Permit the use of $50 million of the $2.5 billion authorized for urban renewal for pilot mass transportation demonstration projects.

Third. Increase the public facility loan program to authorize an additional $100 million in low-cost, long-term loans for facilities and equipment to preserve and improve essential mass transportation service.

I was pleased by the committee's action because I feel very strongly that this legislation touches upon one of the most important nerve centers of our national social and economic life—the movement of people and goods in and around our urban and metropolitan areas.

The hearings last year on S. 3278, the Senate's passage of that bill with strong, bipartisan support and the extensive hearings again this year have demonstrated beyond doubt the national importance of overcoming traffic congestion and the Federal interest in helping overcome that congestion by preserving and improving essential mass transportation service in our cities and towns.

It is now widely recognized that the problem of traffic congestion strikes at the heart of the economic capability of our metropolitan areas—which harbor two-thirds of our population and account for about 75 percent of our national productivity and wealth.

It chokes central city commerce and business. It lowers retail sales and burdens real estate values. It discourages investment in the central cities, thus aiding the spread of urban blight. It spawns unnecessary and costly decentralization, uprooting lives in the process. It adds to the cost of moving goods in interstate commerce. It increases accident rates and costs, and it provides a whale of a drain on our individual peace of mind. Probably never has anyone devised a more cunning device of human torture than the traffic jam.

Our cities are truly at a crossroad. The rapid increase in urban population and automobile ownership, coupled with a serious financial and physical decline in mass transportation service, demand a solution.

In that connection I believe the latest census figures with respect to automobile ownership show that there are now 95 million registered motor vehicles. Today there is one motor vehicle for every 2 Americans. We frequently see cars bumper to bumper twice a day in every major metropolitan area of the country.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from New Jersey for keeping the issue of mass transportation very much in the foreground. Is it not true that automobile transportation is about the most inefficient form of mass transportation we could have, so far as movement

from the suburbs to the working places in the cities is concerned?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Without question it is the most inefficient, and by far the most costly, way of moving people.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Per person moved, the automobile occupies too much space on the highways. The automobile requires large parking spaces in the cities. If the increase in traffic continues, will not the central cities disintegrate from having so much of their land taken for streets, superhighways, and parking lots?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Such disintegration will come, and in some areas it has come.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in Los Angeles about 60 percent of the downtown area is occupied by superhighways, streets, and parking lots?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly. I believe the figure is precise. I have heard that two-thirds of the center of the city of Los Angeles is given over to facilities to take care of automobiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And from 35 to 50 percent in other cities, such as Cleveland, Chicago, and other areas.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the Senator's constructive idea to help change this situation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. In the bill now before the Senate there is included the beginning of a program. It deals with the emergency aspect with a realistic low interest loan program to make present facilities more efficient and more responsive to our need.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, the Senator proposes to keep railroads in existence.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Not only railroads; the provisions of the bill would also be useful to all forms of mass transportation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Including bus transportation?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the trolleys which remain?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes. In addition to the emergency loan program, a program is provided looking to the future, through research, study, and the demonstration of new ways of mass transportation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is always the possibility of monorail with cars traveling appreciably above the surface of the streets. Is that not true?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. There are many advanced ideas that I believe should be studied; some should be tested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Jersey has done a very public spirited job in pressing the issue. As one who lives in one of the metropolitan centers of our country, I can say that a change is very badly needed. What we must struggle against, of course, is the fact that the cities are underrepresented in the State legislatures, underrepresented in the House of Representatives, and not always fully represented in the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. So long as the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is in the Senate, Illinois will not be underrepresented. I thank my friend for the persistent support and strength he has given to the measure in the committee and now in the Senate. I wish to add, too, that we have repeatedly received from the city of Chicago some of the most eloquent pleas for national attention to the mass transportation problem. Again, I thank the senior Senator from Illinois.

Yes, our cities are truly at a crossroad. Manifestly the problem cannot be solved by highways alone, as the President noted in his housing message. At least it cannot be solved that way without increasing the taxes for highways far beyond their present level, for we are talking about a mode of travel which can cost as much as $100 million for one single mile of highway, which would be the case in downtown Manhattan for example.

That sounds incredible, but that is the estimate of the cost of 1 mile in the city of New York, in downtown Manhattan.

But even if we were to try with an urban highway program averaging $10 to $20 million a mile in high density urban areas, there is every possibility that the remedy would only succeed in killing the patient—by replacing valuable tax ratable property with nontaxable concrete and asphalt, by creating huge downtown parking demands which would further remove land for commercial and cultural purposes, and by slowly carving away the very activities that created the demand for access in the first place. That is the point the Senator from Illinois has so eloquently made.

I do not believe there is any question that most of our larger cities and towns need a certain amount of limited access highways to meet transportation needs that can be met in no other way. But improvement of more efficient and less space consuming forms of mass transportation is an absolute imperative if our cities—which are our major sources of national economic power—are to survive the onslaught of the automobile and continue as viable structures for human existence and enterprise.

The need for prompt and full-scale action by all levels of government should be evident from the mere projection of population and automobile ownership trends in the years ahead. The urban population today is over 100 million, and 90 percent of our national population growth will occur in and around our urban areas. The number of vehicles on the road today is 70 million. I indicated earlier that the last census shows it is even more than that. By 1975, it is expected to climb to well over 100 million. In fact, in many urban areas, the cars are multiplying faster than people.

Last year a conference of transportation experts at Woods Hole, Mass., agreed that the rush-hour traffic congestion of our cities is at the limits of tolerance. What will it be like by 1975?

DECLINE IN MASS TRANSPORTATION

At the same time, in the face of these trends, the railroads, which are caught in the squeeze of declining freight revenue and increasingly high passenger deficits, are aggressively pursuing a policy of discontinuing and abandoning unprofitable commuter service just as rapidly as possible, no matter how essential the service to the economic welfare of the urban area.

Bus companies, in order to keep their head above water, are constantly pruning their most marginal and unprofitable service, throwing more and more people into their automobiles. In fact, around 300 of our smaller cities and towns have lost their bus service completely, despite the fact that in all our urban communities, large and small, half the population is not able to drive: the young, the old, the infirm and those too poor to own an automobile. This factor alone should be sufficient reason for preserving and improving our mass transportation service.

The overall trend since 1950 has been a decline of ridership on all forms of mass transportation of 38 percent, according to the American Transit Association and the Association of American Railroads.

It is important, however, to make a distinction in speaking of this downward trend for some may conclude that this is a dying and unnecessary service, not worth preserving. Most of this decline has occurred during offpeak hours and on weekends. Ridership for the home-to-work journey has declined less, and in fact is now showing an upturn in many areas. The point is that, while mass transportation may only be serving a 20-hour-a-week need, this service is absolutely essential. It is inefficient, to be sure, in that it will not be used to anywhere near capacity during offpeak hours and on weekends. But so are our highways underused in the cities at night and in many areas of the country between cities all day long. No one questions, however, that we need these roads. There should be no question that we need adequate, modern mass transportation, even if it is only used to capacity 20 hours a week.

NO ALTERNATIVE TO TRANSIT

The reason is simply that the cost of any alternative to this service would be staggering. For example, the American Municipal Association has estimated that if the five cities of New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, and Cleveland were to lose just their rail commuter service it would cost $31 billion with 30-year, 4-percent financing to build the highways necessary to serve a comparable number of people. In New York it has been estimated that if half the people who come to work in the city by mass transportation were to switch to private car, 10 square miles of more parking space would be required, and the street, bridge, and tunnel capacity would have to be doubled—a physical and financial impossibility.

Here in Washington, an extensive transportation survey found that by 1980, under an "auto-dominant" system, 12 to 18 lanes would be required to carry traffic from the Capitol to Wheaton. The Inner Loop would require 14 lanes. Several other corridors would require

more than eight lanes. Not only would the cost be great, but excessive damage would be done to residential communities and to the character of the central area of the Nation's Capital. These findings led to the conclusions that, in the absence of substantially improved public transit, the highway system needed to serve the projected traffic volumes is hardly feasible from the engineering standpoint, and is certainly out of the question from the viewpoint of desirable regional development.

Last year a representative of the Georgia Department of Commerce testified:

> In Atlanta, the northern portion of the expressway currently has 6 lanes, but has traffic sufficient to warrant 16 lanes. By 1970 this need will have jumped to at least 36 lanes. By no stretch of the imagination is it physically or financially possible to build such a facility.

The same kinds of conclusions are being drawn in city after city where comprehensive transportation studies have been undertaken. The need for mass transportation is imperative.

What is happening, however, is that the ability of private carriers to provide that service is being constantly eroded.

In the case of the railroads, their commuter service has always been a heavy deficit which has been subsidized and carried by the railroad's freight rates. The total passenger deficit rose from $140 million in 1946 to $723 million in 1957. But at the same time, particularly in recent years, freight traffic and revenue began to decline. These trends have forced the railroads not only to abandon and curtail their deficit-ridden passenger and commuter service, but also to increase fares, defer maintenance, and forego modernization and improvement of equipment and facilities. These actions, however, have only served to hasten the departure of the remaining passengers.

The same general trends have been afflicting our bus companies, which have to contend with the additional problem of operating on the same congested streets with the automobile, which greatly reduces the advantage of their service for many people.

If we agree that mass transportation is essential, then there is no alternative to public expenditures in some form to fill the gap of rising costs and declining revenues facing our private carriers, which is forcing them necessarily and inevitably to prune, curtail, and abandon service wherever possible.

As I have said, the alternatives are prohibitive just in terms of the additional demands that will be thrown upon our roads and highways, the increased road maintenance, and need for more traffic control and parking facilities. But perhaps just as important is the fact that these curtailments are establishing new travel habits and patterns that will be difficult and expensive to overcome.

Each year of delay adds new social and economic costs to the city, and they accumulate to a degree that make the amounts of money proposed in this bill for mass transportation seem like a trifling sum.

We have procrastinated and looked the other way too long. We must make a start now.

NOT BY RAILROADS ALONE

But we will be making a big mistake if, in making this start, we delude ourselves into thinking that our most serious problem is necessarily the rail commuter problem.

There has been a tendency, even in some major studies that have been made on the subject, to conclude that because the railroads are suffering the most serious passenger deficits and because those deficits impair the ability of the railroads to satisfactorily perform their vital role in the movement of freight in interstate commerce, the Federal Government should tailor its assistance to this particular emergency.

I think we could make no more serious mistake than to follow that advice.

I say that with strong conviction because we must recognize that rail commuter service is only one of many facets in the urban transportation complex. It is essential that rail commuter service be modernized and improved, but the success or failure of that improvement will depend largely upon the degree to which we come to grips with the whole range of factors affecting public acceptance of mass transportation, from fringe area parking to downtown transfer service. If we merely build up one component of the system and neglect the others, we are letting ourselves in for bitter and costly disappointment.

COMPONENT PARTS OF MASS TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM

The following is a list of at least most of the major elements which must be considered in undertaking any mass transportation program, in addition to the comprehensive planning and search for ways to avoid unnecessary transportation that must accompany the program:

First. Modernization of rail commuter cars and equipment.

Second. Relocation or extension or coordination of rail commuter track, stations, or terminals.

Third. Improvement of rail commuter service frequency and lowering of fares.

Fourth. Conversion of rail commuter service to rapid-transit type operation and utilization of unused freight trackage.

Fifth. Construction of new or expansion of existing rail rapid transit, either underground, surface, or elevated.

Sixth. Coordination of rail commuter service with rapid transit for interchangeable use.

Seventh. Provision of express bus service and reserved bus lanes on highways and major arteries.

Eighth. Extension of bus service to presently unprofitable low-density suburban areas.

Ninth. Improvement of bus service frequency and lower fares.

Tenth. Provision of better bus feeder and transfer service to commuter rail or rapid transit terminals and stations, including coordination of schedules.

Eleventh. Provision of fringe area parking adjacent to express bus, commuter rail or rapid transit lines.

Twelfth. Coordination among mass transportation facilities and coordination of mass transportation facilities with new highway networks.

Thirteenth. Lower taxi fares and development in downtown areas of "carveyors" or similar systems.

Fourteenth. Incorporation of feasible new technological developments into all modes of mass transportation wherever and whenever possible.

Fifteenth. Coordination of mass transportation facilities with housing, urban renewal, and other land use developments.

I have listed these factors, Madam President, because a number of people only casually aware of the purpose and intent of this legislation have been misled by the impression that the only problem is the financial jeopardy of some of the railroads and that the only purpose of the legislation is to give them assistance.

Now it is quite true that rail commuter service plays a vital role in many of the metropolitan areas of the country and that it would be utter folly if we were to allow the huge investments that have already been made to provide this service to dissolve before our eyes by a continuance of the present rapid rate of discontinuance, curtailment and abandonment that is taking place in the railroad industry.

As Lewis Mumford said in a recent NBC television white paper on the railroad problem, if we permit this to happen, we will only have to "reinvent" the railroads in the future to meet the increasing transportation demands of our metropolitan areas.

But the real issue is how we can best spend our money to ease congestion and facilitate the movement of people and goods in and around the urban and metropolitan areas. The importance of this can be seen in the fact that our capacity for economic growth is fundamentally based on our ability to move ever larger numbers of people and ever larger amounts of freight. If this ability gets bogged down in ever worsening traffic congestion, our national economic growth will suffer severely. And of course it is vitally important that we meet our total urban transportation needs at minimum cost.

With this perspective of the problem, we can see that we might be able to make more of a dent on traffic congestion by spending a given amount of money on fringe area parking facilities than on new air-conditioned commuter cars.

It might be wiser in some instances for communities to contract for more frequent bus service in low-density suburban areas where it is not otherwise economically feasible to operate than to renovate or relocate existing rail stations nearer to today's population centers.

What we need is flexibility—flexibility to meet emergency situations if that seems necessary and flexibility to experiment with the whole range of factors that affect public acceptance of mass transportation. The legislation gives our State and local governments that flexibility to meet their own particular and differing needs. It has been suggested that we ought to give more thought to the use of large commuter helicopters. There is nothing in this legislation to prevent this avenue of exploration.

NEED FOR ACTION

Madam President, despite the strong and wide support for this legislation—including such groups as the American Municipal Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American Bankers Association, the National Association of Homebuilders, the AFL–CIO, numerous State and local chambers of commerce, the American Institute of Planners, the National Housing Conference, the Railroad Labor Executives Association, representatives of the railroad industry, and the American Transit Association representing most of the country's bus, trolley and transit companies—there are still some who believe that action on this problem should await further study.

Madam President, this problem has been studied to death. What we need is action now. And I do not know of any reputable study that argues that the provisions now in the housing bill would not be necessary in any type of long-range approach to a solution of the problem.

Just yesterday I placed in the RECORD the recommendations of some of the most recent studies that have been made and statements by some of the most eminent authorities in the field.

Why do I say we need action now? In the first place, this is not just a question of the usual detriment that accompanies delay of needed action. We are faced with a situation that is deteriorating every day, making the ultimate cost of solution more expensive. In many ways this legislation is more urgent than many of the other programs in the housing bill.

Passage of this legislation could be of considerable help in meeting some of the emergency situations that now exist in this field.

It would help reverse the extremely damaging trend toward discontinuing, curtailing, and abandoning vital rail, transit, and bus service. It would give new hope to those carriers which heretofore have seen no hope for effective recognition of their problems by any level of government, particularly the Federal Government.

But, more than anything else, this legislation would stimulate some badly needed activity among all those involved in this problem.

For there is no question that we are now hobbling along on very creaking wheels, indeed. These creaking wheels extend far beyond the many railroads providing commuter service, generally at a loss. It extends far beyond the stagnant bus companies that are able to keep their head above water only by cutting back on their marginal service. There are creaking wheels among State and local officials who recognize the problem, but who have viewed it as hopeless or beyond their financial capacity to solve. There are creaking wheels in the ranks of the planners who have accustomed themselves to solving every transportation problem with more streets and highways for one simple reason: Federal funds for highways are readily available; funds for mass transportation are not. And there are creaking wheels in our great industries, which should be vigorously exploring new technological developments for mass transportation, but are not because there is so little market for the fruits of their research and development.

For these and many other reasons, the Senate will be doing a great service to the urban America we have become by adopting the mass transportation provisions proposed in S. 1922.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As the Senator knows, last year I favored his provision for mass transportation. As a matter of fact, our committee reported it favorably, it was brought up in the Senate, and was adopted. I still favored it this year. I felt that the recommendation made by the administration, that instead of the $100 million proposed for the loan, only $10 million be provided—I believe that was the amount the administration proposed——

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The administration proposed $10 million for research, study, and administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. For study. The administration assured us that the study would be completed and recommendations would be available to us by January 31. I felt it would be better and safer for us to go through with the study and to get the thinking of the best experts in the country on all the many problems which are involved in mass transportation, to be certain that we were charting or starting out on the proper course. I was overruled by the committee as a whole. The amendment of the Senator from New Jersey received very strong endorsement from the committee. I do not remember offhand what the vote was. The Senator may remember by what vote the committee approved his proposal.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. As I recall, the vote in the committee was 9 for the amendment and 4 opposed to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Nine to four, which was a vote of better than 2 to 1 in favor of the amendment. As I recall, every member of the minority voted for it, thus demonstrating strong support on a bipartisan basis.

While those were my feelings, I certainly have no disposition to object to the provision or to propose any amendment to remove the Senator's proposal from the bill. So far as I am concerned, it will go right through.

I compliment and commend the Senator from New Jersey for the outstanding work he has done in sponsoring the amendment, in holding hearings, in having witnesses attended, and in preparing the case for the proposal. As I said in the committee, and as I said last year on the floor of the Senate, I believe it was one of the best prepared presentations I have ever witnessed in the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I cannot express adequately my gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee for his comments and cooperation, even though there was some difference as to whether we should move the transportation program now in the housing bill or separately. Last year I was very happy to propose it as separate legislation at the request of the chairman of the subcommittee. Now, however, it is a year later. The problem is critical, to the point that we feel an emergency exists and must be dealt with now.

Many persons who are now working, at the request of the President, on the studies of a full, long-range program are advocates of what we are proposing in the housing bill for that part of urban America which is so closely related to all our urban living—mass transportation.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Of course, we in New York have a burning interest in the mass transportation problem. I have joined with the Senator from New Jersey in the effort to bring about aid from the Federal Government, but I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Alabama and to the Senator from New Jersey for their work upon this amendment. I am especially pleased that the Senator from Alabama, who is in charge of the bill, proposes to leave the language as we have proposed it, rather than to endeavor to reduce it. I believe that plenty of ideas are available. Further experimentation would only defer prompt action.

Considering the problem, the amendment will add real value to every community. It does not represent wasted money, by a long sight. These will be built-in assets, worth many times the amount the Federal Government will spend to help, in terms of the total value to our country and its capability for productive effort. Therefore, I am pleased that the Senator from Alabama has decided to let this proposal alone and is agreeable to having it included in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Madam President, I wish to acknowledge the fine work of the Senator from New York last year in support of the bill, in having the bill brought before the Senate, and in having it pass the Senate, and his work again this year. It has helped immeasurably to bring mass transportation into national focus. Mass transportation has been too long overlooked. We now know that it must be dealt with as a national program. The feeling across the country is unanimous in this respect. The witnesses have come from all parts of the coun-

try, both from the great metropolitan areas and the smaller communities. That is why we are dealing with this emergency here and now.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954 RELATING TO NONRECOGNITION OF GAIN OR LOSS UPON CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS OF STOCK

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Madam President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock made pursuant to court orders enforcing the antitrust laws.

All Senators, I am sure, are cognizant of the fact that on May 22 of this year, the Supreme Court determined by a 4-to-3 decision that E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. must divest itself of its vast 23-percent share of General Motors voting common stock within a 10-year period.

As chairman of the Securities Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have had some opportunity to study the marked effect which this Court decree would have upon the 226,640 Du Pont stockholders and the 830,873 General Motors shareholders. Moreover, the effect will be felt not only by this large group but also by the millions of mutual fund shareholders whose investment is represented, to some degree, by Du Pont and General Motors holdings.

No less significant than the number of stockholders affected is the type of stockholder who will suffer. It is my understanding that 1,234 charitable organizations, 518 educational institutions, and 119 fraternal organizations own Du Pont stock. Furthermore, there must be tens of thousands of retired citizens and widows whose meager incomes are substantially derived from Du Pont dividends.

According to a statistical survey found by the Supreme Court to have been soundly and objectively conducted, individual stockholders of Du Pont would pay income taxes at rates as high as 60 percent under the Government's plan of distribution; the taxes payable by these individuals could amount to $1 billion, if General Motors stock was valued at $50 per share, and approximately $770 million, if valued at $40 per share; and furthermore, the capital gains tax on the sale of the General Motors stock allocable to Christiana Security Co. and Delaware Realty & Investment Corp., major stockholders in Du Pont, could reach $200 million.

A further consequence of the Court's decision will be a loss in value of both General Motors and Du Pont shares, for during this 10-year period of divestiture the market could be artificially saturated with up to 63 million shares of General Motors stock. At the present market level, it is highly unlikely that there will be a demand for such an overabundance of this stock.

Moreover, since under present law the Du Pont shareholders will be required to pay taxes on the General Motors stock which they receive, many shareholders will have no choice but to sell this General Motors stock, in order to pay income taxes on the receipt of it. Such sales will further depress the market value of the stock.

I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as disputing the opinion of the Court. On the contrary, I agree with the conclusion of Justice Brennan when, in speaking for the majority, he said:

> The divestiture only of voting rights does not seem to us to be a remedy adequate to promise elimination of the tendency of Du Pont's acquisition offensive to section 7 [of the Clayton Act].

Nevertheless, as I interpret their opinions, both the majority and the minority of the Court are gravely concerned over the tax effect which this total divestiture will have upon Du Pont stockholders.

Justice Frankfurter, in delivering the minority opinion, made the following observation with regard to the principles which a court must follow in interpreting the antitrust laws:

> The weighty words of *United States* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (221 U.S. 106, 185) are apposite:
>
> "In considering the subject, three dominant influences must guide our action: (1) The duty of giving complete and efficacious effect to the prohibitions of the statute; (2) the accomplishing of this result with as little injury as possible to the interest of the general public; and (3) a proper regard for the vast interests of private property which may have become vested in many persons as a result of the acquisition either by way of stock ownership or otherwise of interests in the stock or securities of the combination without any guilty knowledge or intent in any way to become actors or participants in * * * wrongs."

Like the courts, we of the Congress also must constantly have the public interest in mind. It is my belief that this bill will benefit the public interest, not only in that the Du Pont stockholders—and, I may add, the stockholders of other corporations affected in a similar manner—will be relieved of an unfair tax penalty, but also in that future courts will no longer have to consider the disastrous tax effects which, under present law, their decrees of stock divestitures would produce.

Robert A. Bicks, then Acting Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division of the Justice Department, discussed the latter public benefit, in his statement before the House Committee on Ways and Means, July 20, 1959:

> Bear in mind, the 1890 Sherman and the 1914 Clayton Acts, the basic antitrust statutes, became law before the income tax was a reality. And the landmark antitrust cases—dissolving illegal trusts and monopolies via divestiture—were largely a product of an era marked by no income tax or much lower tax rates. Indeed, there is real basis for concluding that some bench-mark antitrust divestiture cases * * * might well not have been decreed had today's tax rates prevailed.

Further, Mr. Bicks, in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Finance, May 27, 1959, remarked:

> Our view is that an appropriately fashioned tax proposal, designed to eliminate tax barriers to antitrust divestiture, would serve the ends of effective antitrust enforcement.

My conclusion, therefore, after a careful study of this proposed legislation, is that the public interest will best be served by its enactment.

The Honorable Edward H. Levi, dean of the University of Chicago Law School, in a letter to the Senate Finance Committee, dated May 25, 1959, summarized the arguments in favor of this bill as follows:

> The adoption of this correction in the Federal tax laws will help in the enforcement of antitrust policies. The same principle has been adopted in other similar areas of law such as the public utility holding company act, the bank holding company act, distributions required by the Federal Communications Commission, and in connection with reorganizations under the Bankruptcy Act. There seems to be no adequate reason why it should not be adopted for required antitrust divestitures.
>
> Under the present tax law, where there is enforced divestiture, stockholders are in effect subjected to unintended and capricious penalties which are irrelevant both to the purposes of the tax law and the requirements of the antitrust laws. Even if the antitrust laws were supposed to be punitive, no one would select such penalties as appropriate. The penalties are unrelated to the amount of restraint of trade which may have been achieved. They are uneven, depending on factors which have nothing to do with antitrust. They fall on the wrong people. But the enforcement of appropriate antitrust relief is not supposed to be punitive. The wisdom of this principle is made all the clearer when relief is granted, as under section 7 of the Clayton Act, not because a monopoly has been created or because an acquisition actually has lessened competition; but rather because these consequences might occur in the future because this may be the effect. The hope of successful antitrust enforcement is that it will be accepted not as punitive but as good for American enterprise. A good case can be made out that where divestiture has taken place in the past, it has in fact been good for all, including the stockholders of the companies involved. Under the present tax situation, this would not be true.
>
> Courts have been reluctant for understandable reasons to require divestiture. At best divestiture is an adventure into the unknown with uncertain consequences with respect to efficiency in many cases. It is an extreme step and the present unintended tax situation will make courts and interested parties less likely to take the step even when it is necessary to restore an industry to a position in harmony with the antitrust laws.

This bill, in plain language, would permit a virtually tax-free transfer of the General Motors segment of the Du Pont corporate entity to the Du Pont stockholders without the severe tax bite which would result under present law. If, of course, the Du Pont shareholder who received his percentage of General Motors decided to sell this General Motors stock, he would pay the resulting tax for this transfer, as would anyone else selling stock.

The measure which I am proposing is not intended to relieve the shareholders of Du Pont and General Motors only. On the contrary, my bill is designed to meet a general need, as well as a specific one. Consequently, shareholders of

other corporations affected by similar antitrust decisions, will likewise be protected from corresponding tax penalties.

Legislation of the type which I am proposing would not be without precedent. As long ago as 1938, Congress acted to postpone, until the recipient sold his stock, the tax on distributions made in obedience to orders of the Securities and Exchange Commission under the Public Utility Holding Company Act.

As recently as 1956, Congress applied this principle to the Bank Holding Company Act, with respect to involuntary distributions required by that legislation.

The bill which I am introducing is very technical in nature. However, it is a bill which was approved as section 13 of H.R. 5547 by the Senate Finance Committee, last year. The bill, as reported, was generally similar to S. 200, introduced by former Senator Frear of Delaware. In the hectic closing days of the Congress, last year, this proposed legislation failed to proceed beyond the Senate Calendar.

The Supreme Court has directed that the district court enter an order requiring Du Pont to file within 60 days a proposed judgment providing for a complete divestiture of its General Motors stock, to commence within 90 days, and to be completed within not to exceed 10 years of the effective date of the district court's judgment.

In the light of this decree, I hope Congress will act with dispatch to insure that justice be done to the millions of Americans who will be adversely affected.

Madam President, I introduce the bill and request its appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2013) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the taxation of distributions of stock made pursuant to court orders enforcing the antitrust laws, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I know of no opposition to this amendment. I yield back the remainder of the time available to me, in connection with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all remaining time on the amendment is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alabama on page 62, between lines 16 and 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time used in the quorum call which has just been had not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] may be recognized for very brief remarks, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY DATA STUDIES

Mr. SYMINGTON. Madam President, an article yesterday by an able newspaperman, Richard Fryklund of the Washington Evening Star, states that Secretary McNamara found that reports made for the individual services by private research companies, and paid for with the taxpayers' money, were not only withheld from the other services, but also from him.

The article then states:

> Some of the problems growing out of the practice of turning military research over to private contractors were aired this week by the Johns Hopkins University Operations Research Office, which works for the Army. The O.R.O. is being disbanded because the Army and Johns Hopkins are mutually dissatisfied.

The article continues:

> O.R.O. people were displeased in part because the several hundred research groups were attacking problems for the services without a chance to exchange information outside the service that hired them.

Then the article says:

> Mr. McNamara was reported to be displeased to find that some of the important research findings never reached him. So on April 15 he directed the services to send a copy of each report to him and to Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric. The order applies to all reports submitted after April 1.

In other words, the Secretary of Defense now has the desire, and believes he has the right, to find out what is going on in the Department which he has sworn to administer to the best of his ability.

Apparently this annoyed some, because the article continues:

> Some research people expect complications to arise from the McNamara order. They point out that some of the raw material used in the studies is given to the researchers by the military services with the proviso that no one outside the service involved will see it.
>
> This occurs, they explain, when a service wants a study done to back up its position before the Joint Chiefs of Staff but doesn't want the other services or even the Office of Secretary of Defense to get all the information the report contains.

In other words, if the article is correct the services do not want the other services, or the Secretary of Defense, to know the details of why a certain position is taken before the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

It is felt that either "the services may hold back data from their own contractors," or that the situation will "lead to development of subterfuges whereby the services would receive research results in some form other than formal reports."

Two questions come to mind:

First. Who will pay for these informal research developments?

Second. Does the Secretary of Defense have the right to know what is going on in his Department?

I ask unanimous consent that an article in the Washington Star of Thursday, June 1, entitled "McNamara To See All Military Data Studies," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MCNAMARA TO SEE ALL MILITARY DATA STUDIES

(By Richard Fryklund)

Secretary of Defense McNamara has ordered that he be given a copy of every report done for the services by private research companies, it was learned today.

His order was designed to help break down restrictions on the flow of information inside the Pentagon. Before the change, a study done for one service usually was not shown to the other services or the Secretary of Defense.

Some of the problems growing out of the practice of turning military research over to private contractors were aired this week by the Johns Hopkins University Operations Research Office, which works for the Army. The O.R.O. is being disbanded because the Army and Johns Hopkins are mutually dissatisfied.

O.R.O. people were displeased in part because the several hundred research groups were attacking problems for the services without a chance to exchange information outside the service that hired them.

Mr. McNamara was reported to be displeased to find that some of the important research findings never reached him. So on April 15 he directed the services to send a copy of each report to him and to Deputy Secretary of Defense Gilpatric. The order applies to all reports submitted after April 1.

Some research people expect complications to arise from the McNamara order. They point out that some of the raw material used in the studies is given to the researchers by the military services with the proviso that no one outside the service involved will see it.

This occurs, they explain, when a service wants a study done to back up its position before the Joint Chiefs of Staff but doesn't want the other services or even the Office of Secretary of Defense to get all the information the report contains.

They speculate privately that the compulsory circulation of reports could work out as a handicap to research, because the services may hold back data from their own contractors, or lead to development of subterfuges whereby the services would receive research results in some form other than formal reports.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the pro-

vision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time consumed for the call of the roll not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, I offer an amendment to S. 1922, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 84, beginning with line 11, it is proposed to strike out all through line 8 on page 87 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOME LOANS

SEC. 706. (a)(1) Section 1803 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(a)(1) Any loan to a World War II or Korean-conflict veteran, if made within the applicable period prescribed in paragraph (3) of this subsection for any of the purposes, and in compliance with the provisions, specified in this chapter is automatically guaranteed by the United States in an amount not more than 60 per centum of the loan if the loan is made for any of the purposes specified in section 1810 of this title and not more than 50 per centum of the loan if the loan is for any of the purposes specified in section 1812, 1813, or 1814 of this title.

"(2) If a loan report or an application for loan guaranty relating to a loan under this chapter is received by the Administrator before the date of the expiration of the veteran's entitlement, the loan may be guaranteed or insured under the provisions of this chapter after such date.

"(3)(A) A World War II veteran's entitlement to the benefits of this chapter will expire as follows:

"(i) ten years from the date of discharge or release from the last period of active duty of the veteran, any part of which occurred during World War II, plus an additional period equal to one year for each four months of active duty performed by the veteran during World War II, except that entitlement shall not continue in any case after July 25, 1967, nor shall entitlement expire in any case prior to July 25, 1962; or

"(ii) on July 25, 1967, for a veteran discharged or released for a service-connected disability from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred during World War II.

"(B) A Korean conflict veteran's entitlement to the benefits of this chapter will expire as follows:

"(i) ten years from the date of discharge or release from the last period of active duty of the veteran, any part of which occurred during the Korean conflict, plus an additional period equal to one year for each four months of active duty performed by the veteran during the Korean conflict, except that entitlement shall not continue in any case after January 31, 1975, nor shall entitlement expire in any case prior to January 31, 1965; or

"(ii) on January 31, 1975, for a veteran discharged or released for a service-connected disability from a period of active duty, any part of which occurred during the Korean conflict."

(2) The last sentence of section 1802 (b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Entitlement restored under this subsection may be used by a World War II veteran at any time before July 26, 1967, and by a Korean conflict veteran at any time before February 1, 1975."

(3) Section 1814 (b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended (1) by striking out paragraph (3); (2) by striking out "; and" at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting a period; and (3) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end of paragraph (1).

(b) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (d) of section 1811 of title 38, United States Code, are amended by striking out "$13,500", wherever it appears in such paragraphs, and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000".

(c) Subsection (h) of such section 1811 is amended to read as follows:

"(h) No loan may be made under this section to any veteran after the expiration of his entitlement pursuant to section 1803 (a)(3) of this title except pursuant to a commitment issued by the Administrator before such entitlement expires."

On page 87, line 9, strike out "(b)(1)" and insert in lieu thereof "(d)(1)".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield himself?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Are 2 minutes available?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement the Senator from Texas has control of the time, and is allotted 30 minutes.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. If I have 30 minutes at my disposal, I shall probably use 4 minutes instead of 2.

The amendment has two purposes. First, it would extend the guarantee loan program for World War II veterans until July 25, 1967, and for Korean conflict veterans until January 31, 1975. The extension would make the new termination dates on the guarantee program conform with the termination dates on the direct loan program now contained in the omnibus housing bill. The amendment would establish a formula for termination of entitlement of guaranteed loans. Under the formula the entitlement of World War II veterans would be 10 years from the date of discharge during World War II, plus one additional year of extension for each 4 months of active service performed during World War II.

The same formula in principle would apply to the termination of the entitlement for veterans of the Korean conflict. Of course, the years would be moved forward.

The bill (S. 1922) contains an identical formula regarding termination of entitlement for direct loans.

Madam President, under Senate rules the Veterans' Subcommittee has jurisdiction over the guaranteed loan program. Direct loans come under the jurisdiction of the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. So all I offer is an amendment to bring that portion of the bill under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' subcommittee in order to bring that provision in the bill in line with the dates already determined and fixed in S. 1922 by the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama. The subject was thoroughly covered in the committee hearings.

The amendment would eliminate the climatic condition test to qualify for the $15,000 loan, and would have the effect of providing an across-the-board increase from $13,500 to $15,000 on the maximum amount of a direct loan.

To date 34 percent of World War II veterans and 19 percent of the Korean conflict veterans have used their GI loan entitlements, which leaves more than 9 million World War II veterans and nearly 4 million Korean conflict veterans in civilian life who have not used their loan entitlements. There were approximately 15½ million World War II veterans with entitlements. About 6½ million have built housing under the GI bill; approximately 9 million have not. The amendment would extend the time limitation so that the 9 million might have an opportunity to build housing. I think it would be good for the economy.

During the past 2 years the activity in the guaranteed loan program has declined steadily, due primarily to the unavailability of mortgage lending funds for GI financing. Fewer loans were made and guaranteed in 1960 than in any year since 1946, when the program got underway. In the peak year of the program, 1955, there were 392,870 housing starts under the VA's inspection procedure and that same year there were 669,058 applications for loans. In 1960, by contrast, there were only 74,609 housing starts and only 141,744 applications.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are the provisions of the amendment confined entirely to housing?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would simply extend the time in which loans could be made?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The time would be extended for veterans to apply for guaranteed loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. It would extend the time under which veterans could apply under the G.I. Housing Act?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes, for guaranteed loans. The direct loan provision is under another jurisdiction.

Mr. CAPEHART. To what extent would the amendment liberalize the existing law?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It would liberalize none of the money provisions of the law. It would extend the time in which veterans may obtain guaranteed loans. The amendment I offer is not a direct loan provision. It is only a guarantee of

of loans that would be provided by private industry.

Mr. CAPEHART. The liberalization is confined to the extension of time?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. And not to the extension of down-payments, amounts, interest rates, or anything of that kind?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Not under my amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am speaking exclusively of the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. My amendment would provide an across-the-board increase of direct loans, increasing the maximum amount of direct loans from $13,500 to $15,000. The amendment does contain that one feature. Other than that provision, no monetary change is provided.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator has said that it extends the time. I think it is well to point out also that the effect of the Senator's amendment and also the effect of the provision that we wrote into our bill is not only to extend the time but also to phase out the program. In other words, we provide for the first time a schedule for bringing both of these programs to an end. Is that not true?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes; by giving credit for the length of time a veteran has served. He has a 10-year extension in the first place, and then a 1-year extension for each 4 months of service. That is to phase out the program. It is really more of a terminal facility in the present bill than we have had in any of the past bills.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have in the past simply extended it for a certain time, but always with the intention of extending it again.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Yes; without a phase-out formula such as the Senator's committee has written into the bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes; we have written it into the bill now pending before the Senate, and the Senator from Texas has written it into his amendment. His amendment further consolidates our provision in the bill with the amendment which comes from the Senator's committee.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It consolidates them into one, and relieves us of the burden of passing two laws and then reconciling them. The provision is written into one act.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With reference to the increase in the amount of the loan that would be made, from $13,500 to $15,000, the Senator from Indiana will recall that we wrote that provision in, but limited it to climatic conditions. The Veterans' Administration felt that it would be rather difficult of administration, and expressed the preference that, if we make an increase, we make it across the board. I do not believe $15,000 is an unreasonable limit to place on a house that is to be built for veterans. The amendment offered by the Senator from Texas is a good one.

Because of the difference in jurisdiction, not between committees in the Senate, but as between the House and the Senate, whereby the Veterans Committee of the House handles this type of legislation, and in the Senate the Banking and Currency Committee handles the direct loan part of the legislation and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare handles the GI guarantee part, we have frequently in the past handled legislation in this way—we have passed it as a part of our omnibus housing bill, and after we had concluded action on the bill we have taken from the desk a bill previously passed by the House and have stricken out all after the enacting clause in that bill and inserted in lieu thereof the language that we have written into the Senate committee bill. Then it went to conference, or it went back to the House. There is such a bill lying on the desk at the present time. It was passed by the House 3 or 4 weeks ago, and it has been held at the desk for this very reason. It will be my purpose, after we have completed action on the pending bill, assuming that the language which has been offered is agreed to, to ask that the House bill be taken up and that the language that we have agreed to be inserted in the House bill in lieu of the one that came from the House.

I am certainly in favor of the amendment, and if there is no opposition, I am ready for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Madam President, at this time I would like to submit, for insertion in the RECORD, a 10-year table showing the trends in housing starts under the VA program, appraisal requests, and home loan applications. I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD.

More direct loans were made to veterans in 1960 than in any previous year. The VA approved 30,560 loans amounting to $308,770,000. This was possible because of the additional appropriation of $100 million authorized by Public Law 86–73, approved June 30, 1959. Despite this record number of direct loans, there were, as of January 31, 1961, 30,383 veterans on the waiting list for direct loans. I have information that 279 veterans from my own State are now on the waiting list for direct loans.

There is no question that our veterans are good risks when it comes to loans. Full repayment of 30 percent of the 5.6 million GI home loans has been made since the program was launched in 1944. This is certainly a commendable record on the part of the veterans who have been granted loans, and is a very good reason for extending and expanding their rights to these loans.

The Chief Executive, in his message of March 9, 1961, relative to our Nation's housing pointed out that—

> The highest interest rates prevailing in the past few years made it impossible for many veterans to use their right to obtain guaranteed 5¼-percent loans to purchase housing.

He also indicated that to make guaranteed loans more attractive to private lenders it is essential to bring down long-term mortgage lending rates and that steps have been and are being taken in that direction. Because of the importance of existing Federal programs, however, and in order to allow sufficient time for planning, the Chief Executive recommended an extension of the loan guarantee programs. In extending the program he also recommended that emphasis be placed on veterans who served the longest and most recently. This bill is designed to carry out those provisions.

The economy today, in many areas, is sluggish and, as pointed out earlier, housing starts were down sharply in 1960, especially in the VA sector. GI loan financing has stimulated the housing industry in record years past. This occurred after the extension of the program in April 1958, a year during which we were in a recessionary period. There is every reason to feel an extension of the bill at this time will spur the economy.

Madam President, it is my earnest hope that the Senate will take swift and favorable action on the extension bill. I am certain that if it is passed many of the World War II and Korean conflict veterans who have not used their loan benefit will enter the housing market and this influx of new building will stimulate the residential construction industry and consequently will have an invigorating effect on the entire economy.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Veterans' Administration showing a State-by-State breakdown on the number of veterans who have participated in the housing loan program and the number who have not used their loan benefits be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Housing starts under VA's inspection procedure	Appraisal requests		Applications for home loan guarantee
		Proposed units	Existing units	
1951	148,634	164,365	225,694	377,530
1952	141,274	226,299	224,194	312,908
1953	156,616	251,437	223,239	322,780
1954	307,038	535,412	383,351	527,851
1955	392,870	620,776	392,895	669,058
1956	270,675	401,520	308,208	507,144
1957	128,302	159,399	92,962	248,827
1958	102,105	234,236	105,066	181,842
1959	109,297	233,984	95,706	208,305
1960	74,609	142,925	69,332	141,744

Estimated veteran participation in VA loan program, cumulative as of Dec. 31, 1960

Regional office	World War II and Korean conflict veteran population	Veterans who have used their entitlement	Veterans with unused entitlement
Total	19,695,000	6,058,932	13,636,068
REGIONAL OFFICES			
Alabama: Montgomery	322,000	80,482	241,518
Alaska: Juneau	13,000	1,240	11,760
Arizona: Phoenix	128,000	35,058	92,942
Arkansas: Little Rock	179,000	34,354	144,646
California:			
Los Angeles	1,000,000	467,249	532,751
San Francisco	734,000	305,902	428,098

Estimated veteran participation in VA loan program, cumulative as of Dec. 31, 1960—Continued

Regional office	World War II and Korean conflict veteran population	Veterans who have used their entitlement	Veterans with unused entitlement
REGIONAL OFFICES—cont.			
Colorado: Denver [1]	195,000	79,251	115,749
Connecticut: Hartford	281,000	86,242	194,758
Delaware: Wilmington	46,000	23,779	22,221
Florida: Pass-A-Grille	484,000	152,154	331,846
Georgia: Atlanta	368,000	110,589	257,411
Hawaii: Honolulu	57,000	7,901	49,099
Idaho: Boise [2]	69,000	18,634	50,366
Illinois: Chicago	1,202,000	237,775	964,225
Indiana: Indianapolis	453,000	118,562	334,438
Iowa: Des Moines [2]	289,000	78,591	210,409
Kansas: Wichita [2]	190,000	57,739	132,261
Kentucky: Louisville	320,000	56,342	263,658
Louisiana: New Orleans	298,000	76,552	221,448
Maine: Togus [2]	107,000	28,627	78,373
Maryland: Baltimore	285,000	99,901	185,099
Massachusetts: Boston	567,000	282,551	284,449
Michigan: Detroit	875,000	228,307	646,693
Minnesota: St. Paul	356,000	122,710	233,290
Mississippi: Jackson [2]	193,000	40,968	152,032
Missouri:			
Kansas City	242,000	85,471	156,529
St. Louis	286,000	61,459	224,541
Montana: Fort Harrison [2]	74,000	15,843	58,157
Nebraska: Lincoln	155,000	29,670	125,330
Nevada: Reno [2]	27,000	4,388	22,612
New Hampshire: Manchester	75,000	34,844	40,156
New Jersey: Newark	708,000	291,996	416,004
New Mexico: Albuquerque	93,000	35,619	57,381
New York:			
Buffalo	267,000	120,143	146,857
New York	1,449,000	471,302	977,698
Syracuse	184,000	76,453	107,547
North Carolina: Winston-Salem	442,000	77,079	364,921
North Dakota: Fargo [2]	86,000	15,368	70,632
Ohio:			
Cincinnati	457,000	114,346	342,654
Cleveland	620,000	172,637	447,363
Oklahoma: Muskogee	267,000	101,696	165,304
Oregon: Portland	216,000	38,005	177,995
Pennsylvania:			
Philadelphia	488,000	204,842	283,158
Pittsburgh	592,000	143,008	448,992
Wilkes-Barre	357,000	83,335	273,665
Puerto Rico: San Juan [2]	106,000	6,772	99,228
Rhode Island: Providence	159,000	40,341	118,659
South Carolina: Columbia	218,000	43,220	174,780
South Dakota: Sioux Falls [2]	73,000	15,464	57,536
Tennessee: Nashville	374,000	98,961	275,039
Texas:			
Dallas	418,000	124,414	293,586
Houston	236,000	102,454	133,546
Lubbock	155,000	65,141	89,859
San Antonio	191,000	66,107	124,893
Utah: Salt Lake City	96,000	30,586	65,414
Vermont: White River Junction [2]	41,000	16,866	24,134
Virginia: Roanoke	373,000	90,509	282,491
Washington: Seattle	307,000	119,305	187,695
West Virginia: Huntington	219,000	28,025	190,975
Wisconsin: Milwaukee	405,000	94,888	310,112
Wyoming: Cheyenne [2]	31,000	10,403	20,597
VETERANS BENEFITS OFFICE			
District of Columbia: Washington	197,000	96,512	100,488

[1] Regional office activity at VA center (RO–DO).
[2] Regional office activity at VA center (RO–H).

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do the Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I have been supporting housing legislation for 17 years. Generally speaking, I believe that our housing legislation has been practical, workable, and reasonable. However, there are some features in the bill before the Senate at which I think the Senate should take a good long look and ought to understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is limited. Does the Senator intend to offer an amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. First, let me say that I will speak for 10 minutes on the bill. I yield myself 10 minutes on the bill.

I should like to ask the acting majority leader a question. The unanimous consent agreement, which is printed, and which was agreed to on yesterday, is not quite clear to me in one respect. It states that if there are any yea-and-nay votes they will come on Wednesday. I have 11 amendments at the desk, which have been printed. It is my intention to offer the amendments. Of course, if I am successful in having my first amendment adopted, it will not be necessary to offer four or five other amendments. Should I ask for unanimous consent to have a yea-and-nay vote ordered on each amendment on Wednesday?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If I may make a suggestion, if the Senator did not get the yea-and-nay votes ordered on all amendments, assuming that it could be done, the Senator might be in difficulty when it came to withdrawing the request, because there might be objection. I believe it would expediate matters if in every case when an amendment is offered the Senator at that point ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CAPEHART. If my first amendment shall be agreed to, there will be no necessity for offering five other amendments which are printed and lying on the desk. The unanimous-consent agreement states that we cannot have a yea-and-nay vote today, but must defer it until Wednesday. I do not want to be estopped from having a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My suggestion would be that the Senator take up such amendments as he cares to this afternoon, and to discuss them, but to defer until Wednesday the question of asking for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is understood.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is understood that there will be no yea-and-nay vote until Wednesday, but I would suggest that the Senator defer his request for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have had difficulty on occasion when a unanimous consent request was made to order the yeas and nays. There was objection on the ground that it was not good practice to ask unanimous consent for the yeas and nays. Under the circumstances, in order to protect the rule, I would ask my friend from Indiana to take up each amendment in turn and then, if he asks for the yeas and nays, to have the vote go over until Wednesday, under the existing consent agreement.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would like to read the wording of the last paragraph of the unanimous-consent agreement. It reads:

Ordered further, That in case a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on any amendment, action on that amendment will go over until Wednesday, June 7.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We have already handled one amendment today in this way. The Senator involved said that he might ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment. We used all time for debate on it today. Then we laid it aside until Wednesday, at which time the Senator may ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CAPEHART. There is only 1 hour for debate allowed today. Then on Wednesday 30 minutes are provided for debate on any amendment. My parliamentary question is this. May I ask unanimous consent to have the yeas and nays ordered on my 11 amendments on Wednesday?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the policy not to ask for the yeas and nays by unanimous consent. It is possible to debate the amendment today and then to ask that the yea-and-nay vote go over until Wednesday.

Mr. CAPEHART. One may ask unanimous consent for a yea-and-nay vote on an amendment without debating the amendment. It is not necessary to debate the amendment in order to get unanimous consent for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, it seems to me there is a very simple answer; that is, to debate the amendment as much as the Senator wishes to do so this afternoon and then simply ask that the vote be deferred until Wednesday.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is what I am doing now. I do not have to debate the amendment in order to ask for the yeas and nays. I am asking now for a yea-and-nay vote on Wednesday on all 11 of my amendments.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I shall have to object. I think it would not be in consonance with the understanding we have had about ordering the yeas and nays. If the distinguished Senator from Indiana wishes to offer an amendment and then ask for the yeas and nays, I shall help him get them. That is in conformity with the rule. He does not have to debate the amendment, if he does not so desire. Fifteen minutes will be allotted to each side on Wednesday, when the amendment is called up. But each amendment ought to be offered in turn, and the yeas and nays ought to be requested, under the existing rule. I shall be more than happy to help the Senator get the yeas and nays.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I send to the desk 11 amendments and ask that the yeas and nays be ordered as of Wednesday. All I am trying to do is to protect myself on Wednesday,

to make certain that I will have a yea-and-nay vote on any amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, if the Senator will defer until Wednesday his request for the yeas and nays, he will then have an ample opportunity to get them, and I will join with the minority leader in helping the Senator to get them.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. The wording of the last paragraph of the unanimous-consent agreement is as follows:

> That in case a yea-and-nay vote is ordered on any amendment, action on that amendment will go over until Wednesday.

What do the words "go over" mean?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. "Debate" does not mean action, but if the yeas and nays are ordered on an amendment, the vote automatically goes over until Wednesday.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, may I offer as many amendments as I care to on Wednesday and ask for yea-and-nay votes upon them?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments may be offered at any time until the third reading. There is no agreement concerning when amendments may be offered.

Mr. CAPEHART. In other words, I may offer as many amendments as I wish on Wednesday and ask for yea-and-nay votes on them?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If action on the bill has not been completed.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is understood, of course.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, is it not true, however, that if the Senator from Indiana waits until Wednesday, the time for the debate on an amendment will be less than the amount of time allotted for debate today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the amendment is not offered until Wednesday, the time on the amendment will be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think, with the majority leader, that we had a very clear understanding. It was hoped that discussion on many of the prospective amendments could be carried to a conclusion today. On some amendments a voice vote might be requested, and they could be disposed of. However, if a request were made for a yea-and-nay vote, and there were an adequate showing of hands, that vote would go over until Wednesday.

In addition, on amendments considered before Wednesday, and on which a yea-and-nay vote had been asked, 15 minutes on a side was allotted, so that the Senate might be refreshed concerning the nature of the amendment.

With respect to any other amendment not theretofore offered, which came new before the Senate on Wednesday, debate would still be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just a moment. I have the floor.

Mr. CAPEHART. The Senator from Illinois does not have the floor; I have the floor, but I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senator from Indiana will bear with me for just a moment, if he withholds all his amendments today and offers them on Wednesday, there will still be 1 hour on each amendment, 30 minutes to a side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader has correctly stated the agreement.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Will the debate on amendments on Wednesday be limited to 30 minutes or to 1 hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The debate on any amendment offered on Wednesday will be limited to 1 hour.

Mr. CAPEHART. By withholding all these amendments until Wednesday and offering them then, and having the yeas and nays ordered, the time limitation will be 1 hour on each amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair. I suggest that the Senator from Indiana call up his amendment designated "6–1–61–D" in the hope that we may be able to reach an agreement on it. I do not know whether the Senator is agreeable to that. I have suggested to him a compromise which seems to be entirely reasonable.

Mr. CAPEHART. What is the substance of that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes which the Senator from Indiana has yielded himself have expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield myself another 10 minutes. I send to the desk my amendment designated "6–1–61–D" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$7,000".

On page 15, line 24, strike out "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "fifteen".

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I withdraw my request for 10 minutes on the bill and will speak on the amendment. I allow myself 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As I have indicated previously to the Senator, I would be agreeable to a modification along this line, which I believe is entirely reasonable.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, are we operating now on time yielded on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The $10,000 limitation, I think, is entirely reasonable as to amount, because if a rehabilitation program is to be carried out, that amount will be needed.

I am agreeable to reducing the term of years. As I understand, the Senator's proposal is to reduce it to 15 years. That is perhaps too drastic. I suggest 20 years. I hope the Senator will agree to that modification.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, for some 20 years the so-called repair or rehabilitation section has been in the FHA laws or the housing laws. Under that section, a homeowner could go to his local bank and borrow up to $3,500 over a 5-year period to repair or rehabilitate his house. The bank would lend the money, and the Federal Government would guarantee up to 90 percent of any loss, the bank assuming 10 percent of any loss. But the homeowner—the individual—did business directly with his own bank. That was private industry and private banking. The only part which the Federal Government played was if a default occurred. Then the Federal Government would assume 90 percent of the loss, and the bank 10 percent. That policy has been in effect for many years and, generally speaking, has been successful, particularly after the act was amended, following the so-called FHA hearings in 1954, when a number of abuses were found to be taking place under this particular section. However, since that time that part of the law has been operating successfully.

What is proposed to be done by the amendment—and this is one of the reasons why I want the Senate to pay particular attention to this feature—is to keep the existing law up to $3,500, with 90 percent of any loss guaranteed by the Federal Government, 10 percent by the bank, and then to add a new section, in which we will say to the people of the United States, "The Federal Government will lend to you directly from the Federal Treasury at an interest rate of 6 percent, and FNMA will pick up the commitment."

The loans would be made directly, not through banks; and that would put the Federal Government into the business of making loans directly to homeowners, in amounts up to $10,000; and the loans could be made without any security, for the bill does not specifically require or mandate that the Administrator obtain any security other than a note; that would be left to the discretion of the Administrator of the law. Furthermore, such a loan of up to $10,000 could be made on any one unit; and up to $10,000 could be spent on the rehabilitation of a home, although the money would have to be used for the actual rehabilitation of the home. Not more than $10,000 could be obtained, and the repayment could be made over a period of 25 years.

In addition—and possibly this is one of the worst features of this section—a businessman who might own 500 apart-

ments—individual units—or 500 houses which he was renting, could rehabilitate each of them to the extent of $10,000 each, and could obtain the money directly from the Federal Government, with repayment over a period of 25 years. To my way of thinking, such an arrangement simply would not be good business.

The $3,500 5-year plan has been successful, I believe. Why should a change now be made from the $3,500 to $10,000, and from the 5 years to 25 years; and why should bank participation be eliminated, by having the loans made directly by the Federal Government.

To me, such an arrangement simply does not make sense.

So the amendment I have submitted would reduce the amount from $10,000 to $7,000, and would reduce the period from 25 years to 15 years—which I think is very, very liberal; $7,000 is twice as much as we are lending now, and 15 years is three times as long as the period we are allowing at the moment.

Madam President, who arrived at the decision to have the bill provide for a 25-year period and for loans of up to $10,000? Senators cannot find in the hearings any testimony in favor of such a proposal by anyone who had any yardstick or any formula which called for 25 years or $10,000. That arrangement is just part of the grandiose scheme to spend the taxpayers money, put the Federal Government further into the lives of the American people, and take business away from private industry. There has been no testimony by anyone who particularly demanded such an arrangement; there has been no testimony on the part of anyone who particularly wanted such an arrangement. This is just another one of the very liberal schemes which was added by the new Director of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, without any rhyme or reason at all—just a part of the general, overall scheme in this country to further inject the Federal Government into American business and further inject the Federal Government into the lives of American citizens, by subsidizing the housing industry, through the Federal Government.

If this is to be done, at least it might be limited to individuals and to private homes. Why is this also proposed to be done for a millionaire owner of 1,000 apartments or 1,000 homes? Many businessmen and corporations in this country own, for rental purposes, dozens, and in many instances hundreds, of individual homes, and hundreds and hundreds of apartments. Yet this bill would permit them to obtain up to $10,000 for each home and each unit, and to obtain the money directly from the Federal Government, on a 25-year term; and nothing in the proposed legislation would tie up the security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes the Senator from Indiana yielded to himself have expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield myself another 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana may proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Furthermore, Madam President, nothing in the proposed arrangement would require any security other than a note. Of course, if the Administrator wished to do so, he could require a first mortgage from one person, and could require a second mortgage from another person; but there is no mandatory requirement for that.

Another thing that I do not like about the proposed legislation is that the Administrator could play favorites.

One man who wished to borrow might be required by the Administrator to take out a first mortgage; another prospective borrower might be allowed to obtain the funds on the basis of a straight note.

This proposal is another sample of the kind of legislation the Congress has enacted during recent years—legislation giving a blank check to whoever would administer the law. He would be told, "You can do this for one, and you can decide not to do it for another."

Madam President, I think that even my own amendment is too liberal; I think $7,000 is too liberal, and I think 15 years is too long a term. But I thought the amendment a good compromise.

This proposal would be a new feature in our legislation in this field; we have never done anything of this sort before. Yet it is proposed that we begin with a 25-year term.

When the first FHA bill was enacted under President Roosevelt—and I ask Senators to correct me if I am in error about this—the term allowed for a new house was only 20 years, I believe. If those who originated the FHA idea 25 years ago thought the mortgages on new houses should be limited to 20-year terms, then why is it believed, today, that a term of up to 25 years is proper in connection with the rehabilitation or repair of a house or an apartment?

Another feature of this section which I do not think good is the one which provides that the Administrator can allow almost any kind of rehabilitation to be done—for instance, the building of a swimming pool or porches or additions; or a person could buy a new house, if he wishes, for $15,000, and the next day could spend $10,000 on a new porch or on more rooms, and could be allowed a period of 25 years in which to repay the loan.

Madam President, what is the purpose of this proposal? I do not think anyone can find in the hearings any testimony which would show any reason for this proposal. I can see some virtue in it if it is done on what I call a sane and sound basis; in other words, possibly for the rehabilitation of individual homes, for individuals, to the extent of perhaps $7,000, although I think that amount too large. I am thinking now in terms of persons with low incomes and persons with houses worth, let us say, up to $15,000 or $20,000. Up to those amounts, we might loan them up to $7,000—which my amendment calls for, although I think it is still too liberal—for a period of 15 years, which, again, I think is possibly too liberal, too long. But it is a compromise, for it is 10 years less than 25 years; and possibly that might be all right, if it were limited to such persons and to individual housing.

But it is proposed to permit persons who own homes for rental purposes and apartment purposes to do it. My attention has been called to a statement in the report, on page 10, which reads:

To demonstrate the effect of the proposal—

That is the proposal in the act we are considering—

a homeowner could obtain a $5,000 home improvement loan repayable over a period of 15 years with a monthly payment of $43.77. This example is based on a 5½ percent interest rate, one-half percent insurance premium, and a one-half percent service charge. If this same loan had a maturity of 25 years, the monthly payment would be only $33.68.

So it can be seen that the payments are being gotten to quite a low point, but there is only a $10-a-month difference.

My amendment would reduce the loan which could be made to $7,000. I do not know what else can be said about the unsoundness of the proposal with regard to the act we are considering. I want to repeat what we are doing. For 20 years we have had a program providing for loans up to $3,500, over 5 years, in which there was insured a loan which was made through local banking institutions, and in which the Federal Government guaranteed to absorb 90 percent of the loss of the bank, if one occurred. The banks serviced the loans. They handled the whole procedure. The Federal Government had nothing to do with the loan whatsoever, unless there was a loss.

Now we are keeping that provision as a part of the act and are adding a new section which provides the money will be loaned for a period up to 25 years, but no specific security on the loan is mandated. It is also proposed to lend up to $10,000, and to provide that a businessman who owns many rental houses can get a loan of up to $10,000 on each home. Also, a businessman who owns many apartment buildings will be able to get a loan of $10,000 on each unit. A person might be able to get a loan of $1 million for a period of 25 years, and the Administrator could, or he might not, get a first or second mortgage on a property.

I ask this question, and I wish the Senate would consider it very, very carefully: If the program has been successful to date—and it has been—under a provision of loans up to $3,500 for 5 years, why, all at once and overnight, is it proposed to extend the period of the loans up to 25 years—a period five times as long as the present period provided—and provide for the lending of $10,000—which is nearly three times as much as the loans presently provided for—when we are keeping the old part of the act we are considering, unless it is just to push the Federal Government into business?

Madam President, I withhold my request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield 2 or 3 minutes to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New York on the amendment.

RECENT CRITICISM OF HELEN HAYES

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate a brief flurry which apparently has gotten some notice in the press, and which involves Helen Hayes, the first lady of the American theater, who, as I think everyone knows, is traveling with a company of players, under the auspices of the international cultural exchange program conducted under the President's fund. She has been performing in three plays, one of which is the Thornton Wilder play "Skin of Your Teeth," and another of which is "The Glass Menagerie." Those plays have been shown in many countries of the world. That company is now engaged for a Latin American tour which promises to be successful, too. I have put in the RECORD laudatory articles from the press in other countries, as well as laudatory articles by John Crosby in New York and Dick Coe in Washington.

Apparently, in the other body of Congress a statement was made yesterday which had some reflection upon Helen Hayes as an artist and indicated that she was less than patriotic because, it was said, she was getting a salary of $2,500 a week for participating in these plays.

Mr. Lawrence Langner, longtime director of the Theater Guild Foundation, which sponsors the plays, has asked me to set the record straight on this matter. I have known Helen Hayes for some time. She was the wife of Charles McArthur, with whom I had the privilege of serving in the Army. I think it is really unfair to write down her tremendous efforts in the different countries on our behalf. The fact is, I am advised, that she is getting $1,500 a week, which is the figure set for her salary by the foundation putting on the plays. Artists generally who appear in this particular cultural program, I am told, have received salaries, and this is, for Miss Hayes, a modest salary. She turned down, I am told, two firm offers for appearances at the same time which would have brought to her $250,000, in order to make possible the tour which she is taking, and she turned down several offers so that she could take the Latin American tour. The tour we are speaking of, which has brought so much credit to our country, would not have been possible except for Miss Hayes' willingness to head it as the leading player. Without her it would not have had the viability it has. Also, it is perfectly logical that some modest compensation should be given to the people who participate, who generally are not wealthy enough to participate for months without any compensation.

It seems unfair to me to criticize Helen Hayes, the beloved first lady of the theater in America, under the circumstances which I have described, and which perhaps, were not known before.

Helen Hayes has received ovations and decorations from the heads of government in Europe for her great artistry in her travels through many countries as she has performed under the cultural program, which has helped our country so very much.

Her valiant, tireless efforts on this arduous tour, the energy expended, not only in performances, but in countless meetings with cultural groups in each country, her unfailing attendance at every embassy function, her daily interviews with the foreign press, radio, and television, is a record of cultural ambassadorship for which she should receive great credit.

I hope, as both parts of the record are read, the part of the record I have made here today and the reference in the record of the other body, there may be a fair appraisal made of the question in terms of the contributions of Helen Hayes and her high patriotism.

IDAHO HIGH SCHOOL BOYS PLUG DIKE ON KOOTENAI RIVER

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. CAPEHART. Eight minutes out of 30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield 2 minutes to the able Senator from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Madam President, events in my home State are not frequently reported on the national wire services. However, Idaho has been very much in the news in the past week. Our National Guard units were called out to guard nationwide communications systems which were dynamited in nearby Utah and Nevada. Other National Guard units were rushed to the north Idaho community of Bonners Ferry to hold the dikes against the raging Kootenai River. Great concern is expressed by those across the Nation dependent upon Idaho crops as evidence of a very serious drought continues to mount. Idaho calamities are making news.

However, an Associated Press dispatch which was printed in the Washington Post May 31 was one which I am much pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues. Every day we hear criticism of today's youth. They are disparaged when compared with the youth of history. However, the Post story gives an account of a heroic deed of 24 Bonners Ferry High School youths that could have come out of the pages of history in any age and be pointed to with pride. I am certain that my fellow Idahoans are joining with me in commending these boys for their courage and sense of responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent that the story from the Washington Post giving the account of 24 boys plugging a dike against a raging river, and an Associated Press dispatch by Earle Jester, concerning the vagaries of nature in Idaho, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 31, 1961]

TWENTY-FOUR BOYS PLUG DAM WITH BACKS

BONNERS FERRY, IDAHO, May 30.—Two dozen high school boys are credited with using their backs to put on a modern version of the Dutch finger-in-dike legend.

The boys were assigned to fill sandbags along the swollen Kootenai River at Myrtle Creek yesterday after a woman had called to report water was flowing across her farmland. A break was discovered in the dirt dike but there was a delay until dump trucks and sandbag crews could fill the breach.

The boys volunteered to wade into the chilly water. They locked arms and formed a double human chain which slowed the surge of river water through the dike break.

The breach was repaired and the rich farmland saved from serious flooding.

"It was a dramatic job," said Gilbert R. Bean, public information officer for the Army Corps of Engineers, which is directing the flood fight. "Some of those boys really took a beating from that cold water."

The Kootenai, fed by late-melting snow, flooded 800 acres of farmland and for a time threatened the town of Bonners Ferry itself before beginning to drop yesterday without ever reaching a predicted dangerous crest of 37.5 feet. It read 36.68 feet at mid-morning.

NORTH, SOUTH—WILL THE DRAIN EVER MEET?

(By Earle L. Jester)

BOISE.—Too much water in the north; not enough in the south.

That has been Idaho's situation for many years. Can anything be done about it?

Probably not.

Although some diversion proposals have been suggested which are possible from an engineering standpoint, none ever has been declared economically feasible.

Ironically, while Federal and State agencies now are exploring every possible means of increasing the supply of irrigation water in southern Idaho, other Federal and State agencies are fighting against too much water in the north.

In the south the prospect is for stream runoffs of as little as 30 percent of normal.

Some reservoirs will be dry before the middle of the summer and irrigation water will be gone by July 4. There will be only one crop of hay; grains cannot be matured; pastures will turn brown.

In northern Idaho, the Kootenai River is flooding several thousand acres of river bottom land and is licking at the top of dikes which protect rich farmland and the community of Bonners Ferry.

Workmen from the Army Corps of Engineers and emergency crews from units of the Idaho National Guard, mobilized by order of Gov. Robert E. Smylie, are seeking frantically to keep the muddy, debris-laden water in check.

That water could mean the saving of farm crops in the south, the difference between disastrous losses and financial success to the farmer.

George Carter, Idaho State reclamation engineer and veteran of many years of service with State and Federal reclamation agencies, says that over the years many schemes have been proposed to get that wasted water in the north onto the arid acres in the south.

"But they're all just dreams, so far," he adds.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield me 1 minute?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho for the remarks he has made and for the articles he has asked to have printed in the RECORD. The 24 high school boys from Bonner's Ferry, Idaho, are to be commended, because they are collectively the modern example of the Dutch boy who put his hand in the dike and stopped the sea from coming in and flooding the area in which he and his parents lived.

I express the hope to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Idaho, that this will bring home to our friends in Canada the importance of and the need for the Libby Dam, because every year the people of northern Idaho are plagued by such floods. If we can get Libby Dam built, and we have already done our full share in this country through ratification of the treaty, then we would not have these flood conditions on the Kootenai every year. Again I commend the Senator from Idaho.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana would not eliminate the home rehabilitation program but would cut it down severely. In the bill we propose a maximum of $10,000 and a maximum term of 25 years.

I have indicated to the Senator from Indiana that if he would be willing to accept a compromise I would be willing to lower the term to 20 years. I do not believe the maximum amount should be lowered.

I should like to make this very clear. The Senator spoke about our longtime program of home improvement loans under title I of the Housing Act. This has been a remarkably good program. I noticed in the report only a few moments ago the amount which had been loaned in that program during the time it has been in existence. The extent to which it has been used is simply amazing. Over 24 million loans have been made totaling close to $14 billion in amount. It has been primarily, as the term implies, used for home improvements; for the addition of a bathroom, for the addition of a porch, for putting on a new roof, or for something of that kind. What we are now proposing is something private enterprise, year in and year out, has recommended be done; that is, we propose to set up a rehabilitation program in order that old houses may be reclaimed.

I say to my good friend from Indiana, who is a good friend and a good man to work with—we have worked closely on housing legislation over the years—I have been surprised by his attitude with reference to this proposal, because if there is anybody on the committee or anybody in the Senate who has been interested in trying to do something about existing homes, rather than simply building new homes, it is the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. That is what we are trying to do. We are trying to give people in the neighborhoods which we might call rundown neighborhoods an opportunity to rehabilitate their houses. The program is not simply to make additions or improvements, by putting on new roofs or things like that, but, instead, to a great extent it is a program of rebuilding houses.

I believe $10,000 is a fair maximum limitation. That would not mean that every loan would be $10,000. It would simply mean that no loan could be more than $10,000.

Under the home improvement loan provision we have a maximum of $3,500, yet I would guess that the average spent per case probably is under $700. Incidentally, $3,500 is not the absolute limit. When there are multiple units involved, the amount may go as high as $15,000.

The home improvement program has worked very well. The Senator from Indiana has complimented the working of that program. It is true that there were abuses, and we had to look into them. The Senator from Indiana had a lot to do with correcting those abuses, but they were corrected.

I wish to invite the attention of Senators to the difference between the title I home improvement plan and the proposed home rehabilitation program. The home improvement plan, as the Senator from Indiana said, is not handled by the FHA; that is, FHA does not have the close supervision which is provided over most of the programs. The FHA has nothing to do with checking the property, making any appraisal or any estimate or anything of that kind. What happens is that the homeowner simply goes to the banker and says, "I should like to do this home improvement work." He signs a note with the bank. The FHA accepts it without ever looking at it, or making any inspection or any appraisal whatsoever.

The safeguard we provided 3 or 4 years ago was the provision the Senator mentioned, whereby the amount of insurance the FHA provided was cut to 90 percent of the loan. The bank had to absorb 10 percent in case of a default on the loan.

What will happen in the rehabilitation program? It will be strictly an FHA program. The FHA will go through the same kind of careful handling it has provided for regular FHA home loans. The application will have to be filed. It will go through the FHA offices and FHA procedures. The property will be inspected. The work will be appraised. The entire process will have to be approved by the FHA before the insurance is allowed. It will follow the procedures of the regular mortgage insurance program.

The Senator from Indiana a time or two mentioned "loans" or "direct loans," and so forth, about FNMA borrowings. I am sure the Senator did not mean that.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I finish, please?

It is very easy to refer to FHA loans when, as a matter of fact, there are no such things as FHA loans. The FHA administers an insurance program of insurance which is paid for by the borrower, who pays a premium on the amount.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the new language, the interest rate will be set at 6 percent. For the home improvement loans, as the Senator knows, the banks set their own interest rates.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Under the new rehabilitation section, the interest rate is to be set at 6 percent. Under the law, a bank will take that, but the next day the banker can demand that FNMA pick up the loan. Therefore, the Federal Government, to that extent, will be making the loans direct. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator is not entirely correct in his statement, or at least in the inference I draw from the statement. The banker cannot insist that FNMA pick up the loan. The banker can apply to FNMA, if he wishes to sell the loan note, but the FNMA does not have to buy it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the Senator certain that the law does not demand that FNMA pick up the loan?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand that FNMA may buy the note if it is insured under the FHA section 220 program, that is, the loan is made for improvements on a property in an urban renewal area, but FNMA will not buy notes for loans secured by property outside urban renewal areas.

Of course, FNMA does not have to buy the notes.

He can ask FNMA to buy it if he wishes.

Mr. CAPEHART. We have authorized FNMA to pick up loans from the bank.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not like that feature. I am willing to give the amendment a trial on the basis of $7,000 and 15 years. I do not understand why it should be necessary to go any higher than $7,000, because the average low income family usually buys a house costing from $9,000 to $15,000. The purchaser certainly ought to put a little of his own money into the purchase. If he borrowed up to $7,000 from the bank, the Government, or FNMA, and contributed a little himself, he would receive a loan up to $10,000.

I am afraid that if we go to extremes in writing a housing bill, the public will react against it. I think builders ought to be careful that we do not completely unbalance the Housing Act and bring it to the point where it does not represent good business. I do not believe it is good business to provide for loans up to $10,000 with 25 years to repay.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the statement of the Senator from Indiana that we ought to be careful not to have an unbalanced bill. I do not believe the bill is unbalanced.

Madam President, there is involved one's interpretation of rehabilitation as against home improvement. I have tried to point out the difference. The maximum loan would be $10,000. Loans lower than that amount could be made.

Mr. CAPEHART. I would rather provide for loans of $10,000 with repayment

in 15 years. I would rather cut down the maximum number of years for repayment, because 25 years is a long time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agreed to cut the maximum time to 20 years.

Mr. CAPEHART. I know the Senator from Alabama did so. I would like to cut it to 15.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CAPEHART. I have not offered an amendment to strike out the provision. I have merely offered an amendment to make the bill more workable, practical, and in keeping with what I think are better business practices. The amendment would make the bill more sound. People would be less likely to react against the housing bill if it did not become entirely too liberal. For that reason I think the chairman of the subcommittee and the committee ought to accept my amendment. I believe the majority of Senators will see that what we are trying to do is not to kill the idea, but to make it more practical and to bring it within good, sound business practices.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I do not see the point in the same way the Senator from Indiana does. Let us consider an example with which we are familiar. Over the past several years we know that there has been a great deal of rehabilitation of property in the vicinity of Capitol Hill. We know that in Foggy Bottom homes have been rehabilitated through private enterprise, chiefly by people who bought the homes and were able to rehabilitate them. But suppose an individual owned one of those homes and was not able to reach down into his pocket and obtain the necessary amount of money to rehabilitate the property. Those houses have been made into good homes. In many instances I believe the rehabilitation has cost more than $10,000.

We want to rehabilitate rundown property in order to utilize existing structures. The program is designed to accomplish that objective. While I would go along with the Senator from Indiana in his amendment to reduce the term of a loan to 20 years, I certainly do not believe it would be reasonable or practical to reduce the amount lower than $10,000. I hope the Senator will accept that proposal and let the amendment be disposed of.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I cannot do so, because I know a number of Senators wish to vote upon the amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, without charging to either side the time necessary to obtain the quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which is now pending.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 8, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "interest" and insert in lieu thereof "an interest rate".

On page 8, line 15 after the parenthesis, it is proposed to insert ", uniformly established by the Commissioner for all classes of borrowers,".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Action on the amendment identified as "6–1–61—D" will of necessity go over until Wednesday, due to the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered. The question is on the pending amendment, identified as "6–1–61—B."

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment mandates the Commissioner to treat all nonprofit organizations exactly alike in respect of interest charges. I am hopeful that the Senator in charge of the bill will accept the amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As I understand, the Senator is not offering the material on lines 6, 7, and 8 of his amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. No; I struck out that language.

Mr. CLARK. I believe the amendment will be acceptable to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. He has authorized me to say that he will be glad to accept it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader how long we may expect to stay in session today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That would depend on the course of events. If possible, I would like to see most of the amendments out of the way, one way or another, so that we would have a definite idea as to what we would do on Wednesday when we come in on that day. The Senator may recall that one of the purposes of coming in at 10 o'clock this morning was to try to get as many amendments out of the way as possible, and to put over until Wednesday the amendments which called for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment identified as "6–1–61—J," on behalf of myself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the text of the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

On page 3, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 16 on page 6.

On page 6, line 17, strike out "(8)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

On page 7, line 15, strike out "(9)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)".

On page 8, line 4, strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(8)".

On page 8, strike out lines 10 through 21.

On page 8, line 22, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(9)".

On page 9, beginning with line 6, strike out all through the period in line 20.

On page 9, lines 21 and 22, strike out "subsection (d) (2) or (d) (4) of".

On page 10, line 4, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(10)".

On page 10, beginning with the colon in line 20, strike out all through line 6, on page 11, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, line 3, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 12, line 6, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, strike out lines 7 through 9.

On page 12, beginning with line 24, strike out all through line 10 on page 13.

On page 72, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 3 on page 73, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) Section 212 of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) 'any mortgage under section 220' and inserting in lieu thereof 'any loan or mortgage under section 220 or section 233'."

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. CLARK. In view of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment, I assume that the amendment will go over until Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It automatically goes over, under the agreement. Of course, the Senator from Indiana may use on the amendment the time which is allotted to him under the agreement, if he desires to do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address an inquiry to the majority leader, if I may. Under the unanimous con-

sent agreement, I understand that yea and nay votes will automatically go over until Wednesday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would it be possible to enlarge that agreement to provide that all votes on amendments would go over until that day, so that we might continue our committee work, instead of having to dash back to the Chamber for a quorum call, when no good purpose is served?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I can see the point of view of the distinguished Senator from Florida. However, I would be loath to agree to such a procedure at this time, in view of the fact that plenty of notice was given, and in view of the further fact that this procedure was agreed to by the ranking members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is handling the legislation in a manner which we thought would be to the best interest of all concerned.

Contrary to the usual practice of the past several weeks, committees are being permitted to meet today during the session of the Senate. It is hoped that very shortly most of the committees—perhaps not the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but others—will be able to dismiss their members and thus permit their attendance on the floor. I hope the Senator will not press his point in this instance.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not press the point. It seems to me, since we are not going to have any yea-and-nay votes until Wednesday, and since any Senator who desires to get a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment will try to get us to the floor, it interferes with the good purpose of the leadership to let committees meet without interruption. I therefore suggest that it is interfering with committee service, and that if some arrangement were made whereby a Senator's amendment could, by his asking for it, go over until Wednesday, it would prevent an interruption of committee work, which I know the Senator is very anxious to have proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will withhold his request, and if he desires to return to his committee, I think the problem will be settled very shortly, and the situation will be cleared up.

Mr. HOLLAND. Very well. I shall not insist on anything; I simply wish to help the leader in having committee work continue uninterrupted, which has not seemed to be possible.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the statement of the Senator; he is always helpful.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the present law permits mortgages up to 40 years in the case of families who are displaced as a result of governmental action, such as in the case of urban renewal housing, where they are forced out by the Government. They have no choice; they must get out. That is now in the law, and has been for some time.

Another instance in which the bill will liberalize the housing laws is the provision that anyone having what is called moderate income can get a house with a 40-year mortgage arrangement without any downpayment, so long as the house does not cost more than $15,000. The bill does not define a "moderate income." Although there is a limitation of 40 years on the mortgage, with no downpayment, there is no limitation on the amount of money one earns; it is simply that the house must not cost more than $15,000. In other words, if a millionaire wished to do so, he could buy a $15,000 house, secure a 40-year mortgage, and make no downpayment. I think that sort of thing is unreasonable. It is so liberal and so unsound a business practice that it may weaken the general Federal housing legislation and the good record which the Federal housing authority has established over the years.

A new feature of the proposed section is that a new public housing authority or one which is now in existence may build houses costing up to $15,000 or multifamily or apartment housing and borrow money at interest rates far below the market—3⅝ percent—and rent them or sell the housing to the so-called middle income groups, but there is no definition of middle income groups. Senators well know that the public housing program has been in existence for many years and in the past has been for the benefit of the very low income groups, those who simply do not have sufficient income to pay anything except low rentals. That program operates on the basis that the public housing authority will establish the projects and will borrow money from the Federal Government to sell mortgages which the Federal Housing Administration will insure. The public housing authority will, in turn, rent the houses at a very low rental, and the Federal Government will assume, as a direct payment, direct grant, or gift, the difference between what the apartments or the houses are rented for and the actual cost of operating them, plus the amortization of the mortgage. The cost of that program has run into hundreds of millions of dollars over many years. That represents public housing for people having very low incomes, primarily those who, we might say, are receiving welfare payments.

The new language is such that, under the act, public bodies can build houses or housing units costing up to $15,000, borrow the money at a cost below the market rate, and go into the public housing business. Thus we shall be establishing public housing, not for the benefit of the extremely low income groups, but for the so-called middle income groups, without any definition of "middle income," because there is no definition in the bill. We shall be permitting the socialization of housing. In fact, this might well be the first step toward the nationalization of housing in the United States. At least, it is the first step toward the socialization of housing, because it permits the establishment of a public authority or a nonprofit organization to build houses and then rent them at subsidized interest rates.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield for a question?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield for a question.

Mr. CLARK. Is not the pending amendment designated "J"?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Is not that the amendment which eliminates the entire middle-income housing program?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Is not the Senator from Indiana now addressing himself to a different amendment, one which is not before the Senate, and which deals with public housing only?

Mr. CAPEHART. The amendment we are now considering does not eliminate displaced persons, persons who are displaced as a result of some governmental action. That provision is retained in the bill. The amendment simply eliminates the new features of the act which we are considering, which relate to the middle income groups.

Mr. CLARK. That was my understanding.

Mr. CAPEHART. It permits those people to buy houses on mortgages having a term of 40 years, with no downpayment, and likewise permits the organization of so-called public housing authorities which can build houses, borrow money directly from the Federal Government, and build houses under this act. It extends the public housing beyond the extreme low-income group of people to the middle-income people.

Mr. CLARK. But has not the Senator from Indiana another amendment which he has not called up dealing solely with the public housing feature?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. I will talk about that when it is called up.

Mr. President, that is about all there is to the amendment. We must make up our mind whether we want to adopt an unreasonable, impractical proposal, a sort of socialistic feature of the housing bill—and I say that with the kindest of feelings—under which people may buy houses on mortgages up to 40 years' duration, and with no downpayment. It will take them 7 years to get any equity whatsoever in the house. Anybody can buy such a house. There is no definition of middle income.

The question is whether Congress should permit public bodies to participate in the program by building such houses at subsidized interest rates below the market interest rate, thereby putting into public housing people in the middle-income group. That is what the new proposal amounts to. That is my best judgment, speaking as one who has been writing housing bills and voting for them for many years. I was the author of the 1954 act, which was looked upon then as being the most liberal act passed by Congress. However, Senators now are going further than I care to go, and, I believe, further than the American people want to go and, I believe, further than the building industry and those in the building business ought to go.

Those who really should be against this proposal are, in my opinion, the builders themselves and the real estate people of the Nation, because they would not do this with their own money. But if the Government is foolish enough to

guarantee mortgages for up to 40 years, with no downpayment, I presume the building industry will accept such a proposal.

I attended most of the hearings, and I have examined the record of the hearings; but I have not found any great demand for this proposal. I have not found that anyone demands this sort of arrangement.

I have always looked upon the middle-income people of the Nation as being the backbone of the Nation and those who made our Nation great. But now it is proposed that their housing be socialized or nationalized—because that is what this proposal amounts to. When one who purchases a $15,000 house is allowed a term of 40 years, with no downpayment, and when it takes him 7 years before he gets any equity in the house, he is just having his house subsidized at the expense of the Federal Government; and I do not believe that is good business.

Later, I shall offer another amendment, one to create a different formula, over a 40-year period.

But I believe the Congress should, in the best interests of the American people and in the best interests of the housing industry itself, reject this proposal, because if we go on expanding and expanding and liberalizing and adopting what are unsound business principles, the American people will rise up against the housing legislation, and, in my opinion, they will strike down what has been a good institution.

I do not see anything to be gained by providing for 40-year terms. We have permitted no-downpayments, insofar as veterans have been concerned; but that has been for periods of up to only 30 years. A few years ago we allowed 40-year terms for persons who were displaced, who moved when they were required, but not of their own free will. But now it is proposed that 40-year terms be allowed for these payments. I think a 40-year term would be worse than the no-downpayment feature. I believe we should particularly guard against the 40-year term proposal. Many of the houses that are going to be built and many of the houses that are being built today—and this statement is no reflection against either the builders or the houses—will not be worth very much at the end of 40 years; and at the end of 20 years, under this 40-year term and no-downpayment plan, the man who is buying the house will not have as much money invested in it as it is worth; that is to say, his equity in it will be less than the depreciated value or the resale value of the house. So this proposal would nationalize or socialize or subsidize housing for the middle-income group of the Nation, without including in the bill a definition of the middle-income group, without regard to what their income might be. In that event, as I have said, a man who was worth a million dollars could purchase houses on this basis, for the only limit is the $15,000 restriction.

So, insofar as the FHA is concerned, and in connection with insured mortgages, this proposal would, in effect, say to everyone in America, "If you purchase a house for up to $15,000, no downpayment will be required, and you will be able to purchase it on the basis of a 40-year term." In that event, why should not a person who wished to buy a house for $16,000 be permitted to handle the transaction on the same basis; and why should not one who wished to buy a house for $20,000 be permitted to handle that transaction on the same basis—inasmuch as the bill does not contain a definition of a middle-income person or a middle-income family?

Furthermore, Mr. President, it seems to me that in a few years an attempt would be made to increase the limit from $15,000 to $20,000 or to $25,000 or to $30,000—in other words, the beginning of nationalization or subsidization of the American housing industry.

So in my opinion the present proposal is wrong, and should not be adopted. In fact, in my opinion the persons who are intended to be helped will not be helped by this bill. They may get into houses, but they will not really be helped.

In addition, housing in America would be undermined; and private industry in America would be undermined; and this bill, if enacted, would result in undermining those who should be encouraged to be thrifty, and should be encouraged to pay for the houses in which they live, and should be encouraged to live on a sound basis; and the young people of the Nation would be told, "All you need to do is get married, have a family, buy a house, and then have 40 years in which to pay for it; and if you do not wish to pay for it at all, you can walk away from it any time you want to"—in other words, no responsibility.

This bill would not encourage the young people ever to have any responsibility or ever to save money. In fact, the bill would discourage thrift. In short, the bill would not do the Nation any good. In my opinion, such a bill is wrong.

Some might propose a 30-year term, with no downpayment. I believe that would be bad enough.

I do not know why it is necessary to make any change at all in the existing law. The people of the United States have been getting along well. I have not found any great demand for this proposal. I should be glad to have anyone show me any demand at the hearings—except by the bureaucrats and those who are running the FHA—for this proposal. They are the only ones who favor it.

Are we now developing a situation in which a new Congress or a person running for election to the House of Representatives or to the Senate would say, "Elect me, and I will provide for 50-year terms and no downpayments," and the other one would say, "He is just a piker. Elect me, and I will arrange for 60-year terms and no downpayments." Certainly that is what we are headed for, if this measure is enacted into law—a situation in which each Congress would attempt to outdo the other, by means of providing for increased liberalization.

When shall we be content to permit things to continue for a while as they are? Must we always be liberalizing these policies and these laws? Evidently we shall do the same thing with the farm program, so I understand, or at least it is being talked about. I say that if we do not put a stop to this trend, the time will come when we shall have a completely socialized and nationalized country.

Our people are willing to spend billions of dollars to stop communism and socialism throughout the world; and yet every day we move more and more in the same general direction.

For 17 years I have voted for housing legislation, and I am willing to vote for it again. But I want to caution the Senate and the House of Representatives against becoming unreasonable in regard to these things and against doing things that would be liberal to the point of being harmful.

After all, Mr. President, why should this proposal be limited to $15,000? Why not $15,500? Why not $16,000? Why not $17,000? To show the Senate how, in my opinion, unrealistic this is, let me point out that in America a young fellow gets married, and he starts out, and he progresses and progresses. People today may be getting a low income, and yet in a year or two their income will go up and up. People who today have big incomes may have some bad luck, and a year from now their income may go way down. How are we going to control that kind of a situation in our life and society under the free enterprise system that we enjoy in America? It cannot be done.

I plead with Congress, do not socialize, do not nationalize the housing industry in America. I see signs, on housing, farming, and other programs, that the Congress is going to see if it cannot outdo and be more liberal than previous Congresses. Let us get away from that idea. I think the American people would like to see us, in many instances, go in the other direction. Oh, if we could only get a government and a Congress that had the courage to do the thing it ought to do at the time, which may be something liberal, and then have the courage later to repeal that act and go the other way. That is the kind of Congress and government I would like to see. The kind of legislator the American people would admire is one who has the courage to be liberal today, and conservative tomorrow, and not go merely in one direction. If we keep going in one direction, and have more and more liberalization, year in and year out, we cannot help but end up as a socialistic government, because the Federal Government will be in everything.

We have public housing provided for in the bill. We gave it to the people. I am one who believe that big cities need public housing. Perhaps some of the smaller cities do. I am not saying. But how far can we go without socializing or nationalizing the housing industry?

Mr. President, did I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CLARK. How much time remains to the Senator from Indiana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises that the Senator from Indiana has 7 minutes remaining, if he desires to use them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. I say to Senators who are interested in seeing in detail the reasons why the committee opposed the amendment that between now and Wednesday, when the amendment will be voted on, they may find the arguments on pages 3 to 9, inclusive, of the committee report, under the heading "New Housing Programs—Housing for Moderate Income Families."

I shall merely summarize the arguments in support of the committee's stand now, and then reserve the remainder of our time for use on Wednesday.

The lack of assistance for middle income housing has been the great failure in our American housing program ever since Federal housing legislation began. We have done a great deal to help provide decent homes and a proper environment for American families with incomes in excess of $7,500. We have done something, although not enough, for families who are forced to look to public housing for decent shelter. It is the in-between group for whom we have provided no adequate program.

Ever since I came to the Senate, more than 4 years ago, and even before that, various proposals for middle income housing have been brought before the Housing Subcommittee. Last year the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I joined in a proposal to deal with this problem somewhat in the fashion in which it was dealt with in New York State. The new Administrator of HHFA, with the approval of President Kennedy, has made a new proposal this year, and a statement in regard to it is set forth, as I have said, on pages 3 to 9, inclusive, of the report.

Mr. President, this is a practical, feasible, workable private enterprise system for providing decent housing for middle income families. Of course, there is no definition of a middle-income or moderate-income family in the bill. There is no need to have one. But I call attention to the fact that there are 11,200,000 families with incomes between $4,000 and $6,000 in the United States today. This means one out of every four families in the United States falls into this category. Those are the people for whom the supply of safe, sanitary, and decent housing is just not adequate. Provisions in the pending bill would help private enterprise to make such housing available on an experimental basis.

The reason why the ceiling was fixed at $15,000 for this program was to assure that the program would not be available for those who could afford to pay something down, for those who could afford to make a downpayment, and for whom a 40-year mortgage was unnecessary.

Let me reiterate that this is a private enterprise system. There is nothing socialistic about it. These are privately built, privately financed houses, just as suburban housing is privately developed throughout, with FHA insurance.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that over the years various organizations that might be referred to as private enterprise have been arguing against public housing?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And the need of some kind of private enterprise program that would meet housing needs?

Mr. CLARK. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is not this a program designed, at least part way, to meet the need for which they have argued for so long?

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, it is on an experimental basis for 2 years, and it is limited in scope, for the purpose of trying it out to see if this may, at least part way, be an answer to public housing.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I think the record ought to show, however, that under this section, public housing is permitted on the part of the public housing authorities.

Mr. CLARK. I was going to come to that in a moment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Therefore, while businessmen may have been opposed to public housing in the past, as the Senator has said—at least some of them—nevertheless, there is a section in the bill which is worded in such a way that public housing authorities can, under the section, likewise build houses and handle them just exactly as they do public housing at the moment.

Mr. CLARK. To continue my argument, it has been said that the proposal for the 40-year mortgage is unprecedented. Yet I point out that in 1956 Congress, with the approval of President Eisenhower, authorized a 40-year mortgage under section 221. The present proposal merely extends what has already been approved by Congress and President Eisenhower to the new program, on an experimental basis.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In what year was that program approved?

Mr. CLARK. 1956.

Mr. SPARKMAN. 1956.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I said in my statement that 40-year mortgages, with no downpayments were available, but only to people who had been displaced by the Government against their wills. I admitted that. I said we did that in 1956. Now we are enlarging the law and including every person in the United States who has what is known as a moderate income. Yet we have no definition of what a moderate income is.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There is one more program providing for 40-year mortgages that has nothing to do with displaced persons, and it is under section 213. It has been a very fine program.

It was enacted into law in 1950. It has been one of the best programs we have had. It is a 40-year mortgage plan.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is for cooperatives.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Cooperatives.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is for apartment buildings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Multifamily dwellings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Not for individual homes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No.

Mr. CAPEHART. It is not limited to $15,000. It is for cooperatives, for apartment buildings and not individual homes. The construction is more permanent. It represents a cooperative effort on the part of people to get together and to build their own apartment buildings.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to read, briefly, into the RECORD the justification given by Dr. Weaver for this particular program, but first I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senator from Indiana to the fact that when we were discussing section 213 he said it referred to cooperative housing. It does refer to cooperative housing. The Senator from Indiana also said it related only to apartment buildings. That is not correct. If the Senator will think it over, I am sure he will recall there was sales housing provided in the program, for single-family units, with 40-year mortgages, the same as the proposed program would provide.

Mr. CAPEHART. That was for what was called the garden type or elevator type housing; for a number of houses in a unit.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is entirely possible, but there were single, individual houses.

Mr. CAPEHART. As a group. There were not single houses setting out all by themselves, with no relation to other houses.

Mr. SPARKMAN. There were other houses in the neighborhood. That is the only relationship.

Mr. CAPEHART. No. It was for projects for X number of houses, the so-called cooperative houses, or apartment buildings.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No. They are individual houses, standing alone.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as shown at page 255 of the hearings, Dr. Weaver justified the program now under attack when he said, in response to a question from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]:

First, let me say that we realize that this is, frankly, an experimental program and we

realize that there are hazards in it. In my testimony I was very careful to point that out. Further, that we believe by careful concern with the type of house that is built with avoiding the minimum house which is either too small or not adequately planned or not adequately constructed, that there are houses well located which can and do and will last 40 years, and it is going to be our concern to develop that type of house. Now the success or failure of this program, I believe, will be measured in large part by the degree to which we are able to do this, and we are going to try to do it. We believe we can do it.

The committee also believes it can be done.

Mr. President, I close with a brief comment about the argument of my friend from Indiana, in which he paid great attention to the fact that under another part of the program—a part far less important than the one which I have been discussing—it is true that public housing authorities are eligible as mortgagors for a below-market-rate FHA insured program of loans for rental and cooperative housing for families of low income.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will interrupt the Senator from Pennsylvania to inform him that the 10 minutes have expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CLARK. The program is for the purpose of assisting urban communities which have established workable programs, which have been approved by the housing agency. It will permit nonprofit rental housing companies to operate under the provisions of the existing section 221 of the National Housing Act, so broadened that the housing may be made available to the moderate income families who are not in a position financially to take advantage of the FHA sales housing program, which I have been discussing.

The Senator from Indiana is quite correct when he says that it is possible for a public housing authority to become a mortgagor under this program. I submit, with all deference to the Senator, that while it is possible it is highly unlikely that more than a few public housing authorities will take advantage of this provision, which is primarily intended for cooperatives and other nonprofit private organizations.

To recapitulate, Mr. President, the committee stands firmly behind the recommendations in the bill. We see no reason why the amendment should be agreed to. We think it would wreck a most important part of the program in the bill.

I hope the amendment will be defeated. I reserve the remainder of my time for use on Wednesday before the yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I noticed that in Dr. Weaver's testimony he was quoted as saying that this is an experimental program. If 40 years is experimental, then I begin to entertain a sense of dread and misgiving about the future of my country and about the durability of real estate values. The idea of 40 years with no downpayment, so that at the end of 10 years the mortgage is 15 percent greater than the equity, is one of the most fantastic things I have ever heard of in my life.

This will become, finally, an open invitation to abandon. What will happen at the end will be a little like what happens in the automobile industry. At the end of 10 years, on normal depreciation, a person will still owe more on the mortgage than his equity, and then will come the drive, "Trade in your house on a 1972 model."

Oh, the burden which will be placed upon the Federal Government before we get through, when it comes time to bail these people out. I understand that already there are some bills in the hopper toying with the idea.

I saw what happened under the Home Owners Loan Corporation, when the Federal Government owned under foreclosure over 270,000 properties. It looks like we are going in that direction all over again.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute? I should like, if the Senator will permit me, to take 1 minute in opposition to the amendment to answer what the Senator has said.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it is necessary for me to leave the Chamber, and I should like to yield to the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. CLARK. I am sure the Senator from New York will be quite willing to permit me to use 1 minute, so that the RECORD will have continuity.

Mr. KEATING. By all means.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in answer to the argument made in opposition to the 40-year, no-downpayment mortgage, under the provisions now under attack, I ask unanimous consent that a statement and a table which appear on pages 925 through 927 of the hearings, entitled "Accumulation of Equity With 40-Year, 100-Percent Mortgages," may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCUMULATION OF EQUITY WITH 40-YEAR, 100-PERCENT MORTGAGES

The change in equity of a homeowner in the property he owns for an extended period of time is a result of the changes in the value of the property and the change in outstanding debt secured by the property. Although neither of these quantities is subject to exact prediction, some discussion of the factors influencing each will be helpful in considering the economic feasibility of 40-year mortgage terms for 100-percent financing for the purchase of low- and moderate-priced new homes.

With respect to the outstanding debt secured by the property, the amortization schedule for a level annuity monthly payment covering current interest at 5½ percent plus principal repayment over a 40-year term provides an initial pattern of residual unpaid obligation. On this basis, outstanding balances decline to 90.8 percent of the original debt at the end of 10 years, to 74.9 percent at the end of 20 years, and to 47.3 percent at the end of 30 years.

Modifying this pattern in unpredictable manner will be the influence of partial prepayments of principal (amounts in excess of required current payments), additions to debt because of future borrowings under open end terms or secured by junior liens (for property improvements or for expenditures unrelated to the property) or because of tax indebtedness in the form of special assessments (for street, utility, or neighborhood improvements), or complete revamping of the debt arrangement through refinancing (usually as an accompaniment to property sale but also, on occasion, in connection with financing of property alterations, consolidation of debts, or modification of repayment schedule).

Changes in the value of the property over a 40-year term are subject to an even greater variety of forces and a greater range of unpredictable variation. Principal among these forces are (1) changes in the value of the building dollar (which may be greater or less than changes in general price levels), (2) changes in housing market conditions (which alter the scarcity value of existing properties as demand-supply relationships change through time in an entire locality), (3) changes in the characteristics of the physical security (as a result of additions to and alterations of the original home, construction of additional facilities such as garages and fences, and modifications of the land through landscaping, tree planting, installation of utilities, sidewalks, etc.), (4) changes in physical condition of the property (reflecting the net results of wear and tear and hazard occurrences on the one hand and of maintenance and replacement of equipment or structural elements on the other), (5) obsolescence of physical security (as a consequence of changing tastes and habits of living and of intervening innovations in equipment and design, perhaps offset by modifications and adaptations of the original property in the course of maintenance and replacement operations), and (6) changes in neighborhood conditions and reputation (reflecting not only such adverse developments as poor property maintenance, exhaustion of public facilities, and intrusion of disturbing land uses or occupancy but also such favorable developments as expansion of school and other public services, improvement of transportation and shopping, creation of recreational and cultural facilities, and maintenance and enhancement of neighborhood appearance and reputation).

Simple enumeration of these forces indicates the impossibility of confident generalization concerning long-term future trends in property values. However, ignoring these elements of changes in the value of the building dollar (which will probably tend to increase property values over extended periods of years) and changes in market conditions (which will no doubt continue to occasion erratic changes in current market values of property), some generalizations may be made about the probable course of the remaining forces during the physical life of structures in well-conceived neighborhood developments. Attention should be called specifically to the fact that several of these factors can be influenced favorably by the quality of neighborhood planning, property standards, and construction quality and design which are provided by FHA underwriting processing in anticipation of mortgage insurance.

Most residential properties are improved during early years of physical life, at the very least to the extent of tree planting, lawn development, and installation of minor improvements such as shelving, awnings,

screens, and storm windows, and small equipment items. More commonly the extent of these improvements is substantially greater, encompassing such additions as porches, garages, fences, patios, additional rooms, additional baths, recreation rooms, and air conditioning or ventilating and insulating facilities.

During this period, property values are commonly enhanced by the forces of urban growth and development which are likely to result in (1) more nearly adequate school, fire, and police services; (2) improved access to the central city because of better public transportation arrangements and construction of better traffic facilities; (3) expansion of neighborhood and suburban shopping centers serving the neighborhood; (4) initiation or expansion of suburban churches and other cultural agencies; and (5) development of public, community, and commercial recreational facilities.

Simultaneously with these favorable changes, the property itself is subjected to loss of value as a consequence of deterioration of equipment and structural elements which require occasional replacement. Heating and plumbing facilities deteriorate, water tanks corrode, roofs wear, woodwork is scarred, interior and exterior paint and finishing discolor and wear, exterior surface material deteriorates, etc. Settlement of the structure may cause minor cracks in plaster and brickwork and basement walls or window frames may develop minor leaks.

The net result of these favorable and unfavorable developments may be either increase or decrease in value; perhaps 10 or 12 or 15 years of initial ownership of homes purchased new in subdivision or neighborhood developments. For most such homes, no worse than a very modest net depreciation of perhaps one-half percent annually is a characteristic during this period although it must be recognized that preponderance of either favorable or unfavorable changes can occasion value trends ranging from extremes as high as 2 percent annual appreciation to an equal amount of annual depreciation, or even greater.

After this initial phase of the life of a home, a long period of very gradual loss in value is typical as a consequence of gradual wearing out of the physical structure, increasing obsolescence of equipment and design, and the aging of public and commercial facilities serving the neighborhood. This period may extend for 15 to 40 years, perhaps averaging 20 to 30 years for typical properties and involving depreciation by about 50 percent of original value during that time period. Again, however, wide ranges in experience may either increase or restrain the rate of depreciation of value depending largely on the quality and consistency of maintenance and on trends of neighborhood appearance and reputation.

Following this period of middle life an indefinite period of old age is common. During this time progressive depreciation of value continues, but at a declining rate until some distant future date when the property value consists solely of residual land value. Perhaps a 1 percent annual depreciation can be suggested as typical of this period of senility, but attention should again be called to the wide range of variation in depreciation depending on maintenance efforts and neighborhood or community programs for neighborhood stabilization. The actual depreciation during this period may range from zero to as high as 2 to 2½ percent annually.

Interrupting this fairly simple course of life history for single-family homes may be four major kinds of events. Most common are (1) substantial modernization to offset the accumulated effects of obsolescence and depreciation of both structure and equipment, and alterations of the original structure to provide additional living space, possibly with conversion of use to multifamily occupancy or to mixed commercial and residential use.

A third type of interruption occurs upon demolition of the original improvements to make way for more intensive land use. In such a case the land value for the alternative use increases to exceed the value of the combined land and present improvements for the original land use.

A fourth type of interruption occurs in the event of a persistent neighborhood rehabilitation and rejuvenation effort, either organized in the fashion of a formal urban-renewal program or developing spontaneously under this stimulus of impersonal market forces.

Subject to all these qualifications of pattern for both debt repayment and value depreciation, the accompanying table and chart present the probable course of equity accumulation for home purchases of moderate-priced homes financed with 100-percent mortgages having 40-year maturities. Variations from this pattern in the favorable direction because of any of the many factors mentioned, including changes in market conditions or in the value of the building dollar, amplify the growth of equity. Conversely, adverse valuation trends for individual properties as compared with the suggested pattern limit the rate of equity accumulation and may, in the least favorable cases, result in individual instances of property foreclosures and FHA insurance claims. The frequency of such claims is expected to be modest—probably within the limits of reserves accumulated from a one-half-percent annual insurance premium, and, in any case, at levels which are not excessive in proportion to the benefits of homeownership which will accrue to the vast majority of home purchasers who will never be subjected to property losses.

Depreciated value of $10,000 home and comparison of unpaid balance of $10,000 mortgage, 40-year term at 5½ percent interest

End of year	Depreciated value of property [1]	Outstanding balance of debt	Equity
0	$10,000	$10,000	0
1	9,950	9,929	21
2	9,900	9,854	46
3	9,850	9,775	75
4	9,800	9,691	109
5	9,750	9,603	147
6	9,700	9,509	191
7	9,650	9,411	239
8	9,600	9,307	293
9	9,550	9,196	354
10	9,500	9,080	420
11	9,450	8,957	493
12	9,400	8,828	572
13	9,200	8,690	510
14	9,000	8,546	454
15	8,800	8,393	407
16	8,600	8,231	369
17	8,400	8,060	340
18	8,200	7,880	320
19	8,000	7,689	311
20	7,800	7,488	312
21	7,600	7,275	325
22	7,400	7,051	349
23	7,200	6,813	387
24	7,000	6,563	437
25	6,800	6,298	502
26	6,600	6,018	582
27	6,400	5,722	678
28	6,200	5,410	790
29	6,000	5,080	920
30	5,800	4,732	1,068
31	5,600	4,363	1,237
32	5,400	3,974	1,426
33	5,200	3,564	1,636
34	5,000	3,130	1,870
35	4,800	2,671	2,129
36	4,600	2,187	2,413
37	4,400	1,675	2,725
38	4,300	1,134	3,166
39	4,200	563	3,637
40	4,100	0	4,100

[1] See accompanying text for assumptions and qualifications.

Source: Federal Housing Administration, Division of Research and Statistics.

Mr. CLARK. I think this sufficiently answers the argument of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in further comment, I had one of the greatest housing consultants in the country, who was with the Housing Administration for a great many years, compile figures. Knowing something about the operation, I shall take his estimate on the matter any time as against any figure I might get from a Government agency.

In due course, when we reach the discussion of the amendment again on Wednesday, I propose to put a very considerable memorandum in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on this very point, to show how fantastic the proposal really is.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator means that he would rather take the figures he has had prepared than the figures prepared by a Government agency since the 3d of January, does he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Strangely enough, these figures were not prepared particularly for me, but they were prepared objectively by a man who has some real knowledge.

I will say, if the Senator wishes to put it on that ground, that there has been 100 days of experience in the Housing Administration, and I will take the advice of a fellow who has been in the business for 25 years and who speaks with rare authority upon the subject.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] on the bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in order that the procedure may be correct, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] may now go over to Wednesday, at which time we shall have a yea-and-nay vote and use the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFCER. The Chair advises that the amendment would automatically go over.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes. The 30 minutes available for debate will be equally divided.

FORGERY UNDER THE COMMUNIST WORLD CONSPIRACY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and in a way I apologize for taking time at this point in the debate to discuss the subject to which I am about to refer. However, I believe it to be a subject of transcendent importance, and one which should be brought to the attention of the Senate and the American people promptly. What I wish to say is related to what took place in an executive session of the Subcommittee on Internal Security this morning.

Mr. President, it is well known that the Communist world conspiracy makes use of forgery in its propaganda efforts. The Internal Security Subcommittee has in the past received very illuminating

testimony respecting specific instances of this practice.

But the full extent and scope of Communist fraud by forgery of documents is not, I am sure, fully realized by the people of the free world. In an effort to get this whole picture in proper perspective, as a basis for studying the possibility of legislative action to combat such Communist propaganda attacks, the Internal Security Subcommittee asked the Central Intelligence Agency to gather and study recent known and documented examples of Communist forgeries, and present this information in testimony before the committee. This testimony was taken in executive session this morning.

What I shall say has been completely cleared for security.

Our witness gave us details respecting more than 30 major instances of forged documents, purporting to have been written by or to high officials of the American Government, which have been traced to Soviet propaganda sources within the past 4 years.

The CIA study of these Communist forgeries has shown that this material is manufactured and spread according to a plan which has three main purposes:

First. To discredit the West.

Second. To sow suspicion and discord among our allies.

Third. To encourage dissent among non-Soviet populations and dissatisfaction with their governments.

Since Communist news sources are not well regarded in the West, continuous efforts are made to utilize free world publications that are not tarred with the Communist brush. Such means are employed as the planting of a story with a pro-Soviet columnist, hidden financial subsidies, and the threading of fake anti-Western stories into legitimate news channels.

In one instance, the Soviet forgery factory worked over a legitimate study report made to a congressional committee and turned it into an outline of an alleged U.S. plan to take over Africa.

One example of Communist propaganda-forgery was the much-reprinted fake rumor that the Algerian rebel generals had enjoyed support from NATO, the Pentagon, or our Central Intelligence Agency. This lie was first printed on April 23 of this year, in a Rome daily called Il Paese. The publication is one of a small group of papers published in the free world but known to be outlets for disguised Soviet propaganda. Its director is a member of the World Peace Council, a Communist front.

A day later, Moscow's Pravda published the story and the Soviet official news agency, Tass, broadcast it in English to Europe. Within 24 hours, Radio Moscow had relayed the story in Arabic to the Middle East. The following day, it was published by the London Daily Worker and the Communist daily, l'Humanite, in Paris.

That same day, it was published by a non-Communist Parisian newspaper in a column credited to Genevieve Tabouis, a French writer who is known as anti-American.

By the end of that week, Moscow radio had carried it in a broadcast directed to North America and quite recently the phone story has been livened through telephone calls by Radio Moscow to American newspapers.

The phone call is, of course, a gimmick, its purpose being to record a conversation on tape. During the call, a few paragraphs of Soviet propaganda are read into the record and edited tape, with the American voice and the added Soviet propaganda, makes a completely false propaganda message sound like truth.

Another example of Communist forgery was a well-publicized but completely phony Rockefeller letter. A Communist newspaper in East Germany, in February 1957, printed several pages of what appeared to be a letter from Nelson Rockefeller to General Eisenhower, outlining an alleged plan to gain domination of the world through American manipulation of military and economic aid. That fraud was reprinted during the following 3 weeks in various Soviet publications and revived by the East German paper in March with the comment that the letter served as a basis for the Eisenhower doctrine.

Under close examination, this forgery was found to contain inherent evidence of its own falsity, but that fact did not discourage the Communists.

The forgery had served a purpose, when it fooled those unwary ones who did not examine it skeptically.

Twenty-two of the Communist forgeries about which the committee was told this morning were designed to smear the United States by attributing to us "imperialist American" plans and ambitions for interference with certain free world countries which the Communists sought to influence.

Eleven blamed this country with intervention in the private affairs of Asian nations. Five had to do with the Middle East.

Because of its extreme importance, I shall urge that all this testimony be made public speedily, in full detail, with the charts developed by the CIA and photographs of specific forged documents which went into the committee record. I am confident this will be done. I hope that this committee record, when published, will have the widest possible distribution. Whether or not it proves possible to devise legislation which will furnish any substantial measure of protection against this massive Communist campaign of propaganda by forgery, I believe that the mere disclosure of what we now know about this campaign, and its specific objectives, will be a highly valuable contribution to our cold war effort.

Every citizen of the free world who will read the testimony our committee received this morning is going to develop both a healthy skepticism respecting Communist propaganda claims, and a degree of sophistication in this whole area, based on knowledge of Communist objectives and techniques, which will help him to avoid being taken in by future Communist efforts of this nature.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE CANADIAN-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RANDOLPH in the chair). On behalf of the Vice President of the United States, the Chair wishes to announce the assignment of the following Senators to be members of the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Group: Senators MANSFIELD, DODD, MCCARTHY, PELL, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, AIKEN, WILEY, DWORSHAK, CAPEHART, ALLOTT, and CASE of South Dakota.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 O'CLOCK TUESDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns tonight, it adjourns to meet at 11 o'clock Tuesday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY FORMER PRESIDENT EISENHOWER AT REPUBLICAN DINNER

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished former President of the United States made a transcendental speech last night before 6,000 highly enthusiastic people at the Washington, D.C., Armory. It is my delight to ask unanimous consent to have this great fighting speech printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF EISENHOWER'S ADDRESS AT REPUBLICAN DINNER IN CAPITAL

(NOTE.—Following is the prepared text of former President Dwight D. Eisenhower's speech to a Republican congressional testimonial dinner in the National Guard Armory, Washington, D.C., June 1.)

It is good to be again at a Republican reunion. This time I come as a recent graduate of as tough a political cram course as anyone could devise—6 years with an opposition Congress. Any President with that experience is bound to have learned more about sheer politicking than he dreamed possible. I offer this thought tonight—that we see to it—starting now—that in 1962 we Republicans afford my successor the same opportunity for political enlightenment during his final 2 years in office.

Seeing here so many old friends, I am tempted to talk of years gone by. But I am not here tonight to dwell on the past.

Not that the past isn't useful. It sharpens perspective, warns of pitfalls, and helps to point the way. But we must never let it divert our attention from the future.

We have a right to be proud that these past 8 years, in matters both foreign and domestic, we kept faith with the American people.

So I do not suggest that we sit idly by as our past accomplishments are misrepresented. Neither should we allow others to point with self-serving pride to programs that we long ago proposed and tried vainly to get them to support. But this is simply "keeping the record straight." While important, it has no forward thrust.

HAILS PARTY RECORD

I consider our party's record, at home and abroad, an excellent springboard into the future. We can gladly leave that record to the verdict of history. Time will be far more objective and accurate than present-day politicians in judging the past 8 years.

Let us, then, leave the past behind and concentrate instead on our present and future.

Of course, our first duty is to make emphatically clear the views that we hold on the country's needs. This is not simply our right, it is our obligation.

For we must not forget, or let others forget, that only 7 months ago we were the party that made gains in both the Senate and House of Representatives; we were the party that received more popular votes than any other party in America; it was our national ticket that won a majority both of the States and of the congressional districts. To be sure, the Presidency was denied us by a paper-thin percentage. But from tens of millions of Americans we have a clear mandate to speak out forcefully on the great issues of the day.

I have heard talk about the "role of the loyal opposition." This implies that we should now have a different purpose than when the White House was in our hands. But my friends, we Republicans do not change our ideals, our aspirations or our programs, just because the other party is temporarily in power. We continue to stand for what we believe is wise and sound; we continue to fight against the unwise and the unsound.

STRESSES RESPONSIBILITY

Indeed, anyone, in either party, who resorts to irresponsibility when out of power does not deserve the responsibility of power. As Republicans, our checkpoints are simply these: "What is best for our country—and what is the best way to carry it out?" We need no other yardsticks in power or out. We want America to know that we are not simply Republicans, but also that we are right.

Indeed, the greatest service our own or any political party can render the American people is to be a trustworthy vehicle for strengthening freedom in a world at peace.

As to this, we have no better guide than the statesman who died 10 years ago this April—Arthur H. Vandenberg. He, too, was of the minority. Yet he powerfully influenced the creation of the United Nations, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Treaty.

Arthur Vandenberg told us in January 1945:

"We cannot drift to victory. We must have maximum united effort on all fronts. We must have maximum united effort in our councils."

In this, he still speaks for me, and he speaks for you.

His advice needs attention today. Not only because there is great ability in our party—not only because we have proven executive competence—but also because this Republic cannot exclude anyone of worth from its national security deliberations.

Every one of us appreciates the gravity of the world problems facing our Nation tonight. We Republicans encountered similar problems when the power and the responsibility were ours. All Americans realize that only one individual, the President, can speak for our country as it strives in the world arena to solve those problems. As the President attempts to preserve our freedoms, as he seeks to strengthen peace, as he confers with foreign leaders whether friendly or hostile, he has the hopeful and sympathetic good will of all loyal Americans, regardless of party. History will adjudge the wisdom of his efforts. But we cannot allow, today, the Nation's basic unity of purpose to be in doubt.

By the same token, Republican leaders must frankly, but always constructively, speak their views. And Republicans rightly expect to be consulted before, not after, the hour of decision or the moment of action.

I was proud when, in recent crises, members of our party did not attempt to criticize, condemn, or belittle those in authority. This we did even though some seemed disposed falsely to blame us. We did not scurry about in search of a "scapegoat." We decry anyone's efforts to do so. Here I pay my personal tribute to the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, all the members of which body I have known long and well. It is my conviction that America possesses no group of men more dedicated, more patriotic and more capable in meeting grave responsibility.

I say again that Republicans, while duty-bound not to withhold justified criticism, stand always ready to consult and advise. We have had some experience in careful and effective planning. In Iran, off Formosa (Taiwan), in Vietnam, in Lebanon, in Guatemala and elsewhere we have known—and met—similar crises.

OUTLINES NATION'S NEED

We believe, measuring today's international situation, that our Nation's needs include these:

A widespread understanding of the present dangers that we face.

The will to unify ourselves against those dangers.

Steadiness of leadership, care in planning, prudence in word, firmness in deed.

Wisdom to support the necessary, and the character to defer the merely desirable.

A strong, balanced defense, adequate to the threat, but not wastefully overexpanded.

Assistance to emerging nations determined to help themselves in a society of liberty.

Alliances that will move forward the defense of freedom.

Realistic progress in arms control and peaceful settlement of disputes—progress which, for the sake of all humanity, cannot much longer be safely deferred.

Foreign economic policies that, by reducing trade discrimination, will further mutual respect and mutual advantage.

Programs of individual and informational exchange that underscore the common aspirations of all men.

A creative program of space exploration geared to the rational and related not to hysteria, but to the Nation's scientific needs.

URGES CALM CONFIDENCE

Finally, my friends, there must be a calm confidence among us all, inspired by our country's proud history and traditions. By holding true to these traditions our people may live their lives and raise their families as Americans unafraid knowing that no matter what may be the evil designs of arrogant dictatorships, this Nation will push ever forward toward its appointed destiny as a leader of freedom and peace.

Of this I am certain: For these great ends we of the Republican Party will unhesitatingly make any sacrifice. Certainly these ends reflect the objective we sought to attain during the past 8 years.

Now to our domestic concerns. Here, for America's sake, we take sharp issue with the leadership now in power.

What, exactly, do we stand for here at home? We Republicans see Mr. American in his high station as a free, self-reliant, proud individual. We are convinced that he can plan his own life and spend his own money better than some possibly benevolent bureaucrat can in his behalf. Any action that weakens any citizen's self-respect is wrong. That is the reason we oppose the ever-increasing concentration of power in Washington.

I say this, not for the sake of mere criticism.

I am deeply disturbed, as I believe millions of people are, by the indications of sheer recklessness in programs compelling deficit spending on the Federal level.

A free, healthy, competitive economy cannot long exist if it is to be subject to political abuse, bewildered by constantly shrinking dollars and continually fearful of government controls.

We—all thoughtful Americans—must unite and summon to our thinking and to our councils all our wisdom, all our courage, and all our determination if we are to keep this Nation strong, healthy, and true to its own traditions.

All agree it is criminal for one man to steal from another. But overpowerful government can rob the individual just as surely—only the scale is grander, the stakes are greater, and the loss far more tragic. For what is stolen by paternalistic government is that previous compound of initiative, independence, and self-respect that distinguishes a man from the mob, a person from a number, a freeman from the slave.

OPPOSES CENTRALIZATION

Too much government planes off the peaks of excellence, hones down differences, dries up diversity, and leaves a bleak sameness.

No one can stand, simultaneously, for more individualism and more centralized government. The proposals now flowing in such abundance to the Congress can lead to nothing but greater centralization.

We Republicans take our stand for the individual.

And our respect for his inherent rights and ability will not be compromised away.

We will not barter local and state responsibility for centralization, nor will we trade a little Government intervention for a little handout.

We consider it sheer arrogance to believe that people in Government know better for the people than they know for themselves.

We are, therefore, against programs that would substitute coercion for cooperation. The new farm proposals, creating an agricultural czar, are a case in point.

GIVES EDUCATION STAND

We are against programs that erode away citizen, local, and State self-reliance. Federal payment of teachers' salaries—as distinguished from needed construction—is a case in point.

We are against the insulting concept of government by big brother. Excessive public housing, rampant public power, federalized youth programs are cases in point.

But as we fight the unwise, we Republicans proudly stand for positive programs in every area of public concern. We have long stood for advances in such programs as education, agriculture, minimum wage, medical care, and area redevelopment.

But here is the great difference—our Republican watchword is "responsible progress."

At all levels Government must have a heart as well as a head—and its assistance must go freely as needed to individuals or localities that cannot help themselves. But this must be so done as to avoid overcentralization in Washington. Thereby, the local need can be accurately met with least injury to responsible citizenship.

ASSAILS DEFICIT SPENDING

There is, therefore, a vast difference in what we Republicans propose and what we oppose. This crucial difference is that our programs are kept oriented to the citizen and not to political expediency. They respect local responsibility, avoiding excessive

Federal interference in matters better handled back home.

It follows that we believe in paying as we go for what we do or get.

I believe deeply that continuing deficit spending is immoral.

It forces our children to support spendthrift parents. It visits upon voteless youngsters a mountain of unpaid bills. It is Government by credit card, with the bill to be paid by our children not merely in money but also in liberty.

Even in the short run, unnecessary deficit financing is just as wrong. By debasing our currency, it leads to inflation—the most cynical of all policies, for it strikes most cruelly at the retired, the pensioned, and those who have the least.

So the means that are used are not necessarily justified by the ends being sought.

Too often we hear it said that if we believe in a certain goal, the method and amount used to get there are mere details. But, my friends, frequently method and amount can go straight to principle. One morphine injection may be exactly what a suffering patient needs; a dozen would be fatal.

ALARMED BY EXPENDITURES

I look in vain, and with deep concern, for fiscal responsibility today in public affairs. As I note the mounting expenditures, I often think how easy it is to buy things when you're spending the other fellow's money. That this must stop is one of the things that a strong, unified Republican Party should be teaching and preaching—and, so doing, can stop.

So, my friends, I trust that the aim of every good Republican in these times is to strengthen and unify, not to divide, our party.

Choosing up sides now for 1964, for example, would be a grave disservice to us all and, more important, to our country. More than one man has found that in pushing too fast to get to the front, he has lost a following. Those who run too fast into the future sometimes trip over the present.

All of us, at this point, must work together to build up the entire party, so that our combined voices and influence will command ever wider respect and support.

So I urge this—that we eagerly recruit young people, independents, and Democrats into that great company of men and women who want for America individually oriented progress that is sound and solvent. To every person who so believes, let our door always stand wide open.

ASK EMPHASIS ON 1962

As a party, we have today one overriding mission—to achieve more brilliant victories in the local, State, and congressional elections this year, and then in 1962. We have seen what can be done in Pennsylvania, in Tennessee, in Texas. It is to carry forward this great effort that we have come together tonight. Only after we have laid a solid substructure through victory in 1962 can we start erecting our great skyscraper of 1964.

So now, let's go hard at it to perfect the party organization from the grass roots up. One job is to raise adequate financial reserves, and in this your participation tonight is a good beginning. Another pressing task is to seek out and encourage aggressive and attractive young men and women of high integrity to be our candidates. Then we must carry to every citizen, most especially the youth, our Republican message of dedication to integrity, progress, responsibility, and concern for the individual. We must let everyone know that we do not appeal simply to the citizen's stomach, but we appeal as well to his head, his heart, and his self-respect. Finally, we must help our countrymen understand that what we stand for is a future of opportunity, of prosperity, of growth in continued liberty.

If we should neglect our pressing financial, organizational, teaching, and recruiting jobs until tomorrow, we will surely find that tomorrow is the day on which elections are lost.

My friends, every one of us should be deeply proud to be a member of this great Republican Party.

For ours is the party that fights for equality of opportunity for all, when it is easier—perhaps more immediately popular—to offer special rewards to special groups.

Ours is the party that calls for self-reliance, when it is easier—perhaps more immediately popular—to depend on a condescending bureaucracy.

Ours is the party that asks freemen to continue to earn and to value their freedom, when it is easier—perhaps more immediately popular—to erode away self-reliance through public handouts.

The Republican Party has an abiding faith in the sturdy quality of the American people. Our is a nation of men and women who have moved mountains, built great factories, tilled vast lands, harnessed mighty rivers and, in times of peril, have offered their lives for their country's sake. Our imaginations cannot comprehend what such resourceful men and women can and will do over future years, but our faith in them is complete. They will not, just as we will not, become slaves to class and mass, to so-called minorities, and to the use of divisive labels.

Believing these things, striving always to live by these principles, our dedication to republicanism is our dedication to Americanism.

These truths, I believe, we must confidently lay before the American people—today and every day. So doing, 1961, 1962, and then 1964, will be years of victory for our Nation, led by republicanism, proudly flying the banner of responsible progress by free and self-reliant Americans.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I intend to call up an amendment. I thought we would have a quorum call before doing so. In that connection I suggest the absence of a quorum and I ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "5–23–61—B," which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The amendment ordered to be printed in the RECORD is as follows:

On the first page, beginning with line 5, strike out all through line 10 on page 13.

On page 13, line 12, strike out "102" and insert in lieu thereof "101".

On page 25, line 12, strike out "103" and insert in lieu thereof "102".

On page 30, line 23, strike out "104" and insert in lieu thereof "103".

On page 71, line 13, strike out "section 221(g),".

On page 72, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 3 on page 73, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(e) Section 212 of such title is amended by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) 'any mortgage under section 220' and inserting in lieu thereof 'any loan or mortgage under section 220 or section 233'."

On page 75, line 9, strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)".

On page 75, line 16, strike out "section 221(g),".

On page 76, line 20, strike out "section 221(d)(3),".

On page 83, after line 2, insert a new title as follows:

"TITLE VII—FEDERAL LIMITED PROFIT MORTGAGE CORPORATION

"Findings

"SEC. 701. (a) While the Congress, in the declaration of national housing policy set forth in the Housing Act of 1949, established the goal of a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family, experience has demonstrated that this goal is not being met or even approached for the millions of American families whose incomes are too high for admission to low-rent public housing but too low to afford the range of sales prices and rents required for satisfactory new private housing being produced under the existing Federal programs of assistance to private enterprise in housing. Therefore, to further implement the declaration of national housing policy, and consistent with the provision thereof that governmental assistance shall be utilized where feasible to enable private enterprise to serve more of the total housing need, the Congress hereby determines that there is an urgent need for a supplementary system of housing finance to enable private enterprise to provide homes of sound standards of design and construction for families of moderate income and for elderly persons.

"(b) The Congress further determines that there are means available to State and local governments to further assist private enterprise to meet this need at little or no direct cost to such governments by (1) granting exemptions, in whole or in part, from taxation on the increased value of real property, (2) assisting in the assembling of sites through the use of the power of condemnation and eminent domain, and (3) promoting the use of sites, cleared under the slum clearance and urban renewal provisions of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, for such housing. While not making such assistance mandatory, it is the sense of the Congress that such assistance should be given to housing constructed under this title.

"Purpose

"SEC. 702. The purpose of this title is to provide satisfactory housing in well-planned, economically sound residential neighborhoods for families of moderate income and elderly persons whose needs are not now being served through existing programs of assistance to private and public enterprise, and to accomplish this purpose, this title makes financial assistance available to eligible bor-

rowers for the provision of housing of sound design and construction which will promote such economies as will be fully reflected in reduced rents or charges.

"Creation and powers of Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation

"SEC. 703. (a) To effectuate the purpose of this title, there is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the 'Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Corporation') with authority, as herein provided, to make and service loans, issue obligations in such amounts, at such times, and on such terms as the Corporation may determine, and to exercise the other powers and duties prescribed in this title. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in it by this title, the Corporation, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may—

"(1) adopt and use a corporate seal;

"(2) sue or be sued in any Federal, State, or local court of competent jurisdiction;

"(3) enter into contracts with regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, and include in any contract or instrument made pursuant to this title such other provisions as the Corporation deems necessary to assure that the purposes of this title will be achieved;

"(4) foreclose on any property or take any action to protect or enforce any right conferred upon it by any law, contract, or other agreement, and bid for and purchase at any foreclosure or any other sale any project or part thereof in connection with which it has made a loan pursuant to this title;

"(5) pay all expenses or charges in connection with, and deal with, complete, reconstruct, improve, rent, manage, make contracts for the management of, or establish suitable agencies for the management of, or sell for cash or credit, or lease in its discretion, in whole or in part, any project acquired pursuant to this title and to pursue to final collection by way of compromise or otherwise all claims acquired by, or assigned or transferred to, it in connection with the acquisition or disposal of any housing project pursuant to this title, notwithstanding any other provisions of law relating to the acquisition, handling, or disposal of real or personal property: *Provided*, That any such acquisition of real property shall not deprive the State or any political subdivision thereof of its civil or criminal jurisdiction in and over such property or impair the civil rights under State or local laws of the inhabitants on such property;

"(6) acquire, hold, sell, or exchange at public or private sale, or lease, or otherwise dispose of, real or personal property, and sell or exchange any securities or obligations;

"(7) subject to the specific limitations in this title, consent to the modification, with respect to rate of interest, time of payment of any installment of principal or interest, security, or any other terms, of any contract or agreement to which it is a party or which has been transferred to it pursuant to this title;

"(8) utilize and act through, with regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, any Federal, State, or local public agency or instrumentality, or nonprofit agency or organization, with the consent of the agency or organization concerned, and contract with any such agency, instrumentality, or organization for the furnishing of any services or facilities; and may make advance, progress, or other payments with respect to such contracts without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes;

"(9) enter into contracts with any Federal Housing Administration approved mortgagee to service loans made by such institutions;

"(10) have succession in its corporate name; and

"(11) do all things which are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

"(b) The Corporation may determine the necessity for and the character of its obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and accounted for. The business of the Corporation shall not be considered official business of the United States within the meaning of any statute permitting the free use of the United States mails.

"(c) The Corporation may make available to eligible borrowers technical and other assistance which they may require in the initiation, development, and administration of their project.

"Board of Directors

"SEC. 704. (a) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors (hereinafter referred to as the 'Board') consisting of five persons, one of whom shall be the Housing and Home Finance Administrator as Chairman of the Board, and four of whom shall be appointed by the Administrator from among the officers or employees of the Corporation, of the immediate office of the Administrator, or (with the consent of the head of such department or agency) of any other department or agency of the Federal Government. The Board shall meet at the call of its Chairman, who shall require it to meet not less than once each month. Within the limitations of law, the Board shall determine the general policies which shall govern the operations of the Corporation. The Board shall select and effect the appointment of a qualified person to fill the office of President of the Corporation. The basic rate of compensation of the position of President of the Corporation shall be the same as the basic rate of compensation established for the heads of the constituent agencies of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Board shall select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such other officers and employees as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Corporation, without regard to the provisions of law applicable to the employment, compensation, leave, or expenses of officers and employees of the United States; except that the rates of basic compensation of such officers and employees shall be comparable to those established for officers and employees under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The members of the Board, as such, shall not receive compensation for their services.

"(b) The Board shall supervise the Corporation, shall perform the other duties prescribed herein, and shall have the power to adopt, amend, and require the observance of such rules, regulations, and orders as shall be necessary from time to time for carrying out the purposes of this title and for coordinating the activities of the Corporation with the housing functions and activities administered within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or any of its constituent agencies, and with the general economic and fiscal policies of the Government, and in carrying out these responsibilities the Board shall consult with the Advisory Committee, established under subsection (c) of this section. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in it by this title, the Board, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, may exercise any of the powers enumerated in the second sentence of section 703(a) of this title and shall—

"(1) estimate the need for housing for moderate-income families and elderly persons in each housing market area of the country and allocate and reallocate to each area its appropriate share of the loan funds authorized by this title;

"(2) delegate, in its discretion, any of the functions, powers, and duties vested in it by this title to any officers or employees under its direction and supervision;

"(3) take such steps as it deems necessary and desirable to assure that the benefits of this program are not dissipated through speculative devices, to assure that the organization of any corporate borrower and its proposed methods of operation are such as will avoid its use for speculative purposes or the payment of excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with any housing project, and to encourage borrowers to adopt methods by which occupants of dwellings may be permitted to reduce their rentals or other occupancy charges by occupant maintenance and repair or other means of self-help and methods whereby they may acquire (subject to the right of a cooperative to repurchase) ownership of their individual dwellings where such dwellings are free standing; and

"(4) make an annual report to the President of the United States for transmission to the Congress, to be submitted as soon as practicable following the close of the year for which such report is made.

"(c)(1) An advisory committee shall be appointed by the Board to consist of seven members. In appointing such members the Board shall seek to obtain persons whose knowledge and experience in one or more of the fields of State or local government, the building of rental and cooperative housing projects, or the promotion or development of such projects would be of assistance in the administration of the program authorized by this title. From the members appointed to such committee the Board shall designate a chairman. The committee shall meet on the call of the Board which shall be not less than twice during each calendar year.

"(2) Members of the advisory committee shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Board, but not exceeding $50 per diem, and shall be entitled to receive an allowance for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, while attending meetings of the committee or otherwise serving at the request of the Board.

"Capital stock

"SEC. 705. (a) The Corporation may issue capital stock from time to time which shall be subscribed for by the Secretary of the Treasury on behalf of the United States, and payments for such subscriptions shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the Corporation: *Provided*, That the total amount of such stock subscribed for and held by the Secretary of the Treasury at any time shall not exceed $100,000,000. Stock held by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be entitled to cumulative dividends for each year equal to a return on the average amount, at par, of such stock outstanding during such fiscal year at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the current average interest rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the last day of the sixth month of such fiscal year. The Corporation shall issue to the Secretary of the Tresaury receipts for payments by him for or on account of such stock, and such receipts shall be evidence of the stock ownership of the United States. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the amounts necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments on such stock when called. Such stock or any part thereof may be retired at any time by the Corporation.

"(b) The assets of the Corporation, upon any liquidation, shall be used to retire all outstanding stock at par, to pay any accrued dividends, and to retire, pay, or settle all outstanding obligations. Any residue shall be

covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Mortgage loans

"SEC. 706. (a) To assist the production of housing of sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life available for families of moderate income, and for elderly persons, the Corporation, upon application of an eligible borrower (as defined in section 710(b)) and subject to the terms and conditions of this title, may make a mortgage loan (including advances during the development of the housing project) to such borrower, or enter into commitments to purchase or repurchase loans to finance the development of a housing project to be undertaken by such borrower. No such loan shall be made unless—

"(1) The Corporation shall have determined that—

"(A) the borrower is an eligible borrower of the character described in section 710(b) hereof and that, in the case of a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation, the membership thereof is comprised predominantly of families of moderate income, or elderly persons (or both) or that, in the case of a borrower other than a nonprofit cooperative ownership housing corporation, the dwellings in such housing project are to be made available to families of moderate income or elderly persons;

"(B) the proposed housing project will meet a need for housing of families of moderate income or elderly persons;

"(C) the location and physical planning of the housing project will afford reasonable assurance as to the stability of the neighborhood, and the dwellings in the housing project will meet sound standards of design, construction, livability, and size for adequate family life or for elderly persons; and

"(D) the housing project will not be of elaborate or extravagant design or construction, and such design and construction and the proposed methods of construction and of operation and maintenance are such as will promote such economies as are contemplated to be achieved through the nonprofit character of the borrower, increased efficiency in production through the use of new or improved materials and techniques and methods of construction or otherwise, increased efficiency in operation and management, minimum necessary operating services, occupant maintenance, or otherwise; and

"(2) the borrower shall have agreed with the Corporation—

"(A) not to incur or pay any excessive fees, salaries, or charges in connection with the housing project;

"(B) to establish an initial schedule of rents or charges for the dwellings in the housing project which will permit such dwellings to be made available for families of moderate income, or for elderly persons, and such initial schedule of rents or charges and all revisions thereof shall be subject to the prior approval of the Corporation: *Provided,* That the Corporation shall not approve any initial schedule of rents or charges unless the Board has certified (i) that such rents or charges will permit the dwellings to be made available for families of moderate income or for elderly persons, and (ii) that such schedule is consistent, insofar as applicable, with the requirements of paragraph (2)(E) of this section, and reflects any savings derived by the borrower under any tax exemption which may have been obtained by such borrower in accordance with the proviso to section 712 of this title;

"(C) to give preference in the selection of tenants for the housing project (as among eligible applicants), first, to families displaced by public clearance or enforcement action; second, to families living in substandard homes; and, third, to families living in overcrowded homes, veterans to have preference in each category: *Provided,* That in respect to dwelling units specifically designed and designated for elderly persons, such persons shall have a preference for the tenancy of such housing, without regard to the foregoing preferences;

"(D) to maintain the housing project, including all equipment therein, and all appurtenances thereto, in good condition throughout the life of the mortgage loan, and to establish and maintain adequate reserves for repairs, maintenance, and replacements necessary to so maintain such housing project;

"(E) to pay dividends, if the borrower is a corporation of the character described in clause (2)(1) of section 710(b) of this title, at a rate which is not in excess of 6 per centum per annum: *Provided,* That if in any year the Corporation is unable to pay dividends at the rate agreed to hereunder, dividends may be paid out of surplus earned in any subsequent year at a rate in excess of that agreed to but only to the extent necessary to give stockholders a return on their investment (not including any allowance for interest) equal to that which they would have received if dividends had been paid consecutively at the approved rate; and

"(F) to comply with such other terms and conditions as the Corporation finds, prior to the mortgage loan, are necessary or desirable to carry out the purposes of this title; and

"(3) in the case of a cooperative ownership housing corporation, the members at the time of making application for the mortgage loan are equal to at least 30 per centum of the number of members proposed to be served by such housing project: *Provided,* That, prior to the receipt of any proceeds of such mortgage loan, the members of such cooperative borrower shall be equal to at least 80 per centum of the number of members proposed to be served by such housing project.

"(b) The mortgage loan shall involve a principal obligation in an amount (1) not exceeding 90 per centum of the development cost (as defined in section 710(e)) of the housing project as determined by the Corporation, and (2) not exceeding 90 per centum of such amount as the Corporation shall have determined to be the maximum within which the project must be constructed in order that it may be made available for families of moderate income at rentals or charges within their means. No loan shall be made unless the mortgagor has agreed to certify the cost in the manner provided by section 227 of the National Housing Act for Federal Housing Administration mortgage insurance.

"(c)(1) If a mortgage loan made under this title to any eligible borrower involves a principal obligation which is less than that authorized under subsection (b) of this section, and the borrower proposes to raise additional funds through sources other than the Corporation to be secured through insured or guaranteed mortgages, debentures, bonds, or otherwise, the total mortgage loan and such other borrowing shall not exceed in the aggregate the maximum principal obligation authorized under subsection (b), and the rights of the Corporation under any such mortgage loan shall not be subordinate to the rights of any other creditor supplying such additional funds. The provisions of this title shall apply to any project financed in whole or in part by the Corporation.

"(2) A mortgage loan may be made under the provisions of this title to an eligible borrower involving a principal obligation which is less than that authorized under subsection (b) of this section, to represent part of the obligation secured by a single mortgage with equal priorities, when the remainder of the funds obligated under such single mortgage are secured from State or local government funds, and the total mortgage loan and any other borrowing under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection does not exceed in the aggregate the maximum principal obligation authorized under subsection (b) of this section.

"(d) The mortgage loan shall provide for complete amortization within a period of fifty years by periodic payments upon such terms, including a program providing for level payments of principal and interest, as the Corporation shall prescribe, and shall bear interest, on the amount of the principal obligation of such mortgage loan outstanding at any time, at a fixed rate, based on the cost of the Corporation of capital investment and borrowings from the private market, plus one-half of 1 per centum to compensate the Corporation for its estimated overhead and administrative expenses in connection with such loan and for proportionate payments to required reserves. In the event of the refinancing of the loan (within such period as the Corporation shall prescribe), is the cost to the Corporation of capital investment and borrowings from the private market makes necessary an increase in the rate of interest which, pursuant to this subsection, the Corporation is required to charge on the mortgage loan, the amortization period may be extended to a date not later than sixty years after the date of the original mortgage: *Provided,* That no such extension shall be made unless the Corporation determines that the increase otherwise resulting in the rents or charges for the dwellings in the housing project would adversely affect the stability of such housing project. The mortgage loan may, in the discretion of the Corporation, include provision for the deferment of payments of principal and interest thereunder: *Provided further,* That such deferments shall not in the aggregate result in an extension of the maturity of the mortgage for a period of more than three years nor shall any such deferments result in an extension of the maturity of the mortgage for more than three years beyond the mortgage maturity otherwise authorized herein.

"(e) Subject to the provisions of this section, the mortgage loan shall be in such form, contain such provision as to security, repayment, and redemption, and be subject to such other terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine: *Provided,* That in the case of a borrower of the character described in section 710(b)(1), the mortgage loan shall contain provisions requiring that such borrower have, to the extent permitted by State and local law, a priority for the purchase of the interest of each of its members in the dwelling of such member in the event of sale of such interest.

"(f) The borrower may, with the consent of the Corporation, pledge the contract or commitment of the Corporation to to make a mortgage loan hereunder as security for a loan of construction funds from other sources.

"(g) The Corporation may charge to the borrower (in addition to any interest charges) an amount not exceeding one-half of 1 per centum of the principal amount of the mortgage loan for inspection and other services during the construction of any housing project. The Corporation may also charge to an applicant for a mortgage loan under this title a reasonable fee for the cost of processing applications, which shall be payable by the applicant whether or not such application is approved. If the borrower proposes to raise additional funds through sources other than the Corporation to be secured through insured or guaranteed mortgages, debentures, bonds, or otherwise, the inspection charge herein authorized shall be computed on the total amount borrowed from the Corporation and such other sources for the construction of such project. Such service charges may be included as a part of the development cost of the project and may

be payable from the proceeds of any mortgage loan or advances thereon.

"(h)(1) Each recipient of a mortgage loan under this section shall keep such records as the Corporation shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such mortgage loan, the total cost of the housing project in connection with which such loan is made, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(2) The Corporation and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers and records of the eligible borrowers that are pertinent to mortgage loans received under this section.

"(i) In any State where a State or local agency has been created pursuant to State law to supervise the operation of a housing program found by the Corporation to be substantially similar to the provisions of this title, the Corporation may provide by agreement with such agency for the supervision and administration by such agency of the mortgage loans made under the provisions of this section, in order to prevent duplication of functions, and to achieve administrative economies and coordination between the program established under this title and any State or local programs to deal with the needs of middle income families and aged persons.

"(j) If a local agency has been designated pursuant to the provisions of subsection (i) of this section, mortgage loans under this section shall be limited to borrowers organized or approved with the consent of the local agency pursuant to the provisions of applicable State law.

"(k) After the expiration of twenty years from the date of the original mortgage loan under the provisions of this section, a borrower may relieve itself of further supervisions by the Corporation or any agency designated under the provisions of subsection (i) of this section, upon repayment of the mortgage loan and of such portion of the value of tax abatement as may have been granted it by State or local government and to which such government does not at such time waive the rights of repayment.

"Obligations of Corporation

"SEC. 707. (a) The Corporation is authorized to issue and have outstanding on and after July 1, 1961, notes or other obligations in an aggregate annual amount not to exceed $500,000,000 except that with the approval of the President such aggregate annual amount may be increased at any time or times on or after July 1, 1962, by additional amounts aggregating not more than $1,500,000,000 upon a determination by the President, taking into account the general effect of any such increase upon conditions in the building industry and upon the national economy, that such increase is in the public interest: *Provided*, That the aggregate amount outstanding at any one time shall not exceed the unpaid principal of mortgage loans contracted for or held by it under this title (without regard to amounts of prior advances on such loans), plus the value (as determined by the Corporation) of any acquired properties, the amount of its cash on hand and on deposit, and the amount of its investments authorized herein: *Provided further*, That the interest on obligations issued by the Corporation under this section shall not exceed a rate of 4 per centum per annum.

"(b) The failure of the Corporation to make any payment due under or provided to be paid by the terms of any note or other obligation issued by the Corporation pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be considered a default under such note or other obligation, and, if such default continues for a period of thirty days, the holder of such note or obligation shall be entitled to receive debentures (in principal amount equal to the unpaid principal of the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation plus any interest due and unpaid on such note or other obligation), as hereinafter provided, upon assignment, transfer, and delivery to the Corporation, within a period and in accordance with rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Corporation, of the note or other obligation in default. Debentures issued under this subsection shall be executed in the name of the Corporation as obligor, shall be signed by the Chairman of the Board by either his written or engraved signature, and shall be negotiable. Such debentures shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, at the time the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation was issued, but not to exceed the rate of interest applicable to the defaulted note or other obligation, or the going Federal rate, whichever is the lower, payable semiannually on the 1st day of January and on the 1st day of July of each year, and shall mature three years after the 1st day of July following the maturity date of the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation in exchange for which such debentures were issued. Such debentures shall be paid out of the Insurance Fund or out of any funds of the Corporation which shall be primarily liable therefor, and shall be fully and unconditionally guaranteed as to principal and interest by the United States, and such guaranty shall be expressed on the face of the debenture. In the event the Corporation fails to pay upon demand when due, the principal of, or interest on, any debenture so guaranteed, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to the holder or holders the amount thereof which is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and thereupon, to the extent of the amount so paid, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder or holders of such debentures. Debentures issued under this subsection (b) shall be in such form and denominations in multiples of $50, shall be subject to such terms and conditions, and shall include such provisions for redemption, if any, as may be prescribed by the Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be in coupon or registered form, and shall not be subject to the limitations prescribed by subsection (a) of this section. Any difference between the amount of debentures to which the holder of the defaulted note or other obligation of the Corporation is entitled under this subsection (b) and the aggregate principal amount of the debentures issued, not to exceed $50, shall be adjusted by the payment of cash by the Corporation. The Corporation may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, purchase in the open market debentures issued under the provisions of this subsection (b). Such purchases shall be made at a price which will provide an investment yield of not less than the yield obtainable from other investments authorized by this title. Debentures so purchased shall be canceled and not reissued.

"Reserves, dividends, and investment of funds

"SEC. 708. The Corporation shall carry to a specific reserve account for losses, to be known as the Insurance Fund, semiannually from interest receipts on mortgage loans amounts equal to one-fourth of 1 per centum per annum of the then outstanding balance of such mortgage loans. The Corporation shall make such chargeoffs on account of depreciation or impairment of its assets as the Board shall require from time to time. In addition to the Insurance Fund reserve account for losses, the Board shall require the establishment and maintenance of, and the Corporation shall establish and maintain, such reserve or reserves as it deems necessary. Such reserves, including the Insurance Fund, and all other funds of the Corporation not invested in mortgage loans or operating facilities, shall be kept in cash or on deposit or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"Priority accorded to applications

"SEC. 709. In the processing of applications for financial assistance under this title the Corporation shall give priority to applications with respect to projects which will receive assistance from a State or local government in one or more of the ways specified in section 701(b) of this title.

"Definitions

"SEC. 710. As used in this title, the following terms shall have the meanings, respectively, ascribed to them below, and unless the context clearly indicates otherwise, shall include the plural as well as the singular number:

"(a) 'Families of moderate income' means families, or individuals, whose incomes preclude them from purchasing or renting conventionally financed new housing with total monthly housing expenditures of 20 per centum of their normal stable income as defined by the Federal Housing Administration.

"(b) 'Eligible borrower' or 'borrower' shall mean (1) any private or public nonprofit organization (including but not limited to cooperative ownership housing corporations), or (2) any private corporation, borrowing directly on a commitment from the Corporation and authorized to provide dwellings (i) the occupancy of which is to be permitted in consideration of agreed charges, or (ii) for sale, at cost plus an amount representing profit not exceeding 6 per centum (as certified in the manner prescribed in section 227 of the National Housing Act), to an organization of the character described in clause (1) of this paragraph.

"(c) The term 'corporation' (except when used to designate the Corporation created by section 703 hereof) shall mean either 'corporation' or 'trust' and references to members of such corporations shall with respect to trusts mean the beneficiaries thereof.

"(d) 'Housing project' shall mean a project (including all property, real and personal, contracts, rights, and choses in action acquired, owned, or held by a borrower in connection therewith) of a borrower designed and used primarily for the purpose of providing dwelling: *Provided*, That nothing in this title shall be construed as prohibiting the inclusion in a housing project of such stores, offices, or other commercial facilities, recreational or community facilities, or other nondwelling facilities as are necessary appurtenances to such housing project.

"(e) 'Development cost' shall mean (1) the amount of the reasonable costs incurred by the borrower in, and necessary for, carrying out all works and undertakings for the development of a housing project and shall include the cost of all necessary surveys, plans and specifications, architectural, engineering, or other special services, land acquisition, site preparation, construction and equipment, interest incurred during the development of the housing project up to the time of completion, initial working capital for the administration of the housing project, necessary expenses (including any initial operating deficit) in connection with the initial occupancy of the housing project, and the cost of such other items as the Corporation shall determine to be necessary for the development of the housing project, less net rents and other net income received from

the housing project prior to the time of its completion, as determined by the Corporation, or (2) the cost, as approved by the Corporation, incurred by the borrower in, and necessary for the acquisition of, a housing project developed with a loan made under this title. For the purposes of this subsection, the Corporation shall consider, in determining the reasonable cost of land acquisition, the effect of local assistance for assembling and clearing the site and securing title thereto as provided in section 701(b) of this title.

"(f) 'Mortgage' or 'mortgage loan' shall mean a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple, or on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than ninety-nine years which is renewable or (2) under a lease having a period of not less than seventy-five years to run from the date the mortgage was executed; and the term 'first mortgage' shall mean such classes of first liens as are commonly given to secure advances on, or the unpaid purchase price of, real estate, under the laws of the State in which the real estate is located, together with the credit instruments, if any, secured thereby.

"(g) The term 'veteran' shall mean a person who has served in the active military or naval service of the United States at any time (i) on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, (ii) on or after April 6, 1917, and prior to November 11, 1918, or (iii) on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, and who shall have been discharged or released therefrom under conditions other than dishonorable.

"(h) The term 'going Federal rate' shall mean the annual rate of interest (or, if there shall be two or more such rates of interest, the highest thereof) specified in the most recently issued bonds of the Federal Government having a maturity of ten years or more.

"(i) 'State' shall mean the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the territories, dependencies, and possessions of the United States.

"(j) The term 'elderly persons' means a person sixty years of age or over or a family the head of which or his spouse is sixty years of age or over.

"Amendments of other acts

"SEC. 711. (a) The sixth sentence of paragraph Seventh of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by inserting before the comma after the words 'or obligations of the Federal National Mortgage Association' the following: ', or notes, debentures, or other obligations of the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation'.

"(b) Section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 84), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"'(14) Notes, obligations, and debentures of the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation shall not be subject to any limitation based upon such capital and surplus.'

"(c) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U.S.C. 846) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of the section and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the following: 'Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation.'

"Taxation of property

"SEC. 712. All real property and tangible personal property of the Corporation shall be subject to State, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other similar property is taxed, and any real property shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements: *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit any eligible borrower from contracting with any State, or political subdivision thereof, for the purpose of obtaining a complete or partial exemption from any taxation or assessments otherwise authorized by this section. Except as to such taxation of real property and tangible personal property, the Corporation, including but not limited to its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, income, assets, and other property, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority. All notes, debentures, and other obligations of the Corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation imposed by the United States, or any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

"Protection of labor standards

"SEC. 713. In order to protect labor standards—

"(a) any contract for a loan pursuant to this title shall contain a provision requiring: (1) that not less than the salaries prevailing in the locality, as determined or adopted (subsequent to a determination under applicable State or local law) by the Corporation, shall be paid to all architects, technical engineers, draftsmen, and technicians employed in the development, and to all maintenance laborers and mechanics employed in the administration, of the housing project involved; (2) that not less than the wages prevailing in the locality, as predetermined by the Secretary of Labor pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1931 (Davis-Bacon Act), as amended, shall be paid to all laborers and mechanics employed in the development of the housing project involved; and (3) that certifications as to compliance with the provisions of this subsection be made prior to the making of any payment under such contract;

"(b) the provisions of section 874 of title 18, United States Code, and of section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c), shall apply to any housing project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title;

"(c) any contractor engaged on any housing project financed in whole or in part with funds made available pursuant to this title shall report monthly to the Secretary of Labor, and shall cause all subcontractors to report in like manner, within five days after the close of each month and on forms to be furnished by the United States Department of Labor, as to the number of persons on their respective payrolls on the particular housing project, the aggregate amount of such payrolls, the total man-hours worked, and itemized expenditures for materials. Any such contractor shall furnish to the Department of Labor the names and addresses of all subcontractors on the work at the earliest date practicable.

"Penalties

"SEC. 714. (a) Any person who induces or influences a borrower hereunder to purchase or acquire property or to enter into any contract, in connection with any housing project to be financed, in whole or in part, with a loan made under this title, and willfully fails to disclose any interest, legal or equitable, which he has in such property or such contract, or any special benefit which he expects to receive as a result of such contract, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both.

"(b) No individual, association, partnership, or corporation (except the Corporation established under this title) shall hereafter use the words 'Federal limited profit mortgage corporation', or any combination of words which might reasonably lead to confuse with the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation as the name or a part thereof under which he or it shall do business. Any such use shall constitute a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding $1,000.

"(c) Whoever, for the purpose of obtaining any loan under this title, or any extension or renewal thereof or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation under this title, makes any statement, knowing it to be false, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"(d) Whoever (1) falsely makes, forges, or counterfeits any obligation, in imitation of or purporting to be an obligation issued by the Corporation, or (2) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, any false, forged, or counterfeited obligations purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be false, forged, or counterfeited, or (3) falsely alters any obligation issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, or (4) passes, utters, or publishes, or attempts to pass, utter, or publish, as true, any falsely altered or spurious obligation issued or purporting to have been issued by the Corporation, knowing the same to be falsely altered or spurious, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years or both.

"(e) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged, or otherwise entrusted to it, or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body, politic or corporate; or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes a false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or without being duly authorized draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other such obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

"(f) All general criminal and penal statutes of the United States relating to public moneys, property, or employees of the United States shall apply to public moneys, property, and employees of the Corporation. No officer or employee of the Corporation shall participate in any manner affecting his personal interests or the interests of any corporation, partnership, or association in which he is directly or indirectly interested.

"Short title

"SEC. 715. This title may be cited as the 'Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation Act'."

On page 83, line 3, strike out "VII" and insert in lieu thereof "VIII".

On page 83, line 5, strike out "701" and insert in lieu thereof "801".

On page 83, line 14, strike out "702" and insert in lieu thereof "802".

On page 83, line 22, strike out "703" and insert in lieu thereof "803".

On page 84, line 4, strike out "704" and insert in lieu thereof "804".

On page 84, line 8, strike out "705" and insert in lieu thereof "805".

On page 84, line 12, strike out "706" and insert in lieu thereof "806".

On page 88, line 19, strike out "707" and insert in lieu thereof "807".

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 15 minutes on the amendment. The amendment is a substitute for the so-called 40-year no downpayment provision of the pending bill. It will be noted that I have asked for a rather substantial amount of time on the amendment; hence it was treated specially in the unanimous consent agreement, because I really feel that at long last the idea em-

bodied in the amendment is entitled to the considerate judgment of the Senate and that thorough discussion of it be had as a substitute for the one part of the bill before us which represents a new initiative on the part of the administration, in order to meet a well established need.

Being a lawyer, I will first state what the amendment is about. It proposes to authorize the establishment of a U.S. Government corporation. We are familiar with this type of operation. It would be called the Federal Limited Profit Mortgage Corporation, and would be financed in the first instance by $100 million from the Federal Treasury. But that is only seed money, in order to get the project off the ground. The idea is to have it established as a self-financed corporation, which will raise its money from the public by selling securities, which securities will be guaranteed by the Federal Government and which will carry an income tax exemption in terms of the interest which is payable on the securities.

The amount of money proposed to be raised is $500 million in the first year, and $500 million a year thereafter, as money may be needed in the discretion of the corporation, with the right in the President of the United States, as fiscal and economic conditions may allow, and as housing needs may require, to permit another $1,500 million in the aggregate to be raised in obligations of the corporation, to be issued to the public at any time in the amounts which seem warranted by the considerations which I mentioned before.

The corporation is essentially to be a governmental body. Its board of directors would consist of five persons, who would be essentially Government employees, headed by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator as Chairman of the Board.

The idea, then, would be for this corporation, being in funds in a sense a mutual mortgage corporation, to lend these funds to public or private nonprofit or limited profitmaking corporations, which will operate in the various States, and to lend them money at a rate—because it can itself sell its obligations at a very low rate—which is increased over and above the rate which the obligations bear only by the operating requirements of the corporation itself, including some actuarial reserve.

Therefore the interest rate to the actual builder of the housing would be the interest rate which represents the cost to the corporation plus one-half of 1 percent for administrative expenses, which is equivalent, I might point out, to the FHA premium of one-half of 1 percent which is charged today on all mortgages.

There are quite a number of advantages in this plan which are very much superior, in my view—and I may say in the view of many others—to the untried, brandnew, 40-year, no-downpayment plan which is proposed to the Senate.

I have called up my amendment immediately upon the heels of the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana, which will indeed be the first one to be voted on when we come to the yea-and-nay votes on Wednesday. I may add that I shall ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment when we resume debate on Tuesday. I hope very much that I shall have the cooperation of the Members of the Senate in that regard. I might explain that there has been some annoyance expressed with the calling of Members of the Senate from their committee deliberations, for the purpose of granting yea-and-nay votes on amendments. Out of courtesy to my colleagues I am not pressing that point this afternoon.

I call up my amendment immediately upon the heels of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana so that Senators may have an opportunity to consider the whole question together.

In other words, I feel certain there are Senators who are opposed to the 40-year, no-downpayment mortgages, but who, at the same time, recognize the real need for the moderate income housing field. They desire to fill that need, if they can find some intelligent way, which will appeal to the principles which they believe are consistent with the country's well-being, to do it.

Therefore, I offer this alternative right on the heels of the vote, so that Senators who may decide to strike the 40-year provision may, nonetheless, support the alternative. Also, I hope it will attract Senators who may, in the final analysis, support the 40-year, no-downpayment alternative, but are unhappy about it and would like, if they could, to find a better way. I respectfully submit that this is a better way.

I shall, of course, go into considerably more detail to prove that, but it is interesting to observe, and I think it rather bears upon the validity of this idea, that the amendment is in essence, with practically no changes, the same as S. 1342, a bill which I introduced together with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is not a sponsor of this amendment, his place having been taken by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH]. However, together with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], I introduced a bill last year, and after consideration and testimony, the Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I have the honor to be a member, reported the bill favorably to the Senate on June 17, 1960. It was then Calendar No. 1677. It was not considered by the Senate because of the inability to have it called up for action. However, the bill actually commanded a majority vote in the Committee on Banking and Currency, which reported the very same measure which I am proposing for consideration on the Senate floor. So this proposal is not simply the idea of one Senator but is a rather important grounding in the fact that the proposal commended itself to the committee.

As a matter of fact, even the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency did not report this alternative adversely to the full committee when we considered the housing bill, but rather preferred simply to send it to the full committee and let the full committee act on it. It was rejected by a divided vote in the full committee. I do not say this in any adversary spirit, because the administration had made a choice of means and had submitted the 40-year, no-downpayment measure, and I believe there was a certain amount of loyalty which supervened over other considerations in going along with the administration in terms of the vote in the full committee. So, first, this program has had consideration and has, indeed, commanded, upon another occasion, a majority in the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Second, and most important, the great attribute of this program is that it is a successful one. It is actually working most successfully in the State of New York. That is where I got it and brought it to Congress, in the hope that it might be applied nationally. Indeed, the committee was so impressed in 1960, when it heard the testimony of witnesses in New York, including high officials of the State government who were concerned with housing, that it caused a majority of the committee to favor the measure. The question of trial and success is a most important point.

I think it is very well known that I am sympathetic to housing. I have ardently supported housing bills. I have even voted to override the vetoes of the President of my own party in respect to housing measures, so important have I considered such bills to be to the people of the country. So I am sympathetic to any idea which is proposed which makes any sense at all in terms of helping to provide for the Nation's housing needs.

One of the major elements in determining whether an idea makes sense or not is whether it has been tried. I think the most forceful argument against the 40-year, no-downpayment proposal is that it has never been tried. It is brand new. To show how even its sponsors are worried about whether it can work, they are providing $750 million for the FNMA—the Federal National Mortgage Association, a Government-owned corporation—to buy back the very mortgages which it is intended to dispose of under the 40-year, no-downpayment program. The know, as well as I do, that these mortgages certainly will not be absorbed by banks, insurance companies, or savings and loan associations. They will come right back into Government hands, if the whole project will work at all.

Although I do not agree with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority leader, that the program will ultimately be out of balance in terms of there being an area where people will find it attractive to abandon their homes, I think we cannot simply cast aside the argument that on a 40-year basis there is danger of an imbalance, a disequilibrium, as it were, between the time of a loan and the time when construction begins, if there is not a mutualization feature which is represented by the strength of a limited-dividend mortgage corporation, such as I have described, under which it is possible for construction properties, multifamily properties, and other properties

of that kind, to support property of perhaps a different type, whereas in the 40-year, no-downpayment proposition every piece of property and mortgage must stand on its own and be valid or invalid in terms of its security depending on itself.

I think one of the strong arguments and very important factors in the whole situation is that the entire program has actually worked in the State of New York. It has worked extraordinarily well. We now have completed in the State of New York, or have in process of construction, 30,189 dwelling units, under the New York State Limited Profit Housing program, which is precisely this program. The mortgage loans on those properties now amount to $427,353,990. The plan has produced housing with an average room rent or carrying charge, depending on whether it is a sale or rental, of in the area of $20 to $22, a kind of general average per room, which is what we are all dreaming about and talking about when we talk of moderate income housing.

This is a very impressive record; and to that must be added the fact that New York City also operates a similar program. The program involves no subsidy of any kind or character from government, either from the Federal Government or, in the case of the New York State program, from the State government. It calls for the lending of government credit, because the bonds are salable, due to a government guarantee. Let us remember that in the 40-year, no-downpayment program the government will have to guarantee the mortgages. One of the important questions in committee concerned the redemption of the 40-year mortgages, which differs from the FHA redemption. If there is a default, there is a considerable struggle. We eliminate that in the 40-year, no-downpayment mortgages, which will be sold at an interest rate below the market interest rate. I point that out to show that there is nothing sensational about a Federal guarantee on bonds which will be issued under the plan I am proposing. The important place in which money is saved is in the interest and tax-exemption feature. That, of course, is true of public housing; but in this case we save that for the homeowner or the renter—the tenant—and we in no way impose a cost on the Federal Government, because there is no Federal subsidy, as there is in the case of public housing.

I point that out because I think it is most important. The record of performance as compared with the completely untried situation of the 40-year, no-downpayment proposition, regarding the performance of limited dividend corporations, has been very good. There are other factors which must be considered.

First, we must be certain that people will go out and build on this basis. The State of New York is not an inconsiderable example, because New York has 10 percent of the Nation's housing. One cannot dismiss this as simply a laboratory experiment on a small scale in one particular State. New York is not called the Empire State for nothing. It is an empire, having all kinds of cities, including New York City, the largest in the country and the most powerful in terms of finance and other matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

New York is not an inconsiderable place in which to prove a proposition of this kind. What the program has done in New York has been to attract trade unions, employers, and cooperative organizations of various kinds to enter into this field and to build under this plan, which is a most useful plan for people who are cooperating with one another in other matters, and who then can move into cooperation in the housing field. It lends itself very well to cooperative ownership, as well, in which there are many savings when one gets into the moderate income field—for instance, savings such as those which would be inherent in connection with self-service—savings which represent enormous savings in terms of housing costs.

The other feature is one which is rather rare in terms of a new program. In other words, here we can speak of actual performance and achievement, such as has occurred in New York. Indeed, the voters in New York have twice voted affirmatively, by very substantial majorities, in favor of a program of this kind.

In addition, the program will enable such corporations to negotiate with municipalities or tax concessions, because it will be advantageous to a municipality to defer tax income for a time in order to induce the project to be undertaken in the first place.

In addition—and also very important—States, including the State of New York, often are willing to give condemnation authority to corporations of this kind. So a further important point is the capability of developing at reasonable cost appropriate sites for such housing.

Mr. President, for all these reasons, I respectfully submit that here is an alternative which makes great sense, has actually been tried, avoids the untried aspects of the 40-year, no-downpayment program, and answers the social questions which trouble many persons about the 40-year, no-downpayment program—because it does require investment. Mr. President, I should also point out that the loan authority under this plan can be as great as 90 percent of the replacement cost of the completed project. So some investment is required; and that is why this plan encourages cooperatives.

Furthermore, this plan forms a much better basis for the security behind the mortgage, because it enables many properties to lean on each other in respect to a corporation which issues its own bonds.

Finally, it is a great inducement for the making of arrangements, with municipalities, which result in further reducing costs, through tax abatements of various kinds and through the capability of receiving the power of condemnation.

Therefore, Mr. President, it is not in vain that the Banking and Currency Committee itself has looked with favor, rather than with a jaundiced eye, upon this proposal, even at a time when it felt it had to turn it down, in preference to the plan of the administration itself.

Mr. President, I hope very much that on Tuesday we shall be able to have further debate regarding this matter. As I told the Senator who is the floor manager of the bill, I would take some of my time today and would have this proposal the pending question, but I would hope to reserve at least 1 hour of my time for next week, when perhaps other Senators who support this concept will be here and will have an opportunity to speak, and then I shall be glad to develop the matter further.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from New York will have to leave very soon. So I shall make my remarks this afternoon very brief.

It is a little difficult to oppose a plan such as the one the Senator from New York proposes. He knows that last year I expressed my sympathy with the plan, and voted for it in the committee, and brought it to the floor of the Senate. But we were not able to put it through. I did that largely on the basis of the fine showing made before our committee in regard to what had been done in the State of New York. Of course, at that time we did not have the alternative plan which the administration has suggested.

The Senator from New York knows that the subcommittee referred his proposal to the full committee, in order that we might decide between the two. It was felt that they were alternative plans, and that we should not have both of them.

I will say that I am convinced that the plan has worked well in the State of New York and in the city of New York. But as I said at the committee meeting, I do not know that that can be taken as assurance that it would work well over the country. New York presents an unusual situation, as the Senator from New York has so well stated. New York has 10 percent of the housing of the Nation, and has a tremendous housing program, on a State basis, and has another one on a city basis, and is in a position, and has been in a position to try out new programs, and this one it has tried out, and it has worked well.

Another feature is that I believe it generally would always be preferable to have a program which would rely upon private market financing, rather than direct loans from the Government.

I have supported direct loan programs more than once. I was the author of the direct loan program for veterans. I was the author in the Senate of the program which provided for direct loans for farm housing. I supported—not originally, but eventually—the direct loans for housing for the elderly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to no one in my respect for the Senator from Alabama, and I should only like to make clear a point—one which I am sure he will understand: I think there is a difference between direct loans and what I propose. A direct loan is—as in the veterans' situation—made when the money actually moves from the Government to the borrowers. My proposal would require that the market accept these bonds; otherwise, no money for such loans would be available. I think that makes a very material difference.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree with the Senator from New York, and probably I was not being very accurate when I referred to direct loans.

Let me see whether I correctly understand the matter. The proposal of the Senator from New York is, as I understand it, that the Government underwrite those bonds.

Mr. JAVITS. Oh, no. All that the Government would do would be to put up $100 million, in order to give such a corporation some capital. It could draw down the capital as soon as the corporation accumulated any. Other than that, the corporation would issue the securities to the public, with a Government guarantee of the securities.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is what I said—in other words, the Government would underwrite them.

Mr. JAVITS. I am trying to avoid—because it would be unfair to this proposal—any imputation that this plan involves the proposition of back-door financing.

In talking about direct loans, the question is where the money will come from. In most cases, the money comes from the Treasury, generally under the Second Liberty Loan Act. But in this case the money will come from the public, in a direct way. Therefore, there must be public acceptability; and if the money is not obtained in that way, it will be impossible to go through with the program.

Our experience shows that the public is very receptive, and that the money can be raised from the public by a bond sale of this kind.

I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York in making that point clear. Certainly, he has clarified it for me.

There is another point which I should like to discuss, namely, the tax-exempt status of the bonds. Does the Senator from New York believe it is feasible for the Senate to initiate such action? The Senator from New York has served in the House of Representatives, and he knows how jealously the House defends and stands by its prerogatives with reference to writing legislation of that kind. What would his thought be on that point?

Mr. JAVITS. I would say in this case it is so peripheral to the main point that I would feel the House could not feel it would be amiss. I have served in the House, as the Senator knows, and I know how sensitive it is on this question. If the main thrust were the tax exemption, I would agree, but it is only peripheral to the main point.

The idea of tax exemption on housing bonds has been very deeply imbedded in our housing legislation through public housing, and I do not see how the House could take it to be amiss if we offered it the opportunity to embrace the same principle in respect of moderate income housing, where the main thrust was not tax exemption. However, that is one of the main peripheral benefits. The main idea is not to get tax exemption for the bonds, but the main purpose is different. It happens that the tax exemption helps, but the tax exemption is only incidental to the fact that the bonds would be issued by a Government corporation. It therefore would be tax exempt under State law, too, since a State could not tax a governmental instrumentality.

Therefore, in view of the fact that the main thrust of the proposal is not tax exemption per se, I would say the House should not take offense. I may point out that there are some 15 examples of bonds issued by various types of Government corporations which also, by virute of their origin, have been, for practical purposes, tax exempt. I am confident, and we will check the matter over the weekend, that many of these proposals did not originate in the House. We shall check that point to make sure.

I have made the best answer I can make to the Senator's view, which I deeply respect.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I should like to ask the Senator to check into section 42(a), title III. I shall not take the time to read it, but I believe it would be well to have that statute in mind, not that it would prevent us from enacting a later statute, but simply because it indicates a policy established by Congress since the tax exempt statutes relating to housing bonds were authorized in 1937 or 1938.

Of course, we are all aiming at the same objective. I want to pay my compliments to the Senator from New York for the diligence and earnestness with which he has worked on this type of legislation. What we are trying to do is reach a mass market for decent, safe, and sanitary housing, for a great proportion of our people who today are denied the privilege of owning or living in such property, simply because their incomes are not high enough. We are both trying to do it under the administration experiment—and it is an experiment. That is what the Senator from New York is trying to do.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The question of need has been raised by the very same friends and colleagues who commiserate about the fact that we are underusing the resources of our country. It must be remembered that houses will be built on the basis of demand, and that such construction will greatly stimulate production in this country. The incomes of 40 percent of our people permit them to own houses, but the incomes of 60 percent do not. The mean income of the American family is said to be somewhere around $7,000. The last figure I saw was $6,600. It is a fact which disqualifies a large proportion of the American people from owning homes. So we have the capability of a tremendous stimulant to the American productive economy, as well as a tremendous social benefit of the greatest importance to the majority of the American families.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I have used this figure previously. I cannot vouch for it, but I believe it is accurate. Roughly 75 percent of American families today have incomes too low to enable them to afford the average house. I will not say a decent, safe, and sanitary house, but a typical FHA house. In other words, the great mass market is left without the ability to buy an FHA house under existing law and today's prices.

Regardless of our following divergent routes, we are both aiming toward that objective.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. President, I understand an order has been entered that, when the Senate adjourns tonight, it stand in adjournment to meet at 11 a.m. on Tuesday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I give notice that the Interior appropriation bill will be up for consideration on Tuesday, as well as the continuation of the housing bill, but that if there are to be any yea-and-nay votes ordered on either bill, they will go over until Wednesday.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now adjourn until next Tuesday at 11 a.m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, June 6, 1961, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 2, 1961:

U.S. PATENT OFFICE

Edwin L. Reynolds, of Maryland, to be First Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

Horace B. Fay, Jr., of Ohio, to be an Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

Arthur W. Crocker, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 2, 1961:

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Ernesto Flores, of New Mexico, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 50, with headquarters in Columbus, N. Mex.

Cornelius F. Reardon, of Montana, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 33, with headquarters in Great Falls, Mont.

A. Bayard Angle, of Florida, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 18, with headquarters in Tampa, Fla.

Mrs. Edna M. Scales, of Oregon, to be collector of customs for Customs Collection District No. 29, with headquarters in Portland, Oreg.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 5, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Lamentations 3: 4: *Let us search and try our ways, and turn again to the Lord.*

O Thou who hast made us for thyself, grant that as we turn to Thee in our moments of prayer and meditation we may feel the touch of Thy spirit drawing us unto Thee with the cords of love that cannot be broken.

May it be the deep and dominant longing of our hearts to know Thy presence and power more intimately which alone can dispel our doubts, solve our problems, and quiet our fears.

Help us to respond to the constraint of those lofty impulses and aspirations commanding and encouraging us to remain steadfast, however belligerent the forces of tyranny and aggression may be.

Inspire us to pray fervently and labor faithfully for the fulfillment of the vision of a new and better day which at times is beshadowed but never eclipsed, obscured but never extinguished.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace who came to lead mankind out of hate into love, and out of sin into salvation. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 1, 1961, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5954. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. KUCHEL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1720. An act to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world.

THE LATE JOHN HAROLD FLANNERY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, June 3, at 4:30 p.m., in the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., a distinguished former colleague of yours and of many of the Members still here, and a predecessor of mine in this seat I now have the honor to hold, and a dear and close personal friend of mine, passed from the scene of his many and arduous labors—the Honorable J. Harold Flannery, late president judge of the court of common pleas in Luzerne County, and a former Representative in Congress from Pennsylvania, who died unexpectedly of heart failure. He was 63.

Hospital attachés at the Bethesda institution, a major medical research center, reported the jurist's heart failed as a result of complications due to "acute bronchial asthma," a serious respiratory ailment. He was admitted to the institution on Friday, June 2, at 1 p.m. after a hurried flight by private plane from the Wilkes-Barre-Scranton Airport.

At his bedside when death came was his wife, the former Anne Allen, and his son, Attorney J. Harold Flannery, Jr.

Judge Harold Flannery, a resident of 906 Susquehanna Avenue, West Pittston, Pa., was a candidate for reelection to a third consecutive 10-year term on the common pleas bench this year. He seemed certain to be elected in view of his endorsement by both political parties which nominated him in the recent primary.

Judge Flannery had been in ill health for several months. On the day after he received the nomination of both parties for a third term, May 17, he was admitted to Wilkes-Barre General Hospital. On May 24, a week later, Flannery was removed home from the hospital, where he was recuperating.

His condition apparently worsened, and I made arrangements for his admission to the Bethesda institution on recommendation of his personal physician, Dr. Malcolm Borthwick, of Dallas.

I was deeply grieved when word of his passing came shortly afterward. We had been lifetime friends and years ago appeared together in many Little Theater productions in Wilkes-Barre.

Judge Flannery although endorsed for reelection by both parties, was regarded as a prominent voice in Democratic political circles. He served at one time as county Democratic chairman.

Prior to his election to the common pleas court on November 4, 1941, he served three consecutive terms as Congressman from the 11th District which encompasses Luzerne County. At the age of 38 he was elected to the 75th Congress in 1936 and won reelection to the 76th and 77th Congresses in 1938 and 1940. A terrific vote getter, he garnered over 100,000 votes in winning his third term in Congress, which he resigned to aspire for judge.

Prior to his tenure in Congress, he served from 1932 to 1936 as an assistant district attorney of Luzerne County. He prosecuted a murder case that attracted nationwide attention because of its similarity to "The American Tragedy," a popular novel at that time by Theodore Dreiser.

He also served as solicitor of Pittston, his native community, from 1926 to 1930. Judge Flannery was prominently known as an afterdinner speaker and as a humorist. He appeared at hundreds of functions throughout the county during his career as a Congressman and jurist.

Born in Pittston, April 19, 1898, he was the son of the late Maj. and Mrs. John T. Flannery, whose homestead was at 229 South Main Street, that city. After his marriage, he moved to West Pittston about 25 years ago.

He was a graduate of Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, after which he entered the U.S. Army in World War I. After the war, he returned to pursue his law studies and received his degree from Dickinson School of Law, Carlisle. He was admitted to the bar in March 1921.

His father, who was a city clerk of Pittston for many years, was popularly known as Captain Flannery. He served as captain of Company H, 9th Pennsylvania Infantry Regiment, in the Spanish-American War. He was later promoted to major.

Judge Flannery had two brothers in the legal profession. Attorney Frank Flannery, who died about 10 years ago, and Attorney Patrick Flannery, who died about 5 years ago. His son, Attorney J. Harold Flannery, Jr., is now serving with the Justice Department in Washington, D.C.

Judge Flannery was once a candidate for State superior court. In the late 1920's, he formed a partnership with Attorney William White Hall, of Pittston. Judge Flannery was a member of numerous organizations, particularly the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Greater Pittston. He was a member of the Immaculate Conception Church, West Pittston.

Besides his wife and son, he is survived by a sister, Mrs. Geraldine McCawley of Carbondale. Another sister, Grace, died several years ago.

The distinguished Sunday Independent of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., in the edition of June 4, carried the following editorial:

J. HAROLD FLANNERY

A real shock to all of Luzerne County was the completely unexpected death yesterday in Maryland of President Judge J. Harold Flannery, of West Pittston.

Known for years not to have been robust and known to have been given a recent thorough hospital checkup, he gave the people no reason to feel his life was in danger.

A sudden turn for the worse came and then, so quickly, the end of a splendid career as a jurist and as a man.

Perhaps it is best to let the records speak as to the standing of Judge Flannery.

And, just last month, with no one even in this politically ambitious county showing the slightest disposition to oppose him, Judge Flannery was given both nominations for his third term on the bench.

Even more than that is the fact that this is the second time, as came his time to ask if the people wanted him again, he had been honored with both nominations and given no opposition.

It happened first 10 years ago and then again this year.

This is the finest and the most understandable tribute that can be paid the late President Judge J. Harold Flannery.

Had Judge Flannery lived, he would have returned to the Luzerne County bench as president judge. But we who knew and loved him, remember him also as a distinguished Member of this body. In both of these offices of great trust and confidence, he displayed qualities of leadership and ability that mark him as a statesman of the first order. Devoted as he always was to the Nation's prime interests, he reflected with great honor the confidence placed in him by the citizens of Luzerne County, when he served them in the Nation's Capital during the difficult days of the outbreak of World War II, and later for 20 years as an able and understanding judge.

Thousands of our fellow citizens in Luzerne County, and for that matter throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the country, are indebted to him for his unceasing labors toward our general welfare.

There seemed to be no end to his indefatigable industry and his unlimited capacity for work. Toll, however, was being taken by his ceaseless activities which, no doubt, accounted in a large measure for his sudden death at a time when most of us felt he was at the meridian of his brilliant powers and great capacities.

The name and fame of every man survive for a little time or, perchance, for a little longer time—then disappear. It is strikingly true, however, that what a man is or does remains eternal.

Numberless thousands, recognizing in him the true qualities of leadership and friendship, are sorrowed by his passing. We have lost a great man we can ill afford to lose. The State of Pennsylvania and the county of Luzerne has lost an experienced and able jurist of whom they will always have reason to be proud. I have lost an old and true friend, a fine companion, and a dear colleague, the like of whom rarely exists among men.

Judge Flannery was a devoted husband, a kind and generous father whom his family loved deeply and respected fully. Harold, Anne, and I have been friends even before they were married so many years ago. I held Nicky, his only son, on my knee many and many a time. These ties and his family obligations were foremost in his consideration, and he was always attentive to their interests and their needs. Because of his early demise, a beloved member is absent from this wonderful family hearth.

I can say indeed, to those near and dear to him, that they have our heartfelt sympathy and the knowledge that we sincerely appreciate his real worth, both as a man and as a public servant.

In the busy pursuit of our everyday lives, it is quite appropriate to set aside a sacred hour to pause in serious reflection and to pay deserved tribute to the memory of our departed colleague.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we gather today in this Chamber he loved and graced so well, to do honor to him, who but yesterday walked and labored beside us in public service.

The thought of death and this time dedicated to memorial observances must bring to each of us the stark realization of life's uncertainty, the immutable certainty of death, and the utter vanity of our human pursuits.

The issue of life has been framed for this beloved judge. In all the controversies involving mortal beings, he has finally answered the ultimate summons from the Supreme Judge of us all. How vain and useless would be our present proceedings were they not to awaken in us a more serious and conscious knowledge that we soon will follow in his train.

Mr. Speaker, our sadness today is lightened by a happy reflection of the great accomplishments attributed to him—accomplishments of trust and confidences kept, deeds of unselfish public service, and consecrated devotion to the noble ideals of manhood and statesmanship.

The great American poet, Longfellow, prescribed a mission in life for us all—a mission to which the life of this great statesman and jurist directs us:

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time;
Footprints, that perhaps another
Sailing o'er life's solemn main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother,
Seeing, shall take heart again.
Let us then be up and doing
With a heart for any fate,
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labor and to wait.

Harold could walk with kings and never lose the common touch—he could walk with men in the common walks of life and never lose his appreciation of the value and the contribution of those who occupied a lower stratum of human society. It nearly seems a pity that men of such charm, personality, ability, devotion, and affection should die at any time, but particularly that they should die in the prime of life.

Through the years I missed many of my friends, but not more greatly and grievously than this one.

As long as I shall live, I shall cherish the memory of this fine warm friend, and I hope that today, like Sir Walter Scott on the way from Abbotsford to Melrose Abbey, as the spirit of Harold Flannery looks down from the battlements of heaven, he may catch a hallowed view of the scene where he worked and which he loved.

Mrs. Flood and I extend our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Flannery and to her son, J. Harold, Jr., who in their great sorrow have every right to be exceedingly proud of the spirited heritage which he left to them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the life and services of the late Judge Flannery.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I could not let this moment pass without associating myself with all of the fine tributes that have been paid to a very dear friend and former colleague, the Honorable J. Harold Flannery.

His death, at the age of 63, has removed one of the outstanding citizens of my State of Pennsylvania, where he had served with distinction as a jurist and as a Congressman.

Judge Flannery was a man of tremendous vigor. He also was an individual who possessed a truly wonderful sense of humor. Both helped to mold the qualities of leadership and friendship that everyone who ever knew him admired.

From his school days in Wyoming Seminary, Judge Flannery was marked for distinction. His own townspeople of Pittston named him their solicitor. He later served as an assistant district attorney of his county, Luzerne, and at the age of 38 was selected by the electorate to serve here in the U.S. Congress.

From the time he first came into the halls of Congress with the 75th Congress in 1936, Judge Flannery showed that he was to be a distinguished member of this great body. The intensity of his convictions and the spirit with which he gave his best to every cause he ever championed will long be remembered by all of us who served with him.

Judge Flannery was elected to the common pleas court of Luzerne County on November 4, 1941. His years on the bench proved that he had an unlimited capacity for work. His people knew this and their respect for Harold was reflected this past May when they nominated him for a third term without opposition from either party.

I extend my deepest sympathy to his wife, his son, and his sister. They should find much happiness in knowing that J. Harold Flannery contributed much to making America a better place to live.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee may be permitted to sit while the House is in session this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, if I may reserve the right to object, and I do not

know that I shall object, but it is my understanding that the rather unwritten rule has been that permission to sit during sessions of the House should only be had during general debate. Of course, there will not be any general debate today. May I ask the gentleman if he cleared this with the minority Members?

Mr. MOULDER. Yes, the committee wishes to sit this afternoon in executive session to consider the bill on educational TV.

Mr. HALLECK. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker, with this further suggestion. I think by and large it is not well to have the legislative committees meet when there is important business on the floor of the House where votes are apt to be had. I can understand the variation of the rule when there is general debate. I am not going to object this time, but I think, Mr. Speaker, we might have some discussion on that and arrive at some rule so that it would be better understood.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

LESS THAN HONORABLE DISCHARGES FOR MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the House that, finally, the Department of Defense after having the bill, H.R. 1935, before it since early February made a report to the Honorable CARL VINSON last Thursday. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] promptly sent me the report on Friday, which report contained substantially the same objections to the bill which they made to H.R. 88, the predecessor during the 86th Congress, to H.R. 1935 for the 87th Congress.

The bill, as you remember, dealt with the subject of less than honorable discharges for members of the military. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] last year wrote to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Armed Services on February 5, 1960, as follows:

> I know the position of the Department of Defense in connection with this legislation, but in spite of their opposition, which I think is rather ridiculous, I would consider it a personal favor, if you would let Mr. DOYLE appear before your committee to explain the purpose of this bill.

During the 86th Congress H.R. 88, the predecessor to H.R. 1935, passed the House unanimously on the Suspension of Rules Calendar. But, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the U.S. Senate advised that it had reached his committee too late to arrange for hearings and consideration before congressional adjournment, and on July 20, 1959, I received from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate of the United States the following letter:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN DOYLE: Permit me to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of July 14.
>
> I have been trying to clear away some of the pending committee business that reached us before H.R. 88 but I shall see that you are notified in order that you can be present whenever hearings can be scheduled on your bill.

Other Members have joined in introducing the bill, and we are going to process it as rapidly as we can. Some of my distinguished colleagues who have, in this 87th Congress already filed the identical text of H.R. 1935, or substantially the same are as follows: H.R. 2706, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN]; H.R. 3243, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN]; H.R. 4364, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCFALL]; H.R. 2712, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND]; H.R. 2328, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. WESTLAND]; H.R. 709, the gentleman of Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]; H.R. 250, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI]; H.R. 1279, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN]; H.R. 1187, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCDONOUGH]; H.R. 3185, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO]; H.R. 193, the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON]; H.R. 2243, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG]; H.R. 2241, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HEALEY]; H.R. 673, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT]; H.R. 2703, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON]; H.R. 2462, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]; and H.R. 1202, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER].

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing list of bills indicates very clearly that this House is again determined to try to give many hundreds of deserving American lads at least a little chance to obtain humanitarian consideration for their errors and comparatively minor mistakes made while in the military.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to again emphasize the Doyle bill, H.R. 1935, and companion bills are not designed to apply to any former military man who was found to be of criminal intent, habits, tendencies, and design. But, I believe the record shows that there are thousands of men who have been in the past discharged administratively for far lesser reasons and causes than they should have been. It continues so.

And if I am asked for confirmation by the military itself of my statement often made that any type of discharge less than honorable continues as a severe setback and express limitation to any boy receiving such discharge, I herein set forth the text, quoted from page 2370 of the hearings before the special subcommittee on H.R. 1108 on Monday, June 24, 1957, and which previous bill, H.R. 1108, was a forerunner of H.R. 88 in the 86th Congress and now H.R. 1935 in this 87th Congress.

And, Mr. Speaker, the following quote appraises in exactly the same manner and weight as related to H.R. 1935 and companion bills as it did in relation to H.R. 1108:

> Mr. DOYLE. May I address a few questions to the Secretary?
>
> I think the subcommittee recognizes, or has been informed, prior to the time you came to the service, the very splendid service you rendered to our country. In your prior position you rendered a very distinguished service as juvenile judge in a juvenile court. Therefore, it seems to me that you bring to this discussion very fine experience. We are very glad to have that.
>
> May I ask a couple of questions? There is no question in your mind, then, Mr. Secretary, but that any discharge less than honorable does, as you said in your fine statement, and in your answers to question, leave the holder or the recipient thereof with a stigmatized condition? Is that true?
>
> Mr. JACKSON. That is correct, sir.
>
> Mr. DOYLE. Both as to the social standing in the community, and as to ready ability to obtain dignified and commensurate employment.
>
> Would you agree with me?
>
> Mr. JACKSON. Yes, sir.
>
> Mr. DOYLE. And, of course, in writing the bill which I did, after my study of a couple of years, I then learned that which you now state in agreement with me, only I then learned that there are thousands—I do not mean hundreds—I mean there are thousands, many thousands of former members of the military who have less than honorable discharges and who do not, therefore, have any reasonable opportunity to gain commensurate employment, and who are frowned upon in their own communities; not only they, Mr. Secretary, but I discovered their whole families were in many cases frowned upon by their neighbors because the boy, temporarily in the military services in thousands of cases, got less than an honorable discharge.
>
> Therefore, prefacing the next couple of questions I will ask you, I make that statement as a background because this subject of less than honorable discharges is not chickenfeed. It deals with thousands of boys who have been discharged and who have been handicapped by the stigma which you and I agree was a result of their type of discharge, and their families and their relatives in many cases are affected.
>
> Now I notice in your statement you refer to the fact that you are now further emphasizing the desire or willingness of the military to let a boy who has been back in civilian life for at least 2 years reenlist and try to earn an honorable discharge.
>
> Why do you make it a 2-year period? Why not 1 year, or why not 3 years? How do you fix the term of 2 years?
>
> Mr. JACKSON. We do not have any magic with respect to the period, I presume, any more than the committee has. I understand you fixed 3; we fixed 2. We do not quarrel particularly on that. I think we all agree that it should be a length of time sufficient to warrant a fairly sound conclusion as to the boy's adjustment.
>
> Mr. DOYLE. So in adopting a 2-year term, you did it because you felt that 2 years would be sufficient to prove acceptable conduct in civilian life?
>
> Mr. JACKSON. Coupled with the fact, of course, that there is also going to be his period of service, when he will prove his worthiness.
>
> Mr. DOYLE. So that if you choose 2 years as an acceptable term, coupled with that later service, our suggestion of 3 years would not be out of line?
>
> Mr. JACKSON. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I submit H.R. 1935 for the immediate information of the House, as

it hoped for early consideration and approval again:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 79 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1552 is amended—

(A) by amending the first sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "Under uniform procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of any military department, acting through boards of civilians of the executive part of that military department, may correct any military record of that department when he considers it necessary to correct any error or remove an injustice.";

(B) by adding the following new sentence at the end of subsection (a): "When it considers the case of any person discharged or dismissed, before or after the enactment of this sentence, from an armed force under conditions other than honorable, the board shall take into consideration the reasons for the type of that discharge or dismissal, including—

"(1) the conditions prevailing at the time of the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to that discharge or dismissal;

"(2) the age of the person at the time of the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to that discharge or dismissal;

(3) the normal punishment that might have been adjudged had that incident, statement, attitude, or act occurred or been made in civilian life; and

"(4) the moral turpitude, if any, involved in the incident, statement, attitude, or act which led to that discharge or dismissal."; and

(C) by adding the following new subsections at the end thereof:

"(g) In the case of any person discharged or dismissed, before or after the enactment of this subsection, from an armed force under conditions other than honorable, the board may, with the approval of the Secretary concerned, issue to that person an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date it is issued, if, after considering the reasons for that discharge or dismissal, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of subsection (a), it is established to the satisfaction of the board that he has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years.

"(h) Applications and reapplications for correction of records under subsection (g) may be filed at any time, but not before three years after that discharge or dismissal.

"(i) For the purposes of subsection (g), oral or written evidence, or both, may be used, including—

"(1) a notarized statement from the chief law enforcement officer of the town, city, or county in which the applicant resides, attesting to his general reputation so far as police and court records are concerned;

"(2) a notarized statement from his employer, if employed, attesting to his general reputation and employment record;

"(3) notarized statements from not less than five persons, attesting that they have personally known him for at least three years as a person of good reputation and exemplary conduct, and the extent of personal contact they have had with him; and

"(4) such independent investigation as the board may make.

"(j) No benefits under any laws of the United States (including those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under subsection (g) unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal. Except as otherwise provided in this section or section 1553 of this title, no Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate may be issued except under subsection (g), and after a specific finding by the board that it is issued under that subsection.

"(k) The Secretary of Defense for the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by each board under subsection (g), and the number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued under that subsection."

(2) Section 1553 is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1553. Review of discharge or dismissal

"(a) The Secretary concerned shall, after consulting with the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, establish boards of review, each consisting of five members, to review, under uniform procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense in the case of a military department, the discharge or dismissal of any former member of an armed force under the jurisdiction of his department upon its own motion or upon the request of such former member or, if he is dead, his surviving spouse, next of kind, or legal representative.

"(b) A board established under this section may, subject to review by the Secretary concerned, change a discharge or dismissal, or issue a new discharge, to reflect its findings.

"(c) A review by a board established under this section shall be based on the records of the armed force concerned and such other evidence as may be presented to the board, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of section 1552(a) of this title. A witness may present evidence to such a board in person or by affidavit. A person who requests a review under this section may appear before such a board in person or by counsel or an accredited representative of an organization recognized by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under chapter 59 of title 38.

"(d) In the case of any person discharged or dismissed, before or after the enactment of this subsection, from an armed force under conditions other than honorable, the board may, with the approval of the Secretary concerned, issue to that person an 'Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate' dated as of the date it is issued, if, after considering the reasons for that discharge or dismissal, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of section 1552(a) of this title, it is established to the satisfaction of the board that he has rehabilitated himself, that his character is good, and that his conduct, activities, and habits since he was so discharged or dismissed have been exemplary for a reasonable period of time, but not less than three years.

"(e) Applications and reapplications for correction of records under subsection (d) may be filed at any time, but not before three years after that discharge or dismissal.

"(f) For the purposes of subsection (d), oral or written evidence, or both, may be used, including those matters set forth in clauses (1)–(4) of section 1552(i) of this title.

"(g) No benefits under any laws of the United States (including those relating to pensions, compensation, hospitalization, military pay and allowances, education, loan guarantees, retired pay, or other benefits based on military service) accrue to any person to whom an Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate is issued under subsection (d) unless he would be entitled to those benefits under his original discharge or dismissal. Except as otherwise provided in this section or section 1552 of this title, no Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificate may be issued except under subsection (d), and after a specific finding by the board that it is issued under that subsection.

"(h) The Secretary of Defense for the military departments, and the Secretary of the Treasury for the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a service in the Navy, shall report to Congress not later than January 15 of each year the number of cases reviewed by each board under subsection (d), and the number of Exemplary Rehabilitation Certificates issued under that subsection."

TRACTORS FOR CUBANS

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, ever since last Thursday, when I criticized in a special order on the floor of this House the "Tractors for Cubans" exchange, letters and telegrams have been pouring into my office in support of my position. My principal point during the course of those remarks was that the tractors being asked for were not designed for agricultural purposes but rather were 23-ton track-type caterpillar D–8's which were designed for everything but farming operations, and cost $30,000 or more each.

The last report of the negotiating committee which I read in the press suggests that the committee recognizes this and is now talking about 50 heavy duty track-type tractors and 450 general purpose tractors. I assume the latter are the traditional row-crop tractors which sell in the neighborhood of $4,500 to $5,000. These are not built by the Caterpillar Tractor Co., which Castro specified, and I predict Castro will refuse the offer of the committee for he knew precisely what he was asking for in the first instance—heavy duty machines to build up his defense establishment. If Castro accepts the general purpose tractors, we are talking about a considerably less sum of money to finance their purchase, and I raise the question of what the committee will do with the difference between $3 million, which is sufficient to purchase the smaller tractors and the originally requested $15 million for the larger ones. The smaller sum, however, does not in any way make it a more palatable deal for me. It is still outright blackmail, and there have already been indications that the North Vietnamese will be asking a price for any American-trained guerrillas captured in that area if the Castro deal is consummated.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARY, PASSMAN, CANNON, PILLION, and TABER.

REYNOLDS FEAL CORP., ET AL.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 5178) for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex., with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after "claims" insert: ": *Provided, however,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN NAPOLI

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1346) for the relief of John Napoli, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

(1) Page 1, line 7, after "claims" insert ", of any nature whatsoever,".

(2) Page 1, lines 8 and 9, strike out "for personal injuries, loss of and damage to his personal property, and other loss and damage" and insert "arising from or".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill (H.R. 7446) and minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is the day for the calling of the Consent Calendar. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMPACT

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 225) to grant the consent of Congress to the Delaware River Basin Compact and to enter into such compact on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this joint resolution may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

AMENDING SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL ACT OF 1950

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5751) to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 so as to require the registration of certain additional persons disseminating political propaganda within the United States as agents of a foreign principal, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE GENERAL BRIDGE ACT OF 1946

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5963) to amend the General Bridge Act of 1946 with respect to the vertical clearance of bridges to be constructed across the Mississippi River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

SUITS AGAINST MINERAL ENTRIES IN ALASKA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act entitled "An Act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska", approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459), is hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendment: "Page 1, after line 6, add a new section to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. This Act shall not be applicable to adverse claims on applications for patents filed prior to the effective date of this Act, but the 8-month period heretofore provided for such claims and the 60-day period heretofore provided for adverse suits shall continue in effect with respect thereto."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPANSION OF FUNCTIONS OF THE COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6845) to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of title 14, United States Code, is amended by inserting the words "shall engage in oceanographic research on the high seas and in waters subject to the jurisdiction of the United States;" before the last clause of this section which reads "and shall maintain a state of readiness to function as a specialized service in the Navy in time of war."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF FOR CERTAIN ENLISTED MEN OF THE AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2750) to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all payments of basic allowance for subsistence heretofore made to enlisted members of the Air Force who were assigned to Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, at Baltimore, Maryland, during the period beginning on July 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1958, and which are otherwise correct, are validated to the extent that those allowances were paid, because the military commander concerned determined that no Government mess was available to those enlisted members under regulations prescribed under section 301 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended (37 U.S.C. 251). Any enlisted member who has made a repayment to the United States of

the amount so paid to him as a basic allowance for subsistence is entitled to be paid the amount involved, if otherwise proper.

SEC. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents, of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

SEC. 3. Appropriations available to the Department of the Air Force for the pay and allowances of military personnel are available for payments under this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL AMERICAN GUILD OF VARIETY ARTISTS WEEK

The Clerk called Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas for many years performers and artists in the variety field have circled the globe with their hearts and talents to bring entertainment and joy to all places and under all conditions; and

Whereas performers and artists in the variety field have unstintingly given of their services to the American people in behalf of every cause regardless of race, creed, or color: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of October 9–15, 1961, be designated as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week, in recognition of the outstanding services of performers and artists in the variety field to the American people.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DESIGNATING POLICE WEEK AND PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL DAY

The Clerk called Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 65) designating the week of May 20 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week of May 14–20, 1961, is hereby designated as Police Week, in recognition of the contribution the police officers of America have made to our civilization through their dedicated and selfless efforts in enforcing the laws of our cities, counties, and States and of the United States regardless of the peril or hazard to themselves, and May 15th is hereby designated as Peace Officers Memorial Day in honor of the Federal, State, and municipal peace officers who have been killed or disabled in line of duty. Through their enforcement of our laws our country has internal freedom from fear of the violence and civil disorders that is presently affecting other nations.

To this end the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such period, with appropriate ceremonies and activities, as a tribute to the men and women who, night and day, stand guard in our midst to protect us through enforcement of our laws, and to honor those who have lost their lives in service to the community.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike "May 14–20, 1961" and insert in lieu thereof "May 13–19, 1962".

Page 1, line 8, strike "15th" and insert in lieu thereof "14th".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "Joint resolution designating the week of May 13–19, 1962, as Police Week and designating May 14, 1962, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES RETIRED FROM REGULAR ACTIVE SERVICE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5255) to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a question or two concerning this bill.

This is limited to rehearing cases where retired Federal judges are sent back?

Mr. CELLER. That is correct. The judge sat on the original case and he was unable to sit on the rehearing of the case on appeal en banc.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman what is meant by the phrase "en banc"?

Mr. CELLER. Circuit courts sometimes consist of five judges. When you say "en banc," the five judges sit.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) paragraph (b) of section 43 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each court of appeals shall consist of the circuit judges of the circuit in regular active service. The circuit justice and justices or judges designated or assigned shall also be competent to sit as judges of the court."

(b) Paragraph (c) of section 46 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Cases and controversies shall be heard and determined by a court or division of not more than three judges, unless a hearing or rehearing before the court in banc is ordered by a majority of the circuit judges of the circuit who are in regular active service. A court in banc shall consist of all circuit judges in regular active service. A circuit judge of the circuit who has retired from regular active service shall also be competent to sit as a judge of the court in banc in the rehearing of a case or controversy if he sat in the court or division at the original hearing thereof."

SEC. 2. Paragraph (b) of section 132 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each district court shall consist of the district judge or judges for the district in regular active service. Justices or judges designated or assigned shall be competent to sit as judges of the court."

SEC. 3. The first sentence of section 332 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "The chief judge of each circuit shall call, at least twice in each year and at such places as he may designate, a council of the circuit judges for the circuit, in regular active service, at which he shall preside."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WRIGHT BROTHERS DAY

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 109 designating the 17th day of December in each year as "Wright Brothers Day."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the 17th day of December in each year is hereby designated as "Wright Brothers Day", in commemoration of the first successful flights in a heavier-than-air, mechanically propelled airplane, which were made by Orville and Wilbur Wright on December 17, 1903, near Kitty Hawk, North Carolina. The President is authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe such day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike the words "in each year" and insert in lieu thereof ", 1961".

Page 1, line 9, strike the word "annually".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December 1961, as 'Wright Brothers Day'."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4109) to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 23 of the Indian Claims Commission Act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049,

1055; 25 U.S.C. sec. 70v), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of ten years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon the dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "five".

Page 1, line 10, strike out "the" and insert in lieu thereof the word "its".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 751) to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act, which is a similar bill to the one the House just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 23 of the Indian Claims Commission Act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055; U.S.C. sec. 70v), as amended by the Act of July 24, 1956 (70 Stat. 624), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of ten years from and after April 10, 1957, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of said Act is amended by inserting after "such other employees" the phrase ", including hearing examiners,".

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASPINALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That section 23 of the Indian Claims Commission Act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055; 25 U.S.C. sec. 70v), is hereby amended to read as follows:

" 'SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of five years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States.' "

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform with the action just taken by the House.

There was no objection.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4109) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see this unanimous endorsement by the House of the great work being done by the Indian Claims Commission. No Federal agency in two centuries has done more to right old injustices and to redeem the honor of the United States than this Commission.

While I believe a longer extension of time would be justified, and would like to see the Commission enlarged in view of the great scope of its responsibilities, I understand and appreciate the committee's thinking on these subjects.

I trust the bill will speedily be signed into law in order that the Commission may go forward with its great work.

CHANGING THE NAME OF THE ARMY AND NAVY LEGION OF VALOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 847) to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the corporation known as the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, which was incorporated by the Act entitled "An Act to incorporate the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America", approved August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 486), shall be known and designated hereafter as the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, and any reference to such corporation under the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, shall be held to refer to such corporation under and by the name of the Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. That sections 3(b) and 6(a) of the Act of August 4, 1955 (69 Stat. 486) are amended by inserting after the words 'Distinguished Service Cross,' the phrase 'Air Force Cross,'."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Incorporated, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY SUPPORT FACILITIES AT LOS ALAMOS COUNTY, N. MEX.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7209) to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the bill S. 1941, an identical bill to the House bill.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Atomic Energy Commission is authorized with funds presently available or otherwise made available to it to construct (under the applicable provisions of chapter 14 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended) community support facilities at White Rock, Los Alamos County, New Mexico, at a total cost not to exceed $300,000, and for that purpose there is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill (H.R. 7209) was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARIZONA-NEVADA BOUNDARY COMPACT

The Clerk called the bill (S. 133) giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the compact between the States of Arizona and Nevada as contained in chapter 69, law of the State of Arizona, 1960 (senate bill numbered 203, twenty-fourth legislature assembled, approved by the Governor March 24, 1960), and chapter 119, Nevada Revised Statutes 1960 (senate bill numbered 121, passed by the 1960 legislature of the State of Nevada and approved by the Governor March 9, 1960) establishing a boundary between the States of Arizona and Nevada on the Colorado River between the point where the Nevada-California State line intersects the thirty-fifth degree of latitude north and Davis Dam.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act is expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING PROTECTION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Clerk call the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like some information concerning this bill. I am unable to understand why it is necessary, since it is my understanding that the Vice President of the United States can obtain Secret Service protection at any time he desires; is that not correct

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FORRESTER. That is correct. But, the purpose is to cure that very thing, because it is simply embarrassing for the Vice President to have to ask for that protection. You notice that this request comes down from the White House asking that this protection be granted in a permanent way.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman why it is embarrassing for the Vice President to ask for protection if he needs it? The preceding Vice President had Secret Service protection. I have seen the Secret Service with him time after time in the Capitol Building corridors.

Mr. FORRESTER. Very candidly, the gentleman from Georgia is of the opinion that the Vice Presidency is such a high office that actually this protection should be granted to him without him having to make a request for that protection.

Mr. GROSS. But this bill goes further and provides protection for a former President after he leaves office, does it not?

Mr. FORRESTER. Yes, it does.

Mr. GROSS. What is the reason for that?

Mr. FORRESTER. Well, the reason for that is, as is set out in the communication from the White House, that there are some threats that are made against the President shortly after he leaves office. Now, it does not say so point blank that some threats have been made, but probably we have a right to assume there have been. This does not protect the property but simply the person.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question. I have seen in the newspapers stories about people trespassing on former President Eisenhower's farm near Gettysburg; people coming onto the premises. Now, if you are going to station Secret Service agents on the farm they will also be guarding the property of the former President. Their presence there indicates that, does it not?

Mr. FORRESTER. No. I will say to the gentleman that I saw that same criticism.

Mr. GROSS. Well, now, if tourists come on the farm and the Secret Service agents see them coming onto the farm, they will immediately inquire into their business and send them on their way if uninvited.

Mr. FORRESTER. No. If the gentleman will let me say this, I saw that criticism. I went into it. I was the one who conducted the hearings in the subcommittee on this particular bill. Now, No. 1, he does not have this protection unless he particularly asks for it. I do not think he would ask for it unless he had an idea that he had a good reason for asking for it. But, it is to be restricted purely to the person and not to the property at any time.

Mr. GROSS. It is my opinion that the State of Pennsylvania and the county of Pennsylvania in which the former President lives has the responsibility to protect the property of the President as they do any other farmer or any other citizen of that county, and I am not going to see a bill passed here which in effect provides that the Federal Government, all the taxpayers, provide that protection. After all, former President Eisenhower is not a pauper, and there are other farmers up there who have property to protect. I am not going to approve today the foot in the door that this bill proposes; moreover, I want more time to look it over.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

AMENDING FEDERAL YOUTH CORRECTIONS ACT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5343) to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5021 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 5021. Certificate setting aside conviction

"(a) Upon the unconditional discharge by the divison of a committed youth offender before the expiration of the maximum sentence imposed upon him, the conviction shall be automatically set aside and the division shall issue to the youth offender a certificate to that effect.

"(b) Where a youth offender has been placed on probation by the court, the court may thereafter, in its discretion, unconditionally discharge such youth offender from probation prior to the expiration of the maximum period of probation theretofore fixed by the court, which discharge shall automatically set aside the conviction, and the court shall issue to the youth offender a certificate to that effect."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PERMIT GUAM TO ENTER INTERSTATE CRIMINAL LAW COMPACTS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6243) extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 111 of title 4 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the name "the Virgin Islands," the name "Guam".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FALSE BOMB INFORMATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6834) to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 35. Imparting or conveying false information

"(a) Whoever imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by this chapter or chapter 97 or chapter 111 of this title shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

"(b) Whoever willfully and maliciously, or with reckless disregard for the safety of human life, imparts or conveys or causes to be imparted or conveyed false information, knowing the information to be false, concerning an attempt or alleged attempt being made or to be made, to do any act which would be a crime prohibited by this chapter or chapter 97 or chapter 111 of this title—shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the eligible bills on the calendar.

CLEARANCE OF BRIDGES ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 80, H.R. 5963.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to know why we should return to the bill H.R. 5963.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. In order that the objection might be clarified.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It was my intention to object on the ground that I think this bill should be brought up under a rule, so that the House will understand that we would be establishing another inequity to railroad transportation of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS TAX RETIREMENT ACT OF 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 10) to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals, with committee amendments as printed in the bill as reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Self-Employed Individuals Tax Retirement Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. QUALIFICATION OF PLANS.

Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans) is amended—

(1) by adding at the end of paragraph (5) of subsection (a) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this paragraph and subsection (d)(5), the total compensation of an individual who is a self-employed individual (as defined in subsection (c)(2)) is such individual's self-employment earnings (as defined in subsection (c)(3)) and the basic or regular rate of compensation of such an individual shall be determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, with respect to that portion of his self-employment earnings which bears the same ratio to his self-employment earnings as the basic or regular compensation of the employees (other than self-employed individuals) under the plan bears to the total compensation of such employees.";

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (a) the following new paragraphs:

"(7) A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan of which such trust is a part provides that, upon its termination or upon complete discontinuance of contributions under the plan, the rights of all employees to benefits accrued to the date of such termination or discontinuance, to the extent then funded, or the amounts credited to the employees' accounts, are nonforfeitable. This paragraph shall not apply to benefits or contributions which, under provisions of the plan adopted pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to preclude the discrimination prohibited by paragraph (4), may not be used for designated employees in the event of early termination of the plan.

"(8) A trust shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless, under the plan of which such trust is a part, the entire interest of each employee—

"(A) either will be distributed to him not later than his taxable year in which he attains the age of 70½ years, or, in the case of an employee other than an owner-employee (as defined in subsection (c)(4)), in which he retires, whichever is the later, or

"(B) will be distributed, commencing not later than such taxable year, (i) in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, over the life of such employee or over the lives of such employee and his spouse, or (ii) in accordance with such regulations, over a period not extending beyond the life expectancy of such employee or the life expectancy of such employee and his spouse.

"(9) A trust forming part of a pension plan shall not constitute a qualified trust under this section unless the plan provides that forfeitures must not be applied to increase the benefits any employee would otherwise receive under the plan.

"(10) If—

"(A)(i) on one day in each quarter in the taxable year of the plan, an employer has more than 3 employees, or

"(ii) this paragraph applied at any prior time in respect of such plan, and

"(B) the plan provides for current or future contributions for any owner-employee, then the trust shall be a qualified trust under this section only if each employee having a period of employment of 3 years or more is included under the plan. For purposes of the preceding sentence, (i) the term 'employee' does not include any employee whose customary employment is for not more than 20 hours in any one week or is for not more than 5 months in any calendar year, nor does such term include an owner-employee, and (ii) in the case of a partner who is not an owner-employee, the period of time during which he has been such a partner shall be included in his period of employment.

"(11) If paragraph (10) does not apply and the plan benefits owner-employees, then the determination as to whether a trust is a qualified trust shall be made under this section—

"(A) if such plan benefits only owner-employees, without regard to the fact that such plan does not benefit employees other than owner-employees; and

"(B) if such plan also benefits employees other than owner-employees—

"(i) with respect to the portion of the plan which benefits employees other than owner-employees, without reference to the portion of the plan which benefits owner-employees, and

"(ii) with respect to the portion of the plan which benefits owner-employees, without reference to the portion of the plan which benefits employees other than owner-employees.

"(12) A trust forming part of a plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees (as defined in subsection (c)(4)) shall constitute a qualified trust under this section only if the requirements in subsection (d) are also met."; and

(3) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (h) and inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsections:

"(c) DEFINITIONS AND RULES RELATING TO SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS AND OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) EMPLOYEE.—The term 'employee' includes, for any taxable year, a self-employed individual.

"(2) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'self-employed individual' means an individual who has self-employment earnings (as defined in paragraph (3)) for the taxable year.

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYMENT EARNINGS.—The term 'self-employment earnings' means net earnings from self-employment (as defined in section 1402(a)) determined—

"(A) without regard to paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c),

"(B) in the case of any individual who is treated as an employee under section 3121(d)(3)(A), (C), or (D), without regard to paragraph (2) of section 1402(c), and

"(C) without regard to items which are not included in gross income for purposes of this chapter, and the deductions properly allocable to or chargeable against such items.

"(4) OWNER-EMPLOYEE.—The term 'owner-employee' means a self-employed individual who—

"(A) derives self-employment earnings from a trade or business carried on by him, or

"(B) in the case of a partnership, is a partner who owns more than 10 percent of either the capital interest or the profits interest in such partnership.

"(5) EMPLOYER.—In the case of a trade or business carried on by a self-employed individual, such individual shall be treated as his own employer. A partnership shall be treated as the employer of each partner who is an employee within the meaning of paragraph (1).

"(d) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION OF TRUSTS AND PLANS BENEFITING OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—A trust forming part of a pension or profit-sharing plan which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees shall constitute a qualified trust under this section only if, in addition to meeting the requirements of subsection (a), the following requirements of this subsection are met by the trust and by the plan of which such trust is a part:

"(1) In the case of a trust which is created on or after the date of the enactment of this subsection, or which was created before such date but is not exempt from tax under section 501(a) as an organization described in subsection (a) on the day before such date, the trustee is a bank, but a person (including the employer) other than a bank may be granted, under the trust instrument, the power to control the investment of the trust funds either by directing investments (including reinvestments, disposals, and exchanges) or by disapproving proposed investments (including reinvestments, disposals, and exchanges). This paragraph shall not apply to a trust created or organized outside the United States before the date of the enactment of this subsection if, under section 402(c), it is treated as exempt from taxation under section 501(a) on the day before such date. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'bank' means—

"(A) a bank as defined in section 581,

"(B) a corporation which under the laws of the State of its incorporation is subject to supervision and examination by the commissioner of banking or other officer of such State in charge of the administration of the banking laws of such State, and

"(C) in the case of a trust created or organized outside the United States, a bank or trust company, wherever incorporated, exercising fiduciary powers and subject to supervision and examination by governmental authority.

"(2) Under the plan, no benefits may be paid to any owner-employee before he attains the age of 59½ years, except in the case of his becoming disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(3) If subsection (a)(10) applies, the employees' rights to or derived from the contributions under the plan are nonforfeitable at the time the contributions are paid to or under the plan.

"(4) In the case of a profit-sharing plan, the plan provides a definite formula for determining the contributions to be made to the trust by the employer on behalf of employees (other than owner-employees).

"(5) If subsection (a)(10) applies, the plan does not permit the ratio of contributions by the employer for any owner-employee to such owner-employee's compensation to exceed the ratio of contributions by the employer for any employee (other than an owner-employee) to his compensation. For purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) The term 'compensation' means total compensation, or basic or regular rate of compensation, whichever may be specified in the plan.

"(B) If—

"(i) of the contributions deductible under section 404, not more than one-third is deductible by reason of contributions by the employer for owner-employees, and

"(ii) taxes paid by the owner-employee under chapter 2 (relating to tax on self-employment income), and the taxes which would be payable under such chapter 2 by the owner-employee but for paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 1402(c), are taken into account as contributions by the employer for such owner-employee,

then taxes paid under section 3111 (relating to tax on employers) with respect to an employee may be taken into account as con-

tributions by the employer for such employee under the plan.

"(6) The plan does not permit—

"(A) contributions to be made by the employer for any owner-employee in excess of the amounts which may be deducted under section 404 for the taxable year;

"(B) in the case of a plan (or, if subsection (a)(11) applies, the portion thereof) which provides contributions or benefits only for owner-employees, contributions by or for any owner-employee in excess of the amounts which may be deducted under section 404 for the taxable year; and

"(C) if a distribution under the plan is made to any employee and if any portion of such distribution is an amount described in section 72(m)(5)(A)(i) contributions to be made on behalf of such employee for the 5 taxable years succeeding the taxable year in which such distribution is made.

"(7) Under the plan, if an owner-employee dies before his entire interest has been distributed to him, or if distribution has been commenced in accordance with subsection (a)(8)(B) to his surviving spouse and such surviving spouse dies before his entire interest has been distributed to her, his entire interest (or the remaining part of such interest if distribution thereof has commenced) will, within 5 years after his death (or the death of his surviving spouse), be distributed, or applied to the purchase of an immediate annuity for his beneficiary or beneficiaries (or the beneficiary or beneficiaries of his surviving spouse) which will be payable for the life of such beneficiary or beneficiaries (or for a term certain not extending beyond the life expectancy of such beneficiary or beneficiaries) and which will be immediately distributed to such beneficiary or beneficiaries.

"(8) Under the plan—

"(A) any contribution which is an excess contribution (as defined in subsection (e)(1)), together with the income attributable to such excess contribution, is (unless subsection (e)(2)(E) applies) to be repaid to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution is made;

"(B) if for any taxable year the plan does not, by reason of subsection (e)(2)(A), meet (for purposes of section 404) the requirements of this subsection with respect to an owner-employee, the income for the taxable year attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under the plan is to be paid to such owner-employee; and

"(C) the entire interest of an owner-employee is to be repaid to him when required by the provisions of subsection (e)(2)(E).

"(9)(A) If the plan provides contributions or benefits for an owner-employee who controls, or for two or more owner-employees who together control, the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, and who also control as an owner-employee or as owner-employees one or more other trades or business, such plan and the plans (if any) established with respect to such other trades or businesses constitute a plan which meets the requirements of paragraphs (3) and (4), and paragraph (10) or (11) (as the case may be), of subsection (a) with respect to the employees of all such trades or businesses (including the trade or business with respect to which the plan intended to qualify under this section is established).

"(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A), an owner-employee, or two or more owner-employees, shall be considered to control a trade or business if such owner-employee, or such two or more owner-employees together—

"(i) own the entire interest in an unincorporated trade or business, or

"(ii) in the case of a partnership, own more than 50 percent of either the capital interest or the profits interest in such partnership.

For purposes of the preceding sentence, an owner-employee, or two or more owner-employees, shall be treated as owning any interest in a partnership which is owned, directly or indirectly, by a partnership which such owner-employee, or such two or more owner-employees, are considered to control within the meaning of the preceding sentence.

"(10) Under the plan, contributions by or for any owner-employee may be made only with respect to the self-employment earnings of such owner-employee derived from the trade or business with respect to which such plan is established.

"(e) EXCESS CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) EXCESS CONTRIBUTION DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'excess contribution' means—

"(A) if, in the taxable year, contributions are made under the plan (or, if subsection (a)(11) applies, under the portion of the plan) only by or for owner-employees, the amount of any contribution made by or for any owner-employee which (without regard to this subsection) is not deductible under section 404 for the taxable year; or

"(B) if subparagraph (A) does not apply—

"(i) the amount of any contribution made by the employer for any owner-employee which (without regard to this subsection) is not deductible under section 404 for the taxable year;

"(ii) the amount of any contribution made by any owner-employee (as an employee) at a rate which exceeds the rate of contributions permitted to be made by employees other than owner-employees; and

"(iii) the amount of any contribution made under the plan by any owner-employee (as an employee) which exceeds the lesser of $2,500 or 10 percent of the self-employment earnings for such taxable year derived by such owner-employee from the trade or business (or trades and businesses) with respect to which the plan is established; and

"(C) the amount of any contribution made by or for an owner-employee in any taxable year for which, under paragraph (2) (A) or (E), the plan does not (for purposes of section 404) meet the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee.

For purposes of this subsection, the amount of any contribution which is allocable (determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance shall not be taken into account.

"(2) EFFECT OF EXCESS CONTRIBUTION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If an excess contribution (other than an excess contribution to which subparagraph (E) applies) is made by or for an owner-employee in any taxable year, the plan with respect to which such excess contribution is made shall, except as provided in subparagraphs (C) and (D), be considered, for purposes of section 404, as not meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee for the taxable year and for all succeeding taxable years.

"(B) INCLUSION OF AMOUNTS IN GROSS INCOME OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—For any taxable year for which any plan does not meet the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to an owner-employee by reason of subparagraph (A), the gross income of such owner-employee shall, for purposes of this chapter, include the amount of income for such taxable year attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under such plan.

"(C) REPAYMENT WITHIN PRESCRIBED PERIOD.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an excess contribution with respect to any taxable year, if on or before the close of the 6-month period beginning on the day on which the Secretary or his delegate sends notice (by certified or registered mail) to the person to whom such excess contribution was paid of the amount of such excess contribution, the amount of such excess contribution, and the income attributable thereto, is repaid to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was made. If the excess contribution is an excess contribution as defined in paragraph (1) (A) or (B) (i), or is an excess contribution as defined in paragraph (1) (C) with respect to which a deduction has been claimed under section 404, the notice required by the preceding sentence shall not be mailed prior to the time that the amount of the tax under this chapter of such owner-employee for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made has been finally determined.

"(D) REPAYMENT AFTER PRESCRIBED PERIOD.—If an exceess contribution, together with the income attributable thereto, is not repaid within the 6-month period referred to in subparagraph (C), subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an excess contribution with respect to any taxable year beginning with the taxable year in which the person to whom such excess contribution was paid repays the amount of such excess contribution to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was made, and pays to such owner-employee the amount of income attributable to the interest of such owner-employee which, under subparagraph (B), has been included in the gross income of such owner-employee for any prior taxable year.

"(E) SPECIAL RULE IF EXCESS CONTRIBUTION WAS WILLFULLY MADE.—If an excess contribution made by or for an owner-employee is determined to have been willfully made, then—

"(i) subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D) shall not apply with respect to such excess contribution;

"(ii) there shall be distributed to the owner-employee by or for whom such excess contribution was willfully made his entire interest in all plans with respect to which he is an owner-employee; and

"(iii) no plan shall, for purposes of section 404, be considered as meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to such owner-employee for the taxable year in which it is determined that such excess contribution was willfully made and for the 5 taxable years following such taxable year.

"(F) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—In any case in which subparagraph (A) applies, the period for assessing any deficiency arising by reason of—

"(i) the disallowance of any deduction under section 404 on account of a plan not meeting the requirements of subsection (d) with respect to the owner-employee by or for whom an excess contribution was made, or

"(ii) the inclusion, under subparagraph (B), in gross income of such owner-employee of income attributable to the interest of such owner-employee under a plan,

for the taxable year in which such excess contribution was made or for any succeeding taxable year shall not expire prior to one year after the close of the 6-month period referred to in subparagraph (C).

"(f) CERTAIN CUSTODIAL ACCOUNTS.—

"(1) TREATMENT AS QUALIFIED TRUST.—For purposes of this title, a custodial account shall be treated as a qualified trust under this section, if—

"(A) such custodial account would, except for the fact that it is not a trust, constitute a qualified trust under this section;

"(B) the custodian is a bank (as defined in section 581);

"(C) the investment of the funds in such account (including all earnings) is to be made solely in regulated investment company stock with respect to which an employee is the beneficial owner; and

"(D) the shareholder of record of any such stock is the custodian or its nominee.

For purposes of this title, in the case of a custodial account treated as a qualified trust under this section by reason of the preceding sentence, the custodian of such account shall be treated as the trustee thereof.

"(2) DEFINITION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'regulated investment company' means a domestic corporation which—

"(A) is a regulated investment company within the meaning of section 851(a), and

"(B) issues only redeemable stock.

"(g) FACE-AMOUNT CERTIFICATES TREATED AS ANNUITIES.—For purposes of this section and sections 402, 403, and 404, the term 'annuity' includes a face-amount certificate, as defined in section 2(a)(15) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C., sec. 80a–2), which is nontransferable."

SEC. 3. DEDUCTIBILITY OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO PLANS

(a) INCLUSION OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—Section 404(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deductibility of contributions to pension, annuity, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans or plans of deferred compensation) is amended—

(1) by striking out "section 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6)," in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12))" and, in the case of a plan described in paragraph (9) of this subsection, which meets the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1) and (4)),"; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (7) the following new paragraphs:

"(8) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of a plan included in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for self-employed individuals within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), for purposes of this section—

"(A) the term 'employee' includes a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual is the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5);

"(B) the term 'self-employment earnings' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(3);

"(C) the contributions to such plan by or for a self-employed individual shall be considered to satisfy the conditions of section 162 or 212 to the extent that such contributions do not exceed the self-employment earnings of such individual derived from the trade or business with respect to which such plan is established, and to the extent that such contributions are not allocable (determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance; and

"(D) any reference to compensation shall, in the case of a self-employed individual, be considered to be a reference to the self-employment earnings of such individual derived from the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established.

"(9) PLANS BENEFITING OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—In the case of a plan included in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees—

"(A) the limitations provided by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) on the amounts deductible for any taxable year shall be computed, with respect to contributions on behalf of employees (other than owner-employees), as if such employees were the only employees for whom contributions and benefits are provided under the plan;

"(B) the limitations provided by paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7) on the amounts deductible for any taxable year shall be computed, with respect to contributions on behalf of owner-employees—

"(i) as if such owner-employees were the only employees for whom contributions and benefits are provided under the plan, and

"(ii) without regard to paragraph (1)(D), the second and third sentences of paragraph (3), and the second sentence of paragraph (7); and

"(C) the amounts deductible under paragraphs (1), (2), (3), and (7), with respect to contributions on behalf of any owner-employee, shall not exceed the applicable limitation provided in subsection (e).

For purposes of this paragraph and subsections (e) and (f), the term 'owner-employee' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(4)."

(b) LIMITATIONS ON DEDUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Section 404 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the deductibility of contributions to pension, annuity, profit-sharing, or stock bonus plans or plans of deferred compensation) is amended by adding after subsection (d) the following new subsections:

"(e) SPECIAL LIMITATIONS FOR OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a plan included in subsection (a) (1), (2), or (3) which provides contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees, the amounts deductible under subsection (a) in any taxable year with respect to contributions on behalf of any owner-employee shall not exceed—

"(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), $2,500, or 10 percent of the self-employment earnings derived by such owner-employee from the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, whichever is the lesser; or

"(B) if section 401(a)(10) applies, the maximum amount of contributions permitted on behalf of such owner-employee on the application of section 401(d)(5).

"(2) CONTRIBUTIONS MADE UNDER MORE THAN ONE PLAN.—

"(A) OVERALL LIMITATION.—In any taxable year in which amounts are deductible with respect to two or more plans (whether established with respect to the same trade or business or different trades or businesses) on behalf of an individual who is an owner-employee with respect to such plans, the aggregate amount deductible for such taxable year under such plans with respect to contributions on behalf of such owner-employee shall not exceed whichever of the following amounts is the greater:

"(i) $2,500, or

"(ii) the sum of the amounts so contributed under all such plans to the extent that, with respect to each such plan, the amount contributed does not exceed the amount described in paragraph (1) (B).

"(B) ALLOCATION OF AMOUNTS DEDUCTIBLE.—In any case in which the amounts deductible under subsection (a) (with the application of the limitations of this subsection) with respect to contributions made by or for an owner-employee under two or more plans are, by reason of subparagraph (A), less than the amounts deductible under such subsection determined without regard to such subparagraph, the amount deductible under subsection (a) with respect to such contributions under each such plan shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(3) CONTRIBUTIONS ALLOCABLE TO INSURANCE PROTECTION.—For purposes of this subsection, contributions which are allocable (determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the purchase of life, accident, health, or other insurance shall not be taken into account.

"(f) CERTAIN LOAN REPAYMENTS CONSIDERED AS CONTRIBUTIONS.—For purposes of this section, any amount paid, directly or indirectly, by an owner-employee in repayment of any loan which under section 72(m)(4)(B) was treated as an amount received under a contract purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or purchased as a part of a plan described in section 403(a) shall be treated as a contribution to which this section applies on behalf of such owner-employee to such trust or to or under such plan."

SEC. 4. TAXABILITY OF DISTRIBUTIONS.

(a) EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 72(d)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to employees' annuities) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) SPECIAL RULES FOR APPLICATION OF PARAGRAPH (1).—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

"(A) if the employee died before any amount was received as an annuity under the contract, the words 'receivable by the employee' shall be read as 'receivable by a beneficiary of the employee'; and

"(B) any contribution made with respect to the contract while an individual is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) which is not allowed as a deduction under section 404 shall be treated as consideration for the contract contributed by the employee."

(b) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS AND OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Section 72 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to annuities, etc.) is amended by redesignating subsection (m) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (l) the following new subsections:

"(m) SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEE ANNUITIES AND DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER EMPLOYEE PLANS.—

"(1) CERTAIN AMOUNTS RECEIVED BEFORE ANNUITY STARTING DATE.—Any amounts received under an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract before the annuity starting date which are not received as an annuity (within the meaning of subsection (e)(2)) shall be included in the recipient's gross income for the taxable year in which received to the extent that—

"(A) such amounts, plus all amounts theretofore received under the contract and includible in gross income under this paragraph, do not exceed

"(B) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for the contract while the employee was an owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4)) which were allowed as deductions under section 404 for the taxable year and all prior taxable years (not including any portion of such premiums or other consideration properly allocable, as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to the cost of life, accident, health, or other insurance).

Any such amounts so received which are not includible in gross income under this paragraph shall be subject to the provisions of subsection (e).

"(2) COMPUTATION OF CONSIDERATION PAID BY THE EMPLOYEE.—In computing—

"(A) the aggregate amount of premiums or other consideration paid for the contract for purposes of subsection (c)(1)(A) (relating to the investment in the contract),

"(B) the consideration for the contract contributed by the employee for purposes of subsection (d)(1) (relating to employee's contributions recoverable in 3 years), and

"(C) the aggregate premiums or other consideration paid for purposes of subsection (e)(1)(B) (relating to certain amounts not received as an annuity),

any amount allowed as a deduction with respect to the contract under section 404 which was paid while the individual was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) shall be treated as consideration contributed by the employer, and there shall not be taken into account any portion of the premiums or other consideration for the contract paid while the individual was an owner-employee which is properly allocable (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to the cost of life, accident, health, or other insurance.

"(3) LIFE INSURANCE CONTRACTS.—

"(A) This paragraph shall apply to any life insurance contract—

"(i) purchased as a part of a plan described in section 403(a), or

"(ii) purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) if the proceeds of such contract are payable directly or indirectly to a participant in such trust or to a beneficiary of such participant.

"(B) Any contributions to a plan described in subparagraph (A) (i) or a trust described in subparagraph (A) (ii) which is allowed as a deduction under section 404, and any income of a trust described in subparagraph (A) (ii), which is determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate to have been applied to purchase the life insurance protection under a contract described in subparagraph (A), is includible in the gross income of the participant for the taxable year when so applied.

"(C) In the case of the death of an individual insured under a contract described in subparagraph (A), an amount equal to the cash surrender value of the contract immediately before the death of the insured shall be treated as a payment under such plan or a distribution by such trust, and the excess of the amount payable by reason of the death of the insured over such cash surrender value shall not be includible in gross income under this section and shall be treated as provided in section 101.

"(4) AMOUNTS CONSTRUCTIVELY RECEIVED.—

"(A) ASSIGNMENTS OR PLEDGES.—If during any taxable year an owner-employee assigns (or agrees to assign) or pledges (or agrees to pledge) any portion of his interest in a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or any portion of the value of a contract purchased as part of a plan described in section 403(a), such portion shall be treated as having been received by such owner-employee as a distribution from such trust or as an amount received under the contract.

"(B) LOANS ON CONTRACTS.—If during any taxable year, an owner-employee receives, directly or indirectly, any amount from any insurance company as a loan under a contract purchased by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) or purchased as part of a plan described in section 403(a), and issued by such insurance company, such amount shall be treated as an amount received under the contract.

"(5) PENALTIES APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN AMOUNTS RECEIVED BY OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(A) This paragraph shall apply—

"(i) to amounts (other than any amount received by an individual in his capacity as a policyholder of an annuity, endowment, or life insurance contract which is in the nature of a dividend or similar distribution) which are received from a qualified trust described in section 401(a) or under a plan described in section 403(a) and which are received by an individual, who is, or has been, an owner-employee before such individual attains the age of 59½ years, for any reason other than the individual's becoming disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)), but only to the extent that such amounts are attributable to contributions paid on behalf of such individual (whether or not paid by him) while he was an owner-employee,

"(ii) to amounts which are received from a qualified trust described in section 401(a) or under a plan described in section 403(a) at any time by an individual who is, or has been, an owner-employee, or by the successor of such individual, but only to the extent that such amounts are determined, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, to exceed the benefits provided for such individual under the plan formula, and

"(iii) to amounts which are received, by reason of the distribution under the provisions of section 401(e)(2)(E), by an individual who is, or has been, an owner-employee of his entire interest in all qualified trusts described in section 401(a) and in all plans described in section 403(a).

"(B)(i) If the aggregate of the amounts to which this paragraph applies received by any person in his taxable year equals or exceeds $2,500, the increase in his tax for the taxable year in which such amounts are received and attributable to such amounts shall not be less than 110 percent of the aggregate increase in taxes, for the taxable year and the 4 immediately preceding taxable years, which would have resulted if such amounts had been included in such person's gross income ratably over such taxable years.

"(ii) If deductions have been allowed under section 404 for contributions paid on behalf of the individual while he is an owner-employee for a number of prior taxable years less than 4, clause (i) shall be applied by taking into account a number of taxable years immediately preceding the taxable year in which the amount was so received equal to such lesser number.

"(C) If subparagraph (B) does not apply to a person for the taxable year, the increase in tax of such person for the taxable year attributable to the amounts to which this paragraph applies shall be 110 percent of such increase (computed without regard to this subparagraph).

"(D) Subparagraph (A)(ii) of this paragraph shall not apply to any amount to which section 402(a)(2) or 403(a)(2) applies.

"(E) Subsection (n)(3) shall apply for purposes of computing taxable income for each taxable year to which this paragraph applies.

"(6) OWNER-EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'owner-employee' has the meaning assigned to it by section 401(c)(4).

"(n) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRIBUTIONS WITH RESPECT TO CONTRIBUTIONS BY SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) APPLICATION OF SUBSECTION.—

"(A) DISTRIBUTIONS BY EMPLOYEES' TRUST.—Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C), this subsection shall apply to amounts distributed to a distributee, in the case of an employees' trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), if the total distributions payable to the distributee with respect to an employee are paid to the distributee within one taxable year of the distributee—

"(i) on account of the employee's death,

"(ii) after the employee has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(iii) after the employee has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(B) ANNUITY PLANS.—Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (C), this subsection shall apply to amounts paid to a payee, in the case of an annuity plan described in section 403(a), if the total amounts payable to the payee with respect to an employee are paid to the payee within one taxable year of the payee—

"(i) on account of the employee's death,

"(ii) after the employee has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(iii) after the employee has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)).

"(C) LIMITATIONS AND EXCEPTIONS.—This subsection shall apply—

"(i) only with respect to so much of any distribution or payment to which (without regard to this subparagraph) subparagraph (A) or (B) applies as is attributable to contributions made by or for a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and

"(ii) if the recipient is the individual by or for whom such contributions were made, only if contributions which were allowed as a deduction under section 404 have been made by or for such individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) for 5 or more taxable years prior to the taxable year in which the total distributions payable or total amounts payable, as the case may be, are paid.

This subsection shall not apply to amounts described in clauses (ii) and (iii) of subparagraph (A) of subsection (m)(5) (but, in the case of amounts described in clause (ii) of such subparagraph, only to the extent that subsection (m)(5) applies to such amounts).

"(2) LIMITATION OF TAX.—In any case to which this subsection applies, the tax attributable to the amounts to which this subsection applies for the taxable year in which such amounts are received shall not exceed whichever of the following is the greater:

"(A) 5 times the increase in tax which would result from the inclusion in gross income of the recipient of 20 percent of so much of the amount so received as is includible in gross income, or

"(B) 5 times the increase in tax which would result if the taxable income of the recipient for such taxable year equalled 20 percent of the amount of the taxable income of the recipient for such taxable year determined under paragraph (3)(A).

"(3) DETERMINATION OF TAXABLE INCOME.—Notwithstanding section 63 (relating to definition of taxable income), for purposes only of computing the tax under this chapter attributable to amounts to which this subsection or subsection (m)(5) applies and which are includible in gross income—

"(A) the taxable income of the recipient for the taxable year of receipt shall be treated as being not less than the amount by which (i) the aggregate of such amounts so includible in gross income exceeds (ii) the amount of the deductions allowed for such taxable year under section 151 (relating to deductions for personal exemptions); and

"(B) in making ratable inclusion computations under paragraph (5)(B) of subsection (m), the taxable income of the recipient for each taxable year involved in such ratable inclusion shall be treated as being not less than the amount required by such paragraph (5)(B) to be treated as includible in gross income for such taxable year.

In any case in which the preceding sentence results in an increase in taxable income for any taxable year, the resulting increase in the taxes imposed by section 1 or 3 for such taxable year shall not be reduced by any

credit under part IV of subchapter A (other than section 31 thereof) which, but for this sentence, would be allowable."

(c) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES' TRUSTS DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 402(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to capital gains treatment for certain distributions) is amended by adding at the end of paragraph (2) the following new sentence: "This paragraph shall not apply to distributions paid to any distributee to the extent such distributions are attributable to contributions made by or for an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(d) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT OF CERTAIN EMPLOYEES' ANNUITY PAYMENTS.—Section 403(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to taxability of a beneficiary under a qualified annuity plan) is amended—

(1) by striking out in paragraph (2)(A)(i) "which meets the requirements of section 401(a) (3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in paragraph (1)";

(2) by adding at the end of paragraph (2)(A) the following new sentence: "This subparagraph shall not apply to amounts paid to any payee to the extent such amounts are attributable to contributions made by or for an individual while he was self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."; and

(3) by adding after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'employee' includes an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the employer of such individual is the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5)."

SEC. 5. PLANS FOR PURCHASE OF UNITED STATES BONDS.

(a) QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Part I of subchapter D of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deferred compensation, etc.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 405. QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.

"(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR QUALIFICATION.—A plan of an employer for the purchase for and distribution to his employees or their beneficiaries of United States bonds described in subsection (b) shall constitute a qualified bond purchase plan under this section if—

"(1) the plan meets the requirements of section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, if applicable, the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1), (6)(B), and (8)); and

"(2) contributions under the plan are used solely to purchase for employees or their beneficiaries United States bonds described in subsection (b).

"(b) BONDS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—

"(1) CHARACTERISTICS OF BONDS.—This section shall apply only to a bond issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, which by its terms, or by regulations prescribed by the Secretary under such Act—

"(A) provides for payment of interest, or investment yield, only upon redemption;

"(B) may be purchased only in the name of an individual;

"(C) ceases to bear interest, or provide investment yield, not later than 5 years after the death of the individual in whose name it is purchased;

"(D) may be redeemed before the death of the individual in whose name it is purchased only if such individual—

"(i) has attained the age of 59½ years, or

"(ii) has become disabled (within the meaning of section 213(g)(3)); and

"(E) is nontransferable.

"(2) MUST BE PURCHASED IN NAME OF EMPLOYEE.—This section shall apply to a bond described in paragraph (1) only if it is purchased in the name of the employee.

"(c) DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS TO BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Contributions paid by an employer to or under a qualified bond purchase plan shall be deductible in an amount determined under section 404(a) in the same manner and to the same extent as if such contributions were made to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a).

"(d) TAXABILITY OF BENEFICIARY OF QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLAN.—

"(1) GROSS INCOME NOT TO INCLUDE BONDS AT TIME OF DISTRIBUTION.—For purposes of this chapter, in the case of a distributee of a bond described in subsection (b) under a qualified bond purchase plan, or from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), gross income does not include any amount attributable to the receipt of such bond. Upon redemption of such bond, the proceeds shall be subject to taxation under this chapter, but the provisions of section 72 (relating to annuities, etc.) and section 1232 (relating to bonds and other evidences of indebtedness) shall not apply.

"(2) BASIS.—The basis of any bond received by a distributee under a qualified bond purchase plan—

"(A) if such bond is distributed to an employee, or with respect to an employee, who at the time of purchase of the bond, was not a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), shall be the amount of the contributions by the employee which were used to purchase the bond, and

"(B) if such bond is distributed to an individual, or with respect to an individual, who, at the time of purchase of the bond, was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), shall be the amount of the contributions used to purchase the bond which were made by or for such individual and were not allowed as a deduction under subsection (c).

The basis of any bond described in subsection (b) received by a distributee from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(e) CAPITAL GAINS TREATMENT NOT TO APPLY TO BONDS DISTRIBUTED BY TRUSTS.—Section 402(a)(2) shall not apply to any bond described in subsection (b) distributed to any distributee and, for purposes of applying such section, any such bond distributed to any distributee and any such bond to the credit of any employee shall not be taken into account.

"(f) EMPLOYEE DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' includes an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), and the emplyoyer of such individual shall be the person treated as his employer under section 401(c)(5).

"(g) PROOF OF PURCHASE.—At the time of purchase of any bond to which this section applies, proof of such purchase shall be furnished in such form as will enable the purchaser, and the employee in whose name such bond is purchased, to comply with the provisions of this section.

"(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such part is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 405. Qualified bond purchase plans."

SEC. 6. PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.

Section 503 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to prohibited transactions) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

(j) TRUSTS BENEFITING CERTAIN OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—

"(1) PROHIBITED TRANSACTIONS.—In the case of a trust described in section 401(a) which is part of a plan providing contributions or benefits for employees some or all of whom are owner-employees (as defined in section 401(c)(4)) who control (within the meaning of section 401(d)(9)(B)), the trade or business with respect to which the plan is established, the term 'prohibited transaction' also means any transaction in which such trust, directly or indirectly—

"(A) lends any part of the corpus or income of the trust to;

"(B) pays any compensation for personal services rendered to the trust to;

"(C) makes any part of its services available on a preferential basis to; or

"(D) acquires for the trust any property from, or sells any property to;

any person described in subsection (c) or to any such owner-employee, a member of the family (as defined in section 267(c)(4)) of any such owner-employee, or a corporation controlled by any such owner-employee through the ownership, directly or indirectly, of 50 percent or more of the total combined voting power of all classes of stock entitled to vote or 50 percent or more of the total value of shares of all classes of stock of the corporation.

"(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR LOANS.—For purposes of the application of paragraph (1)(A), the following rules shall apply with respect to a loan made before the date of the enactment of this subsection which would be a prohibited transaction if made in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1961:

"(A) If any part of the loan is repayable prior to December 31, 1964, the renewal of such part of the loan for a period not extending beyond December 31, 1964, on the same terms, shall not be considered a prohibited transaction.

"(B) If the loan is repayable on demand, the continuation of the loan beyond December 31, 1964, shall be considered a prohibited transaction."

SEC. 7. OTHER SPECIAL RULES, TECHNICAL CHANGES, AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) RETIREMENT INCOME CREDIT.—Section 37(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of retirement income) is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(A) pensions and annuities (including, in the case of an individual who is, or has been, a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), distributions by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a)),"; and

(2) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (C), by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (D) and inserting in lieu thereof "and", and by adding after subparagraph (D) the following new subparagraph:

"(E) bonds described in section 405(b)(1) which are received under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a) or in a distribution from a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or".

(b) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—Section 62 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the definition of adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph:

"(7) PENSION, PROFIT-SHARING, ANNUITY, AND BOND PURCHASE PLANS OF SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS.—In the case of an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), the deductions allowed by section 404 and section 405(c) to the extent attributable to contributions made by or for such individual."

(c) DEATH BENEFITS.—Section 101(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to employees' death benefits) is amended—

(1) by striking out clause (ii) of paragraph (2)(B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(ii) under an annuity contract under a plan described in section 403(a), or"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED AN EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this subsection, an individual shall not be treated as an employee in the case of—

"(A) a pension or profit-sharing trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or

"(B) an annuity contract under a plan described in section 403(a),

if such individual was included at any time under the plan as a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(d) AMOUNTS RECEIVED THROUGH ACCIDENT OR HEALTH INSURANCE.—Section 104(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to compensation for injuries or sickness) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For purposes of paragraph (3), in the case of an individual who is, or has been, a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2), contributions made by or for such individual while he was such an individual to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or under a plan described in section 403(a), shall, to the extent allowed as deductions under section 404, be treated as contributions by the employer which were not includible in the gross income of the employee."

(e) AMOUNTS RECEIVED UNDER ACCIDENT AND HEALTH PLANS.—Section 105 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amounts received under accident and health plans) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g) SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUAL NOT CONSIDERED AS EMPLOYEE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'employee' does not include an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(f) NET OPERATING LOSSS DEDUCTION.—Section 172(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to nonbusiness deductions of taxpayers other than corporations) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by adding after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) any deduction allowed under section 404 or section 405(c) to the extent attributable to contributions which are made on behalf of an individual who is a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) shall not be treated as attributable to the trade or business of such individual."

(g) CERTAIN LIFE INSURANCE RESERVES.—Section 805(d)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to pension plan reserves) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subparagraph (B) "meeting the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6), or" and inserting in lieu thereof "described in section 403(a), or plans meeting"; and

(2) by striking out "section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6);" in subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (other than paragraphs (1), (2), and (12)) and, in the case of a plan described in section 404(a)(9), which meets the requirements of section 401(d) (other than paragraphs (1) and (4));".

(h) UNINCORPORATED BUSINESS ELECTING TO BE TAXED AS CORPORATIONS.—Section 1361(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to unincorporated business enterprises electing to be taxed as domestic corporations) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) LIMITATION.—For purposes of sections 401(a) relating to employees pension trusts, etc.) and 405 (relating to qualified bond purchase plans), a partner or proprietor of an unincorporated business enterprise as to which an election has been made under subsection (a) shall not be considered an employee other than as a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2)."

(i) ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 2039 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemption from the gross estate of annuities under certain trusts and plans) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (c)(2) "met the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting "was a plan described in section 403(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (c) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, contributions or payments on behalf of the decedent while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) made under a trust or plan described in paragraph (1) or (2) shall be considered to be contributions or payments made by the decedent."

(j) GIFT TAX EXEMPTION OF EMPLOYEES' ANNUITIES.—Section 2517 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exclusion from gift tax in case of certain annuities under qualified plans) is amended—

(1) by striking out in subsection (a)(2) "met the requirements of section 401(a)(3), (4), (5), and (6)" and inserting in lieu thereof "was a plan described in section 403(a)"; and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (b) the following new sentence: "For purposes of this subsection, payments or contributions on behalf of an individual while he was a self-employed individual within the meaning of section 401(c)(2) made under a trust or plan described in subsection (a)(1) or (2) shall be considered to be payments or contributions made by the employee."

(k) FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX ACT.—Section 3306(b)(5) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) under or to an annuity plan which, at the time of such payment, is a plan described in section 403(a), or

"(C) under or to a bond purchase plan which, at the time of such payment, is a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a);".

(l) WITHHOLDING OF INCOME TAX.—Section 3401(a)(12) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of wages) is amended by striking out subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof the following new subparagraphs:

"(B) under or to an annuity plan which, at the time of such payment, is a plan described in section 403(a); or

"(C) under or to a bond purchase plan which, at the time of such payment is a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a)."

(m) INFORMATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part III of subchapter A of chapter 61 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to information concerning transactions with other persons) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6047. INFORMATION RELATING TO CERTAIN TRUSTS AND ANNUITY AND BOND PURCHASE PLANS

"(a) TRUSTEES AND INSURANCE COMPANIES.—The trustee of a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a) to which contributions have been paid under a plan by or for any owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4), and each insurance company *or other person* which is the issuer of a contract purchased by such a trust, or purchased under a plan described in section 403(a), contributions for which have been paid by or for any owner-employee, shall file such returns (in such form and at such times), keep such records, make such identification of contracts and funds (and accounts within such funds), and supply such information, as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(b) OWNER-EMPLOYEES.—Every individual by or for whom contributions have been paid as an owner-employee (as defined in section 401(c)(4))—

"(1) to a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), or

"(2) to an insurance company or other person under a plan described in section 403(a),

shall furnish the trustee, insurance company, or other person, as the case may be, such information at such times and in such form and manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by forms or regulations.

"(c) EMPLOYEES UNDER QUALIFIED BOND PURCHASE PLANS.—Every individual in whose name a bond described in section 405(b)(1) is purchased by his employer under a qualified bond purchase plan described in section 405(a), or by a trust described in section 401(a) which is exempt from tax under section 501(a), shall furnish—

"(1) to his employer or to such trust, and

"(2) to the Secretary (or to such person as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe),

such information as the Secretary or his delegate shall by forms or regulations prescribe.

"(d) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For criminal penalty for furnishing fraudulent information, see section 7207."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for such subpart B is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Sec. 6047. Information relating to certain trusts and annuity and bond plans."

(3) PENALTY.—Section 7207 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to fraudulent returns, statements, or other documents) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Any person required pursuant to section 6047 (b) or (c) to furnish any information to the Secretary or any other person who willfully furnishes to the Secretary or such other

person any information known by him to be fraudulent or to be false as to any materiel matter shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1961.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 13 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we come before the House today for the third and what I profoundly hope, trust, and am optimistic will be, the last time to do a modicum of justice to a great group of people in this country, the self-employed. We are here today, Mr. Speaker, as on previous occasions, solely and only by reason of your fine cooperation for which I am deeply grateful. I should like also to express my appreciation to the majority and to the minority leadership, to the chairman and members of the Committee on Ways and Means, to the staff of that committee and of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and to the staff director of the Joint Committee as well as to the innumerable persons in private and public life who unselfishly have lent their aid and assistance to the advancement of this worthwhile cause. Mr. Speaker, if I have omitted anyone who is entitled to our appreciation I mean to include him now.

Like its predecessor this bill is designed to encourage the establishment of voluntary retirement plans by self-employed persons. It would do this by permitting such persons to participate in qualified retirement plans and to obtain a current income tax deferment for certain amounts set aside to provide them with future retirement benefits.

The pending bill is H.R. 10, Mr. Speaker, but it might well be any one of the following bills introduced by distinguished Members of this body on both sides of the aisle. They range, and will be listed in my remarks, from H.R. 249 by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LIBONATI] to H.R. 7427 by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER]. The list includes some of the most distinguished and obviously capable Members of this body and is as follows:

H.R. 249, by Mr. LIBONATI, of Illinois.
H.R. 736, by Mr. MCDONOUGH, of California.
H.R. 2289, by Mr. SCHWENGEL, of Iowa.
H.R. 2391, by Mr. ANFUSO, of New York.
H.R. 2406, by Mr. BROOMFIELD, of Michigan.
H.R. 2723, by Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, of California.
H.R. 2801, by Mr. ZELENKO, of New York.
H.R. 3553, by Mrs. MAY, of Washington.
H.R. 3956, by Mr. CRAMER, of Florida.
H.R. 3976, by Mr. DOOLEY, of New York.
H.R. 4138, by Mr. MCFALL, of California.
H.R. 4608, by Mr. KARTH, of Minnesota.
H.R. 5102, by Mr. UTT, of California.
H.R. 5145, by Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana.
H.R. 5214, by Mr. MONAGAN, of Connecticut.
H.R. 5345, by Mr. DEROUNIAN, of New York.
H.R. 5364, by Mr. MORSE, of Massachusetts.
H.R. 5417, by Mr. STEED, of Oklahoma.
H.R. 5515, by Mr. BEERMANN, of Nebraska.
H.R. 5630, by Mr. INOUYE, of Hawaii.
H.R. 5931, by Mr. BURKE, of Massachusetts.
H.R. 6090, by Mr. HAGEN, of California.
H.R. 6616, by Mr. BASS, of Tennessee.
H.R. 6267, by Mr. TEAGUE, of California.
H.R. 6297, by Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6351, by Mr. BETTS, of Ohio.
H.R. 6379, by Mr. STAFFORD, of Vermont.
H.R. 6404, by Mr. FULTON, of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6408, by Mr. GREEN, of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 6435, by Mr. JUDD, of Minnesota.
H.R. 6609, by Mr. HERLONG, of Florida.
H.R. 6881, by Mr. FASCELL, of Florida.
H.R. 6910, by Mr. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island.
H.R. 7055, by Mr. GOODELL, of New York.
H.R. 7107, by Mr. MATHIAS, of Maryland.
H.R. 7187, by Mr. LIPSCOMB, of California.
H.R. 7427, by Mr. SHRIVER, of Kansas.

This bill, like its predecessors, also has the active support of a long distinguished list of national professional and businessmen's associations as follows:

American Angus Association.
American Association of Consulting Chemists & Chemical Engineers.
American Association of Medical Clinics.
American Association of Small Business.
American Bar Association.
American Brahman Breeders Association.
American College of Radiology.
American Dental Association.
American Guernsey Cattle Club.
American Hereford Association.
American Hotel Association.
American Institute of Architects.
American Institute of Chemists.
American Jersey Cattle Club.
American Medical Association.
American National Cattlemen's Association.
American Ophthalmological Society.
American Optometric Association.
American Patent Law Association.
American Podiatry Association.
American Quarter Horse Association.
American Society of Industrial Designers.
American Society of Landscape Architects, Inc.
American Retail Federation.
American Shorthorn Breeders' Association.
American Thoroughbred Breeders' Association, Inc.
American Veterinary Medical Association.
Association of Consulting Management Engineers, Inc.
Association of Stock Exchange Firms.
Authors League of America.
Automotive Affiliated Representatives.
Commercial Law League of America.
Contracting Plasterers' and Lathers' International Association.
Holstein-Friesian Association of America.
League of New York Theatres, Inc.
National Association of Dance Teachers Organizations.
National Association of Homebuilders of the United States.
National Association of Plumbing Contractors.
National Association of Retail Druggists.
National Association of Retail Grocers.
National Association of Retail Meat & Food Dealers, Inc.
National Association of Tax Accountants.
National Association of Women and Children's Apparel Salesmen, Inc.
National Association of Women Lawyers.
National Automobile Dealers Association.
National Council of Salesmen's Organizations, Inc.
National Farmers Union.
National Federation of Independent Business.
National Food Brokers Association.
National Funeral Directors Association.
National Lamb Feeders.
National Liquor Stores Association, Inc.
National Live Stock Tax Committee.
National Milk Producers Federation.
National Shorthand Reporters Association.
National Restaurant Association, Inc.
National Roofing Contractors Association.
National Small Business Men's Association.
National Society of Professional Engineers.
National Society of Public Accountants.
National Sugar Brokers Association.
National Wholesale Furniture Salesmen's Association.
National Wool Growers' Association.
Bureau of Salesmen's National Association.
Painting & Decorating Contractors of America.
American Society of Internal Medicine.
Society of American Florists.
Society of Magazine Writers.
The National Grange.

Mr. Speaker, the objective of the pending bill H.R. 10 is as that of its predecessors which were approved twice by the House. It differs somewhat from their format. In general, this bill would treat self-employed individuals as employees for the purpose of extending to them some of the tax benefits that present law provides in the case of qualified retirement plans established by employers for their employees. For the purposes of this bill, self-employed persons would, in effect, be treated as employers of themselves. Like other employers, they would be permitted to deduct limited amounts set aside under retirement plans for their own benefit, as well as amounts set aside for the benefit of their employees. Like other employee-participants in qualified plans, they would not be taxed on contributions made for their benefit or on any increment thereon until such time as they receive a distribution thereof upon retirement or otherwise.

The pending bill also differs from its predecessors in that it makes a distinction between self-employed persons who have less than four regular employees—excluding part-time and seasonal employees—and those self-employed persons who have more than three regular employees. This distinction not only affects the limitation on the deduction to which a self-employed person would be entitled for contributions made to a retirement plan for his own benefit, but it also affects the extent to which coverage must be provided for his employees under the retirement plan.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill, self-employed persons who have less than four regular employees may establish a qualified retirement plan solely for themselves and defer up to 10 percent of their self-employment earnings, or $2,500, whichever is the lesser, for amounts set aside to provide for their future retirement. For the purposes of this bill the term "self-employment earnings" is not limited to earned income from personal services, but also includes a return on capital invested in the business. Such persons may, but are not required to, set up a retirement plan for their employees.

Self-employed persons who have more than three employees, however, cannot set up a retirement plan to benefit themselves unless they also provide vested benefits for all of their regular employees who have 3 or more years of service. If such a plan is established, the amount that the self-employed person may set aside for his own benefit and obtain a deferment for is limited so that the ratio of the contribution made for himself cannot exceed the ratio of contributions to compensation in the case of any of his employees.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make one point clear. The pending bill, H.R. 10, has absolutely no effect on any existing or contemplated corporate pension plan nor on the participants therein, whether they be stockholders or not. This bill does, however, in a number of other respects adopt the general approach to the retirement problem of the self-employed that was submitted by the Treasury Department last year. For example, this bill does impose additional restrictive qualification tests for retirement plans covering self-employed persons who are sole proprietors or partners who own more than a 10-percent partnership interest in capital or profits. Such persons are designated as "owner-employees" in the bill. In addition, the bill precludes these owner-employees from obtaining certain other income, gift, and estate tax benefits that are provided under present law with respect to distributions from qualified employee retirement plans. These Treasury-submitted modifications have been incorporated in the pending bill in order to minimize the perennial and somewhat vacillating objections made by that Department to any reasonably equitable solution of the retirement problem of the self-employed.

Mr. Speaker, one objection has been made to the pending bill, H.R. 10, which to my mind misconceives the purposes designed to be served by this bill. As I have just indicated, there are certain annual dollar limitations on the amount that may be deducted by a self-employed person. The bill also provides certain penalties in the event that contributions are made in excess of these limitations. This feature of the bill is designed to preclude undue advantage from being taken of the fact that any increment on invested contributions is tax deferred.

It has been suggested that these penalty provisions may make certain fixed-dollar investment commitments—such as life insurance contracts—perilous where a self-employed person has fluctuating income. In such a situation, if the limitation on his allowable deduction were to drop below the level required by his investment commitment, the sanctions of the bill relating to excess contributions would apply. It is my view that the pending bill achieves the desired result in this area and that investment commitments must be tailored to conform to the bill's restrictions and limitations, and not vice versa.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to you today with the overwhelming support of the membership of the Committee on Ways and Means. I strongly urge its adoption in order to correct, in some measure, the grave discrimination that exists under present law which inequitably denies the self-employed the opportunity to obtain any tax benefits analogous to those provided to corporate owner-managers who participate in qualified retirement plans.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In certain respects, the bill is more restrictive than your bill of last year?

Mr. KEOGH. I would say, generally speaking, yes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANFUSO. Does the bill also take in lawyers?

Mr. KEOGH. The bill takes in all self-employed individuals.

Mr. ANFUSO. Well, we wanted to be sure it took in lawyers.

Mr. KEOGH. The bill takes in all self-employed individuals whether they be professional men or businessmen. I would like to make it clear in that regard that I do not like to have this bill considered as a lawyer's bill or as a doctor's bill or as any other professional man's bill. This bill is designed to aid those who by law cannot or by choice do not operate as corporations.

Mr. ANFUSO. I want to congratulate my distinguished colleague from Brooklyn on his very excellent statement.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Would this bill apply to lawyers who are Members of Congress and who are under a pension system?

Mr. KEOGH. I doubt it very much. But, I would prefer not to go into as technical a discussion as that question involves. I would say as a general proposition, certainly, a man who has rendered such long service to his city, State, and Nation as the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives would probably not come within the provisions of this bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LINDSAY. I have asked the gentleman to yield to ask this question. Can the author of the bill or can the gentleman now in the well of the House tell us what the fiscal impact of this measure is in terms of revenue to the United States? What about the amount of revenue that will be lost?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The revenue lost is $358 million for the first full year. That is one reason I might state that I am taking the floor to oppose the bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Of course, I am sure the gentleman must concede that the sponsors of the legislation do not agree with the estimates of the Treasury Department.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I did not realize that, but the figures are the best estimates we have and, frankly, I think they are probably pretty accurate.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in an unusual position, the same position I was in last year when I opposed H.R. 10, because I happened to agree with the author of the bill that present law contains an inequity that discriminates against the self-employed that we are going to have to correct, and we should correct it as soon as possible in as sound a manner as possible.

On the other hand, it is foolhardy, in my judgment, to continue to bring these things out on the floor of the House, pass them, as we did last time, send them over to the Senate, knowing full well that they have not been budgeted and, therefore, the administration in some way or other is going to defeat the legislation; and on sound basis. I have told our friends in the American Bar Association and other professional groups that are interested in this legislation that the battle must be won at the budgetary level, because some of the people who are strongest behind this kind of legislation are also committed to trying to preserve a balanced budget.

It is very strange to find people who have generally over a long period of years had no interest in a balanced budget, no interest in the conservative fiscal viewpoint, who apparently have not any interest in having this legislation included in the budget but who continually push this legislation without making any effort to have it put in the budget. I just wonder whether that is a sign of weakness, to go through these motions just to make it appear as if they were really in favor of creating a reform in this area and yet at the same time discourage the support of those of us who are committed—and I am committed—to trying to preserve a balanced budget.

Incidentally, in my judgment this is no way to bring a matter of this importance to the floor of the House with 20 minutes debate on each side, and I want to remind the House that this is not the same H.R. 10 that the House considered under similar procedures before. I am going to put in the RECORD at this point, and ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to do so, a chart showing a comparison of various versions of H.R. 10.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

Comparison of principal provisions of various versions of H.R. 10

	Original House bill (H.R. 10, 86th Cong.)	Finance Committee bill (86th Cong.)	Present bill (H.R. 10, 87th Cong.)
Basic concept	Self-employed persons were permitted special deduction for retirement savings invested in restricted retirement policies or plans.	Self-employed persons generally were treated as employees for pension plan purposes.	Self-employed persons generally are treated as employees for pension plan purposes.
Coverage for employees	No provision	Nondiscriminatory pension plans were required to be set up under the rules of present law.	Nondiscriminatory pension plans are required to be set up under the rules of present law with certain modifications to cover self-employed individuals if there are more than three employees.
Amount deductible annually by self-employed individuals.	10 percent of net earnings from self-employment or $2,500 whichever was the lesser.	10 percent of earned income or $2,500 whichever was the lesser or an amount equal to one-half of the vested contributions made for true employees. Applicable only to more than 10 percent owners.	(a) 10 percent of self-employment earnings or $2,500, whichever is lesser in the case of self-employed individuals with three or fewer employees. Applicable only to more than 10 percent owners. (b) An amount proportional to contributions made for true employees, in the case of self-employed persons with more than three employees. Applicable only to more than 10 percent owners.
Amount deductible for corporate employees who are more than 10-percent owners.	No provision	10 percent of earned income or $2,500, whichever was the lesser, or an amount equal to vested contributions made for other employees, or an amount sufficient to fund a 20-percent annuity.	No provision.
Special deduction for self-employed persons over age 50.	The limitation described above is increased by 1/10 for each year the self-employed individual was over age 50 on Jan. 1, 1950.	No provision	Do.
Lifetime limitation	$50,000	do	Do.
Vesting	No provision	Vesting was required in case of all profit sharing and stock bonus plans, and in case of pension plans if (a) a covered person controll d (by more than 50 percent ownership interest) the trade or business, or (b) the deductible contributions for more than 10 percent owners exceeded the 10-percent $2,500 limitation.	(a) In the case of self-employed persons with more than 3 employees, complete vesting is required in all plans. (b) In the case of self-employed individuals with 3 or fewer employees, no provision.
Exclusion of certain employees	do	Employees with more than 3 years' service (other than part-time and seasonal employees) could not be excluded for years of service, but could be excluded because of nondiscriminatory classification. Applicable only to plans covering self-employed individuals or more than 10 percent owner employees of corporations.	(a) In the case of self-employed individuals with more than 3 employees, all employees with 3 years' service (other than seasonal and part-time employees) are required to be covered. (b) In the case of self-employed persons with 3 or fewer employees, no provision.
Coordination with social security	do	Coordination permitted under rules of present law where vested contributions for employees were at least twice as great as contributions for more than 10 percent owners.	(a) Coordination permitted in case of self-employed persons with more than 3 employees if contributions for such self-employed persons do not exceed ¼ of the total deductible contributions, but special rules apply. (b) In case of self-employed persons with 3 or fewer employees, no provision.
Capital gains treatment on lump-sum distributions.	Capital gains treatment denied, but special averaging rules provided.	Capital gains treatment denied, but special averaging rules provided.	Capital gains treatment denied, but special averaging rules provided.
Estate and gift tax exclusions	No provision	Exclusions denied in the case of self-employed individuals.	Exclusions denied in the case of self-employed individuals.
Limitation on time of payment of benefits.	Distributions were not permitted prior to age 65 but were required to commence by age 70 and must have been completed by age 80.	Benefits could not be payable to more than 10 percent owners before age 59½ (except in the case of permanent disability or death) but must begin before age 70½.	Benefits not payable to more than 10 percent owners before age 59½ (except in the case of permanent disability or death) but must begin before age 70½.
Face amount certificates	Investment in face amount certificates permitted.	No provision	Investment in face amount certificates permitted.
Custodial account	No provision	do	Custodial account in lieu of trust is permitted if investments are solely in regulated investment company stock.
Bond purchase plan	do	Permitted	Permitted.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. As will be seen one column of the chart shows the original House bill, H.R. 10, of the 86th Congress; the next column shows the Finance Committee version of the 86th Congress, and the third column shows this present bill, H.R. 10 of the 87th Congress. There are 16 items, all major provisions in which there are considerable changes and differences between these three versions of the bill.

The Ways and Means Committee did not give adequate attention to these differences. We considered this matter for only 3 hours in executive session. Under this kind of procedure there is no opportunity to inform the House of where these major differences are.

Four of the members of the Ways and Means Committee signed minority views which can be found in the report beginning at page 93. We point out there that aside from this budgetary problem there is the fact that there are disparities which would either be continued or created under this legislation which in many respects are going to create inequities that presently do not exist, in the attempt to move forward to correct a basically iniquitous condition of the self-employed vis-a-vis those who work for corporations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

It is for these reasons that I would urge, and I think my colleagues who joined me in the minority views will urge, that the House carefully consider this measure. I am one of those who think the way to proceed in this matter is to get it put in the budget. It is an item that should be in the budget in my judgment. The sooner we do that the sooner we are going to actually get legislation and move forward in this very important area with a result that will produce a change that will become law to improve the retirement security of our self-employed and other people who today do not participate in employment pension plans.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to urge favorable action of this body today in passing and sending to the other body H.R. 10, which would allow tax deductions to self-employed persons who set up their own retirement systems.

I am one of a large number of Members of Congress who have joined the

gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] in introduction of companion legislation to H.R. 10, which would encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals.

This program would be of substantial benefit to those who farm, those engaged in small business, and professional self-employed who want to save some of their own money for their own retirement before taxes take most of what they earn.

Provisions in this legislation would allow self-employed persons to deduct for income tax purposes 10 percent of their incomes, up to $2,500 a year, if they invest the sums in specified types of retirement plans. Self-employed persons with more than three employees would be required to set up nondiscriminatory pension plans for their employees in order to enjoy the benefits of the legislation. I feel that this legislation is long overdue, and I am hopeful that it can be enacted into law this year.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy and proud to yield to the junior member on the majority side of the Committee on Ways and Means, the very able and distinguished Representative from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Mr. BURKE.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with my esteemed friend from New York and to compliment him on the excellent job he has done in connection with this legislation.

I am especially pleased today to speak in support of H.R. 10 because not only do I favor this legislation but I am privileged to say that I introduced an identical bill—H.R. 5931—earlier in this session.

Prior to doing so, I reviewed the history of this legislation, a history which now dates back 10 years and which I consider to be much too long for such meritorious legislation.

This bill should have been enacted in the 85th Congress when it first passed the House of Representatives. Instead, the self-employed have year after year had to watch the corporate employee coverage increase by at least 1 million individuals per year to the point where the total number covered in tax deferred pension plans now approximates 21 million people.

I find it difficult to understand why there is any opposition to H.R. 10. It seeks to eliminate a glaring inequity in our tax structure. This was confirmed on June 17, 1959, when a spokesman for the Treasury Department stated before the Senate Finance Committee:

> The Treasury recognizes that present law does not give self-employed persons tax treatment for their retirement savings comparable to that now accorded to employees covered by employer-financed pension plans.

It is in the best interest of our country that H.R. 10 be enacted by the 87th Congress.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts [Mr. LANE].

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in support of H.R. 10, and to compliment and congratulate the gentleman from New York for his persistency year after year in bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of voluntary corporate pension plans is a form of initiative that deserves our praise. Under existing law, more than 50,000 such plans have been established, with somewhat more than $40 million in assets. Corporations contribute more than $4 billion per year to qualified retirement plans.

At the same time, however, there are more than 7 million self-employed persons who pay income taxes, but have no pension protection when they reach the age of retirement.

These independent people who rely upon their own abilities to make a living, and who do not enjoy the economic security of working for an organization constitute the creative individualism of our society.

The bill before us will make self-employment somewhat more attractive than at present, compared to employment with a corporation, and will thus help to keep small business strong and independent professional practice thriving.

As the establishment of private retirement plans must make allowable tax deductions for contributions to the support of such plans, it has an effect upon Government revenues, and thus comes within the jurisdiction of the Internal Revenue Code.

That there are many inequities in the Code, as revealed by experience, is painfully apparent. Eventually there must be a major overhaul to eliminate glaring tax privileges for some, and to relieve punitive tax burdens that are placed on others.

To digress for a moment, I would like to point out the way our tax laws discourage creative effort. A writer, for instance, who has prepared and labored for years to produce a successful book, is not entitled to report his income as a capital gain, or to spread it over the years of effort during which he received little or no compensation, but must hand over most of his delayed reward to the Government, taxed as gross income during the year that his work was published.

This observation leads to the partial remedy, at least for pension purposes, provided for the self-employed through H.R. 10, and to extend to them many of the favorable tax benefits present law now provides in the case of qualified retirement plans established by employers for their employees.

More than 7 million self-employed persons, including those engaged in small business and in the professions, are the victims of discrimination because they are not allowed to make tax deductions for the establishment of voluntary pension plans.

If we do not extend fair treatment to them, the well springs of independent energy and venture and creative accomplishment that are vital to a free society will dry up.

We will never reach the "new horizons" unless we provide the reasonable protection that liberates the spirit of enterprise.

H.R. 10 will remove a roadblock that has hindered the millions whose talent and skill and initiative are essential to national progress.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I join in congratulating the gentleman from New York for his long and thorough work in support of this very worthwhile legislation.

H.R. 10 is a good piece of legislation. Those self-employed in this country who have the wisdom to plan and the initiative to save for their retirement years deserve equal consideration under our laws. The self-employed should have the same opportunities and the same tax treatment as those under qualified tax plans.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is sound legislation, and I am happy to lend my support to the efforts of the gentleman from New York and others who are sponsoring this bill. I certainly hope that it will pass both the House and Senate and be signed by the President.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York, Brooklyn, in fact [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] that perhaps this is the year. Many of us have supported this bill a number of times in the past, and we hope this is the year in which it will become law.

The author of this bill, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] is indeed to be commended upon his fine presentation of the particulars of this legislation, which I am sure will now be approved by this House.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, to the new Members of the House I may say that this was first known as the Reed-Keogh bill, later as the Jenkins-Keogh bill and then as the Simpson-Keogh bill. With that preliminary statement, may I say that I strongly support H.R. 10. It has borne that numerical appellation for a good many years, certainly as long as I have been a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, which is a little over 8 years. I believe I am correct in recalling that it has been designated as H.R. 10 since the 82d Congress.

The primary purpose of the bill is to give self-employed persons access to retirement plans on a basis reasonably similar to that accorded corporate employees under existing law. It is purely a matter of equity to give to the 7 million self-employed income taxpayers of the United States at least some semblance of the tax treatment that corporate employees have with respect to providing for their retirement security. I say "some semblance" of equal treatment because this bill contains many

restrictions that are not applicable under existing law in the case of corporate plans. However, we have gone to the extent we can within the bounds of reasonable revenue limitations.

The bill is designed, as far as it can be, to eliminate discrimination and to permit self-employed people, the whole army of self-employed persons, the opportunity to lay aside a little for the twilight days of their lives.

We inserted a $2,500 limitation in this bill. That is, you may deduct from your earnings as self-employed—from your net income from self-employment—up to 10 percent of your self-employment earnings, or $2,500 a year, whichever is the lesser. That is all there is to it, except we place very rigid restrictions on the fund. It can either be with an insurance company or a bank as trustee or with special U.S. Government bonds, which are not transferable, so there cannot be any tax evasion or avoidance under the bill as now drafted.

The $2,500 maximum limitation, in my opinion, is discriminatory and much too small. Eventually we hope to raise it.

The committee report will show on page 5 the Treasury estimate of revenue effect of $325 to $358 million. I agree with the gentleman from New York, I do not believe it will be that high. However, as we state in the committee report, since this bill becomes effective on December 31, 1961, and the plan would not be put into effect fully during the fiscal year 1962, the best estimate we can arrive at on revenue effect in fiscal 1962 would be $125 million.

Now, my esteemed colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] who favors the principle of it, says "Let us have it budgeted before we pass it." Listen to me a minute. The way to get this bill budgeted is to pass it and put it into law. The White House is sending messages down here on an average of about once a week; $200 million here, $500 million there, $600 million, and just a few days ago $1.1 billion, that were in nobody's budget originally, but yet they get into the budget. This bill has passed the House twice and gone to the other body where they have talked it to death. There is nothing wrong with the bill, I can assure you. Let us pass it by such a staggering majority here today that when it goes over to the other body, the Members of the other body can look at it on its merits; and when it gets to the White House, it will be by such a tremendous vote of approval that the administration will put it into the budget rather than veto it. I cannot urge upon you too strongly the fairness, the justice, and the equity of H.R. 10.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], my very dear friend and distinguished Member of this House, is to be congratulated for his foresight and ability in bringing forth this bill. I wish to say as one who has been here for many years and who may be deemed chronologically an elder but who is spiritually and culturally rather young, that I am in favor of this bill. I am in favor of it even if I am ineligible because of my chronological age. But, that is no reason why others who are Members of this august body should not be within the purview of this bill, if they are so-called self-employed lawyers. I do hope that the bill will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KARTH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that H.R. 10, the self-employed individual's tax retirement bill will shortly be enacted so that 7 million small businessmen and professional people and also their employees can at last enjoy a measure of equity in respect to provision for their retirement incomes.

During my terms in Congress I have supported the principles of H.R. 10 and indeed I have introduced similar legislation in the belief that the Federal income tax laws discriminated most unfairly against men and women who because of their wish to devote their talents and energies to enterprises of their own choosing were not afforded the same tax advantages enjoyed by high-salaried corporation "employee-managers."

In H.R. 10 we have legislation which I believe effectively sets up safeguards against possible abuses so that we will not be creating new income tax loopholes. This has necessitated writing into the bill's provisions some protective language which has been worked out after consultation with the Treasury Department.

Briefly the legislation allows several alternative approaches by which the self-employed and their employees can provide tax deferred pension plans to fit the particular needs of their businesses.

Self-employed employers with fewer than four employees will be permitted to establish retirement programs to begin at age 59½ but not later than age 70½. These employers may deduct up to 10 percent or $2,500 of their self-employment earnings per year, whichever is smaller, to be deposited in supervised retirement plans. The bill intends also to encourage eligible self-employed persons to establish retirement plans for their employees who have at least 3 years of service, although this is not mandatory.

However, self-employed persons with four or more employees, if they wish to set up a pension program for themselves must also establish one for those of their employees who have 3 years or more of service. For such programs the only limitation on the amount of deductible contributions is that they must be at an identical rate for both the self-employed persons and the employee. Furthermore, in such plans the employee must be granted a vested right in the pension so that his benefits are protected should he leave his job.

The details of the plans have been carefully worked out under Congressman KEOGH's direction. High tribute is owed to Mr. KEOGH for his outstanding and untiring leadership in the long campaign to win equal tax treatment for the millions of men and women who represent the best tradition of the free enterprise system—the great economic engine of our Nation.

I support enactment of H.R. 10 despite the fact that the revenue loss to the Treasury is expected to range from $325 to $358 million in a typical full year of operation. This is a heavy burden to be shifted to other taxpayers at a time when the overall revenue needs are increasing because of our staggering defense requirements.

I believe that the need for equity demands that this be done.

Doing justice, as in this case, sometimes exacts a high price; but, at whatever cost, the economic justice as contemplated by H.R. 10 must be done.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD today and also within 5 legislative days.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. UTT].

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10. I am one of the coauthors of the bill and among its illustrious authors of H.R. 10. I have always supported it. I think it is high time that we grant this privilege to the self-employed people, the lawyers, the doctors, the dentists, the shopkeepers, and the farmers throughout the Nation. They will be entitled to establish for themselves a self-employment retirement fund. We have expanded it this year so that no man can take advantage of it for himself unless he will also provide for his employees, provided he has more than three employees for a period of 3 years. I think that is important because many of them were unable to have the retirement program that we have provided for the millions and millions of corporate workers. I might say that the present corporation welfare fund is in excess of $50 billion, which has been in reserve for corporations, upon which income tax has not been paid, and that amounts to about $2 billion a year to the Treasury. If we decide that the self-employed can have a self-employment retirement program, then how is it right for corporate employees to have it at the cost of the self-employed? So, I join with my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BAKER], in supporting the passage and the immediate passage of H.R. 10. As the gentleman from Tennessee has said, after we pass it, it will be budgeted, and we will not then have the problem before us each session of the Congress.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, having also introduced legislation identical to H.R. 10, I, of course, urge its approval here today.

It is particularly gratifying to support legislation which will assist a large group of Americans in providing for their own future well-being, instead of leaning more heavily on government. I believe the principles of this legislation truly reflect the cause which government should serve, helping citizens to help themselves.

In my own State of Vermont, a great many of our citizens proudly carry on small farms and small private businesses. They do not ask what the Government can do for them. They ask only to be able to take care of themselves. This retirement program for self-employed individuals will greatly assist in allowing them to do just this.

I commend the authors of this bill and urge its adoption this afternoon.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time only to ask two questions: A great many of us are interested in this bill and in the debate; but as I understand it the administration is solidly opposed to this legislation. I should like to ask the Members on the majority side whether that is correct, that the administration is opposed to the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. I do not know the source of the gentleman's information. My own impression is that the Treasury Department this year did not express any opposition to the bill but requested a delay in its consideration. I might, however, in elaboration of the answer, point out to my friend that which I am sure he knows, that the form of the bill pending before the House today includes for the most part all of the recommendations in the field of the self-employed retirement that were made to the Finance Committee of the other body by the Treasury Department in the previous Congress.

Mr. LINDSAY. Can the gentleman then answer this question: If the Treasury Department has asked for delay what are the reasons for the request?

Mr. KEOGH. I have no specific knowledge of the immediate motivation, except they would prefer to have this come in with an overall revision program. But my point about that is that this bill and similar bills have been pending before the Congress now for over 10 years. It seems to me that anyone who recognizes the obvious inequity that exists, anyone who expresses a solemn determination that that inequity should be removed, should have acted before this time.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to argue that point with my distinguished friend because he may well be right, and I am in substantial agreement with the statement that there is an inequity here. The question I have in my mind is, if the Treasury Department and the administration have doubts about the bill, then it seems to me that the majority has the responsibility in the interest of full debate to tell us what the position of the Treasury Department is, why it has doubts about the bill and why those doubts are not well founded.

Mr. KEOGH. The best answer I can give to the gentleman from New York is that I have no specific information or knowledge of the bases, if any, upon which the Treasury Department's viewpoint is predicated.

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to talk at length on this proposal; in fact, the procedure under which this proposal is before the House does not permit either lengthy or even adequate debate. However, I was interested in the colloquy concerning the position of the Treasury Department with respect to this legislation. I sat in the committee in executive session when representatives of the Treasury were testifying. Certainly there was no doubt left in my mind, nor do I think there is any question in the mind of other members of the committee concerning the attitude of the administration and particularly the Treasury Department on this legislation. They opposed it. They also called our attention to some technical defects of significant substance aside from the overall policy factors that they thought we definitely should correct or go into before reporting out the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any question that we do have tax favoritism existing today in favor of the employed; or put another way, a tax discrimination against the self-employed in the capacity of the latter group to provide for their individual retirement security. I think it is very essential that we do something to correct the discriminatory inequity contained in present law. On the other hand I do not think that we have any justification whatever in admitting—as almost everybody does—that there are details in this bill that need correction but then proceeding to pass the bill as it is. Under those circumstances I do not think we have any justification for saying: "Let the other body do it." It seems to me the responsibility is here in this House; the responsibility is the responsibility of the Committee on Ways and Means in the first instance to report out a bill which we have confidence does not need correcting in some other body.

For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation. I think what is proposed to be done here is a bad practice. I do not think we are only voting on a principle. We are voting on more than a principle, we are voting on specific legislation, on important details. And in doing so we are admitting that there are defects in the legislation and we are simply relying on the other body to correct them. I think we should take the initiative ourselves and report out a good bill and pass a good bill relating to this important matter of tax equity in the area of retirement security.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the minority views filed by four members of the committee in connection with this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The minority views referred to are as follows:

H.R. 10 is concerned with the important subject of the establishment of tax-deferred retirement programs by the self-employed with respect to themselves and their employees. The purported purpose of the legislation is to establish a reasonable identity in the tax treatment of these individuals with respect to retirement plans as is accorded to corporate employees under present law.

The legislation makes a gesture toward tax equity in this area but unfortunately fails to achieve sufficient identity of treatment. Because the bill does not accomplish its intended purpose and because of the present fiscal posture of the Federal Government, the revenue loss from the enactment of the bill estimated by the Treasury Department at $358 million in the first full year of operation cannot be condoned at this time. The signatories to these views urge that the supporters of this legislation endeavor to have it taken into account in future Government budgeting so that its effect on fiscal balance need not be considered as a factor in evaluating the merits of the bill.

We recognize that an inequity does exist in present law in that certain of our citizens are allowed, and others are not, to participate in tax-deferred pension plans. H.R. 10 would not equalize the tax treatment of our citizens in providing for retirement security but would instead result in the existence of different methods of tax treatment operating side by side, each applicable to a different group of taxpayers.

For example, these disparities would either be continued or created under this legislation: (1) Individuals working for self-employed employers not employing as many as four persons could continue to be discriminated against and precluded from participating in a retirement program; (2) contributions with respect to employees would be limited to earned income whereas contributions with respect to the self-employed would be on self-employment income, including both earnings and return on investment in the business; (3) lump-sum distributions in the case of the self-employed would be treated as ordinary income whereas such distributions to employees would be accorded capital gain treatment; (4) the vesting of an interest in a program would vary so that in the case of the self-employed and their employees (if four or more employees) a nonforfeitable right would attach immediately, but in the case of other types of beneficiaries such right may be forfeitable or nonforfeitable; and (5) various sets of limitations affecting coverage, contributions, and distributions would exist under the different statutory tests that would be applicable.

In seeking to ameliorate the present acknowledged discrimination in tax treatment with respect to retirement security, we must necessarily endeavor to achieve substantially similar treatment of all taxpayers. H.R. 10 would create more disparities than it would remove. In the area dealt with by this bill the details are important and we cannot responsibly limit our concern only to basic general principles. It is entirely possible that precedents would be created under this legislation that could potentially unduly restrict programs to be established under the new authority or tend to impair existing programs. The fact that there is a problem to be solved in this area

does not mean that we accept just any solution.

In the above enumeration of disparities reference was made in item (2) to the fact that contributions with respect to employees would be restricted to a percentage relation to earned salaries whereas in the case of the self-employed the restriction would apply to a percentage relation to self-employment income. It is significant to note that $100 million of the $358 million revenue loss is attributable to this more liberal definition of income for the self-employed.

The present version of H.R. 10 contains numerous and significant changes from the versions that have been previously considered by the House. Because this is a different bill, we are of the view that the committee did not give the careful consideration to the changes that they required.

For the above-stated reasons, we are constrained to oppose the enactment of H.R. 10 in its present form.

NOAH M. MASON.
JOHN W. BYRNES.
THOMAS B. CURTIS.
BRUCE ALGER.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume, not to exceed 30 seconds, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANFUSO].

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I believe this legislation is long overdue. It provides much-needed benefits for employees and self-employed people who have never been covered before. I have not heard any criticism as to the merits of this legislation. Everybody says it is correct in principle. We have gone over it time and time again. This body passed it overwhelmingly in the last Congress. I do not see any reason why we should delay this much needed legislation any longer.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN].

Mr. HAGAN of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to associate myself with the remarks that the gentleman from New York made a while ago in his wonderful explanation of this bill. I think I may be just a little bit qualified to speak about this. Being a life member of the Million-Dollar Roundtable, I received a letter from this international organization in January informing me that I am the only member of the organization ever elected to the Congress of the United States. For a number of years, my business was estate analysis, and I have handled many, many matters of this kind. I want to assure you from actual experience that the gentleman is eminently correct in that self-employed people need the attention this bill would give them which is the same privilege that so many others have already been enjoying.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10, which we are considering today, encourages the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. It gives self-employed persons access to retirement plans similar to those now accorded officials and employees of corporations. It would permit a self-employed person to deduct from his taxable income a sum not to exceed 10 percent of his earnings or $2,500 a year. Taxes would be deferred on this income until the individual retired and started drawing the pension money.

This bill removes a tax inequity which has existed for 19 years. In 1942, Congress passed legislation encouraging employers to establish qualified pension and profit-sharing plans for their employees by granting employers deductions for contributions to such plans and by deferring a tax on the employees until benefits are derived under the plan. At present there are approximately 50,000 such plans governing some 20 million employees.

On the other hand at present some 7 million self-employed persons in this country are not permitted a similar tax deferment on funds placed in a retirement plan. This has caused an inequity which today is penalizing self-employed people such as doctors, dentists, lawyers, accountants, engineers, architects, farmers, and small businessmen who are anxious to make some provision for their own retirement.

This bill will tend to make self-employment more attractive and tend to strengthen small business in America.

We are not pioneers in this field because the principle embodied in this bill has been adopted and enacted into law in Great Britain, Canada, and Australia.

The plan is voluntary leaving the initiative to the individual thus placing the program within the realm of our free enterprise system.

I am supporting this bill because I believe that self-employed persons should have the opportunity of obtaining retirement benefits on substantially the same basis as do corporate owner-managers.

I believe that it is in the public interest to encourage our citizens to help themselves and to provide for their own retirement from their own earnings, by their own planning, rather than to look to Washington for a solution to their retirement problems.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, for the past several Congresses I have sponsored legislation to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. Again earlier in this Congress I introduced a similar bill, H.R. 6910. In doing so, I was adding my voice to the many others who have also offered such bills to correct a discrimination in the present law and to encourage self-employed persons to make provision for their own retirement.

For reasons that I find hard to accept, the group that would be affected by this bill has been overlooked or deliberately ignored in legislation and programs designed to create opportunities and independent living in the later years.

The very fact that more than 7 million persons could establish retirement plans under this bill is convincing evidence of the need for such legislation. Further, this legislation would support and strengthen our fundamental American philosophy of encouraging small business and independent professional practice.

There are those who point to the possible revenue loss under the bill. No one could be more mindful of Government budgeting or the need for fiscal balance than I. However, I strongly object to any tax saving achieved at the expense of any individual or group, especially after it has been identified, and there is almost unanimous agreement that they are unfairly and inequitably treated under the present law.

The implementation and enforcement of this bill will not be easy because of the very nature of the income we are trying to protect. It should be said, however, it would not be any more difficult to administer than many other laws which have been enacted and have served to meet an urgent need or correct a glaring injustice.

It is my sincere hope that this bill will receive your early approval and thereby bring us another step forward in creating and maintaining our form of government, the incentive for individual initiative and equal and fair treatment for all of our citizens.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, once again I have the privilege of offering my support for legislation which would seek to correct one of the greater inequities in our present tax structure. H.R. 10 is a much needed measure, and its architects are to be commended for their attempts to allow a growing segment of America to take a deduction for investment in the future, namely retirement income.

Serious consideration of this proposal involves a basic question—Why should officials and employees of large, shareholder corporations be exempted from taxation of their retirement benefits as these benefits accrue, while the small, self-employed businessman, professional man, and farmer is subjected to great disadvantage while saving for retirement, a disadvantage which results from the higher tax rate during peak income years, rather than later in life when income is normally reduced?

Perhaps the enactment of this legislation would result in a loss of revenue. Yet, to oppose this measure solely on this basis is to ignore reform needed tax where it is strongly indicated.

I submit that the loss in revenue which would result from passage of this bill is relatively small when compared with the inequities which result in wasteful Government spending. Furthermore, this loss in revenue could be quickly balanced if we dedicated ourselves to correction of excessive Federal spending.

It is for the 7 million self-employed persons who stand to benefit from this legislation that the Congress must act favorably. These people should be allowed to enjoy the same fruits of labor in their declining years as employees who have the present advantage of company-supported retirement plans are now allowed to do.

Passage of this measure will reaffirm our belief in the free enterprise system. Why should the independent businessman, whose prototype made this country the great economic success it is today, be today subject to a tax disadvantage regarding his savings for retirement?

Under this passage, the inherent qualities of success will receive their reward.

Reason itself compels equal treatment for this segment of America's taxpayers, and I sincerely hope that Members of this body will put aside partisan feeling and join with me in support of this nonpartisan measure.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my committee colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS]. I support completely the principle of this legislation but I have serious reservations with respect to the mechanics by which the deferment principle would operate. There have been some significant changes made in this bill over last year's version which create some real problems and introduce some precedents that have dangerous implication with respect to existing plans. In view of the program of planned deficit financing to which the present administration seems committed, the bill would impose a deferred tax increase on succeeding generations. The immediate revenue loss which would result from the enactment of this bill, together with the deficit of several billion dollars caused by the administration's spending programs, would serve to only further aggravate inflationary tendencies and the instability of our dollar. We who presented minority views feel this legislation should take into account the budget impact in future Government budgeting so that the fiscal issue need not be a factor in evaluating the merits of the program. Of equal importance, we are convinced that the House, and more particularly the Committee on Ways and Means, should carefully consider the very important details that are involved in the application of this legislation to the retirement plans of this important group of our citizens.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 10, which is designed to encourage individuals who are self-employed to establish voluntary retirement programs. I recognize the validity of some of the arguments against H.R. 10, which have been expressed in the minority views. However, I believe that this is a case where, despite some defects in the legislation as written, there is an overriding reason for the passage of this bill.

During the recent presidential campaign, it was former Vice President Nixon who said that the important thing in this country should not be what Government can do for its citizens, but rather what 180 million free Americans can do by working for themselves. This legislation will give the average self-employed American an incentive to plan for his own retirement, by relieving him of at least a small portion of the onerous tax burden that he now bears.

I strongly believe that tax credits and tax remission could become the vehicles whereby individuals could be encouraged to do for themselves many of the things that the proponents of the welfare state would assign to government. Therefore, because I believe so firmly in the principle that is embodied in this bill, I hope that it will receive the approval of the Congress.

It has been indicated during the debate here on the floor today that the administration is opposed to this measure; ostensibly because it will result in an initial loss of tax revenues to the Treasury.

It seems very strange, indeed, that this administration which to date has demonstrated an almost complete disregard for fiscal responsibility should feel strongly about this bill because of its possibe impact on the budget. Indeed, since the President numbers as his advisers in the inner circle men like Schlesinger, Rostow, and Heller, I am inclined to believe that opposition to this measure is founded rather on his dislike for its basic premise. However, I hope that the administration will permit this bill to become law. It will relieve many of the inequities that presently exist, and I hope it will give a forward impetus to the idea that individuals should be encouraged to provide for their own future and not look to bigger government and more bureaucracy for their security.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10 fulfills most needed legislation for the establishment of voluntary retirement plans for self-employed persons. It is well known that these benefits have been denied to them, even though they contribute as employers to the benefits of employed persons—both under the private plans in all types of industrial and office personnel.

More than 7 million self-employed persons, who pay income taxes, can establish retirement under this bill.

This bill corrects a discrimination in the present law, under which self-employed individuals and partners are prevented from participating in retirement plans established for the benefit of their employees, although owner-managers of corporations may do so.

These self-employed persons, under this bill, have vested benefits on a similar basis as corporation stockholder employees.

To be sure, there are some differences between rules covering retirement plans which include employee pension plans.

If the owner-employee has more than three employees, in order for him to make any contribution for his own retirement needs, he must cover all his employees who have more than 3 years' service. The special rules in the case of an owner-employee, with three or fewer employees, generally involved rigid limitations on the amount of contributions which are made tax deductible.

A nominal loss of an estimated $125 million applicable to the tax-paying years beginning after December 31, 1961, is negligible if compared with the equities involving self-employed persons who are deprived of rights given to other individuals in their employment.

I have introduced H.R. 249, which is similar to H.R. 10. It is my feeling that, under existing law, 50,000 corporation pension plans have been established, covering 20 million, having at this time more than $40 billion in assets in qualified retirement plans. Just because of a revenue loss, those persons who make contributions through investment in the business their life's work, giving the fruition of employment and retirement to others, should not be legislated against for the privilege of employment of financial independence in their own retirement.

A summary of H.R. 249 follows:

Self-Employed Individual's Retirement Act of 1961—Permits self-employed individuals as defined in the Internal Revenue Code to exclude a percentage of their self-employed income to be set aside in a restricted retirement insurance policy or fund for use by the individual at age 65.

Limits such deductions to 10 percent of such income or $5,000 per year with adjustments for those individuals over 50 years of age. Sets a lifetime limit of $50,000 for such deductions and provides for the adjustment of unused deductions, within limits.

Excludes from such plans those individuals who qualify under employer pension or profit-sharing plans.

Sets forth requirements for restricted retirement funds and retirement policies. Provides for inclusion of distributions under such plans as gross income for income tax purposes. Provides for a 10-percent penalty for distribution from such funds prior to age 65. Sets forth provisions for the taxation of the distribution of funds as a result of the death of the individual having such a plan.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 10 and my own bill, H.R. 3976, are of vital importance to approximately 17 million hard-working Americans who, for the most part, constitute the great middle class of our society. These self-employed farmers, small business and professional men and women have been denied an opportunity which, under the law, is granted to virtually every other working individual.

No one can challenge the fact that this is a glaring inequity in our tax structure. Today, a self-employed individual who may be an engineer, a shopkeeper, or any one of the several hundred other self-employed categories, may leave his present field of endeavor and go to work for a corporation and receive every benefit that I would like to give him under this proposed legislation.

It is in the best interest of our country that these self-reliant Americans be encouraged to remain in their chosen vocations. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to give this remedial legislation the united support which will, I am certain, enhance the prospects of enactment by the Senate and finally the approval of the President.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, the House is to be commended for its overwhelming support of H.R. 10. This measure, encouraging the self-employed to establish their own voluntary pension plans, removes a longstanding inequity in our tax laws. It gives to the small businessman, the farmer, and to those engaged in the professions the tax benefits long enjoyed by corporation management. This bill allows self-employed persons to deduct for income tax purposes 10 percent of their incomes up to $2,500 a year, providing the sums are invested in specified types of retirement plans. This program will help the self-employed save some of their hard-earned money for their later years.

Those employers with more than three employees would be required to make available nondiscriminatory pension

plans for their employees in order to make use of the benefits of this bill.

In general, the bill treats self-employed persons as employers of themselves. Like other employers, they would be permitted to deduct limited amounts set aside under retirement plans for their own benefit and amounts set aside for the benefit of their employees.

I will vote in favor of this bill. It is certainly to be hoped that this program becomes law this session of Congress.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side. I therefore ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 10, as amended?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives has just passed H.R. 10, which is designed to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals. I take this occasion to express the hope that in this Congress the measure may receive more favorable consideration than during the two previous Congresses and that it may finally be enrolled as law of the land.

While regreting a possible loss of some $300 million in tax revenues during the first year this statute would be effective, and assuming that the imperative dictates of national security should not unhappily require otherwise, may I suggest that in the long run the loss of revenue to the Government would be relatively inconsequential.

Under the pending legislation these retirement funds for the self-employed still would become taxable at the time of distribution upon retirement of the individual. In essence, it is only an annual tax deferment of funds invested in future retirement benefits up to 10 percent of income or $2,500, whichever is smaller. These limitations are an appropriate safeguard against abuses by those eager to avoid taxes.

Present law provides corporations tax benefits on contributions made to qualified retirement plans for their employees. It is equally important that self-employed individuals—the farmer, the owner of a small business, as well as the professional man, the doctor, the dentist, the lawyer—and there are more than 7 million self-employed in this country—have the same privilege of saving for their retirement.

Corporations receive tax benefits on the more than $4 billion which they contribute annually to employee pension plans. If it is right and justifiable that corporations defer taxes on such funds, should not the same benefits be extended the self-employed individual? This legislation would only give the self-employed equal consideration under our laws.

With the loss to the Government of some $2 billion a year in tax revenues on the corporate contributions made to retirement plans, indirectly the self-employed are sharing some of the tax burden which makes possible the pension plans of corporate employees.

The self-employed are not asking the Government to do anything for them—they are only asking the Government to let them make their own provisions for the time when they must withdraw from active life. They are entitled to pension protection when they reach the age of retirement without being forced to pay taxes twice on the same funds—once when it is earned and invested in retirement, and again at the time of distribution.

A retirement program for the self-employed is just as essential to the health and welfare of a nation as are social security and company retirement plans for the millions of corporate employees.

Mr. KORNEGAY. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act of 1961—H.R. 10—is a very necessary piece of legislation, indeed legislation that in the interests of the national economy and of the national well-being should have been passed long ago. We have been informed that more than 7 million individuals are now operating their own businesses without the benefits and protections accorded the corporations as regards the pension plans and retirement programs which make the years of retirement more secure. These people are not only the lawyers and doctors and other professional people, but are the small businessmen for whom this tax incentive would be a necessary inducement to the establishment of adequate retirement systems, and those who still hold to that part of the American cultural concept that, going back to Jefferson, says that the small independent businessman should always hold a high place in America's hierarchy of values.

It is my considered opinion, Mr. Speaker, that the previously adopted legislation in this field has, through its inequitable treatment of the self-employed from the taxing-power standpoint done much to make less attractive the rewards of self-employment and, concomitantly, much to increase the attractiveness of corporate employment. If this Congress does not provide some remedy to this situation, Mr. Speaker, it will be sadly remiss in its duty to promote and strengthen this basic part of the American way of life.

Now, it has been argued both on the floor of this House and in the Committee on Ways and Means that if H.R. 10 were enacted a loss of $325 to $358 million in revenue for the 1962 fiscal year would result. Your committee, sir, disagreed with this estimate and found that an estimated revenue loss of $125 million was a more accurate one. I believe that the merits of encouraging the voluntary establishment of retirement and pension plans by the self-employed far outweigh the estimated revenue loss that would result from the extending to such self-employed individuals many of the tax benefits that are presently integral to the success of the retirement plans of employers for employees. In addition, I might say that as the funds that would be set aside for future retirement benefits under H.R. 10 would enter the investment stream through either the banks, the insurance companies, or through the purchase of U.S. Government bonds, the stimulation given to business through this availability of funds for capital formation would, doubtlessly, in the long run, more than offset this estimated immediate revenue loss.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York for his excellent service to the Nation's 7 million self-employed men and women who will be covered by this act. As I said earlier, I regard this as very necessary and proper legislation and in my judgment its passage will be noted and approved, not only by those of us here but by the American public as an instance in which the belief in the future of the small unincorporated business was given salient encouragement.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, this House has given millions of self-employed individuals a well-deserved, long-needed benefit, I refer to the so-called Keogh-Utt bill, to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed Americans.

Actually, this measure gives these people nothing more than they have deserved for a long time: the right to provide for themselves and their families in future years. For the first time, they will—if this measure becomes law—be able to set aside a portion of their incomes every year as a retirement fund, with the same tax advantages as have long been enjoyed by corporations.

The self-employed worker in America has long been a neglected person. His reward for individual enterprise and thrift has often been harassment, unfair tax treatment, and Government neglect. This bill, H.R. 10, cosponsored by more than 30 Members of this House, and authored by Mr. KEOGH, of New York, and Mr. UTT, of California, will be a giant step in the direction of correcting many past neglects toward the self-employed individual.

The principle of the Keogh-Utt bill is simple. An individual earning, say, $11,000 a year from a corporation and who puts $1,000 of that sum into a voluntary retirement plan, is taxed only on $10,000. His $1,000-a-year retirement donation grows after 30 years with 4 percent interest to $58,300. A self-employed worker earning that same amount, $11,000, and who puts away $1,000 a year for his retirement is taxed on the entire $11,000, which means that he really only sets aside $740. After 30 years, his accumulated fund would only amount to $36,900. He is penalized $21,400 in those three decades. H.R. 10 allows self-employed individuals to be treated as their own employers and employees, thus putting them under existing legislation relating to nondiscriminatory, tax-favored retirement plans.

It is hoped that this measure, so long sought by the self-employed and by this Congress, will do much to eliminate and encourage small businesses from coast to coast, for these are the backbone of our free enterprise economy. I salute the wisdom of those who authored, sponsored, and voted for the passage of H.R. 10.

U.S. DELEGATION OF CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, in addition to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] chairman; the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD], who were appointed to serve for the 87th Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on June 8, 1961, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. YATES, Mr. IKARD of Texas, Mr. DULSKI, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HARVEY of Michigan, and Mr. TUPPER.

PROVIDING INCREASED COMPENSATION FOR SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 879) to increase rates of wartime disability compensation by amending section 314 (a) through (j) of title 38, United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out "$19" in subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof "$20";

(2) by striking out "$36" in subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "$38";

(3) by striking out "$55" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "$58";

(4) by striking out "$73" in subsection (d) and inserting in lieu thereof "$77";

(5) by striking out "$100" in subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof "$106";

(6) by striking out "$120" in subsection (f) and inserting in lieu thereof "$127";

(7) by striking out "$140" in subsection (g) and inserting in lieu thereof "$148";

(8) by striking out "$160" in subsection (h) and inserting in lieu thereof "$169";

(9) by striking out "$179" in subsection (i) and inserting in lieu thereof "$190";

(10) by striking out "$225" in subsection (j) and inserting in lieu thereof "$245";

(11) by striking out "$450" in subsections (k), (o), and (p) and inserting in lieu thereof "$500";

(12) by striking out "$309" in subsection (l) and inserting in lieu thereof "$335";

(13) by striking out "$359" in subsection (m) and inserting in lieu thereof "$385";

(14) by striking out "$401" in subsection (n) and inserting in lieu thereof "$435";

(15) by striking out "$150" in subsection (r) and inserting in lieu thereof "$200"; and

(16) by striking out "$265" in subsection (s) and inserting in lieu thereof "$285".

(b) The Administrator may adjust administratively, consistent with the increases authorized by this section, the rates of disability compensation payable to persons within the purview of section 10 of Public Law 85-857 who are not in receipt of compensation pursuant to chapter 11 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 2. (a) Subsection (r) of section 314 of title 38, United States Code, is further amended by striking out "for all periods during which he is not hospitalized at Government expense" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ", subject to the limitations of section 3203(f) of this title".

(b) Section 3203 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(f) Where any veteran in receipt of an aid and attendance allowance described in section 314(r) of this title is hospitalized at Government expense, such allowance shall be discontinued from the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of his admission for such hospitalization for so long as such hospitalization continues. In case a veteran covered by this subsection leaves a hospital against medical advice and is thereafter readmitted to hospitalization, such allowance shall be discontinued from the date of such readmission for so long as such hospitalization continues."

SEC. 3. Section 312(4) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "seven".

SEC. 4. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, but no payments shall be made by reason of this Act for any period before such effective date.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the bill seeks to provide increases in the rates of service-connected disability compensation to reflect the changes which have occurred in the cost of living since the last compensation increase in 1957 was enacted, as well as to more adequately compensate our seriously disabled veterans.

Since the last compensation increase in 1957 there has occurred a 5.4-percent increase in the cost of living. The bill, as reported by the committee, provides increases ranging from 5.3 percent to 8.9 percent in the disability compensation rates payable to veterans disabled 10 to 100 percent. For those veterans receiving or entitled to receive one of the statutory award rates other than (k) or (q), the increases range from 7.5 percent to 16.7 percent. The overall average increase provided by the bill is approximately 9.2 percent. All of the rates for service-connected compensation have been increased with the exceptions noted above of the statutory award rate of $47 a month, which is in addition to the basic rates of compensation.

The exact effect on the individual cases—1,934,509—showing the numbers involved and the percentage of increase for each rating and the total cost of the bill, is shown by the table which follows:

Degree and paragraph	Cases, wartime	Cases, peacetime	Current wartime rate	H.R. 879 as reported	Percent of increase, H.R. 879 as reported, over current rate	Current peacetime rate	H.R. 879 as reported, peacetime rate	Total costs, H.R. 879 as reported
10(a)	752,739	47,724	$19	$20	5.3	$15	$16	$9,605,556
20(b)	285,824	14,410	36	38	5.6	29	30	7,032,696
30(c)	271,120	15,985	55	58	5.5	44	46	10,143,960
40(d)	157,989	6,866	73	77	5.5	58	62	7,913,040
50(e)	105,202	4,885	100	106	6.0	80	85	7,867,644
60(f)	82,416	4,090	120	127	5.8	96	102	7,217,424
70(g)	41,203	2,180	140	148	5.7	112	118	4,112,448
80(h)	25,261	1,010	160	169	5.6	128	135	2,813,028
90(i)	7,122	190	179	190	6.1	143	152	960,624
100(j)	74,987	9,626	225	245	8.9	180	196	19,845,072
(l)	2,775	292	309	335	8.4	247	268	939,384
(m)	2,094	295	359	385	7.2	287	308	727,668
(n)	377	16	401	435	8.5	321	348	159,000
(o)	142	45	450	500	11.1	360	400	106,800
(p)	2,194	160						1,393,200
(q)+(r)	3,085	705	150(600)	200(700)	16.7	480	560	4,378,800
(s)	10,600	900	265	285	7.5	212	228	2,716,800
Total								87,933,144

(k) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, rates (a) to (j) increased monthly by ($47 additional to basic compensation paid monthly for veteran with these disabilities; this $47 rate unchanged).

Anatomical loss, or loss of use of a creative organ, or 1 foot, or 1 hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of 1 eye, having only light perception, in addition to requirement for any of rates in (l) to (n), rate increased monthly for each loss or loss of use by ($47 additional to basic compensation paid monthly for veteran with these disabilities; this $47 rate unchanged).

(l) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or 1 hand and 1 foot, or blind both eyes with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently bedridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation.

(m) Anatomical loss, or loss of use of 2 extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place or has suffered blindness in both eyes having only light perception, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, monthly compensation.

(n) Anatomical loss of 2 extremities so near shoulder or hip as to prevent use of prosthetic appliance, or suffered anatomical loss of both eyes, monthly compensation.

(o) Suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to 2 or more rates in (l) to (n), no condition being considered twice, or suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, monthly compensation.

(p) In event disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed requirements for any of rates prescribed, Administrator, in his discretion, may allow next higher rate, or intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of $450.

(q) Minimum rate for arrested tuberculosis. (This $67 monthly rate is unchanged.)

(r) If entitled to compensation under (o), or the maximum rate under (p), and in need of regular aid and attendance, while not hospitalized at Government expense, additional monthly aid and attendance allowance.

(s) If totally disabled and (1) has additional disability independently rated at 60 per centum or more, or, (2) is permanently housebound.

Section 2 of the bill provides that a veteran who is receiving the statutory award of $450 monthly, the most seriously disabled veteran, and who is also receiving $150 additional payment if he is not in the hospital may have his compensation continue until the first day of the second month which begins after his hospitalization. Today the added compensation of $150 a month is discontinued immediately upon his admission to the hospital. The committee believes it is unwise to penalize the veterans in this fashion since good medical practice requires these veterans to report to a hospital whenever they are in need of such care without suffering a financial loss. Advice received from the Veterans' Administration indicates there would be no great cost administratively or otherwise as a result of this section.

Section 3 increases the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis from 3 to 7 years. While the Veterans' Administration is opposed to this type of proposal, the committee took this action based on the recommendation of the National Institutes of Health. The committee believes the scientific studies of this agency and its finding fully support the action taken. A letter from the National Institutes of Health is reproduced below:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH,
Bethesda, Md., May 16, 1961.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of May 9, I have consulted with members of our scientific staff. It is their opinion that 7 years is not an unreasonable period to recognize as the interval between onset and diagnosis in multiple sclerosis. Under these conditions, the committee would be justified in enacting legislation providing for a 7-year presumptive period for this disease.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD L. MASLAND, M.D.,
Director, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER] first called this matter to the attention of the committee when he inserted a statement on his proposal in the record during the course of the hearings on compensation before the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions. This indicated by the following correspondence and statement:

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank you and the members of this subcommittee for allowing me the opportunity of submitting a statement in support of H.R. 2082, to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 with respect to service connection of multiple sclerosis for an additional 4 years. This bill proposes to extend the presumptive period so that it will conform to highly respected and responsible medical opinion which indicates that the average number of years from first symptoms to diagnosis is 7.2 years.

It may not be necessary to remind the members of the subcommittee of the insidiousness of the disease but for the record I wish to note here that medical opinion has stated that the onset of multiple sclerosis is very often unnoticed by the patient himself, his relatives, and even by the general practitioner in the event that he sees the patient in early stages of the disease. Early warning signs are slurred speech, along with tingling sensations and numbness, poor coordination, especially in walking, and double vision. However, it should be noted a person with multiple sclerosis does not always have all of these symptoms, and someone having one or more may not have multiple sclerosis. Furthermore, and I wish to stress this point, many multiple sclerosis patients have remissions, periods of months or even years during which the symptoms disappear and the individual appears to be well.

Mr. Chairman, an outstanding authority, Dr. Thomas L. Willmon, medical and scientific director, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, has made the following statement to Mr. John W. Bill, national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, in Newark, N.J., at his request:

"As you must know, the medical literature on multiple sclerosis makes many references to the fact that the diagnosis of this disease is a difficult one and subject to delays until it has progressed to the point that the physician may be certain that he is dealing with multiple sclerosis and not one of the many other conditions which may have to be considered in the differential diagnosis.

"I believe the best reference which you may make is the excellent study made by A. R. MacLean and Berkson, Jr., which appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association, 1951, 146, 1367. * * * In their study of 418 cases they found that an average of 7.2 years had elapsed between the onset of the symptoms and the time the actual diagnosis was made. * * * I could only say additionally that in talking with many people who have multiple sclerosis I find that such a lapse as MacLean and Berkson describe is not only common but usual."

I have asked the National Institute of Neurological Diseases within the Public Health Service to furnish me information concerning the latest findings of its research of this point, and with your permission, I will submit the information upon receipt of it for the subcommittee's consideration.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1961.

Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman, House Veterans' Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the statement I submitted to the committee in support of H.R. 2082 to amend the Veterans' Benefits Act of 1957 with respect to service connection of multiple sclerosis for an additional 4 years, I referred to my request of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases to furnish me additional information as to the number of years from onset to diagnosis.

I enclose herewith for the record copy of the reply to my letter from Dr. Richard L. Masland, Director of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

With appreciation for your courtesy and cooperation, I am,

Sincerely,
GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE,
NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH,
Bethesda, Md., May 3, 1961.

Hon. GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WALLHAUSER: This is in answer to your letter of April 24 concerning H.R. 2082 and a copy of your statement to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Dr. Thomas L. Willmon, medical and research director at the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, is in an excellent position to review all the published scientific data as well as incidence statistics and time-lag data relating to onset and diagnosis of multiple sclerosis.

I have discussed with Institute scientists Dr. Willmon's reference to the study by MacLean and Berkson appearing in the Journal of the American Medical Association. Institute scientists have said that the time lag does differ with people but that 7 years is not an unreasonable period between onset and diagnosis.

I hope this further information will be helpful.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD L. MASLAND, M.D.,
Director, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Mr. W. O. Cooper, national commander, Disabled American Veterans: "The Disabled American Veterans supports H.R. 879 and urges its passage by the House of Representatives. We appreciate the President's support and the action of the Veterans' Affairs Committee in recognizing the need for increased compensation for the disabled veterans of America."

Mr. Ted C. Connell, commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars: "Veterans of Foreign Wars supports H.R. 879 and urges its passage by the House of Representatives. We recognize the need for a cost-of-living increase to veterans in America who are drawing compensation. Veterans of Foreign Wars is appreciative of the prompt action by the President and the Veterans' Affairs Committee in bringing this much needed legislation before the Congress and urges its speedy passage."

Mr. Harold Russell, national commander, AMVETS: "Increases in the cost of living have made adjustments in the rates of compensation for the Nation's war disabled essential. H.R. 879 will authorize equitable increases in compensation rates. We, of AMVETS, endorse it wholeheartedly and urge its approval by the House of Representatives."

BILLS WHICH HAVE BEEN PASSED DURING THE FIRST SESSION OF THIS CONGRESS AFFECTING SERVICE-CONNECTED CASES

H.R. 846 provides a statutory award for veterans who are totally deaf in both ears. The rate today is $180 or 80 percent. This would give a veteran a total monthly income of $207. It is estimated to affect 900 cases at a cost of $506,000 the first year.

H.R. 848 provides vocational rehabilitation for service-connected veterans serving on and after January 31, 1955, and the interim period between the Korean war and World War II. The cases affected and the cost follows:

Year:	*No. of Cases*	*Cost*
1962	3,900	$11,500,000
1963	7,700	20,100,000
1964	9,500	24,240,000
1965	9,600	24,180,000
1966	9,100	22,800,000
Total	39,800	102,820,000

H.R. 861 authorizes a lump-sum payment representing the monthly statutory award of $47 for loss or loss of use of a creative organ, since the date of enactment of Public Law 427, August 1, 1952. The cost of this measure is $750,000.

H.R. 873 authorizes the payment of a statutory award of $47 for each loss or loss of the use of as specified in the basic rates of disability compensation, thus the loss of an eye in combination with the loss of a limb.

Four hundred and fifty veterans involved at an annual cost of $200,000.

H.R. 879 increases the rates of compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. Cases affected will be 1,934,509 at a cost of $87,938,144.

Bill reported and pending on Union Calendar: H.R. 2417 provides increase in dependency and indemnity compensation for parents and children of deceased veterans. Cases affected will be 40,200 parents and 79,200 children at a cost of $7,535,000.

Section 4 of the bill provides that increases granted shall be effective on the first day of the second calendar month which begins after the date of enactment.

The first year cost of this bill is $87,933,144, as indicated in more detail in the table previously referred to.

Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Compensation and Pensions on April 25, 26, and 27, and May 10, 1961, on 64 compensation bills. I desire to express my appreciation to the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DORN, for his cooperation and assistance in this matter.

The President had submitted a proposal drafted in the Veterans' Administration providing a smaller increase, at a total cost of approximately $65 million.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am very glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I realize the bill itself will provide an increase of benefits to service-connected veterans, but I am wondering whether or not the gentleman's committee is going to give consideration to increasing benefits for non-service-connected veterans.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. The House Committee on Veterans' Affairs will hold hearings on the whole field of non-service-connected pensions soon.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am very glad to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, there is ample precedent to support the present bill that calls for an increase in compensation for service-connected disabled veterans. On a number of occasions since 1933, Congress has responded to the need for making upward adjustments in the rates so that they would not shrivel into token payments in relation to the steady rise in the cost of living.

The table on page 4 of the favorable report accompanying H.R. 879 gives a factual history of compensation increases. After the last increase of October 1957, the accumulated increase since 1933, covering the regular rates from 10 to 100 percent—but exclusive of the statutory awards—was approximately 90.97.

If we average all categories, the total increase would drop a few points. This falls considerably short of the rise in the cost of living since 1933, even after adding the modest increases provided by H.R. 879.

The committee, following the policy established by the 82d Congress, recommends proportionately higher increases for those who are 50 percent or more disabled. The President, the Veterans' Administration, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs are in agreement that there should be greater relief for veterans with the more severe service-connected disabilities.

Another feature of this bill applies to those veterans who are especially in need of our understanding and help. I am personally familiar with several such cases in my constituency. Suffering from a disease whose cause, and inevitable disabling effects were little known until recent times, these veterans have found it almost impossible to establish service connection, and as a result have been denied compensation. "Why does a man with a minor disability of 10 percent that does not interfere with his ability to earn a living, have his claim approved so easily, while I, with a progressively worsening condition that will make it impossible for me to work, find it hard to qualify for service-connected disability compensation?"

I had no answer to their bitter disappointment in the failure of the Government to provide assistance adequate to their needs, except to say that it was up to the medical authorities.

There was encouraging news in the following letter of May 16, 1961, that was sent to the committee by Richard L. Masland, M.D., Director, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In response to your letter of May 9, I have consulted with members of our scientific staff. It is their opinion that 7 years is not an unreasonable period to recognize as the interval between onset and diagnosis of multiple sclerosis. Under these conditions, the committee would be justified in enacting legislation providing for a 7-year presumptive period for this disease.

This recommendation, in particular, is consistent with President Kennedy's statement that "the American people have traditionally insisted that those veterans who were injured in the service of their Nation be treated justly and humanely, a policy which will be carried out by this administration."

Considering all the provisions of H.R. 879, I think it may be said that they are modest, reasonable, and necessary. They are in line with the obligation of the U.S. Government to compensate in part those who have become disabled as a result of their military service in the protection of our Nation.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which I think should have the unanimous support of all Members of the House. The Committee on Veterans' Affairs under the subcommittee chairmanship of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN] heard all those who are interested in compensation for service-connected veterans. We have worked out what I believe is a very fair and equitable bill. The full Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as our chairman said, reported this bill out unanimously after a full discussion. It is a bill which, I think, will eliminate some of the inequities that presently exist in the law and the provisions of this bill will be of benefit to all those who bear the wounds of service-connected disabilities. I certainly hope the bill will be passed unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as it was necessary to be out of the city on an assignment for another committee, I was unable to attend all the subcommittee hearings on H.R. 879 which led to its favorable report from the House Veterans' Affairs Committee. However, as a member of the full committee, I have carefully considered the bill and the report which accompanied the bill.

Accordingly we wish to be recorded very plainly that we are in favor of this measure and take this opportunity to express our views in affirmation of these changes in compensation.

The last compensation increase was made in 1957. Since that time the cost of living has increased 5.4 percent. H.R. 879 provides an increase in compensation for service-connected disabled veterans at the rate of 5.3 percent; and up to 8.9 percent for veterans who are disabled from 10 to 100 percent.

The policy first started in the 82d Congress was followed by the committee in reporting this measure, in that veterans with less than a 50-percent disablement were given a 5-percent increase, while those who were 50 percent or more disabled were increased by 15 percent.

I am sure we must all be in agreement that there should be greater relief for veterans with more service-connected disability. This is of paramount importance. All along the line, both in wage contracts in private industry and in the civil service, there has been recent recognition of the rise in the cost of living. This is so common that when there is a wage agreement, it is written into the contract and termed what is known as a cost-of-living escalator. Last year in the Federal service, the Congress recognized the necessity of an adjustment in the pay of all postal workers.

Here, now, today we are trying to do justice to this group of disabled veterans. It is only fair and right that their compensation be increased by at least those percentage points fixed as the actual increase in cost of living. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 879 and urge every colleague here on the floor today to lend his support to this bill.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs I want to support wholeheartedly the bill H.R. 879, which provides for an approximate 9.2-percent increase in the rates of service-connected compensation for our disabled service-connected veterans.

Since the last compensation bill was passed in 1957 there has been a 5.4-percent increase in the cost of living. The bill as reported by the committee and passed by the House increases the rates from a low of 5.3 percent to a high of 16.7 percent. The overall increase, as I have already indicated, was 9.2 percent. It will affect nearly 2 million individuals—1,934,000.

In addition, the bill has two other important sections. It increases the multiple sclerosis presumptive period from the present 3 years to 7 years, and this was done upon the recommendation of the National Institutes of Health.

It also provides that our more severely disabled veterans, those who have lost all four extremities, as an example, and who are receiving the $150 a month additional compensation while they are not hospitalized at Government expense, will only lose this compensation when they go back into a hospital beginning the first day of the second month after the hospitalization begins. Today they lose this extra compensation beginning from the first day of hospitalization. The committee believes, and I concur, that this is unrealistic.

The overall cost of the bill is slightly less than $88 million—$87,933,000. The measure is supported enthusiastically by the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AMVETS.

Mrs. HANSEN. I wish to associate myself with my colleague, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas, in support of the bill (H.R. 879) to increase rates of wartime disability compensation by amendment. Obviously, if the spirit of the original legislation is to be carried out, the rate of compensation must be adjusted in accordance with the 5.4-percent increase in the cost of living since the last compensation increase. That spirit, which is shared by every American, would not deny just and humane treatment to veterans who were injured in the service of their country; nor should it permit a reduction in the degree of our consideration for veterans through the failure of Congress to make the adjustments proposed by this bill.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 879, which increases the rates of service-connected compensation for our disabled veterans.

I had previously introduced two bills, H.R. 5669 and H.R. 5670, which provided for much more generous increases for our disabled veterans than that provided in the bill now being considered, however, I am pleased to see the progress made in this field even though it is small.

I am deeply concerned with the adverse results of war and its aftermath upon those who served our country and I have viewed with much alarm the upward spiral of living costs and its effect upon disabled veterans and their fixed incomes. As the cost of living rises the purchasing power of compensation payments declines and this brings about a constant decline in the living standards of America's disabled veterans.

H.R. 879 would provide much needed disability compensation increases for service-connected disability and enable the veterans involved to cope more adequately with the ever mounting costs of essential housing, food, and other critical items necessary to maintain body and soul together.

The last general compensation increase was in 1957 and as I understand it, it did not include the statutory awards. Since that time there has been a substantial advance in the cost of living and with all the duties and responsibilities assumed by the United States as leader of the free world all of which entails continuing outlays of Government funds, can anyone seriously doubt that the upward swing in living costs will continue for an indefinite period of time long into the future.

The President has asked for large sums of money to help feed, clothe, educate, and raise the standard of living for underprivileged countries. Is it not our primary responsibility to first take care of these veterans who so ably served our country in order that it might remain free and able to help others?

Congress has already passed an increase in the minimum wage law from 15 to 25 percent over the next 4 years, presumably for workers who are not disabled and on the basis that everyone is entitled to a decent living wage. Surely our disabled veterans are entitled to no less. Certainly we should strive to bring about an increase in the living standards of America's disabled. The time has come when something must be done to relieve their plight and it should be done now. It is my firm belief that H.R. 879, with its modest increase of the compensation rates, constitutes part of the answer to this problem.

This Congress has already passed a large Latin America appropriation bill running into the millions of dollars and I have considerable doubt, if the time ever came to join in with the United States in a defeat of communism, what these Latin American countries would do. However, I have no doubt whatsoever what these veterans would do as their position has already been proven. Certainly, if we can see fit to aid such other countries, we can justify this modest expenditure to help those who have helped us maintain our standard of living. These men have given of their very life and limb to protect your country and mine to see that we have the freedom we now enjoy and the many luxuries we are privileged to have. Surely, these veterans, above all others, are entitled to our support.

Although I would like to have seen a greater increase provided for our service-connected, disabled veterans, I am pleased to support the passage of this bill and it is my sincere hope that the Senate will see fit to move on this legislation immediately and, if possible, to liberalize the rates even further.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 879) to increase rates of wartime disability compensation by amending section 314 (a) through (j) of title 38, United States Code?

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended to read: "A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes."

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, the passage of this important legislation is gratifying and I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and all members of the committee for the constructive interest that they have taken in adjusting the compensation for service-connected disabled veterans.

I am particularly grateful about the inclusion of section 3 of the bill, which increases the presumptive period for multiple sclerosis from 3 to 7 years.

This section accomplishes the result sought by my bill H.R. 2082, which I introduced on January 6, 1961, and which provided a 7-year presumptive period.

Highly respected and responsible medical experts indicate that the average number of years from the first symptoms to diagnosis of this dread disease is 7.2 years. The onset of multiple sclerosis is very often unnoticed by the patient himself, his relatives, and even the general practitioner in the event that he sees the patient in the early stages of the disease. Early warning signs are slurred speech, along with tingling sensations and numbness, poor coordination, especially in walking, and double vision. However, it should be noted that persons with multiple sclerosis do not always have all of these symptoms, and someone having one or more may not even have this disease.

Furthermore, and I wish to stress this point, many multiple sclerosis patients have "remissions" periods of months, or even years, during which the symptoms disappear and the individual appears to be well.

Mr. Speaker, an outstanding authority, Dr. Thomas L. Willmon, medical and scientific director, National Multiple Sclerosis Society, has made the following statement to Mr. John W. Bill, national service officer of the Disabled American Veterans, in Newark, N.J., a longtime advocate of this legislation, at his request:

> As you must know, the medical literature on multiple sclerosis makes many references to the fact that the diagnosis of this disease is a difficult one and subject to delays until it has progressed to the point that the physician may be certain that he is dealing with multiple sclerosis and not one of the many other conditions which may have to be considered in the differential diagnosis.
>
> I believe the best reference which you may make is the excellent study made by MacLean, A. R., and Berkson, Jr., which appeared in the Journal of the American Medical Association 1951, 146, 1367. * * * In their study of 418 cases they found that an average of 7.2 years had elapsed between the onset of the symptoms and the time the actual diagnosis was made. * * * I could only say additionally that in talking with many people who have multiple sclerosis I find that such a lapse as MacLean and Berkson describe is not only common but usual.

I was gratified to receive a signed letter from Dr. Richard L. Masland, Direc-

tor, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness in which he advised me that "Institute scientists have said that the timelag does differ with people, but that 7 years is not an unreasonable period between onset and diagnosis."

The inclusion of this section in H.R. 879 will, in my opinion, and, more importantly, in the opinion of medical experts, correct a situation that should not exist in connection with this dread disease and its relations to our veterans who suffer from it.

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to express my views in affirmation of the action taken in the House of Representatives establishing more equitable provisions for wartime disability compensation (H.R. 879).

Increases in the cost of living since the last adjustment by the Congress in 1957 made it imperative that relief be expedited for those veterans who bore the fierce heat of battle and were casualties in their country's cause.

I wish particularly to commend the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], and members of that committee for their judicious and speedy action in recommending favorable consideration of legislation which not only offsets recent steady increases in the cost of living, but provides more appropriate relief for the nearly 9,000 veterans and former members of the Armed Forces in my State of Utah beset by serious service-connected disabilities.

Of special importance to the large number of our veterans now stricken with the dread malady of multiple sclerosis, is remedial action on a regrettable situation which has existed too long. My reference is to the fact that pending legislation, as passed by the House, would extend the presumptive period for service-connected disability so grave in nature from the present 3 to 7 years.

I take pride in the action of the committee extending this presumptive period for so unfortunate a group of our defenders in the face of departmental opposition of the Veterans' Administration. Medical science can provide us with no foolproof timetable as to how long the incubation period is before a crippling disorder of this kind assumes dominance, but the National Institutes of Health report that a period of 7 years is compatible with the conclusions of respected, responsible medical experts, and scientific studies.

This is in line with the desires of all American people to do what is fair, humane, and just for those who gave so much of themselves.

AMENDING THE VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION ACT

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4750) to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 6 of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act (63 Stat. 350, 353), as amended (48 U.S.C. 1407e(a)), is further amended by striking out the figure "$11,000,000" in both places where it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof the figure *"$13,500,000"*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is a simple and I hope noncontroversial bill. It raises the borrowing power of the Virgin Islands Corporation by $2,500,000, the money to be spent entirely for the purchase of electrical generating equipment in order to take care of the increased power load in the next 2 years. As we know, there has been something of a boom in the Virgin Islands. The demand for electric power has been enormous.

The Virgin Islands Corporation has about exhausted its borrowing capacity.

The bill as presented to the committee originally would have increased the borrowing capacity by $9 million. The committee reduced this to $2,500,000, because there is some sentiment in the committee for liquidation of the Virgin Islands Corporation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any requirement that the electrical generating equipment must be purchased in the United States?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Not in this bill; no.

Mr. GROSS. This is not a loan, but this is in the nature of legislation to increase the borrowing capacity of the Virgin Islands Corporation itself?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no provision that the equipment be purchased in this country?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. No, there is not.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4750) to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act, as amended?

The question was taken and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOME ROOTS OF THE PEACE CORPS

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor to introduce today, along with the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN], and other members, the legislation to establish the Peace Corps on a permanent basis.

The House can take particular pride in the Peace Corps because we pioneered the legislation last year to set up a study of the feasibility and practicability of the Corps.

Young Americans have been much criticized for their alleged apathy and lethargy and conformity. The novelist John Dos Passos, is critical of them in his current novel, "Mid Century":

> Nobody has ever told them, except to get more and do less. Nobody has ever told them that to be an American meant anything more than to look at the comics and to drive around the roads in a new automobile.

If there is any truth in this criticism of young Americans, may the fault not lie with the rest of us? Until the Peace Corps, have we given our young people any real chance to participate in the great adventure of the age—the worldwide revolution of rising expectations—other than as future taxpayers?

Since the Peace Corps was set up on a pilot basis 3 months ago, thousands of young Americans have seen it as their way to serve their country. The new spirit abroad in the land inspired a visitor to this country from India to say the other day:

> I have seen a spiritual surge, a quest for values, something I did not expect and will never forget. It is as if Americans are anxious to do the right thing, an urge to justify their conduct. This appeals to me, for in my country men attach great importance to the spirit.

The Peace Corps bill, and its explanation, has been discussed at length in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for last Thursday by Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 9287–9302. For those who may be interested in some of the roots of the Peace Corps in American history and thought, I should like to speak of the missionary movement, the frontier of Frederick Jackson Turner, the appeal to youth of Ralph Waldo Emerson, the simple life of Henry David Thoreau, the strenuous life of Theodore Roosevelt, "The Moral Equivalent of War" of William James, and the world fellowship of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Each idea has played its part in the fashioning of the Peace Corps.

THE MISSIONARY MOVEMENT

The American missionary movement, as old as the Republic, has increasingly demonstrated an interest not simply in religious conversion, but in a broad humanitarianism. Education and medical care absorb the principal effort of the 33,000 Americans now actively participating in the missionary movement.

The idea of missions as a force for helping primitive peoples to improve the quality of their lives goes back at least to St. Benedict 1500 years ago. Benedict, sent to Rome to study science, found his fellow students to be complacent and corrupt, following the uneven paths of vice, running headlong to their

own ruin. Benedict led missions of young men from the Roman world of wealth to the wilderness of Northern Europe. There, vowed to personal poverty, freed from family obligations, and organized into communities for service, they cleared the forests, drained the swamps, tilled the soil, taught the schools, and wrote the books.

Cardinal Neuman has described the method of St. Benedict:

He found the world, physical and social, in ruins, and his mission was to restore it in the way, not of science, but of nature, not as if setting about to do it, not professing to do it by any set time or by any rare specifics or by any series of strokes, but so quietly, patiently, gradually, that often till the work was done, it was not known to be doing. It was restoration, rather than a visitation, correction or conversion. The new world which he helped to create was a growth rather than a structure. Silent men were observed about the country, or discovered in the forest digging, clearing, and building. There was no one that contended or cried out, or drew attention to what was going on; but by degrees the woody swamp became a hermitage, a religious house, a farm, an abbey, a village, a seminary, a school of learning, and a city.

TURNER AND THE FRONTIER

Americans today are so immersed in the material comforts of the 20th century that they are apt to forget the rough conditions that prevailed during the span of American history from the settlement of Jamestown to the closing of the frontier in 1890. And yet this period, which witnessed the constant struggle of men and women with their natural environment, and the continuous creation through cooperative effort of new settlements where formerly wilderness had existed, covered 300 years of the history of this Nation.

Frederick Jackson Turner attempted to relate the vitality of American institutions and character to the conditions surrounding the moving frontier. In "The Significance of the Frontier in American History," an address delivered on July 12, 1893, Turner held that "American democracy was born of no theorist's dream" but instead, "it came out of the American forest, and gained strength each time it touched a new frontier." The equality and the individualism of the American character, the spirit of community and the feeling of brotherhood, according to Turner, were born out of the need to meet the challenge of the wilderness, a challenge which could be successfully met only if men worked individually with all of their energy toward the realization of an idea that all men shared with intensity and faith. Thus self-reliance, courage, independence, endurance, and directness developed out of cooperation, friendliness, and interdependence.

Yet, the frontier was passing at the very moment that Turner wrote of its influence. The wilderness was giving way to civilization. Turner believed that the uniqueness of the American personality required the conditions of frontier existence to be fully realized. Without the frontier a young man's idealism, his spirit of adventure, his desire to create order out of his natural environment, could not be realized.

EMERSON

With the passing of the frontier, American writers observed a lack of vitality and idealism in the youth of this country. They lamented a civilization which failed to provide its young men and women with constructive opportunities to express their desire for adventure, physical hardship, and cooperation. With the growth of material prosperity and the development of trade, the individual forgot the frontier virtues and became increasingly complacent and conformist.

Emerson observed that "America is suffering from a shortage of the right sort of human material." He noted that the individual had become "an appendage to a great fortune or a legislative majority," while the "deep and high and entire man, not parasitic upon time and space, upon traditions, upon his senses, or his organs" was rapidly disappearing. And, Emerson continued, the American people, with all of their prosperity, were standing still, tied to the "baggage train" of material goods, waiting for the youth of America to cut their ties and come to the rescue. It is to the young people that Emerson looked for a revitalization of the attributes that made America great: self-reliance, courage, perseverance, and individualism. "I call upon you, young men, to obey your heart, and be the nobility of this land * * * stand for the interests of general justice and humanity."

THOREAU

Thoreau also expressed dissatisfaction with the opportunities his society provided for the constructive realization of man's great potential:

Our employment generally is tinkering, mending the old wornout teapot of society. Our stock in trade is the soldier * * * I hate the present modes of living. The life which society proposes to me to live is so artificial and complex, bolstered up on many weak supports, and sure to topple down at last, that no man surely can be inspired to live it, and only "old fogies" ever praise it.

At best some think it their duty to live it. I believe in the infinite joy and satisfaction of helping myself and others to the extent of my ability. But what is the use in trying to live simply, raising what you eat, making what you wear, building what you inhabit, burning what you cut or dig, when those to whom you are allied insanely want and will have a thousand other things.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT

Theodore Roosevelt acutely felt the need of a young man for physical as well as for intellectual stimulation. He understood that these needs had to be realized if the youth of America were to develop their full potential, and if the United States was to continue to be a nation of vitality and courage. He believed that the country could help its youth to realize its ideals, and at the same time help them to further the highest goals of humanity as a whole. In the wilderness, in the forests, and mountain ranges, in the plains and fields of America, the rough conditions of the frontier still prevailed. And in hard work, young men and women could recapture the virtues of an earlier generation, and bring new vitality to the American character.

Roosevelt, writing of the failure of American institutions of higher learning to keep their life in touch with the life of the Nation at the present day observed that "it is a misfortune for any land if its people of cultivation take little part in shaping its destiny. If our educated men as a whole become incapable of playing their full part in our life, if they cease doing their share of the rough, hard work which must be done, and grow to take a position of mere dilettantism in our public affairs," the country as well as the educated men will suffer. According to Roosevelt, "the first great lesson which the college graduate should learn is the lesson of work rather than criticism. * * * It is the doer of deeds who actually counts in the battle for life, and not the man who looks on and says how the fight ought to be fought, without himself sharing the stress and the danger."

The youth of America must be able to "work practically, and yet must not swerve from their devotion to a high ideal. They must actually do things and not confine themselves to criticizing those who do them. They must act as Americans through and through, in spirit and hope and purpose, and while being disinterested, unselfish and generous in their dealings with others, they must also show that they possess the essential manly virtues of energy, resolution, and of indomitable personal courage. No man is worth much anywhere if he does not possess both moral and physical courage."

Roosevelt argued that the same virtues that young men displayed on the battlefield should be evident in the fight for peace: "Peace, like freedom, is not a gift that tarries long in the hands of cowards or of those too feeble or too shortsighted to deserve it."

WILLIAM JAMES

Fifty years ago William James told peace-loving young Americans that they could find the moral equivalent of war by undertaking the hardship and adventure of life on a fishing schooner or a cattle ranch. James believed that young people were characterized by aggressive impulses which, if not recognized and rechanneled in constructive directions would be negatively mobilized in military activities.

In an address delivered before the Universal Peace Congress at Boston in 1904, James suggested that adventurous, even dangerous, peaceful work should be developed to provide the youth of America with an alternative to military conscription. Such an alternative would cater to young men's need for excitement and at the same time utilize their energy in a constructive way.

This idea was more fully developed by James in 1910, in the essay "The Moral Equivalent of War":

That so many men, by mere accident of birth and opportunity, should have a life of nothing else but toil and pain and hardness of inferiority imposed upon them, should have no vacation, while others natively no more deserving, never get any taste of this campaigning life at all, this is capable of arousing indignation in reflective minds.

If now there were a conscription of the whole youthful population to form for a certain number of years a part of the army

enlisted against nature, the injustice would tend to be evened out, and numerous other goods to the commonwealth would follow.

James believed that service in such a peaceful army would "provide gilded youth" of America with experiences which would "knock the childishness out of them" and enable them to "come back into society with healthier sympathies and soberer ideas." He continued:

Such a conscription, with the state of public opinion that would have required it, and the many moral fruits it would bear, would preserve in the midst of a pacific civilization the manly virtues which the military party is so afraid of seeing disappear in peace. We should get toughness without callousness, authority with as little criminal cruelty as possible, and painful work done cheerily because the duty is temporary, and threatens not, as now, to degrade the whole remainder of one's life. I speak of the moral equivalent of war. So far, war has been the only force that can discipline a whole community, and until an equivalent discipline is organized, I believe that war must have its way. But I have no serious doubt that the ordinary crimes and shames of social man, once developed to a certain intensity, are capable of organizing such a moral equivalent as I have sketched. * * * It is but a question of time, of skillful propagandism, and of opinion-making men seizing historic opportunities.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

Franklin Delano Roosevelt in his fourth inaugural address in January 1945, restated the fundamental truth:

We have learned that we cannot live alone, at peace; that our well-being is dependent upon the well-being of other nations far away. We have learned that we must live as men, and not as ostriches, nor as dogs in the manger. We have learned to be citizens of the world, members of the human community. We have learned the simple truth, as Emerson said, that "the only way to have a friend is to be one." We can gain no lasting peace if we approach it with suspicion and mistrust—or fear. We can gain it only if we proceed with the understanding and the confidence and the courage which flow from our conviction.

In an address delivered in Boston on November 4, 1944, he emphasized the responsibility of the young men and women of this country to continue the fight, begun on the battlefield of the Second World War, to achieve and to maintain peace:

Our young men and women are fighting not only for their existence, and their homes and their families. They also are fighting for a country and a world where men and women of all races, colors and creeds, can live, work, speak, and worship in peace, freedom, and security. * * * In embarking on the building of a world fellowship, we have set ourselves a long and arduous task, a task which will challenge our patience, our intelligence, our imagination, as well as our faith.

In his second inaugural address in 1937, F.D.R. set the goal:

The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little.

This goal inspired both the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration. Both depression-born agencies called forth the energy, the idealism, the desire to help others, and the desire to play a part in the work of their Nation that has characterized the youth of America in any period in history. Through these agencies, young men and women cleared land, drained swamps, built hospitals, constructed schools, repaired bridges, harvested crops.

Each idea—the humanitarianism of the missionaries, the frontier of Turner, the "obedience to the heart" of Emerson, the simple life of Thoreau, the strenuous life of T.R., William James' Moral Equivalent of War, the world fellowship of F.D.R.—each has played its part in the fashioning of the Peace Corps.

The Congress, by giving the Peace Corps a legislative foundation, can do its part in directing the American tradition of service to the challenge of the 1960's.

COMMEMORATION OF ITALIAN REPUBLIC DAY

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, through the ages the ancient peoples of Italy have lived under every possible form of government. They have experienced disunity as well as the ultimate in national purpose and power.

The process of development and confederation in this modern world started in 1859 and continued, as it was destined to do, through perils and setbacks of the greatest dimensions. Wars, dictators, events of the world, and opposition from dissenting minorities stood in the path of a republican form of government which could give full expression to all facets of public opinion and yet present a unity of purpose in world affairs.

After surviving the horrors of the Second World War and fascism, perhaps the most destructive decades in Italy's history, a dramatic new beginning was undertaken on June 2, 1946. The people cast their future with a republican government rather than a monarchy. I am proud today to congratulate the Italian people on the 15th anniversary of their decision.

The past 15 years have not been traveled on a smooth highway unmarked by danger signs. International communism has sought a conquest in Italy by placing countless roadblocks in the way to success. Coalition governments have suffered chuckholes dug by minorities, thereby slowing progress. In Italy today, though, we see one of the strongest nations in our Western alliance for peace. Economically, socially, and governmentally, progress has proven the wiseness of Italy's decision on June 2, 1946. Her partnership in NATO, the United Nations, and the European Common Market has not only protected her own interests but has added invaluably to the success of each organization. It is even more rewarding for all Italians to remember that they began anew after the Second World War from a most chaotic position. The ravages of war left a minimum with which to work, but the victors realized that the true nature of the people contradicted the course taken by the Fascist government during the previous years. For the people of Italy are gentle and peaceful, not vicious or belligerent.

The United States stands proudly with Italy in a relationship of brotherhood formed by unbreakable ties. Her people have contributed their very culture and way of life to our Nation through migration and settlement here. There is no question about the future. Italy will continue to progress in her commitment to a democratic social order and a republican form of government. She will provide added strength to the Common Market, NATO, and the United Nations. I congratulate her and wish her even greater success in the coming 15 years.

TAX POLICY ON FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the following testimony was presented to the Ways and Means Committee today by Prof. Walter A. Slowinski. It is so relevant and cogent that I think it should receive wide publicity, particularly as it corrects a very important misapprehension that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon created in referring to our present tax laws, that the deferment of foreign income under our present tax laws was a postwar period promotion of private foreign investment. The tax policy behind our tax laws as they affect foreign investment was to obtain revenue and not to give preference or encouragement to anything, and they have been of long standing.

I think it is very important to treat our tax laws on the assumption that they are for revenue and not for the purpose of trying to create economic results. Certainly, however, it is proper to reexamine our tax laws from time to time to be certain that they are not creating unsociable or inequitable results. Herein follows the testimony:

TESTIMONY OF WALTER A. SLOWINSKI FOR THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES ON FOREIGN SOURCE INCOME TAXATION SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, JUNE 5, 1961

I am Walter A. Slowinski of the law firm of Baker, McKenzie & Hightower of Chicago, appearing on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Academically, I am an adjunct professor of comparative tax law at the Georgetown University Graduate Law School in Washington, D.C., and a lecturer in domestic and foreign tax law at the University of Virginia Law School in Charlottesville.

The chamber recommends that:

1. The tax treatment of income derived from sources abroad be liberalized.

2. A foreign tax credit providing greater relief should be enacted.

3. Income of U.S. citizens earned while residing abroad be exempt.

4. Taxation of the income of branches and agencies abroad be postponed until the income is returned to the United States.

These recommendations are not new. They were first adopted over 10 years ago and were reaffirmed by our membership on May 3 of this year. Quite obviously they were in effect long before the 1961 administration tax message now before this committee. It is equally clear that they coincide with this committee's attitude toward the encouragement of private investment abroad as reflected by its favorable reporting of H.R. 5 in the 86th Congress.

However, insofar as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, the pendulum has now swung away from its 1960 encouragement of private investment abroad, not merely to return to the middle point of status quo, but on to the full negative approach of pressuring industry to curtail its private foreign investment and reduce its competition with foreign competitors on foreign soil.

This benefits our foreign competitors in Western Europe and Japan who, as the President noted in his message, have now completed their postwar reconstruction and are fully competitive with U.S. corporations and their subsidiaries in almost every major country of the world.

Nothing would more gratify our foreign competitors in Western Europe and Japan than to have U.S. private investment shrink or withdraw from these areas of competition. This would naturally occur if U.S. shareholders in foreign corporations operating entirely abroad are harnessed with a new, costly, and complex regime for paying U.S. income taxes on money which they have not yet received.

We should in this testimony like to set forth very briefly specific illustrations of how the Treasury's proposed recommendations would discourage U.S. competitive chances in worldwide competition.

1. TAXING INCOME NOT YET RECEIVED PENALIZES U.S. INVESTORS IN WORLDWIDE TRADE

The very technique suggested in this proposal to tax the income of U.S. shareholders from foreign subsidiaries was used in the Revenue Act of 1937 to destroy a type of foreign corporation operating as a tax avoidance mechanism—and it effectively destroyed most of these foreign personal holding companies. Many other Western countries use this same vehicle where tax evasion is involved to destroy such corporations.

We now find this same technique proposed for use against U.S. business overseas, even though the President urged in his state of the Union message that we should "not penalize legitimate private investment abroad, which will strengthen our trade and currency in future years."

Regardless of the constitutionality or unconstitutionality of this proposed law—and responsible tax authorities and the courts have questioned the constitutionality of taxing income which has not yet been received—such penal measures against private foreign investment cannot but succeed in changing our Nation's attitude toward private investment in developed or less-developed areas of the world.

2. OUR 48-YEAR RULE OF TAX FAIRNESS SHOULD NOT BE ABOLISHED

Secretary Dillon's testimony intimates at page 29 of the printed text that the "deferral privilege," as he termed it, was a postwar period "promotion of private foreign investment" in the public interest.

He suggests that times have changed recently and we should no longer continue this post-World War II "preferential treatment." We are certain this committee knows that this rule of tax jurisdiction was no postwar promotional scheme. The Congress for almost 50 years has promulgated and reconfirmed the rule adopted by all commercial nations of the world of not taxing the income of a foreign corporation earned in a foreign country until it becomes income in the home country.

To suggest, as did the Treasury, that the United States is the only country which currently and only temporarily adheres to this rule of sovereignty is not accurate. We should carefully consider the wisdom of changing an almost 50-year rule to achieve a temporary economic objective.

3. FOREIGN COMPETITORS WILL CONTINUE TO EMPLOY BASE COMPANY OPERATIONS TO CRUSH U.S. COMPETITORS

The administration's tax message unfortunately singles out Switzerland as a base country for U.S. firms as if it were an exclusively American discovery. However, this committee knows that Swiss law as well as most European law has remained almost unchanged for many years on this question of territoriality in taxation. In fact, practicing Swiss corporate and tax lawyers, recently concerned with accuracy of the Treasury Department's Table 15 statistics on the number of U.S.-owned corporations organized in Switzerland during 1954–1960, have conducted an informal study and now have determined that the number of German-owned Swiss corporations exceeds the number of U.S. owned Swiss companies. Thousands more Panamanian, Liberian, and other base companies owned by Japanese, United Kingdom, Canadian, French, German, Spanish, and Italian stockholders, are in deadly competition with United States private investment in the Western European arena.

The term "foreign competition" does not mean small European companies just getting started under the Common Market or the European Free Trade Area. These foreign competitors are among the largest foreign industrial companies—some of them much larger than their U.S. competition.

4. SECRETARY DILLON'S GERMAN-SWISS EXAMPLE PRODUCES MORE (NOT LESS) U.S. TAX REVENUE

Secretary Dillon's example of a U.S. company operating in West Germany through a German manufacturing subsidiary and a Swiss Trading company must be carried to its logical conclusion. To the extent that German taxes can be saved by use of a Swiss trading company which earns the selling profit on a product on which a German company has earned the manufacturing profit, more net tax revenue is available to the United States Government on the dividend distributions to the United States parent.

To the extent that complete manufacturing and selling operations are conducted only in the German company, the overall German tax rate plus a 15-percent withholding on dividends would equal or exceed the U.S. corporate tax rate of 52 percent, leaving no tax revenue for the United States on repatriation of the dividends. The elimination of the intermediate Swiss company, as Secretary Dillon suggests, would not only increase German tax revenue, but defeat any hope of U.S. tax revenue unless, of course, the foreign tax credit provisions of our code are abolished. However, if the foreign tax credit were to be abolished, then there would be no U.S. tax revenue because this business could no longer exist paying approximately a 75-percent tax rate to Germany and the United States.

5. ARTIFICIAL DIVERSION OF INCOME CAN BE STOPPED

European nations are keenly aware of our section 482 provisions for allocation of income, deductions, and credits by the Commissioner to reflect accurately the income of affiliates. Most major European countries have the same type of tax law which they aggressively use as a weapon against artificial diversion of income. To imply—as did the Secretary at page 25—that in Western Europe certain income may be attributed to tax haven companies which is not economically justifiable, is to criticize the Dutch, German, French, Italian, Belgian, and United Kingdom tax administrators who approve such section 482-type allocations in writing in advance for each company and review them periodically as required by law. Where a country chooses to be more liberal in such income allocations, it does so at the expense of its own tax revenue and to the benefit of the United States in ultimately increased tax collections here.

In one recent instance involving a Dutch manufacturing company and a Swiss trading company owned by U.S. investors, it was decided that if this Treasury proposal were to be adopted, the Swiss subsidiary would be liquidated (at a saving in corporate expense) and all manufacturing and selling operations would then be conducted from the Dutch company paying a 47 percent corporate income tax rate on all its income. Under this change little or no U.S. tax revenue would then be payable on the remission of profits to the U.S. shareholders. However, under the present system, approved in writing by the Dutch tax inspectors, that portion of the selling profit which is allocated to the Swiss trading company attracts a lower Swiss corporate tax on such income. This in turn leaves tax revenues for the U.S. Government which would now be lost under the Treasury proposal.

In another recent case, a U.S. company established a manufacturing subsidiary in the Irish Free State. The Irish Government has granted a 10-year tax exemption to the subsidiary because it is anxious to attract foreign capital for the development of local industry.

If the Treasury Department's proposal is adopted—and if Ireland is designated as a "developed" country, the Irish subsidiary's income will be taxed to the U.S. parent corporation at 52 percent in the United States although such earnings are exempt from Irish taxes.

6. U.S. INVESTMENT WILL BE LOST IN ALLIED COUNTRIES

Suppose a U.S. electronics corporation plans to compete in the European Common Market by manufacturing within the Common Market (such as in the underdeveloped area in southern Italy known as Mezzogiorno) to reduce its Common Market tariffs. It forms an Italian subsidiary to do so. A Dutch competitor (one of the world's largest electronics companies) decides to do likewise.

Under the Treasury's proposal, the earnings of the U.S. corporation's Italian subsidiary would be immediately taxed in the United States at the corporate rate of 52 percent, while the Dutch company, operating under a 10-year Italian tax exemption in the Mezzogiorno area program, would be wholly exempt from Dutch corporate tax (under a long-standing Dutch rule of taxation dating back to the 19th century), and it would be wholly exempt from Italian taxes for the first 10 years.

The Dutch company would have been free to enjoy the benefits of the Italian tax exemption program, while the income of the U.S. company's subsidiary would have been fully taxed at 52 percent in the United States on the distributed or undistributed profits of its Italian subsidiary.

We do not consider this "neutrality" in U.S. taxation of foreign source income unless it means being "neutral" against the U.S. investment abroad.

On another important point, the Treasury's proposed definition of controlled foreign corporations is completely unrealistic. The 10 or fewer U.S. shareholders may be totally unrelated and, indeed, may have conflicting interests with respect to the foreign corporation. For example, a U.S. corporation may own a large minority position in a publicly held foreign corporation. Without any act on its part, one or several other U.S. citizens may acquire a small amount of stock so that U.S. citizens then own 51 percent. By this accident, all of the U.S. stockholders are subject to tax on the undistributed profits of a foreign corporation which no one of them can control.

7. TREASURY WOULD ABANDON COURT APPROVED SOURCE OF INCOME RULES IN LESS DEVELOPED AREAS

With regard to the Treasury's recommendations on tax deferral for less-developed countries, it should be noted that the entire system of rules regarding source of income is proposed to be changed. A newly formed Costa Rican manufacturing company would lose its hope of tax deferral, for example, if during its formative year it derived 21 percent of its income from the purchase of products from its U.S. parent and sale of such products outside Costa Rica. To obtain tax deferral in such cases it might be necessary to set up separate foreign corporations in each less-developed country in which such goods are to be sold. This can hardly be called good economics or good tax policy. Certainly few businessmen would choose to establish oversea ventures under such unusual ground rules.

8. U.S. INTEREST IN FOREIGN AIRLINES AND SHIPPING WOULD BE PENALIZED

On a more drastic note, the exception for less-developed countries involves such a complete change in the source rules with regard to profits from the operation of international shipping that a substantial portion of U.S.-owned shipping would be driven from world competition.

For example, if a U.S. corporation now conducts its shipping through a nonsubsidized Panamanian company with Panamanian-flag vessels, the income of such company under the Treasury's proposal would be immediately taxed in the United States at 52 percent, thereby leaving the shipping lanes of the world open to our nontaxed or lightly taxed Greek, Dutch, Italian, and Japanese competitors.

9. THE FOREIGN TAX CREDIT SYSTEM SHOULD BE IMPROVED

The Chamber has consistently emphasized the need for a foreign tax credit giving greater relief for foreign taxes paid which are not strictly "income" taxes. The need for this change becomes more acute when Secretary Dillon's testimony argues only in terms of European "income" taxes in comparison with U.S. income taxes. It must be remembered that more than 30 percent of that total tax burden in Europe is collected in the form of sales taxes, turnover taxes, transmission taxes, trade taxes, excise taxes, taxes on capitalization, privilege and franchise taxes, and property taxes—most of which are creditable under the present U.S. income tax system.

Before this committee in 1958, I advocated that section 903 be amended to achieve equity for taxpayers who pay substantial foreign taxes not specifically designated "income taxes," and for those who lose even the benefits of the "in lieu of" provisions of section 903.

Congress intended, as argued by the late Senator George in 1952, and again in 1954, to give taxpayers credit for those foreign taxes measured by gross income, gross sales, or other methods if they were levied in lieu of an income or excess-profits tax.

A good example is the Colombian patrimony tax already rejected for the foreign tax credit by U.S. courts, or the Japanese tax for which credit was denied in Revenue Ruling 58-548.

The Treasury's narrow regulations make it impossible to assure a businessman in advance that some new—or even some old—taxes levied by a foreign state or political subdivision thereof will be recognized for purposes of a fair and equitable U.S. tax credit.

A legislative recommendation from this committee to remove this inequity is very important to American business overseas. It is important to note that the United Kingdom, in addition to the favorable treatment already provided for investment abroad through overseas trade corporations, has further liberalized its foreign tax credit system in the 1961 finance bill.

10. SECTION 911 SHOULD NOT BE CHANGED

We have received excellent statements from many American chambers of commerce in foreign countries defending the present earned income exclusion of U.S. citizens working abroad. To say that the foreign tax credit mechanism will protect such taxpayers from double taxation is not correct. In France, for example, more than 20 percent of a taxpayer's total budget is taken by large indirect taxes which do not qualify under section 901.

For many reasons stated much more clearly by the American chambers of commerce abroad to this committee in writing for the record, the present section 911 provisions should not be changed.

11. GROSSING UP SHOULD BE REJECTED

On April 11, 1960, Mr. Paul Swantee representing the chamber of commerce of the United States appeared before this committee to oppose H.R. 10859, a bill to amend section 902 by requiring the adoption of the so-called grossing up rule now proposed again by the Treasury Department. His testimony on pages 46 through 49 of the hearings represents the chamber's opposition to this proposal then and now.

The proposal would overturn principles of some 43 years' standing, upset long-established relations in tax treaties, and penalize foreign trade both in developed and underdeveloped areas. Here again, the wisdom of changing long-established rules to gain a temporary economic objective should be carefully considered.

CONCLUSION

The Chamber urges that enforcement of our tax laws, especially the 1960 amendments which only recently became effective, be given a fair chance before consideration is given to the uncertain, costly, and complex legislation suggested by the Treasury.

To the extent that artificial arrangements between related companies have created problems of tax evasion, such practices can be discovered under a new reporting law enacted by the Congress in section 6038 last year—and they can be handled under existing enforcement provisions. In this regard, the Chamber supports the Commissioner in his program for more extensive auditing—including such additional personnel as may be needed—to insure that taxpayers pay their fair share on both domestic and foreign income.

INCREASE IN PAY OF PROFESSIONAL MEN AND WOMEN OF DEPARTMENT OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from West Virginia [Mrs. KEE] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which amends appropriate sections of title 38, United States Code, to increase the pay of the professional men and women of the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration.

It seems to me, if we are to maintain the highest professional standing of the largest hospital and medical system in the world, it is absolutely essential that we give careful attention to this matter. I am hopeful that the administration will be able to support most, if not all, of the salary levels set in my bill.

The salary of the Chief Medical Director is set at $22,500 and in the medical service, generally, the chief grade would range from $16,790 to $18,090. In addition, I am including a provision to set the salary of the Administrator at $25,000. In view of the magnitude of the operations of the Veterans' Administration, it seems to me that this figure and the others mentioned in my bill are entirely reasonable.

COLUMBUS DAY

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to make October 12, Columbus Day, a legal holiday.

October 12 was the day in 1492 when the Italian navigator, Christopher Columbus, landed on that island 600 miles southeast of Miami which we call San Salvador. This day is celebrated in at least 40 States and over 15 neighboring republics as a tribute to the man whose great daring and historic vision made possible the discovery of the New World. Few events in the history of the world have equaled Columbus' phenomenal feat. Surely it is fitting that this Nation join the several States and our neighbors to the South in honoring the discoverer of America.

By making Columbus Day a national holiday we honor not only Christopher Columbus but the ties of friendship which bind the two great continents which he discovered. For many years October 12 has been celebrated in both North and South America as a symbol of inter-American solidarity. Surely there can be no better time than the present to exemplify this theme, when we are striving to solidify inter-American friendship and understanding.

A national celebration on October 12 would do much to strengthen the "alliance of progress" which President Kennedy has outlined for the two Americas. We can use this occasion to rejoice with

Latin America in our common heritage, and to reiterate our common goals and mutual ideals.

I have frequently heard the argument made that we have too many national holidays, and that additional days should not be given official recognition, lest the importance of each be diminished. I cannot believe that this argument applies to a holiday as significant and as timely as this one. And I must point out that the United States has at present only seven legal holidays, surely not an excessive number and one which is far below the number of national holidays in most other countries.

I am most hopeful that this bill will win approval in the current session. I believe it would be interpreted by our friends to the south as a gesture of friendship, in appreciation of our common origin, and it would certainly constitute a long-overdue tribute to a man of great faith and overwhelming courage.

STRIKE OF MEATPACKING EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, permit me to call attention to something that is happening in Chicago at the present time and which might well be given consideration.

In May, 13 years ago, we had hearings in Chicago on a meatpacking strike which involved 20 States. The packing industry in those States was tied up.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] was on that committee. I am sure he will remember—because he courageously attended those hearings though told by some leaders not to do so. The hearings disclosed as just stated that throughout the United States all of the packinghouses were tied up, not operating, because of the strike. In that strike railroad tracks were blown up, cars burned, trucks destroyed, packinghouses wrecked, individuals beaten—I will not go through it all, you know what happened.

Pictures showing some of the violations are found in the printed hearings of a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments—now the Committee on Government Operations—in the 80th Congress, 2d session—investigation as to the administration of the laws affecting labor disputes. (Interstate and foreign commerce, and the antiracketeering statute, the interstate transportation of pickets, and the activities of the Department of Justice, in connection with strikes in the meatpacking industry in 20 States, hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Expenditures in the executive departments, 80th Congress, 2d session—May 20 and 21, 1948.)

The report filed after those hearings shows the then need for legislation.[1]

The present administration by and large received support from labor leaders. Especially did Walter Reuther direct or, if you prefer, divert the vote of many a worker to the support of the President, who, as a member of the McClellan committee, on which the present Attorney General, Robert Kennedy, was counsel, failed to expose some of the unlawful activities of the Reuther outfit.

As has many times been stated, the record is clear that the UAW–CIO employed goons who repeatedly violated the law; used union money to implement their activities, but, so far as the press discloses, the administration has taken no major action to bring any member of the Reuther outfit before the courts.

---

[1] From 21st Intermediate Report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, H. Rept. No. 2464, 80th Cong., 2d sess.:

"CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

"As stated at the outset, it is not the purpose of this report to comment on the merits of the strike or the position taken by the union or the company. Neither are we concerned with the wisdom or motives of the officers of the UPWA–CIO in calling this strike and then after many weeks of violence accepting the original pay increase offer of the companies which they rejected and the AFL Butcher Workmen accepted 4 months before.

"However, we are directly concerned with the conduct of the strike. This report merely sketches what the hearings discuss in exhaustive detail. Plant managers, maintenance and supervisory personnel, and office forces, were generally denied access to the plants, were beaten, interfered with, and intimidated, not only at the scene of the strike, but at their homes as well. The rank-and-file employees who did not wish to strike were subjected to the same indignities and abuses. Many were hospitalized with severe injuries. Police officers were beaten, and local laws against violence and mob conduct were flouted with impunity. Union officers publicly threatened their own members with physical violence unless they obeyed orders.

"Union officers publicly announced that they were taking the law into their own hands, and dared their members, the public, the police, the Army, and even the President of the United States to interfere. They were so successful in carrying out this threat that physical violence, property destruction, and willful disregard for the simplest rights of others became the general rule at the struck plants.

"Chicago was the only exception, and even there nonstriking employees seemed to feel that there was some rule of good conduct violated when the police guaranteed them safe conduct through the picket lines when they elected to return to work. They seemed uncertain as to whether they really had the right to work if they choose. In other communities, particularly in Minnesota and Nebraska, where law enforcement was obviously secondary to political consideration, the right to work was subordinated to the right to insult, intimidate, and beat individuals who desired to return to work.

"To correct this intolerable situation in industries affecting interstate commerce, this committee suggests the enactment of Federal laws, similar to the Michigan statutes which read as follows:

"'(28.584) SEC. 352. Any person or persons who shall, by threats, intimidations, or otherwise, and without authority of law, interfere with, or in any way molest or attempt to interfere with, or in any way molest or disturb, without such authority, any person, in the quiet and peaceful pursuit of his lawful occupation, vocation, or avocation, or on the way to and from such occupation, vocation, or avocation, or who shall aid or abet in any such unlawful acts, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor.

"'SEC. 9f. It shall be unlawful to hinder or prevent by mass picketing, threats, intimidation, force, or coercion of any kind the pursuit of any lawful work or employment, or to obstruct or interfere with entrance to or egress from any place of employment, or to obstruct or interfere with free and uninterrupted use of public roads, streets, highways, railways, airports, or other ways of travel or conveyance. It shall be unlawful for any person acting either individually or as one of a group to engage in picketing a private residence by any means or method whatsoever: *Provided*, That picketing, to the full extent that the same is authorized under constitutional provision, shall in no manner be prohibited.'

"The committee is convinced that unless the coercion, the intimidations, the beatings, the destruction of property, the disregard of court orders, which this and other hearings by subcommittees of the Committee on Education and Labor have disclosed are prevented or lessened and punished, civil strife will ultimately follow. Hence the committee suggests that the Congress, without delay, consider legislation similar to that to which reference has just been made.

"Probably one of the most important single factors in making possible the mob rule described in this report is the fact that the offending pickets invariably were strangers to the community, acted with precision and ruthlessness, and, in most instances, were not effectively opposed by local officers. They were roving squads of strong-armed men whose sole function seemed to be that of inflecting physical violence on nonstrikers, company officers, and anyone else whose enthusiasm for the strike was not at fever pitch. A no lesser phase of their duties was property destruction.

"Another factor which undoubtedly contributed to the success of the goon squads' program of intimidation, violence, the destruction of property and defiance of court orders, was the fact that invariably the police were outnumbered, usually 10 to 1 by the goons, and perhaps of more importance, were not only reluctant to employ force in making arrests, but were usually hampered by instructions from politically minded superiors to avoid bloodshed.

"In the instant case, the charge has repeatedly been made that the violence was due to the activities of strikebreakers. That charge has not, to date been substantiated by the evidence.

"There is, however, on the books section 1231 of title 18 of the United States Code, which makes interstate transportation of strikebreakers unlawful.

"It is suggested that Congress now give consideration to a bill similar perhaps to H.R. 4906, March 1936, 76th Congress, 1st session.

"Inasmuch as the testimony discloses an interference with interstate commerce, and that there seems to be no Federal statute prohibiting such interference, it is suggested that the Congress consider the question of the passage of legislation which makes interference with interstate commerce a Federal offense.

"A bill designed to accomplish that purpose was introduced in the 80th Congress, 2d session, on June 14, 1948. It is H.R. 6914."

Today we lack not only legislation, but enforcement of the present Federal laws.

Saturday, the Chicago Tribune carried a story of a pending strike which holds up deliveries of meat.

Since the strikes in 1948, the packing industry, Swift, Armour, and others who were then operating in Chicago and who at that time had plants that were tied up in these 20 States moved their plants out of Chicago. They got out of trouble. Many, many jobs were lost, people were inconvenienced.

This article to which reference is made states that over a million dollars worth of meat would spoil in Chicago unless some helpful action was taken.

The strike is to prevent the packing people who moved out now sending meat into Chicago, either by their own or other trucks. Some are thinking about the policy of the New Frontier, what if anything does the administration intend to do about these strikes of today?

If I understand correctly the testimony of Mr. Goldberg, as given before the Subcommittee on Education and Labor of the House, Mr. Goldberg, who is Secretary of Labor, takes the position that only union men are to have jobs. That means only those who in Chicago belong to a union—in this instance perhaps a Teamsters Union—are to make deliveries of meat.

That seems a strange doctrine, that only those who pay tribute to some labor organization may have a job, earn a livelihood in this country of ours.

If I get Mr. Goldberg's statement correctly and the administration's statement and policy correctly with reference to strikes in defense industries, what they now say is that in industries making missiles, the unions have agreed there shall not, and will not, be any strikes in connection with our missile plants.

Now, that sounds all right, does it not? But, if you think down the line, you learn that that is Government's money in those industries making missiles and other defense munitions. So, they just ask Congress to appropriate more money in order that members of the unions get their jobs at top wages.

And, you recall that in the report of the McClellan Committee some union members in those plants were getting $500 a week, some $600, and some as high as $700 a week.

Do not forget, if the Government wants you, a citizen, and you are qualified to go to war, it reaches out, takes you by the arm and puts you in the ranks. You do not have anything to say about that. You may not be able to be deferred as was Reuther—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 101, part 10, page 13012, August 2, 1955.[1]

Nor will the military service pay $300 or $700 a week. You know about what the serviceman got in 1941 when Reuther was deferred? A private, $30 a month.

So, what is the result of Goldberg's policy, the policy of the New Frontier? It is this: Industry, in this particular case using Government money, gets a contract for cost and a profit. I do not know whether it is too much or too little a profit. The union worker gets what he wants for his work and the union gets what it wants, and the added cost, sometimes millions of dollars, is put on the taxpayer. The production is delayed.

My point is this, that is no fair way of proceeding. Pay the serviceman a nominal wage—now $99 a month—give the man working here at home—living with his family in comfort and safety $500 a week.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I would just like to state in connection with the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that I was a member of the subcommittee and accompanied the gentleman to Chicago where the hearings were held after very careful investigation by staff people. At the time we arrived in Chicago to hold the hearings in the Federal Building, our Federal marshal said that there were a number of goons there prepared to do us in and that he was no longer willing to guarantee that he could protect us in case of attack. The gentleman from Michigan proceeded to conduct the hearings, and I think in that respect restored a great deal of credit to the great House of Representatives of which he has been a very devoted Member.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Permit me to thank the gentleman. But, I want to say to the other Members on the floor that there was no danger, at least, in my opinion, because my experience with those goons is—and there were many hearing days in several places—that while they talk, they would not injure any Congressman. Why? Because they like the Congressman? Oh, no, no, no. They never beat up a Congressman or kill him, because if they did, the rest of the Congressmen would get frightened and pass some worthwhile legislation. Their forbearance was a matter of self-interest, that is all there was to that.

On this labor policy of Mr. Goldberg and the New Frontier in private industry note what they are doing. Give the union what it wants, let the industry add the cost to the price and soak the purchaser.

That is what happened in the automobile business. The companies have to make a profit. The union worker wants his wage increased. That is natural. So, what do they do? Well, they boost the price of the product—whatever it may be. We all pay more when we buy a car. I think they want too much for their cars, so I personally am interested.

When a sufficient number of the people throughout the United States have their pocketbooks hit, and where the price of things they buy—whether it be autos or bread—gets so high that they cannot take it any more, we all will be interested. Then the home folk will write their Congressmen and tell us we will not be reelected unless we do something about it.

I hope that day will come soon. Why? So I can help to bear the burden, so I can help to fight the battle for my grandchildren and great-grandchildren. I have six or seven—no eight. A grandson in the armed service in Germany just advised he was the proud father of a daughter.

It is my hope the burden of future generations will grow less rather than greater.

Maybe the New Frontier would extend that civil rights bill so as to protect white gentiles, so as to protect the honest union and the nonunion men who do not want to pay tribute; in effect, to protect all of us.

Permit me to ask about some of the effects of this civil rights bill. As I understand, it says no discrimination because of religion or creed, race, color, or state of origin.

I saw a statement, that there were six or seven nations in which individuals were allowed to have or did have one, two, three, or four—I do not know how many—wives. Their religion or creed

---

[1] Letter from National Headquarters, Selective Service System:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *August 5, 1941.*

Hon. CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: In accordance with your request we have made a complete investigation of the classification of Walter Philip Reuther, Order No. 744, Wayne County Local Board No. 31, Lansing, Mich.

It appears that this registrant at no time made a claim for deferment on the grounds of dependency, although his record indicated that dependency was involved. The registrant did claim deferment as a necessary man because of his occupation as a representative of the United Automobile Workers, an affiliate of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Upon appeal of the case of this registrant, Board of Appeal No. 3 at Detroit, Mich., deferred the registrant in class III–A on the grounds of dependency.

While it is not specifically stated in the file, it appears that the registrant does not desire to be deferred on account of dependency but rather desires to be deferred as a necessary man.

When a case is appealed to a board of appeal it is incumbent upon that board of appeal to consider all questions and to place the registrant in the lowest classification justified by the evidence and information contained in his record. Occupational deferments in class II–A or II–B are not as low in classification as the dependency deferment in class III–A. For this reason, the board of appeal acted in direct conformity with the selective service regulations when it placed this registrant in class III–A, as the lowest deferment status justified by the record.

Accordingly, as the record now indicates, the registrant is deferred and is free to carry on his occupation and maintain those who are dependent upon him. In our view this deferment should be entirely satisfactory to the registrant, and we believe that there is no good reason why he should pursue any further his objection to such a classification. In the event that subsequently his classification may be changed, by reason of a change in circumstances, from class III–A, then full consideration would be given to any other grounds upon which a claimed deferment would be found to exist.

We trust that the information contained in this correspondence is found satisfactory to your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS B. HERSHEY,
Deputy Director,
Selective Service System.

justifies taking more than one wife.[2] Suppose some of those people come over here, as they do, become citizens, bring all their wives with them—two or three of them. Most States, if not all, have a law against bigamy. Are we to say to these fine people whom we ask over here and who have, as I said, two or three wives—are we to make them discard all the wives but one? Is the first or last wife to be discarded? And what about the children? And if we do, are we going to put those excess wives on relief? What are we to do with them?

There is another angle to this civil rights bill. It does not protect a man if he comes from abroad and has extra or surplus wives. Mr. Speaker, what is he to do? He may have trouble because we have a law, in Michigan at least, that says that a man who does not support his wife, having sufficient ability so to do, is a disorderly person, and in Michigan, may be sent to jail.

Mr. Speaker, there is another angle to this civil rights legislation which will be discussed later when time is available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

LT. GEN. ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, 1961, a most interesting article written by Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott appeared in the Philadelphia News. The article mentions that the President of the United States is considering one of three distinguished soldiers for his personal Chief of Staff. These three are Gens. Maxwell Taylor, James Gavin, and Arthur G. Trudeau. The first two have been given important assignments by the President. I am most pleased to hear that the President is considering Lieutenant General Trudeau, the present brilliant Chief of Army Research and Development, and formerly Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, for a position of even greater responsibility. I have known General Trudeau for many years and he is truly a great patriot, soldier, and statesman. An example of this man's versatility is his knowledge and understanding of the problems of the Latin American area. He is not only admired and respected by numerous Latin American officials, but his soldier-pioneer proposals might be the salvation of the Latin American economic dilemma and the solution to many of the problems confronting our southern neighbors.

I consider the May 26, 1961, article in the Philadelphia News of such importance that I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

J. F. K. PLANS TO CHOOSE PERSONAL CHIEF OF STAFF

(By Robert S. Allen and Paul Scott)

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy has decided to add a personal Chief of Staff to his White House assistants. Three noted military leaders are under consideration.

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, famed battle commander and former Army Chief of Staff whom the President recently recalled from retirement to direct a sweeping study of the Central Intelligence Agency as a result of the Cuban invasion fiasco.

Gen. James Gavin, another renowned combat commander, who quit as head of Army research and development because of disapproval of Eisenhower policies. Gavin, now Ambassador to France, will accompany the President on his visit to President de Gaulle.

Lt. Gen. Arthur Trudeau, who succeeded Gavin as chief of Army research and development and is highly regarded by the President.

In discussing this innovation with congressional and other friends, the President stressed his increasing need of "a qualified military man to whom I can turn for yes or no answers."

He emphasized it is not his intention to discard or in any way relegate the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"They have their statutory functions," the President explained, "but frequently that isn't much help to me in reaching a prompt decision. I have found that when I submit a matter to the Joint Chiefs, I frequently get four different answers, one from each chief. Also, there are too many 'maybes' and 'yes buts' in their recommendations. That's what happened on the Cuban operation."

The President has an official legal opinion that he can appoint either an active-duty or retired officer as his personal Chief of Staff.

Three military aids already are members of the White House staff. But they serve in liaison capacities and are not consulted on policy matters. That would be the primary function of a personal Chief of Staff.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed to hear my distinguished colleague speak so eloquently and so favorably of General Trudeau. I think he is one of the Nation's finest soldiers, a man who has contributed greatly to the Nation. I would be pleased indeed to see him honored as my distinguished friend has suggested.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the observation of the gentleman, in which I wholeheartedly concur.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 67, I was necessarily absent on official business. Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on the bill H.R. 7371, the appropriation bill for the Departments of State and Justice.

Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 65, I was necessarily absent on official business. Had I been present I would have voted against the motion to recommit the bill, H.R. 1986, the Railway Express legislation.

WAGMIGHT CONTROVERSY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I have noted a number of comments and some controversy about the status of Wagmight. These have been prompted by congressional and other inquiries directed to representatives of the Department of Defense. It does not appear a thorough discussion of the facts in this matter has been brought to the attention of the public, and I take this opportunity to attempt to clarify misconceptions which apparently exist.

It might be noted here that insofar as I can determine the Wagmight controversy was first revealed in the hearings in the spring of 1960 before the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee. There had been earlier publicity about Wagmight, but at these hearings it was revealed that proponents of the Wagmight advanced a set of views which were directly contrary to the official views of the Navy. The Navy's viewpoint was expressed principally by Vice Adm. J. T. Hayward, the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations. Admiral Hayward, I would like to add, is an officer of very great experience and recognized integrity and one in whom I have implicit confidence.

For the record, let it be said that the Wagmight concept is based upon the use of inflatable foldable aircraft for military missions. Several years ago, the Office of Naval Research initiated an inflatable aircraft project. A small number of these aircraft were built, all by the Goodyear Aircraft Corp. They were low-performance aircraft. They were

[2] John Gaines Vaughan, "Religion, a Comparative Study," 1919, pages 358–359, "A Brief Comparison, Polygamy." A brief comparison of polygamy:

Mohammedanism: Encourages and teaches polygamy. Mohammed himself practiced it.

Brahmanism: Polygamy common among Brahmans.

Buddhism: Those who are financially able may have plural wives or concubines.

Confucianism: Polygamy is taken as a matter of course, for every mother is expected to give birth to a son. "Every mother who bears no son is a slave, while a mother with grownup sons is a monarch."

Egyptian religion: No record is found of any signs of polygamy. Concubinage may have been permitted.

Parseeism: Monogamy is the rule, though some of the wealthy are polygamists. Parsee family relations on the whole seem to be quite happy.

Shintoism: Christianity has disestablished concubinage. Polygamy is now illegal in Japan.

Taoism: Priests are allowed to marry. Polygamy is governed by personal tastes. There are no rules or restrictions.

Teutonic religion: Largely practiced by wealthier Teutons. Plural wives were obtained by purchase or capture.

Mormonism: Originally Mormonism forbade polygamy, but Joseph Smith, Jr., had a "revelation" granting permission to have plural wives. Men were encouraged to have several wives. Polygamy was done away with in 1893, in order that Utah might be admitted to the Union.

Theosophy: There seems to be no evidence of polygamy. Such as may have been practiced, if any, has been secret.

tested, and following two in-flight wing failures resulted in total loss of the aircraft, one of which killed the pilot, further flight testing was stopped. Modifications were made, and minor work continues, on an objective basis. Wagmight proponents claim that improved fabrics and other techniques would provide high performance aircraft, suitable for military missions.

A recent press release reported endeavors to renew interest in the Wagmight concept. It contained a statement that the Wagmight concept has been suppressed. This is not the case. The truth of the matter is that work on low-performance inflatable aircraft of various types continues. These include several evaluations of various Wagmight proposals for high-performance aircraft, including VTOL aircraft.

In order to fully clarify this matter, understanding of a number of points is necessary. I shall enumerate some of them.

The feasibility of inflatable aircraft concept was established through the development of about 10 very low-speed aircraft—60–70 knots—for possible observation or rescue operations under a contract with the Goodyear Aircraft Corp. jointly sponsored by the Office of Naval Research and the Army. The initial development of the aircraft was funded beginning in 1956. It is felt that if an attempt were made to extrapolate a militarily useful vehicle in the high-speed range, one could be sure that many difficulties and problems would be encountered that would be both time consuming and costly.

The view that Wagmight would be a time-consuming and costly project is based upon extensive experience in the development of new and advanced weapons systems. While the system, as proposed, has been represented as simple and inexpensive, the development of a fully operational combat vehicle would obviously entail all of the usual development costs attributable to components and component systems and installations, powerplant, electronics, equipage, and flight tests, as in any other new aircraft plus those unique to the inflatable concept. The claimed savings, if any, would have to be realized in the airframe structure alone, that is, in the basic shell of the airplane not including such items as landing gear, cockpit, cockpit enclosure, controls, and so forth. The cost of that portion of an airplane in which metal could conceivably be replaced by inflatable fabric is not a large fraction of the total cost of its development. Furthermore, it appears that there are so many engineering unknowns in such a development that it could take longer and cost more than conventional structures. Success is not expected in folding the many components, electronics, instruments, and various interconnections needed in military aircraft.

During the fiscal year 1962 budgetary reviews, no military service requested research and development funding for Wagmight or for any high-performance inflatable aircraft.

The most recent proposed adaptation of the Wagmight concept is a V/STOL—vertical/short takeoff and landing—aircraft. The proponents of Wagmight were made aware of, and were given the opportunity to participate in, the triservice VTOL transport aircraft competition. By this means it could compete with the other designs submitted against a common performance requirement, to be evaluated by the Army, Navy, and Air Force for selection. A contractor known to have been associated with the Wagmight concept advised the Bureau of Naval Weapons that no proposal would be submitted by the contractor. No proposals were received by the Bureau of Naval Weapons that utilized the inflatable fabric principle.

During recent exhaustive discussions between the Department of Defense and the services regarding development of tactical aircraft for missions requiring high performance, there were no proposals made in support of Wagmight or inflatable aircraft, even though the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Department of Defense research and engineering representatives were aware of the Wagmight concept.

The Navy has repeatedly and carefully evaluated and reevaluated various Wagmight proposals. These patient and objective reviews are a credit to the Navy and to the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Hayward. These reviews have all indicated that an aircraft employing the Wagmight techniques would not have sufficient military value to provide an effective weapons system. Further, the concept of an inflatable airframe would not lend itself to application in high-performance aircraft carrying essential military equipment, and the proposed operational advantages are not technically realizable. The proposal for a Wagmight V/STOL aircraft represents an inferior mechanical and aerodynamic solution to V/STOL problems.

Recently the Secretary of the Navy and senior cognizant naval officials examined a letter advancing the Wagmight V/STOL concept in the light of the views of the Navy's technical experts on this matter. Despite previous findings, it is my understanding that the Navy will again reexamine the Wagmight V/STOL concept, on the basis of all available information on the feasibility and practicability of the Wagmight V/STOL.

It appears to me that the basic issues of this matter may be considered to involve the integrity and the technical competence of the individuals concerned. I am confident that there is no question regarding this with regard to those responsible naval officials who have been associated with this matter. In particular, I stand by Admiral Hayward. His services to the Navy and the Nation have been outstanding in every particular. I am confident that he and his military and civilian advisers have given fair and objective consideration to and will properly deal with this matter and that their decisions have been and will be in the best interest of the United States. I am convinced this is not a project which carrier admirals are seeking to destroy. Its weaknesses are objected to by the rank and file of Navy personnel, the people who would fly and maintain the craft.

For further clarification of the record, I submit copies of correspondence on the Wagmight from responsible and high-ranking officials in the Government and I submit a news release by the Secretary of the Navy on the subject.

FEBRUARY 8, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I regret we are unable to supply you with a cost estimate for a thorough research and development program for Wagmight. Information available to this office regarding the inflatable-aircraft concept has indicated that most of the investigations have been directed toward a feasibility study of such a vehicle and do not include detailed cost estimates.

The comment in my letter of January 7 to you that Wagmight would be a time consuming and costly project is based upon our extensive experience in the development of new and advanced weapons systems. While the system as proposed has been represented as simple and inexpensive, the development of a fully operational combat vehicle would obviously entail all of the usual development costs attributable to components and component systems and installations, powerplant, electronics, equipage, and flight tests, as in any other new aircraft, plus those unique to the inflatable concept. The claimed savings, if any, would have to be realized in the airframe structure alone, that is, in the basic shell of the airplane not including such items as landing gear, cockpit, cockpit enclosure, controls, etc. The cost of that portion of an airplane in which metal could conceivably be replaced by inflatable fabric is not a large fraction of the total cost of its development. Furthermore, it appears that there are so many engineering unknowns in such a development (for example, in making seams of predictable strength, a problem that has already given trouble in a much simpler application) that it would probably take longer and cost more than conventional structures.

An analysis of the Wagmight proposal was made by the Research Division of the Bureau of Aeronautics who concluded that the project did not offer sufficient merit to recommend an all-out funding program to develop a weapons system. No report of the analysis was prepared.

If I can be of further assistance to you regarding our participation in this project please feel free to call on me.

Sincerely,

HERBERT F. YORK.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE,
RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., April 20, 1961.

Mr. PAUL L. SCHMITZ.

DEAR MR. SCHMITZ: Your telegram of March 21, 1961, to the President regarding Project Wagmight has been referred to this office.

On behalf of the Department of Defense, the Bureau of Naval Weapons is administering a design competition for a triservice VTOL transport aircraft operational prototype. This competition had a closing date of April 3, 1961. As a prelude, a large number of companies were asked whether they wished to be included on the invitation to bid list.

The proponents of Wagmight were made aware of, and thus were given an opportunity to participate in, this competition. A contractor in Akron, Ohio, who has been associated with the Wagmight concept, received

this inquiry and declined to submit a proposal. Of the large number of proposals received, none utilized the inflatable fabric principle.

The Wagmight concept for a military aircraft, in every case so far wherein it has been evaluated on a purely technical and impartial basis, has proved unable to demonstrate superiority over other programs of lesser risk and greater promise. I must, therefore, reiterate that no further action is warranted.

Sincerely,

T. C. MUSE,
Director of Aeronautics.

STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY REGARDING PROPOSALS FOR AN INFLATABLE AIRCRAFT CONCEPT BY CAPT. COOPER BRIGHT, U.S. NAVY

Since assuming office, I have encouraged the development and submission of new ideas.

The idea of an inflatable aircraft frame is not new. Many proposals have been reviewed over the years. The low performance, so-called inflatoplane project, begun in 1957 actually reached the flight test stage with 10 vehicles ordered from the Goodyear Corp. Two of them were lost in crashes—one fatal to the test pilot.

The so-called Wagmight idea is similar, but was conceived later and separately. Despite repeated reviews of the project, it has not been adopted or pursued because the Navy's top scientific and engineering experts found the proposals to be impractical in the light of the state of the art in inflatable structures.

The latest revival of the theory is occasioned by the reorientation of the Wagmight concept to the current vertical takeoff and landing vehicle studies being conducted by the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

I have diretced Capt. Cooper Bright to provide the Bureau of Weapons with his complete V/STOL concept, including all supporting data available to him. The concept will be given a full and unbiased consideration, along with the other V/STOL proposals submitted by industry.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, Dr. James H. Wakelin, will monitor the program. Should the facts warrant, additional counsel and advice of appropriate industries will be sought.

Captain Bright's transfer to duty in San Francisco is a normal rotation of duty, since he has completed over 3 years of service here in Washington. It has no connection with his current activities in reviving the Wagmight proposal as a V/STOL vehicle.

However, his departure from Washington may be deferred as necessary to allow him to provide his supporting V/STOL data to the Bureau of Naval Weapons.

Some reports have stated that Captain Bright had been ordered to destroy his plans. Captain Bright prepared a brochure and had this printed at Government expense for the apparent purpose of promoting his idea outside the Navy. His superiors very properly ordered him to dispose of the copies he had not already distributed, and instructed him to cease using the Government printing facilities to support his private ideas.

After personally going into the matter, it is my opinion that this basic theory—far from being stifled—has received as much attention in the last 3 years as any unadopted concept.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to Mr. CAHILL (at the request of Mr. ARENDS) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. CLEM MILLER, for 60 minutes, on Monday and 60 minutes on Tuesday of next week.

Mr. SIKES, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. PILLION, for 90 minutes on Monday, June 12, and 90 minutes on Tuesday, June 13.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. DOYLE in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. REECE and to include some excerpts from a speech made by Senator KEFAUVER, at Memorial Day ceremonies held on May 28.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska.

Mr. ALFORD and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PHILBIN in two instances.

Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. ALGER.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. CURTIS of Missouri) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. KEARNS in two instances.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH.

Mr. SAYLOR.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. WRIGHT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. O'NEILL.

Mr. ROBERTS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1720. An act to continue the authority of the President under title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to utilize surplus agricultural commodities to assist needy peoples and to promote economic development in underdeveloped areas of the world; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office; and

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 6, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

977. A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report concerning agreements concluded during April 1961 under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) as amended, pursuant to Public Law 85–128; to the Committee on Agriculture.

978. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), relative to the proposed transfer by the Department of the Navy patrol craft YP–583 to the North Carolina Tuberculosis Association, Inc. of Raleigh, N.C., pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 7308; to the Committee on Armed Services.

979. A letter from the Chairman, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, transmitting the First Annual Report of the Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia for the period November 15, 1960, to May 15, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 86–531; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

980. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the general supply fund"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

981. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of selected supply activities of the U.S. Army Signal Depot, Ascom City, Korea; to the Committee on Government Operations.

982. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the fifth annual report of operations conducted by or under contract with the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries of the Department of the Interior to encourage the distribution of domestically produced fishery products, pursuant to 70 Stat. 1119; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

983. A letter from the Governor, Canal Zone Government, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to revise the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, as amended, and to enact it, as revised, into law as a new code of laws for the Canal Zone, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

984. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Refugee Relief Act of 1953; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

985. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

986. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by the subjects, pursuant to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

987. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of an order suspending the deportation of Constantinos Partheniades, A6975372, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality

Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

988. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

989. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 3579, title 10, United States Code, to provide that commissioned officers of the Medical Service Corps may exercise command outside the Army Medical Service when directed by proper authority"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 1, 1961, the following bills were reported on June 2, 1961:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7444. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7445. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 449). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[*Submitted June 3, 1961*]

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 7446. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of June 1, 1961, the following bills were introduced June 2, 1961:

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.R. 7444. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 7445. A bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred June 3, 1961*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7446. A bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 7447. A bill to amend the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act to provide for the immediate disposition of certain waterfowl feathers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7448. A bill to amend section 1362 of title 18 of the United States Code in order to provide penalties for malicious damage to certain private communication facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 7449. A bill to create a Public Works Coordinator to promote long-range planning and coordination of public works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7450. A bill to provide that private aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada or Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 7451. A bill to amend section 302 (b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

H.R. 7452. A bill to amend title II of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 so as to provide that certain members of the uniformed services shall not be entitled to receive any pay or allowances from the United States after engaging in any activity or conduct, while a prisoner of war, which results in the giving of aid or comfort to an enemy of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7453. A bill to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain officers and employees of the Federal Government retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 7454. A bill consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7455. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 7456. A bill to promote the conservation of migratory waterfowl by the acquisition of wetlands and other essential waterfowl habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7457. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7458. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and certain supplementary and related acts with respect to the requirement of an oath for certain reports, applications, and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 7459. A bill to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain changes in such laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7460. A bill to grant the consent of Congress to an amendment to the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 7461. A bill to amend sections 210, 4103, and 4107 of title 38, United States Code, to provide increased compensation for medical personnel of the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 7462. A bill to curb monopolistic control of professional boxing, to establish within the Department of Justice the Office of the National Boxing Commissioner, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H.R. 7463. A bill to provide for the issuance of a postage stamp in honor of the life and contributions of Henry Ford; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7464. A bill relating to the occupational training, development, and use of the manpower resources of the Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7465. A bill to provide that owners of surface rights to certain real property, the subsurface mineral rights of which are owned by the United States, shall have the right to purchase such mineral rights; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 7466. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the southern interstate nuclear compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 7467. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the Battle of Pea Ridge; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 7468. A bill to revise the Canal Zone Code, approved June 19, 1934, as amended, and to enact it, as revised, into law as a new code of laws for the Canal Zone, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the retirement of and additional benefits for reservists with 20 or more years of satisfactory service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation which will provide Federal aid to public education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to extend the northern terminus of the proposed interstate highway from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7469. A bill for the relief of Daniel Walter Miles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAVIN:

H.R. 7470. A bill for the relief of Willard Edwin Kramer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 7471. A bill for the relief of Richard I. Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 7472. A bill for the relief of Sum Chun Kuai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7473. A bill for the relief of Albert R. Serpa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALLHAUSER:

H.R. 7474. A bill for the relief of Helmut Scholz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

161. By Mr. KING of Utah: Petition of the city council and mayor of Fillmore City, Utah, concerning building of transmission lines for marketing of Flaming Gorge and Glen Canyon Dams in Upper Colorado River storage project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

162. Also, petition of the Upper Colorado River Commission at its adjourned regular meeting held in Denver on May 11, 1961, unanimously endorsing the San Juan-Chama and Navajo Indian irrigation projects in the States of Colorado and New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

163. By the SPEAKER: Petition of J. B. Bassett and others, Santa Clara, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the control of obscene literature, and requesting passage of the bills H.R. 1826 and S. 162; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

164. Also, petition of C. C. Robinson and others, Texas City, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to requesting the withholding of Federal funds for education from those States which refuse to desegregate their public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

165. Also, petition of Harold Elsten, Cortland, N.Y., relative to a grievance relating to *Elsten* v. *U.S. and FCC;* to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Department of the Interior Shoots From the Hip When It Declares It Cannot Afford To Present the National Symphony Orchestra at the Carter Barron Amphitheater Which Was Given to the Nation's Capital by the People of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is always instructive to us old hands in the Congress to have replies shot from the hip at us by minor officials in Federal departments and agencies which hit the front pages of the newspapers even before we get an official answer to our letters to the heads of those Federal departments and agencies.

Such was the case this morning when the Washington (D.C.) Post published a reply of a kind by T. Sutton Jett, Superintendent of the National Capital Parks, to a letter I wrote to the Secretary of the Interior on June 1. I have not yet had a reply from the Secretary of the Interior, although I continue to hope that he will answer my letter himself instead of having a minor official reply to it in this manner.

It may be that the Secretary of the Interior is too busy with his hikes up the historic canal on the outskirts of the Nation's Capital to answer his own mail.

But it does seem extremely interesting to me to learn that the Department of the Interior cannot afford to present the National Symphony Orchestra at the Carter Barron Amphitheater.

Puerto Rico can afford the Pablo Casals Festival, but the richest Nation in the world cannot afford to present the National Symphony Orchestra of the Nation's Capital in the Nation's Capital.

The Nation's Capital spends $16,000 a year on art, probably the smallest sum spent by any city in the United States.

The present sum of $16,000 for the arts will not be raised unless the Congress, which is in charge of the purse strings regarding local appropriations of the city of Washington, raises it.

The Department of the Interior, and the District of Columbia Recreation Department—both of which have been directed to carry on cultural and artistic programs in the Nation's Capital—have a responsibility to ask the Congress to appropriate the necessary funds out of local tax revenues and to match that amount with appropriated funds, since the Federal Government is by far the largest employer in the Nation's Capital.

The Federal Government cannot continue any longer to occupy its present anomalous position which, by its control of the purse strings in the Nation's Capital, denies to the people of the Nation's Capital the right to appropriate their own tax funds for the support of cultural activities; and by its control of the Carter Barron Amphitheater denies its use for the National Symphony Orchestra and other local nonprofit cultural groups.

I include as part of my remarks a second letter which I have addressed to the Secretary of the Interior in the hope that I will receive a reply from him and not from a member of his staff.

I also include a study by the Library of Congress of municipal support for the arts in the United States:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., June 5, 1961.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: It is always instructive to us old hands in the Congress to have replies shot from the hip at us by minor officials in Federal departments and agencies which hit the front pages of the newspapers whenever we write to the heads of those agencies; and even before we get an official answer.

I wrote to you on June 1 pointing out, among other things, that Puerto Rico, in the Pablo Casals Festival, had a much higher cultural content to that program than the Capital City of the richest Nation in the world had in the Carter Barron Amphitheater program run by the Department of the Interior. So far, I have had no reply to my letter.

You are advised that my letter was hand delivered to your office on May 31. This morning I have had a reply of a kind to my complaint that the Department of the Interior has no place in its Carter Barron Amphitheater programs for the National Symphony Orchestra and other nonprofit cultural groups of the Nation's Capital. The National Symphony Orchestra is the only major symphony orchestra in the United States without a summer season.

In a front-page article in the Washington Post of June 5, 1961, we find the following information: "We would love to have them there," T. Sutton Jett, Superintendent of the National Capital Parks charged with administration of the amphitheater said, referring to the National Symphony, "but we can't afford them."

A study made by the Library of Congress in 1959 and inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by both Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY and Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., showed that the Nation's Capital spends annually on the arts the fantastic sum of $16,000. This is the lowest amount of any city in the United States except Hagerstown, Md., which spends $12,500 on the fine arts, according to the study.

In the 86th Congress bills were introduced by Senator HUMPHREY, Senator MORSE, Representatives HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., and Representtaive FRANK THOMPSON, JR., setting aside 1 mill, or one-thousandth of a dollar, out of local taxes for cultural programs. It was estimated at the time that this would raise $185,000 at a minimum for cultural programs.

This year, Senator CLARK, of Pennsylvania, Congressman FRANK THOMPSON, Congressman POWELL, of New York, Congressman CHELF, of Kentucky, and Congressman CELLER, of New York have introduced legislation providing a Federal-State grant-in-aid program to help the fine arts. I have cosponsored this legislation and I am happy to advise you that $100,000 would be provided annually for the District of Columbia art programs including those at the Carter Barron Amphitheater.

However, since the Department of the Interior has the largest cultural facility in the Nation's Capital in its charge, it should have come to the Congress for the funds necessary to properly present the National Symphony Orchestra and other nonprofit cultural programs such as the Washington Civic Opera Company, the Children's Theater of Washington, the Washington Ballet Company, and other groups at the Carter Barron Amphitheater.

The present appropriation of $16,000 for the fine arts won't be raised unless the Congress, which is in charge of the purse strings regarding local appropriations of the city of Washington, raises it. It won't raise it to anywhere the sums spent on the arts by other cities until you, Mr. Secretary, and others, including the District of Columbia Recreation Department, which is charged by the Congress with carrying on cultural programs in the Nation's Capital together with the Department of the Interior, seriously get down to the business of developing the kind

of cultural program which the Congress authorized in the Carter Barron Amphitheater Act, and the act establishing the District of Columbia Recreation Department.

It was with this in mind, Mr. Secretary, that I suggested in my letter that a special advisory committee made up of educational, cultural, and fine arts experts and leaders should be set up to make a study of how the Carter Barron Amphitheater could be made a major cultural force. I said that the Department of the Interior's stewardship of the Carter Barron Amphitheater as a cultural facility over the years should be subjected to a critical and searching analysis and no attempt to justify sins of omission or commission should be permitted. Nor should any bureaucratic whitewash be attempted.

In view of the evident feeling at the Department of the Interior that the richest nation in the world can't afford a worthy cultural program in the Carter Barron Amphitheater which was the gift of the people of this Nation to the Nation's Capital for such program, the special advisory committee should undertake a study of how such programs are financed in other major cities of the United States and Europe.

The Federal Government cannot continue any longer to occupy its present anomalous position which, by its control of the purse strings, denies to the people of Washington, D.C., the right to appropriate their own tax funds for the support of cultural activities, and by its control of the major summer cultural facility denies its use for the National Symphony Orchestra, the Washington Ballet Co., the Washington Civic Opera, the Children's Theater, and other local cultural groups.

You must know, Mr. Secretary, that the Water Gate is no longer suitable for cultural programs due to the fact that at least one great 4-engine airplane flies immediately overhead every minute as the landing field at the National Airport is approached.

The Federal Government shows not the slightest concern for this situation, and has consistently supported the airplanes over culture. Having made the Water Gate unsuitable by the airflight landing patterns, it now says that it cannot afford to use the Carter Barron Amphitheater for major cultural programs.

If this situation doesn't cry for a broad-based inquiry then nothing does.

No doubt sick jokes and burlesque hall humor pays its way. This is the way with things in our society where educational and cultural programs are crowded out of the television programs by soap operas, westerns, and a myriad of other items which are able to find wealthy sponsors, who can write their cost off as business expenses.

As I said in my letter of June 1, which I hope you will soon find time to answer even though it might keep you from a hike up the canal in this beautiful weather, the American people want something better than is so easily available to them and their children in the Carter Barron Amphitheater and over the television stations. They want something vital, alive, and close to the American dream and the American promise. I wrote you, too, that "the sweep of history has made the United States the leader of the free world, and we must compete with the Soviet Union for the minds and the hearts of men everywhere in the world." The United States, and its National Capital "must take its place" beside other nations and other capital cities in support of cultural matters. That the Nation's Capital is behind even such a provincial capital city as Tiflis, U.S.S.R., should and must be a matter of concern to you, Mr. Secretary, just as it is to me if only because of the cold war and the competition of the Soviet Union. I shall look forward to hearing from you personally on this matter, Mr. Secretary. I enclose herewith a copy of the Library of Congress study to which I have referred.

Sincerely yours,

CARROLL D. KEARNS,
Member of Congress.

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
Akron, Ohio	$36,000	General fund (indirect support in lieu of tax for facility).	Art museum.
	$5,000,000	Direct tax construction cost	Plans for the construction of a municipal auditorium and "cultural grouping for arts, library and arena."
Atlanta, Ga	1 or 3 parts of a $100,000 recreation program	General fund (part of "recreation program")	Band concerts.
	$7,500	General fund	Atlanta Symphony Guild.
	$6,000	do	Atlanta Pops Concert.
	$5,000	do	Municipal Theater Under-the-Stars.
	$10,000	do	Atlanta Art Association for Benefit High Museum and School of Art.
Baltimore, Md	1959 appropriations:		
	$25,594	do	Municipal Museum.
	$119,994	do	Bureau of Music.
	$288,000	Endowment funds (estimated income)	Walters Art Gallery.
	$15,000	General funds (pensions)	
Birmingham, Ala	$90,000 (this year's appropriation)	General funds	Birmingham Museum of Art.
Buffalo, N.Y	Appropriated in 1958–59:		
	$73,430	Real estate tax and other current revenues	Albright Art Gallery.
	$30,000	do	Buffalo Philharmonic Orchestra Society, Inc.
	$27,300	do	Kleinhans Music Hall.
Chicago, Ill	Calendar year 1958:		
	$232,405.87	Payments from Chicago Park District, an independent municipal corporation in the city of Chicago	Art Institute of Chicago.
	$232,369.11	do	Museum of Science and Industry.
	$232,405.92	do	Chicago Natural History Museum (Field Museum).
Dallas, Tex	$80,000	General revenues, "the major part of which is ad valorem tax."	Fine Arts Museum.
Detroit, Mich	1959–60 gross appropriation, $543,081	Local taxes, grants and gifts, and revenues	Arts Commission.
Evansville, Ind	1959 contribution, $9,200	Civil City of Evansville	Evansville Museum of Arts and Sciences.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
	1959 contribution, $9,200	School City of Evansville [1]	Do.
	Proposed budget for 1960, $18,400		
Hagerstown, Md	$12,500 (provided for in annual budget)	General revenues	Washington County Museum of Fine Arts.
Houston, Tex	$19,500	do	Museum of Natural History.
	$20,000	do	Museum of Fine Arts.
	$3,000	do	Civic Theater.
	$25,000	do	Houston Symphony.
Kansas City, Mo	For fiscal year ended Apr. 30, 1959:		
	$21,211	General fund; park funds	Nelson Art Gallery (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$9,925	General fund	Philharmonic Orchestra (free rent).
	$42,830	General debt and interest fund	Starlight Theater (debt service for facility developed by park department).
	$48,231	General fund	Museum (buildings and ground maintenance).
	$33,592	do	Liberty Memorial (operation and maintenance).
Los Angeles, Calif	Appropriation for fiscal 1959–60: $196,908	General revenues	Department of municipal art; bureau of music.
Newark, N.J	1959 appropriation: $525,426	Tax and general revenues	Newark Museum.
New Orleans, La	$40,000 annually	Appropriated by city	Delgado Museum of Art.
	Appropriated "this year":		
	$5,000	do	New Orleans Philharmonic Society.
	$2,500	do	New Orleans Opera House Association.
	$875	do	Crescent City Concerts.
New York, N.Y	$944,525 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Metropolitan Museum of Art.
	$904,989 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.
	$1,329,559 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	American Museum of Natural History.
	$1,071,985 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
	$125,140 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Children's Museum.
	$95,866 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	do	Brooklyn Institute of Brooklyn Academy of Music.
	$69,510 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	Do.

See footnotes at end of table.

Municipal financial support of certain artistic and cultural activities in selected U.S. cities, a compilation of answers to a questionnaire—Continued

City	Amount of municipal financial support	Source of municipal financial support	Type of activity supported
New York, N.Y.	$127,000 (operating budget, July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960).	Tax levy and general fund revenues	Museum of the City of New York.
	$50,250 (capital budget, Jan. 1, 1959, to Dec. 31, 1959).	Capital allocations	
Norfolk, Va.	$2,000	General revenue	Norfolk Symphony Orchestra.
	$69,083	do	Norfolk Museum of Arts and Sciences.
Oakland, Calif.	1958–59: Salaries for a professional staff of 6 plus $2,000 allowance for books and $500 for pictures.	Annual appropriations by city council to library department from which library and museums commission adopts an operating budget.	Art and pictures department of main library.
	$70,377	do	Oakland Public Museum.
	$57,212	do	Art Museum.
	$31,577	do	Snow Museum.
Philadelphia, Pa.	$25,000	General revenues	Academy of Fine Arts.
	$75,000	do	Robin Hood Dell.
	$25,000	do	Philadelphia Grand Opera.
	$624,760	do	Philadelphia Art Museum and Rodin Museum.
	$30,000	do	Johnson paintings.
	$10,000	do	Philadelphia Art Festival (every 2 years).
Pittsburgh, Pa.	$35,000 (1959)	General revenues (through specific appropriations each year).	Pittsburgh Symphony.
	$20,000 to $30,000 (annually)	do	Free summer band concerts.
	$25,000 (approximate cost to city annually).	do	Arts and Crafts Center.
Providence, R.I.	Current appropriations: $24,877	General revenue	Museum in Roger Williams Park.
	$1,500	do	Band concerts.
Reading, Pa.	$140,000 (approximate expenditures for 1959).	General revenues (budgeted annually according to estimated needs).	Recreation Bureau (sponsors orchestra, Nature Museum, etc.).
	$3,028 (1959)	do	Bureau of parks weekly band concerts.
Richmond, Va.	$5,000	Direct appropriation	Valentine Museum.
Rochester, N.Y.	1959–60 expenditures: $10,000	General revenues or real estate taxes	Civil Music Association.
	$20,000	do	"Opera Under the Stars."
	Not indicated	Not indicated	Museum.
Sacramento, Calif.	1959–60 budget amounts: $4,500	General ad valorem taxes	Philharmonic Orchestra.
	$4,000	do	Park band concerts.
	$66,866	do	Crocker Art Gallery (city-owned).
	$17,000	do	Children's art and dancing classes (city recreation department).
St. Louis, Mo.	1958 Revenue: $320,007.53	Permanent levy of $0.02 per $100 valuation on all real and personal property (established under State law in 1907).	St. Louis Art Museum.
St. Paul, Minn.	1959 city budget appropriations: $13,500	Appropriations "financed as part of the overall city budget."	St. Paul Gallery and School of Art.
	$10,000	do	St. Paul Civic Opera.
San Antonio, Tex.	$81,000 (approximate budget for ensuing year).	Supported primarily by general fund	Witte Museum.
	$81,000	do	2 municipal auditoriums.
	$1,500	do	San Pedro Playhouse (auditorium devoted primarily to theatrical productions).
San Diego, Calif.	1959–60 city budget: $57,159	General revenues	Fine Arts Gallery.
	$19,289	do	Serra Museum (local history).
	$48,715	do	Natural History Museum.
	$45,949	do	Museum of Man (anthropology).
	$10,000	do	San Diego Symphony.
San Francisco, Calif.	1958–59 budget: $158,365 (taxes, $120,665; other, $37,700)	Budget of the city and county of San Francisco	Art commission.
	$35,493 (taxes)	do	War Memorial Art Museum.
	$255,456 (taxes, $254,856; other, $600)	do	California Palace of the Legion of Honor (art museum).
	$367,942 (taxes, $367,692; $250)	do	De Young (art) Museum.
Scranton, Pa.	An average of about $28,740 per annum over the past 10 years.	General funds	Everhart Museum.
Seattle, Wash.	$233.37	City's annual budget funds without regard to income source.	Art commission.
	$34,097.55	do	Art museum.
	$18,000	do	Public music.
	$62,743.57	do	Art division of the library department.
Springfield, Mass.[2]	$33,127.93	General tax revenues	Museum of Natural History.
	$31,092.45	do	George Walter Vincent Smith Museum.
	$18,161.40	do	William Pynchon Memorial (Connecticut Valley Historical Museum).
	$1,267	do	Springfield Museum of Fine Arts.
	Not indicated	do	Fine arts department of library.
Syracuse, N.Y.	$25,000 appropriation annually	General tax levy	Syracuse Museum of Fine Arts (privately chartered institution).

[1] City budget for 1960 based on 1 cent per $100 valuation of the city. Funds provided by taxes earmarked for this specific purpose.

[2] Included in the library budget is the position of musical adviser, which is the way in which the city contributes to the salary of the conductor of the Springfield Symphony Orchestra.

Source: Compiled by Anne M. Finnegan and Helen A. Miller, Education and Public Welfare Division, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, July 29, 1959.

Bar Mitzvah Year, State of Israel Celebration at Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of my remarks at the celebration of the bar mitzvah year of the State of Israel, sponsored by the Greater Lawrence Zionist District, Jewish Community Center, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, June 4, 1961. President Abraham Rappaport presided at this well-attended and interesting meeting in which several of the speakers cited the progressive accomplishments of the State of Israel in the past 13 years.

The State of Israel has grown up.

On May 14, 1961, its people celebrated the 13th anniversary of their independence day.

This is the happy bar mitzvah year when the young nation crosses the threshhold to adulthood. The comparison between the life of reborn Israel, and the life of every Jewish boy, is a testament to hope and responsibility. In Jewish families, when a boy reaches the age of 13, he passes through the sacred ceremonies of bar mitzvah to be recognized as a man in Jewish religious life. In the Jewish State of Israel, its 13th year is hailed as the transition from the struggles and tragedies of the early years when it was fighting for its life to a future of proud strength and development that it enters in 1961.

We, in the United States are proud of the brave little democracy on the shores of the Mediterranean, because in so many ways it

has followed our own example. Inspired by the goals of a free society, and with the pioneering spirit to overcome every hardship and challenge, Israel has won the admiration of the world.

By tremendous work and faith, it has become the showcase of democracy in the Middle East, and has become the beacon of hope to millions throughout that area and in nearby Africa who see what a free and independent people can accomplish when they have the opportunity to prove their worth.

Its population has expanded from 790,000 in 1948 to 2,150,000 in January 1961.

This dynamic republic has become virtually self-supporting as regards her food requirements. Industry is booming. Israel produces phosphates and minerals, cement, paper, automobiles, glass, electrical equipment, fruit juices, and canned foods. Prominent among her exports are citrus fruits, cut diamonds, textiles, chocolates and sweets, wines, and pharmaceutical products.

Over 100,000 tourists and pilgrims visit Israel during the year to pray at the shrines of their spiritual heritage and to witness the exciting progress of the present.

Most Israelis speak two or three languages.

There is encouragement and respect for excellence in every field. Science and the arts flourish. Everywhere you go, among Jews, Christians, and Mohammedans, you find people working together in human dignity and harmony.

It was on December 29, 1958, that the Committee for Interfaith Understanding in Israel and the World was created in Jerusalem, the capital city of Israel, and the spiritual and cultural center of Jewish people the world over. That understanding is the illuminating truth that all peoples in time must learn to practice and cherish.

At this bar mitzvah we do not say that there are no serious problems and difficulties in the future of Israel.

But we do say that in the spirit of young David who accomplished the impossible by overcoming the giant Goliath; that the reborn State of Israel has much to teach this Old World.

The Jewish people of the United States, by their great and generous encouragement, spiritual as well as financial, have helped to provide for and raise the fledgling State of Israel to manhood.

Members of the Greater Lawrence Zionist district share in this accomplishment.

By your contributions to the growth of Israel you serve the cause of human freedom.

Confederate Memorial Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DALE ALFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest honors I have had in my capacity as a Representative in this distinguished body was to be invited to give the annual Confederate Memorial Address at the Confederate Monument in Arlington Cemetery on yesterday afternoon, June 4, 1961. The Confederate memorial services are sponsored annually by the Confederate Memorial Committee of the District of Columbia in cooperation with the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Sons of Confederate Veterans. The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF THE HONORABLE DALE ALFORD, CONFEDERATE MEMORIAL SERVICES, ARLINGTON NATIONAL CEMETERY, JUNE 4, 1961

It is a happy and proud occasion to be here with you today and witness this impressive ceremony, this Confederate memorial service and this rededication of a handsome monument to the memory of so many of our fallen heroes.

Just a few days ago, much of the Nation celebrated another Memorial Day but one lacking in the tradition and solemnity of this occasion. Instead, in an escape from its original concept, Memorial Day, itself, has become an occasion of sports events, outings, trips to the beaches, and slaughter on the highways.

This occasion we participate in here today is more in keeping with the objectives of a tiny group in Columbus, Ga., headed by Miss Lizzie Rutherford, who in 1866 banded together for the purpose of caring for the graves of the Confederate dead.

The date they chose was April 26, the anniversary of the surrender of the last Confederate leader of a major force to lay down his arms, Gen. Joseph E. Johnston.

Meanwhile, in another town that happened, coincidentally, to be named Columbus, similar plans were going forward. Sometime in the spring of 1866, a group of ladies in Columbus, Miss., determined to make the decoration of soldiers' graves an annual occurrence, and selected April 25 as the date. On that day a procession was held, the ladies bearing flowers to the cemetery and the ceremony included a memorial address and a prayer, as well as the decorating of the graves.

Thus it was in Dixie that any idea of any sort of a memorial for the fallen soldiers of the Civil War was given birth. And I am proud, as a loyal son of Dixie, to gather here with you other sons and daughters of the South, on this memorable occasion.

And I want to commend you especially for having the desire and the drive to keep your ceremony alive and active.

There is a very great need in this Nation today for organizations dedicated to patriotic ideals. I know there are times when many of us become a bit discouraged about the world in which we live and toil. We become puzzled, perplexed, and ofttimes bewildered by all the pressures, all the tensions of the times.

But then we are sustained, and we take new heart with each day's sunrise, because we have so many companions with us all along the way; folks with whom we can dip the cup of memory into the spring of our sacred heritage.

May I say to you that our patriotic organizations are so very, very important. On many occasions, I am invited to address chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy; posts and State and regional meetings of the American Legion; the Veterans of Foreign Wars; the DAV; and many other devoted patriotic groups, and I pause to salute each and every one of them and all of their members.

These and like groups are motivated not only by maintaining friendships and ideals, but also in aiding us, one and all, in living today and facing tomorrow better prepared because we know and treasure what went on yesterday.

To me, in this decade we are facing and which some may refer to as the sensational sixties, I love to recall that decade 100 years ago which so many of us look upon as the sacred sixties.

And we must take new hope from this backward turning in our thoughts. And we must take new courage.

For on all sides today, we find patriotic groups and patriotic individuals under fire. It almost seems to me that there is a conspiracy of some sort to discredit those of us who love America; those of us who love our traditions and cherish our sacred rights.

On all sides the cry goes up against the patriot. And it is only by banding together, and, yes, sticking together, in groups such as you represent today that we can as one unite and fling back the challenge to those who would tear us down.

So long as we can have such solid groups as are represented here today—just that long are we treading on solid ground.

And world conditions today dictate that we remain on solid ground. We have seen the collapse of Cuba to communism. We have seen the virtual swallowing up of Laos where we have poured so many, many millions of our hard-earned dollars, only to see them go down the drain.

Even at this moment, the President of the United States is conferring with the head of the Communist regime that has vowed to bury us.

Yes, these are troubled times.

And we have the great threat from within—the threat of Communist agents moving about this Nation as they will, safe in the knowledge that they have a certain protection afforded them by highly questionable decisions from our own Supreme Court.

Yes, because of these questionable decisons, is it not almost safer for a Communist agent, a provocator, if you please, to move about this Nation, than it is for a peaceable, law-abiding citizen to go about his daily chores?

Yes, this is just another threat, another peril, to which we all must remain constantly alert if we are to preserve and protect this beloved Nation. If we love our country; if we love our blessed freedom; if it is our burning desire to safeguard for our children and our grandchildren the same inherent, basic rights that our forefathers guaranteed to us by the toil of their hands and the sweat of their brows, we must be determined as never before to stand up and be counted in the fight that faces us all.

There is, and there can be, no middle ground.

That this danger is very real is best reflected by the comments of J. Edgar Hoover, a dedicated Communist fighter, following the riots at the hearings conducted by the House Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco, last year. Said Mr. Hoover: "They revealed how it is possible for only a few Communist agitators, using mob psychology, to turn peaceful demonstrations into riots. Their success there must serve as a warning that their infiltration efforts aimed not only at the youth and student groups, but also at our labor unions, churches, professional groups, artists, newspapers, Government, and the like, can create chaos and shatter our internal security.

"Looking at the riots and chaos Communists have created in other countries, many Americans point to the strength of our Nation and say: 'It can't happen here.' The Communist success in San Francisco in May 1960, proves that it can happen here."

Yes, there is, and there can be, no middle ground in our fight. We must resist more keenly than ever the inroads being made upon our Nation by atheistic communism.

In these all too troubled times, just as it is altogether fitting and proper that we here today do recommemorate and rededicate this monument to those noble heroes for whom it stands in silent, but splendid, tribute, I say it is also altogether fitting and proper that we rededicate ourselves to the noble spirit and noble traditions for which they perished.

It is dismaying to me at times, as I look all around, to see an apparent dearth of national pride in our Government. It is disturbing to me to see, also, an apparent weakened national spirit among high officials. And we also see at times a mighty

nation that now appears hesitant to flex its muscles.

Now I am not saying to you that this Nation of peace-loving citizens should abandon its eternal quest for peace. I am not saying that we should send our sons back into another and more horrible war. But I do not agree, and I will never agree for 1 second, that this Nation should stand idly by while it is being blackmailed.

I refer, of course, to the situation in Cuba where the enemy has entrenched itself only 90 miles from our shores. I say it is high time that this Nation faced up to this Communist threat. We have too many of their agents and sympathizers running roughshod through this country today to permit the building up of a staging area just off the coast of Florida.

I say: Implement the Monroe Doctrine. It is just as effective a weapon today as it was when first conceived more than a century ago. I say tell the Communist meddlers in the Western Hemisphere to go home and stay home. And we must say it firmly.

I, too, am saddened by the fact that some citizens of this Nation have entered into an ill-begotten plan to ransom with tractors those 1,200 prisoners of the Communist Castro regime. To me, this is beneath the dignity of our country.

To me, the idea was best expressed by an Arizona newspaper, the Arizona Republic, which said in part: "Patrick Henry once asked his fellow man, 'Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery?'" Today, 186 years later, during which time we have grown from an infant nation of unlimited courage to a mighty nation which appears suddenly to have lost her national conscience, we might ask whether life is so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of blatant blackmail? We think not.

What in heaven's name goes on here in the home of the free and the land of the brave?

Yes, it is a time for national reawakening; a time for national rededication; a time for us all to solemnly pledge that just as those noble heroes of the Confederacy died in pursuit of a cause, so must we, if it becomes necessary, be willing to give of our lives to the sacred cause of American greatness.

There can be no faltering along the way. There can be no giving halfheartedly of ourselves.

These are times that call for men, as Benjamin Hill wrote of the great Gen. Robert E. Lee, the immortal symbol of our Confederate heroes:

"When the future historian shall come to survey the character of Lee he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he must lift his eyes high toward heaven to catch its summit.

"He possessed every virtue of other great commanders without their vices. He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression; and a victim without murmuring.

"He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile.

"He was Caesar, without his ambition; Frederick, without his tyranny; Napoleon, without his selfishness; and Washington, without his reward. He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king.

"He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates; and grand in battle as Achilles."

There can be no greater goal for us all to attain this spirit of greatness; this spirit of devotion to God and country; this spirt of love of our sacred and cherished ideals.

Let us join hands and trod firmly along the way toward attaining this goal as we join in the solemn and memorable dedication service here today.

And what words could fit better this occasion than those of Virginia Frazer Boyle to another hero of the Confederacy, Gen. Nathan Bedford Forrest:

"His hoofbeats die not on fame's crimsoned sod,
But shall ring through his song and story.
He fought like a Titan and struck like a god,
And his dust is our ashes of glory."

Yes, as is written on the monument to the Confederate dead at the University of Virginia, "Fate denied them victory, but clothed them with glorious immortality."

I thank you.

Secretary Ribicoff on Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to include in the RECORD the excellent statement on educational television delivered before a subcommittee of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on May 17, 1961, by the Honorable Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is as follows:

STATEMENT BY ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WEDNESDAY, MAY 17, 1961

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you to offer this testimony relating to six bills designed to complete a nationwide system of educational television.

I am here to support the general objective of these bills.

I shall also suggest some modifications through which I believe this objective will be more quickly and efficiently achieved. The modifications would be to meet technical situations in the television field.

The bills on which I am making this statement are: H.R. 965, by Representative OREN HARRIS, of Arkansas; H.R. 132, sponsored by Representative KENNETH A. ROBERTS, of Alabama; H.R. 5099, by Representative BYRON G. ROGERS, of Colorado; H.R. 5536, by Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, JR., of Delaware; H.R. 2910, by Representative CLIFFORD G. MCINTIRE, of Maine; and H.R. 645, by Representative HALE BOGGS, of Louisiana.

The very fact that these gentleman come from geographical areas so widely scattered over the country is evidence of the general need for this legislation.

Each of these bills would authorize, for the purpose of educational television, grants to the States of a total not to exceed $1 million in any State. These grants would be used to assist public agencies and nonprofit organizations to acquire broadcasting apparatus for educational television.

H.R. 132, H.R. 5099, and H.R. 5336 include two further provisions:

1. State matching of Federal funds on a 50–50 basis.

2. State surveys of the needs for educational television and State plans for a construction program.

We recommend the inclusion of such provisions in the legislation. I do not believe that ETV stations will have enough vitality to survive unless the areas they serve show enough interest and put up at least half the funds. And I consider the most careful planning absolutely essential if the entire country is to be served by educational television.

For the surveys and plans we recommend the same amount mentioned in the three bills, an authorization of $520,000, with not more than $10,000 to be granted to any State.

For construction, we recommend the authorization of $25 million which when matched by the States would mean an investment which will average about $1 million for each State, which is included in all the bills.

The total authorization for Federal grants in the 4 years would thus be $25,520,000.

In addition, and for the technical reasons which will be developed in this testimony, we recommend—

1. That provisions be included whereby State plans may be developed cooperatively into interstate or regional plans.

2. That construction grants be made on a project-by-project and not a State-by-State basis.

Any one of the bills now before you could be modified to meet our recommendations.

THIS ADMINISTRATION FAVORS ETV

This administration strongly favors a nationwide system of educational television. No domestic challenge which faces us is more crucial than education.

Educational television could help us catch up on our schoolwork, in which, I regret to say, we are behind. It could focus sustained national attention on music, art, literature, and drama.

It could help us to make scientific progress. And educational television will advance as science advances.

Already an experiment is underway on an airborne instructional program in the Midwest. We look forward to a future in which information and instruction may be conveyed from nation to nation through installations in outer space.

President Kennedy in his education message of February 21 this year said: "Our twin goals must be a new standard of excellence in education—and the availability of such excellence to all who are willing and able to pursue it."

The achievement of those two goals could be hastened by the legislation now before you. Television is as great in its possibilities of increasing the excellence of education as the invention of printing was in its time. And no medium has ever equaled television in availability to all.

Of course, we all understand that television will never do all of our education. It will never supplant person-to-person and classroom teaching. Television is simply a powerful instrument to open up many more vistas in the lifelong educational process.

THE STATES ARE READY FOR ETV

The chairman of your full committee, Representative OREN HARRIS, recently sent an inquiry to the Governors of all the States with regard to their readiness to participate in a cooperative Federal-State matching program for the establishment of educational television plans and facilities.

The replies were turned over to our Department for analysis.

Twenty-five replies from Governors were in the affirmative. These came from Alabama, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee,

Vermont, Washington, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

Eight replies were indefinite. In these cases, the question was pending before State legislatures, or the opinion of another official was being sought, or the Governor was not yet ready to deal with the question. These replies were from Alaska, Delaware, Kansas, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, Ohio, and the District of Columbia.

Fourteen States have not yet been heard from. From other records, however, we know that six of these have one or more operating educational television stations within their borders. They are Colorado, Florida, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, and Utah. It seems reasonable to anticipate that later replies from these areas will maintain the high ratio of affirmative responses evidenced by those already in hand.

A GOOD FOUNDATION HAS BEEN LAID

Many here remember the dramatic hearings before the Federal Communications Commission in 1952 which resulted in the reservation of a block of television channels for educational television.

These hearings made possible the ETV stations now broadcasting in this country, which we now seek to add to and also to link together in networks for broadcasts important to an entire area.

The evidence presented to the FCC in 1952 was impressive indeed. It had been assembled by trained researchers who sat, hour after hour, day after day, in front of television sets in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles. The subject matter on all channels was charted and analyzed from sign-on to sign-off—so many minutes devoted to entertainment, to crime, and violence, to advertisements, to education, and culture.

Obviously educational television is needed as much now as it was in 1952, and we are encouraged by Federal Communications Commission Chairman Newton Minow's announcement that he will do all in his power to promote a nationwide educational television system.

The channels set aside for educational use in 1952 totaled 242. These have since been increased to 268, of which 90 are VHF (very high frequency) and 178 are UHF (ultra high frequency).

These are all open-circuit stations and include such important trailblazers as the community-supported stations of Boston, Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburgh, San Francisco, Minneapolis-St. Paul, and New Orleans.

The typical educational television station devotes its schoolday hours to programs for the classroom at all levels—elementary, secondary, and higher. The late afternoon is usually devoted to programs for women and children, whereas the evenings are devoted to adult education as well as cultural and educational types of programing.

Of the stations now on the air, about 40 percent are financed and controlled by universities, about 20 percent are part of a public school system, and the remaining 40 percent are sponsored by independent community agencies.

Two cities, Oklahoma City and Pittsburgh, already have started their second ETV stations. Miami and Milwaukee have applied for their second allocations.

In contrast, there are great areas still largely unserved by ETV. One of them is the vast metropolitan complex starting in New England and reaching on down to Washington, D.C., and Virginia.

In much of this area, which includes about one-fifth of the population of the United States, commercial stations had been set up to use all existing channels before the FCC set-aside for educational television was made. New York State conducts its extensive programs of in-school television over a commercial station. A study is now underway to find out if frequency allocations are available to set up a regional educational television network in this highly populated area—which, incidentally, is exceptionally rich in education resources.

All the VHF channels reserved by the FCC in areas of more than 300,000 population have now been assigned.

The task of the next 4 years will be stimulating new VHF stations in low-population areas and in making use of the UHF channels in all areas needing ETV.

Where it is in use, ultrahigh frequency television has been well accepted. Its adoption has been hampered by the fact that the manufacturers have not produced many sets capable of receiving UHF. However, it is entirely possible to produce TV sets which receive all frequencies.

The problem now being faced by this committee is to make it possible for the remaining bands to be used in such a fashion as to best serve the population which does not yet have access to educational television. It is obvious from the situation I have described that the plans and services often should be interstate or regional and that the allocations of funds should be project by project, rather than State by State.

OUR PROPOSALS

Our proposals are put into legal language in my letter to the chairman which I hereby furnish for the record.

In essence, these proposals provide for—

Surveys and program development

We recommend authorization of $520,000 to enable the Commissioner of Education to make grants to the States to cover one-half the costs of conducting surveys and developing programs for educational television. Not more than $10,000 would be granted to any State. The legislation should make clear that multistate, area, or regional planning and surveys would be encouraged. Modifications of the requirements otherwise applicable on a State basis to facilitate accomplishment of this objective should be authorized.

Projects for construction of ETV facilities

The legislation should authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants on a project basis under priorities to be established. The criteria for such priorities should be designed to achieve the prompt and effective use of the available channels, equitable geographical distribution of the facilities throughout the country, and the setting up of the facilities in such a way as to serve the greatest number of people and broadest uses possible. We recommend an aggregate of $25 million to be authorized over a 4-year period to pay up to one-half the costs of approved projects. This would be matched by the payment of one-half the costs by the individual sponsoring agency.

If State plans have been made, the grants would proceed in accordance with the State plan. If not, the grants could be made available by the Commissioner directly after the State has had a reasonable opportunity to prepare such a plan.

Our proposals would include a definition in the bill which would exclude from Federal grants closed-circuit transmission within a single school or occupying a single site. We do not believe Federal funds are warranted for this limited type of facilities.

Research and experimentation

Two other pieces of legislation recommended by the Kennedy administration could round out Office of Education services to educational television.

One is the Educational Assistance Act of 1961 which provides for new demonstration programs to meet special education problems. Such programs might include the use of a new media such as television.

The other is currently in progress—the provision under title VII of the National Defense Education Act whereby research is being carried on to evaluate and aid in the development of television and other audiovisual education media. President Kennedy has recommended that the National Defense Education Act, which expires next July 1, be extended and improved.

ETV HAS PROVEN ITS WORTH

Educational television has proven its worth. More than 50 careful studies provide evidence that anything that can be taught by lecture and demonstration in the classroom can be taught at least as well by television.

As one example, a complete junior college curriculum has been on the air for 5 years in Chicago. It has been taken by thousands of students. Tests have proven that these televised courses have brought students to the level of skill attained by classroom practice.

There have been spectacular demonstrations that television can do certain instructional tasks much better than they can be done in the classroom.

For instance, in test tube chemistry and other courses requiring minute motions, every television student can watch as well as though he were in the front row in the classroom.

A 10-member educational media study panel of the Office of Education met in January and, on the basis of the 50 studies, compiled a list of the areas in which educational television appears to offer important advantages. A summary of their findings follows:

1. Educational television affords unique opportunities for massive and rapid qualitative improvement of education which is now a national challenge.

2. Educational television provides a means of removing the barriers which have kept American teachers from being able to observe their colleagues in action. For years teachers never see other teachers in action—it is as though actors could never see plays.

3. Educational television gives parents a chance to get back into the orbit of education. They can look at will into the classroom.

4. Educational television offers opportunities to focus national attention and effort on general cultural improvement.

5. Educational television, by strengthening the fiber of our own education and culture, will also provide the needed basis for strengthening similar efforts elsewhere in the free world.

EDUCATORS HAVE ACCEPTED TV

For some years educational leaders were cautious about using television in the classroom. There were even fears that TV would replace the teachers, that it would make teaching mechanical, and that pupils would become mere robots.

Nine years of experience with educational television stations have brought the whole subject into perspective. Educators have learned that TV is neither a curse nor a cure-all. They have learned that it is simply another medium for getting ideas across—and a very powerful one.

As I see it, the legislation you are considering today has for its primary purpose making educational television available to every section of the United States where it is needed and can be useful.

It seems to me that the time is ripe for such action. The administration is ready for it. The States are ready for it. The foundation has been laid. Experience has proven its worth. And the educators now accept it.

Danny R. Jones, California Attorney and Scholar of Soviet Jurisprudence Writes Congressman Doyle Letter Opposing Abolition of House Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for your reading, and that of all my other distinguished colleagues, a letter written me by Danny R. Jones, of Compton, Calif., on the subject of the Un-American Activities Committee of the House of Representatives. Mr. Jones does not happen to be registered in the same political party of which I am a member, but is a very widely known and able lawyer at the California bar, and I have been pleased to know him personally for a good many years.

Naturally the receipt by me of this letter from him, who has sojourned in the Soviet Union twice now on a definite study of the subject of justice in the Soviet Union, is pleasing indeed.

Mr. Speaker, all the contents of Attorney Jones' letter, herewith set forth, but especially the contents of paragraph 3 thereof, make it crystal clear that any effort or plan or program to do anything which manifestly is intended to, or does weaken, lessen, or destroy any facet of the Government of the United States, or the U.S. Congress, charged with the internal security of our Nation against subversive activities of the Communist Party of the United States, or any other group of persons, or any individual, to that extent does definitely contribute toward the success of the internal operations of the Communist Party in the United States. This is what distinguished California lawyer, Danny R. Jones, tells us about the Communist Party objectives in the United States, and I urge your attention to the fact that in the very last sentence of paragraph 3 of said letter Attorney Jones says:

> Any method which would accomplish the goal will be utilized.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have heard me say heretofore on more than one occasion, during these more than 14 years I have now served in this distinguished body, that the Communist Party in the United States is dedicated and destined to use any method which in the short run or the long run would contain any possibility of accomplishing their illicit design to destroy the American constitutional form of government by force and violence if and when they should choose to use that method.

And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not hesitate to again state that in my humble judgment and considered opinion, the Communist Party in the United States and its avowed followers—whether members of the Communist Party or not—are definitely contributing to the weakening and planned eventual destruction of the security measures of the U.S. Government and Congress against subversive communism in the United States, and in the world as well. The taxpayers of the United States are expending hundreds of millions of dollars a year for defense purposes; they have been doing this for many years. Recently we unanimously approved a bill from the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member, which bill authorized the largest sum of money for our military defense which has ever been adopted by this Congress in one bill. We were frankly told about it, as we are told about all appropriations for national defense and for foreign aid; to wit, that we are in a life-and-death struggle against the spread of subversive communism.

Mr. Speaker, thus it is, that the signed letter herein set forth by Danny R. Jones, more recently again returned from a study in Russia of the Soviet Union judicial system, should further warn us that the Communists in the United States are in a highly gleeful mood because, as Attorney Jones said:

> There is a move afoot to eliminate the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Speaker, having been a member of that vital committee now for about 14 years, at your request and urge, and again affirming that said committee is always working on its own desire to further improve its procedures, I cannot but again also state, that I am constrained to believe that with the world as it is, and with the activities of the Communists and their avowed allies and voluntary supporters in the United States, the move which is afoot to eliminate the Un-American Activities Committee cannot but contribute to the plan which Attorney Danny R. Jones specifies when he wrote me this letter shortly after his return from his second trip to the Soviet Union. I especially call attention to the last sentence of the third paragraph of his letter which states:

> I was blatantly told by even the lowest of Communist underlings that the plan was to do this by internal operations of the Communist Party, i.e., "Internal Operations of the Communist Party in the United States," and any method which would accomplish the goal will be utilized.

Some people know this is a fact; some people deny it is a fact. But Mr. Speaker, the Communists all know it is a fact and the Communists are very much pleased. As for us, I will not knowingly contribute to the weakening of our legal barriers to the subversion of the efficient and honest functioning of our constitutional form of Government.

The letter follows:

Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
23d Congressional District,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CLYDE: I understand that there is a move afoot to eliminate the Un-American Activities Committee of the U.S. Congress. Firstly, I urge you with all of your influence to fight any action to eliminate this committee and its functions. If anything, I would strongly recommend that more funds be allotted to this committee to expose the Communist threat to the free system of which America is the major citadel in the world. I make these recommendations to you only after having recently been to the Soviet Union, the home base of all world Communist activities and having seen that system function after its 40 years of existence.

In spite of all the insistent and consistent propaganda which Moscow may constantly blast into the ears of the peoples of the world, the Communist system has only been able to supply the people of that country and all other Communist countries, barely a fraction of the material benefits and essentially none of the individual freedoms which we have all taken for granted.

There is no question about the fact that the fathers and leaders of communism based in Moscow are bent upon complete domination of the world by the Communist Party, which is the same as the Moscow leaders. Everyone from Lenin down to Khrushchev, further on down to the Communist underlings working in the Communist bureaucratic offices, frankly and openly assert this to be their goal. In order to accomplish this goal, America with its free enterprise is the No. 1 target. I was blatantly told by even the lowest of Communist underlings that the plan was to do this by internal operations of the Communist Party, i.e., "Internal operations of the Communist Party in the United States" and any method which would accomplish the goal will be utilized.

A major victory for this goal would be the destruction of this Un-American Activities Committee and a death blow to public efforts to expose this menace to individual freedom. If you desire further information in connection with what I saw or did in the Soviet Union, I should be most happy to give them to you publicly or privately. I shall assert every effort to see that I, and my children, never live under such a system.

Yours very truly,

DANNY R. JONES.

Public Laws 815 and 874 Discharge a Clear Federal Obligation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation today, H.R. 7459, to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain changes in such laws.

I include here as part of my remarks my press release and the text of H.R. 7459:

FROM THE OFFICE OF REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL D. KEARNS, REPUBLICAN OF PENNSYLVANIA

Congressman CARROLL D. KEARNS, Republican, of Pennsylvania, today introduced a bill, H. R. 7459, to extend for 3 years the temporary provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874, 81st Congress, and to make certain changes in such laws.

Congressman KEARNS said today:

"For over 10 years these programs have assisted local school districts, which suffer a burden on their educational programs because of military and other Federal installations.

"Public Laws 815 and 874 discharge a clear Federal obligation to support the operations of schools where heavy concentrations of Federal employees and Armed Forces personnel have caused undue burdens on local school districts.

"I believe that one of the principal defects of the administration's school bill, H.R. 7300, is that it combines the general aid provisions and the impacted areas provisions in the same bill. These are separate problems and should not be tied together in an omnibus-type bill.

"The reason the administration has tied them together is that it is hoped that by doing so the general aid provisions will gain the support of those who are in favor of the impacted area provisions, and use it as a political crutch for final passage of the bill.

"I believe, however, that each is deserving of separate consideration.

"Moreover, the political gimmick of combining impacted areas legislation with the general aid provisions in a single bill may well backfire. It could well mean the defeat of both at a time when I am certain that the majority of the Congress is in favor of the impacted area legislation.

"These are the reasons which led me to introduce H.R. 7459.

"On June 1 I introduced H.R. 7413, to authorize a 3-year program of Federal financial assistance for the construction of public elementary and secondary schools, and to provide certain additional assistance for both public and private education on a permanent basis.

"These two bills make it possible to consider the general aid provisions and the impacted areas legislation separately.

"I plan to offer my impacted areas bill, H.R. 7459, and my general aid for school construction bill, H.R. 7413, as substitutes for the administration bill, H.R. 7300, when that bill is called up on the floor of the House for debate.

"I have the utmost faith and confidence that the Republican Party and many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will vote for my bills, H.R. 7459, and H.R. 7413 in preference to the inflated provisions of the administration bill which combined general aid for school construction, aid to impacted areas, and teachers salaries."

H.R. 7459—A BILL TO EXTEND FOR THREE YEARS THE TEMPORARY PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC LAWS 815 AND 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS, AND TO MAKE CERTAIN CHANGES IN SUCH LAWS

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first sentence of section 3 of the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 633), is amended by striking out "1961" and inserting in lieu thereof "1964".

(b) Section 10 of such Act is amended by inserting the following sentence after the first sentence thereof: "In any case in which the Commissioner makes arrangements under this section for constructing or otherwise providing minimum school facilities situated on Federal property in Puerto Rico, Wake Island, Guam, American Samoa, or the Virgin Islands, he may also include minimum school facilities necessary for the education of children residing with a parent employed by the United States though not residing on Federal property, but only if the Commissioner determines, after consultation with the appropriate State educational agency (1) that the construction or provision of such facilities is appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, and (2) that no local educational agency is able to provide suitable free public education for such children."

(c) Subsection (b) of section 14 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "1961" each time it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "1964", and (2) by striking out "$40,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$60,000,000".

(d) (1) Paragraph (13) of section 15 of such Act is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam,".

(2) Paragraph (15) of section 15 of such Act is amended by striking out "1958–1959" and inserting in lieu thereof "1961–1962".

SEC. 2. (a) The Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by striking out "1961" each place where it appears in sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) and inserting "1964" in lieu thereof in each such place.

(b) Such Act is further amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each place where it appears in sections 3(d), 6(c), and 9(8).

(c) Subsection (d) of section 3 of such Act (relating to the computation of the local contribution rate) is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "and the local educational agency".

(2) Clauses (1) and (2) of the first sentence of such subsection are amended to read as follows:

"(1) he shall place each school district within the State into a group of generally comparable school districts; and

"(2) he shall then divide (A) the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which he is making the computation, which all of the local educational agencies within any such group of such comparable school districts made from revenues derived from local sources, by (B) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such second preceding fiscal year."

(3) The third sentence of such subsection is amended by striking out "If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in those school districts which he has selected under clause (1)" and inserting in lieu thereof "If, in the judgment of the Commissioner, the current expenditures in the school districts within the generally comparable group as determined under clause "(1)".

(d) Paragraph (10) of section 9 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this paragraph, average daily attendance under subsections (a) and (b) of section 3 shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner on the basis of the average daily attendance determined in accordance with State law (excluding children for whom the local educational agency received tuition) multiplied by the membership ratio between children qualifying under subsection (a) or (b) of section 3 and all children for whom free public education is provided; such membership ratio shall be derived from membership counts for two days during the fiscal year covered by the application, in accordance with such regulations."

The Death of George S. Kaufman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, June 2, the country lost a distinguished citizen with the death of George S. Kaufman. Mr. Kaufman, whom I was proud to have as a constituent, died at his home, after a long illness, at the age of 71.

George Kaufman was a giant of a man who brought grace and power and eloquence to the American theater. There are few men who have been his equal as a playwright in modern times. At his funeral, his close friend and another distinguished playwright, Moss Hart, delivered the eulogy. Mr. Hart spoke of the "many Georges" who were part of the complete Mr. Kaufman. He went on to say:

There was the cantankerous George, the terror of head waiters, taxidrivers, and barbers. There was G.S.K., the wit, and he was one of the wittiest men of his time. There was the wintry and distant George, the warm and spring-like George, and there was George, the playwright—we all sat at his feet.

He was not a comfortable, happy, or cozy man, but he was a loving man. He felt deeply, but sheared away from any expression of emotion. He had pride, but no vanity. He was a unique, an arresting man. Our solace is that we should have known him, and were living in his time.

The United States is the better for George Kaufman, and the country mourns his passing and treasures his memory and his work.

Lane Addresses Postal Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include part of my remarks at the annual convention banquet of the Massachusetts State Branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, at Swampscott, Mass., on June 3, 1961:

The British and West German postal systems are regarded as models of prompt and efficient service.

In Britain, you can mail anything at all by their special messenger service except a live human being. There was the case of a newspaper that put the Post Office to the test by mailing, of all things, a cow. It was delivered on schedule, alive and contented.

While the U.S. Post Office Department does not go so far afield it does win top honors for being the busiest postal system at least on this planet.

More than 500,000 Federal employees handle over 65 billion pieces of mail a year. That averages out to 130,000 per each postal worker.

From the sorting and delivery of plain post cards to precious checks and bulky parcel post packages, our postal system has developed an amazing record of reliable performance since the first Postmaster General, Benjamin Franklin, was appointed by the Continental Congress in 1775.

In fact, the whole American economy would slow down to a crawl, without this smooth-functioning network of communication and transportation that unites the Nation.

The business community is well aware of this, as evidenced by its increasing use of, and dependence upon the postal service.

The Department and its employees appreciate the confidence reposed in them, although this faith in your ability to do the job can be overdone. It begins to appear that the Post Office is being forced to do too much of the large mailers' own work for them.

As more and more of this burden is shifted from private enterprise to the public service, the cost of operating the Post Office Department has no way to go but up.

Top-ranking officials, knowing that the Government on its own can achieve only limited handling cost savings, and reluctant to press for compensatory postal rate increases are turning to their big patrons for help.

Under consideration is a plan to enlist heavy users of the mails in cost-cutting partnerships with local post offices.

Under this do-it-yourself approach, businessmen will be asked to cooperate in the following manner:

1. Spread mailings throughout the day.
2. Install mail processing equipment such as canceling machines in their own offices.

Business cannot expect to have everything its own way by demanding more and more service from the Department and at the same time complaining about the recurring rise in postage costs or the larger appropriations from general revenues that the Congress must assign to cover the deficit between postal costs and postal income.

By assuming a fair share of the load, business would aid in the development of faster and better service.

As it stands now, postal supervisors are the men in the middle who are giving their best leadership under trying circumstances as they strive to satisfy patrons who expect the impossible from the undermanned and overworked crews of postal employees.

Combat-tested by experience that has proved their resourcefulness in handling emergencies, the postal supervisors of Massachusetts are equal to the present task.

The annual convention of the Massachusetts State Branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors helps to focus attention on these problems.

With a growing understanding of your responsibilities and problems by the patrons of our postal service, I am confident that they will cooperate with you to make them somewhat easier in the near future.

Sugarbeets and Burns Creek

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, the House Agriculture Committee recently held hearings on U.S. sugarbeet allocations. Members of Congress from Arizona, California, Maine, Minnesota, Nevada, New Mexico, and Texas appeared before the committee sincerely urging an increase in the domestic allocation of the sugar quota so that farmers in their respective States might enjoy a larger share of the market.

The United States consumes about 1½ million tons of sugar annually, and domestic needs have been expanding by some 200,000 tons per year. In the past, 70 percent of the U.S. sugar requirements have been met through imports. In dollars and cents, this amounted to $550 million in 1959–60, and has been increasing recently by about $90 million annually. Cuba has traditionally been one of the largest suppliers of sugar to this country, holding approximately 30 percent of the quota. Since the rise of Castro, however, that quota has been reallocated to producers from friendly nations.

Our esteemed colleague from Texas [Mr. RUTHERFORD] highlighted the plight of domestic sugarbeet producers in a recent newsletter by pointing out:

> This "new" quota is the primary target of those of us in the Southwest who have been seeking to obtain a quota for domestic farmers. At present, there is no restriction on how many acres of sugarbeets a farmer may plant and no restrictions are contemplated. However, growing them is only a part of the project. The farmer obviously must have a market to sell his product, and the only possible market is to a sugar mill. A sugar mill is a costly operation, representing some $15 million in investment and requiring several years to construct and put into operational order. Obviously, such an investment cannot be made unless an area has a guarantee of a large enough quota to grow many acres of sugarbeets.

At the present time, 16 States have almost the total allocation for sugarbeets. The following table shows the acreage planted in sugarbeets, by States, for 1960 and the estimated acreage in 1961.

Sugarbeets

[In acres]

State	Acreage planted	
	1960	Indicated, 1961
Ohio	23,300	24,000
Michigan	69,400	78,000
Wisconsin	6,300	7,000
Minnesota	81,000	89,000
North Dakota	42,600	48,000
South Dakota	6,800	10,000
Nebraska	69,500	76,000
Kansas	9,300	10,000
Montana	61,700	63,000
Idaho	96,900	108,000
Wyoming	42,500	52,000
Colorado	157,300	175,000
Utah	33,000	27,000
Washington	37,900	54,000
Oregon	20,900	23,000
California [1]	212,000	237,000
Other States	6,400	6,400
United States	976,800	1,087,400

[1] Relates to year of harvest. Beginning 1952, includes some acreage carried over to the following spring.

Source: Crop Reporting Board, AMS, USDA, March 1961.

It may be noted that little or no acreage is allocated to growing sugarbeets in Arizona, Maine, New Mexico, or Texas, even though testimony before the House Agriculture Committee revealed that farmers in these States are willing and able to produce this important money crop. While Members of Congress from these non-sugarbeet-producing States are trying diligently to protect the interests of their farming constituents by getting sugarbeet allotments, they are being pressured to vote against the best interests of these same constituents by supporting the unnecessary Burns Creek public power project in southeastern Idaho.

Hearings before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee in 1959, 1960, and 1961 clearly show the questionable nature of this $50 million expenditure; which, if approved, will adversely affect the agricultural constituents of these Members. Witnesses from the Bureau of Reclamation testified that not one single acre of new land will be irrigated using water stored in the Burns Creek Reservoir. However, these witnesses go on to point out that power made available from the hydroelectric generating facilities installed in the Burns Creek Dam would be used to pump-irrigate large tracts of new land—variously estimated at from 55,000 to 125,000 acres, with the most recent testimony being somewhere between 55,000 and 65,000 acres.

According to the Office of Irrigation Specialists, Rural Electrification Administration, January 1956, on the proposed West Side Electric Irrigation Cooperative, crops grown on this land would be typical of those already produced under irrigation in the adjacent areas which are primarily alfalfa, potatoes, sugarbeets, and small grains.

During the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee hearings on the Burns Creek project, April 17, 1961, the honorable gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] questioned Mr. Harold Nelson, Regional Director, Bureau of Reclamation, Boise, Idaho, concerning sugarbeets that would be grown on land pump irrigated using electricity from Burns Creek. The following colloquy appears on pages 236 and 237 of the hearing transcript:

> Mr. LANGEN. I am still curious to know how many acres of sugar you are going to have. Where are you going to get the acres from?
>
> Mr. NELSON. I would say, just from experience in the area, that probably five to six thousand acres of sugar beets would be correct.
>
> Mr. LANGEN. We have a most difficult time in getting any surgarbeet acreage up in our area, and we think we have a reasonably good area to raise sugarbeets in, a place where we can raise them without irrigation and without cost to anyone. And all we seek is the mere permission to plant them and to sell them. And so consequently it is just natural that we are going to be curious when we see a project that requires tax dollars in order to promote a matter such as sugarbeets.

Mr. Speaker, the prospective increase in sugarbeet acreage irrigated with subsidized power from this project is roughly equal to the entire acreage planted in all other States, in the above table—and Idaho already is the third largest sugarbeet producing State in the Union. The sugarbeet area of Idaho is in the southern portion of the State surrounding the proposed Burns Creek public power project. Furthermore, the problem of getting sufficient acreage allocations to justify construction of sugar mills, mentioned in my friend, Mr. Rutherford's newsletter, does not exist in Idaho since they already have the mills.

The proposed Burns Creek project—H.R. 36 and H.R. 378—is unnecessary, uneconomical, and a distortion of traditional concepts of reclamation. It is a public power proposal pure and simple for an area where there is admittedly no power shortage. If approved, it will

have the effect of seriously damaging future reclamation programs of the West by changing the concept that revenues from incidental power production should be used to benefit water users, to a new concept that future irrigation projects be penalized for the sake of preference power users.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives who are interested in irrigation or sugarbeet production to oppose Burns Creek vigorously as being contrary to the best interests of their own constituents.

Diminishing Public Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I point out for attention and consideration a most important matter of national interest. Legislation pending before both the House and Senate is designed to return to the Congress the responsibility for the management of our Nation's public lands. I refer to H.R. 1785 by the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], H.R. 6377 by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], H.R. 5252 by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING], H.R. 3342 by myself, and S. 2587 by Senator BARTLETT for himself and 20 other Senators. I use the term "return to the Congress" because the Constitution vests in the Congress the power to carry out such responsibility, which has for many years been delegated to the executive branch, and the effect of the bills I have mentioned would be to reinstate the initial power of Congress in the premises.

The problem with which we are confronted is two-pronged. In the first place, public land disposition incident to our population growth and settlement of the West has greatly reduced the size of our Federal public domain. In the second place, executive agencies have effectuated massive withdrawals without the benefit of congressional attention, scrutiny or sanction, including some unwise withdrawals and overwithdrawals, thus accelerating the disappearance of the Federal public domain in the sense of vacant, unappropriated and unreserved public lands.

In recognition of this problem, the Congress has already made a start in reasserting its authority over our public lands in the form of Public Law 85–337, commonly known as the Engle Act, which was enacted to protect the public domain from inadequately considered withdrawals for the use of the armed services, by requiring an act of Congress to effectuate all military land withdrawals exceeding 5,000 acres. In my opinion, the hearings this year on six military withdrawal bills proved to be constructive and fruitful of sound analysis and evaluation as to the need for the proposed military uses, size of acreage, duration of the use period, and development of specific requirements consistent with future civilian use and the general public interest.

Although Public Law 85–337 places a check on the military departments in this regard, there remains in all other executive agencies the authority to request from the Interior Department withdrawals of any size or duration. During 1959 and 1960, since the Engle Act was adopted, there have been granted 16 such nonmilitary land withdrawals, each exceeding 5,000 acres. The land involved is in Alaska, Colorado, Montana, Oregon, Utah, Idaho, and Wyoming.

The purpose of H.R. 3342 and the other bills mentioned is to extend the purview of the Engle Act to cover all nondefense withdrawals the same as military withdrawals. I believe you will agree with me that the need for legislative review of large executive land dispositions is as obvious in regard to nonmilitary agencies as in the case of the military branches. Public land stands out as a great resource which can be best utilized in the public interest only when the competing demands for its use are weighed and analyzed by the Congress.

NBC White Paper on Panama: Subversive Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an article on "NBC White Paper" by Lawrence Laurent in the Washington Post of May 26, 1961, that writer made the following comment about the TV program, "Panama: Danger Zone," which was broadcast on February 14 over the NBC system, and I quote:

> It gave many viewers their first long look at a newly troubled area. Apparently it left no room for argument and for the first time in the life of the series there were no protests.

As a participant in that TV program who also saw it and as a long-time student of the problems of the Caribbean, I feel it is incumbent on me to speak out again against those who would subvert our position in that strategic area, particularly at Panama.

First, as to my participation, I went to New York last fall while the film was being prepared. There I was queried extensively by the director of the program, Harry Rasky. In my replies, I endeavored to give comprehensive answers to all his questions and, at the time, had no reason to expect anything but an objective treatment of the crucially important subject.

Second, when the program was shown on February 14, I hardly recognized the fact that I had contributed. Reduced to insignificance and taken out of context, it produced exactly the opposite result to that most desired—a clear treatment of our just rights and obligations for the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal. I shall comment briefly on parts of the program.

Starting with an accompaniment of calypso music, it promptly focused on a theme hostile to the United States and gave local agitators an opportunity to voice their extreme views without adequate clarification.

It gave a fleeting glimpse of the former Governor of the Canal Zone who had bravely faced the 1959 Canal Zone invasion and effectively handled the crisis without giving him an opportunity to reply to his castigator.

While the narrator repeated a mass of details, much of it wholly irrelevant and misleading, his statements were most significant for what he failed to say. There was an obvious avoidance of presenting a true picture of the just rights and obligations of the United States, or our vital interests as well as the interests of the entire world.

The total effect was against the true needs of our country—a view that seems to have conformed with that of certain policymakers in the Department of State.

As to the effect on the public, as shown by my extensive correspondence, an overwhelming number of letters from informed observers were highly critical of the program as tending to subvert our position in the Canal Zone. A few criticized me as being more representative of European despotism than of the United States and its policy of generosity. Some had been confused by what was actually a most misleading program.

Now to return to the comments by Lawrence Laurent, I wish to stress, despite assertions to the contrary, the following:

First. The subject of the NBC "White Paper on Panama: Danger Zone" is not new as suggested by him, but old.

Second. While the TV program may have given a "first look" to some, its story has been treated extensively in many addresses in the Congress and in numerous thoughtful articles over the last few years in various magazines that are available to those who seek enlightenment.

Third. Notwithstanding statements to the contrary, the views presented in the NBC White Paper are subject to argument and should be clarified and not confused.

Fourth. Instead of universal approval as implied by Writer Laurent, there were many protests of the strongest character to the obvious slant of the program against the best interests of the United States.

It is indeed unfortunate that in these tragic times when our Nation, which is the last great outpost of freedom, is being consistently attacked and undermined by those who have received the bounties of our national freedom, these subversive forces control not only many of the great newspapers of the country but also the television and radio networks; and the opportunity seems never

to be overlooked by them to misrepresent every incident of international friction in a way antagonistic to and downrightly subversive of the best interests of our country and in derogation of the facts involved.

These subversive methods are, in effect, conspiratorial against the best interests of the American people and so intended. They are altogether irresponsible and alien, and the methods and practices of these enemies of our institutions should be recognized, exposed, and abated. They represent the same character of communistic infiltration that has weakened lesser nations throughout the world and made them easy prey for communistic conquest.

Mr. Speaker, since February, the situation in the Caribbean has continued to deteriorate. No responsible official of the executive branch has yet spoken out in ringing words as to what our policy should be. Accordingly, I urge the people of the United States to write their views to the President, the Secretary of State, their Senators and Representatives, demanding an end to diplomatic weakness and adoption of reasoned policies that are fully protective of our national interests at Panama.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article in full:

"NBC WHITE PAPER" PROVED A TRIUMPH

(By Lawrence Laurent)

The "NBC White Paper" series has a pretentious title, borrowed from the British term for an official government report. The series never did get around to the subjects, originally announced, on "The PR Boys" of the public relations business, on "Government by Publicity" or "The Soviet Union from Within."

If these are failings, however, they are minor failings. Certainly nothing since Edward R. Murrow's first season with "See It Now" has covered as many controversial subjects with as much depth and understanding. The "NBC White Paper" series is a major triumph for the newly emphasized dimension of reality on television.

The series arrived last November with a report on "The U-2 Affair." This frank and caustic interpretation on a major international blunder drew much applause and many complaints. One veterans organization condemned the program, not for any inaccuracies or mistakes but because it lacked the proper patriotic fervor.

Another outcry followed (in December) the poetic and over-stated study of the sit-in crisis in Nashville, Tenn. On this program, producer Al Wasserman, an intense, perceptive, documentary artist, used some rigid stereotypes to achieve a tremendous dramatic impact. Artistically, it was superb. As a reporting job, it was much too subjective.

"Panama: Danger Zone" came in February and it gave many viewers their first long look at a newly troubled area. Apparently, it left no room for argument and for the first time in the life of the series there were no protests.

A situation that had been overlooked, the diminishing powers of the State legislature, was studied in March. Interviews, filmed meetings, charts and the narration of Chet Huntley put "Man in the Middle: The State Legislature" into new perspective for many American citizens.

"The Anatomy of a Hospital" was booked into an April Sunday evening's schedule. This was a sympathetic look at the sometimes sudden, often violent death that is a part of a city hospital. The suffering and the mercy was contrasted with the nonemotional, prosaic problems of finance that harass hospital administrators.

These separate parts of hospital operation are inseparable and never before on television had they been linked for such effect.

The "NBC White Paper" series ended its first season this week with the telecast of "Railroads: End of the Line?" One would not expect the problems of mass transportation to contain much poetry, imagery or romance. Yet these were exactly the qualities that producer Wasserman caught and which were passed along by haunting film footage and by Huntley's matter-of-fact narration.

Seldom in history have we loved any machine as we loved the homely, noisy steam locomotive. Wasserman wisely picked up a paragraph out of Thomas Wolfe's "Of Time and the River" to illustrate this improbable love affair between the North American and the mechanical monster:

"Trains cross the continent in a swirl of dust and thunder, the leaves fly down the tracks behind them; the great trains cleave through gulch and gully, they rumble with spoked thunder on the bridges over the brown wash of mighty rivers, they toil through hills, they skirt the rough ground stubble of shorn fields, they whip past empty stations in the little towns and their great stride pounds its even pulse across America."

Now, the railroads are in trouble. The wonder and glamor which belonged to the locomotive now belong to the jet airplane and to the space rocket. The "White Paper," however, had a note of hope that the train will recover with new uses.

After a season of six shows, executive producer Irvin Gitlin can be proud of the work of his staff. He should also have proved the value of such programs.

Statesmanlike Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am honored and pleased to include in the RECORD a very timely and statesmanlike address recently delivered by my valued friend and able and distinguished colleague, Congressman HAROLD D. DONOHUE, of Massachusetts, at the commencement exercises at Anna Maria College in Paxton, Mass., on Sunday, June 4.

Congressman DONOHUE's stirring commentary and remarks on current conditions facing contemporary graduates are a sober warning and a lofty inspiration.

His talk was deeply appreciated by the graduates and was appropriately noted in the press by the celebrated Worcester Telegram in an article which I also ask leave to include as part of my remarks.

I heartily congratulate Congressman DONOHUE upon his excellent address. It is in an admirable tenor and should do much to clarify national thinking on the vital matters which he discussed:

ADDRESS TO GRADUATES, ANNA MARIA COLLEGE, PAXTON, MASS., BY THE HONORABLE HAROLD D. DONOHUE

My dear young graduates, somehow the title, "Address to the Graduates," on your program above my name seems to suggest the appearance of an all-knowing somebody, to reveal secret guidelines, guaranteeing the prosperous pursuit of worldly happiness and success.

I am sure you graduates entertain no such illusion; I am certain I possess no such knowledge.

In truth, I am here more to receive, from your own composite picture of youthful beauty, wholesomeness, and vitality, renewed inspiration for my own labors than to offer you any directional counsel.

As members of the new generation, rather than seeking any advice for your future, you might well ask your elders for an account of our stewardship of your American heritage. If you did, our approach to an explanation would be more in a tone of apology than any tune of triumph.

Particularly on this bright and happy day of your lives it would be our heartfelt desire to bring you "news of good tidings," that all is well at home and abroad. That is the kind of legacy we elders hoped to have waiting for you but which, unfortunately, we cannot fully deliver at this time.

For, at home, we have been suffering a long period of frightening national decline in our traditionally high moral standards and ethical principles. More than a decade of excessive self-indulgence and inordinate concentration upon personal profit and pleasure has alarmingly weakened the spiritual strength and moral fiber of our country.

Out of this general decline we have become afflicted with constantly increasing numbers of major crimes of sex and violence, high divorce rates, waves of juvenile delinquency, and a common disregard of spiritual concepts and patriotic restraints. Let me cite a few current examples of this latter development.

For instance, while most were demonstrating wide unconcern about true moral values, a few were discovered directing their attention to fixing false prices.

While the majority were experiencing renewed confidence from the coordinated success of our first astronaut, disturbing examples of questionable work delays at vital missile production bases were being uncovered.

While Presidential representatives were proclaiming abroad our creed in the equality of man, some sections of our own country were incredibly denying the personal liberties of certain American citizens.

While our most informed leaders exhort us to the imperative defense of our institutions, a few are heard in plaintive appeal for appeasement at any cost.

Meanwhile, abroad, our capabilities and qualifications for free world leadership have been seriously questioned. Our self-accepted superiority in the technical sciences was temporarily dented. Some programs to aid and advance the rehabilitation and welfare of other countries were proving to be misused and misguided. In some places we were criticized for being too quick with too little and, in others, of being too late with too much. Some of our traditionally close allies were being tempted to doubt and hesitate while our avowed enemy moved forward in arrogant daring.

Happily, but cautiously, I believe we can now observe the appearance of a few signs that will lead, please God, toward a healthy, general recovery. With respect to your depreciated legacy, first sign is the recog-

nition and admission of past indiscretions by your elders; however, we have not yet bankrupted you.

We may have been ethically lax, but the fundamental faith of our forefathers is still within us.

Because of good will and peaceful desire, we have permitted our enemy abroad to embarrass us but we have not permitted him to drive us to despair or defeat.

We may have often been loose in our thoughts but we have retained our basic understanding. In my opinion, it is indeed vital that we unceasingly project that understanding.

You are particularly fitted to help in this objective.

The gravest threat to our national integrity, from within and without, was principally brought on, in my judgment, by previous delays in three fields of fundamental understanding.

We have been complacently slow in understanding the destructive nature of the evil afflicting us from within, the vicious nature of the enemy without, and the changing nature of modern warfare.

We have been almost fatally slow in understanding that the destructive nature of the pagan materiality suffocating the original spirit of our society is the same as that which has marked the pages of history with the fall, of other proud, prosperous and strong nations of the past, into the dark valley of humiliation and oblivion from which nations rise no more.

We have been almost tragically slow to understand the nature of atheistic communism as the deadliest enemy in world experience. We have been acting, and reacting, from the unfounded conviction that communism is but the name of a passing fashion and involves no more threatening danger than a buzzing bumblebee.

We have been carelessly unmindful that the historically written and avowed purpose of this devilish philosophy is to patiently and ultimately enslave the world by any means and in whatever time it takes.

It seems incredible that in more recent times we could likely forget the arrogant warnings of the current Kremlin leader when, in 1956, he said "we will bury you." Again, during his visit to the United States in 1959, he told us "your grandchildren will live under communism."

Addicted with our own lassitude and seeming security, we have been tempted to overlook the stark fact there is another great power in the world bent on perverting the meaning of democracy and peace into tyranny and death.

Let us be ever mindful that these ruthless aggressors hold up deceit, hypocrisy, falsehood and treachery as the high standards of their atheistic immorality. For them there are no spiritual restrictions in their race to conquer.

We have been, further, dangerously slow to understand the nature of modern warfare. We too commonly think of war in terms of shooting, when, in fact, shooting has become a last resort in modern war.

Today, war is a matter of pressure. Pressure can be political, economic, psychological, violently physical, or any combination of them. The Communists, with their long range strategy, dedicated patience and their knowledge that the whole globe is their field of battle, have developed the war of varying pressures to its highest degree. By its skillful use, they have been repeatedly throwing us and the free world into recurring status of disunity, confusion and hesitation.

Through unhurried and persistent probings of American moral and military preparedness, they have not yet followed up their intermittent indications of peaceful negotiation with concrete evidence of sincerity. It is quite probable they will not provide such evidence until they are satisfied that American morale and might has regained the structure and the stamina of our founders. This pattern of the Russian cold war scheme and design has long been spelled out before us and we have finally and realistically analyzed it. Let us, then, to the doing of the task that clearly lies before us.

In this doing, your new generation should willingly accept its full part. We remind you that each generation of Americans has been called upon to make its own contribution to the preservation of our national liberties and institutions.

The false worship of materiality in America must be rejected. The faith, the beliefs and the principles of our founders must be revived and restored: the creeping curse of mass apathy must be scorned and replaced with a new era of personal responsibility. In no other way can the moral integrity of this Nation be regained.

Against the godless enemy abroad our traditionally heroic virtues of patience, fortitude, courage, sacrifice and concern for our neighbor, must be resurrected. For the common goal of modern military preparedness on every front, all segments within our society—the individual, business, labor, agriculture, political parties—must submerge self-interest for the national purpose. We can, and we will, succeed if we march forward in living observance of the words in our pledge of allegiance, to be one Nation under God.

As Catholic American patriots, you are uniquely equipped to lead your new generation in this desperate fight to save the blessings of freedom for all mankind.

You have been taught that the dignity of man comes from His divine creation. You have been instructed that sacrifice is merely following the example of our Saviour. You have been shown that virtue in an individual, or a nation, can be attained only by adherence to the commandments of the Almighty. You have come to realize that man is the master of his own soul and the dictator of his own destiny. You have seen how the glory of the resurrection followed only after tortuous testing in the soul-searing fires of pain, sorrow, humiliation and even betrayal. You have learned that honorable service to country is but fulfillment of dutiful service to God.

The President of the United States has issued a clarion call for us to unite in a renewed and reinvigorated beginning to establish honorable peace throughout the world. He has indicated his own conviction that our desperate duel for such peace with a godless enemy may extend indefinitely.

He has further expressed his solemn belief that the hour has come for each American to decide for himself whether he wishes to abjectly accept the tyrannical yoke of Communist slavery or patriotically accept the long sacrifices imperative for the continuing enjoyment of the inalienable rights endowed upon him by his Creator.

The summary challenge before us, then, is whether the voluntary self-discipline of a free people in a united society, under God, can prevail over the regimented rule of a slave state under atheistic dictators.

Therein lies the opportunity for you to apply your training toward the victory we must commonly achieve.

The united proof of our capacity and character in self-discipline, for God and country, is the last chance we may have to convince the Kremlin leaders that peaceful settlement in honor, is their wisest choice in prevention of their own self-destruction in a nuclear war.

Strengthened by your special learning, inspired by your dedicated teachers, obligated by the sacrifices of your parents, with faith in your country and belief in your God, I ask you to go forth and assume your rightful leadership in this battle, fortified by the thoughts expressed by William Lloyd Garrison (when principles are involved) which were repeated and reiterated by President Kennedy as he recently left for Europe to meet the heads of state of that continent—"I am in earnest. I will not equivocate. I will not excuse. I will not retreat an inch and I will be heard."

I know that you graduates, when principles are involved, will be in earnest. That you will not equivocate. That you will not excuse. That you will not retreat an inch and you certainly will be heard and all will listen.

In dedicating yourselves to duty, for God and country, may I remind you your perseverance does have the inspiring guarantee of success in the promise contained in the words from the Scriptures, "He who endureth to the end will be saved."

DONOHUE EXHORTS ANNA MARIA 1961 CLASS

(By Betty Lilyestrom)

PAXTON.—Today's American college graduates have not been left the all-bright kind of legacy their elders would have liked, U.S. Representative HAROLD D. DONOHUE told graduating seniors at Anna Maria College yesterday.

Speaking at the college's 12th annual commencement exercises in Foundress Hall, the Worcester Congressman said it is up to the graduates themselves to make this the kind of world they would like to live in.

"I would like to be able to tell you that all is well at home and abroad—this is the kind of legacy we elders hoped to have waiting for you," he said, "but, unfortunately, this is not the case."

DONOHUE charged that America at home has become "soft from a long decline in our traditional high moral standards and ethical conduct" and that America abroad has underestimated both the strength and dedication of the enemy—communism—and the degree to which modern warfare has changed.

PAGAN MATERIALITY

"We have been complacently slow to understand the destructive nature of our emphasis on pagan materiality—the same pagan materiality that has marked the pages of history with the fall of other prosperous, proud and strong nations of the past into the dark, deep valley of oblivion from which no nation ever rises," he said.

He also charged that America has been guilty of treating communism as "a passing fashion no more threatening than a buzzing bumblebee," rather than as a force intent on ultimately enslaving the world.

Finally, he said, we have been "dangerously slow" in recognizing the fact that modern warfare has changed and that the old "shooting war" has been replaced by a war of pressure.

On a hopeful note, DONOHUE commented that a few signs of a "healthy general recovery" from these ills are observable.

"The first sign," he said, "is the recognition and admission of past indiscretions on the part of your elders. We may have been ethically lax, but the fundamental faith of our forefathers is still within us.

"We have permitted our enemy to embarrass us, but we have not allowed him to drive us to despair or defeat."

Much is yet to be done, he said, and the responsibility for doing it will fall on the shoulders of the young people emerging from colleges and universities throughout the country.

"The false worship of materiality in America must be rejected," he said. "The creeping curse of mass apathy must be replaced with a new era of personal responsibility.

"Against the godless enemy abroad, our heroic virtues—patience, fortitude and concern for our Nation—must be resumed. And in order to reach our common goal of preparedness on every front, we must each learn to submerge our individual interests to the single interest of the Nation."

Bishop Flanagan presided at the exercises and conferred degrees on 66 seniors, largest class ever graduated from the college.

Special honors included:

The Marian Award, presented by the Catholic Women's Club of Worcester to a member of the graduating class who best exemplifies the true spirit of Catholic womanhood, to Jacqueline Duguay Walsh of Worcester.

BISHOP GIVES DIPLOMAS

The Archibald R. LeMieux Award of $100 for outstanding merit—shared by Catherine T. Christmas of Holden, president of the student government; Jeannette Y. Hebert of Worcester, vice president of student government; and Cecile C. Quintal of Central Falls, R.I., president of the senior class.

Elected to Kappa Gamma Pi, national honor society of Catholic colleges for women—Geraldine M. Nadeau of Grand Cascapedia, Quebec; Gloria A. Stuart, of Easthampton; Jacqueline Duguay Walsh and Joanne C. Walsh, of Auburn.

Elected to Delta Epsilon Sigma, national scholastic honor society for students of Catholic colleges and universities—Elizabeth A. Dame of North Grafton, Geraldine M. Nadeau and Gloria A. Stuart.

Other speakers at the exercises included Rev. Theodore A. Fortier, A.A., who gave the invocation, and Sister Irene Marie, S.S.A., president of the college.

Bishop Flanagan officiated at a pontifical baccalaureate mass for the graduates yesterday morning in St. Paul's Cathedral. The sermon was preached by Rt. Rev. Msgr. David C. Sullivan, pastor of St. Peter's Church.

Excerpts From Remarks of Senator Estes Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee, at Memorial Day Ceremony, Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn., Sunday, May 28, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUISE G. REECE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mrs. REECE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include very fine excerpts from remarks made by the senior Senator from Tennessee, the Honorable ESTES KEFAUVER, in the Memorial Day ceremonies held at the Veterans' Administration Center, Mountain Home, Tenn., on Sunday, May 28, 1961:

No one can stand in this place, at this moment in time, without feeling caught up in our Nation's past, present, and future. Vast memories are collected here. So, also, are our dreams.

History's rollcall for Mountain Home stretches back to the Revolution. This was the home of Robert Young, a Revolutionary soldier who fought at King's Mountain and is now buried here.

It was the home, too, of other great figures: John Sevier and Andrew Jackson; the late Congressman Brownlow, who founded Mountain Home, and our lately departed friend, Representative Carroll Reece.

A great love of country, confirmed in duty, has always pervaded this area. It has long been acclaimed as having furnished more volunteers to the colors than any other section of the country.

Nearby Carter County, for example, furnished three companies of volunteers in World War I; so many that it became unnecessary to draft even one man in the county.

Many of those who died in that war and in later ones are buried among the 3,800 graves just beyond this memorial park. Their lips are sealed; most of us cannot know what had been their hopes and dreams.

And neither can we more than guess what were the hopes and dreams of those countless other Americans who have died for freedom's sake, as symbolized by the replica of the great tomb in our midst.

But many of those yet living who are gathered here today—the Gold Star Mothers, the Spanish-American War veterans and the survivors of other wars—can tell us much about the agony that war brings.

So can the patients and the doctors, the nurses and the counselors at the Veterans' Administration Center here at Mountain Home.

From them all, we can learn what it means to lose a son, a father, or some other relative in war. Or we can discover what it is like to forfeit an arm or a leg or otherwise become disabled by war.

It is not difficult to find out about the horrors of war. But how difficult it is to solve the riddle of peace; to learn how to advance the cause of freedom and brotherhood without resort to war.

Perhaps we could start by consulting some of those who hold the future in their hands—the hundreds of Boy Scouts who are taking part in this Memorial Day service.

What were their thoughts this morning as they moved through the VA cemetery close by, placing an American flag on each grave? What are their hopes and dreams?

Surely, they must have felt, as all of us do, a sense of gratitude to those departed for the contributions they had made to the cause of preserving freedom.

But did these youngsters have deeper, personal thoughts? Did they wonder whether it is inevitable that one day they, too, might be called upon to fight for freedom on shores not yet known?

Such a prospect, we elders must admit, can be exciting to a boy of scout age. It's an excitement not likely to be tempered by the sobering knowledge of war's horrors.

Besides, the search for peace, by contrast, is usually dull. It is sadly the marks of our civilization that we remember more vividly those who have fought in war than those who have fought for peace.

Yet, unless all civilization is now to be lost, we must teach our children to cherish freedom without automatically yielding to war as the inevitable and only recourse for settling disputes.

We must teach them that it is sometimes the better part of valor to exhaust all peaceful, honorable means of preserving and advancing freedom's cause before committing ourselves or our friends to battle.

In my lifetime, I have met few Americans called into their country's service who did not hope that the war they were then being asked to fight was supposed to be the war to end all wars.

So it is fair to ask ourselves whether those whose memory we honor today will have died in vain unless we, the living, dedicate our lives to the task of preserving freedom in peace.

The nature and character of today's world makes this a formidable task. It is a far different world than existed 40 years ago, 20 years ago, or even a year ago.

No longer does the balance of power lie with the great powers of Europe and North America, or even between the United States and the Soviet Union.

We are quickly discovering that millions of people in formerly out-of-the-way corners of the earth—in Africa and Asia particularly—are responding to the appeal of freedom and daily groping toward it.

Once we merely looked to the moon. Now we talk of shooting for it. But in our conquest of the skies, we are sharply reminded of the pressing problems that remain unsolved on earth.

Some of these are right at our doorstep. How can we persuade uncommitted millions that we truly believe in brotherhood and freedom when we deny the right of some Americans to ride a bus unmolested?

A score or more of limited wars have been fought in various parts of the world since the close of World War II. What a sad commentary on man's failure to live in peace with his international neighbors.

We have the machinery for peaceful settlement of our international problems. But this machinery is seldom used. There is, for example, the World Court. It is situated at The Hague and is staffed with brilliant international lawyers. Yet, it has decided less than 20 cases in 15 years.

In addition, there is the machinery of the Atlantic Alliance—both civilian and military—through which we can build a common front against communism and help small nations to help themselves.

But we need to use more of this machinery and use it more actively. We also need to close ranks: an Atlantic community which is divided, to paraphrase Lincoln, is one which is sure to fall.

The cause of democracy is one of freedom for all people under God. In subscribing to this principle, we must recognize that Americans hold no copyright on freedom; to flourish, it must be shared.

As Americans, let us recognize that democracy imposes greater responsibilities than any other kind of government—and then let us accept those responsibilities willingly.

In this rapidly changing world, let us freely listen to new ideas and fearlessly discuss them, for ignorance and a closed mind can contribute little to the awesome need of our times.

Finally, let us have faith in ourselves, in the people around us, in our leaders who are trying to serve, and in our country. But most of all let us have faith in God and the right. Thank you.

National Catholic Youth Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, the 11th annual observance of National Catholic Youth Week will be from October 29, 1961, through November 5, 1961. The theme for the week is "Youth, Unity, Truth."

The National Council of Catholic Youth, under the guidance of the Rt. Rev. Msgr. Joseph E. Schieder, director of the Catholic youth of the United States, is sponsor of the week.

They are to be congratulated for selecting such an acutely appropriate theme, "Youth, Unity, Truth," which aims to focus the attention of the world on dedicated Catholic youth who pos-

sess the truth and yearn to work toward the union of all nations and all faiths, to alert the world to the tremendous power in the hands of young people committed to truth, and to help youth realize that all truth comes from God and that only through Him can youth achieve its goals.

No theme could be more attuned to the crises dominating the world today. Never before in the history of our country has it become more vitally necessary for American youth to band together their prayers and talents to spread truth and peace the world over. The theme has vast spiritual implications. Further, its political aspects are vital to our time. Youth will pray for the success of the United Nations and any future summit conferences, for the union of a world now severed by communism and unnatural stress between East and West.

Youth Week provides an opportunity for young people to display their talents and achievements—thus counteracting the unfavorable publicity incurred by a small minority of the young people in this country. It includes participation by thousands of schools, colleges, and universities, and local and national youth groups, in addition to millions of young people in the working world. Many military installations, both at home and abroad, count their young people among youth week participants. Programs of the week include religious services, radio-TV shows, award presentations, athletic events, parades, and social affairs.

The 8 million young people involved in Catholic Youth Week, along with the competent and unselfish adults working with them, deserve our congratulations and good will. I ask the attention of the entire public to this great week, and the support of the public for all those private programs devoted to the development of an able, spiritually strong and resourceful youth.

Prisoner-Tractor Exchange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

WASHINGTON REPORT BY CONGRESSMAN BRUCE ALGER, FIFTH DISTRICT, TEXAS

JUNE 3, 1961.

The prisoner-tractor exchange demanded by Castro is almost unbelievable and should be carefully studied and understood by every American—1,214 Cubans and 500 tractors ($30,000 each for heavy construction) are involved. Legally and morally many other matters are involved. The President planned the U.S. end by setting up the private committee of Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther, and Milton Eisenhower. These factors must be considered as pointed out by the President: (1) He acted as a private citizen; (2) this transaction (a) will not violate the law, the Logan Act, (b) is tax deductible, (c) the existing partial embargo preventing tractor shipment to Cuba can be changed, and (d) this is a humanitarian effort to save the lives of several hundred men.

Let's look at the facts: (1) The President, as head of our Government, cannot deal as a private citizen in foreign and military policy, even if he can in any other field (which is questionable). (2) He misinterprets the law, the Logan Act, when he says "I am advised that the Logan Act is not involved inasmuch as it covers only negotiations 'in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States or to defeat the measures of the United States.'" As I see it, the facts of this deal clearly establish violation of the Logan Act. This deal does involve the defeat of measures of the United States. We are in controversy with Communist Castro. Finally, clearly private citizens cannot engage in foreign policy replacing the Government. (3) Contributions cannot be tax deductible as charity or in rehabilitation and assistance of needy refugees. Cuban prisoners do not fit this picture at all. Blackmail is not charity nor vice versa. (4) An export license to ship tractors as a humanitarian effort further fails in logic when it is realized that the equipment is quite possibly to build military bases, later to kill those who endeavor to free Cuba from communism (as the President has promised we will do). (5) This is not humanitarian, when the price of saving these prisoners is (1) blackmail, (2) aids and gives comfort to the enemy in his military buildup, (3) will result in later deaths as the fortifications are strengthened, (4) sets the precedent for later ransom situations when American citizens as tourists, as military or civilian representatives, or in whatever capacity, can be seized and held anywhere outside the continental limits.

For my part, as a Representative, I swear to uphold the Constitution and this action clearly violates the letter and spirit of the Constitution. Therefore, I do not so define national unity and purpose as reason for my silence and refusal to criticize. On the contrary, it is my hope that citizens throughout this great land will rise up and demand a different and clear policy that repudiates this blackmail effort. In this case, the people must lead the Executive (as has occurred many times when Congress overrode a Presidential veto, the voice of the people) to the right course of action. Patriotism demands that we all protect our beloved Nation from faulty leadership and poor judgment.

John and Lou Tower took Washington by storm. The airport reception, the private reception, the heartfelt eulogies over this Texas election on the floor of the House and Senate have provided a fresh breath of air in this staid and jaded political center. John and Lou were never better than when greeting their new-found friends. Poised, happy and sincere, they accepted the plaudits with modesty. I am more convinced than ever that we will now see unfold before us one of the most outstanding political careers of our times. JOHN TOWER has the ability, the understanding and the determination to make an outstanding legislator, a Senator of whom Texas can be proud. There is no question of the good will extended to JOHN by all. He starts his political career with the admiration and respect of friend and foe alike. The entire Nation has taken heart over this election. For my part, I am proud to have been able to participate in JOHN'S election and reception to Washington.

President Eisenhower made an outstanding speech at the congressional dinner in which he outlined a role of Government, foreign and domestic, called responsible progress. Besides the ex-President, greatest applause went to Senator GOLDWATER and TOWER.

Extension of the Korean wartime excise and corporate taxes passed in the Ways and Means Committee, 22 to 3. I opposed the extension as a protest to the temporory extension of a temporary tax. It is time for broadly based tax reform. We keep talking about doing it but no action. Further, I am getting tired of "picking up the tab" for the big spenders. It's time we cut down the Government's spending money. This will not succeed (my opposition) unless the people demand less Federal spending and a balanced budget. After all, there are no constitutional limits on Federal borrowing. Here, too, is an area where Government needs to be curtailed.

Our gold supply is down to $17.4 billion of which $11.2 billion supports our currency. That leaves $6.2 billion and President Kennedy has asked that we give away $4½ billion in foreign aid. Looks like our solvency and sound money won't last long at our current rate of spending. President Kennedy's spending proposals are already over $4 billion beyond his January estimates. Where are we going?

Excerpt From Opening Statement by Hon. Francis E. Walter, Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, for Opening of Public Hearings by the Committee in the Caucus Room, House Office Building, Washington, D.C., May 31, 1961, Before Hearing Any Witnesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of an opening statement by Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER, chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, of which committee I have been a member for about 14 years.

The primary reason I am pleased to present this statement by my distinguished chairman is that it is a good illustration and sample of the sort of preliminary statement which is always read by the chairman of either the full committee or a subcommittee prior to the swearing in of any witness to testify before the committee or the hearing of testimony before the committee.

Mr. Speaker, can there be any question in the mind of any reader of this statement that it clearly sets forth the purposes and objectives of the hearing to which the statement relates? Can there be any question but that any officer or member of the Fund for Social Analysis, some of the officials of which were about to be questioned by the committee, were put on notice before they took the witness chair in the hearing room of the pertinency of questions which they might be asked about their organization's operations?

And, Mr. Speaker, not least of all in this statement do I call your attention to the next to the last paragraph thereof which states as follows:

The committee is not in any sense interested in restricting bona fide research and

study of communism. In fact, it has encouraged an objective study and teaching of communism, so that America may better understand the problems that communism poses throughout the world.

EXCERPT FROM OPENING STATEMENT

(By Hon. FRANCIS E. WALTER)

Many hearings held by the committee over the past several years have documented the volume of Communist propaganda being printed in the Soviet Union and its satellite countries for dissemination in the United States. The methods used to import this propaganda has also been documented. In an effort to curb this abuse, I have offered H.R. 5751, which is presently on the Consent Calendar. This bill is identical with the one which passed the House in the 86th Congress, but did not reach a vote in the Senate.

We do not believe that Communist propaganda will be fully controlled by this bill, or for that matter by any bill. A Communist propaganda offensive is being waged both from without and from within this country in many different fields, and this committee has endeavored and will continue in its efforts to aid Congress in its consideration of necessary remedial legislation to control this Communist weapon.

Prior to 1947, scores of Communist-front organizations, engaged in propaganda activities, enjoyed tax-exempt status. Moneys donated to such organizations were deductible on the income tax returns of individual and corporate donors. In 1947, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, acting on the findings of the Attorney General, removed the tax-exempt status of those organizations which the Attorney General found to be subversive.

This was thought to be the coup which would fold most of these subversive organizations but as we know, it did not. Most of the organizations continued to flourish, although at the start with a reduced budget. It was not until organizations were found to be subversive by the Subversive Activities Control Board that many ceased to exist, at least under the name by which they had been known for years. However, even such a finding did not bring about the demise of the American Committee for Protection of the Foreign Born. Newly named organizations are cropping up daily to replace those which have served their purpose.

None of these propaganda organs died from the lack of income. They were discontinued because they had served their purpose or because the citation as subversive removed their acceptability to the general public.

Years have now passed since the Attorney General has cited an organization as subversive. The limitation placed upon his office by the courts is having the effect of stopping further citations. The courts delay in passing upon the provisions of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950, and the years it takes between a hearing before the Subversive Activities Control Board and the issuance of a final order, have all worked to the advantage of Communist organizations. Therefore, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue needs authority to deny tax relief to these organizations immediately upon their formation.

However, denial of tax exemption has not, and will never bring about the elimination of propaganda organizations. Preliminary investigations by the committee has uncovered the fact that one organization has solicited over the period of less than 5 years, over a quarter of a million dollars. This money has been used almost exclusively in the dissemination of propaganda in defense of the Communist Party and its members, and in the furtherance of Communist Party objectives. Its principal income has not been taxable because it is derived from gifts or contributions. The organization does not seek tax-exemption. It files a return which excludes gifts or contributions from tax computation. Thus, the expenses exceed the taxable income and no tax is due the United States.

We have found that many organizations engaged in subversive propaganda do not bother to even file a return. They likewise do not bother to maintain records and thereby place a burden on the Internal Revenue Service of proving the amount of income received and the source thereof. In the case of one organization, when the Internal Revenue Service made inquiry as to why no return had been filed, it refused to make its records available for examination. By the time the Internal Revenue Service demanded the production of the records, the organization had been abolished. Within months the same people, organized under a new name, were back working on behalf of communism.

Based on this preliminary evidence, I introduced H.R. 4700, to amend section 11 of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. This legislation is designed to place in the hands of the Internal Revenue Service authority to proceed immediately against Communist-action, as well as Communist-front, organizations. It further provides that contributions made to such organizations shall be considered as taxable income, and further that money expended in carrying out subversive propaganda shall not be deductible.

The purpose in calling the officers of the Fund for Social Analysis is to determine whether the organization is using funds contributed to it for Communist propaganda purposes or other Communist Party objectives, and if so, whether or not the use of funds for such purposes by this and other organizations justifies the enactment of H.R. 4700, which has been referred to this committee.

An additional purpose of the hearing is to ascertain whether or not the witness, aside from any relationship he might have with the Fund for Social Analysis, is engaged in activities in behalf of the Communist Party of the United States or the international Communist movement.

The committee is not in any sense interested in restricting bona fide research and study of communism. In fact, it has encouraged an objective study and teaching of communism, so that America may better understand the problems that communism poses throughout the world.

Among the witnesses subpenaed are three officers of the Fund for Social Analysis, who have been served with a subpena duces tecum requiring the production of certain records. The production of these records is being sought for the purpose of aiding the staff in the conduct of its investigations and not for the purpose of spreading them on the public record.

The Preeminence of Bach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, in the year 1740 a survey was made in central Europe to determine the leading composer of that period. George Philipp Telemann—1681–1767—a contemporary of Bach, was given first place, while Bach was placed seventh. Exactly 200 years later another survey was made and Bach was placed second behind Beethoven, but the experts disagreed and Bach was accorded first place.

What is the explanation for Bach's growing esteem, and his contribution to the annals of musical art? Is it not because of the fact that his selections of harmonic progressions always result in a triumphant conclusion? It is true that in playing Bach the ears must listen as well as hear, because Bach does not go out to meet you—you must go to meet him. We see the intensive mental concentration of mind, because he had trained himself to think accurately in musical terms, and we have only to listen with open mind to enjoy it.

As H. E. Wortham wrote in Country Life several years ago:

> Bach was one of the men whom God sends into the world from time to time to remind us that He exists. His stature is not to be measured by a critical apparatus. But in spite of his angelic qualities Bach was still a man. Nay, more, he was a German ready to write music for 25 hours a day, expecting one to listen to it with equal laboriousness.

A hundred years ago the name of Bach did not figure often on concert programs; in fact his name was seldom met with outside the organ-loft and choir. Even Beethoven recognized him chiefly for the well tempered clavichord, and it was not until 1821 when Mendelssohn, filled with great enthusiasm for Bach's genius, presented the St. Matthew Passion in Berlin with a chorus numbering about 400.

The crowded hall looked like a church—

wrote Fanny Mendelssohn—

> and everyone was filled with the most solemn devotion; one heard only an occasional involuntary ejaculation that sprang from deep emotion.

He was respected as a great organist and composer but his true greatness was not understood during his lifetime by his contemporaries. Many were ill-disposed toward his music, among which Johann Scheibe made a scathing attack in 1737 in his periodical, Der Critische Musikus.

Bach was essentially a church composer and his religious works are his finest achievements. Built on the foundation of supreme craftsmanship, they are reared with the devotional fervor derived from unbounded religious faith. Many of his loftiest pages written for the church belong to the greatest music of all times. His many chorales are the purest manifestations of the spirit, and are examples of the strongest, soul-filled, noblest, and most contenting music in the world. Nobody else could do what he did, and that within the bounds of his own particular style, he developed the art of music as far as it could possibly be developed.

On many of his manuscripts he wrote, "To God Alone the Glory"; and on one occasion he wrote: "The sole end and aim of music should be nothing but the glory of God and pleasant recreation;

and where this object is not in view, there can be no true music, but only an infernal scraping and bawling."

He is not only one of the great dramatic composers but one of the masters of psychology in musical art. In his Passions he transcends every other composer in the portrayal of both rare individuality, as in the Jesus parts, and the maddened bloodthirsty crowds. The demand for the destruction of Jesus in the "Passion According to St. John" is wrought by him into music which in its savagery stands literally alone.

As cantor at St. Thomas Church it was his duty to provide for the services of the church, as well as for those of St. Nicholas, a cantata for every Sunday in the year, as well as for special festivals as Epiphany, Trinity Sunday, et cetera. In all, 59 cantatas were required, and if, as was stated in his obituary notice—a statement which Forkel, the first biographer of Bach affirmed—Bach composed 5 complete yearly cycles of cantatas, he must have written 295. Of these, 100 have evidently been lost. He composed in all styles and forms, vocal and instrumental, sacred and secular, and his compositions demonstrate abilities which render them only accessible to genius.

In his great study of the art of J. S. Bach, M. Andre Pirro writes:

> Parallel with his hunger to know all the resources of his art, Bach's most essential feature is his stubborn resolve to make it in some way an instrument whereby he may dominate men's minds. He is vehemently expansive, and desires to compel his hearers to follow and understand him. But first he must guide them and show them which way they are to be led by his will. He marks out their path sternly by unceasing insistence on his motives by the irresistible rigour of his rhythms, by the significant intensity of his harmonies.

Wagner spoke of him as "the most stupendous miracle in all music," while Chopin recommended that all piano students study Bach because, "this is the highest and best school. No one will ever create a more ideal one." In 1827 Goethe, after listening to Bach's music, said:

> One seems neither to possess nor to need one's ears; still less eyes or any other sense.

Once while playing to a French opera composer, Schumann nearly lost his temper over the Frenchman's inability to understand Bach, and his persistent belief that Bach was an old composer whose music was likewise old. "I told him he was neither new nor old," wrote Schumann to his future wife, "but a great deal more, and that is, eternal." When only 22 Schumann wrote to his mother that Bach "seemed to have a strengthening moral effect upon my whole system," for he was "a thorough man, with nothing sickly or stinted about him."

Last year seven foreign countries held special Bach concerts and many American cities have held special concerts in recent years. It is significant that after more than 200 years after his death, the appreciation of Bach's monumental polyphonic works are constantly on the increase.

Congressman Lane Addresses American Gold Star Mothers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of my remarks as the principal speaker at a reception and tea given by the American Gold Star Mothers, Inc., Department of Massachusetts, for the newly elected officers that took place on Sunday afternoon, June 4, 1961, at Lawrence, Mass.

Mrs. Eva A. Prunier, a resident of Greater Lawrence, Mass., one who has been most active for many years as an officer and former president of the auxiliary of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and who has worked zealously in behalf of the Gold Star Mothers, was installed as president of this highly respected and admired organization representing the mothers whose sons have made the supreme sacrifice.

The remarks follow:

In choosing this location for the reception and tea for the newly elected officers of the Department of Massachusetts, Gold Star Mothers of America, you honor Greater Lawrence which is the home of Mrs. Eva A. Prunier, your department president.

In turn, our community honors your organization by its example of sacrifice and courage above and beyond the call of duty.

Near the center of the Lawrence Common—about a block and a half from here—is the memorial to three Campagnone brothers who died in the service of our country, during World War II.

A few more streets to the southwest is a square with a bronze plaque in memory of the two Kater brothers and the lives they gave for freedom, less than 20 years ago.

When we were children watching the few surviving veterans of the Civil War riding in open cars along the route of the Memorial Day parade they represented an experience that had happened to other people long ago and would never happen again.

We had hardly grown up when our fathers and brothers were summoned to meet the test of World War I. A generation later sons and daughters followed in their footsteps.

Then came Korea.

And now the children of yesterday guard the frontiers of freedom in these days of uncertain peace, at duty stations far from home.

To us history is no longer the story of how previous generations of Americans lived up to their responsibilities: it is also the story of the present. Whether we succeed or fail we are writing with our lives the history that will influence the schoolchildren of tomorrow.

The blessings of freedom will be saved for posterity if we strive to eliminate intolerance and discrimination from our own society and extend understanding and help to the underprivileged peoples of this world who claim the right to human dignity and progress.

To overcome the challenge of communism and to prove that freedom alone will achieve the emancipation of mankind, we shall have to work hard, and to make sacrifices for the sake of others.

Being human and aware of our limitations as one person among billions, we look for the encouragement, the strength, and the purpose to go forward from the people around us.

In my opinion, the faith and fortitude of the Gold Star Mothers is the example that should inspire our Nation with the character to meet the responsibilities ahead.

A mother's love is the greatest influence for good in the lives of her children. The memory of it sustains and guides them through all the years of their journey because it never dies.

Those mothers who put aside every personal longing and gave their sons the confidence to fight and die for human rights remind all the people of the United States that they too must give the best of mind and heart and effort for the future of mankind.

If the people respond, as I am sure they will, with only a small part of your complete love for our country, we will do what must be done to win the cold war.

Without an organization like the American Gold Star Mothers, many of our people now concentrating on their private interests might neglect their obligations to the community of freedom.

With your example before them they cannot forget.

In wishing every success for your newly elected department officers, I bring the congratulations of a friend and neighbor to your president.

Mrs. Edward D. Prunier represents the highest ideals of service to the Nation. Her son, George, was killed in action during World War II. Howard Prunier and Allan Prunier, two of her five living sons, are protecting us as members of the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force.

Her courage, cheerfulness, and compassionate heart for those in need of understanding and assistance are the qualities you have recognized and honored by electing her to lead the department of Massachusetts.

As president of the Gold Star Mothers in our State, Mrs. Prunier will initiate those policies and programs that will increase your pride in the comradeship of sacrifice.

The people of Massachusetts are grateful to you and to her for the inspiring example of our Gold Star Mothers.

Ware, Mass., Bicentennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 5, 1961

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address which I made on Sunday, May 28, at the commemorative services of the 200th anniversary celebration of the town of Ware, Mass., in my district.

The program for the occasion, ably conducted by one of Ware's prominent sons, Mr. Philip W. Robinson, was most thoughtfully arranged and featured an organ recital, community singing of standard oldtime songs and a most unusual reading and musical cantata entitled "Holiday Montage," by a special

bicentennial chorus; an eloquent introduction of the speaker by the able and distinguished chairman of the board of selectmen, Mr. Bernard Wilson; a salute to the flag read by Mrs. Alice Hannum, distinguished president of the Women's Relief Corps; and the presence of four generations of descendants of the prominent and distinguished Schoonmaker family.

Seldom have I ever been privileged to observe, let alone participate in, such an impressive program. It was in the best traditions of New England and the Nation and deeply inspired all those privileged to hear it.

The Ware bicentennial celebration has been very ably planned by a committee of outstanding citizens and includes publication of a history of Ware, 1911–60, by John Houghton Conkey and Dorothy Denham Conkey, a very able piece of work; a marble tourney conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars; coronation ball; selection and crowning of the bicentennial queen; and a memorial program; Decoration Day services; Little League baseball; fireworks on July 4; open house at the Mary Lane Hospital and dedication of a new wing; tennis tournament and weekly band concerts during the month of August; Old Home Day at the First Congregational Church; Ware Center historic exhibit, "Ware in Retrospect"; Ware Library; road race; paintings by Elizabeth H. Lincoln, Young Men's Library Association; Firemen's parade and muster; display of products manufactured in Ware; various church services and family gatherings; picnics; sports; band concerts, bicentennial parade, barbecue and fireworks; high school dedication and Boston Celtics game.

Ware is a community of unsurpassed beauty located in a lovely New England valley flanked by eternal hills. It is a small industrial town composed of hard-working, industrious, God-fearing people. Textile industry was originally located there. In recent years with the decline of textiles, its industries have been diversified. Ware is a thriving business and trading center for the people of surrounding towns and is a prosperous, thrifty, well-conducted community, still a manor of peace where people of different races and religious faiths live in complete harmony, neighborliness, and amity, exemplifying the finest traditions of American life.

Ware is a progressive and forward-moving community that always adjusts itself to the needs of the times. Its citizenry is alert, well educated, dedicated, and loyal to free government.

The Ware bicentennial slogan, "Active and Neighborly," appropriately describes its spirit. Ware has completed 200 glorious years. As it goes into the future with characteristic courage, bouyant spirit and high hopes to the new levels of achievement that are foreordained for this loyal, patriotic American community, its neighbors, many friends, and admirers are certain that it is one community that "cannot be licked."

The address follows:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN PHILIP J. PHILBIN, WARE ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION, SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1961

It is a real pleasure, honor and happy privilege to join you today in this impressive commemorative service of the great anniversary celebration of the beautiful town of Ware.

In the first instance I must extend my warm compliments and heartiest congratulations to your brilliant bicentennial chorus, its leaders and accompanists for the very beautiful musical program, delightful singing of oldtime songs so dear to our hearts and the rendition and reading of the most appealing cantata, "Holiday Montage."

I want to compliment your committee upon the outstanding work of arranging a fine, suitable program for this anniversary, and am sure that it will bring many happy memories, much strong inspiration and renewed dedication for all the people of Ware and for many others who admire your outstanding history, your unsurpassed civic spirit and your stanch patriotism.

All of us may well take pleasure and satisfaction today in contemplating the early founding of Ware, its illustrious history, and the many magnificent contributions which its people have made, in war and in peace, to human progress and to our Commonwealth and Nation.

The proud history of Ware dates back to the early Indian wars, to a period long before the formal incorporation of the town November 28, 1761, before the establishment of the Union and before the Revolutionary War.

Some historians assert that John Read, owner of large tracts of land in Connecticut and Massachusetts, gave the name of "Manour of Peace" to this community because at the time the area was enjoying an uneasy peace from Indian raids.

In his scholarly, well-documented history of Ware, Rev. Arthur Chase gave the year 1726 as the first date of settlement, when Henry Dwight located on 200 acres of land in the southern part of the "Manour of Peace" which he had leased.

At an early date, in fact as early as 1730, the value of Ware's waterpower was recognized, because it was then that a mill was established near the falls of the river. This was run by Capt. Jabez Olmstead, a stalwart Indian fighter and officer in the expedition against the French at Louisburg in 1745.

From the very beginning the river has greatly influenced the town, and from it has come its name of today. The Indians called the river the Nenamesec, which means fishing weir. The river in those days abounded in fish, especially salmon, and it was a favorite fishing spot for the Indians.

Today the town seal of Ware recalls the catching of fish by the Indians at the falls.

The Ware River has certainly been a principal source of the town's industrial strength because its swift running waters furnished a cheap source of power able to turn the wheels of industry.

Down through the years the town has seen many industries grow, prosper, and sometimes fade away with the changing needs of the times.

In 1937 the famed Otis Mills in Ware provided employment for about 1,700 of the town's population. That is the year, some will recall, when the town's economy received a crushing blow when the mills closed without much advance warning.

And that is the year, one of the most glorious in its long history, when the town fought back to become hailed as "the town that couldn't be licked," because in 11 days the townspeople dipped into their savings to put up $50,000 to organize an industrial comeback.

We all should be proud to recount the days when in a little more than 2 years, due to the courage, persistency, good judgment, and intelligent direction, and above all the loyalty of the people, Ware had more people working with larger payrolls than ever, in such diversified industries as hats, shoes, dresses, metal, woolen, and woolen goods.

Reared in struggle and sacrifice, profoundly devoted to freedom and its meaning, unshakable in religious and patriotic faith, it was only natural that Ware should make great contributions in the Civil War. Just a few days after the firing on Fort Sumter, a special Ware town meeting voted $5,000 to equip volunteers and provide for their families in their absence.

The Ware company, Company D, 31st Regiment, Massachusetts Volunteers, with about 60 enlistees from Ware, was the first to land for an attack on New Orleans in 1862.

The Civil War Memorial in Aspen Grove Cemetery bears the names of 42 honored dead from Ware who made the supreme sacrifice in that war. In all, 211 served from Ware, a most exceptional sacrifice for the then small community, and the history books abound with the heroic exploits of the noble sons of Ware who sacrificed so much to preserve the Union.

In the Spanish War, in World War I, in World War II, in the Korean war, in every crisis that confronted the Nation, the sons and the people of Ware were found in the foremost ranks of those who rallied in every way to the defense of freedom, the preservation of the Nation and the perpetuation of the great ideals of democracy and justice.

Certainly we must pause today and recall the unselfish service, the heroic deeds, the gallant sacrifices, the steady, loyal citizenship typical of Ware residents who have sprung to the defense of the Nation in times of danger, and have served with such shining example, warm inspiration and wholehearted dedication in the days of peace.

We must always remember with most grateful appreciation the struggles of the early American settlers who carved this beautiful community out of the wilderness, and set up their temples of worship, homes, schools, and civilized institutions and orderly free government, in this honored place. They were hardy, resolute people, fiercely and militantly committed to human freedom in all its ramifications. We can never forget the great debt we owe them.

As years sped along, peoples of other races have come to this community bringing their rich heritage of love of God and passion for liberty, representing the so-called newer races of many nationalities, that loyally joined with the older ones to bring fulfillment to the American dream—the Irish, the Poles, the French, the Italians, the Germans, the Jews, the Scandinavians, people from the Near East, and many other parts of the world who have come to this community, some of them in larger numbers than others, all bringing with them something of worth and value to the building of a greater and better community and a stronger, greater Nation.

In intervening years great changes have occurred in the makeup of Ware's population, and today many peoples and strains are here—all loyally working for the betterment of community and country.

We may well be proud and thankful today—proud of the achievements and accomplishments of the past wrought out of the hands and minds of sturdy pioneers, out of the loyalty and devotion of all the dedicated peoples who have followed them, thankful that this community and our Nation have been blessed by the Almighty to be endowed by such patriotic, able, intelligent leadership, strengthened and sustained by such wholehearted and devoted people, all seeking and working to sustain the great po-

litical ideals and moral truths of our way of life, building on the great foundation stones of the past, and steadily forging ahead in these crucial days with unabated vigor and faith, carrying the torch of freedom into the space age and wherever it may lead man in his quest for knowledge, human betterment, and spiritual enlightenment.

This troubled world would be better, I know, and the critical problems which face us today would be more easily solved, I am sure, if we of this generation are ever mindful, as we go into the future, of the great sacrifices that have been made to build this great Nation of ours, because it is only by living up to the principles, ideals, and values which the people of past generations fearlessly fought and died for, and which we must resolutely guard in our time and transmit to those who come after us, that the previous blessings of ordered liberty may be assured for this Nation and the world.

If we boldly face every problem and danger that confronts us in the spirit of this great heritage, no power on earth can ever prevail over us.

I congratulate the town and wonderful people of Ware upon this historic anniversary and hope and pray that in the time to come the good Lord will bring you and your inspiring American community his choicest blessings of good health, prosperity and happiness and many anniversaries like this one, and a people, ever grateful to the glorious past, and resolutely dedicated under God to the principles and values of human freedom, security, and peace.

Thank you very much for the high privilege of being with you today.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1961

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward Hughes Pruden, minister, First Baptist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, we turn to Thee once more in thanksgiving as we take up the duties of a new day. While the conditions of our contemporary world give us grave concern, we are grateful that even the crucial circumstances of life remind us of our desperate need of Thee. Give us the sense of humility that will send us to our knees in prayer, and the willingness to do Thy will which will cause us to rise up and go about our task with confidence and joy. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 2, 1961, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT WORK ON J–2 ENGINE

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on proposed research and development work on the J–2 engine; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

AGREEMENTS CONCLUDED UNDER TITLE I OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, Department of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on agreements concluded during April 1961, under Title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 with the Governments of Ecuador, Bolivia, Iceland, Iran, Pakistan, Republic of China (Taiwan), and Yugoslavia (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 3579, TITLE 10, U.S. CODE, RELATING TO AUTHORITY OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 3579, title 10, United States Code, to provide that commissioned officers of the Medical Service Corps may exercise command outside the Army Medical Service when directed by proper authority (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF PATROL CRAFT TO NORTH CAROLINA TUBERCULOSIS ASSOCIATION, INC.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of a patrol craft to the North Carolina Tuberculosis Association, Inc., of Raleigh, N.C.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON OPERATIONS OF BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES TO ENCOURAGE THE DISTRIBUTION OF DOMESTICALLY PRODUCED FISHERY PRODUCTS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the operations of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries to encourage the distribution of domestically produced fishery products, for the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN'S RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF LEGAL AID AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Chairman, Legal Aid Agency for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Agency, for the period November 15, 1960, to May 15, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, TO REMOVE LIMITATION ON THE MAXIMUM CAPITAL OF THE GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, so as to remove the limitation on the maximum capital of the General Supply Fund (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF LEASING OF CERTAIN AIRCRAFT TEST ENGINES TO GENERAL ELECTRIC CO.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of the leasing of Government-owned aircraft test engines by the Department of the Air Force to General Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, dated June 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF REVISED ORGANIC ACT OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS, RELATING TO SALARY OF THE GOVERNMENT COMPTROLLER

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 17(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands pertaining to the salary of the Government Comptroller (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 70

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for the retirement of and additional benefits for reservists with 20 or more years of satisfactory service

"Whereas article 1, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States gives the Congress of the United States the power to provide for the common defense; and

"Whereas the presence of a youthful and extensive Reserve force is one of the best ways to provide for the common defense; and

"Whereas the present situation, wherein the advancement of the more youthful and dynamic elements in the reserves is being delayed by the lack of openings in the higher levels, will cause this group to abandon the program; and

"Whereas such an abandonment would not occur if there were a better chance for advancement; and

"Whereas there would be more openings in the higher levels if additional fringe benefits were granted to retirees with 20 or more years of satisfactory service; and

"Whereas the cost of such a program of fringe benefits would be negligible as compared with the benefits that would accrue to the country; and

"Whereas the United States has already made a great investment in the training of these young men that it would be economically sound to continue to employ their services: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, General Session of 1961 (the senate concurring), That

the Congress of the United States of America be and it is hereby requested to amend the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948, or by other appropriate legislation, to provide that reservists with 20 or more years of satisfactory service, shall be retired and in addition to those benefits already granted them by any law, shall receive the following additional benefits, to wit:

"(1) the privilege of purchasing at the commissaries and post exchanges or other comparable service establishments;

"(2) the use of all recreational and service facilities within the bounds of present service establishments, such as, but not to be limited by the following examples:

"(a) service clubs;

"(b) beach facilities;

"(c) golf clubs; and

"(d) swimming pools;

"(3) travel on any service transport on a space available basis; and

"(4) *Provided, however,* That there shall be no change in the retirement pay benefits which shall still accrue only upon the attainment of the age of 60; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate, and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to the Senators and Representative to Congress from Hawaii."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

"Resolution relative to the Arab League boycott of American citizens, business, and industry

"Whereas Arab nations including the United Arab Republic, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Libya, Sudan, Tunisia and Morocco, functioning as the Arab League, have been conducting a boycott of American citizens, business and industry; and

"Whereas the Arab League has blacklisted all American ships which have touched at Israeli ports of call; and

"Whereas American firms doing business with Israel are cut off from trade with Arab countries; and

"Whereas most American companies controlled or managed, partially or wholly, by Americans of the Jewish faith are not permitted to establish commercial relationships with countries that are members of the Arab League; and

"Whereas American servicemen and armed forces employees of the Jewish faith are not permitted to serve at the Dhahran airbase in Saudi Arabia; and

"Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally not permitted to disembark on Arab soil, by land, sea, or air; and

"Whereas approximately 500 American business firms during 1960 received warnings through the U.S. mails from Arab-boycott officers in Damascus and Kuwait that if Americans have commercial dealings with Israel, they must forego doing business with Arab countries; and

"Whereas individual Hollywood motion picture stars have also been blacklisted; and

"Whereas American citizens of the Jewish faith are generally excluded from private employment in any capacity in any Arab owned or controlled company; and

"Whereas the U.S. Navy reserves the option to cancel the charter of any vessel carrying Navy cargo, if any Arab country refuses to allow the vessel to load or unload cargo, because of the ship's charterers or owners have previously done business with Israel; and

"Whereas with the approval of the Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation and the U.S. Navy, contracts for the shipment of U.S. surplus wheat to the United Arab Republic provide that the vessel may not have traded at Israel ports; and

"Whereas the Democratic Party platform of 1960 has pledged the protection of the rights of American citizens to travel, to pursue lawful trade, and to engage in other lawful activities abroad without distinction as to race or religion; and has further pledged to oppose any international agreement or treaty which by its terms or practices differentiates among American citizens on grounds of race, or religion; and

"Whereas the Republican Party platform of 1960 pledged to seek an end to transit and trade restrictions, blockades and blacklists, and further pledged to secure freedom of navigation on international waterways and the cessation of discrimination against Americans on the basis of religious beliefs: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States to instruct the Department of State to take a firm position against Arab interference in the conduct of the affairs of American citizens and businessmen; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Department of State abstain from any cooperation with Arab League boycott activities and policies; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Department of State resist any efforts by Arab nations to maintain or widen its boycott activities in the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Department of State exert all possible efforts and utilize its resources to the fulfillment of the spirit and purposes of this resolution; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is directed to prepare and transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Secretary of State, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15

"Resolution to oppose Federal aid to public schools and to provide that should the U.S. Congress enact legislation providing Federal aid to public schools that it allot 1 percent of the Federal income tax collections for this purpose to the States to be used without Federal control or intervention in areas where collected

"Whereas there is currently a move in Congress for that body to authorize a program of Federal grants for both higher education and public education in the States; and

"Whereas such a program of Federal aid may lead to Federal intervention, control, and domination of our system of education thereby affecting academic freedom and independence of our State system of public education; and

"Whereas the Federal Government is at the present time collecting large amounts of money in taxes from the respective States and local communities with the result that the ability of the State and local units to maintain their present system of local school finance is jeopardized; and

"Whereas there has been pending in Congress for several sessions a bill providing for the retention and subsequent transfer to the States of 1 percent of all Federal income taxes collected in the States to be used for educational purposes without Federal control or interference: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana (the senate concurring), That if the Congress should pass legislation providing for Federal aid to education, despite the opposition of the Legislature of Louisiana, the State of Louisiana does hereby petition that body to include in such legislation a provision that 1 percent of all Federal income taxes collected on individual and corporation incomes shall be deemed to be revenue of the State or territory within which it is collected for use for educational purposes only without any Federal direction, control or interference, after the pattern set out in H.R. 3236; be it further

"Resolved, That district directors of Internal Revenue, before forwarding income tax collections to the Federal Treasury, be required to report and transfer said revenue quarterly to the State or territory of collection for such purpose; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent to each Member of Congress from the State of Louisiana and to the members of the congressional committee reviewing the proposed legislation."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"SENATE RESOLUTION 520

"Whereas Moses Austin, born in Connecticut October 4, 1761, arrived in San Antonio December 23, 1820, and successfully petitioned Spanish authorities for the right to bring 300 colonists to Texas; and

"Whereas exposure and exhaustion during his journey caused his death June 10, 1821, a few days after receiving notification that his petition had been granted; and

"Whereas his dying request was that his son, Stephen F. Austin, should carry out his vision which was accordingly done by the patient, deliberate and tactful Stephen F. Austin; and

"Whereas it was Moses Austin who initiated the movement that ultimately and soon thereafter resulted in the expansion of the borders of the United States to include not only Texas, but all of New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, and parts of Colorado, Kansas, and Oklahoma; and

"Whereas our senior Senator, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, on behalf of the Texas Heritage Foundation, the Texas Historical Association and other historical groups, has submitted to the Postmaster General a request for that Department to issue in November 1961, a postage stamp commemorating the 200th anniversary of the birth of Moses Austin: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Texas go on record in favor of the issuance of said postage stamp; that copies of this resolution be sent to the Postmaster General, to the Governors of Connecticut and Missouri; to Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH for the Texas delegation in Congress, and to Vice President LYNDON BAINES JOHNSON."

A petition signed by E. J. Petus, and sundry other citizens of the State of Texas, praying for the enactment of legislation to repeal the 10-percent excise tax on toiletries; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Anti-Communist Committee of the Americas, Caribbean Division, New Orleans, La., praying for a redress of grievance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Lehi, Utah, favoring the enactment of legislation to accelerate the full development of water and power resources; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JOINT RESOLUTION OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the Congress to extend the northern terminus of the proposed Interstate Highway from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress to extend the northern terminus of the proposed Interstate Highway from Houlton to some point located on the northern boundary of the State of Maine

We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 100th legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

Whereas it has been recognized that the Nation's economy and the Nation's security require the construction of a National System of Interstate Highways; and

Whereas the primary responsibility for construction of such a system rests in the Federal Government; and

Whereas the objective is to complete the presently designated National System within a period of 16 years; and

Whereas the people of Maine through appropriate action have deemed it essential that the highways of this State be integrated into the Interstate System; and

Whereas the necessary development to the State of the economic resources and industrial potentialities of Aroostook County is seriously curtailed for lack of adequate highway facilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the memorialists, recommend and urge to the Congress of the United States that appropriate action be taken to require the Department of Commerce through the Bureau of Public Roads to relocate the northern terminus of the proposed Interstate Highway construction in Maine from Houlton to some point on the northern boundary of the State of Maine which would adequately serve the more heavily populated areas of central and northern Aroostook County; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of state, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

In the senate chamber, read and adopted May 17, 1961.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW,
Secretary.

House of representatives, read and adopted May 26, 1961.

HARVEY R. PEASE,
Clerk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT (for Mr. MAGNUSON), from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1189. A bill to amend title 14 of the United States Code in order to authorize the Coast Guard to carry on certain oceanographic research (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 48. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreation facilities in reservoir areas (Rept. No. 296); and

S. 811. A bill to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission (Rept. No. 297).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 49. A bill to provide for the annual audit of bridge commissions and authorities created by act of Congress, for the filling of vacancies in the membership thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 298).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 82. A bill for the relief of Naoko Ishwatari White (Rept. No. 299);

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Min-sun Chen (Rept. No. 300);

S. 373. A bill for the relief of Myung Ja Kim (Rept. No. 302);

S. 435. A bill for the relief of Knud Erik Didriksen (Rept. No. 303);

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Roman Dackow (Rept. No. 304);

S. 722. A bill for the relief of Aideh Kobler (Rept. No. 305);

S. 805. A bill for the relief of Yu Liao (Rept. No. 306);

S. 817. A bill for the relief of Octavio Jimenez Marquez (Rept. No. 307);

S. 825. A bill for the relief of Vasiliki Yeannakopoulos (Rept. No. 308);

S. 944. A bill for the relief of Mr. Najm Boulos Rihani (Rept. No. 309);

S. 1373. A bill for the relief of Giuseppa Lanza Lascuola (Rept. No. 310);

S. 1430. A bill for the relief of Terez Kaszap (Rept. No. 311);

H.R. 1293. An act for the relief of Djura Zelenbaba (Rept. No. 312);

H.R. 1360. An act for the relief of Anna B. Prokop (Rept. No. 313);

H.R. 1467. An act for the relief of Modesta Pitarch-Martin Dauphinais (Rept. No. 314);

H.R. 1508. An act for the relief of Mary A. Combs (Rept. No. 315);

H.R. 1523. An act for the relief of Kazimiera Marek (Rept. No. 316);

H.R. 1572. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sato Yasuda (Rept. No. 317);

H.R. 1578. An act for the relief of Mah Quock (Rept. No. 318);

H.R. 1621. An act for the relief of Miss Kristina Voydanoff (Rept. No. 319);

H.R. 1622. An act for the relief of Dr. George Berberian (Rept. No. 320);

H.R. 1871. An act for the relief of Min Ja Lee (Rept. No. 321);

H.R. 1873. An act for the relief of Anna Stanislawa Ziolo (Rept. No. 322);

H.R. 1886. An act for the relief of Panagiotis Sotiropoulos (Rept. No. 323);

H.R. 2101. An act for the relief of Evelina Scarpa (Rept. No. 324);

H.R. 2107. An act for the relief of Pietro DiGregorio Bruno (Rept. No. 325);

H.R. 2116. An act for the relief of Wanda Ferrara Spera (Rept. No. 326);

H.R. 2141. An act for the relief of Henry Wu Chun and Arlene Wu Chun (Rept. No. 327);

H.R. 2158. An act for the relief of certain aliens (Rept. No. 328);

H.R. 3489. An act for the relief of Bernard Jacques Gerard Caradec (Rept. No. 329);

H.R. 3846. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Louis Benedetti, retired (Rept. No. 330);

H.R. 3850. An act for the relief of Clark L. Simpson (Rept. No. 331);

H.R. 4217. An act for the relief of David Tao Chung Wang (Rept. No. 332);

H.R. 4219. An act for the relief of the estate of William M. Farmer (Rept. No. 333);

H.R. 4282. An act for the relief of Casimir Lazara (Rept. No. 334);

H.R. 4713. An act for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt (Rept. No. 335); and

S. Res. 90. Resolution to refer to the Court of Claims the bill (S. 1004) for the relief of the Sorensen Fish Co. (Rept. No. 301).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 193. A bill for the relief of Reverend Patrick Floyd (Rept. No. 336);

S. 263. A bill for the relief of Guiseppe Glorioso (Rept. No. 337);

S. 331. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuko (Wm. R.) Zittle (Rept. No. 338);

S. 592. A bill for the relief of Nishan Der Simonian (Rept. No. 339);

S. 866. A bill for the relief of Jose Erasmo Reina (Lajara) (Rept. No. 340);

H.R. 1425. An act for the relief of Marian Walczyk and Marya Marek (Rept. No. 341); and

H.R. 2346. An act for the relief of Maria Cascarino and Carmelo Giuseppe Ferraro (Rept. No. 342).

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 85. A bill for the relief of Rosario Barrena Villachoia, Maria Dolores Villar Salinas, Angela Casanova Cabello, Carmen Guenaga Anchustegui, and Flora Casals Pons (Rept. No. 343);

S. 172. A bill for the relief of Chi Yan Chu (Rept. No. 344);

S. 242. A bill for the relief of Mary Dawn Polson (Emmy Lou Kim) (Rept. No. 345);

S. 266. A bill for the relief of Georgios Tzotzolas (Rept. No. 346);

S. 553. A bill for the relief of George John Coutsoubinas, Olga G. Coutsoubinas, Spyridon G. Coutsoubinas, and Agatha G. Coutsoubinas (Rept. No. 347);

S. 700. A bill for the relief of Fung Wan (Rept. No. 348); and

S. 942. A bill for the relief of Doctor Perkins P. K. Chang (Chang Peng-Keng), and his wife Yu-lh Chuang Chang, and their two minor daughters, Jean Li and Jean Lh Chang (Rept. No. 349).

By Mr. ERVIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 1206. A bill for the relief of Continental Hosiery Mills, Inc., of Henderson, N.C., successor to Continental Hosiery Co., of Henderson, N.C. (Rept. No. 350).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John O. Garaas, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of North Dakota;

Gibson Greer Ezell, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia;

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California;

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California; and

Adam J. Walsh, of Maine, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maine.

By Mr. HART, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Cecil F. Poole, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of California.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2018. A bill for the relief of Robert B. Kasparek, Robert M. Kearny, Richard A. Stokes, J. R. Whitehouse, Jr., and Herbert A. Wolff, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2019. A bill for the relief of Frederick John Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING):

S. 2020. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gasfield, Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, for the purpose of making gas available for sale to the native village of Barrow and to other non-Federal communities and installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. BARTLETT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORTON:

S. 2021. A bill relating to withholding, for purposes of the income tax imposed by certain cities, on the compensation of Federal employees; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2022. A bill to amend section 18 of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide free transportation on any railroad carrier subject to that act for individuals receiving pensions or annuities under that act, and for their dependents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 2023. A bill to amend section 505(d) of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, with respect to certain positions in the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes; and

S. 2024. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code relating to funds received by the Post Office Department from payments for damage to personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2025. A bill for the relief of the Housing Authority of the City of Derby, Conn., to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (by request):

S.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to provide for the preservation and protection of certain lands in Prince Georges and Charles Counties, Md., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DEVELOPMENT OF NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would allow the Secretary of the Navy to use and otherwise dispose of natural gas produced within Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4. The purpose of this bill does not conflict with the provisions of S. 1378, which I introduced in the Senate on March 20, and which called for the release of petroleum reserve No. 4 by the Department of Defense to allow private exploration and development. To the contrary, my bill today supplements those provisions of S. 1378 which would allow the Secretary of the Navy to maintain control of natural gas reserves within a producing area of petroleum reserve No. 4 known as the South Barrow field.

There is an additional provision in the bill which does not directly concern the South Barrow gas field. Included at the request of the Department of the Navy, it would allow future appropriations made available to the Department for maintaining and developing petroleum reserves to be reimbursed from profits accrued through petroleum sales.

In the South Barrow field there are now two producing gas wells. These wells tap a gas pool estimated sufficiently large to supply all fuel requirements in the Barrow area for 25 to 30 years. However, Navy experts indicate that existing wells cannot be pumped to supply other than Federal needs. There apparently is not a shortage of gas but it is feared that increased pumping would draw water, ending the gas flow. Permanent damage would then result to the wells through formation of ice. This bill, therefore, contemplates drilling by the Navy initially of an additional well close to the existing wells. This further development will be in the interest of not only the residents of Barrow but of the Defense Department as well.

Now, the gas produced by the Department of the Navy is used only by agencies of the Federal Government, including those of the Defense Department, located in and near the Barrow community. The gas is transported a short distance from wellhead through a Government pipeline capable of accommodating production four times greater than that which is now pumped.

With the exception of Federal buildings, no establishment or private home in Barrow, Alaska, has the benefit of gas fuel. The 1,300 permanent residents of Barrow, all but a few being Eskimo people, are without any comparable fuel. These people, living almost on top of a gas field which contains ample gas for their needs have, during the past two winters, virtually exhausted their fuel supplies. Mercy missions have been flown by the U.S. Air Force to supply villagers with desperately needed fuel oil.

To understand their situation, it is necessary to understand the very nature of living on the coast of the Arctic Ocean at the most northerly point of America.

Barrow was once one of many similar Eskimo villages along the cost of the Arctic Ocean. In 1939, the population of the community was only 363. Then, Barrow, as was the case with neighboring coastal villages, was so located as to allow the people to live much as they and their ancestors had always lived; hunting on land and ocean ice in the winter and fishing in the summer. Barrow was distinguished from neighboring communities only by its location on a point which stretches farther out into the Arctic Ocean than any other on the Alaska coastline.

During the two short decades which have passed since then many changes have taken place at Point Barrow. The same geographic characteristics which first drew the Eskimo people to this point stretching into the Arctic Ocean and dividing the Chukchi from the Beaufort Sea, attracted—for far different reasons—the U.S. Government. Barrow grew as world conditions forced America to build the distant early warning system across the top of the globe.

Added to the impact of defense construction at Point Barrow was another development which greatly contributed to the economic revolution experienced in the community. Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, forgotten for more than 20 years, was remembered. A flow of men and equipment entered the 37,000 square miles of the reserve through the village of Barrow. Between the years 1944 to 1953, the Navy spent nearly $50 million in the area drilling 36 test wells and 40 core holes. By 1950, the permanent population of the village had increased to 951. Still predominantly an Eskimo population, Barrow rapidly became a community of wage earners, rather than one of hunters. The old ways of living gave way to the new. While the other coastal villages gradually became smaller, Barrow boomed with its new economy.

Now the distant early warning system in the Arctic is completed. The Navy has drilled no new wells since 1953. Some of the people have returned to the old ways of earning a livelihood, but still, the population remains at its increased size. There are now 1,314 persons permanently residing in Barrow according to the 1960 census.

Although the Navy did not sufficiently explore the vast area of petroleum reserve No. 4 to prove or disprove its oil and gas potentialities, there was located one gasfield which was partially developed and in which there are producing wells. This field, adjacent to the village of Barrow, now supplies nearby Federal operations with fuel. It is the gas pumped from this field which our bill would allow to be sold the people of Barrow through a utility company to be formed.

The contemplation of this bill, then, is not that the Navy enter the utility business. The Navy would simply make gas available to a private or public utility company at wellhead. The contractor would then either construct his own pipeline for transmission or be allowed to lease existing pipelines. The Navy would undertake no responsibility for transmission or service. The contractor would have exclusive responsibility for every facet of his operation. The State of Alaska would, of course, exercise its regulatory authority, necessary to assure safe operation and reasonable rates and service.

The bill would also reaffirm the authority of the Navy to develop the field further and to continue to supply Federal agencies in the Barrow community

which already have the benefit of natural gas heat. The price at which gas would be sold would be determined through open competitive bidding consistent with normal procedures.

Mr. President, there is no reasonable excuse for depriving the villagers at Barrow of an opportunity to heat their homes with natural gas. An ample supply exists in the south Barrow field to meet all fuel requirements, Federal and public. It is believed by many experts that the field is far greater than its proved size.

The annual fuel shortage which has beset the community will otherwise continue indefinitely. There is but a short period of time during the summer months in which oil may be transported to the Arctic coast. The civilian population of the community lacks storage facilities ample to accommodate the fuel necessary for yearlong use. Although coal may be mined at a site some 75 miles from the village of Barrow it may only be transported during winter months, and then only by sled train. Production has never been great enough at the mine to meet more than a fraction of village needs. As a matter of fact, the mine was forced to close last winter as a result of mechanical breakdowns. When coal is available it costs more than $40 per ton, despite the constant effort of the mining company to reduce costs.

The only other source of fuel is oil. Oil, even if it were possible to bring in an adequate winter supply while the arctic ice is open in the summer, is extremely costly. Barrow villagers pay about $30 for a 50-gallon drum of oil and this price reflects no profit to the native cooperative store from which it is purchased. Even paying a fair market value for natural gas, the Barrow villagers would have an estimated two-thirds fuel cost reduction.

The Daily News-Miner of Fairbanks, Alaska, has long supported the cause of the Barrow villagers. At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted an editorial from that newspaper along with two news articles which were printed in the Anchorage Daily Times. These three articles, published over the course of the past two winter seasons eloquently record the urgent need for natural gas heat in the Barrow community.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Dec. 5, 1959]

STATE GOES TO BAT FOR BARROW IN FUEL ISSUE

BARROW.—The temperature dipped to 9° below zero here Thursday as Eben Hopson worked in the arctic chill tending his white fox traplines.

But in Juneau, 1,100 miles to the south where the temperature stood at 37 above, officials rallied in support of Hopson's plea for aid in heating homes in Barrow.

The problem was stated by Hopson in a letter to President Eisenhower, made public here Wednesday.

He said plentiful natural gas supplies from a nearby naval petroleum reserve were used by Federal agencies here, but were denied to the 1,800 native residents of the village.

The gasfield, discovered in 1959, is at a depth of 2,500 feet. It has a pressure of 1,000 pounds per square inch and since discovery has produced between one-quarter and one-half million cubic feet per day.

Its estimated reserve is 5 to 7 billion cubic feet of gas, enough to take care of Barrow's needs for many years.

Barrow, one of the biggest Eskimo communities in the world, faces 6 to 8 months of cold weather, Hopson told the President, with native residents paying up to $42 a ton for coal for heating and cooking purposes.

Before the temperature gets down to its January average of 18.5 below zero, Hopson said, he hoped it would be possible to cut Government red tape and permit residents to share use of the natural gas supplies.

Hopson, an Eskimo, who is a Democratic member of the State senate, told the President:

"As you know, the Eskimo people in Alaska live facing the Russian frontier and I think it would be the most wonderful thing you, as President, could do if you would show to the world that the United States, no matter how large it is, still is considerate of the hardships facing its own people, and despite Government redtape, will give quick relief and assistance when sincerely and desperately needed."

At Washington, the White House said Hopson's appeal was under study and a reply would be given. There was no indication of what the reply would be.

The problem is not new. Barrow residents and various State officials have been trying for some time to gain permission to use the natural gas for local heating purposes, but the status of naval reserve on the supply has blocked efforts.

At Juneau, Gov. William A. Egan wrote Wednesday to Navy Secretary William B. Franks asking whether natural gas service could be made available by administrative action—or whether congressional legislation might be necessary.

Hopson said in his letter to the President that the pipeline from the nearby well ran right past his home, but he was barred from tapping it for use for fuel for his family.

Egan said in his letter to Franks that it might not be permissible for individuals to use the pipeline, but asked whether a community utility might not take advantage of the abundant supply.

Phil Holdsworth, State commissioner of natural resources, said he could see no reason why the natives can't utilize the fuel—there's no other use for it.

Holdsworth said the existing pipeline has been used for 7 or 8 years, carrying natural gas for heating purposes to various Federal agencies at Barrow, including the Government school and the U.S. Weather Bureau station at the Federal Aviation Agency office.

"The Navy aready has declared the petroleum reserve at Barrow is excess to its needs," Holdsworth said "We have suggested before that that portion supplying natural gas to Barrow be declared outside of the reserve, if the reserve itself is to be left intact. I can't see how the Government could object to that much, at least."

The State legislature earlier this year passed a memorial urging the Federal Government to release the gas supplies for use at Barrow, but no results were ever noted from the action.

[From the Fairbanks News-Miner, Feb. 2, 1960]

THE FOLLY OF STOPGAP FUEL

Yesterday's announcement that the civil defense office has made arrangements with the Air Force for shipment of 2,000 barrels of heating oil to Barrow certainly is welcome news for that community.

The annual fuel crisis at Barrow has been whipped—at least for this winter. The possibility that Barrow would have to be evacuated to save the lives of its residents—a possibility that has been seriously considered—has now been eliminated.

With all due respect to the good efforts of the Alaska civil defense office and the Air Force, we must label this emergency airlift of fuel to Barrow for what it is: a stopgap measure. It is a measure which will alleviate the symptoms but leave the underlying disease just as virulent as ever.

This frantic, dead-of-winter scramble to bring "barrels to Barrow" would never have been necessary had it not been for a jungle of redtape and the monumental mulehead-edness of those who could wipe out Barrow's chief woes with a scratch of a pen.

Several years ago, the U.S. Navy, using the tax dollars supplied by Americans—including Eskimos—discovered a sizable natural gas field only a few miles from Barrow. Experts checked this field and estimated it contained reserves of natural gas sufficient to supply all the needs of Barrow for at least 15 years—and possibly double that time. Yet Uncle Sam has stubbornly barred residents of Barrow from tapping the supply. The pipeline into Barrow is for Government and military use only.

The simple, reasonable, and humane solution to Barrow's fuel problem of course, would be to permit the villagers to avail themselves of the area's plentiful supply of low-cost fuel.

But it's not too often that the simple, reasonable, and humane solution prevails where bureaucracy calls the turns.

In the long run, will it be easier—and will it be less costly to the taxpayer—to launch an annual fuel oil airlift to save Barrow? Can anyone see where our Government's dog-in-the-manger approach to the supply of natural gas at Barrow is going to benefit anyone—including the Government itself? Is it less costly to ship to Barrow via military plane fuel oil produced in California than it is to transmit natural gas over a few miles of tundra into homes that desperately need it?

The people of Barrow live on a perpetual razor's edge, menaced always by the specter of freezing cold. Their very survival at Barrow depends on a series of vital "ifs." They will get along only if their fuel oil lasts; if enough coal can be brought from the Meade River mines and if they can scrape up the cash to pay for it.

To this bleak roster can be added another big if: if Civil Defense, the Air Force, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs can act fast enough each year to bring in fuel before Barrow's fires are snuffed out.

Stopgap measures such as the 2,000 airborne barrels of oil are not the answer and will never be the answer. The answer is clear: the people of Barrow should be permitted access to the abundant natural gas in their back yard.

[From the Anchorage Daily Times, Mar. 24, 1961]

"COAL SHORT" BARROW GETS EMERGENCY OIL

JUNEAU.—Gov. William A. Egan said yesterday that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has arranged for 30,000 gallons of fuel oil to be made available to residents of Barrow.

Senators Eben Hopson (Democrat, Barrow) and Lester Bronson (Democrat, Nome) had advised the Governor that only a 2- or 3-day supply of fuel oil remains on hand. They asked assistance by the Civil Defense division.

Public Safety Commissioner Martin B. Underwood replied that James Hawkins, area director of the BIA, said 10,000 gallons of fuel oil from the BIA school at Barrow and 20,000 gallons from the Air Force would be transferred to the native store at Barrow today.

Hawkins estimated the 30,000 gallons would last for approximately a month, at

which time, he told Underwood, the situation would be reevaluated.

The shortage was brought on when breakdowns at the Barrow coal mine forced Barrow residents normally using coal to switch to fuel oil.

Mr. BARTLETT. It is my most sincere hope that this bill will have early approval. It will be the first of many necessary steps toward providing adequate fuel for Barrow.

Life is difficult on the Arctic coast. Without proper heating facilities it can be unbearable and even fatal. It would be both inexcusable and inhumane were we not to do all things possible to allow these hardy people the right to enjoy the fuel taken from the very ground upon which their ancestors had lived for centuries.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2020) to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gas field, naval petroleum reserve numbered 4, for the purpose of making gas available for sale to the native village of Barrow and to other non-Federal communities and installations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HARTKE submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FONG submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 1922, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself, Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. JORDAN) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to Senate bill 1922, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1922, the housing bill, which I ask to be printed and lie on the table.

The purpose of the amendment is to extend to the public housing provisions of this legislation, a special authorization for higher limits on construction costs for this kind of housing similar to those allowed under title II of the National Housing Act with respect to mortgages insured under that act. The fact of higher construction costs in Alaska than elsewhere has long been recognized in other provisions of the law. This amendment, which would increase the limits on construction of public housing in Alaska from $2,500 to $3,000 for low cost housing and from $2,500 to $3,500 for housing for elderly families is as necessary in the successful administration of the public housing program as it is in the mortgage insurance programs.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962—AMENDMENTS

Mr. GRUENING proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. DIRKSEN proposed an amendment to House bill 6345, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. PROXMIRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6345, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN LAWS RELATING TO FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAYS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal aid highway program, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

THE PEACE CORPS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be joined as a cosponsor of Senate bill 2000, the Peace Corps bill. I understand the bill has now been removed from the desk for the purpose of joint sponsorship, but I know the invitation to become a cosponsor still holds, and I wish to join as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] be included as a cosponsor of the Peace Corps bill, which was sent to the printer yesterday. A number of other Senators will wish to be cosponsors of the Peace Corps bill, in accordance with their expressed desire. From time to time I shall ask that their names be added. Subsequently it may be desirable to ask for a star print of the bill so that their names may be affixed to the original text.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ITEM VETO—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as a cosponsor to Senate Joint Resolution 31, providing the President with the item veto power on appropriations, and I ask that at the next printing of the joint resolution his name be listed as a sponsor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PEACE CORPS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 1, 1961, the names of Senators PELL, CLARK, SMITH of Massachusetts, MCGEE, HART, and GORE were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2000) to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT) on June 1, 1961.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF FRANK W. WILSON TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, June 13, 1961, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2300 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Frank W. Wilson, of Tennessee, to be U.S. district judge, eastern district of Tennessee, vice Leslie R. Darr, retired.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

Speech delivered at centennial commemorating Battle of Philippi, Philippi, W. Va., June 3, 1961.

Excerpts from remarks at commencement exercises of the Perkiomen School, Pennsburg, Pa., June 4, 1961, and invocation and prayer on same occasion.

By Mr. WILEY:

Radio address delivered by him over station WJN, Chicago, on June 4, 1961, relating to present-day challenges.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Article entitled "National Parks for the Future," written by the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, published in the June 1961, issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

THE HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, S. 1922, the proposed Housing Act of 1961, contains new authorizations for programs in

which I am actively interested, such as urban renewal and redevelopment, college housing, and housing for the elderly. In many respects, the urban renewal and college housing titles of the bill are similar to bills which I introduced early in the present session. In addition, two new programs are included—mass transportation loans which can help solve the commuter problem affecting an important area of my State, and Federal grants to assist State and local governments in preserving open-space land in and around urban areas. I favor both.

The bill authorizes the Federal Housing Administration to continue programs which have long been of benefit to home buyers and homebuilders—that is, insurance of home mortgages and home improvement loans.

Also included in the bill are provisions for programs about which I have serious reservations—notably, proposals for FHA insurance of 40-year, no-downpayment mortgages, including a new program for moderate income families, and for 25-year, $10,000 home improvement loans. I also question the wisdom of completely removing the ceiling on public housing.

Once again, I protest the practice of lumping all these programs—some sound, and others questionable—into an omnibus bill, and presenting it to the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. Once again, I protest the bad practice of financing these programs by the "back door" of direct borrowings from the Treasury, instead of by appropriations.

The danger of these practices has been dramatically illustrated by President Kennedy's appearance before a joint session of the Congress to deliver a special message on "urgent national needs." In that message, the President asked Congress and the country to accept, among other things, a commitment to put a man on the moon by 1970—a venture which will cost an estimated $20 billion to $40 billion. He asked for large new expenditures for defense—expenditures which, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I believe are necessary in the present state of world tensions. We face a marked expansion in defense costs.

In the same message, President Kennedy sounded a note of caution when he said:

> If the budget deficit now increased by the needs of our security is to be held within manageable proportions—if we are to preserve our fiscal integrity and world confidence in the dollar—it will be necessary to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards: and I must ask the cooperation of the Congress in this regard—to refrain from adding funds or programs, desirable as they may be, to the budget.

The Committee on Banking and Currency completed its work before the President's special message was delivered, and reported to the Senate this omnibus bill, which involves more than $6 billion in commitments by the Federal Government. Outright grants authorized in the bill total $2.69 billion. Loan programs, in which the initial funds, at least, will come from the Federal Treasury, total $3.5 billion. The expenditure impact upon the budget for the fiscal year 1962 will be $462.5 million.

To place an omnibus bill involving expenditures of this magnitude before the Senate on a take-it-or-leave-it basis is hardly in keeping with the spirit of the President's statement about the need to hold tightly to prudent fiscal standards.

There are seven titles in S. 1922. Title I contains provisions for new housing programs, including housing for families of "moderate income"—a term which is nowhere defined in the bill. Title II deals with housing for the elderly and low-income families. Title III deals with urban renewal and planning. Title IV deals with college housing, community facilities, and mass transportation. Title V deals with the Federal National Mortgage Association and FHA insurance programs. Title VI deals with open space and urban development; and title VII is a catchall for provisions dealing with other housing programs, including farm housing and direct home loans by the Veterans' Administration.

Each of these unrelated subjects deserves separate consideration. Each should be considered upon its own merits; and Senators should not be forced to vote upon such a clumsy omnibus bill. It is a practice which invites logrolling, back scratching, and other dubious legislative practices.

I have raised this issue on the Senate floor in former years, but have met no encouragement from the majority which now controls the Senate and the Congress. On the contrary, some members of the majority have frankly admitted that sound, accepted programs are held as hostages, in order to insure acceptance of more dubious proposals which tag along as unwelcome passengers on the omnibus.

Amendments have been offered to correct some of the more glaring defects in the bill. I hope the bill can be thus improved before we come to a final vote.

SENATOR CHAVEZ—RESOLUTION

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, in executive session, on May 31, 1961, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

> Whereas the Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ, the senior Senator from the State of New Mexico, has, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate, given progressive and eminent leadership and continuing inspiration to the members of the committee in its deliberations and work; and
>
> Whereas the committee is duly cognizant of the devotion of the Chairman to the work and duties of the committee; and
>
> Whereas the committee has been informed that the able and distinguished Senator from New Mexico has undergone surgery and is presently hospitalized at Bataan Memorial Hospital in Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the full committee hereby expresses its sincere hope and prayer that Senator CHAVEZ may have a complete and speedy recovery from the illness which necessitated such surgery, and that he may soon return to give continued active and dedicated leadership to this committee.
>
> SEC. 2. The chief clerk of the committee is directed to transmit to Senator CHAVEZ a copy of this resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business, Senate bill 1922, Calendar No. 252, the housing amendments of 1961, be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the decades we have labored together with the Latin American nations to develop a rational system of inter-American relations. The enduring aim and direction of this effort has been peace in this hemisphere and the advancement in concert of the common interests of the American Republics.

The inter-American system is far from perfect. It is not all that we wish it to be. It is not all that Latin American States desire it to be. Nevertheless, it has served all well, particularly since the beginnings of the good neighbor policy.

It has brought immense gains in trade to all. It carried us all safely through World War II. In general, it has functioned since that time to keep the peace of the hemisphere.

In saying that, I am not overlooking the threats from without and within which now beset the Americas. I am not overlooking Cuba. I am not overlooking recent events in the Dominican Republic. I am simply putting these concerns in fuller perspective. I am suggesting that whatever we do with respect to any particular situation had better be done with a close eye on the inter-American system. In short, we need to think with and act with the other American nations in the patterns that are embodied in the Rio Treaty and the Charter of the Organization of the American States. We must do so, no matter how pressing a hemispheric problem may seem to us alone at any given moment.

If we are to recall anything worth recalling from the Cuban experience, it is this principle. And we need to recall this principle now, in the light of recent events in the Dominican Republic.

The crisis in that tragic island is of concern, in the first place, to the Dominican people who have lived with this desperate situation for so many years. In the second place, it is of concern not to this Nation alone, but to

all the nations of the Western Hemisphere. There is only one aspect of this situation which is of preponderant concern at this time to the United States. That is the well-being of our citizens living on the island who may be caught in the political maelstrom.

I do not know what present conditions are within the Dominican Republic. There are disturbing reports and rumors, but I doubt that anyone yet knows the facts with any degree of accuracy. The technical qualities of our communications with Ciudad Trujillo are poor. Even worse, our capacity to learn what is going on in that capital is limited and, outside of it, virtually nonexistent.

But, I repeat, our only significant and unique interest in this situation is the well-being of our citizens. To the extent that outsiders are involved at all, whatever else transpires in the Dominican Republic is the concern of all the American Republics.

Since that is the case, the course we pursue in the days ahead should be closely concerted with these Republics through the Organization of the American States. In this matter, there are Latin American heads wiser and grayer with direct experience. They should be listened to with respect and attention. In the meantime, we must make every effort to increase the flow of accurate information from the Dominican Republic so that we shall be in a position to make intelligent judgments. In this connection, the OAS is moving in the right direction in trying to arrange to send a subcommittee to the island.

Finally, Mr. President, we must not permit a clogging of the channels of information, advice, and decision in this matter—from the Secretary of State directly to the President and other elected officials of this Government. There is no room for "paradecisions" on the Dominican crisis—by other departments, agencies, or officials, if we are to act effectively in this situation.

We do not yet know what will emerge from the Dominican crisis. It seems to me, however, that this Nation will contribute all it is able to contribute, in good sense, to the development of a better situation for the Dominican people and to the more rapid return of the Dominican Republic to the House of the Americas if it pursues a course based upon the following premises:

First. Our only unique concern with the internal situation in that country is the welfare of American citizens. To that end we must be prepared to safeguard them as circumstances require.

Second. We have a shared concern with the other American Republics for the welfare of the Dominican people, and must be prepared to join with those Republics in alleviating immediate human want in the island.

Third. We have a shared concern with the other Republics in the emergence of more responsible and responsive government in the Dominican Republic, and must be prepared to entertain suggestions from the Latin American nations on how joint action may be effective in aiding the Dominican people to achieve this end.

Fourth. We have a shared responsibility with the other American Republics to facilitate the prompt return of the Dominican Republic to full participation in hemispheric cooperation, and we must be prepared to entertain suggestions from the other American Republics and, as our own knowledge of the situation increases, to offer suggestions as to how this may be achieved.

Mr. President, if what I am suggesting is not clear from this enumeration, then I shall put it more bluntly: The future of the Dominican Republic is not ours alone, or even predominantly, to decide under the inter-American system. It is for the Dominicans to decide. It is for the nations of the Western Hemisphere, and not for us alone, to determine, through the institutions of hemispheric cooperation, how the Dominicans may be helped in a practical way, and it is for the American Republics to act in concert to extend that help.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; the Committee on Finance; the Committee on Government Operations; the Agricultural Credit Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; and the Postal Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, one committee was meeting today and there was some objection. I think, in the interest of uniformity, and so I shall not be charged with partiality, I shall have to object. I hope the majority leader is not offended by my objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand the objection of the distinguished minority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the rollcall be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED RULE RELATING TO COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, a few moments ago the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was advised that the minority leader, as was his right under the Senate rules, objected to a committee meeting while the Senate was in session. As a result, the committee probably adjourned, and efforts to bring the National Defense Education Act promptly to the full committee and to the floor, as had been requested by the majority leader, had to be temporarily abandoned.

I am so happy that, as I make these remarks, the distinguished President pro tempore [Mr. HAYDEN] of the Senate is in the chair, as he is the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration before which my proposed change in the Senate rules is pending, which would make it impossible for any single Senator to prevent any committee from meeting, whether the Senate was in session or not, as is presently the case.

Under my proposed rule, it would be required that a majority of the Senate could refuse permission to a committee or subcommittee to meet while the Senate was in session if the committee or subcommittee chose to meet.

I point out the increasingly disastrous results which the ancient and untenable rule is going to have on the business of this session of the Congress during the next several months.

As measures reach the calendar it becomes important for them to be considered and passed, the leadership, quite naturally, will call the Senate into session earlier in the day and will keep the Senate in session later in the day. This will mean that equally important proposed legislation, still pending in committees, cannot be considered if even one Senator objects.

I can think of no greater bit of obsolete folly than this particular rule, Mr. President.

Much has been said about the need to change rule XXII in respect to cloture. I respectfully submit that there are other ancient survivals of a bygone day in the Senate rules which are almost equally effective in preventing the Senate from performing its constitutional function of passing promptly on proposed legislation in the national interest.

I hope that my words, reiterated from day to day as they have been over the last 2 years, will at some point make some impact on my colleagues.

I note the majority leader has returned to the Chamber. The majority leader is the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, and is committed to bringing a proposed change in rule XXII to the Senate in the reasonably near future. I hope that he and the President pro tempore, as well as the other members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, will look with favor on other changes in the Senate Rules, which rules are presently being used—I do not say for the purpose of, for I challenge no man's motivation—with the result that proposed legislation much in the national interest cannot move through committees and to the Senate without undue delay.

I close, Mr. President, with the plea that we take a good, hard look at the ancient survivals of a day which has been dead for over 100 years which, as I said before, prevent the Senate from performing expeditiously, with even a moderate amount of efficiency, its constitutional duties.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wish to set the record straight.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be taken from the time allocated in opposition to the pending amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I merely wish to set the record straight. It was not the minority leader who objected for himself, as the minority leader objected to the committee meeting because I asked that objection be made.

I might explain my reason. The subcommittee called a meeting for 10 o'clock. I was at another committee meeting, and I told the staff to call me when a quorum was approached. The quorum was approached at 11 o'clock. I had business on the Senate floor which I wished to take care of, so I felt it within my rights to object to the meeting of the subcommittee, so that I could be in the Chamber and would not miss an official meeting of the subcommittee.

Mr. CLARK. I am happy to stand corrected by my friend from Arizona, who acted clearly within his rights. The minority leader, in a private conversation we had a week or two ago, advised me that he would always object to committees or subcommittees meeting while either the education bill or the housing bill was before the Senate, and that he did this not so much on his own account but because he had been requested to do so by other Members of the minority.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wished to have that straight in the record, because the distinguished minority leader is not a member of the subcommittee involved. I am. I made the objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute from the time in opposition to the amendment.

In response to what the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has said, it is my understanding that the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration does intend to hold hearings on the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania and does intend to give the very worthwhile suggestions of the Senator from Pennsylvania every consideration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall have to yield myself 2 minutes, in the absence of the Senator from New York, to respond to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may have 2 minutes without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania raises at once an interesting and also a very difficult question. I can illustrate the problem from my own experience.

I have membership on the Judiciary Committee and eight subcommittees. Those subcommittees meet at times. That is a total of nine.

I am a member of five subcommittees of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as the full committee. That is six. That makes a total of 15 committees and subcommittees on which I am supposed to be in attendance when they meet.

In addition, I serve on the Special Committee on Aging, and I believe on two subcommittees of that committee. That makes a total of 18.

I also serve on the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. That raises the total to 19.

In addition, I have a few leadership chores now and then, so we will raise the total to 20.

The question is, How does one dispose oneself? There are 36 Members on this side of the aisle, and all of them face the same difficulty, so far as committees are concerned.

How does the minority protect itself? How can I protect myself if I wish to attend a particular meeting of a subcommittee, when the Senate is in session?

I have no other weapon. I know of nothing else to do except to object to the committee meeting.

If there is objection on any given day to the meeting of any subcommittee or committee, I think I have to treat all committees impartially and fairly, and I cannot say, "This committee may meet; that committee may not meet."

The difficulty is, how do we resolve the problem? It is really a difficult question, to say the least. I have no answer for it.

I wished to be in attendance at a committee meeting this morning, when the Attorney General was to be present, yet I discovered I was invited—graciously invited; and I am glad I was—to go to Andrews Field to help to escort the President of the United States to the White House. When I got back the Judiciary Committee could not develop a quorum, and hence the proceeding came to an end, and the Attorney General must return.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I think the problem the Senator raises is a real problem which all Senators on this side of the aisle as well as the other side of the aisle face. Would the Senator agree that definitely one way not to solve the problem is to prevent any committees from meeting?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think the way to solve the problem is to see whether a coordinating service can be worked out so that we will not have these inevitable conflicts as between committee meetings and Senate meetings. Probably we could look at the schedule over a longer period of days than we sometimes do, in the hope that when there is important proposed legislation, a part of the administration program, which ought to be advanced to the Senate, we could probably arrange committee meetings to get the proposed legislation to the Senate. I would be the last to obstruct the progress of the administration's program.

Mr. CLARK. I think the Senator has made a very useful suggestion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is a matter of great difficulty, to say the least.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today it stand in adjournment to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate temporarily lay aside the housing bill and proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 265, H.R. 6345.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H.R.6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before I ask unanimous consent to rescind the order for the quorum call, I suggest that the attachés of the Senate notify Senators individually that the Senate is now considering the appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies, and that their presence in the Senate Chamber is most respectfully urged.

I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOD AND THE DIGNITY OF MAN

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, ultimately the cold war—and a hot war,

too, if one should occur—will be decided on the basis of the relative strength of character of America and the free world in relation to that of the Communist world. We believe that national character will be no stronger than the character of our people as individuals—individuals whose strength is founded on a belief in God coupled with the freedom to realize their fullest potential. This philosophy cannot be overemphasized or repeated too often today. So it is encouraging when one of America's great patriots—a recognized leader and thinker—has the courage to speak out on this subject, to warn our people that the disciples of atheistic communism deny the existence of God and the dignity and worth of the individual, and to state in clear, unequivocal words the difference between a free society and the materialistic society of the Communists. I refer to a great American, Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, and distinguished longtime member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the outstanding address delivered by Admiral Burke last Sunday, June 4, on the occasion of the commencement at Loras College in Dubuque, Iowa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AT THE LORAS COLLEGE, DUBUQUE, IOWA, JUNE 4, 1961

Your Excellency Most Reverend Archbishop, distinguished guests, gentlemen of the class of 1961, it is a great pleasure for me to be with you this afternoon. And it is a particular privilege to have this opportunity to share some of my thoughts with you at this wonderful time in your lives. This is a great day for you, and for your loved ones—an unforgettable day.

In preparing my remarks for this occasion, I tried to recall my own commencement in 1923. Some of the events of that day stand out vividly, others less clearly, and some I can remember only hazily. But there is one thing of which I am absolutely certain—I cannot remember a single word that was said by the commencement speaker on that day nearly 40 years ago.

But this is really rather comforting. For that speaker, confronted by the pressing issues of his time, probably found it as difficult a task as I do, to project the future for a graduating class. One generation cannot prophesy with any accuracy the kind of world in which another generation will live. Today, a revolution in science and technology has made change a familiar part of our environment. Much of the world is in chaos. The pressures created by awakening aspirations in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and the tensions of the all-embracing competition between two fundamentally opposed ideologies, make any prediction of the future a hazardous guess.

That is why what is said to you who graduate is not nearly so important as what you are saying to yourselves; what you are thinking about as you look to the years ahead. The really important issue is what you propose to do with your lives. And it is important that you think hard and long on these matters now; because you will never again be able to consider them with such detachment. When you leave Loras College, when your ideas and skills enter the competition of the marketplace, you will find that you have very little time for quiet reflection. The compelling task of finding a job, of making a living for yourself and, later perhaps, for a family, will frequently distract you from many of the broader issues of life, and from many of the problems of the world in which you live.

You stand now at the end of the beginning, and I must congratulate you on that beginning. Through hard work, through diligent study, you have earned not only our admiration, but our respect. A very real sense of victory is attached to this occasion. You have won a great start, and you have demonstrated the persistence, the courage, and the intelligence that are the hallmarks of success.

And there are many others who deserve congratulations as you reach this important milestone in your lives. You graduates are not alone in your victory. It is also a victory for your parents, for your teachers, for all those whose help and sacrifice made this beginning possible. And it is a victory as well for our free society which has provided the environment, the facilities, and the frame, in which you could do the work.

And so today you reach the end of the beginning. You are equipped with the tools of knowledge and the techniques of rational thinking. You have passed the tests, the examinations, of the academic world. But now, you will face even greater tests; even tougher examinations, examinations that will last for the rest of your lives.

You are fortunate to have been so well prepared. The years of your preparation—the forties and the fifties—have been a time of strife and conflict. But the years ahead promise to be even more difficult, even more demanding. In an otherwise uncertain world, however, one thing is certain. You will succeed, or you will fail, on the basis of your own efforts. That is a part of the process of maturing which by now you all recognize. In infancy, our parents protect us from the problems that surround us, and from the problems that we create ourselves. In adolescence and young manhood, the world is not quite so indulgent. Both parents and teachers are still there to help, to advise, and to give us the confidence to try again.

Now that you have reached this point in life, however, the world is harsher, realities are sterner. And performance—not excuses—will be the test. You will be confronted directly with the vital issues of this missile age, issues that can change the destiny of your lives, of our Nation, and of the entire world. Your lives will be complicated by the aggressive, ruthless forces at work in the world, powerful forces that no nation, that no individual, can ignore.

But these forces are not unique in the history of mankind. Tyranny has never been a unique phenomenon. Unfortunately, there have always been men without respect for either God or principles, men obsessed with a godless lust for power. Totalitarian ideologies are not new in this world. Communism is nothing more than ancient tyranny with modern refinements—an old idea poured into a new mold.

Certainly these are "times that try men's souls." But no times could be more trying than when those words were first written during the agonizing struggle that gave birth to our Republic. And if the older members of this audience will recall the year Loras College received its name, if they will think back to 1939, they will remember Hitler shouting before the Reichstag—preaching the tyranny of nazism. At about the same time, Mussolini was celebrating the anniversary of the first Fascist squad and their bloody conquests in Africa.

In that time period, as today, the areas of the world where men were free, free in their own ideals, free in their own aspirations, were growing smaller. Freedom itself was in grim jeopardy.

Now your generation, just as previous generations have done, will have to find the answers to some grave questions, to some fundamental questions. Your generation will have to decide if the concept of freedom and justice for which our forefathers fought and died is still valid. You must decide if this concept is worth the price that freedom always demands. Your answer to these vital questions will reflect the basic qualities of our national life. Your response will be the real measure of what Loras College has given you—the real gage of your maturity, and of your integrity.

I have no doubt as to what your answer will be. But before you respond, you might do well to pause a moment and reconsider what has made America great. You might reexamine the realities, the simple truths, the beliefs, on which our society is based.

Our most important belief, the bedrock of our society, is our spiritual faith—our belief in God. Behind the concept of freedom itself is the conviction that man is a child of God, and that men derive their rights from their Creator. It was this conviction, this belief in God, that gave rise to our political liberty—to the inalienable rights that we find expressed in our basic documents.

And it was this same conviction that determined our principles, our polices, and our practices. For from our belief in God came our belief in the individual—in the supreme worth of human beings. Our Nation was founded on faith in the capacities of the individual. And the accomplishments of individuals have justified that faith. Our Nation has grown from insignificance to greatness through the efforts of hard working individuals, the efforts of determined, courageous individuals. Individual men subdued this continent, and put it under the plow. Individuals built our great industries, established our cities, founded our colleges.

But our concept of the individual is by no means universally accepted. There are many today who do not share our belief in the importance of the individual. Across the seas, and even close to our own shores, are those who scoff at human dignity, who regard man as an expendable commodity. The disciples of atheistic communism first denied God—and then denied the individual. To them, people are not individual human beings, with individual dignity and worth. To them, people are the proletariat—the masses.

This is the basic conflict between the two concepts of man; whether man is to be respected as an individual with God-given rights and obligations; or whether man is to be a cog in the machine of the state, a cog to be used, degraded, and enslaved.

Many Americans, of course, are well aware of the threat that this materialistic ideology presents to free society. And they work hard and long to develop our national strength, to build our Nation's military power. Many of you will undoubtedly be called upon to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Whether your period of service is long or short, I trust you will look upon it not as an intolerable burden, but rather, as a challenge. And I hope that you will accept this challenge as an opportunity, an opportunity to contribute significantly to the security of this wonderful country of ours.

Yet, as a military man and as a citizen, I want to make one point abundantly clear. The real strength of a democracy does not depend on its military power, on its ships and aircraft, on its missiles and submarines. Lincoln recognized this a century ago when he said our security does not rest in "our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army, and our Navy."

Today, as in the past, the only real way to increase the strength of our Nation is to strengthen what is under attack—to strengthen the individual. At times, however, this can be far more difficult than meet-

ing the threat of an armed aggressor. Because in a democracy an individual can be strengthened only by voluntary acts of his own. In a free society, it is men who must manage themselves; they cannot be coerced. They are not dominated by terror, nor by the threat of force. There are no laws, no codes, which can force you to act responsibly. As citizens, you will have to accept your responsibilities voluntarily. This is your obligation; this is your duty; and you cannot escape it or deny it.

You will be responsible for your own welfare, for your own success, for your own destiny. But you have public responsibilities, as well as personal ones. For talents and abilities also help determine a man's responsibilities. Because you have both knowledge and capacity, because you have received fine educations, your obligations will be greater than others. You are potential leaders—leaders in thought and action. And you will be responsible to make the choices of a leader.

During your lifetimes, all of you will be faced with many choices. You will be called upon to play many roles and share in many decisions, in your professions, in your homes, and in your communities. And you will make many other choices alone, by yourself, in your own conscience. Some of these choices will be easy, and some will be hard, very hard. Some choices will be relatively unimportant; still others will affect your entire life. But whether these choices are easy or hard, significant or insignificant, each will leave its mark on our society. For a nation takes on the character of its citizens, of what they choose to do—or choose not to do.

If you want our Nation to be strong and virile, you must choose to be strong and virile yourself; you must be willing to do the hard work that will give our country vitality and growth.

If you choose as citizens to identify yourself personally with the problems of our times, if you are willing to show the interest, if you are willing to question and to contribute, the solutions of many of our national problems will be advanced.

If you choose to act in the public interest and let selfish interests take second place, our Nation will be in good hands.

If you choose to increase your strength, your mental strength, your strength of character, the United States will reflect that strength.

These choices must be made, for there is a "something for something" aspect in life. You just don't get something for nothing. There is always a cost—a cost in effort—a cost in risk.

There was a time when all those choices were not too complicated, when the issues were more sharply drawn. But today life is complex. The world is a world of change, bringing with it many impersonal, abstract relationships to complicate your choices and distort your attitudes. But when you find yourself in a "gray area," where the distinction between right and wrong appears less clear cut, remember that you still have a benchmark with which to check your attitudes. You still have your principles to guide your choices.

Brave men with strong principles came to the New World. These men made their principles the basis of our national life and gave reality to the concept of self-government. The principles that guided our forebears, the principles of faith, integrity, and responsibility, of loyalty, courage, and determination, will also serve as the surest guide for you in the days ahead.

That is why, this afternoon, as I give you my best wishes at your commencement, I would like to add one other wish. It is not a wish for comfort—or security. Nor is it a wish for fame—or material success. Rather, it is my sincere wish that you will always hold fast to your principles, that you will always have the stamina and strength to meet the challenges that await you.

So that someday, many years from now, you will be able to say with pride and with truth; "I have fought the good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith."

May God bless you all.

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, it was my privilege to speak at the annual State convention of the League of United Latin American Citizens in Davenport, Iowa, last Saturday evening, June 3. The league was founded in 1929 by a group of men dedicated to uphold the democratic principles of individual freedom, first as human beings and second as American citizens. Today it is composed of some 10,000 members from all walks of life—laborers, tradesmen, business men and women, as well as professional men—who recognize their responsibilities and opportunities as members of a great freedom-loving citizenry.

Membership in the league is open to all Americans of Mexican descent and others who seek an opportunity to become of service to their country and their community. Its national headquarters is in 711 Kress Building, Houston, Tex., and the current national president is Mr. Hector Godinez. The motto of the organization is "All for one and one for all."

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement of brief history of the league, a short statement of LULAC Milestones, and the LULAC Code, which is a splendid and challenging statement of principles for all Americans.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEAGUE OF UNITED LATIN AMERICAN CITIZENS

BRIEF HISTORY

Because of the prejudicial attitude that had prevailed for many generations, and that had been directed at the Mexican-American population group, it became necessary for certain men who believed this to be unfair, to assemble in the city of Corpus Christi, Tex. for the expressed purpose of formulating a means by which to restrain the curtailment of the rights, privileges, and opportunities of Americans of Spanish or Mexican descent.

The prejudicial attitude and discriminatory acts had, at this point, reached such extreme proportions in various localities in the Southwest that Americans of Mexican extraction could do no more than to unite their efforts in an endeavor to maintain a position of self-respect and decency.

Several Latin American organizations merged at a convention held for this purpose in Corpus Christi, Tex., on February 17, 1929. At this convention, the League of United Latin American Citizens became the accepted name of the organization. Immediate steps were taken to draw up a constitution and bylaws; adoption of a motto, prayer, and hymn followed. "All for one and one for all," became the motto; Washington's prayer and "America" were adopted as the league's prayer and hymn, respectively.

Among those responsible for the organizing of LULAC, were Ben Garza, Alonso Perales, J. Luz Saenz, J. T. Canales, Juan B. Lozano, A. De Luna, Juan Soliz, Mauro Machado, E. N. Marin, and M. C. Gonzales.

LULAC has continued to grow in membership and in area. Today, there are hundreds of councils extending from California to New York. Included in its ranks are Anglo-Americans, who have added greatly to the league with their dedicated efforts in an endeavor to further the cause for which LULAC aspires.

LULAC is well on its way toward the consummation of its objectives. All this is being accomplished through an understanding of its purposes by friends and foes alike.

Many are the activities that LULAC has participated in and still participates in today in its struggle to bring about an equality of opportunity, privilege, and responsibility. LULAC has taken on large programs dealing with education, segregation, hygiene and child care, scouting, migrant worker problems, and many other general fields of endeavor.

LULAC has played important roles in civic affairs through its various members who serve their communities loyally and well; through participation in various civic and welfare drives of all kinds; through bringing about better understanding of peoples, problems, and possible solutions; and also through an encouragement of citizens in more assumption of responsibilities. Many other fields of endeavor have been opened to LULAC, however space does not permit details.

This presentation of LULAC history is perhaps the briefest form ever presented but to give the complete history of the league with all of its achievements, would take many volumes. At any rate, LULAC has contributed to the amalgamation of a group of people through one form or another, and it continues to strive for certain self-imposed objectives destined to bring about the socio-economic betterment of a people, the safeguarding of their political and civil rights, and the emphasis of their duties and obligations as citizens of the United States of America.

LULAC MILESTONES

Perhaps you are wondering about the accomplishments of the League of United Latin American Citizens. By this time, you know that it was founded in 1929 and up to this date, it is established throughout the United States. It has thousands of members and hundreds of councils. There are professional and business men and women, and there are tradesmen and laborers in its ranks. But what has the league really accomplished?

It would take many volumes to cite every successful endeavor that LULAC has undertaken; however, a few general cases should be listed for your information.

One particular case that LULAC tackled was that of the "wetback" situation in 1948. Even our leaders were doubtful at times as to the amount of benefit that could be derived from LULAC efforts in this matter. However, LULAC went to work on it with determination to win. Washington sat up and took notice and almost overnight, the condition was alleviated.

A swimming pool in a west Texas town had been denied Spanish-speaking American citizens for generations. The situation was hopeless to everyone except LULAC, but of this hopeless situation came a pool for all without restrictions and without differentiations.

Infant mortality was very high in a west Texas town. This was accepted as an inevitable misfortune of Spanish-speaking Americans, but LULAC thought different about this. Lady LULAC's went to work on the case and today that town's population has been augmented by those infants whose doom was a foregone conclusion in the minds of many.

Segregation of Spanish-named schoolchildren in school systems was a disliked but accepted state of affairs. So-called Mexican schools with poor teachers, poor facilities, and poor physical plants were and had been the accepted pattern. To change the status quo presented a can't-be-done situation. It was a David against Goliath role which LULAC accepted. The situation is now a part of the past.

Similar situations of seemingly impossible proportions have been tackled by LULAC with regard to theaters, employment, hotels and motels, restaurants, housing, etc.

LULAC has accomplished many other missions that are to the benefit of its members and fellow citizens. The Little Schools of 400 is a completely new educational program started by our past national president, Felix Tijerina, who spent much of his time, effort and personal money getting this program on its way. Preschool children of Mexican descent, who have never spoken English in their lives, are taught the 400 basic words in English to prepare them for their first year in public school. This has been a remarkable program by which hundreds of Spanish-speaking children have been adequately prepared to compete with other children in the first years of school. The Little Schools of 400 are highly recognized by the State of Texas and a substantial appropriation has been made by the State to help pay for expenses incurred in this program.

The *Mendez* v. *Orange County, California* case, in which it was found unconstitutional for children of Mexican extraction to be segregated in schools. The case was taken by the Santa Ana LULAC Council to the San Francisco Circuit Court of Appeals, where a favorable decision was rendered reversing a decision by the Supreme Court of Orange County, Calif. This case has been used successfully in Texas, particularly in the Salvatierra case, and by the NAACP in the Supreme Court of the United States.

There are many more conditions that have been successfully remedied by LULAC. Each has presented what some would accept as insurmountable barriers or obstacles, and they seemingly were until LULAC came along and accepted them as balky and tenacious but removable obstacles in the path of progress and success.

LULAC has been responsible for the removal of all types of erroneous ideas and attitudes harbored in the minds of many people. It has also opened opportunities for a large segment of the American population to enjoy its constitutional rights and its citizenship responsibilities, for our young men and women to educate themselves, to enter the professions in greater numbers, to participate in civic affairs, and to assume the true role of American citizenship in fact and in theory without any ifs, ands, or buts.

LULAC—League of United Latin American Citizens—Code

Respect your citizenship and preserve it; honor your country, maintain its tradition in the spirit of its citizens and embody yourself into its culture and civilization;

Be proud of your origin and maintain it immaculate, respect your glorious past and help to defend the rights of all the people. Learn how to discharge your dues before you learn how to assert your rights; educate and make yourself worthy, and stand high in the light of your own deeds; you must always be loyal and courageous;

Filled with optimism, make yourself sociable, upright, judicious, and above all things be sober and collected in your habits, cautious in your actions and sparing in your speech;

Believe in God, love humanity and rely upon the framework of human progress, slow and sound, unequivocal and firm;

Always be honorable and highminded; learn how to be self-reliant upon your own qualifications and resources;

In war serve your country, in peace your convictions; discern, investigate, meditate and think, study, at all times be honest and generous. Let your firmest purpose be that of helping to see that each new generation shall be of a youth more efficient and capable and in this let your own children be included.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Madam President, times have changed since 1945, as has the entire character of warfare.

Admittedly, in England in World War II, air raid wardens rendered needful wartime service. Here in America, they and the fine volunteer civilians under their authority were trained and ready to serve their neighbors in event of an air raid attack on our country, which happily never occurred.

At that time there was ample warning of an air raid attack. At that time it was quite certain that, in event of an attack by air upon this Nation, a warning of hours, and not merely a few minutes would be given.

We are now in a jet and missile age of challenge. At most, we Americans could expect a warning of 3 minutes—or no warning whatever—of a missile attack from an enemy submarine off our coast. Missiles with atomic warheads could be rained upon us from the Soviet Union, striking on target within 16 minutes of the firing. In a few years, the elapsed time will be much less.

America's defense against such attacks is our vast power of immediate retaliation; hurling atomic missiles from our bases, from submarines, and from our jet bombers. We have the potential to destroy missile bases, airfields, and cities within the Soviet Union, and in the process kill many millions of the inhabitants. In our country mass evacuation programs would be futile. They would prove dangerous; probably resulting in the worst traffic jams ever. Civil defense shelters in basements, on the other hand, might prove huge firetraps in urban areas.

The power and might of our Armed Forces on land, sea, under the sea, and in the air is our foremost line of defense, and safeguarding the lives of 180 million civilians is too important to be in charge of the discredited Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as it has been operated from 1952 up to and including early in the present year.

More than $1 billion of taxpayers' money has been wasted throughout this period on civil defense. Sixty percent of this huge sum for this outmoded bureaucracy, which developed into a billion dollar boondoggle, has gone for salaries and expenses. It is astounding that more than 40 percent of the paid personnel of this agency receive $10,000 a year or more each.

Unfortunately, a sizable percentage of this money comes from States and municipalities where tax dollars are exceedingly scarce. Surely, vital programs for schools, hospitals, and housing should not be permitted to die for lack of funds, particularly at a time when so much money goes down the drain in utter waste for civil defense.

In this space age of challenge, civilians in armbands in a national emergency brought on by an atomic attack would be as useless as the flintlock muskets, tallow dips, and mustache cups of our country's Founding Fathers.

Madam President, civil defense volunteers, including many hundreds of good, patriotic men and women in my own State, have performed nobly in times of natural disasters, such as floods and tornadoes. They serve without compensation. They study first aid procedures and respond to calls from paid civil defense officials sitting safely behind desks, or of paid policemen assigned to civil defense who sit around waiting for a bomb to drop. This at a time when crime is rampant in our cities; and the services of every policeman needed to protect women from crimes of violence in Washington and elsewhere.

I maintain that our newspapers, civic organizations, the Red Cross, and television and radio stations would perform more important services and do more toward saving lives in event of an atomic attack by disseminating first aid and lifesaving procedures. Also, these media of communications could instruct and train men and women who have been volunteers in civil defense work and others to serve capably as auxiliary firemen, special policemen, and special deputy sheriffs.

It is an American tradition that neighbors have always rushed to the assistance of neighbors in times of disaster, voluntarily and freely giving help to those suddenly stricken and needing help.

If this Nation were to be attacked, our President, as Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces, would immediately declare a national emergency. He would doubtless suspend the writ of habeas corpus, as did President Lincoln early in the Civil War.

In a time of attack, the Armed Forces would necessarily control the movement of civilians. No appointed politician wearing an armband of civil defense would be permitted for one instant to supersede the military.

Over the country there is an outcry against the waste and futility of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as it has been conducted during the past 10 years.

The time is long past due for a change. The patience of our taxpayers has worn thin.

I read and embody in my remarks an editorial which appeared on June 1 in the Washington News, a Scripps-Howard newspaper, entitled "Fifth Wheel in Defense."

In addition, Madam President, I read and embody in my remarks an editorial under the caption "Holes To Hide In," which was published in the Cleveland Press of May 30. The Cleveland Press is also a newspaper of the Scripps-Howard chain. It is a great newspaper in my State of Ohio. From the time E. W. Scripps founded the Penny Press to this

good hour its circulation and influence have increased. Its present circulation is 384,000. It is truly a newspaper with a great history and noble tradition.

I hope my colleagues who are not presently listening to my remarks will read these editorials in their entirety.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, June 1, 1961]

FIFTH WHEEL IN DEFENSE

Civil defense, with its screeching sirens and its snowstorm of conflicting pamphlets, is something to frighten your children and nervous adults at a time when the Nation needs spunk. Its spending is a waste. Its arm-banded functionaries would be in the way of police and firemen, in the event of real national emergency.

Current appropriation for civil defense is $60 million. The new Director has been talking about $300 million; sounds like he'd settle for $104 million.

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Ohio Democrat, speaks our piece:

"By reason of poor planning, confused thinking, negligence, maladministration, inordinately high salaries and colossal ineptitude, the paid officials and employees charged with defense of civilians in event of war have managed to squander more than $1 billion since 1951.

"My view is that the defense of civilians is too important to be entrusted to civilians wearing arm bands. As in Canada and England, it should be under the direction of those trained and experienced in defense—the Armed Forces of the United States."

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Press, May 30, 1961]

HOLES TO HIDE IN

Never, since the coming of the big bomb, has there been any consistent national policy for civil defense. The President, in his state of the Union message, has stated and appeared to endorse two opposing points of view. Not much has been done to clear away the fog.

President Kennedy has assigned primary responsibility to the Secretary of Defense, which is a sound decision. On the other hand he proposes to retain, under a new name, the present, futile, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, to assist in coordination of civilian defense functions. That is what it is supposed to do now.

He proposes a shelter program involving additional expense of around $200 million in the coming year and "sharp" increases thereafter. Administration spokesmen say the eventual cost might be as much as $20 billion.

Taking an at least partially opposite tack, he says with considerable eloquence, "We will deter an enemy from making a nuclear attack only if our retaliatory power is so strong and so invulnerable that he knows he would be destroyed by our response. If we have that strength, civil defense is not needed to deter an attack. If we should ever lack it, civil defense would not be an adequate substitute."

This, he can be sure, is the kind of talk Americans like to hear. There is little interest one can discern in digging holes to hide in. The billions these holes would cost are better spent in making our military defense so strong it forbids attack.

If we don't have the kind of military strength the President mentions, we should drop everything else, including social reform and moon shots, until we get it. That is the soundest possible method of civil defense.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I would like to ask the Senator from Ohio, who has repeatedly spoken so effectively on the follies and wastefulness of our civil defense operation, whether he does not believe it advisable that the present setup be abolished and the functions of civil defense transferred to the Military Establishment. Does he not believe that that would be the proper and happy solution to the present disastrous performance we have been witnessing?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes. I was heartened by the statement of our President in his recent message to Congress, that we should place the functions of civil defense under the Secretary of Defense who is the proper civilian official to have charge of the defense of our country.

I was somewhat dismayed, however, that in the course of his address the President indicated he would treble the budgetary request for civil defense activities in fiscal 1962, and that he would keep the present setup on a smaller basis.

I am certain that the distinguished Senator from Alaska will be one of the Senators who will scrutinize the goings on of this small agency with great care, lest it become a huge boondoggle and bureaucracy, as the present Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has been throughout the last 8 or 10 years.

Mr. GRUENING. I commend the Senator from Ohio for the persistent and effective presentation of the case against the present mismanagement of civil defense. I am hopeful that when the appropriation bill comes before the Senate it may be fully scrutinized so that we may ascertain whether this wastefulness will continue. I hope it will not. We should have an entirely new approach, and I hope the Department of Defense will present tangible and reasonable proposals which will do away with what has been going on and save the amount of money sought for genuine national defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator.

UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, the problem of high unemployment in periods of comparative prosperity is an enigma that has plagued this country for the last 8 years or so. At the moment, as we are recovering from a serious recession, we still find that nearly all the 150 largest labor markets of our Nation are suffering from high unemployment. Too many areas have had jobless rates in excess of 6 percent for as much as 5 or 6 years.

Last year, a Committee on Unemployment Problems reported to the Senate on its findings in this field. As a member of this committee, I was pleased to see many of our recommendations adopted by the President as part of this administration's legislative program. Yet, the basic problem is still with us.

Too few of us have felt the urgency of this problem. I, for one, have spoken numerous times on this floor about the vexation of an economy of an affluent society in which 1 worker in 15 or 16 cannot find work. I have called attention to the fact that technological changes, new people in the labor market, increased efficiency of workers and the jobless are tied together in one of our greatest domestic problems. For example, we must find 2 million new jobs in the coming year, in addition to trying to put additional millions back to work.

A free economy can do these things. They are being done by other free nations where the standard of living is high and where wage rates are comparable to ours in buying power.

In last Sunday's Washington Post and Times-Herald, Bernard D. Nossiter, wrote a very thoughtful and interesting article on this enigma entitled "Affluent Society's Beset by a Poverty of Jobs." I commend its reading to my colleagues and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFFLUENT SOCIETY'S BESET BY A POVERTY OF JOBS

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

In a society so affluent that it can afford Roman baths in the Gotham Hotel, madcap speculation in cheap new stocks and indignant complaints about a ceiling on tax-deductible expense accounts, a little problem disturbs the national euphoria. Nearly 5 million able-bodied men and women can't find jobs to support themselves and maintain their sense of dignity.

The problem has engaged some of the country's better (and poorer) minds, inspired tons of speeches and analyses and produced what the Kennedy administration accurately labels as "modest" legislative programs.

MYTHS OF OUR TIMES

The talk, as talk will, also has produced some myths about the causes of unemployment and even about the very nature of the discussion. Perhaps these myths should first be cleared away.

Myth 1: That a great debate is raging between those who blame rising levels of unemployment on structural causes and those who blame it on cyclical causes.

Much against their will, Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve Board has been identified as the exclusively "structural" man and Chairman Walter Heller of the President's Council of Economic Advisers has been identified as the exclusively "cyclical" man.

Structural unemployment means the kind of hard-core unemployment resulting from lack of skills, workers trapped in abandoned one-industry towns and workers replaced by new machines, all of them glibly lumped under the heading of automation.

Cyclical unemployment refers to the business cycle, the up-and-down waves in the economy. It blames unemployment on a weakness in the only kind of demand that counts, the desire for goods and services backed by cash or credit. This weakness shows up when incomes and public and private spending don't keep pace with the expanding volume of goods and services that our factories and shops can turn out.

Both Heller and Martin are too intelligent to get impaled on the horns of a false dichotomy. They agree that both structural and

cyclical causes account for our high unemployment. This does not mean that they agree on which set of causes is more important and the policies to be pursued. But a description of that quarrel must wait until another myth is examined.

Myth 2: That automation is the root of all evil.

As Malcolm L. Denise, the knowing Ford Motor Co. vice president who bargains with Walter Reuther, has said: "Automation is frequently used to mean anything that causes unemployment * * *. Automation calls to mind a mental picture of radical new automatic devices, spreading like wildfire, leaving behind a trail of useless, idle men."

If this were a real picture of what has been happening, we would have had tremendous increases in productivity—the amount a worker can produce in a given period of time—in recent years. The fact is, productivity gains for the economy as a whole in the past 5 years have been about even with the historic average.

There is no known statistical evidence that technological unemployment—the replacement of workers by machines—has been increasing for the economy as a whole.

This is not to say that the new technology has not caused some severe problems in some industries. Any coal miner or railroad worker can testify to that and the statistics for these industries bear them out. Moreover, it doesn't mean that any new and rapid introduction of, say, computers won't throw bank clerks, retail clerks, and others on the jobless rolls in the future. But the record of the fifties argues that automation unemployment is a relatively small, specialized concern.

The past decade's experience further argues that the problem will disappear if two things happen. One is that the industries enjoying or suffering rapid technological change provide severance payments, retraining, adequate pensions with pension rights available in several companies in an industry or several industries and other similar and well-known devices. (Mr. Kennedy's second state of the Union message proposed a $60 million Federal contribution for some of this.) The second thing needed, of course, is an economy growing fast enough to provide jobs.

Now let us turn to the Martin-Heller question of emphasis: Should we rely chiefly on a rifle approach to rebuild depressed areas; train the unskilled and the like? Or should we also employ buckshot methods to strengthen demand through tax cuts or increased Government spending?

The question can be put another way: Is the rising amount of unemployment which has ridden the crest of the last three waves of "prosperity" due to increasing structural or increasing cyclical unemployment? The evidence is scant. The only serious attempt to discover the answer has been made by Heller and his colleagues.

Their statistics show that rising jobless rates can't be traced to a worker's occupation, skill, age, or sex. In other words, the extra or incremental unemployment in each "prosperity" period is cyclical, a lack of demand. There has been much muttering about the Council of Economic Advisers' data, but none of the experts emphasizing the structural or hard-core problem have yet backed up their case.

THE BURNS SCHOOL

So the brighter conservatives have shifted their attack to another ground. The leading exponent of this line is Arthur F. Burns, the last distinguished economist to chair the President's Council before Heller's brilliant entrance on the Washington scene.

Burns doesn't waste his time with the false cyclical-structural dichotomy. In fact, he brushes past structural unemployment entirely. He blames the abortive recovery of 1959–60 chiefly on the Eisenhower administration's overrestrictive budget and the overrestrictive money policies of the Federal Reserve—policies pursued after he left Mr Eisenhower's Council.

In other words, like Heller and most economists, he blames the recent slump on a lack of spending or demand. He parts company with Heller over the future. The Kennedy administration believes that the successively higher waves of unemployment indicate a basic flaw in the economy which can be corrected either by increased Federal outlays or increased private outlays stimulated by a tax cut.

But Burns argues that the 1959 wave was an exception caused by misguided policies. At the other end, the relatively low 3 percent jobless rate of the first prosperity crest (1953) was a fluke, he says, caused by the heavy spending of the Korean war. So, Burns contends, there is no real mounting wave of joblessness.

In sum, Heller argues that unless the Government steps up its efforts, unemployment will still be a major problem a year from now. Burns is confident that the recovery is strong; that unemployment could well be down to 4 percent in 18 months or sooner and without added Government pump priming.

There is an arid quality to this kind of debate, even when conducted by such able men. Worse, there is an unreal dimension to it because the administration has largely turned its back on its own experts' analyses. The President's second state of the Union message proposes both rifle and buckshot attacks.

But the buckshot is too feeble, if Heller is right. Instead of the increased spending of $800 million this year that Mr. Kennedy proposes, something around $4 billion is needed to bring unemployment down even to the modest 4 percent goal next year.

Perhaps, then, Burns may be right.

Perhaps all the discussion so far has been beside the point. Perhaps other kinds of structural problems are preventing the economy from growing and are keeping millions idle.

If the boy who asked about the emperor's clothes had grown up to be an economist, he might have asked these questions:

1. Why should blue-collar jobs in steel, autos and electrical machinery rise and fall as output rises and falls? White-collar workers aren't victimized this way.

In Europe, the steel industry runs its plants near capacity and moves prices up and down as demand rises and falls. Here, the big, concentrated industries set prices to achieve a target rate of return at some point below capacity. Prices are then held steady regardless of drops in demand, and raised when buying increases. The brunt of the drop in demand is borne by blue-collar jobs.

2. Why shouldn't industries like steel, autos, and electrical machinery—the core of much of the postwar rises and falls in employment—plan for steady employment? We are now requiring Latin American nations to plan their development in return for aid. Isn't sauce for the Latin goose sauce for the corporate gander?

3. If a lack of demand is a major problem, are our incomes so perfectly distributed? Or is there a maldistribution, with too much concentrated at the upper end of the scale where savings and spending on services are high and too little at the lower end of the scale where spending for goods is strongest?

A recent Commerce Department study shows that there has been a slow but steady widening of the gap between the top and the bottom in the past 5 years.

4. If Government spending is such a powerful force, should the military turn on and off huge orders and big installations in such a disconcerting, planless fashion? The 1957–58 slump, remember, was triggered by a sudden drop in military outlays. And there may be much deeper, steadier cuts ahead.

Why not plan and have ready alternative, useful private or public outlays to fill the local and national gaps these cuts will produce?

The President's Labor-Management Advisory Committee professes to be concerned about unemployment. It is noteworthy that none of these questions has yet appeared on its agenda.

In fact, this group of businessmen, labor leaders, and citizens is talking about automation and exports, exclusively, which are interesting but secondary problems.

To their credit, Heller and his fellow Council members are not unaware of the primary problems. They are now studying the steel industry's tentative threat to raise prices this fall as part of their mission to examine the forces affecting jobs, growth, and economic stability.

But everything is for the best in the best of all possible worlds. A new auto and steel "boomlet" is apparently under way. The business community is catching the investment fever, and with any luck, we will have a spurt in outlays for modernizing and expanding the capacity of our factories. A year from now, the chances are that most of us will be richer.

Whether Burns is right and 2.8 million are jobless or Heller is right and 4 million are jobless may seem less important than the fact that industrial production and the Dow-Jones average will be setting new records.

Less important, that is, except for the 2.8 to 4 million who want work and can't find it. And, when this upturn has run its course and the economy sinks again, there will again be sober studies and somber warnings about the dangers and miseries of unemployment.

THE PROPAGANDA WAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, every American is deeply concerned about the propaganda offensive of the Communists—not only the Soviet Union, but also of Red China which has stepped up its efforts in the Latin American and African areas.

The U.S. Information Agency under the new leadership of Edward Murrow has the responsibility and the opportunity to put the American information and propaganda programs into high gear. A very thoughtful and penetrating article, entitled "Can We Stop Losing the Propaganda War?" written by Mr. Henry Mayers, an advertising executive from Los Angeles, Calif., is worthy of the study and consideration of every Member of Congress and those who are responsible for our information efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE STOP LOSING THE PROPAGANDA WAR?

(By Henry Mayers)

When the Foreign Ministers of NATO nations met in Paris last December, the world press devoted columns to their discussions of the Polaris missile as a possible addition to the NATO shield. Another Paris conference during the same month, considering other measures vital to free world security, was largely ignored by the press.

The International Conference on Soviet Political Warfare had brought to Paris 500 leading citizens of NATO nations, including parliamentary officials, political leaders, labor representatives, writers and educators. For 3 days these delegates, representing all shades of left and right political opinion, discussed the nature and scope of the Soviet threat in the areas of political subversion and propaganda. They then adopted unanimously a resolution reminding free world governments that while NATO and SEATO have been acquiring deterrents against possible military aggressions by Moscow and Peiping, these powers have been conducting unrestricted aggressions on the political fronts of all free nations.

Against such worldwide psychological warfare, the free world has no counterforce. A recent issue of "Fifteen Nations" carried a thoughtful article which stated that "psychological warfare is now moving rapidly toward a final decision which could certainly lead to our surrender." The article proposed countermeasures, but stipulated that psychological warfare must be the responsibility of the individual nations of the West. This is the present strategy.

It has inherent weakness.

It cannot succeed.

Unified strategy by NATO nations is as essential to effective psychological warfare as to NATO military operations. Until this principle is recognized by each member of the NATO and SEATO alliances, their adversaries enjoy all the advantages. Unhindered in their maneuverings on political fronts, the Soviets are in a position to turn whole nations against the West, without firing a shot. Battle after battle can be lost on the psychological front through failure to realize where the battlefields are. The entire free world is a battle area. Deployed over it is an army of propagandists, agitators, and secret agents totaling 500,000 persons, and their activities represent annual Soviet-Sino expenditures of $2 billion. This is not a political party operation. It has both the characteristics and the objectives of a military operation. But it is one against which military deterrents are useless.

The recent Conference on Soviet Political Warfare has urged specific steps by the alliances to close the serious gap in free world defenses. However, there is little evidence that consideration is being given to united action by free world governments. Each nation apparently believes it has no alternative to going it alone in the field of propaganda, which it confuses with information. Each considers such efforts exclusively a national affairs.

This attitude in Western governments which gives incalculable advantages to their Communist adversaries, has developed largely because of the successful Soviet strategy of keeping each Western nation's propaganda continually on the defensive. By constant attack on every aspect of U.S., British, and French policy, the U.S.S.R. has induced these powers to devote most or all of their information facilities to defending themselves to the rest of the world, and to each other. Meanwhile, the Communist bloc carries on effective pro-Communist propaganda in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, through saturation broadcasting, press infiltration, pamphleteering, and harranguing. Despite Hungary, Tibet, and a long history of oppression, Moscow and Peking are attracting admirers in the developing countries, through propaganda that manipulates the hopes and passions of the masses.

The U.S. Information Agency attempts to combat such developments through counterpropaganda, but its efforts face insuperable handicaps. In most developing countries, for example India, the Communists are a legitimate political party, claiming to be interested only in helping the nation's workers and farmers. The U.S. Information Service, being a guest in the country, cannot aggressively expose native Communist intrigue without getting into difficulties with the host government. Voice of America broadcasts from the United States are not so restricted but if they devote much time to anticommunism, they simply lose their radio audience. Few Asians, Africans, or Latin Americans care to listen to such broadcasts from the United States. They do not regard America as an objective source of information about Communism.

Realistic undertakings to counteract worldwide Communist propaganda, particularly when aimed at colored peoples, would do better without a "made in the U.S." label. What other label? Made in England? Made in France or Belgium or Holland? All these former colonial powers face propaganda handicaps in addressing the developing nations of the world.

COUNTER-OFFENSIVE ESSENTIAL

All Western nations must, of course, continue their individual information activities to interpret their individual policies to the world, particularly when under propaganda attack. But defensive action alone can never win in psychological warfare. Success comes only through counter-offensive. There is no reason why that should be the function of any individual nation. Communist psychological warfare is global. Total free world security is involved. A unified strategy would be logical, even if it were not the only effective strategy for an offensive.

In a very limited way, a unified free world offensive has long been in operation, reaching behind the Iron Curtain to frustrate Communist internal propaganda. From its inception Radio Free Europe has been as bitterly assailed by the Soviet and satellite press as NATO itself. By keeping both the civil and military populations of the satellites in sympathy with the West, and thus politically unreliable to the Soviets, R.F.E. acts as one more deterrent to possible Soviet aggression in Western Europe. Since it is not operated by any one government, R.F.E. is not committed to explaining a policy or action of any Western nation. Its voice is that of native Hungarians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Rumanians, or Bulgarians, known and believed by their fellow countrymen. It is not a defensive operation. Its basic function is to conduct a continuous psychological, moral, and political offensive against the Soviets, with the full moral support of the Western powers.

Broadcasting, however, is only one media of communication available for effective warfare against Communist propaganda and political subversion in all areas. There is no lack of potential weaponry for exposing Communist maneuverings in any country, for discouraging support for political leadership with Communist leanings, and for alerting a citizenry susceptible to Communist blandishments. It is not a problem of weapons, but of will.

To fortify that will among free world governments was the chief purpose of the recent Conference on Soviet Political Warfare. The recommendations of that conference were substantially the same as those made 18 months earlier at the June 1959 Atlantic Congress in London. The report of that congress, published by the International Secretariat of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, contains the following resolution by the Committee on Propaganda Policies:

"Noting that ideological aggression constitutes an immediate, serious threat to the free world;

"Recognizing the value of the work already carried out by public and private bodies to counter Soviet ideological warfare, but considering that the resources at present deployed on this front by the Atlantic Powers and the other free countries are wholly inadequate as compared with the colossal machine constructed by Soviet communism to enslave men's minds;

"We propose as matters of utmost urgency that:

"1. NATO should create a new division to serve the governments of the Allied countries as a headquarters to counteract the ideological war waged against them by the Soviets; and further recommend that where they do not already have them, member states of NATO set up the appropriate agencies necessary to cooperate with the new divisions; and

"2. An international unofficial organization be set up as a separate institution, for the purpose of diffusing throughout the world basic information which will help people to assess and understand more clearly the ideological aggression of totalitarian communism and to appreciate the true value of liberty."

UNITY OF PURPOSE

A first step in the direction of the above recommendations may have been taken on September 8, 1960, when the U.S. Congress authorized the appointment of a permanent Citizens Commission for NATO. This body is directed to arrange for and to attend conferences with similar commissions to be set up in other NATO countries, to explore "means by which greater cooperation and unity of purpose may be developed, to the end that democratic freedom may be promoted by economic and political means." Further steps may result from forthcoming visits to NATO governments by a delegation from the recent conference.

It is too early to know what actions, if any, will result from these tentative moves toward a united strategy for psychological warfare. In any event, the Kremlin is alerted. There probably is already under way a determined underground Soviet effort to prevent or delay the setting up of the proposed new NATO commissions by other nations than the United States. All the devices by which the Soviet sought to frustrate the formation of NATO, and by which it continues to seek ways to destroy its harmonious functioning, unquestionably would be resorted to, in the face of a serious undertaking by NATO and SEATO nations to consolidate forces for psychopolitical warfare. For the Kremlin would recognize such a move as its first serious challenge on the front on which it pins hopes for easy world conquest.

THE FREEDOM RIDERS

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I note with some interest that various persons around the country, including former President Truman, are taking the freedom riders to task for "provoking"—and I use that word in quotation marks—violence in the South by their insistence on testing out whether or not the interstate bus transportation system in the South is desegregated or segregated, and for trying to get it desegregated.

Let us understand that these freedom riders, whatever may be their individual backgrounds, are nonetheless asserting rights of free Americans, and asserting them because it becomes sensationally clear that there has been segregation in interstate bus transportation, notwithstanding Federal laws and the regulatory power of the ICC, during all this time when such segregation supposedly has been illegal.

It is one thing to ask people, who have the full legal right, in terms of their course of action, as a matter of wisdom,

for the moment, perhaps, not to go into certain areas as the Attorney General is said to have urged. It is another to equate them in the same terms as those who would violate the law and by violence prevent Americans from exercising rights, or with those who would lend themselves to covering up the fact that the interstate bus system, notwithstanding the law, has been kept segregated.

As to former President Truman, I have no question whatever about his sincerity. I am sure he feels as deeply about it as I do, and as all of us do who are concerned with civil rights. But I raise this point only because he is a very important American, and his views are important in terms of influencing other Americans.

I merely present what I believe is the other side of the coin in respect to this situation. We are somewhat helped in a keen analysis of what is at stake by a comment published in the New Yorker magazine. The New Yorker is usually associated with the lighter side of life, but in this instance its comment is most penetrating because of the wisdom it envisions concerning the subject to which I have just referred.

This item contains comments to which I fully subscribe—that one can hardly, with justice, inform a Negro that he has a duty as a citizen to refrain from sharing in the rights of citizenship.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the comment from the New Yorker be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES AND COMMENT

We have been a little puzzled by the editorialists who, in speaking of the recent outbreaks of mob violence in the South, have urged moderation on "the extremists of both sides." Such phrases have a fine and statesmanlike ring, but they don't make much sense. One does not, after all, speak of the North Pole and the Equator as being "poles apart." It strikes us as equally absurd to try to make an antithesis of the howling crowds of armed hoodlums and those Negroes who, defended by nothing but their gallantry, are quietly pressing for an active acknowledgment of the rights that already are guaranteed them on parchment. It is not as though the freedom riders were struggling for the freedom to burn buses themselves, or to shoot white ministers. Conceivably, it is in the national interest to persuade Negro leaders to set a slower pace, but the argument is one that does not permit of taking a high moral tone. One can hardly, with justice, inform a Negro that he has a duty as a citizen to refrain from sharing in the rights of citizenship. We can imagine asking it, under special circumstances, but only as the immense favor that it would be, rather than as the obligation that it decidedly is not.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STUDY ACT

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, recently I introduced—and I invite the attention of Senators to it—a bill called the International Affairs Study Act. It is closely related to the purposes of the bill to establish a Peace Corps. Incidentally, the Peace Corps bill was introduced on the same day I introduced the bill for an International Affairs Study Act.

It is my belief that the success of the Peace Corps is very heavily—perhaps almost entirely—dependent upon the implementation of the International Affairs Study Act, which, incidentally, I shall call up as an amendment to the National Defense Education Act, which is now being considered in the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

My bill provides for the training which is so desperately needed by those whose good will and patriotism has swelled the ranks of Peace Corps applicants to 10,000. Mr. R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., Director of the Peace Corps, estimates that the total number of volunteers requested by foreign countries will be between 20,000 and 30,000, and that this need cannot be met at present.

This gap must be closed. I believe that the provisions of my bill are designed to help in doing so through the establishment of fellowships and stipends for international affairs study, and through contracts with and grants to institutions of higher education for the expansion and improvement of international affairs study programs. Of course, this bill is not exclusively a response to the needs of the Peace Corps. It goes beyond this purpose in providing for trained personnel in the service of other governmental agencies and of the United States private economic system.

In addition, the bill also deals with a fundamental requisite for the Peace Corps, namely, that those who represent the United States abroad, whether they work for business or for Government or serve in the Army or otherwise represent us abroad, shall be adequately educated in terms of achieving what needs to be done.

The Peace Corps is an extraordinary idea. I strongly favor it. In connection with my joining as a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, I shall nonetheless reserve the right to support or to offer for myself amendments further to buttress and support the Peace Corps.

I may say, without in any way derogating from the initiative which suggested the Peace Corps, that I have myself been working on a similar idea; as a matter of fact, I proposed it in a commencement address some 2 years before the campaign of 1960. For such an organization to be really effective, it must become the work of the people and must rely on the experience and organizational framework of existing voluntary and business organizations working in foreign nations.

The Peace Corps must become an extension of the will and awareness of the American people, applying their various skills for the good of others within a broad understanding of the international situation and of the particular sense of the language, culture, and knowledge which are required of those who work abroad.

Madam President, by way of implementation of my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Eight Countries Ask Help of Peace Corps," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 5, 1961, and an editorial entitled "The Peace Corps," published in the New York Times of June 5, 1961.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 5, 1961]

EIGHT COUNTRIES ASK HELP OF PEACE CORPS—SHRIVER SAYS THEY SEEK 5,000 WORKERS

WASHINGTON, June 4.—From just eight countries have come requests for 5,000 Peace Corps workers, R. Sargent Shriver, Jr., said today.

Mr. Shriver, Director of the Peace Corps, said that at this rate the total number requested probably will amount to 20,000 or 30,000—a greater demand than can be met.

As of now, the Peace Corps has about 10,000 volunteers, but Mr. Shriver said that only 1 or maybe 2 out of 10 will be sent overseas. He emphasized they first must undergo careful screening, testing, and training.

The Peace Corps has been set up on a temporary basis by Executive order, but President Kennedy has asked Congress for legislation to make it permanent. An appropriation of $40 million is sought for the fiscal year starting July 1.

A fourth Peace Corps project, calling for 40 workers to go to Chile, was announced today. These workers are to be sent this year to assist in village development and teaching. The volunteers will get part of their training at Notre Dame University.

The three projects announced earlier are to be in the Philippines, Colombia, and Tanganyika.

Mr. Shriver, interviewed by Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, on a television program taped for Michigan stations, told of requests he had received for Peace Corps workers on a recent trip around the world.

"We went only to countries which invited us, Senator," he said. "We didn't go out trying to sell the Peace Corps. In each case we asked them whether they wanted the Peace Corps, and, if they wanted it, what they wanted us to do.

"We didn't cook up some plan down here in Washington and then go out and try to sell it to somebody."

To train workers for the roadbuilding project in Tanganyika, he said, the Peace Corps looked about for a place in this country that could teach civil engineering, or surveying, and also Swahili, the language of the African country, and that would have a similar climate or terrain.

He said two places already have been found, both in the Southwest. He said he couldn't tell yet which one would be selected, and he did not identify the institutions.

He said that contrary to the ideas of some people, the Peace Corps is not a children's crusade.

"In the first 4,000 applicants that we got, over 100 of the people volunteering were over 68 years of age," he said.

[From the New York Times, June 5, 1961]

THE PEACE CORPS

President Kennedy has now asked Congress to establish the Peace Corps on a permanent basis. Preliminary activities have been carried on under an Executive order, and, in fact, several thousand candidates for membership have already taken the first examination.

The most obvious skills called for are those required for the physical development of relatively underdeveloped nations and communities: construction of roads, public works, and buildings, scientific farming. Competence in public administration and teaching is also in demand. More important, however, is a skill that is hard to detect through examinations, and even harder to develop by training: the art of getting along with strange people in strange lands.

The Corps will succeed in direct proportion to the ability of its members to gain the confidence and cooperation of those with whom they will work. The hazards are great. Suspicion of all foreign government employees or agents is widespread in every country. Dislike of those who parade their own superiority is all but universal.

One of the ways in which the Peace Corps administration can reduce hazards such as these is illustrated by the project in Colombia, first in Latin America. It is to be carried on in collaboration with the private, voluntary agency CARE, which is already well-known and respected by Colombians and whose staff is thoroughly familiar with conditions in the villages. The less the Peace Corps operation seems like a foreign invasion the greater its success will be.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY, U.S.A.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, yesterday's Supreme Court decisions, dealt a severe blow to the Communist Party, U.S.A.

After many long years, the Communist Party will now be forced to register as an agent of the Soviets, and dedicated party members will be subject to prosecution.

Many people still insist on thinking of the Communist Party, U.S.A., as just an extremist political organization. The majority opinion of the Supreme Court based on the voluminous hearings of the Subversive Activities Control Board should serve to convince even the most skeptical of the subservience of the Communist Party to Moscow.

While I recognize that the timing was coincidental, I am glad that this opinion was handed down so soon after President Kennedy's meetings with Khrushchev. They will serve as a reminder of the ruthless nature and evil mission of international communism. They will alert Americans to the need for continued vigilance in the fight to preserve our liberty and freedom. They will help Americans see behind the phony expressions of peace and good will, cynically exuded by the Kremlin boss while he plots our enslavement.

The Supreme Court has done right by the American people in rendering these decisions.

NEW YORK STATE AND THE FIRST 100 DAYS OF KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration saw a lot of activity. At home and abroad there were ups and downs. The pros and cons of the first 100 days were discussed from one end of the country to the other.

In the area of economic activity most objective observers saw a certain amount of improvement, whether the result of Kennedy programs or natural economic factors. Imagine, then, my dismay when I perused the just released statistics of the Department of Defense for the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration to discover that in the area of defense procurement New York's economic activity has dropped sharply compared with the first 100 days of 1960. There has been a drop of nearly 5 percent—to be exact 4.8 percent—in the value of New York State defense contracts in January, February, and March 1961 as compared with the previous year.

Madam President, for some time now I—and other Senators, as well—have been pointing out the great disparity in the distribution of defense work in the United States. One State, which is neither the biggest nor the most populous, gets nearly one-quarter of the value of all military prime contract awards. Over the past 2 or 3 years California has received between 21 and 24 percent of this work. During the first 3 months of 1961 California got 23.3 percent of defense procurement dollars—more than twice as much as New York. The gap is apparently increasing rather than decreasing under the new administration. For the whole fiscal year to date, that is, from July 1960, through March 1961, New York's share of defense work has dropped from 12.3 percent as of this time last year to 11.9 percent. That amounts in dollars to a decline of over $110 million.

Madam President, I do not raise this point as a political issue. I was equally critical of the previous Republican administration because it allowed such a serious imbalance to be perpetuated. But if the Eisenhower administration was responsible for a recession in New York State defense contracts, by comparison the present administration seems to be causing a real depression for New York State defense contractors. The situation has certainly gone from bad to worse.

GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER CALLS FOR OBSERVANCE OF PUERTO RICAN WEEK

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, on March 28 of this year, I introduced a resolution to designate July 25 of each year as Puerto Rican Day in the United States of America. The resolution also requests the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for observance of this day with appropriate ceremonies.

Although New York State is only 1 State out of 50, it is noteworthy and heartening that Governor Rockefeller has issued a proclamation calling for the observance of Puerto Rican Week by New Yorkers from June 4 to June 10.

It is hoped that the recognition by New York's Governor of the many contributions of Puerto Ricans to the State of New York will give further emphasis to the consideration of my resolution for a national Puerto Rican Day.

Madam President, I know that Governor Rockefeller's proclamation will be of great interest to many of my colleagues; and, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the text printed at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER, ALBANY—PROCLAMATION

Forty-four years ago the Congress of the United States passed the Jones Act which granted U.S. citizenship to all people of Puerto Rico. The anniversary of the signing of that act is cherished and celebrated with great enthusiasm by all Puerto Ricans.

They lost no time in showing clearly the high value they placed on their association with the United States. Nevertheless the Jones Act fell short of expectations in some respects.

In 1947 the 80th Congress—a Republican Congress incidentally—amended the Jones Act to allow Puerto Ricans to elect their own governor and to allow the governor to appoint his own cabinet with the advice and consent of the Puerto Rican Senate. This was the first major legal advance in self-government since 1917.

One of the most effective advocates of this reform was Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., Governor of Puerto Rico from 1929 to 1931, who earned the abiding affections of the people of the Commonwealth. He valued Puerto Ricans' Spanish heritage and the distinctive Puerto Rican character. He was opposed, he said, to efforts "to remodel all Puerto Ricans so that they should become similar in language, habits, and thoughts to continental Americans."

The Puerto Ricans among us, with their cheerful manners, their capacity for gaiety, their love of music and other good things of life, have endeared themselves solidly as neighbors. They respect a human being because he is himself, regardless of his creed or the color of his skin. They have shown in three major wars and in peacetime full appreciation of their responsibilities as well as their privileges as citizens of the United States. In New York they have 160 organizations banded together in a community program to help solve problems which have gone unsolved for decades.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the week of June 4–10, 1961, as Puerto Rican Week in New York State, and I urge the widest possible cooperation with our Puerto Rican neighbors in its observance.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 24th day of March in the year of our Lord 1961.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.

By the Governor:

WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I wish to speak for perhaps 8 or 10 minutes in regard to the anticrime program regarding which the Attorney General appeared today before our committee in behalf of his bills. However, before speaking on this matter, I shall be happy to yield to other Senators who may be pressed for time and may wish to obtain recognition, provided it is understood that in yielding to them, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE PROPOSED TRACTORS-PRISONERS EXCHANGE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, in connection with the proposed program of tractors-prisoners exchange, as everyone knows, a great deal of interest has been expressed throughout the country.

I believe it is always in the interest of truth to make sure that all the facts in connection with such a matter are known.

I made some little exploration of what would be necessary in order to articulate the proposed program. In line with the expressions which have been made by the sponsors, I find that it would require, first of all, tax exemption for the contributions which may be made; second, an export permit, which is issued, under statute, under a power delegated to the President, and reposed in the Department of Commerce; and, finally, a license to solicit in the District of Columbia.

After making inquiry, I discovered that the so-called certificate of incorporation was filed on May 25 with the Office of the Superintendent of Corporations of the District of Columbia.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire certificate be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the certificate was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is to certify that the pages attached hereto constitute a full, true, and complete copy of a certificate of incorporation of Tractors for Freedom Committee, dated the 25th day of May 1961, and filed the 25th day of May 1961, as the same appears of record in this office.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of this office to be affixed, this the 5th day of June A.D. 1961.

ALFRED GOLDSTEIN,
Superintendent of Corporation, Washington, D.C.

"CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION

"We, the undersigned, all citizens of the United States and a majority citizens of the District of Columbia, of full age, desiring to associate ourselves as a corporation pursuant to the provisions of title 29, chapter 6 of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition, do hereby certify as follows:

"1. The name or title by which such society shall be known in law is: 'Tractors for Freedom Committee.'

"2. The term for which it is organized shall be perpetual.

"3. The particular business and objects of the society shall be: The objects of the committee are exclusively charitable and educational and no other. In furtherance of those objects, the committee will undertake, among other projects, the rehabilitation of, and assistance to, needy or distressed refugees. Any funds not expended by the committee will be put to charitable and educational uses similar to the purposes above stated at or prior to dissolution.

"4. The number of its trustees, directors or managers for the first year of its existence shall be not less than 3, nor more than 15.

"The names and respective addresses, including street and number, of the incorporators are: Victor G. Reuther, 3701 Porter Street NW., Washington, D.C.; Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., 3625 Appleton Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and John Silard, 6916 Wilson Lane, Bethesda, Md.

"Dated: May 25, 1961.

"DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, *ss:*

"I, Mary C. Asay, a notary public in and for the District of Columbia, do hereby certify that Victor G. Reuther, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and John Silard, parties to a certain certificate of incorporation bearing date on the 25th day of May 1961, and hereunto annexed, personally appeared before me in said District, the said Victor G. Reuther, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and John Silard, being personally well known to me as the persons who executed the said certificate of incorporation, and severally acknowledge the same to be their act and deed.

"Given under my hand and seal this 25th day of May 1961.

[SEAL] "MARY C. ASAY,
"Notary Public."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I would add to this, first, that the incorporators are not actually the persons whose names appeared in the press. The incorporators are three in number. The first is Victor G. Reuther, 3701 Porter Street NW., Washington, D.C. I understand that he is a brother of Walter Reuther.

The second is Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., 3625 Appleton Street NW., Washington, D.C. At one time he was president of Americans for Democratic Action.

The third is John Silard, 6916 Wilson Lane, Bethesda, Md.

I also notice that the term for which the corporation is to be organized is to be "perpetual." So it is quite evident that when the job presently proposed is done, that will not mean the end of this corporation, for it is to be perpetual, and will be able to continue, unless on the petition of the incorporators or on the basis of an action by the Superintendent of Insurance the corporation is finally dissolved.

The purposes of the corporation are recited as follows:

The particular business and objects of the society shall be: The objects of the committee are exclusively charitable and educational and no other. In furtherance of those objects, the committee will undertake, among other projects, the rehabilitation of, and assistance to, needy or distressed refugees. Any funds not expended by the committee will be put to charitable and educational uses similar to the purposes above stated at or prior to dissolution.

So that is a rather broad grant of power.

The fourth thing on which I comment is the following: This has generally been described as a program of exchanging tractors for prisoners. But the name of the so-called society is to be "Tractors for Freedom Committee," not "Tractors for Prisoners." Of course, "Tractors for Freedom Committee" can encompass the whole wide world; and it will be rather interesting to see how this matter finally unfolds.

But this is the certificate. I procured a copy from the Office of the Superintendent of Corporations; and I have obtained consent to have it printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, so that the entire record will be available to the whole country.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the minority leader may yield to other Senators who may wish to make comments or to question him on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it it so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I merely wished to ask the minority leader whether it is possible to obtain tax exemption in any way other than by forming such a corporation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, I am advised by the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that, first, it is necessary to have a vehicle—whether an individual, a partnership, or a corporation; and when such has been created, then the application for tax exemption must be made, and it must be processed by the Tax-Exemption Division of the Internal Revenue Service—hence, the reason for creating a corporation of this kind, known as Tractors for Freedom.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator from Illinois have any idea how long it usually takes to process such applications?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have had some experience, over a long period of time, with other groups of eleemosynary and charitable persuasion who have sought to obtain tax exemption; and, as a general rule, those matters are rather meticulously examined by the Internal Revenue Service, and it takes quite a considerable amount of time for it to do so.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Perhaps in the nature of a year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, as a matter of fact, I know of some cases from home that have been in the mill for 2 or 3 years—because, as I said, a rather careful examination is made of the proposed activities, purposes, and objects of the corporation in question, in order to make sure that it is essentially educational, charitable, or eleemosynary.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Will the Senator from Illinois state whether in his opinion the proposed use of the tractors falls under any of the categories he has mentioned; namely, charitable, educational, and so forth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. According to the certificate, it would have to be charitable or educational. What will be the interpretation and decision of the Tax-Exemption Division, I am not in a position to know. But I know they draw the line rather finely.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the charter or certificate give any information as to whether salaries will be paid the officers of the corporation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the certificate, there is no hint as to salaries. I sup-

pose an amendment setting out such matters in detail could be filed at a future time.

This certificate of incorporation is only a single page, double spaced. It is properly attested, and was filed on May 25. But other than that, there is no detailing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there any provision for election of the successors of the officers of the corporation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. It is filed under a provision of the District of Columbia Code; the reference is to title 29, chapter 6, of the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia, 1951 edition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The three names given were the initial directors for the corporation. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there anything about initial officers or their successors?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The recital sets forth the names and respective addresses, including the street and number, of the incorporators: Victor G. Reuther, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., and John Silard, with the three addresses. Two of the addresses are Washington, D.C., and one address is Bethesda, Md.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But there is nothing as to the first officers or their successors, nor is there any provision relating to stockholders?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. The only details are the number of its trustees, directors, or managers for the first year of its existence shall be not less than 3, nor more than 15.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have not looked up the statute here in the District of Columbia, but in my State a corporation which seeks to be classified as a nonprofit corporation and seeks to come under the general law relating to deductibility for contributions made for that purpose must set forth very clearly in the charter a prohibition against dividends or use of the corporation for profits. In most of them that I have known anything about, there has also been a prohibition against salaries being paid to officers, to make sure no profit is made.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only reference is to the code. The rest of the detail must be gotten from the code, necessarily, unless at some time in the near future an amendment to the charter were filed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has asked most of the questions I had intended asking the minority leader. I should like to ask an additional question. The Internal Revenue Service must find, if this corporation is to be a charitable corporation, and therefore free from taxation, whether the object of "the rehabilitation of, and assistance to, needy or distressed refugees" would include refugees outside of the United States, and make a determination as to whether they were distressed. Is that true?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Probably so. I can only say the regulations for the guidance of the Internal Revenue Service in resolving a matter of this kind are long and detailed. The Internal Revenue Service has had long experience in matters of this kind. I know, from experience of my own, it makes a very elaborate investigation, and it has a list of regulations to guide it.

Mr. MILLER. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I should like to ask my leader the question as to whether he understands that, quite apart from all the various possible uses to which this organization may be put, the real, fundamental—in fact, the exclusive—function of this organization is to be, in substance the exchange of tractors to ransom prisoners in Cuba.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That could very well be. I shall let the certificate of incorporation speak for itself. The title is "Tractors for Freedom Committee." Its term is perpetual. That is rather broad. I presume it was rather carefully drawn to cover every circumstance the incorporators may have in mind.

Mr. MILLER. Quite aside from all the purposes set forth in the charter, the real question, as a matter of tax law, is What is the actual purpose or function of the organization? There is an old saying in tax law that substance governs over form. Tax law does not care about nice sounding objectives set forth in charters of incorporation. What the tax law is concerned about is, What is the substance of the organization? It is my understanding, from reading newspapers only, that the real purpose of the organization is to use tractors to ransom prisoners in Cuba. I should like to add further that I know of nothing in tax law, in connection with the definition of a charitable organization, which would cover as a charitable activity the ransoming of prisoners.

That being the case, I would suggest that, when the time comes for the Internal Revenue Service to review the deductibility of contributions to this organization, it ascertain whether, in substance, it is a contribution for the purpose of ransoming prisoners. If it ascertains that to be the fact, I would suggest it cannot possibly, under the law as it is now written by Congress, permit a deduction for that purpose.

We may discuss the various humanitarian arguments which have been made with reference to this activity, whether it is desirable or not from a political standpoint; but, speaking only from the standpoint of technical tax law, I would say it probably would have to be up to Congress to determine whether the Internal Revenue Code should be amended to include in charitable activities the ransoming of prisoners.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The general recitation herein contained is:

> The objects of the committee are exclusively charitable and educational and no other.

Then the language continues:

> In furtherance of those objects, the committee will undertake, among other projects, the rehabilitation of, and assistance to, needy or distressed refugees.

That is a matter for the Internal Revenue Service to interpret, but this is the language of the charter, and obviously it must speak for itself.

Mr. MILLER. May I say to my leader that, regardless of the charitable activities expressed in the charter, they mean nothing from the standpoint of tax law. Tax law does not care about what is recited very nicely in a charter. What tax law is concerned with is the substance; what actually takes place. I know nothing in the tax law which relates to ransoming of prisoners, or, if that is the preponderant activity of the committee, there is nothing under the tax law which would permit deductibility under the guise of its being a charitable organization.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The District law requires that a majority of the incorporators be residents of the District of Columbia. One of those whose names has been rather frequently mentioned as being connected with the organization is Walter Reuther. He is domiciled in Michigan. Victor Reuther is domiciled in Washington. Likewise Joseph L. Raugh, Jr. But Mr. John Silard happens to be domiciled in Maryland. This is done in compliance with the District Code so far as residence requirements for incorporation is concerned. I think that fact ought to be made clear.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. YATES, of Illinois, Mr. IKARD, of Texas, Mr. DULSKI, of New York, Mr. PHILBIN, of Massachusetts, Mr. STRATTON, of New York, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, of Nebraska, Mr. HARVEY of Michigan, and Mr. TUPPER, of Maine, as additional members of the U.S. Delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 133. An act giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, New Mexico; and

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate, severally with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 751. An act to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act;

S. 847. An act to change the name of the Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.; and

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution designating the week of May 14–20, 1961, as Police Week and designating May 15, 1961, as Peace Officers Memorial Day.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5178) for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1346) for the relief of John Napoli.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5954) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PILLION, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals;

H.R. 879. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2750. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 2924. An act to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459);

H.R. 4750. An act to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act;

H.R. 5255. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service;

H.R. 5343. An act to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6834. An act to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 6845. An act to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard;

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December 1961 as Wright Brothers Day.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 1346. An act for the relief of John Napoli;

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office;

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; and

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H.R. 10. An act to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; and

H.R. 879. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide increases in rates of disability compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2750. An act to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members of the Air Force;

H.R. 5255. An act to clarify the status of circuit and district judges retired from regular active service;

H.R. 5343. An act to amend section 5021 of title 18, United States Code;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6834. An act to amend section 35 of title 18, United States Code; and

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution designating the 17th day of December 1961 as Wright Brothers Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2924. An act to repeal an act entitled "An act extending the time in which to file adverse claims and institute adverse suits against mineral entries in the district of Alaska," approved June 7, 1910 (36 Stat. 459); and

H.R. 4750. An act to amend section 6(a) of the Virgin Islands Corporation Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6845. An act to amend title 14 of the United States Code to provide for an expansion of the functions of the Coast Guard; placed on the calendar.

SUPREME COURT DECISION ON INTERNAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator from New York for indulging me so long.

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I should like to comment upon the decision of the Supreme Court yesterday with respect to the Internal Security Act of 1950, to which the Senator from New York has already alluded.

The junior Senator from South Dakota was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in the years 1949 and 1950, and as such was a member of the special subcommittee which was designated to work out amendments for what became the Internal Security Act of 1950. We had certain problems at that time. The original draft of the bill was known as the Mundt-Nixon bill. In the 80th Congress, the prior Congress, it did not become law.

In the 81st Congress the bill was reintroduced. Some of us who believed at that time the bill had a good chance of enactment started to work it over with a view to having it meet constitutional tests.

I, for one, was delighted to learn last night that the Supreme Court had held the law to be constitutional.

As I recall, one problem with which we dealt at the time was avoiding the charge that we were outlawing beliefs, that we were outlawing political organizations which merely confined themselves to beliefs. The bill, as originally drafted, used the phrase "Communist political organization," as I recall. It was my motion which suggested the use, instead of "Communist political organization," of the words "Communist action organization" and "Communist front organization." We thereby made a distinction between those organizations in which a person might merely engage in philosophical dialectic, or something like that, and those organizations which had action as an integral part of the purpose of the organization.

I was interested to note that upon that "Communist action organization" the constitutionality of the act was upheld. I think as we passed the bill in the House in 1950 it provided that the members of an action organization should all be required to register, but that only the officers of the Communist front organization were to be required to register.

None of us flattered ourselves at that time that we would insure all of the people being registered, but we did think we were laying the foundation for prosecution in the event of a failure to register, and that the law would be applicable for criminal offenses.

Madam President, I was certainly gratified to read in the papers last night, and again this morning, of the decision of the Supreme Court holding the act constitutional. I hope it will be the basis on which the Subversive Activities Control Board can proceed to act.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I well remember the great contribution made by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota at the time of the discussion of the proposed legislation and the framing of the law. Due to the extremely narrow margin by which the decision came about, it is quite possible that the work of our friend from South Dakota, in changing the word "political" to differentiate between action organizations and front organizations, might have resulted in the favorable decision in the case.

While the bouquets are being passed around about the decision a large share of them should go to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] who demonstrated in this regard, as he does so often, his meticulous attention to details of proposed legislation and the importance of using the exact words in framing such legislation.

There is no field which is more delicate. None of us wishes to interfere with the beliefs of anyone or with the rights of anyone to state beliefs, so long as the person does not seek to overthrow our Government and is not a part of a conspiracy to do so. The Court was very careful in its decision to point that out.

I know the work of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and of his

colleagues was extremely helpful and valuable to all Americans.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I certainly appreciate the generous words of the Senator from New York. If we are going to give credit, I think we should not forget that the original bill, in the 80th Congress, was introduced by my colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the former Vice President of the United States, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of California, Richard Nixon. In fact, under the term "the Mundt-Nixon bill" the bill did achieve the attention it required to get the support it needed for enactment.

I remember the former Vice President of the United States once said that on occasion he felt sometimes people thought "Mundt" was his first name, because of references to the Mundt-Nixon bill.

As the distinguished Senator from New York knows, when any bill involving major legislation, reaches passage, it is the result of efforts of a great many people.

I feel that significant contributions were made by my colleague [Mr. MUNDT] and by then Representative Nixon. As I recall, a subcommittee of the House Committee on Un-American Activities worked on the amendment to the bill. The members included the former Vice President and former Senator, Richard Nixon; Francis Walter, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania; and Representative John Wood. I think there were five members of the subcommittee. I remember that Representatives Walter, Wood, and Nixon worked on the bill.

I thank the Senator again for his kind references to my part in this regard.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I wish to include in my commendation the Members of the House to whom the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has referred. I well remember the hard work they did and the debate on the bill. There was outstanding work done by all the members to whom the Senator has referred.

ANTICRIME PROGRAM

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, this morning the Senate Committee on the Judiciary heard very strong testimony by the Attorney General on a critically important subject, one with which I have been deeply concerned over a period of many years, both in the other body and in the Senate. The subject was crime.

Unfortunately, the full significance of the committee's inquiry will not be appreciated by a large majority of the public.

The public is simply unaware of the extent to which our anticrime laws have become obsolete in coping with 20th century criminal activities. Lurid crimes get front-page headlines in many of our newspapers.

But the $22 billion a year business of organized crime, quietly promoted by ruthless nationwide syndicates, is seldom given as much attention as certain specific lurid crimes, which are written about in articles appearing on front pages, on the second inside sheet, or the third inside sheet, depending upon the format of the newspaper.

Organized crime in America has been called an "invincible government." It has its leaders, a treasury, and a rigidly enforced code. It gets expert advice from unscrupulous lawyers, accountants and others. It sometimes functions in cahoots with crooked politicians and public officials. Its leaders hold their power by cunning and brute force. Its treasury consists largely of the proceeds from professional gambling. Its code is enforced by murder when necessary.

Organized crime is a menace to the liberty and security of the Nation. I can think of no greater deprivation of an individual's civil rights than that suffered by the victim of a murder, extortion, or other intimidation.

No individual American is safe from this scourge. It has taken over whole communities. It hides behind fortresses made impregnable by local corruption. It enjoys the privileged use of the world's most efficient communications and transportation systems.

All these statements are documented in reports issued by State and Federal agencies after extensive investigations. In the light of these urgent conditions it is incredible that the Congress has neglected for so long the task of bringing our criminal laws up to date. Law enforcement today is hamstrung by archaic limitations and illogical jurisdictional standards.

In general, law enforcement stops at State lines, while crime flourishes without regard to ancient boundaries. The criminals enjoy advantages and technical protections which have no relation to the Bill of Rights or any other constitutional guarantees. Even at this moment the most potent Federal statute for coping with the barons of the underworld is the Internal Revenue Code. I cannot think of any punishment less fitting for murder and extortion than a fine and imprisonment for income tax evasion. This is just one example of the artificial and inadequate Federal laws which must be utilized now to combat organized crime.

Congress has been inexcusably reluctant to come to grips with this subject. We have been intimidated by slogans and shibboleths and by a squeamishness which conjures up all sorts of theoretical injustices to criminals, but blinds itself to the actual injustices to the community and the victims of crime.

The specter of a national policy force is frequently raised against any proposals to expand the Federal Government's role in law enforcement. I do not believe that there is any substance to this ghost. At the present time, there are some 347,000 people engaged in some kind of law enforcement. This includes uniformed policemen, law enforcement agents, and clerical, administrative and custodial personnel concerned with police protection activities. Of these 347,000 law enforcement employees, 326,000 are employed by State and local governments. On the other hand only 21,000 are employed by all the Federal law enforcement agencies combined, including the FBI, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Bureau of Narcotics, and Secret Service. To give one direct comparison, the FBI employs only 6,000 special agents, compared to the almost 25,000 policemen on the New York City Police Force alone. It is obvious from these statistics that there is considerable room for expanding supplementary Federal law enforcement activities without any danger to the community or to State and local law enforcement responsibilities.

The reason for such an expansion is not a matter of statistics, but a matter of necessity in view of the constant use of interstate facilities by organized crime.

At the hearing this morning it was agreed that the Attorney General would return later for questioning by members of the Committee on the Judiciary with regard to the details of his proposals.

In outline form, I believe that the following 10 measures are imperative instruments for a combined Federal, State, and local counteroffensive against organized crime:

First. A bill to make it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce to break specified State laws. The laws specified should be those to which these interstate syndicates are particularly prone, such as narcotics trafficking, fraud, murder, and gambling.

The Attorney General recommends a bill which would be limited to traveling in interstate commerce to commit a local offense. Of course, I have a high regard for his views, but in my judgment, such a bill would not go far enough because crooks, instead of traveling to take their money from one place to another, would send it through the mails. For example, he gave us the illustration of traveling from the District of Columbia to Virginia to lay off bets or pick up money. Instead of traveling, crooks could send the money through the mails and, so far as I know, there is nothing to prevent money from being sent through the mail. The proposal which I make is that any of the facilities of interstate commerce which are used to commit such a crime should subject the offender to the charge of a Federal offense.

Second. A bill to permit State and Federal law-enforcement officials to use electronic and other modern investigative devices under court supervision and to prohibit the use of such devices by blackmailers, "private eyes," and other unscrupulous persons;

Third. A bill to broaden the scope of the Fugitive Felon Act to include all felonies or offenses punishable by more than a year in prison;

Fourth. A bill to permit the wider use of grants of immunity where essential to obtaining vital evidence;

Fifth. Bills which would destroy the privileged communications and transportation systems now utilized by professional gamblers and to terminate the

immoral rule granting gamblers tax deductions for the expenses of their operations;

Sixth. A bill to strike directly at bribery in sports by making it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce in connection with any schemes to fix sporting events;

Seventh. Bills to amend the perjury laws and obstruction of justice statutes to punish all false swearing under oath and to protect every potential witness from intimidation;

Eighth. A bill to permit the Government to appeal from lower court decisions suppressing evidence of crime;

Ninth. Bills to expand criminal intelligence files so as to unify and centralize the gathering of information on all types of crime as well as commercial frauds akin to crime;

Tenth. A bill to establish a National Crime Commission to maintain continuous surveillance over the operations of organized crime and the adequacy of Federal laws and methods for combating such crime.

I will not take the time now to discuss these proposals in detail. Some are included in the Attorney General's program, and in former Attorney General Rogers' program. Others, like the interstate crime bill, I have been urging for many years with the support of many knowledgeable persons in this field. I hope that the Committee on the Judiciary will hear from many witnesses in the course of its hearings, and that on the basis of a full record will recommend action to the Senate which will be fully adequate to meet the tremendous challenge confronting us. It does not matter to me which numbered bills or whose bills we report, as long as proposals are made by the committee which are sufficient for the task.

In closing, I pay tribute to Attorney General Kennedy for the strong interest he has shown in this field and for the initiative he has taken in trying to obtain the new legal tools we need to cope with the growing danger of organized crime. Although he is a young man in years, he speaks with the benefit of a wealth of experience in this subject, and he is to be commended for giving this problem such diligent attention.

I hope Congress will respond to his plea for updating our criminal laws. As I have said before and will continue to say until this problem is licked: "Crime is at war with America. It is time America declared war on crime."

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

During the delivery of Mr. KEATING's remarks,

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, will the Senator yield so that I may make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, when requests were made for committees to meet today, I objected across the board. The objection included objection to the request of the Committee on Government Operations.

The committee is taking testimony in regard to reorganization plans. The deadline for two such reorganization plans is June 26, for a third July 2, and for a fourth July 7. It is imperative that the testimony be taken to beat those deadlines. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit during the sessions of the Senate for the remainder of the week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KEATING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy in this regard be printed in the RECORD after the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I invite the attention of my colleagues to an excellent article appearing in the Industrial Union Department of the AFL–CIO in support of the Youth Conservation Corps proposal, S. 404, which it has been my honor to sponsor. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH CORPS AT HOME

The Nation's imagination seems to have been stirred by the idea of dedicated American youth working without regular pay in the underdeveloped nations. While the idea isn't new, it was greeted with enthusiasm when President Kennedy called for a national Peace Corps in a Los Angeles campaign speech.

The Peace Corps idea got a further substantial boost when it was given top priority at a Washington, D.C., conference of 100 organizations interested in foreign aid. It burst into the headlines after a Kennedy task force headed by Prof. Max Millikan of Massachusetts Institute of Technology urged rigid standards for participating young men and women.

On the college campus, the idea has been hailed as a challenge to dedicated and adventurous youth. Almost all proposals for the Corps have centered around the selection of specially trained college youth with backgrounds in public health, engineering, agronomy, education, and related subjects.

President Kennedy now has established a pilot Peace Corps and has proposed the formation of a permanent Corps. While it will be open to other than college graduates, it is doubtful that opportunity within it will be extended to those lacking highly specialized knowledge and skills.

A Peace Corps having from 5,000 to 10,000 members is now a possibility. The Corps may become a major outlet for the creative energies of newly graduated college youth who will be the better for the experience. It is not intended nor can it be an answer for other hundreds of thousands of U.S. youth who now have no place to go.

HOME PROBLEM

Important though the Peace Corps idea may be, it is regrettable that it has so much overshadowed another important proposal for harnessing the energies of our youth. This involves a youth corps at home to attend long-neglected national housekeeping chores.

Recent figures on the composition of America's army of unemployed state the case for a home youth corps. About 30 percent of the unemployed are under 25 years of age.

Because there is no other outlet, too many of the Nation's urban youth are drifting into delinquency. This is not to say that any home youth corps should be a correctional institution. But the disciplines and demands of work in a youth corps could do much to give affirmative direction to many now drifting toward delinquency.

Delinquency has been termed a form of protest and a cry for recognition. In many of the distressed areas of the Nation, apathy prevails among a youth too dispirited even for such protest. Here, tens of thousands of young Americans have no chance for jobs; lacking funds, education, and skills for a start elsewhere, these youth are joining their fathers in the long wait for nothing.

A third of U.S. youth in high school senior classes will drop out before this year ends. Others will have dropped out before reaching senior level. The reasons are economic, emotional, and lack of desire, or, perhaps, aptitude for the schoolroom. Whatever the reason, these youth will be an important element in the Nation's future. Lacking skills and discipline, many—possibly a majority—are condemned to permanent failure that will haunt their children as well as themselves.

The neglect of aimless youth is matched only by neglect of the Nation's natural heritage. America's forest preserves, her polluted waters, her wasted land areas, and her need for recreational facilities cry out for immediate attention. Deterioration of both human and natural resources offers a unique opportunity to employ the one to restore the other.

Like the idea of a youth peace corps employed in the world arena, the idea of a youth conservation corps at home isn't new. The idea has cropped up several times in the last decade and has been placed before the Congress, where lengthy hearings have taken place. Economists, conservationists, sociologists, and youth leaders have strongly advocated such a corps. Opposition has come chiefly from those who would neglect both human and natural resources to assure that fiscal responsibility which seems to elude the Nation more dramatically every time human needs are set aside.

Two years ago, Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, introduced a youth conservation corps bill in the 86th Congress. Hearing were conducted and the measure was reported to the floor of the Senate, where, despite GOP opposition, it was approved by a very narrow margin. The vote was 47 to 45 in favor, with only two Republicans, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, and MILTON YOUNG, of North Dakota, in favor.

The press and other communications media paid little attention to the measure. Former President Eisenhower was spared the embarrassment of veto because the measure never reached the discussion stage in the House of Representatives.

The Kennedy administration presents new hope for a home youth corps. As a U.S. Senator, the President voted for the YCC bill. The President is also known to be concerned with the fitness of U.S. youth.

The Korean conflict revealed that many of U.S. youth are physically neglected and unfit. The purposes of the YCC are not, and should not be, military. Nonetheless, a YCC would help to inculcate the values of physical fitness and bodily care among a youth badly in need of these disciplines.

A task force on distressed areas and another on resources and conservation recommended the creation of a youth conservation corps in reports to President Kennedy as he took office. The distressed areas report noted that the corps could be used to rebuild the

lands and forests in areas which have run down badly after years of unplanned resource exploitation. The resources report pointed to the overall needs of the Nation and the place of a YCC in meeting those needs.

NEW EFFORT

Shortly after the 87th Congress convened in January, Senator HUMPHREY again introduced his bill to establish a 150,000-man youth conservation corps to help speed development of the Nation's resources. In introducing the measure, the Minnesota solon told the Senate that the youth conservation corps would also serve to reduce juvenile delinquency and accelerate Federal and State conservation measures.

The press again gave little attention to the introduction of this year's YCC measure, although it was then reporting plans for the youth peace corps in great detail. Unless the YCC idea is drawn to the attention of the Nation, there is serious danger that it will again be shunted aside.

The Humphrey proposal has called for a youth conservation corps of 50,000 in its first year. Enrollment would be doubled in the second year, and the corps would reach full strength of 150,000 in the third.

Recruitment would be voluntary among youth from 16 to 21 years of age. Recruiting campaigns would stress opportunity for useful work in the outdoors. If past experience is a guide, there will be no difficulty in recruiting and maintaining a full complement.

As already noted, the YCC would not be a correctional or penal colony for hardened youthful criminals. No judge could sentence any youth to the camps. But there is no reason that youth guidance officers and the youth courts should not guide salvageable youth toward enlistment where such a course is advisable. In the main, however, the YCC purpose should be useful jobs for jobless young men.

The tools of the YCC would be shovel, spade, truck, and bulldozer. Because of size and task, a quasi-military discipline would prevail. Applied with reason, such discipline would add purpose and moral strength to those experiencing it.

YCC recruits would be paid $60 a month plus room and board. Cost, including personnel and administration, is estimated at somewhat more than $1,000 a year for each enrollee. At full strength, the project might cost $200 million a year—a small price considering the potential return.

The YCC would not be a substitute for military service. Its objectives and work would be entirely different and separate from the Nation's Defense Establishment. Boys entering the YCC would have to take their chances on the draft the same as all others working at other gainful employment, or remaining in school. It is doubtful that this would be a deterrent to enlistment to youth facing job shortages or lacking training for existing jobs.

Enlistment would be for 6 months, with reenlistment permissible up to a maximum of 2 years under the Humphrey plan. Recruiters would concentrate upon urban areas with high unemployment and upon the distressed areas. Enrollees would work under supervision of adult professional conservationists such as Forest Service rangers. Educators and guidance officers would also be employed for work in the corps.

The program presented by Senator HUMPHREY may indeed be too limited. Resource and human neglect are such that a much larger force could profitably be employed. The cutoff age of 21 years seems low in view of the number of unemployed single youth under 25. Separate camps might well be established for presently aimless and jobless young men between the ages of 21 and 25.

CCC PRECEDENT

America has precedent enough for a youth corps at home. During the great depression of the thirties, the Roosevelt administration proposed and won approval of the Civilian Conservation Corps. The CCC became a major triumph for FDR who initially had been accused of establishing another leaf-raking outfit.

While the youth corps idea is New Deal, its restoration would be entirely consistent with the New Frontier of today. President Kennedy is pledged to rebuild the Nation's resources. Trees, water, land, and recreation are an integral part of any livable tomorrow. Employment of today's youth to help create such a tomorrow would be in the finest democratic tradition.

This year's bill for a Youth Conservation Corps is identical to that contained in the measure sponsored by Senator HUMPHREY in 1959. It is frankly modeled upon the Civilian Conservation Corps of yesteryear.

The CCC came into being during the hectic glory of the New Deal's famed first 100 days. It was a characteristic Roosevelt reply to wasted youth and wasted land—dramatic and affirmative.

In calling for the CCC, the New Deal proclaimed that healthful outdoor work for youth was, in itself, a beneficial end. This end is as valid now as it was then. A YCC could accomplish what the CCC did before it—bring fitness and purpose into the lives of thousands.

A few weeks after enabling legislation was passed in 1933, Camp Roosevelt—the first of 2,600 camps—came into being just outside metropolitan Washington. This camp—and the others that followed—was under command of Army Reserve officers returned to duty for the purpose.

Reports made to Congress on the progress of the CCC showed that a spirit of comradeship and cooperation soon grew up among the urban recruits who flocked to the camps. The conservation job given the corps became a great challenge and the young men of the depression responded magnificently. In the 9 years of the CCC, there were few complaints of mismanagement, lack of discipline, harsh treatment, or boondoggling.

CCC camps mushroomed across the country. Full strength of 300,000 was achieved in short order and up to the war years there was a new applicant for every camp graduate. The camps were a New Deal showpiece until war caused their disbandment in the early forties. Because of high employment in the immediate postwar period, the camps did not become part of the Fair Deal program.

The YCC merits the support of even Republican conservatives, who proclaim that they are for time-tested programs of value to the Nation. The CCC record, virtually from the start, was one of solid achievement.

At the start, the CCC was almost as much maligned as the Works Project Administration which despite its make-work aspects, did much that was constructive. In the case of the CCC, however, an enthusiasm was generated that soon muted the criticism of even the worst New Deal haters.

The U.S. Forest Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Soil Conservation Service, and other public and private conservation agencies soon saw the great possibilities of the CCC. With the entrance of such forces into the program, the boys were set to work at long-neglected resource restoration tasks.

Three million American boys served in the CCC over its lifetime. The statistics showed that corpsmen, on the whole, gained weight, had their medical and dental needs taken care of, and bloomed with health. In the challenge of their job, delinquency was forgotten. Most developed manual skills and many obtained vocational training as truckdrivers, bulldozer operators, carpenters, woodsmen, machine maintenance men, cooks, and in other trades and crafts.

Training soon became as important a part of camp life as pick and shovel work. Leaders emerged from the ranks and were recognized with command jobs, specialized tasks, and special training. The corps soon learned the art of fire prevention in the forest preserves. It learned to combat erosion and stop floods. It corrected and removed sources of river pollution and restored wasted soils.

The CCC planted some 3 billion trees, the basis of many of today's new forest growths. It strung almost 100,000 miles of telephone wire and brought powerlines into some rural areas. It built 45,000 bridges and more than 4,000 fire towers.

Great floods often start in freshets and creeks where cover has been torn away. The CCC built check-dams to hold floods by the thousand, and restored cover where it was needed. Literally millions of such projects were undertaken successfully by boys who had never before known the outdoors.

The CCC fought encroaching desert by planting grasses on land that had been surrendered to the sagebrush. It restored cover in wildlife refuges that still serve as sanctuary for the Nation's ever scarcer wildlife. It built windbreaks that still dot the prairie.

The skills learned in the CCC were in evidence throughout World War II, and the physical fitness achieved in the camps served the Nation well during that ordeal. Conceived as a peace venture, the CCC had a defense value never envisioned by its originators.

Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out that in 1940 dollars, the CCC added $1.5 billion to U.S. assets. Its real value is beyond monetary calculation.

Since the days of the CCC, deterioration of natural resources has reached dangerous proportions. River pollution has become a national scandal. A new dust-bowl is threatening in the West. Forest stands inside and outside the public domain have been stripped or permitted to deteriorate.

Last summer, the Outdoor Recreation Resources Board reported that while population is booming, recreation land is dwindling. Speaking for this quasi-government agency, Laurance Rockefeller urged the Nation to acquire and develop land for recreation while there is time.

A youth conservation corps could perform miracles in restoring land for recreational purposes. It could be used in the grimly serious tasks of combating beach erosion. It could again build check dams against flood and erosion, and could eliminate sources of water pollution.

CONSERVATION PROBLEMS

Foresters estimate that there are some 275 million acres of timberland in need of improvement. Another 50 million need replanting to become productive again and to provide cover against flood and erosion. Some 300 million acres of farmland need rebuilding.

The proportions of today's conservation problems have been stated by Resources for the Future, a privately financed nonprofit organization. It estimates that $17.5 billion must be spent over the next 10 years to check the spoilation of our natural resources. Because of population growth, the problem is far more serious than in the thirties. National survival as a leading power may depend as much upon attention to conservation as to space problems.

American youth can make a tremendous contribution to solution of the resource problem. Needed is the mobilization of youth for this creative purpose with as much seriousness as youth is recruited for the awesome tasks of destruction.

America knows how to reverse the depletion of her topsoils and to clean up her

streams. Professional foresters and conservationists are eager to restore wasted forests and wornout lands. Lack of funds alone holds back the Nation. Youth simply awaits the allocation of funds and direction to play its part in rebuilding a land in which they and their children hope to live creatively. There is enough to be done to keep a youth corps busy for years ahead.

National service in such a corps can be a great unifier and can help to lend purpose to this Nation. If such a corps is permitted to become a source of national pride because of its works, it will be emulated throughout the world.

A youth conservation corps can be one of the Nation's great educational institutions. The Humphrey bill would set aside 20 percent of YCC time for educational activity. School dropouts and others who have set aside their books might again be induced to take an interest in learning, especially if education were in areas related to their lives.

Out of the CCC there came an awakening to the values of outdoors to thousands who had previously known only city pavements. In today's far more urbanized society, a YCC could provide similar understanding for boys equally deprived of contact with land and forest.

America found that she could afford a CCC during the great depression, and that it brought to the Nation returns far greater than the dollars spent. America certainly can afford a similar, more limited program now.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, with respect to the youth conservation proposal, S. 404, which has very broad sponsorship in the Senate, a written proposal along the same lines, following some of the administration's suggestions, will be offered in a very short time.

I am glad to call this matter to the attention of the Senate because one of the most urgent needs today is gainful private employment opportunities for the young men who are graduating from high school or are dropping out of secondary schools.

I listened this morning to the former president of Harvard University, Dr. Conant, on the "Today" TV show. His report on the urgent need of employment opportunities for young men is something that surely gives me considerable concern.

I am hopeful that Congress will give these young men the opportunity for work in our parks, in our national forests, and on our public lands, along the lines of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the 1930's. I am hopeful that as the measure goes through the committee process we will act expeditiously in order to insure employment opportunities for these young men.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that under the unanimous-consent agreement the housing bill will again be laid before the Senate at 1 o'clock?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Then at this particular time the Senate may proceed to the consideration of other business.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment, which is the pending amendment, to the housing bill. Then I would be relieved of the need to remain in the Chamber. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield for that purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, indeed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment to the housing bill. It is the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc; that the bill, as so amended, be considered as original text for the purpose of further amendment; and that no points of order against legislation in an appropriation bill be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The committee amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 10, to strike out "$32,400,000" and insert "$34,644,000".

On page 5, line 19, to strike out "$71,000,000" and insert "$71,500,000".

On page 6, line 3, after the word "law", to strike out "$29,000,000" and insert "$29,275,000".

On page 6, line 10, after the word "contract", to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$41,708,000".

On page 6, line 24, after "(72 Stat. 834)", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$17,000,000".

On page 10, line 3, after the word "Basin", to strike out "$21,690,000" and insert "$22,786,500".

On page 10, line 11, after the word "Service", to strike out "$17,500,000" and insert "$18,238,000".

On page 10, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,250,000" and insert "$6,200,000", and in line 22, after the word "property", to strike out "$34,000,000" and insert "$39,807,500".

On page 17, line 2, after the word "activities", to strike out "$49,500,000" and insert "$50,200,000".

On page 18, line 11, after the word "substitutes", to strike out "$24,800,000" and insert "$25,100,000".

On page 18, line 18, after the word "Mines", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$920,000".

On page 20, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "$60,000,000".

On page 22, line 10, after the word "law", to strike out "$11,700,000" and insert "$12,225,000".

On page 22, line 24, after the word "States", to insert a comma and "and in addition, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $700,000."

On page 23, line 9, after the word "the", where it appears the second time, to strike out "Lower".

On page 24, line 21, after the word "deer", to strike out "$23,000,000" and insert "$23,972,000".

On page 25, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "$3,770,000" and insert "$5,350,650".

On page 25, line 6, after the word "offices", to strike out "$1,016,000" and insert "$1,071,000".

On page 26, line 21, after "(42 U.S.C. 1958a–1958g)", to strike out "$4,550,000" and insert "$4,685,000".

On page 27, line 14, after the word "service", to strike out "$3,125,000" and insert "$3,185,000".

On page 30, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "$118,000,000" and insert "$149,200,200", and in line 9, after the word "than", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$300,000".

On page 30, line 17, after the word "law", to strike out "$22,978,000" and insert "$27,313,000".

On page 30, line 25, to strike out "$15,500,000" and insert "$15,800,000".

On page 31, after "(16 U.S.C. 471, 472, 475, 476, 551)", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000".

On page 35, line 15, after the word "Act", to strike out "$52,430,000" and insert "$54,590,000".

On page 35, line 24, after "(42 U.S.C 2004a)", to strike out "$6,616,000" and insert "$9,285,000".

On page 38, line 1, after the word "expended", to strike out "$200,000 which shall be available for the purposes of section 1(a) of said Act of May 29, 1930" and insert "$2,700,000, of which (1) $1,500,000 shall be available for the purposes of section 1(a) of said Act of May 29, 1930, (2) $600,000 shall be available for the purposes of section 1(b) thereof, and (3) $600,000 shall be available for the purposes of section 1(c) thereof".

On page 38, line 20, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "$650,000" and insert "$925,000".

On page 42, line 14, after "(72 Stat. 1769)", strike out "$75,000" and insert "$100,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee, as indicated on page 1 of the report, considered budget estimates of $782,387,000, including indefinite appropriations of receipts and requested borrowing authorizations, for the agencies and bureaus of the Department of the Interior and for the related agencies listed on page 3 of the report. Excluded

from this bill are the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, the Bonneville Power Administration, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

The committee recommends definite appropriations totaling $799,841,850 for the programs and activities of these agencies, an increase of $69,330,850 over the amount allowed by the House of Representatives, and an increase of $45,262,850 over the sum of the budget estimates.

The major increases recommended by the committee are as follows:

Bureau of Land Management, $2,244,000; Bureau of Indian Affairs, $8,483,000; National Park Service, $7,642,000; U.S. Geological Survey, $700,000; Bureau of Mines, $470,000; Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, $525,000; Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, $2,607,650; Office of Saline Water, $135,000; Forest Service, $38,835,200; Public Health Service, $4,829,000; National Capital Planning Commission, $2,500,000.

The increase for the Forest Service is the largest in the bill.

The committee feels that these increases are conducive to proper public land management practices and to needed research programs. While aiding in these activities, impetus will be given to greater employment through accomplishment of already planned and necessary programs, thus avoiding initiation of public works for the sole purpose of creating employment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk. I now offer the amendment and ask that it be stated.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, first, if the Senator from South Dakota will permit me to do so, I wish to make a brief observation with respect to one of the amendments adopted en bloc a moment ago.

The bill contains an item in the sum of $675,000 for a forest research laboratory at Athens, Ga. The laboratory is of such transcendent importance to the people of my State at the present time that I wish to make a statement concerning the justification—nay, I may say the compelling necessity—for this item.

The farmers of Georgia have suffered a terrific economic beating during the past 8 or 10 years. In fact, over the last 20 years, for some reason or another, the family farmer has been encountering great difficulties. Thousands of farmers have been lost to farming. The planting of cotton in my State has been reduced to about one-fifth the acreage which we once had. In a desperate effort to enable farmers to stay in business and to get some return from their farms, a tremendous program of the planting of pine trees has been adopted in my State. In the fiscal year 1960, around 300 million pine seedlings were planted in Georgia.

We have seen the growth of a number of paper mills in the Southeast. Unfortunately, very few of the people who live in my State have profited directly, financially, from the operation of those mills; they have not been among the largest stockholders. But they have found a market for the product of the soil, in the sale of pulpwood to these mills.

Mr. President, at the present time a number of diseases have appeared in the pine forests of my State, and are causing great losses. I shall not undertake to name all of them. Some of them have Latin names—for instance, annosus root rot and fusiform rust; and they are taking a tremendous toll of our pine forests, particularly the forests planted on land which for a long number of years had been devoted to the production of other crops.

Our people's last hope lies in the production of pine trees—the marketing of pulpwood, when the trees are thinned; and, later, the production of saw timber, after 25 or 30 years—for a saw tree can be grown in this area as rapidly as anywhere else in the world.

It so happens that only two States of the Union have greater commercial forest land areas than Georgia has; they are the States of Oregon and Alaska. Seventy-five percent of our farm forests are small, privately owned tracts, most of them owned and operated by the farmers.

This is a very dire threat, and we sorely need this laboratory, in order to be able to find ways and means of combating these diseases, which are taking such a heavy toll of our forests. I had heard of these diseases for a year or two; but I had not realized how serious they were, until the last few years, when I went to see some of these forests, and drove in a jeep in an area where 4 or 5 acres would have scarcely a tree left alive.

It so happens that at the University of Georgia we have one of the finest schools of forestry in the country, and we are very proud of it. The Forest Service has for a long time cooperated with our School of Forestry; and we have high hopes that if we can obtain this important facility, we shall be able to preserve this last attempt to make these lands productive by planting them to farm trees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a brief statement regarding the necessity of this program, and also giving an analogy which shows the tremendous losses caused in Eastern United States by the chestnut blight, which we permitted to run wild until it had denuded and killed practically every chestnut tree in our forests.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

FOREST AREA AND OWNERSHIP

Georgia is third among the 50 States in area of commercial forest land with a total of 24 million acres, exceeded only by Oregon and Alaska. Of this 24 million acres, 18 million or 75 percent is in small privately owned tracts, most of which are held by farmers. Farm forestry is highly important in the economy of the State.

EXTENT OF TREE PLANTING IN GEORGIA

One of the keys of Georgia's forestry future is tree planting. Georgia has increased its tree planting program until it is the largest in the country. Seedling production reaches 311 million in fiscal year 1960, and the area planted was 330,000 acres. Over the last 3 years, 858,000 acres were planted in the State.

VALUE OF FORESTS AND PRODUCTS

The capital value of Georgia's forests for timber purposes is estimated to be more than $1 billion. This forest resource supports about 3,000 manufacturing units, among which are sawmills, pulp mills, wood preservation plants, furniture, veneer, and plywood plants, and many others. These plants annually turn out products with a market value of approximately $1¼ billion. The value added by manufacture, included in this total, is estimated to be almost $500 million, which places forest products second only to textiles in this rating. Forests and forest industries provide employment for about 45,000 people in the woods and 55,000 people in the plants, or a total of about 100,000.

SOUTHERN PINE DISEASES

In the last year, two of the most serious southern pine diseases ever encountered are threatening the future of pine timber production in the South—annosus root rot and fusiform rust. The first, by destroying roots, kills pines particularly in thinned plantations on old agricultural land. The other kills and deforms pines, especially slash and loblolly. Together, they have riddled many natural stands and plantations until the timber is virtually worthless. Some forest land owners are so concerned about annosus root rot that they are considering forgoing profitable pulpwood thinnings as a desperation measure to reduce losses that seem to be associated with thinning operations. Fusiform rust is extremely damaging wherever loblolly and slash pine grow, much worse in some areas than others, but a distinct threat to orderly investments in timber growing.

Many other diseases of southern pine do damage. All are capable of sweeping out of control at any time in the future when conditions are right. The more troublesome ones are the cone rust that destroy crops of seed, nursery diseases that reduce number of plantable seedlings, little leaf diseases of shortleaf pine, and brown spot needle disease of longleaf pine.

A strong and aggressive research program is needed to develop preventive and corrective measures for these diseases, especially annosus root rot and fusiform rust. Some hope lies in selecting and breeding disease-resistant trees. The development of biological controls has promise. Fungicides and fumigants need to be evaluated. Preventive management practices and control measures must be devised to curb the trend of heavy losses to timber.

Past research has done much to reduce disease losses in southern pine stands. Concentrated study can reduce the threat of the diseases now devastating southern pine. They must be controlled if southern pine forestry is to continue as a profitable enterprise.

CHESTNUT BLIGHT

Chestnut blight supplies a classic example of what happens when an introduced disease finds a highly susceptible host and favorable environmental conditions. Prior to 1900, the American chestnut occurrred from New England west to Indiana and south to north Georgia and Mississippi. In 1904 chestnut blight was found in New York. By 1940, the disease had spread like wildfire throughout the range of the tree and had eliminated it as a component of North

American forests. It has been estimated that the volume of chestnuts killed was in excess of 18 billion board feet.

Losses in the South accounted for about three-quarters of the total amount. In the southern Appalachians chestnut comprised about one-quarter of the stand on about 33 million acres of forest land. In north Georgia, it was as much a part of the landscape as the red clay hills that bore it.

About one-quarter of the 18 billion board feet killed was salvaged but the renewable resource was destroyed. Most of the land once occupied by chestnut now supports less valuable, slower growing species. Estimates have been made that the reduction in returns from forest lands from which chestnut has been eliminated range from 15 to over 50 percent.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I renew the offering of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, in line 22, it is proposed to strike out "$39,807,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$39,882,500."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to increase by $75,000 the amount available for the construction of buildings or facilities within the areas administered by the National Park Service. The purpose is particularly to make possible certain additional facilities for the accommodation of the public at the Mount Rushmore National Memorial.

At a meeting of the National Memorial Society, last week, it was brought to my attention that the facilities are totally inadequate at the present time to accommodate the crowds; that on Mother's Day, 800 people were in line on the reserve list for dinner, and 600 on Easter Sunday.

This $75,000 would be repayable under a contract between the Society and the National Park Service.

I hold in my hand a letter from Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service, dated June 2, 1961. It reads as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1961.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CASE: As I understand it, the Mount Rushmore National Memorial Society of Black Hills, which has a concession contract with the National Park Service at Mount Rushmore National Memorial, passed a resolution requesting a further advance of $75,000 to provide additional facilities to take care of the increase in visitor travel. You were instrumental in getting Congress to appropriate approximately $500,000 for the purpose of providing visitor facilities at Mount Rushmore, to be paid back by the society over a period of years at an estimated rate of $25,000 a year. For your information, the society is ahead in its payments, and has paid back the advance as follows:

1955	$28,619.46
1956	32,626.95
1957	40,737.60
1958	44,309.59
1959	48,640.75
1960	48,877.71

My understanding is that the society in requesting this additional $75,000 believe that they can pay it back within the original proposed period of 20 years. Even if they wished an extension of time for this additional amount, I believe it would be a good investment because the impact of visitors and service requirements of these visitors at Mount Rushmore has certainly been demonstrated. I am, of course, not in a position to recommend any action to Congress without the permission of the Bureau of the Budget, but I am furnishing you this data for your information as requested.

Sincerely yours,

CONRAD L. WIRTH,
Director.

Mr. President, I take note of the fact that each year they far exceeded the $25,000 minimum repayment; and during the last 3 years they have been paying back at the rate of more than $40,000 a year. So they can take care of the additional $75,000 within the 20 years contemplated; and that is the request.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in view of the very favorable repayment record in this instance, it seems to me that the committee would be justified in accepting the amendment and taking it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I thank the chairman of the committee for his consideration.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Arizona for restoring to the bill $450,000 which was in the budget, for the purpose of the acquisition of land in the Everglades National Park. This amount, if appropriated, would be the first amount for the purchase, by means of Federal funds, of lands for inclusion in this park. The record shows that over 1¼ million acres have been donated either by the State of Florida or by private owners, or have been purchased with funds, in the amount of $2 million, supplied by the State of Florida.

In 1958, we passed legislation reducing very greatly the authorized limits of the park. The lands left to be acquired in the reduced area are, of course, not available to development; and for the last 3 years the private owners have been looking anxiously to the time when the Federal Government would carry through on the authorization of the 1958 legislation.

The $450,000 restored to the bill by the committee will allow the purchase of the most critical sites in the area now still in private ownership.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD—if it will meet with the approval of the chairman of the committee—the top half of page 8 of the committee report, which shows rather clearly the facts with reference to this appropriation item, which, as I have said, was included in the budget this year, as indeed it was last year, and is long past due in the fulfillment of the obligation of the Federal Government in this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. I have no objection to the inclusion of that matter in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that part of the page be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the report (No. 294) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The $450,000 budget request for acquiring an additional 30,000 acres of land in the Everglades National Park, Fla., has been restored. This would be the first Federal expenditure for land acquisition in the park, about 1,290,091 acres having been donated by the State, local agencies, and private donors, some of which was acquired by the $2 million cash grant made by the State of Florida. This acquisition would carry out the authorization in Public Law 85-482 (July 2, 1958), which fixed final but greatly reduced boundaries for the park and authorized up to $2 million to complete land acquisition.

The State has carried out its part of the exchange contemplated under that act by granting 64,000 acres for the park in exchange for 65,000 Federal acres. It has also conveyed 30,000 acres previously donated by the Collier interests for purposes of the park in contemplation of the redefining of the boundaries by the 1958 act. Thus, only the Federal Government is in default on obligations imposed by that act.

Sizable Federal funds are now being expended in building a west coast headquarters for the park at Everglade City. Unless the intervening lands are acquired, this headquarters will be cut off from the main body of the park.

The owners of the private property are in the position of having to make tax and other payments without being able to develop or sell their property. The proposed acquisition is necessary not only from the standpoint of equity to them and to the west coast area of Florida but also from the standpoint of the park's optimum development. Among the lands which cannot be acquired without Federal appropriation are such critical areas as the lands close by Duck Rock, one of the major birdlife attractions, and the Indian Mound areas on Turner River.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

THE NEED FOR THE VESSEL "NORTH STAR," OPERATED BY THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Arizona for the excellence of the presentation of various items in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Unfortunately, one item was omitted; namely, that for a ship to take care of the ports in the western and northern parts of Alaska, inhabited largely by Eskimos. The services supplied by such a ship are not only desirable; they are absolutely essential for the welfare of these inhabitants. So I shall send to the desk an amendment which calls for restoration of the item of $375,000.

This area is not served by any commercial vessel, except to very limited degree. Of approximately 98 ports which now are served by vessels of the Office of Indian Affairs, 90 are not served by commercial vessels; and it is absolutely essential that these communities be served.

The question has frequently been raised as to the reason for the Bureau of Indian Affairs operation of a service vessel. This can best be answered by giving a very brief background of con-

ditions as they existed at the time the first vessel for the Alaska Service was commissioned and brings this information up to date. The U.S.M.S. *Boxer*, a 300-ton converted brigantine, was commissioned for use by the Office of Education in 1922, which Department then had charge of the education and health work carried on by the Federal Government in the Territory of Alaska. The justification for this vessel being that in order to extend education and health facilities to native groups of Alaska, it was necessary to have transportation facilities other than those supplied by regular commercial carriers. Regular commercial carriers, being able to serve only the major cities, were not justified in dispatching their vessels to the many small and scattered Indian, Aleut, and Eskimo villages. Due primarily to the services of the *Boxer* in delivering supplies and the transportation of personnel, additional schools and hospitals were established in the more remote areas of the North and Western Pacific, Bering Sea, and the Arctic Ocean. This growth continued, and by early 1930 the need for a larger vessel was clearly demonstrated. Funds were secured through congressional appropriation; and in 1932, the first *North Star*, a 2,000-ton combination passenger and freighter, was launched.

It was thought then that this vessel would adequately take care of the service's requirements, and plans were made to retire the *Boxer*. However, increased demands for additional schools, hospitals, reindeer projects, native cooperative stores and other native enterprises made it necessary to operate both vessels up until 1941, when all shipping—due to the national emergency was taken over by the U.S. Maritime Commission. Both the *Boxer* and the *North Star* were taken over by the Navy during the entire period of the Second World War. With the ceasing of hostilities in 1945, the *North Star* was returned in 1945 to the Department of the Interior, for servicing the Bureau of Indian Affairs stations. During the war years the economy of native people in northern Alaska changed from a "barter" to a "wage" economy, thereby bringing about a marked improvement in their standard of living. With increased income, the native people in almost every village in the Bering Sea and Arctic Ocean area demanded more commercial food, shelter, and clothing. More demands were made by the native groups for increased educational and medical facilities.

Commercial ocean transportation companies, instead of increasing their facilities, began a definite curtailment program to this area. Santa Ana Steamship Co. quit operating in 1948. The Backland Transportation Co. never reentered the trade after the war. The Alaska Transportation Co. and the Northland Transportation Co. stopped operation immediately following the Second World War. The Lomen Commercial Co. sold their equipment to the Alaska Steamship Co. just prior to our entry into the war. The Berger Transportation Co. ceased to operate beyond Nikolski, thereby leaving this entire North Pacific, Bering Sea, and Arctic Ocean to be served by the Alaska Steamship Co. All commercial passenger service was discontinued, since the Alaska Steamship Co. only dispatched freighters to this area. The Alaska Steamship Co. also refused to call at any port unless it had a minimum of 100 tons of freight for discharge, and would not then guarantee to discharge such freight at the designated port if weather conditions were such as to necessitate a delay of over 48 hours. With the curtailment of commercial transportation facilities, it was impossible for the old *North Star* to transport all of the Bureau of Indian Affairs cargo to these isolated villages, plus the supplies for the natives, their cooperative stores, reindeer projects, coal mines, and so forth. Since no other ocean transportation facilities were available to these villages, it was also necessary for the *North Star* to accommodate white traders, the missionaries, and other governmental agencies such as the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Weather Bureau, the Alaska Communication Service, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey. Therefore, steps were taken in 1948 for the acquisition of the present 5,000-ton vessel.

Since 1922, when the *Boxer* was commissioned, through the years 1932–49, when the first *North Star* was in operation—with the exception of the war years—and from 1950 to the present, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has had in operation at least one supply vessel. During all of these years there has never been a failure in the delivery of supplies to a Bureau of Indian Affairs station or villages. The above information is very significant when one considers that since 1934, the Seattle waterfront along with the remainder of the Pacific coast has been plagued with a series of work stoppages.

Prior to 1943, four strikes or series of strikes, 1934, 1936–37, 1946, and 1948, continued for approximately 3 months each. During the months of May, June, and July of 1952 the Sailors Union of the Pacific were out on strike for 53 days, during which time no commercial shipping took place on the Pacific coast, resulting in crippling effects on Alaska economy. During the 95-day strike of 1948, the *North Star* made an emergency trip to southeastern Alaska and Seward in December taking food, clothing, and shelter supplies.

Longshoremen refused to load even emergency cargo on any ships owned or operated by members of the Pacific Maritime Association. Again in 1952, during the months of May through July, the Sailors Union of the Pacific had all of the ships owned and operated by the Pacific Maritime Association tied up. During this time the *North Star* was cleared by the unions, and had the strike continued, she would have been able to supply her regular outlets without delay.

When one considers the shortness of the open shipping season—June, July, August, September, and October for Bering Sea ports; August to the 15th of September for the Arctic Ocean ports south of Blossom Shoals; August 20 to September 7, north to Barrow—it is evident that a real threat would be imposed upon a great number of native communities were their shipping facilities placed entirely in the hands of commercial operators. Any transportation company operating under union agreements would find it next to impossible to perform the many services of the *North Star*.

Under union agreements their mates, sailors, engineers, radio operators, and members of the steward department would refuse to do any work away from the vessel, not only because of union regulations prohibiting the same, but also because their compensation laws cover work only which is performed on board ship. Such services include longshoring, lighterage, setting up of bulk oil tanks on shore, laying of oil pipe lines on shore, pumping oil from barge to shore tanks, driving tractors on shore, repairing of shore light plants, furnaces, outboard motors and repairing of shore radio telephone sets. It would be a violation of union agreements to have the purser on a commercial ship perform such extra services as selling reindeer products or to have him go ashore for the purpose of checking cargo on the beach.

During the 4 years 1950–54 the officers and crew of the *North Star* set up and installed 38 bulk oil tanks, making it possible for the vessel by the use of its double bottoms to deliver 570,000 gallons of liquid fuel each year to our stations. At the close of the 1960 shipping season the *North Star* officers and crew had installed 74 bulk oil tanks, making it possible for the vessel to deliver 750,000 gallons of liquid fuel each year. A saving in excess of $90,000 a year is effected on the purchase price of the fuel thus delivered, while an additional saving of $32,000 is effected in delivery costs.

Each year the vessel en route south from Kotzebue loads on board the natives from Diomede and returns them to their home. She also transports the King Island people from Nome back to their island home. This service is directly connected with the economic life of these people, and the services are absolutely essential.

The native stores take part in approximately 25 percent of the lighterage and longshoring operations off the *North Star*. Through careful records kept by the ship's purser, the vessel acts as a billing agency for all native stores, thereby performing a very valuable service to the store through the collection of thousands of dollars which otherwise would be difficult or almost impossible to collect.

Since 65 percent of all of the cargo carried on the vessel belongs to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, approximately 25 percent of all cargo is stockpiled aboard the ship and delivered as requisitioned by the various villages. This action is necessary due to the great number of ports of call, and is advisable from an economy angle. By so doing, considerable savings are effected.

The Alaska Steamship Co. is the only commercial company operating ships departing from the States to Bering Sea and the Arctic Ocean. This company only calls at the following ports in this area which are also served by the *North Star:* Dillingham, St. Michael, Unalakleet, Nome, and Kotzebue. Out of the *North Star's* 98 ports of call, 90 are not served by any commercial carrier carrying cargo from Seattle; 6 of these 90 stations are north of Kotzebue and the Arctic Circle, an area where regular commercial insurance rates are excessive; 4 are on small, isolated Bering Sea Island; and 1 is located at Atka, almost 500 miles west of the regular route followed by commercial carriers. Since a minimum discharge of 100 tons is required by the Alaska Steamship Co. before the booking of cargo for a direct discharge, less than 25 percent of Bureau stations could qualify.

The *North Star,* being a vessel operated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the express purpose of improving the health, educational, and economic growth of the native people, has over a period of years become as much a part of the Government's overall program as the hospitals, schools, and native enterprises which it serves.

The *North Star* has been operating on an enterprise basis since 1955, during which time a very accurate account of her expenditures and income has been kept. The table below sets forth these figures:

Fiscal year	Voyage	Direct costs	Indirect costs	Total costs	Total tons	Average cost per ton
1956	65, 66	$467,011.92	$33,354.08	$500,366.00	10,814	$46.27
1957	67, 68	463,655.97	39,533.37	503,189.34	10,213	49.27
1958	69, 70	543,810.35	43,586.78	587,397.13	11,944	49.18
1959	71, 72	510,153.57	37,866.99	548,020.56	10,581	51.79
1960	73, 74	491,844.49	37,848.13	529,692.62	10,631	49.83
Average for 5 fiscal years						49.26

The above costs include *North Star* freight charges, Seattle wharfage and handling, and local lighterage and longshoring. On the regular yearly scheduled first trip of the *North Star* the vessel makes direct discharge at the ports of call listed below. For the sake of cost comparison we have figured, using the latest published tariffs, what it would cost to ship our freight to such stations where commercial facilities are available.

Tatitlek: No commercial carrier.
Chenega: No commercial carrier.
English Bay: No commercial carrier.
Port Graham: No commercial carrier.
Tyonek: No commercial carrier.
Anchorage Bay: $46.83 per ton.
Chignik Lake: No commercial carrier.
Perryville: $69.56 transshipped via Kodiak.
Akutan: $74.56 transshipped via Kodiak.
Nikolski: $83.09 transshipped via Kodiak.
Atka: No commercial carrier.
Kanakanak: $64.59 via Dillingham or Nushigak.
Togiak: $95.54.
Goodnews Bay: No commercial carrier.
Tumunak: No commercial carrier.
Newktok: No commercial carrier.
Umkimute: No commercial carrier.
Nightmute: No commercial carrier.
Chifornak: No commercial carirer.
Mekoryuk: No commercial carrier.
Hooper Bay: No commercial carrier.
Chevak: No commercial carrier.
St. Michael: $60.48 per ton.
Stebbins: $74.28 per ton via St. Michael.
Colovin: $87.85 per ton via Nome.
White Mountain: $93.75 per ton via Nome.
Unalakleet: $68.73 per ton.
Shaktoolik: No commercial carrier.
Koyuk: $102.23 per ton via Nome.
Elim: No commercial carrier.
Gambell: $90.45 per ton via Nome.
Savoonga: No commercial carrier.
Scammon Bay: No commercial carrier.

On the regular yearly scheduled second trip of the *North Star* the vessel makes direct discharges at the following ports of call. The cost of shipping our freight to these stations, using the latest published tariffs where commercial facilities are available, are also given.

Kotzebue: $66.81.
Barrow: $119.61 via Kotzebue.
Wainwright: $110.23 via Kotzebue.
Point Lay: $114.81 via Kotzebue.
Point Hope: $101.81 via Kotzebue.
Kivalina: $94.31 via Kotzebue.
Deering: $65.61 via Kotzebue.
Shishmaref: $100.81 via Kotzebue.
Diomede: No commercial carrier.
Wales: $91.43 via Nome.
Teller Mission: No commercial carrier.
Mekoryuk: No commercial carrier.
Nome: $63.73.
King Island: No commercial carrier.
Belkofski: $69.25 via Kodiak.
Larsens Bay: No commercial carrier.
Karluk: No commercial carrier.
Alitak: No commercial carrier.
Old Harbor: No commercial carrier.
Afognak: No commercial carrier.

The Alaska Steamship Co. makes direct discharges at the following stations also served directly by the *North Star:* St. Michael, Unalakleet, Nome, and Kotzebue.

The Alaska Steamship Co. for a number of years has been transporting a large portion of Bureau of Indian Affairs supplies to these stations. For instance, this season we shipped no supplies for Nome on the *North Star;* however, 43 tons were shipped by way of the Alaska Steamship Co. freighters. Into St. Michael this year we shipped by way of the *North Star* 46 tons, by way of the Alaska Steamship Co. freighters 440 tons. The Alaska Steamship Co. freighter serving Kotzebue closes off the acceptance of freight too early to be of service to us. In fact, their early close off causes us to overload the *North Star* in order to accommodate non-Government personnel including Kotzebue and upriver merchants who frequently are unable to get their supplies purchased and delivered in time for shipment by way of the Alaska Steamship Co. freighter. On several occasions the Bureau of Indian Affairs has shipped to Kotzebue by way of the Alaska Steamship Co. freighter a portion of their supplies for the upriver stations only to later discover that these supplies were held in Kotzebue, where warehouse facilities are almost nonexistent, until the arrival of the balance of the upriver supplies being shipped on the *North Star* thereby enabling all the upriver supplies to be barged upriver at the same time. Not only is this procedure more expensive, but loss due to pilferage and spoilage is excessive.

The *North Star* regularly serves 34 villages operating cooperative stores under the direct supervision of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. These stores are the only medium through which the villagers can purchase food, clothing, and fuel supplies. The transportation of such supplies, together with costs, constitutes one of the biggest problems these communities encounter. Listed below are the 34 stores and a comparison of the shipping costs, *North Star* versus commercial carriers:

Native stores—Rate comparison, commercial and "North Star" rates, as of November 1960

Native store	*North Star* rate	Commercial rate	Commercial rate exceed
Atka [1]	$52.85	$120.11	$67.26
Barrow	77.65	119.61	41.96
Buckland	86.45	91.11	4.66
Chenega [1]	48.65	67.71	19.06
Deering	58.65	65.61	6.96
Diomede [1]	59.05	120.93	61.88
Elim	57.85	96.23	38.38
Gambell	62.05	90.45	28.40
Hooper Bay [1]	61.85	79.85	18.00
King Island [1]	59.05	121.93	62.88
Kivalina	61.65	94.31	32.66
Koyuk	58.35	102.23	43.88
Mekoryuk [1]	55.85	85.85	30.00
Newktok [1]	76.45	108.35	31.90
Nightmute [1]	55.85	116.37	60.52
Nikolski	52.85	83.09	30.24
Noatak	96.35	100.91	4.56
Noorvik	82.05	86.61	4.56
Perryville	52.85	69.56	16.71
Point Hope	64.15	101.81	37.66
Point Lay	68.65	114.81	46.16
Savoonga [1]	57.05	88.88	31.83
Scammon Bay [1]	55.85	114.61	58.76
Shaktoolik [1]	58.35	70.13	11.78
Shishmaref	58.15	100.81	42.66
Shungnak	102.95	107.51	4.56
Stebbins	55.85	74.28	18.43
Tununak [1]	56.45	85.85	29.40
Tatitlek [1]	48.65	67.71	19.06
Tyonek [1]	51.45	72.05	20.60
Unalakleet	60.85	68.73	7.88
Wainwright	69.65	110.23	40.58
Wales	57.55	91.43	33.88
White Mountain	70.85	93.73	22.88

[1] No commercial rates available. For the purpose of this study local rates estimated from past contracted on-carriers.

This past season the *North Star* on Voyage 74 lost 20 days and on voyage 75 another 34 days because of inclement weather—24 of the above 34 days were lost in making the delivery of supplies at King and Diomede Islands.

A number of essential and varied services essential to the welfare of the villages which are performed by the *North Star* in addition to the delivery of freight are as follows:

First. The ship's crew performs the necessary lighterage work where the villagers themselves do not provide this service. This includes bulk oil delivered by means of an oil barge and portable pump carried on the ship. The crew also installs bulk oil tanks for the schools, using a small caterpillar tractor, also carried.

Second. A trained man is carried to care for maintenance and repair of light plants for all schools, and a stock of new light plants is available on board when needed.

Third. An experienced radioman is provided by the ship for repair on transmitters and receivers in the villages.

Fourth. Mail is carried to certain outlying villages where other means of transportation are not available.

Fifth. The entire population of King Island, numbering upward of 200, migrates each Spring to Nome, and the men are relied upon every summer to perform the lighterage and other heavy work in that town. In October the *North Star* has been depended upon to transport the entire group back to King Island, carrying along all their personal belongings and winter supplies, as well as their native boats. The same service is rendered to a much smaller number of natives of Diomede on the same voyage.

Sixth. On Nunivak Island a considerable industry in reindeer meat and by-products has been developed and is the main source of cash income. One of the *North Star* officers, without compensation or cost to the natives, acts as their agent in selling and distributing these products in many of the ports.

The total proceeds of this enterprise last summer was $47,402.70, and this is said to be a typical year. This service is one of great value to the inhabitants of Nunivak, as well as to the natives of the ports of delivery, where the meat is highly regarded as a food.

Certain other aspects of the *North Star* operation are worthy of mention. One is that the ship is committed to delivery of cargo without fail and without layover charge for the long delays occasioned by adverse weather conditions. The record in this respect is highly commendable. Another is that no insurance on cargo is available to shippers, which means a considerable saving to consignees, especially at the far northern points, but also involves their carrying whatever risk is involved. Up to this time the ship seems to have a fine record for deliveries of freight with only slight losses or damage. Another unusual feature is that although the crewmembers are generally members of unions, they are given a leave of absence from their unions during the period of their service on this ship, and as a result the *North Star* has been relieved of the consequences of the numerous and lengthy strikes that have seriously affected water transportation between Alaska and the continental United States.

The appropriation sought will permit the Interior Department to take out of mothballs and rehabilitate a cargo ship, the *Emory Victory*, which will then be suitable to carry on the historic mission of the previous *North Stars*. It is planned to rename the ship the *North Star*. This is an appropriate name not merely for historic reasons but because it will serve our Nation's farthest north. It will serve the northernmost dwellers of the State whose flag proudly displays on a field of blue the seven gold stars of the dipper and the Pole or North Star. Let us keep that flag flying and that ship sailing. She and her predecessors have served the aboriginal people of Alaska and latecomers to the last frontier for 40 years. This is no time to haul her ensign down. She is more than ever needed now when the people she serves man our first line of defense of the North American Continent.

I urge that the amendment be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 6, in line 10, to strike out the numeral "$41,708,000" and insert in lieu thereof the numeral "$42,083,000."

Mr. GRUENING. That is merely to cover the price of rehabilitating the vessel.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator refers to rehabilitation of a ship. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. This ship is to bring supplies to the people along the coast, largely Eskimos.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the ship is worn out, and the purpose of the amendment is to rehabilitate another ship to be used for that purpose.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee considered this proposal and could not agree to it. However, the Senator may want to ask for the yeas and nays and try to have the amendment adopted.

Mr. GRUENING. I do not know what these communities would do without the ship. They are not served by commercial vessels. The Alaska Steamship Co. serves only 8 of the 98 ports involved. They are communities chiefly inhabited by our Eskimo citizens. If the vessel is not forthcoming, the cost of shipping by air is going to be much greater, and the larger cost will ultimately have to come out of the funds appropriated to the office of Indian affairs or out of the meager income of the consumers.

Mr. HAYDEN. The facts just stated by the Senator were not available to the members of the committee. The assumption was that a regular steamship line could provide the service.

Mr. GRUENING. That assumption is not justified. The arguments in favor of the proposal are fully contained in the statement I have made, and which will appear in the RECORD. I think it is a convincing statement, giving facts and figures as to the number of communities that will not be served if the appropriation is not restored.

Mr. HAYDEN. I regret that I cannot accept the amendment; but since the committee has acted on this matter, I am not at liberty to do so. However, members of the committee will be present tomorrow, and the Senator may submit his amendment at that time and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope that by tomorrow the distinguished chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Arizona, will have read the record, and after having read the facts and figures in the argument in support of the amendment, I hope he will be favorable to accepting the amendment.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Is not this an item that was in the House bill?

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. It was in the House bill which came to the Senate. It is not a new item.

Mr. BIBLE. The Senator did not mention that fact.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Alaska that I was unaware of the need for this particular item. The Senator has conveyed certain information to some Senators individually, and, by his statement now, to the Senate as a whole. If the facts are as he has stated, and I gather that they are, and that the deletion of this item would cause a great hardship, I am sure the amount will be restored.

Mr. GRUENING. The deletion of the amount and the loss of the ship would cause a great hardship.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assure the Senator that in light of his comments, and the information which he has conveyed to the majority leader, and to the Senate as a body, these funds should be restored. It is my view that the funds should be restored. I regret the action of the committee. I am sure, once Senators have a chance to read the RECORD, justice will prevail, because it is quite obvious that if there are 98 ports, I believe the Senator said——

Mr. GRUENING. Ninety ports out of ninety-eight which would not be served.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If only 8 out of 98 will be served by a commercial line, the other communities must be served by some form of transportation, and there are only two forms available—air and sea.

Mr. GRUENING. Yes. In some of the communities there are no airports. Therefore, such communities will not be served at all unless they are served by sea.

I commend the Senator from Minnesota for his sympathetic understanding on behalf of the people—most of them not well off economically—who are involved. It would be a body blow to the Secretary of the Interior, in his responsibility for taking care of the needs of the Indians and Eskimos of Alaska, if this item remains deleted. The Eskimos and Indians make up about one-seventh of the population of Alaska. Although not the entire Indian and Eskimo population is served by this vessel, a substantial number is.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am sure the Senate respects the judgment of the two Senators from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING and Mr. BARTLETT]. When it comes to the needs of Alaska, we must reflect that most of us have not had the privilege of traveling extensively in that State. We have to rely on the long experience and dedication to the public welfare of the two Alaskan Senators.

When the RECORD is read, and tomorrow we vote on this particular item, I am sure it will be clear that had the information that has been furnished been available and understood by Senators—by this Senator particularly—we would have registered a protest, long before this, to the deletion of the item. I will join with the Senator from Alaska tomorrow in support of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska. [Putting the question.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question relating to the procedure on this bill? I want this amendment to be adopted, but I also wish to make sure that we are following the general understanding.

Mr. HAYDEN. There was a unanimous-consent agreement that there would be no yea-and-nay votes today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Was it understood that there would be no yea-and-nay votes today?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. That there would be no yea-and-nay votes today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. And that includes a vote on an issue which is as controversial as this amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Undoubtedly, the yeas and nays will be requested.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am not too sure about the yeas and nays being requested. They may be requested, but it so happens that members of the committee who raised a question about this particular item are not present today. For that reason, action on the amendment should go over until tomorrow, so that those members of the committee may pursue the matter further, if they care to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope, therefore, we shall not have an announced vote on this amendment, in line with the understanding that such votes will go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota make a unanimous consent request that the amendment go over until tomorrow?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, Mr. President. On behalf of the committee I make the unanimous consent request that the amendment go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, before the third reading of the bill—I gather we shall have a delayed vote—I should like to make some comments on the portion of the bill which relates to the regional laboratory-office building of the Forest Service known as the Lake States Forest Experiment Station. It is presently located on the St. Paul campus of the University of Minnesota on space donated by the University, with an additional amount of rented space.

The School of Forestry has been expanding greatly in recent years, and soon it will require the laboratory space currently occupied by the Lake States Forest Experiment Station.

Because of these facts the committee has included an item for the Lake States Forest Experiment Station. The amount for the laboratory-office building is $1,250,000. Facilities would include:

Specialized laboratories for forest tree insects and diseases research.

Soils laboratory for determining forest soil characteristics and productivity and soil moisture movement.

Electronic computing facilities for compiling and analyzing forest research and resource information.

Office and related laboratory space for housing scientists working in the fields of timber, water, and soil management, fire research, recreation and wildlife habitat, and timber utilization and marketing.

Administrative offices and services for a regional forest research organization.

Mr. President, I note these facts because I wish to make sure that the particular budget item will be maintained in the bill. It is of urgent importance that the laboratory and administrative office facility be established.

BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee at the request of Senator DWORSHAK has agreed to take out the word "Lower," as it relates to construction by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, as applied to the Columbia River. By taking out the word "Lower" the reference is to the entire Columbia River, rather than the Lower Columbia River.

Mr. President, on page 22, line 12, I move to strike out the word "Lower" where it appears in relation to management and investigation of resources by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WEST YELLOWSTONE AIRPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to discuss briefly the Interior appropriations bill which is now before the Senate. Generally I am in complete accord with the action taken by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Probably no other money bill is quite as important to my State of Montana as the Interior appropriations bill. This bill contains funds for many agencies which are active in Montana.

At this time I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee to the funds provided for the National Park Service in fiscal year 1962. As the chairman knows, the late Senator James E. Murray and I appeared before the committee on a number of occasions in support of National Park Service participation in the construction of the West Yellowstone Airport, a facility which would provide improved and modern airline service to Yellowstone National Park. My distinguished colleague [Mr. METCALF] is also interested in this project and supported an appropriation of the necessary funds when I recently appeared before the appropriate subcommittee.

For some time now this airport project has been ready to go, with the exception of the necessary National Park Service funds. The Department of the Interior, acting through the National Park Service, plans to sponsor the construction of the West Yellowstone Airport as soon as the funds are available. Interior Department participation will require $726,000. Federal Airport Act funds are available in excess of $600,000 and the necessary land for the airport will be transferred from the U.S. Forest Service and the Montana State Aeronautics Commission will sponsor and maintain the project after completion.

Yellowstone National Park is one of 12 parks under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service which has had an annual traffic count in excess of 1 million tourists. In 1959 it ranked fifth, and last year was No. 11. Tourist traffic in our national parks is ever increasing, and the interest in access to these areas by airlines is of considerable interest to the traveling American. This project which would provide the only immediate air access to the park from Montana is becoming more important as certain of our surface carriers are curtailing and discontinuing service.

I have noted with interest that the committee has included, as a new item, $880,000 as the National Park Service portion of construction cost of an airport at the Grand Canyon National Park. This park which has a traffic count comparable to that of Yellowstone National Park has needed these facilities for some time and I am very pleased to note recognition made to the project by the committee.

My colleague [Mr. METCALF] and I are disappointed that a similar project has not been approved for Yellowstone National Park. I should like to take this opportunity to ask the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. HAYDEN] if the West Yellowstone Airport project was discussed, and what is the sentiment of the members pertaining to the project?

Mr. HAYDEN. The appropriations to be provided by the National Park Service at Yellowstone were greater than the appropriations to be provided by the Federal Aviation Authority, which is the reverse of the situation at Grand Canyon National Park.

I have no doubt that if the Senator can obtain a budget estimate for the supplemental appropriation bill, to be later considered, we would have no trouble approving the item.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assume, from what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said, my colleague

[Mr. METCALF] and I can be assured that if and when the appropriate information and figures are forthcoming from the Department of the Interior and other related departments, the item will be given the most serious consideration by the Appropriations Committee, and possibly will be included in a supplemental appropriation bill later this year.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is possible. I particularly urge the Senator to try to obtain a budget estimate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall do my best. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, line 4, it is proposed to strike "$149,200,200" and to insert "$134,200,200."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to direct some remarks to the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] with respect to the amendment. It is my understanding that the $30 million provided for forest management and related subjects was not included in the bill by the House. I understand also that the item was not included in the budget, so the bill is $30 million above the budget by virtue of that one item.

I am fully aware of the fact that the amendment has been cosponsored, probably on both sides of the aisle, but it would appear to me from reading the testimony on pages 852 and 853 of the printed transcript of the hearings that the $30 million item is designed mainly to help certain areas where it is believed the work could be coordinated with the work to be performed under the distressed areas bill and its objectives.

I thought that in the course of the colloquy, Mr. McArdle, of the Forest Service, and those associated with him, made quite clear what was desired. Mr. McArdle was asked a question by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], as reported on page 853:

Mr. MCARDLE. Senator, I want to make sure that one point is in the record. These estimates that I was just talking about, the total estimates for a 12-year program, were for the entire country. We are now talking about economically distressed areas, singling out some of the areas in the entire country and your question just a moment ago as I understand it was how many such areas would be involved.

Senator MCGEE. That is particularly where surplus labor is available?

Mr. MCARDLE. Last fall we began following very closely the reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics on unemployment and began marking areas on a map, trying to see how close national forest areas would be to some of these areas of unemployment. We began trying to find a way in addition to show those areas of rural unemployment which we know about because our people lived out there.

These areas generally were not reflected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at that time. And as a result when the new administration came in and encouraged us to present to them some of these figures we did so. I see you have our map in front of you now——

Parenthetically, I do not believe that the map was reproduced in the transcript of the hearings. The colloquy continued—

Senator MCGEE. Yes.

Mr. MCARDLE. Which we prepared.

Senator MCGEE. The staff advises me we probably can't print it in color but we can get the other emphasis.

(The map referred to is in committee files.)

Mr. MCARDLE. We attempted to show on that map the areas reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics on unemployment which gave considerable emphasis as you might expect to the cities and towns. We tried to get in also the areas of rural low income. To answer your question specifically, we would have to study, I would imagine, any special appropriation that might be made by this committee or any directive. We would need to also study the provisions of S. 1 which is now public law.

S. 1 is the distressed areas bill. The Chief of the Forest Service has said that a further study will be made. In view of the fact that the item is not included in the House bill, and notwithstanding the fact that the general language of the President in his state of the Union message still did not persuade the Budget Bureau to include the item in the bill before the Senate, I think the amount ought to be cut in half, at least. If I had followed my own bent, I think I would have suggested in the first instance that the entire amount be eliminated. I make that statement for a reason. Recently I have not had the opportunity to pay as much attention to the budget as I should. In the days when I was a member of the Committee on Appropriations I certainly did so. But I have become more and more fearful about the budget problem and the fiscal situation confronting our country. For the first time in history the combined trust fund budget and the expenditure budget have broken the $100 billion barrier, and the total, as of the last revision on May 25, indicates that the combined trust fund and appropriation expenditure budget is now $106 billion.

The Deputy Budget Director spoke before the Industrial Conference in New York 2 weeks ago. I requested him to send me a copy of his speech. He spoke in terms of the possible addition of another $13 billion to $20 billion in welfare appropriations in the decade of the 1960's.

We have talked about other billions of expenditure under the regular budget; and if my arithmetic is sound, I foresee a combined budget in the area of $135 billion to $140 billion.

Where shall the emphasis be? Our distinguished President has just returned from abroad. It was my pleasure to meet him this morning at Andrews Field. I do not know what kind of report he will make. But the accent everywhere today is in a great many places—in Laos, in Vietnam, in Thailand, in the Congo, in Iran, in Berlin, and East Germany, in Latin America, in orbit, in a moon shot, and in all the things we expect to do in the space field. We are confronted with the old question of attempting to distinguish clearly between expenditures on the domestic front and those that appear to be absolutely indispensable to our survival and the survival of national freedom. The Congress must take account of what we are spending in the domestic field. That point is one of the prime reasons why I voted against the aid-to-education bill when it was before the Senate about 10 days ago. I understand that the bill now before the Senate has been pretty well pared down, but I invite attention to a $30 million item that did not come from the Budget Bureau. It was not included in the House bill; and I think the Senate ought to exercise the utmost prudence and caution when it comes to an item of that size. I would cut the item in half, if the Senate were willing. I will not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. Absent Senators who are interested in this proposal would not be able to vote on it. A record vote might be regarded as a departure from our understanding that there would be no yea-and-nay votes until Wednesday. But I felt that I had to make the record.

My amendment would eliminate $15 million from a $30 million new item, which represents an increase over the budget, if I am properly informed. I can quite well understand the argument for the item but no matter what the argument is, we know that there are thousands of desirable projects. One argument is that the proposal would aid employment. That argument is of doubtful validity, in my judgment. I think what is needed in some areas is to have private enterprise go in with pulp mills, for example, to manufacture kraft paper or some other kind of paper. Such action would do the job.

If the Senate now includes the proposed item, it will become the base for the estimates next year. That is the way such items are perpetuated.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I am happy that the minority leader has offered his amendment.

I am not a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of the Interior. However, I did bring up the question as to whether the amount should not be cut when the full committee met to approve the budget. I did so for the same reasons that have been stated by the Senator from Illinois. We will have immense increases in a number of appropriations—in the military, in mutual security, and in a number of other subjects of that character.

We are considering a $30 million item which was not put in the bill by the House and was not recommended by the administration. It was put in originally, as I understand, to assist in unemployment areas, such as in connection with reforestation. That purpose has been cut out by the subcommittee headed by our chairman, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. So it is a question of reforestation in the country, whether it is to help unemployment or not, but it is left to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior. I hope the Senator

from Arizona, who is always very reasonable in these matters, may be willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I talked with the distinguished Senator from Arizona only to alert him to the fact that I was going to offer the amendment. I did not ask him for a commitment. I would not do so. I would not pressure him. I am doing it because I believe we have come to the time when we have to have a summit budget which is in the very highest altitude.

I point out one thing, and then I am through. When the previous administration sent its budget to Congress in January, it was in the $80 billion area. There have been two revisions in the budget since then. One came on the 28th of March. The last one was made on the 25th of May. Under the revised budget figures for fiscal 1962, the estimate now is—and I am pretty sure that these figures are correct—that the deficit will be $3,550 million.

If additional requests come to Congress from time to time the budget will be larger. If we fail to provide the revenues which the administration asks in some fields, then the deficit will be larger also.

Therefore, at a time when there are so many fevers in the world, and we are going to be placing emphasis and accent upon those things that are directed to survival, I think it is high time for Congress to stop and take a good look and to listen and to act wherever we can in the interest of our economy.

The January budget showed a surplus of $1,400 million. The last administration revision on May 25 showed a deficit of $3,550 million. I do not know how much larger it will be for fiscal 1962, because that is contingent on the revenues and upon the additional requests that may be presented to Congress. So this is a humble effort to make a little record in the interest of a sound economy on an item that did not have the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, unless that approval was subsequently procured. I have seen nothing in the RECORD on that point. With that, Mr. President, I surrender the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in response to the comments directed to me by the distinguished minority leader, and as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has already indicated, the committee does not attach as a condition to the distribution of this money the requirement that it shall be in areas of labor surplus. Initially, when we presented the amendment to the committee, we did suggest that this would make good sense. Parenthetically, I still think it would make good sense. However, the appropriation is not conditioned on any item of labor surplus. I would call attention in the RECORD to a portion of the hearings just beyond the section read by the Senator from Illinois. I refer to page 856 of the hearings. Senator BYRD of West Virginia is questioning Dr. McArdle. The Senator from West Virginia asked this question:

Dr. McArdle, could it not be said that keeping in mind we have a rapidly expanding industrial economy and an expanding population and that concomitant thereto we have an increasing need for better conservation of our soil, conservation of our water which in itself is beginning to constitute more and more a problem, the need for improved timber, the need for more and more recreational facilities? Could it not be said that we could divorce entirely from our consideration the problem, pressing problem, that confronts some of us in particular? Could it not be said that we could divorce entirely the matter of employment and that still the Forest Service could justify the expenditure of the additional $30 million now on these other bases themselves and leaving out the matter of unemployment entirely?

Mr. MCARDLE. I think the only honest answer to your question, Senator Byrd, would have to be "Yes."

Then he recited the many unmet obligations in the Forest Service without any reference to any labor surplus.

I would call attention to the fact also that the amendment is a reflection by the very able chairman of the Appropriations Committee of unmet forest needs. Interestingly enough the $30 million in additional appropriations will scarcely advance the schedule that former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, proposed we adopt to meet these needs. If we are going to measure this as a matter of budget responsibility, I would suggest that both sides of the aisle could be comforted in supporting the committee in this $30 million amendment if all it did was to restore the rate of progress in this area that was suggested by the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson.

True, it would advance in the second year about $6 million beyond that rate. However, to suggest that out of a passing boxcar or out of a cloud we picked the $30 million figure and threw it into the bill is not wholly accurate.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement expanding on the reasons which persuaded the committee to adopt the amendment be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HART

FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

The budget submitted by the administration for the Forest Service, exclusive of funds for forest protection and reforestation on private lands, but inclusive of all research funds, was $181,755,000, or about $1 per acre of national forest.

On a comparable basis the Senate bill provides $215,763,000 or an amount equal to $1.20 per acre.

The $30 million increase is but 16⅔ cents per acre for the entire national forest system. For each national forest the increase would amount to but $200,000 per forest.

I cite this only to point out that the $1.20 per acre we are proposing to spend on all phases of the national forest is quite minute. When we consider that these holdings encompass 180 million acres and they contain over $7½ billion worth of capital values the budget level is extremely modest.

The average city lot is one-fourth of an acre and a homeowner does not think it extravagant to spend $1.20 to have the grass mowed—to spend several dollars for lawn fertilizer or $2 or $3 for a single rose bush. One can scarcely expect to get a dozen of our wonderful Michigan tulip bulbs for this price.

Yet we expect those charged with administering our national forests to do a huge job for an expenditure of $1.20 per acre. We expect forest research to unlock the mysteries of wood use and forest disease. We expect watersheds to be adequately protected. We expect fire, insect, and disease attacks to be controlled. We want ample recreation facilities, well equipped and kept clean of debris. We expect the wildlife to be managed. We expect roads and trails all properly constructed and maintained.

In sum we expect not only proper operations but also proper investments for our conservation future.

In the bill before us increases have been made. These are really modest increases. I question whether we can, however, really do the conservation job on our national forests at a cost of but $1.20 per acre.

The long-range forest program indicates that a level of appropriations closer to $2 per acre is needed. This too is modest.

I congratulate most warmly the action of the committee in budgeting the modest increases they have made.

The record should show that the committee has long recognized the importance of this forest conservation work.

In the conference with the House the Senate conferees will meet to resolve whether we shall appropriate about $1 per acre for this vital work or $1.20 per acre.

I express the hope that the House, which too is dedicated to conservation will agree that the time is here for moving ahead.

We must do more than be the custodians of a great resource. We must be its provident manager.

Our national forests and their great resources can provide fruitful opportunities for expanding and developing our national vigor.

With critical unemployment still gripping many of our rural and urban areas the expansion of conservation work will also provide needed jobs. This work will in turn generate solid growth in the private sector of the economy.

The $30 million of new funds for the Forest Service could provide 6,000 conservation jobs, many of which would offer employment to those now jobless.

Reforestation, soil and watershed improvement, outdoor recreation facilities, roads and facilities—all these and the other important tasks would not create jobs for the sake of creating them but would create opportunities for expanding our economic growth through wise natural resource management.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly in support of the general observations made by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]. I was present at the hearing of the Committee on Appropriations at the time the amendment was included. I commend the Senator from Michigan and his associates for pressing the amendment. I considered it a privilege to be associated with them.

The amendment could be justified on the ground of keeping up a schedule of the Forest Service program, and I am pleased that the Senator from Michigan noted that particular fact. In 1959—I believe that was the year—the then Secretary of Agriculture laid down this kind of program of accelerated reforestation, which was a 12-year program.

In 1959 there was a $13 billion deficit. That did not in any way deter the then Secretary of Agriculture from outlining what was considered to be a very modest and very reasonable program of improvement of our forests. What we are

attempting to do with the amendment is to set the program back on schedule, as the Senator from Michigan said. Therefore, from that point alone one can justify the amendment.

I can say that I can justify it in my area of the country if all the money were to go to my State. I am eager to see what Congress intends to do about the unemployment situation of 24 percent of the gainfully employable force which is now without jobs there. I returned from Minnesota yesterday morning. The food stamp plan went into operation in Virginia, Minn. People by the thousands are in need of help. These are the same people who mined the ore from the great Mesabi Iron Range and produced the sinews of war. They are of the same good stock that produced the fabulous quantities of iron ore for the industrial plants of America. They are faced today with a prediction that the iron ore production in northern Minnesota will be less than the production of 1938.

It is fine for people to tell me what we ought to do about this item and that item; but I was sent to the U.S. Senate to attempt to represent the legitimate interests of a good, solid, patriotic, dedicated citizenry in the State which I am privileged to represent, in part, in this body.

This amount of money will not be wasted. The Forest Service is known for its frugality. It is known for its constructive, productive programs. This program will yield dividends. It will yield profits. This is not a make-work, leaf-raking, lawn-mowing operation. These programs are scheduled. They are planned. They are organized. The talent, skill, and manpower are there to do the job.

I can appreciate the concern over these budgetary items. But we must remember that the bill will go to conference. Everyone knows that when a new figure is added to a bill and we go to conference, it is necessary to make some adjustments. If we start to adjust this matter downward now, before we even go to conference, we are likely to end with nothing.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. He is one of the prime movers in this program. He is a practical, prudent Senator. His State, with all its great forest reserves, will find in this particular appropriation a sound investment, with no waste of money.

I really believe the committee did the right thing. I hope the Senate will not reverse the action of the committee.

Mr. President, I, too, have prepared a statement relating to this item. I do indeed support the committee's decision to approach the problem in the sound manner in which we have discussed it here today. I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I wish to provide some historical background to the $30 million amendment which the Committee on Appropriations has added to the Forest Service budget under the line item "Forest land management."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] originally proposed that $30 million be appropriated for conservation work in national forests located in or near rural and urban areas of labor surplus as defined in Public Law 27, the Area Redevelopment Act. I was happy to join with a number of Senators in supporting this amendment.

During the Senate hearings, it was clearly established that this additional appropriation of $30 million would be used to accelerate the existing program for the national forests as developed by the U.S. Forest Service. This program was developed at the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and it was submitted to Congress in March 1959. This program provided clear-cut goals for the orderly and progressive development of our forest resources. Its major purpose was adequate preparation to meet the demands of a rapidly expanding population.

As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] pointed out in his testimony before the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, this important conservation and development program is currently about $24 million behind schedule. President Kennedy recognized this fact in his natural resources message presented to the Congress earlier this year. Let me quote two sentences from that address:

"Wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failures to act now may be opportunities lost forever. Our country has been generous with us in this regard—and we cannot now ignore her needs for future development."

This $30 million amendment represented an important step in putting this forest development program back on schedule.

At the same time, the amendment as originally proposed would have explicitly directed the Forest Service to give rural and urban areas of persistent labor surplus priority in receiving the accelerated program of conservation work. It was determined that practically each of the 40 States containing national forests would have received assistance on this basis. In other words, the original amendment had a dual purpose: (1) to accelerate the existing Forest Service conservation and development program for the national forests; and (2) to do this in a way which would aid those areas afflicted by chronic labor surplus.

In no manner, then, was this a make-work project. There would have been no raking leaves or mowing lawns. All of the scheduled work would have been planned and supervised by the professional foresters of the U.S. Forest Service. This work would have been a solid investment in the long-term productivity of the national forests.

The Committee on Appropriations voted to provide this additional $30 million for the acceleration of the program for the national forests. It was informally agreed that persistent labor surplus would be taken into consideration by the Forest Service in the implementation of its accelerated program.

I support the committee's decision to approach the problem in this manner. I realize that additional factors will have to be considered by the Forest Service to determine the best way to accelerate its forest development program. However, since the committee report did not contain any explicit reference to the criterion of persistent labor surplus, I wish to review briefly the history of this amendment.

I wish to emphasize the importance of the Forest Service considering the factor of unemployment when it moves to allocate whatever funds Congress sees fit to approve for the acceleration of this important conservation program.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has referred to the junior Senator from West Virginia.

The Forest Service has advised me that it could wisely spend in my State, over the next 5 years, $45,275,000 to develop an accelerated program for the national forest lands of West Virginia. In West Virginia today, as was brought out in the course of the hearings, about 5,000 men are employed in the forest industries. Some 2,000 of them are engaged in logging operations, another 2,000 in sawmilling, and 1,000 in the manufacture of secondary wood products.

The Forest Service has advised me that with an accelerated and intensified work program in West Virginia, the production of sawtimber would be increased from the present 400 million board feet to a potential of 3 billion board feet annually; and that, instead of employing only 5,000 men, as is the case at present, there is a potential employment of 37,500 men at the present level of manufacturing. With a medium level of manufacturing, there is a potential employment of 52,500 persons in West Virginia, and with a high level of manufacturing there is a potential employment of 90,000 persons in my State of West Virginia alone.

So, with regard to West Virginia, 8,800 man-years could be devoted to forest work and the manufacture of forest products in my State each year over the next 10 years by the Forest Service, whereas at present only some 100 man-years are devoted to this type of work.

I join with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and other Senators who cosponsored the amendment in urging the Senate to reject the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader. I believe that money spent for this purpose is money well spent. It is in the best interests of the future welfare and security of our country. It can be justified from the standpoint of the conservation of forest resources; from the standpoint of the preservation of watersheds; from the standpoint of providing for an expanding population and an expanding industrial complex; to say nothing of the benefits which would be derived from the standpoint of supplying work for unemployed persons in depressed areas. In my opinion, whatever the cost of such a program as this, it is a bargain. I again urge the Senate to reject the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator has referred to the expanded program affecting primarily depressed areas. Certainly he would not deny participation in this program to some of the U.S. forests in areas which are not depressed, would he? My State of Idaho has 20 million acres of U.S.-owned forest lands. It

is true that in a few areas—rather small areas—unemployment is widespread. But certainly the Senator from West Virginia would not contend that the money to be provided by this item must be almost completely expended in those areas which are labeled as distressed, would he?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Not at all. I do not contend that this money should be spent only in depressed areas. The bill as it comes before us makes ample provision for the expenditure of money in States such as Idaho, a State which is so ably represented, in part, by the distinguished Senator who has just propounded the question. The appropriation does not direct the expenditure of money in depressed areas alone. I was merely saying that the expenditure of this additional money could be justified entirely on the basis of the need for the development of the forests, on the basis of the need for conservation of forest resources, of soil resources, and water resources. Nobody is contending that the moneys will be spent only in the depressed areas.

But, as a Senator from a State which has many depressed areas, I plead with the Senate to reject the amendment offered by the distinguished minority leader, keeping in mind the fact that certainly some of the money, if it remains in the bill, will be spent in depressed areas. We in West Virginia need this money for the development of our forests. However, disregarding entirely unemployment in the depressed areas, I say to the Senator from Idaho that this appropriation can be amply justified. It will benefit his State, just as it will benefit the State of West Virginia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does not the Senator agree with me that there is already in the bill for the purpose $118 million?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is true.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So there will be $118 million already recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and provided by the House and the Senate Committee on Department of the Interior Appropriations, even if the whole $30 million is stricken. So actually there will be $118 million plus $15 million, if the minority leader's amendment is included. That would mean $133 million would be in the bill for this purpose, in any event.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I emphasize that this is one item which has consistently returned to the Treasury and the people more money if dollar value can be placed upon all benefits derived than has been spent on it. I feel it is a good appropriation item from the standpoint of dollars and cents alone. It is a money-making appropriation. In the long run, it will contribute more money to the Treasury than will be taken from the Treasury.

So, although there are considerable amounts of money for this purpose in the bill, as has been pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, it is my contention, and the contention of other Senators who cosponsored the amendment, that the amount referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts is not enough, and that any Federal moneys spent for such a worthwhile program will, in the long run, be repaid manyfold to the United States Government.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it is my understanding from the distinguished minority leader that a yea-and-nay vote will not be taken on this question. Therefore, I rise to say a few words, in order that my position about the matter may be perfectly clear.

I come from a forest State also, and I am as much interested, I believe, in the reforestation program as is any other Member of the Senate.

Unfortunately, at the time of the markup of the bill the other day, I had a conflicting meeting of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee and I reached the Appropriations Committee meeting just as the committee had concluded the vote on this particular item. Therefore, I wish to say that I feel that I must go along with the amendment of the distinquished minority leader.

I believe the time is here when we as Americans must decide which things are most important, and somewhere along the way we must stop spending money for everything that is desirable. There are thousands of desirable things. There is no question in my mind that in the long run this item might return a handsome profit to the Government. But already this year we have passed a depressed areas bill; and after reading the hearings on this matter, I noticed that the whole predicate of this appropriation item is based upon depressed areas. It was my understanding that when the committee voted on this appropriation item, it was being voted on with complete disassociation from any depressed areas or excess labor areas. After all, we cannot be on both sides of the fence at the same time. Today, we have heard very strong arguments in behalf of this item, primarily on the basis that this money will be spent in an excess labor area.

Certainly there are many things that are desirable; but this year we have spent $3,550 million in excess of the budget.

The distinguished minority leader has stated that the total expenditures are approximately in the amount I have stated; and there is no question in my mind that the total next year, before we are through, will be $5 billion in excess of the budget.

When I stop to consider the events of the last few weeks—the developments in Laos, the situation in Iran, the situation in Cambodia and in Thailand, the situation in Venezuela and in Guinea, the situation in Cuba, and the very obvious change in the attitude of President Quadros, of Brazil, toward the Communists across the sea, I believe it is about time that we take a good, hard look at our pocketbook, because if we continue to expand the Federal debt and expand our inflation, then, when we reach the time when we have to fight brush wars—and, Mr. President, we must make up our minds that the time will come when we shall have to fight brush wars all over the world—our country will have very little credit available.

There is no necessity for this item. In that connection I now quote from page 852 of the hearings. where we find that Mr. McArdle said:

> In some parts of the country there might not be some kinds of work represented in a way that you could squeeze up the total program. But in general the answer to your question is "Yes." This 12-year program can be compressed.

So we are compressing a program for the sake of spending the money now.

I say the time has come when we must start looking at all our cards—if I may use the poker vernacular—to see what we have left to do and what we have to do in the world that is ahead of us.

The demands on our country in the next few months and the next few years will be so greatly in excess of anything that anyone on this floor dreams of now, I believe the time has come to start cutting down.

I cannot see that this item has an immediate necessity. Therefore, I shall support the position of the distinguished minority leader—much as I dislike not supporting the position of the chairman of the committee, for usually I support him in the positions he takes; but I believe that we must decide whether we are going to try to provide everything everyone wants. One columnist said that the present policy of this administration and this Government is, "Ask, and ye shall receive. Ask not, and ye shall receive, anyway."

I think that is about the way we are proceeding. Unless we stop it, we shall find that when the chips are down, in the next few months and the next few years, we shall be very hard pressed to get together enough money to be able just barely to save our country and to keep it in existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator of Illinois.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President on this question, I ask for a division.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Those who are in favor of adoption of the amendment will stand and be counted. Those who are opposed will stand and be counted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to the pending amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, having obtained the floor, I do not want to interfere with the program of the majority leader, and shall be happy to yield to him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I did not hear the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. Having obtained the floor, I should like to go forward with my speech, but I shall be glad to yield to the majority leader if there is any other business that should intervene first.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yea and nay vote already agreed to on the Dirksent amendment be postponed until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to cooperate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MURPHY, of Illinois, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 215. An act for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren;

S. 546. An act for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung;

S. 949. An act for the relief of John G. Tiedemann; and

S. 1064. An act for the relief of Samuel Pisar.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I am a little puzzled by the show of panic represented by the $9.3 billion housing bill before the Senate. This panic is illustrated by the fact that this bill proposes to spend as much as has been authorized by the same Federal housing programs since the beginning of these programs in the 1930's.

I refer my colleagues to page 64 of the committee report. It is shown there that the bill authorizes $6.2 billion for new and existing housing programs. For these same programs, we have authorized $6.4 billion since they began. But not included in these figures are expenditures for public housing. As of March 31, 1961, we had spent $848,225,933 for public housing, representing all expenditures since the beginning of this program. In addition, an estimated $150 million has been spent for administration of this program, for a total expenditure of approximately $1 billion spent to date on public housing and its administration. This bill authorizes $3.1 billion for public housing, three times the above amount. This excludes the problem of tax losses due to the tax-exempt status of public housing authority bonds. And it also does not take into account administrative expenses.

PANIC LEGISLATION UNJUSTIFIED

I would not be so concerned about such extravagance if I thought that our housing situation justified it. I would be willing to risk a little inflation if I thought a large segment of our citizens were going homeless. But the facts do not bear this out. This almost smacks of some of the same panic expressed by Russian leaders. In a speech broadcast by Radio Moscow in 1957, Molotov said:

> We are lagging—and badly—in housebuilding. We are justly reminded of this by the workers.

The trouble is, Mr. Molotov's statement is well justified, since the dwelling space per person in Russia is only 6 square meters, or approximately 60 square feet. This is the size of cell space allotted to inmates of Federal prisons in the United States, according to the Justice Department. I can, therefore, understand a sense of urgency in Russia's housing programs. And I could understand it if it were decided by the Russian leaders to risk busting their budget and inducing inflationary pressures to bring their housing up to safe and sane standards.

But for us I cannot see authorizing in one bill as much as has been authorized in all housing bills since their beginning in the 1930's to meet so-called emergency housing needs. Comparing our situation with that of Russia, we have at present an average of about 250 to 300 square feet of dwelling space per person, five times the Russian average.

These comments are not meant to imply that we should use the very inadequate Russian housing standards as a base against which to compare our housing programs. I agree wholeheartedly with the declared national housing policy of the United States, which is the realization as soon as feasible of the goal of a decent home and a suitable level of environment for every American family. My concern is that the authors of this legislation are using panic tactics to push through the most extravagant housing bill in history. And in so doing they are keeping very quiet about the great advancements we have made during the past decade. This legislation is advancing steadily but quietly through Congress under what are really false pretenses.

FEDERALIZED MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING UNNECESSARY

What concerns me most is the proposal to have the Federal Government move into the middle-income housing field—income brackets of $4,000–$6,000—under the guise that these people are trapped between public housing on the one hand and luxury housing on the other. It is incredible to me that, in proposing this program, the administration of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would not rely upon the 1956 housing inventory by the Census Bureau as to the housing status of America's great middle class. This is the latest census available. The complete 1960 data will not be out until later this year.

Referring to owner-occupied units, of the 7 million American families living in owner-occupied dwellings in the middle-income brackets in 1956: First, 1,819,485 had a conventional mortgage; second, 1,188,547 had a VA mortgage; third, 698,570 had an FHA mortgage; fourth, about 2 million who had purchased with a mortgage held free and clear at the time of the 1956 inventory of housing, and fifth, there were over 1 million in this category who had acquired their homes without a mortgage.

As to the condition of these nonmortgaged properties, 93 percent of these occupied by the $4,000–$6,000 income group were not dilapidated.

Of more than 11 million families in the $4,000–$6,000 income bracket living in both owner-occupied and renter-occupied units, only 1,350,121 lived in either dilapidated housing or housing lacking facilities. I would like to point out that more than half of these units are located in nonmetropolitan, or rural, areas where adequate building codes are infrequent and where adequate housing codes are almost nonexistent.

These are official census figures. They repudiate the allegation that moderate-income families need a new form of public housing. If the Congress does not want to accept the 1956 housing inventory, it ought at least to wait a few months until the final housing part of the 1960 census will be available, and then Congress will be better able to judge the condition of housing for moderate-income families.

There were significant improvements in the quality of American housing between the 1950 census and the 1956 census. And preliminary figures issued by the Census Bureau last March indicate that the trend has continued through 1960. We should wait for these final figures before acting on this extravagant legislation. If Congress decides to go ahead after seeing the 1960 data, that is its prerogative. But I find it difficult to follow the reasoning that we should expand our Federal housing programs when the status of our private housing is being continually improved and upgraded.

Preliminary figures show that between 1950 and 1960, occupied housing increased by 10.1 million units, but the number of occupied units with complete plumbing facilities and good quality structures expanded by 16.5 million. These better quality units with complete facilities, which constituted only 64 percent of the total occupied inventory in 1950, represented 83 percent in 1960. Meanwhile, occupied housing of lower standard—in dilapidated structures or

lacking some or all plumbing facilities—declined by 6.4 million units, or by two-fifths.

During the same period that our housing was improved, vacancies rose considerably. The number of vacant good-quality units available for rent or sale more than doubled, to 2.0 million units at the end of last year. This is equivalent to more than a year and a half's worth of new construction at recent rates of output. By the first quarter of this year, the rental vacancy rate, which was 2.6 percent in 1950, reached a postwar high of 8.0 percent.

Much of this supply of vacant housing appears to be well within the financial reach of low or moderate income groups. The typical rent of vacant units in the first quarter of 1961 was $53 per month, and the typical asking price of vacant dwellings for sale was $12,500, according to a Census Bureau sample survey. Roughly half of all vacant units were offered at rents or prices below these medians. This same report shows that the level of quality of these vacant units, as measured by plumbing facilities, did not change significantly over the period.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator states that the vacancy rate has increased to 8 percent. In the Senator's opinion, is that due to the recent unemployment problems, or simply the result of having more houses; or is it the result of both factors?

Mr. BENNETT. I am sure some people who are unemployed have had to find less expensive housing, but I do not believe they have moved out onto the streets and are living under the stars. I think the effects of unemployment might be to shift the pattern of vacancy, but I do not think it would increase the rate of vacancy tremendously.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So, in the opinion of the Senator, the increase in the vacancy rate is due to an increase in number of houses, rather than to other conditions?

Mr. BENNETT. I think that is true. New houses have been built. Many houses are built by builders for inventory, with the expectation of selling them later. The rate of building is currently approximately 1¼ million units a year. Apparently our family formations have not been keeping pace.

I know many people in this country feel that everybody is entitled to move into a new house and that we should look down in pity on those who have to live in old houses. I think most vacancies, obviously, are in the older houses. This represents a shift from old to new houses.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In the next paragraph of the Senator's speech he says:

> The typical rent of vacant units in the first quarter of 1961 was $53 per month, and the typical asking price of vacant dwellings for sale was $12,500.

Am I correct in estimating that under the terms of the bill, using the 20-percent ratio of a man's income to determine what he should pay for a domicile——

Mr. BENNETT. That is the ratio the sociologists use, ordinarily.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In this case, with a typical rent of $53 a month, that would be well under the 20 percent for people who wished to occupy the house.

Mr. BENNETT. On this theory, any person who earned $3,000 a year could pay $53 a month for his rent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. With a rent of $53 a month and a sales price of $12,500, the $53 a month would be well under the 20 percent.

Mr. BENNETT. If the Senator is talking about men whose incomes are within the $4,000 to $6,000 bracket, that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is what the Senator is talking about.

Mr. BENNETT. That is the group I am talking about, and that is the new group to be subsidized under this bill. I thank my friend for emphasizing this point.

Further additions to the supply of housing are being made at a rising rate. Private housing starts in April were at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of 1,233,000 units, more than one-fourth above the December level of 970,000. Some further increase may be likely, judging from the expanded volume of outstanding mortgage commitments.

Another measure of improvement in our housing quality is data on expenditures for home improvements. In a new series of Census Bureau reports, the Census Bureau revealed that in 1960 Americans spent more than $13 billion for the upkeep and improvement of their dwelling places. This is equal to 75 percent of the amount spent for new construction of all housing units. This brings the total expenditures for all residential building—including new buildings and upkeep and improvement of existing buildings—to nearly $31 billion.

HIDDEN TRICKS IN THE BILL

The proposal to authorize this vast new spending without waiting for the detailed facts of the 1960 Housing Census is only one thing that bothers me about this bill. I wish to warn my colleagues against certain neat hidden tricks in this bill whereby public housing is offered to middle-income families under the cloak of the generally accepted section 221 program formerly limited to displaced persons.

First, this bill offers a 40-year, no-down-payment loan on a one-family residence of up to $15,000 in the case of sales housing, and, of course, more for multifamily units.

To illustrate the effects of a 40-year mortgage, I invite attention to a table inserted in the hearings, based on 1961 prices, showing that a borrower with a $13,500 mortgage—as opposed to $15,000 for the section 221 sales housing program—acquires no net equity, after depreciation, in this residence until at least 20 years have passed. I refer my colleagues to page 800 of the Senate subcommittee hearings.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator mentions the word "depreciation." How much depreciation is legitimately to be taken on a house of such quality and size, per year?

Mr. BENNETT. For a house which is supposed to last 40 years, I assume the figures are based on the idea that the house would be depreciated completely at the end of 40 years, and that would be 2½ percent per year.

Witness after witness has set forth data showing that for many years the homeowner will owe more on the mortgage than the value of his home, in the absence of a considerable amount of inflation.

I was, therefore, amazed to discover on pages 925 through 927 of the Senate hearings a table developed by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and inserted in the RECORD to show that a homeowner begins to acquire equity on a 40-year no-downpayment purchase beginning with the second year after acquisition.

However, the table has a footnote which admonishes the reader to study an accompanying memorandum for "assumptions and qualifications."

Fascinated by what appeared to me to be an exercise in dialectical logic, I read the assumptions and qualifications to discover how the Agency was able to reconcile early accumulation of equity under such a program with an earlier Agency pronouncement that the present section 221 program for displaced families, which is also no downpayment for 40 years, has resulted in a greater drain on the FHA insurance reserves than any other program.

Here, then, are the Agency's assumptions and qualifications to its conclusions that equity will start accumulating after the first year, instead of after the 20th year, as was concluded by the nationally known Wenzlick Real Estate Research Corp., which prepared the table to which I referred earlier.

First. That the homeowner will pay more than is required on his monthly payments. This is an assumption that must fall with a dull thud. Remember that we are dealing with moderate-income families. There is far from an impressive record of overpayment, even among homeowners of higher priced FHA housing who would be in a much better position to make such excessive payments.

Second. Changes in the value of the property over a 40-year term. Certainly, this does not lend weight to the early accumulation of equity unless there is an increase in value due to inflation.

Third. Changes in housing market conditions. Is this an argument in support of greater or less accumulation of equity? We no longer have the housing shortage which we suffered in the early post-World War II years. Witness even this year, when the easing of the mort-

gage market and the accompanying reduction in interest rates failed to be reflected in an upsurge in housing conditions. Remember those 2 million vacant units. Yet the Housing and Home Finance Administrator makes this assumption to support his early equity accumulation theory.

Fourth. Another assumption made by the Administrator is a change in the characteristics of the physical security by the addition of capital improvements. But there is just as much chance that these additional capital improvements will result in increased debt on the part of the homeowner and aggravate his poor, negative equity status rather than improve it as the Administrator would have us believe.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance, would that phase of the program not mean that the homeowner would have to spend money of his own to make the physical improvements because there would be a 100-percent mortgage on the home?

Mr. BENNETT. The Senator is correct. The homeowner would have to contribute cash at a rate faster than the rate of depreciation in order to bring about the condition assumed by the Administrator.

It appears, therefore, that the assumptions and qualifications to the Agency's conclusion that equity accumulates after the first year are actually arguments against the Agency's position. This is as weird an exercise in dialectics as I have ever witnessed, and in my opinion reflects the desperation with which the Administration attempts to justify a program which does violence to reason. However, even using the Administration's table, if we take into account an average sales commission of 5 percent, the borrower still has no real equity until the 23d year.

The emotional and financial ties are broken down in a no-equity situation lasting 20 or more years. There is little, if any, financial incentive to encourage the mortgagor to hang on to the property. He could walk off and leave it to the Government at any time.

A mortgage lender making 100-percent loans on a 40-year basis would not really be lending on real estate. Rather, his security would rest entirely in the FHA insurance and the probability that he would be buying FHA debentures is quite clear. The result is little different from public housing.

I believe the proposed program would be public housing of a new type designed to avoid the restrictions and difficulties that surround our present public housing program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. A 100-percent mortgage on a depreciating house would have value only on two conditions: First, if the value of the land underneath the house increased during the term of the mortgage; or, second, if there were inflation and the dollar became of less value.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, to a very large extent the value of the land underneath the house would also depend upon inflation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Not entirely, because it might be located in an area in which there was an improvement in real estate values.

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, that is true, but ordinarily land also is a good underpinning of general inflation.

I have said many times that in my opinion the proposal is a new public housing device intended to bring more and more of our people into a situation in which they would be entirely dependent upon the Government for housing.

It is my opinion that no mortgage holders would risk these mortgages. Apparently the committee agrees with that belief, because the committee has added to the bill a provision for $750 million, which FNMA can use to buy the 40-year mortgages. During the discussion in the committee it was proposed that the amount be $1.5 billion, and I believe they will eventually have to have all of it, because they will get all the mortgages almost as fast as they are prepared.

A second far-reaching provision of this bill would extend a form of public housing to moderate-income families under the below-market-rate provision. Under this provision, a local public body, which includes public housing authorities, would be able to obtain Treasury funds at interest rates under current conditions as low as 3⅛ percent, and at 100 percent of cost, to build and operate rental housing for moderate-income families, with the mortgages eligible for purchase by FNMA.

The Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association are brought into the picture only by debasing their underlying economic soundness. The result is the same—Government-owned shelter to a new tenant class, America's middle class—at subsidized rents.

There is a third hidden trick in this bill. Title II of the bill authorizes home improvement and rehabilitation loans of up to $10,000 per dwelling unit to be repaid over a period of 25 years. This is a sweeping change from the current program for home improvements of $3,500 for 5 years for single-family homes or $2,500 per unit for 7 years for multifamily structures. A smart person could tie this feature together with the 40-year, no downpayment mortgage and come up with more than a $20,000 total loan in the case of sales housing with a 25-year mortgage on one part and the remaining portion of a 40-year mortgage on the other part, both with no downpayment. It would simply be a matter of building the units in two steps. The first step would be the 40-year mortgage for a basic part of a unit. Then, after a few years, the mortgagor could add additional rooms under the $10,000, 25-year rehabilitation program and allow both mortgages to run concurrently, with no downpayment in either case. Thus, instead of $15,000 we have now granted $25,000, less any amounts paid on the basic mortgage, and subject to a current limit $22,500 for a total mortgage.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What would happen to the guarantee or the underwriting of the original mortgage which was based on 100 percent of cost, with no downpayment, with this additional amount? Would that mortgage go up, too?

Mr. BENNETT. No, that mortgage would stay where it is. But, as I understand, the man who operates on that basis has the Federal Government behind him. In one case he will have made a mortgage which FNMA, in my opinion, will have to buy. In the other case, he will have made a loan on which he has 25 years to pay. He is not forced to increase his first mortgage. He has two concurrent obligations backed by the Federal Government, and I think he could walk out and leave either of them. I do not think he would have any fundamental obligation, because at any point within the first 20 years the property value would not equal the value of the basic mortgage and the improvement debt the homeowner has put on the house.

The above are examples of the hidden tricks in this bill. There are many others. My point is that Congress should put a spotlight on this legislation and beware of the pitfalls it contains.

HOW FAR CAN WE GO?

My concern over this legislation is broader than the specific points I have raised here. I have a philosophical aversion to continually expanding the Federal role in housing to serve as a political crowbar whereby Senators and Congressmen promise ever greater Federal assistance each year in the hope of buying political favor.

Take, for example, the basic section 203 program, first enacted in 1934. Under the original law, the statutory ratio of insurance to loan value was 80 percent and the mortgage limit was for 20 years for a home up to $16,000. In 1938 the ratio of insurance to loan value was raised to 90 percent for the first $6,000 of a mortgage for new housing and the term was extended to 25 years. In 1948 the ratio of insurance to loan value was raised to 95 percent for the first $6,000 of the mortgage for new housing and the term was extended to 30 years. In 1950, the 95-percent ratio was applied to mortgages up to $7,000, or up to $8,000 in high-cost areas, with lesser ratios for amounts above that. In 1954 the ratio was raised to 97 percent of the first $10,000 of value. In 1958 the 97-percent ratio applied to the first $13,500 of value, with lesser ratios above $13,500 to a maximum mortgage of $20,000. Finally, in 1959, the basic 97-percent ratio

was continued for mortgages up to $13,500 and the maximum mortgage was extended to $22,500 for 30 years.

We come to the end of the road with respect to value. I suppose the time for repayment of the mortgage could be pushed up to 50 years, but I think we have already passed the point where this process would produce any obligation on the part of the home buyer. I am very much impressed by the fact, as I indicated in my earlier table, that in spite of all of this, the big proportion of the American people are buying and building their homes under other than FHA guaranteed mortgages. This illustrates the trend in one of the most basic of our programs. Now we have a proposal for a 40-year mortgage with no downpayment for middle income families. This is a new program beginning from a much higher plateau. How far can we go? It seems that this is about the limit in offering liberal provisions for downpayment and mortgage terms. However, maybe next year a proposal will come forth which would even offer a $1,000 grant to someone agreeing to sign one of these mortgages.

I think that we should step away from the trees and take a look at the forest and reassess our whole basic position. Do we want to maintain our traditional free-enterprise philosophy with respect to housing, or do we want to replace that with complete federalized welfare housing for our citizens?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BENNETT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciated very much the opportunity to listen to the Senator discuss this problem, because it concerns me very much as to whether we should extend a 40-year no-down-payment loan to this class of housing, when all the indications are that housing is going along at a reasonably satisfactory rate. The Senator mentioned that it was at the rate of over 1,200,000 units a year. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. There has not been any great problem connected with financing these houses. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. That is right. At the same time, the vacancies are increasing. At the present time they amount to 8 percent, according to the Bureau of Census figures.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. People have stated that a man who gets one of these houses with no downpayment for 40 years on his mortgage is tied to that house, if he wants to move to another location or if he wants to move to another city, because the mortgage may become greater than the depreciated value of the house, and under those circumstances he would have to pay out of his own pocket for that house if the mortgagees sold for less than the value of the house.

Mr. BENNETT. That is one way of looking at it. It seems to me that if I found myself with a house for which I had paid $13,500 and I had paid on it for a number of years and then discovered that I still owed $13,000 on it, and that all I could get for it was $11,000, I believe I would walk out and leave it, because the mortgage is guaranteed to the lender. In fact, the Federal Government will probably be the owner of the mortgage. I do not believe any private investor would invest money in that kind of mortgage.

Rather than tying the man to the house, I believe this would give him an excuse to decide that he liked a different house or a better house somewhere else. He would merely default and walk out and leave the house. There is apparently nothing to prevent him from getting another no-down-payment, 40-year mortgage on another house.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What the Senator is saying is that the mortgage is really not a mortgage on the real estate, but a mortgage which is based upon the guarantee of the Federal Government.

Mr. BENNETT. Entirely so. That is all there really is behind it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the man walks out, am I correct in understanding that the Government becomes the owner of the house if the mortgagor defaults?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, after foreclosure proceedings have been carried through.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the value is not there for the mortgagor to sell.

Mr. BENNETT. That is correct. I have another observation. In the deal for the house for which there would be a no-down-payment mortgage for 40 years, there will be included many items which do not have a 40-year life. Included will be kitchen equipment. That has a life of perhaps 10 or 15 years, at the most. I have been in the business of selling building supplies. I do not see how anyone could try to get anyone to guarantee a roof for 40 years. One would be lucky to get a guarantee for 10 years and then be lucky to find someone who will live up to that guarantee if the roof should need repairs.

So we are dealing with items that have a life much shorter than 40 years, and taking 40 years to pay.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under present law it is 25 years, as I understand.

Mr. BENNETT. No; it has gone up to 30 years for some of the basic sales programs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The pending proposal would extend it from 30 years to 40 years?

Mr. BENNETT. It has gone up to 30 years for our basic programs. The proposal now is to make it 40 years for this new program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would extend it to this class of dwellings, with no downpayment. Is that correct?

Mr. BENNETT. There is a 40-year program which is limited to people who are moved out of their previous homes by Government action—the building of highways or urban renewal or public housing, or for some other similar reason. The proposal before us would open it up to everyone in the middle income groups.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one who has always supported slum clearance and housing bills, the pending bill disturbs me greatly, because of these extensions which seem to me to put the problem directly into the hands of the Government. The Government would be taking on a great many more houses, and will destroy the impetus that comes from private building and the incentive that comes from private ownership of residences.

Mr. BENNETT. All of these 40-year no-down-payment houses will be built with the backing of Government money, and eventually the Government will supply the money by direct draft on the Treasury through the Federal National Mortgage Administration.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. I said earlier that I wondered where we could go when we got to 100 percent for 40 years. I recently received a letter from a gentlemen who said in effect, "The time has come when the Federal Government must go into the business of buying houses to tear them down. We cannot keep our mechanics busy. We should therefore buy 100,000 houses a year and destroy them so we can be sure 100,000 houses will be built to replace them."

That is not seriously before us, but it indicates the kind of thinking that goes into the proposal that makes the Federal Government responsible for private houses for people without imposing any real financial obligations upon them in the process.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST WITH RESPECT TO UNUSED TIME FOR DEBATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time for debate not used and reserved on all amendments to S. 1922, the housing bill, considered prior to Wednesday, under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on June 1, 1961, be available for further debate thereon in each instance when they are next considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at this point perhaps I should ask the majority leader what the program is for the balance of the week insofar as he can now determine it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished minority leader, it is anticipated that we will be able to finish in good part the Interior Department appropriation bill when the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] reaches the floor to consider the so-called Gruening amendment.

An agreement has already been entered into to vote on the so-called Dirksen amendment tomorrow. I hope it will be possible to complete action on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill tomorrow and to make good progress on, if not to finish, the housing

bill on the same day. If action on the housing bill is not completed tomorrow, it will be carried over until Thursday.

On Friday, it is planned to take up some of the items on the calendar which went over under objection.

Since the Senator from Illinois has raised the question, I wish to serve notice that beginning tomorrow it will be the responsibility of every Senator to be present from that day on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I extend to the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and to all of the other members of that committee my warm congratulations on the excellent bill they have reported to the Senate, providing appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies. In my humble judgment, the chairman, who comes from Arizona, is a man who knows the frontier. He knows the old frontier, and he knows the New Frontier. More important, he knows what is required if America's natural resources are to be developed and protected for the benefit of this and future generations.

I am particularly pleased to see the instructions from the committee to the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior which direct them to cooperate in making an appraisal of the range resources of the Nation. This is a matter which I urged the previous Secretary of the Interior to consider, and I say frankly that he evidenced little interest in the suggestion. However, the stockmen in my State made the suggestion to me and, in my judgment, it is a sound idea. Such a study is long overdue. I shall be completely satisfied if the Secretaries proceed carefully to map out and delineate what must be done to amass the necessary facts during this coming year. To me it is an astounding thing that we have never had an accurate appraisal of our important range resources and the growing importance of proper land use makes it imperative that we make this study carefully and completely so that it will be useful as a device for planning conservation programs.

I am pleased that the committee made substantial increases to the Bureau of Land Management for grazing administration and soil and moisture conservation. Unfortunately, there have been cuts in range use in eastern Oregon. I am satisfied that these would not have occurred if the budgets of the last several years had requested adequate funds. It is to the credit of the Senate that almost every year we allowed as much as was requested in the budget for these vital functions, and in many years we increased the budget requests.

The foresight shown by the committee in making a fully adequate appropriation to the U.S. Forest Service for all parts of its important conservation work is most commendable. The committee presented a balanced bill for this important agency. The national forest program is augmented by a $30 million increase which will cover such vital work as reforestation, recreation, range improvement, watershed protection, and wildlife management. In addition, a special allotment of $955,000 has been made for improved fire protection. These two appropriations, taken together, should bring the administration of the national forests up to the level that these times require. Anything less represents inadequate management of these great resources.

Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is the chairman, I testified in support of a public works appropriation for Oregon under the title "Investments That Increase the Nation's Resources." Just before I was to begin my testimony, I received an emergency call from the floor of the Senate, advising me that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had offered an amendment which sought to cut at least 50 percent from an increase recommended by the Senate committee for the Forest Service appropriation. I came here as quickly as I could, and learned, to my great pleasure, that the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had spoken in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and that with the cooperation of the majority leader he had helped to reach a procedural agreement to have a yea-and-nay vote on the Dirksen amendment tomorrow.

I desired to make these few remarks in opposition to the Dirksen amendment this afternoon, so that the Senators might at least have the benefit of the point of view of those of us who are completely opposed to the Dirksen amendment.

I repeat what I just said concerning the increase which was recommended by the committee. The committee presented a balanced proposal for this important agency, the U.S. Forest Service. It augmented the national forest program by a $30 million increase which will cover such vital work as reforestation, recreation, range improvement, watershed protection, and wildlife management.

It is now suggested that we economize on these needs. It is suggested that we cut by some 50 percent the recommendation of the committee for a $30 million increase in the necessary appropriations for the Forest Service.

As I said, I am deeply appreciative that the junior Senator from West Virginia was in the Chamber when the proposal of the Senator from Illinois was made. I was in the Committee on Appropriations, and I have never learned how I can be in two places at the same time. I thank the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the majority leader, for at least preventing the Dirksen amendment from coming to a voice vote this afternoon, when very few Senators were present in the Chamber. If there had been a voice vote while many Senators who are supporters of a needed conservation program had been off the floor, attending to other Senate business, the amendment might very well have been agreed to, and great damage would have been sustained not only by our generation but also generations to come.

I wish to mention a fact or two which I hope the Senate will keep in mind when we vote on the Dirksen amendment tomorrow, and when I hope it will be overwhelmingly defeated. Last year the Forest Service, in many of its holdings, suffered the greatest fire losses in 50 years. I repeat: The devastating forest fires of last year in many of the national forests and on many of the Federal grazing lands were the worst in 50 years. Now it is suggested on the floor of the Senate that we cut back on both the range rehabilitation program and the reforestation program under the jurisdiction of the United States Forest Service. How can we be so shortsighted? How can we be so derelict in connection with our responsibility to future generations?

Each generation is called upon, from time to time, to make what might appear to be sacrifices for future generations. But the proposal we are considering is not, in fact, a sacrifice of a single dollar of the taxpayers. When we vote for the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee, we shall be voting to put money in the bank for the taxpayers. We shall be voting for a program which will result in tremendous savings for the taxpayers. We shall be voting for an investment in a self-liquidating program. We shall be voting for an investment in reforestation, fire prevention, range rehabilitation, and watershed protection which future generations of Americans will sorely need.

I hope that tomorrow the Senate will not write a historical record of letting them down, because this appropriation need of the U.S. Forest Service is so important that any reduction of it will have an adverse effect on the rights of future generations of Americans.

Let us consider the needed money for watershed protection. If in our generation we do not follow the conservation program necessary in order to guarantee a legacy of adequate water supply for future generations, what will the people in many parts of the United States do for water, 50 years from now? Do Senators think it is possible to strip the mountainsides of this country of standing timber and still have enough water, 50 years from today, for the needs of the American people? The experts will tell you that is impossible.

Also let Senators consider the shocking experience of other countries and the lessons to be learned therefrom. Other countries have made the same mistake; once they were covered with the rich forest vegetation, but they squandered it, and thus their water tables were lowered; and, as that happened, their civilization declined, and followed the water table. That has always been true; no civilization climbs on a falling water table.

So when the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and his committee recommended this $30 million increase in the appropriation for the Forest Service, they based their recommendation on the facts which were presented to their committee. Those facts—as set forth in the testimony of witness after witness—show that there is no justification for squandering the natural resources which come under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Forest Service, for if those natural resources are squandered, it will not be possible to leave a heritage of economic freedom—upon which political freedom is completely dependent—to our great-grandchildren and—yes—to our grandchildren.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Alaska?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to commend my good friend, the senior Senator from Oregon, on his extremely constructive and far-sighted presentation.

I should like to ask him whether this appropriation item is not really an investment, and whether it is not the type of investment which would be included in a capital budget—which he has often proposed—if we had one.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alaska. It is a perfect example of the need for a capital budget.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has been proceeding on the false assumption, I respectfully say, that if we make a cut in the budget of the Forest Service, we are making a reduction in the operating budget of the Government. But that is not the case. Instead, such a cut will be a cut in the capital investments owned by the people of the United States; and thus the Congress will—if it makes the proposed cut—be following an extremely poor course of housekeeping procedure in connection with protection of the wealth of America.

Failure to rehabilitate the range would be a shocking false economy.

Failure to reforest the burned-over lands of Federal forests—and also those of private forests, I may say—would be a shocking false economy.

Failure to protect the watersheds of the United States would be a shocking false economy.

Failure to provide the Forest Service with adequate funds with which to carry on a fire-protection program on our public lands would be a shocking false economy.

In short, there is no economy in the program proposed by the Senator from Illinois. Instead, it would really amount to a weakening of the capital investments constituting the wealth of the American people. These are the great income-producing investments of the American people.

Certainly it is a truism, which all should recognize, that the great national forests and the great national range lands are self-liquidating, insofar as any appropriated funds the Government spends on them are concerned. They are income-producing.

Let us consider the income the Federal Government receives from the sale of Federal timber: Let me say that the amount of money we are requesting in this appropriation item is a paltry sum and a parsimonious sum, when compared with the appropriation which should be made under the good investment policy the American people will insist that their legislators follow in protecting the people's investment in these natural resources. So here is one place where there cannot possibly be any justification for cutting down the amount of the appropriation item, because to do so would be to spell out in capital letters the words "false economy."

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that tomorrow afternoon the Senate will reject the Dirksen amendment.

If the $30 million item advocated by the committee were spent on only two items—namely, range rehabilitation and forest rehabilitation—the money would be well spent. Certainly the amount recommended is not an excessive one. In fact, it is not enough. However, after the committee came forward with a $30 million increase, it was then proposed that it be reduced 50 percent.

Mr. President, I see that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is now returning to the floor. Certainly it is an honor for me to be here in his presence. I wish to say to him that in the last 30 minutes I have expressed, not only on behalf of the people of my State, but, I believe, also on behalf of all conservationists in America—not only those who believe in the conservation of our natural resources, but also those who believe in the conservation of our human resources—our sincere thanks for the far-sighted statesmanship of this great frontiersman from Arizona. He recognizes the importance of the appropriations for the U.S. Forest Service, as recommended by his committee, in connection with this bill, which he and the majority leader and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] were able to protect, when some of us were necessarily off the floor of the Senate. Those Senators were successful in their efforts to protect this proposed increase in this appropriation bill item until all of us could be present tomorrow, to participate in the yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

So I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona for his foresightedness in connection with the recommendation he and his committee have made; and I wish him to know that we will stand shoulder to shoulder with him tomorrow, in opposition to the Dirksen amendment, which just now I have stated not only spells out false economy, but also, in my judgment, will do great damage to the welfare of the generations who will follow us on this continent.

Mr. HAYDEN. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. In line with the eloquent remarks of my good friend, the Senator from Oregon, I should like also to thank the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], for including in the bill the item of $350,000 for a forest research laboratory for the vast interior forests of Alaska, which never have received adequate attention. Although we have two national forests along the coast of Alaska, the Tongass and the Chugach, an area of not less than 200,000 square miles in the interior is covered by forest growth composed of black spruce, white spruce, birch, tamarack, cottonwood, and willow, and that great resource has received little attention or protection. Those vast interior timber resources have been devastated repeatedly by forest fires. Relatively little is known about the commercial uses of that timber; and this item, which the President has included in his budget, will be of vast usefulness in that connection.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course, we should realize that conditions in Alaska are quite different from those in continental United States, and special attention will have to be given to that consideration.

Mr. GRUENING. We appreciate that, and I appreciate very much the entire attitude displayed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am also pleased with the forward-looking position taken on forest research. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] deserves great personal credit for the genuine interest he has consistently displayed in this important work. The committee increase provides funds for a new forest research laboratory at Bend. The city of Bend has contributed the site, and eagerly wishes to assist in every practical way. It is my hope that when this matter goes to conference, the conferees for the Senate will be persuasive with our colleagues in the House in impressing upon them the desirability of achieving progress on forest research.

Finally, I wish to laud the action taken by the committee in restoring funds for forest roads. The House made a cut of $3 million in the item for forest roads and trails—pointing out that it did not wish to utilize as much of the 1963 authorization as was proposed by the administration.

May I say I sit on the Foreign Relations Committee, and am called upon to vote millions of dollars to be spent in other parts of the world for developing the forest roads, protecting their nat-

ural resources, paying for their conservation programs, and doing a good many other things which are not conservation programs, in my humble judgment.

Yet I am always at a loss to understand why here in the Senate we always get out the carving knives to carve up the legacy of future generations of Americans in respect to needed appropriations to conserve our natural resources. I am always at a loss to understand that attitude. If this were something expendable, that would be a different thing; but our natural resources just are not expendable.

I do not propose to sit in the Senate Foreign Relation Committee and vote millions to be spent abroad—although I recognize those millions are needed—unless the Senate is willing to first protect the natural resources of our own country so that future Americans are going to be left a heritage of natural resources that will, it seems to me, protect their rights to the economic opportunity that natural resources always make available by way of the wealth that they pour into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator from Oregon has alluded to the double standard by which the Congress has been asked to vote, without question, billions of dollars—almost always in the form of blank checks—for forest rehabilitation abroad, for all kinds of economic development in foreign countries, whereas at the same time we were told by the previous administration that similar expenditures for almost identical projects, when devoted to the benefit of the American people, were unrealistic, extravagant, and unnecessary. And appropriations voted for these domestic projects were vetoed. I hope that double standard will disappear under the Kennedy administration.

Some of us who are watching the policy proposals of this administration will be guided very much in our attitude toward expenditures requested for foreign aid by the evidence that there is corresponding solicitude for the needs of the folks at home, which, in my perhaps limited judgment, I feel deserve a priority, not merely equality. I think the needs of the American people should come first; and if that is a narrow and a provincial view, I plead guilty. That is my view, and I shall retain it.

I hope as these resource conservation and development projects come before the Congress, they will be approved by the administration, if it expects us to vote billions of dollars for foreign aid.

Mr. MORSE. I could not agree more with the Senator from Alaska. I want to thank him for the contributions he has made to the Foreign Relations Committee time and time again, because what he has said on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Alaska has been pressing for in the Foreign Relations Committee. He is seeking to get us at least to eliminate the double standard.

The American people are entitled—and this is, I think, the point of the Senator from Alaska—to an equal break; but time and time again they do not get even an equal break.

The instance before us is a good example of what we mean. Here we are with a great need of doing a better job to protect the American taxpayers' investment in our natural resources, and the thought is that we ought to strike into it with a meat ax and eliminate it. I am for the elimination of waste anywhere in the Government, where it can be shown, including foreign aid; but the double standard which the Senator from Alaska has been talking about cannot be justified, neither in our natural reresources, nor in other fields.

I must not get started on this subject, because I will be making a full length speech on it. The Senator from Alaska has just spoken about the disparity which exists between what we are willing to do under foreign aid programs for the protection of natural resources abroad and for the building of roads abroad and the difficult time we have in the Senate in getting necessary funds appropriated for access roads, so we can officially harvest overripe, wind-blown, diseased timber, the loss of which costs the American people millions and millions of dollars a year which could be saved if we had access roads into that timber.

The fact that we have this great disparity between our domestic policy and our foreign aid policy can be illustrated in another program, to which I have been devoting many hours of the day and night for several weeks, namely, the whole educational problem in the United States.

How concerned and excited some American people get when the suggestion is made that, under the National Defense Education Act, we recognize that the training of a nuclear phsyicist, or a biochemist, or a surgeon, or any other trained individual so vitally needed for the defense of our country is just as important whether that student is in a private school or is in a public school, and we have agreed to work out a formula whereby we can provide an expenditure for the benefit of a child in the development of a particular intellectual qualification that we seek to develop in the interests of our country.

So we have had established in the National Defense Education Act the principle that money can be spent to train an individual student, irrespective of whether he is in a public or private school, so long as the money is spent on him for specialized training essential to the defense of the country.

Oh, one has to be in Congress to really fully appreciate how disturbed some people can become over a doctrine that has no relationship whatsoever in regard to defense expenditures, namely, the doctrine of separation of church and state.

Yet, look at the huge sums of money that we appropriate and send abroad for educational purposes, knowing full well that the money will be administered and spent in schools completely run by religious groups. Does anybody want to propose to eliminate the whole educational section of the foreign aid bill? But is it not interesting that in mutual security—and by that term I include the development of mutual security programs between and among nations—it is satisfactory to spend millions and millions of dollars of the American taxpayers' money on church education abroad, without the checks, the controls, and the limitations that are proposed in this country?

Mr. President, do you know what the difficulty is? The American people just do not have the facts. I am perfectly satisfied that, once we can get the facts to them, in a National Defense Education Act, or an extension of it, which already establishes the principle of helping students, no matter what school they go to, public or private, and helping schools provide necessary equipment and facilities for defense education, it will be seen that it is perfectly constitutional and does not have the remotest connection with the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state. I yield to no man or woman in this body in the insistence on the constitutional doctrine that there be a separation of church and state.

The difficulty is that too many people do not take the time to follow through and to see the application of such a program as we are advocating in connection with the National Defense Education Act, which limits the expenditure of each dollar to specific training of a specific student for the specific purpose of defense. Of course, if one did not accept that major premise, then the whole National Defense Act would fall to the carpet of this floor.

Again I say if it is proper to spend such huge sums of money for education in countries in which we all know the education is completely under the control of the church administration, or practically under the control of the church administration, it certainly is proper to limit the expenditures, under the safeguards about which I have been talking, in this country for the training of individual children.

A nuclear physicist, a surgeon, a biochemist, or any other trained mind is as valuable to the American people and as important to the security and defense of the country irrespective of what is the religious faith and irrespective of where the mind got its training in these recognized, special subject matters so vital to protecting the security of the country.

That general principle is related also to the matter of protecting the defenses of this country in regard to appropriations for the protection of our natural resources. If it is all right to spend millions of dollars abroad, I wish to say it is many, many more times all right for us to insist upon the protection of our own natural resources at home. Tomorrow the Senators will have an opportunity to stand up and be counted on one phase of this problem, as the Senate votes on the Dirksen amendment.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Is it not a further fact that if we do not protect and develop our natural resources, one of these days we shall be unable to afford to spend such vast sums of money abroad?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is quite correct. We will not have wealth coming into the Treasury if we dissipate the natural resources from which we raise the money to protect the natural resources. Once we destroy our resources they will be gone. Not only will the natural resources be gone, but also the wealth production which the resources, if conserved, would produce will be gone for all time.

We must not forget that great civilizations have followed such a course of action. China and the Middle East have great eroded areas, demonstrating there was no protection of natural resources and no protection of the water table. Really, there was no protection of the people's wealth.

Mr. President, I wish to comment further on the need for forest research, because the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has recognized it very wisely—I was delighted to support him in his effort—and has included in the appropriation bill a forest research institute at Bend, Oreg.

As I stated a moment ago, the city of Bend has contributed the site, and eagerly wishes to assist in every practical way. It is my hope that when this matter goes to conference, the conferees for the Senate will be persuasive with our colleagues in the House in impressing upon them the desirability of achieving progress on forest research.

Finally, I wish to laud the action taken by the committee in restoring funds for forest roads. The House made a cut of $3 million for forest roads and trails, ponting out that it did not wish to utilize as much of the 1963 authorization as was proposed by the administration.

The Senate committee has responded by providing a $3 million increase under the program to purchase access roads. The expenditure of this money will be of great help in opening up several billion board feet of national forest timber now served by private roads, but unavailable to market. I view this action by the committee as a desirable alternative to providing new funds for construction, as much as these are needed. The action of the Appropriations Committee will bring immediate offsetting revenues into the Treasury and thus this action should be viewed as a wise investment rather than an expenditure.

I have singled out only these few items for special commendation, and I close by reiterating that the committee has shown a great deal of wisdom and extremely sound judgment in discharging its constitutional obligation for the appropriation of money to make it possible for the President to discharge his responsibilities effectively for the conservation of our natural resources.

Mr. President, it is particularly fitting that there should follow now in the RECORD, immediately hereafter, the statement I made before the Appropriations Committee this afternoon, without my taking the time of the Senate to read it. I testified on public works appropriations for Oregon under the title "Investments That Increase the Nation's Resources." I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS FOR OREGON—INVESTMENTS THAT INCREASE THE NATION'S RESOURCES

(Statement of Senator WAYNE MORSE before Subcommittee on Public Works of the Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, June 6, 1961)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this year the implementation of the Nation's public works program through appropriations for projects under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior is a matter of enormous importance. In these projects we are building, not for today alone, but for tomorrow and for America of the future. What we do now will mean benefits for our generation and for those who follow us for decades to come.

SELF-LIQUIDATING PROJECTS SHOULD BE TREATED AS CAPITAL ASSETS

Our lack of budgetary imagination, our failure to deal on a businesslike basis with our income-producing resource assets is costing us heavily through deferred construction. We are bringing this burden upon ourselves by our refusal to deal with these assets as would the prudent businessman. We still insist upon building revenue-producing projects such as multipurpose dams out of current appropriations. If the businessman were to try to construct his factory or warehouse or to purchase his machinery and equipment out of current operating revenues, he would never catch up with his competitors. Again this year, as I have said for many years before, these great resource projects, particularly our multipurpose dams, should be treated apart from the ordinary budget procedures and placed under a 20th century capital budget program.

The sooner these income-producing, wealth-creating projects are completed, the sooner will their great benefits by way of hydroelectric power generation, flood control, water pollution abatement, navigation control, and recreation benefits, become available.

PUBLIC WORKS—A REMEDY FOR UNEMPLOYMENT

Unemployment has reached serious proportions in Oregon during the past year. For example, the most recent official figures available show that the overall rate of unemployment in Oregon is almost 6½ percent of the workers in jobs covered by unemployment insurance.

Unemployment in Oregon presents a problem of special magnitude because Oregon is essentially a one-industry State. Lumber is our basic industry. When the lumber industry slumps, unemployment goes on the rise and business declines. As yet, we have not developed alternative industries to take up the slack. Until we do so, employment of Oregon's very competent and efficient labor force on much-needed public works projects can supply at least a partial answer to the problem.

NEW STARTS FOR OREGON

The budget submitted by President Eisenhower offered no new starts for projects within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers for the State of Oregon. Early this year I urged the new administration to revise the Eisenhower budget so as to include some new starts in the interest of flood control and increased employment. It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I learned that President Kennedy's revised and increased budget of March 24, 1961, made possible the inclusion of a request of $1 million for the start of construction on Fall Creek Dam in Oregon.

Two new reclamation starts for eastern Oregon are included in the budget—Bully Creek Dam and the Dalles project, western division.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The ensuing portion of this statement covers my recommendations concerning appropriations for fiscal 1962 for public works projects in Oregon. Included are projects within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as well as the transmission line and substation programs of the Bonneville administration.

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

1. Construction

A. Flood Control and/or Power Projects

John Day lock and dam

John Day Dam, located on the Columbia River approximately 26 miles upstream from The Dalles, Oreg., has been under construction since June 1959. It is estimated that 8 years, including fiscal 1962 will be required for its completion, although I hope that accelerated appropriations in the years ahead will enable its great benefits to be realized in advance of this schedule.

John Day Dam will create a reservoir of 76 miles and will provide 500,000 acre-feet of flood control storage. The project will consist initially of 8 generators and 12 skeleton units to accommodate future generators. The 20 units, when installed, will provide 135,000 kilowatts each. In recent testimony the division engineer indicated the possible installation of 10 generators at the outset.

Benefits to be conferred by John Day Dam include flood control, navigation, power generation, and recreation. Irrigation benefits will be provided by reducing pumping lifts to irrigable lands near the reservoir.

The budget request for fiscal 1962 on this project was $31 million, but earlier this year the Corps told me it had a capability, from a strictly engineering standpoint, of $35 million. However, when the Corps testified, the capability was only $31 million. Apparently this reflected a more leisurely pace in the acquisition of lands for the project—an extension from April 1967 to June 1969.

For 2 years in succession, the John Day Dam project has been subjected either to inadequate budget requests, reductions in funds usable by the Corps, or congressional reductions in budget requests. The net result has been delay in the construction schedule for this project with consequent losses of benefits incident to such delay. I ask the committee's thorough review of the appropriations history relative to John Day Dam and urge the committee to take prompt action to bring the project back to a schedule that will more nearly coincide with the program of construction envisaged in the original plan.

Green Peter Reservoir

Last year the initial appropriation of $1,400,000 for construction funds on Green Peter Dam culminated a battle which we waged for several years to preserve this dam as a multipurpose project for the benefit of all the people.

Green Peter Dam will be located on the Middle Santiam River. Its reregulating

dam, Foster Reservoir, will be situated on the South Santiam about 7 miles downstream from Green Peter. The project will provide flood control and hydroelectric power generation and will serve to reduce fluctuations in downstream flows created by the peaking plant at Green Peter.

The budget of fiscal 1962 called for $6 million for further construction work. I ask the committee to approve the full amount which the corps earlier this year told me it could use, namely, $7,600,000. In fact, last month the division engineer testified that the additional $1,600,000 could be used for added land procurement rather than for construction.

It is my request that the amount usable be approved. The acquisition of real estate in fiscal 1962 will eliminate the necessity of making the acquisition in fiscal 1963 and we will be just that far ahead in the program, ready to tackle the jobs that lie ahead in fiscal 1963 and thereafter.

Flood losses on the South Santiam continued to be excessive. When completed, the Green Peter-Foster project will prevent annual average flood damages of about $2,930,500. The prospect of this benefit, aside from the other benefits involved, warrants maximum appropriations for this meritorious project.

Cougar Reservoir

Cougar Dam, upon which we fought and won battles several years ago to prevent putting into effect a so-called partnership scheme to give electric power windfalls to the private electric utilities, will soon be completed as another dam that will belong entirely to the people of the United States. It is located on the south fork McKenzie River and will supply flood control and electric power generation as well as increased water flows for conservation purposes in the dry season.

According to the district engineer, flood control will begin at Cougar Dam about October 1963.

Twelve million dollars is the amount requested in the budget for this project this year. I hope the committee will approve the full amount.

Hills Creek Dam

The Senate Appropriations Committee can take a great deal of credit for bringing about construction of Hills Creek Dam on the middle fork, Willamette River, about 45 miles southeast of Eugene, Oreg. It was the action of this committee, back in 1955, that provided the initial $300,000 of funds to get construction on the project underway.

The benefits of Hills Creek include hydroelectric power generation and 200,000 acre-feet of flood control storage. Its operation will be integrated with the operations of Lookout Point Dam to assure maximum power production.

According to the district engineer, flood control will be available at Hills Creek for the flood-flow season of 1961–62.

I urge that this year's appropriation of $1,800,000, which will almost complete the dam, be approved.

McNary Lock and Dam

The fiscal 1962 budget contains an item of $285,000 for McNary Dam. This sum is required for work on nearby railroad bridges to improve navigation on the Columbia.

Lower Columbia River bank protection

The $600,000 requested in the budget this year is designed to take care of bank protection work on two locations in the lower Columbia, namely, Beaver Slough and Sauvie Island.

The Corps of Engineers has advised me that it could use $800,000 on this bank protection project during fiscal 1962. Inasmuch as there are several other important projects that could benefit through bank protection work within the area of this project, I ask the committee's serious consideration to the appropriation of $800,000 instead of the budget $600,000 for lower Columbia River bank protection.

(a) Warrenton-Hammond area

A great deal of local interest has been expressed on the lower Columbia River bank protection project designated as Warrenton-Hammond area. Interested businessmen, members of the legislature, and residents of the cities of Warrenton and Hammond have informed me of their deep concern over the erosion along the banks of the Columbia River in this vicinity. The erosion threatens docks and important business and residential property on the river front. If the erosion is permitted to continue, it will endanger the Hammond Coast Guard Station and the Corps of Engineers' mooring basin. Consequently, there is an important Federal interest as well as local interest to be served by adequate appropriations to bring about remedial works during 1962. In order that this work may proceed with the utmost speed, I urge an appropriation of $800,000 for the lower Columbia River bank protection project.

Willamette River bank protection

The serious floods on the Willamette River during November 1960 and February 1961 provided convincing evidence of the urgent need for larger appropriations for this project. There are scores of areas requiring flood protection on the Willamette and its tributaries, but the priority list for the balance of fiscal 1961 and fiscal 1962 includes only 13 projects.

The tours I made this spring to inspect flood damaged areas on the Calapooya, Clackamas, Santiam, and Willamette Rivers, convinced me that we are allowing thousands of tons of topsoil to be wasted annually due to inadequate bank revetment and channel work. Unless we do something about it, we will lose, not only for ourselves, but for future generation, the benefits of this fertile soil.

The Corps of Engineers indicates that $500,000 is the maximum amount usable on the Willamette River bank protection for fiscal 1962. This is far short of the amount required to do the essential bank protection work at other sites where the urgency is great.

There are many additional areas that stand urgently in need of bank protection work, but for which no funds will be available in fiscal 1962. The floods do not await congressional appropriations. Their damage goes on, year after year.

The results of these floods have to be seen so that the severity of the damage may be realized. I have seen flood-ravaged areas in my home State. It is an appalling sight to view a family farm of 27 fertile acres reduced to 3 acres; it is a shocking sight to view acre after acre of once flourishing croplands converted into gullied, eroded land covered with tons of gravel, rocks, and debris.

Emergency Willamette River bank protection funds

The sad fact is that much, if not most, of this terrible destruction could be avoided by prompt and adequate bank protection works. Enormous damage can be avoided by comparatively modest expenditures on bank protection. For this reason, I urge this committee to approve in addition to the $500,000 budgeted for this year, an additional $500,000 for emergency bank protection work, with the proviso that unused funds, if any, can be carried into succeeding fiscal years.

Emergency funds of this type suggested would perform another useful function. They would place the corps in a good position to assure property owners that they could proceed ahead to obtain the essential rights-of-way, easements, and other requirements that must be fulfilled prior to the undertaking of bank protection works. This would speed up the making of preparations for regular bank protection work during fiscal 1963 and ensuing years.

It is my opinion that if this committee on its own initiative were to approve not only the budgeted $500,000, but an additional $500,000, it would provide the means whereby this work, which has proceeded at too slow a pace, could be given a new impetus.

Rehabilitation of major Oregon projects

Columbia River at the mouth, Coos Bay, Siuslaw River, Umpqua River, and Tillamook Bay and Harbor

The deteriorated conditions of the south jetties on important ports along the Oregon coast, has resulted in serious property damage, including losses of ships and cargoes, and has endangered the lives of many people engaged in navigation pursuits.

When jetties sink and become covered with water, they not only fail to perform their normal functions, but constitute hidden threats to navigation in the harbor entrances. To illustrate this point, I quote from a portion of a letter dated March 25, 1961, addressed to me by Mr. Henry Sause, Jr., president of Sause Bros. Ocean Towing Co. In these words Mr. Sause vividly portrayed the dangers and the losses of property inherent in attempting to enter the Siuslaw River harbor:

"I would hope that the Siuslaw south jetty project might be accelerated some time within the next 12 months. Our company has experienced the following insurance losses in serving the port with only the partial improvements there to work with:

Tug *Kliyham*, insurance collected	$275,000
Tug *Wianaco*, insurance collected	77,000
Barge *Humboldt Woodsman*, insurance collected	410,000
Barge *Humboldt Woodsman* cargo, insurance collected	183,000
Total insurance losses paid by underwriters	945,000

"Our company is the only company serving the port because of the hazards and this year in renewing our insurance, underwriters insisted that we eliminate calls on ports located on the Siuslaw River by large LST-type barges. This has reduced our service to Siuslaw ports and if we should experience further losses at the Siuslaw entrance I have been put on notice by underwriters that they will not insure tugs and barges serving the area. The Siuslaw River area produces approximately 70 million feet of lumber per year that should be moved by water, because of the heavy weight that results in a shipping penalty where rail shipment is used. I estimate the shipping penalty to be $4 per thousand on the entire 70 million feet, or $280,000 per year cost to the mills in shipping penalties if all lumber is forced on rail through cancellation of marine insurance to the port. Ninety-five percent of the stumpage in the area is owned by the U.S. Government. Therefore, I am certain that the loss would be to the people in the long run. Why freight savings are not considered as part of the economic justification for the improvements needed is very questionable to my mind."

Prevention of losses such as Mr. Sause described would more than compensate for the cost of rehabilitation works.

The money spent in rehabilitating the jetties saves many times the cost of maintenance operations. In the long run, the restoration of the jetties saves money for the Government and stimulates navigation and industry in our coastal areas.

The budget this year contains a request for $700,000 for the rehabilitation project designated as Columbia River at the mouth. The $700,000 would cover initiation of repair on the south jetty and constitutes a part of an overall Columbia River mouth rehabilitation project.

Five hundred thousand dollars is included in the 1962 budget request for the initiation of construction on the rehabilitation of the Coos Bay south jetty and $500,000 for repair of the south jetty at the Siuslaw River harbor. Due to evidence of some deterioration near the shoreline of this jetty, the Corps of Engineers recently advised me that it could use $800,000 on this project. If the $800,000 were approved, it would enable the corps to use a substantial amount of the appropriated funds on repair work prior to the coming of the winter storm season. An appropriation of $800,000 for the Siuslaw River project seems clearly justified.

The Umpqua River south jetty is also in need of rehabilitation and $500,000 is included in this year's budget for that project.

No funds have been budgeted for the Tillamook Bay and Harbor rehabilitation project, but the north jetty of this harbor, near Garibaldi, is in need of substantial repair work. Strong local interest has been manifested in obtaining this repair at the earliest possible date. The corps advised me that it could use $40,000 during the fiscal 1962 to complete the planning of the north jetty repairs. I urge the inclusion of this sum in the bill reported by this committee.

Small authorized projects

Due to the very strong local interest manifested in Oregon with respect to the small authorized project program, and the excellent results achieved under this program for projects such as the Garibaldi and the Hood River small boat basins, I have become convinced of the excellence of the small authorized projects program. This year the budget includes a request of $1,500,000 for this program. The corps advises me that it could use, effectively and efficiently, $3 million for this purpose. An appropriation of $3 million appears to be clearly warranted.

2. Authorized projects not under construction

A. Flood control and/or power projects not under construction

Fall Creek Reservoir

Fall Creek Dam, to be located on a tributary of the middle fork Willamette River about 19 miles southeast of Eugene, Oreg., has been ready for construction since fiscal 1961. The Eisenhower budget, for the second year in succession, asked nothing for this important project, but President Kennedy's March 24, 1961, upward revision to the extent of over $20 million for the public works program of the Corps of Engineers, made possible the inclusion of $1 million in a revised fiscal 1962 budget request for this dam.

When completed, the reservoir of this project will have a usable storage capacity of 115,000 acre-feet. It will be operated as part of a coordinated reservoir system of the Willamette River Basin for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and conservation uses. Total annual average benefits will be approximately $2,323,600 of which $1,200,000 will consist of flood control benefits. This is an impressive indication of benefits that will emanate from a project costing approximately $24,500,000. It has an excellent benefit-cost ratio of 2.3 to 1.

Although the budget request is $1 million for fiscal 1962, the Corps of Engineers has informed me that it could use $1,600,000 on the project in the coming fiscal year. I urge appropriation of the latter sum because this will bring much nearer the time at which this project will begin to provide a substantial amount of employment to help ease Oregon's unemployment situation.

John Day River

The John Day River flood control project would provide protection against floods in the vicinity of the town of John Day, Oreg. This project is important and should be undertaken as soon as the planning of the project has been completed. Although nothing is included in this year's budget, the Corps of Engineers has advised me that an appropriation of $37,000 for fiscal year 1962 would enable the corps to complete the planning. I ask the committee's serious consideration for the inclusion of this planning item.

Pilot Rock

This flood control project has been authorized for almost 20 years and has been the subject of restudies for economic feasibility. The project calls for channel rectification, levies, and revetments through the town of Pilot Rock and along Birch Creek below the town. There was no budget request for this item but the corps has informed me that $15,000 could be used in the coming fiscal year to complete the planning. In view of the long period that has elapsed since the initial authorization, I ask that an appropriation for the completion of the planning be approved for fiscal 1962.

Other Oregon flood protection works not under construction

There are many areas along the navigable rivers of Oregon and their tributaries that need final planning for long overdue flood control works such as those at Clatskanie Drainage District, Bear Creek, Shelton Ditch, West Muddy, and Mary's River. Others, such as the improvement works at Beaver Drainage District, are ready for construction. They are listed on the chart appended to this statement.

None of these important flood control projects has been included in the budget for fiscal 1962. The threat of flood damage is continuing and persistent. I ask the committee's serious consideration for inclusion of these items in the fiscal 1962 appropriations.

B. Navigation projects not under construction

Coos and Millicoma Rivers

Although the budget for the coming fiscal year did not include a request for preconstruction planning funds on the Coos-Millicoma project, the division engineer has indicated a capability of $23,000. I ask that this be considered by the subcommittee in passing upon this item.

The Coos Bay area is a major lumber and sawmill area of Oregon. The Coos-Millicoma project is an important artery of commerce for the logs that are so essential to the area. During low water, the logs cannot be brought down the river, thus retarding the commerce in this major industry.

Yaquina Harbor modification

The budget request for continuation of planning on this project during fiscal 1962 is $200,000. However, the planning is far behind schedule. Earlier this year the corps told me that a total of $691,000 would be required to complete the preconstruction planning. Late last week the corps revised this figure downward to a total of $325,000 because of very favorable contract developments. Due to the fact that construction is long overdue, I ask the subcommittee to approve the relatively small amount above the budget request in order to assure completion of the preconstruction planning.

3. General investigations

A. Flood control investigations

The budget for fiscal 1962 contains requests for investigation funds relative to the Calapooya, Coquille, Grande Ronde, Rogue, and Umpqua Rivers and for Willow Creek.

All of these requests are meritorious and they have my full endorsement. With the exception of the Calapooya River survey, the budget requests reflect the full amounts usable on the above-listed projects. They are of special importance in that, except in the cases of the Calapooya and Umpqua Rivers, the budget requests will complete the surveys. They have been long delayed and should be finished as rapidly as possible during fiscal 1962.

Calapooya River

The Eisenhower budget contained no request for the Calapooya River, but President Kennedy's March 24, 1961, increase in the budget for public works within the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, enabled a revision of the budget to include $20,000 for the Calapooya River. This year I visited various flood-damaged sites on the Calapooya and I can state to this committee, without reservation, that I was appalled at the damage I observed. For example, on the Joe Murphy farm near Brownsville, Oreg., I saw the 3 acres that remained of what was once a fine 27-acre farm. This was but one of many instances of enormous flood damage attributed to the lack of adequate flood control on the Calapooya.

The Calapooya River survey is of primary importance to a fertile farming area of Oregon, because upon its results, hinge flood control works on the Calapooya and the basis for proceeding with construction of Holley Dam on the Calapooya. The completion of these two projects would eliminate most of the enormous flood damage experienced in recent years. The sad fact is that Holley Dam is ready for construction now, but work on the dam must await completion of the survey to assure that the river below the dam will have ample capacity to take the essential runoffs of the operation of the dam. The Corps of Engineers has informed me that $30,000 could be used on the Calapooya survey during fiscal 1962. In the interest of accelerated flood control works, I ask that the full $30,000 be approved for this urgent project.

Thomas Creek

Floods on Thomas Creek, a tributary of the South Santiam River, caused enormous damage to farmlands last winter. This has generated keen local interest in the Thomas Creek survey and a representative of the interested farmers, Mr. Stanley A. Soli, vice chairman of the Willamette Basin Project Committee, will testify before your committee in support of an appropriation of $10,000 with which to initiate the survey. The photographs he will bring to the hearing will show, far better than words can portray, what happens to formerly productive farmland after floods have reduced them to

eroded, gravel and rock strewn, and debris littered areas.

The severe property damage in the Thomas Creek area warrants prompt completion of the survey of this creek. I urge approval for the full amount usable by the corps for fiscal 1962—$10,000.

Yamhill River and Rickreal Creek

Two surveys relating to areas west of the Willamette River have been outstanding many years. I refer to those covering the Yamhill River and Rickreal Creek. In recent years residents of these areas have manifested a great deal of local interest in the surveys to be completed by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. As the years go by, it is becoming more and more evident that flood control works are essential for Oregon areas west of the Willamette and, during the summer months, farms in that locality are becoming increasingly in need of irrigation water. The prospects for great benefits from flood control and irrigation are indeed promising, and I ask that the committee implement these surveys by approval of the maximum funds usable by the corps and the Bureau of Reclamation for fiscal 1962.

Oregon navigation investigation projects

On the attached chart are listed several Oregon navigation surveys. A number of these, including Chetco River, Lower Snake River, Port Orford, Tillamook Bay, and Umpqua River contain budget requests for completion of the surveys. All of these projects are of major importance, and I ask the committee to approve the budget requests.

Port Orford

The Port Orford survey project illustrates the importance of helping those who help themselves. In the winter of 1959, facilities of the port, which were constructed by local authorities on their own initiative, suffered severe storm damage. This case had particular appeal to me because of the fact that locally constructed facilities were damaged or destroyed. It seemed to me that the Federal Government should do everything possible to assist under such circumstances. The Senate Committee on Appropriations cooperated admirably by approving an appropriation of $9,000, although the budget request of the previous administration was zero for fiscal 1961. We succeeded in holding the $9,000 appropriation in conference and as a result the corps was able to complete the Port Orford navigation study with an appropriation of $8,000 for fiscal 1962. This amount is included in the budget for the coming year and I strongly urge its approval.

Tillamook Bay

The completion of the Bay Ocean Spit project several years ago placed the Tillamook Bay project in position to resume its status as a major port area of the Oregon coast.

Last year, $10,000 was appropriated for this investigation and the sum of $7,800, as requested in the fiscal 1962 budget, will enable the corps to complete the survey in fiscal 1962. This, together with the $40,000 I have also requested for completion of the planning on rehabilitation of the north jetty at Garibaldi, will constitute major steps forward on this most meritorious project.

4. Operations and maintenance

A. Flood control and/or power

Ten items are included in the budget for fiscal 1962 under the caption "Operations and maintenance," relating to existing flood control or multipurpose projects in Oregon. In several instances, the budget request is less than the amount usable by the agency operating the project. In the interest of efficiency and economy to be attained through expenditures of the maximum amounts usable, I asked the committee to give serious consideration to approval of the full amounts that can be used, effectively and efficiently, for operations and maintenance on Oregon flood control and power projects.

B. Navigation

The budget request for fiscal 1962 for operations and maintenance of navigation projects includes 14 Oregon projects. Again, in some cases, the budget request is less than the amount usable by the Corps of Engineers. In the interest of long-run economy, I suggest that the full amounts usable be appropriated for operations and maintenance on these navigation projects.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

1. Construction

On the chart attached to this statement is a list of five Oregon reclamation projects for which substantial construction funds have been requested in the budget for the coming fiscal year. All of these projects are meritorious and the requested appropriations are clearly justifiable. They have my enthusiastic support. I am particularly pleased over the fact that two new reclamation starts are included in the fiscal 1962 budget. These projects are the Vale-Bully Creek extension and The Dalles, western division.

Vale project-Bully Creek

The $690,000 requested in the fiscal 1962 budget for Bully Creek will enable the Bureau of Reclamation to complete the design memorandum of this meritorious project to acquire rights-of-way and to award initial construction and supply contracts for the Bully Creek Dam spillway and outlet works. The project is of special importance to the Vale area and I urge approval of the budgeted amount.

The Dalles project, western division

The Dalles project, western division, was authorized in the closing days of the 86th Congress. This project is one of extreme urgency due to the fact that the water table of the project area is falling rapidly; in fact, the State authorities have declared the area to be one of critical water supply. The project, upon completion, will draw water from the Columbia River. The water thus transported will not only provide irrigation for highly productive orchards, but will restore the water table and prevent depletion of sources of water for the area.

The budget request for this project for the coming fiscal year is $350,000. Because of the acute water situation, I ask that $500,000 be approved on an accelerated program for the construction of this project. Last year officials of the Bureau of Reclamation testified that $500,000 could be used on an accelerated construction program. The appropriation of the large sum is clearly warranted under the circumstances, and I urge its approval.

2. Investigations: Oregon reclamation projects

The chart appended to this statement contains a list of important project investigations being carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation within the State of Oregon. All are of utmost importance and I ask their approval. In the paragraphs that follow, special reference is made to some of the more urgent investigations.

Red Prairie

Farmers, businessmen, and local residents have expressed great interest in the reclamation survey designated as the Red Prairie-Mill Creek. This enthusiasm and the strong support manifested locally speaks well for the success of the project, should the investigation demonstrate feasibility. The $78,000 included in the coming year's budget has my strong support.

Walla Walla project, Oregon and Washington

Residents of the Milton-Freewater area of Oregon have corresponded with me for several years, expressing deep concern over the falling water table of the Walla Walla Basin. Strong and continuing local interest in the project has been evidenced. I was pleased to observe that $69,000 is budgeted for the coming fiscal year's survey of the 5-year study involved in this case. The project promises great success and I endorse strongly the budget request.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

A total of $7,507,000 has been requested by the Bonneville Power Administration for the construction of transmission lines and substation facilities in the Pacific Northwest. Listed below are a number of important Oregon projects within this category:

Harvey Aluminum service	$1,400,000
Big Eddy-Keeler 345-kilovolt line	380,000
Green Peter-Lebanon	1,000,000
Alvey-Reedsport 230-kilovolt line	464,000
Keeler-Tillamook 230-kilovolt line	190,000
System reactive facilities	906,000
Big-Eddy Mclaughlin 345-kilovolt line	391,000
Hills Creek-Oakridge 115-kilovolt line	94,000
Cougar-Eugene 115-kilovolt line	479,000
Hanna Substation additions	106,000
Fern Ridge Substation	48,000
Hampton Butte Substation	78,000
Gold Beach Substation additions	65,000
Harney Electric Cooperative service	377,000
Miscellaneous (capital additions, replacements, communication, etc.)	1,507,000
Total in Oregon	7,507,000

Harney Electric Cooperative

The attention of the committee is directed to the item of $337,000 to be applied to the Harney Electric Cooperative service line. This amount will complete the funds needed to serve the Harney Electric Cooperative. Energization of its facilities is scheduled for the fall of 1961. A small substation will be built at Hampton Butte to serve the Central Electric Cooperative from the Harney service 115-kilovolt line to bring service to another Oregon area where central substation service has not been available. This appropriation is of enormous importance because it is the culmination of our work of years to bring low-cost Bonneville power to farms and ranches in southern Oregon and northern Nevada which, until this year were isolated from the benefits of such power.

Alvey-Reedsport; Keeler-Tillamook

The Alvey-Reedsport and Keeler-Tillamook lines are major additions to improve the load carrying capacity to the Oregon coast and to increase the reliability of power service.

SUMMARY, PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL 1962

Recommendations of Senators Morse and Neuberger

ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Project	Amount included in President's fiscal year 1962 budget	Amount usable fiscal year 1962	Amount recommended by Senators Morse and Neuberger
A. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS UNDER CONSTRUCTION			
1. Oregon flood control and/or power projects under construction:			
Cougar Reservoir	$12,000,000	$12,000,000	$12,000,000
Green Peter Reservoir including Foster	6,000,000	7,600,000	7,600,000
Hills Creek Reservoir	1,800,000	1,800,000	1,800,000
John Day lock and dam	31,000,000	31,000,000	31,000,000
Lower Columbia River bank protection	600,000	800,000	800,000
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:			
Rainier drainage district	381,000	381,000	381,000
Sauvies Island drainage district	259,000	259,000	259,000
Willamette River bank protection	500,000	500,000	500,000
Emergency Willamette River bank protection	0		500,000
McNary lock and dam	285,000	285,000	285,000
2. Rehabilitation of major Oregon projects:			
Columbia River at the mouth	700,000	700,000	700,000 (C)
Coos Bay, south jetty	500,000	500,000	500,000 (C)
Siuslaw River	500,000	800,000	800,000 (C)
Tillamook Bay and Harbor	0	40,000	40,000 (P)
Umpqua River	500,000	500,000	500,000 (C)
3. Small authorized projects: Total for United States	1,500,000	3,000,000	3,000,000
B. AUTHORIZED PROJECTS NOT UNDER CONSTRUCTION			
1. Oregon flood control and/or power projects not under construction:			
Fall Creek Reservoir	1,000,000	1,600,000	1,600,000 (C)
John Day River	0	37,000	37,000 (P)
Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:			
Beaver drainage district	0	350,000	350,000 (C)
Clatskanie drainage district	0	16,000	16,000 (P)
Pilot Rock	0	15,000	15,000 (P)
Willamette River Basin, channel improvements and major drainage:			
Bear Creek	0	26,000	26,000 (P)
Shelton Ditch	0	50,000	50,000 (P)
West Muddy and Marys River	0	50,000	50,000 (P)
2. Navigation projects not under construction:			
Columbia Slough	0	20,000	20,000 (P)
Coos and Millicoma Rivers	0	23,000	23,000 (P)
Siuslaw River and Bar	0	21,000	21,000 (P)
Willamette River above Portland and Yamhill River	0	45,000	45,000 (P)
Willamette River at Willamette Falls	0	85,000	85,000 (P)
Yaquina Bar and Harbor	200,000	325,000	325,000 (P)
C. GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS			
1. Flood control investigations:			
Amazon Creek	0	13,000	13,000
Beaver Creek	0	10,000	10,000
Calapooya River	20,000	30,000	30,000
Clackamas River	0	7,000	7,000
Coquille River	4,000	4,000	4,000
Grande Ronde River	3,000	3,000	3,000
Horse Creek	0	10,000	10,000
Luckiamute River	0	$25,000	$25,000
Mary's River	0	8,000	8,000
McKay Creek	0	10,000	10,000
Nestucca River	0	25,000	25,000
Rickreal Creek	0	12,000	12,000
Rogue River	$33,500	33,500	33,500
Salmon Creek	0	2,500	2,500
Thomas Creek	0	10,000	10,000
Tillamook Bay streams	0	20,000	20,000
Umpqua River	25,900	25,900	25,900
Willow Creek	21,100	21,100	21,100
Yamhill River	0	40,400	40,400
Yaquina River	0	10,000	10,000
2. Navigation investigations:			
Chetco River	10,000	10,000	10,000
Coos Bay-Charleston small boat basin	0	6,000	6,000
Coquille River	0	8,400	8,400
Lower Snake River	15,000	15,000	15,000
Port Orford	8,000	8,000	8,000
Rogue River-Gold Beach	0	3,000	3,000
Siuslaw River	0	6,000	6,000
Tillamook Bay	7,800	7,800	7,800
Umpqua River	9,500	9,500	9,500
Yaquina River	0	6,000	6,000
3. Flood plain studies: Collection and study of basic data	500,000	500,000	500,000
D. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE			
1. Flood control and/or power:			
Bonneville Dam	1,986,000	2,054,000	2,054,000
The Dalles Dam	1,508,000	1,508,000	1,508,000
Detroit Reservoir	548,000	548,000	548,000
Hills Creek Reservoir	115,000	115,000	115,000
Lookout Point Reservoir	602,000	602,000	602,000
McNary Dam	1,700,000	1,718,000	1,718,000
Cottage Grove Reservoir	52,000	52,000	52,000
Dorena Reservoir	48,000	50,000	50,000
Fern Ridge Reservoir	99,000	102,000	102,000
Willamette River bank protection project	35,000	75,000	75,000
2. Navigation:			
Chetco River	90,000	90,000	90,000
Columbia River between Vancouver, Wash., and The Dalles, Oreg	500,000		500,000
Columbia River at the mouth	759,000	1,292,000	1,292,000
Columbia and lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash. and Oreg	2,660,000	4,041,000	4,041,000
Coos Bay	423,000	524,000	524,000
Coquille River	55,000	55,000	55,000
Rogue River at Gold Beach	78,000	78,000	78,000
Siuslaw River	65,000	65,000	65,000
Tillamook Bay and Harbor	63,000	63,000	63,000
Umpqua River	57,000	111,000	111,000
Willamette River above Portland and Yamhill River	426,000	709,000	709,000
Yaquina Bay and Harbor	155,000	155,000	155,000
Yaquina River	75,000	75,000	75,000
Willamette River at Willamette Falls	164,000	167,000	167,000

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Project	Amount included in President's budget for fiscal year 1962	Amount recommended by Senators Morse and Neuberger
A. CONSTRUCTION		
1. Oregon reclamation projects under construction:		
Klamath project	$1,034,000	$1,034,000
Rogue River Basin, Talent division	789,000	789,000
Crooked River	256,949	256,949
2. Oregon reclamation projects not under construction:		
Vale project, Bully Creek	690,000	690,000
The Dalles project (western division)	350,000	800,000
3. Oregon rehabilitation project: Rogue River Basin	159,000	159,000
B. OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE		
Rogue River project, Talent division	58,462	58,462
Klamath project (California and Oregon)	55,400	55,400
Crooked River project	20,000	20,000
C. GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS		
1. Reconnaissance: John Day project	42,000	42,000
2. Project investigations:		
Crooked River	51,000	51,000
Deschutes project (central division)	$62,000	$62,000
Monmouth-Dalles	39,000	39,000
Red Prairie	78,000	78,000
Tualatin project	47,087	47,087
Umatilla project (Birch Creek)	26,000	26,000
Umpqua River	30,000	30,000
Tule Lake division (Lost River, storage unit)	68,362	68,362
Walla Walla, Oreg. and Wash	69,000	69,000
3. Basin surveys:		
Columbia River Basin, Oreg. and Wash	80,000	80,000
Upper and middle Snake River	15,000	15,000

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Total for construction of transmission lines and substation facilities in Pacific Northwest	$7,507,000	$7,507,000

FARM LEGISLATION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter to the editor which was published in the Wall Street Journal for the 16th of May 1961 entitled "Fall Guys." I think it is a very interesting letter to the editor, and it deals with the problem of farm legislation.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALL GUYS

Edna M. Tuft's excellent "Victim, Not Victor" letter on farm legislation in your issue of April 13 underlines the fact that the Wall Street Journal, with all its editorial acumen and economic sagacity, has never quite understood the economics of agriculture.

You often speak of the farmers as a favored class, and this, in any real sense, they are definitely not. Farmers are, and have always been—perhaps always will be—the ultimate "fall guys."

The reason should be obvious. Every producer of raw materials is at the mercy of buyers unless he is able to adjust his production to demand, and if necessary to starve the buyer into higher prices. Some can do it. The oil man can and does shut down his pumps. The miner closes his pits and slows his smelters. Even the lumberman can lay off his crews. The fishing fleet does not sail.

Only the farmer, in his millions of small units, largely unorganized and plagued with internal dissensions and rivalries, producing in a fixed cycle which may be 1 to 3 years, cannot reduce quickly or effectively.

That is the justification, and the only possible justification, for Government intervention. The alternative is the old reliable system of volume control and equality in bargaining by ruining the least efficient farmers.

The argument against that system is not economic, but sociological. Is it or is it not desirable to maintain the laregst practicable number of independent farm family units? Does or does not much of the Nation's intellectual force and moral character originate there? Is or is not a bold peasantry as valuable for this country as for Goldsmith's England? It is at least arguable.

Whether Government intervention to date has been stupid, ineffective, and fantastically costly is another question altogether. But if it is, do not blame it on a "favored" agriculture.

ARTHUR H. JENKINS.

THOM McAN LEADERSHIP AWARD TO PATRICIA ANN LITTON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Patricia Litton of Woodrow Wilson High School in Portland, Oreg., has won first place in the Thom McAn Leadership Awards. She will receive a $1,000 scholarship to a college, or university of her choice and an all-expense paid trip to Washington, D.C., and New York City.

I ask unanimous consent to have her prize winning essay, entitled, "Why I Want To Go to College," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I WANT TO GO TO COLLEGE

(By Patricia Litton)

When I graduate from college, I hope to possess, in my mind and in my heart, the qualities I will need to serve my country abroad. It is my desire to become a member of the United States Foreign Service, to play an active role in strengthening the bonds between men and nations, and to dedicate my life to the preservation of world peace. These goals are of the greatest importance to me. But before they can be realized, I must make myself a better person, worthy of the responsibilities I will accept in life. This is why I want to go to college.

A valuable diplomat, I believe, is one who knows the country in which he is serving—its history, its culture, its economic needs, its political ideals, and who speaks its language fluently. He is sensitive to the fact that its people, though they may have external differences, have basic needs and desires which correspond very closely to his own. A diplomat must therefore understand himself to serve as a disseminator of understanding. The intellectual freedom of college life will give me the opportunity to discover my strengths and weaknesses, to determine my beliefs and aspirations, and to establish a set of values that will give me the courage of my own convictions. Added to this self-discovery, I hope to develop a mind capable of clear and intelligent thinking, a mind which continuously seeks the truth and never becomes too satisfied with its own knowledge to realize how much it does not know.

To graduate from college with an excellent education and the realization that this education will continue all through life, with every new acquaintance and experience—this is the purpose of a college education. To graduate with a solemn pledge to use this knowledge in serving humanity through the diplomatic service—this is the culmination of a college education.

THOM McAN PRESS RELEASE

Two Portland high school seniors won scholarships in the national Thom McAn Leadership Awards. Leading all female students from 1,236 high schools across the country, Patricia Ann Litton, senior student at Woodrow Wilson High School won the first place award of $1,000 and an all-expense trip to Washington, D.C., and New York City. Patricia is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Don E. Litton of 6900 Southwest 15th Avenue. John Edgar Bryson, of Cleveland High School, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Bryson of 6211 Southeast 29th Avenue, won sixth place among male students and a $250 scholarship.

Patricia Litton ranks first in her class of 444 students and has maintained an A average all through her high school career. She is rated superior by her faculty advisers on all counts of motivation, industry, initiative, influence and leadership, concern for others, responsibility, integrity and emotional stability. In describing her character, her counselor said: "Academically, Patti ranks first in the senior class. Socially, her contributions have earned the respect and admiration of teachers, classmates and community. Personally, she is a lady in the best sense of the word, thoughtful, intelligent, and attractive. Her values are very mature for a high school girl. She is the personification of the student who makes one feel that the future in the hands of the young will be good."

Of her own ambitions, Patti wrote in the prize-winning essay which accompanied her application for scholarship: "When I graduate from college, I hope to possess, in my mind and in my heart, the qualities I will need to serve my country abroad. It is my desire to become a member of the U.S. Foreign Service, to play an active role in strengthening the bonds between men and nations, and to dedicate my life to the preservation of world peace. These goals are of the greatest importance to me. But before they can be realized, I must make myself a better person, worthy of the responsibilities I will accept in life. This is why I want to go to college."

In her essay, Patti showed a clear understanding of the requirements of diplomatic service. "A diplomat," she said, "must understand himself to serve as a disseminator of understanding."

John Bryson is the only student in a class of 373 who has maintained a 4.00 grade point average through 3½ years of his high school career. He is, in the words of his counselor, "concerned with academic experiences that will give him an insight in a variety of subject matter areas. He has set very high standards for himself through participating in our Gifted Child program in mathematics and social studies. John does extremely well academically; however, he is equally as strong as a leader."

President of the junior class, he is president of the school chapter of the National Honor Society, president of Sigma Phi, a boys' service club, president of the student council, student body president. A member of the basketball team, John has been commended by his coach for his leadership qualities.

In his prize-winning essay, John wrote: "Wisdom has never been more desperately needed than it is now. We know that there is no defense against the most destructive modern weapons. Both the victor and the defeated will lose the next war. Therefore, we must have understanding and cooperation between the nations of the world, and it is only with the wisdom of the citizens within the nations that an understanding can be achieved. A desire for knowledge and understanding, then, is my reason for going to college. My college experience must be the basis upon which it will be decided whether I will make a contribution to society through wisdom or will just eat my share, drink my share, and put in my 40 hours a week."

John Clifton Thoms of Ballard High School, Seattle, Wash., won first place in the Thom McAn Leadership Awards among male students and will be Patricia Litton's companion on the trip to Washington, D.C. and New York City. Candidates were judged on academic standing, extracurricular activities, exemplified leadership and student and faculty respect as well as their papers on higher education.

Judges of this year's Thom McAn Leadership Awards were: Senator Styles Bridges; A. B. Weller, chairman of the board, the Meadow Brook National Bank; Dr. Austin Wright, head of the English department, Carnegie Institute of Technology; Joseph J. Francomano, administrative vice president, Junior Achievement, Inc.; Rev. Andrew Young, associate director, department of youth work, National Council of the Churches of Christ.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have had this high school student essay printed in the RECORD because ever since the time of Socrates the older citizens of each generation have deplored what was happening to the younger generation. For some reason, Mr. President, the older generation—or at least many people within it—always seems to think the younger generation is "going to pot."

I have never shared that pessimistic view about the younger generation. I am perfectly confident that our younger generation, which is the beneficiary of more than 150 years of free education in this country, can be relied upon to be guardians and protectors of our system of freedom.

As one reads Miss Litton's essay one will find adequate documentation for my

expression of faith in the younger generation. That is why I am so happy to have the essay printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

A GOOD HOUSING BILL THE MEANING OF FEDERAL HOUSING LEGISLATION FOR ALASKA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in the report on S. 1922, it is stated on page 2, that, in submitting his excellent housing program to Congress, the President aimed to accomplish three basic national objectives:

1. Renewal of our cities and the assurance of sound growth in rapidly expanding metropolitan areas.
2. Provision of a decent home for all of our people.
3. Encouragement of a prosperous and efficient construction industry as an essential component of general economic prosperity and growth.

The President's objectives accord with the State of Alaska's objectives in this important area of government. As reported to the Senate, I believe S. 1922, if enacted, will carry out the announced Presidential objectives and go far toward meeting the 49th State's special housing needs.

The State of Alaska, our Nation's last frontier, represents a unique challenge to the programs advanced by the New Frontier in Washington. Our State's problems, because of our geography, and our overlong status as a territory, require solutions different from those applicable in the other States. As Alaska develops into a fullfledged State our developing economy will no longer require specialized solutions now needed to solve specialized problems.

In housing the difference between the kind of Federal assistance required in Alaska and in other States is less marked than with some other Government programs.

In Alaska, as in our sister States, there is a continuing need for the historical programs of housing mortgage insurance and low cost public housing which began nearly 30 years ago and have long since been recognized as among the most significant examples of the governmental genius of the New Deal. The effectiveness of a program of Government insurance of housing loans in providing our citizens with decent housing is unquestionable, and its continuation is assured.

Alaska, however, has some special housing needs for which S. 1922 provides.

ADDITIONAL HOUSING NEEDED

Alaska is a growing State, a trend that is certain to continue with the westward movement of our population. Nowhere is this more evident than at Anchorage and Fairbanks, where the defense of the United States is the most important business of these communities. At Fairbanks, the location of vital defense installations, a critical situation has arisen due to lack of sufficient housing for workers stationed at these bases and their families. The mayor of Fairbanks, the Honorable J. M. Ribar, has informed me that the city is losing

> all of personnel to be stationed at Clear [missile base] because of our inability to furnish standard housing of the two-, three-, and four-bedroom size at rental cost commensurate with the present salary rates.

Fairbanks, among Alaskan cities, is not alone in its need for additional housing, of course. The mayor of Ketchikan, the Honorable R. N. Hardcastle, has also emphasized the need of that city for additional housing to be obtained at more liberal terms. There are other cities, as well, where relaxation and extension of loan insurance provisions will be of great assistance in meeting housing shortages.

From Juneau, our beautiful capital city, City Manager Lauris Parker reports an urgent need for additional housing units. A survey by the Juneau Chamber of Commerce, made this year, of housing needs of the 27 Federal agencies and 18 State agencies located there showed a requirement for 195 rental units and 115 homes needed for purchase in the Juneau area. Low-cost housing is badly needed for Indian residents of the area where the abnormally high number of fires and incident loss of lives and property points up a critical situation due to inadequate housing.

Coast Guard personnel stationed at Juneau as a result of the recent establishment there of the 17th Coast Guard District are also a group in special need of rental housing. The District Commander has written concerning this as follows:

> For some years now there has been a critical shortage of adequate housing for Coast Guard military personnel in the Juneau-Douglas area. As a result, too many of our personnel have to put up with substandard, inadequate housing—too often at rentals bordering on the exorbitant. As a related problem, too many of our personnel have to seek temporary hotel accommodations on original entry into the Juneau area. Too often this temporary living goes on for an undue length of time, upward to or exceeding several months, at substantial personal expense to the individual and at prolonged discomfort to the family, especially where small children are involved. Moreover, in too many cases, when a coastguardsman is fortunate enough to find himself even inadequate housing, he is not given the usual stateside benefit of a lease, so that he is placed continually in the insecure position of being a pawn to the whims of his landlord. Unfortunately the foregoing describes the rule—not the exception.
>
> Obviously, this creates a serious morale problem—for next to seeing that his wife and kids have a full stomach, the most important need of any man is to see that his family has a secure and adequate roof over its head.

Dillingham is also a community in need of additional housing. Mr. Eldon L. Gallear, manager of the Dillingham Public Utility District, informs me that Dillingham is experiencing population growth from the return to their homes there of large numbers of Alaskans who have been working in the lower 48 States, but find the opportunities greater on the last frontier. A good fishing season last year has increased the registration of fishing boats in the Dillingham area from approximately 350 in 1960 to about 900 this year. A new boat harbor is now under construction and, if this can be enhanced with the construction of a fish-processing plant, there will be a further increase in population with the addition of many fishermen who could work a longer period of time than is now possible.

According to Mr. Gallear:

> There is already a housing shortage. People who work at Dillingham during certain periods of the year return to their homes in other parts of the State due to the critical shortage of housing. If this were alleviated these people would stay in Dillingham.

To accommodate the new residents, Dillingham could use at least 50 new housing units every 2 years.

For these cities, and all the others in a similar situation, there is particular urgency to enact the provisions of S. 1922 for Federal insurance of loans for moderate-income families and for additional public housing units.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES PROGRAM

In sparsely populated Alaska there are a number of extremely remote communities, unlike those in any other part of the United States. Nome, Bethel, Dillingham, Kotzebue, and Point Barrow, the farthest northern community in the country, are examples of small towns where the daily routine of living is far more complicated by reason of a remote location than is the case anywhere else in the country. All of these are unconnected with any other community by highway or railway. In these towns, struggling for economic development and civic improvement, may be seen most clearly the benefits of community facilities loans.

In these areas need is urgent for the construction and rehabilitation of basic community facilities—streets, water and sewage treatment systems, all the public works required by modern communities—if these towns are to thrive and grow. The increased authorizations for community facilities provided by S. 1922 will be especially welcomed in these towns.

URBAN PLANNING

In other parts of Alaska established communities are rapidly developing following discovery and production of natural resources, particularly oil. Among the most striking examples of these cities are Kenai and Soldatna, on the Kenai Peninsula, where there is a new and thriving oil and gas field. This is one of the parts of Alaska showing the most exciting promise of rich industrial development. Kenai and Soldatna, and other communities there are in need of additional housing in a hurry to accommodate the oil field workers and their families, and to make room for all the associated service and professional workers who are beginning to come there in ever-greater numbers.

Along with the evident need for construction of housing in these cities, there is a special need for the help that can come from urban planning grants. These are cities that, without this assistance, might become unsightly and badly organized. There is still time to prevent this, before population grows

and too much helter-skelter construction takes place. There could be no legislation more directly suited to the needs of these communities than the provisions of S. 1922 for increasing the Federal share of planning costs and increasing the authorization for appropriations for this purpose.

In this connection, Alaskans welcome the inclusion in S. 1922 of the open space preservation provisions of the bill. There is nothing more important to Alaskans than the enjoyment of our magnificent scenery and wilderness areas. Love of the outdoors and of nature are predominant characteristics of the people of my State. Thus, it would be regrettable if the new cities that are growing in Alaska should be ruined by a failure to preserve that which is so dear to the hearts of the inhabitants. While I recognize the particular interest of the crowded industrial eastern cities in the preservation of open spaces, I would emphasize that in Alaska there is, also, a special interest in this, and I shall enthusiastically support the provision of the bill which would make possible the saving of some open spaces around our cities.

URBAN RENEWAL

In contrast with the new communities of Kenai and Soldatna, developing with the oil industry, there are older, established cities of Alaska that present different, but also urgent, housing needs. Juneau, established before the gold rush days of 1898, and Ketchikan, the most easterly and southerly of the cities of Alaska, are communities in which much housing was constructed long ago, some of it run down and obsolete. These cities are in special need of urban renewal, and of the help from the provisions of S. 1922 for home improvement and rehabilitation loans on long terms and with low-interest rates.

At Anchorage, our metropolis, there is, as at Juneau and Ketchikan, considerable old housing and some blighted areas which will benefit greatly from increased urban planning and urban renewal assistance. Anchorage, growing fast, will also need additional help in planning and constructing public works for the community.

I support enthusiastically the provisions of S. 1922 for increased capital grant authorizations for urban renewal projects, and the home improvement and rehabilitation program, as I believe these programs have much to offer the cities of Alaska, such as Juneau and Ketchikan, as well as others where there is older housing that should be improved or cleared and rebuilt.

The increase in authorization for college housing loans in S. 1922 is especially welcomed by the University of Alaska, at College, Alaska. This school, the northernmost institution of higher education under the flag, is in the process of becoming a great and important university which will produce ever-increasing numbers of graduates to make useful contributions to the State and the Nation. The university is even now facing, along with other schools throughout the United States, a critical shortage of housing for students and faculty which threatens to retard its development. The program of college housing loans is particularly needed here, and I look forward to seeing the enactment of its proposed liberalization.

In closing, I extend my congratulations to the able chairman of the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the members of the entire committee, and its staff, for their fine service in reporting S. 1922 to the Senate. They have completed a difficult task with distinction in having brought to the Senate a housing bill which can be of exceptional benefit to the Nation.

At the conclusion of my remarks, I request unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD the text of telegrams I have received from mayors of cities of Alaska commenting on the needs of their communities for Federal housing assistance.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *June 3, 1961.*

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Reference your inquiry concerning housing needs for the City of Fairbanks. It is estimated that new homes at the rate of 50, 1961; 100, 1962; 100, 1963; 150, 1964; 100, 1965 are needed. Our greatest need at the present time is the development of two-bedroom houses and up in size for rental purposes. Especially housing developed under section 213 of title II of the Housing Act. This city is losing all of personnel to be stationed at Clear because of our inability to furnish standard housing of the two-, three-, and four-bedroom size at rental cost consummate with the present salary rates. Additional housing is needed for personnel to be added to the university staff. By 1965, our estimated needs will exceed 500 units.

J. M. RIBAR,
Mayor, City of Fairbanks.

JUNE 3, 1961.

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.:

During past 2 years new housing starts in Ketchikan has come to almost standstill although numerous existing houses overage and substandard plus fact Ketchikan continue growth in population. Initiation State ferry system next year will create additional housing demands. Believe broadened FHA housing program with lower down payments and interest rates would stimulate housing construction to meet population growth and to replace worn out structure.

R. M. HARDCASTLE,
Mayor.

SOLDATNA, ALASKA, *June 6, 1961.*

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Soldatna needs not less than 45 homes by end of year some 100 house trailers of all description being used in area many of these unsuitable.

BURTON CARVER,
Mayor.

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA, *June 6, 1961.*

ERNEST GRUENING,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Statement on housing needs urgent continuing program for assistance in urban planning studies within area covered by Anchorage metropolitan general plan approximately 140 square miles need for low rent housing in city of Anchorage preliminary estimate of 100 dwelling units low interest rate bank loans and continuing need for relocation assistance urban renewal programs Anchorage city general plane document complete July 31 will forward.

JOHN W. AULT,
Director of Planning.

CORDOVA, ALASKA, *June 5, 1961.*

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Cordova has about 75 severely substandard housing units and could use an additional 25.

Mayor LOUIS D. BANTA,
City of Cordova.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have talked with the distinguished Senator from Alaska regarding his proposed amendment to S. 1922. I think it is perfectly in line with the changes we have heretofore made in bills because of high costs in Alaska. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate resume consideration of the housing bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment, offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], be temporarily laid aside in order that the amendment to be offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 42 it is proposed to substitute the following for lines 5 and 6: "(2) striking in paragraph (5) '($2,500 per room in the case of Alaska or in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families),' and inserting in lieu thereof '($3,000 per room in the case of Alaska, or in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families $3,000 per room and $3,500 per room in the case of Alaska)';"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is the pending question now the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the Javits amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the time required for the quorum call be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1962 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

AIRCRAFT

For aircraft: For the Army, $211,000,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,585,600,000; for the Air Force, $3,670,200,000; *Provided, however,* That $337,000,000 of the foregoing $3,670,200,000 is authorized only for the procurement of B–52 and/or B–58 bomber aircraft.

MISSILES

For missiles: For the Army, $550,800,000; for the Navy, $606,400,000; for the Marine Corps, $27,000,000; for the Air Force, $2,792,000,000.

NAVAL VESSELS

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $2,925,000,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes on the amendment which is the pending business. When we terminated the discussion on the amendment on Friday last a number of questions had arisen with respect to the amendment I am proposing, which I would like to answer today. Before I do so I would like again to put the whole question of the amendment in focus, as follows.

Nothing has been done for a considerable period of time for what is properly called moderate income housing, although a great many efforts have been made in that regard for some time. Moderate income housing relates to the housing needs of those people who live in families whose income is lower than what is needed to rent or buy reasonable, respectable private housing, and yet whose incomes are higher than would in the main qualify them for public housing. This is a group of families which are in the so-called gap. This is a very serious and large gap, as the evidence shows. Hence, the great need for doing something to meet the housing requirements of those families.

To give some idea of the size of the gap, I call the attention of the Senate to page 88 of the committee report on the bill, which reflects the testimony of J. Clarence Davies, chairman of the Housing and Redevelopment Board of New York City, one of the witnesses who, in 1960, supported this particular amendment when it was a separate bill before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. Davies pointed out that in a representative, very large city like New York, more than 88 percent of the city's 2,228,000 families had incomes of less than $10,000 a year, and more than 45 percent, or almost half the population, was in the $5,000 to $10,000 a year bracket.

Yet when we consider rental housing, we find that three-quarters of all the units of private housing for rental completed in New York in the last year for which figures were available, which was 1958, came in the area of between $85 and $125 a month, with an average monthly rental per room of $47. The normal family can hardly get along with less than four rooms, so that would cost an average of $155 a month per dwelling unit. It is normally assumed that in the area of 20 to 25 percent is what shelter ought to cost. It can be readily seen, therefore, that shelter is not available strictly from the private enterprise standpoint in a great city like New York to very much more than one-half the population, considering the income level of those families.

Also, again as bearing upon the very large area with which we are dealing here, I call attention to the family income brackets which are shown at the bottom of page 83 of the committee report.

Taking a representative city like Philadelphia, we find that the income of 32 percent of the people fell between $4,000 minimum and $6,000 maximum, again in the representative year—in this case, 1956. That is the gap about which we speak. Normally, it is estimated that about 40 percent of the population, either in terms of population which rents or population which buys its dwelling space, fits into that gap. This is the area which the amendment which I have proposed seeks to fill in terms of making housing available. This is also the area, I may say, in which the administration, in its so-called 40-year, no downpayment plan is trying to fill, as well.

The big difference between my amendment and the administration's measure is this: My amendment proposes to inaugurate a program in which Government credit is utilized to get low interest rates through in order to make available the housing at the costs which the modern income families can afford to pay. This is done under my amendment by collective financing; that is, by the issuance of bonds by Government corporations. This represents a fund of mortgage money available for this kind of housing construction. The difference is that the administration plan proposes that the traditional FHA mortgage procedure shall be undertaken, except that it provides a very long term for those mortgages—40 years—and proposes to give, if it can, a below-market interest rate of the individual mortgages, knowing that if it did give a below-market interest rate, those mortgages are not very marketable. The administration plan sets up a very large fund in the Federal National Mortgage Association which will insure the purchase of that kind of mortgage, which it is proposed to dispose of at a rate below the market rate.

There is great opposition to the 40-year, no-downpayment mortgage for many reasons. The primary reason for the opposition is the very element of no downpayment and the fact that the Government, so far as I can see now, will have to take over the whole mortgage by its acquisition in the Federal National Mortgage Association; whereas under my plan the Government would guarantee the securities—the bonds—which would be issued by a limited-dividend corporation, a federally started corporation, a U.S. Government corporation, and the responsibility for financing would be borne by the public at large.

This is a very serious difference, because my amendment involves very much smaller sums of money insofar as the Government is concerned. Yet with the same leverage and accomplishment for building moderate income housing, it also involves an investment by the individual homeowner which gives the same sense of responsibility in connection with the whole enterprise. Let us analyze that one step further.

My amendment creates a system which is analogous to the public housing system in terms of the marketability of the bonds, which are the fundamental financing, but with this enormous difference. For public housing an annual subsidy, voted by Congress, is necessary on the part of the U.S. Government in order to sustain these properties year in and year out; under the amendment

which I offer, in the moderate income field no such subsidy is necessary or called for. The first part of the enterprise—that is, the flotation of the bonds themselves—does the whole job. In New York a very fine market for public housing bonds was found. This assures, I think, a very fine and ready market for the bonds for moderate income housing.

The big difference, it seems to me, is reflected by what the committee itself says with respect to its own 40-year no-downpayment plan. The committee says on page 3 of the report:

> Section 101 of the bill would authorize on a temporary, experimental basis a new FHA mortgage insurance program which would assist private enterprise to provide homeownership for families of moderate income.

On the following page, page 4, the report reads:

> The committee, therefore, feels that it would be wise to treat this new program as an experimental one which could be reviewed by the Congress before extension beyond July 1, 1963.

The program which I have proposed as an amendment is not an experimental one; on the contrary, it is tried and true and has been found eminently satisfactory for the very need which we are trying to serve. I emphasize that point. I realize that not many Senators are in the Chamber now, and that this amendment will not come to a vote until tomorrow. Nonetheless, I hope that Senators will read the RECORD. I hope very much—and I say this especially to Senators on the majority side—that Senators will disentangle their thinking from the cliche that since the bill is an administration proposal, it is therefore right. It is not necessarily right as a matter of course simply because it is an administration program. I think I can claim, in all honesty, to be as much in favor of housing as any other Senator. I can be just as grateful to the administration as any other Senator for opening the door to a moderate income housing program, which is what the 40 year, no-downpayment plan is. But I say: Go a step further: Go through the door. If there is a better plan, which is not experimental, which has been tried and found entirely workable, as the one I propose is in the State of New York, why reject it simply because it is a plan which is not uniquely the administration's idea and initiative.

I respectfully submit, without charging anyone with bad faith, because that is quite unnecessary in a situation of this character—and I am sure bad faith does not exist—nonetheless, I have the deep feeling that if the program which I propose as an amendment had been first thought of by the administration, that is the one they would have proposed to Congress, because it is so consistent with the very point and principle which the administration makes for a moderate income housing program.

On Friday last I placed in the RECORD an extraordinary record of performance. Mind you, Mr. President, this has all taken place since 1955, so we have for consideration a very current, extraordinary record of performance made by the very program which I present as an alternative to the one provided for in the bill. This record has been made in the State of New York, both on the State level and on the city level. Over 30,000 units—and this is to be found at page 78 of the committee report—have either built or are in the process of construction in the city of New York and in the State of New York, and approximately $425 million in mortgage funds has been committed. In other words, those bonds have been floated and have been bought by the public; otherwise, the money would not be available. The enormous difference is that if the administration's program had been tried, for the same 30,000 units, it would have required $427 million—the amount of mortgage money involved in the New York program—for FNMA, whereas my proposal will require only the "seed" money of $100 million, with which the Federal Government will get a limited-dividend housing corporation started, and will get back its money just as soon as the enterprise accumulates a sufficient reserve. It will do that fairly quickly, because it will charge one-half of 1 percent for exactly that purpose, in connection with its operation.

So the difference is the difference between a program which the administration frankly labels experimental and a program which has been tried and has been found extremely satisfactory and successful in a great State which has every conceivable housing condition which can be found in the entire Nation, because New York is truly the Empire State, and this kind of construction has taken place both in New York City and in smaller cities in New York, and all have been very successful—and also at a small proportion of the cost of the plan proposed by the administration, because it is a 40-year, no-downpayment plan. At the same time, our program avoids the problems and the issues which arise in connection with the 40-year, no-downpayment plan, because of the fact that it is felt very strongly by many Members of the Senate that to have no downpayment would be very unwise and would jeopardize the security of the enterprise itself.

Finally—and this is very important—under my plan there will be very representative and very responsible entities which will promote this type of housing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. For example, Mr. President, in the city of New York and in the State of New York, trade unions are promoting these projects, and tenant cooperatives are promoting them, and there is the possibility that employers will do precisely the same thing—and also organizations or associations of almost every kind or character. Thus, there is a ready receptacle for those who have a common interest in providing housing for moderate-income families.

In addition, there is in New York a pattern by means of which those promoting entities for this type of housing find it very convenient to seek agreements with municipalities for limited tax exemptions, which are very useful for municipalities, because they will put in place of a sterile piece of land or a slum or a blighted area, a beautiful piece of construction which in the years ahead will be a credit to the community and will be a taxpaying entity. Therefore, communities find it very convenient to allow tax exemptions or tax standstills, in order to permit such projects to get started.

In addition, the power of condemnation is allowed—it is often given, in New York—and thus materially reduces the cost of the land sites themselves.

All these features lend themselves to the plan I have proposed, but do not develop in connection with the moderate-income housing plan proposed by the administration.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from New York knows that I have been quite sympathetic with his program; but he also knows that I have had some reservations about how it would work throughout the entire country.

In order to clarify my own thinking, let me ask the Senator from New York whether the central thought is that there would be a government underwriting, central corporation——

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Something like the Home Loan Bank Board?

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What would it be in the individual States?

Mr. JAVITS. First, let me say that I have rarely been as encouraged in putting forward a new idea as I have been by the open mindedness of my colleague, the Senator from Alabama, notwithstanding the fact that he is the administration's floor manager for the bill, as I understand very well. So I am very grateful to him. Also let me say that—regardless of whatever may happen to my amendment now—I am so confident that this is the right way to proceed, that I really feel that this course will be followed, even if we do not follow it right now—although I hope we do.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from New York that many years ago I learned—as I know he did—that many times it may take several years to get a good idea perfected into legislation. In that conection, I think, for instance, of the Small Business Investment Company Act.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, and I remember it very well—a program in connection with which the Senator from Alabama has been so outstanding a leader.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that Senator O'Mahoney, of Wyoming, offered such a bill even prior to the time when I introduced my first bill on that subject. At any rate, I introduced such a

bill 8 or 10 years before it was finally enacted; and year after year we kept hammering away on it. The Senator from New York has seen similar developments in connection with other proposals, of course.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think there is merit in the Senator's plan, and I realize that it has worked well in New York. But how many million people are there in New York?

Mr. JAVITS. Almost 17 million in the entire State.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, almost 17 million persons in a relatively compact area, which includes giant insurance companies, corporations, savings banks, commercial banks, mutual banks, and similar institutions—all of which constitute a climate for the organization of the machinery necessary in order to do this job.

But such a climate does not exist in Wisconsin, for instance, or in Alabama or in Arizona or in many other parts of the country. That is what I am wondering about.

Mr. JAVITS. In the first place, New York is one of the largest States, in terms of territory; and in New York there are vast reaches—as large as any in Alabama, for instance. The State of New York, from New York City to Buffalo, extends for 450 miles, approximately; and from New York City to Rouses Point, on the Canadian border, is almost the same distance. So New York State is enormous in size.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Second, Mr. President, the experience to which I have been referring is Statewide experience, not limited to New York City.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that.

Mr. JAVITS. The only climate needed is a climate of interest in a proposition of this character.

The Senator from Alabama referred to Wisconsin. I think there would be precisely the same interest there.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I referred to Wisconsin only because our friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, was standing nearby at the time.

Mr. JAVITS. I realize that.

The question is, how would it work? It would work in a relationship, first, directly between a Federal corporation and individual promoters. It is conceivable that a trade union, or an employer such as a large aircraft company or meatpacker, would find it a convenient way to develop housing, after which it would sell the housing to its employees. As I have said, trade unions have done it. It is conceivable that Masons organizations, Elks lodges, or other organizations which would have the initiative to use their organizations for this purpose to get the program off the ground would do so.

Second, my amendment provides that a State may also set up such an entity which will actually be the channel through which this kind of enterprise may get started in the State, the promoter dealing with the State agency, which in turn deals with the Federal Government.

I have little doubt that benefits would come from such an arrangement in New York State, notwithstanding the fact that we have an active and working program. Our State housing agency would make contact with the appropriate Federal housing office to develop this kind of program.

There are a number of peripheral benefits which strongly commend themselves and which have been sharply brought out by our colloquy. Instead of the untried 40-year, no-downpayment plan, here is a proposal which offers benefits in a feasible plan.

I reserve the remainder of my time, and I yield the floor.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior being considered by the Senate today contains $9,497,000 for the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo.

This memorial will soon rise on the banks of the Mississippi River as a monument to that great westward expansion which made America truly a Nation.

Funds now to be made available will bring this National Park almost to completion. But $500,000 in additional funds will be required in subsequent years.

As my colleagues know, this project has been under consideration for more than 25 years. President Roosevelt gave his full support in the mid-1930's. But the depression and the two wars long delayed its progress.

Over recent years, as the result of the fine mutual cooperation of local officials, many dedicated individuals, the National Park Service, and the entire Missouri congressional delegation, steady progress was made, to now culminate in this Senate approval today.

I take this opportunity to thank my colleagues, and all those whose hard work and cooperation have made this memorial possible.

APPOINTMENT OF GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY AS NEW AIR FORCE CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, President Kennedy is to be congratulated on the choice of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay to be the new Air Force Chief of Staff, to succeed an able and brilliant leader, Gen. Thomas D. White.

As is known to Members of the Senate, General LeMay has one of the most distinguished military careers in the history of aviation.

Except for the Congressional Medal of Honor, he has every high award this Nation can bestow both for heroism and ability, including the Distinguished Service Cross, the Distinguished Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Silver Star, the Distinguished Flying Cross with two oak leaf clusters, and the Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters.

In addition he holds many foreign decorations including the British Distinguished Flying Cross, the French Legion of Honor, and the French Croix de Guerre with Palm.

As a combat flier, LeMay led his men in their defense of freedom.

As commander of the USAF in Europe, he directed operations during the critical period of the Berlin airlift.

As head of the Strategic Air Command, more than any other man he is the one any possible aggressor has considered with apprehension during the past decade of the cold war.

Able, forthright, dedicated, America is fortunate to have his extraordinary capacity for courageous leadership recognized by the President.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that articles from the New York Times, May 23, and the Baltimore Sun, May 23, and editorials from the Washington Star, May 24, the Washington Post, May 24, and the New York Herald Tribune, May 24, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 23, 1961]

AIR CHIEF OF JET AGE: CURTIS EMERSON LEMAY

Gen. Curtis Emerson LeMay, nominated yesterday to be the next Air Force Chief of Staff, is a decidedly outdoors type, with one overriding quality: forced. Sometimes this quality makes him seem mostly gruff and dominating. At other times it makes him appear implacable and unduly blunt. It has been said that his abhorrence of socializing and small talk, together with his unrelentless advocacy of airpower, would deprive him of the top uniformed job in his service.

The stories told about him emphasize this. One story is that when a group of colonels invited him to dinner, he replied cooly: "A man should have dinner with his friends, and the commanding general has no friends."

SAID WHAT HE WANTED

At his first staff conference in Germany, in 1947, he told his officers at headquarters:

"I want to see all my key staff officers at least once a week. Don't bother to knock, just walk in. If I'm busy I'll tell you to get out. I want men of action in my organization who can make their own decisions."

Then he added, in what demonstrates one of his most admirable traits:

"If you make an occasional wrong one, I'll back you up."

While in England he once cautioned his officers with:

"Now I don't want to hear of any of you men getting into any fights with the British. But if you do, you'd better not get whipped."

What this 54-year-old disciplinarian always had in place of tact, however, was fairness. He rewarded the men who made good just as he broke those who failed. He never asked his men to do what he would not do himself.

LED DANGEROUS RAID

For instance in 1942, as commander of the 305th Bomber Group, the then Colonel LeMay declared there would be no more zigzagging evasive action to avoid antiaircraft fire; then he led the next raid over Saint-Nazaire and kept his plane on a straight course for 7 minutes through murderous enemy fire.

Curtis LeMay has been a general for 18 years, winning his brigadier's star in September 1943, after leading the first B–17 raid over Regensburg, Germany.

In August 1944, he was a major general assigned to the China-Burma-India theater. There he initiated low-level, nighttime incendiary attacks on Japanese industrial centers.

HELPED PLAN ATOMIC RAIDS

His first attack on Tokyo, in March 1945, ravaged 10 square miles in the industrial heart of the city. That August, as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces, he took a major part in planning the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

In 1947 General LeMay was assigned to command the U.S. Air Forces in Europe. He directed the Berlin airlift from June 26 to September 30, 1948, occasionally flying a transport that broke the Soviet blockade. When the blockade was ended, he was called "the one man who licked the Russians."

In October 1948, he was commanding general of the Strategic Air Command, and held the post until 1957, when he became Air Force Vice Chief of Staff.

The son of a French-Canadian ironworker, General LeMay was born in Columbus, Ohio. He was inspired by Charles A. Lindbergh's solo transatlantic flight in 1927, and became airminded.

Although eager to go to West Point, he could not get an appointment. So he took the civil engineering course at Ohio State University, working in a foundry at night, and at other jobs to get through.

He failed to graduate with his class—1928—because he lacked credits. However, he was accepted as a flying cadet and was sent to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps primary and advanced flying schools. He became a second lieutenant in January 1930.

In 1942, the chain-cigar-smoking colonel was in England as part of the 8th Air Force, one of the first Army Air Force units to enter combat in World War II.

Through his career he has been frequently apart from his wife, the former Helen Estelle Maitland, whom he married in 1934. But she, also a believer in keeping busy, took over the leadership of the Dependents Assistance program in 1948. They have one daughter, Patricia.

[From the Baltimore Sun, May 23, 1961]

LEMAY NOMINATED TO HEAD AIR FORCE

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, May 22.—Gen. Curtis E. LeMay, the most distinguished of American combat fliers of World War II, today was at last assured his long-delayed arrival at the top of the U.S. Air Force.

On June 30 he will be moved from his present No. 2 post as Vice Chief of Staff, to that of Chief of Staff.

SMITH TO GET SECOND POST

He thereby will succeed Gen. Thomas D. White, who has held that high office for the customary period of 4 years, General White then planning retirement.

Into the No. 2 post will be advanced—by coincidence on his 53d birthday—Gen. Frederic H. Smith, Jr., who now commands the U.S. Air Force in Europe.

If almost anyone in the Air Force—or, indeed, in any of the other armed services—were asked to name the outstanding Air Force officer, a combination of Mr. Bomber and Mr. Missile, he would promptly reply "Curt LeMay."

One woud guess that only LeMay's unrestrained plain speaking has kept him thus long out of the top post. One also would guess that even in that exalted position he will go right on expressing himself plainly and vehemently.

FIRST FIGHTER PILOT

LeMay was born in Ohio in 1906. Soon after graduating from Ohio State University he was enrolled as a flying cadet and began his steady climb in proficiency and in grade—first as a fighter pilot but quickly moving over into bombing.

In 1937 he participated in the Army Air Force's initial mass-flight demonstration with the new B–17 planes, over South America, and again in 1938, winning the MacKay Trophy at that time.

With World War II underway in Europe, he pioneered the two major transatlantic flight routes from South America to Africa and from North America to Great Britain, by which American-made planes were rushed to the Royal Air Force.

TOOK GROUP TO EUROPE

In 1942 he was given command of the 305th Bomber Group, which he took to Britain in 1943.

Thereupon he began development of both formation procedures and bombing techniques which proved immensely successful in the mass bombing of German-occupied Europe.

Having devised his theories, LeMay unfailingly proved them in practice by leading the earliest formations in their difficult and hazardous missions.

CONTINUOUSLY REVISED

These techniques were revised continuously to cope with newly disclosed dangers and to circumvent the German defensive techniques.

Thus, when the depleted German Air Force devised the trick of delaying part of the interception until the allied bombers, often crippled and always short of gas, were returning from their mission, LeMay had his formations give up the usual return route across France—they flew in relative safety to bases in north Africa.

Having established the practices of mass bombing for the B–17's, and demonstrated them repeatedly until the Normandy invasion was an assured success, General LeMay was transferred to the Pacific, where he set up still more advanced techniques for the new and more powerful B–29 formations.

LED JAPANESE RAIDS

It was these which he then continued to lead, from Guam and the Marianas, in the enormous raids over Japan.

The war over, LeMay, now Chief of Staff of Air Forces in the Pacific, was ordered to duty in Washington. Typically, he piloted his own plane all the way from Hokkaido, Japan, to Chicago, thereby setting a distance and speed record.

He was given the new post of Deputy Chief of the Air Staff for Research and Development, but in 1947 sought and was given another field command—this time in Europe, where he stayed long enough to organize the plans for the Berlin airlift.

[From the Washington Star, May 24, 1961]

FIGHTING FLIER

The Air Force has picked its toughest "boy" to be Chief of Staff, and this is as it should be.

When President Kennedy nominated Gen. Curtis E. LeMay for this top command he was not reaching out for a chairborne general or a military diplomat. He was picking a do-it-yourself flier, whose 30 years-plus in the air service has been marked by a consistent pattern of energy, action and accomplishment.

The stories of General LeMay's brusqueness and toughness are many and colorful. They can be documented. But these qualities have been only incidental to his dedicated passion for making the Air Force a constantly better and stronger fighting outfit. World War II gave him a worthy stage and the formation procedures and bombing techniques which contributed so much to victory in Europe were largely the product of LeMay planning and personal experimentation. In the vast area of the Pacific, he did the same thing with bigger planes and their more devastating capacity for destruction. For almost a decade, from 1948 to 1957, he was boss of the Strategic Air Command. It is hardly an exaggeration to say that when he took command he picked up the outfit and shook it by the neck, and in the years that followed he drove it tirelessly toward his own concept of what the Nation needed to deliver massive retaliation.

Since 1957, General LeMay has been relatively calm and noncontroversial as Vice Chief of Staff. There has been some speculation that that would be the end of the line for "Old Iron Pants"—not because he doesn't have what it takes to be No. 1 but because he might rub some brass, civilian or military, the wrong way. Now he is being moved up, and this is good—good for the Air Force and for the Nation's security.

[From the Washington Post, May 24, 1961]

LEMAY AS CHIEF

Associates of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay are amazed, it is said, over the transformation that has gradually come over the once blunt and forbidding airman. Whereas this gruff general with the familiar cigar used to have virtually no small talk, he now exudes cordiality at chance meetings in the Pentagon.

In others this might be a sign of affectation or too much exposure to Washington banalities. In General LeMay it is an indication of the much more profound broadening and maturing that have taken place during his 3½ years as Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force under the able and balanced Gen. Thomas D. White. This capacity for growth is no doubt a significant factor in President Kennedy's decision to nominate him as the next Air Force Chief of Staff.

It has not been so long since General LeMay was identified rather bombastically with championship of one particular doctrine to the virtual exclusion of all others—namely, the massive strategic deterrent. He seemed at times to couple this advocacy with a narrow insularity and chauvinism.

No one questioned his competence; he was an extremely capable Chief of the Strategic Air Command at a time when the security of the United States depended very largely on manned bombers. It was his job to be tough, and he was. The questions arose over his ability to understand other views and to tolerate other services, or even the place of tactical air and missiles in the Air Force.

No one ought to conclude that General LeMay has suddenly become a docile and unaggressive fellow. He remains a tenacious fighter for his viewpoint, and he scarcely has a bedside manner. But he has carefully avoided braggadocio in public, he has demonstrated loyalty to decisions once made and he has developed a capacity to work with others in mutual respect. Moreover, he has cultivated a valuable balance in looking to the steady, long-pull needs of the Air Force. Under the direction of a civilian official of

the caliber of Secretary Zuckert, General LeMay should do well.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 24, 1961]

COLORFUL NEW CHIEF FOR THE AIR FORCE

Appointment of Gen. Curtis E. LeMay as the new Air Force Chief of Staff comes as no surprise. The vigorous, cigar-smoking former Strategic Air Command Chief had long been rumored as most likely successor to the scholarly Gen. Thomas D. White.

One thing certain is that the Air Force is going to have a colorful leader, probably the most colorful member of the Joint Chiefs. By temperament a man of action, he thrives on the legends that have grown up around him.

The new Air Force Chief is also a firm believer in the necessity for manned aircraft even in a dawning age of missiles; one who still considers it important to have a pilot up there where he can make decisions. He is counted as a tough administrator and a strong advocate of what he thinks is right, though perhaps less inclined than General White to contemplative deliberation in arriving at his choices.

He also is counted as a man of intelligence and a hard worker—qualities his new job will give him plenty of chance to display.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to associate myself with the remarks just made by the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri concerning the appointment of General LeMay as Chief of Staff of the Air Force. I feel he is one of the greatest military men in this country and that he will make one of the greatest Chiefs of Staff the Air Force has ever had.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from South Carolina, who is one of the most knowledgeable men in this body on national defense.

The distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska, on hearing I was going to refer to General LeMay today, said he too would like to add his approval of this worthy appointment.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, only 27 years ago, Congress initiated legislation to stretch the interpretation of the welfare clause of the Constitution just enough to ease the National Government into the field of housing. It was a modest and respectable beginning. The first program was soundly designed and self-sustaining. It operated on the principle of reinforcing and strengthening private capacity to provide housing.

The FHA program has proved successful. Nearly one-third of all private nonfarm housing now comes within the loan guarantee programs of FHA, or its warborn cousin, the veterans loan guarantee program.

Mr. President, there is no evidence that anyone was overly concerned with the precedent set by the ultra vires character of the first injection of the National Government into this area of endeavor. My research reveals no demand that the undertakings in the housing field await amendment of the Constitution. After all, FHA was a sound program, and the need for it could be demonstrated. The dire consequences of that innocently appearing deviation from the Constitution are now staring us in the face in the form of the omnibus housing bill of 1961. S. 1922 is a far cry from the sound program with which the unconstitutional excursion into the field of housing by the National Government was begun.

The country was hardly given time to become accustomed to the sound, but unconstitutional, program of FHA before the concept of subsidy was enacted in the Public Housing Authority program in 1937. While FHA was a departure from the letter of the Constitution, PHA, based on the concept of Government subsidy, flagrantly violates both the letter and the spirit, of not only the Constitution, but of the totality of the concept of Government which the Constitution sought to implement. FHA was the conditioner with which the constitutional defense was breached, thus leaving the concept of subsidy as the sole remaining major obstacle to be overcome by PHA in order to demolish the lid to the Pandora's box of National Government programs to usurp, confuse and conquer the field of housing.

Unlike FHA, its predecessor, PHA was neither sound, self-sustaining nor respectable. Rather than reinforcing and strengthening the capacity of the private segment of our economy to provide housing, PHA competes with and fetters private capacity. Due to the competition, or potential competition, from low-rent subsidized PHA projects, private owners of low-priced rental housing found themselves unable to economically operate and maintain, and unable to finance needed repairs of, their rental property. Thereby did PHA substantially contribute to the creation of inadequate and unsanitary housing, to which we refer as slums.

Having contributed to the creation and perpetuation of slum housing through PHA in 1937, the National Government, rather than acknowledging the error of its ways through repeal of PHA, pursued the unsound course of subsidy even further with the urban renewal program enacted in 1949. This program, also based on subsidy, was theoretically designed to correct and eliminate the slums which PHA had helped to create and perpetuate. The displacement of persons incident to urban renewal, however, served as a pretext for more PHA housing, which, in turn, contributed to the creation of additional slums and greater efforts to expand urban renewal programs. The monstrosity reported by the committee to the Senate in S. 1922 is the vicious offspring of this self-defeating circle.

From the meager beginning in 1934 with the loan guarantee program of FHA, the National Government has, with the omnibus housing bill of 1961, gone the full circle to the acceptance and usurpation of the responsibility for the provision of shelter for all Americans from the private sector of our economy where it belongs. Even the soundly designed program of loan guarantees under FHA would, under this bill, be sacrificed to the poisonous concept of subsidy; for by no other means could a program which authorizes the guarantee of no downpayment, 40-year loans be sustained.

The bill before us not only is at odds with the Constitution and based on the untenable concept of subsidy, but also ignores all practical considerations demonstrated by experience in the housing field. Mr. President, the extension of FHA guarantees for no downpayment, 40-year loans will make the FHA another creator of slums. It requires more than the financial ability to merely make timely mortgage payments for one to successfully exercise homeownership. Other costs are involved for maintenance and preservation of the property itself. The terms which are provided in this bill for FHA guarantees will encourage and persuade those without the financial ability to exercise homeownership to embark on the purchase of properties which they cannot maintain and many of which will, in due course, fall into the category of inadequate and unsanitary housing, which will no doubt inspire in this body renewed pleas for new programs of slum clearance.

Admittedly, Mr. President, it is difficult to conceive of anything additional which could be included in what is loosely referred to as the housing legislation considered by the Congress. Already it has gone far beyond the field of housing and now overlaps into the field of education with assistance to colleges, and into the field of community facilities including almost every conceivable form of public works. One who did not know better, and who attempted to judge by the provisions of this bill, would think Americans had truly been reduced to desperate straits for shelter and are now living, at least in part, in public transportation vehicles; for included within this bill is a program for subsidy to mass transportation systems for cities

and towns. One might also believe that the park benches are overcrowded, for there is even money sought to be authorized in this bill for the acquisition by communities of open space.

Mr. President, the doing of this much violence to the traditional concept of the division of responsibilities between government and private individuals is neither easy nor cheap to accomplish. The chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, which reported this bill, estimates the outlay authorized to exceed $9 billion. It involves the authorization for housing programs of almost as much money as has been authorized by Congress in the 27 years since Congress took its first timid step over the constitutional boundary with FHA in 1934. We do not here propose to pay for our own iniquities, however, Mr. President. Most of the costs of this bill will be in the form of deficit financing and added to the already burdensome national debt. This debt will be visited upon the backs of posterity, so that future generations will not only be deprived of the splendid heritage, based on freedom and initiative which our forefathers devised to us; but those future generations will also have to bear the financial burden created as a cost for destroying their heritage. It is an ignoble legacy, which I for one emphatically decline to join in devising. I would not contribute to the justification of the charge by future generations that seldom have so many owed so much because of so few sensible people in our generation.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], from the time on the bill, such time as he needs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

OPEN SPACE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to voice my strong support for title VI of the housing bill, S. 1922, containing the major provisions of the open space bill, S. 858, I introduced on February 9 of this year.

I will say frankly that when I introduced this bill I anticipated a rather lengthy incubation period. But in his housing message to the Congress on March 9, the President spoke very feelingly about the urgency of the problem when he stated:

> Land is the most precious resource of the metropolitan area. The present patterns of haphazard suburban development are contributing to a tragic waste in the use of a vital resource now being consumed at an alarming rate. Open space must be reserved to provide parks and recreation, conserve water and other natural resources, prevent building in undesirable locations, prevent erosion and floods, and avoid the wasteful extension of public services.

While calling for the development of a long-range program and policy for dealing with this problem, he also declared that the problem was "so urgent that we must make a start now."

I might say, parenthetically, that much the same sort of situation applies in the field of mass transportation. We need a careful study for the development of a sound long-range program, but the problem here is also urgent—perhaps more urgent than the disappearance of open space around our urban areas—and we could and should make a start now to help meet some of the rapidly deteriorating and emergency situations and also to help gather actual experience for the formulation of a long-range program.

To document the urgency of the open space problem, I should like to refer to the statement of Mr. Max Wehrly, executive director of the Urban Land Institute and an authority on the subject of urban land uses, made at the Soil Science Symposium in New York last year. In summarizing why open space preservation is becoming progressively more urgent, he said:

> In a recent study of metropolitan growth projections for the United States, our research director has projected that by the year 2000 the United States may contain some 320 million inhabitants—over four times its population at the beginning of the present century. Ten gigantic supermetropolitan areas may hold 107 million people—one-third of the Nation's population. Another 40 percent of the American people may reside in about 285 metropolitan areas having populations between 100,000 and 5 million. Cities and urban areas of smaller size will contain about one-half of the remaining population. Urbanites will compose about 85 percent of our national population.
>
> In the face of the explosive growth of our urban areas, the chronology of the diminution of open space in and near urban centers continues, as for instance, in Portland, Oreg., where proposed highways would pass through 21 city parks; in Buffalo, N.Y., where a library was built on a golf course and a veterans hospital in a park; and in Andalusia, Ala., where the entire city square was black-topped for automobile parking. So much for the magnitude of the problem.

The proposed legislation I introduced and the proposed legislation approved by the Banking and Currency Committee was in response to this problem, in response perhaps to the "unfelt needs" of our future generations, who will not be able to undo our present reckless use of land around our cities and towns.

Despite the short time which elapsed between introduction of this proposed legislation and the holding of hearings, a wide variety of individuals and organizations gave their endorsement or informal support to the bill, including the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the American Recreation Society, the Natural Resources Council, the American Municipal Association, the National Association of County Officials, the National Association of Homebuilders, the AFL–CIO, the American Institute of Planners, the American Institute of Architects, the National Housing Conference, the American Society of Landscape Architects, the National Recreation Association, the American Institute of Park Executives, the Audubon Society, the Wildlife Management Institute, the Cooperative League, the National Farmers Union, the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, and the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

I noticed that during the Housing Banking and Currency Subcommittee hearings, a representative of the National Association of County Officials testified:

> We had a survey made quite recently in order to determine what the present feeling was among the counties of the Nation on this matter and an analysis of the results showed that 37 counties, which reported with a total population of 17 million persons or 10 percent of the total national population, favored grants for open-space acquisition whereas 11 counties representing a little over 1 million persons did not favor this type of legislation.

Mr. President, I was much pleased by the strong support that developed for this proposed legislation during the housing hearings, but I never felt quite so sure that this was good, sound legislation as the day a young man came to my office as part of his research project on this subject. It turned out that he was a graduate student at a well-known eastern university, and during the course of the conversation he allowed that he was a Republican and that he did not much care for a lot of the urban-oriented Federal aid programs designed to overcome past mistakes in urban development. He said:

> But I will say this: This is one of the few bills I've seen that tries to prevent these mistakes from occurring.

Mr. President, the process of urbanization is covering over more than a million acres of unspoiled land each year, pushing back nature's horizons farther and farther from the homes of more and more urban and suburban families.

This process of urban sprawl leapfrogging all over the countryside is causing severe recreational and conservation problems.

The effect of urban sprawl and readily accessible recreation areas is evident and needs no elaboration. I would, however, like to quote a statement on the relationship to conservation made in the Senate Document No. 59, printed in the 86th Congress on "Facility Needs: Soil and Water Conservation Research":

> The rapid expansion of housing subdivisions and shopping center developments around most urban areas has created serious conservation problems that are of direct concern to conservationists working in these areas. The need for the development of methods whereby sediment production from the areas can be controlled was stressed at many of the public hearings. The current practice of stripping the vegetation from areas being developed, as well as changing the drainage paterns of these areas, is extremely detrimental to downstream water management control structures. The effect of urban development upon the hydrologic characteristics of the watersheds being developed has not been adequately recognized by zoning authorities.

Recently New Jersey's secretary of agriculture, Mr. Phillip Alampi, elaborated on the consequences of urbanization on conservation in testimony to the House Appropriations Committee.

He cited a study by the Rutgers University planning service indicating that New Jersey can expect to lose one-quarter of a million acres to urban encroachment by 1975, and commented:

> It is not so much the loss of land with which we are concerned—although this is a serious problem, but rather what happens to

adjacent lands, rivers, and streams, when the vegetation denuding process starts on 105 million acres.

Scattered research studies from various areas of the Northeast show that the results of the urbanization process could be staggering. One study in the Rock Creek watershed in neighboring Maryland, for example, shows that when 5 to 10 acres of land were cleared for a housing development, it resulted in the production of 100 tons of sediment per acre during the construction period. In Pennsylvania, the highway department found that the costs of maintaining roads for 1 year in the Brandywine watershed varies from $9 per 1,500 feet to $112 per 1,500 feet, depending upon how well sediment production was controlled on the adjacent lands. On the Stony Brook watershed in New Jersey, accelerated erosion in construction areas where gas pipelines are being laid has already seriously threatened the usefulness of several new lakes and flood retention reservoirs.

Two conclusions may be drawn from the evidence:

1. The urbanization process is underway and will continue.

2. If we want to protect our soil and water resources we must meet the challenges of urbanization.

Mr. President, the challenges of urbanization bring me to the central purpose of the proposed legislation—to help curb urban sprawl and encourage more orderly patterns of urban development.

Important as the recreational, conservation, and scenic purposes of this legislation are, it is not enough to merely sprinkle a few parks and open spaces around the urban areas.

Open space should be an integral part of the plans for urban development, located so as to enhance the total environment, to help prevent sprawl, to halt the spread of deterioration, to provide contrast and relief from urban development, as well as to meet our recreation and conservation needs.

Hopefully an effective open space program will also encourage greater efforts toward more imaginative patterns of urban land use, to come up with some alternative to urban sprawl.

I emphasize this point because it is eivdent that an open-space program even much more ambitious than the one now proposed will scarcely be sufficient to secure sufficient open space if we continue to lay out endless seas of subdivisions in the same manner we have been.

Not only does this low-density sprawl absorb open-space land at an alarming rate, it also forces heavy additional and unnecessary expenditures to provide all the services—from roads to schools to sewers—needed to accommodate residential development spread thinly over large areas of the land.

More imaginative development of land in the urban areas—perhaps in the form of clusters, corridors or new satellite cities—would serve a twofold purpose: it would economize on the cost of providing a multitude of community services, and it would reduce the rate at which open-space land is absorbed.

While there is no magic in providing open space to encourage more economic forms of land use, it can be a vital aid if the preservation of open space is based on genuinely comprehensive areawide planning. At least it can be said that without an open-space program, communities and homebuilders will tend to offer the next best thing: to provide as much land to each homebuyer as the zoning law and the market will permit, no matter how seriously this practice accelerates the process of sprawl.

With an open-space program the Administrator can fill an important educational role in pointing out the advantages of counterbalancing the preservation of open space with higher density development, as was proposed for the 516-acre Whitney estate in old Westbury, Long Island, for example.

Here the designer, Victor Gruen, suggested that instead of building the 250 houses permitted with a 2-acre zone, the same number of buildings be clustered on about 6 percent of the land in a series of two- or three-family "town" houses, each with its own private patio. The proposed cluster development would have retained 94 percent of the very lovely land in its natural state and it would have reduced the land development costs—for earthwork, paving, drainage, sewers, utilities and so forth—by approximately $1.6 million.

Mr. President, we have long needed tools to help our communities grow and develop as they truly wish instead of as they are driven by forces over which they have no control. Title VI provides one such tool, and I earnestly hope the Senate will accept it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point several resolutions, letters, and other material, as well as an article from the January 28 issue of the Saturday Evening Post, by Charlton Ogburn, Jr., on "The Battle To Save the Trees"; an address by Frederick Gutheim, president of the Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, to the conference of the National Wildlife Federation here in Washington on March 8; and an article from the May 28 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald.

There being no objection, the resolutions, letters, and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE,
Emporia, Kans., May 16, 1961.

Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: At the recent meeting of the Kansas Academy of Science at Manhattan, Kans., a resolution favoring passage of Senate bill S. 858 was passed. As secretary of the Kansas Academy, I have been instructed to send a copy of this resolution to you. The resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas Senate bill S. 858, 87th Congress, 1st session, authorizes the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency to assist States and their political subdivisions in preserving open-space land in and around urban areas which, for economic, social, conservation, recreational, or esthetic reasons, is essential to the proper long-range development and welfare of the Nation's urban areas and their suburban and rural environs; and

"Whereas rapidly expanding urban areas in Kansas need assistance in preserving open space in and around those areas: Therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Kansas Academy of Science in annual convention on May 5, 1961, at Manhattan, Kans., That bill S. 858 be enacted; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary send copies of this resolution to each member of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the U.S. Senate, to each of the two U.S. Senators from Kansas, and to each of the Congressmen from Kansas."

We hope that this resolution will warrant your serious attention.

Very truly yours,

GILBERT A. LEISMAN,
Secretary, Kansas Academy of Science.

RESOLUTION OF 10TH ANNUAL GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON RECREATION AND PARKS, APRIL 20, 21, 22, 1961, CARVEL HALL, ANNAPOLIS, MD.

Whereas Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, our conference keynote speaker, has introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate devising a new approach to the problem of providing open spaces where people live, and

Whereas his bill, S. 858, attempts to implement the concern for open spaces of the State of Maryland's 10th Annual Governor's Conference on Recreation and Parks, by providing for low-matching grants to help municipalities and regional agencies acquire land in and around urban areas for recreation, conservation, historic, scenic, or esthetic purposes; and

Whereas his bill tends not only to discourage urban sprawl, but to encourage more imaginative and economical forms of residential development by linking the preservation of open spaces to the comprehensive planning process in the urban areas: Now, therefore, this 10th Annual Governor's Conference on Recreation and Parks hereby endorses this type of progressive legislative endeavor to provide not only a cooperative and orderly procedure for acquiring and preserving open spaces, but making our recreation and park areas serve the larger effort of improving the whole quality of urban and metropolitan living.

The conference further directs the general chairman, John P. Hewitt, to forward a copy of this resolution to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS and additional copies to Senators J. GLENN BEALL and JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, in support of this legislative effort.

JOHN P. HEWITT,
General Chairman.

RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE TOWNSHIP OF FRANKLIN, N.J.

Whereas the township of Franklin, county of Somerset, State of New Jersey, is at the edge of the ever-expanding New York metropolitan area; and

Whereas the population of the township of Franklin has doubled in each decade since 1940, thereby creating severe problems of taxation and planning for sound community development; and

Whereas the present areas of open space land that now exist in the township of Franklin will, without prompt preservation for future generations, soon be developed; and

Whereas the financial resources of the township of Franklin do not permit acquisition of necessary open space land to help provide sufficient recreational, conservation and scenic areas for future generations and to assist in promoting the sound and economic development of the township: Now, therefore be it, and it hereby is

Resolved by the township council of the township of Franklin, county of Somerset, State of New Jersey, That the Legislatures of the United States of America and the State of New Jersey, the Somerset County Board of Chosen Freeholders and the Somerset County Park Commission be, and they hereby are, petitioned to enact an open space land program that will give assistance to the township of Franklin in the provision and preservation of adequate open space land for sound community development; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the national, State and county representatives of the township of Franklin.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY
PLANNING COMMISSION,
Portland, Oreg., April 24, 1961.

Mr. BERNARD F. HILLENBRAND,
Executive Director,
National Association of County Officials,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HILLENBRAND: At the regular meeting of April 18, 1961, the Multnomah County Planning Commission unanimously acted to endorse the principles contained in S. 858 to authorize the Administrator of the Housing and Home Financing Agency to assist the States and their political subdivisions in preserving open space land in and around urban areas.

The Multnomah County Planning Commission is responsible for the preparation of plans to guide the growth and development of the unincorporated area of the county outside the city of Portland. This portion of the county comprises some 350 square miles and has a population of 150,000 persons, an increase of 54 percent since 1954. The county planning program was established for this area in 1953. Since that time, the board of county commissioners, upon recommendation of the planning commission, has adopted a development pattern (master plan), a comprehensive zoning ordinance, a subdivision regulation and a building code. As a part of this work, in 1955 the county established a park and recreation program, and to date has purchased 26 parks as part fulfillment of the present and future recreational needs of the community.

During this period of rapid growth and development, the planning commission has become aware of the very great need for adequate measures to preserve open space for recreation, agriculture, and as a positive device in structuring the form of the future community. The planning commission, after examination of the proposals, recognizes S. 858 as a significant contribution toward this end.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. BALDWIN,
Planning Director.

S. 1495

An act to add chapter 13 (commencing with section 7000) to division 7, title 1 of the Government Code, relating to the preservation and acquisition of open land in and around urban areas and making an appropriation therefor

SECTION 1. Chapter 13 (commencing with sec. 7000) is added to division 7 of title 1 of the Government Code, to read:

"CHAPTER 13. OPEN SPACE AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

"7000. (a) The legislature finds and declares that a combination of physical, social, economic, and governmental forces have caused, and are continuing to cause, rapid and extensive expansion of the State's urban areas, and that this expansion has frequently been of a scattered and sprawling character thereby causing or threatening severe economic and environmental problems for the inhabitants of these urban areas, including air and water pollution, flood damage, blight and slums, and loss of valuable open land for recreation and other community and areawide purposes.

"(b) The legislature further finds and declares that premature, scattered or sprawling urban development is a matter of statewide concern in that many recent studies and historical trends indicate that more than 90 percent of the State's inhabitants live in urban and suburban areas comprising 10 metropolitan population concentrations and that the loss of open land in and around metropolitan areas is a major development problem within the State.

"(c) The legislature further finds and declares that there is a need to assist the local governments comprising the State's metropolitan areas in planning for the acquisition and preservation of, and in directly acquiring or otherwise preserving, open land in and around urban and suburban areas through the provision of technical and financial assistance; and that such planning, acquisition, and preservation are public purposes for which public funds may be expended or advanced.

"7001. It is the intent of the legislature in enacting this chapter to help curb scattered, healthy, and esthetically satisfying urban development, to help prevent urban blight and deterioration, and to encourage more economically sound, environmentally healthy, and esthetically satisfying urban development through the preservation of open land useful and necessary for the proper long-range growth and economic and social welfare of the State's urban areas. It is further the intent of the legislature to make possible, through the provision of financial and technical assistance, prompt action by local government in planning for, and acquiring and preserving open land in and around urban areas, and in coordinating such local planning and acquisition with similar plans and programs of State and Federal Government agencies.

"7002. For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'open land' means any open or predominantly open land, including agricultural or forest land, in and around urban areas characterized by: (1) economic, social, or physical value as a means of guiding or shaping land use and development in a more economic and environmentally desirable manner; (2) recreational value; (3) conservation value in protecting water supplies, preventing or lessening air or water pollution, providing flood control, or preserving forest, fish, and wildlife, or other natural resources; or (4) scenic, historic, scientific, or esthetic value.

"7003. For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'urban area' means any area urban in character, including surrounding suburban, semirural, or rural areas, which forms an economic and socially unified region, taking into account present and future population distribution, land use and development patterns and trends, trading areas, utility and transportation systems and networks, and similar mutual or common areawide activities and interests.

"7004. For the purposes of this chapter, the term 'official comprehensive plan' shall mean a plan meeting the requirements set forth in section 65462 of the Government Code in their entirety.

"7005. In order to achieve and attain the intent and purposes contained in this chapter, and to specifically provide financial assistance to local government therefor, the planning officer of the State office of planning, department of finance, is authorized to make grants to any county, city, city and county, or to any public agency established by State or local law which is acceptable to him as capable of carrying out the provisions of this chapter, to help finance: (1) the acquisition of the fee or any lesser interest, development right, or easement in open land, the preservation of which is of regional or areawide importance and essential to the proper long-range development, health and welfare of an urban area and to the larger region of which it may be a part; and (2) the planning for the acquisition and preservation of such open land. Grants for the purposes specified in this chapter shall be made from such sources and in such amounts as the legislature may determine.

"7006. The amount of any grant made in accordance with the provisions of this chapter shall not exceed 25 percent of the total cost, as approved by the planning officer, of acquiring the fee or any lesser interest, development right, or easement in any open land; or shall not exceed 35 percent of such cost in the case of a grant extended to any regional or areawide agency or body which (1) is established under State or local law, and (2) exercises planning and acquisition responsibilities consistent with the purposes of this chapter for an urban area as a whole.

"7007. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this chapter, an amount not to exceed 10 percent of the funds available at any time to implement the purposes of this chapter may be allocated for the preparation of detailed open space plans for the acquisition and preservation of open land, provided that such detailed plans are undertaken as an integral part of, or subsequent to the completion of an official comprehensive plan.

"7008. Grants made pursuant to the provisions of this chapter shall be made solely to assist (1) planning for open land acquisition, and (2) acquisition of the fee or any lesser interest, development right, or easement in open land and shall not be made to defray development costs, project or nonproject operating expenses, or ordinary governmental expenses.

"7009. In making grants pursuant to this chapter, the planning officer, with the advice and guidance of the department of finance, shall impose terms and conditions that are designed to protect the State's investment and that are necessary to carry out the purposes of this chapter.

"7010. Authority and responsibility for the administration of the assistance provided under this chapter is hereby vested in the planning officer. All applications for assistance shall be submitted for his approval and the planning officer shall, with the advice and guidance of the department of finance, prescribe such rules and regulations, procedures, forms and submission of information as he may deem necessary or appropriate. The planning officer may delegate any administrative functions to any other State agency authorized to perform such functions, except that responsibility for such functions shall remain solely with the planning officer.

"7011. In extending financial assistance under the provisions of this chapter, and in processing applications for such assistance, the planning officer shall consider the extent to which the communities constituting the urban areas making application are undertaking comprehensive physical planning, are employing sound zoning and other land use regulations for orderly urban development, and are using enabling legislation permitting the acquisition and preservation of open land by local government. The planning officer shall give preference to those proposals for the acquisition of the fee or any lesser development right, or easement interest in open land which are in accordance with an open space plan which is an integral part of an official comprehensive plan for an urban area as a whole. Subsequent to 4 years after the passage of this chapter, no application or proposal shall be approved which is not in accordance with such an areawide plan.

"7012. Where there exists an open space plan which is an integral part of an official comprehensive plan for an urban area as a whole or for any portion thereof, no assistance shall be provided for the acquisition or preservation of any open land unless said acquisition or preservation is in accordance with that plan in the urban area having largest geographic scope and including the area in which such land is located.

"7013. Whenever application is made for financial assistance under the provisions of this chapter, and the open land proposed to

be acquired or preserved is located in a substantially larger open or predominantly open area, the planning officer may condition approval of the application upon the preparation of a detailed development plan for the future sound use and development of that portion of the larger open area under the jurisdiction of the applicant as the planning officer determines is necessary to meet foreseeable development needs. To facilitate such planning, the planning officer may allow such portion of any assistance granted as is necessary to accomplish such planning.

"7014. No open land acquired or preserved with assistance under this chapter shall be converted to uses which are inconsistent with the purposes of this chapter without the approval of the planning officer. The planning officer shall issue no such approval unless there is compelling evidence that such other uses are essential to, and in accordance with, an official comprehensive plan for the urban area as a whole. The planning officer shall require that the proceeds from the disposal of the fee or any lesser interest, development right, or easement in any open land acquired or preserved with assistance under this chapter shall be used to further the intent and purposes thereof.

"7015. In extending assistance under the provisions of this chapter, the planning officer shall make every effort to coordinate the open land acquistion and preservation efforts of State and local government and shall transmit copies, or otherwise notify affected State agencies, of applications submitted to him.

"7016. To further the purposes of this chapter, the planning officer may, from time to time, study and make recommendations respecting the following: (1) more effective utilization and coordination of other State and local programs so as to increase, to the greatest extent feasible, their contribution to open land needs in urban areas; (2) the extent to which State land may be more effectively used in urban areas for the purposes of this chapter; (3) such legal, financial, planning or administrative measures as will enhance the ability of State and local government to provide adequate open land in and around urban areas. The planning officer may contract for professional services in connection with such studies.

"7017. Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as altering or affecting the provisions of chapter 1.5, title 7 of the Government Code relating to the planning officer, the State office of planning, the Director of Finance, or the Department of Finance.

"7018. This act shall be known and may be cited as the 'Open Space and Urban Development Act of 1961'."

SEC. 2. The sum of _____ dollars ($_____) is hereby appropriated from the general fund in the State treasury to carry out the provisions of chapter 13 (commencing with sec. 7000), division 7 of title 1 of the Government Code during the 1961–62 fiscal year.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

S. 1495, as introduced, Farr (Gov. Eff.). Open space and urban development.

Adds Chapter 13 (commencing with sec. 7000), division 7, title 1, Government Code.

Declares legislative policy to help curb sprawling urban development and prevent urban blight and deterioration.

Provides for State financial assistance to be made to local government entities, by grants made by planning officer of State office of planning, to help finance planning and acquisition of rights in property for long range urban development, subject to conditions and limitations in act.

Makes appropriation from general fund to carry out provisions of act.

[From the Saturday Evening Post]

THE BATTLE TO SAVE THE TREES

(By Charlton Ogburn, Jr.)

The generality of Americans have an unconquerable aversion to trees; and whenever a settlement is made, they cut away all before them without mercy. They are looked upon as a nuisance, and the man that can cut down the largest number, and have the fields about his house most clear of them, is looked upon as the most industrious citizen, and the one that is making the greatest improvements in the country. So wrote an Irishman, Isaac Weld, Jr., of his travels in the United States in the years 1795–97.

In those days, as our visitor conceded, the face of the country was overspread with trees. Nothing could be farther from the truth today, but still on the outskirts of our cities where the New America of the suburbs is coming into being, the remaining stands of trees are being attacked with much of the same zeal that Isaac Weld lamented. He found it "strange, that in a country where the rays of the sun act with such prodigious power, some few trees near the habitations should not be spared, whose foliage might afford a cooling shade. * * * Today, as I watch the bulldozers clear the way, scrape the landscape clean for new subdivisions, I find it still strange, even frightening. Must we ruthlessly destroy our countryside in order to live in it?

As a member of the park authority of one of the fastest-growing counties in the Nation—Fairfax, Va., just outside Washington, D.C.—I am forced to witness more destruction of the landscape than is seen by the average suburbanite. For example, there was a 60-acre tract, mostly forest, near a proposed park site in Springfield, Va. When I first saw this forest it was an intricate community of oaks, dogwoods, orchids, mosses, and lichens, squirrels, mice, woodpeckers, and moths; its spongy topsoil teemed with microscopic organisms. On my next visit, a few days later, nothing remained but some piles of charred, slowly burning tree stumps. A shopping center was going in there.

Such a scene is characteristic of other developing areas. In California, developers wreck whole hills, encircling them with gouged-out terraces to multiply house sites. An aerial view of the outskirts of any of our expanding cities shows houses laid out like trains of boxcars, in uniform ranks on a denuded plain. From the ground, the bare, bleak vistas of regimented homes with only telephone poles and television aerials breaking the expanse of roofs are as depressing as the sight of slums, if in a different way. A supplier of kitchen equipment, a man who has built model houses and has worked with builders all over the country, expressed a judgment which few, even in the building industry, would dispute, when he said, "A good 90 percent of all housing tracts must be featureless, badly laid out, and totally barren."

Why is this so? Can we do anything about it?

Recently I set out to try to find some answers to these questions. From enlightened land planners, architects, and builders, I have learned that we do not need to destroy our countryside in order to live in it. We can meet the demand for millions of new houses and still preserve trees and our natural landscape.

But I also learned that the problem of curbing the bulldozer is a lot tougher than I had imagined—that it is going to take a far wider exercise of vision than is being displayed today. Also, in the long run we face some difficult choices in land use by, and housing for, our increasing population. It is estimated that in the next 15 years our metropolitan population will increase by 60 million, and of these, 25 million will move into new houses in suburbs. This is just a 15-year projection, looking no farther into the future than World War II lies in the past. Will the land for the oncoming developments be scalped and flattened, or will the new dwellings be fitted into the existing terrain with minimum destruction of trees and undergrowth, of stream beds, rock outcroppings, and contours sculptured by geologic eons? The answer will make an important difference in the kind of country we have to live in—and in the kind of people we are. Or so I believe.

Let us look first at some practical reasons for saving and living with trees. A 35-foot oak or maple having a total leaf surface of about 4,000 square feet will evaporate more than 35 gallons of water during a summer day, according to computations by Prof. Paul J. Kramer of Duke University. By evaporation and deflection of the sun's rays, the Urban Land Institute, Washington, D.C., points out, a tree will reduce the heating effect of the sun on the area below it by as much as a half. But even more informative than figures is the experience of driving into a wooded park after dark in the summer. City streets, cooked to as high as 135° by the sun, radiate heat all night long. In a tree-shaded area the temperature drops with the sun.

In our country, with its history of rampaging rivers and gullied hillsides, no one should have to be reminded of the function of natural plant cover in holding soil and water. The story of erosion and of the siltation of streams and rivers, which destroys aquatic life, clogs channels and causes floods, has been told frequently and well, but generally in terms of bad farming practices. Less well understood is the extent to which the damage is compounded by bulldozing off the vegetation and the topsoil, during the development of subdivisions. The District of Columbia's famous Rock Creek, which winds through its chief park after draining an adjacent part of Maryland, tends to flood twice as badly as it did 20 years ago. You know why when you read a statement by Harold P. Guy of the U.S. Geological Survey pointing out how the water-holding capacity of the watershed has been reduced, as for example in subdivision in Kensington, Md., from which "nearly all of the trees were removed and the natural waterways were altered." After this scalping, each inch of runoff from rain falling on the area carried about 250 tons of sediment into Rock Creek, or about fifty times as much as from an equivalent underdeveloped watershed. Further reading tells you that in the Washington area as a whole the streams now move about 1 million tons of sediment a year, helping to explain why game fishing has suffered so severely in the lower Potomac and why experts debate the ways and means of keeping the Washington harbor open in the future.

Certainly we don't need to depend on trees to keep us cool; we can buy airconditioning equipment. With money—lots and lots of it—we can maintain our water supply and control floods by means of reservoirs, levees and similar engineering works. But the most lavishly financed mechanical ingenuity will not manufacture peace of mind or keep us in tune with our environment. Discord and conflict seem implicit when we build habitations which suggest an army of occupation deployed upon a ravaged land. When, on the other hand, our dwellings seem to belong where they are, to be part of their surrounding rather than invaders, we ourselves seem to gain a sense of belonging, of having roots. We even gain some of the serenity which is apt to be the scarcest commodity of all in the abundant life.

Of course, there are subdivisions which are good by any reasonable standards, and the National Association of Home Builders, with 40,000 members, is encouraging more of them with its development merit awards. Each year the association finds noteworthy examples of developers who are "working with nature instead of against it in land planning" and gives awards to projects which incorporate "the highest standards of land planning, design and development."

Near my home is an award-winning subdivision, Potomac Overlook, built on a steep, forested hillside on the Maryland side of the river just above the District of Columbia. The 19 houses it comprises are fairly expensive; they sold originally for between $27,000 and $40,000, but no purchaser is likely to lose on his investment. Potomac Overlook is an exciting example of what a builder with an active conscience can do when working with lots of between a quarter and a third of an acre on an attractive but difficult site. Most of the trees have been saved—black oaks and tulip trees soaring 30 or 40 feet before branching—and so has much of the original forest floor. This, wrapped around the small lawns, ties the human handiwork into the terrain. The contemporary-style houses, although only 3 years old, look as if they had always been meant to be there.

When Potomac Overlook had been just about completed—the stage at which some developers might hesitate to tour their creations without police protection—the builders and the new homeowners gave each other a party. Subcontractors, county officials and laborers all came to it. Tables were set up in a carport, beer, soft drinks and mountains of fried chicken were served, and musical skits were put on in which each side ribbed the other's foibles. It was a fair enough demonstration of the good will on both sides.

Another subdivision on the outskirts of the Nation's Capital, Pine Spring, built in 1952, shows what can be done in a lower cost field. The homes here originally were priced at $15,250 to $20,500. The tract didn't seem to offer much—it was 55 acres of spindly woods west of Falls Church, Va. But each of the 125 houses was individually sited by the architects to make the most of the land and the builders, Luria Bros., saved every possible tree. The horizontal planes of the lawns and low, ground-hugging houses, opening to the outdoors through floor-to-ceiling windows, contrast with the vertical forms of the columnar pines and oaks to create a somewhat Japanese effect, and a charming one. It is not surprising to find a high degree of community spirit and pride among the Pine Springers. They issue an annual directory, which includes names and ages of children and interests of adults; they have taken pains to add further imaginative planting, shrub-screened patios, and other improvements to already desirable properties. When resold, houses in Pine Spring have brought as much as $5,000 above their original price. Summing it up, House and Home—a magazine addressed to builders—observed: "It is better to pay a skilled architect than to overpay a salesman."

I talked to one of Pine Spring's architects, Francis D. Lethbridge, who also had a hand in designing Potomac Overlook "To save the existing vegetation always takes trouble and almost always costs more," he said. "The developer can sell the houses even if he doesn't leave a tree standing, so why should he worry? The answer is—he usually doesn't. Someone asked one of our big developers if he didn't want to leave any more creditable monuments behind him than a spread of subdivisions resembling Siberian penal colonies. His reply was: 'I don't want any monument except a tombstone.'

"If you're going to preserve anything of the natural cover," Lethbridge continued, "you've got to preserve the contours. Lower the grade a few inches, and you scalp it completely. Raising the grade is just as bad. Even the biggest tree is apt to die if you dump soil around it—as little as 6 inches. To adapt yourself to the land as it is, you have to visualize the finished product before you turn a spadeful of earth. You have to plan every element—location of houses, roads, utilities—simultaneously. Everything depends upon having a builder who cares, one who'd find it hard to live with himself if he were known for having loused up the countryside."

Indeed, the builder has to care—that was the main thing I learned from every subdivision in which the natural setting had been carefully protected. Take, for example, Green Acres, a subdivision of $16,500 to $32,000 houses built on a 130-acre tract near Wilmington, Del. The forest had been in process of reclaiming the area for the past 30 or 40 years. Here the developers, Franklin Builders, dedicated 8 acres to public use and preserved belts of woods behind and between the rows of houses. They also left the trees almost untouched right up to the foundation walls, at great extra labor. (I counted 20 trees in one front yard.) The result is an award-winning subdivision, and one in which the Governor of Delaware chooses to live in a middle-priced house.

The same care is the hallmark of other award-winning subdivisions, such as Kendallwood near Detroit, where the Thompson Brown Co. used curvilinear streets flowing with the contour of the land, as well as retaining walls costing up to $1,500 each, in order to limit regrading and to save the trees. Thompson Brown makes a practice of calling in land planners before permitting the first saw on the site. Then, in the Southwest outside of Tucson, Ariz., is Suffolk Hills, where 195 homes, costing an average of $20,000, on one-acre lots have been creatively tailored to the landscape. Lusk Homes, the builder, was commended by the NAHB judges not only for preserving the desert vegetation, including saguaro cacti, and ocotillo, but also for siting the houses in a way that blends the rooflines with the rolling terrain. These results were not easily achieved; a dozen plans were prepared by the engineers before one was accepted.

Before condemning the average builder out of hand, it is worth listening to Edmund J. Bennett, one of the builders of Potomac Overlook, an outstanding subdivision. "I figure we spent a year more on the job than we would have had to if we would just gone in there and flattened everything. Also by flattening we would have got twice as many building sites. We located every major tree on a big topographic map and cranked them all into the plan. Each house was carefully sited." Bennett also points out that Potomac Overlook ran into manmade as well as natural obstacles, because of its plans to fit houses to the landscape.

"To avoid regrading, we had to put in driveways with as much as 16-percent grade," he said. "We could get away with it because we were not dependent on FHA financing. (FHA limits driveway grades to 5 percent.) We had to get a waiver from the Department of Public Works for a stretch of street with a 14-percent grade—that took two or three conferences over a period of 3 months. Then there were the sewer lines. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission says that the floor of a basement may not be more than 6 feet below the street, which means the first floor must be 3 feet above the street. But to keep from butchering the land we had to have houses below street level—and run the sewers through easements along back property lines in the woods. With all the extra cost of hand labor, the commission hated like the Devil to agree to it."

The builder is up against other unyielding facts. There is, probably, a road code. For a secondary residential street 25 or 30 feet wide, it will specify a cleared right-of-way of, say, 60 feet. The permissible grade will be perhaps 10 percent. When the street meets rising ground, a cut must be made, and the sides of the cut must not be too steep, perhaps only 30 percent in grade. So our 60-foot swath becomes 90 or 100 feet wide. Provision for offstreet parking will add 20 feet. There is also the matter of "sight distances." The speed limit may be 25 miles per hour, but where streets cross, the code may specify leveling the ground far enough back to permit cars doing 40 miles per hour to see each other in ample time to stop.

Enters now the Federal Housing Administration. If the builder wishes to be able to offer FHA financing with its low downpayments, he will have to limit the grade of his driveways, as pointed out. Because buyers generally do not like to climb long flights of stairs to reach the house, bulldozing out a driveway may necessitate cutting off the top of the entire lot. Another regulation specifies that the lot slope down from the house on all sides. That, too, can mean drastic regrading.

The FHA was not set up to be either for or against trees. Its sole function is to guarantee mortgages, and its concern is with market values. The Veterans' Administration, which guarantees mortgages under the GI bill of rights, generally follows FHA's lead.

"I will wager that FHA and VA have received thousands of complaints about poor lot grading, unwanted water from an uphill neighbor, or flat spots that don't drain rapidly," says Cushing Daniel, director of the Home Builders Association of Metropolitan Washington, "and probably not one thank you for waiving a grading requirement to permit the saving of a fine tree." As Government agencies don't want complaints, "they have evolved a pat formula," says Daniel. "This results in a 'Jello-mold' type of land plan and the virtual impossibility of saving any original topography."

Many subdivisions are barren not because the builder laid a violent hand on a single tree but because the tract was treeless pastureland to begin with—not that lack of trees justifies the destruction of the natural configuration and topsoil. If the tract is not served by a sewerline, the county authorities will probably insist on an adequate septic field, with every tree within 10 feet of the field having to come down. Also, the mere compaction of the soil under the tread of heavy machinery can be fatal to trees—and the damage may not be apparent for a year or more, when the houses will have been built and the removal of a tree will have become costly. So the builder, who often is responsible, is tempted to get rid of any doubtful cases while he can still do it cheaply.

At the end, if the builder has made a burning issue of saving trees, can he be sure his labors will be appreciated? Take the case of Ralph Schacter of the North American Building Corp. Mr. Schacter is an ardent tree lover. When you drive into North American's 300-acre Fawn Ridge development north of Peekskill, N.Y., you are warned by a large sign:

"NOTICE TO ALL TRADES: TREES ARE SACRED

"Trees must be kept in perfect condition.

"Do not destroy unless construction 'super' gives approval.

"Anyone guilty of damaging trees will be put off job."

The huge oaks and copses of younger trees at Fawn Ridge testify to Mr. Schacter's efforts. To save them costs $300 per lot, he estimates. It is easy to understand his emotion as he points to an oblong oak stump—4 feet in maximum width—standing by the entrance to a newly completed house and exclaims, "The trouble we went to to save that tree. And you know what the buyer said? 'Take it away.' That cost us $175." Many of North American's customers are apartment dwellers buying their first house, and buying in a low price range. These, Mr. Schacter finds, are the least likely to appreciate trees. But he is ready for them. He hauls them into his office and gives them a lecture on preserving nature, illustrated with color photographs. "A year after they've settled in, they're all for trees," he says. "Yeah," comments another official of the company, "and giving builders a headache by their agitation for large-lot zoning to protect the woods everywhere else."

Growing discrimination on the part of buyers, and higher personal incomes with which to back it up, is likely to have an effect on building practices. If buyers pass up the scalped lot, builders will have more incentive to restrain the bulldozer. There are signs that this incentive is working. The Urban Land Institute in its hardheaded "Community Builder's Handbook" states: "Healthy existing trees on the development site should be saved wherever possible. A good tree will add greatly to the value of the lot." Edward R. Carr, a large-scale builder of Springfield, Va., whose program of saving trees has been widely praised, says that just by looking at a sales plat he can tell which lots have the best trees; they are the ones that have sold first. In advising builders on "How To Succeed With Today's Serious Buyers," House and Home points out that the leaders in the industry "are finding that attractive neighborhoods give them a big comparative edge, particularly with second- and third-time buyers. They are laying out lots to take advantage of the land."

FHA could well recognize this trend, and encourage it, by giving greater credit for careful land planning, instead of making land scalping all but mandatory on hilly terrain. FHA says it will give maximum valuations where the builder's plans call for saving trees, but the differential is small, and the agency shies away from giving an individual lot a higher valuation when trees have been preserved on it. The requirement for virtually level driveways seems to me wholly uncalled for.

We should ask ourselves, I submit, whether we are building for motoring or for living. Does it make sense to require residential streets to meet the standards of highways, providing drivers with the opportunity and temptation to go tearing through, to the peril of children and anxiety of parents? Must we go on sacrificing the human values of charm, beauty, privacy, and peace and fix upon our country that open, bare look for the minor convenience of motorists?

It is not written in the Constitution or the Ten Commandments that highway departments shall rule supreme. There is nothing, either, to prevent local authorities, particularly planning boards or county engineers charged with approving subdivision plats, from exercising a stronger influence for good site planning. (Nothing, that is, but the political power of unscrupulous builders.) The town of North Castle, in Westchester County, N.Y., has adopted an ordinance, typical of those of a growing number of communities, which requires that plans of developments show the areas from which trees will be removed and states that "no live tree exceeding three inches in diameter may be cut down in such areas without expressed consent of the planning board." This is not just a statement of pious intent; inspections are rigorous, and the planning board makes the ordinance stick. Moreover, says Chief Hergenham of the North Castle police with a wry grin, "If you want to cut down a tree along the highway, the garden club will fight you all the way to Albany."

Conscientious builders would, I believe, welcome tree-saving ordinances as tending to put them on a fairer basis with less-scrupulous competitors. As a matter of fact, a building firm of North Castle has gone the town one better. At Windmill Farm the deeds stipulate: "No trees of any kind located on the highway or road in front of or adjoining the said described plot shall be cut down, destroyed or removed without the written consent of the grantor, its successors or assigns." This subdivision of $33,000–$70,000 homes is being developed by Edward J. Tobin and Mac Welson on a 1,000-acre tract of luxuriant forests, reefs of exposed, lichen-covered granite, specimen plantings of hemlock, beech and spruce, topped off by four ponds. It is, I might add, the most beautiful development I have ever seen. The local pride it fires was demonstrated to me on a guided tour by Chief Hergenham, with commentary: "The builders hold all supplies at the barn and bring them to the site only as needed, to keep from piling them on the vegetation. This is the Mesbergs' house. How's that for saving a tree? It goes right through the overhang of the roof."

If builders, buyers and public boards were uniformly enlightened, we should be a lot better off. But the melancholy fact is that our worries still would not be over. The larger the lot, the more of the topography the builder can save—but large lots present two big problems: (1) Many people cannot afford them and (2) the larger the lots, the faster suburbia gobbles up the countryside. If the large-lot mania continues, says Stephen Sussna, a planning consultant of Trenton, N.J., "this Nation faces a danger that in the near future there will be no suitable residential building sites available."

Some innovators have come up with an answer in the form of the "cluster" type of development. This draws houses together in fan-shaped groups fronting on a common garden-and-parking courtyard. It reserves unspoiled, in joint ownership, the land to the rear and between the clusters. It amounts to the owners' pooling their spare acreage for the common enjoyment. Not only does this conserve more of the natural setting but it reduces the length of roads and utility lines, thus saving both money and landscape. Stephen Sussna Associates has a partial cluster-type development underway on a 77-acre tract in Mount Laurel, N.J., in which houses have quarter-acre lots, and the project as a whole has over 7 acres of park. In St. Louis, Architect Roger Montgomery has designed a cluster development for the Ballas Corp. utilizing a rough tract zoned for 1 acre lots. By concentrating the houses in nine groups of five to seven each, he found he could reduce street length by a third while serving 15 percent more dwellings and preserve nearly 50 percent of the site in its natural state.

The most striking development of this kind now underway is in an outlying section of Philadelphia known as the Far Northeast. Here 17,000 dwellings, many in the $11,500–$13,000 range, are being built on a tract of 1,800 acres—nearly 10 to an acre—by private builders in accordance with a plan drawn up by Edmund N. Bacon of the Philadelphia Planning Commission. Row houses, which are economical to build and sparing of land, predominate in the project, and the clusters are formed by rows of houses rather than individual units. There are green areas within and between the clusters and in addition some 250 acres of stream valley have been dedicated as parks. In comparison with either treeless city blocks or parkless subdivisions of boxlike dwellings each on its own little plot, the Far Northeast comes out far ahead. In fact, many home designers believe our country will have to go farther in this direction. George Nelson, a New York architect and design coordinator for the U.S. National Exhibition in Moscow, says it is unfortunate that "the possession of the one-family detached house is one of the great American dreams." He believes that it cannot meet our future needs. He maintains that "we are eventually going to have to build towers that can house a large number of families. These towers will not take up much land, and they can be surrounded by parks and gardens that will be for the use of all the families."

Many architects and land planners agree with him. Perhaps our explosion in population eventually will demand that we give up the one-family dwelling as a norm of our national life. But in any case let us use our heads and our good taste to keep a countryside that is a joy to behold, not a treeless, dreary waste.

THE COMING END OF THE SUBURBAN BOOM

(An address by Frederick Gutheim, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies, to the 26th Conservation Conference of the National Wildlife Federation, Statler-Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., March 8, 1961)

The increasing urbanization of the United States has been frequently reiterated in recent years. About two-thirds of the national population already lives in 216 standard metropolitan areas as defined by the census. These metropolitan areas are cities embracing at least one central city with a population of 50,000 or more and typically embracing a number of separate political jurisdictions. But beyond the fact that we are now a Nation over two-thirds urban, substantially the whole of the anticipated future population growth is destined to occur in these great urban complexes.

The nature of the modern city is such that its growth has been taking place largely at the periphery. The central city, as it is only too clear from the 1960 census, in most places is not growing or, as in the case of Washington, is actually losing population. As room has been found in the central city for new forms of transportation, parking, commercial and industrial growth; as the older congestion in slums has been removed; and especially as families with children have escaped the unfavorable environment of older cities and migrated to new suburban communities—these changes have left their mark on the central city. Most central cities in metropolitan areas today find they contain predominantly a daytime population of employees and customers rather than a resident population. Those who make their home in the central city tend to be the very young and the very old, the very rich and the very poor.

The predominant characteristic of our postwar growth has been the development of the modern American suburban community. We think of the suburbs as residential areas. While it is true that many of them are predominantly residential, it would not be accurate to neglect the equally great growth of decentralized manufacturing plants, shopping centers, or other forms of activity and institutions. Yet in most cases this related decentralization has taken place as business has followed its customers to the suburbs and established suburban and regional shopping centers; or as much business, requiring types of labor that exist in good supply in

suburban communities, has found it easier to operate there than under the more congested or competitive conditions that prevail in the central city. It must be concluded that the suburban movement has been predominantly one of families seeking homes in the outlying parts of our large cities, and that the larger part of other suburban growth is related to this fundamental movement.

During the last 15 years, since the end of the war, this suburban movement has taken place on an enormous scale. It has been estimated that 4,000 families a day have been moving into new suburban communities. In general they have been occupying new homes built by the Nation's builders who, during this period, have produced a million to a million and a half houses a year, almost all of them in suburban communities. These have been almost entirely single-family houses, at densities typically of four homes to the acre. Each has been thought of as occupying a large suburban lot, within whose limits many family activities, especially those connected with child care, could be accommodated. This type of housing consumes vast amounts of land, far more than row houses or apartments, and broad-front lots greatly increase housing costs, particularly in streets, water and sewer lines, and other land development items. The uniformity with which this relatively low-density housing development has been taking place, and the thousands of square miles that have been consumed by this process, coupled with the leapfrogging or bypassing of substantial tracts of vacant land in the process, has generated the descriptive term "urban sprawl" to describe this relatively unstructured suburban development. As an illustration of the rate at which open land has been consumed by suburban homebuilding, it is reported that if all the land withdrawn for urban use in the Santa Clara Valley since 1947 were consolidated, it would approximate 26 square miles; however, subdivisions have been placed in such a manner as to commit a total area of 200 square miles to urban development.

It is the uniformity of the appearance of today's suburban community that has given rise to the visceral apprehension of overstandardization. The San Fernando Valley, seen from the air, is such a thought-provoking spectacle. It is true that the external appearance of uniformity accurately reflects the relatively uniform age, marital condition, family size, per capita income, and social status of those who have purchased the homes.

The suburb of the last 15 years has been the place in which the marriages and children that were deferred during the war are found. During this 15 years of postwar growth, an exceptionally large number of families in the age group from 33 to 55 years came into being. These were also years of housing shortage in which Government mortgage insurance and other forms of assistance and planning directed the concentration of housing activity to overcome the postwar housing shortage, predominantly in suburban areas where other market conditions dictated the production of single-family houses.

Given the relatively long period over which this type of urban growth and housing production has been the predominant characteristic, it has been assumed by many people, including such experts as urban planners and housing specialists, that the future would see more of the same. Our future population growth has been translated, therefore, into identical terms yielding the image of future metropolitan areas that, like Los Angeles, can be described as "100 suburbs in search of a city."

It has also been assumed that the principal problems that cities face in the future are predominantly those associated with overcoming the deficiencies that have become increasingly apparent in suburban growth. One of the most important of these is the failure to preserve any parks or open spaces adequate to meet the needs of our present and future population, whose numbers are also associated with such characteristics as greater per capita income, higher educational status, far greater leisure, and substantially greater mobility as the result of widespread automobile ownership. Such parks and open spaces as had been provided in our recently developed suburbs are almost exclusively in small tracts of land suitable for playgrounds, many of them actually related to schools. While there has been a substantial addition to the total recreation areas of the Nation, little of these recently acquired parklands have been located in metropolitan areas or are the type suited to the recreational and cultural needs of the new suburban population.

In the great and nameless cities that have come into being as urban growth has become interurban in character, these deficiencies have become pronounced. It has been found, for example, that the 70,000 suburban residents of Fresno, Calif., are not served by a single park.

As has been noted previously, the expectation of the character of future urban growth has been based almost exclusively upon the projection of the type of growth that has occurred during the spectacular past 15 years. To an even more precise degree we have projected the abnormal growth of the 3 years from 1947 to 1950, years in which 1,100,000 new urban households were being added. This rate may be compared to a figure of 300,000 new urban households annually in the decade of the 1930's. In criticizing such projections, the economic consultant Robinson Newcomb has pointed to a number of circumstances that are not likely to be characteristic of future growth but which explain much of the magnitude and character of past growth. He has noted, for example, that while nearly 15 percent of the increase in urban population has been due to migration from farms, this source of urban growth has largely been exhausted. Mr. Newcomb has also noted that up to 1956 marriages exceeded deaths, but the dissolution of households as the result of deaths has been taking place at an increasingly rapid rate, thus reducing the total number of households. This authority has also pointed to the very substantial demand for housing units by other than married couples, a factor of importance in the period 1950–55, but one of greatly diminished significance today.

Of the many social and economic changes that may be responsible for a different pattern of future housing and urban development than what we have known in the past 15 years, however, probably the most important is the changing age composition of the population. In the next decade there is not expected to be a significant increase in the number of households headed by people between the ages of 35 and 55—the age group that had been responsible for the greatest housing demand in the past. There will be a big increase in young households—those just getting formed—and in old households—those containing individuals who have retired from active life. These latter groups whose numerical significance is increasing, require a quite different type of housing than the suburban home that has earlier been described. This changing housing demand has already been reflected in the markedly increased emphasis upon apartment houses of all types, both in central cities and in suburban communities, and in special types of housing for the elderly.

It is quite possible that we have at the present time substantially all of the conventional suburban housing that will be required for another decade or two. Not until 1980 do demographers anticipate any recurrence of the spectacular rate of family formation that characterized the period 1947–50.

If the demand for conventional suburban homes appears to be slackening, the difficulties that suburban communities have been facing have also been increasing to such an extent that the attractiveness of this way of living has been markedly affected. We have already entered a period of disenchantment with the image of suburbia that was so attractive 10 years ago. Among the dissatisfactions that have been mentioned are the increasing cost of suburban life, particularly the cost of suburban governments due to their small size and general balkanization coupled with the abnormally heavy financial requirements of an extensive new school system; the low standard of public services in suburban communities; dramatically exemplified by such rudimentary problems as removing snow from highways; the low cultural and leisure standard of suburban communities where the capacity to make extensive outlays to build libraries, museums, concert halls, and other cultural institutions is weak and where even the provision of outdoor recreation facilities has been conspiculously inadequate; the increasing difficulties of transportation, especially the journey to work whether on crowded expressways or an obsolescent mass transportation system. The suburban communities of a metropolitan area have shown little ability to deal with their problems or even to find an overall view of them; and their spot deficiencies are many. The catalog of dissatisfactions could be greatly expanded, and it is steadily being enlarged.

The trek back to the central city from the suburbs has already begun. The principal factor seems to be greater choice in the housing market. Cities are also fighting back with urban redevelopment programs, proposals for rehabilitating central business districts and for generally strengthening their ability to provide a high standard of service for the central requirement of a much larger metropolitan area. They have the money. They are getting more Federal aid. Increasingly, suburban communities are being committed to the generally helpless image of themselves as specialized residential communities. Yet the diversification of suburbs is one of the principal future trends that are already discernible.

Diversification is taking many forms. There is within the framework of the residential suburb, a growing diversification of housing types and a greater range of housing costs.

More apartment houses are being built. In some cases these are tall buildings; and in others, garden apartments. The significant thing is that they all represent far higher densities than any form of single-family dwellings that we have known. They also represent the advent of renting rather than home ownership in the suburban economy. The repercussions of this in local fiscal policy and tax debates have already become evident.

The second form of diversification in the suburbs is economic. The residential suburb is now being replaced in many areas by one that is more balanced in activity. It contains substantial areas devoted to manufacturing, services (other than local business, which has always been well established in the suburban community) and the development of other specialized economic activities associated with transportation, leisure, or cultural activity. Contrasted to the 1950 suburb, as it came raw from the hand of the builder, even the advent of churches, schools, and other rudimentary community institutions has been a notable development, bringing with it the pressure to find housing accommodation for such individuals as

schoolteachers, ministers, and others who cannot typically afford high suburban home ownership costs. The diversification of economic status has also become evident. Today's suburb is increasingly less one of families with relatively uniform incomes, as was the case a decade ago, and increasingly marked by a range of incomes. Racial diversification is also a feature of many suburbs, especially the older ones, as Negro families of the central city have acquired sufficient capital to enter the suburban homebuying market and as they, like other immigrant groups, seek to share in the prevailing demand for suburban community living.

A revolution in transportation is making up which, taken in association with these other changes, may have the effect of reducing the exclusive reliance upon travel by private automobile, chiefly on urban expressways, and substituting instead, at least for the journey to work, such forms of express mass transportation as electric railways, express buses in reserved rights of way in expressways, and perhaps even such advanced technological types as the low-pressure "air-car" that hovers over a barely improved right of way, or the monorail—both capable of speeds roughly twice that attainable by the private automobile.

The image of the future suburb thus is wholly different from the suburban community we have been creating, and making jokes about, during the last 15 years. So far as that type of suburb is concerned, we can say with some assurance that the suburban boom has ended. The future suburb—whether as developed from existing communities, or as new towns—will be markedly different, so much so as to demand a new word for it. Nowhere is this difference likely to be more conspicuous than in the distribution of population and the amounts of land required.

II

We are now on the threshold of metropolitan development in which suburban communities will be far more self-contained and independent from each other, and from the central city, to which they will always be linked for certain essential purposes. The free-standing satellite community may range from 25,000 to 100,000 in population. At the upper ranges it will be able to provide for virtually all of its basic needs, including a substantial part of the cultural activity that was formerly reserved for the central city.

Perhaps the most important distinction will be that the future satellite suburb will contain its population in a far smaller area than the older and more wastefully sprawling suburb. This development can be greatly furthered and will itself facilitate the retention of large areas of open land within the metropolitan area that are held free from urban development. Let me at this point call to your attention Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS' bill to authorize loans for the acquisition of metropolitan regional open spaces, the principal Federal measure that has been offered, and which I regard as the first step in a more ambitious long-range program.

Metropolitan open spaces will be constituted by the aggregate of public and private open uses of the land. These include not only publicly owned parks but conservation areas, watersheds, and natural areas maintained for scientific or cultural purposes. They will also include agricultural and other privately owned land that may be restricted by public regulation or through the acquisition of some form of easement or development right. These privately owned tracts could also embrace swamplands, flood plains, watersheds, or a multitude of types of land whose open character is required by some form of conservation such as the maintenance of water tables or flood control. It could include golf courses, or areas for hunting and riding.

The provision of large areas of land for outdoor recreation and such typical uses as fishing and hunting, indeed, is a further requirement if the metropolitan city of tomorrow is to offer its inhabitants a rich variety of leisure-time opportunities. Perhaps one of the most significant of these is the use of lakes and waterways for recreational boating.

The city of the future, we can increasingly discern, is one that will be better articulated, organized into more solid and more open pieces, less sprawling, although covering perhaps a still wider area than at the present time. Where it is developed, it will be intensively developed; in other places it will be held firmly in its open character.

It remains necessary only to comment that the future city that I have sketched, and its suburban communities in particular, offer greater social and cultural advantages as well as inherently greater economies than the suburbs we have known in recent years. They offer to begin with, a greater variety of housing types and tenures that are more consistent with the economic facts of life as we know them. The experience of living in a socially diversified community of this kind is certainly a richer one to both children and adults. Communities of such heterogeneous character are inherently more democratic and offer more satisfactions and wider choice to their inhabitants than the more narrowly structured, older suburb. The tax base of satellite communities of the type I have described should be larger and stronger than the wholly residential suburbs of today. There are greater business opportunities and more satisfactions to the consumer in that type of community. Architecturally we should recover the urbanity of space in plaza and sheltered areas, the excitement of crowds and social purpose. From the point of view of the land itself, there are major gains. Instead of the relentless and inexorable chewing up of the best agricultural lands and the resulting pattern of 9 acres lost to either human or natural use for every acre required by urban development, it is possible to substitute a pattern where open space in its aggregate form is large enough, strategically located, and of such a character that it can contribute positively both to maintaining natural balance in metropolitan areas, and to providing room for the human activities and enjoyments that belong in our increasingly leisured and educated society.

From the viewpoint of the conservationist this consummation can be furthered by steps that will encourage the planning and management of open spaces in metropolitan areas in an overall fashion. There will not only be the immediate benefit of structuring and concentrating the developed areas which urban growth will require, but each use of the open space itself will gain strength from the other open uses and from being allocated according to its particular needs of area and type as well as location. We need a total strategy, if not a plan, for open space in each metropolitan area.

We are far from being organized to contribute as strongly as necessary to the creation of a future urban America along the lines I have mentioned. The urban programs of Federal, State, and local governments have tended to ignore the reciprocal need for well-planned urbanization and firmly held open spaces. We have yet to make a beginning at inventorying the necessary open uses of the land and of giving them a corresponding importance accorded the developed portions of the area. In few metropolitan areas do we know what particular pieces of land should be preserved because of their value as natural scenery, as habitats for wildlife, as recreation areas qualified by location and character, much less by their contribution to an overall plan of open spaces. The making of such metropolitan open space inventories is an immediate national need, one to be undertaken as speedily as possible in metropolitan areas with the aid of all possible and appropriate State and Federal assistance.

To reflect in such inventories the greatest conservation wisdom and the broadest spectrum of interest in open space is an intellectual challenge that should enlist a response from our universities, museums, and other scientific communities, from our more thoughtful educators, conservation and recreational leaders, and cultural authorities, and from that widespread network of citizens' organizations that have in the past been the mainstay of all our conservation and outdoor recreation programs. Working together, these groups can be counted upon to provide for each of the future cities in which our American population will be so largely concentrated the appropriate pattern of open spaces that will direct and concentrate the necessary urban growth into a wholly new and far more desirable pattern than the formless, sprawling, monotonous, wasteful, and inhuman suburbs that we have so heedlessly planned and built during the past 15 years and which offer nothing in the way of a pattern for future urban development.

We have yet to determine what the urban areas in which the next 60 million Americans will live will look like or how they can be brought into being during the next 40 years. But one thing is certain—the challenge must be faced in a creative spirit and not by assuming that we can project the older suburbs that we have known. Bold visions and humanistic ideas of the future city are what we need.

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1961]

HARVARD GROUP'S "NEW CITY" FIGHTS SPRAWL

(By George Watson)

Twelve Harvard graduate students have preempted 1,500 choice acres in Prince Georges County, assembled a mass of data, and designed the city of their dreams.

Called simply New City, the metropolis was created on paper to illustrate how to thwart the ungainly urban sprawl that threatens to obliterate open spaces between Washington and Baltimore.

Last fall, while subdividers plotted new developments, the students were at work planning their concept of what the metropolitan area should do to avoid the already noticeable tendency of the two cities to grow together.

IDEALISTIC AND DARING

What the students in Harvard's Design Studio came up with is frankly idealistic, even utopian. But it is an exciting and daring approach to area development.

The students assumed for their project that the Federal Government was genuinely interested in urban planning and had made land available for a "starter" community of 50,000 in an eventual community of 200,000.

Although it was assumed that the Government would finance initial phases of development, New City was planned to support itself, like TVA after its first stages.

Therefore, the students had to plan an adequate tax base, including sufficient commercial and industrial land use.

Proponents of traditional architecture might be offended by New City. Certainly, it bears little resemblance to the usual subdivisions and sprawling shopping centers, which have themselves become almost traditional in America.

HIGHWAYS AND MONORAIL

Since the citizens of New City would be largely commuters to Washington and Balti-

more, the plan relies on an integrated highway and monorail transportation system. (The monorail feature ran counter to the students' own premise that transportation in the Washington area was automobile oriented and likely to remain so.)

A main feature of New City is the complete separation of the central business core from nearby residential centers. High-density development was made possible because of reliance on rapid rail transportation and limited access highways.

The business core (shown in the left foreground of the photograph) contains high-rise office buildings built on multi-story parking facilities. The parking structures are tied in with the highway system and connected to the buildings by elevators.

Between the slablike structures, containing offices, government buildings and large stores, are cultural and recreational facilities. These include theaters, a library and a museum.

SELF-SUFFICIENT COMMUNITIES

Outlying from the central business and cultural center are several residential communities, each designed to be as nearly self-sufficient as possible. (Three such communities can be distinguished in the photograph.)

The residential centers provide a variety of housing, ranging from high-rise apartments to single-family dwellings. Within each community is a smaller core of shops and markets, sufficient for the day-to-day needs of the residents.

Also decentralized and in easy walking distance from the three residential cores are elementary schools and health facilities. A central high school (seen in the center of the photograph, to the left of the athletic field) and a central hospital would serve the residential communities.

Although the students were free to use their imaginations in designing New City, they were bound by specific data on the metropolitan area—including the character of the countryside and the people.

One assumption on the climate, that "snow is infrequent and melts quickly," might lead those who recall last winter vividly to question Harvard's intelligence sources.

But the planners were careful to select an area strategically located about 18 miles from downtown Washington, 24 miles from Baltimore, and 12 miles from Annapolis.

While planned communities in the past have been either the residential or the old company town variety, New City would be a self-sustaining satellite metropolis.

The Harvard plan might come as something of a surprise to builder William J. Levitt. He already has purchased the same land near Bowie on which to build 4,500 air-conditioned, suburban houses.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1962

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate temporarily lay aside the Housing Act of 1961, and resume the consideration of the appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

THE INTERNAL SECURITY ACT OF 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it has been said that the mills of the gods grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly fine. Certainly as we read the decision of the Supreme Court which was handed down yesterday in connection with the Internal Security Act of 1950—the old so-called Mundt-Nixon bill—which was passed over the veto of President Truman in 1950, with fewer than a dozen Senators supporting the President in his veto of that act, it takes men with long memories to recall what Congress determined to do about communism as it passed that Internal Security Act of 1950.

Now, 11 years later, by a 5-to-4 decision of the Supreme Court—in a most welcome, constructive, and necessary decision if indeed we are to survive in this world against communism—the Supreme Court held the act to be valid and its provisions operative.

The particular section which had been challenged and which was finally adjudicated yesterday in the 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision, was the section dealing with registration of Communists and their front organizations. Since many have forgotten what Congress did so well in 1950, I take the floor of the Senate this afternoon as one of the authors of that particular piece of legislation to remind the country, the Congress, and the Communist world as to the exact status of things now that the Supreme Court has arrived at its decision.

Virtually all the newspapers of the country have reported the decision of the Supreme Court in bold and multi-column headlines. In the main the lead is the same as that contained in the newspaper which I hold in my hand, which happens to be the Chicago Daily Tribune for Tuesday, June 6. The article states:

The Supreme Court today upheld the right of the Government to brand the Communist Party of the United States a Communist action organization dominated from Moscow, and order it to register with the Department of Justice.

Eleven years have elapsed. The Internal Subversive Activities Control Board has done a highly creditable job throughout this period in trying to compel the "front" organizations of the Communist Party to register, and trying to implement the prohibitory language of the legislation. Not until the 5th day of June did the Supreme Court finally arrive at its adjudication of the legislation. Although a period of 11 years has been lost, I rejoice in the fact that we can now, for the first time, move effectively to expose and eradicate un-American influences in America which seek to destroy us from within and to deliver us to Communist Moscow without the firing of a single shot.

I read an additional statement from the news story reporting this great, important, and historic decision of the Supreme Court. The article points out that—

The Communist Party case has been in the courts nearly 10 years, or since shortly after Congress enacted the Internal Security Act in 1950. The Subversive Control Board three times ordered the party to register with the Justice Department, but the party put off the day of reckoning each time by appealing to the courts.

Mr. President, I interpolate to say that we have noticed with great satisfaction that in all the lower court decisions the Government has been successful in maintaining the constitutionality and validity of the act, and now the decision has been made final by the Supreme Court.

The article continues—

The delay of the High Court in deciding the issue had brought activity by the Board in recent years to a virtual standstill as the members held there was no reason to proceed further against Communist-front organizations until the Supreme Court ruled. Similarly, appeal courts have held up rulings and the Justice Department has postponed citing front organizations to the Board.

Today's ruling is expected to put the Board back in business and also produce additional front citations from the Justice Department.

I point out that in the 11 intervening years since passage of the Mundt-Nixon bill, we have seen spewed out on the American scene a host of front organizations which now, for the first time, will be compelled to register under the provisions of the act, or their officers will be put in the Federal penitentiary, where they belong, and the organizations will be in violation of the Federal statute.

We now have the means to enforce the legislation. I am confident that the Attorney General, who has demonstrated an interest in the elimination of communism in this country, will act with dispatch, courage, and fortitude to bring to task Communists who have cringed behind front organizations and have slowed down the wheels of justice for 11 years, taking every advantage, as they had a right to do, of the cumbersome legal appellate machinery of America, while they have continued to develop their front organization mechanisms in this country.

I continue to read from the news story:

The order of the board against the Communist Party labeled it a "Communist-action organization" which receives its orders from a foreign power, Russia.

This statement is precisely what was recited in the preamble language of the Mundt-Nixon bill when it was first introduced and passed in the House over a year before it passed the Senate. Then we induced the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, to override the veto of President Truman to enact the proposed legislation into law over the Presidential veto.

I continue to read from the article:

Under the act members of the party would be barred from holding nonelective Federal office.

Now, for the first time in American history, we have an operative Federal statute making it a crime for Communists to seek and obtain nonelective Federal jobs, and for those in positions

of authority knowingly to make available to Communists nonelective Federal jobs.

It may come as quite a shock to some to realize that a country that has been spending $50 billion a year in an effort to defend itself against communism, until the 5th day of June 1961 has not been able to enforce a law which makes it a crime for Communists to hold jobs of a nonelective nature in the Federal Government, so that by surreptitious methods they can undermine the very Government which we depend upon to protect the sanctity of the free world.

The Mundt-Nixon Act did other things. It included workers in defense plants. It included those serving as officers of labor unions. The party was required to file the names of its members with the Justice Department and stamp its literature with the words "Communist propaganda." It must also so label its broadcasts, television programs, brochures, and propaganda publications.

It must label anything that passes through the mails as to its origin with the Communist Party, or those guilty can also be sent to the Federal penitentiary.

I rejoice in the fact that the Mundt-Nixon bill, as it is incorporated in the Internal Security Act of 1950, also makes it a Federal crime for a Communist to seek or obtain and for the Federal Government to provide a passport for a Communist to travel abroad. Now for the first time we have an effective mechanism, so that those who can be shown to be Communists not only can be denied a passport, but if they secure one, we are not limited to the puerile attempt of trying to have it recaptured, but we can send these sneak thieves and traitors to the Federal penitentiary.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Earlier today I commended the distinguished Senator from South Dakota on the floor of the Senate in a colloquy with his colleague from South Dakota for the part which he played, as did Vice President Nixon, in the enactment of this legislation. I am very much heartened by the decision of the Supreme Court. One point has been troubling me, however. I have not looked into it yet. Does the Senator believe that the decision of the Supreme Court went so far as to cover also the provision of the act relating to passports? Was it sweeping enough to cover that point?

Mr. MUNDT. I would, of course, bow to the superior legal knowledge and information of my colleague from New York who is a distinguished lawyer but it is my information from what I have heard and read that this was a case which forms an area of adjudication which laid down the operative features of the Internal Security Act and upheld it. I believe the decision goes to the constitutionality of the act itself.

Mr. KEATING. I believe there were two cases that were before the Court, or more than two cases. Did they deal with the specific subject of passports?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure about all the specific cases that were involved. There were a series of decisions, and I have not yet had an opportunity to get from the Supreme Court the exact text of all the decisions. However, I believe the Senator from New York will find that it goes beyond the area simply of the registration feature. On some aspects the decision was more vigorous and overwhelming than on others.

The Senator said that in my absence he said something kind about my efforts in cooperation with Dick Nixon in getting the bill enacted. I was not present at the time, but I deeply appreciate what the Senator has said. One of the thrilling experiences of my period of service in the House was working with the then Representative Nixon, of California, in shaping the legislation we are discussing. I had the unique and unusual privilege, because I came from the House to the Senate, of having voted for the legislation twice, the time that it passed the House before it got to the Senate, and the second time, when it was passed by both the House and the Senate. The Senator from New York, who was a Member of the House at that time, was certainly very helpful in the enactment of the legislation.

Mr. KEATING. Did the Senator vote in both the House and in the Senate twice, in the same Congress?

Mr. MUNDT. The bill passed the House twice. The first time it passed it did not get to the Senate. The second time it passed was in the next session of Congress and I had moved over to the Senate. I was able then in this body to support the efforts of Representative Nixon and Representative KEATING.

Mr. KEATING. I did not want to have anything inherently illegal about this by having it appear that the Senator from South Dakota voted in two bodies in one session of the Congress.

Mr. MUNDT. Indeed not; there is nothing illegal about going from the House to the Senate. I am sure the Senator from New York would not hold that.

Mr. KEATING. I certainly would not. I am glad to learn that it was in the next session that the Senator voted for this measure here in the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. That is correct. I voted for it in both the 80th and in the 81st Congresses. The bill was finally enacted into law in the 81st Congress over the veto of President Harry Truman.

I do not wish to detain the Senate longer on this point. I do urge, because 11 years is a long time in which people should be asked to remember details, that Members of the House and of the Senate, and certainly members of the Department of Justice, who I am sure will now vigorously enforce the act, and I would hope also newspaper editors and commentators and the radio people speaking on this topic, would give themselves the benefit of going back and reading what is involved in these first 17 sections of the Internal Security Act of 1950. It will be good news for every patriotic American and bad news for every Communist and every individual who unfortunately has been duped or deceived by the Communists.

At long last we have devised a method for purging these organizations masquerading under pious titles and patriotic labels, but which are owned and operated and controlled and financed in the main from Moscow. This will give the well meaning citizens, who somehow or other do not exercise either common caution or good judgment about whether they join a Communist front organization or not, serious cause to ponder before they lend their good names and funds from their purse to a front organization, which under the law, as upheld by the Supreme Court, is compelled to register its membership and its source of income and its purpose and its Communist connection with the Federal Government, or the officers themselves will be sent to the Federal penitentiary.

I congratulate the Supreme Court in striking a blow for freedom. This is more important to the national defense of America than any billion dollar appropriation we could make in any area of our military defense; more important than any single missile or armament program. It gives us effective weapons at last to provide that the homefront will be staffed and manned and equipped with loyal Americans.

I should say this at this time too, because it may save a great deal of the type of correspondence which I get almost every day from people who say, "Why didn't you and Nixon put in the bill a provision to outlaw the Communist Party? Weren't you a little bit weak? Weren't you a little bit negligent? Having fought and battled this legislation through two Congresses and overridden the veto of the President, why did you not outlaw the party?"

The reason we did not write this legislation to outlaw the party, the reason we provided for the exposure and then the elimination of Communists from high places, the reason we elected a course of action making them register and making them tell where they get their money, and who spends it, and making them label their propaganda for what it is, so that if they poison the well of American thought at least the American drinking from the bottle now sees the label on its that says, "Let the buyer beware; there is poison in the bottle," was due to the wise counsel we received from America's greatest authority on communism, J. Edgar Hoover. That advice was to the effect that the device and mechanism and machinery used in the Mundt-Nixon bill and in this legislation as now validated by the Supreme Court would be more effective than outlawry, which after all can be detoured by the Communists through simply changing the name of the party.

Mr. Hoover pointed out that Canada tried twice to outlaw the Communist Party and twice had to repeal the law because it failed. This legislation is in harmony with the American method. This provides for operating in the open, for trying to captivate the American mind in the free marketplace, because I am convinced that patriotism will succeed if we but identify the rats running loose in America, and I am convinced we can develop the proper kind of penalty,

the proper kind of traps, and the proper type of rat poison to eliminate communism once we fully expose those who are involved in its activities.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. I remember Mr. Hoover's advice very well. There seems to me to be another reason why the course selected by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has turned out to be the correct one. As the Senator knows, this was a close decision. It was by a vote of 5 to 4.

If the act which was before the Court had been one to outlaw the party, we might have had a different result. In that case we might not have anything today, instead of having an effective piece of legislation. In framing this measure originally, the words, which I think were "political committee," were changed to "action committee," or words to that effect. That was done specifically to avoid any implication that there was an effort to outlaw thought or to prevent opinions or views, no matter how radical they might be, from having free currency in our free country. The bill was designed to get at only those whom the Senator has termed the "rats." There are hundreds of loyal Americans who got into the party by mistake, but who, when they found out what was wrong, got out. Also there were "dupes" who got into the party by mistake and were not smart enough or patriotic enough——

Mr. MUNDT. Or courageous enough.

Mr. KEATING. Or courageous enough, to get out. They, of course, would be caught under the "action" provisions.

I have had the same thought as has the Senator from South Dakota: Why not outlaw the party completely?

As a member of the Subcommittee on Internal Security, I have sat on the committee, as he has, and have bit my lips, trying not to enter into a contest with witnesses who come before us, such as one who appeared the other day. I asked him, "Are you a citizen of the United States?" He replied, "Yes."

I asked him, "Do you live in the United States?" His response was, "Yes, I have lived here too long." Imagine an American citizen saying he had lived in this country too long. That kind of testimony makes one's blood boil.

In framing legislation in this delicate area, we seek to abide by the Constitution, which provides that anyone may think anything he wishes to think and say anything he wishes to say in this free country, so long as he does not directly and actually attack the Government of the United States and seek to overthrow it by force.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KEATING. Or engage in an international conspiracy to overthrow it.

Again, I congratulate the Senator from South Dakota. I was a little apprehensive about what the Court might do. We have had before our committee in the past year some of the characters alluded to, who have said that the Supreme Court had not passed on this question. They have said, "I can be a member of the Communist Party, and I can advocate anything I wish to advocate until the Supreme Court acts." I was somewhat apprehensive.

I have not in a long time rejoiced so much over a headline in the newspapers as today, when I saw that the Court had held this law to be constitutional. I join with the Senator from South Dakota in saluting the Supreme Court for its decision.

Mr. MUNDT. I was thrilled with gratification over this decision. I was flying back from a visit to my home State, and I picked up a morning newspaper on the plane. I virtually let out an old Sioux Indian war whoop of gratitude. This is a great day for America and a great day for the free world.

The Senator from New York has very properly called attention to the highly logical, persuasive, and historically sound advice we received from the FBI against passing legislation to outlaw the party, and has also put his finger on another very good point, namely, that the decision of the Supreme Court was a 5-to-4 decision. I think it should have been 9 to 0. However, it was a 5-to-4 decision. The result might have been the other way, had we packed too much into the legislation.

It was for that reason, also—and this has caused some consternation among people who wanted Communist-control legislation—that the act specifically provides a prohibition against a Communist holding a nonelective job in the Federal Government. It is still possible under our legislation and, under the Supreme Court decision—it is still legal, but not proper—for a Communist to be elected to an office in this country and to hold the job. That is not outlawed or declared illegal. To have done so might have impinged upon some of our cherished American freedoms. I do not believe that anyone running openly under the Communist label can find a single congressional district in the United States in which he could be elected today. However, he has the legal right to try. But that relates to an elective position.

Starting on the 5th day of June, 1961, no American has any further right to sneak through the back door of Government by an appointment to a nonelective position and there try to undermine, destroy, and sabotage the whole framework of freedom and the constitutional concepts enjoyed by all the rest of our American citizens.

Mr. President, this is a happy day. I congratulate the courageous majority of the Supreme Court which kept faith with what Congress is trying to do in this legislation. The court of last appeal has held the act to be valid and constitutional.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SYMPHONIC BAND TRIUMPHS IN EASTERN EUROPEAN TOUR

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Friday, June 2, in a concert in Carnegie Hall in New York, the University of Michigan symphonic band marked its return to the United States after a 15-week tour of the Middle East. This has been a triumphant visit by these 94 young people, boys and girls, who have carried a sample of our finest cultural achievement to the U.S.S.R., Rumania, Poland, and a number of other countries.

The senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], recently received a letter from his sister-in-law, who is the wife of our chargé d'affaires in Bucharest. They heard the concert in Brasov, Rumania. I believe Senators would enjoy a few excerpts from her letter, in which she indicates the effect of the concert by these young Americans behind the Iron Curtain:

> Well, the Michigan band has come and gone, and what a wonderful group of kids they were. We were all so proud of them, and they had an enormous success.
>
> Imagine, 90 of them have been traveling 15 weeks—all over the U.S.S.R., Middle East, now here—plus 1 more week in Poland and then home, via a concert in Carnegie Hall. There are 23 girls along. They are all serious musicians, but also extremely alert, attractive, young men and women—though some of them look like babies.
>
> Wednesday we drove up to Brasov to hear the concert there, which was their first in Rumania, and a big success—encore after encore. When they started off with the "Star Spangled Banner" we all were standing there teary eyed. To hear it played so far from home in such an alien country by that nice group of American young was very emotion making.
>
> They have a most varied repertoire—Wagner, Bach, Musorgski, plus Gershwin and "My Fair Lady"—which they play divinely, and made a great hit.

We in Michigan are proud of this group and their director, Dr. William D. Revelli. Their talent has carried a message that no words could have expressed. It includes an answer to the dreary critics of the American scene who fear we count only our bathtubs and TV sets; who charge that we value and can and do contribute only to the material aspects of life. As an alumnus, I am, of course, especially proud that I may bring this achievement to the notice of the Senate and the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD two articles in the New York Times. The first is of February 22, 1961, describing the opening concert of the tour in Moscow. The second is of June 3, 1961, which reviews the Carnegie Hall performance of Friday. We welcome home these young men and women and their director, and I know you would have me say "Well done."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Feb. 22, 1961]

MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY BAND PLAYS IN MOSCOW—ENSEMBLE USES BORROWED INSTRUMENTS TO REPLACE THEIRS DELAYED IN FLIGHT

(By Seymour Topping)

Moscow, February 21.—The University of Michigan's symphony band delighted Muscovites tonight with its youth, smiles, and good music.

Opening an 8-week tour of the Soviet Union, the 94 musical ambassadors from Ann Arbor served up a varied list of Russian and American music, including selections from "My Fair Lady."

Hundreds of young Russians surged to the edge of the stage of Moscow's Sports

Palace as the concert ended to plead for encores and to communicate with the pretty girls and crewcut members of the orchestra.

Few of the 6,000 persons who listened with a mixture of curiosity and appreciation to this unfamiliar style of band music knew that some of the players were using borrowed Russian instruments.

Four of the band's trumpets, four euphoniums, two clarinets and one timpani were still languishing in London Airport because their crates could not be fitted into the two Russian jet airliners that brought the players here last night.

SOVIET INSTRUMENTS USED

Between 3 and 5 p.m. today officials hastily replaced instruments from Soviet music conservatories and orchestras. The show went on at 7.

"We still do not have any cymbals," William D. Revelli, faculty conductor, said at intermission, "but the band is playing well."

Because of the lack of cymbals Morton Gould's Symphony for Bands was dropped from the program. The missing instruments have been recrated in London and are expected to arrive here tomorrow by air before the band leaves for Leningrad.

The band lost an audience of 10,000 last night because it was delayed by bad weather and compelled to cancel its initial concert.

Most of the Muscovites who filled the Sports Palace tonight were serious young music lovers who did not quite know how to judge symphonic band music except as entertainment. They warmed slowly to the program, which opened with Rimsky-Korsakoff's "Procession of the Nobles."

STORM OF APPLAUSE

The program ended with a storm of applause for the rendition of the popular "Comedian's Gallop" by Dmitri Kabalevsky.

Cheers were drawn from the crowd of youngsters, who surged up to the stage after the Michigan's conductor's remarks: "Music is the greatest instrument for peace."

The band then played four encores and as it left the stage a few of the university student players lingered to exchange smiles and remarks, half in English and half in Russian, with the crowds of eager Russian youngsters.

The Michigan band of 27 girls and 67 boys is touring the Soviet Union under the U.S. State Department's cultural-exchange program. After its final concert in the Soviet Union on April 15, it is to visit many Middle Eastern cities.

[From the New York Times, June 3, 1961]

MUSIC: AT HOME AFTER A LONG TOUR—UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN BAND PLAYS HERE—ENSEMBLE PERFORMS WITH PRECISION

(By Raymond Erickson)

Fresh from triumphs in Sukhumi, Tbilisi, Erevan, Baku, and Brasov, a crack ensemble of young instrumentalists invaded Carnegie Hall last night, attracting a full, enthusiastic house. Another Soviet cultural invasion? No, it was the University of Michigan Symphony Band, which has just returned to this country from a swing around the Middle East and Eastern Europe.

Instead of barnstorming around the United States, as it does annually in the spring, the band gave 85 concerts abroad during a 15-week period, 8 of those weeks being spent in Russia.

The tour was sponsored by the Department of State as part of the President's international cultural exchange program, which is administered by the American National Theater and Academy. If the band played as well abroad as it did last night—and there is no reason to believe it didn't—the tour was well advised and was one we can be proud of.

This is said knowing that bands are frowned upon by many musicians. By their very makeup, they do not constitute an ideal concert ensemble, particularly when they appear indoors. Yet this concert gave a good deal of pleasure, and the astutely planned program did not grow wearisome.

The Michigan ensemble, composed of 94 students of the university, played with the precision of a well-oiled machine. More than that, it produced some luscious, gleaming organlike sonorities within performances that were always accurate, texturally clean, and smooth flowing.

The playing was especially notable in works composed for the band by contemporary American composers. The statement of the tune "Chester" at the beginning of William Schuman's overture on that tune had a noble ring. The interplay of muted sonorities in Vincent Persichetti's "Psalm for Band" was beautiful, and the virtuosity of the various sections, particularly the trumpets, in excerpts from Morton Gould's Symphony for Band was extraordinary.

There were the inevitable transcriptions of orchestral works, of course. If anyone thinks the "Pines of the Appian Way" section from Respighi's "Pines of Rome" is loud in its original version, they should have heard the Michigan band's performance. It threatened to blow the audience through the back walls of the auditorium.

Credit for the success and skill of the ensemble goes to William D. Revelli, who has been conducting it for the last 26 years. If he tends to drive the music too rigorously in fast tempos, he can be flexible at other times and produce some poetic playing.

The program also included Roger Nixon's "Elegy and Fanfare," and Vittorio Giannini's Praeludium and Allegro, and works by Berlioz, Mendez, Demerssman, and Mussorgsky. Donald Tison, trumpeter, and Richard Kruse, clarinetist, were the soloists. Some of the American composers represented, including Mr. Schuman and Mr. Persechetti, were present and acknowledged the applause of the audience.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill and ask that it lie on the table and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to correct what I believe is a most unfortunate oversight. The President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget approved an appropriation of $300,000 for the forest products laboratory in Madison, Wis. In spite of its approval, a part of the appropriation was left out by the committee. Although it was left out, the committee in its wisdom approved appropriations for other research facilities, which were disapproved by the Bureau of the Budget and by the President, in Tennessee, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Arizona, Georgia, Wyoming, Minnesota, Oregon, Montana, and Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I hope this $300,000 item, requested by the President, for reconstruction planning and the proposed addition to the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., will be included.

I understand that the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture feel that this is a most essential appropriation item.

The Forest Products Laboratory in Madison recently celebrated its golden anniversay. It was established in 1909 by Gifford Pinchot, during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt; and its history is a monument to effective Federal-State cooperation.

The main laboratory building, now 30 years old, is located on land donated by the University of Wisconsin. It is seriously overcrowded—providing accommodations for 400 employees, in facilities originally designed for 200.

Additional land for the proposed addition to the laboratory was recently acquired from the University of Wisconsin, with the approval of the Wisconsin Legislature.

I may say that the University of Wisconsin sold the land at a very great sacrifice; much more than the amount received by the university could have been obtained for this land. In fact, the university could have obtained a great deal more than the $48,000 which it received from the Federal Government, in connection with the sale of this land for this purpose. The legislature has approved the sale, although it, too, realizes that much more than that amount could have been obtained for the land.

Failure now to provide the funds with which to pay for architectural and other preconstruction planning would prevent the planned orderly expansion on the basis of which the Wisconsin authorities have approved this land transfer.

Wood utilization research has brought enormous benefits to all Americans. But great progress remains to be made in such fields as improved processes for making paper from low-grade hardwoods, fabrication of construction materials, and other products.

Mr. President, I intend, of course, to call up the amendment tomorrow. I hope the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who also is the chairman of the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee, will give this amendment the most thoughtful consideration. I have talked to him informally about it, and he says he has sympathy for it, and will consider it; and I hope the other members of the committee will do likewise.

Mr. President, in view of the great benefit to the entire Nation, certainly it will be a shame if this proposal, which has the very-hard-earned approval of the Bureau of the Budget, is knocked out.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand adjourned until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Ernest Morgan, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice Russell B. Wine.

Harold Barefoot Sanders, Jr., of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice William B. West III.

William W. Justice, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice James Crawford, Jr.

Woodrow B. Seals, of Texas, to be U.S. attorney for the southern district of Texas for the term of 4 years, vice William B. Butler.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

From the Sermon on the Mount, Matthew 5: 16: *Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.*

Eternal God, who alone can give worth and meaning to our life, may we have the insight to see what is vital and the will and the courage to pursue whatsoever is of highest value.

Make us more responsive to the needs of all who are walking the cold and wintry way of doubt and disillusionment and show us how we may lead them into the warmth and light of a vivid and victorious faith.

May we daily feel the urge, by kind words and good works, to identify ourselves more personally and sympathetically with humanity, with its hopes and aspirations, its struggles and sorrows, and may we pour the healing balm of love into hearts that are bruised and broken.

Give us a clearer vision of our opportunities and a keener sense of our obligation to be generous and charitable in behalf of those countries and people who know the bitterness of hunger and want.

Hear us in the name of the Master who being Lord of all was willing for the sake of a needy world to become the Servant of all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT ON RENEGOTIATION, JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 437) relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4(b)(2) of Public Law 86-89, July 13, 1959, extending the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, is further amended by striking out "June 30, 1961", relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1962".

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 325) and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Providence Hospital, the oldest general hospital in continuous service in the District of Columbia, was founded on June 10, 1861, by Sister Mary Sarah Carroll, Sister Clothilda O'Neill, Sister Mary Vincent Foley, and Sister Mary Alfonsa, of the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, of Emmitsburg, Maryland; and

Whereas Providence Hospital was incorporated by a special Act of the Congress approved April 8, 1864; and

Whereas Providence Hospital was the only nonmilitary hospital in the District of Columbia during the Civil War and provided hospital care for casualties of the Union and Confederate forces as well as for the civilian population; and

Whereas Providence Hospital during its existence has received financial assistance from the United States through appropriations by the Congress to assist it in carrying out its purpose of providing care for the sick regardless of their means; and

Whereas Providence Hospital, during the period when Alexandria and Georgetown were thriving ports-of-call for merchant vessels, afforded facilities for the care and treatment of sick and injured merchant seamen from ships docking at such ports under the supervision of surgeons of the United States Marine Hospital Service (now the United States Public Health Service); and

Whereas today employees of the United States with service-connected illnesses or injuries are cared for at Providence Hospital under the supervision of officers of the United States Public Health Service; and

Whereas in 1898, at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and assisted by an appropriation by the Congress, facilities for the treatment of contagious diseases were constructed as part of Providence Hospital, which was the first contagious disease hospital in the District of Columbia and until 1931 the only hospital of such type in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas many wounded and disabled veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I were brought back from the battlefronts and received treatment and rehabilitation at Providence Hospital; and

Whereas the facilities of Providence Hospital on Capitol Hill by the end of World War II were taxed beyond their capacity and with the assistance of the Federal Government new facilities for Providence Hospital were constructed at 12th and Varnum Streets, North East, in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas these new facilities, which were first occupied by Providence Hospital on April 5, 1956, received for that year the award of Hospital of the Year of the National Association of Architects; and

Whereas Providence Hospital continues to be administered by the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul on a nondenominational basis without regard to financial status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul and the advisory board, officers, staff, and personnel of Providence Hospital, Washington, District of Columbia, on the occasion of the centennial of the founding of Providence Hospital.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDENCE HOSPITAL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the English poets once wrote that we live in deeds, not years. Surely this is true of institutions, for the history of Providence Hospital has always been closely linked with the life of this community through the deeds of compassion and courage of the Sisters of Charity who established this institution. So today, in celebrating this centennial, we are commemorating a century of service, not merely the passage of time in the life of a distinguished institution.

The Government had moved to Washington in 1799, but in 1861 it was still a small country town. The only general hospital in the city in that fateful year was the Washington Infirmary. On August 29, 1842, Congress had appropriated $10,000 for the renovation of an old jail on Judiciary Square as an insane asylum and hospital. However, after the repairs were completed, the asylum and hospital were not used by

the Government. On June 15, 1844, Congress passed an act directing the Commissioner of Public Buildings to permit the medical faculty of Columbian College—now George Washington—to occupy the insane hospital for the purpose of an infirmary for medical instructions and for scientific purposes. This became known as the Washington Infirmary and was the first real hospital in Washington. In April 1861, shortly after the declaration of war, the Government requested the return of the property for use as a military hospital. It was operated by Sisters of Charity until it burned in November of that year.

Upon the preemption of the Washington Infirmary, it had become evident that a new hospital open to the public would have to be established and a group of physicians, headed by Dr. Joseph M. Toner, approached the Sisters of Charity of Emmitsburg, asking them to take charge of such an institution. This order of Sisters had been in Washington since 1825 when they founded St. Vincent's Orphanage and School. Many leading physicians of the city, colleagues of Dr. Toner, knew and were friends of the Sisters and were impressed by their work. It is probable that the Sisters of the orphanage acted as intermediaries between the soliciting doctors and the nuns at Emmitsburg. In fact, Sister Anne Simeon, the head of the order, had been stationed at St. Vincent's Orphanage for some time and personally knew most of the physicians in the District of Columbia. Sister Lucy Gwynn, Superior of St. Vincent's in 1861, according to old records, aided in the negotiations. In any event, the atmosphere was most cordial and the Sisters soon agreed to start a new hospital. When these negotiations were settled, the Sisters and physicians began a search for a suitable piece of property, which was found on Capitol Hill. The daughters of Daniel Carroll of Duddington, distant cousins of Charles Carroll of Carrolltown, were friends of the Sisters of Charity since the days of Mother Seton and had been students at their school, St. Joseph's College, Emmitsburg, Md. These ladies, owners of the Nicholson house at the corner of Second and D Streets, SE., willingly rented this house to the Sisters in May 1861. After some slight alterations and renovations, the establishment of the new hospital was announced in the National Intelligencer on June 8, 1861, as follows:

> In the course of a few days a hospital under the charge and direction of the Sisters of Charity will be opened for the reception of patients. The site chosen for the institution is Nicholson Park, formerly the residence of the late Major Nicholson, on Second Street, East, opposite the well known Carroll Mansion. The house is large and airy and the location high and healthy. The sisters who will preside over the institution are experienced nurses. They devote themselves to the attention of the sick, not for the sake of compensation but as a religious duty.

On June 10, 1861, the hospital was formally opened and in a few days the hospital received its first patient, a good Irishman named Lawrence O'Toole. Sister Mary Carroll—no relative of the owners of the property—was in charge, assisted by Sister Mary O'Neill, Sister Mary Vincent Foley, and Mary Alfonza Groell.

The hospital had been in operation only 6 weeks when the First Battle of Bull Run was fought on July 21, 1861. The casualties from this battle were brought back to Washington and Capitol Hill became known as Bloody Hill and was covered with tents for soldiers wounded in battle. The facilities of the hospital were small and the number of casualties so great that the Sisters often had to leave the hospital and care for the wounded in the surrounding tents. The records of the hospital state that one of the first soldiers wounded at Bull Run was admitted to the hospital on July 22, 1861, the day after the battle. The records also reveal that the first soldier to receive a pension for Civil War injuries was treated at Providence in July 1861. Later in the war the first person of Jewish faith to be awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, Leopold Karpeles, was hospitalized at Providence for wounds incurred in the Battle of the Wilderness. Throughout the Civil War the hospital provided care for casualties of the North and the South, and the civilian population.

They set up their hospital in a rented house which looked up toward the Capitol and in 3 weeks they admitted their first patient. Less than 1 month later their hospital was filled with the wounded and dying soldiers from the Battle of Bull Run.

The Sisters slaved day and night in service to this community which was then facing the worst crisis in its history. For 3 days and nights there was a continuous procession of ambulances into the city as the steamers brought the wounded to the wharves of the Potomac. But the Sisters were equal to the crisis. Their hospital was well stocked with bandages, medicines, instruments, and they themselves were prepared with skill, courage, and compassion. For, as Cardinal Gibbons once said, "In every Sister of Charity you find a Florence Nightingale. They move silently, effacing their own names. Their courage is sublime."

Their courage and devotion was such that they were not content to limit their service to the Nation's Capitol, but went in bands out into the camps of Richmond and Petersburg, Va., Philadelphia, Gettysburg, and New Orleans to bring their nursing skill to the battlefield.

The qualities which the Sisters of Charity had then have remained unchanged throughout the years and the story of Providence Hospital reflects the character of those who have been associated with it these past 100 years.

When hostilities broke out with Spain, Providence Hospital became the distributing center for nursing sisters. Again, the Sisters of Charity extended their services to the battlefield and later brought many of the wounded back to Providence Hospital for convalescent care. And when World War I began, this institution was one of the first large general hospitals to offer its services to the Government when 20 members of the medical staff and 75 graduate nurses volunteered for active service.

The building of 83 large military hospitals in the city removed much of the original load of caring for the military and the Sisters and the physicians of the staff were able to care for the civilian population. However, many Sisters of Charity were sent to Washington to work strictly in the military hospitals, particularly the 2,500 bed Lincoln Hospital. This is one of the reasons why the work done at Providence has sometimes been confused with these military hospitals. Providence was the only nonmilitary hospital in Washington during the Civil War, and is the only private hospital that has remained in continuous operation since that time.

With the requisition by the military of the Washington Infirmary in April 1861, no facilities were present in the District of Columbia to care for residents or transients. Some attention was given to the city poor at the infirmary attached to the city poorhouse, but this was not adequate. In 1862, Congress appropriated $6,000 to Providence Hospital "for the support, care and medical treatment of 40 transient paupers, medical, and surgical patients." This was the main financial support of the new hospital. This appropriation was continued for 3 years but failed in 1865, only to be raised to $12,000 on April 7, 1866. The number of patients to be treated was also raised from 40 to 60. The hospital at this time found a powerful and persistent friend in the Honorable Thaddeus Stevens who later was joined by the Honorable Sam Randall and the Honorable James A. Garfield. These men aided the newly formed hospital for many years and helped to obtain an annual appropriation. In 1864 Providence bought the Nicholson house that it had rented for its first 3 years of existence and gradually thereafter acquired property on square 764, lot by lot, until in 1897 it finally owned the entire square.

The hospital was incorporated by a special act of Congress approved April 8, 1864. The act of April 7, 1866, which appropriated $12,000 for the operation of the hospital also included $30,000 for the erection of an additional building. Two years later, in 1868, a further $30,000 was appropriated for the completion of the hospital. This enabled the center and east wing to be completed by 1872.

At the time it was provided that all such expenditures authorized by Congress should be made under the direction of the Surgeon General of the Army. This relationship of the hospital to the Surgeon General of the Army must have been satisfactory for it continued until 1920. On numerous occasions the Surgeon Generals and particularly Surgeon General Sternberg testified before Congress to the excellent care given by Providence to the poor of the District of Columbia.

Another type of medical care which Providence in its early days provided was for the sick and injured merchant sailors from the then busy ports of Alex-

andria and Georgetown. These sailors were placed in Providence by the Collector of the Ports and put under the care of surgeons of the Marine Hospital Service. The agreement between Providence and the U.S. Health Service—which grew out of the Marine Hospital Service—has continued to this day. Employees of the U.S. Government with service-connected illnesses or injuries are cared for at Providence by surgeons of the U.S. Public Health Service. With the development of other hospitals in the District of Columbia and the founding of Gallinger Hospital—now District General—Providence gradually shared the medical care of the indigent.

The early bulletins of Providence show that the physicians on its staff were among the most prominent of their time in the Nation's Capital. Dr. Joseph M. Toner, one of the founders of the hospital, was the house physician and surgeon. He had the foresight to advise that the hospital be opened to all physicians, so that any qualified doctor of the District of Columbia might send his patient to the hospital and to care for him there. This was a radical departure from the usual hospital procedures of the time. Most hospitals in this country were closed-staff hospitals and only physicians on the staff could care for patients admitted to their institution. The principle of open-staff hospitals in the District of Columbia has continued to this day.

Dr. Toner, a man of many talents, was a historian as well as a leader of his profession. His connections with the establishment and founding of many of the hospitals and charitable institutions of the District of Columbia are facts of history. In 1874 he was president of the American Medical Association and in 1884 was president of the Medical Society of the District of Columbia. His oration delivered before the medical society on September 26, 1866, is the basis of many facts concerning the early medical history of the District of Columbia. In 1882 he presented his valuable library of 2,800 books and 1,800 pamphlets to the U.S. Government. It is now known as the Toner Collection in the Library of Congress.

Three physicians connected with the hospital in the early days, Drs. Noble Young, Johnson Eliot, and Flodoardo Howard, were among the four founders of Georgetown Medical School in 1849. The connection between Georgetown Medical School and Providence dates from the founding of the hospital. The wards, amphitheater, and dispensaries were used exclusively by the teachers of Georgetown for clinical demonstrations to their students. Students from Howard University and Columbian Medical School were also invited as guests to demonstrations in the hospital. In 1899 Georgetown University built its own hospital, yet the relationship between the two institutions continued for almost a century. Many physicians on the active staff of Providence today are members of the teaching faculty at Georgetown. Two deans of Georgetown have been interns of the hospital and many departmental heads received their hospital training at Providence. The old amphitheater at Providence built in 1881 was erected for the sole purpose of teaching students and nurses. The archives of Georgetown show that Sister Beatrice, the superintendent, erected it upon request of the teachers of Georgetown, members at that time of the active staff of the hospital.

Before the turn of the century, the District Commissioners had been looking for some time for a site for a hospital to care for contagious diseases other than smallpox. No site could be obtained until Sister Beatrice, administrator, offered the use of the hospital land for this purpose. In the year 1898, at the request of the District Commissioners and by an appropriation of Congress, a large contagious building containing 37 beds was erected on the hospital grounds. This unit was the first contagious disease hospital of the District and was used until 1931 when these cases were hospitalized at Gallinger Hospital. Thereafter, this old building lay vacant for almost 10 years. In 1939, Congress appropriated $50,000 for renovation of this building for use as an outpatient department. Hon. Ross Collins, Congressman from Mississippi, chairman of the District Committee, and Hon. Joseph P. Tumulty, former secretary of Woodrow Wilson, were very helpful in seeking this needed improvement. After the building had been renovated an additional $15,000 was appropriated by Congress for equipping and furnishing the building. Thus the outpatient department which had originally been in the basement of the main building and had long since been outmoded was moved to a separate building. This made possible the handling of an even greater volume of indigent cases than in the past. In a typical year of 1949 23,706 patients were treated in the outpatient department and 16,101 were treated in the emergency room. In that same year 2,021 needy were aided by the social service department.

Until the end of the century there was still a large area of the property, purchased in the previous years, not built on. This was used as a walking garden for the patients. It soon became evident, however, that the hospital would have to be expanded and the Sisters with congressional approval, in 1900 borrowed $200,000 from the Philadelphia Savings Fund Society, of Philadelphia, Pa. In July 1901 a new wing on the Third Street side was started, but before the building was finished the total cost had amounted to $530,629.67. This large debt was staggering. Some civic-minded members of the board, notably Mr. N. H. Shea, loaned the Sisters $30,000 at reduced interest rates and also some other friends endorsed the note of the hospital to the Citizens National Bank allowing them to borrow another $50,000. Costs were greatly increased when it was found that the original building was in a bad state of decay and had to be repaired along with the construction of the new building. The deficit incurred in this construction amounted to $130,626.67. Finally, in the fiscal year of 1907, Congress, in recognition of the vital work that Providence was doing in the care of the poor, appropriated this money to help the Sisters settle their longstanding debt. The central tower that became a landmark on Capitol Hill, second only to the Capitol dome, was built at this time.

There were those, however, who questioned the propriety of congressional appropriations in aid of a hospital operated by a religious order. When Congress authorized Government funds for the isolation building, a citizen named Bradfield challenged the right of Congress to do so, claiming that such payments violated the first amendment of the Constitution as a "law respecting an establishment of religion." But the Supreme Court in the case of *Bradfield* v. *Roberts*, 175 U.S. 295, held that Providence was essentially a charitable corporation and that an appropriation of public funds for the purpose of aiding its hospital service to the community did not conflict with the first amendment merely because the members of the corporation as chartered by Congress belonged to a monastic order or sisterhood of the Catholic Church.

One of the unusual activities of the old hospital was the alcoholic or topers ward. Sister Regis, who in her early days as a Daughter of Charity had gone to Cuba with the Army in 1898, was in charge of the ward for many years. It was said that her gentle care and wise counsel to many men of prominence, in business and government, who had imbibed too long or freely and then had spent a few days in her ward were never forgotten. Later when the hospital needed help some of these men are reported to have been the first to volunteer their services. The park across the street from the hospital was established, with the aid of some of these friends in Congress, so that the front of the fine hospital building would not be obscured by other buildings.

Around the turn of the century the board of visitors contained many of the most outstanding local and national names, including: Gen. Joseph C. Breckenridge of Civil War fame; Hon. N. N. Parker; Edward B. McLean, the founder and owner of the Washington Post; Thomas F. Walsh, father of Evelyn Walsh McLean, who had struck it rich in Comstock Lode; Hon. Joseph C. Cannon, Speaker of the House; Gifford Pinchot, Cabinet member of Theodore Roosevelt and later Governor of Pennsylvania; Hon. J. H. Gallinger, in whose honor Gallinger Hospital was named; Peter Goelet Gerry, the financier and Senator from Rhode Island, and Joseph Leiter, another prominent Washingtonian. These men not only aided Providence by their prestige, but on many occasions were called on to help the struggling hospital by contributing funds. No one knows how much they contributed to help the hospital continue to take care of the poor and the sick of the District of Columbia. They should not be forgotten.

The Spanish American War and World War I both threw additional burdens on the hospital and because of the wise construction it was possible to

expand facilities to meet the need. Following the Spanish American and during the First World War, many wounded and disabled veterans were brought back from the battlefronts and rehabilitated at Providence. World War II brought a tremendous increase in population in Washington and the facilities were taxed beyond belief. Every conceivable space was fitted with beds and the operating room would run a daily schedule of from 25 to 30 operations.

Before the end of World War II, it became evident that the once modern buildings and equipment were completely worn out and that only an entirely new building would answer. A lay advisory board, organized in 1945, under the brilliant and untiring leadership of John A. Reilly, president of the Second National Bank, undertook to help the Sisters obtain the facilities essential to the continuance of their great work.

Not only was the old site too small for a modern hospital, but tearing down the old buildings and replacing them would have deprived the city of an indispensable asset for at least 3 years. Therefore, a new and suitable location was sought and finally in 1947 obtained from the Catholic Sisters College on a high elevation in Northeast Washington.

Meanwhile, House Majority Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, sponsored an amendment to the District of Columbia Hospital Center Act to authorize the General Services Administration to make incentive grants to the nonprofit hospitals not included in the Center for rebuilding their obsolete and outworn plants. Senators Pastore, of Rhode Island, Butler, of Maryland, McMahon, of Connecticut, Taft, of Ohio, and like-minded colleagues who realized the vital part which such private hospitals played in meeting the community needs, were strong supporters of the legislation. General Services Administration, under this law, was directed to make such grants as it deemed in the public interest to the qualifying hospitals up to one-half of the cost of the proposed new buildings and equipment. This constructive legislation and the several appropriations bills which Congressman MCCORMACK introduced for its implementation were responsible for the fine new hospital buildings or additions constructed at Providence, Children's, Sibley, Columbia, Casualty, and Georgetown Hospitals. It is not too much to say that all the voluntary hospitals in the District of Columbia—with the exception of the three already provided for in the original Hospital Center Act—trace their rebuilding programs and their present modern status to this legislative measure and the generous interest of the men in Congress who sponsored it.

Providence was the first hospital to present plans under this program to General Services Administration and to raise the matching funds necessary to qualify for the grant in aid. The estimated cost of the new air-conditioned and completely modern hospital building and nurses' home planned for the 12th and Varnum Street site was approximately $8 million. The Sisters of Charity were able to raise a total of $3 million, so it was necessary, for the first time in its 90 year life, for the hospital to make a general appeal to the public for the $1 million to make up the full $4 million to match the Government grant of $4 million. This campaign of funds, headed by John A. Reilly and given invaluable help by the Most Reverend Patrick A. O'Boyle, archbishop of Washington, was long and arduous but ended in a complete success.

Meanwhile the architectural firm of Faulkner, Kingsbury and Stenhouse, with the active advice of Sister Celeste, administrator, and Sister Eleanor, then secretary of the corporation, were engaged in designing a completely modern air-conditioned 350-bed hospital and nurses' home to provide the finest medical, surgical, and nursing care possible. The success of their efforts was later attested when the new Providence won the Hospital of the Year Award of the National Association of Architects Association in the year of its completion.

In designing and constructing the new hospital, close collaboration with the Public Buildings Administrator of the General Services Administration, Mr. W. E. Reynolds, was necessary because of the public interest in the large expenditure of Federal and District funds. Competitive bidding resulted in an award of the construction contract to the Charles H. Tompkins Co.

Ground was broken by Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle on February 12, 1954, and a little over 2 years later the hospital and nurses' home were completely finished and equipped and ready for occupancy. Dedication ceremonies were held on March 25, 1956, the transfer of patients from the old hospital was speedily effected, and the active functioning of the new hospital began on April 5.

The first 5 years in the new hospital have surpassed all expectations. The large daily patient census, the excellent performance of the operating rooms and equipment, and the efficient integration of all the facilities attest to the careful planning, design and construction that have combined to make the new Providence an outstanding success in keeping with its noble tradition.

No history of Providence would be complete without mentioning some of the superiors who directed the activities of the hospital over these many years. The first superior was Sister Mary Carroll, who came to Washington with three other nuns and ran the hospital during the Civil War years. In 1866 Sister Loretta O'Reilly, who had served at the Lincoln Hospital, was appointed superior and remained so until 1870 when Sister Beaurice Duffy was appointed. Sister Beatrice had also served in the military hospitals in Washington during the war and was quite familiar with the District of Columbia. She obtained all additional property needed for the construction of the east wing, the nurses' home, the powerhouse, and the contagious disease building, and under her wise guidance the hospital expanded and progressed. She died on September 25, 1899, having served the hospital and her country for 30 years. At the time of her death the medical board adopted the following resolution:

> Viewed from any standpoint, Sister Beatrice must be graded as a woman of unusual power in her day and generation.

Among other notable superiors were Sister Berchmans Beltzhoover who served the hospital from 1906 to 1927; Sister Rosa McGhee, Sister Marie Daly, and Sister Celeste Cummings, who was administrator of the hospital when plans for the new Providence were started and the first administrator of the newly occupied building. Sister Eleanor McNabb, as Sister Celeste's assistant, aided greatly in planning the new hospital and has been administrator since 1957.

The 100 years of this Washington medical institution has resulted in many firsts, some have been mentioned and others are briefly noted here in closing. Many nursing schools in this area, including Providence, were organized around 1892 and 1893. Providence was the first hospital to organize a 3-year school in 1896 in the United States. The first social service department was organized in 1919. The first interns trained in Providence Hospital were Dr. Joseph Repetti in 1896, followed by Dr. Joseph Wall in 1897. The first house physician from Washington to be killed during World War II, Dr. Edward Stone, left Providence in 1940 to join the British Army and was killed in action in north Africa. Providence was the first hospital in this area to be approved for training by the Cadet Nurse Corps of the U.S. Army during the Second World War. Providence Hospital was among the first in the District of Columbia to be approved for a 4-year training program for surgical residency by both the American College of Surgeons and the American Medical Association.

The story of a hospital such as Providence is the history of medicine during the last 100 years. It is the history of the days before antisepsis; the beginning of modern cellular pathology; the advent of local anesthesia, first advocated by Halstead; and the use of insulin in the treatment of diabetes. It witnessed the gradual eradication of all great epidemics, such as: typhoid, dysentary, measles, mumps, and the control of poliomyelitis. It is the history of the gradual evolution of the socioeconomics aspects of the medical education in the city of Washington from the old days of the doctor's apprentice to the emergence of the residency training program and the clinical clerkship of the highly educated students of today. Yet, 100 years is still short enough for the present generation to have talked with parents and grandparents who remember the early days of Providence and the dedicated men and women, whose sacrifices made possible the development of our modern community hospital serving so well the demands of the world today.

We cannot speak of Providence Hospital without mentioning "firsts" for its century of service is filled with many such examples. It was the first general hospital in the city and is, therefore, the oldest general hospital in Washington.

In 1882 an amphitheatre was built so that students and surgeons could watch operations. It was the first operating room of its kind in this country. In 1895 it was the first hospital school of nursing in the city to adopt a 3-year course of nurses training. Later, in 1942, Providence Hospital was the first hospital in the United States to be approved for the installation of a Cadet Nurses Corps.

The Sisters of Charity have not confined their efforts in this instance either, for they have gone out in this community and enriched its life with their social service. They were instrumental, for example, in the opening of Washington's first soup kitchen for the unemployed. Another "first" came in 1909 when they opened a day nursery for the children of working mothers. Their hospital was also the first to recognize the necessity of a social service department to call upon patients and their families at home.

I express my appreciations to Dr. John A. Long, M.D., Dr. Philip A. Caulfield, M.D., Miss Rose Martin, and Mr. Daniel M. O'Donoghue, for their cooperation with me in preparing these remarks which convey in part the wonderful history and achievements of the first 100 years of Providence Hospital.

All of us take pride in the tradition which has made Providence a great hospital and a credit to the city of Washington. And today, we still rely on this hospital to meet our crises—just as others did 100 years ago. We find today, just as others did a century ago, that Providence Hospital and the Sisters of Charity are equal to the task. Their hospital possesses equipment and facilities second to none. But, most important, we find that there is still a Florence Nightingale in every Sister of Charity and her courage is sublime. And Providence Hospital, young in spirit and vitality, is making plans and looking forward to its next 100 years of service to God, mankind, and country.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation from a group:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am very grateful for your appointment as a delegate to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group. I regret, however, that previous commitments prevent my serving as a delegate and I must therefore respectfully submit my resignation.

Sincerely yours,

SIDNEY R. YATES,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on June 8, 1961, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY] to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

BILL DANIEL, GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to inform the House, from information received firsthand from the fiscal consultant of the Legislature of Guam, that the new Governor of that farflung unincorporated territory in the distant Pacific already has won the hearts of the people.

Like his fellow Texan, Vice President JOHNSON, in his recent good-will mission to the Far East, he has made stuffed-shirtism a thing of the past. His first executive order came as a pleasant departure. There were to be no frills of fancy nomenclature. The official signature was to be just plain down-to-earth "Bill Daniel, Governor of Guam."

My correspondent tells of a scene at a farewell to someone departing on a trip. He continued:

> Deep in the middle, not perched out in front, of the aloha singing crowd of several hundred was white-suited, white-haired Bill Daniel singing as loud as anyone else. Several rows behind him in Texas sombrero and Philippine shirt, lustily singing, was 19-year-old Bill, Jr. You can tell everybody in Washington that Bill Daniel surely has taken Guam by storm.

I venture the suggestion that with more of this sort of thing, more human touch and heart and less dignity of pretense, it will not be long before the old image of Uncle Sam is restored the world around.

My congratulations to Speaker Won Pat of the Legislature of Guam, so well and affectionately known on Capitol Hill, and the other members of the Guam Legislature, in having the pleasure of working with a Governor of the same democratic mold as themselves.

No matter how high his office, whether elective or appointive, and regardless of whether he serves in continental United States, in the States or territories not contiguous or in foreign lands, a public official is a public servant. Public servants as well as others do not make friends for their country by throwing their weight around. The true dignity of office is shown in integrity, industry, humility, and dedication, and of these humility is not the least.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

WORTHINGTON OIL REFINERS, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1414) for the relief of the Worthington Oil Refiners, Inc.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

LOUIS J. ROSENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2686) for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $7,500 to Louis J. Rosenstein, of 1916 Sixty-fifth Avenue, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for personal injuries sustained as the result of an accident on March 21, 1946, near Lyon, France, involving a United States Army vehicle: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAURICIA REYES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3843) for the relief of Mrs. Mauricia Reyes.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MR. AND MRS. JAMES H. McMURRAY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4872) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray, Two hundred and seventy-eight Eighteenth Avenue, Paterson, New Jersey, the sum of $10,000 in full settlement of their claims against the United States for the death of their son, Airman Second Class Joseph A. McMurray, which occurred on March 7, 1957, as a result of an accident involving a United States Air Force jet aircraft at an airfield at Manston, England: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERICA BARTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 277) for the relief of Erica Barth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erica Barth shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, after the words "visa fee." strike out the remainder of bill and substitute the following: "Upon the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall reduce by one number the number of refugees who may be paroled into the United States pursuant to sections 1 and 2(a) of the Act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504), during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORLD GAMES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1687) for the relief of World Games, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in recognition of the outstanding success of the 1959 Games of the Modern Pentathlon in promoting international good will toward the United States of America, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the World Games, Incorporated, a Pennsylvania corporation, the sum of $41,567, to enable the corporation to discharge the obligations incurred by the corporation in connection with the 1959 Games of the Modern Pentathlon held at Hershey, Pennsylvania, September 26–30, 1959. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the corporation shall use such sum to discharge such obligations: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS ELSIE ROBEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6224) for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Miss Elsie Robey, of Breckenridge, Michigan, the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all the claims of Miss Elsie Robey against the United States arising out of an accident in Saginaw, Michigan, on May 31, 1943, in which she was struck by a United States Post Office truck and received severe and permanent injuries: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX BLEIER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1353) for the relief of Max Bleier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212(a)(9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Bleier may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. JOSEFA PIDLAOAN AND DAUGHTER, ANNABELLE PIDLAOAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1399) for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "fee" and substitute "fees".

Page 1, line 11, strike out the words "one number" and substitute "two numbers".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANSUREH RINEHART

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1477) for the relief of Mansureh Rinehart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mansureh Rinehart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee: *Provided,* That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IN FIL CHUNG, IN AE CHUNG, IN SOOK CHUNG, AND IN JA CHUNG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 546) for the relief of In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung, and In Ja Chung.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, In Fil Chung, In Ae Chung, In Sook Chung and In Ja Chung, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Bussmann, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural father of the beneficiaries, by virtue of such parentage, shall not be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL PISAR

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1064) for the relief of Samuel Pisar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for

the purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Samuel Pisar (A-10022768), admitted to the United States for permanent residence on October 29, 1956, shall be held to have complied with the residential and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEJEN PI CORSA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1620) for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Kejen Pi Corsa shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Captain and Mrs. Richard T. Corsa.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK KONKO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1626) for the relief of Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mendel and Shirley Prengler, citizens of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the names "Wladislaw Konko (Jack Konko)" and substitute the name "Jack Konko".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill for the relief of Jack Konko."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RICAREDO BERNABE DELA CENA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1911) for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 2, 1954, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SODE HATTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1915) for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Sode Hatta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Sode Hatta. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Sode Hatta shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TAKAMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2360) for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Tome Takamoto shall be held to be classifiable as a nonquota returning resident under the provisions of section 101(a)(27)(B) of that Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENNIS CRAFT McLAREN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 215) for the relief of Ennis Craft McLaren.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ennis Craft McLaren, boatswain's mate, first class, United States Navy, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of $750, representing the amount paid to him for travel allowances in connection with his transfer from Yukosuka, Japan, to Boston, Massachusetts, in September 1956, for humanitarian reasons, the payment of such amount having occurred as a result of administrative error.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Ennis Craft McLaren, the sum of any payments received or withheld from him on account of the administrative error referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN G. TIEDEMANN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 949) for the relief of John G. Tiedemann.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John G. Tiedemann of Washington, District of Columbia, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the District of Columbia government the sum of $1,160.67, representing unauthorized payments of salary paid to him for services which he rendered as an employee of the public schools of the District of Columbia during the periods from June 17, 1957, through June 30, 1957, and from July 1, 1959, through August 31, 1959, such payments having been received by the said John G. Tiedemann in good faith.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said John G. Tiedemann, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM J. STEVENS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1891) for the relief of Engineman First Class William J. Stevens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That William J. Stevens, Engineman First Class, United States Navy (serial number 3868239), is hereby relieved of liability to repay to the United States the sum of $1,876.52, which represents the aggregate amount erroneously

paid to him by the United States because of an administrative error in granting him credit for pay purposes for service in the United States Naval Reserve from April 12, 1946, through April 12, 1951. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay, out of current appropriations for the payment of basic pay to members of the naval service, to the said William J. Stevens the aggregate amount paid to the United States by the said William J. Stevens, or withheld by the United States from amounts due the said William J. Stevens from the United States, on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount paid under this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5: strike out "$1,876.52" and insert "$1,526.52".

Page 1, line 9: strike out "12" and insert "13".

Page 1, line 10: strike out "12" and insert "23".

Page 2, lines 11–12: strike out "in excess of 10 percentum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY ROBERT LOWRY (ANTONIO PIANTADOSI)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2973) for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 8, after the word "fee", strike out the period and the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID RILEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3101) for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David Riley, lieutenant colonel, United States Marine Corps, First Marine Air Wing in Japan, the sum of $8,553.98 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 2732, as amended, for household and personal effects destroyed or damaged in June 1960 when the CM and L Moving and Storage Company warehouse in which such effects were stored in Brooklyn, New York, was inundated by a fire: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$8,553.98" and insert "$3,783.32".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANUEL MARTINEZ-LOPEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4557) for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Manuel Martinez-Lopez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NORA M. HAMMOND

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4565) for the relief of Nora M. Hammond.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nora M. Hammond, Trotwood, Ohio, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States a sum of $323.14, which was erroneously paid to her by the Department of the Air Force as salary between October 30, 1955, and May 24, 1959.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amounts refunded by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act by the said Nora M. Hammond, or any amounts withheld by the United States from money otherwise due her. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REAR ADM. CARL H. COTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4639) for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Rear Admiral Carl H. Cotter, United States Navy, retired, is relieved of liability to pay to the United States the sum of $27,917.94, which amount represents the total of overpayments of retired pay during the period beginning May 1, 1956, and ending July 31, 1959, while the said Carl H. Cotter was president of the Capitol Construction Company and that company was engaged in certain contract work for the United States. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this section.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rear Admiral Carl H. Cotter, United States Navy, retired, the amount certified to him by the Secretary of the Navy as the sum of the amounts withheld from him by the United States on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Carl H. Cotter against the United States for amounts withheld from his retired pay on account of the liability referred to in the first section of this Act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this section in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NISSIM S. TAWIL AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6452) for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Jacqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Nissim S. Tawil, of Brooklyn, New York, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,307, issued April 8, 1949; and that Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), his wife, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,618, issued October 1, 1948; and that Solomn Tawil, his son, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,308, issued April 8, 1949; and that Kathy Tawil, his daughter, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,621, issued October 1, 1948; and that Jacqueline Tawil, his daughter, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,620, issued October 1, 1948; and that Sarina Goldman, his daughter by adoption, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 231,309, issued October 1, 1948; and that Isaac Tawil, his son, is relieved of all liability and responsibility to the United States based upon departure bond numbered 229,619, issued October 1, 1948; and that each of said bonds is canceled as of the date of its execution.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EARL GUPTON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6453) for the relief of Earl Gupton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Earl Gupton, in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such sum represents compensation for injuries sustained as the result of an accident while working in institution laundry on May 11, 1956, while an inmate of the United States prison, Atlanta, Georgia: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,277.34".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES H. STYPE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6767) for the relief of Charles H. Stype.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles H. Stype, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, an employee of the postal field service, the sum of $99. Such sum is the amount which the said Charles H. Stype was required to repay to the United States on account of the loss, on or about March 20, 1957, without fault on his part, of an equal amount which was in a contingent fund for expenses of Motor Vehicle Service employees under his custody as administrative assistant, motor vehicle facility, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Adair	Evins	Harsha
Bailey	Fallon	Hébert
Bennett, Mich.	Fino	Hosmer
Blitch	Fogarty	Jones, Ala.
Boggs	Grant	Kee
Cahill	Gray	Kilburn
Cramer	Green, Oreg.	Knox
Daniels	Green, Pa.	Mason
Davis, Tenn.	Hall	Merrow
Dominick	Halleck	Miller, George P.
Dwyer	Hardy	O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski	Roberts	Teague, Tex.
O'Neill	St. Germain	Thompson, La.
Pilcher	Schadeberg	Utt
Pirnie	Shelley	Walter
Powell	Sikes	Westland
Rains	Spence	Willis
	Taber	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 382 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit today and tomorrow during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the majority leader, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 3 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7444, with Mr. KILDAY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may take.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, once again it is my privilege

to bring to you, as chairman of the committee handling agricultural appropriations, the annual Appropriation Act for the Department of Agriculture. May I say that I hope the Members will read the report that we have prepared. While these funds are identified as being funds which the Federal Government spends for agriculture, in reality these represent the funds which are spent in providing for the American people the basic necessities of life. Whatever we may learn and whatever we may do and however we may prosper, food, clothing, and shelter remain basic.

Mr. Chairman, in recent years we have heard much about our surpluses, and we have had large productions which are surplus to our domestic need. There are real reasons in regard to some of these commodities for us bringing together supply and demand. But, when we study the countries of the world and see how much more fortunate we are than they, when we see that the one place that Russia has not been able to touch us at all, it is in the production of agricultural crops. Truly, in spite of the high costs which we have had in recent years, because of overproduction in some areas, this wonderful job that American agriculture does and has done and can continue to do represents one of our chief strengths in these trying times.

For those of you who have looked at the report, you will see that this year for the first time we have tried to identify in our report and in our bill the various aspects of the appropriations which we make. We identify those appropriatons which necessitate our committee having to pick up the tab after the funds have been expended under legislation which authorizes such expenditures. We attempt to show what has been done in the field of price support activities, and we show what part is storage, what part is transportation, and what part is interest, and so forth. So, as large as the amount of money in this bill may be, we have tried to let each program and fund stand on its own bottom by identifying the sums in this bill for what they really are.

One of the things that we face, those of us that handle agricultural appropriations and those on the legislative committees that have to deal with agriculture, is the fact that so frequently people fail to recognize that many, many things are carried in the Department of Agriculture bill which, in effect, are a part of our foreign policy and many sums are spent under legislation which authorized it, where, again, we just have to appropriate money after the fact.

With the enactment of the first farm price support program in 1933, Congress created the Commodity Credit Corporation. At that time it provided the Corporation with capital funds to enable it to make loans, buy and sell commodities, and conduct the normal business activities in connection therewith. These capital funds have been increased from time to time by the Congress to meet the needs of the various price support programs enacted through the years.

Price support is mandatory for the basic commodities and other commodities specifically designated by law. It is imperative, therefore, because of the unpredictable nature of the operations under the various price support programs, that the Commodity Credit Corporation have flexibility in the use of funds and adequate resources available at all times to meet the needs of the price support programs.

The financial ability of the Corporation to take supplies of a commodity off the market in whatever quantity necessary makes the price support program effective in encouraging orderly marketing. It removes the necessity for farmers to rush their crops to market when prices are unfavorable.

If there were doubt of the ability of the Corporation to finance required operations, the price-support program would not prove effective in stabilizing prices and markets. Also, the inability of the Corporation to meet its financial obligations would adversely affect the willingness of banks, warehousemen, processors, and others to cooperate in price-support operations.

Over the years, Congress has recognized that flexibility in the Corporation's operations is indispensable to the proper conduct of the price-support programs for which the Congress established the Corporation and directed that it be so employed. Such flexibility is not only desirable but absolutely essential to successful operation of these programs.

However, in recent years the ability of the Corporation to fully use its financial resources for its primary purpose of price support has been seriously limited by charging the Corporation with the financing of special activities not originally contemplated to be within its functions.

With the passage of the International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949, the Corporation was called upon to finance this special program, subject to later reimbursement through appropriation action. Then in 1954, with the passage of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (Public Law 480), Congress directed the Corporation to finance the oversea exportation of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies and for emergency relief assistance, leaving the Corporation dependent upon reimbursement from subsequent appropriations. The financing of this program has had large amounts of Corporation funds tied up each year.

Further, legislation adopted in 1956 authorized the Corporation to transfer bartered materials acquired in exchange for agricultural commodities to the supplemental stockpile. It further provided for appropriations to reimburse for value of materials so transferred. Also the special milk program, which is now costing about $90 million a year, is being financed by this Corporation in accord with basic law.

It is expected that by June 30, of this year, the Corporation will have available for price-support operations only $815 million or less. If an unusual volume of price-support activities should develop suddenly, or if some new program should be undertaken, this balance would be entirely inadequate to meet the price-support demands which would result. In the opinion of a majority of the members of the committee, it is most unwise to attempt to operate this huge Corporation on this narrow margin, for the law requires price supports—but it prohibits expending funds where the capital assets are exhausted.

To help correct this situation, the 1962 budget proposed funds to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1961 fiscal year costs of these various special programs which are not related to price-support operations. It also included funds to finance "in advance" the cost of these programs during fiscal year 1962. This is a "doubling up" of appropriations in the appropriation bill for next year to place these programs on a pay-as-you-go basis and to relieve the capital funds of the Corporation of this heavy financial load next year.

The committee does not feel that these special programs should be allowed to jeopardize the Corporation's ability to carry out its primary functions of price support. Also, the committee is concerned about the tendency of many people to consider these programs as a part of the price-support program and to charge them to American agriculture. Financing these foreign assistance and special programs through separate appropriations in advance appears advisable for these reasons.

The committee, therefore, has included funds in the bill for 1962 to accomplish the purposes intended by the budget estimates. It has included in title II the sum of $1,600 million to finance the estimated fiscal year 1962 costs of Public Law 480, the International Wheat Agreement, and bartered materials for the supplemental stockpile. In addition, it has included in title III of the bill the sum of $1,951,915,000 to reimburse Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1961 costs of these programs. It is expected that future appropriation bills will carry funds for each ensuing fiscal year, on the same basis as for other programs of the Department.

This proposal to provide separate appropriations for 1962 on a pay-as-you-go basis is made for the following reasons:

First. The primary function of the Commodity Credit Corporation is to carry out the price-support programs authorized by law. Its capital funds should be left entirely free to finance these primary functions.

Second. Funds required to finance the many unrelated programs of various types, which have been financed through Commodity Credit Corporation at the direction of Congress as a matter of convenience, should be provided through separate appropriations for the specific purposes. They should be provided in advance in the usual manner, so as not to tie up the operating funds of the Corporation needed for regular purposes.

Third. Appropriations for these large programs with international implications should be provided on their own merits and should be separated from regular Commodity Credit Corporation funds in all budgets and appropriation bills.

Fourth. The tendency of the general public and the press to charge the cost of these multibillion-dollar programs to the Department of Agriculture, and to American agriculture, is unfortunate. The fact that these programs are important instruments of our international relations, and are controlled largely by departments of the Federal Government other than the Department of Agriculture, is not generally understood. It is hoped this proposal will be the first step in making a clear distinction between Commodity Credit Corporation price-support operations and foreign assistance programs financed through the Corporation as a matter of convenience.

Mr. Chairman, only about 10 percent of the American people are on the farm. That 10 percent has lost its political influence to a great degree because of its constantly decreasing number. We find many, many people saying, "Well, since it is only 10 percent of the people that are involved, why worry about it?" But may I say that for every farmer who has left the farm, there has been a constantly increasing amount of cash that the farmer who is on the farm has to invest. When I first came to Congress, when I first went on the committee handling appropriations for agriculture, it took a farmer about 10 years under adverse circumstances to lose his land. Today, because he has had to substitute high-priced machinery, high-cost insecticides, and all the other things that go with farming today, a farmer can lose his farm in less than 2 years if he has crop failures. In other words, the cash investment required, the risk incurred has greatly increased as the number of farmers has decreased.

Because farming efficiency has increased rapidly, food costs during the past 10 years have risen much less than the cost of most other consumer items in the market. Few of the Nation's consumers are aware of the great savings and benefits that have come to them as a result of agriculture's contribution to the national welfare. Food is one of today's best bargains.

Mr. Chairman, in the committee report I repeat a statement that I made in speaking to the National Agricultural Chemical Association in California last year, to this effect:

> It now takes so few of us to produce the food, clothing, and shelter for the rest of us, that the rest of us can provide the highest standard of living ever known for all of us.

It is 10 percent who produce the food, clothing, and shelter for us, and that leaves 90 percent to produce the refrigerators and air conditioners and automobiles and the thousand and one things which make up our high standard of living.

Mr. Chairman, for those who may feel that agriculture has lost its importance because of the decreasing number of farmers, may I point out some significant facts, to those who come from city districts, those who represent the 90 percent, that they frequently overlook. And that is the importance of agriculture to them. In addition to providing food, clothing, and shelter, which is the best buy and the best bargain that our American people have today, agriculture is still the most basic factor in our national existence. Agriculture is still the mainstay of our economy. It is the principal source of new wealth. It is the main provider of basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the rest of our economy.

Agriculture is still our largest industry. Today, in spite of the decreasing number, over 7 million people are employed on our farms and ranches. This is 12 times the number of people in the steel industry. It is nine times the number in the automobile industry, and is twice the number in our transportation and public utilities industries combined.

Agriculture is still our largest market for the products of industry. It uses more steel in a year than is used for a year's output of passenger cars. It uses more petroleum products than any other industry in the country. It uses more rubber each year than is required to produce tires for 6 million automobiles. It is one of the Nation's largest users of electrical power. Its inventory of machinery and equipment exceeds the assets of the steel industry, and is five times that of the automobile industry.

I mention this so you may know that agriculture is a big part of our economy and as it goes so in the long run will the Nation go. There is no way from the standpoint of economics that you can have a prosperous industry, a prosperous labor, and an unprosperous agriculture, with agriculture pulling the other two down. You may hide it for a few years, it may take a few years for it to be felt, but any time the biggest market for industry in this country has to quit buying you have invited a depression, which has followed every time that the purchasing power has gone down.

I was more a lawyer than farmer when I came here. I have worked with this problem and with this subject matter through the years, and I have given to it what legal training and legal background I possess. It has been a revelation to me as a lawyer to sit there and review with the Department of Agriculture representatives some of the very basic problems we have in this country and of which so many of us are unaware.

A former Secretary of Agriculture once pointed out that life is a contest between man and insects. Truly as you sit on this committee you learn that there is hardly a thing in this country that is not threatened by a variety of insects and diseases.

During our hearings this year, the committee received voluminous testimony from Department of Agriculture officials, Members of Congress and representatives of various private organizations concerning this problem. The information received indicates that, despite excellent research results and improved control techniques, the threat from insects and diseases continues to become a greater and greater element of cost to our farmers and consumers.

A review of the hearing records will indicate the many and varied threats to nearly every type of commodity grown in the United States. An example of the problem is the recent invasion of "pear decline" in the major pear producing States of the west coast, where a disease which was first recognized in 1959 is threatening to destroy the entire industry in that area in a very few years.

Tuberculosis, hog cholera, brucellosis, airsacculitis of poultry, fowl typhoid, swine erysipelas, and many other diseases of animals—some of which affect humans—are plaguing the livestock and poultry producers of the country.

Witchweed, nematodes, gypsy moth, boll weevil, Japanese beetle, pink bollworm, European chafer, citrus blackfly, Mexican fruit fly, khapra beetle, sweetpotato weevil and white fringed beetles continue to cost the Nation billions of dollars annually in production losses and control costs.

The threat from insects and diseases is further complicated by the increased speed and volume of travel between all areas of the world. Nearly 5 million more persons entered the United States during fiscal year 1960 than in 1959. The number of planes requiring inspection in 1960 was 140,000, about double the number in 1954. Automobiles and trucks crossing from Mexico reached 25 million last year, an increase of 10 million over 1955.

The opening of additional ports along the St. Lawrence Seaway and increased nonstop overseas air flights to airports in the interior of the country are also increasing the threat of introduction of new pests from abroad.

A total of 314,367 unauthorized plant materials was intercepted by the foreign quarantine inspections in fiscal year 1960, including 30,230 containing dangerous plant pests. This is an increase of 19.5 percent over the preceding year. The insects intercepted included many of the world's most destructive pests of food, fiber and forestry crops.

It has been estimated by agricultural experts that the damage to crops by the more than 600 different kinds of major destructive plant insects in the United States amount to nearly $4 billion each year. Cotton insects account for nearly $600 million annually, cereal and forage insects account for some $400 million annually, and stored grain and household insects cause annual damage of over $1 billion. It is further estimated that annual losses caused by plant diseases total $2.5 billion, and that livestock losses due to diseases and parasites exceed $2 billion per year.

If foot-and-mouth disease should become established in this country, it is estimated that annual losses would be

in the billions of dollars. It is further predicted that the introduction of fowl pest in this country could virtually eliminate the poultry industry. The introduction of rinderpest would cost the Nation $1 billion annually.

To fully appreciate the effects of these destructive diseases and pests, it is necessary only to look to other parts of the world where food production is subject to their ravages. In the Middle East, desert locusts have been sweeping the semiarid lands for centuries, leaving ruin to crops and starvation in their wake. In Pakistan, severe locust, caterpillar, and cricket outbreaks have caused losses as high as 80 percent in some areas. It is almost impossible to maintain supplies of grain in storage in India because of the ravages of weevils, bran beetles, and the world's worst pest of stored grain—the khapra beetle.

Stored-grain pests are so bad in tropical areas of the world that the race to eat the grain before insects devour it results in frequent periods of starvation. The people compete with the pests for survival. Their low standard of living thus becomes understandable.

The distribution of cattle in Africa is determined primarily by the presence or absence of the tsetse fly. This is a major reason why an African child, once weaned, may never again taste milk. The cattle tick and the human warble or torsalo fly cause tremendous losses to hides, beef, and milk production in Central and South America. Mortality among calves may be as high as 70 percent in some of the more heavily infested areas.

A recent report from Argentina indicates that 50,000 calves succumbed in 1 year's time to screwworm—the same one found in this country. The Argentines have no effective means of dealing with this pest.

It is estimated by officials of the Department of Agriculture that failure to meet these increasing insect and disease threats could double the cost and reduce the quality of food to the American consumer in 5 years. It is further estimated that in 10 to 15 years this Nation could be short of essential foods.

Food is an outstanding bargain in the United States today. It is usual for people in most areas of the world to spend one-third to one-half or more of their income for food. United Nations figures for 1958 show the percentage of income spent for food in certain areas as follows: Italy, 46 percent; Japan, 51 percent; Ceylon, 57 percent; Nigeria, 71 percent. In the United States, food costs take 20 percent or less of the disposable income.

American consumers also enjoy the greatest variety and the finest quality of food available anywhere in the world. Further, such food is the most wholesome and healthful in the world.

In the Middle East, it is common to find insect larvae in the fresh fruit placed on tables in the best hotels. The average consumer in America wouldn't consider buying the rusty, scrubby, pitted fruit offered in the public markets of that area.

American agriculture has made many contributions to human health and well-being, in addition to providing wholesome foods for the family table. Agricultural scientists developed commercial methods of making penicillin. They also produced dextran, a blood plasma substitute, a starch sponge for medical and surgical use, and dicoumerol, a blood thinner of great medical significance.

Through its research in the field of human nutrition, the Department of Agriculture is developing very significant information on the health aspects of fats in our diets, fat metabolism, and cholesterol in the blood.

One of the moving forces behind the amazing evolution in American agriculture has been our progress in agricultural science and technology. Many of these advances have begun with the agricultural research carried on cooperatively by the Department of Agriculture and the State experiment stations, supplemented by industrial research.

The committee has supported the research programs of the Department. It has provided funds each year as fully as could be justified within the financial limits of the Federal Treasury. Funds provided for such research through the years have proved to be a sound investment. It is estimated by agricultural experts that, if farmers today were still using the practices of only 20 years ago, it would cost an additional $13 billion a year to produce our food and fiber. The additional annual food bill to the American consumer would be much larger.

One of the major problems of the research programs of the Department is to keep ahead of research needs. The research programs must anticipate future problems and devise ways to solve them before they emerge. Much of the research being done today will not begin to influence agriculture for another 10 to 15 years. Research administrators must foresee what future conditions will be—judging from present information—and develop answers that will be needed in the future.

This is particularly true for the diseases and pests of livestock and crops discussed earlier. For example, the Department is conducting research overseas on African swine fever, which has recently swept out of Africa into other areas of the world. This work is insurance for our hog producers, should the disease appear in this country.

Similarly, the Department went abroad recently to study hoja blanca, because its appearance in tropical American areas posed a real threat to rice production in the United States.

The Department was well prepared for the Mediterranean fruit fly when it invaded Florida in 1956 and threatened the Nation's fruit industry. Eight years of work in California and Hawaii had produced a great deal of basic information a swell as attractants and sprays that helped eradicate this pest within a year and a half.

To meet the needs of Agriculture, the Department must be in a position to take effective research action at once when a serious problem arises. It should have a source of funds from which to draw immediately, without having to negotiate a transfer of funds from other work.

For instance, the spotted alfalfa aphid invaded the Southwest in 1954 and spread throughout the Western States in the next 2 or 3 years. The Department shifted about $40,000 from other work to develop chemical controls, look for parasites and predators, and develop resistant varieties. An adequate contingency fund would have enabled the scientists to save at least a year in the period required for eradication—at a time when the spotted alfalfa aphid was costing growers $30 to $40 million annually.

Another invader has been the face fly, which came into New England from Canada some years ago. Suddenly, in 1959, it threatened to become a serious menace to our livestock. Again, the emergency was met by shifting $30,000 to $40,000 from other programs. This worrisome pest has now spread across the country as far west as Nebraska. Department entomologists feel that they lost valuable time in bringing this threat under control due to the lack of a contingency fund from which to draw.

To enable the Department to move in on such problems quickly, the committee has established for the first time a contingency research fund of $1 million for fiscal year 1962. The fund will be available to the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service to expedite work on research problems and to meet special research needs as they arise.

Such a fund will also be available to give increased emphasis to some of the many special problems presented to the committee by Members of Congress and other witnesses this year, including basic research on wheat and grains, research on the improved digestibility of dry edible beans, barley and malt research, research on pear decline, forage and range research, soybean research, poultry research—particularly with reference to airsacculitis—soil and water conservation research, and others. In many of these areas, the work might best be done through contracts with qualified research institutions.

As in previous years, many persons appeared before the committee in support of additional funds for various projects, many of which were not included in the 1962 budget. Several hundred witnesses presented requests for additions to the budget totaling about $500 million.

Proponents of many of these programs offered sound and persuasive evidence to support their requests. However, the committee is faced with a larger than usual budget this year. It is also faced with the fact that two Presidents have considered and approved the present budget. This makes it virtually impossible to add funds for all of these many proposals.

In most cases, the proposed research projects are what the committee had hoped the Advisory Committee would urge the Department to undertake by shifts in emphasis within present funds. The committee is somewhat disappointed

that the Advisory Committee system has not been more effective in screening these proposals and in getting the Department, to the greatest extent possible, to transfer personnel and shift its facilities to meet these urgent problems.

The committee has called on the specialists of the Department to review these many special requests and give them careful consideration. In most cases, it appears that further detailed findings by the Department are necessary and further consideration should be given to them in the preparation of future budgets.

Further, some of the more urgent research needs presented to the committee should be given consideration by the Research Administrator in the allocation of the contingency research fund discussed above, where a shift of emphasis will not meet the need fully.

Remarkable progress has been made in soil and water conservation in the United States in the last 25 years, but the biggest part of the job still lies ahead. The United States continues to suffer heavy soil erosion losses. Some 120 million acres are being endangered seriously. Only about a third of our land is safeguarded adequately.

More than half the estimated $1.2 billion average annual floodwater and sediment damage in the United States occurs on the headwater streams and small tributaries. And sediment causes costly damage to the Nation's 10,000 major water storage reservoirs.

Increased farm production resulting from tremendous advances in science and technology, and surpluses of some farm crops, tends to obscure the fact that, to meet food and fiber needs of 15 years hence, this country will need the production equivalent of over 200 million more acres, based on current yields. Since we do not have 200 million more acres of cropland, this production must come largely from increased yields on existing cropland. This is in the face of continuing annual losses of some 400,000 acres of cropland because of erosion, and 3 times that amount each year through conversion of good farming land to urban and industrial uses.

Nearly one-fourth of the people of the Nation face problems of water shortage, poor water, or both. The rate of water use predicted for 1980 is nearly twice what it was in 1955.

Since three-fourths of our land area is in private ownership and 60 percent is in farms and ranches, it follows that our farmers and ranchers are the principal managers of the Nation's soil and water resources for all the people. How our farmers and ranchers manage the lands under their stewardship for the benefit of us all determines whether we shall have soil conservation or soil erosion, whether we shall have the right quality and quantity of water or poor water and not enough of it, not only for agriculture but for cities and industry.

It is essential that we recognize the national scope of the problem and put forth extra effort on programs that will conserve and most effectively utilize the soil and water resources of our country. It is imperative that we intensify our national programs to protect and improve our soil and water resources.

In his special message on natural resources presented on February 23, 1961, the President again emphasized the importance of our soil and water resources to the future of this Nation. The majority of the members of the committee agree with this belief and feel that adequate funds must be provided for all programs which contribute to soil and water conservation, including the Soil Conservation Service, conservation research, watershed protection and flood prevention, and the agricultural conservation program.

Through the years, the agricultural conservation program has been the Federal Government's principal economic stimulus to farmers and ranchers to voluntarily apply needed conservation measures. It is used in all agricultural counties in the 50 States, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Conservation practices were carried out under this program in 1959 on over a million farms and ranches, covering 388 million acres.

This program has served the Nation well for a quarter of a century. It has helped to meet the public responsibility for protecting and conserving the soil, water, and woodland resources of the Nation. The accomplishments of this program have been significant. From 1936 through 1959, stripcropping has been established on over 104 million acres of cropland, and contour farming has been installed on over 138 million acres. Nearly 25 million acres have been terraced and 762 million acres of vegetative cover have been installed. Over 1.6 million storage dams and reservoirs of various types and sizes have been built, and over 38 million acres have been drained for conservation purposes.

During this period, this program has stimulated twice as much economic activity as the amount of Federal funds spent, since the farmer puts up about half the cost of the practices, plus his labor. The per capita annual cost is about $1.40, and the investment per acre of farmland is 54 cents.

This committee has opposed efforts through the years to cripple this vital program. Nearly every year, it has had to fight efforts to reduce the program below the traditional level of $250 million per year. Since 1953, it has had to restore proposed budget cuts in all but 3 years.

In view of the importance of this program to our broad national efforts in the soil and water conservation field, the committee recommends the continuation of the $250 million program authorization for the coming year. The majority of the members feel strongly that any reduction below this level will seriously impair future conservation programs throughout all areas of the country.

Flood prevention work on the 11 original watersheds was initiated by the Flood Control Act of 1944. Work has been in process under the supervision of the Department since that time. This committee has frequently provided more funds than requested for this purpose and has consistently urged the Department to speed up construction to prevent continued loss of soil and water and to save money in view of steadily increasing construction costs.

Recognizing the value of this upstream watershed approach to our conservation efforts, and realizing the need for such work throughout the entire United States, the committee initiated the watershed protection program in 1954 by adding $5 million not requested in the budget to initiate conservation work on about 60 pilot demonstration projects in various areas of the country. This program was so well received and proved so successful that Public Law 566 was adopted the following year to establish a permanent upstream watershed program on a nationwide basis.

Funds for this watershed protection program have grown rapidly in view of its great acceptance and the large local demand for Federal assistance. This appropriation has grown from the original $5 million in 1954 to $36.8 million in 1961 and to a recommended $53,787,000 for 1962.

The committee has actively supported this program and the appropriation increases needed. It has included in the bill for 1962 the full increase of $9,562,000 recommended by President Eisenhower which was further increased to $17,062,000 by President Kennedy. It recognizes that only 650 of the 1400 communities which have applied for watershed planning have received Federal help to date. It is estimated that more than 8,000 small watersheds need the type of conservation assistance provided by this program.

The committee also recognizes the urgent need to accelerate the work on the 11 major watersheds initiated in 1944. At that time, it was estimated that these projects would be completed in 15 years. In 1961, some 17 years later, the work on these projects is estimated to be only 33.4 percent complete. On one of the major watersheds the work is only 17.5 percent complete.

Testimony presented to the committee indicates that the local sponsors of these projects are anxious to move ahead at a much faster rate. In some cases, delays in obtaining local easements and funds have been overcome and the local organizations are fully equipped to proceed.

There is an urgent need to move ahead at a faster rate. In view of the evidence that local interests are prepared to proceed more rapidly, the committee has increased the funds in this bill for the 11 major watersheds to $25 million, an increase of $5,537,000 over the budget. This should permit work in these watersheds to proceed at the same accelerated rate as the new budget has provided for watershed protection work in the rest of the country.

The committee recommends $76,558,000 for the research programs of this agency during fiscal year 1962, which is $616,000 less than the budget estimates. The increase of $5,325,000 over funds appropriated for 1961 includes $2 million for staffing the new Animal Disease Laboratory which will be ready for operation about July 1, 1961; $935,000 for

staffing other research laboratories constructed with funds included in previous bills and now ready for operation; $250,000 for staffing North Central hydrology research watershed at Columbia, Mo.; $205,000 to expand and strengthen research on tobacco quality and production; $60,000 to intensify research on pear decline and other rootstock problems; $600,000 for utilization research on fibers, fruits and vegetables, oilseeds, cereal and forage crops, and new and special plants; $275,000 for research on human nutrition; and $1 million for the contingency fund for research discussed earlier in this report.

The committee has provided what it considers to be adequate funds for staffing the new Ames Laboratory. Based on prior experience and the inevitable delays in getting a new facility in operation, and the difficulties of recruiting additional staff, it is unlikely that the full funds requested will be required for the first year.

In the implementation of research projects at the new Ames Laboratory, the Department is urged to give special attention to the airsacculitis disease of chickens and turkeys. The Committee has received considerable testimony as to the seriousness of this problem to the poultry producers of the Nation. The statistics on condemnations by the poultry inspection service of the Department due to this disease are alarming. It is understood that the Department is now spending nearly $300,000 for research on this problem and expects to increase the funds for fiscal year 1962. It is recommended that, of the funds provided in this bill for fiscal year 1962, a minimum of $387,800 be used for this work. If additional funds for this purpose should become necessary, the new contingency research fund could be used to meet the need.

The additional $935,000 for staffing new laboratories covers staffing and first year operating costs of the cotton insect research laboratory at Mississippi State University and the two grain insect research facilities at Brookings, S. Dak., and Tifton, Ga. Of this amount, $50,000 should be used to restore the original level of operation at the conservation research laboratory at Morris, Minn., which was curtailed to provide $25,000 each for two subsidiary research facilities at Madison, S. Dak., and Crookston, Minn. The purpose of the north central hydrology research watershed is to gain basic information on precipitation-runoff relationships, sedimentation, and channel stability in one of the most highly developed agricultural areas in the United States. The area, over 110 million acres in extent, includes large portions of the central clay pan and the Iowa-Minnesota Till Plain as well as an extensive portion of the Upper Mississippi loess drift and the Missouri Valley deep loess soils. Those areas are under intensive land use, ranging between 60 and 80 percent in cultivation and grassland. An additional $250,000 is provided for this project.

Tobacco production requires a greater amount of labor per dollar value to the grower than any other field crop. The need to mechanize is great, but the end product of mechanized production must be of high quality to meet the specific demands of discriminating consumers. Variations in quality brought about by changed production and handling practices, or by the use of filters and reconstituted tobacco, affect both domestic and export markets. Research is urgently needed on the laborsaving and cost-reducing potentialities of mechanization and on improved cultural and management practices. The committee recommends the budget increase of $205,000 for this purpose.

One of the most urgent needs for additional research results from the recent appearance of pear decline in the Nation's pear-producing areas on the west coast. This disease has spread alarmingly in the commercial pear growing areas of Washington, Oregon, and California. It threatens to destroy a very substantial portion of the pear trees in these three States which produce 87 percent of the commercial crop of quality pears. Affected trees fail to make normal growth, do not set or mature normal fruit, and become progressively weaker until they die. Slow development of the disorder causes death of the tree in 1 or 2 years, but, in many cases, vigorous and apparently healthy trees may develop quick wilting and die within a week. The committee has included the budget increase of $60,000 for the study of this and other root stock problems. This will make about $100,000 available for fiscal year 1962. If additional amounts become necessary during the year, the use of funds in the contingency research fund might be considered by the research administrator.

The additional $600,000 for utilization research will assist the Department to serve the farmer by finding new and larger uses for his products, just as industrial utilization research serves the chemical industries. If the farmer's traditional markets are to be protected and if he is to share in large future markets, agricultural utilization research must be as vigorous and progressive as that of its competitors.

With the additional $275,000 provided for human nutrition research, it is expected that work will be expanded on the biological value of food, on fats differing in fatty acid composition, on foods important for protein, such as meats and dairy products, and on selected foods important for other nutrients, such as cereals and certain vegetables. Research is needed to determine the range in levels of consumption of these products that will yield the greatest nutritional effect without risking imbalances in metabolism and to determine and evaluate food consumption patterns of individuals in different population groups. Findings of the Department in this area are used widely by medical and health agencies.

The many and varied problems of agriculture, as well as many consumer problems relative to food and home economics, continue to increase the need for additional research beyond the funds that can be provided to meet them. Year after year, the research budgets of the Department increase. And each year, the committee is approached by many individuals and groups requesting additional funds for special research projects in nearly every phase of agriculture. As pointed out earlier in this report, nearly 200 persons not connected with the Department appeared before the committee this year, most of them proposing new and additional research projects.

Since the financial limitations under which the budget is prepared and approved are so stringent, it appears necessary that some new approach to this problem be found. The Department is directed, therefore, to make a thorough review during the coming year of research by private organizations, State experiment stations, and agencies of the Department to determine: (1) The importance of research now being conducted as compared to the additional research needs which have not yet been met; and (2) how more of these additional research needs can be met on a cooperative basis with the many private research agencies in the field of agriculture.

Further, unavailability of labor for farming operations has greatly increased the need for additional research on mechanization of practices and procedures which can be adapted by virtue of size and cost to smaller farms. Such problems as weed control, pest control, cultivation, and harvesting, all of which require labor which is not available, should have special attention.

The Department is also requested to make a careful reevaluation of the priority position of the facility proposed to study soil-water-plant relationships. There seems to be considerable interest in locating this faciilty at Cornell University, because of the many advantages this institution has to offer. The committee believes the same review should be made of the mechanics of erosion laboratory in which many representatives from North Carolina have expressed deep interest.

For plant and animal disease and pest control, the sum of $55,165,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year, an increase of $1,195,000 over fiscal year 1961 and a decrease of $225,000 in the budget estimate. The amount proposed includes increases of $450,000 to staff the control and regulatory activities at the new Ames Laboratory, $400,000 for additional plant quarantine inspectors, and $345,000 to meet mandatory salary increases due to a recent reclassification of all veterinarians in the regulatory, control, and inspection programs of the Department.

The increase of $400,000 for plant quarantine work will permit the employment of 35 additional inspectors to strengthen staffs at existing ports of entry and to staff new ports of entry where traffic volume requires full-time inspection personnel. The growing volume of foreign traffic means that new ports of entry must be opened, and that established ports must enlarge their

facilities to take care of increased traffic. Further, the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway, and increased nonstop oversea airflights into the interior of the United States has increased the inspection load. Many destructive pests and diseases, such as the Mediterranean fruit fly, oriental fruit fly, khapra beetle, citrus canker, and others, formerly established in limited areas of the world, are now spreading among other countries as international traffic increases—thus adding to potential sources of entry into the United States.

In the fall of 1960, the Civil Service Commission began a study of veterinary positions in the Department in view of the increasing responsibilities and educational requirements of this type of work. As a result of this study, the Commission is preparing to issue revised standards which will result in the upgrading of about 60 percent of the people involved. It is mandatory that the Department pay the additional salary costs required. An increase of $345,000 is included in this paragraph of the bill for this purpose.

The committee believes that a more effective and economical program for the control and eradication of brucellosis and tuberculosis of cattle could be conducted by closer coordination of the two programs. It is recommended, therefore, that the Department combine the personnel and facilities of these two activities into a single operation. It is further recommended that the funds for the two programs be handled as a single item in order to provide flexibility in handling personnel assignments.

The bill includes $24,216,000 for meat inspection for fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $1,090,000 over funds for 1961. The increase provides $675,000 for the employment of 108 additional meat inspectors to meet increased workloads. It also includes $415,000 to meet mandatory salary increases due to reclassifications, as discussed under the preceding heading.

The most important factor in the inspection workload increase is the ever-growing number of establishments requiring Federal inspection, as well as the number of cities and towns in which they are located. Since 1959 the number of cities and towns has increased from 546 to 624—14.3 percent—and the number of meatpacking establishments has increased from 1,334 to 1,484—11.2 percent.

For the foreign currency program, the committee recommends the budget estimate of $5,265,000 for fiscal year 1962, a decrease of $9,866,000 below 1960 appropriations. This amount will permit continuation of essential oversea research in those countries where foreign currencies generated under Public Law 480 are excess to normal U.S. requirements.

The program includes research in the fields of crop production and diseases, human nutrition, marketing and forestry. This research supplements the work done under the regular research programs of the Department, using foreign currencies generated abroad through Public Law 480. Since these currencies generally must be spent in the countries in which earned, this appears to be a productive use for them.

The sum of $800,000 is included in this portion of the bill for construction of facilities, a reduction of $6,950,000 below funds for 1961 and an increase of $250,000 in the budget. The amount recommended includes $425,000 for the construction of a facility for research on biological control of insects through use of parasites, predators, and diseases as a means of avoiding residues and other hazards.

This item also includes $375,000 for a soil and water conservation research laboratory at Florence, S.C., to conduct research on soil and water resource problems in the upper and middle coastal plains of the Mid-Atlantic States, an area characterized by a flat to rolling topography. The 30 million acres of the Coastal Plain soils constitute a major agricultural area. The soils are highly susceptible to surface crusting and compaction, conditions which limit infiltration and movement of water through the soil. These problems also influence surface runoff and erosion, reduce irrigation efficiency and affect the efficiency of ground water recharge.

An appropriation of $34,803,000 is provided for grants to State experiment stations for fiscal year 1962. This includes $34,553,000 for payments to States and $250,000 for penalty mail costs. The increase of $2 million will provide funds to pay salary increases where needed and to expand the research programs of the State institutions. The committee is informed that a major portion of this increase will be used for increased salaries to compete with those paid in similar organizations.

The committee believes in this program and has consistently supported adequate funds for this purpose. It recognizes that there are many problems which differ from one State to another, that can be solved only through research findings of these local institutions. It agrees that funds must be provided to continue the research programs of each of these facilities to meet this need.

At the same time, however, it is aware that many of our most pressing problems are national in scope, requiring a more centralized approach to their solution. The regional research program of this organization has provided a logical and effective approach to this matter. However, there is still a great need for further centralization of research work where an urgent areawide or nationwide problem arises. The committee recommends that the Department give further study to the most effective means of, first, preventing duplication in research efforts and, second, centralizing research activities to bring about the most satisfactory research results where required on a broad basis.

The sum of $58,790,000 has been included in the bill for 1962 for payments to States and Puerto Rico, an increase of $2,212,000 over funds provided for fiscal year 1961.

This increase provides additional funds to strengthen State and county extension work and to expand marketing educational work designed to assist farmers, consumers, and marketing firms to adjust to the changes taking place in the entire marketing process.

The need to maintain competitive salary levels is also a problem for this organization. It is expected that much of the increase for this program will be used for salary increases for county extension agents and home demonstration workers, where essential to maintain salaries at competitive levels.

The Federal Extension Service provides for leadership counsel and assistance to the 50 States and Puerto Rico. An appropriation of $2,452,000 is proposed for fiscal year 1962, a reduction of $48,000 in the budget estimate. The increase of $50,000 over fiscal year 1961 will permit the employment of several new specialists in the Washington office to provide leadership in rural development, community development, agricultural chemicals, and related subjects. The complexities of modern-day agriculture make further specialized leadership of this type necessary.

During the current fiscal year, soil conservation assistance has been provided for 20 new districts which have come into existence. It is expected that an additional 18 districts will be organized in fiscal year 1962, which will bring the total to 2,905 districts by June 30, 1962.

The committee recommends the full budget estimate of $89,725,000 for the soil conservation operations, an increase of $1,121,000 over the 1961 appropriation. This amount will provide an additional $496,000 to staff the 18 new districts expected to be organized next year. It also includes $25,000 for additional space needed at field locations.

Last year's bill authorized the Department to carry forward $600,000 of unused 1960 funds to employ conservation aids and other nonprofessional personnel on a part-time or contract basis to meet the increasing workload of this organization. The pending bill includes a direct appropriation of $600,000, in lieu of the carryover provision in last year's bill, to continue this arrangement in 1962.

For watershed protection, the bill carries an appropriation for 1962 of $53,787,000—the full budget estimate. This is an increase of $17,062,000 over the appropriation for fiscal year 1961. However, when the carryover of over $5 million from 1960 into 1961 is considered, the actual increase is about $12 million.

The amount recommended includes $5,500,000 for investigations and planning, an increase of $296,000 over 1961. The committee agrees, however, that an additional $1 million of the increase for watershed improvements may be made available for further planning parties, if found necessary during the year.

As discussed earlier, the need for this program and the demand from localities for participation are growing at a tremendous rate each year. Additional applications are being received at almost twice the rate that work plans are being completed. The backlog of unserviced applications on hand amounts to about

4½ years' work at the present level of planning assistance.

It is estimated that there will be 338 Public Law 566 watershed projects at the beginning of the fiscal year 1962 in which works of improvement will be in process of installation. About 158 of these will be receiving advance engineering and technical assistance only, which is a prerequisite before the projects can be advanced to the construction stage. An estimated 80 are expected to be advanced to the construction stage during 1962 and about 100 additional projects will be approved for advanced engineering and technical assistance.

The same type of watershed treatment in certain important areas of the Nation is carried out under the flood prevention program, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. For this work in these 11 major watersheds during fiscal year 1962, the committee has included an appropriation of $25 million in the bill. This is an increase of $5,537,000 over the 1961 appropriation, which will enable the Department to speed up works of improvement in these areas in line with the rate requested by the President's budget for other regions.

As pointed out earlier, the work on these 11 major watersheds is lagging far behind the program envisioned when this program was initiated in 1944. At that time, it was estimated that these projects would be completed in 15 years. It is now 17 years later and the overall program is only about 33 percent complete. It was also pointed out earlier that information given to the committee shows that the local sponsors of these projects are now able to proceed at a much faster rate than funds have been made available heretofore, which indicates the need for additional funds to finance the Federal portion of the projects at an accelerated rate.

The bill carries an appropriation for this organizational unit of $9,049,000 for fiscal year 1962, a reduction of $484,000 in the budget estimate. The committee has held this recently organized service to the 1961 level of operation, feeling that it should complete its realinement of functions and reevaluation of activities and financial needs within present limits of funds.

The committee recommends a appropriation of $8,688,000 for the coming year, a reduction of $34,000 in the budget estimate. The increase of $500,000 over 1961 is provided to extend to additional States and commodities basic improvements in the crop and livestock estimates program. This is the second year's installment of a 3- or 4-year program to modernize this service and improve the accuracy of these estimates. The committee feels that this modernization effort should continue.

In developing these improvements, consideration should be given to the advisability of establishing objective crop estimates of grapes and lemons in cooperation with the State of California. The need for more frequent reports on inventories of potatoes and other commodities should also be given further review.

An appropriation of $37,702,000 is recommended for marketing research and service, including $4,515,000 for marketing research and $33,187,000 for marketing services. The amounts proposed are $108,000 less than the budget estimate and are $3,789,900 over the 1961 appropriation.

The increase of $297,800 for marketing research is provided for marketing research at Clemson, S.C., to improve the spinning, weaving, and finishing qualities of cotton. This work was started in 1961 with Commodity Credit Corporation funds. It is proposed to carry this work forward and expand it slightly in 1962 from funds included in this appropriation item.

Increasing mechanization in cotton production and harvesting methods and in drying and cleaning cotton during ginning appears to have resulted in serious problems in the spinning, weaving, and finishing qualities of cotton. These problems are being reported by domestic and foreign users of American cotton to such an extent that it is of mounting concern to the cotton industry. More data is needed to determine what processes and practices damage cotton fiber and to develop corrective measures.

The increase for marketing services provides $59,000 for additions to the leased wire service for the market news service, $75,100 for more effective administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, $25,000 for the rental of additional space needed for the various activities of this agency, $500,000 to meet salary increases due to the reclassification of poultry inspectors—along with other veterinarians as discussed earlier—and $20,000 for a special study of the possibility of coordinating weather reports and market news service broadcasts.

The funds recommended also include $2,813,000 for grading and classing activities of this organization. Heretofore, these functions have been financed on a reimbursable basis through Commodity Credit Corporation. Inclusion of these funds for 1962 as part of marketing services is part of the general proposal to provide separate funds in advance for these various special programs.

Several years ago, the Appropriations Committee provided for the establishment of a special weather reporting and forecasting system in the Mississippi Delta to disseminate weather information in a manner best suited for agricultural purposes. This project has proved very valuable and we now consider this a permanent installation. It is estimated that the savings to the farmers of the area due to better weather information exceeded $1 million last year. The committee has urged that this service be extended to adjacent areas. It believes that the same type of service would also be valuable to certain other areas of the country. Such service is now provided by the Weather Bureau under the Department of Commerce.

The committee recommends that both the Department of Agriculture and the Weather Bureau make a survey of the need for this type of weather information in other sections of the United States. It is believed that if the Weather Bureau would provide such information where needed, the Department of Agriculture could assist greatly in its dissemination. The Department now has an extensive network for market news reporting purposes which should be coordinated with Weather Bureau facilities more closely to provide more detailed weather information and weather forecasts. The sum of $20,000 has been included in the bill for 1962 to enable the Department to make a full study of this matter in cooperation with the Weather Bureau.

The Department should also consider the feasibility of including market news information on other commodities not now covered, where they are of sufficient importance. The need for additional information on truck unloadings of fruits and vegetables should also be given further review in this connection.

The sum of $1,400,000 is provided for fiscal year 1962 for payments to States and possessions, an increase of $205,000 over 1961 and the budget estimate for 1962. This increase is provided to meet an urgent need for improving agricultural market facilities at a number of major cities and to enable some States to participate to a larger extent. Since a large part of the retail cost of food is incurred after agricultural commodities reach the marketplace, these improvements should be of real benefit to the consumers of the Nation.

As a result of recent legislation, urban redevelopment programs are expanding and moving forward in many places. Usually the antiquated market areas in the major cities are directly involved in such redevelopment plans. As a result, many cities are now seeking Federal assistance in planning the relocation of their large wholesale and retail markets. Requests have been received from many places including Boston, Chicago, Oakland, San Diego, Huntington, Jersey City, and Miami.

By making funds in this appropriation available for "Marketing research," the committee believes the Department might well proceed with the city of Boston, which is now undertaking plans to redevelop the blighted areas of the city. In some of these areas are located the market facilities used by wholesalers, processors, and storers of fruits and vegetables and other food products. Federal assistance at this time to help in the planning and location of the new markets could be exceedingly valuable to all concerned. Plans for additional cities should be considered in preparing the budget for next year.

Also several States which have not been participating in this program in the past are now ready to provide the matching funds and enter into this cooperative marketing improvement program with the Department. States such as Missouri, which have had only a nominal program, now have funds in hand and are ready to proceed on a much larger basis as soon as Federal funds are available.

For the school lunch program, the committee recommends $125 million for fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $15 million over the 1961 appropriation and is $5 million over the 1962 budget request. In addition, the bill provides for the transfer of $45 million from section 32 funds to be used to purchase meats and other foods needed to provide balanced school lunches. This transfer authority is the same as provided for 1961 and as requested in the budget for 1962.

Of the increase, $10 million is included to provide special assistance to help particularly needy schools defray the cost of serving lunches to needy children. Language is included in the bill to authorize the Secretary to allocate this money to areas of greatest need and to prescribe standards and criteria under which the funds will be used.

The balance of the increase, $5 million, will be distributed to all States in the usual manner. This increase is included to partially offset the steadily decreasing rate of Federal assistance, due to the constantly increasing student participation in the program.

The number of schools enrolled in the program has increased from a peak of 61,442 in fiscal year 1959 to 62,975 in fiscal year 1960. The number of children receiving lunches has increased from a peak of 12 million in 1959 to 12.8 million in 1960—and further substantial increases have occurred during the present school year.

Since 1947, the first year under the School Lunch Act, the number of meals served has nearly tripled, while funds for Federal cash payments have increased about 50 percent. As a result, the average rate of Federal cash assistance permeal has declined from an average of 8.7 cents in 1947 to about 4 cents in the current year. In States where participation has increased faster than school population, the rate of Federal assistance has fallen substantially below the national average—as low as 1.5 cents in one State. It is hoped that the additional funds in this bill will help to correct this situation.

During fiscal year 1960, over $1 billion was expended under this program, including appropriations and contributions from all sources. Federal contributions, including donated commodities and the special milk program totaled $304 million, State and local contributions were in excess of $220 million, and payments by participating children exceeded $555 million. While Federal funds represent the smaller portion of the total funds involved, they are highly important since they serve as the financial foundation for the entire program.

The budget estimate provides a total of $15,877,000 for the Foreign Agricultural Service during the coming fiscal year. Of this amount $12,760,000 is requested as a direct appropriation and $3,117,000 is requested as a transfer from section 32 funds.

The committee recommends the full transfer of $3,117,000 for 1962, plus a direct appropriation of $12,457,000. The appropriation figure represents a decrease of $2,818,300 below 1961 and $303,000 in the 1962 budget request.

Two increases are provided within the amount allowed: $300,000 to open three new attaché posts and increase the number of marketing specialists abroad and $74,500 for studies of the competitive position of major U.S. farm commodities in leading foreign markets and for expanding reports to the U.S. trade. These increases are more than offset by a reduction in market development activities, leaving the net decrease set forth above.

Attaché posts at Addis Ababa, Beirut, and San Salvador are proposed to provide more adequate information on market prospects for U.S. agricultural commodities and to permit better support of commercial agricultural trade operations.

With agricultural exports from Ethiopia to the United States running so much higher than agricultural imports from the United States, greater efforts are needed to increase the exports of U.S. agricultural commodities to Ethiopia. There is also a need to intensify agricultural representation in Lebanon in order to keep abreast of marketing developments and to take advantage of expected opportunities for further U.S. participation in international trade in this area. Also, Central America is of vital importance to the United States as a market and source of supply. It is an expanding market for a significant variety and volume of U.S. agricultural exports.

The budget estimate of $3,444,000 is recommended for the coming fiscal year for market development activities under section 104(a), through the use of foreign currencies generated by the sale of U.S. agricultural commodities abroad under Public Law 480. The program to be financed under this appropriation will be conducted primarily in those countries where the United States has an excess supply of local currencies to its credit.

The market development work financed with these funds includes promotion of the sale abroad of various U.S. products. These include cotton, dairy and poultry products, fats and oils, grain and feed, livestock and meat products, and tobacco, all of which require substantial foreign markets to support a healthy domestic economy for producers of these commodities. Through cooperative projects the Department furnishes foreign currencies and overall guidance, including assistance by the agricultural attachés abroad. The cooperator carries out the work, either directly or in cooperation with foreign groups. In all projects, however, U.S. trade and agricultural groups cooperate directly or indirectly, to the maximum extent possible.

Since all commodities sold, donated, and bartered under Public Law 480 are paid for and charged to the Department of Agriculture and to American Agriculture in the public mind, all sales agreements under this program should contain provisions, as authorized by the act, to set aside for market development purposes the maximum amount of foreign currencies which can be efficiently and effectively used. Such agreements should also provide for the maximum convertibility of the foreign currencies for use in other areas where this work can be productive.

For acreage allotments and marketing quotas, an appropriation of $44,098,000 is included in the bill for 1962, an increase of $500,000 over 1961 and a decrease of $735,000 in the 1962 budget estimates.

The additional funds are provided for checking compliance on an increased number of cotton acres, due to an increase in the national acreage allotment for the 1961 crop. On October 13, 1960, a national acreage allotment of 18,398,424 acres was proclaimed for the 1961 crop of upland cotton. In addition, 60,000 of the 310,000-acre national acreage reserve was used to take care of minimum farm allotments, making a total of 18,458,424 acres available for allotment to cotton farms. Since a total of 660,000 cotton acres are in the Conservation Reserve, this leaves 17,798,424 acres for measurement under this appropriation. This is an increase of 930,544 acres over the 1960 crop. When marketing quotas are in effect, compliance with acreage allotments is mandatory. Only the production from the allotted acres can be sold without penalty. Compliance checking must be done as quickly as possible when seasonal development of the crop and weather conditions permit, so that within-quota marketing cards may be issued before the beginning of the marketing year on August 1.

For the Sugar Act program, the committee recommends the sum of $78 million for fiscal year 1962, an increase of $3,500,000 over 1961 and a decrease of $3,314,000 in the 1962 budget. This increase over 1961 funds for mandatory payments to sugar producers is based on a projected increase of sugar production in 1961 over 1960 production. The decrease in the budget request has been made since recent estimates of sugar production are somewhat lower than those upon which the budget was based.

Payments are made to domestic producers of sugarbeets and sugarcane who comply with certain special requirements. To finance these payments, a tax of 50 cents per hundred pounds is imposed on all beet and cane sugar processed in or imported into the continental United States for direct consumption.

During the period 1938–60 collection from excise taxes and imports have exceeded payments by $428.1 million.

The purposes of the agricultural conservation program include restoring and improving soil fertility, reducing erosion caused by water and wind, and conserving water on the land. To effectuate these purposes, the agricultural conservation program offers cost-sharing assistance to individual farmers and ranchers for carrying out approved soil building and soil and water conserving practices on their farms. The Federal assistance represents only a part of the cost of performing the practice. The farmer bears the balance of the cost—50

percent on the average—and in addition often supplies the labor necessary to carry out the practice.

An appropriation of $238 million is included in the 1962 appropriation bill for payments earned under the program authorized in the 1961 Appropriation Act. The committee also has restored the authorization for the 1962 program to the $250 million level.

As has been pointed out earlier, this program provides the primary financial support for the entire conservation effort of the Department. The program has over 1 million participants each year, which represents nearly 25 percent of all farming units in the United States.

The act of March 22, 1961—Public Law 87–5—provides for a special agricultural conservation program for feed grains. Under this program, conservation payments, in amounts specified in the act, will be made to farmers who divert acreage from the production of corn and grain sorghums to an approved conservation use and increase their average acreage devoted in 1959 and 1960 to designated soil-conserving crops or practices by an equal amount.

This appropriation provides funds for the administrative costs of the agricultural conservation portion of the program. It assumes that approximately 1,500,000 farmers in areas throughout the United States producing corn and grain sorghums will participate in the 1961 feed-grain program. The program will be administered in the field by ASC State and county committees.

The bill for 1962 includes $15 million for this purpose, a decrease of $5,500,000 in the budget estimate.

An appropriation of $300 million is provided to pay off obligations incurred under 1960 and prior year conservation reserve program. This is a reduction of $30 million in the budget estimate. It is the same amount below the 1961 appropriation.

Based on past experience, the committee feels that the amount recommended for 1962 will be adequate. Of course, the Government will be required to meet its commitments under this program for some years to come, regardless of the size of annual appropriations. Authority to enter into new contracts expired at the end of the 1960 program year. Unless the program is reactivated, future appropriations will be limited to amounts needed to liquidate existing contracts.

The 1962 bill carries an appropriation for the Crop Insurance Program of $6,561,000, which is the same amount as was provided for the current fiscal year. In addition, authority is provided for the Corporation to spend $2,830,000 from its premium income for administrative costs in fiscal year 1962. This provides an increase over 1961 of $200,000.

The program is operating in 895 counties in fiscal year 1961 and is expected to be extended to 939 counties in 1962. The program for 1962 contemplates 415,000 crops insured as compared to 390,000 in 1961. During the 12 years that the program has been operating on a limited experimental basis, premiums have exceeded indemnities by about $6.4 million.

The committee believes that this program, which now appears to have gone beyond the experimental stage, should be made available on a much broader basis as rapidly as sound insurance practice will permit. It feels that the program should now be offered throughout the country and should be undertaken where local interest is high and where signups are sufficient to make the program actuarily sound.

The 1962 budget proposed authorizations of $195 million for electrification loans and $150 million for telephone loans under REA. The committee has included these amounts in the bill. However, it has placed a portion of each item in a contingency reserve, in accord with the practice it has followed for a number of years.

The amount approved for electrification loans includes a direct authorization of $125 million plus a contingency fund reserve of $70 million, making a total of $195 million. For telephone loans, the direct authorization approved is $120 million plus a reserve of $30 million, a total of $150 million.

The amount recommended will provide a total of $225 million for electrification loans for fiscal year 1962, including a carryover of about $30 million. The amount included in the bill will provide a telephone loan program of $151 million for 1962, including $1 million to be carried over from 1961. These amounts appear to be adequate to meet the loan applications expected during the year.

In connection with new loans, the REA should determine a proper level of reserve for each applicant, should set up proper criteria for granting new loans, and should make certain that funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available.

For the lending programs of the Farmers' Home Administration, the bill includes total loan authorizations of $284,900,000. This includes $31,900,000 for farm ownership loans, $250 million for farm operating loans, and $3 million for soil and water conservation loans. Of the amount for farm operating loans, $25 million has been placed in a contingency reserve to be drawn upon when and as needed.

The need for agricultural credit has been increasing greatly in recent years in most areas of the country. The full contingency of $40 million provided for fiscal year 1961 has been used and reports indicate that operating loan funds have been completely exhausted in many areas for several months. Many farmers are in urgent need of credit to plant their crops during this season of the year. Should such a situation develop next year, the contingency fund of $25 million will be available to meet the need.

It came to the attention of the committee last year that two sets of standards were being used for housing loans. One set was established for counties participating in the rural development program, and another set was used for other counties of the Nation. The committee disapproved of this policy in its report last year. It has been informed that necessary changes have been made since January. It is expected that all regions will continue to be treated on the same basis.

The repayment record under this program has been excellent through the years. Repayments of both principal and interest continue to exceed the face value of loans due and repayable. Also, annual collections are beginning to approximate amounts loaned each year.

Again, there is lots of money in this bill. But may I say to you that the main difference between agriculture and other segments is that labor can pass on any increase in wages it gets by bargaining, by the minimum wage laws, and such, as a part of the retail price. I do not know how to estimate what the increased income may be to industry by reason of its markup. I do not know, and you do not know. However, if labor does not prosper agriculture cannot, if labor does not prosper industry cannot, neither can we have a prosperous labor or industry unless agriculture is prosperous. One of the chief differences between what we do by law for other segments and what we do for agriculture is that agriculture is identifiable, it sticks out, you can see it. The other is there equally as much if you analyze it.

In this bill we have divided the amount in half and each half into three parts, like Gaul, but we did that because we want you to see what the money has gone for so that we may let each tub stand on its own bottom.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. SHORT. I should like to ask a couple of questions.

First of all, I want to compliment the gentleman for a very forthright analysis of this agricultural appropriation bill. Certainly I think the gentleman should be commended for putting into proper perspective, or at least making a diligent effort to put into proper perspective the relationship between the expenditures that are probably for agriculture and the expenditures that get into a far different category.

The first question I should like to ask is this: I notice the appropriation for the International Wheat Agreement for 1960 was $32 million, the budget for 1961 is $88,790,000, an increase of some $56 million.

Can the gentleman explain to me this item, and I am not criticizing, I am just seeking information.

Mr. WHITTEN. The International Wheat Agreement commits us to certain payments. Whatever is handled under the International Wheat Agreement, the Commodity Credit Corporation is committed to. The Corporation has already spent the money. So what you see here is the money spent under that agreement. Since it has been spent, there is nothing else for us to do but pick up the tab.

Mr. SHORT. This is our contribution to the cost of maintaining the International Wheat Agreement; is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is the cost to us of participation in the International Wheat Agreement, with all of its ramifications.

Mr. SHORT. I thank the gentleman for that information. And, I seek a little further information, and would like to ask one more question. In regard to the appropriation for the Foreign Agricultural Service, first of all I would like to commend the Foreign Agricultural Service for the job that they are doing around the world. I think they have some extremely able people; I think they have some realistic people who are doing a real good job in furthering the marketing of American agricultural products all over the world. Again I would like to ask, Do we utilize to the greatest possible extent the foreign currencies that are generated in foreign countries under Public Law 480 in defraying the cost of maintaining not only our Foreign Agricultural Service representatives but, I might ask, in defraying the cost of all our foreign installations in foreign countries?

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly do. Unfortunately, we generate most of these currencies in countries where we do not have much use for them. In those countries where we really could use them, we do not generate many currencies. But, to the fullest extent possible, we do use them.

Again I say, foreign currencies are not subject to complete control by our subcommittee or the Committee on Appropriations. The basic act provides that only a small percent is available for U.S. uses. Not only that, but the executive department down through the years has taken currencies generated by agriculture, for which we have to pick up the tab, and used them for other governmental purposes. Many of us feel that the agricultural problem should be met first, and our committee says so in the report and in the bill. Of course, there again we do not control anything, only do the best we can.

Mr. SHORT. It just seems to be practical, sound, commonsense, wherever in those cases it is possible, to use these foreign currencies to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. WHITTEN. A lot of it is used to promote new markets, and a lot of it is used for research on diseases that we do not happen to have here but which are a threat all the time. So to the fullest extent possible they are being used.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. In the present fiscal year there has been some difficulty in the meat processing plants because of lack of funds for inspectors. Can the gentleman say whether there are sufficient funds in the bill this year to take care of the inspectors in the plants in the next fiscal year?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee feels that there are. We have gone along with the full amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, and they have made their recommendation after a thorough study of the situation.

Mr. BOW. The processing plants have been practically or partially shut down because of lack of inspectors.

Mr. WHITTEN. The problem is supposed to have been met.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. What I consider to be my greatest privilege as a Member of this Congress is the privilege of serving on the Committee on Agricultural Appropriations under the most able chairmanship of the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN.

As the gentleman from Mississippi mentioned in his remarks, he has had legal training, but coupled with that legal training he has one of the best agricultural minds of anyone in the United States. JAMIE WHITTEN'S understanding of the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation, enabled us to force the export sales program. He clearly initiated the watershed protection in the Democratic platform of 1952 and later when our subcommittee set up the pilot plant program which led to Public Law 566. We initiated the construction of laboratories for research on many problems facing us. I want to say that the people of this country and particularly the farmers of this country are extremely fortunate that the gentleman from Mississippi is the chairman of this subcommittee.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, FRED MARSHALL. Knowing of his knowledge, interest in, and contributions to agriculture, I doubly appreciate his statement.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I cannot let this opportunity go by but to concur in what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL] has stated about our good chairman. I have served with the gentleman from Mississippi for about 18 years on the Committee on Appropriations, and I think that the farmers of America owe to the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN, a real debt of gratitude. He has done much more for the farmer than the average Congressman comprehends, as far as agriculture is concerned. He has done much to persuade the Commodity Credit Corporation to lower the huge stocks of cotton and sell them in the markets abroad. His work on soil conservation and things of that nature has not been exceeded by any Member of this Congress.

I am so very well pleased, as the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, that I have the opportunity to serve under a gentleman such as the gentleman from Mississippi, JAMIE WHITTEN.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very kind remarks. He and I have worked together for agriculture. Many members say we have worked so closely that seldom if ever do our views differ.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I, too, wish to join my colleagues in complimenting the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] on an outstanding job. I realize the problems he has, particularly in this area, with the number of attacks that are made upon our various farm programs.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman about testimony of the Department with reference to soil and water conservation loans under the Farmers Home Administration. I think the gentleman probably will remember that I spoke to him about this and also corresponded with him on it. I was curious to know, in view of the fact that there was no increase—I believe the bill calls for $3 million, which is the same amount as was appropriated last year. The appropriation last year was used up in the first 45 days of the year. Of course, there was no money available throughout the balance of the year. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain to me what the Department's position was on this and to what extent he discussed with them what might be done, if anything, to make this money available, because it seems to me now that it represents a delusion, to some extent, suffered by our farmers.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman that the Department supported the budget figure as being what they could well use under present conditions.

I do not know how much money could be spent in the general area of flood control and watershed protection. I guess the whole national budget could well be used; it is that big and there is that much interest in it. All that we are trying to do is to go along with the Department and its planners.

May I say again that in this watershed protection field there is over $22 million more in this bill than there was last year.

Mr. SISK. May I clarify the point I was trying to make? I was referring to the soil and water conservation loans under the Farmers Home Administration. This has nothing to do with watershed protection.

Mr. WHITTEN. The overall problem is what I was trying to address myself to.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate that. May I ask the gentleman one further question; as to whether or not his committee has given any thought to the idea of permitting—I realize, of course, that probably this would come under the jurisdiction of another committee—but of permitting interest rates to go up, or of permitting Farmers Home Administration to

insure loans at a higher rate of interest than at present. What we are concerned with now is that local banks will not participate in the matter of insuring loans under the present interest ceiling. So as a result, in this program, we do have some real shortcomings. I am speaking specifically with reference to the money provided the Farmers Home Administration for loans to farmers for the deepening of wells or the digging of new wells, and so forth, separate and apart from watershed legislation.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say that when you have a bill that carries as much as this bill does, it is mighty hard to come here with an increase in the budget. I just hope that the gentleman will take this matter up with the Department for consideration in the next budget. I realize the soundness of the gentleman's proposal, but there is just so much a horse can carry, and we have done about all we can in this particular bill.

Mr. SISK. I thank the gentleman for yielding. We have had long and interesting discussions with the Department on this subject.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I want to compliment the chairman and subcommittee on this bill. However, the hearings on this bill were closed before we knew to what extent the farmers would participate in the new feed grain program. Since the hearings have closed, we know there is going to be a much broader participation than most had expected. The money needed to check compliance will therefore be increased in comparison to the amount estimated at the time of the hearings. I understand the updated figures and requests will be submitted to the Senate. Consequently, I should like to know if the gentleman thinks there might have to be a revision in conference in the figure for this program.

Mr. WHITTEN. The funds required will have to be provided. The Department picked its figure out of the air, and we substituted our own, which was arrived at in somewhat the same way. But if this program takes additional money, we will be right there to provide it.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. The gentleman has mentioned that the amount of the bill is about $6 billion. That is a terrific amount of money. Not long ago I heard a statement made that what agriculture needs is a better public relations job, that some of the people of the United States might believe that this $6 billion is all going to agriculture. I repeat what I have said before, that some day, somehow, some differentiation must be made as to what benefits agriculture and what benefits the entire economy.

Mr. WHITTEN. You are absolutely correct. In our report last year we attempted to show how much of the annual appropriations in the agriculture bill have direct benefits to the general public. That analysis showed that over 54 percent of the funds were spent for programs which benefit the general public as well as the farmer.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSEN. I notice on page 27 dealing with rural electrification there is a paragraph that aroused my curiosity. It reads:

> In connection with new loans, the REA should determine a proper level of reserve for each applicant, should set up proper criteria for granting new loans, and should make certain that funds are used for the purposes for which they are made available.

The implication is made that some funds have been used for purposes other than those for which they have been made available. Has it come to the attention of the committee that any such thing has happened?

Mr. WHITTEN. The committee had some question as to whether the Department had ever made a determination as to what an adequate reserve was. For the last several years they have testified they were considering it and working on it. There have been rumors and reports, about which I have no specific information. What we included in the report we think is adequate.

Mr. NELSEN. There has been some criticism that has come to my attention. I believe this language is well taken.

Mr. WHITTEN. Without specific information we did not want to set out an indictment or anything of the sort. What we have said we think is sound business. The representatives of REA indicated they meant to do that, but we thought we might repeat our position again.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. I should like to express my personal appreciation to the gentleman and the members of the subcommittee for establishing a contingency reserve fund of $1 million and for the sympathetic consideration you gave to many of us who appeared before your subcommittee on the problem of pear decline in the Pacific States. We appreciate the action you have taken in the bill on this problem.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I, too, want to join my colleagues in congratulating the gentleman from Mississippi on his wonderful work on this committee in reporting out this bill. I come from an area that grows a great deal of wheat and we are interested in markets and market development. I notice in your report here on page 23 with reference to the foreign agricultural service that the committee recommended a direct appropriation of $12,457,000. I want to ask the gentleman these questions.

First. The initial budget estimate indicated that $8,893,000 of the dollar appropriation requested for the foreign agricultural service would be for agricultural market development abroad. How much of the $12,457,000 recommended in your bill, which is now under consideration, is supposed to be for market development abroad?

Second. Since the use of the $3,444,000 of Public Law 480 foreign currencies recommended for the Foreign Agricultural Service in the bill under consideration is specified for agricultural market development abroad, it is assumed that these currencies can only be used for such purposes. However, is the same true in respect to the dollars intended for agricultural market development and included in the appropriation recommended for the Foreign Agricultural Service in the bill under consideration?

Third. Since Public Law 480 specifies that not less than 5 percent of the proceeds from title I sales and loan repayments shall be made available in advance for agricultural market development, abroad, why is the amount of foreign currencies recommended for market development abroad so low in the bill under consideration? If such currencies are not used for market development abroad, what will they be used for? Why was not the maximum use of Public Law 480 foreign currencies specified for agricultural market development abroad? Where possible, why was not conversion of such currencies required in order to generate funds for use for market development purposes in those countries which are or offer reasonable potential of becoming dollar markets? Would not the use of Public Law 480 foreign currencies instead of dollars assist in correcting the balance-of-payments problem which the United States has been experiencing?

Fourth. Why has agricultural market development abroad been given such low priority in the allocation of foreign currencies accruing under title I of Public Law 480 when the legislative history of the act so clearly indicates that Congress intends that priority be given to this important activity?

Fifth. Carrying out market development abroad through private trade and industry groups has proven to be a sound basis for developing export markets for American agricultural products. Will the funds for market development which are included in the dollar and foreign currency appropriations recommended for the Foreign Agricultural Service in the bill under consideration be used in collaboration with private trade and industry groups?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that we have gone along with the Department's recommendations in this matter. The market development funds in both appropriations are intended to be used to purchase local currency as fully as possible for market development purposes in cooperation with trade and industry groups.

I counseled personally with our former colleague, Congressman Hope, who, as the gentleman knows, represents some of

the wheat interests. I have talked with the gentleman from Kansas himself. We have gone all out to bring about cooperation in providing markets to the fullest extent possible.

There is language in the bill tying down foreign currency to the fullest extent possible in line with basic law, which came from the Committee on Agriculture. But again this is a matter that is beyond our control. Other agencies of Government also have a voice in the handling of these funds.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to close without expressing my sincere appreciation to my colleagues on this subcommittee for their gracious statements and their cooperation. Let me say that each one of them has contributed greatly to the welfare of agriculture. This bill has been a committee effort.

BILL NATCHER, from the tobacco country of Kentucky, is an able member of the subcommittee. FRED SANTANGELO, of New York City, has done so much for his country and has added so much to this committee. JOHN SLACK, of West Virginia, is serving his first term on the committee. He is an able and effective member and his interest and counsel are invaluable.

The interest of both CARL ANDERSEN and WALT HORAN and their efforts for agriculture through the years have been unsurpassed. BOB MICHEL, from Illinois, happens to have different views on some matters than my own, but no one can question his deep interest and efforts for American agriculture.

I am proud to serve with each of them.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to serve with these gentleman on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture. I regret losing the close association on the subcommittee with my very good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. I also want to pay tribute to Mr. HORAN, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. SANTANGELO, Mr. SLACK, and our capable chairman, Mr. WHITTEN, for the splendid job they are doing for the farmers of America. Again, I repeat, it is a pleasure to serve with gentlemen of such stature.

Mr. Chairman, the agricultural appropriation bill has been discussed, at least the major portions of it, and I intend to use a few minutes this afternoon to touch upon basic agricultural legislation. We on the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture can only really act after the deed is done, so to speak. We have throughout the years influenced the trend of legislation, as has been pointed out by the chairman, when the Andersen-Hope pilot watershed program was first enacted; when we on the subcommittee were responsible for transferring the Foreign Agricultural Service from the Department of State to the Department of Agriculture; and when the conservation reserve had its beginning in this particular subcommittee through the efforts of Mr. MARSHALL and myself.

In my 23 years in the House of Representatives I have been a stanch supporter of farm legislation. I have always sought to set aside completely any partisan, sectional, or such considerations in my approach to a solution of the farm problem, as evidenced by the fact that I recently voted for the feed-grain program on the floor of the House when only three other Republicans did so. I personally stand ready to support any bill by any author which contains the basic, essential provisions necessary for solving the economic and supply problems which now plague American agriculture, so long as such bill is in the best interests of all Americans.

Thomas Jefferson warned of the pitfalls awaiting us if we ever departed from our basic philosophy when he said:

> Arm not the magistrate with too much power lest you be taxed in your eat, your meat, your drink, and your recreation and your freedom be lost.

I have carefully analyzed H.R. 6400, the Freeman omnibus farm bill, and am forced to conclude that the proposal is a legislative monstrosity. It would give the Secretary of Agriculture, an appointed official, and his successors unprecedented powers over American agriculture—powers to undertake any type of program for setting farm prices and controlling production and marketing that he saw fit—regardless of cost. It would include the power to set base periods; the power to establish minimum allotments; the power to grant exemptions; the power to make direct payments; the power to limit payments to individuals; the power to provide for the transfer and sale of farm marketing allotments and quotas; the power to establish conditions of eligibility for price supports; the power to hand-pick the farmer advisory committees; the power to disregard their advice; the power to terminate their services, and the power to develop marketing quotas for any agricultural commodity including all grains, dry beans, hogs, cattle, lambs, chickens, turkeys, whole milk, and butterfat.

The supporters of this unprecedented bill accuse those who are opposed to it, of letting their imagination run away with them in being unduly disturbed by the concentration of power in the hands of one man. But no one has explained away the fact that Congress would—by the enactment of this bill—abdicate to an appointed official, its constitutional prerogative to develop legislative policy, retaining only the right of veto and even that right is somewhat beclouded.

As I have said, I am a strong advocate of farm programs. We all know that we must have farm legislation of some type. But why must we have programs which involve such mountainous volume of detail and the unnecessarily huge amount of paperwork and the ever increasing army of personnel? The costs for the administration of a separate program for each and every commodity would be staggering.

There has been a great deal of misunderstanding and confusion at the Washington level and at the State, county, and farm levels in the administration of the feed-grain program, and that involved only two commodities—corn and grain sorghum—for which acres and yields had to be determined. Can you then visualize the cost, the manpower and the confusion that would result from the administration of a separate program for each individual commodity, each such program supposedly written by the producers of that particular commodity?

By comparison, let us look at the simplicity and the economical provisions of the green acres program which I introduced last year and which was the only major farm amendment approved by the House of Representatives last year. This green acres bill was reintroduced at the opening session of Congress this year as H.R. 40.

The cornerstone of the green acres farm program is the requirement, after approval in a single nationwide farmer referendum, that every farmer producing price-supported crops such as wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseeds, in order to qualify for the benefits under the bill must have a minimum of 20 percent of his cropland in green acres, that is, grass, hay, or tame pasture.

Farmers who already have 20 percent or more of their cropland under green cover would be immediately eligible for the green acres benefits. They are farming their land now as it should be farmed.

To liquidate the price-depressing surpluses now stored at huge cost, additional payment-in-kind is provided equal to 80 percent of the farmer's average yield for additional cropland taken completely out of production, not to exceed one-half of the total cropland.

In addition to the green acres, the bill provides that participating farmers could produce any and all of these grains, and receive a price support of 80 percent of parity during the first 2 years, 85 percent the next 2 years, and 90 percent of parity thereafter. This can be done because 32 million acres of cropland are retired without cost to the taxpayers. The farmer has balanced production with consumption and his remaining production justifies an increased price level, at very little cost to the consumer, but providing a tremendous shot in the arm of our Nation's economy.

With no surplus production, this price support schedule will cost the taxpayer very little, since commodities on hand are used in lieu of cash outlay. Most of the county ASC offices have the history and acreage record for every farm in their respective county, hence administration costs will be as low as any possible program can be.

The green acres program as proposed contains numerous provisions previously advanced by other able and distinguished Members of Congress. The payment-in-kind feature, for example, may be found in several bills including the feed-grain bill, where it is now in use. The idea of payments-in-kind has long been advocated by such able colleagues as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN],

along with his colleague the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN], the distinguished chairman of my Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. The latter gentleman and I were the original authors of the present conservation reserve.

I personally discussed the green acres proposal with more than 400 farmers, ASC committeemen, county agents, conservationists, livestock men, and others representing a cross section of Midwest agriculture. As a result of these discussions, the initial idea was considerably modified and several very valuable improvements were made. The green acres program is the result of the combined thinking of a cross section of farm people and the leaders, and I want to acknowledge their help and express my personal appreciation for their contributions. It is a program which requires only one administrative verification—and that is, the proper measurement of the 20 percent of retired green acres. This 20 percent can be rotated in order to make sure that the Government gets the average—not the poorest—of the farmland.

Section 2 of H.R. 40 provides for a nationwide referendum to permit farmers to determine for themselves whether or not they want this program to go into operation. Since every farmer in the United States who produced wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed would be immediately affected, all of those producers who produced one or more of these commodities in at least 3 of the last 5 years would be eligible to vote in the referendum. If two-thirds or more of the producers voting in the referendum favored the program presented to them, it would be in effect for 1962 and thereafter unless the Congress authorized and the Secretary of Agriculture conducted another referendum on this or a modified program.

Section 3 covers the green acres provision and is the cornerstone of the entire proposal. Beginning with the 1962 crop, all producers of the commodities enumerated earlier would be required to put at least 20 percent of their total cropland under green cover. Farmers would receive no direct compensation for so doing, and they would be free to do anything they wanted to with these green acres other than the production of price-supported crops. They could graze it, cut hay off of it, put it into wildlife cover, and so forth. The principal stipulation would be that it must be under green cover and not in the production of nonconserving crops. This is mandatory after two-thirds of the Nation's producers have so voted. This is the only compulsion or control in this bill.

Everyone we discussed this with advised us that it must be absolutely enforcible. To make it effective we have put some real teeth into it by providing a penalty of 50 percent of the total production on any farm not in compliance with the green acres provision. This penalty would be in the amount of one-half the value of the violator's total production the year of his noncompliance and we believe there would be little or no noncompliance.

Section 4 provides a vital incentive insofar as farmers and our rural economy are concerned. Under this section price supports on all the commodities listed would be set at 80 percent of parity the first 2 years, at 85 percent the next 2 years, and at 90 percent of parity thereafter. The reduction in surpluses will make this possible at less cost—far less than the present feed-grain program.

Section 5 contains the provisions for the liquidation of present surpluses; the maintenance of an adequate supply for the protection of consumers, world markets, and food-for-peace programs; and the balancing of farm production in the future. We provide for that balance by regulating the amount of green acres needed. The payment-in-kind program is to be entirely optional with the producer, but we have purposely set the rate at 80 percent of average yields to make it attractive to producers. We must use up on the farm the bulk of our present commodity holdings. In addition, we have set a maximum of 50 percent of any farm which may be temporarily retired from production in the best interests of farm families and the local economies. Mr. MARSHALL and I had always urged this step in relation to the conservation reserve. The previous Secretary of Agriculture decided otherwise.

There is also another payment-in-kind feature in this section relative to the green acres retired from cropland under section 3. To protect the livestock economy against a flood of cheap hay, we authorize an optional 25 percent of normal yield payment-in-kind for the complete retirement of this cropland. Please note that all payments come directly out of taxpayer-owned commodity credit stocks.

Section 6 provides that the acreage diverted either into green acres or by payment-in-kind shall be in addition to any acreage already in the conservation reserve. The present 27 million acres under conservation reserve are to run their course.

Section 7 assures producers eligibility for ACP cost-share payments on their farms, including the green acres and land diverted under payment-in-kind.

Section 8 provides that the program shall be administered by the farmer-elected committees which are already in existence. This is the most effective known form of administration for farm programs.

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Agriculture to transmit annual reports to the Congress in order that the operations of the green acres program may be constantly reviewed. In addition, it provides that any increase in the percentage of cropland required under the green acres provision shall first be approved by Congress and then submitted to producers in another nationwide referendum.

Section 10 guarantees to cotton, peanut, rice, tobacco and wheat producers that no terms of this measure shall in any way affect their present programs of acreage allotments, marketing quotas or price supports except for the 80 percent of parity price support floor under wheat.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a section-by-section summary of the bill.

I would like to emphasize the fact that the entire program proposed in this bill will cost the taxpayers little or nothing more than the costs of administration and the release of surplus CCC stocks which are now actually costing us about $600 million a year to store. The savings in total costs would be enormous, not to mention the nationwide benefits that would accrue from a prosperous and healthy farm economy.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I support this bill, H.R. 7444, making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies and for other purposes. Before commenting on the contents of this appropriation bill, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. JAMIE WHITTEN, for the efficiency and completeness of the hearings and the solicitude he has shown to me and the members of this subcommittee. I want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER], for the constant aid, advice, and assistance he gave me throughout the hearings. I have derived a great deal of pleasure from my association with Representatives CARL ANDERSEN, of Minnesota, WALT HORAN, of Washington, ROBERT MICHEL, of Illinois, and the new addition to the committee, Representative JOHN SLACK, from West Virginia. My recent trips to the farmlands of the United States in Texas, Puerto Rico, California, Arkansas, and Asia, have not only been arduous and pleasant, but also have given me a keen insight into the agricultural problems which beset farmers and the American people.

I would like to make a few general observations about this bill and about agriculture. In the race to reach outer space, the planets, and to get out of this world, some people seem to forget that the most basic factor in our national existence on earth is agriculture. We should never forget the moral of the legend of the semigod, Hercules, wrestling with the giant, Antaeus, that the further away from the land we go the weaker we become, and the closer to the soil we stay the stronger we get.

Agriculture is still the mainstay of our economy. It provides the basic necessities of life, food and fiber. The farms of our country feed not only the 180 million people of these United States, but serve the needs of additional millions throughout the world. They accomplish this result with fewer farmers, but with superior technological skill and with improved machinery. Agriculture provides basic raw materials which support all segments of business and industry. Reliable estimates indicate that each dollar of wealth taken from the soil generates $7 of income throughout the

rest of our country. Certain programs which ostensibly benefit farmers and farms also carry with them tremendous benefits to the urban dweller and the residents of suburbia. If I seem to be an apologist for farm programs, it is because during my inspection trips I have seen and observed, and during the hearings I have listened. Also, because as a consumer, I recognize that without the produce and the fruits of the farms we in the cities, despite hydroponic developments, could not last very long. As a consequence, I believe that despite many abuses and weaknesses in the farm program that the interests of farmers and city folk dovetail, and we are mutually dependent. Our independence as groups, and as persons, rests on the basis that we are dependent on each other.

Recently, in February of this year in Dallas, Tex., I had the opportunity to speak before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association national convention, which was attended by approximately 8,000 members from all over the United States. In my talk I detailed the reciprocal benefits of the REA program to the city resident and farmer. I stated at that time my observations, which are still valid today: that, if we in the cities feel that we paid taxes to underwrite and finance the original REA funds and loans, history has demonstrated that because of this program we in the cities have been repaid manyfold by increased business, by better food, and by increased employment. The report of the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Benson, described the benefits to the farmer in the terms of human needs, but it omitted to set forth the benefits which are correlative and which have been and are being generated by the increased use and consumption of electric power. I believe that these benefits and the relationship between the rural resident and the city dweller are interdependent and go hand in glove. They should not be overlooked but should be emphasized.

To the farmer and his family, rural electrification means many things and has provided many advantages. To the farmer, rural electrification has meant a radio and television set, warning of an oncoming frost in Georgia or a late market report in Iowa or the price of cotton futures to the Texans. It means a pleasant evening at home, a political debate between candidates or educational programs for the family. In 1959 the farmer's new gadgets benefited the city man by opening up a market for the sale of 3,200,000 television sets with the attendant employment for the tradesmen, the electricians, the mechanics, the Charlie Chaplin-type automatons. It means advertising fees for the merchants of discontent and Madison Avenue advertisers, a market for the television broadcasters and their networks which span the Nation. It means the illegal loot for quiz showmen, diskjockeys, and quack pundits answering the $64,000 question.

The rural electrification program means now that the farmer has light to read by on a dark night. On the other hand, the farmer's enjoyment in reading gives a reciprocal benefit to a city person and businessman. It means a sale of books and magazines, book-of-the-month club, and the production of electric bulbs. It means greater circulation for Time, Look, Life, Reader's Digest, and the Atlantic Monthly, as well as the Sears Roebuck catalog.

Rural electrification to the rural housewife means ironing without stoking a range red hot to heat a flatiron. This benefit to the rural woman means sales by the city merchant, increased production, and consequently, increased employment.

To a rural youth, the benefits of rural electrification means changing his mind about seeking his fortune in the city and making plans to stay on the ranch after graduation. To the city folk, administrators, and officials, it means that the boy who stays on the farm, represents one less misguided juvenile delinquent in the city streets, and one less person congesting youth houses and living in our overcrowded cities.

To the rural farmer, rural electrification means refrigeration—modern freezers and refrigerators—without the inconvenience of lugging ice into the icebox or the tedious chores of preserving ice in a icehouse covered with sawdust. To both the city folk and the rural farmer, refrigeration means better food all year round, less harmful bacteria in the food supply, in milk, and less contamination and potentially lower consumer prices of milk, meat, and Mozzorelle—cheese. To the city manufacturer in the year 1959, refrigeration meant the sale of 2,030,000 electric freezers, 3,780,000 electric refrigerators, with the concomitant employment in production and in trade. To the housewife, electric washing machines, and electric dishwashers mean less drudgery, cleaner garments, and more leisure time. To the city people, it means employment, sales, of numerous detergents, such as Fab, Comet, Ajax, Tide, Clean, Lux, and Duz, with their TV-doggerels and limericks. Summed up, it means that rural electrification has brought about a greater self-respect for millions of American families. It means comfort in the home, greater efficiency on the farm, and dignity to the individual, and a train of benefits to its fellow urbanites.

This farm program, the REA, for which we make appropriations in this bill, upon a survey was found to have generated a billion dollars of business annually in appliance sales and that over 4,200,000 have purchased many of these appliances because of the availability of electric power. Other areas exist in which interest between the rural communities and the city sections can be spelled out. In the garment and textile industries, I believe, a survey would be informative to see how much of an increase in the sale of clothing has been brought about as a result of the raising of the standard of living of people residing in the rural communities. If these relationships, the interdependency between the city and the farm people, are fully developed and explored, and the results publicized, I am confident that rural folks would not feel antagonistic, estranged, or indifferent to city problems, and we who live in the city and read about soil-bank payments and farm subsidies might be more sympathetic to the rural problems and farm programs.

Because of the widespread notion that the farm program contains features which are wasteful and which are give-always, the committee in its report has sought to identify the recipients of America's bounty and to earmark the objects of several appropriations. There are appropriations for agriculture's regular activities, appropriations restoring the Commodity Credit Corporation capital impairment, and appropriations for foreign assistance. Some of these should not be changed in logic nor in fairness to farmers, inasmuch as they serve our foreign policy, our unemployed, our children and oftentimes our consumers. Fairness and equity dictate that those who benefit directly or indirectly should be made aware of their obligations and should acknowledge their participation in these farm benefits.

This bill recommends a total appropriation of $5,948,566,000 a decrease of over $140,000,000 from the budget request. This bill recommends for regular activities for fiscal year 1962, the sum of $1,379,006,000; for reimbursement to the Commodity Credit Corporation for fiscal year 1960, this bill recommends $1,017,610,000.

The committee also recommends a reimbursement for the foreign assistance and special activities expenditures made by CCC in fiscal year 1961, the sum of $1,951,915,000. To put the foreign assistance programs on a pay-as-you-go basis, the committee has recommended an appropriation of $1,600 million. This bill recommends $345 million in loan authorizations for REA and RTA.

The committee report from pages 12 to 15 details the regular activities of the Department of Agriculture. These include agricultural research services which do a tremendous job in preventing and eradicating disease in livestock, in animals, and in poultry. It has had great success in the prevention and eradication of tuberculosis, hog cholera, brucellosis, and airsacculitis of poultry. This research helps mankind to control insects which if left unchecked would destroy agriculture's produce both in food and in fiber. While the farmer is aided in his endeavors to preserve his production, the consumer is also protected in the type of food he eats and the clothes he wears.

In connection with the price support programs which I know city Representatives and the country are concerned with and critical of, I direct your attention to page 33 of the committee report wherein the price support costs for fiscal year 1959 and 1960 are listed.

These figures show that while less than half of the 1960 costs was due to loss on commodities under price support operations, that payments to nonfarm groups exceeded payments to farmers.

These figures of losses show that the taxpayer in 1960 subsidized farmers to the extent of approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars, and that nonfarm groups received in 1960 over $850 million for storage, transportation, interest and administrative expense. These are expenditures which should be cut down and can be reduced if the farm groups and other ancillary organizations cooperate.

I would like to mention one other item in the appropriation bill which city residents appreciate, and that is the school lunch program. The bill provides $125 million for fiscal year 1962 in cash payments for school lunches. This sum represents $5 million more than the budgets of President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have provided and it is $15 million more than last year's budget. Of this $15 million, $10 million is included to provide special assistance to help particularly needy schools defray the cost of serving luncheons to needy children. Language is included to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to allocate money to areas of the greatest need and to prescribe standards and criteria under which the fund will be used. The school lunch program serves the farmer by providing outlets for the consumption of his products, it helps develop stronger bodies among our schoolchildren, and it encourages and develops new tastes and a greater consumption of our food supply.

During the year 1960, 62,975 schools participated. In 1960, 12,800,000 children received school lunches and further substantial increases have occurred in the present school year. We are hopeful that with these additional $15 million, together with the $44 million authorized to be used from section 32 funds—that is the customs receipts—to purchase red meats and other foods needed to provide a balanced diet for schoolchildren, and we are hopeful that these appropriations will help correct some of the imbalance which has developed between the rate of Federal assistance and the rate of schoolchildren participation in this program.

This bill deserves your support and I trust that it will be passed.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to my chairman.

Mr. WHITTEN. I wish to say to the gentleman from New York that I appreciate very much, and I am sure the membership does, the speech he is making here. I want to say for the record that the gentleman from New York has made a great contribution to all America in his service on this committee, in seeing how these programs fit together and in seeing that the moneys are handled in the best way possible. Since he has been on this committee, the gentleman's contributions to the school lunch program have been immeasurable. I wish to say again the gentleman from New York has rendered and is rendering outstanding service, and I want the RECORD to show we all appreciate it very much.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his generous remarks.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MARSHALL. I had the privilege to go out through the country to look into some agricultural problems with the gentleman from New York. I would like to say the gentleman from New York has made a great contribution not only to people in the agricultural areas of the Nation, but to the people of New York City as well by bringing about a better understanding between the people of the city of New York and the people of the country at large. Every time we met with any group to discuss the problems of agriculture, the gentleman from New York did a marvelous job of public relations. I would like to say for the record that I have gotten over the feeling that New York was a city that did not care anything about the rest of the Nation because through my association with the gentleman from New York, I have learned that our colleague from New York is concerned for all the people and he has a great heart for all the people of the United States and he has made a splendid contribution toward better understanding between the people of cities like New York and the country as a whole.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MARSHALL]. My colleague has been very helpful to me in my efforts to have a better understanding of these problems.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. First I want to say that this is one of the very best speeches I have heard in this House in the years of my service here. The gentleman from New York has been able to do that because he has studied the subject matter, not only attending all the hearings of our committee but also having gotten hearings of other committees and studying them. I think we owe a great debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York for the information he has brought us.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I might say that as a result of information we received in Des Moines, Iowa, we were able to save the people of the United States $72 million last year in storage costs alone by reason of a reduction in storage charges. This came about as a result of the work of the gentleman from Iowa and the Committee on Agriculture and the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the gentleman from New York for the fine statement he has just made in the field of agriculture, and the part he has played in bringing the consumer and the masses of our people together in this program and this problem. He has made a fine contribution as a member of the committee. I know of his particular interest in a project which I regret to say I find no funds for in this bill. I am referring to the so-called research facility for soil-water-plant relationship at Cornell University in New York State.

The gentleman knows that this facility is listed as a desirable means to make a study, particularly with regard to soil-water-plant relationship. I regret that the committee has not seen fit to include funds for this project in the bill. However, I do want to call attention to the fact that the committee has made reference to this project on page 14 of the report. I note particularly that your committee in this report asks the Department of Agriculture to make a careful reevaluation of the priority position of this project, and assuming that if the Department could or would give this project a better position by way of importance the committee would see fit to provide funds.

Will the gentleman enlighten me about that?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. As the Members of the House know, the Senate has set out a list of priorities which perhaps may or may not have any validity today. The program to which the gentleman referred has a low priority. Some of us feel it should have a higher priority. We have called upon the Department of Agriculture to reevaluate these programs and turn to the present need with relationship to their efficacy and the contribution to the whole economy of the United States.

Secondly, in regard to the soil-water-plant research program I can say that we considered and we discussed it. We had hearings, there was testimony, the gentleman from New York testified and made a wonderful presentation. Last year the gentleman was instrumental in obtaining one-half million dollars for soil-water research. We have asked the Department of Agriculture to reevaluate these priorities which were lumped together in Senate Document No. 59 to determine whether the research program in which the gentleman and New York are so keenly interested should not have a higher priority.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Has the gentleman's committee any estimate as to when the Department might come up with a reevaluation of this project so that money could be provided? Not this year, perhaps.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I will refer to the chairman of the subcommittee to answer that question if he desires. We did refer this matter to the Department of Agriculture. I know of no commitments or any indication on their part as to when they will come up with a reevaluation. I assume that after they read our report, which was brought out only last week, that they have had little time to give it consideration and we will hear from them in the near future.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Chairman, I want to add my sentiments to those just expressed by my good friend and colleague, Representative HAROLD OSTERTAG.

Research in the field of soil-water-plant relationships is of vital importance to the farmers of the Northeastern United States and, for that matter, to farmers throughout the country. For this reason, I am disappointed that funds were not requested by Agriculture Secretary Freeman or made available by the committee for a soil-water-plant relationships laboratory at Cornell University.

However, I am encouraged to note in the committee report that the members of the committee have taken cognizance of the need for additional study in this area and have requested the Department of Agriculture to make a careful reevaluation of the priority position of the proposed soil-water-plant relationships facility.

I hope and trust that this reevaluation will be completed at an early date, that the Department will recognize the importance of assigning a high priority to this project and that the Congress will move expeditiously to make the necessary funds available.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York on the wonderful speech he has just made. It is real heartening to find one standing before the microphone in support of agriculture being a Member from the State of New York. It is not often that a Member from a metropolitan area stands up and speaks in favor of agriculture, as the gentleman from New York has just done.

Mr. SANTANGELO. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice to the fact that I am from a great metropolitan area also, namely, Los Angeles County, and I stand for agriculture needs as presented in this bill by the committee. I compliment the gentleman from New York on his splendid statement.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SANTANGELO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I appreciate the affection you folks all have for our colleague from New York, but I do rise at this time to inquire if the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE] is not from one of the biggest dairy areas in the United States?

Mr. DOYLE. Yes; and I am very proud of it.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Now that we have spilled some milk, let us proceed with consideration of the bill.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, being considered by the House of Representatives today, includes a new approach to helping meet the always serious need for additional agriculture research.

This is the establishment for the first time of a contingency research fund for $1 million, available to the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service to expedite work on research problems and to meet special research needs as they arise.

Members will note that the report on this bill states in the final paragraph on page 8: Such a fund will also be available to give increased emphasis to some of the many special problems presented to the committee by Members of Congress and other witnesses this year, including basic research on wheat and grains, research on the improved digestibility of dry edible beans, barley and malt research, research on pear decline, forage and range research, soybean research, poultry research—particularly with reference to airsacculitis—soil and water conservation research, and others.

I would like to state, Mr. Chairman, that there is indeed a serious need for additional attention to research in these fields, as I testified before the Agriculture Subcommittee, Committee on Appropriations.

As an example, the problem of pear decline, which renders pear trees nonproductive, has become alarmingly serious in the west coast States of Washington, Oregon, and California. The problem is so serious as to threaten the very existence of the west coast industry from which 95 percent of the Nation's Bartlett pears originate. The congressional delegations from the three States worked closely with the Department of Agriculture, land-grant college research people, and the industry to develop a crash research plan, the only ray of hope to stem this unsolved problem before the industry is rendered nonexistent. The three-State cooperative program, in which the industry and the States will share cost responsibility, requires a Federal effort in fiscal year 1962 of $180,000, a modest sum considering the urgency and gravity of the problem. The committee, in the agricultural appropriations bill, has allowed $90,200 specific effort to this end in fiscal year 1962, but has stated that the contingency research fund may be used for further pear decline research during the fiscal year.

Other specific research areas where the contingency research fund may be used, and in which there is specific need in the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Washington, include soil and water conservation, hops, dodder, mint wilt, sugarbeets, and dry edible beans.

The distinguished chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee discussed such a contingency research fund with me earlier in this session, and at that time I expressed to him a keen interest in such a plan as an effective method of administration of additional research by the Agricultural Research Service. I am, therefore, pleased to note that the committee has, in the legislation and report before us, made provision for the establishment of the plan.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Washington concerning their subcommittee hearings with respect to the progress being made in the four regional research laboratories sponsored by the USDA, and what significant progress they are making, if any, in the field of research for greater utilization of our present surplus commodities.

Mr. HORAN. I would much prefer that the gentleman from Mississippi answer that question.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Would the gentleman from Mississippi care to comment on that?

Mr. WHITTEN. If the gentleman would repeat his question, I would appreciate it.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I was asking concerning the progress report from the regional research laboratories particularly in regard to the utilization of our present surplus commodities.

Mr. WHITTEN. Progress is being made, as the gentleman knows. An example is in the use of animal fats in plastics, and the hearings cite quite a number of illustrations of successes and of development. I refer the gentleman to the hearings, because they are spelled out in considerable degree in the hearings.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Does there appear to be any significant breakthrough in any special area at this time?

Mr. WHITTEN. The one thing mentioned was the use of animal fats in plastics as a tremendous breakthrough. Animal fat is the one thing which has little, if any, market and of which we have a tremendous surplus. By the same token, plastics are becoming quite a big consumer item. So, tying the two together, I would say that the development that they have had there has probably in itself been worth all the money that we have spent in this activity.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. There seems to have been some sentiment in the past that too much money was being spent on personnel and that too much of the funds have been used in the field of pure research and not enough in the field of utilization. Would the gentleman care to comment on that phase of the problem?

Mr. WHITTEN. Well, I would say it all depends on who you talk to. Those

that are primarily interested in utilization research think they are getting too little and the others think they are getting too much. Actually we are doing a lot of research and trying to get the best results possible.

Mr. HORAN. If I may comment on this—and I do not want to consume all of my time on this phase—we are doing some very good work in utilization. Now, it is true that we can make industrial alcohol out of wheat, but we cannot make it economically out of wheat at $2 a bushel. However, some of our utilization research is in the better preparation of wheat products for consumption by the human individual, and that is a utilization, I think, in the right direction.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. In the bill itself there is an item of $600,000 to press this matter of utilization research, particularly at the laboratories at Peoria, Ill., and Albany, Calif., where they are developing a high grade of starch used in the making of fine grades of paper. I think that is an accomplishment.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, it is the way we set our sails that determines our course. I make this observation as we here in the month of June 1961, consider the funds needed to implement our Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1962, which begins some 3 weeks from now. The late and beloved Senator Pat Harrison, of Mississippi, once said, and it was hardly original, that everyone was entitled to his own opinion, when he found himself in conflict with the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Now, on this particular part of our national budget which is before us today, I beg leave to express some opinions of my own.

In a very great sense, we who serve on the Appropriations Committee are your servants. We have a duty to perform for the entire Congress. We try diligently to review the work that has been done by the various departments. We have in our mind the tax burdens—Federal, State, and local—which our people shoulder today. We know that the dollar, 100 cents in 1939 is 43.9 cents today. We also note whether the estimates before us involve increases over the previous year and we delve into the requests for additional personnel. It concerns me that almost every revised budget request does this. If we are to maintain fiscal sanity in this country, it is incumbent upon us that we do this. Incidentally, it is my intention to have more to say about this phase when our subcommittee has the Commerce appropriations bill before you here in a week or so from now.

There are those among our adversaries in the East who are convinced that the United States is headed for some dismal years of fiscal instability. Hence, our work takes on an added importance. Not only should we think of our children and our children's children, who will be called upon to shoulder the costs of our current efforts, but I do feel that the fiscal stability of the United States is of vast importance to all our allies in the West and other friendly nations. These projects and programs which we annually consider are largely the result of legislation passed by the Congress. We do try to find out if these programs and projects are getting things done constructively, or if they are "halt and lame." If the latter, I think we have a duty to express our opinion and tell you so. Therefore, today, in expressing my brief opinions, I want to steer wide and clear from any placing of particular blame. My opinions and observations, I hope, will be construed as in the direction of constructiveness. I have served on this subcommittee during the services of five Secretaries of Agriculture. Every one of them was dedicated to what he thought was in the best interests of the American farmer. Personally, I think we lose sight of the principles that need debate and discussion when we dip to criticism of individuals and the creation of horrid images for political purposes. These certainly obscure the issue and fail to solve the problems of American agriculture. Every one of these five Secretaries of Agriculture has served during periods of great change. Technological revolution after technological revolution has visited our American farms during the last score of years. What was new in 1942 was obsolete a decade later, and what was new in 1952 is often antique as we consider the budget items here before us. When I observed that it is the way we set our sails that determines our course, I had reference to the fact that basically the sails under which our ship of Agriculture is now sailing were set in 1938.

At that time we had visions of an ever-normal granary. And, we gave life to a program that would encourage our producers of basic crops to grow more. They did. And do not let anyone tell you that American agriculture failed in its task of winning the war. I think our bounty today is the greatest asset we have for finally winning the peace and ending the cold war. But the ever-normal granary idea also had a sort of anchor to leeward called marketing quotas and acreage allotments. This troublesome addition to the 1938 program just did not come out from under the political rocks until 1952. Meanwhile, under various colors and garbs, we were helping to rebuild the devastated world. Our help then and now is going everywhere, as from a Christian-Judaeo nation, it should. We retooled such able competitors as West Germany and Japan. For a while we helped the always competent British to recoup. And, of course, we helped others to rebuild their industrial commerce. You know all about that. We always set forth to aid the so-called underdeveloped countries, and we have. But most of these countries are agricultural and their progress adds to the world's supply of farm products which concerns us here at home.

In the last 10 years, while we have reduced cotton acreages in the United States by well over 10 million acres, the total world acreage has actually increased. While we have reduced wheat by 9 million acres, world acreage has increased by 64½ million acres. We have cut rice acres here at home, but world acreages have increased by 50½ million acres. We have cut tobacco at home, but world acreage has increased by 1¾ million acres. Only soybeans and corn have increased in acreage here at home during the last 10 years. But meanwhile, worldwide, corn has increased by 48½ million acres while soybeans have increased by nearly 18 million acres. I mention these brief facts because I think it is time we stopped and thought about our domestic problems in terms of the total world. At this point, Mr. Chairman, under privilege previously granted to me, I would like to insert some tables and comments which briefly set forth in more detail the facts that I have just mentioned.

World acreage of selected crops, 1950 and 1960

	1950	1960	Increase or decrease
Cotton	88,315,000	80,900,000	−7,415,000
Corn	219,000,000	267,500,000	+48,500,000
Wheat	424,200,000	488,800,000	+64,600,000
Rice	237,967,000	288,630,000	+50,663,000
Soybeans	36,015,000	53,995,000	+17,980,000
Tobacco	7,743,000	9,479,000	+1,736,000
Total	1,013,240,000	1,189,304,000	[1] +176,064,000

[1] Net.

NOTE.—Although cotton acreage was reduced 7,415 acres, total acreage increased 176,064,000 acres.

U.S. acreage of selected crops, 1950 and 1960

	1950	1960	Increase or decrease
Cotton	26,949,000	15,316,000	−11,633,000
Corn	81,800,000	82,100,000	+300,000
Wheat	61,600,000	52,600,000	−9,000,000
Rice	1,637,000	1,595,000	−42,000
Soybeans	13,807,000	23,516,000	+9,709,000
Tobacco	1,599,000	1,144,000	−455,000
Total	187,392,000	176,271,000	[1] −11,121,000

[1] Net.

NOTE.—U.S. acreages of all crops except corn and soybeans were reduced. Total acreage for the 10-year period was reduced by 11,121,000 acres. Thus, while acreage on a worldwide basis was increased by 176,064,000 acres, the United States reduced its total acreage by 11,121,000 acres.

COTTON

In 1950, 26,949,000 acres of cotton were harvested with a yield of 15,149,000 bales in the United States. In 1960, 15,316,000 acres were harvested with a yield of 14,309,000 bales.

The world production and yield for the same period is as follows: In 1950, 88,315,000 acres of cotton were harvested with a yield of 39,295,000 bales. In 1960, 80,900,000 acres were harvested with a yield of 46,995,000 bales. Thus, while worldwide area in cotton has only decreased about 7,415,000 acres during the last 10 years, the United States has reduced its area by 11,633,000 acres.

India, with the second largest cotton acreage, harvested 14,556,000 acres in 1950 and increased their harvested area to 18,700,000 acres in 1960. Their production was increased from 2,720,000 acres in 1960. Their production was increased from 2,720,000 bales to 4,400,000 bales during this same period.

China has the third largest area and, according to the best information we can obtain, harvested 10 million acres in 1950; 14 million acres in 1960. Their production was 3,650,000 bales in 1950 and 7,500,000 bales in 1960.

The only countries to reduce their acreages in cotton during the 10-year period 1950–60 were: United States by 11,633,000; Brazil, by 300,000; Congo, by 215,000; Egypt, by 106,000; U.S.S.R., by 350,000.

It should be further noted that although acreages were reduced in the above countries, the total production from 1950 to 1960 increased in every country with the exception of the United States and the Congo. Russia, although reducing acreage by 350,000, increased her production from 5,500,000 bales in 1950 to 6,800,000 bales in 1960.

CORN

All countries increased corn acreage during the period 1950–60.

Of the total world corn acreage of 219 million in 1950, the United States had 81.8 million acres. Of the total world corn acreage of 267.5 million in 1960, the United States had 82.1 million acres.

In 1950, the total world corn production was 5,385 million bushels. The United States produced 3,075 million bushels of this total. In 1960, the total world corn production was 8,100 million bushels. The United States produced 4,353 million bushels of this total.

Russia's acreage totaled 11.9 million in 1950; 29.5 million in 1960. Russia's production totaled 250 million bushels in 1950 and 590 million bushels in 1960.

Thus, the United States increased its corn acreage three-tenths of a million from 1950 to 1960. It raised its production of corn by 1,278 million bushels.

The rest of the world increased its corn acreage 48.2 million from 1950 to 1960. They raised production of corn by 1,437 million bushels.

Despite the fact that the United States, Canada, Argentina, Italy, France, England, and Japan decreased their overall wheat acreage between 1950 and 1960 by 19 million acres, worldwide production during this 10-year period increased 1,840 million bushels.

This is due to many reasons. Russia, for example, increased its acreage from 95 million acres in 1950 to 148.5 million acres in 1960. Its production was increased from 1,020 million bushels to 1,700 million bushels.

Likewise, India, Turkey, Australia, Pakistan, and Spain—all planting 10 million or more wheat acres—increased their total acreage during the 1950–60 period and, thus, their total production.

Almost all other wheat-producing nations, whether reducing their acreages or not, increased their production.

The United States decreased its acreage during the 10-year period from 61.6 million acres to 52.6 million acres. Production, however, increased from 1,019 million bushels to 1,363 million bushels. Canada also reduced its total acreage by 4.1 million acres but increased production from 467 million bushels in 1950 to 490 million bushels in 1960.

The total wheat acreage—worldwide—in 1950 was 424.2 million acres. The total wheat acreage—worldwide—in 1960 was 488.8 million acres. Total increases of 64.6 million acres. Russia's increase of 53.5 million acres accounted for most of this increase.

The total production in 1950 amounted to 6,340 million bushels. The total production in 1960 amounted to 8,180 million bushels. Total increase of 1,840 million bushels.

RICE

Despite the fact that the United States, Egypt, and Italy reduced their total acreage of rice during the period 1950–60, worldwide rice acreage and production increased sharply.

Total rice acreage in 1950 amounted to 237,967,000 acres; in 1960 the figure rose to 288,630,000 acres. Total rice production increased from 337,850 million pounds in 1950 to 487,560 million pounds in 1960.

The United States decreased its acreage from 1,637,000 acres in 1950 to 1,595,000 acres in 1960. However, its production was increased from 3,882 million pounds in 1950 to 5,440 million pounds in 1960.

India, Communist China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Thailand, and Burma, on the other hand, all increased their acreages substantially and, thus their production.

India, for example, increased its acreage from 76,135,000 acres in 1950 to 82,500,000 acres in 1960—an increase of 6,365,000 acres during this period.

SOYBEANS

All soybean-producing nations increased their total acreages during the 1950–60 period. In 1950, a total of 36,015,000 acres were planted throughout the world. In 1960, the figure rose to 53,995,000 acres.

Production rose from 645,257,000 bushels in 1950 to 976,850,000 bushels in 1960—an increase of 51 percent during the 10-year period.

The United States increased its acreage from 13,807,000 in 1950 to 23,516,000 acres in 1960. Production rose from 299,249,000 bushels in 1950 to 588,778,000 bushels in 1960, a production increase of 87 percent.

China, the second ranking soybean producing nation, increased its production 17 percent—from 298,530,000 bushels in 1950 to 350 million bushels in 1960.

TOBACCO

All tobacco producing countries except the United States, Belgium, France, West Germany, Algeria, Iran, and Burma increased their acreage.

Worldwide production increased during the period from 7,122 million to 8,895 million pounds. Worldwide acreage increased from 7,743,000 acres in 1950 to 9,479,000 acres in 1960.

The United States decreased its acreage from 1,599,000 acres in 1950 to 1,144,000 acres in 1960. Its production was also decreased from 2,030 million pounds to 1,960 million pounds. Of the total 1960 worldwide tobacco production of 8,895 million pounds, the United States produced 1,960 million pounds.

One might add also that we have for at least 12 years been shipping American know-how abroad to encourage new acres and to show them how to grow more per square inch. There is no question but what in terms of proper diet, there is a food deficit in the world. Now, these things that we have been doing for the free world are all good. What we have been doing is a glowing testimonial to our leadership of an enlightened Western civilization. All that remains to be done is, of course, to ease out political corruption abroad, assist in the development of well-paid middle classes wherever possible and embark upon a new era of commercial exchange that will make us all happy with per capita income sufficient to make paying customers in every country. But Rome was not built in a day. And, the purchasing power of too many of the billions on this earth does not make them very good customers. They can be in time, impossible as it may now seem.

One of the big items in this bill to which I heartily subscribe is the work we are doing under Public Law 480. Under that law, we are sending bread to the hungry and to the very areas where the Communist East is sending the stones of political promise and the sabers of fear. In my opinion, it is the finest missile in our international arsenal. It is a true belly blow to our adversaries. Daily reports reach us of crop failures and food shortages in both China and Russia. Daily we know of some of the difficulties that have attended land reforms and efforts to step up production behind the Iron Curtain. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, we are prone to consider farm legislation as though the political, economic and space boundaries were the same today as they were in 1938.

True, we have considered, and we have enacted certain laws affecting agriculture. Most of them, to me, at least, and, remember, I am merely expressing my own opinion, have been the mere adding on of sails in a blind and stubborn effort to continue sailing in the direction of an ever-rising sun that worked so well until 1952. In the face of increasing world production, we try to make painless the removal from production of acres here at home. To me, the answer is spelled out in those programs in the bill before you that would increase consumption. That is, of course, the main purpose of production. There are many such items in this bill—research, the work of the Foreign Agricultural Service, an activity that I am particularly happy to have had a hand in creating, the various marketing services in our economic divisions. In fact, throughout the bill there are programs that can help in the needed purpose of consuming at home and abroad what we produce instead of endless and expensive storage.

We may and we should debate the food stamp plan, but I must remind you that it is now an actuality. We may discuss the relative responsibilities that attend the more than a billion dollars that we annually expend as a nation for school lunches. We may inquire into the donations of our bounty to CARE and other groups who so nobly help the needy. But, we can at least take comfort in the thought that in these programs we are doing that which nature meant when

water, sunlight and soil gave us food. Balanced nutrition is a problem in every country.

As this point, I also want to remind you that under the continued insistence of the gentleman from Mississippi, the Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, we finally, a few years ago, established a sales office for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Imagine the world's largest corporation without a sales office. The result of the setting up of this office has been reflected in a proper reduction of commodities held by that corporation.

And, so, in my opinion, we should reset our sails in terms of the factual winds of today. Whether they be commercial, political, economic, or social. Why should we ever consider the shackling of the great American farmer when those of other lands are goaded with our aid to unleash their latent powers to produce. Why should we consider, even by common consent, the imposing of further acreage reductions at home upon the finest agrarian community that was ever developed unless we also can effectively reduce production elsewhere. In my mind, either consideration is repugnant since everyone in the world does not have the advantage of a square meal.

The Congress is now considering a farm bill. I think there are good things in that bill. But I cannot go along with title I. I like the commodity approach but I cannot for the life of me assume that there will be wholesome agreement among our national producers of any crop. The result of attempting to achieve commodity agreement on a national basis could be frustrating, disheartening, and destructive. In the end, the final responsibilities of any program to further control acreage allotments here at home would have to reside in the office of the Secretary. And, that is an awesome responsibility that I do not want my friend and neighbor, Orville Freeman, to have to assume.

As I close, let me urge this great Committee of the Whole House to consider helping to set our sails anew. The shibboleths of 1938 are out of date. Food is produced to make whole the bodies of men everywhere, not to be stored in Pharaoh's bins. Fiber is produced to cover folks against the elements and shelter is needed in every climate. In a word, let us bend our efforts for consumption of our produce; deny the advocates of acreage restrictions here at home.

Any course we set our sails for will not be pleasant sailing, but we can at least be reassured that we are sailing in the right direction. Let us do what is right, as facts and conscience tell us in today's terms.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield.

Mrs. MAY. I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Washington, with whom I am very proud to share representation of our great agricultural area, for a wonderful statement, in particular the very significant point he brings out in any plan that this agricultural administration might bring up that would result in the cutting back of agricultural production at a time when we are asking for increased production of these same things abroad.

In this connection, I know the gentleman shares my interest, and our interest, in the wheat marketing plan. I wonder if he has seen the recent study issued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture entitled "How Wheat Farmers Would Adjust to Different Programs," which compares the effect of various wheat programs on producer income and on total grain production.

Mr. HORAN. I have. I want to say to my colleague from Washington, I have studied that. I think it is a worthwhile study produced by Warren Bailey and Ronald Aines of the USDA for a commodity group which is national in scope, and one reason for getting permission this morning to include additional matter in my speech was to include their studies, which I believe cover this, if I am correct, studies in different parts of the United States. If we are serious about this commodity approach to the solution of our farm problems I think this study that has been made by the Department in the interests of the National Wheat Producers' Association would be a valuable contribution for the RECORD at this point.

(The matter referred to follows:)

HOW WHEAT FARMERS WOULD ADJUST TO DIFFERENT PROGRAMS

(By Warren R. Bailey and Ronald O. Aines, agricultural economists)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The study reported here was undertaken to see how representative wheat farmers in specialized producing areas would adjust most profitably to different wheat programs. What changes would occur in the acreage and production of wheat and other crops? How would the income opportunities of programs compare?

Six different programs were studied on representative farms, otherwise identified as study farms, in eight specialized wheat-producing areas in the Great Plains and the Pacific Northwest. Study farms are located in Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, Washington, and Oregon. These farms represent major producing situations in each area. As the figures are not area averages, they do not reflect average incomes among areas, although comparisons are valid between programs on the same farm.

Program features used include modifications of the present acreage-allotment and price-support program; marketing allotments and stratified wheat prices; and no controls or price supports. "Prototype programs" constructed around each feature specify the price of wheat and other crops and either the maximum acreage of wheat, or the maximum quantity that could be marketed. Many other combinations might have been developed, but these combinations include the major features of programs under discussion at the time the study was made.

To determine the adjustments that would maximize incomes on the study farms with the programs, budgets were prepared for each farm. A charge for all labor at hired wages per hour is included in expenses, but no charge is made for management and invested capital. Crop yields are the average that operators of the study farms can expect with average weather and present practices. Crops other than wheat could be grown under each program without restriction for sale at the following assumed prices (U.S. average):

Grain sorghum, bushel	$1.01
Barley, bushel	.90
Dry peas (Washington farm), hundredweight	3.60

Effects of each specified program on wheat acreage, total grain production, and net income to management and invested capital of study farms are compared with effects of program A (1960 acreage allotments and price supports). These comparisons are summarized in table 1.

Smaller acreage allotments (program B): With wheat prices raised to 85 percent of parity and acreage allotments decreased 25 percent from the 1960 level, net income to management and investment capital would be slightly higher on most study farms. It would equal the income under program A on the north-central Montana farm and would be 2 percent below the income under program A on the northeastern Montana and eastern Washington farms. Wheat production on each farm would decrease 25 percent, but total grain production would change very little except that it would increase 11 percent on the northwestern Kansas farm and 16 percent on the Colorado farm.

Larger acreage allotments (program C): With wheat prices lowered to 65 percent of parity and acreage allotments increased 20 percent, net incomes would be reduced 8 to 25 percent. Wheat production would increase about 20 percent, but total grain production would change very little. On the Colorado farm, the reduction would be 8 percent.

Food and export allotment and land reserve (program D): This program would include a marketing allotment on food wheat, export wheat priced at 65 percent of parity and other wheat at a feed price, 80 cents a bushel payment on food-wheat quota, and 20 percent of the wheat base acreage in a land reserve, at the 1960 rate of payment. With this program, net incomes would increase on all study farms. The increase would be 15 percent or less on the Kansas farms, 20 to 25 percent on the Colorado and northeastern Montana farms, and 34 to 39 percent on the Oklahoma, north-central Montana, Washington, and Oregon farms. Wheat production would decrease on the northwestern Kansas and Colorado farms and increase on the other farms. The Kansas farms would produce only marketing-allotment wheat. Operators of other study farms would find it profitable to produce all wheat and no feed grains except as a catch crop on wheat seedings that fail. Operators of all study farms would place land in a reserve to earn the special food-wheat payment. Total grain production would decrease.

Food allotment (program E): With marketing allotments on food wheat priced at 90 percent of parity, other wheat at a U.S. price of $1.25, and no land-reserve requirement, net incomes would decrease 2 to 11 percent on the Colorado and Kansas farms and would increase 5 to 19 percent on the others. Operators of the Kansas farms would maximize income by producing only marketing-allotment wheat, but operators of the other farms would produce all wheat and no feed grains. Total grain production would increase 8 to 10 percent on the northwestern Kansas and Washington farms. It would decrease 5 to 11 percent on the Oklahoma and Colorado farms but would change little on other farms.

No controls (program F): With no production controls and no price supports, net incomes would decrease on all study farms. Incomes would decrease least (19 percent) on the Washington farm, and most (66 percent) on the Oklahoma farm. Wheat production would increase on all study farms

except the northwestern Kansas farm (−1 percent). Total grain production would change about the same as with program E.

The impact of each program would vary on the different farms. A program restricting wheat production (such as the restricted acreage-allotment program) would favor the farms with a profitable alternative crop, such as grain sorghum in the Southern Plains. Conversely, programs permitting production of additional wheat for sale at a nonsupported or feed price would favor farms with a less profitable alternative crop, such as barley in the Northern Plains and the Pacific Northwest.

Net returns from a land reserve at 1960 rates of payment would be higher than from wheat at a feed price on the Kansas and northcentral Montana farms; higher than wheat at the nonsupported price on the Colorado, northeastern Montana and Oregon farms; higher than wheat at 65 percent of parity on the Oklahoma farm. Net returns from the reserve would be higher than grain sorghum on the northwestern Kansas, Oklahoma and Colorado farms; and higher than barley on the Montana and Oregon farm.

Conclusions drawn from the study would seem to warrant generalizations to cash grain farms other than study farms in specialized wheat-producing areas.

When acreage allotments are in effect, operators of specialized wheat farms grow the allotted acreages even though wheat prices are supported at prices as low as 65 percent of parity.

Even at a feed price, wheat is a more profitable crop than barley on specialized wheat farms in Montana, Washington, and Oregon. With no production restrictions, specialized wheatgrowers in these areas would produce maximum acreages of wheat and little or no barley at the assumed prices. In Kansas and Colorado, however, grain sorghum is more profitable than wheat at a feed-equivalent price. With no wheat acreage base to protect and with unallotted wheat selling at a feed price, farmers in these areas would grow all the grain sorghum they could safely grow and still control erosion.

The best income-producing crops other than wheat are feed grains on specialized wheat farms in both the Great Plains and the Pacific Northwest. Forage might be relatively more profitable on livestock farms, but these farms were not included in the study.

Wheat production would not decline but would continue for some time at least on specialized farms in the Northern Plains and the Pacific Northwest, even if the price of wheat were lower than any level now seriously considered. Income would cover the direct expenses of production although return to invested capital would be reduced.

TABLE 1.—*Effects of specified programs on wheat acreage, grain production, and income, study farms*

Item	1960 acreage allotment program (program A)	Percentage change with— Smaller acreage allotment (program B)	Larger acreage allotment (program C)	Food and export allotment (program D)	Food allotment (program E)	No controls (program F)
Acreage of wheat:	*Acres*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
West central Kansas	280	−25	20	4	7	22
Northwestern Kansas	270	−25	20	−23	−16	−1
Northwestern Oklahoma [1]	473	−25	20	25	55	55
Eastern Colorado	550	−25	20	−3	16	16
Northeastern Montana	405	−25	20	14	43	43
North central Montana	405	−25	20	14	43	43
Eastern Washington	166	−25	20	73	98	98
Columbia Basin, Oreg	520	−25	20	23	54	54
Production of all grain:	*Tons*					
West central Kansas	215	0	0	−28	3	0
Northwestern Kansas	246	11	1	−21	8	9
Northwestern Oklahoma [1]	314	1	−3	−21	−5	−5
Eastern Colorado	368	16	−8	−25	−11	−11
Production of all grain—Con.	*Tons*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Northeastern Montana	260	1	−1	−22	−2	−2
North central Montana	370	1	−1	−22	−2	−2
Eastern Washington	434	−1	1	−4	10	10
Columbia Basin, Oreg	734	0	1	−19	−2	−2
Net income: [2]	*Dollars*					
West central Kansas	4,675	7	−22	15	−4	−52
Northwestern Kansas	5,755	5	−22	4	−11	−49
Northwestern Oklahoma [1]	5,748	6	−25	39	5	−66
Eastern Colorado	10,513	9	−15	20	−2	−47
Northeastern Montana	6,022	−2	−13	38	14	−42
North central Montana	9,756	0	−14	25	11	−35
Eastern Washington	12,175	−2	−8	34	19	−19
Columbia Basin, Oreg	17,812	2	−13	37	9	−44

[1] Excludes panhandle counties.

[2] Return to management and invested capital. Computation explained in section on "Budget Analysis."

Although income from feed grains is smaller than that from wheat on most farms, the income from feed grains is important to the specialized wheat farmer when wheat acreage is restricted. If the farm is to remain efficient, all of its resources must be used productively.

Total grain production on specialized wheat farms changes very little whether wheat or a feed grain or a combination of the two is produced.

INTRODUCTION

The U.S. wheat industry has operated under essentially the same production-control and price-support program for 6 years. During that time, surplus stocks of wheat have accumulated, and public expenditures for storage have mounted. The situation that has developed needs no documentation here. Almost everyone agrees that changes in the wheat program are needed, but general agreement as to what the new program should be has not been reached.

Views differ as to the role of wheat prices. Should prices chiefly regulate supply and demand or should they assure farm income? Some persons believe that it would be best to discontinue production-control programs and price supports, to let supply and demand be equated at a free market price. Others think this might work if enough wheat land were retired from farming by some other means.

Some persons believe production controls and supported prices should apply only to the wheat needed for food in the United States and possibly for commercial exports. Let farmers produce additional wheat for other uses if they wish, but in competition with other grains used largely for feed. Still others would prefer a combination of programs that would include some production-control features, some price supports, and some land retirement. Perhaps most of them would agree that the wheat industry needs help in making adjustments.

Views on proposed wheat programs differ because some people focus on the aggregative problem of surpluses, while others stress the income problem of wheat farmers. Information is lacking as to how various program features would affect the production and returns on representative farms. We need to consider such effects in the choice of alternative programs. Knowledge of the impact of alternative programs on individual farms is necessary to determine whether a program would in fact solve the problem.

This report describes the impact of different programs on the production and income of representative wheat farms in specialized wheat-producing areas. The features examined are of four kinds: (1) modifications of the present acreage-allotment program; (2) marketing allotments in bushels and stratified wheat prices; (3) no production controls or price supports; and (4) land retirement alone or in conjunction with each of the other programs. Around each feature is constructed an example, or prototype, program which specifies the price of wheat and other crops and in some instances, the maximum acreage or quantity of wheat to be produced.

Since the study was made, legislation has been enacted providing an emergency program for feed grains. This program was not included among those studied.

The analysis deals with the effects of specified programs on individual wheat farms, without regard to the aggregative effects. In fact, some, perhaps all, of the programs tested may not be "equilibrium programs" in that they might not balance supply and demand of wheat or feed grains at the assumed prices. To ascertain the aggregative effect of the different programs and to test them for equilibrium would require study of many additional farm situations in many areas. Such a study in major wheat-producing areas is now underway as western regional research project W–54. This report is based in part on some of the preliminary analyses and on data from a few selected situations under study in projects contributing to the regional effort.

FARMS STUDIED

The farms selected for study are representative of cash grain farming in eight specialized wheat-producing areas. Six are in the Great Plains and two are in the Pacific Northwest. Five are in areas in which wheat is usually grown biannually, alternating with fallow. In the three remaining areas, wheat is customarily grown annually, after wheat or another crop, but fallow may be used when rainfall is low. The farms studied are in areas that produce three classes of wheat. Soft White Winter wheat is produced in Washington and Oregon, Hard Red Spring wheat in the Northern Plains, and Hard Red Winter wheat in the Northern, Central, and Southern Plains.

Although study farms represent a major production situation in each area, we do not

imply that response would be the same on all farms in each area. Farms of another size or with different resources might find it profitable to respond differently. A study farm is not necessarily an average of all farms in the area; usually it represents a central model size group. Obviously, the study farms do not reflect relative incomes per farm among areas, although comparisons are valid between programs on the same farm. General characteristics of the farms studied are shown in table 2.

BUDGET ANALYSIS

The analysis presented here is based on farm budgets of the study farms, in which production, income, expenses, and net returns are computed. Budgeting determines the most profitable use of land and other resources of the farm under each program, considering program and other restrictions incidental to the practical operation of the farm. Several budgets or partial budgets may be required to determine the most profitable production plan under each program. Budgets also permit comparison of the economic advantage of different programs on the same farm—within the limits of the specified assumptions. Comparability between study farms of adjustments to the same program is achieved to a degree by using uniform program assumuptions and a common set of prices, adjusted for area and regional differences. Comparability is not achieved completely, however, in that study farms may not represent their respective areas equally well.

The budgets are simplified to the extent that they focus on crops, the chief concern of the analysis. Livestock enterprises found on grain farms are not included. Budgets are simplified also in that minor feed grain crops are converted, when feasible, to the major feed grain crop on the farm—grain sorghum in the Central and Southern Plains and barley in the Northern Plains and the Pacific Northwest. These simplifications do not affect the essential validity of the results.

TABLE 2.—*Description of study farms*

Study farm	Acreage in—			Alternative crop	Method of growing—	
	Farm	Crops	Wheat base		Wheat	Alternative crop
	Acres	*Acres*	*Acres*			
West central Kansas	640	540	440	Grain sorghum	Continuous cropping	Chiefly continuous cropping.
Northwestern Kansas	960	770	417	do	Chiefly fallow	Do.
Northwestern Oklahoma	960	735	718	do	Chiefly continuous cropping	Do.
Eastern Colorado	1,920	1,800	803	do	Chiefly fallow	Do.
Northeastern Montana	1,200	1,156	578	Barley	All on fallow	On fallow.
North central Montana	1,200	1,156	578	do	do	Do.
Eastern Washington	540	520	255	Barley, peas	Chiefly continuous cropping	Both ways.
Columbia Basin, Oreg	1,650	1,600	800	Barley	All on fallow	On fallow.

In the main, budgets depict the most profitable adjustments on the farm to each program situation, with consideration given to good farming practices and farmers' demonstrated preferences. For example, grain sorghum on fallow increases the hazard of wind erosion, hence it is to be avoided when possible. Again, some farmers may prefer to grow all wheat even though another crop might pay slightly better than feed wheat. Farmers might grow wheat exclusively rather than provide storage for two kinds of grain.

Crop yields used in the analysis are average yields—those that farmers operating similar farms can expect in the future. Yields vary under different programs as influenced by the crop sequence. For example, the yield of wheat following wheat differs from the yield of wheat following fallow. The yield of sorghum differs when the sorghum follows sorghum, wheat, or fallow, or is seeded on abandoned wheatland. Wheat yields vary also because farmers tend to select the better land when acreage is restricted and they have a choice of land. The production shown in the tables excludes seed requirements.

Expenses in the budget analysis were computed at the 1959 cost rates per unit. Expenses include the usual inputs of motor fuel and lubricants, repairs, treatment of seed, fertilizer and chemicals at common rates of application, property taxes, insurance, motor licenses, custom hire (as applicable), depreciation, hired labor, and a charge for operator labor at the hired wage rate per hour. With all labor included, the farm incomes under the programs have greater comparability. Not included is a charge for the use of capital, or for management.

Commodity prices used in the analysis are assumed to be at the farm level. All prices were adjusted for prevailing regional and area differences; they are for the average grade of product marketed in the area. In programs under which wheat prices are supported, the U.S. average price was computed relative to parity, then adjusted to the area. Nonsupported wheat prices and prices of other commodities summarized in table 3 are those assumed for purposes of the study. None of the prices are necessarily equilibrium prices in the aggregate sense, that is, they might not equilibrate aggregate supply and demand if the adjustments induced by the various programs were widely adopted. As estimates of equilibrium prices were not available, the prices used are approximations judged to be the best available for this analysis. Even though these prices are not based on supply-demand analysis, they serve the purposes of comparability among programs.

Net farm income in the budget analysis is gross income minus expenses as defined. It is the return to management and to capital investment in the farm including equipment.

The budget analysis is based on full ownership of the farm. No appraisal was made of the income effects of the programs to tenant operators. Moreover, the analysis does not consider problems that might occur in adjusting from the present program to a new one. Problems of this kind might delay some farmers in making the adjustments found to be most profitable. The question of implementing a program was not an expressed purpose of the study reported.

PROGRAMS STUDIED

The programs used in the study include the major types of features proposed or discussed. An example, or prototype, program was constructed around each feature to specify the conditions under which wheat is produced and its price. These specifications and prices were selected arbitrarily for purposes of the analysis. For easy reference, programs are identified by letters of the alphabet; they are described in the paragraphs that follow.

Acreage allotments, 1960 (program A): This is essentially the present (1960) acreage-allotment program, but without the conservation reserve. It consists of the 1960 wheat acreage allotments (harvested basis) with the price of wheat supported at a U.S. average price of $1.80 a bushel, which is assumed to be 75 percent of parity. Penalties, which are not specified, effectively limit production to the allotted acreage. Other crops can be produced and marketed freely at the assumed prices (table 3). The situation under this program is used as a basis for comparing situations under other programs.

TABLE 3.—*Crop prices per bushel established for budget analysis, study farms*

Item	West central Kansas	Northwestern Kansas	Northwestern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado	Northeastern Montana	North central Montana	Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.	Assumed United States
Wheat at—	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*	*Dollars*
90 percent parity	2.15	2.12	2.14	2.12	2.08	1.96	2.10	2.15	2.16
85 percent parity	2.02	2.00	2.02	2.00	1.95	1.84	1.98	2.03	2.04
75 percent parity	1.82	1.79	1.78	1.77	1.72	1.61	1.75	1.79	1.80
65 percent parity	1.55	1.53	1.54	1.53	1.47	1.36	1.52	1.55	1.56
Nonsupported price	1.26	1.24	1.24	1.22	1.19	1.12	1.20	1.25	1.25
Feed price [1]	1.20	1.18	1.12	1.01	1.05	1.00	1.20	1.25	
Grain sorghum	1.02	1.00	.95	.86					[2] 1.01
Barley					.72	.69	.82	.87	.90
Peas							[3] 3.60		

[1] Based on price of predominant feed grain produced in the area, adjusted for equivalent feeding value.

[2] Equivalent to U.S. price of $1.80 per hundredweight.

[3] Price per hundredweight.

Smaller acreage allotments (program B): Under this program, wheat acreage allotments would be 25 percent smaller than those under program A, but the price of wheat would be supported at a U.S. average price of $2.04 a bushel, about 85 percent of parity. Other conditions would be the same as under program A. Program B is intended to determine the production and effects on the study farms with smaller acreage allotments combined with higher wheat prices.

Larger acreage allotments (program C): Under program C, wheat acreage allotments would be 20 percent larger than those under program A, but the price of wheat would be supported at a U.S. average of $1.56 a bushel, about 65 percent of parity. Other conditions would be the same as under program A. The purpose of program C is to determine the production and income effect on the study farms of larger wheat acreage allotments combined with lower support prices.

Food and export allotment (program D): With this program, each farm would have a wheat marketing allotment in bushels equal to two-thirds of the normal yield on the 1960 wheat base acreage. The marketing allotment is presumed to be the farm share of the wheat required for domestic food uses and exports. This quantity of wheat would be supported at a U.S. average price of $1.56 a bushel, about 65 percent of parity. Other wheat could be grown and sold at a feed-equivalent price, based on the price of the predominant feed grain grown in the study farm locality. The farm has a food wheat quota in bushels equal to five-twelfths of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. The farmer could earn a payment of 80 cents a bushel on the food quota by contracting 20 percent of his wheat base acreage in a land reserve. In areas where wheat is commonly grown on fallow, an equal acreage of fallow land must be put into the reserve. This acreage depends upon the proportion of wheat grown in fallow in 1959. Land in the reserve earns annual rental payments equal to the 1960 rates of the conservation reserve program. The farmer would not be required to put the land in the reserve if he wanted to forgo the payment of 80 cents a bushel on his food wheat quota. The total land-reserve payment per farm would not be limited. There would be no other form of land reserve. Other crops could be produced on any remaining land and sold at the assumed prices (table 3).

With program D, the farmer could carry over wheat to apply against his marketing allotment or food quota of a later year. He or the trade would store the extra production from a bumper crop. With the present acreage-allotment program, most of the carryover is stored by the Government.

Food allotment (program E): This program is a similar though simplified version of program D. Each farm would have a marketing allotment in bushels equal to normal yield on five-twelfths of the 1960 wheat base acreage. This quantity of wheat would be equal to the food quota in program D. The price of allotment wheat would be supported at a U.S. average price of $2.16 a bushel, about 90 percent of parity. No special payment could be earned by participation in a land reserve. In fact, no land-reserve program is assumed. Other wheat might be grown and sold at a nonsupported price of $1.25 a bushel, U.S. average. Presumably, nonallotment wheat would be exported, but some of it would be used for feed. Other crops could be produced and sold freely at the assumed prices (table 3).

With program E, the farmer could carry over wheat to apply against his marketing allotment, and he or the trade would store any extra production.

No controls (program F): Under program F, wheat and other crops could be produced in any quantity as no acreage or marketing restrictions would be in effect. Wheat would sell at a nonsupported price, $1.25 a bushel, U.S. average. Other crops would sell at the assumed prices (table 3). There would be no land-reserve program.

The chief production-control and price features of the programs studied may be summarized as follows:

Program	Control	Wheat support level	Price of wheat
			Dollars
A	1960 acreage allotment	75 percent of parity	1.80
B	75 percent of 1960 acreage allotment	85 percent of parity	2.04
C	120 percent of 1960 acreage allotment	65 percent of parity	1.56
D	Marketing allotment: ⅔ normal yield on 1960 wheat base acreage	do	1.56
	Food wheat quota: 5/12 normal yield on 1960 wheat base acreage	80 cents a bushel	
E	Marketing allotment: 5/12 normal yield times 1960 wheat base acreage	90 percent of parity	2.16
F	None	None	1.25

With other specifications, the programs would affect the study farms differently. For example, if in program C, the price of wheat were at 70 instead of 65 percent of parity, net farm income would be about equal to that with program A.

ECONOMIC SETTING FOR ADJUSTMENTS

The adjustments that wheat farmers make to programs are influenced by several key things. One is the comparative returns from wheat and alternative crops. Another is the restriction imposed by crop sequences—crop A may readily follow crop B but not crop C. This becomes important when the choice includes fall-seeded and spring-seeded crops and when some crops are grown on fallow and others in annual cropping.

Traditionally, wheat has been the crop of highest return on the study farms. Generally, it is the crop best adapted ecologically to climate and soils. It often yields more pounds of grain per acre than other crops, except the recent hybrid sorghums, which in some instances yield equally well.

For various reasons, wheat may be grown on study farms when comparative average returns seem to favor other crops. Farmers seed wheat whenever crop prospects are especially favorable because high-yielding wheat may pay better, even at a moderate price, than another crop. Moreover, yield prospects for the other crop may not be as good at the time. Some farmers may prefer to grow only one crop (wheat) because two or more crops would complicate storage. Other farmers have other reasons.

After wheat, the next best paying crop on the study farms usually is a feed grain (table 4). Much of the land is diverted to production of feed grains when the acreage of wheat is restricted by programs. Budget analyses show that returns from forage are not as high as returns from feed grains on the study farms. Forage crops may pay better on farms that specialize in livestock.

On the west-central Kansas study farm, net returns from grain sorghum are higher than wheat at a nonsupported price but lower than wheat priced at 65 percent of parity (table 4). Net returns from grain sorghum are nearly equal to returns from fallow-wheat priced at 65 percent of parity. Most wheat is grown under annual cropping, but in periods of low rainfall some wheat is grown on fallow. Another consideration is that farmers wish to maintain their wheat base acreage when acreage allotments are in effect.

Grain sorghum is the best paying alternative crop to winter wheat on the northwestern Kansas farm. Net returns from grain sorghum at the assumed price are higher than the returns from wheat at the nonsupported price but lower than those from wheat priced at 65 percent of parity (table 4). However, farmers restrict the acreage of grain sorghum because it creates an erosion hazard, especially when it is grown on fallow land. Grain sorghum after wheat, as when in a wheat-grain sorghum-fallow rotation, is less erosive.

On the Oklahoma study farm, grain sorghum pays better than other grain crops, although even at a feed price, it is a relatively poor alternative to winter wheat. Hence this study farm would grow little, if any, grain sorghum if the acreage of wheat were not restricted by programs. Both wheat and sorghum are grown without the use of fallow.

Grain sorghum is also the best paying alternative crop to winter wheat on the Colorado study farm, although returns per acre are somewhat below those from wheat priced at 65 percent of parity. Much of the sorghum is grown on abandoned winter wheat land; wheat abandonment, resulting mainly from low rainfall, averages about 29 percent of the seeded acreage. If not planted to sorghum, the abandoned wheatland can be summer fallowed and may be seeded back to winter wheat in the fall.

Spring-seeded barley is the chief crop alternative to wheat on the Montana study farms. Even so, returns from barley are relatively low, averaging less than wheat at a feed price (table 4). Consequently, little, if any, barley is grown profitably on the study farms except when programs control the acreage of wheat. Because of limited moisture, both wheat and barley are grown on fallow. On the northeastern Montana farm, both crops are spring seeded. Fall-seeded wheat is grown on the north-central Montana farm. If the wheat winterkills, the land can be seeded to spring wheat or barley and a crop will be made the same year.

On the Washington study farm, winter wheat is the major crop, although spring wheat is seeded on fields where the winter wheat kills out. Winter wheat is now grown chiefly in annual cropping, whereas 10 to 20 years ago it was usually grown on fallow. At that time, the problem with annual cropping was the slow rate of decomposition of straw from the preceding crop, which meant that the soil nitrogen was tied up and the wheat seedling starved. Nitrogen fertilizer is now applied to hasten decomposition and to feed the young seedlings. The shift to annual cropping and the use of fertilizer has greatly increased the capacity of this farm for wheat production. Some clean, cultivated fallow has been retained chiefly to control thistle and other weeds. The chief alternative crops are barley and dry peas, but at the assumed prices, neither crop would pay as well as wheat—even at a feed price (table 4). Pea production is held in check by market prices rather than availability of land. Hence, barley is the chief alternative crop when wheat acreage is restricted by programs. Wheat, barley, and peas may be grown on fallow or in annual cropping.

On the Oregon study farm, winter wheat is the best-adapted and best-paying crop. Wheat is grown on fallow land. Annual cropping with the aid of nitrogen fertilization has been tried, but it has no advantage over the fallow system in the locale of the study farm. Spring wheat is seeded on abandoned fields of fall-seeded wheat. Barley, the next best paying crop, gives a return much below that of wheat even at a feed price. Traditionally, the barley has been a spring-seeded variety but in recent years, hardy fall-seeded varieties that yield more bushels than spring barley have been

developed. Both wheat and barley are grown on fallow land.

ADJUSTMENTS TO PROGRAMS

In this section, the adjustments that the study farms would make to maximize profits under each program are discussed. The effects on acreage and production of wheat and other crops and on expenses and net returns are observed. Since the present situation on study farms is represented essentially by program A, this program is the basis for comparing other programs.

Program A—1960 wheat acreage allotments and prices

Program A is similar to the 1960 wheat program except that no land-reserve program is assumed. The wheat acreage allotments would average about 65 to 70 percent of the acreage of wheat grown before allotments came into effect in 1954. Allotments would be in terms of acreage harvested. Wheat prices would be supported at a U.S. average price of $1.80 a bushel, about 75 percent of parity.

TABLE 4.—*Net return per acre, wheat and alternative crops, study farms* [1]

Item	West-central Kansas		Northwestern Kansas [2]	Northwestern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado [2]	Northeastern Montana	Northcentral Montana	Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.
	Continuous wheat [2]	Wheat-fallow [2]							
Wheat at—									
90 percent of parity	$16.18	$14.14	$12.79	$18.90	$10.17	$11.29	$16.38	$79.50	$23.70
85 percent of parity	15.06	12.47	11.80	17.39	9.50	10.34	15.13	73.74	22.35
75 percent of parity	12.91	10.66	10.10	13.95	8.23	8.64	12.73	62.72	18.12
65 percent of parity	10.03	8.31	7.95	10.52	6.90	6.81	10.11	51.71	14.47
Nonsupported price	6.96	5.62	5.58	6.23	5.17	4.75	7.60	36.38	9.13
Feed price	6.18	5.58	5.13	4.52	4.00	3.72	6.35	36.38	9.13
Other crops:									
Grain sorghum	8.09		6.84	3.75	6.00				
Barley						3.06	5.37	31.47	6.89
Peas								20.06	
Land reserve on— [3]									
Continuously cropped land	6.80		8.27	11.37	7.39			13.72	
Crop-fallowed land		5.68	5.52		5.39	4.85	5.55	8.79	9.50

[1] Return to cover depreciation management and use of capital. Return per acre of land used: Average for 2 acres where crop is grown on fallow; wheat on the Oregon, Montana, Colorado, and northwestern Kansas study farms; barley on the Oregon and Montana study farms. Based on prices in table 3, and 1960 cost rates.

[2] Return for wheat includes net income from grain sorghum grown on abandoned wheatland.

[3] Based on average accepted bid rates, 1960 conservation reserve program.

With program A, all study farms would maximize profits by growing their full acreage allotment of wheat. All would use the land diverted from wheat for production of feed grains and other crops. On the Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado study farms, the diversion would be mainly to grain sorghum, and on the Montana, Washington, and Oregon study farms, it would be mainly to barley. The west-central Kansas farm would have more summer fallow than it would have without the program. The additional fallow would be used in the wheat enterprise, with more of the wheat seeded on summer fallow and less in annual cropping. The Colorado farm would have less fallow acreage with program A, along with the reduced acreage of wheat. Ordinarily, grain sorghum, the alternative crop, would not be grown on summer fallow. Both Montana farms and the Oregon farm would maintain the prior acreage in fallow because barley, the alternative crop, is also grown on fallow land. The Washington farm would also maintain its prior acreage of fallow to control thistle and other weeds.

The acreage and production of crops, the expenses, and the net returns to management and invested capital with program A for each of the study farms are shown in table 5.

Program B—Smaller wheat acreage allotments, higher prices

Wheat acreage allotments would be a fourth smaller than under program A, but the price of wheat is assumed to be supported at 85 percent of parity, instead of 75 percent as under program A. The increase in price, about 24 cents a bushel, would not compensate fully for the reduction in wheat production. Therefore, gross income from wheat would be reduced about 15 percent. For example, suppose that under program A, a farm has a wheat allotment of 100 acres and a gross income of $3,000. Without program B, the allotment would be 75 acres, and the gross return from wheat $2,550.[1] But more land would be available for producing other crops. For example, a farm with 100 acres of wheat base and a wheat allotment of 68 acres under program A, would have 32 acres available for other crops. Under program B, the wheat allotment would be 51 acres, which would leave 49 acres for other crops.

With program B, operators of all study farms would seed their full though reduced allotted acreage of wheat. All of the land released from wheat would be diverted to production of feed grains, except on the western Kansas study farm. This farmer would divert some of the released land to summer fallow for use in the wheat enterprise. The acreage of feed grain (sorghum) would increase 20 percent. The increase in acreage of feed grains on the study farms in Oklahoma, Montana, and Oregon would be roughly 50 percent. But on the northwestern Kansas and Colorado study farms, the feed grain acreage would nearly double because for each acre of wheat removed from a wheat-fallow system, 2 acres of sorghum could be grown. Operators of the Montana and Oregon farms would shift from wheat-fallow to barley-fallow. The operator of the Oklahoma farm would shift from annual wheat to annual grain sorghum.

[1] Computed: 75 acres at 85%/75% × $30 + $2,550.

Total production of all grain (wheat and feed grains) would remain essentially unchanged on six study farms. But it would increase about 11 percent on the northwestern Kansas farm and about 16 percent on the Colorado farm, because of the shift from wheat fallow to annual cropped sorghum.

Although gross income from wheat would be lower with program B, the difference would be approximately compensated for by the income from the crops grown on land released from wheat production (table 6). Farm expenses would change hardly at all because the costs of growing feed grains would be similar to those of growing wheat.

With program B, net returns to management and invested capital on the four study farms in Montana, Washington, and Oregon would be within 2 percent of the returns with program A. But net returns on the four study farms in Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado would be increased by 5 to 9 percent with program B. Program B seems to favor slightly the study farms on which the alternative crop, for instance grain sorghum, is grown annually in contrast to farms on which the alternative crop, such as barley, is grown on fallow.

Although program B would affect the study farms differently, the effect would be somewhat more uniform than those of the other programs considered.

TABLE 5.—*Land use, production, and income on study farms with program A*

Budget item	Unit	Kansas		Northeastern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado	Montana		Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.
		Central	Northwestern			Northeastern	Northcentral		
Land use:									
Wheat on fallow	Acre	110	270		550	405	405		520
Wheat, continuous cropping	do	170		473				166	
Grain sorghum	do	138	162	262	364				
Barley	do					173	173	163	280
Summer fallow	do	122	338		886	578	578	87	800
Peas	do							104	
Production: [1]									
Wheat	Bushel	4,444	5,510	6,786	8,204	5,954	8,465	8,238	16,120
Grain sorghum	do	2,932	2,890	3,925	4,365				
Barley	do					3,399	4,817	7,792	10,456
All grain	Ton	215	246	313	368	260	370	434	736
Peas	Hundredweight							1,210	

[1] Excludes seed.

TABLE 5.—*Land use, production, and income on study farms with program A*—Continued

Budget item	Unit	Kansas		Northeastern Oklahoma	Eastern Colorado	Montana		Eastern Washington	Columbia Basin, Oreg.
		Central	Northwestern			Northeastern	Northcentral		
Income:									
Wheat	Dollar	8,088	9,863	12,079	14,521	10,241	13,629	14,417	28,855
Grain sorghum	do	2,990	2,890	3,728	3,754				
Barley	do					2,447	3,324	6,389	9,097
Peas	do							4,356	
Total	do	11,078	12,753	15,807	18,275	12,688	16,953	25,162	37,952
Expenses [1]	do	6,403	6,998	10,059	7,762	6,666	7,194	12,987	20,140
Net return [2]	do	4,675	5,755	5,748	10,513	6,022	9,756	12,175	17,812

[1] Includes all expenses except a charge for use of capital. Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates.

[2] To management and capital.

TABLE 6.—*Changes on study farms with program B*

[25 percent smaller wheat acreage allotments, wheat price at 85 percent of parity]

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns [1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	−25	20	35	0	−6	23	2	7
Northwestern Kansas	−25	95	−25	11	−17	83	6	5
Northwestern Oklahoma	−25	45	(2)	1	−12	45	1	6
Eastern Colorado	−25	99	−25	16	−15	99	8	9
Northeastern Montana	−25	58	0	1	−15	58	−1	−2
North-central Montana	−25	58	0	1	−14	59	0	0
Eastern Washington	−25	25	0	−1	−16	32	−1	−2
Columbia Basin, Oreg	−25	46	0	0	−14	46	1	2

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Program C—Larger wheat acreage allotments, lower prices

Wheat acreage allotments under program C are assumed to be a fifth larger than under program A, but the price of wheat would be supported at 65 percent of parity instead of 75 percent as in program A.

Even with the lower price, wheat would be a better paying crop on the study farms than feed grain at the assumed prices (table 4). The advantage of wheat would be substantial on the Montana, Washington, and Oregon farms where barley is the alternative grain crop. Wheat would have less advantage over grain sorghum on the Kansas and Colorado farms.

Because of the income advantage operators of the eight study farms would seed their full, expanded wheat acreage allotments. They would do this by taking land from feed grains. The operator of the west-central Kansas farm would also take some land out of summer fallow and would grow more of his wheat in annual cropping.

The larger acreage in wheat with program C would compensate for the decrease in price of the wheat—about 24 cents a bushel—so that gross income from the wheat enterprise with program C would be about 4 percent higher than with program A. For example, a farm with 100 acres of wheat allotment and a gross income of $3,000 from wheat with program A would have an allotment of 120 acres and a gross income of $3,120 from wheat with program C.[2] Gross income from wheat would be reduced 5 and 7 percent, respectively, on the west-central and northwestern Kansas farms (table 7). But income from other crops would not decrease as much on these farms as on other study farms.

With more land in wheat under program C, less land would be available for producing other crops. The acreages available for other crops on study farms would be decreased by roughly half. For example, on a farm with 100 acres of wheat base and a wheat allotment of 68 acres under program A, 32 acres would be left for other crops. Under program C, the wheat allotment would be increased to 82 acres, so only 18 acres of the base acreage would remain for other crops. Allotments of study farms would deviate somewhat from this proportion. Associated with the reduction in available land would be a nearly proportionate reduction in gross income from other crops, that is, feed grains (table 7). This loss in income would be greatest, percentagewise, on the Oklahoma, Colorado, Montana, and Oregon farms.

Gross farm income—from all crops—under program C would be reduced by 4 to 10 percent on the study farms. The reduction would be slightly greater on the Kansas, Oklahoma, and Colorado farms than on those in Montana, Washington, and Oregon.

Under program C, net returns to management and invested capital would be reduced on all study farms (table 7). The reduction would be greatest on the Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado farms—those having grain sorghum as the alternative grain crop. The reduction would range from 8 to 14 percent on the farms in Montana, Washington, and Oregon—those having barley as the alternative grain crop.

[2] Computed: 120 acres @ 65%/75%×$30+$3,120.

TABLE 7.—*Changes on study farms with program C*

[20 percent larger wheat acreage allotments, wheat price at 65 percent of parity]

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns [1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	20	−16	−28	0	−5	−18	−8	−22
Northeastern Kansas	20	−10	−11	1	−7	−14	−9	−22
Northwestern Oklahoma	20	−36	(2)	−3	2	−42	−8	−25
Eastern Colorado	20	−63	13	−8	4	−63	−10	−15
Northeastern Montana	20	−47	0	−1	3	−47	−7	−13
North-central Montana	20	−27	0	−1	1	−47	−8	−14
Eastern Washington	20	−20	0	1	5	−24	−4	−8
Columbia Basin, Oreg	20	−37	0	1	4	−37	−6	−13

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

TABLE 8.—*Marketing allotments and food wheat quotas with program D, study farms*

Study farm	Wheat base acreage [1]	Production on base [2]	Marketing allotment [3]	Food wheat quota [4]
	Acres	*Bushels*	*Bushels*	*Bushels*
West-central Kansas	440	6,380	4,249	2,654
Northwestern Kansas	417	6,338	4,226	2,645
Northwestern Oklahoma	718	10,275	6,851	4,486
Eastern Colorado	803	12,306	8,203	5,015
Northeastern Montana	578	9,090	6,060	3,784
North-central Montana	578	12,606	8,465	5,278
Eastern Washington	255	12,495	8,330	5,194
Columbia Basin, Oreg.	800	25,584	17,056	10,656

[1] As defined by ASC program.
[2] With normal yields.
[3] Computed as 2/3 of the production on the base.
[4] Computed as 5/12 of the production on the base.

With program C, the price of the wheat would need to be supported at about 70 instead of 60 percent of parity, to achieve the same net return to management and invested capital as with program A.

Production of all grain measured in tons would not differ greatly between programs C and A, except on the Colorado farm, where it would drop by 8 percent under program C.

Program D—Marketing allotments on food and export wheat, stratified prices

Under program D, each farm would have a marketing allotment in bushels equal to two-thirds of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. This quantity of wheat is assumed to be supported at a U.S. average price of $1.56 a bushel, or about 65 percent of parity. Other wheat could be produced and sold freely at a feed-equivalent price. Each farm would have a food wheat quota in bushels equal to five-twelfths of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. It is further assumed that a payment of 80 cents a bushel of the food quota could be earned by contracting 20 percent of the wheat base acreage in a land reserve. Land in the reserve would earn annual payments equal to the 1960 rates of the conservation reserve program. If wheat is usually grown on fallow, an equal acreage of fallow land would be put into the reserve at a reduced nondiversion rate.

The eight study farms would grow their full marketing allotments (bushels) of wheat as computed in table 8. With a support price of 65 percent of parity, wheat would pay better than the next most profitable crop—feed grains—on each study farm (table 4).

Each of the study farms would also place 20 percent of its wheat base acreage in the land reserve, as would be required to earn the payment of 80 cents a bushel on food quota wheat. This payment, together with the rental payment, would represent a higher return on the reserve acreage than any other available use of the land. Suppose a farm has a wheat base of 100 acres, with a normal wheat yield of 18 bushels, and the land-reserve payment is $10 an acre, at the diversion rate. The food wheat quota would be 750 bushels (100×5/12×18), and the payment would be $600 (750×80 cents). The 20 acres in the land reserve would earn a rental payment of $200. These two payments together would average $40 for each acre in the reserve. In a wheat-fallow area, another 20 acres would be placed in the reserve at the nondiversion rate and would earn a rental payment of $100. The total payment of $900 would average $22.50 an acre for the 40 acres in the land reserve. Returns computed in this way for each study farm are higher than the returns from other available uses of the reserve land. Readers are reminded that the food quota payment is assumed to be independent of the marketing allotment and can be earned only by participation in the land reserve.

Growing the marketing-allotment wheat and meeting the land-reserve requirement for the food quota payment would account for about 90 percent of the wheat base acreage and the associated fallow on the study farms. This would leave only about 10 percent for such other uses as growing feed wheat and other feed grains. This would compare with about 30 to 35 percent of the acreage available for nonwheat uses under program A.

The Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Oklahoma farms would use the remaining 10 percent of their wheat base acreage to grow feed wheat, because it would pay better than barley or grain sorghum (table 4). Also, with wheat grown on the remaining land, ample supplies of wheat would be more nearly assured to fill marketing quotas in periods of below-average yields. These farms would grow no feed grains with program D (table 9). But both Kansas farms would grow grain sorghum in preference to feed wheat. The Colorado study farm would seed all its land to allotment wheat because the average rate of abandonment is so high. The Colorado farm would grow grain sorghum on part of its wheat seedings that fail to make a crop. Except for the Oklahoma farm, all study farms would have less land in fallow with program D, chiefly because of the land-reserve requirement. The Oklahoma study farm would not have this requirement because it would grow wheat cropped annually. The west-central Kansas farm would reduce its fallow acreage even more because it would grow more of its wheat in annual cropping. The Washington study farm would have less need for clean cultivated fallow to control weeds. With some acreage in the reserve, less land would be farmed.

Production of all grain (wheat and feed grains) in tons would be about 20 to 30 percent smaller except on the Washington study farm, where it would be about 4 percent smaller (table 9).

Gross cash returns on study farms would be about the same as with program A on the Kansas farms and from 7 to 14 percent higher on the other farms (table 9). Net returns would be improved even more because farm expenses would be lower with land in the reserve. Net returns to management and invested capital would be slightly higher than with program A on the northwestern Kansas farm, 15 percent higher on the west-central Kansas farm, and 20 to 39 percent higher on the other study farms. With program D, income effects on the representative wheat farms would vary widely from area to area.

TABLE 9.—*Changes on study farms with program D*

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns [1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	4	−64	−44	−28	9	−67	1	15
Northwestern Kansas	−23	−15	−23	−21	−12	−15	−2	3
Northwestern Oklahoma	25	−100	(2)	−21	28	−100	10	39
Eastern Colorado	−3	−72	−5	−25	13	−72	7	20
Northeastern Montana	14	−100	−20	−22	24	−100	11	38
North-central Montana	14	−100	−20	−22	24	−100	9	25
Eastern Washington	73	−100	−10	−4	62	−100	14	34
Columbia Basin, Oreg.	23	−100	−20	−19	33	−100	12	37

[1] Returns to management and capital.
[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Program E—Marketing allotments on food wheat, stratified prices

Under this assumed program, each farm would have a marketing allotment in bushels equal to five-twelfths of the normal yield on its 1960 wheat base acreage. This quantity of wheat is supported at a U.S. average price of $2.16 a bushel, about 90 percent of parity. For purposes of the study, the marketing allotment was presumed to be the farm share of the wheat required for domestic food use—the food wheat quota in program D. Other wheat could be produced and sold at the nonsupported price which, for purposes of the study, was assumed to be $1.25 a bushel, U.S. average. This other wheat could be exported, used industrially, or used for feed. Other crops, such as feed grains, could be produced on any remaining land, for sale at the assumed prices (table 3). There would be no land-reserve program.

In adjusting to program E, each of the study farms would produce the marketing allotment (bushels) of wheat. The allotment could be produced on about 44 percent of the wheat base acreage, leaving about 56 percent for production of other wheat, feed grains, or other crops. The choice would depend largely upon the relative returns from these crops.

Returns from grain sorghum at the assumed price would be substantially higher than returns from wheat at the nonsupported price on both Kansas study farms. Consequently, these farms would grow as many acres of grain sorghum as they could grow safely in view of the erosion hazard. They would use any remaining land for production of wheat for sale at the nonsupported price. Although grain sorghum would pay slightly better than wheat at the nonsupported price on the Colorado farm, the difference would not be sufficient to

overcome a reluctance to change enterprises. Thus, the Colorado farm would produce no grain sorghum with program E, except on part of its wheat seedings that fail. On the Oklahoma, Montana, Washington, and Oregon farms, wheat grown would be at the nonsupported price in preference to feed grains, because wheat would bring a higher return (table 4). Also, by growing wheat on the remaining land, ample supplies of wheat would be more nearly assured to fill marketing quotas in periods of below-average yields. On the Kansas and Colorado farms, acreages of summer fallow would be reduced, whereas in the Oregon, Washington, and Montana farms, the same fallow acreages as in program A would be kept.

Total wheat production would increase with program E on all study farms except those in Kansas. On these farms, it would decrease. Wheat production would be nearly a sixth larger on the Colorado farm than with program A. It would be nearly a half larger on the Oklahoma, Montana, and Oregon farms, and nearly twice the wheat production under program A on the Washington farm.

The effect of program E on total grain production (tons) would also vary among the study farms. Grain production would decrease 5 percent on the Oklahoma farm and 11 percent on the Colorado farm. In contrast, grain production would increase 8 percent on the northwestern Kansas farm, and 10 percent on the Washington farm. On the other study farms—west-central Kansas, Montana, and Oregon—grain production would change very little. These differences would result from the relative yields of wheat and other grains. If the yields were equal, a shift in acreages between the crops would not affect total grain production. If the yields were unequal, the size of the shift would also affect the degree of change.

Income from wheat would increase with program E on all except the Kansas farms. On these farms, it would decrease because less wheat would be produced. These farmers would grow as much grain sorghum as they could grow with program E. On the other study farms, income from wheat would increase with program E because these farmers would grow only wheat. Except for the Colorado farmer, who would plant grain sorghum on part of the wheat seedings that fail, they would grow no other grains. Total gross income would decrease slightly on two study farms, would be unchanged on one, would increase roughly 5 percent on 4, and would increase by 12 percent on the Washington farm (table 10).

Program E would affect diversely the net returns to management and invested capital on each study farm, even if each made the most profitable adjustments available. Net return would be 4 to 19 percent higher than in program A on 5 of the farms but 2 to 11 percent lower on 3 farms. The Kansas and Colorado farms would have decreases. The Washington farm would have the largest increase in net returns followed by the Montana, Oregon, and Oklahoma farms in that order.

TABLE 10.—*Changes on study farms with program E*

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns[1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	7	19	−38	3	−3	9	0	−4
Northwestern Kansas	−16	59	−16	8	−19	55	−2	−11
Northwestern Oklahoma	55	−100	(2)	−5	35	−100	4	4
Eastern Colorado	16	−64	16	−11	12	−64	−3	−2
Northeastern Montana	43	−100	0	−2	32	−100	6	14
North-central Montana	43	−100	0	−2	32	−100	6	11
Eastern Washington	98	−100	0	10	65	−100	12	19
Columbia Basin, Oreg	54	−100	0	−2	37	−100	4	9

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Program F—No production controls, no support prices

Under program F, farmers would be free to produce wheat and other crops in any quantity and in any combination they wished, to the extent of their resources, for sale at nonsupported prices. U.S. average prices assumed per bushel are wheat $1.25, barley $0.90, and grain sorghum $1.01. Corresponding prices of these crops for study farms are shown in table 3. Program F would have no provision for a land reserve.

Wheat production at the assumed nonsupported price would return more income per acre than barley on the Oregon, Washington, and Montana farms (table 4). These farmers would grow a maximum acreage of wheat and no barley. Wheat would also pay better than grain sorghum on the Oklahoma farm. This farmer also would grow a maximum acreage of wheat. But on the two Kansas farms, wheat would not pay as well as grain sorghum. So operators of these farms would grow as much grain sorghum, with program F, as they could grow safely without serious hazard to erosion. Although grain sorghum would seem to pay a little better than wheat (at nonsupport prices) on the Colorado farm, this farmer prefers to grow wheat. As mentioned previously, he seeds winter wheat on all available land whenever crop prospects are favorable at the fall seeding date. He prefers not to take the chance that crop prospects may not be as good for grain sorghum the following spring. The Colorado study farmer grows grain sorghum as a catch crop when winter wheat seedings fail. Other changes on study farms are found in table 11.

The effects of program F on total grain production would vary on the different farms. Little or no change from program A would occur on the west-central Kansas, Montana, and Oregon farms (table 11). Grain production would increase about 10 percent on the northwestern Kansas and Washington farms. It would decrease 5 percent on the Oklahoma farm and 11 percent on the Colorado farm. This means that a shift from other grains to wheat would increase total grain output if wheat yielded more pounds of grain per acre, and it would decrease the total output if wheat yielded less per acre than feed grain. Study farms differ in this respect.

TABLE 11.—*Changes on study farms with program F*

[In percent]

Study farm	Change in acreage of—			Change in production, all grain	Change in gross income from—			Change in net returns[1]
	Wheat	Feed grain	Fallow		Wheat	Feed grain	All sources	
West-central Kansas	22	−18	−31	0	−22	−21	−21	−52
Northwestern Kansas	−1	56	−26	9	−38	48	−18	−49
Northwestern Oklahoma	55	−100	(2)	−5	2	−100	−22	−66
Eastern Colorado	16	−64	16	−11	−20	−64	−29	−47
Northeastern Montana	43	−100	0	−2	−1	−100	−20	−42
North-central Montana	43	−100	0	−2	−1	−100	−20	−35
Eastern Washington	98	−100	0	10	32	−100	−7	−19
Columbia Basin, Oreg	54	−100	0	−2	4	−100	−21	−44

[1] Return to management and capital.

[2] No fallow used on this farm.

Although wheat production would increase, with program F, the gross income from wheat would actually fall on three of the study farms because of the lower price of wheat. Wheat income would be lower on the Kansas and Colorado farms. It would change very little on four study farms—those in Oklahoma, Montana, and Oregon. And it would increase substantially only on the Washington farm (table 11).

Gross farm income from all sources would be lower with program F on all study farms. On six of the farms, the reduction would be about 20 percent, but it would range from 7 percent on the Washington farm to 29 percent on the Colorado farm.

Net returns would decrease even more than gross returns with program F because expenses would be about the same as with program A. Program F would reduce the net return to management and invested capital by 19 percent on the Washington farm. The reduction would be 35 to 44 percent on the Montana and Oregon farms, about 50 percent on the Kansas and Colorado farms, and 66 percent on the Oklahoma farm.

Adjustments With a Land-Reserve Program for Cropland

A land reserve is a device for holding land out of production. It may or many not reduce the production of a specific crop. The recent acreage-reserve program reduced the acreage of allotment crops because it applied solely to these crops. But a reserve program might be unrelated to any specific crop; it would merely reduce the total acreage of crops on the farm, as did the 1958–60 conservation reserve program. This is the kind of reserve program discussed here.

Because the reserve land could come out of the acreage of any crop, it would tend to come first from the least profitable crops. If rental payments per acre were high enough and funds were available, the program would eventually reach the land now producing wheat. Before wheat production could be affected significantly in the study farm areas, the reserve would need to take the land out of less profitable crops such as oats, rye, barley, grain sorghum, and forages. The question is, What rate of annual rental payments per acre for reserve land would exceed the returns from these crops?

Land-reserve programs would mean a different kind of decision for the farmer than would either acreage-allotment or marketing-allotment programs. In the two latter programs the choice would be among crops within the present scale of farming operations. The land reserve would offer the choice of reduced scale of operations or of quitting farming. The farmer would need to consider what productive use he could make of his time (labor and management) and the capital that would be released from farming. A combination of part-time (or no) farming, land in the reserve, and part-time (or full) nonfarm employment might yield a larger net income than full-time farming. The nonfarm opportunities available to operators of the study farms were not considered. Such opportunities would depend upon both the availability of job opportunities and the training, aptitudes, and interests of the farmer. Instead, the net returns from farming with and without land in the reserve are compared and any nonfarm opportunities the farmer may have are disregarded.

For simplicity of analysis, the returns from crops and from the land reserve are compared using the data in table 4. The returns shown for the reserve are based on 1960 rental payment rates of the conservation reserve program.[3] When cropland is diverted from either wheat or barley grown on fallow, 2 acres are involved—one earns the full diversion rate and the other the nondiversion, or half rate. When cropland is diverted from a continuous crop, the 1 acre earns the full rate. The return from the land reserve under each circumstance is shown in table 4. The net return shown represents the rental payment minus taxes, insurance, and repairs to buildings and fences. Depreciation on equipment was not subtracted from returns of either the crops or the land reserve; for this analysis, depreciation is considered a business expense. To the extent that depreciation would be reduced, the reserve would be more attractive than the data indicate.

With these assumptions, the net return per acre from the land reserve compared with the net returns from crops on study farms is summarized as follows:

	Return per acre from the reserve higher than—
West central Kansas	Wheat at feed price.
Northwestern Kansas	Wheat at feed price and grain sorghum.
Northwestern Oklahoma	Wheat at 65 percent of parity and grain sorghum.
Eastern Colorado	Wheat at the nonsupported price and grain sorghum.
Northwestern Montana	Wheat at the nonsupported price and barley.
North central Montana	Wheat at feed price and barley.
Eastern Washington	None.
Oregon	Wheat at the nonsupported price and barley.

If a land reserve with the assumed rates of payment were added to the programs considered in the study, the reserve would bring a higher return per acre than the following crops and might compete with them:

	Land reserve could compete with—
All programs	Feed grains on all farms except west-central Kansas and eastern Washington.
Program C	Wheat on Oklahoma farm.
Program D	Feed wheat on all farms except north-central Montana and eastern Washington; wheat on Oklahoma farm.
Program E	Wheat at nonsupported price on Oklahoma, Colorado, northeastern Montana, and eastern Washington farms.
Program F	All wheat on northwestern Oklahoma, eastern Colorado, northeastern Montana and Oregon farms.

These comparisons suggest that in any land-reserve program, the rental rates should be carefully considered if the desired adjustments in land use are to be accomplished.

PATTERNS OF ADJUSTMENT ON STUDY FARMS

Study farms provide interesting similarities and contrasts in their patterns of adjustment to the array of programs considered in the study. Of particular interest are the production patterns of wheat and feed grains, and the patterns of expenses and returns. These patterns are shown in figures 1 to 4, based on data from budget summaries in tables 12 through 19. The charts depict relationships only for the specific programs and prices assumed in the study.

West central Kansas farm: Total grain production in tons would be about the same with all programs except D, in which some land would be idled by the reserve. With the other programs, the variation in wheat production would be compensated for by an almost equal and opposite variation in production of feed grains. Expenses would be about the same except with programs D, in which they would be lower because some land would not be farmed.

Northwestern Kansas farm: Total grain production would be about 10 percent higher with programs B, E, and F, those under which more land would be in grain sorghum and less in wheat. With program B, the wheat acreage restriction would cause a shift to sorghum production. But with programs E and F, the shift to grain sorghum would be due to the lower returns from wheat at nonsupported or feed prices. Net returns would be highest with program B, lowest with program F, and about the same with other programs. This farm alone would have the highest net return with program B.

Northwestern Oklahoma farm: Total grain production would decrease with any shift of land from grain sorghum to wheat as with programs C, D, E, and F. Expenses are about the same except with program D, in which some land is in the reserve. Net returns would vary widely; they would be highest with program D, followed by programs B, E, A, C, and F.

Eastern Colorado farm: As on the northwestern Kansas farm, total grain production would vary inversely with the acreage in wheat. Grain production would be largest with program B, under which wheat production would be most restricted. Grain production would be about 10 percent smaller with programs E and F, under which there would be a choice between wheat and grain sorghum, than with program A. Net returns would vary widely; they would be higher with programs D and B and lowest with program F.

Montana farms: the northeastern and north-central Montana farms would have similar patterns of production and income adjustments. Total grain production would be smaller with program D but would be about the same with the other programs. A substantial part of the grain would consist of barley with programs A, B, and C but entirely of wheat with programs E and F. Net returns would be enhanced with programs D and E and greatly depressed with program F.

Eastern Washington farm: Total grain production on this farm would be about the same with acreage-allotment programs A, B, and C, but it would be increased substantially with programs E and F, under which wheat acreage would not be restricted. With programs E and F, wheat would be the only kind of grain produced. As with the other farms, expenses would be about the same under all programs except D. The pattern of net returns would be similar to those on the Montana farms—highest with program D followed by program E, then A and B, then C, and lowest with program F.

Columbia Basin, Oreg., farm: The pattern of total grain production on this farm would be about the same as the pattern on the Montana farms—about the same production with programs A, B, and C, and slightly lower with programs E and F, under which only wheat would be produced. The pattern of net returns would be similar also—highest with program D and lowest with program F.

[3] We assume no limitation in payment per farm.

ADDITIONAL TABLES BY PROGRAMS

TABLE 12.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the west-central Kansas farm (540 acres cropland, 440 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat on fallow	Acre	110	149	79	61	68	76
Wheat, continuous cropping	do	170	61	157	230	232	267
Grain sorghum	do	138	165	116	49	164	113
Summer fallow	do	122	165	88	68	76	84
Land reserve	do				132		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	4,444	3,776	4,969	4,249	4,424	5,033
Grain sorghum	do	2,932	3,598	2,397	960	3,208	2,325
Total grain	Ton	215	214	216	154	223	216
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	8,088	7,628	7,702	8,815	7,830	6,342
Grain sorghum	do	2,990	3,671	2,445	980	3,273	2,371
Land reserve	do				1,375		
Gross income	do	11,078	11,299	10,147	11,170	11,103	8,713
Expenses [2]	do	6,403	6,297	6,483	5,804	6,620	6,487
Net return [3]	do	4,675	5,002	3,664	5,366	4,483	2,226

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 13.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the northwestern Kansas farm (770 acres cropland, 417 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat on fallow	Acre	270	202	240	207	228	200
Wheat, continuous cropping	do			84			67
Grain sorghum	do	162	316	146	138	257	253
Summer fallow	do	338	252	300	259	285	250
Land reserve	do				166		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	5,510	4,108	5,982	4,226	4,645	4,941
Grain sorghum	do	2,890	5,294	2,482	2,450	4,485	4,305
Total grain	Ton	246	271	249	195	265	269
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	9,863	8,216	9,153	8,635	7,967	6,127
Grain sorghum	do	2,890	5,294	2,482	2,450	4,485	4,272
Land reserve	do				1,370		
Gross income	do	12,753	13,510	11,635	12,455	12,452	10,399
Expenses [2]	do	6,998	7,440	7,147	6,455	7,304	7,445
Net return [3]	do	5,755	6,070	4,488	6,000	5,148	2,954

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 14.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the northwestern Oklahoma farm (735 acres cropland, 718 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	473	355	568	592	735	735
Grain sorghum	do	262	380	167	0	0	0
Land reserve	do				143		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	6,786	5,247	8,017	8,286	9,944	9,944
Grain sorghum	do	3,925	5,700	2,259	0	0	0
Total grain	Ton	313	317	304	249	298	298
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	12,079	10,598	12,345	15,496	16,367	12,330
Grain sorghum	do	3,728	5,415	2,146	0		
Land reserve	do				1,863		
Gross income	do	15,807	16,013	14,491	17,359	16,367	12,330
Expenses [2]	do	10,059	9,921	10,154	9,389	10,346	10,346
Net return [3]	do	5,748	6,092	4,337	7,970	6,021	1,984

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 15.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the eastern Colorado farm (1,800 acres cropland, 803 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	550	412	660	535	639	639
Grain sorghum	do	364	724	135	102	130	130
Summer fallow	do	886	664	1,005	841	1,031	1,031
Land reserve	do				322		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	8,204	6,145	9,834	8,025	9,531	9,531
Grain sorghum [2]	do	4,365	8,685	1,620	1,230	1,560	1,560
Total grain	Ton	368	428	340	275	330	330
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	14,521	12,290	15,046	16,532	16,323	11,628
Grain sorghum	do	3,754	7,469	1,393	1,058	1,342	1,342
Land reserve	do				1,932		
Gross income	do	18,275	19,759	16,439	19,522	17,665	12,970
Expenses [3]	do	7,762	8,328	7,536	6,851	7,394	7,394
Net return [4]	do	10,513	11,431	8,903	12,671	10,271	5,576

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] 252 and 640 acres, respectively, of sorghum in programs A and B is grown in continuous rotation. The remaining sorghum in all programs is grown on abandoned wheat land.
[3] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[4] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 16.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the northeastern Montana farm (1,156 acres cropland, 578 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Spring wheat	Acre	405	304	486	462	578	578
Barley	do	173	274	92			
Summer fallow	do	578	578	578	462	578	578
Land reserve	do				232		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	5,954	4,469	7,144	6,781	8,495	8,495
Barley	do	3,399	5,384	1,808			
Total grain	Ton	260	263	258	203	255	255
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	10,241	8,715	10,502	12,693	13,477	10,109
Barley	do	2,447	3,876	1,302			
Land reserve	do				1,333		
Gross income	do	12,688	12,591	11,804	14,026	13,477	10,109
Expenses [2]	do	6,666	6,687	6,649	5,696	6,631	6,631
Net return [3]	do	6,022	5,904	5,155	8,330	6,846	3,478

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 17.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the north-central Montana farm (1,156 acres cropland, 578 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Winter wheat	Acre	405	304	486	462	578	578
Barley	do	173	274	92			
Summer fallow	do	578	578	578	462	578	578
Land reserve	do				232		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	8,465	6,354	10,157	9,661	12,080	12,080
Barley	do	4,817	7,640	2,564			
Total grain	Ton	370	374	366	290	362	362
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	13,629	11,691	13,814	16,931	17,963	13,530
Barley	do	3,324	5,272	1,769			
Land reserve	do				1,552		
Gross income	do	16,953	16,963	15,583	18,483	17,963	13,530
Expenses [2]	do	7,197	7,224	7,174	6,290	7,149	7,149
Net return [3]	do	9,756	9,739	8,409	12,193	10,814	6,381

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 18.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the east Washington farm (520 acres cropland, 255 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	166	125	199	287	329	329
Barley	do	163	204	130			
Peas	do	104	104	104	104	104	104
Summer fallow	do	87	87	87	78	87	87
Land reserve	do				51		
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	8,238	6,008	9,916	13,909	15,890	15,890
Barley	do	7,792	10,271	5,915			
Peas	Hundredweight	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210	1,210
Total grain	Ton	434	429	439	417	477	477
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	14,417	12,074	15,072	23,397	23,742	19,068
Barley	do	6,389	8,422	4,850			
Peas	do	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356	4,356
Land reserve	do				969		
Gross income	do	25,162	24,852	24,278	28,722	28,098	23,424
Expenses [2]	do	12,987	13,320	13,034	12,383	13,500	13,500
Net return [3]	do	12,175	11,532	11,244	16,339	14,598	9,924

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

TABLE 19.—*Land use, production, and income with each program on the Columbia Basin, Oreg., farm (1,600 acres cropland, 800 acres wheat base)*

Budget item	Unit	Acreage allotments			Marketing allotments on—		No controls or supports (program F)
		1960 allotments (program A)	Reduced allotments (program B)	Increased allotments (program C)	Food and export wheat (program D)	Food wheat only (program E)	
Land use:							
Wheat	Acre	520	390	624	640	800	800
Barley, winter	do	158	231	99			
Barley, spring	do	122	179	77			
Land reserve	do				320		
Summer fallow	do	800	800	800	640	800	800
Production: [1]							
Wheat	Bushel	16,120	12,285	19,344	19,840	24,000	24,000
Barley	do	10,456	15,308	6,571			
Total grain	Ton	735	736	738	595	720	720
Income:							
Wheat	Dollar	28,855	24,939	29,983	38,442	39,590	30,000
Barley	do	9,097	13,318	5,717			
Land reserve	do				3,960		
Gross income	do	37,952	38,257	35,700	42,402	39,590	30,000
Expenses [2]	do	20,140	20,105	20,147	17,932	20,152	20,049
Net income [3]	do	17,812	18,152	15,553	24,470	19,438	9,951

[1] Excludes seed.
[2] Includes a charge for all labor at hired wage rates and all other expenses except a charge for use of capital.
[3] Return to management and capital.

Mrs. MAY. I want to commend the gentleman, and I would like to have all Members study his suggestions, particularly the significance of this objective study of several hypothetical plans in every major producing area, plans similar to the bushel plan which is sponsored by the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Farmers Union, and others, which shows that this is the plan which brings about the highest income return but, at the same time, results in the smallest quantity of total production of wheat which would bring down in the controlled area the wheat production instead of having it go into storage.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. BREEDING. I want to congratulate the gentleman from Washington for his wonderful talk here today and his contribution to this committee.

I should like to bring up the question of acreage. I noticed in the gentleman's statement he said that world acreage for wheat was increasing, yet we in the United States are losing acreage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BREEDING. What is going to happen to the American wheat farmer if this situation continues to exist?

Mr. HORAN. I do not think our American wheat farmer is pleased with acreage restrictions. I am happy to have talked to and to have served with my colleague from Kansas in the direction of more use of wheat, more marketing of wheat, because it just does not make sense for us to hog-tie the American farmer, then try to liberate the farmers all over the world. We may be able to control our own citizens but we cannot control people in foreign countries. That is one of the things that we have to face when we try to solve the farm programs. These facts I have placed in the RECORD I think are as good as we can get. I have had the Foreign Service working on it for some time.

Mr. BREEDING. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be more appropriations for expanding marketing development in foreign countries? I know the field is stifled somewhat, as we cut down our production. What is the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. HORAN. I believe the Department will come up with a program that this subcommittee will be very cordial to. We have in the bill this item, what was in the budget when it originally came up;

it was not revised by the new administration.

Mr. BREEDING. Expanded markets would be the answer to part of our problem here?

Mr. HORAN. I want to say not only is my friend from Kansas serving ably here but his predecessor was one of the fine representatives of the wheat industry and other elements of American agriculture. I commend to the Committee of the Whole House the reading of the testimony of the former Member here, the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, when he appealed to the subcommittee for additional funds for wheat utilization. It is splendid because he breaks down this utilization, not into the making of industrial alcohol that we might burn in automobiles or to paper which is being created at Peoria, but in better utilization as human food.

Mr. BREEDING. Did not Mr. Hope appear before the gentleman's committee and ask for an increased appropriation?

Mr. HORAN. Yes. I have checked and under the able leadership of Dr. Hazel Stiebling we are already carrying on considerable of the work that he did request, and that can be improved, I am certain.

Mr. BREEDING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. I noted with interest the gentleman's reference to the appearance of the Honorable Clifford Hope before the committee. I have read his statement. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Washington for his very excellent statement before the House today. I noticed his interest in the provisions of this bill and in the report relative to market development work. Those of us who have worked on the legislative side of Public Law 480 have been very much interested in the provision that some of these funds shall be made available. We have been very much concerned that there are others who feel they ought to have access to these funds in connection with market development, which is at the end of the road as far as funds are concerned.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman is referring to other departments?

Mr. McINTIRE. That is right; other departments of Government. Is it the opinion of the gentleman that perhaps at long last we have these funds sufficiently well identified, both legislatively and in the appropriation bill, so that they will be used for these purposes?

Mr. HORAN. Well, that is a subject that concerns us all, and I know it concerns my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], because we have made a study of these foreign currencies that are a residue of our activities under Public Law 480. You understand that Public Law 480 made it possible for us to sell our surplus foods for foreign soft currencies, and these are variously distributed. A portion of these currencies finds its way back into our own Treasury, and we have a considerable sum there. And, it just seems to me that some of the departments are somewhat like the casual visitor to Las Vegas. He is leaving the gambling halls and he just cannot wait to spend the last change in his pocket. We find various groups wanting to spend this money abroad, but I want to see our expenditures of those soft currencies reflected in some help to the American taxpayer, and I think in this bill they are, because we have moved out of storage enormous amounts of our surplus commodities to places where it is needed, to places where China and Russia cannot supply wheat and the good things in life. But, in the uses by the other departments we should find a way so that the benefit of the expenditure of these soft currencies is reflected in some help for the American taxpayer here at home.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee once again brings to the floor of the House for your approval the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture.

It has been a pleasure serving with our chairman, the able and distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WHITTEN. It is a distinct honor to be permitted to serve on this committee with Mr. SANTANGELO, of New York, and Mr. SLACK, of West Virginia. The American farmer has no better friend than the ranking minority member on our committee, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. ANDERSEN. It is a pleasure serving with the distinguished gentleman from Washington, Mr. HORAN, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, Mr. MICHEL. We are fortunate to have as our executive secretary Ross P. Pope.

We are in a race with the Soviet Union in outer space and in certain other fields, but this does not apply to agriculture. Our country today is the strongest, most productive and wealthiest nation on earth, and in the field of agriculture we have unquestioned superiority.

Today only 8.7 percent of our people live on farms, but we are still leading the world in agriculture. The Soviet Union has 50 percent of its people living on farms and they are still unable to keep up with the necessary requirements of their country. In our country only 1 person in 12 is engaged in agriculture, and in the Soviet Union 1 out of every 3 is engaged in agriculture.

Under no circumstances should the people in this country criticize the American farmer. Living as we are in the most crucial period in the history of our Nation, we must not only recognize the achievements of American agriculture, but we should be proud of the fact that we are producing all of the food and fiber necessary for our people.

A few people believe that agriculture is not as important as it once was due to the fact that only about 12 percent of our population live on our farms. We must remember that agriculture is still our largest industry and is still the mainstay of our national economy. It is true that the workers engaged in farming have declined over the years and that today only some 7.1 million people are employed on our farms and ranches. This is still 12 times as many people as work in the steel industry; nearly twice as many as the number of people in our transportation industry and public utilities combined, and nearly 9 times as many people as work in the automobile industry. More workers are engaged in farming than in all of the industries that manufacture nondurable goods, including textiles, processed foods, wearing apparel, tobacco products, paper and paper products, printing and publishing, chemical products of all kinds, coal and petroleum products, and products made from rubber and leather.

In addition to those who live on our farms, some 6 million people have jobs furnishing the equipment and supplies necessary for our farmers. Ten million people have jobs storing, transporting, processing and merchandising agricultural products. In this country today 35 percent of all the American workers now in civilian employment are in jobs relating directly to agriculture.

Area by area and crop by crop, our agriculture is the envy of the Communist world. We must continue our efficiency of production. When we produce our agricultural commodities at lower unit cost our farmers receive benefits by way of savings and the same applies to the consumers. We are a great agricultural nation.

From time to time we hear complaints over what is being done to our family-size farm, but not too much action is taken to correct the treatment received by the family-size farmers. When we consider the family farm, we must remember that on this farm most of the labor and management is performed by the operator and the members of his family, and the main source of income comes from this particular farm.

In 1954, we had 4,782,000 farms in the United States. The 1960 census shows a decrease of 23 percent, which makes the total today only 3,704,000. From 1954 to 1960 the size of our farms has increased from 242 acres to 302 acres. The value of the land and the buildings per farm totaled $20,405 in 1954, and in 1960 the total was $33,242.

The productivity of the individual American farmer increased more in the last two decades than at any time in the past. Regardless of this amazing record, realized net farm income dropped about one-third from the year 1947 to the year 1960.

Regardless of our farmers' improved efficiency, his income has been going down. Today, he is paying more for the products he must buy and at the same time is receiving less for the commodities he sells. Our American farmer is making a great and essential contribution to the national welfare but is not being rewarded equally with other groups in the Nation. Our gross farm income for 1945 totaled $25.8 billion and production expenses totaled $12.9 billion. The realized net income for this year was $12.9 billion.

In 1950, the realized gross income for the American farmer totaled $32.5 billion with production expenses amounting to $19.3 billion. Here, we have a realized net income of only $13.2 billion. In the year 1960, the realized gross income of our farmer was $37.9 billion and production expenses totaled $26.3 billion. This leaves a realized net income of only $11.6 billion.

We must keep in mind that the farmers' share of the consumers' dollar for food totaled 51 percent in 1948 and 49 percent in 1951. The American farmer in 1960 received only 39 percent of the consumers' dollar for food purchased.

Our farms are the real backbone of our country and it is largely from the fruits of the soil that we have established our present position of being the strongest, wealthiest and most productive nation on earth.

Mr. Chairman, for fiscal year 1962, we recommend $1,379,006,000 for regular activities; $1,951,915,000 for reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation for foreign assistance and special programs for fiscal year 1961; $1,017,610,000 for restoration of Commodity Credit Corporation capital impairment for fiscal year 1960; $1,600 million for foreign assistance program for fiscal year 1962; and $35,000 for related agencies.

For Agricultural Research Service, we recommend appropriations totaling $196,807,000. For research, we recommend $76,558,000; for plant and animal disease and pest control $55,165,000; and for meat inspection $24,216,000.

We recommend that the committee appropriate $69,992,000 for our Extension Service. For Soil Conservation Service, we recommend $178,680,000.

For Rural Electrification Administration, we recommend $125 million direct authorization for electrification loans together with a contingency authorization of $70 million, making a total of $195 million for electrification loans. This is an increase of $25 million over the 1961 fiscal year authorization. We recommend a direct authorization for telephone loans of $120 million together with a contingency authorization totaling $30 million. The total recommended for telephone loans is $150 million, which is $10 million more than the 1961 fiscal year authorization.

For Agricultural Marketing Service, we recommend an appropriation for fiscal year 1962 of $37,702,000 for marketing research and marketing services. We further recommend that the committee appropriate $1,195,000 for payments to States and possessions under the Agricultural Marketing Service.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Our greatest asset is our schoolchildren. We recommend $125 million for the school lunch program for fiscal year 1962. This is an increase of $15 million over the 1961 appropriation and is $5 million over the 1962 budget request. In addition, we recommend that $45 million be transferred from section 32 funds to be used to purchase meats and other foods necessary to provide balanced school lunches. This is the same transfer authority which was approved for fiscal year 1961. Of the $15 million increase, we recommend that $10 million be used to provide special assistance to help needy schools defray the cost of serving lunches to needy children. Our bill contains the language authorizing the Secretary to allocate this money to areas of greatest need and to prescribe the standards and criteria under which the funds will be used.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

In our Rural Electrification Administration program we now have approximately 5 million consumers on REA-financed lines. Some 96 percent of the farms, ranches, and rural establishments of this country now have electricity. The average number of consumers per mile is about 3.1 and a large number of the cooperatives average less than 2 consumers to a mile. Since a great many of the cooperatives are operating in such thin territory, the amount of equity REA borrowers have accumulated is exceedingly low. Approximately 50 percent of the rural electric systems have less than 20 percent equity in their facilities. Our REA program is one of the great achievements of our present-day Government and it is imperative that an adequate amount be authorized for Rural Electrification Administration loans for fiscal year 1962.

TOBACCO RESEARCH

Last year the need for additional research in tobacco was clearly established. The tobacco industry is undergoing scientific and technological changes that have so significantly affected American agriculture as a whole that tobacco has been neglected in terms of an adequate research program which would provide for its progress and welfare.

At the present time, between 400 and 500 hours of human labor are required to produce and harvest an acre of tobacco. This commodity is grown on a total of approximately 1,154,000 acres in 22 States and is a major source of income in 8 of these States. Seven hundred and fifty thousand farm families are engaged in the production of tobacco and the number of hours required to produce an acre of tobacco has changed very little over the past 50 years. Tobacco is one of the most important cash crops in America. According to the figures for 1958, the amount received from tobacco was $1,007 million which makes this amount the fifth largest amount received from agricultural commodities. Tobacco pays its own way. A little over $2½ billion annually is received in tobacco taxes by the Federal, State and local governments. Of this amount, $1,700 million goes into the Federal Treasury and this does not include indirect taxes. In January of 1960 the Kentucky Legislature approved the sum of $1 million to be used in the construction of an agriculture research building and, in addition, appropriated $50,000 for tobacco research. The tobacco research laboratory established in the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal year 1961 at Lexington, Ky., will be housed in this new agriculture research building. Ordinarily, in establishing a research laboratory, the cost of the building is paid by the Federal Government and, in most instances, the cost of the land must also be paid for by the Government before a research laboratory is constructed. Kentucky's action clearly shows the need for tobacco research and certainly sets a precedent. The research laboratory established will research all types of tobacco. In this country we produce burley, dark, flue-cured, Maryland-type tobacco, and other types. The research laboratory established will prove of great benefit to the tobacco producers in the 22 States involved. We recommend approval of the amount carried in the bill totaling $205,000 for use at the new research laboratory at Lexington, Ky.

SOIL CONSERVATION

Our soil conservation districts were started some 26 years ago as an experiment in local self-government. Today our districts include approximately 96 percent of all of the farms and ranches in our country. No program has had a greater impact upon American agriculture, and each year the importance of this particular program will increase. The people in this country generally support our soil and water conservation program. In Kentucky, we have 122 soil conservation districts in the 120 counties, and today over 86,000 farms are participating in this program. In Kentucky, thousands of acres of good farmland have been restored to productive capacity by our soil conservation service, and the eastern and western sections of Kentucky, where we annually suffer flood damage, are in much better condition.

RESEARCH

The American farmer receives many benefits from our agriculture research program and it is all important that this program be geared to the problems now confronting American agriculture and be able to meet future problems. A good research program must reduce waste and losses and improve efficiency of production. Such a program must also improve processing, marketing, and consumption. In order to prosper, we must develop new and improved crops and production and expand our markets for the sale of our commodities. If we are to have an adequate research program it must provide improved nutrition and better living for rural and urban people. It is true that our agriculture research funds have increased over the years, but the results justify the amounts expended.

SOIL AND WATER RESEARCH LABORATORY

Drought, poor drainage, and rapid runoff cause water problems of critical importance in Kentucky. Soil and water are two of the most important resources in the State of Kentucky. Soil erosion is a particularly serious problem on the majority of Kentucky's 193,000 farms. This is due to the high percentage of sloping lands and the erosive nature of many of the soils and the character of the rainstorms which create an erosive problem. The increasing demand for application of conservation measures in

Kentucky under the Public Law 566 program creates a growing need for basic information which will lead to more effective methods of soil and water conservation. Lack of adequate research information is handicapping efforts of State and Federal agencies in planning and applying land and water use and watershed protection programs in the State. Kentucky is one of the only two of the larger States in the entire humid region which does not have federally supported cooperative soil and water conservation investigations. Studies of the soil and water research needs of Kentucky have revealed critical and immediate problems for which information is lacking. A soil and water conservation research laboratory should be established in Kentucky. This laboratory would serve not only Kentucky but those adjoining States which are also in need of such a research program.

Mr. Chairman, when our farmer is prospering, tractors, automobiles, combines, trucks, milking machines and mechanical devices of every description are moving from the factory to the farm. We also know that modern farm problems are tremendously complex and there is no easy answer.

Our committee recommends this bill to the Members of the House.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. First may I express my appreciation for the kind remarks the gentleman from Kentucky made relative to the work of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The gentleman has referred to the benefit to our economy from a prosperous agriculture, if and when that is obtained. We might also point to the fact that the rural electrification program, which has been so successful, as the gentleman knows, and which the gentleman from Kentucky has been one of the leaders in promoting throughout the United States, has pumped $12 billion worth of business back into the private economy channels in America. $12 billion worth of radios, television sets, electric irons, and electrical articles of every description have been first manufactured by the makers of these appliances and then sold in the farm areas in the United States, simply because of the fact that we do have the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank my friend for his statement, and I certainly concur with his remarks concerning the Rural Electrification Administration.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have before us today a bill calling for expenditures of nearly $6 billion to run the Department of Agriculture and finance its related activities—and I might say some not so closely related—for the coming fiscal year.

We are now paying the bill for authorizations enacted by the Congress years ago, and unfortunately during the deliberations of those authorizing acts too little consideration was given to the cost of the program. The legislative Committee on Agriculture has the responsibility for drafting and reporting to the House authorizing legislation, but it is the responsibility of our Appropriations Committee to scrutinize carefully the line items calling for expenditures of public funds. The full searching light of inquiry should be made into the costs of all programs presented for authorization. All of us are aware of the current legislation before the House Agriculture Committee and so far as I have been able to determine no serious attempt has been made to estimate the costs of administering such a program as outlined.

For example, the most recently enacted farm legislation, the so-called emergency feed-grain bill, enacted on March 22 of this year, did not include an estimate of administrative cost. However, subsequently and prior to the end of the sign-up program for feed grains, the Department had asked our committee for $20.5 million for administrative expenses. We reduced this amount to $15 million, a decrease of $5.5 million in the budget, but I would wager that before the fiscal year is out there will be a request for supplemental funds. I cite this figure to call attention to the fact that little or no mention was made of this expenditure when the program was presented by the legislative committee earlier this year.

It is always a stimulating experience to participate in the consideration of appropriation items for the Department of Agriculture since I have the honor to represent one of the best agricultural districts in the country. Our land is relatively flat and level and sells in the neighborhood of $500 to $700 per acre and taxed at $10 and $12 an acre. Ours has always been a farming community, and I presume it always will be. Nearly 100 percent of the farmers in my district farm on a full-time basis, and use the most advanced methods of production and marketing; and for the most part dislike the regimentation imposed by the Federal Government upon their operations. Our farmers in the main are an independent, resourceful lot.

There are several programs, and sizable ones, with which I am very much concerned. The first is the insistence of the committee to disregard the recommendation of the President with reference to the agricultural conservation program. This program is designed to stimulate farmers and ranchers to voluntarily apply needed conservation measures. It is used in nearly all States and territories of the United States and has over the years provided splendid technical service to operators to conserve our natural resources. However, in recent years practices have violated what was considered to be basic conservation practices and have gotten over into the field of production which is in contradiction not only to this administration but to all past administrations to reduce output. I refer specifically to the application of lime and phosphates to land which definitely increase production, and I do not believe is necessary in a conservation project. I am somewhat disturbed also because of the fact that in the face of the decline of the number of farmers participating in the ACP program the advance authorization is continued by this committee at the $250 million level.

On page 10 of the committee report reference is made to strip-cropping and contour farming which has been instituted on several millions of acres. If my memory serves me correctly, part of this should be credited to the Soil Conservation Service, which has been very effective in many of these districts. It appears to me that part of the justification for the ACP program rests on the accomplishments of the soil conservation districts.

For the last several years I have offered amendments to cut this particular item by $50 million and $100 million, and I have not had too good a support from Members on the floor of the House. I know it is not an easy task for a Member of Congress to tell a farmer that he has voted to take $100, $200, or $300 away from him in ACP payments, but I just happen to have the old-fashioned belief that conservation of one's own land is the individual's responsibility and that if we eliminated the entire program all of our farmers would be on an even footing and we would save an expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars.

There has been more concern expressed in this Congress about backdoor spending. I think we ought to touch a little bit on the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Public Law 480 program. I am rather distressed when I find even Members of the Congress coming to me and, frankly, knowing so little about how the Public Law 480 program works and for what we are selling our commodities abroad. These commodities are not being sold for dollars but for local currencies which cannot be used to restore the capital impairment of CCC. In this bill we are restoring the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation for sales made in 1960 and 1961. We are not getting hard dollars for these sales abroad and so we have to come back eventually and restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and this is brought home to us very forcefully in the bill we have here today. There has been some question as to the committee taking it upon itself to put this on a pay-as-you-go basis. In other words, we have added an additional $1,600 million—to place this particular program on a pay-as-you-go basis. In other words, we are saying in effect we would like to see Public Law 480 operated in this coming year within these limitations. It should bring the financial operations of Public Law 480 out into the open. I think it is a step in the right direction.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] earlier had raised a question as to what is being done in utilization research. I support the research activities of the committee. I think we told the

Department we would like to see a little more emphasis on utilization rather than basic research, and we provided funds in the bill for that. Specifically, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Indiana, I would refer him to pages 421 and 422 of the hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I now turn to a discussion of the REA program. Rural electric cooperatives should be complimented on the remarkable job they have done for the past 25 years getting electricity to the Nation's farmers. It was brought out in the hearings that since the inception of the electrification program in 1935, the percentage of farms with central station electric service has increased from about 10 percent to approximately 97 percent, with the facilities financed by REA serving slightly more than one-half of these farms. In addition, REA facilities were serving 2 million nonfarm customers.

As a member of this subcommittee, I have a particular interest in this program—what it has accomplished and where it may be going in the future. I want to see that farmers have the needed funds to take care of their electrical requirements—and I think the Congress is making certain of this—but at the same time there are several aspects of the program brought out in the course of the hearings which cause me serious concern.

The rural electric program is being sold to the American people and to the Congress on the representation that it was to be self-liquidating and, therefore, does not constitute a drain on the taxpayers.

The program is now 25 years old, which seems to me should make it mature enough to start standing on its own two feet. However, the borrowers are still receiving more money annually from the Federal Government than they are repaying, thereby increasing the taxpayer debt. I prepared a chart on this subject based on the following data. It appears on page 499 of the hearings.

The chart shows that the difference between REA funds being advanced and principal being repaid is becoming increasingly greater year by year rather than lesser.

Rural electrification program—Loan advances, principal collections and funds outstanding, 1942–60

[Millions of dollars]

As of June—	Loan advances		Principal collections		Funds outstanding (advances less principal repayments)
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
1942	58.2	354.6	5.5	12.4	342.2
1943	14.6	369.2	12.1	24.5	344.7
1944	18.4	387.6	15.1	39.6	348.0
1945	39.8	427.4	10.7	50.3	377.1
1946	87.2	514.6	11.0	61.3	453.3
1947	190.1	704.7	13.6	74.9	629.8
1948	246.2	950.9	21.2	96.1	854.8
1949	321.3	1,272.2	22.7	118.8	1,153.4
1950	286.7	1,558.9	26.7	145.5	1,413.4
1951	268.1	1,827.0	37.2	182.7	1,644.3
1952	227.6	2,054.6	48.4	231.1	1,823.5
1953	207.6	2,262.2	48.8	279.9	1,982.3
1954	181.6	2,443.8	59.0	338.9	2,104.9
1955	156.7	2,600.5	74.4	413.3	2,187.2
1956	154.7	2,755.2	79.8	493.1	2,262.1
1957	186.0	2,941.2	84.3	577.1	2,363.8
1958	205.3	3,146.5	97.2	674.6	2,471.9
1959	211.8	3,358.3	99.9	774.5	2,583.8
1960	222.6	3,580.9	100.2	874.7	2,706.2

Source: Rural Electrification Administration, "Rural Lines, U.S.A.," Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960, p. 56. Data for fiscal 1960 from Rural Electrification Administration, Monthly Statistical Bulletin, July 1960.

Unfortunately, this discrepancy will tend to grow larger now that virtually all of the farms have been electrified and the REA is concentrating more on loans for construction of the more expensive generating and transmission facilities and facilities to serve large industrial and nonfarm loads.

REA was given an opportunity to comment on the chart and admitted it is correct. The first sentence of their statement on page 500 of the hearings says, "The chart, 'Rural Electrification Loan Program' accurately reflects the status of loan funds advanced, funds outstanding, and cumulative principal repaid for the electrical program for 1942 to 1960."

The REA statement then goes on to discuss the repayment of loans, but never once does the REA address itself to my fundamental question relating to the non-self-liquidating nature of the overall program. Thus, let us here and now admit to the people of this Nation that the rural electrification program as it is presently operating is not really self-liquidating.

While it is true that some individual loans have been repaid and others will be repaid in the future, the fact still remains that borrowers always come back to the Government for additional expansion funds. This means the program as a whole can be viewed as an inverted pyramid getting larger and larger as it goes up. Congress seems to have accepted the policy that it is necessary to provide Federal loan funds for the REA at 2 percent—a rate of interest lower than that paid by the Government on its borrowings.

Therefore, it would seem to be sound fiscal policy to make every effort to get this program on a self-liquidating basis to the point where it is showing a decreasing balance rather than a consistently increasing balance as has been the experience to date, because if the present trend continues there may come a time in the not too distant future when this Nation's taxpayers may either be unwilling or unable to carry the load.

The Nation's rural electric program must continue to meet the future energy needs of cooperative customers effectively. To accomplish this without being too burdensome on the taxpayers, Congress must assure the most efficient and economical use of REA loan funds. This can only be done by a more careful examination of loan applications—particularly for generation and transmission-type loans since they are relatively much larger in size—in terms of whether the loan must absolutely be made or whether more benefits will accrue to the cooperative customer by utilizing an alternative source of power.

I might say that there is a small reference to this particular item in our report at page 27, and I am very happy to see it there.

At the present time there seems to be no checks or balances on this type loan even though 40.5 percent of last year's appropriations were for G. & T. facilities. However, the G. & T. loan application is held in absolute secrecy and it is impossible for existing suppliers to learn whether their wholesale business is being taken away from them or even given a chance to bid on a new contract which might prove more favorable to the farmer consumers of an REA cooperative than a generating plant of their own.

Our very capable subcommittee chairman, the honorable gentleman from Mississippi, seems to be concerned about this problem, also. During the hearings, he sincerely said, and I quote:

> As long as we have our present debt and determinations are made as to the reasonableness of any existing or proposed contract, in my opinion at least, good faith would require that private enterprise be given an opportunity to meet objections to the terms of any existing or tentative contract, prior to making a loan for these purposes.

These purposes he mentioned were G. & T. type loans.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

Mr. BECKER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question:

I see from the report that this appropriation bill carries approximately $195 million additional loan money for the REA. Is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes; that is true.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that this money will be lent by the REA at a 2-percent interest rate fixed under previous law?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, by law.

Mr. BECKER. Is it not a fact that the Government must borrow this money on today's market at approximately 3.5 percent or more?

Mr. MICHEL. That is true.

Mr. BECKER. Therefore, the taxpayers throughout the country must

pay this additional interest at all times on all money that is lent to the REA by the Treasury.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. BECKER. This has amounted to millions and millions of dollars over a period of years. I feel that a prospering area can well afford to pay the going rate of interest on this borrowed money. It is my understanding that various cooperatives of the REA have created surpluses which they have invested in Government bonds that pay 3 or 3.5 percent interest; is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I might say that last year the distinguished gentleman from New York and I explored this matter with the REA Administrator. At that time, as I recall, there was about a quarter of a billion dollars in reserves that was being reinvested in Government securities, not all of it being, of course, at an interest rate in excess of 2 percent, but a good share of it was.

Then the Treasury Department came back with the issue, and I understand in the hearings this year they say $10 million has been invested in that special Treasury issue. Nonetheless, I do not think it is morally right for our co-ops to take money from the Government at 2 percent and reinvest it at a greater rate of interest.

Mr. BECKER. I have offered amendments in previous years to correct this situation. I would think the farmers would want to do this. It is a morally sound proposition.

Mr. MICHEL. When the farmers in my district were told what the conditions were and what the situation of the country is, they are quite willing to pay their share. Frankly, I have had no qualms about supporting the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BECKER. I am going to introduce the same amendment again to try to get a recognition of this problem, so that these people we want to help and have been helping during the years, because today there are others throughout the country who have been paying high rates for electricity and taxes, shall pay the going rate of interest. I think that is morally sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, inspired by my subcommittee chairman's thought-provoking words, I was prompted to insert into the record of the hearings a letter which I had just received from a Mr. Walter Bouldin of Alabama. He happens to be the president of Alabama Power Co. I had never met nor heard of Mr. Bouldin prior to receipt of his letter, but he later testified before our subcommittee. His letter and testimony clearly point up the overall problem of REA secrecy and the inability of existing power suppliers to obtain any information from REA or its borrowers on proposed generation and transmission loan applications. I commend its reading to every Member of the House who is concerned about the success of the REA.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Bouldin's letter, appearing on pages 493–494 of the hearings, is as follows:

ALABAMA POWER CO.,
Birmingham, Ala., April 21, 1961.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, you will soon be considering appropriations requested by the Rural Electrification Administration. We know that in considering such appropriations you will examine into the policies of such Administration in granting loans for generating and transmission facilities. As the situation in Alabama may be typical of many other such instances in our country, an outline of it may be helpful to you in defining the problems involved.

There is in Alabama one generating and transmission co-op which sells power wholesale to six municipalities, some industries, and to five distribution co-ops in Alabama, three of which also receive such service from our company. Our company serves the entire power requirements of nine other distribution co-ops. Our rates to the distribution co-ops are substantially lower than the rates of this generating co-op to its co-op customers. Our company has a contract with the generating co-op under which we undertake to provide all its power requirements over and above its own generating capacity, and we make such power available at a very low rate which has averaged about 6.5 mills per kilowatt-hour over the past 3 years.

In March 1959, this co-op inquired as to whether we intended to increase our power rate to it upon completion of its steam plant then under construction. In May, representatives of our company visited the co-op but did not determine definitely just what term contract this co-op would desire; and in July we wrote asking the term of contract which it desired us to consider. Its reply to our letter did not give us this information. Without a specific answer to our inquiry, we made a proposal to this co-op in October for a new power contract for a term of 5 years at the same rate then in effect. In the closing paragraph of our October letter, we stated, "We will be glad to hear from you regarding this matter and to meet with you to discuss any problems that may occur to you in connection with this proposal." We wrote a followup letter in April 1960, stating that we would appreciate hearing from it about our proposal. In July 1960, the co-op wrote us advising that our proposal was receiving careful consideration. We have heard nothing further from the co-op.

We understand that this generating co-op has for some time been planning to make application to REA for a loan for additional generating facilities. We have inquired at the REA office in Washington whether such application has been filed and have been informed that it is not the policy of REA to disclose whether or not any such application is pending. As you doubtless know, it has been the policy of REA not to disclose the contents of any such application.

We are convinced that an allocation of public funds to this co-op for generating facilities is completely unjustifiable. Such generating facilities would not make electric service available to a single customer to whom such service is not now available. Such facilities would idle generating facilities which our company has already provided for service to this co-op or take the place of future facilities which our company is ready, able, and willing to provide.

The generating co-op is, of course, exempt from Federal income tax. Allocation of public funds to provide generating facilities for such co-op would deprive the Federal Government of income tax paid by our company on the revenue derived from our generating facilities which the co-op facilities would supplant. To use tax funds to destroy a source of tax revenue seems to us fundamentally wrong in principle and particularly unjustifiable at this time when every means should be sought to protect Federal revenues which are so sorely needed for vital purposes.

Co-op generating facilities in Alabama are not necessary to provide electric service at reasonable rates. Cost of power under our rate to this generating co-op, even with Federal income tax included, is, we believe, lower than the cost to such co-op of providing such power from additions to its own generating facilities. If the income tax component were excluded in a comparison between our rates and their costs, we are certain that our rates would be lower than such costs. As mentioned above, however, we are not permitted to present to the REA a comparison of such costs, as the co-op cost estimates in loan applications are not available to us.

Loan policies of the REA, of course, determine the amount of appropriations which they request. If it is to be the policy of REA to grant loans under such circumstances as are presented here in Alabama, the Federal Government would be subject to vast unnecessary expenditures and a serious erosion of its revenue, which you, as well as we, desire to avoid.

Sincerely,

WALTER BOULDIN.

This letter raised in my mind the question of what other areas throughout the country, including my home State of Illinois, are having similar problems. Therefore, I requested of the REA a list of G. & T. loan applications pending or under study similar to the list appearing on page 50 in the Senate second urgent deficiency appropriation hearings of 1957. Furthermore, I thought it would be of interest to have these data in the RECORD so that all Members of Congress might be aware of what is being planned in their areas. However, I was unable to get this information put into the record of the hearings, even though the REA is financed by the taxpayers' money.

I feel it appropriate at this point to call attention to the Moss special subcommittee which has been engaged for the past several years in an intensive investigation into the "Availability of Information From Federal Departments and Agencies." The subcommittee issued a report on July 2, 1960—House Report No. 2084, 86th Congress, 2d session—stating in part that: "Secrecy—the first refuge of incompetence—must be at a bare minimum in a democratic society, for a fully informed public is the basis of self-government. * * *" Moreover, it will be recalled that President Kennedy made an issue in the presidential campaign on the matter of the flow of Government information and stated emphatically:

An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine and,

when necessary, to criticize, its government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy. And the President—who himself bears much of the responsibility for the preservation of American democracy—has the affirmative duty to see that the American people are kept fully informed. It is true that in today's world of peril some Government information must be kept secret—information whose publication would endanger the security of the United States. But within the rather narrow limits of national security the people of the United States are entitled to the fullest possible information about their Government—and the President must see that they receive it.

The policy of secrecy is of special significance in connection with loans for generating and transmission facilities because of the standards REA is required to apply in making such loans. According to the agency's regulations—Administrative Bulletin No. 61—G. & T. loans will only be made either, first, when no adequate and dependable source of power is available, or second, where the rates offered by existing power sources would result in a higher cost of power to the borrowers than would be the cost of power from facilities financed by REA. Unless alternative power suppliers—whether they be municipalities, public utility districts or private companies—have an opportunity to negotiate or make additional offers it cannot be assumed that the proposed loan is necessary.

Now this brings up another point which bothers me concerning the obvious intent of the REA to indulge in what might be called back-door lawmaking in its announcement of a new criterion to be added to the existing generation and transmission loan policy. In the hearings the Administrator stated that the REA was in the process of expanding its established criteria to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry.

I previously mentioned the two criteria under which the legislative history of the 1936 act permitted the REA to make generating and transmission loans. There is nothing in the 1936 act or in congressional legislative history on REA legislation or in reports in Congress or floor debate that could be interpreted in any sense of the word to make generating and transmission loans to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry. Should a major policy change like this be made, it should be done by the appropriate legislative committees of Congress, and not by agency action.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that it is important for our colleagues to realize that the institution of this so-called third criteria—when considered in connection with the subsidy to the REA through the use of 2-percent money and freedom from Federal taxation—might possibly have the effect of not merely securing "a permanent place in the American power industry," but of taking it over completely.

I think it is perhaps appropriate again to repeat the very sage advice given by our esteemed subcommittee chairman during the recent hearings when he said:

> I think that authority to make loans for power generation is very, very important. I would take issue with anybody who wished to repeal it. I do think that it is important, however, not to put the private companies out of business, but to see that they give reasonable contracts in time and in cost to their co-op customers.

He went on to say further—

> I subscribe to the fact that, since the Government has to have taxes any way you take it, the Government can't provide sound REA loans except from taxes. Those taxes are obtained from private enterprise, not from Government enterprise, or from the sale of bonds, which in turn must be predicated on tax income.

The able gentleman from Mississippi then concluded by saying:

> So I think anybody who studies it realizes that the REA—as sound and solid as it is—should not be used for the purposes of putting the private companies out of business.

Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the taxpayers of the country who must put up the money for this program, as well as in fairness to the REA, for this is creating a bad public relations picture of the REA, I bring these facts to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HOEVEN].

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity also to compliment the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for reporting what I consider to be a very good bill.

My purpose in taking the floor at this time is to give the Members of the Congress an insight into some of the glaring defects of the so-called omnibus farm bill now pending before the House Committee on Agriculture.

I want to compliment particularly my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] for disclosing some of the glaring defects in this legislation. Too little has been said about this bill which is of great importance not only to the farmers of this country but to the entire American economy.

Title I of H.R. 6400, is the most fantastic power grab ever devised by any administration in the history of our country. The Secretary of Agriculture would virtually become a one-man national legislature for agriculture. Under our concept of separation of powers as set forth in the Constitution of the United States, the Congress writes the laws and the executive branch of the Government, through the President, approves or vetoes the legislation. Under the provisions of title I of H.R. 6400, the executive branch of the Government through the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to write the law and the Congress, or legislative branch of the Government, is given the authority to approve or veto. Such procedure is a complete reversal of what the Founding Fathers of this country intended.

Proponents of the legislation contend that the Secretary of Agriculture could only present a farm program after consultation with commodity advisory committees. They say this would give farmers an effective voice—the formulation of farm programs. The truth is that the Secretary of Agriculture would select the members of the advisory committees, he could set their term of office, set the number of members, and could limit the committee's functions and even dissolve them. Furthermore, the Secretary will not be required to follow the recommendations of an advisory committee. Farmers should not be deluded into thinking they would have an effective voice in the formulation of farm programs. They would merely be rubberstamp advisers to the Secretary. The Secretary of Agriculture himself would actually write the bill. Even the referendum process provided for in title I is rigged because the Secretary can determine who will vote and who will not vote in the referendum. These tremendous grants of power would raise grave constitutional questions.

May I also point out that once a farm program is submitted to the Congress by the Secretary of Agriculture, the bill provides that it must be affirmatively rejected by the Congress within a period of 60 days after its submission. If the program is not affirmatively disapproved within the 60-day period, the program becomes law subject to a referendum. There is no provision in the bill which provides for committee hearings. The Congress would have to act on the proposal on a take-it-or-leave-it basis without any opportunity to even amend or revise the proposal. I cannot conceive of the Congress thus delegating its legislative rights and prerogatives to the Secretary of Agriculture. The Congress would completely abdicate all of its legislative authority to the executive branch of the Government, which in my opinion would be unconstitutional.

There is no limit on the amount of money which can be spent on any one or all of the possible 256 farm programs. With a great number of commodity groups acting independently, the administrative bottlenecks and Government costs would skyrocket. It is estimated that title I alone could well cost from $12 to $15 billion a year.

Farmers would lose under this bill. If they accepted the proposed programs they would be subjected to the strictest controls in history. If they turned them down, which they would not likely do, their price support would be reduced to not more than 50 percent of parity. Hence, every farmer would almost be forced to approve any program in a referendum as a matter of self-preservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank the gentlemen for yielding me additional time.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEVEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Can the gentleman from Iowa inform me as to any probability that this House or this Congress would admit that it cannot legislate on agricultural matters?

Mr. HOEVEN. I cannot conceive of the Congress of the United States abdicating its rights and prerogatives in the field of legislation; a complete reversal of our legislative process.

Probably the most fantastic single aspect of this whole bill is in regard to the Secretary's request for a "blank check" for a 1962 wheat program. H.R. 6400 allows the Secretary to handpick a wheat advisory committee for the 1962 wheat program without going through the regular selection process outlined for other crops. After he had picked this advisory committee, the Secretary would submit his new wheat plan directly to eligible wheat farmers for a referendum. The new plan would not be subject to any review, study, or amendment by Congress whatsoever. Many of us from the Corn Belt feel certain that the 1962 wheat program proposed would be the multiple-price plan endorsed by President Kennedy in last fall's campaign. This type of legislation has been resisted by the Corn Belt for many years because of its adverse effect on the feedgrain picture. I do not propose to sit idly by and let a program such as this go into effect by default as Secretary Freeman has proposed. The outcome would be quite certain under this provision because the bill sets the choice that wheat farmers would have as either the new plan or virtually nothing—that is, not more than 50 percent of parity to those wheat farmers who stay within their present allotments and no price support at all to those who fail to comply with these allotments. Needless to say, this "blank check" grant of legislative power to the Secretary raises the most serious constitutional questions as well as being a dire economic threat to the Corn Belt.

I should point out, however, that title I of H.R. 6400 is in real legislative trouble at the present time. Similar legislation last year had the same trouble. The so-called Family Farm Income Act of 1960, or Poage bill, could not even get out of committee until 251 commodities were exempted from the provisions of the bill. That bill was overwhelmingly defeated by the House in June 1960, by a vote of 236–170. Title I of H.R. 6400 which is this year's model of that same legislation is now facing the same fate.

Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle have in recent weeks been increasingly vocal in opposition to H.R. 6400. Several of my Democratic colleagues on the House Committee on Agriculture apparently cannot swallow title I in its present form.

Playing underneath the current of controversy on this bill is the avowed intention of the architects of H.R. 6400 to control American agriculture in a manner similar to that of a public utility. Farmers are now facing one of the most important decisions ever faced by American agriculture. I sincerely hope that the Congress will not abdicate its constitutional responsibilities in favor of such an unworkable plan. I urge all Members of Congress, farmers, and all citizens to study title I of H.R. 6400 carefully with the full confidence that if this is done the most effective opponent of the administration farm bill will be the administration farm bill itself.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREEDING. Mr. Chairman, I would like to comment briefly on the general farm bill. Inasmuch as some of my colleagues are critical of this legislation, I would like to have included in the RECORD the remarks of Mr. Herschel Newsom, Director of the National Grange, contained in the June 1 issue of the National Grange Letter. I consider Mr. Newsom to be one of the greatest authorities of our country on farm matters, and I believe the statements made by him on the farm bill will be helpful to all Members.

This is the kind of a Grange Letter we don't like to write—that we had hoped it would never be necessary to write.

Through its nearly 100 years of distinguished service to rural America, the Grange has earnestly striven for cooperation and the maximum possible unity in agriculture. We shall continue those efforts.

The Grange, however, never has, and does not now, compromise basic principles, or sacrifice the interests of agriculture, for the sake of unity. Nor can we continue to leave unrefuted the falsehoods and distortions by those who place their own interests above those of farmers and the Nation.

The Grange has never hesitated to consider, discuss, and debate the issues affecting American agriculture. The Grange since 1867 has defended agriculture against those who would exploit farmers. The efforts of the Grange are closely interrelated with the progress of family farmers and sound programs over the past 94 years.

When forces from within agriculture form an alliance with interests foreign to those of farmers, agricultural unity becomes less important than preservation of the basic principles of equity for American agriculture.

We believe that, in the long run, farmers will, given the facts, reject those who would mislead them, that they will make decisions which support their legitimate interests. They always have.

American agriculture is today reaping the harvest of suspicion and distrust sown in past years by those who sought, first, to discredit present programs, and then substitute their own ideas of an agriculture defenseless against those who would exploit it and force on it their ideologies.

Those efforts are more insidious by reason of the fact that some of those make them do so in the name of American farmers.

"We believe," Grange Master Herschel D. Newsom said, "that Grange responsibility does not end with a fair presentation of the facts, but that it includes the exposure of false and misleading propaganda."

Where the interests of American agriculture are involved, any other course, he said, would be a disservice to farmers and the Nation.

It is not possible within the space limitations of this letter to expose and refute all of the false propaganda being used to block enactment of progressive agricultural legislation. Some of the baseless charges being made in regard to the Agricultural Act of 1961, now before the Congress, must be refuted if sound decisions, based on facts are to be made.

Congress has wisely given both those who support and those who oppose the principles and objectives of that bill the full opportunity to be heard. That opportunity still is open to every farmer who wants to write to or talk with his Congressman.

The use of unsupported and unfounded, but inflamatory generalities, in a frantic effort to defeat improvements in farm programs is regrettable. Two paragraphs in the June issue of the Nation's Agriculture (Farm Bureau official organ) indicate the extent to which opponents of the farm bill will go into the realm of fantasy.

The statements attributed to Charles Shuman, AFBF President, are:

"Purpose of the administration omnibus farm bill is to have the Nation's food produced by docile, licensed, and properly managed farmers who would look to the political machine rather than consumer markets for determination of family income.

"Would any farmer dare risk displeasure of the multitude of Government agents and committees required to measure all crop acres and count every cow, sow, ewe, and hen in the Nation?"

A more flagrant distortion of facts would be difficult to imagine.

Any sane and objective study of the bill refutes such wild generalizations. Some of the allegations, however, are more specific, although equally unfounded. Let's look at some of those, and then at the facts.

"The omnibus bill," it is charged by some, "would force Congress to abdicate its power to enact farm legislation."

The truth is: Congress would retain intact it's responsibility to hold hearings, to approve, reject or amend any farm program proposals made by the Secretary of Agriculture and representative committees of producers.

"The bill would make the Secretary a virtual dictator over agriculture."

The truth is: It would diminish the power of the Secretary by requiring, first, congressional approval of changes in price supports, allotments, and other program changes, and secondly, a two-thirds vote would be needed before a change in programs could be made.

"The bill would force rigid controls on all producers."

The truth is: Producers of any commodity which does not have price supports or controls can remain free of controls. Any change would have to be initiated by producers, and later approved by two-thirds of them.

"The bill would add billions of dollars to the cost of farm programs."

The truth is: It would cut governmental costs for programs designed to raise farm income in direct proportion of the ability of producers to design sensible marketing agreements and tools.

"The bill would regiment farmers."

The truth is: It would encourage self-help, self-financed plans to stabilize agricultural markets. It would clear the way for fewer, not more, Government controls.

Those are only a few of the obvious distortions being made in a frantic effort to defeat enactment of reasonable and sensible farm programs. No one contends the present bill is perfect. Changes to improve it should and will be made by the agriculture committee or on the floor by Congress.

It is the responsibility of reasonable farm leaders to work for improvements, rather than seek total defeat because of imperfections. There is too much at stake to permit any other approach.

The legislative timetable for consideration of the omnibus farm bill still is indefinite. Hearings have been completed, except return appearance by Secretary Freeman before the Senate Agriculture Committee to answer charges made by opponents of the bill.

The House Agriculture Committee expects to meet next Monday in executive session to begin revisions. The rewriting is expected to take at least a week, possibly two. The Senate Agriculture Committee plans to start making revisions in a week or so.

It appears now that floor debate will begin sometime late in June. Odds are that a modified bill will be passed—but without destroying the objectives of maximum freedom of choice by producers to initiate self-help farm programs, commodity by commodity.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the members of the committee have convinced some of us that the farmers are in dire need and that they are following a pursuit, that is, farming, which apparently is unprofitable. And, I reach that conclusion because this bill is to aid the farmers, and it carries something like $5.9 billion. Certainly a group as intelligent and conservative as are the Members of the House never would advise appropriating that much money unless it was sorely needed. Farming must be a hazardous business and farmers near starvation if it takes $5.9 billion to keep them alive.

There was another matter that I thought should be called to the attention of the House. This morning the Members of Congress who come from Michigan all received a letter. It is important, because it has some bearing upon the Federal aid to education legislation which will come before us in the next 2 or 3 weeks. This letter is from the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 5461 Brush Street, Detroit.

It is as follows:

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE
FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM,
Detroit, Mich.

To Michigan Representatives THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ, GEORGE MEADER, AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, CLARE E. HOFFMAN, GERALD R. FORD, Jr., CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN, JAMES G. O'HARA, JAMES HARVEY, ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, VICTOR A. KNOX, JOHN B. BENNETT, CHARLES C. DIGGS, Jr., LOUIS C. RABAUT, JOHN D. DINGELL, JOHN LESINSKI, MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS, WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD:

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom at its annual meeting in Rochester, Mich., on May 27, 1961, has passed the following resolution:

The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom of Michigan will continue in its efforts to abolish the House Committee on Un-American Activities because:

1. In the case of *United States* v. *Watkins* the U.S. Supreme Court made it clear that the HUAC misused its powers in unconstitutional ways and had become an agency for repression.

2. The mandate given the HUAC is contrary to democratic traditions. The Supreme Court has upheld the Congress' legality in creating the committee, but the Congress is not bound to continue it.

3. The committee acts with powers and under immunities that even police and public prosecutors do not have.

4. Huge appropriations given to the HUAC are wasted because its occasional legitimate functions belong more properly and effectively to other, older standing committees. The committee encroaches upon the jurisdiction of other governmental agencies including police, justice departments, and the courts without producing the results of these agencies. The HUAC investigations have resulted in no important convictions in the years of its existence nor in the proposals for any legislation.

5. It has used legislative investigation to disgrace, harass, and abridge the freedom of Americans, many of whom have been working for racial equality and justice. Secret witnesses and sources, defamation, denying due process of law have been the committee's methods of "investigation." Its use of deliberately distorted film in the guise of combating communism is reprehensible.

6. The committee is as dangerous to our country as what it investigates. The news of its activities when it reaches other countries discredits our democratic ideals at this time when we need to reassert our confidence in democracy.

Sincerely,
NANCY FOWLER (Mrs. Don E.),
State Legislative Committee,
Michigan Branch.

The purpose is to abolish the Committee on Un-American Activities. Permit me to quote again a part of No. 6.

The committee is as dangerous to our country as what it investigates.

They are referring to the Committee on Un-American Activities. We have a Michigan man on that committee, Mr. JOHANSEN, from the Third District. It is the committee of which Mr. WALTER, our very patriotic, able, and distinguished colleague is chairman. This organization insists that that committee should be abolished because it is doing more harm than the Communists.

Thinking that over, you recall that we are to have Federal aid to education. It occurred to me that inasmuch as this letter makes that statement, and inasmuch as all but six of the Members of the House, 431 of the 437, voted to sustain the committee, and we voted every dollar the committee wanted for its work in order to enable it to operate, does it not follow, and I come to the conclusion the ladies reach is that Members of the House are either ignorant or disloyal because if the committee on Un-American Activities is doing that kind of job, doing more to ruin our country, our form of Government, and destroy it, than the Communists, there must be something wrong with our thinking.

Then thinking along down the line I began to wonder whether the committee that sponsored this letter knew what they were writing about, because did we not a month or two ago, all but six of us, as I said, vote to sustain that committee? Are they not a little late? Are they up to date with what they are trying to do? I would not criticize them because they do not apparently know that the Supreme Court Monday sustained the anti-Communist legislation that has been before the Court so long.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. They did not ask for abolishment of the Supreme Court, did they?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Not this organization, no. They praised the Chief Justice and some of his colleagues. But my mail is overwhelmingly in favor of impeaching Justice Warren. This committee is on the other side of that question. They think more of the commies than of us. Democrats from Detroit please note—this committee which wrote you is one of your chicks or chickens. The gentleman from Iowa, I am sure, is not intimating that the Supreme Court should be educated? He did not have that in mind?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. At once as is usual I answered, writing to Mrs. C. E. Woodruff, who, with a covering letter, sent on the quoted communication. I wrote:

JUNE 6, 1961.

Mrs. C. E. WOODRUFF,
State Legislative Chairman and Chairman of Resolutions, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Detroit, Mich.

DEAR MRS. WOODRUFF: Thanks for your recent form letter, enclosing a copy of the resolution adopted by the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, calling for the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and citing your reasons.

In the sixth reason, you state, "the committee is as dangerous to our country as what it investigates."

In my opinion—and I have had 26 years' experience here—you couldn't show greater ignorance of what the committee has done than by that statement. Since the committee was first created, it has received overwhelming support in the House, which leads me to the conclusion that you either do not know what you are writing about, or, you have reached the conclusion that House Members (and I think the last time, there were only 6 out of 437 who opposed the committee) lack either good judgment or patriotism.

The thought occurs to me that perhaps your members should do a little research, a little sound, patriotic thinking. I assume your motives are patriotic, and am extremely sorry you have reached such erroneous conclusions.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

And here is a pertinent editorial from next Saturday's Evening Post:

RED ADVANCES SPARK A MODEST CONSERVATIVE REVIVAL

Despite all the hoop-la, including pickets, full-page advertisements in newspapers, student riots in colleges and solemn declamations by some of our more naive professors, the backers of "Operation Abolition," designed to end the House Committee on Un-American Activities, managed to corral only six votes. Even Representative JIMMY ROOSEVELT, of California, who started out as the sponsor of the abolition movement, finally settled for an effort to curtail the

committee's appropriation. That didn't get anywhere either.

Those who expected some other result have overlooked symptoms at the grassroots, which Members of Congress, perhaps even including JIMMY ROOSEVELT, have been quick to detect—a quiet but unmistakable impatience with politicians and others who, for whatever reason appeals to them, object to investigations of the Communist conspiracy. For one thing, there has been a shift in college and university opinion. Young conservatives are no longer sneered at—anyway not so often.

On the literary front, Allen Drury's novel, "Advise and Consent" (Doubleday), which suggests that liberal statesmen can play some pretty dirty pool, is doing a land-office business; and in New York the play based on Mr. Drury's book has been a sellout. Rumors that the play might be toned down because liberals didn't like it were emphatically blown down by Mr. Drury. John Dos Passos' exciting novel "Midcentury" (Houghton, Mifflin), in which the tyranny of some labor unions over their own members is dramatically portrayed, is another best seller. A few years back, books like these would have been hard to come by in many bookstores if you didn't know the manager.

In several universities conservative student magazines have appeared. An impressive representative of this new group is "Analysis," published by students at the University of Pennsylvania. The writers in the first issue of "Analysis" are not all students. Prof. A. H. Hobbs of the sociology department is a contributor. The students, however, dissect their ideas with freshness and frankness and without invective like that credited to a member of Students for Democratic Action who declared that student conservatives displayed "the social conscience of a Hitler, a Stalin or a BARRY GOLDWATER."

In JIMMY ROOSEVELT's own State an interesting movement recently got into orbit, launched at the outset by Walter A. Wolford, city clerk of San Gabriel. Mr. Wolford first persuaded his city council to adopt a resolution citing the peril of Communist infiltration and urging "rededication of all loyal Americans to the principles and ideals of our Founding Fathers." He then formed a committee which put on a mass meeting, the main feature of which was the showing of "Operation Abolition," the documentary moving picture of last year's riots against the Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco. The place was packed. Since then a score of California communities have taken similar action.

Mr. Wolford insists that his idea is not to promote "witch hunting" or merely to make people angry. The program he advocated includes education, with special emphasis on seeing to it that public libraries and school libraries have reliable books on the history, ideology and purposes of communism. Whatever comes of this particular effort, it represents a straw in the wind which Members of Congress undoubtedly felt blowing strongly when they voted on the resolution to put an end to the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Of course, the battle isn't over. Queer characters still appear on college campuses sponsored by "liberal" groups. Nevertheless, as the response to City Clerk Wolford's crusade suggests, America seems to be catching on.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the Agriculture Subcommittee, referred to the addition of a third criterion to be used by REA in considering a generating and transmission loan as "back-door lawmaking." The REA, by unilateral administrative action, has proposed to use its authority to grant such loans "to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry." I believe he expressed the opinion that if REA wants to change the basic authority of its act, it should come to Congress and go through the proper procedures as do other agencies of Government. I would like to add a lusty "Amen" to the gentleman's statement. If Congress sits complacently by and allows bureaucrats to pervert the body of existing law to suit their own questionable ends, then we might as well close up shop and go home.

I have before me now a speech made by the REA Administrator on June 5 before the New Mexico Rural Electric Cooperative Association at Albuquerque. The speech says the so-called third criterion has already been put in force.

This criterion is an attempt to take out all stops in making loans for generation and transmission facilities. This in spite of the fact that there is nothing in the legislative history of the 1936 REA Act or in subsequent reports of Congress or floor debate that could be interpreted in any sense of the word to permit REA to stretch generating and transmission criteria "to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry." As a matter of fact, REA was made permanent by Congress in 1944, and it had nothing to do with G. & T. loans.

It should be recalled that during the Senate debate on the 1936 act there was much controversy raised on the Senate floor as to the advisability of giving REA any right whatsoever to construct generating plants. Senator George Norris, generally considered one of the fathers of REA, clarified the discussion by placing in the RECORD a memorandum from Morris Cooke, then Administrator of the temporary REA agency, as to the conditions under which such loans could be made. The Cooke memorandum set forth the basic criteria which were to be followed in making a generating loan. They were: First, energy was not available from any existing source, second, a plant could produce energy at lower costs than it could be obtained from any other source, and third, the output would be used mainly for supplying rural areas.

It did not take REA very long to use "back-door lawmaking," changing generation and transmission criteria to permit loans to be made when in REA's opinion no adequate, dependable source of supply was available to meet the borrower's needs, or where the rate offered by existing power sources would result in higher cost of power to borrowers than the cost of facilities financed by REA. Note the broadness of the change. Eliminated from it was the primary condition of the first criterion that power was not available from any other source. Also note the elimination of the words "and the output would be used mainly for supplying rural areas." It was revised so the generation and transmission criteria would take on a competitive rate element rather than a means of getting power out into unelectrified areas. However, this first administrative change at least stuck somewhat to the original legislative intent of the act as it was limited to cost and supply of wholesale power.

But to guarantee the cooperative device a permanent place in the American power industry has nothing whatsoever to do with the specific problems of rates or service, even though the Administrator has tried to stretch it by claiming they need it to assure fair power contracts. The words of the third criterion are so broad and nebulous an REA Administrator could approve virtually any G. & T. loan under any conditions irrespective of the actual need and certainly irrespective of the availability or the price of power from an alternative source.

In addition, the Administrator in this very same speech states they are going to broaden the use of section 5 loans. This type loan was made available to REA borrowers in the 1936 act to finance the wiring of the premises of people in rural areas and to acquire and install electrical and plumbing appliances and equipment. Now, through back-door lawmaking or the back-door legislating, whichever you care to call it, the REA is trying to expand this section of the act so co-ops can use section 5 loans to finance the purchase and installation of electric-powered machines and equipment in factories and commercial establishments in their service areas.

In other words, REA is now getting completely away from the original purpose of the act and is becoming what might be termed a rural power company. And these rural power companies will use 2-percent money and the other subsidies we are giving them to lure industry right out of your towns and cities into rural areas.

Congress enacted the area development bill last month because it apparently believed it would help depressed areas. But, now we find the Agriculture Department, by administrative fiat, has set up through its rural development program a community facilities program where the Department will lend money in any rural area to develop industry and to take business, irrespective of whether the area is depressed or not.

As the gentleman from Illinois stated, this is all being done through back-door lawmaking. It is not being done through Congress. REA is an outstanding example of how a government agency makes its own "back door" law through the issuance of policy statements. If it desires to stretch its authority just a bit to accomplish an objective not covered by its basic act, it issues a statement or a legal opinion to carry out its plan and then at some convenient time tells a congressional committee of its action. Unless REA is specifically overruled by Congress then it goes forward with this new policy as though it were the law of the land. If at a later date there are objections, REA contends that it has notified a committee of Congress and Congress' failure to take action authorizes this activity. This holds true even

though a vast majority of our Members may never have known of REA's action until some complaint occurs long after the policy has been put into effect. Criticism of this back-door legislative tactic acknowledges the fact that Congress cannot write legislation that does not require some interpretation by the administering agency, but REA presents a case in point where this type of activity is a rule rather than the exception.

I want to repeat there is nothing in any act of Congress that would permit REA to expand its duties as it has done in the case of the expanding of G. & T. and section 5 loan criteria. These are not the only cases in which REA has followed this tactic, just the current ones. If REA desires to do these things; if they want to build generating plants just for the sake of building generating plants; if they want to build industries out in the rural areas just for the sake of building industries, then they should come here and get the permission of Congress and not try to do it through the back door.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I listened intently to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SANTANGELO] when he spoke earlier this afternoon, and to others from the metropolitan areas who have said they support this bill and who support farm legislation generally. I am not questioning their sincerity for one moment; I can understand why they do, and that is because under the farm programs that we have today the food basket is being heavily subsidized to consumers in the cities. Without this farm program the price of food would eventually be considerably higher to the consumers in the metropolitan areas. So, while I do not for one moment question the sincerity of their statements, they have a real interest in this farm legislation on behalf of their consumers.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

Seventy-one Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. May a Member of the minority be recognized for a motion to adjourn?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this stage of the proceedings. The Chair has directed that the roll be called.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 69]

Adair	Conte	Fallon
Beermann	Cramer	Farbstein
Bennett, Mich.	Daniels	Fascell
Blitch	Davis, Tenn.	Fino
Boggs	Derwinski	Fogarty
Boland	Diggs	Ford, Jr.
Brooks, La.	Dominick	Grant
Buckley	Downing	Gray
Celler	Evins	Green, Pa.
Halleck	Mason	Saund
Hardy	Miller,	Sheppard
Harrison, Va.	George P.	Sikes
Hébert	Morrison	Smith, Miss.
Henderson	O'Brien, N.Y.	Spence
Herlong	O'Konski	Springer
Hosmer	O'Neill	Thomas
Kearns	Passman	Utt
Kilburn	Pilcher	Walter
Kirwan	Pirnie	Williams
Kluczynski	Rains	Willis
Knox	Roberts	
Machrowicz	St. Germain	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 371 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did the gentleman ask for this quorum call?

Mr. GROSS. No, no, not this one.

Mr. Chairman, when the quorum call was made, I was at the point of asking the chairman of the subcommittee a question or two concerning the bill. Do I understand there are two airplanes in this bill for the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. The Department of Agriculture has these planes that are used in spraying for the control of the various insects, and that is by far the most economical way to deal with these pests. But insofar as any personal use of these planes is involved, there is none.

Mr. GROSS. Neither of these planes is for the personal use of the Secretary?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. These are strictly planes to be used in spraying?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. If the gentleman will permit me to make an announcement at this time for the benefit of our colleagues, I want the Members to know that general debate is about to conclude and we will start reading the bill when the gentleman from Iowa has concluded. I expect to take 1 minute on this side. I thank the gentleman from Iowa for yielding to me to make that statement.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. May I ask the gentleman from Mississippi if there is any representation allowance in this bill other than the $30,000 appropriation to be found on page 16 of the bill?

Mr. WHITTEN. That allowance is for the agricultural attachés who, as the gentleman knows, are our representatives in various foreign countries and who are a part of our embassies. They have their obligations along with our other representatives. The total amount here is only $30,000.

Mr. GROSS. That is quite some contrast to the allowance of $925,000 for the State Department. I suppose we treat Agriculture differently than the State Department in this respect.

I will say to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I am not going to offer an amendment to strike out the $30,000, for the reason that I offered an amendment to the State Department appropriation bill to strike out some $400,000 for liquor and entertainment and got nowhere on that; so I do not believe I would get very much support on the $30,000.

I believe the report indicates that there was a 5 million increase in foreigners coming into this country last year. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. Those are the figures that were provided to us.

Mr. GROSS. And the House passed a bill not long ago authorizing the appropriation of a substantial sum of money to promote foreign tourists coming to this country. Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is my recollection.

Mr. GROSS. Now we find it necessary to appropriate additional money in this bill to take care of any diseases that may be imported by these foreigners. Is that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. That is one way of expressing it. The money is for additional inspectors to inspect baggage and other things that may be brought in by visitors, to this country or our citizens returning from abroad.

Mr. GROSS. If the tourist promotion bill is successful it will means still greater appropriations for inspections will it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. We certainly will, because just one disease might cost us millions of dollars.

Mr. GROSS. It is a good deal like the farm program where money is spent to take land out of production while spending with the other out of Federal funds to increase production. Then there is the added cost of taking care of the surplus. So we are going around Robin Hood's barn.

Will the gentleman agree with me that that is the situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly we are in some sort of vicious cycle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTOYA. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, a question. I note in title I

under subparagraph head entitled "Special Funds," page 4 of the printed bill, there is provided $1 million for a special contingencies fund for research. Also the committee report on page 8 contains an outline of possible purposes for which this fund may be used. In the West for years we have been faced with progressive infestation of our streams and water by what is known as phreatophytes. Some means for the eradication of this menace is sorely needed.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to pose this question to the subcommittee chairman: Is it the gentleman's understanding that any part of this appropriation item may be used for this type of research by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from New Mexico, I think he is looking at a special fund which is for a different purpose. However, included in the bill is an extra $1 million for a contingency fund which was set up for the purpose of meeting the type of situation the gentleman describes. Personally, I am not familiar with the gentleman's problem; but it is that type of thing that we have tried to make provision for. The way it is in this bill, it is a matter within their discretion based upon the circumstances.

Mr. MONTOYA. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, including administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, $76,558,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C 113a): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may sell the Entomology Research Laboratory at Orlando, Florida, in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as he deems advantageous and the proceeds of such sale shall remain available until expended for the establishment of an entomology research laboratory: *Provided further*, That in the establishment of such laboratory the Secretary may acquire land therefor by donation or exchange;

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FISHER, Texas: Page 3, line 20, change the semicolon to a colon and add the following: *"Provided further*, That the Secretary may acquire approximately thirty-five acres of land at Kerrville, Texas, by donation, for research purposes;"

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply authorizes the donation of 35 acres of land to the Department of Agriculture for use by the Entomology Research Station located at Kerrville, Tex.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, approved February 29, 1936, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g–590(o), 590p(a), and 590q), including not to exceed $6,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $238,000,000, to remain available until December 31 of the next succeeding fiscal year for compliance with the program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices authorized under this head in the Department of Agriculture and Farm Credit Administration Appropriation Act, 1961, carried out during the period July 1, 1960, to December 31, 1961, inclusive: *Provided*, That not to exceed $29,100,000 of the total sum provided under this head shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses for carrying out such program, the cost of aerial photographs, however, not to be charged to such limitation; but not more than $5,750,000 shall be transferred to the appropriation account "Administrative expenses, section 392, Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938": *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used to pay the salaries or expenses of any regional information employees or any State information employees, but this shall not preclude the answering of inquiries or supplying of information at the county level to individual farmers: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with the formulation and administration of the 1962 program of soil-building and soil- and water-conserving practices, under the Act of February 29, 1936, as amended (amounting to $250,000,000, including administration, and no participant shall receive more than $2,500, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community): *Provided further*, That no change shall be made in such 1962 program which will have the effect in any county of restricting eligibility requirements or cost-sharing on practices included in either the 1958 or the 1959 programs, unless such change shall have been recommended by the county committee and approved by the State committee: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the 1962 agricultural conservation program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the agricultural conservation program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the 1962 program $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out agricultural conservation practices and $1,000,000 shall be available for conservation practices related directly to flood prevention work in approved watersheds: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other farming material, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out farming practices approved by the Secretary under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That no part of any funds available to the Department, or any bureau, office, corporation, or other agency constituting a part of such Department, shall be used in the current fiscal year for the payment of salary or travel expenses of any person who has been convicted of violating the Act entitled "An Act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, or who has been found in accordance with the provisions of title 18, United States Code, section 1913, to have violated or attempted to violate such section which prohibits the use of Federal appropriations for the payment of personal services or other expenses designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose any legislation or appropriation by Congress except upon request of any Member or through the proper official channels.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 19, line 24, after the word "to" strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000".

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would reduce the $250 million for the agriculture conservation program in the appropriation bill to the $150 million requested by the Kennedy administration. As reduced, it would still be $50 million more than the $100 million requested in President Eisenhower's budget of January 16, 1961.

I am proud of the achievements of the ACP insofar as genuine soil conservation is concerned—stripcropping, terracing, contour plowing, tree planting, and the like. But increasingly a large part of ACP has been devoted to subsidizing practices which have little to do with permanently conserving our soil, but are primarily aimed at getting more production per acre.

The Kennedy administration's $150 million budget request is ample for the legitimate conservation activities of ACP. Keeping the budget request at this level, and rejecting the extra $100 million which the Committee on Appropriations has tacked onto it, will enable the ACP to do its intended job, and cut out the waste.

My amendment will force the ACP to curtail two of its present programs which are related primarily to expanded production, rather than to real soil conservation.

The first such wasteful program involves governmental subsidies of $70 million or more a year for fertilizer, largely lime, and rock phosphate. Much of this is applied on flat land, where there is no erosion, and simply results in larger crops per acre. The taxpayer then has to pay for the price-support program on these overproduced crops, costing billions of dollars every year. He then pays a third time in higher food prices.

The fertilizer manufacturers, of course, are all in favor of this multi-million-dollar subsidy. In fact, the main witness who testified for adding another $100 million to the Kennedy administration's $150 million budget request was Robert M. Koch, who is president of the National Limestone Institute—hearings, part 3, pages 21–23.

The second such wasteful program is the subsidized program of draining farm wetlands, which has cost the taxpayers $16 or more million every year.

Like the fertilizer program, it results in more crops per acre, higher price supports, and higher food prices.

But the farm drainage program has caused harm over and beyond the waste of taxpayers' money. As a result of the Government-subsidized drainage of valuable wetlands, particularly in the prairie pothole region of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, more than one-third of the valuable wetlands where wild ducks and geese nest and rest have been drained in recent years. As a result, the Department of the Interior estimates that if the drainage movement continues, our continental supply of ducks and geese will go the way of the passenger pigeon.

You have the ridiculous spectacle of the U.S. Government, through the Department of Agriculture, paying farmers to drain their potholes, and the Department of the Interior then paying farmers again to flood the drained potholes so that they will once more support waterfowl.

All of this drainage is done in the name of conservation. Madame Roland deprecated the excesses of the French Revolution by saying, "O liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name." One might say the same thing of some of the conservation administered by the agriculture conservation program.

The efforts of myself and others to end federally subsidized drainage of wetlands valuable for wildlife have so far come to nothing. Bills I introduced in the last two Congresses to forbid federally subsidized drainage of wetlands where wildlife preservation would be seriously harmed died without a hearing.

The Department of Agriculture made a so-called agreement on May 2, 1960, to listen to the Department of the Interior before going ahead with subsidizing farm drainage which would hurt wildlife. Mr. Chairman, during the first period under this agreement for which we have a record, the period July 1–December 31, 1960, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior reports that the Department of Agriculture went right ahead and subsidized drainage in 77 percent of the 553 cases recommended by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for denial of financial assistance for drainage.

The full report of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife follows:

A total of 1,863 wetland areas, for which farmers had requested assistance for drainage, were inspected between July 1 and December 31, 1960. These areas were located within six counties in South Dakota, three counties in Minnesota, and three counties in North Dakota.

The Soil Conservation Service need and practicability surveys revealed that 234 (13 percent) of the wetland areas were not qualified for drainage assistance. Of the 1,639 wetlands qualified for drainage assistance 553 areas (34 percent) had significant wildlife values and Bureau biologists recommended their conservation. The ASC county committees denied drainage assistance for 128 wetland areas. This was 23 percent of the areas the Bureau recommended for conservation. However, 23 percent of the wetland areas denied Federal assistance for drainage were drained privately in South Dakota and Minnesota. Surveys to determine the extent of such private drainage have not been completed in North Dakota.

Considering both the private and federally assisted drainage, 11 percent of the wetland areas the Bureau recommended for conservation were saved in South Dakota and Minnesota.

The ASC county committees approved assistance for the draining of 93 potholes whose owners expressed interest in our acquisition program in Minnesota and South Dakota.

Data are being compiled to show the number of acres of wetlands saved as a result of the inspection program. This information should be available in about a month.

When drainage data for the calendar year 1960 have been collected and analyzed for all 89 prairie pothole counties, probably in April or early May of 1961, it will be possible to compare the trend of drainage in the 12 pilot counties with the trend in the 77 remaining counties for calendar years 1959 and 1960 to give a better measure of the effectiveness of the inspection program.

The attached table is a current, cumulative summary of the ACP 247 drainage referral inspection program in 12 pilot counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota.

Cumulative summary inspection of ACP 247 drainage referrals in 12 pilot counties in North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota

	South Dakota	North Dakota	Minnesota	Total
1. Number of wetland areas which SCS said qualified for assistance for drainage	339	1,000	300	1,639
2. Number of wetland areas which SCS said did not qualify for drainage assistance	108	100	26	234
3. Number of SCS qualified wetlands FWS recommended saving	148	234	171	553
4. Number of SCS qualified wetlands FWS did not recommend saving	191	856	29	1,076
5. Number of SCS qualified wetlands FWS recommended saving for which ASC committees denied drainage assistance including appealed cases	42	84	2	128
6. Number of wetlands listed in item 5 which were drained privately	8	(1)	2	
7. Number of wetlands actually saved (item 5 minus item 6)	34	(1)	0	
8. Number of wetlands in which farmer was interested in our acquisition program	80	0	4	93

[1] Incomplete.

Here is the resolution on drainage adopted by the National Wildlife Federation at its 25th annual convention, Washington, D.C., March 2–5, 1961:

Whereas the United States of America continues to be plagued by so-called surpluses of some agricultural products and we, the National Wildlife Federation, being dedicated to preservation of natural resources, cannot see any logical reason for removing an important resource, our soil, from a state of natural protection: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government or any State or any subdivision thereof discontinue the practice of financing any drainage of wet lands either by direct subsidy or by loan or by free technical assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation commend the President of the United States for his statement to the Congress wherein he directed the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture to resolve the conflicts between agencies "Namely, one department paying to have wet lands drained for agricultural purposes while another is purchasing such lands for wildlife or waterfowl refuges."

The National Wildlife Federation heartily endorses the President's directive to the executive branch of the Federal Government and respectfully requests Congress to enact such legislation as is necessary to eliminate the drainage of wet lands with the aid of Federal subsidy and acquire or otherwise reserve the necessary habitat to provide a stable continental waterfowl population.

The Kennedy administration's $150 million request will permit the real conservation job to be done.

I ask all Members who are interested in economy in Government, and in conserving our natural resources, to support the Eisenhower-Kennedy budget request by supporting this amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I think the gentleman recognizes that the Fish and Wildlife Subcommittee has just reported a bill to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries which would cure, in part, some of the problems by accelerating the acquisition of these wet lands and stopping them from going into production of additional surplus crops.

Mr. REUSS. Yes. That is a splendid bill, and I commend the gentleman for his leadership in reporting that out of the subcommittee. But how ironic it is that we are embarking on an accelerated program of using taxpayers' money to buy wet lands at the same time that we are using taxpayers' money to drain wet lands.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. A few moments ago I made the same point, that money is spent to drain these lands, put them into production, and then pay to take care of the surpluses grown on the land. Let us keep a reasonable amount of this land in its present state and bring it into production when it is needed, and it will be needed some day.

Mr. REUSS. I think the gentleman has spoken well. That would be the best

kind of a soil bank. Meanwhile, the people of this country who love the outdoors would have some use of it.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, would not the gentleman's amendment somewhat cutback the use of lime rock, which increases production and is a form of subsidy?

Mr. REUSS. Yes. The administrations of both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have felt that there is too much use of subsidized fertilizers, such as lime rock, and this amendment would cut out some of the abuses there. There would be plenty left for all legitimate conservation purposes.

Mr. PELLY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has discussed with us several times the problem he has in his area in regard to wet lands and the interests that they have in the breeding of ducks in those wet lands. I am in accord with his desires, and we have requested the department to cooperate fully. They assured us this year that they would meet with the Department of the Interior and try their best to solve the problem that the gentleman points out.

Now, let us look at the merits of this thing. This bill carries lots of money, as I have pointed out. But, my friends, I do not know of anything in this Nation that is a better investment than the agricultural conservation program. More than a million farmers put up $2 for each one that the Federal Government puts up in conservation practices scattered all over the United States.

In spite of our efforts, not only through this but through every other means, the record shows that the amount of erosion of topsoil into our rivers and harbors each year exceeds the volume of earth dug from the Panama Canal.

There is nobody in this Congress that is more disturbed about the national debt and inflation than I. But, as I pointed out in making a motion to override the veto of the public works bill a few years ago, nothing of local, national, or international interest is more important than to leave our children a good, sound country with the soil protected and erosion stopped.

The gentleman has had this argument and we have tried to resolve it. But if you are going to have this program, the cost of administering a $150 million program would be just as high as if you carried the $250 million. We have had the $250 million for some time. I think we would get far more good from a soil conservation program if we carried it on at a consistent level.

The practices are selected by the farmer himself. He selects the practice where he is willing to put up a dollar and his own labor. It means in the areas where there are minerals lacking in the soil that the farmer selects the mineral that he feels is worth the dollar he contributes and his labor.

I say again, this is a program where 1 million participants put up an equal amount of money with the Government and supply their labor. Do not take a step back. I hope you will vote the amendment down and go along with this program. I assure the gentleman from Wisconsin I will cooperate as fully as I know how in trying to get his problem resolved. If the gentleman will read the hearings, he will find that we have the assurance of the Department of Agriculture that they will cooperate.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin has clearly exposed his interest in this amendment. It is not merely aimed at reducing the ACP practices. He is trying to damage my area. I resent the gentleman's trying to say to the House of Representatives that the rights of the duck hunters from Milwaukee should take precedence over the rights of my farmers in western Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Iowa. The farmers of this area want to be able to get the excess water off their farms. I think the gentleman ought to be ashamed of himself for taking the back-door way. His amendment is not going to have anything to do with wet lands. He would not try to take away the $100 million, because he knows that would be legislation on an appropriation bill. So I say to my good friend from Wisconsin that he has been in here every year as long as I can remember trying to do damage to my part of the country. He is trying to help his duck hunters at the expense of my farmers. He should go to the legislative committee and try to get legislation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. I will not yield to the gentleman because I know I cannot convince him and he cannot convince me.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is not often that I come to the well of the House and oppose any amendment designed to save our Government some money, but there is such a thing as being pennywise and pound foolish.

If we adopt this amendment and delete this money from the agricultural limestone program, we will be doing exactly that—saving what actually represents a mere pittance, when compared to the massive outlays of money for every conceivable purpose, at the expense of our God-given and irreplaceable soil. We would be saving only a few pennies per taxpayer while opening the door for millions of dollars of soil damage and paving the way for the loss of land that cannot be replaced in the future with dollars.

We will also strike a blow at a program which does what I have advocated since coming to the Congress in 1940 and that is helping the farmer help himself.

Money spent on the agricultural limestone program is, in a way, a fulfillment of the obligation we owe to prosperity. If there is any obligation we owe to posterity more than that of conserving our God-given soil, I do not know what it might be.

With our great increases in population comes the necessity for feeding ever-growing numbers.

The old Chinaman once told his young son, "Hold onto this half acre of land because God will not make any more." We had better follow this advice, because that man was right—God is not going to make any more soil. We are going to need it. It does not belong to us. We are just tenants of the earth. We owe it to posterity to take care of it, and to leave it as good as or better than we found it.

In my opinion, and I have studied this problem for many years, there is nothing that would do more to destroy the earth than to stop the agricultural limestone program which helps establish roots in the soil and keeps it from washing down into the brooks, creeks, and rivers. It has saved and will save millions of dollars that would otherwise be necessary for flood control. By holding the soil in place, by stopping runoff and erosion, it keeps stream beds from being filled up and it lessens the possibility of floods.

Now, I believe that my recommendation to defeat this amendment might lose now, but when we go back to the House there will be a separate record vote on the amendment to delete money from this program and it will be defeated. Those who support this amendment will be saying, in effect, that they are indifferent to the good created by this program, that they are callous to the desires of farmers who are preserving our soil and making it better for posterity.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think it would be most unwise for the House to reduce the level of the conservation program. We have had a good program in this particular area for several years and I do not think it should be disturbed. The program has worked well year in and year out both under Democratic and Republican administrations. I think it is in the overall best interests of the country. I urge the defeat of the amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this debate is getting warm. I agree with the gentleman from Indiana, my very good friend [Mr. WILSON] that we should conserve the soil. But, what good would that land be to anyone if we did not have water on it? We would have another dust storm. We all remember those days when for lack of water the soil blew over the fences and farms were abandoned—sure, we all do. It is not very often that I find myself in support of anything that comes from the other side—usually, because it is not very beneficial to our people—just another spending measure. But, in this particular case, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], I think, is right. If the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] will excuse me for differing with him, permit me to share part of the shame and disgrace which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN]

intimated was due to be loaded upon the shoulders of our friend from Wisconsin because he offered an amendment to save $1 million. I would like to help to divide his burden of disgrace which our colleague so graciously said he should bear. Everyone knows we have been appropriating a great deal of money to build ponds on the farms. What for? For water—sure—to conserve the land as well as water.

The gentleman from Wisconsin said why with one hand drain every damp spot and with the other dig ponds, dams, to hold water, prevent floods? We spend millions to conserve water—our supply is in danger we are told. Then out of the same fund we speed the flow of water to the oceans. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is right about this, and I am sorry—oh, I am so sorry—you have no idea how grief bears me down to find myself doing something which the gentleman from Minnesota says will hurt the farmer—benefit future generations. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSEN] how much do the duck hunters, those lazy fellows he berated pay in for licenses and how much do the fishermen pay in for licenses; and how much have we spent; and how much will we spend to build dams to create lakes to conserve water? On a little piece of sand that I own, I put a pond. Why? Because we wanted to hold some water there. Millions of others do the same as do the States and the good old United States of America. Farmers pump some of this stored water over on the land and grow watermelons and canteloupes and all kinds of garden trucks. It was helpful. My heart certainly goes out to the farmers that the gentleman from Minnesota represents and in anguished tones cries for on every possible occasion. To hear him you might get the idea that every individual who was not a farmer or a farm corporation in that great and glorious State was some kind of odious creature. To hear him talk you would think we were taking the shirts right off the backs of the farmers and giving them to some dirty duck hunters or fishermen—a new breed of inferiors who should be shot if they did not own a farm and draw subsidy.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I rise at this time to speak to my colleagues who represent city areas so that they may have the benefit of information which we have so that they can properly evaluate this amendment. We have assurances that this pothole situation will not take place. The Department of Agriculture is going to work with the Department of the Interior so that this bad situation will not be repeated. But, this particular program is good for the people in the cities who need good water. It is a program that is closely connected and related to the water supply situation in our city of New York as well as the State of New York. These soil conservation practices preserve the land keep water from running off as a result we can get good fresh drinking water in the city of New York and other big cities. If we do not protect the land areas of our Nation, the people who depend on this program to safeguard their supply of potable water will find themselves in a mess. This is no time to be pennywise and pound foolish. I strongly urge the committee to defeat this amendment.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, not very often do I come to the well of the House to talk in favor of an amendment which would make this size cut in the budget. I think my good friends, at least one of whom said that we are going to cut out a valuable program, and some of my other colleagues on the Appropriations Committee may, perhaps, have failed to tell the House the full story because of lack of time to debate this matter properly. But, let me say this. The last administration recommended $100 million for this program. The present administration recommended $150 million for this program. The agriculture subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations in its generosity put $250 million in this program which is over $100 million more than was requested and over $100 million more than the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of the Budget and the administration say can properly be spent for this program. We are told that this ACP program preserves water. My good friend, the gentleman from Michigan, who preceded me, pointed out that on the one hand we are draining and on the other hand we are building ponds. The $150 million will build a lot of ponds. The $150 million will buy a lot of phosphate. The $150 million will buy an awful lot of lime to improve the land. This is the amount left by the amendment.

We were told that the Department of Agriculture was going to get together with the Department of the Interior and try to solve this problem of drainage of waterfowl habitat.

I have been in Congress for a long time, and others here much longer. We have had this agriculture problem for a long time, but I have not seen any signs that the Department of Agriculture has solved a single major problem it has had in its hands since it has been there. If the money provided is not sufficient to meet its needs they can come back for more next fiscal year, we can always give them more, but as it stands now it is just a form of largesse, a form of waste, a form of squandering the taxpayers' substance and taxpayers' money; and I say that if this House of Representatives today votes this extra $100 million we can go home and look our taxpayers in the eye and say "I was a party to waste; we wasted, we shot, we blew $100 million of your money in a program which goes far beyond the needs of the country."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to say to the members of the committee that the Department of Agriculture requested $250 million, which was the same level we have had heretofore. In checking the matter, I have been unable to find any possible reason for the reduction to $150 million; I have not had anybody from the Budget Bureau or anyone from the Department justify this.

It seems to be something of an accident rather than a real intent of those in control. May I also say that this is the announcement of next year's program. It is not in the money to pay for the present year's program. If you adopt the amendment it will reduce the program for next year.

I repeat, Secretary Freeman of the Department of Agriculture requested that $250 million and made a very strong case to our committee on the basis that we should keep it on an even keel. To adopt this amendment would be to help defeat the very purpose for which we devised the program.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I believe the amendment should be defeated.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REUSS) there were—ayes 107, noes 65.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REUSS: On page 20, line 4, after the colon, strike out all through the end of line 9.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment becomes necessary in order fully to effectuate the amendment which the Committee of the Whole House has just seen fit, wisely in my opinion, to adopt. It would strike out language on page 20, lines 4 to 9, which says in effect that the county committee can have the absolute voice over whether a given practice can or cannot be followed.

I know that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], takes the view that this language does not inhibit the Department of Agriculture from cutting down on certain practices, but the language on its face seems to do so; therefore, in order to permit the Department of Agriculture fully to comply with the amendment which has just been adopted, which amendment cut down the appropriation to the $150 million requested by the administration, it is necessary to delete the language which is at issue in the amendment now before the House.

Before I yield back my time, I should like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for his very cooperative efforts over the years to get the Department of Agriculture to get rid of some of the excesses in connection with its farm drainage program. It has been through no fault of the gentleman from Mississippi that the Department of Agriculture finds itself subject to the criticism which it so much deserves. The only way, however, in which the Department can be induced to comply with the will of Congress is by the kind of amendment which was just passed.

I hope the House will adopt my technical amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REUSS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the Justice Department deem the language in the gentleman's amendment necessary to bring about the results he desires?

Mr. REUSS. No. I have not consulted the Department of Justice. I have consulted with able lawyers, like the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, if this committee should agree to the gentleman's amendment, it will take away from the county ASC committees practically any voice whatsoever in the program and place all of that authority in the hands of the Secretary in Washington. Certainly the gentleman should know that all the practices by which the county committees must abide are contained in what is known as the ACP Handbook which has been approved at the State level and at the Washington level. It is only from those particular practices that the county committee can make recommendations. It simply says that the county ASC committee, with reference to its own particular county, may find certain practices will do more good. If so, then the State committee cannot veto that decision. They can then carry out that particular practice and pay for that particular practice out of the county allotment of ACP funds.

I again say, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin does succeed in getting this amendment adopted, it simply means that what little voice the county committee has had in the farm program will be lost due to the action of this committee.

I hope the gentleman's amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

There is not a Member of this House who would not have supported this amendment had he been out in the field the last 2 years as I have, seeing what is being done with this agricultural limestone program.

I have traveled all over my district and other soil-conservation districts in Indiana. I have seen farmers doing the very job I have advocated ever since I came here in 1940—prevent erosion and soil damage and make a sweeter and more productive soil through the use of agricultural limestone.

I think we are really just getting started on this program. The agricultural limestone program is the greatest program we have ever offered, because it is the kind of program that does the very thing in which I believe—it helps the farmers to help themselves.

Earlier in this debate there was some talk of foreign aid. I would be for foreign aid if it was as good a program as the agricultural conservation and agricultural limestone programs. If we were only helping nations overseas to help themselves as this program does, I would be an ardent foreign aid supporter.

Here is a program that is developed lock, stock, and barrel to help the farmers cure their own problems. The Government does not dictate. It does not regulate, interfere, or meddle. It provides the bare essentials. The farmer provides the knowledge, the work, and the enthusiasm.

We have seen in the House today where someone who has a pet peeve of some kind about the program is trying to promote opposition to the conservation program by bringing in topics and discussion that have nothing to do with this program at all. Ninety percent of the debate you have heard on this amendment by the gentleman from Wisconsin has absolutely nothing whatsoever to do with this program. The gentleman has been trying to undercut this program for years and he has taken advantage of an opportunity, with unlimited time for debate, to clarify his stand against this valuable program.

I could take time here today to go into the public law under which this program was initiated. I could review its purpose and review sites in my district and down South that I have inspected. I could show you exactly what this program has done for people in many soil conservation districts.

I could show you how farmers terrace the hillsides, use lime and then plant legumes that grow in the soils, making firm, sturdy root systems which hold back the soil when rain falls. This lime makes the soil sweeter, more productive, and better.

You can look 5 miles across some of the valleys in my district and see, just as clearly as if a fence had been built, the difference in land where the agricultural limestone program is followed and where it is not followed. In August you would find herds of cattle grazing in lush clover and succulent grasses on a farmer's land where limestone had been used. The difference where the program has not been used is as clear as if a fence were built, but none exists.

Why are pastures that have been limed so much better? Why is the grass greener and more lush? Why is the soil being conserved better than in other ways? It is simple. Water is held back by terracing, limestone treatment induces legume growth, sturdy roots are formed. The end result is excellent pasture; better, sweeter land for this and other generations.

How is all this accomplished?

I will tell you how. It is done by the simple expedient of helping the farmer to help himself. This is the best kind of soil conservation policy and I urge you to vote down this amendment, or any amendment, which cripples this program.

I feel just as assured as I did on a previous amendment that if this amendment is not voted down here in committee, it will be voted down later in the House when Members are on record and when those for and against soil conservation will have to stand up and be counted.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It was even said here that lime was used to increase the yield of corn, when, as a matter of fact, corn is grown in acid soil. Lime is used on legumes which are not supported crops.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Of course; they do not know what they are talking about. Lime is used to produce legumes which, in turn, harbors a nitrogen producing bacteria. This bacteria lives in the soil and grows there. When inoculated, the soil produces nodules on the roots of legumes and adds to the fertility of the soil, making it productive. This program does much for my section of the country in just this manner. It will continue to do more if not hobbled by this or any other crippling amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the committee will vote this amendment down. May I explain what it will do? The language that would be stricken prohibits dictation from Washington. I certainly do not think centering this program in Washington would be sound in the least. I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. I would like a point of clarification. Under the language as it now exists in the bill, lines 4 to 9, the language we are talking about, if a county committee wishes to embark upon a practice and use taxpayers' money to do it, which the Department of Agriculture in Washington believes has become a wasteful practice, a practice no longer relevant to good soil conservation practices, then they cannot go ahead, nevertheless, and spend the money.

Mr. WHITTEN. The catalog comes about in this way. Recommendations from the county are made to the State, and from the State to the Federal level. At the Federal level these practices are approved and are put in the Federal catalog. Once they put them in the catalog, then it is up to the State committees to determine what practices they wish to select, and then the county committees select what they wish for the county.

I would hope that they would not dictate from Washington, but I have seen times in the past when the Department told these districts what to do. And, despite the gentleman's interest in this matter, as well as the interest of the present Secretary in that area, I just do not think the gentleman's amendment will help his pothole situation.

One of the troubles we have when we get into a contest with my friend from Wisconsin or my friend from Michigan, or in any contest in Congress or else-

where, is that 10 times as many people not farmers as are farmers. If somebody does not look out we are going to ruin our watersheds and we are going to ruin the water and food supply for a whole lot of cities without meaning to. This whole program is the best investment we can possibly make.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the gentleman know anybody around here who has voted more consistently for these agricultural programs than I or my colleagues?

Mr. WHITTEN. If my friends from the city districts had not been voting for the agricultural programs we would not have any, because you have the numbers. However, in a contest when agriculture has only 10 percent and the other side 90 percent, and with only about 20 percent of the Members in Congress having any farm interests back home, we must have city support. When we get into a division, agriculture is on the little side.

Mr. DINGELL. I would point out to my good friend that we still leave $150 million here to carry out this ACP program, but all we ask is a little bit of consideration be given to some of these aspects of the program to which attention has not been paid, and we preserve one of the best flood control systems that have been developed, and that is better than are all of the programs that have been constructed under the ACP.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have tried to help solve these problems, but when the farmers read this debate and see that you have cut the heart out of the program, they will retaliate by doing what you are against. I am trying to help you.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REUSS) there were—ayes 26, noes 98.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CENTENNIAL OBSERVANCE OF AGRICULTURE

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for planning, promoting, coordinating, and assisting participation by industry, trade associations, commodity groups, and similar interests in the celebration of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture; expenses of an honorary committee established in connection with such celebration; and employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (5 U.S.C. 574), as amended by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); $100,000, to remain available until December 31, 1962.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language beginning on page 28, line 14, and continuing down to and including line 2 on page 29, that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. May I say we have checked this matter and under the organic act of 1862 creating the Department of Agriculture, authority is granted to disseminate information. It is our argument and our insistence that the language which the gentleman would strike under which a centennial observance of the creation of the Department of Agriculture is to be held here in Washington where visitors from all over the United States may come to see the exhibits and demonstrations and reports and various other things that the Department has brought together over the years is clearly disseminating information, and is within the organic act which created the Department of Agriculture, which act was passed in 1862.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman from Mississippi if he can refer the Chair to any special or specific legislation authorizing the celebration of the centennial of the establishment of the Department of Agriculture or does the gentleman rely on the general organic act?

Mr. WHITTEN. I rely upon the general organic act, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard further on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not find anything in that act which said anything about any honorary committee—they never even dreamed of that at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to be heard further?

Mr. WHITTEN. No, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] makes a point of order against that portion of the bill appearing in line 14 on page 28 through and including line 2 on page 29. The Chair is constrained to hold that the language does constitute legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBRARY

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, including dues for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members, $1,000,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 29, after line 2, strike out all down to and including line 8.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether I should be against this item. I am trying to hear something more about it. I wish the gentleman in charge of the legislation would tell me just what that means—what necessary expenses including dues for library members in societies or associations are to be paid. That looks like a move to give members of certain groups special rates. What groups do you want to give a special price to? Why should we give a million dollars to the members of certain groups?

Mr. WHITTEN. The $1 million is for the library for the Department of Agriculture, in which all of the agricultural information that we have accumulated through the years is kept together and which is used throughout the country by the Extension Service and all the other branches of government. The language to which the gentleman refers permits these few people to get this assistance. Incidentally, this is a very small unit that operates the library. This language permits these few people to belong to these societies and associations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me, Mr. Chairman, but what I want to know is what societies and what associations are to be favored? What are the names?

Mr. WHITTEN. I am sorry I do not have the specific names of these societies and associations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What you have here is a million dollars to be given to members of certain societies and you do not know who they are? One of them might be the one I talked about earlier today, that organization called the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, in Detroit, Mich., who say that we are worse than the Communists when we voted to support the Committee on Un-American Activities of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] is chairman. Think of that and support this amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What are the dues to be? If the dues were $100 a year for each one of these societies or associations that would be about 10,000 societies; would it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman, I do not know of any two friends that I have who can stir up more questions on short notice, but this $1 million is for the library and in all probability all of it will not be used.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, what library? The bill says societies and associations, does it not? I cannot yield any more. Here you are giving this money to members of groups, and it is not even foreign aid and we do not know even the names of the organizations getting the money. We are giving away $1 million to unknown beneficiaries of unknown organizations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know just what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] meant. I think the gentleman said something about two people who can stir up more trouble on short notice. Was that supposed to be a compliment to you and me?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not know, but the gentleman, I think, will admit that by and large we have good intentions and favor efficiency and saving the tax dollars.

Mr. GROSS. That is right.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this language has been carried in this bill for many, many years.

I am sorry, I say to the committee, that I do not have the names of the societies at my fingertips. This $1 million is to run the library of the Department of Agriculture; only a small portion of the million is involved. It is used to keep the people who deal with the agriculture library in touch with those associations of library science where they can swap information and deal with others, such as the Library of Congress, on a basis which serves the interest of the Department and the library.

Again I assure you, Mr. Chairman, this $1 million is for the operation of the Department's library.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Nothing in this Act shall be so construed as to prevent the Commodity Credit Corporation from carrying out any activity or any program authorized by law: *Provided*, That not to exceed $47,500,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That $1,000,000 of this authorization shall be available only to expand and strengthen the sales program of the Corporation pursuant to authority contained in the Corporation's charter: *Provided further*, That not less than 7 per centum of this authorization shall be placed in reserve to be apportioned pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, for use only in such amounts and at such time as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That all necessary expenses (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of any real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, including expenses of collections of pledged collateral, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: On page 33, line 22, strike out the period, and add ": *Provided further*, (1) That no part of this authorization shall be used to formulate or carry out a price support program for 1962 under which a total amount of price support in excess of $50,000 would be extended through loans, purchases, or purchase agreements made or made available by Commodity Credit Corporation to any person on the 1962 production of all agricultural commodities, (2) That the term "person" shall mean an individual, partnership, firm, joint-stock company, corporation, association, trust, estate, or other legal entity, or a State, political subdivision of a State, or any agency thereof, (3) That in the case of any loan to, or purchase from, a cooperative marketing organization, such limitation shall not apply to the amount of price support received by the cooperative marketing organization, but the amount of price support made available to any person through such cooperative marketing organization shall be included in determining the amount of price support received by such person for purposes of such limitation, and (4) That the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations prescribing such rules as he determines necessary to prevent the evasion of such limitation"——

Mr. AVERY (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. This in effect is not new language, but was adopted by the House 2 years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for trespassing upon the time of the House at this late hour. However, this is not new language. We adopted this 2 years ago when the House adopted an amendment in substantially the same language in 1959. I thought we had accepted it in 1960 because of a colloquy I had with the gentleman from Mississippi, but apparently we were not in agreement as to what the language meant in the bill last year.

I also attempted last year to amend the basic Commodity Credit Corporation Act that really emanated from the Banking and Currency Committee. However, I could not even get a hearing before the Banking and Currency Committee, so I am left with no remedy except to offer again this limitation on the agricultural appropriation bill for 1962.

The effect of the amendment would be to limit the lending power of the Commodity Credit Corporation to any one corporation to a total of $50,000. You ask: Does anybody get a larger loan than $50,000? Yes, there are loans as high as a million, quite a few as high as half a million, and 117, I think, wheat loans in excess of $50,000.

You ask further: Does not the purchaser pledge his grain to repay this loan? The answer is, yes, he does; he pledges his wheat. The Commodity Credit Corporation sustains in excess of $1 per bushel loss on each bushel of wheat on which a farmer receives a loan. On a half-million-bushel loan the Commodity Credit Corporation loses approximately $250,000.

So I do not see that this in any way jeopardizes the intent of the legislation but it certainly will prevent tremendous loans to these large farms. For instance, in Arizona there is a Goodyear farm which received a loan of $387,000. The Commodity Credit Corporation sustained a loss in excess of $20 per bale on each bale of cotton on which the loan was made, so you figure out what a subsidy was given the Goodyear Farms Corp. from the Federal Treasury. That is charged up to the cost of the Department of Agriculture program.

The Commodity Credit Corporation program was not designed originally to subsidize such farm operations as are listed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It has grown and developed into a vehicle whereby these corporations take advantage of the program, a program that was designed to stabilize the economy of the so-called small or average size farm.

If there is any other way to reach the problem, I will discuss it with the legislative committees of the House, or with the Committee on Banking and Currency. Since it will not entertain legislation to put this limitation on, I feel that certainly we are doing the farmers of America a favor to preserve the program by enacting a reasonable limitation on the lending authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Mississippi insist on his point of order?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. It provides for new duties on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture, in addition to other legislative provisions.

May I say to the gentleman from Kansas that if he will check the matter he will find my statement last year was accurate. It would have the effect of controlling this, so to that degree it was true. I am opposed to the amendment, of course. And may I repeat again, it is our contention that this is legislation on an appropriation bill, and for that reason the point of order should be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AVERY. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

As I recall it, about 2 years ago right now, in 1959, I think the distinguished gentleman from Texas was in the chair that day; if not the gentleman from Texas presently in the chair, it was one of his Texas colleagues. When I submitted the original amendment to this same section of the appropriation bill, the gentleman from Mississippi raised a point of order against the amendment. After a considerable amount of deliberation, shall I say, the Chairman upheld the amendment as being a further limitation on the administrative costs of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Therefore, the point of order was not sustained.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KILDAY). The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment which has been reported. The Chair would observe it was probably this chairman who occupied the chair on the occasion the gentleman from Kansas referred to. It was apparently on the 18th of May 1959.

The Chair did not understand the gentleman from Kansas to state that the amendment now pending is in identical language as that which was offered in 1959.

Mr. AVERY. I did not so state, or at least I did not intend to so state.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman did not understand the gentleman as so stating.

Mr. AVERY. It is substantially the same amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has the language which was before the Chair in 1959, and will read it:

Amendment offered by Mr. AVERY: Page 27, line 19, strike out the period, add a colon and insert: "Further, no funds appropriated in this section shall be used to process Commodity Credit loans which are in excess of $50,000."

The Chair points out that that language was directly, solely and exclusively directed at the purpose for which funds being appropriated at that time could be used.

The Chair has examined the pending amendment, and while the first sentence of the pending amendment would indicate that it is in the nature of a limitation, it does refer to authorizations. This is the crux of the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair points out that the language of the amendment contains definitions, authorizations, and imposes duties upon an officer of the executive department. It is therefore clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. It is not identical or, in the opinion of the Chair, similar to the amendment offered in 1959.

The Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order to inquire of the Chairman in what way the amendment that I have now pending at the desk imposes any further obligations upon the Secretary than is covered by *"Provided further"* at the bottom of page 33.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair calls the gentleman's attention to paragraph No. 4, that the Secretary of Agriculture shall issue regulations and prescribe such rules as he determines necessary to prevent an evasion of such limitations. That is only one of the legislative provisions which the Chair observes in the amendment.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, may I submit another parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, the language of the amendment now pending at the desk is the identical language that came into conference from the other body following action of the House, and my amendment in 1959 became incorporated, I believe, in the conference report. Does that in any way change the legislative history of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may advise the gentleman that nothing is pending before the Chair, but by way of observation, the language the gentleman speaks of was apparently added by the other body. The present occupant of the Chair would not attempt to state or to interpret the rules or procedure of the other body.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the Chairman.

The Clerk continued the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, at a time of worldwide economic competition, with only $6.2 billion gold reserve beyond the $11.2 billion which supports our currency, we here today are asked to provide $3,662 million in food giveaway to foreign nations under Public Law 480. This is in addition to $4½ billion in foreign aid, the billions of unexpended balances of previous years of foreign aid, the offshore procurement, the foreign military bases expenditures, and the interest on that part of our national debt attributable to earlier years of foreign aid and deficit spending. What are we trying to do? Rush to our economic suicide? Are we indeed spending ourselves into bankruptcy? Our estimated Federal expenditures have increased since January until now we are faced with at least a $4 billion deficit. This does not take into account the additional appropriations yet to come.

It is beginning to become clear that if our Nation perishes economically, and it is certainly possible following our present course, it will be by our own hands, our own lack of self-discipline. I am heartily opposed to this ridiculous agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MILLS) having assumed the chair, Mr. KILDAY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7444) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on the Reuss amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote has been demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 19, line 24, after "to" strike out "$250,000,000" and insert "$150,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 184, nays 196, answered "present" 0, not voting 56, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—184

Addabbo	Findley	Michel
Addonizio	Finnegan	Milliken
Anderson, Ill.	Ford	Minshall
Ashbrook	Frelinghuysen	Moeller
Ashley	Friedel	Monagan
Auchincloss	Fulton	Moorehead, Ohio
Ayres	Gallagher	Moorhead, Pa.
Baring	Garland	Morse
Barrett	Garmatz	Mosher
Barry	Gary	Murphy
Bates	Gavin	Nix
Becker	Giaimo	O'Brien, Ill.
Beckworth	Gilbert	O'Hara, Ill.
Bell	Glenn	Osmers
Bennett, Fla.	Goodell	Ostertag
Betts	Goodling	Pelly
Boland	Granahan	Philbin
Bolling	Gray	Pike
Bolton	Green, Oreg.	Pillion
Brademas	Griffin	Price
Brewster	Griffiths	Pucinski
Bromwell	Gross	Ray
Broomfield	Haley	Reuss
Brown	Halpern	Rhodes, Ariz.
Broyhill	Harsha	Rhodes, Pa.
Bruce	Harvey, Mich.	Riehlman
Burke, Mass.	Hechler	Robison
Byrne, Pa.	Hiestand	Rodino
Cahill	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Fla.
Carey	Hoffman, Mich.	Roosevelt
Casey	Holland	Rostenkowski
Cederberg	Holtzman	Rousselot
Chamberlain	Joelson	Ryan
Church	Johansen	St. George
Clancy	Jonas	Schenck
Clark	Judd	Scherer
Cohelan	Karsten	Schneebeli
Collier	Kearns	Schweiker
Corbett	Keith	Scranton
Cunningham	Kelly	Shelley
Curtin	King, Calif.	Short
Curtis, Mass.	King, N.Y.	Sibal
Curtis, Mo.	Kirwan	Siler
Daddario	Kluczynski	Smith, Calif.
Dague	Kowalski	Sullivan
Delaney	Kunkel	Taber
Dent	Latta	Thompson, N.J.
Derounian	Lesinski	Toll
Derwinski	Lindsay	Tollefson
Devine	Lipscomb	Udall
Diggs	McCulloch	Vanik
Dingell	McDonough	Van Zandt
Donohue	McDowell	Wallhauser
Dooley	McVey	Weis
Dulski	Macdonald	Whalley
Durno	MacGregor	Widnall
Dwyer	Machrowicz	Wilson, Calif.
Elsworth	Madden	Yates
Farbstein	Mailliard	Younger
Fascell	Martin, Mass.	Zelenko
Feighan	Martin, Nebr.	
Fenton	Meader	

NAYS—196

Abbitt	Bonner	Dawson
Abernethy	Bow	Denton
Alexander	Boykin	Dole
Alford	Bray	Dorn
Andersen, Minn.	Breeding	Dowdy
Andrews	Brooks, La.	Doyle
Anfuso	Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson
Ashmore	Buckley	Elliott
Aspinall	Burleson	Everett
Avery	Cannon	Fisher
Bailey	Celler	Flood
Baker	Chelf	Flynt
Baldwin	Chenoweth	Forrester
Bass, N.H.	Coad	Fountain
Bass, Tenn.	Colmer	Frazier
Battin	Cook	Gathings
Belcher	Cooley	Gubser
Berry	Corman	Hagan, Ga.
Blatnik	Davis, James C.	Hagen, Calif.
	Davis, John W.	Hall

Hansen	Magnuson	Schadeberg
Harding	Mahon	Schwengel
Harris	Marshall	Scott
Harrison, Wyo.	Mathias	Seely-Brown
Harvey, Ind.	Matthews	Selden
Hays	May	Shipley
Healey	Merrow	Shriver
Hébert	Miller, Clem	Sisk
Hemphill	Mills	Slack
Henderson	Montoya	Smith, Iowa
Horan	Moore	Smith, Miss.
Huddleston	Morris	Smith, Va.
Hull	Morrison	Spence
Ichord, Mo.	Moss	Springer
Ikard, Tex.	Moulder	Stafford
Inouye	Multer	Staggers
Jarman	Murray	Steed
Jennings	Natcher	Stephens
Jensen	Nelsen	Stratton
Johnson, Calif.	Norblad	Stubblefield
Johnson, Md.	Norrell	Taylor
Johnson, Wis.	Nygaard	Teague, Calif.
Jones, Ala.	O'Hara, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
Jones, Mo.	Olsen	Thomas
Karth	Patman	Thompson, La.
Kastenmeier	Perkins	Thompson, Tex.
Kee	Peterson	Thomson, Wis.
Keogh	Pfost	Thornberry
Kilday	Poage	Trimble
Kilgore	Poff	Tuck
King, Utah	Powell	Tupper
Kitchin	Quie	Ullman
Kornegay	Rabaut	Van Pelt
Kyl	Randall	Watts
Laird	Reece	Weaver
Landrum	Reifel	Wharton
Lane	Riley	Whitener
Langen	Rivers, Alaska	Whitten
Lankford	Rivers, S.C.	Wickersham
Lennon	Rogers, Colo.	Williams
Libonati	Rogers, Tex.	Wilson, Ind.
McFall	Rooney	Winstead
McIntire	Roudebush	Wright
McMillan	Rutherford	Young
McSween	Santangelo	Zablocki
Mack	Saylor	

NOT VOTING—56

Adair	Fino	Morgan
Albert	Fogarty	O'Brien, N.Y.
Alger	Grant	O'Konski
Arends	Green, Pa.	O'Neill
Beermann	Halleck	Passman
Bennett, Mich.	Hardy	Pilcher
Blitch	Harrison, Va.	Pirnie
Boggs	Herlong	Rains
Burke, Ky.	Hoeven	Roberts
Byrnes, Wis.	Holifield	St. Germain
Chiperfield	Hosmer	Saund
Conte	Kilburn	Sheppard
Cramer	Knox	Sikes
Daniels	Loser	Utt
Davis, Tenn.	McCormack	Vinson
Dominick	Mason	Walter
Downing	Miller, George P.	Westland
Evins	Miller, N.Y.	Willis
Fallon		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Walter for, with Mr. Pilcher against.

Mr. Daniels for, with Mr. Evins against.

Mr. Beermann for, with Mr. McCormack against.

Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Roberts against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Herlong against.

Mr. Fallon for, with Mr. Willis against.

Mr. Hosmers for, with Mr. Pirnie against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Boggs against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Albert against.

Mr. St. Germain for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Holifield for, with Mr. Loser against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Morgan against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Rains against.

Mr. O'Neill for, with Mr. Sikes against.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Harrison of Virginia against.

Mr. O'Brien of New York for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.

Until further notice:

Mrs. Blitch with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Hardy with Mr. O'Konski.

Mr. Vinson with Mr. Utt.

Mr. Downing with Mr. Adair.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Saund with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Messrs. BUCKLEY, SCHWENGEL, GUBSER, and BASS of New Hampshire changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CUNNINGHAM, BRUCE, and HALPERN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. In its present form I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MICHEL moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 320, nays 65, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 71]

YEAS—320

Abbitt	Brooks, Tex.	Edmondson
Abernethy	Brown	Elliott
Addabbo	Broyhill	Ellsworth
Addonizio	Buckley	Everett
Albert	Burke, Ky.	Fallon
Alexander	Burke, Mass.	Farbstein
Alford	Burleson	Fascell
Andersen, Minn.	Byrne, Pa.	Feighan
Andrews	Cannon	Fenton
Anfuso	Carey	Finnegan
Ashley	Cederberg	Fisher
Ashmore	Celler	Flynt
Aspinall	Chamberlain	Forrester
Avery	Chelf	Fountain
Ayres	Chenoweth	Frazier
Bailey	Church	Frelinghuysen
Baker	Clark	Friedel
Baldwin	Coad	Gallagher
Barrett	Cohelan	Garland
Barry	Colmer	Garmatz
Bass, N.H.	Cook	Gary
Bass, Tenn.	Corman	Gathings
Battin	Cunningham	Gavin
Beckworth	Curtin	Giaimo
Belcher	Daddario	Gilbert
Bennett, Fla.	Dague	Glenn
Berry	Davis, James C.	Goodling
Betts	Davis, John W.	Granahan
Blatnik	Dawson	Gray
Boland	Delaney	Griffin
Bolling	Dent	Griffiths
Bolton	Denton	Gross
Bonner	Diggs	Gubser
Bow	Dole	Hagan, Ga.
Boykin	Donohue	Hagen, Calif.
Brademas	Dooley	Hall
Bray	Dorn	Hansen
Breeding	Dowdy	Harding
Bromwell	Doyle	Harris
Brooks, La.	Durno	Harrison, Wyo.
		Harsha
Harvey, Ind.	Mack	Rooney
Harvey, Mich.	Madden	Roosevelt
Hays	Magnuson	Rostenkowski
Healey	Mahon	Roudebush
Hechler	Marshall	Rutherford
Hemphill	Martin, Nebr.	Ryan
Henderson	Mathias	Santangelo
Hoeven	Matthews	Saund
Holifield	May	Schadeberg
Holland	Meader	Schneebeli
Holtzman	Merrow	Schwengel
Horan	Miller, Clem	Scott
Huddleston	Milliken	Scranton
Hull	Mills	Seely-Brown
Ichord, Mo.	Moeller	Selden
Ikard, Tex.	Monagan	Shelley
Inouye	Montoya	Shipley
Jarman	Moore	Short
Jennings	Moorehead, Ohio	Shriver
Jensen	Moorhead, Pa.	Sibal
Johnson, Calif.	Morgan	Siler
Johnson, Md.	Morris	Sisk
Johnson, Wis.	Morrison	Slack
Jonas	Morse	Smith, Iowa
Jones, Ala.	Moss	Smith, Miss.
Jones, Mo.	Moulder	Smith, Va.
Judd	Multer	Spence
Karsten	Murphy	Springer
Karth	Murray	Stafford
Kastenmeier	Natcher	Staggers
Kee	Nelsen	Steed
Keith	Nix	Stephens
Kelly	Norblad	Stratton
Keogh	Norrell	Stubblefield
Kilday	Nygaard	Sullivan
Kilgore	O'Brien, Ill.	Taylor
King, Calif.	O'Hara, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
King, N.Y.	O'Hara, Mich.	Teague, Tex.
King, Utah	Olsen	Thompson, La.
Kitchin	Ostertag	Thompson, N.J.
Kluczynski	Passman	Thompson, Tex.
Kornegay	Patman	Thomson, Wis.
Kowalski	Perkins	Toll
Kunkel	Peterson	Trimble
Kyl	Pfost	Tuck
Laird	Philbin	Tupper
Landrum	Poage	Udall
Lane	Poff	Ullman
Langen	Powell	Vanik
Lankford	Price	Van Pelt
Latta	Pucinski	Van Zandt
Lennon	Quie	Watts
Lesinski	Rabaut	Weaver
Libonati	Randall	Weis
Lindsay	Reece	Whalley
McCormack	Reifel	Whitener
McCulloch	Reuss	Whitten
McDonough	Rhodes, Ariz.	Wickersham
McDowell	Rhodes, Pa.	Williams
McFall	Richlman	Wilson, Ind.
McIntire	Riley	Winstead
McMillan	Rivers, Alaska	Wright
McSween	Rivers, S.C.	Yates
McVey	Rodino	Young
Macdonald	Rogers, Colo.	Zablocki
MacGregor	Rogers, Tex.	Zelenko
Machrowicz		

NAYS—65

Alger	Dulski	Pelly
Anderson, Ill.	Dwyer	Pike
Ashbrook	Findley	Pillion
Auchincloss	Ford	Ray
Baring	Fulton	Robison
Bates	Goodell	Rogers, Fla.
Becker	Green, Oreg.	Rousselot
Bell	Haley	St. George
Brewster	Halpern	Saylor
Broomfield	Hiestand	Schenck
Bruce	Hoffman, Ill.	Scherer
Cahill	Hoffman, Mich.	Schweiker
Casey	Joelsen	Smith, Calif.
Clancy	Johansen	Taber
Collier	Kearns	Thomas
Corbett	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Curtis, Mass.	Mailliard	Wallhauser
Curtis, Mo.	Martin, Mass.	Wharton
Derounian	Michel	Widnall
Derwinski	Minshall	Wilson, Calif.
Devine	Mosher	Younger
Dingell	Osmers	

NOT VOTING—50

Adair	Davis, Tenn.	Hébert
Arends	Dominick	Herlong
Beermann	Downing	Hosmer
Bennett, Mich.	Evins	Kilburn
Blitch	Fino	Kirwan
Boggs	Flood	Knox
Byrnes, Wis.	Fogarty	Loser
Chiperfield	Grant	Mason
Conte	Green, Pa.	Miller, George P.
Cooley	Halleck	Miller, N.Y.
Cramer	Hardy	O'Brien, N.Y.
Daniels	Harrison, Va.	

O'Konski	Roberts	Utt
O'Neill	St. Germain	Vinson
Pilcher	Sheppard	Walter
Pirnie	Sikes	Westland
Rains	Thornberry	Willis

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Daniels with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. O'Neil with Mr. Conte.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Pirnie.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. St. Germain with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Loser with Mr. Beermann.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Knox.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Roberts.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Harrison of Virginia with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Westland.
Mr. Pilcher with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Downing with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Hosmer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation:

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am unable to participate in the fifth meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group and, therefore, submit my resignation to become effective immediately.

I very much regret that this action is necessary, but because of a conflict in my schedule I must sever my participation in the meeting.

Sincerely,

JAMES HARVEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in the District of Columbia, commencing on June 8, 1961, the gentleman from New York, Mr. HOWARD W. ROBISON, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1852) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. DODD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. PELL, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. AIKEN, Mr. WILEY, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be members of the Canadian-United States Interparliamentary Group.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR AIRCRAFT, MISSILES, AND NAVAL VESSELS FOR THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, S. 1852, to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. VINSON, KILDAY, RIVERS of South Carolina, PHILBIN, HÉBERT, ARENDS, GAVIN, VAN ZANDT, and BATES.

EXCERPTS FROM REVIEWS OF THE "MARK TWAIN TONIGHT" EUROPEAN TOUR

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentltman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, we have recently heard some criticism of the cultural exchange program under current laws on the floor of the House and also in the public prints. Some of this criticism is based on lack of information.

The members of the State Department Organization and Foreign Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs were privileged last week to hear testimony from Hal Holbrook, the eminent actor, who has made such a conspicuous success in recent years in his famous portrayal of Mark Twain.

Mr. Holbrook told the committee of the great success that his appearance in Europe had achieved in improving relations between the United States and Europe and in making Europeans aware of a uniquely American culture.

Since Mr. Holbrook's appraisal of the effect of his performance on European audiences was a personal one, it could be claimed that there was bias in his estimate, but there can be no bias in the estimates of the European newspapers in the various cities where Mr. Holbrook appeared. Their reactions give eloquent testimony to the value of Mr. Holbrook's contribution and the profit which accrues to the United States from this program.

I believe that this editorial comment is so valuable that it should be made available to the Congress and I include at this point excerpts from reviews of "Mark Twain Tonight" which were written during Hal Holbrook's European tour of September, October, and November 1960:

EXCERPTS FROM SOME OF THE REVIEWS OF "MARK TWAIN TONIGHT" EUROPEAN TOUR, SEPTEMBER–NOVEMBER 1960

He presented the phenomenal Twain in his seventies when the author had reached the height of his fame and could pride himself that most "bon mots" which circulated at the turn of the century had originated in the brain from which also the classical romantic figures of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn sprang. In his diversified and mostly ironical causeries which he had amassed in an adventurous life, Twain revealed himself at that age as a fascinating stage personality who owed his great popularity to his qualities as an author rather than to his qualities as an orator.

Holbrook accomplished putting new life into that old subtle entertainer with a suggestive performance which fascinated from beginning to end—De Telegraaf, Amsterdam.

Mark Twain—the renowned American author and humorist who was born 125 years ago—was portrayed full length in Amsterdam last night as a man in his seventies. The American actor, Hal Holbrook, who was born in 1925, that is 15 years after the death of the famous author, again brought to life the great story-teller of the Mississippi River before an audience which he completely enthralled. Not a word was spoken on the sober stage that was not written by Mark Twain, not a gesture made which was not a true copy of the curious mannerisms of a nonconformist old man of some generations ago.

It was especially Twain, the narrator of anecdotes—the great supplier of witty fillers as a welcome attraction for magazines—who was presented on the stage. * * * It was an evening of clever portraying a 2½-hour anthology from Twain's inexhaustible repertory, a sample card of American southern accents. * * * It was a pity that the show did not last longer and that only one show was given in our country. * * * This is American art at its best.—De Volkskrant, Amsterdam.

Americans have a perplexing ability to bring things on stage that at first glance seem utterly untheatrical and ineffective dramawise. But what now was being staged in the Frankfurt Amerikahaus was apparently, at first sight, the most singular rarity of all those American theater treatments. Because there was Mark Twain, the great American humorist, known to everybody here as the author of "Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn"—from which book, according to Hemingway, the entire modern, American literature derives—and Mark Twain made his appearance in a white linen suit, with a red plastron, with gray shaggy hair and a moustache of the same color, and addressed the audience. He talked parenthetically, with a rough snarl, citing and quoting from his own works: hilarious, bitter, sarcastic objects, or bizarre, right out of the realm of Ionesco, and many a thing pensive or meditative.

The young American actor Hal Holbrook lends him physical shape, voice, gesture, and

presence of mind. Holbrook is 35 years old, half as old as the Mark Twain he represented, but the young man allows himself to be merged in the great old man of American literature. This could be seen as more than acting, it is almost identification. * * *

But with all the refinement and the accuracy of the acting, as it were a scientific reconstruction, delightful though, there would remain a slight uneasiness were it not the peculiarly original Mark Twain who is still alive as a satirist and moralist, as a grumbler and jolly dog. His noble attitude considering the human races, his mockery on tourists and guides, for instance, prove himself a writer necessary for our time. * * * It is Mark Twain's imperturbability that makes this guest performance so relevant.—Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung.

So, after many hilarious incidentals Mark Twain's appearance in the year 1960 was a real rapture. The great American humorist is dead for 50 years now and his quips and tales, his innuendos on techniques and civilization are still as fresh as in those days when he toured the world as a traveling entertainer. Hal Holbrook's years of studying Mark Twain and any pertaining material he could lay hands upon gave him the capability of identifying himself with Mark Twain. The personal appearance of the author of Tom Sawyer's adventures—floating white mane, white suit, and a smoking black cigar, his bent carriage, and harsh old-man's-voice was perfectly impersonated by Holbrook in all details. * * *

Mr. Samuel Langhorne Clemens, known everywhere as Mark Twain, appearing bodily at that evening, is the result of an unheard-of-acting training in the services of one single character. Even the purists of the word would gladly agree in this case that true-to-life imitation of a man and his environment may indefinitely enhance the effect of his spoken words.—Frankfurter Rundschau.

The young American actor Hal Holbrook who made theater history in his brilliant performance as the 70-year-old Mark Twain during the last year has re-enlivened the figure of the great American humorist also in Frankfurt. During his Germany tour which led him to Munich, Hamburg, and Berlin he made his appearance in a closed show before an audience of invited guests of the Frankfurt Amerikahaus.

With a wily smile an old man in a white suit conveniently entered the stage. Long before he came to a halt near an old-fashioned reading desk, genially beckoning to the audience, everybody sensed the waves of sympathy and respect that surged toward the stage.

Mark Twain, America's master of humor, died in 1910. But his image, such as it is known to the world, is again taking possession today of the stages and podiums of America and Europe, thereby delighting ever new listeners with the same old quips and stories. However, the Mark Twain of today is the fantastically genuine, clever, and funny creation of a 35-year-old actor called Hal Holbrook.

Before Hal Holbrook gave his debut on Broadway, and by so doing offered the greatest surprise of the theater year 1959, Mark Twain was mainly known to the modern world as the genitor of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn.

Holbrook induced a tide of curiosity. Everybody was eager to learn more about Mark Twain, his life and his few known works. America rediscovered him, enthusiasm reached its climax in 1960, 50 years after his death, and these waves of rapture are now rolling onto the shores of the Old World. * * *

Arnold Bennett once called Mark Twain "the divine amateur." More planning and preparation was applied to the art of narration, though. Hal Holbrook dug up quite a number of Mark Twain's notes on the technique of a speech which subtly analyzed, for instance, the value and the precise length of pauses. And the actor profits by the heritage in a wondrous way—as for example with the trick to let the point of a joke flash up in three to four cascades, seemingly unintentionally and improvised.

Holbrook studied an old record and a film which enabled him to adapt the gestures and the old man's deportment. He talked to relatives and friends who had known Mark Twain. For 12 years he read everything he could find about Mark Twain until the private life of the poet was just as familiar to him as his way of appearing in public.

Holbrook's role is a most difficult test for acting ability. To the components of Mark Twain's personal appearance * * * he had to add something of the peculiarities of Mark Twain's private personality. * * *

The critics' applause was overwhelming. * * *

And so it was. But a new resplendence of his glory brought him back to us, a bright shine which, this time, beams down on two great talents.—Offenbach Post, Frankfurt.

A lively, 70-year-old man in a light suit tripped onto the stage of the Amerikahaus with small, measured steps, apparently feeling at home there, and began to chat, to narrate, and to reason. He lighted a cigar with great ceremony and lectured on the dangers of moderation. * * *

Mark Twain or Samuel Clemens—we have known him almost only as the author of Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn—was already a national institution in the States before his death in 1910, a national court jester, and an unconventional literary pioneer. * * *

Holbrook awakened a Mark Twain renaissance among his own countrymen.—Muenchner Merkur, Munich.

We cast a glance of curiosity at the program and noticed this: "We had engaged a trumpeter but he is unreliable, so please do not wait for him." There was the spirit of Mark Twain, the best humorist that the New World has so far brought to us. And slowly but with certainly there developed the complete and spiritual force of Mark Twain, before a public that completely filled the seats of the Amerikahaus, as at a festival premiere.

It truly was a festival. That which Hal Holbrook presented to us from the podium, through the magic of his theatrical makeup and through his mimicry, was the mask of the 70-year-old Mark Twain. There to the life stood the old man who used to like to speak of the "damned human race," and who yet in his writings and outlook was so truly philosophic and so truly religious in his humor that he could utter these courageous words "Humor is one of the most truly important attributes of God."

And how wonderfully spontaneous did Holbrook present his wit and wisdom. Repeatedly he brought Twain to life on the stage. Realistically Mark Twain with his big cigar moved here and there, his eyes twinkling, re-created through Holbrook. This was a gift worthy of a festival, and the public with thunderous applause gave thanks for this wonderful gift.—Hamburger Abendblatt.

The old gentleman delivered his sharp-pointed sentences on everything and everybody. Each point came out of a full basket of anecdote. How Holbrook achieves this is truly remarkable. How he walks between table and stand, his timing perfect as he smokes his cigar, calculates the timing, and then produces his effect is truly effective. An extraordinary evening.—Die Welt, Hamburg.

It was thanks to the cultural section of the local American Embassy that this witty pleasure was now made available in the original to the American colony in Bonn and also to interested Germans knowing the language. For 2 hours laughter and high spirits prevailed in the auditorium of the university. Hal Holbrook recited Mark Twain and he was Mark Twain; he was authentic right to his finger tips and to the pauses for effect in his recitations. Very well known texts alternated with etudes in prose of which we had no notion, trite aperçus with classical passages from "Huckleberry Finn." Criticism was levied against the press and the abuse of interviewing people; and American tourists in front of European objects of art were taken on the point of his ironical pen, * * * the attention of the audience never ceased. Neither did the laughter. It was magnificent.—General-Anzeiger, Bonn.

When the curtain on the Amerikahaus stage was raised, one believed to see the 70-year old Mark Twain in person. In a white suit, with a red tie, and golden watch chain, he stood at the footlights, slightly bent forward, grinning stealthily behind his white mustache, and talked for 2½ hours with an amusing text material, which had the effect of an ad-libbed speech, to a thrilled, enchanted audience.

The illusion of seeing the old author at the peak of his fame on one of his lecture tours, which 64 years ago also led him to Berlin, was complete.

The American actor, Hal Holbrook, born almost 100 years later than the man he was personifying, has spent many years on detailed study to make his performance seem like a portrait of Mark Twain. As a result the author of typical American humorous spirit was in a very striking way appreciated and represented, even up to details of mannerisms and way of talking.—Der Kurier, evening edition, Berlin.

It was incredible what we experienced in the Merkur Theater last night, and for a couple of hours the performance lasted we would have liked to rename the Merkur the Mark Twain Theater.

Holbrook has identified himself with Mark Twain. As a truly great actor he is—to the life—the great humorist and entertainer on the stage, at the same time keeping a close watch, in a technically polished form, on the character he is bringing to life. In its way it is a work of genius. * * *

We were very fortunate to see him and would have wished him to stay for more performances—in honor of that Copenhagen audience which is very well versed in the English language. * * * One may pay tribute to Holbrook on many counts: His make-up * * *; Mark Twain at 70 (that is, in 1905), an old man's face which we could not have distinguished from Twain's own face, had he been present, a face full of life, with intelligent, warm, sad eyes. The slightly hoarse, but expressive ring of the voice, the figure's shuffling old man's gait, the spry, vivid fiddling of the hands.

But above all, Mark Twain as the interpreter of his own works * * * all that we love in these books, all that we love in Mark Twain leaped out to meet us. * * *

He [Holbrook] received a merited tribute of laughter, emotion, and applause. His performance unites deep originality with a wide, comprehensive humaneness of rich humor, gentle and wry at the same time. We shall not forget Hal Holbrook; we shall not forget Mark Twain.—Aktuelt, Copenhagen.

Somehow this review of Hal Holbrook's "Mark Twain Tonight," presented yesterday on the National Theater's Little Stage, is the most purposeless one I've ever written seeing that Holbrook will give only this one performance. If I succeed at all in giving an impression of the performance I shall only make those sorry who didn't get to see him. As for those who were present my review can be but a pale, indifferent reflection, a voice echoing beyond faraway hills.

This man of 34 who acts Mark Twain, nay, who is Mark Twain, makes him come more intensely alive on the stage than even the best reader can imagine him through his books. * * * "Fantastic" was the sibilant comment soughing through the theater when the curtain went up and the spare old man, in a not-too-well-fitting white suit came out on the stage, a little uncertainly, a little astonished, as he stood for a moment looking at us while we looked at him. A face furrowed by wisdom and wit. The applause rose higher and higher before he had uttered even a word. From there on in he had us all the way; we gave ourselves over completely—no inhibitions were left.

But all this virtuosity would have had no meaning if it had not been for Holbrook's identifying himself so deeply with the poet-man Samuel Clemens, an achievement that took him years of devoted and profound study. No matter how greatly he bewitched us with ever new rockets of histrionic fireworks, he never came closer to us nor gripped us more deeply than at the end where old Mark Twain reminiscences about his life and talks to us about death. Jokingly, of course, but his voice is softer now, and our laughter is too. "Good night." He leaves the stage.

Good night! Yes, but it can't be possible that there won't be another performance after this one.—Morgenbladet, Oslo.

Before his performance October 12 at the conservatory in Helsinki, Holbrook visited Oslo where, the reviews said, the audience had been downright transported to ecstasy. One might say this happened at the conservatory, too, during Holbrook's three-act performance.

Mark Twain who died 50 years ago is a person well known the world over, and no extensive introductions are necessary. This could be observed immediately at the beginning of the evening. Twain's person, however, was to nobody so familiar as to the actor himself. He might be assumed to be a veritable kindred spirit of Twain's, so profoundly had be become absorbed in the person he impersonated, guided by facts as well as an apparent instinct.

Holbrook's makeup is faultless, even seen at close quarters * * * no makeup however, can impart the impression of a pleasantly spiteful, but exceedingly kindhearted old man, if not the performer himself. And it was imparted by young Holbrook. Quite irresistible was the fragment in which Twain—thus no longer Holbrook—performs his young hero Huck Finn. It was a doubly successful piece of acting.

When Twain then bids goodnight and leaves the stage without so much as another look at his audience, with a cigar in his mouth, one is tempted to ask him to prolong his going to bed to a little bit later.—Nusi Suomi, Helsinki.

The 35-year-old actor Hal Holbrook has indeed become absorbed in the figure of the 70-year-old Twain down to every cell, every carefully considered comma and pause. And the audience readily responded to the message and his expressive eyes, the pathos of speech style, the gestures—and to the one-word or two-word remarks which turned noble thoughts topsy-turvy.—Turun Sanomat, Turki, Finland.

As the curtain went up one had the feeling that the old man, who was in Vienna in 1897 and 1898, had stepped down from the Yankee section of Olympus in order to repeat the lectures he held then. He took us to a genuine Golden West of humor, an America which Hollywood films have so distorted. In spite of the two and a half hour length, the audience of the packed house was delighted anew with the mirth of the master of American folk humor and with the artistic ability of his entertaining imitator.—Neues Oesterreich, Vienna.

It is absolutely sensational when one can crawl into another person the way Holbrook can. One laughs, one is enchanted by the performance. One can understand why this presentation must be a success throughout the entire world, even in areas where the people don't know English well enough to understand every nuance of the humor. The audience in the Josefstadt was delighted with the intelligence and ready wit of the author and was carried away by the grandiose acting talent of the interpreter.—Oesterreichische Neue Tageszeitung, Vienna.

Holbrook read from "Huckleberry Finn," a book which many American critics count among the most important writings on the freedom of the individual to come from America. One feels strongly that this is not just a book for children but that here the important thing is the fight for the rights of the individual. Holbrook understood this and brought it out. * * * Holbrook brought Mark Twain back to life.—Die Neue Zeit, Graz.

For us this was not a powerful, skillfully made, technically perfect creation of Mark Twain, but a living, spontaneously seen Mark Twain. The only one, that genuine one.

A few decades ago, when I was in the fourth grade of the secondary school, during a lesson of geography, the professor asked his pupils about the Mississippi. Many pupils just said what they knew about it; that it was the biggest river in North America, that it flowed across many States, what its tributaries were, how navigable it is, what kind of ships could be seen there, which areas are flooded by it, that it flows into the Mexican sea, etc. But, the professor was not satisfied with all those answers in order to show how ignorant we were. He tirelessly continued to put more questions in order to find out whether anybody could tell something more about this subject. After he insisted for quite a while, I got up, and in justified pupil's rage, to everybody's satisfaction and rejoicing, added defiantly the Mississippi constitutes the river which flows through the works of Mark Twain in the most realistic and beautiful way.

Luckily, I say this with melancholy, the time when I was at school is far away. But, if now someone would, with a magic disregard for time, take me back to the distant past and ask me what else I would tell him about Mark Twain, I would really be tempted to say: But that is the talented actor and master of transformation, Hal Holbrook.—Eli Finci, Belgrade newspaper Politika.

Holbrook, a young man, was carving out the well-known figure of the 70-year-old Samuel Clemens—Twain; through intelligently selected excerpts from the large storytelling and novel writing opus of Twain he has painted above all the lively and flexible wit of the writer, slightly disappointed and cynical when speaking about men, but sufficiently brave to look with pleasure at his reflection in the mirror. * * *

It is almost unbelievable how many nuances are there in that complex transmission of the story about Huckleberry Finn.—Berba, Belgrade.

Who does not know Mark Twain, the witty old man of unruly, disorderly hair, of gray hair, the man who knew how to make laugh a continent and to deride it, and through it the whole world. These days he has been staying among us: an interesting young man, Hal Holbrook, took up the idea to do what once was doing the old master of the finest humor. * * *

Twain's humor is typical to us Americans. For us who smile more than ever just then when we are afraid. I feared this laughing would not be received in Europe. However, it occurred at the first performance, as that in Amsterdam, that people were laughing exactly there where Americans used to laugh. This meant that language was no barrier. Joke, the mightiest weapon of mankind, as Twain said, and as I felt it, too, is accepted by all and it does not matter if it is somewhere received with more noise or in a quieter manner.—Nin, Belgrade.

Already while reading a book we imagine that we know the writer and understand his times, but if somebody, this time our unknown friend Hal Holbrook, re-creates for us the actual man we are almost ready to maintain that we have met in the flesh the man who died 50 years ago; but the texture of that flesh is a masterfully composed illustration compelling our belief.—B. Pogainik, last paragraph of a lengthy review in Delo, Ljubljana, Yugoslavia.

On Saturday night, the Komedija Theater's overflow audience * * * enthusiastically greeted Mark Twain's appearance in Zagreb. We saw and heard essentially the true Mark Twain: the pioneer of democracy and free thought (which the famous author always spiced with cynicism to give it its true value). We saw a vivacious old man who in his witty style—now packed with meaning, now calculated to reach the audience of the common American small town that was already beginning to understand what the American way of life means—told of whatever occurred to him; but each of his little stories was as if cut from life. The voice of the writer and lecturer revealed a man who had wandered through printing offices from the age of 12 to 19, had been a pilot on the Mississippi, a dreamer, pioneer, tough guy, and cynic. * * *

Hal Holbrook was given only his due when he received a storm of applause on the open stage after his matchless interpretation of the passage from "Huckleberry Finn."—Zagreb daily newspaper Vecernji Vjesnik.

In spite of the difference of a whole century Hal Holbrook's life reflects a definite analogy with the original reproduced with so much talent by this excellent American actor. As we know, Twain passed a hard school of life before he gained a rare and perhaps unique position of an extremely popular writer in the highest and most exclusive circles in the world and with the millions of old and young readers without any pretensions. Recently Hal Holbrook published a book in which he depicted with fascinating correctness and equally fascinating sense of humor the long and tedious road he had to pass and the painful experiences he had to suffer before he gained recognition, peak success and a wide open road to world fame. * * *

It goes without saying that one must have a good deal of Twain to impersonate this writer on the stage with such unprecedented accuracy. In this case even the most perfect techniques of acting could not produce this result. Insofar as his physical appearance is concerned, he resembles his master and example perhaps only with his stature.

His smile however, and the way he views the world, his attitude toward people—radiating warmth and complete understanding of their shortcomings, the freezing look changing into high strung irony whenever he detects boasting and elation causing justified apprehension and opposition—each motion of his hand or tilting of his head—all of this besides Twain's characteristics reproduced on photographs and described in the detailed analysis of Twain's external features, has in addition a much greater significance, a larger connection with the creator of Huckleberry Finn—a common origin. Both are members of the family more resplendent than any royal family—the family of man. Closely related with them were Swift, Voltaire, Gogol, and Tchechov.

It is commonly accepted that the fortunes of Huckleberry Finn are of interest only to boys. Yet T. S. Elliot, a rather hermetic poet, wrote an introduction to a new edition of this book and devoted an extensive essay to American literature chiefly to Twain. "Twain," wrote Elliot, "belongs to this class of writers of which there are very few in world literature." Twain himself stated: "Laughter is the only power against which nothing can resist * * * the lack of respect," he added, "is the supporter of freedom and the only reliable defense."

Accordingly the reaction of the Warsaw public indicated that * * * its receptivity was certainly large. * * * Besides the already mentioned vitality of the audience and the genius of Twain—the actor's personal charm was irresistible, dominant, and bewitching. His wonderful talent and excellent performance, even including the tendency of exaggerated care in his definitions, must be rated simply as excellent. Again the personal charm of the Holbrook off the stage, shining like a leading star not in the sky but on earth, is clearly outstanding. Seeing him and in contact, we begin to understand the warn out phrase calling great actors—stars.—Nova Kultura, Warsaw.

Holbrook's undertaking is among those that do honor to the theater, and the Roman audience, despite geographical distance and psychological and linguistic differences, compensated the actor with their cordial and repeated applause.—Il Messagero, Rome.

In the second part of the performance, not exclusively humorous, Hal Holbrook revealed the man Mark Twain, and while reciting that part his public did not laugh, and quite rightly so.—Il Gidrnale D'Italia, Rome.

In his disguise as Mark Twain, Hal Holbrook appeared to us as an actor of incomparable virtuosity. * * * Resurrecting the sarcastic personality of the great American writer with hallucinating precision Mr. Holbrook roused the admiration and the laughter of the Anglo-Saxon audience. * * * What it really was may be described as a fantastic feat of incredible cleverness, the result of research and work of immense magnitude. * * * It is something of a miracle.—La Tribune De Geneve, Geneva.

ACTION, NOT WORDS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, we have let Fidel Castro make chumps of us. He dangled the bait in front of our eyes and we jumped at it. He has proven his point—he can get away with blackmailing the United States. But now that his victory over our national integrity is complete, he is apparently turning his back on the deal.

It is but a few weeks since the bearded psychopath, who serves as communism's stooge in Cuba, shocked the world with his outrageously cold, vicious and inhuman blackmail attempt—the "tractors for prisoners" deal.

By yielding to his demands, we have established the fact that we do not have enough confidence in our ability to beat him—and his kind. By yielding to his demands, we have acknowledged the fact that he has a right to deal with the United States—that he is worthy of the world status to which he has aspired. He should have been treated with contempt as he represents an evil, unscrupulous philosophy that endangers the whole free world.

Those private citizens who constitute the "tractors for prisoners" committee argue that it is individual humanitarianism and not the act of a nation giving in to highhanded blackmail. But may I point out this fact: the program to raise money for tractors has been given an endorsement by the President. In my mind, and in the minds of many thousands who resist the degradation implied in yielding to blackmail, this endorsement by the President is tantamount to the labeling of these efforts as "official."

In this case, Mr. Speaker, our own citizens have contributed to the lowering of national dignity and pride.

Action must be taken against Cuba—quickly and decisively. But this necessary action has been delayed—not only by our own citizens but by our allies.

The Organization of American States has been constrained from any action whatsoever in Cuba because of two nations—Brazil and Mexico. These two Governments combined, as Virginia Prewett pointed out in the June 5 Washington Daily News, represent more than half of Latin America's population. For that reason, the United States is "walking softly."

Mr. Speaker, there are 180 million people in the United States—people who ought to be taken into consideration. Communism is our avowed enemy. We must act to resist the inroads of communism in our hemisphere.

Neither the OAS—nor any other organization—can function effectively or even survive if action—or rather lack of action—is determined by 2 or 3 countries.

We must impress it upon Mexico and Brazil that our 180 millions count—that the 5,034,838 in Venezuela—the 13,227,480 in Colombia count. Central America, Venezuela and Colombia, along with the United States—are the nations most directly endangered by the rise of communism in the Caribbean. Should not the fact that their total population is far more than that of Brazil and Mexico count? Or should we continue to be, in Miss Prewett's words, "paralyzed" because of two or three countries?

Mr. Speaker, alliances such as the OAS are forged to protect the common good. Communist aggression is not in the common good for the Western Hemisphere.

Castro has degraded us. We cannot permit him to continue "proving a point" at our expense—as he has done by even suggesting that you can barter men for machines.

As the crises in the Caribbean mount, it becomes even more imperative that we as a nation act—that the OAS, as the guarantor of American solidarity, act.

The necessity for decisive action has been intensified by the recent assassination of Dominican Republic Dictator Rafael Trujillo. Whatever Generalissimo Trujillo's strengths or weaknesses may have been in life, his death has inspired a series of events that will once again test the determination and ability of the Western Hemisphere to preserve freedom and resist the inroads of communism.

We cannot wait. We must act decisively—and let the world know we mean business in our fight against Communist aggression.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on that bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, during the consideration of amendments to H.R. 7444, I was called to the White House as a member of the House minority leadership to attend a briefing by President Kennedy on his recent trip to Europe. During my absence a record rollcall, No. 70, was had on the so-called Reuss amendment. If I had been present to vote on the amendment, I would have voted in the negative.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I was present at the same meeting. I also would have voted in the negative if I had been present.

JEFF DAVIS—KING OF THE HOBOES

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanicous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, many years ago, in the first years of the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson, I met Jeff Davis. I owe a great deal to Jeff Davis. He administered to me a simple oath never to regard someone who begged in public as a panhandler. I could not know what his need was, what circumstances had caused it and what were the events, weaknesses perhaps but also per-

haps misfortunes and tragedies, and it was not given me to judge, but there was given the privilege of giving to another human being in distress, even though my alms might bring a fleeting relaxation from the tensions by an indiscreet indulgence. That was many years ago, but I have never forgotten Jeff Davis, and I have tried to live up to his philosophy.

Jeff Davis then was the "King of the Hoboes." He was the subject of much newspaper comment. He had dedicated himself to the job of putting dignity into the life of the homeless wanderers that the world knows as tramps or hoboes or sometimes but not often as panhandlers.

Many things lead to a man's departure from the usual moorings. It may be a grief, it may be a disappointment, a frustration. It may be alcoholism, or it may be just a natural love of adventure, of having no appointed spot and in finding in all the world the home that he likes best and the people closest to his heart. But who is to judge? Who is to pass upon the decisions of others?

Jeff Davis has found a nobility in many of these homeless wanderers. He is now an old man. His name no longer often appears in the newspapers. I had not heard from him in years until today I received a letter. He is still "King of the Hoboes," the title having been voted to him for life by his homeless followers. He conferred upon me a title, the first title that ever in my humble life I had been given, the title of Grand Supreme Knight of the Knights of the Road. I hope that in my humility and in my consideration of my fellow man I may live up to that title. Here is the letter he sent me:

HI, BARRATT, OLD PAL: I often think of you—especially of the time you got on the soap box on Chicago Avenue—when we held the convention outdoors—and the cops were pinching our delegates whenever they got up on the box.

Then you came along—you got on the box—the cop did not pinch you—and our convention proceeded a la soap box. You were Lieutenant Governor then, many, many years ago.

We are having our 53d annual convention in Kalamazoo, June 26 to July 1.

Drop us a line of greetings—mention the soap box affair—it will give our delegates of today a kick. I saw your name in tonight's paper so I just had to send you a few lines—and a Grand Duke Citation—you deserve it.

Hoboically,

JEFF DAVIS,
King Emperor.

The incident to which he refers was back in 1913 or 1914 when the hoboes were holding their first national convention in one of the parks of Chicago. I happened to be passing by. The police were questioning the propriety of the thing and I think had ordered the removal of the soapbox on which the speakers were to address their fellow hoboes. I then was the Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, young and with black hair worn so long that it might have given the hobo impression. I pushed through the crowd, took possession of the soapbox and proceeded to address the convention, the members of which would not be in Illinois or any other place long enough to vote at the next election, but they all were human beings.

I am happy to note from Jeff Davis' letter that the conventions still go on. The convention this year will be the 53d annual convention. I am happy to send to the convention and to Jeff Davis my warmest good wishes. Who can say which has made a greater contribution to the world into which we were born—I, a Member of the greatest deliberative body in the world, or Jeff Davis, who has given his life to putting dignity into the human existence of men who have no homes, the wanderers the world calls hoboes or tramps.

I think I should add that among the knights of the road, honored as I have been by the title conferred by Jeff Davis, are Supreme Court Justice Douglas, Lowell Thomas, an old friend and associate, and Earl McMahon and Joseph D. Keenan, outstanding leaders in labor.

My hat is off to my fellow knights of the road. It is the road we all pursue, and all who travel the road are our brothers.

FEDERAL AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like all the Members of the Congress to be informed of my sincere opposition to the various proposals for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. Accordingly, I include herewith my full views to be made a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where all Members may examine them:

SUPPLEMENTAL MINORITY VIEWS OF HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL

I emphatically oppose H.R. 7300 providing for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. I do so because the facts clearly indicate that Federal aid in this instance is neither necessary nor desirable.

President Kennedy, in his message to the Congress of February 20, 1961, stated:

"It is equally clear that we do not have enough classrooms. In order to meet current needs and accommodate increasing enrollments, if every child is to have the opportunity of a full-day education in an adequate classroom, a total of 600,000 classrooms must be constructed during the next 10 years."

Six hundred thousand classrooms over a period of 10 years means 60,000 classrooms per year. Average annual construction of classrooms over the past 5 years has been 69,860. Over the past 10 years average annual construction has been 62,600 classrooms per year. Doubtless President Kennedy intended his statement to the Congress as proof of extreme need for Federal intrusion into the general field of lower education. Based on the facts of classroom construction without Federal aid, the President's statement is, in itself, strong proof that the States and local authorities have been meeting this problem effectively.

We often hear the complaint that this Nation does not spend enough money on education. Although I agree that our people should exert more effort and allocate more funds to education, the facts indicate that we have been increasingly doing so over the past 15 years. In 1945 public school revenues represented 1.7 percent of the national income. In 1960, public school revenues represented 3.5 percent of the national income. This was accomplished without Federal intervention. It seems to me rather tenuous, to say the least, for the proponents of Federal aid to argue that increased emphasis on education can only come from the Federal Government.

While student enrollment in our elementary and secondary schools over the past 20 years has increased by 64 percent, expenditures for education have increased 713 percent. The facts completely contradict the absurd assertion that our State and local officials have not been meeting their responsibilities to education.

FEDERAL CONTROL

Many sincere advocates of Federal aid to lower education argue that fears of eventual Federal control are unfounded. At the same time, many other proponents of Federal aid insist that Federal control over education is precisely what is required in America today. This was phrased most emphatically by one advocate in a recent publication.[1] I quote:

"Surely a Congress asked to appropriate a billion dollars a year for the schools will hold hearings to determine whether the money is doing any good. And surely they will be told of all the ways in which it could be more wisely spent if the myopic local school board or the self-seeking State legislators were not in the saddle.

"But if congressional appropriations lead sooner or later to congressional control, does it follow, as everyone seems to assume, that this is undesirable, much less disastrous? Americans are still shackled by the Jeffersonian untruth that the best government governs least, and that central government is worst of all."

If advocates of Federal involvement in general education do not in fact want Federal control, why do they oppose various proposals which would return taxes to the States for education? I have introduced legislation which would return 2 percent of the Federal income tax paid from each State, amounting nationally to $784 million. I have also introduced H.R. 5265, which would return the 10-percent Federal general telephone tax to the States where collected, amounting to $426 million nationally. The Thompson Federal aid bill would provide $720 million of Federal money the first year. The major difference lies in the simple truth that a tax return program could not possibly result in any Federal control, while there is always implicit in the spending of Federal money a large degree of control.

HAS THE INCREASED BIRTH RATE OVERLOADED OUR SCHOOLS?

It is a fascinating fact that from 1914 through 1929, with the exception of a single year, more than 4 million children entered first grade in this country every year. Since 1929 there has not been a single year when more than 4 million children entered first grade in the United States. It would appear that those who point to the birth rate and the great new influx of children into the school as a justification for Federal aid are guilty of considerable exaggeration.

TEACHERS SALARIES

Those teachers who believe that Federal participation will raise their salaries should take a careful look at the record. In the past 20 years, after making allowances for

---

[1] The Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1961, quoting an article from New Republic.

inflation, teachers have increased their earnings by 106 percent while civilian employees of the Federal Government have increased their earnings by 73 percent. During the same period, all persons working for wages or salaries increased their earnings by 91 percent. Watch out, teachers. Look before you leap.

STATE AND LOCAL TAX EXEMPTIONS TO ATTRACT NEW INDUSTRIES

During the debate, I intend to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full text of some of the State laws exempting various new business from taxes. At this point I wish merely to emphasize that the following 7 States, for example, have such laws: Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Vermont. It is interesting to note that the distribution formula contained in H.R. 7300 seems generally to give the highest per population allotments to those States granting special tax exemptions. Are the taxpayers of New York State and other areas of the country to give this kind of a bonus to the very States that have been "stealing" our industries?

THE REAL PROPERTY TAX COMPARED BY STATES

A recent study reveals the disproportionate burden of property taxes among the States.

This study shows the average property tax paid by a person purchasing or building a new or existing home with financing insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

These statistics, which are based on official Federal Housing Administration data published in "FHA Homes in 1959, Data for States and Selected Areas, on Characteristics of FHA Operations Under Section 203," and prepared by Citizens Public Expenditure Survey, Inc., of New York, are as follows:

TABLE I.—*New homes*

	Average property tax	Average property value	Tax rate per $1,000 value	Average owner income	Tax as percent of income
1. Massachusetts	$321.96	$14,548	$22.13	$7,145	4.5
2. New York	331.56	15,607	21.24	7,696	4.3
3. New Hampshire	272.04	13,346	20.38	7,592	3.6
4. Arizona	274.68	13,633	20.15	8,085	3.4
5. South Dakota	262.32	13,613	19.27	7,204	3.6
6. Colorado	269.64	14,907	18.09	7,691	3.5
7. Wisconsin	275.40	15,334	17.96	6,662	4.1
8. New Jersey	252.72	14,387	17.57	7,471	3.4
9. Oregon	243.24	13,932	17.46	7,494	3.2
10. Kansas	240.24	14,738	16.30	7,218	3.3
11. Nebraska	235.68	14,533	16.22	7,127	3.3
12. Vermont	228.00	14,823	15.38	7,251	3.1
13. California	248.28	16,375	15.16	8,399	3.0
14. Pennsylvania	214.92	14,390	14.94	7,141	3.0
15. Maryland	218.40	14,910	14.65	7,473	2.9
16. Rhode Island	186.48	12,752	14.62	6,514	2.9
17. Maine	184.68	12,639	14.61	6,531	2.8
18. North Dakota	197.16	13,655	14.44	6,866	2.9
19. Minnesota	212.88	15,095	14.10	6,415	3.3
20. Connecticut	203.52	14,676	13.87	6,622	3.1
21. Texas	184.68	13,449	13.73	7,147	2.6
22. Montana	217.20	15,895	13.66	8,164	2.7
23. Michigan	199.20	14,872	13.39	6,984	2.9
24. Illinois	198.60	15,206	13.06	7,246	2.7
25. Iowa	181.80	14,004	12.98	6,386	2.8
26. Wyoming	189.72	15,681	12.10	7,944	2.4
27. Washington	$169.68	$14,517	$11.69	$7,263	2.3
28. Alaska	345.96	30,008	11.53	13,986	2.5
29. Missouri	171.24	14,989	11.42	7,151	2.4
30. Ohio	153.84	14,917	10.31	6,762	2.3
31. Utah	150.00	14,951	10.03	6,826	2.2
32. Kentucky	132.36	13,386	9.89	6,626	2.0
33. Nevada	159.24	16,235	9.81	8,771	1.8
34. Idaho	150.72	15,792	9.54	7,594	2.0
35. Oklahoma	124.56	13,236	9.41	6,982	1.8
36. New Mexico	133.92	14,340	9.34	7,603	1.8
37. Tennessee	122.52	13,771	8.90	7,182	1.7
38. Arkansas	124.20	13,969	8.89	7,108	1.7
39. North Carolina	114.60	13,513	8.48	7,298	1.6
40. Virginia	129.00	15,402	8.38	7,640	1.7
41. Indiana	114.12	13,923	8.20	6,954	1.6
42. Georgia	108.84	13,934	7.81	6,908	1.6
43. Florida	98.76	14,184	6.96	7,040	1.4
44. Hawaii	143.28	20,869	6.87	9,325	1.5
45. Delaware	92.16	15,078	6.11	7,210	1.3
46. West Virginia	85.08	16,000	5.32	7,077	1.2
47. Mississippi	68.40	13,181	5.19	6,854	1.0
48. Alabama	76.92	14,894	5.16	7,348	1.0
49. Louisiana	77.64	15,285	5.08	7,069	1.1
50. South Carolina	59.04	13,208	4.47	6,584	.9
U.S. average	182.64	14,645	12.47	7,336	2.5

TABLE II.—*Existing homes*

	Average property tax	Average property value	Tax rate per $1,000 value	Average owner income	Tax as percent of income
1. Massachusetts	$297.84	$12,836	$23.20	$6,741	4.4
2. Arizona	288.12	12,659	22.76	8,089	3.6
3. New York	307.32	14,399	21.34	7,809	3.9
4. South Dakota	235.08	11,696	20.10	6,972	3.4
5. New Hampshire	215.64	11,104	19.42	6,495	3.3
6. Wisconsin	267.00	13,857	19.27	6,570	4.1
7. New Jersey	271.68	14,210	19.12	7,603	3.6
8. Nebraska	232.08	12,621	18.39	6,653	3.5
9. Vermont	192.60	10,616	18.14	5,663	3.4
10. Colorado	230.40	13,237	17.41	6,991	3.3
11. Rhode Island	190.32	11,197	17.00	6,178	3.1
12. Oregon	195.96	11,573	16.93	6,879	2.8
13. Kansas	206.04	12,170	16.93	6,732	3.1
14. Minnesota	245.76	14,953	16.44	6,661	3.7
15. Pennsylvania	178.44	11,248	15.86	6,341	2.8
16. Maine	174.48	11,096	15.72	6,167	2.8
17. North Dakota	204.96	13,214	15.51	7,053	2.9
18. Connecticut	237.00	15,709	15.09	7,555	3.1
19. Michigan	198.00	13,336	14.85	6,851	2.9
20. Maryland	202.68	13,821	14.66	7,239	2.8
21. California	206.88	14,135	14.64	7,761	2.7
22. Illinois	202.92	14,397	14.09	7,352	2.8
23. Iowa	180.12	12,902	13.96	6,602	2.7
24. Montana	193.08	13,904	13.80	7,827	2.5
25. Texas	151.08	11,069	13.65	6,607	2.3
26. Missouri	147.00	12,714	11.56	6,747	2.2
27. Wyoming	$163.44	$14,237	$11.48	$7,705	2.1
28. Nevada	184.44	16,169	11.41	9,636	1.9
29. Ohio	159.48	14,520	10.98	6,954	2.3
30. Idaho	134.04	12,331	10.87	6,702	2.0
31. Alaska	252.48	23,784	10.62	11,963	2.1
32. Utah	142.32	13,773	10.33	6,738	2.1
33. Tennessee	108.24	11,137	9.72	6,367	1.7
34. Washington	120.84	12,875	9.39	6,931	1.7
35. New Mexico	113.64	12,208	9.31	7,004	1.6
36. Virginia	130.08	14,061	9.25	7,368	1.8
37. Arkansas	104.64	11,356	9.21	6,567	1.6
38. Kentucky	113.52	12,463	9.11	6,512	1.7
39. North Carolina	105.60	11,743	8.99	6,754	1.6
40. Georgia	109.56	12,908	8.49	6,646	1.6
41. Oklahoma	89.88	10,600	8.48	6,186	1.5
42. Indiana	108.84	12,894	8.44	7,056	1.5
43. Delaware	106.80	12,668	8.43	6,624	1.6
44. Mississippi	76.20	11,148	6.84	6,390	1.2
45. Florida	92.40	13,746	6.72	7,197	1.3
46. West Virginia	81.12	13,992	5.80	6,986	1.2
47. Hawaii	110.52	19,414	5.69	9,043	1.2
48. Alabama	67.92	12,925	5.25	6,848	1.0
49. Louisiana	67.20	13,426	5.01	6,724	1.0
50. South Carolina	55.32	11,379	4.86	6,153	.9
U.S. average	178.08	13,190	13.50	7,085	2.5

The data shows, in addition to the average property tax, the average property value, the tax rate per $1,000 of value, and the average owner income in each State.

With this information, it is possible to determine the tax as a percentage of income.

The compilation shows some States paying four times as much tax, on the average, as the lower States. This, I believe, illustrates that certain States are falling far below others in utilizing their proper tax resources. That is their right, but is it our obligation to take up their burden under such circumstances?

THE UNFULFILLED PROMISE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend to the attention of our col-

leagues the following article written by the Honorable Orman W. Ketcham, judge, juvenile court of the District of Columbia. Judge Ketcham's comments are particularly important in view of the current discussion of legislation in this area. The article is from Crime and Delinquency, a publication of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, and appeared in their April 1961 issue:

THE UNFULFILLED PROMISE OF THE JUVENILE COURT

(By Orman W. Ketcham, judge, juvenile court of the District of Columbia)

(As the result of a conference conducted by the University of Chicago, School of Social Service Administration, on March 27-28, 1959, this article was originally prepared as a chapter in a forthcoming publication entitled "Justice for the Child."—Ed.

(I wish to acknowledge the invaluable assistance and research of my law clerks, James P. Felstiner and Richardson White, Jr. (who succeeded Mr. Felstiner on August 15, 1959), during the period in which this article was prepared.—O. W. K.)

Even though most readers of this journal are well versed in the judicial history of the juvenile court in the United States, some consideration of the social and legal theory underlying this development is necessary to a proper examination of that unique institution.

ORIGINS OF THE JUVENILE COURT

The Latin phrase, parens patriae, has for many years been used to epitomize the legal and social philosophy underlying the juvenile court.[1] Parens patriae describes a doctrine of the English Court of Chancery by which the king, through his chancellors, assumed the general protection of all infants in the realm. The theory, as was pointed out in an early case,[2] was that the sovereign, as pater patriae, possessed an obligation to oversee the welfare of the children in his kingdom who, because of the frailties intrinsic to their minority, might be abused, neglected, or abandoned by their parents or other guardians. The king, through his Court of Chancery, could thereby step in and provide the requisite parental protection and care.[3]

Despite the apparent latitude suggested by the broad criterion of a child's welfare, the chancery court undertook performance of this duty only rarely. The jurisdiction was "a delicate one," to be "exercised only when plainly demanded as a means of securing the infant's present and future well-being." [4] One reason for this hesitancy was that the English common law imposed a duty on the parents toward their children and also created a presumption that they would live up to it. Consequently, although the chancery court would interfere under appropriate circumstances, a strong case demonstrating a situation severely detrimental to the child had to be made out.[5] Secondly, as stated in numerous cases, the court was cautious about interfering not from want of jurisdiction but rather from absence of the means by which to effectuate care and custody; in practice, for many generations, it limited its parental duty to the supervision of wealthy minors.[6] Finally, the welfare of the child was the sole and fundamental consideration (a limitation which is of interest with respect to later American developments of the doctrine of parens patriae). Neither the punishment of the parents nor the protection of society was a relevant criterion for judicial intervention.[7]

In the United States, the transplanting of the general English judicial system meant that the States and the Federal Government[8] took the place of the crown. Courts all but universally upheld the plenary powers and parental obligations implicit in the doctrine of parens patriae.[9] However, the common law presumption that parents would properly perform their natural duty and later the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution (which has consistently been interpreted to protect the natural right of a parent to the custody of his child from State intervention without due process of law) both tended, during the 18th and 19th centuries, to restrict the court's assumption of custody to cases where it was clearly necessary in order to prevent injury to the child.[10] The focus remained on the protection of the health, morals, and welfare of the child rather than the protection of society, but the absence of property was no longer a consideration.

In addition to the continuation of the doctrine of parens patriae in the colonial courts and later in the State courts, other historical antecedents of the present system—such as the establishment of private and public welfare organizations, orphanages, and houses of refuge, and the use of foster homes and cottage-type reformatories—attempted to deal with children's crime, poverty, and parental fallibility in ways different from the punitive, society-protecting orientation of the traditional criminal court. Furthermore, the 18th century philosophy of laissez-faire in personal affairs was steadily replaced, during the latter part of the 19th century and the first quarter of the 20th, by an expansion of governmental social welfare activity.

In summary, then, the major trends which culminated in the first juvenile court act included the equitable concept of parens patriae, the increased use of legislation to obtain humanitarian social ends, the growing horror at the traditional judicial practice of treating children over seven as criminals, and the mounting number of specialized correctional facilities for dealing with children.

The fundamental aim of the Illinois statute enacted on July 1, 1899 was that "The care, custody, and discipline of a child (found to be delinquent, dependent, or neglected) shall approximate as nearly as may be that which should be given by its parents. * * * " [11] The nature of this first act and its history and development are so well known to students of the juvenile court movement as to warrant no repetition here.[12]

The truly significant innovation of the Illinois act, so far as this article is concerned, was that children charged with law violations were not to be treated as criminals, but were to be accorded the same individualized assistance as that given to dependent and neglected children. It marked an important departure from previous English and American chancery proceedings involving parens patriae, which had provided protection only to those children whose distress was the result of their parents' actions rather than their own delinquent acts.

The innovation met with widespread approval, and by 1927 all but two States (Maine and Wyoming) had similar juvenile court laws.[13] Except for a few early cases, appellate courts upheld the constitutionality of the various juvenile court acts against a variety of challenges.[14] The result has been that—along with the concepts of retribution, punishment, and deterrence—the standard rules of criminal procedure (e.g., right to jury trial, protection against self-incrimination, open hearings, proof beyond a reasonable doubt, right to counsel, limitations upon the use of hearsay evidence, the right to bail, etc.) have been generally discarded in American juvenile courts. Thus the juvenile in America may be brought within the protective power of the juvenile court without the operation of legal safeguards customarily offered to a person accused of a law violation.

In sharp contrast, in England (the country of origin of the parens patriae doctrine), juvenile courts hearing delinquency cases still provide to children all the essential protections of criminal procedure, even though their dispositions are similar to those provided by American juvenile courts.[15]

MUTUAL COMPACT THEORY OF PARENS PATRIAE IN AMERICA

By the enactment of a typical American juvenile court act, a State undertakes to remove the detriments and stigmata of a criminal proceeding against the child and promises to provide him with the essentials of parental training, care, and custody which were not provided by his natural parents. Because of these assurances by the State, the juvenile lawbreaker is stripped of the constitutional protections traditionally afforded to persons charged with a crime or a violation of the law.

For the purposes of this article, let us assume that a relationship which may be described as a mutual compact has been created between the State and the delinquent or criminally inclined child. It can be regarded as a bargain or agreement whereby the State, through the juvenile court,

---

[1] See, e.g., *Commonwealth* v. *Fisher*, 27 Pa. Super. 175 (1904), aff'd 213 Pa. 48, 62 Atl. 198 (1905); *Ex parte Johnson*, 31 N.J. Super. 382, 106 A.2d 560 (1954), aff'd 18 N.J. 422, 114 A.2d 1 (1955), cert. denied 350 U.S. 942 (1956); *In re Holmes*, 175 Pa. Super. 137, 103 A.2d 454 (1958), aff'd 379 Pa. 599, 109 A.2d 523 (1959), cert. denied 348 U.S. 973 (1955); *Pee* v. *U.S.*, 107 U.S. App. D.C. 47, 274 F. 2d 556 (1959).

[2] *Eyre* v. *Shaftsbury*, 2 P. Wms. 103, 118, 24 Eng. Rep. 659, 664 (1722); *Wellesley* v. *Beaufort*, 2 Russ. 17, 20, 38 Eng. Rep. 236, 243 (1827).

[3] Where the court-appointed guardian was deficient in the performance of his duties toward the child, the court could replace him. *Beaufort* v. *Berty*, 1 P. Wms. 703, 705, 24 Eng. Rep. 579, 580 (1721).

[4] Pomeroy, A Treatise on Equity Jurisprudence § 1307 (5th ed. 1941).

[5] Snell, The Principles of Equity 400 (19th ed. 1925).

[6] See Mack, "The Juvenile Court," 23 Harv. L. Rev. 104 (1909) for citations.

[7] *Ball* v. *Ball*, 2 Sim. 35, 57 Eng. Rep. 703 (1827).

[8] Only as to territories and the District of Columbia, 27 Am. Jur. Infants § 102.

[9] 27 Am. Jur. Infants, § 101–105; 43 C.J.S. Infants, § 4; 67 C.J.S. Parent and Child, § 10.

[10] For discussions of the theories under which the State operates when it supersedes the parents as guardians, see Note, 27 Col. L. Rev. 968 (1927); Note, 29 Ind. L.J. 475 (1954) and Note, 19 Harv. L. Rev. 374 (1906).

[11] Ill. Laws, 41st Gen. Ass., 1899, The Juvenile Court Act § 21 at 137.

[12] Among the more useful discussions of the legal and social antecedents of this pioneer legislation are the following: Lou, Juvenile Courts in the United States 1–31 (1927); Hurley, Origin of the Illinois Juvenile Court 9–52 (3d ed. 1907); Tappan, Juvenile Delinquency 167–173 (1949); Ludwig, "Rationale of Responsibility of Young Offenders," 29 Neb. L. Rev. 521 (1950); Flexner, "The Juvenile Court * * * Its Legal Aspect," 36 Annals 49 (1910).

[13] Tompkins, Sources for the Study of the Administration of Criminal Justice, 1949–1955, 130 (1956).

[14] The cases are collected in Note, 29 Ind. L.J. 475, 479–480 (1954) and in Paulsen, "Fairness to the Juvenile Offender," 41 Minn. L. Rev. 547 (1957).

[15] Henriques, "Children's Courts in England," 37 J. Crim. L., Crim. and Pol. Sci. 295 (1946).

is permitted to intervene, under broadly defined conditions of delinquency or violations of law, in the lives of families who have given up certain of their constitutional safeguards. By use of this literary device (which may not be able to withstand the rigorous testing of traditional legal analysis as a bilateral contract, but which, nevertheless, has intriguing possibilities for evaluation of the juvenile court system), we can clearly assess the rights and duties as well as the powers and disabilities of the several parties to the agreement.

The compact authorizes the juvenile court, in its discretion, to substitute State control for parental control. But such an intrusion of governmental supervision is premised on the assumption that the State will act in the best interests of the child and that its intervenion will affirmatively enhance the child's welfare. Applying the contractual analogy, it follows that unless the State satisfactorily performs its obligations under the compact, the juvenile and his parents should have a right to consider the agreement broken and to repossess their full constitutional rights. In other words, if the State fails to make good its promise to act for the improvement of the child's welfare, the child and his parents may demand the full protection of criminal due process afforded adults charged with crime.

McCrea has pointed out that "The first two decades of the juvenile court movement produced a wealth of philosophical comment so sound in conception and so modern in tone that it has scarcely been modified or improved upon since that time." But, after six decades of comment and legislation, as he went on to say, most courts dealing with children are still "not equipped to diagnose their problems, prescribe remedies suited to their individual needs, or provide the treatment necessary to help them."[16] Mere expressions of good intention are not enough. Performance, rather than good intentions, must be the standard for judging the success of the courts. The State, through its juvenile courts, must demonstrate that it is conscientiously striving to achieve the rehabilitation it promises, and that (though it makes no promise to actually bring about the reformation of the child) it will seek to employ the best institutional, probationary, medical, psychiatric, and other techniques in providing an opportunity for each child to develop into a mature and law-abiding citizen. The State has no right to substitute governmental for parental neglect.

The remainder of this article will examine the actual performance by the State acting in loco parentis, to determine whether the compact between child and State (elimination of the protections of criminal due process in return for nonpunitive, rehabilitative, and protective social procedures) has been kept. If it has been abrogated—if the State has failed to keep its legislative promises—the circumvention of constitutional protections and the assertion of State control in the name of parens patriae are neither legally nor morally justified.

PROMISE VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Before the full import of relinquishment by the child and his parents of their constitutional protections can be understood, a closer examination must be made not only of the State's specific obligations under the compact but also of the extent to which these obligations have been met. Five subsidiary promises by the State can be distinguished:

First, the promise that the consequences of a finding of delinquency will, in fact, be noncriminal and that the stigma of a criminal record will not obtain.

Second, the promise that the hearing itself will be promptly held, easily understood, fair, and compatible with, if not a part of, the treatment process.

Third, the promise that family ties will be strengthened and the child removed from his home only when his welfare or the interests of the community demand such action.

Fourth, the promise that the child's treatment subsequent to a finding of delinquency will approximate as closely as possible that which he should have received from his parents.

Fifth, in cases where removal from home and close supervision are required, the promise that the deleterious effects of imprisonment upon habits, attitudes, and aspirations will be minimized by therapeutically rather than punitively oriented restrictions.

Implied in each of these five promises is a complex of duties toward the child which requires implementation if these promises are to be more than specious declarations of intention. I propose now to examine in some detail the actualities of this implementation and to present pertinent statistics and such research findings as seem most accurately to describe the current situation.

Of necessity, the national picture must be painted with broad strokes. In some instances, exceptions and variations substantially qualify the account presented here. American juvenile courts and their adjunctive agencies and institutions vary enormously in the degree to which they perform the duties of a State under the compact. There is a world of difference between the court in a small county seat where juvenile hearings are held 1 day a week and the vast operations of a specialized juvenile court in a city of a million or more population. And there certainly is no assurance that the larger the operation the more compliance there will be with the basic tenets of the compact. But discussions of such ramifications are beyond the scope of this article; the reader interested in obtaining a more comprehensive picture is urged to consult the sources cited below.

Confidentiality

The State engages that its actions will be nonpunitive, that no child found to be within the jurisdiction of the juvenile court will be deemed a criminal or considered to be convicted of a crime,[17] and that no civil disabilities will be imposed.[18] It further promises that juvenile court findings will not be admissible as evidence against the child in any case or proceeding,[19] and that legal and social record will be confidential, except that the judge may allow inspection to persons having a legitimate interest in the child or the work of the court.[20]

Despite these promises, police records of juvenile arrests are generally kept on the same blotters as those of adults without any special confidentiality.[21] Fingerprinting and, to a lesser extent, photographing of arrested juveniles are likewise common practices, and criticism of such police procedures is resisted vigorously by many law enforcement officials.[22] Since approximately 70 percent of all juvenile court referrals throughout the country are made by police officers,[23] these criminal-like procedures take on significance. Happily, in cities where special police units for dealing with juveniles have been established, such practices are far less frequent.

Despite the promise of confidentiality of juvenile court dockets and records, the exceptions made for persons or agencies deemed to have a legitimate need to inspect are so numerous that they hardly qualify as exceptions. The Armed Forces, for example, are generally given the right to inquire into delinquency adjudications in the cases of persons being investigated for security clearances,[24] and the more sought-after services erect stringent enlistment barriers to anyone having a juvenile court record.[25] A study of the New York City children's court revealed that the FBI, the Civil Service, the Army, the Red Cross, the hack license bureau, the department of public welfare, the National Travelers Aid Association, and various other social agencies had access to the court's legal records despite the usual statutory provision that "No adjudication under the provisions of this act shall operate as a disqualification of any child."[26]

In view of the punitive purposes that dominate the sentencing of adult criminals,[27] a recent report on adult presentence investigation practices in the Federal probation system causes special concern. It reveals that, of the 97 reporting offices, the staff of 92 have access to juvenile court records for use in drawing up presentence reports. In 30 of these districts, the presentence reports are available to interested parties (including the U.S. attorney in 28 and various Federal investigative agencies in 3). In 11 districts, counsel for the defense has access to them. In 12 districts, the judges occasionally read the reports aloud, in part or in their entirety, in open court. In seven districts, the reports are filed with the clerk of the court, thus becoming available to public inspection to the same extent as all other criminal court records.[28] I do not know of any survey of State practices in the use of juvenile court records in adult presentence investigations, but I have no reason to believe that State courts respect the confidentiality of a juvenile's record any more than the Federal court system does.

For the most part, then, the State does not achieve its aim of securing court adjudication and treatment without at the same time clouding the child's future social and legal adjustment with a notoriety similar to that produced by criminal proceedings. These unfortunate consequences do not necessarily represent the State's deliberate repudiation of its promise. If the record is of significant assistance to the demanding agency in the performance of its duties, the request for information may be quite legitimate. But however valid the reasons for the disclosure of such records to other State or Federal agencies may be, in this competition the interests of the delinquent child most often give way to the needs of the various governmental and nongovernmental agencies.

---

[16] McCrea, "Juvenile Courts and Juvenile Probation," 3 NPPA Journal 385, 389 (1957).

[17] Sussman, "Law of Juvenile Delinquency," Chart b at 33–34 (revised ed. 1959).

[18] Ibid.

[19] Id. at 35.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Kahn, "The Untried Weapon Against Delinquency," 22 Fed. Prob. 11, 13 (1958).

[22] "Police Services for Juveniles," report of a conference sponsored by the children's bureau in cooperation with the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the special juvenile delinquent project, 27–31 (1954). See also Gronewold, "Presentence Investigation Practices in the Federal Probation System," 22 Fed. Prob. 27, 29 (1958).

[23] Taken from figures compiled by the U.S. Children's Bureau as reported in Teeters and Reinemann, "The Challenge of Delinquency," 218 (1950).

[24] DD Form 398 (18).

[25] E.g., AFM 39–9 (11)(c)(I) and RECRTGWG supplement 6 to AFM 39–9, July 1, 1957.

[26] Kahn, "A Court for Children 59–60" (1942) quoting the Domestic Relations Act of New York City, § 84.

[27] Wechsler and Michael, "A Rationale of the Laws of Homicide," 37 Col. L. Rev. 1261 (1937).

[28] Gronewold, supra, note 22, at 30.

Special quality of hearing

Impinging on this problem of untoward publicity is the agreement made by the State with respect to the conduct of the juvenile court hearing itself. Specifically, it promises nonpublic,[29] informal, dispassionate, and sympathetic hearings [30] at which the procedure will be understandable, equitable, and fairly administered.[31]

The promise of a nonpublic hearing is probably lived up to in the majority of juvenile courts insofar as casual visitors are excluded from the courtroom.[32] On the other hand, the bustle of staff, witnesses, and guests is not very much different from the turmoil of an adult court.[33] Moreover, even in juvenile courts which remain closed to the general public, it is by no means true that juveniles are regularly protected from newspaper publicity. In 1957, for example, four States amended their juvenile court laws in ways designed to permit the same notoriety as attends criminal proceedings.[34]

Another promise which most juvenile courts keep after a fashion is informality of procedures; [35] in many of them, not only traditional procedure but basic orderliness has been abandoned almost to the point of chaos. Thus the implicit aim of equitable, understandable, and wise adjudication is defeated.[36] Compared with most other administrative and judicial tribunals, the juvenile court is extraordinarily free from effective checks and balances.[37] For example, a probation officer (who in most jurisdictions is a court appointee [38]) represents the child before the court while simultaneously presenting charges and evidence which may result in severe and long-term restrictions upon his client's liberty.[39]

The high degree of autonomy which the juvenile court judge typically enjoys has the corollary effect of focusing upon him virtually the total responsibility for a just adjudication and an astute disposition. In the great majority of jurisdictions, however, he is hampered not only by his own lack of training in the necessarily specialized skills demanded by his job [40] and by overloaded calendars,[41] but also by administrative duties and essential extracurricular activities far beyond those demanded of judges in other courts.[42] His task is further complicated in many jurisdictions by intake and probation staffs that are overworked, underpaid, and poorly trained.[43] According to a recent study by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,[44] less than half of the 3,000 counties in the United States have juvenile probation services and only one-tenth of the probation officers have had specialized training.

Legal counsel rarely appear in most juvenile courts.[45] And often, on the rare occasions when they do, their lack of understanding of the juvenile court philosophy and their puzzlement concerning the absence of legal procedures make them more of a hindrance than a help to the judge.[46] Many courts, particularly those stressing social welfare in contrast with their adjudication functions, discourage the presence of lawyers.[47] No figures are available on the subject, but it is reasonable to assume that the indigency of most juveniles hailed before the court further lessens their chances of obtaining legal representation.[48]

Stenographic recording of the court's proceedings is far from a universal practice, and it is unusual for a juvenile court judge to note his reasons for a particular disposition.[49] Consequently, in most jurisdictions it is a singular occasion when an appeal is taken.[50]

In practice, then, the aim of a simplified, easily understood, yet fair hearing at which the remedial efforts of the State should formally begin is frustrated. Doubtless there are many judges, lawyers, and social workers who, despite the problems confronting them, are capable of meeting the intricate and unusual demands of their duties with vigor and imagination. Where juvenile courts are staffed with such persons they are sometimes able to create and maintain a court system, even without the aid of carefully developed procedures, which fulfills in good measure the State's promise. Too often, however, the structure of a juvenile court hearing is jerry-built, a hodgepodge of traditional, criminal-type procedures, values, and attitudes on the one hand, and airy altruism, confusing informality, and noblesse oblige on the other. Such a court structure usually results in denying to the juvenile the benefits promised by the State without granting him the protections generally afforded criminals. Where such is the situation the best interests of the youthful delinquent are dubiously served.

Custody

Both before and after a formal judicial determination that the child comes within the court's jurisdiction, the child may experience interrogation, detention, and other forms of treatment out of the presence of his parents which would be of questionable legality were he an adult criminal suspect. But such treatment is routinely justified on the grounds that the State promises to secure for the child such care and guidance, preferably in his own home, as will serve his welfare,[51] and to conserve and strengthen the family ties wherever possible, removing him from the custody of his parents only when his welfare cannot be adequately provided for without such removal.[52]

Although nearly every juvenile court act provides that any interested party may file a petition to institute a proceeding against a juvenile, the great majority of such actions are commenced by police officers.[53] If the policeman has not been specifically trained or is not inclined toward sympathetic handling of juvenile offenders, his attitudes and actions are likely to be the same as those he displays in dealing with an adult criminal suspect.[54] Thus the child, in his first contact with the juvenile court, often finds himself cast in the role of a junior criminal.

In some jurisdictions, moreover, a police officer or a superintendent of correction who operates the detention home without court supervision decides whether the arrested child should be detained.[55] In either case, considerations peripheral, if not contrary, to that of the child's welfare are likely to predominate.[56] Feelings of misunderstanding, hostility, and resentment which may have been produced in the child by his first contact with law enforcement officials are not likely to be mitigated by incarceration in a detention home pending the adjudication and disposition of his case. One authority has summed up the conditions he will probably face in such an institution as follows:

"Most detention homes violate the very principles of mental hygiene which were violated in the child's own home—denial of love and emotional security, lack of meaningful activity, little opportunity to make successful choices, and so forth.[57]"

Outright cruelty is not unknown in some of the country's detention centers,[58] to say nothing of dismal, crowded quarters and a staff calloused in spirit by overwork and inadequate program and equipment. For children detained there who are charged but not yet adjudicated as delinquents, the mockery is deplorable enough. It is outrageous when the children there are detained on charges of neglect and dependency—yet such occurrences are not infrequent.[59]

In accordance with the promise not to treat the child as a criminal, the right to release under bail bond is denied or strictly

---

[29] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 32.

[30] Mack, supra note 6, at 119–120.

[31] Schramm, "The Court Hearing as Part of the Treatment Process" in Glueck, the Problem of Delinquency 562 (1959).

[32] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 188.

[33] Kahn, op. cit. supra note 26, at 98.

[34] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 80.

[35] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 188 and Note, 58 Col. L. Rev. 702, 716 (1958).

[36] For illustrations see Kahn, op. cit. supra note 26, at 102; Diana, "The Rights of Juvenile Delinquents: An Appraisal of Juvenile Court Procedures," 47 J. Crim. L., Crim. and Pol. Sci. 561 (1957).

[37] Pound, Foreword in Young, Social Treatment in Probation and Delinquency, xiv (1952).

[38] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 56.

[39] Note, supra note 35, at 717–721 and Paulsen, supra note 14, at 565–568 discuss possible abuses in the use of social reports in juvenile court hearings. See also Cheriff, "Correct Use of Background Reports in Juvenile Delinquency Cases," 5 Syracuse L. Rev. 67 (1953).

[40] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 51; Deutsch, Our Rejected Children 225–227 (1950); Gelhorn, Children and Families in the Courts of New York 99–104 (1954); Ellrod and Melaney, "Juvenile Justice; Treatment or Travesty?" 11 U. Pitt. L. Rev. 277, 285–286 (1950).

[41] E.g., the annual reports of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia for 1957–1959; Brecher and Brecher, "Better Courts for Kids," Saturday Evening Post, Oct. 25, 1958.

[42] Alexander, "Of Juvenile Court Justice and Judges" in NPPA Yearbook, Redirecting the Delinquent, 187, 201 (1947).

[43] For a study of factors affecting the efficiency of probationary practices see the report by Hengerer, "Organizing Probation Services," in NPPA Yearbook Reappraising Crime Treatment 45 (1953).

[44] Committee on Juvenile Delinquency, Programs, and Services in the Field of Juvenile Delinquency 4 (1958).

[45] Teeters and Reinemann, op. cit. supra note 23, at 326. See also the discussion of case in Note, supra, note 35, at 716.

[46] Paulsen, supra note 14, at 570.

[47] Diana, supra note 36, at 565–566; see also discussions and citations in Paulsen, supra note 14, at 568–70.

[48] The extent to which legal assistance is generally available in civil and criminal cases is reported by Brownell, Legal Aid in the United States (1951).

[49] Gelhorn, op. cit. supra note 40, at 97.

[50] Note, supra note 35 at 716, footnote 118.

[51] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 38–39.

[52] Id. at 45–50.

[53] Supra footnotes 23, 41.

[54] Consider the following: "Police said their tall, dark-haired, soft-spoken suspect [i.e., a 13-year old] denied involvement through more than 4 hours of questioning. They said he 'broke,' however, when he was confronted by a classmate who said he watched him [commit the alleged arson] * * * [H]e calmly reenacted his incendiary role before a group of school, fire department, and police authorities." Washington Post, Oct. 16, 1959, p. 1. See also Teeters and Reinemann, op. cit. supra note 23, at 219–221.

[55] Teeters and Reinemann, op. cit. supra note 23, at 228.

[56] See Paulsen's comments on *Myers* v. *Collett*, 1 Utah 2d 406, 268 P. 2d 432 (1954) in Paulsen supra note 14, at 552.

[57] Norman, "The Detention Home," 261 Annals 158, 161 (1949). See also Edwards, "Meeting the Challenge of a Juvenile Code," in NPPA Yearbook Reappraising Crime Treatment 94, 97–99 (1953).

[58] Deutsch, op. cit. supra note 40, at 242.

[59] Norman, supra note 57, at 159.

limited by most courts.[60] As a result, in jurisdictions with crowded calendars, children are frequently detained for protracted periods.[61] In the light of the conditions cited above, the denial of bond—though worthy in intent and potentially sound—has little justification.

Incarceration and other forms of treatment traditionally used with criminals may be fully justified in the case of those older or hardened youths whose only qualification for being treated as juveniles is their chronologic age. But the proportion of such mature hoodlums in the total group of delinquents is usually very small and is scant vindication for the general use of such procedures. It certainly cannot justify this kind of treatment for children whose involvement in the offense has not been determined or whose culpability is largely in having been born to neglectful or irresponsible parents.

Juvenile institutions

The State promises that when a child must be removed from his family, it will secure for him custody, care, training, and discipline as nearly as possible equivalent to that which should have been given him by his parents, including any special care made necessary by his mental condition.[62]

In 1950 Albert Deutsch published the results of his investigation of public and private training schools, detention facilities, and juvenile court systems in States "ranking highest in wealth and culture." His findings were endorsed by Austin MacCormick, executive director of the Osborne Association and an internationally recognized penologist.[63] On juvenile reformatories Deutsch summarized his conclusions as follows: "With notable exceptions, the rule in most so-called public training schools I visited was one of fear and repression." [64] Apart from the grounds and buildings—which, in many cases, resembled those of expensive boarding schools—the institutions, Deutsch implied, were little better than prisons, and, in view of the widespread use of corporal and other degrading punishments, were considerably worse than the average maximum-security prison. Not surprisingly, his findings are corroborated by a number of investigations into the recidivism rates (65 to 85 percent) of graduates of such reformatories and training schools.[65]

An equally disheartening observation has been made about the main motive for commitment:

"In actual practice, institutional commitments are frequently made for reasons quite different from security and training. A major persisting motive is punishment—the retributive drive that sustains much of society's attack upon the offender, regardless of age. The intense punitive reaction of the courts, even those specialized to deal with children and adolescents, is a matter of too-common observation." [66]

Even the most sympathetic of judges, those who do not contribute to the prevalence of misplaced motives, have a dilemma of their own to contend with: Should the delinquent be committed to a training school where his chances of reformation are statistically slight, or should he be returned to the pernicious environment of his home and neighborhood with only the weekly visit to a probation officer for supervision? Foster home placement is not suited to the needs of many children; [67] in any event, it is not generally available for delinquents.[68]

Many qualifications might be made to these comments, which seem to state that all juvenile institutions are deplorably operated or in short supply. This generalization does a serious injustice to a number of well-run, privately financed rehabilitation centers and to a few communities which have developed adequate rehabilitation centers or foster home placement facilities. But the proportion of foster homes and publicly supported training schools which make positive contributions to the welfare of their charges remains depressingly small.

CHILDREN IN JAILS AND PRISONS

Close contact between an adult and an adolescent—who is, above everything else, at a stage in life when he is most impressionable—can be either good or bad, depending on the proclivities of the adult. With this in mind, the State promises that no child will be placed in a prison, a jail, or a lockup lest the State abet his downfall by confining him with adult offenders. It also promises that the child will not otherwise be brought into contact with adult criminals or commingled with vicious or immoral persons.[69]

Most juvenile court acts expressly prohibit the detention of children under specified ages in jails and police stations; nevertheless, 50,000 to 100,000 children are confined each year in our county jails.[70] A U.S. Children's Bureau study of 380 courts indicated that "jail detention had been used in 11 percent of all children's cases in 1944 and 12 percent in 1945." [71] A study in California showed that during 1945 more than 11,000 children were confined in city and county jails in the State. The same report indicated that the period of detention ranged from 1 day to 230 days for boys and from 1 day to 69 days for girls; the average length of incarceration for all children during the year was about 12 days.[72] Most jails are destructive not only for the children illegally confined there but also for the adult prisoners: more than 90 percent of the jails inspected by the Federal Bureau of Prisons throughout the country are rated under 60 on a scale of 100.[73]

The reason for this widespread, blatant repudiation of both the letter and the spirit of the juvenile court law is, in large part, the absence of suitable juvenile facilities.[74] But questionable statutory draftsmanship also plays a part. Under some statutes placement in a detention home exclusively for juveniles is not mandatory; few acts provide for the punishment of persons who violate the sections forbidding jail detention of children; [75] in some enactments the scope of the prohibition is obscure.[76]

In the great majority of juvenile court acts the court's exclusive jurisdiction is subject to certain exceptions which give criminal courts concurrent and, in a few instances, exclusive jurisdiction over specific categories of juvenile cases. Other acts provide that the juvenile court may, in its discretion, waive jurisdiction to criminal courts. These exceptions are usually described in terms of the age of the child and the nature of the offense.[77] Thus, there is legal justification for the imprisonment of a certain number of children and youths; however, the degree to which the philosophy of the juvenile court has failed in application is indicated by the large number of juveniles who are serving sentences in State and Federal prisons.[78] Finally, in a number of jurisdictions, it has been possible for a child committed to a training school by a juvenile court to be thereafter transferred to a penal institution without a court order.[79] The effect, of course, is that the juvenile is incarcerated as a criminal without benefit of arraignment, trial by jury, or any of the other protections usually secured by the U.S. Constitution to a person accused of crime.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The cornerstone of parens patriae is the concept that the interests of the State and the welfare of the child are in harmony, not in conflict. From this the presumption arises that the State, acting as a substitute parent, will act considerately in the best interests of the child and will competently control and rear the child. Upon the truth of these promises rests the justification for invoking the doctrine.

By the same token, if the State fails to keep the promises upon which the mutual compact theory of the American juvenile court is based, juvenile courts cannot justifiably abrogate the constitutional protections of criminal due process or intervene in the lives of children without a finding of criminal guilt. Unless the State is required to make good its promises, American juveniles will have exchanged the precious heritage of individual freedom under law for the tyranny of State intervention whenever the State considers that its interests are affected.

Those interested in justice for children, as well as those concerned with their social welfare now and in the future, cannot afford to be complacent about the outcome of this issue. They must insist that the State take prompt steps to perform on its promises. If the juvenile court is not to be swept away by the tide of legal history, those interested in its philosophy must strongly urge (1) that legislatures provide juvenile courts with sufficient trained judges and adequate professional staff to dispose patiently yet expeditiously of all cases referred to them; (2) that juvenile court procedures which afford due process and fair treatment for the child and his parents, and which prevent the unwarranted intervention of overzealous representatives of the State in their private lives, be formulated by bar associations and put into universal application; (3) that systematic procedures for assessing the needs of children coming before these courts be developed by behavioral scientists; and (4) that the State appropriate sufficient funds for the construction and adequate staffing of institutions expressly designed to provide for delinquent juveniles the care, guidance, and discipline that should have been pro-

---

[60] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 38.

[61] Reporting on a study of 68 detention facilities in 22 States, a field consultant for NCCD found children who had been detained prior to trial from 6 months to over a year. Norman, "Detention Facilities for Children," in NPPA Yearbook, Society's Stake in the Offender 86, 87 (1946).

[62] Compare Ill. Laws, 41st Gen. Ass., 1899, the Juvenile Court Act, § 21 at 137, the model for similar provisions in most later acts.

[63] Deutsch, op. cit. supra note 40, Foreword.

[64] Id. at xix, Introduction.

[65] Reported in Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 430. The futility of efforts aimed at achieving rehabilitation in an institution whose primary functions are to maximize internal order and to minimize escapes is well analyzed in Sykes, Society of Captives (1958).

[66] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 428.

[67] Id. at 418.

[68] Gelhorn, op. cit. supra note 40, at 134.

[69] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 39–40.

[70] Id. at 41.

[71] Id.

[72] Tolman and Wales, Juvenile Detention in California 11 and tables 4, 5 (1946).

[73] Reported in Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 41.

[74] Ellrod and Melaney, supra note 40, at 287.

[75] Sussman, op. cit. supra note 17, at 42–43.

[76] Cosulich, Juvenile Court Laws of the United States 60 (1939).

[77] Tappan, "Children and Youth in the Criminal Court," 261 Annals 128, 129–130 (1949).

[78] Tappan, op. cit. supra note 12, at 427, table 25.

[79] Rubin, "Protecting the Child in the Juvenile Court," 43 J. Crim L., Crim. and Pol. Sci. 425, 439 (1952).

vided by their parents. Unless these things are done, and done promptly, the juvenile court movement is in grave danger of foundering. Dean Roscoe Pound regarded the establishment of the juvenile court in America as one of the most significant advances in the administration of justice since the Magna Charta.[50] But the bright hope of this new form of jurisprudence could be snuffed out by failure of legislatures to support the juvenile courts and to carry through on their promises.

Who, then, must insist that the State make good on its obligations; who shall "catch the conscience of the King"? Parents and children have the most at stake; but the parents of delinquent youths and antisocial children are the least adequate of all the breed and their children are inarticulate and unorganized. Unselfish persons and organizations devoted to the welfare of children abound, but only occasionally do State and Federal legislators pay heed to their requests. If the compact is to be enforced, the persons who will have to require compliance by the State with its juvenile court obligations are the juvenile court judges themselves.

These men and women were elected or appointed to judicial office and sworn to carry out the juvenile court law, the mutual compact previously described. On the one hand, they must protect the child and his parents from the community's vengeance or the unwarranted encroachment of the State on the family's individual rights; on the other hand, they must give due consideration to law enforcement and the safety of the community. The strength of the juvenile court movement depends upon their ability to discharge this dual role effectively. In behalf of children in trouble—and an unpopular responsibility it may be—they must insist that the State keep its promises.

"We have to think of the right of the court to probation service, and the responsibility of the legislature to guarantee its adequacy in the courts."[51] The same principle applies to all of the other areas of the compact for which the State has responsibility. Judges should request appropriations for trained staff, psychiatric clinics, and research projects as necessities rather than as alms and benevolent gratuities.

All those who are concerned about the advancement of the juvenile court philosophy should press for prompt State action and should support appropriate legislation on behalf of juvenile courts. But, in the last analysis, the mantle of leadership in this cause must fall onto the shoulders of juvenile court judges. They must require that any invocation of the doctrine of parens patriae be supported by a quid pro quo in the interests of the child. It is the obligation and duty of each juvenile court judge to demand, unequivocally and consistently, that the State keep its part of the bargain.

[50] Guides for Juvenile Court Judges 127 (1957).

[51] Turnbladh, "Half Justice," 2 NPPA Journal 306 (1956), emphasis supplied in original.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. ROOSEVELT for the duration of the meeting of International Labor Organization, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. BARRY) for 15 minutes on June 8.

Mr. SCHERER (at the request of Mr. BARRY) for 15 minutes on June 7.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) for 15 minutes on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. PASSMAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. BOLAND) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HORAN to include tables and extend his material in the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole on the agriculture appropriation bill today.

Mr. DONOHUE, in two instances, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. REUSS, the remarks he made in Committee of the Whole today, and to include a table and extraneous matter.

Mr. ROBISON.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. SCHNEEBELI.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances.

Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. FINDLEY.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. BOYKIN.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1346. An act for the relief of John Napoli; and

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth, Tex.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 133. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; and

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

990. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on examination of the leasing of Government-owned aircraft test engines by the Department of the Air Force to General Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, during the period January 1, 1959, to December 31, 1960; to the Committee on Government Operations.

991. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 17(a) of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands pertaining to the salary of the Government Comptroller"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

992. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 1(f) of the act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

993. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the accounting system and related matters of the Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency (HHFA); to the Committee on Government Operations.

994. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7189. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the compact or agreement between the States of North Dakota and Minnesota with respect to the boundary between such States; without amendment (Rept. No. 451). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 7475. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other

areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7476. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission on problems of small towns and rural counties; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 7477. A bill to repeal section 409 of the Public Buildings Act of 1949, requiring the submission of a report to the Congress concerning eligible public building projects; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CURTIS of Missouri:

H.R. 7478. A bill to amend section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7479. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 7480. A bill to assist the States to provide additional facilities for research at the State agricultural experiment stations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 7481. A bill to amend section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 7482. A bill to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CLEM MILLER:

H.R. 7483. A bill to provide for the establishment of cooperative outdoor recreation research centers; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 7484. A bill to amend section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to legislative proposals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7485. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide that property found on premises owned or leased by the United States may be returned to the finder if the owner cannot be found; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H.R. 7486. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 7487. A bill to establish the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in the State of Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 7488. A bill to amend part IV of subtitle C of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to develop the South Barrow gasfield, Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, for the purpose of making gas available for sale to the native village of Barrow and to other non-Federal communities and installations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7489. A bill to provide for continuity and support of study, research, and development of programs for peaceful uses in science, commerce, and other activities related to Antarctica, which shall include, but shall not be limited to, gathering, evaluating, correlating, and dispersing of information and knowledge obtained from exploration, research, and other mediums relating to weather, communications, travel, and other areas of information; also to coordinate Antarctic activities among those agencies of the U.S. Government and private institutions interested in or concerned directly with the promotion, advancement, increase, and diffusion of knowledge of the Antarctic; and to direct and administer U.S. Antarctic programs in the national interest; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7490. A bill for the protection of marine mammals on the high seas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7491. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide additional compensation for veterans suffering the loss or loss of use of both vocal cords, with resulting complete aphonia; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL:

H.R. 7492. A bill to amend Public Law 86-506, 86th Congress (74 Stat. 199), approved June 11, 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY (by request):

H.R. 7493. A bill to authorize the making and enforcement of regulations at water supply projects in the District of Columbia and environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7494. A bill to provide direct aid to the States and territories for educational purposes only for the benefit of the taxpayers and local governments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7495. A bill to amend section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the donation of surplus personal property to union locals for use in apprentice training program; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7496. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide that certain distributions of stock made pursuant to orders enforcing the antitrust laws shall not be treated as dividend distributions but shall be treated as a return of basis and result in gain only to the extent basis of the underlying stock is exceeded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7497. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 7498. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the southern interstate nuclear compact, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H.R. 7499. A bill to authorize the appropriation to the Corregidor Bataan Memorial Commission, of $7,500,000, to be used to carry out the provisions of the act of August 5, 1953, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.R. 7500. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 7501. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 7502. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7503. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7504. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 7505. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 7506. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland:

H.R. 7507. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 7508. A bill to provide for a Peace Corps to help the peoples of interested countries and areas in meeting their needs for skilled manpower; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 7509. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first-, second-, and third-class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7510. A bill to clarify the intent of Congress in the act of September 2, 1958, relating to the exchange of lands between the United States and the Navajo Tribe; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7511. A bill to revise the effective dates of certain increases in compensation granted to employees of the Government Printing Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H.R. 7512. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to provide for a class of supplemental air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H.R. 7513. A bill to restate terms of the grants covering the Rockefeller Wildlife Refuge and Game Preserve to permit it to comply with current Louisiana law; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.J. Res. 441. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 325. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the con-

struction of an interstate highway in Montana; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. Res. 326. Resolution to express the sense of the House on tax-exempt contributions to secure release of persons held in custody by the Government of Cuba; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. Res. 327. Resolution to express the sense of the House on the application of the Logan Act to private correspondence with foreign governments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the Arab League boycott of American citizens, business and industry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to House Concurrent Resolution 15 of the Legislature of Louisiana, which relates to Federal aid to public schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7514. A bill for the relief of Mercedes Robinson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COAD:

H.R. 7515. A bill for the relief of John L. Toth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 7516. A bill for the relief of Angeliki Psychari; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7517. A bill for the relief of Georgia Kollintza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7518. A bill for the relief of Christos John Kyriakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7519. A bill for the relief of Gin Gim Hang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7520. A bill for the relief of Jorge Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 7521. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ng Kam Ore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7522. A bill for the relief of Col. Harold S. Morton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7523. A bill for the relief of Eva Laner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 7524. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Hanna Diderman Rosental; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H.R. 7525. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarita M. Respicio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H.R. 7526. A bill for the relief of Edith Wang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H.R. 7527. A bill for the relief of Victoria Kendall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 7528. A bill for the relief of Ki Su (Theresa) Moun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

166. By Mr. LIBONATI: House Joint Resolution No. 48 adopted in the 72d General Assembly of the State of Illinois, relative to the U.S. Internal Revenue Service requiring payment of income taxes without permitting deductions of expenses of members of legislatures who have no other occupation by reason of retirement, or otherwise; and that the Honorable GEORGE AIKEN, U.S. Senator from Vermont, has introduced a bill in the U.S. Senate (S. 587) to remedy this situation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

167. By Mr. MONAGAN: Petition of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission regarding the extent of participation of the General Services Administration in proceedings before regulatory agencies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

168. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Eisho Oshiro, Naha City, Okinawa, relative to requesting legislation for payment of U.S. funds for compensation for certain damages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

169. Also, petition of Harumasa Irei, mayor of Kadena Son, Okinawa, relative to requesting legislation for settlement of Ryukyuan pre-treaty claims; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

170. Also, petition of Eisho Kawasaki and Kihei Shiroma, mayors of Tamagusuku and Iheya Son, Okinawa, relative to requesting legislation for compensation for certain damages; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

171. Also, petition of Hajime Takara, Naha City, Ryukyus, relative to requesting compensation for certain damages to the Ryukyuan people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Our Debt to Our War Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last May 30, 1961, appropriate Memorial Day exercises, honoring the heroic dead of all our wars, were held on the Common in my home city of Worcester, Mass.

The exercises were principally sponsored by the Willie Grout Camp, Sons of Union Veterans, and were very well attended by local citizens and members of the various veterans organizations in the area.

It was my privilege to speak at these exercises and I have been asked to include here the address I delivered, which follows:

MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, WORCESTER COMMON, MAY 30, 1961

It is a high privilege to join with you today in paying tribute to the heroic dead of all our wars.

This ceremony very vividly and timely reminds us that the individuals we commemorate today willingly gave up their lives for their beliefs. In dwelling upon their sufferings and deaths in combat against the enemy we are virtually forced to ask ourselves, what are we willing to give up to further preserve the beliefs for which they died?

This question realistically recalls the great obligations we have to our living veterans and those whom our departed heroes have left behind.

A grateful and blessed country will not, I am sure, ever permit our history books to show that the widows and family members of those who died in war were denied a good measure of the material assistance which would have been provided for them by devoted husbands and fathers had they lived.

I am certain that the people of this Nation will never allow it to be said that our handicapped war veterans were forgotten and neglected in their rehabilitation needs or denied the medical and hospital facilities to which they are legally and morally entitled.

The best guarantee for the promotion of genuine patriotism among those who could possibly be called in the future is a demonstration of how we have met our obligations to those who have served in the past.

It is well for us, also, to emphasize today the beliefs of those who have served and are gone. In summary, they believed in the dignity of the individual and his possession of inalienable rights and liberties granted by the Creator.

By their deaths, those we commemorate today retained these beliefs and rights for us.

Just as in the day of those to whom we are paying tribute here, we are now again challenged by an enemy that has openly declared their determination to take away the God-given rights we, and the other free peoples, enjoy and place us all under the tyrannical yoke of atheistic communism.

The scheme of their accomplishment has not yet reached the point of open military aggression, and may God grant that it never will.

Instead, they are projecting a cold war strategy, with which we are becoming increasingly familiar, of provoking irritation on one day and hypocritical gestures for peaceful negotiation on the next.

Their obvious, ultimate hope is that by inciting prolonged discouragement, division, dissension, and peaceful yearning among ourselves and our allies we will finally become so frustrated, so soft, so exhausted, and so spiritless, they will be able to subjugate us all without any violent struggle.

Their indictment of us, in brief, is that we have lost the genuine character for national patriotism, that our traditional unified courage has been dissipated and that our historical capacity for sacrifice has disappeared. We must then urgently and promptly show them that the charges in their indictment are false.

The President of the United States has issued a renewed call for all Americans to join in concerted action to meet and defeat the Russian cold war strategy. He has voiced a most solemn warning for all individuals and segments of American society to unite in demonstrating willingness to undergo the sacrifices necessary to show the

Russian leaders that they are wrong in their convictions about the American people.

He has indicated his own belief that this cold war struggle with the Communist dictators may well be extended over an indefinite period during which we may experience frustrating reverses as well as encouraging triumphs.

This Nation is dedicated to the preservation of peace. Our forebearers came to these shores to escape tyranny and to live in peace. Our purpose today is to maintain peace, with honor. I know that this Government will never abandon the pursuit of such peace. But to accomplish that peace, and avert the wholesale destruction of nuclear war, we must convince the Russian leaders that peaceful negotiation is their own wisest and best choice.

The only way we can convince them of that fact is by a national demonstration of patriotic willingness to pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor, as our forefathers did, for the survival of freedom and liberty in a new and better world of the future.

The men and women whom we publicly honor this morning gave up their lives for this heroic purpose. If this ceremony is to have any real meaning, we must stand ready to do the same.

Let us pray the Almighty to give us the united character, strength, and courage to fulfill the trust placed in us by those who died for God and for country.

When Freedom Dies in Its Sleep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it is an ever-increasing pleasure for me to observe the rising star of my congressional neighbor, the Honorable CHARLES E. GOODELL, of the 43d Congressional District of New York. Although young both in years and in legislative experience, "CHARLIE'S" personality, his devotion to duty, his fighting heart, and, above all, his abundant commonsense, have demonstrated to all of us in the short time he has been with us that here, indeed, is a worthy successor to the Honorable "Dan" Reed, who for so long and so faithfully served both the 43d Congressional District of New York and his Nation in this body.

Congressman GOODELL was the main speaker at the Memorial Day services held this year at Geneseo, N.Y. His address was both stirring and thought provoking. Under leave to extend my remarks, it is my pleasure to insert the full text of that address:

THE MOST IGNOMINIOUS DEATH OF THEM ALL

It is an awesome experience for me each time I return to the fertile acreage of the 43d Congressional District in New York State from the frenetic activity in our Nation's Capital. It is so easy to lose all perspective when you go on and on, shuffling reams of paper and debating momentous issues so far away from the people who are most directly concerned. At times the issues almost become unreal—something out of a ridiculous, insane fantasy. It is then that a man must return to the soil and to his people in search of new inspiration and dedication.

I have journeyed from our Nation's Capital to be with you today, not alone to express a message in words, but perhaps even more importantly, to draw from you a renewed dedication of spirit. I thank you for the opportunity. I always point with particular pride to the fact that I represent such good people in the Genesee Valley. Cherishing the people and the area as I do, this occasion is especially meaningful for me.

We are gathered on Memorial Day so that the children can have a good time, so that all of us may relax from our daily chores with those we love, and so that all of you may practice your self-discipline in sitting through a dry and tiresome address by your Congressman. But we are gathered together for other reasons. This is a time when we pause to look beyond ourselves. We do so, first, by turning backward and remembering the blazing glory along with the humble grime and ache of the past. We remember those among our family and neighbors who have made the final sacrifice, in order that you and I might live in freedom. If we can recapture in our hearts today just a small part of the agony they knew, our gathering will be more meaningful than just a happy frolic for the family.

People have died, have bled, have suffered. Seldom does a hero die with flags waving in the breeze, trumpets sounding their clarion call or people cheering. Nor do they know in those final moments the solemn, simple peace of taps sounded at sundown. They usually die in fear and dirt, uncertainty and pain, loneliness and chaos. The men and women we honor today fought to live, but they were prepared to die in order that you and I might live to carry forward the banner of freedom.

Memorial Day is a fizzle, if we do not relive in our hearts for a few moments the tragedies of the past.

But Memorial Day is not just a time for turning our eyes backward. It is an occasion for appreciating the past, while facing resolutely into the future. Yes, it is a time for bands and parades, for family picnics and fun, for joyful living. Those are the trappings that symbolize a part of our tribute to the great heroes of the past. We cannot celebrate this day only in sadness and tears of despair for what is forever past. We are alive. In the shadow of the past, we can yet pronounce simply and truthfully that the future belongs to us. What kind of future? Will it be worthy of the storied past? Will the future of today build our children's future for tomorrow? Or will these wonderful bundles of energy and love we call children in the words of the Scriptures "inherit the wind"?

Many of you may say, "Don't talk to me about missiles and nuclear bombs and spaceships. Those are things that are beyond me. What do you expect me to do to prevent the human race from raining missiles of desolation on each other?"

Now I agree that neither you nor I will have much to say about the final decisions as to the survival of mankind. But, on the other hand, there is a long preparation for destruction as well as for discovery. No man—no woman—will be entirely exempt from blame if mankind eventually commits mass suicide and wipes the race from the face of the globe. Washington, D.C., seems a long way from the day-to-day business affairs in Geneseo and Livingston County. And much farther away are Paris—where our President will meet shortly with De Gaulle—or Vienna—where our President will meet at the summit with Khrushchev. Nonetheless the support of every American is important to the President at times like these. It is especially important when you think he's wrong and you are critical of the President, yet stand behind him through a crisis as our leader.

But I want to talk to you today, not about the mighty, world-shaking problems in Washington, Geneva, or Paris, but about those things that you can do—every day—here in Geneseo or wherever else you go about "shuffling off your mortal coil." On this Memorial Day 1961 what can you and I do about the unknown expanse of the future that lies before us?

Not long ago our own good Senator KEATING delivered a moving address in Olean, N.Y. He concluded with words to this effect, and I paraphrase: "Freedom has died in many ways over the history of the world. It has died on the battlefields, in deception and intrigue, in revolution, in the grasping selfishness of its leaders, in ignorance. But the worst—the most ignominious—death of them all, is when freedom dies in its sleep."

There is abroad in the streets of Geneseo today a deadly sleeping sickness. It hasn't afflicted too many of our robust, self-reliant Livingston folk—not nearly as many as in other parts of the country. It reaches epidemic proportions in the slums of our cities and has spread to the suburbs. It is the most contagious disease known to mankind. It has many different names. Some call it "Govern-me-itis"; others prefer "Support-me-itis"; you might call it "Cancer of the Lazy Bone." But whatever name you put on it, the disease is the same. It breeds in its most deadly form in nations that have reached the age of maturity and abundance. It is the great destroyer of civilizations in their prime of life. Free Americans have climbed to a new summit of abundance and well-being, a summit far beyond the wildest dreams of our forefathers. Yet we have the dread disease attacking our vital organs. It is a sleeping sickness because it dulls the sense of a nation, gives its citizens a feeling of euphoria—all is well—while it kills from within.

Perhaps you know someone who has this disease or is a carrier? It's not easy to tell. Your son, your aunt, your neighbor may have it. Unfortunately, there is no skin rash as in measles or scarlet fever. Although the victim usually finds the reclining position most comfortable, he has no pain, and no fever at all. Here are some of the symptoms. Watch out for them; they won't hurt you too much, but they'll kill your country.

1. A feeling that hard work is to be avoided, if possible, but in any event kept to a minimum. No longer is hard productive labor—the utilizing to the fullest a person's skills and potential—recognized as one of the deep satisfactions in life.

2. A belief that honesty and high moral standards are relative—relative to what some of your neighbors apply in their lives or perhaps to the standards of our Hollywood and TV scenarios. The usual excuse for this kind of action is, "Well, if I don't do it I won't survive long in this business."

3. A feeling that somebody has got to do something about that problem in the community, but I haven't got time. This usually ends up in passing the problem to those in the community who truly have the least time or, worse, ignoring the problem entirely.

4. A feeling that somehow there is a collective wisdom about government that will solve our problems better for us than we can accomplish on our own.

5. A feeling that we live in an unreal world in which money that comes from Washington is like manna from heaven. No one has to pay extra taxes for it, because we can borrow the money and increase the national debt, or raise the money from economic growth or some other economic theory that seemingly avoids the burden ever falling back onto the taxpayer.

6. A feeling that what we can do as individuals is too small to make any difference. Let's appeal to government to do it for us. The bigger the government and the further

away from us, the better, because it will be less likely to call on us as individuals to take up our own share. This feeling persists in spite of the undeniable truth that the genuinely great personal crises are almost always the person-to-person issues that every one of us has a part in creating and solving.

So there we have named just six symptoms of this dread disease. Each of you could name many more. But starting with those six—avoiding hard work like the plague, compromising honesty and moral standards, leaving community problems to others, revering the collective wisdom of government, imagining that government spending money comes from somewhere other than the people themselves, and degrading the importance of one's own individual contribution in human affairs—those six give you the idea of the character of this sleeping sickness that afflicts our beloved Nation.

They all add up to a loss in the pioneering spirit of a free people. We have gradually allowed ourselves to be lulled into a defenseless condition. We engage in constant discussions about which Government programs will give the most things to the most people. No longer do we look upon government as a means of caring for the unfortunate and expanding the opportunities for the fortunate. Government now must care for both the unfortunate and the fortunate. The classic phrase of Senator CORTON, of New Hampshire, tells us where we're headed:

"A government that gives you everything you want, ends up taking everything you've got."

Each of you has ability, skill, a special attribute. God made us all with a function we could perform better than anyone else in the world. Some may have skill in their hands, others in their tongues; some in their good looks, others in their open hearts; but each of us has that function, that skill, that combination of characteristics that God has given to an individual human being at his creation. If we arouse ourselves—shake off the lethargy that has taken hold of our spirits—we can yet beat off the sleeping sickness that gnaws at our Nation from within.

In summarizing one's thoughts in Geneseo, N.Y., it seems peculiarly appropriate to quote a Wadsworth—in this case Henry Wadsworth Longfellow:

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time."

Today, in the memory of those who have passed beyond ahead of us, let us rededicate ourselves as individuals—amidst freedom and health and abundance unknown before in the history of man—to do the frustrating, perplexing, limitless number of little jobs which God requires of free men. If Americans bestir themselves, there is yet time to prevent the most ignominious death known to man—when freedom dies in its sleep.

Present Day Challenges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a leader of the free world we find ourselves saddled with special responsibility and obligation for serving humanity.

In addition to being a major challenger to communism's effort to conquer the world we are also involved in a great "boot straps" operation by mankind to lift itself to higher standards of living.

By experience we know the task will not be easily or quickly accomplished.

Nevertheless, we must face up to the job and do the best we can to fulfill not only our responsibilities, but also take advantage of the opportunities to serve mankind.

Recently, I was privileged to comment on highlights of present-day challenges over radio station WGN, Chicago. I ask unanimous consent to have this address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, SENIOR REPUBLICAN, SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OVER RADIO STATION WGN, CHICAGO, 7:30 P.M., JUNE 4, 1961

Today, the United States faces the greatest opportunity and challenge in history.

At home, major problems include the following:

Economically, some of the recession hangover is still with us—although more and more "recovery" signs are appearing on the horizon.

Politically, the task of equitably accommodating differing races within our free system is extremely difficult. The recent riots, for example, have given our Nation a "black eye" in the view of the world.

Socially, we have great needs in education, aging, youth development, and other fields.

Overall, we—in a fast-progressing age—need to find new and better ways of utilizing our invaluable human and natural resources.

Internationally, also, we are confronted with great obligations and responsibilities.

As leader of the free world, we "head up" the fighting forces against the spread of communism. The life-and-death struggle involves not only military forces, but also a severe testing of each major feature—political, social, economic, ideological, human—of the opposing system. The fate of modern man—and the survival of freedom—depends upon the outcome of the East-West struggle.

There is need, also, for helping to conquer poverty, ignorance, prejudice, malnutrition, and other age-old enemies of the body and spirit of mankind. Unless this is done, there will never be peace.

Without human dignity, man will not long be satisfied or peaceful.

Whether or not there is opportunity for the human race to attain the ultimate in progress, of course, depends to a large degree upon avoiding a third world war.

To try to find ways to negotiate East-West differences, President Kennedy met with Mr. Khrushchev. Fortunately, the world expected no "miracle working" in Vienna. The range of differences is so wide and varied that even in the best of climates these could not be easily or quickly "ironed out."

By past experiences, we have learned that the Reds are willing to negotiate on points only when:

1. They will benefit from advantages, present or future, to support the cause of communism.

2. Failure to negotiate would threaten to start a large-scale war.

3. World opinion is strong enough to have an impact even on the policies of the Kremlin and of Peiping; or

4. Negotiation offers an opportunity for progagandizing.

However, the willingness of Mr. Kennedy to meet with the Kremlin leader reflects, once more U.S. willingness to go the extra mile—if it will contribute to peace.

In negotiations, however, we must never forget that we, and the Communists confer with the same words—often through a vocabulary of double meaning—to attain different goals: we, and the Western nations want peace; the Reds want to conquer the world.

These then, are a few of the tasks ahead of us.

Despite the magnitude of these problems, this is no time for pessimism. True, history has saddled us with special great responsibilities. However, we also have special tools—born of human ingenuity—to enable us to make our contribution to progress in the world.

A great challenge to modern man is to attain the perspective, in the space age, the understanding, the new sense of interrelationships of man and nations of the space age. Upon such a foundation, we can then design the policies and programs to enable us—within our limitations—to make a useful contribution to man's ultimate destiny.

The Administration General Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's general education bill, H.R. 7300, is supposed to make more money available for public schools, but it provides no adequate safeguard assuring that States will continue their present spending for public schools.

A clue to what may be ahead can be found on page 6 of the Chicago Tribune of June 2, 1961.

The newspaper reports that Illinois legislators are considering a proposal to amend State law so State taxation for school purposes will be reduced by the amount of Federal funds expected under H.R. 7300. The State aid formula of $252 per pupil would be retained but State spending would be reduced by about $60 million.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7300 can and probably will become a tax crutch for State governments, without increasing the amount of money available for education.

As State legislatures shift tax responsibility to Uncle Sam, pressure will increase for still more Federal spending. Another tax shift will follow, and so on. The billion a year provided in the current bill is just a trickle compared with the torrent to follow.

If we enact H.R. 7300 into law, it will be just a few short years before the full tax burden for public education will be shifted to the Federal Government. We would then have a costly, monolithic educational system directed from Washington.

Parents would have about as much influence over local schools as they have over the policies of the local post office.

National Parks for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, warning voices were raised less than a decade ago about the deterioration of our national park system. Magazine writers described the traffic jams, the "outdoor slums," the poorly maintained roads and health hazards which existed in so many of the parks we had set aside for "the enjoyment of future generations."

The response to those warnings was gratifying. The Mission 66 program was initiated. We repaired and restored; we are trying to plan ahead, too, for the greatest crowds and the greatest public use anticipated in the years ahead.

The new Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, has taken stock of Mission 66 at its halfway mark in an article, "National Parks and the Future," printed in the June 1961 issue of the "Atlantic Monthly." Mr. Udall gives compelling account of the difficulties that arise when a nation wants to use its parks and preserve them at the same time. His article should impress all Americans with the need for care and vigilance in our development of and our basic philosophy about national parks.

Impressive as these arguments are, however, Secretary Udall makes an even more profound point when he describes the new administration's concern about the "ever-increasing interest in the land and in man's relationship to it." The Secretary writes:

> This brings into focus the central domestic crisis which confronts America today, the fact that population tends to outrun space, and that the very spaciousness which has formed the face and character of our people is now threatened. The most noticeable scarcity in this society of abundance is land. The pressures on our land—especially land suitable for parks and outdoor recreation—are relentless. Another 4 million Americans will be born into this country this year. Given fair weather each day, another 300,000 acres of countryside will fall to bulldozers, cement mixers, and logging crews.
>
> If we want to save some of this land for parks and for the enjoyment of the outdoors, we must act now.

Here, it seems to me, we can see the true dimensions of the problem. A nation with broad reaches of open land must, nevertheless, conserve and plan for intensive use.

Secretary Udall, though primarily concerned in this article about the national park system in the West, regards the problems of the more crowded Eastern States as part of the same national challenge.

America's families—

He writes—

> should have opportunities for outdoor recreation within easy reach of their homes. And, properly, they should rely for such recreation on their State and local governments. State and local action to set aside land for outdoor recreation would take pressure off the national parks, but more important would be the benefits which carefully developed open land would bring to the communities themselves and to their residents.

The Secretary is therefore sounding a national alarm, not one for the conservationist alone, or for the occasional visitor to our national recreation areas. He makes it easy for every American to realize that our national goals are, like our Nation, indivisible.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL PARKS FOR THE FUTURE

(By Stewart Udall)

(In answer to the question of whether our national parks are in jeopardy, Stewart Udall, the new Secretary of the Interior, has written the following reply. A native of Arizona, Mr. Udall was admitted to the Arizona bar in 1948 and served in the 84th to 86th Congresses before being appointed to the Cabinet.)

In the summer of 1953, Bernard De Voto, the Cambridge conservationist and chronicler of the West, made his way through some 15 of our great national parks. With him traveled, figuratively speaking, some 17 million Americans who sought, with De Voto, to renew their spirits in the wild and scenic places of our land. On this return De Voto pronounced a verdict on what he had seen, and a disturbing verdict it was to all who knew his deep affection for our national parks. "Let's close the national parks," De Voto wrote caustically. "Let us, as a beginning, close Yellowstone, Yosemite, Rocky Mountain, and Grand Canyon National Parks—close them and seal them, assign the Army to patrol them, and so hold them secure for a more enlightened future."

De Voto's anger was directed at the rot, decay, and neglect he had encountered everywhere. Sewage was seeping into Yellowstone Lake, and the campgrounds of the park looked like outdoor slums because, as De Voto put it, "they are slums." On the breathtaking rim of Black Canyon of the Gunnison, the guard rails had rotted away; not one ranger was assigned to the area; and even the visitor's register had been stolen. Fire, health, and safety hazards were prevalent at every turn.

At about the same time, the Reader's Digest warned prospective visitors that "your trip is likely to be fraught with discomfort, disappointment, even danger," and Conrad Wirth, then as now the Director of the National Park Service, had to agree that "We actually get scared when we think of the bad health conditions." The Saturday Evening Post took its turn at bat and editorialized that the "great canyons, pristine lakes and the endless beauties of nature of our national parks" were being displaced by "traffic jams on beat-up highways, beer cans in the geysers, honky-tonk commercialism * * * outdoor slums."

America's glory has been its natural wonders; how, then, did we allow our national parks to suffer such disfigurement?

The answer is that up until 1941 the resources of the National Park Service, the custodian of our parks and monuments, were reasonably adequate. But with the onset of World War II, money and manpower were cut to the bone, and when millions of Americans turned to the parks in the postwar period, the rangers were overwhelmed.

In 1940 some 7 million people visited the parks. By 1953, the year of De Voto's trek, the figure had more than doubled, and the Park Service, with a smaller ranger force, had to administer 18 new areas as well.

Today few in Washington would dispute the proposition that the esprit and dedication of the men who run the National Park Service are unexcelled in our Government. Yet the postwar years found some rangers and their families living in rat-infested shacks and paying the Government a painful percentage of their modest salaries for the privilege. Not only the parks but the morale of the men charged to conserve them had become eroded to the danger point. These were the conditions which in 1956 called into being the restorative work of Mission 66.

RESTORATION

Mission 66 was designed as a 10-year rehabilitation program to accommodate the floodtide of visitors without compromising basic conservation values. A series of master plans was developed for each of the 181 areas administered by the Park Service, and sizable appropriations were obtained from a responsive Congress to enhance maintenance and underwrite new capital improvements. Thus, a frontal attack was made on the conditions that aroused De Voto's ire and caused misgivings in his fellow Americans.

Mission 66 is now at the halfway mark; a new administration has come to power; and it is an opportune moment to review the scope of the program and assess its work.

The Park Service takes justifiable pride in maintenance systems that now protect the health and safety of park visitors. And, unquestionably, the main new capital development projects—roads, trails, campsites, interpretive exhibits—have made the parks more hospitable and have quickened appreciation of their wonders. But problems of delicate judgment have been created also.

For example, take the problem of roads. In 1924, Stephen Mather, the first director of the Park Service, enunciated the basic guidelines: "It is not intended to have the parks gridironed with roads, but in each it is desired to make a good sensible road system so that visitors may have a chance to enjoy them. At the same time, large sections of each park will be kept in a natural wilderness state without feeder roads, and will be accessible only by trails for the horseback rider and the hiker."

CAMPSITES

In the late forties, the road systems in the parks were miserably inadequate and unsafe. However, 653 miles of existing roads have now been improved under Mission 66, while nearly 144 miles of new roads provide scenic vistas and access to new campground areas.

Camping is one of the more intimate park experiences. To encourage it, 7,000 new campsites have been created, and an additional 4,000 sites renovated. For access both to the spectacular and the humbler sites of natural beauty, 300 miles of trails have been built or improved. For many visitors, the most meaningful moments in the parks come when they join together around the fire in the evening to learn from ranger naturalists more of the natural history that surrounds them. There are now campfire circles for more than 25,000 persons, and 54 new interpretive centers to encourage the vital educational work of the Park Service.

Yet Mission 66 has inevitably evoked both praise and blame from those who love and use our parks. The truth of the matter is that in 1916 the Interior Department was pitched onto the horns of a dilemma by Congress directive "to conserve the scenery * * * and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Examining this singular congressional mandate, Wallace Stegner, the well-known novelist and conservationist, once wrote perplexedly: "Provide for use, but leave unimpaired. Use, but protect. Keep the parks primitive, but open them to millions. Make the scenery accessible with roads, trails, lookouts, but don't scar it up. Provide—invisibly—campsites for millions, lodge and motel accommodations for hundreds of thousands, and the facilities of whole towns to take care of them. * * * Protect and restore wildlife, even wolves and mountain lion, in order to keep the balance of nature, but do it in a show window where millions can thrill to see it."

Over the years, some of the wisest men in the Interior Department have wrestled with this dilemma, and it is not surprising that many policy directives have touched off controversy. There have been mistakes; I would cite Tioga Road in Yosemite and the tower on Clingman's Dome in the Great Smokies as two. But when you view the many Mission 66 projects in perspective, it is amazing that so few egregious errors have been committed.

TO USE AND YET PRESERVE

During the Kennedy administration, special care will be taken that in the planning of roads, buildings, and village developments, nature will take precedence over the needs of modern man. The Park Service cannot be too zealous in its work to maintain, and raise, the standards of the facilities and the services it provides. No road or lodging is an end in itself, but exists to enhance the value of the park it serves.

But too often critics have failed to concede that many of the "wrong" decisions have actually been dictated by conditions and compromises which preceded the establishment of the parks. For example, Floridians stipulated a developed area outside its heartland when they donated the land and money which led to the establishment of the Everglades National Park. And the Santa Fe Railroad and others owned land on the rim of the Grand Canyon long before it became a national park.

In my view, wise park administrators must steer judiciously between those who would ignore the park standards and those who construe each alternative according to their personal tastes. In any event, the pressure of tens of millions of people on a limited and often fragile land mass will surely grow more intense. Can our parks be both used and preserved at the same time?

The answer is, They must be if we are to keep faith with future generations and serve the men and women of today.

One concept long respected by the Park Service in its approach to the inherent dilemma has been the development within the wilderness of "zones of civilization" linked by roads. The result is that today 99 percent of our national park land still enjoys wilderness status, and a visitor need only wander 200 yards off any road to enter primitive and untouched country.

In Yellowstone, our oldest and most intensively used national park, the road system has been improved to carry the hundreds of thousands of cars that use it annually, but the natural wilderness has not been penetrated one foot farther than when the first motorcar was admitted 45 years ago. And here it should be borne in mind that Yellowstone is nearly 3 times the size of Rhode Island. All too few of the millions of visitors venture beyond these paved corridors, yet the opportunity is there for anyone who wants to seize it.

Looking at the vast panorama of our parks, one is impressed by the wisdom with which the Park Service has resolved the conflict between use and conservation. There are no more zealous guardians of our places of extraordinary beauty than those who cherish the purity of our wild lands. Fortunately for all of us, each noble stand of trees, each solitary mountain promontory, each desert canyon has its devoted band of friends. And this is as it should be, because wilderness land, paradoxically, is a fragile asset.

PARKS ARE FOR PEOPLE

However, it is also plain that parks are for people, and not people for parks. And these people are entitled to what De Voto has called "amiable diversions" in keeping with the purpose of their visit and the character of the park. The test of whether to allow such diversions as winter sports, for example, should be whether participants scar the terrain. Furthermore, we must consistently ask ourselves whether a particular organized activity adds a worthwhile dimension to the purpose for which our parks were established.

This brings into focus the central domestic crisis which confronts America today, the fact that population tends to outrun space, and that the very spaciousness which has formed the face and character of our people is now threatened. The most noticeable scarcity in this society of abundance is land. The pressures on our land—especially land suitable for parks and outdoor recreation—are relentless. Another 4 million Americans will be born into this country this year. Given fair weather each day, another 300,000 acres of countryside will fall to bulldozers, cement mixers, and logging crews.

If we want to save some of this land for parks and for the enjoyment of the outdoors, we must act now. The enemy is time, not people. And time has run out for piecemeal action. The day is long past when a stroke of the pen could create new national parks out of the public domain. The time is now past when we could hoard a few more acres of park land in the West, where it is still relatively plentiful, and hope that some philanthropist would give us a little more elsewhere.

NEW NATIONAL PARKS—NOW

What is needed today, and needed urgently, is a truly national and wisely balanced program of land acquisition and park development. Last February, within a month of assuming office, President Kennedy spelled out in a message to Congress the broad goals of a national land-conservation program.

We have already come to the second phase of Mission 66. From 1956 to date, we rescued the national parks from rot and erosion; now, quickly, we must round out our park system by the inclusion of the remaining areas of exceptional scenic beauty. But new national parks are only a part of the answer to the exploding demand for outdoor recreation in all parts of the country. Our great national parks represent one of the few remaining opportunities for vacationing families to enjoy the "early morning" experience of the wilderness. We did not set aside our parks for casual inspection. These unique areas were meant to provide what Laurance Rockefeller has called the cathedral experience of nature.

Furthermore, most of our finest parks are located in the western part of the United States, a considerable distance from centers of population. Yet America's families should have opportunities for outdoor recreation within easy reach of their homes. And, properly, they should rely for such recreation on their State and local governments. State and local action to set aside land for outdoor recreation would take pressure off the national parks, but more important would be the benefits which carefully developed open land would bring to the communities themselves and to their residents.

In most areas of our country, enough land is still available if we act now. But in the heavily industrialized parts of America, the only hope of salvaging what remains lies in inspired, and inspiring, leadership from our Governors and mayors.

The challenge is a double one: to preserve the face of our country for ourselves and our children, and at the same time to provide plentiful and varied opportunities for people to enjoy the outdoors.

I should like to see new national parks to protect such unique areas, for example, as the deep, sandstone canyons that surround Rainbow Bridge in southern Utah; the last remaining prairie lands in Kansas; Santa Cruz Island, Calif.; and the proposed Great Basin Park in Nevada. We must also move quickly to add the Great Beach and adjoining land of Cape Cod; Padre Island, Tex.; and Point Reyes to the national seashore system.

Nowhere are the opportunities for outdoor recreation more limited than in or near our cities. What little open country separates the sprawling urban complexes on the east and west coasts is being preempted by various developments. Only bold action can save what remains. For example, at the Delaware Water Gap a magnificently varied recreation area could be created surrounding the proposed Tocks Island Reservoir. This would give nearly one-third of the Nation's population 75 miles of shorefront for outdoor sports and recreation.

America's land and water are on the block. The highest bidder is seldom the wisest user. Short-term developments and short-term gains will be debited a thousandfold against the assets of future generations, whose claim on America is as valid as ours.

Some of us in Washington sense an ever-increasing interest in the land and in man's relationship to it. President Kennedy has already struck the keynote. If we seize the opportunity and act to save the spaciousness and grandeur of our land, later generations may record this period as one of the most significant in the American conservation movement.

Battle of Philippi Fought 100 Years Ago—Lessons From Civil War Strife Meaningful in Today's Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on last Saturday, June 3, there was presented at Philippi, W. Va., a reenactment of the first land battle of the Civil War, originally fought just 100 years ago on that date.

The reenactment of the battle was the culmination of the 5-day centennial commemoration of the Battle of Philippi, which was attended by many thousands of visitors who were drawn by patriotic and historical interests to this dramatization of an event from our Nation's heritage.

It was also the culmination of many hours of devoted work by members of the centennial commemoration committee and by the citizens of Philippi, painstaking and detailed work which occupied their thoughts and time for many weeks preceding the occasion.

In addition to the live-fire skirmish, conducted by members of the North-South skirmish unit, the centennial program included a number of events of historical and cultural value and addresses

by the Honorable W. W. Barron, Governor of West Virginia, the Honorable Walter H. Judd, Representative from Minnesota, and my colleague, Senator Robert C. Byrd.

It was my pleasure to have been introduced by the Honorable Dayton R. Stemple, State senator from West Virginia's 15th senatorial district, and to address the gathering on the final day, June 3, Battle of Philippi Day. Because this event has significance for us all, Mr. President, as part of the ordeal from which our present Union emerged, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the members of the centennial committees and my remarks be printed in their entirety in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the list and remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE OF PHILIPPI COMMITTEES

First Land Battle of the Civil War Centennial Commemoration, Inc., Dr. Karl J. Myers, president; general chairman, Dr. E. E. Myers.

Executive committee: Dr. E. E. Myers, chairman; Miss Alma Pitts, secretary; William Woodford, finance; Elliot Bryant, publicity; Mrs. Eva Margaret Carnes, historian; Ira L. Dadisman, reenactment; Dr. Richard E. Shearer, program; Frank Sigley, administration; John K. Phillips, treasurer.

Pageant committee: Donald Smith, chairman; Mrs. Mary Hogue-Author, Mrs. Rex Pyles, adaptation; Miss Mary Belle Smith, director; Miss Carolyn Shaver, Miss Joanne Isner, Miss Iris Butler.

Parades: Philippi Lions Club, Junior Wolfe, chairman; tours, Dr. Hu C. Myers, chairman; information booth, Mrs. A. Lane Daugherty, chairman; guides, Richard Withers, chairman; history, Mrs. Eva Margaret Carnes, chairman; maps and pamphlets, James Fogg, chairman; photographs, Mr. Richard Crawford, chairman; signs, Denzil Sinsel, chairman; properties, Ralph McDaniels, chairman; exhibits, Wellington Reed, chairman; Philippi area tour, Doyle Phillips, chairman; Belington area tour, Dave Gainer, chairman; Cove district area tour, Lindsey Wolf, chairman; Randolph County area, Donald Rice, chairman; Taylor area, George Shingleton, chairman; Tucker County area, Corricks Ford, Homer Fansler and Ken McClain, co-chairmen; roads, Guy Golden, chairman; office secretary, Miss Willa Humphreys.

Registration and information: Supreme Woodman Circle, Mrs. Paul Skidmore, chairman; housing, Business and Professional Women's Club, Miss Mabel Holsberry, chairman; souvenirs committee, William Lambert, chairman; FHA Club; parking, Police Chief Jones Paugh, chairman; historical window display, DAR, Mrs. A. K. Bush, chairman.

Storefront and street decorations, Philippi Volunteer Fire Department, G. Baughman, chairman; Civil War exhibit, Wellington Reed, chairman; exhibits on Philippi and Barbour County, Charles McDaniel, chairman; descendants and historians dinner, Mrs. Virgil Hotsinpiller, chairman; civilian dress and fashion show, Philippi Women's Club, Mrs. C. O. Phillips and Mrs. W. D. Sturm, cochairmen.

Folk dancing, Miss Joan Wilson and Mrs. Ruth Thomas, cochairmen; religious phases of commemoration, Barbour County Council of Churches; telephone committee, Mrs. Evelyn V. McCoy, chairman; official photographer, Richard Crawford; assistants, William Morrison, John Duncan; hospitality committee, Philippi Kiwanis Club, Curtis Lambert, chairman; publicity, Mrs. Richard Scott and Mrs. Paul Skidmore.

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH, DEMOCRAT, OF WEST VIRGINIA, AT THE CENTENNIAL COMMEMORATION OF THE BATTLE OF PHILIPPI, PHILIPPI, W. VA., JUNE 3, 1961

One hundred years ago today our town of Philippi was entered upon the rolls of history as the site of the first land battle in the terrible ordeal of our Union.

This was an event which we today commemorate, but do not celebrate. For this most costly and dreadful war in our history should not occasion a festive and holiday spirit even now, a century after the wounds were first opened.

I shall not linger over the details of the Battle of Philippi—significant though it was as the initial engagement in the drive which cleared Confederate forces from the Tygarts Valley area and secured the Union communication and transportation lines between Washington and the West. This battle and its importance in the Union strategy have been competently discussed by others during this centennial week.

On this last day of the centennial observance we might pause to read the lessons which the War Between the States holds for us still today. And perhaps none has spoken more clearly on this point than Walt Whitman, our first and greatest national poet, and one whose finest work was born of the ferment of those times.

Writing in "Specimen Days" of the firing on Fort Sumter, Whitman declared that the response of the North was significant "not for what came to the surface merely * * * but what it indicated below, which was of eternal importance. Down in the abysms of new world humanity there had formed and hardened a primal hardpan of national Union will, determined and in the majority, refusing to be tampered with or argued against, confronting all emergencies, and capable at any time of bursting all surface bonds, and breaking out like an earthquake. It is, indeed, the best lesson of the century, or of America, and it is a mighty privilege to have been part of it."

This embodiment of the national will Whitman believed to be the heart of President Lincoln's character. "Not but that he had faults," Whitman wrote on the death of Lincoln, "and show'd them in the Presidency; but honesty, goodness, shrewdness, conscience, and (a new virtue, unknown to other lands, and hardly yet really known here, but the foundation and tie of all, as the future will grandly develop), unionism, in its truest and amplest sense, form'd the hardpan of his character. These he seal'd with his life. The tragic splendor of his death, purging, illuminating all, throws round his form, his head, an aureole that will remain and will grow brighter through time, while history lives, and love of country lasts. By many has this Union been help'd; but if one name, one man, must be pick'd out, he, most of all, is the conservator of it, to the future. He was assassinated—but the Union is not assassinated. One falls, and another falls. The soldier drops, sinks like a wave—but the ranks of the ocean eternally press on. Death does its work, obliterates a hundred, a thousand—President, general, captain, private—but the Nation is immortal."

This then is the first lesson to be read in the text of those 4 cruel years—that a union of states and a nation of free men and women had been created which could withstand the most bitter fratricidal strife seen in the modern era. Perhaps no State knew more intimately the torment of this division than did our own State of West Virginia, which was itself a product of war-born sentiments and conflicting loyalties. With a population of barely more than one-third of a million, the counties of Western Virginia furnished some 35,000 soldiers for the Union forces and almost 10,000 for the Confederates, while only in Hancock County was there an overwhelming adherence to one side.

There is another message which we might find in the record of this war which has particular relevance for our present time of trial. As a nation, we are an impatient people, anxious to finish a job and be done with it. Such was the temper of many of the regiments first mustered on both sides of the Civil War, not the least representative being the 13th Brooklyn with two companies of 30-days men, each of whom marched off conspicuously displaying a piece of rope with which he would lead back a southern prisoner within the month.

McLellan's early victories here in the Tygarts Valley helped to foster the idea in the North that the war would be of short duration. Yet the humiliating defeat of the Union forces at the Battle of Bull Run a mere 7 weeks after the Battle of Philippi, ending in panic and the rout to Washington, brought not only a reaction of stupefying disappointment, but also the expression from many in high places as well as low that President Lincoln should desist in his efforts to preserve the Union.

Today, we are once again embattled in the struggle to preserve freedom. And we are once again prone to be the victims of our own national character of impatience and impetuosity, while our wily and ruthless opponent is convinced that time and the tides of history work to his ultimate benefit. We thus need neither the counsels of despair nor alarm; rather, we need the intelligence, the perseverance and the will to bear with our task even when we may not see the end of it within this generation or the next. We need to know also that we can lose a battle and still win the war.

And this, my friends, is the most important lesson of all to be learned by our review of the past: America cannot and will not win the contest for the loyalty of free men if we fail to remain true to our own ideals and aspirations. For more than seven decades prior to the Civil War we attempted to maintain the fiction that the color of a man's skin separates him from the common destiny of all Americans.

When all the economic, political, and constitutional explanations of that deadly conflict are acknowledged, there still remains the irreducible fact that America could not live and tolerate the contradiction of human slavery. We paid a dreadful price to restore the rights of man to all Americans. And yet, the scars are still not healed, nor is the task completed.

The Union was preserved, and a stronger Nation was created in the crucible of war. Yet we cannot today say in candor and truth that the inalienable rights so eloquently proclaimed by Thomas Jefferson are equally guaranteed for all Americans. There are some 18 million of us who, in greater or lesser degree, are denied a full share in the American heritage. While this condition prevails the battle of Philippi is not yet truly won. But with courage and honest conviction in the reality of the American creed, the generations here today will complete the task.

Questionnaire Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, recently I mailed some 140,000 question-

naires to all registered Republican and Democratic voters of the 17th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent. I have already received replies in numbers substantially exceeding 15,000. These answers have been tabulated by volunteer helpers, and I have the pleasure of calling the results to the attention of my colleagues for consideration:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	Undecided
VOTING			
1. Should the electoral college procedure for electing the President be modified so that election of the President and Vice President would be by popular vote?	82	11	7
FOREIGN AFFAIRS			
1. If Castro demands withdrawal of our naval base at Guantanamo Bay should we disagree and defend it if necessary?	88	4	8
2. Do you approve continued U.S. opposition to the admission of Red China to the U.N.?	70	16	14
3. If Russia refuses to sign a firm agreement banning nuclear testing within the next year, should we resume underground testing?	82	5	13
4. Would you support the establishment of a Foreign Service Academy to train career diplomats?	59	24	17
5. Should our ambassadors and diplomatic representatives abroad be given sufficient funds to allow them to be proper hosts?	50	30	20
SOCIAL			
1. Do you favor Federal aid—			
(a) To the aged by matching funds to the States (Kerr-Mills)?	31	39	30
(b) To the aged by the social security method?	59	27	24
(c) To economically depressed areas?	59	24	17
(d) To be continued for urban redevelopment?	34	35	31
(e) To be increased for urban redevelopment?	10	55	35
2. Should fair trade laws become a matter of Federal legislation?	44	35	21
TAXES			
1. Do you favor taxes on the following so-called tax loopholes:			
(a) Abolition of dividend credit?	30	33	37
(b) Mineral depletion allowance reduction?	39	26	35
(c) Tax on State and local bonds (now tax free)?	16	24	60
2A. Should the historic policy of the post office as a public service with necessary subsidies be continued?	44	35	21
2B. Should postal rates be increased to make the Post Office Department self-supporting—			
(1) By increasing 1st-class mail rates to 5 cents?	31	50	19
(2) By increasing 2d- and 3d-class mail rates?	67	19	14
3. Should the present temporary 1 cent of total Federal gas tax be continued to maintain the interstate highway program schedule?	69	21	10
VETERANS			
1. Do you favor an extension of the previous GI benefit bills to provide educational and training benefits to our Armed Forces veterans who serve during peacetime?	37	54	9
FISCAL			
1. Do you believe the Federal budget should be kept in balance during peacetime years?	86	4	10
2. Should higher tariffs or import quotas be imposed to discourage the purchase of foreign-made goods?	70	18	12
3. Would you favor limiting U.S. tourist expenditures abroad as a means of stemming the serious outflow of gold to other countries?	72	19	9
4. If greater Federal expenditures are required to support this country's defense and foreign policies, should revenue be raised from—			
(a) Increased taxes?	33	33	34
(b) Deficit spending?	19	39	42
(c) Postponement of planned domestic programs?	48	20	32
LABOR			
1. Do you believe the President should, by legislation, be given the authority to require compulsory arbitration of strikes which endanger the welfare or safety of the Nation?	82	10	8
2. Should the Federal minimum wage be held at—			
(a) $1 per hour?	35	23	42
(b) Raised to $1.15 per hour?	20	32	48
(c) Raised to $1.25 per hour?	38	27	35
3. Several million workers, mostly in retail trades and service industries, are not presently covered by the Federal minimum wage laws. Should they be included in this program?	63	22	15
EDUCATION			
1. Should the Federal Government provide financial aid for—			
(a) Local school construction?	38	52	10
(b) Teachers' salaries?	22	66	12
2. Should the Government maintain, and possibly increase, scholarships for worthy students in higher education?	62	27	11
3. Do you favor long-term low-interest-rate loans to colleges for construction of classrooms and dormitories?	70	22	8

George Washington Carver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, born a year before the Civil War ended, stolen by night raiders when he was 6 weeks old and traded back for a wind-broken racehorse, George Washington Carver worked his way through high school and college to become a pioneer in plant chemistry. The frail son of slave parents in 79 years gave inspiration to the Negro people and contributed unselfishly to all the people of the world by his scientific experiment with the now abundant peanut and sweetpotato.

He amazed the membership of the Ways and Means Committee of the U.S. Senate in 1921 in a 1-hour-and-45-minute presentation of byproducts he had created from peanuts. These numbered over 300, but on that day he illustrated the results of his adventurous and sustaining curiosity by showing only a portion: lard, face powder, vinegar, relishes, milk, cream, butter, printer's ink, dyes, plastic, breakfast foods, axle grease, sherbet, soaps, coffee, soft drinks, shampoos and paints. Results of his testimony are now important to the peanutgrowers of the South. The Fordney-McCumber tariff bill was in the making and when the legislation was passed it carried a protective tariff on peanuts. From the sweetpotato, he was able to extract over 115 products, and he devised 32 methods of using the sweetpotato for food.

A friend to the farmer, George Washington Carver had a wagon constructed in which he traveled, educating those men whose flocks and droves were dying from a variety of maladies. His work with plant chemistry had prepared him for the task of healing herds stricken with deadly diseases. He lectured and educated men of the soil, enriching their cattle and their lives.

He received his master of science degree from Iowa State College in 1896, and in 1928 Simpson College at Indianola, Iowa, conferred upon him an honorary degree of doctor of science.

Now, almost a hundred years after his birth, requests are being made that a Carver Memorial Library be established near his birthplace in Diamond Grove, Mo. I have introduced legislation that would direct the Commissioner of Education to assist in this project. It has support from the George Washington Carver Memorial Institute. Mrs. Mallie Robinson is national chairman of the institute and Mr. Robert H. Hobday is president. Publisher William Randolph Hearst, Jr., writes of Mr. Hobday:

I do know that Robert D. Hobday, the president of the George Washington Carver Memorial Institute, is a deserving gentleman, and if there were some way that our Federal Government could, somehow, through him, aid in the establishment of a memorial to George Washington Carver, our papers would favor the project.

A letter arrived recently from a distinguished citizen of Independence, Mo., telling me that he thinks the library is "a good idea." I hope that my colleagues will agree with former President Truman. His letter is printed below:

INDEPENDENCE, MO., *June 13, 1961.*

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JIMMY: I have received a letter regarding a bill which is pending to make the Carver birthplace in Missouri a part of the national park and shrine system.

He was born at Diamond, Mo., and the people who are backing this program, as you know, want to set up a memorial library for him in that small town in southwest Missouri. I think it is a good idea.

I understand you introduced House Resolution 6425 to provide for that library.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S TRUMAN.

Perkiomen School Graduation Program Is Significant—Prayers Express the Substance of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Sunday, June 4, I had the privilege of offering a commencement address entitled "The Commitment to Freedom" to the graduates of the Perkiomen School in Pennsburg, Pa.

I was invited by an old personal friend and former West Virginian, Dr. Stephen Roberts, headmaster, who, with Mrs. Roberts, has been a significant influence in the moral and intellectual leadership of their adopted community in Pennsylvania.

The Perkiomen School is a college preparatory school established in 1892 by the general conference of the Schwenkfelder Church. This church, founded upon the teachings of the Silesian scholar and preacher, Caspar Schwenkfeld von Ossig, a contemporary of Martin Luther and John Calvin, is congregational in its policy and ecumenical in its ecclesiastical organization.

The original forebears of the present church, who were part of the great tide of persons who sought religious refuge in the New World, emigrated from Europe to eastern Pennsylvania in 1734. Their descendants continue to work and live in the Reformation tradition of high regard for intellectual discipline and the belief in individual moral and spiritual responsibility. The Perkiomen School, while upholding the highest ideals of this tradition, also provides its young men with a solid foundation in college preparatory work—as evidenced by the fact that virtually all of its 70 graduates this year are already enrolled in colleges and universities throughout the United States.

I was deeply impressed, Mr. President, with the commencement exercises which were held at the Palm Schwenkfelder Church, a quiet sanctuary in the peaceful countryside of eastern Pennsylvania. There was a quality of warmth and strength engendered by the awareness of a genuine spiritual community. And yet, withal, there was also a sense of dedication to the fundamental intellectual and moral disciplines which comprise the educational process at its best.

These qualities were eloquently expressed in the invocation by the Reverend Jack R. Rothenberger, pastor of the Landsdale Schwenkfelder Church, in the moving prayer of the Reverend Fred A. Trimble, Jr., school chaplain, and in the significant benediction by the Reverend Martha Kriebel, copastor of the Palm Schwenkfelder Church.

Mr. President, the Schwenkfelder Church and its communicants are in the mainstream of the American tradition of religious liberty and of freedom with responsibility. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the invocation by Reverend Rothenberger, the prayer by Reverend Trimble and an excerpt from my commencement address by printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INVOCATION BY THE REVEREND JACK R. ROTHENBERGER, PASTOR, LANDSDALE SCHWENKFELDER CHURCH

In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

There is one God and Father of us all; He is above all and through all and in you all. Let us pray to Him.

Our Father and our God, we humbly bow in Thy presence acknowledging Thee to be our Creator, Sustainer, Judge and Redeemer. We look to Thee in this hour of great joy and expectation, knowing that all we have and are is a gift from Thee. We are truly grateful.

We thank Thee for life itself, for the opportunities of service to Thee by serving the needs of our fellow men. We thank Thee for the guidance Thou has given men and women of vision in the past and for the ideal of brotherhood that permeates the walls of this school. We thank Thee for Perkiomen School, its teachers and administrators and for this great land in which we enjoy countless freedoms which are unknown elsewhere in the world. We thank Thee for bringing us safely to this hour and for the hope of greater achievements in the future.

Keep us ever mindful when difficulties confront us and when life's burdens seem too great that Thou art near to help. May we never turn traitor to the spirit of human love. May we hold on to ideals we have learned here at Perkiomen—ideals such as: the dignity of human personality, the freedom and responsibility of each person in the community of the world, and the love of God.

We pray, Father, that as this new graduating class takes its place among the alumnae of this great school, they will continue in the process of learning how to live their lives for Thee. Help them to step forward into the world as useful citizens of Thy great Kingdom. We pray that Perkiomen may have succeeded in laying the foundations upon which these graduates may build worthy and useful lives under God.

We pray Thy special blessing upon Headmaster Roberts and his family, upon his faculty and staff and those responsible for guiding the work of this school. We pray Thy blessing upon the President of the United States and upon all those charged with the responsibility of making decisions that affect the lives of others. Above all, Father, we pray for peace and good will among men.

Be with us now as we continue in this commencement service. Speak to us, challenge us, encourage us to put first things first in all we do. We pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

PRAYER BY THE REVEREND FRED A. TRIMBLE, JR.

Let us unite in prayer.

As we are gathered together in the sanctuary of Thy presence, to recognize the achievements, to reminisce over the memories of yesterday and to dream of the idealized tomorrow, an aura of sheltered complacency and satisfaction descends upon us. The race has been run, the fight has been fought, and the faith has been preserved.

Rather, O Lord, deliver us from such an illusion of ease and comfort. Even now there are the unsolved problems of yesterday which refuse to remain quiet and at rest. Hatred is being bred anew among the people of this Nation. The sins of the fathers are being visited upon the children even unto the third and fourth generation, and we are now paying dearly for their sins of omission and commission.

At this moment the darkness of night is descending upon a city in which two men who represent powers of the world set against each other are measuring and evaluating each other's courage, resourcefulness, and determination. The impressions they bring to this meeting and take from it may well determine the kind of future these young men before us will face. In the midst of world turmoil and unrest we earnestly pray for Thy blessing upon these world leaders as they seek some respite and relief from world tension. Pour out Thy spirit upon them as they review these crucial problems that they might meet and talk without deceit and chicanery, but with sincerity and benevolent motives.

So, O Lord, equip these graduating men with powers and courage and abilities to come to grips with the unsolved problems of yesterday and the as-yet-unknown problems of tomorrow. May they come to a knowledge of the world and of mankind which will help them to understand what their fathers would or could not understand—that the real problem is not in technological advances and improvements, but in man's relation to man.

So guide them and direct them that they might earn the ultimate reward, "Well done, thou good and faithful servants," enter thou into the joys of the Kingdom. In so doing, may we come upon that ultimate climate in which man might live with fellow man and in which all men will recognize Thee as Lord of Lords and King of Kings. Hear this our prayer, in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

THE COMMITMENT TO FREEDOM

(Excerpt from commencement address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, at Perkiomen School, June 4, 1961)

It is customary at such a time for the person in my present role to tell you that you are "entering the world"—that life is a serious affair, and that you must now place aside the boyhood pleasures and the pastimes of youth.

I believe I need not tell you this. For not only have you been in this world for some time, but I daresay that life wears as real a face to youth as it does to adults. Your sorrows and your joys, your victories and your defeats, are felt as keenly—perhaps more so—than those of your elders, since your sensibilities have not been dulled by custom and usage. Nor is age alone a badge of understanding.

But if commencement is not this simple act of entering the world of adulthood, it is in truth the beginning of a new and significant phase in your life. You are leaving behind the relatively sheltered atmosphere of preparatory school where many of the decisions have been made for you and where the range of your own freedoms and responsibilities has been comparatively restricted.

And you are soon to enter a phase of your studies in which you must give conscious attention to the choice of a career. Whether you decide on a life in business, in one of the professions, in scholarly or artistic pursuits, or in the field of science you will find a world in constant flux, and one in which your most cherished assumptions must be constantly reexamined and tested against a changing reality.

The U.S. Army Engineers—The Unsung Heroes of the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, all too often when the various branches of the military service are being accorded recognition, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is overlooked. This is certainly unfortunate, for the Corps of Engineers' work, although not as spectacular as the other branches, makes a tremendous contribution not only to the defense of this country but to its safety and general welfare. Accordingly, I believe that at this time of year, when the military services are being justifiably lauded, it would be appropriate to review briefly the history of the Corps of Engineers and outline some of the work which it is presently performing in a highly efficient and commendable manner.

The story of the Corps of Engineers opens with the Revolution. The colonists had no professional engineers, and the Army's first Chief of Engineers, Col. Richard Gridley, who fortified the American positions for the Battle of Bunker Hill in 1775, was a self-trained, practical engineer. General Washington sought aid from France and Louis XVI sent him five highly trained professional engineers. Around these men and other European volunteers, Washington built an Army engineering capability that played a major role in winning independence and led to the formation of the American engineering profession.

After the Revolution, Washington recommended reestablishment of the Corps of Engineers, and the organization of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point was placed under its charge. The corps' mission was to train engineers and line officers for the Army and to fortify the coast and frontier.

Foreseeing the need of professional engineers both for military defense and national development, President Thomas Jefferson strengthened both the school and the corps. For many years to come, these were the only means of educating and training engineers in the United States. The corps continued to operate West Point until the Civil War period, and our early civilian engineering schools came out of this source.

By 1824, it was recognized that the kind of transporation network most essential to national growth was not being built. Congress directed the corps to plan a national transportation system that would weld the Nation together. A Board of Internal Improvements was established to spearhead the task, and Army engineers began to improve the national roads, help build State, local, and private canals and improve rivers and harbors that were needed to serve rapidly increasing navigation activity.

Army engineers surveyed the routes for the early railroads, supervised construction of the first section of the Baltimore & Ohio in 1827, and for many years were the major source of railroad construction skill.

During the 1840's, a new and highly significant phase of Army Engineers effort began. These were the engineering and scientific missions sent out to explore, survey, and map the West and to record for the first time the resources it contained. These expeditions, which carried on until the latter part of the 19th century, collected information on meteorology, geology, mineralogy, zoology, botany, the culture of the Indians and many other things. They did much to stimulate the development of the West, and added immensely to the scientific knowledge of those times.

In 1858, the Army Engineers began development of the Great Lakes navigation system, which played a vital part in providing the abundance of iron and steel for our phenomenal growth.

The period following the Civil War saw the rapid rise of the railroads and a steady rise in modern barge traffic developed on our inland waterways. Floods along the lower Mississippi became a menace that could no longer be ignored and the corps took over the herculean task of building a continuous levee system, still one of the greatest construction accomplishments of all times.

After the turn of the 20th century, the corps' Gen. George W. Goethals was given the task of completing the Panama Canal, opened in 1914. Since that time, Army engineers have served as Governors of the Canal Zone and supervised its operations.

In World War I, the Army's Engineers were the first American troops to go into combat, and suffered the first American casualties. The character of war had changed, and the construction of ports, supply bases, railroads, roads, bridges, power and water utilities, hospitals, and other means of supporting an expeditionary force of 2 million men fighting almost 4,000 sea and land miles from home was a new and challenging experience.

The greatest advances made in water resources development came in the period between the two world wars. Congress gave the corps national responsibility for flood control in 1936 and authorized it to carry out comprehensive surveys, embracing power, navigation, flood control, irrigation, and other water uses, for each of the Nation's river basins. Each survey was to deal with a river system as a single entity and to consider all of the problems and uses of water encountered by our complex, industrial society, and to present a plan of development. Here was the first giant step toward the time when public and private development could go forward within the framework of sound river basin planning.

World War II was an engineers' war in the words of General MacArthur, himself a former Army engineer. As in the past, the Army engineers were cast in the role of the advance element of combat. They became expert in amphibious landings—carrying fighting men, their equipment and supplies from ship to shore and establishing them on the beach, under fire. Engineer troops carried out 44 of the 61 major operations of that kind during the war.

The Army Engineers were the first to hit and hold the Normandy beachhead. They cleaned out the mines, reduced the fortifications, held off the enemy, bulldozed roads into the interior and facilitated the movement of the main attack force to engage the Nazi army. Their construction skill kept the mechanized army moving forward with the gasoline and other supplies voraciously required by lightning war moving in right behind them; sometimes in front of them.

The Korean war, too, found the engineers one of the most active and indispensable elements of combat. Their skills of mobility enabled our outnumbered forces to stay and fight and keep the Communists from seizing a vital portion of the free world.

When the fighting in World War II stopped, the corps moved quickly into the current large and comprehensive water resources development programs. Projects such as the great dams on the Missouri, the Columbia, and other rivers were quickly gotten underway. These were followed by projects such as the recanalization of the Ohio, the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the modernization of the Great Lakes navigation system and many others.

The program is now based on the concept that the continued phenomenal growth of our country will ultimately require the fullest practical use of virtually all of our water resources. The corps is now working toward the maximum development of our rivers for flood control, navigation, water supply, hydroelectric power, public recreation, and fish and wildlife protection. We have about reached the halfway point in the construction of active projects authorized by the Congress.

Concurrently, the Corps of Engineers is building, largely for the Army and the Air Force, our worldwide chain of military defenses for deterring Soviet military aggression, including the bases and facilities for conventional air and land power and for developing and deploying the new intercontinental missiles. It is a tremendous program, currently running at the rate of $1.2 billion annually.

Personally, and closer to home, I can cite many valuable peacetime projects which the Corps of Engineers has performed and is performing in my 24th District of Pennsylvania.

The Presque Isle beach erosion project at Erie, for instance, was the first beach erosion project of its kind undertaken in the United States; the contemplated deepening of the Erie Harbor, the most natural lakeport on the American side of the St. Lawrence Seaway, will enable this seaport to realize its full potential for world commerce; the Shenango River Reservoir now under construction near Sharpsville will provide vital flood protection for the entire Shenango Valley; and the all-important French Creek

flood control project, so necessary to the safety, growth, and industrial development of the Meadville area, which is expected to be authorized in the next omnibus bill passed by the Congress—these are but a few of the projects in my district where the Corps of Engineers has demonstrated that it is a group of professional engineers that can perform services to a community which go far beyond anything that can be measured in dollars and cents.

Similar projects—completed, in progress, and pending—are testimonials to the Army Engineers in every congressional district in the United States, which now includes Alaska and Hawaii.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that in view of its wonderful history and marvelous works, starting with the Revolutionary War and continuing right up to the present time, all of the citizens of the United States will want to join the citizens of my district in expressing appreciation to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for its splendid efforts in behalf of all Americans both in times of war and in times of peace. Truly, the Army engineers are the unsung heroes of the armed services of the United States of America.

Keeping Faith With Those Who Died for Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last May 30, 1961, appropriate Memorial Day exercises, in tribute to our war dead, were held in the community of Hopkinton, Mass., which is part of the congressional district I have the honor to represent here.

The ceremonies were sponsored by the Daniel L. McDonough Post 202, of the American Legion, and took place at the Doughboy Monument in the town park.

It was my privilege to be the principal speaker at these exercises, and I have been asked to include here the address I delivered, which follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE AT THE MEMORIAL DAY EXERCISES, HOPKINTON, MASS., MAY 30, 1961

It is a particular pleasure to be able to visit Hopkinton this morning and join with you people in these exercises in remembrance and in honor of the revered dead of all our wars.

Our purpose here, I think, is threefold. We are gathered to honor those who died in military service to the country, to salute the widows and families of these heroes, together with our living disabled veterans, and to rededicate ourselves to the further preservation of the freedom and liberty for which our comrades gave up their lives.

We would be neglectful in our duty if we forgot to express the tribute we still owe to those among us who are quietly carrying on their work despite the disabling scars and handicaps received in combat with the enemy.

We would be faulting ourselves if we were unmindful today of the obligations we owe to the widows, children, and parents our war heroes left behind, whose valiant acceptance of the great human sorrow thrust upon them makes us humble in their presence.

This great Nation, I know, will never permit any unjust hardship to embitter the minds and hearts of our disabled veterans, and the families of those who paid the supreme sacrifice in our national defense. I am sure the grateful American people will never be so unwise as to become neglectful or forgetful in providing a full measure of practical assistance to the family members of the heroes who are gone.

As we dwell upon the memories of our honored dead, we are vividly reminded that once again, as in their day, the liberty and freedom of America, and the rest of the civilized world, is being threatened by a strong, skillful and relentless enemy.

This is a new and more deadly enemy than we have ever before been called upon to face. The strategy of this new enemy is not, thus far, open warfare but a skillful and calculated program of eventual enslavement which we call the cold war. The cold war program of the Kremlin leaders is imposed upon us by executing, at one period, a carefully planned series of provocative incidents all over the globe and, at another period, the extension of tempting gestures toward apparently peaceful negotiation and settlement.

In this manner they have been and hope to continue to keep ourselves, and other nations, in constant hesitation, confusion and division. They hope and expect that by persevering in this devilish scheme, with the threat of nuclear warfare in the balance, they will eventually exhaust the spirit of ourselves and other peoples so that we will offer them peaceful terms at any price.

But let us clearly understand that the Russian leaders have openly proclaimed their intention to subjugate the world under Communist slavery and their price for peace is the acceptance of atheistic dictatorship.

Let us clearly recognize that beneath this cold war strategy we are now, and have long been, basically engaged in a life and death struggle between two ideals of government. It is a desperate struggle for survival between two philosophies of life and government that are exactly opposite, Christian democracy and atheistic communism. Unless we become increasingly aware of, and alert to, the evil dangers confronting us and dedicate ourselves in opposition to them our precious freedom and liberty can well be lost.

The task is before us and the President of the United States has issued to all of us a new call to arms to contain and repel the Russian cold war strategy by peaceful means, if possible. We are a peace-loving people, our intention and objective is to preserve the peace. I am certain that this Government will never abandon the pursuit of peace, with honor, despite any irritation or obstacle. But we must also convince the Communist dictators that peace is the best and wisest course for them.

To so convince them, we must demonstrate readiness to undergo any sacrifice required for us to remain strong and secure against the possibility of aggression either militaristically or ideologically. We must be prepared to meet every contingency and cold war development. Our defense system, our space research, and our missile production must be constantly improved and strengthened to a point where the Kremlin dictators will know they themselves cannot hope to escape total destruction in any nuclear warfare they might be tempted to provoke.

The survival of a free world and Christian civilization principally depends upon American economic strength, continued productive growth, and, above all, united patriotic determination.

To attain this objective every national element, individual, business, agriculture, labor and the government must be willing to undergo the sacrifices that are and will be required.

To save our freedoms, and the freedom of the world, we must all be ready to submerge our various ambitions and unselfishly contribute towards eventual victory and I am confident that the people of this country will do so.

Grave problems have endangered this Nation many times during our glorious history. If we had always surrendered abjectly to difficulty, if we had customarily defaulted to obstacles, if we had always retreated in the face of fears, the United States would have long since disappeared into obscure humiliation.

Let us then once again close our ranks and show the Communist rulers that the voluntary self-discipline of a free people is more than a match for the regimented uniformity of their atheistic slave state.

The road ahead, it is true, will undoubtedly be long, hard, disagreeable, and filled with sacrifice, but the road the heroes we honor today were asked to follow led them to their deaths.

In patriotic acceptance of our personal duties and restraints, to promote common victory and peace, we can have no better inspiration than the revered memory of of those who died in the service of their country.

The only way in which we can justify the continuing enjoyment of the blessings and privileges they left to us is by keeping faith with our war dead.

Let us then join our prayers to the Almighty to give us the national strength, courage, character, and unity to be worthy of their trust.

Dedication of the Sgt. Paul S. Beck U.S. Army Reserve Training Center, Bellefonte, Pa., May 30, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to participate in the dedication ceremony May 30, 1961, of the Sgt. Paul S. Beck U.S. Army Reserve Training Center, Bellefonte, Pa., which is the sixth Reserve training center constructed in my congressional district since the approval of the Reserves Forces Act of 1955. The number of Reserve training centers will be increased to seven when the proposed Army Reserve training center is constructed at State College, Pa., next fall.

The May 30 program at Bellefonte was of dual significance since it combined the annual Memorial Day observance with the dedication ceremony.

In addition to my remarks as a participant in the Memorial Day program, I had the honor of introducing as principal

speaker, Maj. Gen. Ralph C. Cooper, commanding general of the XXI U.S. Army Corps. Following are my remarks:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, DEDICATION CEREMONIES, U.S. ARMY RESERVE TRAINING CENTER, TUESDAY, MAY 30, 1961, AT BELLEFONTE, PA.

It is an honor to participate in this Memorial Day program which has dual significance since it combines Bellefonte's 1961 observance of Memorial Day with the formal deducation of the Sgt. Paul S. Beck, U.S. Army Reserve Training Center.

Before introducing the principal speaker who will deliver the dedicatory address, I should like to emphasize that Memorial Day is a day of reverence and recollection.

In keeping with the annual custom, we assemble on May 30 each year to honor the memory of those who gave their lives in defense of their country.

Today, in addition to paying a tribute of love and respect to all our honored dead, we signally honor one of them by the dedication of the new Army Reserve Training Center in memory of one of Bellefonte's gallant sons, Sgt. Paul S. Beck, who was killed in action in Germany in 1945.

For his heroism, born of boundless courage and deathless valor, Sergeant Beck was awarded posthumously the Distinguished Service Cross.

This new Army Reserve Training Center which immortalizes Sgt. Paul S. Beck is a sturdy and dignified memorial.

It serves a practical and patriotic purpose, and a purpose so suited to the character and military career of Sgt. Paul S. Beck.

Such a fine memorial must be gratifying to all who knew and loved him, and in particular, to his mother, Mrs. Ella Beck, and his daughter, Mrs. Carol Comrod, who are present on this memorable occasion.

It is good to know that the residents of this community and the loved ones of Sergeant Beck, who gave to his country "the last full measure of devotion," will be able to have ever before their eyes, this substantial evidence of the honor in which the name of Sergeant Beck is held by his grateful country.

As a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, I am an advocate of Army Reserve Center construction because I believe in strength in the Reserve.

As our first President urged—I believe in an adequate regular Defense Establishment and a strong, well-organized, well-equipped, and well-trained Reserve.

The Father of our Country strongly recommended—"The citizens of America—from 15 to 60 should be borne on the milita rolls, provided with uniform arms, and so far accustomed to the use of them that the total strength of the country might be called forth at short notice."

It is easy now to recognize the great wisdom of Washington's advice.

However, more than a century passed before his proposals were translated into really effective laws and actions.

In all conflicts in which this country engaged before the Korean conflict, we had time to mobilize before meeting the enemy.

In today's troubled world, the availability of this warning time is dubious.

The initial strike may be our first warning.

We must have, therefore, an effective, immediately available Reserve for national survival.

Since a citizen army may be called to arms on short notice, it has become clear to us that Reserve Forces, well trained and quickly responsive, may be the key to survival.

This capability is being provided through the training received by the young men and women in Bellefonte and in similar communities, at nearly 5,000 Reserve training centers.

The Congress of the United States has demonstrated how much it is aware of the need for a strong and active Reserve Force, by the passage of the Reserve Forces Act of 1955.

Today there is more interest and effort being put into the Reserve Forces training program by the Congress and our military leaders, than there has ever been in our history.

With the passage of the Reserve Forces Act—we in Congress provided for a Reserve Establishment which permits us to broaden the obligation of citizenship and the military obligation as well, so that if a future Korea occurs in the history of our country—we can call upon men who may not be veterans, but who are nevertheless well trained and prepared for combat.

The purpose of the law was to provide the machinery, and the trained men in adequate numbers, to our Reserve Forces, so that they may be mobilized quickly to augment the Active Forces in the event of war or national emergency.

A few years back, it would have been impossible to construct such a building as this for the Army Reserve.

There was neither a construction program, nor funds for construction.

The Army Reserve construction program, under which this building was completed, was only begun in 1950.

Since then 417 centers have been completed, 53 are under construction, and more are planned.

The Army Reserve also leases some 950 training facilities.

The construction of an Army Reserve center such as this one, depends upon several things.

First, there must be enough reserve personnel, actively participating in units in a particular area, to justify the center.

Next, funds must be obtained through the Congress.

Then a suitable site must be obtained and approved by the Department of the Army, the Department of Defense, and in some instances, by the Congress.

Public opinion must also favor and support the construction.

Any Reserve Center becomes a part of the community.

Reserve centers are more than just buildings, they help to enhance community understanding and support of the Reserve program, wherever they are built.

They also provide a means of creating a greater awareness of the vital nature of the mission of the ready reserve, in the protection of our country and the preservation of our ideals.

Your Congressman is, therefore, vitally concerned with all of the details relating to its construction.

A closely coordinated series of events takes place from the time the determination is made to build a training center, in a specific locality, to its completion and actual dedication.

Members of Congress are kept informed of the selection of construction sites for Reserve centers, and the subsequent development of the project.

Your Congress and the armed services are committed to the same primary mission, the security of the United States.

We continually work together, seeking solutions to our mutual problems in the interests of all the people.

While the administrative procedure outlined sounds somewhat complicated, yet routine in nature, in obtaining approval of a Reserve training center, you have my assurance from personal experience that it presents a challenging, yet highly rewarding task.

As a ranking Republican member of the Military Reserve Subcommittee, of the House Committee on the Armed Services, my assignment enables me to keep in close and constant touch with developments regarding new Reserve training centers in the Nation, and especially in my own congressional district—comprising Blair, Centre, and Clearfield Counties.

The result of my being in a key position as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee has proved favorable for my congressional district, as evidenced by the construction of six new Reserve training centers at Altoona, Dubois, Clearfield, and this Reserve training center in Bellefonte, as well as the U.S. Naval Reserve training centers at Altoona and Curwensville.

These various projects are a fitting climax to years of painstaking effort and numerous conferences with officials of the Department of Defense, as well as much time and effort expended in securing authorization and then the construction funds from Congress.

It is a source of deep satisfaction that my amendment in the House Armed Services Committee, concerning this Reserve training center here in Bellefonte, was the initial step in securing congressional approval of the project.

With six new Reserve training centers now a reality in my congressional district, it is pleasing to know that my efforts in behalf of the proposed Army training center at State College have proved successful.

The site has been selected and approved, and negotiations to acquire the land were completed last April 5.

Construction of the State College Army Reserve Training Center, which will be the seventh in my congressional district, is scheduled to begin during the second quarter of the fiscal year beginning July 1.

The delay is due to a revised design which is expected to be completed by September 1, with construction scheduled to begin in early October.

On this solemn and memorable occasion I should like to salute the officers and members of the Reserve organizations that are presently assigned to this $289,000 Reserve training center; namely:

1. The 3d Platoon, Company A, 491st Engineer Battalion C, and

2. The 430th Quartermaster Company.

Both units are combat support units, which means that in case of a national emergency, they would become part of the support and supply efforts of the U.S. Army.

I wish to tender a special tribute to Maj. Harry A. Houston, senior unit adviser, and Capt. W. H. Weaver, senior unit, U.S. Army Reserve, commander, for their wholehearted cooperation extended to me over a period of several years—in compiling information of great assistance in my effort to obtain approval by Congress of this Army Reserve training center.

I would be remiss in expressing appreciation were I to fail in mentioning the fine support accorded Reserve activities by the people of Bellefonte and especially members of the training center advisory board—composed of public-spirited citizens of this community.

The spirit in which you are responding to the need of the Nation for adequate strength in Reserve, and wholeheartedly supporting the Army in carrying out its mission, is heartwarming and it is typical of the response of a patriotic American community.

The American people support their Armed Forces, not for the purpose of making war, but to be able to prevent war, and to protect the United States when this becomes necessary.

That is the basic purpose for which all of us are gathered here today—in dedicating this important Army Reserve Center.

We are very fortunate in having present as principal speaker, Maj. Gen. Ralph C. Cooper, commanding general of the 21st U.S. Army Corps.

General Cooper is a graduate of the Military Academy, class of 1929.

He saw combat service in World War II in the north African invasion, in Tunisia, Sicily, Italy, France, and Germany.

In Korea he commanded the 7th Division and IX Corps Artillery.

In addition to command assignments, General Cooper has had extensive staff experience, which includes service as Chief of the Army War Plans Branch in the Department of the Army, at the outbreak of the Korean operation and, more recently, as Chief of Plans and Operations, U.S. Army Europe.

General Cooper is a qualified parachutist, who commanded the 11th Airborne Division in Europe in 1958.

At the time the 11th Airborne Division was replaced by the 24th Infantry Division, he assumed command of the latter organization.

In that position he was in charge of the training and mounting of the parachute units for the Lebanon operation.

He came from command of the 24th Division in Europe to his present assignment in November 1959.

At this time it is an honor and privilege to present to you as principal speaker, Maj. Gen. Ralph C. Cooper.

The Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews has been in existence since October of 1936. This is a great organization consisting of outstanding men of all creeds in connection with inculcating into the minds of all persons the spirit of broadness and understanding, and the spirit and traditions of the American system of government.

Each year this splendid organization holds a banquet, largely attended, in Boston, and confers an award upon three outstanding Americans; one of the Catholic faith, one of the Protestant faith, and one of the Jewish faith.

The dinner this year was held on May 11, 1961, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in Boston, Mass., with an attendance of more than 1,200 outstanding citizens of Massachusetts.

In my remarks I include a report made by Ben G. Shapiro, secretary of this wonderful organization, and a man who has dedicated his entire life in the field of better understanding. Mr. Shapiro is highly respected and esteemed by countless thousands of persons.

In my remarks, I also include the address delivered by the Very Reverend (Father) Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., president of the University of Notre Dame, who was the recipient of one of the awards given at the dinner the evening of May 11.

In my remarks I also include an address delivered by the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, who was also a recipient of one of the awards.

I congratulate the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, for the constructive work that it has done during the approximately 25 years of its existence.

The report and addresses follow:

A REPORT BY BEN G. SHAPIRO, SECRETARY, MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE, CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, MAY 11, 1961

Gentlemen of the clergy, Governor Volpe, Mayor Collins, our guests of honor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I know that all of you here tonight share with me a deep sense of pride that these wonderful dinners always engender. For those of us who initiated these dinners 24 years ago, the goal was a simple one—to examine the status of the democratic institutions in our great country and to reaffirm the lofty principles upon which these institutions are based.

Throughout the years we have been told that this annual event has helped to inspire in those attending, a deeper sense of commitment to the ideals of equality and justice for all men. Many of us are renewed by this experience in our efforts to create an atmosphere in which equality becomes a reality. Several months ago, His Eminence Richard Cardinal Cushing, whom we honored in this very room when he became archbishop of Boston, spoke before the Advertising Club of Baltimore and affirmed our faith in the importance of the kind of gathering in which we participate tonight. He said—"Like some of you I have been attending good will dinners and brotherhood meetings for more years than I can remember. In the course of these years I have heard many cynical comments about the do-gooders who gather once or twice a year to tell each other of their mutual respect and affection and then go back to work and continue living as if good will didn't exist. Despite these disparagers, I still continued to go to good will dinners and I am still going. Good will dinners and brotherhood meetings are a good investment for us all. Catholics alone could never have managed to put out the little fires of prejudice which bitter history, half-read facts, misunderstandings, and human weaknesses created."

In Cardinal Cushing's statement there was an implicit reference to one of the most significant events in the history of human relations in this country—the election of an American of the Catholic faith to the Presidency of the United States. Indeed, it is deeply gratifying to all men of good will that after 185 years of national life, we have finally grown to the point where the American people have accepted that part of our Constitution which says that there shall be no religious test for a public office. A ringing blow has been struck for good human relations and today 40 million Americans can no longer be looked upon as second-class citizens. Indeed, similar advances have been made by other groups in our society as the fires of prejudice grow dimmer.

Yet, it is at that time and this moment in our history that we cannot afford to become complacent. We must stamp out the remaining evidence of raucous unfairness and subtle discrimination.

Twenty-four years ago when we held our first dinner at the Boston City Club there were 220 persons in attendance.

Tonight there are gathered in this room 1,200 persons. We regret that a great many who wanted to attend our dinner tonight could not be accommodated.

We are especially grateful to our newspapers whose cooperation over the years has been most outstanding. The newspaper coverage of this dinner which will appear in tomorrow's papers will reach hundreds and thousands of persons.

To the staff of WNAC–TV who have been televising our programs for many years, our heartfelt thanks. We are told that our television and radio coverage will reach an audience of over a million persons.

We believe that many thousands to whom our message is important will be influenced and persuaded that bigotry and discrimination must be eliminated. That is the importance of these dinners. We reach not only you but millions who are not here.

As to the question of what else our committee does besides holding these annual dinners—let me enumerate briefly just a few of the things we did this past year.

We cooperated with the following:

Good citizenship program of the Boston Park Department.

Tufts University Civic Education Center (incidentally, in cooperation with the Tufts University Civic Education Center, more than 25,000 copies of a talk given by Dore Schary were distributed by the committee to schoolteachers and heads of educational institutions throughout the United States); Brandeis University, three chapels program; human relations center at Boston University in sponsoring of scholarships for schoolteachers; our 10th annual junior good will dinner, bringing together boys of the Boston public and parochial schools, held at Fenway Park, received national recognition.

Tonight we honor three outstanding Americans, who in their lifetime, have translated our Judaeo-Christian heritage into meaningful, daily actions. And, as we pay tribute to them, we deepen our own commitment in meeting the challenge of democracy and interpreting it to the American community in every possible way. Together may we serve in some small way not only to reward achievements already won, but to encourage new and greater progress on our way to the realization of the American dream.

ADDRESS GIVEN BY THE REVEREND THEODORE M. HESBURGH, C.S.C., PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME, AT THE 24TH ANNUAL DINNER OF THE MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 11, 1961

May I begin this evening by thanking the Massachusetts Committee, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews for your generosity in making this award. May I only say I shall cherish it and try to be more worthy of it, now and in the future.

One is constantly hearing these days about brotherhood. Like so many other well worn words, I often fear it comes to represent sweet nothingness, or a formal badge that is proudly worn on appropriate occasions, like patriotism on the Fourth of July.

It is a sad business that good and strong words like brotherhood do undergo this dilution by too frequent protestation and too casual use. If the word were a reality in all of our lives, there would be no need for occasions like this. I always fear that even good occasions are the means, all unwittingly, of multiplying the application of Gresham's law to semantics.

How can we avoid this? In no other way, I believe, than by meditating on the true and enduring value of words like brotherhood lest they become as common and unmeaning as the conversations at cocktail parties.

Brotherhood allows us ample ground for meditation. The meditation should begin by recognizing the unity of the human race, in its origin, in its aspirations, in its dignity, in its rights, in its destiny. If we can be agreed upon this most basic common ground,

then brotherhood will begin to have deeper meaning. Without this common ground, brotherhood is sentimental nonsense, enunciated easily in public, and in private practice, as easily forgotten.

What I am saying is that indeed we are brothers, whatever our race or religion, simply because we are human beings, made in the image and likeness of God, endowed by Him with unalienable dignity and rights, destined to be His children and heirs to His kingdom. Religion, of course, greatly deepens the significance of this unity. If this is true of our unity, what could possibly be so important that it should separate us from one another, cause us to disregard or disrespect one another. If we are one in the dignity of our common humanity, what sin of man is greater than man's inhumanity to man, except perhaps his blasphemy of God, which indeed inhumanity to man also is, insofar as God's image in man is defiled and dishonored. In the words of our Lord: "Whatsoever you did to one of these, My least brethren, you did to Me."

Given such a conviction of the spiritual order, I am sure that our practical problems would be much easier to handle. Indeed, without this deep spiritual conviction on the true meaning of brotherhood, I fear that no organization, or well-meaning zeal based on vague good will, will suffice to bring into daily play the great force of true brotherhood in our lives and in our times.

The tragedy of our day is that we constantly combat symptoms without coming to grips with the fundamental underlying cause of infection and disease. If we could get Americans generally to accept the strong philosophical and theological truths that illuminate the meaning of brotherhood, it would be inconceivable that Americans would scorn one another in such juvenile and inhuman ways as are current today. You all know the symptoms: the empty lunch counter, the vote denied intelligent people, the exclusive club, the separate facilities, the unspoken ban, the crass assumption of superiority, the snide remark among friends, the barring of equal opportunity, economic, educational, or social, that is a cruel wound in the side of humanity in a land that professes to be the citadel of democracy.

When will there be an end to such stupid nonsense? Not until each American begins to sense the deep and abiding sense of humanity, common dignity and the common cause of uncommon importance in an age that will be the making or breaking of humanity's deepest hopes.

The time is long past when we can abuse the reality of brotherhood at home and still hope to oppose successfully a militant and vicious theory abroad that man is merely of the earth earthy, with no hope beyond time, with no rights beyond those granted by the state, with no freedom from inexorable economic determination and military might making right. Our hope of success in this central battle is indeed futile if we do not believe deeply and practice sincerely the ever-present reality of our common brotherhood, based upon realities that transcend space and time and race. This is the substance of the issue. The real battle is being fought right now on Main Street, North and South, in your neighborhood, in your life. No one can disengage himself from this issue, and the alternatives are clearly delineated—we act as though we are truly brothers, or we give aid and comfort to the enemy on a thousand fronts.

Any impartial observer of the American scene can clearly see that we are far off from making the promises of our Constitution for equal rights and equal opportunities come true. The excuses—sophisticated or stupid—are multitudinous, and the rationalizations and compromises are without end. But whether we really accept it or not, brotherhood is a concept and a reality and a truth that does not admit to any of this deception or hypocrisy, whether it be accomplished in a slick or in a stupid manner. You believe in brotherhood for deep and important, indeed eternal reasons, or you do not. You practice brotherhood in your life, or you do not. And all unsuspectingly, as your life gives the answer to these two questions, you are working for or against ultimate victory, for or against the realization of man's truest hopes in our times, and in our beloved country.

May God grant to all of us tonight the privilege of practicing brotherhood in its purest integrity. In no other way can America indeed become that of which we sing: The land of the free and the home of the brave. And remember that God is not mocked: Brotherhood is the truest test of our freedom and our courage. If we do not pass this test, we do not merit either victory or survival.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AT THE ANNUAL DINNER, MASSACHUSETTS COMMITTEE OF CATHOLICS, PROTESTANTS, AND JEWS, BOSTON, MASS., MAY 11, 1961

I appreciate your overly generous introduction and I shall cherish this award. I bring you the personal greetings and warm regards of a rather well known Bostonian, the President of the United States.

Not too long ago we passed a traditional milestone for a new American administration—the 100-day mark. It is thus a fitting time to appraise the achievements and future goals of this administration in the area of equality and justice championed by your organization.

I count as a significant achievement of these 100 days, that under President Kennedy's leadership, a positive change in regard to civil rights has taken place.

As Ben Shapiro pointed out, the very election of President John F. Kennedy was a rebuke to the tradition of inequality that discounted able men from seeking high office. No longer can it be said that in this Nation a man's religion is an unfortunate but effective handicap in his right to seek our leadership.

In appointments made at all levels in the executive branch, ability, integrity and professional competence have been the qualifications for office. Religious and racial attributes have been, and will continue to be, disregarded.

The President and his administration support completely the decisions of the Supreme Court declaring segregation unconstitutional. The administration does so not only because this is a government by law. We do so because it is morally right.

In the field of equal employment opportunity, the new President's Committee has been armed with a clear, concise, and strong Executive order. As the President remarked, this Committee, under the chairmanship of Vice President JOHNSON, will act to "permanently remove from Government employment and work performed for the Government every trace of discrimination because of race, creed, color, or place of national origin." The execution of this order will be fair and firm.

Every department and agency in the Government has pledged itself to implement the President's order.

Further, the Justice Department, as it is daily demonstrating under the leadership of the Attorney General, will be continuingly active in the field of discrimination, not only as a friend of the court, but, when the circumstances warrant and permit, as an active participant in litigation.

All of these actions are most significant. They represent, in both intention and effect, a new break for millions of Americans denied full access to the benefits and privileges of our way of life.

I would hope that no American would believe that the only reason for fighting discrimination is because it affects our popularity and moral strength abroad. That is a negative and self-serving base for action. Our concern over the problems of prejudice should come from within ourselves, from a sense of inner morality. We know perfectly well that in a world where totalitarianism trumpets its phony equality, America has little to be ashamed of.

In the struggle against political slavery, America is a devoted champion. We do not seek and we oppose the substitution of one kind of colonialism for another. We abominate the kind of discrimination which the Soviet Union is flagrantly guilty of against the Jewish people, and against all the other religious creeds and faiths. Totalitarianism practices the very evils it claims to be against. We admit our weaknesses, but we honestly seek to overcome them, in a spirit of toleration.

The road, of course, is longer before us than behind us. But we are setting out, and we are moving.

But the Government should not be expected to, and cannot, do this job alone.

In his inaugural address, President Kennedy said that we should ask what we might do for our country. Every employer, every union leader, every civic leader, and every citizen in his private capacity, might well answer that question in terms of the responsibility we all bear for increasing toleration and achieving equality.

The national well-being springs from the exercise of private responsibility.

This is true not only in the matters of civil rights and equal opportunity, but across the board. For example, the President has called together an Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy. Distinguished men from business, from labor, from the public and the Government are deliberating questions of economic urgency. From these deliberations will come recommendations about policies for a sound economic life, for dealing with the problems and realizing the promise of technological change, for price and wage policies that lead to stable growth, and for better understanding between labor and management.

But this Committee—in itself and by itself—cannot do the job that needs to be done.

It must rely upon the many associations of businessmen and the many American labor unions to support it. And ultimately its discussions relate to the individual citizen.

Thomas Paine said that "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it."

If we are to achieve living equality in the economic and social order, if toleration is to be the common condition of American life, then no governmental power can move society alone to those ends. Society must move itself. And it does that through the motive power of each man, reading in his own heart and mind the command of conscience.

An analogy can be found in our educational system. Both public and private institutions carry the burden, but the success of the effort rests with the quality of the individual teacher and the excellence of the individual mind. This partnership of public, private, and individual effort is typically American.

It is the same partnership that I look toward to increase understanding and toleration in the period of the challenge we face.

If we accept respect for human dignity as the only basis for a free world, we also

must accept the responsibility for realizing this ideal here in America, and helping others to attain it elsewhere. This means, as the President so eloquently stated it, we must "Pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty."

I am hopeful and optimistic about the future of equality and human dignity. It will gain new strength from new trial, new resolution from new challenge, new conviction from new danger, and new determination from new circumstances. When men know they might be free and equal, they will strive to be free and equal. When men have reason to hope for freedom and equality, they will sacrifice for it. And both the knowledge and the hope are alive on this earth, more alive now, perhaps, than ever before. The wind of change blows strongly, promising a new day, a new order and a new life in the history of the world.

For our own country, we are determined to go forward as a people and a nation aware of our strength, resolved to meet our responsibilities and determined that in our day freedom will be well and honorably served.

Memorial Sunday Service, Grace Methodist Church, Atloona, Pa., May 28, 1961

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the Memorial Sunday service on May 28, 1961, at Grace Methodist Church, Altoona, Pa., it was my privilege to deliver the following Memorial Day message:

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE GRACE METHODIST CHURCH, ALTOONA, PA., SUNDAY, MAY 28, 1961

As we approach Memorial Day we are reminded that to be born and to die is the decree of all men.

To be forgotten is the acme of human bitterness and the greatest sadness of human existence.

Our observance of Memorial Day has been part of American custom for 93 years.

It began with the decoration of Civil War graves.

The original intent was that on Memorial Day, May 30, living veterans should pay tribute to their comrades-in-arms who had fallen in battle.

The Memorial Day custom has grown through the years until now, May 30 is the very special occasion upon which our citizens pay tribute to all their dead.

That means decorating the final resting places of our departed loved ones with floral offerings and with eulogies in every community and with wreaths and flowers cast upon the waters for those who were lost at sea.

When we refer to deceased war veterans we speak of the honored dead.

That term is applied to all Americans who have given their lives in the defense of our country.

More than 400,000 American men are the honored dead from World War I, World War II, and from the Korean conflict.

That number includes some 175,000 whose mortal remains were returned for burial in their home communities.

Nearly 14,000 others are in national cemeteries within the States.

But the largest number—totaling 212,000 are buried, or named on the walls of the missing, in 25 American military cemeteries in 10 countries of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

When we eulogize the departed ones here from this area we are also paying tribute to all those honored dead around the world.

The tombs and the monuments in the Altoona area are symbolic of every war hero.

Memorial Day is unique in its history, its purpose, and its character.

There is no other day like it.

Upon Memorial Day the flag of our country is humbled in tribute to the Nation's dead.

Our Stars and Stripes emblem is flown at half staff from sunrise to noon on the 30th of May.

Then at noon the flag is raised to full staff and there it flies as an inspiration to the living to carry on the unfinished work of the departed—with renewed effort toward fulfillment of our ideals of liberty and freedom.

We call the 30th of May Memorial Day because it is truly a moment for memories.

It is a tiny point in time, yet one from which we can look into the past and from which we see more clearly our obligations of the future.

Memorial Day should not be a day of sadness.

In reality it is a day of great power and beauty.

We give it power through the sincerity of our thoughts and prayers.

We give it beauty with our words and song and flowers.

Memorial Day is different because it contrasts the many facets of man's character.

It reveals his intellectual achievements and his simplicity, his aggressiveness and his humbleness.

Memorial Day emphasizes man's domination over the material realm, on the one hand and his submission to things unseen and eternal on the other.

Man is gaining mastery over his physical universe but still he has not solved the mysteries of the soul.

That is one fact which Memorial Day helps us appreciate.

All this is especially clear in the present year 1961.

Today we are aware that we're all part of a fast moving age.

We see man reaching for outer space.

He sends his missiles into orbit around the Earth and to the Moon and to the Sun.

Man probes trillions of miles into the vast universe around him and he speculates the possibility of life on other planets.

At the same time man delves deeply into the invisible realm of the atom.

And from that universe of the infinitely small he has managed to release tremendous power for the new life—or for greater destruction.

Man has also advanced his knowledge of communications so that his voice is heard in split seconds from pole to pole—and around the earth—and out into space and back again.

With his eyes, his brain, and his marvelous reasoning powers attuned to fantastic scientific challenges, man can be rightly proud of his ability to discover new answers today and for tomorrow.

And yet in the midst of all those achievements man must humble himself on memorial day.

For a brief moment he must stand quietly to contemplate the past and to admit that he has not yet solved the mysteries of the soul nor the mystery of death.

Thus it is that man returns to simple eulogies and to flowers for the dead.

He still must have faith in prayer.

And he still must admit that he does not have all the answers concerning life or the hereafter.

That, in itself commends human intelligence, because it proves that man is not yet a slave to his own technology.

Therefore, man's humility is a tribute to the living as well as to the dead.

On Memorial Day, we prove that science and the soul are distinctly separate entities and that we have deep respect for both.

On Memorial Day we speak from our living souls.

The words we use must come from our deepest emotions because loyalty and honor, courage and sacrifice, love and death and eternity cannot be defined by scientific formulas.

These are simple human qualities.

And, as such, they are far more precious than all the gems of science.

So, in voicing our tributes to the honored dead we turn from the scientists to the writers and to the poets.

When we visit a local cemetery and stand before the final resting place of one honored dead we speak for the many in uttering these words:

"O Blessed dead and for the soul
Of him who for his country dies,
O Lord, is there a higher goal
Than that won by his sacrifice."

Then we can add Robert Ingersoll's words of tribute to all the honored ones when he declared:

"These heroes are dead.

"They died for liberty.

"They died for us.

"They are at rest.

"They sleep in the land they made free under the flag they rendered stainless under the solemn pines and sad hemlocks, the tearful willows, and the embracing vines.

"They sleep beneath the shadows of the clouds—careless alike of sunshine or storm—each in the windowless palace of rest.

"Earth may run red with other wars but they are at rest.

"In the midst of battles, in the roar of conflict, they found the serenity of death."

That is Robert Ingersoll's eulogy.

We, the living, are not perfect.

We must admit that in many respects we do fall short of the goals we set for ourselves.

We fail to practice fully our ideals of justice, equality, and universal respect for our fellow men.

We excuse our failures by attributing them to so-called human nature.

Then we try again.

But on Memorial Day we do strive to render only highest tributes to the honored dead.

Our appraisal of those men is different.

We give them full measure of true worth.

The ones we honor on Memorial Day; who were they?

Does it really matter?

They were as varied as ourselves.

They were the vibrantly living youth of our land.

They came from our cities and towns and neighborhoods.

They left their schools, their homes, and their loved ones to answer the call to arms.

They were from families rich and poor.

They were the educated and the self-taught.

They were the Protestants and the Catholics, the Gentiles and the Jews.

They were the white boys and the black, the native sons and the foreign born.

Those honored ones were as individualistic as you and I but in the final analysis they were different.

They had one powerfully uniting bond; they were all comrades-in-arms.

Together they fought shoulder-to-shoulder against the common enemy.

Together they were impelled by loyalty and by courage.

Together they fought to the death and that is the principal difference between them and ourselves.

The honored ones gave their lives in combat on land, on sea, and in the air.

And we still live in the freedoms they passed to us.

So, actually, it does not matter who they were.

In our evaluation of the honored dead we can quote the poet John Ingalls who said that—

"In the democracy of the dead all men at last are equal.

"There is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave."

We are not alone on Memorial Day in paying tribute to the honored dead.

Our words, our flowers, and our flag at half-staff here in Altoona will be reflected around the world on May 30.

Similar ceremonies will be attended by men and women and children who are decorating American graves in England, France, and Belgium, in Holland, Luxembourg, Italy, and Tunisia, also in Puerto Rico, in the Philippines, and in all the States of the Union.

They are placing their floral offerings at more than 138,000 marble headstones—rows upon rows of Latin crosses and stars of David.

Also, at American cemeteries in foreign lands the people will be standing in silence before inscriptions which say, "This memorial has been erected by the United States of America in proud and grateful memory of her soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen—who laid down their lives in all quarters of the earth that other peoples might be freed from oppression.

"Let us here highly resolve that these honored dead shall not have died in vain."

And upon the walls of the missing the engraved words declare that "here are recorded the names of Americans who gave their lives in the service of their country and who sleep in unknown graves.

"Grant unto them, O Lord, eternal rest who sleep in unknown graves."

What about the loved ones of our battle dead?

They are not forgotten on Memorial Day.

Here at home we give special recognition to the Gold Star mothers and fathers.

And upon a wall at the American cemetery south of Florence, Italy, these words are inscribed—"Do not mourn with the parents of the dead who are here with us.

"Rather, comfort them. Let their burden be lightened by the glory of the dead."

At Arlington National Cemetery, in Virginia—across the Potomac River from our Nation's Capital—there rest more than 102,000 honored dead.

They date back to the American Revolution.

But most familiar at Arlington are the tombs of the unknown war dead.

There—under white marble—are the ever-guarded bodies of three unidentified combat veterans.

They are symbolic of all the unkown dead of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict.

Nearly 2 million visitors every year read the inscription upon their tombs.

It says—

"Here rests in honored glory an American soldier known but to God."

There is little more to say in keeping with the Memorial Day theme except to warmly commend the living who never forget.

These include members of our Nation's churches of all creeds who cooperate with veterans organizations in conducting appropriate memorial services for our honored dead during the Memorial Day period.

In conclusion—the following lines from "Hail Columbia"—seem most appropriate in recognition of the honored dead and of the gift they passed to us and of our never-ending obligation to carry on:

"Hail, ye heroes,
Who fought and bled in freedom's cause.
Let independence be our boast,
Ever mindful what it cost.
Ever grateful for the prize
Let its altar reach the skies."

Champion of Liberty Stamp in Honor of Taras Shevchenko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this year freemen everywhere are observing the centennial of Taras Shevchenko, the poet laureate of Ukraine and the apostle of freedom in Eastern Europe and Asia. Congress took steps last year in preparation for this centennial by passing a resolution authorizing the erection of a statue of this champion of liberty in the Nation's Capital. This is now Public Law 86–749. In addition, it authorized the publication of House Document No. 445, titled "Europe's Freedom Fighter," which is a documentary biography of Shevchenko and his works. Copies of this document have been distributed throughout the world.

In further tribute to the works of freedom and personal liberty composed by this historic figure I join with countless other Americans in urging that a champion of liberty stamp be issued in honor of Taras Shevchenko. The issuance of this stamp would be a fitting climax to this centennial, and I know that many Members share this view.

THE PRESIDENT HONORS SHEVCHENKO CENTENNIAL

The President recently expressed his admiration for the Ukrainian poet. In a message sent to Dr. Roman Smal-Stocki, president of the Shevchenko Scientific Society, the President declared:

I am pleased to add my voice to those honoring the great Ukrainian poet, Taras Shevchenko. We honor him for his rich contribution to the culture not only of the Ukraine, which he loved so well and described so eloquently, but of the world. His work is a noble part of our historical heritage.

One cannot, of course, divorce the works of this champion of liberty from the aspirations and struggles of the Ukrainian and other non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. for national freedom and independence. It is thus noteworthy that in the last campaign the President unequivocally stated the following:

My many statements on the freedom of all peoples and nations should indicate that we cannot afford to overlook any. If you would consult the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as far back as 1953 (Aug. 4), you will find that I have supported ideas of freedom relating to Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Armenia, and other captive nations. Then, as now, I have been of the firm conviction that we must do everything possible to keep alive the spirit of independence and freedom of these nations (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 8, 1961, p. 3525).

There are many productive things that could be done to further the national liberation struggles of these nations. Congress acted admirably on the Shevchenko Centennial and its actions had a marked impact on the puppet governments and the captive peoples in the U.S.S.R. The administration could provide the fitting climax to this year's centennial by issuing the Shevchenko Champion of Liberty stamp and, in keeping with the President's conviction, demonstrating to all the captive non-Russian nations both inside and outside the Soviet Union that we honor their freedom goals by honoring the works of Shevchenko. As we all know, Shevchenko fought not only against the injustices of serfdom and Russian czarist autocracy but also for the freedom and independence of the subjugated non-Russian nations from imperialists and colonial Russian domination. The latter continues to this day and is crucial to the security of freedom everywhere.

Since last December over a half dozen publications in the U.S.S.R. have printed lengthy articles condemning us for taking the lead in honoring Shevchenko.

They know that the great poet belongs to freedom, but they would try deceptively to make out of Shevchenko a precursor of the Bolshevik Revolution. It is significant that on his slow train to Vienna, Khrushchev found it necessary to stop at Kiev, Ukraine, for the purpose of laying "a wreath on the nearby grave of Taras Shevchenko, Ukrainian poet."—Associated Press, Moscow, May 29, 1961.

The nature of this struggle is described in the editorial written by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University on "The New Frontier of Understanding the U.S.S.R." in the winter 1960 issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly, which I extend my remarks to include. It is quite evident that this Shevchenko episode is an integral part of the broader picture of the struggle for freedom by Ukraine and the other captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. In the interest of this struggle I urge, therefore, the issuance of a Shevchenko Champion of Liberty stamp.

The editorial follows:

THE NEW FRONTIER OF UNDERSTANDING THE U.S.S.R.

The cold war goes on unabated. Indeed, it is becoming more intensive, ever widening, more sinister and more perilous for us and the nontotalitarian free world. Needless to say, the change in administration will in no way eliminate or alter the stark realities of Moscow's threat to civilization as we have known it. The cold war is by nature incessant and in one form or another is being waged by imperialist Moscow in every quarter of the world. Those prepossessed with the illusions of "peaceful coexistence" or "relaxed cold war tensions"—the conceptual trojan horses of Moscow—must learn sooner or later that our progressive defeat

in the cold war will guarantee the very thing each of us prayerfully hopes to avoid, namely the enforced outbreak of a devastating hot global war. There is really only one alternative to this—our willful determination to win the cold war by destroying Russian colonial imperialism. It can be done if we have the knowledge, the fortitude, the imagination and skill which the cold war challenge demands.

If we forbid reason to prevail in this situation, then successive shock treatments of totalitarian Russian takeovers in Cuba, black Africa, Laos, and elsewhere may produce the awakening needed to develop a cold war strategy for victory. Unless we are completely blind, just a quick glance at a global map should be enough to convince even the most skeptical of the methodic cold war gaming engaged in by Moscow. Foreign aid in dollars and material is not the adequate weapon against this attack; nor is our military power. Regrettably, we have no cold war apparatus to cope with this subversive onslaught by Moscow. In a full swing from East to West, Moscow plots, presses, probes, pries, pollutes.

RUSSIAN ATTACKS ON THE RISE

In Korea, Moscow seeks the ouster of U.N. forces; against Formosa it backs Red Chinese aggression and propaganda; in Vietnam, it supports pressures on South Vietnam; in Laos, it aids the leftist rebels; it has sealed off Tibet and with its Red Chinese partner continues to press on the Indian borders and the Kingdom of Nepal; in the Middle East its agents are harrassing the Shah in Iran and backing the Arabs against Israel; in Africa, it has successfully infiltrated the Algerian independence movement, had a hand in the revolution in Ethiopia to force the withdrawal of U.N. Ethiopian troops in the Congo, makes secret arms shipments to Guinea, and supports Lumumba's followers in the Congo; in Western Europe, its agents are at work to divide France and to spur the abolition of U.S. bases in Britain; in Latin America, Cuba is rapidly becoming an outpost of imperialist Russian totalitarianism in the Western Hemisphere while Chile, Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Venezuela are being increasingly subverted, and in the United Nations a major attack upon the United States is being steadfastly undertaken, along with an onslaught against the structure of the U.N. And this recital of Moscow's direct and clandestine activities is by no means all. The pattern of its aggression should be quite evident even to those who are prone to appease in one form or another.

As we face the future, this pattern will undoubtedly become more prominent and more ominous. Those who foresaw the development of this precarious global situation 10 years ago have their evidence now. They will have more to fortify their contention that a policy of liberation is inescapable for the United States, the only policy that can provide us with a cold war strategy for victory. Flouncing about the world in piecemeal attempts to put out fires is scarcely a winning course of action. The fact that this policy was not applied by the Eisenhower administration is no reflection on its intrinsic merits and its theoretic necessity. The reflection is on those who verbally espoused it and failed to execute it. We are now witnessing the first fruits of this failure.

This failure and its unmistakable results should prove to be enough of a lesson for us. If we profit by the lesson, at this juncture of world developments, we cannot but resolve to work in behalf of a meaningful liberation or emancipation policy which alone can beget a cold war strategy for victory. The basis for both the policy and strategy resides in the contents of the Captive Nations Week resolution. Both in 1959 and 1960 Moscow has given ample evidence of its profound fear of any implementation of this resolution. For the simple fact is that the channels of implementing the resolution are political, psychological, diplomatic, cultural, and propagandistic. These are the necessary ingredients of a promising cold war strategy.

NEW STRATEGY NEEDED

A realistic and successful strategy couldn't possibly be founded unless the New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. is developed, cultivated, and exploited. This frontier is a challenge to our intellects and imaginative insight, and it exists in an area which truly is most vital to our national existence and future. What is this New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R.? It is an undeveloped area of knowledge and perception dealing with the broad and strategic belt of the captive non-Russian nations within the U.S.S.R. The inherent tendency of such knowledge and perception leads inevitably to the demolition of the current spurious image of monolithic Soviet power. In the period ahead we must push toward this New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R.

In the past we interpreted the U.S.S.R. as "Uncle Stalin's Slavery Row." Stalin is gone but the slavery row endures. Under Nekulturny Nikita, the U.S.S.R. remains as a tenuous "Union of Soviet Slave Regions." This empire within an empire, this prison house of subjugated, occupied and captive non-Russian nations must be forcefully exposed, and the profound fakery of Russian propaganda must be made known throughout the free world. This is the core of the cold war challenge, this is the essential stratum of the New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. Unfortunately, its vistas and opportunities still are very dim and even unknown to many of our public leaders.

For example, it is pitiful to find our U.N. representatives virtually asleep and blind to this New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R., while imperialist Moscow brazenly presses the issue of colonialism in the U.N. There is no question but that we could devastate the Russian representatives and their non-Russian puppets with mountains of evidence proving the worst kind of Russian colonialism and imperialism. We should be hammering away at this evidence daily so that its full meaning and importance would be grasped in every quarter of the globe. Instead, we witness a rather feeble and also inaccurate reply given by Ambassador James J. Wadsworth to Khrushchev's speech in the U.N. On this basic issue our Ambassador appears to content himself with this focal statement: "The Soviet Union also demands immediate plenary consideration of the elimination of colonialism in the world. This is a strange demand indeed from a country whose imperialism has embraced more people, more territory, and more oppression than anything else the 20th century has ever seen."[1]

The Soviet Union a country? The non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. which themselves are captive, conduct this 20th century imperialism? Both would seem to be in the ridiculous affirmative judging by this weak statement. As though this were bad, the Under Secretary of the United Nations, Dr. Ralph Bunche, recently observed in an address given in Cleveland that when the U.N. was established there were 800 million people under colonial rule, today there are only 100 million.[2] For Dr. Bunche there is no colonialism in Moscow's imperial domain. The U.S. abstention in the U.N. on the anticolonialist resolution, which passed 89 to 0, is a further illustration of our lack of leadership on this issue. We evidently gave in to Prime Minister Harold Macmillan and ducked the issue. Yet our entire history, our traditional opposition to both imperialism and colonialism, our moral resources supporting patriotic nationalism and independence point only in one direction.

That there has been inadequate clear thinking on this matter is quite evident. As usual, we have not bothered to do our homework, and also, as usual, the Russians wielded the initiative. We have failed to call things by their right names, and we lack either the courage or the understanding to confront the Russian colonialists with the massive truth. A recent address given by the Honorable Douglas Dillon, serving as Under Secretary of State in the Eisenhower administration, is remarkable for the new, though belated, directions of thought adopted by some in the Department of State. In it Mr. Dillon says, among other things, that "after the downfall of the former czarist empire, many of its peoples organized their own governments" and then he points out that "Soviet power ruthlessly proceeded to crush every attempt by non-Russian peoples to free themselves from the new colonial yoke of Soviet communism."[3] Armenians, Georgians, Ukranians, and other victims are listed.

But here, too, inaccuracies and indistinctions abound. These nations established their independent states before the Russian invasion and aggression. Furthermore, Soviet communism, Soviet Communist imperialism, etc., are only befogging mental constructions.

REFORM OF USIA IMPERATIVE

The productive development of the New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. necessitates also a wholesale reform of the U.S. Information Agency as concerns its activities in relation to this basic empire. It is on open secret that in this hard contest of ideas and interpretation our USIA is virtually a sham. It is a pathetic weak voice in the decisive field of methodic propaganda which alone can move minds and bestir human hearts. Not too long ago, for example, the director of the USIA sought to eliminate non-Russian language broadcasts to the U.S.S.R.[4] In effect, he intended that we turn our backs to the New Frontier in the U.S.S.R. If it were not for the farsighted efforts of certain legislators, he might have gotten his ill-advised way.

Considering these and other events, we look forward to the prolific development of this New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. under the new Kennedy administration. Needless to say, we shall press for it with reasonable and hopeful expectation. There are mauy reasons for these bright hopes. One is the fact that in his greatly appreciated greetings to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, on the occasion of its 20th anniversary, President Kennedy rightly criticized the Eisenhower administration for its naive, monolithic characterization of the U.S.S.R., as though it were a nation made up of some strange animals called the Soviets.[5] We have reason to hope that it will be characterized properly and accurately as an empire consisting of numerous captive non-Russian nations.

Second, President Kennedy's answers to the questions posed by the National Captive Nations Committee also furnish another good

---

[1] Statement by Ambassador James J. Wadsworth, the General Assembly, Sept. 23, 1960, p. 2.

[2] The Evening Star, "Bunche Asserts All Colonialism Must Be Ended," Washington, D.C., Dec. 15, 1960.

[3] The Honorable Douglas Dillon, Department of State release, No. 577, Oct. 1, 1960, pp. 3–4.

[4] See Committee on Foreign Affairs, "Review of U.S. Information Agency Operations," Washington, 1959, pp. 102–103.

[5] "President-Elect Kennedy's Message," the Ukranian Bulletin, No. 1–15, 1960, p. 1.

reason.[6] Anyone comparing objectively the answers given by President Kennedy and those offered by his opponent cannot but favor the former. The questions dealt with the captive nations and related subjects.

Moreover, in the years of 1953 through 1955, President Kennedy, then as Senator, introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD many lectures and addresses developed along this New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. The frontier entailed a wide range of topics: Russian genocide of the Ukrainian Catholic and Orthodox churches, the independence movements of the non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and even the liberation policy. For example, on August 3, 1953 there was the subject of "Western Psychological Strategy Toward the U.S.S.R."; on July 24, 1954, "Principled Unity Forges United Action" was introduced into the RECORD.

It should be plainly clear, then, that in contrast to his predecessors President Kennedy possesses a definite knowledge of this New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. He has spoken and written about it with varying degrees of good insight. His reply to the slick congratulatory note sent by Khrushchev, who would relish the revival of Rooseveltian naivete in regard to Moscow's imperialist and colonial plans, was astute and perceptive. Once again we shall be moving. We have been standing on dead center for too long. Only time will tell whether we shall be moving in the right direction.

Undoubtedly, errors will be made, but the chief thing is the overall direction. And we contend, now as before, that for success and ultimate victory in the cold war the overall direction must be toward the New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. President Kennedy has the knowledge, but from this point on the real and determining questions are: Will it be a working knowledge fed by a growing and passionate understanding of the captive and occupied non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.? Will this knowledge be motivated by courage and determination to develop and exploit this New Frontier? Will we finally display the vision and imagination that stature of leadership among nations demands?

MOVES IN PROPER AND RIGHT DIRECTION ANTICIPATED

We have many good reasons to answer these questions in the affirmative. That we shall be moving again, we have no doubt: that we shall be moving in the right direction, we have reason to be soberly hopeful.

As in the past, so now, resources limit the immediate objectives we can pursue to develop this frontier of understanding. But within our limited range of objectives we will certainly apply our resources toward (1) the defeat of Moscow on the colonialism issue; (2) the passage of the Freedom Academy bill; (3) the successful celebration of the Shevchenko centennial provided for in Public Law 86–749; (4) the establishment of a permanent Congressional Committee on the Captive Nations; and (5) an even more resounding Captive Nations Week this coming July. We shall exert every effort for these and other objectives in what is really the same drive for an implemented policy of emancipation and liberation of all the captive nations.

The New Frontier of understanding the U.S.S.R. is a natural for the new Kennedy administration which is founded on the pledge to accept the challenges of our times. The challenge of imperialist Moscow overrides all others. Our minds are open, our hearts are hopeful, and we are determined to abet and cooperate in the development of this most vital of the New Frontiers.

[6] Release, National Captive Nations Committee, Washington, D.C., Nov. 4, 1960.

A Florida Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 6, 1961

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herein an article which was sent to me by one of my dearest friends and associates for many long years. Col. Albert Ernest, originally from Mobile, Ala., but now of Jacksonville, Fla., sent me the Burroughs Clearing House magazine for April 1961, and in this great magazine is a fantastic story about which I would like all America and the rest of the world to know. This article is on page 44 of the magazine Clearing House, for April 1961, and the story was written by one of my best and dearest friends and one of the human dynamos of this earth. I am speaking of the great Edward Ball of Florida. He lives in Jacksonville most of the time, but does have a 100,000-acre farm, as he calls it, in Tallahassee, the capital of that great State.

How I wish we could have the pictures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, because we all know that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD goes to every beat in the United States and to every library in the entire Nation and most of the foreign countries and is read by so many men and women all over this great Nation of ours and all over the world.

The article tells how Florida national banks are carrying out original service concepts of Alfred I. du Pont who went to his reward many long years ago. This great man who did so much for our beloved Southland married Miss Jessie Ball, who, of course, now is one of the trustees for this great estate. I wish there were some way to show the map and the different cities like Pensacola, Fla., Chipley, Brent, Port St. Joe, Perry, Madison, Starke, all the way down to the Keys and then start up on the east coast. They have banks at Coral Gables, Fla., Miami, Opa-Locka, and on up and of course, to Jacksonville, Fla. I am sure they have plans for many more, and this article does not tell half of the story, and it only tells about banking, land and timber. It does not tell about the great tung oil interests which this great American has, and the shipbuilding, and I guess he must be one of the largest farmers in the country. He is a cattle raiser. He has plants all over the country, including a plant in faraway Ireland, and it's not only making paper, but he ships the pulp from St. Joe Paper Co. in St. Joe, Fla., to Ireland, but he has a toy factory there, too. Also, he and a group of his friends have a very beautiful castle at Ballynahinch. There has been a castle there for over 1,000 years, and I happen to belong to this group with Mr. Edward Ball, and have only been there once, but it is one of the most beautiful places on earth, and it is the finest salmon fishing in the world. The shrubbery and the flowers are the most beautiful of any place I have ever visited, and the river is the finest in the land for salmon fishing, although neither Mr. Ball nor I have ever had time to fish there yet, but we are going to do it one of these days. I have sent many of my friends there, and just last week when my wife and I visited Stratford Hall as a guest of Mr. and Mrs. Forney Johnston, I met and visited with Harry DeButts, another great man, who is president of the Southern Railroad, which has done so much for our part of the country.

Well, when you read this article, you will see that Ed Ball and his group have acquired control of the pioneering Florida East Coast Railway which pushed the opening of the east coast southward, from Jacksonville to St. Augustine, Daytona Beach, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale and Miami. He told me that when he acquired it, he did it in the firm belief that "its status will be preserved in any realinement of the railroads in Florida."

Of course, the great Alfred I. du Pont, who thought so much of Edward Ball, died in 1935, and his wife (Mr. Ball's sister), Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont, and Elmer Dent, whom I know, an attorney in Greenville, Del., and the Florida National Bank and our own Ed Ball are trustees of Mr. du Pont's great estate.

While this story in this magazine tells a good many of the facts, and I won't attempt, Mr. Speaker, to try to tell all of them at this time, because I have some other information, and I want to give it to the people of this country just a little at a time, I have known this man so well. He is one of the outstanding men in so many ways. He's a good man, a hard-working man, and has one of the most brilliant brains of any human I've ever known in all of my long life. He's loyal and when he tells you something, it's just like a million dollar bond, and he never forgets. But the part I think is so great is that this was a young man down in Virginia, and a very beautiful young woman who was his sister, was there, too. I have been down to their home and it's almost in sight of the great Mary Ball's home, who was George Washington's mother. The Richard Lee home is between the Mary Ball home and the father and mother of Mrs. du Pont and Ed Ball. It's a great and good country, and it's an inspiration for anybody to go down into the country there just like when we went down a Sunday or two ago to see a great group of men and women at work and see what they have done at Stratford Hall, the birthplace of Robert E. Lee. There were so many wonderful people there, and the first one that I talked to was the chairman of this great committee, an Alabama woman, and she told the great help which a little Virginia girl had given them, and she was speaking of none other than Mrs. Alfred I. du Pont or Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont. Well, there's many another place where she has helped.

I happened to be sitting with my beloved friend, Ed Ball, when somebody called up and was talking to him and wanted a donation of $100,000. Well, Ed

thought that was a pretty good amount, but he agreed to donate it and give it to the great cause they were talking about provided they would never let anybody know that he had given it. Well, he has given that way many, many times in many parts of this country, and his sister—nobody will ever know the good that Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont has done on this earth.

These three trustees—what a great group they are, and it reminds me of a verse in the Bible in the Book of St. Matthew, the 14th verse of the 25th chapter. Beginning at the 14th verse, it goes on like this:

14. For the kingdom of heaven is as a man traveling into a far country, who called his own servants, and delivered unto them his goods.

15. And unto one he gave five talents, to another two, and to another one; to every man according to his several ability; and straightway took his journey.

16. Then he that had received the five talents went and traded with the same, and made them other five talents.

17. And likewise he that had received two, he also gained other two.

18. But he that had received one went and digged in the earth, and hid his lord's money.

19. After a long time the lord of those servants cometh, and reckoneth with them.

20. And so he that had received five talents came and brought other five talents, saying, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me five talents: behold, I have gained beside them five talents more.

21. His lord said unto him, Well done, thou good and faithful servant: thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

22. He also that had received two talents came and said, Lord, thou deliveredst unto me two talents: behold, I have gained two other talents beside them.

23. His lord said unto him, Well done, good and faithful servant; thou has been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy lord.

24. Then he which had received the one talent came and said, Lord, I knew thee that thou art a hard man, reaping where thou hast not sown, and gathering where thou hast not strewed:

25. And I was afraid, and went and hid thy talent in the earth: lo, there thou hast that is thine.

26. His lord answered and said unto him, Thou wicked and slothful servant, thou knewest that I reap where I sowed not, and gather where I have not strewed:

27. Thou oughtest therefore to have put my money to the exchangers, and then at my coming I should have received mine own with usury.

28. Take therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him which hath ten talents.

29. For unto every one that hath shall be given, and he shall have abundance; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath.

30. And cast ye the unprofitable servant into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

31. When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory.

Well, I know what the Lord will say to old Ed Ball, his sister and Elmer Dent. He will say, "Well done."

I will have some more information on the many things that Ed Ball and his group have done, are doing, and will continue to do, and they are like a great light which I hope can keep burning for years to come, because they are doing so many things that have and will mean so much to all mankind, and I know God has blessed him for the great work that he, his sister, and all of his associates are doing. It is not only like a fairy story, it is like a miracle, and I know God has His hands on Ed Ball's shoulder. I am hoping that we will have Ed Ball and his group with us for many, many long years to come because there is an old poem somewhere which says, "God, give us men." Well, if we ever needed them, it is right now, and you and I know, Mr. Speaker, that God does not take us away from this earth until we have finished the job He has put us here to do, and there is a lot for Ed Ball to do. There is a lot for Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont to do, and they will do it, too. It is a joy and a pleasure to try and help them in some small way.

Anyway, I wanted the whole world to know about this article, and these fabulous, wonderful people from our old mother State of Virginia, who went way down in Florida.

I know that when Mrs. du Pont and Ed Ball and their associates who have worked and pulled and prayed and helped them along the way come to the Pearly Gates, they will hear the glad tidings of "Well done, good and faithful servant; thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things: enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." So there is a great day coming and a great reward coming to these fabulous people who have worked so hard for all mankind and especially in developing our beloved Southland. Then they will certainly and truly get their reward and they will have joy and gladness and happiness forevermore:

GROUP BANKING: A FLORIDA SUCCESS STORY

(By Edward Ball, coordinator, Florida National Group of Banks, and trustee, estate of Alfred I. du Pont, Jacksonville, Fla.)

Both the Florida National Group of Banks and the estate of Alfred I. du Pont have grown and prospered as they have contributed to the development of their communities and to the State.

This primary objective of service was established by Alfred I. du Pont in 1927 to guide our activities. He had recently moved his residence to Jacksonville. He had decided to make his permanent home here, to invest in Florida and to identify himself with the growth of the State. As accurately as his policy statement could subsequently be recalled by the two of us to whom he made it, he then said:

"We are now in Florida to live and work. We expect to spend the balance of our days here. We have all the money necessary for any reasonable effort to help Florida grow and prosper.

"Our business undertakings should be sound, but our primary object should not be the making of money. Through helpful works, let us build up good in this State and make it a better place in which to live. In my last years I would much rather have the people of Florida say that I helped them and their State than to double the money I now have."

For our first project, Mr. du Pont had me buy stock in Jacksonville's three banks, the Barnett National, the Atlantic National and the Florida National, all of which stock, incidentally, the estate still owns. He then suggested that I make a survey to determine on which one we should concentrate to obtain control. We decided on Florida National, the first bank in what subsequently became the group.

In the meantime, the historic Florida real estate boom had come to an end. Half a hundred Florida banks had failed and public confidence was badly shaken. Immediately upon obtaining control of the Florida National Bank of Jacksonville, Mr. du Pont made available $15 million to secure its deposits. This not only prevented its closing but also averted the closing of numerous banks located throughout the State.

Then again, on an occasion during the depression that started in 1929, Mr. du Pont cabled authority from Europe to make a seven-figure deposit in the bank and news of this turned the tide. Reassured customers began redepositing more money than frightened customers withdrew. At a further incident in the depression, another one of our banks gained local acclaim when a line formed outside by serving coffee and sandwiches to depositors waiting to withdraw their accounts.

In the meantime, in the early 1930's, a second bank, the Florida National Bank at Lakeland, was added to the group by the acquisition of a bank in that city. Since then, the group has continued to expand, in part by the acquisition of existing banks but even more by the establishment of new ones.

In the early days, Mr. du Pont also turned his attention to the business side of the development of the State's resources. This represented not only a show of confidence but even more a personal interest on his part in the great pine forests of northwest Florida and their utilization in producing Kraft paperboard. As Mr. du Pont's administrative assistant, I was assigned the task of selecting and purchasing the timber land. In an old car, I covered some 12 counties, through many sections where there were only trails instead of roads, and bought close to a million acres.

Out of this came the St. Joe Paper Co., a substantial containerboard manufacturer that is 75 percent owned by the Du Pont estate, located at Port St. Joe on Florida's northwestern gulf coast. It is a thoroughly modern plant. The overall operation employs approximately 1,000 people, including those that work in the plant, that oversee the 800 miles of firebreaks and that carry on our up-to-date reforestation program. In 1 year alone, this latter group planted more than 15 million seedlings.

The St. Joe Paper Co. owns the St. Joseph Telephone & Telegraph Co. and the Apalachicola Northern Railroad Co., a small line running from Port St. Joe to Chattahoochee, used for transporting the paper company's products. The development of the area also brought in plants of half a dozen other nationally known firms. Some are there to process pulp mill byproducts, others to manufacture pulp and paper mill supplies for sale throughout the South.

We also cooperated in getting a pipeline built from Port St. Joe, with three major oil companies using this to serve Atlanta, Chattanooga and intermediate markets with petroleum products that reach this tidewater terminus by oceangoing tankers. A consequence of this well-balanced solid development is that Port St. Joe is a prosperous community.

Over a period of years, we have acquired control of the pioneering Florida East Coast Railway that pushed the opening of the east

coast southward from Jacksonville and St. Augustine to Daytona Beach, Palm Beach, Fort Lauderdale, and Miami. We acquired it in the firm belief that its status will be preserved in any realinement of the railroads in Florida.

Mr. du Pont died in 1935. We have had a great deal of favorable comment on the fact that the trustees of his estate, instead of considering themselves as conservators, as well they might, have continued the broad, development program that he started. The present trustees of the estate are: Mrs. Jessie Ball du Pont; Elmer Dent, an attorney in Greenville, Del.; the Florida National Bank of Jacksonville; and the writer of this article.

That considerable progress has been made can be seen, for example, in the number of banks in the Florida National Group. At the time Mr. du Pont died there were 8, whereas today there are 29.

Perhaps, as we get into the banking picture, we should explain that each bank in the group is a separate entity, with its own officers and board of directors. There is also an extent of local ownership of the capital stock in each bank, a fact that we welcome. The holdings of stock, as between the du Pont estate and local owners, varies with each bank. All of the banks in the group are strongly capitalized. Our capital funds for the entire group stood at $61,140,000 December 31. This gives us a ratio of better than $1 of capital to each $10 of deposits.

Loans to individuals and corporations by the group range from small consumer and personal loans to seven-figure credits extended to major corporations through participations by all or most of the banks in the groups. These credits of various sizes and kinds finance every conceivable activity of the solid business life of our State, from household appliances to commercial transport airplanes and electronic devices for space exploration. Our lending facilities reach out to stimulate agriculture all the way from cattle loans in northern and other counties to citrus in the central region to truck farming in the mucklands of south Florida.

Sometimes I say we finance everything from the purchase of Government bonds to vacuum cleaners. We have extended millions of dollars in credit for home construction loans, we do farm equipment financing, make 36-month farm mortgage loans, livestock and crop loans, and citrus fruit loans against warehouse receipts; we have our own home improvement loan plan, and we have helped many churches finance building projects through the "church bond" program, which leans rather heavily on character, with good results. At the present time, we have just over 70,000 loans on our books and the size of the average loan is under $3,000.

We do hesitate to extend credit where we feel we may be called upon to make a foreclosure. It is my guess that we have made less than a dozen of them.

I took part in one example a good many years ago that I have always remembered. We had loaned one big citrus grower $800,000 on his canning plant, groves, and warehouse receipts to undertake expansion. Then the price of canned citrus took a big drop.

One morning he came to the bank and said he had come to file his schedule in bankruptcy, that with the drop in prices he was being pressed hard for payment of his bills. The bank officer persuaded the grower to hold off on filing and called me. He agreed to talk to me.

When I saw him, I told him it seemed to me that he was too old to start over, and asked him how much he owed besides the $800,000 he owed us. He said it was about $200,000. The next morning we asked him how it would be if we loaned him the additional $200,000, and mailed out the checks to his creditors ourselves. We finally agreed on this, though it should be remembered that we already had a loan on all his property and could have taken it over. But we wanted to keep him in business.

Well, within 30 days, the Federal Government decided it would be a fine thing to buy up canned citrus and ship it to some other countries around the world. Prices went up and our customer made enough to pay off all his debt and to continue for years as a walking advertisement for our group of banks.

For practically as long as we have been in business, we have undertaken to train our officers and employees in extending friendly, human service to our customers, and we have never relaxed our efforts. We have also encouraged our people to study banking and to improve themselves through such means as weekly seminar meetings and banking study courses, with the thought that there is always a need for new people coming up and that in our organization there is always opportunity for those who are qualified.

Some 20 years ago, we established what we believe to be an outstanding pension program for our people. It is known as a noncontributory plan, under which the entire cost is borne by the banks. Benefits are based on salary and length of service.

Under this program, members of the staff at retirement age after 10 years of service become entitled to a pension of 25 percent of average salary of the last 5 years. With more years of service, pension rights continue to increase but at a slower rate. After 35 years, the maximum, retirees would receive a pension at retirement age of 50 percent of average salary for the last 5 years.

In 1959, arrangements were made for establishing the Florida National Bank retirement program for correspondent banks, giving correspondents an opportunity to set up flexible plans at considerably less cost than if such plans were independently drafted and installed. In addition, through representatives in key areas served by other banks in the group, the retirement program may be offered to qualified commercial customers of the correspondent banks. As a result of this and previous work in this field, we are administering some of the largest pension trusts in the State.

In recent years, we have been giving special attention to modernizing our banking quarters, and in many cases have erected completely new buildings. Even though it was built some years back, the 17-story Alfred I. du Pont Building in Miami, housing the Florida National Bank & Trust Co. there, is a good example. It is still one of Miami's showplaces. The building was constructed to withstand hurricane winds of 250 miles an hour.

Other new buildings are now being occupied by the banks at Gainesville, Fernandina Beach, and Fort Pierce. Still under construction are new buildings at Orlando and Jacksonville.

The new Jacksonville building is already well underway, with completion expected by October of this year. It is being erected on a choice location in the downtown area and will make its contribution to the city's growing importance as a financial and insurance center. Besides giving us a new home for the bank itself, the building will serve as the headquarters for the estate of Alfred I. du Pont, the St. Joe Paper Co., the bank group coordinating staff, which handles public relations, advertising and auditing, and will also provide space for some of our other activities. With its adjoining drive-in tellers and parking area, the new bank operation will cover an entire city block.

The street floor of the bank will be occupied by retail stores and business establishments. The main banking room will be on the second floor, served by five sets of elevators, stairs, and four escalators. A 22-foot arcade will extend the entire length of the building, providing access to the retail stores, to the escalators and the elevators leading to bank and office floors.

Vaults in the bank will rank with the largest in the country. The one for safe deposit and trust services will be 24 by 90 feet and located in the basement, the other, for bank money and operations will be 21 by 36 feet on the banking floor. Both will have floors, walls and ceilings of 18-inch reinforced concrete.

Projecting from the bank buildings into the general parking area will be 12 covered, drive-in teller stations. Inside the bank, adjoining the parking area, will be three walk-up teller windows. And, to provide further fast service for car customers, there will be two curbside auto tellers located on each of two streets paralleling the bank building.

Service at these various stations will be available throughout the day to 4:30 p.m., Mondays through Thursdays, though the main bank closes at 2 p.m. It has been found that this period between 2 and 4:30 is generally the busiest time. On Fridays, with this same object of meeting the needs of customers, we provide continuous service, both in the bank and at the special teller stations, to a 6 o'clock closing.

The growth of the Florida National Group of Banks, as an important part of the Du Pont estate, is well illustrated by the chart accompanying this article. From the single bank at Jacksonville, with deposits of $20,404,930 at the close of 1929, it has become 29 banks, with closing deposit figures for 1960 of $598,330,909. In the same period our loans have gone from $6,425,045 to $205,361,542. And, I believe I can say, both for the Du Pont estate and the other individual investors in our banks in the various Florida cities in which we operate, that investment in the banks has proved profitable.

Besides the Du Pont interests already covered, I should probably mention the Silver Glen Springs Co., which has about 550 acres of unimproved property in Lake and Marion Counties; Jacksonville Properties, Inc., with a general insurance and real estate business in Jacksonville and unimproved lots in Jacksonville, Gainesville, and Eau Gallie; and Florida National Realty Co., which owns land and lots in Arlington, Belle Glade, Perry, Coral Gables, Gainesville, Madison, and Vero Beach.

Throughout her life, Mrs. du Pont has taken an active interest in the rehabilitation of crippled children. Upon her death, well over 90 percent of the income of the Du Pont estate will go to Nemours Foundation which operates a hospital for that purpose, the Alfred I. du Pont Institute, Wilmington, Del., which was opened in 1940. Since that date, the foundation has provided more than half a million patient-days' care and rehabilitation for children.

In 1948, Alfred I. du Pont Institute began a program of direct financial aid to crippled children in Florida, with children selected by the orthopedic surgical staff of the Florida State Crippled Children's Commission. This has supplied between 200,000 and 300,000 additional patient-days' care in Florida hospitals.

That was the way Alfred du Pont wanted it.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Job 22: 21: *Acquaint now thyself with Him, and be at peace; thereby good shall come unto thee.*

O Thou who art seeking to set our life in a new perspective and reveal its deeper meaning, inspire us with those attributes and principles of character which will enable us to walk together in the way of blessedness without fear or friction.

May we follow in the noble tradition of those who see clearly that love, sympathy, good will, and understanding are the roads to that unity and fellowship among the nations which we are so eagerly and earnestly longing and laboring for.

Grant that our wayward wills may be linked to Thy divine will in a single-hearted devotion and may we possess that acquaintance with Thee which is peace and yield ourselves to Thy mind which is infinitely wiser than our own.

Encourage us to seek Thy guidance and strength, believing that never has man sincerely sought Thy help in the doing of good, without finding and receiving it.

Hear us in the name of the Master who went about doing good. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs may be permitted to sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S REPORT ON HIS EUROPEAN TRIP

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon at the bipartisan meeting with the House and Senate leadership and later in a TV broadcast President Kennedy made a report on his recent trip to Paris, to Vienna, and to London.

In both instances he sought to give us an accurate accounting of what transpired, together with his impression of the responsible heads of state with whom he met, and his evaluation of the troublesome spots in the world and the international situation generally.

Our President has assured us that there were no secret agreements, commitments, or understandings of any kind nor was any intended. The trip served the purpose of reemphasizing to the world that this country stands firmly committed to the right of all men to be free and secure in that right. Let there be no misunderstanding in that respect, and let there be no misunderstanding that as a people we are united in carrying out that commitment and, however discouraging, we intend to continue our efforts for the maintenance of the peace of the world.

It is quite evident from President Kennedy's report that this will be a long, hard struggle and that it will necessitate patience and sacrifices. Our enormous defense demands upon our economy will continue in the foreseeable future and may become even larger.

First things first. To meet our security requirements we must forgo luxuries. Most respectfully, I urge the President and the Congress to forgo the political luxury that may be enjoyed by these various new spending programs that have been recommended along with recommended expansion of costly programs already in existence.

While we seek to make ourselves strong internationally, we must determine to be strong nationally. We can destroy ourselves with debts, taxes, and inflation just as surely as we can be destroyed by communism if we let down our military guard in cooperation with our allies in defense of freedom.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 72]

Adair	Gray	O'Konski
Bailey	Green, Oreg.	O'Neill
Barry	Hagan, Ga.	Philbin
Bates	Halpern	Pilcher
Beermann	Harris	Powell
Betts	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Blitch	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Boggs	Holifield	Rivers, S.C.
Boykin	Hosmer	Roberts
Cellar	Kearns	Santangelo
Coad	Kilburn	Shelley
Daniels	Kilday	Sikes
Davis, Tenn.	King, Utah	Spence
Dominick	Kirwan	Thompson, N.J.
Fallon	Knox	Tupper
Fino	Lankford	Utt
Flood	Macdonald	Vinson
Flynt	Mason	Walter
Fogarty	Miller, George P.	Westland
Gavin	Miller, N.Y.	Williams
Granahan	O'Brien, N.Y.	Willis
Grant		

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 371 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1962

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2½ hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York, Mr. OSTERTAG, and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7445, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, we come to you, our colleagues, this morning with this independent agencies bill that covers some 23 agencies. I think I can say with accuracy that your subcommittee has brought to you a bill that is about unanimous with all of us. It covers a good many details, as you know. You are certainly entitled to every bit of information that you need and want, and it will be our sincere effort to give you all the information that we have. So I suggest to the membership that all the members of the subcommittee are here, and we will severally or jointly try to give you all the information we have, because nothing should be withheld and you are entitled to know at least all we know, and we will gladly give it to you.

In the first place, there are about 23 agencies covered in this bill. The budget estimate in round figures is $8.6 billion. The committee reduced the amount about $201 million. If there is anything wrong with the bill, I might say it is a little bit on the generous side, but I think there is much to be said on that point, too.

In the first place, of that $8.6 billion $4.9 billion is for the Veterans' Administration. As far as cuts are concerned, in dollars and cents there is virtually no cut in here. In the medical program of $1,011 million not one penny was reduced. I repeat, of the entire medical program costing in excess of $1 billion, not one penny was reduced. On the contrary, we went $5 million over the budget in that regard with respect to medical research.

Of course, there are some other sizable agencies in here, such as the Fed-

eral Aviation Agency and the Space Agency. The General Services Administration is a big operation. The housing program is a big operation. But by and large, most of the increase goes to about three agencies in this bill.

Much has been said about the independent agencies. We have all heard the criticism that they have accumulated a tremendous backlog in their workload. But, I want to say a kind word about these independent regulatory agencies, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Power Commission and so on. We think they are doing a pretty good job. But, again, the newspapers have leveled criticism at them and it is generally said the reason the backlog is so great is that they do not have the manpower. What does that add up to? It adds up to one thing. It is inferentially suggesting that the Congress has not given them enough money to hire the necessary manpower. We do not agree with them at all. But, I want to point out to you every one of those agencies has asked for a sizable increase in manpower and the committee has been, in our judgment, very lenient with them. I believe, if you will read the report, you will come to that same conclusion also.

But let us go back to that backlog that they complain about. Here is the truth of the matter of the backlog. These independent regulatory agencies cannot control at least two-thirds of their backlog. If you were to give them an army of men, they would have no control over at least two-thirds of it. Well, then, who does control it, if the agencies themselves do not? The controlling factor is the parties litigants. They control it. They appeal decisions. They file motions. Of course, that is perfectly legal. They have the legal right to do that. But, that is what delays matters and that is what accumulates the big backlog. Those agencies will tell you if a case is put on their desk, they will get rid of it in no time. But, it is not put on their desk for decision—motions are filed to continue; appeals are filed—and again, I repeat, it is perfectly legal—the law gives them that right. That is what creates the backlog, and they have no control over at least 60 to 65 percent of it. But most of them, we think, are doing a good job. Of course, they are human like everybody else and make some mistakes. But by and large, they are doing all right.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something about the space agency. They came in for about $1,235 million. May I point out very definitely in the beginning that the authorization had not been completed in its entirety. It had already passed the House but had not cleared the other body. But, we acted and there is also a revised estimate for $549 million additional which has just been submitted and will be considered soon. But I want to say this. They have these big laboratories scattered all over the country. Three of them were inherited, of course, from the old predecessor agency, the National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics, but in my humble judgment, they are staffed with very fine, capable gentlemen. Take Mr. Webb who is head of the organization. Personally, I have known him for a long time and most of you have known him for a long time. He has been before your committees a number of times. At one time he was Director of the Bureau of the Budget. He was one of the Under Secretaries of the Department of State, and in recent years he has been in business and has been in the scientific business. He is not a scientist, but he is on favorable terms with the scientists. He has been associated with them in scientific projects and, in my humble judgment, he is going to make a great administrator. Look at Dr. Dryden—one of the finest scientists I know of and one of the best scientist administrators I have ever seen.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that some of the topflight staffmen that Dr. Dryday and Mr. Webb have surrounded themselves with, certainly, gentlemen like Dr. von Braun and Dr. Silverstein, and so forth and so on, are the finest and ablest scientists. They are level headed. I do not know what the ultimate value of the program will be, and if I were to tell you, I know you would think less of me because I do not think any living man knows. But, it certainly has possibilities for good.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], a member of the legislative committee.

Mr. FULTON. I want to compliment the gentleman on his statement. I believe he has accurately stated the present situation as to the organization of NASA, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I was formerly a member of the House original Select Committee on Space.

I am a member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. We of the committee across party lines are desirous of seeing these U.S. science, research, and space programs go ahead, not only where they are for the security of the country but also for the very good purposes of keeping America first in science and research. The entire research and development item for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided for in this bill is $27,539,000 less than the budget request. I have not been able to go into the details of the cut by the committee since they are not provided by the committee, but I take it from the testimony the gentleman is sure the cut will not delay the programs.

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to have the gentleman's observations. He is an able and distinguished member, not only of this House but also of the Space Committee. He has worked long and hard in this field. I doubt if there are many people in the country who know more about the program than he. I assure the gentleman we have not the slightest intention of throwing it down in any way. We just thought we could save a few dollars, but we are not going to measure savings against their success.

Mr. FULTON. Then I join in the recommendation of the gentleman from Texas at this time. The gentleman from Texas has stated to me that our Science and Astronautics Committee can come back later if we find there is need for more money to carry out the NASA programs outlined.

Mr. THOMAS. I welcome the gentleman's views and appreciate the support of his committee. I do not think there is going to be too much conflict.

Mr. FULTON. One more point on the construction of facilities: There is $20 million in this bill for construction of emergency facilities, so it is my feeling that the cut that has been made of $2,825,000 on construction and facilities will not hold the agency back in necessary programs and I would not oppose that at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that there is in this bill an increase in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration program of $236 million?

Mr. THOMAS. Over last year.

Mr. GROSS. Over last year; and do I understand further that there is somewhere pending a bill or plan to provide this agency with another $594 million?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my friend from Iowa that there will be a deficiency bill in the next 2 or 3 weeks. The supplemental estimate is $549 million more.

Mr. GROSS. So you would not say that this agency was on the verge of poverty.

Mr. THOMAS. They are not poverty stricken as far as that is concerned.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. I believe the Appropriations Subcommittee for Independent Offices has continued to be fair in its approach to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and to the National Science Foundation in the start of an entirely new program in which we have had no previous experience; and I want to put that on the record here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 14 minutes.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to my colleagues and associates on the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee. I want to pay particular tribute to our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas, for his able guidance and leadership, his fairness and devotion to duty, his fund of knowledge and the fine job he has done in developing the hearings in connection with the many independent agencies of our Federal Government.

Along with our chairman, we have the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr.

EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND]. On our side, along with me, I serve with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES]. I think it can be said in fairness that both the majority and minority members of this committee have worked together as a team and in close harmony. There has been no political considerations involved. We have tried to do the best possible job in the consideration of this far-reaching appropriation and the tremendous and varied services applicable throughout the Government as covered by this bill.

First of all, let me point out to you that it took some 2,570 pages of testimony to cover these hearings. We had many weeks of hearings on these budget justifications. You might be interested to know that in this bill some 23 important agencies receive their funds for support of their agencies for the next fiscal year.

As our distinguished chairman has pointed out, this bill totals in round figures $8,424 million, while the budget requests totaled approximately $8,625 million. In other words, the committee has found it possible to make a reduction of approximately $201 million. I grant you that $201 million is not a large sum in comparison to the overall figure involved in this bill, but it is worthy of note that of this entire bill covering 23 agencies and $8,424 million, 3 of these agencies absorb seven-eighths of the total.

Of course, we are all aware of the importance and far-reaching effect of the services and the responsibilities that apply in the field of veterans affairs. In other words, the Veterans' Administration and all of its related operations and services including that of veterans benefits and care, totals nearly $5 billion of the $8,424 million in this bill.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration previously referred to has a budget estimate of approximately $1,235 million. That, coupled with the Federal Aviation Agency which requires nearly $725 million, would perhaps amount to better than $7 billion of the total of $8.5 billion in this bill.

The space agency which has been mentioned previously presented its budget request on the basis of the previous administration's estimated requirements and, as has been mentioned, it is very likely that the administration will come in with a supplemental budget request totaling about $549 million in addition to $1,200 billion as provided in this bill. This will be justified in a deficiency bill and I believe this request will be associated with an accelerated space program as described by the President in his recent message to Congress.

It is fair to note that not only in this bill but in many bills, in fact, in practically all appropriation bills coming before the Congress, these justifications are presented by a new administration but they are based on budgets prepared by the previous administration. It is only fair to say that many of the new commissioners, administrators, and new heads of these agencies, have not had an opportunity to become familiar with the many important matters that constitute the funding for their agencies.

For example, we have in this bill funds for civil defense mobilization. In this same message of the President, he presented an accelerated program in the field of defense, in the field of space exploration, and specific recommendations which relates to the management of the system and the controls of our civil defense program and functions. If the President's recommendations are carried out and accepted by the Congress, we can assume that the funds that are essential for this program will of necessity require transfer authority to another agency, namely, the Defense Department. Just how this will fall into place I am not prepared to say, but certainly all the committee could do at this time was to appropriate the funds necessary to carry out the program and services under the existing law and machinery.

I might point out to you that in the field of civil defense we are appropriating approximately $79 million for fiscal year 1962. Some of that money has to do with disaster relief and emergencies. It also provides moneys not only for this Federal agency, but it provides for the Federal contributions to the localities for such items, equipment and for training, and under the new program, for personnel as provided by law. Such agencies as the Interstate Commerce Commission are involved in this bill. National Capital Housing Authority. I should like to take just a moment to give you a bit of a picture of the veterans program as it was presented to your committee.

Recognizing as we must the far-reaching and tremendous operations of our Veterans' Administration covered by this budget of $4,924 million. Actually a reduction of $45 million has been made. But, I think it is worthy to note that we did not cut the veterans program and we do not propose to cut the veterans program, and the $45 million difference is primarily brought about by virtue of the needs for pensions and compensation. Whatever is required to meet this obligation must be provided. The anticipated unobligated balance of $215 million in this item will be carried forward into this fiscal year. In other words, the Veterans' Administration will have a balance of $215 million which was not anticipated in the first place. So, it is reasonable to assume that not only will the VA have a balance going into this year but it is expected they will have a balance at the end of the next fiscal year. The general operating expenses of the Veterans' Administration takes about $161 million, and that is a slight decrease due to the decline in the workload of the vocational rehabilitation and education program. In the field of compensation and pensions, I am wondering if the Members of the House realize that out of this total sum of nearly $5 billion for the VA $3.5 billion of it goes to veterans of America in the form of compensation and pensions. As I mentioned before, a $215 million carryover exists. We have today in the United States of America approximately 22,425,000 veterans. So, for pensions and compensation that $3.5 billion is paid to approximately 3,077,000 veterans.

Medical care. With our tremendous hospital system I think it is fair to say that the veterans hospitals of America constitute the largest and best hospital system in the world. We are appropriating here in this bill $1,012 million for medical care for our veterans. There is no cut. Actually, we have in operation today 139,372 beds in our veterans hospitals, and that is an increase of nearly 1,000 beds in our veterans hospitals throughout the country. There is an increase of $30 million due to this patient load, and the total cost of our inpatient care is $846 million. The outpatient care, which is the care given to veterans in their homes or in the doctor's office or in the clinics throughout the country amounts to the difference between the $1,012 billion figure and the $846 million. But, it is important, too, to recognize that the committee has been not only concerned but liberal in the granting of funds for our veterans. For example, the budget request called for $22 million for medical research. Do you know that we have included in this bill $27 million for medical research? And, I want to pay tribute to the job that has been done in the field of medical research throughout our veterans facilities, institutions, and hospitals. The estimate is that they do need the $27 million and the committee not only granted the requested amount, but increased the amount by $5 million for next year.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I want to state that I agree entirely with the gentleman's appreciation for the VA research program. Our subcommittee is very proud of the progress that has been made with our help in this program. I think in this appropriation of $27 million for additional facilities, as is shown on page 527 of the hearings, there is provision not only for a specific program of projects but an allocation as well for construction of laboratories. Such laboratories are an essential part of a good research program, and they are needed for the VA medical program.

For those members who are interested in knowing about the accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration, there is an itemized statement of the great achievements that have been performed under this program. These appear in the hearings starting on page 465 in response to the question of the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from New York is to be commended for his warm support of this program.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. My distinguished friend and colleague remarked a few

minutes ago, I believe, that there was not a reduction in the funds provided for veterans hospital construction. If I read the record right, it indicates that there was a reduction of $5 million from the budget estimate. I have a communication this morning, as most of the Members perhaps have, addressing itself to the restoration of this so-called $5 million cut. Would it be the gentleman's position that there are holdover funds or other moneys available so that there will not be a reduction in the money available for construction?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I was about to refer to the hospital construction program, which is a part of this overall veterans picture, and to try to give you a concise and in-a-nutshell picture. We must bear in mind that we are in the second year of a 12-year construction, modernization, and replacement program for our veterans facilities. The total cost of this program is approximately $900 million, in broad figures. Last year we appropriated the requested sum. This year there was a budget request of $75 million. The committee has made available approximately $70 million of that $75 million to carry on this construction and modernization program. I think I can say without fear of contradiction that the last thing in the world this committee would attempt to do would be to retard, or hinder this program in any way, by not making available all the funds necessary to carry it out.

The point is that within this program approximately $850,000 was included for fallout shelters. The committee has eliminated the requested amount for fallout shelters not only in the veterans hospital program but in all public buildings programs throughout this bill.

Second, it must be pointed out that the balance of the $5 million that has been reduced in connection with the overall construction is brought about by virtue of the fact that $49 million is carried over from the current fiscal year. It is anticipated that at the end of this 1962 fiscal year they will still have approximately $42 million in unexpended funds for this purpose. So in the face of the balance or the carryover into this year and the anticipated balance at the end of this next year you cannot regard this amount of $5 million as a cut or a reduction. If it is needed and can be used, I am sure every one of us would support it.

Mr. ROBISON. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. In explanation, may I say that I know he shares my own interest in the veterans activities. I am sure he would not support anything in the committee action here which would in any way delay the proper reconstruction or replacement of facilities that are badly needed.

Mr. OSTERTAG. This appropriation includes funds for technical services for hospital replacement at Atlanta, Ga., and Los Angeles, Calif. It includes construction funds for 16 modernizations, technical services for 4 others, and many minor improvements at other locations. So I repeat that I for one, and I feel that every member of the committee would not be a party to any move which would destroy, hamper, or impede this modernization or construction program. We want them to have all that is required.

The National Science Foundation is another agency, included in this bill. It has grown in importance and expanded in its application and effect. Actually, it has an increase of $74 million. We have several other agencies, but time will not permit me to go into a discussion of them despite the fact that their operations are important insofar as the overall operation of the Government is concerned. I refer to such agencies as the Federal Aviation Agency, the Federal Power Commission, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and last but not least the important General Services Administration, which is the housekeeping agency of our National Government and one which has a tremendous responsibility of far-reaching importance insofar as the general operations are concerned including supervision of our public buildings.

Perhaps, as time goes on, we will have an opportunity to discuss the details of these services and programs, but you can readily see that this bill embraces many agencies, many functions, and many services. We, as a committee, have tried to do a good job in the best interests not only of the services of the Government but in the interest of good government and efficiency.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, there have been some remarks in this debate on the independent offices appropriations bill about the shocking backlogs which exist in some of the regulatory agencies. Attempts have been made to justify or explain away these grievous delays by attributing them to the filing of motions or appeals by litigants. I cannot accept such a lame excuse.

In many States of our Nation, including my own State of New Jersey, rules of courts have been so amended as to speed the administration of justice. This has been done by enforcing time limits for making and perfecting motions and appeals so that undue delay could be eliminated.

It is just as true in regulatory agencies as in courts that justice delayed is justice denied. The people of America have the right to demand that the protection given to them be not dissipated by stalling tactics employed by firms and persons called to account before independent regulatory agencies. These agencies must see to it that their rules insure prompt disposition of pending matters so that the public will be protected.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it has been a pleasure to serve on this subcommittee. The members on both sides are able, genial, considerate and friendly, and their keen interest in the proceedings and their intelligent questions made the long hearings a very happy experience. For this I am most grateful to them.

To try to discuss this bill within the time allotted for the debate is obviously impossible. The bill contains appropriations for 23 agencies with a budget of approximately $8½ billion. The activities of each of any one of the agencies involved and their monetary needs could very well take weeks and in some instances months, the programs are so intricate and complicated. As a matter of fact, we did spend months in our hearings and I invite your attention to them. I think we did a pretty good job and I commend passage of the bill to the House.

I want only to comment on several points today. One relates to the National Science Foundation, an agency which is doing an outstanding job in advancing the cause of science in our country. Most of its emphasis is in the field of physical sciences and I suppose this is as it should be in a time when the pressure for scientific advancement to protect our national interests and promote national defense is so essential. And yet, I cannot escape the belief that the vast amount appropriated for this agency—and for that matter, for all the agencies of our Government—is disproportionately small for the social sciences. It has been said that we have never lost a war and have never won the peace. Perhaps this is in some measure attributable to the lack of emphasis given the studies of the relationships of men with each other and communities with each other. The advancement of the cause of peace must be our constant engagement.

On page 400 of the hearings, I raised the question with the great men of science who appeared before our committee as witnesses. I raised the question and I said:

> Where do you draw the line with respect to basic research in the field of social sciences or do you seek to draw a line?
>
> I am not one to draw that line because I think it is just as vital that we find a way for people to live together in a social entity as it is to make people's lives more bearable through scientific progress.
>
> Are you doing anything to advance the cause of social sciences? Is it not of extreme importance to study the basis of establishing peaceful relationships between people and nations? Is that part of your function, to help the universities turn out people trained to think in these fields? What is your role in this respect?

The physical sciences make our contribution toward this goal, but how very important, too, in this cause are the social sciences.

I suggest this is a most proper function for the National Science Foundation. In reply to my question, Dr. Bronk, who is one of America's great

scientific minds, stated at page 401 of the hearings:

> Dr. BRONK. Behavioral science, psychology, and the understanding of the human mind and the behavior of people are extremely important. In order to help the burgeoning, so-called behavioral sciences, we have projects we are supporting in that area.

I commend the National Science Foundation for its growing interest in the field of the social sciences. I wish it would do more in this field and I wish, too, that it were possible to elasticize its understanding as to what constitutes basic research in the social sciences. I must say that I found some of its approved projects in this field quite abstruse and remote, possibly too remote. I hope it will be possible for them to recognize the advantages and benefits to mankind which may ensue from creative research in the field of human relationships. In this way the National Science Foundation, too, may strike a powerful blow in the cause of peace.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. We have the National Science Foundation in the independent offices appropriation bill and we have the National Defense Education Act providing fellowships and so on and so forth under the appropriations for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. How many committees are handling funds of this nature?

Mr. YATES. Funds for the educational process?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. I would think all of them would be so engaged. I think the total amount the Government pays for research and fellowships exceeds $2 billion, which is split up among the various appropriation subcommittees and almost all of the agencies of Government. I think, if the gentleman reads the hearings, as I know he does, having observed his actions with reference to previous appropriations bills and on this appropriations bill, he will find that almost all of the 23 agencies in this bill, for example, have programs of research. I think that is good. I think research programs are essential to the well-being of our people and of our country. I might say to the gentleman, anticipating I hope, what I think his question is going to be, that it is one of the functions of the National Science Foundation to act as a clearinghouse for scientific research programs. This is one of the responsibilities that was given to it by its organizing legislation. It has tried to act as a clearinghouse with some success, not as much as I will like, but it has tried. It has not yet achieved that very estimable goal. I hope they do it soon. I have tried to press them into doing it, and year by year when I have questioned them on this point, they have advised our subcommittee they are making progress in preventing unnecessary duplication in research.

Mr. GROSS. That is exactly what I am trying to get at. I am not critical of the program necessarily, but can we not get this all under one tent so that we will know what we are doing?

Mr. YATES. I think it would be desirable if we could get it under one tent, to use the gentleman's phrase. Certainly, there should be a central agency which has the task of gathering information about all Government research projects. However, each of the Government agencies is a specialist in its own field. Therefore, it takes jurisdiction of research in its field.

I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, that it is essential that the National Science Foundation be pressed to work increasingly harder to become such a clearinghouse.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I find increasingly difficult to comprehend. How do we keep up with this thing when untold millions of dollars are authorized and appropriated by many committees and for the same or related purposes? We find it is scattered all over, even in the farm appropriation bill.

Mr. YATES. There is research provided for in the farm appropriations bill, and I think there should be. We want continuous improved quality and quantity in food production. I am strong for research programs. They help us keep abreast of the world, and I wonder whether the gentleman's complaint is not really the same as the poet, Wordsworth, when he said:

> The world is too much with us late and soon.

We hope through research activities to keep abreast of developments in this fast-changing world.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I wish to support the gentleman's position in the matter of research and development. The Bureau of the Budget has come up with the figure of $5 billion for other civilian agencies, including national defense. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think the gentleman from Illinois will agree with me apropos the statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee that the committee has been concerned about this very matter of correlating these activities.

Mr. YATES. That is correct.

Mr. JONAS. And we are trying to the best of our ability to bring some order into this thing. I personally think that there should be an office, or person, or committee in Government that would bring together a record for the research programs that the Government is sponsoring.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. We always ask the National Science Foundation about its clearinghouse activities.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I want to join in what my colleague from North Carolina has said, that there should be this clearinghouse to correlate information regarding research activities. We are all concerned with the money that is being spent by every agency of government in fields which overlap and where there is duplication, but this is an agency which has developed over the years. Need for research activity in many fields is very great, but we should find some means by which we can bring some semblance of order into this program.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to our colleague that the National Science Foundation Act makes it clear that one of the functions of the National Science Foundation is to coordinate throughout the Government all scientific activities. If there is any weakness in that act that weakness lies in the fact that there is no power of enforcement; the National Science Foundation has no power to force its ideas on other governmental agencies. We go into those activities every year, and it is justified by the National Science Foundation, and its very distinguished 25 members from all the big universities in the country and some of the finest research institutions. I think they oversee, coordinate, and work hand in glove with other agencies of the Government which participate in the spending of perhaps some $8 billion a year on scientific investigation and research.

Mr. YATES. And the gentleman from Texas does a fine job in requiring National Science Foundation to do its work.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. I just wanted to stand up and congratulate the gentleman for evidencing a knowledge of poetry. I think we are long wasting our powers by spending. I think we are giving the Treasury away as a sort of boon. I think the gentleman knows what I am referring to.

Mr. YATES. I do; but I cannot agree with the gentleman that our country is laying waste its powers.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I think the House ought to know that our expenditures at this time for research will run well in excess of $10 billion a year. That is a lot more than we have been talking about here. There would be pretty close to $5 billion in the armed services alone; there must be close to $500 million in the Public Health Service. There is an enormous amount in this bill here. I think we ought to realize that so that the people who are saying we are not putting money enough will have the answer.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

I was unaware of the amount of money for research in the Armed Forces bill. Frequently in the House we tend, Mr. Chairman, to engage too easily in superlatives and superficial compliments. Occasionally, they come from the heart. I want to say with all the sincerity I possess, Mr. Chairman, how proud I am to be a part of the subcommittee headed by Chairman THOMAS, of Texas. I know many of the Members of the House and many are among the most able I have met. None, however, has greater ability than the genial gentleman from Texas. He is in a class by himself. Each year of the many years I have served with him, I have been amazed at the grasp he has of the activities of the agencies that come before us, of their budgets, of their successes, of their subterfuges. My admiration, my respect, my esteem for him mounts each year. We do not disagree very often, and when we do we disagree on minor things. It is about one of these, a remark he made today about the regulatory commissions, that I want to speak.

I do not believe the regulatory commissions have been doing well. As was shown by the study made by Dean Landis of the Harvard Law School last December, the commissions are not assuming their responsibilities in accordance with the mandate given to them by the Congress. Our hearings disclose that backlog rests upon backlog in each of the commissions, often without good reason. Who is hurt by this? The only ones who are hurt are the people, the people who are the taxpayers and the ratepayers. They are the ones who are losing the protection that Congress intended they should receive when these commissions were created. The commissions have in too great a measure become attuned to the needs and voice of industry rather than the public. Perhaps it is unfair to generalize and say all commissions have been derelict, because not all of the commissions have; but the fact remains that the enormous growth of our economic structure has placed tremendous burdens on regulatory agencies, and some have failed more than others. Most of the agencies are falling behind in their work. They are unable to keep pace with the growth of our economy.

We have attempted to make available adequate appropriations for the agencies each year. There are adequate appropriations in this budget for these agencies. As a matter of fact, some of the agencies have escaped the traditional ax of the Appropriations Committee. We have given them all that they requested, and we hope and we admonish the agencies to more aggressively assume their responsibilities in the public interest.

There is one agency I think deserves particular censure for its failure to assume its responsibility to the public. I refer to the Federal Power Commission; this Commission has been a slacker. It has little conception of the public interest, particularly in the field of natural gas regulation. I quote from page 54 of the report of Dean Landis to the President of last December:

> The Federal Power Commission without question represents the outstanding example in the Federal Government of the breakdown of the administrative process. The complexity of its problems is no answer to its more than patent failures. These failures relate primarily to the natural gas field, in the Commission's handling of its responsibilities with respect to the transmission and the production of natural gas. Enough has already been said about the delays in this field, so terribly costly to the public and so productive of unemployment in other basic industries.
>
> These defects stem from attitudes, plainly evident on the record, of the unwillingness of the Commission to assume its responsibilities under the Natural Gas Act and its attitude, substantially contemptuous, of refusing in substance to obey the mandates of the Supreme Court of the United States and other Federal courts.

Mr. Chairman, the indictment continues, but I will not read it all. I know when I interrogated the Commissioners of the Federal Power Commission, I asked what they were doing to regulate the natural gas industry. I was told they are undertaking hearings shortly to determine the manner of regulating the rates of the natural gas producers. The Phillips decision was isued in 1954. Since that time the Commission has moved one way, then another, has hemmed and hawed and zigged and zagged, but has come to no specific decision on rate regulation for the natural gas industry. It is shocking and shameful.

As a matter of fact, the statement of the chairman of the Federal Power Commission before our committee was to the effect that no matter how much money was given to the Federal Power Commission to carry out its responsibility in the natural gas field, the Commission could not regulate the industry. I said:

> You don't mean to tell this committee that if we gave you as much money as you requested you could not regulate the industry?

And, the answer was: "Substantially, yes."

That they just could not obtain the people to do the work; the work was so tremendous that it could not be done.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I would like to compliment the gentleman as a member of the committee, as well as the committee itself in their effort to get more equitable and speedy action from these regulatory agencies. Without particular regard to the agency about which he has been speaking, I could cite, if time permitted, a number of other agencies whose chief stock in trade seems to be a willingness to procrastinate and delay and do nothing. In many cases this results in a financial loss to the public at large because of their dilatory tactics. And, I would say quite frankly that I do not believe in most instances there was a lack of proper budget consideration that brought about this situation.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman. I would agree with him in respect to the criticism he makes of the agencies. I think, however, that the practitioners before the agencies may bear a portion of the responsibility for the delay in disposing of the cases, but, after all, the responsibility for disposing of its work is the commission's. I am firm in my conviction that an aggressive commission can do much to eliminate the backlog and have a speedy disposition of the cases pending before it.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. I wish to commend the committee for one particular action in reference to the Federal Communications Commission by the adding of some 20 employees to the Safety and Special Radio Services Group. They have been doing an excellent job under a great handicap. They need these 20 people to clear up the big backlog of work.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentlemen for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by commending one of the watchdogs of the Treasury, the guardian of the Government's utilities bill. I refer to the Transportation and Public Utilities Section of the General Services Administration. This is the one agency in the Federal Government which tries to make sure that the Federal Government is not overcharged on its more than $1 billion utility bill. It has done a good job. Its activities have resulted in savings to the Federal Government, and I believe that their work in the future will continue to deserve the commendation of our committee and of the Congress.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration today appropriates $8,424,098,000 and provides funds for 23 independent executive agencies for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1961. This is a staggering sum and underscores the responsibility owed to the taxpayers of this country by those of us who have been selected as custodians of their tax dollars. It is the obligation of all of us to see that the agencies involved are sufficiently financed to properly execute their functions, but equally important it is our obligation to see that tax dollars are not squandered on overstaffing, duplication, waste or inefficiency.

It should be borne in mind that, large as this appropriation is, it covers the financing of only 23 of the independent offices of the Government and does not include any of the activities that are under the supervision of a Cabinet officer. A mere listing of these offices and agencies and the amounts included in the bill before the committee today will present striking evidence of the ever-growing complex of the Federal Government. I will include such list at this point in my remarks.

Agency	Budget estimates, 1962	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
National Aeronautics and Space Council	$320,000	$320,000	
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	104,200,000	79,167,000	−$25,033,000
Disaster relief	6,000,000	6,000,000	
Civil Aeronautics Board	90,750,000	83,700,000	−7,050,000
Civil Service Commission	95,502,000	91,844,000	−3,658,000
Federal Aviation Agency	744,300,000	723,500,000	−20,800,000
Federal Communications Commission	12,525,000	12,400,000	−125,000
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	[1] (12,981,000)	[1] (12,981,000)	
Federal Power Commission	8,793,000	8,793,000	
Federal Trade Commission	10,690,000	10,000,000	−690,000
General Accounting Office	43,000,000	43,000,000	
General Services Administration	552,170,000	535,390,000	−16,780,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency	262,050,000	247,950,000	−14,100,000
Federal National Mortgage Association	[1] (7,450,000)	[1] (7,400,000)	(−50,000)
Federal Housing Administration	[1] (71,975,000)	[1] (67,600,000)	(−4,375,000
Public Housing Administration	183,450,000	178,968,000	−4,482,000
Interstate Commerce Commission	$22,200,000	$21,950,000	−$250,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	1,235,300,000	1,200,000,000	−35,300,000
National Capital Housing Authority	40,000	40,000	
National Science Foundation	277,000,000	250,000,000	−27,000,000
Renegotiation Board	3,000,000	2,900,000	−100,000
Securities and Exchange Commission	11,015,000	11,000,000	−15,000
Selective Service System	34,475,000	33,670,000	−805,000
Veterans' Administration	4,924,846,000	4,809,571,000	−45,275,000
Total	8,625,561,000	8,424,098,000	−201,463,000

[1] Corporate funds available for administrative and nonadministrative expenses.

I should say here and now that the formulation of such a bill is not an easy task. The subcommittee heard testimony from hundreds of witnesses and their testimony and cross examination fills two large volumes of more than 2,500 pages. This bill is the product of hours of study, consideration and compromise. I say compromise because on a measure of such scope and size seven individuals serving as a subcommittee cannot be expected to agree on every point. But we have done our best to find common ground upon which to adjust our conflicting viewpoints and the bill before you represents the composite judgment of the subcommittee. It was arrived at as a result of a blending of our collective knowledge of what we have learned from past experience, liberally spiced with some guesswork, some old fashioned horse sense and some hunch. The bill met the approval of the full Committee on Appropriations.

The printed report provides a detailed explanation of the actions taken by the subcommittee. It shows the budget estimate in each case and the action taken by the committee. It compares amounts appropriated in the bill with agency requests and with funds appropriated last year for each individual agency. The bill appropriates $69,945,400 less than last year and $201,463,000 less than this year's requests.

In reviewing the budget estimates and appropriations agency by agency, it should be noted that almost without exception these civilian agencies sought substantial increases in employees. I include at this point a table showing increased requests and the committee action in each case.

	Positions			
	1961	1962 budget	Proposed increase	Bill
National Aeronautics and Space Council		18	18	18
Civil Aeronautics Board	800	881	81	70
Civil Service Commission	2,558	2,651	93	24
Federal Aviation Agency	42,431	45,060	2,629	1,487
Federal Communications Commission	1,483	1,539	56	50
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,128	1,226	98	98
Federal Power Commission	898	980	82	82
Federal Trade Commission	823	1,119	296	230
General Accounting Office	5,172	5,122	−50	−50
General Services Administration	30,502	31,700	1,198	158
Housing and Home Finance Agency:				
Office of the Administrator	1,886	2,264	378	265
Federal Housing Administration	7,008	7,799	791	500
Public Housing Administration	1,405	1,425	20	
Federal National Mortgage Association	954	994	40	35
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,428	2,494	66	44
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16,493	18,122	1,629	1,500
National Science Foundation	628	742	114	85
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization	1,650	1,650		−50
Renegotiation Board	287	286	−1	−10
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,090	1,254	164	163
Selective Service System	5,197	5,197		
Veterans' Administration	157,340	159,742	2,402	2,200
Total	282,161	292,265	+10,104	+6,899

It should also be noted, and I wish to emphasize, that there are 5,172 positions in the General Accounting Office. In his budget estimate presented to the committee, the Comptroller General recommended that this total be reduced by 50 in fiscal year 1962. Although GAO workload is increasing as fast as that of other civilian agencies, it volunteered to take a reduction of 50 positions. This agency deserves commendation for a fine job performed in looking after the taxpayers' dollars.

MOTOR POOL OPERATION

Public Law 152 of the 83d Congress authorized the General Services Administration to establish and operate interagency motor vehicle pools. I was the author of this legislation and have understandably been particularly interested in the progress of the program. In its budget presentation to our subcommittee, General Services Administration each year makes a detailed report on the operation of these motor vehicle pools and when the bill is under consideration in the Committee of the Whole I usually make a progress report for the information of the Members of the House.

Approximately 18,900 vehicles are currently being operated by 59 interagency motor pools. This is an increase of three pools and 1,560 vehicles during the first 9 months of this fiscal year. Motor pool vehicles traveled over 159 million miles in this period which was an increase of 34 percent over last year. By the end of the present fiscal year General Services Administration expects to have 65 interagency motor pools operating 19,300 vehicles.

To give some idea of the vastness of Government ownership and operation of motor vehicles, I should tell you that there are some 220,000 automobiles not in the pool. Most of these vehicles are utilized in operations scattered throughout the country in such a manner that pool operation is impractical. In order for a motor pool operation to be efficient it must be in a congested area where the maximum mileage can be obtained out of each vehicle. By establishing interagency pools in areas where there is a heavy concentration of government activity, such as in New York, Washington, Chicago, Cleveland, and so forth, substantial savings have resulted. Interagency motor pool operation reduces the number of vehicles required, increases the utilization of each vehicle permitting three cars to accomplish the work formerly done by four, consolidates management and provides for effective and efficient maintenance.

General Services Administration officials testifying before the subcommittee presented evidence showing that at the end of 1960 there were 56 interagency motor pools established. As of that time, the operation of these pools had resulted in a reduction of more than 20 percent in the number of vehicles previously required to accomplish a simi-

lar workload. This has amounted to a saving of nearly 4,000 vehicles required to do the work now performed by pool vehicles.

During the last fiscal year total savings from motor pool operations amounted to over $5 million and by the end of fiscal year 1962, the annual savings will be over $7 million.

The testimony further revealed that accumulated savings from the beginning of the program through June 30, 1960, are $15,697,506.

It is estimated that total accumulated savings through June 30, 1961 will be $22,514,967.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

In studying the report of this bill and listening to the discussion on the floor, you have no doubt noted that $4,879,571,000, or over half the total funds provided in the bill is for the Veterans' Administration. At first glance this must seem to be an unbelievable amount but it does not become so if you reflect on the fact that over 40 percent of the entire population of the United States is either entitled or potentially entitled to some form of benefit under programs administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The amount recommended for 1962 is $545,127,000 less than the appropriations for this year and $45,275,000 less than the budget estimates.

The bill provides $27 million for medical research. This is $5 million more than the budget estimate and demonstrates the committee's continued interest in this vital field. The bill also provides for a total of 139,372 operating beds, an increase of 903 over the current year, and an average daily patient load of 141,504 an increase of 629.

The Veterans' Administration Medical Director assured the committee that there is no waiting list at any Veterans' Administration hospital for veterans with a service connected complaint. There is however a substantial list of eligible veterans with non-service-connected disabilities awaiting veterans hospital admission.

The Members may find interesting a table supplied by the Veterans' Administration to the committee showing the average daily patient load in Veterans' Administration hospitals. This table appears on page 501 of part I of the hearings:

PROGRAM NOTES—INPATIENT ACTIVITIES

Average daily patient load in VA hospitals

	Fiscal year 1960, actual	Fiscal year 1961, estimated	Fiscal year 1962, estimated	Increase (+) or decrease (−), 1962 over 1961
VA hospitals, total:				
Psychiatric patients	56,728	56,900	57,400	+500
TB, psychotic patients	1,079	985	900	−85
Tuberculous patients	7,958	7,315	6,700	−615
Neurologic patients	4,708	4,700	4,700	
Medical and surgical patients	40,935	41,740	42,550	+810
Total patients	111,408	111,640	112,250	+610
NP hospitals:				
Psychiatric patients	49,305	49,500	50,000	+500
TB, psychotic patients	889	805	750	−55
Tuberculous patients	38	50	50	
Neurologic patients	561	550	550	
Medical and surgical patients	1,634	1,745	2,038	+293
Total patients	52,427	52,650	53,388	+738
TB hospitals:				
Psychiatric patients	12			
TB, psychotic patients	1			
Tuberculous patients	3,322	2,504	2,066	−438
Neurologic patients	49	40	30	−10
Medical and surgical patients	1,519	1,117	1,490	+373
Total patients	4,903	3,661	3,586	−75
G.M. & S. hospitals:				
Psychiatric patients	7,411	7,400	7,400	
TB, psychotic patients	189	180	150	−30
Tuberculous patients	4,598	4,761	4,584	−177
Neurologic patients	4,098	4,110	4,120	+10
Medical and surgical patients	37,782	38,878	39,022	+144
Total patients	54,078	55,329	55,276	−53

Congress will soon be considering an omnibus housing bill which I understand will include a substantial number of new public housing units. Since the cost of the public housing program is always the subject of debate when housing bills are on the floor, I am going to include in my remarks at this point some tables taken from the hearings on this bill when the Public Housing Administration people were before the subcommittee.

The following is taken from pages 1020 and 1021 of part II of the hearings:

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS REQUIREMENTS

The U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended, authorizes PHA to make annual contributions to local housing authorities to assist them in achieving and maintaining the low-rent character of housing eligible for Federal financial assistance under the act. These payments are made out of appropriated funds.

Under present requirements annual contributions are limited to amounts needed to liquidate capital indebtedness and may not be applied to current operating expenses. The amounts needed for this purpose are identified as "fixed annual contributions," but the amounts actually paid by PHA are normally lower than these fixed amounts, certain assets of the local housing authorities being available to reduce the obligation of the Federal Government. The most substantial of these "amounts available to reduce fixed annual contributions" are "residual receipts," which, generally speaking, represent the excess of rental income over operating expenses.

The estimate of annual contributions requirements for 1962 is $169.3 million, as shown in the following table:

	1960, actual	1961, estimate	1962, estimate
Number of projects	2,411	2,691	2,940
Number of units	425,850	470,443	501,140
Fixed annual contributions	$147,523,103	$167,939,667	$186,915,962
Amounts available to reduce fixed annual contributions	16,334,726	16,278,650	17,659,638
Annual contributions requirements	131,188,377	151,661,017	169,256,324
Rounded		151,700,000	169,300,000
Appropriation	120,000,000	140,000,000	169,300,000
Supplemental appropriation	12,000,000	11,700,000	
Total	132,000,000	151,700,000	169,300,000
Unobligated balance	$11,623		

The amounts available to reduce fixed annual contributions break down as follows:

	1960 actual	1961 estimate	1962 estimate
Accrued interest	$1,460,676	$3,181,663	$3,101,396
Capitalized interest	1,144,652	1,184,051	3,397,488
Residual receipts, initial operating period	698,537	153,329	302,460
Residual receipts, after initial operating period	13,030,861	11,759,607	10,858,294
Total amount available to reduce annual contributions	16,334,726	16,278,650	17,659,638

Two other tables, taken from page 1022, contain some interesting information which will disclose project income, expense, residual receipts, and a tabulation of annual contributions from the inception of the public housing program in 1941 through June 30, 1962. The second following table shows that total annual contributions from the Federal Government to finance the public housing program since 1941 through 1962 amount to $1,065,916,487. And remember that this is a 40-year program.

Statement of project income, expense, and residual receipts, locally owned projects eligible for annual contributions

Classification	1960 actual		1961 estimate		1962 estimate	
	PUM	Amount	PUM	Amount	PUM	Amount
Operating receipts:						
Rental income	$38.25	$184,842,151	$39.50	$206,234,351	$39.28	$213,120,899
Other income	1.08	5,201,546	1.14	5,963,685	.93	5,056,957
Total operating receipts	39.33	190,043,697	40.64	212,198,036	40.21	218,177,856
Operating expenditures:						
Routine:						
Administration [1]	6.33	30,603,750	7.33	38,257,304	7.51	40,746,292
Utilities [1]	8.79	42,500,108	9.24	48,217,168	9.27	50,302,698
Ordinary maintenance and operation [1]	12.53	60,565,766	12.73	66,446,783	13.24	71,803,772
Payments in lieu of taxes	2.79	13,458,655	2.86	14,953,362	2.84	15,433,090
Collection losses	.24	1,139,907	.24	1,228,310	.27	1,454,708
Other general expenses [1]	.81	3,915,792	.82	4,310,711	.79	4,274,783
Total routine expenditures [1]	31.49	152,183,978	33.22	173,413,644	33.92	184,015,343
Operating, etc.—Con.						
Nonroutine:						
Extraordinary maintenance	$0.85	$4,085,958	$1.86	$9,718,107	$2.00	$10,834,191
Replacement of equipment	.44	2,135,405	.60	3,138,855	.65	3,551,637
Betterments and additions	.89	4,323,731	1.33	6,940,679	1.10	5,977,843
Other nonroutine expenditures	.01	36,301	.02	106,746	.01	61,317
Miscellaneous adjustments	.08	403,139	.06	337,108	.12	635,724
Total nonroutine expenditures [1]	2.27	10,984,534	3.87	20,241,495	3.88	21,060,712
Provision for operating reserve	2.87	13,844,324	1.30	6,783,290	.41	2,243,507
Total expenditures	36.63	177,012,836	38.39	200,438,429	38.21	207,319,562
Residual receipts	2.70	13,030,861	2.25	11,759,607	2.00	10,858,294

[1] Because of changes in budget and accounting procedures, the 1960 figures for these items are not comparable with those for 1961 and 1962. For example, "Administration" now includes the cost of maintenance supervision and contribution to retirement funds, which were previously charged to other accounts.

Comparison of annual contributions from inception through June 30, 1962

Fiscal year	Number of units	Fixed annual contributions	Amount available to reduce annual contributions	Accrued annual contributions	Percent of maximum	Average annual contributions
1941	23,783	$4,747,176		$4,747,176	100.0	$199.60
1942	68,459	11,258,951	$1,333,060	9,925,891	88.2	144.99
1943	89,240	13,049,252	3,166,370	9,882,882	75.7	110.47
1944	101,951	14,436,885	4,306,888	10,129,997	70.2	99.36
1945	141,596	21,132,572	12,410,272	8,722,300	41.3	61.60
1946	144,095	21,115,314	13,978,579	7,136,735	33.8	49.53
1947	144,095	21,044,261	15,377,631	5,666,630	26.9	39.33
1948	144,603	21,044,002	17,103,597	3,940,405	18.7	27.25
1949	145,785	21,325,747	17,082,754	4,242,993	19.9	29.10
1950	146,549	21,321,123	15,105,911	6,215,212	29.2	42.41
1951	145,703	21,407,822	14,221,701	7,186,121	33.6	49.32
1952	156,084	26,215,103	13,649,116	12,565,987	47.9	80.51
1953	204,815	45,091,505	19,212,357	25,879,148	57.4	126.35
1954	259,116	$67,844,328	$23,376,836	$44,467,492	65.5	$171.61
1955	304,383	91,133,962	24,548,099	66,585,863	73.1	218.76
1956	343,907	107,933,030	26,202,984	81,730,046	75.7	237.65
1957	365,896	116,685,509	26,050,696	90,634,813	77.7	247.71
1958	374,172	121,213,830	22,429,416	98,784,414	81.4	264.01
1959	401,467	133,106,635	17,739,971	115,366,664	86.7	287.36
1960	425,850	147,523,103	16,334,726	131,188,377	88.9	308.06
Total		1,048,630,110	303,630,964	744,999,146	71.0	
Estimate:						
1961	470,443	167,939,667	16,278,650	151,661,017	90.3	322.38
1962	501,140	186,915,962	17,659,638	169,256,324	90.6	337.74

Another table taken from page 1026 will show the increasing number of units year by year from 1941 through 1960, the accrued annual contributions made by the Federal Government to provide the subsidy, and the year-by-year PHA administrative expenses. In addition to the more than $1 billion of contributions made by the Federal Government through fiscal year 1962, it is interesting to note that administrative expenses are in excess of $125 million.

Fiscal year	Number of units	Accrued annual contributions	PHA administrative expenses
1941	23,783	$4,747,176	$4,073,664
1942	68,459	9,925,891	4,208,392
1943	89,240	9,882,882	3,517,915
1944	101,951	10,129,997	3,165,000
1945	141,596	8,722,300	2,430,200
1946	144,095	7,136,735	1,700,200
1947	144,095	5,666,630	3,565,000
1948	144,603	3,940,405	2,081,710
1949	145,785	4,242,993	2,617,000
1950	146,549	6,215,212	6,116,233
1951	145,703	7,186,121	9,716,718
1952	156,084	12,565,987	9,241,900
1953	204,815	25,879,148	8,041,330
1954	259,116	44,467,492	6,591,200
1955	304,383	66,585,863	7,383,900
1956	343,907	81,730,046	9,147,700
1957	365,896	90,634,813	9,979,766
1958	374,172	98,784,414	11,575,230
1959	401,467	115,366,664	12,288,162
1960	425,850	131,188,377	12,253,957
Total		744,999,146	129,785,177

Mr. Chairman, I regret that time will not permit a discussion of each item in this bill. Obviously one cannot devote attention to each of 23 separate agencies, or to a 50-page bill, or a 30-page report, in 20 minutes. I have therefore undertaken to address myself to a few specific items that have not been touched upon by other members of the subcommittee. Further opportunities will be given for more detailed discussion of individual items under the 5-minute rule.

In conclusion, I should like to pay my personal respects to the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], who has presided over the activities of the subcommittee with such grace and skill for many years. He is uniformly courteous to all members of the subcommittee and to witnesses appearing before it. I have learned many lessons from him during the period I have been privileged to serve as a member of his subcommittee and I am happy to join my colleagues on the subcommittee in paying a personal tribute to him today.

My association with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] has been equally rewarding. I have also appreciated the opportunity of working in close harmony on the subcommittee with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I apologize to the gentleman for leaving a moment ago, but I had to answer the telephone. Did I hear the gentleman say, as I was walking out of the Chamber, that there were 6,900 new employees provided for in this bill?

Mr. JONAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I am amazed. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Where are the bulk of these employees? Does the gentleman have a breakdown on that?

Mr. JONAS. Yes. 1,500 new employees for NASA; 1,487 new employees for Federal Aviation Agency. The gentleman from Iowa knows how rapidly aviation is expanding and they made a good case for additional employees in that agency to provide navigational aids, safety, and whatnot.

Mr. GROSS. On that point, let me ask the gentleman this question: Has the Federal Aviation Agency taken over, as was proposed a year or two ago, the

manning of control towers on military bases?

Mr. JONAS. They have a coordinated arrangement with the military. The Federal Aviation Agency has primary responsibility in that field, I might say. Every one of these other regulatory agencies reports to us that it just cannot keep up with increased workloads without adding new employees. The SEC has added workloads each year as additional securities are issued and are offered for sale to the public. We gave them an increase, but not nearly as much as they asked for. The Civil Service Commission has increasing obligations all over the country, and asked for an increase. We gave them a few more people. But I would like to call this point to the attention of the committee. The one agency in the entire Government that I recall asked for fewer employees in the coming fiscal year than last year is the General Accounting Office. General Campbell came in and said that they could do their work with 50 fewer employees. If there is any agency in this Government whose activities have expanded more than the General Accounting Office activities, I do not know what agency it would be because that is the office that has to "ride herd" on all of the other agencies and audit their accounts. This office frequently comes up with reports on waste and extravagance and has to supervise the financial transactions of all the other agencies. If the General Accounting Office can come in and voluntarily reduce their payroll and the number of employees, I do not see why some of these other agencies cannot do likewise.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I suspect the General Accounting Office has more employees on loan to and working with congressional committees than any other agency in this Government.

Mr. JONAS. That is true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wonder if I could direct the attention of the gentleman to page 1176 of the subcommittee hearings on this bill and the list there of GSA building projects approved by the Congressional Public Works Committee, which includes a project in Montpelier, Vt., for a courthouse and post office building to be completely designed in August 1961, and capable of contract award in October 1961, and also to the hearings at page 959 where this project is listed in the initially approved budget schedule for 1962. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can tell me the reasons why this project was omitted from the bill, as it has been reported to the floor of the House.

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to try to answer the gentleman. I know of his interest in this project. He has spoken to me about it before, and has been very active in his effort to have this project funded because it is an important project for his State. I am glad the gentleman asked the question here during the course of this debate, and I will try to clear the record and give as satisfactory an explanation as I can for the fact that the Montpelier project is not included in the bill. It is one of 28 projects that are in exactly the same statue. They have all received committee approval. They have been authorized. The design and planning work has been completed in most of these projects, if not all. The only reason they were not considered in this bill is that they were not included in the budget. We have a substantial number of public buildings funded in this bill at a cost, I might add, of $171,600,000; but the one at Montpelier, along with the 27 others listed from all sections of the United States, were not included because they were not budgeted and if they had been included the subcommittee would have had to go $146 million over the budget. We just did not see our way clear to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT].

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Chairman, at Dyersburg, Tenn., a proposed Federal building is to be constructed. We have already bought the lot and the lot is clear. Plans are being drawn. It is the hometown of my able predecessor, the Honorable Jere Cooper. Can the gentleman tell me something about the status of that project in this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I do not know of anyone who has been more diligent about a project than the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] has been about this one in Dyersburg, the hometown of our deceased colleague, Jere Cooper.

Here is the status of it: It is ready to go. We inquired of the General Services Administration if they would put it in next year's budget and ask the Bureau of the Budget for funds to begin a turnkey job. They said they would. We are going to do our best to hold them to their promise.

Mr. EVERETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, may I add that our distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. EVERETT] has certainly impressed the chairman and the members of the committee with his interest in this project. He has worked very diligently to bring this project to completion and to construction. He has rendered a real service and I congratulate my friend.

Over the years of my service on the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, it has been a pleasure to serve with all members of this committee. I particularly want to pay my respects to our distinguished chairman and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I know AL THOMAS to be most efficient, very thorough, and he is certainly one of the most congenial Members of this Congress. My admiration for him has continued to increase over the years. It is certainly a pleasure to work with him, as it has been a source of pleasure of work with all members of the committee. I want to mention also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. Chairman, there is no partisanship shown in our committee. All of the members work together for the betterment of the country.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, represents more than 3 months of diligent, hard work and conscientious labor on the part of all members of the subcommittee. Our hearings comprise two volumes, or 2,570 pages. Along with the members of the committee I want also to commend our able assistant, Homer Skarin, and our other staff assistants.

This bill represents a fund request of some 23 agencies of Government. I shall not name them all, but they are our civilian agencies of Government: The Interstate Commerce Commission, which is one of the oldest and most important of our regulatory commissions; the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Communications Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Power Commission, Veterans' Administration, the new National Astronautics and Space Administration, the President's Base Council, the General Accounting Office, and others.

The total budget request for the 23 agencies was $8,625,061,000. The committee has approved $8,424,098,000, or a reduction of $201,463,000. This is a substantial and a sizable reduction. The bill as compared with last year represents a reduction of $69,945,400 less than the amount last year, notwithstanding the fact that a number of our agencies are accelerating their programs.

Although this is a big bill, and a good bill, I commend it to the favorable consideration of the membership of the House and urge its passage. These agencies of Government are all concerned with service and the protection of the public interest.

There has already been discussed the Veterans' Administration, which carries the largest amount of funds of all the agencies carried in this bill. Might I say that with the Veterans' Administration we have the greatest veterans' program of any nation in the world. No nation in the world excels our country in providing benefits and various programs for the veterans. These include the medical program, hospitalization, medical care, in-patient care, outpatient care, research and development, compensation and pensions, housing, various educational and training programs. Some 5 million veterans have been given some type of education and training under the GI bill, including below- and above-college level. Through

the years the veterans program of our country has been the greatest of any nation in the world.

The VA research program has been increased some $5 million for next year. While the VA asked for some $22 million for the medical care program, our committee provided them with $27 million, or an increase of $5 million, because we want our disabled veterans to have the best medical care and the best services provided to veterans of our country.

Concerning the national science and astronautics agency, we know that President Kennedy recently addressed a joint session of the Congress on this subject. The President pointed out the importance of this program. We know that the public is greatly interested in America forging ahead in space. With Astronaut Shepard vaulting into space, we have again shown to the world that America will not be second to any nation in space, defense, or otherwise.

This program is important from a national prestige point of view, but certainly it is costly. We have a very solid space program, and are moving forward on all fronts with our expensive space program. It is going to be costly, and we do not know what the future recommendations and costs will be in the years ahead.

The National Science Foundation is a tremendously important agency. I wish that all of our colleagues could have had the privilege of attending the hearings and receiving the benefits of the testimony of our scientists—such men as Dr. Detlaf Bronck of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Dr. Lee Dobridge of California Institute of Technology, among others. We are forging ahead and making progress. We have made a reduction of $250 million in this program, because it seems very difficult to supply all of the needs for the science fairs, the great programs of scholarships and fellowships, research and other science programs. Great programs are underway making grants for science scholarships and fellowships to advance our Nation in science.

The Federal Aviation Agency is also a tremendously important Agency. The new Administrator, Mr. Najeeb Halaby, is a capable pilot as well as a fine Administrator. He is a very great American, we think, heading this important and significant Agency concerned not only with the development of aviation in America but also the control of air space and our relations with international air carriers.

I would point out, as was indicated in the report, that the Dulles International Airport has not moved forward as we have expected. It has been entirely too costly. It is going to be necessary to provide additional hangars and other facilities. A hangar has not been built thus far. Facilities for an immigration office for the Immigration Service is also required. This agency is large and certainly an important one. They asked for $744 million, and the committee approved $724.5 million, or a cut of $20.8 million for the Federal Aviation Agency.

Among the other regulatory agencies I would mention the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has been discussed; the Federal Power Commission, the National Capital Housing Authority, the General Accounting Office, and the Space Council for the President. It has been indicated that many of the agencies are faced with a tremendous backlog of work, and these agencies are supposed to serve, and in many instances do serve, the public interest. We think that their efforts should be improved, and the committee is trying to encourage these agencies to improve their services.

I commend the work of the regulatory agencies in their important work and commend the Landis report to their attention.

Referring again to the Veterans' Administration, I should like to mention that the compensation and pension item alone calls for some $3.5 billion. This is a matter authorized by law, by statute, and the Committee on Appropriations necessarily has to provide the funds for this purpose. The veterans hospital construction program will, I understand, be discussed later. We have heard some complaint already on the floor that there has been a slight reduction in the funds for this program. Might I state that due to the efforts of our subcommittee a few years ago we inaugurated a renovation and modernization program for veterans hospitals. We have 173 veterans hospitals throughout the Nation, the largest and the greatest hospital and medical care program of any nation in the world, with an average daily patient load of approximately 120,000 patients per day. For the past several years we have been replacing Army barracks-type hospitals with modern, permanent structures, with improved medical facilities. We have been appropriating from $50 million to $75 million a year for this purpose. The bill carries $70 million for next year for new hospital construction, and this subcommittee will provide all the needed and required funds for essential hospital construction.

Another important agency is the General Services Administration, which is a big agency, that provides many services for all agencies of the Government, including the control of Government office space and the building and construction of new Federal buildings. The bill carries funds for the construction of 21 new Federal buildings for next year—post offices and Federal buildings projects throughout the Nation. These are designated in the report. The report mentions 28 additional projects that are advanced and are now making progress toward construction.

Mr. Chairman, again I wish to urge the passage of this bill in the public interest.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my voice in admiration and tribute to the gentleman from Texas, the fine chairman of this subcommittee, and to the gentleman from New York, the ranking minority member. This is a hardworking subcommittee, with jurisdiction which is as broad as the jurisdiction of any committee in the Congress. When you look over the list of agencies for which this subcommittee is responsible you begin to realize the difficulty which is imposed upon the chairman and the members in trying to do a reasonably good job in giving these people the money they must have to operate, but not too much money.

I think the chairman of the committee will agree with me when I say that this bill is undoubtedly a bit on the generous side. We did not do as good a job in cutting on this bill as we have done in previous years. I trust, however, that when the shiny newness of the New Frontier has worn off a bit, we will settle down, and do a better job in years to come.

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times of May 27, 1961, carried an article which reported on a conference held in Tulsa, Okla., on May 26–27, which the Times called the First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space.

This article is deserving of notice by the Members of this body because it reveals some rather peculiar items of information and it raises some very serious questions indeed.

Three of the top officials of NASA, Dr. Wernher von Braun, Dr. Robert Jastrow, and George M. Low attended this conference, ostensibly as representatives of NASA. I am therefore disturbed to learn that this conference, according to the Times, was sponsored by not only NASA, but by the Tulsa Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Chairman, all of us realize that the principal function of a chamber of commerce organization is to attract business and industry to locate in the area it serves. This, of course, is fitting and, I am sure, everyone recognizes the vital role the chambers of commerce in the United States have played in developing our economy to its present high point. Certainly I do not want anybody to think I am critical of the great city of Tulsa, to which city I had the privilege of making a visit some few weeks ago. I was well treated.

There are as many fine, intelligent people in the city of Tulsa as in any city I have ever visited, and their city is beautiful, well ordered, and prosperous.

But I must state frankly, Mr. Chairman, that I cannot avoid a nagging feeling that politics has intruded into our space program when I observe a number of top officials of a Government agency, and a scientific agency at that, attending and participating in a conference when that conference is not wholly sponsored by a scientific organization and is not held in pursuance of any apparent scientific purpose.

I must say, further, that my suspicions are not at all mitigated when I recall that the new Administrator of NASA, Mr. James Webb, was, prior to his present appointment, an official of Kerr-McGee Oil Industries. Any similarity in the name Kerr-McGee and the name of a Member of the other body who also happens to be chairman of the Senate

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences is not coincidental.

I have made inquiries about this so-called First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space and I believe that the Members of the House of Representatives are entitled to some further information from Mr. Webb.

As a member of the House Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee, which must evaluate and act upon the appropriation request for NASA, I am personally familiar with the difficult and burdensome responsibilities which are carried by the top scientific and technical personnel of that agency. I know further that in carrying out the difficult assignment of having this Nation forge ahead of the Russians in space exploration, these scientific and technical experts are working long hours with dedication to their public duties. I also know that NASA has prided itself on being a nonpolitical agency, and that the agency has restored public confidence in the technical abilities of our country and has deserved and received the full support of the Congress for their programs. I agree fully that politics should not be utilized to cloud the effectiveness of that agency because science and technology cannot operate efficiently within a political environment. Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Webb or other NASA administration officials should advise us of the following:

First. Who was responsible for originating the invitation for NASA personnel to participate in the conference held in Tulsa?

Second. How many NASA officials were present at the recent conference in Tulsa?

Third. Were the NASA personnel invited to speak at the conference by nongovernmental individuals or were they instructed to go by Government officials?

Fourth. Were the NASA personnel traveling under Government orders and at Government expense?

Fifth. How much time did the top NASA personnel lose from their official Government responsibilities by participating in this conference?

Sixth. What scientific purpose did the conference at Tulsa further?

Mr. Chairman, the New York Times article reveals that the President broadcast a message to the conference in Tulsa which expressed the hope the meeting "would set a precedent for the Nation's dedication to its space effort." I believe that if the President intends to continue to ask the American people to support the large increase for our space efforts as his recent money estimates for NASA has reflected and his recent messages to the Congress, our citizens are entitled to know to what extent politics has entered the administration of our space exploration program.

I just have one other question and comment to make on this matter. I would also like to have Mr. Webb tell, in addition to the other questions which I previously propounded to him, who kept the shop while everybody was in Tulsa.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will my friend of the loyal opposition yield for a question and tell me the name of the conference?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will be glad to. The name was the "First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space." The article is in the New York Times of May 27, 1961.

Mr. YATES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I find I must take mild issue with my friend from Illinois who has just spoken on a statement which he previously made with regard to a portion of the General Services Administration known as the Transportation and Public Utilities Service. I agree with my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, that this is a very important service. I agree also, within limits, it has done a good job. But, where I disagree with him is in giving complete and utter approval to the methods that this bureau has used in doing its job. We have had much correspondence, and I think some other Members of the House have had much correspondence from bodies of State governments which are given the responsibility of regulating public utilities. This correspondence, by and large, complains about the role of the General Services Administration in dictating or attempting to dictate the methods by which these regulatory bodies determine rates which will be charged to the utility customers in the State. I think it is fine for this particular bureau to do a job of totaling figures to make sure that the formula, which is applied by the regulatory body, is applied properly. I think it is fine for this particular agency to protect the best interests of the Government as the consumer, but when it goes further than that, then it is not only acting in a way which is inimical, I think, to the best interest of the State, but is acting in a way which is not contemplated by the organic act under which it was set up. Further, it is dangerously close to infringing upon the territory of the Federal Power Commission in some instances, the Interstate Commerce Commission in other instances, and the Federal Trade Commission in other instances. So it would be my hope this particular bureau will take to heart the colloquy which we had with its members in the committee and the words which are set forth in the committee report with reference to it.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I believe the record will show that the committee received a copy of the resolution adopted by the National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissions which is a nationwide association of State regulatory agencies. It was somewhat critical of the activity of this department in the General Services Administration, and the members of the subcommittee went into the matter quite carefully and thoroughly when the new Administrator of the GSA and his associates were before the committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I think the record will also show that the gentleman who presented the resolution on behalf of the Association of Railroad and Public Utilities Commissioners, under questioning took the position which may be the position, too, of the gentleman from Arizona really for this agency, and that is this: "Go into battle for the Government, but do not take any weapons with you. Fight, but in moderation. Do not be too aggressive." This agency acts as an advocate. It acts as a lawyer. As a lawyer representing the Government as a consumer, it has every right and every responsibility to present arguments before the forum in which it appears why it thinks rates are exorbitant. The burden is still with the court or with the regulatory agency before whom it advances its arguments to decide whether its arguments are correct. The court or the commission may accept the arguments if it decides they are right, and it may reject them if it decides they are wrong. This agency of the General Services Administration in acting as an advocate, as a lawyer in the case, should be allowed to present every proper legal position to protect the interests of the Government and the taxpayers.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Of course, the gentleman and I disagreed on this in the subcommittee. I have all the respect in the world for his views; however, I submit to the House that this bureau should not act as a lawyer, or as an advocate of any particular theory of computation of utility rates. Its function goes only to the principle that whatever rules of ratemaking the Public Service Commission applies should be applied properly. It has nothing to do with the dictation of those rules, and it has nothing to do with the advocacy of other rules. It is up to the Public Service Commission to adopt its own rules. As a representative of the Government certainly this agency has the responsibility to make sure that the figures are added correctly and that the formulas are applied accurately.

I also want to mention one other agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission. I note it has received a cut of only $15,000. I am pleased this agency was given almost everything it asked for, because in this day of intense activity in dealing in equitable securities, its function is even more important than it had been previously. This agency must be given the tools with which to protect the investing public.

I would also call attention to the fact on page 13 of the report we mention another revolving fund. Someday I hope that the House of Representatives, or the Appropriations Committee will do a study on the number of revolving funds which exist in the Federal Government. I imagine we will come up with a very staggering sum of money which is in so-called revolving funds which have been completely forgotten about by the people

who first set them up; and we will probably find much Federal money in these funds which could be released for other purposes. I hope we will undertake a study of these funds in the not too distant future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Texas a few questions concerning the bill. I would like to say by way of preface that I did not have the time to do a very good job of reading the hearings.

I would like to ask the gentleman about the Chantilly, Va., airport, since I have not heard it mentioned today. Let me see if I have this situation in proper perspective. As I understand, the committee was told originally that this airport would cost $84,900,000. I believe the committee has appropriated approximately $85 million, and this bill contains some $26 million for construction of this airport. The committee has been told, furthermore, that before it is finally completed it is going to cost $175 million. Am I approximately correct in my understanding?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman has not missed one item.

Mr. GROSS. What does the committee propose to do about continuing to appropriate for this proposition, and if so, under what circumstances?

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman has put his finger on the meat in the coconut right here. What has happened to date is simply this: You have an overrun, and you can spell it out any way you want to as to what caused it, this, that, or the other thing, but it is still an overrun.

The difference between the amount appropriated to date, about $111 million, and the estimated completion cost the gentleman gave of approximately $175 million is going to be on shops and hangars.

Frankly, I do not see any reason why the Federal Government should build them. If you will read the committee hearings carefully you will find that the present Administrator and his predecessor, General Quesada, are very fine, hard-working, intelligent public servants. Some of his people made some errors in calculations, and other errors have been made.

Those two gentlemen have gone to the airlines and said "You have to have some hangars out there. Why do you not go out and build your own like you do in most other big places?"

They came back and said "Money is tight right now, we do not have it, we are up against hard times." They were not able to get the airlines to build them so we had to appropriate $6 million. But let me point this out—it is in the committee report—we suggested and almost told FAA "When you sign up with these big airplane companies, do not do like you did at the National Airport, make a 20-year contract and bind the Government for that long period of time. That is childish. You amortize the land cost, interest, depreciation, maintenance on these hangars in 20 or 25 years, and the taxpayers will get every penny back."

The Washington National Airport out here has made $300,000 net this year and expects to make $600,000 in 1962. It should have been more than that if they had not been tied up with a 20-year contract.

Mr. GROSS. This is money supplied by all the taxpayers of the United States that is being spent on this airport?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I think I am right in saying that.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right.

Mr. GROSS. It was promised to have an operating airport by July 1, 1961. Now they say maybe in 18 months. At least, that is what I understand, maybe in 18 months from now they will have an operating airport at Chantilly.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. The hearings show there has apparently been somebody or perhaps several somebodies who did not do their job, who have mismanaged this project or did not do a good job. Somebody is responsible for this situation. Who is it?

Mr. THOMAS. You are asking me a direct question, and I will give the gentleman a direct answer.

General Quesada was the man who was supposed to be head of the agency. It was somebody on his staff that miscued on the estimate. I do not think there is anything morally wrong with it, but they miscalculated.

Mr. GROSS. Is there no one who can be held to account for a situation of this kind that is going to cost the taxpayers of this country for this completed airport a huge additional sum of money? I believe you have said in your report that this $26 million is the end; that those responsible will have to go somewhere else to get additional money for this project. But I wonder what you are going to do if the $26 million will not do the job.

Mr. THOMAS. They wanted some facilities, and so forth, out there. We said within these funds you get out and provide that space, and I believe they will.

Let me go on. It is easy for us to say this is wrong, and that is wrong, but from what I have seen these overruns are not any different in government than in private industry.

Here is where the original mistake was made. When this money was appropriated 3 or 3½ years ago, the Department of Commerce then was in charge of the whole thing. I remember I talked with the top people in Commerce about this matter. I said "I have talked with some people who have had a lot of experience in heavy construction matters and they suggest you ought to get a top contractor, make a negotiated contract with him to go out and work for you and pay him for working for you, and let him get out and employ the rest of these contractors to do the job for two reasons: you will save 10 to 15 percent in construction cost and at least 20 percent in construction time."

They did not do that. They let little contracts to this fellow, little contracts to that fellow and the other fellow, and when we got through everybody was behind. You had bad weather and other things which added up to the overrun in time and in money.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Is Congress going to be asked to spend additional money of the taxpayers of this country to build a high-speed road to this airport? Is there anything in this bill for that?

Mr. THOMAS. That money has already been appropriated. Maybe we ought to put some tolls on it and get some money back.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think it should be said that hindsight is always better than foresight. We have not detected any misconduct or anything wrong that transpired out there. The whole story is that we were given an estimate several years ago as to what this airport would cost, and it turned out to be too low. Now, that is not unheard of in Government, and I could cite the gentleman from Iowa a lot of more staggering situations than this one in some missile site construction contracts and other construction contracts in which the Federal Government has been involved. But, the reason I asked the gentleman to yield was because I think the RECORD right at this point might well contain the answer of Mr. Pyle, who has been Deputy Administrator for a number of years and who was before the committee with the new Administrator. I asked him the question which appears on page 77 to explain the change in testimony as to when the airport would be completed and the additional cost, and here is his response:

Mr. PYLE. I will answer that. Mr. Tippets may want to supplement it, but I will take the responsibility for this. First, I think the Agency was at fault. I think there is no sense beating around the bush. We did not do a good job. We had some internal problems that resulted in this situation.

Secondly, we did have a series of difficulties beyond our control with weather. This is partially responsible. If you will remember, the previous fall was a very wet one and we had to suspend all construction for a period of 4 or 5 months because we just could not work any of the dirt; it was just muck, and we had to suspend all grading and drainage.

Last winter, as you know, was a very rough winter and we had not advanced to the point we could do interior work; it was still outside work; so the weather last winter was a tremendous hinderance, the snow particularly. So these two factors contributed to the delay. This is not detailed, but this is it.

Mr. GROSS. Well, let me just respond to that, and then I will yield to the gentleman. As to weather, we did have bad weather here last winter, there is no question about that, but that does not explain this part of his statement which says "We didn't do a good job; we had some internal problems." What I

want to know is what were those internal problems? Who was responsible for the internal problems? Who was responsible for the fact that they did not do a good job? I cannot quite pass this off on the basis that "confession is good for the soul" or that this was just an overrun—when the overrun on the originally estimated cost of this thing runs into millions upon millions of dollars. Now, you just cannot pass it off lightly; at least, I cannot.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me correct one remark. The overrun is not going to be anything like two to one. The original estimate was around $85 million or $90 million or $100 million without hangars. Now, when you go to building hangars, you must spend more. It is bad enough. We are not condoning it.

Now, let us look at the overall figure there. It is $175 million with hangars. Idlewild Airport in New York is costing what? $300 million. The big Los Angeles Airport in California with hangars is costing what? $265 million. New York is not doing twice the business, but is on a parity in the amount of business.

Mr. GROSS. I have no way of knowing what they are putting up in Idlewild. All I am concerned about is what they are doing here. But, let us complete the record right here. This is Mr. JONAS again, on page 77 of the hearings:

Mr. JONAS. This committee did not think so, but were we not told this airport could be built for $84.9 million?

Mr. PYLE. I think that is a fair statement, Mr. JONAS.

I think we ought to have that on the record; and hangars are certainly part of a completed airport.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I suggest that you add the next question and answer.

Mr. JONAS. What has caused the increase in estimated cost?

Mr. PYLE. Part is due to the factors that went into my first answer—lack of adequate management, administration of the contract, a certain amount of factors due to weather, which meant the contractor legally within his contract had certain expenses which were legitimate under the contract which were going on all the time.

I think it was a combination of circumstances.

Mr. GROSS. Sure, it was a combination of circumstances, but that does not help the debt-ridden taxpayers of this country, and I do not mean to be abrupt with my good friend from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I am just as much interested in the debt-ridden taxpayers as any Member of this body.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman is.

Mr. JONAS. And we wrote into the report a definite requirement, as far as we can, requiring that every dime of this investment will have to be recovered from fees paid by users of this airport, including the interest, I might say.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DEVINE. Speaking of the debt-ridden taxpayers, I do not think the taxpayers of this country have a greater advocate than the gentleman from Iowa. He is consistently on the floor and is more or less the watchdog of the U.S. Treasury, attempting to protect the overburdened taxpayer.

Getting down to this specific grant for the Dulles International Airport, are we not faced with the same situation in many other Government projects? For instance, they underestimated the highway trust fund about $11 billion. Is that about correct?

Mr. GROSS. I think that is right.

Mr. DEVINE. Then this building right across the street, what they call the additional House Office Building.

Although I was not in the Congress when this extravagant building was approved in 1955, I believe the estimates for that were $64 million; and they now tell us it will cost in excess of $100 million. It seems to me we should thoroughly analyze the entire system of obtaining estimates for all Government projects, and confine expenditure at least within a percentage of these estimates that have time and again proven absolutely unreliable and useless.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his observation, and I commend him for his consistent position in opposition to wasteful spending.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I should like to complete the history of the Dulles Airport for the gentleman. It does not make me too happy to do this, but the original legislation that went into the supplemental bill, and I offered the amendment, provided for appropriations for this airport for Washington. At the time of that discussion on the floor I stated to the House it would cost approximately $60 million. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] opposed it and gave the astonishing figure that it might even run up to $100 million. However, the original estimate that came in when this legislation started, which was a supplemental appropriation, was $60 million. We had been assured it would not run over $60 million. That is why the project was originally adopted by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I know the gentleman was deeply interested in this matter when it was originally presented to the Congress, and with him I thought the cost would be far less than the amount already spent.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The subcommittee is in a difficult position. Here we have an airport half completed. What are we going to do, just say that because somebody made a mistake a year ago and because we had snow and wet weather we are going to stop construction, or are we going to do our best to tie down these additional costs and try to put in some restrictions that will make sure we will recover all the costs? The committee did the best it could under those circumstances. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa is speaking not critically of the subcommittee, because we did what we could to protect the taxpayers and the Government when we found ourselves faced with the situation that developed.

Mr. GROSS. But the fact remains the taxpayers are the losers in a deal of this kind.

Mr. JONAS. What could we do?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know what the committee could do except to have somebody ride herd on this thing. Somebody must be made responsible for failures and internal trouble that costs millions of dollars.

Mr. JONAS. That is what we are doing. If the gentleman will read the report, I believe he will find it cannot be any stronger. How can our subcommittee go beyond that point? We have said that we believe this airport ought to be completed within the limits of the additional appropriation, and we expect contracts to be let with users subject to being renewed every 3 years, which will result in recovering all of the cost.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, because I am far from satisfied that the taxpayers should be saddled with the rocketing expense of construction of the Chantilly airport, and because I learn to my amazement that this one appropriation bill will add 6,900 employees to the Government payrolls, I must vote against it. These are but two of several reasons why I take a position in opposition.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CLEM MILLER].

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask several questions of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas, in regard to the appropriations for the Federal Housing Administration. We know that this appropriation is an educated guess. I am sure the committee has made the best educated guess it could. I notice that the Administration has requested $63,300,000 for nonadministrative expense.

I hear from builders in my area and throughout California of the tremendous lag in approval of applications amounting to 6 to 8 weeks. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency in connection with the recent hearings on the 1961 housing bill the situation with respect to the approval of applications is very uneven throughout the country. A lot of this may be due to the failure to allocate personnel.

On the other hand, is it not possible that the $62,300,000 requested by the Administration might be more appropriate than the sum allotted in the bill as presented to us this afternoon?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my friend that I think he has put his finger on the main problem. I sometimes doubt whether the personnel have been properly used. As the gentleman has said, this is national in scope in connection with insurance all over the country. The gentleman's section is growing and growing. Perhaps other sections are losing population. Perhaps others are static.

I have often thought they could shift personnel from downtown, particularly these experts—the architects, the appraisers, and so forth. The big cost of FHA is putting business on the books—you understand what I mean by that. The big year of the FHA for its nonadministrative expenses was 1959. Do you know how much money they had then? They had $46 million.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Of course, the problem is growing geometrically rather than arithmetically.

Mr. THOMAS. They did not do as much business in 1960 and 1961 as they did in 1959. Yet, they only had $46 million. Now they come in and ask for an increase of $10 million more than they had last year, and they did not do near the business they did in 1959 with a $46 million appropriation. Of course, they did not have the pay act, and that has increased the cost a little bit. This is their money that they are spending and we have been very, very generous, in my humble judgment. We are giving them $5 million more than they had last year. Do you know how many employees that will give them more than they had last year? It will give them 500 more.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. Would the gentleman say the situation has changed? The recent press releases I see coming out of Washington and elsewhere indicate that housing is in for a real boom. The administration of the new housing law is going to present new problems. On this basis, will the committee consider additional appropriations?

Mr. THOMAS. We do not have the slightest idea of doing anything except to help them and keep them abreast of their backlog and to keep houses moving.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I may say to the gentleman that the principal FHA builder in the city of San Francisco said he could put 200 people to work at once if he could get the applications through the local FHA office, now running 60 days behind.

Mr. THOMAS. I hope he is correct. We will try to help him get all the employees. We want to help you out. We will talk to the office here and ask them to send them out there. But you know we are disturbed about the optimism—the thing that impressed our committee most of all was the foreclosures going on in the FHA.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. That is an administrative expense.

Mr. THOMAS. If the gentleman will permit me to continue, I suspect that most of the expenses are nonadministrative expenses in the field. But let us push ahead. Whatever funds they need should not occasion having to wait longer than 4 weeks, in my judgment, for processing of applications.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I read nothing in the hearings that would indicate there would be any change one way or another.

Mr. THOMAS. We do not want to hurt. We want to help.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I respectfully invite the gentleman's attention to the report of the committee in which it is pointed out that the increased appropriation granted by the committee in this bill will provide funds for about 500 new jobs to handle the increased work and most of them will be in field offices. I assume, and it is the committee's intention that the new jobs will go into the field offices for the most part to ease the burden of such offices as in San Francisco.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEM MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. I think at this point it would be well for the record to show that they just have 7,000 employees now and we are giving them money in this bill for 500 more, and that is a pretty good increase.

Mr. CLEM MILLER. The difficulty may well lie in the allocation of personnel in the various offices. At the same time, the large increase in funds requested by the administration may merely be an indication of resolving the unmet need left over from the past. The previous administration sought to avoid housing problems rather than solve them. The fact that a substantial increase in administrative funds have been requested means little in itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, permit me to express gratitude to the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is talking about the cost of the construction of Federal buildings. Apparently, members of the committee thought the committee was being criticized. We are not critical of the committee or of any member of the committee. The committee has a tremendous task. Expressions of disapproval of their work have not been heard. This excessive cost of the construction of public buildings is something we cannot avoid very well under our present procedure. The chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. JONAS], who has done an exceptionally fine job, said that if we had a building started and storms and snow come along, what would we do? We would have to finish it, of course. But these errors that come up all the time in the estimates of cost are so continuous that suspicious individuals like your humble servant have an idea that is a planned part of the procedure. Contractors come along just like some salesmen. I notice the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], is present, and I almost believe, although I am taking a chance, that he would agree with me that that is just what contractors do when public money is used—they come along with a little deal and sell us something, intending all the time to build something bigger. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] nods his head—is that right?

Mr. CANNON. It is a consistent practice.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is just a practice—yes, and until we draw the line some time, and I just do not know when we will do it, and I note the leader of the majority party, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] is here. The gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the committee, and the majority leader are very astute, able and experienced members. It may be they can devise a procedure to correct the practice.

I know that if these two gentlemen will put their minds to it they will find a way in advance before the horse is stolen to make these fellows build these structures in accordance with the original estimate. It will be a tremendous task, but I believe it can be done.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Permit me at this point to read into the RECORD a statement from the committee report for the benefit of those who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and this colloquy and debate but who will not have access to the report, just one short paragraph. May I read it in the gentleman's time?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Certainly.

Mr. JONAS. I read the following from page 7 of the report:

> The committee wants to impress upon the agency that all fees and rentals for this airport, hangars and facilities should be at a figure that is sufficient to amortize the entire cost of acquiring land, construction, maintenance, and interest over a reasonable period of no longer than 20 to 25 years, and that escape clauses should be in all contracts whereby the Government can re-evaluate them every 3 years or less.

That means that the committee thinks the rental fee should be on a basis which would amortize the cost of the hangars in 25 years.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but where does that get us? The airport is ready for use, but they cannot get anybody to use it because the fees are too high. It will be just like some of the loans on foreign aid. The gentleman knows how they turn out.

Mr. JONAS. I do not see what more the subcommittee could do than we did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am not criticizing the subcommittee at all. You are just caught in the wringer, that is all. Unless these two gentlemen to whom I refer here who have so much power and influence in the House, unless they can stop it, it will continue just like the office building over there, almost the largest building on the Hill, if it is not the largest. I heard the other day where we are going to—not we, but the Congressmen who follow us—are going to have three rooms and two lavatories. A taxpayer came along and asked me, What about the shower? Are they going to put showers in there? I cannot find out. I tried to get my industrious friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], to learn what he could about it. He has not been able to get it. I talked to the contractor down there. I have known him a good many years. He helped elect, or erect, the Democrats. He has worked on several buildings up here on the Hill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I wonder if the gentleman from Texas would yield me a little extra time so that I can get your mind off the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. When they were talking about the bathrooms for Congressmen in this building, he asked, are they going to be like the ones over here in the Teamsters Building? He said over there a little shower cost $50,000 to $75,000. I think he bid on it but he did not win out.

So you see how those things creep into these buildings after we make the original estimate. That is the trouble all the time.

I listened last night to our President. He made a wonderful talk, and as I got it, it was a plea for additional foreign aid to avert the danger we were in which, of course, we are in. I gathered from what he said—I think he did not say that, but just from his manner and his implications that his conferees, the men who conferred with him over there—had told him that there was not going to be any war because we were hanging ourselves by excessive spending, that they would take over after a while when we went bankrupt, when our currency became of no value. I have often wondered. I look sometimes to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri, who sits here, and I feel highly honored to think that he would even stay here for the few minutes while I talk—I wonder sometimes if he would express an opinion on where we are going in this spending.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. This is the new 5-year plan. Communists, the Russians, you know, started this 5-year plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. We started it long before that. You were not here when we started it.

Mr. GROSS. We are going to get it, the 5-year plan in foreign giveaways.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. It is called a 5-year plan?

Mr. GROSS. It will be called a 5-year plan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is it now?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You did not tell me about that.

Mr. GROSS. The proposal is for a 5-year plan. That was the 5-year plan which was supposed to have ended in 1962.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I know this, so does every Member of the House, for years and years we have been disregarding the good, sound advice that F.D.R. gave us in October 1932. That is not to spend except in emergencies more than we made, because the inevitable result is bankruptcy.

As the picture comes to me, all these things are desirable, but we are ruining ourselves by continually—the House is a party to it—spending more and more money. You can call it progress if you want to, but we all know where the end is, and until the House revolts and turns down some of these bills and sends them back to the committee with instructions to cut, the practice will go on.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I note that the bill includes $1.2 billion for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. In this connection it seems to me the time has come to take a long second look at some of the things the President of the United States is asking us to spend money for. I have specifically in mind his most recent proposal of a crash program to put a man on the moon. Certain cost figures have been put forward in connection with this project. Nine billion dollars has been mention. But I notice that Dr. Hugh Dryden of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration thinks $20 or $40 billion over a 10-year period might be a closer estimate.

I am sure the President has thought this proposal over carefully. So have I. He has made his decision. And so have I.

Very frankly, I am convinced this crash moon trip is a spectacular piece of nonsense which may very well distract the public from such matters as Cuba and Laos and Berlin, but will produce very little of merit compared with the cost.

And let us all admit that neither the White House nor the Congress nor the Bureau of the Budget has any real notion of what such a project would cost. No one does. Nor can anyone say for sure whether it will produce any really vital new knowledge, or reinforce our military position in any way.

If I thought otherwise I would support it wholeheartedly.

The President, quite naturally, is concerned with national prestige. And well he might be when it is recalled what has happened to our prestige since he took office.

But neither he nor anyone can say what our prestige will be by the time this project could be accomplished. It might well be that another administration of a different political persuasion would be in office, removing any need to bolster up our prestige.

Since I am not a scientist, I have checked with a number of men who are, about this project. Some, of course, are favorable. But there is a considerable weight of opinion opposed.

Among these is Dr. Vannevar Bush, a man who has spent much time in Washington both with the Government and as president of Carnegie Institution. He is now honorary chairman of the board, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

He advised me that in his judgment the moon trip is "not worth a darn"—though he asked me to sweeten up the quotation just a bit.

Dr. Bush continued:

> We get some information out of this kind of thing, but it is utterly incommensurate with the cost. We might better be investing more in finding a cure for cancer, or converting sea water to fresh water. Or we might even try saving a little money for the benefit of the taxpayers.

Again, I am advised that Rev. Francis J. Heyden, S.J., director, Georgetown College Observatory here, has a poor opinion of the moon trip as a likely source of data for his science.

Dr. Heyden points out that the lack of atmosphere on the moon is both an advantage and a disadvantage. It is a disadvantage because it would mean that a man attempting to make astronomical observations on the moon would need to build a huge capsule not only to provide him a place to breathe, but to protect him from a wide variety of dangerous cosmic radiation.

The advantage lies in the moon's lack of atmosphere which would provide a clearer view of the heavens. But this same advantage can be had with a communications satellite which would cost far less and take less time to develop. For the immediate future, a balloon capable of reaching high altitudes beyond the rim of the atmosphere, could be equipped with cameras to take astronomical pictures, according to Father Heyden.

Not long ago, another eminent scientist, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, the nuclear physicist, was critical of the President's moon proposal in remarks in the Washington Academy of Sciences. He chose the convenient figure of $25 billion as the cost.

Dr. Lapp said there are no reliable standards on which to judge the value of a moon shot. But he said if scientists had $25 billion to spend they would rather spread it on more promising research programs. He said the administration's proposal was political rather than scientific, and there I think he hit the nail on the head.

Dr. Lapp's views have been seconded by Dr. Philip Abelson, director of the Geophysical Laboratory of the Carnegie Institution and president of the Washington Academy of Sciences.

It seems to me that when we realize that this moon shot would cost more than it cost to build our entire railroad system, or as much as our whole defense budget for a single year, that Congress, too, had better stop and think.

Today, the administration's spending plans, including social security, are more than $100 billion a year. The burden on the economy not only will create another round of inflation, but will slow down economic growth. At this point, with unavoidable increases in military costs facing us for an indefinite period, do we really need a costly political stunt? After all, the moon shot, which most scientists shun, is the most inflationary proposal in American political history.

Is there any reason why the American taxpayer should be asked to carry the financial burden of nearly half the earth—and at the same time help finance the next Democratic presidential campaign?

I have made my decision. My answer is "No."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time for the purpose of asking for some information from the chairman of the subcommittee about the Interstate Commerce Commission. At the

beginning of the session I introduced a resolution requiring the Interstate Commerce Commission to reevalue and to change and institute new safety protection regulations for the transportation of explosives over the highways. After that was introduced they agreed with the railway brotherhoods that they would instigate an investigation of their own if the resolution was not pressed, and indicated that they would need at least $40,000 for the investigation. What I would like to know is: Did they make a request for any money for an investigation of that kind?

Mr. THOMAS. I remember discussing this matter with our distinguished colleague. He has been very interested in it. I do not think they did; in fact, I am positive. Is there anybody on the subcommittee that knows whether that request was made for $40,000 for an investigation of explosives traveling over the highways? We never heard of it. It is not specifically requested, but they do and are doing this kind of studies.

Mr. BAILEY. I would like to thank the gentleman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to register my opposition to the increased appropriation for the Federal Power Commission. On page 8 of the report the committee approved the full $8,793,000 budget estimate for the Commission. This is an increase of $629,500 over the 1961 appropriation. You may wonder why I am protesting. I am protesting on the ground that the service they are rendering is a disservice to America. For instance, within the last 4 years the Federal Power Commission has issued certificates of convenience and necessity to American producers of gas in Canada, six in all, and two in Mexico. Do you know how much gas was authorized to come into this country daily under certificates of convenience and necessity issued by the Federal Power Commission within the last 4 years? Daily, 1,257 million cubic feet in competition with other fuels, such as coal, natural gas, electricity, and whatever other conventional fuel you might have.

Now, when I say I am protesting this, I mean I am protesting it for the simple reason that under the reciprocal trade agreement, which the State Department said I would violate if the legislation I was proposing was approved, they did not advise the American people that the same trade agreements which they went over to Geneva and drew up in 1957—that allows natural gas to come in from Canada and Mexico on the free list—they did not tell them that the same lousy trade agreement requires us to pay 50 cents a ton on every ton of coal we export into Canada. If the Members of this House expect me to keep quiet about discrimination of this kind, they do not know the Congressman from West Virginia.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask some questions about the translating program under the National Science Foundation. Under Public Law 480, by which our U.S. agencies sell and dispose of U.S. agricultural surpluses abroad, there is a provision that provides that those funds in local currencies can be used for various purposes, and one of those purposes, according to the amendment I helped sponsor, is the translation of various material, such as monographs, scientific material, and books, items of that kind.

The sum to be appropriated under this bill for such translation program has been in the amount of $2 million, and I notice that the National Science Foundation has used only $609,000 for this purpose this year. The estimates for 1962 include a separate appropriation item to purchase $2 million worth of foreign currencies to collect and translate scientific information. Thus purchase is to be made by the National Science Foundation when desired. Obviously, when the National Science Foundation has to purchase these foreign currencies with U.S. dollars, it does not make any difference whether they purchase them or not, as these foreign currencies owned by U.S. agencies are charged against the dollar budget of the agency. It should be our U.S. policy to use these foreign currencies now held in the U.S. Treasury as surplus, for translation of books and publications, and the purchase of necessary scientific and research books and treatises. What good does it do to have these foreign currencies owned by the United States lie around unused?

From the point of view of the American people we should be using these foreign currencies in the countries where we have either sent foreign aid or sold U.S. agricultural surpluses abroad.

To accomplish this, we should have a change in congressional appropriation procedures and appropriate these U.S.-owned foreign currencies in kind from the U.S. Treasury. Why cannot we have new appropriation procedures? I do not see anything in the Constitution of the United States that requires appropriations to be in U.S. dollars. We in the United States have assets such as foreign currencies that belong to us. Why do we not simply appropriate the U.S.-owned foreign currencies and get these U.S. agencies to use them up instead of requiring our U.S. agencies to buy them for dollars, and have their budgets charged with the dollar amounts.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman is right in his thinking, except that the law states that before any agency of Government can get any of these currencies out of the Treasury it must come with American dollars in hand to the Treasury to get them.

Mr. FULTON. The point I am making is that there is nothing in the Constitution which makes the basic law that the U.S. Congress must appropriate in dollars, so it is simply a previous and amendable statute of the U.S. Congress that now says that all currencies in the U.S. Treasury must be appropriated in dollars. When we have in the U.S. Treasury foreign currencies lying there, why do we not just simply appropriate these U.S.-owned foreign currencies as is?

The reason I say we need it is this: Dr. Waterman said in his testimony before this committee in regard to the translation from Russian of foreign periodicals and materials, "We translate about 45 periodicals." As a Congressman I have looked into this question previously and find that on an exchange agreement with Russia we exchange with Russia each year over 85,000 various items apiece in 1 calendar year.

So coming from Russia to us are over 85,000 items to the Library of Congress and other U.S. agencies, and in the National Science Foundation we are now translating 45 periodicals of a scientific nature. What a travesty. We could save money by appropriating this foreign currency in kind from the U.S. Treasury. I wish the Appropriations Committee would think of that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We have $1.6 million in this bill for the use of foreign currencies by these agencies.

Mr. FULTON. Obviously the U.S. agencies will not use that amount because they have to get these appropriations in dollars and buy the foreign currencies that are U.S. owned from the U.S. Treasury in dollars, and our U.S. agencies do not want the dollars added to their budget amounts, as the agencies will be squeezed on some other program or part of their budget.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Much of the foreign currency is available only under conditions set by other governments. The foreign money we have we cannot spend freely.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to address a few remarks to the "Operating expenses, transportation, and public utilities service," an item in the General Services Administration appropriation. I note that the committee is doing its careful review of the functions of this activity has cut the 1962 budget estimate by $25,000, recommending an appropriation of $2,475,000.

From a reading of the hearings which were held, it is evident that the committee has carefully considered not only the functions, but the worthwhile contribution and performance of this activity. While we are spending $2,475,000 for these activities, the record indicates that savings or transportation reduction in rate charges has amounted to $15.7 million for fiscal year 1960, and has saved a similar amount in its appearances before regulatory bodies, principally in connection with the SAGE-Air Force communication projects. Despite considerable opposition and criticism from the communication industry in particular, I feel that the interest of the taxpayer has been protected fully by the existence of this fine organization. In 1955, I, among others, urged its creation. It has continued since that time with a credible record in economies and exercise of transportation leadership.

I believe it is to the credit of General Services Administration that, despite the militant efforts of some quarters of industry to obscure its accomplishments, the performance of this activity has not

been altered nor its organization broken up and scattered among other agency elements in order to avoid clear-cut identity and responsibility in the field of transportation and public utility management. This activity has a duty to represent the executive agencies as a shipper or user of utility services before Federal and State regulatory bodies. It is proper that the Government be represented before these bodies in this guise, which is unrelated to any sovereign capacity on the part of the Federal Government, and I hope that the General Services Administration will continue to exercise this necessary function. I have closely watched and followed closely this activity and I shall continue to do so.

I know of your interest in the subject matter which this appropriation is designed to protect, and I know that the many House Members as well, who have evidenced a continuing interest in the past, will watch the performance of this function carefully in the future.

The Appropriations Committee is to be commended on its extensive inquiry into the funding and work of this activity. The amount granted appears to be adequate at this time, and certainly, based on the programs outlined for the near future, they have sufficient finances to protect the interests of the Government without resort to possible supplemental requests.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, may I make these observations in support of Mr. TEAGUE'S amendment to restore the $5 million cut from appropriation for "Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities." As H.R. 7445 at page 37 very clearly points out, the purpose is "for hospital and domiciliary facilities, planning and major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration."

This action by the Appropriations Committee is most unwise for the reason that the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs has been working for several years to develop a long-range program for the modernization of VA hospital facilities. A 12-year program was proposed by both the former administration and approved for continuation by the new administration and this $75 million recommended in the budget is but the second installment in the long-range program. All this amendment does is to restore an item so that the long-range modernization and repair program can proceed as planned. This was commenced in the 86th Congress and should not be reduced by the 87th.

It has been my privilege as a member of the Hospital Subcommittee of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on several different occasions to make inspections of various veteran installations. When we use the expression "repairs" as set out in the bill, we mean just plain ordinary everyday maintenance. This means the replacing of window sills, much needed caulking, pointing-up exterior masonry walls, water proofing, repairs of roof and the expenditure of small sums which can greatly increase the useful life of existing facilities. To save $5 million here could cost many millions if this maintenance is not performed, when it is first needed and before conditions worsen.

The number of our veterans who are requiring hospitalization is steadily increasing and at the same time our existing hospitals are getting older and there is a growing need for repair. The continuation of this 12-year program is of vital importance. It is most imperative that it continue without reduction.

May I point out to my colleagues, if we curtail this program by the reduction proposed by the committee, or to put it differently, if we fail to restore the $5 million we are but taking the first step toward throwing away an orderly 12-year program which will lead to modernization in 21 VA hospitals and general improvements in 26 other VA hospitals together with funds for orderly maintenance throughout the entire VA hospital system.

The amendment to restore this cut is most deserving of your support.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, in the absence of further requests for time, I ask that the Clerk read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), $430,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished Chairman of the subcommittee, whether he knows if any of the money under this item of "Investigation of U.S. Citizens for Employment by International Organizations" is being expended to hire tract psychiatrists to examine these people.

Mr. THOMAS. If there is, that information was not given to the committee. This money is supposed to be spent by two agencies, one, Mr. Hoover's agency, the FBI, making these security tests, and the other the routine examination made by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. GROSS. I offer this observation to and suggestion the gentleman, that next year he inquire into this subject, because we have psychiatrists already on the payroll of the Government of the United States who ought to be able to handle these examinations, rather than go out and hire them on a per diem or consultant fee basis.

Mr. THOMAS. I am sure that is not so in this particular instance.

Mr. GROSS. I am telling the gentleman they are doing it in other places in the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Perhaps, the gentleman is right, but I do not think that is the case here.

Mr. GROSS. They are doing it particularly with reference to the international organizations in other agencies of Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Customhouse, courthouse, and Federal office building, New York, New York, $59,222,050;

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out page 481 of the hearings to comment on the translation of Russian scientific material by the National Science Foundation. I have been a longtime member of the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House, and I previously was a member of the Special or Select Committee on Space appointed by the Speaker to set up the science and space programs and the National Aeronautics and Space Agency legislation.

We, in America, are making good progress in research and development both at home and in space. But, we are working on many programs that other nations likewise are working on, and on some programs we have spent quite a bit of money and found out later some other researcher abroad had already been working or completed research on the same subject. I would like to point out specifically to the House how little we are doing in keeping up with what the Russians are doing in their research and development on scientific programs both on land, sea, air and in space. On page 481 of the hearings, there is the heading "Translation of Russian Material" and there is the following:

Mr. BOLAND. Now, how much more does the Foundation—

That is the National Science Foundation and Dr. Waterman is the head of it—

spend in this field for just translating Russian material?

Dr. WATERMAN. We translate about 45 periodicals. What would that figure be?

Dr. ADKINSON. Close to $1 million.

Mr. BOLAND. So, the total would be $1.8 million that you actually spend for just the translation of Russian material?

I might add that the $800,000 is used in the State of Israel to have their people who are refugees and new citizens do

the translating for us. I understand a lot of the translation is done in the field of Katchalski, who is considered to be one of the world's outstanding men in the area of biochemistry and particular biochemistry of proteins. If we, as a leader of the world in scientific research and development, are simply going to see what the other leader does or has accomplished in science and research at the rate of translating 45 periodicals in 1 year through the National Science Foundation, we in the United States ought to have our heads examined. This would be a treasure trove of scientific development and a real scientific exchange would be of benefit to both our peoples and world progress. I must say about the Russian scientists that they do a good job in many fields of science and research, and their monographs and research articles are generally scholarly, adequate, and produced for the purpose of scientific research. There is very little on the scientific level that is colored by political comment by scientists of any nation in this scientific and research literature. In the committee we have found those who have been working on many of these Russian publications find when they speak of their research and the results of their experiments they are reliable. Under these circumstances, we have such a resource, the science and research of many countries, open to us. In order to use the research and development progress that is available to us simply for the translating without our having to set up the laboratories and devote our scientists to such problems, we certainly should be making a bigger dent on the translating field through the National Science Foundation.

I have spoken before saying that we are getting over 85,000 documents a year from Russia for translation in exchange through the Library of Congress. I therefore recommend that the National Science Foundation and the Appropriations Committee use these foreign currencies that the U.S. Government has in the U.S. Treasury, which funds are not being put to any use whatever, in many cases. Likewise we should start a new system of appropriating in Congress, so the U.S. agencies such as the National Science Foundation need not buy these foreign currencies for dollars—our U.S. agencies such as the National Science Foundation simply do not use them; for example, in the current fiscal year the National Science Foundation had available $2 million in foreign currencies, but under the rule that the National Science Foundation has to buy them in dollars they have used only about $609,000 worth. I feel that this is an asset going to waste in the U.S. Treasury, and we should modernize our appropriations procedure. Let us appropriate in kind these foreign currencies in the U.S. Treasury owned by the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 19 beginning with line 9 and running through line 16, reading as follows:

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959, 1960 and 1961, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, $25,000,000, to remain available until expended.

I base the point of order on the ground that the appropriation herein called for is not justified, is not authorized; and I respectfully call the attention of the Chair to the language in the report on page 10 under the title "Sites and expenses, public buildings projects."

This amount is needed for financing the site and expense costs of projects that are now pending or will be submitted to the Public Works Committees this year.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is good; it has not been authorized. But is it needed. They testified to that effect. It has not been authorized, however, and on that basis it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOLLING). The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, regarding the National Science Foundation, since the general authorizing legislation in 1955 or 1956 there has not been any need for an authorizing act being passed so that the National Science Foundation as a U.S. agency comes before any legislative or authorizing committee for its annual budget. The National Science Foundation simply goes before the House Appropriations Committee for action. Is that not the case, might I ask the committee?

Mr. JONAS. That is the case.

Mr. THOMAS. Will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. FULTON. I have said that since the act was passed in 1955 or 1956 the National Science Foundation in getting its funds does not have to go before any legislative or authorizing committee of the Congress for authorizations. It simply goes before the House Committee on Appropriations without getting an annual authorization. Is that not correct?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is right, yes. He is very seldom wrong, and he is not wrong now. But that is a matter for the Legislative Committee to handle; not us. The original act of the National Science Foundation is as broad as the world. I do not know how they can use any more legislative authority than they already have.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment on that? The House Science and Astronautics Committee has been given jurisdiction of the National Science Foundation, but we find that the officers of that agency, because of the authorizing act setting up the National Science Foundation, do not have to come before any legislative committee of the House to get an authorization. It is an entirely unusual situation, and it is one of the few agencies of the U.S. Government that can do just that thing, and bypass the legislative committee that has jurisdiction of the particular agency's programs.

My recommendation is that we on the House Science and Astronautics Committee make specific provision that authorization annually must be obtained by the National Science Foundation so that the programs can be justified.

I have been looking over the National Science Foundation programs that are set up currently. I have looked over their grants as well, and I think it would be good to have the authorizing legislative committee check to see that agency programs into the general program of research, development, exploration and science for the whole National Government. So I am going to recommend that, if there is no objection by the House Committee on Appropriations now present.

Mr. THOMAS. We will give whatever recommendation the gentleman makes very, very careful consideration.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct Federal Office Building Numbered 7 in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch, in accordance with plans and specifications provided for in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts, 1959 and 1961 (72 Stat. 1067 and 74 Stat. 432), $23,700,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BALDWIN of California: Page 20, line 5, strike the figure "$23,700,000" and replace it with the figure "$24,927,000."

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would simply put in this bill an item that was recommended by the administration, recommended by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, recommended by the General Services Administration and recommended by the Bureau of the Budget for the construction of a fallout shelter in the new Executive Agency Building that is going to be built next to Lafayette Square.

This item was stricken out of the bill by the Appropriations Committee when this bill was before that committee. It was part of a series of items totaling about $8 million stricken out by the committee for the construction of fallout shelters. I am offering the amendment

to restore an item of $1,227,000 for this one building, ready for construction, the Executive Office Building next to Lafayette Square.

I would like to read briefly from page 980 of the hearings, and this is a quote from the Office of General Services Administration:

> The building will be multistoried; will provide a gross area of about 838,000 square feet and net assignable area of about 540,000 square feet; parking space for approximately 300 cars; a pedestrian tunnel to the Executive Office Building; and fallout protection for 11,600 persons in accordance with OCDM directive issued in August 1960.

I would like to read from page 850 of the hearings in which Mr. Ellis said the following in favor of these fallout shelters:

> Sir, it is my judgment that the reason today there has not been a development of fallout shelters all over the United States in tremendous quantities is because there has been a complete failure of Federal example.

We here in Congress have been authorizing legislation for a number of years dealing with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization. We have authorized legislation to match funds on the local basis all over the United States to stimulate construction; yet every time a proposal comes up in a bill for construction of fallout shelters in Federal buildings we strike that out.

There is no question that considerable protection can be provided by such shelters, so how can we expect the citizens of this country to do anything to protect themselves when we ourselves, given in the budget funds for this purpose, requested by the administration, by the President, by the Director of Civil and Defense Mobilization, by the Bureau of the Budget, by the General Services Administration, strike these sums out?

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. As a matter of fact, this is on a point which the President himself, in an unusual and extraordinary message to the Congress, stressed the urgency of the situation. I join the gentleman in urging the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BALDWIN. I am offering just one amendment for one building. If there is any place where it is needed, it is in the building adjoining the White House. It seems to me that we should deal with realities, and we should get a building constructed which has every fallout protection so that the people of the United States cannot point to us and say if we are not any more interested in the preservation of these United States, then why should they be interested?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and this paragraph end in 5 minutes, with the last 3 minutes reserved for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I respect our friend from California. He is a very active and valuable Member of this body. As a matter of fact, we have had the privilege and the honor of receiving him and having him advise us in the subcommittee on several occasions. As I remarked one time before the subcommittee, if I ever get into trouble, I will call him as my lawyer. He is a very persuasive advocate.

But, Mr. Chairman, what he seeks to do here is add $1.2 million for a $24 million building, using round figures, in the District of Columbia. In my humble judgment, it is $1.2 million thrown away, and I doubt whether anybody can dispute that statement here. Talk about protecting 11,000 people in that one building 8 or 9 stories high. It cannot be any higher than that on account of the rules and regulations in the District of Columbia. The whole building will not hold 11,000 people. How are you going to get 11,000 people on 8 floors down in the basement? All it does is simply add a few more toilet facilities and maybe make the walls 3 or 4 inches thicker. The General Services Administration did not ask for that. They are the construction experts of your Government. They did not ask for it. No; the OCDM has an ear in the White House. They asked for it, not the construction department. Do not make any mistake about that. Get them on the phone, and they will tell you they were told to ask for it. It is not going to afford any protection. Is it for blast? Why, of course not. Nobody will tell you that this kind of extra construction work is going to be any protection should a bomb blast occur. No one contends that. Do we know where the bomb is going to fall? Do we know which way the wind is going to be blowing when it does fall? If it falls in the opposite direction, this building will not do any good. Suppose it is at nighttime. Where are these Federal employees going to be? They are not going to be in that building. After all, the Federal Government is not putting this in buildings in your town or my town. Why is it so important here? It is not going to do any good; it is just wasting money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield. If this amendment is adopted, the door is going to be kicked wide open to others, is it not?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, $14,000,000.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee. Is the amount set out in the bill of $1.2 billion for NASA sufficient to continue Project Rover, the nuclear propulsion vehicle?

Mr. THOMAS. We are not interfering with that a bit.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Some of us are interested in solid fuel research and development. It will not hold that back, either, will it?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished friends from California and Pennsylvania, I had the privilege of sitting with the military gentlemen the other day, and Mr. MCNAMARA was there, and they are going to the solid propellant phase for the big booster. You know what I mean, bigger than anything we ever had. At that time there was perhaps $75 or $80 million involved, and over the long run a figure in excess of perhaps $500 million on that one thing. So there is not the slightest conflict.

Mr. FULTON. If the gentleman will yield. In the 1961 budget there was only $3 million in NASA's budget for solid fuel research while there was $60 million for liquid fuel research. I had offered an amendment to increase the administration figure from $8 million to $18 million for solid fuel. My point is this: Some of us, including the gentleman from California, on our House Committee on Science and Astronautics, feel that for peacetime purposes solid fuel should be likewise emphasized, as well as on the military level. We should have this research and development. So we are really asking here, Are you sure that this solid fuel research under NASA will go ahead full speed and will not be held back? Because we certainly need a big booster.

Mr. THOMAS. In the final analysis the research program is a lump-sum appropriation. I think those good and great scientists we have over there, who are very able, have the authority to spend many, many thousands of dollars for that purpose.

Mr. JONAS. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from California to pay particular attention to the hearings beginning on page 1084 in volume II, at which point we begin discussion of solid and liquid propellants. If you gentlemen have not had an opportunity to read that, I hope you will do so.

Mr. FULTON. With reference to the cut of $37,536,000, and without its being specified where the cut is, some of us want to make sure it is not occurring on some of these vital fuel programs such as the Rover program or the solid fuel propulsion program, that may be so very vital to get the big booster for the U.S. effort.

Mr. YATES. In the last analysis this is the decision of NASA. We went into it very carefully. As a matter of fact, we have advocates of the solid fuel program on the subcommittee as well. We tried to see if we could not make advances in the solid fuel program. But, as I said before, it is up to the administration.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Referring back to the Rover program, which is the atomic-power-propelled vehicle, I remember quite well that the administration in its original request asked for a substantial amount more than the committee authorized. I notice the total amount you authorized is less than they asked for. Will the chairman refer to the part he has listed as the amount for the Rover program? I appreciate the fact that the final decision may be in NASA, but at some point there must be some figure you have accepted as reasonable.

Mr. THOMAS. They did set out a figure, and it is their figure, not ours. This $800 million for the research program is a lump-sum appropriation. There is also another supplemental for $549 million that has just been submitted and we have not yet had an opportunity to consider; I imagine part of the increase will be for that. Under the law they could spend the whole $800 million as they want to. They are going ahead and doing research.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, apropos of the colloquy between the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania concerning solid fuel, I should like to have the RECORD show the following statement made by Mr. Webb in response to questions submitted to him concerning the testimony of Dr. Brunetti before the Brooks committee.

This paragraph begins on page 1088, volume 2, of the hearings. I would like to read this into the RECORD, so that the RECORD will show what Mr. Webb said:

Mr. WEBB. I think your concern for moving as rapidly as Dr. Brunetti indicates he would like to move will be answered in large part by the additional recommendations which will be made by President Kennedy shortly, and which will include the best judgment of the best minds we have in the Defense Department, in the NASA, the best judgment of a booster panel convened by Dr. Wiesner, scientific adviser to the President, indeed, all of those concerned with making the most rapid progress in our space effort.

I think you will find that many of the recommendations made by Dr. Brunetti will be incorporated in one form or another in this national space effort, but I do not believe a concentrated one-shot type of effort aimed at any specific year, such as 1965, will be recommended by the President.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. FULTON. On page 1082 where Mr. Webb said with reference to solid fuel—"I think we had $100 million in 1961." He was wrong. It was $3,100,000. Then when Mr. Dryden, the Deputy Director of NASA, on page 1089 said that the committee added an additional $15 million—we did not. We added $10 million because the Kennedy administration had upped the $3.1 million figure for solid fuels to $8.1 million and it made the total then $18.1 million. There was an amendment for $50 million additional before our Science and Astronautics Committee which was defeated. So the present total is $18.1 million for solid fuels. I just want to make sure that with reference to these big boosters, we are not cutting them out by this bill—that is all I want to do.

Mr. JONAS. I am sure there is no intention on the part of the subcommittee to cut that and, in fact, we believe that research should go forward on solid as well as liquid propellants.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman and I compliment him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), $300,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I tried to get some information from the hearings with respect to the allowances and office facilities for former Presidents. I find that the committee gave the subject the once-over very lightly. There are only a few words of question and answer testimony printed in the hearings on this matter. Then the committee went off the record and, of course, I cannot tell what happens off the record. Will the gentleman tell me about the increase in this appropriation, and how we are getting along with this retirement fund for former Presidents? I will say at the outset that I opposed the authorizing legislation, as the gentleman probably knows.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes. Let me say, for 1961 you had $250,000. This year you have $300,000 for the simple reason that our distinguished former President, General Eisenhower, has only been retired for 6 months. So it will go up next year for the full year basis by $50,000. Here is the way the money goes. Each one of the three former Presidents gets $25,000 salary. You have two living widows who get $10,000 each.

Mr. GROSS. That amounts to $95,000.

Mr. THOMAS. Then you have $50,000 for each of the Presidents for staff salaries. You have $30,000 for office space. That is an open end proposition. There is no limit under the law as to what they can spend for office space but I do not think a distinguished ex-President is going to violate that kind of arrangement. There is the office rent for three of them and this year it amounts to $30,000. The act was clarified some 30 to 60 days ago right here on the floor of the House and the General Accounting Office accepted the explanations. Heretofore they have not been paid for telephone calls and Western Union service and so forth. Now they are. So in all probability, it will come in amounting to about $13,300. That is the way the $300,000 is made up. Those are the details.

Mr. GROSS. So we are providing them with or will be providing them this year with all of the good things of life although they made no contribution to this retirement; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. Except an automobile—that is right.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: Does former President Eisenhower have a military or civilian staff?

Mr. THOMAS. I understand under the law he has no military advantages other than perhaps medicine; therefore the staff in his office is completely civilian and comes out of this appropriation. If he has military their salary costs would be deducted from this allowance.

Mr. GROSS. I notice there was a fire in his Gettysburg office the other day That fire was in the son's office. Does the gentleman know if that office is a part of the staffing expense?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot answer that question. I am not trying to evade, but I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. I understand. One other question: You are having an awful time killing off the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, that is a collection business. That is all it is doing.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that next year we might write it off so that the taxpayers will not have to carry this thing any further after all these years?

Mr. THOMAS. We do not want to write it off because the money they are collecting runs into the millions. Some of those notes will run for 10 or 15 years yet.

Mr. GROSS. Is not this liquidation process down about the size where some agency of the Government could take it over and absorb the administrative costs, take over further liquidation of the assets?

Mr. THOMAS. What the gentleman is suggesting is that the General Services Administration might absorb the cost.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, that is it.

Mr. THOMAS. It is a good suggestion. We might be able to work it out. There are still assets to collect.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed $5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of not to exceed forty-two passenger motor vehicles of which thirty-six shall be for replacement only; $21,950,000, of which not less than $1,696,700 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than $1,129,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 29, line 19, after the colon strike out the balance of that line and lines 20, 21, and 22.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is offered primarily perhaps to get a little information. Will the chairman of the subcommittee please answer, Who are these State commissioners? And what do they do? "Transportation requests for traveling in connection with their duties." Just what requests does that include and for what purpose?

Mr. THOMAS. In the gentleman's State and in my State and others there are no utility-regulating agencies. In our State we call it the railroad commission. They have jurisdiction over the railroads. Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission asked the railroad commissioners to come to Washington or work on some matter. They are traveling on official public business.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, but where do they go, and why?

Mr. THOMAS. Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission, interested in the regulation of railroads, wanted them to come here for a conference.

If they ride on the railroad, and if they made that request, they would be entitled to transportation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The railroads would carry them without charge?

No answer? Does the Federal Government pay for that?

Again no answer?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman mean because I yielded to him he may yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMAS. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. It has become customary here—and I only make this because having served under Speaker Byrnes, a man of great ability and dignity who said there was a rule in effect—that Members had to address the Chair or the Speaker before making a request that the Member speaking could yield to anyone. Is that right?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BOLLING). That is the rule and practice of the House and Committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Pardon me, then. I had not noticed that the practice was being observed.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. HOFFMAN, I do not think there is anything wrong in this request.

Mr. HARRIS. Now I am going to make a point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I cannot yield any more to the gentleman from Arkansas. I want to address the gentleman from Texas. If he assures me this is all right I will be happy to withdraw my amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FULTON. The previous point of order has neither been ruled on nor withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on that?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will answer the question. The Chair made a statement with regard to the rules and practice. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a point of order. The gentleman is using the term "Arkansas" when it is "Arkansas."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, permit me to apologize. Ever since that little incident at Little Rock where troops were sent in, I have been somewhat in doubt as to the status of the city or the State. If outsiders would stay at home, the people in our cities and States would get along all right.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say in my humble judgment there is nothing wrong with this. Suppose the Interstate Commerce Commission asks the people of the gentleman's great State to come here or work on a problem in interstate commerce; it gives the Interstate Commerce Commission authority to pay their railroad fare, that is all.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to see the record left as it is regarding this item. This is an important item, and one necessary through tradition, as the gentleman, the very able, learned and distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, has indicated, to bring the State commissioners to Washington to confer with the Interstate Commerce Commission. However, under the law, the Interstate Commerce Act, there is a procedure where in the case of an extension of service or an application for common carrier service in a given area, where two or more States are involved, members of the State commission are selected to meet and go into the application for extension of service into those areas. The three-State board, as the case may be, makes its recommendations which come to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the Commission's advice, counsel and consideration.

The items here involved, as I understand it, and I am sure I am correct, are to take care of the necessary expenses of the State commissions when they are appropriately appointed as boards on an application of this kind involving 2 or more States in the area. That is what this item is for, and it is very important that it be retained.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his very fine explanation. He is certainly one of the learned Members of this House on this subject.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, since this question of transportation came up I want to take the time to report that the Federal Government pays out some $2.26 billion a year on transportation. There might be some question whether the Federal Government is in the transportation business. This should settle that point because $2.26 billion is a very substantial amount of tickets for Uncle Sam to pay for.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand this is the pass business and that the Government pays for the passes, or what is the situation?

Mr. JONAS. My comment was not addressed to that subject.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee: Are we going back to the old days of the railroads where the railroads issued passes to politicians and others?

Mr. THOMAS. No. They do not get a railroad pass. This is a Government travel order, and the Interstate Commerce Commission pays it.

Mr. GROSS. So it is paid for by the Federal Government.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I want to know.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed $62,000 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and $19,000 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; $33,670,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interests of national defense.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the title "Selective Service" causes me to ask the gentleman from Texas if there is any money in any way in this bill for the so-called Peace Corps?

Mr. THOMAS. Not a dime; not a penny.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002,

and 5004, title 38, United States Code, $70,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the limitation under the head "Hospital and domiciliary facilities" in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1957, on the amount available for technical services for replacement of the general medical and surgical hospital at Nashville, Tennessee, is reduced from "$1,500,000" to "$921,600".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: On page 37, lines 17 and 18, strike out "$70,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$75,000,000".

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in this country we have 171 VA hospitals with an investment of about $2 billion. Back in 1947 the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs began trying to replace the old hospitals, which were girls' schools, hotels, old temporary installations that were built during World War II and others that were over 70 years old. Every year something happens so that this money is denied. In 1950 Korea came along and they said we cannot afford it. Sputnik came along and they said we cannot afford it. Finally, in the last administration, under President Eisenhower, we were able to reach an agreement that a minimum of $900 million was needed to put our hospital program in shape. The Bureau of the Budget and the administration agreed that they would recommend $75 million each year for 12 years. Now, this was a minimum amount they thought we had to use to put this hospital plan in shape.

Now, the Bureau of the Budget this year recommended $75 million. The administration agreed to $75 million. After this amount was agreed upon and placed in the budget, the President announced a policy of fallout shelters, so the Veterans' Administration of necessity said that they would use some of this money for fallout shelters.

If you read the report on page 17 under "Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities," which report shows that they cut $5 million, the last sentence reads:

Funds requested for the incorporation of fallout shelters in projects have been deleted.

Well, I am sure the Veterans' Administration will not use a penny of this money for fallout shelters if this Congress indicates they do not want them to. This $75 million was a budget item under our construction program for veterans hospitals.

For the benefit of the Members, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs has done a lot of work on hospitals, and if you want to know something about hospitals, there are two documents to tell you every detail in every hospital in the United States. We know exactly what the situation is, and I think I speak for every member of the committee when I say it is necessary to put this $75 million in the bill, and this is the amount of money which is necessary.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the position of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. This hospital program has been very carefully studied throughout a long period of time. We feel that the figure of $75 million is the minimum necessary for this year. I urge the House to agree to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. This figure of $900 million referred to by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was arrived at because this very subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations came in and criticized the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Veterans' Administration for not having a definite program. It was as a result of the action of this subcommittee that the Veterans' Administration, the Bureau of the Budget, and all persons interested agreed to this 12-year program.

Last year there was an effort to cut this appropriation by about $35 million, and the Congress said they would not go along with that. This year they have tried to cut it by $5 million. Certainly, if these hospitals are to be kept up and the Veterans' Administration is to provide for the veterans of this country the service they must have it is an absolute necessity that the Veterans' Administration have for this year and for the next 10 years $75 million a year for this construction program. I certainly urge that this program be approved and that this amendment be adopted.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I join with my chairman, my colleague from Pennsylvania, and my colleague from Indiana, on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. If we are to have a planned program, not just a feast-or-famine program, but one where we can do justice to the veterans, we should cross party lines and go ahead with this program. I agree that we should have the $75 million a year for this program.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would restore to the Veterans' Administration appropriation the $5 million cut by the committee from the appropriation for the construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.

I am surprised at this action by the Appropriations Committee since that committee participated in developing the long-range modernization, replacement and repair program under which the Veterans' Administration is operated. In 1956 the report of the committee, No. 304, which accompanied H.R. 5240, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1956, contained the following statement:

Hospital and domiciliary facilities: The committee considered a budget estimate of $13,815,000 for this item and has increased this amount to $30 million. During hearings the administrator testified that the Veterans' Administration was currently making a survey of the hospital facilities to determine what hospitals should be replaced and which hospitals need extensive modernization. The results of the surveys are already startling. The Veterans' Administration is ready to move now and requested $20 million of the Bureau of the Budget this year for the program, which was denied. The committee is of the opinion there is no need for delaying this program because a great amount of work will have to be done. The whole purpose of the modernization of older hospitals is to bring the present plant up to date instead of building new and additional hospitals. Much money can be saved by modernizing rather than having a new hospital construction program.

The committee again commented in its report, No. 1543, which accompanied H.R. 11574, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1959, as follows:

The committee cannot understand why it is taking so long to make any progress with the hospital renovation program. It certainly has not been due to lack of funds. The unobligated balance of construction funds at the present time is $144 million. It will be $105 million at the beginning of fiscal year 1959. The committee will expect an increased number of projects to proceed into construction without delay and will review the situation further next year.

House Report No. 350 by the Appropriations Committee, which accompanied H.R. 7040, the independent offices appropriation bill of 1960, made the following statement:

The committee for several years has urged the Veterans' Administration to accelerate its modernization and replacement program and the increase approved in the bill will enable the Veterans' Administration to move significantly ahead.

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have given this matter their attention and conducted exhaustive surveys. As a result of this work, the President approved a 12-year modernization program at a cost which will ultimately exceed $900 million. The $75 million recommended in the budget was the second installation on this long-range program. It was from this amount the Appropriations Committee has cut the $5 million.

In 1959 the Veterans' Administration completed a much needed study to determine the approximate cost of modernization and replacement of hospitals constructed prior to World War II to meet acceptable standards of modern medical care. This study established the urgent need for modernizing 72 hospitals and replacing an additional 15 of the 171 hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system. The age of these hospitals ranges to over 70 years. The cost of restoring these facilities to an adequate physical and functional condition to meet minimum medical standards was estimated at $900 million.

On the basis of this study a $900 million 12-year program was approved by the President. His budget to Congress for fiscal year 1961 requested $75 million for the first installment of the 12-year program. Congress appropriated these funds and the long-range modernization program was started. The Veterans' Administration has used the money appropriated in 1961 to begin construc-

tion of new hospitals at Martinez, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Washington, D.C.; in addition to many modernization projects at other hospitals. This reflects real progress in the implementation of this program.

The President in his fiscal year 1962 budget has requested the second installment of $75 million to proceed with this 12-year long-range plan. This request provides funds for the construction of a 1,264-bed replacement hospital at Wood, Wis., and a 500-bed new hospital at Charleston, S.C.; planning of a 580-bed new hospital at Atlanta, Ga.; and purchase of a site for a 960-bed hospital at Los Angeles, Calif. In addition, $38.7 million has been requested for modernization projects at other stations.

The continuation of this $75 million annual appropriation is basic in accomplishing the long-range modernization plan to provide adequate hospital facilities for the care of veterans throughout our country. For many years the level of the Veterans' Administration construction program has been subject to changes of economic conditions and the lack of a firm program plan. Each adjustment in the appropriation level results in a checkerboard adjustment of specific projects from one fiscal year to the next through subsequent fiscal year programs.

The acceptance of this 12-year long-range plan and the appropriation of the first $75 million increment in fiscal year 1961 has established this program on a sound basis. Any reduction in the appropriation level below the President's request will again cause checkerboard adjustments and resultant slippages of programed projects throughout the 12-year program. The advantages inherent in the long-range plan to provide modern hospital facilities for our veterans will be lost.

In the fiscal year 1962 budget, $876,000 was included to provide for fallout protection in all new construction in accordance with the President's policy, although funds were not included in the long-range plan for this purpose. The appropriation bill as reported would preclude the use of funds for fallout construction. This limitation on the use of funds for fallout construction, however, should have no effect on the Veterans' Administration's construction appropriation level as funds for this purpose were not included in the long-range plan and there are other projects in the $900 million program for which this money is needed.

The $5 million reduction by the House Appropriations Committee from the "Construction of Hospital and Domiciliary Facilities" appropriation should be restored so that modernization of the VA hospital system can proceed according to the present long-range program without further delay.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

This appropriation provides for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and becomes available for use after Presidential approval of individual projects or groups of projects. The facilities include new and replacement hospitals and domiciliaries, acquisition of sites, modernization of and other improvements at existing facilities—including regional offices and supply depots—and fixed and initial portable equipment.

This amount is the second increment of an orderly 12-year program for replacement and modernization of our existing hospital facilities for the following projects and programs:

Replacement: Charleston, S.C.; Wood, Wis.; Atlanta, Ga.; and Los Angeles, Calif.

Modernization: Battle Creek, Mich.; Coatesville, Pa.; Danville, Ill.; Des Moines, Iowa; Fort Harrison, Mont.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Knoxville, Iowa; Lake City, Fla.; Lincoln, Nebr.; Los Angeles, Calif; Montrose, N.Y.; New Orleans, La.; Oteen, N.C.; Palo Alto, Calif.; Philadelphia, Pa.; San Francisco, Calif.; Seattle, Wash.; Sepulveda, Calif.; Togus, Maine; Tuskegee, Ala.; and White River Junction, Vt.

Other improvements program: Albany, N.Y.; Ann Arbor, Mich.; Baltimore, Md.; Birmingham, Ala.; Brecksville, Ohio; Buffalo, N.Y.; Butler, Pa.; Canandaigua, N.Y.; Chicago, Ill.; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dallas, Tex.; Denver, Colo.; Erie, Pa.; Hot Springs, S. Dak.; Indianapolis, Ind.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; Louisville, Ky.; Omaha, Nebr.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Providence, R.I.; Saginaw, Mich.; Salt Lake City, Utah; Seattle, Wash.; Syracuse, N.Y.; Wilmington, Del.; and various stations.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to see this appropriation in this bill and I hope the Teague amendment will be adopted increasing this appropriation to $75 million.

A continued improvement in our veterans hospital facilities is a constant necessity. This appropriation will make possible the construction of a new veterans hospital at Charleston, S.C. This hospital will be built adjacent to the South Carolina State Medical College. It will be a tremendous boost to our veterans program in South Carolina.

We have many veterans on the waiting list for hospitalization. South Carolina has less beds per capita than any State in the Union. We desperately need this hospital in Charleston and this bill will provide $11,200,000 for its construction.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, in 1959 the Veterans' Administration completed a much needed study to determine the approximate cost of modernization and replacement of hospitals constructed prior to World War II to meet acceptable standards of modern medical care. This survey established the urgent need for modernizing 72 hospitals and replacing an additional 15 of the 171 hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system. The age of these hospitals ranges to over 70 years. The cost of restoring these facilities to an adequate physical and functional condition to meet minimum medical standards was estimated at $900 million.

On the basis of this study a $900 million 12-year program was approved by the President. His budget to Congress for fiscal year 1961 requested $75 million for the first installment of the 12-year program. Congress appropriated these funds and the long-range modernization program was started. The Veterans' Administration has used the money appropriated in 1961 to begin construction of new hospitals at Martinez, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Washington, D.C.; in addition to many modernization projects at other hospitals. This reflects real progress in the implementation of this program.

The President in his fiscal year 1962 budget has requested the second installment of $75 million to proceed with this 12-year long-range plan. This request provides funds for the construction of a 1,264-bed replacement hospital at Wood, Wis., and a 500-bed new hospital at Charleston, S.C.; planning of a 580-bed new hospital at Atlanta, Ga.; and purchase of a site for a 960-bed hospital at Los Angeles, Calif. In addition, $38.7 million has been requested for modernization projects at other stations.

The continuation of this $75 million annual appropriation is basic in accomplishing the long-range modernization plan to provide adequate hospital facilities for the care of veterans throughout our country. For many years the level of the Veterans' Administration construction program has been subject to changes of economic conditions and the lack of a firm program plan. Each adjustment in the appropriation level results in a checkerboard adjustment of specific projects from one fiscal year to the next through subsequent fiscal year programs.

The acceptance of this 12-year long-range plan and the appropriation of the first $75 million increment in fiscal year 1961 has established this program on a sound basis. Any reduction in the appropriation level below the President's request will again cause checkerboard adjustments and resultant slippages of programed projects throughout the 12-year program. The advantages inherent in the long-range plan to provide modern hospital facilities for our veterans will be lost.

The $5 million reduction by the House Appropriations Committee from the "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities" appropriation should be restored so that modernization of the VA hospital system can proceed according to the present long-range program without further delay.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment to restore $5 million to the Veterans' Administration for construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities offered by the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

I am uniquely familiar with the genesis of this program designed to bring the best possible planning techniques to the vast VA hospital construction mission, for I was the Deputy Administrator of Veterans Affairs prior to my election to this body. The program was heartily endorsed by every veterans organization.

It is significant to note that the proposal to phase out an estimated $900 million VA construction program over 12

years, at the rate of $75 million annually was discussed with, and approved by the Bureau of the Budget, by President Eisenhower, and was, of course, supported in the budget request submitted by President Kennedy. So, in a real sense, this is a matter with total bipartisan and universal support, and the principle of this long-range program was approved by Congress last year.

I can assure you gentlemen that this long-range plan of the Veterans' Administration was designed to bring order and precise planning to the mammoth problem of maintaining and replacing the physical plants and equipment of the VA hospital system—the largest hospital system in the United States. It permits sound planning, and it has designed into it a flexibility to cope with the shifting veteran population and medical needs. This plan represents the dedicated effort and creative thinking of hospital construction experts in and out of Government, and it should not be impaired by curtailing the funds required to underwrite its successful installation. I speak in favor of this amendment from the strong personal conviction, based on my personal experience as a member of the VA staff, that the program requested by that agency is soundly conceived and will result in an orderly and effective and vital hospital modernization and replacement program.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRAY].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I was a service officer of the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars for many years, and have been very familiar with the hospital program of the Veterans' Administration. It is a very fine program. I know that the amount that is asked here, $75 million, is a very minimum. It would be a grave mistake to cut this amount, so I wholeheartedly join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] in support of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. RCUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas to reinstate the $5 million appropriation for construction of veterans hospitals and veterans domiciliary facilities. I remember the condition our veterans hospital system was in about 4 years ago, and I know of the great efforts for the veterans of this Nation as carried out by the gentleman from Texas and his very fine committee. I certainly concur that it would be less expensive to the taxpayers to maintain this $75-million-a-year expenditure than to let our hospitals go to rack and ruin as we did previously and then attempt to renovate them, repair them, and place them in operating form.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY].

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I do not think this Congress ought to disrupt an orderly program here that we thought everybody understood. I hope the amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS].

Mr. JAMES C. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, we had in Atlanta before it was abolished a hospital with accommodations for 650 veteran patients. That was eliminated on the promise that we would have established a new 500-bed hospital. It has never been established. The entire area of north Georgia has now only a facility with 300 beds. We are sorely in need of this 500-bed hospital which was promised to us before this 650-bed hospital was abolished. It was promised to us. We need it. We should have it. I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, and sincerely hope it will be adopted. Our situation in north Georgia is tragic as far as the veterans are concerned. The 300-bed hospital is greatly overcrowded, and is utterly inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I do a little bragging on this subcommittee. We started the ball rolling on this modernization and rebuilding program some 7 or 8 years ago. A lot of years when it was dragging its feet we went $12 or $15 million over the budget. So we are in the forefront pushing it. We are not trying to hurt it.

Let us see what the facts are. I hope my colleagues will listen to me carefully. We are going to give you the facts. This is not going to hurt this program one bit. There are 58 projects involved in this. Some are for technical services and others are $100,000, $200,000, $300,000 or more for construction. There are construction funds for new replacement hospitals at Charleston, S.C., $11,200,000, and Wood, Wis., $26,600,000. These are complete replacements along with 56 others. There is not one single contractor's estimate in this whole budget of $70 or $75 million. Let me repeat that. There is not one single firm estimate, not one. Who made these estimates? The bureau made them. Have you ever heard of one of the bureaus cutting themselves out of a job? In the General Services Administration for the last 5 years—we have taken Mr. Floete's own estimates and reduced them 5 percent, 6 percent, 7 percent and 8 percent and then when we got through, he would turn around and reduce with his own staff another 7 percent. They would go ahead and build good, fine buildings. And they are going to build good, fine buildings now. Let me go one step further—but think about that, there is not one single contractor's estimate. The estimate was made here in the bureau. Do you think any of them are going to underestimate it? If that is the case, they have never done it so far.

The committee has adopted a policy and I know you agree with it because you have approved it year after year—we say to the Veterans' Administration—Give us your estimates for a complete project. We want to give you all the money you need but do not start a project until you have the money to complete it.

We think it is good, wise economy and it is going to save everybody money. It will save you money.

On that basis, how much money do they have now that they are not going to spend during fiscal year 1961 that is going to be available for next year in addition to the $70 million in this bill? You notice that nobody told you that. All they have in addition to the $70 million in this bill unobligated and unspent is $49,900,000. So they have $129 million. You ask us what we did with the cut of $5 million out of the $125 million in the kitty. We took out less than $1 million for the shelters as we have in every bill, and that would not amount to a hill of beans. Take a 1,000-bed hospital that is five, six, or seven stories high and add a shelter in the basement. How many of those bed patients could ever get in a wheelchair and get to the shelter? In a 500-bed hospital there are about about 700 or 800 employees. At any given time, and in an emergency there are not enough employees and not enough elevators to ever get them to the shelter downstairs in the basement. Let us be frank about it. Otherwise, this is a general cut. They have $120 million with this $70 million, and they said $42 million of this $70 million will be unobligated next year.

We want them to build these hospitals, good, strong hospital buildings that will last for 50 or 60 or 70 years. This $70 million will do the job.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote and I hope the amendment is voted down because they do not need it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with my colleague, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE, of Texas, in support of his amendment to restore $5 million to the original Bureau of the Budget recommendation for construction of Veterans' Administration hospital facilities in the independent offices appropriation bill (H.R. 7445). I concur wholeheartedly with the general remarks of Congressman TEAGUE and others on the necessity of maintaining the orderly $75 million annual appropriation for this purpose.

The 12-year $900 million construction program now in effect provides, in my view, the very minimum required for replacement of outmoded installations with facilities to meet minimum medical standards.

At Vancouver, Wash., in the district which I serve, the Veterans' Administra-

tion hospital is housed in a group of cantonment-type buildings constructed in 1941 for the care of war wounded. I have been advised by the Veterans' Administration that its present plans envisage using this facility for at least the next 5 years. If this is as quickly as the present hospital construction program can provide for the replacement of these 20-year-old temporary buildings at Vancouver, then I am convinced that the program should certainly not be slowed up by the proposed reduction in the annual allocation.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The question was taken and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS and Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

The committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 116, noes 45.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks following those of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California, [Mr. BELL], may extend his remarks following those of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DORN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and Mr. ALBERT, Speaker pro tempore, having assumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7445) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed, and to include extraneous matter if they so desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SHIPMENT OF CUBAN TOMATOES INTO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently wrote the President to check the accuracy of a report which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer, concerning shipment of tons of Cuban tomatoes into the United States.

These tomatoes are shipped in from Cuba, then crated in the United States so that our people will not know where they are produced. They are flooding the American markets. They are allowed to come into this Nation under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, better known as GATT. This is an international agency which allows the State Department to regulate our foreign commerce in concert with other nations and often against our own best interests.

Mr. Speaker, in public life I suppose one should develop a tolerance for the idea of having tomatoes thrown in your direction—but I have no intention of standing idly by while a Communist dictator throws these blood-stained tomatoes onto the American market.

On May 17, I asked the White House about this trade with Cuba. In my letter, I reminded the President that on March 10 I had telegraphed him to ask that all imports from Cuba be eliminated. I questioned the accuracy of the report on tomatoes, and suggested that if it were true, if we are still importing tomatoes and other goods, that the President halt such imports with an Executive order.

On June 2, I received the following reply from Myer Feldman, Deputy Special Counsel to the President:

MY DEAR MR. WILSON: The President has asked me to reply to your May 18 letter requesting comment on the accuracy of reports that the United States is permitting the import of Cuban-grown tomatoes and suggesting promulgation of an Executive order to prohibit such imports if confirmed.

I have checked this matter with the Department of State and learn that the report is true. Sugar is the only commodity now prohibited entry into the United States.

The Department of State and other interested agencies are now actively considering what further measures, consistent with our international obligations, should be taken to deal with the problem of Cuban trade.

We very much appreciate being advised of your views concerning this matter.

MYER FELDMAN,
Deputy Special Counsel to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that this letter does nothing but point up the dilatory approach to the Cuban trade problem which has characterized the present administration. Last year, President Eisenhower shut off all exports, except food and drugs, to Cuba and halted the importation of all sugar from that country. This reduced Cuban import volume, which in pre-Castro 1958 had been running at a rate of $528 million per year, to a total of 16.7 million during the last quarter of 1960. Since that time, although the present administration has twice advised me the matter is "being studied," no further action has been taken and Cuban imports continue to flow into this country.

During the first quarter of this year, the Department of Commerce reports that Cuban imports totaled $12 million, which means that American funds are still flowing into Castro's pockets. If this trade were not valuable to Cuba, I am sure that Castro would have ended it long ago.

In his letter, Mr. Feldman says the administration is weighing what further measures can be taken consistent with our international obligations to deal with the Cuban situation.

I say the President has the present clear authority under section 5B of the Trading With the Enemy Act to halt the importation of Cuban goods. In today's Washington Post, there is an article which indicates that trade has been reduced considerably through the patriotic actions of several American groups and many individuals in refusing to trade with Castro.

However, as the White House admits, Cuban tomatoes, avocados, other fruits, cigars, or any product except sugar, can flow freely into this country. Even if this trade has been considerably reduced, I believe that in order to be consistent with our own domestic obligations our Chief Executive should use the powers at his disposal to cut off from Cuba any source of U.S.-generated income through trade channels. I sincerely hope he will act at once to do so.

THE LATE THOMAS E. MURRAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the death on May 26, 1961, of Thomas Edward Murray, America lost a man and a citizen of outstanding qualities and achievements. He was one of God's noblemen. Mr. Murray was well known to the country and to the world through his performance as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission from 1950 to 1957, and had since served his country with distinction, both as a consultant to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and as a public speaker of vigor and logical persuasiveness. His voice was heard in effective advocacy of the cause of international peace and the rule of law, of international control of atomic energy, of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, and of the application of atomic military power to limited war, and to the prevention of limited war, through the stockpiling of quantities of smaller atomic weapons. Whatever may be thought of the particular courses Mr. Murray advocated for our country in these matters, it is certain that he did us all a great service in contributing to the discussion of these vital matters an alert mind, rich in learning and experience; a courageous heart, gifted with honesty, vigor, and an outspoken eloquence; and a soul devoted to the unselfish pursuit of the good of all men. And we are now coming around to his way of thinking—years late—but the quicker we do, the better for our country and the free world.

Before he was called to Government service, Thomas E. Murray had established a sound reputation for accomplishment among businessmen and technicians in the fields of electricity and welding. He held 200 electrical and welding patents, and was the head of successful companies engaged in the designing and building of electric powerplants, and in the manufacture of electric switches. He was receiver of the Interborough Rapid Transit Co. in New York City from 1932 until the city took over the subway and elevated lines in 1940. In World War I and in World War II, he contributed substantially toward the equipping of our Armed Forces for war, and for his services in World War II he received a citation for distinguished service and the written thanks of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Murray, a gentleman of deep faith, was a devoted son of the Catholic Church; served for a time as head of the Catholic Charities in Brooklyn, and was honored by His Holiness with the titles of Knight of St. Gregory the Great, and was also a Knight of Malta. He took an active and leading part in religious, charitable, and civic activities.

Tom Murray was my dear and valued friend. I respected him very much, and held him in high esteem. I shall greatly miss my dear friend.

Mrs. McCormack joins with me in expressing and extending to Mrs. Murray and her sons and daughters, and other loved ones, our deep sympathy in their great loss and sorrow.

In my remarks I include a news item that appeared in the New York Times of May 27, 1961, which news item enters into detail on the productive and constructive life of this outstanding man, whose private and public life was dedicated to God and country.

His loved ones can derive great consolation from the beautiful life he led, an example and an inspiration for all others to follow.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished majority leader in his tribute to a great man, a great American, a great public servant, I knew Tom Murray for a period of about 10 years. I followed his work closely when he was a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Later he assumed the active capacity of consultant with the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As the distinguished majority leader has said, he was far ahead of many in his thoughts in the field of nuclear energy. His ideas are being proven out as the years go by. He rendered a great public service. I join the majority leader in extending my condolences to Mrs. Murray and his fine family.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend from Illinois.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I too wish to associate myself with the words which our distinguished majority leader has just offered in tribute to the late Tom Murray, I think that the late Tom Murray was one of the finest gentleman I have ever known, an intellectual without any peer in the work in which he was engaged. After a most successful experience in the business world, he gave unrelently of his talents and exceptional abilities in the interests of his fellow men. This country and the world are much better off for the fine services he rendered while he walked among us. The legion of us who were privileged to know him and receive from him his personal friendship and valued advise shall miss him very much. I join with my colleagues in sending my deepest sympathy to his lovely wife and the children and their families.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thank my friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, the news item that appeared in the New York Times, together with an editorial from the Washington Post, are as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 27, 1961]

THOMAS E. MURRAY DEAD AT 69; MEMBER OF THE AEC, 1950–57—SERVICE MARKED BY CLASHES WITH STRAUSS—ENGINEER A NOTED CATHOLIC LAYMAN

Thomas Edward Murray, consultant to the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy and a former member of the Atomic Energy Commission, died yesterday in St. Luke's Hospital of a coronary attack.

Mr. Murray had been in the hospital since May 19. He was 69 years old and lived at 660 Park Avenue.

Mr. Murray went into Government service after a successful career as businessman, engineer, and inventor. He was also one of the leading Roman Catholic laymen in the United States.

In the latter part of his Government service, Mr. Murray became a center of controversy and was often at odds with Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the AEC. A Democrat, Mr. Murray had strong and independent views and was outspoken when they clashed with Republican policies of the Eisenhower administration.

Mr. Murray differed with Mr. Strauss and the administration on atomic weapons, secrecy and public against private development of atomic power for peacetime purposes. He advocated a halt to hydrogen bomb tests, a limit on the size and number of atomic weapons stockpiled and Government development of peacetime atomic power.

According to Mr. Murray, the administration put too much emphasis on big bombs and not enough on the smaller ones that would be needed in limited wars. He conceded the importance of secrecy when the United States had a monopoly on atomic weapons, but insisted it was foolish when that monopoly no longer existed. Secrecy ruled out an informed public opinion on atomic policy, he held.

CRITICIZED DIXON-YATES

Mr. Murray severely criticized the Dixon-Yates contract of 1954. Under that contract the AEC agreed to acquire power from private utility companies for sale to the public power network of the Tennessee Valley Authority. The contract became a political issue when the Democrats charged the administration with trying to sabotage the TVA. On President Eisenhower's order the contract was canceled in 1955.

Mr. Murray was born in Albany, the second of eight children. The family moved to New York and he attended parochial schools here. He was graduated from the Sheffield Scientific School of the Yale University in 1911, with a degree in mechanical engineering.

He spent most of his business career in companies founded by his father, an electrical engineer and inventor, to develop inventions and patents and to design and build electric powerplants, and in companies he himself founded. He himself held 200 electrical and welding patents.

In World War I, under a commission from the Government, Mr. Murray helped to apply a new welding process to munitions making and to design and weld equipment for the Army's trench warfare division. After the war he evolved an improved type of rear axle housing for automobiles.

After his father died in 1929, leaving an estate estimated at $10 million, Mr. Murray succeeded him as president of the Metropolitan Engineering Co. and board chairman of Thomas E. Murray, Inc. Ten years later he organized the Murray Manufacturing Co. to make electric switches.

He was named receiver of the Interborough Rapid Transit Co. in 1932 and served in

that capacity until the city took over the subway and elevated lines in 1940.

During World War II he converted his plants to the production of mortar shells for the Government. For wartime inventions in this field he received a citation for distinguished service and the written thanks of President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Mr. Murray was named in 1947 presiding trustee of a three-man board to administer the $15 million health and welfare fund of the United Mine Workers of America.

Resigning in 1948 after failing to get the other trustees to agree on the distribution of fund benefits, Mr. Murray said they had taken fixed positions from which they would not retreat.

Former President Harry S. Truman appointed Mr. Murray in 1950 as a member of the five-man AEC to fill the unexpired term of David E. Lilienthal, who had resigned. Mr. Murray was subsequently reappointed; his final term expired on June 30, 1957.

It became apparent as the expiration date approached that President Eisenhower probably would not reappoint him. Therefore, a majority of the Congressional Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the majority including nine Democrats and a Republican, publicly urged the President to reappoint him.

The ten Congressmen wrote a letter to the President crediting Mr. Murray with many AEC accomplishments. They said he had led the way in opening up American uranium resources, starting hydrogen bomb experiments, renewing Pacific bomb tests, promoting electric power supplies for atomic plants and building the first big industrial atomic powerplant.

Mr. Murray himself tried to minimize his differences with Mr. Strauss. He said they disagreed on some policies but agreed on others.

"We agree on the President's atoms-for-peace program, for example, and on the advisability of ratifying the International Atomic Energy Commission," Mr. Murray said.

SOME DISAGREEMENTS

"We disagree about the time schedules for producing civilian atomic power, the need for small atomic weapons, and the need for publishing more information about nuclear hazards," he went on. "The world actually learned about radioactive fallouts from 27 Japanese fishermen and I think that was the wrong way to have learned it."

Mr. Murray explained that he believed hydrogen bomb tests should be stopped because these bombs were already big enough to destroy civilization and there was no reason for building bigger ones. He said the United States should equip its Armed Forces with tens of thousands of smaller atomic weapons to protect against the danger of limited wars.

He also argued that the Federal Government could produce peacetime atomic power earlier than private companies could if the task were left to them. The Federal Government should produce it, he went on, for use where ordinary fuel was scarce and power was costly.

Mr. Murray's arguments failed to change President Eisenhower's mind and the reappointment was not made. After leaving the AEC, Mr. Murray became a part-time consultant to the joint congressional committee that had interceded for him.

Mr. Murray was formerly head of the Catholic Charities in Brooklyn. Two papal titles were conferred on him: he was a Knight of St. Gregory and a Knight of Malta.

He helped to establish the national foundation.

Mr. Murray's survivors include his widow, the former Marie Brady, seven sons, Thomas E., Jr., James B., the Rev. D. Bradley Murray, Paul B., Francis B., Joseph G., and Peter D., and four daughters, Mrs. Basil Harriz, Jr., Mrs. Ralph M. O'Neil, Mrs. Thomas I. Sheridan, Jr., and Miss Margot Murray.

He also leaves a brother, Joseph B.; 4 sisters, Mrs. Ennis McQuail, Mrs. James F. McDonnel, Mrs. H. Lester Cuddihy, and Mrs. Elgood Lufkin; 43 grandchildren and 1 great-grandchild.

[From the Washington Post, June 3, 1961]

THOMAS E. MURRAY

As a dissenter on the Atomic Energy Commission at a time when such dissent was a rare and precious commodity, Thomas E. Murray performed some invaluable services for his country. It was perhaps unfortunate that his dissents so often brought him into conflict with former AEC Chairman Lewis Strauss, for whom he was a sort of hair shirt; but they were altogether necessary for balance on the Commission. His purpose, surely, was not mere dissent.

Rather, he protested against the short circuiting which he felt prevented full consideration of some issues by the AEC. He felt with a burning conviction that national emphasis upon additional large nuclear weapons was wrong and dangerous, and that the country's security depended upon the adaptation of small nuclear weapons to limited war battlefield use. In considerable measure his views have come to be accepted.

But it was not merely in terms of national strategy that Mr. Murray spoke out. He abominated the exaggerated secrecy in atomic energy matters. He deplored the rush into the Dixon-Yates contract that turned out so badly. On the positive side he radiated ideas for peaceful uses of nuclear power.

After the expiration of his term in 1957, Mr. Murray continued to work in the atomic energy area. He argued with a single mindedness bordering upon zealotry that the suspension of nuclear tests was a mistake and that the negotiations at Geneva would not serve the national interest. This would be more difficult to prove; even if the negotiations should fail altogether, as now seems distinctly possible, it would not mean that they should not have been tried.

Whatever the outcome on this issue, Mr. Murray worked indefatigably for what he believed in. This former corporation executive and distinguished Catholic layman, now dead at 69, has an honored place in the evolution of policy for constructive use and control of nuclear energy. He bore his responsibility with a keen sense of its importance, and his candor and courage command respect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members desiring to do so may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding the late Thomas E. Murray.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL ENTITLED "YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961"

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced H.R. 7536, and I would like to submit a statement in explanation.

The purpose of this bill is to improve employment prospects for young people in our country—one of the most compelling needs with which we are faced and one which future progress requires that we meet with constructive programs. It would authorize pilot programs utilizing three different approaches for providing training and useful work experience for the youths of our Nation. These experimental programs will permit development of effective ways of helping untrained and inexperienced youths to obtain employment, and will enable us to foster the most effective development and utilization of their potentials in our labor market. Furthermore, the projects authorized will contribute to the performance of useful local public service projects and of essential work to conserve and preserve our natural resources, the results of which will inure substantially to the public good.

A spectacular increase is taking place in the number of young people entering our labor force. Even though they will stay in school longer, workers under 25 years of age will account for nearly half of the labor force growth during the 1960's. By 1965 we will have 40 percent more persons under 20 years of age in our labor force than we now have. The crest of the tide of youths seeking employment will come in 1966 when an additional 800,000 young people are expected to be looking for jobs. Of the 26 million new young workers expected to enter the labor force this decade, over 18 million will be high school graduates, but 7.5 million will not have completed high school and 2.5 million of these will not have completed even a grade school education. It is toward these latter groups that the programs in this bill are primarily directed.

Many of the young workers entering the labor force will not be equipped with the vocational and professional skills needed to find useful work and compete successfully. School dropouts, in particular, will be in need of further training and job preparation before their work potentials can be utilized effectively. Unless their skills can be upgraded, they are likely to face intermittent and unskilled work throughout their working lives, because more and more jobs in our economy, with automation and technological changes, require increasingly higher standards of skill. In accord with the national commitment in section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 to achieve maximum levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, additional public action is needed to develop ways to train and to channel these young workers into useful and productive jobs.

It is essential in the next few years—before the labor market is swamped by the influx of young people—to experiment with different approaches to provide work experience and training opportunities to out-of-school youth, geared to the type of education and training which is needed for them to secure employment. Today we do not

have effective techniques of tested and proven training and work experience for school dropouts and other youths.

The Youth Employment Opportunities Act will provide training and work experience for a limited number of youths through the use of pilot programs authorizing projects for: first, on-the-job and other appropriate training; second, local public service employment; and third, camps to conserve and develop our forests and other natural resources.

Since the results we intend to accomplish with this experimental program will seek the keys to the future success of our youths, the three programs will vary considerably in their details. This bill is designed to appeal to and to assist young people of widely different qualifications and aims to enable them to orient themselves realistically to the working world of the future.

The on-the-job and other appropriate training programs will develop ways to furnish a stimulus to employment and training for both young men and women between the ages of 16 and 22 to improve their employability and to enhance their chances of advancement after their entry into the labor market as adult workers. Training under these programs could include classroom instruction through arrangements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The public service employment and training programs will develop measures to afford young workers between 16 and 22 with training and employment, both individually and in groups, in public jobs with adequate safeguards that it will not interfere with jobs for regular employees and that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment are reasonably consistent with comparable work in the locality.

The Youth Conservation Corps program will take young men between the ages of 17 and 22 and develop ways to provide them with work training in a healthful outdoor environment, furnishing also the experience of camp community living and educational opportunities. It is envisioned that a variety of combinations of work and training will be afforded, depending on such factors as the projects approved by the cooperating conservation agencies for the trainees to perform.

This program will also have the important effect of contributing to essential public effort to accomplish needed conservation work.

In keeping with their experimental purpose, the programs would be authorized for 3 years. It is estimated that appropriations of $75 million would be required in the first year and $100 million in each of the next 2 years, with the funds divided in approximately equal proportions among the three types of programs. In the first year, it is estimated that this would support projects for over 50,000 youths, and for somewhat larger numbers in the second and third years, depending on the kinds of projects undertaken and the cost of the conservation camp facilities. After the second year of operation, the Secretary would be required to report to the President and to the Congress on the activities and programs authorized by this act, including an evaluation of their comparative effectiveness and recommendations regarding youth employment and training.

PRINCIPAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to administer the proposed act and to make rules and regulations necessary for the operation of the programs it authorizes. He is also given authority to delegate functions to other agencies and to utilize the services of Federal and State agencies.

In making regulations for the selection of trainees, the Secretary is directed as far as practicable to provide: for a fair distribution of trainees among the geographic areas of the country; for consideration of the employment prospects in various occupations and industries; uniform criteria for the selection of trainees; and for a consideration of the benefits to the youths applying.

It is anticipated that the Secretary's functions in counseling youths and developing job opportunities will be of major importance to the success of the objectives of this bill. Our proposal, therefore, expressly directs the Secretary to perform these services for trainees who seek assistance under the bill. Such counseling will take into account the fact that some applicants should be advised to continue their education or embark on a career not included under this bill.

A Youth Employment Advisory Committee of 12 members, broadly representative of the public, would be established by the Secretary. He would also seek the advice and assistance of the heads of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Attorney General.

The bill provides that generally trainees would not be considered Federal employees.

ON-THE-JOB AND OTHER APPROPRIATE TRAINING PROGRAMS

The Secretary is directed to develop and promote the adoption of on-the-job and other appropriate training programs for youth, including supplementary classroom instruction through appropriate arrangements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To these ends, he is directed to make maximum use of appropriate private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor and industry groups, educational agencies and other community groups in developing and carrying out the programs. He may enter into agreements for the conduct of such programs by such groups, individuals, or organizations as he finds qualified and may select and refer trainees to the programs.

The Secretary is authorized to finance the costs of these programs and to pay training allowances for the trainees, up to $20 a week, provided the programs comply with standards which he determines. The bill specifies that the standards shall include the requirement that the program is adequate and suitable; that the training period is reasonable; that the wages paid are comparable to learners performing similar work in the community and that adequate and safe facilities, personnel and records are provided.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

The Secretary is directed to cooperate with State and local governments to develop opportunities for employing qualified trainees on local public service programs.

The programs authorized would be such as would not displace regular workers. The rates of pay would be measured by those for comparable work in the locality.

Public service programs subject to approval would be those furnishing training experience with State and local public agencies or publicly owned facilities, such as schools and hospitals, and on programs for the improvement or expansion of conservation, recreational or other community facilities.

When the Secretary determines that a program meets the prescribed standards, he may enter into an agreement with the appropriate governmental body to pay as much as 50 percent of the cost of wages of trainees on the program, up to a maximum of $20 a week for the Federal share. The Secretary, in his discretion, where necessary, may also furnish such tools, clothing, transportation, or similar items for trainees as he finds appropriate.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Secretary is authorized to organize a pilot Youth Conservation Corps. The trainees would perform conservation and related work, pursuant to agreements between the Secretary and Federal and State conservation agencies, under the immediate supervision of such agencies. The supervisory Federal agencies, under agreement with the Secretary, would provide for quarters, subsistence, transportation, and equipment for trainees and other services or facilities as agreed upon, subject to payment therefor by the Secretary. Medical, hospital, and educational services would be provided through the cooperation of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Arrangements for facilities for trainees used by the States would be provided under agreements with the States. The States would be required to defray up to one-half of the costs incurred for trainees used by the States, as determined by the Secretary.

Trainees would receive a base compensation of $70 a month, with up to an additional $20 a month payable on the basis of assigned leadership responsibilities or special skills. They would also receive quarters, subsistence, equipment, clothing, and transportation, the right to make allotments for dependents or saving funds, protection under the old-age and survivors' insurance program of the Social Security Act and under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. For the purpose of social security contributions and Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits the wages of trainees are deemed to be $200 a month in order to add to the cash wage a factor representing the value of perquisites furnished the trainees.

CAN A COMMUNIST DIPLOMAT INTERFERE IN THE INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF THE UNITED STATES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 1, 1961, I dispatched a letter to the Secretary of State, with an information copy to the Attorney General of the United States. In the letter I asked a series of questions as to whether or not a Communist diplomat has the right to interfere in the internal affairs of the United States by methods of intimidation, perversion of the truth, and a rewrite of history in typical Communist style.

This Yugoslav diplomat in question addressed a letter to me on May 25, 1961. It was typical of the Communist effort to rewrite history and subvert the truth to suit their evil aims. The letter was a bold flagrant action aimed at intimidating a Member of Congress. It contained lies and propaganda and was aimed at casting doubts on the United Croats of America. It was a typical Communist technique of weaving some half truths, distorted facts, and propaganda with an organization in order to cast doubts and defame its members.

This Yugoslav diplomat even went so far as to mislead the clergy and police of Cleveland. He planted the suspicion that a loyal and lawabiding group of U.S. citizens were subversives and Fascists. Fortunately a stanch member of the clergy answered him that there were no stronger fighters for the United States and democracy than the Croats of Cleveland.

My answer was given before the United Croats of America, in Cleveland, on May 30, 1961. It reads as follows:

I received a letter from Ivan Mirosevic, Consul General of Yugoslavia in Pittsburgh, Pa. When I first received the letter I was annoyed by the nerve of this Yugoslav Communist, but then I realized that he is no more than a Communist puppet and must follow the dictates of his superiors. This makes it obvious that it is not worthy of the dignity of a reply. We are aware of how the Communists distort history. In this case Mr. Mirosevic has to memorize the distorted Communist history of the period 1941–45. He has to repeat this distortion along the party lines or else be eliminated.

I am well aware of what occurred in Yugoslavia during the period of World War II. I am also aware of Michalovic's crime, which was that he was anti-Communist and threatened the Communist dictators' rise to power. So he was judged by Communist amoral law. It must be remembered that Communists make and recognize only their laws. They recognize our laws only to the extent where they use them to try to bring about our destruction.

I am well aware of the distorted facts and so-called criminal activities attributed to the Croatian people. I am also aware of the numerous crimes committed by the Communist Yugoslav Party. Of course in their eyes these were just crimes, since to them any means justifies the end.

I am also aware of the nature of the Yugoslav Communist state. It is a Communist state dedicated to the destruction of our way of life. They continuously preach destruction of our system and encourage neutralism leading to socialism (communism) all over the world. Their subversive activities in the Far East and Africa are well known.

I have consistently opposed aid to the Communist Yugoslav state and will continue to do so. I will continue to oppose those within our Government who advocate aid to the Communist dictator Tito.

The only rift between Tito and the Soviet Union is in tactics. They agree that their aim is destruction of our social system and the U.S. system of government. Their only argument is how to arrive at this destruction.

The common factors are: both Communist states believe in (1) Marx-Leninism, (2) destruction of the capitalist system—meaning specifically the United States, (3) establishment of world socialism, and (4) continuation of subversion and international communism in order to undermine all non-Communist states.

Perhaps Mr. Mirosevic would desire to give answers to the common factor which bind Yugoslav communism with Soviet Russian communism. Of course he would have to follow the party line and could never deviate.

I am most honored to aline myself with the United Croats of America. They are Americans and free to speak their minds. They live as freemen. It is natural that Mr. Mirosevic hates these people, since he and his government hate and fear all freemen. And wherever and whenever freemen attempt to expose the crimes of communism and further the cause of freedom, I will assist them with every means in my power.

I consider this matter serious. A Communist diplomat did violence to the constitutional guarantees of free assembly, freedom to organize, and freedom of speech guaranteed to all our citizens. I will delay any further action pending an answer from the Secretary of State, but I wish to serve notice that I will demand, no less, that this Yugoslav consul be declared persona non grata and expelled from our country.

BIRTHDAY DINNER OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 25 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks and include an address made by President Kennedy at the recent birthday dinner for him in Boston, despite the fact that this particular address has already been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, together with remarks made by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, and also remarks made by myself in connection with my introduction of the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Monday evening, May 29, 1961, the biggest banquet ever held in New England was held in Boston in honor of the 44th birthday anniversary of our beloved President. On that occasion there were over 5,000 persons attending the banquet, and the President received a most enthusiastic reception. The respect and esteem in which the President is held was clearly manifested by the large numbers present and the enthusiasm that prevailed. The address made by President Kennedy on that occasion was not only informative, but inspiring, and was of particular significance in view of the fact that it was made just prior to the President leaving on a mission abroad involving two high level conferences and discussions.

I include in the address made on that occasion by President Kennedy, together with remarks made by His Eminence, Richard Cardinal Cushing, archbishop of Boston, and also remarks made by myself in connection with my introduction of the President of the United States:

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Thank you, Congressman McCORMACK. Your Eminence, Governor Volpe, Mr. Mayor, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I first of all want to express my appreciation to our distinguished majority leader, Congressman McCormack. He and I and the leadership of the House and Senate have breakfast every Tuesday morning and what he does with me he did with President Truman and he did before that with President Roosevelt.

So Congressman McCORMACK has been identified with the great decisions that this country has made in the thirties, the forties, the fifties, and now the sixties, and he has been a source of strength and I appreciate the support in past and tonight.

JOSHES VOLPE

I want to state how gratified I am that His Eminence is with us tonight. He married us, he christened my daughter, he inaugurated me, he has prayed over me and I hope he will continue to do so.

And we all pray for Governor Volpe, that now he has seen how pleasant it has been to be a Democrat, he will come over with us.

I want to express my thanks to Pat Lynch, our distinguished chairman, who undertook the responsibility of running this dinner. To Judge Mellen, to the mayor of Boston for his generous reception tonight, to the Members of Congress from our State and Senator SMITH, and also to our friends from other States of New England, Senator Pastore, my friend and valued colleague; Ed Muskie, who is with us from Maine; Governor Notte from Rhode Island, Governor Dempsey from Connecticut—actually I must say that I had something to do with making Governor Dempsey the Governor of Connecticut when we brought Abe Ribicoff down to Washington. We did two good things.

Also, we don't have any Democratic Governors in New Hampshire and Vermont, but we have representatives and we appreciate their being here.

Most of all, I want to thank all of you. I have been informed that with this dinner I am now responsible as the leader of the Democratic Party for a debt of only $1 million. Now, did anyone ever get a birthday present like that? One million dollars? I don't know—they spent it like they were sure we were going to win.

MOST GRATEFUL

But I am most grateful to you. This has been a series of shocks which you have endured on my behalf, in 1952, in 1958, the primaries, the election; and I am sure you are wondering when it is all going to be over. But the great thing is, of course, it never ends. We will get this paid off and then we will start all over again.

This is a tremendous dinner. It is the greatest possible help to us. I want you to know that I have—even though we have many things on our mind—this on our mind, and it is on John Bailey's mind and I am greatly in your debt tonight. Thank you.

I want to also thank Mr. Frost for saying an Irish poem over us. He spoke very highly of Harvard, but I do think it appropriate to reveal that on the morning after the inaugural when he came to the White House he said, "You are something of Irish and I suppose something of Harvard. My advice to you as President is to be something of Irish." So we are going to do the best we can.

I leave tomorrow night on a trip to France. The United States is, as President De Gaulle has said, the daughter of Europe, and in a special way we have the most intimate relations with France.

Paul Revere, who is regarded as a good Yankee, was of French descent. Benjamin Franklin spent 7 years in France and played a leading role in bringing France to our assistance in a moment of need and emerged from France in 1783 bearing the treaty with the British which proclaimed us a sovereign and independent Nation.

LOOK TO FUTURE

Americans in the 19th century went back to Europe, this time on peaceful missions, and particularly to France, and gained from France some of its great understandings of the past and its view of the future.

And twice in this century Americans have gone to France, this time not on a peaceful mission, but on behalf of the new world in its efforts to redress the balance of the old, in 1917 and again in 1944.

I go to France on this occasion not in order to invoke old memories, even though those memories are important, but to look to the future of the close relationship which must exist between France and the United States if the cause of freedom in the Atlantic community is to be preserved.

And I go to pay a visit on a distinguished captain of the West, General de Gaulle, who has been involved for more than 20 years in a struggle to protect the integrity of Western Europe. And therefore I go with good wishes of all the citizens of our country as we pay a visit to an old friend.

I go also to Vienna and I know there are some Americans who wonder why I take that journey. I am only 44, but I have lived in my 44 years through three wars, the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean war.

MISCALCULATIONS

No one can study the origin of any of those three struggles without realizing the serious miscalculations, the serious misapprehensions, about the possible actions of the other side which existed in the minds of the adversaries, which helped bring about all those wars.

On the war of 1914, the Austrians gave an ultimatum to Serbia and the Russians then mobilized, and France, then in alliance with Russia, then mobilized and then the Germans mobilized, and then when the Germans saw that France and the Russians mobilized, attacked through Belgium, which brought in the British.

One week before, the British would never have dreamed they would have been at war and I doubt that the French did. No one would have dreamed that 2 years later the United States would be involved in a war on the Continent.

In 1939 and 1940, after the loss of Austria, Czechoslovakia, finally the British guaranteed Poland but there is certainly some evidence that Hitler never believed that the British would have come to the assistance of Poland and he never believed that the United States would again become involved in a great struggle on the plains of Europe.

Certainly in the war of 1950 in Korea, the North Koreans never imagined that the United States would come to the assistance by warlike means of the Republic of South Korea, and we in our part did not imagine that the Chinese Communists would intervene as we approached North Korea.

SEES VALUE

Now we live in 1961, where freedom is in battle all around the globe, where the United States has intimate alliances with more than 40 countries. I see value in talking to those with whom we are allied, but I also think it valuable at a time when both sides possess weapons of destruction and annihilation, that there should be understanding and communication and a firm realization of what we believe.

So I go to see Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna. I go as the leader of the greatest revolutionary country on earth.

I know that there is in some areas of the world, and even in some parts of the United States, an image of us as a fixed society. Bernard DeVoto once said New England is a finished place. And some people may think that of the United States. That is not my view.

BELIEVE IN PROGRESS

When John Quincy Adams went to call on the British Governor before the Revolution about the problems of the British here in this State, they had an amiable conversation until finally Adams mentioned the word revolution.

Then he wrote in his diary: "It was then I saw his knees tremble." Now, our knees do not tremble at the word revolution. We believe in it, we believe in the progress of mankind. We believe in freedom and we intend to be associated with it in the days to come.

So I come back to this old city, to express my thanks to all of you who are my oldest friends, to express my appreciation for your confidence and support tonight on past occasions, and I hope in the future.

And I carry with me a message which is written on one of our statues by a distinguished and vigorous New Englander, William Lloyd Garrison.

"I am in earnest. I will not equivocate. I will not excuse. I will not retreat a single inch. And I will be heard."

Thank you.

REMARKS OF RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING, ARCHBISHOP OF BOSTON, AT THE BIRTHDAY DINNER OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, BOSTON, MAY 29, 1961

The President of the United States honors his home community by coming to us to mark a birthday which finds him still youthful, yet already seasoned in the testing of the greatest office of public trust within the gift of men. He has been less than a half year in the Presidency, but these brief months have brought with them more than a normal lifetime's experience in the trials of his office and the dangers to our besieged democracy.

These are, once again, times that try men's souls. They are times of deep divisions of opinion within the national community, divisions sometimes healthy, sometimes unfortunate, but in any case inevitable. Of these divisions and of all the tensions, conflicts, and pressures which they involve, the person and the office of the President are the storm center; of them he must be the moderator. These are times of trial and of testing for us all; they take their greatest toll of the President. It is well that his birthday leaves him still young.

These are times of great danger to America and to her traditional ideals. To America's friends and foes, her admirers and critics, wherever in the world they may be, the President is at once the representative and the image of America. At the moment, this places him in an arduous and exacting position. Times of such great danger and decisions for America make superhuman demands on the energy and talent of the President, demands even greater abroad, than are the titanic demands upon him at home.

Such times find him, however talented, in urgent need of the best resources of wisdom and experience which the Nation possesses. They find him, however popular, in need of the most generous understanding and unqualified loyalty consistent with the democratic way of life. They find the President, and with him America, however strong, urgently in need of prayer.

The counsel that comes from the wisdom and experience of advisers is almost bound to be partisan in some degree; loyalties in the political order usually take on a partisan color. Prayer is and must be nonpartisan. No inevitable difference of opinion, no conscientious reservations in political support can possibly diminish the debt of fervent prayer that everyone who loves America or humanity owes the President of the United States in times so perilous. On his birthday and through all the years of his administration, the President has a prior claim on the prayers of all. Prayer is the completely nonpartisan part that every believing citizen brings to the purifying of his Nation and to the strengthening of its Chief Executive.

Antecedent to any prayers or merits of ours, the Providence of God has given America impressive advantages. Our present peril arises at once from the temptations to complacency and selfishness at home, and to envy and aggression abroad, which arises precisely from these very advantages. Hence our prayer must be, and with that prayer our resolution, that Americans will prove themselves a people of spiritual integrity and moral toughness. Only as the representative and image of such a people can the President hope to reassure our friends, and reconcile our foes, as he moves about as the spokesman for America in the international community.

Mankind will be less inspired by the fortune of the American Republic, its material advantages and possibilities, than by its spiritual significance and destiny. They will be less impressed by the geographical magnitude and material splendor of our country, than by the intellectual and moral image which America presents. Nature is fruitful in vain where man is contemptible. To no purpose is the country great, if the men are small.

It is irrelevant and unimportant that America offers facilities for satisfying the physical and material needs, if here the soul is starved. It is not enough that ours be an affluent society; it must be—in Walter Lippmann's phrase—a good society. To Americans this has traditionally meant a society of people who not merely strive to lead loyal, brave, chaste, and helpful lives, but so to live them that the very atmosphere in which they move shall receive from them a magnetic quality—the power to stimulate all who breathe it to more noble thought and more generous loves, to a deeper and more tender solicitude for the rights and needs of all men, women, and children, of all our friends and all our foes, of those who love us and of those who fear us.

In the creation of such an atmosphere and the production of such men, prayer plays an essential, indispensable part. There is no image of America that will be more evocative of our best traditions and our greatest strength, poise and self-confidence than the image of America as a nation united in prayer with and for its President. Prayer exalts man and makes him great. When a strong man prays, he reveals his greatest nobility and proclaims at once the source of his strength and the ground of his nobility, namely, that God, whom alone the prayerful man fears so that he need fear no one but God and nothing but God's judgment.

We owe America our prayers and this debt we discharge when we pray for the President. No support, no gift, nothing anyone

can give him, can be more profitable to him or salutary to the Nation than the disinterested prayers of the devout. We pray that he may be a living channel of God's grace to the national and the human community—that the prayers we pledge him on his birthday may help quicken throughout the world a new spirit: a spirit of willingness, devoid of sham and artifice, that is ready to make whatever sacrifice may be needed, to establish fraternal solidarity among the nations of the world and enduring spiritual dignity here at home.

These are, once again, times that test men's souls; may their testing reveal the soundness of America and the greatness of its President. The times are perilous to all that we hold dear, as believers in God and as free citizens of America. In such times, may the Lord be with us, as He was with our fathers. May His presence be reflected in every word, in every deed, in every accomplishment, at home and abroad, of the President of the United States.

REMARKS OF HONORABLE JOHN W. MCCORMACK, REPRESENTATIVE FROM MASSACHUSETTS

The Office of the President of the United States is the greatest office in the entire world. For under the constitution, in addition to his other duties, the President is the sole repository in the field of foreign affairs—he is also the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces.

In times of peace the responsibilities of a President are great. In times like today they are tremendous.

While the President seeks the views and advice of many, in the final analysis he must make his own decisions.

At all times, but in particular, in a period of world tension and threats, such as exist today, where survival is at stake, our Chief Executive must be a man of great ability, penetrating vision, sound judgment, and more, he must be a man of courage.

At this time in history in the world, we and other freedom-loving people can thank God that in President John Fitzgerald Kennedy we have such a President and such a leader.

For President Kennedy possesses not only outstanding ability, penetrating vision, sound judgment, and as everyone knows, unlimited courage. He does not know the meaning of fear.

Under President Kennedy, freedom here and abroad will be strengthened. He did not assume office to see freedom weakened or liquidated.

The President recognizes that the world threat of atheistic communism is not going to be met by negative action, or by weak and uncertain leadership. He recognizes the pre-Hitler days of uncertainty and weak leadership and the results that flowed therefrom.

The President stands for a strong national defense and a firm foreign policy. But more, he recognizes that in the field of human relations and action with other peoples that we must have an affirmative policy—in other words—forward-looking, dynamic democracy in action.

While the President does not know it, as I sit in the leaders meetings and look at him, I have a profound appreciation of the tremendous responsibilities that rest upon his shoulders. My one desire is to cooperate with the President in lightening that load. For the constitutional responsibilities of his office makes the President a man of history.

Involved in his judgment and decisions is not only the kind of world in which we are going to live, but also the kind of a world in which our children and our children's children will live. And under President Kennedy we can have complete confidence that our children and our children's children will live in a preserved and strengthened America, in a land of freedom.

Our President is entitled to the understanding support of all our people. For with the threat or danger confronting our country, unity is necessary. And the unity of our people under the Constitution can only effectively be expressed through the President of the United States.

It is natural for the people of any State to be proud of a native son who is President of the United States.

The people of Massachusetts are proud that one of our native sons is President. But more, we are proud that John Fitzgerald Kennedy is President of the United States and particularly at this trying period of the world's history. For with his great ability, his vision, sound judgment, and his extraordinary courage, I confidently predict he will meet the problems of this era, and that our beloved President will be recorded as one of the great constructive figures of all history.

I know I express your sentiments when I congratulate our beloved President on his birthday anniversary, and wish for him every future happiness and success. And that God will guide, protect, and direct him.

I have the great honor and privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1962

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will ask the House for a conference on H.R. 6345. This is the Interior Appropriation Act of 1962.

When this bill was reported to the House by the Committee on Appropriations it did not include a recommendation to appropriate funds for the continuance of the stream valley park program in the State of Maryland. This program of land acquisition and development has been successful since first authorized by the Capper-Cramton Act in 1930 (46 Stat. 482). The Senate Committee on Appropriations included funds in this bill to provide for the continuation of this successful program which is now 60 percent complete and the Senate approved its report. I hope that the conferees, yet to be named for the House, will agree on including this appropriation in the conference report.

The importance of this appropriation is clear when operation of this program is reviewed. Since 1930, the Federal Government has contributed 1.6 million in grants to the State of Maryland for stream valley park land acquisition. Local funds in excess of $10 million have been contributed for land acquisition, development, maintenance, and operation of the stream valley park system.

The program, as originally envisioned, is now 60 percent complete. On June 16, the Senate approved S. 588, a bill to increase the present authorization under the Capper-Cramton Act. This bill has as its purpose the completion of the stream valley park program. If the 1962 Interior Appropriation bill does not include funds for expenditures in 1962, the future completion of the program will be in jeopardy. The lands needed to complete the remaining 40 percent of this program are currently threatened by subdivision encroachment and the costs of acquiring these lands are increasing each day.

The completion of the program contemplated in 1930 is still one of the best bargains that the Federal Government can obtain. The stream valley parks provide protection against flooding, erosion and pollution in the streams flowing around and through the District of Columbia. At the same time, these park lands provide recreational areas in and near the Nation's Capital for the metropolitan population. Rock Creek Park is the best known of the stream valley parks, but park lands on the Anacostia River, Indian Creek, Northwest Branch, Paint Branch, Oxon Run, Sligo Creek, and Cabin John Creek are equally important.

I hope that the House conferees will agree to the Senate appropriation for stream valley parks in the report of H.R. 6345. I also urge the House to give favorable consideration to S. 588, a bill to increase the authorization for future expenditures under the Capper-Cramton Act. This bill is supported by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior, and I believe it to be in the best interest of the entire Nation.

CENTENNIAL OF THE HOMESTEAD ACT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. WEAVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to two measures I have introduced today commemorating the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act during 1962.

One measure, a joint resolution, requests the President to proclaim 1962 as the centennial of the enactment of this great piece of legislation. The other, a bill, authorizes and directs the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp on May 20, 1962, the anniversary of the signing of this legislation by President Lincoln.

The Homestead Act has proved to be one of the most farsighted pieces of legislation ever written by the U.S. Congress. The law enabled thousands upon thousands of our citizens to move into, open up and develop our great Western States. It was the one piece of legislation which made the development of much of the West possible. Without that legislation thousands of families would have been forced to live out their lives in crowded cities and would have missed the great adventure of farming land

which had never before yielded its abundance to mankind.

In a very real sense we can owe our present ability to produce in abundance to the men and women who moved West under the impetus of the Homestead Act.

I am particularly interested in this because the first homestead granted under the act was near the city of Beatrice in Gage County, Nebr., which is in the First Congressional District.

I know that plans are already underway for a celebration of the event in our State. It is my hope that through this legislation the people of the United States will join us in that celebration.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, it is generally known that through the years I have voted for and actively supported Federal aid to education. My record on this subject is documented by vote and public utterances.

At this moment we are on the threshold of voting on such legislation. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I voted for this legislation and supported it wholeheartedly. In view of my personal convictions and past record I, of course, intend to do so on the floor. My feelings on this subject are no secret. It has always been my desire to help the public school system and its individual students throughout the United States. It is well known that I have consistently urged Federal aid where needed for all students in all accredited educational institutions, as I feel it is the right and heritage of the American youngster to get the best education possible. For that reason I have also introduced legislation which will assist those attending other than public institutions. However, my desire to aid public schools has never in any way been diminished by my desire to aid children attending private educational institutions. All of the foregoing has been accurately and factually reported in our great American press.

In my constituency in the city of New York this is a most vital issue and our people have looked forward to the time when Federal assistance would be forthcoming to implement our educational institution. With my people I am one in this desire.

Yesterday, June 6, 1961, there appeared an editorial in one of our great newspapers, the New York Times. The tenor of the editorial was most surprising and disheartening to me for in substance it stated that I was a principal in a "highly questionable tactic" to delay the passage of the public school bill.

Upon it being brought to my attention, I immediately communicated with the editor of the Times and informed him that there was no basis for the editorial statement and that it was inaccurate comment. I further told him that I never before had questioned the accuracy of the New York Times, that I respected it as it is respected throughout the world for its fairness, accurate reporting and stimulating editorial comment.

I requested the editor to make a thorough check of the facts and advised him that I would subject myself to the closest scrutiny, that I would assist and cooperate with any members of his staff in order that it may be proved that I was no part of nor did I know of any "questionable tactics" to delay the passage of this vital legislation. He suggested instead that I write a letter stating my views, said letter to be published in the correspondence column but not in the editorial page.

This was not satisfactory to me, whereupon I sent the following telegram:

On Tuesday, June 6, 1961, you published an editorial on school aid in which my name was mentioned. Your statements regarding me are not based on fact. Members of your staff have admitted that they are not based on fact. These statements have caused me irreparable harm.

Thereafter I received a telephone call from the editor in which he stated in substance that the telegram was "inadequate" for publication, that they would not publish it unless I deleted certain portions thereof. Thereupon I informed him that if he wished to publish the telegram he could do so only in its full context.

In any event, it disturbs me that the New York Times, which is one of the great voices of public opinion in the world and which traditionally has been known for its principle of fairplay and accurate reporting, should deviate the slightest from these tenets. I for one do not wish to lose confidence in this great publication.

We all agree that fair criticism based upon the interpretation of facts is the privilege and duty of a newspaper. However, there must be a basis in fact before any comment can fairly be made. It appears unjust that the sincerity of a leader in the crusade for this vital legislation should be impugned in the absence of any supporting facts.

I have confidence in the New York Times that it will not again turn from its traditional concept of fairness, especially in the case of a single individual who has been aggrieved. I shall continue to look to it as a necessary and informative source of information and opinion, to assist me in my task as Representative of the 21st Congressional District of New York. However, there shall remain with me always a question as to why this paper should refuse to correct an acknowledged error.

I have taken the time of this House and have used this forum out of justice to myself and to my constitutents who are entitled to know that I am still representing them to the best of my ability in conformity with their wishes.

EMANUEL CELLER—MASTER OF THE MOT JUSTE

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] is noted for the grace and felicity of his expression. Yesterday, Mr. CELLER gave a luncheon for the Spanish Ambassador to the United States, Mariano de Yturralde, and during the luncheon, he introduced the Ambassador to those present. The words which he used were so graceful, so happily chosen and so well describe the role which the Ambassador will be called upon to play in interpreting Spain and the United States to one another, that I feel that they should be read by Members of Congress generally.

I am happy to include these remarks herewith:

It is always, to me, a happy occasion when I have the opportunity to say some words about a personage of distinction, of culture, of wit. Such a man is His Excellency, the Ambassador from Spain, Mariano de Yturralde.

Ambassador Yturralde is no stranger to America, having served in Washington as commercial counselor in 1945. His education in England, his studies at the Institute of Law in The Hague, his ambassadorships to Ireland and to Canada, as well as to the United States, have given him insights into the Anglo-Saxon basis of our jurisprudence and the pluralism of culture.

Hence, he is in an enviable position to translate our customs, our mores, our law, for the good people of Spain, the hopes, the aspirations, the ideals, of the people of our Nation. He has learned, I know, that because we criticize ourselves freely, we do not fear criticism; indeed, ours is the climate that embraces the cleansing properties of laughter. Through his offices, the peoples of our respective countries will receive fresh insights, which will make our communication easier and our mutual understanding clearer.

By all means, let us continue to exchange views and, in this exchange, value the freedom that permits us so to do.

PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PROJECT IN CUBA

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 26, I wrote to Ambassador Adlai Stevenson expressing disapproval of the reported action of the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund in approving a proposed agricultural research project in Cuba.

I suggested that it was the height of folly for the United States to be providing approximately 45 percent of the United Nations share of such a project in view of the Castro support of the anti-American Communist program.

In the absence of Ambassador Stevenson, I received a reply to my letter from Philip M. Klutznick, U.S. representative in the Economic and Social Council. Mr. Klutznick's letter is as follows:

JUNE 6, 1961.

Hon. JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONAGAN: In the absence of Ambassador Stevenson, I am replying to your letter to him of May 26 about the action of the Governing Council of the United Nations Special Fund with respect to the proposed agricultural research project in Cuba.

Having spoken for the United States in the Governing Council when this matter was considered on May 24, I am glad to give you the facts as they are known to me.

1. The enabling resolution of the United Nations Special Fund provides that assistance by the Fund "shall not be a means of foreign economic and political interference in the internal affairs of the country * * * concerned and shall not be accompanied by any conditions of a political nature." This provision has assured the integrity of the Special Fund in at least two cases: one in which the Governing Council approved a project for the Republic of China over Soviet objections, and another in which it approved a project for Israel over the objections of an Arab country. In both cases the objections were essentially political, and in both cases the projects not only were approved by the Council but were put into actual operation. These precedents clearly ruled out as ineffective any effort by us to defeat the project for Cuba on political grounds.

2. Having in mind this background, in my statement to the Governing Council on the Cuban project I was at pains to make clear that the United States based its objection to the project not on political grounds but on practical economic, technical, and administrative grounds. I pointed out the difficulties and harassment which the Cuban Government had recently put in the way of foreign agricultural experts from various international organizations, and specifically the treatment of a technical mission from the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences, which the Cuban authorities recently evicted from its premises in Havana. I called attention to the failure of Cuba, alone among the 18 members of that same regional Institute, to take any step toward ratifying a 1958 protocol designed to expand the Institute's program of agricultural education and research. I reminded the Governing Council of its own action last December in approving a $4 million Special Fund grant for the expansion of the Institute—an expansion now being blocked by Cuba's failure to act. I cited reports that some 700 Cuban agronomists had been displaced for political or other reasons by the Castro regime; that the number of Cuban cattle, through indiscriminate slaughter, has dropped from 6 million to 3.5 million head; that other resources and equipment had been misused and ruined; and that Dr. Castro had announced his plan to bring 300 agricultural technicians from another country (actually the Soviet Union).

3. In concluding my statement I pointed out that the circumstances I had mentioned had, in the main, arisen or come to light since the managing director and his staff had studied the Cuban project, and that action on the matter should therefore be delayed pending a review in the light of the new facts. "We are confident, therefore," I concluded, "that the project will not proceed until the staff has satisfied itself about the questions we have raised and is certain that the project can be completed successfully to the ultimate benefit of the Cuban people."

4. The matter is by no means concluded. Approval by the Governing Council authorizes the managing director to enter into detailed negotiations, looking toward a possible plan of operations. Until such a plan, meeting the rigorous standards of the Special Fund is mutually agreed upon, the project is not a reality. Strict adherence to these standards is further buttressed by the fact that the United States was not alone in the discussion in the Governing Council, since several other delegations emphasized the need for careful consideration of the objections which we had raised. Representatives of most of the nations on the Governing Council felt it would be unwise to take the unprecedented action of forcing a vote within the council on the Cuba project for two reasons. First, it would be interpreted as a violation of the prohibition against political criteria set forth in the enabling resolution. Second, it is normal practice for the staff of the Special Fund to review projects from a technical viewpoint even after approval by the Governing Council. For these reasons, the U.S. delegate objected to the Cuban project on economic, technical, and administrative grounds and obtained assurances that these points will be investigated carefully before any action is taken.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP M. KLUTZNICK,
U.S. Representative in the Economic and Social Council.

This report is unsatisfactory to the extent that it places the objections of the United States solely upon economic, technical, and administrative grounds. Nevertheless, I welcome the assurance of the U.S. representative in the Economic and Social Council that the objections of the United States are holding up this project.

It may be the part of diplomacy to base our objections upon economic, technical, and administrative grounds, but our basic objection should be on the grounds of our national interest against any proposal which would directly or indirectly assist the Communist penetration of the Western Hemisphere.

NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE ENDORSES IDEA OF AMERICAN EXPORT CREDITS GUARANTY CORP.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York Board of Trade has adopted a resolution recommending the creation of an American Export Credits Guaranty Corp.

This resolution was adopted on May 11, 1961. On May 16, 1961, my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] and I introduced H.R. 7103 and H.R. 7102, respectively, to accomplish this purpose.

The following statement of the board of trade presents some excellent reasons for the passage of H.R. 7102. It was issued on May 16:

The New York Board of Trade, the civic association representing the businesses and industries in the New York area, has called upon Congress to set up a national system for issuance of export credit guarantees insuring American exporters of goods and services. The board expressed itself in favor of the plan devised by the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees. This plan is embodied in a bill introduced today in the House of Representatives by Congressman ABRAHAM J. MULTER, of New York, and Congressman WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, of New Jersey.

Philip F. Swart, president of the board, announced the action of the board's directors and said that messages are being sent to the New York Congressmen and Government officials concerned with international economic affairs.

The board said there is a continuing urgent need for improved export credit guarantee facilities. (Export credit guarantees are a form of insurance that reimburses an exporter for losses that result from political hazards, such as war, or blockage of currency transfer, or commercial conditions, such as bankruptcy of the buyer.)

The board said it acted because of mounting competition making deeper inroads into traditional markets for U.S. products and services and our current balance-of-payments deficit. It called for a program which will contribute to the expansion of U.S. exports on a sound basis. The board said: "There is also a need to modernize and adapt American export credit equipment to put our exporters on an equal footing with the facilities available to their foreign competitors."

In supporting the export credit guarantee proposal advanced by the National Coordinating Committee, the New York Board of Trade declares itself in favor of a federally chartered corporation that would be set up with private capital. The corporation would have the right to borrow from the U.S. Treasury to cover political-risk losses beyond current capacity to handle. This borrowing privilege would entitle the Government to a single representative on the corporation's board of directors.

It also was reviewed in "The United States and World Trade Report" of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which called it the most significant in terms of its breadth of support among the alternative methods of providing export credit guarantees.

Currently, the Export-Import Bank, a U.S. agency, provides the only political-risk coverage of export credits. In most of the leading trading nations of the world, governmental agencies have been established to give their own exporters guarantee facilities, generally much broader and more flexible than those available to American exporters. Such facilities largely determine the freedom of credit terms an exporter can extend to his customers. Therefore, they are an important factor in deciding which export closes a sale in most world markets today.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK BOARD OF TRADE, INC.

Whereas, believing that, with mounting competition making deeper inroads into traditional markets for U.S. products and services and with our current balance-of-payments deficit, there is a continuing urgent need for a program which will contribute to the expansion of U.S. exports on a sound basis, and that there is also a need to modernize and adapt American export credit equipment to prevailing world market conditions by providing U.S. exporters with facilities which they do not now possess, but which are in effective use by all other principal trading nations; and

Whereas having duly considered a proposal prepared by the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees, providing for the creation of a federally chartered

American Export Credit Guaranty Corporation for the furnishing of such facilities, with Government support as therein provided: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade, Inc., urge the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing a national system for issuance of export credit guarantees insuring American exporters of goods and services against loss due to:

1. Political risks, including restriction on the transfer of payments from the buyer's country to the United States; war, revolution and expropriation in the debtor's country; and other governmental action which is beyond the control of the exporter or the foreign buyer;

2. Commercial credit risks, including insolvency and protracted default of the buyer, his failure or refusal to accept goods, and any other loss (other than a political risk loss) not normally insurable with insurers covering other than export credit risk; and be it further

Resolved, That the New York Board of Trade, Inc. favors the export credits guaranty plan prepared by the National Coordinating Committee for Export Credit Guarantees substantially in the form presented to this board providing for the creation of a federally chartered American Export Credits Guaranty Corporation and for the support thereof by the U.S. Government in the manner and to the extent provided in the committee's plan; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State; the Secretary of the Treasury, U.S. Treasury; the Secretary of Commerce, U.S. Department of Commerce; the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture; the Secretary of Labor, U.S. Department of Labor; the Director of the International Cooperation Administration; the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System; the President and Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. JONAS to include in his remarks today certain tables.

Mr. RANDALL.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PELLY in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CORMAN) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky.

Mr. MCDONOUGH.

Mr. DADDARIO.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on June 6, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 1346. An act for the relief of John Napoli;

H.R. 4327. An act to amend section 714 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office;

H.R. 4940. An act relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; and

H.R. 5178. An act for the relief of the Reynolds Feal Corp., New York, N.Y., and the Lydick Roofing Co., Fort Worth Tex.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

995. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting the semiannual report of the Export-Import Bank of Washington as of the close of business, December 31, 1960, pursuant to the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

996. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

997. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create trial boards for the U.S. Park Police, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

998. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and personal property to the State of Washington"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

999. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, relative to the application for a loan by the Klamath Basin Improvement District in Klamath County, Oreg., for the construction of extensions to the Klamath project, pursuant to the Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1000. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill for the relief of Joe Kawakami"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1001. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 1(f) of the act of June 1, 1960 (74 Stat. 151); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1002. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize pilot training and employment programs for youth including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2730. A bill to repeal section 791 of title 18 of the United States Code so as to extend the application of chapter 37 of title 18, relating to espionage and censorship; without amendment (Rept. No. 452). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. POWELL: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 6882. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; without amendment (Rept. No. 453). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 74. A bill to reimburse the city of New York for expenditure of funds to rehabilitate slip 7 in the city of New York for use by the U.S. Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 454). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4528. A bill for the relief of certain persons involved in the negotiation of forged or fraudulent Government checks issued at Parks Air Force Base, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 455). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7099. A bill to validate payments of certain per diem allowances made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard while serving in special programs overseas; without amendment (Rept. No. 456). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 5486. A bill to prohibit the examination in District of Columbia courts of any minister of religion in connection with any communication made to him in his professional capacity, without the consent of the party to such communication; with amendment (Rept. No. 457). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7154. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to regulate the keeping and running at large of dogs; without amendment (Rept. No. 458). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7218. A bill to provide that the authorized strength of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be not less than 3,000 officers and members; without amendment (Rept. No. 459). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MCMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 7053. A bill to provide for the admission of certain evidence in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 460). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 330. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 7446, a bill to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain excise-tax rates; without amendment (Rept. No. 461). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 7529. A bill to provide for the denial of passports to persons knowingly engaged in activities intended to further the international Communist movement; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 7530. A bill to amend the Employment Act of 1946 to establish policies with respect to productive capital investments of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 7531. A bill for the relief of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURRAY:

H.R. 7532. A bill to amend title 39 of the United States Code relating to funds received

by the Post Office Department from payments for damage to personal property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NYGAARD:

H.R. 7533. A bill to provide for the division of the State of North Dakota into two judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 7534. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7535. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7536. A bill to authorize pilot training and employment programs for youths including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7537. A bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHORT:

H.R. 7538. A bill to provide for the establishment of a spring wheat quality research laboratory in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.R. 7539. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ALFORD:

H.R. 7540. A bill relating to the transportation of mail by highway post office service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 7541. A bill to authorize pilot training and employment programs for youth including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 7542. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children; to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 7543. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit retirement by all persons in the United States at the age of 60 years with benefits that will assure full participation by elderly persons generally in prevailing national standards of living, to provide like benefits for disabled persons, and to provide benefits for certain female heads of families and for certain children; to provide for the establishment and operation of this system of social security by an equitable gross income tax; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 7544. A bill to amend section 202(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for partial exemption from the provisions of part II of such act of terminal area motor carrier operations performed by or for common carriers by water in interstate commerce subject to the Shipping Act, 1916, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7545. A bill declaring the Communist Party and similar revolutionary organizations illegal; making membership in, or participation in the revolutionary activity of, the Communist Party or any other organization furthering the revolutionary conspiracy by force and violence a criminal offense; and providing penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7546. A bill to amend section 109 of title 38, United States Code, to provide benefits for members of the armed forces of nations allied with the United States in World War I or World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 7547. A bill to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7548. A bill to exempt from coverage under the old-age, survivors and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WEAVER:

H.J. Res. 442. Joint resolution to provide for the observance of the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H. Con. Res. 326. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the proposed trade by Cuba of prisoners for tractors; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DAWSON:

H. Con. Res. 327. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 198 of the 84th Congress, entitled "The Commission on Intergovernmental Relations"; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 328. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to call a national conference on commercial fishing; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H. Res. 328. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 transmitted to Congress by the President on May 24, 1961; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois:

H. Res. 329. Resolution to pay the Clerk of the House for expenses incurred in preparing contested-election cases; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STEED:

H. Res. 331. Resolution relating to the basic compensation of the stationery clerk and the assistant stationery clerk; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 7549. A bill for the relief of the Lewis Invisible Machine Stitch Co., Inc., now known as Lewis Sewing Machine Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7550. A bill to validate the conveyance of certain land in the State of California by the Central Pacific Railway to Edna Rhodes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAY:

H.R. 7551. A bill to authorize Maj. Vincent Philip Paolucci, U.S. Army, to accept the title of Knight of the Order of the Italian Republic, bestowed upon him by the Government of Italy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7552. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Romuald Czyz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS of Colorado:

H.R. 7553. A bill for the relief of Chang Sheng (also known as Rafael Chang Sing); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H.R. 7554. A bill for the relief of Mee Jin Lew (also known as Lew Pui King); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND:

H.R. 7555. A bill for the relief of Esther Khoe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 7556. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. A. Lewis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERROW:

H.R. 7557. A bill for the relief of Demetrios Batistas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

172. By Mr. MULTER: Petition of the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Communist China to the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

173. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francisco Ghigliotty, Guayanilla, P.R., relative to an investigation of unjust treatment of government of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

174. Also, petition of Chyung Sang Bak, Pusan, Korea, relative to a redress of grievance relating to a claim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

175. Also, petition of Thalia S. Woods, Spencer County Democratic Women's Club, Gentryville, Ind., relative to a resolution adopted by the Spencer County (Ind.) Democratic Women's Club supporting the achievements of the President and the Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 7, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all mankind, with minds burdened for the Nation and for the world, we turn to Thee in this baffling hour, praying that in this fear-haunted earth the flame of our faith may not grow dim. Unworthy though we are, Thou hast made us keepers for our day of the holy torch of freedom the Founding Fathers kindled with their lives.

We would share that sacred fire until tyranny everywhere is consumed and thus all the nations of the earth be blessed.

Steel our wills and steady our hands with power and wisdom, that with eager

joy we may dedicate the Nation's strength to throw open the gates of a new life for Thy children everywhere.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 6, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HOWARD W. ROBISON, of New York, as a member of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 1852) to authorize appropriations for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. GAVIN, Mr. VAN ZANDT, and Mr. BATES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 277) for the relief of Erica Barth, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1353. An act for the relief of Max Bleier;

H.R. 1399. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan;

H.R. 1477. An act for the relief of Mansurch Rinehart;

H.R. 1620. An act for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa;

H.R. 1626. An act for the relief of Jack Konko;

H.R. 1687. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc.;

H.R. 1891. An act for the relief of Enlc. William J. Stevens;

H.R. 1911. An act for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena;

H.R. 1915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto;

H.R. 2686. An act for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3101. An act for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps;

H.R. 4557. An act for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez;

H.R. 4565. An act for the relief of Nora M. Hammond;

H.R. 4639. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter;

H.R. 4872. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray;

H.R. 6224. An act for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey;

H.R. 6452. An act for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Macqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman;

H.R. 6453. An act for the relief of Earl Gupton;

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Charles H. Stype;

H.R. 7444. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 133. An act giving the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; and

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9-15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1353. An act for the relief of Max Bleier;

H.R. 1399. An act for the relief of Mrs. Josefa Pidlaoan and daughter, Annabelle Pidlaoan;

H.R. 1477. An act for the relief of Mansurch Rinehart;

H.R. 1620. An act for the relief of Kejen Pi Corsa;

H.R. 1626. An act for the relief of Jack Konko;

H.R. 1687. An act for the relief of World Games, Inc.;

H.R. 1891. An act for the relief of Enlc. William J. Stevens;

H.R. 1911. An act for the relief of Ricaredo Bernabe Dela Cena;

H.R. 1915. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sode Hatta;

H.R. 2360. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tome Takamoto;

H.R. 2686. An act for the relief of Louis J. Rosenstein;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Piantadosi);

H.R. 3101. An act for the relief of David Riley, lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps;

H.R. 4557. An act for the relief of Manuel Martinez-Lopez;

H.R. 4565. An act for the relief of Nora M. Hammond;

H.R. 4639. An act for the relief of Rear Adm. Carl H. Cotter;

H.R. 4872. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. James H. McMurray;

H.R. 6224. An act for the relief of Miss Elsie Robey;

H.R. 6452. An act for the relief of Nissim S. Tawil, Esther Tawil (nee Goldman), Solomn Tawil, Isaac Tawil, Kathy Tawil, Macqueline Tawil, and Sarina Goldman;

H.R. 6453. An act for the relief of Earl Gupton; and

H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Charles H. Stype; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7444. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.J. Res. 437. Joint resolution relating to the time for filing a report on renegotiation by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be the usual morning hour for the transaction of routine business. I ask unanimous consent that statements in connection therewith be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider, under the new reports, the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

Clarence F. Pautzke, of Washington, to be Commissioner of Fish and Wildlife, Department of the Interior; and

William E. Blankinship, Jr., and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar, under the new reports, will be stated.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. attorneys.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

That completes the new reports on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize pilot training and employment programs for youth including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF ACCOUNTING SYSTEM AND RELATED MATTERS, OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR, HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of accounting system and related matters, Office of the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated June 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

CREATION OF TRIAL BOARDS FOR U.S. PARK POLICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to create Trial Boards for the U.S. Park Police, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS AND PERSONAL PROPERTY TO STATE OF WASHINGTON

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands and personal property to the State of Washington (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Archivist of the United States on a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, favoring the retention of the 27½-percent depletion provision on oil and gas production in income tax laws. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 554

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to retain the 27½-percent depletion provision on oil and gas production in income tax laws; directing distribution of copies

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom, did enact percentage depletion legislation on oil and gas production some 35 years ago in order to enable the great oil industry of this Nation to find more oil; and

"Whereas Congress took this action of providing percentage depletion, which today touches over 100 extractive industries, in order to assure said industries of a means by which depleted capital could be regained; and

"Whereas percentage depletion has provided the incentive which has enabled the oil industry to maintain the oil production necessary to support our national economy and meet our military needs; and

"Whereas experts agree that the national demand for petroleum production in years to come will continue to grow as demand outstrips reserve with an estimated need in an amount in excess of 14 million barrels per day being consumed in the United States by the year 1967; and

"Whereas the forecast need for the year 1967 challenges the oil industry to find 100,000 barrels of oil every 15 minutes, and, in order to keep abreast with demands, the industry must double the present rate of oil discovery by this same future date; and

"Whereas percentage depletion applies only to the field value of the crude oil and raw gas, and only to the extent it can be produced at a profit; and

"Whereas over a long period of time without percentage depletion and the incentive it provides to find new sources of crude, a steadily shrinking oil industry, laboring under an inequitable tax burden, would pay fewer dollars per year in Federal taxes, and State and local revenues would be adversely affected immediately; and

"Whereas a cut in percentage depletion would surely diminish petroleum resources, unless the price of every product made from petroleum, as well as the cost of services provided through petroleum, were to be increased substantially to compensate for the cut; and

"Whereas percentage depletion has accomplished exactly what the Congress of the United States intended it to do—it has enabled the oil industry to find oil: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Oklahoma Legislature (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the 87th Congress of the United States be and is hereby memorialized to retain the percentage depletion allowance at 27½ percent, that percentage which it has wisely and steadfastly maintained for a period of 35 years, in order to assure this Nation of an adequate supply of oil reserves.

"SEC. 2. That duly authenticated copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Honorable John F. Kennedy; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN; to the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD; to the minority leader of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable EVERETT DIRKSEN; to the minority leader of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Honorable CHARLES HALLECK; to the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman WILBUR MILLS; to the minority chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Congressman NOAH MASON; and to every member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 606. A bill to provide for the construction of a shellfisheries research center at Milford, Conn. (Rept. No. 354);

S. 1931. A bill to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance (Rept. No. 351); and

H.R. 2457. An act to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to clarify the construction subsidy provisions with respect to reconstruction, reconditioning, and conversion, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 352).

By Mr. KERR, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 120. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for a more effective program of water pollution control (Rept. No. 353).

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 156) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Commerce, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-seventh Congress, for the purposes specified in section 134(a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, $10,000 in addition to the amount authorized in such section.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 2026. A bill to provide assistance for certain landless Indians in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 2027. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN):

S. 2028. A bill to amend section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, by providing for access to contractors' records by the Comptroller General; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 2029. A bill to revise the laws relating to depository libraries; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mrs. NEUBERGER:

S. 2030. A bill to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study to determine the desirability and practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mrs. NEUBERGER when she introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 2031. A bill to exempt from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. CLARK when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 2032. A bill consenting to the amendment of the compact between the States of Pennsylvania and Ohio relating to Pymatuning Lake; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE):

S. 2033. A bill to amend section 90 of title 28, United States Code, so as to provide for a new division within the Northern Judicial District of the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 2034. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in order to expedite and improve the administrative process by authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases, repealing the review staff provisions, and revising related provisions; and

S. 2035. A bill to provide that section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 shall not apply to candidates for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States, U.S. Senator and Representative, and Governor of any State; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. PASTORE when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2036. A bill to authorize pilot training and employment programs for youth including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2037. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and certain supplementary and related acts with respect to the requirement of an oath for certain reports, applications, and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission; and

S. 2038. A bill to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2039. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to undertake studies of the economic effects of deactivating certain permanent military installations situated in areas of substantial unemployment; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 2040. A bill for the relief of Zenzaburo Yasuda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2041. A bill for the relief of Triantafilia Swteriou Zouglas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of VIRGINIA, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CARROLL, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HICKEY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WILEY, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. JOHNSTON, Mr. GRUENING, and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to provide for the observance of the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. CURTIS. when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S.J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 156) to provide additional funds for the Committee on Commerce, which, under the rule, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

COMMEMORATION OF 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ENACTMENT OF THE HOMESTEAD ACT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, in 1962, we shall observe the 100th anniversary of the enactment of the Homestead Act. A great many historians of considerable prominence and authority have declared that the Homestead Act was the finest act ever passed by a legislative body in order to place public lands in the hands of its citizens.

The Homestead Act has given us a nation of property owners. It was the Homestead Act that built the West. Following the war, the men who wore the blue and those who wore the gray participated in homesteading, and all of them contributed a great part to the building of the West.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two measures. One is a joint resolution, introduced by me on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and Senators BENNETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BYRD of Virginia, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CARROLL, COOPER, DWORSHAK, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, HICKEY, HOLLAND, KEFAUVER, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MILLER, MOSS, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, SCHOEPPEL, SYMINGTON, WILEY, YOUNG of North Dakota, MCGEE, JOHNSTON, GRUENING, and DIRKSEN.

This joint resolution calls upon the President to issue a proclamation designating the calendar year 1962 as the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act, and calls upon the Governors of the States, mayors of cities, and other public officials, as well as other persons, organizations, and groups, particularly in the States most directly affected by the Homestead Act, to observe such centennial by appropriate ceremonies, and to provide, in such manner as he deems appropriate, for participation by Federal agencies and officials in such observance.

Mr. President, I also introduce, on behalf of myself, my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and Senators BENNETT, BIBLE, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BYRD of Virginia, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CARROLL, COOPER, DWORSHAK, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, HICKEY, HOLLAND, KEFAUVER, MANSFIELD, METCALF, MILLER, MOSS, MUNDT, NEUBERGER, SCHOEPPEL, SYMINGTON, WILEY, YOUNG of North Dakota, MCGEE, GRUENING, and DIRKSEN, whose names appear on the measure, a bill directing the Postmaster General to issue a centennial stamp commemorating the 100th anniversary of the Homestead Act.

Mr. President, few measures passed by Congress have had the far-reaching effect of this act, which was passed after many years of debate. It is the cornerstone upon which a great portion of the economy of our country was built. It gave us a class of citizens who were sturdy, industrious, and imbued with self-denial, self-discipline, character, and all the other attributes that have caused us to laud and applaud the pioneers who built our country.

Mr. President, I send the two measures to the desk and ask that they be ultimately referred, but I further ask unanimous consent that they may remain on the desk for a period of 1 week, so that other Senators may join either or both of these measures as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). The bill and joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, will remain at the desk as requested.

The bill and joint resolution, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 2027. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the enactment of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 98. Joint resolution to provide for the observance of the centennial of the enactment of the Homestead Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the joint resolution introduced to commemorate passage of the homestead laws, I commend my colleague, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] on his recognition of the importance to the development of our Nation of the homestead laws. It is entirely fitting that this great American idea for enabling citizens to own their own land receive the attention which will be given it as a result of this proposed legislation.

The homestead laws were not extended to the Territory of Alaska until 1898—36 years after the enactment of the original law, and 31 years after Alaska became a possession of the United States.

Although Alaska did not receive the benefits of this law until much later than the States—a not unusual circumstance for our people with respect to Federal legislation—Alaska homesteaders may well be named among the most valiant of homesteaders anywhere.

I believe Alaska is the only State in the Union where the Homestead Act is still employed to any appreciable extent for the purpose of acquiring land. Considerable numbers of pioneers on the last frontier have obtained a patent to the land of Alaska since the Second World War, and many others are now in the process of doing so. Thus, I think the Homestead Act has greater significance to present-day Alaskans than to citizens of any other State.

I pay tribute to the remarkable energy, perseverance, and vision of those who have homesteaded and are now homesteading in my State. They have the courage, the determination, the stick-to-it-iveness and the vision that made America.

There is nothing easy in acquiring a homestead in Alaska. It is about the hardest, toughest, most demanding work anyone can imagine. Clearing virgin wilderness with scarce and inadequate machinery and under the ruggedest climatic conditions imaginable takes character and strength of which Americans are proud to boast, and which our Alaskan homesteaders have exhibited and are continuing to exhibit.

But the hardest obstacle which has always been faced by the gallant citizens of the 49th State has been that of struggling with the Federal bureaucracy which, in the case of Alaska homesteaders, has gone out of its way to make things difficult. There is no partisan indictment here. The history of lamentable maladministration of the homestead laws in my State has been a fact of life under both Republican and Democratic regimes. The very nature of the homestead procedures seems to bring out bureaucratic genius for smothering ambition with excessive redtape and needless legalism.

Today, we in Alaska look forward with hope to a new and more effective administration of the homestead laws on the last frontier by the young and vital administrators of the New Frontier. There is considerable evidence that the laws need revision to make a homestead program in Alaska better suited to the world of 1961. Meanwhile, I am hopeful that the Department of the Interior will make every effort to administer the laws of 1862, and of the 1898 law for Alaska in a newly streamlined fashion to meet the needs of 1962, and in the spirit of the New Frontier.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Defense Production Act of 1950. This amendment provides that the Comptroller General of the United States or any of his duly authorized representatives shall, until the expiration of 3 years after final payment, have access to and the right to examine any directly pertinent books, documents, papers, and records of any contractor or any of his subcontractors engaged in the performance of contracts negotiated under section 303 of the Defense Production Act, as amended—50 U.S.C. opp. 2098—and a provision to that effect shall be included in each such contract and related subcontracts.

Mr. President, I believe that the adoption of this amendment is essential to good, efficient, and economical government management of contracts under the Defense Production Act.

Recent disclosures in a report prepared by the General Accounting Office revealed that Government auditors were unable to examine the records of a firm engaged in Government defense work as to costs and profits since the contract did not call for such examinations, and the firm refused the Government auditors permission to examine the cost and profit sheets.

A review of the Defense Production Act of 1950 shows the act does not specifically require that contracts negotiated without advertising under the provisions of this act contain a clause giving the Comptroller General access to any pertinent records of the contractor. Some contracts negotiated under the act do contain provisions for adequate examination of records since the contractor permitted this type of clause to be included. In the case cited by the Comptroller General the firm refused to permit the inclusion of such provisions for examination of records.

It is my belief that such provisions which will permit Government auditors to examine the records of defense contractors should be mandatory in all such contracts. The Comptroller General's office also believes such a provision is essential for good, sound business management.

It is my sincere hope that the Senate will give consideration to the proposed bill and judge it on its own merits as desirable and essential.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2028) to amend section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, by providing for access to contractors' records by the Comptroller General, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE (for himself and Mr. MCCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO DEPOSITORY LIBRARIES

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to revise the laws relating to depository libraries. A letter from President George A. Bowman, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio, recently disclosed the difficulties involved by a State university such as Kent in securing a designation as a Federal documents depository.

Dr. Bowman pointed out that although the university has embarked on an ambitious program of advanced studies, their resources were limited in this field of Federal documents. The college of education and the department of history at Kent have been particularly interested in the university securing Federal designation as a depository in order that students pursuing doctoral programs would have access to the immense field of information available in Federal publications.

This bill is designed to revise the laws relating to depository libraries. Twice the House of Representatives has passed similar proposed legislation, but it has not received Senate consideration. The bill would permit certification of not more than two additional designated depositories after the need for such has been properly certified by the head of every existing depository library within the congressional district, territory, or Commonwealth, by the head of the library authority of the State, territory, or Commonwealth.

Under the sponsorship of Representative WAYNE HAYS, this proposed legislation has had repeated success in the House. It is my sincere hope that in view of the demonstrated need for additional Federal depositories the Senate will respond to the urgings of our State educational leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2029) to revise the laws relating to depository libraries, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

METRIC SYSTEM STUDY

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill that would start us on the road to completing some unfinished congressional business. It would provide that the Secretary of Commerce conduct a study to determine the desirability and practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures.

An analogous measure, Mr. President, has been considered and passed by the Congress at an earlier date. That measure made it permissive to use the metric system of weights and measures in the United States. In discussing that measure on the floor of the Senate, a former Senator from Massachusetts said:

> There is something captivating in the idea of one system of weights and measures, which shall be common to all the civilized world; so that, at least in this particular, the confusion of Babel may be overcome. Kindred to this idea of one system of money. And both of these ideas are, perhaps, the forerunners of that grander idea of one language for all the civilized world. Philosophy does not despair of the fulfillment of this aspiration at some distant day; but a common system of weights and measures and a common system of money are already within the sphere of actual legislation.

The Senator making this statement was Charles Sumner. The date on which he made it was July 27, 1866.

I am pleased to know, that, in introducing this bill to the Senate, I have some substantial backing from a number of distinguished citizens. For example, a former President, in discussing the question of weights and measures, expressed a desire for a standard at once invariable and universal. The message was one delivered at the opening of the Second Congress. Its author was George Washington.

A former distinguished Secretary of State made a detailed and elaborate report in which he suggested that we reduce "every branch to the same decimal ration already established in coins, and thus bring the calculation of the principal affairs of life within the arithmetic of every man who can multiply and divide plain numbers." The author of that report was Secretary of State, later President, Thomas Jefferson.

In 1816, President Madison, in his annual message to Congress, said:

> The great utility of a standard fixed in its nature and founded on the easy rule of decimal proportions is sufficiently obvious.

Because of this recommendation, a committee of the Senate, under the leadership of John Quincy Adams, studied in great detail the subject of weights and measures. In his report on this study, filed with the Senate in 1821, Senator Adams, later President, said of the metric system:

> This system approaches to the ideal perfection of uniformity applied to weights and measures.

Mr. President, it is not often that one can introduce a measure with so distinguished an array of sponsors.

The act that passed the Senate and the House in 1866 was signed into law on July 28, 1866. That law made it permissible to use the metric system in the United States. The measure that I introduce today, in essence the envisioned but unfinished business of earlier years, would instruct the Secretary of Commerce to direct a study to determine the desirability and practicability of the metric system.

This study, as outlined in the bill, is to be a broadly based consideration of the adoption of the metric system from the point of view of scientists, engineers, businessmen, consumers, and the military. It provides for a full report after 3 years, and interim reports each year until that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill I have proposed appear in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2030) to provide that the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study to determine the desirability and practicability of the adoption by the United States of the metric system of weights and measures, introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a study to determine the desirability and practicability of the adoption in the United States of the metric system of weights and measures shall be conducted under the direction of the Secretary of Commerce.

SEC. 2. In carrying out the program described in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct investigations, research, and surveys, consult with governmental agencies and private organizations, and cooperate with foreign governments to the extent deemed necessary to determine and analyze—

(1) standards and comparative advantages of weights and measures presently used in science, engineering, manufacturing, commerce and education;

(2) benefits which American consumers might derive from general adoption of the metric system or applications of such system in specific fields, including consideration of the effect on the packaging, merchandising and distribution of products and commodities in the United States;

(3) benefits which the United States might derive from general adoption of the metric system or application of such a system in specific fields, including consideration of the effect such a change would have on United States international relations, world trade, and military activities;

(4) practical problems which would have to be overcome in adopting the metric system for use generally or in specific fields in the United States, including an estimate of the cost of adopting the metric system.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Commerce shall transmit to the Congress, within three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, a full and complete report of the findings made in the conduct of the program described in the first two sections of this Act, together with such recommendations as he considers to be appropriate and in the best interests of the economic development and national security of the United States, and annual progress reports shall be supplied to the Congress prior to submission of the final report and recommendations.

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

PROTECTION OF RIGHT OF RELIGIOUS DISSENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to permit voluntary withdrawal from the obligation to pay social security taxes and from receipt of social security benefits to those self-employed persons whose religious views forbid participation in systems of social insurance.

A great many Pennsylvanians and other Americans were shocked this past April when three horses belonging to Valentine Y. Byler, of New Wilmington, Pa., were seized and sold by the Internal Revenue Service to meet Mr. Byler's unpaid social security self-employment tax. Mr. Byler, a farmer, is an adherent of the Amish faith, which teaches its members to avoid insurance in any form. He therefore declined to pay his social security tax in the years 1956–59, although he quite properly reported the tax on his returns for those years. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue subsequently indicated his agency had no choice but to enforce collection of Mr. Byler's tax, which amounted with interest to $308.96. Present law, the Commissioner explained, does not permit to laymen any exception from the social security tax obligation because of religious conviction.

Permitting exception from the operation of general laws where religious principles conflict, and the exception does not operate to the detriment of the general welfare, is well established in American legislative custom. For example, selective service legislation has for many years permitted registrants who are adherents of the "peace churches" or who give satisfactory evidence of religious objection to military service to be designated conscientious objectors. Indeed, when social security was extended to include most professional groups, members of the clergy were permitted to participate on a voluntary basis. This variation from the usual procedure of compulsory coverage was specifically designed to permit ministers objecting to social insurance on religious grounds to stay out of the social security system. I do not believe the Congress intended to extend to ministers religious privileges not also open to laymen. In fact, I am inclined to suspect the right to the type of religious dissent which Mr. Byler attempted to express may be implicitly guaranteed in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Unfortunately, this question will remain moot, since another characteristic tenet of Amish social ethics is a mandate against entering into litigation.

The design of my bill is simple. It would permit any adherent of a recognized church or religious sect, the teachings of which forbid its members from accepting social insurance benefits of the type provided by social security, to file with the appropriate government official an exemption certificate. Following the filing of the certificate, the individual would be relieved of payment of social security self-employment taxes and would cease to be eligible for those benefits he otherwise would have been accruing.

The number of persons affected by the bill is small, probably not more than 3,000 persons all told, according to Internal Revenue Service figures. Mostly they are quiet farmers. Experience has shown that their refusal to buy insur-

ance does not result in their becoming public charges. Their religion requires them to take care of their own, and they do. The Amish, because of their small number and because of the non-worldly character of their lives, are a people virtually without political influence. Whether or not they continue to be subjected to an inequitable tax thus depends solely on whether the Congress believes in legislating with compassion. I for one am convinced it does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2031) to exempt from coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program self-employed individuals who hold certain religious beliefs, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION TO DELEGATE FUNCTIONS IN ADJUDICATORY CASES

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in order to expedite and improve the administrative process by authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases, repealing the review staff provisions, and revising related provisions. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a section-by-section analysis, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2034) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, in order to expedite and improve the administrative process by authorizing the Federal Communications Commission to delegate functions in adjudicatory cases, repealing the review staff provisions, and revising related provisions, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 5 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of section 5 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c)(1) When necessary to the proper functioning of the Commission and the prompt and orderly conduct of its business, the Commission may, by rule or order, delegate any of its functions to a panel of commissioners, an individual commissioner, an employee board, or an individual employee, including functions with respect to hearing, determining, ordering, certifying, reporting, or otherwise acting as to any work, business or matter, and may at any time amend, modify, or rescind any such rule or order. Nothing in this subsection shall modify the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(2) Any order, decision, or report made or other action taken, pursuant to any such delegation, unless reviewed as provided in subsection (3), shall have the same force and effect, and shall be made, evidenced and enforced in the same manner, as orders, decisions, reports, or other actions of the Commission.

"(3) Any person aggrieved by any such order, decision or report may file an application for review by the Commission within such time and in such manner as the Commission shall prescribe. The Commission shall have authority on its own initiative to order any matters delegated under subsection (1) before it for review on such conditions as it shall prescribe and shall make such orders therein, consistent with law, as shall be appropriate.

"(4) In passing upon applications for review, the Commission may grant, in whole or in part, or deny such applications without specifying any reasons therefor. No such application for review shall rely on questions of fact or law upon which the individual commissioner, panel of commissioners, employee board, or individual employee, has been afforded no opportunity to pass.

"(5) If the Commission grants the application for review, it may affirm, modify, or set aside the order, decision, or report made, or other action taken in accordance with section 405.

"(6) The filing of an application for review shall be a condition precedent to judicial review of any order, decision, or report made or other action taken. The time within which a petition for review must be filed in a proceeding to which section 402(a) applies or within which an appeal must be taken under section 402(b), shall be computed from the date upon which public notice is given of orders disposing of all applications for review filed in any case.

"(7) The Secretary and seal of the Commission shall be the secretary and seal of each panel of the Commission, each individual commissioner, and each employee board or individual employee exercising functions delegated pursuant to subsection (1) of this section."

SEC. 3. Section 405 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"After a decision, order, or requirement has been made in any proceeding by the Commission or designated authority within the Commission under section 5(c)(1), any party thereto, or any other person aggrieved or whose interests are adversely affected thereby, may petition for rehearing only to the authority making the decision, order, or requirement; and it shall be lawful for such authority, whether it be the Commission or other authority designated under section 5(c)(1), in its discretion, to grant such a rehearing if sufficient reason therefor be made to appear. Petitions for rehearing must be filed within thirty days from the date upon which public notice is given of any decision, order, or requirement complained of. No such application shall excuse any person from complying with or obeying any decision, order, or requirement of the Commission, or operate in any manner to stay or postpone the enforcement thereof, without the special order of the Commission. The filing of a petition for rehearing shall not be a condition precedent to judicial review of any such decision, order, or requirement, except where the party seeking such review (1) was not a party to the proceedings resulting in such decision, order, or requirement, or (2) relies on questions of fact or law upon which the Commission, or designated authority within the Commission, has been afforded no opportunity to pass. The Commission, or designated authority within the Commission, shall enter an order, with a concise statement of the reasons therefor, denying a petition for rehearing or granting such petition, in whole or in part, and ordering such further proceedings as may be appropriate: *Provided,* That in any case where such petition relates to an instrument of authorization granted without a hearing, the Commission shall take such action within ninety days of the filing of such petition. Rehearings shall be governed by such general rules as the Commission may establish. The time within which a petition for review must be filed in a proceeding to which section 402(a) applies, or within which an appeal must be taken under section 402(b), shall be computed from the date upon which public notice is given of orders disposing of all petitions for rehearing filed with the Commission in any case, but any decision, order, or requirement made after such rehearing reversing, changing, or modifying the original order shall be subject to the same provisions with respect to rehearing as an original order."

SEC. 4. Section 409 (a), (b), (c) and (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"(a) In every case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for hearing by the Commission, the hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and such other rules as the Commission may prescribe not inconsistent therewith.

"(b) In such cases any party to the proceeding shall be permitted to file exceptions and memoranda in support thereof to such initial, tentative, or recommended decision, which shall be passed upon by the Commission or the authority to whom the matter may have been delegated under section 5(c)(1).

"(c) In any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) which has been designated for hearing by the Commission, no person except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law, shall directly or indirectly make any presentation respecting such case to the hearing officer, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate; provided that a Commissioner conducting the hearing shall be permitted to consult with his assistants and to participate, without restriction because of his conduct of the hearing, with the Commission upon review of the case or any other matter; provided further that examiners shall be permitted to consult with other examiners on questions of law. No person except to the extent required for the disposition of ex parte matters as authorized by law, and except for officers, employees or agents of the Commission not engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions for the Commission in such case or a factually related case, shall directly or indirectly make any presentation respecting such case to the Commission or designated authority within the Commission, unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate.

"(d) To the extent that the foregoing provisions of this section and section 5(c)(4) are in conflict with the provisions of the Administrative Precedure Act, such provisions of this section and section 5(c)(4) shall be held to supersede and modify the provisions of the Act."

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this Act, the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 409 of the Communications Act of 1934 (which relates to the filing of exceptions and the presentation of oral argument), as in force at the time of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to be applicable with respect to any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act) set for hearing by the

Federal Communications Commission by a notice of hearing issued prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. PASTORE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

1. Section 1 would repeal the provisions of section 5(c) of the Communications Act, relating to the review staff. Under these provisions, the review staff, even though it has no other functions than assist the Commission in adjudicatory cases, is nevertheless precluded from making any recommendations to the Commission. This restriction is wasteful and inefficient, since it deprives the Commission of the full assistance of which this review staff is capable, and requires the two-step procedure of instructions and draft order even as to the most routine interlocutory matters. The repeal of these unduly restrictive provisions should contribute to speedier action, without depriving parties of any rights in view of the continuing safeguards of section 409(c) of the Communications Act and section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

2. Section 2 would permit the Commission to delegate any of its functions, including those in adjudicatory cases, to a panel of Commissioners, or individual Commissioners or employees, or an employee board (with the exception that adjudicatory hearings could only be conducted by one of the three authorities specified in section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act). The decision of the authority to whom the matter was delegated could then be reviewed, in whole or in part, by the Commission, either upon its own initiative or upon an application for review filed by a person aggrieved by the decision; but the Commission could deny such application without assigning any reasons therefor. The filing of an application for review is made a condition precedent to judicial review of a delegated decision; and the application cannot rely on questions of fact or law upon which the delegated authority has been afforded no opportunity to pass. In this way, the case will be presented to the Commission (and if the application is denied to the courts) with a ruling on every issue, and the Commission will have an opportunity to review the decision before the matter goes before the courts.

These provisions will give the Commission much needed authority, now withheld under present section 5(d)(1), to employ panels of Commissioners or employee boards to pass on adjudicatory cases. Under the present law, it is necessary for the full Commission to hear every adjudicatory case, including such matters as fishing boat suspensions or the most routine aural broadcast cases. With the new authority the Commission will be able to concentrate on the important cases involving major policy or legal issues, and the hearing of all cases by some authority within the agency should be substantially expedited.

3. Section 3 would revise section 405, relating to petitions for rehearing, so as to reflect the above-described statutory scheme. As revised, the section would permit an aggrieved party to file a petition for rehearing only to the authority making the decision, that is, to the Commission, if it made the decision, or to the designated authority under the new 5(c)(1), if it issued the decision.

4. Section 4 would make extensive revisions in section 409, which contains general provisions relating to adjudicatory proceedings. First, it specifies in subsection (a) that the hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and such other rules as the Commission may prescribe not inconsistent therewith. This latter provision is intended to make clear that the Commission, in its discretion, may adopt hearing safeguards even more stringent than those specified in the Administrative Procedure Act. Further, subsection (a) amends the present 409(a) by permitting one or more Commissioners to conduct the hearing, in accordance with the provisions of 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Second, subsection (b) would retain the right of a party to file exception, which must be passed upon by the Commissioner or a designated authority within the Commission (e.g., a panel of Commissioners or employee board); it would eliminate the other provisions of 409(b) as unnecessary in view of the provisions of section 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Further, it would change the existing law by making oral argument discretionary rather than mandatory. This does not mean that oral argument will no longer be available. On the contrary, it is expected that this valuable procedure would still be greatly employed by the Commission or the panels or employee boards. But the Commission would now have the discretion not to allow such argument in those instances where in its judgment it would serve no useful purpose, as for example in the case of a frivolous appeal or one having no merit or designed largely to gain delay. Every other major Federal regulatory agency presently has such discretion; clearly, the Commission should be given similar flexibility.

Third, the provisions of subsection (c) relating to ex parte presentations and separation of functions would be changed as follows:

(i) Any person, and not just those who have participated in the presentation or preparation for presentation of the case, would be enjoined from making ex parte presentations to the hearing officer or the Commission or designated authority within the Commission. This would extend the present salutory provision.

(ii) Examiners would be permitted to consult with other examiners on questions of law. Full and free discussion among the Commission's examiners of the legal issues in their cases should result in improving the quality of initial decisions and in expediting their preparation. Significantly, examiners in other agencies are governed by the standard in section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act and thus are free to consult among themselves on questions of law; there is clearly no reason for proscribing such consultation in the case of the examiners of this one agency.

(iii) Where a Commissioner conducts the hearing, he may freely consult with his assistants (see sec. 4(f)(2)), and may participate in Commission discussion of the case or any other matter having similar or related issues without any restriction because of the fact that he was the hearing officer in the particular case. This provision is in line with the last sentence of section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act and is intended to make clear that a Commissioner conducting a hearing may continue to participate in all Commission activities and to hear staff presentations in any matter, without raising the claim that an indirect ex parte presentation has been made to him.

(iv) There would be eliminated the provisions in present section 409(c) (2) and (3) proscribing in adjudicatory cases any staff contact with the Commission by the offices of General Counsel, the Chief Engineer, or Chief Accountant. Instead, only staff persons who had engaged in the performance of investigative or prosecuting functions in the case or a factually related one would be precluded from participating in the intra-Commission discussions leading to the issuance of the decision. This is the standard set out in section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act, and, being directed squarely to the fairness problem involved, it is obviously the correct one. Virtually all the major administrative agencies have functioned well under it. There is thus every reason to permit the Commission to return to it. For, it is clearly wasteful to cut off the Commission in an adjudicatory case from the valuable assistance of its chief legal and engineering officers, where these officers have had no investigative or prosecutory connection with the case (or a factually related one).

Finally, subsection (d) provides that to the extent the foregoing provisions or those of the new section 5(c)(4) conflict with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, the latter are superseded. This is made necessary by the statement in section 12 of the Administrative Procedure Act that no subsequent legislation shall be deemed to supersede the provisions of the act except to the extent that such legislation shall do so expressly. This legislation clearly goes beyond the Administrative Procedure Act in two respects:

(i) The Administrative Procedure Act, in section 5(c), exempts initial licensing proceedings from the separation of functions provision; section 409(c) would include such proceedings in its reference to any case of adjudication (as defined in the Administrative Procedure Act). See section 2(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(ii) The restriction in section 5(c) of the Administrative Procedure Act on ex parte consultation by a hearing officer is limited to any fact in issue; the new section 409(c) would extend the limitation to questions of law also (with the proviso that the examiner could consult with another examiner on such questions).

Section 409(b) would also appear to go beyond the provisions of section 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act by bestowing on the parties the right to file exceptions to the initial decision. Finally, it has been argued that a ruling on the merits of every pleading filed in the case is required under sections 6(d) and 8(b) of the Administrative Procedure Act. Whatever the validity of this argument, section 409(d) of the bill, by its explicit reference to the new section 5(c)(4) which authorizes denial, without assigning reasons, of the application for review of a delegated decision, obviates any question on this score.

5. Section 5 provides that all cases set for hearing by the Commission prior to the date of enactment shall continue to be governed by the second sentence of the present section 409(b). This means that in such cases the Commission must hear oral argument upon the request of the parties.

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled "Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961." This measure is recommended and supported by the administration.

I acknowledge a privilege given me by the administration to introduce this bill. It has been given to me because of my long held interest in the problems of youth—but especially of my particular concern that we reestablish a youth conservation corps dedicated to the purpose of properly conserving and developing our human and natural resources.

It was a source of great satisfaction to me, 2 years ago, that the Senate recognized the importance of this program, when under the leadership of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] it passed my proposal (S. 812) to establish a youth conservation corps pro-

viding for a first year's enrollment of 50,000 young men, a second year at 100,000 and succeeding years at 150,000. The President of the United States was then a member of the Senate Labor Committee and he played a significant role in the improvements made by that committee in the bill that I introduced, and his good work was instrumental in securing Senate passage. Thus I am doubly delighted that the concept of this legislation is a part of the President's program.

There is now before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 404, sponsored by 22 members of this body which is identical with S. 812. I am confident that the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower chaired by the able senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] who also played a key role in the perfection of S. 812 two years ago, will proceed expeditiously.

I know the subcommittee will recognize the Youth Conservation Corps is not an experimental program but rather one of proven value. Thus the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 will receive, I am sure, full and proper consideration along with S. 404.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter of transmittal from the President to the President of the Senate, a letter from Arthur J. Goldberg, Secretary of Labor, to the President, and a statement of explanation on the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters and statement of explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2036) to authorize the pilot training and employment programs for youth including on-the-job and other appropriate training, local public service programs, and conservation programs, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The letters and statement of explanation presented by Mr. HUMPHREY are as follows:

JUNE 7, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am transmitting herewith a draft bill to provide useful employment and training on a pilot basis for young men and women between the ages of 16 and 22.

As set forth in more detail in the enclosed letter to me from the Secretary of Labor and the accompanying memorandum, this legislation would provide pilot programs over a 3-year period, designed to develop the most effective methods of assisting our young people in acquiring the skills necessary for productive employment. The draft legislation would establish three different pilot programs through which young people can equip themselves for suitable employment: (1) on-the-job training, (2) a Youth Conservation Corps, and (3) local public service and public works programs performed in the areas in which the youths reside.

The progress we make as a Nation depends upon the use we make of our resources, including manpower. And it is especially important that our young people—the real key to our national future—be prepared to contribute to our economic growth.

Forecasts of the difficulty they can expect to meet in the next few years in finding suitable employment make it clear that we must act without delay. The approaches to this problem proposed in the attached draft will provide a solid base upon which an effective program can be built. We believe, too, that they will stimulate action by all elements of our communities, both public and private, in developing employment opportunities and training for our youth.

A letter similar to this is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., June 2, 1961.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed herewith is a draft bill relating to the employment and training of youth which you indicated in your message of May 25 on urgent national needs you would be submitting to the Congress shortly. I am also attaching a statement explaining in some detail the bill's objectives and provisions.

The need of young people for training and jobs is imperative. Their future outlook is extremely dark unless constructive plans and programs are developed to assist them. In October 1960 some 300,000 young men and 150,000 young women from 16 to 20 years of age were unemployed. By 1965 we will have 40 percent more persons under 20 years of age in our labor force. By that time an additional 800,000 young people are expected to be looking for jobs. A much higher proportion of young people are unemployed than in other age groups. In January 1961 the unemployment rate for all ages in the civilian labor force was 7.7 percent while for the 16- to 20-year group it was 16.8 percent, more than twice the national average.

This draft bill, which is entitled the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961, is intended to develop through the use of different kinds of pilot programs the best methods for assuring that our young people will find useful employment which they are equipped to carry out.

The bill provides three different approaches to this problem. One approach is to offer on-the-job and related training programs, including classroom instruction, in order to improve the employability of young people and to enhance their chance of advancement after their entrance into the labor market as adult workers.

A second approach provided by the bill is the so-called public-service, public-work employment and training program. Under this program the Secretary of Labor is directed to cooperate with State and local governments to develop opportunities for employing qualified young people on local public-service or public-work projects. These projects would furnish training experience with State and local public agencies or facilities, such as schools and hospitals, as well as in local conservation and similar work.

The third approach used in the bill is that of a Youth Conservation Corps. This would be a camp-oriented program in which the trainees would perform conservation and related work pursuant to agreements between the Secretary of Labor and Federal and State conservation agencies under the immediate supervision of those agencies. The trainees would receive a base compensation of $70 a month, as well as subsistence and necessary equipment, transportation, and similar expenses.

The Youth Conservation Corps would be available to young men between the ages of 17 to 22; the other programs to both young men and women 16 to 22. The bill contemplates that maximum use will be made of existing public and private agencies and groups for operating these programs. The Secretary of Labor is authorized, however, where appropriate and under certain conditions, to finance the cost of the on-the-job and related training programs and to pay training allowances. Similarly, he may pay as much as 50 percent of the cost of training in the public-service, public-work projects, up to a maximum of $20 a week per trainee, and contribute to other necessary expenses.

We hope by these programs to develop ways for channeling our young people into jobs as well as to encourage all elements in the community, public and private, to play a far greater role in developing employment opportunities and training for young people. When we encourage communities to become active in this vital area, we encourage the development of a lasting cure for economic ills.

Respectfully,

ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG,
Secretary of Labor.

STATEMENT IN EXPLANATION OF A BILL ENTITLED "YOUTH EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1961"

The purpose of this bill is to improve employment prospects for young people in our country—one of the most compelling needs with which we are faced and one which future progress requires that we meet with constructive programs. It would authorize pilot programs utilizing three different approaches for providing training and useful work experience for the youth of our Nation. These experimental programs will permit development of effective ways of helping untrained and inexperienced youths to obtain employment, and will enable us to foster the most effective development and utilization of their potentials in our labor market. Furthermore, the projects authorized will contribute to the performance of useful local public service projects and of essential work to conserve and preserve our natural resources, the results of which will inure substantially to the public good.

A spectacular increase is taking place in the number of young people entering our labor force. Even though they will stay in school longer, workers under 25 years of age will account for nearly half of the labor force growth during the 1960's. By 1965 we will have 40 percent more persons under 20 years of age in our labor force then we now have. The crest of the tide of youths seeking employment will come in 1966 when an additional 800,000 young people are expected to be looking for jobs. Of the 26 million new young workers expected to enter the labor force this decade, over 18 million will not have completed high school and 2.5 million of these will not have completed even a grade school education. It is toward these latter groups that the programs in this bill are primarily directed.

Many of the young workers entering the labor force will not be equipped with the vocational and professional skills needed to find useful work and compete successfully. School dropouts, in particular, will be in need of further training and job preparation before their work potentials can be utilized effectively. Unless their skills can be upgraded, they are likely to face intermittent and unskilled work throughout their working lives, because more and more jobs in our economy, with automation and technological changes, require increasingly higher standards of skill. In accord with the national commitment in section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 to achieve maximum

levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, additional public action is needed to develop ways to train and to channel these young workers into useful and productive jobs.

It is essential in the next few years—before the labor market is swamped by the influx of young people—to experiment with different approaches to provide work experience and training opportunities to out-of-school youth, geared to the type of education and training which is needed for them to secure employment. Today we do not have effective techniques of tested and proven training and work experience for school dropouts and other youths.

The Youth Employment Opportunities Act will provide training and work experience for a limited number of youths through the use of pilot programs authorizing projects for (1) on-the-job and other appropriate training, (2) local public service employment, and (3) camps to conserve and develop our forests and other natural resources. Since the results we intend to accomplish with this experimental program will seek the keys to the future success of our youths, the three programs will vary considerably in their details. This bill is designed to appeal to and to assist young people of widely different qualifications and aims to enable them to orient themselves realistically to the working world of the future.

The one-the-job and other appropriate training programs will develop ways to furnish a stimulus to employment and training for both young men and women between the ages of 16 and 22 to improve their employability and to enhance their chances of advancement after their entry into the labor market as adult workers. Training under these programs could include classroom instruction through arrangements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The public service employment and training programs will develop measures to afford young workers between 16 and 22 with training and employment, both individually and in groups, in public jobs with adequate safeguards that it will not interfere with jobs for regular employees and that the rates of pay and other conditions of employment are reasonably consistent with comparable work in the locality.

The Youth Conservation Corps program will take young men between the ages of 17 and 22 and develop ways to provide them with work training in a healthful outdoor environment, furnishing also the experience of camp community living and educational opportunities. It is envisioned that a variety of combinations of work and training will be afforded, depending on such factors as the projects approved by the cooperating conservation agencies for the trainees to perform. This program will also have the important effect of contributing to essential public effort to accomplish needed conservation work.

In keeping with their experimental purpose, the programs would be authorized for 3 years. It is estimated that appropriations of $75 million would be required in the first year and $100 million in each of the next 2 years, with the funds divided in approximately equal proportions among the three types of programs. In the first year, it is estimated that this would support projects for over 50,000 youths, and for somewhat larger numbers in the second and third years, depending on the kinds of projects undertaken and the cost of the conservation camp facilities. After the second year of operation, the Secretary would be required to report to the President and to the Congress on the activities and programs authorized by this act, including an evaluation of their comparative effectiveness and recommendations regarding youth employment and training.

PRINCIPAL GENERAL PROVISIONS

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to administer the proposed Act and to make rules and regulations necessary for the operation of the programs it authorizes. He is also given authority to delegate functions to other agencies and to utilize the services of Federal and State agencies.

In making regulations for the selection of trainees, the Secretary is directed as far as practicable to provide: for a fair distribution of trainees among the geographic areas of the country; for consideration of the employment prospects in various occupations and industries; uniform criteria for the selection of trainees; and for a consideration of the benefits to the youths applying.

It is anticipated that the Secretary's functions in counseling youths and developing job opportunities will be of major importance to the success of the objectives of this bill. Our proposal, therefore, expressly directs the Secretary to perform these services for trainees who seek assistance under the bill. Such counseling will take into account the fact that some applicants should be advised to continue their education or embark on a career not included under this bill.

A Youth Employment Advisory Committee of 12 members, broadly representative of the public, would be established by the Secretary. He would also seek the advice and assistance of the heads of the Departments of Agriculture, Interior and Health, Education and Welfare and the Attorney General.

The bill provides that generally trainees would not be considered Federal employees.

ON-THE-JOB AND OTHER APPROPRIATE TRAINING PROGRAMS

The Secretary is directed to develop and promote the adoption of on-the-job and other appropriate training programs for youth, including supplementary classroom instruction through appropriate arrangements with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. To these ends, he is directed to make maximum use of appropriate private and public agencies, employers, trade associations, labor and industry groups, educational agencies and other community groups in developing and carrying out the programs. He may enter into agreements for the conduct of such programs by such groups, individuals, or organizations as he finds qualified and may select and refer trainees to the programs.

The Secretary is authorized to finance the costs of these programs and to pay training allowances for the trainees, up to $20 a week, provided the programs comply with standards which he determines. The bill specifies that the standards shall include the requirement that the program is adequate and suitable; that the training period is reasonable; that the wages paid are comparable to learners performing similar work in the community and that adequate and safe facilities, personnel and records are provided.

PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

The Secretary is directed to cooperate with State and local governments to develop opportunities for employing qualified trainees on local public service programs. The programs authorized would be such as would not displace regular workers. The rates of pay would be measured by those for comparable work in the locality.

Public service programs subject to approval would be those furnishing training experience with State and local public agencies or publicly owned facilities, such as schools and hospitals, and on programs for the improvement or expansion of conservation, recreational, or other community facilities.

When the Secretary determines that a program meets the prescribed standards, he may enter into an agreement with the appropriate governmental body to pay as much as 50 percent of the cost of wages of trainees on the program, up to a maximum of $20 a week for the Federal share. The Secretary, in his discretion where necessary, may also furnish such tools, clothing, transportation or similar items for trainees as he finds appropriate.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS

The Secretary is authorized to organize a pilot Youth Conservation Corps. The trainees would perform conservation and related work, pursuant to agreements between the Secretary and Federal and State conservation agencies, under the immediate supervision of such agencies. The supervisory Federal agencies, under agreement with the Secretary, would provide for quarters, subsistence, transportation, and equipment for trainees and other services or facilities as agreed upon, subject to payment therefor by the Secretary. Medical, hospital, and educational services would be provided through the cooperation of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Arrangements for facilities for trainees used by the States would be provided under agreements with the States. The States would be required to defray up to one-half of the costs incurred for trainees used by the States, as determined by the Secretary.

Trainees would receive a base compensation of $70 a month, with up to an additional $20 a month payable on the basis of assigned leadership responsibilities or special skills. They would also receive quarters, subsistence, equipment, clothing, and transportation, the right to make allotments for dependents or saving funds, protection under the old-age and survivors insurance program of the Social Security Act and under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act. For the purpose of social security contributions and Federal Employees' Compensation Act benefits the wages of trainees are deemed to be $200 a month in order to add to the cash wage a factor representing the value of perquisites furnished the trainees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the Youth Employment Opportunities Act of 1961 is recommended and supported by the administration. As I have said several times on the floor of the Senate, this proposed legislation will meet a very urgent need of employment opportunities for young men who today are without work and are in need of gainful employment.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT, RELATING TO REQUIREMENT OF OATH FOR CERTAIN REPORTS, AND SO FORTH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Presdent, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and certain supplementary and related acts with respect to the requirement of an oath for certain reports, applications, and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the letter, recommendation, and justification, received from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter, recommendation, and justification will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2037) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act and certain supplementary and related acts with respect to the requirement of an oath for certain reports, applications, and complaints filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, recommendation, and justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON are as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1961.

The Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: I am submitting herewith for your consideration and introduction 40 copies of a draft bill, together with a statement of justification therefor, which would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 13 in the Commission's 74th Annual Report.

Your assistance in introducing the bill and scheduling hearings thereon will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

EVERETT HUTCHINSON,
Chairman.

RECOMMENDATION No. 13

This proposed bill would give effect to Legislative Recommendation No. 13 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 191 of its 74th annual report as follows:

We recommend, in view of the prohibitions in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, that the Interstate Commerce Act and various related acts be amended to eliminate the mandatory requirement that certain reports, applications, and complaints be filed with the Commission under oath, and that such oath provisions be made discretionary with the Commission.

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to eliminate from various statutes administered by the Interstate Commerce Commission the mandatory requirement that certain reports, applications, and complaints be made under oath, and to authorize the Commission to impose such requirement at its discretion.

Under section 20(2) of part I and comparable provisions in other parts of the Interstate Commerce Act, the annual reports of the carriers are required to be filed with the Commission under oath. The oath requirement is also mandatory for reports filed under section 1 of the Accident Reports Act and section 9 of the Locomotive Inspection Act. By contrast, such requirement is discretionary with the Commission with respect to periodical or special reports filed under section 20(2) and various other provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, and there is no statutory requirement at all of an oath for reports submitted by conferences, bureaus, and other organizations formed pursuant to section 5a of the act or for periodical and special reports filed under section 20b(6), relating to railroad securities modifications.

In addition to the mandatory requirement of an oath for the above-mentioned reports, an oath is also required for applications filed by railroads and motor carriers under sections 20a(4) and 214 of the act, respectively, for authority to issue securities, and for applications for exemption from regulation filed under section 204(a)(4a) by motor carriers operating solely within a single State. An oath is similarly required with respect to applications filed under section 77(p) of the Bankruptcy Act for Commission approval to solicit, use, or act under proxies, authorizations, or deposit agreements in railroad reorganization proceedings.

Other mandatory oath requirements are found in those provisions of the act governing the filing of applications for motor carrier, water carrier, and freight forwarder operating authorities and complaints involving the rates of motor contract carriers and water common and contract carriers. No comparable requirements are imposed, however, with respect to complaints involving the rates of railroads, pipelines, or express companies subject to part I; motor common carriers subject to part II; or freight forwarders subject to part IV of the act, respectively.

The foregoing oath requirements are, in the Commission's opinion, both unnecessary and burdensome. Section 35 of the Criminal Code (18 U.S.C., sec. 1001) imposes penalties of fine and imprisonment for knowingly making false statements or representations to Federal administrative agencies, and these provisions have been construed to apply to the giving of false information even though not under oath. Moreover, penalties for knowingly making false statements in carrier reports are contained in section 20(7)(b) and comparable provisions in other parts of the Interstate Commerce Act. In view of these statutory provisions against the giving or filing of false information, it seems clear that the mandatory oath requirements in the laws administered by the Commission no longer serve any useful purpose. On the contrary, they are burdensome to the carriers and cause delays and inconveniences in the processing of reports and other documents because of the necessity of returning them to the carriers for authentication when the oath has been inadvertently omitted.

The Commission therefore recommends enactment of the provisions in the attached draft bill which would make the present mandatory oath requirements discretionary with the Commission. Retention of discretionary authority would enable the Commission to require an oath should the need arise.

PROPOSED NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORTS CORPORATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency requesting the proposed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2038) to create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1961.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a draft bill "To create the National Capital Airports Corporation, to provide for the operation of the federally owned civil airports in the District of Columbia or its vicinity by the Corporation, and for other purposes."

The primary purpose of the legislation is to place the operations of the federally owned civil airports in the Washington metropolitan area on a sound business basis so that they may better serve the traveling public, the airlines, and other users of aircraft, at a minimum cost to the taxpayer. Such legislation will facilitate improvements in the efficiency of airport operations, and will permit swift action to correct conditions where the safety or convenience of the public is involved.

A commercial airport operation is precisely the kind of predominantly business type activity for which the Congress has made provision by enacting the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945. Moreover, throughout the Nation public authorities engaged in the operation of commercial airports have generally been established as corporate organizations. The corporate form, which is based upon the experience of private business, has been found to aid greatly in the administration of Federal activities which are revenue producing, which are potentially self-sustaining, which have a large volume of commercial type transactions with the public, and which need greater flexibility than is provided for under the customary appropriation budget.

The desirability of operating National Capital area airports under the corporate form of organization has long been recognized. The first Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (Hoover Commission) recommended in 1949 that the operation of the Washington National Airport be placed under a Government corporation. In his 1955 budget message, President Eisenhower recommended that legislation be adopted to provide for the establishment of a corporation to operate the Washington National Airport.

Bills to create such a corporation were introduced in both the House and Senate in the 83d Congress, and also in the 86th Congress.

During the 83d Congress the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce unanimously recommended enactment of the corporation legislation. The committee, in its report to the Senate, stated that in its opinion the legislation was necessary and advisable to provide more effective management for the Washington National Airport. It cited the essentially business nature of the airport operation. It also cited the difficulties which had resulted from the application of customary budgetary and fiscal practices designed for conventional Government agencies, the requirement that the airport return all of its income to the Treasury as general receipts, and various problems which had arisen in connection with contracting and the acquisition of property under requirements applicable to regular Government agencies.

The approaching completion of the Dulles International Airport will require efficient, integrated operation of two of the largest civil airports in the Nation. The volume of commercial transactions involved in the administration of both airports will increase enormously and the revenues from services provided by the airports will be substantially larger. Therefore, the need for a form of organization adapted to the conduct of business-type operations will become even more urgent.

The demands posed on airport operations by rapid developments in aviation require that the airport organization have the capability of responding swiftly to changing circumstances which directly affect the safety and convenience of the public and the efficient operation of air carriers. The normal

budget processes are simply not capable of responding to such unforeseen demands, and as a result, inadequacies constituting serious hazards to safety and interfering with efficient operations have persisted for prolonged periods of time at the Washington National Airport. Under the corporate form of organization the revenue of the airports can be utilized in the prompt correction of most inadequacies in airport services and facilities.

The existence of a corporation with business type budget and accounting practices will make it easier for the Federal Aviation Agency, the President, and the Congress to review and evaluate the effectiveness of airport operations and management. The corporation will also be able to conduct business negotiations with other commercial entities on a more satisfactory basis than is possible under the current system in which revenues are deposited directly in the Treasury and are not available to provide services or to meet obligations.

The corporation will continue to be under the strict scrutiny of the Congress in accordance with the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act. Therefore, it will be possible both to achieve the operating and managerial advantages of the corporate form of organization and at the same time assure that the activities of the corporation are properly subject to congressional surveillance.

The creation of the corporation will entail no expenditures or increases in employment beyond those which would otherwise be required to operate and maintain the National Capital area airports under the present authority and form of organization.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

COMMEMORATION OF 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 99) to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 25, 1961.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN MAGNUSON: As you know, April 5, 1962, will mark the 75th anniversary of the Interstate Commerce Commission. We are beginning to plan certain ceremonies in commemoration of the occasion.

There is enclosed a draft copy of a joint resolution which we believe would lend great impetus to the successful planning of these ceremonies. Your assistance in introducing this resolution will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

EVERETT HUTCHINSON,
Chairman.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HART (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS ON S. 1396

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the standing Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I wish to announce that the subcommittee has scheduled public hearings on S. 1396, dealing with trademarks, to commence on June 20, 1961.

The hearings, set for 10 a.m. are to be held in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing to testify or file a statement for the record should communicate immediately with the office of the Senate Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights Subcommittee, Room 349A, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone Capitol 4-3121 or Government code 180, extension 2268.

The subcommittee consists of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF REOPENING OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL ELECTION LAWS

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections held public hearings on May 11 and 12, 1961, to receive testimony and statements on several measures offering amendments and improvements to existing Federal election laws.

I wish to announce that hearings before the subcommittee will be reopened on Friday, June 9, 1961, at 10 a.m., in Room 301 of the Senate Office Building. Other hearings have been scheduled for Tuesday, June 13, at 10 a.m. and again on Thursday, June 15, 1961, beginning at 10:30 a.m.

The subcommittee expects to receive statements from Senators sponsoring or cosponsoring measures pending before the subcommittee and from the present chairmen of the National Democratic and Republican Committees. Other Members of Congress who have expressed interest in the bills under consideration have also been invited to appear.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Article entitled "Public Relations: Our No. 1 Job," written by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, published in the Progressive Farmer of June 1961.

THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT TO THE NATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last night the President delivered a report to the Nation. It was a very serious report on the very serious mission which he has just completed.

The report tells the Nation and the world many things. It tells us, first, that the foreign affairs of this Nation are being conducted with a deep understanding of the realities of the world and of the immediate pressures, as well as the great historic forces which shape them. It tells us that they are being conducted by a President of great depth, sincerity and conviction.

There was no idle boast, no bombast, no false optimism, no faltering fear in this report. There was simply a recount of the facts of a highly significant and useful firsthand exploration of some of the great issues which unite, as well as those which divide, mankind. I hope that all of us in the days ahead will try to match the President's soberness and steadfastness. I know that the Senate, and the American people, as well, desire peace and the security and progress of freedom. The depth of our conviction in this connection will be measured by our willingness to make the sacrifices, as these are entailed in essential legislation. It is easy enough to stand firm for peace and for freedom with words. Will we stand equally firm in acts? We shall have a test of our determination very shortly, when we have before the Senate the foreign-aid legislation which now is being studied by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Let me say that this legislation is no panacea for our international difficulties; but let me say equally that this legislation, judiciously administered, is essential to the solution of those difficulties.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's address to the Nation be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. But before I conclude, today, I want to express my deep sense of gratitude for the magnificent effort which Mr. Kennedy has just made on behalf of the Nation by his visit to Europe and his conversations with various heads of state. This grati-

tude, let me say, also extends to Mrs. Kennedy, whose graciousness and sensitivity contributed so greatly to this mission. I am confident that the Senate shares my feelings in this respect.

It is apparent, Mr. President, that the President's mission was singularly free of bombast and propaganda and spirits, which, however exhilarating they may seem at the moment, serve only to set the stage for the hangover. This was a sober and serious undertaking; and because it was, it can only help, rather than hinder, the search for a firmer plateau upon which to base the present uneasy peace of the world. Press comments on the Vienna meeting, both at home and abroad, reflect this comprehension; and I ask unanimous consent that a selection of these comments be printed in the RECORD after the text of the President's report.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the majority leader in expressing high commendation of the outstanding and truly great statesmanship displayed by the President of the United States in his recent trip to Paris, Vienna, and London. I am satisfied that the trip will renew the confidence of the American people in the great leadership they now have in the White House.

I am proud of the President; and I look forward to great progress in the field of international relations, flowing from the wonderful work the President did in behalf of the country and in behalf of world peace on this trip.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the address, the editorials, and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 7, 1961]

PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS TO THE NATION ON HIS TALKS IN EUROPE

I returned this morning from a week-long trip to Europe and I want to report to you on that trip in full.

It was in every sense an unforgettable experience. The people of Paris, of Vienna, of London were generous in their greeting. They were heartwarming in their hospitality And their graciousness to my wife is particularly appreciated.

We knew, of course, that the crowds, and the shouts, were meant in large measure for the country that we represented, which is regarded as the chief defender of freedom.

Equally memorable was the pageantry of European history and their culture that is very much a part of any ceremonial reception.

To lay a wreath at the Arc de Triomphe, to dine at Versailles and Schoenbrunn Palace and with the Queen of England, these are the colorful memories that will remain with us for many years to come.

Each of the three cities that we visited—Paris, Vienna, and London—have existed for many centuries and each serves as a reminder that the Western civilization that we seek to preserve has flowered over many years and has defended itself over many centuries.

But this was not a ceremonial trip.

FOREIGN POLICY GOALS STRESSED

Two aims of American foreign policy above all others were the reason for the trip—the unity of the free world, whose strength is the security of us all, and the eventual achievement of a lasting peace. My trip was devoted to the advancement of these two aims.

To strengthen the unity of the West, our journey opened in Paris and closed in London. My talks with General de Gaulle were profoundly encouraging to me. Certain differences in our attitude on one or another problem became insignificant in view of our common commitment to defend freedom.

Our alliance, I believe, became more secure. The friendship of our Nation, I hope, with theirs became firmer. And the relations between the two of us who bear responsibility became closer and I hope were marked by confidence.

I found General de Gaulle far more interested in our frankly stating our position whether or not it was his own than in appearing to agree with him when we do not.

But he knows full well the true meaning of an alliance. He is, after all, the only major leader of World War II who still occupies a position of great responsibility. His life has been one of unusual dedication. He is a man of extraordinary personal character, symbolizing the new strength and the historic grandeur of France.

FRENCH MEETING 'VALUABLE'

Throughout our discussions, he took the long view of France and the world at large.

I found him a wise counselor for the future and an informative guide to the history that he has helped to make.

Thus we had a valuable meeting * * * Problems which proved to be not of substance but of wording or procedure were cleared away.

No question, however sensitive, was avoided. No area of interest was ignored. And the conclusions that we reached will be important for the future.

In our agreement on defending Berlin; on working to improve the defenses of Europe; on aiding the economic and political independence of the underdeveloped world, including Latin America; on spurring European economic unity; on concluding successfully the conference at Laos, and on closer consultations and solidarity in the Western alliance, General de Gaulle could not have been more cordial. And I could not have more confidence in any man.

In addition to his individual strength of character, the French people as a whole showed vitality and energy which were both impressive and gratifying.

Their recovery from the postwar period is dramatic. Their productivity is increasing, and they are steadily building their stature in both Europe and Africa.

And thus I left Paris for Vienna with increased confidence in Western unity and strength.

The people of Vienna know what it is to live under occupation and they know what it is to live in freedom. Their welcome to me as President of this country should be heartwarming to us all.

REPORTS ON KHRUSHCHEV

I went to Vienna to meet the leader of the Soviet Union, Mr. Khrushchev. For two days we met in sober, intensive conversation. And I believe it is my obligation to the people, to the Congress, and to our allies to report on those conversations candidly and publicly.

Mr. Khrushchev and I had a very full and frank exchange of views on the major issues that now divide our two countries.

I will tell you now that it was a very sober 2 days. There was no discourtesy, no loss of tempers, no threats or ultimatums by either side. No advantage or concession was either gained or given. No major decision was either planned or taken. No spectacular progress was either achieved or pretended.

This kind of informal exchange may not be as exciting as a full-fledged summit meeting with a fixed agenda and a large corps of advisers where negotiations are attempted and new agreements sought.

But this was not intended to be and was not such a meeting, nor did we plan any future summit meetings at Vienna.

But I found this meeting as somber as it was to be immensely useful.

I had read his speeches of his policies. I had been advised on his views. I had been told by other leaders of the West—General de Gaulle, Chancellor Adenauer, Prime Minister Macmillan—what manner of man he was.

CALLS DECISIONS HIS OWN

But I bear the responsibility of the Presidency of the United States and it is my duty to make decisions that no adviser and no ally can make for me.

It is my obligation and responsibility to see that these decisions are as informed as possible; that they are based upon as much direct, firsthand knowledge as possible.

I therefore thought it was of immense importance that I know Mr. Khrushchev, that I gain as much inside [information] and understanding as I could on his present and future policies.

At the same time, I wanted to make certain Mr. Khrushchev knew this country and its policies; that he understood our strength and our determination, and that he knew that we desired peace with all nations of every kind.

I wanted to present our views to him directly, precisely, realistically, and with an opportunity for discussion and clarification.

This was done.

No new aims were stated in private that have not been stated in public on either side. The gap between us was not, in such a short period, materially reduced, but at least the channels of communication were opened more fully.

SEES PERIL LESSENED

At least the chances of a dangerous misjudgment on either side should now be less, and at least the men on whose decisions the peace, in part, depends have agreed to remain in contact.

This is important, for neither of us tried to merely please the other, to agree merely to be agreeable, to say what the other wanted to hear.

And just as our judicial system relies on witnesses appearing in court and on cross-examination instead of hearsay testimony or affidavits on paper, so, too, was this direct give-and-take of immeasurable value in making clear and precise what we considered to be vital.

For the facts of the matter are that the Soviets and ourselves give wholly different meanings to the same words: war, peace, democracy and popular will. We have wholly different views of right and wrong, of what is an internal affair and what is aggression. And above all, we have wholly different concepts of where the world is and where it is going.

Only by such a discussion was it possible for me to be sure that Mr. Khrushchev knew how differently we view the present and the future. Our views contrasted sharply, but at least we knew better at the end where we both stood.

Neither of us was there to dictate a settlement or to convert the other to a cause or to concede our basic interests. But both of us were there, I think, because we realized that each nation has the power to inflict enormous damage upon the other, that such

a war could and should be avoided, if at all possible, since it would settle no dispute and prove no doctrine, and that care should thus be taken to prevent our conflicting interests from so directly confronting each other that war necessarily ensued.

We believe in a system of national freedom and independence. He believes in an expanding and dynamic concept of world communism.

And the question was whether these two systems can ever hope to live in peace without permitting any loss of security or any denial of the freedom of our friends.

However difficult it may seem to answer this question in the affirmative as we approach so many harsh tests, I think we owe it to all mankind to make every possible effort.

NO CAUSE FOR FEAR

That is why I consider the Vienna talks to be useful. The somber mood that they conveyed was not cause for elation or relaxation nor was it cause for undue pessimism or fear.

It simply demonstrated how much work we in the free world have to do and how long and hard a struggle must be our fate as Americans in this generation as the chief defenders of the cause of liberty.

The one area which afforded some immediate prospect of accord was Laos. Both sides endorsed the concept of a neutral and independent Laos, much in the manner of Burma or Cambodia.

And of critical importance to the current conference on Laos in Geneva, both sides recognized the importance of an effective cease-fire. It is urgent that this be translated into new attitudes at Geneva, enabling the International Control Commission to do its duty, to make certain that a cease-fire is enforced and maintained.

HOPEFUL IN LAOS TALKS

I am hopeful that progress can be made on this matter in the coming days at Geneva, so that it would greatly improve international atmosphere.

No such hope emerged, however, with respect to the other deadlocked Geneva conference seeking a treaty to ban nuclear tests.

Mr. Khrushchev made it clear that there could not be a neutral administrator in his opinion because no one was truly neutral, that a Soviet veto would have to apply to acts of enforcement, that inspection was only a subterfuge for espionage in the absence of total disarmament, and that the present test-band negotiations appeared futile.

In short, our hopes for an end to nuclear tests, for an end to the spread of nuclear weapons, and for some slowing down of the arms race, have been struck a serious blow.

Nevertheless, the stakes are too important for us to abandon the draft treaty we have offered at Geneva.

But our most somber talks were on the subject of Germany and Berlin. I made it clear to Mr. Khrushchev that the security of Western Europe and therefore our own security are deeply involved in our presence and our access rights to West Berlin, that those rights are based on law not on suffrance; and that we are determined to maintain those rights at any risk and thus our obligation to the people of West Berlin and their right to choose their own future.

Mr. Khrushchev, in turn, presented his views in detail. And his presentation will be the subject of further communications.

But we are not seeking to change the present situation. A binding German peace treaty is a matter for all who were at war with Germany, and we and our allies cannot abandon our obligations to the people of West Berlin.

CHALLENGE BY RUSSIAN

Generally, Mr. Khrushchev did not talk in terms of war. He believes the world will move his way without resort to force.

He spoke of his nation's achievements in space. He stressed his intention to outdo us in industrial production, to outtrade us, to prove to the world the superiority of his system over ours.

Most of all, he predicted triumph of communism in the new and less-developed countries. He was certain that the tide there was moving his way, that the revolution of rising peoples would eventually be a Communist revolution, and that the so-called wars of liberation supported by the Kremlin would replace the old methods of direct aggression and invasion.

In the 1940's and early fifties the great danger was from Communist armies marching across free borders, which we saw in Korea. Our nuclear monopoly helped to prevent this in other areas.

Now we face a new and different threat. We no longer have a nuclear monopoly. Their missiles, they believe, will hold off our missiles, and their troops can match our troops should we intervene in these so-called wars of liberation.

Thus the local conflict they support can turn in their favor through guerrillas or insurgents or subversion. A small group of disciplined Communists could exploit discontent and misery in a country where the average income may be $60 or $70 a year and seize control, therefore, of an entire country without Communist troops ever crossing any international frontier.

This is the Communist theory. But I believe just as strongly that time will prove it wrong, that liberty and independence and self-determination, not communism, is the future of man and that freemen have the will and the resources to win the struggle for freedom.

But it is clear that this struggle in this area of the new and poorer nations will be a continuing crisis of this decade.

Mr. Khrushchev made one point which I wish to pass on. He said there are many disorders throughout the world and he should not be blamed for them all. He is quite right.

FIGHT ON POVERTY URGED

It is easy to dismiss as Communist inspired every antigovernment or anti-American riot, every overthrow of a corrupt regime or every mass protest against misery and despair.

But these are not all Communist inspired. The Communists move in to exploit them, to infiltrate their leadership, to ride their crest to victory. But the Communists did not create the condition which caused them.

In short, the hopes of freedom in these areas which see so much poverty and illiteracy, so many children who are sick, so many children who die in the first year, so many families without homes, so many families without hope, the future for freedom in these areas rests with the local peoples and their government.

If they have the will to determine their own future, if their governments have the support of their own people, if their honest and progressive measures helping their people have inspired confidence and zeal, then no guerrilla or insurgent action can succeed.

But where those conditions do not exist, a military guarantee against external attack from across a border offers little protection against internal decay.

Yet all this does not mean that our Nation and the West and the free world can only sit by. On the contrary, we have a historic opportunity to help these countries build their societies until they are so strong and broadly based that only an outside invasion could topple them. And that threat, we know, can be stopped.

We can train and equip their forces to resist Communist-supplied insurrections. We can help develop the industrial and agricultural base on which new living standards can be built.

We can encourage better administration and better education, and better tax and land distribution, and a better life for the people.

All this and more we can do because we have the talent and the resources to do it if we would only use and share them.

I know that there is a great deal of feeling in the United States that we have carried the burden of economic assistance long enough. But these countries that we are now supporting—stretching all the way along from the top of Europe, through the Middle East, down through Saigon—are now subject to great efforts internally in many of them to seize control.

If we're not prepared to assist them in making a better life for their people, then I believe that the prospects for freedom in those areas are uncertain. We must, I believe, assist them, if we are determined to meet with commitments of assistance our words against the Communist advance.

The burden is heavy. We have carried it for many years. But I believe that this fight is not over, this battle goes on. And we have to play our part in it. And therefore, I hope again that we will assist these people, so that they can remain free.

It was fitting that Congress opened its hearings on our new foreign military and economic aid programs in Washington at the very time that Mr. Khrushchev's words in Vienna were demonstrating, as nothing else could, the need for that very program.

It should be well run, effectively administered. But I believe we must do it. And I hope that you and the American people will support it again, because I think it is vitally important to the security of these areas.

There's no use talking against the Communist advance unless we're willing to meet our responsibilities, however burdensome they may be.

NOTES AID BY FRENCH

I do not justify this aid merely on the grounds of anticommunism. It is a recognition of our opportunity and obligation to help these people be free. And we are not alone. I found that the people of France, for example, were doing far more in Africa in the way of aiding independent nations than our own country was, but I know that foreign aid is a burden that is keenly felt, and I can only say that we have no more crucial obligation now.

My stay in England was short, but the visit gave me a chance to confer privately again with Prime Minister MacMillan, just as others of our party in Vienna were conferring yesterday with General de Gaulle and Chancellor Adenauer.

We all agreed that there is work to be done in the West, and from our conversations have come agreed steps to get on with that work.

STRESSES WESTERN UNITY

Our day in London, capped by a meeting with Queen Elizabeth and Prince Philip, was a strong reminder at the end of a long journey that the West remains united in its determination to hold to its standards.

May I conclude by saying simply that I am glad to be home. We have in this trip admired splendid places and seen stirring sights, but we are glad to be home. No demonstration of support abroad could mean so much as the support which you, the American people, have so generously given to our country.

With that support I am not fearful of the future. We must be patient. We must be determined. We must be courageous. We must accept both risks and burdens. But with the will and the work freedom will prevail.

Good night and thank you very much.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 7, 1961]

THE PRESIDENT'S INTERIM REPORT

One could not expect President Kennedy in his prompt report to the Nation last night to do much more than express cautious optimism as to the results of his trip to Europe, coupled with a warning of dangerous days ahead. The world situation, as outlined by the President in his radio-television address, has undergone no immediate change as a result of his voyage to meet President de Gaulle, Premier Khrushchev, and Prime Minister Macmillan.

But there is nothing surprising in this, and the President undoubtedly was the last to expect anything different. For Mr. Kennedy, this journey to the summit was a voyage of exploration, and also of education. The confrontations with General de Gaulle and Mr. Macmillan, no less than with Mr. Khrushchev, were bound to be revelatory of the attitudes and approaches brought by different leaders to world problems.

Yet important as the meetings in Paris and London were, it was to the Vienna meeting of the American President and the Soviet Premier that Americans—and, no doubt, Russians as well—looked with most expectation. It is clear from press accounts and from last night's report by Mr. Kennedy that no agreements were reached on such critical matters as Berlin and arms control. The outlook for Laos is somewhat more hopeful, but here, as in so many other cases in the postwar era, it is not what Communist spokesmen say, but what Communist satellites do, that counts.

It is as an interim report rather than a final statement that President Kennedy's address last night was offered, and should be accepted. Nothing but good can come of his visits to Paris and London, where he had the chance to solidify personal as well as political relations with the leaders of our two great traditional allies. Some good may come from his visit to Vienna, which has served to reopen channels of communication, to establish beyond doubt the continuity of basic American foreign policy, and to demonstrate anew the need for patience and perseverance in the quest for peace.

President Kennedy characterized his meeting with Premier Khrushchev as "somber but immensely useful." The same description might be applied to his candid talk last night. For he told frankly of the size and the scope of the challenges and opportunities that lie ahead.

It is in the nature of our adversary that we must face these with caution. But it also is in our own nature that we can meet them with confidence.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 7, 1961]

THE PRESIDENT REPORTS

President Kennedy's television account of his travels was instructive in two quite different ways. It was instructive for what it revealed about the effect of the trip on Mr. Kennedy himself. It was instructive for its insights into the actual state of the cold war.

As for the Kennedy psyche (and the state of the Kennedy psyche is important since he is our President), the trip provided a badly needed boost.

Part of this is traceable directly to the pomp and ceremony so well contrived by the experts in such matters in Paris, Vienna, and London. Let us not underestimate the effect of such glittering proceedings on anyone who is the object of them for the first time.

A more important part (and Mr. Kennedy made this clear) is owing to President de Gaulle; his wisdom, his sympathy and fatherly encouragement and his tremendous certitude. It may be that the strengthening he got from the old man who comes close to being France itself was the most important product of this trip. And to round out the educational results was his 2-day encounter with the equal but hostile certitude of Mr. Khrushchev. At that encounter, Mr. Kennedy discovered once and for all what it is all about, and what it has been all about since a long time before Mr. Kennedy became President.

As to substantive issues, Mr. Kennedy was far less vague than is usual in such reports. It is clear that, for him, doubts on the essential reliability of France in the grand alliance have been removed. He sees that negotiations over nuclear testing are at such an impasse as to raise the question whether there is any point in carrying them on further. He offers no great hope on Laos. He puts a proper, a chilling, value on the new Soviet insistence on a veto over any international arrangement—including the United Nations itself—in which it consents to participate. He concedes (what had been suspected) that discussion of Berlin was the grimmest single part of his whole conversation with Mr. K. And finally, after all the ho-hum and flub-dub about missile gaps and such matters, he downgrades the prospect of hot as distinct from cold war.

This was a cold war message, and a good one, in which the need for military strength was, of course, implicit from beginning to end, yet was never, when one comes to think of it, actually mentioned. He showed a sound instinct, and political shrewdness, in putting the effect of this message to the service of the foreign aid program rather than the military program. The need for the one is less well understood by Congress and the people than the need for the other.

[From the Baltimore Sun, June 6, 1961]

BONN ANXIETY ON TALK ENDS—ADENAUER PLEASED BY KENNEDY'S VIENNA STAND

(By Bynum Shaw)

BONN, June 5.—With evident relief, Chancellor Konrad Adenauer passed the word to top officials of his Government tonight that President Kennedy had "made a good stand" in his Vienna talks with Premier Khrushchev.

The signal for a tense West German capital to relax came after the Chancellor was briefed for 2 hours on the proceedings by Foy D. Kohler, Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs.

The briefing, which also was attended by the American Ambassador, Walter C. Dowling; Hans Globke, a Chancellery assistant; and Karl Carstens, Foreign Office Under Secretary, took place in Dusseldorf, where Adenauer was addressing a convention of Catholic workers.

PLEDGES REISSUED

Officials here said the Chancellor was extremely pleased over the "swiftness" of the appraisal and was satisfied that Mr. Kennedy had not deviated in the slightest from his earlier pledges on Germany.

The Foreign Office made a point of reciting those pledges by reissuing the heart of the communique covering the talks between Adenauer and Mr. Kennedy April 13.

The communique commits both countries to the proposition that "only through the application of the principle of self-determination can a just and enduring solution be found for the problem of Germany, including Berlin."

It also pledges Bonn and Washington "to preserve the freedom of the people of West Berlin pending the reunification of Germany in peace and freedom and the restoration of Berlin as the capital of a reunified country."

On the basis of the Dusseldorf briefing, Government sources were predicting tonight that Moscow now will allow the Berlin problem to rest rest "for awhile," probably until October. But they refused to give any basis for the prediction.

Earlier today Felix von Eckardt, Federal press chief, had said the outstanding characteristics of the Vienna talks were their frankness and realism.

FAR-REACHING UNDERSTANDING

He said the talks might be used as the starting point for far-reaching understanding in the future.

In addition to the report from the American side, Adenauer also received from French President Charles de Gaulle a private assessment of the earlier Franco-American discussions in Paris.

Bonn officials indicated that De Gaulle in his message had predicted certain changes in the NATO setup which sound positive.

Speculation as to the nature of the proposed changes was widespread in the German capital, ranging from equipping NATO with intercontinental ballistic missiles and strategic bombers to the establishment of a new NATO political body and the nomination of a Frenchman to succeed American Gen. Lauris Norstad as NATO military chief. Official sources declined to discourage the speculation.

KROLL BACK FROM MOSCOW

While the Adenauer Government was concerned primarily with affairs involving the entire free world, it had its own private problems today too.

For one thing, Hans Kroll, German ambassador to Moscow, showed up at the Foreign Office here to discuss the reopening of cultural exchange negotiations between Bonn and Moscow.

The talks broke down last month over the issue of including West Berlin artists in the exchange agreement as representatives of West Germany.

REFLECTION EXPECTED

Officials here believe it will be possible to read the outcome of Vienna in the attitude of the Russians toward reopening the talks. A Foreign Office source said Bonn will let Moscow make the next move.

The Bonn Government also declared it was astonished and dismayed over reports that Brazil has opened official contacts with Communist East Germany.

[From the Washington Star, June 6, 1961]

MISSION ACCOMPLISHED

President Kennedy has wound up his journey abroad with an appropriate visit to London, and he has returned with renewed assurances that Britain can be relied upon to continue cooperating closely with the United States in pursuing their common purposes and dealing with the major problems that beset the world.

These assurances have been received from Prime Minister Macmillan, with whom Mr. Kennedy has reviewed the international situation in the light of the talks just held with President de Gaulle in Paris and Soviet Premier Khrushchev in Vienna. Among other things, as set forth in the London communique, Mr. Macmillan has made clear that Britain is in full agreement with France and the United States on the necessity of maintaining the rights and obligations of the allied governments in Berlin. If this means anything at all, it means that the Kremlin will be well advised not to underestimate Anglo-French-American determination to defend the free sectors of the city against any threat of a Communist takeover.

It may be assumed that Mr. Kennedy, besides presenting a good summary of his highly encouraging talks with General de Gaulle, has given Mr. Macmillan a detailed account of the exchange of views with Mr. Khrushchev in Vienna. The account, apart possibly from some promise of progress toward an agreement on Laos, can hardly have been cheering. For the Soviet Premier appears to have been as uncompromising as ever in relation to such matters as Germany and his demand for a veto over any nuclear test ban or any system of general disarmament. But the British Prime Minister, having himself confronted Russia's tough leader, is accustomed to this kind of negativism, and it does not necessarily mean that nothing has been gained from the President's first venture—a strictly limited one—in the difficult art of summitry.

Mr. Kennedy will give his own interpretation of the results of this venture in his report to the Nation tonight. Meanwhile, it is good to welcome him back home from his strenuous, hard-driving mission in behalf of peace—a mission which may actually prove to have been more successful than appearances suggest at the moment. Or so let us hope.

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1961]

NEHRU HEARTENED BY VIENNA REPORT—MOST NATIONS REGARD PARLEY AS GOOD BEGINNING

NEW DELHI, INDIA, June 5.—Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru welcomed today the good news from the Kennedy-Khrushchev talks in Vienna and said he hoped the conversations would have an easing effect on discussions in Geneva about Laos and other matters.

Mr. Nehru said the news from Vienna was very good, a good beginning, and the most we could have expected at this time.

Officials at India's External Affairs Ministry said the Government was particularly pleased by the leaders' reaffirmation of their support for a neutral and independent Laos under a government chosen by Lao themselves.

They expressed the belief that the Lao cease-fire would become more foolproof and effective as a result of the Vienna talks.

TITO HAILS MEETING

[Special to the New York Times]

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA, June 5.—President Tito hailed today the meeting in Vienna between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev as a useful step toward possible settlement of world problems.

Speaking at a meeting in Krusevac, a town in central Serbia, the Yugoslav chief declared:

"We greet from the bottom of our heart the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting, which should have taken place much earlier."

The greater part of Marshal Tito's speech, which was broadcast later by the Belgrade radio, was concerned with domestic affairs, but he said the conference of neutralist nations opening in Cairo today was designed to help the great powers achieve a peaceful settlement of world problems, not to create a third bloc.

The Cairo meeting has the task of making plans for a meeting of leaders of smaller nations to combine approaches to world issues inside and outside the United Nations.

ROME PRESS UNITES IN PRAISE

[Special to the New York Times]

ROME, June 5.—The leftwing and rightwing press was united this morning in applauding the Kennedy-Khrushchev meeting in Vienna.

The meeting has been a good beginning, according to the Communist newspaper Unita, the conservative Il Tempo and independent Il Messagger stressed the feeling that the conversations had been useful.

By the time the afternoon newspapers reached the streets all but the Communist and pro-Communist papers had become more cautious. Most newspapers described the talks as useful but not fruitful.

There was no official comment.

ITALY'S U.N. AID HOPEFUL

[Special to the New York Times]

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., June 5.—Italy's new delegate to the United Nations expressed hope today that the meeting of President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev might reduce world tension a little bit.

Vittorio Zoppi made the observation after presenting his credentials to Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold. He also expressed hope that the slight change in the international political atmosphere might mean that next fall's General Assembly would not be as hard as the last one.

NO SPARKS, GOOD OMEN

LONDON, June 5.—No sparks flew in Vienna—and in the considered opinion of Europe that was a good sign.

Governments and editorial writers on both sides of the Iron Curtain, in comment on the weekend meeting of President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, viewed the calm atmosphere as a mildly hopeful omen.

From Norway to Italy, commentators professed to feel that there was more to the meeting than the two statesmen just sizing each other up.

Communist organs generally referred to the Vienna meeting as a good beginning and declared more talks would be needed.

The Communist party newspaper Pravda commented that the meeting encourages people of good will who detest the cold war and who strive for an enduring peace.

The government newspaper Izvestia said the Vienna talks helped to disperse prejudice and distrust, though some was still around in the West among people who continue to be blinded by a position-of-strength policy.

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1961]

NO TIME TO RELAX

The Soviets are seeking to create something like a "spirit of Vienna" by hailing the Khrushchev-Kennedy meeting as a "good beginning" toward solving the great world problems. If that were the real Soviet attitude, the world could rejoice.

But we have long since learned that the Soviets talk one way and act another, that they exploit a "spirit," whether of Geneva or Camp David, to lull the West into a false sense of security, to disarm it psychologically and to split the Western allies with the wedge of their own differences.

So far as can yet be seen, nothing has changed. The Soviets continue their drive for world domination, with Berlin and Laos as immediate focal points. They seek to prevent any interference with their plans by insisting on tripartite control, with a built-in veto for themselves, on all international action, whether by the United Nations or by a control body for nuclear testing. The free world cannot, therefore, take anything for granted. It must remain strong not only in the interest of free world defense but also because in its strength lies the best hope for peaceful settlement.

This means first and foremost giving what President Kennedy calls "new life" to the North Atlantic alliance. The alliance is the basis of his warning to Premier Khrushchev that the United States fought in two world wars to defend Western Europe and would do so again; and it is the power behind his reinforced agreements with both President de Gaulle and Prime Minister Macmillan to defend West Berlin.

Unfortunately, valiant resolutions in the North Atlantic Council are not always matched with performance. NATO forces are still below required strength. But President Kennedy is taking the lead in remedying the situation. Subject to approval by Congress he is moving toward arming NATO with a truly multilateral nuclear striking force to which the United States would contribute Polaris submarines and also strategic bombers and long-range missiles. He is discussing plans for a new political body in NATO for more effective consultation and putting its forces in Europe under French command to meet some of President de Gaulle's complaints and to facilitate military and nuclear integration. He is pressing on the British definite contingency plans for the defense of Berlin. He urges increasing aid to underdeveloped countries to keep them in freedom's camp.

All these proposals are and must be conditioned on the willingness of our European allies to contribute their fair share toward both military and economic defense by raising their own conventional forces and their financial support. They will only be inviting disaster for all of us by failure to meet the challenge.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 6, 1961]

DESCENT FROM THE SUMMIT—THAT NOTHING MUCH HAPPENED IS ACHIEVEMENT OF SORTS

(By Vermont Royster)

VIENNA.—For all the hard things that lie ahead for the United States after Vienna, what happened here may have been the best thing that anyone could have expected. That is, nothing very much really happened. And that, paradoxically, may be an achievement.

There was nothing cheerful for the peace of the world in the 2-day meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. On the central issues that divide Russia and the United States—nuclear testing, Berlin, and the United Nations—the lines may now well become more rigid. Conceivably this meeting could even make the cold war colder.

Nonetheless, when Premier Khrushchev flew out of here yesterday for Moscow, he should have left behind at least one illusion he brought with him. He may still believe that the sweep of communism over the world is inevitable, and that he holds the upper hand over the United States in terms of power. But at least he has been disillusioned in any hope that just by waving that power he could win easy concessions from President Kennedy.

And President Kennedy, too, must have lost an illusion. For he also found Premier Khrushchev unyielding in all matters of substance. The new President was thus reminded that in this cold war the controlling things are the issues that divide communism from the West and not the personalities of the man who is U.S. President and the man who rules the Communist empire.

If the men around the President reflect his own feelings, it is likely to be some time before he is again tempted to think that he can move Russian policy by sitting down with Nikita Khrushchev.

And there is even a good possibility that the failure of this meeting to change the state of the world may teach some others besides President Kennedy an important lesson about summit conferences and personal diplomacy. If the lines are now more rigid on the Soviet side, they may also be firmer on the Western side.

In any event, the fears of those who thought Premier Khrushchev would push President Kennedy into an impossible corner or trap him into some unwise agreement did not materialize.

BASIC TROUBLES REMAIN

So not all the results are gloomy. The basic troubles which threaten the world today, it ought not to be forgotten, would have been there this morning even if these two men had never met. They are just seen more clearly after this strange meeting.

It was indeed a strange meeting.

President Kennedy came here direct from Paris where he did seem to have a measure of success with his personal diplomacy. Nearly all the issues between America and France that existed when Kennedy arrived there still existed when he left, but those differences were always less than the unifying forces between the two countries. The Kennedy's undoubtedly charmed Paris and the President apparently impressed the General. Here the results of personal contact would have to be put on the credit side of the ledger.

On the surface, the Vienna visit went the same way. President and Premier strolled in the garden of the U.S. Embassy, lunched together twice, shared a state dinner, huddled privately without advisers for 3 hours, took their ladies to a musical gala, and altogether spent a good many hours in personal discussion.

Indeed it's worth noting that when this meeting came to nought it was not because of any boorish behavior on the part of Premier Khrushchev. By all reports he was always courteous, respectful to the President and apparently personally impressed by him. If a willingness to seek peaceful settlements on the part of the U.S. President and good behavior on the part of the Soviet Premier were all that was necesary for a successful meeting, this one would have been a success.

But, of course, this was not all the situation. Premier Khrushchev came to this meeting with some firm objectives in mind. Among them was an effort to force the United States into accepting his plan for reorganizing the United Nations, for a settlement of the nuclear test suspension without inspections, and the acceptance of the Russian two Germanys plan.

To gain these concessions from the United States, the Russian Premier offered both threats and blandishments. He talked tough about Soviet power and at the same time seemed ready to offer some apparent concessions on Laos. But these concessions were really little more than the Russians had already indicated and were more apparent than real. In any event, the bargain was one which no President could have accepted.

WAS IT ALL NECESSARY

President Kennedy did not. Since much of their conversation was private no one can be certain exactly what was said. But in the group discussions the President is reported to have stood firm and in addition to have gone to great lengths to try to disabuse the Premier of any illusion he might have about American military weakness or lack of determination.

That being the case, the meeting could have ended no place but where it did—right where it started. And the state of the world left right where it was before.

Since it was clear long before the meeting started that the Russians were not going to make any meaningful gestures on the dividing issues, and since no President in his right mind should have yielded to them, it is a fair question to ask: Was this trip necessary?

On logic alone, the answer may be no. President Kennedy's former position—no summit meeting without some signs of changes in the Soviet position—is generally the sounder one.

It is not only that otherwise such meetings must prove, as this one did, fruitless of any agreements; there is the added disadvantage that holding fruitless meetings often builds up to disappointment and sometimes even sharpens the differences, as this meeting may have done.

Yet this is a lesson, it seems, that has to be periodically relearned. It was relearned here by President Kennedy, and in a different kind of way by Premier Khrushchev. Neither should now have any illusions about the other. But more importantly, perhaps, Mr. Khrushchev will now have no illusions that he can win what he wants by bluster, and Mr. Kennedy none about the intentions of Communist Russia.

President Kennedy should come out of this meeting a wiser and more experienced man. The rest of the world may now be a little disabused of its idea of an America without will to stand up to the Russians. And the Russians themselves may be forced now to go home and reassess their picture of the cold war.

So even if this trip may not have been logically necessary, it may turn out to have been useful.

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1961]

VIENNA

(By Walter Lippmann)

From the reports based on official briefings we know enough about the Vienna meeting to say that it was significant and important because it marked the reestablishment of full diplomatic intercourse. As a result of the U–2 and the breakup of the summit conference in Paris, there was in fact, although not in form, a rupture of diplomatic relations between Moscow and Washington.

Since President Kennedy's election there have been moves on both sides to repair the break, first through the careful diplomacy of Mr. Thompson, our Ambassador in Moscow, and then through the Vienna meeting which set a seal upon the resumption of diplomatic intercourse.

This is a very considerable achievement, over and above specific agreements and disagreements which were reached in the conversations. For it is only by diplomacy, that is by continual talking, that the ultimate showdown, which neither side wants or can afford, can be put off—and the conflict in the end outgrown and outlived. A worldwide settlement is not in any true sense possible, or even conceivable. But a regulation of the danger of war is possible and is imperative.

It is only by diplomatic talk that the two sides can avoid pushing themselves or getting pushed into some dead-end street where there is no choice except surrender or suicide.

It seems fair to say that an awareness of this existed in the meeting at Vienna. Both men are quite well aware that neither of them is in a position to deliver an ultimatum to the other, and that neither is able, even if he personally were willing, to yield to the other beyond the point where an accommodation of their interests, not a surrender of them, is reached.

Neither side can dictate to the other. Neither side can conquer the other. Neither side can surrender to the other. Therefore, solutions by negotiation and diplomacy are indispensable.

This is illustrated by the one specific issue which is discussed in the official communique. That is Laos. Quite evidently Laos is not of such vital interest to the Soviet Union or to the United States that either of them would in cold blood be willing to fight a costly war to impose its terms of settlement. But at the same time, and of equal gravity, is the fact that an attempt to impose a surrender of Laos to the Communists, that is to say in the end to the Chinese Communists, would be intolerable to the United States and that military moves which would not be undertaken in cold blood might be undertaken in hot blood.

The object of diplomacy is to anticipate and resolve, to cool the fevers of intolerable choices in which the issue is surrender or suicide. In Laos, as the Khrushchev-Kennedy communique recognizes, neutralization is the best possible accommodation of the conflicting interests. In neutralization we abandon the ambition, which was entirely misguided in the first place, of an American satellite government. The other side gives up the hope of absorbing Laos into the Communist orbit.

Whether a neutral Laos can in fact be created is, of course, highly uncertain. We do not know, for example, whether in his relations with Red China, which has the predominant interest in southeast Asia, Mr. Khrushchev has a free hand to do at Geneva what he promised to do in Vienna.

We may hope that he will try. The greater interests of the Soviet State are not involved deeply in Laos or in southeast Asia. For Mr. Khrushchev as for Mr. Kennedy what is at stake in southeast Asia is, in the main, prestige. There would be no loss of prestige for either side if Laos became a neutral state under a government agreed to by the three Lao princes, and legitimatized in an international treaty. It is not at all impossible that such an arrangement to neutralize Laos might be expanded into an arrangement to neutralize all of southeast Asia. This regional association might be guaranteed by India and by Pakistan, by the United Nations, and all the great powers including mainland China.

As to Berlin, which was discussed at some length, the record shows that there has been no showdown and that none is imminent. More time, to be used in continuing discussion, is indispensable.

For Berlin is the supreme example of a situation which could become a dead-end street where for each side the choice was surrender or suicide. Nobody can afford to have any illusions about Berlin—either that Mr. Kennedy would never fight or that Mr. Khrushchev would never fight. Mr. Khrushchev must not have the illusion that the United States would not fight if he drove it into a corner. Mr. Kennedy must not have the illusion, which is held by some of his advisers, that the Soviet Union can be driven into a corner, that it can be intimidated, and that it does not have to be listened to. Nor can we allow ourselves to be caught in the illusion, which is to be found both in Bonn and in Paris, that the West can refuse any negotiation and leave things exactly as they are by threatening to go to war.

The danger of Berlin is that the two sides will let themselves be pushed by their extremists—in East Berlin and in Bonn—into a situation where the problem is what happens when an irresistible force collides with an immovable object. I have a certain amount of confidence that the two men were conscious of this, and having talked with each other are now still more conscious of it, and still more determined that slowly and patiently they must find a way to avoid the intolerable choice.

[From the New York Post, June 5, 1961]

FOOTNOTE TO VIENNA

The Vienna dialog ended with a cryptic communique that reveals almost nothing about what really happened. That no simple solutions were fashioned overnight is as plain as it was predictable. What we may not know for many hours or weeks is whether any semblance of real communication was achieved.

We detect in some immediate local comment a certain relief at the news that no accords were reached. Such remarks have the tone of a nervous matron whose daughter has emerged unscathed from her first rendezvous with a mischievous older man.

In Mr. Khrushchev's camp there is probably similar satisfaction being voiced about his stolid resistance to the charms of a younger companion.

Our instinctive sense is that humanity has lost nothing and perhaps gained something from this encounter. The grave risk was not that Mr. Kennedy would cravenly surrender, but that the meeting would end in some verbal explosion which would block any future exchange. That did not happen.

Our hope is that Mr. Kennedy gave Mr. Khrushchev a true awareness of the degree to which our concern for freedom is matched by our yearning for peace. Conceivably this interview has shaken some of the doctrinaire images of American leadership to which the commissars cling. At the same time Mr. Kennedy may have obtained a glimpse of the pressures operating on Mr. Khrushchev inside the Communist domain.

Some immediate clue may emerge at Geneva, where the search for a nuclear test ban goes on. It is in that life-and-death area that any new prospects for mankind should be soon revealed. But the essential mystery may remain for an infinitely longer time. The question is whether John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev were able for even a moment to break the sound barrier that divides our systems and our ways of life, and to detect their common peril as leaders in the atomic age. Neither man is likely to divulge the answer quickly.

[From the Washington Star, June 6, 1961]

THE POLITICAL MILL—THE VALUE OF THE KENNEDY TRIP

(By Gould Lincoln)

The visit of President Kennedy to Paris, to Vienna, and to London has, it appears, established once more the friendly feeling and respect of our allies, France and Great Britain, toward the United States, and has served notice to the Communist world that the determination of the free world to remain free is not to be brushed aside. The receptions given to President Kennedy by General de Gaulle, President of France, and Prime Minister Macmillan of Great Britain, and by the Russian Premier, Nikita Khrushchev, have been significant. The word is out that the United States is still very much on the map, still a world leader. It is heartening, after the evident slump of our prestige following the Cuban fiasco, further increased by the long delay over a cease-fire in Laos.

It is an old axiom that actions speak louder than words. The words have now been said. President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev have spent many hours discussing the problems which divide the East and West, the free world and the world behind the Iron Curtain. There has been no report on what was actually said—about West Berlin and Germany, about Laos, about disarmament, and nuclear testing. In fact, the only thing at all tangible that has come out was an expression that both Soviet Russia and the United States wish for an effective cease-fire in Laos.

President Kennedy on his return today, will make a report not only to the leaders in Congress but to the American people regarding his trip. Until he speaks, there are several questions uppermost in many minds. The principal, has his trip made the cold war between the United States and Russia less cold in any degree? When the trip was projected, on the initiative of Premier Khrushchev, it was described merely as an opportunity for Mr. Kennedy to talk things over with Mr. Khrushchev, not as an effort to obtain and to seek agreements on vital subjects. The one thing predicted was that Mr. Kennedy would make clear to the Russian leader the United States would not yield to Communist aggression; and that a third world war could easily be touched off if the Communists either wished it or acted without the knowledge that the United States would fight.

A-TEST TALKS STALLED

Eyes turn now to Geneva, where the conferences on Laos and on nuclear testing and disarmament have been stalled because of Russian demands and delays. If there is to be action, if agreements can now be reached, the value of the Kennedy trip to Vienna will have paid off, indeed. The great difficulty in the past has been to get anything from the Russians beyond words. And when they have acted, the action has tended to make worse, rather than better, the relations between the free world and the Iron Curtain world. If there was any saber rattling in the Kennedy-Khrushchev talks, it has not been disclosed. To the contrary, the wish was expressed that better relations would be found possible and Mr. Khrushchev even went so far as to say that President Kennedy would be a welcome visitor to Moscow—an invitation to which Mr. Kennedy has yet to make any reply. The Russian Premier is evidently willing to continue talks about the problems which confront both the United States and the Soviet Union.

OUR EXPERIENCE WITH REDS

If there is to be an agreement reached at Geneva regarding the future of Laos, and the agreement provides for a government in which the Communists or Communist supporters are given a share in the Government of that country, the United States may take a dim view of the situation. We had our experiences in China and elsewhere, where Communists have had a share, no matter how small at the start, in government. The result was an eventual takeover by the Communists. What will be the Communists' next move in regard to South Vietnam? If the supposed buffer state of Laos—a neutralized Laos—goes Communist and South Vietnam follows the same path, all the rest of the rich southeast Asia may be lost to the free world.

These are subjects in which Red China is just as interested, perhaps more so, than is Soviet Russia. In talking with Mr. Khrushchev, did President Kennedy discuss the attitude and activities of Red China in that section of the world? As Mr. Kennedy has reported to the British Government on his talks with Mr. Khrushchev, a report which was awaited by Prime Minister Macmillan with keenest interest, Mr. Khrushchev may be expected to pass on to the Chinese his own impressions of his conference with Mr. Kennedy.

Any way it is regarded, the trip which President Kennedy has just concluded should be of value to him and to the United States. He has had an opportunity to see and confer with the chief protagonist of world communism and to size him up. He has had, too, an opportunity to discuss with President de Gaulle of France problems relating to the unity of free Europe and the United States in defense against Communist aggression. One thing seems vital—there will be no letting down of the guard at this juncture.

Also, Mr. Kennedy may have learned whether summit meetings are of value, or whether his original determination to remain in Washington is the better course for the future.

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1961]

LIVING WITH DANGER

With apparently no indication from Mr. Khrushchev that he is willing to modify the Soviet position on any of the big issues in dispute between East and West, there could be some tendency toward fatalism following the talks at Vienna. That would be unfortunate. East-West relations are no worse than they were before the meeting, and in some respects they may be slightly improved by the mere fact that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev know more precisely what the other means.

On Berlin the two viewpoints seemingly remain far apart. No doubt both leaders were aware that the persons most immediately involved—the people of East and West Germany—were not directly represented. Mr. Kennedy appears to have given the impression that he is more concerned with continued free access to Berlin than with whether the Soviet Union signs a separate peace treaty with East Germany.

If this is an accurate impression there is some logic to the point. Nonrecognition of East Germany has been a moral lever of sorts for the West, but it has become increasingly ineffectual as the fact has become plain that there is no practical present possibility of German reunification. In any event, the West cannot prevent Mr. Khrushchev from signing a separate treaty. But it is very important for Mr. Khrushchev to understand that no such arrangement can abrogate Western rights, and that a war could easily start if his East German satellite should tamper in any way with the freedom of or access to Berlin.

More disheartening is the continued Soviet insistence on the troika—the three-man, veto-equipped inspectorate that Mr. Khrushchev prescribes for the nuclear test ban. This appears to doom the chances of agreement. Moreover, it indicates that the troika has become a part of Mr. Khrushchev's dogma. Some difficult decisions are ahead for the United States on whether to resume testing (it by no means follows that the West would gain more than the Soviet Union in a resumption). The West ought to be willing to talk, at any rate, as long as the Soviet Union wants to talk.

An independent and neutral government for Laos, it is said at the White House, is the only issue on which the two leaders were completely agreed. It would be well to take even this with a pinch of seasoning. We may hope that Mr. Khrushchev will help create the framework for an uncommitted but viable government in Laos, but the test will be in how to use his influence in the not very encouraging negotiations at Geneva.

What, then, are the points that tend to offset the gloom? The administration ought to be wary of peddling too optimistic a line; the mere fact that nothing emerged when nothing was expected hardly constitutes cause for great satisfaction. Nevertheless, there is some value in an effort to establish personal communication and examine policies in detail so that there will be less possibility of misunderstanding. In a sense the two competitors have attempted to define the rules, each remaining suspicious but undertaking to judge actions against stated intentions.

There will be some gain if the net result is to emphasize that the differences are both real and basic and that they cannot be bridged by wishful thinking. In the larger sense it will be well for all of us to learn that there are some issues that cannot be easily or neatly settled. Soviet policy has changed before in response to altered situations, and over a long period that may happen again. In the meantime, however, we shall have to live with our frustrations, competing in every aspect of existence with a leader and system whose purposes are inimical to ours, and still attempting to keep the differences from blowing up.

To the extent that President Kennedy's pilgrimage has reinforced the conviction that the challenge before the free world is a very long-term affair requiring patience and nerve as well as determination, it may indeed have been beneficial. Mr. Kennedy has performed well for his country, without either compromising its interests or selling short its hope of a just peace.

THE CONSTITUTION AND PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, Attorney General Kennedy and the Department of Justice have taken the incredible position that the Constitution of the United States requires the 50 States to provide public education.

That, Mr. President, is a position which is as absurd as it is dangerous. It cannot be supported by either the language of the Constitution and the amendments thereto or by the express intent of their framers.

The methods of amending the Constitution are clearly set forth in its provisions. Judicial decrees and opinions and briefs of the Attorney General are not included among them.

The Washington Evening Star in its editorial of June 6 entitled "Federal 'Big Brother'" correctly assessed the alarming implications of this new attempt of the Attorney General to usurp for the National Government rights and powers which without question are reserved by the Constitution to the 50 sovereign States and their citizens.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL BIG BROTHER

If the Department of Justice is right in its contention that the Constitution requires the States to provide public education, George Orwell's "Big Brother" may be coming to live with us after all.

Although this contention was put forward in response to a court inquiry, it is unlikely, we suppose, that there will be a final Supreme Court ruling sustaining the Department's view in this instance. For the Court, generally speaking, will not break new constitutional ground if the case before it can be decided on some other basis. And this particular case—involving a strictly local decision to close public schools in Louisiana's St. Helena Parish—lends itself to adjudication on other grounds. The mere fact that this novel constitutional claim has been put forward, however, may serve as a portent of things to come.

The gist of the Department's position, as explained by Attorney General Kennedy, is that education for all is an "absolute necessity," and that to deny this to a child is to deprive him of liberty and property under the due process clause of the 14th amendment. (When this amendment was ratified, a number of States did not maintain any kind of public school system.)

If this is a constitutionally sound position, what limit is there to the reach of the Federal authority? If the Federal Government is authorized by the Constitution to decree that education is a necessity, and that the Sates must provide it, it is a very short step indeed to assumption by the Federal Government of responsibility also to decree what must be taught, by whom it must be taught and how it must be taught. What about such other things as medical care, recreation, decent housing, etc? To a degree, at least, all of these are necessary, in the Attorney General's words, to equip individuals "to compete with citizens of other States in the struggle for professional and economic achievement." Does the Constitution require the States to provide all of these and other things, as well as education? Does the ultimate power to decide what is and what is not a necessity for the residents of the States reside in the Federal courts? If so, "Big Brother" has taken over in Washington—and much sooner than we anticipated.

REVIEW BY MRS. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE OF IMPORTANT EVENTS OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S FIRST 100 DAYS IN OFFICE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to a detailed, well thought out letter from former Ambassador Clare Boothe Luce to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, published June 6.

In this letter Mrs. Luce reviews what she considers to be the seven most important events of President Kennedy's first 100 days, and concludes, to quote, "The melancholy fact is that U.S. prestige has reached a new historic low."

I will briefly mention some of the seven events that Mrs. Luce feels have done very grave damage to the respect accorded our leadership around the world.

To quote Mrs. Luce:

The virtual loss of Laos to the Communists (which both Candidate Kennedy and later President Kennedy pledged his administration to prevent) has opened the door wide to the Communist conquest of all Indochina and weakened the morale of the anti-Red alliance in south Asia.

Mrs. Luce calls the collapse of the American-installed parliamentary government of South Korea a severe blow to supporters of democracy in Asia.

Concerning the opinion expressed by U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, that Red China must soon be seated in the U.N. Mrs. Luce notes that—

Mr. Kennedy's silence on the subject seems to give consent.

This has disheartened all the Asiatic nations threatened by Red China.

She contends that—

The continuation of the deadlock in the disarmament and nuclear test ban negotiations, which Candidate Kennedy promised to break, fortifies many Europeans and Asians in the belief that the only choice now open to them is either appeasement of the U.S.S.R. or an atomic war.

Mrs. Luce's comment on Cuba is most thought provoking. Citing the "catastrophic political consequences" of the Cuban debacle, she states:

In no foreign policy question during the campaign, and even after his inauguration, did Mr. Kennedy commit himself more clearly than on that of securing Cuban freedom, overthrowing Castro and expelling Communist influence in South America.

Mr. President, I recommend a close reading of this article to all those interested in assessing our country's position today, particularly Mrs. Luce's study of the consequences of the Cuban affair, which takes up more than one-half of the letter.

Mrs. Luce concludes that—

The Cuban fiasco has been the greatest propaganda, political and strategic victory for Communist policies since the loss of China—

And charges that—

Under last-minute Presidential orders, the American elements withdrew their promised air support, and stood silently by while Castro's tanks and planes mowed down the Cuban freedom fighters.

These circumstances—

She says—

are interpreted by all pro-Americans, or anti-Communist political and military elements in the 20 countries of Latin America, to mean that while the United States of America is indeed willing to meddle in their behalf, when the chips are down and the blood begins to flow they must be prepared to go it alone.

Mr. President, I believe that the chips are down for the United States. I have cited from this letter at length because I believe it is imperative that we assess, no matter how uncomfortable it makes us, the position this country is in today, so that we may better guide her in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, June 6, 1961]

LETTER FROM CLARE BOOTHE LUCE

JUNE 5, 1961.

The EDITOR: During his campaign for the Presidency, Mr. Kennedy made the question of U.S. prestige a major issue. Insisting that it was at an alltime low in the world, he promised, if elected, to raise it. Enough people believed in his ability to do so to elect him. And even those who would have preferred Mr. Nixon in the White House, with much self-restraint and inspired by good will, hope, and patriotism, forbore criticism during the first 100 days of his administration. But in view of the swift and somewhat terrifying pace of events abroad, surely there can be no objection to reviewing the question of U.S. prestige, which is no less important to Americans today than it was in November.

Admittedly, the restoration of our world prestige is not an easy matter. President Kennedy inherited a very sour world situation from Eisenhower (as Eisenhower did from Truman, Truman from Roosevelt, Roosevelt from Hoover, etc.). Moreover, the promise of a candidate to achieve any difficult goal carries with it the reasonable expectation that he will have 4 years to do so. The President still has 3½ years to go.

Meanwhile, the melancholy fact is that U.S. prestige has reached a new historic low. Seven events, transpiring in the 100 days since his inauguration, have done very grave damage to it.

1. The virtual loss of Laos to the Communists (which both Candidate Kennedy and later President Kennedy pledged his administration to prevent) has opened the door wide to the Communist conquest of all Indochina and weakened the morale of the anti-Red alliance in south Asia. And if Vietnam is not to be lost next, armed resistance there is imperative.

Recently President Garcia of the Philippines, calling on the United States to fight in Laos and South Vietnam before it is too late, said, "The question is whether to let the Russians overrun Asia or keep it in the democratic camp. If the answer is the former, then give up the fight and let the Communists gobble it up now."

2. The collapse of the American-installed parliamentary government of South Korea in a military coup is a second severe blow to supporters of democracy in Asia, where many people already believe that their only valid political choice today is between an

anti-Red dictatorship and a pro-Red dictatorship.

3. The opinion expressed by the head of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, that Red China must soon be seated in the U.N. (to which Mr. Kennedy's silence on the subject seems to give consent), whether "inevitable" or not, has disheartened all the Asiatic nations threatened by that country, and dismayed our stanchest Far East ally—the free China on Taiwan.

4. The continuation of the deadlock in the disarmament and nuclear test ban negotiations, which Candidate Kennedy promised to break, fortifies many Europeans and Asians in the belief that the only choice now open to them is either appeasement of U.S.S.R. or atomic war. The choice that too many have already made is reflected in the phrase coined in Great Britain, "Better Red than dead."

5. The Soviet claim to have put the first man into outer space orbit has persuaded millions of people abroad (and many here) that Soviet science and technology, if not already superior to ours, will be so soon. The Russian cosmonaut story (topping their sputnik triumph) is a major propaganda victory for the Reds, especially in nonindustrial countries.

6. The outbreak of anti-Negro rioting in Alabama, requiring (as in Little Rock) the use of Federal troops to restore order, is regarded by nonwhite nations, especially in Africa, as renewed proof of the Russian contention that American democracy still believes that the "colored man" is a second class citizen and an inferior human being.

7. Above all, the failure of the Cuban invasion with its catastrophic political consequences has been a disastrous blow to American prestige. On no foreign policy question during the campaign, and even after his inauguration, did Mr. Kennedy commit himself more clearly than on that of securing Cuban freedom, overthrowing Castro and expelling Communist influence in South America. Today, openly allied with Soviet Russia and Red China, Castro is in complete control of Cuba.

Here are some of the gloomy political and military consequences of the debacle on the shores of the Bay of Pigs:

(a) Castro is better positioned than ever to use Cuban soil and Cuban facilities as a base for Communist military and political undertakings in Latin America. With the help of Moscow, he can place guided-missile sites in Cuba. In the all too likely event that the United States should find its hands full with a new Berlin or Far East crisis, Castro's Cuba would be a military dagger at our backs.

(b) Russian propaganda has tirelessly tagged the United States as an aggressor, interventionist nation and a congenital meddler in Latin American affairs. It can now tag us as something worse: an ineffective, timid, indecisive meddler.

It is no secret that the United States recruited, trained, planned, provisioned, and financed the Cuban invasion, and that two American destroyers and an aircraft carrier escorted the rebels to Cuban shores. But it is also no secret now that under last-minute Presidential orders, the American elements withdrew their promised airlift, and stood silently by while Castro's tanks and planes mowed down the Cuban freedom fighters.

These circumstances are interpreted by all pro-Americans, or anti-Communist political and military elements in the 20 countries of Latin America, to mean that while the United States is indeed willing to meddle in their behalf, when the chips are down and the blood begins to flow they must be prepared to "go it alone."

(c) Similarly in the Far East (Laos, Vietnam, Formosa) and wherever freemen are beleaguered by the Reds, this mournful news seems to spell "the handwriting on the wall." If the United States will not fight by the side of Cuban patriots against Khrushchev's Red protege, less than a hundred miles from its own coast, how (they ask themselves) can it be counted on to defend the freedom of peoples thousands of miles away?

(d) The world's foreign offices construe our last-minute abandonment of the rebels as the final scuttling of the Monroe Doctrine. Mrs. Roosevelt wrote in the June issue of McCall's: "The old Monroe Doctrine is really out of date now" and "there is absolutely no [military] action we as an individual nation can take" (against the incursion of Russian power in the South and Central American countries). The President's personal choice of Mrs. Roosevelt to head the committee to raise funds for Castro's tractor deal seems conclusive evidence to many that she speaks for him in this regard (not a heartening thought to the Cuban underground). This means to other nations that the United States today will not react, unless directly attacked, against the erection of more Communist dictatorships south of the Rio Grande. No sensible foreign statesman believes that we can secure joint action or military cooperation from all 20 nations of South America to overthrow Castro.

Where American power confesses itself impotent, American prestige inescapably suffers.

(e) The assassination of Dominican Dictator Trujillo, a long-expected event possibly precipitated by the political climate of Castro's triumph, is certain to have further serious political consequences. The President's policy of nonintervention anywhere in Latin America, announced a few days before the Cuban invasion, now makes it awkward if not impossible for the United States to intervene either against the erection of a new dictatorship of the right or a Communist revolution, should one succeed in San Domingo. It will be even more awkward for the United States to intervene if Castro launches an invasion against Trujillo's heirs in the name of the liberation of the Dominican masses. There is also every likelihood that any popular uprising engineered by the Communists in San Domingo would also spread to Haiti. If the United States then intervened, it would furnish Russia with a magnificent propaganda weapon—U.S. imperialist suppression of a free Negro republic.

(f) One of the less disastrous consequences of the triumph of Castro is the domestic disunity and controversy which the President's private espousal of Castro's blood blackmail has aroused. Those who feel we should go through with it for humanitarian reasons have been put at the throats of those who feel we should not for reasons of patriotism or ethical principle. I hold that the President's desire to swap $20 million worth of tractors with an avowed enemy is indeed an act of Christian charity, good propaganda, and a politically moral gesture, especially in view of the fact that his own decisions are responsible for the plight of the captives. It proves that the President's (and America's) heart is in the right place and Castro's heart is in the wrong place—propositions that scarcely need proving.

What needs proving just now—and it is a somewhat difficult assignment—is that the President's head is in the right place and Castro's is in the wrong place. Prudence and foresight before the event are the virtues of a statesman, and private compassion after the event will not make up for their lack. The fact that must be made plain to those who are in favor of the tractor deal is that neither swapping nor refusing to swap men for machines with the enemy is an adequate substitute for a sound, vigorous, positive United States-Cuban policy.

All told, as of this writing, the Cuban fiasco has been the greatest propaganda, political, and strategic victory for Communist policies since the loss of China. It is a disaster for which Mr. Kennedy has courageously shouldered the blame. I venture to predict he will not make another such error. Meanwhile, his prime task is to put an end to the calamitous political chain reactions set in motion at the "Bay of Pigs." This means he must soon devise a new and effective policy to free Cuba from Communist domination, not only as a necessary step to protect other Latin American countries from Castroism, but to protect our own shores against possibility of another Pearl Harbor, if Castro should still be in power and were to be militarily dispersed or engaged in struggle in other parts of the globe. In this, by no means easy but not impossible task, President Kennedy has the good will and prayers of all Americans.

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE.

ADDRESS BY LT. GEN. ARTHUR G. TRUDEAU

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the Army, is a native of my State of whom all Vermonters are proud.

On Monday of this week he made a most enlightening speech dealing with research and development of new weapons systems. But, like the thoughtful man he is, he understands that weapons alone are not enough to realize the great possibilities of this country.

More backbone and less wishbone is needed to lift our horizon and rekindle the spirit and dynamism of our forefathers—

He declares in his speech.

This is a national task—and it depends upon industry, on labor, on government, and on the Armed Forces—but basically it is an individual task demanding the dedication of every loyal American.

General Trudeau concludes his speech with the famous words of Vermont's great Ethan Allen, which I find especially pertinent to our day:

I wish to God America would at this critical juncture exert herself—she might rise up on eagle wings and mount up to Glory, Freedom and Immortal Honor if she did but know her strength.

I believe that General Trudeau's address should be shared by all our citizens and I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: FINDING AND FORGING

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army)

Mr. Fraser, distinguished guests, members of this apprenticeship conference, fellow Americans, it is a real pleasure to be here this evening for a number of reasons. Certainly the foremost is the privilege of addressing you—representatives from 18 States and the nearby provinces of Canada concerned with industries vital to the common defense of our two great nations. Another reason is the stimulating experience of returning to the soil of my native State—to sense once more the great potential that lies ahead for Vermont—for its industries and for its people, if we have the wisdom to develop it. And finally—it is always a pleasure to meet and greet old friends in this lovely town of Manchester.

Your presence at these sessions, seeking better ways to industrial progress, is proof to me of a growing interest in national affairs—both here and in Canada. This is the kind of interest that must be maximized throughout the length and breadth of our mighty lands—and the rest of the free world—to keep us alert and ready to cope with the many challenges that color the present and obscure the future.

America's need of the hour is for complete national support of our President as he calls for the building up of our economic and military strength, and for more dynamic and positive foreign policies. Above all, we need a national rededication to the virtues of faith and courage, and to meaningful resurgence of the deep, moral principles that once made our Nation so great and so strong.

Talk of liberty and freedom is common throughout this Republic, yet today there are too many indications that the bulk of Americans fail fully to realize how much is really at stake if we lose the present struggle and suffer the loss of these blessings that are still the hope of freemen everywhere. We seem to be so proud of our heritage that we oft become careless of our destiny. We will be stronger and better Americans when we rekindle in heart and mind the epic days and deeds of our gallant forebears and of our immortal great.

Let us remember that the principles for which they fought are freshly challenged every day. Those great principles must be fought for and won, again and again—through continuous, dedicated struggle.

Ralph Waldo Emerson—famous New England sage—once remarked that "a man's reach should exceed his grasp, else why are the heavens made?"

Today, America and Canada deserve to survive and prosper only to the extent that our leaders and people are willing to scale new heights—to seek new frontiers—and evidence their willingness to pay the price of freedom and liberty in the golden coin of patriotism, preparedness, and progress. The mint of this coin, and the key to our national future, are individual courage, self-discipline and sacrifice, and steadfast adherence to the great tenets of our Christian faith.

In this present world of surging crises—in this age of blinding speed and "hydrogenized diplomacy"—dedication to the patriotic advancement of American ideals and achievements, military preparedness, and economic progress is the first order of the day.

As we move ahead in the decade of the sixties, our world is torn by three revolutionary forces, demanding and dangerous in their implications.

The first—and foremost—is the insidious ideology of Sino-Soviet communism.

The second is the "social revolution of rising expectations" in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and

The third is the tremendous explosion in science and technology which dominates our life and our time.

If communism were a dead issue today, the rising tide of ethnic nationalism—which burst forth from the agonizing struggles of World War II and since—would alone present us with one of the greatest challenges of all time. This tide is creating truly significant problems in areas of Africa, Asia, and South America. In these areas the people—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished, living in a wheelbarrow and A-frame economy—call, and call loudly, for an improved standard of living.

The sound and solid key to economic growth, industrial progress, better health, and richer lives for these peoples is science and technology supported by the right kind, and the right number, of educated scientists, engineers, and teachers, supported in balance by all the artisans and others who contribute to a thriving economy.

Let's turn to science and technology—to that revolutionary phenomenon which is so drastically reshaping our world, bringing to today's generation and our children more changes and challenges than were faced by our forebears in any past period of history.

Modern science today is less than 500 years old and technology is perhaps half of that, but in the last century—2 percent of recorded time—mankind has achieved 90 percent of his technological progress. And the future is even more challenging. Of all the men who have been trained in science and technology throughout the world over the 5,000 years of recorded history—on both sides of the Iron Curtain—it is estimated that nine-tenths of them are alive today.

One cannot reflect upon these startling facts without considering their impact on our daily lives. In business and industry—in politics and the military—even in the most fundamental unit, the family—the daily routine has become firmly geared to scientific advances.

Not only will national security profit from this amazing age of science and technology, but so will our way of life and literally all mankind, if we have but the wisdom to employ its potential.

Certainly there are many complexities facing us. For instance, in terms of military preparedness, the U.S. Army faces the pressing problem of how to provide tomorrow's weapons and equipment in the face of mushrooming costs and rapid technological change.

Each day we are learning how to do something better—how to build weapons and equipment more potent and reliable than ever before.

Change follows so closely on the heels of change that some of our operational weapons are hardly off the production line before they are obsolescent. This has caused more misunderstanding and criticism of the Armed Forces than any other aspect of our peacetime programs. I can assure you that we minimize waste of time, effort, and money through the closest possible military-industry-science teamwork. Nevertheless, some degree of obsolescence is a constant in the preparedness equation.

A parallel problem with which we struggle is how to keep training in pace with new weapon developments and production techniques.

Although simplicity and reliability are prime considerations in our weapon development programs, there has been an increasing tendency since World War II to develop machine tools and equipment along more complex and sophisticated lines. This has led to increased cost, decreased reliability, and untenable maintenance problems for the using troops. The more complex the system, the more difficult for human action to adapt the device to the military environment.

My philosophy is that human factors engineering considerations must be taken into account from the very beginning of the concept-design-development cycle. Moreover, these man-machine compatibility considerations must be brought to bear on the problems of production and maintenance as well as operation.

I insist that human factors, scientists, engineers, and technicians make certain that the human subsystem is fully prepared to contribute effectively and maximally in all new weapons systems. Science must insure that man is the master of his weapons and machines and not their servant.

I want to emphasize that the U.S. Army is calling on scientific research techniques to solve effectively the very critical training problem of putting the right man in the right job—of utilizing our manpower to the best of the Army's ability.

Let me tell you about some of this interesting research.

The area I have selected pertains to electronics—a field that is advancing so rapidly these days that each new advance means a flood of changes in communications equipment, missile guidance systems, and other related fields.

Here, the Army faces a major problem in training electronics personnel to operate and maintain these new systems. We are turning to the Human Resources Research Office of the George Washington University—an agency better known to us as HumRRO—for realistic solutions to this problem.

HumRRO scientists have devised an easily learned set of skills and knowledges—which could be described in terms of "cues" presented by the equipment, such as lights, buzzers, meters, scopes—and "responses" by the individual operator or repairman in terms of turning wheels, adjusting knobs, or pushing buttons.

An interesting sidelight to this research is an improved field radio repairman course at the Army Signal School. This course focuses on recognition and correction of the most common troubles found in modern sophisticated radios—and is taught by a method which the HumRRO scientists call the functional context principle of instruction.

Let me briefly tell you about it. The functional context principle involves a presentation of electronics subjects in the sequence of concrete to abstract—the whole and then its parts—from the operational to the theoretical. This is a change from the normal classroom or training school approach. Usually, theory and fundamentals are presented largely out of context with their eventual use.

Through using this functional context principle, we have been able to reduce our training time materially and—even more important—we have been successful in training men who had fairly low aptitude to do this difficult type of repair work. Under the old system, men with aptitude scores of less than 110 were unable to qualify; under the new training technique, we can employ them productively.

You can see the importance of this in these days of ever-increasing competition for men with highest aptitude and the need to gage overall employment on the total cross section of our population.

For those of you who are interested, I have with me some literature concerning the "functional context principle" and will be happy to make it available at the conclusion of my remarks.

Now, let's look at some of the scientific wonders of today—products of military research and development—which are but the indices of what we may expect in the promising future. I speak of them not only because of their economic and military interests, but because of our attitude as Americans toward science and technology is an increasingly important factor in the fight of free men to withstand and overcome the growing incursions of Sino-Soviet communism.

Several Army research branches are working to solve difficult, immediate problems in the powerplant field. One of the most pressing needs of the decade ahead is for greatly increased energy sources. New fuels as well as new powerplants must be discovered and developed—and our processes for achieving more efficient use of existing fuels must be improved. Especially as we move further into the era of missiles, rockets, and space vehicles this demand for new fuels is ceaseless.

A substantial Army Research and Development effort to solve these problems now ranges from today's gas turbine to tomorrow's fuel cell—from the magnetohydrodynamic generator to the solar cell—and in a

future as awesome as it is near—nuclear plants for propulsion. Of these, the direct conversion of chemical energy to electrical energy through the use of fuel cells is the most promising for the seventies.

The potential of this work is exciting, both for military and civilian use. We may one day have batteries to which we add chemicals and generate enough electricity to drive motors and light whole buildings. The impetus for this research is military—because such fuel cells could free our armies from long, vulnerable supply lines and give our forces the battlefield mobility military planners predict will be needed in any future war—be it general or limited war. It is not only a saving on fuel that is important—fuel cells are simpler and need less maintenance—are noiseless—and give off very little heat or smoke.

Significant also is the fuel cell's potentially high efficiency compared with that of a gasoline motor—about 60 to 80 percent compared with 25 to 30 percent. This means more efficient utilization of fuel with substantial reduction in the logistical load.

Research efforts are also underway today to bridge the gap between materials and solid state physics. Rich dividends, here, will permit us to chain link large molecules so that materials—with properties we can hardly now imagine—can be created at our order. Instead of having to work with materials we have—we can have the materials we want. We can determine the ideal characteristics we need, then tailor them out of atoms and molecules as needed.

These and other materials research-sparked developments will redound to the benefits of our civilian industry and commerce as well as to the military, giving us greater utilization of energy, increased measures of reliability and more efficient space accommodations.

How many of us in these days of wondrous advances remain impressed by the fact that electronic parts have been reduced in size in the last few years by modular concepts so that now instead of 7,000 parts per cubic foot, we can put 350,000 parts in the same space. Now, even this figure can be increased by a factor of 10 in certain fuse applications, and using solid circuit techniques, or molecular electronics, even this is only a beginning. Just around the corner of tomorrow I predict we shall see a good wristwatch radio of the size of an afterdinner mint.

* * * * *

Our Signal Corps scientists have learned independently how to use very high pressures and temperatures to make industrial diamonds out of carbon. Through this research, the Army hopes to learn more about the physics and chemistry of large synthetic crystals, such as quartz and rubies, for use in electronics work.

The need is common to all the military services.

* * * * *

However you view the future, the shape of things to come will depend in large measure upon our progress in electronics. Computers today promise to revolutionize industry just as Watts' steam engine revolutionized the manufacturing methods of the last century. The day is just around the corner when the vast majority of the manufacturing processes of this and, subsequently, other nations will be controlled by automation.

I do not join with those who see automation as a permanent threat to jobs, unions, and prosperity, although adjustments certainly must be made. Rather, to me, the strict quality control and increased production which automation makes possible is the harbinger of a future more prosperous and productive than any period yet experienced in our remarkable history. If kitchen appliances were made by hand, very few of us here could afford them.

It is well to remember that progress is inevitable, absolutely essential to a nation's survival. History clearly points out that every advance in production and marketing has created more goods and services, and more and better jobs.

You will remember from your study of history how the appearance of the steam engine in England was accompanied by dire prophecies of mass unemployment, mass starvation, and mass degradation. Yet, the industrial revolution based on that development raised Western production and employment levels to undreamed of heights.

Automation and numerical control will do the same—it will be a giant step toward relieving more men of common chores and giving these routine tasks to machines. Man will be freed for the more remunerative, skilled tasks for which he is properly fitted. Remember, more than two-thirds of the people in this world have less than the poorest of our grandfathers.

Industrialized nations of the free world are aware today that it is to everybody's best interest to make this transition as rapidly as possible through the use of severance payments, relocation allowances, Government aid, and industrial retraining programs designed to help individuals acquire new skills.

Of course, I think it is most essential that action be taken, and this may involve legislation, providing for more rapid write-offs, in order to modernize our plants and our machine tooling. At best, our machine tools that antedate 1950 are obsolescent and, in most cases, they are really obsolete and inadequate to meet today's costs or tomorrow's production requirements.

Certainly, there is a vital need to improve our production base to meet current and emergency demands for complex, highly sophisticated equipment in quantity and to train artisans to operate it.

The degree to which industry meets these basic requirements is the yardstick that will measure the degree of effectiveness of our national program. Were it not for the critical situation our Nation faces—as well as the rest of the free world—production deficiencies could be calculated simply in terms of added costs and time delays to national progress. But it is the Communist threat and the demands from the underdeveloped nations that set the scene for the sixties—and beyond—and it is our business, our mutual concern, to see that the play ends in victory and not in tragedy for ourselves or free peoples worldwide.

Now, what I have sketched for you this evening should give you an indication that scientific research and technological applications bulk massively in shaping both our military posture and our national progress.

Each of us, here tonight, must perceive more clearly just how deadly is the danger that hangs over us. The trials and tribulations of each day must no longer obscure this fact. We must realize that eternal vigilance, readiness to sacrifice, and adequate preparedness are the price of peace and freedom. Theodore Roosevelt, that strong leader and great American, in accenting the need for adequate military strength and the determination to use it if necessary, said it far better this way:

"I would not pretend for a moment * * * that merely military proficiency * * * would by itself make this or any other nation great. First and foremost come the duties within the gates of our own household; first and foremost our duty is to strive to bring about a better administration of justice, cleaner, juster, more equitable methods in our political, business, and social life, the reign of law, the reign of that orderly liberty which was the first consideration in the minds of the founders of this Republic. * * * This Nation * * * will certainly fail if we do not thus keep ourselves prepared."

This is where a continuous catalytic action is required. More backbone and less wishbone is needed to lift our horizon and rekindle the spirit and dynamism of our forefathers. This is a national task—and it depends upon industry, on labor, on Government, and on the Armed Forces—but basically it is an individual task—demanding the dedication of every loyal American.

That courage, that selflessness, that determination to achieve great things still exists within our people, but first the fog of fear and the clouds of complacency that obscure the horizon must be swept away by the freshening breeze of an awakened America.

The great days of these United States and Canada need not lie shrouded in past glories. We have but seen the dawn of national achievement. Unlimited is our future if we have the courage to seek it. The days of the coming years burn bright with promise—for those who dare.

The kind of individual spirit, dedication, and courage that we must have today was clearly indicated many years ago by a great Vermonter in the earliest days of the Revolutionary War.

After the heroic efforts of Ethan Allen and his "Green Mountain boys" in the capture of Fort Ticonderoga, a timid Continental Congress fell to talking about giving the captured cannon back to the British. Whereupon, Ethan Allen wrote Congress, saying in part, what might well be our thought for tonight:

"I wish to God America would at this critical juncture exert herself * * * she might rise up on eagle wings and mount up to glory, freedom, and immortal honor if she did but know her strength."

I thank you very much.

NOW IS THE TIME FOR ELECTORAL REFORM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, after every national election, electoral reform is on the top of the editorial page. I believe it should stay there. It should not be quickly forgotten and set aside as one of those things that you just do not do because it is no longer of pressing importance—something like buying a snow shovel in July.

I strongly believe the Congress should do something, and do it now, to reform our outmoded electoral system. Although the relevant committees of the Senate recently have been holding hearings on various electoral reforms, there even now seems to be an unfortunate and inexplicable decline in the interest of the general public and Members of the Congress in this issue.

Mr. President, the very heart of a democracy is the right to vote. To constantly improve and expand this right in every way possible is as important as any other function of the Congress.

In the general category of needed electoral reform, there are a number of key areas in which I believe effective reforms are both possible and practical right now. They are: Standardizing residence requirements in presidential elections, eliminating the poll tax; shortening the length of campaigns; tightening up Federal laws on reporting campaign contributions; placing more realistic ceilings on these gifts; permitting a 50-percent tax credit for individual political contributions up to $10; adjusting the timing of elections and campaigns to permit more people to vote and to avoid having a long gap between the election and

inauguration of a new President, and, of course, action to deal with the outmoded electoral college system.

The editors of the Buffalo Evening News have for many years been actively, and may I add consistently, interested in electoral reforms. I commend them for their vigor. I am happy to call attention today to several editorials which have appeared in this newspaper and which relate to abolishing the electoral college.

The editorials which I have selected are among many which I have in my files on this subject from the Buffalo Evening News. I should like to insert three of them in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed at the end of my remarks. The first appeared in 1956, right after the electoral college convened and voted. The editorial notes that the sweetly simple idea of a direct popular vote is always considered momentarily, and then dropped like a hot potato. The editorial goes on to point out that one of the Alabama electors in the 1956 election, who was supposedly pledged to Adlai Stevenson, voted instead for a local judge, whose name and momentary acclaim are now forgotten.

The second appeared in December of 1960, right after the 1960 election. It argues against the several pending revisions of the electoral college and points out that under the so-called Mundt-Coudert amendment, former Vice President Nixon would have been elected President of the United States in 1960 although he did not have the largest popular vote.

The third editorial appeared on May 31 of 1961 and strongly supports the amendment to the Constitution abolishing the electoral college, introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr MANSFIELD], of which I am a cosponsor.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Dec. 24, 1956]

DIRECT VOTE—WHY NOT?

With the electoral college having met, cast its votes and adjourned for another 4 years, this is as good a time as any to make our quadrennial appeal for the abolition of all this electoral nonsense, and the substitution of a direct popular vote for President and Vice President.

After every presidential election, the country goes through a brief period of shuddering over the dangers of a possible constitutional crisis caused by certain flaws in the electoral process, and of tinkering with the electoral apparatus to find some better way of foolproofing it against gross mismarriages of the public will.

The sweetly simple idea of a direct popular vote is always considered momentarily, and then dropped like a hot potato. What's wrong with it is what we want to know.

The usual answer is that the small States would never go for it. Since the only way any change could be made is by a constitutional amendment ratified by three-fourths of the States, this objection is supposed to be fatal. Our only answer is that the small States, if they looked at the thing realistically, might discover that they have as much reason to support a direct popular vote as anybody else.

The present system gives each State one electoral vote for each Senator and Representative. Result: Nevada, with about 1 resident for every 80 in New York, gets 3 electoral votes to 45 for New York—a ratio obviously favoring Nevada. But what good does it do Nevada? Being a small State, with little weight to throw in the national scales, Nevada is practically barred for all time from having one of its favorite sons considered for either party's presidential nomination, and in fact no national candidate is likely to make so much as a single campaign appearance there. So what has a small State got to lose by having its votes count the same as those in any other State? Under the present system, it is the large, so-called key States that dominate every presidential election, but in a direct popular vote, State lines would cease to matter.

Why make any change? Partly, it is because the present system puts a wholly distorted premium on appeals to balance-of-power minority blocs in the key States. But mostly because, in a close election, the existing system is open to a variety of unwholesome shenanigans and downright constitutional dangers, not the least of which is that the popular will could be thwarted by maneuvering in the electoral college, or in Congress.

Last week, for example, one Alabama elector pledged to Adlai Stevenson voted for a local judge instead. It didn't matter because the electoral vote was still 457 to 73 for Eisenhower. But if the electoral college had been split 266-to-267, and one elector exercised the constitutional privilege of exercising his own judgment, the whole election could have been thrown to the House of Representatives, where it might be decided by the crassest political maneuvers.

In a country such as ours, there is something almost mystically precious about respecting the mandate of the people. So far in this century, the winner of an electoral majority has always won the popular majority as well. Twice in the last century—1876 and 1888—this was not the case. When an election is so close that the majority of the people have voted one way, while the weight of the electoral vote is tipped the other way, we happen to think the country would be better served if the popular will prevailed. And we also know that the various gimmicks that have been proposed, as a constitutional compromise between the present system and a direct popular vote, have all turned out on examination to have flaws at least as bad as the system they purport to correct. The best way to correct our cumbersome presidential election system is the cleanest and simplest of all proposals: Just provide that the one who gets the most votes is the winner.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, Dec. 12, 1960]

ELECTORAL RECOUNT

While some uncertainty lingers as to exactly how the electoral votes will divide between Messrs. Nixon and Kennedy December 19, we have been intrigued by the what-if returns from a different kind of electoral vote count: How the election would have gone, if any of various proposals for electoral reform had been adopted a few years back.

According to one such scheme, known as the Lodge-Gossett amendment, each State's electoral votes would have been divided in exact proportion to the popular vote in that State—down to the third decimal point. Under this plan (named partly for Henry Cabot Lodge when he was in the Senate), this year's vote at latest recount would have given Kennedy an electoral plurality of less than 4 (268.871 to 265.036) over Nixon.

Under another plan—the so-called Mundt-Coudert amendment, which would give each congressional district 1 electoral vote and each State 2 at large—Nixon would actually have ended up winner, 282 electoral votes to 250. But, since Nixon did not quite win a popular majority, any electoral-college revision that would make him the actual winner would obviously be worse—in terms of confusing or confounding the popular verdict—than the system we have now.

One main argument for any change, after all, is that the popular winner now can be an electoral loser. And this, in our opinion, is very hard to defend as a method for filling the one office which represents all the people. That is why the one real electoral reform that makes sense to us is to abolish the electoral college and pick a presidential winner by straight nationwide popular vote.

To those who say this would weaken our Federal system, we can only reply that State-by-State elections would continue for every other office, State and Federal; and that the Federal approach to the Presidency (i.e., conducting a series of separate presidential elections in each State instead of one national election) doesn't mean much now in the States where the outcome is taken for granted. Under a popular-vote plan, each vote cast in one party Alabama would weigh the same as cast in 50–50 Illinois so every American would feel himself an equal participant in the national referendum.

This, to us, is how a President should be chosen—but every electoral reform we have seen which stops short of a direct popular vote has flaws at least as serious as the plan we have. So let's leave the electoral college alone until it can be abolished outright.

[From the Buffalo Evening News, May 31, 1961]

ELECTORAL REFORM

Congress, as it does after every Presidential election, is giving a critical once-over to the anachronistic electoral-college method of choosing Presidents, and to a dozen or more different proposals for revising the system. But most of the proposed constitutional amendments look at the problem through the wrong end of the telescope.

In this case, we are convinced, all the gimmicky, compromise formulas for avoiding the obvious solution would simply make matters, if not worse, at least no better. The obvious reform, and to our mind the only one worth taking seriously, is to abolish not only the electoral college, which everybody agrees is useless, but to abolish outright the whole system of assigning electoral votes to States and substitute a direct nationwide popular vote for President and Vice President.

This is the reform advocated in the present Congress by Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and we were glad to note that his proposed constitutional amendment has been cosponsored by our own Senator KEATING. These two, and many others who have come gradually to support their view, have studied all the other proposals for splitting each State's electoral votes or otherwise tinkering with the system. And they have come to see that every such tinkering simply creates a new inequity or problem for each one it seeks to cure under the present system. So there is no point in tinkering at all until we are ready to make our President what most people falsely assume he is now: The choice of the people, directly elected by nationwide ballot in which each citizen's vote counts just as much as any other's.

So long as each State gets its traditional representation in the two Houses of Congress, why shouldn't a vote cast for President in Buffalo, N.Y., count as much as one cast in Buffalo, Wyo.? Or, putting it in reverse, why shouldn't an outstanding statesman who happens to reside in Buffalo, Wyo., have as good a chance to run for President as one who comes from Buffalo, N.Y.? As matters stand now, presidential availability is virtually limited to residents of the closely divided two-party States.

It used to be thought that the present electoral-vote system gives undue weight to the small States—and therefore it would never be possible to sell them on the idea of changing to a direct popular vote. But gradually, the point is dawning on the leaders of both great and small States that the advantages and disadvantages cancel out—and that, on balance, no other plan would be so fair, across the board, as one vote for everybody. Thus, the symbolic significance of having this year's proposal for a nationwide direct popular vote sponsored by a Montana Democrat and a New York Republican. By their cosponsorship, Senators MANSFIELD and KEATING are saying—and they are right—that their plan does not seek advantage for either Republicans or Democrats, or big States or small ones. It is an electoral reform in the national interest.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1922 and ask to have it printed and lie on the desk. The amendment would, on page 45 of the bill, beginning with the word "provided" in line 8, strike the language down to and through the word "prescribe" in line 21.

The language which would be stricken provides for the establishment of a new subsidy, and the subsidy deals with efforts to solve mass transportation problems. I favor whatever provisions are contained in the bill dealing with loans, but I am against the initiation of a new subsidy in mass transportation, because this will merely be the beginning. It will snowball and pyramid into huge proportions in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the desk.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, we are confronted with quite a number of yea-and-nay votes this afternoon. I know it is the expectation of the distinguished majority leader to finish consideration of the Department of Interior appropriation bill and then to return to consideration of the housing bill. There are holdover yea-and-nay votes ordered. Under the circumstances, I think Senators ought to be in the Chamber. For that reason I feel compelled to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSED POSTAL RATE INCREASE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today or tomorrow the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House of Representatives will conclude its hearings on the administration's proposed postal rate increase legislation.

The President in his most recent address to the Congress made it abundantly clear that this measure is an integral part of the administration's program. Urgent fiscal necessity prompts me to bring this proposed legislation to the attention of the Senate.

The gap between income from the users of the mail and the costs of the postal service imposes a financial burden which ought to be drastically cut and, ideally, completely eliminated.

The President has emphasized the urgency of bringing postal revenue more realistically in line with postal expenditures. This can be done only through reasonable increases in our postal rates coupled with increased efforts to cut costs. I am satisfied the new postal administration is making great strides in this direction.

The enormity of the impact of the postal rate legislation was vividly accented by the President when he pointed out that the postal deficit exceeds the cost of all the space and defense measures which were submitted in the President's recent message to the Congress.

Such serious and overwhelming considerations prompt me to pledge every effort to full, immediate, and exhaustive attention by the Senate to the postal rate legislation as soon as House action is completed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a summary of postal rate proposals.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF RATE PROPOSALS

FIRST-CLASS MAIL

A 1-cent increase is scheduled for first-class mail: the rate for letters would rise from 4 cents per ounce to 5 cents and for post cards from 3 cents to 4 cents. This would yield about $409 million. Airmail postage would be raised correspondingly: from 7 cents per ounce to 8 cents for letters, and from 5 cents to 6 cents for cards.

SECOND-CLASS RATES

Second class is the mail service for magazines and newspapers. Postal revenues from second-class mail now cover about 23 percent of fully allocated costs. Under the rate program outlined, postage revenues from second class would be increased $78 million in fiscal 1962. This would amount to an increase of 79 percent.

THIRD-CLASS RATES

Third-class mail consists largely of advertising circulars mailed at bulk rates. It also includes fairly sizable quantities of catalogs and small parcels.

A 1-cent increase to 3½ cents is scheduled for the minimum rate for bulk mail. This increase would affect most of the pieces moving as third-class mail. If enacted, this change, together with other adjustments proposed for third class, would raise $212 million of new revenue.

OTHER CHANGES

Additional revenues will be raised primarily from higher rates for Government mail and for fourth-class educational materials.

Enactment of the entire schedule of legislative rate changes would produce $741 million of added annual postal revenues.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I join the Senator from Montana in giving support to the proposal made by the President in regard to putting the operation of the Post Office Department on a self-sustaining basis. I think it would be a serious mistake if the Senate did not act upon this recommendation. It is a recommendation which was made by President Eisenhower. It is now made by President Kennedy. Every reason calls for the adoption of a program which will put this Department on a self-sustaining basis, which will thus release moneys the taxpayers now have to put into the Department so that they can be used in other avenues which are vital to our country; for example, national defense.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I concur in the sentiment expressed by the majority leader. The postal deficit is now approaching $900 million a year. If sufficient revenues are not obtained, there will be a further increase in the projected deficit which, as I indicated yesterday, is now, under the May 25 revision, foreseen to run at a little more than $3½ billion a year.

For a number of years I have carried the flag in this Chamber for an increase in postal revenues. On one occasion I tried to hitch an increase to the pay increase bill. Somehow we never did succeed. So I assure the majority leader that I regard the proposed increase as a most important item, and I wish him well in securing favorable action by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, so that the proposal for an increase can be brought to the Senate without undue delay.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished minority leader.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. I am very much interested in the present discussion because I am a cosponsor of a measure to bring about the proposed increase. At the time the proposal came to the Senate from the Post Office Department I was told that there was great difficulty in finding any signatures for it. So the present expression of support pleases me greatly, and I believe the sponsor of the bill, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] will be very much interested in having the support of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

WIRETAPPING

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, under the able chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr.

ERVIN] has been conducting important hearings on legislation which would clear up the chaotic condition that now exists with respect to wiretapping. I have introduced legislation which would outlaw all private wiretapping and legitimize some wiretapping by Federal and State police officials, subject to stringent limitations as to the type of crime involved and the procedures which must be observed before wiretapping is permitted. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I presented to the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee on behalf of S. 1495, the bill which I have introduced.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD, PRESENTED TO CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE, CONCERNING S. 1495, WIRETAPPING LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to submit a statement on behalf of S. 1495, the bill on wiretapping introduced by me in the Senate.

Initially, I should like to outline the philosophy behind S. 1495. In essence, it is an attempt to balance the right of privacy of the individual against the need of society to protect itself from serious criminal activity.

S. 1495 seeks this balance by permitting law enforcement officers to wiretap only for certain specified serious crimes and by declaring all other wiretapping unlawful and punishable as a felony. And even where authorized, wiretapping is subject to strict controls and reporting requirements, which are designed to deter abuses.

I note that several witnesses who appeared before this subcommittee charged that S. 1495 casts too wide a net by permitting wiretapping for too many crimes. But let us look at the list. It comprises the national security crimes set forth in title 18 of the United States Code, murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, racketeering, gambling, and violations of the narcotics laws. I am sure we can all agree that the national security crimes, murder, kidnaping, and narcotics violations are heinous offenses, and I think their listing needs no explanation.

As for the other crimes on the list, I believe all are justifiable for inclusion—extortion because it so often involves violence or the threat of violence; bribery, because it so often involves public office or a quasi-public trust; and gambling, because, as the report of a New York State investigating commission has recently shown, it is at the heart of what has come to be popularly known as syndicated crime. For the last reason I have also included racketeering. In so doing, I was fully aware that the term would be susceptible of varying interpretations under the laws of the various States. Hence I confined it to Federal crimes, and you will find that the term "racketeering" as it is used in S. 1495 is in fact a very limited one. The chapter in the Crimnial Code entitled "Racketeering" has but a single section.

I also point out another limitation on S. 1495's concept of serious crimes—that within and described categories of crime, wiretapping would be permitted only for felonies (using the Federal law definition of a felony as a crime punishable by imprisonment for more than 1 year). In no case would wiretapping be permitted for a misdemeanor.

Some critics have argued against S. 1495 on the premise that all wiretapping is an unwarranted invasion of privacy. Although the Olmstead case has long since established that wiretapping is not an unconstitutional search and seizure under the fourth amendment, I think the continuing concern of these critics with the constitutional issue has tended to obscure the extensive controls which S. 1495 establishes over wiretapping: It requires all wiretapping to be authorized by court order, except for very limited authority granted the Attorney General of the United States; it prescribes the minimum contents of an application for a court order permitting wiretapping; it prescribes strict standards under which an order is to be reviewed by the courts; it prescribes the minimum contents of any order that may be granted; and it limits all orders to a duration of 60 days, subject to one 30-day extension.

As for the authority, S. 1495 would lodge directly in the Attorney General, I point out that he must act personally, and cannot act through a delegee; and that he must act under promulgated rules and regulations, which will be open to scrutiny by the Congress and by the public.

It has also been argued by some that the courts will be extremely lax in complying with any controls, but especially with the standards for review.

My reply is that the legislative branch of government must, in the nature of our system, leave it to the appellate courts to correct the judicial errors of the lower courts and to insure that the standards which legislation prescribes for court action actually govern the courts.

I do not feel it is a fair criticism of any bill that sets forth the standards under which a court shall review applications for wiretapping orders to say that the courts will not respect those standards.

A variant of this last argument is that, laxity aside, judges will differ in their interpretation of the standards for review, and that the result will be a so-called shopping around by law enforcement officers seeking wiretapping orders.

I think this argument is inapposite in a society of laws such as ours. I grant that in the nature of things the standards of review must be couched in somewhat general language, leaving some room for interpretation. But again we must leave it to the appellate courts to define the precise limits of these standards. In any event, the problem is not peculiar to wiretapping orders, but applies as well to traditional ex parte orders such as search warrants. I am personally confident that judicial experience with the standards of S. 1495 will breed a fair application of them.

It should not be forgotten that S. 1495 has detailed reporting requirements, under which the Congress would be furnished with a report on the number of wiretapping orders sought from, and denied or granted by, the courts each year, detailing the agency or law enforcement authority applying, the court to which application is made, the geographical location of the intended wiretapping, the category of crime for which the order is sought, and whatever additional information may be requested. In my view such reporting requirements can be a highly effective instrument of control.

First, the information they reveal will permit the Congress to determine on the basis of actual experience whether changes in a wiretapping law are necessary, and, if so, to what extent.

Second, the knowledge that applications and orders must be reported will of itself tend to deter abuses of the limited wiretapping authority available under S. 1495.

I was very pleased in reading the statement of the Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, Mr. Herbert J. Miller, Jr., representing the Department of Justice before this subcommittee, to learn that with one major exception the Department favors the general tenor of S. 1495. The major exception, of course, is that unlike S. 1495, the Department of Justice favors leaving State wiretapping laws entirely to the States.

I personally feel that such wholesale abdication is improper and that any Federal legislation on wiretapping must prescribe as a matter of Federal law the minimum standards to which all State wiretapping laws must adhere. I say this because the telephone is today a most vital form of communication between individuals residing in different States; we need no statistics to establish this.

In my view the heavy interstate character of telephone communication makes it not only constitutionally permissible, but as a matter of policy essentially wise, that Federal law set the pattern for State wiretapping laws. If my basic philosophy is sound, as I feel it is, the question then arises as to what minimum standards Federal law should impose on State wiretapping laws.

S. 1495 would prescribe four limitations on the States:

First, that a State may permit wiretapping only for the felonies of murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, and gambling and for felonious violations of State narcotics laws.

Second, within these categories only a State court may authorize wiretapping.

Third, that the controls over Federal law enforcement officers and the Federal courts with regard to the minimum contents of an application for a wiretapping order, the standards for court review of the application, and the minimum contents of any resulting order shall apply equally to State officers and courts.

Fourth, that the State courts must report all wiretapping applications and orders to the Administrative Office of the U.S. courts, the collecting office under S. 1495 for such information.

I had initially intended a fifth standard limiting the State law enforcement officers who may authorize application, or themselves apply, for a wiretapping order, but this was abandoned because of the practical difficulty of writing a precise standard that would at the same time reflect the differences among the 50 States in their law enforcement systems.

I need hardly add that beyond the four limitations I have outlined State law may impose even more stringent limitations, or may ban wiretapping altogether. But I believe that these four limitations, or variants of them, are essential if the Congress is to discharge its constitutional duty of regulating commerce among the several States.

I have never regarded S. 1495 as the final answer in the field of wiretapping to the serious problem of achieving a balance between the right of the individual to privacy and the need of society to protect itself against serious criminal activity.

I am sure that no single draftsman of a bill such as S. 1495 can evaluate all the facets of this problem.

And so, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I believe that these hearings have been of the greatest value. I have read much of the testimony and have benefited from it, even when I have disagreed. And while I am more than ever confirmed in my view that the approach of S. 1495 is the wisest course for any Federal wiretapping legislation, I must credit the previous testimony for having suggested to me areas in which S. 1495 might be refined. The following are the most notable areas:

1. Page 6, line 12 and page 8, lines 13–14. I initially suggest that the term "probable cause for belief" be substituted for the term "reasonable ground for belief" in sections 4(a) and 4(d). This change would conform the standards under which the Attorney General and the courts would review applications for wiretapping authorization more

nearly with those of the traditional search warrant.

2. Page 7, lines 10–13: I am of the view that the list of Federal crimes for which section 4(b)(2) would permit wiretapping is sufficiently explicit when carefully read against the United States Code. However, to meet the fear of some critics that the list may be extended by judicial interpretation, I suggest that the Federal crimes for which wiretapping may be permitted by section 4(b)(2) be listed by title and chapter or section in the Code.

3. Page 8, line 2: In order to prevent any inference that crimes tangential to those listed by section 4(c) are included within the scope of that subsection, I suggest that the words "which involves" be deleted and a word or words not open to this inference be substituted therefor.

4. Page 11, lines 13–17: I suggest that section 5(b) be revised to limit the divulgence of the contents of a tapped communication under that subsection to divulgence in a criminal action for the offense for which the wiretapping had been authorized.

I am certain that the subcommittee will give these refinements, and in fact the entire concept of limited, controlled wiretapping, the most careful consideration.

NATURAL GAS FOR THE PEOPLE OF BARROW, AMERICA'S NORTHERNMOST OUTPOST: AN ESKIMO SPEAKS OUT ON "NEEDLESS MISERY"

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, yesterday my able colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] introduced a bill, S. 2020, of which I am a cosponsor, which would enable the Department of the Navy to sell natural gas from gas fields in Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, located in northern Alaska, to native citizens of the area. This measure is desperately needed to remedy an inexcusable situation in which there are numerous citizens of Alaska suffering seriously from lack of adequate heat in their living quarters although practically living on top of a rich reserve of natural gas which could provide relief for their plight.

More than a year ago I received a letter from Mr. Jonah Bilo, long a resident of Alaska's Arctic, describing the suffering of people who are unable to obtain heat for their homes in a way which, I believe, is more convincing than anything I could add.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bilo's letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAIRBANKS, ALASKA, *January 7, 1960.*

Hon. Senator GRUENING,
U.S. Senator from Alaska, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: I am writing to you to plead for your help to get natural gas for people at Barrow. I know you are doing all you can, and we, the people who know what a cold house means, appreciate it. At Barrow, the cost of fuel is secondary. The need for gas is urgently needed as I will attempt to point out why. I'll attempt to point out why I'll have to call the existing regulations the "regulations for misery" to the citizens of the United States.

Perhaps, sir, if I use the first person, as an example, you will understand why I choose to call the existing regulation which bans the use of natural gas to the citizens of Barrow, a regulation for misery. Here is what happens when there is no fuel to burn in a house, as I lived it. It is typical of any house at Barrow.

I am an Eskimo, born at Point Hope in the year 1925. In those days the arctic fox commanded a good price, something like $300 for a single pelt. So, dad took the family to the northeastern coast of Alaska, where foxes are numerous and trappers fewer. And, our source of fuel was driftwood washed in along the Arctic coast during the summer months, which was soon depleted as there were other trappers along the coast. So, dad took us on to Barrow in hopes of spending an easier winter. It was easier than what it might have been, had we spent it elsewhere.

It was at that time that I was beginning to get conscious of the world around me. We were living in a frame house, which did not have insulation, as insulation was unknown at that time. There were four of us kids and, of course, dad, as mom passed away a summer before. It seems to me I've never spent a colder winter. I remember my oldest sister, having to stay home from school, while Dad was out hunting or combing the beaches for wood, taking care of us. If dad was lucky enough to bag a seal, my sister kept the fire in the stove going by burning seal blubber and a piece of sod, sod to give sustenance to seal oil so the fire wouldn't go out when the seal oil burnt out. If there was no seal as happened often, she'd keep the stove going to get some heat. But, it didn't give much heat at 40 below in an uninsulated house. So she'd take her parka, warming us in turn, and in the meantime warming our hands by holding them in hers, when hers got too cold, she'd warm them by breathing and blowing on them, a trick we younger ones soon picked up. And, such was life in those days, and we survived.

After a hitch in the Army, I went back to Barrow to work for Arctic contractors, who were doing oil exploration work for the Navy. There was a lot of improvement in living conditions. The houses had insulation; there were oil stoves and coal stoves, but the heck of it is, the stove oil seldom lasts until January. And, the coal miner doesn't start freighting his coal until December. He has to haul it in by "cats," most of the time in almost impossible elements. The temperature would be around 40 below with blowing snow or blizzard so bad you can't see 20 feet in any direction. Often his equipment breaks down and he has to walk miles in cold weather to the village in order to send for parts from Fairbanks. And, he has to wait in frustration, while his parts are being flown in from Fairbanks. He knows there are cold houses at the village, not due to lack of money. He knows well what cold houses mean. He has kids of his own.

I cannot put into words how it feels to hear a child cry and see her shiver uncontrollably in a house. Up there, it is common to be awakened by a child crying because her hands are cold, so cold that it actually makes you jump just to touch them. Only those of us, whose houses have been so cold, can begin to fathom how much throbbing and pain in fingertips can result when the hands are beginning to get warm again. And, a child cannot understand why her hands are hurting so. All she can do is cry, and look at you with tearful eyes, pleading eyes, as only a helpless child can. I cannot help but get emotionally upset to see an innocent child's eyes looking at me so tearful and so very pitiful, because they are cold.

So, sir, you can see why I choose to call the existing regulations which ban the people from using their own natural resources "the regulations of misery." And, I am sure that every American citizen will feel the same way, once they know the real story behind the word "cold."

When I was a kid, the cold was a necessary misery. It was something we dreaded, but learned to take as soon as we learned our parents did their best. But, today, with so much fuel on hand, I or anybody can't begin to understand why the people at Barrow have to suffer such misery, both physically and emotionally, especially when rules are made by people who try to alleviate human suffering.

I remain very respectful servant.

JONAH BILO.

THE RED MEIN KAMPF

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I invite attention to a timely article entitled "The Red Mein Kampf," which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 7, 1961. It is a keen analysis of the international Communist conspiracy and how to meet it most effectively today. It is presented in paid space as a public service by International Latex Corp.

History teaches that man always pays a great price for human liberty and that a true democracy is safeguarded only in proportion to the ceaseless vigilance and interest of its citizens.

By this measure, Mr. A. N. Spanel, founder of the corporation and author of the article, has shown himself to be not only an exemplary citizen of this country but also of the whole free world. It is equally heartening to see a company concerning itself at such great cost and for so long, in the public interest. They deserve much more than praise.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial by Mr. A. N. Spanel which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on June 7, 1961, be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED MEIN KAMPF

(By A. N. Spanel)

The show in Vienna is over. Now let's hope that no one turns it into another spirit.

We have paid too high a price for these intoxicating "spirits"—the spirit of Yalta, of Geneva, of Camp David. Each has caused us to see pink elephants of relaxed tensions, and other mirages in the desert of our confusions. And each time the Kremlin, stone sober and intent on its mischievous business as usual, has made the most of our hangovers of wishful hoping, thereby gaining more power and more empire.

So it's about time we swore off the stuff and confronted the grim realities. Regardless of what transpired in the personal dialogues between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev, "the war called peace" will go on until the terrible consequences are fully understood and there is a final return to sanity.

In the aftermath of the Vienna venture in summitry, it is all-important to remember that the fundamentals of the historic conflict between the two worlds cannot be altered by words or slogans or social amenities. The Kremlin's changes of tactics—its swings between smiling diplomacy and desk-thumping rage—must not again blind us to the inflexible objectives of world communism.

Those objectives have remained fixed, whether their chief spokesman was a Lenin, a Stalin or an exuberant Khrushchev. They

have been spelled out in all the basic Communist documents from 1917 to date. They add up to a total commitment to the conquest and burial of the freedom, the morality, the human dignity and the spiritual values by which the Western World lives.

This, in essence, was the point made brilliantly by one of our ablest journalists, Mr. Roscoe Drummond, in a recent column in the Washington Post when he wrote:

"The place to examine Soviet objectives is not in the face of Nikita Khrushchev but the face of Communist dogma and practice. These objectives have not changed an iota from Lenin to Stalin to Khrushchev, and are expounded in the Moscow manifesto of December 1960, as openly as Hitler's plans in 'Mein Kampf.' Signed by the representatives of 81 Communist Parties, it represents the declared purposes of the Soviet Union and Red China."

The manifesto makes it clear—that wars of national liberation—as in Laos and Vietnam—are sacred wars, justifiable and desirable, never to be considered ended until they have brought Communist regimes.

That any non-Communist regime is automatically illegitimate and therefore fair prey to Communist attack of all kinds.

That peaceful coexistence means that the West must not join in defending any country against Communist attack and must not help any country which has temporarily lost its independence to Communist attack.

When, for tactical reasons, Mr. Khrushchev's words and music may vary from the Moscow manifesto, the only safe course is to remember the Moscow manifesto, no matter how jovial Mr. K. seems at the moment.

Mr. Drummond then went on to express his certainty that Khrushchev will be unimpressed and uninfluenced by what our President says, because the Soviets respect only power and the will to use it. If Mr. Kennedy wants to leave no doubts as to American determination to resist Communist expansion, "the only way to make it clear to the Soviet Premier is not by strong words but by demonstrating the power and the will to resist."

Though Mr. Drummond was writing shortly before the Vienna confrontation, nothing happened there to open his warning to question. On the contrary, it has been confirmed and fortified.

The meaningful elements in the fateful historic equation are power, intelligence, determination, and courage. But even if we have these, they will not suffice unless they rest on a solid foundation of free-world unity. As long as the Western alliance is disoriented and enfeebled by conflicting purposes, the Kremlin will continue to have the right of way in carrying out its grand design for world conquest.

In the perspective of time, indeed, the President's meetings with General de Gaulle before, and with Prime Minister Macmillan after, the exchange of views with Khrushchev are sure to prove much more significant than the Vienna episode.

We are persuaded that first priority, if we are to gain the initiative in the conflict with communism, must become the achievement of true unity in our own badly splintered world. On May 5, 1957, we wrote in these columns:

"We hold in our hands a greater deterrent against the Kremlin menace than the hydrogen bomb and missiles of global range. Its name is 'Unity,' free-world unity of purpose, geared to a renewed confidence in Western civilization."

The need for that all-important deterrent is more urgent than ever before. Serious divisions within the coalition of free nations, more than anything else, embolden the Kremlin to drive more confidently and more recklessly toward its goals of world dominion.

All this is explicit in the Moscow equivalents of Hitler's "Mein Kampf." As long as we gear our emotions and our policies to Moscow's temporary tactics and slogans, we are condemned to remain victims of deception and self-deception. Red leaders from Lenin to Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung have spoken bluntly about their main advantage, namely the "contradictions in the camp of the imperialists." It is within our power to cancel out those contradictions and confront the monolithic enemy with a voluntary but resolute unity of our own.

Our way of life, yes, survival and growth of the whole world depends on it.

UNIFORM FEDERAL TIMBER MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in 1955 and 1956, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee under the chairmanship of the late Senator James E. Murray, of Montana, conducted extensive hearings on Federal timber sales policies. The people of Oregon had considerable interest in the hearings because we had three Federal agencies managing timberland in our State and their policies and activities were not well coordinated.

The hearings resulted in a thorough review of means for improving forest management within the extensive holdings of the Federal Government. As I recall, some 60 recommendations were made and they covered all aspects of forest policy and program. Therefore, it was with interest that I noticed that on May 31 Secretary of Agriculture Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Udall announced adoption of a course to bring their timber sale practices into closer uniformity. I ask unanimous consent that the Departments' release be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIFORM TIMBER MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ADOPTED

(Joint release by Department of Agriculture and Department of the Interior)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced adoption of a study and recommendations made by the two Departments to bring timber sale practices by the two agencies into closer uniformity.

The two Secretaries noted that 13 specific recommendations are being adopted. The changes apply to timber management in western Oregon by the Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior. Several of the recommendations are of wider geographic application. Four of these also apply to certain practices by Interior's Bureau of Indian Affairs on Indian timberlands in the Pacific Northwest.

Both Secretaries noted that the steps being taken to reconcile and standardize timber sale and management practices within the two Departments were in keeping with President Kennedy's special message to the Congress on natural resources in which he stressed the necessity for bringing together "widely scattered resource policies of the Federal Government." Adoption of the study and recommendations follows a special study by the two Departments.

Among the study recommendations being adopted are orders to the agencies involved to standardize management plan inventory procedures, reconcile differences in determining allowable timber cut, and detailed field studies looking to possible uniform adoption of the international one-quarter inch rule and/or cubic foot measurement as substitute for the Scribner decimal C rule. The latter recommendation deals with the way in which the board-foot volume of timber is measured for management inventories of standing timber and for timber sales.

Other recommendations include possible adoption of a joint nursery program, and action to meet land jurisdictional problems in the complicated checkerboard ownership areas of western Oregon.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman noted that the six national forests in western Oregon embrace approximately 6.3 million acres. From these lands some 1.8 billion board feet of timber are harvested each year under sustained yield management.

Secretary of the Interior Udall noted that his Department's Bureau of Land Management manages about 2½ million acres of Federal lands in 18 western Oregon counties. From these lands BLM harvests more than 1 billion board feet of timber each year under sustained yield program.

The Department's Bureau of Indian Affairs is responsible for some 2.1 million acres of commercially valuable Indian-owned forest lands in the Pacific Northwest. Timber sales from these lands amounted to 370 million board feet in fiscal year 1960.

Other efforts toward uniform practices would include action to resolve legal differences now existing in the transfer of contracts, and maintenance of close liaison on set-aside timber sales for small businesses. In addition, existing interagency committees in Washington, D.C., and in Portland, Oreg., are to be strengthened and given specific responsibilities for further recommendations on uniform timber management practices.

The complete text of the 13 summary recommendations is attached.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The agencies will continue adherence to the established management objective of producing sawtimber as the main product of timber harvest cutting.

2. The agencies are to obtain standardization of management plan inventory procedures.

3. The agencies are to reconcile significant procedural differences in determining allowable cut.

4. The Interagency Timber Appraisal Committee is to be continued as a means of progressing toward elimination of timber appraisal differences.

5. The agencies will consider the need for acting in unison when making any changes in bidding methods.

6. The General Counsel for the Department of Agriculture and the Solicitor for the Department of the Interior will confer with respect to the resolution of the legal differences now existing in the transfer of contracts.

7. Both agencies will maintain close liaison with respect to the set-aside sale program of the Small Business Administration and carefully considered common policies will be followed.

8. The agencies will explore the need for a joint nursery program.

9. The Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs will institute jointly a program aimed at providing for the uniform measurement of timber for management inventory and for sales.

10. The two Departments will collaborate on development of a uniform timber trespass bill and regulations.

11. Both agencies are to consider and recommend action to meet certain land jurisdictional problems.

12. The existing interagency committees in Washington, D.C., and in Portland, Oreg., are to be strengthened and given specific responsibilities for recommending uniformity of timber management practices.

13. The offices of both agencies in Portland, Oreg., will establish the same arrangement for exchanging manual and handbook material and all amendments thereto as is presently in effect between both agencies in Washington, D.C.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, my appraisal is that by and large what the Departments have done is agree to do more about agreeing. I say this not in derogation but simply because in virtually each of the 13 points cited one finds these phrases: "The agencies are to obtain," "the agencies are to reconcile," "the committee is to be continued," "the agencies will consider the need for action in unison," and "the agencies will explore."

I think it fine that the two Secretaries are proceeding to work together. I express the hope that we will shortly see announcements indicating that agreements have been reached in the substantive areas where illogical divergencies in policy and program may exist.

HASTE SAVES WASTE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, our national heritage of scenic wonders may be lost unless this Congress acts soon on the various proposals to establish additional National Parks. As a recent article in the New Leader put it:

> Places like these [the proposed parks] with their natural beauties and advantages cannot be saved at the Government's leisure. There is only one of each—and when its gone, it is gone.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Preserving Our National Parks" and authored by William E. Bohn, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESERVING OUR NATIONAL PARKS

(By William E. Bohn)

Why in the world I have never heard about or subscribed to the National Parks magazine I shall never know. Advertisements by the dozen for weekly and monthly journals have been cluttering up my mailbox for years. But until a couple of months ago I had never received a single come-on from the organ of the National Parks Association.

I subscribed immediately and have since received the numbers for April and May. It is a beautiful magazine, only 20 pages thick because it contains practically no advertising. Yet, it is filled with much valuable information about our national parks, a subject I really care about.

The national park system is operated by the National Park Service, a bureau of the Department of the Interior. The Service is probably run about as well as any department of any government ever was. Conrad L. Wirth, its Director, is a first-class public administrator. We are fortunate, too, to have in the Kennedy administration Stewart L. Udall, a Secretary of the Interior who is an intelligent and energetic conservation man. From the point of view of the administration of our national parks, we seem to be entering upon a prosperous and progressive period.

But if there is one thing which we have learned better than any other, it is that no government is ever to be trusted. No matter how good your elected or appointed officials are, you have to keep forever after them. There are some 20 or 25 other private organizations besides the National Parks Association which are interested in our birds, beasts, trees and flowers. But the association seems to be closer to the Service than any other group and better fitted to follow up its activities. Criticism is offered in the friendliest and most constructive way.

An article in the April issue of the magazine is about Mission 66, a massive plan for a series of park improvements to be made from 1956–66. This great forward burst, based on a series of measures passed by Congress, comes during the current decade because 1966 will mark the 50th anniversary of the law that set up the Service and gave form and solid substance to the entire national park system. The article suggests rather politely that better use might have been made of the millions appropriated by Congress for the anniversary celebration. In general, it says, too much has been spent for roads and structures and too little for conservation and development: "Management and protection got $17 million in the 1960–61 budget. Construction got $52 million, and in addition maintenance and rehabilitation of physical facilities got $13,500,000."

The number of customers who come crowding into the parks continues to grow. In 1960, 72,288,000 persons made use of the parks, monuments, and other facilities of the Service. That is an increase of nearly 5 million over 1959. The superintendents, directors, and others in charge of these places are proud of their immense success and naturally want to increase their facilities with the object of taking better care of their many millions of customers.

But in the process, flowers, plants, and trees may be crushed and birds and beasts may be driven out into whatever is left of the wilderness. The members of the association believe that we need something besides more space, more land, more roads, more motels and eating places. We need to take stock of our most exciting and beautiful spots—and then we need the money, intelligence, and tenacity to keep them, increase them, protect them and nurture them.

Into the lively kettles bubbling in the House and Senate down in Washington are going the greatest lot of proposals for parks, monuments, and national seashores ever made in our Federal Legislature. Just run some of them over in your mind: the Cape Cod Seashore in Massachusetts, the Oregon Dunes Seashore, the Indiana Dunes Seashore near Chicago, the Padre Island Seashore in Texas, and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park in Maryland.

It is vitally important that work on all of these projects begin very soon. Places like these with their natural beauties and advantages cannot be saved at the Government's leisure. There is only one of each—and when it is gone, it is gone. Hotels, motels, and every other sort of commercial enterprise are ready to grab them. Once they are built upon, as profitmakers can and do build, that is the end. The wonder disappears, the price goes up, and the possibility of saving the charm for our descendants also disappears. Many such places have already been gobbled up; our children are being robbed of their heritage in order to fatten someone's bank account.

Some of our Congressmen and Senators are doing their best in this respect for the public good; others don't care. The lobbyists are forever on hand to represent the moneymakers. There are millions of people who want to preserve the parks, but most of them don't know what is going on. It is up to intelligent citizens to put in a good word for our descendants.

THE LOGAN ACT—TRACTORS FOR CUBA

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on occasion the Logan Act has been mentioned in the Senate in connection with the proposed tractors-for-prisoners exchange with Cuba. It is always interesting, of course, to go back and examine the act. People do not always have time to procure a copy of the code and examine the appropriate section. Therefore, in the interest of giving the item in question proper currency, I believe I ought to read the section into the RECORD. It is section 953, title 18, of the 1958 edition of the United States Code. I think this is the item that applies:

> Any citizen of the United States, wherever he may be, who, without authority of the United States, directly or indirectly commences or carries on any correspondence or intercourse with any foreign government or any officer or agent thereof, with intent to influence the measures or conduct of any foreign government or of any officer or agent thereof, in relation to any disputes or controversies with the United States, or to defeat the measures of the United States, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.
>
> This section shall not abridge the right of a citizen to apply, himself or his agent, to any foreign government or the agents thereof for redress of any injury which he may have sustained from such government or any of its agents or subjects.

I have read the appropriate section in the so-called Logan Act, which gets its name from the late distinguished Senator Logan from Kentucky, whom it was my pleasure to know quite well. There are many implications in the section. Those who might be interested can now examine it for themselves.

HOUSING LEGISLATION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, the housing bill will be coming up for action immediately after the Interior appropriation bill is disposed of. I should like to call to the attention of Senators one new feature in the housing bill, which is the 40-year, no-downpayment, mortgage provision, backed up by FNMA purchases.

With the subsidized interest rate in the program, it is likely that FNMA purchases will take up all the mortgages, because there will not be any interest shown by anyone else in such mortgages. I merely wish to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that it is frequently said the FHA housing program does not cost the Government any money, because the insurance program has been in the black and the losses have not exceeded the premiums.

On the other hand, what is overlooked all the time is the fact that FNMA's expenses have increased year after year. I am referring to page 74 of the appendix to the hearings on the housing bill, which shows a table entitled "Comparative FNMA Portfolio and Outstand-

ing Purchasing Obligations at End of 1960 and 1959. That table shows that as of the end of last year the total portfolio and contracts of FNMA totaled $6,900 million. What we see here is a race between FNMA and the Commodity Credit Corporation, to see which one will accumulate the heaviest surpluses. We now have an accumulation in the Commodity Credit Corporation of $9 billion. We have nearly $7 billion accumulated in the FNMA program.

The housing bill, if it passes in its present form, will very substantially increase the portfolio. I point that out to Senators who wonder how they shall vote on the 40-year, no-downpayment provision of the bill.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] will offer an amendment to strike out that provision, and there will be other amendments to modify the provision if the Senator's amendment fails. I believe that we should take a long look at it, in view of the various warnings which have come from the President of the United States to protect our credit and to observe fiscal order in the Government. Therefore, we ought to take a long look to see whether we should expand this program.

I note that the minority leader said yesterday that we were facing a deficit of over $3 billion in the next fiscal year. I believe he said it would be $3.3 billion, or something on that order. I would point out that the Budget Director and the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers have advised our Joint Economic Committee of Congress that the cash deficit, as now projected, is over $5 billion. Therefore, it is not only a budget deficit of $3.3 billion that we face, but we also face a cash deficit of more than $5 billion if we stopped right now adding to it.

Therefore, I believe Senators ought to look at the amendments that will be offered by the Senator from Indiana and myself, and by the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. We should look at these amendments very carefully to see that the housing bill does not become a groping giant which is too demanding upon the taxpayers of the country.

There is much in the bill which I support. There is a great deal of good in it. I protested constantly, and I protest anew, against an omnibus housing bill that takes in so many unrelated factors as the pending housing bill does.

THE VIENNA CONFERENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the President of the United States departed for the Vienna Conference, I said that that was a matter wholly within his determination as the Chief Executive. I expressed the hope that when he returned he would make a very meticulous and careful and candid report to the country. I did not have my hopes set too high with respect to the results that might be achieved, for a reason that is intrinsic in a conference of that kind.

Here were doubtless the two greatest leaders in the world, meeting where all the world could see. It was said that approximately 1,800 newsmen and people identified with radio and TV were there to cover the Conference. It was essentially, therefore, something of a showcase. There was also the factor of a sharp conflict of ideology between the two leaders. There was also the question of prestige and the question of "face." I believe that in itself militates against any concession under the circumstances. Those things must be kept in mind when we seek to evaluate what might happen.

I believe that my hope was requited in the message the President delivered to the country last night. He stated what he thought were the major points and what he hoped to accomplish, and disclosed to the American people in brief compass virtually everything that happened.

Therefore I do not believe that anyone can quarrel with the nature of the message, or say that there was anything concealed, because the whole matter was fully and fairly disclosed, and nothing was actually negotiated.

HEARING SCREENING PROGRAM OF THE LOYAL ORDER OF THE MOOSE IN PARKERSBURG, W. VA., PROVES SUCCESSFUL—EFFORT WILL BE MADE TO EXTEND IT THROUGHOUT THE NATION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for many years I have been an active and vigorous supporter of improving the economic opportunities and the physical and social rehabilitation of the physically handicapped. It was therefore with much gratification that I learned recently of the joint efforts of one of the great fraternal organizations and one of our large electronics manufacturers in identifying and thus combating the problem of a hearing loss.

One of the least publicized of our national health problems is spotlighted by more than 15 million Americans now suffering a hearing loss.

This becomes an important statistic to our Government, to industry, and to the average person when it is realized that the hard of hearing number more than those suffering from heart disease, polio, and tuberculosis combined.

For the majority of persons experiencing a hearing loss there is no badge of identity, such as white canes for the blind, or crutches for the lame. Many individuals with impaired hearing who resist surgery or the use of a modern hearing aid walk the streets of loneliness withdrawing from the busy world of sound.

Unfortunately, it is a common belief that only the older or aged people are deaf, but this is a fallacy. Hearing troubles can develop any time in life, even before birth.

Recently, the work of a national fraternal organization in screening the hearing of children and adults came to my attention in my home State. The organization was the Loyal Order of Moose, the members of the local chapter in Parkersburg, W. Va., having volunteered to conduct a pilot program of hearing screening in their city.

The members of the Moose became interested in the problems of hearing when they discovered that thousands of boys and girls go through school and early adult life without a hearing test.

The Moose further learned that prompt attention to early ear infections in a child many times can save a boy or girl the handicap of a hearing loss in later life.

With the general approval of the Moose national headquarters in Mooseheart, Ill., the city growing on the Ohio River was made a laboratory for a test program.

It was decided the members of the Parkersburg Moose would organize a civic affairs committee to offer hearing screening tests to the general public—both children and adults—at no charge.

To successfully execute the program, the Moose organization needed help in training volunteer workers, and sought special equipment to use in the hearing screening process.

A Chicago electronic manufacturer of hearing aids and testing equipment, Zenith Radio Corp., volunteered the time and talents of its training executives, and a team of specialists was dispatched to the laboratory city.

In a short time, a master plan was drawn, Moose committee members trained, and a program presented to the city's mayor and newspapers.

The response was gratifying. The local newspapers cooperated to the utmost, and businessmen willingly contributed radio commercial time on their programs urging citizens to take advantage of the free hearing screening tests being offered. The project began to take shape.

During the 2-week effort last November hundreds of Parkersburg men, women, and children had their hearing tested by a screening device operated by volunteer workers.

The results were interesting: 60 percent of the persons screened were children; 5 percent teenagers; 35 percent adults.

The Moose discovered 1 in 10 needed further advice on their hearing from their family physician.

The laboratory of Parkersburg yielded much information to the members of the fraternal organization. It proved they were effectively offering a public service on a regular basis, and it is my understanding that next year they intend to carry the program into all the Parkersburg schools.

A full report on what happened in this spirited West Virginia community was sent to the national headquarters of the Moose, where officers and representatives from all sections of the country met to appraise the results of this test run.

I am happy to state than on June 25th, when the Loyal Order of Moose holds its important annual convention in Memphis, Tenn., the group will announce to several thousand delegates the wholehearted support of a nationwide hearing-screening program. This announcement will be made by Earle W. Horton, Moose director of civic affairs, who has molded the Parkersburg,

W. Va,. test into a full-fledged hearing conservation program.

Mr. Horton will explain that the Moose of America hope to save children with an inner ear infection the handicap of a hearing loss later in life, and that screenings can help detect this type of hearing loss. Mr. Horton will also reveal that the Moose will call attention to the need for having everyone's hearing tested on a regular basis.

Of special interest to me, as a Senator of the on-the-move State of West Virginia, Mr. Horton will pay tribute to all the Parkersburg volunteers. I wish to do so in this manner today, for their cooperation, vision, and awareness of this serious national health problem.

It is a genuine privilege, therefore, to commend my neighbors and friends and wish them continued success. I am a member of the Elkins (W. Va.) lodge in my home city, and am conscious of the activities there, in our State, and throughout the Nation, which have proven this organization of men—and the auxiliary of women—to be alert and helpful in programs for the benefit of its members and their families. In a broader sense, however, the country and its citizens are aided and strengthened. This specific undertaking embraces an important service to the Nation, and the Zenith Radio Corp. has given its public spirited contribution of technical equipment and trained personnel in a worthy endeavor.

THE FREEMAN FARM PLAN

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Freeman farm plan has been the subject of hearings over the past several weeks. It has been widely written and spoken about throughout the country.

It is a comprehensive bill, containing over 75 printed pages. There is no part of the agricultural or farm subject into which it does not go.

This is neither the time nor the place to go into detail about the many claims of merit made by its advocates, nor the many criticisms made by its enemies. But there is one aspect of the plan which is receiving top-billing in so many of the publicity pieces on it, that wide attention has been accorded to it. Such wide attention is clearly deserved, when a little thought is devoted to the point. And questions arise in one's mind when he does so.

It has to do with the comments as to how the plan would work, the methods used to get it into action.

STEP-BY-STEP PROCEDURE TO SET UP NEW FARM PLANS

The U.S. News & World Report, June 12, 1961, sets forth the step-by-step procedure provided in the bill to set up new farm plans, as follows:

1. Farmers producing any commodity could request the Secretary of Agriculture to set up a plan for production and marketing of that commodity.

2. The Secretary would select a committee of farmers to recommend a plan for the commodity. The committee would be selected from people nominated by farmer-elected county committees in areas producing the commodity. A consumer representative would be named to the committee.

3. This "commodity advisory committee" would recommend a plan based on one or more of a variety of methods provided in the bill now before Congress. These include controls based on acres, or on quotas in pounds, bushels, and bales. Other methods: price-support loans, incentive payments, Government buying to firm market prices. Marketing orders, such as those now used to regulate supplies of milk, fruits, and vegetables in many areas, would be authorized on a broader scale. So would "production payments" by which farmers are reimbursed if the price of a product falls below a certain level.

4. After getting the committee's recommendations, the Secretary of Agriculture would draft a plan and submit it to Congress.

5. If Congress did not veto the plan within 60 days, and the President approved, the plan would be submitted to a referendum of farmers producing the commodity. If approved by at least two thirds of the farmers voting, the plan would go into effect.

As to these steps, how they would be taken and their results, the views of Secretary Freeman are then outlined in the article, in part, as follows:

I urge you to note these important points:

The democratic procedures: Farmer-elected advisory committees in consultation with the Secretary consider and recommend individual commodity programs.

The safeguards: Consumer representatives participate—review by the Congress—approval by two-thirds of the producers.

Note that the bill establishes agricultural procedures, not programs. The democratic process is called into play at every stage. It would mean less, not more, Government in agriculture. The power of the Secretary to initiate programs will be diminished, rather than expanded.

Mr. President, the procedures provided in S. 1643 are not democratic. Nor is the democratic process called into play.

Consider these points which are clearly seen in provisions of the bill:

No provision is made for commodity producers of any commodity to take the initiative in securing the appointment of the farmer advisory committee. The Secretary determines this.

The Secretary would set the terms of office. He would conduct the nomination and selection process.

He would name the appropriate farm organizations from which to select one-third of the advisory committee.

He would set the number of members of the committee and determine the areas from which they come.

They would serve at his pleasure. He would be able to limit the committee functions. He could dissolve the committee any time he wished.

How democratic is a process which embraces such powers of a Secretary?

POWER OF SECRETARY IS INCREASED

The Secretary's statements that the power of the Secretary would be diminished rather than expanded caught the eye of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. He went through title I only of the bill S. 1643 to find and list 23 grants of new authority which the Secretary would be able to exercise for the first time if the bill is enacted. They include the following:

LIST OF NEW AUTHORITY GRANTS UNDER S. 1643

1. Develop national marketing orders, without a public hearing, for any agricultural commodity. Under such orders, the Secretary could:

(a) Administer national orders on a regional basis.

(b) Include volume controls.

(c) Select base periods for production adjustment.

(d) Set quotas in terms of acres, production units or commodity units.

(e) Establish minimum allotments.

(f) Establish voting eligibility.

(g) Regulate marketing by grade, size, pack, and container.

(h) Include mandatory checkoffs for promotional advertising.

(i) Impose civil penalties on producers.

(j) Refuse a hearing on an appeal by a producer.

(k) Require a producer to sell to a particular handler.

(l) Continue an order even though a majority of producers favored its termination.

2. Develop marketing quota programs for any agricultural commodity, whenever the total supply exceeded normal supply. Under such quota programs, the Secretary could:

(a) Set quotas in terms of acres, production units, or commodity units.

(b) Adjust national marketing quotas practically at will.

(c) Adjust farm marketing quotas practically at will.

(d) Establish voting eligibility.

(e) Establish minimum allotments and abolish present ones.

(f) Provide for transfer of allotments on any commodity by any method.

3. Include the following in price-support programs:

(a) Direct payments.

(b) Incentive payments.

(c) Diversion payments, based upon specific authority.

(d) Limitation on price supports to any one producer, based upon specific authority.

(e) Require compliance with conservation practices, based upon specific authority.

Under these facts, this question surely can well be asked: "Is the power of the Secretary greater or less under S. 1643?"

The burden is on the Secretary to answer that one.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business, S. 1922, the housing bill, be made the pending business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That bill is the pending business.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 1922, the housing bill, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 265, H.R. 6345, Interior Department and related agencies appropriations for 1962.

I make the request notwithstanding the previous unanimous-consent agreement entered into, with the proviso that if my present request is agreed to, the unanimous-consent agreement affecting the housing bill will go into effect on the completion of action on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, how much time does that permit for discussion?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no limit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6345) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is the Interior Department appropriation bill now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Interior Department appropriation bill is now before the Senate under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, frequently we hear criticism by the American people to the effect that the Government does not render much assistance to the Indians, totaling some 350,000, who live on the reservations. Often I receive mail from my own State of Idaho, which has a large Indian population, alleging that Congress is parsimonious in allocating funds for the operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The report on the appropriation bill now before the Senate shows that the total amount provided for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, exclusive of tribal funds, is $163,481,000, or an increase of $37,295,000 over the 1961 appropriation.

Then the total amount provided for the Public Health Service for Indians exclusively, for the next fiscal year, is $63,875,000, or an increase of $3,890,000. This makes a total increase for the Bureau of Indian Affairs in these two programs of about $41 million.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs was created in 1789, 172 years ago. For many years, the appropriations for this agency have been increasing materially. Yet the status of the Indians on the reservations indicates that they are making little progress toward the ultimate objective of the Bureau and the American people, which is the full integration of the Indians as American citizens.

Mr. President, I have before me a table, which was prepared at my request, showing the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the fiscal years from 1948 through 1961. In 1948, which was only 13 years ago, the total appropriation for the Bureau of Indian Affairs was $39,806,530, or approximately $2 million less than the increase in the budget for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the coming year as compared with the fiscal year 1961.

It is significant that in the years since 1948, appropriations for the Bureau have been increasing very rapidly. From $39,800,000 in 1948, the appropriation has increased to about $227 million this year. For the 350,000 Indians who live on the reservations, this amounts to approximately $650 per capita. Thus we are appropriating for the operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs $650 for every Indian man, woman, and child.

It is also significant to observe that currently the Bureau of Indian Affairs has almost 17,000 employees.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a tabulation showing the increase in the appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs from 1948 through 1961.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPROPRIATIONS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

Funds for fiscal years 1948–61 [1]

Fiscal year	All other	Health	Total
1948	$31,153,230	$8,653,300	$39,806,530
1949	51,763,327	10,365,195	62,128,422
1950	55,341,067	12,128,679	67,469,746
1951	62,547,167	16,842,888	79,390,055
1952	65,446,982	16,421,949	71,863,912
1953	64,240,642	22,839,765	87,080,407
1954	62,586,760	21,536,000	84,122,760
1955	67,693,562	23,418,898	91,112,460
1956	78,703,498	[2] 39,816,000	119,519,498
1957	87,737,500	[2] 47,537,000	135,274,500
1958	107,743,000	[2] 43,230,000	150,973,000
1959	125,849,500	[2] 48,337,000	174,186,500
1960	115,777,000	50,487,000	166,264,000
1961	121,407,000	57,990,000	179,397,000
Eisenhower 1961 supplemental	4,502,000		
Subtotal	1,093,492,116	419,603,674	1,513,095,790
Eisenhower 1962 budget request	139,786,000	59,037,000	198,823,000
Total	1,233,278,116	478,640,674	1,711,918,790

Number employees as of June 30, 1960

Bureau of Indian Affairs	11,667
Health, Education, and Welfare	5,116
Total	16,783

[1] Does not include tribal funds.

[2] Appropriated to Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with Public Law 568, 83d Cong., transferring the maintenance and operation of health facilities to Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have placed this table in the RECORD primarily to emphasize that Congress has been most generous in making appropriations for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. During the hearings before our subcommittee on this appropriation, when I became critical of the failure of the Bureau to provide services which are essential for the Indians, and to enable them to improve their living standards and qualify themselves for full American citizenship, I suggested that probably the time has come when the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be abolished. Of course, I did not make that comment very seriously; but, Mr. President, it is time Congress made a thorough investigation of the operations of this Bureau to determine what is necessary to improve it. Probably the Bureau of Indian Affairs could not be abolished overnight; but certainly some drastic changes should be made in its program for the benefit of the 350,000 Indians who live on reservations and to reduce expenditures. I think it is the responsibility of Congress to investigate and determine what is wrong in what appears to be the incompetent and ineffectual operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

ASSISTANCE FOR THE TUNA INDUSTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the State from which I come has been intensely interested in the type of succor and assistance available by the Department of the Interior, through the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, for research in our vast tuna industry. As a Californian and as a Senator, I have been interested during the last several years in attempting to resuscitate the tuna industry. It is a highly important segment of our national economy. A regrettable situation has existed in which people engaged in farming the sea, in going to sea to obtain tuna, and the canneries as well, have been facing almost bankruptcy. Beneficent legislation has been passed by Congress in the last several years. Some of it, I was glad to sponsor in the Senate.

I think an important part of the program undertaken by the U.S. Government to be of assistance to the American tuna industry comes in the area of research conducted by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries with respect, for example, to oceanography. A year ago the Senate responded to a reasonable request. I recall, with great regret, that the action taken in this Chamber was largely dissipated in conference.

Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the able Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the purpose of precise legislative history, what, precisely, is provided in the bill now before the Senate for research with respect to tuna?

Mr. HAYDEN. A total of $645,000.

Mr. KUCHEL. Will the Senator from Arizona break down that amount into the three categories which I understand together make up the $645,000?

Mr. HAYDEN. I have from the Department a statement which should interest the Senator from California. It reads as follows:

TUNA PROGRAM—EASTERN PACIFIC

The sum of $100,000, which was made available for eastern Pacific tuna work in fiscal year 1961 is included in the fiscal year 1962 budget, which has been passed by the House. The President has supported increased oceanographic research and House action has approved the sum of $1 million for this purpose; $175,000 is intended for use in the eastern Pacific where the tuna resources harvested by the California-based fishing fleet are found and which will benefit from these oceanographic studies.

The contemplated programing of Saltonstall-Kennedy funds for tuna in the California area in fiscal year 1962 is $370,000 of which $320,000 is for biological research and $50,000 for technological research.

Mr. KUCHEL. I thank the Senator from Arizona.

Then, in the appropriation bill now before us, there is, in total, $645,000 available for research with respect to tuna and tuna fishing?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. KUCHEL. Would the Senator from Arizona say I am correct when I state it is the intent of this legislation,

that those funds—the $645,000—be allocated for this specific purpose?

Mr. HAYDEN. Clearly that is the Department's intention, and it is also the intention of the committee.

Mr. KUCHEL. Once again I thank the able Senator from Arizona for his assistance. If these funds are insufficient, I respectfully reserve the right to urge the committee, and the Senate, later this session to augment them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in connection with this colloquy, to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum I have on this subject.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I have some further information with regard to your letter of February 3 and the letter of January 30 from Mr. Charles Carry and Dr. W. M. Chapman, which you enclosed, concerning the need for additional funds for a tuna research program in California. In my response of February 24 I informed you that the Department had an oceanography program under consideration and expected to make some recommendations shortly.

The revised budget for fiscal year 1962 contains a request by the Department for $175,000 for oceanographic research in the eastern Pacific in the area of interest to the California tuna industry.

The studies are now being conducted with a budget of $470,000. The increase of $175,000 will bring the total program to $645,000 in fiscal year 1962. This increase will accelerate the collection of biological information necessary to determine distribution and behavior of tuna and related species. The results of these studies will be the basis for recommendation to the industry on the best times of methods for maximum harvest of the renewable resources.

We believe this is a reasonable acceleration of the work in this area.

I will keep you informed as further developments occur.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES K. CARR,
Under Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the Interior Department appropriation bill. There are two amendments—one, the so-called Gruening amendment, which went over; the other, an amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. No priority has been established. There was a unanimous-consent agreement, in connection with the housing bill, which provided that amendments which went over would be taken up in the order in which they were proposed. But there was no agreement as to the amendments to the appropriations bill. Without anything further, it would be assumed that they would be taken up in the same way.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then the priority would be established on the basis of which Senator requested action first on his amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That would have been the priority in connection with the housing bill; but in the absence of any order, there is no priority for the consideration of amendments to the appropriation bill. So the priority as to such amendments will be established here and now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then, Mr. President, I recur to the amendment which I offered before the adjournment of the Senate, with the understanding that vote on it was to go over until today. It is an amendment to make a cut in the amount of one of the appropriation items on forest management. I have conferred on this matter with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

First, inasmuch as the yeas and nays have been ordered, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now, Mr. President, I modify the amendment, so it will read as a reduction of $10 million, instead of $15 million. I do not have the appropriate language before me now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has a right to modify his amendment; and the amendment will be modified accordingly.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That modification will make a difference of $5 million in the last amount recited, and will call for the amount to be $139,200,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on that question, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thought perhaps the chairman of the committee would say just a word on this matter.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the committee recommended a $30 million increase, which the Senator proposes to cut in half. If we could have a yea-and-nay vote on it and have the support of the Senate, I would be willing to take to conference a recommendation of a $20 million increase.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have modified my amendment so that, instead of cutting the item by $15 million, it is cut by $10 million. That means that an item of $20 million is still unbudgeted, for which the House made no provision, and will still be included in the bill and taken to conference. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I should like to address my able leader and ask him a question. During the deliberations in the Senate Appropriations Committee, I was personally gratified to have the committee accept an amendment which I offered, providing some additional money for fire prevention and fire control in the four national forests in the southern part of the State of California. I wish to call to the attention of my able leader that only 2 weeks ago we had our first forest fire this season. I shall put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, either today or tomorrow, some startling comments by persons interested in conservation that this may be the worst year in the history of the West with respect to the hazard of forest fires.

Having said that, I ask my able leader whether in the amendment which he now proposes none of the moneys which the Senate Appropriations Committee included for firefighting would be excluded. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator is correct. This is general reference to forest management. The sponsors of the proposal had in mind implementing the action by employment in distressed areas where forestry was involved. So, insofar as I know, this amendment does not in any way circumscribe the firefighting activities of the Forest Service.

Mr. KUCHEL. Under the terms of the amendment which the able Senator from Illinois proposes, the conference would still sit in judgment on two-thirds of the appropriation items which did not have budgetary approval.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct; neither budgetary approval nor House approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 58]

YEAS—77

Allott	Goldwater	Morton
Anderson	Gruening	Moss
Beall	Hartke	Mundt
Bennett	Hayden	Neuberger
Bible	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Boggs	Hickey	Pell
Bush	Hill	Prouty
Butler	Holland	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Saltonstall
Cannon	Johnston	Schoeppel
Capehart	Jordan	Scott
Case, N.J.	Keating	Smith, Mass.
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Church	Kuchel	Sparkman
Clark	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Long, Mo.	Symington
Curtis	Long, Hawaii	Talmadge
Dirksen	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dodd	McClellan	Wiley
Douglas	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Dworshak	McNamara	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Metcalf	Yarborough
Engle	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Monroney	Young, Ohio
Fong	Morse	

NAYS—13

Bartlett	Jackson	Muskie
Carroll	Kefauver	Proxmire
Gore	Long, La.	Randolph
Hart	Magnuson	
Humphrey	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—10

Aiken	Carlson	Fulbright
Blakley	Chavez	Smathers
Bridges	Cooper	
Burdick	Eastland	

So the Dirksen amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HART subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I am about to make may appear following the yea-and-nay vote on the Dirksen amendment to the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is possible for me to speak only for myself on this vote. However, I believe my reason for voting "nay" on the Dirksen amendment is the same as the reason which applied also to each of the other Senators who voted "nay."

I should like the RECORD clearly to identify this "nay" vote as reflecting a belief that the sum of $30 million should be added for the Forest Service, and not the lesser sum of $20 million proposed by the Dirksen amendment. This amendment cuts the $30 million which the Committee on Appropriations recommended. The "nay" vote reflects a desire and full support for the $30 million; clearly it is a vote which must be recognized as supporting the Senate position. Indeed, this yea-and-nay vote establishes virtually unanimous support in conference for the $20 million.

On the next point, I am confident I speak for all who cast a "nay" vote. The leadership of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] both in the subcommittee and in the full Committee on Appropriations, in bringing to the Senate the added $30 million is acknowledged with gratitude. From his broad experience he recognizes the obligation to protect the more than $7.5 billion of capital value represented by our national forests. The Senate, in response to his leadership and wisdom, now has given to him the strongest possible demonstration of its hope and desire that the Forest Service item of increase be held in the conference. I thank the Senator from Arizona for this most recent display of his energy, skill, and devotion to the common good.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, on page 6, line 10, to strike out "$41,708,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$42,083,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. The purpose of the amendment is to restore an item of $375,000, which was designed to bring into the service of the Office of Indian Affairs of the Department of the Interior a reconditioned boat, a better boat with a larger carrying capacity, which will serve the needs of some 98 Eskimo and Indian communities along our long shore front in Alaska.

Such a boat has been in service in Alaska since 1922. It began as a little boat, the *Boxer*, of 300 tons. As the populations increased, other, larger boats were substituted. There has been a boat in this service continuously since then. The boat is called the *North Star*. The last time the boat was reconditioned was in 1956. The repair and reconditioning of this boat is supposed to take place every 4 years. I am informed by the Department of the Interior that the reconditioning of this boat next year is essential, because it travels through very perilous passages, through the floating ice of the Bering and Arctic Seas. The reconditioning would cost at least $250,000, with an additional $50,000 for drydocking the boat. The boat which is sought to be secured can be reconditioned for $375,000. The boat would carry twice the amount of cargo of the present boat and would serve the growing population, which the present boat no longer can do.

The item was contained in the bill as it came from the House. I believe that possibly through lack of complete information it was deleted by the committee. I ask that it be restored.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, may I ask, first, whether the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered on the amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I do not propose to discuss this amendment at great length in support of the committee's position, unless it becomes a matter of some widespread interest or controversy on the floor of the Senate, in which case I reserve the right to change my mind.

I believe that the committee's position should be clarified and approved, because we are at the crossroads today from the standpoint of determining a new governmental policy which will be with us for a long while. So long as Alaska was a territory we had, of course, special responsibilities to that area, as we do about any territorial undertaking. During the period of time in which Alaska was a territory, especially in the latter years, we operated this shipping line as a Government venture to provide, as the Senator from Alaska has pointed out, a service to certain Eskimo tribes and Indian tribes in remote areas of Alaska.

Now we are all happy to see Alaska a State, and of course, we must now consider the proposal before the Senate within the framework of the fact that we are dealing with 1 of our 50 sister States. Alaska is no longer entitled to the special considerations provided a territory.

The second reason, it seems to me, that impelled the committee—I believe by unanimous vote—to strike the proposal from the bill is the fact that before we buy this new ship and instigate in one of our established States a completely socialized shipping line, owned, operated, and controlled by the Federal Government, in competition with private shipping lines, we should fully evaluate and understand the circumstances which are before us.

One thing we should keep in mind is that we are not talking only about the $375,000 initial investment, which is the cost of rehabilitating and reconstructing the ship which it is proposed that the Maritime Commission deliver free of charge for this purpose. The total cost is much more than $375,000. However, let us settle, for the present, on the $375,000 figure proposed for reconstruction and rehabilitation of this ship which the Government is being asked to donate. The fact is that the annual operating costs of this socialized shipping line in the past have been going up each year, and the losses have averaged about $500,000 a year.

Before we decide by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate to move in the direction of

state socialism to the extent of establishing from now on for one of our sister States a socialized shipping service, in addition to the matter of the principle involved, we ought to think of the matter of cost unless this body has lost all interest in economy in Government.

Therefore we have a $375,000 original investment, but we also have the anticipated historic annual cost of over $500,000 a year, for the purpose of operating the ship at most on only two round trips a year. This is not a venture like that of an ordinary ferry which makes a trip every day. The ports which this ship would serve are in areas which are closed by ice to shipping for well over half the year. Understandably, it makes these trips only during the open water season.

It is true that there are some Indians and some Eskimos in these remote areas of Alaska. But it is also true that there are Indians in other remote areas in many of our Western States. Before we initiate such a program, by a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate, for the first time in America, now that Alaska is a State, we ought to ask ourselves some serious questions.

Who actually is being benefited by this kind of venture in socialized shipping? It could be argued that the recipients of the food or the supplies or the merchandise being delivered by the ship are being benefited. However, this is not the case since this is no answer to the Indian problem. It is no answer to the Eskimo problem. It is not an answer to the problem of any of the individual citizens or any of the people for whom America has a responsibility, to continue to keep them into perpetuity isolated from civilization and providing them with services which encourage them to continue living in isolated circumstances. I believe we should devote our attention and spend our money trying to correct the situation which confronts them; in trying to find them better places in which to live; in trying to get them out of isolated pockests; in trying to provide them with acceptable means of livelihood; in trying to train them in handicrafts, in trying to provide them with jobs; and in trying to transport them into areas where they can earn a respectable living.

There is no constructive good to be served by saying to these people: "If you stay where you are, if you do not move out of these pockets, we are going to provide a socialized shipping service for you so you can be assured of getting some of the rudimentary necessities of life."

I think we are moving in the wrong direction, not only because I think it is wrong for the U.S. Senate to establish a socialistic enterprise which is unnecessary, but because there are private competitive shipping facilities available in this area. It is true that these shipping lines have had some union problems and some union troubles, as the Senator from Alaska has stated. It is true that because of the competition of Government service, private ship lines have refused to go into certain areas. It is true that they have not served all of this region.

But it is likewise true that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has airplanes as another means of transportation. So if emergency food problems are to be met, they can be met without engaging in a socialized shipping service.

Not only do I think this proposal is wrong from the standpoint of its impact upon the aborigines, because it tends to hold them in circumstances where they will never become self-reliant and self-supporting, but because instead of spending money to try to improve their conditions and give them an education and move them into other areas, we will be providing through this socialistic enterprise a means of transportation and communication which will make it more likely and more probable that they will permanently live where they are and as they have always existed from now until the end of time, a direct responsibility of the U.S. Government.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe it was Abraham Lincoln, the founder of the Republican Party, who said he believed that government should do for the people only what the people could not do for themselves. This is a case in point. Private enterprise has consistently refused to go into these ports. Private shipping will not go there. We would be glad to have its ships go. There has been no change in the situation by reason of Alaska's achieving statehood. These Indians and Eskimos live in the villages where they have lived since time immemorial. They play an important part in the defense of the United States.

The Senator from South Dakota should know about that. They live within naked eye view of the Iron Curtain of Soviet Siberia. They are an important part of the National Guard. It would be a disaster to remove them. They ought to continue to live there. They play a vital role in the national defense.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, that is quite an intriguing argument. I am not surprised to hear it ventilated on the floor of the Senate. The argument is that the money should be taken from the Public Treasury because the item is for the national defense. I congratulate the Senator from Alaska on using that argument. I do not deny the validity of it. If it is true, we certainly do not need to spend this sum of money to operate a new socialistic enterprise, if these isolated islands of population are essential to the national defense. We have enough other kinds of transportation in our Defense Establishments which are available and which can meet the needs of the people who are without food as a regular operation of defense support.

Mr. GRUENING. Would the Senator from South Dakota wish to have the Navy go into competition with private enterprise? Would that not be shocking?

Mr. MUNDT. I would much rather have the Navy supply the outposts, as it normally does, than to establish a new socialistic enterprise in the form of a socialist steamship operating in competition with private enterprise.

Mr. GRUENING. I assure the Senator from South Dakota there is nothing socialistic about it. If this appropriation is not voted, the Government will spend the same amount of money or more to rehabilitate an old vessel which cannot render service effectively. The present *North Star* will have to be reconditioned.

Those people along the Pacific, Bering Sea and Arctic coasts cannot be left without an essential food and fuel supply. We will not allow them to starve and to freeze. I am quite sure that no Member of Congress, knowing the facts, would let those people go without food, and especially without the fuel supplies needed for their cold winters. They must be supplied. The question is, Shall they be supplied uneconomically by an obsolete vessel, the cost of the rehabilitation of which will be almost the cost of a new vessel, or shall we do it in a much better way, as we are committed to do, effectively?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Alaska has narrowed the alternatives too much. We can do as he has suggested, but we can also take other steps to provide for the betterment of the Indians. We are being asked to invest the taxpayers' money to solve a problem which could better be solved in the direction of improving living conditions, rather than to waste money on a program of operating a Government steamship line to provide them with supplies which might better be delivered through private enterprise.

Mr. GRUENING. I think it is at least as important to take care of our own population as it is to take care of the needy populations in 105 other areas of the world. There is no alternative unless we intend to deprive many of our own people of the essentials of life. This appropriation is not for a luxury; it is not socialistic. Nothing has changed in this respect since Alaska became a State. These American citizens are dependent on the Federal Government for supplies, for education, and health services. The situation has not changed. Neither has it changed in certain other States, as in the Senator's State of South Dakota, where there are Indian communities. They are still, in many respects, the wards of the Federal Government, and the responsibility of the Federal Government still persists.

Mr. MUNDT. I of course agree that we have a greater responsibility for our own people than we have for people in other countries, but I certainly hope that the multibillion-dollar venture in which we are engaged to provide economic assistance to other countries is not directed to the dismal goal toward which this venture is directed, which simply proposes to keep the people as they are and where they are, under conditions in which we find them, forever.

If all we are doing in the multibillion-dollar foreign aid program in other countries is to continue to enable those people to live where they are and under the same conditions in which they have always lived, with no possibility for im-

provement, then we can understand why so much of our foreign aid effort does not result in strengthening the forces of the free world.

Mr. GRUENING. The improved ship is designed to improve the conditions of those people, not merely to keep them as they are. This is a legitimate proposal. It is really an economical one, because the ship will be a much better one, having a higher cargo capacity, three times the cold storage capacity, which will enable the Bureau of Indian Affairs to render a service which it can no longer continue to render properly with the inadequate ship it now has.

Mr. MUNDT. I speak out of sympathy for the Indians and the other Alaskan aborigines. I believe the committee's position should be brought before the Senate, because we have met and considered the present proposal and voted unanimously against this socialistic venture. If the Senate votes for this proposal, it will be voting for a program which will last for many years to come. If we do fail to adopt it, by a negative vote on the Gruening amendment, we shall certainly declare it to be the sense of the Senate that we are opposed to continuing into perpetuity this kind of socialistic procedure.

Mr. President, I speak with some knowledge and experience from the standpoint of what can be done by private transportation in an area like this when Government competition has been removed.

For many years the Missouri River Federal Barge Line ran up and down the lower reaches of the Missouri River, which crosses South Dakota diagonally. The line was run by a great and colorful steamboat captain, Capt. Robert Ingersoll. I sat on the Committee on Appropriations for years, along with many of my colleagues, when the representatives of the barge line came before us and said, "We need more money, because the Missouri River Federal Barge Line is losing money. We cannot operate economically. The Federal Barge Line service is needed. There is no other line to serve that region." So the committee would appropriate money from the general funds for the losses of the Missouri River Federal Barge Line.

Came the happy day when President Eisenhower said we ought to do away with some of the socialistic enterprises in America. He had a list of some 2,400 of them. They had grown up like Topsy. Here we had one; there we had another. President Eisenhower said, "If we believe in private enterprise, why not practice it?" Was there any better reason for having a barge line owned by the Federal Government than there was a bus line, or an air line, or a railroad, owned by the Federal Government?

The Missouri River Federal Barge Line was one of the first desocialization projects of the Eisenhower administration. There was some complaint up and down the river. It was thought that taking away a service was a step backward But, Mr. President, what happened? Capt. Robert Ingersoll, the same man who had operated the old Missouri River Federal Barge Line for the Government, organized a little company which bought the barge line. Today they are operating the line, they are making more frequent trips, and providing more adequate service. The line is operating at a profit, and is paying tax money into the Federal Treasury of the country to help finance the Federal Government.

I can think of no better illustration of what it will mean to the country if Congress will determine to practice its preachments about private enterprise. Let us give it a chance.

Private ship lines are operating in Alaska. The Senator from Alaska is quite correct when he says that they do not operate into every port. They operate against Government competition. But if we believe in private enterprise, let us give them a fair opportunity to operate. I submit that the same experience will be found in Alaska that was found in South Dakota. The private shipping line will continue to make a profit and will deliver the goods where the goods are needed.

If it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to pay the freight, it will pay the freight, so that the private ship line can deliver merchandise.

I do not wish to labor the point. I think the Senate today ought to declare itself by a yea-and-nay vote and say, "We believe in private enterprise. Let us give it a chance."

On the other hand, we can say, "Let us socialize the ship line from Seattle to Alaska and tell private enterprise, 'You are out. We are going to try a little experiment in socialized shipping.'"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that when the bill came from the House, it contained the provision which the Senator from Alaska is now attempting to place in the bill?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Ohio is exactly correct. To be completely fair, I shall place in the RECORD at this point the testimony taken in the House of Representatives. Note the size of the hearings. The volume contains more than 1,450 pages. This is the amount of attention which the proponents of the amendment received in the House—less than a single page of testimony.

Mr. KIRWAN, chairman of the subcommittee, raised the question:

I see that $375,000 is proposed to activate and outfit the ship *Emory Victory* to replace the *North Star* to ship cargo from Seattle to ports in Alaska. Can you give us a litle explanation on that?

They did that, and they certainly emphasized the word "little." I shall read all of it now; it will not take long.

Mr. Massey, in testifying for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, gave the testimony; and I now read it from the committee hearing:

REPLACEMENT OF THE SHIP "NORTH STAR"

Mr. KIRWAN. I see that $375,000 is proposed to activate and outfit the ship *Emory Victory* to replace the *North Star* to ship cargo from Seattle to ports in Alaska.

Can you give us a little explanation on that?

Mr. MASSEY. Yes, sir. The Bureau has operated a vessel for transportation in Alaska for some years. This *Emory Victory* is a larger vessel than we now operate. We will get it from the Maritime Commission. We will only pay for the demothballing and putting it in operating condition. We will, of course, name it the *North Star*, because it has been the *North Star* for many years.

We have many stations where commercial vessels do not go in. We carry cargo into those in lesser tonnage than the commercial vessel would. We have to have our timing just right because of the weather and the ice conditions, and then, of course, we are thinking of the cost. At some stations we do both. We go in, and commercial vessels go in.

Mr. President, I think I should repeat that sentence:

We go in and commercial vessels go in. We will have the commercial vessels carry the cargo that they can, and we will carry a lesser amount. Not very many of the stations that we serve, however, have a regular port of call by the commercial vessels.

That is the total testimony on the basis of which it is proposed that the U.S. Congress—now that Alaska is a State—invest $375,000 in a ship to be operated by the U.S. Government under a concept as completely socialistic as that under which any Russian vessel now operates on the Volga River. In the past, this service has been operated at a net loss to the U.S. Government of $500,000 a year; and it is presumed that the operation of the larger vessel would result in a larger deficit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota differentiate between the former situation and the present one? In other words, will he state how it is believed that such services are not justified now that Alaska is a State, although the case was different when Alaska was a Territory?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes, I can do that. If the Senator from Ohio had said they were justified when Alaska was a Territory, his question would have been different, of course.

But today the Federal Government no longer has the responsibilities for Alaska that it had when Alaska was a Territory, because Alaska as a Territory did not have the control over its taxes and budgets that it now has, as a State. Traditionally, the Federal Government has provided, from the Federal Treasury, funds for almost all manner of territorial services, one of which is still operating in Alaska, and it is one which I have supported in the past as a member of the Appropriations Committee. I refer to the Alaskan Railroad, which still is operating, and still is operated at the expense of the Federal Government, I believe.

The difference is that if the Federal Government now undertakes this steamship shipping service, on the basis of favorable action by the Congress—in the case of the Senate, favorable action on the basis of a rollcall vote, the service will be extended on the basis that the Congress is in favor of this socialistic approach. Thus we will be establishing a pattern which will not be confined to States such as Alaska and Hawaii, which recently were Territories, but will be

equally applicable to, and subject to appeals and persuasions on the part of, all the other States. For instance, I say to the Senator from Ohio that one could build a strong case for providing a Government-owned and Government-operated bus line into the Indian reservations of New Mexico and Arizona, or one could build a very good argument in favor of the construction, at the expense of the Federal Government, of a railroad spur into certain isolated counties of Idaho or Montana, if we are to proceed on the theory that the Federal Government has the responsibility to provide for such construction, at the expense of the Federal Government, for the benefit of the 50 States, in order to meet problems affecting their citizens—for instance, to do so by providing, at the expense of the Federal Government, a socialized system of transportation lines.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from South Dakota takes the position, does he, that if this amendment is adopted and is enacted into law, Congress will be providing a service to a State——

Mr. MUNDT. To citizens within a State—or to a State, if the Senator prefers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. A service to the State of Alaska?

Mr. MUNDT. Very good; I accept that.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And especially, and in an isolated way, services which are not similarly provided to other States?

Mr. MUNDT. That is true. But that is not the basic reason why I oppose it. The basic reason why I oppose it is that I happen to believe in private enterprise; and I see no reason in the world why the taxpayers generally should be taxed in order to put a Government-operated service into competition with established private shipping lines in Alaska.

The second reason why I oppose it is that I believe we would be frittering away over half a million dollars a year in order to perpetuate an unsavory and unhappy and unhealthful situation in which these aborigines live. I would be in favor of voting for twice that amount in order to help provide them with education and means of earning a livelihood for themselves—in other words, to help solve that problem.

In our committee we decided that we had better invest the funds in attempts to cure the problem, rather than invest the funds in attempts to perpetuate the problem. Of course we are only the Senate Appropriations Committee; and the Senate as a whole and the House of Representatives can overrule us, if they wish to do so.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield again to me?

Mr. MUNDT. Certainly.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the past, declarations which were made on this floor were to the effect that with the acquisition of statehood would come surrender of many of the advantages which came to Alaska as a Territory.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Ohio is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My query is directed to the proposition that at this time we may be faced pointedly with the necessity of determining whether it will be possible to have statehood and the Territorial benefits, both at the same time.

Mr. MUNDT. I think that factor is involved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. And I recognize that problem, as I have said; and I recognize that Alaska is a new State, and is sparsely settled. Time after time after time in the Appropriations Committee I have voted most generously—as I am sure both the Senators from Alaska will agree—in favor of providing for Alaska studies and transitional services which are necessary. But I do not propose now to vote to provide a socialistic enterprise which will continue ad infinitum and will not provide for anything more than government service in connection with maintaining a bad situation in a bad way, when, it seems to me, the money might better be used in order to solve a problem which exists there.

I quite agree with the argument that the Indians and the Eskimos there present a problem which is not to be solved solely by Alaska—any more than it would be correct to argue that the problems of the Sioux Indians are to be solved solely by one or two States. But I wish to be sure that the Congress does not take action of such a sort that the Bureau of Indian Affairs will do nothing except provide transportation to the Indians where they now are located, under the most unhappy conditions—those under which they now live.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President the Senator from South Dakota is a member of the Appropriations Committee; and I wish to ask him how the committee voted on this matter.

Mr. MUNDT. I think the Appropriations Committee was unanimous in voting to delete the appropriation. I stand ready to be corrected, if I am in error; there may have been one or two votes contrary to that position. But I think the committee was unanimous.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I gladly agree that the Senator from South Dakota has been most helpful over the years in providing appropriations for the natives of Alaska—that is to say, the Indians, the Eskimos, and the Aleuts. But I cannot agree with him for a moment that what we are discussing here is a choice between socialism and private enterprise. The contrary is the case, and it is the case because private shipping has never been prepared to put into the small ports for the relatively small amounts of cargo that are available.

All of this started 39 years ago. It started in 1922. I submit that that administration was not socialistic, and the proposal to carry forward this activity from 1961 is no more socialistic. It is not, as has been said, that this proposal takes the cream of business from the private carrier and leaves nothing for him so that he may operate with profit to these ports. The fact of the matter is that now there are no private carrier services to 90 of the 98 ports served by the *North Star*. It is also true that the *North Star* delivers very small amounts of freight to each of those ports.

In this connection, it should be stated that the Alaska Steamship Co., the principal maritime carrier of Alaska, in a letter dated October 26, 1960, mentioned the minimum tonnage for ports of discharge as being 200 tons. This minimum has increased 100 tons since 1954. That is an essential fact in all of this, because the fact is that the private carrier will not go in for these lesser tonnages which are landed at so many ports.

It is true that today the Bureau of Indian Affairs gives the private carrier freight when this can be done. An instance of it is the fact that the Alaska Steamship Co. freighters transported last year 444 tons to the port of St. Michael, while only 43 tons were carried by the *North Star*. But, Mr. President, even if all this freight could be carried by private carrier, there are figures to indicate that the charge to the Government would be much higher than it now is.

In that connection, I should like to cite a few figures which had been made available to me by the Department of the Interior in relation to some ports served by both the Government ship and the private carrier. They revealed that in every instance the actual charge to the Government is much higher by private shipping, ranging from $4.66 a ton to $67.26 a ton.

This issue was raised again this year during hearings held by the Committee on Commerce in respect to offshore shipping. A witness from the Alaska Steamship Co. injected the issue again. As a result, the committee solicited the views of Secretary of the Interior Udall. Secretary Udall, in a letter to Chairman MAGNUSON dated April 15, 1961, said that the conclusion reached, after a study had been made in 1955, that continuation of the *North Star* service is essential, is maintained. I ask unanimous consent to include the letter in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 15, 1961.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR WARREN: I was pleased to receive your letter of March 17, 1961. If the information given in this letter regarding the operations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs' vessel, the *North Star*, is not sufficient for your purposes let me know just what additional data is desired and I shall see that it reaches you without delay.

The request made by the representative of the Alaska Steamship Co. for a study of the *North Star's* operation to determine whether a private carrier could provide the services more economically than the Government is one that is under constant review. The most detailed study of the *North Star's* operation was made in January 1955 by Mr. A. R. Munger, of Seattle, Wash. Since the

conditions under which the vessel currently operates have not changed appreciably since Mr. Munger's report was made, it is believed that little would be gained by undertaking a new study at this time.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, as you know, operates the *North Star* because it must transport personnel and cargo to a number of the smaller and more isolated ports of Alaska, which are not served by commercial vessels. One of the objectives of the Munger survey was to determine whether practical alternative means of service by private enterprise was available and, if so, at what comparative cost. In seeking to determine if such service was available, officials of the Alaska Steamship Co., as well as those of the local transportation companies in Alaska, were consulted. However, it was not possible to make a direct comparison of freight rates because the unique services which the *North Star* performs for the natives could not be reduced to dollars and cents. As a result of Mr. Munger's survey it was concluded that the *North Star* would not be retired from service until it has been shown conclusively that all the Alaska communities of consequence are adequately served and that the cost of similar services by private enterprise would not be overly burdensome to the natives. To date, it has not been possible to work out an arrangement which would provide either the unique or the commercial services for the smaller, more isolated ports.

Recently the Bureau of Indian Affairs made a study of the transportation needs of the Federal operations in Alaska served by the *North Star*. This study, which was based on the 1960 shipping season, revealed that a vessel with a greater capacity was required. Enclosed are tables I through XI, giving the data you requested as to the vessel's itinerary, cost of operation, et cetera, together with as much information as is available on comparable carrier rates.

Since July 1955 the *North Star* has been operated on an enterprise basis, which requires that the entire operation cost be paid from revenue realized from the transportation of freight. The charges for the freight carried and the services performed are billed at rates as provided in part 254, title 25 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The *North Star* makes two trips each season between Seattle, Wash., and 98 ports of call in Alaska, all of which must be serviced each year. At those very few points where both the *North Star* and the commercial carrier serve, other than Kotzebue and Nome, all of the freight that the commercial carrier can handle or that can be acquired in time to meet the commercial sailing schedule is shipped by the commercial carrier.

Sincerely yours,

Secretary of the Interior.

STEWART L. UDALL,

Mr. BARTLETT. Secretary Udall stated that every effort would be made to divert this shipping to private carrier as soon as that could be done. As soon as the private carrier can serve the ports now served by the *North Star*, the Interior Department expresses willingness to get out of the shipping business.

I would much prefer to be in a situation where it would not be necessary for me to urge a Government subsidy of an enterprise of this kind, but I think there is no alternative. I think it is clear on the record that, should the Government ship go out of service, these essential goods will not be shipped.

I think there is no connection between this issue and achievement of statehood by Alaska, because the Government owes an obligation to Indians wherever they are found in the United States, whatever the political status of the particular area is. And so it is in the case of Alaska.

Since 1955 the expenses incurred by the *North Star* have been reimbursable by the measurement of a strict accounting system. It will not do to eliminate this service and tell these Eskimo people that if they cannot get freight, if they cannot get the essentials of life, if in some cases they cannot get fuel, they should move elsewhere, any more than our Government should tell the people of New York that they would have to relocate themselves. These people have lived at these places as my colleague from Alaska has said, since time immemorial, and they have a right to live there. It is their home. It would be entirely unfair to suggest to them that they move themselves to a different kind of life, in a different kind of economy, without more adequate training.

I hope the amendment will prevail.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I merely wish to conclude by stating to the Senator from South Dakota that I share his view that the Government should not compete with private business. I agree with him fully in that respect. However, there are special conditions here, which have also been pointed out by my colleague, which render Government operation essential; the alternative would be simply to deprive these American citizens of Alaska of the necessities of life, or compel them to pay for higher costs. Competition with private enterprise is not at issue here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Secretary Udall on this matter, which I received today, be printed in the RECORD at this point, and I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, *June 6, 1961.*

Hon. ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ERNEST: In reference to your inquiry concerning an amendment to the Interior appropriations bill allowing for an appropriation for an *Emory Victory* class carrier. It is clear that $375,000 will be required for reactivation costs of a larger vessel eliminated by the Senate Appropriations Committee from Interior appropriations for operation of its present *North Star*. Because of its age and the obsolescence of much of its equipment, operation and maintenance costs for the present vessel are increasing sharply each year. For the two trips made by the *North Star* in 1959 a total of 12,189 tons of freight was hauled to Alaska. This represents an overload of 1,589 tons as the ship's rated capacity is only 5,300 tons. Despite overloading the vessel to this extent the Bureau had to decline numerous requests for shipping cargo and bulk oil. For the 1960 shipping season the *North Star* hauled 14,130 tons. It is anticipated that by 1964 nearly 18,000 tons of cargo would have to be hauled to satisfy requirements at the ports of call of the present *North Star*. It is currently estimated that the ports served by the current *North Star* require approximately 1 million gallons of bulk fuel oil. The present *North Star* has a capacity of approximately 200,000 gallons. If the Bureau is permitted to obtain a larger vessel of the *Emory Victory* class which is rated at approximately 11,000 tons it would be possible to supply the Government's needs at the ports of call of the *North Star* as well as provide space for freight for missionaries and other persons who are not able at the present time to receive freight by surface carrier. In addition a vessel of the *Emory Victory* class has a bulk oil carrying capacity of approximately 400,000 gallons which would more nearly approach needs and would eliminate the need for carrying oil in 55-gallon drums as deck cargo as is currently being done contrary to maritime regulations.

We are convinced that at the present time, commercial carrier is not in a position to provide the service to the villages and natives of Alaska now rendered by the *North Star*. Based on available commercial rates it has been determined that commercial carrier costs would exceed *North Star* rates by anywhere from $4.56 a ton to $67.26 a ton with the average being between $30 and $35 a ton. Bulk oil delivered by the *North Star* to Point Barrow, Alaska, can be delivered at a cost, including purchase and transportation, of 29 cents a gallon. The same delivered to Point Barrow, Alaska, from Kotzebue of commercial barge would cost 40 cents a gallon. The economy of the native villages would be very adversely affected if the native stores on which they depend for supplies and materials were required to pay the much higher costs of commercial shipping. The *North Star* operation provides another service which has a decided effect upon the economy of certain villages in Alaska in that it loads on reindeer meat from Nunibak Island and sells it to villages at ports of call coming south from Nunibak. This operation for the fiscal year 1960 resulted in a sale of reindeer meat amounting to approximately $40,000. It is anticipated that with larger refrigerated carrier capacity more than twice this amount of meat could be hauled and sold. A ship of the *Emory Victory* class has this capacity. No commercial vessel could perform this service since it is contrary to all union regulations. For these reasons it is felt that every effort should be made to have the $375,000 reinstated in the Interior appropriation bill.

I hope the above will support and make clear why the Department supports your amendment dealing with an *Emory Victory* class ship.

With best personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, because I do not desire to labor this point; but I think we are writing a bit of American history today. This is, after all, a precedent forming case, a laboratory exhibit, of what we confront in the National Congress when we try to stop a socialistic arrangement. I remember the arguments that were made about the rope factory in Boston, about the synthetic rubber plants, about the Missouri River Federal barge line, about the Government coffee roasting plant in Florida. It is not easy to try to discourage or discontinue socialistic ventures. I would not raise my voice if this were a matter of continuing it another year because it was something which should be done temporarily; but we are determining national policy, because we are either going to proceed with this kind of socialistic program or provide other ways of meeting the problem.

I think my friend inadvertently suggested a very realistic way when he suggested that this group of aborigines provides defense services. If they do, they come clearly within the requirements of the defense support of America, and for these one or two trips a year, it might be far better and cheaper to use our naval facilities, which ply up and down this area anyhow, to provide the food and merchandise for these "soldiers" of our economy who are employed in our defense effort, than to start on a new program and spend $500,000 a year, year after year after year, because we decide to have the *North Star*, with its sentimental name, plying up and down the harbors of Alaska, under the operation of this socialistic formula.

I do not think we should do that. I think the time has come when there are so many immediate demands upon the taxpayers' dollars that we ought to be serious about throwing away $500,000 a year which we can save. If we save it, I shall join my friends from Alaska in trying to find some program to help solve the problem this particular service would help to perpetuate.

There is one other thing of importance. There is a difference between the rates, as pointed out by the senior Senator from Alaska. It is true the commercial lines charge more for the tonnage than is charged by the *North Star*. Mr. President, that is the oldest argument in the world for advocacy of a socialistic enterprise. The service or sales rate charged by an socialistic enterprise is always less than that charged by private enterprise, because the socialistic enterprise pays no taxes and has none of the problems which private enterprise must face.

It is not simply the service charge but the end cost of delivered service, the total charge, which we should consider. I am convinced that, when we consider the differential between what it would be necessary to pay the Alaska Steamship Co. or any other private company at commercial rates and what would be paid at the *North Star* rate, multiplying by the number of units of merchandise to be transported, we could not load the ship heavily enough on those two lonesome trips a year to squander the $500 million we are asked to squander each year. We have to take into consideration both those factors.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator spoke of a $500 million expenditure.

Mr. MUNDT. I am sorry.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator must have been thinking of foreign aid.

Mr. MUNDT. I stand corrected. It is $500,000. I was thinking of foreign aid, perhaps because this reminds me of some of the things we do in the foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I do not wish to have my remarks construed as meaning in any way that we should make this an Alaskan problem. It is an American problem. We must solve it with the resources of America.

I hope we shall not solve the problem by overriding the Senate Appropriations Committee, which at long last has struck a blow for private enterprise, by almost a unanimous vote. I think it was a unanimous vote by which the committee decided not to start this new socialistic steam line. By supporting the committee we can save the initial cost and we can save the annual cost, and also we shall be able to reinforce a great American principle of private enterprise.

I am sure we can find a way to do more for the Eskimos and Indians than simply to feed them and keep them alive under the present circumstances.

I urge that the Senate support the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Alaska a question.

I recall that we had the subject of the *North Star* before the Committee on Commerce. Was it before the committee in the form of a bill, or was it discussed incidental to some other item?

Mr. BARTLETT. It was incidental, I inform my good friend from Ohio, for there was a projection of the matter before the committee by an official of the Alaska Steamship Co., who asked us to look into it. This was in connection with the hearings on offshore shipping. This the chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] did by way of a letter to the Secretary of the Interior. Secretary Udall responded—I have placed that letter in the RECORD—saying, in essence, "We wish we could get out of this. We do not see our way clear to do so under present circumstances and conditions."

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from New Hamsphire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 59]

YEAS—48

Anderson	Hart	Metcalf
Bartlett	Hartke	Monroney
Bible	Hickey	Morse
Burdick	Hill	Moss
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Muskie
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Neuberger
Cannon	Johnston	Pastore
Carroll	Jordan	Pell
Church	Kefauver	Randolph
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Mass.
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Sparkman
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Engle	Mansfield	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McGee	Yarborough
Gruening	McNamara	Young, Ohio

NAYS—43

Allott	Goldwater	Proxmire
Beall	Hayden	Robertson
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Russell
Boggs	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Hruska	Schoeppel
Butler	Javits	Scott
Capehart	Keating	Smathers
Case, N.J.	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Case, S. Dak.	Lausche	Stennis
Cotton	Magnuson	Thurmond
Curtis	McClellan	Wiley
Dirksen	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	Morton	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Mundt	
Fong	Prouty	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	Carlson	Fulbright
Blakley	Chavez	Gore
Bridges	Cooper	McCarthy

So Mr. GRUENING's amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, I call up my amendment labeled "G" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, line 17, strike out "$27,313,000" and in-

sert in lieu thereof "$27,613,000, of which $300,000 shall be for preconstruction planning for additional laboratory facilities at the Forest Products Laboratory".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Madam President, the amendment would restore $300,000 to the appropriation bill. This sum was recommended by the Forest Service and approved by the Bureau of the Budget and approved by the administration. It has very great merit. The Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wis., has done excellent work. All that I find necessary to say is that the chairman of the committee, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has said that the laboratory has returned as much as $40 for every $1 that it has spent in the past. We believe it will continue that program of giving us back our money many times over. In view of the merit of the proposal and its distinguished support, rather than argue in behalf of it, I ask the distinguished chairman of the committee if he will consider taking the amendment to conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee will take it to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated and considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On line 2, page 25, under the heading "Construction" it is proposed to delete "$5,350,650" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,738,000".

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, the amendment would lift a restriction which the Senate Appropriations Committee has imposed on the expenditure of requested construction funds to meet conservation needs of the Izembek and Arctic National Wildlife Ranges in Alaska. This item was contained in the Eisenhower and in the Kennedy budgets. The House committee approved this amount and the House bill contains it. The amendment would restore the $387,350 that was deleted for essential work in those outstanding areas. This is the same amount that has been approved by the House.

As a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, I have the opportunity to obtain firsthand knowledge of the requirements of the Department of the Interior to meet this Nation's responsibilities to our people and to Canada and Mexico under the terms of the Migratory Bird Treaties. We face a continuing challenge in preserving and restoring, where necessary, the specialized wetlands habitat that is so vital to the welfare of migratory waterfowl. This fact is recognized by the Commission, many members of this body, and the Nation's sportsmen. Only by aggressive action and a positive program will we be able to keep faith with the millions of people in this country who enjoy and benefit from being able to see and to hunt ducks, geese, and other migratory birds.

The 415,000-acre Izembek National Wildlife Range was created from public lands by former Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton in 1960. Its establishment climaxed an effort of nearly two decades to dedicate that important area for wildlife purposes. Situated at the base of the Aleutian Island chain on the north side of the Alaska Peninsula, the Izembek Wildlife Range is a migration gathering point for hundreds of thousands of ducks and geese. The migratory waterfowl gather there in the spring before they disperse across the nesting grounds. They return again in the fall with their young prior to beginning the long southward migration that takes most of them into most of the Western States and Mexico. Dense growths of eel grass in Izembek and adjacent bays and lagoons, and tundra berries and grasses provide food for the migrants each spring and fall. The birds that stop and rest there contribute to the pleasure of naturalists and sportsmen throughout the length of the Pacific flyway.

I might say that the Pacific flyway extends from the western line of the State of Nebraska all the way to the Pacific coast and north and south from border to border. My colleagues should realize that this 415,000-acre area, which was created at no cost to the Federal Government, contributes enjoyment and healthful outdoor recreation to millions of people in Oregon, Washington, and California, as well as to the residents of the interior Western States. I have an idea that even at the famous Fleming duck shooting lodge in Cheyenne County, Nebr., perhaps the Senator from Nebraska has taken a shot at some of the ducks that started from that area. I do not guarantee that I hit any of them, but I am sure I have shot at them.

Of the $387,350 that I am hopeful the Senate will approve, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has asked for $206,000 so that construction could begin on necessary headquarters buildings at the Izembek Wildlife Range. I want to make clear that the Service intends that the Izembek Wildlife Range facilities would provide headquarters for its entire patrol forces that work along the Aleutian chain.

Mr. MUNDT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HRUSKA. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is to be congratulated for making his persuasive appeal about a problem which is growing greater in this country every year. With the development of high-powered ammunition and better guns and better transportation, the problem of protecting the migratory waterfoul population against the hunter and continuing hunting into each coming generation gets more serious every year.

I am glad the Senator has brought this item to the attention of the Senate. The committee was led to believe that there was a controversy about it in the State of Alaska. Since the House had included the item and there was a controversy about it in Alaska, we decided to delete it. However, I think it would be appropriate for the Senator to insist on a vote by the Senate, so as to have the mind of the full Senate registered in this connection, because the conferees—and I speak as one of them—like to have the sentiment of the Senate supporting their action or rejecting their action, so that they will go to conference fully advised.

This is a subject of great concern in every State which has a sportsman with a gun and a hunting license. I think that includes most of the States of the Union. It is a problem about which there is some division of opinion in Alaska. I think the Alaska Senators should be heard on this question. However, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not simply offer his amendment, make his suggestion, and then drop it, but will press for a vote by the Senate, so that the attitude of this body can be ascertained before we go to conference. I am very much disposed to support his position.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Madam President, the funds would thus accomplish a dual purpose. They would enable the Service to initiate needed management and protection activities at the Izembek area and also to provide a headquarters facility for the important Aleutian Island patrol force.

The second part of the funds that were deleted—$181,350—would enable the Fish and Wildlife Service to discharge the responsibilities with which it was vested by the creation of the Arctic National Wildlife Range in northeastern Alaska by Secretary Seaton. Approximately 8.8 million acres in area, the Arctic Range straddles the spectacular Brooks Mountain Range. It is bounded by the Yukon Territory on the east and the Arctic Ocean on the north. Waterfowl nest extensively along the Arctic slope of the range, and grizzly bears, Dall sheep, wolverine, and great caribou herds are among its large game. This famous area also was created out of public lands at no cost to the Federal Government. The Canadians are considering the withdrawal of an equally large area on their side of the boundary so that the caribou herds, which are migratory in nature and move freely across the international boundary, will have assurance of sufficient habitat for their well-being.

I believe Congress should take action as early as possible for the purpose of developing a fish and wildlife program for the purpose of cooperating with our neighbor to the north.

With the $181,350 it has requested for work in the Arctic Wildlife Range, the Fish and Wildlife Service plans to establish shelter areas for personnel on both the north and south sides of the range, construct a warehouse at Fairbanks, and make provision for operation and maintenance activities in the area. The need for these funds is imperative. Two geological survey parties already have permits to make mineral explorations inside the range, and the Service has pending applications for two additional parties. The Service must have the requested funds if it is to make certain that activities within the range do not impair the purposes for which it has been established. I repeat, Madam President, based upon my experience as a member

of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, that proper management of these two wildlife ranges will contribute greatly to the fulfillment of this country's responsibility to the people in fostering migratory bird resources. Also, it will enable this Nation to fulfill those obligations which we are committed to fulfill in our treaties with both Mexico and Canada.

The provision of the requested $387,350, already approved by the House, means that immeasurable benefits will accrue to these important wildlife resources and to the millions of our people who both enjoy and use them. I urge that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Madam President, the Senator from Nebraska has made an interesting argument. If it had been made before the committee, the action of the committee might have been different. But when we were told that the Governor of Alaska and the Legislature of Alaska were opposed to the proposal, naturally we struck out the language.

I think the committee ought to be consistent. We will have a chance to look into the matter carefully in conference; and if the House should agree with us, it will be only a year before there will be another bill. I do not believe the duck population of the United States will suffer very much in 1 year.

There is merit in what the Senator says, but we did not know about it at the time the item was considered. I think it would be much better to handle it in the way the committee has, and then we can develop all the facts.

Mr. HRUSKA. I am certain the Senator from Arizona has much more experience—and authority, as well—in this field. I recognize the opposition which comes from the State of Alaska. I read the testimony.

Mr. HAYDEN. We will have to find out why Alaska has objected. There must be some reason or basis for it.

On the other hand, the Fish and Wildlife Service may have a much better argument, but it was not presented before our committee. We had no opportunity to look into it. We decided, in this instance, that we would follow the wishes of the State, at least at this time. I think that is the way to proceed.

Mr. HRUSKA. Perhaps so; but notwithstanding the objection and the testimony on the part of the Senators from Alaska, Alaska is now one of the 50 members of the Union, and it seems to me that in some of the obligations which we owe, Alaska also should try to help us discharge them, so that while we can give due weight to the objections and testimony they gave, the program having been considered by the Eisenhower administration and by the Kennedy administration, through the Bureau of the Budget, and having been approved by the House Appropriations Committee and the House itself, I think it would lie well if they would concur.

Mr. HAYDEN. We will find out about that in conference. There will not be anything in conference except the amendment. By the Senate's adopting the committee amendment, the item will be in conference. That is the way I think we ought to proceed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the distinguished Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, give assurance to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that this item will not be forgotten, but will be revived in conference, so that the reasons for the actions taken by the House and Senate separately can be considered in detail and a decision reached accordingly?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the position of the Senate ought to be sustained in view of the representations made by the State of Alaska.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But with the assurance that the subject will be considered in conference?

Mr. HAYDEN. We will give assurance that it will be considered, and we will be willing to have representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service appear before the conference.

Mr. HRUSKA. Madam President, I am greatly heartened by the assurance given by the Senator from Arizona, and I am grateful to the Senator from Montana for his suggestion. If what he states shall be done, I shall be happy to withdraw the amendment and have the matter go to conference, with the assurance given by the chairman of the committee that he will press the subject for some further exploration and adjudication, if one can be had.

Mr. HAYDEN. We owe that to everyone concerned.

Mr. HRUSKA. Very well.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I may withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska is withdrawn.

Mr. BEALL. Madam President, I am most pleased that the Senate Appropriations Committee has included in H.R. 6345 funds for the purposes set forth in the Capper-Cramton Act.

Two projects are concerned:

First, the acquisition of stream-valley parks in Montgomery County, Md. Under the act, the Federal Government provides one-third of the cost. The local authorities must provide the remaining two-thirds. Montgomery County is prepared to contribute its share which amounts to $1,200,000.

The second project involves the construction of the George Washington Memorial Parkway in Prince Georges County, Md. This program requires a 50–50 participation by the Federal Government and the county. Prince Georges County is ready to match the $1,500,000 included in this bill with a like amount of its own funds.

Both of these programs will go far to enhance the devolpment of the Washington metropolitan area.

I wish to thank the members of the committee for this action which is in line with the worthy goals intended by the Capper-Cramton Act. I extend special thanks to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee who has always been interested in the orderly development of our Nation's Capital and its surrounding areas.

WICHITA MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE REFUGE ROAD

Mr. MONRONEY. Madam President, one small but very important item in the Interior Appropriations bill as reported to the Senate is for the construction of an all-weather road approximately 4 miles long to provide a western entrance within the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge. I appreciate very much the attention the committee has given this item to make more accessible this refuge, which more than a million visitors seek out each year to observe the big game herds and other wild animals, as well as the conservation practices preserving native grasses and trees. Actually, a much larger program of road building and repair, something in the nature of $1,500,000, is needed, but the urgency is for this item of $135,000 which will enable visitors to make a loop from U.S. Highway 62 north and west to State Highway 54 and back onto Highway 62. I hope the House can be persuaded to accept this 4-mile road also.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed with my remarks a communication I have received from the State of Oklahoma, a copy of Enrolled House Resolution No. 583 from the State house of representatives, urging the road referred to within the refuge and also calling on the State to improve other roads leading to the refuge.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 583

Resolution requesting Federal and State authorities to plan, program, and construct hard-surfaced access roads to the western and Indiahoma entrances of the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; directing that copies of resolution be sent to appropriate persons

Whereas the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge located in southwestern Oklahoma, is an outstanding national tourist attraction, a scenic wonderland of 59,099 acres, annually accommodating over 700,000 visitors; and

Whereas the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge is one of the oldest, if not the oldest, of game refuges operated by the Federal Government, being set aside as such by the presidential proclamation of Theodore Roosevelt in 1905; and

Whereas the wildlife refuge is famous for its herds of buffalo, elk, deer, its flocks of wild turkeys, the Easter pageant, the scenic Mount Scott Drive; and

Whereas the Federal Government, within the refuge, has blacktopped roads leading to the Meers, Medicine Park, Cache, and Indiahoma gates, leaving only the western entranceway unsurfaced; and

Whereas an all-weather, blacktopped entranceway to the wildlife refuge is needed to provide convenient access from those portions of western Oklahoma lying north of U.S. 62 and the Texas Plains, their nearest route into the refuge now being rough, dusty, and unmarked; and

Whereas another important route to the wildlife refuge leading from Indiahoma northward to the nearest refuge gate, a dis-

tance of approximately 5 miles, still is unsurfaced, rough, and dusty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 28th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma:

SECTION 1. That the need for an all-weather, blacktopped access road leading from headquarters in the Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge to its western gate, a distance of approximately four (4) miles, be expressed to Congress and to appropriate Federal authorities and that said Federal authorities give to such improvement the highest priority in the overall scheme of development for the refuge;

SEC. 2. That the State highway commission in Oklahoma be requested to plan, program, and as expeditiously as is possible to construct a connecting link between S.H. 54 and the western gate of the Wildlife Refuge, a distance of only 6.7 miles; that the commission be requested to lend moral support to those individuals, towns, and civic groups seeking fulfillment of this proposed improvement; and that it also plan, program, and as expeditiously as possible, construct a blacktopped connecting link from the town of Indiahoma northward to the nearest refuge gate, a distance of approximately five (5) miles; and

SEC. 3. That copies of this resolution be sent to Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; Julian Howard, Superintendent, Wichita Mountains Wildlife Refuge; David Bell, Director, Bureau of the Budget; Carl Hayden, U.S. Senator; Mike Monroney, U.S. Senator; Robert S. Kerr, U.S. Senator; Victor Wickersham, Member of Congress; Gene Grubitz, Jr., secretary and member, State highway commission; J. C. Kennedy, member, State highway commission, and Frank Lyons, State highway director.

Adopted by the house of representatives the 25th day of May 1961.

DELBERT INMAN,
Speaker pro tempore of the House of Representatives.

WILLIAM N. CHRISTIAN.
A. MITCHELL.

Mr. THURMOND. Madam President, I desire to have the RECORD show that I am opposed to passage of H.R. 6345, the Interior Department appropriation bill, because the sums appropriated therein greatly exceed the budget estimates for 1962, and there is no adequate showing of an emergency or other special reason for the additional amount.

Mr. SCOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of the debate on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill the statement of Mr. Samuel H. Hoffman, of the Warren, Pa., Chamber of Commerce before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on May 10, last, in support of the forestry laboratory at Warren, Pa.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROGRAM FOR FORESTRY RESEARCH

(Statement of Samuel H. Hoffman of the Warren, Pa., Chamber of Commerce before the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 10)

Mr. Chairman, I am appearing before you today to talk briefly about forestry research, a subject in which you and I share a great deal of interest. My State, like most of the other 49 that together constitute our Nation, enjoys a substantial forest resource. This forest contributes much in the way of water, timber, forage, wildlife, and recreation. But, like in the others, the increased pressures of use can be met only by putting our forest land to work completely. We have scarcely realized the potential wealth that can come from intensively managed forest lands.

To achieve a higher level of use will require knowledge—knowledge that we have not yet acquired. This is why I am so vitally interested in forestry research. It is through systematic study that the many resources of the forest can bring to the people the greatest degree of material wealth, comfort, and enjoyment.

Last January, Senator STENNIS spoke to the Senate about a research program—one that would bring up to date the forestry research efforts needed to move ahead in solving highly important problems. He called for an increase of $4 million to the Forest Service in fiscal year 1962 for research laboratory construction. I agree with Senator STENNIS that these laboratories are needed. This is not an extravagant program. The increase would merely provide for the second-year level of financing of the carefully worked out program of the Forest Service which this committee reviewed and endorsed 2 years ago.

I was happy to see included in the proposals by Senator STENNIS a laboratory at Warren, Pa. As I remarked on the Senate floor at that time this laboratory is vitally needed to speed the research program at Warren. The laboratory, costing $200,000, would give the research staff that are now on the job the kinds of facilities they need but do not have, and would materially hasten the pace of work and efficiency of the scientists.

Forestry research at Warren, Pa., is filling a recognized need. This new laboratory would serve not only the needs of Pennsylvania, but of adjacent States as well which have similar forest types.

I sincerely believe that the forestry research program is sound. The increase of $4 million for laboratory construction is in accordance with carefully developed plans. The action of this committee on previous occasions has established well its position of leadership in the field of forestry by its vision on matters such as I discuss. I support, Mr. Chairman, the action required so this program can go ahead.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H.R. 6345) was passed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Madam President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Madam President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mrs. NEUBERGER in the chair) appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I make this inquiry in the time available on the bill. What is the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is the Capehart amendment identified as "6–1–61—D."

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question, the Senator from Indiana has 22 minutes remaining under his control and the Senator from Alabama has 29 minutes remaining under his control.

The amendment is the Capehart amendment lettered "D"—"D" as in Denver.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or "D" as in Dallas? [Laughter.]

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. What became of the Javits amendment? I thought it was the pending amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the Javits amendment, and it will come up later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Indiana state how much time he yields to himself?

Mr. CAPEHART. Five or ten minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana may proceed.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should like to propose to the floor manager of the bill a modification of my amendment, to see whether he will accept it, namely, to reduce the period of time from 25 years to 20 years, and to state that it applies only to buildings or structures 10 years of age or older.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And leave the maximum amount at $10,000?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. The pending amendment would reduce the amount from $10,000 to $7,000, and would reduce the number of years from 25 to 15. Would the Senator from Alabama accept a modification which would reduce the years from 25 to 20, would leave the amount at $10,000, but would provide that the money can be spent only on structures or houses 10 years of age or older?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, I would be willing to agree to that amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Will the Senator state what amendment is being discussed, to be adopted by unanimous consent?

Mr. CAPEHART. None. We are only discussing this.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not know what amendment is being considered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Chair announced that the amendment is identified as the Capehart amendment "6–1–61—D."

Mr. ROBERTSON. There was so much noise in the Chamber that I could not hear the Chair's announcement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is the amendment relating to the home improvement and rehabilitation loan proposed by the bill. The Senator from Indiana has proposed to reduce the term of the loans from 25 years to 20 years, and to permit the maximum amount to stand at $10,000. He also proposes to include a proviso that loans would only be made on houses 10 years of age or older.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this amendment, the yeas and nays have been ordered. Therefore, the amendment can now be modified only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CAPEHART. I understand, Madam President. I shall use the 10 minutes I have allocated to myself to discuss this matter.

Let me ask whether there is objection to unanimous consent to modify the amendment along this line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Indiana will permit the Chair to put the question——

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, reserving the right to object, let me say that the Senator from Indiana had a printed amendment which goes far beyond the present law. Will he please explain to the Senate why he has abandoned that position, for a still more liberal one?

Mr. CAPEHART. I am not abandoning it. I just asked the able Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from Alabama, whether he would be willing to accept an amendment along the line of the one I have just now stated. Unanimous consent is required in order that I may withdraw my amendment. But I have not yet requested that.

However, I gather that the able Senator from Virginia would be opposed even to providing for 20 years and a $10,000 maximum, and including a proviso that the buildings must be 10 years of age or older.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I take the position that the present law has worked well and is sufficiently liberal. But rather than go to the extent provided by the bill, I was prepared to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana. I will not agree to have that amendment withdrawn.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry: Would it be in order at this time to request unanimous consent that the yeas and nays—which have been ordered on this amendment—be withdrawn, so that the Senator from Indiana may then offer a new amendment—in other words, his amendment in modified form?

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I prefer to have the Senate vote on the amendment as it is now written. If the Senate adopts the amendment, we shall be very happy. If the Senate does not adopt the amendment as it is now written, later I shall offer the modification I have discussed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. That is certainly a more logical position.

Mr. CAPEHART. Very well.

Madam President, this amendment is a very simple one. It reduces the amount from $10,000 to $7,000, and reduces the period of years from 25 to 15. We now have—and have had for many years—a law, regarding home improvements, to do the same thing that this section of the bill would do, but with a limit of $3,500, and for a period not to exceed 5 years.

It is my opinion that 15 years—or three times as long as has been allowed in the past—and $7,000—or twice the amount we have allowed in the past—are ample, and should satisfy, I believe, the most liberal and should satisfy the building industry. I think it is a more sound and sane and sensible approach at the moment, rather than to provide for up to 25 years—a long time—and up to $10,000.

Madam President, I am willing to yield back the remainder of the time under my control.

Mr. BUSH. First, Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to support the amendment of the Senator from Indiana; I believe it is a desirable amendment, and I am glad the Senate will vote on it. I see no reason why the terms should not be raised as gradually as would be the case under this amendment.

To jump to 25 years would, I believe, be unnecessary. I believe 15 years is a reasonable time for a home improvement loan to be insured by the FHA.

Also, to jump from $3,000 to $7,000—an increase of 2½ times—would be more than necessary, in my opinion.

So I believe the amendment of the Senator from Indiana is a sound one and should be supported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield back the remainder of the time under his control?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, Madam President. I wish to speak very briefly. At this time I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I would be perfectly willing to accept the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana as a compromise, but not the amendment on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

I wish to repeat a statement I have already made. Reference has been made to the existing title I home repair and improvement program. This program is a home improvement program. It covers perhaps the painting of a house; a new roof; a new bathroom; a new porch, or something of that kind.

Home improvements and home repairs are involved. It is not a regular type of FHA program. It is true that this program is administered by the FHA, but the agency has nothing to do with processing the application for the loan. The FHA simply insures the lender against loss if the lender requests such insurance. Under the program, the homeowner goes to his local bank and makes application for a loan. If the bank approves the application and makes the loan the bank may ask for insurance under the home improvement program. The FHA, if the bank is an approved institution, merely insures the bank against loss on the loan on a 90–10 basis; that is, the FHA assumes 90 percent if there is a loss and the banks assume a 10 percent loss.

The program proposed by this bill would require that an application for a loan must be processed by the FHA, and that all FHA's regular underwriting standards will apply to the application and, indeed to the applicant's credit ability. In other words, applications under the new program will be processed in the same manner as the agency would process an application for mortgage insurance.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I agree that the proposal goes much further than merely to provide funds to finance a $3,500 repair job.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. But, under the program, the loan will be made on the good faith and credit of the homeowner, and not be secured by a mortgage. No mortgage will be required, and the Federal Government will have to hold the bag.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I must say, with all due deference to my dear friend and my chairman, that his statement is not entirely correct.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Why is it not correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Because we wrote into the pending bill that there must be adequate security, and also in the report we tried to explain what we meant by adequate security. We said for the longer terms and the larger amounts we would expect there would be junior liens or liens as may be appropriate under the circumstances involved and the laws of the particular State.

Mr. ROBERTSON. In committee the proposal that mortgages be required was defeated. Something about it was put in the report, but it means nothing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That was done because there might be smaller amounts provided for which a note at the bank would be sufficient, or collateral might be placed, or something of that kind. I believe the matter is adequately covered by the language in the bill that there must be adequate security and by the statement in the report which is to be found on pages 12 and 13.

Madam President, one of the great advocates of the FHA programs for existing homes has been, through the years, my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The real estate boards, the various building groups and various groups of private enterprise have through the years recommended a rehabilitation program. We had the famous Baltimore plan of rehabilitation. That is exactly what is here proposed. It makes possible, where existing homes can be rehabilitated, making them a part of the inventory of livable homes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has not one of the leading advocates of improving existing houses been the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes, he has, year after year. We are simply trying to carry out something that he has advocated in the past.

It must be remembered that the $10,000 amount is the maximum. I believe it is a reasonable maximum when we consider that there is involved the rehabilitation or the rebuilding of a house.

I am perfectly willing to go along with the Senator, and lower the term from 25 years to 20 years, and I am perfectly willing to provide that the loan shall not be provided on a house that is less than 10 years old, because it is the older homes it is being proposed to rehabilitate.

Mr. CAPEHART. We are certainly not very far apart—$7,000 as against $10,000 and 25 years as against 15 years.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think if we vote down the pending amendment, we can get together very easily.

Mr. CAPEHART. My position is that my proposal is sufficient when we are talking in terms of persons of middle income whose homes cost from $9,000 to $15,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are not talking about that class of homes.

Mr. CAPEHART. We ought to be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are talking generally about deteriorated homes, which at one time may have been good livable homes, but which have become rundown and need repair or some rebuilding or some rehabilitation. I think the figure of $10,000 is a reasonable maximum limit.

Mr. CAPEHART. I appreciate the praise I received from the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Illinois, because it is very seldom that I get praise.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator knows that is not true. I praise him every time we authorize a housing bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not think there is any need for the Federal Government to be lending money to persons with large incomes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We are not talking about such homes nor are we talking about loans being made by the Federal Government.

Mr. CAPEHART. The only reason why I am proposing the 15-year period and the $7,000 maximum is to help the low income and the middle income people. We are trying to help those who have dilapitated homes. I think we are both agreed in principle that it ought to be done and that there is a need for it. I think the provision ought to be 15 years and $7,000. We are being as liberal as we need to be at this particular time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment; if so, I shall be perfectly willing to agree to the proposal which the Senator from Indiana stated a few moments ago.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for himself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the role.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 60]

YEAS—35

Allott	Capehart	Eastland
Beall	Case, S. Dak.	Fong
Bennett	Cotton	Goldwater
Bush	Curtis	Hickenlooper
Butler	Dirksen	Hruska
Byrd, Va.	Dworshak	Keating
Lausche	Robertson	Stennis
McClellan	Russell	Talmadge
Miller	Saltonstall	Thurmond
Morton	Schoeppel	Williams, Del.
Mundt	Scott	Young, N. Dak.
Prouty	Smith, Maine	

NAYS—56

Anderson	Hart	McNamara
Bartlett	Hartke	Metcalf
Bible	Hickey	Monroney
Boggs	Hill	Morse
Burdick	Holland	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Muskie
Cannon	Jackson	Neuberger
Carroll	Javits	Pastore
Case, N.J.	Johnston	Pell
Church	Jordan	Proxmire
Clark	Kerr	Randolph
Dodd	Kuchel	Smathers
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Smith, Mass.
Ellender	Long, Hawaii	Sparkman
Engle	Long, La.	Symington
Ervin	Magnuson	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	Mansfield	Yarborough
Gore	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Gruening	McGee	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	Carlson	Hayden
Blakley	Chavez	Kefauver
Bridges	Cooper	Wiley

So Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment D was rejected.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider out of order an amendment having to do with the same subject, which, I understand, the Senator in charge of the bill, the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], is prepared to accept. It will require only a short time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "used or to be used" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "which was constructed not less than 10 years prior to the making of any such loan, advance of credit, or purchase, and which is used or will be used".

On page 15, line 24, it is proposed to strike out "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof "twenty".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I am willing to accept the amendment. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield back the time allotted to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I call up my amendment 6-6-61—C and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the amendments must follow in order. The next amendment to be considered is the Capehart amendment designated "J."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Would it be in order by unanimous consent to change the previous order? I make the suggestion because the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has an amendment to which

I think we can agree, and the same is true with respect to an amendment to be offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is the pending amendment, known as Capehart J, the only amendment pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment known as Capehart J is the pending amendment.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is there any amendment pending beyond that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes; the amendment known as the Javits-Bush amendment is pending.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the able Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be permitted to call up his amendment at this time, rather than proceeding to the consideration of my amendment J.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unanimous-consent agreement under which the Senate would proceed to consider the Capehart amendment J be dissolved, and that the Senate proceed in regular order, as though there had never been an order entered to call up the amendment known as Capehart J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CAPEHART. I reserve the right to call up my amendment later.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Indiana as to his purpose.

It was my thought that there was an orderly way in which to approach the whole problem. If the Senator will modify his unanimous consent request to allow the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to precede me, I will have no objection.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, if my request is agreed to, whatever Senator obtains the floor and offers an amendment will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, continuing my reservation of my right to object, I respectfully submit that what has been stated is not the situation. I would immediately follow. Therefore, if the unanimous-consent request were amended to call for the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] to proceed, such action would be satisfactory to me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Action on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would be followed by consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I have a noncontroversial amendment that I do not expect to discuss at length, and which I believe the chairman of the subcommittee will accept.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to consider the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I ask that my unanimous-consent request include both the Capehart amendments that have been offered and the Javits amendment, and that those amendments be considered in regular order at a later date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asks the Senator from Indiana to restate his request.

Mr. CAPEHART. I ask unanimous consent that the order providing for the calling up of the Capehart amendment J at this time, to be followed by the Javits amendment, be vacated, and that the Senate proceed in regular order as though neither of those amendments had been ordered to be disposed of at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I believe that by agreeing to the request we would still not meet the issue, because we do not know how much time would be required to consider the other amendments. I am more than happy to accommodate the Senator from Indiana, and I agree with him that my amendment should follow his. But I respectfully suggest that at the moment about all we can do is to yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and then I am sure the Senate would be tolerant of any further arrangements which we would need to make.

Will the Senator from Indiana join with me in that request?

Mr. CAPEHART. I will join in that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, reserving the right to object, may I have added to the list of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] the junior Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JAVITS. Such arrangement would be satisfactory.

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. If the Senator will yield to me to make a unanimous-consent request——

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that in lieu of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the amendments which are now on the calendar for consideration, in the order in which they are on the calendar for consideration, may be preceded by amendments to be proposed by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], and the Senator from Florida, in that order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Senator from Arkansas may proceed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I call up my amendment 6–6–61—C, and ask that it be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 83, line 14, insert "(a)" after "SEC. 702." and after line 20 insert the following:

(b) Section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, any such association whose general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits aggregate a sum in excess of 5 per centum of its withdrawable accounts is authorized to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to any business development credit corporation incorporated in the State in which the head office of such association is situated, in the same manner and to the same extent as the statutes of such State authorize a savings and loan association organized under the laws of said State to invest in, to lend to, or to commit itself to lend to such business development credit corporation, but the aggregate amount of such investments, loans, and commitments of any such association outstanding at any time shall not exceed one-half of 1 per centum of the total outstanding loans made by such association, or $250,000, whichever is lesser."

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. How much time does the Senator from Arkansas yield himself?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Ten minutes.

Madam President, my amendment is based upon Senator ERVIN's bill, S. 846, which he introduced on behalf of himself, Senator JORDAN, and myself. S. 846 in turn is based on S. 3581 of the last Congress.

The proposal would amend section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933. It would authorize Federal savings and loan associations to invest in or lend to State development credit corporations in their States, if State savings and loan associations in their States are permitted to do so under local law. The authority is limited. A Federal savings and loan association may only lend or invest in a development credit corporation in its State to the extent permitted for State savings and loan associations. And in addition, this proposal places a further limit of one-half of 1 percent of the outstanding loans of the Federal savings and loan association or $250,000, whichever is lesser. Furthermore, a Federal savings and loan association may act under the proposal only if its general reserves, surplus, and undivided profits exceed 5 percent of its withdrawable accounts.

A full description of this proposal was given by the Senator from North Carolina on February 9 of this year when he introduced S. 846. At that time he pointed out that the laws of at least 22 States authorized State savings and loan associations to participate in financing business development credit corporations. In March of 1961, Indiana passed house bill 508 which authorized Indiana savings and loan associations to participate. In other States, such as Arkansas, it is my understanding that State savings and loan associations are authorized

to do so although the State statutes do no explicitly confer such power.

In drawing up my amendment from S. 846, I have revised the language so as to make it clear that in Arkansas and other States with similar statutes, Federal savings and loan associations may join State savings and loan associations in supporting these business development credit corporations.

Since the introduction of S. 846, a number of comments have been received which it would, I believe, be helpful to the Senate to see.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the recently released CED report on "Distressed Areas in a Growing Economy" and correspondence be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM REPORT OF COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ENTITLED "DISTRESSED AREAS IN A GROWING ECONOMY"

The most important sources of local funds, outside of normal banking channels, have been the local community development corporations (p. 61).

In several States privately financed development credit corporations have been established which use private funds from conventional financial institutions to make long-term credit available to sound small businesses. The Gilmore study indicates that as of the end of 1957 these corporations in seven States had approved 407 loans for $32 million. Half of the loans have a maturity of 6 to 10 years and most have been made at an interest charge of 6 percent. In New York and five New England States new loans are being made at an annual rate of approximately 115 loans for an aggregate of $10 million (p. 62).

A number of States with extensive chronic unemployment lack State development credit corporations. Private capital may not be as available as in New York or New England, nor State tax resources as extensive as in Pennsylvania. Local industrial development corporations in some States report that they have used most of the available local sources of capital (p. 63).

For these reasons we believe additional assistance in financing is required for local industrial development corporations, for local government units, and for concerns building in distressed areas (p. 63).

THE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORP. OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Charlotte, N.C., February 17, 1961.

Re bill S. 846, 87th Congress.

Hon. SAM J. ERVIN, Jr.,
Old Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: You have rendered a genuine public service in introducing the above bill for yourself, Senator FULBRIGHT, and Senator JORDAN. I think you have drawn a very fine bill. If enacted, it will make a large amount of funds available for small industry in this State through this corporation without additional taxation. The need for small industry aid is very genuine, and for this reason I believe your bill will prove popular and have nationwide interest.

I hope you and all of your associates there in Washington will push this through with all energy possible.

Sincerely yours,

R. A. BIGGER,
President.

UNITED STATES SAVINGS AND LOAN LEAGUE,
Chicago, Ill., March 21, 1961.

Mr. H. POWELL JENKINS,
Executive Vice President, The Business Development Corp. of North Carolina, Raleigh, N.C.

DEAR MR. JENKINS: Thank you for your letter of March 7 discussing S. 846 to amend the Home Owners Loan Act to permit savings and loan associations to invest in, lend to or commit themselves to lend to State development credit corporations.

Our legislative committee has considered this legislation and we are interested in it, and I certainly have no objection to it. In fact, we are generally favorable to it. We are aware of the outstanding work that has been done in North Carolina and the work of some of our member institutions in this program. It has been a very wholesome development and I hope our institutions and our people can take an appropriate part in this kind of activity.

Sincerely,

NORMAN STRUNK,
Executive Vice President.

BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Louisville, Ky., April 6, 1961.

Mr. MATTHEW HALE,
Chief of Staff, U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALE: Attached is a copy of the Kentucky act which is now on the statute books.

I am sorry to say that no State-chartered savings and loan associations are members of our organization. We have had several meetings with association groups.

I recently had lunch with the president-to-be of the association of these organizations. From what he said it seems that the federally charted Kentucky associations are dominant in size, as well as being the leaders in that particular Kentucky industry. Therefore, it was strongly emphasized by this president-to-be that it is fruitless to attempt to get memberships out of the State-chartered associations here in Kentucky until the federally chartered associations take the lead.

Sincerely yours,

Bob,
ROBERT K. LANDRUM,
Executive Vice President.

NEW YORK BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CORP.,
Albany, N.Y., May 16, 1961.

The Honorable SAMUEL J. ERVIN, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR ERVIN: We are gratified to learn that you are a sponsor of Senate bill 846 which contemplates permitting Federal savings and loan associations to invest in, lend to, or commit themselves to lend or purchase stock in State-chartered corporations.

As secretary of the Northeastern Conference of Development Corporations, which embraces all of the New England States, New York, and New Jersey, I would be pleased to appear before your committee if you think my services or testimony would be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. DUGGAN,
Secretary, Northeastern Conference of Development Credit Corporations.

FIRST AND MERCHANTS NATIONAL BANK OF RICHMOND,
Richmond, Va., July 12, 1960.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR WILLIS: I understand your Banking and Currency Committee has had referred to it Senate bill 3581, introduced by Senator ERVIN of North Carolina. This bill has to do with permitting Federal savings and loan associations to invest in the securities of State industrial development companies.

We are getting ready to form a Virginia Industrial Development Corp. to assist in financing new industry moving into our State. The Virginia Bankers Association has endorsed the corporation and undoubtedly many member banks will become lending members of the corporation. We want the Federal savings and loans also to become lending members, but they are prohibited by law.

I am writing therefore to speak a good word on behalf of Senator ERVIN's bill. North Carolina has had for 4½ years an industrial development corporation such as the one we are now forming in Virginia. The State-chartered savings and loan associations in North Carolina are members. The federally chartered associations should also be permitted to be members, in my opinion.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. MARSH, Jr.,
President.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Do I understand correctly that the text of the amendment was introduced as a bill in February?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Have hearings been held on it before the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator refer to the bill which was introduced by the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe hearings were held on it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not normal for a bill to be considered by a committee, instead of bringing it up on the floor in this way?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That bill was preceded by S. 3581 in the last Congress. The author of the bill, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], believes, as I do, that this is the proper way to consider this matter.

Mr. ANDERSON. Which committee would consider the bill?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Banking and Currency Committee, from which the pending bill was reported.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why could not the Banking and Currency Committee consider it and report this proposal?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The committee could. However, this seemed to be the more efficient and proper way of handling the proposal.

Mr. ANDERSON. It would seem to me that the proper way to handle it would be to have the committee consider it and report it, if it is a good bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is a good bill.

Mr. ERVIN. This is a very simple amendment, if the Senator will permit me to comment on it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I raise the question because many States have other than Federal savings and loan associations which might wish to participate. They have had no opportunity to be heard.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My amendment would not exclude them. Its only purpose is to make it possible for Federal savings and loan associations to do what

State savings and loan associations are permitted to do by State law. If the Senator wishes to introduce a bill in behalf of other institutions, I am sure it will receive consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. The other associations may have been waiting for an opportunity to be heard on the bill to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Many State organizations can do so now. The amendment allows Federal savings and loan associations to make investments in a State development corporation. There are 23 States which have State development corporations. Under the bill, Federal savings and loan associations are allowed to take such action only if State savings and loan associations are authorized by State law to make such loans. In addition to that, there are two limitations. One is that the Federal savings and loan association, in order to be permitted to make an investment in the State development corporation, must have at least 5 percent in reserves, undivided profits and surplus above its withdrawal accounts. In addition to that, it can lend not more than one-half of 1 percent of its outstanding loans, or $250,000, whichever is the lesser sum.

Mr. ANDERSON. As I understand, the bill was sent to the Banking and Currency Committee in February of this year.

Mr. ERVIN. It was introduced last session also.

Mr. ANDERSON. Did the Federal agencies report on it at the last session?

Mr. ERVIN. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. Have they reported on it at this session?

Mr. ERVIN. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why do we get a bill on the floor on which we cannot get a report from the Federal agencies?

Mr. ERVIN. This is a permissive bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Why did not one of the agencies report on it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know. Does the Senator make objection purely on procedural grounds, or does he object on the merits of the amendment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know anything about the merits of the amendment. No hearings have been held on it. The Home Owners Loan Act has been under consideration for a long time, since back in 1933. Someone tried to have the bill enacted at the last session, but could not get a favorable report, and therefore it died. Now they put the same bill in this year, and they cannot get a report. There ought to be some procedural way of handling these things.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I should like to ask two questions. First of all, is it true or not that this matter has been reported on by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. My understanding is that no report has been made.

Mr. ALLOTT. Was this particular amendment considered by the committee?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know. The Senator from Alabama knows. Did the committee consider the amendment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. This amendment was not considered by the committee. I believe I can explain the reason for it. It was anticipated that we would have savings and loan legislation before us probably involving reorganization and other matters, and therefore we decided not to consider any savings and loan association legislation in connection with the bill. The legislation we had anticipated being proposed has not been proposed—at least no recommendation has been made. I believe that the sponsors feel it would be highly desirable to have this language enacted in order to have uniform action as between the Federal and State associations within those States which have passed enabling legislation for State associations.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield to me, so that I may explain the position of the Home Loan Bank Board?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The Home Loan Bank Board and a number of other agencies were requested in February to submit a report on the Ervin bill. However, they cannot submit their reports until they have been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget has been so busy sending supplemental appropriation requests to Congress that it has not been able to catch up with all the legislative details, and the committee has not yet received the reports.

The chairman of the committee received a letter from the president of the Virginia Bankers Association. The president of Virginia Bankers Association is the president of the biggest bank in Richmond. They want to take part in the business of the Virginia Redevelopment Corp., and the banks will be more inclined to contribute to it when the Federal savings and loan associations can contribute to it.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. This amendment was introduced as a bill in the last Congress. The Federal Home Loan Bank Board has never expressed any opinion on it. I respectfully submit that where a bill is favored by approximately 23 States, Congress ought not to lose its legislative power merely because the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has not answered a request for its opinion. Action should not be delayed simply because the Federal Home Loan Bank Board has not answered letters.

This is a very simple and progressive amendment. It places no obligation on anyone. It merely authorizes a Federal savings and loan association to lend not more than one-half of 1 percent of the amount of all its outstanding loans or $250,000, whichever is smaller, if such association has a 5-percent surplus above all of its withdrawable accounts, and if State savings and loan associations in the same State are allowed to make loans to State development corporations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator from Arkansas further yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I have listened to the statement of the Senator from North Carolina. I cannot see the logic of adopting a system by means of a bill, or an amendment to a bill, when the adminstration does not consider it important enough to even write a short letter of approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, will the Senator yield a minute to me for a brief remark?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. I remember back in 1933, 1934, and 1935, when the savings and loan institutions of this country were a shambles. I think it is no understatement at all to say that they are no longer a shambles because of the creation of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Contrary to what the Senator from North Carolina has just said, I do not consider that this proposal would give to the States what they want. I have had no letters from the States asking me to provide such facilities. On the contrary, I consider that to take such action would be to relinquish a part of the authority of the Home Loan Bank Board to control these organizations; and that authority is what has kept them strong and made them one of the most vital forces in home ownership in this country.

I myself have grave doubts about the proposal. I hope the amendment will not be pressed.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The bill was introduced late in August last year.

As I recall it, the chairman never requested a statement on it, because he hoped that Congress would adjourn and that we would go to the conventions. As I remember, we did not even make such a request last year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Colorado said he has not received any letters on this subject. I offered for the RECORD a number of letters on the subject which have come from various parts of the country. One of them is from the Northeastern Conference of Development Corporations by its secretary, which endorses the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is not the Home Loan Bank Board?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; these letters are from banks and the people who represent local development credit corporations in the States.

In my State, the First Arkansas Development Corp. is most desirous to have the authority provided by the

amendment. It has already been stated by the Senator from North Carolina that 22 States have requested this authority. The bill will apply only where the State savings and loan associations have this authority; it does not apply generally.

Mr. ERVIN. It cannot apply to Colorado, because Colorado has no law which permits it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would not bother Colorado in the least. It is in no way prejudicial to Colorado. It would apply only in States where the State savings and loan associations are engaged in the same practice.

Mr. ERVIN. Subject to limitations in amount.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Subject to limitations in amount. The Senator has already stated that the bill is not mandatory. No one has said that the savings and loan associations are required to exercise the authority, but the amendment allows them to do so.

On the surface, I cannot understand why the Senator from Colorado objects to the proposal purely on procedural grounds.

I requested from the State Department, as long ago as the first of February, a report on pending passport bills. I have not yet received a reply. We all know there is a new administration in office. The Senator from New Mexico is aware of that. The Senator from Virginia has said that the Bureau of the Budget is behind in its work. I see no reason why an amendment as simple as this should be objected to. Is the objection made on the merits of the amendment or on procedural grounds?

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, if the proposal is so simple, why cannot the committee handle it? Is it impossible for the Committee on Banking and Currency to handle it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I shall have to leave the answer to that question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. He said he did not ask for a report last year. He has not received an answer to date this year.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The committee can handle it, but not so quickly as it can be done by the Senate today.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator from New Mexico objecting on the merits or as a matter of procedure?

Mr. ANDERSON. I have an objection on the merits.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What is the objection?

Mr. ANDERSON. Some of us went through the problems of the home building and loan association previously. I was very much interested in the efforts toward refinancing when we went through the financial difficulties of the 1930's. Congress passed the Home Owners Loan Act in 1933. We tried to have it administered properly. Some of the difficulties which had arisen and it sought to cure were brought about by bad management. I do not want to see the present situation drift into bad management. If we now provide that the Federal building and loan associations shall get into the business of making business loans, we change the whole function of the organization, and we ought not to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

The Home Owners Loan Corporation will not make loans. The Federal savings and loan organizations, if they wish, and they do not have to, will be enabled to participate in lending to the development loan corporations.

I have had a report from the corporation in my State that there has been extremely good participation by the local banks and by the State organizations. The Federal organizations, of course, have great prestige, and they have acquired a large part of the available home loan business. All we would be doing would be to enable them to participate in this program in a limited amount.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Arkansas says the banks enjoy this business. The business of a bank is to make business loans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These loans are made to the development loan corporations.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand, but the Senator says that banks like this type of business. They do. But the Senator proposes to have savings and loan associations, which are primarily supposed to deal with home ownership, get into the banking business. That is wrong.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To the extent of one-half of 1 percent, which is not a very great change. In Arkansas, 138 banks made commitments to lend $1,500,000 to the First Arkansas. The amount is based, in their case, upon 2½ percent of the bank's capital and surplus. As in all underdeveloped States, capital is very scarce in Arkansas.

Insurance companies also participate. Insurance companies traditionally make, primarily, long-term real estate loans, but the States also would like and need the prestige of the Federal savings and loan associations.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Will the Senator from Arkansas state if the amendment has three limitations upon it?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. First, it applies only in States where the State savings and loan associations have this power.

Second, loans cannot be made, even in those States, unless the associations have reserves, surplus, and undivided profits equal to 5 percent of all their withdrawable accounts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, before a loan can be made, the assets must be 105 percent of the withdrawable accounts.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. In the third place, they cannot lend more than an amount equal to one-half of 1 percent of all their outstanding loans, or $250,000, whichever is the smaller sum.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the bill applicable only to the States, where State savings and loan associations have authority to make loans to the development corporations?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would apply only in those States.

Mr. ERVIN. I have been asked by the State authorities of North Carolina to back the amendment. After all, the Constitution of the United States provides that all the legislative power of the Federal Government is vested in Congress, and not in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, does it not?

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. How would the Senator define a "business development credit corporation," as referred to in the amendment on page 2, in line 2?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator will recall—for he took a great part in the legislation which created the authority for Federal assistance to these corporations—that many such corporations are now in operation. There is one in my State. Its purpose is to obtain funds from private and public sources for the financing of small businesses. As the Senator will recall, the SBA can loan an amount up to what the credit corporation borrows from other sources. Local banks, insurance companies, and others lend money to these development corporations. They do not lend directly to the ultimate borrower. This is a program designed to furnish capital on longer terms as compared to ordinary bank loans, for the development of small businesses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 10 minutes the Senator from Arkansas has allocated to himself have expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I think I understand the situation, but I wish the record to show the purpose of the amendment. I recall our discussions of a few years ago about the purpose of these development corporations; but I want the RECORD to show the purpose in this instance. I think the Senator has explained it well enough. Is it not true that the purpose of a development corporation, as mentioned in this measure, is to develop industry or attract industry to a particular area or State?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, or to help existing business, by making available longer term loans than those available from banks, under their restrictions, particularly in the case of small firms which cannot readily obtain financing through the usual channels.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These loans are usually in relatively small amounts; they are not very large. The total resources of the First Arkansas Development Finance Corporation are about $2,500,000 at the present time, I believe.

Mr. BUSH. So really the departure in this instance, for the Federal savings and loan associations, is that this measure would authorize them to make unsecured loans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They will be secured in the same way that other loans of the Development Loan Corporation are secured.

Mr. BUSH. I understand. But there will not be a mortgage or other security; it will be just a debenture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The security will depend on the program of the individual development corporation.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to say that the Senator from Indiana is necessarily absent at the moment; and he has authorized me to say, on his behalf, as the ranking minority member of the committee, that he will support this amendment. And I shall support it, also.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that we have had one of these state development corporations, in North Carolina, for approximately 5 years. It has been a wonderful help to small industrial enterprises. The money is loaned, in North Carolina, on the basis of mortgages or deeds of trust.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is to say, loaned to the borrowers. But the mortgages do not usually run to the banks or other organizations which contribute to the development corporation.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understand that is the question the Senator from Connecticut was asking.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. In other words, the mortgage runs to the development corporation, not to the savings and loan association.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a list of the States which have laws which permit their State savings and loan associations to participate. This list was prepared as of the beginning of this year and does not include Indiana which has since passed a law on this point.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LAWS ON INVESTMENT BY SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS IN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CREDIT CORPORATIONS

Many State laws have authorized State-chartered savings and loan associations to invest in State-chartered business development credit corporations. Summaries of these provisions are set forth in this memorandum, including particularly references to the limits imposed on the amounts of such investments. The memorandum covers all the State statutes on the subject included in the committee print, "Development Corporations and Authorities," dated December 2, 1959, and in recent issues of the Legal Bulletin of the U.S. Savings & Loan League. The list is believed to be complete; however, a complete analysis of all State statutes has not been made. In addition, in a few cases it is believed that the State statute might be interpreted as authorizing such investments, but not sufficiently clearly to warrant inclusion in this list.

Hawaii: Act 288, regular session laws 1957, approved June 5, 1957, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by an association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 188.)

Kentucky: Senate bill 155, laws 1960, approved March 21, 1960, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by associations of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans, with a further proviso that a business development corporation may, in its articles of incorporation, reduce the loan limits of building and loan association members to one-half of 1 percent of total outstanding loans. (See U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1960, p. 174.)

Maine: Chapter 104, laws 1949, effective August 6, 1949, created the Development Credit Corp. of Maine, and authorized loan and building associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a ceiling on such loans by associations of 2½ percent of the association's guarantee funds. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 199.)

Maryland: Chapter 822, laws 1959, approved May 5, 1959, created the Development Credit Corp. of Maryland and authorized savings and loan associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 2 percent of the association's guarantee funds, subject to a further overall limit on loans by any member of $250,000. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 215; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 169.)

Massachusetts: Chapter 671, acts and resolves, 1953, approved July 3, 1953, created the Massachusetts Business Development Corp. and authorized cooperative banks and savings and loan associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a cooperative bank or savings and loan association of 1 percent of the guarantee fund and surplus of the association or cooperative bank (Development Cooperations and Authorities, p. 222).

Minnesota: Chapter 896, session laws, 1957, approved April 29, 1957, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 2½ percent of the association's guarantee funds, surplus and undivided profits (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 245).

Mississippi: Senate bill 1600, laws, 1960, approved March 23, 1960, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 2 percent of the association's outstanding loans. (See U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, May 1960, p. 116.)

New Hampshire: Chapter 328, laws 1951, approved July 10, 1951, created the New Hampshire Business Development Corp. and authorized building and loan associations and cooperative banks to become members of it and make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association or a cooperative bank of 2½ percent of the guarantee funds of the association or cooperative bank. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 248.)

New Jersey: Chapter 218, laws 1957, approved January 6, 1958, appears to authorize savings and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under the act and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans of 2 percent of each member's capital and surplus, or $100,000, whichever is lesser. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 266.)

New York: Chapter 863, laws 1955, effective April 29, 1955, created the New York Business Development Corp. and authorized savings and loan associations to become members of it and to make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 2 percent of the association's guarantee funds, subject to a further overall limit on loans by any member of $250,000. (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 282.) Chapter 595, laws 1959, approved April 20, 1959, adds a proviso that in the case of a member having capital and surplus in excess of $12,500,000, the overall ceiling is $500,000 instead of $250,000. (U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 177.)

North Carolina: Chapter 1146, 1955 session laws, ratified May 20, 1955, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The law originally imposed a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans which was later reduced to one-half of 1 percent (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 310).

North Dakota: Chapter 109, laws 1959, approved March 17, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of small business investment corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by savings and loan associations of 2½ percent of the association's guaranty funds, surplus and undivided profits (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 328).

Oregon: Chapter 660, laws 1959, approved May 27, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 3 percent of the association's capital and surplus (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 344; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 180).

Pennsylvania: Senate bill 1093, laws 1959, approved December 1, 1959, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 2 percent of the association's undivided profits and general reserve funds, subject to a further overall limit on loans by financial institutions of $550,000. Senate bill 1096, laws 1959, approved December 1, 1959, amends the Pennsylvania Building & Loan Code to authorize building and loan associations to invest in shares of any State or regional business development credit corporation created under Pennsylvania law (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 364; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, January 1960, p. 48).

Rhode Island: Chapter 3045, Public Laws 1953–54, approved February 11, 1953, created the Rhode Island Development Co. and authorized building and loan associations and cooperative banks to become members of it and make loans to it. The law imposes a limit on such loans by building and loan associations and cooperative banks of 2½ percent of the guaranty funds, surplus and undivided profits of the association or cooperative bank (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 387).

South Carolina: Act 983, laws 1960, approved May 24, 1960, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of

county business development corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a savings and loan association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans (see U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, September 1960, p. 229).

South Dakota: Chapter 314, session laws 1957, approved March 6, 1957, authorizes savings and loan associations to become nonstockholder members of business development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law provides that the articles of incorporation of the business development credit corporation shall determine what lines of credit are to be established by nonstockholder members (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 146).

Tennessee: Chapter 170, laws 1959, approved March 19, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 1 percent of the total outstanding loans of the association, with a proviso that a development credit corporation may, in its articles of incorporation, reduce the loan limit of building and loan associations to one-half of 1 percent of total outstanding loans (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 424; U.S.S. & L. Bulletin, July 1959, p. 182).

Virginia: Chapter 80, session laws 1960, approved February 24, 1960 (Virginia Code, sections 13.1–140 to 13.1–156), authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of industrial corporations created under that act, and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by savings and loan associations of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans.

Washington: Chapter 213, laws 1959, approved March 20, 1959, authorizes savings and loan associations to become members of development credit corporations created under that act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by savings and loan associations of 3 percent of the association's guarantee and reserve funds (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 442).

West Virginia: Chapter 25, laws 1959, passed March 10, 1959, authorizes building and loan associations to become members of business development corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The law imposes a limit on such loans by a building and loan association of 1 percent of the association's total outstanding loans (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 444).

Wisconsin: Chapter 656, laws 1955, approved November 18, 1955, authorizes savings and loan associations to become nonstockholder members of business development credit corporations created under the act and to make loans to them. The act provides that the articles of incorporation of a business development credit corporation shall determine lines of credit for nonstockholder members (Development Corporations and Authorities, p. 450).

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I reserve the remainder of the time available to me.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President——

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, in the absence of the minority leader, I control the time available to those who oppose the amendment. I am glad to yield from that time to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the Senator from Alabama has control of this time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, under the agreement I would have control of the time only if I were in opposition to the amendment. But I am not in opposition to it.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, in the absence of the minority leader, I have control of this time; and I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator from Connecticut.

Madam President, I cannot in conscience remain silent at this time.

I speak in opposition to the amendment, first, on the ground that the amendment has not been reported on favorably by the Home Loan Bank Board or by the Bureau of the Budget. However, it would be a simple matter for either group to take 5 minutes to write a letter reporting favorably on the amendment.

Second, I believe the Senate has gone overboard too many times in the consideration of proposals brought up more or less out of the blue sky, here on the floor, and not considered and discussed in committee. No committee hearings have been held on this amendment. In the reports I can find nothing to give me any indication of whether this amendment should or should not be adopted. It is said that 23 States have such laws. But 23 States are less than half the total number of States in the Union.

The third reason why I am opposed to this proposal is that the development loan corporations which we authorized—and I think that was a very good authorization, and the corporations have been utilized to some extent, but not sufficiently, in my own State—are organizations of a local type. These development loan corporations are for the purpose of developing new enterprises that are necessarily speculative, hazardous.

Now it is proposed that we authorize Federal savings and loan associations to invest their funds—even though certain reserves are required—in what we know are often speculative and hazardous enterprises. Certainly we hope they will turn out well. But the reason we authorized these development loan corporations was because there was insufficient venture money in the United States to produce new businesses and to get them going. So we authorized them by statute.

Now it is proposed, by means of this amendment, that we authorize our savings and loan associations to invest in these somewhat speculative, somewhat hazardous ventures or loans. Certainly they are not the type of loan that is contemplated in lending money on a real estate investment—in a home.

Fourth, and last, I think there is a very good reason—and any one of these reasons would cause me to vote against this amendment—for voting against the pending amendment, namely, that, as I stated a few minutes ago, I well remember the chaotic situation which existed in the period in 1933, 1934, and 1935. The Senator from New Mexico alluded to that situation.

I saw many instances of the most unfortunate business practices, which were disclosed at the time of the wrecking of many of our savings and loan institutions. Then the Federal savings and loan associations were authorized, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. They brought order out of that chaos. A corporation was established for the insurance of those loans. That brought regulation to the entire situation, to such an extent that today there are very few prominent savings and loan organizations in the United States which have not qualified under the Federal system of insurance, even though they be privately owned.

With that experience and in view of the great good that I know these associations have done—because I know that thousands of people could never have owned their homes if there had not been created a sound Federal savings and loan system in our country—I am unwilling to have this much authority yielded from the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, so as to permit our local associations to invest in what are necessarily venturesome and hazardous projects for them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the Senator from Colorado united with the Senator from Virginia in voting against the Douglas area redevelopment bill?

Mr. ALLOTT. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Is it not true that the Senator from Colorado agrees with the views also expressed by the Senator from Virginia that the 10th amendment meant what it said and that we should protect the rights of the States?

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the Senator from Virginia wants to point out that this is an alternative for private industry to do what was proposed to be done under the area redevelopment bill. First, it is going to be redevelopment with private funds under the American system of private enterprise. Second, the States cannot give to federally chartered savings and loan associations the privileges that have been granted to them by the Congress. Under the principle that we should cooperate with the States where we have assumed jurisdiction, this proposal merely states that in those areas where State savings and loan associations can contribute to the development associations, the Federal savings and loan associations can do the same thing, but not more than to the extent of one-half of 1 percent of their loans or $250,000, whichever is lesser. This could in no sense imperil loans for houses, which is the big field of the savings and loan associations.

Mr. ALLOTT. First, the Senator's statement contemplates that he has me on the horn of the States rights dilemma. Not at all, because Federal savings and loan associations are chartered by the Federal Government. Their right to do business does not derive from the States. It derives directly from

the Federal Government. Second, I believe that no one who invests in a savings and loan association believes that his money is ever going to be invested in ventures or hazardous projects or developments of any kind.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ALLOTT. May I finish answering one question first? Then I shall yield to the Senator.

I would hesitate, as an officer of a Federal savings and loan association, to venture the capital that my friends, my neighbors, my business associates, people I know, have invested in that association. I would hesitate to so use their money, which they thought was going to be invested in first mortgage loans on homes in the particular area in which that association operates. I would not think of putting that money in a venture project such as a development loan project.

I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. If a Federal savings and loan association lost every penny of the loan it made to the development corporation, it would still have 104½ percent of the assets their investors paid into it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I hope I see things differently than that. It says one-half of 1 percent of the total amount of the loans, not of their reserves, capital and surpluses. They could jeopardize one-fourth of their capital.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is also a limit of $250,000, whichever is the lesser.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not care which figure is used. The Senator has said it does not mean anything. This could mean a great deal.

Mr. ERVIN. A Federal savings and loan association could not loan anything unless it had 5 percent in reserves, undivided profits, or surplus, which means 105 percent of the original investments of its shareholders. If it loaned out all of the 105 percent, it could only loan one-half of 1 percent of the 105 percent to a development credit corporation.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; that is not what the measure says. It says one-half of 1 percent of the amount of their loans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is a further limitation of $250,000; whichever of the two is the lesser. It is a mighty small amount to loan.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, if the Senator will yield, in order to loan any money under the amendment, the Federal savings and loan association has to have a 5 percent surplus, which, added to the investment, would amount to 105 percent, and they could loan only one-half of 1 percent of that. It could not loan more than one-half of 1 percent of what it has.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Most of us read the English language. It says "undivided profits, reserves, and surplus." That is the 105 percent. It does not have anything to do with loans. These can be 40 times the amount of the undivided profits, reserves, and surplus. They can loan one-half of 1 percent of the larger sum, not of the 105 percent.

This may be a good proposal, but, if it is, it should not be misrepresented. It is not one-half of the 105 percent that can be loaned. It is one-half of 1 percent of the loans. There are countless building and loan associations that have a million dollars and more, and they can make very substantial loans under this proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. ALLOTT. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. BUSH. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think the Senator from New Mexico has brought out a point which is correct in all of its implications. I say again we have not had a report on this proposal. We have not had hearings on it. We have no documentation on the proposal except letters in support of it. I do not think a Federal savings and loan association should be permitted to invest in this kind of hazard. I say, last of all, it is a breach of the trust of the people who invest in savings and loan associations if we permit the associations to invest the funds in this potentially hazardous fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUSH. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, my understanding is that the money savings accounts in all Federal savings and loan associations are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation up to $10,000 per account.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator yield me 2 or 3 minutes?

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am not going to argue the point when the Senator says the money is insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. The reason why it is insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation is that they are not making speculative loans. They are not gambling. When the character of a building and loan association is changed into something that can take speculative gambles, the whole concept of the organization is changed, because there are people who might have to bail building and loan associations out of their bad building projects. There are people here who know what happened to building and loan associations in the past.

I wish this proposal had been brought before the Banking and Currency Committee and people had testified on it. I wish we could have heard from the people who guarantee these loans and heard what they had to say about it. Certain Senators might change their tune on it. This is not a proper measure to be considering on the floor. It should be brought before the committee and we should have an opportunity to get reports on it from people who work in this field. Here is a bill which came up in February. A report has not been made on it by the Budget Bureau. I do not have much money in building and loan associations, but many of us remember the wringer these associations went through in the thirties. I did participate as a relief administrator for people who lost their money in savings and loan institutions when the ones in their hometown went broke. I do not want to see that happen again. That is my sole consideration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas has 5 minutes. The minority has 12 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I do not wish to delay the proceedings any longer. In reply to the Senator from New Mexico, I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico, as is true of all other Senators, has offered many amendments on the floor which have never been considered by a committee. Any Member of the Senate is free to offer an amendment at any time on any bill. To make a big issue out of the fact that such a simple proposal, which does not require hearings to understand its implications, was not subject to hearings before the committee seems to me to be entirely without merit.

With respect to the charge that this type of investment by a Federal savings and loan association is highly risky, I point out that already the banks of these States where these corporations have been formed, are permitted to invest in these development corporations, and these banks are subjected to strict regulation by State and Federal agencies. Any implication that this is some highly speculative, fly-by-night business is completely in error. I do not think the Senator from New Mexico should try to leave the impression that this type of investment is any more speculative than any other kind of new development.

The experience of lending institutions in this type of program has been extremely good. In fact, it has been excellent in my State. I know that the Northeastern part of the Nation has also had good results from their programs.

There was testimony before the Senate committee about the experience of the corporations which were formed in the Northeast when the committee considered the legislation which led to SBA participation in this field.

This proposal is an effort to make a small additional amount of money available for loans to small businesses. The loans are uniformly small. They do not run into millions of dollars. They will not be used to finance great oil companies or other big corporations. I can understand that such a program means nothing to those companies.

To say that this is more speculative than any other kind of local investment is entirely incorrect. The insurance companies, which are under severe restrictions and regulations as to what they can do, are investing in limited amounts, in the same development cor-

porations in many States. The same is true with respect to banks.

The banks are also subject to strict regulation, and 138 banks in Arkansas have already invested small amounts in the First Arkansas Development Finance Corp. The total commitments from these banks are about $1½ million. This is a community affair and these are prudent investments.

I do not understand why the Senator is so concerned about the proposal. There is a limitation of $250,000 on the amount which any one of the associations could lend to a development corporation. As the Senator said so well, the only purpose is to try to help individual companies make a go of it on their own, instead of coming to the Federal Government for a handout. Every time we try to do something like this, the old "bugaboo" is raised about the operation being very speculative and very dangerous, and it is said it would endanger the solvency of savings and loan associations. That is nonsense. Federal savings and loan associations cannot make these loans until they have met the stated requirements, and then only if they are permitted by State law to do so.

As the Senator said, even if these turned out to be bad investments it would not jeopardize the solvency of the company, in view of the limitations contained in the amendment. I do not wish to leave the impression that I think these would be bad investments, for I know they would not be. Experience with this type of credit program has been very good.

That is all I have to say on this amendment.

Mr. ERVIN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. The North Carolina Business Development Corporation has 1,860 stockholders. Among those stockholders are 92 commercial banks and 13 life insurance companies. The development corporation takes first deeds of trust on the property of the small businesses which obtain loans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Such a loan is about as giltedged as a loan could be in any kind of investment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. All this is a device to try to bring together in a pool the capital needed to fill this special gap in the credit field. Long hearings were held before the Committee on Banking and Currency when I was chairman of the committee, in regard to the gap in credit between what is available, let us say, to a very small grocery store and the credit available to a medium-sized store. Representatives of the Federal Reserve Board came before the committee and testified. The problem was studied for 2 years, and legislation authorizing small business investment companies and assistance to these development companies resulted. Now all we are trying to do is to give the development companies a better opportunity to function properly.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. ALLOTT. I withhold the suggestion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was not a sufficient second.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I call up my amendment "6-2-61—B" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 89, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 708. Section 814 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"RECORDS

"SEC. 814. Every contract between the Housing and Home Finance Agency (or any official or constituent thereof) and any person or local body (including any corporation or public or private agency or body) for a loan, advance, grant, or contribution under the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, or any other Act shall provide that such person or local body shall keep such records as the Housing and Home Finance Agency (or such official or constituent thereof) shall from time to time prescribe, including records which permit a speedy and effective audit and will fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such person or local body of the proceeds of the loan, advance, grant, or contribution, or any supplement thereto, the capital cost of any construction project for which any such loan, advance, grant, or contribution is made, and the amount of any private or other non-Federal funds used or grants-in-aid made for or in connection with any such project. No mortgage covering new or rehabilitated multifamily housing (as defined in section 227 of the National Housing Act, as amended) shall be insured unless the mortgagor certifies that he will keep such records as are prescribed by the Federal Housing Commissioner at the time of the certification and that they will be kept in such form as to permit a speedy and effective audit. The Housing and Home Finance Agency or any official or constituent agency thereof and the Comptroller General of the United States shall have access to and the right to examine and audit such records. This section shall become effective on the first day after the first full calendar month following the date of approval of the Housing Act of 1961."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Madam President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I do not think this will be a controversial amendment. I hope not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] told me he was willing to do so, also. I believe the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is familiar with the situation.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, that is correct. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is necessarily absent, authorized me to say that he favors agreeing to the amendment. I do, also.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The amendment provides for orderly keeping of records and for making them available to proper officials.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Exactly so. I shall say no more. As a young lawyer, I learned not to argue further when the court agreed with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do Senators yield back their remaining time?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield back all my time.

Mr. BUSH. I yield back the time in opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I offer an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 77 it is proposed to strike out lines 12 through 15, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(1) Section 231(c)(2) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(2) not exceed, for such part of such property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Commissioner), $2,250 per room (or $9,000 per family unit if the number of rooms in such property or project is less than four per family unit): *Provided*, That as to projects to consist of elevator type structures, the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitation of $2,250 per room to not to exceed $2,750 per room and the dollar amount limitation of $9,000 per family unit to not to exceed $9,400 per family unit, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; except that the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations contained in this paragraph by not to exceed $1,250 per room, without regard to the number of rooms being less than four, or four or more, in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require;".

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, I have discussed the amendment with the chairman of the committee and the ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from Indiana, and both favor this particular amendment.

The Federal housing authorities downtown do not oppose the amendment. The administration does not oppose the amendment. The House Committee on Banking and Currency has already approved the amendment, and it is at present in the House bill.

In essence, the amendment would provide a liberalization of section 231, which is the section of the bill which calls for the building of housing for the elderly. It would make it possible for private interests which might be interested in building housing for the elderly to build more than a mere efficiency apartment. Surveys have shown that a number of elderly people, while not having much money, nevertheless would like to have more than an efficiency apartment. They would like to have an apartment with one bedroom and a separate living room, or possibly even two bedrooms. The purpose of the amendment is to allow the FHA Commissioner, in his discretion, to examine an application and determine whether or not a guarantee will be given on this type of housing for the elderly, covering both efficiency apartments and some one- and two-bedroom apartments, which, under present law, cannot be built.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, as I have said, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is necessarily absent. However, he has authorized me to say that he favors the acceptance of the amendment, and I do so also.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the Senator from Florida discussed the amendment with me. I believe it is a good proposal and I am willing to accept it. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Madam President, since 1957 Congress has been encouraging the sponsoring of housing for the elderly, first under section 207 of the Housing Act, later under section 231, providing mortgage insurance under the administration of FHA. That the program would take a little time to get underway is understandable, but I have been perplexed that Florida should have enjoyed so little benefit from the program even though I have known of many groups proposing projects for location in my State, which has such great concentration and annual increase of elderly population. Until a year ago or thereabouts Florida had won but one application under the program, Douglas Gardens at Miami. Many groups proposing use of the program have been in evidence, but one by one they have faded away. At times I was inclined, from reports reaching me, to criticize FHA and its three underwriting offices in Florida for seeming failure to cooperate with, promote and encourage prospective sponsors who have wanted to use section 231 in the providing of housing for the elderly. Too often well-intentioned groups have been discouraged when approaching FHA with proposals, even groups with substantial backing in their own right and the additional backing of mortgage insurance firms and banks.

During the past year, and much more recently, evidence has come to my office of increasing interest in the section 231 program on the part of those who would sponsor projects and were prepared to meet the FHA requirements attending the 5¼ percent mortgage insurance availability. Two or three more projects have been received by FHA Florida offices in the past year, but I am constantly receiving requests for assistance in getting other proposed projects approved by FHA.

Turning to the hearings attending the pending housing bill we have sought for information that would be revealing of the general story of failure of the section 231 program. But little or no information can we find there. On the subject of housing for the elderly all the emphasis seems to be on the direct loan program for which we last summer appropriated $20 million of a $50 million authorization, presumably for the purpose of piloting housing for low-income groups. For that program a $100 million authorization is now sought in the pending bill.

This emphasis on the degree of subsidy resting in direct loaning at 3½ percent to attain housing for the elderly would seem to mean that the section 231 program had failed, was not being used. However the continuing interest in the program evidenced in my office caused my staff to make some inquiries of FHA authorities concerning the use made of the section 231 program throughout the country. The findings are startling and leave me with a feeling that our slowness in getting housing in Florida must be traceable in very substantial measure to the weakness of the FHA offices in my State. Other States have enjoyed much more substantial benefit from the program.

In the 4 years of availability of the mortgage insurance help to win housing for the elderly under sections 207 and 231, as of April 30, 1961, $144 million of mortgage insurance is involved in projects completed, under construction and justified to the extent of being accepted applications in process at the present time. According to the publication by the Division of Statistics and Research of the FHA, this total is representative of 114 separate projects containing over 14,000 dwelling units.

When I find Arizona with 10 of these projects, California with 15, Colorado with 7, Iowa with 4, Michigan with 4, Oregon with 7, Texas with 9, Washington with 4, and Wisconsin with 9, there need be no wonderment that I bemoan the fact that my State, Florida, with its great and growing population of elderly, should have but 4 of this total of 114 housing projects for the elderly.

Learning that over half of these projects were born since the beginning of the year 1960, and recalling that through the same period of time we had encountered so many Florida interests wanting to sponsor these section 231 projects for the accommodation of the elderly, I am left wondering why we are placing all present emphasis on the direct loan program and failing to recognize the program that has picked up such great acceptance in the last year.

One of the four sponsors of Florida 231 projects, one in the course of construction, now inquires of my office to know whether they can renegotiate their financing from mortgage insurance at 5¾ percent and have the benefit of the 3½ percent direct loan program about which so much is being written and talked. The writer says such a renegotiation would mean a saving of as much as $20 per month in their rental charge for a unit of housing. He inquires also whether the denominational nonprofit organization he represents as sponsor of the project is going to be up against the competition of a direct loan project when the actual cost of a dwelling unit is about the same under one program as the other. "Is the direct loan program going to be for residence only by those elderly whose incomes are so limited that they cannot afford to pay the very reasonable and low rates our project will require," is a serious question with which the writer concludes his letter.

It seems to me that unless we restrict the use of this proposed direct loan money we are going to find ourselves walking into a pot of boiling water. I called the Special Assistant for Elderly Housing at FHA to inquire regarding the subject and questions of the aforementioned letter and was advised by him that there has been no policy determination as yet as to when and where the direct loan program would apply for use. He told me that the institution of the direct loan program last fall had very materially slowed the filing of added section 231 projects long in the making, that sponsors are sitting back to see whether they could get in under the direct loan program being administered by HHFA. He thought there were several hundred projects, planned for advancement by sponsors as 231 projects, which would not file applications unless and until they knew they could not get in under the direct loan program.

We had better think twice before we pass this pending housing bill without making clear a congressional intent to confine the direct loan program to the accommodation of people of limited income.

Why substitute with subsidy in those cases where there is readiness and ability to accommodate the elderly with projects which pay their own way?

Why hinder and in effect put an end to a program that church and fraternal groups have used and will continue to use to meet the wants of the elderly without Government subsidy? Obviously such groups are not going to continue in that direction so long as there exists a prospect of access to direct loaning.

We are led to believe that $100 million will be all that is required to finance the direct loan program for the year. But unless tight limitations covering its use

are fixed we can be quite certain that such an amount will not begin to cover the demand that will be found to exist. Two authorities have advised me that the demand in the first year could be as much as $2 billion if the program is permitted to absorb all all the projects anticipated of sponsorship throughout the country.

$100 million? What can Congress be expected to do when church and fraternal sponsors of existing section 231 projects ask that they be treated as favorably as are new like groups which enjoy the large benefit of the direct loan program? That aggregate of mortgage insurance is $144 million.

Unless the committee presenting the pending bill is prepared to reveal understandings and limitations agreed upon in the administration of the direct loan program, the bill ought to await passage until the committee can write those limitations after further hearings of intent by the administration of HHFA. At the very least we ought to here and now amend the bill to provide that in no event shall the authorization for loaning under this program exceed $100 million in a calendar year. Perhaps we retain some controls by reason of the power of appropriating committees to limit the money available, but I would think the Senate would want to do whatever is possible of doing to permit the existing section 231 program of housing for the elderly to supply the need in that large field which appears ready to use it, but not if it is going to have to compete with subsidy housing.

If we are wanting to ease the way for sponsors and encourage the building of more housing for the elderly, why not apply that easing to the section 231 program by lowering a bit the existing 5¼ percent interest requirement, by causing FNMA to abandon its 2-percent discount rate, and by reducing the one-half of 1 percent FHA mortgage insurance premium.

The Federal Housing Administration could help its own section 231 program along materially if only it would see to it that there was such administration in its field offices as would give full cooperation to sponsors of elderly housing

I will be the last to object to meeting the growing want for housing for the elderly. But I do not like the idea of direct loaning at rates lower than can be afforded by private industry to accommodate that large element of our elderly who are ready and able to afford the accommodations wanted by using the existing mortgage insurance program available to those who would sponsor the housing.

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, I call up my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 36, between lines 15 and 16 it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

ENCOURAGEMENT OF HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY THROUGH CERTAIN TAX INCENTIVES

SEC. 202. (a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 181. Amortization of housing facilities for elderly persons of low income

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTION.—

"'(1) ORIGINAL OWNER.—Any person who constructs a housing facility for elderly persons of low income (as defined in subsection (d)(3)) shall, at his election, be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of such facility based on a period of 60 months. The 60-month period shall begin as to any such facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"SUBSEQUENT OWNERS.—Any person who acquires a housing facility for elderly persons of low income from a taxpayer who—

"(A) elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided by this subsection with respect to such facility, and

"(B) did not discontinue the amortization deduction pursuant to subsection (c)(1), shall, at his election, be entitled to a deduction with respect to the adjusted basis (determined under subsection (f)(2)) of such facility based on the period, if any, remaining (at the time of acquisition) in the 60-month period elected under subsection (b) by the person who constructed such facility. This paragraph shall not apply if, prior to the time of acquisition of such facility, the amortization deduction has been terminated under subsection (c)(2).

"(3) AMOUNT OF DEDUCTION.—The amortization deduction provided in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be an amount, with respect to each month of the amortization period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month, divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall be in lieu of the depreciation deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 167.

"(b) ELECTION OF AMORTIZATION.—The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a)(1) to take the amortization deduction and to begin the 60-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was completed. The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a)(1) to take the amortization deduction and to begin such period with the taxable year succeeding such year shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for such succeeding taxable year. The election of the taxpayer under subsection (a)(2) to take the amortization deduction shall be made only by a statement to that effect in the return for the taxable year in which the facility was acquired. Notwithstanding the preceding three sentences, the election of the taxpayer under subsection (a) (1) or (2) may be made, under such regulations as the Secretary or his delegate may prescribe, before the time prescribed in the applicable sentence.

"(c) TERMINATION OF AMORTIZATION DEDUCTION.—

"(1) TERMINATION BY TAXPAYER.—A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deduction with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Secretary or his delegate before the beginning of such month.

"(2) TERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—The amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) shall terminate with respect to any housing facility for elderly persons of low income if the Secretary or his delegate finds that, during any month, any of the occupied dwelling units in such facility, or of which such facility is a part, is not occupied by an elderly person of low income (within the meaning of subsection (d)(4)). Such termination shall be effective as of the beginning of the month in respect of which such finding is made.

"(3) DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION.—The depreciation deduction provided under section 167 shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction does not apply, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deduction with respect to such facility.

"(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) ELDERLY PERSON OF LOW INCOME.—The term 'elderly person of low income' means, with respect to any housing facility, an individual who has attained the age of 60 and—

"(A) whose annual income, together with the annual incomes of all individuals who maintain their principal place of abode with him, is below the median annual family income of families residing in the area in which such housing facility is located, and

"(B) who cannot afford to pay sufficient rent to cause private enterprise in such area to provide him and the individuals who maintain their principal place of abode with him with decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing.

"(2) HOUSING FACILITY.—The term 'housing facility' means any property which provides 8 or more dwelling units, and any property which together with other adjacent property or properties of the taxpayer provides 8 or more dwelling units. Such term includes only property of a character which is subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167.

"(3) HOUSING FACILITIES FOR ELDERLY PERSONS OF LOW INCOME.—The term 'housing facility for elderly persons of low income' means any housing facility—

"(A) the construction of which is completed after December 31, 1960,

"(B) which is constructed to provide rental housing for elderly persons of low income,

"(C) the dwelling units in which, or of which such housing facility is a part, are specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons, and

"(D) with respect to which a certificate has been issued by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator under subsection (e). If any housing facility is converted, through alteration, reconstruction, or remodeling, into a housing facility for elderly persons of low income (as defined in the preceding sentence), or if any housing facility for elderly persons of low income (as so defined) is altered, reconstructed, or remodeled so as to increase the number of dwelling units in such facility, or of which such facility is a part, such alteration, reconstruction, or remodeling shall be treated as the construction of a housing facility for elderly persons of low income. The term housing facility for elderly persons of low income does not include any housing facility which is constructed or acquired with funds granted or loaned, or the repayment of which is guaranteed or insured, by the United States or any

agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by any State or political subdivision thereof or any agency or instrumentality of any State or political subdivision.

"(4) OCCUPANCY OF DWELLING UNITS BY ELDERLY PERSONS OF LOW INCOME.—A dwelling unit shall be considered as occupied by an elderly person of low income only if—

"(A) the dwelling unit is the principal place of abode of one or more elderly persons of low income, and

"(B) if any individual (other than the spouse of an elderly person of low income) who is not an elderly person of low income also makes such dwelling unit his principal place of abode, the combined adjusted gross incomes of all such individuals is less than the combined adjusted gross incomes of the elderly persons of low income and their spouses who make such unit their principal place of abode.

"(e) CERTIFICATION BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE ADMINISTRATOR.—

"(1) APPLICATION.—Any person who after December 31, 1961, completes the construction of a housing facility for elderly persons of low income may apply to the Housing and Home Finance Administrator for a certificate under this subsection. Such application shall be filed at such time, shall be in such form, and shall contain such information as the Administrator may prescribe by regulations.

"(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The Administrator shall issue a certificate with respect to a housing facility if he is satisfied that—

"(A) such housing facility has been constructed to provide rental housing for elderly persons of low income, and the dwelling units in such housing facility, or of which such housing facility is a part, are specially designed for the use and occupancy of elderly persons;

"(B) no part of the cost of the construction of such housing facility has been or will be defrayed from funds granted or loaned, or the repayment of which is guaranteed or insured, by the United States or any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or by any State or political subdivision thereof or any agency or instrumentality of any State or political subdivision;

"(C) the portion of the cost of construction of such housing facility allocable to each dwelling unit does not exceed an amount prescribed by the Administrator for the area in which such housing facility is located; and

"(D) for a period of twenty years commencing with the completion of the construction of such housing facility—

"(i) the dwelling units in such housing facility, or of which such facility is a part, will be made available solely for occupancy by elderly persons of low income, and

"(ii) the rent which will be charged for occupancy of a dwelling unit will not exceed such amount as the Administrator may approve as being within the ability of elderly persons of low income residing in the area in which such facility is located to pay.

The Administrator may require an applicant to provide such assurances with respect to the requirements of subparagraph (D) as he may prescribe by regulations and such additional assurances with respect to such requirements as he may prescribe with respect to any housing facility. Such assurances shall be in such form as the Administrator deems necessary to insure compliance with such requirements, and may include covenants, conditions, and bonds.

"(3) REMODELED HOUSING FACILITY.—In the case of a housing facility for elderly persons of low income within the meaning of the second sentence of subsection (d)(3), the cost of construction referred to in paragraph (2) means only the cost of the alteration, reconstruction, or remodeling which constitutes construction within the meaning of such sentence.

"(4) PRELIMINARY CERTIFICATION.—An application under paragraph (1) may be filed with respect to any housing facility prior to the completion of the construction of such housing facility. The Administrator may, by regulations, provide for the issuance of a conditional certificate to any such applicant if it appears from the information contained in his application that such housing facility will, upon completion, fulfill the requirements for a certificate prescribed by paragraph (2).

"(5) REGULATIONS.—The Administrator shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection.

"(f) DETERMINATION OF ADJUSTED BASIS.—

"(1) ORIGINAL OWNERS.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), in determining the adjusted basis of any housing facility for elderly persons of low income—

"(A) if the construction of such facility was begun before January 1, 1961, there shall be included only so much of the amount of the adjusted basis (computed without regard to this subsection) as is properly attributable to construction after December 31, 1960; and

"(B) if the facility is a housing facility for elderly persons of low income within the meaning of the second sentence of subsection (d)(3), there shall be included only so much of the amount otherwise included in such adjusted basis as is properly attributable to the alteration, reconstruction, or remodeling.

"(2) SUBSEQUENT OWNERS.—For purposes of subsection (a)(2), the adjusted basis of any housing facility for elderly persons of low income shall be whichever of the following amounts is the smaller:

"(A) the basis (unadjusted) of such facility for purposes of this section in the hands of the transferor, donor, or grantor, adjusted as if such facility in the hands of the taxpayer had a substituted basis within the meaning of section 1016(b); or

"(B) so much of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of the facility in the hands of the taxpayer (computed without regard to this subsection) as is properly attributable to construction after December 31, 1960.

"(3) SEPARATE FACILITIES; SPECIAL RULE.—If any existing housing facility for elderly persons of low income as defined in the first sentence of subsection (d)(3) is altered, reconstructed, or remodeled as provided in the second sentence of subsection (d)(3), the expenditures for such alteration, reconstruction, or remodeling shall not be applied in adjustment of the basis of such existing facility but a separate basis shall be computed as if the part altered, reconstructed, or remodeled were a new and separate housing facility for elderly persons of low income.

"(g) DEPRECIATION DEDUCTION.—If the adjusted basis of a housing facility for elderly persons of low income (computed without regard to subsection (f)) exceeds the adjusted basis computed under subsection (f), the depreciation deduction provided by section 167 shall, despite the provisions of subsection (a)(3) of this section, be allowed with respect to such facility as if the adjusted basis for the purpose of such deduction were an amount equal to the amount of such excess.

"(h) LIFE TENANT AND REMAINDERMAN.—In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowed to the life tenant.

"(i) CROSS REFERENCE.—

"For special rule with respect to gain derived from the sale or exchange of property the adjusted basis of which is determined with regard to this section, see section 1238."

(b)(1) The table of sections for part VI of the subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof

"Sec. 181. Amortization of housing facilities for elderly persons of low income."

(2) Section 1238 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amortization in excess of depreciation) is amended by inserting after "section 168 (relating to amortization deduction of emergency facilities)" the following: "or section 181 (relating to amortization deduction of housing facilities for elderly persons of low income)".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1960.

On page 36, line 18, strike out "202" and insert "203".

On page 37, line 2, strike out "203" and insert "204".

On page 37, line 18, strike out "204" and insert "205".

On page 38, line 8, strike out "205" and insert "206".

On page 39, line 10, strike out "206" and insert "207".

On page 40, line 23, strike out "207" and insert "208".

On page 41, line 23, strike out "208" and insert "209".

AMENDMENT OF INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me 2 minutes on his amendment?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 751.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 751) to amend the Indian Claims Commission Act, which were, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 23 of the Indian Claims Commission Act approved August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1049, 1055; 25 U.S.C. sec. 70v), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23. The existence of the Commission shall terminate at the end of five years from and after April 10, 1962, or at such earlier time as the Commission shall have made its final report to the Congress on all claims filed with it. Upon its dissolution the records of the Commission shall be delivered to the Archivist of the United States."

And to amend the title so as to read: "An Act to terminate the existence of the Indian Claims Commission, and for other purposes."

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments. I have discussed this subject with both the majority leader and the minority leader, and the majority and minority ranking members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs having committee jurisdiction, and they have no objection to the suggested action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Indiana yield to himself?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Madam President, the amendment has been discussed with the chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and also the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the ranking Republican member of the committee. The senior Senator from Indiana has indicated to me that he is in favor of the amendment. I believe members of his staff will be able to verify that statement.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I have not had an opportunity to study the amendment, but I notice that it is an amendment which deals with the subject of taxes.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BUSH. I wonder if it is appropriate for the Senate to legislate a tax measure on a housing bill. I ask my friend the distinguished Senator from Alabama, who is in charge of the bill, what he has to say on that subject?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. When the junior Senator from Indiana discussed this subject with me I raised exactly the same question with him. I called his attention to the fact that the committee had always been quite careful to avoid dealing with tax legislation. I reminded him, however, that he was a member of the Committee on Finance. I suggested yesterday that he have the amendment printed and have it available on the table so that any member of the Committee on Finance who might have objection to it could so state.

I am in favor of the principle contained in the amendment. I have great respect for the jurisdiction of the various committees. I note the presence in the chamber of other members of the Committee on Finance. I think it is up to the members of the Committee on Finance to raise objections to the amendment, if they care to do so.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I think any Senator could raise an objection to the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to make myself clear. I said to the Senator from Indiana that I favored the principle and I would not oppose the amendment, but I see in it a jurisdictional involvement, involving the committee on which he serves.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. I not only object to the amendment on the basis of jurisdiction, but also on the basis of principle, namely, dealing with selective tax revision in a housing bill.

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, I discussed this subject with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and he has stated that he is willing to accept the amendment. The amendment would not affect any revenue at the present time. No homes of the sort covered are presently being built. The amendment would provide for amortization over a 60-month period for people who are willing to construct homes for the elderly. The amendment would affect none of the parts of the bill presently before this body. In other words, no tax revenue is being derived from this type of building at the present time. The amendment would provide for private investment of capital in housing for the elderly. If any of the type of buildings covered were constructed, the amendment would provide not alone jobs for those building that type of structure, but would provide an opportunity for those who are willing to invest their money to move into a new field, and it would provide for the Treasury some additional taxation from a source from which no revenue is coming at the present time.

Mr. BUSH. I think the Senator from Indiana makes an interesting argument for the purposes of the amendment, but I still object on the basis that the amendment would give a special tax privilege to a special builder for a special purpose. I cannot see the justice of so doing. If we attach little tax privileges to every bill that comes before us, the tax laws will soon be rewritten in this session.

Therefore, I shall have to oppose the amendment, not on the basis of merit, but on the basis that this is the wrong place and time to consider this question, and we should not be giving special tax advantages in this kind of bill or in any kind of bill. If tax deduction privileges are to be proposed, I believe the question should come before the Committee on Finance, and hearings should be held, with reasons stated as to why this particular operation should enjoy a tax advantage or special tax consideration.

So with all respect to my good friend and his senior colleague, I shall have to oppose the amendment on that basis.

Mr. HARTKE. Madam President, the purpose of the amendment to the housing bill is very simple. It is presented as an amendment for the reason that it deals with housing, and if we are to provide decent housing for the 16 million people who are now over the age of 65, it is apparent that it would be more desirable to try to finance the additional housing through private investment rather than to have the financing come from the Government in the form of either a direct subsidy, loans, or grants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut raise the question of constitutionality?

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I did not raise the question of constitutionality, but if there is one available, I will raise it. I ask if a point of order is involved. I ask the Chair to rule on the question as to whether a point of order is involved in connection with tax legislation on a housing bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair reads from page 20 of Senate Procedure:

> The question of the constitutionality of a measure originating in the Senate as being revenue raising in nature or the constitutionality of a revenue raising amendment is submitted by the Presiding Officer directly to the Senate for determination.
>
> It is not within the province of the Presiding Officer to rule a bill or an amendment out of order on the ground that it is unconstitutional; the Presiding Officer has no authority or power to pass on the constitutionality of a measure or amendment; that is a matter for the Senate itself to decide.

The Chair, therefore, submits to the Senate the question, Is the amendment in order?

Mr. HOLLAND. The question is debatable, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is debatable.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be not charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARTKE. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request is out of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not know what the point of order involves. He is being asked to vote on whether an amendment is constitutional, without hearing any argument on it. That kind of procedure cannot be justified.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I was trying to help the Senator by giving him some time so that he could speak on it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not in the position to argue the point. I am being asked to vote on the constitutionality of a proposal without knowing what the proposal is and without having an opportunity to square it against the provisions of the Constitution. Both sides have offered to yield back the remainder of their time. Therefore we cannot learn anything about it.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I reserve my time, for the moment. We have been discussing the merits of this question for about 20 minutes. If the Senator was not present in the Chamber, I am sorry. I have insisted that this is not an appropriate proposal to be considered in connection with the housing bill, and that it should be referred to

the Committee on Finance. It deals with taxes. I oppose it on that basis.

Mr. TALMADGE. Madam President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TALMADGE. I read from the unanimous-consent agreement:

"Ordered, That * * * debate on any motion or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour."

Inasmuch as there is a motion before the Senate to determine whether the Senate has constitutional authority to consider the amendment, I ask whether this question is outside the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that 30 minutes is allowed to each side for discussing the constitutionality of the amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, in order to dispose of the question, I move that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that the motion of the Senator from Connecticut is out of order.

Mr. BUSH. I move that the amendment be laid on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No debate is permitted on a motion to lay on the table. (Putting the question.)

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. BUSH. I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion before the Senate is to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE]. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, yesterday an amendment was offered which contained a technical defect. I refer to the amendment which was offered by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. It related to the additional cost per room for housing in Alaska. It is an amendment on page 42, lines 5 and 6 of the bill. If reference is made to the bill I can point out the error that was made. In the second line of the amendment there were the words "$2,000 per room." Those words were included within quotation marks. They should not have been included. I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the vote by which the amendment was adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now I send to the desk the corrected amendment and ask for its approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42 it is proposed to substitute the following for lines 5 and 6: "(2) striking in paragraph (5) '($2,500 per room in the case of Alaska or in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families),' and inserting in lieu thereof '($3,000 per room in the case of Alaska, or in the case of accommodations designed specifically for elderly families $3,000 per room and $3,500 per room in the case of Alaska)';"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I call up my amendment "J."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, beginning with line 18, strike out all through line 16, on page 6.

On page 6, line 17, strike out "(8)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

On page 7, line 15, strike out "(9)" and insert in lieu thereof "(7)".

On page 8, line 4, strike out "(10)" and insert in lieu thereof "(8)".

On page 8, strike out line 21.

On page 8, line 22, strike out "(12)" and insert in lieu thereof "(9)".

On page 9, beginning with line 6, strike out all through the period in line 20.

On page 9, lines 21 and 22, strike out "subsection (d)(2) or (d)(4) of".

On page 10, line 4, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(10)".

On page 10, beginning with the colon in line 20, strike out all through line 6, on page 11, and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, line 3, strike out "(14)" and insert in lieu thereof "(11)".

On page 12, line 6, strike out "; and" and insert in lieu thereof a period.

On page 12, strike out lines 7 through 9.

On page 12, beginning with line 24, strike out all through line 10 on page 13.

On page 72, beginning with line 20, strike out all through line 3 on page 73, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(e) Section 212 of such Act is amended by striking out in the second sentence of subsection (a) "any mortgage under section 220" and inserting in lieu thereof "any loan or mortgage under section 220 or section 233".

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, to begin with, I allocate only 5 minutes to myself. I shall not take very long, because the amendment was discussed at great length last week.

I think the amendment speaks for itself. It would strike from the bill a new section by which FHA insurance would be extended to 40-year mortgages. A 40-year provision is in the present law and has been there for a number of years. However, it applies only—and I think possibly rightly—to persons displaced by an act of Government, such as urban renewal or highway construction, or for some other reason beyond the control of the home owner. In that instance, the Government wants the land on which the house is situated. The Government takes the property and the owner must move. He must find and buy a new house, and he must move. Under those circumstances, Congress has been very liberal and has provided that the Government will insure such a mortgage up to 40 years.

The bill contains a provision that public housing authorities may build houses for rental purposes for people in the so-called middle-income class. Therefore, there is injected into the bill public housing for so-called middle-income people, the housing to be built by public authorities anywhere in the United States. That, I think, is bad, as is also the 40-year provision. I think the whole section ought to be rejected.

The administration and Senators who have advocated this section have done so on the basis that the program was to be a 2-year experiment. In other words, there must have been some doubt about the practicability and sensibility of it, or they would not have said it was to be an experiment. They admit that they have referred to it as an experimental policy and propose to try it out for a couple of years. That is proof that they are not certain that it is a good policy. I do not think it is good. I do not believe the people will be rendered a service by selling them houses and giving them 40 years to pay for them, with no downpayment. I am certain that the U.S. Government, the housing business, and the people of the country will not be done any good if mayors or other public officials of cities in the United States organize public authorities so as to include middle-income people in public housing projects, because the bill also permits, under those circumstances, reduced interest rates.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Do I correctly understand that the Senator's amendment proposes to strike out all the provisions relating to the 40-year, no-downpayment plan?

Mr. CAPEHART. It would strike out the provision which relates to the inclusion of middle-income people in public housing.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It does not apply to housing for the elderly?

Mr. CAPEHART. It does not apply to housing for the elderly, to college housing, or to any other sections of existing law. In other words, this is a new section which the committee wrote into the bill, or which the administration advocated.

By eliminating this provision, the present law, which has been in effect for many years, will remain as it is. There was no testimony—at least, no profound testimony—that such a provision was needed. It is an experiment. The administration freely admitted that it was contemplated as an experiment, and that it would be tried out for a couple of years, to see how it worked.

The worst section in the present law, so far as repossessions and defaults are concerned, is the section I described a moment ago, which permits mortgages to be guaranteed up to 40 years, with no downpayments, for displaced persons. So there is no need for the proposal

which has been placed in the bill. I think it goes beyond what the people who originally conceived the idea of FHA insured mortgages ever had in mind.

Madam President, I do not see any necessity for the provision. I think we will regret the day it is adopted, if it is adopted in this Congress. I think the period for the mortgage is entirely too long. I hope this section will be eliminated. To do so would not weaken the FHA. To do so would not weaken the Housing Act, because this proposal is new; it has never been tried before.

Another bad feature is that while we talk about the provision being for middle-income people, there is no definition of middle-income people.

There is no definition of the respective income groups.

While the bill provides that the housing shall be for middle-income people, it does not in any way spell out what is meant by middle-income people. It merely provides that the Federal Housing Commissioner may insure FHA mortgages up to 40 years without any downpayment on a house which does not cost more than $15,000. The cost does not need to go that high.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield myself another 3 minutes.

It should not take long for a Senator to make up his mind on this question. There is no reason to debate it at length. The question is whether we want to include in the housing legislation a new section which will provide for 40-year mortgages. That is the question. Do we want to liberalize the law to that extent? In my opinion, to do so would constitute a start toward weakening the housing institution.

Mr. COOPER. Madam President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I was interested in the Senator's statement that no evidence was introduced in the hearings concerning the eligibility of persons to secure these loans.

Mr. CAPEHART. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. Is there anything in the bill or in the hearings which establishes the criteria for eligibility for so-called middle-income loans?

Mr. CAPEHART. The provision covers both rental properties and sale properties. One may build houses on the 40-year mortgage, no-downpayment plan and then rent the property, or he may buy and sell houses on that basis to individual buyers.

As I said a moment ago, a public authority may be established under this section to build housing at a reduced interest rate, a rate as low as 3⅛ percent. The result would be subsidized public housing.

Mr. COOPER. I understand that; but is there anything in the bill which establishes or defines eligibility?

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to be fair and honest. I do not think there is. The able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] will speak on the amendment shortly. He may disagree with me on this point, but I do not think he will. I believe the formula or test of the criteria is that a 40-year mortgage, with no downpayment, cannot be insured, if the house costs more than $15,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. CAPEHART. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Was there any evidence to indicate that when a person received a loan to build a house, he would obtain any equity in the house?

Mr. CAPEHART. He would receive no equity. I think the testimony was that it would be 7 years before he would have any equity in it; and I think there was testimony to the effect that at the end of 20 years the house would be worth less than the total amount of the payments—beyond the interest—which had been made up to that time. So there is nothing sound about the proposal.

On page 4 of the report, at the top of the page, we find this statement:

> Proposals designed to provide Federal assistance for housing families who are not eligible for low-rent public housing, but who cannot afford decent privately financed housing, are not new to this committee.

Just what does that statement mean? In all fairness, I wanted to read it, because, although it is a criterion, there is nothing specific about it.

Madam President, I hope very much that the new 40-year mortgage provisions will be stricken from the bill. If they are not, I hope it will be amended so as to make it more practical, more workable, and more in the interest of those who buy houses, because this provision would invite a person to purchase a house on the basis of a 40-year-repayment plan, with no down payment; and he could live in the house 3, or 4, or 5 years, have no equity whatever in the house, proceed to wreck the house while he was living in it, and then leave it. In that event, the Federal Government would have to repossess the house, then in a wrecked condition. In my opinion, that would weaken the HHFA, which has been a good institution. I believe there could be no other result, because I do not believe Congress can change human nature. I think many persons would purchase such houses; and I think many of them would live in the houses for 3, 4, or 5 years, and then would walk out; and I believe that in that period of time they would, unfortunately, wreck the houses, because I do not think anyone who would buy a house on such a basis would have any feeling other than that he was only paying rent, and he would not have any particular feeling of responsibility for the maintenance of the house in good condition, because he would know that long before the 40 years had passed, the house would be in quite bad condition. I would not attempt in any way to belittle any of the houses or their quality; but I believe that such houses, which would cost up to $15,000, would be in bad condition after 40 years had elapsed.

Many people—particularly the kind of people who might take advantage of such a proposal—move from town to town and from neighborhood to neighborhood, because their jobs require them to move or because they lose one job and get a new one, somewhere else.

So I think this proposal would have an extremely bad effect on the Housing Authority; and I believe the best proof of that is found in the fact that those in the administration who are advocating this program say it is experimental. But it is impossible to experiment with such an arrangement within a period of 2 years. Such an experiment would take 10 years. Two years would not be sufficient, because it would take some time for the program to get underway, and soon the 2 years would have gone by.

So, Madam President, I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, the amendment of the Senator from Indiana strikes at the heart of the bill.

I wish to correct one statement the Senator from Indiana made; I am sure it was only a slip of the tongue. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana does not relate at all to sales property. It relates only to rental property which is built for the purpose of making rental housing available to families of low income who could not otherwise afford to have decent, safe, and sanitary housing.

Madam President, this proposal was not brought to life by the Kennedy administration. I wonder whether the Senator from Indiana realizes the source of the proposal. In 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed an advisory commission to make a study of housing and to make recommendations. This is one of the recommendations. The Chairman of that Commission was Albert Cole, who served as head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. His recommendation was:

> For an experimental period of 2 years, the Federal Housing Administration should be authorized to insure 40-year, 100-percent loans.

The origin of the proposal was in the recommendation by President Eisenhower's advisory commission.

Following that, President Eisenhower sent to Congress a bill to put into effect that recommendation; and the bill was introduced by the then chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. He worked for the passage of the bill back in the 83d Congress; and his committee reported the bill. So this is not a new proposal. It would amend the very section to which the Senator from Indiana referred, namely, section 221.

That section now authorizes 100 percent insured housing, with 40-year mortgages. Congress has done that in the past, and initiated it under President Eisenhower, during a Republican-controlled Congress, and put it into effect following the recommendation of the Banking and Currency Committee, then under the chairmanship of the senior Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator refresh my memory as to whether the bill he is discussing called for subsidized interest and a FNMA support of $750 million?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am sure the FNMA support was provided for.

Mr. BUSH. Did it also provide for a subsidized interest rate?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I would have to check on that; I am not certain. But it did provide for 100 percent, 40-year mortgages. That plan came from President Eisenhower, and it was reported to the Senate by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and was fought for by him; and, essentially, that program was put into effect.

Mr. BUSH. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield for another question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. Was that bill limited to families which were displaced by the slum clearance and urban renewal programs, or did the bill apply to all middle-income families?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The bill Congress passed was limited to those who were dislocated by governmental action.

Mr. BUSH. That is an important difference between the two bills.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I realize that. But I have said—and I think this fact should be clearly understood—that this is a subsidized program, in that it makes money available at an interest rate as low as 3⅛ percent. That is the extent of the subsidization. For years, private enterprise has urged us to find some program as a substitute for public housing, and we have tried to do so. I submit that this is the best proposal that has yet been brought forward; and Senators must admit that the subsidy provided for in this bill is much less than that provided in the ordinary public housing program.

The price of housing has been continually rising, until today 65 percent of the families in the United States receive incomes too low to make it possible for them to purchase the typical FHA house. I refer to the typical, average FHA house. Of course, some buyers are able to purchase some of the FHA houses. But the great mass market is denied the benefits under the regular FHA program.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Alabama describe in greater detail why the average American family, one of the group which comprises 65 percent of all American families—is not able to purchase such houses; and will he state the main factor which contributes to the high cost of houses?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not have the exact figures before me, but I have seen them. According to the census for the past year, 65 percent of the heads of American families received incomes not in excess of $6,000 or $6,500. The typical FHA house last year cost $15,000. Under a rough rule of thumb, in order to afford that kind of house, a person would have to have an income of between $6,000 and $6,500; and 65 percent of the heads of American families do not have such income.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The immediate impact upon me is that a person earning $6,500 a year ought to be in a position to buy a $15,000 home, unless there are factors which contribute to the cost of a $15,000 house that are abnormal and that bring the cost so high that the ordinary person having such an income cannot buy it. What is the principal factor in the cost of $15,000?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not think the reason lies in any factor in it; it is the amount itself. The FHA, in determining its underwriting, ascertains that the average family must have certain amounts for certain items. It makes up a budget to determine that only a certain amount of the income can go for housing cost. It may be that the cost of housing is high. It has continued to rise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the distinguished Senator from Indiana is willing to yield back the remainder of his time——

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, will the Senator yield half a minute to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I did not want to leave unchallenged the Senator's statement that the 40 percent, no-downpayment plan was the best plan. I think I shall have the privilege of proposing the best plan. I serve notice on my colleagues that such a proposal will immediately follow.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I understand.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand the plan now being proposed, it would apply to any area. I have always been in favor of slum clearance and low cost housing programs, but this is a plan which would have possible application, for example, in an area in suburban Washington or in any suburban area of the country where housing of this character is located. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I think the Federal Housing Commissioner would be careful in his selection. It could be done only in areas or towns or cities that have a workable program. It must fit in with a workable program. My guess is that the great majority of the program would be in slum clearance or urban renewal.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yet this is not a slum clearance program.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It is not limited to that, but it is tied in with a workable program.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Madam President, the junior Senator from South Dakota is not an expert in the housing field. His experience in installment buying has not been very great. At one time the junior Senator from South Dakota has some experience with the selling and financing of automobiles. If there was one lesson he learned, it was that if one wanted to make a sound deal, the purchaser ought to have a substantial equity in the automobile he was buying. I think the same thing is true in the field of housing. Unless the purchaser is in a position to make a reasonable initial payment, it seems to me there is no favor to him or to the community in encouraging him to buy a house without some equity in the house on the part of the purchaser. It would be better, in my judgment, for the family to pay rent and in the meantime acquire enough money to make a substantial downpayment before seeking the purchase of a home.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Madam President, in the year 1930 I was a judge. I presided in the courtroom of the common pleas court of Cuyahoga County. I rendered judgments in which litigants were asking for foreclosures of owners' equities of redemption. My experience in countless hearings established the fact that many properties were bought without adequate equity to insure the ability of the buyer to retain possession of his home.

I cannot see how we could help the ordinary individual by saying, "You may buy a house as you would buy a piece of jewelry—without any downpayment whatsoever." The time will come when the failure to have an equity in the house will militate to the disadvantage, economically and otherwise, of the person who is induced to buy.

For that reason I shall vote against the pending proposal.

Mr. CAPEHART. Madam President, I yield back my remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] for himself and the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay," and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 50, as follows:

[No. 61]

YEAS—41

Allott	Eastland	Morton
Beall	Ervin	Mundt
Bennett	Fong	Prouty
Bush	Goldwater	Russell
Butler	Gore	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Capehart	Holland	Smathers
Case, S.Dak.	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Church	Jordan	Stennis
Cooper	Keating	Talmadge
Cotton	Kuchel	Thurmond
Curtis	Lausche	Williams, Del.
Dirksen	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Dworshak	Miller	

NAYS—50

Anderson	Hickey	Monroney
Bartlett	Hill	Morse
Bible	Humphrey	Moss
Boggs	Jackson	Muskie
Burdick	Javits	Neuberger
Byrd, W.Va.	Johnston	Pastore
Cannon	Kefauver	Pell
Carroll	Kerr	Proxmire
Case, N.J.	Long, Mo.	Randolph
Clark	Long, Hawaii	Scott
Douglas	Long, La.	Smith, Mass.
Engle	Magnuson	Sparkman
Fulbright	Mansfield	Symington
Gruening	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Hart	McGee	Yarborough
Hartke	McNamara	Young, Ohio
Hayden	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—9

Aiken	Carlson	Ellender
Blakley	Chavez	Robertson
Bridges	Dodd	Wiley

So Mr. CAPEHART'S amendment "J" was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Madam President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I need only a minute, and I ask the Senator from New York to yield without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield 2 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM AND ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to make inquiry of the distinguished majority leader with respect to the remainder of the day, and also whether he has in mind a time for the Senate to meet tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Madam President, in response to the question raised, it is my understanding that although the amendment is not now before the Senate, the so-called Javits amendment will be made the pending business. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my further understanding that approximately 2 hours, including the extra half hour, or 50 minutes to each side, will be available to consider the amendment. It is my hope that tonight we can come to a vote on the amendment, for which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Such action will depend upon developments.

Madam President, I request at this time a unanimous consent agreement that when the Senate adjourns tonight, that it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate- and low-income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for himself and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], which, under the unanimous-consent agreement, automatically becomes the pending question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Madam President, I should like to address a further question to both the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished Senator from New York. Does the Senator from New York contemplate a rather extended speech on his amendment?

Mr. JAVITS. I do. I think I shall use not less than three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the unanimous-consent agreement was entered into, I understood that probably only a portion of the allotted time would be used on the majority side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. I will tentatively hazard a guess that we may have a vote somewhere between 6:30 and 10 minutes to 7.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Would that vote be the only vote tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JAVITS. Madam President, I yield myself 20 minutes.

The pending amendment, upon which 3 hours was allotted under the unanimous-consent agreement, raises the issues on probably the single most important aspect of this bill. Indeed, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] stated that other than the question of what do we do about moderate income housing, the bill pretty much continues other programs.

Aside from the proposed aid to commuter transportation and the open spaces provisions, each of which would amount to $100 million, the bill is pretty much a standard housing bill, expanding and extending programs which we have and with which we are thoroughly familiar, until we come to the proposed 40-year, no-downpayment plan, for which my proposal is a substitute. Then we get into the one new aspect of this measure.

I should like to state, because probably this will be the final time in which it will be stated, precisely what my amendment proposes as a substitute for the 40-year, no-downpayment program, my amendment proposes a program to organize a Federal Limited-Profit Mortgage Corporation, which will be a U.S. Government Corporation, in the first instance financed by a $100 million stock subscription investment from the Treasury. That will be the only investment in the Corporation by the United States, and it will also be the only investment in this whole model, moderate-income program on the part of the United States forever. That would be the end of it.

The United States would invest $100 million, and that would be it. The program would either work or it would not. But that would be the end of the U.S. investment. There is involved neither subsidy nor any other appropriation. The program is entirely self-operative.

The proposed Corporation, as a U.S. Corporation, would have the right to issue bonded debt, which it would sell to individual investors in very much the same way that public housing is financed today, but with the essential difference that whereas the bonds would be sold to the average investor like public housing bonds, the United States would be under no obligation to provide a subsidy for the purpose of making the proposed bonds good. But the bonds would stand upon their own bottoms as bonds issued by a Federal corporation which, if defaulted upon—and I think we all know from our experience with housing mortgage guarantees that such eventuality is extremely remote—the holder would have the right to obtain U.S. Government-guaranteed bonds in lieu of those issued by the Corporation. But the fundamental appropriation, which is very important, as I shall show in a moment, would involve only the fundamental seed money, the $100 million investment in this Federal Limited-Profit Mortgage Corporation.

I contemplate that the Corporation would have authority to issue $500 million worth of its bonds a year, and under the amendment as it is proposed the President would have the right at any time to add to that amount $500 million a year, and on some portion of it an additional $1,500 million, depending upon demand and depending upon the economic situation and the fiscal situation.

These bonds would be a prime investment, because similar bonds of public housing corporations are a prime investment today. The market will take just about as much of them as is desired to be issued in order to finance public housing units.

The money raised by the sale of the bonds will in turn be used as normal mortgage money for the purpose of financing middle income housing. Middle income housing is very much defined in the same way as it is in the 40-year, no-downpayment program under the pending bill. It relates to people who fall in that so-called gap between those who are eligible for public housing and those who cannot afford private housing which is available today. It is proposed to make mortgage money available at a low interest rate, to wit, the going rate for Federal money, plus one-half of 1 percent for costs of administration.

It is expected that within a reasonable compass of time, perhaps a few years, it should be possible to sell $2 billion worth of such bonds. These orders of magnitude are consistent with the public housing experience and the sale of bonds under the public housing program.

The $2 billion in mortgage money should, of course, produce a very substantial amount of middle income housing. To give some idea as to what it can produce, I now refer to the New York program. The proposal in my amendment is essentially lifted from the New York program, which has been operative since 1955. In New York State it is called the Mitchell-Lama program, which has been very successful in my State. I emphasize State, rather than cities.

Up to now there have been financed some 30,000 units, and approximately $450 million have been raised precisely in the fashion I have described the money would be raised through the Federal Limited-Profit Corporation, as proposed in my amendment.

Based upon this experience, we estimate the $2 billion should be responsible for about 160,000 units, at the rate of about 40,000 units a year. In the State of New York, the voters have on two occasions actually supported the program by an overwhelming majority. They authorized $450 million in the available mortgage funds which I have described.

That, in essence, is the plan.

There is one further point to which I should refer. It is very important. We should mention the people who are expected to be the promoters or the sponsors of these housing projects. In New York State our experience has been that those who are largely interested are trade unions. One of the most prominent sponsors of housing of this character, in a large measure, has been the Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen; also cooperatives, because the plan lends itself to be turned into cooperatives, in the sale of the units to the members of the cooperative, which gets its mortgage money from the State—in this case, of course, from the United States.

However, the plan in New York State and the plan I propose here does not exclude private development. The only point with respect to private development is that the private developer is limited in his profit. He has, however, one advantage. At the end of 20 years he can redeem the whole project, if he can refinance it. So it does have, although limited, some attractiveness to private developers. In New York State the plan has had special attraction to insurance companies; also to employers, as private developers, because they find the plan very interesting, in that they can invest in private housing for their employees on a very desirable basis.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for questions?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The first question is this. As I understand the amendment which the Senator from New York has offered, it would strike out the provisions in the committee bill which would permit housing to be financed with nothing down and over a long period of years. For this provision the Senator's amendment would substitute a plan of housing which would be constructed by and owned by a U.S. corporation, to be known as the "Federal Limited Profit Corporation." Is that correct?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct in part, and incorrect in part. First of all, the housing would be neither constructed nor owned by the U.S. Corporation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It would be owned by the applicant?

Mr. JAVITS. By individuals or by foundations or by trade union organizations, which could in turn cooperate with those who would occupy the housing. The only thing the U.S. Government Corporation would do would be to make available the mortgage money.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On page 31 of the Senator's amendment, under "Taxation of property," the Senator provides:

SEC. 712. All real property and tangible personal property of the Corporation shall be subject to State, county, municipal, or local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other similar property is taxed, and any real property shall be subject to special assessments for local improvements:

Would that mean that the housing project itself would be subject to taxes in the normal fashion, as any other private property?

Mr. JAVITS. Precisely.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the meaning of the sentence which states:

Except as to such taxation of real property and tangible personal property, the Corporation, including but not limited to its franchise, capital, reserves, surplus, income, assets, and other property, shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States, or any State, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

Mr. JAVITS. That relates to the Federal Corporation itself, the U.S. Corporation, rather than a corporation or entity which would own the developed property.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What kind of property is involved here?

Mr. JAVITS. It means its money in the bank, its mortgage papers, its desks, its offices—whatever it had in the way of property, including its franchise as a U.S. Government Corporation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In my State we have two taxes which would normally be applicable but which the Senator's amendment might exempt. One is the money in credits tax. Individuals in my State who have money in credits or money on deposit or who own mortgages or other evidence of indebtedness to them are subject to the money in credits tax. Would the Senator's corporation be exempt?

Mr. JAVITS. Any corporation which owned a project financed under the proposed plan would not be exempt from the tax specified by the Senator. The U.S. Government Corporation itself, which is the Corporation that sells the bonds and gets the money and lends the money to the entities, would be exempt from the tax, and it alone.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The other tax that we have in my State which would be applicable to a private individual would be the State sales tax. If an individual were buying office furniture or anything else, would he pay the State sales tax if the limited corporation which the Senator suggests for his amendment had an office in the State? Would its equipment and office supplies that were purchased be liable to the State sales tax?

Mr. JAVITS. No; just the same as the Department of Commerce or the Department of Labor would be exempt in the purchase of equipment in the State.

In that case, one would be dealing only with the desks and furniture of the Corporation itself.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that. With that limitation, it would not amount to so much.

Mr. JAVITS. It would not amount to anything.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. However, there have been instances in which corporations having Government contracts have sought to avoid the State sales tax.

Mr. JAVITS. There would not be any such situation in this instance, because in my amendment I expressly provide to the contrary, so there could not even be an argument about it. I expressly make all property in a project subject to the normal taxation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In a recent case, a company organized under the laws either of Delaware or New Jersey had a contract to construct a dam in South Dakota. The company objected to the payment of any personal tax on the property used in the construction

of the dam. I think the tax amounted to more than $11,000 over the period of time the company had its property in the State. They sought to escape payment of the tax with the argument that the corporation was organized in another State, and also that it was operating under a contract with the U.S. Government for the construction of the dam. Does the Senator from New York see any possible complication in an instance like that?

Mr. JAVITS. None whatever. Such an entitity, if it were developing a project under this plan, would be fully subject to all taxation, without any hope, in my opinion, of making a colorable opposition to the imposition of the local tax.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then, if a corporation were organized in Delaware or New Jersey to construct a housing project in Illinois, South Dakota, Kentucky, or any other State, the housing project itself, the equipment used in its construction, and the receipts of the corporation as a business enterprise within that State would be subject to local taxes, the same as if the corporation were organized in the State where the housing project was being built.

Mr. JAVITS. Now the Senator has extended the point. It would be subject to precisely the same tax as a corporation organized for private profit, not deriving its mortgage loan from the U.S. Government Corporation which I have named, would have been subject to, because if it is a foreign corporation, there are various questions of tax law which are quite apart from the fact that it draws its mortgage money from this Corporation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the Senator's amendment would not confer upon the foreign corporation any right or privilege which it would not get under other laws?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is precisely correct.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Senator from New York for answering the questions. His answers clarify the situation somewhat. I regard the proposal he has made as far superior to the provisions in the bill.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I refer the Senator to page 32, lines 6 to 9, of his amendment, which reads:

> All notes, debentures, and other obligations of the Corporation shall be exempt, both as to principal and interest, from all taxation imposed by the United States, or any States, county, municipality, or local taxing authority.

I take it that means exempt from taxes in the nature of taxes on these obligations as property.

Mr. JAVITS. That is all; nothing further.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. It does not mean that the holder of these obligations would be exempt from any tax on the interest.

Mr. JAVITS. Not at all. These are words of art, adapted from the public housing law, which provides for exactly the same situation.

In answer to a question which has been asked, this is an incidental aspect of the plan. It is similar to action which the Senate has taken on a number of previous occasions. I should like to key Senators to the occasions when the Senate itself originated legislation of precisely this character with respect to the very limited exemption which is related here. Those cases relate to the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, under the Federal Farm Loan Act; the Federal Home Loan Bank, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the Public Housing Administration itself.

In all those cases, the Senate acted precisely as I am asking the Senate to act in this matter, on a bill which was not a revenue raising bill, and did not have any of the connotations which we would run into if this were the central core of a plan. It is nothing but one peripheral aspect of it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As the Senator explained the amendment, I think he stated that it would be applicable to multiple unit housing of a cooperative type. Would it lend itself to the development of individual units of housing?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; it would.

Mr. COOPER. Will the Senator explain how it would lend itself?

Mr. JAVITS. I will. It would be conducive to unitary sponsorship but to a diverse ownership. In other words, it would be impractical, and it is just as impractical under the 40-year, no-downpayment plan. When we begin to deal with mortgages which are below the market rate, we get into precisely the same situation. The agency says so. A unitary sponsor is needed who will sponsor the project. It might be called a high rise apartment, that is, a tall building having many apartments; or it might be a collection of separately standing houses. In the first instance, it would be necessary to have a unitary sponsor. Then that same facility, that unitary sponsor, could coordinate the units of an apartment house. He could cooperate in the sense of devolving individual ownership upon individual occupants in respect of a project.

The difference would be that he could not deal with one family, one home, as is done normally under the FHA, nor could he feasibly do it under the administration's own program, which we have just decided to keep in the bill. But I think, of course, we should strike it out in favor of this proposal.

That is a very important point. It is one of the major arguments made against my plan. It is exactly analogous to the situation which the administration itself faces. One could not conceivably deal with an individual owner or an individual, single family house on a less than market rate, with a 40-year, no-downpayment mortgage, because it immediately will flow into FNMA, as they themselves concede. So there is really no difference in the end result in terms of the two plans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 5 more minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. As I understand, the mortgage Corporation could make funds eligible to operators defined in the bill. An eligible operator then could develop either multiple unit housing or, if possible, he could develop individual unit housing. The reason I have asked the question is that I think, as the Senator himself has said, it could be argued by the administration sponsors that their provision would enable individual housing to be built. I want to vote for the Senator's amendment. I think it is much better than the provision in the bill. But what would be the answer to the argument?

Mr. JAVITS. I point out again, as I did a moment ago, that in both cases, when we reach the element of the bill which deals with the moderate income housing plan, precisely the same situation exists. One must deal with a central sponsor who will, in turn cooperate with the individual owner-occupant. This is actually what happens in New York. It is actually provided, by the amendment which I have offered, and it is precisely a pattern of the way this plan works. The individual sponsor has in many cases actually cooperated with the apartment house by letting each individual tenant own his own apartment. That is entirely feasible. The only purpose the sponsor has served is to be the recipient of the mortgage money and to be the constructor of the project.

This also leads to one other very important point.

Under my plan, once the Corporation is financed, it stands on its own bottom. It can be as big as the investors will back. It requires no Federal subsidy, which is a limitation in the public housing program. It can go on and grow, depending on the confidence and the substantiality of its operation. So it has a very fine private economic system tie-in.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. In a moment. I wish to finish this thought.

It will be noted that I voted "nay" on the Capehart amendment, because I desire to have the bill contain a provision with reference to moderate-income housing. Now we are at the point where what can be done can be much improved. I do not want the bill to leave the Senate without making this landmark defense of a provision for moderate income housing. It is contemplated, under the 40-year plan, that FNMA will pick up all the mortgages which are issued at below market rates. It is known that that is the only way in which that can be done,

so $750 million is provided as an initial tranche for FNMA to do this. Immediately we see the great economy of the program which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and I have proposed. I am sorry the Senator from Connecticut is not present, but I am grateful to him for his cosponsorship of the amendment, because our program takes $100 million. I think even those who are opposed to the amendment—the administration representatives—will admit, whether they like our plan or not, for whatever reasons, that it will not produce less housing.

Yet it will be done with tremendous economy.

Now I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MUSKIE. The moment for my question has passed to a certain extent; but I shall ask whether it is true that under the proposal of the Senator from New York the mortgages could be for as long as 50 years.

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, and I am glad the Senator from Maine has emphasized that point, because it points up an important matter. I can understand the great opposition to the 40-year proposal, whereas I can see why there would be approval of the 50-year plan, because under the 40-year plan there would not be a leaning of project on project, whereas under my plan there would be. Under my plan there would be a mutualization of risk. For instance, let us assume that the entire amount would be utilized for projects handled by a single borrower, so far as the handling of the bonds was concerned. In that event, if there were "in the deck" a weak project, it would be supported by the others, whereas under the 40-year arrangement, each project would stand on its own feet, and in that event the entire picture would be weaker.

I do not favor the argument, which has been made here, that in 40 years the houses would collapse. After all, in New York there are many excellent apartment houses which are 30, 35, or 40 years of age, and still are in excellent condition. For instance, the one in which I live is a very fine apartment house on the best street in New York, and it is 35 or 40 years old. In view of what I paid for it, I have every expectation that it will last another 35 or 40 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I feel that the risk of the FNMA under the 40-year plan is a much greater risk, because of the individuality of the investment.

In addition, the investor sanction is important. Under the administration's plan the only buyer would be FNMA, a Government agency; and if Congress appropriated the money, the FNMA would buy, but that would have no relationship to whether the project was being run well or being run badly or whether the security was good or was bad. If Congress appropriated the money, the plan would be put into effect and the mortgages would be placed, and the FNMA would pick them up.

But under this plan there will be only $100 million of Government financing, and it would have to have solid investor acceptance; otherwise it would not work.

So this plan will utilize the private enterprise system, and will utilize it on the basis of real intelligence, and will constitute, so to speak, a check or balance, in view of the fact that the Government cannot always be in the area, to apply the checks and balances.

Furthermore, the plan I propose will provide only 90 percent of the cost of the project, and therefore will require some investment by the sponsors of the project. That is important. In addition, of course, a 6-percent return will be assured. But under the administration's plan, no return at all would be guaranteed the sponsors.

Furthermore, many of us who have had experience in this field realize that, on the basis of experience, in order to make viable such a proposal for housing for families of moderate income, it is necessary to have, in addition to a low interest rate—although a low interest rate is probably the most important factor, and such a rate is assured under the plan I have proposed—also the hope of making some arrangement with municipalities for lower tax rates, which would be of great advantage to municipalities in encouraging the development of such projects; and, in addition, there is need for the power of condemnation, in order to make possible the purchase of land at a reasonable price, and in units of sufficient size, and in strategic locations, so as to make the projects viable.

Under the plan I am proposing, in the State of New York we have already seen that such sponsorship is precisely the most conducive to the making of such arrangements with the municipalities, and is the most conducive to obtaining from the State the condemnation authority. The plan I am proposing has experience behind it, and therefore provides that the sponsoring agency may be a State agency, or it may operate through a State agency. That is precisely what would happen in the State of New York, and that might be true in other States.

So this plan has that great element of flexibility and also that great power to attract what is really needed in order to make modern income housing successful.

Another point which I think is very important in this entire area is that, frankly, the administration plan deals with an experiment. In that connection, we find that the committee states very frankly on page 4 of the report:

> The committee, therefore, feels that it would be wise to treat this new program as an experimental one which could be reviewed by the Congress before extension beyond July 1, 1963.

And on page 3 the committee itself calls this program—that is to say, the 40-year, no-downpayment program—temporary, experimental. The committee itself calls it that; and it is that, indeed; whereas the program I am proposing to the Senate is a tried program with which there has been experience, and under which homes for people have been built with great success, and it has actually been working.

The Senator from Alabama has argued that the State of New York is not the United States. Of course I agree; but the State of New York is a very big laboratory—in fact, the largest the Congress will ever find in which to try out, as a pilot plant, such a program. The Empire State is really an empire; it stretches 450 miles from north to south, and 450 miles from east to west, and has a population of 17 million—larger than most countries in the world, and has farms, factories, large cities, and small cities. This program has been a State of New York program, and it has been twice approved by the voters of New York State.

So if Senators are looking for a plan proven by experience and one which has actually been demonstrated to have great viability, the Senate should certainly take this program, rather than the administration's program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. First, I wish to commend the Senator from New York for his great contribution. I think the substance of his amendment is excellent, and it reflects great credit upon him and upon the experience with these programs under both Republican administrations and Democratic administrations in New York.

One point which is particularly interesting is the possibility of single-family ownership of single dwellings under this program. Has the Senator from New York had sufficient experience with such projects to be able to give us an estimate as to the possibility that that would happen?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, because these projects in New York have been cooperative. In short, the sponsors of these projects in New York have, in a number of cases, developed the ownership of the individual unit upon the individual occupant, by arrangement with him. This shows the flexibility of this arrangement.

So, again, this shows that we are dealing with an actuality, rather than an experiment. Therefore, I see no reason why it could not be applied to the entire Nation.

Although this program in New York originated under Governor Dewey, it has also been developed during the administration of Governor Harriman, a Democrat, and now during the administration of Governor Rockefeller. So I believe the program has shown its durability in terms of political sponsorship. But I say to the Senator from New Jersey—

and I do not think I am suspected of blind partisanship, after all these years—that I am quite proud to be presenting this program, because I think the Senator from New Jersey, the Senator from Kentucky, and others of us take great pride in being able to present alternatives which will truly do the job the people need to have done, and at the same time will have greater consideration for the private enterprise system and its place in terms of performing better for the welfare of the people than would be done—and I think this is evident—under many of the administration's programs, which have come from the other side of the aisle.

So I think this is a splendid illustration of what that principle, which we have often stated, actually means in practice.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I should like to conclude by summing up the matter as follows: On Friday, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], a great friend of housing, and the floor manager of the bill, and I had a colloquy here in the Senate Chamber; and at that time the Senator from Alabama said something which I think is rather well recognized in this situation. He said, in effect, "Have patience. A Senator may have a good idea, but it takes a long time for even a good idea to become law." And he stated, as an example, that for 10 years he had been trying to get enacted into the law the idea behind the Small Business Development Corporation. After 10 years the program was legislated, and it is now very well underway, and it promises to be very successful and very important to small business.

So I feel the same way about this program. It has been around, and we have tried it for some time.

Last year, in 1960, I was joined in its sponsorship by a colleague of mine on the other side of the aisle, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who, quite properly and quite understandably, cannot join me this time because he feels the administration has come forward with its own program, which he wishes to support.

Whether as a result of his joining me or not, I do not know, but, in any case, the committee actually reported this program as a separate bill last year, toward the close of the session, but it could not be reached in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

I have a real feeling that there is a great deal of opposition to this proposal because it is a proposal which did not spring from the administration. I wish it had. It would be much easier for me.

I deeply feel, considering the issue involved, considering the fact that, as the Senator from Alabama so properly said, an enormous proportion, at least half, of the American people, are not able to have the housing which we believe in as such a great fortress of freedom in our own country, that a plan of the character such as I have proposed commends itself on so many grounds that it should rise superior to the fact that it was not an administration program.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I shall be happy to have my comments charged against the time of the opponents of the amendment, and I yield myself 3 minutes against the amendment for that purpose.

Mr. JAVITS. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. What the Senator from New York has said is correct. I was happy to be a cosponsor of his proposal last year. We did get it out of committee. We hoped to get it enacted into law. It is just as good a program now as it was then. If the Senator from New York were advocating this proposal as an additional method dealing with moderate income housing, I should support it this year, as I did last year. Unfortunately, the Senator's amendment is really to propose the middle or moderate income housing program as a substitute for the administration bill.

I have become quite sincerely convinced—I know my friend does not doubt it—that the administration approach is a better approach, largely for the reason testified to by Mr. Weaver, as contained in the letter which appears at pages 106 and 107 of the hearings on this measure.

However, I commend the Senator from New York for insisting on this proposal. I think it obviously is a success in New York. I am not at all sure it would be successful in other States where economic and social conditions are different. I think it would be an experiment to try elsewhere, outside of New York.

I regret that my friend did not want to propose his measure as an additional remedy, or as an additional form of dealing with moderate income housing, rather than a substitute, because it is a substitute. I regret I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes to reply to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

First, I am entirely understanding of his position. I think I said that in my main argument. I have the highest regard for his sincerity in seeking housing, just as I do. We are together many times. My reason for proposing my amendment as a substitute, rather than as an addition, is that I feel that, practically, if I am really serious—and I am in this matter—we shall be running the risk of being charged with breaking the back of the bill with another large program additional to that contemplated by the administration. So, in fairness, because I felt strongly about its desirability, I felt my proposal had to be made as a substitute. Also, in all sincerity, I feel it can do everything the administration is proposing to do in this 40-year program, and do it as well.

If the Senator in charge of the bill would like to use some of his time, I should like to reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New York what his thought is? I do not have any idea of talking at length, and I wondered to what extent the Senator from New York intended to continue the debate. May I say, in all frankness, I have said about all I can say on this measure.

Mr. JAVITS. I have 20 minutes left. I had hoped the Senator would make any argument he desired to make. I had hoped then to have a quorum call. I had hoped then to sum up, which should not take more than 10 minutes, and then to have the vote.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I find it difficult to debate this question, because the Senator from New York knows I have considerable sympathy with his proposal. I have heard the presentation as to how a similar program works in the State of New York. I have stated here many times my commendation of the Senator from New York for pressing this program. I have said, very frankly—and I am sincere in it—that I doubt very seriously that this program would take hold over the country as a whole. I can see it as being a good program in a concentrated area, particularly where there is a concentration of financial institutions, which would give the program the financial support it needs. But I should think there would be considerable delay and slowness in organizing the cooperatives, or the limited-dividend corporations, in many areas of the country.

I have felt, and the committee felt, that the choice was between the 40-year, no-downpayment plan and the plan offered by the Senator from New York. Frankly, we regarded them as alternative plans.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. There has been much criticism on the floor of the fact that the administration's plan calls for 40-year mortgages. Is it not true that the plan of the Senator from New York contemplates 50-year mortgages and, under certain circumstances, 60-year mortgages?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator from New York can answer that question. I believe that is correct. That fact does not greatly disturb me, but, nevertheless, there is that difference.

At any rate, the majority of the committee decided the better alternative was the plan proposed by the administration, which, by the way, was the same plan that was proposed by the Eisenhower administration, and that it was preferable to the other plan, for the country as a whole. Therefore we came to the Senate with the 40-year, no-downpayment plan.

We have had a vote on the first amendment relating to it. We have weathered that storm. I hope we shall weather the other storms and that the bill will become the law.

Let me say to the Senator from New York that I join in wishing what he expressed earlier today, or perhaps it was yesterday. He said that he hoped that, even though his proposal did not become the law this time, we would continue to work in that direction, and that at some time it would become the law.

It seems to me it is a long-range program that might very well be considered, and certainly it might be considered if the experiment we are trying should not be successful. Certainly, for the time being, I do not believe we should adopt the substitute.

I reserve to myself the unused time.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment. I wish to tell my colleague how grateful I am to him for joining me.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I am grateful to the Senator from New York for permitting me to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

I shall not speak at length, Mr. President. I know the Senator from New York has made an exhaustive statement in favor of it. I know his philosophy about the amendment, and I fully support his position on it.

To me the important thing is that the Javits-Bush amendment proposes to use funds from the investment market to finance housing operations. In contrast, the bill would turn toward the Federal Treasury once more with another new program. The bill acknowledges that fact by authorizing an additional $750 million of special assistance funds to finance the program. From the standpoint of the taxpayers, I think the Javits-Bush amendment is highly preferable.

I pointed out earlier today that FNMA, at the end of the year, owned some $6.9 billion worth of mortgages. This is the highest figure I have seen recorded. Each year the figure seems to go higher. There seems to be a race between FNMA and the Commodity Credit Corporation to see which can accumulate the greatest amount of surpluses. The Commodity Credit Corporation is accumulating agricultural surpluses, and FNMA is accumulating mortgage surpluses.

The Javits-Bush amendment is designed to check the trend and to set up a procedure which will invite, and really command, the funds of the savers of this country to finance housing enterprises. I think it is a very sound approach, infinitely preferable to the approach provided in the bill, and much better from the standpoint of the taxpayers. I think it will be much better from every angle one can possibly look at the program. I strongly endorse the amendment, and I hope the Senate will approve it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, there is no section of S. 1922, the Housing Act of 1961, more significant than section 401, college housing.

From its inception in 1950, the college housing loan program has provided dormitory accommodations for over 380,000 college students from every State of the Union.

In my own State of Colorado, over 9,500 college students are now living in dormitory facilities financed with the assistance of this program.

The following colleges have received loans ranging from $200,000 to $2 million for the construction of dormitories, dining rooms, and student unions:

Colorado School of Mines, Golden.
University of Colorado, Boulder.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins.
Colorado College, Colorado Springs.
Western State College, Gunnison.
Loretto Heights College, Loretto.
Colorado State College, Greeley.
Regis College, Denver.
Colorado Woman's College, Denver.
Fort Lewis A. & M. College, Durango.
University of Denver, Denver.
Adams State College, Alamosa.
Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo.

The value of these loans to the colleges and universities of Colorado totals $37,875,000.

In this time of high challenge to our liberties and our Nation, it is of the very highest importance that our youth be provided with the education—the knowledge and skills—which it will need to meet the pressures and forces of our times.

In 1960, our Nation had 3,600,000 students at colleges and universities. It is expected that, by 1970, we shall have over 6 million college students.

At least a quarter of these additional students will need new dormitory facilities, and although at least three-fourths of these accommodation needs can and will be met from non-Federal sources, there is still urgent need for the continuation of this program.

Mr. President, I am pleased that the bill before us today provides for this need. In the coming years, education will be the all-important weapon and our colleges must be assisted with the means to provide training second to none in the world.

This college housing loan program is not only good sense; it is good business. Since the inception of the program in 1950, over $1,301 million has been loaned to academic institutions without a single default either in payment of principal or interest. The colleges in Colorado alone have repaid $1,297,000 of these loans and have paid $3,190,109.49 in interest.

With the unanimous consent of the Senate, I should like, at this point of the debate, to insert a summary of the approved loans to institutions in my own State of Colorado, with the amount of loan and the number of students benefiting therefrom.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM

Approved loans, Colorado

Institution and location	Federal funds	Scope
Colorado School of Mines, Golden	$200,000	84 men.
University of Colorado, Boulder	350,000	36 faculty.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	1,320,000	400 women, 4 faculty, dining.
Colorado College, Colorado Springs	576,000	155 men.
University of Colorado, Boulder	2,200,000	900 men, dining.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	1,320,000	408 men, 4 faculty, dining.
Western State College, Gunnison	394,000	174 women.
Colorado College, Colorado Springs	1,152,000	258 women, dining.
Loretto Heights College, Loretto	1,090,000	254 women, dining.
Colorado State College, Greeley	2,800,000	538 women, dining (900).
Regis College, Denver	909,000	214 men, college union dining (400).
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	1,250,000	412 men, dining.
Do	1,250,000	Do.
Colorado Woman's College, Denver	335,000	122 women.
Fort Lewis A. & M. College, Durango	806,000	124 men, 60 women, 20 student families, college union dining.
University of Colorado, Boulder	1,000,000	116 student families.
Western State College, Gunnison	631,000	120 men, 132 women.
Colorado School of Mines, Golden	259,000	84 men.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	1,350,000	412 women, dining.
University of Denver, Denver	1,085,000	216 men, 216 women, dining (346).
Colorado College, Colorado Springs	750,000	89 men, college union dining.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	2,000,000	College union dining.
Adams State College, Alamosa	458,000	52 student families.
Pueblo Junior College, Pueblo	600,000	College union dining.
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	1,450,000	150 student families.
Colorado State College, Greeley	435,000	150 men.
Adams State College, Alamosa	1,330,000	100 men, 88 women, 28 student families, dining (588).
Western State College, Gunnison	1,780,000	452 women, dining (440).
Fort Lewis A. & M. College, Durango	514,000	124 men, 60 women, 12 student families, college union addition.

COLLEGE HOUSING PROGRAM—Continued

Approved loans, Colorado—Continued

Institution and location	Federal funds	Scope
Colorado College, Colorado Springs	$308,000	105 men.
University of Denver, Denver	2,985,000	324 men, 324 women, dining (453).
Colorado State University, Fort Collins	1,867,000	476 women, dining.
Colorado State College, Greeley	2,125,000	504 women, dining.
Adams State College, Alamosa	587,000	100 men, 66 women.
Total	37,875,000	

Reservations of funds, Colorado

Institution and location	Federal funds	Scope
Adams State College, Alamosa	$1,500,000	Housing for 288 men, 96 women, 36 student families.
Colorado School of Mines, Golden	2,275,000	240 men, 75 student families, college union with dining.
Loretto Heights College, Loretto	1,200,000	250 women.
Colorado Woman's College, Denver	784,000	180 women, dining hall addition.
University of Colorado, Boulder	3,000,000	228 student families.
Fort Lewis A. & M. College, Durango	635,000	200 women, remodeling of dining.
Regis College, Denver	900,000	214 men, addition to college union with dining.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I am convinced that an important part of our Federal housing program is found in the respected low rent projects built and maintained with the assistance of the Public Housing Administration.

It is public housing which provides for the very poor, for families with the lowest incomes.

In the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, the Congress approved a program to provide decent, safe, and sanitary homes within the financial reach of families of low income.

It is this program which is administered by the Public Housing Administration, working in cooperation with local housing authorities. Housing is financed, to as large a degree as possible, through private investment secured by Government commitments. These, along with direct Public Housing Administration loans to the local authority and annual Public Housing Administration contributions in the form of grants, serve to insure the low-rent character of the units.

In my own State of Colorado, Mr. President, 3,470 dwelling units have been built under Public Housing Administration authority. Forty-seven more are under construction, and plans are progressing for the construction of 863 additional units throughout the State.

This is a total of 4,380 units—and units, Mr. President, are homes. Low income families—the elderly, the handicapped, veterans, and those displaced by urban renewal—these people receive housing with health and safety standards which they otherwise would not have, at a rent which they can afford to pay.

The city of Denver alone, in its planning for urban renewal, has signed a preliminary loan contract for the construction of 500 units for those citizens who will be displaced by the renewal program.

The cities of Trinidad and Walsenburg, in economic distress because of a continuing slump in the coal industry, have signed preliminary contracts with the Public Housing Administration for the construction of 160 units—60 for Walsenburg, 100 for Trinidad. These houses will provide adequate shelter for many of those who are feeling the full weight of the towns' distress.

Pueblo has plans in readiness for the construction of 103 units. In various stages of planning are 40 units in Alamosa, and 60 in Lamar.

Mr. President, Housing Administrator Weaver said in his testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Housing that "more public housing is needed if we are to redeem the 1949 pledge of a decent home for everyone and if we are to proceed at a rapid pace with the clearance of slums and rehousing of low-income facilities displaced by these activities."

For this reason, Mr. President, and because of the benefits this program has brought to Colorado, I support the action taken by the committee in section 205 of this bill recommending the authorization of the Public Housing Administration to contract for 100,000 additional units, an authorization originally provided for in the 1949 Housing Act.

At this time, I request unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point some figures which the Housing and Home Finance Agency has assembled for me on the operation of the Public Housing Administration program in Colorado.

There being no objection, the figures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Low-rent project directory, Colorado, as of Dec. 31, 1960

Location, local authority or manager, and project name	Project No.	Program	Active dwelling units: Total	Under development: Preconstruction	Under development: Construction	Under management	Move-out rate	Race	Utilities included in rent: Hot water	Heat	Cooking fuel	Light	Refrigeration	End of initial operating period	Fiscal year ends
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
Denver, Housing Authority, city and county of:															
Las Casitas	1-1	USHA	184			184	4.8	0	X	X	X	X	X	6-43	D.
Platte Valley Homes	1-3	USHA	77			77	2.9	0	X	X	X	X	X	9-42	D.
Arapahoe Courts	1-4	USHA	76			76	2.9	0	X	X	X	X	X	9-42	D.
Curtis Park Homes	1-9	HA49	450			450	2.9	0	X	X	X	X	X	3-54	D.
Columbine Homes	1-5	HA49	200			200	2.5	0	X	X	X	X	X	3-53	D.
West Ridge Homes	1-6	HA49	200			200	3.6	0	X	X	X	X	X	3-52	D.
James Quigg Newton Homes	1-7	HA49	400			400	3.1		X	X	X	X	X	6-52	D.
Sun Valley Homes	1-8	HA49	200			200	3.0	0	X	X	X	X	X	12-52	D.
South Lincoln Park Homes	1-10	HA49	270			270	2.9	0	X	X	X	X	X	6-54	D.
Westwood Homes	1-11	HA49	257			257	3.8	0	X	X	X	X	X	3-54	D.
Sun Valley Homes Annex	1-12	HA49	220			220	4.4	0	X	X	X	X	X	9-56	D.
Benjamin F. Stapleton Homes	1-13	HA49	290			290	4.1	0	X	X	X	X	X	6-55	D.
Lincoln Park Homes	1-2	USHA	346			346	1.8	0	X	X	X	X	X	3-41	D.
Do	1-2A	USHA	76			76	1.8	0	X	X	X	X	X	12-42	D.
Pueblo, Housing Authority, city of (CC):															
Sangre de Cristo Homes	2-1	HA49	224			224	4.7	0						12-53	D.
Do	2-2	HA49	150	150											

Low-rent projects, State of Colorado—Additional contracts executed Dec. 31, 1960, to May 31, 1961

Location	Number of units	Program reservation (date issued)	Preliminary loan contract (date executed)
Denver	500	February 1961.	April 1961.
Alamosa [1]	[2] 40	January 1961	January 1961.
Lamar	60	do	February 1961.
Trinidad [1]	[3] 100	do	Do.
Walsenburg.[1]	60	December 1960.	January 1961.
Pueblo	760 (4)	(4)	(4)

[1] Scheduled for annual contributions contract before end of fiscal year.
[2] 10 for elderly.
[3] 20 for elderly.
[4] Of the 150 units under preconstruction (see "Project Directory"), 47 went under construction in March 1961 (6 of these 47 for elderly). The other 103 units are not yet under construction.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the able Senator from Alabama for his courtesy in giving me the opportunity to make a record not only in the national interest but also in the interest of the State of Colorado.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be a quorum call, without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that the time consumed in the quorum call not be taken from either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes to conclude my argument. I hope then to hear the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and unless he presents something to which I must reply, I shall yield back the remainder of my time, and assume that he will do likewise.

I should like to sum up as follows: By now it is well known that the plan which I have proposed is an alternative to the administration's plan for moderate income housing. My amendment provides for a Federal Limited-Profit Mortgage Corporation, which would be financed with $100 million of stock investment by the Federal Government. The Corporation would have power to issue bonds, which it is expected would raise $2 billion from the public over a period of time. The Corporation would then lend the money to cooperative entities—foundations, trade unions, and similar organizations—to build model income housing with restrictions on rents and on the admission to that housing being of middle income families and the elderly.

My program is to be juxtaposed to the administration's program, which has been much discussed. I think it can probably be best summed up as follows:

First. This is the first time we are really considering seriously a moderate income housing program, and the need has been very firmly established. The need extends roughly to 50 percent of American families. So whether my plan or the administration's plan is considered, we would minister to an established need.

Second. The need is for either rental housing or sales housing which is within the reach of moderate income families. I deeply believe that upon that ground my proposal has the best opportunity for satisfying the need.

I should like to state the criteria which I have established in that regard.

First. Shall it be an experimental program or shall it be the product of experience?

Of the two programs before the Senate, mine is a product of experience. It has been used and tried out in the State of New York for 6 years. It has resulted in the construction of or having under construction 30,000 units as a result of $450 million raised from the public. My proposal is certainly not an experimental program, whereas the administration's 40-year, no-downpayment program is definitely experimental. Representatives of the administration say so themselves. They do not know whether it would work or not.

Second. Shall it be a governmental program or shall it be a private enterprise program?

The administration's program is a governmental program. It would depend entirely for its viability upon purchase by FNMA of all the mortgages which are issued at interest rates below market; and unless such mortgages are issued at interest rates below market, we would not help moderate income housing, because that is the way in which we would save the money which is required to make it housing qualified for moderate income families.

My program would depend upon sales to private investors. The Government investment is relatively small. So the private economic system would carry the responsibility.

In addition, it would give us the advantage of having the sanction of private investors' acceptance of the proposed mortgage obligations in order to demonstrate that the plan is being operated right, efficiently, and honestly. Otherwise, it would not receive that acceptance. If the program did not get that acceptance, the program would not operate. Whereas, under the administration plan, if money were fed into FNMA, the program would operate even if it were a bad one.

Third. Shall there be a downpayment or shall there be none? Many Senators are disquieted about the 40-year, no-downpayment plan.

Under my program, we would have a provision for a 90-percent loan. Under the administration's program, there would be a 100-percent loan. I think the difference is significant.

The reason the plan is viable under my program is that there would be an assured rate of return of 6 percent, whereas under the administration's program, we would not be dealing with that kind of area or sponsor.

Fourth. Shall the program have an opportunity to obtain municipal help? Under the administration's program, with the use of FHA, there would be nothing special about that possibility, except what is provided under the terms of the policy. Under my proposed program there would be a unique and distinct effort with a unique and distinct sponsor, which has in the State of New York enlisted municipal cooperation by tax provisions and the power of condemnation. Such action is logical because we would be dealing with the sponsoring of a large-scale project, deriving money directly from a Government-owned corporation.

Finally, Shall it be expensive or inexpensive? The administration's program calls for an appropriation of $750 million. My program calls for a $100 million appropriation. Yet the amount of housing is entirely equal in terms of its potential. We would get at least as much housing. I believe we would get a great deal more under my proposed program than we would under the program proposed by the administration.

As we take all of these points and analyze them in terms of the merits of the proposal, we almost come to this conclusion. I make this statement without rancor and without bitter criticism, but I think it is only fair to say that the administration said:

> What kind of proposal can we dream up that is not like the proposal that was reported out by the Committee on Banking and Currency for moderate income housing in 1960?

It dreamed up the 40-year, no-downpayment proposal with a less than market interest rate and brought it to us. The only distinction it has in any way is the fact that it is different. It is certainly not better. It is much worse in every way that I have described. The only distinction it has is that it is different. I deeply hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle will not take a very poor administration program merely because it is different.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has several times mentioned public cooperation, and public investment or municipal or State investment. What is the proportion in New York State, where the plan is in operation, as between private investment and tax raised investment?

Mr. JAVITS. In the State of New York all of these projects, I believe, without exception, have been privately sponsored, and in practically all cases they have been able to work out deals with municipalities for tax abatement, because the municipality gets a big advantage in the improvement of its slum and blighted property. In most cases it has fundamentally been a privately

sponsored proposition, largely in the nonprofit field. However, it is an entirely viable program for private individuals who are willing to take a limited rate of profit. They have the advantage, however, at the end of 20 years, of being able to refinance the project and have it as a completely private project.

Most of the projects have been sponsored by trade unions or groups of people who get back the property as a cooperative, and then in turn there is a further devolution down to the individual occupant, in his ownership of individual property, a cooperative apartment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The municipality has not had to take over any of the property?

Mr. JAVITS. No; this has been a remarkably successful program in 6 years, with 30,000 units built or under construction, and the voters of the State of New York have twice by statewide referendum approved the program and have increased the amounts which were made available.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The municipalities' participation has been in the form of tax abatement?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes; because it has been to their advantage to do so. This feature is not present in the administration plan.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York is willing to yield back the remainder of his time, I am willing to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate on the amendment has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New York. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

On this vote, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 64, as follows:

[No. 62]

YEAS—25

Allott	Cotton	Mundt
Beall	Curtis	Prouty
Bennett	Dworshak	Saltonstall
Boggs	Goldwater	Schoeppel
Bush	Hruska	Scott
Butler	Javits	Smith, Maine
Case, N.J.	Keating	Williams, Del.
Case, S. Dak.	Kuchel	
Cooper	Morton	

NAYS—64

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bartlett	Hickey	Moss
Bible	Hill	Muskie
Burdick	Holland	Neuberger
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Cannon	Johnston	Pell
Capehart	Jordan	Proxmire
Carroll	Kefauver	Randolph
Clark	Kerr	Robertson
Dodd	Lausche	Russell
Douglas	Long, Mo.	Smathers
Eastland	Long, Hawaii	Smith, Mass.
Ellender	Long, La.	Sparkman
Engle	Magnuson	Stennis
Ervin	Mansfield	Symington
Fong	McCarthy	Talmadge
Fulbright	McClellan	Thurmond
Gore	McGee	Williams, N.J.
Gruening	McNamara	Yarborough
Hart	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Miller	
Hayden	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—11

Aiken	Carlson	Humphrey
Blakley	Chavez	Wiley
Bridges	Church	Young, N. Dak.
Byrd, W. Va.	Dirksen	

So the amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS, for himself and Mr. BUSH, was rejected.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, because of unusual circumstances, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on the Judiciary of the Committee on the District of Columbia may be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am aware of the circumstances. I shall not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONSIDERATION NEXT WEEK OF NOMINATIONS OF JOSEPH C. SWIDLER AND HOWARD MORGAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I announce the intention of the leadership to call up next week the nominations of Joseph C. Swidler, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1965, and of Howard Morgan, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1963, vice Paul A. Sweeney. I hope the announcement will put the Senate on notice that such action is contemplated.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that House Resolution 1118 recently passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, entitled "Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make available for bid to police and fire departments of the respective States all surpluses after the needs of civilian defense, schools, and others now receiving them have been satisfied," be inserted in the RECORD.

I trust that the appropriate departments of the Government will give most serious consideration to making available surplus property to police and fire departments after the needs of other agencies now using surplus property have been satisfied.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 1118

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to make available for bid to police and fire departments of the respective States all surpluses after the needs of civilian defense, schools, and others now receiving them have been satisfied

Whereas all surpluses, after the needs of civilian defense, schools, and other units now using said surpluses have been satisfied, should be submitted by bid to police and fire departments of the respective States to augment their essential facilities for the protection of life and property: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence

Plantations respectfully requests the Senators and Congressmen from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States to give consideration to the purpose of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved, That duly certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the units of the Federal Government under whose jurisdiction such surpluses are allocated, asking that special attention be given to the enacting of necessary legislation to activate this request.

REPORT ENTITLED "THE ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT—1961" (S. REPT. NO. 355)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on behalf of the Select Committee on Small Business, I submit a report entitled "The Role of Small Business in Government Procurement—1961," and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

HOUSING ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT

Mr. LAUSCHE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1922) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate and low income families, to promote orderly urban development, to extend and amend laws relating to housing, urban renewal, and community facilities, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT, RELATING TO HEARINGS CONCERNING THE LAWFULNESS OF NEW RATE SCHEDULES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1946) to amend section 4(e) of the Natural Gas Act relative to hearings concerning the lawfulness of new rates schedules, the names of Senators MCCARTHY, CLARK, MORSE, and PELL be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PEACE-BY-INVESTMENT CORPORATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] be joined as a cosponsor of S. 1965, the so-called peace-by-investment bill, of which I am the principal sponsor, and that at the next printing of the bill his name may appear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to announce that a public hearing will be held at 10 a.m. on Friday, June 16, 1961, in room 357, Old Senate Office Building, at which time persons interested in the following nominations will appear and testify:

Ervin N. Griswold, of Massachusetts and Spottswood W. Robinson III, of the District of Columbia, to be members of the Commission on Civil Rights; and

Berl I. Bernhard, of Maryland, to be staff director for the Commission on Civil Rights.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 7, 1961, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 133. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact between the State of Arizona and the State of Nevada establishing a boundary between those States;

S. 1941. An act to authorize construction of community support facilities at Los Alamos County, N. Mex.; and

S.J. Res. 34. Joint resolution designating the week of October 9–15, 1961, as National American Guild of Variety Artists Week.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the order previously entered, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Thursday, June 8, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 7, 1961:

U.S. ATTORNEYS

John O. Garaas, of North Dakota, to be U.S. attorney for the district of North Dakota for a term of 4 years.

Cecil F. Poole, of California, to be U.S. attorney for the northern district of California for the term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Adam J. Walsh, of Maine, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Maine for the term of 4 years.

George E. O'Brien, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of California.

Gibson Greer Ezell, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years.

Edward A. Heslep, of California, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of California.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tom Wallace: Editor and Conservationist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BURKE
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. BURKE of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere regret that I announce to the House the death on Monday last of Tom Wallace, editor emeritus of the Louisville Times. Tom Wallace was a working newspaperman. He had served as president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1940–41 and as president of the Inter-American Press Association in 1945. He was honorary life president of the latter organization.

His crusades for inter-American friendship and for conservation of natural resources brought him nearly as much recognition as his journalistic career. He received countless conservation awards.

He was the 1949 winner of the American Award, given annually for "outstanding contributions to hemispheric amity and understanding." The previous year it had been awarded to former President Herbert Hoover.

Named for Wallace are a lake, an organization, and two contests. The lake is Tom Wallace Lake, in the Jefferson County (Ky.) Forest. The organization is the Tom Wallace Chapter of the Izaak Walton League. The annual contests are the Tom Wallace Forestry Award, established by the Louisville Times, the Courier-Journal, and WHAS for farm people of the Kentuckiana area, and the Inter-American Press Association—Tom Wallace Awards, consisting of a plaque for the newspaper or magazine doing most to promote inter-American friendship, and a scroll and $500 for the writer of the winning article or articles.

A fifth-generation Kentuckian, Wallace was a courtly man, graceful in demeanor, and possessing a sharp wit. He kept his youthful interest in news coverage through all his years. If something caught his eye on his way downtown, he would come to the Times' newsroom in the morning before even taking off his overcoat. He was a working newspaperman to the last.

He retired as editor of the Times in 1948 at the age of 74 and from then on wrote a three-times-a-week column on the editorial page.

He suffered a heart attack on his farm at Prospect about 10 years ago and was in the hospital for nearly a month.

Back on his feet, he resumed his regular round of convention-going and traveling about the State for news.

About 5 years ago, he suffered food poisoning on one of his South American trips, recovered, but seemed to have lost some of his old drive. He worried about insomnia. He told colleagues that his eyes were giving him some trouble and said that it was the first time in his life that he had difficulty in sleeping. Finally, in 1959, he had to discontinue coming to the office.

"OLD MAN BARKLEY"

But to the end, he retained his sense of contemporary affairs.

One day at luncheon, he referred to "old man Barkley."

A younger executive broke in to say, good-humoredly, "Pardon me, Mr. Wallace, did you say, 'old man Barkley?' "

Wallace twinkled. "I did, indeed. True, he is some years my junior, but you heard me correctly." He proceeded with the story he was telling.

In social gatherings, he was the true, old-school gentleman, urbane and dignified. He was a delightful storyteller with a sense of pertinent detail. He could tell of incidents of long ago, yet with a verve that made listeners feel it was only yesterday.

Capable of swift anger, he also held in him a tremendous loyalty toward good newspapering. When the Times' news staff produced an unusually outstanding story, Wallace was the first to send what was almost a gloating memo of congratulations.

FOUND TIE IN OFFICE

Little personal quirks and traits of Wallace became stories in themselves. At his 40th anniversary dinner, Russell Briney—now editor of the Courier-Journal, at that time one of Wallace's aids on the Times—spoke wryly of the editorial smoke and fire he had to whip up "when a farmer shoots a hawk or a city slicker cuts down a Christmas tree."

A year later, in 1941, the late Harry Bloom wrote a column in the Times about Wallace's forgetting to wear his necktie to the office. Bloom said Wallace thought things over and decided: "A man careless enough to leave home without a necktie is careless enough to have a forgotten tie around his office." And he did.

Wallace was 26 when he joined the staff of the Times without pay, "because I hated all kinds of business." He had been a Richmond, Va., bookkeeper for a short time and tried working briefly with an ice company in Shelbyville and a tooth powder factory in New York City.

He was put on the police beat, as many new reporters are nowadays, and began writing a daily feature called "Little Dramas of the Police Court."

OFFERED SALARIED JOB

After 6 weeks, the Louisville Dispatch offered him a salaried job.

Afterward he worked successively for the old Evening Post, Louisville Herald, St. Louis Republic and again for the Times, serving at various times as Frankfort and Washington correspondent.

When Wallace was 31, Henry Watterson invited him to become the youngest member of the Courier-Journal editorial staff, because he wanted some of "the point of view of youth."

After "Marse Henry" resigned, Wallace left the Courier-Journal and took over the Times editorial page at his own request. He was its chief until he became the Times editor 7 years later.

He was at his desk each morning earlier than most staff members, and wrote most of the Times editorials, usually on the same day they were published.

His policy: "No editorial should be longer than a pencil."

DAILY FARM CHORES

Before coming to the office, he started at 5 a.m. on chores at his 158-acre farm near Prospect, tending his poultry flock and bringing milk from his jersey herd into town.

Wallace bought the farm 47 years ago when it consisted of only 85 acres of eroded, untended, almost worthless land. As time passed he added another 73 acres. By treating the soil with fertilizer, planting cover crops, and making sure that every conservation measure was practiced, he built up the land until it became one of the most productive farms in the county.

He turned down many job offers in New York, including that of chief of the editorial page of the old New York Sun. Although he traveled all over the world, he called himself "a Kentuckian by birth and inclination." His birthplace was Hurricane, in Crittenden County. An ancestor had been given the land by the Government for his service in the Revolutionary War.

HARD-HITTING LECTURER

He was a hard hitter from the lecture platform as well as in his writings. He raged at the laxity of States in ending pollution of the Ohio River and other streams, and after a commission was established to clean up the Ohio, criticized it sharply for devoting more attention to research than enforcement.

He warned Kentuckians that their State was becoming "uglified" by the industrial age and charged that they don't care enough to do much about it.

In 1934 the American Scenic and Historical Preservation Society awarded Wallace its Pugsley Silver Medal for "saving" Cumberland Falls when utility interests tried to buy the area.

Between World Wars, he stated at a Lexington meeting that the United States was responsible, more than any other nation, for "tooth and claw" rule in the world because it did not join the League of Nations.

URGED REFORESTATION

The Democratic Women's Clubs of Kentucky once voted that Wallace "should never again be invited" to address the group. An independent in politics, he had said in a speech to the body that persons who are too party-bound injure their own party. The women later retracted their action.

For years Wallace railed at neglect of Kentucky forests, and declared that with proper reforestation, "We could support 2 million persons east of Winchester and transform the citizens of pauper counties into good taxpayers."

A believer in local columnists in preference to syndicated columns, he gave his opinion of both to a press group in Washington a few years ago:

"Some columnists serve the public and the press and some stink—and that is equally true of editors."

An indefatigable worker, a courageous crusader for truth, freedom, and fair play, Tom Wallace was a great man; in his death we each suffer a major loss.

Problems of the Farmer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, is the author of an outstanding article on the need for improved public understanding of the problems of the farmer which appears in the June issue of the Progressive Farmer. Secretary Freeman perceptively points out and emphasizes that the very future of American agriculture is at stake and that it is time that the American consumer be fully informed of the fact that he is better fed at a lower cost than ever before.

Mr. President, Secretary Freeman is doing an effective job of bringing the facts about agriculture, its problems and its importance to the entire economy to the attention of the people of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his article, entitled "Public Relations—Our No. 1 Job," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC RELATIONS—OUR NO. 1 JOB

(By Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture)

Every farmer knows that the success of his year's work depends a lot on the weather.

He has seen his cotton top-blooming, and the corn leaves curling up and losing their glossy green, because of drought. He knows what happens to his crops when his fields get soggy wet and stay that way day after day; or when a flood tops the creek bank and sweeps across his ripening grain. He's seen frost blacken his fruit and vegetable crops, and 15 minutes of hail beat a year's hard work and some borrowed money into the ground.

If he's been farming long enough, he might remember a year or two when the climate was just about perfect. Rain and sunshine came at the right time, frost stayed off until hog-killing time, and the hailstorms didn't come at all.

Today the American farmer is learning—and must learn more—about another kind of climate.

This is the climate of public opinion. Right now it's nearly as dark and ominous

as the hour before a tornado strikes. Much of the nonfarm public is critical of, even hostile toward, agriculture.

More than a year's work and operating capital are endangered by this unfriendly climate of opinion. Agriculture's future is at stake. So is the Nation's, for the withering of any segment of our economy is a drain on the growth of all other segments. Everyone depends on agriculture for his food, most of his clothing, some of his shelter. For the millions who market, transport, process, and retail farm products, who manufacture and sell farm supplies, agriculture is a regular paycheck or a dividend.

That's only half of this hard fact of interdependence. The other half is that everyone is a customer of the farmer's products.

And far too many of the farmer's customers are unhappy with him. Within the past few weeks, I've read charges that farmers are people who have chosen to farm and complain, that the farmer is a kept man between wars.

This withering climate isn't going to change simply because the criticism and the hostility are unjust. It is up to us to set the record straight. There is a tremendously big and important job of public relations to be done. It is time for farmers and their organizations, for farm magazines, farm editors of newspapers, for the farm directors of radio and television, to talk a little less to agriculture and a great deal more about agriculture. It is time to tell the smashing success story of American agriculture to labor and industry, to business and professional men, in short, to the consumer, the taxpayer, and the voter.

Agriculture has done, and is doing, a marvelous job. But agriculture hasn't bothered to give the facts to its customers.

The fact is that American farmers have achieved one of the truly great breakthroughs. They have abolished, here in America, one of mankind's oldest anxieties, the fear of hunger and famine.

The American consumer is better fed, and at lower real cost, than ever before. An hour's factory work buys much more farm food than it did 20 or 30 years ago. Wages from 1 hour of factory work in 1960 would buy 83 percent more round steak, 126 percent more milk, 138 percent more oranges, or 169 percent more bacon than in 1929.

The truth is that farmers are not getting the rewards that their great success deserves. They are not receiving the returns that skill, efficiency, and productivity bring to labor and capital elsewhere in our economy. Farmworkers last year received less than 82 cents an hour for their labor. The farmer received 12 percent less for the food he produced in 1960 than he did in 1947–49, while the cost of getting it to the housewife increased 36 percent. That's the real reason we pay 12 percent more for farm food than we did in 1947–49. By comparison, the cost of rent has gone up 43 percent; transportation, 46 percent; and medical care, more than 59 percent.

The fact is we have not learned to live with—to manage—our agricultural abundance. That is the crux of what is called the farm problem. Too many have come to look on abundance as a burden, and not as the great blessing that it really is.

The solution can be found in giving to farmers the same kind of tools that nonfarm labor and capital have long used—the right of labor to bargain, the ability of industry to manage production.

This is the aim of this administration for agriculture, the goal of President Kennedy's far-reaching farm message to the Congress, the purpose of the recently introduced legislation to carry out President Kennedy's farm recommendations and bring decisionmaking back to the grassroots.

Misunderstandings and misconceptions about agriculture, particularly among city people, can be big roadblocks to enactment of such practical farm legislation. We need the support of Congressmen representing the great metropolitan districts. In turn, these Congressmen must have the support of the voters back home—the city consumers, so many of whom are misinformed about agriculture and unaware of the direct relationship between the farmer's welfare and their own.

Once they have the tools to adjust production, farmers must be certain that the programs they build are good for the entire national economy—beneficial to their customers and the taxpayers as well as to themselves. More than that, farmers must do everything they can to make these new programs work—to participate in them as, apparently, corn and grain sorghum growers are participating in the 1961 feed grain program.

This is the first essential of public relations for agriculture—doing a good job. The other essential is telling the public.

Arm yourself with the facts. Take these facts to your farm equipment dealer, your fertilizer distributor, your oil dealer, and others from whom you buy. Remind them how much you've spent with them the last year, the past 5 years.

Tell them that American farmers spend $25 to $26 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock, and at least another $15 billion for the same things that city people buy. They spend $2.5 to $3 billion every year for tractors and other motor vehicles, machinery and equipment. Another $3.5 billion goes for fuel, lubricants, and upkeep of machinery and motor vehicles. The bill for fertilizer and lime is nearly $1.5 billion a year.

Talk with your banker. The accounts of his farm customers will show him whether agriculture in the county is keeping abreast of the rest of the local economy, slipping behind, or going deeper in debt.

See to it that your newspaper editor, and the program directors of your radio and television stations get the facts. Enlist and encourage their help.

A membership in the local chamber of commerce or in one of the civic clubs is a good investment in public relations.

When you hear people complain about the high cost of food, ask them to do a little checking for themselves. Do they know how much they spend at the grocery store for food, and how much for things they can't eat—for soap, detergents, paper, toothpaste, clothing, toys, towel racks, brooms, utensils, and many of the other nonfood items?

Explain that the farmer isn't getting rich at the expense of the consumer. Last year he received only 39 cents out of each $1 spent for farm-grown food. The other 61 cents went for processing, transportation, corporation profits, labor, fuel, electric power, containers, advertising, and other costs after the food left the farm.

The farmer received 2.3 cents for the corn in a 26-cent box of corn flakes; 2.3 cents for the wheat in a 20-cent loaf of white bread; about 11 cents from a 25-cent quart of milk; 9 cents for the oranges in a 23-cent can of frozen orange juice.

Last year we spent only 20 percent of our disposable income for food. And we had a diet high in animal products—for each person an average of 161 pounds of beef, veal, pork, lamb, mutton; 35 pounds of chicken, turkey; 393 pounds of dairy products.

When more of our city consumers understand these and other facts, the climate of public opinion will be friendly to the idea that efficient family farmers deserve a parity of income and can achieve it without exploiting either consumers or taxpayers.

Kings Highway Democratic Club, Brooklyn, N.Y., Eulogizes the Late John J. Cashmore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the president of the Borough of Brooklyn, John J. Cashmore, died in New York on May 7, 1961.

On May 15, 1961, the Kings Highway Democratic Club passed a resolution expressing the grief that its members felt upon the loss of the late Mr. Cashmore. The text of that resolution follows:

Whereas the late John J. Cashmore throughout his lifetime evidenced an intense interest in his community in all its civic, religious and philanthropic affairs; and

Whereas his integrity and firmness in support of sound principles of good government won for him the profound respect and complete confidence of the people of Brooklyn as well as of the entire city of New York, together with great acclaim from the public press for his achievements; and

Whereas he has served the people of Brooklyn diligently and faithfully as assemblyman, alderman, district leader, county leader and borough president; and

Whereas the officers and members of the Kings Highway Democratic Club desire to record their profound sorrow caused by his death on May 7, 1961: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kings Highway Democratic Club takes this means to formally express their grief upon this great loss and hereby extends to his beloved widow, Edythe Cashmore, and their son, James Cashmore, their heartfelt sympathy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to them as a humble expression of our condolence.

JOSEPH B. WHITTY,
Executive Member.
ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
President.

MAY 15, 1961.

Mr. Speaker, John Cashmore was a very dear, longtime friend of mine. Born in Brooklyn on June 7, 1895, Mr. Cashmore was the youngest of 10 children. When he was quite young his father died and he began his working career by servicing a newspaper route to help his mother support the family.

In World War I he served his country in the U.S. Army, returning, as a young man, to enter the trucking business in a small way. While thus engaged he studied business and law at New York University and worked around the Democratic Club of the old fifth assembly district. His district leader, the late James Sexton, soon noticed his energy and ambition and persuaded him to enter politics seriously. Cashmore abandoned the trucking business and opened a furniture store.

In 1922 he was elected to the State assembly and in 1925 he ran for alderman. He won, and having thus gained the confidence of the people he was re-

elected to that post until the board of alderman was replaced by the city council.

In 1937 he was elected to the newly formed council and in 1938 he was elected by the Democratic members of the council as Democratic majority leader.

In 1941 he was elected to a 4-year term as president of the Borough of Brooklyn. Again, he so justified the faith of the people of Brooklyn that he was reelected in 1945, 1949, 1953, and in 1957. As a tribute to his great public service and impartiality he received—both in 1953 and in 1957—the formal nomination of the Republican Party.

In 1951 Mr. Cashmore had declined to run as the Democratic candidate for the presidency of the New York City Council.

From 1946 until 1950 he served as Democratic leader of Kings County.

John Cashmore was well known as one of the few men serving on the city board of estimate thoroughly familiar with all of the many citywide items which confronted the board at its weekly meetings. As borough president he surrounded himself with competent engineers and lawyers to assist him in solving the many problems and carrying out the multitude of tasks which faced him.

A kind father, loving husband, a man of true stature in a community he was proud to call his home, the Honorable John Cashmore will be sorely missed by his loved ones and his many, many friends. He will long be remembered as "Mr. Brooklyn."

Fifteenth California Congressional District Opinion Poll on Vital Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting herewith the results of the 15th District opinion poll in which I recently requested the people of my district to participate giving me their opinion on 24 issues of vital importance to the United States and all its citizens.

It was gratifying to receive replies from people in every section and area of the 15th District which indicated to me that there is a wide and comprehensive interest in the vital questions and issues which this session of Congress may act upon.

It is interesting to note the large "no" vote on the current major controversial issues, namely, question No. 1, Youth Peace Corps; question No. 3, Medical aid under social security; question No. 5, Federal aid to education; question No. 6, Federal aid to education to include both private and public schools; question No. 7, Federal aid to education to include teachers salaries; and question No. 10, increase in minimum wage to $1.25 an hour.

It is good to know that the thousands of people who participated in this opinion poll are so well informed on the current and important issues before Congress.

The following are the results of the 15th District opinion poll which I am sure will be of interest to all Members of this Congress:

15th district questionnaire poll

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you favor the establishment of a Youth Peace Brigade to send young Americans abroad?	43.8	56.2
2. Should such service be considered as complete exemption from military service or Reserve training?	20.6	79.4
3. Do you favor a compulsory medical aid plan under social security?	26.4	73.6
4. Do you favor medical aid for the elderly under a plan which would permit all elderly people to benefit, regardless of social security coverage?	54.1	45.9
5. Do you favor Federal aid to education?	33.9	66.1
6. Should Federal aid to education include assistance to both public and private schools?	20.7	79.3
7. Should Federal aid to education include teachers' salaries?	19.7	80.3
8. Do you believe there is a missile gap between the United States and Russia?	38.4	61.6
9. Should the United States expend whatever funds are necessary to make an all-out effort to assure equality with Russian achievements in missile development and exploration of outer space?	65.1	34.9
10. Do you favor an increase in minimum wage to $1.25 an hour?	40.6	59.4
11. In your opinion, do we need stronger laws for labor union control?	91.3	8.7
12. Should the Federal Government increase unemployment compensation?	21.6	78.4
13. Do you believe full employment should be a responsibility of the Federal Government?	16.5	83.5
14. Should the Federal Government assist distressed areas where unemployment exceeds 6 percent of the labor available?	57.2	42.8
15. Should there be an excise tax reduction on leather goods, cosmetics, transportation, communications, and amusements?	66.5	33.5
16. Do you favor extension of the temporary Federal 1-cent tax increase on gasoline?	45.3	54.7
17. Do you believe that farm subsidies are necessary to maintain the agricultural economy?	18.5	81.5
18. Should Federal employees be permitted to form trade unions for the purpose of collective bargaining with the Federal Government?	10.0	90.0
19. Should our immigration laws be liberalized to increase the number of immigrants admitted to the United States each year?	17.4	82.6
20. Do you approve of the recent action in the House of Representatives to pack the Rules Committee?	22.7	77.3
21. Should Federal public housing be increased?	27.6	72.4
22. Do you approve the United Nations handling of the Congo situation?	66.1	33.9
23. Should the United Nations have authority to intervene in the civil affairs of a member nation?	30.8	69.2
24. Do you favor stronger civil rights legislation?	43.5	56.5

Grassroots Support of North Cascade Park Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Pacific Northwest is proud of its scenic resources that culminate in the forests, peaks, and glaciers of the Olympic Peninsula, Mount Rainier, and the North Cascades. This complex of spectacular terrain is unsurpassed anywhere and is one of the primary attractions that has enabled recreation to become a major economic resource in Washington State. Even without considering the economic value of this backdrop of American alps, such a magnificent heritage of scenery is one of the things that make our State a satisfying place in which to live.

The people of Washington State and of the Nation as a whole are deeply concerned about what happens to this scenic treasure house, especially to the North Cascades. They remember that a study of the area in the late thirties singled it out as a potential national park outranking all others in our national park system. Many of them feel that the North Cascades could become an integral part of a golden triangle of national parks, and thereby be reserved unspoiled for all generations of Americans to see and know and become proud of.

A time of decision for the area is at hand. So far the area has been splendidly protected by the U.S. Forest Service, which recently established the Glacier Peak Wilderness in the heart of the area. In the rapidly growing pressure of population upon resources and upon open space itself, however, we may have reached a point in our history where this unique resource needs firmer guarantees of protection and different specialized skills in administration and interpretation from those with which the Forest Service is charged under present national policy.

As I have made clear in the legislation I introduced in the previous Congress and in this one, I, myself, have not decided whether I think part of this great area should become a new national park. I personally know much of the area from having explored its wilderness myself and I know it to be outstanding, but this in itself is no reason for advocating a change in the area's administration. I am convinced, however, that there is public need for a comprehensive study of aspects of the region which

have not yet been given due consideration in the light of emerging needs. The Forest Service is ably staffed to study the area's economic potential, particularly with regard to its timber resources, and this the Forest Service has done, as well as to weigh some of the other multiple uses.

On the other hand the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service, both of them also public agencies but within the Department of the Interior, have additional skills that can be focused on this region in estimating its highest use in a changing future.

Before steps are taken that cannot be untaken in this region, I wish to see these special skills brought to bear. My bill would bring about a complementary study of this great region by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to submit evidence of the widespread grassroots support for this proposal. I have had prepared a tabulation of petitions urging an Interior Department study of the North Cascades. Between January 1960 and June 1 of this year, 21,669 signatures were obtained by the North Cascades Conservation Council. I should like to pay tribute to the council for its remarkable feat. It is not remarkable because it shows support for the park study, for this is the kind of reaction you would expect from people who value the grandeur of the Pacific Northwest. What makes it remarkable is that this group of signatures comes from a new and entirely volunteer grassroots group, no member of which has anything personal to gain from the enormous effort expended in trying to preserve this important part of America's natural beauty. Each member, however, has demonstrated something else that is beautiful in America—the willingness of citizens selflessly to sacrifice time and funds for a cause important to the Nation's interest.

Headquarters of the North Cascades Conservation Council is the home of its president, Dr. Patrick D. Goldsworthy, a University of Washington biochemist, who lives at 3215 East 103d in Seattle. The organization's sole financial support is the tiny sum of $2 per year its members pay in dues—$1 for spouse members. Although the council is only 4 years old, it already numbers nearly 1,000 members from all parts of the country.

The spread of interest in the North Cascades seems quite significant to me, Mr. Speaker, and also the intensity of interest right in the State of Washington itself, where you might expect the people to become inured to the beauty around them and to take for granted that it would always remain that way. I think that the 15,018 Washingtonians who have signed these petitions so far know that Washington will remain beautiful only if they take a hand in preserving that beauty. But the interest in the North Cascades is nationwide. For example I am happy to see that 616 people from Massachusetts also care. I hope we will always have unspoiled Cascades to attract them out our way. This will happen if enough people want it that way—and let their Government officials—administrative and legislative—know it.

The tabulation by States of those signing petitions follows:

NORTH CASCADES CONSERVATION COUNCIL IN COOPERATION WITH THE MOUNTAINEERS AND TRUSTEES FOR CONSERVATION

Tally 2 of the number of signatures in favor of having the North Cascade Mountains of Washington, from Stevens Pass to the Canadian border, studied by the Department of the Interior with the object of possibly recommending the establishment of a national park within this area. A total of 21,669 signatures have been collected on petitions No. 1 through No. 1251 from January 1960 to June 1961.

Tally by States:

Alabama	2
Alaska	11
Arizona	7
Arkansas	9
California	2,678
Colorado	119
Connecticut	202
Delaware	25
Florida	23
Georgia	12
Hawaii	43
Idaho	64
Illinois	299
Indiana	2
Iowa	61
Kansas	29
Kentucky	28
Louisiana	19
Maine	28
Maryland	49
Massachusetts	637
Michigan	102
Minnesota	229
Mississippi	0
Missouri	88
Montana	40
Nebraska	1
Nevada	28
New Hampshire	50
New Jersey	135
New Mexico	12
New York	387
North Carolina	60
North Dakota	5
Ohio	66
Oklahoma	4
Oregon	643
Pennsylvania	160
Rhode Island	25
South Carolina	1
South Dakota	3
Tennessee	64
Texas	13
Utah	30
Vermont	32
Virginia	38
Washington	15,018
Washington, D.C.	22
West Virginia	2
Wisconsin	34
Wyoming	30

Tally by Washington congressional districts:

No. 1, Seattle (plus)	761
No. 2	3,472
No. 3	178
No. 4	904
No. 5	1,290
No. 6	827
No. 7, Seattle (plus)	662
Seattle	6,916
Total in Washington	15,018

Address by Hon. Arthur J. Goldberg at the Dedication of the Klau Library, Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion, Cincinnati, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my good fortune to have been present in Cincinnati on June 3, 1961, at the dedication of the Klau Library of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion. All of us present were treated to an especially fine address by our Secretary of Labor, the Honorable Arthur J. Goldberg. It is with pleasure that I commend to the attention of our colleagues the Secretary's remarks upon that significant occasion:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF LABOR ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG AND DEDICATION OF LIBRARY OF HEBREW UNION COLLEGE-JEWISH INSTITUTE OF RELIGION, CINCINNATI, OHIO, JUNE 3, 1961

I am greatly honored and privileged to dedicate this new library of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion.

As an outstanding rabbinical school, this college-institute continues to demonstrate that fidelity to Judaism is also devotion to the moral heritage that informs our civilization.

This building will be a splendid repository of the learning of the past—a treasure house of the truths of a great religion and the convictions of a people. Within it will be a record of man's success and failure in grappling with his own nature, with reality, and with his own purpose and condition. History is filled with blind waste and magnificent triumph, with angry stupidity and dazzling discovery. In hours of trial a library offers us the opportunity to judge the results of past decisions.

It was Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., who said "Continuity with the past is a necessity, not a duty."

Libraries in particular and educational institutions in general make continuity with the past possible. And we are bound to the past, creatures of time, but free to look to a future we ourselves help to make.

I wonder, then, how it is that modern society fails to resist the impulse to relearn, often in more bitterness, lessons learned so bitterly in the past.

"Those who forget the past," said Santayana, "are doomed to repeat it." Are we today forgetting the past?

I raise this question at this time and in this place, because it seems particularly fitting to dedicate a monument to man's collective knowledge when voices are heard urging disengagement from history, withdrawal from the continuity of responsibility that has flowed from father to son in our free Nation.

These voices rejecting history are raised because of the genuine struggle of human conscience at a time of truly awesome responsibility. Good people are deeply troubled about man's course toward holocaust. They fear that a race of arms can end in the ravage of civilization.

We all stand in the shadows of the towering giant of nuclear power, the colossal bomb that can obliterate centuries. It is argued

by these men of good faith that the sole moral position for a moral people who possess this weapon is to unilaterally divest themselves of it.

This manifestation of pacifism, not new in history, is, of course, accentuated by the character of the nuclear weapon. But the necessity of continuity with the past requires an answer to evident questions.

Will unilateral abandonment of defensive arms deter aggression? Will the unilateral pledge of our own disengagement actually turn tyranny aside and guarantee universal peace with justice?

In pondering these questions, we might turn, for one place, to here, to a library. Contemporary history offers some comparative examples. Many of you will remember the Oxford oath era in Great Britain prior to the Second World War. Its feeling for peace, its rejection of war, its longing for order in the world's affairs were all emotions that good men could and did share.

This open commitment to disengagement did not stop Nazi aggression. I wondered then, and I do now, whether or not Hitler was encouraged by the policy of disengagement he sensed in the English people. Like every dictator, before and since, he incorrectly judged the stamina and will of a free people.

In this Nation, unlike some others, the argument to disarm unilaterally and to divest ourselves of nuclear capability does not enjoy the wide respectability of a movement. I believe that the President spoke for most Americans when he said: "Our arms do not prepare for war; they are efforts to discourage and resist the adventures of others that could end in war."

I am sure that in the light of the plain postwar record, everyone cognizant of fact and not deluded by propaganda—either of their own making or made for someone else's consumption—recognizes the sincerity and good faith of our efforts to achieve an enforcible ban on nuclear testing and genuine disarmament. I am sure that no one, except the propagandists and their victims, questions the good faith of our President, who at this very moment is on a mission of peace, not peace in our time but for all time.

Disengagement, however, takes many forms. There are those respected among us who recognize that unilateral disarmament in the face of the postwar history of totalitarian aggression is an invitation to increased aggression. But they also seek to disengage the Nation from the performance of other actions necessary to strengthen our alliances and maintain the free world.

It is the intellectual disengagement—this withdrawal of assent to the total demand that freedom makes upon us—that I wish to discuss here.

I am not implying that all intellectuals seek disengagement. On the contrary, the Harvard manifesto has, in our healthy and free society, brought forth a Princeton pronouncement. But nevertheless, there is indication of a current of intellectual disengagement in our Nation today.

I suggest to the intellectual seeking peace through disengagement that he ponder an activist path toward peace which we can all share. This path leads toward the completion of our own revolution in other free societies, and the making of a world order in which a balance of terror would lose its power. I would suggest to him the historical reminder that peace can only be attained in freedom, and that it is peace in freedom that we all seek and must work to attain.

The President, in the conduct of the foreign policy of his administration, has enunciated several concepts related to the pursuit of peace in freedom.

As a nation endowed by God with great resources and one of history's great examples of just government by law, we are charged with the responsibility to lead the free world. The President has aptly remarked: "This Nation was born of revolution and raised in freedom. And we do not intend to leave an open road to despotism."

Secondly, our whole history and purpose as a people makes it impossible for us to be neutral in our devotion to the cause of peace in freedom.

Thirdly, in terms of the world alliance we lead, the historical encouragement disengagement would give to those intent upon conquest, and the vacuum of responsibility it leaves in a world of growing nuclear mastery, makes it clear that a leader of freedom cannot disengage without leaving not only itself but all others allied with it the quick target of aggressive despotism.

Fourth, we welcome all allies devoted to peace in freedom. In this regard, I think we should all be clear—despite our own intellectual differences—that we respect the right of every nation to seek freedom and equality, order and independence in its own way, flying its own flag, charting its own course.

We support the revolution of peace and hope sweeping the world, and we offer that support, as the President stated, "regardless of which political or economic route they choose to freedom."

Fifth, we recognize the right of every Nation not charged with our responsibility or armed with our resources to pursue a policy of noncommitment, whether to us or any other power. Our alliance is one of voluntary commitment to peace in freedom. It is not cemented with force, not held together with the bonds of political domination and fear. We do not force nations to be our allies. And we resist efforts on the part of others to compel, coerce or subvert them to be their allies.

Finally, in this open posture of support for all nations seeking freedom, our sympathies are manifestly with those seeking to end injustice, tyranny and exploitation, anywhere in the world.

The volumes of history that will be contained in this library make it plain why this is so. Even before we were a nation, as a group of rebels seeking freedom we had the support of Lafayette, De Kalb, Kosciusko, Steuben, and others. They were brave men who crossed distant seas to help us fight for liberty. After we were a nation, we extended the hand of help to Louis Kossuth, Garibaldi, Mazzini, Carl Schurz, Lamartine, and others because they shared the ideals of our own Revolution. Even more recently, I recall with no sense of regret serving as a member of the Committee To Aid America by Aiding the Allies. In those dark hours of 1940, our Government welcomed and sheltered thousands of exiles from Europe.

It is clear that the idea of freedom has always been basic to our national policy—and with it, sympathy for those fighting for freedom.

We extend our full measure of sympathy and support to the true revolution and not the false one, to the revolution that seeks freedom and does not suppress it.

We know too well from the lessons of history that tyranny often seeks to disguise itself by the assertion of humane goals. For us, means as well as ends are important. And for us, while we recognize any nation's right to achieve a fashion of economic system of its own making, we do not concede the right in moral terms to fashion a political system which denies liberty, human dignity and the rights of man.

I believe that these concepts, which are basic to our President's foreign policy, deserve and command the support of all who believe in a democratic way of life.

Yet, as I read the manifestos being circulated recently, I find that while there is not disagreement with these principles there is a note of skepticism about our commitment to allow any nation to pursue its own social and economic path to peace and freedom. I believe this skepticism is totally unwarranted. Our words and deeds bear eloquent testimony to our total commitment to the just aspirations of people everywhere. This is what the President, speaking for all Americans, has said on this subject:

"Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and success of liberty.

"We stand for freedom. That is our conviction for ourselves—that is our only commitment to others. No friend, no neutral and no adversary should think otherwise. We are not against any man—or any nation—or any system—except as it is hostile to freedom.

"Asia, Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East * * * theirs is a revolution which we would support regardless of the cold war, and regardless of which political or economic route they choose to freedom."

The President's actions have been consistent with his words.

In the United Nations, we have voted against colonial powers even at the discomfiture of allies.

We have extended material and economic aid to other nations embarked on more sweeping reforms than those of Castro.

The downfall of dictatorships in Argentina, Colombia, and Venezuela was followed by American support for the democracies seeking to bring hope and security to their people.

Our quarrel with Castro, as the President stated, "is not over the people's drive for a better life. Our objection is to their domination by foreign and domestic tyrants. Cuban social and economic reform should be encouraged. Questions of economic and trade policy can always be negotiated. But Communist domination in this hemisphere can never be negotiated."

The situation we face is not that of social reform. Let us regard it clearly as the President describes it: "The menace of external Communist intervention and domination in Cuba." The real issue is the survival of freedom in this hemisphere.

I am sure that all men of good will are united in seeking a world in which genuine nonintervention in the struggle of nations to attain peace and freedom is practiced. But the dilemma facing us as a nation is that we who believe in nonintervention are confronted by a force that practices aggression in many forms.

Consider the words of the President: "They send arms, agitators, aid, technicians, and propaganda to every troubled area. But where fighting is required, it is usually done by others—by guerrillas striking at night, by assassins striking alone, by subversives and saboteurs and insurrectionists, who in some cases control whole areas inside of independent nations."

The basic dilemma in that kind of situation was described a little more than a century ago by John Stuart Mill:

"The doctrine of nonintervention," he wrote, "to be a legitimate principle of morality, must be accepted by all governments. The despots must consent to be bound by it as well as the free States. Unless they do, the profession of it by free countries comes to this miserable issue, that the wrong side

may help the wrong, but the right side must not help the right. Intervention to enforce nonintervention is always rightful, almost moral, if not always prudent. Though it be a mistake to give freedom to a people who do not value the boon, it cannot but be right to insist that if they do value it, they shall not be hindered from the pursuit of it by foreign coercion."

Today, in 1961, we must ask: Will the wrong continue unopposed to aid the wrong while the right declines to aid the right?

I submit these thoughts and questions in the spirit of good intention—not to try to create a pale unanimity of views but to encourage all Americans to consider the full responsibility we carry.

At the signing of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin remarked that he had been observing the painting of a sun on the chair in which George Washington sat. He said that it gave him happiness to know now that it was a rising and not a setting sun.

I think the world knows now that the light of freedom will rise over the exploited peoples of the world. They know that this Nation will commit its power, and its people, to the alliance for genuine social advancement in every nation. They know we stand for freedom and oppose tyranny, wherever it may appear, whatever form it may seek to shield itself from recognition.

It is that knowledge, and our own firm resolution, that will fix the course of history. It is in that spirit I dedicate this new monument to history today.

Italy Observes Two Anniversaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, on June 2, when the House was not in session, a significant anniversary for the free world was marked. Not only was the date the 15th anniversary of the establishment of the Republic of Italy, but the occasion was also the 100th anniversary of the gathering of the first Italian Parliament in 1861.

The people of Italy willingly and freely chose the republican form of government in 1946 for their future. In effect, this was a difficult and meaningful choice, for Italy, as a result of decisions made by her Fascist leaders some years before, had come to a state of chaos and anarchy by 1945. Different forces, some interested in the future of Italy, others interested in serving an alien master, were vying for control. The vote in 1946 was a vote for freedom and for the individual.

I have recently been studying some of the participation by Italy in the defense of the free world in recent years and I have been most impressed. Italy has rebuilt her own economy; Italy has encouraged programs in the interest of a West European and NATO defense system and Italy has taken a lead in looking into programs which would help ease the problems of underdeveloped nations.

The people of Italy have been challenged by hardship, by political, economic, social, and fiscal problems in their recent history. They have met that challenge and overcome it. They have worked hard to strengthen the democratic institutions in their country. On this 15th anniversary celebration, I believe the United States can join wholeheartedly in wishing the people of Italy many blessings in the years to come.

Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1962

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WM. J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 7, 1961

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, as many of those who were on the floor yesterday afternoon will recall, there were several moments of heated debate over the Reuss amendment which would have reduced the 1962 agricultural conservation program appropriation from $250 million to $150 million.

There was even some suggestion that this was a contest between the farmer on one hand, and the duck hunter on the other, because during the debate it was pointed out that the drainage of the wet lands would adversely affect the nesting place for ducks and geese and any effort to drain these lands would simply put more tillable land into production and still further increase surpluses.

Because of the lateness of the hour, many who would have participated in the debate under the 5-minute rule, relinquished their right for time, and such is the reason I am asking that my views be inserted in the RECORD on this amendment.

In the discussion yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Congressman REUSS, makes a point of the fact that the budget as submitted contained only $150 million for the 1962 agricultural conservation program appropriation. However this is not a true picture of the administration's position, because the records of the hearings clearly substantiate the fact that the budget for the Department when it left the Secretary's office contained $250 million for this program. Another point was made that the fertilizer and limestone producers would benefit greatly by the amounts spent for these materials, but no one took the time or went to the trouble to bring out the fact that strontium 90 that may be in the atmosphere is reduced or absorbed by the calcium contained in the limestone applied to crops under this program. This is an unfrequently mentioned but most vital byproduct of the appropriation for this program which may not have been anticipated or appreciated by many when this amendment was considered.

The Reuss amendment prevailed on a division vote of 107 to 65, but was later defeated on a rollcall vote of 196 to 184. During the interim between the division vote and the rollcall vote which preceeded final passage, the general feeling of those who supported the Reuss amendment was that they had voted for economy in the Department of Agriculture.

Although every Member is entitled to his own point of view, I wish to make it plain that any reduction in the agricultural conservation program appropriation is simply a case of being "penny wise and pound foolish," and is not true economy, for in reducing the appropriation to $150 million, after deducting the administrative and other costs, it would leave only about $108 million for farm payments. In other words it would cut payments to a million farmers but would not reduce the administrative expense. This would result in the program being made ineffective. It would not only reduce the number of participants, but would also curb the amount of payments in dollars and thus would reduce the program in two ways.

Under the program the farmer selects the practice which will fit his individual farm and for every dollar he receives in payment, he matches it with $1 of his own, plus his time and effort. Even if his wages are figured at $1 an hour, this would mean he puts up $2 for every dollar he receives in conservation payments.

Even though we have been working at conserving our soil and have been doing a remarkable job, yet every day, 365 days a year, 40 acres of good topsoil flows down the river and is forever lost as a part of the Mississippi Delta. This is also undoubtedly true for other watershed areas. Records prove that only one-third of our land is safeguarded adequately from loss or damage by destructive erosion. To meet the food and fiber needs of 1976, reliable estimates show we will need the production equivalent of over 200 million more acres—based on current yields. Since we simply do not have 200 million more cropland acres, this production must come from increased yields on existing cropland. This is true, even in spite of continual yearly losses of approximately 400,000 acres devastated by erosion, plus the loss of three times that amount through conversion of good farm land for urban, suburban, and industrial uses. It has been said by many scientists and careful observers that it is only the very thin layer of topsoil that stands between man and his starvation.

The American farmer is the steward of our soil and our water resources. In him is vested the responsibility of conserving and preserving these resources for the rest of the Nation. He cannot do it alone—he cannot insure our having food and water 15 years from now especially in view of the fact that he does not have, nor has he had for the past several years, equality in purchasing power.

We should all be very grateful that this amendment failed yesterday.